UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 100—PART 1

JANUARY 6, 1954, TO FEBRUARY 5, 1954

(PAGES 3 TO 1422)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1954

J
11
.R
v.100
pt.1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 100—PART 1

JANUARY 6, 1954, TO FEBRUARY 5, 1954
(PAGES 1 TO 1422)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1954

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
8-13-54

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1954

The 6th day of January being the day prescribed by Public Law 199, 83d Congress, 1st session, for the meeting of Congress, the 2d session of the 83d Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Let us lift our hearts in prayer.

Our Father God, who hath made and preserved us a nation, we thank Thee for new years and for new days, for new thoughts of Thee and for new hopes for a redeemed humanity and a cleansed earth. That hope is brightened and that faith is strengthened as we turn from all beside to an altar of dependence and contrition where, around our incompleteness, flows the completeness of the divine resources.

We pray Thy choicest blessings upon these servants of the Nation's welfare, who with renewed powers and restored souls return this day to the high tasks of this National Chamber of deliberation. To Thee we come with a solemn sense of our own inadequacy. With the dim lamps of our own devices we cannot find a sure and clear path through the tangled maze of this stricken generation. May no cherished resentments, no camouflaged selfishness, no small loyalties nor ingrained prejudices choke and clog the channels of our public service. Enlarge our spirits to meet the stupendous dimensions of these epic days.

O God, to whom the future belongs, use us as pioneers of a better world for ourselves and for all people. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler, Nebr.	Dirksen
Anderson	Byrd	Duff
Barrett	Carlson	Dworshak
Beall	Case	Eastland
Bennett	Chavez	Ellender
Bricker	Clements	Ferguson
Bridges	Cooper	Flanders
Bush	Cordon	Frear
Butler, Md.	Daniel	Fulbright
George	Kennedy	Pastore
Gillette	Kerr	Payne
Goldwater	Kilgore	Potter
Gore	Knowland	Purtell
Green	Kuchel	Robertson
Griswold	Langer	Russell
Hayden	Lehman	Saltonstall
Hendrickson	Lennon	Schoeppel
Hennings	Long	Smathers
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Hill	Malone	Smith, N. J.
Hoey	Martin	Sparkman
Holland	Maybank	Stennis
Humphrey	McCarran	Symington
Hunt	McCarthy	Thye
Jackson	McClellan	Watkins
Jenner	Millikin	Welker
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Wiley
Johnson, Tex.	Mundt	Williams
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Young
Kefauver	Neely	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LIST OF SENATORS, BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John J. Sparkman.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Barry M. Goldwater.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. William Fulbright.

California.—William F. Knowland and Thomas H. Kuchel.

Colorado.—Edwin C. Johnson and Eugene D. Millikin.

Connecticut.—Prescott Bush and William A. Purtell.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Allen Frear.

Florida.—Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers.

Georgia.—Walter F. George and Richard B. Russell.

Idaho.—Henry C. Dworshak and Herman Welker.

Illinois.—Paul H. Douglas and Everett M. Dirksen.

Indiana.—Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Guy M. Gillette.

Kansas.—Andrew F. Schoeppel and Frank Carlson.

Kentucky.—Earl C. Clements and John Sherman Cooper.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Margaret Chase Smith and Frederick G. Payne.

Maryland.—John M. Butler and J. Glenn Beall.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and John F. Kennedy.

Michigan.—Homer Ferguson and Charles E. Potter.

Minnesota.—Edward J. Thye and Hubert H. Humphrey.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John C. Stennis.

Missouri.—Thomas C. Hennings and Stuart Symington.

Montana.—James E. Murray and Mike Mansfeld.

Nebraska.—Hugh Butler and Dwight Griswold.

Nevada.—Pat McCarran and George W. Malone.

New Hampshire.—Styles Bridges and Robert W. Upton.

New Jersey.—H. Alexander Smith and Robert C. Hendrickson.

New Mexico.—Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson.

New York.—Irving M. Ives and Herbert H. Lehman.

North Carolina.—Clyde R. Hoey and Alton A. Lennon.

North Dakota.—William Langer and Milton R. Young.

Ohio.—John W. Bricker and Thomas A. Burke.

Oklahoma.—Robert S. Kerr and A. S. Mike Monroney.

Oregon.—Guy Cordon and Wayne Morse.

Pennsylvania.—Edward Martin and James H. Duff.

Rhode Island.—Theodore Francis Green and John O. Pastore.

South Carolina.—Burnet R. Maybank and Olin D. Johnston.

South Dakota.—Karl E. Mundt and Francis Case.

Tennessee.—Estes Kefauver and Albert Gore.

Texas.—Lyndon B. Johnson and Price Daniel.

Utah.—Arthur V. Watkins and Wallace F. Bennett.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Ralph E. Flanders.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

West Virginia.—Harley M. Kilgore and Matthew M. Neely.

Wisconsin.—Alexander Wiley and Joseph R. McCarthy.

Wyoming.—Lester C. Hunt and Frank A. Barrett.

SENATOR FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk the certificate of appointment of the Honorable ROBERT W. UPTON, of New Hampshire, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of my colleague, Senator Tobey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate will be read.

The certificate of appointment was read, and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of New Hampshire, I, Hugh Gregg, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint ROBERT W. UPTON a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Charles W. Tobey, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Hugh Gregg, and our seal hereto affixed at Concord, this 14th day of August, in the year of our Lord, 1953.

HUGH GREGG,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ENOCH D. FULLER,
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM OHIO

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present the certificate of appointment of THOMAS A. BURKE, to be a Senator from the State of Ohio, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of our colleague, Senator Taft.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate will be read.

The certificate of appointment was read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF OHIO,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Ohio, I, Frank J. Lausche, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint THOMAS A. BURKE a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Robert A. Taft, is filled by election, as provided by law.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the great seal of the State of Ohio to be affixed, at Columbus, this 13th day of October, in the year of our Lord, 1953.

FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] TED W. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the two Senators designate will come to the desk, the oath of office will be administered to them.

Thereupon, Mr. UPTON, escorted by Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. BURKE, escorted by Mr. BRICKER, respectively, advanced to the desk; and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President. [Applause.]

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 167), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 168), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 169), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian, unless otherwise ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it has been customary in the Senate not to transact any business, such as the introduction of bills and other matters, until after the President's state of the Union message has been delivered to the joint meeting of the two Houses. Following that precedent, it is not the purpose today to have the Senate consider any measures other than the resolution relating to the death of the late Chief Justice of the United States.

However, I have been asked by a number of Senators to make a brief statement as to the anticipated general program for the remainder of this week, so that Senators may make their arrangements, and so that certain committees which may desire to hold meetings may do so.

When the Senate adjourns today it will be until tomorrow at 12 o'clock, and then the Senate will proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the joint meeting, to hear the President's address. When the Senate returns to its Chamber from the joint meeting, it is proposed at that time to have a morning hour, with opportunity for the introduction of bills, resolutions, and other routine matters, and that then the Senate take a recess or adjourn until Monday.

On Monday it is expected that the President's message on agriculture and labor will be presented to the two Houses, coming to us by messenger.

Beginning on Monday we propose to hold, and I believe we shall hold, daily sessions thereafter.

I have already advised the Democratic leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], of certain bills which we propose to take up beginning on Monday. The order in which I shall state them is not necessarily the order in which they will be taken up, but I wish to give to the Senate advance notice of the program.

The bills are as follows: On page 9 of the calendar, Senate bill 987, Calendar No. 731, authorizing the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.;

House bill 1917, Calendar No. 730, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase;

Senate bill 2474, Calendar No. 719, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the founding of the city of New York;

Senate bill 2038, Calendar No. 617, to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government;

Senate bill 2457, Calendar No. 615, to authorize the Administrator of General Services and the Postmaster General to enter into building purchase contracts; to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease space for postoffice purposes, and for other purposes;

Senate Joint Resolution 1, Calendar No. 408, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; and

Senate bill 2150, Calendar No. 442, providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, because of the illness of the Sergeant at Arms, there is one matter which it is felt should be taken up at this time. I have conferred with the minority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas]. This action is deemed necessary in case any legal question should arise as to the authority of the Acting Sergeant at Arms in connection with obtaining a quorum, or in connection with other duties of that office.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, wishes to present a communication from the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I send to to the desk a communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate designating a special Deputy Sergeant at Arms to serve for a limited period, and ask that it be read.

The communication was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
January 2, 1954.

In accordance with authority conferred on me by Senate resolution agreed to December 17, 1889 (Senate Journal 47, 51–1, December 17, 1889), I hereby appoint C. A. Bottolfsen a special Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate for the period from January 2, 1954, to February 15, 1954, to perform in my absence any and all duties required of or devolving upon the Sergeant at

Arms of the United States Senate by law or by the rules or orders of the Senate.

FOREST A. HARNESS,
Sergeant at Arms, United States Senate.

DEATH OF CHIEF JUSTICE FRED M. VINSON

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Supreme Court of the United States, which will be read and will lie on the table.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C. September 9, 1953.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am directed by the Supreme Court of the United States to notify the Senate, through you, that the Chief Justice of the United States died in this city on Tuesday, September 8, at 3:15 a. m.

I have the honor to be,
Yours very respectfully,
HUGO L. BLACK,
Senior Associate Justice, Acting
Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk a resolution for which I request immediate consideration, and I ask that the resolution be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 170) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Fred M. Vinson, late the Chief Justice of the United States.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the Supreme Court and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, since last we assembled here the Commonwealth of Kentucky has suffered a profound sorrow and the Nation has sustained an irreparable loss in the untimely death, on September 8, 1953, of Fred M. Vinson, the Chief Justice of the United States.

Most of us knew him, many of us regarded him as an intimate friend, and all of us are familiar with the brilliant record of public service rendered by this great and gifted Kentuckian, who had the unique distinction of having served in all three branches of our Government—in the legislative branch as the Representative of the Ninth Congressional District of Kentucky—later the Eighth; in the executive branch as Director of Economic Stabilization, Federal Loan Administrator, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and as Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and in the judicial branch as Associate Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, as Chief Judge of the United States Emergency Court of Appeals, and finally as Chief Justice of the United States, in which capacity he presided over the Supreme Court of the United States during the last 7 years of his life.

As a friend and admirer of Fred Vinson over a period of 30 years, I knew him as a realist, endowed with a fine mind, clear and decisive vision, boundless energy, a genial personality, and an immense fund of commonsense. Because of his years of active interest, observation, and broad experience in Government service, I venture to say that by the time he reached the pinnacle of his career as the 13th Chief Justice of the United States, he had a practical working knowledge of government equaled by few, if any, of his predecessors. Courageously, constructively, unsparingly, and unselfishly, Fred Vinson devoted his splendid and versatile talents—as legislator, administrator, and jurist—to the progress and welfare of his State and Nation. Happily, but as so rarely happens, Fred Vinson reaped while he lived every honor that a grateful citizenry could bestow upon him in recognition of his matchless loyalty, impeccable integrity, and sound achievements. Throughout his long and arduous career of public service, Fred Vinson never lost sight of the fact that public office is a public trust; and no occupant of public office ever more clearly realized that the real and lasting compensation derived from public service stems from the understanding, appreciation, and approval of one's efforts by the friends and well-wishers who placed their confidence in him and depended on him to meet intelligently and fearlessly the obligations and to discharge justly the duties and responsibilities of the office entrusted to him. Fred Vinson died "poor of purse," but he left a priceless and shining heritage to his sons and an inspiring example to young Americans everywhere who choose to serve God and country on the high and noble plane Fred Vinson attained.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a tribute to the late Chief Justice of the United States by a former majority leader of the Senate, Hon. Scott Lucas, of Illinois.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORY OF CHIEF JUSTICE FRED M. VINSON

It was years ago when I first met this sage;
My service in Congress was youthful in age,
But a friendly hand from this Kentucky great
Was a straw in the wind which measured my fate.

And, all through the years since that meeting of ours,
Our friendship grew stronger with the passing hours.
And, now, at a time when our freedom is low,
This stalwart so true is commanded to go.

It seems cruel and strange that a man so just,
Should leave us untimely when needed so much.
And, yet, who are we, who are children of chance,
To question the sting of the Almighty's lance?

For, in his life, God planted a seed,
That will grow green grass and never a weed.
And he leaves, as he goes to his home on the hill,
A void in our life that is so hard to fill.

And, now he's at rest in a new-found grave,
The coil is removed from this noble so brave;
From out of this slumber, so shrouded with clay,
Burn the lights of the just from his deeds of the day.

In this silent home of everlasting sleep
Lies the cross of faith Americans must keep.
In death, as in life, he chants from freedom's shore,
O blessed Republic, bloom forevermore.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join my colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky, in expressing the regret and sorrow of the people of Kentucky over the passing of the late Chief Justice of the United States, Fred Vinson.

The sorrow and sense of loss are not limited to his native State of Kentucky. They are felt by the people of the entire Nation.

The career of Fred Vinson is well known to practically all Americans. It was a varied and remarkable career, characterized by hard work, steady growth, and a determination to master every position to which he was called. He possessed a unique capacity to work with his colleagues and associates. This unusual ability in the field of debating and conciliating issues, and in arriving at a synthesis of judgment was best demonstrated, perhaps, in his service as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States at a very difficult time in history.

In his own State he was known as a man of integrity, warmhearted and generous, loyal to his friends and the community in which he lived. He exemplified in the finest way devotion to his wife and family. His love of country transcended party and personal ambition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Chief Justice of the United States, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 7, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1954

This being the day fixed by Public Law 199, 83d Congress, enacted pursuant to the 20th amendment to the Constitution, for the meeting of the 2d session of the 83d Congress, the Members of the House of Representatives of the 83d Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Speaker, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose spiritual nature we cannot define and whose supreme sovereignty we cannot deny, in Thy divine keeping and control are the coming in and the going out of all our days.

Hitherto Thou hast blessed us and we have been the beneficiaries of a bountiful

providence which never withholds from us anything that is needful.

Grant that daily, during this new session of Congress, we may enter the sacred retreat of prayer and be inspired with a clear and commanding vision of Thy holy will for ourselves and all mankind.

May our President, our Speaker, and the Members of this legislative body be endowed and encouraged with a vivid sense of Thy guiding presence and sustaining power as they respond to the high vocation of leadership in the affairs of government.

Hear us as we bow in adoration and unite in offering unto Thee the prayer of our Saviour, the Prince of Peace:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.

Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 167

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Senate Resolution 168

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Senate Resolution 169

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian, unless otherwise ordered.

RESIGNATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a Member of Congress:

AUGUST 13, 1953.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of New Jersey my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Sixth District of New Jersey, to take effect 12 o'clock midnight.

Yours sincerely,

CLIFFORD P. CASE.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll to determine whether or not a quorum is present.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following members answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

Abernethy	Allen, Ill.	Angell
Adair	Andersen,	Arends
Addonizio	H. Carl	Ashmore
Albert	Andresen,	Aspinall
Alexander	August H.	Auchincloss
Allen, Calif.	Andrews	Ayres
Bailey	Frelinghuysen	McCulloch
Baker	Friedel	McDonough
Bates	Fulton	McIntire
Beamer	Gamble	McMillan
Becker	Garmatz	McVey
Belcher	Gary	Machrowicz
Bender	Gathings	Mack, Wash.
Bennett, Fla.	Gavin	Madden
Bennett, Mich.	Gentry	Magnuson
Bentley	George	Mahon
Bentsen	Golden	Mailliard
Berry	Goodwin	Marshall
Betts	Gordon	Martin, Iowa
Bishop	Graham	Mason
Boggs	Granahan	Matthews
Boland	Grant	Meader
Bolling	Green	Merrill
Bolton, Frances P.	Gregory	Merrow
	Gross	Metcalf
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gubser	Miller, Kans.
	Gwinn	Miller, Md.
Bonin	Hagen, Calif.	Miller, Nebr.
Bonner	Hagen, Minn.	Mills
Bosch	Hale	Mollohan
Bow	Haley	Morano
Bowler	Halleck	Morgan
Boykin	Hand	Moss
Bramblett	Harden	Multer
Bray	Hardy	Mumma
Brooks, Tex.	Harris	Murray
Brown, Ga.	Harrison, Nebr.	Neal
Brown, Ohio	Harrison, Va.	Nelson
Brownson	Harrison, Wyo.	Nicholson
Broyhill	Hart	Norblad
Buchanan	Harvey	Norrell
Budge	Hays, Ark.	Oakman
Burdick	Hays, Ohio	O'Brien, Ill.
Burleson	Hébert	O'Brien, Mich.
Bush	Heller	O'Brien, N. Y.
Byrd	Herlong	O'Hara, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Heselton	O'Hara, Minn.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hess	O'Neill
Camp	Hiestand	Osmers
Campbell	Hill	Ostertag
Canfield	Hillelson	Passman
Cannon	Hillings	Patman
Carlyle	Hinshaw	Patten
Carnahan	Hoeven	Patterson
Carrigg	Hoffman, Ill.	Pelly
Cederberg	Hoffman, Mich.	Perkins
Chatham	Holifield	Pfost
Chelf	Holmes	Philbin
Chenoweth	Holt	Phillips
Chiperfield	Hope	Pilcher
Church	Horan	Pillion
Clardy	Hosmer	Poage
Clevenger	Howell	Poff
Cole, Mo.	Hruska	Polk
Colmer	Hunter	Preston
Condon	Hyde	Price
Coon	Ikard	Priest
Cooper	Jackson	Prouty
Corbett	James	Rabaut
Cotton	Jarman	Radwan
Coudert	Javits	Rains
Cretella	Jenkins	Ray
Crosser	Jensen	Rayburn
Crumpacker	Johnson, Calif.	Reams
Cunningham	Jonas, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
Curtis, Mass.	Jonas, N. C.	Reed, Ill.
Curtis, Mo.	Jones, Ala.	Reed, N. Y.
Curtis, Nebr.	Jones, Mo.	Rees, Kans.
Dague	Jones, N. C.	Regan
Davis, Ga.	Judd	Rhodes, Ariz.
Davis, Tenn.	Karsten, Mo.	Rhodes, Pa.
Davis, Wis.	Kean	Richards
Dawson, Utah	Kearney	Riehlman
Deane	Kearns	Riley
Dempsey	Keating	Rivers
Derounian	Kee	Roberts
Devereux	Kelly, N. Y.	Robeson, Va.
D'Ewart	Keogh	Robsion, Ky.
Dies	Kersten, Wis.	Rodino
Dingell	Kilburn	Rogers, Colo.
Dodd	Kilday	Rogers, Fla.
Dollinger	King, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Dolliver	King, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.
Donohue	Kirwan	Roosevelt
Dorn, N. Y.	Klein	Sadlak
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Saylor
Doyle	Knox	Schenck
Durham	Krueger	Scherer
Eberharter	Laird	Scott
Edmondson	Landrum	Scrivner
Elliott	Lane	Scudder
Ellsworth	Lanham	Secrest
Engle	Lantaff	Seely-Brown
Evins	Latham	Selden
Feighan	LeCompte	Shafer
Fenton	Lesinski	Sheehan
Fine	Long	Shelley
Fisher	Lovre	Sheppard
Forand	Lucas	Short
Ford	Lyle	Shuford
Forrester	McCarthy	Sieminski
Fountain	McConnell	Sikes
Frazier	McCormack	Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.	Whitten
Small	Thornberry	Wickersham
Smith, Kans.	Tollefson	Widnall
Smith, Miss.	Trimble	Wier
Smith, Va.	Tuck	Wigglesworth
Smith, Wis.	Utt	Williams, Miss.
Spence	Van Pelt	Williams, N. Y.
Springer	Van Zandt	Willis
Staggers	Velde	Wilson, Calif.
Stauffer	Vinson	Wilson, Ind.
Steed	Vorys	Wilson, Tex.
Stringfellow	Vursell	Winstead
Sutton	Wainwright	Withrow
Taber	Walter	Wolcott
Talle	Wampler	Wolverton
Taylor	Warburton	Yates
Teague	Watts	Yorty
Thomas	Weichel	Young
Thompson, La.	Westland	Younger
Thompson, Mich.	Wharton	Zablocki
	Wheeler	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 392 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 19, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law, showing the election of the Honorable WILLIAM H. NATCHER as a Representative-elect to the 83d Congress from the 2d Congressional District of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Garrett L. Withers, has been received and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DECEMBER 2, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law for the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., as a Representative-elect to the 83d Congress from the 6th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Clifford P. Case, has been received from the secretary of state of New Jersey, and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DECEMBER 2, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law for the Honorable GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB as a Representative-elect to the 83d Congress from the 24th Congressional District of the State of California, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Norris Poulson, has been received from the secretary of state of California, and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

OCTOBER 26, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law for the Honorable LESTER R. JOHNSON as a Representative-elect to the 83d Congress from the 9th Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Merlin Hull, has been received from the secretary of state of Wisconsin and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Messrs. NATCHER, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LIPSCOMB, and JOHNSON of Wisconsin appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS AT ANY TIME TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, January 7, 1954, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 394) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

NOTIFICATION OF SENATE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 395), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 396), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

THIRTY-FOURTH REPORT FOR LEND-LEASE OPERATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office on September 28, 1953, and said to contain the Thirty-fourth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations for the year ending December 31, 1952.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 233)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
September 24, 1953.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Thirty-fourth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations covering the calendar year of 1952.

Section 5 (b) of the act of March 11, 1941 (Public Law 11, 77th Cong., 1st sess.) provides:

The President from time to time, but not less frequently than once every 90 days, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this act.

This requirement was generally observed during the years of World War II when lend-lease operations were in full swing. However, since the end of the war, it has been found expedient to submit these reports to the Congress at greater intervals. I believe that the Congress should be kept informed on lend-lease activities and that, under existing circumstances, this can be done satisfactorily through yearly reports.

One of the important remaining lend-lease functions is the collection of payments due under various international agreements. For example, the lend-lease settlement agreements call for the eventual payment to the United States of a total of $1,574,534,330.31 plus interest. According to figures supplied by the Department of the Treasury as of December 31, 1952, the United States has received $429,020,540.49 from debtor governments under lend-lease settlement agreements. This figure comprises payment in dollars totaling $322,052,260.18, local currency payments to the equivalent of $30,067,994.38, the acquisition of real property and improvements thereto amounting to the equivalent of $2,408,214.43, and the assumption of claims by debtor governments to a total value of approximately $74,492,071.50. These figures do not include the lend-lease silver accounts or sums paid the United States by other governments for lend-lease supplies or services received on a cash reimbursable basis.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

(Enclosure: Thirty-fourth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations.)

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

AUGUST 17, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the office of the Clerk on August 17, 1953, said to contain the Report to Congress on the mutual-security program for the 6 months ended June 30, 1953.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM (H. DOC. NO. 226)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the report on the mutual security program covering operations during the 6 months ended June 30, 1953, in furtherance of the purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended.

In the mutual security program we find tangible expression of our belief that the safety and self-interest of this Nation are inextricably tied in with the security and well-being of other free nations.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 17, 1953.*

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

SEPTEMBER 24, 1953.

Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, established by section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to be effective as of this date.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

APPOINTMENT TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, September 24, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Attached hereto is a letter from the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN resigning as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 712 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

Sincerely,

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 220, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 3, 1953, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did, on September 14, 1953, appoint as members of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries the following leaders representing labor, business and professional, and agriculture, from private life: Walter Cenerazzo, president, Watchmakers Union, Waltham, Mass.; John E. Galvin, chairman of the board, Ohio Steel Foundry Co., Lima, Ohio; Herschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange, Columbus, Ind.

And the following as advisory members of the Commission who have been or who are Members of the 82d or 83d Congress:

Hon. Harry L. Towe, New Jersey; Hon. Hardie Scott, Pennsylvania; Hon. Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, your committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 12:30 o'clock p. m., January 7, 1954, to a joint session of the two Houses.

SERGEANT AT ARMS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 14, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I submit herewith, effective at the close of business today, my resignation as Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives, which additional duty I assumed pursuant to House Resolution 323, dated July 8, 1953, 83d Congress.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT OF WILLIAM R. BONSELL AS SERGEANT AT ARMS

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that, pursuant to the provisions of section 208 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, he did on September 15, 1953, appoint William R. Bonsell, of the State of Pennsylvania, to act temporarily as Sergeant at Arms until the House chooses a person for that office.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted (at the request of Mr. CANNON) to Mrs. SULLIVAN, for 10 days, on account of a death in her immediate family.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 184) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 7, 1954, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and remembering the terrific jams we have had upon the floor upon the occasion of appearances by the President of the United States at joint sessions of the Congress, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders the Chair announces that on tomorrow the doors immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other.

No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House during the joint session tomorrow who does not have the privilege of the floor.

THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure on this occasion to address the House on a most pleasant subject to me, one that is truly noncontroversial and nonpolitical, an exception to my usual procedure, perhaps.

Before addressing myself to the subject, however, I want to extend to my Republican friends—and I think I speak the sentiments of the Democratic Members—our very best wishes for a happy and, outside of politics, a most successful new year, and to my Democratic colleagues I extend my very best wishes for a happy and, including politics, a most successful new year.

Today is the first time that the Congress has met on January 6. Today is the birthday of an outstanding American, one who is a distinguished Member of this body. I think it is well to pause and pay our respects to the living as we do on occasion pay our respects to the great Americans of yesterday.

The gentleman I have in mind is a Texan by birth, but by his contributions to our country's progress, both in time of peace and in time of war, he is a citizen of the entire United States.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I take great pride in stating to the gentleman that Mr. RAYBURN was born in the great State of Tennessee.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend is right. I apologize to the people of Tennessee for my unintentional error; however, he is also a Texan by heritage, tradition, and everything else. I accept the correction. He was born in Tennessee, but I think everyone will admit that while he loves Tennessee his whole life has been identified with Texas and his primary love is there.

In any event he is more than a Tennessean or a Texan. He is a son of Massachusetts, he is a son of every other one of the States of the Union. We claim him as our own due to the high regard we have for him, not only personally but officially, and for the great contributions he has made, as I said, in time of war and in time of peace in the service and progress of our country.

I think it can be safely said that while he is one of the great citizens of our country, he is the No. 1 son today, and has been for some years, of Texas—I do not think any Texan will contradict that—and I know no other American in any other of the 47 States of the Union will contradict that.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with everything the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has said and wish to congratulate Mr. RAYBURN on his birthday. I would like to remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Constitution provides that the Congress shall meet on January 3 of each year unless another date is fixed by law. Is it not a fact that in view of the fact that January 3 this year came on Sunday, the leaders, through the generosity of our distinguished friends on the other side, actually took into consideration in fixing a date for the meeting of this Congress the fact that today is the birthday of our distinguished friend, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is an inference the Republican leadership will not challenge.

SAM RAYBURN has been a Member of this body for many years. He is near and dear to the hearts and minds of everyone who has ever served with him. Between SAM RAYBURN and myself there has been the relationship of leadership in the Democratic Party since 1940. Our friendship and our feelings for each other are the same underneath the surface as they are on the surface. On a number of occasions, and I repeat today, I have referred to him as a man with the heart of gold. I know I speak the sentiments of all of my colleagues with-

out regard to party in extending to SAM RAYBURN our congratulations on this, his birthday anniversary, and our very best wishes and our sincere hopes that God, in His infinite wisdom, will continue to shower upon him for many years to come an abundance of his choicest blessings.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield gladly to the leader of the Texas delegation.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, speaking for the Texas delegation and at their request, I want to join in wishing our distinguished senior Member a very happy birthday, and many happy returns of the day. We all know the spot he occupies in our hearts.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I gladly yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, for myself and for the Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, and for all of the Members on our side, may I say that we join in congratulating the gentleman from Texas, our warm, close, personal friend, SAM RAYBURN, upon this, his birthday. We also wish for him many more years of happiness and a certain kind of success upon which I shall not elaborate because it is obvious that a slight implication has struck home. But certainly we want him to have many more happy birthdays. As one who had something to do with the selection of this date, January 6, for our meeting, may I say that we did take into consideration the fact that it was SAM RAYBURN'S birthday, and I think it might also be said that as an evidence of his humility he really would have desired that we not meet until tomorrow so that he might have been spared these words that are spoken today. I did not have any ulterior purpose in going along with this suggestion of meeting today because it was SAM RAYBURN'S birthday, because I recognize that things being as they are I may have to get along with him, and I am quite sure we will get along, as a matter of fact. In a serious vein, it has been a pleasure through all the years that I have been here, whether on the majority or minority side, to work with SAM RAYBURN because he is always fair; he is always helpful; he is always considerate. He always wants to vote to adjourn a Republican Congress right early because he says, "Nothing good can come of it," and I always have to dispute that. But, in any event, this is a happy day for him, and because it is a happy day for him, it is a happy day for all of us.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate very much the remarks made by my friend, the majority leader, and I know that the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], representing not only his own thoughts and sentiments but those of the Republican Party in the House, will bring more happiness to SAM RAYBURN, and that the feeling of all of us for him on this day, and on all days throughout the many years that I hope lie ahead of him, will be one of the most treasured memories of his life.

Mr. Speaker, to SAM, I again extend to you the congratulations and the best wishes of all your colleagues.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the warm words just uttered will always mean much to me. They will mean much to my family and they will mean much to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Texas who, through 21 elections, have stood by me with a loyalty unsurpassed in political annals. I am grateful in my appreciation of these words.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD regarding our dear friend from Texas, SAM RAYBURN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege, as chairman of the Oklahoma delegation in the House, to place in the RECORD the following resolution adopted unanimously today by the Oklahoma delegation:

Whereas today is the birthday of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, minority leader and former Speaker of the House; and

Whereas the great State of Oklahoma joins the Nation in commending this great American upon his distinguished service to his country through nearly two generations; and

Whereas this great Texan who makes his home just south of the border of Oklahoma and is affectionately regarded by the people of Oklahoma as ex officio Congressman at Large from Oklahoma, is deeply appreciated by our State for the service he has given to the people of Oklahoma as well as to the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma delegation in the House extends to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN its best wishes and its warm greetings on this day, the anniversary of his birth.

Unanimously adopted this 6th day of January 1954.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish a happy birthday to our beloved friend, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and I congratulate him. I congratulate him not because he has lived 72 years, for many people have done that, but because as he reaches the age of 72 years he is still growing in mind and spirit and in wisdom, and has chosen to share his great heart, mind, and wisdom with the American people.

He could no longer seek honor, for that he has had many years. It therefore must be that he seeks only to serve a people and a country he loves and respects.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the greatest Americans in this or any other age, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN from the State of Texas. Mr. RAYBURN is not regarded as the Representative of the Fourth District from the State of Texas, but as a truly great representative of this entire Nation. He belongs to the ages.

Although I have not had the good fortune to enjoy the friendship and acquaintance of SAM RAYBURN for very long, being myself a relatively newcomer to the House of Representatives, I have known of his great service to this country as a Member of Congress and have admired and respected him as a man and as a statesman for many years. In the past year he has been most helpful to me with his counsel. He has borne aloft the standards of the Democratic Party and in my judgment is largely responsible for the great humanitarian works of the Democratic administration for the past 20 years. He is admired and respected by Republicans and Democrats alike as probably no other man has ever been and the great State of Texas can well be proud of her son, SAM RAYBURN, statesman.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy indeed that the opening day of this second half of the 83d Congress was set in connection with the birthday of a distinguished colleague, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. These 7 years that I have now been a Member of this House have been much more pleasant and more profitable in every way because of the extension of understanding, gracious and wise council and friendship by this typical and great American, your friend and my friend, SAM RAYBURN. May he continue to give honor and distinction to each and all of us by continuing for many more happy birthdays as a Member of this great legislative body is my wish and prayer.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, as one of the newer Members of this body I, too, wish to express my congratulations and good wishes to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN on the anniversary of his birthday. Long before I was elected to represent West Virginia's Sixth District in Congress I formed a great admiration and acquired a deep respect for the gentleman from Texas. I first met him when he visited a session of the West Virginia Legislature in 1947. During the past year I have had the opportunity to serve in the House of Representatives with our beloved colleague and distinguished minority leader, and my respect and admiration for him have never ceased to grow.

It is not within the power of every man to build for himself a great shaft of granite or to engrave his name upon a plate of bronze; but it is possible for each of us to plant an everblooming flower in the hearts of those with whom we come in contact—a flower which will continue to shed its fragrance throughout all eternity. SAM RAYBURN has done this.

I hope that this new anniversary will bring to Mr. RAYBURN a deeper realization of the profound regard which all Americans hold for him. A native son of Tennessee, an adopted son of Texas—yet all America knows and loves him. May God's richest blessings rest upon his life, and may the allwise Creator give to each of us the happy privilege of being present with SAM RAYBURN on many future anniversaries.

I join with the poet in saying:

Count your garden by the flowers,
Never by the leaves that fall;
Count your life by the sunny hours,
Not remembering clouds at all;
Count your nights by stars, not shadows,
Count your days by smiles, not tears;
And on this, your happy birthday,
Count your age by friends, not years.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McGREGOR (at the request of Mr. McCULLOCH), on account of official business.

Mr. DEROUNIAN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), on account of a death in the family.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for 2 days, on account of official business.

Mr. MACK of Illinois (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. CHUDOFF (at the request of Mr. GREEN), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. DONOVAN (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), for 1 week to 10 days, on account of illness.

Mrs. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. CANNON), for 10 days, on account of a death in the family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WOLVERTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROYHILL.

Mr. D'EWART.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska.

Mr. BENDER in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. HELLER in two instances.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. YORTY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas.

Mr. LYLE.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Mr. RODINO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in two instances.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRED M. VINSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication which he received on September 9, 1953, from Justice Hugo L. Black, senior Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, concerning the death of the late Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Fred M. Vinson.

The Clerk read the communication, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., September 9, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am directed by the Supreme Court of the United States to notify the House of Representatives, through you, that the Chief Justice of the United States died in this city on Tuesday, September 8, at 3:15 a. m.

I have the honor to be
Yours very respectfully,
HUGO L. BLACK,
Senior Associate Justice, Acting Chief Justice of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 397) and ask that the Clerk read only the first two paragraphs thereof.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Chief Justice of the United States.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and to the Supreme Court and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the late Chief Justice.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word before the remainder of the resolution is read. I was a Member of the House of Representatives when Fred Vinson came here, a young man who we all knew at that time was a man of great promise. His friendship and mine began immediately upon his coming here and lasted throughout his useful and wonderful life. Frankly, I do not know how I am going to get along without Fred Vinson. Since his retirement from the House of Representatives through all the various positions that he occupied, and lastly that of Chief Justice of the United States, he and I alone spent an evening together at least once in 2 weeks and many times once in each week. He was one of those men that you never tire of. I think he had the most unfailing judgment of any man I have ever known.

There are a great many people in the world who have a lot of sense but that sense does not do them a great deal of good unless they have judgment. As I say, I think he had the most unfailing judgment about political, legal, social, and other problems of any man it has been my privilege to be associated with throughout the years.

Again, I want to express to his family my deep sympathy. I made a long, hard trip into the mountains of Kentucky to be at the place where he is resting. There are few men I have ever known that I would have made that trip for, but to me his friendship was an enriching treasure, in the memory of which I will not grow old.

He made a great Chief Justice. He left his mark on the legislative, on the administrative, and on the judicial branches of this Government. His contribution of unselfishness and wisdom to this Republic and all for which it stands was, in my opinion, as high as any contribution made by any other man in the long history of this great Republic.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Fred Vinson meant to me the loss of one of my very first friends in Washington.

When I first came to the Capitol in 1935, my family met the Vinsons as neighbors at the Wardman Park Hotel. As strangers to Washington it was a great comfort to have the friendship of Fred and his wife, Roberta, together with their two fine boys, Fred, Jr., and Jimmy.

For us it was an especially happy relationship since the Vinsons' younger son was the same age as our own twins, Patricia and Charles.

Our respect and affection for the Vinson family grew with the passing years and my admiration for Fred Vinson deepened as I watched his work in the Congress where he served with such high distinction as an outstanding member of the great Committee on Ways and Means.

Fred Vinson was a serious student of government who possessed a solid comprehension of the difficult legislative problems facing the Nation during the period he served as a Congressman.

But Fred Vinson was a man with a fine sense of proportion.

I well recall that, beyond carrying his heavy responsibilities of public office, he was a good father, and he equipped himself with a working knowledge of such things as the batting average of every major league baseball player because that was a subject close to the hearts of his sons.

While such genuine humanity endeared Fred Vinson to his friends on the Washington scene, his reputation among the home folks in Kentucky was no less secure.

It was my pleasure a few years back to address a Republican meeting at Ashland, and there I found that people, without regard for politics, respected and admired Fred Vinson in his home community.

As the years passed, Fred was called upon to move from his duties in the House to new and varied assignments within the administration. The times were trying and the responsibilities which our former colleague was asked to assume were heavy and confining.

Yet it was typical of the man that regardless of station Fred Vinson remained the same fine, friendly person we had known in those earlier years.

The title of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States is an honor which has been bestowed on few Americans.

I am glad it came to our beloved friend.

But I am not unmindful of the fact that had he been so inclined, Fred Vinson could have left public life for far more remunerative pursuits as a private citizen.

Instead, he chose to devote his remaining years as a servant of his country at heavy financial sacrifice.

He was a man dedicated to the public service, but his legacy to us is great. It is that of a great friend whose example of citizenship, service, and, not the least, deep paternal devotion will be a continuing inspiration to all who knew him.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who desire to do so may extend their remarks on the life and services of Fred Vinson at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I could not fail to embrace the opportunity to join with many of my colleagues in raising my voice in brief but very sincere tribute to the life, character, and public service of Hon. Fred M. Vinson.

It was my privilege to enjoy a very close association and warm friendship with him throughout my period of service in Congress. He and I served side by side as members of the Committee on Ways and Means for many years and worked together very closely on all important legislation considered by that committee during that time.

He was always tolerant and considerate and enjoyed the greatest degree of confidence and affection of his colleagues. His keen intellect and penetrating understanding of the many difficult and complicated problems coming before our committee enabled him to make an outstanding contribution to all legislation receiving his attention.

He was a man of splendid educational and mental attainments and possessed the highest attributes of character and was devoted to public service. His great achievement in all three branches of our Federal Government will always stand as a great tribute to him.

I join with other good friends in conveying my deepest sympathy to his dear wife and two fine sons and assure them that his host of friends share with them the great loss they have sustained.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, although he hailed from eastern Kentucky, Judge Vinson lived in the hearts of legions of friends and relatives in the tri-State area.

To the citizens of this locality his genial personality, his effectiveness as a public servant, and his success as a leader of men will long live in the memories of those who knew him as friend and neighbor.

West Virginia joins Kentucky in paying tribute to a great statesman and in extending sympathy to his family.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I was stunned to learn of the untimely and unfortunate passing of my dear friend, Chief Justice Fred Vinson, of Kentucky. The Nation can ill afford to lose a man of his Christian principles, integrity, wisdom, industry, and leadership during these perilous days in which we find ourselves.

He made an outstanding contribution to America in the House of Representatives from Kentucky, as a Federal district judge, a wartime administrator in many difficult assignments, as Secretary of the Treasury, and as Chief Justice of the United States.

In my opinion, Chief Justice Vinson did more to restore the faith and confidence of the American people in the judicial branch of our Government than any other man during my lifetime, especially when he called the Supreme Court, which he so ably headed, into extraordinary session in the Rosenberg case. That very wise and judicial decision and the dispatch with which it was reached shall stand as a perpetual monument to his everlasting glory.

The Nation has lost a great American and Kentucky has lost a stalwart, faithful son. I extend to his dear wife and all of his family my deep and sincere sympathy. May the good Lord bless them and keep them, may He cause His bright and glorious countenance to shine upon them and give them comfort and peace always.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend, Hon. Fred Vinson, was born and brought up across the Ohio River a short distance from where I live and have lived for many years. He and I were acquainted before either of us came to Congress. We grew up as young lawyers in that section together, and we came to Congress about the same time.

It was my privilege and honor to serve with him on the Ways and Means Committee for many years. I want to give this testimony here for him, as I have given it many other times in many other places. He was the smartest man with Government finance that I ever knew. He was the best-qualified man, all around, on financial matters that were taken up in the Ways and Means Committee that I ever knew. That is borne out by the fact, known to those who have been here a number of years, of the fine friendship that existed between Hon. Robert L. Doughton and Mr. Vinson. Damon and Pythias never surpassed them in their loyalty to each other. Mr. Doughton was the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and as such had a heavy task which Mr. Vinson helped him carry. For his loyalty to Mr. Doughton he won the love and affection of Mr. Doughton which was shown by Mr. Doughton on every occasion.

I have said this about Fred Vinson many times, and I want to say it again here, so that some of these younger Members may know what kind of a man he was. I think, Mr. Speaker, he served in more capacities in the Government than anybody you, Mr. RAYBURN, or I knew, in all the years we have been here. He served on the Ways and Means Committee. He served as Secretary of the Treasury. He served, I believe, as Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He served as a judge of the United States Court of Appeals here in Washington. He was so versatile in Government matters that the President gave him several very important positions to fill. And finally the President appointed him to be the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. The President could have selected no more competent man for this high position.

I made a trip to Europe about 2 weeks after Mr. Vinson's death and I was profoundly impressed when I saw that the American flags flying over the American Embassies—were flying at half mast out of respect for my old friend, Fred Vinson. This was a very fine gesture by President Eisenhower to order immediately after Mr. Vinson's death that the American flag should be flown at half mast for 30 days over all Government buildings in the United States and all foreign countries.

I am sad but proud to say these few words concerning my distinguished friend, Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I first had the opportunity to meet Fred Vinson in 1931 when I was 19 years of age. It is my privilege now to represent some of the counties he formerly represented in eastern Kentucky.

Fred Vinson was a gentleman who dedicated himself to accomplish whatever he undertook to do. His people loved him. The people he represented loved him.

I have observed that when his former constituents from back home came to Washington, Fred Vinson was never too busy to see them. He loved people. He loved service for his Government. He devoted the last 30 years of his life to public service, repeatedly refusing more lucrative offers in private industry. During all this service to his country, which included more top-policy making positions than any other person in our history, he acquired a reputation for leadership and good judgment that is unsurpassed among our leaders.

His ability to work with people and obtain their wholehearted cooperation and respect made him the logical selection as Chief of the judicial branch of our Government in that trying postwar period when the public was searching for leaders they could trust. His gentle dignity and courageous efforts in this position enhanced the prestige of that illustrious body, the Supreme Court of the United States. His contribution to Kentucky and this great country will be recorded in the pages of history.

I extend, Mr. Speaker, my deepest sympathy to his good wife and his children.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying a very sincere tribute to a great Kentuckian who passed away last summer. Especially I wish to tell my colleagues that I fully concur in what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] said. In Kentucky all the people loved Fred Vinson. In the long and honorable history of our State, one of its great contributions to the Nation was when it gave to all the people Fred Vinson.

Mr. Vinson was a friend of my father's long years ago in his early life. When I first had the honor to come to this august body to represent my people of Kentucky he was a friend of mine. I believe that every member of the Kentucky delegation over the last two decades has received from Fred Vinson friendly advice and encouragement in the performance of his official duty.

Fred Vinson was a great man, loved by all of our people. We sincerely extend to his family our sympathy and hope for them the great solace that comes when a good life has ended through death. We wish we could say

something that would console them more in the dark hours that were experienced when Fred Vinson passed on. However, if they will remember the great and lasting contributions that he made not only to his native State of Kentucky but to the Nation as a whole, and that they can look forward to meeting him in a happier world knowing that he lived a good life, and that he accomplished much while here, their grief will be softened and their hopes brightened.

We are glad to have the privilege of adding a word to do honor to a great and good man who has departed from us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there are few men who have played such an important part in my life as has Fred Vinson. Coming from Massachusetts, as I did in 1928, Fred Vinson preceded me. He failed of reelection in the 1928 campaign because he fought for the principles in which he believed. He temporarily failed of reelection because of his refusal to compromise in any way the unfortunate situation that existed in the campaign of that year.

Fred Vinson was a man of great capacity and unusual ability, but, above that, he was a man of understanding. He typified to the highest degree humanly possible what a gentleman should be—"one who can disagree without being disagreeable." Fred Vinson and I served on the Ways and Means Committee from 1930 until the time he was appointed to the judiciary. Thereafter he left the judiciary, making a great sacrifice, to become Economic Stabilizer. I believe very few men would have left the important position of circuit court judge with the security of that office to enter into the controversial and insecure position of Economic Stabilizer. But he was asked by the then President of the United States, and he responded as an American willing to make all the sacrifices necessary for the best interests of our country.

In the House of Representatives he wielded tremendous influence. Those of us who served with him knew of his great mind and the power of his logic, of his convincing arguments. As an illustration of his penetrating and logical mind and the effectiveness he had in convincing others, may I refer to a personal incident that happened in my life and while I was a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

In the middle of the 1930's, one of the most important pieces of legislation recommended by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt was what was known as the Bituminous Coal Commission bill. The first bill contained two features, one of which was very controversial, and while I favored the basic proposition I was opposed to the other feature of the bill. My vote probably would have defeated the bill in the Committee on Ways and Means, and Fred Vinson called to see me one day, and as a result of his logic, the manner in which he presented the case that I should not vote against the bill because I was opposed to one part when I favored the other part which was of greater importance to millions of Americans employed in the coal areas of our country, he convinced me that I should act so this bill could be reported out of committee. That bill came out of the Committee on Ways and Means and passed this House and the other body and became law. So, I refer to that as showing the effectiveness of Fred Vinson in convincing other Members as to what they should do in the interest of our country. As regards that particular bill, it was Fred Vinson's argument to me, coupled with the respect that I had for him, that prompted me to act in committee as I did, which enabled the bill to be reported favorably, when otherwise it probably would have been defeated in the Committee on Ways and Means. That is history that has never been publicly disclosed before; history that millions of people in Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and other States of the Union in which the coal industry is located, would be interested in hearing. It was due to the personality and the ability and the effectiveness of Fred Vinson that the votes were obtained in the Committee on Ways and Means to report out the original bill establishing the Bituminous Coal Commission.

To Mrs. Vinson and her sons I join with my distinguished friend from Texas and all of my other colleagues in extending to them my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 7, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The following executive communications were submitted subsequent to the adjournment of the 83d Congress, 1st session:

905. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 4, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Blaine Harbor, Wash., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 23, 1943. (H. Doc. No. 240.) August 25, 1953, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 153, 83d Cong.).

906. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 22, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Scituate Harbor, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on July 20, 1946. (H. Doc. No. 241.) August 25, 1953, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 153, 83d Cong.).

907. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 26, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Bullocks Point Cove, R. I., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946. (H. Doc. No. 242.) August 25, 1953, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 153, 83d Cong.).

908. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 23, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the shore of Plum Island, Mass., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented. (H. Doc. No. 243.) August 25, 1953, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with six illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 153, 83d Cong.).

909. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 6, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Little River (branch of Niagara River) at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945. (H. Doc. No. 246.) September 22, 1953, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 153, 83d Cong.).

910. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 2, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of the Mississippi River between Coon Rapids Dam, Minn., and mouth of the Missouri River for local flood protection at Sny Island Levee Drainage District, Illinois. This interim report is submitted in response to the resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on September 18, 1944, requesting a review of the report on the Mississippi River between Coon Rapids Dam and the mouth of the Ohio River, with a view to determining the advisability of providing flood protection along the Mississippi River above the mouth of the Missouri River. (H. Doc. No. 247.) September 22, 1953, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 153, 83d Cong.).

911. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 4, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach-erosion control study of the shoreline of the State of Connecticut, area 7, Housatonic River to Ash Creek, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented. (H. Doc. No. 248.) October 5, 1953, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 10 illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 153, 83d Cong.).

912. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 15, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on August 6, 1948, and June 7, 1952, and of the Committee on Public Works,

United States Senate, adopted on August 4, 1948. (H. Doc. No. 249.) October 9, 1953, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 153, 83d Cong.).

913. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 18, 1952, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, Texas, with reference to flood protection for the city of Houston. This interim report is submitted under the authority of resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control and Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on July 16, 1945, and April 20, 1948, for a review of report on the Houston ship channel and Buffalo Bayou, Tex. (H. Doc. No. 250.) October 9, 1953, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 153, 83d Cong.).

914. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 5, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach-erosion control study of the Pacific coastline of the State of California, Ventura and Los Angeles Counties, from Point Mugu to San Pedro breakwater, appendix II, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented. (H. Doc. No. 277.) November 3, 1953, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 153, 83d Cong.).

915. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 2, 1953, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of the Mississippi River-Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Ill. This interim report is submitted in response to a resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on January 15, 1944, and resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on September 18, 1944, requesting a review of report on the Mississippi River between Coon Rapids Dam and the mouth of the Ohio River, with a view to improvement of the Mississippi River for flood control at East Moline and Campbell's Island and additional flood protection along the Mississippi River above the mouth of the Missouri River. (H. Doc. No. 281.) November 30, 1953, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 153, 83d Cong.).

916. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 6, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Holland Harbor and Black Lake (Lake Macatawa), Mich., with a view to determining if it is advisable to modify the existing project in any way at this time, and particularly with a view to replacing the present rubble mound pier connection by concrete connections at a higher elevation, requested by a resolution by the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 13, 1948. (H. Doc. No. 282.) November 30, 1953, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 153, 83d Cong.).

[*Submitted January 6, 1954*]

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, Executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

917. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress, pursuant to rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 273); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

918. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, pursuant to paragraphs 102, 103, 104, and 111 of the Code of Laws of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

919. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting reports covering a complete statement of research work being performed under contracts or cooperative agreements under authority of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, showing the names of the agencies cooperating and the amounts expended thereon, pursuant to title I, section 11, and title II, section 205b, of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

920. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "To authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land"; to the Committee on Public Works.

921. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Farm Credit Administration covering its operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4, of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended; and the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration (H. Doc. No. 267); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

922. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report dated October 12, 1953, covering refunds and credits of internal-revenue taxes for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1951 and 1952, pursuant to section 8777 of the Internal Revenue Code (H. Doc. No. 286); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

923. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the 15th quarterly report on the administration of the advance planning program, pursuant to Public Law 352, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 287); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

924. A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the 35th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in St. Louis, Mo., August 31–September 3, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 284); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

925. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting a report of the proceeedings of the 55th National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 28 to September 3, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 283); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

926. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the national gathering, held in Kansas City, Mo., August 16–22, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 285); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

927. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report showing the names of all persons against whom claims in excess of $1,000 have been compromised during the fiscal year 1953, the addresses of such persons, the nature of the claims, the amounts of the settlements, and the reasons therefor, prepared as of June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 41 (g) 4 of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, Public Law 731, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

928. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of July 1953, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

929. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of August 1953, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

930. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of October 1953, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

931. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of September 1953, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

932. A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting the report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222, U. S. C., title 16, sec. 715b); to the Committee on Agriculture.

933. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a copy of the report to the President with respect to an overexpenditure of an allotment of funds within the Federal Housing Administration, pursuant to the requirements of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

934. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report certifying that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands on the Nickwall and Charley Creek units, Montana pumping division, Missouri River Basin project, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

935. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report certifying that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands on the Bluff unit, Bighorn Basin division, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

936. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report certifying that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands on the Hanover unit, Bighorn Basin division, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

937. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report certifying that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands on the Sargent unit, Middle Loup division, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

938. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report certifying that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be served by the Midde Rio Grande project, New Mexico, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

939. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the report on status of appropriation accounts for the period ended

June 30, 1953, for the appropriation account "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration," pursuant to subsection (i) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

940. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the report on status of appropriation accounts for the period ended June 30, 1953, for the appropriation "Management of resources, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1953," pursuant to subsection (i) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

941. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report on the postage on mail matter sent and received through the mails under the franking privilege by the Vice President, Members and Members-elect of Congress, the Delegates and Delegates-elect from Alaska and Hawaii, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 286, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

942. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on certain information concerning a violation of subsection (h) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, pursuant to subsection (i) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C., supp. V, 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

943. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on certain information concerning a violation of subsection (h) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, pursuant to subsection (i) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C., supp. V, 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

944. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report on certain technical violations of section 3679 (h), Revised Statutes, as required by section 3679 (i) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

945. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of a violation of subsection (h) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes which occurred at the Veterans' Administration central office, Washington, D. C., pursuant to subsection (i) (2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

946. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the fourth semiannual report on payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records, pursuant to Public Law 220, 82d Congress, approved October 25, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

947. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

948. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison Department of the Air Force, transmitting a quarterly report of the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty, pursuant to section 201 (c) of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951, Public Law 150, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

949. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report on the United States Air Force flying pay, showing grade and age for all flying officers above the grade of major, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

950. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report pertaining to transportation furnished by the Air Force classified as class A bus operation or transportation for which the passengers pay a fare for the period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 560, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

951. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for the period January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

952. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To repeal section 1174 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the cooperation of medical officers with line officers in superintending cooking by enlisted men"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

953. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on providing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, and for other purposes, for the period July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 560, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

954. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "To amend the part of the act entitled, 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes,' approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

955. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the second semiannual report of contracts, in excess of $50,000, for research, development, and experimental purposes awarded by the Department of the Navy, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

956. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report with respect to furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, pursuant to Public Law 560, 80th Congress, for the fiscal year 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

957. A letter from the Acting Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting a report of contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work executed during the period January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 2 (c) (1) of Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

958. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the ninth quarterly report of contributions for the quarter ending September 30, 1953, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

959. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the 11th quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending September 30, 1953, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

960. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

961. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of contributions for the quarter ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

962. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report detailing the activities with respect to stockpiling, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

963. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 24th quarterly report covering export control, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

964. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the 90th Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the Year 1952, pursuant to section 333 of the United States Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

965. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, transmitting the quarterly report on borrowing authority for the quarter ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

966. A letter from the Managing Director, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the 16th semiannual report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, covering the period from January to June 1953, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

967. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the Sixth Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the Calendar Year 1952, pursuant to section 301 (b) of the Housing Act of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

968. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the seventh quarterly report of the Small Defense Plants Administration for the period ending July 31, 1953, pursuant to section 714 (g) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

969. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "To amend the act entitled 'An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia' "; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

970. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "To regulate the sale of shell eggs in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

971. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "To amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved February 4, 1925"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

972. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "To amend the act entitled 'An act to provide an immediate revision and equalization of real-estate values in the District of Columbia; also to provide an assessment of real estate in said District in the year 1896 and every third year thereafter, and for other purposes,' approved August 14, 1894, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

973. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "To authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes";

to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

974. A letter from the president, Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act of the District of Columbia, transmitting an annual report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 47 of "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

975. A letter from the Acting Director of Foreign Operations, Foreign Operations Administration, transmitting a report of survey of the refugee situation in the Near East, pursuant to section 706, title V (g) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

976. A letter from the Director of Foreign Operations, Mutual Security, transmitting the third semiannual report on operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, from January 1 to June 30, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 213, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

977. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 10th semiannual report of the international information and educational exchange program, from July 1 to December 31, 1952, pursuant to section 1008 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

978. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the sixth semiannual report of the International Claims Commission of the United States, from January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, Public Law 455, 81st Congress, approved March 10, 1950; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

979. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a message from the Chamber of Deputies of the Republic of Haiti addressed to the House of Representatives of the United States expressing deep gratitude for the cordial sentiments manifested by the House of Representatives on May 19, 1953, on the occasion of the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the creation of the Haitian flag; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

980. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the eighth semiannual report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, dated August 1953, pursuant to section 603, Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

981. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Department of the Interior on the Clikapudi unit, Sacramento River division, Central Valley project, California, prepared under authority of the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

982. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

983. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "To amend the definition of 'airman' in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

984. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual financial report for the fiscal year 1953 on the commissary activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in Alaska and other points outside the continental United States, pursuant to Public Law 390, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

985. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act, as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

986. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of July 31, 1953, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act, as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

987. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of September 30, 1953, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act, as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

988. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of October 31, 1953, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

989. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of publications entitled "Typical Electric Bills, 1953" and "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1952;" to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

990. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the annual report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

991. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Bureau of Mines and the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration, agencies in the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

992. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the government of the Virgin Islands of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to authority contained in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

993. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Bureau of Narcotics, an agency in the Treasury Department, for the period March 1, 1951, through June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

994. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Southeastern Power Administration, an agency in the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

995. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of contracts negotiated for research and development purposes for the period January 1 through June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 302 (c) (10) of Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

996. A letter from the Acting Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report showing that proceedings have been concluded with respect to certain Indian claims, pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

997. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain bills passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

998. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual credit report of revolving fund transactions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 10 of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984, 986; 25 U. S. C. 470); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

999. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of laws enacted by the Second Guam Legislature (first regular session), pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, 81st Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1000. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of laws enacted by the Second Guam Legislature (first regular session), pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, 81st Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1001. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of laws enacted by the First Guam Legislature (first regular session) and the First Guam Legislature (second regular session), pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, 81st Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1002. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of laws enacted by the First Guam Legislature (second regular session) and the Second Guam Legislature (first regular session), pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, 81st Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1003. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of laws enacted by the First Guam Legislature (first regular session), First Guam Legislature (second regular session), First Guam Legislature (second special session), Second Guam Legislature (first special session) and the Second Guam Legislature (first regular session), pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, 81st Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1004. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain bills and resolutions passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Comittee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1005. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved

June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1006. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1007. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain bills and resolutions passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1008. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I., pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1009. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Atomic Energy Commission of claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28 of the United States Code, for the period July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1010. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Department of Commerce during fiscal year 1953, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, Public Law 601, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1011. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the annual report of claims paid by the Federal Civil Defense Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 2673 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1012. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels in the Coast Guard service, which have been settled by the Treasury, pursuant to section 646 (b) of title 14, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1013. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report listing the tort claims approved for payment for the fiscal year 1953, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1014. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the payment of $4,143.75 to Grace Line, Inc., 2 Pine Street, San Francisco, Calif., in full settlement of claim for damage to the motor ship *Coastal Nomad*, pursuant to 14 United States Code 646 (b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1015. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Central Intelligence Agency for the fiscal year 1953, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1016. A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer, the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, transmitting the annual report of the proceedings, including financial report, of the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, pursuant to section 7 of Public Law 702, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1017. A letter from the Secretary of the Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1018. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To amend further the act of January 2, 1952, an act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damage occasioned by the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Forces in Foreign Countries," relative to the jurisdictional amount that may be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, and paid by claims commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1019. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, Department of the Navy, transmitting a report of the payment of claims for damage occasioned by naval vessels, which have been settled by the Navy Department, pursuant to section 8 of the act of July 1944 (58 Stat. 726; 46 U. S. C. 797); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1020. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, Department of the Navy, transmitting a report showing the settlement of claims for damage caused to Navy Department property, which have been settled by the Navy Department, pursuant to section 2 of the act of December 5, 1945 (34 U. S. C. 600a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1021. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of amounts paid and received by the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to the Maritime Claims Act of October 20, 1951 (65 Stat. 572; 10 U. S. C. 1861–1866); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1022. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the summary report of claims paid under the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, for the fiscal year 1953, pursuant to the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended (ch. 135, sec. 1, 59 Stat. 225; 31 U. S. C. 222c; 61 Stat. 501, 66 Stat. 321, Public Law 439, 82d Cong., 2d sess., July 3, 1952); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1023. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid for the fiscal year 1953, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended and codified (28 U. S. C. 2671–2680) as required by section 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1024. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on tort claims paid by the General Services Administration during the fiscal year 1953, pursuant to title 28, section 2673, of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1025. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of the tort claims paid by the Veterans' Administration during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, title IV, Public Law 601, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1026. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of a list of aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1027. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order entered in the case of a certain named alien who has been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1028. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of a list of aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1029. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of a list of aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1030. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Claude Calvert Sue, A–3333824, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1031. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Lam Tim, A–9770888, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1032. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a list of names of aliens involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1033. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a letter relative to a list of names involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1034. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1035. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1036. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1037. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1038. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3)

of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1039. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1040. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 25th report of action taken by the United States Maritime Administration, pursuant to section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1041. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report on the activities and transactions of the Maritime Administration for the period ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 13 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1042. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities providing war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, for the quarter ended September 30, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1043. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report on the activities and transactions of the Maritime Administration for the period ending September 30, 1953, pursuant to section 13 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1044. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Federal aid in fish restoration program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 11 of the act of Congress approved August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 430, 16 U. S. C. 777); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1045. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the annual report on additional step increases as rewards for superior accomplishment for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 702 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1046. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 18, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of Little Magothy River, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

1047. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 26, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination and survey of Neuse and Trent Rivers, N. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1048. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 23, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Olympia Harbor, Wash., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 5, 1943, and also authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1049. A letter from the Executive Officer, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting the land-acquisitions report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, covering acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition, pursuant to Public Law 284, 71st Congress (44 Stat. 482), approved May 29, 1930, amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

1050. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the 32d Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 16 of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1051. A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion for the period ending October 31, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 47, 66th Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1052. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, prepared by the Commissioner of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1952, pursuant to section 1 of the act of June 14, 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1053. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "To amend sections 2885 (b) and 2886 (a), as amended, of the Internal Revenue Code"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1054. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To amend the act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1055. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the special helium-production fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Amendatory Helium Act approved September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 885; U. S. C., sec. 164); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1056. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the Secretary of Defense, together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force for the period January 1 to June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 202 (d) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1057. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a notice of proposal by the Department of the Navy to transfer the ex-German submarine *U–505* to the Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago, Ill., pursuant to section 6 of the act of August 7, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1058. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an itemized report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1953, for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund, pursuant to the act of June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 426, sec. 3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1059. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a list of cases of aliens involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1060. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Power Commission, transmitting two publications entitled "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1952 Supplement," "Typical Residential Electric Bills, January 1, 1953"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1061. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 4 (d) of the Federal Power Act of 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1062. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the 19th annual report of the Federal Communications Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and additional material specified in section 4 (k) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952 (Public Law 554); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1063. A letter from the secretary, the American National Theater and Academy, transmitting the transcript of the National Theater Assembly held January 1 to 3, 1953, at Cincinnati, Ohio, and miscellaneous data, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1064. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To provide for compensation of certain employees on days when departments, agencies, or establishments of the Government are closed by administrative procedure"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1065. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "To approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Hermiston and West Extension Irrigation Districts, Oregon, and to authorize their execution and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1066. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1067. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list by rank and age groups, the number of such officers above the rank of major in the Army or lieutenant commander in the Navy with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, pursuant to Public Law 301, approved February 18, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1068. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for the fiscal year ending August 31, 1953, including a full and complete report of receipts and disbursements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1069. A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 548, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1070. A letter from the Chairman, War Claims Commission, transmitting the eighth semiannual report for the period ending September 13, 1953, pursuant to section 9 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1071. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the 20th annual report for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and ending June 30, 1953; to the Committee on Public Works.

1072. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting a report of progress and expenditures for the fiscal year 1953 and plans for the coming year, pursuant to section 15 of Public Law 592, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1073. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the act of May 7, 1928, as amended July 1, 1948 (22 U. S. C. 278a); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1074. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a joint report by the Bureau of the Budget and the General Services Administration dealing with a cooperative undertaking to obtain prompt disposal of real properties, except those in the public domain, which are surplus to the needs of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1075. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the United States Court of Claims for the year ended October 2, 1953, pursuant to section 791 (d), title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1076. A letter from the Shipswriter Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting the annual report of receipts and expenditures for the official year ending April 30, 1953, pursuant to the law governing these reports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1077. A letter from the national commandant, Marine Corps League, transmitting a report of proceedings and activities, including complete statement of receipts and expenditures during the preceding calendar year, pursuant to section IV of the act of Congress which incorporated the Marine Corps League, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1078. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report on the stockpiling program pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1079. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the Air Force's semiannual report entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period January 1 to June 30, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1080. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of November 1953, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1081. A letter from the Director of Foreign Operations, transmitting the third semiannual report on operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, for the period January through June 1953; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1082. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mount Whitney Pack Trains which will, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, authorize the permittee to provide saddle horse and pack trip service at Furnace Creek Ranch in Death Valley National Monument, Calif., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1083. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed award of a concession permit to William W. and Barbara W. Myers which will when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, authorize them to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at Wildrose Station in Death Valley National Monument, Calif., etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1084. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed extension of contract No. I-1p-3348 which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service, extend for 1 year from January 1, 1954, the authorization under which Martin Kilian provides accommodations, facilities, and services for the public in Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1085. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed award of a concession permit to Edward B. Rushford and George I. Gravert which will, when approved by the regional director, region 1, National Park Service, authorize Messrs. Rushford and Gravert to operate the Rum Shop at Salem Maritime National Historic Site, Mass., for a period of 5 years from January 1, 1954, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1086. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to the Naches Co., Inc., which, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, will renew for the period October 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954, concession permit No. 14-10-426-43; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1087. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. Albert Weiss, doing business as Friant Garage, which will, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, authorize Mr. Weiss to provide towing service and emergency automotive repairs and services in Millerton Lake National Recreation Area, Calif., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1088. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. George W. Hurt which will, when approved by the regional director, region 2, National Park Service, authorize Mr. Hurt to operate ski tows and a lunch stand and to rent ski equipment in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1089. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mrs. Marilyn J. Wright which will, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, authorize Mrs. Wright to provide a limited lunch service at Crater Lake National Park, Oreg., for the period September 16, 1953, to June 14, 1954; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1090. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to Mr. Joseph E. Niemeyer which, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, will renew for the period December 1, 1953, through April 30, 1954, concession permit No. 14-10-447-56, under which Mr. Niemeyer is authorized to operate a ski-rental business in Olympic National Park, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1091. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed extension of contract No. I-1p-1101 which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service, extend for 1 year from January 1, 1954, the authorization under which Glacier Park Co. operates at Glacier National Park, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1092. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to Mr. Donald P. Christianson which, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, will renew for the period December 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954, concession permit No. 14-10-426-42, at Narada Falls-Paradise area, Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1093. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed extension of contract No. I-1p-6780 which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service, extend for 2 years from January 1, 1954, the authorization under which Oregon Caves Resort operates at Oregon Caves National Monument, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1094. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to Mr. and Mrs. Charles Roening which will, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, renew for 1 year from January 1, 1954, concession permit No. 14-10-447-89 under which it operates at Olympic National Park, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1095. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed award of a concession permit to John C. Turner and Louise M. Turner, his wife, which will, when approved by the regional director, region 2, National Park Service, authorize Mr. and Mrs. Turner to operate the Triangle X Guest Ranch in Grand Teton National Park, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1096. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to Mr. Anton Ashenbrenner which, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, renew for the period January 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954, concession permit No. 14-10-447-84, under which Mr. Ashenbrenner operates at Olympic National Park, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1097. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. Clifton D. Rock which will, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, authorize Mr. Rock to sell souvenirs and related items at Cabrillo National Monument, Calif., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1098. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to Mr. Muri Emery which will, when approved by the regional director, region 3, National Park Service, renew for the period January 1, 1954, through June 30, 1954, concession permit No. 14-10-304-7 under which Mr. Emery operates at Searchlight Ferry located in Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1099. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed extension of contract No. I-1p-1114 which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service, extend for 1 year from January 1, 1954, under which Fred Harvey operates at south rim of Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1100. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to nine proposed awards of concession permits which will, when approved by the regional director, region 1, National Park Service, authorize charter boat services and bait sales to be provided in Everglades National Park, Fla., for a period of 2 years from January 1, 1954; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1101. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relative to a proposed award of a con-

cession permit to Mr. J. R. Dickson which will, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, authorize him to operate a gasoline service station at Big Stump in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1102. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting relative to negotiations with the Crow Tribe to the end that a fair and just settlement be concluded between the United States and the Crow Tribe for the use of tribal property in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hardin Unit of the Missouri Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1103. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To validate conveyance of a 40-acre tract in Okaloosa County, Fla."; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1104. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering claims paid during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1953, on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel, pursuant to section 207 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1105. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 15 of the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U. S. C. 264); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1106. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To authorize the collection of indebtedness of military and civilian personnel resulting from erroneous payments, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1107. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 259); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6186. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant a preference right to users of withdrawn public lands for grazing purposes when the lands are restored from the withdrawal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1096). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 6863. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age insurance benefits and to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to income subject to social-security taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 6864. A bill to amend certain procurement statutes to limit authority for the purchase of supplies and services without advertising during periods of national emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 6865. A bill to extend the limitation on prosecution for false statements by Federal employees concerning membership in subversive organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6866. A bill to provide that World War II prisoners of war shall be paid the sums which they would have received as increases in pay and allowances if promotions which they received on their return had been made for pay purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 6867. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that arthritis developing a 10-percent-or-more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6868. A bill to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6869. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 6870. A bill to amend the act of February 13, 1900 (31 Stat. 28), by approving existing railway installations and authorizing further railway installations on the batture in front of the Public Health Service Hospital property in New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 6871. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain automobile seat covers from the manufacturers' excise tax on automobile accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 6872. A bill to provide a mandatory minimum sentence for draft evasion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6873. A bill to provide for stockpiling 5 million bales of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6874. A bill to amend section 402 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to eliminate discrimination against certain personnel of the uniformed services incapacitated prior to physical examination for promotion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 6875. A bill to provide that the Clark Hill Reservoir, on the Savannah River, S. C., and Ga., shall be known as the Hamilton-Moody Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 6876. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Potomac River and Theodore Roosevelt Island in the vicinity of E Street, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 6877. A bill to make it a crime to belong to the Communist Party or to any other subversive organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 6878. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 6879. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the founding of a national memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 6880. A bill to continue the rates of tax which were in effect under sections 480, 1400, and 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code prior to January 1, 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 6881. A bill to provide that title to certain school lands shall vest in the States under act of January 25, 1927, notwithstanding any Federal leases which may be outstanding on such lands at the time they are surveyed; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 6882. A bill to amend the act of September 27, 1950, relating to construction of the Vermejo reclamation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 6883. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exempt certain classes of wheat from controls under that act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6884. A bill relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of field civilian personnel of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6885. A bill to amend section 1 of Joint Resolution 12 enacted by the 25th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, in the regular session of 1949 and approved by the 81st Congress of the United States of America at the 2d session (Public Law 746, ch. 833); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6886. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 280 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1953 and to authorize the issuance of certain public improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6887. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 254 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1953 and to authorize the issuance of certain public improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii and the city and county of Honolulu; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6888. A bill to amend section 207 (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6889. A bill to appropriate moneys for the removal of certain abandoned military installations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 6890. A bill to approve Act No. 27 of the Session Laws of 1951 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to amend Act 24 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1927, as ratified by the act of Congress of March 2, 1928, so as to extend the electric light and power franchise granted by said act to cover the entire districts of Waimea and Koloa on the Island of Kauai, T. H."; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6891. A bill to provide for the review and determination of claims for the return of lands, in the Territory of Hawaii, conveyed to the Government during World War II by organizations composed of persons of Japanese ancestry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 6892. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 6893. A bill to restore to the Shoshone Irrigation District the share of the net revenues from the Shoshone powerplant to which it is entitled under its contract with the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6894. A bill for granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation by the States of Colorado, Kansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to enter into and negotiate a compact with each other and with the United States of America for the conservation and development of land and water resources in the Missouri Basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6895. A bill to establish the Civil Aeronautics Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6896. A bill to extend the period for filing claims for compensation by World War II prisoners of war to August 1, 1954; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 6897. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to increase the penalties for kidnaping and to create an immediate presumption of interstate transportation of a kidnap victim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6898. A bill to establish an Office of Government Investigation within the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 6899. A bill to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and to grant immunity from prosecution in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 6900. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Foreign Affairs Advisory Board; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 6901. A bill to authorize the establishment of a harbor of refuge for light-draft vessels at Port Ontario, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6902. A bill to authorize certain modifications in the existing project for Oswego Harbor, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6903. A bill to provide that the Federal Government shall not give preference to certain firms in the awarding of contracts or the making of purchases; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6904. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously in the name of George Washington a commission as General of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 6905. A bill authorizing additional loans for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 6906. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to moving-picture admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6907. A bill to provide revenue from an excise tax uniformly applied to end products of manufacture; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 6908. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 6909. A bill to provide that certain Government officers and employees shall be excused from duty for a sufficient period of time to vote in elections; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 6910. A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act so as to provide that in issuing bonds under that act, preference shall be given to trust funds and other subscribers seeking to invest funds which represent real savings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 6911. A bill to provide for the construction of certain reservoirs on the Kentucky and Big Sandy Rivers so as to provide a year-round supply of industrial water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 6912. A bill to permit the free marketing of newly mined gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 6913. A bill to provide for a reduction in the total number of officers and employees in the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6914. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the income-tax exemptions allowed for a taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents, and the additional exemptions allowed for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6915. A bill to amend the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act so as to require the registration thereunder of certain State, Territorial, and local agencies which engage in lobbying activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6916. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the income-tax exemptions allowed for a taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents, and the additional exemptions allowed for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6917. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the income-tax exemptions allowed for a taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents, and the additional exemptions allowed for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6918. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the income-tax exemptions allowed for a taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents, and the additional exemptions allowed for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 6919. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the Customs Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6920. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6921. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6922. A bill to allow an additional period for filing claims for loss of property in the case of prisoners of war in Korea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6923. A bill to extend certain benefits of the War Claims Act of 1948 to Korean prisoners of war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6924. A bill to extend the direct loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to correspond to the expiration dates provided for guaranteed loans under such title, to make additional amounts available for direct loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6925. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the income-tax exemption allowed a taxpayer for a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 6926. A bill to amend subsection 602 (j) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6927. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6928. A bill to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6929. A bill to provide for the payment in a lump sum direct to counsel of a reasonable attorney's fee in a suit brought by or on behalf of an insured during his lifetime for waiver of premiums on account of total disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6930. A bill to extend to December 31, 1954, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6931. A bill to amend veterans' regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for multiple sclerosis and the chronic functional psychoses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6932. A bill to redefine "widow of a World War I Veteran" for compensation and pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6933. A bill to enable World War II veterans to qualify for benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 of which they would otherwise be deprived because of recall to active service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6934. A bill to provide increases in the monthly rates of wartime service-connected death compensation payable to widows alone and to dependent parents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6935. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to provide for transportation of the body of a veteran dying in a State veterans' home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6936. A bill to limit eligibility of a stepchild and of a stepparent for servicemen's indemnity awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6937. A bill to prohibit the payment of gratuities under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any person who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6938. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Rockland County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6939. A bill to discontinue the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6940. A bill to prohibit payment of annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to persons convicted of felonies involving or relating to the improper use of their authority, power, influence, or privileges as officers or employees of the United States or the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 6941. A bill to amend section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916, as amended, providing for the retirement of certain members of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 6942. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a taxpayer furnishing over half the support of a dependent may be allowed an exemption for such dependent's gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 6943. A bill to create a commission to study the question of outlawing the Communist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 6944. A bill to terminate Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 6945. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to authorize the reapportionment of frozen acreage allotments for the 1954 crop of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 6946. A bill to permit review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 6947. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces serving under enlistments may collect damages for certain reductions in the rights, benefits, or privileges to which they are entitled; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 6948. A bill to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6949. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6950. A bill to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6951. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act (relating to hospital survey and construction) to provide mortgage-loan insurance to stimulate investment of private capital in the construction of self-supporting hospitals and other medical facilities and to facilitate the extension of voluntary prepayment health plans providing comprehensive medical and hospital care; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6952. A bill to amend section 23 (x) of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the deduction of certain payments for health insurance without regard to the 5-percent limitation contained therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 6953. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that an individual taxpayer may deduct $200 in dividend income received during the taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOW:

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. J. Res. 328. Joint resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. J. Res. 329. Joint resolution providing for the rehabilitation, improvement, and restoration of certain facilities of the Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of money to be available for use in assisting the construction of the Tri-Dam project on the Stanislaus River in California, and providing for the repayment of any of such money so used, after the amortization of the bonds locally used for such project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 331. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to empower Congress to regulate the use and ownership of trade-marks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. J. Res. 332. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. J. Res. 333. Joint resolution providing for the creation of an International Food Reserve; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. J. Res. 334. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, with respect to the pledge of allegiance to the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. J. Res. 335. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. J. Res. 336. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the admission of new States as sovereign States of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 337. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that a new State may be admitted only with the consent of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 338. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1954, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance of the 175th anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. Res. 398. Resolution for the relief of Joseph P. Piggott; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Con. Res. 185. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to make a study of the organization and operation of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution establishing rules of procedure governing investigations by committees of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution requesting the International Joint Commission to amend its order of approval of the St. Lawrence power project to specify the range of water levels to be maintained in Lake Ontario; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution providing protection for communities along the shores of the Great Lakes against damage from changes in water levels resulting from projects authorized and approved by the International Joint Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas:

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare and develop a new and comprehensive soil-conservation program, including adequate provision for the construction and maintenance of needed soil conservation and flood prevention in all parts of the United States, to be implemented and placed in operation at the end of the present national emergency or in time of business recession so as to provide useful employment for returning veterans and others; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution requesting the International Joint Commission to amend its order of approval of the St. Lawrence power project to specify the range of water levels to be maintained in Lake Ontario; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution providing protection for communities along the shores of the Great Lakes against damage from changes in water levels resulting from projects authorized and approved by the International Joint Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the revision of the agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama transmitting a copy of Act No. 650, Alabama law, authorizing the Governor of Alabama to enter into agreements and compacts with other States of the United States for mutual interstate aid in any emergency or disaster arising from enemy attack or other causes, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to relocating the boundary between the States of Florida and Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, requesting the Congress to submit an amendment to the Constitution of the United States amending article V; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

relative to the social-security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, requesting no legislation levying a Federal sales tax of any kind, but to leave this field of taxation to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to taking steps to restore confidence in the cattle industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to granting Federal relief to drought areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, urging relief be given the cotton farmer of Arizona from the stringent limitations of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, by raising the national cotton acreage allotment from 17½ million to 22½ million acres, and by providing that no individual State's allotment be reduced thereunder by more than 27½ percent of 1952 plantings; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Railroad Retirement Act, and requesting favorable action on H. R. 356; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requesting the Congress to extend old-age and survivors insurance to Arizona employees in positions covered by retirement system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to S. 1155, an act locating the boundary between the States of Florida and Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to transmitting duly certified copies of interstate civil defense and disaster compacts between the State of Idaho and the States of Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, New Mexico, and Tennessee, pursuant to charter 277, Idaho Session Laws of 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to transmitting a copy of Senate Enrolled Act No. 271, State of Indiana, concerning civil defense and authorizing the State of Indiana to enter into civil-defense compacts with other States in providing for mutual aid and assistance in meeting any emergency or disaster from enemy attack or other cause, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, Public Law 920, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the establishment of a federally operated soldiers' home in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Atomic Energy Act so as to eliminate therefrom any language which may be interpreted as providing for the extension of tax exemptions to private contractors, etc.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to amending the Internal Revenue Code for the elimination of tax on cigarettes and gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to transmitting copies of the interstate compacts between the State of Ohio and the States of Virginia, Kentucky, and Wyoming; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation recognizing and confirming State title to certain assigned school land and assigning leasing funds derived from such lands in escrow; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide adequate safeguards in tariff and trade legislation against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reduce Federal taxes and lessen the drain of money from this and other States into the Federal Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to proceed with the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin States by authorizing the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by passing Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Second Legislature of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation similar to H. R. 4769, 81st Congress, 1st session, i. e., to extend the benefits of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to certain citizens of Guam captured at Wake Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Second Legislature of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact war claims legislation for employees of contractors interned during the occupation in Guam by a foreign power; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing for the issuance of public improvement bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the issuance of public improvement bonds of the Territory of Hawaii during the years 1953 to 1959 inclusive, without respect to the limitations imposed by the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6954. A bill for the relief of Buonaventura Giannone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6955. A bill for the relief of Mr. Margers Nulle-Siecenieks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6956. A bill for the relief of Markos Demetrius Spanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 6957. A bill for the relief of Joseph Contrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6958. A bill for the relief of August J. Strigga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6959. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Baptist Mid-Missions for use as a church site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6960. A bill for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 6961. A bill for the relief of Nicola Sardelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6962. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 6963. A bill for the relief of Peter Khattum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 6964. A bill for the relief of Joseph Di Folco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 6965. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Del Mul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 6966. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Agostinho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6967. A bill for the relief of Guerdon Plumley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 6968. A bill for the relief of Margarete Gartner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 6969. A bill for the relief of Maria Benkiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6970. A bill for the relief of Charles Daly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 6971. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Richard C. Kadel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 6972. A bill for the relief of Aspasia and Dimitra Panoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 6973. A bill for the relief of Frank Kreft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 6974. A bill for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 6975. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Siskiyou Joint Union High School District, Siskiyou County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6976. A bill for the relief of Marquis R. Stevens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6977. A bill for the relief of Alison MacBride; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 6978. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 6979. A bill for the relief of Ara Ter Vardanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6980. A bill for the relief of Francesco Scarfaloto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6981. A bill for the relief of Ioan Vasile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 6982. A bill for the relief of Maria Elizabeth Sanchez Y Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 6983. A bill for the relief of Kiyoko Satoh Dekker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 6984. A bill for the relief of Elly Maszun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6985. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Spiropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 6986. A bill for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6987. A bill for the relief of Gene C. Szutu and Florence C. Szutu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 6988. A bill to amend an act approved December 15, 1944, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in Powell Townsite, Wyo., Shoshone reclamation project, Wyoming, to the University of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 6989. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Sodano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6990. A bill for the relief of Pfc. Giovanni Di Giulio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6991. A bill for the relief of Sam Fatovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6992. A bill for the relief of Constantina Ianuale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6993. A bill for the relief of Virginia Froonjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 6994. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Abluso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 6995. A bill for the relief of Tokiyo Nakajima and her child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 6996. A bill for the relief of Pacifica Alido Boco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6997. A bill for the relief of Rolf Peter Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6998. A bill for the relief of Erna White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6999. A bill for the relief of Teresa Alice Townsend; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 7000. A bill for the relief of June Beatrice Simmons Hightower Darling, nee Arron, alias Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 7001. A bill to prohibit the payment of any civil-service retirement annuity to Alger Hiss, and to provide for the return to Alger Hiss of the amount to his credit in the civil-service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 7002. A bill for the relief of Michael Logothetis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7003. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie DiRosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7004. A bill for the relief of Miriam and Mordechaj Rymland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7005. A bill for the relief of Chnaier Wallach, Todrys Wallach, and Henoch Wallach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 7006. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Medola and Ernest H. Macias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7007. A bill for the relief of Harold Kageff-Kay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7008. A bill for the relief of Pedro B. Trevino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7009. A bill for the relief of Aldo Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7010. A bill for the relief of Nunzio Minardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7011. A bill for the relief of James J. Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 7012. A bill for the relief of Nicole Goldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7013. A bill for the relief of Louis S. Levenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7014. A bill for the relief of Loucia Hannouche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7015. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Szajna Sapir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 7016. A bill for the relief of John On Pong Young and Mrs. Ivy Elena Ho Asjoe Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7017. A bill for the relief of Ingrid U. Baske Blaising and Gerhard Harald Baske; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7018. A bill for the relief of Steve Rouchos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 7019. A bill for the relief of Hadi Babazadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7020. A bill for the relief of Hedy Reisenhofer Johnston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 7021. A bill for the relief of Emil Lotthammer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 7022. A bill for the relief of James Joseph Shaker, also known as Najm Shaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7023. A bill for the relief of Mario Renato Talin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7024. A bill for the relief of Bekir Akin, also known as Tahsin Akim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7025. A bill for the relief of Luigi Scognamiglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7026. A bill for the relief of Rossana Gatti Mosca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7027. A bill for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 7028. A bill for the relief of Mary Riley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7029. A bill for the relief of Nicholas DeClaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7030. A bill for the relief of Hua Lin and his wife, Lillian Ching-Wen Lin (nee Hu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 7031. A bill for the relief of Mrs. George A. Meffan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 7032. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Hooper Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7033. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna J. Weigle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7034. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fujiko Koert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7035. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margot Elizabeth Schaeffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7036. A bill for the relief of Beryss Bernard Blinbaum and Lotte Blinbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7037. A bill for the relief of Anastasios Seleimetzidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 7038. A bill for the relief of Jaber Hassan El Assaad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 7039. A bill for the relief of Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 7040. A bill for the relief of Chung Pang Ja and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7041. A bill for the relief of Waltruade Elsa Solleder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7042. A bill for the relief of Merija Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 7043. A bill for the relief of Stephanie Cecil Gardiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 7044. A bill for the relief of Joe G. Washburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7045. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marciano Gutierrez, Dr. Amparo G. Joaquin Gutierrez, and their children, Rosenda, Rebecca, Raymundo, and Marciano, and Mrs. Brigida de Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 7046. A bill for the relief of Steve Elefteriou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7047. A bill for the relief of Miss Hildegard A. Vornweg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 7048. A bill for the relief of John P. Farrar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7049. A bill for the relief of Basil Theodossiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H. R. 7050. A bill for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 7051. A bill for the relief of Mary George Solomon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7052. A bill for the relief of Ofelia Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 7053. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Stiegler Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

409. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Mrs. C. J. Estal of Green Mountain, Iowa, and 202 other residents of several communities in Marshall County, Iowa, urging that steps be taken to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in all newspapers, periodicals, and on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

410. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of Sioux City, Iowa, Chapter No. 277 of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees to urge the Ways and Means Committee of the House to make a prompt and favorable report

on H. R. 5180; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

411. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the clerk of the general assembly, the United Presbyterian Church of North America, Aliquippa, Pa., relative to commending the House of Representatives for its action in ordering that 1 million tons of wheat be sent to the needy people of Pakistan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

412. Also, petition of the president, Retired Officers Association, Washington, D. C., transmitting four resolutions affecting the welfare of retired officers of the uniformed services and their dependents, widows, or other survivors, adopted by the Retired Officers Association at its biennial convention in Washington, D. C., on November 14, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

413. Also, petition of the president, City Council, Philadelphia, Pa., transmitting a resolution memorializing the Secretary of Defense of the United States to reconsider the program providing for cutbacks of workloads and personnel at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

414. Also, petition of the secretary, board of managers, St. Francis Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pa., relative to stating that they are opposed to any amendment of the Taft-Hartley law which would permit collective bargaining to apply to hospitals, etc.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

415. Also, petition of the secretary-treasurer, Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to setting aside a day during 1954 to be known as Labor Pray Day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

416. Also, petition of the president, Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, San Juan, P. R., protesting the general mechanization of the sugarcane fields and sugar mills, and stating that economic and social crisis would be created if this takes place; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

417. Also, petition of the secretary, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, North Rome, N. Y., requesting that they be placed on record as being opposed to the recognition of the Communist regime in China, and being against the expelling of the Government of the Republic of China from the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

418. Also, petition of the secretary, the Federation of Poles in Manchester, Manchester, England, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting a definite protest against the persecution of religion in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

419. Also, petition of V. K. Wellington Koo, Ambassador, Chinese Embassy, Washington, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to messages from the Yilan District Council, and the Miaoli District Council in the Province of Taiwan opposing the turning over to Japan the Amami-O-shima Islands belonging to the Ryukyu Island group as being inconsistent with article 3 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan signed at San Francisco; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

420. Also, petition of the chairman, Agricultural Committee, Citizens Committee for Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a year-end report on reorganization which has taken place in the United States Department of Agriculture during 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

421. Also, petition of the president, West Virginia State Federation of Labor, Charleston, W. Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the last meeting of the West Virginia State Federation of Labor and the American Federation of Labor, requesting that organized labor be invited to participate in the work of the Committee on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

422. Also, petition of the Governor, Territory of Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation which will enable the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue public-improvement bonds for flood-control purposes, and for construction of a sewerage system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

423. Also, petition of the city and county clerk, city and county of Honolulu, Honolulu, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Resolution No. 862, relating to congressional approval for the issuance of $8 million of public-improvement bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

424. Also, petition of the director, New Mexico Legislative Council, Santa Fe, N. Mex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the sixth annual legislative service conference of the Council of State Governments, at which meeting it was noted that the Library of Congress has not published the State Law Index since 1947, and requesting that Congress further the restoration of the publication; to the Committee on House Administration.

425. Also petition of the secretary, Municipal Housing Authority of the Capital of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing the deep sorrow by the membership of that body over the passing of Senator Robert A. Taft; to the Committee on House Administration.

426. Also, petition of the executive director, Federation of Commerce of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their deep sympathy on the passing of Senator Robert A. Taft; to the Committee on House Administration.

427. Also, petition of the president, Free Confederation of Workers of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to placing a statue of Maestro Santiago Iglesias Pantin in the galleries of the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

428. Also, petition of R. E. Brookes and others, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the enactment of legislation now pending that will amend the Railroad Retirement Act by providing retirement after 30 years of service regardless of age at half pay based on the 5 years of highest earnings (maximium annuity $200 per month); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

429. Also, petition of Meliton and Maxima Ramiro, Babálom, Antique, Philippine Islands, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their claim in reference to the death of their son who died while fighting as guerrilla soldier on Panay Island on November 17, 1942; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

430. Also, petition of the secretary, State bar of New Mexico, Santa Fe, N. Mex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsing increases in the salaries of Members of Congress and members of the Federal judiciary and urging the enactment of appropriate legislation to effectuate such increases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

431. Also, petition of the secretary, the West Virginia State Bar, Huntington, W. Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to transmitting a copy of a resolution endorsing Senate bill 1663, relating to increase of annual salaries of United States judges and Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

432. Also, petition of western area chairman, American Bar Association, Oklahoma City, Okla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the judicial congressional salary program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

433. Also, petition of the president, National Conference of Police Associations, Minneapolis, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending the so-called civil-rights law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

434. Also, petition of the clerk, Board of Supervisors, County of Westmoreland, Montross, Va., acknowledging receipt of the copy of House Concurrent Resolution 28 of the 83d Congress regarding its tercentennial anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

435. Also, petition of the national secretary, Supreme Lodge, Order Sons of Italy in America, New York City, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending and modifying the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

436. Also, petition of the supreme secretary, Supreme Lodge, Order Sons of Italy in America, New York City, N. Y., strongly favoring national legislation declaring Columbus Day, October 12, a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

437. Also, petition of the president, District Attorneys' Association of Oregon, Portland, Oreg., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a resolution adopted concerning the propriety of present congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

438. Also, petition of the secretary, West Virginia State Bar, Charleston, W. Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to international treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

439. Also, petition of the secretary, New Jersey State Bar Association, Trenton, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the procedure used by congressional committees in making investigations and pertaining to social security and retirement pension plans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

440. Also, petition of Dr. Henry L. Peckham, Washington, D. C., for impeachment of Judge Alexander Holtzoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

441. Also, petition of the president, United Neighbors, Inc., For Affiliated Organizations, Los Angeles, Calif., requesting a congressional investigation and legislative action in connection with the United States Supreme Court decision in the case of *Barrows* v. *Jackson;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

442. Also, petition of Carl William Burkholder, Steilacoom, Wash., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to redress of grievances, *United States* v. *Carl William Burkholder,* No. 10766 Cr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

443. Also, petition of the president, the Yamada Institute, Nagoya-City, Japan, relative to requesting recognition of a secret machine in reference to atomic power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

444. Also, petition of the chairman and executive officer, Lihue, Kauai, T. H., relative to Federal aid for Hanapepe flood-control project, Island of Kauai, T. H.; to the Committee on Public Works.

445. Also, petition of the president, American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., condemning the abuse of legislative powers and calling upon the Congress to adopt appropriate rules to govern the conduct of congressional committees; to the Committee on Rules.

446. Also, petition of the president, Committee of United Russian Anti-Communist Organizations in Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the United States Congress investigating the United States State Department subsidy of Soviet agents among Russian refugees; to the Committee on Rules.

447. Also, petition of the president, Rhode Island State Federation of Labor, Providence, R. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the welfare of Federal employees; to the Committee on Rules.

448. Also, petition of Jouett Shouse, National Association of Taxicab Owners, Washington, D. C., pledging their support to the Government in its fight against all who have communistic or subversive tendencies; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

449. Also, petition of the president, Rhode Island State Federation of Labor, Providence, R. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the transfer of the administration of the Federal social-security program to the State governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

450. Also, petition of the president, Conference of State Social Security Administrators, Richmond, Va., relative to the meeting of the Conference of State Social Security Administrators at Chicago, Ill., November 5 and 6, 1953, requesting the enactment of legislation amending section 218 (d) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

451. Also, petition of the president, West Virginia State Federation of Labor, Charleston, W. Va., relative to the 51st convention meeting at Wheeling in October 1953, going on record as being against any legislation that would transfer the funds, administration, and operation of the social-security program from Federal administration to that of the various States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

452. Also, petition of the president, National Tire Dealers, Tulsa, Okla., respectfully requesting the Federal Government to eliminate or materially reduce the excise tax on tires and tubes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

453. Also, petition of Harry C. Gilbert and others of Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

454. Also, petition of Mitiki Sawada and approximately 6,200 others, Kumamoto Junior College, Kumamoto, Japan, requesting release of the Japanese people who are serving prison terms as war criminals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Increasing Income-Tax Exemption From $600 to $1,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on this opening day of this new session of Congress I have introduced a bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the income-tax exemption allowed a taxpayer for a dependent. The purpose of this bill is to provide reasonable relief to the American taxpayer possessing dependents. If this bill of mine is enacted into law, the present income-tax law would be amended permitting this increase from $600 to $1,000 for dependents for the taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953.

The American taxpayer has earned some relief. In no other country in the world have the citizens of such nations answered their responsibilities to government as honestly and as loyally as have the American people. Not only has the American taxpayer shouldered the burden of financing war and the armament of free nations but he has also gladly and willingly shouldered the responsibility of reconstruction of the whole free world. The enormous sums of money which our country has contributed abroad has come, and is coming, from the American taxpayer.

Due to these large foreign requirements, together with the great expense of government here at home, the American taxpayer has suffered. His family has suffered; his children have suffered; American life has suffered. In view of the present $600 low exemption for a dependent, it is exceedingly difficult for American families not only to finance the day-to-day living costs of their dependent children and their education, but it has become so difficult, it is regrettable to say, children are avoided. In other words, this low exemption of $600 not only threatens American family life but it threatens the future of America.

If our country is to survive during these next crucial generations, young parents must have every encouragement, not only to have children, but to properly care for them and to give them an adequate education. A nation in which its people are educated is a strong nation. Freedom depends upon education and education depends upon freedom. Certainly the time has come in this country when the American taxpayer has earned this reasonable relief in order that his own country might be strengthened.

There are some who hold the view that the Nation cannot afford to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $1,000 because it would cost the Government too much in taxes. It is my view that this is faulty economic reasoning. It is not fact; it is pure opinion. This opinion is not based upon sound economic thinking. If at the proper time I am asked to do so, I shall be glad to state my views on this subject to the Congress. I expect to do everything I possibly can to get this bill passed during this session of Congress. I shall appreciate the support of the American people.

The bill follows:

A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the income-tax exemption allowed a taxpayer for a dependent

Be it enacted, etc., That section 25 (b) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to normal tax and surtax exemptions) is hereby amended by striking out "An exemption of $600 for each dependent" and inserting in lieu thereof "An exemption of $1,000 for each dependent."

SEC. 2. Section 58 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to requirement of declaration of estimated tax) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) his gross income from wages (as defined in sec. 1621) can reasonably be expected to exceed the sum of $4,500 plus—

"(A) $600 with respect to each exemption provided in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 25 (b) (1); and

"(B) $1,000 with respect to each exemption provided in subparagraph (D) of section 25 (b) (1); or."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953.

Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 11, 1954, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has arranged to resume its inquiry into the subject of a comprehensive health program. These hearings will constitute a continuation of the committee's study of methods now available to groups and individuals to protect themselves against the cost of illness and to find ways and means of improving or expanding the same. The study is a continuation of the hearings conducted by the committee in Washington last fall after the adjournment of Congress and which were subsequently supplemented by studies in foreign countries.

In these health studies, serious consideration will be given to the formulation of a program that will enable assistance to be given to our people in carrying the tremendously burdensome cost of medical attention, particularly where hospitalization is necessary, or the illness is of a long-term character.

Commendable progress has been made in this connection by many of our labor unions and industrial concerns. What has been provided by such and the experience they have gained can be of great assistance in formulating a program for the general public. Likewise, much is to be learned from the experience of voluntary health organizations, such as Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and similar group-insurance plans.

Study and consideration should also be given to the possibility of enacting legislation to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of payments made to medical-insurance plans as an incentive to individuals to join such health programs; to legislation designed to provide Federal reinsurance of prepaid

health service plans of nonprofit associations; to Federal guarantees of private loans for the construction of hospital and clinical facilities; to programs for strengthening medical schools and providing an increased number of medical students and nurses, and programs designed to extend preventive medical care.

The organizations and individuals who are expected to testify at the hearing either are concerned directly with the securing or furnishing of medical and hospital services or have made studies with regard to the cost involved in furnishing such services.

The committee's health inquiry was begun during the congressional recess on October 1 and the first 2 weeks of the committee's hearings were devoted to a study of the causes and control of some of the principal diseases of mankind. The second phase of the hearings is now being continued. It was opened with testimony by insurance companies and industrial concerns with regard to group and individual health insurance available today.

I am introducing today 4 bills incorporating one or more of the aforementioned proposals. I am expecting to introduce additional bills in order to have before the House alternative proposals designed to assist our people in carrying burdensome medical costs.

At the close of the 81st Congress I introduced a bill to strengthen group-insurance plans. I am reintroducing this bill today. The purpose of the bill is to expand health services by encouraging the growth of and guaranteeing the strength and security of nonprofit associations. It would also permit extended coverage and allow protection against long, costly treatment.

The second bill I have introduced is designed to assist nonprofit associations offering prepaid health-service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans.

My third bill would amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act—relating to hospital survey and construction—to provide mortgage-loan insurance to stimulate investment of private capital in the construction of self-supporting hospitals and other medical facilities, and to facilitate the extension of voluntary, prepayment health plans providing comprehensive medical and hospital care.

The fourth bill I have introduced would amend the Internal Revenue Code and authorize a deduction up to $100 for income-tax purposes of payments made to medical-insurance plans. This deduction would be in addition to deductions for medical expenses now authorized by law.

The schedule of hearings and the names of the witnesses who are expected to testify are as follows:

Monday, January 11: Mr. Henry J. Kaiser, Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Oakland, Calif.; Dr. Sidney R. Garfield, Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Oakland, Calif.

Tuesday, January 12: Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, president, Rehabilitation Institute, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. H. Clifford Loos, Ross-Loos Clinic, Los Angeles, Calif.

Wednesday, January 13: Mr. Lowell J. Reed, president, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Dr. Russel Van Arsdale Lee, director, Palo Alto Clinic, Palo Alto, Calif.

Thursday, January 14: Dr. George Baehr, president and medical director, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, New York, N. Y.

Friday, January 15: Mr. Fred Umhey, executive secretary, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, New York, N. Y.; Mr. A. J. Hayes, international president, International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Nelson Cruikshank, director, Social Insurance Activities, A. F. of L., Washington, D. C.

Monday, January 18: Mr. Jerry Voorhis, executive secretary, Cooperative Health Federation of America, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Dillon S. Meyer, executive director, Group Health Association, Inc., Washington, D. C.

Tuesday, January 19: Congress of Industrial Organizations, Mr. Walter Reuther, president, United Automobile Workers, Detroit 7, Mich. (Names of additional representatives of CIO to be announced.)

Wednesday, January 20: Dr. Dean A. Clark, general director, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Mass.

Thursday, January 21: Mr. Benjamin Lorber, insurance manager, Universal Pictures Co., Inc. New York, N. Y.

Tuesday, January 26: Research Council for Economic Security, Chicago, Ill., Mr. Gerhard Hirschfeld, director; Mr. Leon Werch, director of research.

Wednesday, January 27: Health Information Foundation, New York, N. Y., Admiral W. H. P. Blandy, United States Navy (retired), president; Mr Kenneth Williamson, vice president and executive secretary; Dr. Odin Anderson, research director; Dr. Clyde Hart, director, National Opinion Research Center.

Thursday, January 28: American Medical Association. (Names of witnesses to be announced.)

Monday, February 1: Mr. George Bugbee, executive director, American Hospital Association, Chicago, Ill.; Commission on the Financing of Hospital Care, Chicago, Ill. (Names of witnesses to be announced.)

Tuesday, February 2: Mr. E. A. Van Steenwyk, executive director, Associated Hospital Service of Philadelphia, and chairman, Government relations committee, Blue Cross Commission, Chicago, Ill.; Blue Shield Medical Care Plans, Chicago, Ill. (Names of witnesses to be announced.)

Return to Competitive Bidding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have this date introduced a bill which in substance provides that Government contracts be awarded to the low bidder in the vast majority of cases. This bill would amend section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 and amend section 302 (c) (1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

It was the original intent of the Congress, as expressed in the House and Senate reports which accompanied the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, that competitive bidding be used in the vast majority of cases and that negotiation be made the permissible exception. Unfortunately, the intent of the Congress, as expressed in the House and Senate reports, had not been embodied in the policies and regulations issued under authority of the act. There has been an indiscriminate use of negotiation in Government procurement contracts. Negotiation has in practice become the rule rather than the permissible exception.

It is the purpose of this bill to insure that through advertising and competitive bidding the Government as a purchaser will receive the best bargain available and that suppliers in a position to furnish the Government's requirements will have a fair and equal opportunity to compete throughout the United States. Competitive bidding applies to everyone who is in a position to supply the Government's requirements and not merely to those who happen to be located where Government surveys are conducted. The procurement laws which were passed by the Congress applied fairly and equally to all of the people. The Office of Defense Mobilization discriminated against the thinly populated areas of our country by writing policies which applied only to areas having a labor force of at least 15,000 and estimated nonagricultural employment of at least 8,000.

There has also been a growing awareness that small-business concerns have not fared well under negotiated contracts. In the preparation of this bill, numerous persons closely associated with the daily problems of small business were consulted. I have gained the impression that a return to competitive bidding as the rule rather than the exception would restore to small-business concerns a confidence in our procurement program which is needed at this time. It is the declared policy of the Congress that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government shall be placed with small-business concerns.

During this period of negotiation of Government contracts by Executive order the cost of awarding and administering a typical textile contract reached the unbelievably high cost of $557 per contract. The American people expect and are entitled to receive the maximum defense obtainable from funds expended by our military services, without paying unnecessarily high prices or unnecessarily high administrative costs under a system which is foreign to competitive bidding and free competitive enterprise.

Negotiation has had the effect of saddling segments of American industry with an economic control over manufactured items in surplus supply at a time when it is the declared policy to abolish controls. I would not desire to prevent the Government from negotiating for a critical material in short supply which could not be secured by competitive bidding, but I do object to the negotiation of contracts for supplies and services which can be secured under competitive bidding.

The inequities which have resulted under the system of negotiated contracts

procurement have been many. Policies have been written which authorized up to 15 percent in excess of the lowest bid price for negotiated contracts. Bid matching policies have been followed which resulted in manufacturers taking contracts away from other manufacturers who would have received the contract except for location. Unemployment has been created in one section by negotiating contracts for the stated purpose of solving an unemployment problem in another location. Government surveys were not made for all areas, resulting in a failure to recognize the fact that unemployment can be as severe in one location as another. Manufacturers could move to distress labor areas and take away contracts from other manufacturers in nonsurplus labor areas. In Arizona, 250 seamstresses were thrown out of work and a parachute manufacturer forced out of business on a negotiated contract. In New Jersey a company engaged in research and development was almost forced out of business on a negotiated contract. A premium was placed on inefficiency by giving preference to mills operating 80 hours or less per week, and efficient textile manufacturers of the South were penalized.

An attempt has been made to justify the negotiation and channeling of contracts to preference areas on the ground that the Government would save in unemployment compensation payments; that the Government would otherwise lose taxes; that lost sales would otherwise result; and that additional relief payments would be necessary in the absence of the policy. If contracts can be negotiated to serve these purposes, for which no figures were made available, it would be difficult to mention any other matter of local public interest which would not also be of equal concern to those who administer our procurement program. These are all matters which are not remotely concerned with Government procurement, and which designated departments of the Government are already engaged in administering.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that an amendment to existing procurement legislation is necessary in order that competitive bidding be reestablished as the rule rather than as the permissible exception, and this is the purpose which I seek to accomplish in introducing the bill.

Eleven American Legion Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement concerning 11 bills I am introducing today at the request of the American Legion:

On this opening day of the second session of the 83d Congress, I am introducing 11 bills at the request of the American Legion. These bills are the result of resolutions adopted at the 1953 national convention of the Legion.

Five of these measures would change the existing laws relating to veterans' insurance. One of these bills provides that the commuted value of any installments of insurance remaining unpaid at the death of the last beneficiary shall be paid to the estate of the insured. Another bill provides that any person having United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance on the 5-year level premium term plan, the term of which expires while the person is in active service after April 25, 1951, or within 120 days after separation from such service, shall upon application made within 120 days after separation be granted an equivalent amount of insurance on the 5-year level premium term plan at the premium rate for his then attained age. Another bill amends the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 by waiving all premiums on United States Government or national service life insurance term policies and so much of the premiums on permanent plan policies as represents the pure insurance risk for those insured who were unable to apply for the waiver authorized by law because of being missing in action or captured by the enemy after April 25, 1951. Another insurance bill provides for the payment in a lump sum, direct to counsel, of a reasonable attorney's fee in a suit brought by or in behalf of an insured during his lifetime for waiver of premiums on account of total disability. The other insurance measure would limit eligibility of a stepchild and of a stepparent for servicemen's indemnity awards. It would authorize an award to a stepchild or a stepparent designated as beneficiary by the insured, making certain that payment would be made if the person in service wanted this. Also, as is proper, if a stepparent not designated as beneficiary, had nonetheless stood in the relationship of parent to the insured for 1 year or more at any time prior to the insured's entry into active service, such parent would be in the permitted class of beneficiaries.

There is also a bill that would continue the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to January 1, 1955, with the same rate of annual appropriations to be allotted on a quarterly basis as now provided under existing statutes.

Another bill would grant a statutory 3-year presumption of service-connection, instead of the present statutory 2-year presumption, for multiple sclerosis. It would also grant a 3-year statutory presumption of service connection for the chronic functional psychoses, instead of the present 1-year presumption now afforded by inclusion in a list of chronic diseases in a Veterans' Administration regulation. By the enactment of this legislation, multiple sclerosis and the chronic functional psychoses would then be placed on a parity with all types of active tuberculosis.

Still another bill would redefine the term "widow of a World War I veteran," by extending from December 14, 1944, to January 1, 1953, the date before which a woman must be married to a World War I veteran to be determined to be his widow for VA compensation and pension purposes.

Another bill would enable World War II veterans to qualify for benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, of which they would otherwise be deprived because of recall to active service in the Armed Forces.

There is also a bill to provide increases in the monthly rates of wartime service-connected death compensation payable to widows alone, and to dependent parents. It proposes a monthly compensation rate in wartime service-connected deaths of $85 for a widow with no child, instead of the present $75, and $75 for a dependent mother or father, instead of the present $60, or where both are granted the benefit, $40 each, instead of the present $35 each. The American Legion points out that there is ample justification for the recommended adjustment of rates. All other disability and death compensation and pension rates were increased in 1952, in the 82d Congress. The cost of living increased for these survivors as for everyone else. There are widows and dependent parents of deceased World War I veterans who are eking out a bare existence because the compensation award is their only income to meet their living expenses.

The final Legion bill would amend existing regulations so as to provide for the transportation of the body of a veteran dying in a State veterans' home. At the present time up to $150 may now be paid by the Veterans' Administration, where a veteran meeting the allowance requirements dies in a State veterans' home, for burial and funeral expenses and transportation of the body, including preparation of the body, to the place of burial. Assumption by the Federal Government of the cost of transporting the body to its final resting place will make certain that the burial and funeral allowance is sufficient to assure a fitting burial for the veteran, in recognition of his service to his country. The Legion believes that equal treatment in this regard should be accorded the veteran, whether he has been domiciled in a State veterans' home or a Veterans' Administration home.

All of these measures will be numbered and referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives. They will then be assigned to the proper subcommittee for study and possibly hearings, with a view toward their enactment.

My Social-Security Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which represents my individual views for the improvement of social security. This proposal is H. R. 6863.

The following points represent the major items incorporated in this bill:

First. Coverage under title II of the Social Security Act—OASI—is extended to practically all occupations now excluded from coverage. This is along the line previously recommended by President Eisenhower. The coverage provisions of my bill are virtually identical with the bill introduced by Chairman Reed, H. R. 6812. Most people who have given any attention to social security are agreed that a national compulsory social security system cannot work with the greatest degree of success without universal coverage or nearly so. In addition to extending coverage to occupations now excluded from the act, it also makes coverage possible for State and local employees who are already covered by a retirement system, but with the exception of firemen and policemen.

Second. The eligibility requirements are liberalized in my bill. This is sometimes referred to as the $75 a month work clause. At the present time, if a beneficiary earns even a few cents more

than $75 in a given month, he loses all of the benefits for that month. I have placed this on an annual basis. This should be of great help to many people. If an OASI beneficiary has a chance to take seasonal work or to work for a few months and earn substantial wages, he can do so and he will not lose any benefits unless for the full year he exceeds the amount of permissible earnings. My bill also raises the amount of permissible earnings to $1,000 per year, but by placing it on an annual basis it is my belief that it will be much more workable and fair to a considerable number of people.

Third. At the present time there are over a million of our aged population who are eligible for benefits but are continuing to work. The reasons for their not asking for the benefits and for continuing to work may be many and varied. My proposal would remove the social security taxes on the earnings of all people after they reach the age of 66 if they have 40 quarters of coverage. The individual who declines the benefits and continues to work saves the system considerable money and it is certainly fair that if he has paid for 40 quarters that he be relieved from continuing to pay the social security tax.

Fourth. The bill that I am today introducing calls for a raise of the minimum benefit to $45 per month. At the present time the minimum benefit is $25. This will bring a raise in benefits to more than one-third of the present beneficiaries who are now receiving the very low benefits. This is a social program designed to meet a social need and the present minimum benefit is inadequate for that purpose.

Fifth. This bill also provides that the benefit paid to a widow or widower will not be less than the minimum primary benefit; to wit, $45 per month. At the present time a widow only receives three-fourths the amount of the husband's primary benefit. With the present very low primary benefit, three-fourths of that amount is an extremely small allowance. My bill says that the widow's or widower's benefit shall not be less than $45 per month.

Sixth. My bill also carries a provision that will eliminate a great many of the abuses in the payment of benefits to individuals living in foreign countries. Under the present law it is possible for individuals who are not our citizens—who in fact may never have been in the United States—to receive social-security benefits for years and years. In the calendar year 1952, the payments of social-security benefits to individuals residing in foreign lands were greater than the payments of social-security benefits to the people in any one of the following States: Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Wyoming, and Mississippi.

There are situations where as a matter of fairness and equity an individual should draw his benefits even though he leaves the United States. I have not sought to disturb those.

Seventh. My bill would make the survivor benefits available now to fatherless children and their mothers where the father died without having become eligible for the survivor benefits. The manner of doing this and the reasons for it will be discussed in connection with the provision that follows:

Eighth. My proposal would make it possible to extend title II benefits—OASI—now to approximately 5 million more of the Nation's retired aged.

The 5 million aged people to whom I propose payment of the minimum OASI benefit are individuals of advanced age who as a class have been unable to qualify under the new-start provisions of the 1950 amendments to the social-security law. Much of the criticism against this proposal has arisen from a lack of information as to how the present system is working. These criticisms are erroneously based on the belief that the present system is one where an individual pays for his own benefits and that every individual who has a social-security card is buying and paying for his benefit or is laying up savings in the program.

The fact is that under the present law an individual can qualify for minimum benefits by paying as little as $4.50 taxes. But, lest I be charged with talking about the exceptional case, let us consider the individual who has paid the maximum tax. An individual who has paid the maximum tax since the act became effective in 1937 and who retires this year could not have paid more than $543 in social-security taxes throughout the period. Such an individual would draw the maximum benefit; and if his wife was likewise 65, together they would draw $127.50 per month, which is paid to them as a matter of right, regardless of their need or other income. At age 65 the life expectancy of a man is 12 years and that of his wife is 14 years. In other words, these benefits will total approximately $18,000.

Many individuals have already qualified for the maximum benefit above referred to for the payment of only $81 in taxes.

In other words, the system that we have now, in truth and in fact, provides that nearly all of the benefit that an aged person receives is paid from the current social-security taxes of the people now working.

The payment of benefits to substantially all of the retired aged now is in line with the previous amendments to the social-security law. The 1939 amendments moved up the effective date as to when individuals could draw benefits. The 1950 amendments did the same thing. The 1950 amendments had the provision referred to as the "new starts."

The adoption by Congress of the new-start provision was the first step toward the extension of OASI benefits to all the retired aged. When the 1950 act was written Congress made social-security benefits available to many people who were already aged. They accomplished this by shortening the time in which these old people would have to work under social security and pay social-security taxes to qualify for benefits. This is what the term "new starts" means. These new-start provisions which became law in 1950 made it possible for older people to qualify not only for benefits but for the maximum benefits by working in covered employment for as little as 6 quarters or 1½ years.

The people that I am talking about today are by and large the people who because of age or physical condition were unable to take advantage of the new-start provisions of the 1950 act. Had they been able to do so they would now be drawing benefits. But they would not have paid for their benefits, they would have made a mere token payment.

The partisan obstructionists who now scream at my proposal and raise the cry that it is unfair and unsound were silent in 1950—likewise for partisan reasons.

The late Senator Taft recognized the true nature of the present system and the effect of the 1950 amendments. In speaking on those amendments on June 14, 1950, Mr. Taft said:

> In the long run we have to recognize that the only way to pay those sums is for the people who are working at the time to pay the benefits for the people who are not working. There is no other way to do it.

In the course of that debate Senator SMITH of New Jersey asked Senator Taft the following question:

> Mr. SMITH. Is the Senator proposing that hereafter those presently working will be taxed to pay benefits to those who are 65 and over, but at the same time those presently working will not be contributing to their own retirement benefits?
>
> Mr. TAFT. That is correct. I would favor a universal old-age pension system. At the same time, we might just as well recognize what we are doing. In the old days children were supposed to take care of their parents. That was sometimes done, and sometimes it was not done. Sometimes there were no children to assume the responsibility. For that system we should substitute a system under which all the people under 65 are undertaking to say they will pay old-age pensions to everyone over 65, hoping that when they reach the age of 65 the people who are at that time working will assume the same obligation.

Mr. Taft went on to say:

> What I want to point out is that this bill already has gone far toward recognizing the principle of paying to those over 65 years of age a pension, with little relation to what they paid in during their life. In other words, it is no longer insurance. It is something called social insurance. It is not insurance, and, at least up to date, this system has not been very social either, because it has covered only a very small portion of the total number of people who are over 65 years of age.

Senator Taft further said:

> In other words, we are recognizing in this bill that we have an obligation to pay old-age pensions to people who are old. Simply because they are old and not because they paid money into the fund.

Senator Taft in specifically referring to the new-start principle on that same day said:

> Under the new-start principle, a man who pays in practically nothing will get $70 a month. Why should we not give the man who does not pay in anything $70 a month, or at least $65 a month? As I see it, we have practically destroyed the theory of social insurance. All I regret is that we still use the name "insurance" when as a matter of fact there is no insurance about it.

The net effect of what I propose to do for the present retired aged is to give the minimum benefit to those retired aged who do not have a wage record which would entitle them to a benefit under existing law. The people who have a wage record and who have paid sufficient taxes would of course continue to get wage-related benefits up to the present maximum. It is interesting to note that this is substantially in line with what Senator Taft said in the debate in the other body on June 14, 1950, and I quote:

I personally, at the moment, should be inclined to favor a flat minimum and then have an increased benefit as people have paid taxes during their life or as they have earned money during the 10 years prior to the time they retired. Under that rule there would be some relation to the amount paid in. I think some relation should be recognized.

The method that I would use for giving an OASI benefit to the present retired aged who have an insufficient work record would be to make those aged eligible to apply for a benefit on a presumptive wage record which would give such an individual the minimum benefit. However, in order to hold down the cost of this provision and in order to prevent the sending of OASI checks to individuals of considerable income if they had never been in covered employment or paid any social-security tax, I would require an aged person who applies for the minimum benefit on the basis of a presumptive wage record to waive his extra personal exemption in the income-tax law. This provision of course would not apply to the individual who has established a wage record making him eligible for benefits.

There are many arguments pointing up the fairness and the equity of my proposal. First let us consider who these unprotected aged are. It is estimated that there are approximately 5.3 million additional aged persons who would draw a benefit under my proposal. More than half of these are widows. Some of them are in their 90's, some of them in their 80's, and many of them past 70. It is estimated that probably more than half of them are over 75 years of age. They were unable to qualify under the new-start provisions of the 1950 law. Had they been able to come under the 1950 law they could have, with the payment of as little as $4.50 tax, become eligible for a minimum benefit.

It must also be borne in mind that many of these people have paid some social-security taxes. Every Member of Congress has in his files letters from aged people who have paid social-security taxes but for one reason or another the quarters of coverage are not such as would make them eligible for benefits. No doubt many of these unprotected aged have paid considerable social-security tax as an employer in a small unincorporated business before self-employment was covered. There are, of course, many of them who have not paid any social-security tax. But we should not forget that many of them have paid and they may well have paid more in direct social-security taxes than others who are now drawing benefits. There are many cases of individuals who have paid considerable social-security taxes but technicalities in the law have prevented the payment of benefits to them or to their survivors. I want to quote from the testimony before the subcommittee studying social security:

COUNSEL. Suppose an individual had worked 24 quarters or 6 years, in covered employment, from January 1940 to January 1946 and died in January 1950, just before reaching age 65. Would his widow, upon reaching age 65, be eligible for an old-age benefit?

WITNESS. No. In the example you give he would not have met the insured status requirement in effect at the time he died. He would have been required to have 26 quarters of coverage, and he actually had 24.

COUNSEL. Suppose an individual with exactly the same wage record, that is, 24 quarters, or 6 years, in covered employment from January 1940 to January 1946, died in January 1951, just before reaching age 65. Would his widow upon reaching age 65 be eligible for an old-age benefit?

WITNESS. Yes. (Hearings, Nov. 20, 1953, p. 1163 of transcript.)

The critics of this proposal say they object to paying benefits where no tax has been paid or where there is no wage record. Can these people have forgotten what Congress has already done in the present social-security system?

When the 1950 law was passed the Congress raised the benefit schedule. Then in order to do justice and to carry out a social purpose they raised the benefits of the people who already had retired prior to the amendments of that year. These people who were already on the benefit rolls were given an additional benefit for which no taxes were paid. Some individuals received an additional benefit of as much as $30 a month for which no additional taxes were required. The total cost of these additional benefits for those already on the OASI rolls for which no added tax payments were required by the 1950 act is estimated at $5,460,000,000. A similar principle was followed by the Congress in 1952 and additional benefits were paid to those already on the rolls for which no added tax payments were required at a total estimated cost of $2,530,000,000.

Those who charge that my proposal to pay benefits to all the present retired aged is radical or is "a dishonest approach" either are totally ignorant as to what Congress has done in the past or they are deliberately attempting to mislead the public. I grant to anyone the right to disagree on what should or should not be done, but I suggest that we debate these things on their merits and not attempt to discredit proposals by smears and name calling.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the payment of benefits to these 5 million aged people is an extension of the principle followed in previous amendments to the social-security law that permitted older people to become eligible upon the payment of a mere token tax. I submit that many of these people have already paid some social-security taxes and I further submit that in 1950 and in 1952, Congress did grant billions of dollars of additional benefits for which no added tax payments were required.

Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of equity, fair play, and justice the Congress would be justified in extending the minimum benefit to these aged people who do not now receive a benefit. However, my proposal has a further important provision. It distinguishes it from any other proposal that has been made for blanketing in the unprotected retired aged. I provide for an additional source of revenue to the social security fund in lieu of the token taxes that these older people would have paid had they been able to qualify under the 1950 law.

Briefly, this added revenue would be obtained by applying the social-security tax at the employees' rate on the first $3,600 of income of all people regardless of its source. At the present time an individual who works for wages or is engaged in self-employment pays the social-security tax on his first $3,600. This would continue. But an individual whose sole income is from investments or rent or the like pays no direct social-security tax. My bill would require all individuals to pay the social-security tax, except those paying civil service and railroad retirement.

This added source of revenue will bring in a substantial amount to the social-security fund. It will be a continuing source of revenue. A fair and conservative estimate of it would be $200 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, if these 5.3 million aged to whom I propose the payment of a minimum benefit of $45 a month had qualified as "new starts" under the 1950 amendments at wage levels for 6 quarters sufficient to give them $45 monthly benefits, the combined employee and employer social-security taxes for them would have totaled $250 million. In other words, an amount equivalent to the total OASI taxes that would have been paid by these older people and by their employers under the new-start provisions will under my bill flow into the fund every 15 months.

Mr. Speaker, as the Congress proceeds to make social-security coverage universal, we are faced with our last good opportunity to make the program sound.

It is difficult for us to realize that the way to make OASI sound is to pay benefits to more of our aged now. This, however, is the way for us to act with responsibility. There is a reason why I say this. Most people are agreed that there is a limit as to how high benefits and taxes should go. Those who seek extremely high benefits can attain their goal while the number of beneficiaries is low because the cost isn't felt or realized. When the program begins to carry the full load of all the retired aged, then radical and extreme increases in benefits will be much less likely because we would be immediately faced with the increased expenditure of billions of dollars and the necessity for an immediate increase of the tax. It would minimize the present danger of hidden and delayed costs. It would put checks and balances in the system—checks and balances that do not now exist. Those who would propose radical and extremely high maximum benefits or the whole range of welfare-state benefits are opposed to assuming a realistic approach with reference to

our present retired aged. They are unwilling to take on the full load of the aged now—a load which they are expecting today's children to take on two decades hence.

My proposals will make for soundness now and in the future, and in addition, they will bring social-security benefits to approximately 6 million of our aged who are now denied those benefits.

Lowering the Retirement Age in Old-Age and Survivors Insurance to 60

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing quite a lot of talk today about ways in which our social-security system should be improved. And, in the beginning, I would like to suggest that some of the so-called remedies which are being advanced will bear careful watching. For example, we cannot, I am convinced, improve our social-security system by allowing it to do less and less for more and more people. We need to extend the coverage of the system, certainly, but not, as some of the proposals would do, at the expense of those of us who are now receiving its benefits, or who will be receiving them in the future.

As many of you know, my own overall solution for improving our present system is not only to extend its coverage, but to improve its protection and its benefits structure substantially. My bill, H. R. 6180, would accomplish the purposes of a genuinely protective social-security system not only by providing for more generous benefits under the existing system, but also by furnishing protection against wage loss caused by the fearful hazard of disability, be it temporary or permanent. This is an ambitious program, and one which will, I am afraid, hardly meet with the approval of the present Congress. But I am glad to be a sponsor of this bill because I am very sure that it outlines the social-security program which this country will someday achieve.

Meanwhile, I am greatly concerned with supporting such genuine improvements as may be possible under existing conditions. And today I want to talk with you about one such improvement which, to my mind, is of the utmost importance in relieving the fear of insecurity in the later years of life, but which has so far received little attention. I am convinced that we could make one of the most important single steps in the direction of genuinely improving the system and bringing it more in line with the realities of our time, by lowering the retirement age under old-age and survivors insurance from age 65 to age 60.

Why was the retirement age in the original Social Security Act set at age 65? I have asked that question repeatedly, and I have never had a satisfactory answer. Perhaps the best one is that the choice of age 65 was made almost two decades ago, at a time when we had had little experience with retirement plans. By and large, therefore, the eligibility age was set at 65 by a mathematical and arbitrary choice, rather than because it had any special meaning in our industrial structure.

My point, here, then, is that we must now reevaluate that decision made over 18 years ago in the light of our experience with the system and our development as a nation. And I am convinced that the record of the old-age and survivors plan, the experience of the people entitled to its benefits, and the industrial development and increased productivity of our country dictate the wisdom of adopting the more realistic retirement age of 60 years.

Such a revision will recognize the clear fact of our time that the very increase in our productivity is shortening the work life of most Americans very decisively. We hear much talk, for example, of the merit of hiring older workers—or of encouraging them to remain at their jobs as long as possible. All of this is laudable and desirable. But the stark reality of the matter is that a great many older workers cannot continue to work either because they are physically unable to do so or because nobody will hire them. Nearly all evidence shows that job opportunities for older workers are decreasing simultaneously with the expansion of our economy. Studies made by the Department of Labor show that men and women who lose their jobs after age 45 have the greatest difficulty finding new jobs. According to these studies, even those employers who keep older workers who are already on their payrolls put strict age limits when hiring new workers. Tragically enough, about one-third of all persons applying for employment are 45 years of age and over. This evidence that older workers are the first casualties in the labor market is, in my opinion, one more very important reason why we should lower the eligibility age in old-age and survivors insurance at least to age 60.

And let us remember, too, the hardship caused in the case of men and women who are forced to leave their jobs before age 65 because of disabling injury or illness. All of us know that such tragedies occur without regard to age. They do not wait until age 65, because the law has set that arbitrary age as the one which makes benefits available. We know, too, that crippling accidents and illnesses are more likely to occur as we grow older.

Now in my opinion, the only real solution to this problem lies in enacting a really protective disability insurance program—such as the one outlined in my omnibus bill. For in this way we could reach down to protect the worker against such a tragedy at any age. But again—short of that long-range goal—we can substantially reduce the tragedy by lowering the retirement age to 60 years. This will mean that men and women who now are so disabled after their 60th birthday will not have to wait until they are 65 to receive social-security benefits. Shortening the waiting period for workers who are disabled at earlier ages will not completely solve their problem—but if we can, on their 60th birthday, say to these people, "You are entitled now to your social-security benefit. You do not have to wait another 5 years until you are 65," we shall have taken an important step toward relieving at least part of the heartless waiting period which is caused by the age restrictions of present law.

May I remind you of another area in which the simple matter of lowering retirement age would be a step in the direction of righting a real injustice to many of the widowed mothers of our country. As you know, women are not entitled to benefits as the widows of workers until they reach age 65 under our existing system. This works a special hardship on the aged widows and on the dependent mothers of wage earners who have died. It is especially true that women age 55 and over find it practically impossible to get a job unless they have been recently employed. If a bereaved widow has never had a job, or if she has been out of the labor market for a long time because she was primarily a homemaker, her problem of sustaining herself after the death of her husband is one of tragic proportions. Under the existing law, she will be entitled to a widow's benefit if her husband was covered by social security. But not until she has reached age 65. If she was widowed at age 55, she must wait 10 years for that benefit. If she has no children living in the home, and if she is unable to find work—either because of inexperience or ill health—she often has no recourse but public relief. Again, lowering the eligibility age to 60 would be a step in the direction of relieving much misery. And for those wives and mothers who are 60 and over when tragedy strikes, it would be avoided altogether.

I have so far mentioned some special conditions which, because of the individual inequities they produce, demonstrate how much more protective our social-security system could become by the simple means of lowering the retirement age by just 5 years. But such an improvement is also desirable from the point of view of all of us. We are faced with the fact that the genius of modern industrialism and the productiveness of our working force have made it possible for us to produce more than we had ever dreamed we could produce—and all that by working less. But we know, as well, that in creating new opportunities and new production records we have also increased some of the risks having to do with economic security for the American family.

The conditions of our time call as insistently for a shortening of the working life as they have for a shortening of the working day. For the most part, we have adjusted the hours of the working day—or of the working week—to meet modern conditions. But we are still wedded to a working-life concept which dates back at least three decades. We are here concerned, then, not with the condition

of the country in 1910—or even in 1935—but with the situation today. We have revised and modernized our social security structure in nearly every other respect, but we have held on to an outworn concept in allowing the retirement age to stand at 65.

I believe our social-security system should be one which will encourage us to make way for younger workers, and encourage a way of life which, in the democratic pattern, produces the maximum of economic progress and individual security. Short of the enactment of a genuinely protective social-security system, such as is proposed in my omnibus bill, I suggest that an amendment lowering the retirement age from age 65 to age 60 would be one of the most universally beneficial improvements we can make in the system. It will, I submit, be a long step forward in providing better and more adequate protection against the economic risks of our time.

Present Income-Tax Exemption of $600 Should Be Raised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the present personal income-tax exemption of $600 for each taxpayer and each dependent is totally unrealistic today. At the time when these exemptions were made so low a dollar was worth more than it is today. With the decreasing value of the dollar it is now necessary to raise the personal income-tax exemption in order to end the disproportionate tax burden which now falls on large families.

In January 1953, I introduced H. R. 2281 which provides for raising the income-tax exemption from $600 to $750 for all personal taxpayers and for each dependent. According to the Treasury Department estimates this change in the income-tax laws would make an additional $3½ billion a year available to American families. We all know that the American family is the great spending unit which keeps the wheels of American industry turning. This additional $3½ billion in the hands of American families would be spent on the usual family necessities and would thus help to keep American business at a high level and help to absorb American farmer products.

Since it has been proposed to reduce taxes beyond the amount which has already gone into effect as of January 1 of this year, it would be much more equitable to bring about this reduction by increasing the personal exemptions rather than by an overall percentage decrease in the tax rates. An overall decrease in rates, while helpful, would still leave the large families bearing a disproportionate share of the tax burden. On the other hand, a reduction in the personal exemptions would benefit everyone but would be particularly beneficial to large families.

H. R. 2281 is also applicable to the double exemption for blind persons and persons over 65. Hence, a married couple, both over 65, would be entitled to an exemption of $3,000 under H. R. 2281, in contrast to the present exemption of $2,400. Thus, this bill would be a great help to the old people who have particularly borne the burden of inflation which has sharply reduced the value of their savings and annuities.

The Republican administration which came into office in 1920, following World War I and its high taxes, particularly benefited the people with low incomes by greatly reducing their income tax from its previous high level. The present new Republican administration can likewise do a worthwhile act of justice and give priority in tax relief for the persons with low incomes and large families by raising the present tax exemptions $600 to $750 or more per dependent.

Federal Cooperation With Local Subdivisions for the Conservation and Development of Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in line with the announced policy of the Department of Interior to cooperate with the States and other political subdivisions in the conservation and development of water resources, I have today introduced a bill to provide Federal assistance to permit the financing and construction of the Tri-Dam project on the Stanislaus River in California.

The South San Joaquin Irrigation District and the Oakdale Irrigation District have combined their interests in undertaking this joint project. These two districts were pioneers in the development of irrigation in California which turned our agricultural production from grains, hay, and so forth, to specialized crops such as almonds, walnuts, peaches, plums, pears, prunes, grapes, truck garden crops of all kinds, and so forth. This has resulted in California being the State which for years has been the largest producer, in dollar value, of agricultural crops.

This bill will authorize assistance in the amount of $10,370,000 to these districts. The districts have each voted bonds in the sum of $26 million for the development of the Tri-Dam project. The districts are operated jointly, and have two Federal Power Commission licenses authorizing the construction of this project.

It is fantastic that a small group of people who are the owners of these districts—about 30,000 people in the boundaries of the districts—should be willing to bind themselves to the payment of $52 million plus interest, in order to more fully develop a water supply to meet the expanding needs of the irrigators.

The amount which is provided as financial aid is the sum which it would cost the Federal Government for the irrigation features of the project, should it develop the water resource and in turn sell it to the irrigators. Under the reclamation law this would be repaid by the water users, without interest, over a period of 40 years. This sum is not a gift to the irrigation districts. It is merely a loan to help them get started on the project. It will be repaid by the districts.

This bill is a "guinea pig" bill that may pave the way for other similar projects and that will result in collaboration between the Federal Government and State agencies in the development of water resources. It will place the management and control of these resources in the hands of those who will use and pay for the works necessary to bring the water to their lands. It will be controlled at the level of and by the very people who use the resource. It will remove remote control of water which comes from an intrastate stream in California, which by its constitution provides that the water of its streams belong to the people of the State.

Another interesting feature of this development is that hydroelectric development of these waters will provide electricity, the sale of which will completely pay for the whole project in 50 years. These districts have an executed contract with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. that all the power developed by these dams will be purchased by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., and it is estimated that in 50 years the income from this contract will pay the money for which the people of the districts have bonded themselves

A most interesting thing about this situation is that the vote of the people who authorized these bonds was over 9 to 1 in one district, and over 5 to 1 in the other district.

Deduction of College Expenses for Income-Tax Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a proposal has been made that the income-tax laws should be revised to allow deduction for tax purposes of certain expenses connected with college education. I am thoroughly in agreement with the basic principle upon which this proposal is based. My specific reasons I will enumerate for you in a minute, but first I would like to say a few words about the importance of a college education for the

youth of today. If we are willing to support tax advantages for the sake of making college education more readily available, we must first agree that a college education is a good and desirable thing.

We live in a very complex world today, a world which our ancestors would find completely baffling. We are engaged in all sorts of activities which they could never have anticipated. We have made tremendous strides in both the physical and the social sciences. Life is infinitely more complex today than ever before. How are we to cope with this increased complexity, with this myriad of new inventions and new developments? How are we to equip the young men and women of today to go out with a chance of making a better world for themselves? One answer is that we must provide better and more extensive education for as many of our population as possible. Now, a better education does not mean that everyone must go to college. But, certainly, it means that we should provide the opportunity for the best qualified of our young people to do so. We need desperately, for instance, many more scientists and adequately trained professional men and women. We need, too, men and women who have an understanding of our social and economic structure, of our cultural institutions; men and women with a background adequate to enable them to devise workable solutions to the many problems which confront us. Colleges are equipped to help us satisfy those needs.

Today, 150,000 top students each year are unable to go on to college from high school, mostly for financial reasons. Only 20 percent graduate from college. We can and must do better than this.

There are a few fortunate families who have no trouble in meeting all the expenses their children incur during the course of their college educations. But most of us experience a great deal of difficulty in scratching up the thousands of dollars required to put a child through college. Many of us find it far beyond the realm of possibility, or are forced to go heavily into debt to secure the necessary funds. One action which would provide some relief is the raising of the income tax deduction allowed for a dependent in college to a figure which more nearly corresponds to the actual cost than does the present $600 allowance. Experience has shown that a parent must expect to pay nearly $1,500 a year to keep a child in college; many schools require a much greater amount; some are somewhat less expensive, especially if the child is living at home. Very few of us have $1,500 a year to spare, and the situation becomes even worse when two or more children are ready for college at the same time. Increased tax deductions would not solve the whole problem, but they would make it a little less burdensome. We allow deductions for medical expenses, for contributions to charities (possibly including the education of someone else's children), and we grant special tax advantages for such things as the rapid amortization of the cost of defense plants. It would be even more logical to allow tax advantages for the college educations of our children. Not only would this help the children, but it also would help some of the private institutions of higher learning by increasing the number of students in attendance. In the long run, of course, all of us would benefit by having a citizenry which was better educated and better equipped to face the problems of modern-day living.

Trade With Iron Curtain Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have been home among normal people so long that it takes reconditioning to understand some of the things I have been reading about in the Washington papers for the last 2 days.

When I left here in August to go home, Russia was a mortal enemy of mankind, cruelly bent upon the destruction of freedom and decency and all of the things we cherish. That is, I thought so, but I read this morning where the President's man, Stassen, now called Foreign Operations Administrator, had a press conference and said that the National Security Council decided last summer to relax the curbs on trade with the Iron and Bamboo countries, and that the administration has been relaxing the bans on items considered nonstrategic over the last 5 months. As a matter of fact, the article said that the Eisenhower administration has reversed its policy of opposing trade with Russia and is now encouraging such trade. The article reminds us, however, that this will not favorably affect the surpluses of America—it will only favorably affect the countries that we have been giving money to since the war and, of course, Russia.

Mr. Speaker, when can an enemy be forgiven for purely economic purposes? When is it advisable to prohibit Americans from trading with the Iron Curtain countries, and at the same time advisable to permit and encourage our beneficiaries and competitors to carry on this trade?

I have not been able to wipe away the blood and sacrifice and suffering brought on by the Communists sufficiently to accept without protest a policy that will strengthen the Government of Russia.

It is not possible for me to experience anything except anger and sadness that my country would make such a decision, a decision which, apparently, was made last summer when young Americans were dying at the hands of the stooges of the Communist government. I do not propose to tell the Governments of England, France, Italy, or any other government except my own what they should or should not do with reference to someone who is trying to kill them, but I do say that I am not going to share with them the hard-earned dollars of the American people, and to further say that the proposed announcement by Mr. Stassen does not make sense to me. If it is the administration's proposal, we are entitled to a full explanation from those responsible for it, and an opportunity for the people's representatives to pass upon its soundness.

It does not seem right, somehow, to have one hand asking for billions and sacrifice to destroy an enemy and the other hand patting him on the back and encouraging his economic welfare.

Resolution Introduced Calls for Nationwide Soil Conservation and Flood Prevention Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD S. MILLER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced for consideration of the House and the Senate a resolution requesting the Department of Agriculture to take immediate steps to develop a comprehensive and nationwide soil conservation and flood-prevention program.

In introducing this resolution I had in mind two principal objects.

First of these arises out of the seriousness of the problem of saving our soil. The United States fell heir to the greatest fortune ever inherited by any nation, 3,628,130 square miles of land—forests, minerals, farmland in seemingly inexhaustible quantity. We were the rich man's son of the world, and I regret to say we have wasted our substance very much as the proverbial rich man's son is likely to do.

We have wantonly wasted our metals until we are being driven to import iron for our steel mills. We have denuded our mountains of timber until we can foresee a shortage of lumber within a lifetime. But these losses, serious as they are, are small compared to the loss of the soil that is being yearly washed into the sea.

No man who loves his country and who has a decent regard for the generations to come after him, and knowing the soil loss this Nation annually sustains, can look into the future without fear and anxiety for his country.

Think of it, my colleagues, you guardians of the welfare of the people of this Nation, the loss, the irreparable loss that can never be retrieved. It is not like the destruction of a city. Cities can be rebuilt and they are rebuilt, often bigger and better than ever, but the good soil, the life of a nation, washed into the sea, can never, never be replaced.

Think of it, my colleagues, the waste, the unredeemable waste, such as no nation on the earth has ever sustained. Shall we stand idly by and see it continue? We must not, we dare not do it. If we Members of Congress, guardians of this Nation, knowingly permit this waste to continue we shall deserve the condemnation, not only of this generation, but of all the generations that come

after. We cannot plead ignorance—we know the facts; we cannot plead poverty—we can only plead guilty—guilty of a crime for which we cannot make amends.

What then shall be our course of action? Shall we close our eyes to the hideous spectacle of our basic wealth being transported into the sea? Shall we close our ears to the roar of the rivers carrying not our "black gold" but our "bread of life" into the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans?

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, what will this Congress do in such circumstances? No more important question can come before this session. There can be but one answer: We shall, we must, adopt a sensible, comprehensive soil-conservation program. To prevent further waste of our soil should be our first and primary consideration.

We have more than 3 million men in the armed services. We have other millions engaged in the manufacture of instruments of war. We all know that, sooner or later, the international tensions must lessen, these soldiers will be brought home, and the men in war plants will be out of jobs. All must be given employment. Where in all this land can be found a better place to put these young men to work, than in saving our basic resource, the good black soil that produces the corn, the wheat, the cotton, the wool, the swine, and the cattle that feed and clothe the people of this Nation.

Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, there is great dissatisfaction in our country today with the investigative methods and procedures used by congressional committees. Unfortunately, there has been a good deal of abuse of these processes, which has proven injurious to the civil rights and liberties of American citizens. It is undermining our whole concept of freedom and may in the long run destroy our way of life.

The trend of fear and hysteria, which is felt throughout the length and breadth of our country today, is a direct result of the abuse of congressional power and the dictatorial manner of some of those who utilize this power for personal or partisan reasons. Our tradition of freedom, our respect for human rights and for the dignity of the individual, the privileges we enjoy in the form of civil liberties—all of these rights and privileges which made America great—are being trampled upon.

It is not too late to retrace our steps and to correct this situation, and that can best be done by promptly putting in their place the vociferous witch-hunters, the book-burners, the character assassins, and the like, who have made America the laughing-stock of the world. It can best be done within the halls of Congress itself by exerting greater control over these run-away committees and by prescribing set rules of procedure in their investigative activities.

Mr. Speaker, during the 82d Congress, back in 1951 and 1952, I had the honor to serve as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee which conducted an investigation of the Securities and Exchange Commission. At the very first meeting of our subcommittee, I laid down the rules by which the investigation would be conducted. I quote from the subcommittee's hearings, part 1, page 2:

> The subcommittee will seek to ascertain whether or not the legislative intent and policy have been understood and carried out by the Commission. The inquiry will be conducted in an objective, fair, judicial, and impartial manner in the interest of the Nation.
>
> In reviewing the Commission's activities we shall aim to do so in a constructive and dignified manner, to give credit and recognition to the Commission's achievements, and to point out any deficiencies and weak spots wherever these may occur, so that proper steps may be taken to correct them.
>
> * * * Slander and character assassination will be ruled out of order. We will not smear, but we will not whitewash. At all times it shall be the aim of the subcommittee to extend to those involved and to those who want to be heard the privilege and opportunity to present their views. We shall, however, avoid cluttering the record with irrelevant testimony and baseless defamatory remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I need not tell you that I followed that procedure scrupulously. I sought to conduct the hearings judicially and to track down every lead in a fair and impartial manner, without sensationalism and without seeking headlines at the other fellow's expense.

I want to reiterate my position that congressional investigations must be conducted in such manner. The rights and the privileges, the good names, and the good reputations of those appearing as witnesses or those named during the course of such hearings, must be safeguarded. Irresponsible charges, made under the protective cloak of congressional immunity, must be ruled out. The sooner that is done, the sooner we shall be able to preserve the great moral and political freedoms we so proudly call our own.

It is for these reasons that I have given much thought in recent months to this matter in the hope of suggesting certain rules of procedure in order to ameliorate the investigative processes of congressional committees. I am of the opinion—and I believe all my colleagues in this Chamber will agree with me—that the primary purpose for which Congress is entitled to use compulsory power in its investigative procedure is to obtain the necessary information to perform its legislative functions. When these legislative investigations take on the appearance of a court trial, when they are conducted in a way to advance the political fortunes of an individual who is a member of such committee or the political party with which he is affiliated, then it is time to revise or amend our rules of procedure to bring them within the scope of our democratic process.

Consequently, I am introducing a concurrent resolution which seeks to establish certain rules of procedure governing investigations by committees of Congress. It follows generally some of the provisions contained in a similar resolution introduced by the distinguished Senator of Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and nine of his Senate colleagues, but with certain exceptions and modifications.

My resolution contains a new provision—section 3—which specifies that the subject and purpose of an investigation shall be stated before hearings are held, and that the evidence developed by the committee during the hearings shall be relevant to the subject and purpose as stated. This section is in accordance with my views expressed in the quotation cited above from the hearings of the SEC Subcommittee which I headed in the last Congress.

Another provision in my resolution—section 14—prescribes that television or radio coverage shall be omitted during hearings if the witness objects on the ground that his reputation is at stake. Where there is no objection on the part of the witness, such coverage is to be facilitated to the fullest possible extent.

Other sections of my resolution provide as follows:

Any person or organization whose activities are the subject of an investigation shall be notified of the nature of the charges against them and the derogatory material which is to be presented against them.

Such person or organization should be given the opportunity to present evidence in their own behalf.

Persons or organizations investigated should be permitted the advice of counsel, who shall be entitled to question within appropriate limits such person or representatives of organizations for pertinent facts.

They may file with the committee a limited number of questions to be answered by witnesses who have testified to derogatory information.

At the conclusion of the evidence, such person or organization may file a rebuttal statement.

Witnesses should not be compelled to testify as to their religious or political beliefs unless a majority of the committee rules that such information is relevant to the investigation.

These are the main provisions of the resolution, but there are also several minor provisions which contain safeguards concerning subpenas, the presentation of bona fide claims of privilege, inquiries into the private affairs of an individual, testimony developed in executive sessions, and other safeguards.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of Congress to give serious consideration to this matter and to the proposals contained in my resolution. By adoption of these rules of procedure, we shall not only vastly improve the prestige of Congress but also bring to an end the period of fear and hysteria and lift the national morale to great heights.

The full text of my resolution follows:

Concurrent Resolution 186

Concurrent resolution establishing rules of procedure governing investigations by committees of Congress

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), That the following provisions of this concurrent resolution are adopted as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, governing the conduct of investigations undertaken by committees.

SEC. 2. As used in this concurrent resolution, the term "committee" means a standing or select committee of either House of Congress, a joint committee of the two Houses, or a duly authorized subcommittee of any of the foregoing.

SEC. 3. Before any committee begins any hearings in connection with any investigation, the chairman, or a member of the committee designated by him for the purpose, shall clearly state the subject and purpose of the investigation. The evidence sought to be elicied by the committee in the course of such hearings shall be relevant to the subject of the investigation, and reasonably calculated to contribute to the accomplishment of the purpose of the investigation, as so stated.

SEC. 4. Insofar as practicable, any person or organization whose activities are the subject of investigation by a committee, or about whom derogatory information is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of a committee, shall be fully advised by the committee as to the matters into which the committee proposes to inquire and the derogatory material which is proposed to be presented. Insofar as practicable, all material reflecting on the character of any individual or organization which is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of a committee shall be first reviewed in executive session and shall not be presented at a public hearing except pursuant to majority vote of the committee.

SEC. 5. Any person or organization whose activities are the subject of any investigation by a committee, or about whom a derogatory statement is made or material is presented at any public hearing of a committee, shall—

(1) be given an opportunity to present evidence in his or its own behalf at the same session and, if possible, on the same day;

(2) be permitted in appearances before the committee to be accompanied and advised by counsel, who shall within appropriate limits be entitled to question such person or representatives of such organization, in order to bring out all pertinent facts;

(3) be permitted to file with the committee a limited number of interrogatories to be answered by witnesses who have testified to derogatory material about such person or organization;

(4) be entitled to have the committee subpena witnesses for limited direct or adverse examination by such person or organization, or by his or its counsel, subject to the discretion of the committee; and

(5) be permitted to file at the conclusion of the evidence a rebuttal statement, which shall be made a part of the record and considered in the committee's report.

SEC. 6. Any witness who asserts a bona fide claim of privilege shall be entitled to present such claim to the committee, either in his own proper person or through counsel, and secure the committee's ruling.

SEC. 7. No subpena to inquire into the private affairs of any individual shall be issued by any committee except pursuant to majority vote of the committee.

SEC. 8. No person shall be required to testify in executive session of any committee unless a majority of the committee expressly rules that the public interest requires that such person's testimony shall be kept secret. Any such examination shall be held before not less than two committee members. Testimony taken in executive session shall be kept secret and shall not be released, or used in public hearings, without the approval of a majority of the committee.

SEC. 9. No witness before a committee shall be compelled to testify as to his religious or political belief unless the committee rules by majority vote that such testimony is relevant to the inquiry.

SEC. 10. Until after the committee has been given a reasonable time to file its report, members of committees shall refrain from making derogatory comments about a witness in either House or elsewhere and shall refrain from revealing the contents of any committee report or the conclusions contained in such report prior to its issuance.

SEC. 11. Minority reports, if any, shall be filed at the same time as majority reports on investigations involving the private affairs of individuals.

SEC. 12. All of the evidence involving the private affairs of individuals upon which a committee report, finding, or conclusion is based shall be made public concurrently with such report, finding, or conclusion.

SEC. 13. A verbatim record shall be made of all hearings. Records of public hearings and published portions of executive hearings shall be made available to the public upon payment of the cost thereof.

SEC. 14. The appearance of a witness before a committee in the course of an investigation shall not be broadcast or televised without his consent, where there is reasonable ground to believe that in the course of his appearance a reference will be made, by the witness or by any member of the committee or its staff, to any matter adversely affecting the reputation of the witness.

Ukrainian National Independence Truth or Fiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for time today in order to invite the attention of the Members of Congress to some unusual developments taking place within the U. S. S. R. These events have been given scant public notice in the United States and have received like treatment, with a few notable exceptions, elsewhere in the free world. But they have been given intense treatment within the prison of nations, which we, by habit, refer to as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Since these events have a vital bearing on the security of the United States and the advancement of human freedom throughout the world, I feel they should be of special interest to all Members of Congress.

Just a few months ago we and the other people of the free world were informed by the Kremlin that Stalin, the czar of tyrants, was about to pass from this earth like all mortal men. Scarcely had this announcement been made when the official mouthpiece of the Red conspirators called for unity of the many nations and peoples making up the U. S. S. R. Their fear and uncertainty was so overriding that they let the cat out of the bag on several critical issues. To begin with, even before Stalin was announced as dead, they denied his only significant contribution to Marxian theory by admitting that the multinational tensions of the U. S. S. R. were greater than ever before in history. The greatest myth surrounding Stalin was that he had solved the perplexing problem of nationalism by getting the people to accept the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as the road to utopia. Their fears also led them to admit publicly their belief that the ethnic Russians, the minority peoples of the U. S. S. R., were the superior people of the system and the dependence of the regime upon their loyal support of the transition following Stalin's death.

The struggle between Malenkov and Beria was forecast on the very day they carried Stalin's mortal remains to Red Square. In the funeral orations given by both men, one finds the seeds of the struggle which ensued during the following 5 months. Malenkov, in his oration, made particular reference to the peoples of Russia. Beria on the other hand, chose to call them peoples of the U. S. S. R. The passage of time and the elimination of Beria have proved the real significance of the choice of these terms by the leading contenders for Stalin's throne.

Beria, by virtue of his long tenure of office, as head of the dreaded secret police, knew better than anyone else the structural and political weakness of the Communist empire. He also knew what the vast majority of the peoples of the U. S. S. R. wanted because he spent most of his lifetime sending people to death or slave labor camps just because they did seek goals and objectives which did not agree with those of the regime. He knew why the police state was necessary and he thereby knew what kind of internal pressure would assure his victory in the struggle with Malenkov.

Malenkov on the other hand, was a typical Moscow bureaucrat, steeped in the chauvinistic life of Muscovy. Well schooled by Stalin in the technique of imperial control, he, above all others, came closest to the requirements of a czar. He thereby became the candidate of the Moscovites and as such all ethnic Russians were committed to support him.

What followed is a matter of history. Beria spent his time building up strength in the 14 non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. Russians were dismissed from high office in most of those areas and in their places Beria put men who could be counted upon to demand concessions from the Muscovites. In dismissing the Russian bureaucrats, charges were placed against them for attempting to Russify the non-Russian nations, disregarding the legitimate aspirations of the people and for reviving the chauvinistic policies of the Czars. In retrospect we can now see that Beria came close to attaining total power. Malenkov, having made his deal with the Russian controlled Red army, was able to use that force to stop Beria—to arrest him, to try him and to liquidate him. Perhaps we shall never know exactly how close Beria came to winning this

struggle but there are strong indications at this early date that Malenkov stopped him with little time to spare. There are also signs that Beria left behind some violent seeds of internal disruption which may very well burst in the hands of Malenkov—if he lasts long enough.

I am not attempting to analyze Beria's motives or to suggest that he sought to reform after Stalin's death. He was a ruthless, amoral person all his life and the record should remain clear on that point. In his struggle for total power, however, cold-blooded judgment rather than sentiment was required.

The Soviet indictment of Beria charged him, among other things, with the following:

First. Supporting remnants of the bourgeois nationalist elements in the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R.

Second. Sowing hatred and discord between the peoples of the U. S. S. R.

Third. Undermining the friendship of the peoples of the U. S. S. R. with the ethnic Russian people.

The closed court committee which supposedly tried Beria announced him guilty of these charges, among others, and ordered his execution. This was carried out on December 23, 1953.

But this does not end the case of Lavrenti Beria. Even before his announced execution, the frightened Muscovites felt compelled to take a most extraordinary step to demonstrate what they call the unbreakable friendship of the peoples of the U. S. S. R. for the ethnic Russians. Pravda of December 9, 1953, announced that by official decree, January 8, 1954, was to be a multinational holiday celebrated throughout the realm, in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the annexation of the Ukraine by Muscovy. This decree makes it "incumbent upon local party and Soviet organizations to mark widely this event—to organize lectures, reports and talks devoted to this important event—and the further strengthening of friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union."

Pravda, in an editorial of December 9, 1953, gives extravagant instructions on why this multinational holiday is proclaimed and how it is to be carried out. The Ukrainians are to be told that they have now realized their centuries long struggle for national independence because their Russian "brothers" have granted it to them. The Ukrainians are to be praised for this centuries long struggle and told that they attained it through the efforts of the Communist Party. They are to be reminded, however, that their national independence is not the same kind sought by Ukrainian patriots over the centuries. It is a new kind, manufactured by the Muscovites, and called National Soviet Ukrainian statehood. According to the editorial, this means "national in appearance and socialist in substance." What the Ukrainians will not be told is that this is the same old stuff put out in revised form and tailored to cause more than the ordinary confusion resulting from such proclamations. But, I am sure the Ukrainian people will not be fooled by this maneuver and will see in it an admission of fear on the part of the Kremlin.

I am also sure that the Ukrainian people will recall the true story about the Treaty of Peryaslav. They will remember that Hetman Khmelnitsky was deceived by the Muscovites 300 years ago at a time when he was making an heroic struggle for the independence of Ukraine. They will never forget how the Muscovites violated this treaty and in the end used it as a means to annex Ukrainian lands and make the people subservient to Moscow. They will surely recall the failure of the czars to Russify the Ukraine just as today they see on all sides the efforts of the Communist Party to accomplish what the czars failed to accomplish. Their courage and true national spirit will be strengthened by the expressed fears of Moscow. They cannot fail to press forward with renewed vigor toward the centuries old goal of an independent, sovereign Ukraine taking its place among the other nations of the world as a respected equal.

I am equally confident that the other non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. will not be deceived by the Kremlin falsification of history in connection with the Treaty of Peryaslav. The Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians have fresh in their memories the treaties they were forced to sign in 1939 which were later used illegally to annex those sovereign nations into the U. S. S. R. The people of Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaidzhan will never forget how they lost their national independence gained after World War I through the violation of similar treaties by Moscow. Nor will the people of the Independent Byelorussian or the Turkestani Democratic Republic ever forget what signing any sort of treaty with Moscow means. Down through all recorded history, Muscovy has always considered any treaty of mutual assistance or nonaggression with a foreign state as a legal instrument to perform any illegal act necessary to the extension of the empire.

Now that the Kremlin has been forced to admit that the aspirations of all the Ukrainian people is, and always has been, for national independence, we should extend similar recognition. There is pending before the House Foreign Affairs Committee a resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 58—calling for the establishment of full diplomatic relations with Ukraine and Byelorussia. Public hearings have been held on this resolution and it is time action was taken on it.

By taking early and affirmative action on this resolution, we can establish a real test of the sincerity of Moscow in its claimed support for peace and tranquility among nations. We could not be accused of interference in the internal affairs of the U. S. S. R. because the Kremlin itself has announced to the world that the Ukrainian nation has been given its national independence. All the other non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. have been given instructions to prepare appropriate celebrations for this occasion. The Kremlin knows that all these nations also seek the same goal. It is clearly in our best interests to find out whether the Kremlin announcement of December 9, 1953, is truth or fiction.

Eighty-Third Congress, Second Session, Report to the People of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK SMALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, as the second session of the 83d Congress opens, offering new opportunities for constructive legislation, I should like to make several observations for the record at this time. I therefore submit this report to my constituents:

My work on the Public Works Committee is both interesting and demanding. Many of the projects considered by our committee have real merit. You can readily appreciate how difficult it is to establish projects which should be given priority for appropriations. You and I are impelled by our sense of responsibility as conscientious and patriotic citizens to do our duty. The very safety of our great Republic depends upon the way in which you and I discharge this responsibility.

The last session of Congress accomplished a saving of $13 billion, compared with the estimate prepared in advance by the previous administration. This was a saving of about $81 for every man, woman, and child in the country. More can be saved if Congress will clamp down on foreign spending, as I believe we should do, for I still believe that you cannot buy friends. It is hoped that Congress can discontinue foreign-aid programs soon and thus further reduce our Government expenditures.

While the last session of Congress passed up a proposed increase in the national debt limit, it is anticipated that this will be up for consideration early in the second session. Budget requests were cut, but the present administration is confronted with the heavy commitments of the former regime. Bills coming due must be paid. The Government must borrow the money to pay them unless tax payments take a spurt. We must always be in a position to pay our obligations or face a national calamity. This is just a business reality.

Matters of vital concern to the Fifth Congressional District to which I shall continue to devote my attention and personal efforts include the following:

Anacostia River Basin flood-control project, better known as Peace Cross: Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER and Senator J. GLENN BEALL are cooperating actively with us in an effort to obtain conclusive, favorable action for some construction funds in 1954. This project is important not only as a relief to homeowners and businesses in the area, but also for the movement of traffic on United States Routes 1 and 50 and for the defense of the National Capital. The State of Maryland has made mandatorily available a sum of $4,250,000 for construction on this project, predicated on an appropriation by the Federal Government, which would permit us to go ahead without further delays.

Planning by the United States Army engineers has progressed sufficiently for construction to begin as soon as Federal funds can be provided.

Andrews Air Force Base and Friendship International Airport: The entire Maryland congressional delegation, including all Representatives and both United States Senators, is cooperating with us in opposing the partial commercialization of Andrews Air Force Base; and we unitedly favor the use of Friendship International Airport to handle the overflow load of transoceanic and transcontinental air traffic which cannot be readily accommodated at Washington National Airport.

Washington-Baltimore Expressway: The Baltimore end of this new highway, built by the State of Maryland, will be open to all types of traffic. The Department of the Interior has indicated that the Washington end, designated as "parkway" and built by the Federal Government, will be limited to passenger vehicles only. We are seeking a solution to this problem which has two schools of thought. We feel that the Interior Department should afford further opportunity for both sides to be heard.

The Hatch Act: I shall continue to press for enactment of my bill, H. R. 1418, to amend the Hatch Act so that Government employees will be able to enjoy the same rights as other citizens to participate in political campaigns.

I shall continue to look out for the best interests of our schools, so far as I can help at the national level, with due consideration for the heavy load we carry in federally impacted areas. I am ever ready to do what I can to protect the extensive varied interests of all segments of agriculture and other legitimate business and industry, employees and employers alike. I shall continue to work also for improved retirement benefits for Government employees in the interest of a better civil service.

The opportunity to serve the people of the Fifth District of Maryland in Congress is deeply appreciated, but there are some things more important to me than my commission as your Congressman. What happens to me will be of little importance, in a general sense, but what happens to this country is tremendously important to my children, to your children, and to our children's children. I want to do a good job. You can help. I shall be glad to hear from you on any matters which you feel should be brought to my attention. My address is room 1608, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Acreage Restriction on Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust acreage restrictions according to the various types and grades of wheat in the areas in which they are produced according to the supply of such types and grades in relation to demand for them.

The present law providing for acreage restrictions on wheat contains a serious defect in that it does not take into account the fact that the supply and demand situation varies with different classes of wheat.

At present the surplus of wheat in the United States is so great that acreage restrictions have been applied. However, investigation reveals that the largest oversupply is in the soft wheats, while there is a high level of demand and indications of some shortage of high protein spring and hard winter wheat and durum.

Montana farmers received premiums as high as 50 cents per bushel on high protein wheat this year. I am told that the 1953 crop of durum is only about one-half our normal requirement. It appears that the production of high protein and durum in 1953 did not contribute to the surplus supply of wheat.

Nevertheless, the present law requires that the acreage allotments be assigned to all producers of wheat, regardless of the class of wheat produced, and therefore the acreage of these needed and desirable classes of wheat must be restricted just the same as the acreage of those classes of which there is a surplus. I feel it is desirable to give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority he needs to administer the law with greater flexibility so that he may take into account these special situations.

Properly administered, this amendment will assure American consumers a continued adequate supply of high protein wheat, while at the same time protecting the economy against an oversupply of other grades.

The amendment would have no effect on price support operations for any class of wheat.

Proposed Span Over Potomac River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, it now rests with the Congress to make the decision necessary to the solution of the serious bridge problem affecting the greater Washington area. I believe that it will be decided in the best interests of the citizens of Washington and neighboring Virginia.

I sincerely regret that some well-intentioned citizens have objected to the E Street bridge location because the proposed span would go over Theodore Roosevelt Island. This island was dedicated to the memory of that great American and former President.

I sincerely share their admiration and respect for the lovable "Teddy" Roosevelt. As a boy in knee pants he was one of my heroes. His exploits in the Spanish-American War were dear to my heart. And as I grew older I learned of his efficient and successful administration of our Nation's affairs as its Chief Executive.

I would most certainly do nothing to mar the cherished memory of that great statesman-soldier. On the contrary my proposal would serve to enhance that memory. The bridge I propose would carry the name "the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge." It would be a constant reminder to the millions of people who would pass over it that Theodore Roosevelt will ever live in the American hall of fame.

No one will contend that the Lincoln Memorial Bridge in Washington offends the memory of Abraham Lincoln. Nor will they say that the George Washington Bridge in New York reflects adversely on the memory of the man who was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." If any luster could be added to the names of Lincoln and Washington, these splendid bridge structures have added it. And so it would be with the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge which I proposed in the bill I have introduced in the House today.

Theodore Roosevelt Island will not be destroyed, nor will the bird sanctuary there be disturbed. I am sure that were the great "Teddy" alive he would be the last to stand in the way of progress and the great needs of the citizens of our communities. When the best interests of our Nation and its people were concerned he moved fast. When he conceived the Panama Canal it is said he acted first and obtained the approval of Congress later. That was the nature of the man. He was a doer and he did not believe in haggling about it.

Clear All Decks for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eisenhower has taken over. This is the big news story of January 1954. After a year of taking soundings, the President is prepared to steer the ship into deep waters. In the past month, White House conferences with Congressmen have given the President a direct insight into the thinking of the folks at home, and the people on whom he must rely in Washington. Ours is a country which prides itself upon action. We like to know the facts and act. So does President Eisenhower. His whole history is a testimonial to this decisiveness. He hates fence sitting. But he does not like to become involved before he knows the situation.

We have reached a point in world history where no government can sit complacently on the sidelines and sim-

ply referee the game. Today, governments are active participants in the national economy, whether we like the role or not. Military expenditures are a large element of the Nation's budget; social-security payments serve as a floor under personal planning; farm price supports assure basic income to a vital element of our population; taxes impinge on every business and every family, daily, quarterly, and yearly.

To meet these problems, a firm hand on the tiller is necessary. As the year opens, we can be sure that this strong hand is there. President Eisenhower is running the show. In moments when indecision is fatal, it is good to know that he is there.

The Social Security Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to continue the rate of social-security tax at 3 percent. Under existing law social-security tax was fixed at 1½ percent to be paid each by the employer and the employee until January 1, 1954. On that date under the law the amount of tax to be paid by the employer and the employee increased to 2 percent, making a total of 4 percent. This raises the tax one-third on both the employer and the employee, and it is estimated that this increase would bring into the fund an increase of approximately $1½ billion per annum.

In many instances this increase in social-security tax would more than offset the tax reduction resulting from the 10 percent cut in individual income taxes which went into effect January 1.

In view of the fact that the whole matter of social-security legislation has been under study by the Ways and Means Committee, and in view of the further fact that important changes may be made in the social security laws during the present session of Congress, I think we could well afford to wait and see whether any far-reaching changes will be made by Congress in social-security laws before we arrive at a figure to which the tax will be increased. It is possible that no increase at all will be necessary at the present time. On the other hand, it is possible that changes might be made in the laws which would call for a different schedule of payments by the taxpayer.

Certainly, while the entire subject is under consideration, the matter of tax increases should be held in abeyance until it is determined whether the present provisions of the law will be continued in force or whether they should be changed.

In order to allow ample time for a thorough and complete study of the entire question, my bill continues the present rate of tax in effect on self-employment income until January 1, 1960, and extends the present rate of tax on employers and employees under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act until 1959. In each instance the bill provides that its provisions shall be retroactive to January 1, 1954, the date the increase went into effect.

I shall ask the Ways and Means Committee to set the bill down for a hearing at the earliest possible date so that action may be had upon it.

Mrs. Isabella Greenway King, Former Congresswoman From Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Arizona I wish to express regret and sorrow over the passing of Mrs. Isabella Greenway King, former Congresswoman from Arizona.

Isabella Greenway King was born March 22, 1886, on a farm in Boone County, Ky. She spent her early years between St. Paul and Kentucky sharing her grandfather's home and the Kentucky farm where she and her mother were born. She attended schools in New York City.

In 1928 Mrs. King became national committeewoman from Arizona and took an active part in Al Smith's campaign. She took part in local Tucson political activities and in 1931 she took the first steps toward organizing a preconvention campaign for Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was largely due to Mrs. King's efforts and leadership that Arizona sent delegates instructed to vote for the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt. After the nomination of Governor Roosevelt, Mrs. Greenway, as national committeewoman for her party, applied herself to the organization of Arizona for the Democratic Party's nominee. Mrs. King was well known for her diplomacy, ability, and personal charm.

During the depression years she established an employment agency in Tucson.

Mrs. Greenway became prominent when at the 1932 Democratic convention she seconded the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt. She never had been a candidate for office, but consented to do so when Lewis Douglas was appointed Director of the Budget. Mrs. Greenway became a candidate for his unexpired term in Congress and won the nomination at a special primary election. She polled 30,277 votes more than her two opponents combined. At the general election in October she again won with a total of 24,163 votes; reelected to the 74th Congress and served from October 3, 1933, to January 3, 1937; was not a candidate for nomination in 1936.

Because of her close personal friendship with Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Mrs. Greenway combated the idea that this friendship with the Roosevelt family gave her either special privileges at or responsibilities to the White House. After her election she made it clear that she meant this by taking an active part in opposing some of the administration programs. She fought for the soldiers' bonus, which Mr. Roosevelt opposed. She opposed the third term for Franklin D. Roosevelt, and accepted the chairmanship of the Democrats for Willkie in Arizona. In April 1939, Mrs. Greenway married Harry O. King, of New York City. Her first marriage was to Robert Munro Ferguson. Mr. Ferguson passed away in 1922. In 1923 Mrs. Ferguson married Gen. John C. Greenway, a friend of many years. Shortly after their marriage General and Mrs. Greenway moved to Ajo, Ariz., where as mining engineer he had been responsible for the development of the New Cornelia Copper Co. General Greenway passed away in 1926. In 1928 when her two elder children were of college age, she purchased a working cattle ranch and with the children operated the outfit. Mrs. King owned and operated the famous Arizona Inn, at Tucson.

Mrs. King served on the governing boards of a number of charitable institutions. She was one of the trustees of Tucson Desert Sanitarium before it became the Tucson Medical Center; the first chairman of Tucson's emergency unemployment relief committee; and numerous other committees. During World War II she was national chairman of American Women's Volunteer Services.

Besides her husband she is survived by her daughter, Mrs. Charles Breasted, two sons, Robert Munro Ferguson and John Selmes Greenway.

Topsy-Turvy World Gets Topsier in 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, some day some farsighted genius of world history will come up with another Arnold Toynbeeish analysis of what happens as the years go by. It will take somebody with the sardonic humor of George Bernard Shaw or the cynicism of Voltaire to do the job, because no normal gent would be able to decipher the life and times of the 1950's.

Witness the major trends of our day. The western world is vigorously alined with West Germany and Japan on the one hand, and with Italy on the other, in the struggle for world leadership against the eastern Communists. In World War II, these countries were our primary targets. Today, we are wooing them with all the ardor money can buy.

Consider, too, the other side of the picture. Our allies during the same war were France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. We are worried to death about France's apparent inability to stabilize her political organization. We

have been scared stiff on numerous occasions by the British determination to trade with anybody, any time, for anything, even if it hurts us. As for the Soviet Union, the exchanges of verbal brick-bats between Moscow and Washington sometimes become so vigorous that we can feel them. Off in China, our friends of World War II are virtually exiles on Formosa, and it is often difficult for us to determine whether they are friends or enemies, and, in all honesty, they feel the same way about us. If you like your generation confused, this is the right time to be alive. If you have a kind of nostalgic hankering for orderliness, brother, did you pick the wrong time.

Opening Statement Made by Chairman Wolverton, of Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on Resumption of Committee's Hearing on Providing a Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, among the diversified legislative functions assigned to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am chairman, none appear to me more important than the committee's legislative jurisdiction with regard to health. None of the many other subjects with which this committee deals affects every family and individual in these United States more directly than the subject of health. Apart, however, from the human factors involved, I have become convinced from my study of health problems that the subject of health has more important economic implications for our Nation than are generally recognized. The following figures are evidence of the economic importance of ill health.

Four major diseases alone—heart, cancer, tuberculosis, and rheumatism and arthritis—have resulted in an annual loss of 370,000,000 man-days. This accounts for over one-third of the total man days lost annually on account of chronic diseases.

During the course of our hearings, we received the startling testimony that the annual costs to the Nation from illnesses is roughly equivalent to the total Federal income-tax revenues—or $30 billion annually.

By contrast, the United States is spending only $181 million annually for public and private research into the dreaded diseases. At the same time, there is as yet no adequate private program for helping the aged and ill to bear the expenses of hospital and medical bills, particularly those that extend over long periods of time.

The magnitude of the human suffering caused by these diseases and the enormous economic losses suffered both by the Nation as a whole and by individuals and family units, raises two important questions for which the committee sought answers:

First. How can some of the suffering and some of the economic losses be prevented or mitigated; and

Second. How can groups, individuals, and family units project themselves against the unavoidable economic losses flowing from these diseases?

The first aspect of our inquiry was, therefore, directed primarily toward the public and private efforts that are being made into the causes, treatment, and control of some of these major diseases.

During the second series of our hearings which began October 13, we are seeking from insurance companies, Blue Cross, Blue Shield, cooperatives, employers, and unions, information with regard to some of the plans now in operation designed to protect individuals and members of groups and family units against the economic hazards of ill health.

During the recess, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and two members of the committee, Representatives HOFFMAN and SPRINGER, made a trip to Europe and other parts of the world for the purpose of getting the benefit of the experience of European and other governments, and private agencies and groups, in establishing programs for widespread alleviation of the costs of both preventive and curative measures. Material and data obtained on this trip will be made a part of the record of the committee in the hearings being held.

President Eisenhower, in his message on the state of the Union, expressed his concern for the health of the people of the United States and stated:

> I am flatly opposed to the socialization of medicine. The great need for hospital and medical services can best be met by the initiative of private plans, but it is unfortunately a fact that medical costs are rising and already impose severe hardships on many families. The Federal Government can do many helpful things and still avoid the socialization of medicine.

The President endorsed the participation by the Federal Government in medical research programs into the various diseases, the assistance given to States in their health and rehabilitation programs, and endorsed the hospital survey and construction program. He specifically endorsed private and nonprofit hospital and medical insurance plans. He stated that a limited Government reinsurance service would permit the private and nonprofit insurance companies to offer broader protection to more of the many families which want and should have it. He stated that on January 18 he would forward to Congress a special message presenting this administration's health program in detail. I, personally, am highly pleased that the President included within his program such a broad statement of health objectives.

Today the committee resumed it hearings by continuing the inquiry into what protection is available to the people by group insurance plans.

Are "New Look" Defense Policy Manpower Reductions Threatening Our Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues here on the floor of the House and my constituents back home know, I have always supported wholeheartedly a strong defense establishment for our country. This support is the outgrowth of my experience in the military service as a combat officer during World War II. I was in hopes then, as I am sure we all were, that never again would our sons, nor the sons of the mothers and fathers all over the country, be called upon to suffer the anguish and horror of another war, with its inevitable depletion of the Nation's irreplaceable young manhood and our diminishing national resources.

During World War I, this Nation suffered 364,800 casualties and spent $33 billion. In World War II the casualties rose to 1,066,938 and to the astronomical sum of $330 billion—3½ times greater in terms of casualties and 10 times as great in dollars spent; and then we had Korea, with its 27,711 casualties and untold billions still to be tabulated. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I voice my own and many of my colleagues' deep concern over recent announcements by the present administration on the reduction and redeployment of our Armed Forces, commonly referred to as the "new look." I, for one, do not intend to gamble with our national defense; nor do I believe the people of this country want us to do so. Apparently this legislative body has been called upon to support this program without being informed of the circumstances or conditions upon which these decisions have been based.

Are we being led to believe the threat from Communist Russia has so radically diminished that we can afford to gamble with the security of this Nation as well as the free world? Do we have a peace treaty with Austria? With Germany? Or in Korea? Has the Kremlin agreed to any disarmament proposals or to any plan for atomic control, or in fact honored any agreement among the community of nations?

If so, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of it, and if there has been a radical change by the Communists, this legislative body and the people of this country should be so informed. Not only have there been no overt acts by the Communists leading to peace, but Communist Russia and its satellites are maintaining and building a war machine of tanks, planes, and submarines second to none. To augment this powerful striking force, it has been announced that Russia has atomic weapons and, in fact, may be ahead of the free world in nuclear and thermonuclear developments. Those of you who have witnessed an atomic explosion—and many of you have—do not have to be reminded what this means.

In the face of this threat to our way of life and to freedom everywhere, we have been called upon to support a program which is based upon the following premises:

(a) That a strong retaliatory air and sea power will deter aggression and blast the aggressor into submission if war is thrust upon us; and

(b) That the present combat effectiveness of our Armed Forces can be maintained by reducing the number of men in our military establishment through the development of new weapons and "slicing away the fat"—that is, reducing our support units.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has been privileged to lead soldiers into combat, I view with deep concern the effects of such a program based largely upon supposition rather than fact, which affects this Nation's ability to wage war and to win if war is thrust upon it. Are we not guilty of subscribing to the easier, more popular way to win a war as advocated by wishful thinkers? Are we casting aside what history recorded in all wars down through the centuries that wars, hot and cold, are waged for the purpose of controlling land areas, areas which are the source of the world's wealth? While control of the air above and the sealanes are vital, the decisive battle will be determined on the land. Nowhere in history has airpower alone been able to stop aggression. And Korea and Indochina have indicated no change in this pattern. The hard cold facts—unsavory as they may be—are that the ground forces must dig out the aggressor before victory can be achieved.

As part of the new look we are called upon to support a program which is also based upon the premise that greater combat effectiveness can be gained by reducing the number of men in our Armed Forces through the development of new weapons and reductions, primarily in our support forces. What are these new weapons that will make such a reduction possible? Can we reduce the Armed Forces and expect the Army, Navy, and to a lesser degree the Air Force to carry out their assigned missions equally effectively? History shows that with the development of new weapons, each more complex and destructive than its predecessor, more manpower, not less, is required to keep it in action. Is this truth no longer valid? Can we now engage in wishful thinking of the push-button warfare strategists who would lead us to believe that this day has arrived? I repeat, what are these new weapons? How many do we have? How are they used, and by whom? I realize the security aspects of this revelation, but certainly Members of Congress primarily concerned with military matters should have this information and I have no assurance from my colleagues that such is the case.

I know of no responsible official in the administration who discounts the ability of Russia to produce and use atomic and nuclear weapons. In fact, we are periodically warned by administration spokesmen that Russia is capable of delivering atomic and nuclear explosives to our continent. In addition to its arsenal of atomic and nuclear weapons, it is common knowledge that Russia maintains vast numbers of ground troops, great quantities of armor, and a rapidly expanding tactical Air Force. In substance, the administration is asking the Congress of the United States and the American people to believe that through some mysterious formula recently devised, our Nation, depending primarily on airpower and atomic and nuclear weapons, can deal successfully with an enemy which also possesses atomic and nuclear weapons, a numerically superior air force, tremendous numbers of well-trained, well-equipped ground troops, and their supporting units. It must be emphasized also, that in addition to the massive army which the Russians control directly, that they have access to unlimited supplies of manpower in their satellite countries, and particularly in Asia.

During the past few years, we have been repeatedly warned of the presence of a rapidly growing fleet of Russian submarines. We have been told that advanced types of Russian submarines exist in such quantities that they could successfully challenge our control of the shipping lanes. In the face of a drastically reduced naval arm, what solution is being advanced in the "new look" to deal with this growing threat to our naval superiority?

Let me make it clear that I support the maintenance and expansion of a powerful Air Force. We must continue research and development of atomic and nuclear weapons. I raise the question, however, as to whether sharp curtailment in Army ground forces and naval arms will leave us an adequate Defense Establishment.

Most of you remember that well worn phrase of "slicing off the fat" of only a few years ago when the then Secretary of Defense started cutting the Armed Forces. As a result of this reduction our Armed Forces, especially ground combat and support units, when suddenly called upon to resist aggression in Korea, were woefully inadequate. Combat divisions were at half strength; regiments consisted of two battalions instead of three; and our combat support forces were seriously lacking. It was only through the heroic efforts and sacrifices of a handful of ground forces that gained for us sufficient time to prevent the aggressor from engulfing all of Korea.

As another part of the new look in our combat forces, the announcement has been made that two divisions will be withdrawn from Korea. Are we being asked to support another program of bring the boys home in the face of an armed truce? Will not this action be viewed by a ruthless aggressor as a sign of weakness? Are we going to break faith with those who have already made the supreme sacrifice, and to sacrifice needlessly the lives of thousands more of our youth because we did not have the fortitude to stick it out? We made that mistake in World War I and World War II and it appears to me we are doing it again and if this is unfortunately true, what will be the reaction of our allies as well as the Communists. Are we inviting further aggression? I should like to know the set of circumstances surrounding this decision and I feel it is the responsibility of Congress to determine the facts.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I, along with many of my colleagues, do not have the answers to the questions that have been raised. I do not pretend to be a military expert nor do I have the information that is available to the administration. I do, however, have complete confidence in our military leaders and before I can support such a program that has been laid down, there must be further assurance that such a program is sound and its adoption will not impair the safety of this country.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, how will the Senate Republicans manage responsibility with a Democratic majority? For answer, see Mr. WAYNE MORSE. He has the code.

Retirement of Judge Charles C. Lockwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, as of January 1 of this year, my friend, Judge Charles C. Lockwood, official referee of the Brooklyn supreme court, has retired from the bench on which he had served for the past 22 years. He was originally elected to the supreme court in 1931 and was reelected in 1945. When he reached the statutory retirement age of 70, 6 years ago, he was named an official referee, and served 3 successive 2-year terms in the latter capacity.

Those of us who know Judge Lockwood intimately are not surprised to learn that he has no intention of retiring completely from all active work. He will be associated hereafter with the law firm of Guggenheimer & Untermeyer in private legal practice. Furthermore, I see where Governor Dewey, of New York, has named Judge Lockwood as a member of a special 12-man committee to formulate a code of ethics for public officials and political party functionaries. He is unquestionably the perfect man for such task.

Judge Lockwood is a native of Brooklyn, where he was born 76 years ago. He was a member of the New York State assembly in 1914, and served in the State senate from 1915 to 1922. Although a lifelong Republican, Lockwood was appointed by the late Governor Alfred E. Smith as a member of the State transit

commission and was subsequently reappointed to that post by another Democratic governor, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. He held this post until 1931, when he was elected to the New York supreme court.

Prior to his election to the bench, Judge Lockwood served at various times as chairman of the Kings County Republican General Committee, and was Republican candidate for city controller and for Lieutenant Governor of New York. During his 22-year tenure on the supreme court he specialized in transit matters, condemnation proceedings, and pretrial settlement of cases. He is president of the board of trustees of Brooklyn Law School, a trustee of Brooklyn Hospital, Brooklyn Law Library, and of many charitable institutions in our borough.

On the occasion of his retirement from the bench, I extend to Judge Lockwood my sincerest wishes for a long and active life and for many fruitful years of constructive service to our community and to the people of New York. Men of his caliber and reputation are a source of great inspiration to all of us.

Excise Taxes on Communication and Transportation Services Should Be Modified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the existing Federal excise-tax rates on communication services and the transportation of persons are unreasonably high, are unfair to the users of these services, and should be modified immediately. The bill, H. R. 7618, would reduce these excessive taxes generally to a level of 10 percent.

Even a tax rate of 10 percent on services which are essential to the day-to-day life of the general public is too high. Telephone and telegraph services and travel by air, rail, and bus are not items the public can do without but, on the contrary, are necessary to the general welfare of the Nation, to commerce, and to the national defense. These taxes must be further reduced as soon as possible, and, when the revenue requirements of the Government will permit, should be completely eliminated.

The present excise-tax rates were enacted and increased during time of war primarily to discourage civilian usage of utility services whose capacities were strained by defense requirements. The rates then imposed were generally higher than excise-tax rates imposed on most other articles, including luxuries. The continuation of these high rates has resulted in gross discrimination against the users of communication and transportation services. It should be mentioned that of the four essential household utility services—water, gas, electricity, and telephone—only telephone service is subject to any Federal excise tax. Moreover, the tax rates imposed on telephone services is the next highest to that on liquor and tobacco. Manifestly, this inequitable treatment of the telephone user should not be allowed to continue.

Regulatory authorities are greatly concerned over excise taxes on communication and transportation services. The National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, by resolution adopted at its November 1952 convention, stated:

> The present excise taxes on transportation and communication services are inimical to the maintenance of reasonably priced and nondiscriminatory public transportation and communication services, and that, accordingly, the excise taxes on transportation and communication services should be repealed or greatly reduced.

This position was reaffirmed by the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners at its September 1953 convention.

The excise taxes on communications and transportation are disliked by the general public more than the excise taxes on all other items. The American Institute of Public Opinion—Gallup Poll—on September 25, 1953, released the results of a nationwide poll which showed that of the excise taxes most disliked, the tax on telephone calls was first and the tax on railroad tickets second. A copy of the results of this poll, as reported in the Washington Post of September 26, 1953, follows:

> PUBLIC MOST IRRITATED BY TAX ON PHONE CALLS, RAIL TICKETS
>
> PRINCETON, N. J., September 25.—The special excise taxes on telephone calls and on railroad tickets are the two types of excise tax which the general public dislikes the most, judging by results of a nationwide survey by the American Institute of Public Opinion.
>
> The levy on cosmetics and toilet preparations ranks next in order of dislike, followed by the tax on telegrams, movie tickets, and women's purses and handbags.
>
> Approximately 4 out of every 10 adults (39 percent) named the telephone tax as the most irritating one, which was more than twice the 17 percent naming the railroad ticket tax.
>
> Utility companies and other industries, particularly the movie industry, whose services or products carry an excise tax have pressed for tax relief.
>
> The 25 percent tax on long-distance telephone calls and 15 percent surcharge on local service, as well as the 15 percent transportation tax, are levies that were imposed during World War II to discourage use of these facilities.
>
> In his pocket veto of the bill to exempt motion pictures from the 20-percent Federal admissions tax, President Eisenhower noted that it would have been unfair to single out one industry for relief.
>
> To determine which excise taxes paid directly by the consumer are the most irritating or annoying, the institute prepared a list of certain items carrying these levies and sounded national opinion among adults on the following question:
>
> "During World War II the Government put a special tax ranging from 15 percent to 25 percent on such things as jewelry, furs, movie tickets, railroad tickets, etc. Which one of the taxes do you personally dislike the most?"

The list, ranked in order of frequency of mention, is given below:

1. Telephone calls.
2. Railroad tickets.
3. Cosmetics, toilet preparations.
4. Telegrams.
5. Movie tickets.
6. Women's purses, handbags.
7. Sports tickets.
8. Jewelry.
9. Men's wallets.
10. Luggage.
11. Nightclub tickets.
12. Furs.

Women questioned in the survey gave somewhat different answers from men.

As might be expected, more women than men expressed dislike for the tax on cosmetics and toilet preparations and women's purses and handbags.

Following is the way the women ranked the list:

WOMEN

1. Telephone calls.
2. Cosmetics, toilet preparations.
3. Women's purses, handbags.
4. Railroad tickets.
5. Telegrams.
6. Movie tickets.
7. Jewelry.
8. Men's wallets.
9. Furs.
10. Luggage.
11. Sports tickets.
12. Nightclub tickets.

And here is the men's list:

MEN

1. Telephone calls.
2. Railroad tickets.
3. Telegrams.
4. Movie tickets.
5. Cosmetics, toilet preparations.
6. Sports tickets.
7. Women's purses, handbags.
8. Jewelry.
9. Men's wallets.
10. Nightclub tickets.
11. Luggage.
12. Furs.

An institute survey in March 1950, found that the excise tax then being levied on baby oil and baby powder was the one disliked the most.

Congress later repealed the excise tax on the baby products.

Political Patronage and Veterans' Preference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, since taking office, the administration, and particularly the Justice Department, has made a continuous assault on the Veterans' Preference Act. During the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Department of State, the Commerce Department, and the Justice Department attempted to place a rider on the department appropriation bills which would give the Secretaries and the Attorney General absolute discretion and authority to "terminate the employment of any officer or employee when it

is determined that such termination is necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States." Proponents of the proposal argued that this sweeping authority was necessary to get rid of security risks. This argument was advanced despite the fact that the administration had just published its new security program, which gave an agency head authority to remove persons who were considered to be unsatisfactory security risks. The obvious effect of the provision, had it been included in the appropriation bill, would have been the creation of a political patronage device for the heads of these three departments. The proposal was rejected in the House; however, its proponents were not content with their defeat in the House and attempted to secure its inclusion in the Senate, where it was again defeated.

At the time the proposal was under discussion in the House and Senate, warnings were issued that favorable action on the proposal would, in fact, eliminate protection for veteran employees of those departments under veterans' preference laws. The true motives of the Department heads, and particularly the Attorney General, are now clear. Not content with his failure to obtain blanket authority from the Congress to fire veterans without regard to the Veterans' Preference Act, the Attorney General summarily fired a young lawyer by the name of John P. Witsil without regard to his veteran status and his rights under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. Witsil was a GS–9 attorney in the Department of Justice, receiving an annual salary of about $5,060 per year. It is apparent, therefore, that Witsil did not occupy a policymaking job in the Department.

Witsil filed an appeal with the Civil Service Commission under the provisions of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act. After investigation and consideration of the evidence, the chief law officer of the Civil Service Commission recommended that Witsil be retroactively restored to active duty in his position and grade in the Justice Department. The Attorney General declined to accept the recommendation of the chief law officer and filed an appeal from the finding and recommendation of the chief law officer with the Civil Service Commission.

The Civil Service Commission considered the case and advised the Attorney General that his action in discharging Witsil was illegal and invalid and directed that Witsil be restored to his position and grade. The Civil Service Commission was acting under the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, the pertinent part of which is as follows:

> After investigation and consideration of the evidence submitted, the Civil Service Commission shall submit its findings and recommendations to the proper administrative officer and shall send copies of same to the appellant or to his designated representative, and it shall be mandatory for such administrative officer to take such corrective action as the Commission finally recommends.

Despite the fact that the Veterans' Preference Act clearly gives the Civil Service Commission authority to make the final administrative determination in such a case and further provides that it shall be mandatory for the administrative officer to take such corrective action as the Commission finally recommends, the Attorney General refused to comply with his statutory duty and return the veteran to his former position, as recommended by the Civil Service Commission.

As a result, Witsil filed a complaint for relief, in the nature of a mandamus, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, in an effort to compel the Attorney General to comply with the law. The Attorney General apparently was reluctant to allow his actions to stand the test of a court action, and reinstated Witsil. Shortly thereafter, the Attorney General, acting under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act, which he had previously denied was applicable in Witsil's case, preferred charges of incompetency against Witsil, as follows:

First. He used Government telephones for personal business.

Second. He talked to Federal employees about non-Government business during office hours.

Third. He had an inability to organize data.

To date the Civil Service Commission has not held a hearing on Witsil's case to determine the validity of the Attorney General's charges.

The Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 gives the veteran no special privilege other than protection from being fired without cause. Specifically, it protects the veteran from just such an attempt as is being made by the Attorney General to turn the Justice Department and the Federal service into a political-patronage device. Mr. Speaker, we have here the sad spectacle of the Attorney General of the United States, the officer who is charged with upholding and defending the laws of the United States, willfully ignoring existing law and legally constituted authority for the express purpose to turning his Department into a political-patronage haven.

Beware of Muscovites Accepting Gifts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Malenkov's acceptance of President Eisenhower's invitation to talk through the proposal for an international pool of atomic materials is by all odds one of the most constructive steps which have been taken since the end of World War II in the whole field of diplomacy. Beyond this, there is apparently some inclination to broaden the talks to include the possibility of ending any threat of atomic warfare. All the better, of course, but there must always be awareness of the past when one looks hopefully toward the future.

We are eager to end the tensions of current world history. We must not be willing to end them at the expense of America's position. That position is one of moral leadership, no less than of economic, military, or political strength. America's desire for peace has led us frequently to the scrapping of our ships, to the reduction of our standing military forces, to the elimination of planes, and the general weakening of our strength, long before anybody else was ready to follow suit.

It may be good and noble to set a wholesome example, but in matters of such great moment, only the foolish are ready to strip themselves bare while others remain mightily armed. Moscow will be glad to see Uncle Sam take the initiative in this regard. Let us be sure of simultaneous action before we prepare to turn in our equipment.

Military Utilization of Land Needs Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Franklin G. Floete, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Properties and Installations, has asked our military commands to report on their utilization of real estate now held by them. This is certainly a timely undertaking. The Secretary's commendabe foresight and initiative will result not only in worthwhile savings but also in better coordination between civilian and military requirements.

The United States Military Establishment now has gigantic real estate holdings. It is, nevertheless, constantly reaching out for more and more land. Furthermore, each service seems to feel it must have exclusive holdings for its limited purposes although proper implementation of our policy of unification should create a trend toward joint use of real property and a consequent fuller and more efficient utilization of it.

Many military properties were acquired long ago and are now in the heart of congested cities whereas when acquired they were well outside crowded centers. In such cases an up-to-date survey might well indicate that both civilian and military purposes would best be served by moving all or part of such installations to less crowded areas. For example, in my own State of California, the Army is hoarding hundreds of idle acres in the great city of San Francisco. This city is literally bursting at the seams for lack of room to grow. Meanwhile, Camp Roberts is put in mothballs. An impartial survey would determine

how many of these hoarded idle acres are really still needed by the Army.

My colleagues from other parts of the Nation will, I am sure, instantly think of other examples of questionable retention of real estate by the Military Establishment. Of course, none of us would recommend any curtailment or removal of installations where this would weaken our military forces, but I am convinced that many acres are being held in excess of need both from the standpoint of quantity and time.

Acquisition by the Military Establishment has not always been circumspect. Camp Pendleton was acquired without adequate determination of water supplies. This has resulted in the bringing of a costly and irritating lawsuit by the Government against thousands of civilians.

The military is a large landholder on Chesapeake Bay. It owns Governor's Island in New York. It is ever acquiring more and more land while seeming reticent to let go of any. Assistant Secretary Floete deserves commendation for tackling this important problem.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1954

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who art love and light and truth, we turn unfilled to Thee. In a world where the very foundations seem to be shaken we cherish this hushed and hallowed moment which so long ago the Founding Fathers set apart as an altar of prayer at the day's beginning. Here, bowing with contrite hearts, we would be sure of Thee and of spiritual resources before facing the high solemnities of waiting tasks.

Grant that those who in this fateful day by the people's choice have been called to high places of state, facing responsibilities as heavy as the servants of the Commonwealth have ever borne, may be filled with the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of Thee. In an hour when such vast issues are at stake for all the world, may those who here serve, conscious of the great tradition in which they stand, rise to greatness of vision and soul as the anxious eyes of all the nations are fixed upon this Chamber.

Upon the President of the United States and his counselors, upon the Vice President, the Members of the Congress, upon all who mold our domestic policies and our relationships with other nations, whose decisions affect the lives of untold millions, we implore the wisdom which is from above and the undergirding of Thy everlasting arms. Together, with fixed purpose of heart, in Thy might, unafraid, send us forth to meet the issues of this crucial year as in the name of the Lord our God we set up our banners. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

HOMER E. CAPEHART, a Senator from the State of Indiana, and A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 6, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The message also informed the Senate that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 184) providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 7, 1954, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Fred M. Vinson, late the Chief Justice of the United States.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas advanced in the center aisle, and

Mr. KNOWLAND said: Mr. President, the committee appointed by the President of the Senate to act in conjunction with a similar committee on the part of the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the Congress had assembled and was ready to receive any communication he might be pleased to make to it, report that they have performed that duty, and the President of the United States has requested the committee to state that he will address the Congress in person on Thursday, January 7, today, at 12:30 o'clock p. m.

I may say that I am also informed that two other messages, one on the Budget and one on the Economic Report, will be submitted by the President on Thursday, January 21, and Thursday, January 28, respectively.

ORDER FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the Senate returns to its Chamber following the joint session in the Hall of the House of Representatives there be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and resolutions and submission of material for printing in the RECORD, and that discussion be limited to the usual time allowed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 184.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 184, which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 7, 1954, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Maybank
Anderson	Gore	McCarran
Barrett	Green	McCarthy
Beall	Griswold	McClellan
Bennett	Hayden	Millikin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bridges	Hennings	Morse
Burke	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Payne
Capehart	Hunt	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kefauver	Smathers
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	Kuchel	Symington
Ellender	Langer	Thye
Ferguson	Lehman	Upton
Flanders	Lennon	Watkins
Frear	Long	Welker
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Martin	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the concurrent resolution just agreed to, I move that the Senate now proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives, for the joint session to hear the address of the President of the United States.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (J. Mark Trice), its special Deputy Sergeant at Arms (C. A. Bottolfsen), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the annual message of the President of the United States.

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 251)

(The annual message of the President of the United States this day delivered by him to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress appears at pp. 78–82 of the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint session of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

SEATING OF SENATORS AT JOINT SESSIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the prior understanding and order the Senate will transact routine business at this time.

First, however, I should like to make a brief observation in relation to future joint sessions of the Congress. I regretted to note that a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle did not have seats in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

We realize that it is a small Chamber, and when the entire House membership is present, together with the full membership of the Senate, as well as the diplomatic corps and the members of the President's Cabinet, there is presented a very real seating problem.

However, I should like to request that the Sergeant at Arms and the Secretary of the Senate, perhaps under the leadership of both the majority and the minority, consult with the officials of the House in an attempt to solve the problem of providing seats for all Senators. It seems to me that Senators and Representatives now serving in the Congress should have first preference to the seats. Thereafter, if any seats are available our former colleagues, having the courtesy of the floor, might be permitted to occupy them. I do not believe such a situation should prevail that presently serving Senators are required to stand during a joint session.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to add just a word along the line referred to by the majority leader. I noticed some of the present Members of the Senate, namely, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], were required to stand during the joint session. Perhaps other Senators were required to stand also.

In addition to what the majority leader has stated, I believe when the line is formed in the Senate, preparatory to going to the Hall of the House of Representatives, that the line should be made up with the officials of the Senate proceeding first in line, followed by Senators in the order of their seniority, and then by former Senators and others who have the courtesy of the floor.

I should like to see the rights of the Members of the Senate protected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I share the sentiments expressed by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I think it is nothing short of disgraceful that so many Senators had no seats on the floor of the House of Representatives. I shall certainly welcome the opportunity to join with other Senators in communicating to the organization of the House our views with respect to the subject.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the situation was badly handled. I do not know whose fault it was. I know that many Senators were standing up. Some of us gave up our seats in order to see that our guests, the representatives of foreign countries, might have seats. I talked to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who was next to me, and we both gave up our seats, as did also the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], in order to provide seats for our guests. But something should be done, Mr. President, to enable every Senator to have a seat. Our guests, the representatives of foreign countries, should also have seats. I do not know who handled the situation, but it certainly was badly handled.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

APPOINTMENT TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 3, 1953, the Vice President appointed, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, Mr. CARLSON as a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, vice Mr. Taft, deceased.

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received by the Secretary of the Senate on August 17, 1953, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
August 17, 1953.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the report on the mutual security program covering operations during the 6 months ended June 30, 1953, in furtherance of the purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended.

In the mutual security program we find tangible expression of our belief that the safety and self-interest of this Nation are inextricably tied in with the security and well-being of other free nations.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received by the Secretary of the Senate on September 28, 1953, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
September 24, 1953.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 34th Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations covering the calendar year of 1952.

Section 5 (b) of the act of March 11, 1941 (Public Law 11, 77th Cong., 1st sess.) provides, "The President from time to time, but not less frequently than once every 90 days, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this act." This requirement was generally observed during the years of World War II when lend-lease operations were in full swing. However, since the end of the war, it has been found expedient to submit these reports to the Congress at greater intervals. I believe that the Congress should be kept informed on lend-lease activities and that, under existing circumstances, this can be done satisfactorily through yearly reports.

One of the important remaining lend-lease functions is the collection of payments due under various international agreements. For example, the lend-lease settlement agreements call for the eventual payment to the United States of a total of $1,574,534,330.31 plus interest. According to figures supplied by the Department of the Treasury as of December 31, 1952, the United States has received $429,020,540.49 from debtor governments under lend-lease settlement agreements. This figure comprises payment in dollars totaling $322,052,260.18, local currency payments to the equivalent of $30,067,994.38, the acquisition of real property and improvements thereto amounting to the equivalent of

$2,408,214.43, and the assumption of claims by debtor governments to a total value of approximately $74,492,071.50. These figures do not include the lend-lease silver accounts or sums paid the United States by other governments for lend-lease supplies or services received on a cash reimbursable basis.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

(Enclosure: 34th Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLA.

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to validate conveyance of a 40-acre tract in Okaloosa County, Fla. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Farm Credit Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of July 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of August 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of September 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of October 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF COMPROMISE SETTLEMENTS OF CERTAIN CLAIMS BY THE FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Farmers' Home Administration, showing the names of persons against whom claims in excess of $1,000 were compromised during the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

Ten letters from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, reporting, pursuant to law, that the following appropriations had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Veterans' Administration, for "Servicemen's indemnities," fiscal year 1954;

Administrative expense authorization, Commodity Credit Corporation, fiscal year 1954;

Treasury Department, for "Salaries and expenses, Internal Revenue Service," fiscal year 1954;

Treasury Department, for "Administering the public debt, Bureau of the Public Debt," for fiscal year 1954;

The Tax Court of the United States, for "Salaries and expenses," fiscal year 1954;

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," fiscal year 1954;

Department of Justice, for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons," fiscal year 1954;

National Mediation Board, for "Arbitration and emergency boards," fiscal year 1954;

Department of Agriculture, for "Salaries and expenses, Forest Service" (subappropriation, "Fighting forest fires"), fiscal year 1954; and

Treasury Department, for "Salaries and expenses, Division of Disbursement," fiscal year 1954.

Two letters from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for "Grants to States for public assistance," fiscal year 1954, and the Veterans' Administration, for "Compensation and pensions," fiscal year 1954, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS ON OVEREXPENDITURE OF ALLOTMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of appropriations to certain allottees of that Commission, fiscal year 1953; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, an overobligation of appropriations in the account "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration," for the period ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of appropriations for that Administration in the amount of $2.84 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of an appropriation in the United States Coast Guard for the month of December 1952 amounting to $18.01; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overexpenditures of an allotment of funds within the Federal Housing Administration (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of an appropriation for the United States Coast Guard (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, together with a secret statistical supplement to that report, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1953 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF AWARD OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND EXPERIMENTAL PURPOSES, BY THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts, in excess of $50,000, for research, development, and experimental purposes awarded by the Navy Department, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on research and development procurement, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FURNISHING TRANSPORTATION FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation furnished for certain Government and other personnel, by the Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AWARD OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law a report on the award of contracts, in excess of $50,000, for research and development, Department of the Army, for the period January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RETENTION IN SERVICE OF DISABLED COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND WARRANT OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

COOPERATION OF MEDICAL OFFICERS WITH LINE OFFICERS IN SUPERINTENDING COOKING BY ENLISTED MEN

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 1174 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the cooperation of medical officers with line officers in superintending cooking by enlisted men (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF AN EX-GERMAN SUBMARINE TO CITY OF CHICAGO, ILL.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Museum

of Science and Industry, Chicago, Ill., had requested the Navy Department to transfer to it the ex-German submarine *U–505;* to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, by rank and age groups, the number of officers above the rank of major in the Army or lieutenant commander in the Navy, with the average monthly flight pay authorized to be paid to such officers, for the 6-month period ended December 29, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED BY AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation furnished by the Air Force, for the period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED OR DETAILED TO PERMANENT DUTY IN THE EXECUTIVE ELEMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that there were, at the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1954, 2,475 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ARMY-NAVY NURSES ACT OF 1947, RELATING TO DATES OF RANK OF CERTAIN NURSES AND WOMEN MEDICAL SPECIALISTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY FOR CERTAIN FLYING OFFICERS

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on flight pay of all flying officers above the grade of major, for the period March 1 to August 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED TO PERSONNEL ATTACHED TO NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation facilities to and from their places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by naval establishments, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS ACT RELATING TO NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL-SHALE RESERVES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT RELATING TO PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1953 for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY COAST GUARD FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the acting commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, during the period January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1953, by the Coast Guard (with an acompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS BY CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Two letters from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports of that administration, on contributions to the States, Territories, and possessions under the civil-defense program, for the quarters ended June 30, 1953, and September 30, 1953 (with acompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Two letters from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Administration, for the quarters ended June 30, 1953, and September 30, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, the amount of money credited to, and the disbursements from the helium-production fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

A letter from the chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that committee, dated October 20, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Managing Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 16th semiannual report of that bank for the period January to June 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh and final quarterly report of the operations of the Small Defense Plants Administration, including the operations of the final 4 months ended July 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 24th quarterly report on export control (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the quarter ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that agency for the calendar year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT HOUSING POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs dated December 14, 1953 (with an accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSION ON LICENSURE

A letter from the President of the District of Columbia Commission on Licensure, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON LAND ACQUISITION BY NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Executive Officer, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on land acquisitions by that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that agency for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of that Legion for the period ended October 31, 1953 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the International Information and Educational Exchange Program, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the

International Claims Commission of the United States, for the period January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission dated August 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

A letter from the Director of Foreign Operations, received during adjournment, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, for the period January through June 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF SURVEY OF REFUGEE SITUATION IN NEAR EAST

A letter from the Acting Director of Foreign Operations, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of survey of the refugee situation in the Near East, dated December 11, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSALS OF CANDIDATES FOR NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

A letter from the chairman, Office of the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, Oslo, Norway, transmitting copies of proposals of candidates for the Nobel Peace Prize to be distributed December 30, 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated by that Administration for research and development purposes, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Southeastern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Bureau of Narcotics, Treasury Department, for the period March 1, 1951, through June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT OF GOVERNMENT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Government of the Virgin Islands, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF MINES AND DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Bureau of Mines and the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN INDIAN CLAIMS

A letter from the Acting Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the claims of the *Potawatomi Tribe of Indians and the Prairie Band of the Potawatomi Tribe of Indians* v. *The United States; The Seminole Nation* v. *The United States; The Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan, et al.* v. *The United States;* and *The Hannahville Indian Community, The Forest County Potawatomi Community, Frank Wandasego, Sr., et al.* v. *The United States* had been concluded (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CLIKAPUDI UNIT, SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of the Interior on the Clikapudi Unit, Sacramento River Division, Central Valley Project, California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAW ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF HAWAII

A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of Act 280, enacted by the Hawaiian Legislature, relating to public improvement and the financing thereof, making appropriations for public improvements and providing for the issuance of public improvement bonds, and memorializing Congress to authorize the issuance of public improvement bonds of the Territory of Hawaii during the years 1953 to 1959 inclusive, without respect to the limitations imposed by the Hawaiian Organic Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CREDIT REPORT OF BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual credit report of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Division of Resources, Branch of Credit, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CERTAIN PROPOSED AMENDATORY REPAYMENT CONTRACTS RELATING TO IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on proposed amendatory repayment contracts with the Hermiston Irrigation District and the West Extension Irrigation District, Umatilla Federal Reclamation Project, Oregon, together with a draft of proposed legislation to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Hermiston and West Extension Irrigation Districts, Oregon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

Six letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF GUAM

Five letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of Guam (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATIONS OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands on the Nickwall and Charley Creek units, Montana pumping division, Missouri River Basin project, for irrigation and agricultural purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Four letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that adequate soil surveys and land classifications had been made of the Hanover unit, Bighorn Basin division, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming; the Bluff unit, Bighorn Basin division, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming; the Sargent unit, Middle Loup division, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska; and the Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico, for irrigation and agricultural purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF EXTENSION OF CERTAIN CONCESSION PERMITS IN NATIONAL PARKS, ETC.

Eleven letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of proposed extensions of concession permits providing accommodations, facilities, and services for the public in Mount Rainier National Park, Wash., Oregon Caves National Monument, Oreg., Glacier National Park, Mont., Olympic National Park, Wash., Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev., Cabrillo National Monument, Calif., Olympic National Park, Wash., Crater Lake National Park, Oreg., Grand Teton National Park, Wyo., and Mount Rainier National Park, Wash. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RENEWAL OF CERTAIN CONCESSION PERMITS IN NATIONAL PARKS

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the renewal of concession permits in Olympic National Park, Wash., and in the Narada Falls-Paradise area, Mount Rainier National Park, Wash. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AWARDS OF CONCESSION PERMITS IN NATIONAL MONUMENTS, ETC.

Five letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of proposed awards of concession permits to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at Wildrose Station in Death Valley National Monument, Calif., Furnace Creek Ranch in Death Valley National Monument, Calif., Salem Maritime National Historic Site, Mass., and Everglades National Park, Fla. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of its recently issued publications entitled "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1952 Supplement," and "Typical Residential Electric Bills, January 1, 1953" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of its recent publications entitled "Typical Electric Bills, 1953" and "Statistics of Electric Utilities

in the United States, 1952" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CERTAIN COMMISSARY ACTIVITIES OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the commissary activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in Alaska and other points outside the continental United States, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR-RISK AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, for the quarter ended September 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the United States Maritime Commission under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Five letters from the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting reports on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission, dated August 3, 1953, September 4, 1953, September 28, 1953, November 3, 1953, and December 11, 1953 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938 RELATING TO IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTIES IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938 RELATING TO DEFINITION OF "AIRMAN"

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF ACTIVITIES OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION UNDER PROVISIONS OF MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

Two letters from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the activities of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce under the provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the periods April 1 to June 30, 1953, and July 1 through September 30, 1953 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 19th annual report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1953, together with a biographical report on all employees at the close of the fiscal year (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

STATEMENT OF COMPROMISE SETTLEMENTS AND ADJUDICATIONS OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of adjudications and compromise settlements of certain claims, during the year 1953 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on settlement of claims for damages caused by naval vessels, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AMOUNTS PAID AND RECEIVED BY DEPARTMENT OF AIR FORCE UNDER MARITIME CLAIMS ACT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on amounts paid and received by that Department under the Maritime Claims Act, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY VESSELS OF THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on settlement of claims for damages caused by vessels of the Coast Guard (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF GRACE LINE, INC., V. UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting pursuant to law, on the settlement of the claim for damages of the Grace Line, Inc., versus The United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS PAID RELATING TO CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS OF COAST GUARD PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid during the 6-month period ended June 30, 1953, on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Commission for the period July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, for the fiscal year 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration during the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of Commerce during the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Treasury Department during the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO PROVIDE SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS FORCES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," relative to the jurisdictional amount that may be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined and paid by claims commissions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records, for the period January 1, 1953, through June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE MILITARY CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer, The Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that association, for the year 1951 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NAVY CLUB

A letter from the Shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, Rockford, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that club, for the year ended April 30, 1953 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF CLAIMS PAID UNDER MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid under the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, by that Department, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Four letters from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting temporary admission into the United States of sundry aliens, together with statements giving the reasons for granting such admissions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting temporary admission into the United States of sundry aliens, together with statements giving the reasons for granting such admissions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS INTO THE UNITED STATES

Four letters from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, copies of orders granting admission into the United States of certain immigrants and nonimmigrants, together with statements of law pertaining to each alien and the reasons for granting such admissions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Four letters from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of certain aliens from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, heretofore transmitted to the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Lam Tim from a report transmitted to the Senate on February 16, 1953, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WAIVER OF CLAIM FOR REPAYMENT OF ASSISTANCE GIVEN CERTAIN AMERICAN INTERNED CITIZENS, WORLD WAR II

A letter from the Chairman, American Civilians Interned in Enemy Occupied Countries During World War II, transmitting a memorandum relating to the waiver of the claim against American civilians who were interned in enemy occupied countries during World War II for repayment of assistance rendered (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COLLECTION OF INDEBTEDNESS OF CERTAIN MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL RESULTING FROM ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the collection of indebtedness of military and civilian personnel resulting from erroneous payments, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES WORKING ON DAYS WHEN DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES ARE CLOSED

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for compensation of certain employees on days when departments, agencies, or establishments of the Government are closed by administrative order (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON NUMBER AND TYPES OF ADDITIONAL STEP INCREASES AS REWARDS FOR SUPERIOR ACCOMPLISHMENT

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number and types of additional step increases as rewards for superior accomplishment made by the several Government departments and agencies during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REIMBURSEMENT OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR HANDLING CERTAIN FRANKED MAIL

A letter from the Postmaster General, relating to the reimbursement of the Post Office Department for handling mail of individuals entitled to use the franking privilege; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON LICENSED HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS AND PERSONNEL OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF ADVANCE PLANNING PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the advance planning program, dated June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

FEDERAL AID FOR HANAPEPE FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, KAUAI ISLAND, T. H.

A letter from the Delegate from Hawaii, transmitting, at the request of the chairman and executive officer of the Board of Supervisors of Kauai County, T. H., correspondence with respect to the flood-control project at Hanapepe in the County of Kauai (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial urging relief be given the cotton farmer of Arizona from the stringent limitations of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, by raising the national cotton-acreage allotment from 17½ million to 22½ million acres, and by providing that no individual State's allotment be reduced thereunder by more than 27½ percent of 1952 plantings

"*To the President of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"With the advancement of man's knowledge, the lands and climate of Arizona have proved Arizona to be one of the portions of the United States best fitted for the efficient and economical production of cotton. The full appreciation of this knowledge is of such recent origin that the major portion of Arizona's cotton production has become a reality only in the last 2 or 3 years.

"The Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, places limitations upon Arizona's cotton production which are based on an analysis of only the infant stages of our present industry. If these limitations are applied, it will result in an overall decrease of Arizona's present cotton acreage by 54 percent: A reduction of approximately $100 million in Arizona's present cotton income, with a corresponding severe blow to Arizona's entire economy.

"Rather than correcting farm problems by measures which produce such damaging impact, transition to improve farm programs should be made in an orderly manner so that there will be continuous stability in the process of adjustment.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

"1. That the national cotton-acreage allotment be raised from 17½ million to 22½ million acres and that no individual State's allotment be reduced thereunder by more than 27½ percent of the 1952 plantings."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Memorial 2

"Concurrent memorial urging the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture to grant Federal relief to drought areas

"To the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Government of the United States has advanced to drought areas various kinds of feed at reduced prices for the preservation of breeding herds; and

"The Governor of Arizona has had statistics compiled of Arizona's drought-stricken areas and made recommendations on October 8, 1953, to the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture for relief thereof.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, the house of representatives concurring, prays:

"1. That the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture immediately accept the October 8, 1953, recommendation of the Governor of Arizona for drought relief funds and that such relief be granted in accordance with those recommendations.

"2. Copies of this memorial shall be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, both Houses of Congress, Governor of Arizona, members of Arizona congressional delegation, and all interested persons."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Memorial urging the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture to take steps to restore confidence in the cattle industry

"To the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas the condition of the livestock industry is approaching a state of economic disaster; and

"Whereas there are numerous reasons for the decline in the price of both fat and feeder cattle, one of them being the failure of retail prices to come down in proportion to the drop in price of beef on the hoof, 2 consecutive years of severe losses, and the difficulty of operating on a free market when grains and other commodities fed to cattle are supported.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture consider:

"A. Placing a support price of 90 percent of parity on all grades of fat cattle and canner cattle at all major markets until support prices on all grains or agricultural products used in the process of fattening cattle have been removed, or

"B. A greatly accelerated, nonspeculative, Government meat-purchase program.

"2. That if the decision is in favor of a support price on cattle, that it be installed at once and maintained until such time as Congress convenes and the necessary steps are taken to establish a new agricultural program in which all phases of agriculture would be treated alike.

"3. Copies of this memorial shall be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, both Houses of Congress, Governor of Arizona, members of Arizona congressional delegation, and all interested persons."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial requesting the Congress to extend old-age and survivors insurance to Arizona employees in positions covered by retirement system

"To Arizona's Senators and Representatives in the Congress; to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and to the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"That the 21st Legislature of the State of Arizona at its 1st regular session, being desirous of extending the benefits of old-age and survivors insurance to all State employees, enacted house bill No. 195. That said law provided for the termination of the Arizona teachers' retirement system and the extension of old-age and survivors insurance benefits and the supplemental State employees' retirement system to the members of such system as employees of the State of Arizona.

"That notwithstanding such legislation, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare refused to permit coverage of persons holding teachers' certificates issued by the State board of education who were in positions subject to the Teachers' Retirement Act of 1943 because of the prohibition to such coverage by section 218 (d) of the Social Security Act.

"That the 1st session of the 83d Congress of the United States enacted House Resolution 2062, amending section 218 (d) of the Social Security Act so as to permit public employees of the State of Wisconsin subject to the Wisconsin retirement system to obtain old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, respectfully requests:

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact legislation amending section 218 (d) of the Social Security Act so that public employees of the State of Arizona who were in positions subject to a retirement system on the date of the agreement extending old-age and survivors insurance benefits to their coverage group may have extended to them such benefits in the same manner as was provided by the Congress for the public employees of the State of Wisconsin.

"2. That the Arizona Senators and Representatives introduce such legislation in the next session of Congress.

"3. That the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recommend to the Congress the adoption of legislation similar to that enacted in behalf of the public employees of the State of Wisconsin."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Memorial 1

"Concurrent memorial requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper

"To the President, Congress, and the Departments of State and Interior of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The mining of copper is one of Arizona's chief industries, an industry so great that in point of copper production Arizona leads all of the States of the United States, and, in fact, is responsible for approximately 40 percent of all copper mined in the Nation.

"The copper-mining industry gives employment to many thousands of miners, artisans, mechanics, and craftsmen, whose welfare and prosperity is in very large measure dependent upon this major activity; indeed, the economic welfare of the State is vitally affected by the status of the mining industry.

"There are, in addition to the properties now being worked, great areas and bodies of copper ore in the State which are susceptible of development, to the enrichment of the State and the Nation.

"Should the price of copper be allowed to be determined by foreign countries with low wage standards and high-grade deposits, the result would be a general shutdown of our mines, and a consequent deterioration of the industry both by the heavy damage to the mines and disbandonment of working organizations.

"Should the Nation suddenly be caught without the foreign supply and with a war manpower shortage to rehabilitate abandoned mines, the resulting copper shortage could be the cause of defeat to our Armed Forces.

"It is, therefore, of major importance that the price of copper be maintained on a basis which will insure an active industry with normal production, fair profits, steady employment, and a good standard of living for workers in the industry, and from which would result a continuation of the benefits which accrue to the national security and the State's economy by reason of the industry.

"This can only be insured through the medium of an adequate import tax on raw copper to equalize the difference between the cost of producing the metal in this country and in the copper-producing countries of South America, Africa, and elsewhere.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, the house of representatives concurring, urgently requests:

"1. That a 2-cent-per-pound tariff be placed on all foreign copper."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Resolution 120

"Whereas in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 fears were expressed that Congress would someday grow so powerful that the States would not be able to secure amendments to the Constitution necessary to maintain their rights and powers; and

"Whereas as a result of their fears article V was written so as to empower the States to call on Congress to call a convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution; and

"Whereas throughout the history of this country the States have applied 64 times to Congress to call conventions, but at no time have as many as 32 States made such a call on Congress; and

"Whereas it has become advisable for article V to be amended so that the States in addition to Congress may originate amendments to the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Alabama (the Senate concurring), That Congress be requested to submit an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, so that article V of the Constitution shall read as follows:

" 'ARTICLE V—AMENDMENTS

" 'The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments; or the legislature of any State, whenever two-thirds of each house shall deem it necessary, may propose amendments to this Constitution by transmitting to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the secretary of state of each of the several States a certified copy of the resolution proposing the amendment; which, in any case, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution: *Provided*, That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the

Senate. Any proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless so ratified within 12 years from the date of its submission, or such shorter period as may be prescribed in the proposal. The validity of any amendment shall constitute a justifiable question to be decided by the courts and not by the Congress.'"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Resolution 7

"Whereas at present the State derives a very substantial portion of its revenue from its sales-tax receipts; and

"Whereas the revenue derived from such sales tax is devoted to the support, maintenance, and operation of our public-school system; and

"Whereas there have been indications that the Federal Government might enlarge its field of taxation to include a Federal sales tax: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Alabama (the Senate concurring):

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and requested not to enact any legislation levying a Federal sales tax of any kind, but to leave this field of taxation to the States.

"2 The clerk of the house is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and each member of the Alabama congressional delegation."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to amend the Atomic Energy Act so as to eliminate therefrom any language which may be interpreted as extending exemption from State and local taxes to private contractors dealing with the Atomic Energy Commission

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that the activities of a private contractor performing services for the Atomic Energy Commission are to be treated as activities of the Atomic Energy Commission itself for the purpose of securing immunity from State and local taxes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to amend the Atomic Energy Act so as to eliminate therefrom any language which may be interpreted as providing for the extension of tax exemption to private contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission or to the vendors of such contractors, contrary to the well-established principles of intergovernmental relations which have assured to the States and their political subdivisions full power to impose nondiscriminatory taxation upon private persons who deal with the Government.

"2. The secretary of state is hereby directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this joint resolution, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, to the respective Presiding Officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and to all of the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey in Congress.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the elimination of the Federal tax on cigarettes and gasoline in all cases where a tax on cigarettes and gasoline is imposed by any State so as to afford to the States the right to impose and collect taxes on cigarettes and gasoline for State purposes without any Federal tax on such commodities

"Whereas the State is in need of additional revenues for State aid to schools and other State purposes; and

"Whereas such additional revenue could readily be obtained by increasing the taxes on cigarettes and gasoline but that any such increase would be unduly burdensome if the present Federal taxes on cigarettes and gasoline are continued; and

"Whereas the taxation of these commodities should properly be left to the States and Federal taxes thereon should only be imposed in States which do not tax such commodities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to amend the Internal Revenue Code by providing for the elimination of the Federal tax on cigarettes and gasoline in all cases where a tax on cigarettes and gasoline is imposed by any State so as to afford to the States the right to impose and collect taxes on cigarettes and gasoline for State purposes without any Federal tax on such commodities.

"2. The secretary of state is hereby directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this joint resolution, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, to the respective Presiding Officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and to all of the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey in the Congress.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States of America to reduce Federal taxes and lessen the drain of money from this and other States into the Federal Treasury

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas collections of direct Federal taxes and other revenues by the Federal Government from the citizens of Utah are in excess of $164,000,000; and

"Whereas Utah's share of Federal taxes of all kinds is in excess of $268,000,000; and

"Whereas the State of Utah is urgently in need of additional revenues to maintain public services which are financed by State and local taxes; and

"Whereas Utah and its political subdivisions are ready and willing to assume the obligation for additional public services which are now being performed by the Federal Government if sufficient revenues are available on a State and local level: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby commended for the effort that has been made to reduce expenditures and return government to the people and is requested to pass necessary measures to reduce Federal taxes and permit Utah and other States of the Union greater tax leeway for the purpose of meeting pressing needs in the State and local governmental units of the State; be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to reduce Federal taxes now used to support public services which can more economically be maintained by the States and political subdivisions thereof and permit greater taxing leeway for the States in maintaining such public services; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of of State of the State of Utah be, and is hereby authorized and directed, to send copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives of the State of Utah in the National Congress."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the increased importation of numerous products that come into competition with the output of factories, farms, and mines of Pennsylvania, replacing the products of Pennsylvania's industries, is a constant menace to the State's continuing economic stability; and

"Whereas the lower wages paid abroad make it impossible for many of our own smaller and medium-sized producers to compete with imports without resorting to ruinous price cutting, which in turn would result either in financial losses or heavy pressure for wage reductions and outright unemployment; and

"Whereas our national obligations have reached such extreme proportions that the national income must be maintained at its present unprecedented high level, or close thereto, lest we become insolvent; and

"Whereas pressure that comes from imports of residual fuel oil, having risen from an average of 50 million barrels in the 1946–48 period to more than 125 million in 1952, or the equivalent of 31 million tons of coal; from imports of pottery, watches and parts, glassware, lace, carpets and other textiles, hats and millinery, chemicals, scientific apparatus, cutlery, dairy products, wallpaper, luggage and leather goods, and many other articles, will render the upholding of the economy at its high levels most uncertain and difficult, unless all import trade is placed on a fair competitive basis and the potential injury therefrom thus contained; and

"Whereas a maximum of such trade results from a prosperous domestic economy freed from the threat of a breakdown resulting from unfair import competition: Therefore be it

"Resolved (if the house of representatives concurs), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States that adequate safeguards be provided in tariff and trade legislation against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living, the labor standards of our workmen, and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition and that existing trade agreements legislation be amended accordingly; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation recognizing and confirming State title to certain assigned school land and assigning leasing funds derived from such lands in escrow, and providing for funds for a modified survey and recommendation for a modified survey

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas a congressional act of July 16, 1894, granted a total of 7,374,356 acres of land (secs. 2, 16, 32, and 36 of every township) to the State of Utah for support of the common schools and certain educational and public institutions; and

"Whereas a congressional act of January 25, 1927 (ch. 57, U. S. Statutes at Large; 69th Cong.), confirmed that such assigned State school sections would be transferred to the States even if known mineral in character; and

"Whereas failure of the Federal Government to complete original cadastral surveys on 10,330,730 acres of Utah land has prevented transfer of title to more than 1,000,000 acres of those school lands assigned 57 years ago; and

"Whereas potentially valuable mineral rights and leasing revenue in that unsurveyed acreage are being usurped by the Federal Government through application of a land policy which decrees that school sections under mineral lease will not pass to the State at acceptance at the survey unless the lease has terminated; and

"Whereas no lands can be provided in lieu of such acreage, from the vacant public domain, of comparable value to mineral rights in an area being heavily expored for oil, gas, and uranium; and

"Whereas completion of the survey—which would require an additional 180 years at the present rate, under funds allotted to the exclusive surveying agency, the United States Bureau of Land Management—would facilitate development of the natural resources of the respective Western States, including petroleum and other minerals, and the identification of the lands for use or disposal; and

"Whereas these same problems also apply in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America take the following action promptly to preserve the land rights of the school children of Utah and other Western States:

"1. Passage of legislation clearly confirming State property rights to assigned school sections in unsurveyed areas not included at the time of Statehood within existing Federal reservations and assigning to escrow for the benefit of the respective States any funds derived from minerals leases or royalties on such acreage until title is conveyed to the respective States. The legislation should provide further that all Federal leases on said school sections at the time the survey is completed will promptly revert to the State, without delaying the transfer.

"2. Amending the act of January 25, 1927, so as to clearly confirm the title of the States to its sections in place even if known mineral in character and whether surveyed or unsurveyed.

"3. Passage of legislation providing for funds for a modified cadastral survey, as proposed June 4, 1953, by region IV of the Bureau of Land Management and endorsed recently by Assistant Secretary Orme Lewis of the United States Department of the Interior. This modified survey will place monuments at the corners of the school sections in each unsurveyed township, and can be completed in 3 years and for one-third the cost of a complete survey, according to a Bureau of Land Management report. Completion of such a modified survey will permit final transfer of title to the assigned school sections to the States within a reasonable period; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Utah be, and he is authorized and directed, to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States of America and to the members of Utah's congressional delegation and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

Two resolutions of the Second Legislature of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution 58

"Resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the substance of H. R. 4769, 81st Congress, 1st session

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to pass legislation similar to House Resolution 4769, 81st Congress, first session. Said resolution reads as follows:

" 'A bill to extend the benefits of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to certain citizens of Guam captured at Wake Island

" *'Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 5 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 is hereby amended by inserting "(or a citizen of Guam, if he was captured at Wake Island)" after "citizen of the United States"; and be it

" *'Resolved*, That the executive secretary be and she is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Senate and to the House of Representative of the Congress of the United States.' "

"Resolution 114

"Resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact war-claims legislation for employees of contractors interned during the occupation in Guam by a foreign power

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas provision has heretofore been made by the United States Congress for war-claims damages to be paid to employees of the Government of the United States and employees of the Naval Government of Guam who were interned in Guam as a result of the Japanese occupation; and

"Whereas no like provision has been made for employees of contractors who were also working on defense projects but were not direct employees of the United States Government; and

"Whereas there are many hundred Guamanians who have suffered loss without compensation therefore as a result of being interned as employees of defense contractors and who now have no means to redress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested and memorialized to make adequate provision by statute for compensation to employees of contractors who were interned as a result of the occupation of Guam by the Japanese military forces; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Governor of Guam be and he is hereby respectfully requested to make the appropriate representations to the Department of Interior in connection with the details of proper legislation to alleviate the hardship of these civilian internees; and be it further

"Resolved, That the executive secretary be and she is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Congress of the United States and to the Governor of Guam."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial relating to the Railroad Retirement Act, and requesting favorable action on House of Representatives bill 356

"To the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"House of Representatives bill 356, introduced in the United States House of Representatives by Hon. James E. Van Zandt, Representatives from Pennsylvania, provides for the repeal of the dual-benefits-restriction provision of the Railroad Retirement Act.

"This measure passed the United States House of Representatives on July 24, 1953, by an overwhelming voice vote. The measure, as passed by the House, was sent to the Senate and was referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Due to the rush of business in the closing days of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Senate committee decided to withhold action on the measure until the 2d session of the 83d Congress, to convene January 1954.

"The dual-benefits-restriction provision provides that the retirement annuity of a retired railroad employee must be reduced by the amount of old-age benefit which he is receiving or 'is entitled to receive' under the Federal Social Security Act. Thus the amount is deducted even though the annuitant is not receiving social-security benefits to which he might be entitled.

"As a result of this provision, at the close of 1952, there were an estimated 30,200 retired railroad annuitants and 10,500 wives of retired railroad annuitants who received reductions in their railroad annuities ranging up to $85 per month for the retired annuitant and $40 for his wife.

"In addition to this cut, railroad annuitants found that when, in 1952, the Federal Congress raised social-security benefits, their railroad annuities were again reduced by an amount corresponding to the increase in their social-security benefits. The relief intended to be given retired workers to meet increased living costs was passed on to all retired workers with the single exception of retired railroad annuitants.

"The inequities and injustice of the dual-benefits-restriction provision are contrary to all concepts of fair play and penalize one class of retired workers at a time when the ever-rising cost of living has reduced the living standards of that portion of our population which has, through its own industry, earned the right to a just and adequate compensation.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona prays:

"1. That the Congress enact House of Representatives bill 356."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Utah memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by passing Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 83d Congress, 1st session, as proposed by Senator BRICKER

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (both houses concurring therein):

"Whereas there must needs be preservation of the constitutional autonomy of the sovereign States; and

"Whereas all rights and powers reserved to the States by the Constitution can presently be transferred by treaty to the Federal Government destroying the Federal State form of government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we do petition and memorialize the Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by passing the following amendment, known as the Bricker amendment, to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"'SEC. 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

"'SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

"'SEC. 4. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"'SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the President of the United States, United States Senate, House of Representatives and each congressional delegate from the State of Utah."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Joint Resolution 83

"Joint resolution of House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Alabama

"Whereas our Nation has today lost one of its finest statesmen, a man who not only stood by his convictions but who in doing so retained the admiration, respect, and friendship of his colleagues, and commanded the confidence of people of all parties and stations of life in our country, and who was the worthy son of a worthy father: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Alabama (now in session)*, That we do extend to the wife and family of Senator Robert A. Taft our deepest sympathy in this sad hour and to the United States Senate our sense of its loss, and that the clerk of the house and the secretary of the senate extend immediately our sentiments, as hereinabove expressed, by transmitting to the bereaved family and to the United States Senate a copy of this resolution."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution of the 1st special session of the 30th Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, reaffirming Senate Joint Resolution 10 of the 30th Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to proceed with the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin States by authorizing the Colorado River storage project and participating projects

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein)*:

"Whereas the 30th Legislature of the State of Utah passed on March 9, 1953, Senate Joint Resolution 10; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has still taken no action; and

"Whereas the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin States, consisting of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, is of foremost importance to the future development and general welfare of said States and of the western United States; and

"Whereas the allocation of the waters of the Colorado River apportioned to the upper basin by the Colorado River compact has been amicably settled by and between the above States; and

"Whereas the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission, comprising one member each from the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and the Federal Government is a functioning body and has already completed a dynamic plan for the development of the project; and

"Whereas a report of the participating projects has been compiled by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, approved, with modifications, by the Secretary of the Interior, and submitted by him to the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas this desirable development cannot be commenced without the authorization of the Congress of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 1st special session of the 30th Legislature of the State of Utah (its Governor concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, United States Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Representative in Congress WILLIAM A. DAWSON, and Representative in Congress DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission, and to the governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming."

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Trinity Bay Soil Conservation District, Anahuac, Tex., favoring the continuance of the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Arizona United Livestock Producers' Association in Phoenix, Ariz., relating to the stabilization of prices in the livestock industry; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the California Association of Airport Executives, Inc., relating to the appropriation of sufficient funds to operate airports during a national emergency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States Department of California, at their council of administration meeting, in Sacramento, Calif., relating to the appropriations for the medical program of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Governor of Alabama, notifying the Senate that that State had entered into an interstate civil-defense compact with the other States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Letters from the Governor of the State of Idaho, transmitting copies of the interstate civil-defense and disaster compact entered into by that State with the States of Indiana, Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, New Mexico, Tennessee, Colorado, and Alabama (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the secretary of state of Indiana, notifying the Senate that that State had entered into an interstate civil-defense compact with the other States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Deputy Director, Civil Defense Corps, Fort Hayes, Columbus, Ohio, notifying the Senate that the State of Ohio had entered into interstate compacts with the States of Virginia, Kentucky, and Wyoming (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the 54th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, held at Milwaukee, Wis., commending Gen. Lewis B. Hershey for his administration of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Three resolutions adopted by the convention of the Retired Officers Association, Washington, D. C., relating to retired pay of officers and civilian personnel, to correct inequities in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and the classification of warrant officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient public housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Home and School Association, Anacostia High School, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds to continue equal but separate facilities in relation to schools for all citizens of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution adopted by the Conference of State Social Security Administrators, in Chicago, Ill., favoring the extension of old-age and survivors' insurance to public employees; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Guilford County (N. C.) Young Republican Club, favoring the enactment of legislation allowing a $25 exemption in income taxes for each pint of blood donated to the American Red Cross; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Gov. Gordon Persons, chairman, and sundry other members of the Alabama State Board of Public Welfare, praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the old-age and survivors' insurance coverage to groups now excluded; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by local union No. 1265, United Mine Workers of America, West Frankfort, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the social security law, relating to the age limit for retirement purposes, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Bar Association, favoring the enactment of legislation to include lawyers under the provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

Three resolutions adopted by the 12th annual convention of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, New York, N. Y., relating to the freedom of Poland and other countries of central and eastern Europe, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a special session of the Americans of Polish Descent and Poles in the U. S. A., at Cleveland, Ohio, relating to the arrest of Cardinal Wyszynski; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the State conference, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, New York State Organization, Rome, N. Y., relating to the recognition of the Chinese Communist regime; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the St. Francis general assembly, Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus, and Gold Gate Council, No. 2507, Knights of Columbus, both of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the action of the Polish Government in arresting Cardinal

Wyszinski, primate of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Oakland, Calif., unit of the Women Defenders of America, Inc., favoring the enactment of legislation to repudiate the treaty entitled "The Status of Armed Forces Treaty"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Burlington County Pomona Grange, Vincentown, N. J., relating to the serving of alcoholic beverages at official functions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the California State convention, Jewish War Veterans of the U. S. A., at Coronado, Calif., relating to the supervision of holy places in Jerusalem by the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the 17th Annual Constitutional Convention of the International Woodworkers of America, at Vancouver, British Columbia, relating to the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the West Virginia State Federation of Labor, A. F. of L., at Wheeling, W. Va., relating to the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted at the Special Convention Against the Evils of Mechanization held under the auspices of the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, at Arecibo, P. R., relating to the mechanization of the sugar industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, T. H., relating to the issuance of public improvements bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the California section of the American Water Works Association at Pasadena, Calif., reaffirming its opposition to the central Arizona project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., transmitting a copy of Act 254 of the Legislature of Hawaii, providing for the issuance of public-improvement bonds (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Two letters from the Governor of Hawaii, transmitting two resolutions adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, T. H., relating to the issuance of public-improvement bonds for the construction of sewerage systems, and for flood-control projects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Carlos Westerband, member of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., relating to an investigation of crime conditions on the Puerto Rican waterfront; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the California Association of Airport Executives, Inc., relating to the continued operation of control towers and landing aids with Civil Aeronautics Administration funds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the New Jersey Baptist Convention at Asbury Park, N. J., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Burlington County (N. J.) Pomona Grange, favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Cecil S. Lucas, of Atlanta, Ga., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Dr. C. H. R. Hovde, of Lawndale, Calif., dated October 20, 1953, together with an addenda to the above petition dated December 14, 1953, praying for a redress of grievances (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Bar Association, relating to communism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Two resolutions adopted by the Jewish War Veterans of the U. S. A., relating to a Middle East Defense Organization, and the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the secretary of State of Alabama, transmitting a copy of Act No. 440 of the Legislature of Alabama, relating to the location of the boundary between the States of Florida and Alabama as defined by the constitution of each respective State, at the mouth of the Perdido River and adjacent thereto (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Philip Billard Post, No. 1650, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Topeka, Kans., relating to the deportation of Dick Haymes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the New York organization, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Rome, N. Y., relating to the display of the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Supreme Lodge, Order of the Sons of Italy in America, Supreme Executive Council, New York City, N. Y., relating to the amendment of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Supreme Lodge, Order of the Sons of Italy in America, Supreme Executive Council, New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation designating Columbus Day, October 12, a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Special Convention Against the Evils of Mechanization, held under the auspices of the Puerto Rican Free Federation of Labor, at Arecibo, P. R., relating to the designation of a day during the year 1954 to be known as Labor Pray Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the District Attorneys' Association of Oregon, Portland, Oreg., relating to the propriety of present congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, Detroit, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the Nationality and Immigration Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Conference of Police Associations, at Minneapolis, Minn, relating to the danger in the published Communist doctrine to discredit police forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the 35th Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of Michigan, Detroit, Mich., commending the patriotic American officials who have fought in a manner consistent with the Constitution and laws to rid the country of those seeking to overthrow the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A paper in the nature of a petition signed by Beatrice Miller Montanye, as agent for her brother, Harry B. Miller, concerning her claim against the people of the State of New York, in the matter of the closing of an abandoned bridle path in the town of Webb, Herkimer County, N. Y. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the secretary of state of Florida, transmitting a copy of Chapter 28141, Laws of Florida, Acts of 1953, relating to the location of the boundary between the States of Florida and Alabama, as defined by the constitutions of each respective State, at the mouth of the Perdido River and adjacent thereto (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of the United Neighbors, Inc., signed by F. A. Lydy, president, and 17 affiliated organizations, Los Angeles, Calif., relating to an investigation and legislative action in connection with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Barrows* v. *Jackson* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the convention of the Retired Officers Association, Washington, D. C., relating to medical treatment for veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by Memory Post, No. 1844, Santa Rosa, and the Sonoma County Chapter, No. 48, both in the State of California, favoring the establishment of a veterans' hospital in the Santa Rosa area, for the treatment of neuropsychiatric patients; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the New York organization, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Rome, N. Y., favoring an investigation of the activities of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, as they affect the American school system; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Harding Franco-Soto, San Juan, P. R., relating to the restoration of the cost-of-living allowance payable to Federal employees of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the State Bar of New Mexico, Santa Fe, N. Mex., favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of Members of Congress and the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, San Juan, P. R., signed by Nicolas Nogueras Rivera, president, relating to the restitution of the 25-percent differential to the Federal employees in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., relating to investigations by congressional committees; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the New Mexico Legislative Council, Santa Fe., N. Mex., relating to the restoration of the printing of the State Law Index, formerly published by the Library of Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Free Confederation of Workers of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., signed by Nicolas Nogueras Rivera, president, relating to the placing of a statue of Santiago Iglesias Pantin, deceased, in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by a Democratic caucus of the General Court of Massachusetts, at Worcester, Mass., commending the loyalty and devotion to country of former President Harry S. Truman; ordered to lie on the table.

Resolutions adopted by the West Virginia State Bar, Charleston, W. Va., the board of directors of the Ebell of Los Angeles, Calif., and the Friday Morning Club of Los Angeles, relating to international treaties and executive agreements; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, San Juan, P. R., signed by Nicolas Nogueras Rivera, president, enclosing a resolution

adopted by that organization, felicitating the President and his administration on the Korean problem; ordered to lie on the table.

Letters from the Ambassador of Honduras, the Ambassador of Germany, and a telegram from the Ambassador of Brazil, offering condolences on the death of the late Senator Robert A. Taft; ordered to lie on the table.

Resolutions adopted by the City Planning Commission of Cleveland, Ohio, the board of directors of the Puerto Rico Federation of Commerce, San Juan, P. R., and the Puerto Rican Housing Authority, Rio Piedras, P. R., expressing condolences on the death of the late Senator Robert A. Taft; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the New York State organization, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Rome, N. Y., relating to the treaty-making power; ordered to lie on the table.

Resolutions adopted by the Women for Good Government, San Pedro, Calif., and the the New Jersey State Bar Association, relating to the treatymaking powers and executive agreements; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the convention of the American Federation of Labor, St. Louis, Mo., favoring an amendment of Senate Rule XXII, relating to unlimited debate; ordered to lie on the table.

PROPOSED RETURN TO JAPAN OF AMAMI-O-SHIMA ISLANDS—LETTERS FROM DISTRICT COUNCILS, PROVINCE OF TAIWAN, CHINA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from V. K. Wellington Koo, Ambassador from China, transmitting communications from city and district councils of the Province of Taiwan, China, relating to the proposed return to Japan of the Amami-O-shima Islands belonging to the Ryukyu Island group; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PARITY FOR FARM COMMODITIES — RESOLUTION OF BOTTINEAU COUNTY FARMERS UNION, OMEMEE, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Bottineau County Farmers Union, at Kramer, N. Dak., relating to the two-price system for agriculture and full parity for all farm commodities.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMEMEE, N. DAK., *December 28, 1953.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the annual convention of the Bottineau County Farmers Union, held at Kramer, N. Dak., December 1, 1953, the following resolution was adopted by the convention:

"*Be it resolved*, We instruct the board members to notify our Senators and Congressmen in Washington, D. C., that we, the Bottineau County Farmers Union, are against the two-price system for agriculture and favor full parity for all farm commodities."

The convention was attended by over 200 members and the above resolution was unanimously adopted.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN FRASER, *President.*
ALDA FRASER, *Secretary.*

TRANSMISSION AND SALE OF FEDERAL ELECTRIC POWER—RESOLUTION OF MIRAGE FLATS (N. DAK.) FARM BUREAU

Mr. LANGER. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Mirage Flats (N. Dak.) Farm Bureau, relating to the transmission and sale of Federal electric power.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has come to our attention that the criteria covering transmission and sale of Federal electric power, effective date January 1, 1954, abrogates most of the past policies with regard to protection to preference customers; and

Whereas it is known that such marketing criteria will work a hardship on the local REA project which furnishes our members with electric service, and such hardship will eventually be passed on to individual customers; and

Whereas it appears that any benefits to be received from such marketing criteria will accrue to nonpreference customers (who are profit-type organizations) at the expense of the preference customers (non-profit-type organizations): Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Mirage Flats Farm Bureau respectfully request the Nebraska delegation in Congress to oppose at all times legislation or administrative order that will in effect take the people's electric power (Federal power) from the control of the people in any area of the Nation and place such control in the hands of private or monopolistic hands; and be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be distributed to all Nebraska Representatives in Congress, to the Nebraska Rural Electric Association, and to each REA organization in Nebraska. Further, anyone receiving this resolution is hereby permitted to reprint it for his use.

MIRAGE FLATS FARM BUREAU,
By ANDREW F. YOUNG, *Legislator.*

FEDERAL POWER POLICY AS APPLIED TO MISSOURI BASIN — MINUTES OF MEETING AND RESOLUTION OF McLEAN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., GARRISON, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the minutes of a meeting, and a resolution adopted by the McLean Electric Cooperative, Inc., at Garrison, N. Dak., relating to the Federal power policy as applied to the Missouri Basin.

There being no objection, the minutes and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A regular meeting of the McLean Electric Cooperative, Inc., was held October 19, 1953, at the office of the cooperative in the city auditorium at Garrison, N. Dak., at 2 p. m.

Directors present were Thompson, Mattson, Leidholm, Buehler, Forland, Stadler, Hauf, and McElwain.

Director absent was Fiedler.

Also present were W. S. Comings, Jr., manager, and Robert Vogel and Jack Williams, attorneys.

Minutes of the September 21, 1953, meeting were read and approved. Motion to accept the minutes was made by Leidholm, seconded by Thompson, and duly carried.

Application for membership was read and voted on for acceptance. Motion to accept was made by Buehler, seconded by Hauf, and duly carried.

Final action was taken on the audit. Upon motion by McElwain, seconded by Thompson, and duly carried, the $1,258.32 in deferred debits is to be charged off in 4 months from the members' equity.

A motion was made by Buehler, seconded by Stadler, and duly carried, that deferred debits $2,718.66, unamortized loan expense, shall be charged off over a period of 6 years.

Delegates to NRECA meeting at Miami, January 11 to the 14 of 1954, were selected: Hauf, voting delegate; Thompson, alternate delegate.

Julius Mattson gave his report on Central Power Cooperative's regular meeting. They are about ready to hire a manager. Their annual meeting will be held November 12 in the Clarence Parker Hotel beginning at 10 a. m.

Upon motion by Thompson, seconded by Buehler, and duly carried the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the recently announced power policy as applied to the Missouri Basin as set forth by Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, at the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee meeting at Fargo, N. Dak., on September 29, 1953, is shocking, unreasonable, and contrary to the best interests of the Rural Electrification program in North Dakota; and

"Whereas this power policy will, in effect, nullify the preference clause expressed in various Federal power statutes and will jeopardize all rural-electrification programs within the State of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution condemning the recently announced power policy be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress."

The manager and a few directors will meet with the county commissioners the first week in November about the road building without moving our poles, thereby leaving them in a weakened condition.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned.

SARA MCELWAIN, *Secretary.*

CERTIFICATE OF SECRETARY

I, Sara McElwain, do hereby certify: That I am the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of McLean Electric Cooperative, Inc. (hereinafter called "cooperative"), and the keeper of its records; that the attached and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original minutes entered in the minute book of the cooperative of the annual meeting of the members of said cooperative convened and held pursuant to and in accordance with the laws of the State of North Dakota, and its articles of incorporation and bylaws of the cooperative, on the 19th day of October 1953; that none of the resolutions or motions contained in the aforesaid copy of said minutes has been rescinded or modified, and that the same are as of the date hereof in full force and effect.

In witness whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name as secretary and affixed the corporate seal of the cooperative this — day of December 1953.

SARA MCELWAIN.

[CORPORATE SEAL]

INCLUSION OF LEGAL PROFESSION UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY LAW—LETTER FROM MINNESOTA COUNTY ATTORNEYS ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter

which I have received from the secretary of the Minnesota County Attorneys Association, Mr. Robert B. Gillespie, in favor of extending the provisions of the social security laws to include members of the legal profession, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMBRIDGE, MINN., *December 31, 1953.*
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The members of the Minnesota County Attorneys Association, in convention assembled at St. Paul yesterday, passed a resolution in favor of extending the provisions of the social security laws to include members of the legal profession.

The writer, as secretary of the association, was instructed to forward this information to you so that you might be advised as to our position with reference to this matter.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT B. GILLESPIE.

RESOLUTION BY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MINN., URGING AN APPEAL TO THE COURTS ON THE TIDELANDS OIL BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a motion adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis, Minn., on December 28, 1953, urging an appeal to the courts on the tidelands oil bill, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The resolution reflects the attitude of one of the larger counties in our State, calling upon the Governor of the State of Minnesota and the attorney general to join with other States in appealing the validity of the action of the Congress, and making that appeal to the courts of the land.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS,
OFFICE OF COUNTY AUDITOR,
Duluth, Minn., December 30, 1953.
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

The following motion was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of the County of St. Louis, Minn., at its meeting held on December 28, 1953:

"Upon motion of Commissioner Solem, the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County joins in the appeal of the Duluth Federated Trades and Labor Assembly in requesting the Governor of the State of Minnesota to join with other States in appealing the passage of the tidelands oil bill enacted at the last session of the United States Congress.

"No. 917."

Very truly yours,
W. H. BORGEN,
County Auditor.
By I. A. FINK,
Clerk of County Board.

STATE DEPARTMENT — FILE SURVEY—INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS (S. REPT. NO. 836)

Mr. McCARTHY, under the order of the Senate of August 3, 1953, from the Committee on Government Operations, on October 12, 1953, submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 40, 83d Congress, 1st session, an interim report entitled "State Department—File Survey."

TRANSFER OF OCCUPATION CURRENCY PLATES—ESPIONAGE PHASE — INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS (S. REPT. NO. 837)

Mr. MUNDT, under the order of the Senate of August 3, 1953, from the Committee on Government Operations, on December 15, 1953, submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 40, 83d Congress, 1st session, an interim report entitled "Transfer of Occupation Currency Plates—Espionage Phase."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2602. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President;

S. 2603. A bill to extend temporarily the rights of priority of nationals of Japan and certain nationals of Germany with respect to applications for patents; and

S. 2604. A bill to relieve independent distributors from restrictions on their freedom to compete imposed by section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2605. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 so as to provide benefits for members of the Armed Forces held as prisoners of war during the conflict in Korea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. FERGUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 2606. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Gerasimos Christoforatos (otherwise known as Ioannis Gerasimu Christoforatos or John Christoforatos or Jon Christoforatos); and

S. 2607. A bill for the relief of Faustino Achaval Aldecoa and his wife, Carmen Achaval (nee Cortabitarte); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 2608. A bill to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to certain lands in Powell, Wyo., conveyed to the University of Wyoming under the provisions of the act of December 15, 1944; and

S. 2609. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to permit the exchange and amendment of farm units on Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 2610. A bill to extend until August 1, 1954, the time for filing claims for compensation under section 6 (d) of the War Claims Act of 1948 by World War II prisoners of war;

S. 2611. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel;

S. 2612. A bill for the relief of Dr. K. A. Peter van Berkum; and

S. 2613. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2614. A bill to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnapping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2615. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the apportionment of farm acreage allotments for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2616. A bill to provide for payment of annuity to widows of judges;

S. 2617. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges;

S. 2618. A bill for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. GRISWOLD):

S. 2619. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the founding of a national memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 2620. A bill for the relief of Matteo Yuranich; and

S. 2621. A bill for the relief of Joseph G. Gerrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 2622. A bill for the relief of Heino Puhk;

S. 2623. A bill for the relief of Sime Ivan Saric; and

S. 2624. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. James C. Vanneter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2625. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2626. A bill for the relief of Christ Lekas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 2627. A bill to confirm the rights of the State of Wyoming in and to its public school lands and the minerals therein whether or not such lands were surveyed on the date of the original grant to such State; and

S. 2628. A bill to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to certain lands in Powell, Wyo., conveyed to the University of Wyoming under the provisions of the act of December 15, 1944; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 2629. A bill to regulate the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation of passengers by common carriers by water engaged in foreign commerce and in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2630. A bill to authorize deductions from the salaries and retirement benefits of Federal officers and employees and former Federal officers and employees to satisfy delinquent Federal taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2631. A bill to prohibit the payment of Government retirement benefits to persons convicted of certain offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2632. A bill for the relief of the Epes Transportation Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 2633. A bill for the relief of Stanislavas Racinskas (Stacys Racinskas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2634. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William A. Curran; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2635. A bill for the relief of Nadeem Tannous and Mrs. Jamile Tannous; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2636. A bill for the relief of Arturo Rodriguez Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 2637. A bill to forfeit citizenship of conspirators against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2638. A bill for the relief of Leon Silverman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2639. A bill for the relief of Etsuko Tamaki (Shimizu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2640. A bill for the relief of Esther Joanne Potter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

S. 2641. A bill to amend certain procurement statutes to limit authority for the purchase of supplies and services without advertising during periods of national emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2642. A bill to provide for the inclusion of the Territory of Alaska within the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 2645. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See remarks of Mr. MAYBANK and other Senators relating to the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. CASE):

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KNOWLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948 RELATING TO BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 so as to provide benefits for members of the Armed Forces held as prisoners of war during the conflict in Korea. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2605) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 so as to provide benefits for members of the Armed Forces held as prisoners of war during the conflict in Korea, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the War Claims Act of 1948 is amended by inserting after section 6 thereof a new section as follows:

"PRISONERS OF WAR; KOREAN CONFLICT

"SEC. 6A. (a) As used in this section, the term 'prisoner of war' means any regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the Armed Forces of the United States who was held as a prisoner of war for any time subsequent to June 25, 1950, by any hostile force with which the Armed Forces of the United States has actually engaged in armed conflict subsequent to such date.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any prisoner of war for compensation for the violation by the hostile force by which he was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, of its obligations to furnish him the quantity or quality of food to which he was entitled as a prisoner of war under the terms of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929. The compensation allowed to any prisoner of war under the provisions of this subsection shall be at the rate of $1 for each day he was held as a prisoner of war on which such hostile force or its agents failed to furnish him such quantity or quality of food.

"(c) (1) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and to provide for the payment of any claim filed by any prisoner of war for compensation—

"(A) for the violations by the hostile force by which he was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, of the obligations of such hostile force under title III, section III, of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929, relating to labor of prisoners of war; or

"(B) for inhumane treatment by the hostile force by which he was held, or its agents. The term 'inhumane treatment' as used herein shall include, but not be limited to, violation by such hostile force, or its agents, of one or more of the provisions of article 2, 3, 7, 10, 12, 13, 21, 22, 54, 56, or 57 of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929.

"(2) Compensation shall be allowed to any prisoner of war under this subsection at the rate of $1.50 per day for each day he was held as a prisoner of war on which he alleges and proves in a manner acceptable to the Commission—

"(A) the violation by such hostile force or its agents of the provisions of title III, section III, of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929; or

"(B) any inhumane treatment as defined herein.

In no event shall the compensation allowed to any prisoner of war under this subsection exceed the sum of $1.50 with respect to any 1 day.

"(d) Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

"(e) (1) Claims under this section shall be paid to the persons entitled thereto, and shall in case of death of the persons who are entitled be payable only to or for the benefit of the following persons:

"(A) Widow or dependent husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

"(B) Widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children of the deceased in equal shares;

"(C) Child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or dependent husband; and

"(D) Parents (in equal shares) if there is no widow, dependent husband, or child.

"(2) Where any person entitled to payment under this section is under any legal disability, payment may be made in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of section 5.

"(f) Claims for compensation under this section shall be filed with the Commission within 1 year from the date of enactment of this section. Nothing contained in this section shall extend the period of existence of the Commission beyond the time prescribed in subsection (e) of section 2."

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 and section 302 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

More definite specifications are established. Negotiation of Government contracts under the above sections would be confined to specific instances rather than a blanket determination that it would be in the public interest to negotiate contracts.

The effect of the amendment would be to return to competitive bidding in the great majority of cases, as was intended by the Congress when the legislation was passed. Competitive bidding, under this bill, would be the rule and negotiation the permissible exception.

Greater economy and efficiency would be required under those sections which have been most widely used for negotiating Government contracts. Findings in writing would also be required that market conditions do not permit full and free competition, or that specifications are not precise, or that it would be more economical to the United States, or that it would be necessary to carry out the declared policy of Congress that small-business concerns receive a fair proportion of contracts awarded.

The bill, in effect, provides that the Government, as a purchaser, shall receive the best bargain available, and that suppliers in a position to furnish the Government's requirements shall have a fair and equal opportunity to compete wherever located in this country. The bill would prevent the unfavorable results which have flowed from implementing orders which apply to one area in preference to another.

Thinly populated areas would benefit, in that Government surveys were not made in these localities, and they did not have an opportunity to obtain preferences.

The bill would delete from existing legislation those sections on which the Office of Defense Mobilization has relied to solve unemployment problems with Government procurement and thereby created unemployment in other locations. The bill would prevent defense agencies from concerning themselves with problems unrelated to defense purposes, such as savings in taxes, savings in unemployment compensation, the prevention of lost sales, and savings in relief expenditures. These matters are too important to be handled as a sideline, and would be more appropriately left with Congress and the departments

more directly concerned with the specific problems involved.

The bill places small-business concerns in a more advantageous position, in that they would have an opportunity to compete for a greater share in the Government's business.

During the recess of the Congress, and in the absence of the committee members, the bill was reviewed with various staff members closely associated with the handling of procurement matters for small-business concerns. The object of this review was to safeguard and to make more effective the declared policy of Congress that a fair proportion of total purchases and contracts for supplies and services shall be placed with small-business concerns. It is believed that the bill will do much to provide a greater proportion of the total procurement for small business. The bill was also reviewed with the Legal Section of the Small Business Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2641) to amend certain procurement statutes to limit authority for the purchase of supplies and services without advertising during periods of national emergency, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

INCLUSION OF ALASKA WITHIN FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the inclusion of the Territory of Alaska within the Federal Reserve System.

The bill would have the effect of bringing the Territory of Alaska within the Federal Reserve System so that the national banks of Alaska will derive all the advantages and also accept all the responsibilities of national banks anywhere in the United States.

I have hopes that this bill, if enacted, will go a long way toward easing the chronic shortage of credit in Alaska which has made it so difficult to secure industrial development there. One other immediate effect will be to abolish the service charge on cashing checks in Alaska.

When the original Federal Reserve Act was enacted prior to World War I, Alaska was still many days distant from the United States in point of time. I suspect that was the principal reason why Alaska and Hawaii were not included within the Federal Reserve System—because it took several days in transit for the transmission of checks and other financial documents back and forth from Alaska to the States and it therefore was not financially feasible to expect the banks in Alaska to sustain the expense of cashing checks without charge or of coming within the same system of bank clearances, as did the banks on the continent. Now with the airplane, substantially every bank in Alaska is within 24 hours of principal banking centers in the 48 States, and there is no reason to exclude Alaska from the Federal Reserve Act.

The same situation exists with respect to Hawaii, but special legislation for Hawaii is not necessary since this problem is covered by the pending Hawaii statehood bill.

The bill (S. 2642) to provide for the inclusion of the Territory of Alaska within the Federal Reserve System, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REDUCTION OF VOTING AGE TO 18

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote.

I should like to say to Members on both sides of the aisle, with reference to the joint resolution, that it proposes a constitutional amendment providing for voting by youths of 18 years of age or over, and I should be glad to have any Senators on either side of the aisle who care to join in the general sponsorship of the joint resolution, attach their names to it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I join in the proposed amendment introduced by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] providing for voting by those who arrive at the age of 18 years.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask that my name be included in the list of cosponsors of the proposed constitutional amendment introduced by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND].

A proposed constitutional amendment in the State of South Dakota to the same effect was defeated by a very narrow margin in the last general election. I am sure that, with the impetus given to the movement by the introduction of the proposed constitutional amendment, when the question next comes up in the State of South Dakota the proposal will be promptly agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to join the distinguished majority leader as a cosponsor of the proposed constitutional amendment which he has sent to the desk this morning.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 112) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. CASE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for a great many years I have been a stanch advocate of a constitutional amendment allowing 18-year-olds to vote. On July 18 of last year I set forth that recommendation in Senate Joint Resolution 103. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are 18 years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to my good friend, the distinguished Senator from California, that of course I am delighted, as the representative of the Independent Party in the Senate, to acknowledge that the Republicans in the Senate have, at long last, reached a point of agreement with the Independent Party on one matter. Other Senators including some on the Democratic side have introduced similar resolutions in the past.

Although I think it might have been a little more appropriate to hold early hearings on resolutions already pending before the Senate calling for a constitutional amendment on this issue, I have no objection, Mr. President, irrespective of Republican partisan maneuvering to joining with the Republicans in the introduction of this resolution. I hope we can have early hearings on it. It involves a very desirable recognition of the importance and citizenship rights of the 18-year-olds in this country.

As I said when I introduced the joint resolution last July, it is a belated recognition of the valuable contribution to 160 years of free education. If those who are 18 years old do not have the maturity of judgment and the mental ability to vote after the intensive educational efforts we have made during the course of many years, then we are simply confessing the failure of our educational system.

I assure the distinguished Senator from California that I am delighted to be a cosponsor in the introduction of the joint resolution introduced by him, which is identical in purpose with the one previously introduced by me as a representative of the Independent Party in the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was very pleased that the President of the United States in his state of the Union message saw fit to endorse the proposal to grant the privileges of the franchise, the right to vote, to the 18-year-olds in our country. I also listened with keen interest to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I am fully aware ofhis steadfast efforts to attain this objective, to which the President of the United States has now given

his support. I understand that the majority leader has endorsed an appropriate resolution.

Let me say that early in the first session of the 83d Congress the junior Senator from Minnesota introduced such a resolution, proposing a constitutional amendment making it possible for 18-year-olds to vote. I have said, and it will be my position as a Member of the Senate, that I am not at all interested in the parentage of the bill or resolution; I am interested in the legislative child or the legislative product. Therefore I will, of course, be willing to give my wholehearted support to any appropriate resolution on this subject, whether that of the Senator from Oregon, that of the Senator from California, the majority leader, or that of any other Senator—and of course I would be exceedingly proud if it were my own resolution—which would make the proposal to grant to 18-year-olds a right to vote a reality.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article prepared by me, and which was printed in the magazine Redbook, be made a part of my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL CITIZENSHIP FOR YOUTH

(By Senator HUBERT M. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In November 1950 Redbook proposed that the legal United States voting age be lowered to 18. In the following editorial, Senator HUMPHREY explains why he has taken up this campaign and reports on its progress.)

On April 1 of this year I introduced an amendment to the Constitution that would permit 18-year-olds to vote. There are a number of reasons why the voting age should be lowered. We ask 18-year-olds to fight and to die for democracy; yet we do not give them the most fundamental democratic right—the right to vote. Our 18-year-olds take on tremendous responsibilities in our Armed Forces. Surely they are equal to the responsibilities of good and informed citizenship. I agree with President Eisenhower when he said, "If they are old enough to fight, they are old enough to vote."

One of the most alarming problems in our democracy today is voter apathy. Only 63 percent of our people voted in the last national election. I think that many people are more interested in politics and political issues and are better informed on these issues when they are between the ages of 18 and 21 than they are later on. When they have been out of school for a longer time, they become more absorbed in the everyday business of earning a living, and they become subject to the voter apathy which affects so many of our citizens.

The young people of this generation are better prepared educationally for political responsibility than were Americans of previous generations. Our young people would be more than mere passive voters—they could be an informative force in American politics. They have the enthusiasm and idealism of youth, and have at the same time learned to know responsibility in many walks of life. Many of them are fresh from our schools and colleges, with a lively interest in political and social affairs. They would take on their civic responsibilities at an age when they are more apt to place national interest above those more particular interests which they may later acquire.

Finally, there is no better civic training than the exercise of the vote. Without the vote, all other forms of civic training are lacking in meaning and effectiveness. It is essential that our young people take on political responsibility as soon as they are ready to do so, for the real value of education comes from its association with responsibility.

Youth ought to have a voice in determining its own future. And, what is more, it has a definite contribution to make to the future of our whole country. I hope that the Congress and the States will act soon to permit 18-year-olds to take their deserved place as full citizens.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. MAYBANK. I had intended to submit an amendment relating to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, but after having a full discussion with several other Senators, and with representatives of cotton and cottonseed producers and ginners of South Carolina, I now understand that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under the leadership of its able chairman, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], have agreed upon a temporary measure in connection with cotton allotments; therefore, I shall not submit the amendment. I think the committee did a good job. I understand some amendments, with which I am in accord, will be proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and by the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as has been mentioned by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been busy during the last 2 days trying to work out solutions to a critical situation in the cotton-production program for the coming year. This morning the committee agreed upon what we believe to be a very satisfactory and fair solution of the problem.

We realize that any legislation which is to be of any use this year must be enacted promptly. We know that Senators will desire to read, as soon as they can do so, the bill approved by the Senate committee. However, I am not certain that the proposed legislation will be quite ready before the Senate concludes its session today. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent, that the bill may be introduced and the report filed after the adjournment or the recess of the Senate today, if it is possible to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the progress he and the other members of his committee have made on this very important proposed legislation. Certainly I have no objection to his reporting the bill when the Senate is not in session. I am very hopeful that the bill may be reported promptly, so that the Senate can proceed to its consideration at the very earliest possible date on which the distinguished majority leader can find a place for it on the calendar.

Mr. AIKEN. We think we have found a very good solution of the problem confronting the people of Texas and other cotton-producing States. We had almost a full attendance of the committee. However, the subcommittee, consisting of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], worked diligently on the bill for a much longer time than did the full committee.

It is the desire of the committee to have the bill and the report ready by tomorrow morning, if possible, so that Senators may have an opportunity to read and study them before the Senate meets next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Vermont is agreed to.

The bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. KUCHEL), read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Subsequently, Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported the above bill, without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 838) thereon.

ELECTION OF GOVERNOR AND SECRETARY OF ALASKA BY THE PEOPLE OF ALASKA

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill heretofore introduced by me (S. 224) to provide for the election of the Governor and Secretary of Alaska by the people of the Territory.

My amendment simply changes the date for the first election under this bill from 1954 to 1956. This change is necessary because the filing date under the laws of Alaska for the 1954 election is very close, and there would not be time to have this change put into effect for this year's election.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska to the bill (S. 224) to provide that the Governor and the Secretary of the Territory of Alaska shall be elected by the people of that Territory, was received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF RECREATION ACT OF 1926, TO INCLUDE OTHER PUBLIC PURPOSES AND TO PERMIT NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS TO LEASE PUBLIC LANDS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 1815) to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes. House bill 1815 is in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The bill as it passed the House would permit the sale or leasing by the Federal Government of small acreages of

Federal land to State or local bodies and would also permit the leasing of public land to nonprofit organizations. The principal effect of my amendment would be to permit the sale as well as the leasing of public land to nonprofit bodies at a fair appraised value.

The bill, H. R. 1815, and my proposed amendents to it have particular application to Alaska because of the fact that over 99 percent of the land in the Territory is owned by the Federal Government. There is less than 1 percent in the hands of private parties and therefore it is almost impossible to buy land anywhere except from the Federal Government.

That situation creates a great problem, particularly for churches and other charitable and nonprofit institutions, for the reason that today there is no law under which they can acquire title to any public land. As a result, such institutions can secure title only through a special law in each case, which takes the form of a private bill. Last year the Congress passed three such private bills for the benefit of particular groups in Alaska, and it is my understanding that there are seven similar bills pending in the House committee. Until Congress gets around to taking action on these individual bills one by one, the church organization or other charitable group in each case cannot proceed with its plans for securing land or constructing necessary facilities to carry on its work.

The bill, H. R. 1815, and my amendments do not propose to give away anything. My amendments simply propose to permit such organizations to buy such land as they need at its fair value without waiting months and months for Congress to pass a special bill in each case. I hope this bill can be acted upon before the beginning of the construction season in 1954 so that such organizations can proceed in a businesslike way with their programs.

The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska to the bill (H. R. 1815) to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes, were received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PAYMENT OF AN ANNUITY TO WIDOWS OF JUDGES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2616) to provide for the payment of an annuity to widows of judges, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938 RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT OF FARM ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS OF COTTON—AMENDMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2615) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the apportionment of farm acreage allotments for cotton, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE AVAILABILITY OF SUPPLIES OF CRITICAL RAW MATERIALS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 171), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the authority of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under Senate Resolution 143, 83d Congress, agreed to July 28, 1953 (authorizing a full and complete investigation and study of the accessibility of critical raw materials to the United States during a time of war), and the time for reporting the results of its study and investigation thereunder, is hereby extended to April 30, 1954.

SEC. 2. The sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution shall be available for the expenses of the committee covering obligations incurred on or before April 30, 1954.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska subsequently, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to which was referred the above resolution, reported it, without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES RELATING TO INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JENNER (for himself and Mr. McCARRAN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 172), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, agreed to December 21, 1950, is hereby increased by $170,000, and such sum together with any unexpended balances of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution and Senate Resolution 46, 83d Congress, agreed to January 30, 1953, Senate Resolution 314, 82d Congress, agreed to May 29, 1952, Senate Resolution 198, 82d Congress, agreed to September 27, 1951, and Senate Resolution 7, 82d Congress, agreed to January 29, 1951, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolutions on or before January 31, 1955.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BRICKER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 173), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as set forth in section (1) (j) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and especially all matters pertaining to—

(1) communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television;

(2) civil aeronautics;

(3) domestic surface transportation;

(4) maritime matters generally, including a continuation of the study of the maritime subsidy program, and

(5) fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, until January 31, 1955, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF CHARITABLE AND PRIVATE WELFARE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 174), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the activities of all charitable and private welfare organizations using the United States mails or radio, including but not limited to the solicitation and disbursement of funds by such organizations, for the purpose of—

(1) improving the administration and enforcement of the provisions of title 18, United States Code, relating to mail fraud;

(2) establishing standards and requirements for charitable and nonprofit organizations having or seeking Federal charters; and

(3) recommending such other legislation as such committee or subcommittee may deem advisable as a result of its study and investigation.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee, shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties,

and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of the heads of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee covering obligations incurred on or before January 31, 1955.

TREATY WITH CANADA RELATING TO REGULATION OF COMMERCE ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. POTTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 175), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the future security of western democracy, indeed that of the whole free world, depends ultimately upon the industrial might of the United States and Canada; and

Whereas the industries of these nations depend to a great extent upon raw materials located in close proximity to the Great Lakes thereby making trade on these waters an indispensable factor in the growth and development of these countries; and

Whereas vessels of United States and Canadian registry engaged in Great Lakes commerce are essential to the defense of the United States and Canada as demonstrated in World Wars I and II and in the Korean conflict; and

Whereas vessels of foreign registry trading between both nations on the Great Lakes are withdrawn from this trade in time of war or national emergency thereby placing a heavier burden on United States and Canadian vessels and at the same time jeopardizing the defense efforts of these two nations; and

Whereas foreign ship operators, having lower construction and operating costs and having other advantages, place United States and Canadian ship operators in a seriously unfavorable competitive position; and

Whereas United States and Canadian ship operators on the Great Lakes, unable successfully to compete with foreign flag vessels because of construction and operating cost differentials and certain tax escape clauses, will be driven from this field of commerce thereby resulting in curtailed fleets and a greater dependence on foreign flag vessels, which, when withdrawn from this trade in time of war will severely impair the industrial output of the United States and Canada for want of an adequate fleet of Great Lakes vessels: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That since no laws presently exist to restrict the right of any vessel to trade between the ports of the two countries on the Great Lakes, and since it is essential to the mutual security of the United States and Canada that this trade be preserved by mutual agreement to vessels of the United States and Canada, that the President of the United States is requested to direct the Secretary of State to undertake immediate steps with officials representing the Canadian Government to negotiate a treaty between these nations declaring that no vessel other than a vessel built and registered in the United States or Canada be permitted to engage in the transportation of goods by water between a port or place in the United States of America and a port or place in Canada, within the Great Lakes, where the ports of loading and discharge are within the Great Lakes.

INVESTIGATIONS BY SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, every standing committee of the Senate has authority to make investigations within the scope of its duties as set forth in the Reorganization Act. In the past it has been customary for a standing committee to adopt an investigatory resolution, and instead of formally reporting it to the Senate, the resolution has been sent directly to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the second paragraph of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, which reads:

All reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of a subject, and all subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over 1 day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

I call attention to the provisions of this rule because I now give notice, and make it of record, that I shall object to any immediate action on any investigatory resolution reported from any other standing committee of the Senate which would result in referring such resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration until it has been before the Senate for at least 1 day, as provided by the rule.

I make this suggestion for two reasons, first, for the benefit of the Senate, which has a right to be advised and have notice of all resolutions proposing to authorize committee investigations.

Secondly, I make the suggestion for the benefit of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, in order that it may have the advantage of any consideration given in the Senate prior to the referral of any investigatory resolution to that committee before reporting such resolution back to the Senate with its recommendation as to what sum of money should be made available from the contingent fund of the Senate to carry out the purpose of the proposed investigation.

I desire to say that I shall from this time on insist upon a strict adherence to the rule I have just read.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. If any such matters have been received today, the officials of the Senate will take due notice of the rule which the Senator from Arizona has cited.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON THE SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY (S. DOC. NO. 80)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated January 23, 1953, from the Chief of Engineers, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on the Sabine-Neches Waterway, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON THE CUMBERLAND RIVER, KY., AND TENN. (S. DOC. NO. 81)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated January 23, 1953, from the Chief of Engineers, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on Cumberland River, Ky., and Tenn., and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY. (S. DOC. NO. 82)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated June 26, 1953, from the Chief of Engineers, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Green and Barren Rivers, Ky., and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON ROGUE RIVER, OREG. (S. DOC. NO. 83)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated August 7, 1952, from the Chief of Engineers, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on Rogue River, Oreg., and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY (S. DOC. NO. 84)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I submit a document entitled "Summary of Activities of Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 83d Congress, 1st Session." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON (S. DOC. NO. 85)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I submit a document entitled "Legislative History of the Export-Import Bank of Washington." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORGANIZATION SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT (S. DOC. NO. 86)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I submit a document entitled "An Organizational Survey of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS ENTITLED "REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER" (S. DOC. NO. 87)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last session the Senate authorized the Committee on Foreign Relations, or a subcommittee thereof, to make a study of the United Nations Charter. In 1955 the General Assembly of the United Nations is to consider whether or not to call a charter review conference. It was the wish of the Senate that the Foreign Relations Committee prior to that 1955 session of the General Assembly obtain the views of the American people as to possible changes which they might be willing to support. The resolution creating this special committee asked that it report its views to the Senate and to the President of the United States.

During the last few months while Congress has not been in session this committee has prepared a collection of documents which need to be made available to Members of Congress and to the American public if they are to have before them factual information to help them judge what, if any, changes might be made in the charter. I consider it extremely important that this collection of documents be given as wide distribution as possible. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that this collection of documents entitled "Review of the United Nations Charter" be printed as a Senate document, with an additional thousand copies made available to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON OPERATIONS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK AND THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held under Senate Resolution 25, which authorizes a thorough study of the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and their relationship to expansion of international trade.

The hearings will begin at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, January 12, 1954, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

Anyone wishing to appear as a witness should contact immediately the clerk of the committee.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Albert Cummins Beeson, of California, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, vice Paul L. Styles, resigned, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think it important that the Congress of the United States incorporate into its official record the stirring address delivered by President Eisenhower before the United National General Assembly on December 8, 1953, entitled "Atomic Power for Peace." I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC POWER FOR PEACE

(Address by the President)

When Secretary-General Hammarskjold's invitation to address this General Assembly reached me in Bermuda, I was just beginning a series of conferences with the Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of Great Britain and of France. Our subject was some of the problems that beset our world.

During the remainder of the Bermuda Conference, I had constantly in mind that ahead of me lay a great honor. That honor is mine today as I stand here, privileged to address the General Assembly of the United Nations.

At the same time that I appreciate the distinction of addressing you, I have a sense of exhilaration as I look upon this Assembly.

Never before in history has so much hope for so many people been gathered together in a single organization. Your deliberations and decisions during these somber years have already realized part of those hopes.

But the great tests and the great accomplishments still lie ahead. And in the confident expectation of those accomplishments, I would use the office which, for the time being, I hold, to assure you that the Government of the United States will remain steadfast in its support of this body. This we shall do in the conviction that you will provide a great share of the wisdom, the courage, and the faith which can bring to this world lasting peace for all nations, and happiness and well-being for all men.

Clearly, it would not be fitting for me to take this occasion to present to you a unilateral American report on Bermuda. Nevertheless, I assure you that in our deliberations on that lovely island we sought to invoke those same great concepts of universal peace and human dignity which are so cleanly etched in your charter.

Neither would it be a measure of this great opportunity merely to recite, however hopefully, pious platitudes.

A DANGER SHARED BY ALL

I therefore decided that this occasion warranted my saying to you some of the things that have been on the minds and hearts of my legislative and executive associates and on mine for a great many months—thoughts I had originally planned to say primarily to the American people.

I know that the American people share my deep belief that if a danger exists in the world it is a danger shared by all, and, equally, that if hope exists in the mind of one nation that hope should be shared by all.

Finally, if there is to be advanced any proposal designed to ease even by the smallest measure the tensions of today's world, what more appropriate audience could there be than the members of the General Assembly of the United Nations?

I feel impelled to speak today in a language that in a sense is new—one which I, who have spent so much of my life in the military profession, would have preferred never to use.

That new language is the language of atomic warfare.

The atomic age has moved forward at such a pace that every citizen of the world should have some comprehension, at least, in comparative terms, of the extent of this development, of the utmost significance to every one of us. Clearly, if the peoples of the world are to conduct an intelligent search for peace, they must be armed with the significant facts of today's existence.

My recital of atomic danger and power is necessarily stated in United States terms, for these are the only incontrovertible facts that I know. I need hardly point out to this Assembly, however, that this subject is global, not merely national, in character.

THE FEARFUL POTENTIALS

On July 16, 1945, the United States set off the world's first atomic explosion.

Since that date in 1945 the United States of America has conducted 42 test explosions.

Atomic bombs today are more than 25 times as powerful as the weapons with which the atomic age dawned, while hydrogen weapons are in the ranges of millions of tons of TNT equivalent.

Today the United States stockpile of atomic weapons, which, of course, increases daily, exceeds by many times the explosive equivalent of the total of all bombs and all shells that came from every plane and every gun in every theater of war in all of the years of World War II.

A single air group, whether afloat or land-based, can now deliver to any reachable target a destructive cargo exceeding in power all the bombs that fell on Britain in all of World War II.

In size and variety, the development of atomic weapons has been no less remarkable. The development has been such that atomic weapons have virtually achieved conventional status within our armed services. In the United States, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps are all capable of putting this weapon to military use.

But the dread secret, and the fearful engines of atomic might, are not ours alone.

In the first place, the secret is possessed by our friends and allies, Great Britain and Canada, whose scientific genius made a tremendous contribution to our original discoveries, and the designs of atomic bombs.

The secret is also known by the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union has informed us that, over recent years, it has devoted extensive resources to atomic weapons. During this period, the Soviet Union has exploded a series of atomic devices, including at least one involving thermo-nuclear reactions.

NO MONOPOLY OF ATOMIC POWER

If at one time the United States possessed what might have been called a monopoly of atomic power, that monopoly ceased to exist several years ago. Therefore, although

our earlier start has permitted us to accumulate what is today a great quantitative advantage, the atomic realities of today comprehend two facts of even greater significance.

First, the knowledge now possessed by several nations will eventually be shared by others—possibly all others.

Second, even a vast superiority in numbers of weapons, and consequent capability of devastating retaliation, is no preventive, of itself, against the fearful material damage and toll of human lives that would be inflicted by surprise aggression.

The free world, at least dimly aware of these facts, has naturally embarked on a large program of warning and defense systems. That program will be accelerated and expanded.

But let no one think that the expenditure of vast sums for weapons and systems of defense can guarantee absolute safety for the cities and citizens of any nation. The awful arithmetic of the atomic bomb does not permit of any such easy solution. Even against the most powerful defense, an aggressor in possession of the effective minimum number of atomic bombs for a surprise attack could probably place a sufficient number of his bombs on the chosen targets to cause hideous damage.

Should such an atomic attack be launched against the United States, our reactions would be swift and resolute. But for me to say that the defense capabilities of the United States are such that they could inflict terrible losses upon an aggressor—for me to say that the retaliation capabilities of the United States are so great that such an aggressor's land would be laid waste—all this, while fact, is not the true expression of the purpose and the hope of the United States.

To pause there would be to confirm the hopeless finality of a belief that two atomic colossi are doomed malevolently to eye each other indefinitely across a trembling world. To stop there would be to accept helplessly the probability of civilization destroyed, the annihilation of the irreplaceable heritage of mankind handed down to us from generation to generation, and the condemnation of mankind to begin all over again the age-old struggle upward from savagery toward decency and right and justice.

Surely no sane member of the human race could discover victory in such desolation. Could anyone wish his name to be coupled by history with such human degradation and destruction?

Occasional pages of history do record the faces of the "great destroyers," but the whole book of history reveals mankind's never-ending quest for peace and mankind's God-given capacity to build.

It is with the book of history and not with isolated pages that the United States will ever wish to be identified. My country wants to be constructive, not destructive. It wants agreements, not wars, among nations. It wants itself to live in freedom and in the confidence that the people of every other nation enjoy equally the right of choosing their own way of life.

NO IDLE WORDS OR SHALLOW VISIONS

So my country's purpose is to help us move out of the dark chamber of horrors into the light—to find a way by which the minds of men, the hopes of men, the souls of men everywhere, can move forward toward peace and happiness and well-being.

In this quest I know that we must not lack patience.

I know that in a world divided such as ours today salvation cannot be attained by one dramatic act.

I know that many steps will have to be taken over many months before the world can look at itself one day and truly realize that a new climate of mutually peaceful confidence is abroad in the world.

But I know, above all else, that we must start to take these steps—now.

The United States and its allies, Great Britain and France, have over the past months tried to take some of these steps. Let no one say that we shun the conference table.

On the record has long stood the request of the United States, Great Britain, and France to negotiate with the Soviet Union the problems of a divided Germany.

On that record has long stood the request of the same three nations to negotiate an Austrian State Treaty.

On the same record still stands the request of the United Nations to negotiate the problems of Korea.

Most recently, we have received from the Soviet Union what is in effect an expression of willingness to hold a Four Power meeting. Along with our allies, Great Britain and France, we were pleased to see that this note did not contain the unacceptable preconditions previously put forward.

As you already know from our joint Bermuda communique, the United States, Great Britain, and France have agreed promptly to meet with the Soviet Union.

The Government of the United States approaches this conference with hopeful sincerity. We will bend every effort of our minds to the single purpose of emerging from that conference with tangible results toward peace—the only true way of lessening international tension.

We never have, we never will, propose or suggest that the Soviet Union surrender what is rightfully theirs.

We will never say that the peoples of Russia are an enemy with whom we have no desire ever to deal or mingle in friendly and fruitful relationship.

On the contrary, we hope that this conference may initiate a relationship with the Soviet Union which will eventually bring about a free intermingling of the peoples of the East and of the West—the one sure, human way of developing the understanding required for confident and peaceful relations.

Instead of the discontent which is now settling upon Eastern Germany, occupied Austria, and the countries of Eastern Europe, we seek a harmonious family of free European nations, with none a threat to the other, and least of all a threat to the peoples of Russia.

Beyond the turmoil and strife and misery of Asia, we seek peaceful opportunity for these peoples to develop their natural resources and to elevate their lives.

These are not idle words or shallow visions. Behind them lies a story of nations lately come to independence, not as a result of war, but through free grant or peaceful negotiation. There is a record, already written, of assistance gladly given by nations of the West to needy peoples, and to those suffering the temporary effects of famine, drought, and natural disaster.

These are deeds of peace. They speak more loudly than promises or protestations of peaceful intent.

FOR THE BENEFIT OF MANKIND

But I do not wish to rest either upon the reiteration of past proposals or the restatement of past deeds. The gravity of the time is such that every new avenue of peace, no matter how dimly discernible, should be explored.

There is at least one new avenue of peace which has not yet been well explored—an avenue now laid out by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

In its resolution of November 28, 1953, this General Assembly suggested—and I quote—"that the Disarmament Commission study the desirability of establishing a subcommittee consisting of representatives of the Powers principally involved, which should seek in private an acceptable solution * * * and report on such a solution to the General Assembly and to the Security Council not later than September 1, 1954."

The United States, heeding the suggestion of the General Assembly of the United Nations, is instantly prepared to meet privately with such other countries as may be principally involved, to seek an acceptable solution to the atomic armaments race which overshadows not only the peace, but the very life, of the world.

We shall carry into these private or diplomatic talks a new conception.

The United States would seek more than the mere reduction or elimination of atomic materials for military purposes.

It is not enough to take this weapon out of the hands of the soldiers. It must be put into the hands of those who will know how to strip its military casing and adapt it to the arts of peace.

The United States knows that if the fearful trend of atomic military buildup can be reversed, this greatest of destructive forces can be developed into a great boon, for the benefit of all mankind.

The United States knows that peaceful power from atomic energy is no dream of the future. That capability, already proved, is here—now—today. Who can doubt, if the entire body of the world's scientists and engineers had adequate amounts of fissionable material with which to test and develop their ideas, that this capability would rapidly be transformed into universal, efficient, and economic usage.

To hasten the day when fear of the atom will begin to disappear from the minds of people, and the governments of the East and West, there are certain steps that can be taken now.

PROPOSAL FOR JOINT ATOMIC CONTRIBUTIONS

I therefore make the following proposals:

The governments principally involved, to the extent permitted by elementary prudence, to begin now and continue to make joint contributions from their stockpiles of normal uranium and fissionable materials to an International Atomic Energy Agency. We would expect that such an agency would be set up under the aegis of the United Nations.

The ratios of contributions, the procedures and other details would properly be within the scope of the private conversations I have referred to earlier.

The United States is prepared to undertake these explorations in good faith. Any partner of the United States acting in the same good faith will find the United States a not unreasonable or ungenerous associate.

Undoubtedly initial and early contributions to this plan would be small in quantity. However, the proposal has the great virtue that it can be undertaken without the irritations and mutual suspicions incident to any attempt to set up a completely acceptable system of worldwide inspection and control.

The Atomic Energy Agency could be made responsible for the impounding, storage, and protection of the contributed fissionable and other materials. The ingenuity of our scientists will provide special safe conditions under which such a bank of fissionable material can be made essentially immune to surprise seizure.

The more important responsibility of this Atomic Energy Agency would be to devise methods whereby this fissionable material would be allocated to serve the peaceful pursuits of mankind. Experts would be mobilized to apply atomic energy to the needs of agriculture, medicine, and other peaceful activities. A special purpose would be to provide abundant electrical energy in the power-starved areas of the world. Thus the contributing powers would be dedicating some of their strength to serve the needs rather than the fears of mankind.

The United States would be more than willing—it would be proud to take up with

others principally involved the development of plans whereby such peaceful use of atomic energy would be expedited.

Of those principally involved the Soviet Union must, of course, be one.

OUT OF FEAR AND INTO PEACE

I would be prepared to submit to the Congress of the United States, and with every expectation of approval, any such plan that would—

First, encourage worldwide investigation into the most effective peacetime uses of fissionable material, and with the certainty that they had all the material needed for the conduct of all experiments that were appropriate;

Second, begin to diminish the potential destructive power of the world's atomic stockpiles;

Third, allow all peoples of all nations to see that, in this enlightened age, the great powers of the earth, both of the East and of the West, are interested in human aspirations first, rather than in building up the armaments of war;

Fourth, open up a new channel for peaceful discussion, and intitiate at least a new approach to the many difficult problems that must be solved in both private and public conversations, if the world is to shake off the inertia imposed by fear, and is to make positive progress toward peace.

Against the dark background of the atomic bomb, the United States does not wish merely to present strength, but also the desire and the hope for peace.

The coming months will be fraught with fateful decisions. In this Assembly; in the capitals and military headquarters of the world; in the hearts of men everywhere, be they governors or governed, may they be the decisions which will lead this world out of fear and into peace.

To the making of these fateful decisions, the United States pledges before you—and therefore before the world—its determination to help solve the fearful atomic dilemma, to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life.

ADDRESSES BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, since the Congress adjourned last August the Secretary of State has delivered a number of thoughtful and important speeches with reference to our foreign policy. The most important of these speeches are as follows:

First. On August 26, 1953, Mr. Dulles addressed the American Bar Association at Boston on the subject of the United States Constitution and U. N. Charter: An Appraisal. In this speech he outlined his views on the Bricker amendment and the scheduled revision of the U. N. Charter.

Second. On Setpember 2, 1953, before the American Legion convention in St. Louis, Secretary Dulles spoke on the subject of Korea. He reviewed the developments leading up to the signing of the armistice, and outlined the position then held by the United States vis-a-vis the conference called for in the armistice agreement.

Third. On September 17, 1953, Secretary Dulles addressed the United Nations Assembly in general debate covering the entire range of the most important problems then affecting United States-Soviet relations.

Fourth. On December 22, 1953, Secretary Dulles spoke before the National Press Club shortly after his return from the meeting of the NATO ministerial council in Paris. It was there that the Secretary of State realistically observed that if there was not "an early and affirmative response" to the need of action on the European Defense Community the United States would have to undertake an "agonizing reappraisal" of basic foreign policy in relation to Europe.

I ask unanimous consent that these important speeches be printed in the body of the RECORD with their appropriate titles.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND U. N. CHARTER: AN APPRAISAL

(Address by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, before the American Bar Association, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, August 26, 1953)

Our association is celebrating its diamond jubilee. When it was founded in 1878, our country was at peace and foreign war seemed remote. Now we have had three foreign wars in quick succession, and, because we are a principal source of free world strength, we face the intense hostility and growing might of the Soviet-dominated world.

It has become no easy task to assure the safety of the United States.

Our Army, Navy, and Air Force necessarily constitute an ultimate reliance. But they are only partial insurance against disaster. We do not want to have to depend on our own unaided strength. Any free world nation which attempts, singly, to match the military might which a totalitarian system can extract out of one-third of the people and one-third of the natural resources of the world will wreck its domestic economy. It will have to impose sweeping governmental controls which will destroy the very freedom it defends. Further, no measures that we take in isolation will assure our supply of strategic materials.

There is but one answer to the coerced unity of the Soviet-dominated world. That answer is the voluntary association of free nations for the common defense. To win friends and allies, to bind them to us and us to them in dependable ways, is, therefore, an essential aspect of United States foreign policy.

MUTUAL SECURITY

The master security treaty of our time is the Charter of the United Nations. It has been adhered to by 60 nations. It represents the world's best hope of peace with justice. But the United Nations, in its present form, has not met all our expectations. I shall speak more of that later.

Because the United Nations itself does not provide adequate security, the United States has, by bipartisan action, entered into a series of treaties with other nations for the purpose of furthering collective self-defense. This is authorized by the United Nations Charter.

We have the North Atlantic Treaty Organization of 14 nations, designed to insure the peace and safety of the North Atlantic community.

We have the so-called Rio Pact of 21 American Republics, designed to promote peace and mutual security in the Western Hemisphere.

In the Pacific, we have mutual defense or security treaties with the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan. Two weeks ago I initialed a proposed mutual-defense treaty with the Republic of Korea and we have close ties with Nationalist China on Formosa.

These security treaties have been implemented by a series of base agreements made by the President. These give our Armed Forces the means to operate abroad more effectively in the protection of our security. For example, 1 plane based abroad may be the equivalent of 3 like planes based here at home. Under the Mutual Security Act we have joined to build up strategically located military establishments, in which we share, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The result is that we and others can keep our defense expenditures within limits compatible with a free domestic economy.

In addition to treaties and agreements dealing expressly with matters of security, we must have many other kinds of treaties. No treaty of alliance is dependable without the added ingredient of friendliness. This requires treaties of friendship, commerce, and trade, reciprocal trade agreements, extradition treaties, agreements defining the status of forces located abroad, treaties controlling the drug and narcotic trade, treaties in avoidance of double taxation, and a multitude of other agreements that are necessary to put international intercourse on a friendly and nonfriction basis.

Treaties and executive agreements are the political tools which make it possible to provide our Nation with an environment of security.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEM

At this juncture a movement has grown up to limit severely the treaty-making power and to curtail the authority of the President to conduct international business.

This movement reflects concern that our treaty power might be used to effectuate domestic reforms, particularly in relation to economic and social matters, and to impose upon our country socialistic conceptions which are alien to our traditional American ideals.

These fears were largely founded upon the activities of certain committees of the United Nations.

I believe that this concern, when it arose, was a legitimate one, and that those who voiced it performed a genuine service in bringing the situation to the attention of the American public.

But I point out the arousing of that concern was a correction of the evil—a correction in the most dependable way, that is, by the vigilance of our citizenry. The danger, never great, has passed.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

However, some fear that the danger may recur and that our citizenry may not then be alert. So, various constitutional amendments have been proposed, with a view to preventing possible future abuses of the treatymaking power.

None of these proposals takes the form of trying to confine treatymaking to the historic and, I believe, constitutional sense of that word. It seems to me that "treaties" within the meaning of our Constitution are contracts with foreign governments designed to promote our national interests by assuring that our Nation and others will act internationally in a way deemed mutually advantageous.

I do not believe that treaties within the meaning of article VI of our Constitution, which provides that treaties shall be the supreme law of the land, are measures of primarily domestic import, or that the treaty form can lawfully be used to circumvent the constitutional procedures established in relation to what are essentially internal affairs.

That concept is difficult to put into constitutional words. Perhaps for that reason those who would now amend the Constitution have adopted a more rigid and less selective approach.

Let me refer to the amendment proposed by Senate Joint Resolution No. 1.

Section 1 provides that any provision in a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution shall be of no force or effect.

I believe that this states the law as it now is. However, some seem to feel that the question is in doubt, and fears in this regard have been widely spread. To meet any legitimate fears on this score, President Eisenhower has stated that he approves a constitutional amendment, such as that introduced by Senator KNOWLAND, which will make it clear that a treaty cannot override the Contitution or deprive citizens of their rights under our constitutional Bill of Rights.

The remaining provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would make fundamental changes.

Section 2 would cut down the Nation's treaty power so that no treaty could bind the Nation in respect of matters which, under our Federal system, fall within the jurisdiction of the States. This would set the clock back to an approximation of the condition which existed under the Articles of Confederation. Then, that condition was so intolerable and it so jeopardized the Confederation that the present Constitution was adopted to give the Federal Government authority, in international matters, to act for all the Nation, including the States.

Let me tell you of our experience with treaties in the present session of the Congress.

Since it convened in January 1953, the Senate has approved 23 treaties, 12 of which, our legal advisers say would be unconstitutional if the proposed amendment had been in effect, because they deal with matters of State jurisdiction, such as negotiable instrument laws, local licensing laws, etc. In the case of 8 of these 12 treaties the Senate vote was 86 yeas to 1 nay. Included in the 86 who voted in favor of these treaties were 55 of the 64 Senators who were originally listed as sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 1, which would have made the treaties unconstitutional.

This suggests, I think, that the import of the proposed amendment is not fully understood, even in the Senate. Also I suggest that the Senators, when it comes down to concrete cases, recognize that our Nation must be able to make treaties which will bind not only the Federal Government but also the States.

EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Section 3 of the proposed amendment would give the Congress the power to regulate all executive and other agreements.

No more fundamental change in our constitutional system can be imagined, for under it Congress, and not the President, would be responsible for the day-by-day conduct of our foreign relations.

The phrase "executive agreements" brings to mind such major wartime commitments as were made at Yalta and Potsdam, and which have proved unpopular and perhaps ill-advised. But "executive agreements" are the means, and the only means, whereby the President carries on the day-to-day business of dealing with other nations. Daily the President, directly or through his diplomatic or military agents, makes agreements with foreign nations. In the State Department, for example, we may agree that Foreign Ministers will meet at a certain time and place. Perhaps we agree with the British and French on a joint note to the Soviet Union about Germany. Perhaps we agree with other members of the United Nations upon a proposed resolution. Agreements are the warp and woof of international life, and without them there could not be friendly international intercourse.

The Korean armistice was made by a United States military commander under instructions from Washington. This armistice agreement was the climax of a series of subsidiary agreements, some made with our enemies in relation to procedures as to armistice negotiations. Some were made with the Republic of Korea, and some were made with our United Nations Allies in Korea. Many of these agreements I made under the authority of the President.

The more important of these agreements were made after informal consultation with congressional leaders. The Security Treaty whic... I initialed in Korea will, of course, be effective only with the advice and consent of the Senate. Agreements for economic rehabilitation are subject to congressional appropriations. But these conspicuous agreements, requiring Senate or congressional action, grew out of a series of preliminary agreements which were indispensable to the final result. These were of a multiplicity and of an immediacy which excluded the assumption of responsibility by a deliberative assembly like the Congress.

President Eisenhower has stated his views on these matters in the following words:

"I am unalterably opposed to any amendment which would change our traditional treaty-making power or which would hamper the President in his constitutional authority to conduct foreign affairs. Today probably as never before in our history it is essential that our country be able effectively to enter into agreements with other nations."

I can say to you soberly that the proposed amendment, except for section 1 which President Eisenhower accepts, would have a calamitous effect upon the international position and prospects of the United States. It would make it impossible for the United States to share in the voluntary and friendly association of free nations which is necessary to offset what the Soviet Premier refers to as monolithic unity of the Soviet system. It would make it impractical for the President to conduct foreign affairs and would throw upon the Congress in this respect a daily and incessant responsibility which such a numerous and already overburdened legislative body is, in practice, incapable of discharging.

THE TEST OF EXPERIENCE

We have a system which has survived for over 160 years without there being a single instance of treaty abuses such as are feared. Of course, abuse is always a possibility. I admit that. I not only admit it, I have said it. But I do not admit that, because power can be abused, it follows that power should be annulled. That is the reasoning that leads to anarchy.

If the United States renounces the power to act effectively in international affairs, because that power might be abused, the result will be a large measure of international anarchy.

It is impossible to rewrite the Constitution of the United States so that it is foolproof. It is impossible to make freedom so automatic that its retention does not need constant vigilance.

The supreme test of any constitution is the way it works. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, warned against amending the Constitution to meet hypothetical dangers. "Experience," he said, "is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country. Facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion."

Our Constitution, as it is, has served us well for 160 years in the field of foreign relations. There is no actual experience to demonstrate the need for the far-reaching changes that have been proposed. The fears are hypothetical. The facts are reassuring.

The founders of this Nation, seeing international peril, created power to meet it. They enabled the Nation to speak as a unit and with prompt, effective authority in the field of foreign relations. The system worked well. Today, we face a new and perhaps even greater peril than that which the founders confronted. We need that same political authority which they provided. If it is taken away, I see only a steady increase in our peril and a steady decline in our capacity to meet that peril.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND ORDER

Physical scientists have enabled man to destroy himself. Political wisdom must enable man to save himself. Political leadership that timidly goes backward will never cope with scientific knowledge which goes ever forward.

This administration has a vision of something better than bare survival in the face of danger. We have faith that it is possible to end the menace under which humanity has existed for so long. It was hoped that the United Nations would achieve this, and I still believe that it can. But to realize this hope will require that the Charter be altered in some important respects.

The United Nations Charter now reflects serious inadequacies.

One inadequacy sprang from ignorance. When we were in San Francisco in the spring of 1945, none of us knew of the atomic bomb which was to fall on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945. The Charter is thus a pre-atomic-age Charter. In this sense it was obsolete before it actually came into force. As one who was at San Francisco, I can say with confidence that if the delegates there had known that the mysterious and immeasurable power of the atom would be available as a means of mass destruction, the provisions of the Charter dealing with disarmament and the regulation of armaments would have been far more emphatic and realistic.

A second inadequacy sprang from the fact that the three leaders who planned the United Nations were President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Generalissimo Stalin, precisely the three who led the wartime victory coalition against Hitlerite Germany. Inevitably, they looked upon the United Nations as a kind of peacetime prolongation of the wartime triumvirate. Consequently, the proposals initially put forward by the United States, United Kingdom, and Soviet Russia, placed primary authority in the Security Council and stipulated that the great powers permanently represented on that Council must be in agreement.

At San Francisco, this concept was to some extent altered and greater scope was given to the General Assembly. However, the veto remained in the Security Council and the General Assembly was permitted only to recommend. Indeed, the Assembly voting procedure, with one vote per nation, precludes its decisions having more than advisory weight.

Now we see the inadequacy of an organization whose effective functioning depends upon cooperation with a nation which is dominated by an international party seeking world domination.

A third inadequacy came out of disregard for the fact that world order, in the long run, depends, not on men, but upon law, law which embodies eternal principles of justice and morality. When the Charter was drafted at Dumbarton Oaks, it contained no mention of the word "justice" or of the word "law." That defect was to some extent remedied at San Francisco. At several points in the Charter, references to justice were introduced. Also the General Assembly was required to promote "the progressive development of international law and its codification." However, in the 8 years of its existence, the General Assembly has made but little progress in this respect.

I recall the views expressed by that great statesman and student of public affairs, the late Senator Robert A. Taft. In his book

entitled "A Foreign Policy for Americans," he said of the United Nations Charter:

"The fundamental difficulty is that it is not based primarily on an underlying law and an administration of justice under that law. I believe that in the long run the only way to establish peace is to write a law, agreed to by each of the nations, to govern the relations of such nations with each other and to obtain the covenant of all such nations that they will abide by that law and by decisions made thereunder."

The opportunity which Senator Taft saw has not irrevocably passed. The present Charter of the United Nations provides that the 1955 General Assembly will have on its agenda a proposal to call a general conference to review the present charter. I have already announced that the United States will then vote in favor of holding such a review conference.

The 1955 conference will be comparable in its importance to the original San Francisco Conference. It will provide a conspicuous opportunity for which the lawyers of America should be prepared. There are, of course, many other opportunities.

The important thing is that the bar of America, which exerts a powerful influence on the thinking and political action of the American people, should itself be looking forward and inventively and creatively try to solve the great problems which confront our people at this time. The founders of our Nation showed a political wisdom which has rarely if ever been matched. Surely, however, their effort did not exhaust the political genius of the American people. They invented and bequeathed to us an ordered society of spiritual and intellectual freedom. Such a society ought to be able to produce the new ideas needed to meet changing conditions. That is for us to demonstrate. Now, when new peril threatens, it behooves us to prove our worth. May we not, in our generation, emulate what our forebears did in their generation, and find the way to develop international order to shield national life? That is the challenge of our time. Let us dedicate ourselves to meet it.

KOREA AND THE KOREAN ARMISTICE

(Address by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, before the American Legion at Kiel Auditorium, St. Louis, Mo., Wednesday, September 2, 1953)

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, my fellow Legionnaires; I thank you for having invited me to this platform. By reason of your service to your country, you are a select group. By reason of the vigorous interest you have maintained in the affairs of your Government, you are an influential group.

Our outgoing commander, Mr. Gough, and myself had talks which, at least from my point of view, have been profitable. It is my hope that such exchange of views will continue under our incoming commander.

We want to keep in close touch with each other. Fortunately, that is inevitable. You, and I am proud to be one of you, have penetrated the ranks of the State Department. Two out of five of the Department's personnel at home and abroad are veterans. We are glad of that. We want our foreign policies always to reflect the patriotism of those who have fought for their country.

My subject for today is Korea, the scene of our latest war, and, let us hope, our last war.

THE ART OF PEACE

The Korean war began in a way in which wars often begin, a potential aggressor miscalculated. From that we learn a lesson which we expect to apply in the interests of future peace. The lesson is this: If events are likely which will in fact lead us to fight, let us make clear our intention in advance; then we shall probably not have to fight.

Big wars usually come about by mistake, not by design. Aggressive despots think that they can make a grab unopposed, or opposed but feebly. So, they grab. And to their surprise they find themselves involved in unexpected opposition which means major war.

Many believe that neither the First World War nor the Second World War would have occurred if the aggressor had known what the United States would do. It is even more probable that the Korean war would not have occurred if the aggressor had known what the United States would do. The Communists thought, and had reason to think, that they would not be opposed except by the then small and ill-equipped forces of the Republic of Korea. They did not expect what actually happened.

There is in this a profound lesson. All the peoples of the world passionately want peace. But too often they think that peace is won merely by pacifism. They should know by now that peace is not had merely by wanting it, or talking about it, or seeming to accept the role of a doormat. To win peace is as hard, if not harder, than to win a war. To achieve peace is a science. Indeed, it is a most difficult, sometimes a rugged science.

Peace requires anticipating what it is that tempts an aggressor and letting him know in advance that, if he does not exercise self-control, he may face a hard fight, perhaps a losing fight.

The Korean war—the third such war in our generation—should finally have taught us that if we can foresee aggression which will cause us to fight, we should let this be known, so that the potential aggressor will take this into his calculations.

This administration intends to act realistically to win the battle for peace.

AGGRESSORS REPELLED

Since there was a war in Korea, it was vital that the outcome should justify the sacrifice made. It was important to establish the fact that aggressors, hostile to the free world, cannot go on enlarging themselves by the conquest of small nations, until they become bloated with power and dizzy with success.

This fact has been established in Korea.

The aggressor, which initially overran all of Korea except a small beachhead at Pusan, has been thrown back to and beyond his point of beginning. He now controls 1,500 fewer square miles than when he started and has incurred casualties totaling about 2 million. The cost to the aggressor has been colossal. His gains have been nil.

Some persons seem to feel that our men who fought in Korea fought uselessly. That is a cruel misjudgment of the situation. Those who rolled back the military aggression in Korea checked forces, which, if unchecked, would have gone on to imperil the United States. They showed a discipline, a courage, a competency, on the land, in the air, and on the sea, which has gained the respect of the whole world, including our enemies. Because of what they did, we today live more safely. Our armed services wrote in Korea another epic chapter of glorious service for the Nation. For that, the American people must be forever grateful.

POLITICAL ASYLUM FOR PRISONERS OF WAR

The terms of the Korean armistice also established another principle of great importance to us: the right of enemy prisoners to enjoy political asylum.

Let me explain why this principle is so important.

The Soviet leaders fear that, if they were to launch a major war of aggression, many of their soldiers and airmen would seize the opportunity to desert or to allow themselves readily to be made prisoners. Such desertions are occurring even now. Therefore, the Soviet leaders hoped that the Korean armistice would establish a principle which would discourage future defections and thus make their Red armies more dependable. They demanded, in Korea, that any who deserted or who were made prisoners, and who espoused the cause of freedom, must be forcibly returned to where they could be punished for their defection.

In Europe, after the end of World War II, many who were claimed by the Soviets were forcibly returned, except as some elected suicide as a preferable fate. The Communists wanted the Korean armistice to elevate that practice into generally accepted international law. We refused.

This time no Red army prisoners who want freedom will be sent back to captivity. A new and healthy principle has been established. As a result, from now on, the Red armies will be less dependable as tools of aggression. So in this way, too, we have increased the prospect of peace and added to the security of our Nation.

TREATMENT OF CONVICTED PRISONERS

Today we can also report that it seems that none of our prisoners of war will be held back because of alleged offenses. When I was in Freedom Village last month meeting returning prisoners, there were reports that the Communists intended to require a number of our men to serve prison sentences. The Communist official radio was declaring that the Geneva Convention gave them this right.

I at once made a public statement to the effect that the armistice agreement required the return of "all" prisoners who wanted to be returned and that, to us, "all" means "all". I further stated that we would hold Communist prisoners of war against whom charges were pending until we knew what the Communists were going to do.

We have now received word from General Clark that the Military Armistice Commission, representing the two sides, has agreed that all captured personnel who desire repatriation shall be returned without regard to alleged offenses. This is good news. We on our side shall, of course, conform to this understanding.

DETERRENTS TO NEW AGGRESSION

We can all take satisfaction in the fact that President Eisenhower has found it possible to stop the fighting on honorable terms. Now, we turn from the military to the political aspects of the problem.

I headed a delegation that went to Korea last month to discuss these matters with President Syngman Rhee. We acted with a background of regular consultation with congressional leaders, both Democrat and Republican. The Republic of Korea and our delegation then agreed on the terms of a security treaty. It will not, of course, be effective until the Senate gives its consent.

This proposed treaty is another step in the development of a Pacific security system. The treaty would complement the earlier treaties which I negotiated in 1951 with the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan. Also, the Korean Treaty would prevent any recurrence of the enemy miscalculation of 1950 which brought about the Korean war. The proposed new security treaty will constitute a clear warning. It will make it unlikely that the Republic of Korea will be subjected to another act of unprovoked military aggression which would again involve the United States.

As another deterrent to renewed aggression, the United States and the other 15 members of the United Nations which fought aggression in Korea issued a declaration that if the armistice should be breached by unprovoked Communist aggression, then the 16 nations "would again be united and prompt to resist." Also, that declaration points out that "the consequences of such a breach of the armistice would be so grave

that, in all probability, it would not be possible to confine hostilities within the frontiers of Korea."

Since 1950, the forces of aggression have been supplied, equipped and protected by air, from unmolested bases in China, just north of the Yalu. If, however, the Communists desire to resume the war, they now know that they could no longer count on this "privileged sanctuary."

THE KOREAN POLITICAL CONFERENCE

We are now making plans for a political conference which, we hope, will turn the armistice into permanent peace.

There have been some differences of opinion as to the composition of the conference. Some, for example, favored the inclusion of India. These matters were debated and resolved at the meeting of the United Nations Assembly which concluded last week.

The United States opposed the inclusion of India in the Korean conference. We did so reluctantly, but for two reasons that seemed controlling. The Korean armistice agreement called for a conference of the two sides and India did not fit into either side. India was not identified with the Communist side and it had preferred not to join with the forces fighting aggression in Korea. That abstention was India's privilege. But like most privileges it cost a price. One price was profound distrust on the part of the Republic of Korea. When in Korea last month we realized the full intensity and depth of this distrust. That provided the second reason why we opposed the inclusion of India.

Korea is the primary subject of the political conference. Seventy-five percent of all Koreans are under, and loyal to the Republic of Korea. They have shown an intensity of anti-Communist dedication and a willingness to sacrifice which has few, if any, historic parallels. Their attitude cannot prudently be ignored.

The United Nations has been inclined to debate Korean matters without paying much attention to the Republic of Korea. Some of the member states seem to have assumed that the Republic of Korea would automatically go along with anything that the United Nations wanted. In fact, the Republic of Korea is not a puppet. It has a will of its own, and 20 million people have backed that will with enormous sacrifices. The Korean question cannot be settled without the Republic of Korea. We felt that the United Nations should give the political conference its maximum chance to succeed. So the United States voted against extending an invitation to India. In doing so, we had the support of good friends. Also, we regretfully split votes with some other good friends. In the end, India graciously withdrew.

Our action involved no reflection upon India. This administration has great respect for India and we seek friendship with India. We have already shown that in unmistakable ways and we intend to go on showing it.

But the forthcoming conference is a serious business. It is a prolongation of the struggle in which over 25,000 Americans laid down their lives, and in which nearly 125,000 more became casualties. We owe it to these Americans to be as disciplined in our political thinking as they were disciplined in the cause of liberty.

A CONFERENCE WITH A TERMINAL POINT

We have come to another conclusion regarding the postarmistice conference. We shall not sit in it indefinitely.

There is a long record of Communist negotiations which have been dragged out merely in order to give the Communists a cover for achieving ulterior purposes.

Negotiators seeking an Austrian peace treaty have met 374 times since 1946—and last week the Soviets announced that they called the whole thing off.

In 1951 the deputies of the so-called Big Four Foreign Ministers spent 109 days in Paris talking repetitiously and futilely about an agenda for a proposed Big Four meeting on Germany—a meeting that was never held.

The Korean armistice negotiations, begun in June 1951, were for many months prolonged as a cover for a Communist military buildup and, by the first of this year, they had lapsed into nothingness.

We shall not repeat such performance. We are always ready to negotiate in good faith. But we expect good faith to be mutual. We shall not lend ourselves to Communist maneuvers designed to win their ends through guile.

So if the Korean conference discusses Korea for 3 months without making genuine progress toward the settlement of the Korean business, we shall pause to take stock of the situation. We shall consult with the Republic of Korea and with our other friends.

If, as a result of these consultations, we conclude that the conference is serving no useful purpose, we shall expect to withdraw from the conference.

We believe that in negotiating with the Communists we should always have in mind a terminal point.

THE CHANCE OF POLITICAL SUCCESS

It would, of course, be foolish to attempt to forecast what the result of the Korean political conference will be. It ought to succeed, but that is not to say that it will succeed. The United States, at least, has no secret or ulterior purposes. We seek no pretext for turning Korea into a United States base on the Asia mainland. We seek only the long-proclaimed goal of the United Nations, namely, the peaceful unification of Korea under a representative form of government. We stand for "a united Korea for free Koreans." On details our thinking is flexible. We hope that the Communists will come to the conference in the same spirit, and not throw roadblocks in the way of achieving a simple and fair result, in the interest of the long-suffering Korean people.

THE WAR IN INDOCHINA

We do not make the mistake of treating Korea as an isolated affair. The Korean war forms one part of the worldwide effort of communism to conquer freedom. More immediately it is part of that effort in Asia.

A single Chinese Communist aggressive front extends from Korea on the north to Indochina in the south. The armistice in Korea, even if it leads to a political settlement in Korea, does not end United States concern in the Western Pacific area. As President Eisenhower said in his April 16 speech, a Korean armistice would be a fraud if it merely released Communist forces for attack elsewhere.

In Indochina a desperate struggle is in its eighth year. The outcome affects our own vital interests in the Western Pacific, and we are already contributing largely in material and money to the combined efforts of the French and of Viet Nam, Laos, and Cambodia.

We Americans have too little appreciated the magnitude of the effort and sacrifices which France has made in defense of an area which is no longer a French colony but where complete independence is now in the making. This independence program is along lines which the United States has encouraged and justifies increased United States aid, provided that will assure an effort there that is vigorous and decisive.

Communist China has been and now is training, equipping, and supplying the Communist forces in Indochina. There is the risk that, as in Korea, Red China might send its own army into Indochina. The Chinese Communist regime should realize that such a second aggression could not occur without grave consequences which might not be confined to Indochina. I say this soberly in the interest of peace and in the hope of preventing another aggressor miscalculation.

We want peace in Indochina, as well as in Korea. The political conference about to be held relates in the first instance to Korea. But growing out of that conference could come, if Red China wants it, an end of aggression and restoration of peace in Indochina. The United States would welcome such a development.

THE AMERICAN TRADITION

These international tasks are, as you can see, complicated. However, one simple sentiment dominates all that we do. We seek to promote the welfare of the United States.

We are not indifferent to the welfare of other people and oftentimes our own welfare is tied into that of others. We know that any individual who tries to live a wholly selfish life is an unhappy outcast. That is equally true of nations. But the basic motive which animates those of us who work for your Government is the same motive that animated you Legionnaires when you fought for your country—that is, a patriotic dedication.

This Nation was founded by men who were intensely patriotic but there was nothing narrowly selfish about their patriotism. They were men of vision who saw for our Nation a great destiny. Always they showed what our Declaration of Independence calls "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." Always they were understanding of the wants of others and generous in efforts to fulfill them. Always they sought that our national purposes should conform to the principles of moral law, which have universal application. In their international relations they were not arrogant or inflexible. They always believed in international cooperation and accepted the principle of interdependence. Indeed our earliest foreign policy, which bears the name of President Monroe, affirmed the soldiarity of the nations of this Western Hemisphere. The faith which led the American people to lead in organizing the United Nations was no abberation, but the same kind of faith which has animated our people since the earliest days. The United Nations as the "town meeting of the world" is the realization of an early American concept. We welcome it, because we know that our own international purposes can afford exposure to the light of day.

There is much talk these days about the increased responsibility that now devolves upon the United States. That responsibility is a reality. And we need not shrink from it out of fear that it requires the scrapping of our American traditions and ideals. It does not mean that we have to be constantly taking international public opinion polls and then doing what it seems will make us popular with others. Popularity won in that way is shabby and fleeting.

For more than a century the United States has enjoyed worldwide respect and prestige. That kind of respect is worth having. I hope that we shall continue to win it in the only way it can be won, which is the way of our forefathers. That is the American way. It is the way we expect to follow.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET RELATIONS

(Address by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, made in general debate of the United Nations Assembly, New York City, Thursday, September 17, 1953)

It is an honor for me to be with you again. As one of the founding group at San Francisco, I shared in the hopes and the labors which brought this organization into existence. I have served on most of the previous General Assemblies. In this new Assembly I am fortified by the fellowship of many of you who are veterans in the battle for peace.

The United States comes to this eighth session of the General Assembly with renewed determination to use, for peace and justice, the opportunities which this organization provides. President Eisenhower has a deep and abiding faith in the United Nations. He has often said so, and he has asked me to say it again. He wants the United Nations to become an increasingly effective instrument of peace.

The United States delegation will work here in that spirit. We shall state as clearly as possible what we deem to be the just and right solution of the problems we shall here encounter. We do not think that the United States ought to be ambiguous about the problems of our time. But also we adhere to the basic United States belief expressed in our Declaration of Independence that we owe "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." We are ready to learn from others. Also, we recognize that our views may not always prevail. When that happens, we shall no doubt regret it, but we shall not sulk. We shall try to accept the result philosophically, recognizing that we have no monopoly of wisdom or virtue; also, that sometimes the passage of time alone provides the final verdict.

We shall have in mind the charter mandate to this organization "to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations." Never was the need for such harmony more urgent. Never were the consequences of disharmony so menacing. Yet the fact of tension cannot be ignored. That would be dangerously unrealistic. Also, the causes of that tension will have to be explored. Otherwise there can be no cure. But, in whatever it does here, the United States will seek to avoid any word or deed which might needlessly aggravate the present state of dangerous tension.

LIMITS ON U. N. CAPABILITIES

The primary purpose of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security. Yet for over 3 years there was a war in Korea. A war in Indochina still goes on. Nowhere is there a sense of security.

Because of these things, some say that the United Nations has failed.

We must admit that the United Nations has not realized all the hopes that were held for it. That is largely because many of those hopes were unrealistic. They arose from underestimating the profound difficulties which lie in the way of establishing an international order of peace and justice.

The United Nations was built largely on the expectation that the leaders of the grand alliance, who had worked together for victory, would continue voluntarily to work together for peace. That expectation proved ill-founded. The alliance was the product of Fascist danger and when that threat was battered down, allied unity disappeared, to be replaced by new division and new fears. These reached a peak when the Korean aggression occurred.

It is to the eternal credit of the United Nations that it was not then indifferent. The Security Council promptly called upon its members to help the victim of aggression. Almost every free nation responded in one way or another. Sixteen sent troops to Korea to fight to repel the aggression. That result is now signalized by the armistice which ends the aggression and ends the killing.

Korea became the place where, for the first time in history, an international organization was instrumental in actually repelling armed aggression. That fact may have profound consequences. It may open new avenues to peace. We must hope so and try to make it so. Never was the need so great.

Physical scientists have now found means which, if they are developed, can wipe life off the surface of this planet.

These words that I speak are words that can be taken literally.

The destructive power inherent in matter must be controlled by the idealism of the spirit and the wisdom of the mind. They alone stand between us and a lifeless planet.

There are plenty of problems in this world, many of them interconnected. But there is no problem which compares with this central, universal problem of saving the human race from extinction.

The nations are groping for the spirit and the institutions which will enable man to dominate matter. It has unhappily so far been impossible to provide either the spirit or the institutions on a universal basis. Therefore, some of the nations have developed their own community measures to deter aggression and to give protection to moral values that they cherish.

These countermeasures have, by common consent, involved the sharing of facilities, and sometimes the placing of the military forces from one country in another country.

Soviet leaders have complained of these arrangements. But they should know, and probably they do know, that community arrangements are the least likely to be aggressive. Military force which is within a single nation can be used offensively at the dictation of one government alone, sometimes of one man alone. Military force which is distributed through several countries cannot be used effectively unless all of the countries concerned are in agreement. Such agreement would be totally unattainable except for operations responsive to the clear menace of aggression.

A community defense system has two great merits. It makes it possible for the small and the weak to get real security. Also it assures that even the great and the strong cannot, practically, pervert the system by using it for aggression. That way is the enlightened way. By that way the goals of our charter are advanced by means which none has cause to fear.

It may be asked, why do we fear? I could speak of that at length. But in order to avoid what seems provocative, I confine myself to a single summarizing fact: since 1939, some 600 million people of some 15 nations have been brought into the Soviet camp of dictatorships, and in no case has this come about by voluntary action of the peoples and nations concerned.

History records no more frightening fact.

In his address of August 8, 1953, the new Soviet Premier twice speaks of peaceful coexistence of the Communist system with that of the non-Communist world. Such expressions are welcome. But as against the background that I mention, mere words do not instantly or totally reassure us. We have heard them before and we know that Soviet doctrine prescribes the use of such words as guile.

If the Soviet leaders are honest, they must recognize that if there is to be a new world climate they must contribute to it more than they have yet contributed.

The United States is quite prepared to explore ways to end the present tension. President Eisenhower has already made that clear. We shall, I hope, never grow weary or discouraged in our quest for peace. But what the United States does cannot achieve the desired goal unless there is an equivalent response.

Occasions are now imminent which permit—indeed, require—the Soviet leaders to show more authentically their present intention.

KOREA

The Korean armistice evokes a heartfelt welcome. The United States is glad that it was able to contribute to it as it did. But the armistice of itself is inconclusive as a test of the Communist will to peace because there was by then an effective military barrier to aggression. The Korean political conference, if the Communists come to it, will afford a better test.

Korea has for many generations been the victim of big-power politics. Russia, Japan, and China have successively sought to use Korea to advance their aggressive purposes. It has been a long time since the Koreans have truly been the masters of their own destiny. Now, we seek an opportunity to determine whether any one of the great powers wants to use Korea again for its own purposes or whether we all will renounce such ambitions, so that there can be at last a united Korea for free Koreans.

The United States itself seeks no pretext for using Korea as a place for building up a military outpost on the Asian mainland. We are eager to bring our troops home.

The Republic of Korea has no ambitions which run beyond Korea.

Japan has loyally undertaken to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country.

If Soviet Russia and Communist China are willing to renounce ambitions which would be served by control of North Korea, then it should be possible to unite Korea under conditions which will enable the Koreans freely to manage their own affairs.

So far, it seems to us, the Communist side is pursuing dilatory tactics. The United States, pursuant to this Assembly's resolution of August 28, 1953, after consultation among the 17 nations nominated to represent the United Nations side, proposed a specific time and specific places for the meeting. This proposal was received by the Chinese Communists on September 5. A response was made on September 15. The response, however, was merely a reference to the proposal which the Chinese Communists made to this Assembly asking that it reopen its past decision and review its 10-day debate of last month with reference to the composition of the conference.

Meanwhile, October 28, the last day for the opening of the conference, as recommended by the armistice agreement, is rapidly approaching, without the possibility of making the necessary time-consuming preparations.

One is forced to question whether the Communist side really wants to comply with the armistice and face up to the problem of withdrawing their forces from Korea and creating a united and independent Korea.

INDOCHINA

Let me turn to Indochina. There, the fighting continues. Communist forces are seeking to gain political power by military violence. Their military strength comes from a steady flow of military supplies from Communist China and Soviet Russia and from the Soviet-controlled Skoda Munition Works. The pretext, until now, has been that the Associated States of Indochina were mere colonies, and that the Communist war was designed to promote independence rather than to expand by violence the Soviet camp.

It is no longer possible to support such a pretext. The French Government by its declaration of July 3, 1953, has announced its intention of completing the process of transferring to the Governments of the three Associated States all those remaining powers that are needed to perfect their independence to their own satisfaction.

The Communist-dominated armies in Indochina have no shadow of a claim to be regarded as the champions of an independence movement. If the Soviet bloc countries outside of Indochina persist in promoting war in Indochina, they cannot now be surprised if their conduct is taken as proof that they adhere to the design to extend their rule by methods of violence.

Southeast Asia affords the Soviet leaders a chance to give substance to their peaceful words. We anxiously await their verdict.

GERMANY

Germany is another place where the present purposes of the great powers face an inescapable testing.

When Germany surrendered over 8 years ago, 4 zones of occupation were created, 1 each for Britain, France, the United States and the Soviet Union. This was deemed a convenient way for the Allies to administer the first phases of the surrender terms. It was never intended that Germany should be permanently partitioned. Over 4 years ago, Britain, France, and the United States put their zones together and enabled the Germans there to have free elections and build their own political community. The Germans in the Soviet Zone have been denied that unity and that opportunity.

This division of Germany cannot be perpetuated without grave risks. For no great people will calmly accept mutilation.

Since the Foreign Ministers Conference in Moscow in 1947, many efforts have been made to unite Germany and to establish through free elections an all-German Government with which peace could be dependably negotiated. The task has proved one of immense difficulty. The Russian people, like the French people, have not forgotten what their nation suffered from Hitlerite Germany during the Second World War. They expect, and they are entitled to, assurance against a repetition of such events. And that is also the ardent wish of the German people themselves. That is, indeed, the large purpose of the European Defense Community. It will merge German military strength into the structure of a nonaggressive European community. No single member of the community will have national military strength to serve national ambitions. That is a result which Soviet leaders should welcome if they honestly want peace. So the three Western Powers have again sought a meeting with the Soviet Union to accomplish the unification of Germany. So far, our proposals have met with no response.

AUSTRIA

Austria presents another test case. At the Foreign Ministers meeting held in Moscow in 1943, the Governments of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States declared their purpose to restore the independence of Austria. That declaration remains to be honored. An Austrian state treaty was virtually completed 6½ years ago. Today there is no substantial item of disagreement. The Soviet Union has now said it prefers not to continue to deal with this matter through deputies of the Foreign Ministers. So the three western occupying powers have offered to conclude an Austrian traty at a meeting of the Foreign Ministers which has been proposed. So far that proposal has met with no response.

THE SOVIET SATELLITES IN EUROPE

The entire situation in eastern and central Europe is bound to be a cause of deep concern. The peoples there are essentially religious people and they are essentially patriotic people. They have a spiritual faith that is enduring and great traditions which will never be forgotten.

It is not in the interest of peace, or the other goals of our charter, that the once-independent peoples of Europe should feel that they can no longer live by their traditions and their faith.

It is charged that unrest only exists among them as it is artificially stimulated from without.

That is true only in the sense that faith is a contagious thing which penetrates even curtains of iron. The American people, like many others, hold to the belief which our founders expressed in the Declaration of Independence, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Also, we believe, as Abraham Lincoln put it, that there is "something in that Declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time." No peace can be enduring which repudiates the concept that government should rest on free consent, or which denies to others the opportunity to embrace that concept. We do not conceal that conviction and no United States Government could contain it.

But our creed does not call for exporting revolution or inciting others to violence. Let me make that emphatic. We believe that violent change usually destroys what it would gain. We put our hopes in the vast possibilities of peaceful change.

Our hope is that the Soviet leaders, before it is too late, will recognize that love of God, love of country, and sense of human dignity, always survive. Repressive measures inevitably lead to resentment and bitterness and perhaps something more. That does not come about by artificial stimulation. It comes about because the Creator endowed all human beings with the spark of spiritual life.

We can understand the desire of the Russian people to have friends. The American people, in the past, have often shown, by generous deeds, their friendship with the Russian people. We can understand the particular desire of the Russian people to have close neighbors who are friendly. We sympathize also with that desire. The United States does not want to see Russia encircled by hostile peoples.

But we foresee that unless Soviet policies are changed, those policies will, in their actual operation, create precisely such surrounding animosity and hostility as Soviet policy understandably wants to avoid.

Policies which will permit Korea to be united and free; which will allow independence to come peacefully in Indochina; which will unite Germany and free Austria; which will enable Russia's neighbors to enjoy national independence; which will end the dedication of the Soviet Communist Party to the violent overthrow of independent governments—such are the policies which would go far to end present tensions.

There are, of course, other ways to reduce tensions. I have by no means exhausted all the possibilities. I have, however, spoken of the major causes of present tension, and I have, I hope, made clear the willingness of the United States to discuss them all. So far, the invitations in which we have joined with others of you represented here, remain unanswered.

Governments which exert themselves without reserve to the creation of ever more powerful means of mass destruction, which tolerate no delay and spare no expense in these matters, and which at the same time are dilatory, evasive, or negative toward curing the situations which could bring these destructive forces into play, such governments cannot but stand morally condemned.

The Soviet Union can make a great contribution toward the relaxing of these tensions which threaten to develop into major disasters. At the same time let me make it clear we recognize that the United States and others have their contributions to make and their obligations to fulfill. That is true both in relation to Russia and in relation to what our charter calls non-self-governing territories.

I say on behalf of the Government of the United States that we are prepared to show in ourselves the spirit which we invoke in others.

Such a spirit, if it is mutual, should make it possible to tackle hopefully what is perhaps the greatest problem—that of controlling the forces which could destroy us all.

LIMITATION OF ARMAMENT

On April 16, 1953, President Eisenhower expressed eloquently and vividly the terrible danger to humanity from present weapons. Also he pointed out our desire to divert expenditures from destruction to construction which would particularly benefit the underdeveloped areas of the world. He recognized that it would be difficult to alter the armament situation markedly while there existed the present measure of distrust. He called for deeds, such as those which I have outlined, which would relax the tension. He went on to say that "as progress in all these areas strengthens world trust, we could proceed concurrently with the next great work—a reduction of the burden of armament now weighing upon the world."

I emphasize this word concurrently. The United Nations here has, for some years, been dealing with the problem of armaments. We know that even between nations of good will it is difficult to find a workable formula to do this. The task cannot, perhaps, be finally solved under the conditions of distrust which exist today. That, however, does not mean that the task should be abandoned nor even postponed. We believe, on the contrary, that there should be intensified study of the problem of limitation and control of all categories of armament. There is a vast amount of technical work which needs to be done preparatory to any final solution, and without that preparatory work no final solution would be practical.

We have faith that the time may come—it might come quickly and suddenly—when political leaders would be prepared to put into effect international agreements limiting armaments. When that moment comes, the nations should be able to seize it. That moment—we must not let it escape. Perhaps it could never be recaptured. But to seize that moment when it comes requires that the technical analysis of the problem should before then have been advanced.

The United States has already put forward a series of proposals here which have attracted widespread support. On these we are not inflexible; except that we do insist that any proposals must meet one fundamental test—there must be effective safeguards to insure compliance of all nations and to give adequate warning of possible evasions or violations.

We do not believe that the studies which have been made up until now have involved a waste of time. On the contrary, we believe that they have laid the foundation for quick action once the general atmosphere makes this possible. But these studies need to be carried on to a still higher state of completion. So far as the United States is concerned, we are prepared to dedicate ourselves with renewed vigor to this high task. Given a concrete demonstration of an equal desire on the part of the Soviet Union to negotiate honestly and sincerely on the substance of these matters, we are confident that this work can usefully go forward.

CHARTER REVISION

I note that the Argentine, Egyptian, and the Netherlands delegations have proposed agenda items dealing with charter revision pursuant to article 109. This article provides that unless a review conference is held earlier, the 10th General Assembly to be held in 1955 shall have on its agenda the question of calling such a conference. I have no doubt that a review conference will be held. Article 109 was put into the charter in an effort to allay the very large measure of dissatisfaction which was felt at San Francisco with many of the provisions of the charter. Many nations, particularly the smaller nations, strongly objected to what they thought was an excessive award of power to the permanent members of the Security Council. They feared that the Security Council would prove unworkable because of disagreements among the great powers. Unhappily, these fears have in large measure materalized. There were other provisions of the charter which were adopted with great reluctance and concern.

It was only possible to secure acceptance of the charter at San Francisco by a provision assuring that there would be an opportunity to review it in the light of experience.

It is already apparent, after 8 years, that this opportunity should be grasped.

In 1948 the United States Senate adopted a resolution calling for the elimination of the veto power from all questions involving the pacific settlement of international disputes (ch. VI) and from the admission of new members. It also called for a revision of the charter under article 109, if the United Nations should not otherwise have been strengthened.

This year the United States Senate adopted a resolution appointing a special committee, of which Senator WILEY is chairman, to study proposals for amendment to the charter.

Many private United States organizations have shown their desire for a charter review, and they are preparing for it.

Such a conference will not work miracles, but it can be of major importance. In order, however, to get the best results, the task should promptly engage the best thought and attention of all member nations—not merely their governments but also private organizations. The influence of private groups was not adequately felt in 1945, because World War II had not yet ended and normal communications were lacking in much of the world.

We should also welcome suggestions from those nonmember nations which aspire for membership and which are excluded by the veto in the Security Council. Today the number and influence of these nations is so great that their views should not be excluded in considering the future of an organization designed to include all peace-loving nations able and willing to carry out the obligations of the charter.

CONCLUSION

Surely, it is possible to make this Organization more responsive to the needs of our peoples. They only want simple things. They want the opportunity to worship God in accordance with the dictates of their conscience.

They want the opportunity to think in accordance with the dictates of their reason. They want the opportunity to exchange views with others and to persuade or be persuaded by what appeals to their reason and their conscience. They want the right to live in their homes without fear. They want the opportunity to draw together in the intimacy of family life, of community life, and to establish worthy and honorable traditions, which they can pass on to their children and to their children's children. They want to be able to work productively and creatively in congenial tasks of their own choosing, and to enjoy the fruits of their labor. They want governments to which they consent.

Surely it is not beyond the wit of man to make it possible to satisfy such wants and to put to rout the vast impersonal forces which seem imperiously to demand that humanity be bent and broken merely to produce the engines for its own destruction.

To a large extent, the simple wants of the people are denied them because of international tensions. These are not always within the direct competence of this Assembly. Some of the problems of which I have spoken are the primary responsibility of other international groupings. That, however, does not mean that these problems are beyond the influence of the members of this Assembly, and that is why I have spoken of them.

This Assembly is the only world forum where the attitudes of the world community make themselves felt. No one can take part in the deliberations of this Assembly without feeling the impact of moral forces. It is an impact which none can disdain.

In these coming days we can, and I think we shall, set up influences which will move the nations nearer the goal for which all the peoples yearn. That should be the overriding dedication of all the nations represented here. It is, I assure you, the dedication of the delegation and of the nation for which I have the honor to speak.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

(Address by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles before the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., December 22, 1953)

Last week the NATO Ministerial Council met in Paris. The United States was represented by the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Defense, and by the Director of the Foreign Operations Administration. We reviewed the progress made and we made plans for the future.

NATO—FOR COMMUNITY SECURITY

This is important business from the standpoint of the American people. NATO comes closer than anything yet to being an effective international community police force. Fourteen nations have joined together to create a defensive organization committed to protect the security of a large area. This area is vital to the defense of freedom. It constitutes the principal home of western civilization. Also, the western European part contains coal and iron and industrial plants which, if they fell into hostile hands, would markedly shift the balance of power away from us.

All of the 14 member nations have made important contributions toward building this North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Many strategic facilities are contributed by smaller nations. Most of the forces in Europe are contributed by nations other than the United States, although there are approximately six United States divisions, with air and naval support, now in the European theater. The United States has made the largest single contribution to arming and equipping the NATO forces. We have put some $11 billion into this phase of our effort.

The project is so vital and the investment in it so large that it deserves careful supervision. That is, of course, the continuing task of our able permanent representative at NATO's headquarters in France. But also it is important that Cabinet Ministers from the 14 countries should come together to talk about NATO and its problems.

THE LONG-HAUL CONCEPT

We found the organization in good shape. It has adapted itself to a new concept which the United States brought to the NATO meeting of last April. This was that NATO should operate on a budget which the member nations can sustain for what may be a long period.

When NATO was organized in 1950, many thought that general war might come quickly, and that NATO should build itself up, on an emergency basis, to full defensive strength. That involved setting a pace which none of the member nations could sustain indefinitely.

At the Ministerial Council meeting of last April, virtually every member nation was saying that it could not carry its allotted share of the NATO program without large grants of economic aid from the United States. The total was a figure which the United States itself could not indefinitely support.

It seemed to us that it was justifiable, and even prudent now to moderate NATO's emergency and exhausting pace.

So at the last April Council meeting the United States put forward a new concept, now known as that of the long haul. That means a steady development of NATO, which, however, will preserve, and not exhaust, the economic and fiscal strength of member nations.

Some feared that this shift, from the mood of emergency to that of a steady pace, could not be made without destroying the morale of the organization and leading to its disintegration. Some felt that what we proposed would be misinterpreted as a loss of United States interest in NATO. We knew that the change of pace could not be safely accomplished except by skillful handling. But that has now been done. It was made possible by comprehension on the part of the permanent staff and the military leaders of NATO. They were statesmen, as well as soldiers, and they understood and adapted themselves to the need of taking into account all of the risks, not merely the military risks, but also the nonmilitary risks.

A SUSTAINING BASIS

Today we can honestly judge that NATO is on a sustainable basis.

This sustaining basis is one which largely reduces the necessity for continuing United States economic aid to the countries of Western Europe.

These countries have made a good economic recovery. Their currencies are showing greater strength and stability. The inflationary pressures are reduced as a result of sounder fiscal and monetary policies. There is also some progress toward greater economic freedom and liberalization of trade, though there continue to be serious restrictions on the movement of goods, and especially, on the import of dollar goods.

These NATO meetings, along with the activities of other international groups, are spreading an understanding of the requirements for economic strength, which is basic to the political and military strength of the West.

THE DETERRENTS OF CAPTIVES' DISCONTENT

It is important to bear in mind that while military power is a principal deterrent to armed aggression, it can be importantly reinforced by other deterrents. For example, the Soviet rulers may hesitate to attack if contrasting social conditions bring them domestic troubles.

At our Paris meeting it was generally judged by the NATO ministers that the danger of open military aggression from Soviet Russia was less than it had been a year or two before. That, if true, is largely due to NATO's growing power. But also it is due to internal pressures and discontents resulting from the bad living conditions within the Soviet bloc and the contrasting better conditions within the neighboring free countries.

It seems that the Soviet rulers' exploitation of their own and the satellite peoples has reached a point where it would be reckless for them to engage in general war. All recent major speeches by high Soviet officials seek to encourage their people to hope for more food and more consumer's goods of better quality. That clearly shows a popular demand so insistent that it cannot be ignored. It suggests that perhaps the workers within the Soviet Union may be allowed to work less for military purposes and more for their own good. That, of course, would be a welcome approach to the practices observed in the free world.

Tre revolt of last June within East Germany exposed the vast underlying discontent which exists among the workers within the satellite areas. It indicates that if there were an armed invasion of Western Europe, the Soviet lines of communication might not be altogether secure.

These were among the factors which, the foreign ministers at Paris felt, operated to deter an invasion of Western Europe. It shows how important it is for the free world countries to continue to provide living standards really superior to those within the captive world.

MILITARY POWER PLUS ECONOMIC WELFARE

I am not suggesting that an orgy of self-indulgence is the answer to the Soviet menace. The danger is immense and persistent. This is no time for the free world to relax and to weaken its own military capacity to defend and strike back. We are, however, at a time when we can usefully confront Soviet rulers with a demonstration of our capacity to do two things at once, that is to develop military power and to increase well being.

I said to the NATO Council:

"We are convinced that our members can provide the resources for an adequate defense, including a wide range of new weapons and at the same time permit a steady improvement in the living standards and general welfare of our peoples. * * * That itself is a security measure. It nullifies the Communists' subversive efforts against the free governments. Also, it creates a striking contrast to despotism, and thus confronts the Soviet rulers with a dilemma at home."

CONTINENTAL DEFENSE

We gave consideration to the problem of the defense of the North American continent. Canada and the United States form part of the treaty area and the Council recognizes that it is important to protect North America's military potential. The temptation to aggression would be great if the aggressor could, by an initial blow, knock out the industrial power of North America.

It is not feasible to provide an absolute insurance against serious damage to our cities and industries. However, it is possible to secure a substantial measure of protection.

The Foreign Minister of Canada joined with us in emphasizing the importance to NATO of defensive measures within this continent. But we both indicated that this would not be sought at a scale of expense which would impair the ability of our countries to contribute to other aspects of the NATO effort.

NATO VIGOR

We were greatly impressed by the spirit of vigorous fellowship which pervades NATO. The permanent NATO staff, drawn from 14 countries, is dedicated to a common purpose. That is an inspiring fact. Indeed, NATO is a unique organization in more respects than one. Never before have sovereign nations so freely exchanged military information. Never before have nations taken recommendations from an international body concerning length of military service, balance of forces between military services, and other equally delicate problems and, what is even more surprising, accepted them in spite of adverse domestic political considerations.

The American people can take pride in NATO and take comfort in it. We should sustain it on the basis now planned—a basis which involves a fair sharing of burdens and benefits, and which combines growing strength for NATO with economic and fiscal integrity for ourselves and other member countries.

Certainly, each member of NATO gets out of it much more than the price of admission. It is costly, but it is not nearly as costly as though each tried to buy separately, for itself alone, the amount of security that it now gets on a collective basis. Indeed, no nation, at any cost, could get alone what NATO provides for all its members.

THE PRECARIOUS FOUNDATION

So far, so good. However, if we go farther and delve deeper, it is not so good. NATO has become a splendid structure. But it rests upon a foundation which is precarious and which must cause us grave concern.

United States postwar policy has consistently recognized the imperative necessity of a closer integration of Western Europe. Congress expressed that when it adopted the European recovery program in 1948, when it ratified the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949, and when it subsequently provided economic and military assistance to Europe. In so doing, our Congress was not imposing an American concept on Europe. It was endorsing a conviction that every western European statesman of this generation has eloquently and forcefully expressed.

Actually, much progress has been made toward economic, military and political unity.

A coal and steel community has already been created and the possibility of broader unity now resides in the treaty to create a European Defense Community (EDC). This treaty was signed in May 1952, by France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and the West German Republic. In essence, this treaty provided for the establishment of a common military force, drawn from the six countries, which would be placed under common institutions created by them. They would operate under a single budget, with common procurement of military equipment. They would have similar uniforms and training and would be put at the disposal of the NATO Supreme Commander.

At the same time that this EDC Treaty was signed, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France signed a convention with the West German Republic designed, in effect, to end the postwar occupation. This convention, however, provides that it does not come into force unless the EDC Treaty comes into force.

It was contemplated by the EDC Treaty that it would be ratified within 6 months. Now 18 months have elapsed and there is still no assurance of early action, although good progress toward ratification has been made in several of the EDC countries. No parliament, to which the EDC Treaty has been submitted, have voted against ratification. But some of the parliaments have not wanted to face the issue.

None of us must underestimate the difficulty of affirmative action. It involves a merging of national institutions which the nations identify with their respective histories. It involves substituting fellowship for hatreds which are both ancient and recent. However, the day of decision cannot be indefinitely postponed. We are close to a date when nonaction is the equivalent of adverse action. This is the more true because the Mutual Security Act of 1953, conditions much of our European military support upon the actual existence of EDC.

THE DEADLY DANGER OF PROCRASTINATION

General Eisenhower, in an address made in London on July 3, 1951, made an appeal for European unity which has rarely, if ever, been equalled in its eloquence and in the clarity of its reasoning. After speaking of the immense gains that could be achieved through unity, General Eisenhower pointed out that "the project faces the deadly danger of procrastination. * * * The negative is always the easy side, since it holds that nothing should be done. The negative is happy in lethargy, contemplating, almost with complacent satisfaction, the difficulties of any other course."

Since he spoke, 2½ years have gone by and the truth of his observation has been manifest.

When I was in Paris last week, I mentioned the importance of action soon, and said that if there was not an early and affirmative response, the United States would have to undertake an agonizing reappraisal of basic foreign policy in relation to Europe.

That statement, I thought, reflected a self-evident truth. Successive international communiques issued throughout this year have said that the consummation of EDC was urgent, of paramount importance, necessary, needed, and essential. But these weighty utterances seem not to have sunk in. Let me, therefore, mention three of the factors which make EDC essential.

1. There is the immediate problem of the so-called forward strategy in Western Europe. This means a plan, and a will, to defend the entire area of the prospective EDC countries rather than to contemplate from the beginning the abandonment of advanced positions in Germany, which might make the rest untenable. In pursuance of this strategy, a substantial part of the United States Army occupies advanced positions in West Germany. However, without the EDC, it is not legally permissible to draw on German strength for the defense of German soil. Equally, of course, it is not acceptable that the United States should continue in the role of being a principal defender of Germany, while the Germans themselves look on as mere observers. The forward strategy was initiated in September 1950 on the assumption that there would soon be German participation in the common defense. If that prospect disappears, then the basic strategy of NATO will have to be reexamined.

2. There is not merely the problem of providing German contingents, but of doing so in a form reasonably acceptable to Germany's neighbors. EDC meets this problem by limiting German forces and providing that the Germans who are armed will form part of a six-power army. They will not be subject to a German general staff and they cannot be used for national purposes. This gives assurances to France and other nations, including the Soviet Union, which have a legitimate concern that Germans shall not be rearmed under conditions which would make possible a recurrence of such invasions as they have suffered from German militarism.

3. There is the problem of permanently sealing the breach between France and Germany.

Twelve years ago, as the United States formally entered into World War II, I wrote:

"Continental Europe has been the world's worst fire hazard. Now the whole structure is consumed in flames. We condemn those who started and spread the fire. But this does not mean when the time comes to rebuild that we should reproduce a demonstrated fire trap."

To my mind this is the dominant consideration. It takes precedence over getting German divisions under NATO, important as that is. The essential is to end, once and for all, the suicidal strife which has long plagued the Western World. It has so weakened it, both materially and in prestige, that western civilization can now be seriously challenged by a materialist civilization, which, behind the thin veneer of sanctimonious theory, actually reproduces the human degradation of dark ages.

ALTERNATIVES TO EDC

It is said that there must be alternatives to EDC. Of course, if EDC fails, there will be things to be done. We are not blind to that. But I do not see alternatives in the sense of other practical ways of accomplishing the three EDC goals I mentioned.

Let us, by way of illustration, take the alternative which is most mentioned—that is, to restore sovereignty to the West German Republic and then to make it a member of NATO.

That is simply said, but hardly done; at best it accomplishes merely the first of the three purposes of EDC. It would bring German soldiers into NATO.

But how about the second goal of doing this in a way to reassure France and Soviet Russia? It would recreate a German national force which could be withdrawn for national purposes at the will of a German general staff. This is not reassuring.

How about the third goal of creating organic unity in Western Europe which will assure an ending of its suicidal strife? This great goal will be lost in the rebirth of nationalism.

But supposing we decided, as we might, to try this way. Let us not imagine that the procedure would be simple or expeditious. First, it would call for renegotiation of the present four-power convention designed to restore West German sovereignty. That is because, as I pointed out, the present

convention depends upon the coming into force of EDC. The renegotiation of that treaty under present circumstances might not be easy; nor is it clear that the four powers would again readily find themselves in agreement.

If, however, this hurdle can be overcome, there would then be the problem of bringing West Germany into NATO: This would require first of all willingness on the part of West Germany to apply for NATO membership. This willingness cannot be assured. Many Germans strongly oppose the recreation of a German national army with a German general staff.

There would then be the problem of securing the necessary amendment of the NATO Treaty by each of the 14 member nations. There are many in France who wonder whether a French Parliament which rejected German rearmament under the severe limits of EDC, would ratify an amendment to NATO which would entitle West Germany to arm without those limitations. France has in this matter a legal power of veto.

There are, of course, many other suggested alternatives. I would not want to be understood as rejecting any of them. But all of them, as President Eisenhower has said, are feeble. Also they all would take time, a factor which cannot now be ignored.

Powerful forces are now here to draw together the six nations of the proposed European Defense Community, and Britain and the United States are prepared to pledge to this Community their firm support. But unless unity is achieved soon, this historic moment may pass and different and divisive forces may take command.

Already there is evidence of this in Europe. The Soviet Union is playing the dangerous game of seeming to support France and Germany against each other. Soviet propaganda is recreating in France the fears of Germany. It is creating in Germany resentment against France, on the ground that its indecision is prolonging an occupation of Germany which already has lasted for nearly 9 years since the armistice. Chancellor Adenauer already last week found it necessary to plead with the German people to be patient. The fact that that plea was necessary should be a warning sign that we do not have time to burn.

We have reached one of those points where the perfect is the greatest enemy of the good. No doubt the EDC Treaty is less than perfect. However, it does decisively pose the fateful choice. It has become the symbol of Europe's will to make it possible to achieve a unity which will dependably safeguard our Western civilization and all that it means in terms of human dignity and human welfare.

Of course, if EDC fails, we shall do something. But what we then do may be quite different from what we had hoped would be possible. It may involve our tactically picking our way through a maze of manifold perils, as of old.

I have confidence that the United States is strong enough, resourceful enough, and wise enough to preserve its vital interests even in the face of a failure of the EDC and the European unity it symbolizes.

We need not, however, end upon any somber note. I do not believe that there will be failure to achieve European unity. My belief derives from the fact that the peoples of Europe do in fact possess qualities which make it imperative that Europe should be saved.

Europe is important for many reasons. It is strategically located and it has industrial power. But above all, Europe is important because of its people. They possess to a unique degree the qualities which ennoble a civilization which bears the deep imprint of Christianity. That is a fact which it is, I think, appropriate to mention as we approach Christmas Day.

What are those qualities? In individuals they are minds trained to reason clearly and serenely; vision to see far and truly; hearts which comprehend the fathership of God and the fellowship of man, and finally, capacity to act rather than to be merely contemplative.

In government, the quality we respect is willingness to trust, in great matters, to the response of individuals possessed of the qualities I mention.

I have hopes in the response to be made regarding European unity, because I have faith in our civilization and in its human products. Delays and difficulties so far encountered are above all due to the fact that the issues have been obscured, so that the people do not see and think and comprehend and act.

That murky period is coming to an end. As the day of decision irrevocably approaches, so does comprehension grow. Therefore, we can have high hopes.

I have dealt in my talk with NATO because a report on that organization is due the American people. But also we can find elsewhere good ground for hope.

Our society of freedom has gained a clear moral initiative over the forces of reaction.

After years of futile and evasive debate on the part of the Soviet Union about atomic weapons it has at least indicated a willingness to talk confidentially, and we hope seriously, about this problem.

After months of attempted evasion, the Soviet Union finally, it seems, will meet and talk, again, we hope seriously, about the unification of Germany and the liberation of Austria. We have not yet had any formal reply to our invitation to meet at Berlin on January 4, but the Soviet statement received yesterday speaks of "the forthcoming conference in Berlin."

The coming year will be a year for great decision. There lie ahead European unity, a possible recession of the horror of atomic warfare, and a beginning of an ending of the unnatural division of Europe.

In Korea we look forward to the first year of peace since 1949.

The problems are many and grievous, but our hopes are high. We can, therefore, in all honesty, look forward to the happier New Year, which I wish you all.

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE PRINT ON LAW DEANS' OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the recess, there was published a 59-page print by the Senate Judiciary Committee on the issue of the treaty-making power under the Constitution.

The print consists of a series of comments by deans of America's law schools and by professors of constitutional law of our great universities with regard to—

First. Senate Joint Resolution 1, popularly known as the Bricker amendment.

Second. The substitute offered by the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

I had invited these expert university reactions in order to gain from the law deans and professors their best judgment on this crucial constitutional issue.

In the 1st session of the 83d Congress, I had reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several of the messages which I had received up until that time.

Several messages came in after the Congress had concluded its initial session.

Every single one of the replies is incorporated in the Judiciary Committee print.

The document speaks for itself. Every single law-school dean in the United States who took the trouble to write to me opposes the amendment, with but one exception.

Virtually every dean and professor of law expressed doubts even about the substitute, although they said that it would be infinitely preferable to Senate Joint Resolution 1, as reported from the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, I believe that this Judiciary Committee print is an extremely valuable reference tool. I hope that all my colleagues in the Senate will have an opportunity to look through it.

I am indebted to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who has graciously consented to the printing of this reference document.

I have in my hand the text of an editorial carried in the December 28 issue of the Los Angeles Daily News, which kindly refers to this document.

There are numerous issues on which I might disagree with the present editorial policy of that vital newspaper, but on this issue I am delighted that we agree so emphatically.

I send now to the desk the text of the editorial and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAMPHLET ON BRICKER MEASURE ENLIGHTENING

A valuable service to the public has been rendered by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, in publishing, in pamphlet form, a symposium of opinions expressed by the Nation's law school deans with regard to the proposed Bricker amendment.

There are 4 versions of the so-called Bricker amendment before the Senate, 2 of which go to the heart of the matter of changing the Constitution to limit treaty-making to provisions that do not contravene the Constitution and/or which must be supported by legislation which would be constitutional even in the absence of a treaty. In the Watkins and McCarran versions Presidential power is greatly curtailed.

Senator WILEY is opposed to all of the proposed amendments, including the KNOWLAND (Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, of California) substitute and it may not be altogether a coincidence that 26 of the 27 law deans who replied with reference to the original Bricker bill are opposed to it or to any change in our treaty-making machinery on the ground that time has proved it sound.

Perhaps the most comprehensive and certainly the most succinct opposition to any change in the Constitution with regard to treatymaking is expressed by Dr. Ray Forrester, dean of law at Tulane University, New Orleans, in his letter to Senator WILEY. Dean Forrester says:

"It is my opinion that the Constitution should be amended only in cases of obvious need. The burden of proof should be on the proposer of any change. It would certainly be inadvisable to modify the Constitution each time we have some temporary fear concerning the exercise of an established constitutional power, whether it be in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government. Power in government

must reside somewhere and, wherever it resides, it may be abused at times.

"On its merits I do not believe that the proponents of the suggested amendment have convincingly demonstrated the need for this change in our basic structure of government. The existing system has worked relatively well over a long period of time and I doubt the wisdom of changing it, particularly at a time when the power has shifted to our careful and conservative Republican friends."

The Wiley pamphlet is in limited issue, but inquiry about it may be made to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

INDICTMENTS AND CONVICTIONS OF EMPLOYEES AND FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, under date of November 20, 1953, the Treasury Department submitted to me a schedule of criminal actions for the period January 1, 1951, to November 17, 1953, showing the indictments and convictions of employees and former employees of the revenue service, as well as persons not employees of the service, but who were involved in such actions.

The first list shows that since charges were made against that agency there has been a total of 388 employees separated for cause or who retired or resigned as a result of charges during the course of investigation.

A breakdown of the 388 employees shows—

(a) eighty-eight were charged with the acceptance of gratuities or bribes.

(b) forty were charged with embezzlement.

(c) fifty-one were charged with failure to pay their own proper income taxes.

(d) fifty were charged with falsification of Government records.

(e) the remainder ranging from refusal to cooperate in the investigation, incompetence, etc.

The second report shows that there have been a total of 214 indictments—

(a) one hundred and five representing employees and former employees.

(b) one hundred and nine representing indictments against outsiders who conspired with Government employees to defraud the Government.

This second chart shows that of this 214 who have been indicted there have been 101 convictions.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, first the letter dated November 20, 1953, signed by O. Gordon Delk, the Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue; followed by the charts labeled "No. 1" and "No. 2."

There being no objection, the letter and charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1953.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request of November 6, 1953, you will find attached a schedule of criminal actions for the period January 1, 1951, to November 17, 1953, showing the indictments and convictions of employees and former employees of the Internal Revenue Service, as well as of persons not employees of the Service, who were involved in such actions.

I am also enclosing a summary showing the number of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who were separated for cause, or who retired or resigned as a result of, or during the course of, investigations for alleged wrongful conduct for the fiscal years 1951, 1952 and 1953, broken down according to the various charges leading to such separations.

Very truly yours,

O. GORDON DELK,
Deputy Commissioner.

Number of employees of the Internal Revenue Service separated for cause, or who retired or resigned as a result of, or during the course of, investigations for alleged wrongful conduct, for fiscal years 1951–52 and 1953

CHART NO. 1

FISCAL YEAR 1951

Classes of employees	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	I	Total
Collectors	1								1
Administrative officers	2			1					3
Internal revenue agents	5				1		3	1	10
Deputy collectors	11	8	1	2			6		28
Accountant-auditors			1						1
Storekeeper-gagers				1			1		2
Clerks		2	1				4		7
Claims examiners							2		2
Clerk-typists							2		2
Bookkeeping machine operators						1	2		3
Bindery workers							1		1
Messengers							1		1
Laborers							1		1
Total	19	10	3	4	1	1	23	1	62

FISCAL YEAR 1952

Classes of employees	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	J	Total
Collectors	2					3	2			7
Assistant collectors	1		1		1					3
Administrative officers	2	1	2		1	4	2			12
Administrative assistants	2		2		1					5
Special agents	3						1			4
Internal revenue agents	13		5		6		4	2		30
Deputy collectors	26	14	8	2	6		23			79
Criminal investigators	1						1			2
A and TT inspectors	1			1						2
Miscellaneous tax investigators			1							1
Accountant-auditors							1			1
Storekeeper-gagers		1					1		1	3
Position classifiers							1			1
Auditors		2	1							3
Tax accounting clerks	2	2					1		1	6
Clerks		3	1	1			5			10
Clerk-stenographers				1			1			2
Bookkeeping machine operators		1								1
Messengers							1			1
Laborers							1			1
Total	53	24	21	5	15	7	45	2	2	174

FISCAL YEAR 1953

Classes of employees	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	I	Total
Regional commissioners	1					3	2		1
Collectors	[1]1		3			3	2		9
Administrative officers			1		1	2	1		5
Administrative assistants	1		1		2		1		5
Inspectors			1						1
Special agents	1								1
Internal revenue agents	7	1	3	6	2		3		22
Deputy collectors	4	4	7	14	5	1	11	2	48
Investigators	1								1
Chemists						1			1
Criminal investigators			1				1		2
A and TT inspectors					1				1
Accountant-auditors							1		1
Storekeeper-gagers			1	1			4		6
Position classifiers				2					2
Auditors			3	1	1				5
Tax accounting clerks			1	1			4		6
Returns examiners			1						1
Clerks		1	2	8			7		18

[1] Collectors were separated upon the reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service.

Number of employees of the Internal Revenue Service separated for cause, or who retired or resigned as a result of, or during the course of, investigations for alleged wrongful conduct, for fiscal years 1951–52 and 1953—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1953—continued

Classes of employees	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	I	Total
Clerk-typists				3		1	2		6
Bookkeeping machine operators			2	4			1	1	8
Messengers				1					1
Laborers							1		1
Total	16	6	27	41	12	8	39	3	152

Code — *Cause of separation*

A—Acceptance of gratuities, bribes, etc.
B—Embezzlement involving U. S. Government fund or property.
C—Failure of employee to pay proper tax.
D—Falsification or distortion of Government reports, records, etc.
E—Unauthorized outside activity.
F—Failure to properly discharge duties.
G—Personal misconduct unrelated to tax cases.
H—Refusal to cooperate in an official investigation.
I—Divulgence of confidential information.
J—Failure to file financial statements.

Criminal action, Jan. 1, 1951, through Nov. 17, 1953

CHART NO. 2

Charge	Indictment		Convictions	
	Employees and former employees	Outsiders [1]	Employees and former employees	Outsiders [1]
A. Embezzlement	24	2	21	1
B. Defrauding Government	1	0	1	0
C. Bribe	19	13	9	8
D. Collusion	3	40	0	13
E. Conspiracy	23	46	14	18
F. Interfering with Government official	0	2	0	2
G. Extortion	7	1	3	0
H. Preparation of tax returns for compensation	1	0	0	0
I. Falsifying records and destroying records	6	2	6	1
K. False statements under oath	9	0	2	0
L. Perjury	3	1	1	0
M. Assault	0	1	0	1
N. Wrongfully converting money to own use	4	0	3	0
O. Evasion of tax	2	0	1	0
P. Failure to make timely remittance of tax collected	1	0	0	0
Q. Impersonating Government official	0	1	0	0
Total	105	109	60	41

[1] Persons never employed in the Internal Revenue Service who were involved with employees or former employees.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE POSSIBLE TRANSFER FROM PHILADELPHIA TO KANSAS CITY OF WESTINGHOUSE JET ENGINE PLANT?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may obtain permission of the Senate to do so, I wish to make a brief statement regarding a serious defense plant problem in Pennsylvania. I wish this statement to appear in the RECORD today because of an event which will occur next week in relation to the subject matter I wish to discuss.

So I now ask unanimous consent to proceed for not more than 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. The statement is on the subject What Is Behind the Possible Westinghouse Jet Engine Transfer From Philadelphia to Kansas City?

Mr. President, in early November the Westinghouse Corp. announced that it was considering transferring its jet engine and gas turbine operations from Philadelphia to Kansas City. No final determination has been disclosed.

The Federal Government has a vital interest in this matter as the United States owns the power tools in the jet plant. The reported cost of the transfer to the Government is $25 million.

That is a lot of money. This expensive move is all the more interesting in the light of the strong possibility that the administration will recommend a tight budget for the armed services. The transfer hardly seems consistent with the announced economy program.

Some 2,600 workers—many of them highly skilled—are employed in the jet plant. The plant is the principal industry in small communities lying outside Philadelphia. It will obviously not be possible for all of these employees—or even a majority of them—to move to Kansas City which has been certified as a labor-shortage area. The Philadelphia area, in contrast, has a labor surplus.

Production from the transferred facilities will be disrupted while the necessary machinery is in transit and until it can be reinstalled. Further disruption can be expected until a full complement of skilled employees is recruited and some of them trained.

The Westinghouse plant, including the jet department, is presently organized by the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America (Independent), which was expelled from the CIO several years ago on the grounds that it was a Communist-dominated organizatio

Perhaps the transfer is dictated by security considerations stemming from the suspect nature of the expelled union.

Next week the National Labor Relations Board will conduct a representation election at the Westinghouse plant. Three unions will be on the ballot: the UE and two devotedly anti-Communist unions—the IUE-CIO and the IAM.

I hope that the Defense Department will clarify this matter as the result of congressional inquiries and conferences with Mayor Clark and others.

The American people and the Congress have a right to know why a $25 million move to a critical employment area is under consideration.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR MORSE—EDITORIAL FROM THE DALLES OPTIMIST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks, in the body of the RECORD, a guest editorial from a newspaper in my State, written by five Republicans. Some of the Republicans who wrote the editorial have been critical of me in the past for following my independent course of political action. Yet they wrote the editorial, which appeared in the Dalles Optimist on November 19, 1953, in which they expressed their reasons for supporting me at the present time.

I wish to say with some pride, Mr. President, that in the speaking tour I recently completed in my State I was delighted to find hundreds of Republicans in my State coming to me and assuring me of their continued support in the political battles of the future in my State.

So, Mr. President, I submit this editorial with a considerable amount of pleasure, because I am so accustomed to reading editorials that represent the dipping of the editorial pen into my blood. It is enjoyable for me to offer some editorial comments showing my friends in the Senate that the Republican leaders were quite mistaken when they conducted a political funeral about a year ago over what they assumed were my political remains. They are now discovering that there was not a corpse in that political coffin. The editorial makes clear that the Independent Party is far from dead. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be published in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO DESERTED WHOM?

He was right.

He was right all the time, and his critics were wrong.

Few there were who realized this a year ago, when he stood almost alone, reviled and ridiculed by the victors, unwilling to share in the friendly company of the vanquished.

Even worse times were to come—days of humiliation; nights of black defeat. Malicious gossip.

But, after all, these were not calamities entirely strange and unexpected. He had fought before for his political life. And this time had he not known he was one man trying futilely to hold back an avalanche? He had told friends weeks before the election the impending Republican sweep was irresistible. Yet he had spurned the easy path of expediency. He refused to compromise. He had come out for Stevenson, even when he knew Eisenhower could not be beaten.

There have been other such men in history. Lonely men.

Intelligence is always lonely.

It is as great a handicap to a man to be intelligent as it is to a woman to be beautiful.

People admire intelligence; they admire beauty. They also resent them. Politicians cannot understand and always resent a man with the qualities they usually lack—intelligence and courage.

Yes; we are talking about WAYNE MORSE.

And who are we?

Democrats? No. Independents? No.

Each of the five principal collaborators of this editorial is a registered Republican.

We don't have much to say about party policy; we are not heavy contributors to campaign funds—we can't afford very much—we don't even own any tidelands.

But we feel somehow, instinctively, that we speak for the rank and file of the Republican Party. Perhaps we could call ourselves Liberal Republicans.

And we like WAYNE MORSE.

For we think that is exactly what he is and what consistently he has been—a Liberal Republican.

We think that is why the Republicans of Oregon twice have nominated him, and why the people of Oregon have twice elected him.

And they will continue to elect him—the people, we mean, not the professional Republicans. For we feel that the majority of the voters, who after all are small people like us, want liberal republicanism.

Wasn't that what they voted for in 1952?

At least, that is what they thought they were voting for.

A change, a change to some of the liberal principles MORSE stood for, and which they thought Eisenhower stood for.

And what did they get?

A sellout. A sellout which had its beginnings even before the convention.

The party which had represented itself as favoring a degree of realistic liberalism deserted that principle. In doing so, it deserted its most ardent spokesman, WAYNE MORSE.

The party had deserted him even before the convention. Some of our Oregon delegation, in the face of explicit instructions from our own Republican voters, obviously favored Senator Taft, an invited guest at the delegation's first Oregon breakfast. They managed to relegate Senator MORSE to an ineffectual role. A cartoon in a Chicago newspaper showed MORSE sitting quietly reading his newspaper, while lesser men huddled in the aisles in strategy meetings.

Our delegation shoved competence under the table, and chose as its chief strategist in matters of party principles, a man completely undistinguished; under the circumstances, a man altogether ridiculous.

But MORSE proved himself bigger than most men. He suspended judgment. He waited. Weeks went by. And then, when the evidence, to him, was unmistakable as to which side had achieved party control—he spoke.

He spoke as he always speaks, with the fire which illuminates; the logic which is unforgiveable.

Who deserted whom?

The answer is obvious. Let's take a look at what became of the campaign issues.

The Republicans had complained of Democratic special privilege. What have we now? Republican special privilege.

They promised a balanced budget. Unless they have found $30 billion by the time we go to press, they're still in the red.

Where are the promised Taft-Hartley amendments? Where are the snows of yesteryear?

They were going to lower the cost of living. So far they have succeeded in raising that and at the same time lowering farm prices.

Can we blame this, too, on Harry Dexter White?

It is high time the Republican Party stopped playing to the grandstand. Instead, they might well spend their time going to work on some of the important problems which confront us.

They could learn a great deal from WAYNE MORSE.

Will they?

SENATOR DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of November 19, 1953, paying tribute to our colleague and friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD. I endorse its sentiments wholeheartedly, and I rejoice at the news

that Senator DOUGLAS has announced his availability to return to the Senate for a second term. I am confident that the people of Illinois will reelect him next November. I consider him to be one of the great men of America and one of the greatest Members ever to sit in this body.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS

PAUL H. DOUGLAS is such an unusual kind of Senator that the announcement of his candidacy for a second term is worth unusual notice. He is among the most independent, courageous, and thoughtful men in Congress. While this newspaper has certainly not always agreed with him in the past, and probably will not always agree with him in the future, we respect him as one of the country's outstanding legislators. The voters of Illinois are fortunate that he is willing to endure the slings and arrows of what promises to be a rough political campaign in order to continue to serve the people of all the United States for another 6 years.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, throughout our country in recent days a great deal of concern has been expressed about the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Sometime ago my attention was called to the fact that the National Association of Retail Grocers, the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, the National Candy Wholesalers Association, the National Association of Retail Druggists, the National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, the National Food Brokers Association, and the United States Wholesale Grocers Association addressed a letter to the Attorney General of the United States, and also made available a statement, on antitrust policy and antitrust laws. I believe that this letter and the policy statement bear very careful examination by the Members of the Senate, and particularly by the appropriate Senate committee, which, I believe, is the Committee on the Judiciary.

In the country there is deep concern that we may be confronting a period when there will be a weakening of the protections to free enterprise and competitive enterprise which are provided by the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and by the enforcement procedures and regulations of the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. I wish to join with the associations I have mentioned in their worthy endeavor—to protect the full meaning and application of the antitrust laws of the Nation. I now serve warning that any effort administratively or legislatively to weaken those laws and their enforcement will meet with full-fledged opposition from the junior Senator from Minnesota. I believe it is time that we not only talk about free enterprise and competitive enterprise but that we give to the agencies of the Government which are entrusted with the protection of the free economy of the Nation the tools, appropriations, and whatever else may be necessary to assure effective enforcement of the antitrust laws and effective protection under them.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred and the statement on our national antitrust policy and laws, as prepared for submission to the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, be incorporated at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
RETAIL GROCERS,
Chicago, Ill., December 16, 1953.

The Honorable ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The organizations subscribing to this letter have submitted a written statement of their views to your committee now undertaking the study of our antitrust laws. A copy of that document is enclosed herewith.

We understand that this committee, as a part of its duties, will give particular attention to the Robinson-Patman Act and therefore will be concerned with issues that have been pending in Congress for the last several years involving changes in the act.

Desperate efforts have been made during the past several years to enact legislation that would legalize discriminations if they are made in good faith to meet competition even though such discriminations destroyed the competitive position of the multitude of competitors who were not recipients of the discriminations. This, of course, is a far-reaching question for Congress to decide.

Every provision of the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936 grew out of the tragedy and distress among multitudes of independents in every corner of the land. Every provision had for its purpose the stopping of notorious discriminatory practices in trade. It won the unanimous approval of the Senate and the almost unanimous approval of the House and has come to be regarded as the Magna Carta of independent enterprise in America.

Several individuals, including some members of your committee, have long advocated amendments which would seriously weaken this important act. We have heard much from them advocating the right of a businessman to give discriminatory prices when attempting to meet a competitor's price and to do this without fear of any law and without any regard to the fact that it will destroy or injure a multitude of other businessmen. We raise our voices, as have others before us, to save the right of all businessmen, regardless of size, to equality of opportunity.

We respectfully call upon you as the President's and the administration's spokesman and administrator in the field of antitrust laws to give adequate consideration to the impending threat against the vast majority of businesses in our land. Independent businesses, and particularly small businessmen, are seriously threatened by efforts to weaken or repeal the Robinson-Patman Act. It would be tragic, indeed, if your Antitrust Committee should fail to give heed to the disaster which would befall competitive enterprise if this essential law is weakened or impaired in any way.

Your great office can be instrumental in preventing this from taking place. It is already known to us that the Standard Oil decision is being taken advantage of, and a veritable saturnalia of unfair price discrimination is in the making, equaling, if not exceeding, the disastrous practices of pre-1936. If independent business is to be saved, affirmative legislation is needed effectively to carry out the original intent of the Congress. We urge you to recognize the danger to the Robinson-Patman Act and to exert your greatest efforts to preserve and strengthen its effectiveness.

The members of the organizations who have subscribed their names to this letter and to this appeal are engaged in business in every city, in every town, in every community in the United States. They ask with one voice that you save equality of opportunity in America.

Respectfully submitted.

MARIE KIEFER,
National Association of Retail Grocers.
JOHN W. NERLINGE, Jr.,
National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc.
C. W. KITCHEN,
United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association.
C. M. MCMILLAN,
National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc.
GEORGE H. FRATES,
National Association of Retail Druggists.
W. W. MARSH,
National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc.
WATSON ROGERS,
National Food Brokers Association.
HAROLD O. SMITH, Jr.,
United States Wholesale Grocers Association, Inc.

STATEMENT ON OUR NATIONAL ANTITRUST POLICY AND LAWS

(Submitted by National Association of Retail Grocers; National Association of Retail Druggists; National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc.; National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc.; United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association; National Food Brokers Association; National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc.; U. S. Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc.; December 1953)

The ATTORNEY GENERAL'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ANTITRUST LAWS,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The organizations subscribing hereto submit for consideration of the Committee the following statement outlining their views, in general terms, with respect to the national antitrust policy and laws, in the area of price and service discriminations, as suggested by the Attorney General.

The groups joining in this statement are particularly concerned over the attacks being made upon the policy and provisions of the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and, therefore, deem it necessary to state, as they see it, the need for maintaining and preserving this basic law in a strong and healthy condition.

I. THE NATIONAL ANTITRUST POLICY AND LAWS IN GENERAL

Constitutional freedom, equality of opportunity of the people to engage in trade or business, is the essential concern of the national antitrust policy.

Equality of opportunity is the goal we seek to attain as a free society, whether it be in the economic, social, or political field. As a concept it gives reality to the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, under which we as a nation have progressed and advanced. Our Declaration of Independence asserts that "all men are created equal." This precious heritage of all freemen depends for its continued existence on keeping open, for all people, the door of opportunity.

If we kill or damage this basic concept in trade and commerce, our freedoms and democracy itself cannot long survive. At this hour, there are many advocates pleading for a weakening of the antitrust laws to enable a relatively few unthinking, big, and powerful units in our industry to practice dis-

crimination without fear of restraint and without regard to how much it destroys or damages the equality of others to compete.

On the other hand we who subscribe to this presentation raise our voices in behalf of the people in every city, town, and township of the land who would be the victims of legalized unfair discrimination and whose right to equality of opportunity would thus be impaired or even destroyed.

In *Standard Sanitary Manufacturing Co. v. United States* (226 U. S. 20, 49 (1912)), Mr. Justice McKenna stated in the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court:

"The Sherman law is a limitation of rights, rights which may be pushed to evil consequences and therefore restrained."

And, in *Ramsay Co. v. Bill Posters Association* (260 U. S. 501, 512 (1923)), Mr. Justice Reynolds stated for a unanimous Court:

"The fundamental purpose of the Sherman Act was to secure equality of opportunity and to protect the public against evils commonly incident to destruction of competition through monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade."

That this policy, common to our antitrust laws, was specifically affirmed by Congress in acting on the Patman bill is conclusively shown by the House Report (No. 2287, 74th Cong. 2d sess., 3) stating as follows:

"The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restore, as far as possible, equality of opportunity in business by strengthening antitrust laws and by protecting trade and commerce against unfair trade practices and unlawful price discrimination.

* * * * *

"Your committee is of the opinion that the evidence is overwhelming that price discrimination practices exist to such an extent that the survival of independent merchants, manufacturers, and other businessmen is seriously imperiled and that remedial legislation is necessary."

Probably the most eloquent description of both the philosophy and need behind the Robinson-Patman Act was given on the floor of the House when Hatton W. Sumners, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee stated in support of the measure—

"We cannot preserve a democracy in government unless we preserve a democracy in opportunity."

There can be little wonder that the measure was approved in the Senate by a unanimous vote, passed the House with only 16 dissenting, and that the conference report which embodied the act was agreed to in both Houses without objection.

Today, as then, the act is supported by leaders of the Nation.

On October 16, 1952, Presidential Candidate Eisenhower stated his beliefs in a letter to small-business representatives quoted in part as follows:

"I am opposed to all unnecessary Government restriction and regulation of private enterprise. I favor with equal vigor the maintenance and effective enforcement of the necessary basic safeguards to free American enterprise. These are provided in our antitrust laws and in those laws supporting fair competitive pricing practices. I shall oppose any legislation which will weaken them.

"American business cannot prosper and contribute in growing measure to our national well-being unless the opportunity to engage in business and to provide consumers with new and better products and services is vigilantly preserved.

"Our laws against unfair and destructive pricing practices as well as other practices leading to monopoly must be fearlessly, impartially and energetically maintained and enforced.

"I am for such necessary rules of fair play because they preserve and strengthen free and fair competition, as opposed to monopolies which mean the end of competition."

With equal vigor, Presidential Candidate Stevenson, in a letter dated October 10, 1952, gave his endorsement to a strong Robinson-Patman Act in the following words:

"The citizens of America must be protected by a continuation of the free competitive system which has helped make our Nation strong. In this connection, free does not include the right of some businesses to do whatever they please where the effect is to destroy others. It does include the right of all business to have equal opportunity to compete without fear of hindrance or hurt from monopoly forces."

No partisan issue was involved here.

These were not mere campaign promises given lightly in the heat of battle to be forgotten in the full glory of victory.

President Eisenhower lost little time after he assumed high office to dedicate his leadership to equality of opportunity for all.

Thus, in his address on the state of the Union, before the joint session of the House and Senate on February 2, 1953, he stated, in part:

"The grand labors of this leadership will involve:

* * * * *

"Dedication to the well-being of all our citizens and to the attainment of equality of opportunity for all, so that our Nation will ever act with the strength of unity in every task to which it is called."

Enjoyment of the right to equality of opportunity to compete in trade or business is protected by the antitrust laws. Although we are concerned with the Sherman Act of 1890, which generally prohibits contracts, combinations in the form of trusts or otherwise, and conspiracies in restraint of trade, and monopolies of trade or commerce, and also with the Clayton Act of 1914 which, "to strike the weed in the seed," supplemented the Sherman Act by specifically prohibiting abusive price discriminations, among other incipient restraints of trade and tendencies to monopoly, the particular concern of the undersigned is the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, which amended and strengthened the Clayton Act specific prohibition of such price discriminations. It is true, however, that the basic purpose of all antitrust laws is further to secure Americans in their right to equality of opportunity to compete in said commerce by protecting them from coercive and subversive influences impeding full and free exercise of that right.

II. THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT IN PARTICULAR

The several provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act are indispensable to the protection of the opportunity of business rivals to obtain commodities of like grade and quality, on equal terms. They deter continual and persistent price discrimination practices which unfairly favor one rival over the others. In particular, they aim to prevent a big nationwide operator which is so disposed to use its sheer economic and financial size and power to crush its local competitors by continually getting its supplies on discriminatory terms, and at the ultimate expense of farmers, labor, and the consumer.

That farmers, labor, and the consumer have a big stake in the Robinson-Patman Act was shown by what happened in the period 1920–29 when abusive price discriminations were widespread throughout the land. It was during this period that the prices paid to farmers declined considerably. As the pressures for discriminatory allowances were exerted more and more irresistibly by the largest corporate distributors on the processor, the processor necessarily had to make it up somewhere, and very often he was compelled, against his better judgment, to press for lower and lower prices paid to the farmer and for lower and lower wages paid to labor. And, as a result, the proceeds of the discrimination were pocketed by recipients thereof and that far from benefiting the consumer, the consumer as well as farmers and labor paid the bill.

No one of the independents—large or small—no tire dealer, no grocer, no druggist, no gasoline dealer, or other such businessman can hope to succeed in his contest with a competitor which continuously gets the goods it sells at a substantially lower price not economically justifiable. What chance, what opportunity has he successfully to compete with a competitor which continually and unfairly buys the same goods as he, but 5 percent, 10 percent, 20 percent, etc., cheaper? What chance has a man of equal physical ability to win a 100-yard race against a man who always has a 15-yard handicap at the start, or to win a prize fight with an opponent who has horseshoes concealed in his gloves?

By prohibiting unfair price advantages, the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, in our opinion, is the Magna Carta of free, independent business enterprise in America.

III. THE ATTACK UPON THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

The attack on the Robinson-Patman Act aims to persuade Congress to open for sellers and buyers a large area of freedom to practice price discriminations. This aim is clothed in the beguiling proposition that sellers should be allowed to grant price discriminations where necessary "in good faith" to meet competition.

It is said that the Robinson-Patman Act makes competition soft because it provides a crutch for the inefficient.

The terms "soft" competition and "hard" competition are frequently used by those contending that there is a basic conflict between the Sherman Act and the Robinson-Patman Act. Actually, these terms have little meaning and serve only to confuse the real issues.

If by soft competition is meant competition which is restrained by governmental action, then the Sherman Act, by prohibiting predatory competitive practices that give rise to restraints of trade, does itself promote soft competition. The Sherman Act, like the Robinson-Patman Act, imposes certain limitations which restrain competition, but this is done because without such necessary restraints the consequence would be the eventual destruction of free competition through the formation of monopolies and combinations.

The Robinson-Patman Act supplements the purpose of the Sherman Act by strengthening competition by depriving the small fringe of unscrupulous firms of the advantages of special deals, secret rebates, and other unjustified allowances.

The whole purpose of the act is to protect competition so that price discriminations will not create a small permanent class of buyers who by abusing their power contrive to gain an unnatural and overpowering advantage over their less-favored competitors.

To permit this would certainly mean that those buyers starting the competitive contest with the leverage of unfair advantage would have an easy time of it.

The charge that the act is not in the public interest because it protects the inefficient has no foundation in fact.

This indictment cannot stand. It presupposes that those who are the recipients of systematic price discriminations are the efficient and that those who are the victims of this practice are the inefficient. Such a proposition falls of its own weight.

The extent of buying power and availability of large financial resources are not an accurate criteria of efficiency, but they are the standard by which price discriminations are secured and measured. The fountainhead of efficiency is competition based on equality of opportunity. The act is designed to preserve this necessary prerequisite to the competitive system.

As further aid to their efforts to get Congress to amend the Robinson-Patman Act to give them greater latitude to grant discriminations "to meet" their competition, the opponents of the act seek radical changes in national antitrust policy. It is proposed to restate national antitrust policy in terms of allegedly "new" concepts of competition academically christened "effective competition" or "workable competition." In support of this proposal, it is argued that the Robinson-Patman Act is basically inconsistent with the main line of the antitrust laws—that it protects competitors whereas the Sherman Act protects competition. It is further argued that the Robinson-Patman Act, or at the very least its per se prohibitions, should be repealed and that price discriminations should be governed by a rule of reason including a right of sellers to grant price discriminations continuously and persistently to meet their competition. The dangers and disadvantages of such a proposition are clearly shown in the paragraphs that follow.

IV. OUR POSITION REGARDING PROPOSAL TO CONFER RIGHTS TO PRACTICE ABUSIVE PRICE DISCRIMINATIONS WITHOUT REGARD TO INJURIES CAUSED BY THEM

Prior to enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936, the original Clayton Act of 1914—good-faith-meeting-of-competition proviso, insofar as it was interpreted and applied as an absolute defense, had the practical effect of nullifying the prohibition against price discriminations.

In the decade following World War I, Congress became acutely aware of the problem of price discriminations, particularly the mounting destruction of small businesses in the retail trade, with coercive buyers eliminating their independent rivals by the thousands. In 1928, Congress directed the Federal Trade Commission by Senate Resolution 224 (70th Cong., 1st sess.) to undertake a comprehensive study of coercive buying and to report the practices and its recommendation for additional legislation. Over a period of 6 years the Commission submitted to Congress more than 30 factual reports pursuant to this resolution and a final report on this investigation on September 13, 1934 (S. Doc. 4, 74th Cong., 1st sess.). Based on that investigation, the Commission was of the opinion that it had been the persistent policy of coercive buyers to seek out and demand special and unwarranted price concessions on the goods that they bought and that the suppliers who granted such price discriminations to these buyers had done so, by and large, in good faith to meet competition. As a solution to the problem, the Commission recommended that the good-faith defense be eliminated altogether.

In enacting the Robinson-Patman Act amendment to the Clayton Act, however, Congress retained the good faith defense but left it to the Commission to determine as a matter of fact in each case whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given. That this was the intent of Congress in the Robinson-Patman Act is made perfectly clear by the statement of the chairman of the House managers of the conference report on the Robinson-Patman bill, explaining the section 2 (b) good faith proviso (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 80, pt. 9, p. 9418):

"It is to be noted, however, that this does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and duties. It leaves it a question of fact to be determined in each case, whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given. * * *

"This procedural provision cannot be construed as a carte blanche exemption to violate the bill so long as a competitor can be shown to have violated it first, nor so long as that competition cannot be met without the use of oppressive discriminations in violation of the obvious intent of the bill.

"If this proviso were construed to permit the showing of a competing offer as an absolute bar to liability for discrimination, then it would nullify the act entirely at the very inception of its enforcement, for in nearly every case mass buyers received similar discriminations from competing sellers of the same product."

On January 8, 1951, however, the Supreme Court in a 5-3 decision ruled that the good faith meeting of competition is an absolute defense to a charge of violation of the prohibition against price discrimination (*Standard Oil Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231)). In this case, the majority was of the opinion that the defense must be taken as absolute in the absence of more explicit requirements and more specific standards of comparison for fairly balancing injuries to competition against a justification for meeting competition.

Bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 83d Congress to amend the Robinson-Patman Act, to make good faith meeting of competition an absolute defense to any charges of violation of the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act.

In our opinion the majority opinion in the Standard of Indiana case, evidenced a new-found weakness in the Robinson-Patman Act. Moreover, in our opinion, the aforementioned bills would cement this weakness into the statute with the result of destroying one of the major basic safeguards to free American enterprise.

We oppose and we believe the American people are opposed to any such radical change in the national antitrust policy and law.

It is already known to us that the Standard Oil decision is being taken advantage of, and a veritable saturnalia of unfair price discrimination is in the making, equaling, if not exceeding, the disastrous practice of pre-1936. If independent business is to be saved, affirmative legislation is needed effectively to carry out the original intent of the Congress.

We strongly recommend preservation of the existing antitrust policy and the elimination of the aforementioned new-found weakness in the Robinson-Patman Act by positive legislative enactment preserving commerce from substantial suppression of competition.

We repeat, the antitrust laws concern the constitutional freedom of all Americans to engage in trade or business; equality of opportunity gives reality to that freedom. The Robinson-Patman Act was enacted to restore, so far as possible, equality of opportunity in business. The Robinson-Patman Act should be strengthened and not weakened.

V. OTHER ATTACKS ON THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

The price and service discriminations specifically prohibited as unfair trade practives in section 2 (c), (d), and (e) of the Robinson-Patman Act, are under attack as being "per se rules" to outlaw "accepted business practices not demonstrably resulting in harmful effects," and it is proposed that these discriminations be permitted wherever they may be held as being "reasonable." The aim of these attacks is clear, namely, to insure that there be at least one good loophole through which all discriminations may legally pass regardless of the disastrous effect upon competition—upon equality of opportunity to compete.

Per se prohibitions are not new in our jurisprudence. Murder, rape, robbery, mayhem, arson, etc., have always been specifically prohibited because it was in the interest of society to do so.

The history of antitrust legislation shows that Congress and the people have been trying assidously to find those trade practices which were per se inimical to our free, competitive society. In 1887, Congress was goaded by popular demand to declare discriminatory freight rates per se an evil in competition, and Congress prohibited those discriminations absolutely. The history of the Clayton Act legislation shows Congress tried desperately then to pick out and define those practices which were per se evil. Because of the haste with which the Clayton Act was passed—with the upheaval of the First World War taking place—the effort was abandoned. But Congress and the people continued to believe that per se evil trade practices had to be spelled out. There is no doubt Congress and the people thought in 1936 that payment of brokerage to buyers was a subterfuge, a price discrimination, evil per se. The same thing was true of discriminatory advertising allowances and discriminatory allowances for services. So Congress spelled out in section 2 (c), 2 (d), and 2 (e) evil practices which all reasonable men agreed should be prohibited.

Businessmen want definiteness in law so that they know what they can do and what they cannot do. Has there been any change in our standards of morality since 1936 or in what is right and wrong? We think not. Those who would eliminate or emasculate these provisions must face the responsibility of advocating a return to indefiniteness in the law, chaos in voluntary compliance by businessmen and very likely collapse of administration and enforcement by government.

The question resolves itself whether reasonable citizens, big and little, in trade and commerce, really want definite, specific, fair rules of the game. It is quite clear if we did not have fair rules in sports, such as football, the game would become a savage struggle on the gridiron. It is equally clear that if we do not have fair rules in trade and commerce, competition is by nature such that no little man, however industrious and efficient, could stay in business, and only the most powerful would survive.

There are those who criticize the Robinson-Patman Act by saying it is indefinite and that even lawyers do not know what it means. We say that the public, and particularly businessmen, know the evil practices which were sought to be prohibited by the act; and the courts have shown that they know the spirit and intent of the letter of the act. To illustrate, section 2 (c) has been litigated to the end and there can be no reasonable doubt in any lawyer's or layman's mind what it means; the courts have unanimously caught its spirit, approved its intent, and have answered all questions as to meaning and constitutionality again and again in their opinions.

In short, the Robinson-Patman Act furthers and fosters genuine competition in trade and business, not by restraining competition, not by protecting competitors instead of competition, but by restraining the exercise of the right to compete, by prohibiting persons from persistently, continuously and systematically engaging in coercive and subversive buying practices which lessen competition, tend to monopoly, and ultimately destroy competition altogether.

VI. ENFORCEMENT

With respect to improved enforcement, we urge the adoption of the recommendation which the Federal Trade Commission has repeatedly made to Congress, namely, that orders under the Clayton Act, as amended, shall become final 60 days after service on the respondent unless court review is sought within that time. In case of review, the order should become final on its affirmation by the circuit court or the Supreme Court.

With respect to enforcement generally, however, it is also very important that Government agencies shall have the heart and will to enforce the law in the public interest, without fear or favor.

VII. CONCLUSION

The facts of the legislative history of the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, its administration and enforcement, prove beyond any reasonable doubt that all of the provisions of that act are a consistent, integral part of, and have marked the greatest advance in the effectuation of the national antitrust policy and in the realization by the American people of their constitutional freedom to engage in trade or business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader would state for the RECORD, and for the benefit of Senators, when he proposes there shall be a call of the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under my proposal of this morning we are now transacting the business of a morning hour. My thought was that when we have concluded the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and the submission of material for the RECORD, the Senate would then adjourn until Monday; that on Monday there would be a call of the calendar, with the usual provision that there shall be considered only measures to which there is no objection, and that following the calendar call the Senate would proceed to the consideration of some of the bills I mentioned yesterday.

The first bill I shall propose to have taken up, and to have made the pending business when the Senate concludes its session this evening, will be Calendar No. 731, Senate bill 987, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.

Immediately following that I shall propose that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 730, House bill 1917, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase.

When those two bills are out of the way, the procedure will depend somewhat on whether the bill which has been mentioned by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is ready so that discussion of it may be started. If not, I shall make an announcement on Monday, before the calendar call, as to what measures it is proposed to take up for the remainder of the week.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF FOUNDING OF CITY OF NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to prior notice to the Senate, and after consultation with the minority leader, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 987, Calendar No. 731. It is the intention to make this bill the unfinished business of the Senate. It is not our intention to proceed with its consideration today, but merely to make it the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 987) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "coinage", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the initial number of such pieces coined shall not be less than one hundred thousand"; and in line 8, after the word "coins", to strike out "Not less than five thousand such coins shall be issued at any one time, and no such coins shall be issued after", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., to be held in June 1954, there shall be coined not to exceed 1 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition, and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for such coinage: *Provided*, That the initial number of such pieces coined shall not be less than 100,000.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date 1953, shall be legal tender to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of the city of Northampton, Mass., or its duly authorized agent, upon the payment by it of the par value of such coins. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium, and the net proceeds from the disposition of such coins shall be used for such purposes related to the observance of such tercentennial celebration as the city of Northampton, Mass., shall direct.

SEC. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the processes of coinage, providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall so far as applicable apply to the coinage herein authorized.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in connection with the bill now before the Senate, I wish to submit an amendment and have it printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it might be well to have the amendment printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amendment is merely to change "1953" to "1954."

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock meridian.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. Are we to act upon the coinage bill at this time, or is the bill to go over until Monday?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It will go over until Monday. As I previously announced, immediately following the disposition of the pending bill it is my purpose to move the consideration of Calendar No. 730, House bill 1917, and Calendar No. 719, Senate bill 2474, dealing with somewhat similar subjects. The order of procedure will depend somewhat upon whether or not the agricultural bill mentioned by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is ready, and whether, in the meantime, we may wish to dispose of some other bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 11, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 7, 1954:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Albert Cummins Beeson, of California, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 16, 1954, vice Paul L. Styles, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, our Father, may we daily be more mindful of our filial relationship to Thee and more eager to cultivate a fraternal feeling toward all the members of the human family.

We pray that we may be numbered among those who are living and laboring together in the spirit of concord and cooperation, of sympathy and understanding, of amity and peace.

Grant that as the President and the Congress face the great responsibility of formulating and adopting plans and policies for the welfare of our beloved country and the whole world they may have the infallible guidance of Thy divine spirit.

In all our deliberations and decisions may we be conservative without being reactionary, liberal without being radical, and conciliatory without being guilty of the sacrilege of surrendering our devotion to lofty ideals and principles.

May we be resolute and courageous in our determination to safeguard our heritage of freedom and the liberties which we cherish. Show us how we may undergird and strengthen the foundations of our Republic and champion every noble effort that is being made to bring peace and good will among men.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title (H. Con. Res. 184):

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 7, 1954, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 170):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Fred M. Vinson, late the Chief Justice of the United States.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the Supreme Court and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 184 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Members of the United States Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS; and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RAYBURN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort, the Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND; the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON; and the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper anounced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

THE STATE OF THE UNION—ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 251)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the 83d Congress, it is a high honor again to present to the Congress my views on the state of the Union and to recommend measures to advance the security, prosperity, and well-being of the American people.

All branches of this Government—and I venture to say both of our great parties—can support the general objective of the recommendations I make today, for that objective is the building of a stronger America. A nation whose every citizen has good reason for bold hope; where effort is rewarded and prosperity is shared; where freedom expands and peace is secure—that is what I mean by a stronger America. [Applause.]

Toward this objective a real momentum has been developed. We mean to continue that momentum and to increase it. We mean to build a better future for this Nation.

Much for which we may be thankful has happened during the past year.

First of all we are deeply grateful that our sons no longer die on the distant mountains of Korea. [Applause.] Although they are still called from our homes to military service, they are no longer called to the field of battle.

The Nation has just completed the most prosperous year in its history. The damaging effect of inflation on the wages, pensions, salaries, and savings of us all has been brought under control. Taxes have begun to do down. [Applause.] The cost of our Government has been reduced and its work proceeds with some 183,000 fewer employees; [applause] thus the discouraging trend of modern governments toward their own limitless expansion has in our case been reversed. The cost of armaments becomes less oppressive as we near our defense goals; yet we are militarily stronger every day. During the year, creation of the new Cabinet Department of Health, Education, and Welfare symbolized the Government's permanent concern with the human problems of our citizens.

Segregation in the Armed Forces and other Federal activities is on the way out. We have also made progress toward its abolition in the District of Columbia. These are steps in the continuing effort to eliminate interracial difficulty.

Some developments beyond our shores have been equally encouraging. Communist aggression, halted in Korea, continues to meet in Indochina the vigorous resistance of France under the Associated States, assisted by timely aid from our country. In West Germany, in Iran, and in other areas of the world, heartening political victories have been won by the forces of stability and freedom. Slowly but surely, the free world gathers strength. Meanwhile, from behind the Iron Curtain, there are signs that tyranny is in trouble and reminders that its structure is as brittle as its surface is hard. [Applause.]

There has been in fact a great strategic change in the world during the past year. That precious intangible, the initiative, is becoming ours. Our policy, not limited to mere reaction against crises provoked by others, is free to develop along lines of our choice not only abroad, but also at home. As a major theme for American policy during the coming year, let our joint determination be to hold this new initiative and to use it. [Applause.]

We shall use this initiative to promote three broad purposes: First, to protect the freedom of our people; second, to maintain a strong, growing economy; third, to concern ourselves with the human problems of the individual citizen.

Only by real progress toward attainment of these purposes can we be sure that we are on the forward road to a better and a stronger America. All my recommendations today are in furtherance of these three purposes.

I

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

American freedom is threatened so long as the world Communist conspiracy exists in its present scope, power, and hostility. More closely than ever before, American freedom is interlocked with the freedom of other people. In the unity of the free world lies our best chance to reduce the Communist threat without war. In the task of maintaining this unity and strengthening all its parts, the greatest responsibility falls to those who, like ourselves, retain the most freedom and strength.

We shall, therefore, continue to advance the cause of freedom on foreign fronts.

In the Far East, we retain our vital interest in Korea. We have negotiated with the Republic of Korea a mutual security pact which develops our security system for the Pacific. I shall promptly submit it to the Senate for its consent to ratification. We are prepared to meet any renewal of armed aggression in Korea. We shall maintain indefinitely our

bases in Okinawa. I shall ask the Congress to authorize continued material assistance to hasten the successful conclusion of the struggle in Indochina. This assistance will also bring closer the day when the Associated States may enjoy the independence already assured by France. We shall continue military and economic aid to the Nationalist Government of China. [Applause.]

In south Asia profound changes are taking place in free nations which are demonstrating their ability to progress through democratic methods. They provide an inspiring contrast to the dictatorial methods and backward course of events in Communist China. In these continuing efforts, the free peoples of south Asia can be assured of the support of the United States.

In the Middle East, where tensions and serious problems exist, we will show sympathetic and impartial friendship.

In Western Europe our policy rests firmly on the North Atlantic Treaty. It will remain so based as far ahead as we can see. Within its organization, the building of a united European community, including France and Germany, is vital to a free and self-reliant Europe. [Applause.] This will be promoted by the European Defense Community, which offers assurance of European security. With the coming of unity to Western Europe, the assistance this Nation can render for the security of Europe and for the entire free world will be multiplied in effectiveness.

In the Western Hemisphere we shall continue to develop harmonious and mutually beneficial cooperation with our neighbors. Indeed, solid friendship with all our American neighbors is a cornerstone of our entire policy. [Applause.]

In the world as a whole, the United Nations, admittedly still in a state of evolution, means much to the United States. It has given uniquely valuable services in many places where violence threatened. It is the only real world forum where we have the opportunity for international presentation and rebuttal. It is a place where the nations of the world can, if they have the will, take collective action for peace and justice. It is a place where the guilt can be squarely assigned to those who fail to take all necessary steps to keep the peace. The United Nations deserves our continued firm support. [Applause.]

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND TRADE

In the practical application of our foreign policy, we enter the field of foreign assistance and trade.

Military assistance must be continued. Technical assistance must be maintained. Economic assistance can be reduced. [Applause.] However, our economic programs in Korea and in a few other critical places of the world are especially important, and I shall ask Congress to continue support in these particular spots in the next fiscal year.

The forthcoming budget message will propose maintenance of the Presidential power of transferability of all assistance funds and will ask authority to merge these funds with the regular defense funds. It will also propose that the Secretary of Defense have primary responsibility for the administration of foreign military assistance in accordance with the policy guidance provided by the Secretary of State.

The fact that we can now reduce our foreign economic assistance in many areas is gratifying evidence that its objectives are being achieved. By continuing to surpass her prewar levels of economic activity, Western Europe gains self-reliance. Thus our relationship enters a new phase which can bring results beneficial to our taxpayers and our allies alike, if still another step is taken.

This step is the creation of a healthier and freer system of trade and payments within the free world—a system in which our allies can earn their own way and our own economy can continue to flourish. The free world can no longer afford the kinds of arbitrary restraints on trade that have continued ever since the war. [Applause.] On this problem I shall submit to the Congress detailed recommendations, after our Joint Commission on Foreign Economic Policy has made its report.

ATOMIC ENERGY PROPOSAL

As we maintain our military strength during the coming year and draw closer the bonds with our allies, we shall be in an improved position to discuss outstanding issues with the Soviet Union. Indeed, we shall be glad to do so whenever there is a reasonable prospect of constructive results. In this spirit the atomic-energy proposals of the United States were recently presented to the United Nations General Assembly. A truly constructive Soviet reaction will make possible a new start toward an era of peace, and away from the fatal road toward atomic war. [Applause.]

DEFENSE

Since our hope is peace, we owe ourselves and the world a candid explanation of the military measures we are taking to make that peace secure.

As we enter this new year, our military power continues to grow. This power is for our own defense and to deter aggression. We shall not be aggressors, but we and our allies have and will maintain a massive capability to strike back. [Applause.]

Here are some of the considerations in our defense planning:

First, while determined to use atomic power to serve the usages of peace, we take into full account our great and growing number of nuclear weapons and the most effective means of using them against an aggressor if they are needed to preserve our freedom. [Applause.] Our defense will be stronger if, under appropriate security safeguards, we share with our allies certain knowledge of the tactical use of our nuclear weapons. I urge the Congress to provide the needed authority.

Second, the usefulness of these new weapons creates new relationships between men and materials. These new relationships permit economies in the use of men as we build forces suited to our situation in the world today. As will be seen from the budget message on January 21, the airpower of our Navy and Air Force is receiving heavy emphasis. [Applause.]

Third, our Armed Forces must regain mobility of action. Our strategic reserves must be centrally placed and readily deployable to meet sudden aggression against ourselves and our allies.

Fourth, our defense must rest on trained manpower and its most economical and mobile use. A professional corps is the heart of any security organization. It is necessarily the teacher and leader of those who serve temporarily in the discharge of the obligation to help defend the Republic. Pay alone will not retain in the career service of our Armed Forces the necessary numbers of long-term and able personnel. I strongly urge, therefore, a more generous use of tradtiional benefits important to service morale. Among these are more adequate living quarters and family housing units, and medical care for dependents.

Studies of military manpower have just been completed by the National Security Training Commission and a committee appointed by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Evident weaknesses exist in the state of readiness and organization of our reserve forces. Measures to correct these weaknesses will be later submitted to the Congress.

Fifth, the ability to convert swiftly from partial to all-out mobilization is imperative to our security. For the first time, mobilization officials know what the requirements are for 1,000 major items needed for military uses. These data, now being reduced to civilian requirements and our supply potential, will show us the gaps in our mobilization base. Thus we shall have more realistic plant-expansion and stockpiling goals. We shall speed their attainment. [Applause.] This Nation is at last to have an up-to-date mobilization base—the foundation of a sound defense program.

Another part of this foundation is, of course, our continental transport system. Some of our vital heavy materials come increasingly from Canada. Indeed our relations with Canada, happily always close, involve more and more the unbreakable ties of strategic interdependence. [Applause.] Both nations now need the St. Lawrence seaway for security as well as for economic reasons. [Applause.] I urge the Congress promptly to approve our participation in its construction. [Applause.]

Sixth, military and nonmilitary measures for continental defense are being strengthened. In the current fiscal year we are allocating to these purposes an increasing portion of our effort, and in the next fiscal year, we shall spend nearly a billion dollars more for them than in 1953.

An indispensable part of our continental security is our civil-defense effort. This will succeed only as we have the complete cooperation of State governors, city mayors, and voluntary citizen groups. With their help, we can advance a cooperative program which, if an attack should come, would save many lives and lessen destruction.

The defense program recommended in the 1955 budget is consistent with all of

the considerations that I have just discussed. It is based on a new military program unanimously recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and approved by me following consideration by the National Security Council. This new program will make and keep America strong in an age of peril. Nothing should bar its attainment. [Applause.]

The international and defense policies which I have outlined will enable us to negotiate from a position of strength as we hold our resolute course toward a peaceful world. We turn now to matters which are more naturally characterized as domestic, well realizing that what we do abroad affects every problem at home—from the amount of taxes to our very state of mind.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Under the standards established for the new employee-security program more than 2,200 employees have been separated from the Federal Government. Our national security demands that the investigation of new employees and the evaluation of derogatory information respecting present employees be expedited and concluded at the earliest possible date. [Applause.] I shall recommend that the Congress provide additional funds where necessary to speed these important procedures.

From the special employment standards of the Federal Government I turn now to a matter relating to American citizenship. The subversive character of the Communist Party in the United States has been clearly demonstrated in many ways, including court proceedings. We should recognize by law a fact that is plain to all thoughtful citizens—that we are dealing here with actions akin to treason—that when a citizen knowingly participates in the Communist conspiracy he no longer holds allegiance to the United States. [Applause.]

I recommend that Congress enact legislation to provide that a citizen of the United States who is convicted in the courts of hereafter conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence be treated as having, by such act, renounced his allegiance to the United States and forfeited his United States citizenship. [Applause.]

In addition, the Attorney General will soon appear before your committees to present his recommendations for needed additional legal weapons with which to combat subversion in our country and to deal with the question of claimed immunity.

II

STRONG ECONOMY

I come now to the second great purpose of our Government: Along with the protection of freedom, the maintenance of a strong and growing economy.

The American economy is one of the wonders of the world. It undergirds our international position, our military security, and the standard of living of every citizen. This administration is determined to keep our economy strong and to keep it growing.

At this moment, we are in transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. I am confident that we can complete this transition without serious interruption in our economic growth. But we shall not leave this vital matter to chance. Economic preparedness is fully as important to the Nation as military preparedness.

Subsequent special messages and the economic report on January 28 will set forth economic plans of the administration and its recommendations for congressional action. These will include: Flexible credit and debt management policies; tax measures to stimulate consumer and business spending; suitable lending, guaranteeing, insuring and grant-in-aid activities; strengthened old age and unemployment insurance measures; improved agricultural programs; public works plans laid well in advance; enlarged opportunities for international trade and investment. This enumeration of these subjects only faintly hints at the vast amount of study, coordination and planning, to say nothing of authorizing legislation, that altogether make our economic preparedness complete.

If new conditions arise that require additional administrative or legislative action, the administration will still be ready. A government always ready, as this is, to take well-timed and vigorous action, and a business community willing, as ours is, to plan boldly and with confidence, can between them develop a climate assuring steady economic growth. [Applause.]

THE BUDGET

I shall submit to the Congress on January 21 the first budget prepared by this administration. It will be for the period July 1, 1954, through June 1955.

This budget is adequate to the current needs of the Government. It recognizes that a Federal budget should be a stabilizing factor in the economy. Its tax and expenditure programs will foster individual initiative and economic growth.

Pending the transmittal of my budget message, I shall mention here only a few points about our budgetary situation.

First, one of our initial acts last winter was to revise, with the cooperation of the Congress, the budget prepared before this administration took office. Requests for new appropriations were greatly reduced. In addition, the spending level provided in that budget for the current fiscal year has been reduced by about $7 billion. In the next fiscal year we estimate a further reduction in expenditures of more than $5 billion. This will reduce the spending level over the 2 fiscal years by more than $12 billion. [Applause.] We are also reducing further our requests for new appropriations.

Second, despite the substantial loss of revenue in the coming fiscal year, resulting from tax reductions now in effect and tax adjustments which I shall propose, our reduced spending will move the new budget closer to a balance.

Third, by keeping new appropriation requests below estimated revenues, we continue to reduce the tremendous accumulation of unfinanced obligations incurred by the Government under past appropriations.

Fourth, until these standing claims on our Government's revenues are further reduced, the growth in the public debt cannot be entirely stopped. Because of this—because the Government's bills have to be paid every month, while the tax money to pay them comes in with great unevenness within the fiscal year—and because of the need for flexibility to manage our enormous debt, I find it necessary to renew my request for an increase in the statutory debt limit.

TAXES

The new budget provides for a lower level of taxation than has prevailed in preceding years. Six days ago individual income taxes were reduced and the excess-profits tax expired. These tax reductions are justified only because of the substantial reductions we have made and are making in governmental expenditures. As additional reductions in expenditures are brought gradually but surely into sight, further reductions in taxes can and will be made. When budget savings and sound governmental financing are assured, tax burdens should be reduced so that taxpayers may spend their own money in their own way. [Applause.]

While we are moving toward lower levels of taxation we must thoroughly revise our whole tax system. The groundwork for this revision has already been laid by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, in close consultation with the Department of the Treasury. We should now remove the more glaring tax inequities, particularly on small taxpayers; reduce restraints on the growth of small business; and make other changes that will encourage initiative, enterprise, and production. Twenty-five recommendations toward these ends will be contained in my Budget Message. [Applause.]

Without attempting to summarize these manifold reforms, I can here illustrate their tendency. For example, we propose more liberal tax treatment for dependent children who work, for widows or widowers with dependent children, and for medical expenses. For the business that wants to expand or modernize its plant, we propose liberalized tax treatment of depreciation, research and development expenses, and retained earnings. [Applause.]

Because of the present need for revenue the corporation income tax should be kept at the current rate of 52 percent for another year; the excise taxes scheduled to be reduced on April 1, including those on liquor, tobacco, gasoline, and automobiles, should be continued at existing rates.

Immediate extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 is also needed to eliminate excessive profits and to prevent waste of public funds in the purchase of defense materials.

AGRICULTURE

The well-being of our 160 million people demands a stable and prosperous agriculture. Conversely, every farmer knows he cannot prosper unless all America prospers. As we seek to promote increases in our Nation's standard of living, we must be sure that the farmer fairly shares in that increase. Therefore, a farm program promoting stability

and prosperity in all elements of our agriculture is urgently needed.

Agricultural laws now in effect successfully accomplished their wartime purpose of encouraging maximum production of many crops. Today, production of these crops at such levels far exceeds present demand. Yet the laws encouraging such production are still in effect. The storage facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation bulge with surplus stocks of dairy products, wheat, cotton, corn, and certain vegetable oils; and the Corporation's presently authorized borrowing authority—$6,750,000,000—is nearly exhausted. Some products, priced out of domestic markets, and others, priced out of world markets, have piled up in Government hands. In a world in which millions of people are hungry, destruction of food would be unconscionable. Yet surplus stocks continue to threaten the market, and in spite of the acreage controls authorized by present law, surpluses will continue to accumulate.

We confront two alternatives. The first is to impose still greater acreage reductions for some crops and apply rigid Federal controls over the use of the diverted acres. This will regiment the production of every basic agricultural crop. It will place every producer of those crops under the domination and control of the Federal Government in Washington. This alternative is contrary to the fundamental interests, not only of the farmer, but of the Nation as a whole; neither is it a real solution to the problem facing us.

The second alternative is to permit the market price for these agricultural products gradually to have a greater influence on the planning of production by farmers, while continuing the assistance of the Government. This is the sound approach. To make it effective, surpluses existing when the new program begins must be insulated from the normal channels of trade and devoted to special uses. These uses would include school-lunch programs, disaster relief, emergency assistance to foreign friends, and of particular importance the stockpiling of reserves for national emergencies. [Applause.]

Building on the agricultural laws of 1948 and 1949, we should establish a price-support program with enough flexibility to attract the production of needed supplies of essential commodities and to stimulate the consumption of those commodities that are flooding American markets. Transition to modernized parity must be accomplished gradually. In no case should there be an abrupt downward change in the dollar level or in the percentage level of price supports.

Next Monday, I shall transmit to the Congress my detailed recommendations embodying this approach. They have been developed through the cooperation of innumerable individuals vitally interested in agriculture. My special message on Monday will briefly describe the consultative and advisory processes to which this whole program has been subjected during the past 10 months.

I have chosen this farm program because it will build markets, protect the consumers' food supply, and move food into consumption instead of into storage. It is a program that will remove the threat to the farmer of these overhanging surpluses, a program, also, that will stimulate production when a commodity is scarce and encourage consumption when nature is bountiful. Moreover, it will promote the individual freedom, responsibility, and initiative which distinguish American agriculture. And by helping our agriculture achieve full parity in the market it promises our farmers a higher and steadier financial return over the years than any alternative plan. [Applause.]

CONSERVATION

Part of our Nation's precious heritage is its natural resources. It is the common responsibility of Federal, State, and local governments to improve and develop them, always working in the closest harmony and partnership.

All Federal conservation and resource development projects are being reappraised. Sound projects now under way will be continued. New projects in which the Federal Government has a part must be economically sound, with local sharing of cost wherever appropriate and feasible. In the next fiscal year work will be started on 23 projects that meet these standards. The Federal Government will continue to construct and operate economically sound flood control, power, irrigation, and water supply projects wherever these projects are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, and consistent with the needs of the whole Nation.

Our conservation program will also take into account the important role played by farmers in protecting our soil resources. I recommend enactment of legislation to strengthen agricultural conservation and upstream flood-prevention work, and to achieve a better balance with major flood-control structures in the downstream areas. [Applause.]

Recommendations will be made from time to time for the adoption of:

A uniform and consistent water resources policy;

A revised public lands policy; and

A sound program for safeguarding the domestic production of critical and strategic metals and minerals.

In addition we shall continue to protect and improve our national forests, parks, monuments, and other natural and historic sites, as well as our fishery and wildlife resources. I hope that pending legislation to improve the conservation and management of publicly owned grazing lands in national forests will soon be approved by the Congress.

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

To protect the vital interest of every citizen in a safe and adequate highway system, the Federal Government is continuing its central role in the Federal-aid highway program. So that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half-cent decrease which otherwise will become effective April 1, and will maintain revenues so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken.

When the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations completes its study of the present system of financing highway construction, I shall promptly submit its report for consideration by the Congress and the governors of the States.

POST OFFICE

It is apparent that the substantial savings already made, and to be made, by the Post Office Department cannot eliminate the postal deficit. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress approve the bill now pending in the House of Representatives providing for the adjustment of certain postal rates. To handle the long-term aspects of this, I also recommend that the Congress create a permanent commission to establish fair and reasonable postal rates from time to time in the future.

III

HUMAN PROBLEMS

Along with the protection of freedom and maintenance of a strong and growing economy, this administration recognizes a third great purpose of government—concern for the human problems of our citizens. In a modern industrial society banishment of destitution and cushioning the shock of personal disaster on the individual are proper concerns of all levels of government, including the Federal Government. This is especially true where remedy and prevention alike are beyond the individual's capacity.

LABOR AND WELFARE

Of the many problems in this area, those I shall first discuss are of particular concern to the members of our great labor force, who with their heads, hearts, and hands produce so much of the wealth of our country.

Protection against the hazards of temporary unemployment should be extended to some 6½ millions of workers, including civilian Federal workers, who now lack this safeguard. Moreover, the Secretary of Labor is making available to the States studies and recommendations in the fields of weekly benefits, periods of protection and extension of coverage. The Economic Report will consider the related matter of minimum wages and their coverage.

The Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 is basically a sound law. [Applause.] However, 6 years of experience have revealed that in some respects it can be improved. On January 11, I shall forward to the Congress suggestions for changes designed to reinforce the basic objectives of the act.

Our basic social security program, the old-age and survivors insurance system, to which individuals contribute during their productive years and receive benefits based on previous earnings, is designed to shield them from destitution. Last year I recommended extension of the social insurance system to include more than 10 million additional persons. I ask that this extension soon be accomplished. [Applause.] This and other major improvements in the insurance system will bring substantial benefit increases and broaden the membership of

the insurance system, thus diminishing the need for Federal grants-in-aid for such purposes. A new formula will therefore be proposed, permitting progressive reduction in such grants as the need for them declines.

Federal grants-in-aid welfare programs, now based on widely varying formulas, should be simplified. Concrete proposals on 14 of them will be suggested to the appropriate committees.

The program for rehabilitation of the disabled especially needs strengthening. Through special vocational training, this program presently returns each year some 60,000 handicapped individuals to productive work. Far more disabled people can be saved each year from idleness and dependence if this program is gradually increased. [Applause.] My more detailed recommendations on this and the other social-insurance problems I have mentioned will be sent to the Congress on January 14.

HEALTH

I am flatly opposed to the socialization of medicine. [Applause.] The great need for hospital and medical services can best be met by the initiative of private plans. But it is unfortunately a fact that medical costs are rising and already impose severe hardships on many families. The Federal Government can do many helpful things and still avoid the socialization of medicine.

The Federal Government should encourage medical research in its battle with such mortal diseases as cancer and heart ailments, and should continue to help the States in their health and rehabilitation programs. The present Hospital Survey and Construction Act should be broadened in order to assist in the development of adequate facilities for the chronically ill. Moreover we should encourage the construction of diagnostic centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes. The war on disease also needs a better working relationship between Government and private initiative. Private and nonprofit hospital and medical insurance plans are already in the field, soundly based on the experience and initiative of the people in their various communities. A limited Government reinsurance service would permit the private and nonprofit insurance companies to offer broader protection to more of the many families which want and should have it. On January 18, I shall forward to the Congress a special message presenting this administration's health program in detail.

EDUCATION

Youth—our greatest resource—is being seriously neglected in a vital respect. The Nation as a whole is not preparing teachers or building schools fast enough to keep up with the increase in our population.

The preparation of teachers as, indeed, the control and direction of public education policy, is a State and local responsibility. [Applause.] However, the Federal Government should stand ready to assist States which demonstrably cannot provide sufficient school buildings. In order to appraise the needs, I hope that this year a conference on education will be held in each State, culminating in a national conference. From these conferences on education, every level of government—from the Federal Government to each local school board—should gain the information with which to attack this serious problem.

HOUSING

The details of a program to enlarge and improve the opportunities for our people to acquire good homes will be presented to the Congress by special message on January 25.

This program will include:

Modernization of the home mortgage insurance program of the Federal Government;

Redirection of the present system of loans and grants-in-aid to cities for slum clearance and redevelopment;

Extension of the advantages of insured lending to private credit engaged in this task of rehabilitating obsolete neighborhoods;

Insurance of long-term, mortgage loans, with small down payment for low-income families [applause]; and, until alternative programs prove more effective, continuation of the public housing program adopted in the Housing Act of 1949. [Applause.]

If the individual, the community, the State and Federal Governments will alike apply themselves to the purpose, no good American family should honestly have to be ashamed of its home.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The internal reorganization of the Veterans' Administration is proceeding with my full approval. When completed, it will afford a single agency whose services, including medical facilities, will be better adapted to the needs of those 20 million veterans to whom this Nation owes so much.

SUFFRAGE

My few remaining recommendations all relate to a basic right of our citizens—that of being represented in the decisions of the Government.

I hope that the States will cooperate with the Congress in adopting uniform standards in their voting laws that will make it possible for our citizens in the Armed Forces overseas to vote. [Applause.]

In the District of Columbia, the time is long overdue for granting national suffrage to its citizens [applause] and also applying the principle of local self-government to the Nation's Capital. I urge the Congress to move promptly in this direction and also to revise District revenue measures to provide needed public works improvements.

The people of Hawaii are ready for statehood. [Applause.] I renew my request for this legislation in order that Hawaii may elect its State officials and its representatives in Washington along with the rest of the country this fall.

For years our citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 have, in time of peril, been summoned to fight for America. They should participate in the political process that produces this fateful summons. I urge Congress to propose to the States a constitutional amendment permitting citizens to vote when they reach the age of 18. [Applause.]

CONCLUSION

I want to add one final word about the general purport of these many recommendations which are not in any sense exclusive. Others will from time to time be submitted to the Congress.

Our Government's powers are wisely limited by the Constitution; but quite apart from those limitations, there are things which no government can do or should try to do.

A government can strive, as ours is striving, to maintain an economic system whose doors are open to enterprise and ambition—those personal qualities on which economic growth largely depends. But enterprise and ambition are qualities which no government can supply. Fortunately no American Government need concern itself on this score; our people have these qualities in good measure.

A government can sincerely strive for peace, as ours is striving, and ask its people to make sacrifices for the sake of peace. But no government can place peace in the hearts of foreign rulers; so it is our duty then to ourselves and to freedom itself to remain strong in all those ways—spiritual, economic, military—that will give us maximum safety against the possibility of aggressive action by others.

No government can inoculate its people against the fatal materialism that plagues our age. Happily, our people, though blessed with more material goods than any people in history, have always reserved their first allegiance to the kingdom of the spirit, which is the true source of that freedom we value above all material things.

But a government can try, as ours tries, to sense the deepest aspirations of the people, and to express them in political action at home and abroad. So long as action and aspiration humbly and earnestly seek favor in the sight of the Almighty, there is no end to America's forward road; there is no obstacle on it she will not surmount in her march toward a lasting peace in a free and prosperous world. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order: The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I know that many Members would like to know what program there may be for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. As was indicated by the President, it is expected that on Monday he will send two messages of considerable importance to the Congress. Those messages will be read. On Monday, it is my intention to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over from Monday to Thursday. So far as next week is concerned, there are no rules out of the Committee on Rules at the present time which might be called up on the floor for action. I know of no important legislative business for next week. That, of course, does not preclude the possibility of some noncontroversial matters being taken care of; and, of course, anything of that nature would be taken up only after consultation with the leadership on the minority side.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Republican conference is scheduled for 3 o'clock this afternoon in the House Chamber.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next for 15 minutes, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, and also to revise and extend his remarks and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SHAFER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING in three instances.

Mr. MCDONOUGH.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 11, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1108. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and supplementary acts, and title I, sections 5 and 9, of the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935, as amended by the act of August 14, 1946, authorizing payments to States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations, pursuant to the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, approved July 5, 1952, the Purnell Act, approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 972), and the Adams Act, approved March 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 64); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1109. A letter from the chairman, Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, relative to a report on its study and appraisal of crime and law enforcement at the beginning of each regular session of Congress, pursuant to title IV, section 401 (c) of an act to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia, approved June 29, 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1110. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to the request contained in House Concurrent Resolution 108 for a report to the Congress of recommendations for such legislation as may be necessary to free the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin, among others, from Federal supervision and control and from all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1111. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a report of the claims paid by the Post Office Department, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act during the fiscal year 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GAMBLE: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Third annual report of the activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production. (Rept. No. 1097). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5529. A bill to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., the most important historic properties relating to the battles of Manassas, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1099). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 7054. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 7055. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department, beginning January 1, 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7056. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 7057. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to transfer, exchange, and dispose of land in the Eden project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 7058. A bill to provide for the deduction by a divorced husband of certain payments for the support of minor children, for the reduction of the exemptions claimed by the divorced wife in such cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7059. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of public-school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 7060. A bill to amend section 344 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which relates to cotton-acreage allotments to farms; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 7061. A bill to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7062. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1944, which regulates the placement of children in family homes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 7063. A bill to amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act with respect to the definition of the term "labor dispute"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 7064. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 7065. A bill to amend section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 7066. A bill to provide additional safeguards to assure the safety of persons carried for hire on motorboats not more than 65 feet in length; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7067. A bill to amend further the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," relative to the jurisdictional amount that may be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined and paid by claims commissions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7068. A bill to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 7069. A bill for protection of Anaheim Bay area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 7070. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a multi-purpose project at the Rocky Reach site on the Columbia River, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. J. Res. 339. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to assure the equal application thereof to individuals of both sexes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution designating the month of September 1955 as John Marshall Bicentennial Month, and creating a commission to supervise and direct the observance of such month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the right of citizens of the United States 18 years of age or older to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. J. Res. 342. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the right of citizens of the United States 18 years of age or older to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the return of 944 American prisoners of war who have not been accounted for by the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Res. 399. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate charitable contributions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. Res. 400. Resolution providing funds for the operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7071. A bill for the relief of Bruno Romeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 7072. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Sbuttoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7073. A bill for the relief of Irving I. Erdheim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 7074. A bill for the relief of Gertrud H. Schoetz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 7075. A bill for the relief of Sergio J. Veira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 7076. A bill for the relief of Colin D. Burgess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 7077. A bill for the relief of Frances Palermo Conti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 7078. A bill for the relief of Gudrum Noback Slaughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7079. A bill for the relief of Carmen Vartagnan Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7080. A bill for the relief of Bartolomeo Montalto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7081. A bill for the relief of Frances Palermo Conti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 7082. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Jonathan Jones; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 7083. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mercede; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Luther Rose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7085. A bill for the relief of Brigida Valiquet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7086. A bill for the relief of Malvina Raphael David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7087. A bill for the relief of Gisela Ilse Beyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cazzato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 7089. A bill for the relief of Ryon Gzoon Chough and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7090. A bill for the relief of James Neville Beaton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Richardson Beane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7092. A bill for the relief of Kuo-Yen Ai, Mrs. Josephine Yueh-Li Ai, and Rosemary Patricia (Melba) Ai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 7093. A bill for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7094. A bill for the relief of Nicola Quaranto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7095. A bill for the relief of Silvio Svagna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 7096. A bill for the relief of Serpouhie Gulezian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 7097. A bill for the relief of Alina Kosmider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 7098. A bill for the relief of James Arthur Malcolm Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7099. A bill for the relief of Eugene Spitzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 7100. A bill for the relief of Irenka Petravanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7101. A bill for the relief of Gloria Fan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

455. Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin presented a resolution by members of the Wisconsin State Horticultural Society in annual meeting at Fond du Lac, Wis., November 17, 1953, opposing any fundamental changes in our present pesticide laws as covered in the so-called Delaney bills and favoring procedure as outlined in the Miller bill, H. R. 4277, which provides adequate protection for the consumer without setting up impossible standards for the producer of fruits and vegetables, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mrs. Walter R. Tuckerman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Friday a great many persons in this area were saddened to learn of the passing of Mrs. Walter R. Tuckerman. This is a great personal loss to me, a real friend of many years—great of heart and mind; loyalty was one of her finest attributes.

Mrs. Tuckerman was known to thousands in the District of Columbia and throughout the Nation, for she was one of the leaders in the social, cultural, and charitable life of the Nation's Capital. She was an indefatigable worker in the many varied interests in which she participated. For 20 years she was a member of the executive committee of the Washington Committee for the Cathedral of Saints Peter and Paul. She was also a member of All Hallows' Guild, the Garden Guild of the Cathedral, of which she was president for 12 years.

In both World Wars Mrs. Tuckerman was active in war work and for this she received many decorations from foreign governments.

She was intensely interested in the preservation of our historic houses and was vice chairman of the first committee organized in the District for the restoration of Stratford, the Lee birthplace.

One of her earliest interests was writing, and she was the author of several books and plays, as well as a number of short articles and poems in magazines and papers.

Mrs. Tuckerman will be sorely missed by everyone who ever knew her. It was always a joy to talk with her. She was so alert and so well-informed of the problems of the day, and so solicitous for those who called upon her for assistance.

In addition to her devoted husband, Mrs. Tuckerman is survived by 5 daughters. To them in their great sorrow go the deep sympathy and condolences of all of us. Her passing is a great loss to the community and to the Nation.

Accent on Immunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1954

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6899 is a consolidated bill providing for the granting of immunity to witnesses who plead their fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination before congressional committees, Federal courts, or Federal grand juries. The bill differs from other pending legislation in that it gives the Attorney General absolute control over immunity grants to witnesses before congressional committees, as well as over grants in court and grand jury proceedings. This is in accord with the position strongly taken by the Attorney General in recent public statements on the subject.

I have consolidated these two measures, immunity grants for witnesses in congressional proceedings and in the Federal court system, because the only thing which made it necessary to treat them separately was the difference in power accorded to the Attorney General. I feel very strongly that there should be no such difference. The Attorney General, as the chief law enforcement officer of the United States, should have the same absolute control over immunity grants proposed by Congress as he would have over grants to be made in courtrooms and before grand juries. I recognize the possibility that embarrassing situations may arise from vesting such power in the Attorney General with respect to Congress. But the need for control seems to me to outweigh this risk.

Immunity grants are necessary to get at the truth in two very intricate fields: the empires of organized crime and the activities of subversives and Communist conspirators. Both these groups are clever, tough, and very devious in their modes of operation. Only the Attorney General, directly in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the enforcement efforts of his United States attorneys, can possibly have access to all the facts about witnesses in these categories. Only he can tell whether evidence has been painstakingly collected, and whether a prosecution is about to be launched against some hoodlum or saboteur, when the congressional committee comes along with a proposal to hand out immunity. Only he can fairly weigh the possible value of the testimony that could be elicited from the witness against the importance of the crimes which might be exonerated.

I still have some misgivings about this whole immunity device. I think we should not lose sight of the fact that in every case it amounts to buying testimony from a witness in return for a blanket pardon from crimes he has actually committed. That looks like a questionable bargain most of the time. But, in any event, if we are going to go ahead and make such bargains with wrongdoers, it is absolutely imperative that we do not do so blindly. And the only Federal officer who can avoid that is the Attorney General.

This consolidated bill retains the other safeguards which have been developed by Congress in recent considerations of this problem, such as the requirement that immunity can only be granted by a congressional committee after approval of two-thirds of the committee's membership, including at least two members of each of the two major political parties represented on the committee; the limitation that immunity shall only be accorded to a witness who has pleaded the privilege and thereafter answered the questions under compulsion; and the exclusion of prosecutions for perjury and contempt committed by the witness during the course of otherwise immune testimony.

Under leave granted, a copy of the proposed bill is attached, followed by an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle:

A bill to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and to grant immunity from prosecution in connection therewith

Be it enacted, etc., That title 18, United States Code, section 3486, is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 3486. Compelled testimony tending to incriminate witnesses; immunity

"(a) No witness shall be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other records or documents before either House, or before any committee of either House, or before any joint committee of the two Houses of Congress on the ground that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture, when the record shows that the Attorney General has adjudged the testimony of such witness or the production of such evidence to be necessary to the public interest and —

"(1) in the case of proceedings before one of the Houses of Congress, that a majority of the Members present of that House, or

"(2) in the case of proceedings before a committee, that two-thirds of the members of the full committee, including at least two members of each of the two political parties having the largest representation on such committee,

shall by affirmative vote have authorized such witness to be granted immunity under this section with respect to the transactions, matters, or things concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify by direction of the presiding officer or the chair. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is so compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Attorney General the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other records or documents by any witness, in any case or proceedings before any grand jury or court of the United States, is necessary to the public interest, such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other records or documents on the ground that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise.

"(c) The judgment of the Attorney General that any testimony or the production of any books, papers, or other records or documents is necessary to the public interest shall be confirmed by him in a written communication addressed to the House of Congress, committee, grand jury or court of the United States concerned, and shall be made a part of the record of the hearing, case or proceeding in which such testimony or evidence is given.

"(d) No witness shall be exempt under any provision of this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this section."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "3486. Testimony before Congress; immunity" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "3486. Compelled testimony tending to incriminate witness; immunity."

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle]

ACCENT ON IMMUNITY

If assurance of immunity from prosecution will gain more cooperation from witnesses at congressional hearings, Representative KENNETH B. KEATING has a sound proposal to prevent abuse of the privilege.

He himself believes that grants of immunity are necessary to get at the truth in the "intricate fields" of organized crime and Communist subversion. The bill he has just introduced in Congress provides, first, for approval of the grant by a two-thirds vote of the committee concerned, and final approval by the Department of Justice.

Communists and racketeers are, as he says, "clever, tough, and very devious in their modes of operation. Only the Attorney General, directly in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the enforcement efforts of his United States attorneys, possibly can have access to all the facts about witnesses in these categories." There can be no quarrel with that reasoning, if Congress is willing to defer to the executive branch of Government. What has to be proved is to what extent fear of prosecution is responsible for the present popular practice of hiding behind the fifth amendment.

It seems probable that some resistance to questioning can be charged to a change in the character of the congressional investigation. The traditional purpose is to summon witnesses for information upon which to write new legislation or to learn how existing laws are operating. It has been possible to get that information in the past without turning the inquiry into a trial and the witness into a suspect, with the committee acting as judge, prosecutor, and jury.

The unresolved question is whether today's witnesses fear prosecution so much as they resent persecution. But nevertheless, Mr. KEATING'S proposal has value.

We've Come a Long Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1954

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's state of the Union message provides many graphic evidences of how very far the Nation has progressed in the 12 months of Republican administration in terms of sound political philosophy and governmental policy.

That progress must not be obscured by impatience over progress which still needs to be made or by the inevitable honest disagreements, even among Republicans, over how that future progress is to be best achieved.

Progress, to be truly gaged, must be measured in terms of how far we have come from the starting point as well as how far we still have to go. It is worth while reviewing some of the highlights of Mr. Eisenhower's message on the basis of how far the Nation has come during the past year.

First. Mr. Eisenhower defined the objective of tax reductions already made, and in prospect, as being that of enabling taxpayers to spend their own money in their own way. Think how far removed that is from the philosophy of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect. And think how completely that reverses the openly avowed New Deal purpose to use the taxing power to redistribute wealth.

Second. Mr. Eisenhower, in his message, asked for legislation to strip American citizenship from those who are "convicted in the courts of hereafter conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence." Think how far removed that is from President Roosevelt's "some of my best friends are Communists" and President Truman's glib references to American communism as a bugaboo and red herring.

Third. Mr. Eisenhower flatly rejected any farm plan which would "regiment the production of every basic agricultural crop" and "place every producer of those crops under the domination and control of the Federal Government." Think how far removed that position is from Brannanism—which demanded that Congress impose just such socialistic controls on agriculture.

Fourth. Mr. Eisenhower reported that foreign economic assistance can be reduced, that the airpower of our Navy and Air Force is receiving heavy emphasis in defense planning, and that our Armed Forces must regain maximum mobility of action. Think of the contrast of these policies with the Truman-Acheson-Marshall program, which sought unlimited authority to disperse American economic resources and manpower—in terms of ground forces, primarily—all over the world.

Fifth. Mr. Eisenhower, citing reductions in Government expenditures, payrolls, and taxes, declared that "the discouraging trend of modern governments toward their own limitless expansion has in our case been reversed." Think how far removed this is from the record of limitless expansion of Government in the 18 out of 20 years prior to the Eisenhower administration in which New Deal Democrats controlled both executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Sixth. Mr. Eisenhower described the Taft-Hartley law as basically sound. Contrast this with Mr. Truman's veto of this law, his refusal to use it in a grave emergency, and his constant rabble-rousing attacks on it as a slave-labor law.

Seventh. Mr. Eisenhower pointed out that "our Government's powers are wisely limited by the Constitution; but quite apart from those limitations, there are things which no government can do or should try to do. Enterprise and ambition are qualities which no government can supply." Think how far removed this philosophy is from the 20-year New Deal record of deliberately cultivated reliance upon Government and persistent encroachment upon constitutional limitations on Government which culminated in Mr. Truman's illegal seizure of private property.

Eighth. Consider, finally, the restored dignity of the Presidency and the enhanced respect for all branches of the Federal Government under Mr. Eisenhower—with no demands for must legislation, no attacks on Congress, a co-equal branch of Government, no attempted purges of opponents, and no personal vendettas against American citizens or groups of citizens.

Yes; we have truly come a long way in the past 12 months.

An Economy Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1954

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from the Reno (Nev.) State Journal and the Lynchburg (Va.) News in support of a proposed amendment to the Constitution to permit executive disapproval of specific items in general appropriation bills.

There has been much discussion over the course of the years concerning this problem. It is not a partisan matter. Every President in the last 50 years or so has made the same complaint, that he is often forced to sign into law bills calling for the expenditure of funds which he does not approve. If he refuses to sign, he runs the risk of depriving the particular department or agency entirely of the wherewithal with which to operate.

At least 39 of our States permit their governors to veto separate items, and in some cases, simply to reduce an item.

It is true that the power of the purse lies in the Congress and should be jealously guarded. It is equally true that, at times, appropriations are voted for expenditures that are not warranted, many of them for worthy purposes, but which could be eliminated or deferred.

The dollar is our first line of defense. Unless we have the courage and the self-control to protect its value and its buying power, we have lost the very economic system which we are fighting to save. Our power to resist Communist forces abroad will be fatally undermined if we fail to preserve a basically sound economy here at home.

To do this will require great sacrifices on the part of each one of us.

To do this and to make a real effort to reduce governmental expenditures Congress should be buttressed by power in the President to eliminate individual items which he feels are unwise, or, at least, deferrable. Today that power does not exist. The President must accept or reject the complete bill in its entirety. He is often faced with a dilemma. He is practically forced to sign an appropriation bill. Otherwise he leaves an important Government department without funds. But he is frequently compelled to approve individual items in the bill he would never sanction if they were incorporated in separate legislation.

I appreciate the fact that adoption of this proposal for a constitutional amendment could not be effective to help our immediate situation due to the fact that ratification by the required number of States would take substantial time. I see no prospect, however, except that this will be a continuing problem. The sooner we come to grips with it, the better.

To accomplish real economy in Government operation requires the full cooperation of both the executive and legislative branches of our Government. The President has voiced a sincere plea for strict economy. Congress should not deny him any weapon he can employ to bring about drastic reductions in nondefense, nonessential spending. We should open up our anti-inflation, pro-tax-cut arsenal by prompt enactment of legislation to enable the President to disapprove individual expenditures in appropriations bills.

In addition to House Joint Resolution 43 proposing a constitutional amendment, I have also introduced House Resolution 484 which would amend a basic act passed in 1842 by providing that for the purpose of the Executive veto, each separate item appropriating money shall be considered a bill within the meaning of the Constitution.

Whether the necessary approach to this problem is by the constitutional amendment route is a debatable point. I lean toward the view that amendment to the Constitution is necessary. There can be little dispute, however, it seems to me, over the proposition that we should set out at once down one or the other of these alternative roads toward fiscal reform. If a constitutional amendment is necessary, the time element involved furnishes an additional reason for early action.

Opposition to this legislation may be voiced in that it centers too great power in the President. Any step to enlarge Executive authority is certain to be

viewed, and very properly, with some skepticism. Generally speaking, it is the position of many members, including my own position, that curtailment rather than enlargement of Executive powers is desirable. Particularly in the field of appropriations, the Congress has historically been reluctant to yield any part of its control of governmental operations. When we are faced, however, with an operating deficit year after year, greater than the entire cost of running the Federal Government 20 years ago, the time has come for us to reappraise our attitude. Right at this critical moment, it seems to me the most constructive service we could render would be to adopt every reasonable suggestion advanced to cut down the cost of running the Government.

Although as a general principle, I am opposed to the grant of more power to the executive branch of our Government, I think we have reached the point where, on balance, the stern necessities of fiscal solvency should outweigh our concern, proper as it is, for legislative sovereignty.

It is true, of course, that the President might strike out some pet project of an individual member and that action would stand, unless revised by a two-thirds vote. But that is a chance I am prepared to take. I believe that, by and large, the people of this country would prefer to run the hazard that some particular Federal project might be curtailed if they were reassured by the prospect of achieving a substantial overall reduction in spending.

I can think of no single action which the Congress could take which would be more likely to bring about long range and substantial savings of the taxpayers' dollars than to provide for the Executive item veto.

This is our opportunity to prove that we mean what we say about economy and are not rendering lipservice only. Admittedly, from time to time, the item veto will step on congressional toes. Do we have the courage to endure that pain in order to serve the larger good of the entire Nation? I believe we do and that we would be applauded for evidencing that fact.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Reno (Nev.) State Journal of Tuesday, October 6, 1953]

AN ECONOMY PROPOSAL

The proposal to give the President of the United States the power to veto individual items in appropriation bills is likely to come up when Congress meets again. Many Presidents have favored it.

Any Member of Congress who wants to put a brake on wild Government spending would have a strong motive to support it. But will the measure sponsored by Representatives KEATING and BENNETT fare better than its predecessors? With President Eisenhower's public support, it might.

The lack of this presidential power has often made it possible for Congress to force expenditures a President—including Presidents Roosevelt and Truman—would have preferred to avoid. In order to make sure of the essential appropriations contained in a bill and to avoid the often appalling consequences of killing them, Presidents have accepted unwise expenditures and Treasury raids that could hardly be justified.

But a Congress genuinely bent on economy might well deprive its less scrupulous Members of their power of blackmail over the Chief Executive.

But this is not the sort of issue over which voters and taxpayers become emotional. Even those who are aroused over economy in the abstract find it hard to get excited over the mere mechanics of government.

[From the Lynchburg, (Va.) News, September 26, 1953]

ITEM VETO POWER

"At present, when Congress passes a bill to spend money, the President cannot approve just parts of that bill, but must approve it in full or turn it down in full. Should this be changed so that he can turn down some parts of the bill without turning down the entire bill?"

This question was the subject of a recent Gallup poll and, as might be expected, the result was overwhelmingly for such a change, with more articulate expression from the public than is usual in a topic of this legal, technical nature.

Only 13 percent of those interviewed voiced no opinion, in fact, with a bare 24 percent against the change. The description of the survey fails to note any of the reasons given by individual citizens for opposing the change, but our surmise would be such comments as "it would complicate enormously the passage of the bill," "the system has worked well enough nearly 200 years," "it might increase the Executive power over Congress, which is already too great," "it would make even more complex the complex subject of appropriations." None of these comments strike us as particularly valid.

But constitutional experts and students of political science have long contended that elimination of the expensive and often useless little riders attached to huge appropriations bills will save the taxpayer millions and results in better legislation.

Presidents of both parties have expressed the need for an item veto power. Democrats and Republicans alike agree on its desirability, reflecting the nonpartisan nature of the issue. President Eisenhower has expressed the view that it would be of great assistance to him.

How can such a change be brought about? The cure, says Congressmen BENNETT (Democrat, Florida) and KEATING (Republican, New York) is a constitutional amendment which they have drafted. That means a long road ahead, even if the battle isn't strenuous—and it is unlikely that it would be in view of the overwhelming weight of public opinion for the change.

It is interesting to note that the Confederate Constitution provided for an item veto, leading Adlai Stevenson in last year's campaign to remark that the provision was "a classic example of the political genius of the South."

Air Force Academy Should Be Located in Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there is no other location in the United States which offers as many advantages for the adequate training of the future air cadet as southern California. Southern California is tailormade as a location for the new Air Force Academy. It has all of the necessary facilities to properly educate and train the future air cadet.

THE EDUCATION OF THE FUTURE AIR CADET

He will be an important man—that future air cadet. Some day his judgment, his skills, the scope of his thinking may be the decisive factors in determining the Nation's survival.

What kind of man will he be? How shall he be trained?

He should be strong in body, mind, and spirit. He should be soundly schooled in the military sciences. These are basic requirements for any national military leader.

The future air cadet should be familiar with and understand the world in which he lives.

To understand today's complex world, academic training alone is not enough. It must be augmented by direct exposure to the world at work.

The future air cadet will get a high caliber of classroom training at the Air Force Academy no matter where it is located. But only in southern California can he get stimulating firsthand experience in a combination of all the fields—industry, business, finance, engineering, economics, and science.

Only if he is educated in southern California can the future air cadet be equipped to meet the full specifications.

INDUSTRY

In southern California, the future air cadet can learn about the operations of a wide range of successful and significant industries.

More important, he can learn, by direct observation, about the industry which most directly affects him—the aircraft industry. For southern California leads the Nation in airframe assembly and in the production of aircraft parts.

Southern California's aircraft industry will, needless to say, be at the disposal of the future air cadet, no matter where the Air Force Academy is located.

But if the future air cadet receives his education in southern California, that cooperation will be direct and closely integrated. He will develop his understanding of the aircraft industry in close and continuous association with the Nation's most productive pool of aeronautical specialists—designers, engineers, executives, pilots.

He can visit nearby plants—the Nation's largest—and observe the work of these experts. They can come to his campus as guest lecturers and directors of research projects.

Here in southern California the future air cadet can become an active participant in the development of the Nation's airpower.

BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Southern California can provide the future air cadet with dynamic case histories in the fields of business and finance. He can watch business problems as they arise and are solved, in an active, expanding environment.

Because southern California and its people are forward looking, top management throughout the country has migrated here. Today more than 70 well-known business organizations have located their national headquarters in southern California. The chief executive of one of these firms—an organization which does an annual volume nationally of $180 million—said:

"I believe it is possible to put together a better top executive team here in Los Angeles than in any other region of the United States."

Proof of the effectiveness of the region's management skill is the fact that 26 industries in the Los Angeles metropolitan area rank third or higher nationally in value of product.

In southern California the future air cadet can share in management experiences and develop from them a broad and alert understanding of the world of business and finance.

SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

The future air cadet should be familiar with the ultimate findings of science and engineering. It is equally important that he understand the scientific method and the techniques of its application.

In southern California, he can work with technicians and with facilities which will train him at both the theoretical and the applied levels. A continuing and well-rounded program of aeronautical research and development is in progress here. Indicative of its range is the following inventory:

The California Institute of Technology at Pasadena, and the associated Guggenheim Aeronautical Laboratory. Research at these institutions includes studies in aerodynamics, structures, metallurgy, computing techniques, jet propulsion, and heat transfer.

Manufacturing research sponsored by the aircraft and petroleum industries in the fields of radar, pressure and high altitude equipment, guided missiles, jet propulsion equipment, fuels, and lubricants. The level of manufacturing research is indicated by the presence in southern California of such organizations as Aerojet Engineering Corp., AiResearch Manufacturing Co., Schwien Engineering Corp., and the Rand Corp.

Development contracts now being fulfilled by the University of California at Los Angeles and the University of Southern California.

Seminars, group sessions, and technical meetings held by the National Advisory Council for Aeronautics at the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences.

Official proving grounds at Point Mugu, Edwards Field, and Inyokern for guided missiles and aircraft.

Nowhere else could the future air cadet share in the development of so advanced and diversified a program of aeronautical research as is being carried on in southern California. Nowhere else could he draw upon so high a level of personnel and facilities for guest lecturers and joint research projects.

ECONOMICS

Southern California offers the future air cadet a continuous exhibit of the workings of the modern economic scene. The economy of the region is one of great diversification, providing him with the opportunity to understand all phases of the production and consumption of goods and services.

The region is well developed in both manufacturing and distributive activities.

Its manufacturing covers durable and nondurable goods. Plant size ranges from 3,500 plants with fewer than 5 employees to 35 plants with more than 1,000 employees.

Its employment pattern shows a healthy balance between manufacturing and trades and services, with good representation in all the other fields.

In southern California the full story of economic interrelationships can be observed and studied by the future air cadet.

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Southern California contains a concentration of universities and colleges of high academic standards. These include the University of California at Los Angeles and the University of Southern California, both offering complete professional and graduate training; California Institute of Technology, one of America's finest scientific centers; a group of excellent smaller universities, colleges, and technical schools.

Here the future air cadet can receive his academic training in a community which has a tradition for academic achievement and which has attracted to it some of the world's most learned men.

From this academic pool, southern California's distinguished scholars can collaborate as exchange faculty members and guest lecturers in the academic enrichment of the future air cadet.

A TRADITION IN AVIATION

In no other community will the future air cadet find people as air-minded as southern Californians are. Aviation history has been made here, and the community feels closely identified with its progress. This air-mindedness can contribute effectively to the esprit de corps of the Air Force Academy.

A devotion to the tradition of aviation and a dedication to its future are indispensable attributes of the future air cadet. These can be developed in southern California in an exceptionally compatible personal environment. Many of the Nation's foremost plane builders, aeronautical engineers and flyers live and work here. More than 20 well-known aeronautical organizations conduct active programs in southern California. Their members are keenly air-minded, alert to the position of air power in America's future. They will cooperate in the training of the future air cadet.

Southern California's tradition of aeronautic achievement dates back to 1884 when the first glider flight made in the United States occurred here. In 1910 the Nation's first air meet was held at Dominguez Field. Through the years scores of newsworthy events in aviation have occurred in southern California.

In southern California the future air cadet will find that his interests are shared, his problems understood, his future plans supported.

PHYSICAL WELL-BEING

The future air cadet will enjoy, during his training period in southern California, a climate which is both healthful and pleasant. The average temperature over a year's period is 69.6 degrees. Such climate makes its possible for southern Californians to benefit from outdoor activity all year 'round.

The future air cadet will accordingly be able to take part in a recreation and athletic program more continuous and more diversified than would be possible in any other area. Southern California's enthusiastic interest in athletics will provide a stimulating environment for the development of great Air Force Academy teams to rival those at West Point and Annapolis. The Academy's athletic prowess will be sharpened by the presence on the Pacific Coast of strong competitive teams, by the tradition for big games at the Rose Bowl and the Los Angeles Coliseum.

Southern California's recreational pattern is complete—football, basketball, winter sports, swimming, fishing, track and field meets, tennis, golf, ice hockey, polo, riding, baseball, soccer, sailing. All these can contribute to the physical well-being of the future air cadet.

THE STIMULUS OF METROPOLITAN LIFE

The city of Los Angeles is the urban hub of the entire southern California area. Third largest metropolitan area in the country, it offers the future air cadet well-developed facilities—social, cultural, spiritual, recreational. Here he can enjoy the diversified, challenging experiences which only a modern American city can offer.

LOW COSTS

The building and operating of an Air Force Academy can be achieved at lower cost in southern California than in other metropolitan areas.

Construction costs are estimated to be 20 percent less here than elsewhere. Further building economies are possible because no air conditioning need be installed; the heating system need not be a costly one. Once the building is completed, it can be maintained at less cost in southern California than in any other large metropolitan area. This region offers operating advantages in terms of power, fuel, and water.

To a budget-minded Air Force, these savings can be a telling advantage. What the Air Force saves by building and operating its Academy in southern California can be used in the direct training and equipping of the future air cadet and the men he will lead.

THE SPIRIT THAT GETS THINGS DONE

Southern California offers the future air cadet one final—and perhaps most important—advantage. It's an asset that cannot be supported by statistics, but it is nonetheless very real. It is southern California's energetic, resourceful spirit.

It's an attitude which is openminded, ready to experiment. It is a willingness to try a new approach. It is the ability to develop fresh solutions to old problems.

It is what enabled southern California to build a manmade harbor at San Pedro and develop it into one of the Nation's major ports. It is what made it possible for the community to seek out its water supply 250 miles away and bring it in across mountains and deserts so that a great metropolitan area could live and flourish. It is what boomed the west coast's relatively undeveloped aircraft industry into a dynamic arsenal which produced 44 percent of America's warplanes between 1942 and 1945.

It's the spirit that gets things done.

The spirit of southern California generates the vision, drive, and leadership which are indispensable to the future air cadet.

The City of Shreveport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was certainly delighted to learn from the editors of Look magazine that my home city of Shreveport, La., had been named as one of the 11 all-American cities entitled to an award for this honor. This contest, which was sponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine as cosponsors, reviewed the status of 115 other cities throughout the United States. One of the reasons why the city of Shreveport was selected for this award was due to the survey of the Negro community which was conducted in Shreveport by 1,000 white and Negro volunteers. This survey originated by the Shreveport Council of Social Agencies and before the comprehensive project was finished, almost every civic group had cooperated and participated to lend assistance.

The survey dealt with all phases of life among the city's Negro population. This selection of the city of Shreveport was such a coveted honor that undoubtedly it will have the effect of spurring other southern cities to make progress in the direction of removing unlivable quarters from their midst and working out more acceptable programs to take care of the colored population living in their midst.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the recognition which has been given my home city of Shreveport. It is a city of 140,000 people, resting along the banks of a great stream, and is the queen city of the Red River Valley. Its streets are wide and paved and its buildings and people are modern. It is most appropriate that Look magazine and the National Municipal League would give this place of honor to the city of Shreveport.

Another Weapon for the Government's Anticrime Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1954

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7404 is a bill which would give the Federal Government a right of appeal in criminal prosecutions after the court has knocked out evidence on which the Government relies.

This is a part of the crime legislation program in which the section of criminal law of the American Bar Association is deeply interested.

It is a very dangerous mistake for us to go on ignoring the challenges of big-time crime and criminal activity, which affect every community in our land.

This bill only has 18 words but it packs a wallop against the criminals. What it does is to plug an important loophole through which guilty defendants are now escaping. In some types of criminal prosecutions, such as narcotics and stolen property cases, the Government must depend almost entirely on evidence seized at the time of the arrest to win a conviction. If the defense succeeds in obtaining a pretrial order to suppress such evidence, there is no point in going ahead with the trial for all practical purposes. The case is lost before it even begins. At present, the Government has no appeal from this.

H. R. 7404 would permit such appeals. It would thus help save many prosecutions which are now lost by the Government on technicalities without ever reaching a trial on the merits.

The last phrase, "when the defendant has not been put in jeopardy" is necessary to avoid a constitutional difficulty—for the Government cannot appeal from an acquittal, once the trial has commenced.

A copy of the bill is attached:

A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the fifth paragraph of such section (relating to appeal by the United States from the district courts to a court of appeals) the following new paragraph:

"From a decision sustaining a motion to suppress evidence, when the defendant has not been put in jeopardy."

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, from whom all holy desires and all good counsels do proceed, rise mercifully with the morning upon our darkened hearts. In this tragic and tangled world, so willful and divided, we are conscious of our woeful inadequacy to sit in the seats of judgment, to balance the scales of justice, and to respond with equity to the myriad calls of human need. Wilt Thou crown the deliberations of this Chamber with Thy wisdom and with spacious thinking. Lighten the eyes of these Thy servants, who here speak for the Nation, with Thy sympathy for all mankind. As they here face questions which confound fallible human appraisals, quicken in them, we beseech Thee, every noble impulse, and sanctify for Thy glory and for human good their best endeavors. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 7, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 215, 83d Congress, after the adjournment of the Congress, the Speaker appointed Mr. REED, of New York; Mr. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania; Mr. VORYS, of Ohio; Mr. COOPER, of Tennessee; and Mr. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, as members on the part of the House, on the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 249, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 3, 1953, the Speaker had appointed, after the adjournment of Congress, Mr. LATHAM, of New York; Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey; Mr. CELLER, of New York; and Mr. DONOVAN, of New York, to serve with him as members on the part of the House, on the United States Commission for the Bicentennial of Columbia University in the city of New York.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 198, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 3, 1953, the Speaker had appointed, after the adjournment of the Congress, Mr. FORAND, of Rhode Island; Mr. HESELTON, of Massachusetts; Mr. COTTON, of New Hampshire; Mr. SADLAK, of Conecticut; Mr. CARRIGG, of Pennsylvania; Mr. O'BRIEN, of New York; and Mr. HYDE, of Maryland, as members on the part of the House, of the Joint Committee To Participate in the Celebration of the 200th Anniversary of the Congress of 1754, held at Albany, N. Y.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 263, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 3, 1953, the Speaker appointed Mr. POFF and Mr. ROBESON of Virginia as members of the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 109, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 3, 1953, the Speaker appointed, after the adjournment of Congress, Mr. MASON, of Illinois; Mr. DOLLIVER, of Iowa; Mr. OSTERTAG, of New York; Mr. DINGELL, of Michigan; and Mr. HAYS, of Arkansas, as members of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 220, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 3, 1953, the Speaker appointed, after the adjournment of the Congress, Mr. TOWE, of New Jersey; Mr. HARDIE SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, as advisory members of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the authority of section 712 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, the Speaker announced that Mr. WOLCOTT, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, had appointed Mr. SPENCE, of Kentucky, a member of that committee, as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, vice Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, resigned.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 292)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the message from the President relating to agriculture be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 291)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is my proposal that there now be a morning hour, under the customary limitations as to debate. Thereafter, I shall ask for a quorum call, before having a call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

Following the call of the calendar, it will be my purpose, as announced last week, to call up Calendar 731, S. 987, a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.; Calendar 730, H. R. 1917, a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; Calendar 719, S. 2474, a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the founding of the city of New York; and then Calendar 831, S. 2643, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

When action has been completed on Senate bill 2643, whatever time that may take, I shall propose to have taken up Calendar 442, S. 2150, a bill providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp.

Following the completion of action on the St. Lawrence seaway bill, it is proposed to take up Calendar 408, Senate Joint Resolution 1, which is the so-called Bricker amendment.

Thus the Senate may be advised for some period in advance as to the proposed legislative program.

As was attempted to be done in the last session of Congress, I shall constantly keep the minority leader informed in advance of the program the majority has in mind, and I shall also make announcements to the Senate as a whole, so that Senators may make their plans by reason of having advance knowledge of the measures it is intended to consider.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the transaction of routine business as in the morning hour, under the usual limitations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories for the year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON RESEARCH WORK PERFORMED UNDER CONTRACTS OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of research work being performed under contracts or cooperative agreements, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the receipts, expenditures, and work of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Extension Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of November 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, President, National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS ESTABLISHED IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense, for the year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS IN COCOLI, C. Z.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain property transactions in Cocoli, C. Z., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Department of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that no agreements involving naval petroleum reserves had been entered into during the calendar year 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

GRANT OR RETROCESSION TO A STATE OF JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LAND

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATEMENT OF JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended October 2, 1953 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PERMANENCY OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS BY DISBURSING OFFICERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed

legislation to amend the act of December 23, 1944, to make permanent the authorization for certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK, COLO.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of the concession permit in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RECOMMENDATION FOR FREEDOM OF MENOMINEE TRIBE OF WISCONSIN FROM FEDERAL SUPERVISION APPLICABLE TO INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 108, recommendations for legislation necessary to free the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin, among others, from Federal supervision and control and from all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF COUNCIL ON LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the chairman, Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, reporting on the activities of that council, and requesting that it be permitted to delay submitting its report until February 1, 1954; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LAWS ENACTED BY GUAM LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Second Guam Legislature (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSFER OF RIGHT, TITLE, AND INTEREST IN A CERTAIN INVENTION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon F. Parry, the right, title, and interest of the United States in foreign countries in and to a certain invention (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted by the delegates to the 61st annual convention of the United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill., relating to the general policy of the national administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Seneca Nation Clan Mothers and Sons and Daughters of the Cold Springs and Newtown Long Houses of Allegheny and Cattaraugus Reservations, N. Y., protesting against the adoption by Congress of House Concurrent Resolution 108, expressing the sense of Congress that certain tribes of Indians should be freed from Federal supervision (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DURUM WHEAT—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Farm Bureau, relating to the planting of additional acres of durum wheat.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DURUM WHEAT

Our own industry, particular to North Dakota, in which we supply the macaroni industry with durum wheat, is in serious trouble due to a combination of rust and drought.

This trouble arises from an inability to supply the demand and this can result in a halt in the growth of macaroni consumption by the United States public. Efforts by the industry to use substitutes have failed.

Therefore we ask for prompt legislation by Congress to permit any farmer (with a previous durum history in 1951, 1952, or 1953) who plants 40 percent of his 1954 allotted wheat acres to durum, to be permitted to seed to durum additional acres to bring his total wheat and durum acres up to his total farm wheat base acreage.

This formula will apply to the 1954 crop year only and does not apply to red durum.

PRICE SUPPORTS—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Farm Bureau, relating to price supports for agricultural commodities.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE SUPPORTS

Since our 1953 platform was approved in November 1952, there have been no efforts made to introduce the factor of quality into the support program, to make realistic reductions in production of basics, or to take any other realistic steps to put the support program in a sounder position.

Therefore we urge Congress to enact extension of the amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949, providing for a minimum support of 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities.

We ask that this extension be for a period suitable in length to enable proper reduction of national wheat acreages, and of other basic acreages where surpluses exist.

We will accept marketing quotas and acreage restrictions to accomplish this goal of matching production with demand.

With shrinkage of the present wheat surplus we ask Congress and the industry to work toward our common goal of full 100 percent of parity income in the market place.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1990. A bill to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 839); and

S. 2319. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act; with amendments (Rept. No. 840).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1577. A bill to authorize the exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 841).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 2404. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers (Rept. No. 842); and

S. 2583. A bill to indemnify against loss all persons whose swine were destroyed in July 1953 as a result of having been infected with or exposed to the contagious disease, vesicular exanthema (Rept. No. 843).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 1381. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 (Rept. No. 844); and

S. 1399. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 845).

KOREAN WAR ATROCITIES—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS (REPT. NO. 848)

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 40, 1st session, 83d Congress, a report relating to the Korean war atrocities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER in the chair). The report will be received and printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 2644. A bill for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis;

S. 2645. A bill for the relief of Marion S. Quirk; and

S. 2646. A bill for the relief of Victoriana Areitio Berincua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2647. A bill to create an indeper.dent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to promote world leadership by the United States in aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCARRAN when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2648. A bill for the relief of Johanna Pessler and her child; and

S. 2649. A bill for the relief of Chaya Frangles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2650. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the last abovementioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2651. A bill to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia; and

S. 2652. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1944, which regulates the placement of children in family homes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 2653. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2654. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes;

S. 2655. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 as amended;

S. 2656. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 2657. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia";

S. 2658. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide an immediate revision and equalization of real-estate values in the District of Columbia; also to provide an assessment of real estate in said District in the year 1896 and every third year thereafter, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1894, as amended;

S. 2659. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Prince Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls;

S. 2660. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; and

S. 2661. A bill to regulate the sale of shell eggs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. 2662. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2663. A bill to provide that ex-Presidents of the United States shall be members of the National Security Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2664. A bill to provide rates of compensation for overtime, night, and holiday work for certain Federal officers and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2665. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2666. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 2667. A bill for the relief of Mary George Solomon;

S. 2668. A bill for the relief of John Lewis Pyles, Jr.; and

S. 2669. A bill for the relief of Andree M. Doyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 2670. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes, bands, and colonies of Indians in the State of Utah and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to assure the equal application thereof to individuals of both sexes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1954

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which constitutes a complete redraft of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. I have introduced bills of this nature in several Congresses, ever since 1944, when I introduced a bill of this kind as S. 1790 of the 78th Congress. Other bills of this nature which I have introduced include S. 1 of the 79th Congress, S. 1 of the 80th Congress, and S. 1 of the 81st Congress.

It is my hope that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee may see fit to make this bill the basis of broad and comprehensive hearings on this subject, to the end that the committee may rewrite the Civil Aeronautics Act as its wisdom dictates. To this end, I have addressed a letter to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], which I shall, at the conclusion of these brief remarks, ask to have inserted in the RECORD.

I desire now to make it clear to my colleagues that by introducing this bill I am not disowning the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which I had the honor to sponsor, and toward the enactment of which I gave a great deal of my time and effort over the space of 3 years. I think the Civil Aeronautics Act is a good act, and I believe it has accomplished a great deal of good for the United States and in particular for the aviation industry of this country. But that industry has grown tremendously even in the 16 years since enactment of the Civil Aeronautics Act. In connection with that growth there have been changes, and new problems have arisen, both within the industry and in the administration of the act. Recognition of these changes is one of the purposes of the redrafted law which I propose.

I wish to say that while this redrafted law contains a number of provisions which I believe are very much worthwhile and very desirable, it will not be my purpose to insist on any single provision of the bill. I hope the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in its deliberations on this subject, will agree with me respecting certain provisions which I have proposed; but I recognize that it is the function of the committee to make the decisions, and that the committee may well differ with my views. What I am mainly concerned with is getting a thorough and comprehensive review of the Civil Aeronautics Act, and the enactment by the Congress of such changes as may appear justified on the basis of the hearings which I hope the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will hold. I know that committee, if it decides to hold hearings, will call in all the best minds of the country in this field, will get the views of all the interests concerned with aviation, including the regulatory and administrative agencies of the Government, and will give due and proper weight to the proposals and expressions of all those who come before it, sifting the wheat from the chaff so that in the end there will come from the committee to the Senate proposed legislation which will preserve the spirit and purpose of the Civil Aeronautics Act and perpetuate its benefits, while at the same time recognizing and effectively dealing with the situations and problems which require new or amended legislative provisions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] which I mentioned a moment ago, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2647) to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to promote world leadership by the United States in aviation, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

DECEMBER 21, 1953.

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: For many years, experience in administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 has demonstrated with increasing force the need of revising the act.

Basically, the Civil Aeronautics Act is sound, and I believe I am not unduly immodest in crediting that act with substantial accomplishments for our Nation in the field of civil aviation. But times do change; new problems arise; and while I would resist with the last of my strength any effort to alter the basic philosophy of the Civil Aeronautics Act, I have long recognized the necessity for changes to make administration of the act easier, and to meet new problems and new situations which have arisen since the act was made law.

It was with this objective in mind that I introduced, 10 years ago, a complete redraft of the Civil Aeronautics Act. That redraft has been revised several times, and I have kept the matter constantly before the Congress, sponsoring such a bill in each Congress since I first made the proposal. It was S. 1790 in the 78th Congress, S. 1 in the 79th Congress, S. 1 in the 80th Congress, and S. 1 in the 81st Congress. For various reasons, the bill has never had detailed consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Because I have been engaged in redrafting this bill once again, I did not introduce it during the first session of the 83d Congress. I shall introduce it soon after the Congress reconvenes in January.

This question of necessary changes in the Civil Aeronautics Act is a matter with which we cannot continue forever to temporize. Revisions must be made to bring the act in

line with modern times and to meet present-day problems and issues. Such revisions can be made without departing from the basic philosophy of the act, and the net effect of making them can be good. This is a task which only Congress can undertake, though I can well envision the possibility that if Congress does not soon accept its responsibility in this regard, some effort may be made on the part of the executive branch of the Government to bring about changes in the act by executive or administrative action. Already there has been far too much of this sort of thing.

While I know that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is one of the busiest committees of the Senate, and has much extremely important legislation pending before it, I respectfully urge upon you the view that no legislation pending before the committee is of greater importance than this matter of modernizing the Civil Aeronautics Act.

When my proposed redraft of the Civil Aeronautics Act is again before you, in the coming session, I hope the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee may see fit to make consideration of this proposed legislation a major project.

In that connection, let me make it clear that I consider my own bill only as a starting point. Undoubtedly it can be improved by your committee as a result of its deliberations and such hearings as it may hold on the subject. I plead with the committee to set its teeth into this subject and do the kind of a job which is needed in the interest of American aviation.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act. This bill incorporates in legislation the recommendations of the President to amend the act. I have introduced this bill as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor, in order that what might be called the administration bill may be immediately before our committee.

It should be noted that in the President's message he suggests that certain areas in national labor relations should be further studied to the end that additional legislation can be presented. I recognize also, of course, that there may be other areas of controversy that the members of the committee, or other Members of the Senate, will bring to our attention, and that other proposals in the way of amendments may be submitted. I can assure the Senate that any such suggestions will be given our careful consideration.

It is my purpose to request the committee to consider the President's recommendations immediately, and it is my hope that the bill which I am introducing today may be passed promptly and without waiting for the results of the studies in these other areas.

I have had prepared by the staff of the committee a brief summary of the bill incorporating the President's recommendations, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE BILL INCORPORATING THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDMENT TO THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Agency: It enacts the common-law rule of agency and relieves unions of responsibility for acts of their members based on membership alone.

Secondary boycotts: It eases the ban on secondary boycotts by permitting the unions to bring pressure on secondary employers who are working on materials farmed out by a struck employer and on secondary employers who are jointly engaged in performing work on a construction project with the primary employer.

It requires the National Labor Relations Board to give priority in its investigations of unfair labor practice charges in cases involving secondary boycotts.

Free speech: It extends the guaranty of free speech to representation cases as well as unfair-labor-practices cases.

Stability of bargaining agreements: It strengthens the stability of collective-bargaining relationships by relieving the parties thereto of the obligation to bargain on the terms and conditions of employment during the life of a valid collective-bargaining agreement.

Casual, intermittent, or temporary employments: It permits employers and unions in industries in which employment is casual, intermittent or temporary, more particularly construction, maritime, and entertainment industries, to enter into prehire collective-bargaining agreements which require membership in the union within 7 rather than within 30 days.

Secret ballot: It gives to employees involved in a strike, a voice through a secret ballot, in determining whether they wish the strike to continue.

Economic strikers: It imposes a ban on the holding of representation elections requested by a rival union during the first 4 months of a strike called by the incumbent union and imposes a similar ban against the holding of such elections requested by the employer for the duration of the strike or during the first year of the strike, whichever is shorter.

Filing of union information: It simplifies and eliminates duplication in the requirement that unions file organizational information with the Department of Labor.

Non-Communist affidavits: It requires employers as well as unions to file non-Communist affidavits.

Injunctions: It eliminates mandatory injunctions in connection with secondary boycotts but retains the discretionary injunction with respect to all unfair-labor practices.

It provides for the intervention of the Federal Mediation Service through a panel of local citizens to bring about a voluntary settlement of the dispute in cases where a discretionary injunction has been obtained.

Federal and State jurisdiction: It authorizes the States and Territories to protect the health or safety of their inhabitants in emergencies resulting from labor disputes.

National emergencies: It amends the national-emergency provisions of the law to give the President discretion to require the Board of Inquiry to make recommendations for the settlement of the dispute which recommendations shall not be binding on the parties to the dispute.

Checkoff of dues: It permits the checkoff of union dues to run until revoked in writing by the employee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I also ask unanimous consent that because of the importance of this proposed legislation, and its controversial nature, the full text of the bill, which is introduced as an administration measure, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2650) to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 2 (13) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(13) In determining whether any person is acting as an 'agent' of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the common law rules relating to agency shall be applicable: *Provided*, That no labor organization shall be held responsible for the acts of any individual member thereof solely on the ground of such membership."

(b) Section 8 (b) (4) (A) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(A) forcing or requiring any employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization or any employer or other person (herein called secondary employer) to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person (herein called primary employee)—

"(i) unless the employees of the primary employer are engaged in a strike which—

"(a) is ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom the primary employer recognized when the strike began or is required to recognize under an outstanding order or certification under this act, and no petition for certification of another labor organization is pending;

"(b) is not unlawful under this act; and

"(c) does not violate the terms of any existing collective-bargaining agreement; and

"(ii) unless—

"(a) the secondary employer has contracted or agreed with the primary employer (I) to perform work which the employees of the primary employer who are engaged in such strike normally would perform, or (II) for the account of the primary employer, to render services that such employees would normally perform; or

"(b) the secondary employer is in the construction industry and is jointly engaged at the site of the work with the primary employer, who is in such industry, in constructing, altering, painting, or repairing a building or other structure;".

(c) Section 8 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding the following language: "nor shall it be the basis for setting aside an election conducted under section 9."

(d) Section 8 (d) of such act is amended by striking out all of the language after the colon at the end of paragraph "(4)" of said section and in lieu thereof, inserting the following:

"The duties imposed upon employers, employees, and labor organizations by paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall become inapplicable upon an intervening certification of the Board under which the labor organization or individual, which is a party to the contract, has been superseded as or ceased to be the representative of the employees subject to the provisions of section 9 (a), and the duties so imposed shall not be construed as requiring either party to a contract for a fixed period to discuss or agree to any modification of the terms and conditions of employment, whether or not embodied in such contract, prior to the expiration of such period, unless the contract

contains reopening provisions for modification of such terms and conditions of employment prior to the expiration date of such period. Any employee who engages in a strike within the 60-day period specified in this subsection shall lose his status as an employee of the employer engaged in the particular labor dispute, for the purposes of sections 8, 9, and 10 of this act, as amended, but such loss of status for such employee shall terminate if and when he is reemployed by such employer."

(e) Section 8 of such act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsections:

"(e) It shall not be an unfair labor practice under subsections (a) and (b) of this section for an employer primarily engaged in the construction, maritime, or entertainment industries, or in any other industry or section of an industry in which the Board finds employment to be casual, intermittent, or temporary in nature and in which the average period of continuous employment therein with any single employer is less than 30 days, to make an agreement covering employees engaged (or who upon their employment will be engaged) in construction, maritime, or entertainment work or in such casual, intermittent, or temporary employment, with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in section 8 (a) of this act as an unfair labor practice and which at the time the agreement was executed or within the preceding 12 months has received from the Board a notice that it has complied with the requirements imposed by section 9 (f), (g), and (h)), solely because (1) the majority status of such labor organization has not been established under the provisions of section 9 of this act prior to the making of such agreement, and (2) such agreement requires, as a condition of employment, membership in such organization after the seventh day following the beginning of such employment or the effective date of the agreement whichever is the later: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall set aside the final proviso to section 8 (a) (3) of this act: *Provided further*, That agreements made pursuant to this subsection shall in all other respects be subject to the provisions of section 9 of this act: *Provided further*, That agreements made pursuant to this subsection shall not constitute a bar to petitions filed pursuant to section 9 (c) or 9 (e).

"(f) Any labor organization (as defined in sec. 2 (5)) calling a strike or work stoppage shall notify the Board thereof upon the commencement of such strike or work stoppage. Upon receipt of such notification the Board shall direct the taking of a secret ballot among the employees in the collective bargaining units in which such strike or work stoppage occurs, on the question of whether they wish to continue the strike or work stoppage. Such balloting may be conducted by mail or by any means or at any place deemed appropriate by the Board. Unless a majority of the employees eligible to vote cast their ballots in favor of a continuance thereof, such strike or work stoppage shall cease to be a protected, concerted activity within the meaning of this act."

(f) Section 9 (a) is amended by inserting immediately after the comma following the word "purposes" where it first appears in said section the following language: "or labor organizations which are parties to agreements entered into pursuant to section 8 (a) of this act,"

(g) Section 9 (c) (3) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) No election shall be directed in any bargaining unit or any subdivision within which, in the preceding 12-month period a valid election shall have been held. Employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote: *Provided*, That in any lawful strike in which recognition was not an issue when the strike began, no petition for an election filed by an employer pursuant to section 9 (c) (1) (B) shall be entertained prior to the termination of such strike or the expiration of 1 year from the commencement of such strike, whichever occurs sooner, nor shall any petition for an election filed by a labor organization other than the labor organization which called the strike be entertained for a period of 4 months after the commencement of such strike. In any election where none of the choices on the ballot receives a majority, a runoff shall be conducted, the ballot providing for a selection between the two choices receiving the largest and second largest number of valid votes cast in the election."

(h) Section 9 (e) (1) of such act is amended by inserting following the words "section 8 (a) (3)" the words "or 8 (e)."

(i) Section 9 (f) (A) of such act is amended by striking out all of the subsection numbered (6).

(j) Section 9 (h) of such act is amended by redesignating said section as "(h) (1)" and adding a new subsection "(2)" thereto as follows:

"(2) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by an employer under subsection (c) of this section, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by an employer under subsection (b) of section 10, unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by such employer, its officers if it is a corporation, that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member of or does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code shall be applicable in respect to such affidavits."

(k) Section 10 (b) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof, the following: ": *Provided further*, That whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of paragraph (4) (A), (B), or (C) of section 8 (b), the preliminary investigation of such charge shall be made forthwith and given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred."

(l) Section 10 (j) of such act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof, the following: ": *Provided*, That where such temporary relief or restraining order is granted by the court in any case involving a labor dispute between an employer and a labor organization which the employer recognized when such temporary relief or restraining order was granted or was required to recognize under an outstanding order or certification of the Board, the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is directed, if such labor dispute has not been settled, immediately to appoint a board composed of citizens of the locality in which the dispute exists, to meet with the parties to such dispute and seek a settlement thereof."

(m) Such act is amended by striking out all of section 10 (l).

(n) Section 14 of such act is amended by adding thereto a new subsection "(c)," as follows:

"(c) Nothing in this act shall be construed to nullify the power of any State or Territory to protect the health or safety of the people of such State or Territory during emergencies resulting from labor disputes."

(o) Section 209 (b) of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out the words "sixty-day period" and in lieu thereof inserting the words "forty-day period."

(p) Section 209 of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection "(c)":

"(c) Upon the certification of the results of such ballot, the President, unless the dispute has been settled, shall have authority to reconvene the board of inquiry which has previously reported with respect to the dispute and direct such board to make recommendations for the settlement of the dispute, but neither party to the dispute shall be under any duty to accept, in whole or in part, any recommendations for settlement made by such board of inquiry."

(q) Section 210 of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by inserting after the word "Upon" where it first appears, the words "the twentieth day following."

(r) Section 301 (e) of title III of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In determining whether any person is acting as an 'agent' of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the common-law rules relating to agency shall be applicable: *Provided*, That no labor organization shall be held responsible for the acts of individual members thereof solely on the ground of such membership."

(s) Section 302 (c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out everything between "(4)" and "(5)" therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "with respect to money deducted from the wages of employees in payment of membership dues in a labor organization: *Provided*, That the employer has received from each employee on whose account such deductions are made a written assignment which shall be valid until revoked in writing; or"

(t) Strike out all of subsection (a) of section 303 of title III of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"(a) It shall be unlawful for the purposes of this section only, in an industry affecting commerce, for any labor organization to engage in any activity or conduct defined as an unfair labor practice in section 8 (b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any individual employee to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under the National Labor Relations Act, as amended."

(u) Title IV of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is hereby repealed; title V of such act is redesignated as title IV; and sections 501, 502, and 503 are redesignated as sections 401, 402, and 403, respectively.

(v) The amendments made by this act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a short time ago a hearing on juvenile delinquency was held in the city of Denver by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. At that time the district attorney, Mr. Keating, appeared before the committee and gave some very excellent testimony which he later put into the form of a letter to the subcommittee, dealing with the matter of parental

delinquency. He referred to cases of fathers running away and not supporting their wives and children. In a great many cases the fathers went to other States, and it was impossible to bring them back in order that appropriate action might be taken in order to compel them to support their children.

On behalf of myself, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the latter of whom some 2 or 3 years ago introduced a bill along similar lines, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders.

In view of the great importance of the bill, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2662) to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Family Support Act."

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby declares that every individual has a natural, moral, and social obligation to support the members of his immediate family, which obligation transcends the status of debt.

(b) The Congress further declares that, while sound national policy requires that migration from State to State be unrestricted, experience has disclosed that in the exercise of the right of migration and travel many persons leave behind them broken homes, dependent and neglected children, and spouses; that, although the courts of the State in which the family resided may have properly ordered an individual to meet his natural, moral, and social obligations, once he has removed himself to another State he has a practical sanctuary against the rightful jurisdiction of the original State of residence.

(c) The Congress further declares that in other instances the departure preceded acquisition of jurisdiction over the person by the original State's courts with like result.

(d) It is the policy of Congress in enacting this act to correct the evils outlined above (1) by requiring that orders of State courts directing individuals to meet their natural, moral, and social obligations to child and spouse shall be enforced in Federal and State courts in areas to which such individuals have migrated from the original State; (2) by giving Federal courts in States of which such migrants have become citizens original jurisdiction, in suits brought by citizens of other States, to order such migrants to meet such obligations, to the end that children and spouses will not suffer want or be made the objects of charity and thus become an unnecessary burden to the general public and be themselves thereby humiliated; and (3) by providing criminal penalties for persons who move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid compliance with support orders.

SEC. 3. Part IV of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 173—ENFORCEMENT OF STATE COURT SUPPORT ORDERS

"Sec.
"2711. Definitions.
"2712. Registration of support orders.
"2713. Enforcement.
"2714. Notice to original court.

"§ 2711. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"The term 'support order' means an order of a State court having jurisdiction over an individual, directing such individual to make payments periodically to (or for the support of) his spouse, former spouse, or child (whether the issue of his body, legitimate or illegitimate, or adopted).

"The term 'obligor,' with respect to a support order, means an individual who is directed to make payments under the order.

"The term 'obligee' means any person to whom the proceeds of a support order is payable for himself, or the use or benefit of another, or such beneficiary or his guardian or guardian ad litem.

"The term 'original court,' with respect to a support order, means the court in which it was made.

"The term 'State' includes the Territories and the District of Columbia.

"The term 'registered,' with respect to a support order, means registered under section 2712.

"§ 2712. Registration

"Any obligee of a support order may register the order in any district court of the United States for a district, and in any court of a State having jurisdiction of like matters, in which an obligor of the order resides, or is found, and which is outside the State in which the support order was made. Registration shall be accomplished by filing with the clerk of such court a certified copy of the support order and of each order of the original court modifying the support order.

"§ 2713. Enforcement

"(a) Any court in which a support order is registered shall entertain contempt proceedings, in the same manner as if the order were an order of such court, against an obligor who fails to comply with the order within 30 days after being served notice that it has been registered.

"(b) No proceedings to enforce a support order shall be begun in any court under this section unless a copy of each order of the original court modifying the support order is registered under section 2712.

"(c) The cost of enforcement proceedings under this section shall be taxed against the party against whom the issues are resolved. The obligor shall be required to pay a reasonable attorney fee to the obligee if the court finds the proceedings were necessary to compel the obligor to comply with the support order.

"§ 2714. Notice to original court

"When, in any court, any support order is registered or any proceedings are taken under section 2713 to enforce a support order, written notice of such action under the seal of such court shall be sent to the original court."

SEC. 4. Section 1332 of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Each district court located in a State shall have original jurisdiction, concurrent with State courts, of civil actions brought by a citizen of another State to order a citizen of the State in which the court is located to make payments periodically to (or for the support of) his spouse, or child (whether the issue of his body, legitimate or illegitimate, or adopted) if under the law of such State a State court is authorized to make such an order, as an incident to a divorce proceeding or otherwise. Nothing in this subsection shall authorize any district court to make a decree of divorce or separation, or to order an individual to make any payments to (or for the support of) a spouse who has without legal justification quit the home of such individual.

"(c) The words 'State' and 'States,' as used in this section, include the Territories and the District of Columbia."

SEC. 5. The jurisdiction of the courts upon which jurisdiction is conferred by sections 3 and 4 of this act shall not be affected by the amount of controversy, and such court shall have the power to enforce its orders by proceedings against either the person or property of the obligor, or both.

SEC. 6. The table of contents of part I of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by inserting after

"1. General provisions..... 1"

the following:

"2. Abandonment or desertion of minor children..... 21"

SEC. 7. Part I of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by inserting at the end of chapter 1 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 2—ABANDONMENT OF DEPENDENTS

"Sec.
"21. Definitions.
"22. Abandonment and desertion.
"23. Prima facie evidence.
"24. Testimony of wife.

"§ 21. Definitions.

"As used in this chapter—

"The term 'support order' means an order of a State court having jurisdiction over an individual, directing such individual to make payments periodically to (or for the support of) his spouse, former spouse, or child (whether the issue of his body, legitimate or illegitimate, or adopted).

"The term 'State' includes the Territories and the District of Columbia.

"§ 22. Abandonment and desertion.

"Any individual who, to avoid compliance with a support order, shall travel or move in interstate or foreign commerce, from the State in which such support order was issued or from any State in which proceedings have been instituted under chapter 173 of title 28 of the United States Code, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,500, or by imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"§ 23. Prima facie evidence.

"For the purposes of this chapter, failure of any individual to comply with the terms of a support order, after travel or movement in interstate or foreign commerce shall constitute prima facie evidence that such individual so traveled or moved with intent to avoid compliance with such support order, if personal service (including service by registered United States mail) of a certified copy of such support order has been had on such individual.

"§ 24. Testimony of wife.

"In all criminal proceedings under this chapter a wife may testify against her husband without his consent."

SEC. 8. Section 3237 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Any offense under the provisions of chapter 2 of this title, is a continuing offense and may be inquired of and prosecuted, in any district from, through, or into which,

such offender so travels or moves, or in the district where the offender is found."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, I should like to say that the subcommittee has under consideration right at this time the problem to which the Senator from North Dakota has been referring.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey no doubt noted that I read his name as one of the cosponsors of the bill I have introduced.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The members of my subcommittee are mindful of the facts which the Senator from North Dakota and his subcommittee developed in Denver.

MEMBERSHIP OF EX-PRESIDENTS ON NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it has often seemed to me that after our public officials have either been defeated in election or have voluntarily retired from office, we in the United States have not taken full advantage of a great deal of the experience they have had, particularly in matters nonpartisan in nature. It seems to me we could well avail ourselves of the great experience of some of those who have served in public office, particularly in such fields.

Therefore, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that ex-Presidents of the United States shall be members of the National Security Council. It seems to me that we as a nation could profit a great deal by their experience and advice, particularly in such matters as affect all the people of the United States and are not partisan in character.

The bill (S. 2663) to provide that ex-Presidents of the United States shall be members of the National Security Council, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949 AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY ACT OF 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill amending the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes.

In my judgment the time is overdue when these acts should be amended in order that the so-called fringe benefits of Federal employees may be made more equitable and the pay structure more nearly consistent with practices in private industry. If this is done, I feel certain it will mean a more economical program for the taxpayer and at the same time improve working conditions and the morale of the employees.

Therefore, this bill will provide for a strong incentive award program, revise the supergrades in the Classification Act of 1949, and Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945. The whole structure of the bill, in my judgment, will help to bring about a more coordinated and an improved civil-service program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2665) to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary 2,000 additional copies of the hearings relative to treaties and executive agreements held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress, 1st session.

SUSPENSION OF OPERATIONS OF NEW POWER POLICY AND MARKETING CRITERIA WITH REFERENCE TO MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. HUNT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 176), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Whereas on September 14, 1953, the Department of the Interior announced a new power policy and marketing criteria for the eastern and western divisions of the Missouri River Basin which became effective prior to the reconvening of Congress; and

Whereas the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary has commenced hearings on the new power policy and marketing criteria to determine its possible effects on competition within the electrical industry which hearings have not been completed: Be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the United States Senate that the Secretary of the Interior suspend further operation of the new power policy and marketing criteria for the Missouri Valley Basin for a period of 90 days following the adoption of this resolution in order to give the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation an opportunity to complete its investigation and study.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 177), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations 500 additional copies of the hearings relative to the St. Lawrence seaway held during the 83d Congress, 1st session, by the said committee.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE BY UNITED NATIONS TO INVESTIGATE COMMUNIST ATROCITIES IN KOREA

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution expressing the grave concern of the Senate over the commission of Communist war atrocities against American and other United Nations personnel in Korea, and requesting that the United States delegation to the United Nations ask for the establishment of an impartial investigating commission, consisting of representative member nations, to inquire into and report the facts of all war crimes committed by the North Korean and Chinese Communist forces in or near Korea since June 24, 1950, and the means of subjecting the criminals responsible to just and lawful punishment.

Most of my colleagues, I am sure, have read or heard of the calculated acts or omissions to act on the part of the Red Chinese and North Korean Communist Armies against American and Allied prisoners of war. I can say to you, Mr. President, that some of these acts were so inhuman, so cruel, and so animal-like that common decency prevents me from reporting them in complete detail. However, I suggest that each of my colleagues read the testimony presented before our subcommittee last month by GI's, field commanders in Korea, and officials of the War Crimes Division, to learn first-hand of the true nature of this vicious Communist enemy.

As a proud Nation of God-loving civilized people, as a member Nation of the United Nations, and as a Nation dedicated to every principle of justice and respecting every inherent right of man, we cannot and must not allow these crimes to remain unpunished.

To do this would not only be an ineffaceable blot of disgrace on our national honor, but it would also be a sin against every mother, wife, sweetheart, and relative who has given a man in defense of our great Nation.

To do this would not only demonstrate a weakness in the eyes of all free nations, but would also give the Communists carte-blanche permission to continue the commission of these ruthless barbarisms in the future.

No, we cannot afford to sweep these horrible facts under the rug as though they did not happen. On the contrary, it is our duty—indeed, our responsibility, as a free Nation, and particularly as a member of the United Nations, to make certain that those responsible for these war crimes are sought out and that appropriate punishment is administered to them.

On October 28, 1950, General MacArthur, then Commander in Chief of the United Nations Command in Korea, set up a military commission to try accused war criminals. Therefore, in view of the number of provable cases of Communist war atrocities documented in the files, and since it has been established that these crimes were deliberately perpetrated by the Communist aggressor, it now becomes necessary to prosecute these war criminals as was done with the

Nazi and Japanese war criminals following World War II.

Accordingly, I am submitting the resolution expressing our deep concern over these barbaric Communist atrocities, and urging our delegation to the United Nations to ask for the establishment of an impartial investigating commission to inquire into and to report upon these atrocities and devise a means of prosecuting those found responsible.

We suffered more than 14,000 casualties in Korea; let us never for a moment forget this sad but true fact. If this Nation is to stand for real justice, we must stand for its every principle. Therefore, I hope this distinguished body will unanimously endorse the resolution at the earliest possible time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 178), submitted by Mr. POTTER, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Communists in Korea have committed revolting atrocities against members of the armed services of the United States and members of other United Nations forces; and

Whereas the American people are gravely concerned that the commission of these atrocities should not go unpunished; and

Whereas it is the sense and desire of the Senate that speedy prosecution and conviction of the offenders under applicable law would not only mete out justice against the guilty, but would also be a warning to deter the commission of such offenses in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate and its strong desire that the United States delegation to the United Nations urge the United Nations to establish an impartial investigating committee composed of representative member nations or representative members of the International Red Cross to inquire into and report upon atrocities committed in or near Korea since June 24, 1950, and the means of subjecting the criminals responsible to just and lawful punishment.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I am sure that Senators who were present in the Chamber and heard the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] were impressed with the importance of bringing to the attention of the American people the atrocities which heretofore have not been fully disclosed.

In the Saturday Evening Post of November 1953 there appeared an editorial entitled "Red Murder of 6,000 GI's Finally Angers Us."

In the days ahead it might be well for those in responsible position who are negotiating and hoping to make deals with the Reds, to read and reread this editorial, because it strikes a responsive chord in millions of American hearts and minds.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be placed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, lest we forget.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED MURDER OF 6,000 GI'S FINALLY ANGERS US

The United States has finally decided to get mad about the torture and murder of more than 6,000 American soldiers, not to mention unknown thousands of Koreans, by the Chinese and North Korean Communists. The American delegate to the United Nations has finally managed to bring this outrage to the official attention of the United Nations Assembly.

But the 6,000 American dead whose sacrifice has finally aroused official indignation are the same men whose murder was reported 2 years ago by Col. James M. Hanley, chief of the Eighth Army's section concerned with war crimes. Colonel Hanley estimated that about 6,100 American GI's had been killed by Chinese or North Koreans. The estimate in the recent release by the Department of Defense is substantially the same.

When Colonel Hanley made his statement, which might have been expected to arouse the indignation of civilized people throughout the world, the reaction was one of distress that the colonel should so far have forgotten himself as to fail to have the information cleared in Washington. Our allies in the United Nations were indignant that atrocity stories should be bruited about at a time when a cease-fire agreement with the Communists was in the making. General Ridgway, at that time supreme commander in Korea, commented on Colonel Hanley's statement in a gingerly fashion, forbearing to indicate that he was talking about the Chinese Communists. He did, however, state that it was possible that Colonel Hanley's estimate was correct.

Public indignation in this country seems to have been confined to a few Members of Congress like Representative W. STERLING COLE, of New York, who stated that the United Nations must deal with these outrages or "it might just as well not meet again." Doubtless the relatives of American soldiers reported as missing were indignant, but the official view was that nothing should be done to upset the cease-fire applecart by irritating the Communists. Somewhat more rational was the feeling that publication of the report might endanger the lives of United Nations soldiers still in the hands of the Reds.

All this was in late 1951. The truce negotiations continued for almost 2 years, during which, according to eminent military authority, we withheld our Sunday punch and accepted every humiliation heaped upon us by the Communists, all in the interest of peace. Eventually, we got the truce. What that amounts to remains to be seen. What we shall never know is what would have happened if our official representatives had shown as much spirit when Colonel Hanley's statement first appeared as we are showing, now that it is too late for moral indignation to have any effect on the truce terms.

It is just possible that this country might have developed moral indigation enough to slam the Communists out of the ring, regardless of what our U. N. associates thought about it. Maybe that would have been bad, but it would at least have been more satisfying than to continue dealing with murderers as if they were decent and responsible statesmen.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 179), which was ordered to be placed on the Calendar:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under Senate Resolution 146, 82d Congress, agreed to August 6, 1951, Senate Resolution 249, 82d Congress, agreed to January 15, 1952, and Senate Resolution 33, 83d Congress, agreed to January 31, 1953, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ two additional clerical assistants, is hereby continued until January 31, 1955.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 180), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the 83d Congress section (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended—

(1) By striking out "11" in subsection (e) (relating to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service) and inserting in lieu thereof "13"; and

(2) By striking out "11" in subsection (a) (relating to the Committee on Public Works) and inserting in lieu thereof "13.".

SEC. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as amended, is further amended by striking out "14" and inserting in lieu thereof "18," and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(b) In the event that during the remainder of the 83d Congress members of one party in the Senate are replaced by members of the other party, the 21 third committee assignments shall in such event be distributed in accordance with the following table:

Senate seats		Third committee assignments	
Majority	Minority	Majority	Minority
48	48	18	3
49	47	16	5
50	46	14	7
51	45	12	9"

INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WATKINS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 181), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1954, and ending on January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistance, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $37,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND MOBILIZATION, BANKING POLICIES, ETC. (S. REPT. NO. 846)

Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 182) and

submitted a report thereon. The resolution was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the period from February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper relating to (1) economic stabilization and mobilization; (2) domestic and international banking policies, including Federal Reserve matters and deposit insurance; (3) construction of housing and community facilities; (4) Federal loan policies; and (5) securities and exchange regulation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized until January 31, 1955, inclusive, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department of agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to expend not to exceed $16,000 in addition to any other unobligated balance of funds made available pursuant to Senate Resolution 42, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to on January 30, 1953.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF OPERATIONS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK AND THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT (S. REPT. NO. 847)

Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 183) and submitted a report thereon. The resolution was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a thorough study of the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and their relationship to expansion of international trade.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized until January 31, 1955, inclusive, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the limits of funds made available by this resolution; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $83,000 in addition to any other unobligated balance of funds made available pursuant to Senate Resolution 25, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to on June 8, 1953, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KERR submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES TO COMMEMORATE THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF LOUISIANA PURCHASE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1917) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2308, TO AUTHORIZE AND DIRECT THE INVESTIGATION BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CERTAIN OFFENSES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, January 15, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 2308, a bill to authorize and direct the investigation by the Attorney General of certain offenses, and for other purposes. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH KOREA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive A, 83d Congress, 2d session, a mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on October 1, 1953.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the treaty, that the treaty, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on October 1, 1953.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate a document containing the joint statement by President Syngman Rhee of the Republic of Korea and by the Secretary of State on August 8, 1953, on the occasion of the initialing of the Mutual Defense Treaty in Seoul, and the text of an address by the Secretary of State on the occasion of the signing of the Mutual Defense Treaty on October 1, 1953.

There is further transmitted for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Secretary of State regarding the aforesaid treaty.

The Mutual Defense Treaty signed by the United States and the Republic of Korea is designed to deter aggression by giving evidence of our common determination to meet the common danger. It thus reaffirms our belief that the security of an individual nation in the free world depends upon the security of its partners, and constitutes another link in the collective security of the free nations of the Pacific.

I recommend that the Senate give early favorable consideration to the treaty submitted herewith, and advise and consent to its ratification.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1954.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) mutual defense treaty with Korea; (3) joint statement by President Syngman Rhee and the Secretary of State; (4) address by the Secretary of State.)

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the following nominations were received today from the President of the United States:

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chile, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Wiley T. Buchanan, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Panama, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipo-

tentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Costa Rica, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, a Foreign Officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Czechoslovakia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

H. Freeman Matthews, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

John E. Peurifoy, of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guatemala, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Colombia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

George Wadsworth, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Economic Coordinator—special representative for Korea—to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, Foreign Operations Administration, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Mrs. Mildred C. Ahlgren, of Indiana.

Richard L. Bowditch, of Massachusetts.

Arthur J. Connell, of Connecticut.

Miss Helen G. Irwin, of Iowa.

Allan Blair Kline, of Iowa.

Mrs. Lucille Leonard, of Rhode Island.

Herschel D. Newsom, of the District of Columbia.

James G. Patton, of Colorado.

Abbott McConnell Washburn, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Notice is given that the nominations listed above will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired, in accordance with the committee rule.

BUNGLING OF DEFENSE AGREEMENTS IN EUROPE—ARTICLE BY GORDON W. RULE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of November 21, 1953, and which is entitled "I Saw Us Bungle Defense Agreements in Europe." The author of this article is Capt. Gordon W. Rule, United States Navy Reserve, who was and is in a position to know what he is talking about. Captain Rule is a specialist in procurement and contract negotiation, and I consider him to be one of the ablest men in his field. I know he is an intensely loyal and patriotic American, and I am sure Senators will be interested in the article he has written. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SAW US BUNGLE DEFENSE AGREEMENTS IN EUROPE

(By Gordon W. Rule)

For 9 months recently, I drew a handsome Government salary and allowance in Europe at the expense of the American taxpayers. They were gypped, and I feel they should know why. Not that this is a confessional, for I did not consciously go to Europe to ride the gravy train. I went there to do a job of the utmost importance to the security of Europe—and the United States. I was not permitted to do so by our embassies and our Department of State. It is the reasons behind this failure that are important, not just my unearned paychecks. For those reasons were the result of a situation which is exactly the same today as it was when I returned to Washington in disgust to have my job abolished as a waste of the taxpayers' money.

It was a good job, too, as Government pay scales go, for the basic salary, combined with overseas allowances and per diem pay, figured out to a stipend of nearly $17,000 a year after taxes—which is what I would have earned if I had had the gall to stick it out for a full year. Nine frustrating months were enough to convince me, however, that I should return to my private law practice in Washington. I did so with great relief, but also with much concern at what I had seen. For it had been my unhappy privilege to sit at the negotiating table and watch our State Department Foreign Service officers bungle major negotiations with our European allies, to the detriment of the United States Treasury and the efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to build the West's defenses against the Soviet threat—which we must continue to do.

After spending this time in Europe, working with our embassies on the Continent, I am convinced that the United States is woefully lacking in capable, experienced negotiators who can sit down at a conference table with representatives of other countries and at least hold their own. I think our average representatives—be they career foreign servants, politically appointed ambassadors or what have you—do the best job they know how to do, but just because a man spends 20 years in our Foreign Service or is a successful business or professional man who has made large political contributions is no assurance that he can properly negotiate in the best interests of the United States. I submit, the opposite may well be true.

Insofar as our defense negotiations with other NATO countries are concerned, I know that not only do we not have properly trained men conducting our negotiations but many of them are being conducted in a shameful fashion. When I speak of defense negotiations, I refer to the negotiating of important bilateral agreements which commit the United States to certain courses of action and under which hundreds of millions of our taxpayers' dollars will be spent in foreign countries. More precisely, I refer to the agreements which our country must make with our NATO partners for military bases and facilities for United States forces in those countries.

One thing I wish to make perfectly clear. I am not an expert on embassy procedure generally. I have neither the desire nor the ability to crusade for overall embassy reform. But I was exposed to a sufficient number of our career diplomats with whom I had to work on defense negotiations to realize that, in my opinion, they are not keeping uppermost in their minds at all times what to me is fundamental—namely, the best interests of the United States. I must confine the above statement to defense matters, because that is what I was engaged in.

These were the negotiations which I was supposed to conduct for the United States Department of Defense when I went to Europe in August of 1952 to conduct negotiations for United States military operating rights and facilities in NATO and Western European countries for the purpose of providing facilities for peacetime training and maneuvers and military operations in time of war. I took on the assignment because I felt it was so important that no man could or should refuse to take it if asked. It was obvious to me that the principal purpose of our forces being in Europe at all was to be able to fight for our allies and ourselves, and that in order to fight we must have the necessary bases and facilities as soon as possible. I felt that with just a fair amount of cooperation from the military and the United States embassies in Europe, the job could be done well and expeditiously.

The latter supposition was based on past personal experience, for I was not exactly a stranger to the art of negotiation. Though a lawyer by profession, I am a naval officer by avocation. I entered the Navy in April of 1942 as a junior grade lieutenant, serving in the South Pacific as a line officer until I was ordered back to Washington in July of 1944 to work on Navy contracts. I went to inactive duty in 1946 with the rank of captain, but as a result of the Korean war, I left my law office and voluntarily returned to active duty in March of 1951, to negotiate again on behalf of the Navy for ships and other items. During my two periods of active duty with the Navy, I personally negotiated and signed contracts involving more than $2 billion of American taxpayers' money.

In the spring of 1952 the Navy sent me to Europe to negotiate with foreign governments approximately $150 million worth of contracts for naval vessels. This was under the offshore procurement program whereby we made part of our contribution to the military strength of European nations by paying for production of military items—in this case ships—to be used by our NATO allies. Although this was an entirely new field of Navy procurement, the job went quite well. As a contracting officer with power to make decisions on the spot and

sign for our Government, I was somewhat of an innovation to our embassies in the countries I visited, and in all but one country the State Department officials let me alone to conduct these government-to-government negotiations as I saw fit, because not even an ambassador can tell a contracting officer what sort of contract to negotiate and sign.

Not that I didn't have some troubles. Everywhere I went the foreign government officials with whom I negotiated would run to our embassy or our economic mission, during the negotiations, in an attempt to get me to change my position on various aspects of the bargaining. I do not criticize them for this at all—that is negotiating from their point of view. I did learn very soon that our embassy representatives were most anxious to help the foreign countries get what they wanted from us. In one case I made the mistake of telling our embassy team the best terms I hoped to get and the least I would settle for on several points under discussion. In less than a day the foreign negotiators were demanding the poorest settlement I would accept on every one of these points. I never made that mistake again.

One item on which I insisted was inclusion in the contracts of a clause limiting the profits to be made by the shipyards which would build the ships we were buying to give away. When I made this demand in the first country I visited on this assignment, a country with quite a reputation for getting everything it wants from us, I was told that only the president of the nation could make such a decision. So I gave their negotiators 48 hours to get the right decision or, I announced, I would close the negotiations and move on to another country. The proper decision was obtained, and we parted with respect for each other, although I was far from being a popular figure. This convinced me that foreign government officials prefer firmness and clarity to pussyfooting and indecision.

Nor did I ingratiate myself with a United States minister who had charge of all our give-away programs in another country. He knew how much money I could spend there, and he became quite unhappy because I negotiated the contract for about half the money allotted, thus reducing his total give-away for that year. The minister circulated reports that I had been too blunt in my talks with Government officials in that country. I confess that I was blunt, because I had received a signed statement that after the shipyards in that country had submitted estimates to their Government of what it would cost to build the required ships certain officials of that Government had told the yards to raise the estimates because Uncle Sam could pay more. I was thus on notice that the estimates were likely to be inflated and had to clear up the point. You don't clear up points like that with anything but plain talk. My friend, the minister, was understandably shocked, because he doesn't comprehend that such things really happen in this world.

These sour notes notwithstanding, the Navy concluded the best offshore procurement contracts in existence today, from the point of view of the American taxpayer. I returned to the United States, received a Navy commendation, and was released to inactive duty in July of 1952.

This experience abroad confirmed a set of basic negotiating principles which I had learned and which I firmly believe should be applied to any negotiation on behalf of the United States. These principles are as follows:

1. For lasting results, a negotiator must seek to accomplish a fair result for both parties; but if err he must, it should be in favor of the United States.

2. If the best possible results are sought, the first-team negotiators should conduct the negotiations. Don't play the second team or the reserves and expect first-team results.

3. There is no such thing as a popular negotiator. One can gain genuine respect, but a negotiator who thinks he can be popular and well liked while negotiating with the United States funds cannot achieve maximum results.

4. Where the United States funds are involved, a negotiator must think, act, and make decisions as though he were spending his own money—not someone else's.

Although I have always enjoyed Navy duty and consider it a privilege, I was anxious to get back to my law practice. But just as I was getting out the Department of Defense asked me to return to Europe as a civilian to undertake the bilateral negotiations for base rights and facilities. "What we need on this job," said the Defense Department official who offered it to me, "is an experienced negotiator who is also an S. O. B." I was persuaded he had the right man.

I realized when I took the job that there were difficulties inherent in trying to reconcile the views of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the State and Defense Departments, in dealing with our own Embassies in Europe, and last but not least in negotiating with the foreign countries. These I accepted as hazards of the game and they only added to the challenge.

I underwent lengthy briefings in Washington and had conversations with all the top military authorities and with State Department officials. It became apparent, even before I left for Europe, that the difficulties would be greater than I had initially expected. I would be asking the foreign countries for something for the United States as distinguished from our giving them something. The distinction is important because the vast majority of Americans employed abroad today are engaged in one form or another of our aid programs. But I was amazed to learn, while still in Washington, that there was no connection whatsoever between give away and get back. In other words, no matter how many hundreds of millions we might give country X, I could in no way try to synchronize this with what the United States might want from that country by way of land, for example, on which to train United States soldiers so they would be better prepared to help defend that country in case of war. I wasn't interested in any strict quid pro quo—just a commonsense, businesslike approach such as any of our NATO partners would use under similar circumstances. But the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of these matters told me flatly that the Department would not permit the two aspects to be handled together in any way. I began to wonder whether there was any meaning to a part of my official job description which said I was to "see that American aid and diplomacy are utilized to achieve the facilities which we require."

I left for Paris to join the staff of Ambassador William H. Draper, special representative of the President in Europe, assigned to NATO. I recruited three young able lawyers to assist me. We worked day and night studying economic, political, and military data about the NATO countries, analyzing and codifying all previous agreements, and generally preparing to do the job and come home.

In the first country I visited I found that our Ambassador—supposedly one of our best career men—and his staff literally refused to cooperate with anyone from Ambassador Draper's staff. Moreover, our Ambassador delegated all responsibility for the negotiations, which I thought I was sent to conduct, to a first secretary five steps removed from the Ambassador. The first secretary—one of several—was a pleasant young man, in his late twenties or early thirties, with absolutely no experience in such matters. He also had a full day's work to do aside from the military base negotiations.

But we were informed that I would not be permitted to negotiate with the country because that was the Embassy's job and all contacts, appointments, telephone calls, and the negotiations themselves would be handled by the first secretary. He informed me and my three associates that we could advise him if he asked us to, but otherwise it was his show.

I was shocked at the negative attitude prevailing in that and other embassies. They are staffed with experts on why something could not be done, on why meetings could not be set up. They wanted to compromise issues immediately, and they even refused to let us ask the country for certain contracting procedures, because they felt they knew best what was good for that country. Finally, when a special ambassador was sent from Washington at the request of the Secretary of Defense, and he bypassed the embassy by going directly to the foreign officials on the procedural questions, they were readily agreed to.

But weeks would go by before we could even have a meeting in some countries. When a session was finally arranged, the unprepared first secretary insisted on doing the negotiating, and he got nowhere. It was pitiful to watch. Even more discouraging was the fact that by putting a first secretary in charge for the United States, the pattern of the whole negotiation was set. The foreign country, naturally, used a representative of equivalent rank. There we were, five grades down from the top levels on both sides, so decisions had to travel a most tortuous and devious route. This is what is known as relegating negotiations to the "mattress mice" rather than keeping them on the proper plane. Under such circumstances we could hardly expect any country to take seriously the contention of American military authorities that the requirements for bases and facilities were of the utmost importance and deserving of the highest priority.

Many able people work for months preparing requirements, language, and so on, in the field, in the military services in Washington, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, in the Department of State, and in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and after all this effort and work an ambassador tells one of his young men, who never saw such a thing before, to conduct the actual negotiations.

And there I sat, able, willing, and ready to conduct the negotiations, drawing a large salary supposedly for doing just that, but not permitted to do so. There was no accountability on the first secretary's part for his failures or mistakes. All that happened was that our NATO commitments fell further behind schedule, our military services had to live with the mistakes, and in some cases we had to do without the desired bases entirely.

I can't blame the negotiators from the foreign countries for taking every advantage of our juvenile representatives. They would be foolish, from the viewpoint of their immediate national interest, not to do so. I could hardly blame them for laughing at our immature efforts in the so-called art of diplomacy.

But the results can be terribly serious. For example, the United States had been trying for more than 2 years to conclude an agreement for construction of an aviation-fuel pipeline from a French seaport to a point beyond the Paris area, which was to be financed with United States funds. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, had placed this pipeline as No. 1 on his list of priority projects, for you can't fly a jet fighter on cognac, and French cognac is good. But the issue was bogged down in a debate over control of the pipeline.

Although several United States congressional groups have cited this pipeline as an example of French noncooperation, I can't

blame the French. I blame ourselves for our inept handling of the matter. If our Paris Embassy really wanted to get prompt results, the Ambassador or at least his No. 2 man would have gone to work; or the Embassy might have permitted Ambassador Draper's full-time, experienced, but unemployed negotiators to move in and conclude the job. I warned the Embassy that the assignment would be taken out of its hands if action was not forthcoming. That is just what happened when Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson and Assistant Secretary Frank Nash came to Paris for the NATO meetings last April and concluded the negotiations the easy way, by capitulating completely to the French. Even the Embassy could have done this, months ago. Thus there never was a negotiation worthy of the name, and the whole job was thoroughly bungled. There must have been some anxious head scratching in American military circles during the French public-utility strikes last August.

While weeks and months passed with no progress at all toward obtaining bases and facilities for our forces, our missions and Embassies all over Western Europe were driving full speed ahead on our giveaway programs, which had priority over everything else. I can't adequately describe the cajoling, the arguing, the threatening, the fighting we went through with the people in our own Embassies in an attempt to get action on our military-base rights in step with our aid programs. We couldn't seem to convince them that if war came, all the aid in the form of dollars, offshore procurement items, and so on, would not fuel a single fighter, build a single airstrip, or provide naval port facilities.

These base-rights agreements are not only necessary for the logistic support of our troops but are also most important from a dollars-and-cents point of view. We can't just walk into a country, pick out a nice 5,000-acre site and build an airbase as if we were so many Russians. We have to negotiate what local taxes, what import and export duties, what port, landing, and other fees we should pay. We must get an agreement for general operating rights for our troops in the host country, determine what kind of money we shall use to pay our troops, agree on the residual value of our installations when we leave, work out many questions of jurisdiction over our forces while we are in the country, agree on the sharing of costs of our occupation, and on many other questions involving not only rights and privileges but dollars and cents. These agreements set the basic ground rules for hundreds of millions of dollars in expenditures on construction and contracting. Much congressional criticism has been leveled at the armed services for wasteful expenditures and faulty construction of bases, but I know of no group in Congress that ever looked at the heart of the question—to see just how and by whom the agreements that set the construction procedure were negotiated.

Generally speaking, where only United States money is involved, the military wants to make construction contracts the way it makes them in the United States—to draw the plans and specifications, determine the lowest responsible bidder, award and sign the contract and then inspect and supervise the work. Some foreign countries, however, feel they should do all these things, thereby gaining control of our expenditures.

In one country, notorious for its 10-percent kickbacks on all construction contracts, I was to draft a memorandum restating our position, which had already been given orally. The foreign country's position was directly opposite ours. Again, a part-time first secretary was put in charge with exactly the same lack of experience and lack of results—his full-time job was on giveaway programs. I wrote in my memo that in order to safeguard the expenditures of United States funds we must have the right to award the contract, and we must have the right to inspect and supervise the work. This was only a negotiating paper, but the Ambassador concerned struck out all the "musts" and inserted "desires to" in each instance. One can imagine how impressed the foreign government was with our desires.

I also got a sharp verbal rap on the knuckles from the Embassy for presuming to mention during these negotiations that a contractor in that same country had come to our military to ask where he should pay his 10-percent kickback. But the contractor was properly startled when we took care of that matter by cutting his bill to Uncle Sam by 10 percent.

My experiences with American diplomats abroad were not all bad, of course. The smaller Embassies, I found, were by far the best from the standpoint of a will to get ahead with a job and produce results. Ambassador Eugenie Anderson and her staff in Denmark, and Ambassador John E. Peurifoy in Greece, were the outstanding examples in this respect. But two of our larger Embassies on the Continent offset such happier experiences.

In another country we had been waiting more than 2 months for a very basic decision, and time was of the essence. Coincidentally, word came to notify this particular government that we now had so many more millions of dollar aid available for that country. Again I went to the Ambassador and begged him at least to mention the decision we wanted, and had to have, while breaking the pleasant news of our new bounty. He and his staff refused even to mention the two things together.

This was the last straw for me. I had gone to Europe to conduct negotiations with foreign countries for military bases that we urgently needed. Our Embassies wouldn't let me do this. I had pleaded for some businesslike approach to synchronize our aid with the facilities we needed, as my job description said I should, but I failed to budge the Embassies' determination not to do so. I had drawn large paychecks monthly without earning one of them—unless it was by negotiating with our own Embassies. This can become most demoralizing.

I therefore sent the Secretary of Defense a very strong cable, by military rather than Embassy communications, in which I warned that we might never get one agreement, while another would be far from satisfactory as a result of the Embassies' ineptitude. I further stated that under existing procedures my job was a complete phony, that I was not earning my pay, that I was not hired to advise a first secretary, and that I wanted no further part of the show unless the situation was changed to allow me to conduct the negotiations as I was hired to do and could do.

When one of the ambassadors concerned heard about this cable he sent an "Eyes Only" cable to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, asking that I be withdrawn from the negotiations for criticizing his Embassy and sending a message by military communications. I was delighted to learn that this cable had been sent, because I felt certain that Secretary Dulles, who had taken office nearly 6 months after I was sent to Europe, would be fair enough to look into the merits of my complaints and possibly take corrective steps. I had called the shots as I saw them, and knowing the Secretary's reputation, I felt that he would appreciate honest criticism.

But a friend of the Ambassador, a career man in the State Department, evidently came to my same line of reasoning, because I was reliably informed that this career man stopped the message intended only for the eyes of the Secretary of State and that Mr. Dulles, in fact, probably never saw the Ambassador's dispatch. In any event, I immediately became persona non grata at the Embassy involved, whereupon I returned to Washington and had my job abolished in order that no one else would get stuck with it.

One might ask why, instead of writing this article, I do not take this matter up with the new men now running our State Department, for surely they would do something about it. I wish it were that simple. I think the case of the "Eyes Only" cable, just cited, indicates a part of the problem. It must be remembered that the faces of only a relatively few top people are new ones in the Department, that, basically, the same team is calling the signals and running the show. It would be the height of optimism—and I am an optimist—to expect the necessary changes to come from within. Moreover, although the United States may have appointed new and able ambassadors to some foreign countries, the career Foreign Service officers in those countries will most assuredly attempt, and perhaps with success, to indoctrinate our freshly minted diplomats into their way of thinking and acting. The ultimate of this indoctrination is a benevolent mental state whereby we always know better what is best for a particular country than the country does itself.

It is not entirely a State Department matter either. The Defense Department has known, and in detail, of this situation, but either cannot or will not take steps to correct it. It must therefore share some of the responsibility, although the military and the three service Secretaries gave us wonderful cooperation at all times.

The fundamental issue involved in this whole unhappy episode remains unsolved. To me the issue is how the United States can obtain, train, and have available top-flight negotiators to represent our country and conduct the highly important defense negotiations with other nations. Perhaps in their other negotiations also, if we can reason by analogy. These first secretaries and most of the career Foreign Service people I met may be qualified to undertake the day-to-day routine problems which confront our Embassies. But what is it that makes an Ambassador or the Department of State think they can put an inexperienced young man, who wants to be well liked so he can be promoted in our Foreign Service, on a major negotiation on a part-time basis and expect to get the best results for our country?

No business would think of combining the jobs of sales manager and purchasing agent in one man. These career Foreign Service people, many of whom I have known for years, are uniformly charming people and may fill the bill as sales representatives of the United States. But they are about as effective in negotiation as a cup of warm water. We certainly are in need of a different breed of purchasing agents to represent us.

Perhaps what is needed is trained and qualified defense experts who can be appointed to the Ambassadors' staffs to handle these new problems, reporting directly to them. Alternatively, and I believe preferably, we might have a hard core of well-trained negotiators based in Washington in the Department of State who could go into a country, headed by a man with the rank of minister, be accountable only to the Ambassador, complete a negotiation and return home with no thought of becoming well liked or remaining in the country. In addition, we should be more general in our approach and not try, in a diplomatic agreement, to get in everything but the kitchen sink. We should agree on general principles and leave the later working out of details to the operating levels in the country.

We need trained men who understand the basic principles of negotiation set out above, who have the will to be firm, though polite; purposeful, while remaining considerate of others' rights, and who can temper their judgments with humility. This, plus less of

a desire to be popular. I am not advocating a "get-tough" policy, but rather a "get-wise" policy of using a little God-given commonsense.

This is not, in my opinion, a political problem; rather, it is a problem of training and constant objective review to make sure that our foreign servants do not go stale, social, or get imbued with a burning desire to be well liked above all else in the country where they are serving. Indeed, there is one school of thought among those who have been exposed to the vacillating, paternalistic, and negative attitudes of some of our embassies, that if more United States Ambassadors were declared persona non grata, the American people would have a clearer indication that their interests were being properly protected. Perhaps the United States Congress should give all such ambassadors medals to equate them properly with the popular individuals who get decorations or medals from the foreign countries when they leave.

Although we still indulge in the luxury of appointing completely untried and untested ambassadors from the ranks of political contributors, we most certainly should stop playing games when it comes to the hard task of conducting actual negotiations. Only experience should be tolerated. Man for man, the foreign countries will outnegotiate the United States if we do not train and make available the best our country can produce. In the absence of such men to negotiate on behalf of our country, I am forced to agree with the proponents of the so-called Bricker amendment which would limit the scope of our international negotiations without congressional approval. If we are to continue to have agreements concluded by such inexperienced persons as are today conducting them, the very least that should occur is some review of their terms by the appropriate committee of the Congress.

Above all, it seems to me that we could certainly use some new blood. I am thinking, in particular, of the career Foreign Service Officer who gave orders that the American flag should not be flown on our Embassy in Rome last May 1 for fear the Communists would not like it. Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, our Ambassador, was not aware of this piece of pussyfooting nonsense, but Secretary of Defense Wilson, visiting Rome, certainly was. To his everlasting credit, Mr. Wilson refused to set foot in the Embassy that day until the flag was flown. What he doesn't know, however, is that 5 minutes after he left the Embassy, the career man had the flag hauled down, again. To me, this incident epitomizes the mentality I faced throughout the 9 most frustrating months of my life.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AND ALASKA

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is taking a final look at the question of statehood for Hawaii, and many of us are making an effort to add statehood for Alaska to the current proposal. The Scripps-Howard newspapers recently carried an editorial, entitled "Hawaii and Alaska," which points to the necessity of bringing statehood to these two Territories at the same time. I desire to have the editorial reprinted at this point in the RECORD, and to have it followed by a letter which appeared in the Anchorage Daily Times of Wednesday, December 23, 1953, in which Republican residents of Alaska protested to Governor Heintzleman over the way his office was being conducted, and in which these prominent Republicans urged the Governor to take a positive stand in favor of passage by the current Congress of the Statehood Act for Alaska. I ask that the editorial and the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAII AND ALASKA

As President Eisenhower and Republican congressional leaders discuss a legislative program this week, statehood for Hawaii doubtless will be on the agenda, and if the past attitude maintains it will be designated as one of the "must" items for the forthcoming session of Congress.

There is no good reason why Hawaii should not be admitted to the Union—nor Alaska.

The political complexions of the two Territories and of the present Congress make it virtually impossible to push Hawaii statehood through in 1954 unless Alaska is granted the same status.

That is because Republicans have been able to maintain a steady majority in Hawaii over the years, while Alaska more often than not votes Democratic. To politicians this means Hawaii probably would send two Republican Senators to Washington, while Alaska would be likely to send two Democratic Senators.

The GOP does not even have a majority in the Senate now, and its margin of control in the House is too thin to assure it of a victory on any strictly partisan issue. Obviously, then, this Congress will not pass Hawaii statehood if the Republicans continue to make it a partisan issue, even if it is the No. 1 item on the President's "must" list.

To pretend otherwise is to perpetrate a hoax on the Hawaiians, without accomplishing any other discernible end.

This matter, of necessity, has to be treated on a bipartisan basis. It involves the granting of self-rule to hundreds of thousands of citizens who want to get out from under the rule of bureaucrats from Washington.

The Republican leaders should face up to the facts of the matter and support statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. Anything less would be simply another meaningless gesture.

B. FRANK HEINTZLEMAN,
Governor of Alaska,
Juneau, Alaska.

DEAR GOVERNOR HEINTZLEMAN: We, the undersigned Republicans residing in Anchorage, wish to advise you that we are displeased with the present administrative program and policies of the Territorial government.

Our chief complaints pertaining directly to your office include the following:

1. We feel that controls of Territorial affairs are in the hands of stateside groups and special interests.

2. We feel a lack of representation by western Alaskans in Territorial affairs.

3. We feel a lack of strong leadership necessary to consolidate and unite the Republican Party throughout the Territory.

4. We feel a lack of interest by the Department of the Interior and other Government agencies for the economic welfare of the Territory.

5. We feel a lack of interest by the Governor's office on the statehood program is disastrous.

6. We feel the Governor's office has taken a negative attitude for a special session.

To show that you respect the will of the people; to demonstrate that the Republican Party deserves support at the next election; and to enable our rightful economic development, we specifically request:

1. Replacement of DeArmond by a progressive man from the rail belt.

2. The calling of a special session of the legislators within 60 days.

3. A positive stand by you in favor of passage by the current Congress of a statehood act for Alaska.

4. A public declaration and vigorous support by you of necessary Federal action, to include:

(a) A documented program for APW appropriations up to the authorized limit.

(b) Division of Bureau of Reclamation survey funds on an equitable development basis throughout the entire Territory.

(c) Creation of a joint commission of Canadians and resident Alaskans for power, transportation, and other matters of common interest.

5. A vigorous protest to the Department of the Interior regarding the cut in road appropriations.

E. E. Rasmuson, J. C. Morris, Harold Strandberg, George R. Jones, Glenn S. Miller, Fred W. Axford, John McManamin, Robert A. Baker, Carl T. Rentschler, Neil S. Mackay, Walter J. Hickel, K. M. Lesh, B. C. Rutherford, Gerald J. Foley, John H. Clawson, Jack Anderson, William A. O'Neil, Don H. Goodman.

WHY THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED BY THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, today the 2d session of the 83d Congress starts its legislative work by considering measures which were on the calendar at the end of the first session. Among those measures is one providing for construction of a St. Lawrence seaway. If and when that bill comes up for discussion by the Senate, I hope to speak again and to give reasons showing why it should not pass. I should like to explain why the proposal to construct a St. Lawrence seaway deserves no consideration at this session of Congress. The bill merits no consideration for the following reasons:

The administration is asking for an increase in the national debt limit beyond $275 billion. With a $9-billion deficit this year, the unnecessary spending of $105 million—only a fraction of the ultimate cost—is not justified.

The pending proposal to construct a 27-foot channel in the 46-mile stretch of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River would provide only a 27-foot channel as far as Toledo, Ohio, on Lake Erie, and is, therefore, only a small part of a project that would ultimately cost billions of dollars.

The seaway would, at best, be a part-time transportation facility, frozen over for 4 or 5 months of each year.

Fewer than 4 percent of American-flag ships, fully loaded, could use the proposed 27-foot waterway, and 30 leading American steamship operators have stated they would not use the 27-foot seaway if built. Shipping experts estimate that about 20 percent of foreign-flag tonnage could use it. To the extent it would be used by small foreign, cheaply operated, tramp steamers, the American fleet would have to be further subsidized.

The seaway would not contribute to national defense, but, on the contrary, in time of war it would be a defense liability. With its 2 dams and some 15 locks, it would be most vulnerable to bombing or sabotage, and could be put out of commission for long periods of time. Any effort to afford protection

against such hazards, even though ineffective, would be costly, not only in money but to an even greater extent in manpower and material.

The seaway would serve primarily for the movement in lake vessels of Labrador-Quebec iron ore and for the movement of taconite rock or low-grade ore from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan iron-ore ranges to the Lake Erie steel plants which have invested vast sums in ore and taconite development. At the present time these steel and mining companies have committed over $500 million for construction of commercial taconite plants in the Lake Superior region; and within the next 20 years they expect to produce annually some 30 million tons of taconite concentrate. Such a capacity will require an investment of about $1 billion; and to produce 30 million tons of taconite pellets annually will cost between $750 million and $1 billion.

These investments by the steel and mining interests are made with the knowledge that the source of supply will be continuous. Even the estimates submitted by the proponents of the seaway show that the supply of high-grade iron ore, not taconite, in the Lake Superior region is adequate to meet anticipated needs from that source for approximately 30 years.

Added to this are the virtually inexhaustible quantities of taconite ore in the same Lake Superior region—reserves, estimated as high as 60 billion tons—enough to provide for all foreseeable needs of the future for more than 100 years.

If the steel and ore mining companies who so strongly advocate the building of a seaway are willing to invest billions of dollars as just outlined, why cannot they spent $105 million to complete their investment instead of saddling it onto the United States Government? Last Saturday, January 9, the Washington Evening Star carried an Associated Press story stating that the United States Steel Corp. is climaxing 7 years of exploration, 2 years of construction, and a $170 million investment by shipping its first load of ore mined in the Venezuelan wilderness. The Associated Press dispatch reported that the President of Venezuela would press a button completing loading of the ship, and that "the chartered vessel will then begin a 176-mile journey down the Orinoco Channel dredged by the company to the sea."

Why do not the companies interested in Labrador ore do the same? The answer is clear. The St. Lawrence seaway is necessary neither for the development of Labrador ore nor for the transportation of taconite ore to steel mills in the United States. The group of steel and ore companies interested in the development of taconite and the Labrador field would like to have our Government build the seaway only because it would improve their competitive position in the steel industry. In fact, they are going ahead with their development regardless of whether the seaway is built. But it is increasingly clear that their advocacy of this project is more self-serving than anything else. They would like to have the Government subsidize their transportation costs for many years in the future, without regard to the adverse effect on major American industries and localities, including the railroads, the coal industry, the American merchant marine, the Atlantic and gulf ports, and every individual employed in those industries and localities.

Those of us from coastal States know only too well how the seaway would affect us. Maryland's port is in the market for more business, and because our economy is greatly dependent upon the activity of the port of Baltimore, we are at this moment concerned with a decrease in port business. Baltimore's shipping during 1953 dropped 2,205,194 tons below the port's 1952 level. The reduction consisted largely of lower overseas shipments of coal and grain—the very items which Baltimore is best able to handle—cargoes for which the seaway would offer the greatest competition.

The seaway proponents have now gained the support of the present administration and they sold the administration by arguing that, if we do not join, Canada will build it alone. What is their complaint then? They plan to bring in the ore regardless of whether the seaway is built, but, if Canada is going to build it, why should they insist that we do it?

It cannot be that they are afraid of doing business with Canada. The iron ore is in Canada. They are developing the ore under an agreement with the Canadian Government. The Canadian Government receives a royalty on every ton they produce. They have to bring this ore 360 miles by rail—a common carrier subject to the regulation of Canada. Then the ore is moved down the St. Lawrence more than 400 miles, in Canadian territory, before it reaches the International Rapids section. All this time the ore has been produced and moved at the pleasure, so to speak, of the Canadian Government.

Suddenly, here at the International Rapids, these operators insist that for the next 46 miles they want the friendly embrace of the United States Government, and they say it will cost the taxpayers only $105 million. What makes the situation all the more amazing is that the ore, moving on from the rapids, will again be in Canadian clutches at the Welland Canal.

From a socialistic standpoint, the proposed seaway fits into the plans of those who would expand governmental activities into all possible fields. It would put the Government in the transportation business primarily to benefit five or six steel operators by giving them an advantage over their competitors, through a subsidized waterway competing with rail transportation.

Should the railroads be forced into bankruptcy brought on by this subsidized competition which would make it impossible for them to do their job, the Government would have to take them over. Government-operated railroads would then be in direct competition with all other forms of transportation; and the end result would be the taking over by the Government of all forms of transportation, as has been done in Great Britain. From nationalization of transportation to that of many, if not most, basic industries, such as communications and utilities, would be but a short step. This has been the pattern in other countries.

So, without any conscious choice or desire on their part to promote the socialistic way of life, the advocates of the seaway, if successful, could bring about, through gradual steps and changes in our American economy, conditions under which private enterprise would no longer earn enough to continue without Government aid. The seaway from this standpoint affects the very life of our economy. The Congress could do more by continuing its policy of eliminating government in business, as typified by abolition of the RFC and disposal of Inland Waterways Corporation and the defense rubber plants.

The political repercussions in the various States and congressional districts which would follow any attempt to take up the seaway bill at this session of Congress would be far-reaching and no doubt disappointing, from my partisan point of view.

To bring up the seaway bill, with no possible assurance that it could pass the Senate and would incur rougher opposition in the House, seems to be courting trouble. A defeat of the project in either the Senate or House certainly would not enhance the prestige of the administration or Republican leadership.

Because of the close division in both the Senate and House, the support of the opposition will be sought in order to carry out the administration's program. In June 1952, when the St. Lawrence project was being advocated by a Democratic administration, 19 Democratic Senators in 15 States voted to send it back to committee, and 3 others were paired to do likewise. At the same time, 24 Republican Senators from 16 States voted to recommit, and 2 were paired to recommit. While there have been a number of changes in the Senate since 1952, they have not been sufficiently numerous to indicate that consideration of the St. Lawrence project, even in a watered-down form, would promote harmony for the administration, particularly at the beginning of a session so pressed with issues of really vital importance to the Nation.

In the congressional election of 1952, there were 40 districts in which the candidates from my party won by less than 55 percent of the total vote. These marginal districts are not lumped together in big electoral vote States, but are sprinkled widely across the country, in 22 States. Similarly, in another 45 districts, in the same 22 States, plus 9 others, the candidates of my party received more than 45 percent of the total vote. Here is a total of 85 so-called marginal seats in 31 States. It would be political folly to think that a vote for the seaway in many of these districts would not seriously influence the outcome of elections next November. Many of the districts are in States that are strongly opposed to paying taxes for a project that brings them no benefit. Such a controversial project injected in an election year could have the effect of weakening the party in power.

It should not be forgotten that the seaway is opposed by business organizations and trade unions in some 30 States, including such groups as the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, representing the largest port on the Great Lakes, the West Side Association of Commerce of New York City, the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, and many others just as important.

In the Congressional Quarterly of September 4 appeared an article entitled "Congress Picks the Issues." The Congressional Quarterly listed 40 issues and asked Members of the 83d Congress to check the ones they thought would be the major issues in their districts. Some 184 Representatives and 39 Senators replied and voted. With respect to bringing up the St. Lawrence seaway bill, it is interesting to note that as a rated issue it ranked 34th out of the 40. Obviously it is not considered sufficiently important to be brought up at this time.

In another endeavor to determine the issues of Congress in 1954 the U. S. News & World Report sent telegrams to all Members of Congress. Upward of 200 Members responded, and in the publication of December 18, 1953, 8 big issues for 1954 are listed in order. The seaway was not one of those selected by either Republicans or Democrats. In fact, of the 88 Members quoted, only 1—the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]—mentioned the seaway.

The seaway project has been defeated or pigeonholed in Congress on four occasions, and since its last defeat, no new arguments have been presented to justify reconsideration by the 83d Congress.

We of the Republican Party and the administration can ill afford to subject ourselves to the controversy and resultant difficulties which a debate on the seaway would create. All evidence indicates that Congress will be very busily occupied with more important issues and problems than the seaway, which would primarily benefit a very small segment of our economy, at the expense of all.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the business of the morning hour has been concluded, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum before the Senate proceeds to a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk (Emery L. Frazier) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gordon	Hennings
Anderson	Daniel	Hickenlooper
Barrett	Dirksen	Hill
Beall	Duff	Hoey
Bennett	Dworshak	Holland
Bricker	Eastland	Hunt
Burke	Ellender	Jackson
Bush	Flanders	Jenner
Butler, Md.	Frear	Johnson, Colo.
Butler, Nebr.	Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.
Byrd	George	Johnston, S. C.
Capehart	Gillette	Kefauver
Carlson	Goldwater	Kennedy
Case	Gore	Kerr
Chavez	Griswold	Kilgore
Clements	Hayden	Knowland
Cooper	Hendrickson	Kuchel
Langer	Morse	Smith, N. J.
Lehman	Mundt	Sparkman
Lennon	Murray	Stennis
Long	Payne	Symington
Magnuson	Potter	Thye
Malone	Purtell	Upton
Martin	Robertson	Watkins
McCarran	Russell	Welker
McCarthy	Saltonstall	Wiley
McClellan	Schoeppel	Williams
Millikin	Smathers	Young
Monroney	Smith, Maine	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the prior announcement, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

ESTABLISHMENT OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DOMICILIARY FACILITY AT FORT LOGAN, COLO.

The bill (S. 242) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was announced as first in order.

EARLY RELEASE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BECAUSE OF WEATHER CONDITIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief announcement. The Traffic Bureau of the District of Columbia requests that Federal employees be released today at least 2 hours earlier than usual because of the weather and ice conditions and the traffic congestion which is expected to develop. Under the circumstances, I believe that the various Federal departments are cooperating in this regard. I have notified my own staff to that effect. It is up to each individual Senator, of course, to determine what his own "ground rules" shall be. However, I feel that Senators should know that such a request has been made by the Traffic Bureau. Pursuant to that request, I shall endeavor, within reasonable limitations, to conclude the session of the Senate shortly after 3 o'clock this afternoon, if it is possible to do so.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on President Eisenhower's message on agriculture, which was read to the Senate a short time ago. The message proposes a program which I believe constitutes a broad basis for enacting the best and soundest agricultural legislation which we have ever had.

The President has drawn on our experience with all types of programs affecting agriculture, which have been in effect up to this time, and has made his recommendations accordingly. It is significant that, in accordance with the promises he made during the campaign last year, he is not requesting a repeal of the acts of Congress which provide for 90 percent of parity price supports for the basic commodities, through the years 1953 and 1954; nor is he asking for repeal of the suspension of the modernized parity formula with respect to the basic commodities which will carry through until January 1, 1956.

He is, however, requesting a return to the basic legislation which was enacted in 1948 and 1949, after those two exemptions expire.

The basic legislation, first enacted in 1948, and amended and improved upon in the Agricultural Act of 1949, contrary to reports which we have read in some newspapers lately, was included in the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties of 1948. It was not an issue in the campaign of that year. It was enacted as sound legislation; and it was, I believe, fully applicable to conditions which prevailed at that time.

However, the President recognizes that there have been material changes in the situation affecting agriculture since the Agricultural Act of 1949 was passed. Therefore, his recommendations deal with ways to meet those changes.

The new conditions have been created primarily as a result of the Korean conflict. During 1949 and in the spring of 1950 there was developing an agricultural price decline. Then the Korean conflict broke out and the farmers of the United States were urged to overproduce beyond what would be sufficient under normal conditions.

The administration at that time, of course, could not tell how long the Korean conflict would last. Therefore, the farmers were urged to overproduce as a safety measure. They overproduced with a vengeance in 1951, 1952, and 1953. Probably some controls should have been imposed on certain crops in 1953, particularly on wheat, but that was not done. Consequently, we find the United States Government owning and lending on several billion dollars worth of farm commodities. In fact, the Government owns so much of the commodities now that by June 1 the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, now limited to $6,750,000,000, will be completely exhausted.

It will be noted that the President has asked for additional borrowing authority amounting to $1,750,000,000, to take care

of the crops which will be produced during 1954.

The President recognizes the fact, with the tremendous surpluses hanging over the market, it is impossible for any farm program to work as we would like to have it work, without imposing extremely severe conditions upon the producers of this country.

Therefore, he suggests that we set aside and take out of the normal channels of trade $2½ billion worth of commodities which may be regarded either as surplus or as reserve.

He does not go into detail as to how this should be done. Indeed, it will not be easy to do it in such a way as to accomplish the objective and still be safe otherwise. Congress must work out the details as to how much of each commodity will have to be set aside, and how it shall be handled. The commodities proposed to be set aside primarily are cotton, wheat, dairy products, vegetable oils, and possibly other commodities of lesser value. Some wool will be set aside, too. So far as cotton and wool are concerned, probably it will not be too difficult to set these commodities aside in a reserve pool, to be used in case of emergencies. It will not be so easy to handle wheat and vegetable oils, and we will have to use our abilities to the fullest extent to handle surpluses of dairy products adequately.

At the present time the Federal Government buys practically every bit of cheese and powdered milk produced in the United States.

Mr. President, the President of the United States puts emphasis on the need for developing new markets. I believe new markets may well be developed in the so-called undeveloped areas of the world—markets which are presently outside the present normal channels of trade. That is a situation into which we shall have to look very carefully. It is probable that we may be able to develop new markets in countries whose currencies it will be necessary to accept in exchange for commodities which we have in excess of our own requirements in the United States.

Last summer we placed a provision in the Mutual Security Act, section 550, which gave our Government an opportunity to try out, in a small way, a program of selling our surplus commodities to foreign countries in exchange for their currencies. I believe we have learned a good deal from that small beginning, and we shall have to make full use of our experience in that regard.

The President also suggests that we pay attention to increasing the normal carry-over of corn. He is on sound ground there, because what was a normal carry-over in 1948 certainly could not be considered an adeuaqte carry-over as of today. It is entirely possible that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may wish to consider increasing the carry-over of certain other commodities as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. LANGER. Madam President, I did not know that we were going to debate the agricultural program today. I remember very well that a few years ago, when Wendell Willkie was the Republican candidate for President, he said he was against war. A short time later he testified before a committee, and a distinguished Senator asked Wendell Willkie, "When you were campaigning, did you not say so and so?" Wendell Willkie's answer that rang around the world was, "Yes, but that was campaign oratory."

Mr. President, Candidate Eisenhower came to Fargo, N. Dak., and said he was in favor of the present 90 percent parity. He said he was for REA. I read nothing in the President's message today which carries out the promises made by Candidate Eisenhower.

I did not know that we were going to debate the subject at this time. If I had known, I should have brought the speech which was delivered by Candidate Eisenhower at Fargo, N. Dak., so that I might read it to the Senate. I shall avail myself of the very first opportunity to bring it here and read it to the Members of this body so that they may become familiar with the speech made by the candidate, not in Minnesota or in Iowa, but when he came to the State of North Dakota, and spoke to an assembly of farmers who were depending, in order to make up their minds, upon what he said relative to the 90 percent of the present parity, and relative to other subjects. For example, he stated that before anything would be done with reference to the farm program, farmers would be invited to Washington and that their advice would be heeded. Changes were made in the REA program, without, so far as I know, any farmer being invited to give his views on that subject. We shall take that up a little later. I remember Madam President, that a caravan of cattlemen came to Washington to be heard. When they were half way to Washington the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture said he wished there were not so many of them coming. Yet Candidate Eisenhower said, when he spoke in Fargo, N. Dak., that he wanted the farmers to come and that "their advice would be heeded."

I cannot sit here in silence when my distinguished friend from Vermont, under the 5-minute rule, makes such statements as he has made.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DOMICILIARY FACILITY AT FORT LOGAN, COLO.—BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate bill S. 242 to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, I reserve the right to object, and shall object to its consideration at this time. I do so by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

ERICH ANTON HELFERT

The bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert was announced as next in order.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, I shall not undertake to discuss the matter of the REA in North Dakota at this time, but I wish to state that the State of North Dakota is receiving more under the present administration than it ever did before. The whole country is getting more than it got last year.

There are certain things that must be considered in working out an agricultural program. We have to consider, first, that some of the surpluses are temporary in nature and will be overcome by an increase in the population of the United States. There are certain surpluses which probably will not be overcome. We have to consider the growing use of substitutes for our fiber crops. I noticed only last week that the Du Pont Co. has reduced the price of orlon fiber 10 cents a pound. We have noticed reductions in the prices of other commodities. That is something which we must consider. We must also consider what shall be done with the twenty-five or thirty million acres which are taken out of the production of wheat and cotton. In years when acreage controls are in effect, our basic crops would account for only 21 percent of the agricultural income of the United States. We cannot permit the acreage diverted from those crops to upset the situation with respect to other crops.

I wish to call attention also to the terms "flexible" and "rigid" as applied to price levels. We are confronted with a paradoxical situation. Ninety percent does not always mean 90 percent of parity for all crops. It is possible that farmers might receive 90 percent of parity in the market a greater percentage of the time without rigid 90 percent price supports, although at harvest time last year farmers received only 75 percent of parity for their crops.

I also wish to point out that under the act of 1948–49, price support at 90 percent of parity is mandatory for the basic commodities so long as supplies are kept in line with demand.

We all want a prosperous agriculture. We all want freedom from dependency on Government checks if it is possible to attain that end.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been at work for a full week, and it is going to continue to work.

On January 14 we shall take up the so-called watershed bill.

On January 18 Secretary Benson will discuss the agricultural outlook and, presumably, the President's message before our committee.

On January 21 we expect to take up the so-called range improvement bill. We hope to have these conservation measures out of the way this month.

We shall have a new program and new legislation soon with reference to wool. We shall have to ask Congress for perhaps $2 billion more borrowing authority to support the agricultural program

for 1954, over and above that which is already available.

We shall take up as soon as possible, probably this month, the President's request for setting aside certain supplies which are now acting as depressants on the market. Time is of the essence. If we are going to relieve the pressure on the dairy farmers of this country, we must have legislation ready before April 1.

I realize that my 5 minutes have expired, but let me say that a prosperous agriculture and a healthy economy are the objectives of all of us. I hope that no one will take the position that he is against anything in the way of legislation that President Eisenhower recommends. I hope a good agricultural program will not be opposed simply because Senators may be on the other side of the question as to this or that detail. Let us consider the program as a whole. Let us work wholeheartedly for the good of the American farmer and of the American economy. I am sure that if we do that—and I know we are going to do that, so far as the committee is concerned—we shall have full cooperation and will bring forth legislation which the Congress may well be proud of having had a part in enacting.

ERICH ANTON HELFERT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert?

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. LANGER. Madam President, I desire to say to my distinguished friend from Vermont I am certain that, so far as I know, the farmers are going to cooperate with the President of the United States, provided he carries out the promises he made during the campaign, which were published in newspapers all over the United States. The farmers relied upon those promises, and unless recommendations are made which carry out those promises, some of us upon the floor are going to oppose the proposed legislation.

The Senator from Vermont mentioned the fact that Du Pont lowered the price of a certain commodity 10 cents a pound. I also noticed in the Washington press that bread had gone up another cent a loaf. Nearly every product which the farmer buys is just as high today or is higher than it was a year ago.

I wonder what has been done to enforce the antitrust laws so far as they relate——

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I only have 5 minutes. I reluctantly am compelled to decline to yield at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. There are 20 cases now underway.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder what has been done to enforce the antitrust laws and the antidumping provision to prevent grain from Canada being dumped into the United States of America.

With acreage allotments going into effect all over the Northwest, a large amount of land which last year was planted in wheat has now been planted in rye. Yet what do we find? We find that month after month after month rye has been coming in from Canada. We have been trying to have the importation of rye from Canada stopped. Although the United States produces roughly only from 23 to 25 million bushels of rye, nevertheless between 5 and 7 million bushels of rye were poured into the United States from Canada within the past few months.

Similarly, we find the same thing happening with respect to oats. Millions upon millions of bushels of oats have been imported, to the detriment of the American farmer. Not much has been done about that, although I read recently that the Department of Justice finally took cognizance of the situation.

Mr. President, the importation of rye, which has forced the price of rye down almost 50 percent since Congress adjourned last August, could have been stopped months ago by the authorities, if they had wanted to do so. The officials of the Department of Agriculture sat idly by for a long time and did nothing about it. Finally they made an investigation, after the antimonopoly committee had had a hearing on it. The Department then referred the matter to the President. After it had lain on the President's desk for a while, he referred it to the Tariff Commission, which is now making another study of the conditions. But rye is still pouring into the United States. The Wall Street Journal recently stated that 250,000 bushels were received in Chicago in 1 day.

ERICH ANTON HELFERT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I understand that the Senate is considering Calendar No. 48, S. 56, a bill for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have been sitting here rather patiently, hoping that Senators would abide by the spirit of the 5-minute rule, under which the Senate is now operating, until the call of the calendar is completed. Certainly there is a special purpose in following that rule. There is a special purpose for the rule. The call of the calendar was announced last week. Senators who are charged with the handling of the calendar must sit by, on many days, hour after hour, while debate goes on under the 5-minute rule. In my judgment, that is strictly a violation of the spirit of the rule.

I hope that from now on, today, Senators will abide by the spirit of the rule and will carry on with the calendar call. We have alrcady been operating for 25 minutes on the calendar call and have acted on but one bill. When we have finished with the call of the calendar, controversial speeches can then be made without objection of any sort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 56?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Calendar No. 48, S. 56, would undoubtedly be objected to if the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] were on the floor. Therefore, I should not at all insist upon its being considered. However, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a very brief statement explanatory of the bill and, if possible, by unanimous consent, offer, and to have lie on the table, an amendment to the bill, which has been printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Nevada that the bill was objected to. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada to make a statement? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. This is the case of a 20-year-old native of Czechoslovakia, and a citizen of Germany, who came to the United States in August 1950 as an exchange student. He attended the school of journalism at the University of Nevada until June 1951. He is presently employed by the Martin Iron Works, where his services are said to be needed in the interests of the defense effort.

There is no question about the fact that this is a young man of clean character and good morals who will make an excellent citizen.

In order to meet objections by certain Senators who contend that an exchange student should not be permitted to receive the benefits of the so-called Fulbright program in the way of expenses, school fees, maintenance, and so on, and then frustrate the program by failing to return to his native country, I propose to offer an amendment, which I now send to the desk, to require that before this young man shall be granted the privilege of permanent residence in the United States he shall be required to repay in full all of the sums which he may have received from the Institute of International Education, which administers for the State Department certain funds in connection with the student exchange program. This amendment has been printed and is lying on the table, so Senators have had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with it and it does not come as a surprise. I hope this proposal may solve the difficulty which has arisen with regard to this bill and also with regard to the next bill on the calendar, which is entirely similar.

Madam President, I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, immediately preceding the period, it is proposed to insert: "and refund to the Institute of International Education, New York, N. Y., of all sums paid or advanced by such Institute for expenses, including travel, school fees, room, board, clothing, books, and spending money, of said Erich Anton Helfert."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Madam President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada if his amendment would include interest on the investment so far as the State Department is concerned.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know that the present language would include interest, but I shall be glad to have the language so amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Can that amendment be offered?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to accept it, so as to read at the end of line 3: "with interest thereon," at whatever rate may be proper, 4 percent or 5 percent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to offer such an amendment. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that I think he has proposed a good, constructive formula. There are at present a great many cases of this type, and there will undoubtedly be others in the future, and such a provision should be a condition with respect to each one of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering the bill so that the Senator from Nevada may offer his amendment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, since the Senator for whom I am objecting is not on the floor, and since the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada does not change the principle involved, I feel constrained to ask that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will not the Senator permit me to amend my bill so that it may appear on the calendar as amended?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is all I ask.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am merely indicating that I would have to ask that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be considered for the purpose of enabling the Senator from Nevada to offer his amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I now offer the amendment which has been read, with the modification proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment, as modified, is agreed to, and the bill, as amended, will go over.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the bill be printed as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FELIX KORTSCHOK

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Felix Kortschok was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I have proposed, with the modification of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], may be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SMATHERS. I withdraw my objection, so that the request of the Senator from Nevada may be considered, namely, that the amendment proposed by him may be acted upon. Then I shall renew my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be considered so that the Senator from Nevada may offer his amendment. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, immediately preceding the period, it is proposed to insert: "and refund to the Institute of International Education, New York, N. Y., of all sums paid or advanced, with interest thereon, by such institute for expenses, including travel, school fees, room, board, clothing, books, and spending money, of said Felix Kortschok."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to, and, under objection, the bill will go over.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the bill as amended be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PHED VOSNIACOS

The bill (S. 101) for the relief of Phed Vosniacos was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. I make the same objection as was made to the previous bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I object to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 57) to amend rule XIII of the standing rules relative to motions to reconsider was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I also ask that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 389) for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Moruzi was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 978) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PROMOTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1063) to authorize and request the President to promote certain naval officers, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Tennessee if there is any fundamental objection to the bill? In its present form it was passed by the Senate in 1949. It is an effort to correct certain injustices suffered by approximately 600 officers of the Navy during the war years.

I have no personal interest whatsoever in the bill. It is the same as a bill which has heretofore passed the Senate. That bill was reported favorably by the House committee and then died in the House because it could not pass on the Consent Calendar.

This is a bill which I discussed with the Senator a few days ago. As I have said, I have no personal interest in the bill, except that I believe it insures fair treatment to a number of officers to whom injustices may have been done.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am through.

Mr. GORE. In his conference with me the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts was, as he generally is, very persuasive. The objection which I have voiced is not on my own behalf, but by request of a fellow Senator. If the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts would confer with the Senator who has registered objection, it might be possible that he would as a result withdraw his objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 1663) to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Madam President, this bill must of necessity go over, but I ask unanimous consent that I may make a very brief statement regarding it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. The figure on page 4, line 16, of the calendar print of the bill, is $15,000. That should be $15,500. This is a typographical error, and in order to correct it I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered and be amended by striking out on page 4, line 16, the figure "$15,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$15,500." This is merely to provide for a correction of the bill. I then desire to make a very brief statement regarding the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, did the Senator indicate that he desired to make a statement regarding the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to make a very brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Madam President, as Senators know, the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, created by Public Law 220, is required by that law to make its report to the Congress not later than January 15. Public Law 220 requires in terms that the Congress within 60 days after the submission of this report shall act on the report making such adjustments in judicial and congressional salaries as the Congress sees fit to direct. It is assumed by all that the vehicle for such congressional action will be the bill now under consideration, which is No. 259 on the Senate Calendar, S. 1663, reported favorably from the Committee on the Judiciary on May 12, 1953.

In order that Senators may know what to anticipate in this connection, I ask the majority leader if he can tell the Senate at this time what plans the leadership has made for bringing Senate bill 1663, Calendar No. 259, before the Senate. I hope the bill may be brought up as speedily as possible after the salary commission makes its report, so that in the light of that report the bill may be amended, as the Senate may determine, and sent to the other body of the Congress for consideration and action within the 60-day limit.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Nevada, I would say that Senate bill 1663, No. 259 on the calendar, has not been scheduled as yet by the policy committee or the leadership on this side of the aisle. I have announced the general program for the coming week or two, but I shall be glad to call this measure to the attention of the policy committee, and also to discuss it with the minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and I may be prepared to make an announcement about it at an early date.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to say that my inquiry stems from the fact that it has been my privilege to act as an advisory member of the salary commission appointed by the Vice President. The commission will make its report on or before the 15th of this month, and the law requires that something be done with it by the Senate within a reasonable time.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I wish to make a very brief statement with respect to the bill. It may be that a careful examination of the facts will support the conclusion that judges are entitled to some increase in salary, but I am satisfied that any increase should be much less than the amount provided for in the bill.

I seriously doubt that a case can be made for any increase in salary for United States attorneys. They are fairly well paid now. The salary of a United States attorney is far above the average income of other American lawyers. In fact, I think it is considerably above other lawyers of equal ability in most instances.

I am satisfied that no case can be made for increasing the salaries of Members of Congress. I think they are very well paid as public servants. When they go into public service they do so with the knowledge that they are not going into it for their financial advantage.

I do think that the financial problem of service in Congress is not so much one of inadequate salary, but of an inadequate accountable expense allowance. What we need to do is to inform the American people of the office expense problem that confronts the Representatives of the people, and to seek to have appropriated enough to meet the expenses that can be shown on the record to be justified in order to enable their Representatives to serve effectively the people in the Congress of the United States. The expense allowance problem is what really should concern Members of Congress, and not the matter of salary. The expense allowance should be absolutely accountable and made a matter of public record. It seems to me that we ought to seek to improve the services of our offices to our constituents through an increase in expense allowance.

Madam President, with thousands and thousands of people in America becoming unemployed each week, with many factories going on 2- and 3-day per week schedules, with signs on the horizon of a very serious economic recession sweeping across the country, I am at a loss to understand how any serious consideration can be given in the Senate of the United States to increasing the salaries of Members of Congress. I think such a suggestion is an affront to the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

RESOLUTIONS AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 20) amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1857) to amend certain statutes providing expeditious judicial proceedings for the condemnation of lands for public purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1461) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, concerning requests of common carriers for increased transportation rates was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1691) to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia and to cross Kenilworth Ave. NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1396) to authorize the adoption of certain rules with respect to the broadcasting or telecasting of professional baseball exhibitions in interstate commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2150) providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1806) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 848) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2314) to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate commerce by communication facilities, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4557) to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to permits for construction of radio stations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4558) to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4559) to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 281) to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act, with respect to the provisions of certain medical and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service and for dependents and widows of officers and employees of such Service, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, may we have an explanation of the bill? Until we are able to have an explanation of the bill, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3704) to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Sam Rosenblat was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2413) to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives, for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2457) to authorize the Administrator of General Services and the Postmaster General to enter into building purchase contracts; to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease space for post office purposes, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, I ask that the bill go over, by agreement. I should like to have that appear in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, by agreement.

The bill (S. 2038) to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2231) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1243) to amend the War Contractors Relief Act with respect to the definition of a request for relief, to authorize consideration and settlement of certain claims of subcontractors, to provide reasonable compensation for the services of partners and proprietors, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, the bill is clearly not a measure to be disposed of during the call of the calendar. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6287) to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1688) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill go over to the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over to the next calendar call.

The bill (S. 796) to permit the charging of tolls on certain highways constructed with Federal aid was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let the bill go over.

Mr. MORSE. I request that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 666) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and right-of-way in the State of Wyoming to the town of Jackson, Wyo., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the founding of the city of New York was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, I understand that this measure and the next two measures on the calendar—Calendar No. 730, House bill 1917, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; and Calendar No. 731, Senate bill 987, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., are very soon to be made the unfinished business of the Senate. So I ask that all three of those bills be passed over at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all three bills will be passed over at this time.

The Chair will state that Calendar No. 731, Senate bill 987, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., will be the order of business at the completion of the calendar call.

The bill (H. R. 116) to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 395) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over. Amendment of Merchant Ship Sales Act—bill passed over.

The bill (S. 1918) to amend section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let the bill go over.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Madam President, let me inquire of the acting minority leader from what Senator comes the objection to consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that I shall be happy to discuss the matter with him at the appropriate time. However, there is objection to consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER OF MARYLAND

Senate bill 1918, as amended by the committee, does two things:

First, it repeals section 9 (c) (3) of the present law which no longer has any application. That section was made dependent specifically upon the existence of a national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941. That emergency was terminated by proclamation of the President on April 28, 1952 (No. 2974). This simply takes out of the statute books a provision of law which is obsolete and without effect.

Secondly, the bill amends section 9 (c) (2) of the present law and adds a new section 9 (c) (3), in lieu of the one repealed. The effect of these changes is briefly as follows:

At the time the Merchant Ship Sales Act was adopted in 1946, the Committee on Commerce was faced with the problem of permitting the Government to dispose of its surplus war-built vessels, which were constructed and used by the Government during World War II years, in an orderly manner,

and upon prices and terms approved by the Congress.

Section 9 of the act was authorized by the Congress due to the fact that a substantial number of Government-owned, war-built vessels had been purchased from the Maritime Commission in good faith prior to the enactment of the act and on the basis of the wartime construction costs. Section 9 was enacted in order to place those prior purchasers on an equal footing with those who purchased such vessels after the date of enactment on the basis of the much lower statutory sales prices.

Therefore these prior purchasers were given an opportunity to seek an adjustment from the Government. However, there were then in existence charters entered into before the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 was enacted. There was a desire on the part of the Committee on Commerce to protect the Government in connection with those charters. Accordingly, it was decided to place into the law a specific limitation of liability for use or loss of the vessel under a charter already in existence at the time the 1946 act was adopted as a condition to adjustment.

There could not logically have been an intent to place the same limitation of liability for use or loss in charters to be entered into after enactment of the 1946 act, because no such limitation was being placed in the act upon future charters with citizens or foreigners purchasing after the enactment of the act. The whole emphasis of section 9 was to place prior purchasers on an equal footing with those who purchased such vessels after the date of enactment on the basis of much lower statutory sales prices.

However, while the emphasis in the hearings and debates was placed upon this desire to place prior purchasers upon an equal footing with the new purchasers, the wording of section 9 (c) (2) was not too specific upon this point. Applicants for adjustment under section 9 contended from the start that section 9 (c) (2), limiting the amount of charter hire and indemnity loss in such cases, applies only to charters made before the Merchant Ship Sales Act was enacted and has no application to charters entered into after the enactment of the Ship Sales Act. The Maritime Administration held that the limitations applied to any charters made with prior purchasers before or after the act.

Our committee held hearings upon this matter, and we were convinced that the intent of the 1946 act was to place the limitation for use or loss upon charters made before enactment of the 1946 act only. Otherwise there is a real discrimination in favor of alien and American purchasers who bought their vessels after the enactment of the 1946 act. Section 9 would fall far short of its clear intent to put prior and past purchasers upon an equal footing.

Accordingly, the bill as amended by the committee adds to section 9 (c) (2) after the words "any charter party" the new language, "executed prior to such date." This language simply clarifies the intent of section 9 (c) (2) and makes it evident that prior purchasers seeking an adjustment are to be limited to specific remuneration for use or loss only in connection with charters entered into before enactment of the 1946 act. As to prior purchasers having charters entered into or to be entered into after the 1946 act, they are on an equal footing with new purchasers in that they are entitled to negotiate an agreement and the Government, in case of seizure, is bound to pay just compensation, as it must pay to new purchasers.

The language of the bill does not authorize refunds by the Government upon adjustments already entered into and concluded by the Maritime Administration. A vessel owner cannot insist on a return from the United States of charter hire sums reimbursable to the United States in connection with the adjustment of a prior sales under section 9 (b). The hearings, the committee report, and this statement make that abundantly clear should anyone look upon the language of this bill as somewhat ambiguous in this respect.

There was some question as to the effect of section 9, as contained in this bill, upon charters executed after March 8, 1946, particularly in connection with the Korean emergency. It was established at the hearings that all charters made on and after that date have been charters made on a voluntary basis. They have not been requisition charters and not charters made across the table on a bargaining basis. They have been made on the basis of rates, terms and conditions promulgated by the Government agency that sought those charters for the furtherance of our military effort. The charters are subject to renegotiation and, therefore, there is no possibility of excess compensation.

The pending bill, as reported by the Senate, is simply a clarifying amendment to make evident what should have been made more clear in the 1946 act, that the limitation upon use and loss contained in section 9 is applicable to charters entered into before the enactment of the 1946 act, even though these charters might still be in existence today. Thus, the 1946 act is strengthened in its purpose to place prior purchasers upon an equal footing with purchasers of vessels who bought after enactment of the 1946 act. It entails no refunds by the Government of adjustments voluntarily concluded while the 1946 act was misconstrued.

The new section 9 (c) (3) is technical and simply furnishes the mechanics for placing all purchasers upon an equal footing as outlined above. The Government is not made liable to make refunds on prior, concluded adjustments. It is simply required to relieve prior purchasers of the added and discriminatory liability on charters entered into after the enactment of the 1946 act under the construction placed upon section 9 by the Maritime Administration in the past.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I wish to raise a procedural point. I think the request of the Senator from Maryland as to the source of the objection to present consideration of the bill is a perfectly fair one. When bills are objected to on the floor of the Senate, I believe the sponsor of the bill or any other Senator is entitled to know what Senator is objecting. In fact, I believe the rules of the Senate provide that the objecting Senator be made known. I do not know why the matter should be kept secret.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not insist on it.

Mr. MORSE. I do, if I have a right to do so.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, for the sake of the RECORD, the junior Senator from Florida objects to the bill.

Mr. MORSE. That is quite all right, but that is different from objecting for some other Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5976) to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6648) to amend section 205 of the Small Business Act of 1953 was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, upon objection.

That completes the call of the calendar.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 987.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF FOUNDING OF CITY OF NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 987) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.

ENDORSEMENT OF THE UPPER COLORADO STORAGE PROJECT, INCLUDING THE ECHO PARK DAM

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, there is before the Senate a bill (S. 1555) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes. These projects are reclamation projects of great benefit to the States of New Mexico, Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah.

Recently there was discussion of the advisability of constructing the Echo Park Dam as one unit of the project. Several bills in relation to this unit of the project have recently been introduced.

There recently appeared in the New York Times an excellent letter to the editor, written by Ernest H. Linford, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

I should like to explain that the author of the letter in the New York Times is chief editorial writer of the Salt Lake Tribune. The same Mr. Linford was in Washington last October to accept a plaque from the American Forestry Association for "distinguished service to conservation through his courageous editorials and writings dealing with the various phases of western land management."

Officials of the AFA pointed out at the ceremony that for 5 years Mr. Linford has "spearheaded the Salt Lake Tribune's crusade to protect watersheds and encourage good management of soil and water." They cited more than 100 of his editorials on conservation subjects, many of which have received wide circulation beyond the borders of Utah.

Mr. Linford's award was for the field of press and radio. Other recipients of the 1953 conservation awards were Sherman Adams, assistant to the President, for his work while Governor of New Hampshire in helping to frame and secure enactment of key legislation in connection with forest management; George L. Drake, vice president of the Simpson

Logging Co., of Washington, for his leadership in cooperative forestry between public and private agencies; Thomas V. Downing, Virginia State Department of Education, for his work in pushing youth programs in forestry in the Southern States; and P. H. Gladfelter, of Pennsylvania, for his pioneering work in impressing the importance of sound woodland management.

Madam President, also a very valuable aid in fighting this campaign of misinformation is an editorial published in the January 7, 1954, issue of the Salt Lake Tribune, under the heading "Scenic, Recreational Values at Echo Park."

This very fine factual summary attacks the arguments now being propounded by the opponents to Echo Park, who would have the general public believe that Echo Park Dam would flood about 90 percent of the spectacular canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers.

I invite the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to this editorial, which refers to the Bureau of Reclamation's report showing that not more than 11 percent of the Dinosaur National Monument would be flooded.

Madam President, on the same subject a very excellent editorial, entitled "Time To Stop Backpedaling," appeared in the January 5, 1954, issue of the Deseret News and Telegram, of Salt Lake City. We, in the upper basin States of the Colorado River Compact, have been plagued by the false propaganda generated by pseudo-conservationists in their attempt to deprive us of our life blood, which is water. Misrepresentations and misleading phrases have been used by the opponents to Echo Park Dam as substitutes for the facts; and innocent, well-meaning organizations, victimized by this scurrilous practice, have blindly entered opposition, when if the truth were presented to them they would have entered support, instead.

Madam President, I conclude by asking unanimous consent that the three matters to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 9, 1954]

ECHO PARK DAM UPHELD—ITS CONSTRUCTION DEFENDED AS PART OF NEEDED PROGRAM FOR AREA

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is disheartening to me to note that the New York Times, usually temperate and factual, is repeating the irresponsible allegations of some wilderness zealots regarding the proposal to build Echo Park Dam.

Your editorial, No Dam at Dinosaur, of December 22 repeats the familiar shocker that this dam (in a remote and almost inaccessible section of western Colorado) would destroy one of the West's great scenic preserves and that Secretary McKay's decision is, as the Sierra Club of California claims, a threat to the national park system.

Actually, as many sincere conservationists have testified, Echo Park Dam and Split Mountain Reservoir, scheduled for later construction, would flood nothing much of scenic, historical, or geological value except in a small section of the canyon, and this can be duplicated in a hundred other areas.

ALTERNATIVE SITES

Your editorial argues that alternative dams could be constructed outside the national monument that would accomplish the purpose of Echo Park Dam without destroying forever one of the unique remnants of primeval America. These alternative sites have been subjected to intensive engineering scrutiny and were studied just recently by Under Secretary of the Interior Tudor before the Interior Department approved the plans. The sheltering canyons and low temperatures prevailing at Echo Park, plus other considerations, make it far the superior site.

This dam is called the "wheelhorse" of the nine-dam upper Colorado River Basin storage project and many elements enter into the complex picture. Evaporation loss is paramount. The "most favorable" alternative site—as to storage, cost economy, electric power production, and so forth—would evaporate 300,000 more acre-feet of water annually than would Echo Park. Such a water loss would supply a good-sized city, would irrigate 200,000 acres of western land, now needing such water, and would supply an agricultural livelihood for more than 20,000 persons.

In addition, substitution of another dam or dams for Echo Park would eliminate from the upper basin program Split Mountain and the Gray Canyon Dams downstream on Green River.

The upper Colorado River Basin program must be considered as an entity. It is carefully integrated and balanced—as to storage, power links, other use of water and as to repayment to the Government. Eliminating or radically changing one element in the coordinated plan could throw the overall program out of balance, making it economically or otherwise unfeasible.

USE OF WATER

This program is the only means by which Utah, Colorado, and other upper basin States can fulfill their compact obligations to the lower basin States and put to beneficial use their share of the Colorado River water. Perhaps one has to live in this semiarid country to realize just how important this "last water hole" is to the region.

You warn that Echo Park is a kind of foot in the door—a threat to the inviolability policy of national parks. I read of no such alarmist material about construction of the great tunnel and water and power works in the Colorado Big Thompson reclamation project. And I have not been aware of mourning over the "damage" to the scenic or recreational value done by these works to the immensely popular Rocky Mountain National Park.

The 1938 Presidential order increasing the size of Dinosaur National Monument from the 80-acre "Dinosaur graveyard" to 200,000 acres, including the Green and Yampa Canyons, clearly contemplated future use of the area for a water project. Moreover, Park Service spokesmen made definite pledges to residents of this area that the monument extension would not interfere with such a project.

With so much at stake in the battle over the public lands it is difficult to understand why Echo Park is being made the blazing symbol of conservation at this time. The epidemic of editorials and intemperate statements arouses the suspicion that Echo Park is the mere window dressing for a behind-the-scenes movement of far greater consequence to the Intermountain West and, indirectly, to the Nation.

ERNEST H. LINFORD.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *January 2, 1954.*

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of January 7, 1954]

SCENIC, RECREATIONAL VALUES AT ECHO PARK

Anomalies and ironies are multiplying in the hysterical campaign against the proposed Echo Park Dam.

The Washington news conference show held this week by vociferous opponents of the key storage power project in the upper Colorado River Basin program was clearly an attempt to inflame public opinion prior to the congressional hearing scheduled for January 18. The wild and fantastic statements made in the name of impressive-sounding organizations might well cause rank-and-file members of these organizations to examine aims and leadership long and hard. Good would accrue from the calamity howling if Congress were moved to look behind the facade and probe the financial backing of some self-styled conservation groups involved in the emotional crusade.

Ironically, some foot dragging and downright opposition comes from Colorado, the State in which Echo Park Dam would be built, and which would receive more than half the firm water rights and other benefits from the upper basin program. The dam, which would be just below the confluence of the Green and Yampa Rivers, in Dinosaur National Monument, 2 miles east of the Utah-Colorado line, would be constructed under Colorado labor laws and contractors and others would be subject to Colorado taxation. Denver and other Colorado cities would benefit from the electrical power output as would other communities in both upper and lower basins.

Vernal, Utah, less than 30 miles from the damsite, and other Uintah Basin communities would benefit economically in many ways from the dam project because of their close proximity and because of the low-cost electric power it would make available.

Fish and wildlife spokesmen have joined in the loud wail about Echo Park, yet neither the Green nor the Yampa currently yields any fish but the "trash" variety. The creation of miles of quiet, clear water in the canyon bottoms would pave the way for splendid bass and trout fishing in the park and the wildlife situation there could be improved otherwise.

A sportsmen's group leader, writing in the Denver Post, says Echo Park Dam would "flood out about 90 percent of the spectacular canyons" of the Green and Yampa. And a Los Angeles Times columnist writes that the dam's "vague in purpose and staggering cost, would flood virtually every inch of them (the canyons)."

Bureau of Reclamation reports assert, on the other hand, that rivers within the Dinosaur Monument now inundate about 3 percent of the area. After construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams the total flooded area would be increased to about 11 percent of the monument, with most of the increase in the vicinity of Pat's Hole, near the dam. The water would be deep, of course, at the dam, but farther up the canyon gorges—in the areas of best scenery—the reservoirs would gradually decrease in depth.

There are many definitions of beauty and scenic values, but it would seem that covering sandbars, sagebrush, and rubble in the bottom of a canyon would improve the general appearance to many unprejudiced eyes. In the steep canyons the dams would result in widening the present water channel only 1½ to 3 times.

Some sincere wilderness enthusiasts see a concrete dam as sinister and horribly ugly, artificially held water as a crime against nature. Yet annual figures on recreational visits to Hoover Dam and Lake Mead indicate that the popularity of this national recreation area, administered by the National Park Service, is exceeded only by that

of Yellowstone National Park. Some hardy outdoorsmen abhor the idea of opening a wilderness area to the public and fight all means of making such sections more accessible. These and others would put preservation of a wild land above the economic and agricultural development of a whole region. Their attitude is hardly consistent with the concept of serving the best interests of the largest number.

[From the Deseret News and Telegram of January 5, 1954]

TIME TO STOP BACKPEDALING

Three years ago the Federated Utah Artists learned a lesson on the importance of facts. It is a lesson we submit—not very hopefully—for the consideration of a good many people who badly need it.

The association of artists at its annual meeting in January 1951 had before it a proposed resolution opposing construction of Echo Park Dam. Sentiment was high in favor of the resolution. After all, these were artists, interested mainly in preservation of beauty. Other artist organizations throughout the country were opposing the dam on the basis of what they had been told. The resolution seemed certain to sweep through the Utah group in the same way.

Then, just before a vote was to be taken, someone rose to ask whether more information wasn't needed. The membership agreed it was. A committee was appointed to investigate.

In the fall of 1951, after a summer of looking into the problem, the committee—chairmanned, incidentally, by the person who made the original motion—made its report. It concluded that building the dam would make possible development of a beautiful recreation area, that concern about the much-discussed destruction of areas of geological and archaeological value is a myth, that there is no comparable alternative site, and that Utah has many other canyons of comparable or greater beauty and wonder from the aesthetical or any other point of view.

That ended that particular resolution against construction of the dam.

What a pity that so many other well-intentioned but misguided organizations and individuals who are making such a public clamor over the dam haven't bothered to similarly inform themselves.

For make no mistake about it, the Echo Park Dam still has rough going ahead. It has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior for immediate action, but Congress still holds the purse strings. Congressmen live on votes, and the national campaign of misinformation is going to make a good many Congressmen tread very softly—or not at all—where this project is concerned.

We might as well face it. California wants Colorado River water that belongs to Utah. As long as Echo Park and other upper Colorado River project dams go unbuilt, she will get that water. So the present campaign will continue. And it is effective. Shibboleths such as "bureaucratic boondoggling," "stealing the public's inheritance," "destroying nature's wonderland," and other empty phrases make an effective substitute for facts in the public mind.

It is time, we believe, to stop backpedaling and apologizing and explaining.

It is time Utah and Colorado and other States with a stake in the lifeblood of the Colorado took the ball away from the pseudo-conservationists and did some ground-gaining for themselves.

We suggest that the chambers of commerce of Utah and western Colorado cities and other organizations interested in the economic development of this area cooperate in building a fund to acquaint key people in the Nation with exactly what we have here. Let's challenge the opponents of these dams to come out here themselves and actually take a look, not only at the canyons in question but also at others along the Green and Colorado and San Juan equally worthy of public recognition.

A task force of the Department of the Interior saw for itself last summer and was convinced. So did a House Interior Committee. Whenever the facts have been studied, as the Utah artists studied them, the projects have won approval.

And yet, the Los Angeles Times, in a typical sob-sister story, writes:

"When people of the United States discover what they own in these unscarred, unsurpassed, unbelievable canyons, they will no more surrender them up for materialist uses than they would a Yosemite, a Zion, or a Crater Lake."

Mere facts never catch up with that kind of romantic tripe. Not unless we find some way to expose it to the public for what it is. And unless we do, the upper Colorado River project may never get beyond its blueprint.

FINANCING OF MOUNT RUSHMORE NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the unfinished business is Senate bill 987, a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass. I understand that following the disposition of that bill, another special coinage bill will be considered.

For a number of years Congress has been enacting bills of this character. I have had pending, both in the House and in the Senate at different times, a bill to provide for the completion of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by the issuance of a special coin. If now it is to be the policy to consider bills of this character, I trust that the Committee on Banking and Currency will give early consideration to my bill, Senate bill 1657.

For the information of Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1657) to provide for the completion of Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by issuance of a special coin, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to complete the Mount Rushmore National Memorial and to commemorate the lives and perpetuate the ideals of the four Presidents of the United States there sculptured—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt—there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 2 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design carrying a replica of the memorial to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Interior. The United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage but may accept the services to be provided by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society therefor and may accept such other services as may be contributed in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society, incorporated under the laws of the State of South Dakota.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by banks or trust companies selected by the said Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society or at the studio of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial, and all proceeds therefrom shall be used for the following purposes: (1) To provide additional parking space in the Mount Rushmore Reserve and adequate comfort and sanitary facilities for visitors; (2) to complete the monument as specified by the models in the administration building maintained by the National Park Service at the memorial, such completion to be under the direction of Lincoln Borglum under the general supervision of the National Park Service; (3) to remove a portion of the debris at the base of Rushmore Mountain and to construct there an appropriate open-air amphitheater suitable for holding public gatherings on historical occasions; (4) to complete the construction of the Hall of Records and the native stone stairway and other features of the memorial as originally conceived by the sculptor, Gutzon Borglum; all such expenditures and construction to be under the supervision of the National Park Service.

SEC. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material; and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

SEC. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued in such numbers and at such times as shall be requested by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins: *Provided*, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of a 10-year period immediately following the enactment of this act.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last bill on the calendar today was Calendar 831, Senate bill 2643, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I understand that it was objected to primarily as a matter of procedure because the bill is to be brought up for consideration and full debate in the very near future.

The bill contains an amendment which was submitted by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], which deals with a very serious Irish-potato problem in the Pacific Northwest.

I received today a series of telegrams from some leaders in the potato industry in my State, representing the potato growers. I ask that these telegrams be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDMOND, OREG., *January 11, 1954.*

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

The bill permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to use section 32 funds for diversion

of Irish potatoes comes on floor tomorrow. We need these funds. Work for passage.

ROY SNABEL,
Chairman, Oregon-California Marketing Committee.

REDMOND, OREG., *January 11, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Work for passage of bill on floor of Senate permitting Secretary of Agriculture the use of section 32 funds to divert Irish potatoes.

H. W. STEELHAMMER,
President, Central Oregon Potato Growers Association.

REDMOND, OREG., *January 11, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Back legislation to pass bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to use section 32 funds for diversion of Irish potatoes. We need this help.

BEN DAVIDSON,
Administrator, Oregon Potato Committee.

Mr. MORSE. The first telegram is typical. It reads as follows:

The bill permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to use section 32 funds for diversion of Irish potatoes comes on floor tomorrow. We need these funds. Work for passage.

I have been informed that what the potato growers of Oregon are seeking to do is to obtain authorization for the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds for the purchase of potatoes in such programs as the school-lunch program. It is claimed by the Secretary of Agriculture that at the present time he does not have such authority. It seems to me obvious, Madam President, that such authority should be given him. The Welker amendment is a sound one. I not only support it, but I shall urge its favorable consideration when the bill comes up for debate in the near future.

THE PRESIDENT'S AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not know that I have anything world-shaking to say about the farm problem. It is a little difficult to make one's self heard with the overtones in the galleries. I hope they will subside, so that this feeble voice of mine may reach into the appropriate corners of the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Let there be order on the floor and in the galleries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By way of prelude, let me say that I am unequivocably and unreservedly for the President's agricultural program.

As Senators know, I come from the Corn Belt. Next to Iowa, Illinois produces more corn than any other commonwealth in the entire United States. We think of corn not only in terms of a cereal grain, but also in terms of its use in the commercial market. It is the fact that roughly 80 of every 100 bushels of corn produced go into livestock. Consequently we cannot think of the livestock problem without thinking of the corn problem.

In my section of the country we measure corn not only in terms of bushels, but also in terms of gallons on occasion, because it enters into the commercial market in a rather large way.

As I sense the President's program, in seeking to simplify what I think are its fundamental items, I should say that it would permit mandatory supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity to expire with the 1954 crop. Secondly, it would provide for flexible parity based upon supply after 1955. Under present law there is authority to use the old or the modernized parity on basic commodities, which authority expires January 1, 1956.

There is also what is known as adjusted or transitional parity. That is nothing more than an adjustment, to enable us to go from the old to the new formula.

The plan also provides the setting aside of about one-half the commodities now owned by the Government, for a variety of purposes, including national defense, the school-lunch program, and other diversions, so long as they do not have any effect upon the commercial market.

I think the effect of the program is very nicely stated in the President's message at the bottom of page 6, under the heading "Conclusion." I could do no better, for the purpose of my remarks, than to read it. It reads as follows:

It will help the farmer attain full parity in the market. It will avoid creating burdensome surpluses. It will curtail the regimentation of production planning, lessen the problem of diverted acreage, and yield farmers greater freedom of choice and action.

It has some other objectives, of course, but those are all that are necessary for my purpose.

If I were to recite the reasons why I think this is a sound program, I should say, first of all, that it is fundamental. Secondly, it conforms to certain basic economic principles. I believe it is fair to every segment of our society, including both producers and consumers. I think it presents the best hope for some kind of durable solution, after nearly 30 years of failure. When all is said and done, in connection with the farm problem, we are back where we were 30 years ago.

In indicating to the Senate why I am in favor of this program, I think it would be well to invite attention to a little history.

I was in the House of Representatives in 1933, when there was agricultural distress in the United States. I remember how we wrestled and struggled in the hope that we might find a practicable, workable, and durable solution.

Those were the days when it was urged—and I suppose with some truth—that we were destroying little pigs, and probably trying to teach birth control to the rest of the hog population, in order to overcome the surplus problem. Those were the days when we were talking about plowing under every third row of cotton. I would be less than candid if I did not confess that there was distress in agricultural areas, because corn was selling at a very low price, and so were hogs. Senators know what the price of wheat was at that time. I very freely confess that there was an agricultural stringency, and that the spectral hand of foreclosure was moving over the country.

Nor would I be quite candid if I did not at least say that the emergency programs which we had in 1933, in some degree, at least, represented decisive action, whether right or wrong. I have not had too many pleasant things to say about the New Deal, but I will say at least that there was decisive action at that time. It was sought to meet something which was an emergency if we ever saw one.

We had ever so many farm measures in those days. There was the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1934. I am not sure whether my esteemed colleague [Mrs. SMITH of Maine] was in the House at that time or not. That measure was the beginning of an entire series of legislative proposals, which went back, in large part, to the basic Agricultural Adjustment Act. As I saw the legislative program unfold, I sometimes wondered whether or not we were getting into an atmosphere of confusion. I tried on occasion to spell out all the things which were designed, first, to increase productivity; second, to increase production; and third, to cut it down by acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and otherwise. Then of course there was the attempt to put it all together to determine whether it was a realistic, reasonable, and consistent program.

Let us consider productivity for a moment. Let us remember the improvement in fertilizers, the amount of money expended in order to make the soil produce more, and the expenditure of money which resulted in producing more corn. More cotton can be produced per acre, and more wheat can be produced per acre, and more of everything can be produced per acre.

I remember not so long ago when, on the basis of averages, 25 bushels of corn per acre seemed a good yield in the Corn Belt. Today 100 bushels and even in excess of 150 bushels are grown. All those improvements have been made on the productivity side.

So far as production is concerned, let us consider the potato situation. I remember when millions of bushels of potatoes were made inedible by being dyed with an indelible dye or by being sprinkled with kerosene.

It seemed for all the world as though the conjunction of good weather, rainfall, and fertility in the acres devoted to potatoes produced more potatoes than ever before. The result was, of course, that not only did the price go down, but it became necessary, out of the Public Treasury, with the dollars of the taxpayers, to support the price; and the further the price went down the more support was required. The cost ran into hundreds of millions of dollars.

We had a similar situation with respect to eggs. I think the policy finally was to buy them in order to support the price, and to dry them. Many drying plants were developed. Then they had to be stored somewhere. I recall as a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in the House

that we caused an investigation to be made of a cave which the Government took over in Kansas. It was air conditioned and electrically lighted, so that the equivalent of literally millions of dozens of eggs could be stored there. The hens had become too productive. The balanced ration fed them had become too effective. So there we were, with a surplus. We had to move in and take over. I am afraid the aroma finally reminded the people of the United States what such a program would finally lead to.

In all this time, despite all the plasters which were placed upon the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and all the implementing legislation which was passed up to 1949, there was no solution to the problem. I say that very kindly, and I express the hope at the same time that this will not become a very tart and severe partisan issue. I do not see how we can put it on a partisan basis. I mean to be just as kindly about it as I can. Probably some testy things could be said. However, I am content to say now that the farm problem was never solved at any time since I first came to Congress in 1932.

The best answer I know is the bulging bins we have today, the waste, the losses, the giveaways, and all the rest. With all that, we are plagued in the year of our Lord 1954 with surpluses such as we have never seen before.

What finally did solve the problem—or rather sidetrack it, because it cannot be called a solution—was the intervention of war, with its attendant inflation, and all the evil and ulcerous things which come out of the crucible of war. There was a giveaway program. When other countries saw their economy slipping and they could not till their soil, obviously we had to dip into the American economy to help them maintain a solid front and enable them to retain their vitality as allies in a worldwide effort.

We had troops in the field. The demands upon our economy were necessarily multiplied. So, of course, the economy had to be stimulated in wartime. The fact of the matter is that nearly 1 out of every 3 bushels of wheat which we produced went abroad at that time. Nearly 1 out of every 3 bales of cotton went abroad for one purpose of another. Probably the equivalent of 1 out of every 3 bushels of rice went abroad. So there was an almost unlimited area in which our farm commodities could find a market with the qualification, however, that the very farmers who produced the surpluses had to pay, in part, through their taxes, for that kind of giveaway program.

Frankly, that is not a solution. I am sure that no one would have the temerity to stand up and say that it was a solution. But we must confess that the problem was sidetracked.

We must also confess that the problem was sidetracked because a false prosperity, which was conditioned upon conflict and broken bodies, had sidetracked it. Surplus labor had gone into the war plants. Wages were firm and reasonably high, and there was great buying power in the country. That helped to sidetrack the problem. But God forbid that anyone should ever undertake to call that a solution, when it depends upon sending young Americans into all corners of the earth, and sending materiel, munitions, and all the other things that such a condition involves. A synthetic and artificial condition was produced in our country which sidetracked the problem for the time being.

We have now reached the point where it seems that we can diminish the number of our troops abroad in small part, because of the progress we have made in the field of atomic weapons. It seems that we do not need quite so many of the accoutrements of war; and when we do not need them, we do not need quite so many men to operate them. I think it is fair to say that probably we shall experience some reaction in our country—how much or how little, we do not know.

War is an abnormal thing; and when we excise it from our economy, it is the same as removing a hideous, cancerous growth from the body. There is a little pain accompanying the operation; but I am confident that we have not only the courage, but the capacity and vitality, to take it in stride and see it through.

Here we are with respect to this problem which has been gathering momentum for a long time, except when it was sidetracked temporarily by the conditions to which I have referred. We have been floundering again, and we are in an area of confusion.

I think it is interesting perhaps, to note that our friends on the other side, at their national convention in 1948, wrote a provision in their platform which endorsed the principle of a permanent system of flexible price supports. It intrigued me a great deal; in fact, two suggestions intrigued me: First, the one respecting flexible price supports, such as the President now advocates, and, secondly, the one making it a "permanent system." Certainly, those who wrote that provision in the platform were doing their earnest and most sincere best in order to find a basis for what looked like a durable and workable policy.

Immediately thereafter came another proposal. I examined rather carefully the suggestion made by the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, in Des Moines, Iowa. Many people had gathered there. Then, of course, the attack began, and I am delighted now that the Congress saw fit to turn that proposal aside, because I have no idea, nor does any finite mind, what the Brannan plan, with its almost unlimited provisions, would accomplish, in paying the difference between the price the market would bear and what the price should be. Who can estimate what the burden upon the Federal Treasury would have been?

Then came the act of 1948. I think my friend from Tennessee was in the House at that time, and I know he gave a great deal of attention to the act to extend high supports until 1949, as I recall, and then we were to drop back to a flexible basis in 1950.

As I understand, the act of 1949 was extended through 1950, with a provision that the flexible scale should not become effective until 1951 and 1952.

There was action in the Congress last year dealing with the same problem. If I correctly remember—and I would do no Member of this body an injustice—I thought at the time of the discussion the word "temporary" was used. In other words, it was not a solution. So we had to wait for new facts and data to assure that a sound program would be enacted.

Mr. President, I have indicated briefly the unhappy inheritance President Eisenhower received in the agricultural field. He can say with truth that he received an unsolved problem that was only temporarily aborted and sidetracked by the conflict which intervened, and that in fact we are about where we were 20 or more years ago. He can say, of course, that there has been a diminution of export markets. Certainly we are stimulating the export of agricultural commodities, but nations are today stimulating their own production; they are trying to develop a self-sustaining basis for themselves. In addition to that, many countries, directly and indirectly, developed war debts of their own that have to be paid. Consequently, they have to turn to that field of activity and endeavor to find something with which to pay their debts.

This is a reasonably kindly observation to make, Mr. President. I do not believe we looked the economic facts of life fully in the face when we were dealing with agriculture.

I remember that Mr. Truman went to Detroit and said he thought the farmers would be ungrateful if they did not vote for his ticket. I think he could have better served the country if he had told the whole story and everything involved in it and told them that here was a shadow which was going to plague not only his party but the Republican Party, and the entire Nation as well.

Congress provided that 66 million acres could be used for the production of wheat at 90 percent of parity, when the Department of Agriculture, under their own findings, said the amount should not be more than 55 million acres.

If we are going properly to serve the farmers of the country and the Nation itself we must be courageous about it and put aside some of the political considerations which have too freely intervened.

Mr. President, I am not so naive as to believe that any feeble effort on my part or any mere words are going to dispel political considerations, but I think it is proper to remind everyone that if there should be a crucifixion it will not be a case of crucifying one party or the other; it will be a case of hanging the country upon an economic cross.

I do not want to be charged with that responsibility. Like Pilate, I do not want that blood to be upon my hands.

So, Mr. President, it behooves us to give almost prayerful thought to this problem, because we cannot aid the economy of the Nation unless we do.

Mr. President, there is another factor in the picture which certainly ought to make us prayerful, namely, the carryover of commodities. It is astounding.

Let us consider the wheat situation. There was a carryover in 1952 of 236

million bushels. By 1953 it jumped up to 559 million bushels, and the estimated carryover for 1954 amounts to 780 million bushels. That is a whole year's requirement. What are we going to do with it? Place it in unused liberty ships, or put it in storage in holes in the ground? We did that for a while, Mr. President; but there will come a day when there will be such a revulsion on the part of the consumers of the country that our whole agricultural picture may be in danger.

Let us consider cotton. There was a carryover of approximately 2,800,000 bales in 1952. It jumped to 5,500,000 bales in 1953. It was up to 9 million bales in October of 1953. The estimated amount for 1954 is 9 million bales. The Department of Agriculture advises us that that is a whole year's supply.

What shall we do? It is one of those items which certainly press upon the conscience of the people when they deal with the policy.

With reference to corn, there was a carryover in 1952 of 486 million bushels. It increased to 764 million bushels in 1953, and the corn carryover in 1954 is estimated at 900 million bushels. Whether we spell it out in bushels or in gallons, Mr. President, that is a lot of corn. Of course we have to gear that great supply of feed to the livestock industry, because we cannot divorce these problems one from another.

Let us look at the Commodity Credit Corporation's report on its investment in commodities. I remember the days when we started out with very modest sums for the Commodity Credit Corporation, but, little by little, they grew, until, even before I left the House of Representatives, the line of credit for the Commodity Credit Corporation was up to $5,250,000,000. It could issue debentures and could borrow from the Treasury, and then it could operate in the whole field of price supports and purchases. The fact of the matter is that the Commodity Credit Corporation's borrowing power today is $6,750,000,000. That is 2 times the whole budget of the United States Government for 1932. We cannot laugh that figure off. We have committed to the Commodity Credit Corporation twice as much as the whole cost of operating this Government, including the Army and Navy, in 1932, 21 years ago.

The value of the commodities which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns is estimated at $4,500,000,000. The remainder of its obligations is accounted for by the commitments and the promises the Corporation has already made.

Let us consider what has happened in the last year. Two and one-half billion dollars has been the increase in commodity holdings in a single year. It is an unhappy thing to have to continue to buy wheat and to put it in storage and to buy corn and to put it in galvanized containers, of which there are hundreds of thousands in the Corn Belt. One can fly over that region on a clear night and see those cans, containing thousands of bushels of corn, glistening in the moonlight.

The point I wish to make, and I shall not be too sharply partisan, is that it is not Eisenhower corn that is in those bins. That corn got there before the Eisenhower administration. I say this because I mean to make my argument as well as I can. But it is an added reason why every Senator, irrespective of his political persuasion, has something more than a political interest in a problem which has been presented to the Senate by the President of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that in 1953 the production of corn was not very far out of line with the requirements of the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The total carryover or total surplus, on which we are paying storage, was produced in previous years. It goes back as far as 1948.

However, what I now wish to point out is the cost of carrying this supply. Not only is there involved the interest on the money involved, but it is estimated that by May 1 it will be costing the Commodity Credit Corporation $1 million a day in storage charges. That will be $365 million for storage alone each year.

There was a time when it was thought that that amount would be the entire annual cost of the farm support program. Indeed, it should be. I think that if we once get started afresh, that amount probably will carry the farm program year after year. But when it is considered that it costs $365 million a year for the storage of Government-owned commodities alone, that gives us something to think about in addition to the cost of supporting farm prices themselves.

This year Congress has imposed acreage controls on wheat and cotton. Of course, under the law, controls should have been imposed on both those commodities last year, in which event we would be seeing our way out of the woods by this time. But that was not done. Congress did not have the heart to reduce wheat planting from 76 million acres to 55 million acres, as required by law. In order to soften the shock and to prevent real hardship among wheat farmers, Congress decided that the farmers could plant a total of 62 million acres of wheat for the present year. That will not reduce the carryover at all. Probably it will result in the addition of another 100 million bushels of carryover, because 62 million acres of wheat grown by modern methods of production will grow more than can be used.

There is now before the Senate a bill to permit cotton growers to plant 21 and a third million acres of cotton this year, a reduction from the 24½ million acres harvested last year. Under the law, cotton farmers would have had to reduce their planting to a little under 18 million acres. That would have been a shock. It would have been an economic shock to a large number of small cotton growers of the United States.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has reported a bill to the Senate, which has been made the unfinished business for tomorrow, which will permit cotton growers to plant a little more than 21 million acres this year. I am sorry to say that that will not reduce the carryover at all. In fact, that, too, probably will result in adding a little to the surplus of cotton.

The emergency measures we have adopted will not solve the problem at all. They will not reduce the carryover. They will simply keep the carryover from increasing as fast as it has increased in the past few years.

I am making this statement now in order to point out that the problem we face is not simple. As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will recall, the continuous piling up of these commodities began in 1949, and only the Korean war kept us out of serious agricultural trouble at that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Twice in the last 20 years we have been bailed out of agricultural catastrophe by war. We do not want to depend upon war to keep agricultural prices on an even keel. I do not believe we should have to depend on war. I do not think the American people want to depend on war. What we are trying to do now is to devise a program which will result in continuing agricultural prosperity at a high level. None of us is satisfied with 90 percent of parity. We want the American farmer to get his full share of the economic dollar. I believe that that can be done. I believe Congress will devote every effort to that end. I believe those who constantly attack the President in his effort to do that are not making too much of a contribution.

I realize that we cannot all be expected to agree on details. Necessarily this has to be a give-and-take proposition. But if I am any kind of prophet at all, I prophesy that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will bring forth a good program within the next 7 weeks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to hear the Senator from Vermont say that.

While we are still talking about the Commodity Credit Corporation and the money that is involved, it is my understanding that a request will be made to increase the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to $8,500,000,000. That is a tremendous sum. It means that prices will be supported, that there will be borrowing, and that commodities will be placed in storage. Then will come the real headache of wondering what is to be done with the surplus.

We cannot let spoilage, deterioration, and aging of grain go on forever. We cannot let hungry people notice, on the front pages of newspapers, that corn has been hauled out of storage bins, where it has been deteriorating, to be sold at a great discount in the market. I remember encountering that situation once before. I remember a couple of thousand troops being around me as I was standing on a platform in Frankfurt, Germany.

I said, "Ask me any question you wish to ask."

The first youngster brought up a clipping from a newspaper and asked, "Is this what they are doing back home?"

Of course, he pointed to the fact that bulldozers were running over and mascerating potatoes so that they could not be used.

Ultimately we get to moral considerations when food is destroyed in that way. So we shall have to find the answer, as we go into this astronomical problem. We must consider the impact it will have on the budget.

I do not know what amount will be received finally for the commodities which are in storage, but I know that, under the Commodity Credit Act, the Commodity Credit Corporation, with a hundred million dollars of capital, is mandated to make a report to the Treasury, and every year the Treasury is mandated to make a report to Congress, showing what the impairment of the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation is. Under that law, it is the responsibility of Congress to appropriate from the Treasury of the United States to compensate for those losses.

So we come right back to the unending spiral as it affects the taxpayers of the United States. Suppose that out of this great accumulation we lose two or three billion dollars. That simply means that the deficit faced by the Treasury will be greater than it ever was.

I am still one of those who believe it is proper, sound, and prudent to try to balance the budget of our country if we can do so. So as the matter moves into the stratosphere, it demands attention.

At this point we might consider the amounts of commodities on hand as of October 1952 and October 1953. In October 1952 the Commodity Credit Corporation owned 289 million bushels of corn; in October 1953 it owned 520 million bushels, almost double the amount.

In the field of wheat, in October 1952, it owned 451 million bushels; in October 1953 it owned 806 million bushels. As I recall, it had only 700,000 bales of cotton in October 1952. In October 1953 there were in its inventory 3⅓ million bales of cotton.

In 1952, it had 448 million pounds of tobacco, and in October 1953 that had jumped to 512 million.

It had 335 million pounds of fats and oils, and the amount has now reached the astronomical figure of 1,070,000,000 pounds.

In October 1952 it had only 31 million pounds of dairy products in the investment account. Today there are 1,700,000,000 pounds.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois earlier made reference to the junior Senator from Tennessee, which I very much appreciate. In former years it was my privilege to work with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, then a Member of the other House, in the formulation of agricultural legislation.

The distinguished Senator has just called attention to the stocks of butter on hand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, I did not specify butter. I said "dairy products," although I think I have the figures as to butter. But if the Senator has the figure, he can offer it.

Mr. GORE. I do not have the exact figure as to butter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is 331,000,000 pounds.

Mr. GORE. Is the distinguished Senator from Illinois aware of the fact that the only recommendation today with respect to dairy products is for a continuation of the present law? The Senator will find that on page 9 of the President's message. No improvement, no change whatsoever, is recommended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I expect to deal with that.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator will yield one moment further, I may say that the cattle producers of the United States, many of whom have faced bankruptcy and are now facing bankruptcy, have been hoping that the farm program to be recommended by the administration would provide some improvement in their position. The conditions have been tragic. In my State, and in the State so ably represented by the Senator from Illinois, and in many other States, conditions have been so tragic that failure has already been the fate of many cattle farmers; and an equally desperate plight faces many more. Yet, in spite of those conditions, let me read the concluding sentence of the President's message, under the hearing "Meat Animals":

> It is recommended, therefore, that the existing conditions with respect to meat animals be continued.

The cattle farmers have been hoping the conditions would be remedied, not continued.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator says the cattle farmers hope the condition will be remedied, and I prefer to deal a little more specifically with the matter. They thought the cattle population would finally hit the 100 million head figure because of the policy of the past, which encouraged the raising of cattle. Now, however, the Secretary of Agriculture is pretty confident that he is going to hold the figure well under 95 million head, and the conditions since the recent drought, over which the Secretary, of course, had no control, have resulted in so many canners and cutters moving into the market that it is becoming a manageable problem, and that is why the statement was included in the message.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that the Secretary of Agriculture has not been unaware of the condition of cattle raisers and of the low price which has prevailed for low-grade beef animals. We all know what has been done and what the Congress has done at the request of the administration for the relief of farmers in the drought areas.

I might add that the Secretary of Agriculture has purchased the equivalent of about 800,000 head of low-grade beef animals during this year. I do not know whether or not that program should be continued. I think we shall have to wait until we get the cattle census as of January 1, which I understand will be made public on February 12.

If the cattle census shows that there is no increase in beef animals this year or shows a slight reduction, I think it will have a very healthy effect on the market. If, however, it shows a substantial increase, I would say that the Secretary then would have to continue the purchase program of low-grade animals, because they are the ones which are selling at a low price at the present time.

I know a good deal of pressure has been put upon the Secretary to go into the livestock business, to purchase live animals. Personally, I can see no point in the Federal Government's supporting live animals except for subsidizing the meat industry; and I do not think the people of the United States have yet been conditioned to that point; in fact, I would say they are being deconditioned in that respect at the present time.

If anyone would like to find good reasons set forth why the Government cannot feasibly purchase live animals, I suggest that he refer to some of the Senate Agriculture Committee hearings of, I think, 1951. At that time, Secretary Brannan was undergoing the same type of pressure to purchase live hogs which is now being put on the present Secretary. He came before the committee and explained very clearly why it was impossible for the Government to go into the livestock industry. Of course, the Government could go into the purchase of live hogs much easier than it could go into the purchase of live cattle, because of the smaller number of grades involved. Secretary Brannan's reasons why the Government could not purchase live animals are clearly set forth in one of the Senate committee hearings. I will furnish a copy for any Senator who desires to read it.

For 20 years officials of the Government have tried to develop some means of supporting the livestock industry through the purchase of live animals, and they have not been able to do it. Secretary Benson this year has probably purchased more beef animals than have been purchased in any previous year during the past 20 years.

One reason why there has been overproduction of dairy products is that farmers are milking old cows instead of selling them. My section of the country is offending in that respect more than other sections. In the country as a whole that is true to the extent of 1 percent more than last year. In New England and New York it is true to the extent of 10 percent more than last year. The farmers are milking old cows which they should have sold. They are getting the same income and producing 10 percent more milk in order to get it. If they produced the same amount of milk as last year they would get the same price.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The junior Senator from Oklahoma happens to be against the purchase of live animals, just as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is; but the junior Senator from Oklahoma feels that if we again enter upon a beef-buying program, such as the Secretary of Agriculture engaged in to the extent of over 200,000,000 pounds, it should be a beef-buying program for the relief and the benefit of the cattle raisers and not the big meat packers.

If it is a part of our tradition to support prices by removing the glut, whether it be in the case of dairies which had contracts with the creameries, or otherwise, I cannot see why we should not require that the prices to the producers of live cattle reflect the price normally received, and which they have historically received when it comes to sales to the Government.

In the case of cottonseed, I may call attention to the fact that we required cotton ginners to pay a certain price to the cotton producers, and the price for their cottonseed bore an historic ratio to what the Government was paying for the refined cottonseed oil.

If the Government buys pecans, the processor must certify, in order to get the Government to buy his product, that the producer has received a price which preserves the historic ratio in relationship to the price received by the processor.

But when we study the program that is designed to help the cattle farmer, we find that the Secretary of Agriculture has completely ignored the price to the producer; that while 38 cents a pound was being paid for much of the beef sold to Armour, Wilson, Cudahy, and Swift, the Government had buyers throughout Oklahoma who were waiting until the market got as low as 5 cents on the hoof for cutters and canners.

If the market had been strengthened, as could easily have been done if the Secretary of Agriculture had used the commonsense and good judgment of any administrator who was seeking to benefit the producer; and if there had been a requirement that a minimum of 11 or 12 cents a pound be paid for the cutters and canners, if 38 cents a pound was being paid to the processors, we would have found that the market would have rectified itself long before now, and we could have stopped this situation in February or March with very little money, or in June with a very little more money. But the conditions caused not only by drought but by liquidation of the herds and the hopelessness of the cattle raisers have made this agricultural problem a major one.

I, for one, am tremendously disappointed to read that in the President's program there is nothing except a statement that the existing conditions with respect to meat animals shall be continued.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to make one observation; namely, that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Advisory Board, on which the cattle raiser is well represented, believe they have this matter within manageable dimensions now.

Let me say also that during the summer I noticed that those who came to Washington in an effort to have something done for the cattle industry received considerable publicity. I was traveling up and down the country, and at the time I talked to cattlemen in California. They said the situation was not nearly so acute as it would seem to have been represented. I was in Oklahome, as may be known from the press. I talked to some cattlemen there, and also I had talks in Los Angeles. I did not receive the impression that the situation was nearly so acute as some sought to make it appear.

I must add that I state only what I know. I sat down with the feeders in northern Illinois, where cattle feeding is engaged in almost as extensively as in any other State of the Union. In speaking and in conferring in that feeder area with a great many persons engaged in that activity, I learned that they were going to make out reasonably well.

I do not say that to indicate that I do not believe no one was hurt, because somebody in that business did get hurt. When there is a drought, when there is a lack of feed, and when it is necessary to assemble feed and to pay the transportation charges on it, very often damage to some extent is done before an inert government can move.

I do not say that no damage was done; but I say that in view of the number of marketable cattle that can be handled in the country, relatively little damage was done.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me at this time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me point out to my colleague from Illinois that in the markets in Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Kansas, he will find that the price being paid today for low-grade cattle is still a distress price.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is true.

Mr. MONRONEY. I grant that an inert Government with an inert Secretary of Agriculture, if you please, finds it difficult to move. However, the situation must be acute, if it is important enough to warrant the purchase of more than 200 million pounds of meat.

What the junior Senator from Oklahoma is saying is that certainly we are entitled to expect some of this largesse to go to the producers. It will not suffice to show big profits to the processors. It is the producer who is being hurt; and the program the administration recommends will only continue that situation.

If the Government buys another million pounds of beef, the only result will be larger profits for the processors; but the cattle raisers will still be left in a very precarious situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think we are mindful of the distress of those who sent canners and cutters into the markets; but too often that operation was the one which received the headlines. On the other hand, in a good many areas there was still a pretty good market for the prime and the good beef.

So it becomes a matter of having just half the information reach the country. I think sometimes that situation misleads even those of us who are here in this great deliberative and, shall I say, omniscient body.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that I think the Senator from Oklahoma is partly right and partly wrong.

There is a great divergence between the price in the small country markets and the price in the large markets in Chicago, Omaha, St. Paul, and elsewhere. In the large markets, the price of canners, cutters, and utility cows and bulls has gone up materially, as I have followed the market prices, since the Secretary of Agriculture has inaugurated his program.

However, there seems to be a difference of 3, 4, or sometimes 5 cents a pound between the price in the small markets and the price in the major cattle markets of the country.

I wish to say that in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry we have appointed a subcommittee on price spreads between the producer and the consumer, and that situation is one of the subjects which will be studied. Why do the smaller eastern markets pay so much less for second-grade, or low-grade beef animals than is paid in some of the major markets, such as Chicago? In New England, prices run consistently behind those in Chicago, when an attempt is made to sell a cow from a dairy herd. But I must submit that I do not see how the Secretary of Agriculture is going to go into a thousand and one small markets throughout the country and make sure that the price in all of them is sustained.

I hope that can be done. The first thing we want to do is ascertain who is manipulating the market, if it is being manipulated, and what we can do about it.

There can be no question that every major packing company and probably most of the smaller packing companies have made large profits this year. However, if all their profits are added together, they will not amount to what the farmers have been losing.

Probably the big gain that is being made is in the tremendously increased consumption. We know that the increase in consumption was the direct result of the administration's removal of price controls and the unworkable regulations for the grading of beef last February.

Unfortunately the dairy farmer who wishes to cull his herd has little incentive to do so, so he continues to overproduce dairy products.

I agree with the Senator from Illinois, and I hope we will find the answer.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield further to me——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me say that what the distinguished Senator from Vermont has said regarding the wide divergence is absolutely true; but there is wide divergence in the market in the case of wheat, cotton, and corn; and many markets are involved in those cases.

Yet because the Government has a policy of establishing a certain reasonable floor the reasonable price is maintained in every county in the United States.

I am not asking for a rigid system of supports; but I say that, if the Secretary of Agriculture had geared his purchase of more than 200 million pounds of beef to a minimum price of 11 or 12 cents, which would have preserved the historic ratio between 38-cent hamburger from the packer and the price of the live animal, such a minimum price of 11 or 12 cents for cutters and canners would have been reflected in every market in the United States, because the farmer would have known that was what those animals were worth, and that the Government was buying at that figure.

Mr. AIKEN. It is entirely possible that conditions will improve, and we hope to find some way of achieving that result.

But, so far as I know, that has not been done in previous years, even when the price of all the cattle in the country, both high grade and low grade, went to 7 cents a pound, as occurred in 1940.

As to being able to enforce a fairly equitable support price throughout the country, the Senator from Oklahoma has used wheat as an example. Wheat is a good example of how it cannot be done.

Mr. MONRONEY. How about using butter?

Mr. AIKEN. At harvesttime this year the wheat farmers were guaranteed 90 percent of parity, but they were selling their wheat for an average of 76 percent of parity at harvesttime; and today the farm price of wheat on the average is only 82 percent of parity. In other words, over at least half of the country the farmers received, instead of $2.21 a bushel, which the Government guaranteed them, $1.50 or $1.75 a bushel. That is how the matter worked out. It is working that way in the case of livestock.

Mr. CASE rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before we get away from cattle, I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. AIKEN. He comes from a cattle-producing section. He should have the answers.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it seems to me that not all the blame should rest at the door of the Secretary of Agriculture. A part of the responsibility properly rests upon Congress. During the debate last summer when we were working on the foreign-aid bill, in which we provided funds for the procurement of beef in the purchase program, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] and I did all we could to persuade the Senate to write a 10-cent floor under the price of cattle. We did not obtain sufficient support on the floor of the Senate to make it effective.

Our argument at the time was that if there were a 10-cent floor for the poorest of the canners and cutters, prices would grade up from that figure. It would have made a substantial difference at a time when it would have been quite important. Canners and cutters were selling as low as 6, 7, or 7½ cents—perhaps even as low as 5 cents.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. In connection with the livestock problem, under the present law the Secretary can do what he does in connection with butter, and in connection with purchases of other commodities. He could establish a figure of 10, 11, or 12 cents if he chose to do so. He does not require legislation to do it.

Mr. CASE. Perhaps that is true; but the Congress could have insured that he would do it had the Senate been responsive to the pleas which the Senator from Nebraska and I made at that time.

Furthermore, the price of cattle has somewhat improved. I have been following the market fairly closely, because I have a few cattle to sell. I know that the price of stockers and feeders has improved. The price of cows has improved somewhat during the past few months. It sagged a bit, but it improved after the Department started its purchase program in earnest.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator make it clear that in connection with the beef buying program, the butter program, and other purchasing programs, the Secretary of Agriculture is acting under discretionary authority, and not under a mandatory direction by Congress? We could have written decent provisions into the law, but we could not have forced the Secretary of Agriculture to pay a decent price to the cattle producer.

Mr. CASE. We could have provided for a minimum floor price. There are minimum floor prices in connection with other commodities. However, the Secretary of Agriculture is, of course, on notice that the Senate had the opportunity to establish a floor of ten cents, and failed to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose it is an established fact that members of the Cabinet and their advisory groups and staffs probably read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I have detained the Senate far too long this afternoon. I wish to make only a few additional points.

First, at the end of nearly a quarter of a century there is on the books no solution for the farm problem.

Second, the farm problem was sidetracked by the war. Of course, as our preparations for war diminish, the agricultural program takes on a new difficulty, and I think furnishes a new anxiety, not only for the Congress but for the farm producers and for the entire country.

I earnestly believe that any program which is to be durable and workable over a period of time must be geared to the essential principles of the law of supply and demand. After we have estimated our carryover and reserve, and have indicated pretty well what we can let go into the export market, and after we have estimated what consumption is to be, when we go beyond that point we are beginning to produce for storage. That is what we have been doing, at the expense of the taxpayer. I am confident that realistic farmers will go along with the program which has been advanced by the President of the United States. I am confident that in the main the great bulk of our farmers in Illinois, so far as I can tell, will go along with the essential principle which has been expressed in this program.

I wish to analyze only one further aspect of the program. I am not so sure but that we can produce more than we can finally dispose of in one way or another. The majority of the populations in countries over the world are farmers, and they are producing to make themselves self-sufficient and to sell something in the market. So probably there will be a diminution of our exports.

I have been intrigued by a study made by the Department of Agriculture, in which it is pointed out that actually, in terms of pounds of food consumed per capita, the situation is not much different today from what it was a long time ago, although, of course, there have been shifts in the diets of our people which account for a certain disturbance of the balance.

The program which is now before us is designed to get back to the principle of supply and demand, and to maintain, as nearly as possible, a reasonably free market for the farmers of the United States, and at the same time to obtain, as nearly as possible, parity income in that market.

In my judgment the suggested program offers the best hope for agriculture and for the country. I intend to give my full support to the program, which follows out the principles delineated by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, earlier in the day I announced that because of the weather conditions the Traffic Bureau had requested Government departments to release their employees about 2 hours earlier than usual. So far as the Senate is concerned, I hope it may be possible to comply with that request as nearly as possible. However, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has spoken, and I have been informed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that he has some remarks to make at this time. It is not my purpose to foreclose any Senator, but I wish to say that I plan to recess the Senate until tomorrow as soon as the Senators have concluded their remarks.

Tomorrow it is our purpose to take up the coinage bills, to be followed by the cotton acreage allotment bill, which it had been previously our purpose to take up today. When those bills are disposed of, it is our purpose to take up for consideration the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

I make the announcement so that Senators may know the general program I have in mind. There is no desire on my part to foreclose anyone, but when the discussion has been concluded this afternoon, I shall move a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have been listening with interest to the very able discussion of my distinguished friend from Illinois. I would not like him to interpret the remarks which I have made as indicating a partisan consideration of the President's message.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed I would not do so.

Mr. GORE. There are many praiseworthy features in the message. I notice that the President recommends the continuation of the tobacco program, without change. That recommendation I applaud. The tobacco program has been perhaps one of the most successful of our farm programs. I should like to point out that in paragraph after paragraph, and in section after section, continuation of the present law and of the present program is recommended. With respect to the parts of the program that have proven very successful, I believe the Pres.dent is to be congratulated upon his recommendations.

What I rose to point out was the fact that I find nothing new in the recommendation except the sliding scale of supports. There is also in the message a recommendation that we insulate certain stockpiles from the economy, from the market. That is already effective now. The Government holds these commodities through the instrumentality of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Cotton, wheat, and corn held by the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot go upon the market except under conditions prescribed by Congress. The market is already insulated. So I ask: What is new there?

I expect to join with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], as I have in years heretofore, in giving careful, nonpartisan consideration to farm legislation. However, I do not believe the proposed program should be held up as a panacea for all agricultural ills.

It recommends a continuation of existing conditions in the case of the most deplorable parts of our agricultural program, and all I can find new is a sliding scale for supports in the case of the most successful parts of the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me make a brief observation for the information of my gracious friend from Tennessee. Government is a continuing operation. It has continued ever since the beginning of our country. When, by the will of the people, we get a new administration of government, it does not mean that we must kick everything out the window. I voted for some of the programs which were put on the books of our land ever since 1933. Some of them I rejected. In some cases it was necessary to take the good with the bad, because there was no choice in the matter. However, because a new administration comes into power is no reason to fling out the window those things that have been tested in the fire of experience and found to be sound. That which is good ought to be retained in the continuing process of government.

The second point I wish to make is that the flexible part of the program is, after all, the essence of the whole program. If we are to continue the farm program on a high, rigid, mandatory level, and not gear parity and price supports to the law of demand and supply, there is no use talking about a program. That is the essence of the program. In that way it is possible finally to develop a balanced agriculture.

Finally there is the matter of the insulation of two and a half billion dollars' worth of commodities. Insulation is not the word used in the President's message, if I am correct in my recollection. I believe the word was "frozen."

Mr. AIKEN. Set aside.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Set aside. It is intended to make sure that the surpluses will not impinge upon the price structure. I wish to give one illustration of what I have in mind.

I remember when the old Farm Board was operating. At the time I was in the bakery business and I bought great quantities of flour. A flour salesman would come in, and I would say to him, "Do you have a quotation for 5,000 barrels of flour?"

He would say, "If you can tell me what Alexander Legge and the farm board will do, I will tell you what flour will cost for future delivery, 10 months or 8 months hence."

Unless the surpluses are set aside, they amount to an overhang, which would defeat the whole program. In that way we would never get to the desired goal of parity income in a reasonably free economy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I wanted to yield the floor, as a matter of fact.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand, but I shall be very brief in my question. As I remember, the President used both the term "insulate" and the term "frozen." However, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois with reference to his statement that flexibility is the essence of the whole program. I notice that there is no flexibility in the wool program, but that it is a direct subsidy up to 90 percent. I wonder how that part of the program fits into the rest of the program as a justification of the application of the Brannan plan to this particular segment of agriculture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will give an answer to my distinguished friend from Alabama by saying that he was running the show for 20 years. Two-thirds of the wool needed today in the Nation is imported wool. The number of sheep is less than it was 40 years ago. That is what has happened to the sheep and woolen industry. It is in a bad fix. I do not know what the answer is unless one wishes to listen to the many protestations of the people who use wool.

We have 100 million pounds of wool in the pool. Meanwhile foreign wool is coming into the country. That is about as distressing a situation as can be in the agricultural picture today. Probably that commodity requires heroic and rugged treatment, quite more so, perhaps, than any other commodity in the whole list. However, we inherited that problem. We did not create it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I may say that the fixed guaranty for the wool-support program is an effort made in the interest of national security. We cannot fight a war, even a defensive war, without wool. At least we have not been able to do so up to date. In the interest of national security it was deemed necessary to produce in this country, if possible, at least 260 million pounds of shorn wool a year. When wool production in the United States reaches that point, I believe the Senator from Alabama will find 90-percent price supports are not required. That is an incentive.

With reference to the method of supporting prices as proposed by the President, that is what we had in 1948, when we provided that the Secretary of Agriculture could support prices of farm commodities through loans, purchases, or payments. The word "payments" was written into the law expressly for the purpose of providing a wool program such as we have proposed here today.

In the spring of 1949, the Senator from Alabama may recall, the Secretary of Agriculture came before Congress and advocated applying that principle to practically the whole consumer list of commodities. The minimum cost would have been approximately $4 billion. Some persons calculated it would cost up to $10 billion. Congress rose up in arms against Secretary Brannan. They voted unanimously against his proposal and kicked it out. Along with it they kicked out authority for making payments for wool. The President advocates putting that particular authority back in the law. At that time we had to use $200 million to buy up Government wool. By the method of making direct payments it would have cost only $20 million. In the case of wool, of course, there is only one purchaser and that is the Boston Wool Trade Association. The payment system is applicable to wool, whereas it is not so applicable to potatoes or a great many other commodities.

I repeat, the main purpose is in the interest of national security, that is, of producing sufficient wool so that if the wool supply from Australia, for example, should be shut off we would at least be able to wage a partial war, so to speak.

I may say that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] tells me that the figure is 360 million pounds of shorn wool, instead of 260 million pounds, as I stated. He is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield briefly to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois if he knows of any time in his legislative experience when there has been so much effort and thought and care given to the preparation of a program as has been given to the one presented today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure that a sincere endeavor has been made in other days by other Secretaries to find the answer to the problem. I doubt

whether more attention and deliberation have been devoted to finding an effective solution.

Mr. WATKINS. I listened to the message as it was read to the Senate this morning. We may well be assured that every care has been given to the preparation of the message in consultation with the various segments in the farm industry in a sincere effort to work out a difficult situation.

I happen to be interested in the production of fruits. Many people in my State are interested in the production of fruit. There are many growers of perishable fruit who would be given no protection at all in the proposed program. The same has been true of past programs.

We are not complaining about it. We realize it is almost impossible to provide a price-support program that would not be an outright subsidy. Fruits cannot be stored. Fruitgrowers sustain many losses. Yet there is no way of giving relief. We are not complaining about what has happened or about the proposed program. In fact, we believe it to be the best program in principle. Ultimately we must get some kind of balance between production and consumption. We must work in that direction, unless we are to completely nationalize the farms of the Nation.

I wish to say further that I appreciate what the Senator from Illinois has stated today, and I wish to be associated with him in his remarks. I believe we have before us a program that is one of the best we have ever had to meet a situation as difficult as the present one is.

I realize that nothing will ever be 100 percent perfect. However, we have gone along in the past, and the result has always been surpluses. It is a very difficult problem. We will have losses, of course, on commodities that have been stored. I do not believe, however, that they should be destroyed. Instead, they should be consumed. Those that can be used only for animal feed should be used for that purpose. I do not believe that any food should be destroyed.

It seems to me at least we have made an approach as best we can to bring us through the transition period, to the operation of the law of supply and demand. There must be some protection given to the farmer. He is engaged in a hazardous business. It is a speculative business. Farmers cannot control the elements. They cannot control production in the same way that a manufacturer can control his production. Therefore some protection must be afforded the farmer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In closing, Mr. President, I should like to add with respect to the matter of agriculture, that I do not believe I have encountered a man who has devoted so much thought and attention to this problem, who has pursued it with so much vigor and so much courage, and has shown greater diligence in his efforts to solve it than has Mr. Benson. I salute him and take off my hat to him as a great citizen and as a great Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE RULES REGARDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to express my feelings of amusement over the proposed amendments to the Senate rules submitted to the Senate committee by the leadership of the Senate, referring to the committee issue.

Of course, Mr. President, the representative of the Independent Party did not expect the courtesy of being consulted in regard to any proposed changes in the rules on the committee issue. He was not extended the courtesy of such a consultation. Not expecting it, he, therefore, does not take offense. But I want to say, Mr. President, that since Congress adjourned I probably have spoken in more places in the United States and to more audiences than has any other Member of the Senate. I was pleased to find that in audience situation after audience situation—and the audiences were a pretty good cross-section of our citizenry, Mr. President—I found a great deal of resentment over the unfairness of the Senate of the United States in the last session in its handling of the committee issue. The people of America understand sportsmanship and the rules of fair play.

I want to say that the people apparently understand those ethical principles much better than do many of my colleagues. The people are aware of the fact that there is no precedent for the course of action which the Senate has followed in denying to me my seniority rights except one, and that is the unfortunate precedent of 1871. In that instance Sumner of Massachusetts, having years of seniority in the Senate, was denied his committee seniority rights in the Senate. There is no other precedent in the entire history of the Senate. The one which the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] tried to advance on May 25, 1953, is no precedent at all, as the Senator from Oregon pointed out at the time. The Senator from Texas cited the case of Hale of New Hampshire who was elected as a Free Soiler. However Hale had no seniority in the Senate at the time that the dispute over his committee assignments arose. When he entered the Senate as a newly elected Senator he was discriminated against because he was a Free Soiler. However, in my case I had 8 years of seniority in the Senate when the Senate voted to discriminate against me and my State.

I repeat today, and no one can successfully contradict it, that there is only one precedent in the history of the Senate for the course of action which the leadership of the Senate has followed in the controversy over my committee assignments. All the other precedents and there are many of them, support my position in this fight.

The action today on the part of the leadership of the Senate in both parties makes it very clear that they intend to continue the gross injustice which they did to the people of the State of Oregon in the last session because of the discriminatory course of action which the Senate leaders took against the people of Oregon.

The people of my State understand that, Mr. President, and they resent it. They resent it because, irrespective of what the personal view of any group in the State may be toward the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Oregon represents his people in the Senate. The people of my State look to me to continue to raise my voice in protest against the unconscionable, inequitable conduct of the leadership of the Senate toward the Senator from Oregon in this whole committee fight. I have been informed by some of my friends among the Democratic Senators that the minority leader has not presented the proposed changes in the rules to a conference of the Democratic Senators for approval.

It is interesting, Mr. President, that, having had a new opportunity to right a wrong, the leadership of the Senate proposes to repeat the same mistake which it made in the last session of the Congress. The representative of the Independent Party intends to continue to keep it fresh in the minds of not only the people of Oregon, but of the people of the country. He will give fairminded men in the Senate an opportunity to reject this proposal for changes in the rules which, obviously, has been drawn in a manner which will continue the injustice done to me.

It is interesting to see the kind of amendment which the leadership proposes, Mr. President. They propose to increase the membership of the Public Works Committee. I know something about the workload of the Public Works Committee. As I said last year, on the basis of a garbage-can disposal principle, I was relegated to the Public Works Committee. Therefore, I know something about its workload. There is no justification, in my opinion, for increasing the membership of the Public Works Committee on the basis of any workload the committee has to do.

I am sure the same goes for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. But, of course, the leadership does not want to increase the membership of one committee, which was the only major committee last year whose membership it did not increase—the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I wonder why. Obviously to increase the membership of the Labor Committee would serve to focus attention on the wrong done last year to the Senator from Oregon.

There is some major legislation to be put through that committee, Mr. President. One would think that the Senate majority and minority leadership would want to have the membership of the Labor Committee large enough to carry the load, instead of increasing the Public Works and Post Office Committees which I say cannot be justified. I think everyone knows why the Senate leaders did not want to increase the membership of the Labor Committee. It would be a little more difficult for them to alibi the injustice they have already committed against the representative of the Independent Party.

Mr. President, I think I have made it very clear that once the Senate speaks on an issue I take the decision and abide by it, which I did when the decision

was rendered last year. There is not a Member of this body who could say, after consulting with any member of the Committee on the District of Columbia or the Committee on Public Works, that the Senator from Oregon, once assigned to those committees, has not carried out to the fullest his responsibilities of committee duty on those committees.

When the Senate makes its next decision on this issue, I shall abide by it, but I shall give them a chance, now that I know the action proposed by the leadership of the Senate, to vote on a choice of amendments to the rules. I believe that if the Members of the Senate will follow the dictates of their consciences on this issue a huge majority will correct the injustice of their past votes. Therefore, in due course, the representative of the Independent Party will submit amendments to the rules which he thinks should be adopted in order to do equity and justice on this issue—amendments which will give to the people of Oregon their just deserts in the Senate of the United States, amendments which will bring to an end all unfair discrimination against the people of Oregon of which the Senate of the United States is guilty as the result of the discriminatory policy which the majority of the Senate followed last year on the committee assignment issue.

So, Mr. President, I shall prepare, overnight, amendments to the rules which, if adopted, will correct the continuation of a great injustice done the people of Oregon by the Senate last session when I was denied my seniority rights of 8 years. Let me assure the leadership of the Democratic Party that it is making a grave mistake in the course of action it is following on this issue. The people of the country are fast coming to expect such actions of political expediency from the Republican Party leadership. However, I am satisfied that most people expect the rank and file members of both of the major parties in the Senate to play fair and square. They expect the Democratic Party in the Senate to enter into no deal for inflicting discipline upon the Independent Party.

Once again the Senate has a chance to correct an injustice which a majority of its Members committed on January 13, 1953, and again on May 25, 1953, when the committee issue was before the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there be no further remarks, pursuant to the previous statement which I made, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 12, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11 (legislative day of January 7), 1953:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chile, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Wiley T. Buchanan, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Panama, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Costa Rica, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Czechoslovakia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

H. Freeman Matthews, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

John E. Peurifoy, of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guatemala, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Colombia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

George Wadsworth, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Foreign Operations Administration

The following-named persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, Foreign Operations Administration, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Mrs. Mildred C. Ahlgren, of Indiana.
Richard L. Bowditch, of Massachusetts.
Arthur J. Connell, of Connecticut.
Miss Helen G. Irwin, of Iowa.
Allan Blair Kline, of Iowa.
Mrs. Lucille Leonard of Rhode Island.
Herschel D. Newsom, of the District of Columbia.
James G. Patton, of Colorado.

Webster Bray Todd, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Morris Wolf, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel, Foreign Operations Administration, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Economic Coordinator (Special Representative for Korea), to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Department of Defense

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

Hugh M. Milton II, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Department of Agriculture

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Department of Commerce

Lothair Teetor, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Post Office Department

Eugene James Lyons, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

J. H. S. Ellis, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Treasury Department

Louis B. Toomer, of Georgia, to be Register of the Treasury, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

General Accounting Office

Frank H. Weitzel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Comptroller General of the United States for a term of 15 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Department of Labor

James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Labor, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Alice K. Leopold, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, to which office she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

John William Tramburg, of Wisconsin, to be Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Federal Security Agency

Samuel Miller Brownell, of Connecticut, to be Commissioner of Education, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Council of Economic Advisers

The following-named persons to be members of the Council of Economic Advisers, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Neil H. Jacoby, of California.
Walter W. Stewart, of New Jersey.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

Laurence Ballard Robbins, of Illinois, to be Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Robert O. Boyd, of Oregon, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the remainder of the term expiring February 1, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

George C. McConnaughey, of Ohio, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Edward Steidle, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 1955, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the board of directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Robert E. Lee, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the term of 7 years from July 1, 1953, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Harmar D. Denny, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1959, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Abbott McConnell Washburn, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for the terms indicated, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

For terms of 1 year from December 1, 1953, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

Clark L. Brody, of Michigan.
Harlan Bruce Munger, of New York.

For terms of 2 years from December 1, 1953, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

John David Anderson, of West Virginia.
Raymond Sayre, of Iowa.

For terms of 3 years from December 1, 1953, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

H. W. Clutter, of Kansas.
Marshall H. Edwards, of Florida.

For terms of 4 years from December 1, 1953, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

Marvin J. Briggs, of Indiana.
C. H. Matthews, of Texas.

For terms of 5 years from December 1, 1953, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

Golden F. Fine, of California.
Elbert J. Hodge, of Alabama.

For terms of 6 years from December 1, 1953, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

Earl H. Brockman, of Idaho.
L. V. Ritter, of Arkansas.

BUREAU OF THE MINT

Charles O. Parker, of Colorado, to be Assayer in the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo. (Mr. Parker is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Andrew Parker, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the unexpired term of 5 years from March 4, 1952, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

The following-named persons to be members of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Lewis W. Douglas, of Arizona.
Alfred M. Eberle, of South Dakota.
Joseph J. George, of Georgia.
Capt. Howard T. Orville, United States Navy, retired, of Maryland.
Kenneth C. Spengler, of Massachusetts.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Arthur H. Frye, Jr., Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U. S. C. 661), a position to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Col. William J. Ely, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U. S. C. 661), a position to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Earl Warren, of California, to be Chief Justice of the United States. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

THE JUDICIARY

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

John A. Danaher, of Connecticut, to be United States circuit judge, District of Columbia Circuit.

Carroll C. Hincks, of Connecticut, to be United States circuit judge, Second Circuit.

Elmer J. Schnackenberg, of Illinois, to be United States circuit judge, Seventh Circuit.

Edwin F. Hunter, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

Edward William Day, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge for the District of Rhode Island.

George T. Mickelson, of South Dakota, to be United States district judge for the District of South Dakota.

James Lewis McCarrey, Jr., of Alaska, to be United States district judge, Division No. 3, District of Alaska.

Albert M. Felix, of Hawaii, to be third judge, First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

Harry R. Hewitt, of Hawaii, to be fifth judge, First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

Calvin C. McGregor, of Hawaii, to be seventh judge, First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Fred Elledge, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

Heard L. Floore, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas.

Donald R. Ross, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska.

W. Wilson White, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

J. Leonard Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky.

Jack D. H. Hays, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona.

William T. Plummer, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

Theodore F. Bowes, of New York, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York.

Louis Gorman Whitcomb, of Vermont, to be United States attorney for the district of Vermont.

Donald E. Kelley, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado.

Julian T. Gaskill, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina.

George Edward Rapp, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

Duncan Wilmer Daugherty, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia.

Osro Cobb, of Arkansas, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas.

Madison B. Graves, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

Robert E. Hauberg, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi.

N. Welch Morrisette, Jr., to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Claire A. Wilder, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska.

Fred S. Williamson, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

Albert Fuller Dorsh, Jr., of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

Cooper Hudspeth, of Arkansas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Arkansas.

Donald A. Fraser, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut.

Eugene Levi Kemper, of Kansas, to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas.

Louis O. Aleksich, of Montana, to be United States marshal for the district of Montana.

Xavier North, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio.

Frank Quarles, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee.

John Overall Anderson, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

Peter Auburn Richmond, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

J. Bradbury German, Jr., of New York, to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York.

Cedric E. Stewart, of Nevada, to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada. (He was appointed to this position during the recess of the Senate.)

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

James W. Bingham, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 22, with headquarters at Galveston, Tex.

Douglas Butler, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

Gustav F. Doscher, Jr., of South Carolina, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C.

Edward C. Ellsworth, Jr., of Montana, to be collector of customs for customs collection

district No. 33, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont.

Edward M. Elwell, of Maine, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine.

J. Chalmers Ewing, of Colorado, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

Frank W. Hull, of Washington, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 30, with headquarters at Seattle, Wash.

John G. Kissane, of Vermont, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt.

James L. Latimer, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex.

Josiah A. Maultsby, Sr., of North Carolina, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 15, with headquarters at Wilmington, N. C.

Anne A. Mitchell, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE

Aleer J. Courl, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Maj. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. John Max Lentz, O10343, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Bernice Musgrove McFadyen, O10384, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Riley Finley Ennis, O11854, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joseph Sladen Bradley, O12428, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. William Nelson Gilmore, O16196, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, O16755, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Maurice Gavin, O17676, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Warburton Stephens, O15569, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Russell Dewey, O15575, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj Gen. Gordon Byron Rogers, O15620, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joseph Pringle Cleland, O16239, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

UNITED STATES ARMY EUROPE

Lt. Gen. William Morris Hoge, O4437, Army of the United States, for appointment as Commander-in-Chief, United States Army Europe, with the rank of general, and as general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for appointment to the position indicated and for appointment as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Floyd Lavinius Parks, O10582, United States Army, to be commanding general, Second Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Walter Leo Weible, O11308, United States Army, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Administration, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Shepard Biddle, O15180, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Alexander Klein, O7536, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Charles Macdonald, O8402, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams, O8425, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Albert Carl Lieber, O8184, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Philip Edward Gallagher, O11249, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Harrison Stokes, Jr., O12181, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Bartlett Murphy, O12238, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Wilkes Christenberry, O8373, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Robert Gibbins Gard, O12247, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395, Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. John Gibson Van Houten, O16669, Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck, O12744, United States Army.

Col. Emery Ernest Alling, O16545, United States Army.

Col. Frederick Prall Munson, O16505, United States Army.

FOOTNOTE.—Above-named officers were appointed during the recess of the Senate.

RESERVE COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton II, O154541.

To be brigadier general

Col. Wendell Westover, O145721, Armor Reserve.

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Homer Oliver Eaton, Jr., O201691, California National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Maj. Gen. Carl Lawrence Phinney, O244577, Texas National Guard, to date from May 28, 1953.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Lucien Abraham, O178022, Arkansas National Guard, to date from May 28, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Harold Arthur Doherty, O2270961, Indiana National Guard, to date from May 28, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Waldo Henry Fish, Jr., O282806, Rhode Island National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Henry Kimmell Fluck, O415805, Pennsylvania National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Ward Henry, O1293051, Tennessee National Guard, to date from May 28, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Robert Milliard Ives, O140472, Texas National Guard, to date from May 28, 1953.

Brig. Gen. John Rutherford Noyes, O2270935, Alaska National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Maxwell Evans Rich, O323746, Utah National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. John Darrell Sides, O330823, Alabama National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. John Walter Squire, O155858, Virginia National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. James Edward Taylor, O376731, Texas National Guard, to date from May 28, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Edmund Robert Walker, O291567, Connecticut National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Raymond Watt, O209364, Connecticut National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Oscar Ivy Wrenn, O221793, North Carolina National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

MAJOR TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Air Force

×McCluskey, Jack Lawrence, 3924A.
×Pocock, William Stephen, Jr., 5316A.
×Fisher, Henry Bishop, 5334A.
×Carey, Eugene Courtney, 5340A.
Monfort, Harry Nirkirk, 5343A.
×Ray, Hugh Jefferson, 5357A.
Batty, Paul Stewart, 5364A.
Mandel, Samuel, 5365A.
×Shelton, Calvert Probasco, 18078A.
×Newkirk, Raymond Francis, 19903A.
Nelson, James Edward, 18064A.
Strange, Luther Gragg, 18066A.
×Bryan, Loren Andrew, 5270A.
Stompler, Russell, 5288A.
Vaughan, Francis Lyle, 5367A.
Berry, Secrest Laughlin, 5368A.
Freeman, Forbes Snow, 5369A.
Bowen, Robert Lee, 5370A.
Frantz, James Tilden, Jr., 5371A.
×Price, James Albert, 5372A.
×Rauen, Robert L., 5373A.
Giegel, John Stanley, 5374A.
×Royal, Benjamin Ellis, 5375A.
Hancock, John Albert, 5377A.
Stattler, Cornelius James, Jr., 5379A.
×Wolf, Harold Clair, 5380A.
Myers, Robert Martin, 5381A.
×Emery, Daniel Breen, 5382A.
Kelley, Charles Williams, 5383A.
×Ritter, Robert Joseph, 5384A.
Cooke, Gilbert Cady, 5385A.
Etter, Richard William, 5386A.
×Mathews, Francis Joseph, 5387A.
×Schwandt, Harold Albert, 5388A.
×Darnell, George William, 5389A.
Gentry, Allison Phy, 5391A.
Gowdey, Hodges Clarence, 5392A.
Goldenberg, Carl Theodor, 5394A.
×Dawson, Van Brunt, 5396A.
×Yates, Joel Hume, 5397A.
Fuller, George Alvin, 5398A.

×Bankert, Ward Earl, 5399A.
Bolen, William Francis, 5400A.
Shipe, Frederick William, 5401A.
Abdalah, Ernest George, 5403A.
Williams, Donald Grant, 5679A.
Bates, Frederick Reed, 5404A.
×Gray, Richard Robert, Jr., 5406A.
Walters, Joseph Carl, 5408A.
Freeman, Lloyd Atmer, 5409A.
Johnson, Donald Walter, 5410A.
Dunn, Hardie McKowen, Jr., 5412A.
×Aebischer, Joseph Edward, 5413A.
Haun, James Robert, 5415A.
Gordon, Michael Jacob, 5419A.
Spees, Everett Kencheon, 5420A.
Smith, Leland Prather, 5422A.
Frankel, Arthur Grover, Jr., 5423A.
Nall, Harrold Edward, 5424A.
×Howell, Edwin Shelton, 5425A.
×Richman, Charles Phillip, 5426A.
Burgner, Newton Milton, 5427A.
×Forwood, William Garland, 5429A.
×Budway, George, 5430A.
×Swanson, Arthur Robert, 5432A.
×Hensch, Edward Konken, 5433A.
×Updike, Perry Collier, 5434A.
Guerin, Bernard Peter, 5435A.
Comer, Hubert Walker, 5436A.
×Keesling, James Clarence, Jr., 5437A.
George, Dominic John, 5438A.
×Parks, Gordon Thomas, 5439A.
Wolfsohn, Robert Soloman, 5440A.
Joy, Wilbur Rolland, 5441A.
Welch, Robert Newman, 5442A.
×Magrath, Joseph Stephen, Jr., 5443A.
Singleton, Emmett Fove, 5444A.
×Rhode, John Edward, 5446A.
×Strieber, Edward Miles, 5447A.
×Perry, Edward Lloyd, Jr., 5448A.
×Stephens, Elmer Shand, 5449A.
×Hutto, Earl Barry, 5450A.
Zeller, Winn Fredrik, 5451A.
Stratton, Max Milliard, 5452A.
Dolezel, Edward Joseph, 5453A.
×Watkins, Guy Leroy, 5454A.
×Black, John Orville, 5455A.
Ellis, John Edward, Jr., 5456A.
Hoglund, Glen Arnold, 5457A.
Butler, Charles Duane, 5458A.
Marston, Glenn Frederick, 5459A.
×Smith, David Gage, 5460A.
Higginbotham, Raymond, 5461A.
Cassell, Ernest Murray, Jr., 5462A.
Almy, Donald Comstock, 5463A.
White, Warren Mason, 5465A.
×Reynolds, Douglas Hanford, 5466A.
Gunter, George Cleveland, Jr., 5467A.
×Carrithers, Judd McClelland, 5469A.
Wilson, Lewis Baron, 5470A.
Greer, Robert William, Jr., 5472A.
Koby, Francis Robert, 5473A.
Hamill, Estil Lee, 5474A.
McElroy, Edgar Earl, 5475A.
Morrison, Cleo Elwin, 5476A.
Beasley, Everett Lyn, 5477A.
Kage, Gordon Dayton, 5478A.
Adams, Bill, 5480A.
Caulfield, Donald Brown, 5481A.
×Quin, Harold Joseph, 5482A.
×Kogan, Edward Mart, 5483A.
Alyea, Louis French, 5484A.
Brown, Robert William, 5485A.
Truesdell, Ebin Trantham, 5487A.
Cowan, William Vincent, 5489A.
McCaskill, Bernard, Jr., 5490A.
×Halfman, Rollie Joseph, 5491A.
McCracken, Dwight Henry, 5492A.
×Payne, Roger Barton, 5493A.
Smith, Frank Malone, 5494A.
Hilderbrand, George Paine, 5495A.
×Beam, Howard Earl, 5496A.
×Mattoon, Ernest Ray, 5497A.
×Gray, George Arnett, 5498A.
Fantone, James Earl, Jr., 5499A.
×Vann, James Oliver, 5500A.
×Renshaw, Donald Earl, 5503A.
Nelson, Carl George, 5504A.
Irvine, David Raymond, 5505A.
×Ryan, Frank LeRoy, 5506A.
Bobela, Michael, 5507A.
Blume, Irving, 5508A.
Smith, Lynn Powers, 5509A.
Duke, James Laran, 5511A.
Toolin, Brendan Emmett, 5512A.
×Myszewski, Chester Frank, 5513A.
Leclaire, Wilfred Brassard, 5514A.
Leyendecker, Max Thomas, 5515A.
Wallace, James Hampton, 5516A.
Evers, Vincent August, 5518A.
×Kingston, Jarvis Rowland, 5519A.
Johnson, George Hill, 2d, 5520A.
Levi, James Cobb, 5521A.
Bertoni, Louis, 5522A.
×Hammer, Wendell Austin, 5523A.
Hurd, Richard Perkins, 5524A.
Walrod, Harold Henry, 5525A.
×Lindhard, Povl Verner, 5526A.
Lock, Raymond Harold, 5527A.
Swanson, Clyde William, 5528A.
Merritt, Willard Earl, 5529A.
Stachura, Walter, 5530A.
Durni, Fred Kenneth, 5531A.
Mauldin, Osberne C., 5534A.
Driggs, Chase, 5535A.
Weber, Robert Herman, 5536A.
×Harris, Riley Wickliffe, 5537A.
Mahan, Fulton Samuel Duval, 5538A.
×Rethke, William Henry, 5539A.
O'Bryan, Joseph Earl, 5540A.
Beamer, Harry Ramond, 5541A.
Smith, Clark Jackson, 5542A.
Thornton, Raymond Allen, 5545A.
×Botsford, Charles Goddard, 5546A.
×Dameron, Claiborne, 5547A.
×Ryker, Frederick Arthur, 18096A.
Adams, Ralph Wyatt, 5548A.
Arendt, Harry Stanley, 5550A.
Motyl, James Dimitri, 5551A.
×Thomas, George Oscar, 5552A.
×Bartlett, Edgar Earl, 5553A.
×Kelley, George Thomas, 5554A.
×Breeden, Lindsey Carlisle, Jr., 5555A.
Fulton, Gordon Roy, 5556A.
×Riordan, Leonard Daniel, 5557A.
×Wagner, Edward John, 5558A.
×Brown, Harvey Coleman, Jr., 5559A.
×Sawhill, Edgar Lewis, 5560A.
×Moran, Frederick Andrew, 5561A.
Bergin, Joseph Andrew, 5562A.
×Hughes, Robert Calvin, 5564A.
×Knouse, Lloyd Berton, 5565A.
Hertzler, John Garman, 5566A.
Persky, Jacob, 5567A.
×Mulholland, Howard, 5568A.
×Vestal, Waymoth Delmar, 5569A.
×Hoover, Edward Daniel, Jr., 5570A.
Patton, Joe Robert, 5571A.
×Nixon, Perry Edward, 5572A.
×Peters, Bernard, 5573A.
×Jarcho, Louis Morton, 5574A.
×Wayshak, Abraham Edward, 5575A.
Micka, Louis Joseph, Jr., 5576A.
×Cappucci, Joseph John, 5577A.
Eichhorn, John Dunn, 5578A.
×Gallagher, John Vincent, 5579A.
×Lash, Robert Louis, 5580A.
×Carroll, James Vincent, 5581A.
×Davies, William Velasko, 5582A.
×O'Brien, Raymond Ransom, 5583A.
×Suttle, Dale Davenport, 5584A.
Burgy, Eldred John, 5585A.
Hubbard, Raymond Marvin, 5586A.
McBee, Shannon Cleo, 5587A.
Woolever, Marshall Edwin, 5445A.
Grashoff, William Henry, 5588A.
×Lulejian, Norair Melkon, 5589A.
Peake, William Kilbourne, 5590A.
×Armstrong, Richard Elliott, 5591A.
×Curtis, Jack Harry, 5592A.
Nied, George John, 5593A.
×Dick, Robert Marcus, 5594A.
Van Buskirk, Arthur Brown, 5595A.
×Carpenter, Neal Holton, 5596A.
Cofield, Gene, 5597A.
Wolcott, John Payne, 5598A.
Foster, Ross Johnson, 5599A.
Emmertz, Roger Nelson, 5602A.
×Brown, Ted, 5603A.
×Graham, James Edward, 5604A.
×O'Neil, Raymond Francis, 5605A.
Barker, Paul Bernard, 5606A.
Tebbs, Jim Reid, 5607A.
DuBose, Robert Lee, 5608A.
Kay, Charles Woodford, 5609A.
×Fox, John Edward, 5610A.
×Hiller, Martin William, 5611A.
×Dawson, Harold Cleveland, 5612A.
d'Acosta, Uriel Pereia, 5613A.
Langley, Samuel Firth, 5614A.
Luck, Ellis Chester, 5616A.
Burns, Jackson Ralph, 5618A.
Smith, Vincent Edgar, 5619A.
Marthens, George Walker, 2d, 5621A.
×Cavender, Joe Judson, 5622A.
McGibeny, Arthur David, 5623A.
Lewis, Dwight Francis, 5624A.
×Carpenter, Donald Charles, 5624A.
Gravin, Irving Henry, 5626A.
Shewbart, William Monroe, 5627A.
Hunt, Edward Herman, 5628A.
Parkins, William Howard, 5629A.
Griffin, Charles Webster, 5630A.
×Burns, Charles Timothy, 5631A.
×Michael, Pierce Baynard, 5632A.
Coleman, Harry Southside, Jr., 5633A.
×Betz, Albert Leslie, 5634A.
×Gosling, Kenneth Reginald, 5635A.
×Smith, Don Ansel, 5638A.
Hastey, Raymond Lester, 5640A.
Eckert, Jacob Clayton, 5643A.
×Thrash, Joe Merriwether, Jr., 5644A.
McDouall, Bradford Houghton, 5645A.
Bauer, Christian Schmid, 5646A.
×Kandel, Edward Robert, 5647A.
×Egerland, Arnold Victor, 5648A.
×Spooner, Julius Leonard, 5649A.
Hunter, William Campbell, 5650A.
Lund, Theodore Karl, 5651A.
Correll, Victor Crosby, 5653A.
Disana, Joe Vincent, 5654A.
×Rush, Donald Wesley, 5655A.
Nettles, Jesse Eugene, 5656A.
×Dewey, Willis Alonzo, 5658A.
McDonald, Claud Wayne, 5659A.
×Gill, John Edwards, 5660A.
×Bennett, Herbert Holinworth, 5661A.
×Shealy, William Thomas, 5662A.
×Commons, Enos Larrance, Jr., 5663A.
×Hill, Jesse Gorham, 5664A.
×Fallows, Albert Dunn, 5666A.
Sinex, Charles Helm, Jr., 5667A.
×Ware, William, 5668A.
×Steele, William, 5669A.
×Wright, Lewis Walter, 5670A.
×Quinlan, Francis Emmet, 5671A.
Myers, Lawrence Talbot, 5672A.
Trojanowski, Maurice John, 5673A.
×Rosno, Raymond Joseph, 5674A.
Hilley, William Allen, 5675A.
Hunt, Robert Fletcher, Jr., 5676A.
Hansen, Robert Peter, 5677A.
Moist, Robert Elrose, 5678A.

Medical

Denslow, Joseph Carlos, Jr., 19580A.
Steinbock, Henry Fred, 19218A.
×Holliday, John C., 19219A.
Lawn, Raymond Arnold, 19220A.

Dental

Burch, Richard Jackmond, 18889A.
Williams, James Perry, 18890A.
Eastman, John Robert, 18891A.

Veterinary

×Madison, Russell Martin, 18992A.

Medical Service

×Moore, James Henry, 19424A.
×Doyle, James Michael, 19425A.
×Shutt, William Franklin, Jr., 19426A.
Runyon, Merlyn Walker, 19427A.

Chaplain

×Nolan, John Francis, 18736A.
Taylor, Robert Preston, 18737A.
×O'Connor, James Coleman, 18738A.

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

Air Force

Webb, John Davis, Jr., 10383A.
×Woods, Durward Allen, 10467A.
×Hayes, Harold Carl, 10501A.
×Sliger, James Edwin, 10502A.
×Perry, William Dewey, Jr., 10503A.
×Derck, Walter Frank, 10504A.
×Simonson, Sidney Arnold, 10505A.
Wallace, Robert Andrew, 10506A.

Fancher, Robert Edwin, 10507A.
×Teeter, James Harley, 10508A.
×Roelofs, Milton, 10509A.
Brundage, Robert Sayles, 10510A.
×Ervin, Davis Fletcher, Jr., 10511A.
Smith, Edward Douglas, 10513A.
×Netherland, James Ollian, 10514A.
×Williams, Roger Allan, 10515A.
×Paul, William Edward, 10516A.
×McElroy, Carroll Bernard, 10517A.
×Foley, James Edwin, 10519A.
×Fife, William Paul, 10520A.
×Powers, Clarence Arthur, 10521A.
Briggs, James Kay, 10522A.
×Walters, Benjamin Burton, 10523A.
×Clements, Manen Osco, Jr., 10524A.
Watters, John Furniss, 10525A.
Ross, Donald Harding, 10526A.
×Stowell, Philip Musgrave, 10528A.
×Van Dyk, William Cornelius, 10529A.
×Dean, Floyd Rhadamanthus, 10530A.
×Mihailov, Nicholas Nicholas, Jr., 10531A.
×Fritchman, Curtis Clayton, 10532A.
Truscott, James Calvin, 10533A.
Mitchell, Kirk Richard, 10534A.
×Lian, Elmer Theodore, 10535A.
Burris, John Franklin, 10537A.
Patterson, Jerry Frank, 10540A.
Gaygan, Jack Aloysius, 10541A.
×Harris, Wallace Andrew, 10542A.
Mays, John Billy, Jr., 10544A.
Clark, Jack Wilson, 10545A.
Davis, John Pharon, 10546A.
Lassiter, Charles Beers, 10547A.
Thompson, Donald Melvin, 10548A.
×Southall, Russell Melvin, 10549A.
×Vinson, Elmer Leroy, 10550A.
Sjodin, Daniel LaVerne, 10551A.
Colley, Gordon Townsend, 10552A.
×Berk, Irving Boris, 10553A.
Gilmore, James Robson, 10554A.
Spence, Claude Pierce, 10555A.
×Hupperich, Herman Culrose, 10556A.
Renz, L. Jay, 10557A.
×Smith, William Arthur, 10559A.
×Matthews, Jewell, Jr., 10562A.
Hathorn, Vernon Burkett, Jr., 10563A.
Jones, Robert John, 10564A.
×Batie, John Samuel, 10566A.
×Ball, Fred George, 10568A.
Zagorsky, Stanley Charles, 10569A.
Leyrer, Robert Joseph, 10570A.
Porter, Vernon Davis, 10571A.
Harrelson, Jay Barnard, 10574A.
Ross, James Montgomery, 10575A.
Rice, Charles Sutton, 10576A.
Van Wingerden, Nicolas, 10577A.
×Harrison, Robert Clarence, 10578A.
Herweg, John Bernard, 10579A.
Armstrong, John Alan, 10580A.
Jordan, Jay Julian, 10581A.
Baker, Robert Gordon, 10582A.
×Miller, James Earl, 10583A.
Daugherty, Francis Leslie, Jr., 10584A.
×Ward, Rufus Alexander, 10585A.
Williams, John L., 10586A.
×Kampmann, Charles William, 10587A.
×Gillett, Richard LeMar, 10589A.
Moseley, Wendell Ford, 10590A.
Barrett, Harold Warren, 10591A.
×Downey, Robert John, 10592A.
×Clark, Cortis Anderson, Jr., 10594A.
Rea, Kenneth Ross, 10595A.
×Coleman, William Woodrow, Jr., 10596A.
×Cottrell, Bert Maxwell, Jr., 10597A.
×Kjelland, James Oliver, 10598A.
×Gay, Robert Eugene, 10599A.
×Koerschner, William Frederick, Jr., 10600A.
Beaty, William Emery, Jr., 10601A.
×Bruner, William Preston, 10602A.
Kelleher, William Francis, 10603A.
Dale, Theodore Roosevelt, 10604A.
Proctor, Kenneth Earle, 10605A.
×Bynum, Clyde Holstun, 10606A.
×Tisone, Albert Anthony, 10607A.
Blackwell, Lynn Douglas, 10608A.
Barnes, George Roy, 10609A.
×Helvey, Hazen Dale, 10610A.
Whalen, John Lester, 10611A.
Moutier, John Louis, Jr., 10612A.
Back, Charles Harold, 10613A.
×Pratt, Dwight William, 10614A.
Smith, James Charles, 10615A.
Howe, Robert Maitland, 10616A.
Dahl, Paul Warren, 10617A.
×Manley, James Colby, 10618A.
Culp, William Kenneth, 10619A.
×Mueller, Glen Edward, 10620A.
Gaede, David Livingstone, 10621A.
×Rogers, Fredrick Albert, 10622A.
Abbitt, Charles Webb, 10623A.
McLaughlin, Burl William, 10624A.
×Feicht, Edward R., Jr., 10625A.
×Binks, William Porter, Jr., 10626A.
Hamilton, Charles Edward, Jr., 10627A.
×Cosel, Richard Morton, 10628A.
Hull, Joseph DuBarry, 10629A.
×Coe, Grover Krueger, 10630A.
×Copley, Robert Edgar, 10631A.
Waltman, William Smedley, 10632A.
Compton, William Benjamin, 10633A.
Ezekiel, Thom[illegible] Clark, 10635A.
Malmstrom, L[illegible]ald Oscar, 10636A.
Acebedo, Adrian Wood, 10637A.
×Taylor, Gerald Othel, 10638A.
Hoke, DeAlbert Southerland, Jr., 10639A.
Prarat, Victor Henry, 10640A.
Gessner, Harlan William, 10641A.
×Treat, Mark Gilmour, 10642A.
Riley, Martin Eldrige, 10643A.
White, Harrison Gurney, 10644A.
Trimble, Harry Burt, 10645A.
Saltzman, Stephen Ginns, 10646A.
×Adams, Bill Russell, 10648A.
×Correll, Harold McCullough, 10649A.
Sampson, Allan Theodore, 10650A.
×McDill, James Nixon, 10651A.
Sanders, William Allie, Jr., 10652A.
×Manch, Jacob Earle, 10653A.
Zdanzukas, Vincent Raymond, 18076A.
Dees, Robert William, 10654A.
×Vitunac, Walter Charles, 10655A.
Baldwin, Allen Edward, 10656A.
Wood, Thomas Lucas, 10657A.
×Baldwin, Elwyn Seward, 10658A.
Northcutt, George Carl, 10659A.
Hopfenspirger, Thomas Warren, 10660A.
Lloyd, Marion Gene, 10661A.
×White, Oscar Edward, 10662A.
Lantz, Roy Frederick, 10663A.
McCormick, Kenneth James, 10666A.
×Smith, Earle Marshall, 10667A.
Hunter, James Edward, 10668A.
Schaffer, Glenn Joseph, 10669A.
×Sims, John Wendell, 10670A.
Baldwin, Irl Edgar, 10671A.
×Martin, John Gordon, Jr., 10674A.
×Maier, Oscar Lee Walter, 10675A.
×Harris, Walter Raymond, Jr., 10677A.
×Tannen, Martin Robert, 10678A.
×Finton, James Robert, 10679A.
Edwards, John Lee, 10680A.
Sears, Aubrew Chester, 10681A.
×Harless, Leonard Jackson, 10682A.
Taylor, Oliver DeForst, 10683A.
×Holmes, Besby Frank, 10685A.
Standifer, Lee Roy, Jr., 10686A.
×Wilson, Carl Woodrow, 10687A.
×Morhous, William Reed, 10688A.
×Umpleby, Arthur Norman, 10689A.
×Davis, George Harrison, 10690A.
Bounds, William Fay, 10691A.
Vaughan, William Rolland, 10692A.
Bastian, Earl Lehne, 10693A.
DeBord, Robert Louis, 10694A.
×Peirson, Jean Saxton, 10695A.
×Story, James Benjamen, 10697A.
Knofczynski, Joseph John, 10697A.
Grimwood, Don Milford, 10698A.
×Sorenson, John Maxwell, 10699A.
Johnson, Raymond Fredric, 10700A.
Marshall, Henry Curtis, Jr., 10701A.
×Fassmann, LeRoy John, 10702A.
Doolittle, James Harold, Jr., 10703A.
×Burtnette, Claude Sidle, Jr., 10704A.
×Sage, Wayne Philip, 10705A.
×Harris, Jack Hamilton, 10706A.
Fleming, William Harry, Jr., 10707A.
Newton, Dalton Francis, 10708A.
Firestone, Clinton Dewitt, Jr., 10709A.
Voyles, James Homer, Jr., 10710A.
Lewis, George Dewey, 10711A.
Bennett, Warren Allen, 10712A.
Jackson, Larkin LeRoy, 10713A.
Spiller, William Lacy, 10714A.
×Stephens, William Hoyt, 10715A.
Staples, George Madison, 10717A.
×Herbold, Robert Vernon, 10718A.
McDowell, Bert, Jr., 10719A.
Mackey, John Joseph, 10720A.
Menczkowski, John Marion, 10721A.
×Williams, Daniel Boone, 10722A.
×Meyer, Erwin Adolph, Jr., 10723A.
Hargis, Troy Alvis, 10724A.
Philips, Verne Douglas Joseph, 10725A.
Matthews, Thomas, 10726A.
×Johnson, Perry Guess, 10728A.
×Jacoby, Joseph Harry, 10729A.
Lichte, Martin Edgar, 10730A.
×Simmons, Albert Durant, 10731A.
×Brundydge, Henry Harold, 10732A.
×Lake, Donald Jackson, 10733A.
×Knauf, Albert Sledge, 10734A.
Garfinkel, Bernard, 10735A.
Johnston, Kingsley Maxwell, 10736A.
Senecal, Robert Percy, 10737A.
×Tullock, Willard Donald, 10738A.
×Graham, H. Allen, 10739A.
Milner, Robert Stanley, 10740A.
×Hessey, Francis Dodson, 10741A.
LeGwin, John Hardy, 10742A.
×Paige, Harold William, 10743A.
×Barker, Arthur Forbes, 10744A.
Sill, Leo Glenn, 10745A.
Fuerst, Robert Edward, 10746A.
McColl, James Quentin, 10747A.
×Rood, Ralph Winton, 10748A.
French, Joseph Elmer, 10749A.
×Foss, Joseph Aldridge, 10750A.
×Price, Edward Carson, 10751A.
Scanlan, John Francis, 10752A.
Rudolph, James Otto, 10753A.
×Crutcher, Robert Bryan, 10754A.
Keene, Thomas James, 10755A.
×Powell, William Howard, 10756A.
Fisher, Norman Decatur, 10757A.
Redden, George Alfred, 10758A.
×Neelly, Dale, 10759A.
Work, Byron Russell, 10760A.
×Goodwin, Dexter Beven, 10761A.
×Wolters, Elmer Henry, 10762A.
×Box, Francis Marion, 10764A.
Bryant, Donald Daniel, 10767A.
Walsh, John Joseph, 10768A.
×Mink, Wesley Stiles, 10769A.
Waldmire, Henry William, 10770A.
Eckley, Paul Witherspoon, Jr., 10771A.
×Glyer, John Robert, 10772A.
×Cummings, Claude Harold, Jr., 10773A.
Gaston, Arthur Dale, 10774A.
×Ellis, Sherman Edward, 10775A.
×Dabolt, Robert Lewis, 10776A.
Bauers, Frank William, Jr., 10777A.
Bowen, Lewis Love, 10778A.
Decker, John Allen, 10779A.
×Stewart, Harrie Lloyd, Jr., 10780A.
King, Joseph Henry, 10781A.
Kelso, John Maller, 10782A.
×Swanson, John William, 10783A.
Harms, Warden Dana, 10784A.
Harb, Wallace Sylvester, 10785A.
Lindquist, David Max Wadsworth, 10786A.
Rogers, Gerald Talbot, 10787A.
Oppelt, Alexander Leslie, 10788A.
Craven, Charles Waller, 10789A.
×Turner, Charles Sheridan, 10791A.
×Hilliard, Ray Lewis, 10729A.
×Morrison, Marvis Charles, 10793A.
Palmer, James Morton, 10795A.
Martin, Ewell, 10797A.
×Redfield, Tyler Adams, 10798A.
×Clair, William Alonzo, 10799A.
×Ballweg, Lawrence Henry, 10800A.
×Hollingsworth, Dal Oliver, 10801A.
×Ellis, Samuel Wayne, 10802A.
Burke, Billy, 10805A.
Gorgol, George Frank, 10806A.
Sheldon, John Warren, 10807A.
×Lowrance, Joseph Butler, Jr., 10808A.
Ingram, Sidney Oscar, Jr., 10809A.
Moore, James Merton, Jr., 10810A.
×Jones, Elmer Douglass, Jr., 10811A.
White, Foster Lee, 10812A.
×Brown, John Harrington, 10813A.
×Goodson, Walter Cass, 10814A.
×Hickey, Rolet V., 10816A.
×Guy, Carroll Wilson, 10818A.

Hayes, Burgain Garfield, 10819A.
×Stevenson, Dudley Waddell, 10820A.
Fowler, J. Riley, 10821A.
Robinson, James Bushfield, 3d, 10822A.
Stevens, Vaughan Orvis, 10823A.
×Gentry, M. D., 10824A.
×Goodbread, Jonah Eugene, 10825A.
×Harrison, Charles Dean, 10826A.
×Larson, Leon Hubert, Jr., 10827A.
×Glickman, Emanuel, 10828A.
×James, Paul Carr, 10829A.
Brown, Kimbrough Stone, 10830A.
×Roberts, Edward Theo, 10831A.
×Brooks, Clarence Rolland, 10832A.
Gilpin, John Ashbrook, 10833A.
×Kesler, Joseph, Jr., 10835A.
Cross, George Edward, Jr., 10836A.
×Williamson, George Austin, 10837A.
McClellan, John Markle, 10838A.
×Decker, Harold Raymond, 10839A.
×Ballard, Herbert LaRoy, 10840A.
×Johnson, Feroi William, 10841A.
Behrens, John Nevin, 10842.
×Roth, Myron Alfred, 10843.
×Murphy, Lloyd Joseph, 10845A.
Bruce, Avery Creedon, Jr., 10847A.
Fuchs, William Robert, 10848A.
×Hart, Gordon Lamar, 10849A.
Stribling, Robert Arris, 10851A.
Harchalk, George, 10852A.
Barr, Robert Ray, 10854A.
×Collie, Robert Lucius, 10855A.
Hamblen, William, 10856A.
Keller, Howard Wesley, 10857A.
Garrett, William Alton, 10858A.
Beaven, William Morris, 10859A.
×Guyer, Loren Ezra, 10860A.
×Martin, Frank Herbert, 10861A.
×Windsor, Leon Joseph, 10862A.
×Lindahl, Thomas Burdick, 10863A.
×Horton, Harold Everett, 10864A.
×Wood, William Penn, 10865A.
Tiffany, Robert Samuel, Jr., 10866A.
×Satterfield, John Robert, 10867A.
Krebs, John Louis, 10868A.
×Cushman, George Hawley, 10870A.
Heiman, Grover George, Jr., 10871A.
Chesmore, Emery Richard, 10872A.
Cook, Eugene Harry, 10873A.
Benner, Ralph Warren, 10874A.
×Shofner, Floyd Kelly, 10875A.
Thompson, Raymond Gail, 10876A.
×Baker, Marvin Earl, 10877A.
McQueen, Verden, 10878A.
Hoff, Burton Marvin, 10879A.
Britton, Wilbur Randall, 10880A.
Hardison, John David, 10881A.
George, Arthur Franklin, 10883A.
Lewis, Stanley Coryell, 10884A.
Walsh, Francis Robert, 10885A.
Brush, Elvin Watson, 10886A.
Byrnes, Conley Henderson, 10887A.
Hill, William Harris, 10888A.
Magness, Ped G., 10889A.
Saliba, Ernest John, 10890A.
Keating, Walter Franklin, 10891A.
×King, Max James, 10892A.
×Jones, Lewis Carriker, 10893A.
×Mitchell, Max Oliver, 10894A.
Carr, George Theron, 10895A.
Meyers, William Christopher, 10896A.
Rodden, Jasper Aaron, 10897A.
McClure, Frank Leslie, 10898A.
×Miller, Victor Norman, Jr., 10899A.
Tanassy, Emil George, 10900A.
×Zimmer, Robert William, 10901A.
×Maucher, Robert Allen, 10902A.
Young, John Newton, 10904A.
×Hammer, Kenneth Merle, 10905A.
Bock, Harry, 10906A.
Stemme, Robert Bolton, 10907A.
×Witsell, Edward Fuller, Jr., 10908A.
×Dibble, George Arthur, 2d, 10910A.

Medical

×Kellsey, David Canfield, 19348A.
×Shirer, Ralph Francis, Jr., 19351A.
×Schear, Evan Weible, 19352A.
×Hansen, Carl Ludwig, Jr., 19353A.
×Midgley, Elwin Wilmer, 19354A.
×Wiedershine, Leonard Jack, 19355A.
Van Vranken, Eugene Edward, 19356A.
×Koonce, Duval Holtzclaw, 19989A.

Dental

×Rock, George Washington, 18953A.
×Leonard, Leo John, 18954A.
×Jameson, John Rock, 18955A.
×Bienvenu, Patrick Xavier, 18956A.

Veterinary

×Snider, Charles Henry, 19009A.

Medical Service

×Pomphrey, Patrick James, 19485A.
×Hall, Auston Sylvester, 19486A.
×Merritt, William Freeman, 19487A.
×Holmes, Warren Harding, 19488A.
×O'Malley, Robert Joseph, 19593A.
×Geary, John Maurice, 19489A.
Maybell, Robert Edward, 19490A.
×Swanson, Fred Hans, 19491A.
×Force, Ronald Clarence, 19492A.

Chaplain

×Whitlock, Harold Thomas, 18797A.
×McHugh, Thomas Patrick, 18798A.

FIRST LIEUTENANT TO CAPTAIN

Air Force

Yates, John Hanley, 20041A.
Burkett, Daniel Lee, 17571A.
Roy, Carl William, 17572A.
×Packer, William Henry, 21788A.
Robinson, Leroy Buddie, 17573A.
Blanton, William Jennings, 17553A.
×Maurer, Lyle Eugene, 17554A.
×Rhoads, William Clarence, 17555A.
×McCurdy, Norman Roy, 17556A.
Frizzie, Bernard Emil, 21442A.
Marquardt, Elden George, 24262A.
Bullard, James Thomas, 22996A.
×Bunn, DeWitt Relyea, 17557A.
×Frazier, Eugene Claude, 21443A.
Smith, Walter Aloysuius, Jr., 17574A.
×Knapik, Delores Marie, 21359W.
×Hamblen, J. Fred, 21789A.
Logan, James William, 22997A.
×Vickers Robert Lehman, 21790A.
Dixon, Jack Charles, Jr., 24263A.
×Birdsong, Samuel Ernest, Jr., 21791A.
×Keough, James John, 21792A.
Berthelsen, Alvin Lang, 20046A.
Schulte, George August, 20044A.
Craft, William Cecil, 20043A.
Fink, Donald Laroy, 22998A.
×Cooper, Willie Lee, Jr., 22999A.

Medical

Hibben, Herbert Arthur, 23069A.
Sturr, Robert Porch, Jr., 23171A.
Bryan, Richard Stephen, 24664A.
Bralliar, Max Burton, 25468A.
×Good, Raphael Simeon, 22969A.
×McClain, Roland Eugene, 21691A.
×Ellswood, William Harry, 24207A.
Bosley, Robert Johnson, 25653A.
×McChesney, John Allen, 24127A.
×Wuesthoff, Hubert Ernest, 24665A.
Deuel, James Thayer, 23588A.
Collins, Frederick Gene, 21737A.
Grimmer, Billy, 22562A.
Neely, Samuel Eugene, 21767A.
×Reed, Josiah Frederick, Jr., 22563A.
×Patrick, Theodore Emil, 21738A.
×Drummy, William Wallace, Jr., 21736A.
×Staudinger, Leonard Singleton, Jr., 22564A.
×Parapid, Nicholas Vladimir, 24666A.
Weimer, John Russell, 22409A.
Sanford, William Gordon, 23107A.
Watson, Arthur Charles, Jr., 23589A.
×Krumbach, Ronald William, 22410A.
Tucker, Andrew Lewis, 22970A.
×Ainsworth, George Edward, 23212A.
Schroering, Gerard Bernard, Jr., 22971A.
Smartt, Walter Haines, 23213A.
×Murphy, Paul Daniel, 22565A.
Smith, Luther Jerome, 2d, 24208A.
×Relyea, William Volk, 23121A.
Reed, Joel Earl, 23590A.
×Caris, Timothy Nick, 21854A.
×Ferguson, Richard Harding, 21853A.
Roads, Wesley Alfred, 24667A.
Giles, Upton Wright, 24209A.
Coles, John Edmond, 24129A.
Boyd, Joe Whitfield, 24128A.
Orth, John Stambaugh, 24668A.
Moffatt, Keith, 24210A.
×Gabby, Samuel Lee, Jr., 22413A.
×Turpin, William Richard, 24130A.
×Nolan, Paul Vernon, 22567A.
×Ring, Dean Merrill, 24670A.
Berry, Charles Alden, 22414A.
×Easter, Stratton Robert, 23070A.
White, Stanley C., 23173A.

Dental

Parson, Ray Elton, 22975A.
×Wyatt, James Leslie, Jr., 19847A.
×Turk, Roy Stanley, 22988A.
×Grant, Ambrose Gaines, 24675A.
×Ayres, William Edward, 22976A.
×Weaver, Robert Norman, 24140A.
×Julius, Loy Luvern, 23071A.
Shuttee, Thomas Smith, 23594A.
×Roy, Edward Wallace, 24676A.
×Mueller, Roy Louis, 21428A.
×Dirlam, James Horace, 21765A.
Schrader, George Watts, 21851A.
×Morris, Charles Robert, 21852A.
McCall, Clarence Milton, Jr., 22408A.
×Salentine, Russell James, 22407A.
×Armstrong, Harold Leverne, 22989A.
×Woodward, Hubert Walton, 22977A.
Varrin, Rene Douglas, 25481A.
×Dohoney, William Parkhill, 21739A.
×Steiner, William Wayne, 21740A.
×Dickson, Edward Etzell, 22978A.
×Knoll, Oliver J., 19969A.
Hill, Robert Edwin, 19971A.
Jackson, Hiram Madison, 20850A.
×Schwatka, Charles Taylor, Jr., 21768A.
×Jordan, David Robert, 21742A.
×Ryan, Robert Leroy, 20061A.

Chaplain

×Levitan, Kalman Lionel, 23204A.
Jellico, Thomas Michael, 24681A.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Air Force

×Anderson, Robert Haralson, 24448A.
×Kidner, John Powell, 21656A.
×Shipley, Dan Spears, 21662A.
Curtis, Edward Harold, 21655A.
Petrie, James Waite, 21659A.
Wayne, John William, 3d, 21658A.
×Mullins, Jack Colvard, 21660A.
Wall, James Smith, 24450A.
Bates, Randolph Clark, Jr., 23874A.
Pasko, Joseph John, 23875A.
Gaskins, Calvin Coolidge, 24796A.
Rodriguez, Rigoberto, 24797A.
Yurgel, Albert, 21696A.
Schropp, George Edward, 21695A.
Glasgow, Joseph Magoffin, Jr., 21697A.
Jenista, Charles Otto, Jr., 23876A.
Egbert, Darrell Howard, 24453A.
Schneider, Calvin Chris, 24452A.
Andrew, Hugh Samuel, 23877A.
King, Bruce Francis, 24454A.
×Smith, Kenneth Richard, 21671A.
×Edwards, Boyd Hunt, 21669A.
Krekelberg, Donald Leo, 21672A.
Ambrose, Robert Fred, 21666A.
Christensen, Grant S., 21673A.
Dowdy, Derrell Coolidge, 21667A.
×Mills, Edward Kenneth, Jr., 21670A.
DuBois, Joseph Mortimer, 24455A.
Wellinghurst, Jack Moreman, 24799A.
Clinger, Bordean Wardell, 23878A.
Barker, William Robert, 23880A.
McCracken, Frank Searcy, 23047A.
Erdmann, Robert Lewis, 24800A.
Mauro, Louis Salvatore, 24802A.
Robinson, Victor Russell, Jr., 24801A.
Blodgett, Dolphus Ernest, 21698A.
Webber, Byron Lewis, 21701A.
Carey, Carl Henry, Jr., 21702A.
Pitts, Earl Wayne, 21703A.
×Heyde, Richard Reimers, 21704A.
Beyer, Richard Scott, 21699A.
Koernig, Robert Walter, 21700A.
Voigt, William Frederick, 21705A.
Vastine, John Edward, 24458A.

Asseo, Sam, 24803A.
Ryan, Thomas Martin, Jr., 24804A.
Kovacich, George Joseph, 21675A.
Kirsch, Donald David, 24459A.
Matthews, George Dale, 21676A.
Newsom, Thomas Louis, 23882A.
×Chapman, Milton Charles, Jr., 21677A.
Yerg, Kenneth Gideon, 21708A.
×Bahl, James Frederick, 21706A.
Huggins, Earl Leroy, 21707A.
Martin, Francis Thomas, Jr., 21709A.
Runnels, Charles C., Jr., 25552A.
×Coy, Edwin Alexander, 21679A.
Bolvig, Christoffer Peter, 21678A.
Lamont, James Nicholson, 24806A.
Hill, Ployer Peter, 24807A.
Schifferdecker, Charles Ray, 25553A.
Downing, Dale Edwin, 25554A.
×Nelson, James Toy, Jr., 24460A.
×Innis, John Woodson, 21770A.
Matthews, Harry Hargan, 24461A.
Meux, William Leigh, Jr., 23883A.
×Mitchell, Robert Fred, 21774A.
Rader, Norvin Elwood, 23884A.
Jordon, Harold Kenneth, 24462A.
×McEachron, Edward Harvey, 23885A.
×O'Brien, William Claude, 21820A.
×Galvin, Donald William, 23886A.
×Hackett, James W., 24808A.
Cox, George Rogers, 21744A.
×Bigelow, Robert Berle, 21745A.
Polhemus, William Leroy, 24463A.
×Bunker, Gerald Byron, 21824A.
×Stephens, William Richard, 23887A.
×Kincaid, William Leo, 24464A.
Wade, Thomas Dell, 24809A.
Clarke, Roderick William, 24810A.
Bayer, Edwin Ralph, 24811A.
×Gordon, Paul Kelly, 24812A.
×Kuchta, Daniel John, 24465A.
×Lucia, Norman Rowland, 24813A.
×Simpson, Charles James, Jr., 23085A.
×Wagner, Richard Edwin, 23088A.
×Reichardt, Delbert Dale, 23084A.
×McCargar, Lolare, 23082W.
Thomas, John Joseph, 23086A.
×Julian, Elton, 2308A.
×Prescott, Lester Albert, 23083A.
Turregano, John Edwin, 23087A.
Sayers, Merl Edward, 24815A.
×Hays, Robert Earl, Jr., 24814A.
Mianecke, Ernest Aloysious, 24816A.
Rathburn, Virginia Ransom, 25556W.
×Leatherby, Harold Franklin, 25555A.
Pollock, William John, 21813A.
Clark, Lynwood Edgerton, 21812A.
Starke, Eugene Raleigh, 21814A.
Kirk, Leland Richard, 21810A.
Carter, Vernon Henry, Jr., 21815A.
Swim, Virgil Paul, 21807A.
×Allen, Alfred Stanley, 21805A.
Dudley, William Ewart, Jr., 21809A.
Yary, William Whytle, 21806A.
Darlington, Robert Edwin, 21811A.
Diaz, Robert, Jr., 24468A.
Weber, Lawrence Wayne, 24467A.
Thomas, Maurice Charles, 24817A.
Vancleave, Walter Shelby, 24818A.
Rundle, David Bradford, 23889A.
×Johnson, Robert Edward, Jr., 23890A.
×Sprankle, Robert Lafayette, 23891A.
×Borders, Robert Henderson, 3d, 23892A.
×Brown, Allan Lee, 21905A.
Heard, Robert Jewel, Jr., 24469A.
Jones, Henry Lewis, 25557A.
×Sturmthal, Emil, 21825A.
Kelly, Victor Clayton, 23893A.
Bright, Charles Delotter, 23888A.
Stodghill, Clifford Alexander, 24481A.
Hunerwadel, Hugh Pat, 24470A.
Messmore, Jack Winston, 24472A.
Jubber, George Ferris, 24471A.
Jefferis, Joseph Denny, 25558A.
Clark, Edward Brown, 25559A.
Zaroban, Richard Herman, 24475A.
Morrell, Bruce Elliott, 24473A.
Waters, Ralph R., 24474A.
Cox, Harold Morris, 24819A.
Feero, Urban Austin, Jr., 24820A.
Corrigan, Robert Calvin, 24821A.
Vavrinek, Raymond Harding, 23894A.
Boersole, Howard Royal, 24476A.
×Alexander, William Tipton, 24477A.
Luchsinger, Vincent Peter, Jr., 21817A.
Raunikar, Eugene, 21816A.
Schutt, Carlton Edward, 23895A.
Watkins, Eugene Conrad, 24480A.
Bouton, Arthur Franklyn, Jr., 24478A.
Webb, James Arnold, Jr., 24822A.
Fagan, James Francis, 21748A.
Murley, Kenneth Earl, 21749A.
Cisco, Guy Cleveland, Jr., 21747A.
Lorenz, Bernard Charles, 21750A.
Cooke, Gerald Edward, 25560A.
Decima, Eleo, 23896A.
Shipman, Frank Wilson, Jr., 24823A.
Elliott, Robert George, 25561A.
Hansen, Richard Earl, 23898A.
Miller, George Richard, 24483A.
Brandom, Thomas Martin, Jr., 24482A.
McDowell, Dwight Calvin, 24825A.
Nolan, James Albert, 24484A.
Stewart, Gerald William, 24826A.
Leverett, Sidney Duncan, Jr., 24827A.
Muterspaw, Emmett Edgar, Jr., 24485A.
Koons, Burt Stanley, 24486A.
Ward, Billy Ray, 24487A.
×Madigan, Albert Whittier, 21752A.
Thornton, James Henry, 23897A.
Runyan, Charles Curtis, Jr., 25562A.
Miller, Donald Edwin, 24489A.
Kokoszka, Florian Theodore, 24828A.
Cole, Arthur Scott, 25563A.
Marsters, Thomas Charles, 24492A.
Murray, Jack Godfrey, 24490A.
Shivley, Robert Wendell, 24491A.
Patterson, Glenn Alden, Jr., 23899A.
Cottle, Joe Irvin, 24495A.
Babcock, Bernard Roland, 24496A.
Roll, Frederick August, Jr., 24494A.
Andrews, Richard Thomas, 24829A.
Wolf, Earl John, Jr., 23900A.
Foster, Jack Richard, 24497A.
Timm, William Machamer, 24832A.
Bodie, Donald Edward, 21755A.
Dennis, Robert, 23901A.
Scovell, Rolf Sanford, 21756A.
Golden, William George, Jr., 23902A.
Dunn, Mathew Thomas, 24498A.
×Williamson, Donald Stroup, 24505A.
×Waterbury, David Eugene, 24833A.
Nunemaker, John Jacob, 24499A.
Marymee, Hubert Eugene, 23905A.
Lane, Gerald Richard, 23903A.
Gamm, Thomas Joseph, 24500A.
Martin, William Hubert, 21818A.
Lebaron, Allen Dee, 21819A.
×Wasson, Glenn Everett, 21904A.
Grimes, Charles Kenneth, 24501A.
Purser, Henry William, 24503A.
Brewer, Lee Allen, 24502A.
Skillman, Tom Mike, 22441A.
Davis, Philip Carroll, Jr., 22436A.
Baker, Kenneth Grant, 22434A.
Sleep, Otis Arnold, 22442A.
Snodgress, Paul Edward, 22443A.
Odom, James Riley, Jr., 22440A.
Bennett, Frank Everett, 22435A.
Gyulavics, Joseph James, 22437A.
Warren, William Jerry, 22444A.
McGehee, Frank Boaz, 22439A.
Hostetter, Henry Glenn, 24504A.
Brown, Richard Shaw, 24506A.
Whitehurst, Elbert Wyma, 24834A.
Joppa, Jacob Anthony, Jr., 25457A.
Dahl, Gerald Raymond, 25565A.
×Anderson, Jesse Jack, 25564A.
Trueheart, James Lawrence, 24509A.
Yeager, George Gordon, Jr., 25566A.
Friss, Raymond James, Jr. 23907A.
Johnson Grant Wallace, 21772A.
×Barnes Warren Samuel, 21773A.
Stotts, John Hunter, 21775A.
Perham, Guy Dorman, 21776A.
McDonald, David Richard 21771A.
Savage, Robert Louis, 24511A.
Davis Cecil, 24513A.
Williams, Reuben Edward, 24835A.
Tackwell Joseph Jerry, 23908A.
Krause, William Guy, 24515A.
Colvin, Marc Jay, Jr., 24516A.
Renz, Robert Edward, 24514A.
Hall, Harold Cleo, 25567A.
Longanecker, Walter Ridgely, Jr., 23909A.
Rayner, Robert Vance, 24836A.
×Pallouras, James Louis, 23910A.
Harpster, John Wilbur, 24517A.
Dietz, Frederick Chester, 25569A.
Welsh, Mark Anthony, Jr., 25568A.
Bertic, Samuel Lawrence, 25570A.
×Caruso, Charles Peter, 21822A.
MacLaren, William George, Jr., 21823A.
×Van Dusen, John Nash, 21821A.
Carey, William Ellis, 24519A.
Munn, James Stanley, 24518A.
Hughes, William Virgil, 25571A.
Omley, George Edward, 25572A.
Bartalsky, Steven Louis, 24536A.
Stringer, William Lawrence, 24837A.
Cobb, Tommy, 23912A.
Cotter, John Abner, 24520A.
McIntire, Robert Henry, 25574A.
Matsen, Ralph Stephen, 22857A.
Wood, Raymond Brooks, 23913A.
Watson, James Milton, Jr., 24521A.
Christman, Fred John, Jr., 24524A.
Nielsen, Jessie Patricia, 24838W.
Cressap, Edward Robert, 24839A.
McMillan, John Aubrey, 25575A.
Webb, Herbert Godfrey, 24525A.
Palmer, Wallace Jackson, 24526A.
×Rule, John Henry, 21827A.
Smith, Chadwick Boyd, 21832A.
Driessnack, Hans Helmuth, 21831A.
Dudley, Charles Herbert, 21830A.
Broussard, James Harold, 21826A.
×Henslee, Robert Young, 21829A.
×Winders, Voy Arthur, 22856A.
Divall, Robert Harold, 23915A.
Slayton, Donald Kent, 23914A.
Scharling, Stanley Victor, 24532A.
Cooney, Lloyd Irving, 24531A.
Wallace, Neil Warren, 24530A.
Berg, Robert Leonard, 24527A.
Archuleta, Harry Manuel, 25577A.
Abbey, Charles Earl, 23917A.
Denton, Irving LaRue, 23916A.
Voseipka, George Kenneth, 23918A.
Rossel, Robert Louis, 24840A.
Magdich, Joseph, Jr., 23919A.
×Koehler, Frederick George, 21835A.
×Stanton, Richard Robert, 21833A.
Davis, Thomas Holman, 23920A.
Mullen, Maurice Leland, 24535A.
Prior, James Clark, 24534A.
Custer, Gerald Boyce, 25578A.
Hutchison, Curtis Roland, 23129A.
Powell, James Virden, 23134A.
×Myers, Ralph Harvard, 23132A.
×Olsen, William Pross, 23133A.
Bosstick, Charles Dale, 23127A.
Wurthmann, Henry St. Clair, Jr., 23136A.
×Rieder, Henry Robert, 23135A.
×Call, Edward Fleming, 23128A.
×Lauderdale, Carl Joseph, Jr., 23131A.
×Landon, Robert Melville, 23130A.
Barwin, Richard Otto, 23126A.
×Barnes, Jack Lyle, 23125A.
Woods, David Andy, Jr., 24540A.
Hagen, William Stanley, 24537A.
Lorey, Willis Edward, 24539A.
Appleby, Phillip Edward, 24842A.
Williams, Walter Alexander, 24844A.
Harris, Armond Edgbert, 24843A.
English, Robert Bryan, 22466A.
Dingwell, Cyril Howard, 22447A.
Anderson, Charles Douglas, 22445A.
Kottas, William Max, 22446A.
Dickerson, Lewis Hayes, 23921A.
Zippel, Irving, 24542A.
Woldt, Robert Conrad, 24541A.
Enslen, Allen Taylor, 24845A.
Watson, Wilbur Charles, 25579A.
Davis, Charlie Brown, Jr., 25580A.
Martinet, Pierre Warren, Jr., 23922A.
Rickard, Ernest Hughes, 23923A.
Johnson, William Thomas, Jr., 22423A.
Kieckhaefer, Robert Victor, 24543A.
Brown, Jack Ferrell, 24544A.
Hooten, Donald Hugh, 24545A.
Myers, Charlie Clement, 24547A.
Garrison, Charles Evens, 24846A.
×Knowles, John Stevenson, Jr., 21836A.

Halbert, Billy Gene, 25581A.
Bedford, James Reuben, Jr., 24549A.
Brown, Floyd Blaine, Jr., 24848A.
Baltzell, Leonard Earl, 25582A.
×Renfro, Charles Ralph, 22493A.
Murray, Robert Blaine, 22492A.
Walters, George Samuel, 24849A.
Algeo, John Burton, 23925A.
Couvillion, Richard Wilson, 21834A.
Mease, Harry Vernon, 23926A.
Eden, Douglas Scott, 24568A.
Stillwagon, Edwin Andrew, 24850A.
×Hunter, Robert Bruce, Jr., 22452A.
Graham, Bruce Edward, 22449A.
Grissom, Virgil Ivan, 22450A.
×Hadley, Thomas Erie, 2d, 22451A.
Stephens, Dallas Kirkpatrick, 22455A.
Meeker, James Irwin, 22454A.
King, Robert Partner, 22453A.
Ward, Albert Highert, Jr., 22457A.
Fremont, John Charles, 22448A.
Kasler, James Helms, 24551A.
Schiffer, John Thompson, 23092A.
Grubaugh, Kenneth Wayne, 21906A.
Danyliw, Bohdan, 24553A.
Lua, Royal Chester, 24554A.
Young, Everett Oliver, 24552A.
Mercer, Roger Neal, 24555A.
Isaac, Alfred Eugene, 23927A.
Farry, Stephen Francis, 24556A.
Leonard, Thomas Joseph, 24557A.
Erbschloe, Richard Ross, 24851A.
Bensing, Robert Goddard, 24558A.
McNamara, Francis Joseph, Jr., 24559A.
×Morrison, Lawrence David, 24852A.
×Strand, John Henry, Jr., 22858A.
Gaffey, John Tracy, 2d, 22859A.
Tolle, Frederick Francis, 23928A.
Hanjian, Jerry, 24562A.
Grasher, Howard K., 24563A.
Weiler, Jerome Conrad, 24561A.
Koeninger, Charles Edwin, 25583A.
Pippen, John William, 24564A.
×Drain, Edgar Lee, 23024A.
×Hall, John Rolin, 24853A.
×Allison, Jack G., 24565A.
Miller, Alfred Leslie, Jr., 24566A.
×Scofield, Lansing Guion, 22458A.
×Bushboom, Wendal Lee, 24567A.
Parker, Alan Leslie, 24569A.
×Hallgren, John Fridolph, 24570A.
O'Leary, William Simon, 25584A.
Brown, Julius Warren, Jr., 25585A.
×Loftis, George Roland, 22087A.
Rauchenstein, Henry David, 25586A.
Kinnard, Dennett Hixon, 22389A.
×Pickett, Donald Edward, 23929A.
×Skaggs, Alvin Douglas, 23931A.
×Yale, George Edward, Jr., 24571A.
×Stevens, David Boyette, 24572A.
×Forster, Francis Xavier, 24573A.
Drake, Raynolds, 24857A.
Heard, Richard Adrian, 25587A.
×Greene, Carl Kennedy, 22494A.
Garvey, Joseph John, 23932A.
×Risteen, William Hardy, 22938A.
Wilson, Charles Lowry, 25588A.
Wagner, William Louis, 24574A.
Farris, Harold Daws, 25589A.
Rew, Thomas Frederick, 23933A.
McKeever, William Lawrence, 24576A.
×Feeney, Edward Marquis, 23934A.
×Horne, Joseph Allen, Jr., 24577A.
McVay, William David, 23806A.
×Traendly, Eugene William, 24578A.
Miller, Edward Longanecker, 24855A.

Medical Service

Gray, Hollis Burdette, 25335A.
×Spaur, Carl Leroy, 23228A.
×Dibona, Joseph, 23229A.
×Quenk, Joseph John, 23230A.
×Schofield, James Bernie, Jr., 23231A.
×Covell, Donald Edward, 23232A.
Bitzko, Joseph Thomas, 23233A.
×Krakauer, Hans Anatol, 23235A.
×Martin, Robert Peter, 23234A.
Perkins, Arthur Hewett, 25336A.
×Harper, Oliver Franklin, Jr., 23237A.
Kirkel, Hubert Paul, 23238A.
Berlow, Leonard, 23239A.
Glenn, Sam David, 23240A.
Bissett, Daulton Edwards, 23241A.
Griffith, Llewellyn Brooks, 24238A.
Colon, Howard, 25337A.
Briley, James Russell, 24239A.
Murphy, James Donald, 25674A.
Clay, John Lloyd, 23242A.
×Jones, Bruce, 24240A.
Braden, Robert William, 25339A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

MAJOR TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Nurse

Kehoe, Doris Angela, 20906W.
×Wimberly, Edith Marie, 20909W.
×Hogan, Rosemary, 20977W.

Women's medical specialist

Perry, Miriam Esther, 21185W.

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

Nurse

×Daniel, Margaret Elizabeth, 21919W.
×Spearnak, Pearl, 20914W.
×Evans, Claretta, 20918W.
×Schmidt, Sabina Christina, 21023W.
×Darden, Elizabeth Ann, 20925W.
×Thorp, Frances P., 20902W.
Hall, Sara Caroline, 20985W.
×Bryant, Frances Lucia, 20945W.
Lay, Frances I., 20946W.

Women's medical specialist

×Laughlin, Mary Margaret, 22058W.
×Horr, Frances Mary, 21195W.

FIRST LIEUTENANT TO CAPTAIN

Women's medical specialist

×Paynter, Elizabeth Nichols, 20899W.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Nurse

×Cooney, Patricia Ann, 21886W.
×Danowski, Dorothy Dolores, 21890W.
×Chandler, Glenna Loving, 21884W.
×Elser, Florence Frances, 21887W.
×Zila, Mildred Anna, 21891W.
×Calm, Helen Elizabeth, 22068W.

Women's medical specialist

Fusco, Filomena Roberta, 21894W.
×Lacy, Barbara Lee Funk, 21892W.
×Hodgkins, Barbara Merle, 21895W.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 1 year from February 1, 1954.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Rear Adm. Alfred C. Richmond to be Assistant Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned commander

Glenn W. Moore

To be commissioned lieutenant

Steven L. Hollis, Jr.

To be commissioned lieutenant (junior grade)

John B. Watkins, Jr. Bruce E. Greene
Jack E. Guth Robert E. Williams
James D. Hodges

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John Caskey, of Trinity Episcopal Church, Galveston, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, we humbly beseech Thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for their Representatives in Congress assembled; that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the good of Thy Nation, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy whole people; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us for all generations. These and all other necessaries, for them, for us, and Thy whole Nation, we humbly beg in the name and mediation of our most blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 7, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 291)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I submit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a number of legislative recommendations affecting labor-management relations. These recommendations are in the interests both of working men and women, and our business and industrial community. In a broader sense, they are in the interests of all our people, whose prosperity is in so great a degree dependent on the existence of genuine mutual respect and good feeling between employers and employees.

This field of legislation has had a long, contentious history. It has taken time for objective principles to emerge which can command mutual acceptance of the fundamentals which govern the complex labor-management relationship. Although the process is not and perhaps never will be complete, we have now achieved a measure of practical experience and emotional maturity in this field which, I do not doubt, is responsible for the relatively peaceful character of recent industrial relations. No drastic legislative innovations in this field are therefore desirable or required at this time.

Federal labor-management legislation at best can provide only the framework in which free collective bargaining may be conducted. It should impose neither arbitrary restrictions nor heavy-handedness upon a relationship in which good will and sympathetic understanding should be the predominant characteristics.

The National Labor Relations Act—known as the Wagner Act and adopted in 1935 by bipartisan majorities—came into being because American working men and women needed the protection of law in order to guarantee them the free exercise of their right to organize into unions and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. As unions became strong, a need arose to protect the legitimate rights of employees and employers and to protect the general public from the consequences of unresolved labor disputes that created emergencies endangering the health or safety of the Nation. To meet this need the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley Act, was adopted by bipartisan majorities.

In enacting labor-management legislation, the Congress has always built upon the legislation which preceded it. We have never turned backward. The Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, was no exception. It built upon the National Labor Relations Act, and not only reaffirmed, but reinforced the right of working men and women to organize into unions and to bargain collectively with their employer. The protection of this right is firmly fixed in our law and should remain a permanent policy of our Government.

The Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is sound legislation. Experience gained in the operation of the act, however, indicates that changes can be made to reinforce its basic objectives.

In the area of employer-employee relations the injunction has always been a controversial process. It is apparent, however, that where irreparable damage threatens, the restraining effect of an injunction is required in the interest of simple justice. Nevertheless, where a collective-bargaining relationship exists, the issuance of an injunction often has the effect of making settlement of the dispute which led to the injunction more difficult.

Therefore, I recommend that whenever an injunction is issued under the National Labor Relations Act where a collective bargaining relationship exists between the parties, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall impanel a special local board to meet with the parties in an effort to seek a settlement of their dispute. I further recommend that in secondary boycott cases, the application for an injunction be discretionary.

The prohibitions in the act against secondary boycotts are designed to protect innocent third parties from being injured in labor disputes that are not their concern. The true secondary boycott is indefensible and must not be permitted. The act must not, however, prohibit legitimate concerted activities against other than innocent parties. I recommend that the act be clarified by making it explicit that concerted action against (1) an employer who is performing farmed-out work for the account of another employer whose employees are on strike or (2) an employer on a construction project who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the project, will not be treated as a secondary boycott.

As the act is now written, employees who are engaged in an economic strike are prohibited from voting in representation elections. In order to make it impossible for an employer to use this provision to destroy a union of his employees, I recommend that, in the event of an economic strike, the National Labor Relations Board be prohibited from considering a petition on the part of the employer which challenges the representation rights of the striking union. I further recommend that for a period of 4 months after the commencement of the strike, the Board be prohibited from considering a petition on the part of any other union which claims to represent the employees. The prohibition against considering a petition by the employer should continue as long as the strike continues, provided, however, that a reasonable limit of time, which I suggest be 1 year, be stipulated.

The act has been interpreted to mean that even though a collective bargaining contract is in force, either party may insist that the contract be reopened for the purpose of bargaining about matters that were not the subject of negotiations when the contract was made. Thus stabilization of the relationship between the parties for the period of the contract can be completely frustrated. I recommend that the law be amended so as to protect both parties to a valid collective bargaining agreement from being required to negotiate during its term unless the contract so authorizes or both parties mutually consent.

The national emergency provisions of the act are essential to the protection of the national health and safety. As the act is now written, the board of inquiry established to inquire into the facts of the dispute causing the emergency must report the facts to the President without recommendations. In order that the President may have the authority to require the board's recommendations, I recommend that after he has received and made available to the public the last report of the board of inquiry—if the dispute has not then been settled—he be empowered to reconvene the board and direct it to make recommendations to him for settlement of the dispute. Although the recommendations of the board would not be binding upon the parties, yet there is real value in obtaining the recommendations of informed and impartial men for the settlement of a dispute which imperils the national health and safety.

Employees engaged in the construction, amusement, and maritime industries have unique problems because their employment is usually casual, temporary, or intermittent. I recommend that in these industries the employer be permitted to enter into a prehire contract with a union under which the union will be treated initially as the employees' representative for collective bargaining. I also recommend that in these industries the employer and the union be permitted to make a union-shop contract under which an employee, within 7 days after the beginning of his employment, shall become a member of the union.

Under the act as presently written, both unions and employers are made responsible for the actions of their agents. In order to make it clear that a union cannot be held responsible for an act of an individual member solely because of his membership in the union, I recommend that the act be amended to make the traditional common-law rules of agency applicable.

The act presently provides that the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board are available only to those unions whose officials execute affidavits disclaiming membership in Communist organizations. The Communist disclaimer provisions are not presently applicable to employers. I recommend that they be made applicable. Specific proposals for legislation dealing with Communist infiltration generally are now under study. If such legislation is enacted, making the Communist disclaimer provisions of the act unnecessary, I then will recommend that they be entirely eliminated.

The right of free speech is fundamental. Congress should make clear that the right of free speech, as now defined in the act, applies equally to labor and management in every aspect of their relationship.

The act presently prohibits an employer from making payments to a union to assist in the financing of union welfare funds unless the fund meets certain standards. These standards are not adequate to protect and conserve these funds that are held in trust for the welfare of individual union members. It is my recommendation that Congress initiate a thorough study of welfare and pension funds covered by collective-bargaining agreements, with a view of enacting such legislation as will protect and conserve these funds for the millions of working men and women who are the beneficiaries.

The act should make clear that the several States and Territories, when confronted with emergencies endangering the health or safety of their citizens, are not, through any conflict with the Federal law, actual or implied, deprived of the right to deal with such emergencies. The need for clarification of jurisdiction between the Federal and the State and Territorial governments in the labor-management field has lately been emphasized by the broad implications of the most recent decision of the Supreme Court dealing with this subject. The department and agency heads concerned are, at my request, presently examining the various areas in which conflicts of jurisdiction occur. When such examination is completed, I shall make my recommendations to the Congress for corrective legislation.

In the employer-employee relationship there is nothing which so vitally affects the individual employee as the

loss of his pay when he is called on strike. In such an important decision he should have an opportunity to express his free choice by secret ballot held under Government auspices.

There are two other changes in the law that I recommend. The authorization which an individual employee gives to his employer for the checkoff of the employee's union dues should be made valid until the termination of the collective bargaining contract which provides for such checkoff, unless the employee sooner revokes such authorization. The provisions of the act which require reports from unions concerning their organizations and finances should be simplified so as to eliminate duplication in the information required by such reports.

I hope that the foregoing changes will be enacted by Congress promptly, for they will more firmly establish the basic principles of the law. The appropriate committees of the Congress will, I am certain, wish to keep the law under continuous study and in the light of experience under it propose further amendments to implement its objectives and constantly improve its administration.

Government should continue to search diligently for sound measures to improve the lot of the working man and woman, mindful that conditions and standards of employment change as the products, habits, and needs of men and women change. It will be continually a challenge to Government to sense the aspirations of the working people of our country, that all may have the opportunity to fairly share in the results of the productive genius of our time, from which comes the material blessings of the present and a greater promise for the future.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1954.*

AGRICULTURE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 292)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I submit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a number of recommendations affecting the Nation's agriculture.

PART I

The agricultural problem today is as serious and complex as any with which the Congress will deal in this session. Immediate action is needed to arrest the growing threat to our present agricultural program and to prevent the subsequent economic distress that could follow in our farming areas.

I have given assurances to the American farmer that support of existing agricultural laws, including continuance through 1954 of price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity, was a moral and legal commitment that must be upheld. Along with the fulfillment of this commitment, an unending effort has proceeded in the past 12 months to provide the American farmer his full share of the income produced by a stable, prosperous country. This effort requires for success a new farm program adjusted to existing conditions in the Nation's agriculture.

This message presents to the Congress that new program. It is designed to achieve the stability and growth in income over the years to which our farmers are entitled and which the Nation must assure in the interest of all 160 million of our people.

STUDIES OF THE PROBLEM

In constructing its program, this administration resolved to get the benefit of the best thinking of the Nation's farmers, as well as that of its farm experts. Over 60 different survey groups, and more than 500 of the most eminent farm leaders in the country, have participated in these studies. Agricultural colleges and research institutions contributed their work and thought. Scores of producer, processor, and trade groups, as well as national farm organizations, gave their findings and proposals. Mail from thousands of individual farmers, and opinion polls among farmers, have been analyzed and weighed. The bipartisan, broadly representative National Agricultural Advisory Commission has steadily worked and consulted on the problem for the past 12 months. Numerous commodity organizations have been consulted. Many Members of the Congress have shared their own rich experience in this effort. Accordingly, as promised a year ago, the most thorough and comprehensive study ever made of the farm problem and of governmental farm programs has been completed.

RECOMMENDATIONS BY COMMODITY

The recommendations which have been reaped from all this inquiry are in the best traditions of bipartisan approach to the Nation's agricultural legislation. They recognize that each farm crop has its own problems and that these problems require specific treatment. Accordingly part II of this message presents detailed proposals for the treatment of 16 commodities or commodity groups. I here confine myself to those aspects of the farm program in which all farmers and all citizens are equally concerned.

SOME FUNDAMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

In its approach to this problem, the administration has held to the following fundamentals:

First. A stable, prosperous and free agriculture is essential to the welfare of the United States.

Second. A farm program must fairly represent the interests of both producers and consumers.

Third. However large surpluses may be, food once produced must not be destroyed. Excessive stocks can be removed from commercial channels for constructive purposes that will benefit the people of the United States and our friends abroad.

Fourth. For many reasons farm products are subject to wider price fluctuations than are most other commodities. Moreover, the individual farmer or rancher has less control over the prices he receives than do producers in most other industries. Government price supports must, therefore, be provided in order to bring needed stability to farm income and farm production.

Fifth. A farm program first of all should assist agriculture to earn its proportionate share of the national income. It must likewise aim at stability in farm income. There should therefore be no wide year-to-year fluctuation in the level of price support.

Sixth. No single program can apply uniformly to the whole farm industry. Some farm products are perishable, some are not; some farms consume the products of other farms; some foods and fibers we export, some we import. A comprehensive farm program must be adaptable to these and other differences, and yet not penalize one group of farmers in order to benefit another.

Seventh. A workable farm program must give the administration sufficient leeway to make timely changes in policies and methods, including price-support levels, within limits established by law. This will enable the administration to foresee and forestall new difficulties in our agriculture, rather than to attempt their legislative cure after they have arisen.

Eighth. Adjustment to a new farm program must be accomplished gradually in the interest of the Nation's farming population and in the interest of the economy of the Nation as a whole.

Ninth. Research and education, basic functions of the Department of Agriculture since its beginning, are still indispensable if our farmers are to improve their productivity and enlarge their markets.

Tenth. The soil, water, range, and forest resources of the United States are the natural foundation of our national economy. From them come our food, most of our clothing, much of our shelter. How well we protect and improve these resources will have a direct bearing on the future standard of living of the whole Nation.

THE PRESENT AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

Present laws discourage increased consumption of wheat, corn, cotton, and vegetable oils and encourage their excessive production. The huge and growing surpluses held by the Government act as a constant threat to normal markets for these products. Thus, present law produces results which in turn are hurtful to those whom the laws are intended to help. Partly because of these excessive stocks, farm income has fallen steadily over the past 3 years.

The urgency in this situation may be illustrated by a few basic facts. During the past year, the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in farm commodities more than doubled, increasing by about $2,500,000,000. As a result, the financial obligations of the Corporation are pressing hard against the $6,750,000,000 limitation on its bor-

rowing authority. In order to assure that present price-support commitments on 1953 and 1954 crops will be covered, I shall request the Congress to take early action to restore the Corporation's capital losses as of June 30, 1953, and to increase its borrowing authority to $8,500,000,000, effective July 1, 1954.

The Government's commodity holdings are enormous. It has investments in more than $2 billion worth of wheat alone. This includes 440 million bushels owned outright. About 400 million additional bushels are under loan, the greater share of which the Government can expect to acquire. This is more than the domestic wheat requirements of the entire Nation for a full year.

The cotton carryover will amount to about 9,600,000 bales. Here again the carryover is approximately equal to the domestic needs of the entire Nation for a full year.

The carryover of vegetable oils may be about 1,500,000,000 pounds, roughly double the carryover that should normally be maintained.

Because such tremendous supplies are already in hand, acreage allotments and marketing quotas have had to be applied to wheat and cotton. An appeal by the Government for sharp acreage reductions for corn appears unavoidable. These allotments are expected to reduce the acreage planted to these crops in 1954 by the following amounts: Wheat, 16.5 million acres; corn, between five and six million acres; cotton, 3.5 million acres. Without the most careful handling, a diversion within a single year of 25 million acres of productive cropland—about 8 percent of the total—from their accustomed use could have the most unfortunate impact on the total economy.

Even these reductions probably will not appreciably lower the surpluses of wheat and cotton because of the likelihood of increased yields that will be sought from the reduced acreage, and because markets will continue to shrink as a consequence of rigid price supports. As for corn, it is estimated that enough diverted land will be used for oats, barley, and sorghums to hold total supplies of feed grains at present levels, thus largely offsetting the purpose of the corn acreage reduction. It is also expected that some 3 million diverted acres may be planted to soybeans, thus aggravating the tremendous oversupply of vegetable oils. The likely production from other diverted acres threatens producers of potatoes, sugar beets, rice, alfalfa, flaxseed, vegetables, and many other crops. Therefore, we must move without further delay to treat the fundamental causes of our present excess supplies of farm commodities.

The Nation's agricultural problem is not one of general overproduction: Consumer demand continues at or near record high levels; the average prices of farm products that lack direct price supports have been as high in recent years as those of price-supported products. The problem is rather one of unbalanced farm production, resulting in specific surpluses which are unavoidable under the present rigid price supports. The problem is complicated by the continuing loss of some of those foreign markets on which American agriculture has depended for a large part of its prosperity.

MAJOR FEATURES OF FARM PROGRAM

The new farm program here proposed is consistent with all the foregoing conditions and fundamental considerations. It has five major features:

First. The new program should first be given an opportunity to start operating without the handicap of such large accumulated surpluses. This is to be done by setting aside certain quantities of our surplus commodities, eliminating them from price-support computations.

Second. The 1948 and 1949 Agricultural Acts were soundly conceived and received bipartisan support. The principles on which they were based are particularly applicable to the agricultural industry today. Although based generally upon those principles, the proposed agricultural legislation of 1954 contains certain new features, improvements and modifications.

Third. The amendment to the 1949 Agricultural Act providing for mandatory rigid supports, attuned to war needs and demonstrably unworkable in peacetime, will be permitted to expire. After the 1954 crops the level of price supports for the basic commodities will be gradually related to supply, promising farmers greater stability of income.

Fourth. Modernized parity is to become effective for all commodities on January 1, 1956, as scheduled by law. Provision should be made for moving from the old to modernized parity in steps of five percentage points of the old parity per year until the change from old to modernized parity has been accomplished.

Fifth. The key element of the new program is a gradual adjustment to new circumstances and conditions. Application of modernized parity and the relation of basic crops to supply levels require a transition period to assure a stable farm economy. This transition should be accomplished in a prudent and careful manner to avoid sharp adjustments which would threaten the dislocation of the program.

Sixth. In keeping with the policy of gradual transition, the Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variations in price-support levels will be limited.

Seventh. The authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to apply price supports at more than 90 percent of parity when the national welfare or national security requires should be continued.

PARITY AND PRICE SUPPORTS

Under the provisions of the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949 the Government will—

First. Support the prices of basic crops of those farmers who cooperate with acreage allotments and marketing quotas when such are in effect;

Second. Announce the price-support level for various crops before those crops are planted, insofar as practicable;

Third. Support price levels at up to 90 percent of parity. For some products a schedule of price floors will also be provided as authorized by the 1949 act, ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity, according to the relationship of total to normal supply; and

Fourth. Vary the price-support level one percentage point for every two percentage points of variation in the total supply. If the supply is short, higher support levels will encourage production. If the supply is overabundant, a lowered price will stimulate consumption. Thus, not only will a floor be placed under all basic crop prices, but variations in price and supply will tend to offset each other, and thus stabilize the income of the farmer.

MODERNIZED PARITY

Parity calculations for most commodities under the old formula are based upon price relationships and buying habits of 40 years ago. Because methods of farm production have changed markedly, the Congress has wisely brought the parity concept up to date. Modernized parity takes account of price relationships during the most recent 10 years. It permits changes in farm technology and in consumer demand to express themselves in the level of price support and restores proper relationships among commodities.

For the basic commodities, the law provides that until January 1, 1956, the old or modernized parity, whichever is higher, shall be used. For all commodities except wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts, modernized parity is already in use.

Equitable treatment of the various commodities requires that we should use modernized parity for all farm products as now provided by law, beginning January 1, 1956.

INSULATION OF SURPLUSES FROM MARKETS

Removal of the threat of huge surpluses of farm commodities from current markets is an essential part of the program here presented. Destruction of surplus commodities cannot be countenanced under any circumstances. They can be insulated from the commercial markets and used in constructive ways. Such uses will include school-lunch programs, disaster relief, aid to the people of other countries, and stockpiled reserves at home for use in war or national emergency.

I recommend that authority be provided to set aside reserves up to the value of $2,500,000,000 from the stocks presently held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Broad discretionary authority should be provided to manage these frozen reserves. This authority should be coupled with legislative safeguards to prevent the return of these stocks to domestic or foreign markets so as to cause disturbance in normal trade. Perishable stocks should, of course, be rotated. Stocks of wheat, cotton, vegetable oils, and possibly some dairy products should be set aside after this program takes effect.

The special circumstances relating to the crop and the date of initiating the

proposed new program should govern the time for establishing each such commodity reserve. This reserve program will be effective only if it is carefully integrated with the new program as a whole. The insulation of our excess reserves of food and fiber is an essential first step in launching this new program.

EXPANSION OF FARM MARKETS ABROAD

One of our largest potential outlets for present surpluses is in friendly countries. Much impetus can be given to the use of a substantial volume of these commodities by substituting to the maximum extent food and fiber surpluses in foreign economic assistance and disaster relief. I shall request a continuation of the authority to use agricultural surpluses for this purpose.

It is not enough, however, to rely solely on these measures to move surpluses into consumption. No farm program should overlook continued economic growth and expansion. By revolutionary increases in farm productivity during and since World War II, American farmers have prepared our Nation to supply an ever-greater proportion of the food needs of the world. Developing commercial markets for this expanded production is part of the larger problem of organizing a freer system of trade and payments throughout the free world. Because our farmers depend to a considerable degree on foreign markets, their interests will be particularly served by strengthening of the work of the Department of Agriculture in developing market outlets, both at home and abroad. In my budget message I shall recommend that sufficient funds be appropriated for this purpose.

Meanwhile, a series of trade missions, working in cooperation with our representation overseas, will be sent from the United States, 1 to Europe, 1 to Asia, 1 to South America, to explore the immediate possibilities of expanding international trade in food and fiber. Moreover, the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, is organizing discussions for the exchange of views with foreign ministers of agriculture on subjects affecting the use of agricultural surpluses and stockpiles.

USE OF DIVERTED ACRES

In addition to the removal of surpluses and the expansion of markets, special measures must be taken to deal with the use of acreages diverted from crops under allotment. To avoid these difficulties, the number of diverted acres must be reduced to a minimum. The proposed program accomplishes this by increasing the utilization of commodities, thereby reducing the need for acreage restrictions.

When land must be diverted from production, it is essential that its use be related to the basic objectives of soil conservation—to protect and to improve that land. Wherever acreage adjustments are especially difficult, agricultural conservation program funds will be used to help farmers make these adjustments in a manner that will advance soil conservation and long-term efficiency.

SMALL FARMS

The chief beneficiaries of our price-support policies have been the 2,000,000 larger, highly mechanized farming units which produce about 85 percent of our agricultural output. The individual production of the remaining farms, numbering about 3,500,000, is so small that the farmer derives little benefit from price supports. During 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, will give further special attention to the problems peculiar to small farmers.

CONCLUSION

The agricultural program proposed in this section, and in part II which follows, will open new market outlets both at home and abroad, not only for current supplies but for future production. It will provide a firm floor on which our farmers can rely while making long-term plans for efficient production and marketing. Year in and year out, it will provide the best prospects for the stability and growth of farm income.

It will help the farmer attain full parity in the market. It will avoid creating burdensome surpluses. It will curtail the regimentation of production planning, lessen the problem of diverted acreage, and yield farmers greater freedom of choice and action.

It will bring farm production into closer balance with consumer needs. It will promote agricultural interests, along with the public interest generally. It will avoid any sharp year-to-year change in prices and incomes.

The program will again stimulate and encourage good farm management. It will prevent arbitrary Government control and afford the greatest freedom to the individual farmer. It will provide added incentive to make wise use of all our agricultural resources, and promises the Nation's agriculture a more stable and reliable financial return than any alternative plan.

I urge its early approval by the Congress.

PART II

In this part of the special message the principles developed in part I are applied to specific commodities and commodity groups.

WHEAT

Wheat is a prime example of the results that ensue from a support program which fails to adjust to the level of demand. As of December 16, more than $2 billion of Commodity Credit Corporation funds were invested in wheat.

The export market, historically vital to our wheat farmers, was itself partly responsible for the expanded production of American wheat during the war and postwar years. To meet the food needs of devastated countries, our farmers continued their high level of production after the war and thus rendered a great service to humanity and to the cause of freedom throughout the world. These expanded outlets have since greatly diminished. Yet the support price has remained at the level associated with wartime needs. The result is that production has continued at wartime levels and, annually, more and more of this production has become surplus.

In foreign markets, the high rigid support program of the United States has become an umbrella for competitors. This has created an artificial competitive situation which has cost the American farmer a substantial part of his world wheat market. During the past 2 years our exports of wheat outside the International Wheat Agreement have fallen from 220 million bushels to 64 million, while Canada's free market sales have risen from one hundred and five to one hundred and sixty-one million bushels. Thus our price policy shrinks the very market that could otherwise help absorb our excess stocks of wheat.

Continuance of present price support levels for wheat would confront us with two undesirable alternatives:

First. Curtail production to the amount needed for domestic use and very limited exports. This would require a reduction in wheat acreage of about 40 percent—from the 79 million acres planted in 1953 to between forty-five and fifty million acres.

Second. Subsidize the consumption of wheat by increasingly severe burdens upon the taxpayer.

The foregoing alternatives make it increasingly clear that the Nation must depart from the high rigid support level for wheat.

It is, therefore, recommended that:

First. A substantial part of the present excessive wheat carryover be set aside as an emergency reserve and removed from the market.

Second. After the 1954 crop, the level of price support for wheat be related to supply. Because of the substantial set-aside, computations of the support level under the Agricultural Act of 1949 would insure that changes in support levels would be gradual. The Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variations in price support levels will be limited.

Third. Beginning January 1, 1956, a change be made at the rate of 5 percent a year from old to modernized parity;

Fourth. Acreage allotments and marketing quotas be continued, with the anticipation, however, that adjusted support levels will increase the incentive to employ some of the present wheatland for other purposes.

RICE

Price supports for rice at 90 percent of parity have had no recent application. Market prices have been at or above support levels; restraints on production have not been needed; stocks have not accumulated. Nevertheless, present price supports for rice can inhibit an adjustment, if one should be needed, in the same manner that they prevented the adjustment for wheat, when it was needed.

It is therefore recommended that mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity for rice be allowed to expire after the 1954 crop.

CORN

Corn is a dominant factor in the feed grain-livestock economy. This economy is based on an interdependent process involving the production of feed, its conversion into livestock products, and its movement into consumption as meat, dairy products, and eggs. To hold this economy in balance, prices are a critical factor, encouraging and discouraging livestock production by turns, rationing feed when it is scarce and moving it into use when it is plentiful. For the efficient use of corn, some price freedom is indispensable.

A program of high rigid price supports for feed grains involves the danger of curtailing our livestock industries and limiting the quantity of their products to consumers. We have made great strides in improving the efficiency of corn production and in passing some of those gains on to consumers in the form of reasonably priced livestock products. Our corn support program should be designed to encourage those trends.

Corn is used in the same manner as pasture and hay on farms where grown. Seldom does more than 25 percent of our corn crop move through commercial channels, and the bulk of this is eventually used as feed by other farmers. Farmers, therefore, are the principal users of corn. It follows that a high support price for farmers who produce corn for sale aggravates the cost-price squeeze on other farmers who normally buy corn and competing feeds to produce livestock products.

To guide the corn price support program, the adjustable price and income-balancing features of the Agricultural Act of 1949 on the whole are well suited. The level of support specified is designed to move corn into use. Livestock producers are assured of a steady supply of feed at reasonable prices.

The old parity formula holds the support price for corn too high in relation to livestock prices. Use of modernized parity, scheduled by law to become effective on January 1, 1956, will help to balance these vital price relationships.

It is, therefore, recommended that—

First. Modernized parity for corn become effective on January 1, 1956, with modification limiting the rate of the transition to 5 percent in any single year;

Second. Except as provided in third and fourth, the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 become effective for the corn crop of 1955 and subsequent crops;

Third. The act of 1949 be amended to provide a change, within the range of 75 to 90 percent of parity, of 1 percentage point in the support price for corn for each 1 percentage point of change in supply, thereby giving greater flexibility to corn support prices and tending to prevent the building up of excessive holdings by Government;

Fourth. Legislation be enacted to raise the normal carryover allowance for corn from 10 percent to 15 percent of domestic use plus exports, to become effective for 1955 and subsequent crops. This would help to assure more stable feed supplies and reduce the impact of current carryover stocks on future production controls and support levels;

Fifth. Upon adoption of the foregoing recommendation, the system of marketing quotas be abolished.

FEED GRAINS OTHER THAN CORN

The Agricultural Act of 1949 authorizes price support for such nonbasic crops as oats, barley, and grain sorghums at not to exceed 90 percent of the parity price. The amounts, terms, and conditions of price support operations and the extent to which these operations are carried out are determined or approved by the Secretary of Agriculture upon consideration of various factors specified in the law.

Inasmuch as this program has worked satisfactorily, it is recommended that these provisions be continued.

MEAT ANIMALS

The fact that mandatory price supports are ill adapted to meat animals has been recognized by Secretaries of Agriculture for years. The present law provides tools well adapted to deal with the problems peculiar to the livestock industry.

It is recommended, therefore, that the existing conditions with respect to meat animals be continued.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

The Agricultural Act of 1949 requires price support for dairy products at such levels between 75 and 90 percent of parity as are necessary to assure an adequate supply. Sufficient discretionary authority is provided to operate a satisfactory program.

It is recommended that these provisions of law be continued.

POULTRY AND EGGS

Price supports have not been generally desired by the poultry industry. Temporarily, and in special circumstances, price support can, however, be helpful.

It is recommended, therefore, that—

First. Provisions of the 1949 act be continued for poultry and eggs, with discretionary authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices at not to exceed 90 percent of parity;

Second. Discretionary authority be continued to purchase poultry products for use in the school-lunch program in nonprofit institutions, and for certain other purposes.

COTTON

Cotton, like wheat, is an export crop whose price is currently supported above the world level. Carryover stocks in the United States have been accumulating rapidly in the past 2 years. These stocks, probably close to 9,600,000 bales by next August, will approximate a full year's domestic requirements.

Our high rigid price support program stimulates competition of foreign producers and reduces exports. During the twenties and early thirties our net exports of cotton generally exceeded domestic consumption. Current exports amount to hardly a third of our larger domestic requirements.

Our problem is to develop a program which will help growers adjust gradually to changing circumstances, including foreign and domestic competition of rising intensity.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 provides price supports for cotton at a level between 75 and 90 percent of parity, dependent on the supply. Thus changes in supply and price would tend to offset one another, giving a relatively stable income. This plan will allow limited price variation, thus affording growers reasonable market stability and yet offering added inducement for heavier use of cotton in years of abundant supplies.

Separate legislation has made the adjustable pricing provisions of the 1949 act ineffective for cotton. The Secretary of Agriculture is now required by law to set such marketing quotas and allotments that the required price-support level can seldom if ever fall below 90 percent of parity. Instead of relying in part on the schedule of price floors intended in the act of 1949, the law requires reliance almost entirely on production controls.

It is recommended, therefore, that—

First. A substantial part of the present large carryover of cotton now in prospect be set aside as an emergency reserve and removed from the market.

Second. After the 1954 crop, the level of price support for cotton be related to supply. Because of the substantial set-aside, computations of the support levels, under the Agricultural Act of 1949, would insure that changes in support levels would be gradual. The Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variations in price-support levels will be limited.

Third. Modernized parity becomes effective for cotton as scheduled on January 1, 1956.

Fourth. The Congress repeal the present provisions whereby the maximum use of production restrictions before there can be any reduction of the price-support level is required.

TOBACCO

Tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government. The relatively small acreage of tobacco and the limited areas to which it is adapted have made production control easier than for other crops.

The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect.

It is recommended that the tobacco program be continued in its present form.

PEANUTS

The law requires that mandatory 90 percent supports for peanuts continue through 1954 and that old parity remain in effect until the end of 1955.

This program, which has experienced some difficulties in adjusting supplies to demand at the supported price can operate successfully with certain changes.

It is recommended that—

First. The Agricultural Act of 1949 become effective for peanuts on January 1, 1953.

Second. The shift to modernized parity for peanuts begins as now provided by law on January 1, 1956.

Third. A transitional provision be provided to limit the change from the old to modernized parity to not more than 5 percent per year.

TUNG NUTS AND HONEY

Tung nuts and honey should be in the same category with other products for which price supports are permissive rather than required. It is recommended, therefore, that the mandatory price supports for these commodities be discontinued.

OIL SEEDS

Price support is authorized for soybeans, cottonseed, and flax at not to exceed 90 percent of the parity price. It is recommended that the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 be continued for these commodities.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Existing law authorizes the use of 30 percent of general tariff revenues to encourage the exportation and domestic consumption of agriculture commodities. In the event of market distress these funds may be used for limited purchases of market surpluses of such perishable commodities as fruits and vegetables. No purchases may be undertaken unless outlets are available.

It is recommended that—

First. Present provisions for the use of funds from tariff revenues be continued.

Second. Authorization for the use of marketing agreements be continued and liberalized to—

(a) provide for inclusion of additional commodities to which marketing agreements are adapted;

(b) enlarge and clarify the authorization for agencies established under marketing orders to engage in or finance, within reasonable limits, research work from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order;

(c) provide for the continuous operation of marketing agreements, despite short-term price variations, where necessary to assure orderly distribution throughout the marketing season; and

(d) enlarge and clarify the authorization for the use of marketing orders to promote marketing efficiency, including the regulation of containers and types of pack for fresh fruits and vegetables.

POTATOES

It is recommended that legislation be enacted to allow assistance to potato growers in the same manner as is available for producers of other vegetables and of fruits.

SUGAR

The sugar program, extended in 1951, is operating in a generally satisfactory manner. It is recommended that this program be continued in its present form.

WOOL

Price support for wool above the market level has resulted in heavy accumulations of wool—now nearly 100 million pounds—by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the substitution of imported for domestic wool in our home consumption. Two-thirds of the wool used in the United States is imported; yet our own wool piles up in storage.

A program is needed which will assure equitable returns to growers and encourage efficient production and marketing. It should require a minimum of governmental interference with both producers and processors, entail a minimum of cost to taxpayers and consumers, and aline itself compatibly with overall farm and international trade policies.

It is recommended that—

First. Prices of domestically produced wool be permitted to seek their level in the market, competing with other fibers and with imported wool, thus resulting in only one price for wool—the market price.

Second. Direct payments be made to domestic producers sufficient, when added to the average market price for the season, to raise the average return per pound to 90 percent of parity.

Third. Each producer receive the same support payment per pound of wool, rather than a variable rate depending upon the market price he had obtained. If each grower is allowed his rewards from the market, efficient production and marketing will be encouraged. This has the further advantage of avoiding the need for governmental loans, purchases, storage, or other regulation or interference with the market. Further, it imposes no need for periodic action to control imports in order to protect the domestic price-support program.

Fourth. Funds to meet wool payments be taken from general revenues within the amount of unobligated tariff receipts from wool.

Fifth. Similar methods of support be adopted for pulled wool and for mohair, with proper regard for the relationships of their prices to those of similar commodities.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1954.*

EXPERT TRANSCRIBERS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 401) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for the employment of two additional expert transcribers, office of the official committee reporters, House of Representatives, to be appointed in the same manner, and to receive the same rate of compensation, as the other expert transcribers.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will there be any special orders today?

The SPEAKER. There will be special orders.

Mr. HALLECK. I think one special order has already been granted.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will there be opportunity for others to be granted?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SERGEANT AT ARMS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference of the House and by direction of that conference, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 402).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That William R. Bonsell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. Bonsell appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

AMENDMENT TO IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 349 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to the loss of nationality by native-born or naturalized citizens.

The purpose of the amendment is to forfeit the citizenship of those who are convicted of advocating or conspiring to overthrow the Government of the United States by the use of force or violence. This proposed legislation was recommended by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message delivered to the joint session of Congress on last Thursday.

I trust the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, of which I am a member, will proceed expeditiously to consider this bill and that it will shortly be enacted by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, too long traitors to this country have taken advantage of the many wonderful benefits provided citizens of the United States at the same time they are plotting to destroy the country.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT ON INVESTIGATING AND SELECT COMMITTEES, 83D CONGRESS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I have had compiled and arranged in tabular form a statement showing the amount

of money authorized for expenditures by each of the several special and standing committees of the House, and also showing the amount that has actually been expended, and the balance that remains unexpended for the first year of the 83d Congress, the figures being brought up to January 1, 1954. The totals show that there was authorized out of the contingent fund of the House the sum of $1,879,550, of which slightly more than $1 million has been expended. There remains unexpended as of January 1, $871,742.69. This even includes some joint committees where the House participated on an equal basis with the other body. All committees are included in this compilation except, of course, the Committee on Appropriations, which handles its own funds.

Inasmuch as some obligations were contracted by committee chairmen and bills or statements had not been received by December 31, there may be a few additions, but the figures are substantially correct.

The Committee on House Administration checks and audits the expense accounts of all committees of the House.

The table referred to is as follows:

Investigating and select committees, 83d Cong., Jan. 3, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953

Committees	Amount authorized	Amount expended to Dec. 31, 1953	Balance available, Jan. 1, 1954
Agriculture Committee (general) (Congressman Hope, Kansas, chairman) H. Res. 161, Apr. 15, 1953	$50,000	$29,458.51	$20,541.49
Armed Services Committee (general) (Congressman Short, Missouri, chairman) H. Res. 125, Feb. 24, 1953; H. Res. 156, Mar. 5, 1953	150,000	53,534.82	96,465.18
Baltic States (Nations) Investigations (Congressman Kersten, Wisconsin, chairman) H. Res. 346, July 27, 1953; H. Res. 356, approved July 31, 1953	30,000	14,909.68	15,090.32
Congressional salaries, Members of Congress, etc., Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, Public Law 220, approved Aug. 7, 1953 (House share)	10,000		10,000.00
Defense Production (Joint Committee) (Senator Capehart, Indiana, chairman) Public Law 95, June 30, 1953—fiscal year 1954	50,000	19,939.67	30,060.33
District of Columbia Committee (Congressman Simpson, Illinois, chairman) H. Res. 270, June 11, 1953	2,000	55.22	1,943.78
Education and Labor Committee (Congressman McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania, chairman) (general) H. Res. 115, Feb. 24, 1953; H. Res. 116, Mar. 5, 1953	50,000	12,697.10	37,302.90
Foreign Affairs Committee (general) (Congressman Chiperfield, Illinois, chairman), H. Res. 113, Feb. 24, 1953; H. Res. 145, Mar. 5, 1953	75,000	15,118.39	59,881.61
Foundations (tax exempt) (Congressman Reece, Tennessee, chairman), H. Res. 217, July 27, 1953; H. Res. 373, approved Aug. 1, 1953	50,000	24,141.07	25,858.93
Government Operations Committee, clause 8 of rule 11; H. Res. 150, Feb. 25, 1953, and H. Res. 339, July 29, 1953:			
(A) Full and Special Subcommittee (Congressman Hoffman, Michigan, chairman)	100,000	48,860.73	51,139.27
(B) International Operations Subcommittee (Congressman Brownson, Indiana, chairman)	66,000	46,223.22	19,776.78
(C) Military Operations Subcommittee (Congressman Riehlman, New York, chairman)	64,425	48,040.00	16,385.00
(D) Public Accounts Subcommittee (Congressman Bender, Ohio, chairman)	65,000	37,818.18	27,181.82
(E) Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee (Congresswoman Harden, Indiana, chairman)	59,625	20,888.39	38,736.61
Immigration and Nationality (Joint Committee) (Senator Watkins, Utah, chairman) (Congressman Graham, Pennsylvania, vice chairman), legislative appropriation, 1954	20,000		20,000.00
Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (general) (Congressman Miller, Nebraska, chairman), H. Res. 109, Mar. 5, 1953; H. Res. 117, Mar. 16, 1953	50,000	7,597.08	42,402.92
Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (general) (Congressman Wolverton, chairman) also (Newsprint), H. Res. 126, Mar. 5, 1953; H. Res. 127, Mar. 5, 1953; H. Res. 128, Mar. 16, 1953	60,000	6,055.47	53,944.53
Judiciary Committee (general) (Congressman Reed, Illinois, chairman) H. Res. 50, Feb. 24, 1953; H. Res. 66, Mar. 5, 1953	110,000	82,627.48	27,372.52
Judiciary Committee (Congressman Reed, Illinois, chairman) privileges of the House in re *Michael Wilson et al.* v. *Loew's, Inc.*, H. Res. 190, Mar. 26, 1953	(1)		(1)
Kitty Hawk, N. C. (air flight) (Congressman Hinshaw, California, chairman), S. J. Res. 42, Public Law 32, May 22, 1953	(1)	377.13	(1)
Merchant Marine and Fisheries (general) (Congressman Weichel, Ohio, chairman), H. Res. 197, Aug. 3, 1953; H. Res. 198, Approved Aug. 3, 1953	50,000	18.45	49,981.55
Post Office and Civil Service Commission (general) (Congressman Rees, Kansas, chairman) H. Res. 32, Feb. 24, 1953; H. Res. 148, Mar. 5, 1953	50,000	17,447.05	32,552.95
Public Works (general) (Congressman Dondero, Michigan, chairman) H. Res. 366 approved Aug. 1, 1953; H. Res. 365, Aug. 1, 1953	30,000	17,323.86	12,676.14
Rotunda Frieze—United States Capitol (ceremonies—Joint Committee on the Library) S. Con. Res. 45 adopted July 31, 1953 (House share)	2,500		2,500.00
Small Business Committee (select committee) (Congressman Hill, Colorado, chairman) H. Res. 22, Feb. 3, 1953; H. Res. 131, Feb. 24, 1953	135,000	60,891.03	74,108.97
Un-American Activities Committee (general) (Congressman Velde, Illinois, chairman) sec. 17 of House Rule 11 (H. Res. 5) H. Res. 119, Feb. 24, 1953	300,000	267,932.76	32,067.24
Veterans' Affairs Committee (Congresswoman Rogers, Massachusetts, chairman) H. Res. 34, Mar 5, 1953; H. Res. 168, Mar. 16, 1953	50,000	10,547.27	39,452.73
Ways and Means Committee (general) (Congressman Reed, New York, chairman) H. Res. 91, Feb. 24, 1953; H. Res. 123, Mar. 5, 1953; H. Res. 243, May 27, 1953	200,000	165,680.88	34,319.12
Total	1,879,550	1,007,807.31	871,742.69

[1] Necessary expenses.

THANKS TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as I entered the Capitol this morning I heard the new air-raid loudspeaker stating that this is a new warning to be used in case of an air raid. I could not help but have the deepest gratitude that we civilians do not wait in horror for an air-raid warning, and also, most of all, that our men in Korea are not being shot at all the time and being terribly mutilated. I have the deepest feeling of gratitude to our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, for bringing about the cessation of fighting in Korea. He has kept his promise.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the President on Thursday, in his state of the Union message, recommended that Congress extend the Federal 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax beyond April 1 which is the date under existing law when the 2-cent rate is due to expire and the former rate of 1½ cents a gallon to be resumed.

In return for the continuation of the 2-cent gasoline tax, the President promised an expanded highway program. Most of the Nation's 53 million automobile and truck owners who pay this tax, I believe, will cheerfully accept the higher rate provided revenues from this Federal 2-cent gasoline tax are employed to provide this expanded highway program. The motor-vehicle owners, however, will have justifiable cause for complaint if the revenues of the higher gas tax rate are devoted to other than highway purposes.

The Federal Government, last year, collected almost $867 million from the existing Federal 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax. It provided to the States for the year starting next July 1 only $575 million for highway purposes. Thus, almost $300 million of the Federal gasoline taxes have been and are being diverted to purposes other than highway construction. This diversion, in my opinion, should be stopped and all Federal gasoline tax money go for road building.

I have introduced, today, a bill which would authorize an increase of 50 percent in the amount of money provided as Federal aid next year to the States for highway purposes. My arguments in favor of this increase will be found in a speech which I am inserting today in the RECORD.

I, also, am including with the speech a table showing the amount of Federal highway funds which have been allocated to each State for the year July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955, and also the amount by which adoption of my bill will increase the allocation of each State.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER] may address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the President is to be commended for recommending a program that appeals to all farm groups. The plan offers a way to dispose of present excess reserves and to prevent their accumulation in the future. At the same time, it meets the requirements of those Members of Congress who strongly favor high price supports.

Under the President's suggestions, there will be little change in the support level when the program is put into effect. This is because a sizable portion of our present reserves is to be frozen and removed from normal marketing channels. Also, contributing to an orderly transitional period is the limitation of a 5-percent drop in support prices in any one year on basic commodities.

What the farmer wants is an equitable price for his product. If natural economic forces are free to function, the farmer has a chance to obtain prices in excess of parity. If he sells to the Government under a rigid support plan as at present, the best he can possibly do is to receive 90 percent of parity.

All classes of Americans should recognize the wisdom of the President's suggestions. They represent a truly democratic answer to one of the Nation's knottiest problems.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

INCOME-TAX EXEMPTION FOR DEPENDENT UNDER AGE OF 21 YEARS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which provides that the head of a family may claim an exemption for a dependent who has not reached the age of 21 years, which dependent may earn an amount in excess of $600 or whatever the exemption allowance may be. Of course, any such dependent earning in excess of whatever the deductible amount may be, would be required to file an income-tax return. Many dependents are reluctant to earn in excess of $600 because the head of the family would be unable to claim the exemption, and if the dependent earned slightly in excess of the amount of the established exemption, the head of the family would be taxed in many instances, far in excess of the amount that the dependent earned in excess of the deductible allowance. Many heads of families of moderate means find it extremely difficult to rear and educate their children unless the children find employment to obtain funds to help defray their expenses in pursuit of their studies.

There are in my district, and in many other districts, large families of children, all under 21 years of age, where the head of the family is a person of modest means, and this bill would help these families to maintain a proper standard of living and at the same time enable the children of high school and college age to pursue their education.

I invite the study and support of all Members of Congress to this bill and I hope that this session of Congress will pass it.

BOONDOGGLING IN DEFENSE

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to include with my full approval an editorial from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Boondoggle in Defense":

BOONDOGGLE IN DEFENSE

It is not hard to understand the administration's concern with unemployment, for the administration is concerned with the health of the Nation's economy. Thus President Eisenhower's order to divert some defense contracts to areas having jobless men will be viewed with some sympathy at first glance.

But a second look will show how glaringly wrong it is.

It is wrong because unemployment is one concern of the administration and defense is quite a different one. The tax dollars that the Congress appropriated for defense ought to go for defense, and the most defense that can be got from those dollars is the particular concern of the Defense Department. There is a catchy phrase around Washington to describe what the Defense Department is trying to do in this regard. They call it "more bang for a buck."

But one doesn't get more bang for a buck by saddling the Defense Department with directives which say that certain areas with labor surpluses ought to get preference in contracts over areas which have no labor surplus. And the buck loses some of its bang when faster tax writeoffs are granted certain distressed areas for erection or improvement of plants which other areas are denied.

At best, such a plan is only a shot in the arm which may for a time seem to ease the pain of unemployment in a particular locality. But it will not cure it, and conceivably it may help to spread it. For there are only a certain number of dollars which can be spent through these defense contracts. To give preferential treatment to one section because it has less people at work than another place could result in unemployment in the locality which lost the contract. What does the Government do then? Designate another area as distressed, give it preferential treatment over other areas and thus create more economic distress? But that would be spoonfeeding everyone on a merry-go-round.

A case can be made for Government concern about its jobless citizens, especially where it affects the national economy. But no case can be made for preferential treatment in defense contracts because of local unemployment. It is an expedient which contains no permanent cure for the troubled areas but which does contain potential danger for the Nation. A little boondoggling with defense can lead to a lot of boondoggling and no defense at all.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would prevent this boondoggling and trust that it will receive prompt action by the Congress.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRED M. VINSON

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, seldom has this body had the opportunity, even though occasioned by a sad and tragic incident, to pay homage to a more honorable man; a better public servant than our late Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson.

Fred Vinson was kind and helpful by nature; he loved mankind; nothing gave him greater pleasure than to be of service to people.

It is my good fortune that I am permitted to represent in Congress a number of the Kentucky counties that he so ably represented in the House of Representatives. When I visit with the people in those counties, I find that love of Fred Vinson is deeply imbedded in their hearts and memories of his great services to them are indelibly inscribed on their minds. They like to recall their associations with him and are proud to speak of him as a friend.

Fred Vinson as a public servant had a long and brilliant record; he held practically every public position of trust and honor. He filled each position with honor and credit and was willing to undertake any task if its performance was of service to his country. He was the champion of right and freedom and a courageous opponent of evil and oppression.

Although I did not have the pleasure of serving with him in Congress, I did have the good fortune of knowing him as a friend and being able to discuss with him national problems. His keen intel-

lect and comprehensive knowledge of national affairs were unsurpassable. His death was a serious loss not only to his family and friends but to all people of our country. We have lost a great American; his family has lost a devoted husband and father; and Kentucky has lost a favorite son.

DIRECT LOANS TO VETERANS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Congress should during this session overhaul the veterans' loan program which is serving only a small percentage of the veterans the Congress intended to help by enactment of the veterans' loan program.

It is a deplorable fact that the Nation just does not have a workable veterans' loan program. Veterans seldom are able to borrow money to build homes or to establish themselves in business. This situation is not the intent of Congress. Legislation passed by Congress to help the veterans secure loans was intended to be one of the principal means by which veterans could reestablish themselves in private life. During this session we should determine that we shall rewrite the veterans' loan program in such clear, mandatory terms that the Government will have to carry out the true intent of Congress to the benefit of our veterans and to the credit of their Government. The present program not only has failed in its objectives, but it has made many veterans lose faith in the very Government that they served so well in time of war.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PATMAN was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday, January 18, 1954, following any special orders heretofore entered and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts was given permission to address the House for 1 minute today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE AND THE INABILITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO CARRY OUT HIS PROMISES

The SPEAKER. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower made certain definite promises to the Congress, and to the people, in his state of the Union message last Thursday, January 7. It is not my purpose of criticize President Eisenhower or to criticize the proposals he made. That is not the object of my discussion. My object is to commend the President on his forthright statements and promises and to express the hope that those promises and statements are carefully considered by Congress.

I sympathize with the President. I know he has a difficult job. I know that he must depend upon advisers in order to do the difficult job that he has. I know, too, that he needs the support of the Members of the Congress from both sides of the aisle.

The major promises made by the President involve credit and money, debt management and budget. These promises cannot be carried out without the cooperation of the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve System was enacted into law December 23, 1913, 40 years ago last December.

ACT COMPLETELY CHANGED

The Federal Reserve Act has been substantially changed. Many amendments have been made. Many of the most far-reaching amendments were made without any discussion on the floor of either House of the Congress or without any reference in committee reports to these changes. They were just made, a little amendment here and a little amendment there. If the Federal Reserve Act as amended over these 40 years were to be proposed to the Congress now and anew, it would not have a chance of enactment because these amendments have entirely changed the original purpose of the Federal Reserve Act.

Under the present act the Board of Governors and the Open Market Committee have all the power to shape the monetary and credit conditions of the country.

The officers and other officials of the 12 Federal Reserve banks have very little power, just choosing officers and personnel problems—the housekeeping part—and no power or authority in the economic field.

Prior to the act of 1935 the officers of the 12 banks had tremendous powers but this was all changed by the 1935 act.

The Board of Governors—seven—here in Washington, D. C., must have several million dollars a year to carry on their operations. They get this money by assessing each of the 12 Federal Reserve banks its pro rata part. The officers of the banks, to date, have never resisted the payment of an assessment.

The officers of the 12 banks also want something out of the Board occasionally. For instance, the Board must approve the salaries paid by the banks to its officers and employees. Up until a few years ago the highest salary paid was $25,000 a year. About 2 or 3 years ago the highest salary was raised to $40,000 and last year, although it has not yet been publicly announced, the salary of the President of the Federal Reserve bank of New York was raised to its present figure, $60,000 a year.

Possibly it will be of interest to mention some of the salaries paid by the System and compare them with other Government salaries.

They are as follows:

President of the United States	$100,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York [1]	60,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Chicago [1]	40,000
Presidents, Federal Reserve Banks: Boston, Philadelphia, Richmond, Atlanta, St. Louis, Kansas City, and San Francisco [1]	30,000
Vice President of the United States	30,000
Speaker of the House of Representatives	30,000
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court	25,500
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court	25,000
Presidents, Federal Reserve Banks: Cleveland, Minneapolis, and Dallas [1]	25,000
Cabinet members	22,500
Deputy Secretary of Defense	20,000
Secretaries, Army, Navy, and Air Force	18,000
Judges, U. S. Courts of Appeal	17,500
Under Secretaries of executive departments	17,000
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	16,000
United States district judges	15,000
Senators and Representatives	12,500

[1] Salaries fixed by each Federal Reserve bank, with approval of the Board of Governors, under law passed by Congress. All other salaries listed fixed by Congress.

Where does the money come from to pay the salaries and expenses of the Federal Reserve banks and the Board of Governors? It comes from the taxpayers just like the money is obtained to pay other salaries of Government employees. There is one major difference. The Federal Reserve makes no accounting to Congress in a way that Congress can effectively veto any proposal. It gets no appropriation from Congress. It uses the Government's credit to obtain its funds to use for its purposes.

How does the System use the Government's credit to get such funds? It has traded about $25 billion worth of Federal Reserve notes—printed money—for about $25 billion worth of United States Government interest-bearing obligations—United States Government bonds. The 12 banks keep these interest-bearing obligations and continue to collect the interest from the United States Treasury. This gives the System an income of several hundred million dollars a year. They first pay their expenses and then turn over 10 percent of the remainder to the surplus funds of the 12 banks and the other 90 percent goes into the United States Treasury.

It will probably be of interest to some to point out that there is no reasonable limit on the amount of Federal Reserve notes that could be issued, and are being issued, and the debt limit does not apply to their issuance. They are obligations of the United States Government, just as much so as an interest-bearing obligation. In fact, each Federal Reserve note states right on its face, "the United States of America will pay to the bearer on demand $—."

The Federal Reserve System has the power to pay every depositor in a bank—over $170 billion—in Federal Reserve

notes without reference to the fact that such payment would increase our national debt to $445 billion and without raising the present limit of $275 billion.

President Wilson warned the Congress and the country at the time he signed the act in 1913 that the bankers should never be allowed to get control of the Federal Reserve System. He said that to permit the banks to control or influence the Federal Reserve System would be just as bad for the country as permitting the owners of the railroads to control the Interstate Commerce Commission. He warned the country against banker control.

BANKER CONTROL ADMITTED

I am inserting herewith an excerpt from a weekly publication—Washington Bank Trends—devoted to the interest of bankers from its issue of January 11, 1954. It is as follows:

MAKING BANKERS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROSPERITY

The Federal Reserve, through its open-market committee, controls the monetary and credit resources of the Nation. Even President Eisenhower cannot keep the Nation prosperous unless the Federal Reserve System cooperates. "The private commercial banking interests control the Federal Reserve System." So said Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, and who will deny his premise?

And, the argument could then follow, that the banking industry—possibly even influential bankers—are responsible for the maintenance of national prosperity.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, who as chairman of a joint economic subcommittee investigated Treasury-Federal Reserve monetary policies about a year and a half ago, formally pointed out last week the necessity for Federal Reserve cooperation if President Eisenhower's promise of continuing national prosperity is to be kept.

Congressman PATMAN pointed out that the Reserve System is legally independent of the Chief Executive, yet all powerful in determining the availability of money and credit. The President must have the system's cooperation, "if he should lose it, the system will defy him," said Mr. PATMAN.

The Congressman's logic stopped just short of making the banking industry responsible for national prosperity. Yet, grant his premise, and it follows.

It is unfair, perhaps, to hold the bankers from Milpitas, Calif., to Great Neck, N. Y., responsible for national prosperity. On the other hand, Representative PATMAN's logic carries a warning, even though it may be politically colored.

First, the presumed influence of the banker-dominated Reserve System to maintain prosperity. Second, the influence of prominent banker personalities now high in the councils of the administration. Q. E. D., American bankers are responsible for national prosperity.

But, would the bankers within the administration let the private commercial bankers, which Mr. PATMAN says, "controls the Federal Reserve System" allow the latter to refuse to cooperate in the interests of national prosperity?

Obviously not. This is on the assumption that bankers think alike and form a cohesive group, which they do not, any more than do doctors, lawyers, carpenters, and plumbers.

While the logic of banker responsibility for prosperity is intriguing, although faulty, it remains true that they are very much in the political spotlight. The focus is on their credit and monetary policies. And the popular interpretation of these policies will be politically colored. Vividly.

FOURTH BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

The bankers refer to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as the supreme court of finance.

The system is now for all intents and purposes a separate branch of the Government. It has declared its independence from the President. This was done in March 1951. It is now footloose and fancy free. It has charge of the Government's credit. The members of the Board are selected for 14 years and the President has no power over an appointee.

They will cooperate with the President as long as he is popular with the Congress and the people. They cooperated with Presidents Roosevelt and Truman as long as they were popular with the people. But when Mr. Truman became less popular the Board declared its independence and although Mr. Truman fought back in the public interest he was too weak as a President to prevent it.

How does this delegation of power work?

The 160 million people have, under the Constitution, delegated the money and credit powers of the Nation to 531 Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

These 531 over the years, gradually—a little change here and there as legislation passed—delegated this enormous power to 12 men composing the Open Market Committee.

These 12 men, under a law passed by Congress, delegate this enormous power to an executive committee of 5 of their number.

These 5 turn this enormous power over to 1 of their number—the President of Federal Reserve Bank of New York—to execute. He is the selection of the private commercial banks.

The Federal Reserve System was 40 years old December 23, 1953. A Member of Congress has never seen an audit of the Board or of either one of the 12 banks. The Comptroller General has no power to audit the system. For 39 years the Board was never audited by an independent auditor. I complained about it. An audit was made, we are told, but no Member of Congress has been given an opportunity to see it. I do not believe there has ever been an independent audit of the 12 banks of the system or either of them or a proper audit of the Board of Governors.

I mention this to warn the Members of Congress that they have gone too far in amending the Federal Reserve Act. We have gone so far that the President of the United States is denied the power and the ability to carry out the promises that he makes for the economic security of our people. Furthermore, our national security and prosperity depend upon 12 men who have demonstrated their willingness to keep in mind the interests of the private banks, and who are not directly or indirectly obligated to the people or the Congress for the positions they hold that give them this power. The President cannot carry out his promises because he does not have the power. Congress has allowed the power to be taken away from him. I refer to March 1951, when the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board on March 4, 1951, declared its independence from the executive branch of the Government. It was on that date that they went contrary to the administration in power, defied the President, and commenced a policy of high-interest rates. It was then that farm prices commenced to decline, in March of 1951. That is when the Federal Reserve System declared its independence from the President of the United States. I am repeating some, but I believe these facts cannot be too strongly emphasized.

Now, they had never done that before. Under Mr. Roosevelt and under Mr. Truman, up until that time, they had never done it. They did not have the courage to do it. They had wanted to do it. They had been looking for an opportunity to do it. It was only when the popularity line of the then President had taken a considerable dip downward, and they believed he was so unpopular with the Congress and the country they could defy the President and get by with it that they had the courage to do it, and they did do it, and they declared their independence then from the President of the United States, and under no obligation to the President, so they claimed and contended.

All right. How is the President going to carry out his promises if he does not have that power? In order to corroborate what I have said about declaring their independence from the Executive I want to quote Dr. W. Randolph Burgess. He is the unconfirmed Deputy to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. He has not been confirmed by the United States Senate, but he has complete charge of everything, practically, concerning monetary matters that the Secretary of the Treasury can delegate to him. Dr. Randolph Burgess for 34 of the 40 years' existence of the Federal Reserve System has had a very close contact with it, and when he came down to Washington in the early part of this year he brought with him 5 directors, including himself, of the 9 directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and placed them in bottleneck positions in this administration to carry on the monetary policy. So, Dr. Burgess speaks for this administration. In a speech he made December 29, 1953, before the American Economic Association and the American Finance Association here at the Statler Hotel in Washington, in referring to that declaration of independence that I mentioned of the Federal Reserve System, he said this in his speech. Let me read it to you:

Here in this country we have had in these years something of a miracle. You had a period in which the Federal Reserve System was under the dominance of the Treasury, and in a battle for its independence of existence I heard it said so many times when we discussed that battle over that period, that in a battle between the central bank and the Treasury—

In other words, a battle between the Federal Reserve and the administration in power—

the central bank never wins. In this case the Treasury had the backing of the President of the United States and the central bank won the battle.

I am quoting from Dr. Burgess, confirming the statement I made that the Federal Reserve System has declared itself separate and independent from the President of the United States and under no obligation whatsoever to carry out his wishes. That is what I am saying.

Further quoting Dr. Burgess, in which he is still referring to this declaration of independence by the Federal Reserve System from the Executive of the United States:

> It is one of the dramatic instances in history where the central bank regained the right to exercise its essential powers.

Is not that just as plain as words can make anything?

The Federal Reserve System definitely withdrew or seceded from the President and the executive branch of our Government March 4, 1951. That being true, they consider themselves outside the power of the President of the United States. How is the President going to carry out these promises without their help and cooperation? As long as President Eisenhower is popular with the people and the Congress he will have no trouble, because they know that they are so vulnerable that any President that is popular can go before the Congress and wipe the law off the statute books or completely change it overnight. They know that. They are sensible men. So they are not going against the wishes and the will of the President of the United States as long as he is popular.

In bringing this up I am looking into the future, not only during President Eisenhower's administration but in other administrations, a Democratic administration or another Republican administration or another President. We do not want a President handicapped and handcuffed in any such way or manner as that. We want the President to have power, the kind of power contemplated in the Constitution of the United States.

The Open Market Committee absolutely shapes and controls the monetary and credit policies of the country. Who are they? They are 7 members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the presidents of 5 of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, who were selected and who were elected by the private commercial banks of the country. They represent the Open Market Committee. The have all this power. Of course, each member of the Board is selected for 14 years. He does not feel obligated to the President after his appointment is made. He feels that he is empowered to do anything he wants to do. The five presidents of these banks who are members of the Open Market Committee are certainly not obligated to the Congress or to the people. They were not selected by the Congress or the people. They were selected by the private commercial banks. That is the reason the private commercial banks have complete control today over the Federal Reserve System. That is the reason the President of the United States cannot carry out his wishes and his promises if he is opposed by this Open Market Committee.

If Mr. Eisenhower continues his popularity he will not have any trouble with them, but the very minute he becomes the least bit unpopular they will turn on him and defy him as they did his predecessor, because they claim that they are separate and distinct in their obligations to this country and to the people, and they can carry out their own powers in their own way and are under no obligation to the President of the United States.

DISCUSSION OF FEDERAL RESERVE IN LAST CONGRESS

At the end of the last session of Congress, the 1st session of the 83d, July 1953, I inserted remarks that appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 12, page 5276, in which I discussed the following:

First. Dr. Randolph Burgess, architect of the administration's hard-money, high-interest policy.

Second. Status of Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the 12 Federal Reserve banks, showing that they are agencies of the Federal Government.

Third. That there is no free-money market for Government securities; that it is controlled by the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System.

Fourth. That the Open Market Committee has tremendous powers—in fact, more power than the United States Congress—and determines whether we have good times or hard times.

Fifth. That the 12 members of the Open Market Committee—composed of the 7 members of the Board of Governors and 5 presidents of 5 of the 12 Federal Reserve banks—are not charged primarily with protecting the public interest but have demonstrated their desire to help, aid, and assist the private commercial banking interests instead.

Sixth. How the Open Market Committee was created under the act of 1935 and how its powers have been used and abused.

Seventh. Why Mr. Martin, a Democrat, is allowed to remain as Chairman of the Board of Governors by President Eisenhower, and how, under the arrangement, Mr. Martin is a captive of the present administration.

Eighth. The laws says the President shall fill a vacancy on the Board of Governors when one is created, yet there has remained a vacancy on the Board ever since—and before—the present administration came into power.

Ninth. Why long-term Government bonds should be supported at par. How it breaks faith with investors in these bonds to fail to support them and how they can be supported without any risk of inflation.

POLITICS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HESELTON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, with the dawn of a new year and with the reconvening of a new session of Congress let us hope that among the resolutions of this administration is one that in the future the public may expect the truth, even though at times it may hurt, and certainly will be a deviation from practices of the past year in some departments.

Since I have no desire to make broad charges which cannot be substantiated, Mr. Speaker, I will at this time merely recite an incident which took place on October 10, 1953, during the recent recess, when the House Committee on Agriculture was convened here in Washington for the purpose of hearing the Secretary of Agriculture explain the proposed reorganization in the Department of Agriculture.

While the detailed explanation of the proposed reorganization which was later implemented was given by Mr. Earle Coke, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, it was given in the presence of the Secretary, who presumably concurred in the explanation given by his assistant, and who later was specifically questioned with relation to the operation of certain agencies within the Department, specifically the Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees—formerly the PMA—at which time the Secretary stated emphatically that no partisan politics would be involved in filling appointive offices at the county level. It was explained at that time that the ASC would continue to function in a manner similar to the PMA in that the county committeemen would be elected by the farmers of their particular county and that the county committees would fill the appointive offices within the local setup, including that of the county office manager.

The Secretary was under no compulsion to make that statement, and he could have stated the intention of the Secretary and his Department in establishing the policy which was to be followed.

If the Secretary had stated that it was the intention of this administration to fill all such appointive offices with Republican politicians, I believe he would have enjoyed the respect of all of us, both Democrats and Republicans alike, for I know of no one who challenges his authority to make appointments which conform to standards of his own choosing.

But, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call your attention and the attention of the other Members of this House to the fact that the Secretary denied that it was his intention to follow a policy of partisan political patronage in selecting the people who are to administer this farm program. I told Mr. Benson that it was my understanding that one of the purposes of the proposed reorganization plan was to bring about the wholesale discharge of competent employees who happened to vote the Democratic ticket, as a vast majority of the people living in the 10th Congressional District of Missouri do, and to replace these Democratic employees with Republicans. I was not challenging the Secretary's authority to do this and would much have preferred to have had the truth as to his intentions, rather than to have had a denial of

what appears to have been a well-laid plan in the face of events which have followed.

While numerous instances might be cited, I will give one example of the practice which is being followed. The county committee in Bollinger County—one of the few Republican counties in the 10th District—is composed of 2 Democrats and 1 Republican, since the farmers themselves do not feel that politics should have any part in this program. This committee recommended a qualified young man with a farm background and approximately 90 hours of college training to be the office manager. His selection was unanimous. The ASC fieldman informed the county committee that their selection could not be approved and that another selection would have to be made, and the fieldman's recommendation for the job was the Republican brother-in-law of one of the members of the committee.

When the county committee hesitated to retreat from its original recommendation, the politically chosen field man again appeared on the scene—this time with a typewritten directive:

From: W. E. Foster, State administrative officer, Missouri State PMA office.
Subject: Office manager rejection.

The State PMA committee after considering application of J. C. Wagner for office manager for Bollinger County has rejected him for this position. You shall consider other applications with the assistance of our farmer field man, Elmer Kincaid, and with his approval submit another application to the State committee.

This directive was not signed, but at end thereof appeared the initials W. E. F.

Although the directive upon which field man Kincaid was attempting to override the decision of the county committee, elected by and who have the confidence of the farmers of Bollinger County, stated that the State committee had rejected the application of Wagner, I personally talked with 2 of the 3 members of the State committee and learned that neither the chairman of the State committee nor one of the other members had ever heard any discussion of the application of Wagner and did not know that the directive had been prepared by the patronage-dispensing State administrative officer. A day or so later the chairman of the State committee told me over the telephone that while he was not acquainted with the case at the time he had talked to me—after the letter had been written—that the committee had delegated this authority to the State administrative officer and they were backing him up in this matter, although they never have told me why the application of the unanimous choice of the county committee had been rejected.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully call your attention to the wording of the directive from the State office to the county committee ordering them to consider another application with the approval of the politically appointed field man who has urged the appointment of a brother-in-law of one of the members in direct conflict with regulations. Since having this called to their attention, the State committee now denies that it was attempting to have a brother-in-law of one of the members selected.

I realize Mr. Speaker, that this appointment in itself is a trivial matter, but the principle involved is not trivial, and I do say that it is typical and characteristic of the manner in which the Department of Agriculture is attempting to destroy the farm program which has been built up over the years.

If you will bear with me further, I would like to cite another example of how the farmers of my home county have avoided politics in the administration of this program. Dunklin County is one of the banner Democratic counties of Missouri, yet when we go to elect members of the county PMA committee, one never considers the partisan politics of the candidates. From the time that the program was started there have been Republican members of the county committee. In fact, the present office manager, Howard Hardin, a former chairman of the committee who has given years of service to the efficient administration of this program, and who is recognized as one of the best informed men in the State of Missouri on the farm program, is a Republican and everyone knows he is a Republican; but again I repeat, as long as a man does a good job in this program, we are not interested in his politics. And again I would remind you that on October 10, 1953, Assistant Secretary Coke, in the presence of Secretary Benson, assured me that partisan politics was not to have any part in the administration of the farm program, but it appears now that they have permitted the Republican State Committee in Missouri to take over the patronage down to and including the smallest county office.

But one thing about the Secretary of Agriculture, he knows how to delegate responsibility, for when I wired him on December 10 inquiring, "if the Secretary of Agriculture has renounced or reneged on policy announced by Assistant Secretary Coke before House Committee on Agriculture in your presence on October 10 when this Representative was assured there would be no partisan politics involved in filling appointive offices," and so forth, and after receiving no reply, again wired the Secretary on December 14, informing him that his "failure to reply leaves no alternative than to assume Republican State Committee in Missouri has been vested with authority to hire and fire personnel in PMA and ASC," I did receive a reply 5 days later on December 19 in a telegram signed by True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, in which he attempted to explain that "selections by county committees are subject to review by State ASC committees prior to appointment to determine that approved standards have been met. County office managers do not hold Federal appointments. Employees holding positions under competitive civil service are given the benefit and protection which accompany such status. This is policy, Assistant Secretary explained, and no changes have been made. We have no information policy that is not being followed in Missouri or elsewhere."

As I wired Under Secretary Morse suggesting that he read the newspapers in Missouri which recognize the development of a public scandal in the handling of patronage by State ASC office, these violations of policy have been so flagrant that I am certain every Member of this Congress is cognizant of conditions and I am not going to take the time to point out other individual cases.

I am taking exception to the statement of Under Secretary Morse when he tried to tell me what Assistant Secretary Coke said. I was there. Mr. Morse was not. Other members of the House Committee on Agriculture were there and the Secretary of Agriculture—who incidentally had not planned on being present until he received a telegram from me that morning—was present. I think every person there heard Mr. Coke when he said that no partisan politics was to be involved in filling these positions, yet I must admit that few of us believed the statement when it was made, and I say now that it is my honest belief and was at the time that the statement was not made in good faith. The Secretary of Agriculture has not denied that Mr. Coke gave our committee that assurance, and he is the person to whom my telegram was sent. He could have signed the telegram sent by Mr. Morse or he could have referred my telegram to Mr. Coke for reply.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this administration adopts a resolution pledging itself to the truth and nothing but the truth in 1954.

It has been amusing to watch the operation of the handling of patronage through the ASC State committee in Missouri, with a representative of the chairman of the Republican State committee sitting in the office and drawing a salary as an employee of the State ASC committee, yet reporting direct to her boss. There is no wire tapping in that office. The representative of the Republican State committee merely listens in on an extension.

When directives go out to the "hatchet men" they are not signed. Someone might use them as evidence that political pressure is being applied, but like the egg-sucking dog who is never caught in the act, you can see the yolk stains on their chins and the remnants of shells on their whiskers.

But peanut politics is not the only kind of politics in which the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates are interested.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the closing days of the first session of the 83d Congress this House unanimously approved legislation which directed that the Secretary of Agriculture would establish a national cotton acreage allotment of not less than 2[illegible] million acres. This bill was passed in this House after certain compromises had been made in the House Committee on Agriculture, and differences of opinion among the various sections had been dissolved. This bill was not acted upon in the other body and as far as anyone could learn, the Department of Agriculture took no action and did not lend its support to the passage of this bill.

However, during the recess, the Secretary of Agriculture became very interested, or at least so it appeared as he made speeches expressing his concern over the very severe production adjustments which would be required of cotton producers in 1954 under the marketing quotas and acreage allotments which he contends are mandatory under present legislation.

The Secretary has gone so far as to say:

> These excessive adjustments—amounting to a cut of more than 7 million acres below 1953—would impose hardship on individual farmers, and upon the economy of the entire Cotton Belt.

In press release USDA 3042-52 under date of December 11, 1953, the Secretary is reported to have said:

> I have also said that I would urge the Congress to take prompt action in its next session to insure a reasonable increase in the national cotton-acreage allotment, in order to make it possible to correct substantially the more serious inequities in individual farm acreage allotments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, anyone with an ounce of intelligence knows that there was far more reason for the Secretary of Agriculture to have made such a statement in July 1953 when the cotton estimate indicated a crop between 1½ and 2 million bales less than the crop finally turned out, than there was to make this statement in December when the surplus had been increased by almost 2 million bales.

All of the Representatives from the Cotton Belt were pointing out to the Secretary in July the condition that was bound to exist, but which he apparently did not recognize until December.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say there is a reason for this. Someone has the Secretary's ear, and perhaps they have a higher ear, which has prompted this administration to say that it believes there is a need for more acres to increase the national cotton-acreage allotment to approximately 21 million acres with the increase being apportioned to farms in such a way as to correct allotment inequities among individual farms to the fullest extent possible.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have been unable to learn from the Secretary or from the Department of Agriculture, specifically how this additional acreage is to be distributed. He has indicated that he is inclined to take his cue from and to follow the recommendations of the Farm Bureau which has stated that it would provide for the allocation of 374,000 additional acres on the basis of 216,500 acres to be held as a reserve and apportioned by the Secretary on the basis of need to establish certain minimum State allotments in States not mentioned above. The Bureau proposals also limit reduction in any States to 34 percent of its 1952 planted acreage. By tying this limitation to a single year's history would bring extra acreage to California and Arizona.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we are afraid of giving this leeway to an administration that has followed a give-away policy which has resulted in the loss to the United States of America of resources estimated in excess of $70 billion, and of course I am referring to the tidelands giveaway under the terms of which this administration has attempted to pay off its political debt. Frankly, I do not know if the administration considers that the debt has been paid in full, and I for one am not in favor of using cotton acreage that belongs to the South to be used in paying a political debt to California.

I have made repeated requests to the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish the public with figures showing how the additional acres would be distributed to all of the States. I insist that the Department has this information now, but for some unknown reason has declined to make it public. However, no later than Thursday morning, in a letter dated January 5, 1954, signed by the Under Secretary True D. Morse, I was informed that—

> We are currently compiling and analyzing farm allotment data as a basis for determining a Department position for distribution of additional national allotment so as to give equitable treatment to farms. Such analysis is not sufficiently final to determine a firm recommendation at this time.

The question I would like to ask is how can the Department know that 21 million acres is a proper figure unless they knew how much was needed in each State. The national total is arrived at by adding the totals for each of the respective States, and what I want to know is how many acres are slated to go to each State under the Department of Agriculture formula.

I may say also that since these remarks were prepared the other body has amended its cotton bill to give added acres to Florida in addition to those for California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and put in a potato amendment for Maine in the hope they can make a good political bill out of it and continue to take cotton acres from the South where it really belongs. If the Secretary is interested in all the cotton farmers of America, including those in the South, he had an opportunity last July and August which he did not exercise.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would establish limitations on the number of officers who may serve in the higher commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Marine Corps.

The purpose of this legislation is to impose restrictions on promotions in the Armed Forces and at the same time repeal that portion of present law appearing in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1954 which restricts the promotion of officers in the Armed Forces.

You will recall that last year the Congress adopted the so-called Davis amendment to prevent unlimited promotions, particularly temporary promotions, in the Armed Forces. Last year, a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services conducted extensive hearings on this subject in an attempt to ascertain, particularly for the senior officers, whether there was justification for the present number of general officers and colonels serving on active duty in the Armed Forces.

While the subcommittee, of which I was chairman, did not issue a formal report, I think it is reasonable to say that we did individually conclude that there were some billets now occupied by senior officers that could be served adequately by more junior officers. We found instances in which officers awaiting retirement were serving on boards which could be considered unnecessary or overstaffed. We found staff organizations, particularly in Europe, imposed upon other staff organizations in a mumble-jumble that almost defies intelligent interpretation.

But in many instances we found that not a few of the billets now occupied by senior officers have been created as a result of unification. In other words, there are many officers today serving in staff organizations overseas or even in this country that are not performing duties directly related to their own service.

And of greater significance is the fact that we did not find a general overexaggerated rank structure in the armed services when all things are considered together.

I want to make this point clear. The Congress in 1947 enacted the Officer Personnel Act. This act set up a promotion system for regular officers based upon a 30-year career in the Armed Forces. It envisioned that every young officer entering the Armed Forces would have the opportunity, through diligence and perseverance, to attain promotion and eventual retirement unless sooner retired or separated for failure of selection. It established a fairly heavy attrition rate so that there was no guaranteed promotion, but at least it assured the more capable officer of an opportunity to advance up the ladder until he attained the rank of colonel, and perhaps in the case of a few officers, even the grade of general.

There seems to be no quarrel with the provisions of this law with respect to permanent promotion, but unfortunately the outbreak of war in Korea, which more than doubled the size of our Armed Forces, brought about the need for more officers and more higher ranking officers, and as a result the services made use of the temporary promotion provisions in order to keep pace with the expanding size of our Armed Forces.

It is this type of promotion to which the Congress has apparently objected and which has brought about, for 2 successive years, severe restrictions.

Now in connection with these promotions and these higher grades, I would

like to call the attention of the House to the fact that we cannot compare a World War I grade structure with a World War II grade structure, nor can we compare a World War II grade structure with present-day requirements.

The Armed Forces of today are much more technically advanced than anything this country has ever experienced in the past. And as a result we have more specialists, and more requirements for men with complicated technical knowledge. And just as the average civil service employee of today draws a much higher salary for comparable work performed 10 years ago, so today the armed services must promote men to keep pace with the increasing costs of living and the greater responsibilities brought about by the tremendous advances in the skill required of the operators of modern equipment of warfare.

All told, I am convinced that while there must be some restrictions on the promotions of officers in the Armed Forces, particularly in the higher grades, nevertheless those that are now in effect are too drastic and are having a very serious morale effect, particularly upon our junior officers.

I think the Congress would be startled to learn that under some circumstances a young second lieutenant entering one of our military services today, for example, has 1 chance in 300 of becoming a brigadier general, and under the present Davis amendment, that young officer would have to attain the age of 103 before qualifying for promotion to brigadier general. This could occur provided the present officer strength of the service concerned remains approximately constant, and that all the officers who enter that service remain for a career and do not become so disillusioned that they resign in large numbers. In other words, if the present promotion policies and restrictions are continued, the chance for a normal career for a young officer is extremely limited. This is a serious matter and one which deserves the attention of this House, even though it is one of the most complicated subjects I have ever attempted to unravel.

In an effort to impose reasonable restrictions, but at the same time allow promotions which will permit reasonable career planning and provide some incentive for making the service a career, I have introduced a bill which, for want of a better phrase, can be called a sliding scale system of promotion. It imposes limitations on the promotions of general officers, colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors. In some cases the limitation is imposed by number and in other cases by a per centum. The theory of the bill is that as the Armed Forces increase in size, the proportion of higher ranking officers decreases. For example, under the proposed legislation the Army would be permitted to have 520 general officers, compared with the 500 that they are now permitted under the Davis amendment, based upon an officer strength of 120,000 officers. In the event that the officer strength in the Army should be reduced to 100,000, the number of general officers would be reduced to 495. In the event the size of the Army were decreased to 50,000 officers, the number of general officers would be reduced to 350. The Air Force, under the proposed bill, would be permitted 435 general officers based upon an estimated end strength of 130,880 officers at the end of this fiscal year. At present they are allowed 428. The Navy would be permitted 307 flag officers, as contrasted to the 290 now permitted under the Davis amendment. There would be no change of the general officers permitted in the Marine Corps.

Now this bill is merely the first attempt to solve an extremely complex, but highly important problem. We will conduct hearings on this proposal and it may be altered in many respects before it is reported to the House. But I did want the membership to know that we have made an effort to solve the problem.

I might mention one other feature of the proposed bill. That is, it repeals the so-called Van Zandt amendment, which imposes limitations on retirement. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] himself has not favored the limitation for the past 2 years.

It seems to our subcommittee that it is rather inconsistent to place restrictions on promotions which drastically reduce career opportunities in the Armed Forces and at the same time preclude voluntary retirement which further reduces promotional opportunities. During the actual war in Korea there may have been justification for precluding voluntary retirement, but we have found, as I am sure many Members of this House have found, that the prohibition against voluntary retirement is one of the major reasons why young officers are not being attracted to the armed services for career planning. It has had a very serious effect upon morale and this bill will repeal the present limitation now contained in the Defense Appropriation Act.

I know that the Members of this House are very anxious to rebuild the morale of our Armed Forces, which, in my opinion, has over the past few years undergone serious deterioration, and I am confident that repealing the Davis amendment and the prohibition against voluntary retirement will go far toward attaining this objective.

AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat amazed to listen to the speech of my colleague and good friend from Missouri representing what is called the Boothill cotton section, and his complaints about the patronage system in the State, and particularly in relation to the Department of Agriculture. I noticed that one of the main complaints, as he personalized it, was against the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. True D. Morse, who is a resident of my congressional district and a Democrat. Inasmuch as the issue involved is the accusation of partisan politics, it is pretty hard for me to appreciate that Mr. True D. Morse, who is a Democrat, and acknowledged to be so, would be part and parcel of any Republican scheme along partisanship lines.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was not accusing Mr. Morse. I was taking exception to Mr. Morse's answering a telegram about a situation that he knew nothing about, and was merely confirming and passing on someone else's word. I did not accuse Mr. Morse of anything.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am sure Mr. Morse will stand behind anything that he states. Therefore, I say that the charge would be against him. The main thing that concerns me, however, is that the attack is one on motives rather than a free discussion of actual issues.

I was also a little concerned that after naming a couple of specific cases the gentleman from Missouri said he was not going to mention any others, but he had lots of them. I think the specific cases are the things that make a difference.

We are confronted with a situation in Missouri, as I see it, and this is my own personal view, where the previous administration under Mr. Brannan actually had moved into the PMA organizations in the State of Missouri to put partisans in those particular positions. I use the word "partisan" not so much from the angle of Republican and Democrat as I do to mean partisan in carrying forth a particular philosophy in farm matters.

We are all familiar with the fact that Mr. Brannan was a great advocate and partisan for his particular views on our overall agricultural program. To carry those out he felt that it was perfectly proper to put partisans in those positions.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Did the gentleman ever hear Mr. Brannan deny that he was using partisan politics in that?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I know that we had a congressional investigation on how he was using it. He denied it quite vociferously there. As a matter of fact, had we been able to establish it clearly, as I thought it was, incidentally, in investigating lobbying with Federal funds, that we had the case proven, and had a majority of this Congress been willing to take that record and do something about it, we would have been able to move ahead. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that he did not deny it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I did not say that. The gentleman misunderstands me. I said, Did the gentleman ever hear Mr. Brannan deny it? I did not say that he denied it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not know. I assumed when the gentleman asked me that that he was saying that he openly admitted he had done it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I did not say that. The comparison was that the present Secretary of Agriculture was denying that there was any politics involved.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes. I think he can deny it in good faith, I might add. I base that on this looking at the other side of the picture, having received, as I have, and as the three other Republican Congressmen from Missouri have, constantly over a period of months, complaints from the Repub-

lican organizations about the fact that they are unable to do anything about changing some of these people in PMA. I know the standards which are being applied in Missouri. They are these:

No. 1, essentially those jobs must be filled with people who are qualified. Our position, and I say "our" because I am going to join with the other three Republican Congressmen from Missouri, is to get out of office these people who have been playing partisan politics with their positions. They are still in there.

I will bring this out specifically. When we had the Federal drought-relief program in Missouri being administered we were having difficulty in certain counties because of the interpretation of the laws there. Indeed, we have run down a few of the partisans holding these positions. Yes, I hope we do have an opportunity—I hope I personally have an opportunity—of screening any of these appointments in the PMA, and so forth, to be certain they are not partisans along the line I have outlined. And I do think it is perfectly proper, I might add, for an administration to not have men in office who will not try to carry out the philosophy and the program established by the Congress which is being attempted to be carried out by the Department of Agriculture under the laws passed by the Congress. If it were a situation of partisanship in the small sense, I could not agree more with the gentleman, but I completely disagree when we are looking at it in the larger political sense. Using the word "politician," I might state to my friend from southern Missouri, is using an honorable term. I resent anyone, at any time, particularly anyone who is in politics, using that as a term of degradation. The true test of whether a politician is good or bad is not the use of the term "politician," but, indeed, what sort of politics he uses and what sort of methods and technique he uses, and if those methods and techniques are bad then we should attack those methods and those techniques, but let us not use the word "politician" as a smear word. I think that is an honorable term.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman state to this House that the Republican State Committee has not been approving appointments in the county offices of the PMA or the ASC?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not know. I hope they have been, I will tell the gentleman that.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I can assure the gentleman that they have been doing that in direct conflict with what the Secretary of Agriculture said was going to happen.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I can assure you of this. That in many instances, in fact in the majority of instances, he has not, and that has been one of our objections because, I will say to the gentleman, the power of that Republican State chairman should be limited as it has been. He has not the power to name the person who should be in there, but he has the power to say whether or not that person or persons nominated has through his activities in the community, and so forth, exhibited a fairness and a broadmindedness, or whether the person has been motivated by questions of partisanship. We do not want to get other people in there who would try to carry out the Brannan theme and the Brannan philosophy as to what the agricultural program of this country should be. I do not want any more of those people in such positions. The Congress never voted for the Brannan plan. They repudiated it, yet in spite of that, there was a serious attempt on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, to propagandize, to implement and put into effect that plan, and we have people holding positions in the State of Missouri right now, who participated in this scheme. The gentleman is certainly correct in believing that I want those people out of office. I do not want anyone placed there who practices narrow partisanship either. I want someone in those positions who will actually carry out the laws as passed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the other gentleman from Missouri should get too perturbed about this. You know those of us who have been in the minority for a number of years have had to go through that very same experience, and we have had various of these individuals who have been okayed by the Democratic Party out campaigning against us vigorously and diligently even to the extent of giving money to help in the campaigns of our opponents. Do not get too disturbed about these things.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not criticizing the appointment of Republicans for the jobs. I would do it, but I would not have the Secretary of Agriculture denying that you have done it. That is the only criticism I have. I am criticizing the fact that he is denying that it is being done. I am not blaming you for doing it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I personally believe that there again the Secretary is stating what his policy is. He insists only that the people who are appointed shall be people who are qualified to handle that particular job, and I would go one step further; of course, he wants someone with the philosophy of trying to carry out as best he can the laws written by the Congress to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. That is his high standard. When it comes to the patronage aspect of the matter, if these are patronage jobs, of course, in meeting those high standards, I would naturally hope that the Republicans will get some people into these offices, as I think they should. I have had too many of these other people who have been campaigning, I might say, against me to want to have a situation like that. But I will go one step further and say to the gentleman that I personally hope both parties will exercise the proper restraint in these times when there is a change of administration. I say that particularly about my own party although we have not had too much of an opportunity to exercise this restraint so far; but I hope we will always use the proper restraint.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would point out to the gentleman that in my home county we have had a Republican office manager down there all these years during the Democratic administration. We did not play politics. That is what I am objecting to here.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I regret to say that is not true in the State of Missouri as a whole nor has it been true for the past 20 years.

THE FARM PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore granted, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, we have just had presented to us the President's message on agriculture.

After listening to the reading of that message it looks like the 5 years' victory we have had over the plans of Mr. Allen Kline and the American Farm Bureau Federation have not yet convinced him that the Congress is not going to approve his views in connection with agriculture. For 5 years he and the directors of his organization have been before our Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and with relatively few exceptions, while advocating billions for foreign aid, they have advocated drastic reductions in practically every agricultural program that is so vital to the welfare of this country, including soil conservation, ACP payments, REA, and many other things. During those years we have been able to overcome his recommendations in our committee, and when he took his fight to the floor of the House we have been able to defeat him here. But apparently the Department and the President have been sold on his views, which also include the provisions of the law passed in the 80th Republican Congress, for sliding-scale support prices for basic commodities.

These sliding scales sound like they are good. They sound like they would stretch when you need them and would tighten up when you do not need them. May I say they are directly the opposite. If a farmer is in a plight and needs protection, it gives him less. If on the other hand you have a small supply and there is a shortage of a given farm commodity, they give you more. Of course if there is scarcity and there is a shortage there is a market, and you need none. Instead of a farm program to help farmers, it is geared to something else.

I made a speech to the Washington women correspondents early last year, with Senator AIKEN, in which I discussed this situation in an effort to give the administration the benefit of the experience which I had had, and on which most of our Republican Members from agricultural areas had agreed. I would like to repeat what I said before I finish for I said I thought we should continue farm price supports for basic commodities at least 26 years: the remaining 2 years of this administration, the 20 years

they will be out, and then their next 4 years.

The President says we have priced ourselves out of foreign markets. I differ with that statement. That is not the situation. We have had few foreign markets because we have been unwilling to take in payment things that other people had to give us. Not only that, but this administration has under the law now, and has had for the year they have been in power, the right to offer American commodities on the world market at prevailing world prices, for section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act sets up funds which can be used to offer those commodities on the world market at the world price. The Department has refused to use that authority for many commodities. Why did they not use it? I will tell you. A trial run on offering such commodities at world prices would have shown that our problems in world trade are not primarily price but the fact that foreign countries cannot sell to us for we will not buy. That would have disproved the President's beliefs.

I have letters and correspondence to show that it is not a matter of pricing ourselves out of the world market at all.

I would like to point out in the message today, a conflict which clearly proves they are wrong. The administration says that because of pricing ourselves out of the world market, because we have learned we cannot control farm production by controls, they are making this change to the Farm Bureau bill of the Republican 80th Congress. I tell you that in the same message they say they are continuing the tobacco program as it is, because they have proven that you can handle the production problem by controls.

There is nothing in the President's message about sliding scales for wages. In fact, if you will wait a short time you will probably see the President's recommendation increasing minimum wage levels from 75 cents to $1 per hour.

There is nothing in the message about reducing tariffs, but it is said that the American farmer, under the law, should be given less protection when he needs it and more protection when he will have no use for it. It is as simple as that. My friends, once again farmers are coming out second best—if the Congress should follow the President who speaks the thoughts of Mr. KLINE.

May I present the message I gave the Women's Press Club last February. It becomes almost prophesy:

SPEECH OF HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN, OF MISSISSIPPI, WOMEN'S NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 24, 1953

It is a real privilege to be with you on this occasion. I know the keen interest all of you have in agricultural matters, in the cost of living, and in the national welfare generally.

I hope that I may contribute some information on a subject which is primary in its importance. For 4 years I have served as chairman of the Appproriations Subcommittee for Agriculture. That group each year reviews the entire operations of the Department: price supports, soil conservation, rural electrification, research, farm credit extension, 4–H Club work, and the thousands of activities important to all of us. By our action on funds, we decrease, increase, or veto activities of the Department, provided, of course, the Congress approves our actions, which it has done for 4 years.

This year I am being succeeded by Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, Republican, but one who is deeply interested in agriculture. I think the Nation is fortunate to have him head that committee.

I am glad to be on your program with Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, who heads the Senate Committee on Agriculture. I know he is interested in agriculture, though I have differed with his viewpoints a number of times. He will largely write the new law.

He gave his name to the Agriculture Act of 1948, Public Law 897, 80th Congress. This law provided for 90 percent of parity support price when there was a shortage of a basic commodity—of course, if there was a shortage there would be a market and no need for any support. But if there was a surplus of as much as 30 percent—and, therefore, a need—then the support assured was much less.

Many Democrats in my section who supported Eisenhower are making discoveries.

Many thought that candidate Eisenhower gave assurances of firm 90-percent support prices for basic commodities. However, the Republicans are reading the fine print to us now.

As one Washington newspaper which supported General Eisenhower recently pointed out:

"The platform (of the Republican Party) on agriculture favored a farm program aimed at full parity prices in the market place." (The last four words were in italics.)

Of course, if the buyers would buy at that price you would need no price supports.

I wonder if the Republican Party has tried to determine why their ticket ran so far behind President Eisenhower? Could it be that the farmers remembered the Aiken bill, which gave complete assurance of help to the farmer when he did not need it and only two-thirds as much when he did need it?

Could it be that the American people were afraid of the advice of that great farm organization leader who was held out by the President as one of his chief advisers on farm matters? The people knew that leader was one, if not the chief advocate of the flexible-support program, which stretched when you didn't need it and was tight as Dick's hatband when the farmer needed help to get his breath. His farm advice to our subcommittee on cutting down and cutting out farm programs read so much like the recommendations of the National Manufacturers Association you would wonder which was writen first, if you did not already know. Of course, the Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia farm organizations, which differed with their national leadership, practically saved our farm programs the last 2 years.

Now that the Republicans are reading the fine print to us and the new Secretary of Agriculture is making speeches, the general tone of which is that a little hardship and privation visited on some of us would be good for all of us, Democrats and farm-minded Republicans are almost falling over themselves introducing bills to extend firm price supports 2, 4, and 7 years.

I told a number of people that if the Republicans kept their present ideas on farm legislation, I thought I would offer a bill to extend firm supports for 26 years—for the remainder of this Republican term, the 20 years they would be out, and through their next term.

I note Secretary Benson says he doesn't see why they should find fault—that he is carrying out every order the late Secretary Brannan left behind. I thought he was going to improve on Brannan. Why, I made the closing argument in the House debate against the Brannan plan, so to me, a Democrat, Brannan's order is not the complete answer.

Another thing the Republicans were going to stop was "the dictation from Washington."

The first thing Secretary Benson did was to stop all construction programs which had been authorized and directed by Congress, in many instances where there was an outright obligation and local participation, including flood-prevention work. Unfortunately the rains did not obey his order.

The Secretary's overruling of the action of the Congress would be taken to be dictation in many countries of the world.

You can all see the calendar unfolding. There will be a study period this year, classes will be held, and new farm legislation will be passed late next year which will be claimed to be all things to all people. This legislation will be passed early enough to help in the November elections, but late enough so you can't tell just what it is.

That is probably the regular course around Washington. The disturbing factor is that most of President Eisenhower's major advisers on farm problems have proven records against much of present farm programs. They have known views which, in my judgment at least, if put into law will do the farmer no good and thereby pull the rest of our economy down, too.

I am sure the present farm program is far from perfect. I have several bills to revise it pending, myself. However, the present program has resulted from many years of experience. We want it improved; but what frightens us is that the new Secretary and others who are opposed to firm supports are chief advisers to the President. We are afraid that, since they are opposed to the farm program, if the matter is left to them, they may improve it to death.

Now I know all this might be taken as somewhat partisan. Nevertheless, you can't get away from these facts:

The Department of Agriculture is operating with 40 percent less people and on 50 percent less money than in 1940.

The remainder of the Federal Government (exclusive of national defense) shows an average of 360 percent increase.

The farm commodities on hand in 1941 saved the day for us and our allies. Today we are building ships, airplanes, guns, atomic bombs, H-bombs, trucks, tanks, storing up everything—not just to meet the Korean war—but as a margin of safety in the event of all-out war. This buildup far exceeds that for World War II. On each item of these hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of equipment, the Government paid cost plus a profit to the manufacturer and fixed pay to the worker. Yet there is great fear at a $1 billion or $2 billion reserves of food and fiber.

Are we in danger enough to spend hundreds of billions on the military? The military people say so. We have acted on that assumption. Then is our food and agricultural surplus too large?

In World War II we asked industry to expand. We paid the bill. We later gave them quick tax amortization. We asked labor to work—they did—we paid them.

We asked the farmer to expand his plant. We did not pay him. We gave him no firm contract. We promised only to support his production of basic commodities at 90 percent of the comparative gross purchasing power which he had in 1904–14, when his farm was 70 percent land, when out of his gross he did not have to buy expensive farm machinery and equipment, which is more than half the value of today's farm. And with those farmers who did not produce the six basic commodities, their support price, if any at all, was usually 60 percent of the comparative purchasing power the farmer had in 1909–14, when his house went unpainted, his boy or girl had to work their way through school, and the average farm family did not enjoy ordinary conveniences.

We spent $4 billion on consumer subsidies during the war. We paid out over $14 billion to get industry to convert and expand during World War II, and have spent much more since then. Shall we complain at the job the farmer has done at less than $2 billion expense, if we count the value of what we have on hand?

We are going to keep the minimum-wage law. They are not going to repeal the tariff. If these factors are to keep up the price which the farmer pays, don't you have to give him some protection, at least to the amount of 90 percent of his comparative gross purchasing power of 1909–14?

Farming today is a commercial operation. It costs money to farm. Now, is it not more sound, when there is a supply on hand of any commodity, over and above that needed for normal use, to either buy it and hold for a national reserve if needed, as we do other things, or, if that is not done, let the farmers vote limited production on themselves and at least save the money it takes to produce a crop, and the fertility such unneeded crop takes from the soil? Is it not better to do that than to let production go, and when it becomes too large try to force limited production by lowering the support to as little as 60 percent of the 1909–14 gross purchasing power?

There are taxes. There are fixed charges. The lower the price the farmer receives the more of the commodity he must produce to meet such taxes and fixed charges, his mortgage, and basic living expenses.

There is the basic difference in our views. We say let the farmer limit his production by vote, by his own free choice. To do otherwise is to push him into further trouble.

The action of the new Secretary of Agriculture in stopping the flood-prevention programs, which were authorized and directed by the Congress, certainly looks like dictation from Washington. Yet he says he is going to restore the freedoms to the farmer, who lived on that for years.

The farmer had a free market when the rest of our economy had some degree of protection under the law. During that period the farmers wore out 40 percent of our fertile lands—200 million acres out of 500 million—and used up to 80 percent of our timber. Thousands of acres are diseased, and insects are destroying our timber and our growing crops.

Today we spend on agricultural research only a little more than the cost of 12 B–30 bombers.

An entire new poultry industry has been built up at about 12 percent of the cost of one medium-sized tank.

We spend twice as much annually on handling our mail as we spend on all the activities of the Department of Agriculture. I know you are interested in the cost of groceries. So am I. I am a lawyer and a consumer. I, too, have housekeeping troubles.

An analysis of the situation, however, shows that prices received by farmers are 11 percent below a year ago. Prices paid at the grocery store are only 1 percent below a year ago. There have been 11 freight-rate increases since World War II and an almost annual round of wage increases.

I do not pass on the merits of those increases. Perhaps behind them there may have been increased wage contracts, and behind them there may have been the increased cost of living. I am saying you do have a cycle, and where other things keep costs up you cannot make it up by decreasing the cost of farm commodities and have the farmer make it up by depleting the soil.

The point I would make here is that when these other things are fixed by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, by the courts, by legislation we pass, by protective tariffs, by minimum-wage laws, or by the bargaining power of labor unions, however they are fixed or whatever the merit of the change, if you do not put some floor under the price of the original raw material that goes into the price to the consumer, the high prices of these elements push the price of the raw material right into the ground. We will either pay for it now or in the future by further exhausting the natural resources on which we are all dependent.

Our high standard of living is largely based upon the ability of our land to produce food and fiber. We must see that such ability is maintained.

We must not let our country get like India, China, or Greece, and many other depleted nations.

If we are to feed our expected population by 1975 (190 million), we will have to add to our present milk supply an amount equal to that now produced in Wisconsin, Michigan, and New York.

In pork, add an amount equal to production of Nebraska and Iowa.

In beef, add the production of Minnesota, Texas, and Oklahoma.

In sheep and lambs, add an amount equal to production of Utah, Nevada, Montana, and Wyoming.

In eggs, we will have to add the production of California, Kansas, Missouri, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

The peoples in the ancient cities of the Roman Empire, in Syria, and in Greece and those other great empires, bled the area of its natural resources to maintain for themselves the high standard of living which they enjoyed for a time. We must not continue to do likewise, for to this date we have been going down the same road.

For a few years farmers have been living a little bit like other segments of our population; for a few years farm prices have been sufficient to plow back into the land a fair share of what has been taken out. I like that situation. I believe it is necessary to maintain that standard, not only to avoid a depression, for a drastic break in farm prices has led off in every depression we have ever had, but to save the productivity of our country which is the real basis of all wealth.

As I said in a recent speech in the House of Representatives: "I am trying to point out these matters and things before mistakes are made. Now, I certainly am not being merely critical, but rather I view it as giving a very fine gentleman a chance to make good—to profit by experiences of the past, throw off the counsel of those leaders who would have wrecked us under the law passed in the 80th Congress.

"I hope he will accept the challenge and be the Secretary for Agriculture, for the welfare of agriculture is, and remains, the base for our general prosperity for today and the welfare of our children tomorrow, for how we treat the land will largely determine their well-being."

Mr. Speaker, may I say I am truly sorry that my speech of last February has proven to be so accurate.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. POAGE was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday, January 18, 1954, following the legislative program of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday, January 14, 1954, following the legislative program of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROYHILL and to include a statement.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois.

Mr. MASON.

Mr. MACK of Washington.

Mr. BYRD in two instances.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska on the subject of his new food and drug bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, January 14, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1112. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a statement of the adjudications rendered during the year 1953, pursuant to the act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. Appx. ss — 1981–1987), amended by Public Law 116, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1113. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the 26th annual report of the work and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 350, 70th Congress (H. Doc. No. 258); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1114. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Extension Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 7 of Public Law 83, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1115. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for 1953, pursuant to the requirement of the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1116. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as requested by paragraph (e) of that section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1117. A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Department of the Navy, transmitting the annual report on all agreements entered into involving the Naval Petroleum Reserves, pursuant to the act of June 17, 1944 (58 Stat. 260); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1118. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense for the calendar year ending December 31, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 758, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1119. A letter from Steptoe and Johnson, attorneys at law, Washington, D. C., transmitting the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1953, pursuant to the act incorporating said company; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1120. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a

proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, to make permanent the authorization for certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1121. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1122. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes and bands of Indians located in western Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1123. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of laws enacted by the Second Guam Legislature (first regular session), pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, 81st Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1124. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled, "A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians located in the State of Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1125. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon P. Parry, the right, title, and interest of the United States in foreign countries in and to a certain invention"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1126. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize certain property transactions in Cocoli, C. Z., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3300. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; without amendment (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 7102. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 7103. A bill to establish limitations on the numbers of officers who may serve in various commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 7104. A bill to terminate the war tax rates applicable to the taxes on communications and those applicable to the taxes on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 7105. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c) part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment of motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 7106. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 7107. A bill to permit the use of certain evidence intercepted by Federal law-enforcement officers in the course of investigations in connection with the national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 7108. A bill to provide for a postal rate-making procedure by the establishment of a Joint Commission on Postal Rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 7109. A bill to make the Hunter College Library a public depository for Government publications; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 7110. A bill to provide that title to certain school lands shall vest in the States under the act of January 25, 1927, notwithstanding any Federal leases which may be outstanding on such lands at the time they are surveyed; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 7111. A bill to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7112. A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of domiciliary care and medical and hospital treatment by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7113. A bill to assist the States in providing education and schooling for physically disabled individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 7114. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow exemptions thereunder for dependent children whose gross incomes exceed $600; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLELSON:

H. R. 7115. A bill to authorize an emergency appropriation for the construction of a post office and building for Federal use in Rich Hill, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 7116. A bill to encourage State supervision of labor union health and welfare funds, to promote the honest administration thereof, and to protect employees and employers from racketeering; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 7117. A bill to reduce the tax on champagnes and other effervescent wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7118. A bill to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit organized crime offenses against any of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 7119. A bill to forfeit citizenship of conspirators against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7120. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to authorize the United States and the District of Columbia to grant temporary employment for not more than 30 days in any calendar year to certain annuitants under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7121. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 7122. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 7123. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 7124. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 so as to increase certain amounts authorized therein for highway purposes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 7125. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 7126. A bill to regulate the sale of shell eggs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7127. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7128. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide an immediate revision and equalization of real estate valued in the District of Columbia; also to provide an assessment of real estate in said District in the year 1896 and every third year thereafter, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1894, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 7129. A bill to provide for exemption from the land-limitation provisions of Federal reclamation laws as applied to supplemental water projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 7130. A bill to provide for the forfeiture of the citizenship of persons convicted of advocating or conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 7131. A bill to repeal a limitation on pay of certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7132. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 7133. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7134. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the income-tax exemption allowed a taxpayer for a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 7135. A bill to provide for a per capita distribution of Menominee tribal funds and authorize the withdrawal of the Menominee Tribe from Federal jurisdiction; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. J. Res. 343. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 344. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. J. Res. 345. Joint resolution amending section 172, title 36, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. J. Res. 346. Joint resolution making it unlawful for members of the Communist Party to be candidates for Federal elective office and to provide for the immediate deportation of aliens found to be members of the Communist Party; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Alabama and the State of Florida establishing a boundary between such States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER (by request):

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution proposing the erection of a monument substantially similar in inspiration to the Statue of Liberty on the west coast of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 403. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearing of the Committee on Public Works on the National Highway Study, Part II; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 7136. A bill for the relief of Karl Erik Blauberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7137. A bill for the relief of George Petrossian Minassians, Albertouhi Petrossian Minassians, Eda Petrossian Minassians, Vahag Petrossian Minassians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 7138. A bill for the relief of Rosa Marie Adelheid Herok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7139. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 7140. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Duval; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 7141. A bill for the relief of Roberto Fantuzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 7142. A bill for the relief of Haseep Milhem Esper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. R. 7143. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rotics Whitney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7144. A bill for the relief of Bejla Szwarobort, Mordechai, Uri, and Naftul Herc Swarobort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7145. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Catalino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 7146. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to John McMeel No. 1; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 7147. A bill for the relief of Ada M. Funk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7148. A bill for the relief of Buckley F. Norris and his father Charles Victor Jones (also known as Victor Lopez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 7149. A bill for the relief of James Roland Christie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 7150. A bill for the relief of Thora June Grumbles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS of Illinois:

H. R. 7151. A bill for the relief of Mazal Kolman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7152. A bill for the relief of Josef Van den Broeck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7153. A bill for the relief of Henryk Kaminski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 7154. A bill for the relief of Alice Petrides or Alice Defotiou or Alice Mathews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 7155. A bill for the relief of Patricia Bettine Tishler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 7156. A bill for the relief of Karm Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 7157. A bill for the relief of Sang Won Liu and Yung T. Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 7158. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to S. J. Carver; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 7159. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Soledad Tejera Suarez Herreros and her son, Rafael; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 7160. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Gerner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 7161. A bill for the relief of Jean Valda Choma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 7162. A bill for the relief of Jose Esteban Romero-Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7163. A bill for the relief of Enrique R. Godinez, Enriqueta P. Godinez, and Lydia M. Godinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 7164. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gayton O. Larson (nee Eleonore Therese Utenreuther); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 7165. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Ursula Margarete Fuss Hamilton and her minor daughter, Marion Fuss Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

456. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frank Severa, New Jersey State Prison Farm, Rahway, N. J., relative to redress of grievance relating to his imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

457. Also, petition of V. K. Wellington Koo, Ambassador, Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C., relative to a message from the Changhua District Council, the Nantou District Council, the Yunlin District Council, and the Tautung Anti-Communist Resist Russia Cultural Activities Committee pertaining to the Ryukyu Island Group; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Proposal for Obtaining More, Better, and Safer Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I today introduced a bill to authorize an increase of 50 percent in the highway matching funds provided by the Federal Government to the States for the Federal fiscal year which starts next July 1.

Under an appropriation bill passed by Congress last year, $575 million has been allocated to the States for highway purposes for the year July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955. My bill would authorize an immediate increase of this amount by $287,500,000.

Since every dollar of this additional $287,500,000 must be matched by the States before any State can obtain it, the enactment of my bill will result in a more than half-billion-dollar increase in the amount of Federal-State highway construction undertaken in the year which starts next July.

This additional highway work will provide jobs for many thousands of construction workers. Also, it will stimulate the demand for steel, cement, asphalt, lumber, plywood, and other construction materials, thereby adding to employment in the industries which produce these goods. Railroad and transportation workers will be benefited by the increased freight such an expanded highway program will generate.

Officials of the Bureau of Public Roads, repeatedly, have warned that our highways have been wearing out, during the past 10 to 15 years, much faster than old roads have been reconstructed or new ones built.

The Nation needs more and better roads. It needs them now. The program to provide these desperately needed, better, and safer highways

should be started at the earliest possible time, not postponed and delayed.

EISENHOWER ON ROADS

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union speech last Thursday, said:

To protect the vital interest of every citizen in a safe and adequate highway system, the Federal Government is continuing its central role in the Federal-aid highway program. So that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half-cent decrease which otherwise will become effective April 1, and will maintain revenues so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken.

The President, in his message, urged that the present 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline taxe be kept in effect after April, when it is due to expire. In return for keeping this 2-cent-a-gallon tax in effect, and not allowing it to return to the 1½-cent former rate, the President promised an expanded highway program.

If the 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax is continued after April 1, the expanded highway program promised by the President should be put into effect at the earliest possible date after April 1. The start of that expanded highway program should not be delayed until July 1, 1955, which will be the case if Congress waits until the regular road appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1955 is enacted.

Unless a highway bill, such as the one I today introduced, is enacted promptly, America's 53 million automobile and truckowners will continue paying the Federal Government 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax, instead of 1½ cents a gallon, without obtaining any benefits in the form of the promised improved highways for this extra one-half-cent-a-gallon payment until July 1955.

GASOLINE-TAX COLLECTIONS

The Federal Government last year, from its 2-cent-a-gallon gas tax and diesel-oil tax, collected $867,200,856. All of this money came out of the pockets of American automobile and truckowners. It was a special tax on this group, and this group alone.

All of this Federal gas-tax money ought to be spent in building highways that serve the motorists who pay this special tax. None of it should be diverted to other Federal uses, as long as the present great deficiency in needed highways exists. The diversion, by both the Federal Government and the States, of gas-tax revenues to other purposes than roadbuilding should be stopped.

While the Federal Government last year collected $867,200,856 from the Federal gasoline tax and its tax on diesel oil, it will use only $575,000,000 of this money for highway purposes. It will divert almost $300 million of it to other than highway purposes, to such purposes as foreign aid.

My bill, by granting a 50-percent increase, or $267,500,000 of additional funds, effective July 1 next, to States for highway and bridge construction will bring the total amount of Federal highway funds available to the States for that year to $862,500,000. This total is substantially less than that now being collected from the Federal taxes on gasoline and diesel oil.

It will be most unfair to motorists to continue to collect the 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax unless the promised expanded highway program is initiated at the earliest possible moment.

On the other hand, the more than 53 million motorists who now pay this gasoline tax, I am sure, will make no complaint against continuing the 2-cent rate after April 1, provided all, or practically all, of these added gasoline tax revenues are devoted to an expanded highway program. These motorists, however, will have justifiable cause for complaint if the start of the program for more, better, and safer highways is delayed until July 1955.

OUR HIGHWAY DEFICIENCY

The failure, during the past two decades, of the Nation's highway program to keep pace with its growth in population and motor vehicles has created one of the greatest deficiencies in our national economy.

In 1940, less than 35 million motor vehicles were licensed in the United States. In 1952, more than 53 million motor vehicles were licensed. This was an increase of 50 percent in the number of automobiles and trucks on our highways. The traffic-load increase probably was even greater, for the average car owner today drives more miles a day than he ever has.

Despite this more than 50-percent increase in the traffic load, the mileage of new roads constructed and old ones replaced in the last few years was not much greater than during the thirties. We have been making little or no gain in providing better or safer highways for those who by increased gasoline taxes are providing the money to build roads. More money, it is true, has been spent on highways in recent years than in the thirties, but due to the depreciated dollar, or to state it another way, due to higher construction costs, we have not obtained any material increase in better highways.

During 1953, the highway directors of the 48 States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia made estimates of the number of miles of highways in each of the States or Territories that were in need of improvement. These men, probably, are in closer touch and know the Nation's highway problems better than any others. Their combined estimate was that 429,282 miles of highways in the Nation are in need of improvement. Their combined estimate on the cost of this needed highway work was that $34,951,312,000, say $35 billion, was required to do this job adequately.

TOLL ROADS

There are those who think, or profess to think, that toll roads, financed by private interests or the States, can go a long way toward solving our highway deficiency. This, in my opinion, is an overly optimistic view. Toll roads are all right. Toll roads should be encouraged wherever feasible. Toll roads will help. However, toll roads will fall far short of solving the traffic problem.

Today, only 641 miles of toll roads are in operation in the United States. Another 1,172 miles of toll roads are under construction which will require at least 3 years to complete. An additional 818 miles of toll roads have been proposed and are in early planning study stages. Altogether, completed, under construction, and proposed there are only about 2,600 miles of toll roads. These toll roads represent only about one-tenth of 1 percent of the 3 million miles of roads on the Federal highway system and only about one-half of 1 percent of the 429,282 miles of highways in the several States and Territories which the State highway directors say are in need of improvement.

The one and only complete answer to solving the Nation's $35 billion highway deficiency is larger appropriations by the Federal Congress and by the State legislatures for road and bridge-building purposes. One of the most effective steps toward obtaining the additional money required would be for both the Federal Government and the States to stop diverting gasoline tax revenues to other purposes than road building.

The Federal Government should spend on highways every dollar it obtains from motorists in Federal gasoline and diesel oil taxes at least until the present highway deficiency is materially lessened. Let Congress, if it wishes, spend on other than highway purposes the approximately billion and a quarter dollars it collects annually from excise taxes on new automobiles, trucks, tires, tubes, and auto accessories. It should not, however, dip into Federal gasoline-tax revenues and use them for other purposes than roads.

When the Congress or the State legislatures make appropriations for highways, members should not look upon these appropriations as expenditures but rather as investments.

Many of our great railway corporations are heavily in debt. Often their profits are not as large as in former years. Still the directors of these railroads borrow additional funds to modernize their lines and equipment in order to make their railroads more efficient. These directors, all hardheaded businessmen, regard the money put into these improvements as good business investments that will be returned to the railroads through savings.

The same sound business principle should cause legislators who, in fact, are the directors of the Nation and of the States, to provide funds for better highways, in order to make the Nation's motor transportation more efficient and less costly.

The money invested in highways will be returned in savings to those who use these roads and to the national economy.

Studies made by the Automobile Manufacturers' Association reveal that if this Nation, today, had an adequate interstate highway system, that the savings to motorists would total more than $2 billion a year, which sum is the equivalent to a 6 percent return on the $35 billion investment which the Nation's State highway directors say will be required to place all of the Nation's highways in first class condition.

The Automobile Manufacturers' Association survey figures show adequate highways would produce these savings: $550 million to motorists from a saving

on gasoline, brakes, and tires, $725 million to motorists through traffic accident reduction, and $825 million to commercial vehicle owners in time savings.

The Nation cannot, due to financial limitations, overcome its highway deficiency in a year or just a few years. It should, however, move as soon and as fast as possible to overcome it.

The American people are going to pay for more, better, and safer highways whether these are built or not. If these highways are built the people will pay for them in taxes. If these highways are not built, motorists will pay for them just the same through increased medical and hospital bills, in costlier automobile repair bills, in added wear and tear on their tires and cars and in higher automobile insurances rates.

Appended to this address is a table showing the present sums allocated to each State for the year July 1, 1954 to June 30, 1955, under the $575 million appropriation bill passed last year and also, the amounts by which the money available to each State will be increased if my bill is enacted by Congress during the next few months.

Chart showing the present apportionment by States of Federal-aid highway funds for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1954, and the additional funds each State would receive under the bill introduced by Representative Mack, Republican, of Washington

	Present apportionment	Increase proposed by Representative MACK [1]	1954–55 total under Mack bill [1]
Alabama	$11, 629, 238	$5, 814, 619	$17, 443, 857
Arizona	7, 090, 267	3, 545, 133	10, 635, 400
Arkansas	8, 552, 216	4, 276, 108	12 828, 324
California	30, 269, 263	15, 134, 631	45. 403, 894
Colorado	8, 962, 425	4, 481, 212	13, 443, 637
Connecticut	5, 177, 072	2, 588, 536	7, 765, 608
Delaware	2, 409, 449	1, 204, 724	3. 614. 173
Florida	9, 442, 291	4. 721, 145	14, 163, 436
Georgia	13. 335, 300	6. 667, 650	20. 002, 950
Idaho	5, 738, 448	2, 869, 224	8, 607, 672
Illinois	25, 055, 311	12, 527, 655	37, 582: 966
Indiana	13, 697, 571	6, 848, 785	20, 546, 356
Iowa	12, 505, 287	6, 252, 643	18, 757, 930
Kansas	12, 035, 698	6, 017, 849	18. 053, 547
Kentucky	10, 170, 437	5, 085, 218	15, 255, 655
Louisiana	8, 983, 105	4, 491, 552	13, 474. 657
Maine	4, 318. 722	2, 159, 361	6, 478, 083
Maryland	5, 998, 746	2, 888, 373	8, 887, 119
Massachusetts	10, 224, 769	5, 112, 384	15, 337, 153
Michigan	19. 363, 779	9, 681, 889	29, 045, 668
Minnesota	13, 741, 435	6, 870, 717	20, 612, 152
Mississippi	9, 264, 239	4, 632, 119	13, 896, 358
Missouri	16, 087, 259	8, 043, 629	24, 130, 888
Montana	9, 167, 781	4, 583, 890	13, 751, 671
Nebraska	9, 485, 200	4, 742, 600	14, 227, 800
Nevada	5, 730, 198	2, 865, 099	8, 595, 297
New Hampshire	2, 532, 280	1, 266, 140	3, 798, 420
New Jersey	10, 486, 958	5, 243, 479	15, 730, 437
New Mexico	7, 602, 745	3, 801, 372	11, 404, 117
New York	35, 428, 657	17, 714, 328	53, 142, 985
North Carolina	13, 669, 505	6, 834, 752	20, 404, 257
North Dakota	6, 757, 350	3, 378, 675	10, 136, 025
Ohio	22, 493, 115	11, 246, 557	33, 739, 672
Oklahoma	11, 052, 688	5, 526, 344	16, 579. 032
Oregon	8. 661, 811	4, 330. 905	12, 992, 716
Pennsylvania	26, 616, 706	13, 308, 353	39, 925, 059
Rhode Island	3, 097, 079	1, 548, 539	4, 645, 618
South Carolina	7, 326, 960	3, 663, 480	10, 990, 440
South Dakota	7, 245, 354	3, 622, 677	10, 868, 031
Tennessee	11, 989, 709	5, 994, 854	17, 983, 553
Texas	34, 757, 747	17, 378, 873	52, 136, 620
Utah	5, 563, 341	2, 781, 670	8, 345, 011
Vermont	2, 342, 840	1, 171, 420	3, 514, 260
Virginia	10, 892, 628	5, 446, 324	16, 338, 952
Washington	9, 240, 247	4, 620, 123	13, 860, 370
West Virginia	6, 174, 811	3, 087, 405	9, 262, 216
Wisconsin	13, 110, 327	6, 555, 163	19, 665, 490
Wyoming	5, 610, 550	2, 805, 275	8, 415, 825
Hawaii	2, 464, 524	1, 232, 262	3, 696, 786
District of Columbia	3, 208, 123	1, 649, 061	4, 947, 184
Puerto Rico	3, 773, 439	1, 886, 719	5, 660, 158

[1] Approximate.

Parcel-Post Size and Weight Limitations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me before the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on January 11, 1954:

Madam Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before you to give certain facts and conclusions of mine concerning this controversial issue of parcel-post size and weight limitations.

I want to say at the outset that I bear no ill will toward the Railway Express Agency or anyone else who may hold opinions contrary to mine. I trust their position will be set forth fully in this record. There are some facts on both sides of this question that can best be had from those who have a direct interest in the matter. That is why I deem it appropriate for this hearing to be held on this subject—to give both sides an opportunity to present their views thoroughly.

Of course, we who serve on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee have an important responsibility to decide not only as between the direct antagonists on this issue, but also on behalf of the general public whom we represent in Congress. The parcel-post system is a service of the post office department that reaches the entire population of this country. This issue, therefore, must be decided primarily on the basis of what is best for 160 million fellow-countrymen; and secondarily to meet the desires of special interests, whether they be on this side or that side of the issue.

It is appropriate that hearings be held at this time, because we now have had 2 full years experience with Public Law 199, which was passed in the preceding Democratic Congress. Based on 2 years' experience, I believe the present Congress should have an adequate basis on which to make a proper judgment for future policy. The facts properly assembled on this subject, should speak for themselves. There is no purpose served in resorting to cliches, name-calling, or partisan argument.

I introduced my bill to repeal Public Law 199 almost a year ago. I thought the facts were clear then that Congress had made a mistake—an honest mistake, wherein sympathy for the Express Agency outweighed a realistic appraisal of the damage which would be done to the Post Office Department and the general public. Events of the past year have confirmed my previous conclusion.

In my statement today I want to try to shed light on some questions which I believe go to the heart of this controversy. These questions are:

What has been the effect of this legislation?

Is there justification for curtailing parcel post service for the general public with the avowed purpose of aiding a special group?

Is there justification for discriminating against parcel post users on the basis of the area in which they live?

What were the arguments in favor of the passage of Public Law 199—and how have these arguments stood up, after 2 years' experience with the law?

Is parcel post a threat to "private enterprise"?

What results or consequences can be anticipated from the repeal of Public Law 199?

First, what has been the effect of this legislation? What about the general public, the Post Office Department, the express agency, the railroads and the employees of these agencies?

As far as the general public is concerned, there obviously is substantial dissatisfaction with the present size and weight limits. The amount of protest mail which all of us in Congress have received is one indication. Similarly, the Post Office Department has received numerous complaints. In fact, official mention of the criticism and dissatisfaction of the public toward the present law was noted in the last annual report of the Department.

Perhaps those best qualified to judge how the public feels are the postal clerks who are assigned to the windows for the acceptance of parcels in first-class post offices. A type measure is a much-used implement of their task. A reference book listing first-class post offices must constantly be referred to. I am told that these clerks are almost unanimous in their dislike for the new limitations—because of the abuse they get from patrons who dislike or cannot understand the differences and complexities which presently govern the acceptance of parcels. Some incidents were reported to me in the recent Christmas-mailing season where parcel post clerks were simply worn down by the strenuous objections raised by some mailers. The clerks accepted oversize and overweight packages, notwithstanding the law, because they were hopelessly unable to explain the logic of the situation to some abusive objectors. The clerks had to deal with too many who persisted in mailing parcels formerly acceptable which are now oversize or overweight.

An unusual twist to this situation is the fact that the Express Agency has wisely sought to capitalize directly on this public dissatisfaction with parcel post service. In its advertisements, the agency blandly proclaims that express service (in contrast to parcel post) has no size and weight limitations.

Public dislike of something is not always a final gage of what is proper. No one likes taxes—yet we have to have them. In the case of parcel post size and weight limits, however, I think the general public is justified in their dissatisfaction. For more than 20 years prior to January 1, 1952, the Post Office Department provided a parcel-post service which permitted 70 pounds and 100 inches per parcel. The general public cannot understand the reasons why, or the justification for, the limitations imposed in 1952.

What about the effect of Public Law 199 on the Post Office Department? The Department originally opposed this law because of administrative difficulties which they foresaw—nevertheless, they have endeavored to give it a fair test. I do not want to presume to speak for the Department, but I do want to summarize some of the effects on the Department, insofar as I know them.

When I introduced my bill last February, I estimated that the size and weight limitations had caused a net loss of revenue to the Department of some $60 million—that it had been impossible by that margain to cut costs to keep pace with the reductions in revenues resulting from barring the high-revenue parcels from the mails. Sometime later, the Department made an official estimate in the parcel post rate case before the Interstate Commerce Commission that the net revenue loss resulting from the size and weight limitation was $52,400,000. Undoubtedly, since that time, the Department has made further studies which will be reported on in this hearing. Taking into account the 37-percent rate increase which became applicable for parcel post last October 1,

1953, it is obvious that the net revenue loss at present rates is in excess of $75 million.

In other words, in round figures, about $100 million worth of parcel business at present rate levels has been barred from the mails by Public Law 199 and the Department has been able to cut costs only $25 million as a result of the lesser parcel volume. In fact, I understand that in certain handling operations postal costs are actually higher now, with a lesser poundage of parcel post—because the splitting of shipments makes for higher handling costs, in the Department as well as for the mailer.

Concerning the subject of parcel-post rates, I want to make my position clear: I am opposed to a subsidized parcel-post system. I believe parcel post should pay its own way. Too often, the separate questions of rates and service are confused. Making the service available is one thing; placing the proper charge on the service is another matter. I think the facts are entirely clear that it was the rate equation—not the service equation—which caused the Express Agency problem in the immediate postwar years. The Express Agency had some of its most profitable years prior to that, and, I emphasize, the prosperity was under the old size and weight limits of parcel post.

Getting back to the effects of this law on the Post Office Department, let me point out one far-reaching effect of curtailed service that has ominous implications. The Post Office Department is committed to a universal service throughout the length and breadth of the land. That means that it must average out the high traffic costs of sparse-volume areas with the low costs of high-volume areas. It probably costs the Department several dollars to deliver a 3-cent letter in certain areas of Alaska. On the other hand, there is a good margin of profit in handling a heavy first-class letter locally or between metropolitan areas. The same situation applies, in general, to the movement of parcel post. A volume shipment between first-class post offices is much less expensive to handle proportionately than a single parcel on an R. F. D. route. In the case of first-class mail, Congress has given the Department a monopoly in handling all first-class mail so that no one can come in and skim off the profitable business while leaving the Department with the dregs. Public Law 199 did exactly the opposite in the case of parcel post: It prohibited the Department from handling the profitable end of the business. Again, what is the effect of this? Obviously, the general level of parcel-post rates must rise accordingly. The farmer, who previously got a break because of volume shipments elsewhere in the parcel-post system, will necessarily have to pay higher rates in the future, if the restrictions of this law are retained. In fact, in the recent parcel-post rate-increase case, it was acknowledged by the Post Office Department that approximately one-third of the rate increase that was imposed, which was made effective last October 1, was due solely to the effects of the parcel-post size and weight curtailment.

Let me add one further comment about parcel-post rates and express rates. Some people assume that the service and costs are the same and that hence the rates should be the same. Actually, the express service has always been a specialized deluxe service with certain features that parcel post has never had (insurance, pickup service, shipment records, expedited service, etc.). That this deluxe service is desired by many is attested by the large number of shipments that Railway Express has in the weight range of 1 to 20 pounds, where it might be anticipated that parcel post would be used almost exclusively. According to express company statistics about 43 percent of l. c. l. (less-than-carload lots) express shipments are in that weight range, or almost 40 million shipments in 1952.

Because of this de luxe service and because the Express Agency does not have the advantage of density traffic and the sharing of overhead such as parcel post enjoys, the Express Agency says it needs a minimum of $2.30 per shipment, even on the 1- to 20-pound parcels, although the ICC recently rejected this proposed minimum charge. The Express Agency can make a good case for substantially increased express rates, because the analyses of the Interstate Commerce Commission show that express revenues pay for less than half of the costs of the service to the railroads. In other words, the freight traffic of the railroads is subsidizing the express and other "head-end" passenger traffic by a very substantial amount.

As compared with the minimum of $2.30 which the Express Agency says it needs, for any parcel the Post Office Department can provide a lesser, "streamlined" package delivery service at a much lower cost. The Post Office Department can make money handling parcels on which the Express Agency loses money—and that is no reflection on the efficiency of the Express Agency, but a simple statement of economic fact.

When treated as a unit and when permitted to handle the normal volume between metropolitan centers, the Post Office Department has operating advantages which cannot be matched by an individual private enterprise—unless the enterprise were to take over the entire function of the Post Office Department as an entity. This basic operating advantage which the Post Office Department enjoys is the fundamental reason why the parcel post system exists. In my opinion, Public Law 199 is doing a serious injustice to patrons of first-class post offices in not permitting them to have the full advantages of this system—and at the same time the law is undermining for the future the ability of the service to provide what it is now providing for the rural patrons of parcel post.

So much for the effects of this law on the Post Office Department and the parcel post system. Let me turn now to the effects of this law on the Express Agency, the railroads, their employes, etc.

The available statistics show that the transportation revenues of the Express Agency did increase somewhat in 1952 and 1953 as compared with the immediate preceding years. Total revenues for 1952 were reported by the Interstate Commerce Commission to be $402 million, as against $326 million in 1951. It appears, however, that about $40 million of the $76 million increase was due to rate increases which became effective on November 15, 1951, and February 28, 1952. Of the $36 million due to increased traffic, it must be remembered that this includes carload traffic, and also LCL traffic over 70 pounds and under 20 pounds—none of which was affected by Public Law 199. On the basis of Express Agency figures about 45 percent of the LCL traffic and, of course, none of the carload traffic fall within the 20–70-pound range affected by Public Law 199.

In other words, it appears that of the $100 million of traffic driven out of the Post Office Department, the Express Agency has been able to attract less than $20 million of it. What happened to the rest? It has gone to trucks, private carriage, split parcel-post shipments, or just has not moved at all.

It seems obvious to me that the railroads and railroad workers have fared badly as a result of this law. I am particularly conscious of the plight of railroad employees because I happen to have many railroad workers in my district and only recently the railroads have made severe layoffs due to a general decline in traffic.

Traditionally, almost all of parcel post moves by rail. What is more, the payments of the Post Office Department for this transportation are much more compensatory to the railroads than Express Agency payments to the railroads for the same service. It all adds up to this: The railroads have lost business and revenues as a result of this law; and that in turn is reflected in railroad jobs—because roughly half of all railroad revenues are paid out to employees in wages and salaries.

Statistics of the ICC show that average employment for the Express Agency increased from 44,546 in 1951 to 46,487 in 1952, or an increase of 1,941 jobs. I am glad that these additional jobs exist in the express organization. Nineteen hundred jobs, however, is a substantial difference from the 40,000 jobs which were claimed to have been lost to parcel-post diversion, when the size and weight bill was under consideration in 1951. As a matter of fact even in 1951, the Express Agency had almost exactly the same number of employees as in prewar 1940.

Members of the committee, I venture the assertion that as a result of this size and weight law there has been a net decrease in railroad employment which exceeds the nominal increase in jobs which the express agency has had.

What about the discriminatory aspects of Public Law 199? Can a justification be made for withholding from the patrons of first-class post offices a postal service which is provided to the remainder of the population? I am not competent to pass on the legal aspects of the question, but I am told that actually there is a substantial constitutional question involved, that the postal service of the Government has been judged to be an essential service which cannot be withheld without good reason. Regardless of the legal aspects, I think it is wrong that patrons of first-class post offices are discriminated against. I am well aware of the argument that was used at the time the law was passed: that there was no discrimination involved because most first-class post-office areas had express service or alternative shipping facilities to send packages.

The plain fact is that there is no comparable service to parcel post. The first and foremost difference is that of rates. If the mailer of a package in a first-class post office city does not want to have the frills of express service, why should he be forced to use that service? And why is he not entitled, the same as his rural or small city neighbor, to the economical rates which are inherent to a parcel post type of operation? Express service, while a de luxe service, actually has some disadvantages too: it does not reach into many areas where postal service is had, and delivery of packages can not normally be had on Saturdays. In short, it seems to me that there is unwarranted discrimination against patrons of first-class post offices under this law.

The free-enterprise argument is the one most often cited in support of Public Law 199. No one is a firmer believer in free enterprise than I. I have been engaged actively in free enterprise for many years before I was elected to Congress. I believe I know something about it. Just who is free enterprise? Is it the Railway Express Agency or is it approximately 6 million farms, 640,000 service establishments, 250,000 manufacturers, 1,700,000 retail merchants, and 240,000 wholesalers serving 160 million Americans, all of whom use the mails?

I don't think many people can be sold the bill of goods that the Post Office Department is a threat to free enterprise. I don't think that very many people believe that the parcel-post system is a socialistic scheme or is tinged with red. We Republicans think that there were some things in Washington that tended in that direction during the last 20 years, but the parcel-post system and the former size and weight limitations are and were respected parts of our economy, long before that. No; the parcel-post system and

the old size and weight limitations bear the full stamp of approval that the test of time can give. Furthermore, it should not be overlooked that the Post Office Department is a substantial support for free enterprise, in the large volume of goods and services which it buys from transportation agencies, contractors, landlords, etc., coast to coast, and in the transportation wherewithal, it provides for small business or any business to grow and prosper.

What can be expected with the repeal of Public Law 199? In my opinion, repeal of this law can be of substantial help to the Postmaster General by (1) increasing fourth-class postal revenues, (2) reducing unit costs in parcel-post operations, and (3) making possible reduction in parcel-post rates in the near future. Also $75 million of net revenue, which I believe will result, can be of substantial help in making readjustments in postal salaries which I believe are overdue. Most important of all, I believe that reversion to the old size and weight limits will restore an economic balance to the parcel-post system and remove the unwarranted discrimination which presently exists against certain mail users.

A 5 Percent Flat National Manufacturer's Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, consistent with my public statements over the past months, I have introduced a bill to transform the Federal excise system from a hodge-podge of selective and discriminatory levies into a sound and fair tax instrument. My bill would apply a uniform rate of tax to all end products of manufacture and would repeal all existing excises except those levied on alcoholic beverages and tobacco. The excises to be repealed include all those levied for revenue purposes at the retail level, all levied on communication and transportation, all admission taxes, as well as all those now levied on manufactured products.

The exemptions from the uniform tax would be all foods, whether for human or animal consumption, seeds, fertilizers, insecticides, fungicides, defoliants, drugs, printed material used exclusively for and by the blind, and religious articles.

The exceptions to repeal of all existing excises, other than those on alcoholic beverages and tobacco, are confined to imposts which are levied for regulatory instead of revenue purposes.

My intent is to maintain the existing level of excise revenues, not to increase them. Hence, I have set the rate of uniform tax at 5 percent on the basis of estimates that this would yield revenue equivalent to the $5½ billion now derived from the excises to be replaced.

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill for initial consideration of the House Ways and Means Committee, I do so with the conviction that it offers the only way to end the bitterness and resentment against the present excises. In their selectivity, these imposts are harmful and unfair to the companies and industries involved, to their employees, and to the communities and areas in which they are located. My interest in and long study of this situation has convinced me that adoption of a uniform replacement tax is the only way by which the existing revenue can be maintained and the irritation and controversy caused by selective excises can be ended.

I understand the Treasury has suggestions for moderating some of the most flagrant abuses of the present system, making up for the lost revenue by extending the list of taxable items. While this approach would be better than nothing for those industries which would receive some relief from present high rates, it would not eliminate the basic objection of being subject to arbitrary and selective taxation, and would create new sources of bitterness and opposition from the industries whose products would be subject to tax for the first time. We simply cannot cure the inequities of selective taxation by makeshifts of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the members of both major political parties to give my proposal their most objective and sympathetic consideration. In doing so, I am acutely aware of the misunderstandings and misinformation which have existed in regard to this proposal. I hope all concerned will recognize the truth of these points:

First. A uniform excise would not be a new tax—it would simply be the fair use of a tax method which goes back to the beginnings of the Republic. As a replacement tax, it would impose no additional tax burden on the public at large, nor upon any segment thereof.

Second. This tax would not shift tax burdens from the higher incomes to the lower incomes. Items now taxed at rates up to 20 percent are used universally throughout the economy without regard to income levels. The replacement of these rates by the low uniform rate of 5 percent, and elimination of excises on services, would fully offset the burden on the consumers of applying the tax across the board on manufactured end products. Lower income groups would have special advantage from the exemption of food and drug products. With these exemptions, careful studies have shown that there should be no shift in tax burdens at all.

Third. A uniform excise will not be hidden. As compared to existing excises, it would be more open and aboveboard. Actually, it would be impossible to hide the fact of a uniform tax from our well-informed citizens, whereas today even a tax expert cannot always be sure what is and what is not taxed under the present hodgepodge.

Fourth. The tax would not pyramid any more than present excise and other business taxes pyramid.

Fifth. Because of the uniformity and low rate of tax, the effect on industries—and their employees and communities in which located—whose products were being taxed for the first time would be minimized. In competing for the consumers' dollar, these industries would be at no greater disadvantage than all other industries.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to providing an equitable and defensible means of excise taxation, my bill would eliminate many of the administrative and compliance problems which characterize the present system and are inevitable under any selective system. In preparing this bill, I have sought and received the advice and counsel of leading tax experts from American industry, mostly men who are in intimate touch with day-to-day operation of the present system. Wherever possible, trouble points of the present system have been avoided, and provisions have been inserted which should assure the maximum amount of revenue to the Government at the least cost and inconvenience to the taxpayers. The burdens of tax collection and payment are always onerous, but I am certain that this bill as drafted will prove to be one of the most workable and least controversial pieces of major tax legislation ever enacted. However, despite the accumulated knowledge and judgment which has gone into the drafting of this bill, I have no illusions that it is perfect. I urge every affected industry, through individual companies or their trade groups, to give it the most careful study, and to submit suggestions for amendment on any aspect in regard to which they believe improvement can be made.

In a future statement I will outline the major provisions of the bill and explain in some detail how they would work.

My final plea for understanding at this time is directed to the various segments of industry and business, and to taxpayers at large. The bill offers a bold and new concept in Federal tax policy—fairness for all and discrimination against none. The issues involved transcend political, business, and group interest. I solicit the support of all good citizens.

Action Needed To Save the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, in his evening radio and television address to the American people last week President Eisenhower stated that "'help' is the keyword of the administration," and that "this administration believes that no American—no one group of Americans—can truly prosper unless all Americans prosper." In his state of the Union message on Thursday Mr. Eisenhower stated as one of the great purposes of government recognized by this administration "concern for the human problems of our citizens," and he placed emphasis upon the American economy as "one of the wonders of the world." The President expressed a determination upon the part of the present administration to "keep

our economy strong and to keep it growing."

I am glad that this administration is taking the position that no American can truly prosper unless all Americans prosper, because the deduction naturally follows that America cannot truly prosper when one of its component parts is suffering such adverse economic disturbances as are presently being suffered by the people of West Virginia. This administration, in the light of the foregoing quotations from the President's speech, must surely take cognizance of the disturbing problems which confront the coal industry, and the administration must certainly assume the responsibility for finding a solution to those problems.

Upon leaving Beckley, the largest city of my county, on Monday of last week, I saw hundreds of men standing in line awaiting their turn to make application for unemployment compensation. The same sight is becoming a common one throughout the coal-mining areas of southern West Virginia. These lines of hungry, unemployed coal miners are reminiscent of an earlier day. Whether the situation may be termed a recession or a depression is beside the point. Hunger and privation are fully as terrible in the one case as in the other.

This past weekend, the West Virginia Department of Employment Security supplied me with a report depicting unemployment conditions currently existing in West Virginia. A study of this report reveals a very discouraging picture. At the end of December 1953, there were 31,930 applications for work on file at the 23 State employment security offices. This was an increase of 44 percent over the number on file at the end of December 1952. There were 8,837 applications for work on file in the three offices which serve the Sixth West Virgina District which I represent. This was an increase of 51 percent over the number on file at the end of December 1952.

During December 1953, there were 17,352 initial claims filed for unemployment compensation. This was an 80-percent increase over the number filed in December 1952. There were 4,674 initial claims filed in the Sixth Congressional District during the month of December 1953, and this was more than twice the 2,041 filed in December 1952—an increase of 129 percent. This substantial rise in the level of initial claims over a year is again indicative of the continuing rise in new unemployment in the State.

The 56,349 continued claims filed for unemployment compensation this past December was 54 percent more than were filed during December 1952. There were 12,949 continued claims filed in the Sixth Congressional District, an 82-percent increase over the number filed in December 1952. This increase in continued claims not only indicates the upturn in unemployment, but it is also indicative of the longer duration of unemployment.

Claims activities so far this January indicate a continuing rise in the already high level of unemployment in West Virginia.

Information received last week from the West Virginia Department of Mines indicates that 170 commercial mines have closed in West Virginia during the year of 1953 out of a total number of 800 mines which were operating at the beginning of that year. In addition to the 170 which have been shut down completely, 64 other mines reported no production in 1953. Overall employment in the coal-mining industry, I am further advised by this source, has receded from a total number of 125,669 miners employed in 1948 to 85,490 as of the 31st day of December 1953. In other words, 40,179—or 1 out of every 3—coal miners have lost their jobs over the past 5 years. In most cases, these discharged men are too old to gain employment elsewhere, and they lack the necessary training for employment in other industrial fields. What is going to become of these men and their families? The administration must supplement its kind words with positive action. Action, not words, is the order of the day, so far as unemployed men are concerned. What kind of action is necessary?

The answer to this question is obvious. Last year, 132,000,0000 barrels of residual oil were imported into this country from South America. This figure constitutes the most sizable importation of residual oil ever to be brought into the country in any 1 year, and it approximates three times the amount of residual oil which was imported in 1946—the figure that year being 45,000,000 barrels. Last year's importation of oil displaced about 32,000,000 tons of coal. This was a loss in coal tonnage large enough to account for much of the unemployment presently existing in the finest coal fields of our Nation. Such a loss is largely responsible for the difficulties which confront not only those people directly employed in the coal industry, but also those who are engaged in business and in the professions.

I maintain that the answer to the problem lies in legislative action by the Congress. I sincerely hope that the administration and the President will lend support to legislation limiting the importation of residual oil into the country. With the passage of such legislation, coal markets can be regained; those people who depend upon a healthy and thriving coal industry for a living can be given new hope in its future; and, stability and confidence will be restored in this vital segment of our economy.

Facts and Figures Point Up Outlook for Normal Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to point out that of late some politically inspired prophets of economic doom have seized upon figures relating to employment throughout the United States as the basis for predicting depression and disaster.

We are told that unemployment in this country rose to a total of about 1,850,000 last December, and that it approximates 2,000,000 today. This is cited as evidence that depression is just around the corner. Yet Government figures show that no more, and probably fewer, lack jobs now than lacked them a year ago. And 1953 marked the period of highest employment in the Nation's history.

It is generally conceded that the 8 years since World War II—from 1945 through 1953—were years of continuous prosperity. Highest employment was reached only 2 months ago. The period of lowest employment was in February 1950.

Now it is true, Mr. Speaker, that unemployment increased during December by 422,000, and by a lesser number in the first week of this month. But why is this true?

Well, winter is the off season for agricultural employment. In December many of the great automotive industrial plants were retooling for the new motor-car models, which have been unveiled to the public since the first of the year. And a tremendous number of industrial and commercial establishments closed for inventory at the end of the year.

In spite of the rise in unemployment over the last few weeks, the number of jobless still is small. It is small, indeed, in comparison with the total of more than sixty-one million now gainfully employed in the United States.

The number of unemployed looks smaller than ever, when it is considered that even at the top—2 months ago—there were 1,162,000 workers without jobs.

This number represented then, as it does now, approximately the total falling into three major classifications—those out of work temporarily, while changing jobs; those at home because of illness; and those voluntarily ceasing to work, although remaining on the employment rolls.

Therefore, it follows, Mr. Speaker, that the number of unemployed, as of today, is no more significant than was the number of unemployed a year ago today.

The number without jobs on any day, or in any month, is not a cause. It is an effect. It can serve as no basis on which to forecast the economic future. The true basis for prediction exists rather in the outlook and the planning of business and industrial management.

Announcements by American industrial managers indicate that this year industry will spend just about as much for expansion of plant and equipment as it did in the banner year of 1953.

The amount of building-construction work now on the boards indicates that this year substantially the same number of new homes will be built as were put up during the banner year of 1953. And commercial construction appears certain to keep pace.

Mr. Speaker, to me at least, all of this does not look like economic recession. It looks more like continued prosperity, and perhaps more of it. It looks like more jobs, instead of fewer. With the leveling off of war production, it seems

to me, the Nation is safely converting to a peacetime economy.

We are not moving from a period of great prosperity into a period of lesser prosperity. We are moving, I believe, from a "phony," Korean war-based prosperity into a sound and lasting prosperity, based upon the enjoyment of more things of pleasure and necessity by every American.

Herein, I believe, lies the real answer to the dismal forebodings of the politically inspired prophets of economic disaster.

Protecting the Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II, the use of new chemicals in the production of pesticides has increased at such a rate that the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 has, for all intent and purposes relative to pesticides, become obsolete. During the last session of this Congress, I introduced legislation, H. R. 4277, to amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so that officials of the Food and Drug Administration could more easily cope with the present situation.

Many have become quite fearful of any or all pesticide chemicals—some of these fears are based on fact, but the vast majority have arisen from vicious propaganda designed to provoke hysteria. The very nature of the existing laws tends to foster rather than eliminate these fears. Under present conditions, the manufacturer of a new pesticide chemical need only to apply to the Secretary of Agriculture and get his approval under the Federal Insecticide, Rodenticide, and Fungicide Act of 1947 in order to place his product on the market. A tolerance need not be established and, therefore, it was possible that a dangerous product could be placed on the market.

I believe it is proper to point out at this time that industry has been quite careful to insure that the products they place on the market are not dangerous to public health. Recently, one manufacturer withdrew his product voluntarily from the market just as soon as he found out it might be dangerous to public health. This was done before his product was investigated by Food and Drug. Had this individual been without scruples and cared only for economic gains, he could have let his product remain on the market until such time as Federal authorities confiscated it as poisonous or deleterious.

Under the provisions of the bill which I have introduced today, no product could be placed on the market unless a tolerance is first established.

When I introduced the first pesticide residue bill, I said that it was the culmination of many hours of conferences with interested groups and was the common ground of thinking for all concerned. There were some differences of thinking in respect to some of the provisions and language. Hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee headed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], and it was determined that further study should be made with the hopes that the differences could be ironed out. It was agreed that the counsel for the committee along with representatives of the Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the farming industry, the manufacturing industry, and myself should meet and recommend any changes which might be necessary.

The meetings have been held. Officials of Food and Drug, Agriculture, land-grant colleges, farm organizations, chemical industry, and myself have held several conferences and have agreed on all major issues in question with the result being the clean bill which I introduced today.

PRESENT LAW

Under the provisions of the 1938 act, a food is considered adulterated if it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which is unnecessary or which exceeds an amount specified by regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Pesticide chemicals used in agriculture are generally considered to be poisonous or deleterious substances, and, as such, are subject to the provisions of the act limiting the amount which may remain in or on food. The amount which may remain in or on food, which is determined by secretarial regulations, is generally referred to as a tolerance.

The present procedure for establishing tolerances involves the holding of public hearings at which time evidence must be presented to show: First, the use of the pesticide chemical is necessary in the production of food; second, the amount of residues remaining in or on the food; and, third, toxicity data upon which tolerances adequate to protect the public health may be established.

This procedure has been in effect for over 15 years. I might point out that at the time this procedure was established, it was not anticipated that such tremendous gains would be made by industry. Many thought then as others did during the early 1800's in regard to the United States Patent Office when legislation was introduced to close that office because some felt that everything that was to be invented had been invented already. It would be folly, or the words of a person destitute of imagination, if he were to say nothing more could be invented and the Patent Office should be closed.

Mr. Speaker, it would border on the same today if someone were to say every new chemical pesticide had been discovered. Government and industry are just beginning to clear the way for new and better pesticides to curb, and perhaps some day completely eliminate, the staggering losses incurred by agriculture due to fungi and pests. These losses have cost not only agriculture, but the consumer as well, billions of dollars.

Industry has been faced with an almost insurmountable handicap in this field. This handicap has been the cumbersome and impracticable procedure to establish tolerances under existing laws. Since 1938, a tolerance has been established for only one pesticide chemical. In 1950 lengthy public hearings at a cost of nearly a half a million dollars to Government, to industry, to agricultural organizations, and to the various land-grant colleges were held. These hearings, despite the extensive hours of testimony, failed to produce the establishing of a single tolerance of any degree.

The bill which I introduced is designed to remedy this defect by providing a simple, more appropriate procedure to establish tolerances for pesticide chemicals and to prevent the use of the new pesticide chemical until such a tolerance as needed has been established.

SUMMARY OF PROCEDURE

Under my bill, the process for establishing a tolerance on a pesticide chemical used on raw agricultural commodities would be initiated by the manufacturer of the chemical, or by one similarly situated, or by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare initiative. Such person would file a petition with the Secretary requesting a tolerance with scientific data and reasons in support thereof, and would request the Secretary of Agriculture to certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that the pesticide chemical was useful for its intended purpose, and that the requested tolerance was in line with the amount of residue likely to result when the pesticide chemical was used as proposed.

Within 90 days after this was done, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would make public a regulation establishing a tolerance. If within this period the person petitioning for the tolerance requested, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare deemed it desirable, the matter would be submitted to an advisory committee of scientific experts familiar with the problems involved. Members of the advisory committee would be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from a list submitted by the National Academy of Sciences. The advisory committee, after studying the data before it, would make a report and recommendations of an advisory nature to the Secretary, who would consider the report in establishing a tolerance.

The bill also provides that anyone adversely affected by a tolerance issued under the foregoing procedure could request a public hearing on the tolerance or portions thereof deemed objectionable upon a showing of reasonable grounds. A public hearing would then be held on the controversial issue of the proposed tolerance. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would then publish an order affirming or modifying the original tolerance upon the basis of evidence produced at the hearing. This order would be subject to court review in the manner generally prescribed in other regulatory statutes.

CONCLUSION

All in all, I believe the procedure specified in this bill would enable the prompt and efficient establishment of appropriate tolerances for pesticide chemicals used in or on raw agricultural commodities. This would definitely be to the advantage of all concerned with the use of pesticide chemicals. The food consumer for the first time would be assured that a tolerance assuring safety has been established for every pesticide chemical used in the production and storage of the raw agricultural commodity. At the same time, chemical manufacturers would have standards upon which to base recommendations to the grower in the use of these chemicals, and the grower would not have his products confiscated because he did not know the tolerance for the various chemicals.

The grower would be assured that he would be in compliance with the law if he followed the recommendations of these agencies and of the manufacturer. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have a definite standard to carry on their enforcement responsibilities as regards to a safe food supply under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

In view of the urgency of this legislation and the expressed need for it, as well as the complete agreement, I sincerely hope early action will be given this bill.

The Need for Increasing the Salaries of Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I honestly feel that the time has come when Congress should reappraise the schedule of salary payments made to postal employees with a view to adjusting these salaries so that they will be more in line with increases in the cost of living, continuing heavy tax burdens, and those other factors which have eroded the substance of postal employees' take-home pay.

In my opinion, no other group of Federal employees enjoys as long a history of service to our nation as the United States postal workers. There is no group of employees in or out of the Federal employees enjoys as long a history with greater pride to its record of steadfast, loyal, and efficient service to our nation. Unfortunately, too many people seem to take the loyalty and devotion to duty of our postal carriers for granted, just as they do so many other important factors that join to make the American way of life. I have been impressed deeply by the famous words so often used to personalize the postal service:

Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these carriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.

How many people have considered just what these words mean to us and to our country? Because of this loyalty and devotion, I feel that it is our responsibility in Congress to demonstrate to these employees that we recognize and appreciate their efforts and that every attempt will be made to see that they are treated as fairly as is possible.

I do not feel that it is necessary to discuss at length increases in the cost of living, increased taxes, reduced purchasing power of the dollar, or increased deductions for retirement; all of these facts are well known to us. But it is for other reasons also that I think an increase in salaries of postal employees is urgently required at this time.

Let us take, for example, the situation with regard to the increased productivity per worker in the Post Office Department. The type of activities engaged in by most of these employees is not too conducive to mechanization; because in sorting and handling mails and packages, it is still necessary for the human eye to differentiate between various names and addresses in order to assure that packages and letters are forwarded to their eventual destination with a minimum of delay. For this reason, any increase in the output per man-hour in the Post Office Department is largely the result of increased productivity on the part of these employees. During fiscal 1952, 49,740,510,000 pieces of mail were handled by the Post Office Department—the largest volume in any year of postal history. This was an increase of 6 per cent over the 1951 volume, and an increase of 32.9 per cent during the past 5-year period. While the volume of mail was increasing by over 30 per cent, the number of postal employees increased by slightly over 11 per cent in the years from 1947 through 1952, indicating that the output per man-hour must have increased considerably.

It should be remembered that production in a purely service institution of this kind is not as controllable as in many lines of business. The postal service does not choose its customers; it does not control the extent, time, or place that the patrons may hire its services. It cannot allow demands for its services to accumulate awaiting a time when facilities and personnel may render performance of duties under the most economical circumstances; neither can it stockpile productive effort to meet future increased or unusual demands. It must perform, with all possible speed and dispatch, when, where, and in whatever quantity the public chooses.

Among many little known facts about employees of the postal service, one is that it is necessary for them to study long hours at home on their own time in order that they may do their job more efficiently for the general benefit of everybody in our country. They must study changing schemes and transportation routing and destinations so that your mail may arrive more quickly at its appointed destination.

It would be possible to go into many more reasons for increasing postal salaries, but, unfortunately, our time here is limited. So, may I simply state my honest opinion on this matter. It is imperative that we in Congress enact pay raise legislation for postal employees as rapidly as possible to prove our trust in them; to reward them for their loyalty and devotion; to help them recoup a part of their losses resulting from increased prices and taxes, and decreased purchasing power of their take-home pay; to compensate their improved productivity; in short, because of the justice of the case made for such an increase in salary.

The Man Who Sentenced Beria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, can the man who sentenced Beria give us a clue to what might happen in Russia? Liquidation of the Bolshevik clique by the professional military?

Reports indicate Beria was sentenced to death by the man he made eat crow in 1945–46, General Konev, Soviet opposite number to Gen. Mark Clark, on the allied commission in Austria. Konev, proud, oldtime professional, took his orders from Zheltov, bullnecked Beria hatchetman in Vienna.

Konev, short, well liked by his troops, was friendly to the West. He didn't last long in Vienna. Zheltov saw to that. Then, the tables turned. Stalin died (?), Beria is tried. Konev sentences him. Where's Zheltov?

Does this mean that the professional military of Russia has had its fill of the crum-bums in the Kremlin? Does it spell a better break for the Russian, his wife and family—for all the men and women whose kin spilled blood in the hopes of a better tomorrow? One wonders. One hopes. One prays.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who knowest our frame and the frailties of our dust, we turn to Thee who alone canst fill our life with holy purpose. In the stillness of this hallowed moment we would bring to Thy altar the ancient sacrifice of an humble and a contrite heart. Breathe upon us, breath of God, with Thy quickening power restoring our souls, that we may feel a renewed sense of privilege as we enter upon the duties of yet another day.

We thank Thee for this new day, with all its precious possibilities, for its fleet-

ing hours waiting to be filled with honest labor; but especially we are grateful that it is an open door of golden opportunity to serve Thee, our Nation and our fear-haunted world. We pray that through the turmoil of life we may find Thy peace, that for all the challenges of life we may find Thy strength and in the adventure of death Thy rod and Thy staff in the shadow of the valley. We ask it in that Name that is above every name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

PAUL H. DOUGLAS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, and IRVING M. IVES, a Senator from the State of New York, appeared in their seats today.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BENNETT thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 11, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and the insertion of matters in the RECORD, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT ON INCLUSION OF ESCAPE CLAUSES IN EXISTING TRADE AGREEMENTS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (Public Law 50, 82d Cong.), I hereby submit to the Congress a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing trade agreements.

This report was prepared for me by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1954.*

(Enclosure: Report on trade agreement escape clauses.)

REPORT ON FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing the condition of the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953, in accordance with section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724), 79th Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1954.*

(Enclosure: Report Concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

A letter from the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from Frederick S. Hill, attorney at law, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Washington, D. C. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON FREEING THE INDIANS OF TEXAS FROM FEDERAL SUPERVISION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 108, a report of recommendations for such legislation as may be necessary to free the Indians in the State of Texas from Federal supervision and control and from all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THOMAS BARRON *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, and Senate Resolution 216, 82d Congress, 1st session, a certified copy of that court's opinion entered in the case of *Thomas Barron v. The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SALE OF POSTAGE-DUE STAMPS FOR PHILATELIC PURPOSES

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the sale of postage-due stamps for philatelic purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC., CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted at the 12th annual convention, National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, Inc., at Cleveland, Ohio, relating to the freedom of Poland, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT 12TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC., CLEVELAND, OHIO, OCTOBER 24, 1953

The convention of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent held on the 24th and 25th of October 1953, in Cleveland, Ohio, voted the following resolution:

"1. The National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent for 11 years has been active in behalf of the liberty and security of the United States, stronghold of democracy and rights of the free world threatened by Soviet Russia. Keeping in memory the heavy toll of American lives taken by the war against Germany and recently in Korea, the committee sees with deep concern the growing dangers threatening the future of the world and of this country. It is also with grave concern that the committee looks at the tragic fate of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain enslaved by communism, and particularly at that of Poland, the fatherland of our ancestors. The national committee wishes to express its deepest belief that there cannot be free and secure United States without Poland and other countries of Central and Eastern Europe enjoying freedom.

"2. Contrary to the pledges given last year during the election campaign, and contrary to the statement by President Dwight Eisenhower included in his declaration of February 2, 1953, the new administration did neither repudiate nor invalidate the Yalta Agreement. Contrary to the same pledges, the program of liberation of nations subjugated by Soviet Russia did not find any practical expression in the policy of the United States, and it is still limited to verbal declarations of the administration's representatives, who at the same time prepare a plan of nonaggression pacts with the Soviet Union. Under these circumstances we regret to state that the change of administration at the beginning of this year not only did not bring any improvement as far as our policy in respect to Poland and other countries behind the Iron Curtain is concerned, but there are grounds for fearing a further deterioration in that field. We feel regretfully obliged again to object to the

policy of our administration as we have been doing for the past 10 years in connection with the policy of the previous administration which was based on principles accepted at Yalta.

"3. We are strongly against any attempts at reaching agreement with the Soviet Union, which, after the death of Stalin, continues to constitute a menace to the free world's security and to that of our country. We warn that any temporary agreement with Russia will be used by her only to strengthen her military, economic, and political potential so as to better prepare for a final surprise attack against the free world.

"4. In accordance with the opinion which we have been expressing for over a decade, we consider that the only solution to the international situation lies in a steady and extensive strengthening of the United States of America as the foremost power capable to eliminate the Soviet Communist danger. The ultimate goal of American policy should be to take the initiative in her hands in order to liquidate Soviet terror and oppression and so to liberate the world and our own country from the constant threat of a Soviet aggression, and to liberate Poland and other subjugated countries from Moscow's oppression, thus restoring in the whole world the respect for the principles of freedom and democracy. The United States should accomplish this task even at the price of heavy sacrifices, since what is at stake is no less than the highest values of our civilization and culture, the liberty of the United States and of the whole world.

"5. Any attempts at solving those problems by restoring and rearming Germany not only are bound to fail, but also create a source of new dangerous complications hardly less serious than the Soviet danger. There are in the past history plenty of proofs that a restored German imperialism could not be expected to stop a prescribed limit but would again undertake plans of domination of Europe if not also other parts of the world, bringing new bloodshed and conflicts. The economic and political potential of Germany ought to be so limited as to enable her to take a suitable place in Europe on the basis of equality with other countries of that continent, but not to become a basis of a revised German imperialism. As Americans of Polish extraction we firmly oppose any tendencies aiming at restoring to Germany any part of Poland's western provinces which must be considered and remain an integral part of Polish territory.

"6. We express our strong protest against the persecution of the Catholic Church and other Christian denominations in Poland by a regime of foreign agents. In connection with the illegal demotion of the Primate of Poland, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, we denounce that act of Soviet terrorism perpetrated against the highest representative of the church's hierarchy in the enslaved country. We pay our highest tribute to the Polish people and their magnificent stand against their invaders. We appeal to the Polish people to remain calm and at the same time we appeal to the free world to raise a unanimous voice of protest against Soviet terrorism directed against its defenseless victims behind the Iron Curtain."

Henryk Liwacz, Chairman; Stefan Koziowski, Secretary; Resolution Committee: Z. Dybowski, Cleveland, Ohio; E. Kleszczynski, New York, N. Y.; A. Szczepanik, Detroit, Mich.; A. Nabosny, Buffalo, N. Y.; T. Napiorkowski, Chicago, Ill.; A. Buczek, Philadelphia, Pa.; G. Rowinska, Jersey City, N. J.

The convention of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, held in Cleveland, Ohio, wishes to draw attention to certain anti-Polish activities in some American circles.

The book Poland: White Eagle on Red Field, by Samuel Sharp definitely falls into that category. The author of this book tendenciously and maliciously distorts Poland's past history as well as her present situation, while endeavoring to induce the policy of the United States of America to adopt toward Poland an attitude of complete detachment and indifference. The book was written by a Washington professor and published by the Harvard University; it was received approvingly and almost enthusiastically by the leading newspapers such as the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune. These facts prove that there is nothing incidental in the publication of such a book in this country, a book which is devoid of any scholarly objectivity, which distorts well-known historical facts and endeavors to influence and mislead American opinion in a way definitely unfriendly to Poland, while at the same time purporting to represent the expression of scientific opinions of American scholarly circles.

We express our deep regrets that this anti-Polish, prejudiced, and hardly objective book was published by Harvard University, and warmly received by two leading papers.

The convention of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, held in Cleveland, Ohio, wishes to draw attention to an improper approach of certain American circles to the Polish problems and the Polish community.

Into that category falls the case of the creation by the National Committee for a Free Europe of a special commission for study and preparatory work for a future cooperation of the liberated countries of Central and Eastern Europe with a united Western Europe. Without consulting any of the Polish political responsible quarters, the National Committee invited an alleged Polish representative who, together with other similarly selected representatives of other East European countries, is presumed to deal with matters of vital importance for Poland and other countries of the above-mentioned area.

We consider such a method to be contrary to the principles of democracy and smacking of the methods used by Communists in imposing to the Polish people their alleged representatives without the consent of Polish independent political circles.

We strongly protest against such methods and we state that we consider them incompatible with the best American traditions. It is obvious that a body assembled in such a way can by no means represent the interests and opinions of the emigration circles of the subjugated countries. Thus nominated, the Polish representative in the above named commission has no right to represent the Polish interests and opinions.

Henryk Liwacz, Chairman; Stefan Koziowski, Secretary; Resolution Committee: Z. Dybowski, Cleveland, Ohio; E. Kleszczynski, New York, N. Y.; A. Szczepanik, Detroit, Mich.; A. Nabozny, Buffalo, N. Y.; T. Napiorkowski, Chicago, Ill.; A. Buczek, Philadelphia, Pa.; G. Rowinska, Jersey City, N. J.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING CARDINAL WYSZYNSKI'S ARREST VOTED AT A PUBLIC MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT IN CLEVELAND, OHIO

At a special session held on October 25, 1953, in Cleveland, Ohio, Americans of Polish descent and Poles in United States of America express their solemn protest against the act of terrorism committed on the primate of Poland, Stefan Wyszynski by the Communist regime in Poland. They also protest against the arrests and trials of Bishop Czeslaw Kaczmarek, Archbishop Eugeniusz Baziak, Archbishop Stanislaw Rospond, Bishop Stanislaw Adamski, Bishop Herbert Bednorz, Bishop Juliusz Bieniek, Bishop Lucjan Bernacki, and Bishop Antoni Baraniak.

The assembled protest before the free world against the persecution of the Catholic Church in Poland, against the arrests and sentences directed against the physical and spiritual freedom of the Catholic clergy in Poland.

Paying homage to the victims of Communist terror, we appeal to all Catholics in free countries, to the Catholic bishops and priests in the whole world, and particularly in United States of America, to all free men and women of any religion, asking them to raise a unanimous voice in protest against these religious persecutions.

Should such acts of terror and oppression remain unanswered, the atheistic rulers of Soviet Russia would see in it a proof of the passitivity and complacency of the Catholic world, remaining inactive in face of Soviet attempts at the destruction of the Catholic faith behind the Iron Curtain.

We solemnly warn against such a complacency. We firmly believe that the Catholics in this country and all its free citizens will undertake a unanimous campaign of mass protests, denouncing the acts of violence and terrorism committed by Soviet Russia and its subjugated countries.

The free world is directly threatened by Soviet aggression. Any agreements or pacts concluded with Soviet Russia, any abandonment of the great idea of liberation of peoples oppressed and terrorized by Communists in consequence of Yalta agreement, would be in flagrant contradiction with the spirit of the American tradition of freedom.

STEFAN SLIWINSKI,
Chairman.

PARITY FOR THE FARMER—RESOLUTIONS OF MERCHANTS OF KILLDEER, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the merchants of Killdeer, N. Dak., relating to parity for the farmer.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PARITY FOR THE FARMER," SAY TOWN BUSINESSMEN

Since the State of North Dakota is a major agricultural State, the businessmen of this city feel that it is most imperative that we work side by side with all those who are attempting to maintain a farm program which will enrich and develop the agricultural activities wherever they are a major industry or source of livelihood. In view of the above conclusion, the Killdeer merchants have adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That we go on record condemning any effort on the part of any Congressman, the Department of Agriculture, or any agency for attempting to disrupt the present farm stabilization program, affecting all basic farm commodities.

"We further resolve that Congress shall not only maintain 90 percent of parity, but shall endeavor to establish 100 percent of parity for basic farm commodities. We do not favor any tendency toward flexibility of price support, but urge Congress to maintain a production control program which is essential in order to have stabilized price support.

"We further resolve to condemn any form of prosperity based on war and bloodshed, but favor a genuinely sane and sound economic program, particularly for the producer, which shall be based on industry, security, and individual initiative.

"We further urge all business groups in other cities of this State as well as those of other agricultural States to go on record favoring similar resolutions."

Killdeer Merchants: Roy A. Boomer, Manager, Motor Implement Co.; Mayme Patton, Killdeer Hotel; Bernard Kruckenberg; Fred Hollingsworth, Killdeer Drugs; Schmidt Standard Service; Hansen Implement; Clifford Wing, Wing Electric; Anton Wetsch, Wetsch Bros.; John J. Zimbrick, Zimbrick Department Store; Adamski Chevrolet Co.; Robert R. Rychmer; Glen Lawhead; Joseph J. Wetch, Variety and Confectionery; Douglas Swenson, Doug's Meat Market; Irene C. Trinka, Shannon Hotel; Peter Goetz, Occident Lumber Yard; Forest M. Gunwall, Manager, FU Oil Co.; Ed's Club; Marvin Holt, Occident Elevator; Victor H. Fraase; R. T. Dullum, Chuck Wagon; James Bank, Killdeer Willys Motors; Killdeer Milling Co.; Karey Motor Sales; Joseph Dolezal; M. E. Anderson; H. M. Weydahl; Ernest Churchenko, Ernie's Bar; Jerry Kadrmas; Geo. L. Grayson, Grayson Trucking; Jimmy Olynyk; Wolf & Weidner; E. S. Hoffman; Ambrose Stroh; Earl's Hardware; Pat Woods; Irene Stoll; Felix Dauenhauer, Hap's Bar; Patton Electric Service; Carl Anderson; Lloyd Dahl; Senester Anderson, all from Killdeer, N. Dak.

TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—RESOLUTION OF FOURTH STUDY CONFERENCE ON THE CHURCHES AND WORLD ORDER, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in October 1953 there was convened the Fourth National Study Conference on the Churches and World Order in Cleveland, Ohio.

I have before me the report of that conference, as published by the famed Department of International Justice and Goodwill of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

It is a pleasure to read this inspiring report. Included in it is the message of greeting by the President of the United States to Mrs. Douglas Horton, chairman of the National Study Conference.

Also included are quotations from the comments of the distinguished president of the National Council of Churches, Bishop William C. Martin, calling the conference together.

The resolutions adopted by the various sections of the conference are extremely stimulating and valuable. One such resolution which I should like to present to the Senate at this time relates to treaties and executive agreements. The resolution confirms the forthright position of leading churchmen in the United States in opposing any constitutional amendment which would hamper our Government amidst its present grave foreign-policy responsibilities.

I present the resolution for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The principle of cooperation and mutual concern implicit in the moral order and essential to a just and durable peace calls for a true community of nations. The United States can best insure its own peace and security by strengthening, and not weakening, the processes by which our Nation exercises its rightful influence within the family of nations.

The power of our Government to negotiate treaties and to make executive agreements should be so maintained as to insure (a) that the United States will not be hampered in taking expeditious and effective action in fulfilling our responsibility as a member of the world community of nations and (b) that the United States should be in a position to make its full contribution to the continuing development of international law and to bring international relations into greater harmony with the moral law. Convinced that adequate safeguards respecting the making of treaties and executive agreements are already provided, we express our opposition to any constitutional amendment which would hamper our Government in carrying forward and making effective a responsible foreign policy.

DEVELOPMENT OF HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS—RESOLUTION OF DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE, LA CROSSE, WIS.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Dairyland Power Cooperative concerning Federal Government policy as it relates to the development of hydroelectric projects, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE 12TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MEMBERS OF THE DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE HELD AT THE VOCATIONAL AND ADULT SCHOOL, LA CROSSE, WIS., ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1953

Whereas during these, the most critical times ever faced by our Nation, it is important to combat the insidious effects of communism not only on the international front but also here at home by preserving and building stronger the basic economic and political institutions upon which our country has been founded. To successfully resist Communist military attacks from without and Communist infiltration from within our democratic way of life must be fully nurtured and at the same time protected from private interests which are willing for purely selfish reasons to make inroads upon our democratic way of life under false propaganda and name calling in order to destroy and impede progress accomplished through democracy in action; and

Whereas it has always been the fundamental purpose of our democracy to have the Government assist the people in doing those things together which either could not be accomplished at all or not as well by the people acting individually, and through such governmental assistance it has been possible to accomplish the enviable record of the best standard of living for our people generally the world has ever known. In addition to our fine educational system, good roads, postal system, and public health the standard of living for whole segments of our population and geographical areas has been raised through such agencies as Rural Electrification Administration, and TVA in a system in which the Government has helped the people to help themselves on a dignified basis of self-liquidation of those projects; and

Whereas a vicious and well-subsidized propaganda program is being carried on today which through the use of a debased name-calling scheme labels such outstanding accomplishments as "creeping socialism" all for the purpose of attempting to acquire monopolistic control of the remaining natural resources with an electric power potentiality, and to prevent electric cooperatives from generating their own power or buying power at cost from Government dams: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates to Dairyland Power Cooperative in its 1953 annual meeting assembled, go on record as urging the Congress—

1. To proceed in developing the natural resources of the country in a manner calculated to aid and benefit all the people by developing available water power projects in such manner as to obtain maximum benefits from flood control, soil conservation, and the development of low cost power.

2. That such developments be made upon the basis of the overall river basin development with the reservoirs capacity constructed at public expense utilizing Government power projects from which revenue can be obtained to properly contribute to defraying the expense.

3. That to permit construction of private profit power projects as parasites upon the reservoirs capacity investment of the Government is atrocious.

4. That to force sales of the electricity at the dam to a single purchaser at forced prices of whatever the monopolistic purchaser will pay is a surrender of the people's rights to have the electricity made available by the Government at places where the people need it and where the Government can obtain a full and fair price through the action of the demands of diverse users.

5. That for the Government to fail to build all necessary transmission lines to market the power is analogous to turning all bridges over to private companies to take whatever toll they wish to tax upon the public road system; and be it finally

Resolved, That the secretary be and the same is hereby authorized and instructed to send a copy of this resolution (1) to each of the dairyland member distribution cooperatives, and (2) to each Senator and Congressman representing the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois in which Dairyland Power Cooperative operates.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2671. A bill to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. BUTLER of Maryland):

S. 2672. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2673. A bill for the relief of Frank M. S. Shu; and

S. 2674. A bill for the relief of Moxon J. van den Abeele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 2675. A bill to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shoreline of the State of Connecticut from the Housatonic River to Ash Creek; and

S. 2676. A bill to authorize beach erosion control of the shoreline of the State of Connecticut from New Haven Harbor to the

Housatonic River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRISWOLD:

S. 2677. A bill for the relief of Michio Yamamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2678. A bill for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2679. A bill for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski Memorial Day for observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 114) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, introduced by Mr. Saltonstall, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, under the terms of the joint resolution, the President would be directed to call upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on that day and to invite the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches. Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski died on October 11, 1779, from wounds received 2 days earlier at the siege of Savannah, Ga., in the Revolutionary War.

It is especially fitting that we should commemorate the death of this great soldier for freedom. He was a true patriot, both of the newly created United States and of his native land of Poland. That land today suffers under Communist enslavement, and his memory is an inspiration to those who keep alive the spirit of freedom not only in Poland but in all the other oppressed countries behind the Iron Curtain.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 184), which was placed on the calendar:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsections (g) (1) (B) and (2) (C) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1954, and ending on January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed the unexpended balance of the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 56, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to on February 20, 1953, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

EMPLOYMENT OF TWO CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations an original resolution, Senate Resolution 179, continuing the authority of the committee to employ two additional clerical assistants. The resolution was placed on the calendar, but it should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ANSWERS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE FARM PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture has prepared a set of questions and answers on the new farm program recommendations embodied in the President's message of yesterday to the Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have these questions and answers printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 1954.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON NEW FARM PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

Following is a series of questions and answers which give information on the chief provisions of new farm program recommendations covered in a special message to the Congress from President Eisenhower on January 11, 1954:

Question. Why is a new farm program needed?

Answer. Because the present farm program is proving unworkable. Huge surpluses are mounting steadily. At the same time, farm purchasing power has dropped in spite of aggressive application of price-support laws now on the books.

The Commodity Credit Corporation's investments in surplus commodities have more than doubled in the past year alone. Jumping from $2 billion in October 1952, to $4.5 billion in October 1953, the CCC's financial obligations now are pressing hard against the $6.75 billion limitation of its borrowing power.

Acreage allotments and marketing quotas have spread to wheat and cotton for the 1954 crops. Acreage allotments for corn seem certain. And millions of acres diverted from these crops can be expected to cause serious trouble with the supplies of other crops.

But even with the application of price-support programs, farm income has gone down. Thus a new program—an improved program—is needed.

Question. Is the new program entirely different?

Answer. There are a number of new features. But in general, the program would retain successful features of past programs, strengthen others, and replace the least successful portions.

Question. What are the most important features of the new program?

Answer. These features stand out:

A flexible (rather than rigid) price-support program, adjustable according to the supply of the respective commodities.

A modernized parity formula, permitting the price-support program to reflect the ever-changing pattern of farm costs as farming methods are improved.

A "freezing" of excess commodity reserves, isolating these stocks for emergency use, and other uses outside regular channels, thus preventing them from having a depressing effect on the market or handicapping the new program with burdensome stocks accumulated under present high rigid price supports.

High level trade missions and a conference with ministers of agriculture and food of other countries to discuss the stabilization of prices for farm products moving in international trade and the utilization of accumulating supplies of food and fiber.

An increase in the Commodity Credit Corporation's borrowing authority to $8.5 billion to cover present price-support commitments for 1954 crops.

In addition, the program would provide an entirely new program for wool. It would continue virtually unchanged the programs for tobacco, meat animals, dairy products, poultry and eggs, fruits and vegetables, sugar, and feed grains other than corn. Except for tobacco, the basic commodities would be placed under the adjustable provisions of the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949. Potato growers would be given the same price-support assistance as the growers of other fruit and vegetables, on a permissive basis. And mandatory price supports would be discontinued for tung nuts and honey, which would be placed in the category for which price supports are permissive.

Question. What is the new program designed to do?

Answer. These are some of the goals:

Protect farm prices and income.

Avoid building up burdensome surpluses.

Give farmers freedom to increase efficiency and adjust production to changing consumer demand.

Enable consumers to buy food and other farm products at prices reflecting available supplies.

Allow American agriculture to operate on a flexible, rather than a rigid basis.

Minimize the problem of diverted acres and production curbs.

Restore the rewards for good farm management to those who earn them.

Increase incentives to conserve and improve the soil.

Provide long-range planning for efficient production and marketing.

Open new markets both at home and abroad.

Improve international relationships.

Question. How was the new program worked out?

Answer. Through the most thorough study of farm problems and governmental programs ever undertaken. Participating in the study were congressional committees, the farm organization, the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, the departmental agencies, scores of producer, processor, and trade groups, the agricultural colleges, 500 of the best qualified and best known agricultural men in the country, and countless individual farmers and interested citizens.

Question. What are the advantages of flexible price supports?

Answer. They are the only type of supports which promote shifts in production and supply to meet changes in demand. They do this by allowing for modest price fluctuations which provide incentives for farmers to adjust their production. The present system of rigid supports, in contrast, perpetuates surpluses and unbalanced production. It also results in lower farm income when artificially high prices result in lost markets. Flexible supports, on the other hand, can produce larger income because they permit larger production—farm income being the product of units sold multiplied by the price received.

Question. How would flexible supports operate?

Answer. They would operate as set forth in the agricultural acts of 1948 and 1949. Under this law—which was amended to postpone the flexibility features from becoming effective until 1955—the level of price support on basic commodities would vary between 75 and 90 percent of parity, depending on the level of supply. Here is what the act provides:

"Support shall be at levels not in excess of 90 percent of the parity price and for some products not less than the levels called for by a minimum support schedule ranging from 75 to 90 percent of the parity price, according to the relationship of total supply to normal supply.

"That minimum support schedule in general declines 1 percent for every 2 percent increase in the total supply. If the supply is abundant, a lowered price stimulates consumption and discourages production. If the supply is short, an increased price support level encourages production. Fluctuation in price and supply tend to offset one another, and to stabilize income."

Question. What are the advantages of the modernized parity formula?

Answer. It permits parity to reflect changes in farm costs as farming methods are improved. It also takes account of the consequences of changing trends in demand for different farm commodities and products.

Question. What effect would the modernized parity formula have?

Answer. First, it would place all price-supported farm commodities on a fair basis, ending the present situation in which some commodities come under the new parity calculation while others are exempt. The basic commodities are exempt until 1956, their computations being based either on the old or new formula, whichever is higher. The old formula is based on the conditions of the 1909–14 period and does not allow for increased production efficiency or changes in consumer demand. The modernized formula is based on a progressive 10-year average.

Second, it would provide support for all commodities at a realistic level, in keeping with present-day conditions. For example, in 1950 it took wheat farmers an average of only 26 hours to produce a hundred bushels of wheat as compared with 106 hours in 1910–14. Thus parity for wheat under the new formula is 15 percent lower than under the old. For peanuts parity is 23 percent lower. For corn it is 10 percent lower. And for cotton it is 4 percent lower.

Question. How would the changeover to the new formula be made?

Answer. The exemption from the modernized parity formula now granted the basic commodities would be allowed to expire as scheduled on January 1, 1956. Following this, the changeover would be made gradually by dropping the parity level not more than 5 percent per year until the new formula is completely in effect.

Question. What are excess reserves?

Answer. Excess reserves are the surplus farm commodities left over after the Nation's normal reserve needs have been filled. The normal reserve includes sizable quantities of some farm products for use in the event of war, drought, famine relief, and other domestic and foreign-aid programs. When these needs have been filled reserve supplies still on hand are designated excess reserves.

Question. What would freezing excess reserves accomplish?

Answer. It would isolate present excess reserves of wheat, cotton, vegetable oils, and possibly dairy products from the market in order to give the new program a chance to work.

The farm problem today is not so much one of overproduction as it is a problem of unbalanced production. It is this problem which the new farm program is designed to solve. However, it cannot be expected to work effectively if excess reserves of various commodities are allowed to hang over the market where their presence would have the effect of depressing prices or necessitating too much of a decline in the level of price supports.

Question. How would the freezing be accomplished?

Answer. It is recommended that up to $2.5 billion be used for the setting aside of reserves from present CCC stocks. Deterioration and loss of quality would be held to a minimum through rotating stocks where necessary.

Question. How would frozen stocks be moved?

Answer. Broad discretionary authority would be granted the President and Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of the commodities in a way that would not disturb normal trade. Likely outlets would be foreign aid, new foreign markets, barter, and disaster and famine relief.

Question. Why should CCC's borrowing authority be increased?

Answer. Because its financial obligations are now pressing hard against the $6.75 billion limitation on its borrowing authority. An additional authorization to $8.5 billion is necessary to cover price-support commitments for 1954 crops alone.

Question. How would the new program affect major farm commodities?

Answer. Wheat: The provisions of the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949 would apply, with the price-support level to depend upon supply. The computation of parity for wheat would be modernized beginning January 1, 1956.

The authority for acreage allotments and marketing quotas would be continued, but lower support levels would take away some of the incentive to grow wheat on land better suited for pasture or other crops. It would also open new market outlets. There would be less need to restrict production as the Nation moved away from fixed supports at 90 percent of the old parity.

It is recommended that a sizable portion of the wheat surplus be frozen. This reserve would not be considered as part of the total supply used in determining price support levels and acreage allotments.

Cotton: Price supports between 75 and 90 percent of parity, dependent upon supply, would go into effect as set forth in the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949. Modernized parity would become effective as scheduled on January 1, 1956, the difference involved being less than 4 percent.

Under the proposed program, Congress would repeal the provisions which require that production controls be fully applied before there can be any reduction of the price-support level.

A part of the cotton carryover now in prospect would be frozen effective January 1, 1955. The new program could then become operative without the burden of the present excess reserves.

Corn: Support would range from 75 to 90 percent of parity, according to the relationship of total supply to normal supply. Under the 1948–49 law the level of price support would drop 1 percent for each 2 percent increase in supply.

Under the proposed program, Congress would take several steps to amend existing legislation. One would prevent a decline of more than 5 percent in the support price on corn in any single year as a result of the transition from the old to the new parity formula. Another would provide that the Agricultural Act of 1949 become effective as scheduled for the corn crop of 1955 and subsequent crops. A third would provide a decrease of 1 percent in support price for each 1 percent increase in supply, instead of 1 percent for each 2 percent increase in supply. This change would give greater flexibility to corn support prices and help prevent the building up of surpluses. A fourth legislative change would raise the normal carryover allowance for corn from the present level of 10 percent to 15 percent of domestic disappearance plus exports. A fifth would make the modernized parity formula effective January 1, 1956. And a sixth would suspend requirements for marketing quotas on corn because they cannot be effectively enforced.

Corn stocks would not be frozen. Since there is little hope for a substantial export market for corn, our large stocks can be used as feed for livestock and poultry and our growing population.

Other feed grains: The present program would be continued for oats, barley, and grain sorghum. The Agricultural Act of 1949 authorizes price support for these nonbasic crops at not to exceed 90 percent of parity. The amounts, terms, and conditions of price support operations and the extent of such operations is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Wool: An entirely new program is recommended for wool. Under it, domestically produced wool prices would be permitted to seek their own level in the market, competing directly with other fibers and with imported wool. Then domestic producers would receive direct payments.

These would equal the difference between the average market price for the season and 90 percent of parity. In other words, these payments, when added to the average market price for the season, would raise the average return per pound to 90 percent of parity. Each producer would receive the same support payment per pound of wool, no matter how much he received for his wool in the market place. This would allow each grower his reward for efficient production and marketing.

This system would not require Government loans, purchases, storage, or any other interference with the market. Funds for the direct payments would come from the general revenue within the amount of unobligated tariff receipts on wool.

Meat animals, dairy products, and poultry and eggs: Present price-support legislation would be continued for all these products.

Support for meat animals is authorized at levels not to succeed 90 percent of parity. Such support is permissive, not mandatory. The same is true for poultry and eggs.

Price support for dairy products is mandatory between 75 and 90 percent of parity. In addition to continuing such support, a part of the carryover might be frozen.

Peanuts: The Agricultural Act of 1949 would become effective January 1, 1955, to permit price adjustments when the supply changes. In addition, modernized parity would become effective for peanuts beginning January 1, 1956, as now scheduled. A transitional provision also would be provided which would limit the decrease from the old parity to not more than 5 percent per year. The old parity is 23 percent higher than the new parity.

Tobacco: The price-support program for this commodity would be continued in substantially its present form. The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect.

This program is being continued because producers and processors are generally satisfied with it and tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government.

Rice: Mandatory price support at 90 percent of parity would be allowed to expire for rice after the 1954 crop. With the supply situation as it is now estimated, the 1955 crop would probably be supported at about 90 percent of parity.

Although no difficulty has been experienced in supporting the price of this crop, the time to make a change is before trouble occurs. Mandatory supports at 90 percent of parity could prevent an adjustment for rice, if one should be needed, just as they prevented the adjustment for wheat, when it was needed.

Oil seeds: The provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 would apply for soybeans, cottonseed, and flax. Price support is authorized at not to exceed 90 percent of the parity price. In addition to continuing such support the new program would freeze a large quantity of vegetable oils, effective January 1, 1955. It is estimated that at that time the surplus will be over 1 billion pounds valued at about $200 million.

Fruits and vegetables: Present provisions for the use of section 32 funds in behalf of fruits and vegetables would be continued. These funds taken from tariff receipts are used in case of market distress for limited purchases of market surpluses, for diverting products from normal marketing channels or into export outlets, and for similar purposes.

Marketing agreements also would be continued, but would be liberalized in several ways: First, to include additional commodities to which marketing agreements are suitable. Second, to enlarge and clarify the authorization for agencies established under marketing orders to engage in or finance, within reasonable limits, research work from funds collected under the marketing order.

Third, to provide for the continuous operation of marketing agreements, despite short-term price fluctuations, where necessary to assure orderly distribution throughout the marketing season. And fourth, to obtain congressional approval for enlarging and clarifying the authorization for the use of marketing orders to promote marketing efficiency, including the regulation of containers and types of pack for fresh fruits and vegetables.

In addition, the new program would also require legislation to allow assistance to potato growers in the same manner as is available for producers of other fruits and vegetables. All price-support assistance to potato growers was removed several years ago when difficulties arose involving much waste and expense. The new proposal would not restore the old program, but would simply give potato growers the same type of assistance that is available to other producers of fruits and vegetables.

Sugar: The sugar program would be continued in essentially its present form. The Sugar Act was extended in 1951 by unanimous vote in the House of Representatives and by a 72-to-4 vote in the Senate.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF FOUNDING OF CITY OF NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 987) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.

Mr. WILLIAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the unfinished business is Senate bill 987, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass. So far as I know, there is no objection to the bill. Because I must preside at a committee meeting early this afternoon, I ask the Senator from Delaware if he will permit the Senate to take action on the bill at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am glad to accommodate the Senator from Massachusetts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "exceed", to insert "one million."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 1, after the word "coinage", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the initial number of such pieces coined shall not be less than one hundred thousand."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, after the word "coins", to strike out "Not less than five thousand such coins shall be issued at any one time, and no such coins shall be issued after ————."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, at the beginning of line 5, it is proposed to strike out "1953" and insert in lieu thereof "1954."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., to be held in June 1954, there shall be coined not to exceed 1 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition, and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for such coinage: *Provided*, That the initial number of such pieces coined shall not be less than 100,000.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date 1954, shall be legal tender to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of the city of Northampton, Mass., or its duly authorized agent, upon the payment by it of the par value of such coins. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium, and the net proceeds from the disposition of such coins shall be used for such purposes related to the observance of such tercentennial celebration as the city of Northampton, Mass., shall direct.

SEC. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the processes of coinage, providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall so far as applicable apply to the coinage herein authorized.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a statement which I have had prepared relating to the bill just passed by the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On February 18, 1953, I introduced S. 987, a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.

This bill is to celebrate the tercentenary of Northampton, Mass., which is one of our fine and old industrial communities. It is also a fine residential community. It received its charter as a city in 1654, when there were probably less than 75,000 settlers in the New World.

Northampton is the home of Smith College for Women, which is famous throughout our Nation. It was established in 1875, and until very recently was the largest college for women in the world. Smith College was selected by the Navy Department as the site for its WAVES Officer Training School.

Northampton is the home of Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, widow of our 30th President. Clarke School for the Deaf, founded by John Clarke, a Northampton citizen, is known all over the world due to the fact it teaches lip-reading exclusively. Mrs. Coolidge once taught in Clarke School and was later president of its board of trustees.

One of the oldest newspapers in the country with continuous circulation—the Hampshire Gazette—was established in Northampton in 1786.

Northampton is a city of many fine public parks. It has an outstanding library—Forbes Library—containing over 250,000 volumes, which in point of size among city libraries ranks 4th in Massachusetts, and 40th among the 7,000 libraries in the United States, a fact which is a striking tribute to the cultural traditions of this comparatively small community.

Northampton has been the cradle of many outstanding Americans throughout the years. It has produced 1 President of the United States, 1 Vice President, and a grandson of a Northampton citizen became Vice

President. Four members of Presidential Cabinets, 4 United States Senators, 3 Congressmen, 2 Governors of the Commonwealth, and 9 attorneys who were appointed to either the supreme or superior court were all residents of Northampton.

Calvin Coolidge was 29th Vice President and 30th President of the United States. Franklin Pierce, 14th President of the country, received his legal education in Northampton at a law school established by Judge Samuel Howe and Senator Elijah H. Mills. Aaron Burr, the third Vice President of the United States, was a grandson of the Reverend Jonathan Edwards, a noted preacher of Northampton.

The four United States Senators from Northampton were Caleb Strong, Eli P. Ashmun, Elijah H. Mills, and Isaac Bates.

Elijah H. Mills, Isaac C. Bates, and Charles Delano were Congressmen from Northampton to the United States House of Representatives.

Caleb Strong served as Governor of Massachusetts for 12 years—from 1800 to 1807 and again from 1812 to 1816. Calvin Coolidge served both as Lieutenant Governor and Governor of the Commonwealth.

The Marquis de Lafayette, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Jenny Lind, Oliver Wendell Holmes, William Lloyd Garrison, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Horace Greely, Wendell Phillips, P. T. Barnum—to mention only a few—were among the many distinguished visitors to Northampton. President McKinley visited the city in the early 1900's.

The U. S. S. *Northampton*, now on active duty, is the second cruiser to be named for this Massachusetts community.

I believe it very fitting that the tercentenary of this fine Massachusetts city should be commemorated by the 50-cent pieces which are authorized in S. 987.

STRANGE IMMUNITY FROM PROSECUTION OF FRANK CAMMARATA

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have called the attention of the Senate to the strange immunity from prosecution which certain members of the underworld had under the previous regime of the Treasury Department.

Among those enjoying this special protection were such notorious characters as Frank Costello, Ralph Capone, the members of their gangs, along with many others of the country's most dangerous criminals.

The record, as documented at that time, plainly showed that these gangsters were not being made to pay their taxes, nor was there any serious attempt being made to prosecute them. Their criminal cases were pigeonholed and their tax liabilities settled for an insignificant fraction of the assessment.

Today I shall outline another case which, if possible, is an even more disgusting example of gangster coddling.

In this instance the racketeer was caught in a clear-cut violation of our Federal income-tax laws. For a period of 7 years, 1939 to 1946, he admitted having willfully failed either to file his returns or to pay any Federal income tax.

This case, involving Frank Cammarata, alias Sam Commarata, alias Sam Morecia, alias Frank Camarati, FBI No. 9739, was reported to the Treasury Department, and their attention was called to the fact that the individual involved was a dangerous criminal.

Upon receiving this information the Treasury Department ordered an investigation, and the agents' report confirmed the fact that Frank Cammarata did willfully fail to pay any income taxes for the period 1939 to 1946.

What happened? He was allowed to file belated tax returns for the 7 years involved. His case was dropped and there is no record of any effort being made to bring criminal prosecution against this notorious racketeer. Furthermore, as of today there is no criminal action pending by the Treasury Department.

There are, however, two civil cases in the Tax Court against Frank Cammarata for the years 1949 and 1950 in the amounts of $5,916.64 and $3,334.68, respectively, but still no evidence of any criminal prosecution. The fact that these two civil cases are pending merely shows that even after having successfully fixed his tax obligations for the 1939–46 period he still did not recognize his responsibility to pay taxes as is required of the average American citizen.

Of course, that attitude is easily understood in the light of his past experience with the Treasury Department.

The following is a chronological record of this case, along with a background of the racketeer involved.

The police files show that Frank Cammarata's operations extended throughout several Midwestern States, centering principally in the Michigan area.

Frank Cammarata, in addition to having a rather notorious criminal record of his own, is also listed in the police files of Youngstown, Ohio, as being a brother-in-law of the notorious Pete Licavoli, the reputed head of the Detroit Purple Gang. The police record of his brother-in-law contains 3 charges of armed robbery, 2 involving kidnapping, and 3 charges of murder.

Frank Cammarata was also charged with illegal entry into this country.

He was convicted of bank robbery in Detroit in 1931 and was sentenced to 15 to 30 years in the Michigan State Penitentiary.

The Bureau of Immigration then took cognizance of the fact that Frank Cammarata was not a desirable American citizen and deportation proceedings were instituted. He was paroled December 16, 1936, by the Michigan authorities for the purpose of being deported back to Sicily.

In 1946 the Immigration authorities discovered that shortly after his deportation, Frank Cammarata had, some time during 1939, been smuggled back into this country and that he had been hiding out in Ohio.

The Michigan State authorities sought to have Mr. Cammarata brought back to that State as a parole violator to serve the remainder of his sentence. The Immigration Bureau likewise brought charges of illegal entry against this racketeer and again asked for his deportation as an undesirable alien.

The efforts of the Immigration Bureau to deport this criminal were blocked, however, by the introduction in Congress of three different bills, the purpose of which was to delay deportation proceedings and to give protection to Frank Cammarata.

Those three private bills were as follows: H. R. 6286, introduced April 20, 1948; S. 2587, introduced April 30, 1948; H. R. 3890, introduced March 29, 1949.

Thus we find at this point the following situation:

The State of Michigan was attempting to have Frank Cammarata brought back from Ohio for the purpose of serving the remainder of his sentence as a parole violator. This action by the Michigan authorities was being contested and delayed in the Ohio courts by Mr. Cammarata. The Immigration authorities had been stopped in their effort to deport this undesirable character by the introduction of the three private bills referred to above.

It was at this point that the Treasury Department moved in.

An investigation soon developed the fact that during the interval between 1939, the date when Frank Cammarata was smuggled back into this country, until his discovery by the Immigration authorities in 1946 he had failed either to pay or to file any income-tax reports.

It should be noted that the failure of a racketeer to file proper income tax returns has always been considered as one medium whereby the Federal authorities could prosecute these undesirable characters. However, in this instance rather than take advantage of an opportunity to remove this man from decent society, the Treasury Department allowed this gangster to file belated tax returns for each of the years involved and dropped all efforts for prosecution.

Just who in the Treasury Department is responsible for this extreme leniency to another racketeer is a question which thus far I have been unable to obtain; however, it is one to which the American people should be given an answer.

I have been advised by the Treasury Department that due to the fact that I do not have any official committee status, section 55 would preclude their giving me information regarding this member of the underworld.

I do find, however, that the Michigan State authorities on July 2, 1953, were finally successful in their effort to have Mr. Cammarata brought back to Michigan where he is presently serving the remainder of his previous term. However, it should be noted that Frank Cammarata is in jail today in spite of and not as the result of any action taken by the United States authorities.

Thus far I have been unable to find any explanation whatever for the reason that the Treasury Department in 1948 deliberately gave this whitewash to the 8-year tax delinquency of a notorious criminal, particularly when that racketeer was during the period involved living in our country illegally.

I do know this much, however, such leniency was not extended by the same authorities to the average American citizen.

I have been advised that the Department of Justice now has an outstanding deportation warrant lodged with the Michigan authorities as a detainer to be executed at the time Frank Cammarata is released from prison.

I know of no better way to express my opinion of the Treasury Department's handling of this case than to quote Mr. Edward J. Allen, former chief of police, Youngstown, Ohio:

It would be interesting to learn how such a character who has shown nothing but contempt for our laws, and is himself an alien, can flout the income tax laws for so many years and then get it "fixed up."

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, Frank Cammarata's criminal record.

There being no objection, the record was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRIMINAL RECORD OF FRANK CAMMARATA (FBI, No. 9739) AS COMPILED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

February 13, 1921,[1] Detroit, Mich., disorderly person; discharged.

November 29, 1922, Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged .

September 23, 1923,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, not armed; discharged.

February 10, 1924,[1] Detroit, Mich., disorderly person; no disposition.

March 10, 1924,[1] Hamtramck, Mich., disorderly person; no disposition.

April 14, 1924,[1] Detroit, Mich., disorderly person; discharged.

May 6, 1924,[1] Detroit, Mich., investigation; discharged.

November 7, 1924, Rochester, N. Y., investigation; released.

November 7, 1924,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; forfeited bond.

March 22, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., violation Drug Act; turned over to Department of Justice.

March 30, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

April 26, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., violation Dyer Act; discharged.

June 15, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

June 15, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., violation of Dyer Act.

August 29, 1925, St. Louis, Mo., concealed weapon; discharged.

August 29, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

October 6, 1925,[1] Detroit, Mich., carrying offensive weapons; discharged.

May 24, 1926,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

March 31, 1927,[1] Detroit, Mich., robbery, armed; discharged.

May 15, 1927,[1] Detroit, Mich., disturbing the peace; $5 or 10 days.

August 8, 1927, Windsor, Ontario, possession of offensive weapons; 3 years; served 30 months.

May 19, 1930, Watertown, N. Y., violation National Motor Vehicle Act; turned over to Detroit court, Detroit, Mich.

February 26, 1931, Jackson, Mich., robbery, armed; 15 to 30 years.

December 15, 1950, Youngstown, Ohio, violation of parole.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask a question of the senior Senator from Delaware.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Delaware stated a few moments ago that he was unable to get a report on Frank Cammarata from the Treasury Department because the Senator is not a member of a committee. Frankly, I do not understand the situation. I always understood that any Member of the Senate could at any time write to any member of the Cabinet and get a reply.

I should like to inquire what the situation is in this case and why the Senator cannot get a reply with reference to this particular racketeer case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that I can get a reply from the Treasury Department, but as to getting certain information I had asked for I cannot get it. I should like to read to the Senator from North Dakota excerpts from a letter which I received from the Treasury Department with reference to the case. I had asked certain questions, such as who had settled the case, what the procedure was, the amount of tax delinquency, as well as terms of settlement. I quote from the reply which I received from the Treasury Department:

Specifically, we can tell you, in response to your first question, that Cammarata did fail to file income-tax returns for the period you mentioned.

The letter goes on to say:

An investigation covering most of the years you mentioned was made in 1948. We are securing additional details about the case from our field office. As soon as we receive this information, we will be in a position to reply more fully to some of your remaining questions. To what extent we can furnish you with information as to how the case was finally adjusted and settled, and the amounts involved, cannot be definitely stated at this time since section 55 will have some pertinence with respect to this type of data.

I may say further to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that it is the typical situation which a Senator encounters when he does not enjoy official committee status. That was the reason I had asked for a special subcommittee, so that I could follow through on these cases. The complete answer should be obtained and given to the American people.

However, it has been definitely established that Cammarata did not file tax returns, for the period indicated. He was not prosecuted.

[1] These arrests are unsupported by fingerprints in the Department of Justice files.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES TO COMMEMORATE THE TERCENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 719, S. 2474, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the founding of the city of New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the founding of the city of New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I hope the bill pending before the Senate will be passed. This year New York City will celebrate the 300th anniversary of its founding. A committee composed of distinguished citizens of New York has been appointed to conduct the anniversary celebration in a manner consistent with the dignity and stature of the great city. The event will serve to demonstrate to the people of our country and peoples abroad the tremendous importance of New York City both in domestic and foreign affairs.

I wish to point out that the passage of the bill will cause no substantial expense to the United States. The bill definitely provides that the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage shall not be borne by the United States, and that such coins shall be issued only upon payment of the face value of the coins by the committee which is in charge of the celebration.

New York City is not only the largest city in the State of the New York but is also the oldest. It is certainly the largest city in the United States, and, with the possible exception of London, the largest city in the world.

New York City has for three centuries played a very prominent part in the history of our country. It has been a Dutch city, a British city, and for the past 180 years an American city. It has been active in industry and commerce and in the cultural, educational, and spiritual life of the Nation. The issuance of the special coinage is a small but very appropriate recognition of the great part which New York City has played in the life of our Nation and of the free world.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is not on the floor. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the senior Senator from New York is a cosponsor of the bill, and that he filed the report of the subcommittee, of which I was the chairman, and he also filed the report of the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 724) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill authorizes the Director of the Mint, in commemoration of the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York, to coin not to exceed 5 million silver 50-cent pieces. However, the initial number of such pieces to be coined would not be less than 200,000, which is slightly less than 1 week's production of coins on 1 press and is sufficiently large that it precludes the issue from acquiring an artificial-scarcity value.

Your committee wishes to emphasize that provision is made in the bill that the expense of making the models for master dies

or other preparation for their coinage shall not be borne by the United States.

The Treasury Department is authorized to issue to the Committee for New York City's Three Hundredth Anniversary Celebration the commemorative coins upon payment of the face value of such coins. The coins are to be issued in such numbers and at such times as shall be requested by the above-mentioned committee. The committee is, of course, a nonprofit organization, and any proceeds from the sale of the coin above par shall be used only for the purposes of participating in the tercentennial celebration of the foundation of the city of New York.

Your committee is fully aware that the Treasury Department for a number of years has consistently objected to the enactment of legislation authorizing the issuance of commemorative coins; and, while recognizing that there is much to be said for the objections which are raised to the policy of authorizing commemorative coins, it is your committee's considered judgment that exceptions should be made to the general policy when the event to be celebrated is, in the opinion of the Congress, of such magnitude and of such historical importance in the life of our country and its institutions that it deems the event should be commemorated.

The possible small additional cost to the United States in the issuance of the commemorative coin which this bill authorizes and which from time to time the Congress may authorize is, in your committee's opinion, far outweighed by the benefits that redound us as a people and a Nation. Our history, our traditions, our institutions are historic benchmarks in the development of the Nation, and their commemoration is symbolic of the spiritual and political development of the Nation, and they help as does our flag, to instill in the minds of our people that patriotic and spiritual fervor, without which we as a Nation cannot survive. We must be just as vigilant—in fact, more vigilant—about maintaining and encouraging the spiritual resources of the Nation as we are about the preservation and development of our physical and economic resources. The material resources of a nation can be dissipated or destroyed; the spirit, tradition, and sacred history of a nation, if reasonably protected and developed, will not only never die but will serve also to make it strong physically and economically.

With this in mind, your committee believes that the foundation of the city of New York is of such genuine national and historical interest that it is fitting and proper that a coin be issued in commemoration of the 300th anniversary.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

When Peter Stuyvesant and his council in 1653 proclaimed a grant of municipal government, placing city affairs in charge of 2 burgomasters (mayors), 5 schepens (councilmen), and a "shout" (prosecutor), western democracy was born in America. That municipal council was the first democratic institution on this continent. It, therefore, is your committee's belief that the celebration of the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York exceeds the boundaries of New York City.

In fact, the celebration of the foundation of the city of New York is of international importance. In 1783 negotiations started between the Dutch and the Continental Congress, which led to a loan of 5 million guilders for what is now the city of New York. It was in the city of New York that a farmer by the name of Klaes Martensen van Roosevelt arrived in the year 1650. He became the common ancestor of seven Presidents of the United States—James Madison, Martin Van Buren, Zachary Taylor, Ulysses S. Grant, William H. Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The city of New York, thus, historically and today is truly one of the first cities, not only of the State of New York but of the United States. It is our largest city, and its size, its importance, its tremendous development, and, to a very large extent, its history is dependent and inextricably tied to the history and development of our Nation.

It is therefore fitting that the 300th anniversary of the foundation of this great city be commemorated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the foundation of the city of New York, there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 5 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the initial number of such pieces shall not be less than 200,000: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the Committee for New York City's Three Hundredth Anniversary Celebration.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by banks or trust companies selected by the Committee for New York City's Three Hundredth Anniversary Celebration, and all proceeds therefrom shall be used for the purposes of such committee in connection with the observance of said tercentennial.

SEC. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for security of the coin; or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

SEC. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued in such numbers, and at such times as shall be requested by the Committee for New York City's Three Hundredth Anniversary Celebration and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins: *Provided*, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of the 2-year period immediately following the enactment of this act.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DR. JOHN ZIGBDIS, MEMBER OF THE GREEK PARLIAMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. SMATHERS] and myself, I am happy to announce to the Senate that we have as a guest in the Senate Chamber, Dr. John Zigbdis, a member of the Greek Parliament for 4 years, and formerly Minister of Industry in the Greek Cabinet.

I am sure that our colleagues are happy to welcome Dr. Zigbdis as a representative of a courageous and friendly nation, and I hope as many Members as can do so will come and greet him. [Applause.]

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it had been my intention to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 730, H. R. 1917, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; but, at the request of the minority, because both Senators from Louisiana are at present absent from the floor, I shall not move the consideration of the bill at this time. Instead, I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 831, S. 2643, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. However, as soon as the Senators from Louisiana enter the Chamber, I shall ask that the agricultural bill be temporarily laid aside so that the Senate may extend the same courtesy to the Senators from Louisiana with respect to the coinage bill which was extended to the other Senators with reference to the other coinage bills.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 831, Senate bill 2643, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the cotton-acreage proposal contained in the bill does not alter the permanent legislation which is now on the statute books. All through the bill, as it comes before the Senate, an effort is made to provide temporary legislation for the 1954 growing season. If, subsequently, it is desired to make changes, that can be done after hearings have been held and an opportunity given to all persons to be heard upon it. That is why a great many things which might have been considered in the bill have been postponed for subsequent action.

It is extremely important that the cotton farmers know what their allocations for 1954 are going to be sufficiently early

so that they may make their plans for their planting.

The planting season for cotton varies greatly among the States now receiving quotas under the law. There are States where the planting will start early in February or probably late in January. There are other States which do not need to know their quotas until perhaps March or April, but, nonetheless, if the bill is to pass, it should be passed immediately and the Secretary of Agriculture, at the earliest possible moment, should give to the States an opportunity to know what their quotas are going to be.

The bill does 3 or 4 things. It starts by providing that the acreage allotment, which is at present restricted to a sufficient number of acres to produce 10 million bales of cotton, which the Secretary of Agriculture has determined to be 17,910,000 acres, may be increased to a minimum of 21 million acres. That is the first temporary relief which the bill provides.

I may say that that temporary relief is based upon the fact that the present acreage is somewhere in the neighborhood of 26 million. It might normally come down to 18 million acres if the 10-million-bale limitation should be enforced, and this bill is a halfway step toward what the final limitation would be. It gives the farmer 2 years in which to adjust, rather than a single year, and for that reason seems to be desirable.

While the bill does not exactly follow the recommendations the Secretary of Agriculture announced some time ago, it does come to about the same figure, because he said he would make a recommendation that acreage be increased to 21 million acres, once the first step had been taken.

Then the bill contains a provision for some hardship acreage, which runs to a total of 315,000 acres. One-half of that has been allotted to the States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and one-half to the other States, excluding those which receive minimum allotments under the so-called minimum production plan. For example, the State of Nevada gets a minimum allotment, which is not necessarily taken care of by this special arrangement.

There is an additional provision that the acreage of no State shall be cut more than 34 percent. That applies specifically and only to the State of Arizona and California. Since those States have an irrigated cotton situation, it is extremely difficult to cut back the acreage very rapidly. Farmers, perhaps realizing that there were no quotas last year, went ahead and planted to cotton a rather large number of acres during 1953. Some of that acreage is within old, well-established areas that would get quotas, but when farmers have gone to the expense of installing pumps and various other appliances required for cotton farming on irrigated land, it is extremely difficult to cut back quotas suddenly, though it was felt that it may be possible gradually to take care of this situation. So there is special consideration given to those two States for the year 1954 only.

I say special consideration is accorded to those two States for the year 1954 only, because by 1955, the quota which may be established for 1955 will take into consideration the very high plantings in the States of Arizona and California. It is my belief, and I am certain it is the belief of others, that after 1954 the California and Arizona situations will be taken care of by the history which those States have.

The allotments are made to the other States on the basis of their history for the last 5 years. Taking into consideration 1951, 1952, and 1953, those States would be given this year a great deal more acreage for cotton than they would otherwise be entitled to receive. This temporary adjustment is to be for the sake of those States for this 1 year.

Those are the three main provisions as they relate to cotton. Undoubtedly there will be questions raised with respect to those provisions.

Two subsequent items are covered in the bill, which I desire to mention briefly before returning to the main items of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I desire to report a committee amendment to the bill. The amendment is offered by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, section 2 also contains a provision which relates to cotton. It is in rather general terms, but is confined to a given area and to cotton only. It relates to a situation where a major flood control reservoir has been constructed. Obviously, it would not be fair to cover by reservoir such a cotton-producing area which had brought a cotton-producing history to the State, and which could be used subsequently for that purpose, and not allow land somewhere else to be utilized for the production of cotton. So section 2 is simply an amendment to the law so as to permit that to be done.

In section 3 there is a complete change in what is covered by section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Whenever, after investigation, it is determined that a substantial difference exists between the usage and the marketing outlets of certain kinds of wheat, the Secretary may authorize expansion of the acreage devoted to such wheat. That is illustrated by the situation with relation to durum wheat.

Durum wheat is produced in three States only, namely, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota. But actually the growing of durum wheat is almost entirely confined to the State of North Dakota. The acreage in both Minnesota and South Dakota is small. At present, there is not sufficient durum wheat produced in the United States to take care of the market needs. Manufacturers of macaroni and products of that nature need and require the production of durum wheat. Present limitations are such that not enough durum wheat is being produced, and the price of such wheat is considerably above support limits and the market price of other types of wheat.

We would be placing ourselves in a ridiculous position if, when there is already a scarcity of durum wheat, we should continue to clamp down on durum-wheat acreage and impose restrictions that would make it impossible to grow even the small quantity now produced.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from New Mexico yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from New Mexico has made a very fine statement for the wheat amendment. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to insert in the RECORD several telegrams and communications I have received from the Farm Bureau, the Farmers' Union, and other organizations and individuals on behalf of the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I should be very happy to have them placed in the RECORD; and the Senator from North Dakota may make any further statement he wishes to make on the subject. However, I am trying to assure the Senator that the provision I am now discussing relates to a local situation only, where, without the provision in the bill, we would be restricting the production of a commodity already in short supply. It would not help farm production generally to be doing that sort of thing. By the proposed amendment, we would be making it possible to increase the supply.

Mr. YOUNG. There is presently only a 40-percent supply of durum on hand to meet the requirements of macaroni makers.

At present, durum wheat is selling for about $4 a bushel, or double the amount good spring wheat is bringing. That is due almost entirely to a bad rust situation. Our present varieties of durum wheat are no longer resistant to a new type of rust known as 15B, and until we can find a new variety of rust-resistant durum, we shall have a hard time producing enough durum wheat to meet our domestic requirements. I think it would be most unfortunate to reduce the acreage of durum wheat now, when we ought to be increasing it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the material submitted by the Senator from North Dakota will be printed in the RECORD.

The material is as follows:

AMBER MILLING DIVISION,
FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., December 24, 1953.

To: M. W. Thatcher.
Re 1954 durum acreage.

The present durum supply is so inadequate it is necessary for the durum mills to grind a mixture of 50-percent durum and 50-percent hard wheats.

In spite of the short durum supply in the United States and in other countries, under

present law a further reduction in acreage will be forced in our North Dakota durum territory. We believe such a decrease in acreage is against the public interest, as well as against the interest of the durum producer. It is desirable to have a 1954 durum acreage of at least 3 million to 3,500,000 acres. To get this acreage, the present law must be amended. We believe this objective can be best reached by removing entirely restrictions on the acreage of durum in the main producing counties of Pembina, Cavalier, Towner, Rolette, Bottineau, Walsh, Ramsey, Benson, Pierce, Wells, Eddy, Foster, Nelson, Ransom, and Sargent, all in the State of North Dakota.

If this cannot be done, then each durum grower's allotment should be set at the highest acreage of durum wheat he planted in any one of the last 5 years, with the allotment in no case to be less than his 1953 durum acreage.

If neither of the above methods of relief can be put into effect, then each durum grower should have as his allotment his full average durum wheat acreage, but in no case should his allotment be less than his 1953 acreage.

If restrictions are not removed on durum acreage in the above mentioned counties, the durum acreage will probably be greatly reduced and that of hard wheat increased, because hard wheat is regarded as a surer crop. Hard wheat is in plentiful supply.

Any increase in durum acreage will result in a corresponding reduction in the acreage of hard wheat, barley and flax, all of which are in plentiful supply.

We believe that the removal of restrictions on durum will not result in a burdensome supply of durum, for the following reasons:

1. Without restrictions, the acreage of durum wheat has exceeded 3,500,000 acres only once in the last 15 years and then only slightly.

2. Durum is particularly susceptible to 15–B stem rust because of its longer growing season; therefore, many growers will not plant durum.

3. Durum wheat planted on summer fallow, especially fertilized summer fallow, has been hardest hit by rust. In 1954 more durum will be seeded on second year and unfertilized land, which will result in low yields unless the season is exceptionally favorable.

4. By the time another durum crop is harvested, the pipelines will be empty both as to durum and durum products.

5. There has been a steady increase in consumption of macaroni products made from durum wheat, both per capita, and in total tonnage.

6. There should be an export demand for at least 5 to 10 million bushels. Canada, in the past, has been the major supplier to the export market. The Canadian acreage has declined year after year, mainly because durum does not command a premium there.

7. There is a short world supply of durum. The Swiss Government recently issued regulations requiring the mixing of hard wheat with durum ground, to conserve their durum supplies.

Other wheats do not produce macaroni with quality equal to that made from durum. Even macaroni made from the 50–50 blend, while the best available, is of unsatisfactory quality. The short supply of durum has resulted in very high prices, and the cost of macaroni to the consumer is the highest in history. The public, therefore, is forced to pay high prices for food of unsatisfactory quality. This condition can be corrected only by an adequate supply of durum wheat.

Attached hereto are durum acreage and production statistics since 1940.

Yours very truly,

D. J. COOK.
JULE WAFER.

	Production	Harvested acres
	Millions of bushels	*Thousands*
1935–39 average	26.3	2,601
1940	32.3	3,029
1941	40.7	2,524
1942	41.3	2,109
1943	33.5	2,078
1944	29.7	2,057
1945	32.8	2,004
1946	35.8	2,453
1947	44.3	2,948
1948	44.7	3,187
1949	38.8	3,525
1950	37.2	2,829
1951	34.8	2,518
1952	21.4	2,153
1953	13.4	1,865

DURUM USE

Mill grind, 24 to 26 million bushels; cereal and other uses, 1 to 2 million bushels; seed, 3½ to 4 million bushels; export, 5 to 10 million bushels; total, 33½ to 42 million bushels.

PRICE SUPPORTS—EXCERPT FROM 1954 RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU

Since our 1953 platform was approved in November 1952, there have been no efforts made to introduce the factor of quality into the support program, to make realistic reductions in production of basics or to take any other realistic steps to put the support program in a sounder postion.

Therefore we urge Congress to enact extension of the amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949, providing for a minimum support of 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities.

We ask that this extension be for a period suitable in length to enable proper reduction of national wheat acreages and of other basic acreages where surpluses exist.

We will accept marketing quotas and acreage restrictions to accomplish this goal of matching production with demand.

With shrinkage of the present wheat surplus we ask Congress and the industry to work toward our common goal of full 100 percent of parity income in the marketplace.

In view of the present short supply of good amber durum for milling purposes, and the necessity of increasing that supply in order that the industry may continue to manufacture high quality durum wheat products such as the American consuming public demands, we, the members of the Towner County Crop Improvement Association, do propose that wheat acreage allotments for 1954 be increased by 30 percent for any durum grower who can produce evidence of having marketed amber durum during each of the past 3 years and will seed at least 70 percent of his wheat acres to amber durum in 1954.

TOWNER COUNTY CROP IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
R. E. PILE, *President.*

DURUM WHEAT—EXCERPT FROM 1954 RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU

Our own industry, particular to North Dakota, in which we supply the macaroni industry with durum wheat, is in serious trouble due to a combination of rust and drouth.

The trouble arises from an inability to supply the demand and this can result in a halt in the growth of macaroni consumption by the United States public. Efforts by the industry to use substitutes have failed.

Therefore we ask for prompt legislation by Congress to permit any farmer (with a previous durum history in 1951, 1952, or 1953) who plants 40 percent of his 1954 allotted wheat acres to durum, to be permitted to seed to durum additional acres to bring his total wheat and durum acres up to his total farm wheat base acreage.

This formula will apply to the 1954 crop year only and does not apply to red durum.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 8, 1954.*

Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly request your support amendment to cotton quota bill to include durum wheat which will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to exclude durum from acreage allotment. Present extreme shortage durum wheat harms consumers, processors, and producers. Acute durum wheat shortage certain to prevail for many years even without acreage restrictions.

F. PEAVEY HEFFELFINGER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 6, 1954.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The durum wheat industry is in a critical condition because of destructive stem rust epidemics during 3 of the last 4 crop seasons. Normal annual durum grind for domestic consumption in the United States requires 25 million bushels. My recent survey indicates less than 10 million bushels millable durum available after deducting 1954 seed requirements, purchases by puffers and other users. Macaroni products now made from durum wheat are an economical and important part of our national diet. Durum wheat is a specialized crop grown to produce a high quality specific product. Durum never should have been included with other wheats under the acreage allotment program for it is used for another purpose and does not compete with them on the market. In addition it is in short supply and apt to remain in that condition for some time, even if acreages of former growers were unrestricted. The reason is the lack of resistant varieties of durum to race 15B of stem rust. Consumers, processors, and producers are seriously affected by the present situation. We urge that you speed action to correct acreage allotment restriction on durum production in present durum area.

DONALD FLETCHER,
Secretary, Rust Prevention Association.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 6, 1954.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Durum is a specialty crop. The 1953 crop of 13 million bushels is not half enough to provide the consumers demand for macaroni products. There will be no carryover in 1954. The removal of durum acreage restriction for durum growers should help to increase the 1954 durum supplies.

HENRY O. PUTNAM,
Executive Secretary, Northwest Crop Improvement Association.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 6, 1954.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently need larger amounts durum wheat for milling for macaroni trade. Prior advent durum wheat into U. S. A. nearly all macaroni products were imported. Now domestic macaroni sales exceed $197 million annually. Must have durum wheat to protect this business. Urge no restrictions planting durum wheat by farmers with historical record of durum growing in prior years.

H. H. KING FLOUR MILLS, INC.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 5, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Endorse your effort secure durum exemption from acreage allotments provided confined to farms having recent durum acreage history and limited to average acreage on those farms seeded to durum since 1950. Closing market today No. 2 durum 58 to 59 pounds, 11 percent protein, $3.74. If heavy No. 1 amber durum available it would bring $4, and several cars 1952 durum have sold for over $4 during December. Production of 14 million bushels this year satisfies only 40 percent of present domestic demand. Durum acreage has receded for several years with result that 1953 seeded acreage at average yield 15 bushels would not have met demand. Adulteration of semolina flour with Farina has resulted distinctly inferior product. Strongly urge regulations be tailored permit North Dakota to produce requirements for this unique and easily identifiable wheat.

J. W. HAW.

PALATINE, ILL., *January 6, 1954.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Macaroni manufacturers and durum millers urge every consideration be given relaxation of wheat quotas on durum which is in very short supply. Your cooperation with Agriculture Committee will be most appreciated.

ROBERT M. GREEN,
Secretary, National Macaroni Manufacturers Association.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 7, 1954.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:

The durum milling industry is faced with a critical shortage of durum wheat. Our normal durum grind is 24 to 26 million bushels annually. Production of millable durum this year was less than half that amount. Carryover from previous crops was very small. There will be no carryover to next crop.

The semolina and durum flours ground from durum wheat are required by the manufacturers of macaroni and noodles for the manufacture of high-quality products. An adequate supply of durum wheat is necessary to maintain the quality of these important foods and to permit consumers to purchase them at reasonable prices.

Because 90 percent of all milling durum production is in the "durum triangle" of North Dakota, our industry and the macaroni industry and the American consumer are entirely dependent upon the farmers of that territory for durum supplies. Since durum wheat is in critically short supply rather than in a surplus position, durum wheat acreage in the durum triangle of North Dakota should be excluded from the acreage allotment program. We urge, in the interest of consumers, producers, and processors, that you seek exclusion of durum wheat from acreage allotment restrictions in the durum territory.

JULE M. WABER,
Chairman, Durum Committee, Millers' National Federation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree completely with the Senator from North Dakota. For that reason, although the committee tried to restrict the bill and to make it an emergency measure affecting cotton, we felt this matter ought to be dealt with now, so that the farmers, in planning their spring plantings, could make sure of large plantings of durum wheat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from New Mexico if it is true, even with the acreage of 21,315,000 acres which will be allowed under the bill, that it will result in the withdrawal from cultivation of about 4 million acres presently devoted to the production of cotton?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it will result in a reduction of about four or five million acres now planted in cotton. If the experience of the 1949 law can be used as a guide, it might result in a still further reduction in acreage. That is impossible to predict. However, Congress passed a law in 1949, and then subsequently amended it in 1950 to cover hardship cases. The hardship amendment would have permitted about 21,708,000 acres of cotton. I do not exactly guarantee that figure, but it is close. There was a planting of 21,600,000 acres of cotton. Actually, the farmers harvested only about 18 million acres of cotton, because of a great deal of so-called cutting back of cotton quotas, after several years when cotton had not been under quotas.

We do not have exactly the same situation at present, but we have very much the same situation. This allotment of 21,370,000 acres could result in the planting of perhaps only nineteen or twenty million acres of cotton.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may ask a further question of the Senator, are any restrictions placed in the bill on the uses to which the land thus withdrawn from the production of cotton will be devoted?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. There has been a great deal of discussion on that point, and suggestions have been made that a law should be passed strictly providing for the disposition of this acreage. That comes under the head of permanent legislation, and we would have been here a very long time if we had tried to enact such legislation.

A very fine farm organization, with which the Senator is familiar, has recommended that all acres diverted from the production of crops, such as wheat, corn, and cotton, that may be taken out of production because of acreage limitations, should not be allowed to be put into certain other types of crops, such as soybeans, in which the Senator's State is very much intersted. That farm organization has recommended that those acres be used to restore fertility to the soil; that the farmer be required to plant crops which will increase the fertility of the land and then plow those crops under. However, it would be a very drastic remedy to be prescribed until we can ascertain what it will mean State by State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not possible that in improving the condition of the cotton farmers by restriction of the acreage, with a consequent higher unit price than would otherwise be obtained, and a total higher gross income, nevertheless, by diverting acreage to other crops we would worsen conditions in other sections of the country?

Mr. ANDERSON. I say to the able Senator from Illinois that that always is a consideration which is present in these limitation-of-acreage bills. I will say, however, that when acreage limitations were put into effect in 1950 they did not result in the dislocation of all or any large segments of American agriculture.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The same reasoning would apply to wheat or corn, would it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The same question was not raised when the wheat bills were under discussion. The Senator did not raise the question then.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say that in the case of wheat and corn we had in mind the fact that a great deal of pasture land in States such as Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa had been ripped up during the war. The wheat and corn bills gave the farmers opportunity to put that land back into pasture. It is a fine soil conservation practice, but to encourage it is one thing and to require it is quite something else. Many times, while it is encouraged, there is no requirement to do it by proper legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I was not proposing any provision as to cotton which should not apply to other crops, but this is the first of the farm bills we are to consider, and we are going to have the same problem in connection with future farm bills, namely, what is to be done with the acreage which will be withdrawn from cultivation in supporting crops on which marketing quotas and acreage restrictions have been imposed? It seems to me it is important to settle this question from the beginning, rather than to make no limitations on certain crops, or to introduce a system for corn and wheat which is different from the system in the bills which provide for cotton.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to say, in reply, that we are all desirous of enacting appropriate temporary legislation which deals with the farm problem, but I do not think it is possible to answer, and I think we will get into serious trouble if we try to answer every one of these questions immediately and try to handle the complete farm program as a whole.

When the wheat acreage bill comes up, I shall be in favor of giving some temporary relief. I introduced some bills on the subject, and pointed out that it was not necessary to plant or harvest a single kernel of wheat in 1954 to take care of our domestic needs. The same thought applies to cotton and other crops. I am very much in favor of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry trying to work out a permanent program for handling acres diverted from excess crops, but I do not think the enactment of temporary legislation is the way to handle it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. If I may reply to the Senator from Illinois, he said we should adopt the proposed program as a beginning. This is not the beginning. We have passed a wheat bill which provided for acreage reduction, and under which acres diverted from wheat are already planted to oats, rye, barley, and other grain crops.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that in my opinion the question of dealing with diverted acreages is one of the most serious problems of the entire farm program, so serious that in the President's message on agriculture yesterday he called special attention to it, and indicated what the 25 million acres diverted this year from cotton and wheat should be planted to. I noticed that the President estimated that 3 million acres could be planted to soy beans, which would have a very definite effect on the State of Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very much so. Soy beans are an important crop in Illinois and we will be injured if erstwhile cotton acreage is turned to soy beans.

Mr. AIKEN. The acreage diverted from wheat undoubtedly will be planted to oats, barley, and a good many other similar crops, which will nullify the effect of acreage allotments on corn.

The situation is such that if we are to continue the practice of controlling acreage which can be planted to certain crops, we most certainly will have to find some means of controlling the acreage taken out of such crop production.

As the Senator from New Mexico has said, we would be engaged in discussion for a long time if we undertook to do that through a temporary relief measure; and the pending bill is a relief measure. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], as many of our colleagues know, comprise the subcommittee which has been working on the cotton-acreage problem for the last 8 or 9 months. They did not get anywhere with its last summer, and, as Senators recall, after Congress adjourned the rains came and several million more bales of cotton were produced than we expected there would be when Congress adjourned in August. The Senators from the other cotton-growing States, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], although he was not a member of the committee, have all worked diligently in an attempt to agree on as fair a bill as possible. No one claims the pending bill is a perfect measure. Any Senator from a cotton-growing State can find something to object to in it. He can probably point out something in the bill that is unfair to his State. But time is of the essence. What would result under the bill as a whole would be much better for the cotton growers than the situation was before the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and others undertook to do something about it.

In the main, the pending measure is a 1-year bill, and I hope it may be passed in such shape that it can become law and afford genuine relief to the hundreds of thousands of small cotton farmers in all the States where cotton is produced.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am happy he mentioned the very hard work done by both the senior and junior Senators from Mississippi, the Senator from Florida, the Senator from California, and the Senators from Texas. All these Senators have been trying hard to prepare a measure which can be passed and which will afford a degree of assistance at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the difficulties under which the committee has been working, and I, too, am grateful for their energy and devotion in seeking to meet the situation. But the question as to what should be done with the acreage taken out of cultivation is an extremely important one.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, if the Senator will wait a moment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I merely desire to answer the question of the Senator from Illinois, and to explain something along the line of his question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that if legislation such as that now proposed is not enacted, there will not only be a reduction to 21,600,000 or 21,700,000 bales, but there will be a reduction to 17,900,000 bales. In that event the Senator from Illinois would be complaining a great deal, I believe, about the diversion of so many acres—many more, I believe, than would be diverted under this particular amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, Mr. President; I wanted to say the same thing a moment ago to the Senator from Illinois. I was looking to the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from California; and I was realizing that if the original allocation made by the Secretary of Agriculture had gone into effect, the acreage in California would have dropped from approximately 1,406,000 acres to approximately 700,000; and the acreage in Arizona would have dropped from approximately 660,000 or 630,000 acres to approximately 300,000. Those 700,000 eliminated acres in California and 300,000 eliminated acres in Arizona consist of irrigated land that is extremely productive, could go into the production of other crops; and if that much of a change were made quickly, it would tend to destroy certain other segments of our agricultural economy.

For example, at one time the State of California had to reduce sharply its cotton acreage and go into the production of tomatoes; and as a result, for a long time the Department of Agriculture was purchasing great quantities of tomatoes.

Similarly, there could be an enormous increase in the production of potatoes, as occurred some time ago, and thus cause great difficulty to the potato producers of Maine, Idaho, and many other States.

So the problem is a very large one. We are trying to reduce it a little. However, it would be much worse to proceed in the way the Senator from Illinois suggested as the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from New Mexico is still proceeding?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If he will yield to me, let me say that what he and the Senator from South Carolina are saying is, "If we do not pass this bill, conditions will be worse."

Mr. ANDERSON. Exactly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the real question, however, is whether we cannot make this bill better by providing for a better use of the acreage which is taken out from the production of cotton.

I should like to suggest, for consideration at least, that there be included in the bill an amendment to provide that the acreage withdrawn from cultivation shall be devoted to soil-building purposes, whether by the planting of legumes which are nitrogen fixing or by devoting the acreage to pasturage, or by other methods.

I say very frankly that by means of this present measure we shall be establishing a precedent which may very well continue in other agricultural bills. If we withdraw 4 million acres from the production of cotton, and if later other acreages are withdrawn from the production of other crops, and if such withdrawn acreage is devoted to the growing of vegetables, or soybeans, or other crops, we shall merely be transferring the problem from one group of farmers to another group of farmers.

In view of the fact that the soil of the Nation needs to be built up, what objection is there to providing that the acreage thus withdrawn shall be devoted to soil-building purposes?

That is the proposal of the President in his farm message of yesterday. I think this would be an excellent time for us to evidence a little cooperation with the administration.

So I offer this amendment as one which is submitted in the hope, at least, that our friends across the aisle will rise to its support.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield further to me——

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to answer the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois by saying that we had to take into consideration a

great many of the small farmers. When we consider the fact that 39,145 farms in South Carolina plant less than 5 acres to cotton, and that in my State only 845 farms plant more than 99 acres to cotton, we realize that if all those farmers are forced to engage in soil-building practices and soil conservation or soil preservation instead of the growing of cotton, we would penalize and hurt very badly a great many of the small farmers.

Mr. DOUGLAS and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield briefly, first, to the Senator from Illinois; and then I shall yield to others of my colleagues.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would not object to a classification system which would provide that farms of less than a given number of acres should not be made subject to the amendment I suggest, but that in the case of farms of more than the given acreage the amendment would apply. It seems to me that the proposed amendment embodies a proposal which might well be considered.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield now to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to do so, I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for preserving and protecting the cotton acreage in Kansas. I notice that previously 88 acres in Kansas were planted to cotton, and that now we are to be allowed to have 80 acres planted to cotton. I thank the Senator very much. [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, Mr. President, the time may come when cotton will become an important crop in Kansas.

I yield now to the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement.

As a result of the allocations which were prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture under the present law, I believe it is the unanimous opinion of all individuals familiar with conditions in the States in the Cotton Belt and the Southwest that an emergency situation has been created, and that if the cotton production of those States is to receive any assistance whatsoever from this Congress, it is necessary that Congress pass a law in the nature of an emergency measure, and do so now. I believe it is agreed that we need to pass such a law now.

I do not think any comment need be made regarding the merits or demerits of the suggestion made by the able Senator from Illinois; but if it is true that there is an emergency—and I believe people generally concede that there is one—then we are faced with an emergency piece of proposed legislation which is in the nature of a compromise, and which should not be the vehicle for any such recommendations as those just made by the Senator from Illinois, no matter how potentially meritorious those recommendations may be.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to commend very strongly the subcommittee which has worked out this measure in the main, and which is entitled, I believe, to great credit. I should also like to invite the attention of all Senators present, including the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to the table on page 3 of the committee report, which shows, with reference to my own State, the highly critical condition now existing, and which must be corrected by early action or else not be corrected at all, because the planting in my State will have to take place within the next 3 or 4 weeks, at the latest.

My colleagues will note that the planting in the State of Florida—and while Florida is not a large factor in the cotton industry, yet, to each individual there who is engaged in producing cotton, it is a very important matter—last year was 71,000 acres, whereas the recent allocation or allotment made by the Secretary of Agriculture under existing law allows our State only 33,122 acres, or less than half the acreage planted last year.

If the remedial action proposed to be taken by means of this bill is not taken speedily, so far as we in Florida are concerned, there will be no purpose in taking it at all, because our cotton has to be planted within the next few weeks.

The second point I should like to make—and again, I hope the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is following this discussion—is that in the State of Florida, at least, most of the acreage of cotton is produced by tenant farmers, and it is generally produced on small acreage; frequently 3 or 4 or 5 acres will be the average planting. Both because it is a tenant-farmer operation and because it is such a small operation, it is obvious that any attempt to write on the floor legislation which would force conservation practices in that kind of situation would be bound to be hurtful, rather than helpful.

I desire to assure the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I join him in the feeling that the permanent legislation which should be enacted must deal with the important question he has mentioned. I felt so last year when we handled the emergency wheat problem, which, by the way, reduced the wheat acreage from 78,500,000 to 62,000,000; and that reduction was so great as to make it of vastly greater consequence than anything that is provided for in the measure now before the Senate.

But it would still seem obvious that without extensive hearings which would take into consideration the differences in soil and in conservation practices and the differences in landowner operations, tenant operations, and the like, it would be impossible to bring forth any sound legislative proposal in these fields.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois has made a very fine suggestion, in which I join him, with respect to a permanent program. I shall insist, with him, that something be done to make sure that when, under permanent legislation, we reduce an important acreage we shall not aggravate the problems of producers of other products.

Nevertheless, I hope that he will not insist upon any amendment to this bill, because, in the very nature of things, it is an emergency measure which must be passed at once. It could not be passed if it were to have added to it on the floor a poorly considered conservation-practice amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is much needed emergency legislation. In considering this question the committee tried to iron out the features which might stir up too much controversy, in order that, when the measure reached the floor of the Senate, it could be passed. We all realize that it is not perfect by any means.

It will be recalled that on December 15, 1953, the Secretary of Agriculture called for a vote upon acreage control. At that time in South Carolina 98 percent of the cotton farmers voted for it. They did so in the expectation that the Congress would make some adjustments in the legislation which are badly needed by the cotton farmers of my State. The same is true of the cotton farmers of other States.

Senate bill 2643 makes some adjustments, but they fit mainly the irrigation sections of the Western States. Furthermore, they take away a share of the cotton market from the farmers of my State and place it in the hands of giant cotton factories in States where per capita farm income is already among the highest in the Nation.

I went along with this bill in committee in the interest of harmony. However, it must not be considered as a precedent for legislating economic advantage from one area to another.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that of 90,811 farms with cotton allotments in 1950, 39,145 had 5 acres or less. Of 51,666 remaining, only 845 had allotments of 99 acres or more.

Mr. President, I believe it must be agreed that the 13,470 farms on which cotton was grown in California, New Mexico, and Arizona are faced with less drastic hardship from necessary cotton reduction than are the farmers of South Carolina, many of whom are finding it most difficult to keep going financially in the face of the increased prices which farmers must pay for the things they must buy.

There are several changes in the law which are not embodied in Senate bill 2643, but which are badly needed as the law affects the southeastern cotton growers. I shall not offer any amendments at this particular time, but I ask that they be printed in the RECORD. It is my understanding that they are embodied in House bill 6665, which passed the House of Representatives. They should be included before the pending legislation becomes law.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the various amendments to which I have referred. I do not ask that they be considered at this time, but I ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERMANENT-TYPE AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 344, AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, WHICH SHOULD BE ADDED TO SENATE BILL 2643

SEC. 5. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) The proviso in section 344 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1938 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and following: "or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship."

(Explanation: Sec. 344 (e) provides that not to exceed 10 percent of the State acreage allotment (15 percent in Oklahoma) may be set up in a State reserve. The use of this acreage is now limited to making adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage, abnormal conditions affecting plantings, or for small or new farms. By adding the words "to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardships," to this section, the State committee will then have the additional latitude needed to place acres where they can do the most good. As the law is now written, unless a farm falls in one of the specified categories, it is ineligible to receive help from the State reserve.)

(b) Section 344 (f) (3) is amended by striking out the colon before the word "provided" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding "or in making adjustments in farm acreage allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hardships."

(Explanation: Sec. 344 (f) (3) deals with use of the county reserve acreage. The proposed amendment would liberalize the use of such reserves, thereby helping to prevent hardships at the farm level.)

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, and beginning in 1955 and continuing therefrom, if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, or among farms in administrative areas, the county acreage allotment, or that of administrative areas, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted in any 1 of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm during such 3-year period. If the acreage allotment is apportioned among the farms of the county or administrative area, in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection may be used to make adjustments so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable to farms receiving allotments under this paragraph in relation to the factors set forth in paragraph (3).

(Explanation: This provision would give county committees the authority to select the method that will more nearly fit local conditions in distributing acreage from the county level to the farm. The law as now written provides that acreage will be distributed to farms on a percentage of cropland factor basis. This provision will allow the county committees, in 1955 and thereafter, to either distribute acreage allotments on either a percentage of cropland factor basis or an individual farm history basis. Senate bill 2643 makes this provision for 1954 only, however, so it is important that provision should be made for such an optional feature on a long-term basis. The individual farm history method of distributing acreage to the farm level will, in most instances, more nearly fit the needs of the Southeastern States. However, the percentage of cropland factor method more nearly fits the farm pattern in other areas. By giving county committeemen the authority to select the method of distribution, local requirements will more nearly be met.)

(d) In determining the national acreage allotment for cotton for 1955 and thereafter, the Secretary shall give due consideration to acreage normally underplanted and abandoned.

(Explanation: This provision will allow the Secretary of Agriculture to take into consideration normal rates of abandonment and underplantings in setting the level of allotment for any particular year. The present law, section 344 (a), states: "The national acreage allotment for cotton shall be that acreage, based upon the national average yield per acre of cotton for the 5 years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, required to make available from such crop an amount of cotton equal to the national marketing quota." Section 342 states that the national marketing quota shall not be less than 10 million bales or 1 million bales less than the estimated domestic consumption plus exports, whichever is smaller. For 1954, the marketing quota would therefore be 10 million bales. The 5-year rate of abandonment is 2½ percent. In 1953, the rate of abandonment was 3.7 percent. In 1950, the last year of allotments, underplantings amounted to nearly 15 percent. Had the Secretary been able to take these facts into consideration, he could have set a national allotment in the neighborhood of 19½ or 20 million acres. The Solicitor ruled, however, that the Secretary did not have the authority to take these facts into consideration.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing allocation of State acreage allotments for cotton under the provisions of Senate bill 2643. This table is a corrected copy of the table contained in the committee report, which failed to show Nevada's full allotment of 2,289 acres with the error of 289 acres being distributed to other States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proposed State allotments for 1954 upland cotton and related data

State	1952 planted acreage [1] (1)	1953 acreage in cultivation July 1 (2)	1954 State acreage allotments 17,910,448 (3)	State shares of national allotment of 21,000,000 acres [2] (4)	State adjustments on basis of 5-year average [3] 157,500 (5)	157,500 (6)	State acreage added by reason of 66 percent provision [4] (7)	State acreage added by reason of 15 percent provision (8)	Proposed State acreage allotments (9)
	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres	Acres
Alabama	1,605,000	1,630,000	1,139,121	1,335,690	10,711				1,346,401
Arizona	627,000	643,500	288,223	337,958		39,362	36,495		413,815
Arkansas	2,040,000	2,112,000	1,562,684	1,832,343	14,693				1,847,036
California	1,418,800	1,381,600	697,806	818,220		95,298	22,879		936,397
Florida	55,800	71,000	33,122	38,837	311			4,968	44,116
Georgia	1,479,900	1,387,000	1,005,862	1,179,436	9,458				1,188,894
Illinois	2,750	2,400	[5] 4,000	[5] 4,000					[5] 4,000
Kansas	35		[5] 80	[5] 80					[5] 80
Kentucky	10,500	10,500	9,136	10,713	86				10,799
Louisiana	900,000	954,000	634,906	744,466	5,970				750,436
Mississippi	2,435,000	2,554,000	1,759,641	2,063,288	16,545				2,079,833
Missouri	525,000	570,000	391,396	458,936	3,681				462,617
Nevada	1,950	2,000	[6] 2,289	[6] 2,289					2,289
New Mexico	288,000	301,200	167,243	196,102		22,840			218,942
North Carolina	765,000	781,000	528,638	619,860	4,971				624,831
Oklahoma	1,310,000	1,058,000	929,202	1,089,547	8,736				1,098,283
South Carolina	1,160,000	1,181,000	786,006	921,640	7,390				929,030
Tennessee	865,000	959,000	575,891	675,268	5,415				680,683
Texas	12,287,965	9,656,400	7,376,858	8,649,817	69,361				8,719,178
Virginia	27,000	30,000	18,344	21,510	172				21,682
United States	27,805,730	25,284,600	17,910,448	21,000,000	157,500	157,500	59,374	4,968	21,379,342

[1] Acreage in cultivation July 1, plus abandonment prior to July as estimated by the Crop Reporting Board, Agricultural Marketing Service.
[2] Apportioned to States on basis of acreages used in establishing allotments shown in col. (3).
[3] 157,500 acres apportioned to California, Arizona, and New Mexico on basis of their 5-year base one to the other. 157,500 acres apportioned to remaining States (except Nevada, Kansas, and Illinois) on basis of their 5-year base one to the other.
[4] Minimum State allotments, Public Law 272, 81st Cong.
[5] Acreage required to increase State acreage allotment to not less than 66 percent of the 1952 planted acreage.

Prepared by: Cotton Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, USDA.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I join in what the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has just said. This is an emergency bill. It should not and will not establish a precedent for the legislation of economic advantage from one section of the country to the other. I believe that the South—and I am frank to say that that is where my main interest lies—would receive a considerable advantage from this bill.

In the State of Mississippi there are 18 counties which did not have a sufficient cotton allotment to give the little 5-acre farmer the minimum allotment to which he was entitled. In 50 counties in the State of Mississippi there were a great many farmers whose cotton acreage was reduced 50, 60, 70, 80, or 90 percent. I know of one man, at one time editor of a farm publication, who in 1953 had 300 measured acres in cotton. His acreage allotment for 1954 was 40 acres. There are thousands of instances in the State similar to the case of a man at Utica, Miss., who had 280 acres in cotton last year, and received an acreage allotment of 67 acres for the next year. He would have to turn his tenants out. They have a right to make a living.

The purpose of the pending bill is fundamentally to remove such hardships and inequities, so that people can make a living in the production of cotton. The bill provides that the acreage shall go to the State on the basis of cotton producing history, and that the State committee shall have the first call on that acreage, to build up to 65 percent each farmer who has been reduced below that figure for the past 3 years of his average planting. I think it is a very wholesome measure.

In Mississippi we will get approximately 320,000 acres. It will require 150,000 acres to build up the allotments of farmers whose allotments have been reduced, to 65 percent of the average of their past 3 years planting.

Under the terms of the amendment submitted by my colleague [Mr. STENNIS] and myself, the next call on each State's additional acreage will be used to build up to 5 acres the allotment of the 5-acre farmer who did not secure sufficient acreage to give him the exemption to which the law declared he was entitled. In Mississippi that would require, roughly, 11,500 acres. In addition, there would be more than 100,000 acres for general distribution to the farmers of the State.

I think the bill would do a great amount of good. It would prevent the bankruptcy of thousands of farmers in the hill area of the State of Mississippi. While I do not go along with the idea of legislating economic advantage from one section of the country to the other, I was willing to support this proposal in order to relieve hardships in the case of thousands of growers in my own State.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Am I correct in understanding the distinguished Senator to say that under the increased allotment provided in the bill it would be possible, in the State of Mississippi, to give the farmers in the State sufficient additional acreage so that they would all have 65 percent of their 3-year average?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator not feel that there should be provision in the bill to do the same for other historic cotton producing States?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is a question of what has been learned from history. With respect to the State of Oklahoma, which is so ably represented in part by the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma, the figures show that last year Oklahoma harvested 993,000 acres of cotton. In 1954 Oklahoma gets an allotment of 1,098,000 acres of cotton.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware of the fact that, on the one hand, a part of it cannot be used, and, on the other hand, the State would have to have an additional allotment of approximately 25,000 acres over and above what it will receive under the terms of the bill, in order for the same situation to prevail in Oklahoma as my good friend has indicated will prevail in his State?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know the facts about Oklahoma; but I know that if there is an allotment, it can certainly be used. Oklahoma secures an allotment roughly 100,000 acres greater than the acreage on which it harvested cotton last year.

Mr. KERR. Of course the Senator is aware of the terrific drought in Oklahoma in 1953, which prevented the harvesting of many acres of cotton which had been allotted and planted.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I know about the drought. I also know there was a drought in Mississippi, and I believe there was a drought in most of the other Southern States. The point is, even though they all suffered droughts, all of them have taken terrific reductions. Nevertheless the Senator's State gets an increase of 100,000 acres.

Mr. KERR. I desire to express my appreciation to my good friend from Mississippi for his statement. I am happy that the great State of Mississippi is faring as well as it is under the bill, because I would be just as much interested in the State of Mississippi as I am in the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly we are also interested in the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. However, I have the feeling that there is just as much reason why the bill should contain a provision which would permit the farmers of Oklahoma to have the two-thirds of the 3-year average, as there is for the other States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Every State has earned its allotment on the basis of history. Every Southern State stands on the same footing. Mississippi earned its acreage by planting it.

Mr. KERR. I am not objecting to Mississippi's allotment. I am merely asking that Oklahoma be as well off as is Mississippi, on the basis of the individual farmer.

Mr. EASTLAND. Historically that is the case.

Mr. KERR. It might appear so from what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has stated and believes to be the fact. However, from the standpoint of the individual allotments which have been made to the farmers and which will be followed under the bill if enacted into law, it does not work out that way.

Mr. EASTLAND. There are three States which certainly should have no complaint under the bill. One of the States is Oklahoma. Another is Arkansas, which last year harvested 1,849,000 acres of cotton. Under the pending bill Arkansas would be allotted 1,847,000 acres, which is a reduction of 2,000 acres. The remaining State is Missouri, which last year harvested 494,000 acres. In 1954 it would get an allotment of 462,000 acres.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Mississippi taking the position that the allotment for this year is based solely upon the amount of acreage the farmers were able to harvest in 1953?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I am not taking that position. It is based on history. It is based on what the States earned under the formula contained in the pending bill. There is one exception. It is the provision that no State shall be reduced more than 34 percent.

Mr. KERR. I understand. However, there is a further provision contained in the bill which, as I understand, would give to the individual farmer an amount equal to two-thirds of his 3-year average.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; if the acreage for the State will justify it; that is, if the State has earned sufficient acreage to justify its being done. In such a case the gadget is effective.

Mr. KERR. My good friend from Mississippi bases his statement on the record of 1953, which was adversely affected by one of the worst droughts Oklahoma has experienced, instead of the 3-year average, which is the basis of the allocation to the individual farmer.

Mr. EASTLAND. If Oklahoma is entitled to more acreage under the formula, Mississippi is also entitled to more acreage, as is Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I shall offer an amendment which will give additional acreage to Mississippi and Oklahoma and Georgia and Alabama.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator does so, it will probably result in a veto of the bill. When we were meeting with representatives of the Department of Agriculture we were given to understand that the proposed agreement is one which the administration will approve.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the Senator's point of view, but so far as the Senator from Oklahoma is concerned, he shall try to have enacted a bill which will take care of the situation in Oklahoma, even though the bill may be vetoed by both California and the White House.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know anything about that; but I do know that Oklahoma fares as well under this bill as does any other Southern State.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to point out the fact that on July 1, 1953, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which is the only authority we have on the subject, Oklahoma had 1,158,000 acres of cotton in cultivation. Under this bill it gets 1,098,283 acres. Perhaps that is not as much acreage as Oklahoma would like to have, but it is fair and reasonable on the basis of what all the other States had.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. The junior Senator from Texas would like to associate him-

self with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the committee on the bill which they have brought to the Senate. At the same time I wish to state, as has been stated by the Senators from South Carolina and Mississippi, that there are some provisions in the bill which we in Texas do not like. We hope the conference committee can make some improvements in it relating to the distribution within States and counties. However, because it is an emergency measure, and because of the fact that it has added to the total allotment in our State approximately 1,300,000 acres, I believe it to be in the best interest of the Senate to enact the bill and then permit the matters in disagreement to be worked out in conference. The junior Senator from Texas will support the pending legislation, and he congratulates the committee on the fine work it has done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to say that I had hoped to mention the concluding sections of the bills and then to have statements by other Senators follow. It is difficult to yield back and forth during a discussion of the bill. However, I am glad to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to comment on one statement made by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. According to the report of the committee, on July 1 the acreage planted in Arkansas during 1953 was 2,112,000 acres. Under the bill the allotment to Arkansas would be 1,847,000 acres.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but Arkansas harvested 1,849,000 acres; as did Oklahoma.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] said with reference to our having suffered the misfortune of a severe drought. The Senator from Mississippi and other Senators have apparently made special dispensation for the benefit of the Far West. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico what the justification for it is. What is the justification for the two different gadgets in the bill, giving added acreage to his own State and to his neighbors, Arizona and California? In other words, why is not the bill based on the history of cotton production in all the States? Why did not the committee merely provide that the acreage which has been stated by the Secretary of Agriculture as being permitted—and there is some difference of opinion as to the interpretation—is hereby raised to 21 million acres, and the distribution would be followed upon the basis of history?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can give only my own answer to the Senator's question, and I shall not presume to speak for the States of Arizona and California. If the Secretary of Agriculture wishes to take Public Law 272, which was Senate bill 1962, as introduced by me in the Senate in 1949, and which became the law of the land, and will follow its provisions exactly in the 1954 growing season, I would support him, and so would the farmers in my State. It would mean a reduction in the production of cotton this year by approximately 2½ million bales, and would give an opportunity for quotas to be taken off by the end of 1955, and possibly by the end of 1954.

A strict application of that law would very substantially reduce the amount of cotton produced in a single year. The Western States expand very rapidly in their cotton production, because they have a very easy way of producing it. They have good, flat, level land and are able to use cottonpickers and four-row cultivators and many other devices, so that the acreage expands rapidly in those areas.

But it was felt that the reduction was too great. The Secretary of Agriculture went to the conference of southern Governors and said he would recommend that the national acreage be increased to approximately 21 million acres. We felt that a bill which took a recognition of the factor of growth in those western areas was not an improper bill. The original bill, introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], provided that no cut should be more than 25 percent. That matter went to a conference of cotton-producing States and an attempt was made to reach a compromise. It was not agreed to at Fort Worth, and it went before a meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, where a compromise was suggested that no cut would be more than 27½ percent. All but two States seemed well satisfied with the maximum of 27½ percent.

The percentage mentioned did not apply to New Mexico because it has reduced its acreage as the Secretary requested.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All the other States did that.

Mr. ANDERSON. There were efforts made to compromise it again, and a figure of 29½ percent was suggested. That was provided, I believe, in the House bill. The maximum cut that could be made in any State was 29½ percent. Here the maximum cut is 34 percent, which we thought was a very reasonable and fair adjustment of the situation.

All I say is that if the proposed legislation should be killed, no State would be allowed to produce more than the amount of cotton which is required to make 10 million bales. I think approximately 17 million acres is more than sufficient to produce 10 million bales. I have never questioned it, but if the national acreage were cut down to 17,910,000 acres only for 1954, my State would be highly pleased.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator apparently did not understand me. I was not making the point that it should not be 21 million acres, although I think there is doubt that that much is required. I am asking why California and Arizona are given special consideration. They are given a far greater participation than are the other States. I understood the Senator to intimate a moment ago that there were some special factors making it difficult to reduce acreage in California. I want the Senator to explain why. I do not understand why it is more difficult for California to reduce acreage than it is for Arkansas and Mississippi to reduce acreage.

Mr. ANDERSON. We are getting into questions that I did not think we would get into.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from New Mexico is the most knowledgeable man with reference to agriculture in the Senate. If he cannot answer my question, no one else can.

Mr. ANDERSON. A piece of land in California on which water has not previously been put can be irrigated so that cotton can be grown upon it. Cotton can be grown with an expenditure of 2½ acre-feet of water, whereas alfalfa may require 3 or 4 acre-feet of water. To cultivate alfalfa instead of cotton it is necessary to redesign the pumps, change the capacity of the concrete ditches, and change the rapidity with which the water flows across the land. The cultivation of alfalfa is entirely different from the cultivation of cotton.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With reference to cotton, the expenditures are made on a basis wholly different from those made in connection with some other crop.

Mr. ANDERSON. The situation in irrigated areas is wholly different from that in the rain belt. The question of the size of the pump is involved, where it should be installed, and how rapidly the water should flow down the ditches and onto the land. So it is a much more expensive proposition. It requires a very greatly increased initial investment. In the opinion of the farmers, it is a very hazardous thing. One of the reasons why I think the western farmers are entitled to special consideration is that if cotton quotas had been proclaimed for 1953 as the supply situation seemed to require, many of these investments would not have been made. They were made, and it is pretty serious to impair them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. As soon as I have concluded with the question asked by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That brings up a question which I think the Senate ought to know about. There is an implication from the Senator's remarks that there is hardship on the farmers, as he calls them. Is it not a fact that the largest operators in California and Arizona are not farmers in the sense of farmers in my State, but are huge corporations? Is it not a fact that a special tax dispensation was given to those corporations for the very purpose for which we are now proposing to reimburse them with extra acreage? Were they not given special tax dispensations, and is it not a fact that the Anderson, Clayton & Co. and its subsidiary, the Western Cotton Oil Co., have certificates of $15,791,000 for the purpose of recompensing them for at least a part of the expenditures which the Senator has mentioned? Is not that true?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is not true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is in the record, I believe.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not familiar with the situation except to the extent that I have been on the ranch in California which was purchased by the Anderson, Clayton & Co. I do not know anything about the tax amortization. The only tax amortization which they could get would be for the construction of gins or compresses to take care of the cotton production of all California farms, not only their own.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator tell me how many acres the Anderson-Clayton Co. and its subsidiaries have?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I cannot. At one time I saw a news story in California identifying me as a partner of Will Clayton. I am deeply regretful that that rumor is not correct. I do not know anything about their income. I only wish I had half of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not see the statement to which the Senator has referred, but I certainly had no intention of leaving any such impression. I have in my hand data which I believe to be correct and which I shall offer for the record a little later on, showing that there was not a single tax dispensation made in any State east of the Mississippi River; at least, not in my State. The only States given such special treatment were Arizona, New Mexico, California, and Texas. The certification was for a total amount of more than $30 million.

I am not making an attack on New Mexico. All I am trying to bring out is the fact that there is no reason to give special treatment to California and Arizona, which are the principal beneficiaries of this bill. I am not complaining about the 21 million acres. I see no justification at all for the special treatment. They were given special tax treatment for added expenditures they made. Not only were they compensated in that way, but we all know they have had extremely profitable operations during the past 3 years. We have only to look at the Anderson-Clayton stock on the stock exchange to see how it has gyrated.

In the State of California there are only 8,000 farmers who produce cotton, as compared with 100,000 in the State of Arkansas. Yet, as the figures clearly indicate, $30 million dispensations, $30 million tax certificates, were issued, and $15,791,000 were to this one great corporation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Every nickel of that is for amortization on cotton gins and cotton processing, and has nothing to do with the business of farming. Not a nickel of it went to a farmer in the State of California.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think farmers in the Arkansas delta would not agree that cotton ginning has nothing to do with cotton farming. I think the Senate ought to be told how many acres in the States receiving special consideration are going to the large corporations, because Congress legislates not simply for business. It must take into consideration all those who are engaged in this industry. If it is only a question of the amount of cotton which should be grown, I suppose we ought to abolish all the poor farmers in the South. But that has not been the purpose of such legislation in the past. I do not see any justification for the special acreage allotment to the 3 Western States which are involved in 2 of the gadgets in the pending bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not have the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Am I to understand the theory of the Senator from Arkansas to be that the normal economic development which has taken place in various areas of the country should be interfered with by Government action?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, indeed. The Senator from California completely misunderstands my point. My point is that a bill was agreed to by the people of the Senator's State and the people of other States, setting up a formula for the allocation of cotton planting. That was done in 1950, and it is proposed to do it again, but now it is desired to change the formula. I see no reason why it is necessary to change the formula. We have already had interference with normal cotton growing under the provisions of the old bill. All I am complaining about is that in so-called emergency legislation, which we have before us so suddenly, it is necessary to proceed to change the formula.

The only fair way to proceed is to use exactly the same basis for allocating acreage, in this case perhaps 21 million acres, as was provided in the previous law, on which our cotton-producing history was built. Now it is proposed to change the basis in so-called emergency legislation. I can see no justification for special treatment being given to 3 States, especially to 2 of those States. I agree that the State of New Mexico gets a very very small bite under this proposal. The greater part, of course, goes to Arizona and California. I do not see any reason for it. If there is economic justification, or any other justification under the basic history of the last 5 years, in due course those States will get the benefits for what they planted in 1953.

What is sought to be done by this bill is to step up the benefits and to give special privileges. I do not see the justification for it. Certainly there is no justification from a humanitarian point of view, the point of view of trying to help people. The principal beneficiaries obviously are huge corporations which have gone into those States, and, because of their tremendous financial capacity, have been able to bring this acreage up from under 600,000 acres in 1950 to 1,400,000 acres. Compare that with the acreage in the other States.

Who is it that is making the largest contribution to the tremendous surplus which is worrying everyone? It is the same States who are the beneficiaries of these special gadgets. I see no reason to grant special privilege to increase acreage for their benefit by the terms of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I presume the distinguished Senator from Arkansas knows that the State of California is taking a most substantial cut under the whole plan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not according to the historical basis, but only when we consider the production of last year, which is not the basis of the legislation on which we have been proceeding for several years. In other words, by this bill we are changing the basic rules.

Mr. ANDERSON. We are not changing a single basic rule. We are altering for 1954 only the pattern, but the basic law will remain the same. That is one thing we are trying to preserve.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In view of the question raised by the Senator from Arkansas, does not the Senator from New Mexico believe it would be a good idea to place in the RECORD at this point the letter addressed by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under date of December 14, 1953, setting forth the Secretary's reasons for believing an increase of 3 million acres planted in cotton would be highly desirable?

I may say further that the bill was written as it is because the committee believed that a reduction of more than 34 percent in cotton acreage in 1 year would be injurious to a number of States, and no less injurious to California, New Mexico, and Arizona than it would be to South Carolina, Arkansas, Texas, or any other State.

Speaking of special privilege, I may further point out that there was an area, including virtually all the State of Oklahoma, portions of the Panhandle of Texas, some of Arkansas, and possibly portions of New Mexico, although I do not believe there was much in New Mexico, where in 1951 there was a heavy abandonment of acreage of winter wheat, and thousands upon thousands of acres abandoned to wheat were planted to cotton. Now we come to a year when we have acreage allocations for both wheat and cotton. Certain areas are privileged to count the same acres twice in figuring their allotments for both wheat and cotton for this year. If we are going to do away with all special privilege, we should take care of such a situation as that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Am I to understand that the Secretary of Agriculture recommended a special privilege for California?

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry decided that 34 percent——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, no. The Senator from Vermont has a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture. Did the Secretary recommend a special privilege for California?

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I know, the Secretary of Agriculture has not recommended special privileges for anyone.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand why the committee has done so.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has not done so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the justification for the California allocation? I have not yet heard it.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has great regard for the economy of the entire country and for the producers of every commodity, wherever they may be located. Does the Senator from Arkansas believe that restricting cotton acreage reduction to 34 percent for any one area of the country is wrong?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. California was aware of the law, and agreed to it when it was passed, and California was given special tax dispensation for investments made in facilities there.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Arkansas advocate recommitting the bill and letting the law stand as it is? Why does not the Senator move to recommit the bill and let everyone go back to the present law if he likes it so well?

All the Senator needs to do is to move to recommit the bill, and he will have a law already in existence with which he is perfectly well satisfied.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that is an answer to my inquiry with respect to the justification of special acreage. If California is to take that attitude, I think the Senator from Arkansas is entitled to know what reasons motivated the committee to grant this privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Without objection, the request of the Senator from Vermont to have printed in the RECORD the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture is granted.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 14, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: On October 9, pursuant to provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, I announced a national cotton marketing quota of 10 million (500-pound gross weight) bales and a national cotton acreage allotment of 17,910,448 acres for the 1954 crop. I acted in accordance with the legislative provisions of the act and had no authority to adjust or change the quota level or the acreage allotment specified to produce cotton at the quota level.

On several recent occasions I have expressed my great concern over this severe production adjustment with its attendant hardship on many farmers, and in fact on the whole Cotton Belt economy. I have also publicly indicated that I would urge Congress to make a reasonable increase in the minimum national marketing quota specified in the act for the year 1954, so that the adjustment of cotton supplies could be spread out over 2 or more years instead of attempting to accomplish it within a single year.

The basic work in establishing individual farm cotton acreage allotments has proceeded to the point where it is abundantly clear that the currently announced national acreage allotment will result in grossly inequitable farm acreage allotments in many cases. If the allotments remain unchanged they will create undue hardship for many cotton farmers, as well as other segments of the cotton industry.

An appraisal of the program as developed to date indicates that an additional 3 million acres would make it possible to substantially correct the more serious inequities in individual farm acreage allotments, and to bring such allotments more nearly in line with plantings in recent years. A national allotment of this size, when adjusted for historical underplanting and normal abandonment, could be expected with average harvested yields of the past 5 years to produce about 10.5 million bales of cotton. A crop of this size should result in a material reduction in our cotton stocks. Thus, even with the proposed increase in the national allotment, a good start would be made toward adjusting cotton supplies.

I, therefore, desire to recommend to the Congress that action be taken at the earliest possible date to increase the 1954 cotton acreage allotment to 21 million acres, thus providing latitude for correcting individual farm hardship cases. I also recommend that this additional acreage be apportioned to farms in such a way as to correct substantially the more serious inequities in individual farm acreage allotments.

I have expressed regret that producers had not previously reached agreement on the apportionment of an increase in the national allotment, in order to facilitate the necessary action by Congress. While I have not had an opportunity to examine the proposal, I understand that representatives of major cotton producer groups have now reached general agreement on these questions. This is a very encouraging development and seems to be very much in accord with our thinking on the subject. The Department of Agriculture will support the provisions of such an agreement if it will lessen the hardship of severe acreage reductions, provide an equitable basis for the apportionment of the increased allotment among individual farms, and still provide for a reduction in total cotton supplies.

The Department is gathering detailed information on the currently authorized farm allotments. It expects to be in position by the time Congress reconvenes to recommend specific amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act which will carry out the broad policy recommendations made above.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, who has been seeking recognition.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in an effort to attempt to answer some of the questions propounded by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, I wish to state, with respect to Arizona, if the matter were left to what the Senator terms large cotton interests—and he has not mentioned all of them—those whom the Senator mentioned are not land owners; they are ginners.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator stating that they own no cotton-producing facilities?

Mr. GOLDWATER. They are not large owners of cotton-producing facilities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator place in the RECORD the number of acres they control?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not have that information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then how does the Senator know they are not large producers?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am attempting to answer the basic question of the Senator from Arkansas. If it were up to the people who are termed large cotton growers in the State, of whom there are substantial numbers, I agree they would be unanimously in favor of retaining the restriction of 17,900,000 acres, because if they should go through, as they would be able to do this year, with a low amount of cotton planting next year, it would bring a tidal wave of cotton in the Southwestern area, and in the next period of allocation the Southern States, and the Senator's own State, would suffer from it.

This action, of course, was asked and suggested by the Farm Bureau, and agreed to by the Senators and Representatives from the States of New Mexico, Arizona, California, and also Texas, because there are a large number of small planters in new producing areas of those States. Consider, for instance, the southwestern area of Arizona, under the project called the Welton-Mohawk, which came into being only last year. We need 22,000 acres of land available for cultivation this year.

We find in the southeastern section of Arizona, in Cochise County, a similar situation, where the cultivation of cotton has a history of only a year or two. Arizona, California, New Mexico, have had a history of growing cotton that extends back, in any substantial amount, only to about 1950. With the start of the war our country needed more cotton than the South and the State about which the Senator from Arkansas is concerned could produce, so the Government went and urged the farmers to the west in increase the planting of cotton.

Our land can produce cotton at remarkably low rates. In Texas it can be produced at 13½ cents a pound, in Arizona at 20 cents, which is substantially lower than it can be produced for elsewhere in the United States.

Eventually, no matter how we may word the law, no matter how much our distinguished friends from the South like it or dislike it, the production of cotton is going to move to the Southwest and the West because of the cheapness of production costs. Likewise, we in the West, who have been producing cattle are resigned to the fact that ultimately the rich States of the South will produce much of the cattle we have been producing in our section.

I merely desired to explain that this request for a small increase of acreage is on behalf of the little growers in Arizona and California.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Arkansas will not have any confusion in his mind as to what the bill would accomplish, and will realize that every dollar of money he is talking about relates to tax-amortization concessions made in order to bring gins and compresses into areas in the West.

The Anderson, Clayton & Co., as I recall the situation on the ranch referred to, grows cotton on about 20,000 acres out of 1,400,000 acres in the State of California. If the cotton acreage should be cut down greatly, as would be done under the existing law, Anderson-Clayton could stand it because it has many other sources of income. But the small farmers would be in trouble. I have met some of the farmers in California in the past few months—supplementing the remarks which the distinguished majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the junior

Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] have made—and I know that if the national quota is left at 10 million bales, as the present law requires, the large corporations that have one or two tracts are not going to worry about it, but the farmers who are in desperate need because they are small operators are going to be in great distress.

I do not believe there is a dollar in that list that the Senator from Arkansas referred to that ever went into the development of cotton acreage. The money that Anderson-Clayton paid was paid for a developed ranch, including 2,000 acres in melons, and that has nothing to do with ginning operations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, 58 of the gins of the Anderson, Clayton & Co. and the Western Cotton Oil Co. were, of course, granted accelerated amortization. Of a total of 133 for the States of California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, 58 were granted to Anderson-Clayton and its subsidiary, the Western Cotton Oil Co., which would indicate they have a very substantial acreage. I have tried to find out what the acreage is, but apparently that is a great secret. In my opinion, the committee ought to be able to tell the Senate just what the situation is.

I am leading up to the point that Senators keep talking about the small farmers in Arizona and California. Of course, there are small farmers in Arkansas, in Georgia, and everywhere else. Does the Senator know what the average acreage is per farmer or per voter in California?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, but it is very substantially larger.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is about four times as much; is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not try to give the figure, because I do not know it. But I point out that the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] brought out before the committee a few days ago that there were 18 counties in his State in which not a single farmer got more than the allotment. That would be unheard of in the West. In the State of California a man who wanted to operate 5 acres would be committed to an insane asylum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think 35 acres is the average in California, and 44 in Arizona. Senators come before us and base their case on the hardship imposed on various farmers. Of course, conditions are hard on everyone, but relatively how do Senators make a case for any special privileges to a State which has an average of 44 acres per voter as compared with a State with an average of 5 acres, as I believe the figure is in Mississippi? I think it is 12-plus, nearly 13, in Arkansas. That is a third or fourth as many.

If we are to take action based on concern for the individual, we can make a better case. We can ask special privileges in Arkansas. I am only opposing giving special privileges and dispensations to States which need them least of all. Based on the statistics and the figures which I read in the hearings, the last places which really need special privilege are California or Arizona. They have already the largest cotton acreage per person. As we have been told just now by the Senator from Arizona, they can produce cotton very economically. There is some question about that, incidentally. We have to evaluate how much the Federal Government has poured in. I would certainly file a caveat that they cannot produce it cheaper than it is produced in our good delta country, if the special privileges are equalized.

I am not trying to have taken away from the States anything that belongs to them according to the law under which we have been living for the past several years. The only thing I am asking is why they cannot live under the same law. I think they can. I think they are better off today per capita or in any other way; I know they are. I have not heard any justification in fact for a special privilege to these three States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, one of the factors in the consideration given Western States was that if we turn loose a million acres in California and Arizona of higher production land, and throw it into alfalfa, we can calculate pretty well what the alfalfa price will be across the country. If we throw it into potatoes, we know what would happen to the potato producers across this Nation. Large groups discussed this at Forth Worth and Chicago, and what we did was based on our desire to keep Arizona and California from entering into competition with the other States which are producing crops already near a surplus position.

I again wish to say that the whole story of the acreage in California owned by the large corporation would not be very difficult to obtain. Although I do not know the operations of Anderson, Clayton & Co. as well as I should, yet I feel reasonably safe in saying that Anderson, Clayton & Co. do not plant more than 20,000 acres of cotton in any State. In all the States put together, I believe the only large cotton plantation they have is the one in California; and I believe they bought it to keep that cotton from going to a rival gin.

I yield now to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first of all, as a new Senator I should like to tell my colleagues in the Senate how deeply appreciative I am of the cooperation of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who formed a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in discussing and working on this entire cotton question.

A year ago I introduced a piece of legislation at the request of the cotton growers in California. They were apprehensive that at the next planting the Secretary of Agriculture would announce an allotment which would restrict the acreage in California perhaps by as much as one-half. As a matter of fact, when the acreage allotments were made, the result was a cut of more than one-half in California.

At that time the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considered the proposed legislation I had introduced, but did not approve it.

Meanwhile, with cotton quotas being put into effect across the entire cotton belt, the Secretary of Agriculture requested emergency legislation at this session. I believe I can tell you, Mr. President, that one of my memories of the time I have spent in the Senate will be that of sitting in a subcommittee, listening to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and seeing them write what I am sure constitutes the best type of compromise legislation in a very difficult situation.

I listened to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] state a few moments ago that the cotton acreage in California was controlled by big business. I deny that, Mr. President.

I wish to indicate one figure which I believe will bear somewhat upon the subject. In 1950, when the Secretary of Agriculture proclaimed cotton quotas in the United States, 9,684 farms in California were given allotments. One thousand, two hundred and seventy-seven farms of that number represented allotments to cotton farms of 5 acres or less.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator from California tell the Senate how many acres Anderson, Clayton & Co. and its subsidiaries farm and control in California?

Mr. KUCHEL. I regret to state to the Senator from California that I do not have that particular statistic; but if he deems it relevant, I shall be glad to obtain it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do think it is relevant. I tried to obtain it from the Department of Agriculture, but no one there could supply it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me say that I do not believe it is a figure with which the Department of Agriculture concerns itself. The Department does not go around inquiring about the ownership of tracts of land.

But I believe that the Anderson-Clayton firm owns and controls approximately 38,000 acres of land of all kinds in California. Approximately 20,000 acres of it go into the production of cotton; about 2,000 acres of it normally go into the production of melons; and the rest in alfalfa. That was the pattern the last time I drove by the farm, and I believe it is the only farm owned by that company.

I have said that I know something of the reason which compelled that company to buy that farm.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does that include the Western Cotton Oil Co.?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when the allotments were made, acreage in California was cut more than one-half. I believe that represents a potential loss to the economy of California of between $150 million and $200 million.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. No, Mr. President; I prefer to conclude my very brief statement. I shall not speak very long.

I am sure it seemed to the subcommittee that it would not be proper to prepare a bill under which some States would suffer, as in the case of Arkansas, approximately 10 percent, whereas other States would suffer a vastly greater amount.

Finally, on the recommendation of the farmers of the United States, the subcommittee recommended that no State should be cut more than 34 percent. And that is what the bill before the Senate provides.

Only two States—namely, Arizona and California—would benefit by that provision. That is another way of saying that no State affected by the proposed legislation with which we deal today would have a cut of more than 34 percent in its cotton economy.

Mr. President, how else can we find a basis upon which to write a fair piece of legislation of this kind? If anyone were to object, if anyone were to offer amendments to this bill, it seems to me it should be either the Senators from Arizona or the Senators from California, the States that are cut 34 percent under this measure. Yet I am glad to say that the Senators from Arizona and the Senators from California are satisfied with what is a fair and just compromise, and will support it as a 1-year emergency stopgap bill. They hope that the amendments which will be offered on the floor will be rejected in their entirety.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield at this time for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a moment ago the senior Senator from Oklahoma attempted to ask me a question. I must confess that subsequently I forgot about it, and yielded to other Senators.

At this time I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a question, or I shall be glad to yield the floor, as he may prefer.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question or two.

I should like to say that I am seeking information. I tried to ask the Senator from Arizona a question, but he declined to yield. Then I tried to ask the Senator from California a question, but he declined to yield.

So I am very grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for yielding for a question or two.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KERR. In order that the RECORD may be clear as to the meaning of certain provisions of the bill, I should like to ask some questions relative to the release and reallocation of acreage, both as to the manner and as to the timing.

Beginning in line 20, on page 3 of the bill, we find the following:

(2) Any part of any 1954 farm cotton acreage allotment on which cotton will not be planted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotment to such farm and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable—

On a certain basis.

Does the Senator from New Mexico believe it is accurate to interpret that provision to mean that such voluntary surrender by one farmer to the county committee may be made at any time up to the end of planting time for that county?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I so interpret it; and I would call his attention to the fact that in 1950 an almost identical hardship provision was written into the bill then pending. Under its terms, several hundred thousand acres of cotton land were temporarily surrendered to the county committees, and were reallocated by the county committees to farms requiring additional acreage. No time limit was specified in the bill then; and for the sake of the legislative intent, let us say that no time limit is specified in this bill. It can be done any time by the individual farmer surrendering the acreage to the county committee; and it may be reallocated by the county committee at any time prior to planting.

Mr. KERR. To other farmers within the county.

Mr. ANDERSON. To other farmers in the county having allotments.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Reading further from page 4, beginning at line 5:

If all of the allotted acreage voluntarily surrendered is not needed in the county, the county committee may surrender the excess acreage to the State committee to be used for the same purposes as the State acreage reserve under subsection (e) of this section.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico if he would interpret that language to mean that the surrender of unused acreage back to the State by the counties, and the reallocation by the State to other counties within the State, would also be without time limit, in the year for which the allocation is made.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that that also is without time limit. A special provision was written into the 1949 act for the State of Oklahoma, because it had an unusual problem. The planting of cotton was shifting from one area of the State to another, as the distinguished Senator well knows. Had this provision been in the law at that time, it would not have been necessary to allow Oklahoma to have a special 15-percent reserve, because counties not using the acreage could have surrendered it, and it could have been used by the other counties. However, at that time this provision had not been thought of, and Oklahoma could not do that. Therefore it was necessary to give Oklahoma special consideration, because of the transfer of cotton production from one end of the State to the other.

It is the intention of this provision to make possible the very thing which was needed in Oklahoma at that time, and which, in my opinion, is needed in Texas now. I do not think the Senators from Texas agree with me completely as to how much could be transferred, but I think a fairly large acreage could be transferred there. No effort is made to establish any time limit whatever.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for his answer. I appreciate his tribute to the distinguished former Senator from Oklahoma who, in 1949, was a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I must say that in the opinion of the present senior Senator from Oklahoma, if we had a member on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in 1954, Oklahoma might come as near being a special beneficiary of the act as the senior Senator from Oklahoma thinks California is. I was addressing my questions to the meaning of the proposed legislation in 1954, which, as I understand, is applicable to all the States.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask one further question in that connection.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was not trying to say that Oklahoma received preferential treatment in 1949. It had a problem, and the Congress tried very hard to meet that problem by providing that Oklahoma might set aside a 15 percent reserve, as against a 10 percent reserve somewhere else, not as something which was preferential, but something which was required by the facts of life within that individual State.

Mr. KERR. As I recall, under that provision Oklahoma did not receive an additional allotment not participated in, on the basis of the historical background, by all other States.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator a further question. Would the Senator's interpretation as to the surrender by farmers within the county for reallocation within the county and also by counties back to the States, followed by reallocation by the State committee within the State, apply equally to all the cotton acreage allocated to the State, as well as to the additional acreage provided for in this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have my own opinion, and I am reinforced by the legislative counsel for the committee. My opinion is that it applies to all of it.

Mr. KERR. That is the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. ANDERSON. If we are in agreement on that point, we have almost fixed the legislative history.

Mr. KERR. I wanted to be sure that the RECORD disclosed that that was the interpretation of the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma that that was the intent of the committee.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that answer.

I should like to ask the Senator one further question, which does not relate to information about the bill.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma, in listening to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] a while ago, thought he understood the Senator from Arizona to say that the allocations in this bill were as requested and agreed to by the Farm Bureau Federation. Did the Senator from New Mexico hear that statement by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I heard the statement. I shall not try to interpret it.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. ANDERSON. As a matter of fact, many conferences have been held. There was a conference held at Fort Worth, which was sponsored, I believe, by the Farm Bureau Federation. There was a subsequent conference to which, for obvious reasons, I was not invited. It was not held by Farm Bureau groups, but by another group, who were trying to alter some things which some of us had planned. There was a subsequent meeting held in Chicago by the Farm Bureau Federation.

Many persons have tried their best to arrive at a solution for this problem. There was an approval of this particular method by the Farm Bureau Federation. I mention that fact because the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and I had some discussion on the subject, and we arrived at a formula not quite the same as that in the bill. Our formula did not include additional acreage for Arizona and California by limiting reductions to 34 percent. It is interesting to note that it was as a result of efforts by Members from Southern States that the decision to give additional acreage to California and Arizona was written into the act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand the Senator's statement. Does he mean to say that the idea of a special allotment for certain States originated with Members from the Southern States?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I say that when the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi, and I tried to reach an understanding, it was decided that there would be 21 million acres, plus the hardship allowance of 1½ percent. That decision was transmitted to a meeting in Chicago attended by Farm Bureau representatives from all the cotton-producing States. The States of Arizona and California were greatly outnumbered. The proposal now before the Senate, providing that there shall be no cut greater than 34 percent, came out of that meeting, in which, as I say, a great many Southern States were represented. I therefore feel that they were entirely satisfied with that proposal.

I should like to conclude my discussion with respect to section 4. Does the Senator from Arkansas have any questions as to that section?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to have any misapprehension left in the RECORD. I wish only to say that I do not believe that the cotton producers of my State feel that they agreed to the provision with respect to a special acreage for California. It is not my impression that they feel they agreed. I do not know whether the Senator is saying that in his opinion they agreed.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be happy to have the Senator correct me if my statement is not accurate. I think the decision of the Farm Bureau meeting in Chicago on this subject was unanimous. There was no conflicting opinion when they finally came to the settlement of it. Walter Randolph appeared before our committee as the representative of the Farm Bureau, and he voiced no objection to this provision. In fact, he supported it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He is not from my State.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. He is from Alabama, but he represented all the Farm Bureau organizations. I did not mean to go into that question. I meant only to say that there were Senators from Southern States on the committee. They tried to solve this problem in what they considered to be an equitable fashion.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. One point has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas which we have failed to clear up, and which I believe should be cleared up for the record. There is the possibility that his remarks with respect to tax amortization privileges might be construed as applying to the land. I should like to make it clear that they do not apply to the land. Tax amortization certificates have been issued to cotton ginners and oil processors in the West. In the East similar certificates have been issued applying to other phases of agriculture. I did not wish to leave any misapprehension in the RECORD.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas mentioned special privileges accorded to cotton growers of Arizona, California, and New Mexico. I did not want the tax amortization privileges to be included among them. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has visited Arizona repeatedly. He is one of the most welcome visitors we have. I am sure he refers to the special privilege our farmers enjoy because of the delightful sunshine, the fine weather, and the pleasant and industrious people who live in that State. I am sure he does not intend at all to allude to any special grants from the Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to finish with section 4 of the bill. Section 4 relates to the potato situation. In a joint resolution passed by Congress either in 1949 or 1950 provision was made that unless the potato growers adopted a system of controls they would not be eligible for price supports on potatoes. I must plead guilty to having drawn up the original amendment. It was offered by the former Senator from Illinois, Mr. Lucas. It was subsequently supported by many Senators, and I believe the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] finally introduced the successful joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New Mexico is mistaken in that regard. The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] introduced the joint resolution. He was joined in its introduction by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. ANDERSON. I apologize to the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. However, provision was made that price supports could not be given to the growers of potatoes. In presenting the joint resolution it was not the intention that the Secretary of Agriculture should not have the right to make use of section 32 funds. We never dreamed that could happen until an interpretation was made by the Department of Agriculture to the effect that the joint resolution forbade the use of section 32 funds. Therefore, the pending bill contains a provision making it possible to use section 32 funds for supporting the price of Irish potatoes.

Mr. KERR and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, inasmuch as my name has been mentioned, I am sure the Senator from New Mexico will recall that we tried to amend the law so as to leave discretionary power in the hands of the Secretary with respect to potatoes; but because of the insistence of the Senators from the potato-growing States that a mandatory provision should be enacted into law, the joint resolution referred to was finally adopted in the present form of the law. We would have readily agreed to discretionary power.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from New Mexico referred to section 32 funds. Can he tell the Senate how much money is available in that fund?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will be able to tell the Senator in a moment. I believe it is approximately $400 million.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator also able to refresh our memory as to the percentage of that fund which the law pertaining to it permits the Secretary to use with reference to any commodity which is available to be supported by such funds?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not certain, but I believe it is 25 percent.

Mr. KERR. Then under section 4 of the pending bill the Secretary of Agriculture would be permitted to use up to $100 million in supporting the price of Irish potatoes. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe that is correct. However, he would be restricted by the provision that he could buy only what he could readily dispose of.

Mr. KERR. Does the section provide how the Secretary of Agriculture may readily dispose of the potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I have the answer to the Senator's previous question. I have before me the Department of Agriculture handbook. It states that under section 32 the amount of money available is $402,200,000. My answer with respect to 25 percent is correct.

Mr. KERR. The bill contains the provision that in 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use $100,500,000 to support the price of Irish potatoes. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe theoretically he could do so. I do not believe that practically it could be done.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from New Mexico explain why the Secretary could not do so?

Mr. ANDERSON. Because I do not believe any Secretary of Agriculture would hold that he could buy $100 million worth of Irish potatoes and dispose of them advantageously.

Mr. KERR. But it would be within his legal authority to do so if the bill became law?

Mr. ANDERSON. If he should follow the criterion set up in the bill, it would be in his power to do so.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from New Mexico enlighten the Senate as to what part of a cotton-emergency measure section 4 is, inasmuch as it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to spend $100 million in 1954 to support the price of Irish potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is not a part of the cotton-emergency measure. The Senator is getting onto ground that probably we should not be entering. I suggested in committee the subject should be treated in a separate bill. On the other hand, the interpretation of the Department of Agriculture was obviously contrary to what Congress intended, so I agreed with others to put it in this bill. I firmly believe that the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority now to spend and can spend, up to $100 million. The Solicitor General does not agree with me. Realizing that he is a lawyer and I am not, I thought it would be desirable to correct the situation in the pending legislation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico admit that the proposed section 4 has nothing whatever to do with the emergency situation with reference to cotton acreage and cotton planting this year?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will admit it.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator feel, insofar as germaneness and applicability are concerned, that an amendment to the bill requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of beef cattle on the hoof at 90 percent would be just as much a part of the cotton-emergency bill as is the provision with reference to Irish potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I would not agree, because I believe in my own heart that Congress never intended to take away from the Secretary of Agriculture the right to use section 32 funds to support the price of Irish potatoes. I believe Congress did not intend to do it, and that the interpretation made by the Department of Agriculture is a little bit on the whimsical side, to say the least. I thought perhaps it was desirable, if the Secretary of Agriculture did not want to do it, to say that he did not have the authority. I believe he does have the authority.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma would like to aline himself with the Senator from New Mexico in acknowledging the possibility of whimsical action on the part of the Department of Agriculture as now constituted. However, I do not believe the Senator understood my question. If he understood it, I do not believe he answered it. I asked him, insofar as the provisions of law are concerned, whether it would not be just as applicable to amend the emergency cotton acreage allotment bill so as to provide mandatory provisions to support the price of beef cattle, as it is to authorize the expenditure of $100 million now on hand for the support of the price of Irish potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. I tried to answer it by saying that a proposal requiring the Secretary of Agriculture in mandatory fashion to support the price of beef cattle at 90 percent of parity in my opinion is quite different from a provision which permits him to do what I believe he already has the power to do.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator admit that such an amendment would be just as much in order as section 4 of the pending bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it would be in order; yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator permit me to make a brief statement on the background of the potato amendment?

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has asked that he be allowed to yield the floor. I am perfectly willing to yield to other Senators, but I should like to complete my statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from New Mexico would yield to me for two very brief questions, which I believe he can answer immediately. I should like to have the answers for my own information.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very happy to yield to other Senators when I have completed my statement.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and I were the joint authors of the amendment in its final form which struck out the provision in the then existing law for the support of Irish potatoes.

It was our intention simply to strike out the possibility of any further support-price program as that term is generally recognized—a mandatory price-support program or any other price-support program in the normal usage of the term—and there was no intention whatever to strike Irish potatoes off the list of agricultural commodities or to put them under different treatment from other commodities which are entitled to the use of portions of section 32 funds whenever surpluses should justify that use under other provisions of law.

So, Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] came before the committee, stating that the potato producers of Idaho did have surplus production of potatoes this year which they wanted to have handled under the school-lunch program or some other similar program, and had been confronted with a ruling by a former solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, to the effect that the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana and myself was so broad as to prevent that use, we both felt, and the committee felt, that there was no such reasonable interpretation to be placed upon our amendment, and that by all means Irish potatoes ought to be restored to the list of agricultural commodities and be given the same right which every other agricultural commodity has under the law for the use, if needed, of portions of section 32 funds.

Therefore, this amendment is in the bill. It was simply to place Irish potatoes in the same position as livestock and other agricultural crops. The largest amount of recent use of such funds has been for the livestock industry, and the purpose of this amendment is to permit Irish potatoes to regain and retake their place in the list of agricultural commodities which are entitled to relief through section 32 funds.

As to the amount, every other agricultural commodity stands on the same basis, and there is no more reason for assuming that the full $100 million, if that is 25 percent of the total, would be used on Irish potatoes than there would be that it is to be used in full on citrus or prunes or raisins or apples or peaches or pears or any of the other numerous commodities where section 32 funds have been used.

The whole result of the amendment would simply be to restore Irish potatoes to their rightful place with reference to the use of section 32 funds in the family of agricultural products, so that they would at least have equal standing in connection with the use of some of the section 32 funds to relieve their distress.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be glad to yield so that the Senator from Oklahoma may ask a question.

Mr. KERR. As I understood the Senator from Florida, he said that section 32 funds were being used for the livestock industry.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator explain what he had reference to, so that I may

acquire some information which I do not now have?

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood that a very substantial amount of those funds had been used with respect to the purchase of canned meat for the direct purpose of assisting the livestock industry. I have in my office a statement of the total amount used. I do not recall the amount at the moment, but it was quite large. My statement was to remind the Senator from Oklahoma, if he had forgotten it, that the livestock industry is already on terms of parity with every other agricultural commodity, insofar as the use of section 32 funds is concerned, with the sole exception of Irish potatoes, and the purpose of the amendment is to restore Irish potatoes to the position from which it should never have been taken.

Mr. KERR. I should like to remind the distinguished Senator that if he is referring to the $100 million which the Secretary has spent for hamburger meat and canned meat, it has been for the benefit of the packers and not for the benefit of meat producers.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from New Mexico will yield further, I should like to say that I do not care to enter into any argument with the Senator from Oklahoma as to the result of the investment of section 32 funds. My statement was, and it continues to be, that the largest amount of section 32 funds expended this past year have been in the effort to help the livestock industry in connection with products of the livestock industry, and the result of the amendment in the committee bill relative to Irish potatoes is simply to restore Irish potatoes to a position of equality with livestock and all other agricultural commodities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I promised to yield very briefly to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wanted to ask some questions in order to be certain in my own mind on some points.

First, if I have correctly read the proposed legislation, the particular acreage provided for would be sufficient to give to every farmer the higher of 2 figures, or 40 percent of the highest acreage during any one of the years 1951, 1952, and 1953, provided the farmer did not exceed 50 percent of the cropland. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a rather difficult question to answer in a brief way. It is correct as to nearly every State. It is not correct as to the State of Texas and the State of Florida.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand Louisiana is short approximately five thousand acres plus.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would my statement be correct so far as Alabama is concerned?

Mr. ANDERSON. It would be correct so far as Alabama is concerned and if the figures supplied by the Cotton Production Division are correct. It is just barely correct as to Louisiana.

Mr. SPARKMAN. While I was in Alabama during the adjournment of Congress I inquired as to allotments made under the existing law, and I heard many complaints. One farmer came to my office and stated that he had a farm of 160 acres. There were 22 persons living on it. Three acres of the 160 acres were allotted to the home place, the house, barn, and outbuildings. Some 50 acres were in pastureland, and 100 acres in cropland, 90 acres of which were in cotton. Yet he had been assigned 22 acres. Is my understanding correct that he would be allotted 50 percent of the cropland, provided he did not exceed one of the other figures?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; he would be given the larger of 65 percent of the 3-year average or 40 percent of his largest planted acreage, but not more than 50 percent of his cropland. The 1954 Alabama allotment would be approximately a total of 1,346,401 acres.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That leads me to the next question. If I understand correctly, from examining the figures, it would make a minimum of 5 acres available to every cotton farmer. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it is left to the county committee as to the use to be made of the land.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But, as a matter of fact, under the old allotment, in my State every county except 12 received 5-acre allotments and those 12 counties could receive such allotments if they wanted to.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the State committee has power, in its discretion, to bring an exempt farmer up to his exemption. I understand that only 3,500 acres will be taken in the State of Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator mean 35,000 acres?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; 3,500.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I know it is not a large amount, because only a few counties have been left out.

Mr. EASTLAND. Alabama has 12 counties affected; Mississippi has 18 counties affected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. First, I wish to join with other Senators in expressing appreciation to the chairman of the committee and to others Senators for their expeditious reporting of the bill. During my visits to the cotton-growing sections of Tennessee during the past summer and fall, no problem was more pressing or about which there was more concern than the allotment of cotton acreage. It was realized by all cotton growers that in order to work out matters for their best interests with regard to planting, the whole question must be settled quickly. The bill will give them a better plan than would be the case if the bill did not pass.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, in connection with the 65–40–50 formula, set forth in the bill, if, according to his records, there would be sufficient to satisfy the farm demands of Tennessee on that basis.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that the final allotment for Tennessee under the bill will be about 680,000 acres. The amount which Tennessee would need to satisfy the 60–40–50 provision would be 664,000 acres. So Tennessee would get roughly 30,000 acres more than would be needed for that purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a further question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield. However, I may first say that I have now been advised that the Tennessee figure is 671,901 acres, so there would be even more acreage than I at first stated.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would be about 10,000 acres more than the amount necessary to meet the formula?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Before the pending bill was reported, I introduced a bill, S. 2615, which I had intended offering as an amendment, had not the bill contained provisions, which set up 65 percent of the average acreage, and also provide a minimum of 45 percent, which, I believe, was contained in the law of 1950. Is it the understanding of the Senator from New Mexico that whether it is 45 percent or 50 percent, the State of Tennessee would not be materially affected?

Mr. ANDERSON. The bill would not materially affect the State of Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Many Tennessee farmers, as apparently is true of farmers in Arkansas and other States, have expressed a great deal of concern about the increased allocation to California and Arizona, not only with reference to this year, but also with reference to what might happen in the future. Is there any assurance, or can the Senator from New Mexico express any opinion, as to whether these increased allocations, under the present formula, will be carried out in the years to come, or whether there will be new requests for additional allotments to those States?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee, as I tried to say earlier, that by 1955, if quotas are provided for 1955, the States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico will gain nothing by a 66-percent gadget. Because of their large plantings in previous years, no device of this special nature will be needed for either California or Arizona.

The cotton-producing history of California and Arizona for 1948, 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, which will be the 5 years under consideration, will be sufficiently high so that those States will need no special 34-percent gadget to take care of them.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it the opinion of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, and the opinion of other members of the committee, that in the event there is to be a cotton quota in years to come, there will be necessity for some special gadget or quota for California, Arizona, and New Mexico?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am quite sure the Senator is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator feel that in the years to come Congress

will apply the principle to all the States, including the Southern States and Western States alike?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not want to try to commit Congress, but I think that is probably what the facts will reveal at that time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the Senator's own opinion, and we consider him to be a great authority on the problem of agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for his explanation of the bill. In the first part of his statement, I noticed he made a point that the bill is merely temporary legislation on the subject of cotton-acreage allocation. However, the Senator from New Mexico recognizes that there are certain parts of the old law with respect to administration that need some continuing legislation for 1954. Is not that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is not saying to the Senate, is he, that the bill covers all the problems, or even goes into all the problems, that need attention?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi that the bill does not touch many agricultural problems. The one he has mentioned ought to be acted upon only after notice has been given and open hearings have been held. That is why it is not touched in the proposed legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, the present position of the Senator from New Mexico is that that is an important matter, and perhaps he would have liked to go into it, but because of the time emergency with reference to planting he did not go into it and make a recommendation.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Another point involved is the broader use of power by State and county committees in using the reserves available to them. Is not that another matter which needs some continuing legislation beyond 1954?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a matter which I do not feel may need legislation, but it needs consideration by the committee, and probably the committee will recommend legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate having the opinion of the Senator on these matters, because they are urgent and important.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before the Senator from New Mexico leaves that question, and on the same point, does he mean that he does not believe the Senate should consider what might be termed permanent provisions in connection with the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Mississippi asked for my personal opinion. I do not think they should be considered now, because if we go into matters of that kind, we might find that we shall be here for many months.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think such provisions are included in the House bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Mississippi asked for my personal opinion, and I tried to give it to him. I am not trying to speak for the committee.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department of Agriculture has advised me that it will be between 2 and 3 weeks after the bill becomes law, if it becomes law, before the Department can really give final allocations for 1954. As I understand, in some areas cotton planting will be started in about 2 weeks from now. That is the reason why we did not take up some of the other matters we realized ought to be considered. I can assure the Senator from Arkansas that there will be an opportunity to take up matters which pertain to permanent law. It was after the Department told us they would require 2 or 3 weeks following the signing of the bill to place the law into operation that the committee decided to handle the matter on an emergency basis.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. With reference to the matters not covered in the bill, for example, the question of the Secretary of Agriculture being permitted to take into consideration the normal rate of abandonment and also underplanting, does not the Senator believe that they are matters which need the consideration of Congress, in connection with continuing legislation beyond 1954?

Mr. ANDERSON. Again I say to the Senator from Mississippi that I am fairly well satisfied with the pending bill, but I recognize that there are many persons who are not. I should be very happy to have the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry take up the other matters, but they could not possibly be handled in the pending bill.

Within 2 or 3 weeks farmers will begin planting cotton in Texas and Florida, and they are entitled to know as soon as possible what the allotments will be. It will take 2 or 3 weeks after the bill becomes law before the Secretary of Agriculture can advise the various States. So we thought it best to act promptly on this bill. As a matter of fact, not many persons thought we could get a bill to the Senate floor as quickly as this bill got here, and I commend the leadership for getting it here so quickly.

Mr. STENNIS. I desire to make it clear that even though we pass over these matters, it is recognized that they should be considered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I have not heard all the debate on the bill. Some of the things in which I am very much interested have been covered in the Senator's remarks and in his reply to the questions asked by other Senators. However, I was very much interested in the questions of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and in the replies to those questions, and also with respect to the questions of the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], with respect to the contention that the bill is intended to be strictly a stopgap measure for 1954.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is entirely correct with reference to cotton.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am speaking with reference to cotton.

I understood further that the passage of the bill by the Senate in its present form would not preclude the conferees from considering some of the permanent provisions which are in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe I said that, but I agree that that is true. The passage of the bill by the Senate in its present form, if we strike out everything after the enacting clause in the bill as passed by the House, would not preclude the conferees from considering the House bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am trying to differentiate between the bill we are considering now and the bill the Senate may pass, for example, as a substitute for the House bill.

The bill does not take into account, is not intended to, and does not undertake to enact, permanent legislation or to incorporate provisions which would extend beyond 1954. The bill as it passed the House does incorporate some such provisions. There will be the opportunity in conference to consider provisions which some of us would like to have considered in conference and possibly have incorporated in the bill in its final form. That opportunity is present, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it is.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Or that opportunity will be present if the pending bill is passed as a substitute for the House measure?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that there has been a discussion of permanent changes. The bill provides only for temporary legislation.

It was also pointed out that if we did what it is proposed to do; namely, to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and insert the Senate bill as a substitute, these matters could be considered. Many Members of the Senate, including members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, would like to consider these matters. The conferees have the right to look these provisions over.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The bill provides that the county committee shall have three different methods of allocating to individual farmers.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is a very important provision of the bill. The provision permitting the county committee

to use three different methods of allocating to the individual farmers in the county is not in the bill as it passed the House, but is strictly a Senate provision. It is intended as a stopgap measure only for this year.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not remember whether that provision was in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wanted to make certain that the county committees had such authority, and that that was the intent of the provision. The county committee, in its discretion, can use the historic factor with regard to each farm for making the county quota allocation to that farm.

Mr. EASTLAND. I did not quite understand what the Senator said.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I interpret the provision, after the allocation of the increased acreage is made to the State, this bill increases the national acreage allotment from 17,910,448 acres to 21 million acres, and for individual allotments provides a formula of percentages of 65, 40, and 50. After these allotments have been taken care of, if there is acreage left over in a county for further allocation to individual farmers, then the county committee may, in its discretion, make allocations to individual farmers, based on previous farm history.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The county committee has the discretion to make the allocations in any of those ways.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then the county committee can make further distribution or allocation upon the basis of farm history, if it deems it wise to do so.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the Senator from Arkansas asked me the question, he did not speak of the percentages of 65, 40, and 50.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; I did not.

Mr. ANDERSON. I fully agree with the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Mississippi. The way the Senator from Arkansas has stated it is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The provision in the bill is limited to 1954.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If there are to be any permanent features incorporated in the legislation at this session, assuming that no amendments are offered to correct some of the deficiencies we find in the measure, they will have to be taken from the bill as it passed the House or the conferees will have to work out in conference those provisions and the final language of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has already developed, more ably than I could have done, the points I had in mind. I should like to point out further that I believe it is fair to say that there is much sentiment among Senators for some of the permanent features which are contained in the bill as it passed the House. Those provisions will all be a proper subject for consideration by the conference committee, and it is the hope of the junior Senator from Tennessee that the committee will give consideration to them.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the Senator from Tennessee that they will be fairly considered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield, or I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for the presentation he has made on the floor of the Senate of the pending bill. It was because of the emergency aspects of the measure, which the Senator has pointed out, that a general agreement was arrived at at the several meetings to which the Senator referred, and because of the position taken by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that a bill should be reported that could be handled in an emergency sort of way in order to meet the dates which will soon face us, that the majority leader, at the request of a number of Members of the Senate, especially members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, agreed to schedule this bill ahead of several highly controversial measures which will be facing decision by the Senate in the immediate future. Otherwise, had it not been given the right of way, it might have gotten behind several weeks of debate on other measures, which would have adversely affected the objective the committee was trying to accomplish.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the majority leader that those interested in the bill appreciate very much the scheduling of the bill at this time, because if it had gotten behind several weeks of debate, no good whatever would have been done by the bill, because then action upon it would have been too late.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 17, after the word "section" and the period, it is proposed to insert:

> Before apportioning such unallocated acreage to counties as provided in the foregoing sentence, the State committee may, if it determines that such action is required to provide equitable allotments within the State, apportion such unallocated acreage directly to farms to the extent required to provide each farm with the minimum allotment described in subsection (f) (1) of this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator from Mississippi rise to explain the amendment?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; or if the Senate is ready to vote, that is all right, and I shall not explain the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to have a little explanation of the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this amendment means that after acreage is allocated from the State's increased allotment under the 65–40–50 provision, then the State committee is authorized to allocate acreage to the 5-acre man or to the man who grows less than 5 acres and who is exempt from acreage reduction, in order to bring up his allotment to his exemption, which the law requires.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield to me, let me say that I do not quite understand this amendment. I thought the 5-acre man was already taken care of.

Mr. EASTLAND. There are a great many counties in the country where the county allotment was not sufficient to give the 5-acre man the 5 acres to which he was entitled.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This amendment is intended to insure, then, that each man has at least 5 acres; is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; if the farmer has grown 3 acres, he will get 3 acres. If he has grown 4 acres, he will get 4 acres. If he has grown 5 acres, he will get 5 acres. That is the maximum.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, the purpose of the amendment is to insure that if in the past the farmer has grown 5 acres, that much acreage will be assured to him as the minimum. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. The amendment provides that minimum in the State.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In the State or in the county?

Mr. EASTLAND. In the State.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, this has to be done at the State level. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly, because under the provisions of this bill many counties would not get sufficient acreage to be able to build up the 5-acre farmers to that amount.

This amendment was presented to the committee by my colleague the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and myself.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. In the first place, this amendment would not change the allocation of acreage in the bill, as between the States, would it?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, sir.

Mr. KERR. In the second place, as I understand the amendment, it does not apply to a State with reference to which the allocation in the bill is inadequate to give the 65 percent of the 3-year average to all the farmers in the State. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

This amendment does not add an acre to this bill. The amendment purely has to do with the distribution of each State's quota, after each State secures its quota.

Mr. KERR. The amendment has to do with distribution within a State if there is any surplus acreage left after every farmer has received 65 percent of the 3-year average. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. This amendment means that in most of the States the farmer who has had 5 acres will get his 5 acres, does it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. As a practical proposition, yes; the amendment will mean that, except as to Florida and Texas, which require approximately 80,000 acres.

Mr. HILL. But in all the other States, as a practical operation this amendment means that the farmer who has had 5 acres will get his 5 acres this year, does it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. It means that the farmer in practically every State will get the exemption to which the law says he is entitled.

Mr. HILL. Yes; in practically every State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to say that I think this bill is a distinct improvement over the orders issued by the Secretary of Agriculture and the allotment of 17,900,000 acres to all the cotton-producing States of the Nation. However, it appears to me that the bill contains features which are discriminatory and unjustified.

I believe the provision which provides for 315,000 additional acres, and then gives half of that acreage to 3 States arbitrarily, and not on the basis of permanent legislation which has been in effect for years, is unjustified and constitutes special privilege by legislation, in favor of the beneficiary States, and against the great majority of the cotton-producing States.

I have been greatly impressed by what has been said here about the emergency features of the bill. I have been somewhat intimidated by the chairman of the committee; who has dared Senators to move to recommit the bill if it does not suit them—in effect saying to them that they will either take this bill or the Benson order of 17,900,000 acres.

Mr. President, I respect the committee——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I did not quite understand the Senator from Oklahoma when he referred to "the Benson order." He means, does he not, that the public law requires the cotton acreage to be that much, unless Congress enacts the measure now before the Senate?

Mr. KERR. I understood there was a man by the name of Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, and that he had issued an order about the cotton acreage allotments for 1954.

Mr. THYE. In order that we may be certain we are not accusing one man, let me say there is a public law which this Congress or a previous Congress enacted, and the Secretary of Agriculture must follow that provision of law. Therefore, in the event this Congress does nothing about the pending measure, the Secretary of Agriculture must revert to that public law; and therefore there would be only 17,900,000-plus acres of cotton to allocate to the States in accordance with the historic base that each State and each county had.

As a member of the subcommittee, I, along with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], studied the question covered by the pending legislative proposal. We studied it as carefully as any three men could. We were serving as a subcommittee of the full Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This measure was the very best we could possibly recommend to the full committee and to the Senate.

The only reason why special acreage allotments were provided for or taken into consideration for Arizona and California was simply that there is a growing population in the Nation. No one can deny that. California and Arizona had some land come into production, through irrigation; and some came into production because of a military request or a national-defense measure.

When the drastic cut-back occurred because of a previous public law, the subcommittee, acting for the full Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, arrived at the only possible sound recommendation, as embodied in the provision for Arizona and California. So that the subcommittee would be correct in its consideration, the question was submitted to a farm organization representing the cotton-producing States of the South, in order that they might assist in advising us. This particular farm group gave consideration and, according to their best judgment, made to us a recommendation which we embodied along with the best judgment that those of us serving on the subcommittee had; and we submitted it to the full Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the full committee finally acted. That is the question before us.

With all due respect to my distinguished friend from Oklahoma, I ask him not to refer to the law as one individual's law, because the National Legislature enacted the law to provide 17,900,000 plus acres as a cotton base. That is what we shall have if we do not pass some other measure.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator name the particular farm organization which made the recommendation? If he did, I did not understand it.

Mr. THYE. I shall be very happy to name it. It was the National Farm Bureau Federation, which happened to consider the subject at one of its national conferences. I had met those gentlemen before, not only in connection with discussions of the cotton question, but in the discussion of other agricultural questions. I have found them to be a pretty reliable body on which to lean.

Mr. KERR. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his confessions and observations. But, Mr. President, I do not recognize the Farm Bureau Federation as the agricultural authority for prescribing farm programs for the State of Oklahoma. I recognize them as a great organization. Their president probably is the most powerful contribution that the Republican Party has made to this administration. However, I do not happen to agree with him on many vital issues affecting the people of Oklahoma. Nor do I permit him to speak for me on this floor. Nor am I bound by what he says when he speaks. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to be so bound, that is his privilege; but I disown it either as a privilege or obligation of the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. The question I wish to ask the Senator is this: Was not the Senator mistaken when he referred to a cotton-acreage allotment as one individual's proposal? Was he not mistaken when he referred to it as an order of Mr. Benson rather than as a public law on the statute books?

Mr. KERR. In that regard I will say that I do not agree with the Secretary of Agriculture in the interpretation which he accepted, either from the Farm Bureau Federation or from his Solicitor, as to the amount of acreage that should be allotted for the year 1954, under the law then in effect. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to accept without question the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to the meaning of law, that is his privilege; but it is neither my prerogative nor my duty. I disown it and disclaim it and refuse to be bound by it. I say that it was a Benson order. I say that there are serious differences of opinion as to whether or not the allotment could have been anything else. I, for one, am of the belief that it did not have to be that figure. Its issuance by Benson makes it neither legal, sacred, nor above criticism or dispute, so far as I am concerned. Does that answer the question of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Oklahoma will still have to admit that it is a public law.

Mr. KERR. No. The Senator from Oklahoma proclaims that it was an order issued by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. THYE. Under a public law.

Mr. KERR. Based upon what he said his concept of a public law was, yes; with which concept I do not agree.

I do not acknowledge that the Secretary of Agriculture can speak for the Senator from Oklahoma; and I wish to say to my good friend from Minnesota that he is free from any such bonds or shackles, except as he chooses to accept them.

I repeat that I prefer the provisions of this bill, as reported by the committee, to the Benson order. But I still agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that the bill contains provisions which constitute legislative special privileges for certain States and certain industries.

The provision with reference to authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to spend $100 million to support the price of Irish potatoes is no part of the emergency cotton acreage situation which confronts the Congress. I wish to say to my good friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], for whom I have as much respect and affection as for any other Member of the Senate, that I could not be in more complete disagreement with

any man than I am with him when he says that the Secretary of Agriculture has spent money for the benefit of the meat producers, in spending $100 million to buy canned meat, hamburger, and canned gravy from the packers. That operation has left the producers where it found them—broke—and it has resulted, in 1953, in the packers having an increase of 50 percent in their net profits over the preceding year. It was an act by the Secretary of Agriculture which penalized the consumers. It raised the price of processed meat on every meat counter in America. He did not compete with the packer for the live animal, for the benefit of the producer. He competed with the millions of consumers of the country for the product, to the benefit of the packers. Their financial reports for last year reflect greatly increased profits, brought about directly by reason of the bonus with which the Secretary of Agriculture provided them, under the guise of an act on his part for the benefit of the meat producers.

Let me say to the sponsors of the potato amendment that if the Secretary of Agriculture uses section 32 money for the benefit of potato producers on the same basis that it is claimed he used it for the benefit of cattle producers, he will spend the money buying potato chips, French-fried potatoes, industrial alcohol, and vodka, which are the products of the processors of Irish potatoes, and which, I assure Senators, will lend small comfort to the producers of the potatoes.

Mr. President, this is an emergency measure. I resent the fact that the chairman of the committee has said to the Senate, "Take it or recommit it." That is intimidation and coercion which is unjustified and unwarranted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator permit the Senator from Vermont to accept the compliment just paid him by the Senator from Oklahoma? The Senator from Vermont is very happy to learn that he can intimidate the Senator from Oklahoma, but he is sure that he has not rendered the Senator from Oklahoma speechless.

Mr. KERR. I will say that if the Senator from Vermont is ever rendered speechless, it will be a phenomenon which I have never contemplated, and the evidences of which I have yet to see. I compliment his power, yes; but neither his using it nor his parading it. Perhaps the emergency is sufficient to justify bowing to coercion and intimidation, but I hope the day will never come when those who represent the rank and file of the cotton producers will be in the position of intimidating or coercing anyone in order to obtain simple justice on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I call up an amendment, on page 2, line 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to strike the word "one-half" and insert in lieu thereof the word "one-fourth."

On page 2, line 6, it is proposed to strike the word "one-half" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three-fourths."

Mr. KERR. The effect of the amendment would be to reallocate the 315,000 bonus acreage which is provided for in the bill, and would distribute it one-fourth to the 3 Western States and three-fourths to the historic cotton-producing States. I believe, in the interest of equity and justice, and in order to eliminate to some extent the discriminatory features of the language of the bill as written, the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment would be to take away from the States of New Mexico, Arizona, and California an allotment of cotton acreage which is absolutely essential if distress among numerous cotton growers in those States is to be avoided.

So far as the large cotton operators in my State are concerned—and I believe the statement applies to California—namely, those who are able to stand a reduction, it would be much better for them in the long run to allow nature to take its course, so to speak; that is, to allow the cotton to be produced in those areas of the United States where a pound of it can be produced at less cost than elsewhere. That is the reason why there has been an increase in the cotton acreage in New Mexico, Arizona, and California. In those States cotton can be produced at less cost—in fact, at about half the cost—because they can produce more pounds per acre.

If there were no action taken at all, and the allotment remained at 17,900,000 acres, we would have to endure it only for 1 year, certainly for not more than 2 years, and even in the second year we would get credit for the acreage history which we would have made in 1953, and that history would help us along.

There are those in the Western areas—and I am speaking now about the large growers—who, because of their financial ability, would be pleased to see the allotment remain as it is. But that would be exceedingly hard on a large number of people who have grown cotton only for a short time, for they would be reduced to practically no acreage at all.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Arizona understand that the acreage referred to is hardship acreage?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Where is the hardship?

Mr. HAYDEN. The hardship is in the States to which the additional acreage has been assigned by the committee bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. HAYDEN. Hardship is the sole reason for the assignment of the acreage. The impression seems to have spread that some very wealthy cotton producers have gone into the cotton-growing business in Arizona and California and that they are the ones who would be benefited by the provision referred to and which the Senator from Oklahoma seeks to strike out. The provision was not put into the bill for that purpose at all. It was for the purpose of assisting the smaller growers, namely, those who have been planting cotton for only a year or two. In two counties in Arizona, Yuma, and Cochise County, cotton has been planted only recently to any great extent. They would have practically no opportunity to plant anything at all. They would have to go out of the business.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is that because they have been planting cotton for only the past 3 years or so?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And because each year they have doubled or tripled the planting of the year before?

Mr. HAYDEN. They have planted more acres to cotton. The result is that they are building up a cotton history, which they do not have now.

Such a history would be immensely valuable to them. If we did nothing but stand by what the Secretary of Agriculture has done, those who could afford it would be better off, because they would have the benefit of the history which has been built up in the past 2 or 3 years, but which does not do them any good now.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. On the face of it, it looks like discrimination to place a special provision in the bill to take care of growers who just recently started to plant and grow cotton, whereas the historic cotton-producing States, which have grown cotton all the time, must make a concession in order to aid those States which just recently entered the production of cotton. On the face of it, it appears to be unfair to ask the older States to make these tremendous sacrifices. I do not charge that to be a fact, but I say, on the face of it, it looks as though we are giving some special consideration to States which have just started the growing of cotton.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me point out, first, that the total increase in the bill is divided between the old cotton-growing States and the new cotton-growing States, and that it is a provision by which distress may be relieved.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to make two points: First, with respect to the new cotton growers, the history is based upon a 5-year period. The law refers to the 5 years preceding the year in which the proclamation of quotas is made. That means that on 1954 quotas, announced in 1953, the years 1952, 1951, 1950, 1949, and 1948. The Secretary of Agriculture has ruled that since 1949 cannot be counted, the year 1947 is to be used instead. The cotton growers in California wanted to take the Secretary into court. I believe they could take him into court successfully, because the law calls for the last 5 years. However, a 6-year period is taken, with the year 1949 being

dropped out because it was not to be counted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is being done without any authority of law. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. The Secretary has made a very careful study of it, but I know what we intended to do, because I wrote that part of the bill.

The second point I wish to make is that cotton-producing States get credit for other crops planted. In many States during the war the farmers would stop growing cotton for a few years and get credit for the production of other crops. We always carried the credits ahead, and some States received dual credit, one credit for wheat, for example, and another for cotton, grown on the same land, or they would get credit for cotton and proceed to plant soybeans.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe the Senator meant that it was done in my State.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure it was not done in the State of Arkansas.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the Senator from New Mexico confirm what I say, namely, that if it comes to choosing between the provisions of the bill and standing on the law as it reads today we in New Mexico, Arizona, and California would be in a far better position eventually if we abided by the present law.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no question about it in my mind.

Mr. HAYDEN. Because we would gain immediately under the historic basis, inasmuch as if we stopped production for 1 year we would get credit for the acreage. In other words, it is inevitable that the growing of cotton will move west where it can be grown at less cost a pound.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator is entirely correct. I have been in a cotton meeting in his State and sat right beside him while the cotton farmers were saying they would prefer to have the 17-million-acre allotment stand for the next year, but I think that would work great hardship across the country, and it would work great hardship in the Senator's State. There were persons in the meeting who could stand it, but the small cotton farmer of Arizona could not stand it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was about to ask the Senator whether he considered the provision to give half of the approximately 300,000 acres special increase provided in the bill to the three States mentioned would be an advantage to those States over the original allotment of 17,900,000 acres?

Mr. HAYDEN. They would have to be balanced in order really to determine what would be best.

What I was trying to say was that in Arizona, California, and New Mexico we can grow cotton at less cost than elsewhere in the United States. We can produce more pounds per acre at less cost per pound. The grade of cotton we grow by careful selection of seed is the kind of cotton the manufacturer desires to buy. Proportionately, in that there are not so many pounds going into the loan as in the South.

Those are facts which cannot be overlooked. It is clearly indicated that the movement is to the West. While it may be a disadvantage to the South this year and next year, if the law operates as it must, and we go along in the regular way, we will continue to grow more cotton in the western area, and as we build up our acreage——

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator means, does he not, that if there were no controls the farmers would continue to build up a cotton-producing history.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. Or, if we had controls, we would still gain the advantage of additional history made prior to the controls. We have devoted much of the land to cotton in the past 2 or 3 years, and do not have a 5-year history.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought I understood the Senator to say that without this special increase and special allocation assigned to the 3 States mentioned, his State would really be better off with an allocation of 17,900,000 acres instead of one of 21,000,000 acres.

Mr. HAYDEN. The increased amount provided for in the bill is divided between the old cotton-growing States and the new cotton-growing States. The old cotton-growing States get as many additional acres as do the new ones. We need to take care of the small grower, not the large producer who could worry along very well on the basis of 17,900,000 acres.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I do not understand is why the 3 States need to take care of the small growers when an overall increase of 3,000,000 acres is provided above the 17,900,000 acres under existing law.

Mr. HAYDEN. Because we do not have the background of a cotton-growing history. We would not have more than 10 or 15 percent of the acreage, because cotton planting in the western area is so recent. The provision is designed to meet hardship cases.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understood from the junior Senator from New Mexico awhile ago, in discussing the provisions of the bill, that this is a stop-gap bill, a measure to meet the emergency situation of this year, because of the planting season being right at hand, so that if any legislation is to be enacted it must be enacted quickly in order to make it effective for this year; but after this year, in the general legislation which is to follow, the overall farm program legislation, such special features, such as this provision in the bill, will not be required.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; because, in the meantime, we shall have built up our history of cotton growing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is to enable the farmers this year to build up their history so that next year in permanent legislation they can be on an even basis with the traditional cotton-growing States without asking any special provision for increased acreage.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the Senator has stated it well.

There is one other matter I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate, with reference to Anderson, Clayton & Co. They are represented in Arizona by a subsidiary which buys and gins cotton. The only amortization I know of was in connection with a company called the Federal Warehouse & Compress Co., whose headquarters, I think, are in Memphis. It is made up of people from Arkansas and Tennessee who moved to Arizona and erected some oil mills. My recollection is they received tax amortization on three of those mills. But that does not apply to Anderson, Clayton & Co. The mills were badly needed in order to take care of the situation.

The same thing is true of compresses. We needed them very badly. The normal market for the cotton produced in that area before the war was Japan. We hope that in due time the bales can be compressed for shipment overseas.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate not to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who has had charge of the bill, has stated that the necessity for the expeditious enactment of the bill as proposed prevented the consideration of some provisions which certainly some farmers and those who represent some of the farmers feel should be in independent legislation.

I think we all realize the necessity for expeditious action on this bill. Some provisions which we may call long-term provisions have already been adverted to, but I desire to emphasize what I feel to be the need for those provisions in independent legislation by referring to 2 or 3 of them.

Specifically, I should like to call attention to the fact that the authority for the use of reserve acreage, both at the county and State levels, should be broadened. This would provide State and county committees with the machinery to meet more adequately problems commonly referred to as "hardship cases." Local farmer-elected committeemen are more nearly in a position to judge the extent of hardships and should have the latitude to meet local conditions at the local level.

Secondly, while the percentage of cropland factor method of distributing acreage by the county to the farm, as is now provided in the law, fits some parts of the Cotton Belt, a farm history method of distribution would more nearly fill the requirements of other sections.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I was particularly interested in. So, I inquired of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] regarding the provisions of the bill on page 3, lines 14 to 19, inclusive, which were amended a while ago by the committee amendment offered by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] which does give the county committee discretion to use 1 of 3 methods.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. I was going to invite attention to that fact. The bill does give the county committees a discretionary power to make the selection.

As I understand, this provision, which is considered highly desirable, applies only to 1954. As I said in the first instance, I wish to call attention to what I would call long-term provisions, which I think ought to be included in any cotton legislation, not merely for 1954, but also for succeeding years. That is what I am calling attention to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was particularly interested in having the emergency legislation give such authority and discretion to the county committees, because I feel that they know best what will fit the local situations, and can more equitably provide for the extra allotment or distribution. In my opinion, although there may be some exceptions, generally the historical basis is the better way to handle the matter.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his contribution. The Senator from Arkansas and I find ourselves in full accord. What I was seeking to do was to emphasize that this provision ought to be carried not only for 1954, but should be written into the law for succeeding years.

Thirdly, the Secretary of Agriculture should have the authority to take into consideration normal underplantings and abandoned acres in setting the level of allotment for any particular year.

The 5-year rate of abandonment is 2½ percent of the total acreage planted to cotton. In 1953, the rate of abandonment was estimated by the USDA at 3.7 percent.

In 1950, the last year of acreage controls, underplantings amounted to more than 10 percent of the total allotment. The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture has ruled that the Secretary does not have the authority to take these important facts into consideration in making his calculations.

The Secretary should be permitted to use all of the information available to him in arriving at an allotment figure.

Finally, S. 2643 provides that the additional acreage allotted to States will first be used by State committees to provide that all farms will receive an allotment equal to the larger of 65 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953, or 40 percent of the highest acreage planted on the farm in any one of these 3 years, provided that this acreage does not exceed 50 percent of the tilled land on the farm. This 50 percent cropland limitation more nearly fits the farming system in irrigated areas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe that the committee of conference might properly consider these suggestions?

Mr. HILL. The only reason I am now addressing the Senate is that I very much hope the committee of conference will give these matters their earnest consideration, and do some of the very things I am certain the Senator from Arkansas and I very much wish to see done. I agree with the position of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope that when the bill goes to conference, the conferees will go thoroughly into the matters and consider them carefully. I hope that as many of these provisions as possible will be written into the bill by the committee of conference.

Incidentally, the conference committee will have very wide latitude because, as the Senator knows, there are 2 different bills, 1 passed by the House, and the bill now before the Senate. So, under the rules, the conference will have very wide latitude.

Mr. HILL. Furthermore, this feature would benefit most the farmers who have helped to build the surplus by failure to practice diversification and continuing to plant a high percentage of their cropland in cotton. This extra benefit to the high-planting farm would be at the expense of the family farmer, who has sought diligently to diversify his farming. A 40-percent cropland limitation on hardship cotton acres would prevent inequities on farms that have continued high cotton plantings and, at the same time, would assure a wider and fairer distribution of the State's additional cotton allotment, thereby benefiting a greater number of farms. This is the same cropland limitation that was in effect in 1950, and I can see no reason why it would not work equally well in 1954.

In conclusion, I wish to point out that both the Senate and the House Committees on Agriculture spent many days, during the summer of 1953, in hearing and considering the problems of cotton acreage and apportionment. If we fail to act now upon these questions of technical administration, we are merely postponing, for a few weeks or months, problems that will again have to be considered at a time when the Members of Congress will be much more deeply involved in other pressing legislation.

The farmer's welfare and the welfare of the whole Nation, so dependent upon the economic well-being of the farmer, demands that we act now.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I heartily favor the 40-percent limitation. I hope something along that line can be worked out in conference. The committee agreed to it, but the solicitor for the Department of Agriculture could not devise a gadget that would work. He is now working on one. If he can develop it, I think it will be adopted.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I am very much gratified to know that he feels as I do about this provision. I may say that I am also very much gratified to know that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi will be on the committee of conference. I know that the Senate can repose great faith in him as a member of the conference, feeling as he does with particular reference to this provision. As the distinguished Senator from Arkansas suggests very frankly and very forthrightly, we are relying on the Senator from Mississippi.

I strongly feel that the provision to which I have adverted should be included in cotton legislation, not simply for this year, but also for succeeding years. I hope the committee of conference, representing the Senate and the House, will have the same desire to see this provision included in the bill and will report to Congress proposed legislation containing such a provision.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I was about to yield the floor, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope that the proposed legislation which has been presented to the Senate as meeting an emergency situation, which I believe was generally recognized as an emergency, will not be so altered by the conference committee as to change the equity of the bill or the spirit in which it has been presented to the Senate. It is expected that permanent legislation will be reported later, but I should not want the statement to stand in the RECORD that there was a general invitation so to change the bill that it would come back to the Senate not looking like the type of equitable legislation pending before the Senate today.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that I think this provision would not change the equity, the justice, or, I may even say, in many ways the emergency nature of the bill. I think these provisions would greatly enhance and confirm the equity and justice of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. As I understand the Senator from Alabama, he desires to have in the bill a workable, legal provision to the effect that if the West wants 50 percent, it can have it; and if the South wants 50 percent, it can have it.

Mr. HILL. If the South wants 40 percent, it can have it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; the South may have it. It must be worked out in a legal manner.

Mr. HILL. I think that it can be worked out in such a manner that it will in no way change the fundamental character of what the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has referred to as the equity or justice of the pending bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would seem to me that if we could divide the 315,000 acres in such a way that it meant about 13 and a fraction percent to the 3 Western States and about 1 percent to the other States, it ought to be possible to split the cropland allotment in some way that would do justice to the southeastern historic cotton-growing area, at least.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Georgia has so well suggested, I think there is no danger of injustice in the proposal.

On the other hand, I think the proposal is shot through with justice.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Alabama gave me the privilege of reading portions of his statement before he delivered it in the Senate, so I am familiar with it, although I was not in the Chamber at the time he delivered it. The Senator from Alabama was referring to matters of administration and changes that are needed in the law regardless of what the acreage allotments may be. Is not that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is pleading for permanent, continuing legislation in connection with the administration of the law. It will be needed as much in future years as it is for the year 1954.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi is exactly correct. One of the provisions is that the election shall be left with the county committee as to which method shall be used. That is written into the 1954 allotment. I say that is good. We ought to have it for 1954, and we ought to have it for succeeding years.

Mr. STENNIS. On that point, no one needs to be disturbed about the equity of the proposal.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder if the Senator would enlighten me a little about the question of the difficulty of adjustment with the Western States. On page 174 of the hearings before the Senate committee I find that in Alabama there will be about 6½ acres per voter, and in California 35.1 acres. Why is it so much more difficult for a man who has a large farm to take a cut than it is for the man with a small farm, and why is that an argument for the added allocation to California?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on the one hand, I do not believe such an argument is a good one, and on the other hand, I think what we ought to do is to encourage, as much as possible, what we call the family farm, a farm on which a man and his family live. He and his family not only vote there, but they run and operate the farm. That is the type of farm of which there are so many in Mississippi, Alabama, and Arkansas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall vote for the pending bill with a great deal of reluctance.

It is a measure which will create some injustices. It will not, in every instance, distribute the cotton acreage according to strict standards of fairness.

Were there time, I would offer some amendments. They would seek to meet the peculiar conditions under which cotton is planted in Texas—conditions which are not duplicated on the same scale in any other State.

Unfortunately, there is not time. Amendments at this point would involve time-consuming debate and study. They would result in delay, and our cotton farmers, particularly the cotton farmers of Texas, cannot afford delay.

Texas every year plants the first and almost if not the last acre of cotton planted in the United States. The planting starts in south Texas and moves gradually north.

A few of our farmers in South Texas and the lower Rio Grande Valley will start planting before the end of the month. Large-scale planting will start early in February.

Our south Texas farmers cannot plan their operations with any confidence in the future unless Congress acts speedily. Without a law, they will not know how much to plant.

I do not feel that their future should be jeopardized by a prolonged debate over a highly complicated issue. There are more than 3,400,000 acres of cotton land involved in this bill—some 1,300,000 additional acres for Texas. The farmers of America are entitled to know as soon as possible what they can count upon as their share.

There is one other point I should like to make. Between the Senate and the House bills, there is sufficient leeway to permit an adjustment that will go far toward solving the situation. This adjustment can be reached in the conference committee, and I am assured by some of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee who will be on the conference that remedial language will be carefully considered when the conferees discuss both the House and Senate bills.

I am foregoing lengthy discussion now on the unusual problems of Texas—problems complicated by geographical distribution and different types of farming.

I shall be ready to assist the conferees in any possible manner. It is a difficult and complex issue and I hope it can be solved in a spirit of reason. I also hope there will come back to the Senate in a conference report a bill which will assist us in our State to make allotments directly to the counties on the same basis on which the national allotments are made to the State.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it has been stressed here again and again that the pending measure is emergency legislation, and is applicable only in the year 1954, and on that basis, and on that basis alone, I have been able to bring myself to support the bill.

I can see no justification for the great increases that have been given to the irrigated areas. In the division of the extra 315,000 acres we find that 157,000 acres is given to 3 States which are comparative newcomers in cotton production, compared with the 157,000 which is allocated to the 11 or 12 other States which have been engaged in the production of cotton for many decades. More than that, another gadget has been inserted in the bill which has the effect of giving 59,000 acres to the States of Arizona and California.

It may well be that in the economic shifts which have occurred in the life of this land there has been a shift in the production of cotton from the historic areas where it was produced for so long, areas which produced cotton and exported it to the markets of the world in sufficient quantity to maintain a favorable balance of trade for our country for more than 80 years by the sale of that commodity alone. It may be that cotton can be produced in the irrigated States of the West cheaper than in the South, and that the old cotton States will be forced out of the cotton business. If that is to happen by economic forces, there is nothing that can stop it. But, I certainly do regret that it is found necessary to accelerate that program on the basis of gifts such as will be awarded under the proposed law.

My support of the pending bill on the 1-year basis certainly cannot be taken as a precedent for the future when cotton legislation is before this body for consideration.

There are some provisions in the bill that will prevent a great many hardships. The additional acreage involved is necessary because of a very patent failure in the basic law which provides for the distribution of cotton on the basis of historical production as between the States, which instructs the States to allocate it as between the counties in the States on the basis of historical production, and then in the counties themselves, where the base has been established it is distributed on the basis of cropland.

That has brought about a great dislocation on many farms. They were prepared to produce cotton. They had the labor available. Anyone who is familiar with agricultural life in America knows that it takes more downright back-breaking hand labor to produce cotton than it does to produce any other commodity with the possible exception of tobacco.

The bill does eliminate that inequity by giving the increased acreage on the 65, 40, and 50 percent basis.

In passing I wish to say to the Senators who have spent so much time on the bill and who will serve as conferees that I hope that some arrangement can be worked out that will retain the 40 percent basis, at least for the Southeastern States.

Another great advantage of the bill is that it helps to cure the basic weakness in the original law, which distributes the cotton acreage on the basis of cropland rather than on the historic basis. It is very helpful to have in the proposed bill a provision which permits any farmer to turn in to the county committee for redistribution any acreage allotment which he will not use. That will go a long way in remedying some of the more acute conditions and preventing a dislocation of many farmers.

If some relief is not afforded such as is provided in this bill, hundreds of the poorest people in this land, those who have the lowest income in the Nation, tenant farmers and sharecroppers, will practically be put "in the road," because there will be no work for them on many farms where the original allotments are so small.

I share the hope that the conferees will devise ways and means of providing permanent legislation that will establish a fairer and more equitable basis for the distribution of our basic national allotments when it comes to the distribution within the county to the individual farms. It should be done on a historic

cotton-acreage basis rather than on cropland.

Mr. President, I hope that the bill will eliminate the many very great hardships that would have been prevalent under the failures and weaknesses of the basic law. It is a 1-year bill. I hope that the conference committee will devise a fairer measure than either the House or Senate bill. If one is proposed which is a fairer one than either the temporary legislation or the permanent legislation proposed in the House bill, I shall give it my support.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator recognizes the fact that we are confronted with an emergency situation?

Mr. RUSSELL. As the Senator knows, if time were not of the very essence, the measure undoubtedly would be on the floor of the Senate for 2 or 3 weeks, during which time we would thresh out once and for all some of these very important questions regarding the allotment of cotton acreage. I regret that time does not permit the writing of a more equitable bill. However, we know that a delay in the Senate means no law at all can be enacted.

I desire to congratulate my friends from the wheat-producing areas for having been able, last year, to get through legislation relating to wheat allotments, and not be confronted with the condition in which those of us who came from areas that are primarily devoted to the production of cotton find ourselves today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to say that the Senator from Georgia has very ably expressed my sentiments regarding this bill. We are here confronted with such a situation that obviously we cannot take time to try to solve these problems and at the same time meet the urgency that is upon us.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are confronted with a very grave condition, and we are operating with a very tight time limitation. For that reason alone I can justify my support of the pending bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished and able junior Senator from Georgia has voiced the thought in my mind more ably than I could have done, with respect to the shift, by means of legislation, in the production of a basic commodity from a historic area of production to a new area of production.

Will not the Senator from Georgia, with his great ability, also indicate to the Senate his agreement with me, if he entertains it, that in an area where the production is the product of many hands, many small homesteads, such a shift of production will occasion far greater human hardship than will be relieved by granting additional acreage to certain production areas where the land is owned in large tracts and is irrigated, thereby bringing in great production?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Tennessee well knows that particularly in the hill areas of his State and my State and all the other historic cotton-producing States, the average cotton farm is very small, sometimes having only 3, 4, or 5 acres. Cotton produced there is tediously dug out of the ground—and the hill country is more often than not rocky ground—with hoes and pony plows. This cotton is picked by the fingers of women and children and placed into bags swung from their shoulders. It is carried long distances on weary backs before the cotton is weighed and sent to the gin.

This tremendous shift in cotton to the high producing irrigated areas is a great blow to thousands of small family-sized farms. The large number of cotton farms in any one of the historic cotton producing States as compared with the small number of cotton farms in the States that have only lately come into the field of cotton production with irrigated lands will demonstrate that when we speak in terms of human beings, human welfare, and human values, we are adversely affecting the lives of thousands of poor people by reducing the only cash income they have when we take cotton away from the historic cotton producing States. In the new irrigated areas farming is mechanized, and in most instances these large farms are owned and operated by corporations.

These shifts in production depress the already low standards of living of the very poorest people of the Nation. Any table of statistics relating to national income which can possibly be produced will show that the lowest annual income goes to the small cotton farmers of the historic Cotton Belt.

These people who are already our poorest will be further disadvantaged by shifts in production to the corporate farms in irrigated areas. To deny them the opportunity to produce a few pounds of cotton, which is their only source of cash income, is a serious matter. They are so poor it gets down to a question of being able to provide shoes for their children. Reductions in their income involves real hardship and privation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on amendment B, I hope the Members of the Senate will realize that the amendment only reduces the acreage for the State of New Mexico. The amendment is supposed to reduce by one-half the hardship acreage for the States of Arizona and California; but those States get back that same acreage under the 34 percent gadget.

I am trying to say that neither Arizona nor California would lose one acre of production, under the provisions of the amendment. The only State adversely affected by the amendment would be the State of New Mexico, which would lose 11,000 acres.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator say that this bill is written in such a way that if an amendment would change the discrimination visited in one paragraph upon these States, they would regain that acreage by other provisions in other paragraphs of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I only point out that the amendment as now written would cut 11,000 acres from the allotment for the State of New Mexico. The amendment would not touch the acreage in Arizona; it would not touch the acreage in California. It would add approximately 50,000 acres to be divided among all other States.

I point out to certain Senators that I have tried to be fair with reference to this legislative proposal.

I know the Senator from Mississippi tried very hard to have a provision written into the bill concerning total cropland, and he found that I tried my very best to find a legal basis upon which it could be put into the bill. The same statement applies to many other recommendations which came before the committee.

I think it is a little severe to cut 11,000 acres from the allocation for New Mexico, which did not have to have another gadget in order to keep its acreage in line.

If the Senator from Oklahoma wishes to have the acreage given to the States of Arizona and California reduced, he has to do it by amending the 66 percent gadget.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, with great reluctance I withdraw the amendment. I say to the Senator from New Mexico that it was not intended to take 11,000 acres from New Mexico and give it to the historic cotton-producing States; but it was intended to take half of 157,500 acres from California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and reallocate it to the historic States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I know that was the Senator's intention; but because of the 66 percent limitation, I know the amendment would not affect California or Arizona. It would affect only New Mexico.

Mr. KERR. What the Senator from New Mexico has said indicates that in this bill there are gadgets and devices of discrimination beyond those which I thought I had discovered in the limited time available to me to study the bill.

On that basis and on the basis of the withdrawal of this amendment, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD amendment A, the purpose of which would have been to increase the 21 million-acre allocation to a 21,500,000-acre allocation. I shall not urge the amendment at this time. I now ask that amendment A be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. KERR to the bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, viz: On page 1, line 9, strike the word "twenty-one" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one million five hundred thousand."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I join other Senators who have here expressed the wish that the discriminations in this bill, reinforced and safeguarded by gadgets and language in various provisions of the bill, will be found by the conferees, and that in the conference committee a meeting ground will be found between the provisions of this bill and those of

the House bill, that will, in the spirit of real equity and justice, accomplish and be consistent with the principle expressed by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], but by finding a different objective than the one he outlined.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself also, along with the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], with the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I was not present to hear previous debate. No doubt there are other Senators with whom I, representing in part the cotton growers of the State of Missouri, would also like to associate myself.

Mr. President, I have a short statement to make with respect to the problem of the cotton growers of Missouri.

Responsible cotton-producer representatives from Missouri and other States have informed me they cannot support the bill in its present form.

They state this bill tends to promote sectionalism; also that thousands of farm families in the old-established cotton-growing areas, such as Missouri, will be penalized at the same time that special acreage is given to Western States. That would seem most unfortunate.

Missouri has a relatively small cotton-growing area—seven counties to be exact; but there are more cotton farms in Missouri than the combined total of cotton farms in 3 large cotton-producing States of the West to which first 157,500 acres, and then 59,000 more, are given.

These 3 States already have an allotment of 1,153,262 acres for 1954. Missouri has an allotment of 391,396 acres.

In other words, Missouri farmers have approximately one-third the allotment per farm as have these western farmers. These same Western States have 108,465 more acres than they had under allotments in 1950.

Missouri, on the other hand, has 71,443 acres less than the 1950 allotment.

Will this shift bring about a need for additional foreign workers to be imported? Figures from the Department of Labor show that in 1952, the latest figures available for a complete year, one Western State imported 22,539 foreign workers, another 57,407, another 19,352.

In 1952, Missouri used 1,790 foreign workers.

Do the western growers need the acreage from the South and the East to provide employment for citizens of other countries?

For the answer to this question I now refer to a telegram received on January 8, last, by the Missouri Cotton Producers Association. This telegram is signed by a Mr. William H. Tolbert, chairman of a western labor users committee. It reads:

Suggest joint resolution Senate and House Agriculture and Appropriations Committees to expand authority of Departments Labor and Justice to continue Mexican national supplementary labor program and supply of funds for activities for remainder fiscal year. California crops in jeopardy due inability to obtain workers now. Appreciate any influence brought on committees involved for affirmative action.

It is my understanding the old growers one time agreed to give up 157,500 acres with the expectation of more reasonable amendments to the current law. These amendments for the old growers are not in S. 2643, and if not inserted, either here or in conference, Missouri would face the same situation later in the year. Missouri cotton producers representatives have been here for days trying to have these amendments included.

Would it not be possible to insert these amendments in the bill; and thereby recognize the serious problems of the little farmers in the old cotton-growing States?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I am a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That committee has given this bill very long, careful, and painstaking consideration. It is not by any means a perfect bill; but I am in favor of the bill because I believe it is absolutely necessary to have some increase in acreage unless we are to impose tremendous hardships upon the farmers throughout the cotton-growing States?

I opposed some of the provisions of the bill in committee, but after full and detailed discussion on the part of the committee certain amendments were adopted and some others were defeated. Some of them relate to the mechanism of the bill. I think they could very well be taken care of in conference. The subject has been discussed by a number of Senators, who have already spoken to the effect that the conference is the proper place to make certain adjustments. However, I think we should disabuse the public mind of the notion that this is not a pretty good bill in most respects. The bill has so many features that will help the cotton-growing States that I do not think we could afford to jeopardize its passage by delaying methods or by undertaking to insert amendments which would be destructive of the context of the bill.

I think the committee has done a very good job. I believe that with the possibility of some changes being made in the mechanics of the bill in conference, we can go back to our people and say that this bill represents a distinct improvement over what we would have if we were to allow the present law to apply, with a restriction to 17,910,000 acres.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate bill 2643. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had thought that there was an amendment pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] was withdrawn.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to make a statement preparatory to offering an amendment.

The bill as presently written would withdraw approximately 4 million acres of land from the production of cotton but would impose no limit upon the uses to which the 4 million acres of land thus withdrawn might be put.

We know quite well what will happen in the absence of any such limitation. The farmers will naturally be anxious to increase their incomes, and they will use the land for the production, in the main, of other crops. The result will be an increase in the planting and production of soybeans, as well as an increase in the production of soybean oil.

We shall also have an increase in the planting of vegetables, and we shall have an increased quantity of potatoes, lettuce, celery, tomatoes, and so forth. This last may be particularly the case in areas in the West where cotton is grown under irrigation. The acreage withdrawn from cotton will be diverted into other channels.

While we deal with the question of surpluses in cotton, we shall be increasing the problem of surpluses in other commodities. It seems to me that we should deal with this issue in this initial bill, and that we should provide that the acreage which is thus withdrawn shall be devoted to soil-conserving purposes, and employed in soil-conserving practices. In other words, alternative crops—at least cash crops—should not be planted on the land thus withdrawn, but instead there might be a planting of the nitrogen-fixing plants, the legumes, lespedeza, clover, and alfalfa, in particular, which are soil-building plants taking nitrogen out of the air and putting it into the soil. In many cases, also, this land might be used for pasturage purposes.

I know that if we produce more clover and alfalfa and pasture more cattle, that this will not be a complete withdrawal from use, because it will increase, directly and indirectly, the production of beef cattle and dairy products. But at least we shall be putting something back into the soil, instead of further taking valuable natural elements out of the soil. The entire problem will face us when we come to deal with other farm commodities—when we withdraw, if we do, 16 million acres of wheat land, and when we withdraw many million acres of corn land. The question will arise as to the alternative uses of these soils. If we do not make any attempt whatsoever to deal with this question, what we shall do will be to improve the position of the producers of the so-called basic crops, but worsen the condition of the producers of other crops.

It is in a sense, I think, somewhat shocking that we must deal with the problem of farm surpluses at all, in a world where there is still hunger. I hope very much that we can devise methods to get so-called surplus food products into the stomachs of hungry people, and surplus cotton on the backs of ill-clad people. We obviously now have the problem of what is called overproduction with respect to these commodities, and we are not helping the national interest when we transfer the problem from one crop to another. So,

I shall offer an amendment, as an addition to line 23 on page 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 23, it is proposed to add the following proviso:

Provided further, That acreage which is withdrawn from the cultivation of cotton in excess of 3 acres per farm shall not be devoted to the production of other cash crops but shall be used for soil-conserving practices such as the growing of legumes and other nitrogen-fixing plants, for the pasturing of cattle, and for other appropriate means.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wonder whether the Senator would be agreeable to adding wheat to his amendment. I believe that ought to be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am perfectly willing to have that principle carried out with respect to wheat and corn.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Wheat should be added to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The pending bill deals with cotton. When we come to consider wheat and corn I shall be glad to offer such an amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator realize that the pending measure contains a wheat amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. We have already taken care of wheat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would suggest that we try first to obtain agreement on the amendment which I now offer.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from Illinois add an amendment providing compensation to the farmer for thus putting his acreage into use and providing a cash income for him and his family, so that there will be adequate incentive to carry out the provisions of the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe that it is necessary at present to give a bonus for that purpose. The use of the proposed practice will build up the soil in itself. We want the South to prosper. We want the position of the cotton grower to be protected. However, we are well aware of the fact that the great increase in the production of soybeans in the South will worsen the position of the Middle West. I am perfectly willing to apply the same principle when we come to a consideration of corn and wheat.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In order that the legislative history may be clear, will the Senator agree, after the word "cotton," to add the words "or wheat or corn"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to do so when we consider wheat and corn.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the conferees would understand the meaning of the amendment and would endeavor to work out the purpose of the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator says he will be glad to offer such an amendment when we consider wheat. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the pending bill is a wheat bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is only by a great stretch of the meaning of the bill that wheat has been tacked on. It is in the form of a vermiform appendix.

Mr. EASTLAND. Such an amendment would certainly be germane.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Obviously, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois would change the basic character of the pending bill. It raises some very vital questions which would adversely affect and would certainly have great repercussions upon those whose acreage would be taken out of production. It is not the type of amendment that should go into emergency legislation. A situation has arisen which needs quick attention. If the farmers are to obtain relief, they must get it quickly. I refer to the farmers in the South and in the West. In my opinion, an amendment of this kind would kill the legislation. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that the President of the United States in the message which was read to the Senate yesterday recommended that land which is withdrawn from cultivation should be devoted to soil-conservation practices? Is that not correct? I read from his message:

When land must be diverted from production it is essential that its use be related to the basic objectives of soil conservation—to protect and to improve that land.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct, but we have——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can hardly believe it possible that the majority leader should now be opposing on the floor of the Senate a proposal advanced only yesterday by the head of his own administration. It is extraordinary that it falls on the shoulders of Senators on this side of the aisle to take on the armor and do battle for the administration—against its own supposed leaders.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is trying to get a laugh. He knows that the proposal of the President of the United States related to a permanent farm program. We have before us a piece of emergency legislation designed to meet a critical situation in the South and in the West. It is a situation which, if we are to meet it at all, we must do it immediately. The amendment which the Senator offers, for the first time on the floor of the Senate today, has not had the consideration of the committee. It has far-reaching consequences. The Senator from Illinois knows as well as the majority leader this is not the type of amendment that should be added to the bill, and in my opinion, the effect of adding it to the bill would be to kill it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to point out that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois does not conform to the recommendations of the President. The recommendations of the President, as I recall them, were that when the land was taken out of cultivation from one crop and devoted to soil conservation practice, ACB payments should be made. I am sure he recommended payment. The Senator from Illinois is unalterably opposed to any payments being made, as I understand. Therefore, his amendment does not conform to the more liberal recommendations of the President of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Both the amendment of the Senator from Illinois and the proposal of the President of the United States will be given time to be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and by the Senate. Such an amendment does not belong on the pending bill.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the vote on the cotton-acreage bill there may be inserted in the RECORD messages and telegrams which I have received with reference to that measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The messages and telegrams presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

EAST GRAND FORKS, MINN.,
January 11, 1954.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building:

Strongly urge passage of Welker rider providing for use of section 32 funds for diversion of potatoes.

FARMERS CO-OP POTATO MARKETING ASSOCIATION,
HERMAN SKYBERG, *President.*
T. P. FREDRICKSON, *Manager.*

PALATINE, ILL., *January 8, 1954.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Macaroni and noodle industry is faced with critical shortage of durum wheat raised in a small section of North and South Dakota and Minnesota. We urge your support of the amendment removing durum acreage allotments in Senate bill 2643 in the best interests of the growers, processors, and consuming public.

ROBERT M. GREEN,
Secretary, National Macaroni Manufacturers Association.

JANUARY 11, 1954.

ROBERT M. GREEN,
Secretary, National Macaroni Manufacturers Association, Palatine, Ill.:

You can count on my support for efforts to exempt durum from acreage allotments. Letter follows.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 8, 1954.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The durum milling industry is faced with a critical shortage of durum wheat. Our normal durum grind is 24 to 26 million bushels annually. Production of millable durum this year was less than half that amount. Carryover from previous crops was very small. There will be no carryover to next crop.

The semolina and durum flours ground from durum wheat are required by the manufacturers of macaroni, spaghetti, and noodles for the manufacture of high quality products. An adequate supply of durum wheat is necessary to maintain the quality of these important foods, and to permit consumers to purchase them at reasonable prices.

Milling durum is a highly specialized crop. It is produced only in a small territory in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota. The macaroni industry and the American consumer are entirely dependent upon the farmers of that small area for durum supplies. Since durum wheat is in critically short supply rather than in a surplus position, durum acreage in the durum territory should be excluded from the acreage allotment program. We urge in the interest of consumers, producers, and processors that you support the section in Senate bill 2643 dealing with durum acreage allotments.

JULE M. WABER,
Chairman, Durum Committee, Millers National Federation.

JANUARY 12, 1954.

JULE M. WABER,
Chairman, Durum Committee, Amber Milling Division, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.:

You can count on my support for efforts to exempt durum from acreage allotments. Letter follows.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. AIKEN. After the bill has been read a third time, I propose to move to substitute the wording of the Senate bill for the language contained in H. R. 6665. I do not want the bill to be passed before that is done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6665.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the House bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the title be amended so as to read:

An act to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. WELKER, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. CLEMENTS conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2643 will be indefinitely postponed.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 442, Senate bill 2150.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2150) providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say for the information of the Senate that what I have in mind is to bring up the bill for consideration and make it the unfinished business. I would not propose at this hour that the Senate proceed with debate on the measure.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have discussed the matter with 1 Senator who desires to make more than 2 speeches, but not at length, if the parliamentary situation is such that he may make 2 brief speeches. For that reason, I wish the Senator from California would not make his motion at this time but wait until I can further discuss the question. We should like to make it possible for one of the Senators to make more speeches than he would ordinarily make under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am merely trying to expedite the business of the Senate. For over a week I have given advance notice that we would take up these bills in orderly sequence. There was no attempt to bring them up without prior notice to the Senate. Under the circumstances, we should have unfinished business before the Senate. The orderly procedure would be to bring the bills up, and a Senator could submit a request to make six speeches if he so desired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the information of the Senate I should like to say that I have just had a discussion with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Maryland for whom the Senator from Louisiana had spoken, and it is agreeable to them, as I understand, that the quorum call be dispensed with and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2150, with the understanding that the debate will proceed tomorrow.

I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 442, Senate bill 2150, providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 730, House bill 1917, which is the only one of the three coinage bills which has not been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the title of the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1917) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have a series of amendments at the desk which I desire to call up at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, to strike out all in lines 7 through 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Such coins shall be disposed of at par by banks or trust companies selected

by the Louisiana Purchase One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Association, or the Missouri Historical Society."

On page 2, line 24, to strike out "1953" and insert in lieu thereof "1954."

On page 3, beginning with the semicolon in line 16, to strike out all through the word "sesquicentennial" in line 19 and add a period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this bill authorizes the coinage of a certain number of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase. There have been celebrations in States which were originally a part of the Louisiana Purchase territory. The President of the United States participated in these celebrations, as did the Ambassador from France.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS REFERRED

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate take a recess until noon tomorrow, but I shall be glad to withhold my motion if there be any further business to be transacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate certain nominations, which will be referred to the appropriate committees.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 13, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 12 (legislative day of January 7), 1954:

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Vernon Woods, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Carl J. Werner, resigned.

George M. Glasser, of New York, to be United States marshal for the western district of New York, vice Raymond A. Morgan whose term has expired.

Emmett Mitchell Smith, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas, vice Clifton C. Carter whose term has expired.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our shelter from life's stormy blasts and our eternal home: We come with confidence, not in our feeble hold of Thee but in Thy mighty grasp of us as we trust the love that will not let us go. Gird, we beseech Thee, with a strength and power which is not their own Thy servants in the ministry of public affairs, who, in this temple of the people's hope, give their consent to enactments expressing the inflexible creed that human tyranny is an offense to the Creator and that by divine decree mankind everywhere is crowned with infinite worth and dignity, the right to abundant life and abounding freedom.

We humbly pray that Thou wilt use us in these decisive days as Thy instrument to bring to naught the evil schemes of all who, at home and abroad, deny the fundamental faith which flames in splendor at the heart of a democracy which shall at last redeem all the sons of men and make them the sons of God.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 12, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FREAR was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow, Thursday, January 14, 1954, in order to attend to official business in the State of Delaware.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MALONE, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to hold a hearing beginning at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

On request of Mr. MCCARTHY, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday next.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and the insertion of matters in the RECORD, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	McCarran
Anderson	Hayden	McCarthy
Barrett	Hennings	McClellan
Beall	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bennett	Hill	Monroney
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Burke	Holland	Mundt
Bush	Humphrey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Payne
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kefauver	Smathers
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Upton
Frear	Lennon	Watkins
Fulbright	Long	Welker
George	Magnuson	Wiley
Gillette	Malone	Williams
Goldwater	Martin	Young
Gore	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the Vice President, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, for the year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of action initiated and completed in carrying out the saline water conversion program, dated January 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER PROPERTY OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Sac and Fox of the Missouri Tribe of Indians located in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, the Iowa Tribe of Indians located in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, the Kickapoo Tribe of Indians located in the State of Kansas, and the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians located in the State of Kansas, and the individual members thereof; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Seminole Tribe of Indians in the State of Florida and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana, and the individual members thereof; for assistance in the orderly relocation of such Indians in areas of greater economic opportunity; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.

A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, Inc., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that association, for the period ended March 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SCHOOL PROBLEMS—RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers during their 1953 convention in Minneapolis, Minn., be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS, 1953 CONVENTION, MINNESOTA CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS, INC., MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., OCTOBER 26, 27, 28

In a confused and changing world we are deeply conscious that an intelligent and courageous program of action alone can make for progress.

The Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers calls upon its members to devote themselves wholeheartedly to the basic objectives of our organizations to the end that this progress shall be realized in the fullest possible development of our children and their integrations in the on-going life of our Nation and world.

Therefore to attain this "progress through action" we, the 31st annual convention of the Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers make the following declaration:

We declare our complete commitment to the action program of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers for better homes, better schools, and better communities.

Our faith is reaffirmed in the public school as the foundation of democracy. We commend its teachings of the basic skills and its effective work in educating our children in a democracy in a changing world.

We call upon our educational system to provide adequate facilities for the full development of all our children including the handicapped and the gifted so that each child may attain his full capacity of development.

We call upon the people of each community to provide the means necessary for such a program.

1. We affirm our confidence in the integrity and loyalty of our teachers and we declare our faith in the American tradition of freedom of thought and expression and we call for vigorous opposition to the efforts of self-appointed critics who seek to enforce conformity of thought and expression.

2. We oppose any movement to curb the right to read and we endorse the Freedom to Read as embodied in a statement prepared by the Westchester Conference of the American Library Association and the American Book Publishers Council which statement has been endorsed by President Eisenhower.

3. In view of the interdependence of peoples in the modern world we consider the teaching in our schools of the programs and progress of the United Nations as vital to prepare them for responsible citizenship.

4. Realizing the acute shortage of teachers and realizing the increase of 50 percent in the birth rate since 1940 and the increasing school enrollments we commend the governor on the establishment of the Teacher Recruitment Committee. We also commend the committee in taking steps to attract worthy persons into the teaching profession including efforts toward the establishment of teacher training scholarships. We further urge that this Committee on Teacher Recruitment explore the possibility of a legislative program that will help finance and encourage worthy high school students to enter the teaching profession. We also urge that the committee study the advisability of tuition-free training courses. We pledge our hearty cooperation and support of this committee.

5. In view of the terrific increase of accidents on our highways and streets and because 95 percent of high-school students today are or will be driving automobiles, we urge that every high-school district inaugurate a program of driver training. Because of the problems of funds for this purpose we urge that the legislature interim committee recommend driver-training State aid.

6. In view of the enormous death toll due to automobile accidents, a large percentage of which are our children between the ages of 1 and 15, we call upon our local units to take the lead in promoting in their communities a campaign for traffic law enforcement and safe and sensible driving that will stop this needless slaughter of our children.

7. We urge enforcement of all school-bus laws relating to school-bus chauffeurs and school-bus traffic as passed by the last legislature and that the Governor, secretary of state, and others pertinently concerned be informed, and to seek the cooperation of the Governor's commission on safety.

8. In order to protect children who must cross highways going to and from school we ask that the Minnesota commissioner of highways secure adequate traffic controls, including automatic signals and devices.

9. We urge that driver-training courses be offered at more of our colleges in order that qualified instructors for courses in safe driving will be available.

10. In preparing for the 1955 session of the State legislature we renew efforts now for obtaining the following legislation: Channels for the establishment of noncommercial educational television; to work for a fair employment act; child-labor laws that meet the national standards; continuing and strengthening the school reorganization act; the mental-health and youth-conservation programs; adequate building and equipment to care for our handicapped children, including those institutionalized; aid for statewide library service and aid for junior colleges.

11. We renew our endorsement of the legislative program of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers as passed upon by the State convention body of 1952.

12. We encourage local PTA units to take leadership in urging the improvement of recreational opportunities offered by schools, churches, community councils, and other voluntary agencies.

13. We urge all local PTA units and their members to (a) oppose actively liquor advertising by radio, television, or through other media which reach great numbers of our boys and girls; (b) to protest the insidious propaganda of those motion pictures and television programs that show or refer to the use of liquor as if such use were to be considered a normal and desirable custom of adult living; (c) we urge the development in both school and community of more effective programs of alcohol and narcotic education.

14. In view of the fact that over 95 percent of our children are suffering from dental caries, and fluoride in one part in a million reduces dental caries by from 50 to 65 percent, the Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers strongly urges all of its local units to work actively for the fluoridation of their communal water supplies in cooperation with dental and public-health authorities.

15. We reaffirm our stand that the appropriation of the National Congress under the School Lunch Act, chapter 396, should be continued, at least in its present amount, and we further advise an increased appropriation for the school-lunch program.

16. In view of the great increase in delinquency in recent years we again wish to emphasize the importance of example in family life during the entire period of childhood in the prevention of delinquent behavior. In this same regard be it urged that our growing children be made to understand that with privileges there always goes responsibilities.

17. Being greatly concerned about the critical shortage of public school teachers,

and as we want to indicate our concern concretely, the Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers Convention delegates, here assembled, suggest and approve the established of a fund to be contributed by PTA members through their local units from which scholarships for teacher education will be awarded worthy high school graduates who agree to complete training for the teaching profession.

It is further suggested that the State board of managers set up a committee to carry out the intent of this proposal.

18. Notices of the above resolutions will be sent to all interested agencies and individuals.

Mrs. HENRY KRAMER,
Mr. ANDERS R. THOMPSON,
Dr. ROY BURT,
Mr. R. S. COWIE,
Mr. T. J. BERNING,
Dr. H. F. HELMHOLZ,
Acting Chairman,
Resolutions Committee.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, at their State convention in Minneapolis, relating to the warmaking power, and the financing of State employment security programs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas the power to declare war rightfully belongs to our United States Congress, as the people's representatives, duly chosen to govern their affairs, and as so expressly stated in our Constitution; and

"Whereas this constitutional power of Congress was usurped by the executive branch of our Government when the United States President persuaded the United Nations to launch the so-called police action in Korea in June 1950, embroiling America in a 3-year war and bypassing Congress sitting in regular session only a short distance away from the White House: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, in convention assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., on August 5, 1953,* That we hereby call upon Congress to zealously guard this warmaking power and to surrender not one iota of it to either the executive branch or to the United Nations, insofar as Executive or United Nations action would commit even one American boy to fight an engagement not expressly authorized by the American people's own House of Representatives and Senate, which comprise the collective wisdom of our country through the constitutional democratic process; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the above resolution is not intended to criticize America's entry into the Korean war to put down aggression, but only to criticize our manner of entry into it, whereby our United States Constitution became a meaningless scrap of paper, rendering our representative Government farcical in its impotence; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Minnesota Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

"CARL GRANNING,
"*Department Adjutant.*"

To the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the Federal Government levies a payroll tax of three-tenths of 1 percent for the purpose of financing the administration of the State employment security programs; and

"Whereas the full amount of this tax revenue has never been reallocated to the State by the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the recently passed congressional appropriation for the administration of the State employment security programs will cause a serious reduction in the staff of the offices of the Minnesota State Employment Service with the resultant impairment of services to veterans; and

"Whereas there is currently pending legislation in Congress which provides that the full amount of the three-tenths of 1 percent payroll tax shall be returned to the States in order that their employment security program may be properly and adequately financed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, in convention assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., on August 5, 1953,* That we respectfully urge the Minnesota delegation in Congress to support this legislation so that the Minnesota State Employment Service office may be adequately staffed to provide proper care and attention to the problems of the disabled veterans, older veterans, and other veterans seeking job counseling and employment placement assistance; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Minnesota members of the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

"CARL GRANNING,
"*Department Adjutant.*"

PRICE SUPPORTS—RESOLUTION OF SAUK LAKE COOPERATIVE CREAMERY ASSOCIATION, SAUK CENTRE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Sauk Lake Cooperative Creamery Association of Sauk Centre, Minn., at their regular annual convention, in support of a price support of 90 percent or better, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the prosperity of agriculture is basic to the well-being of the United States; and

Whereas the farmer cannot control production, cannot set the price for what he sells or what he buys and at the same time pays the freight both ways; and

Whereas other segments of the economy—some monopolistic and others adjusting prices through collusion, leave the farmer of today in a position where he needs governmental support to secure justice in the market place.

Whereas there are two factors that increase production; one, higher prices and the other, lower prices. Further, it isn't easy for the farmer to change his type of operation, especially at a time when surpluses seem to be common to all basic crops and farm products.

Therefore it appears necessary that the Federal Government supply supports so that the farming community can exchange the dollar it receives on a fair basis with the dollar that it must pay in the market place. Parity should be parity—the figure should be 100 percent. A flexible support price means a lower price and the farming community is modest in its demands when it insists that the support price be at least 90 percent.

Therefore the Sauk Lake Cooperative Creamery Association in its annual convention goes on record for a support price of 90 percent of parity or better, and instructs its officers to send this communication to the Secretary of Agriculture, to our two United States Senators, and the Congressman from this district, FRED MARSHALL, and to the chairman of the Agricultural Committees of both Senate and House.

JOSEPH ZIRBES,
Secretary.

PARCEL POST RESTRICTIONS—LETTER FROM ST. PAUL ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the St. Paul Association of Commerce, requesting repeal of Public Law 199 and the enactment of H. R. 2685, relating to parcel-post restrictions, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
St. Paul, Minn., January 7, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Leading merchants in the Retail Department of the St. Paul Association of Commerce urgently request a repeal of Public Law 199 and further request enactment of H. R. 2685 (Broyhill bill) for these reasons:

Present restrictions are costing merchants and other shippers great added expense in extra packaging and costs required by other methods of shipment.

Present restrictions are causing losses in millions of dollars to the postal service. Retailers have a real stake in maintaining a sound and adequate postal service.

Present restrictions are unfair and discriminate against the patrons of thousands of post offices.

Present rules are difficult and costly to administer. Larger sizes and weights should be restored and should be uniform in all zones and post offices.

In 1951, over opposition of the Post Office Department, Congress enacted Public Law 199, cutting weights of parcel-post packages to 40 pounds in first and second zones and 20 pounds in other zones when mailed between first-class post offices. Size limit (length plus girth) was cut to 72 inches, reducing cubic content of packages to 37.8 percent of original permissible volume. Since 1931 the size (100 inches) and weight (70 pounds) has been uniform in all zones.

Parcel post has opened service to thousands of rural communities, towns, and cities. Recent discriminatory restrictions have cut this service to fewer communities.

The Annual Report of the Postmaster General for 1952 said in part: "The reduced size and weight limits were established by Congress for the purpose of diverting some of the large parcels to other means of transportation, such as express, freight, etc. This legislation was not initiated or recommended by the Department, but was opposed because

of its discriminatory features. The law has proven very difficult to administer and has created widespread criticism and dissatisfaction. It has resulted in hardship and inconvenience to many manufacturers, merchants, and others."

The Post Office Department recently showed the Interstate Commerce Commission that the new size and weight limits resulted in a net deficit of $52,400,000 in 1952.

We earnestly request your cooperation along the lines as outlined in our letter.

Respectfully yours,

M. W. THOMPSON,
Retail Secretary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs at their fall council meeting in St. Paul, urging the Congress to pass the so-called O'Hara bill amending the present Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Whereas women of the United States play a vital role as the principal purchasers of food for the members of their households, and are concerned about the quality of food served in public eating places, as well as in their homes; and

Whereas a new and perplexing food problem confronts the public as a result of a decision of the United States Supreme Court permitting the interstate shipment of products labeled "imitation"; and

Whereas the O'Hara bill (H. R. 2739) now pending in the Congress as an amendment to the present Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is designed to prevent the flood of imitations as well as substandard foods currently reaching the market under the imitation label: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs strongly urges the Congress to pass the O'Hara bill (H. R. 2739) and that a copy of this resolution be sent to all of its Representatives and Senators in the United States Congress and to the General Federation of Women's Clubs resolutions committee for favorable action.

USE OF SURPLUS BUTTER ON ARMED FORCES MENU—PETITION FROM MENAHGA FARMERS COOPERATIVE CREAMERY ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition from 600 patrons of the Menahga Farmers Cooperative Creamery Association, adopted at the annual meeting on the 24th of February 1953. The petition deals with surplus butter and its uses. I suggest that this petition be brought to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during its deliberations on agricultural legislation.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION OF MENAHGA FARMERS COOPERATIVE CREAMERY ASSOCIATION, MENAHGA, MINN.

FROM 600 PATRONS OF MENAHGA FARMERS COOPERATIVE CREAMERY ASSOCIATION

We at our annual meeting resolve on the 24th day of February 1953 that butter as long as it is a surplus commodity be on the Armed Forces menu.

We believe that if this is done it will relieve the surplus situation, and also help keep our market and prices in keeping with our cost of production.

ALBERT ANDERSON,
President.
ART PETERSON,
Secretary.

P. S.—This resolution was passed unanimously at our annual meeting.

John Markkula, Nels Pietila, Axel B. Hepola, Nutt Pulgin, Nels Carlsen, J. J. Lehse, Mrs. E. Stahlbuck, Gust Patson, Jacob Palokangas, John E. Niemela, Mrs. Henry Nickanen, Robert Nevala, Harry Mallory, Wm. G. Wisuri, Geo. A. Howes, Joe Dusch, Henry Newhouse, Mrs. Levi Kayala, Emil Jacob, Ehner Jumes, Paul Sakkinen, Henry Nikanen, Frank Swarth, Andrew Pietila, John Maaninga, Elmer Ollila, Eino Kangar, W. W. Wells, Mrs. Betty Alajoki, Eino Samuelson, Jack Dahlberg, Fritz Stomberg, William Haataja, Henry Hiltunen, John H. Lake, Oscar Torvinen, Art Rasky, Matt White, Enok Breeder, Oscar Niskanen, Ben Maningo, Onni Niemela, Arthur Breider, Gust Dorneane, Hans Carlson, Helma Castren, Guy Rutherford, Lester Lowe, George Allingham, Jacob Yliteio, Hilma Ollila, P. E. Bartlett, Alex Kuha, V. J. Wagner, Emil Maijasson, Allie Juntunen, Pete Jacobson, Leo Matson, Paul Day, Art Ervasti, Wm. Blanchard, Wesley Ervasti, E. A. Vitt, Theo Oakland, Waino Wiitala, Leonard Maum, W. Stowell, C. W. Johnson, O. W. Jacobson, Evert Maaninga, Saima Maaninga, Evert Wirkkunen, Ruth Wirkkunen, Wm. Stahl, A. J. Kismunen, P. O. Peterson, Rufus Patson, Otto Wehmas, Sig Knogotad, Wm. Carlson, Fred Vanderhoef, Henry Torkkala, Louis W. Etter, Mary Kynusfeisne, Victor Karkinen, Olaf Liimatta, Alma Etter, Reino Maaninga, Wm. Granroth, John Salminen, Robert White, Fritz Liimatta, Ernest Kluge, Lester Ely, Edwin Kinnunen, Eino Maaninga, Ellis J. Bower, Charles Rydie, Mrs. Eino Maaninga, E. A. Jacob, Emil Jacob, Arvid Newhouse, Arma Ristinen, Oscar Walkama, Walter Maijamaa, August Baso, Walter Jefferson, Olivier L. Bash, Norman Johnson, George Koski, Asher Wiemele, Edward A. Ristinun, Eugene H. Burgess, Dewitt D. Downer, Wallace Lalli, Wm. L. Anderson, Mrs. Enoch Anderson, Mrs. Wm. L. Anderson, Harry Burkman, Jalmer Lake, Arthur Ohlgren, Fred Sakkinen, Elmer Schwartz, Eino Makela, Lowell Hilgeson, Oswald Bohjanen, James Juntunen, Lars P. Leinonen, Jalmar Maijamaa, Walter Samuelson, Wilmer Karjala, Albin Gronlund, Ed Morgan, A. A. Alanina, Sam Torma, John Schwartz, Wesley Ely, Joseph Reger, Elmer Redetzki, Alben Olson, John Jarwa, Laurence Schendeldecker, Viola Schendeldecker, E. A. Palokangos, Betty Palokangas, Ethel Liimatta, Evert Newhouse, Ruby Kinnunen.

TREATYMAKING POWERS AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from all over the Nation, I have received a vast number of communications from thinking Americans, individually and collectively, who strongly oppose the so-called Bricker amendment.

Public-spirited citizens who have occupied great and renowned positions in national life and others, relatively unknown, doing their daily tasks at the grassroots of our Nation have written to me. They have stated that, in their judgment, Senate Joint Resolution 1 must be defeated in order to protect the United States Constitution and to protect United States foreign policy.

Aroused citizens are sending to me increasing numbers of petitions and public statements along this line. Indeed, so many statements and petitions against Senate Joint Resolution 1 have already come to my attention that it would be impossible for me to refer to them all.

I have in my hand one such important public statement as endorsed by 100 citizens from all parts of the Nation. It was sent to me by Mr. Goodhue Livingston, Jr.

I send to the desk now the text of Mr. Livingston's release, along with the powerful statement endorsed by the citizens and a list of those who signed it.

I ask unanimous consent that these materials be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the materials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELEASE FROM GOODHUE LIVINGSTON, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE ORGANIZING GROUP FOR THE COMMITTEE FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY, NEW YORK CITY

More than 100 leading citizens from all parts of the country have signed a statement labeling the Bricker and similar proposals to amend the Constitution as the beginning of an attempt to cause the United States to withdraw from the United Nations and urged the Congress to move for their defeat.

The statement was made public today by one of the signators, Goodhue Livingston, Jr., chairman of a group organizing the Committee for Collective Security.

In making public the statement, Livingston said: "This is the most dangerous piece of proposed legislation since the effort to pack the Supreme Court."

Livingston stated that the Committee for Collective Security is being formed on a nationwide basis. He said the purpose of the committee will be: "The support of collective security as vital to national security, and opposition to all forms of totalitarianism."

STATEMENT RELEASED BY THE COMMITTEE FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY

We urge Congress to defeat the proposal for a constitutional amendment concerning treaties and executive agreements.

We believe that the effort to limit the treatymaking power and to curtail the constitutional responsibility of the President to conduct our foreign relations is the beginning of an attempt to cause our withdrawal from the United Nations by those who do not understand that the only alternative to collective security is universal insecurity.

The adoption of this proposal might critically weaken the United States in its conduct of foreign relations, hinder the President in carrying out major responsibilities, prevent effective moves leading to universal disarmament or control of the hydrogen and atomic bombs, and upset the constitutional balance of power between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government.

The supremacy of the constitutional guaranties of our Bill of Rights over any treaty has often been stated by the Supreme Court.

Had the Bricker resolution been in effect at this time, 12 of the 23 treaties approved this year would have been unconstitutional despite the fact that they were overwhelmingly passed by the Senate.

Believing that any constitutional amendment regarding treatymaking powers is unnecessary and that the various texts suggested carry serious hazards in varying degrees, we oppose this proposal and urge its defeat.

LIST OF SIGNATORS OF THE STATEMENT FROM THE COMMITTEE FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY RELEASED BY GOODHUE LIVINGSTON, JR.

Herbert Agar, Frederick L. Allen, New York City; Dean Paul Shipman Andrews, Syracuse, N. Y.; Ernest Angell, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, Louise Laidlaw Backus, Dana C. Backus, William H. Baldwin, New York City; Courtenay Barber, Jr., Chicago, Ill.; Ulric Bell, New York City; Augustus Bennet, Newburgh, N. Y.; Dr. William S. Bernard, Mrs. Monroe Percy Bloch, Mrs. Sidney C. Borg, New York City; Pierce Butler, St. Paul, Minn.; Eric C. Bellquist, Berkeley, Calif.; Henry B. Cabot, Boston, Mass.; Cass Canfield, Dr. Henry J. Carman, Richard S. Childs, Edwin F. Chinlund, New York City; Dean Austin V. Clifford, Bloomington, Ind.; Paul P. Cohen, Niagara Falls, N. Y.; Rev. Edward A. Conway, Earl F. Cruickshank, C. Suydam Cutting, Russell W. Davenport, John W. Davis, New York City; Mrs. Henry P. Davison, Sr., Locust Valley, N. Y.; Dr. John S. Dickey, Hanover, N. H.; Mrs. Arthur H. DeBebian, Great Neck, N. Y.; George B. Denny, Jr., West Cornwall, Conn.; Dr. Clyde Eagleton, Tuckahoe, N. Y.; Edward L. Easton, Pelham Manor, N. Y.; Dr. Edward Mead Earle, Princeton, N. J.; Albert Edelman, Clark M. Eichelberger, George Fielding Eliot, Christopher Emmet, Irving M. Engel, New York City; Milton S. Erlanger, Elberon, N. J.; Leon Falk, Jr., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Raymond S. Fanning, New York City; Dean Jefferson B. Fordham, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Carl Friedrich, Cambridge, Mass.; Varian Fry, New York City; Prof. Paul A. Freund, Cambridge, Mass.; Rt. Rev. Charles K. Gilbert, Charlemont, Mass.; Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Bedford Village, N. Y.; Arthur J. Goldsmith, Ernest A. Gross, New York City; Prof. Mark O. Hatfield, Salem, Oreg.; Oscar W. Hausserman, Boston, Mass.; Dean Harold C. Havighurst, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. Elinor M. Herrick, New York City; William H. Hessler, Cincinnati, Ohio; Ernest M. Hopkins, Hanover, N. H.; J. Wallace Hopkins, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Prof. Mark DeW. Howe, Cambridge, Mass.; Mrs. Katherine C. Jackson, New York City; Dean Schuyler W. Jackson, Topeka, Kans.; Vincent C. James, Providence, R. I.; Dr. Alvin Johnson, Davis Jonas, Dr. Hans Kohn, Chester J. LaRoche, New York City; C. W. Leaphard, Missoula, Mont.; Prof. Gertrude Leighton, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Dr. Henry Smith Leiper, Leonia, N. J.; Goodhue Livingston, Jr., Orin Lehman, Cloyd LaPorte, New York City; John J. Mackrell, Troy, N. Y.; Prof. Douglas B. Maggs, Durham, N. C.; Thomas H. Mahony, Boston, Mass.; Raymond F. McCoy, Cincinnati, Ohio; Prof. Myres S. McDougal, New Haven, Conn.; Frederick C. McKee, Pittsburgh, Pa.; J. A. Nigel, Charlestown, R. I.; Dean Vernon X. Miller, San Francisco, Calif.; William D. Mitchell, New York City; Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Washington, D. C.; Henry Lee Munson, New York City; Maurice H. Merrill, Norman, Okla.; Pearson E. Neaman, Milton I. Newman, H. H. Nordlinger, New York City; John Nuveen, Chicago, Ill.; Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, Norfolk, Conn.; Prof. Covey T. Oliver, Berkeley, Calif.; William R. Oliver, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mrs. Robert P. Patterson, Ferdinand Pecora, Louis H. Pink, New York City; Raymond Pitcairn, Philadelphia, Pa.; Auguste Richard, B. A. Rittersporn, Jr., New York City; David Robinson, Portland, Oreg.; Prof. John P. Roche, Haverford, Pa.; Mrs. Ruth Bryan Rohde, Lindsay Rogers, Paul C. Sheeline, Dr. James T. Shotwell, Fred Smith, Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, Roderick Stephens, Mrs. DeWitt Stetten, Herbert Bayard Swope, Telford Taylor, Barent Ten Eyck, New York City; Dr. A. J. Thomas, Jr., Dallas, Tex.; Prof. Peter Viereck, South Hadley, Mass.; Dean Leon H. Wallace, Bloomington, Ind.; J. H. Wallis, Scarsdale, N. Y.; W. W. Waymack, Adel, Iowa; Philip Willkie, Rushville, Ind.; David J. Winton, Minneapolis, Minn.; Prof. Quincy Wright, Chicago, Ill.; Herbert A. Wolf, New York City.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. Res. 173. Resolution to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce; with an amendment.

SUMMARY OF REPORTS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a summary of monthly personnel reports on civilian personnel in the executive branch of the Federal Government issued during the recess of Congress. The reports were concerned with employment and payrolls during the period June-November 1953, inclusive.

In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Personnel and pay summary, June through November 1953

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In November numbered—	In June numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In October was—	In May was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,366,710	2,469,640	−102,930	$787,943	$803,818	−$15,875
1. Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,181,569	1,211,878	−30,309	401,670	403,405	−1,735
2. Department of Defense	1,185,141	1,257,762	−72,621	386,273	400,413	−14,140
Within the Department of Defense:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,852	2,020	−168	965	1,013	−48
Department of the Army	464,894	504,528	−39,634	138,351	141,957	−3,606
Department of the Air Force	288,587	302,339	−13,752	94,494	94,038	+456
Department of the Navy	429,808	448,875	−19,067	152,463	163,405	−10,942

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1953, and comparison with June 1953, and pay for October 1953, and comparison with May 1953*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	May	October	Increase	Decrease	June	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	22,751	24,078	1,327		81,233	70,262		10,971
Commerce [1,2]	21,669	18,650		3,019	55,319	45,459		9,860
Health, Education, and Welfare	12,527	12,701	174		36,742	36,238		504
Interior	20,308	20,236		72	58,746	52,367		6,379
Justice	12,534	13,080	546		30,625	30,172		453
Labor	2,386	2,308		78	6,627	6,237		390
Post Office	161,325	161,349	24		500,942	506,584	5,642	
State [3,4]	10,567	7,031		3,536	31,048	19,808		11,240
Treasury	31,552	31,386		166	85,498	81,104		4,394

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1953, and comparison with June 1953, and pay for October 1953, and comparison with May 1953*—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	May	October	Increase	Decrease	June	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	125	130	5		251	247		4
Bureau of the Budget	272	259		13	457	420		37
Council of Economic Advisers		13	13			22	22	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	22	25	3		105	127	22	
National Security Council [1]	13	16	3		24	28	4	
Office of Defense Mobilization	237	191		46	424	395		29
Office of the Director for Mutual Security [2]	59			59	126			126
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	1			1	6	6		
Emergency agencies:								
Defense Materials Procurement Agency [3]	69			69	75			75
Defense Transport Administration	50	23		27	96	38		58
Economic Stabilization Agency [4]	1,605	30		1,575	1,627			1,627
Federal Civil Defense Administration	399	396		3	766	698		68
Foreign Operations Administration [5]		2,200	2,200			6,634	6,634	
Mutual Security Agency [5]	1,786			1,786	4,465			4,465
National Security Training Commission	1	5	4		1	10	9	
Renegotiation Board	404	399		5	764	699		65
Small Defense Plants Administration [7]	241	326	85		452			452
Subversive Activities Control Board	19	19			29	31	2	
Postwar agencies:								
War Claims Commission	71	61		10	167	160		7
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	97	91		6	460	447		13
Atomic Energy Commission	3,018	3,008		10	6,979	6,404		575
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	242	256	14		583	583		
Civil Aeronautics Board	266	274	8		553	542		11
Civil Service Commission	1,776	1,786	10		4,736	4,487		249
Commission on Foreign Economic Policy [8]		6	6			54	54	
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations [10]		1	1			9	9	
Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel	7	7			19	18		1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	77	74		3	137	129		8
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	3	3			8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	499	527	28		1,070	1,103	33	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	431	444	13		1,045	1,032		13
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	230	236	6		381	373		8
Federal Power Commission	301	321	20		631	663	32	
Federal Trade Commission	312	342	30		642	582		60
General Accounting Office	2,389	2,466	77		6,206	5,956		250
General Services Administration	8,569	8,743	174		28,957	27,821		1,136
Government Contract Committee [10]		3	3			11	11	
Government Printing Office	2,877	2,777		100	7,306	7,088		218
Housing and Home Finance Agency	4,976	4,773		203	11,956	11,065		891
Indian Claims Commission	8	9	1		11	14	3	
Interstate Commerce Commission	858	636		222	1,910	1,814		96
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,745	2,956	211		7,259	7,301	42	
National Capital Housing Authority	109	112	3		349	343		6
National Capital Planning Commission	2	9	7		4	20	16	
National Gallery of Art	89	96	7		311	320	9	
National Labor Relations Board	625	624		1	1,390	1,254		136
National Mediation Board	59	75	16		108	112	4	
National Science Foundation	58	73	15		181	170		11
Panama Canal	4,256	3,958		298	17,850	17,091		759
Railroad Retirement Board	737	753	16		2,178	2,104		74
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,022	776		246	2,051	1,235		816
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission [11]		1	1			5	5	
Securities and Exchange Commission	386	403	17		774	732		42
Selective Service System	1,749	1,702		47	7,786	7,313		473
Small Business Administration [12]		18	18			349	349	
Smithsonian Institution	178	177		1	529	498		31
Soldiers' Home	138	150	12		768	776	8	
Tariff Commission	96	103	5		196	195		1
Tax Court of the United States	65	69	4		131	137	6	
Tennessee Valley Authority	8,915	[13] 9,718	803		22,406	22,905	499	
United States Information Agency [6]		2,398	2,398			9,919	9,919	
Veterans' Administration	54,245	55,804	1,559		178,402	181,841	3,439	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	403,405	401,670	8,081	9,816	1,211,878	1,181,569	22,308	52,617
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			1,735				30,309	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [14]	1,013	965		48	2,020	1,852		168
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	128,540	124,984		3,556	451,907	414,861		37,046
Outside continental United States	13,417	13,367		50	52,621	50,033		2,588
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	86,012	86,328	316		266,746	252,840		13,906
Outside continental United States	8,026	8,166	140		35,593	35,747	154	
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	154,008	143,509		10,499	417,618	398,550		18,068
Outside continental United States	9,397	8,954		443	31,257	30,258		999
Total, Department of Defense	400,413	386,273	456	14,590	1,257,762	1,185,141	154	72,775
Net decrease, Department of Defense			14,140				72,621	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	803,818	787,943	8,537	24,412	2,469,640	2,366,710	22,462	125,392
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			15,875				102,930	

[1] November figure includes 845 employees of the Business and Defense Services Administration (formerly National Production Authority), a decrease of 443 from the June figure of 1,288.

[2] Includes seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[3] Under Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953 the Foreign Operations Administration was created which assumed the duties and functions of the Office of Director for Mutual Security and the Mutual Security Agency. The duties and functions of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs were transferred from State Department to the Foreign Operations Administration.

[4] New agency created under Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953 and functions transferred from State Department.

[5] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligency Agency.

[6] Ceased to exist Oct. 31, 1953.

[7] Transferred to Small Business Administration under Presidential directive dated Aug. 8, 1953, under Public Law 163, 83d Cong.

[8] Under Executive Order 10478 the Defense Materials Procurement Agency was transferred to General Services Administration.

[9] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 215, 83d Cong.

[10] Under Executive Order 10479 the Government Contract Committee was established and the Committee on Government Contract Compliance was abolished.

[11] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Cong.

[12] Includes $34,050 in retroactive pay increases paid in October.

[13] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 109, 83d Cong.

[14] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 205, 83d Cong.

[15] Includes 243 employees assigned to the Cataloging, Standardization and Inspection Agency, and 44 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1953, and comparison with June 1953*

Department or agency	June	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	79,640	68,790		10,850
Commerce [1 2]	51,963	42,324		9,639
Health, Education, and Welfare	36,201	35,693		508
Interior	51,260	46,389		4,871
Justice	30,092	29,653		439
Labor	5,485	5,120		365
Post Office	498,624	504,246	5,622	
State [3 4]	10,053	6,096		3,957
Treasury	84,480	80,103		4,377
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	251	247		4
Bureau of the Budget	457	420		37
Council of Economic Advisers		22	22	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	105	127	22	
National Security Council [5]	24	28	4	
Office of Defense Mobilization	424	395		29
Office of the Director for Mutual Security [3]	126			126
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	6	6		
Emergency agencies:				
Defense Materials Procurement Agency [6]	71			71
Defense Transport Administration	96	38		58
Economic Stabilization Agency [7]	1,608			1,608
Federal Civil Defense Administration	766	698		68
Foreign Operations Administration [3]		1,448	1,448	
Mutual Security Agency [3]	1,055			1,055
National Security Training Commission	1	10	9	
Renegotiation Board	764	699		65
Small Defense Plants Administration [8]	452			452
Subversive Activities Control Board	29	31	2	
Postwar agencies:				
War Claims Commission	167	160		7
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	16	15		1
Atomic Energy Commission	6,968	6,391		577
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	583	583		
Civil Aeronautics Board	544	534		10
Civil Service Commission	4,727	4,470		257
Commission on Foreign Economic Policy [9]		54	54	
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations [10]		9	9	
Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel	19	18		1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	137	129		8
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	1,045	1,076	31	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,044	1,031		13
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	381	373		8
Federal Power Commission	631	663	32	
Federal Trade Commission	642	582		60
General Accounting Office	6,172	5,916		256
General Services Administration	28,852	27,717		1,135
Government Contract Committee [11]		11	11	
Government Printing Office	7,306	7,088		218
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,803	10,925		878
Indian Claims Commission	11	14	3	
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,910	1,814		96
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,259	7,301	42	
National Capital Housing Authority	349	343		6
National Capital Planning Commission	4	20	16	
National Gallery of Art	311	320	9	
National Labor Relations Board	1,363	1,233		130
National Mediation Board	108	112	4	
National Science Foundation	181	170		11
Panama Canal	534	538	4	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,178	2,104		74
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,044	1,229		815
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission [12]		5	5	
Securities and Exchange Commission	774	732		42
Selective Service System	7,572	7,105		467
Small Business Administration [13]		349	349	
Smithsonian Institution	527	496		31
Soldiers' Home	768	776	8	
Tariff Commission	196	195		1
Tax Court of the United States	131	137	6	
Tennessee Valley Authority	22,406	22,905	499	
United States Information Agency [14]		2,113	2,113	
Veterans' Administration	177,192	180,619	3,427	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,130,896	1,120,966	12,696	42,626
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			29,930	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,976	1,801		175
Department of the Army	451,907	414,861		37,046
Department of the Air Force	266,746	252,840		13,906
Department of the Navy	417,618	399,550		18,068
Total, Department of Defense	1,138,247	1,069,052		69,195
Net decrease, Department of Defense			69,195	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,269,143	2,190,018	12,696	111,821
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			99,125	

[1] November figure includes 845 employees of the Business and Defense Services Administration (formerly National Production Authority), a decrease of 443 from the June figure of 1,288.

[2] Includes seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

[3] Under Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953 the Foreign Operations Administration was created which assumed the duties and functions of the Office of Director for Mutual Security and the Mutual Security Agency. The duties and functions of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs were transferred from State Department to the Foreign Operations Administration.

[4] New agency created under Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953 and functions transferred from State Department.

[5] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[6] Under Executive Order 10478 the Defense Materials Procurement Agency was transferred to General Services Administration.
Ceased to exist Oct. 31, 1953.

[7] Transferred to Small Business Administration under Presidential directive dated Aug. 8, 1953, under Public Law 163, 83d Cong.

[8] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 215, 83d Cong.

[9] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 109, 83d Cong.

[10] Under Executive Order 10479 the Government Contract Committee was established and the Committee on Government Contract Compliance was abolished.

[11] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 205, 83d Cong.

[12] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Cong.

[13] New agency created under Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953 and functions transferred from State Department.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1953, and comparison with June 1953*

Department or agency	June	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,593	1,472		121
Commerce	3,356	3,135		221
Health, Education, and Welfare	541	545	4	
Interior	7,486	5,978		1,508
Justice	533	519		14
Labor	142	117		25
Post Office	2,318	2,338	20	
State [1 2]	20,995	13,712		7,283
Treasury	1,018	1,001		17
Emergency agencies:				
Defense Materials Procurement Agency [3]	4			4
Economic Stabilization Agency [4]	19			19
Foreign Operations Administration [1]		5,186	5,186	
Mutual Security Agency [1]	3,410			3,410
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	444	432		12
Atomic Energy Commission	11	13	2	
Civil Aeronautics Board	9	8		1
Civil Service Commission	9	17	8	
Federal Communications Commission	25	27	2	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1		
General Accounting Office	34	40	6	
General Services Administration	105	104		1
Housing and Home Finance Agency	153	140		13
National Labor Relations Board	27	21		6
Panama Canal	17,316	16,553		763
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7	6		1
Selective Service System	214	208		6
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
United States Information Agency [2]		7,806	7,806	
Veterans' Administration	1,210	1,222	12	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	60,982	60,603	9,636	10,015
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			379	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	44	51	7	
Department of the Army	52,621	50,033		2,588
Department of the Air Force	35,593	35,747	154	
Department of the Navy	31,257	30,258		999
Total, Department of Defense	119,515	116,089	161	3,587
Net decrease, Department of Defense			3,426	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	180,497	176,692	9,797	13,602
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			3,805	

[1] Under Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953 the Foreign Operations Administration was created which assumed the duties and functions of the Office of Director for Mutual Security and the Mutual Security Agency. The duties and functions of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs were transferred from State Department to the Foreign Operations Administration.

[2] New agency created under Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953 and functions transferred to State Department.

[3] Under Executive Order 10478 the Defense Materials Procurement Agency was transferred to General Services Administration.

[4] Ceased to exist Oct. 31, 1953.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1953 and comparison with June 1953*

Department or agency	June	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Commerce	573	490		83
Interior	3,094	2,516		578
State	134	128		6
Treasury	8,424	7,140		1,284
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	99	106	7	
Panama Canal	1,421	1,372		49
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,559	14,160	601	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	27,304	25,912	608	2,000
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			1,392	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	228,410	202,589		125,82
Outside continental United States	33,275	31,333		1,942
Department of Defense—Continued				
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	152,621	143,928		8,693
Outside continental United States	20,813	20,889	76	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	275,963	260,897		15,066
Outside continental United States	23,136	22,038		1,098
Total, Department of Defense	734,218	681,674	76	52,620
Net decrease, Department of Defense			52,544	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	761,522	707,586	684	54,620
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			53,936	

TABLE V.—*Federal employees assigned to Mutual Defense Assistance Program*

Department or agency	Payroll (in thousands)			Civilian personnel		
	In May was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In June numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	$9,707	$7,961	−$1,746	29,632	24,455	−4,177
State Department	135	103	−32	76	1,039	+963
Office of the Director for Mutual Security [1]	11		−11	21		−21
Foreign Operations Administration [1]		22	+22		38	+38
Mutual Security Agency [1]	10		−10	17		−17
Office of the Secretary of Defense	83	69	−14	152	146	−6
Department of the Army	7,065	[2] 5,817	−1,248	21,577	[2] 17,211	−4,366
Department of the Air Force	1,337	1,056	−281	3,918	2,900	−1,018
Department of the Navy	1,066	894	−172	2,871	3,121	+250

[1] Under Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953 the Foreign Operations Administration was created which assumed the duties and functions of the Office of Director for Mutual Security and the Mutual Security Agency.
[2] Subject to revision.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government decreased by 102,930 during the period June through November 1953. The total in June was 2,469,640. In November there were 2,366,710 civilian employees.

Employment by civilian agencies of the Government showed a net decrease of 30,309 during the period from June through November 1953, dropping from 1,211,878 in June to 1,181,569 in November. Civilians employed by the Department of Defense decreased 72,621 during the same period, dropping from 1,257,762 in June to 1,185,141 in November.

Of the 72,621 decrease in civilian employment by the Department of Defense, nearly three-fourths was in blue-collar jobs. Defense Department white-collar employment decreased 20,077 from 523,544 in June to 503,467 in November; and industrial employment decreased 52,544 from 734,218 in June to 681,674 in November.

In May the Federal civilian payroll was running at an annual rate of $9,646,000,000, and in November it was running at an annual rate of $9,455,000,000.

These figures summarize compilations of monthly personnel reports certified by executive branch agencies to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE (for himself, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 2680. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to certain widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2681. A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of emergency hospital care by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 2682. A bill for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 2683. A bill to restore to the Shoshone Irrigation District the share of the net revenues from the Shoshone powerplant to which it is entitled under its contract with the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2684. A bill for the relief of Kiki Chumbris; and

S. 2685. A bill for the relief of Nathan Begay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 2686. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932; and

S. 2687. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanatoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2688. A bill to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes;

S. 2689. A bill to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio;

S. 2690. A bill to amend the part of the act entitled, "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; and

S. 2691. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bills (by request), which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2692. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2693. A bill for the relief of Robert Lee Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2694. A bill for the relief of Francis Bertram Brennan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2695. A bill for the relief of Francoise O. McMahon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2696. A bill for the relief of Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to provide for the rehabilitation, improvement, and restoration of certain facilities of the Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ARMED SERVICES LEGISLATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, four bills relating to the armed services. The bills are recommended by the Department of Defense and are accompanied by letters of transmittal from the Department explaining the purpose of the bill in each case.

I ask that the accompanying letters be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of bills introduced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 2688. A bill to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 2688 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, November 18, 1953.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of legislation, "To further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes."

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954, and it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The responsibility for representing the Department of Defense on this legislation has been delegated to this Department by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The Department of the Air Force, on behalf of the Department of Defense, recommends that the proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to correct inequities existing in the dates of rank in permanent grade of captain of nurses and women medical specialists of the Army and the Air Force. A study of permanent-grade captains has pointed up the fact that a number of nurses and women medical specialists were integrated into the regular components during the 1947–48 integration and accorded permanent grade of captain on the basis of a requirement of 10 years' service. This was because at that time section 107 (a) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act (61 Stat. 44), which became law April 16, 1947, required of Army nurses and women medical specialists for permanent grade of captain completion of the same length of service "now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of captain." At that time, 10 years' continuous commissioned service were required of promotion-list officers for promotion to permanent grade of captain, by virtue of section 3 of the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 506) as amended (10 U. S. C. 552a).

This 10-year requirement for promotion to permanent grade of captain, however, was repealed, effective December 31, 1947, by section 507 (d) (2) of the Officers Personnel Act of 1947, which substituted in lieu thereof, in section 509 (b) (10 U. S. C. 559c (b)), the requirement of completion of 7 years' promotion-list service for permanent grade of captain.

As shown above, section 107 of the original Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 required for permanent grade of captain the same number of years service now or hereafter required of promotion-list officers to the same grade. Hence, even under the original Army-Navy Nurses Act, which became law prior to the enactment of the Officer Personnel Act, the change from a 10 to a 7 years' service requirement for permanent grade of captain could be made in integrating Army nurses and women medical specialist officers subsequent to December 31, 1947. This change from 10 to 7 years was made even clearer in section 107 (b) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act (10 U. S. C. 166f (b)) as amended by section 3 (c) of the act of May 16, 1950 (64 Stat. 161). Section 107 (b) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act as so amended provides that army nurse and women medical specialist officers may be promoted to permanent grade of captain on completion of 7 years' service. While section 107 of the Nurses Act applies specifically to the Army, it is also applicable to the Air Force by virtue of section 307 (c) of the Air Force Organization Act (10 U. S. C. 1837 (c)).

To summarize, those army nurses and women medical specialists integrated as permanent captains before the change effected December 31, 1947, by the Officer Personnel Act in the number of years' service required for permanent captains, were obliged to have had at least 10 years' service, actual or constructive, whichever was greater. In contrast, those in the same personnel categories in the Army and Air Force who were integrated as captains after this change effected by the Officer Personnel Act were required to have had at least 7 years' service, actual or constructive, whichever was greater. As a result of this difference in the number of years' service required for permanent grade of captain as between the two integrations, there are nurses and women medical specialists who were integrated during the earlier period who have dates of rank in the permanent grade of captain which are later than the dates of rank of those nurses and women medical specialists who were integrated as permanent captains after the above mentioned change effected by the Officer Personnel Act, although the latter individuals, in many instances, are younger and have a shorter period of actual military service.

The nurses and women medical specialists who would be affected by the enactment of this proposed legislation include not only those integrated originally in the grade of captain, but also those who were integrated in the grade of first lieutenant and thereafter were promoted to permanent grade of captain without adjustment in date of rank for the individual's actual or constructive service in excess of 7 years.

The inequity caused by the difference in the number of years' service required for permanent grade of captain of nurses and women medical specialists integrated at different periods into the regular components is obvious from the foregoing facts.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

There have been no bills in recent Congresses dealing directly with this situation. A somewhat similar situation existed, however, in the Medical Service Corps of the Army and Air Force. To correct the inequity which arose, the act of July 16, 1949 (63 Stat. 144; 10 U. S. C. 1561) made mandatory the rearrangement of the Medical Service Corps promotion list. This statutory authority was utilized by both Army and Air Force to rearrange their Medical Service Corps promotion lists in 1949. The act of July 16, 1949, cited above furnishes a precedent for legislation to remedy injustices in a promotion list.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

This legislation will not increase the number of officers allotted to the various grades. Consequently, its enactment will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

H. E. TALBOTT.

S. 2689. A bill to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 2689 is as follows:)

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the presentation of this proposal to the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation will retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over those portions of State and county roads enumerated therein and located within the reservation boundaries of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. The United States now has exclusive jurisdiction over the Government-owned lands comprising this installation, including the land areas covered by these roads. Ohio State Routes No. 4, No. 69, and No. 235 are through highways, and all the roads included in this legislation are heavily traveled by the civilian public. The retrocession of concurrent jurisdiction to the State will permit the State to exercise criminal jurisdiction for the promulgation and enforcement of traffic regulations on such highways. At the same time, the United States will retain the jurisdiction necessary for appropriate military control of areas within the military reservation. This measure will, therefore, permit proper control of the highways under the joint jurisdiction of the State of Ohio and the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. ADAMS,
Acting General Counsel.

S. 2690. A bill to amend the part of the act entitled, "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to

the conservation, care, custody, protection and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 2690 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, November 25, 1953.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To amend the part of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes,' approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the transmittal of the proposal to the Congress for its consideration. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to permit the Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, to authorize production from the naval petroleum reserves during a national emergency or state of war declared by the Congress when he finds that this production is necessary for the national defense. Also, during such periods, the Secretary of the Navy would be authorized to dispose of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons produced from the reserves by negotiation.

A joint resolution of the Congress is now required before the naval petroleum reserves can be placed in production pursuant to a finding by the Secretary of the Navy that production is necessary to the national defense. This proposal would eliminate the necessity for such a joint resolution during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress. Positive action by the Congress would still be required, however, in the form of a declaration of a national emergency or of a state of war.

Also under existing law, all production from naval petroleum reserves must be disposed of at public sale, and contracts for the disposition of this production do not become effective until after award by the Secretary of the Navy, and except for sales of royalty oil and gas, consultation with the Armed Services Committees of the Congress and approval by the President. Experience has shown that 75 days or more may elapse after opening of bids before all of these steps can be accomplished.

This proposal has been recommended by the National Security Council which feels that delays arising out of restrictions in existing law would particularly impede the accomplishment of the planned objective of having Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 (Elk Hills), California, ready to produce at the onset of a major war or during a national emergency when production from this reserve might be imperative to the national defense. The proposed bill would remedy this situation by giving the Secretary of the Navy authority, subject to the approval of the President, to initiate production from the petroleum reserves during a national emergency or state of war declared by the Congress, and also, during such periods, to negotiate sales of the products so produced. Congressional check would be retained by requiring a report to the Armed Services Committees with respect to any such authorization of production and as to all details of any agreements made for the disposition of these products.

It is to be noted that the legislation proposed would not relax any of the requirements as to public sale, consultation with the Armed Services Committees, and approval of the President for contracts entered into by the Secretary of the Navy during peacetime, or when a national emergency or a state of war has not been declared by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

R. H. FOGLER,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

S. 2691. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 2691 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1953.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To amend the act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to its submission to the Congress. The Department of the Army, on behalf of the Department of Defense, recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat 489), provides in substance that disabled officers, warrant officers, and flight officers of the Army and Air Force of the United States without component and who hold no other military status will be retained in service, until their treatment for physical reconstruction has reached a point where they will not be further benefited by retention in the military service. The purpose of this act was to preserve the military status of certain disabled officers, warrant officers, and flight officers, who held no appointment other than a temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, until their treatment for physical reconstruction had reached a point where they would not be further benefited by retention in the military service, notwithstanding that the statutes under which they have received their appointments may be terminated or rendered inoperative.

Subsequent to the enactment of this act, the services have implemented the Rusk committee report which was approved by the President on February 3, 1951. The implementation prescribes early transfer to Veterans' Administration facilities and early separation for certain disabled members of the uniformed services. Members affected by the Rusk committee report may be Regular or Reserve officers. However, officers who hold no appointment other than a temporary appointment in the Army or Air Force of the United States are precluded from such early transfer and separation by reason of the act of June 19, 1948, and this situation creates an inequity in the treatment of disabled officers.

In addition to eliminating the present inequality of treatment of temporary officers as compared to that afforded other officers of the Army and Air Force, the legislative proposal will permit retention in the active service of those Army and Air Force Reserve officers whose 5-year appointments would otherwise expire while undergoing hospitalization and evaluation of their possible entitlement to disability retirement or severance benefits. Until July 8, 1957, the current 5-year appointments of Reserve officers of the Army and Air Force will be expiring. It is foreseen that in some cases the individuals concerned will, at the time of such termination, be on active duty but undergoing necessary hospitalization or physical evaluation of possible entitlement to disability benefits. It is very possible that some of these officers may, by reason of physical injury or disease, be mentally incompetent to accept the Indefinite Reserve appointment.

Under such circumstances the disability benefits provided by the Career Compensation Act and to which the individual would otherwise be entitled would not be payable unless formal determination of such entitlement is made prior to termination of military status. Uncontrollable factors such as the time, the nature, or character of disabilities in such cases could result in loss of benefits. The proposed amendment will authorize retention of such individuals in active service for the purpose of hospitalization and determination of their possible entitlement to disability benefits.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

This legislation will result in savings to the Government by removing impediment to certain disability separations and transfers to the Veterans' Administration.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 185), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), the Committee on Armed Services or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and any other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $190,000 for the period beginning February 1, 1954, through January 31, 1955, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 186), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, until January 31, 1955, to employ four additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

ELIMINATION OF FARM TRACTOR FUEL AND OTHER LIQUIDS FROM MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAX ON GASOLINE—ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, there is pending in the Senate a bill (S. 2238)

to eliminate farm tractor fuel and certain other liquids from the manufacturers' excise tax on gasoline, introduced by my distinguished senior colleague, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] on June 29, 1953. As a matter of practical economy and administrative efficiency, this bill would eliminate farm tractor fuel from the manufacturer's excise tax on gasoline.

I should like to be associated as a cosponsor of this proposed legislation, although the bill is in printed form, I, therefore, ask that the RECORD show at this time that I am in support of the bill, and wish to be considered as a cosponsor. The bill now is pending in the Senate Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unianimous consent that Senate Resolution 184 be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator explain what the resolution is?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Senate Resolution 184 provides that the reorganization subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations shall be permitted to use the balance of the $10,000 appropriated last year, of which only $580 was spent last year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture;

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

Clark L. Brody, of Michigan, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board;

Harlan Bruce Munger, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration;

John David Anderson, of West Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Administration;

Raymond Sayre, of Iowa, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration;

H. W. Clutter, of Kansas, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration;

Marshall H. Edwards, of Florida, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration;

Marvin J. Briggs, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration;

C. H. Matthews, of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration;

Golden F. Pine, of California, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration;

Elbert J. Hodge, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration;

Earl H. Brockman, of Idaho, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration; and

L. V. Ritter, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL BY NONCERTIFIED AIR CARRIERS, AND ABOLITION OF AVIATION SAFETY DIVISION CHIEF

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, Senators who are interested in aviation—and I know a number of my colleagues share that interest—had their attention attracted, during the month just passed, by two important matters, one specifically relating to the Civil Aeronautics Board, the other involving specifically the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

In the case of the Board, the matter was the decision of the Board, by a split vote of 3 to 2, that it had the power to issue special exemptions having the effect of authorizing noncertificated air carriers to transport mail. In the case of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the matter attracting the attention of Senators was abolition of the position of Aviation Safety Division Chief in each of the various regions of the CAA.

These matters have concerned me greatly; and for the benefit of my colleagues who share my interest in such things, I wish to make my position clear on the record.

With respect to the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which I consider to have been erroneous and beyond the scope of the Board's powers under the Civil Aeronautics Act, I addressed a timely letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 14, 1953.

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: By a split vote of 3 to 2, the Civil Aeronautics Board has ruled that it has the power to issue special exemptions which will in effect authorize noncertificated air carriers to transport mail. Voting to support this remarkable view were Vice Chairman Denny and Members Lee and Adams. In the minority were Mr. Oswald Ryan, Chairman, and former Senator Chan Gurney, member.

Mr. Ryan and Senator Gurney were 100 percent right in stating that the majority decision "can be correct only if it is determined that the Board has the power to rewrite any provision of title IV of the act."

This decision is an unwarranted extension of the burgeoning power-grabbing philosophy of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It stems from the original erroneous decision of the Board that it had authority, under the guise of granting exemptions, to grant what were in effect certificates for nonscheduled operation.

The Civil Aeronautics Board should have the power to regulate non-scheduled air carriers and other fixed-base operators. It should have the right to license such operations and control them. But this should be done under authority of an act of Congress and in line with standards fixed by the Congress, not under authority self-created and self-administered by the Civil Aeronautics Board and under standards fixed or changed by the Board at its pleasure.

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 did not convey such authority. For many years now, I have been sponsoring legislation to give such authority to the Board, and to fix the standards under which such authority should be exercised. In the present session, my bill for this purpose is S. 9.

In view of the situation as it exists today, I believe it is most urgent that Congress should consider this matter and take appropriate action. Therefore, I respectfully request and urge, as strongly as I may, that you schedule hearings before your committee on my bill S. 9, and that the scope of such hearings be sufficiently broad to cover the entire situation thoroughly, and point the way to the means by which Congress may reassert its proper authority in this field.

Agencies in the executive branch of the Government, even boards vested with quasi-judicial functions, have no right to seek to exercise legislative authority, and should be curbed when they try it. And the Congress should never countenance the existence of a legislative vacuum which appears to invite the attempted exercise of legislative authority by any such agency.

Kindest personal regards and all good wishes.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, with regard to abolition of the position of Aviation Safety Division Chief, and respecting certain other closely related matters, I addressed a letter to the Administrator of the CAA, Mr. Fred Lee. It is interesting that, although I sent the letter to Mr. Lee on December 14, 1953, I have not yet received a reply. I anticipate that Mr. Lee may be having considerable difficulty in replying. In fact, I consider that with respect to many of the points raised in the letter there is no effective answer except a change in policy by the CAA.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of my letter to Mr. Lee, to which I have referred, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 14, 1953.

Mr. F. B. LEE,
Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEE: Abolition of the position of Aviation Safety Division Chief, in the various regions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, gives me great concern. This ac-

tion in itself, while not necessarily a fatal blow to efficiency of the field agent, certainly detracts from the singleness of purpose in the direction of the work program under which the agent receives his guidance, and is a disturbing action to an already demoralized group of employees who cannot help but interpret it as a further act which undermines the stability of their organization and job security.

In the past the Civil Aeronautics Administration worked under an organization structure in aviation safety, having no one position responsible for the entire safety program. First, until 1948, there were three separate field divisions: General, Air Carrier, and Aircraft Engineering, each responsible for its own program and relying on the regional administrator for proper coordination. Then, in 1949 and until 1951, the first two divisions were combined into one called Safety Operations Division, with the Aircraft Engineering Division kept independent but not having control of both general and air-carrier maintenance as in the past. However, the Washington office of Aircraft Engineering Division did have control of the maintenance functions. This caused confusion.

In 1951, partially at least as a result of urging by the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which I was then chairman, this was changed to the present structure having a Chief, Aviation Safety Division, with three branches: General Safety, Air Carrier Safety, and Aircraft Engineering.

Presumably reversion will now be had to 1 of the 2 old plans of operation; and with the experience gained in the past it is reasonable to suppose that either one of these old plans can be worked with some measure of success if operations are guided by similar policies and philosophy. The benefits of having one man at the head of the show accrue mainly from program direction and planning and careful integration of the varied functions and tasks that overlap between the three specialties.

From my observation of operations under the most recent plan I am convinced that it has resulted in a singleness of purpose and direction that has made for healthy progress, and was leading to a simplification of procedures, staffing, and planning that would have led eventually to a gradual and objective program for turning back more and more responsibility to industry, as industry evidenced readiness to assume it.

Elimination of the position of Aviation Safety Division Chief gives us a situation analogous to having a police department with a homicide division, a robbery and bunko division, and a traffic division, with no police chief, and then expecting the city manager or mayor to keep the show on the road. It can be done, but why do it when there are better ways.

Obviously, with the position of Aviation Safety Division Chief abolished, each regional administrator will have more people reporting directly to him for decisions and action. The general and air carrier safety functions have very little in common, and should not be combined into one division, as was done once before. That was the weakest of the three plans under which CAA safety functions have been operated.

From the standpoint of program direction, staffing planning, budget planning, and housekeeping, I feel strongly that the structure of the organization under one division chief has proven superior. Therefore, I consider the abolition of the position of Aviation Safety Division Chief to be a backward step, which will make it much more difficult to retain the same efficiency of operation.

Justification of this move as a reasonable economy measure is difficult. Efficiency cannot be measured in dollars. The elimination of 3 jobs in each region by this move is of negligible importance.

What I most greatly fear is that this latest move presages or indicates embarkation upon an entirely different program, in which safety is not given its proper importance. Already, national and regional aviation safety programs have been abandoned by the CAA, and the regions have been forced to turn over any such planning to the agent in charge of each air line, giving final decision in such matters as "operating procedures and manuals, specifications, waivers, etc." to such agent. Any inspection program is left to his discretion also. CAA safety personnel have been told, in effect: "If you want to find out how an airline is doing, ask its management: they know the answer better than anyone."

In connection specifically with aviation safety manpower utilization, CAA personnel has been told: "Industry should be given the responsibility and authority to make final decisions and take action in all matters except those involving high policy issues. The regions will be evaluated on how well this policy is put into effect.

In the face of all this, it is probable that CAA safety personnel are wondering whether they are to have any authority at all in the future. Certainly, in this situation, the regional office will be relatively powerless, and will find it almost impossible to detect faulty decisions on the part of CAA agents or the air carrier until after they have been made and are in effect. You know how tough it is to change decisions once they have been made.

Let me make it clear that I do not quarrel with the idea of giving rather wide responsibility to the agents and to industry. I do question the timing and the method now being employed. Air carrier agents are not ready for this sudden authority and neither is industry in general. I do believe, and have felt for some time, that CAA has been leading industry around by the nose too much, and can relax in some areas with some carriers and other specific segments of industry. I do not believe that everyone is so ready and willing to assume all this new responsibility that CAA should abandon its safety mission at high levels capable of taking a clear second look before certain decisions are made.

Practically all aviation safety work reporting procedures in CAA have been done away with, so that it is virtually impossible for CAA to tell what any agent is doing or whether he is doing anything, except by travel to the district office. Yet Washington is now going to decide the location of all agents in each region. Without work reports, that simply cannot be done intelligently from Washington.

The key to the whole situation is the know-how and integrity of the carriers and manufacturers. Some are much closer to being ready than others. Industry autonomy with respect to aviation safety should be considered a prize to be gained by performance, not handed out gratis to all. There are still those in the industry who have the same state of mind as the manufacturer who once told a former CAA administrator: "You can wipe out all pilot regulations for all I care. The more they crack em up, the more planes I build."

No one familiar with CAA operations through the years will have any trouble in recalling at least one instance of a bitter fight by a manufacturer against changes necessary to eliminate some dangerous flight characteristic of his airplane. Under the new philosophy of the CAA with respect to safety, if applied to factories, such changes probably would never be made until after many people had been killed as a result of the dangerous characteristic.

Safety is the most important factor in aviation. The new policy of the CAA with regard to aviation safety does not seem well calculated to augment either safety standards or actual safety in flight. On the contrary, it seems bound to have an opposite effect.

Because this is a matter of great importance to the people, and not just to the CAA, the aircraft manufacturers and the airlines, it will be my purpose to make this letter public a decent period of time after it has been delivered to your office. The matters mentioned here will, I hope, be discussed more fully before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. I should be glad to confer with you and receive your advice as early as possible. I assure you that my object is to be helpful and to give to the administration of civil aeronautics my best thoughts after many years of study and consideration. I would hope that a conference would effectuate these results.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN.

AMERICAN MILITARY POWER AS A DETERRENT TO AGGRESSION—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we were privileged this morning to have before the Foreign Relations Committee the Secretary of State, who spoke to us concerning the meaning of our treaty with Korea.

I was greatly impressed by the powerful statement by Secretary John Foster Dulles in his address before the Council on Foreign Relations in New York Tuesday night.

The speech was frank, hard-hitting, and will, I am sure, have an important impact on the consciousness of the leaders of the Kremlin.

It will help to make them realize the United States' determination to mobilize forces for massive instant retaliation in the event the Soviet chooses a policy of further puppet aggression.

The Secretary's emphasis on United States strength as the basic deterrent power is a crucial implementing of President Eisenhower's previous comments.

I for one have long urged that we be wary lest the Soviet Union suck us into a series of localized wars at the frontiers of the Iron Curtain which would bleed us indefinitely.

The Secretary had himself wisely previously pointed out that wars have come about in the past because aggressors have overconfidently assumed that free, peace-loving nations would not strike back at aggressors, themselves with all the force available.

I shall of course study the full text of the Secretary's remarks in greatest detail.

I wish to emphasize, however, that the Eisenhower-Dulles policy can be meaningful only if we maintain and improve our massive military force through adequate appropriations in the coming year for our armed services, particularly United States airpower.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the address delivered by Secretary of State Dulles to which I referred.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EVOLUTION OF FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, before the Council on Foreign Relations, New York City, January 12, 1954)

It is now nearly a year since the Eisenhower administration took office. During that year I have often spoken of various parts of our foreign policies. Tonight I should like to present an overall view of those policies which relate to our security.

THE GOOD IN PAST POLICIES

First of all, let us recognize that many of the preceding foreign policies were good. Aid to Greece and Turkey had checked the Communist drive to the Mediterranean. The European recovery program had helped the peoples of Western Europe to pull out of the postwar morass. The Western Powers were steadfast in Berlin and overcame the blockade with their airlift. As a loyal member of the United Nations, we had reacted with force to repel the Communist attack in Korea. When that effort exposed our military weakness, we rebuilt rapidly our Military Establishment. We also sought a quick buildup of armed strength in Western Europe.

These were the acts of a nation which saw the danger of Soviet communism; which realized that its own safety was tied up with that of others; which was capable of responding boldly and promptly to emergencies. These are precious values to be acclaimed. Also, we can pay tribute to congressional bipartisanship which puts the Nation above politics.

THE INSUFFICIENCY OF PAST POLICIES

But we need to recall that what we did was in the main emergency action, imposed on us by our enemies.

Let me illustrate.

1. We did not send our Army into Korea because we judged, in advance, that it was sound military strategy to commit our Army to fight land battles in Asia. Our decision had been to pull out of Korea. It was Soviet-inspired action that pulled us back.

2. We did not decide in advance that it was wise to grant billions annually as foreign economic aid. We adopted that policy in response to the Communist efforts to sabotage the free economies of Western Europe.

3. We did not build up our Military Establishment at a rate which involved huge budget deficits, a depreciating currency, and a feverish economy, because this seemed, in advance, a good policy. Indeed, we decided otherwise until the Soviet military threat was clearly revealed.

We live in a world where emergencies are always possible and our survival may depend upon our capacity to meet emergencies. Let us pray that we shall always have that capacity. But, having said that, it is necessary also to say that emergency measures—however good for the emergency—do not necessarily make good permanent policies. Emergency measures are costly, they are superficial, and they imply that the enemy has the initiative. They cannot be depended on to serve our long-time interests.

THE NEED FOR LONG-RANGE POLICIES

This long-time factor is of critical importance.

The Soviet Communists are planning for what they call an entire historical era, and we should do the same. They seek, through many types of maneuvers, gradually to divide and weaken the free nations by overextending them in efforts which, as Lenin put it, are "beyond their strength, so that they come to practical bankruptcy." Then, said Lenin, "our victory is assured." Then, said Stalin, will be "the moment for the decisive blow."

In the face of this strategy, measures cannot be judged adequate merely because they ward off an immediate danger. It is essential to do this, but it is also essential to do so without exhausting ourselves.

When the Eisenhower administration applied this test, we felt that some transformations were needed.

It is not sound military strategy permanently to commit United States land forces to Asia to a degree that leaves us no strategic reserves.

It is not sound economics, or good foreign policy, to support permanently other countries; for in the long run, that creates as much ill will as good will.

Also, it is not sound to become permanently committed to military expenditures so vast that they lead to practical bankruptcy.

Change was imperative to assure the stamina needed for permanent security. But it was equally imperative that change should be accompanied by understanding of our true purposes. Sudden and spectacular change had to be avoided. Otherwise, there might have been a panic among our friends, and miscalculated aggression by our enemies.

We can, I believe, make a good report in these respects.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

We need allies and collective security. Our purpose is to make these relations more effective, less costly. This can be done by placing more reliance on deterrent power, and less dependence on local defensive power.

This is accepted practice so far as local communities are concerned. We keep locks on our doors; but we do not have an armed guard in every home. We rely principally on a community security system so well equipped to punish any who break in and steal that, in fact, would-be aggressors are generally deterred. That is the modern way of getting maximum protection at a bearable cost.

What the Eisenhower administration seeks is a similar international security system. We want, for ourselves and the other free nations, a maximum deterrent at a bearable cost.

Local defense will always be important. But there is no local defense which alone will contain the mighty land power of the Communist world. Local defenses must be reinforced by the further deterrent of massive retaliatory power. A potential aggressor must know that he cannot always prescribe battle conditions that suit him. Otherwise, for example, a potential aggressor, who is glutted with manpower, might be tempted to attack in confidence that resistance would be confined to manpower. He might be tempted to attack in places where his superiority was decisive.

The way to deter aggression is for the free community to be willing and able to respond vigorously at places and with means of its own choosing.

So long as our basic policy concepts were unclear, our military leaders could not be selective in building our military power. If an enemy could pick his time and place and method of warfare—and if our policy was to remain the traditional one of meeting aggresion by direct and local opposition—then we needed to be ready to fight in the Arctic and in the Tropics; in Asia, the Near East, and in Europe; by sea, by land, and by air; with old weapons and with new weapons.

The total cost of our security efforts, at home and abroad, was over $50 billion per annum, and involved, for 1953, a projected budgetary deficit of $9 billion; and $11 billion for 1954. This was on top of taxes comparable to wartime taxes; and the dollar was depreciating in effective value. Our allies were similarly weighed down. This could not be continued for long without grave budgetary, economic, and social consequences.

But before military planning could be changed, the President and his advisers, as represented by the National Security Council, had to take some basic policy decisions. This has been done. The basic decision was to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing. Now the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff can shape our Military Establishment to fit what is our policy, instead of having to try to be ready to meet the enemy's many choices. That permits of a selection of military means instead of a multiplication of means. As a result, it is now possible to get, and share, more basic security at less cost.

THE FAR EAST

Let us now see how this concept has been applied to foreign policy, taking first the Far East.

In Korea this administration effected a major transformation. The fighting has been stopped on honorable terms. That was possible because the aggressor, already thrown back to and behind his place of beginning, was faced with the possibility that the fighting might, to his own great peril, soon spread beyond the limits and methods which he had selected.

The cruel toll of American youth, and the nonproductive expenditure of many billions has been stopped. Also our armed forces are no longer largely committed to the Asian mainland. We can begin to create a strategic reserve which greatly improves our defensive posture.

This change gives added authority to the warning of the members of the United Nations which fought in Korea that if the Communists renewed the aggression, the United Nations' response would not necessarily be confined to Korea.

I have said, in relation to Indochina, that if there were open Red Chinese army aggression there, that would have "grave consequences which might not be confined to Indochina."

I expressed last month the intention of the United States to maintain its position in Okinawa. This is needed to insure adequate striking power to implement the collective security concept which I describe.

All of this is summed up in President Eisenhower's important statement of December 26. He announced the progressive reduction of the United States ground forces in Korea. He pointed out that United States military forces in the Far East will now feature "highly mobile naval, air, and amphibious units"; and he said in this way, despite some withdrawal of land forces, the United States will have a capacity to oppose aggression "with even greater effect than heretofore."

The bringing home of some of our land forces also provides a most eloquent rebuttal to the Communist charge of "imperialism."

NATO

If we turn to Europe, we see readjustments in the NATO collective security effort. Senator Vandenberg called the North Atlantic Treaty pledges "the most practical deterrent and discouragement to war which the wit of man has yet devised." But he said also that "if the concept and objective are to build sufficient forces in being to hold the Russian line * * * it presents ruinous corollaries both at home and abroad."

In the first years of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, after the aggression in Korea, its members made an emergency buildup of military strength. I do not question the judgment of that time. The strength thus built has served well the cause of peace. But the pace originally set could not be maintained indefinitely.

At the April meeting of the NATO Council, the United States put forward a new concept, now known as that of the "long haul." That meant a steady development of defensive strength at a rate which will preserve and not exhaust the economic strength of our allies and ourselves. This would be reinforced by the striking power of a strategic air force based on internationally agreed positions.

We found, at the Council of last December, that there was general acceptance of the long-haul concept, and recognition that it better served the probable needs than an effort to create full defensive land strength at a ruinous price.

EDC

One of the emergency aspects of NATO is that it was begun before there was a solid foundation.

For example, Western Europe cannot be successfully defended without a defense of West Germany. West Germany cannot be defended without help from the Germans. German participation is excluded by the armistice arrangements still in force.

The West German Republic needs to be freed from the armistice; and new political arrangements should be made to assure that rearmed Germans will serve the common cause and never serve German militarism.

The French produced a plan to take care of this matter. It was to create a European Defense Community, composed of France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and West Germany. They would have a European army, including Germans, but there would be no national armies in West Europe.

A treaty to create this defense community was signed in May 1952. But when the Eisenhower administration took office last January, no Government had sought parliamentary ratification, and the project was nigh unto death.

President Eisenhower is deeply convinced that there can be no long-term assurance of security and vitality for Europe, and therefore for the Western world including the United States, unless there is a unity which will include France and Germany and end the disunity which has led to recurrent wars, and in our generation to two world wars. As NATO's chief commander, and now as President, he continues to make clear the importance which the United States attached to the consummation of the European Defense Community and, we would hope thereafter, a political community.

Until the goals of EDC are achieved, NATO, and indeed future peace, are in jeopardy. Distrust between France and Germany is inflammable and already Communist agents are looking to it as a means for international arson.

There are of course immense difficulties in the way of the final consummation of Franco-German unity. But we have confidence that peace will soon have the indispensable foundation of the EDC.

ECONOMIC AID

New collective-security concepts reduce nonproductive military expenses of our allies to a point where it is desirable and practicable also to reduce economic aid. There was need of a more self-respecting relationship, and that, indeed, is what our allies wanted. Trade, broader markets, and a flow of investments are far more healthy than intergovernmental grants-in-aid.

There are still some strategic spots where the local governments cannot maintain adequate armed forces without some financial support from us. In these cases, we take the judgment of our military advisers as to how to proceed in the common interest. For example, we have contributed largely, ungrudgingly, and I hope constructively, to end aggression and advance freedom in Indochina.

The technical assistance program is being continued, and we stand ready to meet nonrecurrent needs due to crop failures or like disasters.

But, broadly speaking, foreign budgetary aid is being limited to situations where it clearly contributes to military strength.

THE HOPE

In the ways I outlined we gather strength for the long-term defense of freedom.

We do not, of course, claim to have found some magic formula that insures against all forms of Communist successes. It is normal that at some times and at some places there may be setbacks to the cause of freedom. What we do expect to ensure is that any setbacks will have only temporary and local significance because they will leave unimpaired those free world assets which in the long run will prevail.

If we can deter such aggression as would mean general war, and that is our confident resolve, then we can let time and fundamentals work for us. We do not need self-imposed policies which sap our strength.

The fundamental, on our side, is the richness—spiritual, intellectual, and material—that freedom can produce and the irresistible attraction it then sets up. That is why we do not plan ourselves to shackle freedom to preserve freedom. We intend that our conduct and example shall continue, as in the past, to show all men how good can be the fruits of freedom.

If we rely on freedom, then it follows that we must abstain from diplomatic moves which would seem to endorse captivity. That would, in effect, be a conspiracy against freedom. I can assure you that we shall never seek illusory security for ourselves by such a deal.

We do negotiate about specific matters but only to advance the cause of human welfare.

President Eisenhower electrified the world with his proposal to lift a great weight of fear by turning atomic energy from a means of death into a source of life. Yesterday I started procedural talks with the Soviet Government on that topic.

We have persisted, with our allies, in seeking the unification of Germany and the liberation of Austria. Now the Soviet rulers have agreed to discuss these questions. We expect to meet them soon in Berlin. I hope they will come with a sincerity which will equal our own.

We have sought a conference to unify Korea and relieve it of foreign troops. So far, our persistence is unrewarded; but we have not given up.

These efforts at negotiation are normal initiatives that breathe the spirit of freedom. They involve no plan for a partnership division of world power with those who suppress freedom.

If we persist in the courses I outline, we shall confront dictatorship with a task that is, in the long run, beyond its strength. For unless it changes, it must suppress the human desires that freedom satisfies—as we shall be demonstrating.

If the dictators persist in their present course, then it is they who will be limited to superficial successes, while their foundation crumbles under the tread of their iron boots.

Human beings, for the most part, want simple things. They want to worship God in accordance with the dictates of their conscience. But that is not easily granted by those who promote an atheistic creed.

They want to think in accordance with the dictates of their reason. But that is not easily granted by those who represent an authoritarian system.

They want to exchange views with others and to persuade and to be persuaded by what appeals to their reason and their conscience. But that is not easily granted by those who believe in a society of conformity.

They want to live in their homes without fear. But that is not easily granted by those who believe in a police-state system.

They want to be able to work productively and creatively and enjoy the fruits of their labor. But that is not easily granted by those who look upon human beings as a means to create a powerhouse to dominate the world.

We can be sure that there is going on, even within Russia, a silent test of strength between the powerful rulers and the multitudes of human beings. Each individual no doubt seems by himself to be helpless in this struggle. But their aspirations in the aggregate make up a mighty force.

There are signs that the rulers are bending to some of the human desires of their people. There are promises of more food, more household goods, more economic freedom.

That does not prove that the Soviet rulers have themselves been converted. It is rather that they may be dimly perceiving a basic fact, that is that there are limits to the power of any rulers indefinitely to suppress the human spirit.

In that God-given fact lies our greatest hope. It is a hope that can sustain us. For even if the path ahead be long and hard, it need not be a warlike path; and we can know that at the end may be found the blessedness of peace.

FLEXIBLE SUPPORT PRICES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I received this morning from the Cass-Clay Cooperative Creamery Association, as well as a telegram addressed to the President, with reference to the President's message on the agricultural program.

This creamery association is one of the very largest and most successful in my State. The letter is signed by Mr. Charles Ommodt, general manager of the Cass-Clay Cooperative Creamery Association. He points out the losses to the producers of dairy products in Minnesota if the flexible price-support program should go into effect. His telegram to the President is very direct and pointed. One sentence thereof, I believe, is explanatory and reveals what the manager had in mind. He said:

Should parity drop to 75 percent, it would reduce dairy farmers' income 16.66 percent under the present 90-percent parity.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASS-CLAY COOPERATIVE
CREAMERY ASSOCIATION,
Moorhead, Minn., January 9, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Our farmers in this area are gravely concerned about the President's message advocating flexible support prices and we are enclosing herewith a copy of a telegram we sent him.

Flexible support prices will mean that supports will be lowered to 75 percent of parity, which is ridiculous. The argument that supports should be low when we have surpluses and high when we have shortages is not basically sound for the reason that when we have surpluses farmers are distressed and need the supports. When we have shortages prices become automatically high due to demand, and therefore supports become ineffective under such circumstances.

Seventy-five percent of parity would mean 11.08 cents less on butter, or butter supports

would be only 55.42 cents, and on milk powder the price support of 16 cents would be reduced to 13.34 cents. It seems to us that 90-percent parity must prevail and even that is a sacrifice by the dairy farmer.

It is apparent that the propaganda that has been coming out of the Department of Agriculture, and even some of the Secretary's speeches, has been made with a deliberate attempt to rally consumer support for flexible supports.

Just the other day an article appeared in the paper with reference to the total expense of carrying on farm programs, going back to the expenditures of the old Farm Board under the Hoover administration in order that the amount might look staggering. But on the other hand, not a word was mentioned as to the subsidies for industry during the same period. It would be interesting to compare such figures in order that the taxpayers might be informed as to just where the big subsidies go.

Thanking you for your support of a sound and constructive farm program, we are

Yours respectfully,

CHAS. OMMODT,
General Manager.

MOORHEAD, MINN., *January 8, 1954.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

We are disturbed by your state of the Union message referring to flexible supports for agricultural products. Should parity drop to 75 percent, it would reduce dairy farmers' income 16.66 percent under the present 90-percent parity. This represents a reduction in payment of more than a half million dollars to our creamery patrons. They cannot stand this drop, which not only would bankrupt them but it would affect all business likewise. It is important that the 90-percent parity remain in effect and that the Secretary of Agriculture immediately announce support prices in order to keep market stable. Unless dealers in dairy products have some assurance, they will cut inventories between now and April 1 and sell them to the Government. Had the Secretary of Agriculture announced support prices earlier a year ago, the Government would not have been the recipient of dairy surpluses. Washington propaganda that dairy products are being priced out of the market has been deceiving and misleading to consumers. Dairy products are not high in comparison with other food staples or with consumers' earning power, which is the highest in our history. There is no reason why farmers should be discriminated against. Therefore it is urgent that we get immediate action by Congress on this matter.

CHAS. OMMODT,
General Manager, Cass-Clay Cooperative Creamery.

ELECTRICAL CONTRACT AWARDED TO AN ENGLISH COMPANY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, before the Senate concludes its session today, I should like to make a statement regarding the award to an English company of a contract for electrical equipment in preference to the bid of an American company.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is interested in the unfinished business of the Senate, as I am. He replied to a request which I had submitted to him from Mr. Joseph Feeney, chairman of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference. In his reply the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin answered very fully and comprehensively the questions raised by Mr. Feeney. I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the letter from the Senator from Wisconsin to the Senator from Iowa, dealing with this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
January 9, 1954.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This has been my first opportunity to thank you for your letter of December 8 enclosing for my comment and return a letter addressed to you on November 27 by Mr. Joseph Feeney, chairman of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference.

As you know, your letter had arrived during my absence, and for that reason, I was not in a position to send a more prompt reply.

I have taken the liberty of presenting very detailed comment now on each of the points involved in Mr. Feeney's remarks.

My reason for doing so is that he had sent the letter apparently to all Senators, and I thought that with your kind permission, I might make this reply to you in the form of an open letter so that its contents might be familiar to all of our colleagues who have received Mr. Feeney's remarks.

I know how anxious you are to get the true facts, just as our other colleagues in the Senate are likewise desirous of separating fact from fiction in this long controversy.

Unfortunately, the opposition to the seaway has tried perpetual tactics of creating confusion, throwing up smokescreens and, in some instances, engaging in absolute, downright distortion.

I am hopeful, however, that the President's splendid message to the Congress Thursday firmly reiterating the need for the St. Lawrence seaway will once and for all banish the smokescreen which the opposition has tried to build up and will help bring to a consummation this long and much debated subject.

Let me just say a word about the organization which Mr. Feeney represents. As everyone is aware, the National St. Lawrence Project Conference over the years has been the mouthpiece for opponents of the seaway project. Its chief source of support has been the American Association of Railroads and the National Coal Association, with the railroads predominating.

I have a great respect for America's railroads and for the invaluable role which they have played and are playing in our free-enterprise system.

But I have been extremely disappointed at the shortsighted view which a few of the railroads have foisted upon the rest of the railroads of the country, and which they have thereafter tried to foist upon the American people as a whole.

The leaders of the railroad opposition have opposed the seaway on the ground that it will cause a diversion of traffic which will injure them economically.

Yet, the plain hard fact is that they have appeared before congressional committees 10 times claiming an alleged injurious diversion of traffic, but not once have they presented to the committees facts and figures to show their economic stake in the project and the extent to which they would be injured.

This failure must be deliberate on their part because on three occasions, twice before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and once before the House Public Works Committee, they have been specifically requested by Chairman DONDERO and me to furnish for the record evidence to show how, and to what extent, they would be injured.

The inference is clear that they cannot back up their claims of possible injury.

The basis of the opposition of the coal operators and miners has been that they would be injured, due to the alleged facts that (a) the hydroelectric power development would supplant a market for some 5 million tons of coal each year and, (b) that the seaway would provide a low-cost transportation route to the heart of our country that would facilitate the importation of foreign coal to compete with United States production.

Neither of these contentions is sound. The historical facts are that development of natural hydroelectric power resources in other parts of the Nation actually increases rather than decreases the consumption of coal. This is due to the stimulation of old, and attraction of new, industries to the area which use large amounts of coal for heating and process purposes in the particular industry.

As to the importation of foreign coal, the record shows that the United States has been a coal exporting country rather than a coal importing country over the past 10 years.

Not only are the arguments of the railroads and coal interests invalid but, more important, they are completely irrelevant and beside the point. This as you know, is because Canada is ready and willing to build the seaway, alone, whether we participate or not. So the basis of the objections of both the railroads and the coal interests, therefore, no longer obtains.

With the construction of the seaway by Canada, alone, the railroads will be confronted with the feared diversion of traffic to this waterway anyway; the coal interests lost their fight when the Federal Power Commission issued a license to the State of New York to construct the power development with the Province of Ontario.

In brief, these interests are going to be confronted with exactly the same set of economic circumstances and conditions as they would be if the United States was a participant, with this exception: With the United States as a participant, and part owner, we will be in a position to exercise control over the operating policies, including toll determination and traffic regulation of this vital navigation facility.

The population ratio between the two countries is approximately 11 to 1, viz, 160 million United States as against 15 million Canada. This factor, together with our advanced state of industrialization in this area, indicates that 85 percent to 90 percent of the traffic moving over this waterway would be

destined for, or originate in, the United States.

It seems only reasonable to assume that a voice in the control and management of the seaway by the United States would very well afford these interests a degree of protection that would be helpful as well as necessary.

I might add, at this point, the further fact that due to this same preponderant use of the waterway by United States interests, the ultimate cost of the Canadian investment, should she build the seaway alone, will be borne by the United States taxpayers in the form of navigation tolls. This is because most of the tolls, which Canada will determine and charge, will be paid by United States traffic.

In view of the foregoing it is not strange that Mr. Feeney's organization has shifted its basis of objection.

Let me briefly review, and answer, Mr. Feeney's separate contentions:

1. He first asserts that the taxpayers of this country should save $110 million by defeating the Wiley bill which proposes a seaway only as far as Toledo and which is designed primarily to serve six of the smaller steel companies that have invested in the Labrador development.

It is true that the Wiley bill proposes a 27 foot waterway only as far as Toledo, or the western end of Lake Erie. But, Mr. Feeney conveniently neglects to mention that the present Great Lakes connecting channels, giving access to Lakes Huron, Michigan, and Superior, have a present depth of 21 feet upbound and 25 feet downbound.

He also charges that the bill has been "lifted out of the old St. Lawrence waterway hydroelectric package," whereas exactly the reverse is the case.

The power development was lifted out of the previous, so-called package when Congress failed to approve the 1941 agreement between the two countries for joint development and it was found that authorization of the power development could be obtained through presently existing agencies hitherto created by Congress, viz, the International Joint Commission and the Federal Power Commission.

The deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels, like all internal waterway improvements, was never a self-liquidating part of any of the previous bills, and has always been specifically so stated.

This part of the previous project was removed on the initiative and at the behest of Great Lakes shipping and industrial interests. It was strongly believed that the deepening of these channels must be expedited to meet the new conditions brought about by the increase in size and capacity of new ships now being put into service on the Great Lakes, especially in the ore and grain trades.

Since these reasons, as well as considerations of national security, make the deepening of the connecting channels a project of national importance, irrespective of the seaway, it was thought advisable to treat the two projects independently of each other.

It is true that westbound iron ore from Labrador will be an important cargo, but it is a distortion to say that the project is designed primarily to serve six of the smaller steel companies who have invested in the Labrador-Quebec iron ore. This is evident in the appearance at the hearings, in support of the St. Lawrence project, of witnesses representing the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange and the National Farmers Union, the three major farm organizations of the country.

Their primary interest in the project is a low cost water transportation route for grain to the world markets as well as for the materials and supplies which the great Midwest agricultural economy must purchase.

The seaway will be available to all who can use it and the support for the project from the entire Great Lakes area is an indication of its economic importance and the breadth of interest in its construction. This should provide a sufficient answer to Mr. Feeney's contention.

The phrase, "the taxpayers of this country could more easily save $110 million," is an attempt to create the false impression, by inference, that the cost of United States participation in this project is an outright expenditure of taxpayers' money from which no return would be received other than intangible economic benefits.

The fact is that this expenditure which should rightly be called an investment, will be offset by the creation of a revenue-producing asset, owned by the United States taxpayer, that will produce fiscal returns of $1.65 in revenues for every $1 of cost (that is, expenses to operate, maintain, pay interest at 3½ percent and liquidate the bonds issued to finance the cost).

This is an absolutely sound business investment which will not only more than pay its own way, but, over and above, yield tremendous economic benefits. The tremendous strategic value of this great asset, of course, cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents.

2. Mr. Feeney's second point: Canada does not want United States participation and now charges for the use of the Welland Canal.

With respect to the former, no one has contended that we pass the bill merely to cooperate with Canada, as laudable as that purpose is. Arguments for our participation rest on wider ground. It so happens that our good neighbor, Canada, has frequently indicated she wishes United States participation, a subject which Premier St. Laurent stressed when he was in Washington last May.

We also know that President Eisenhower's reference to future United States participation was most warmly received when he addressed the Canadian Parliament during his recent visit to Ottawa. The fact that Canada wishes our participation is a consideration which adds weight to the compelling reasons of our national security.

As to his contention that Canada now charges for the use of the Welland Canal, this is a prime example of the tactics of the opponents, who overlook no opportunity to twist the facts and "muddy the waters" in their attempts to confuse the issue.

The facts on the Welland Canal charges are these: No tolls or lockage fees are charged by the Canadians for the use of the Welland Canal. The only fee of any kind that is charged is what is known as a "lineman's fee." Under the canal operating regulations, the members of the crew of the vessel transiting the locks are not permitted to handle mooring lines while the vessel is passing through the locks. This labor is performed by lock employees, employed by the Canadian Government, and the so-called lineman's fee is charged to cover the cost of this labor. The reason for this regulation is that should anyone be injured, or an accident occur, there could be no claims for injury or damage against the ship, or its owners, as the responsibility would be that of the lock employees. In the case of the Welland Canal this charge is inconsequential—$50 each way for the entire eight locks traversing a distance of 28 miles.

No charge of any kind, not even a "lineman's fee," is charged by the Canadians to transit the Canadian lock at the Soo. All that is required is a "let pass" to use this lock and this is secured by application prior to the arrival of the vessel for passage.

In brief, the fact that Canada charges a nominal "lineman's fee" at the Welland Canal is hardly an answer to the argument that we should have a voice in the tolls to be charged for use of the seaway, when most of the traffic will be American and most of the tolls will be paid by United States taxpayers. Here, again, is an example of the tenuous thread upon which the opponents hang their arguments.

3. Now we come to the argument that with the 27-foot channel there will be 2 waterways because Canada is committed to maintain the present 14-foot channel.

Here is the answer: Under the terms of the 1941 agreement for the joint development of this project by the 2 countries it was agreed that the present 14-foot Canadian canals would be maintained both during construction and thereafter.

When Congress failed to approve this agreement in June 1952 the Canadian Government abrogated it November 4, 1952, claiming that it had been superseded by the action of the International Joint Commission.

In a subsequent conference between the Corps of Engineers and R. A. Henry, project engineer for the Canadian Government, held in February 1953, the following question was propounded to Mr. Henry by the Engineers, and I quote verbatim:

"Question. Under the latest engineering planning, what sections of the existing 14-foot-canal facility are to be maintained or abandoned upon completion of the new construction?

"Answer. It is contemplated that in the International Rapids section provision for 14-foot navigation would be abandoned and there would be substituted therefor on the Canadian side of the international boundary a canal providing for 27-foot navigation in lieu thereof. It is also contemplated that the Soulanges Canal would be entirely abanoned from Lake St. Francis to Lake St. Louis. As regards the Lachine Canal, it will be impossible to abandon the Lachine Canal because of the number of industries that are located on that canal, which will require maintenance of navigation for some years to come."

So that you may be able to visualize the significance of this statement, I am enclosing the most recent map of the Corps of Engineers of the site of the project. I have indicated thereon by the red line the point where the St. Lawrence River begins to flow entirely within the boundary of Canada.

The existing 14-foot Canadian Canal between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal is divided into four sections, viz, International Rapids section, Lake St. Francis section, Soulanges section, and Lachine section.

Note what Mr. Henry had to say above to the effect that the 14-foot canal in the International Rapids section would be abandoned. The canal in Lake St. Francis consists of a 14-foot channel, there are no locks. Note that Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis are connected by the 14-foot Soulanges Canal. Note that Mr. Henry says this canal will be entirely abandoned. The Lachine section is 24 miles long, includes Lake St. Louis and connects the latter with Montreal. This section is composed of the upper end of Lake St. Louis, the lower end to a town called Lachine, located where the actual canal link to Montreal starts. The length of the upper and lower ends of Lake St. Louis, is 15 miles leaving the canal link from Lachine to Montreal 9 miles in length. It is this 9-mile link on the outskirts of Montreal which Mr. Henry says will require maintenance for some years to come due to the number of industries located on it. Thus, out of a total distance of 114 miles traversed by the existing 14-foot canal, 105 miles will be abandoned, leaving but 9 miles in service and that on the fringe of Montreal for the convenience of industry already located there. So much for the two waterways argument—another patent attempt to confuse.

4. Mr. Feeney finally discloses his hand when he contends the $110,000,000 figure for a 27-foot seaway is only an entering wedge for a 35-foot channel from Montreal to Duluth at an ultimate cost of $2 billion.

This is the absurd entering wedge or camel's nose under the tent argument. There are two answers to this:

One, the Wiley bill does not propose this. It proposes construction in United States waters, in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, of two, new, lateral canals having an aggregate length of 11 miles; the building of 3 locks 800 feet long, 80 feet wide, and 30 feet deep over the sills and a guard gate; also the lowering of rock shoals in the Thousand Island section of the St. Lawrence River.

All of this is estimated to cost, at December 1952 prices, $88,074,000; adding interest at 3½ percent during the period of construction, $7,706,475, makes the total investment of the United States $95,780,475. The Wiley bill limits the amount of the authorization to $105,000,000 and not $110,000,000 as Mr. Feeney says.

Second, isn't it fair to state that the action of future Congresses for a further deepening and investment will depend upon the economic feasibility when and if such a proposal comes up in the future? It is idle to talk about the cost of such a proposal now, which no responsible proponent has ever advanced, and which has never been submitted, much less studied. Mr. Feeney here attempts to put up a strawman and then proceed to knock him down.

Finally, in reading Mr. Feeney's letter, I am impressed with the care he has taken to avoid mention of the fact that a St. Lawrence seaway has been supported by every President, Democratic and Republican, since 1923, and has the unanimous support of President Eisenhower, the Cabinet, and the National Security Council.

Their action was predicated on the enormous importance of the seaway to the interests of our national security. In urgently recommending United States participation in the seaway with Canada they have said, in part:

"Early initiation and completion of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway is in the interest of national security. * * * Participation by the United States now in the project would strengthen our position at all times respecting the use of the seaway for the transportation of basic materials * * * would increase its defense advantages to this country, and would in time of emergency insure it of full benefits of joint participation."

As you know, our Foreign Relations Committee, by a vote of 13 to 2, approved United States participation in the seaway. A report of our committee on S. 2150 (Rept. No. 441, 83d Cong., 1st sess.) summarizes the many reasons which justify the committee in taking the action it did (report, pp. 23–27, inclusive). It seems to me that the committee's statement on the importance of the project to our national defence cannot be challenged (report, pp. 25–26):

"The seaway will constitute an important part of our system of national defense. It will provide an alternate route for low-cost mass movement of vitally needed iron ore to our steel arsenal. It will provide access to shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities located in a relatively secure area to supplement our coastal shipyards. It will furnish an additional needed line of communication for ocean shipping which can ease wartime strain on rail transportation and the port facilities of the gulf and Atlantic coasts. It is needed as a reserve route in case of interruptions of other routes. The seaway would be a valuable part of the national defense of Canada and the United States, while the related hydroelectric power will be available for defense industries and is urgently needed for the general economy of the market region both in Canada and the United States. It is by reason of this urgency for making this low-cost power available as quickly as possible that has removed the power development from the project facilities which require the attention of Congress at this time."

Considered in this light, it seems to me that Mr. Feeney's criticisms are completely unconvincing. Furthermore, the fact that Canada has decided to build a seaway with or without the United States goes far to answer all arguments concerning the economic feasibility of the undertaking.

Thank you again for your kind thoughtfulness and interest in sending this letter on to me for comment.

Do not hesitate to call on me further if you have any other questions.

With personal regards and every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, years ago when I was a student in the Law School of the University of Michigan, a very distinguished lawyer who was also a professor, and who practiced law in Detroit, laid down a fundamental rule, not only in law, but in life's practice, which I have always remembered. He said, "Get the facts, first, before you seek for the principles."

In my 30 years of practicing law I found that rule to be very important. The professor said, "If you get the law and try to fit the facts to the law, you may go to jail for subornation of perjury."

How is that applicable to the discussion of the St. Lawrence seaway in which we are about to engage? It is applicable in this way: The facts have changed. The facts are different now from what they were in times past. When I first came to the Senate, 15 years ago, we were thinking in terms of consolidating the electric generating problem with the problem of navigation, and making the project a joint venture of the United States and Canadian Governments. At that time there had not developed the overwhelming fact which President Eisenhower has brought into the open, namely, that if we do not build the link in the St. Lawrence, Canada will build it, and that if Canada builds it we will have nothing to say about the tolls, the management, and so forth.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. No; I decline to yield at this time. I should like to continue with my main argument.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. After I have completed my argument I shall be very glad to yield for questions. However, I should very much prefer not to yield at this time, because I believe that by yielding now my consecutive train of thought will be interrupted and will not appear clearly in the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Wisconsin, with his usual graciousness, will permit the RECORD to be set straight, by having it indicate that it was not General Eisenhower who first discovered that Canada would proceed independently, but that such fact was discovered long before, in the previous administration.

While I am glad to support my good friend from Wisconsin, I believe that accuracy of statement, which he laid down as one of his standards, should dictate the correction I suggest.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure there was no intention on my part to claim omniscience for General Eisenhower. I do say, that, as we consider the pending bill, Canada's intention to proceed with the development is one of the very significant facts which have become apparent since the subject was discussed when I first came to the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. Another significant fact is——

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in connection with that point, I wish the Senator from Wisconsin would indicate whether there is any assurance that if the United States participates in the project, the United States will participate in the control of the 4 Canadian locks through which ships will have to pass in order to proceed through the 3 locks on our side in the International Rapids section.

Mr. WILEY. I shall be very glad to cover that point in the course of my argument.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN SEAWAY

As I believe everyone is aware, another significant fact which has developed is that the generation of electricity and the building of the canal have been separated. The construction of the navigation feature of the canal will be under the jurisdiction of the United States through the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, provided for in the bill. The Canadian agency concerned with the navigation feature is the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority.

We know that a United States agency, the Power Authority of the State of New York, and a Canadian agency, the Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario, will build the dams and the hydroelectric plants. That takes from the overall cost approximately $400 million or $500 million, with respect to which the United States Government will not bear any expense.

Another significant fact is represented on the map. I trust all Senators who are listening to me will become acquainted with the map. It is in a very large scale, and hangs on the wall. In addition, on every Senator's desk there is a map on a smaller scale. The map covers the area from Montreal to Ogdensburg.

The map is very significant, because already the Canadian Government has said to us: "If you come in now, this is substantially the last chance to do so. If you do not come in now, we will build it in accordance with what we have on the map here."

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have already expressed myself in that connection. I shall cover the points the Senator from Maryland has in mind.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thought the Senator from Wisconsin might have had a change of heart.

Mr. WILEY. I shall yield this time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin

a question. How many times has the Canadian Government in the past told the United States Government, the Congress, and its committees: "If you do not go in with us this time, this is the very last chance you will have"?

Mr. WILEY. I know of no time it has happened, except in the past year and a half. If the Senator from Maryland can show me a record to the contrary, I shall be very glad to see it.

In the first place, in previous years there was no discussion relating to the separation of the hydroelectric power feature and the navigational projects. At this time the plan is feasible, and the Canadian Parliament has acted on it. This is the first time the Parliament has acted on it. That point will be covered in my discussion, if I may be permitted to continue with my remarks.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not correct to say that some Members of the Canadian Parliament have stated on the floor of the Parliament that if we build the channel, they will build a parallel channel, and that they do not want to have anything to do with us in connection with the matter? Has not that statement been made on the floor of the Parliament?

Mr. WILEY. I have no information to that effect. Supposing it were a fact, what would it mean? It would mean that ships would have the privilege of sailing up the St. Lawrence and to enter locks either on the Canadian side or on the American side. I presume that most of the shipping would be American and that they would enter our locks. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin know that approximately only 2 percent of the ships which could use the canal are American ships? It would be impossible to get more than 2 percent of our shipping through the canal.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is mistaken in his information. I suggest that he look up the facts.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have looked them up.

Mr. WILEY. More than 75 percent of our American merchant marine could use the water passage. That is the undisputed fact. Of course, we do not expect the *Queen Mary* or ships of that type to use the water passage. We are speaking of what such a canal would do to provide an outlet from the great central section of the country which, thank God, is not dominated by the railroads, although we have good railroads.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland rose.

Mr. WILEY. Just a minute, please. That brings me to another point. The other day a railroad man who had been on the team for years came to me and said, "Senator, of course I am still on the team, but," he said, "I realize that if we do not go in with Canada, in view of what the President of the United States has said, this canal will be built by Canada and then the railroads will have cut off their nose to spite their face, because their own Government will have little or nothing to say about regulating the traffic and regulating the tolls, and so forth."

LOCATION OF WORKS

Mr. President, I should like every Senator to become familiar with the map on his desk, because it explains very clearly all the facts which are connected with the discussion in which we are about to engage.

Senators will notice that to the far left on the map appears Ogdensburg. Farther down the river, to the right, appears Rockway. There is a black mark at the south, at Point Rockway. That represents the first development we would make if the Wiley bill becomes the law of the land. It is entirely within United States territory.

It will be noticed that through the channel there is a small line which divides the United States from Canada. Then, as we proceed farther, past Massena, we come to where, again, there are 2 black marks which indicate the 8-mile development which the United States will make. North of that can be seen the all-Canadian plan, which will be prosecuted if we do not go into the enterprise. It is all ready to go ahead.

Mr. President, the actual cost, as appears in the RECORD, is some $88 million for the United States side. The Canadians will expend in the neighborhood of $170 million, if we go in. If we do not go in, they will have to build all the locks. But our failure to participate will give Canada total control.

Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee approved the bill, S. 2150, providing for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, by a vote of 13 to 2.

I am sure that all Senators are familiar with this project. It has been debated so often that one would think everything that can be said has been said. Yet, such is the vitality and overwhelming appeal of this project that we are now presented with a totally new situation, and the bill now before the Senate is a totally new bill.

THE FACTS TODAY

These are the facts:

First. We no longer have a choice as to whether or not the seaway will be built.

That is a very important consideration, Mr. President. Senators who vote against this project will live to regret it if the bill is defeated. It will be said of them that because of provincialism, because of other interests, they have failed to see the overall national public interest. Yet, Mr. President, there are those—and I have talked with them—who have said, "It does not make any difference. Let Canada go ahead and control this vital waterway which the President has said is most important in the national defense."

Our only choice is whether we will join with Canada or stand by while Canada builds it alone.

That is the choice, Mr. President. Senators may laugh it off if they want to, but that is our choice.

Second, we have the emphatic recommendation of President Eisenhower that we join with Canada.

Third, the project would pay for itself, and the pending bill would not put an additional burden on the Treasury.

Fourth, the project is fully justified by the needs of our national economy and our national security.

Fifth, the project will create new national wealth; it will not take wealth away from any section or industry.

Let me set the matter in its proper context.

The Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River form one of the greatest natural resources in the world. They drain an area of more than 300,000 square miles. The lakes themselves act as great natural reservoirs which let out their water through the St. Lawrence at a remarkably even rate.

Duluth, Minn., is more than 2,000 miles from the Atlantic Ocean, but except for half a dozen roadblocks, most of which have already been removed, the entire distance is navigable by ocean-going ships.

At the same time, the fall of the water as it moves to sea level offers unexcelled opportunities for the cheap generation of electric power.

SUPPORT FOR SEAWAY

This combination of possibilities for navigation and power has excited the imagination of men for more than a hundred years. Every President of the United States since 1923 has recommended development of these resources.

Most recently, in his state of the Union message on January 6, President Eisenhower currently pointed out that a part of the foundation of a sound defense program is our continental transport system. He went on to say:

> Some of our vital heavy materials come increasingly from Canada. Indeed, our relations with Canada, happily always close, involve more and more the unbreakable ties of strategic interdependence. Both nations now need the St. Lawrence seaway for security as well as for economic reasons. I urge the Congress promptly to approve our participation in its construction.

In thus repeating his support of the seaway, President Eisenhower was agreeing with earlier stands taken by Presidents Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman. In political points of view and in temperament, they cover about as wide a range as can be found in America. But they had one thing in common, and that was their support of the St. Lawrence seaway. They supported it in the national interest, not the provincial interest, not the localized interest. Certainly, Mr. President, no other issue of our times has had such a wide appeal.

Mr. President, 50 million persons, representing approximately one-third of the population of the United States, live in the valley of the St. Lawrence and the valley of the Great Lakes. They are asking that this Government reach out and do the advisable thing in the interest of national defense and not give up the control to our neighbor to the north, especially when that neighbor wants us as a partner.

How, then, has it been possible for its opponents to block it? The answer is that they have not blocked it; they have merely delayed it. So inexorable is the logic of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project that it is coming into being anyway. Little by little, it has been

built in piecemeal fashion, and it is now on the point of final consummation.

There is no longer any question as to whether the seaway should or will be built. That has already been decided in the affirmative. The only question now is whether the United States should retain for itself a share in the management of the seaway after it is built. In substance, the President, the executive head of this Nation who was elected to office by the greatest vote ever given any man in the history of America, has made that statement.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the only question now is whether the United States should retain for itself a share in the management of the seaway after it is built.

POSITION OF CANADIAN GOVERNMENT

Let me review developments since the Senate last debated a St. Lawrence seaway bill in June of 1952. The Canadian Government at that time had already served notice that, if it could not secure the cooperation of the United States for an international seaway, it nevertheless intended to build an all-Canadian seaway. It had even passed legislation to make this possible.

The vote to recommit the 1952 seaway bill was taken in the Senate on June 18. On June 30, the Governments of the United States and Canada filed concurrent applications with the International Joint Commission, under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, for an order of approval of construction of the power phases of the project in the International Rapids section. At the same time, Canada reiterated its intention to build the seaway alone, if need be, as soon as the power aspect was provided for.

In October 1952, after hearings on the applications in both Canada and the United States, the International Joint Commission issued its order of approval.

Canada designated the Hydroelectric Commission of Ontario as its agent for construction of the Canadian portion of the power development and informed the United States that, inasmuch as the way was clear for unilateral Canadian development of navigation, it did not intend to submit to Parliament the 1941 agreement for joint United States-Canadian development—an agreement which it noted had lain 11 years unapproved by Congress.

In January 1953 the Canadian Government declared, in effect, that it was still willing to talk about an international seaway only if the talk did not mean delay; otherwise, it said, it was going ahead with its own seaway. This statement is worth reading in full:

CANADIAN STATEMENT ON PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE COMMENT ON THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY, 1953

President Truman's observation in his budget message to Congress that there is still an opportunity for the United States to join in building the St. Lawrence seaway has been noted by the Canadian Government. Various other proposals by Members of the Congress for United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway have also come to the attention of the Canadian Government.

While the Canadian Government is, of course, prepared to discuss, in appropriate circumstances, joint participation in the seaway, the demand for power in the area to be served by the International Rapids power development is so urgent that the Canadian Government is most reluctant to engage in any discussion which might delay the progress of the plan now underway for the development of power in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River at the earliest possible moment.

Once an entity is designated and authorized to proceed with construction of the United States share of the power works, if the United States wishes to put forward a specific proposal differing from that put forward by the Canadian Government for the construction of the seaway in the international section which proposal would not delay the development of power under arrangements agreed upon in the exchange of note of June 30, 1952, and approved on October 29, 1952, by the International Joint Commission the Canadian Government will be prepared to discuss such a proposal.

The Canadian Government would naturally expect the discussion to be such as not to cause any serious delay in the completion of the whole seaway.

So I say to Senators: Time is running out. This is our last chance to participate in the development of one of the greatest natural resources on the face of the earth.

THE POWER DEVELOPMENT

Meanwhile, the Power Authority of the State of New York had renewed its application to the Federal Power Commission for a license to develop the American portion. After hearings, which developed a voluminous record, the Power Commission granted that license in July 1953. President Eisenhower subsequently named the New York Power Authority as the agent of the United States in constructing the works jointly with the Ontario Hydro Commission.

This was followed by appeal to the Federal courts by three opponents of the project. Oral arguments were heard in the circuit court in the District of Columbia December 23. On December 29 the court denied a motion by the opponents for leave to adduce additional evidence.

The opponents have asked the circuit court to review the decision of the FPC in issuing the license, but their action has not stayed the license, and it is in effect at this moment. The New York Power Authority is going ahead with its plans to start construction in June and has already borrowed $1 million from private banks to finance its preliminary planning. The Canadians likewise are proceeding on the assumption that actual construction will begin in June.

None of these plans is in the least dependent on what the Senate does about the pending bill.

By passing the bill, we can assure ourselves, and we can assure our Government, as the railroadman said, of a voice in the control of one of the world's greatest transportation facilities.

By the way, the railroadman to whom I have referred has said, "I have taken the blinders off my eyes. Heretofore, whenever we wanted to stop the St. Lawrence seaway project, we could stop it. But, now we know there is only one course open. We had better join with Canada and have something to say about managing this development in the interest of the general welfare."

It should also be pointed out that in passing the bill, we pass no judgment on the pending court cases. Those cases have to do solely with power; this bill has to do solely with navigation. If the FPC should be upheld in the courts, work will go head on power and navigation concurrently. If the FPC should be overruled in the courts, Congress can then decide what action should be taken in the light of the circumstances prevailing at that time.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

The bill is really a very simple one. Other developments, such as I have described, have made it possible for the bill to be streamlined and stripped down to its bare essentials. All it now does—all it is necessary for it to do—is to authorize the construction of 2 canals and 3 locks plus certain relatively minor channel improvements. The whole project will involve an outlay of $88 million, and will not cost the taxpayers a cent, because every penny of the investment will be returned, with interest.

I have indicated on the map where the development by the United States will take place. The other portions of the development will be in Canada. Canada will look after that.

Let me describe briefly the works involved, and the part the United States will play in construction. Beginning at the head of the St. Lawrence River at Lake Ontario and continuing for 68 miles is what is known as the Thousand Islands section of the river. Actually, there are more than 1,700 islands, but most of them are quite small with precipitous banks. The river in this section is generally wide and deep and well-suited to navigation. In a few places rock shoals occur at depths of only 25 feet under the surface, and to provide a deepwater seaway, these will have to be lowered to 27 feet. This operation will cost $1,766,000.

Below the Thousand Islands section is the International Rapids section, extending for 46 miles, roughly from Ogdensburg to St. Regis, N. Y. Along this stretch the river falls 92 feet in a series of turbulent rapids, and this is where the power project will be located and the major navigation work will have to be done.

The power project—which, remember, is being paid for by the State of New York and the Province of Ontario—will consist of—

First. A control dam between Iroquois Point on the Canadian side and Point Rockway on the American side, about 12 miles below Ogdensburg. I pointed that out in the opening part of my statement. On the map, it is the dark spot to the left. It is designated "Point Rockway lock (United States plan)." It is about 12 miles below Ogdensburg. Ogdensburg may be seen to the left on the map.

Second. The Long Sault Dam, between the top of Barnhart Island and the American mainland, about 4 miles below Massena. That is just above St. Regis.

Third. A powerhouse between the foot of Barnhart Island and the Canadian mainland. As I said, the powerhouse

will be taken care of by the State of New York and the Province of Ontario.

It will also be necessary to build some dikes and to relocate certain railroads and highways.

That is the New York-Ontario power project. The navigation project in the International Rapids section, so far as the United States is concerned, will consist of certain cutting and dredging operations and the following construction work:

First. The Point Rockway Canal, about 3 miles long and with one lock, to carry traffic around the Iroquois Dam. I have shown on the map where Point Rockway is located.

Second. The Long Sault Canal, 8 miles long, with 2 locks and a guard gate, to carry traffic around the Long Sault Dam and the Barnhart Island powerhouse. That is to the right, down the river, between Massena and St. Regis, as indicated by the two black spots on the American side. Both canals will be in the United States.

Mr. President, that is our agreement. The bill specifies that the controlling depth in the channels and canals will be 27 feet and that the locks will be 800 feet long, 80 feet wide, and 30 feet over the sills.

For their part, the Canadians will enlarge the Welland Canal, between Lakes Ontario and Erie, to conform to the dimensions of the International Rapids works. The Canadians will also undertake the construction work in the Canadian section of the river, between St. Regis, N. Y., and Montreal, at a cost of $172,950.

To do its part of the work, or to do the whole job if that should be necessary, Canada has created a St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, with a borrowing power of $300 million. They mean business.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to interfere with the argument of the Senator from Wisconsin, but, for the purpose of exposition, will the Senator state whether the Canadian locks are to be near the Beauharnois powerplant?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is correct. Those are Canadian locks. The Canadians undertake their construction and assume the cost. I might say again, in order that there may be no mistake in that respect, that I have already outlined what will happen to the north of our locks if we do not join in the project. I indicate here on the map where the Canadians will construct their locks.

SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The pending bill—S. 2150—would create a corresponding agency of the United States—the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation—to carry out our share of the work. It is authorized to borrow up to $105 million from the Treasury and is given the usual corporate powers. The details of its organization are spelled out in the committee report and I shall not go into them here.

Senators can easily refer to the committee report. I must say that I think excellent work was done by the staff of my committee and I wish to compliment them. They have really done well in assembling what I think are very important maps and factual material, so that he who reads without prejudice can easily understand, without confusion, the simplicity of the proposal we are making and the necessity thereof.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I stated at the beginning that I would not yield, but I will yield to the Senator this one time.

Mr. WELKER. I dislike to interrupt the Senator's address, but I should like to ask a question. Did I understand the Senator correctly to say that the power-site development would be between Point Rockway and Ogdensburg?

Mr. WILEY. No. The power site is between St. Regis and Massena. Barnhart Island is the powerhouse site.

Mr. WELKER. I understand the Senator. According to the bill, the power is to be developed by the State of New York and the Province of Ontario jointly. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator very much. I shall not interrupt him again.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator for asking the question.

I desire to call particular attention to the proviso that the Corporation shall not proceed with the construction unless and until it has received satisfactory assurances that—

First, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada will complete the Canadian portions of the navigation works as nearly as possible concurrently with the completion of the American portions; and

Second, the State of New York, or an entity duly designated by it, or other licensee of the Federal Power Commission, in conjunction with an appropriate agency in Canada, will complete the power works as nearly as possible concurrently with the navigation works. Those are conditions.

There is thus assurance in the bill that all phases of the project will move along together and that the United States will not be left holding the bag.

In that connection, let me emphasize that Canadian participation in the navigation phases of this project is vital; American participation is not. For 114 miles, from Lake Ontario to St. Regis, N. Y., the St. Lawrence River forms the boundary between the United States and Canada, but for the rest of its length it is an entirely Canadian stream. This makes it all the more essential, Mr. President, that the United States promptly take the necessary steps to insure itself of a voice in the project.

The bulk of the traffic that moves on the seaway will be in American ships bound to or from American ports. The only question is whether these American ships will pay tolls to Canada at rates set by Canada, or whether the United States will share in the receipts and have a voice in fixing the rates.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. From the Senator's own explanation, the participation of the United States, if it joins in this project, will be so small that it reminds me of buying a very minor interest in a very large concern, and the Senator knows what happens to minority interests in any large concern. Is that not the case here?

Mr. WILEY. That is a new fear that has been raised, and it is decidedly not the case here. In other words, the canals are to be on the American side and Americans will control them. The Americans would have just as much power to stop the traffic as Canada would.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That leads me to the next point. In order to reach to the ocean the ships would have to go through 8 Canadian locks, locks which would be solely owned by Canada, and would have to pass through 3 or 4 going in the other direction. So we would be right in the middle; they could squeeze us each way, and we could not get in or out unless they wanted us to.

Mr. WILEY. That is what I consider to be the most disparaging statement I have heard about the United States in relation to the republic to the north.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Well——

Mr. WILEY. I do not want to interrupt my statement, but I desire to answer that argument. It is utterly fallacious. It has no basis in fact. We already have a treaty with Canada in relation to the navigation of the St. Lawrence. We have found that the St. Lawrence, according to our military officials and according to the President, is necessary for our national defense. We have now a proposal that is workable. The argument just advanced is a new one. Heretofore every argument was based upon the idea that the project was too expensive, that it would not work, that there would not be any tonnage carried on it, that the ships could not get through. We have demonstrated that 75 percent of our own merchant marine ships can go through if this canal is built, and we know that there is more tonnage going through the Detroit River than there is through the ports on the Atlantic Ocean. So it seems to me that what the Senator should now do is to remove the veneer and simply say that he is afraid that Baltimore might lose a little business or that the railroads which enter Baltimore might lose a little business.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. And the Senator from Wisconsin should do the same and admit that the automobile industry and the steel industry might not get a preferential rate if the canal were not built.

Mr. WILEY. Now that we have that exposure——

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I did not make any exposure. The Senator from Wisconsin brought it out.

Mr. WILEY. The whole Middle West, which has contributed so vastly to building up the Nation through its great industrial plants, must have steel. Any American so provincial in mind that he would close his eyes to the needs of his

own Nation had better take the blinders off his eyes. I think that is clearly indicated.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am waiting for the Senator from Wisconsin to show us how we are to get more steel from this project. I should like to have him tell us how we are to get it. The reasons he advanced for our participation in the project are conclusive proof, to me, that we would not get steel by means of the project.

Mr. WILEY. I would expect that argument to be made, of course.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does my colleague from Wisconsin mean to tell Senators that the Dominion of Canada or the British Empire would have the effrontery to tell the United States that she could not use the seaway on an equal basis with any other nation in the world?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Maryland argued to the contrary, just a moment ago.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. But I ask the question now. Does the Senator from Wisconsin think that would happen?

Mr. WILEY. I say that the Dominion of Canada would live up to any agreement she made. If she must build the seaway alone, all by herself, she will have a right to say how it is to be used.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. How about the agreements in connection with the project?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Maryland will find that the agreements are to be made between the authority involved and the government or governments involved.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes, some nebulous sort of agreement. Why does not the Senate have the agreement before it, so that all Senators may know what they are to pass on, when they act on the bill?

Mr. WILEY. I do not think anything would satisfy the Senator from Maryland. So, Mr. President, unless the Senator from Maryland has some fact to comment upon, I ask him to permit me to continue my statement.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Whether I carry on is up to the Senator from Wisconsin, inasmuch as he has the floor. If he does not wish to yield to me for questions, I am very happy to take my seat.

VALUE OF JOINING CANADA

Mr. WILEY. In opposition to joint participation it is argued that we should let Canada go ahead and build the seaway alone. Mr. President, has there ever before been such a proposal to give away a great national resource? We might just as well have said, "Very well; let someone else build the Panama Canal."

It is certain that United States shipping will want the seaway, and that construction of the seaway will be of vital importance to our defensive arrangements. To my mind, the latter point is a perfect answer to the idea that the United States could, like the ostrich, put her head in the sand, say farewell to this great enterprise, and not become a partner in what I consider to be one of the greatest joint undertakings ever presented to our people.

In that connection let me emphasize that Canadian participation in the navigation features of this enterprise is vital, whereas I have said that United States participation is not. That makes it all the more essential, Mr. President, that the United States take steps to assure itself a voice in the project.

If the project is to be self-liquidating over a period of 50 years, it must return $5.2 million a year to the United States and $9.4 million a year to Canada, or a total of $14.6 million a year.

This is well within its capabilities. Careful estimates by agencies of both the United States and Canadian governments, working independently, place the probable traffic in the range of 40 million to 50 million tons a year. That would mean tolls averaging from 29 cents a ton to 36½ cents.

Traffic expected to use the seaway will include a wide range of products—grain, coal, petroleum, automobiles, agricultural machinery, coffee, sugar, newsprint, manganese, and many other materials. But by far the largest part of the traffic will be iron ore. This is so important that I think a case could be made for the seaway on the basis of iron ore alone. We are dealing here with a major readjustment in the economy of the United States.

IRON ORE SUPPLIES

Our economy is solidly based on the United States steel industry, and the steel industry is based on the link which the Great Lakes provide between the iron ore deposits of Minnesota and the coal deposits of Pennsylvania. Let me illustrate how much cheap water transportation on the Great Lakes means to steel.

From Hibbing, Minn., in the Mesabi iron ore range, to the port of Duluth, on Lake Superior, it costs $1.03 a gross ton to ship iron ore 73 miles by rail.

From Duluth to Cleveland, it costs $1.60 a gross ton to ship iron ore 833 miles by water.

From Cleveland to Youngstown, it costs $1.48 a gross ton for 67 miles by rail.

The total freight costs for 973 miles are $4.11 a ton. Of that $4.11, $2.51 is for 140 miles by rail, and $1.60 is for 833 miles by water.

The steel industry as it now exists, with its enormous investments and payrolls, could never have reached anything near its present capacity of 117 million tons a year if it had had to rely exclusively on land transportation. The costs would have been prohibitive.

We are coming to an end of the economic pattern I have just described. The high-grade Minnesota ore is running out. There are still large reserves of low-grade taconite ore in Minnesota, and these are being developed; but steel production has outrun domestic ore supplies.

We are becoming increasingly dependent on imports. Until the late 1940's, we never imported as much as 5 million gross tons of iron ore a year; but imports have now reached 10 million tons a year, and it is estimated that by 1975 we shall need 65 million tons a year. This estimate assumes continued taconite development in Minnesota.

Fortunately, nature has provided additional supplies in Labrador, at the extreme opposite end of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system. The high-grade ore reserves in Labrador have already been proved up to 400 million tons, and there may be more. They have been developed over the last several years by a group of United States companies, and the first shipments are expected this year.

I hope the Senator from Maryland has been listening.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. May I answer that?

Mr. WILEY. I just said that the first shipments of high-grade ore from Labrador are expected this year.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Speaking of the importation of ore into the United States, let me say that most of it comes from South America and goes directly to the plants in Maryland. That is the most economical ore the steel companies can obtain. That is why they get it there, is it not? They do not do so because there is any shortage of ore; they do so because that is the most economical way to obtain good ore.

I simply dispute the figures the Senator from Wisconsin has cited as to the need to obtain any additional ore.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I can plainly see that my good friend, the Senator from Maryland, and I are at sixes and sevens on this issue. I think he had better obtain the facts.

I may say that when complaints are made about the seaway as a self-liquidating project, those who complain are not saying anything about the $65 million they want to obtain today from the Treasury to improve a river on the east coast.

TRANSPORTATION OF ORE

The Labrador ore will move by rail to Seven Islands, Quebec, on the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The next logical, economical move would be up the St. Lawrence River, through the seaway, to the Great Lakes ports in the United States—the same ports which now receive Minnesota ore.

There are those who say, Mr. President, that the Labrador ore can be shipped by sea from Seven Islands to the east coast ports of the United States and thence by rail to Pittsburgh and even farther west. Or, they say, the Labrador ore can be used by steel plants near the east coast.

There are a number of things wrong with this argument. As I have shown, the cost of rail shipment of ore is fantastically more expensive than the cost of water shipment. Do not forget that the cost of ore shipment goes into the price of steel, and the price of steel goes into the price of nearly everything we buy. Regardless of the cost, the railroads simply do not have the capacity to handle the volume of ore that would be required. That was shown during the war, when as an emergency measure, an effort was made to move Minnesota ore by rail during the winter months when the lakes were closed to navigation.

It is true that steel capacity on the east coast is being expanded. These east-coast plants will use ore from Venezuela, from Liberia, and possibly also from Labrador. But that does not solve the problem of ore supplies for midwestern plants, which still account for the bulk of American steel capacity.

Any way we look at it, Mr. President, there are only two alternatives to moving Labrador ore through the St. Lawrence. One is a great increase in the price of steel, reflecting the increased transportation costs of shipping ore by rail. The other is a migration of the steel industry to tidewater. The economic repercussions of either of these are staggering, but happily we do not have to dwell on them. Our good friend and neighbor, Canada, will save us from our own folly if we do not have the good sense and foresight to save ourselves. Canada is going to build the seaway with or without our participation, and the Labrador ore will move through the seaway. But unless we pass this bill it will move under terms and conditions set by Canada. As Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay has put it—

> It would be highly undesirable to leave any part of the welfare of our great industries to the sole determination of a foreign power, no matter how friendly our relations have been, are, and will continue to be.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is not the ore itself under the complete dominion and control of the Dominion of Canada? The ore itself is in Canada. Yet the Senator says that we should not put it under Canadian control. We cannot take the ore out unless Canada permits us to do so.

Mr. WILEY. Canadian ore is being mined in Canada by a company which is financed with American capital and Canadian capital. The investors already have interests in American steel mills. The Canadian ore was bought for the specific purpose of taking care of those mills, so that the ore could be shipped to those mills, which contribute to the economic health of the Middle West.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It could be shipped if the Canadian Government permitted it to be shipped; but suppose Canada wanted the ore for her mills. Suppose Canada should face an emergency and needed the ore. Does the Senator believe that under those circumstances Canada would allow the ore to come to this country?

Mr. WILEY. My answer is that Canada has already agreed to do so. Title to the ore has already been turned over to the joint company. Of course, Canada will use some of the ore. She will also undoubtedly import some foreign ore, just as we do, for various special purposes. Different kinds of ores are required for making different kinds of steel.

It is very clear that the American companies which found the Labrador deposit have proved the existence of 400 million tons. They do not know how many more million tons will be available. All mills on the east coast do not consume more than 15 million tons.

BENEFITS TO MIDWEST

Mr. President, I said that a case could be made for the St. Lawrence seaway on the basis of iron ore alone. But, so great are the benefits of this project, that a case can also be made without reference to iron ore. Indeed, such a case was made more than 30 years ago when our dependence on foreign sources of ore was unforeseen.

This is the case for cheap water transportation to the Midwest—the case for bringing deep-water shipping to Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, Duluth, and other lakes ports. The direct, immediate benefits in lower shipping costs would be felt throughout the Great Plains. The wheat and other products of this area would have an assured outlet at savings in transportation costs which in some cases have been estimated as high as 50 percent. Similarly, savings would be reflected in the prices of imported products.

Of course, that does not mean anything to my friends on the Atlantic coast. We of the Midwest raise the grain, the cattle, and other foods which go into the bellies of easterners. But we are not entitled to any consideration.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thought the Senator was going to show that this project is an extremely valuable adjunct to our national defense. I have not heard him say anything yet except that the West ought to have an even more adequate transportation system.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Maryland could not be expected to see, even from the point of view of that argument, that from the standpoint of national defense an adequate transportation system is of importance to the great Midwest and the valley of the St. Lawrence. That would not mean anything to the Senator. When the blind lead the blind, both fall into the ditch.

In connection with the question of national defense, I simply say that I can cite an instance before we got into the last World War. Speaking on the floor of the Senate, and anticipating what would happen when oil carriers were torpedoed and thousands of lives were lost, I suggested that corvette-type boats be built on the Great Lakes in shipyards which were then protected, and that such boats be used to patrol the east coast. Of course, the isolated minds of that day could not see the advisability of doing that; and the isolated minds of this day cannot see the advisability of the St. Lawrence Waterway.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not perfectly true that if this project were of any real value to the national defense, and if it really proved detrimental to our enemy, he would drop a torpedo or bomb or something of the kind to blow up one lock, which would put the entire project out of commission?

Mr. WILEY. That is a possibility, just as it would be possible to drop one bomb on Washington and wipe out the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Wisconsin started the submarine argument. If submarines are to be used to attack shipping on the east coast, certainly the enemy will drop bombs on the locks of the proposed canal. There would be 14 or 15 such locks. The enemy would sabotage one of them, or do something to put it out of commission.

Furthermore, there is the long-standing argument which no one can controvert, that the waterway would be frozen over 4 or 5 months out of the year. In addition submarines operated very successfully in the Gulf of St. Lawrence all during the war.

Mr. WILEY. That is an argument which I have heard many times before.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It is not argument but fact.

Mr. WILEY. The answer to what the Senator from Maryland has said, or to the question which he purported to ask, is full and complete. Men who know, men like the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, the members of our national security organization, and the President himself, are all of the opinion that the seaway would contribute to the national defense.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Just a moment. This project would be no more vulnerable than any other defense installation. It would be no more vulnerable than the port of Baltimore, for that matter, the port of New York, or any other port.

One thing is true. It would be in a place where it could be far more easily defended than could Baltimore, New York, or Pittsburgh, where the steel plants are located.

We have had the benefit of the judgment of men who are well informed. I know the Senator from Maryland pays no attention to the judgment of men——

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, may I answer that observation?

Mr. WILEY. We have the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President, to the effect that the project would contribute to the national defense. Aside from that, it would contribute to the economic health of one-fifth of the population of the country. It would insure our control of a great waterway, a waterway which will be built in any event, whether or not we have the sense to realize what we should do.

One thing further is certain. There are those who have the national outlook. In our record we have shown what has been done for the East, the West, and the South, in relation to developments which are of national importance. Those who have the national outlook will constantly have in mind the national welfare.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, may I make one observation? Then I shall leave the Chamber and not disturb the Senator further.

Mr. WILEY. That would not be exactly a welcome event, but it might give me a breathing spell.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There are those who say that the proposed waterway could be defended, and would be a valuable adjunct to the national defense. Does not that argument depend on the time when such men are called before congressional committees to testify? Have not some of the most important leaders in our National Defense Establishment heretofore come before Senate committees and said that the project would be completely indefensible, and would be folly? That is in the records of the Senate. One group will say the project is all right, even though another only a few years ago said it was not feasible, and that it would not be defended.

Mr. WILEY. I believe many loose statements have been made on the subject. The gentlemen I have quoted have stated that development of the waterway is in the interest of national defense. With the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb, and now a third type of bomb coming into existence, I do not know whether anything is immune. However, I do know when the executive head of the Government, the military authorities of our Government, and the great States of the Union who want the development all agree, they are entitled to serious consideration, and should not be foreclosed from realizing what they believe to be in the public interest, as well as in their own interest.

GOVERNMENT AID FOR WATERWAYS

Waterway improvements of this nature have been traditionally carried on by the Federal Government. Canals have been built, rivers dredged, and harbors improved since the earliest days of our country.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to have placed in the RECORD the exhibit which appears at page 16 of the committee report, showing the amounts of money which have been voted for certain waterway and river developments. It shows the total estimated Federal cost, the amount appropriated to date, and the 1951 appropriation. It does not cover all the harbor improvements.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	1951 appropriation
Alabama:			
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida	$42,208,000	$14,949,000	$2,750,000
Buford Dam, Ga	40,225,000	2,300,000	900,000
Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama	20,843,000	3,438,900	2,100,000
Arkansas: Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma	686,370,000	3,175,000	[1] 240,000 700,000
California:			
Sacramento River ship channel	27,600,000	2,298,700	263,000
San Diego River and Mission Bay	10,300,000	6,025,000	1,500,000
Florida:			
Jacksonville to Miami Waterway	24,131,000	8,131,100	500,000
Jacksonville Harbor	12,044,400	9,663,200	800,000
Georgia: Savannah Harbor	9,057,700	8,487,700	540,000
Illinois:			
Illinois Waterway (exclusive of Calumet-Sag Channel)	29,164,800	27,422,300	700,000
(A) Chain of Rocks Canal	39,825,000	33,528,000	8,500,000
(B) Regulating works	55,778,000	42,083,500	330,000
Minneapolis:			
(A) St. Anthony Falls, Minn	20,477,700	3,609,800	494,400
(C) Other work	173,108,300	154,588,500	77,200
Ohio River locks and dams: (D) Work (exclusive of major replacements)	120,222,100	111,614,100	
Ohio River open channel work	21,546,300	15,873,100	200,000
Iowa: Missouri River from Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa	172,112,900	102,555,900	3,750,000
Louisiana:			
Calcasieu River and Pass	12,645,000	6,818,700	600,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: (A) Algiers Cutoff	14,400,000	9,472,000	3,400,000
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico	31,609,000	25,300,000	
Maryland: Baltimore Harbor and channels	10,400,000	6,801,600	650,000
Massachusetts: Fall River Harbor	2,929,800	2,252,800	250,000
Michigan: St. Marys River: Soo locks	92,228,100	62,020,600	1,300,000
Missouri: Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth	113,297,100	89,136,900	2,250,000
Montana: Missouri River at Fort Peck	156,900,000	131,974,800	883,000
New Jersey:			
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers	9,822,000	7,790,000	1,100,000
New York and New Jersey Channels	53,141,000	33,497,000	2,665,000
New York:			
Buffalo Harbor	16,146,000	4,623,000	900,000
Hudson River Channel	7,074,000	6,528,000	300,000
New York Harbor, entrance channels and anchorage areas	17,900,000	15,776,000	350,000
Ohio: Cleveland Harbor	23,904,000	10,227,900	237,000
Oregon: McNary Dam, Oreg. and Wash	270,000,000	112,185,000	39,610,000
Pennsylvania:			
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.: (C) Locks 2, Pennsylvania, and Morgantown lock and dam, West Virginia	24,400,000	18,780,000	5,780,000
Schuylkill River (culm removal)	12,574,000	400,000	
Tennessee: Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.: Cheatham lock and dam, Tennessee	14,000,000	3,636,500	2,050,000
Texas:			
Brazos Island Harbor	7,759,300	4,709,300	
Houston ship channel	17,403,800	12,058,500	800,000
Gulf Waterway (Galveston District)	20,222,500	22,218,500	880,000
Sabine-Neches Waterway	15,320,500	14,835,500	1,500,000
Washington:			
Chief Joseph Dam	206,000,000	26,700,800	18,529,000
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River	6,622,200	3,991,500	500,000

[1] Planning funds.

Table supplied by the Department of the Army.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Federal appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 for the Corps of Army Engineers—and I wish Senators would take note of this fact—involving improvements of harbors along the coastlines of the United States and the intercoastal and inland waterways leading to the harbors amount to $1,440,000,000.

Every year we appropriate more money for such work than the total cost of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and we appropriate it as an outright expenditure of the Federal Government—a gift, if you please, Mr. President—because we believe the benefits to the entire country are greater than the costs.

That is a very significant statement, and I wish to repeat it for the benefit of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. Every year, we appropriate more money for such work than the total cost of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and we appropriate it as an outright expenditure of the Federal Government—a gift, if you please, Mr. President—because we believe the benefits to the entire country are greater than the costs.

I have no quarrel with the appropriations indeed, I have supported them, because I believe in the projects they are designed to carry out.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Just a moment. I believe that, in the interest of a little reciprocity, and in the interest of taking blinders from one's eyes, which have been placed there in the fear that one's own little locality might be injured, there ought to be some consideration given to the 50 million people who live in the Valley of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know of any worthy navigation project in the State of Wisconsin which the Senator from Louisiana has opposed?

Mr. WILEY. Generally we do not have any navigation projects in Wisconsin. There may be, at times, a little improvement along the Mississippi. It is possible that a few dollars have been appropriated at times for a lighthouse or a harbor. The amount is of no consequence. I repeat, Mr. President, every year, out of the Treasury, we appropriate more money for rivers and harbors than we ask for in the pending bill, to permit us to build a self-liquidating project. The other undertakings are not self-liquidating, although they are all in the interest of the public welfare.

However, whenever we come to the St. Lawrence seaway, which would be self-liquidating, we are told we cannot afford it; and that statement is made by some of those who have benefited from other navigation projects.

For one river in the United States, as I recall, the Delaware River, there is being asked approximately $65 million. A steel plant is being built along the river, and $65 million is being asked for the improvement of the river. That amount will come out of the Treasury. It will be used to improve navigation on the Delaware River. I do not hear any objection raised to it by anyone in Maryland or Louisiana on that score. It will be an outright payment. It will not be on the pay-as-you-go basis which will be the case in the proposed St. Lawrence project.

THE POWER RESOURCES

To be carried out cheaply and to produce the maximum benefits, the navigation development of St. Lawrence is dependent upon power development, because the rise in the water level caused by the power dams through the International Rapids section will greatly facilitate navigation. Let us examine the power project briefly.

In the 46 miles of the International Rapids section, the St. Lawrence falls 92 feet. It is capable of generating an average of 12,600,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity a year. The United States share of that production will be 6,300,000,000 kilowatt hours. The cost, at the damsite, will be approximately 2.3 mills per kilowatt hour. Even after the costs of transmission, this power can be delivered to load centers at a cost of approximately 4.2 mills per kilowatt hour.

This great block of more than 6 billion kilowatt hours a year will be available to the acute power-shortage area in the northeastern United States. The power will find a ready market as fast as the generating equipment can be installed. Nor will it displace any other fuel, because it will supply needs over and above those now being met by all types of fuel.

As a matter of fact, the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission concludes:

It is apparent that in the 5-year period from 1956 to 1960 considerably more generating capacity will be needed than can be provided by the St. Lawrence project. In fact, either the New York or the New England area separately could, in the 5-year period, readily absorb the output of the St. Lawrence plant. * * * About 3,500,000 kilowatts of power will be needed in the combined area between 1955 and 1960, and, therefore, it is evident that the 700,000 kilowatts of dependable capacity at the project on the United States side could be utilized as fast as units could be installed.

DEFENSE ASPECTS

Mr. President, there is one further immediate tangible benefit from both the navigation and power developments which we cannot overlook, and that is in the field of national defense. This project has long had the support of the Defense Department and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The defense plants of the Northeastern United States need the additional power which the project would make available. American shipping in time of war would need the protection from submarines which the inland St. Lawrence route would provide as compared to the exposed Atlantic. The American defense economy needs this additional transportation capacity. We all remember how all our transportation facilities were strained to the utmost during the last war. We all remember, also, the terrible load on our shipyards. The St. Lawrence seaway would give us the additional shipbuilding capacity of the yards on the Great Lakes.

The national defense aspects make it all the more urgent that we join with Canada so that we can have some control over the matter. If we leave it a Canada, as Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson has pointed out:

The United States would be wholly dependent upon Canada to evaluate and take steps necessary to protect its interests in the matter of the operation of the seaway, not only in relation to toll charges and priorities in transportation in times of emergency but also in relation to the physical security and control of the seaway.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST SEAWAY

Mr. President, the benefits of this project are so great, and the cost is so low in relation to the benefits, that there just are no valid arguments against it. But so fertile are the well-paid brains of the lobbyists against this undertaking that, every time 1 fallacious objection is knocked down, they conjure up 2 more.

I do not believe that any public works project in history has had the careful, meticulous, repeated, expert engineering studies that have been made of the St. Lawrence. But with a magnificent disregard for the overwhelming preponderance of the evidence, the opponents complain that it would not pay for itself, when the fact is, as I have shown, that it would pay for itself with ridiculously cheap tolls.

The opponents growl that oceangoing ships could not use the seaway, when the fact is that at least 75 percent of the United States merchant fleet could use it.

They whine that ice would make it unnavigable so much of the year that it would be useless, but the fact is that at the Soo, where there is the same ice problem, the MacArthur lock alone handles 57 million tons of traffic a year—as compared to only 50 million expected on the seaway.

The opponents cry that the seaway would be useless for national defense, because it could be destroyed or sabotaged. The same argument applies to the Panama Canal, to Oak Ridge, Tenn., and to every power plant, dam, railroad bridge, and other defense facility in the country.

If we had always proceeded on the theory that we would build only what was absolutely safe from attack, we would still be living in wigwams and navigating in birch-bark canoes. Yes, we would not even have bathtubs, because many persons said they were unsafe.

BASIS OF THE OPPOSITION

I still have not touched upon the real basis of the opposition to this project. The opponents dislike to admit it and to bring it out into the light of day. Their real objection is that the project would be to their economic disadvantage. The coal industry has the effrontery to tell the American people that they either have to use coal to generate their electric power or do without.

Yet, Mr. President, a night or two ago I saw John Lewis on television telling about the future of coal. It has a great future, because within coal are the ingredients of undiscovered potentialities. Already we are getting out of it many useful things. Chemistry is turning what was heretofore simply a heat unit into something with which we can produce miracles. I heard John Lewis tell about it. He was right on that point, but he is wrong when he would frighten his miners into believing that they would gain something by opposing this great national and international enterprise.

The railroad industry has the insufferable arrogance to tell the American people that they have to ship their products by rail or not ship them at all.

Mr. President, this growing country of ours has almost infinite potentialities. It is now said that by 1975 there will be 200 million people within our borders. We need all the great developments the human mind can bring into existence. The railroad industry has tried to block the St. Lawrence project, and every time their arguments were knocked down, they came up with others. But now, Mr. President, the St. Lawrence seaway is going to be a reality. If the railroads are going to be so blind as to prevent United States cooperation in this project, then I prophesy that such an evil deed will bear bad fruit.

Mr. President, I referred to the coal industry and to the attitude of the railroads—not all the railroads, however. I quoted the statement of a man who has removed the blinders from his eyes. I should like to repeat what he said. He said, in substance, "Senator, you know where I have stood, and if I could block it now, I would block it, for selfish reasons. But I now know that the President of the United States has said the project will be constructed. The railroads would be cutting off their noses to spite their faces if they did not have our Government in the picture."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As the Senator from Wisconsin knows, I come from the Southwest, and I think we have some wonderful railroads there.

Mr. WILEY. So do I.

Mr. CHAVEZ. A man came to my office and stated that he wanted me to oppose this bill, although I am not opposed to it. I put a question to him in this way: I said, "You are in business, supposedly, to serve the people of America, and, at the same time, to pay dividends to those who own stock in your railroad. If you can get freight to Chicago on the Great Lakes by the development of this project, will it not be to the advantage of the railroad to pick up the freight and take it to the Pacific coast?"

He said, "That is correct; but, after all, New York has a great deal to do with it."

I could tell, then, what the idea was. Every railroad west of Chicago would have more business if this project were completed. But, nevertheless, higher powers seem to think it would hurt them if it should be put into operation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I desire to correct one impression which my distinguished friend from New Mexico seems to have, that the opposition to the proposal to build the St. Lawrence seaway stems from New York. I can assure him that the junior Senator from New York has been in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway for 30 years. I can assure him that the present Governor of New York is in favor of the seaway. I can assure him that a former Governor of New York and later President of the United

States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was in favor of the seaway; and I can assure him further that our predecessor as Governor of New York, Alfred E. Smith, was strongly in favor of the project.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New York misunderstood me. I was stating what the gentleman who represented a railroad operating west of Chicago told me. He said, "While we know we will have more business if the project is constructed, nevertheless, we must be against it because of New York."

I am not saying that I have that impression, because I myself think differently. I believe the people of the State of New York, in good faith, want to see, and are patriotic enough to want to see developed, this natural resource, whose development will help everyone. I ask myself, What does it mean to me, coming from the Southwest, as it affects the general welfare of the country? That is why I am for it.

So the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] need not worry about the Senator from New Mexico. I am not saying that New York feels about it as my railroad friend indicated. I was simply trying to state what a representative of a railroad of the West, a railroad for which I have admiration and which means much to the West, has said in trying to make an argument. He agreed with me that the railroad would have more business, and I think it would if the project were built.

Not only that, but I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that unless Uncle Sam takes care of this project and puts it over, Canada eventually will build the seaway, and the wheat growers of Wisconsin, of Michigan, and of Minnesota will be paying tribute to someone else.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that history teaches that with respect to every proposal to build an important canal, the railroad interests have been against it on the ground that the railroads would lose business? As I recall, the railroad interests objected to the building of the Panama Canal.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. They claimed that their business would be completely destroyed. Instead, it was built up many times over.

Similarly, the railroad interests objected to the building of the great canal in Texas which, I believe, connects Galveston with Houston. Nevertheless, the trade and commerce of Texas were greatly increased by the construction of that canal.

The railroads even objected to the widening of the New York State Barge Canal, running from Albany to Buffalo. But the improvement of that canal has tremendously increased the revenues of the railroads and the prosperity of the State of New York and of the Nation.

That has been the record of the railroads right along. They are shortsighted and completely misinformed. They would block such projects as these which in the long run will surely benefit them. I hope that we who believe in building up the country as a whole, not simply one section, not merely one group, will continue to make this fight which we will ultimately win.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I asked the Senator earlier, at a time when he was reluctant to yield to answer questions, whether the proposal of spending $100,000,000 on the construction of these 3 locks would assure the United States of any control or any participation in the operation of the 4 locks on the St. Lawrence downstream from the International Rapids section, or the 8 locks in the Welland Canal section, of the proposed navigation project.

Mr. WILEY. I answer that question for the Senator by saying to him and to the other Senators what the bill provides in substance:

Insofar as the United States is concerned, in the event of failure of the two countries to agree on charges or tolls to be levied for use of the seaway, provision is made for the establishment by the United States of charges and tolls on a unilateral basis for the use of the works under the administration of the Corporation, that is, in the United States.

Insofar as Canada is concerned, in the event of such failure to agree, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority may unilaterally establish charges and tolls for the use of the works under the administration of the authority.

We have every reason to assume that these neighbor nations will negotiate in good faith and will effect agreements with respect to these matters. To argue otherwise is to overlook North American history.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator's answer relate to the proposed 3 locks on the American side, or does it relate to the 4 locks in the Montreal area, or to the 8 locks on the Welland Canal?

Mr. WILEY. To the whole shebang.

Mr. LONG. In other words, he is saying that there is some agreement that this Nation is to participate in fixing, commodity by commodity, any tolls which may be charged on the Welland Canal? Can the Senator shows us where that is included in the bill?

Mr. WILEY. We have in mind that there would be provision for agreement between the countries in relation to the St. Lawrence River. In relation to the Welland Canal, that is between the two lakes. The Welland Canal is now in existence, and shipping passes through it. If the Welland Canal is deepened, it would be deepened at the expense of Canada.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator assure us that if the Welland Canal is deepened, it will be deepened entirely at the expense of Canada?

Mr. WILEY. Can the Senator indicate that Canada is interested in deepening the Welland Canal beyond 27 feet?

Mr. LONG. Not beyond 27 feet, but up to 27 feet. If it were proposed to deepen the Welland Canal more than 27 feet, and this Nation desired it to be deepened below 27 feet, without any particular desire on the part of Canada to deepen it below that point, can the Senator from Wisconsin suggest whether Canada would be willing to pay the expense of deepening the Welland Canal below 27 feet?

Mr. WILEY. No; I cannot answer that question. Twenty-seven feet is all that is needed. That depth will carry 75 percent of the present merchant marine of the United States now on the seas, to say nothing about the present shipping on the Great Lakes. As I have said, the shipping going through Sault Ste. Marie today has been as high as 90 million tons in 8 months. There is nothing like that on the Senator's coast.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Wisconsin feel that such a very excellent navigation project, with the enormous potentiality which he predicts will develop, should be forever limited to a depth of 27 feet?

Mr. WILEY. It is not forever limited. That is the agreement at present. But I do not believe there is need for anything further, because there are vessels now operating on the Great Lakes averaging 70 feet in length.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator from Wisconsin visualize a day when more than ore carriers, even the largest merchant ships sailing the high seas, might sail on the Great Lakes system to the seaway entrance he would like to have opened up?

Mr. WILEY. We are talking about a definite project, and the Senator from Louisiana is trying to say the project should be constructed so that the *Queen Mary* can pass through it. We do not want the *Queen Mary*, the *Queen Elizabeth*, or the *United States* operating in the lakes. We do not need those ships there.

What is needed is to have an outlet from a highly important economic section of the United States, a great waterway which nature has provided. We want to produce electric power and to open up the waterway to the markets of the world. Small ships are now going through the 14-foot canal on the Canadian side.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. With regard to most of the waterways which have been very wisely built by the Federal Government, it was found that many of them should be expanded and should be deepened.

Mr. WILEY. The intercoastal waterway is only 14 feet deep.

Mr. LONG. It is 14 feet in depth, but I believe it has been deepened and also widened several times, to the point where it is now perhaps 3 or 4 times as wide as it was when first constructed.

Mr. WILEY. According to the judgment of the Corps of Engineers and of others who have been interested for many years, the bill provides an adequate basis and is economically sufficient to take care of commodities and travel that will be routed to the sea.

Besides that, it will provide, as the President of the United States and other officials have said, a defense element significant to the life of this Nation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. With respect to the depth, it appears to be strange that there are objections to the effect that the canal project, when constructed, will not permit the passage of the larger vessels. Some of the interests which are objecting believe it should enable them to go into the Great Lakes. I am wondering whether this does not fill the needs. As I understand, the Department of Defense has gone over the program and has approved it, so far as defense and other elements are concerned. It is considered that it will be of sufficient size to accommodate ships to take care of essential transportation.

I wonder what the Senator from Louisiana has in mind. Does he feel that the project should be constructed at a cost which is greater than is proposed, so as to take in such ships as the *United States*, the *Queen Mary*, and the *Queen Elizabeth?*

Mr. LONG. Coming from an area which has a 30-foot channel, I am certainly interested in knowing what this proposal is and what it will ultimately mean. The only reason I inquired was that it is said that this Nation by rushing to participate in the project and to prevent Canada from building it unilaterally, would have some say with respect to tolls. The impression is that the United States would have some say about the item by item fixing of tolls, but there is no assurance that the United States would participate in the regulation of tolls on purely Canadian locks.

If the reason we are called upon to spend $100 million at this time to build 3 locks is to assure that this Nation will participate in fixing the tolls on 3 locks on the International Rapids in Canada, then I should be interested to know what assurance we will have that we will participate in determining any tolls which may be charged in the future, in the event this project is expanded, and in the event it should become necessary to build, or deepen, 8 locks to handle traffic on the Welland Canal, and to provide a greater depth in the segment around Montreal.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does it not sound reasonable that it would be well if the Commission were to negotiate with Canada so as to have control of these 3 locks, so far as tolls are concerned, and so that the whole question of tolls and transportation on the Great Lakes and through the proposed canal would be under 1 commission, the proper charges to be worked out later between the 2 countries? We have a commission having to do with commerce between these two countries on the Great Lakes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator knows that at the present time Canada is bound by a treaty which requires that any tolls which are imposed on that traffic shall not be discriminatory against the United States. There is a treaty of long standing between the United States and Canada that does protect this Nation, and also, of course, protects Canada with regard to improvements this Nation makes in the Great Lakes area.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, but it is not always a question of tolls being discriminatory; it is a question of their being reasonable. If certain articles which the United States uses, and which Canada does not use, come through the toll must be reasonable, so that the canal can be used to advantage by citizens of the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have studied this subject for a great many years, both as Governor and as Senator. It seems to me to be perfectly obvious that unless we join Canada in building this seaway we will have absolutely no voice whatsoever with regard to the administration of the seaway and the locks, and no authority in the fixing of tolls, whereas if we join Canada now in the undertaking we will be partners with Canada. Questions of administration, of conduct of the affairs of the seaway and canal will be matters of discussion and joint action. Canada will not, through unilateral action, ask us to do anything that is harmful to us and the United States will not do anything harmful to Canada. I cannot conceive that our country would ever desire to do any such thing. Neither nation would do it under such an agreement as is provided for, a joint adventure, a partnership, in which our voice would be just as powerful and as effective as that of Canada. I cannot conceive of any serious difference ever arising between us and the friendly and peace-loving nation to our north.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, let me make myself clear, because it seems to me Senators have been running around in circles. I have heretofore answered the question raised but it did not seem to be understood. The question is, "What will happen if Senate bill 2150 should become law and no agreement should be reached pursuant to section 12 of the bill on tolls to be charged?"

Mr. LONG. I do not believe that is the question.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator will see that it is, if he will follow my remarks.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is answering a question I did not ask. If he desires to answer the question he asked, I shall be glad to listen, but I should be glad to restate my question. My question is, If the bill shall pass, does it assure us any control or any voice in any tolls which may be fixed in the future by Canada on the four locks in the St. Lawrence, where the St. Lawrence is in purely Canadian territory, or on the Welland Canal between the two Great Lakes?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have answered that question, which is the same as the one I have read, from a different angle, I am going to state what the bill provides.

Insofar as the United States is concerned, in the event of failure of the two countries to agree on charges or tolls to be levied for the use of the seaway, provision is made for the establishment by the United States of charges and tolls on a unilateral basis for the use of the works under the administration of the corporation, that is, in the United States.

Insofar as Canada is concerned, in the event of such failure to agree, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority may unilaterally establish charges and tolls for the use of the works under the administration of the authority.

In other words, if these two nations engage in an enterprise to develop this great waterway, and if they cannot agree on the tolls, then we have absolute control over that part of the water highway that is on our soil, and can fix the tolls, and Canada has the absolute right to fix the tolls in her area. That means, of course, that no one could travel up that highway past our locks without paying our tolls. It means also that the treaty we have in relation to the joint use of the St. Lawrence would be observed.

These two great nations have not had a battleship or fortification on the Great Lakes since the War of 1812, and there is no need to say that we are not going to be so asinine as to enter into an agreement such as now proposed and then proceed to block our own activity, which is for the political and economic health and security of our Nation. That cannot happen.

Mr. President, if that does not answer the question, I am not going into it any further, because I desire to conclude. If the Senator has another question, I shall yield to him.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator, with regard to the existing project, how many locks there are between Montreal and Lake Erie when we count the eight that are on the Welland Canal and add the others. I desire to know how many locks there are on the St. Lawrence segment of the existing project.

Mr. WILEY. There are four sets of locks. But we are not talking about the existing project; we are talking about the problem of the two nations getting together and creating a great waterway system. I told the Senator that if the proposed arrangements were to be concluded, there would be 1 lock at Point Rockway entirely on our side and 2 between Massena and St. Regis, which would be entirely on our side, and the Canadians would have 2 locks at Soulange and 3 at Lachine.

Mr. LONG. My reason for asking the question was that it is my understanding that at the present time, after leaving Lake Erie, there are 8 Canadian locks to bypass Niagara Falls and a certain number—I presume 4 locks—on the St. Lawrence—all of which are in Canadian territory. All those are in the navigation project and have been developed by Canada at a cost of $300 million. It is my understanding that Canada charges no tolls whatsoever to United States shipping for the use of that entire navigation project which has been constructed entirely on Canadian soil. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether that is a correct statement of the situation.

Mr. WILEY. Frankly, Mr. President, I cannot tell my colleague about the utilization of the present locks or whether any toll is charged for their use. I know there are some 14-foot locks and I know that considerable traffic goes through them. I know that small ships from Scandinavian travel there; some of them move all the way to Manitowoc, in my State. They have a draft of only 14 feet.

Mr. LONG. The point I had in mind is this: Inasmuch as Canada has developed this navigation project to this point, at an expense of approximately $300 million, but has not seen fit to request United States shipping to pay any tolls whatsoever on that waterway, I am curious to know why the Senator from Wisconsin feels that as a result of failure of the United States to put up approximately $100 million at this time for the project, the United States would not be fairly treated by Canada in the case of the three locks the Senator from Wisconsin would like to see constructed.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Louisiana is putting words into my mouth. I have never said that Canada would not be fair. On the contrary, Canada has been fair to us all through the years, and I believe she will continue to be fair.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator from Wisconsin is correct in that statement.

Mr. WILEY. My point is that it is the judgment of the military authorities of our Nation, as it is also my judgment, that it would be a great advantage to the United States to have control as a copartner, particularly in the case of the locks to be built, because they would increase the potentialities of the traffic on the Great Lakes, in that, instead of the meager number of small ships which now use the existing waterway, the shipping traveling the ocean lanes of the earth would be able to move there. To my mind, that aspect of the matter is most important.

TYPES OF SEAWAY TRAFFIC

Mr. President, at this time I wish to submit a table for printing in the RECORD. The table relates to a matter which was brought up by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. In my humble opinion—and as one railroad man told me, and as the distinguished junior Senator from New York also said—there has always been opposition in the United States to the development of water resources, because of the fear that in so doing we would cut our economic throat.

At this time I wish to submit in evidence what I might call the commodity exhibit to be found on page 18 of the committee report on the St. Lawrence seaway bill. This exhibit is very interesting because it shows the amount of tonnage, assuming that iron ore would go from Labrador to the Great Lakes by water, except for the rail route to the St. Lawrence. The table on page 18 shows that the rest of the tonnage going through this channel will be relatively small, as compared with the hundreds of millions of tons the railroads carry. For instance, it is estimated that the potential traffic on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway will include from 6½ to 11½ million tons of grain, 4 million tons of coal, from 6 to 20 million tons of petroleum, 48,000 tons of agricultural machinery, and 640,000 tons of automobiles, parts, and accessories. I now ask unanimous consent that this table be made a part of my remarks, and be printed at this point in the RECORD, so that all who study the RECORD may see the basis on which the fear that the railroads will be damaged is built.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Possible range of toll charges and annual toll revenue on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway

Commodity	Potential traffic	Toll charges per short ton	Total revenue
Iron ore	30 to 37½ million tons	50 cents	$15,000,000–$18,750,000
Grain	6½ to 11½ million tons	25 to 35 cents	1,625,000– 4,025,000
Coal	4 million tons	do	1,000,000– 1,400,000
Petroleum	6 to 20 million tons	25 cents	1,500,000– 5,000,000
Agricultural machinery	48,000 tons	$1.25	60,000– 60,000
Automobiles, parts, and accessories	640,000 tons	do	800,000– 800,000
Iron and steel	1,371,000 tons	do	1,713,750– 1,713,750
Office appliances and parts	7,000 tons	do	8,750– 8,750
Wheat flour	555,000 tons	50 cents	277,500– 277,500
Industrial chemicals	13,000 tons	$1.25	16,250– 16,250
Coffee	245,000 tons	do	306,250– 306,250
Sugar	963,000 tons	do	1,203,750– 1,203,750
Oil seeds	125,000 tons	do	156,250– 156,250
Wool, unmanufactured	6,000 tons	do	7,500– 7,500
Newsprint paper	121,000 tons	do	151,250– 151,250
Manganese, chrome, and ferroalloy ores and metals, n. e. s.	240,000 tons	50 cents	120,000– 120,000
Copper, refined and unrefined	34,000 tons	$1.25	42,500– 42,500
Nitrogenous fertilizer materials	25,000 tons	do	31,250– 31,250
Residual general cargo traffic	6,885,000 tons	do	8,606,250– 8,606,250
Ballast shipping	25½ to 42 million dead-weight tons.	15 cents per dead-weight ton.	3,825,000– 6,300,000
Total			36,451,250– 48,976,250

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, to my mind those who oppose the seaway fail to take into account what I mentioned before, namely, the great potential vitality and growing ability of our Nation. It is estimated that the population of the United States will be 200 million by 1975. At that time many of those who listen to me today will still be alive. Think of the demand on the railroads and the demand on shipping at that time. Why should we in the Senate dynamite, as it were, one of the great potential arteries of the earth?

As was said by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I know that some of the representatives of the ports of the east coast and west coast, as has been evidenced here today, say, "Either use our ports or do not enter or leave the United States." I am glad that stand has never been taken in the slightest degree by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and other Senators.

Mr. President, we are all one people, one great country. I trust that it will be demonstrated that the States of the United States are one and indivisible. What strengthens one of them, strengthens all; what weakens one of them, weakens all. Certainly that is true in a national sense.

If the commerce in iron ore from Labrador is cut off, if the flow of traffic over the water artery that would be made possible if this bill becomes the law of the land is curtailed, what will have been done? In that event, our commerce will be weakened, in the same way that a man's arm is weakened if he does not use it. This waterway is one of the most needed developments of the earth, Mr. President. Shall we have the vision to use it? After all, as the Good Book says:

Where there is no vision, the people perish.

Mr. President, was there ever anything more outrageous than the attitude of those who close their minds to the national interest?

Such selfishness would be bad enough, even if the fears of the coal industry and the railroads and ports were well-founded. But the fact is that all of these interests are seeing ghosts. Not one of them would lose a nickel's worth of business because of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. That project would enable every one of them to grow richer and fatter than it is now—and that is saying a great deal.

What a pity it is, Mr. President, that the opponents of the seaway have not devoted their considerable talents to constructive ends. If the effort, the time, the money, and the brains that have been spent in the vain attempt to defeat the St. Lawrence seaway had, instead, been spent on something worthwhile, there is no telling what monument to the public good we would have seen erected.

UNITED STATES ECONOMY IS GROWING

But the really pitiful thing about it, Mr. President, is that these opponents of the seaway are so shortsighted. They have no conception of economic growth. All they see is the present volume of traffic and the present demand for fuel in the United States. Somehow, they have never managed to grasp the notion that in an expanding economy, there is a sufficient increase in wealth for everyone—themselves included—to get more.

This is the real crux of the matter, Mr. President. It is a question of faith in economic growth and progress. It is a question of an expanding, vigorous economy versus a stagnant economy. It is a question, really, of faith in America. No one knows the capacity of the American people to produce and to absorb that production. It is, as President Eisen-

hower well said in his state of the Union message, one of the wonders of the world.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In view of the argument the Senator from Wisconsin is making for the development of commerce, and also in view of the attack on the railroad lobby, I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin goes along with the railroad lobby in favoring the imposition of tolls for the use of the waterways covered in the proposed legislation now before the Senate. Why does not my colleague simply propose that a toll-free waterway be built?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has forgotten his yesteryears. One of the arguments the railroads previously made was that the St. Lawrence seaway would not be a self-liquidating project. Now we have taken steps to provide that it shall be self-liquidating. But now the representatives of the railroads say, "We do not want that. We want the American people to pay for the project, out of the Treasury."

What a lack of consistency on the part of the opponents of this valuable project, Mr. President. To quote the well-known proverb:

Consistency, thou art a jewel.

SEAWAY WILL PROMOTE GROWTH

Supply creates demand. New capacity is no sooner added than it is absorbed, and more than absorbed. New highways are no sooner built than they are jammed with traffic. New airports are overcrowded almost before they are finished.

We cannot possibly foresee the demands which will be made on the transportation and power facilities of this country by the growth of the next 10 years. Who in 1933 could have foreseen the full extent of the transformation which the Tennessee Valley Authority brought to a great section of our country? Who in 1870 could have forecast the tonnage that would eventually move through the Suez Canal? Who in 1903 could have made such a forecast, estimating with accuracy the tremendous potentialities of the Panama Canal? Advance estimates of the traffic that would move over the San Francisco Bay bridges, the Chesapeake Bay Bridge, and the Pennsylvania and New Jersey turnpikes were far too low.

History has taught us that the total benefits of these great, imaginative projects are never fully realized in advance.

So I am confident it will be proved to be in the case of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

I only hope that my country can have a part in it.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Mr. President, let me conclude by summarizing the situation which confronts us:

First. The President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Commerce support this project from the point of view of both the national defense and the national economy.

Second. The overwhelming preponderance of the evidence shows the project to be technically feasible and economically sound.

Third. No conclusive evidence has been presented that any economic interest will be affected adversely.

Fourth. The project will be fully self-liquidating and will not cost the taxpayers a cent.

Fifth. The present moment, when business activity is declining and unemployment increasing, is particularly appropriate for undertaking the project.

Sixth. Work on the project is going to start in a few months. Canada is unwilling to delay longer. This is our last chance to insure that our interests will be protected by joint operation.

Mr. President, we simply must not miss that chance. In the language of the street, we must not miss the boat.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Maybank
Anderson	Griswold	McCarran
Barrett	Hayden	McCarthy
Beall	Hennings	McClellan
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Monroney
Burke	Hoey	Morse
Bush	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Pastore
Byrd	Ives	Payne
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Kefauver	Smathers
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	Kuchel	Symington
Ellender	Langer	Thye
Ferguson	Lehman	Upton
Frear	Lennon	Watkins
Fulbright	Long	Welker
George	Magnuson	Wiley
Gillette	Malone	Williams
Goldwater	Martin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). A quorum is present.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, S. 2150, providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes, be temporarily laid aside so that the Senate may have an opportunity to consider several resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 177, authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relating to the St. Lawrence seaway, submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on January 11, 1954, and I submit a report (No. 849) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 177), was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations 500 additional copies of the hearings relative to the St. Lawrence seaway held during the 83d Congress, 1st session, by the said committee.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably without amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, and I submit a report (No. 850) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54) to print additional copies of hearings on treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to inquire which resolution the Senate is now considering.

Mr. JENNER. The concurrent resolution provides for the printing of additional copies of hearings on treaties and executive agreements. It relates to the so-called Bricker amendment.

Mr. LONG. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary 2,000 additional copies of the hearings relative to treaties and executive agreements held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress, 1st session.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE AVAILABILITY OF SUPPLIES OF CRITICAL RAW MATERIALS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with amendments, the resolution (S. Res. 171) extending the authority to investigate the accessibility and availability of supplies of critical raw materials, and I submit a report (No. 851) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV RELATIVE TO THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 180. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 180) amending rule XXV relative to the standing committees of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would suggest, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Oregon, that there is only one amendment, purely of a technical nature, offered by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The clear intent of both the majority and the minority leaders in submitting the resolution was that it shall apply only to the remainder of the 83d Congress. That is made clear in the first part of the resolution, which reads:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the 83d Congress, section (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended.

However, the staff of the Committee on Rules and Administration felt that the resolution should be amended as follows:

On page 1, line 10, after "SEC. 2.", to strike out "Section 4" and insert "During the remainder of the 83d Congress, section (4)", and in line 12, after the word "by", to insert "inserting '(a)' after '4' and by."

The sole purpose of the amendment is to make certain that the resolution shall apply only to the remainder of the 83d Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as stated by the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I submit an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the resolution it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. For the remainder of the 83d Congress, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], is hereby assigned to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which are hereby enlarged accordingly. These assignments shall be in lieu of his seats on his present committees, whose size shall be adjusted accordingly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if it is agreeable I should like to make a brief explanation of the resolution. In the first place, under the terms of the resolution as submitted by the majority and minority leaders, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is increased by two members. If the resolution is agreed to, by order of the Senate, to be presented subsequently, two members would be assigned to the committee, one by the majority and one by the minority.

The Committee on Public Works is increased by two members. Again, if the resolution is adopted, by subsequent order of the Senate one member would be assigned to that committee by the majority and one member by the minority.

The remainder of the resolution is based on the premise that whichever party is charged with the responsibility of being the majority in the Senate shall also be entitled to have a majority on each of the committees of the Senate. Therefore, it was necessary to make a readjustment in the number of places which the majority party could assign to Senators who hold two committee seats and who are permitted to hold a third committee seat. In each of the committees of the Senate, the Republican Party, which is charged with having the responsibility as the majority party, has only a majority of one Senator. In any event, on any of the committees of the Senate, it is not possible to divide that majority of one. In other words, either we have the responsibility or we do not have the responsibility.

I wish to say that the subject was discussed at the very beginning with the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the minority leader. I proceeded on the basis that if the Republican Senators were sitting on the minority side of the aisle, instead of on the majority side, we would feel that the solution of the problem as proposed by the resolution would be equitable and fair.

It was in that spirit that the resolution was prepared. We had our respective staffs work on it, after considering various proposals which had been made, including the proposal that on certain committees there would be a tie vote, with the chairman of the committee being permitted to vote to break the tie.

Grave questions were raised as to the constitutionality of such a proposal, because the Constitution itself provides that each Senator shall have one vote. A question might arise in the future as to certain committee action if the chairman broke a tie by having two votes. That might jeopardize legislation and also committee action.

Over the long term of the history of the Senate it has been customary for a majority of the Senate to assign members to committees. For many years the majority party made committee assignments of minority as well as majority members, but in later years it was recognized that there were certain inequities involved in such a procedure. I think the precedents of the Senate are very clear that the majority party assigns its members and any third-party memberships, and the minority party, as a matter of equity, assigns its memberships.

In my opinion, it would be a very dangerous precedent, Mr. President, if the Senate of the United States should take it upon itself to assign to committees the member of the third party and upset the control of the Senate itself.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as the debate in the last session of the Congress will show, made it clear that he did not desire to be assigned to committees by either the majority or the minority. It believe the solution we have worked out is fair. I believe it is workable. I think any upsetting of the solution which has been arrived at, Mr. President, will open up a sequence of events which will not be in the best interests of the Senate itself.

I hope the resolution as unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration will be adopted by the Senate. If the resolution shall be adopted, I shall then offer, in accordance with the custom in the Senate, a series of orders which the Senate itself will have to approve. I assume that the Senate itself would be in position to change such an order and substitute the names of some other Senators for those whom the majority shall propose. Perhaps it would be better at that time, if the Senate wanted to pursue the matter, to have it come to a vote rather than to name a particular Senator in the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this question arose originally on January 13, 1953. Someone has the responsibility for the assignment of members of minority parties other than the members of the two major parties. Someone has that responsibility, and someone must exercise it. This question came up in January, last year, and it was my suggestion at that time that we should follow the precedents which had been established. At that time it was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] that it was the responsibility of the majority to make the assignments in the case of a member of a third party. He stated that it had been his understanding that traditionally it has been the obligation of the majority party to make assignments of Members of the Senate who may not be members of the majority party or of the principal minority party. In my opinion, that is correct.

At that time the distinguished majority leader, the late Senator Taft, pointed out that the membership of the Senate was 48 Republicans, 47 Democrats, and 1 Independent. Therefore, it was the theory of the Members on this side of the aisle that the responsibility passed to the party which had 48 Members and not to the party which had 47 Members.

The situation has now changed. The Democratic Party has 48 Members, the Republican Party has 47 Members, and there is 1 Independent. So, what was the responsibility of the Republican Party at that time may perhaps be the responsibility of the Democratic Party now. Someone has that responsibility, and if the party with 47 Members is not going to exercise it, the party with 48 Members has to do it.

Mr. President, it is in that spirit that in behalf of myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I have offered the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think it is clear that the responsibility in this case is the responsibility of the majority party, if it is done by a party. The rule of the Senate, of course, provides that the Senate shall elect the members of committees. There is, of course, no reference in that rule to party, but, through custom and practice, and I think it has been wise practice, the assignment of members to committees has really been done, as a practical proposition, by the respective majority and minority parties.

In this instance our distinguished friends on the other side are the majority; they control the Senate; they have the chairmanships of all committees and they control the Senate.

I want to be fair about this, Mr. President. I do not think the distinguished minority leader has the responsibility in this case. I am sure the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will agree with me. I do not think the Steering Committee has the responsibility. Places have been allotted by the majority party to the minority party to take care of the members of the minority party. Those places have been filled, as they should have been, with minority members.

Under the procedure followed in the past, the majority party should make the assignments in this case; but if it does not make the assignments, then the basic responsibility is on the Senate itself to make them, because, so far as the rules are concerned, they take no note of political parties. The rules provide that the Senate shall make the assignments. The majority party controls the Senate and has allotted to the minority party places on committees.

The minority leader said he does not have the responsibility in this instance. He has been given so many places on committees for members of his party, so many places for Democrats, but not any place for members of the Independent Party.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] ought to be given good committee assignments. He is one of the hardest workers, and one of the ablest Members of this body. I do not always agree with him, but that is nothing unusual in the Senate. Seldom do we agree with all our colleagues on some matters. But I know how conscientious, devoted, and able he is. I had the honor of serving with him for some years on the Committee on Armed Services, and I know the very fine, devoted, and outstanding work he did on that committee. He has considerable seniority in the Senate. In my opinion, that seniority should be considered and should be given due weight. If the majority party does not see fit to meet the responsibility which has been its responsibility in the past so far as majority assignments are concerned and in the allocation of certain committee assignments for minority members, then the responsibility falls on the Senate itself.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator. I have not criticized the minority leader at all. I am trying to point out that someone has to assume this responsibility. If the Republican side of the aisle takes the position that it cannot do so because it has only 47 Members, and the Democrats have 48, then we are in a peculiar situation. It is said that the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is an Independent. If the Republicans are willing to take the junior Senator from Oregon as an Independent to their side for organization purposes, so that the Republicans can become the majority party, then, I think common justice demands that the junior Senator from Oregon should be returned to the committees which he formerly occupied.

Mr. LONG and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I desire to yield to Senators in the order in which they have asked me to yield. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana; then, I shall yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it seems to me that the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico would be only simple justice. The junior Senator from Oregon has given many years of devoted service to the Committee on Armed Services and also to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. By virtue of his background and long experience with labor problems, he is one of the best qualified Members of the Senate to serve on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Having been myself a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I can testify, personally, to the very diligent service of the junior Senator from Oregon on that committee. However, the junior Senator from Oregon is not on either of those committees at present because he chose to do what, I believe, was a very honorable thing. After having supported the Democratic candidate for President of the United States in 1952, he felt that, in all honor, he should resign from the Republican Party, and he did so.

When it came to the assignment of members of the minority to committees, the minority leader did everything in his power to provide the best possible committee assignments for them. The majority leader, at that time Senator Taft, undoubtedly did the best he could to provide the best possible committee assignments for members of the majority party.

At that time the Senate, by a resolution, or order, reduced the number of members on the least important committees and increased the size of the more important committees, so that new Members of the Senate would have an opportunity to serve on the more significant committees.

In that connection, so diligent was the leadership on both sides to provide for all the new Members that they simply assigned to the Independent Party member of the Senate whatever committee places remained, with the result that the junior Senator from Oregon was eliminated from the two committees on which he had served, and was thereafter available for what was regarded by the majority leader as the two least important committees.

Having gone through that experience, it seems to me that before any new Members are assigned to committees, it is the responsibility of the entire Senate to rectify what I believe was an injustice to the member of the Independent Party of the Senate. I hope that in creating the new positions on committees, the Senate will right what I believe was a wrong by again assigning the junior Senator from Oregon to the two committees on which, by reason of his experience and seniority, he is entitled to serve.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the junior Senator from Louisiana that that is exactly what prompted me to move the amendment. On the previous occasion, if we wanted to vote to have the junior Senator from Oregon retain his old committee assignments, we had the choice of voting to knock off a Republican or voting to knock off a Democrat—an equally intolerable situation.

Mr. LONG. I was one of the Senators who voted to have the junior Senator from Oregon retain his committee assignments.

Mr. ANDERSON. So was I.

Mr. LONG. At that time we had a vote to determine whether to remove from the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare either 1 Democratic member or 1 Republican member, in order to enable the junior Senator from Oregon to be restored to his old committee assignments. We should not have been placed in that unfortunate position. I believe many Senators at that time who perhaps desired to vote to allow the junior Senator from Oregon to retain his committee assignments, felt compelled to vote otherwise. I hope the situation can now be corrected.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is all I seek to do by my proposal. I was hopeful that

by placing the junior Senator from Oregon back on the committees to which he was formerly assigned, we would then place upon the majority leader and the minority leader the responsibility of working out the assignments of Members they might want on committees, the assignments they thought they needed, and restore the Senator from Oregon to the committees to which I think he belongs, and to which I believe according to the traditions of the Senate he should be placed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that the majority leadership on this side of the aisle is not escaping its responsibility, nor will the majority party so long as it has the responsibility for the leadership of the Senate try to escape its responsibility.

In accordance with that responsibility, we entered into discussions with the minority leadership. The discussions were carried on over a long period of time. After careful study, we agreed upon a resolution on the part of both the majority and the minority. Then, in accordance with that responsibility, I offered in the Senate the resolution on behalf of myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. If it shall be adopted, then on my responsibility as majority leader I shall offer, a series of orders for action by the Senate, assigning certain members to committees. Because of the deaths that have taken place on our side of the aisle, there have been a series of changes in committee assignments, since when a Senator goes to a new committee, he gives up an assignment on another committee.

Based on our responsibility and our judgment, we shall offer the series of orders to which I have adverted.

I submit that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico is, in effect, an effort on the part of his party, or at least on the part of himself and the group that is sponsoring the amendment——

Mr. ANDERSON. The amendment is not sponsored by the Democratic Party.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment that is being sponsored by a group of Senators on the other side of the aisle is an attempt to say to the majority conference how they should make their committee assignments. I think that is a highly dangerous precedent to be established. On the other hand, if that is not what the Senator from New Mexico is attempting to do, I say, in perfect frankness and friendliness, that what is being attempted to be done is to take away from us our judgment with respect to assignments to committees on which we are entitled to have a majority of one. I say it is an attempt to create a tie on those committees and deprive us of a majority. If successful, I think that would constitute a highly dangerous precedent. It is an attempt to tell us how we should assign Members on the part of the majority, and I do not believe such a precedent should be established.

Mr. ANDERSON. That does not happen to be the situation in the slightest degree. The Senator from California is trying to say that he has a right to assign the junior Senator from Oregon, as a member of his party. The junior Senator from Oregon has said he is not a member of the Republican Party.

The Senator from California does not claim the right to assign Democratic Members. Why should he claim the right to assign the Member of the Independent Party, if that Member has left the Republican Party? The junior Senator from Oregon had seniority on the committees to which he was formerly assigned, and he is entitled to remain on those committees, but he is not a member of the Republican Party. He is an Independent. Why was he not consulted, along with the minority leader?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; the Senator from New Mexico has mistaken what I have said. We are prepared to take the responsibility which the majority party has. I said earlier in my remarks that the precedents of the Senate are to the effect that when there is a second minority in the Senate of 1, 2, or whatever number it might be, the majority party, which is the party charged with the responsibility of operating the Senate, the party which elects the President pro tempore and names the chairmen of the several committees assumes the responsibility not only of assigning its membership to committees, but also of assigning the membership of the so-called Independent Party. We are prepared to accept that responsibility, and we have done so. That is what I have said; and that is what I have tried to make clear.

The Senator from New Mexico and other Senators who have joined with him are trying to upset the responsibility which the majority party is prepared to assume. We had full consultation with the leadership of the minority party. The Senator from New Mexico, by his amendment, is trying to upset, in effect, the control of the Senate of the United States.

I believe that in the interest of orderly legislative procedure, we should not let the Senate get into a position where no one knows which party is responsible for the organization, the day-to-day procedures, committee structure, and other activities of the Senate. If we get into that position a chaotic situation may be developed in the Senate such as has occurred in the Parliament of France.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I feel constrained to yield first to the Senator from Texas. However, I wish to say that if the amendment should be adopted, I see no reason why the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished majority leader should not again go into conference and come forth with another list of assignments which will preserve the majority which the majority party desires. The amendment would not bar them from doing the same thing they now propose doing. It merely provides that when a Senator decides to resign from a party the Senate will not whip him by removing him from his committees. That is all.

I now yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it the purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to bring about a tie on 4 of the 15 committees?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it is not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does not the Senator from New Mexico realize that that is what his resolution would do?

Mr. ANDERSON. I realize that in the present situation, what is proposed to be done will result in inequities. But if the Senator will go back into another of the huddles that have been held during the past few days, he can come out with a solution that will obviate a tie on four committees. The Senator well knows that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. For several days the staffs of the majority leader and the minority leader, with the help of their respective steering committees, worked out the best plan they could devise.

The resolution worked out by the majority leader was presented to the 15 members of the Democratic steering committee, the effect of it was related to them, and it was their unanimous judgment that we should support the resolution.

It is my feeling that as an actual minority of the Senate we would be treading on very dangerous ground if we should seek to substitute our judgment for the judgment of the majority in regard to committee assignments, which the majority has always made since the first Senate met. There is no precedent for any assignment of minor party members except by the majority party. The majority party has always made the assignments.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then the distinguished majority leader misstated the situation a moment ago, because he said the majority had assigned both majority and minority members.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Not at all. He said that during a period in our history, a very unpleasant period, which could recur if the Senator from California were disposed to follow a course other than that which he has chosen, the majority assigned every Member of the Senate to committees.

Mr. ANDERSON. That could not happen today. There are in the Senate 48 Democrats and there is 1 Independent, who would not stand for that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is speaking for more Democrats than the minority leader stands for. I am sure the Senator from New Mexico is not under the illusion that the Democrats control the Senate, and it is not the purpose of the Senator from Texas for them to attempt to do so, much less to control the Republicans.

Mr. ANDERSON. No one suggested that the Democrats should control the Senate, but if the majority leader of the Senate rose tomorrow and presented a

list of committee assignments which did violence to seniority, which removed Senators from their committees and changed the whole setup, I believe there would be 48 Democratic votes and 1 Independent vote against him, and I do not believe he could accomplish that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, the present majority leader is not going to do that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course he is not.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure that if the situation were reversed, and the present minority leader were the majority leader, he would not do it.

Mr. ANDERSON. He would not do it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But there have been times in the past history of the Senate when the majority has taken upon itself the responsibility of making assignments to all committee places, and those of us who have been in the Senate for several years know that precedents once established can plague the Senate in the future. I wish to point out that with the general comity between the two parties, it is not good practice, so far as the organization of the body is concerned, for the party which is in the minority in the Senate to attempt to take upon itself the assignment to committees, which is a responsibility of the majority.

The minority party assigns its own members to committee places which are allotted to them. Under the allotments to committees the Republicans have only a majority of one on each of the 15 committees of the Senate, and if we started adding members to those committees, we would upset that majority. In my judgment we would establish a precedent which would rise to plague us in the future, and I believe at some future day one party or the other might attempt to pick and choose between the members on the opposite side of the aisle and say, "While that Senator is a Democrat," or "While that Senator is a Republican, we think it would be better, from our point of view, to have Senator X or Senator Y on that committee."

I do not believe we should play with that kind of fire, and I submit to the Senator from New Mexico that when he attempts to upset the resolution which the majority party has presented to the Senate, he is playing with that type of fire.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I still do not agree with the Senator, because I think there are enough Members of the Senate with fair minds so that if the Senator from Oregon should choose two committees on which he desired membership, it would be possible to pass an appropriate resolution increasing the size of the committees so that the Republican Party would have adequate representation on them.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. It has long been evident to many Members of the Senate, and I believe to most of the American people, that the only reason why the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], was thrown off the two committees was that he refused to support the candidate for the presidency nominated by his party. When the Senator refused to support the candidate of the Republicans he very courageously announced that he was no longer a member of that party. He could very easily have done what has been done time and time again, have refused to support the nominee of his party, but still technically have remained a member of the party. I think it is greatly to his credit that he refused to do so, and that he came out honestly, fairly, and boldly and said, "I am no longer a member of the Republican Party."

There have been many instances in the past in which Senators have refused to support their own parties or the nominees of their own parties, and, with one exception, not one of them was deprived of a committee assignment. That one instance—and I do not recall the name of the Senator involved—came as an aftermath of the bitterness resulting from the Civil War.

The Senator from Oregon served for 8 years on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He served for 8 years on the Senate Committee on Armed Services. I believe that, with 1 or 2 exceptions, his service on each 1 of these 2 committees was longer than that of any other member. Certainly the Senator's service on those two committees was outstanding. I cannot speak with personal knowledge of the Senator's participation in the deliberations of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, but I can speak, and do speak very confidently, from long personal observation, regarding his noteworthy service on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I can say without fear of contradiction from any member who has served on that committee since I came to the Senate 5 years ago, that there was no Senator who had greater experience or more intimate knowledge of the subjects that were considered or that will be considered by the committee than the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

It is a well-established fact that no Member of the Senate can, while away from the floor of the Senate, be questioned with regard to any subject which he has brought up in a speech or debate on the floor of the Senate. I think it should be an equally accepted fact that no Member of the Senate should be disciplined for his honest political views. That is exactly what has happened in the case of Senator WAYNE MORSE. Let us face the fact. He was disciplined because he was courageous enough to say he would not support the candidate of his party. I, for one, respect him for that courage and integrity. I greatly hope that a Member who has served in the Senate for so long, who has given outstanding service on the two committees on which he was a member, will now be restored to the committees so that the Senate and the committees may have the benefit of his valuable services.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to say, in closing, that some years ago the then Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, became a candidate of the Progressive Party for President, and the then Senator from Montana, Mr. Wheeler, became his running mate. They left their parties. They campaigned, respectively, for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States. When the campaign was over they returned to this body. Not one Senator on either side of the aisle tried to whip them because they had stepped out of their parties and sought those offices.

So far as I know, this is the first time a Senator has been told that he must campaign for his party and for the candidates of his party. Obedience is a difficult thing to teach a man. It is one of the hardest things to teach a man. It is about the only thing you can teach a dog. It is a difficult thing to say to a Member of the Senate that he has to give blind obedience to what he is told to do for his party.

I have merely tried, by this amendment to the resolution, to restore the Senator from Oregon to his committees and then allow the majority leader and and the minority leader, who are honest men and to be trusted, to say that in view of the changed condition they will now make committee assignments which will be absolutely fair to the majority and still be fair to the minority. I have no other purpose.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the distinguished Senator from New Mexico remember that about 10 years ago, former Senator Ball, of Minnesota, who was nominated on the Republican ticket, supported President Roosevelt in the State of Minnesota; but when Senator Ball returned to the Senate he remained on the committees on which he had previously served, and no disciplinary action was taken against him?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I do.

Mr. LANGER. Yet he openly supported Mr. Roosevelt in the presidential election, although Senator Ball had been elected on the Republican ticket.

If precedent is to be followed at all by the Senate, it seems to me there is the precedent for the Senate to follow.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe also that is the precedent to follow. I remind the Senate that in 1932 a distinguished Senator from my State, Bronson Cutting, supported Mr. Roosevelt in the presidential election. Mr. Cutting was a Republican Senator. Yet no attempt was made to remove him from the committees on which he had been serving. Certainly that is a very fine Republican precedent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The situations just referred to have no parallel whatsoever to the present situation, I submit. In none of those cases did the Senator involved, after returning to the Senate, state, both off the floor and on the floor of the Senate, that he was resigning from his party and that he was asking

that he not be assigned by that party to committees.

Furthermore, there have been cases in the Senate of a Senator having been removed from his committee position.

Reference has been made to a former distinguished Senator from the State of Wisconsin. In 1925 he lost his chairmanship of the Manufactures Committee, and was dropped to the bottom of all the other committees on which he served.

After all, seniority on committees is not based on length of service in the Senate. It is based on the party service within the committee.

In that connection, let us consider the situation in the case of a Member of this body having great seniority; for instance, let us consider the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who leads the Senators on our side of the aisle in terms of seniority. He happens to be chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and he is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Armed Services. If today he were to ask that his assignment be changed from the Armed Services Committee, let us say, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and if such a change were made, when it was made he would go to the bottom of the committee list of the latter committee, to which he would then be duly assigned.

Mr. ANDERSON. Precisely.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So his service in the Senate does not follow him in the committee.

Now the distinguished Senator from Oregon has eliminated himself from our party; he has resigned from the Republican Party. He said he did not desire to be assigned to committees by either the Republican conference or the Democratic conference.

Thereupon it became the duty, in my judgment, of the leadership of the Republican Party and the leadership of the minority party to make the committee assignments which in their judgment would best carry out the policies of their respective parties in the Senate. When those assignments had been made, inasmuch as the Reorganization Act provides that each United States Senator shall serve on 2 committees, pursuant to the requirement of that act the Senator from Oregon was assigned to 2 committees.

I submit to the Senator from New Mexico that the instances he cites as precedents are not at all parallel to the instant situation, and do not constitute precedents.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let us bear in mind that when the Senator from Oregon was elected to the committees on which he served, he was elected by the Senate, not by the Republican Party or caucus. He was elected to the Senate as a Republican. But under the Reorganization Act the Senate elects the committees; and the Senate—not the Republican caucus—should have been the one to have removed him from his committee assignments.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will not the Senator from New Mexico agree with me that within recent years we have had a case which it is very appropriate to mention in connection with this matter? I refer to the case of Senator Glenn Taylor, of Idaho, a Democrat, who not only did not support the presidential candidate of his party, but actually became a candidate for vice president of the Progressive Party, a party opposed to both the Democratic and the Republican Parties. Yet he was not disciplined; he was not removed from the committees on which he had served. He was allowed to continue to serve on them during the remainder of the period of his service in the Senate without losing either his place or his seniority.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; and I did not hear a single Senator rise to suggest that Senator Taylor be removed from the committees on which he had served. If any Senator on the Democratic side of the aisle did make such a suggestion, I did not hear it, and I would be glad to have him hold up his hand at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I recall, we had quite an argument about a year ago over rule XXII. The position which prevailed was that the Senate is a continuing body. It was also argued that the concept that the Senate is a continuing body also includes the apparatus or the organizational activities of the Senate, namely, the committees of the Senate.

It seems to me the question involved here is whether, when the Senate assigns a Senator to certain committees, as was done in the 82d Congress—during the 82d Congress the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was serving on the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—those assignments continue. We are now faced, point blank, with the question which I understand was somewhat resolved by a rather overwhelming vote last year in the first session of the 83d Congress, namely, whether the committees of the Senate are continuing, and, if they are, whether the membership of the committees is to continue until the Senate itself acts otherwise.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senate elected the Senator from Oregon to those committees; and since the Senate is a continuing body, the Senator from Oregon should have remained on those committees. However, the Republican caucus took him off those committees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further, so that we may explore this point?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think we need consider the background of this matter. Unfortunately there were some developments which were hardly within the control of either the present majority leader or the present minority leader. As I recall the developments in the opening days of the first session of the 83d Congress, it was the intention of the majority to assign the Senator from Oregon to committees. I understand there was controversy over that matter, and as a result the Senator from Oregon was not assigned by the majority to the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Then the matter was brought up in the Senate, by means of a most unusual and peculiar legal procedure.

At this time, as I understand, the Senator from New Mexico is trying to avoid that procedure.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my understanding that the Senator from New Mexico is trying to avoid the procedure whereby we, as Senators, would be compelled by ballot vote to choose between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and some other Senator, so far as committee assignments are concerned.

What the Senator from New Mexico is attempting to do by the amendment he submits is simply to have the Senate instruct the majority leader and the minority leader and their respective steering committees that in the preliminary planning of committee assignments, which must finally be acted upon by the Senate itself, as a legal procedure under the Reorganization Act—in those preliminary plans which, in fact, amount to nominations to the Senate by the respective steering committees—the rule of committee seniority or committee service, in the case of the service of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the Armed Service Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, be followed and adhered to.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must say there are arguments to be made on precedents involving Senators on both sides of the aisle; let us be honest about that matter. If we wish to consider precedents, we have a precedent during 12 years of complete majority party domination, so far as committee assignments and control of the Senate is concerned. We have a precedent on the basis of the action of the minority in making its committee assignments and the action of the majority in making its committee assignments.

However, it is not unusual for the Senate to have included among its Members what are called third party representatives.

In past times all sorts of political parties have been represented in both the House or the Senate. The representatives of those parties in the Congress have always been assigned to committees; and insofar as I have been able to determine, their respective positions on the committees on which they had had long service have been recognized. They may not have been recognized in terms of committee position—in other words, whether such Senator was the ranking Member or was at the bottom of the totem pole, so to speak; but at least he was preserved within the committee household, in terms of committee assignment.

I think it is reasonable that if a Senator is asked to leave a committee, because of a re-shuffling, that at least he actually be asked—in other words, that the majority leader or the minority

leader come to him and say to him, "We have to make some changes in committee assignments. Would you be willing to leave the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and accept assignment to the Committee on Public Works or the Committee on Banking and Currency"?

That matter is generally one of a gentleman's agreement, following a request that seeks an answer, and not a matter of perfunctory or disciplinary action of a legal sort.

In this instance we have seen such disciplinary action taken, Mr. President; and we have seen a failure to recognize that a third party is now represented in the Senate.

There may be those who are unhappy over that situation. I have been pleading with the Senator from Oregon to come forth to the Democratic Party. I have told him that the welcome mat is out, that the household of liberal democracy looks forward to the day of his entrance, and that we will reward him and anoint him with the precious oils of political brotherhood and fellowship. But he resists. He is not easily persuaded. I hope we can continue to offer such temptations, and that this reasonable man may be persuaded by the rules of reason and logic. But being the kind of man he is, he apparently will do it in his own good time or not at all. I have almost lost my zest for using my powers of persuasion upon the Senator from Oregon. I feel that the least we can do, as fellow Senators, is to utilize his valuable services and talents on these two important committees.

The two committees in question are confronted with great problems. Amendments are being proposed to the Taft-Hartley law, and the Armed Services Committee has great problems relating to the security of our country. Very few Members of this body are as well qualified in these areas as the Senator from Oregon. I hope, therefore, that instead of leaving him in committee assignments which he never had until last year, we may give him an opportunity to return to his home committees, the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—not that he should be the ranking member, not that he should take any particular chair, but that he should at least be a member of those committees. After that is done, I do not see any reason why we cannot make the assignments which may be necessary in other committees. I do not believe the problem is quite as complicated as it is made to appear. That is particularly true when one has the faith that I have in the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is undisputed that in most cases in which a Member of the Senate has left his party during an election and supported the candidate of the other party or joined a third party permanently, the Member has been allowed to remain on the committees to which the Senate had assigned him and to maintain his seniority on such committees. That seems to have been what has happened in most cases.

For my part, when this question arose in the last session I not only voted to allow the Senator from Oregon to remain on the Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare Committees, but I wrote his name in at the place to which his seniority and long service on those committees would entitle him. However, the distinguished Senator from Oregon seemed to be willing to agree to another precedent which has some application—that when a Senator leaves his party or supports the candidate of another party, he should go to the foot of the list. In the case of the elder Senator La Follette, I think he did go to the foot of the list. I know of no precedent for completely removing a Senator from a committee to which he has been assigned by the Senate merely because he supported someone other than the nominee of the party for the Presidency of the United States. The Sumner case is not fully on all fours. There are many, many precedents to the contrary.

It seems to me that what this resolution would do would be, first, to right an injustice which may have been done to the distinguished Senator from Oregon. According to precedent, the majority committee usually assigns Independent members to committees. That is a precedent, but since the other precedent has been broken by taking the Senator from Oregon off the committees to which the Senate had assigned him, we are justified in altering a precedent to correct the error previously made in breaking a well-established precedent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator know that the majority caucus did not take the Senator from Oregon off the committees to which the Senator has referred? The action which was taken in constituting the present list of committees of the Senate was taken by the Senate itself. The action was based upon recommendations by both the majority and the minority leadership, each of which assigned its own committee places. Then the Senator from Oregon was assigned to two places, as required by the Reorganization Act. This action was taken by the Senate itself.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator wishes to avoid responsibility when the acceptance of responsibility hurts him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Just a moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The majority leader is not attempting to avoid responsibility.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I yielded to the majority leader for a question. I did not yield to him a second time.

The majority leader is now saying that it was not the majority which refused to allow the Senator from Oregon to continue on his committees, but that it was the action of the Senate. Of course, he is technically correct; but we always recognize—and it was recognized the last time—that in the organization of the Senate, the majority party has charge. The right of organization was being protected by certain members of the minority—almost all of them who voted to go along with the then majority leader, the late Senator Taft, in his recommendations. So certainly the majority leader cannot dodge responsibility. It was the majority party which did this injustice to Senator MORSE. It was the majority party which broke a precedent by taking the Senator from Oregon off the two committees on which he had served so well, merely because he had not supported the nominee of the party and joined a third party. He was placed on those committees by vote of the United States Senate. So far as I know, the precedents may take him to the foot of the list, but this is the first time I have ever heard of a case in which a Senator has been entirely removed from his committees.

So, Mr. President, precedent was violated. But even though there may be precedent now for blindly following the recommendation of the majority leader, I believe that since one precedent was broken in the first place, we can alter another precedent to a slight degree in order to right a wrong.

We are faced with a strange situation today. The majority party is willing to accept the vote of the member of the Independent Party in order to retain control of the Senate, and yet the majority party violates a precedent by taking him off the committees on which he has served, and is not willing to have another conference to try to make some arrangement to get him back on the committees on which he is entitled to serve. That is indeed accepting a benefit and not even being willing to give the Member what I think is ordinary justice.

In this situation the resolution does not say that the Senator from Oregon shall be the one who can break a tie. It merely provides for the arrangement of those committees in such a way that he may have service on the Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare Committees.

In the final analysis, since he should not have been taken off those committees in the first place, it seems to me that we must consider what is best for the Senate and what is best for the United States, in the vote upon the amendment of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. That is what the people of the country are interested in. A precedent was broken when the Senator from Oregon was taken off his committees. Perhaps another precedent will be slightly altered if he is placed back on those committees over the objection of the majority leader. But what is best for the Senate, and what is best for the people of the United States?

The Senator from Oregon has served in this body since 1944. At the time he came to the Senate he had for a number of years been a distinguished member of the National War Labor Relations Board. I dare say that at that time he knew more about labor-management relations than almost any other man in the

United States; and I believe the same situation holds true today.

Moreover, Mr. President, he is a very important adviser on that great question, because while he usually has a progressive and liberal attitude, when he disagrees with labor he does not mind saying so, and voting accordingly. His calm judgment and great experience are badly needed by the Senate and by the Nation, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at this time, when it is considering amendments to the so-called Taft-Hartley law. I know of no man who can make a better contribution to the welfare of the Nation as a member of a committee than can the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon on that committee. His judgment is needed. I am not in favor of depriving the Senate or the people of the United States of the good judgment and work of a Member of the Senate on a committee merely by worrying that a little rule may thereby not be followed exactly.

As to the Committee on Armed Services, on which I have the privilege of serving, no member was more diligent in his attendance on that committee than was the Senator from Oregon. He was a member of the Preparedness Subcommittee. I am sure that the minority leader, who served as an excellent chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee for such a long time, when it did such excellent work, will attest to the fine contribution which the Senator from Oregon made in saving the taxpayers of the Nation millions of dollars in bringing about better processes in management and purchase and control in the armed services of our Nation.

The junior Senator from Oregon accompanied the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] on an inspection trip of our bases in Africa, Europe, Greenland, and other places. Their report is a magnificent compilation of facts and irrefutable evidence showing how money was wasted and how tremendous amounts of money could be saved.

Those are the contributions which the junior Senator from Oregon has made on that committee; and the committee can ill afford to get along without him.

Mr. President, we know that on those two committees ordinarily none of the members act in any partisan manner on measures that come before them. Legislation which comes before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Armed Services is not decided on the basis of whether a member is a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent. We always find a crossing of party lines. The members of these committees, regardless of which side of the aisle they sit on, vote on measures before them in accordance with the merits of the measures. On matters pertaining to the defense of our country, over which the Committee on Armed Services has primary jurisdiction, we always find a nonpartisan or bipartisan approach. So far as the average member of the two committees is concerned, no partisanship is displayed in considering measures before the committees. Even if there were partisanship involved, we all know the Senator from Oregon well enough to know that he would not go along on any basis of partisanship. We all know that he gets his own facts and reaches his own conclusions, and that he will always vote in accordance with what he believes to be in the public interest, whether he votes with the Democrats or with the Republicans. He would never be a party to a deal or a trade. He is a man of great and good conscience.

That was always his experience as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. That was always the way he voted. I am sure every Member of this body will agree that that is his approach.

Therefore the great fear of the majority leader, that it would upset the control of the Republican Party if he were to agree to an even division, with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] being a member of the two committees, would not be applicable with respect to the subject matter of any measure that might be considered by the committees. The junior Senator from Oregon has always voted on the facts as he saw them to be.

That leaves only one further point to be considered. Assuming that after another conference it was agreed to have a membership of 8 Republicans and 7 Democrats on the committees, and that the Senator from Oregon would also be appointed, thus making an even division, it should be remembered that the Senator from Oregon stated some time ago that, although he is an Independent and did not agree with certain actions being taken by the administration, until another election is held and the next Congress comes into office he will vote with the Republican Party to continue the control of the United States Senate.

His logic, that until the people have had another opportunity to vote, in spite of what has happened to him in the Senate, was very commendable on his part; although I believe under the circumstances, having been pushed off the committees, in violation of the precedent, and not having been allowed to remain on the committees, and furthermore in face of the fact that every other Senator in the same circumstances had been allowed to remain on the committees, he might very well have decided to vote to take away the control of the Senate and give it to the Democratic Party.

There again, whatever the pressure has been, he has acted like a statesman, and I believe we ought to applaud him for it. At the time he stated that, until the next Congress came into office after the next election, he would vote to keep the leadership in the Republican Party, I assumed that that referred not only to the officials of the Senate, but also applied to the chairmen and staff and to purely partisan matters in the various committees to which he might be assigned. I assumed that to be the case.

Of course, the junior Senator from Oregon will speak for himself, but I did ask him that question a short time ago, and he assured me that it was so and that I was authorized to say that, until after the next election and another Congress came into power, if the complexion of the Senate was changed by the voters in the next election, so as to result in a clear Democratic majority or a clear Republican majority, he would vote to retain the leadership in the Republican Party in the Senate, and that his statement applied not only to the Senate itself but also to the committees.

With his position made clear in that respect, what does the majority leader fear? Why should not the Senate, under those circumstances, when the majority position will be fully protected, remedy the injustice that has been done to this great man and give the United States and the people of the Nation the benefit of his judgment in the two posts in which he is best qualified to serve?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma thought he heard the distinguished Senator from Tennessee refer to the possibility of the complexion changing the control of the next Senate. Will the Senator from Tennessee be a little more explicit? The Senator from Oklahoma did not quite understand.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma either draws the same inference or feels about it as I do.

Mr. KERR. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not mean to refer to a complexion that one feels.

Mr. KEFAUVER. When the Senate becomes Democratic after the next election it will be a delightful complexion that one would enjoy feeling. This is a complexion that I believe and hope will come about. However, this is a little beside the point.

The fact is that any possible objection which the majority leader might have either on the basis of votes on the merits of a measure considered by a committee or the control of a committee has been resolved by the commendable position taken by the Senator from Oregon.

I hope the Senate will vote in favor of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and thus permit us to work out the situation on these committees the best we can.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I assure my colleagues that I shall be exceptionally brief—at least brief for me. I am very deeply moved by and very appreciative of the demonstration of friendship this afternoon on the part of so many of my colleagues who are cosponsors of the Anderson amendment, and on the part of the Senators who have said so many kind things about me.

Mr. President, before I make my argument, which will be, as I say, a brief one, I take this opportunity to ask for the courtesy of the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are demanded. There is a sufficient second, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to review very quickly the position in which the representative of the Independent Party finds himself in the Senate. It is true, Mr. President, that in the 1952 campaign I found that I could

not, in keeping with my political principles, support the candidate of my party. I had the right, of course, to remain silent and remain within the party. I have always said, Mr. President, that one has no right to stay within his party and campaign for the candidate of the opposition. That has always been my position. It was my position, publicly stated, in a series of speeches in 1944 when a member of my then party campaigned for the opposition party candidate and did not resign from the Republican Party. I did not and do not think that is good political ethics, Mr. President.

When I finally came to decision of conscience that I could not support the candidate of my party, I felt the duty to resign from my party. As I stated on many occasions, as many of my friends know, I did not think there was a chance of the Democratic candidate being elected, but I proceeded to campaign for him. But in making that decision I resigned from the Republican Party.

That brings us to the formation of the Senate following that election. The Republicans were very kind and courteous to me. They sent, through the secretary of the conference, an invitation to attend the Republican conference, at the beginning of that session, before the Senate formally convened.

I explained to the secretary of the conference that I had resigned from the Republican Party and would not be present at the Republican conference, for the simple reason that I no longer was a member of the conference.

In this debate, Mr. President, great emphasis seems to be placed by the opposition on the point that because I announced to the public that I did not wish to be assigned to committees either by the Republican conference or the Democratic conference, I therefore placed myself in a position of being demoted by the majority party.

But what is being overlooked, or, at least, underemphasized, in this debate, is a point which I have made many times, that the 1946 Reorganization Act declares that members of committees shall be elected by the Senate.

It will be remembered that in the first argument on this question on January 13, last year, that was a point which I perhaps emphasized above all other points.

Mr. President, it appeared to be the ethical thing for me to come to the Senate as a member of a third party in the Senate and ask to be assigned to committees by the Senate and not by the Republican conference or by the Democratic conference.

Let us consider the question of precedents. There is only one case which is parallel with my case in the history of the United States. I have cited it many times and will review it here very quickly. It was the Sumner case in 1871.

Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, a Republican, was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. He had his outs with the Republican President, Ulysses S. Grant. I say, most respectfully that his disagreements with Grant were as basic to his thinking as are my disagreements with Dwight Eisenhower.

In 1871 the Republicans kicked Charles Sumner off his committee. He was the only man, Mr. President, in the history of the United States Senate, who had seniority in the Senate at the time, who has been subjected to any discipline in relation to committees by either party or by the Senate as a whole.

Let us look at the other so-called precedents.

The Hale case, in 1847, which is cited as a precedent, is no precedent at all. Hale, of New Hampshire, did not have a day's seniority in the Senate when the issue over his committee assignments arose. He was disciplined as a freshman in the United States Senate. He never sat in the Senate. He had no seniority in the Senate when he was disciplined.

Let us consider the precedents which are on my side of the ledger. WAYNE MORSE does not count, but the principle with which we are dealing counts in the life of the Senate. The history of the Senate of the United States will disclose that all the men who have been dubbed "mavericks"—I care not what they may have been called, whether Free Soilers, Sons of the Wild Jackass, Independents, Progressives—no matter what label was attached to them, the fact is that after they bolted their party in an election they were not removed from their committees. There is no precedent save and except the precedent of 1871 and the precedent of 1953.

What happened to some of those men who exercised an honest independence of judgment as they saw the political light in their day? Some were removed from the chairmanship of committees.

If Senators will refer to the debates of last year they will find that from the first day I stood on the floor and presented my argument on this issue, I agreed that Members of a minority party should not serve as chairmen of committees. They were dropped, in some instances—not all—to the end of the table within their committees.

But, Mr. President, I want the Senate again to refresh its recollection on the meaning of seniority in the Senate. Seniority in the Senate is not limited to the matter of committees. Seniority in the Senate stems from the length of tenure in the Senate. I happen to have 9 years of it.

Mr. President, it is not easy or comfortable for a Senator to plead his own case before the bar of the Senate in a matter such as this. Would that it were not necessary. It would be preferable to plead the cause of someone else who as a representative of his State had been treated unfairly, though I would not wish such an unfortunate circumstance on anyone else. I am making my plea for two main reasons. As a Senator, I have the duty to make it in order to protect the traditions of the Senate of the United States, to promote its best interests, and to safeguard its history, because we are dealing here with a matter of history, not of politics.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I prefer to complete my argument first, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, this matter of historical precedent is of importance to men who are going to serve in this Chamber long after we are dust. When they refer to the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1953 and 1954 they ought to be able to find that in 1954 we corrected an injustice perpetrated in 1953. In 1953 a most unfortunate precedent was established along with the Sumner precedent of 1871. A reading of the history books about the Sumner precedent will not disclose a single American historian who has written a line supporting, justifying, or approving the precedent of 1871. So I find from the research done for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The Sumner incident in 1871 is cited in the history books as an example of the political horsewhipping of a great Senator who refused to bend his knee to what he believed to be political expediency and improper proposals.

I say, good naturedly and most respectfully, that I do not think the Senate of the United States as a whole should be particularly concerned or interested in protecting the jurisdiction of the Republican woodshed, because, regardless of what language is used to alibi, rationalize, or explain away what happened in 1953, it will be found that 9 out of 10 American people will realize when the facts have been made clear to them, that it was a political horsewhipping.

Mr. President, under the Reorganization Act, the Senate has the duty of electing to Senate committees minority Members of the Senate belonging to a third party. That obligation cannot be met by saying, "We submitted a list of Republican caucus committee appointments and a list of Democratic caucus committee appointments." Such mimeographed caucus lists brought to the Senate floor and then sent to the desk with the individual names of Senators signed at the bottom, cannot constitute such a ballot as complies with the spirit and intent of the Reorganization Act of 1947. The procedure followed last January was not in accord with that act. After all, on January 13, 1953, the majority of Senators simply supported the jurisdiction of the Republican Party's political woodshed.

Now a word about what would be accomplished by this particular amendment. I have eight years of seniority in the Senate. I am advised that I have more seniority than the chairmen of some six committees of the Senate. I was elected or appointed or assigned, whatever word one may wish to use, to the Committee on Naval Affairs on September 18, 1945. Previously thereto, I had served on the Post Office Committee.

On January 10, 1945, I was assigned to the Committee on Labor.

There is my seniority record. It is a precious right I am talking about, not from the standpoint of WAYNE MORSE, but from the standpoint of all Senators, of all parties, for all time that this body continues to exist.

Mr. President, would that Senators could forget about the personality of the individual involved. Would that they could look upon this problem simply from the standpoint of the ordinary

rules of the playground. Is it fair play that is being practiced? Is it good sportsmanship that is being followed? Or is it not true that underneath some Senators do not like the political facts of the case?

Let me give you, Mr. President, a precedent that is on all fours, on point after point.

It so happens, Mr. President, that I cannot fill his shoes; I cannot even begin to walk in his footprints; but I can try, and I have been trying, at least, to live up to the high principles of political service that characterized the great George W. Norris. In the midst of his term, and in a presidential campaign, George Norris supported Alfred E. Smith, the Democratic candidate for the presidency in 1928. He thereafter became a member of a third party in the Senate of the United States. He ran as an Independent in Nebraska in 1936, and was reelected.

I say, Mr. President, that, as far as events are concerned, my case cannot be distinguished from that of Norris. It is on all fours with it. In 1928 Norris was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senate of the United States did not even remove him from his chairmanship. I think the Senate had a perfect right to remove him from his chairmanship if it had wanted to exercise that right. But on the basis of his seniority, I take the position that the Senate would have had no right to remove him from the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senate had a right to drop him to the end of the table in the committee, but I am still of the opinion that his tenure in the Senate, his length of service in the Senate, entitled him, as a matter of right, to stay on his committee.

What is done within the committee, procedurally as to committee seniority or other organizational matters such as staff appointments present entirely different questions. Norris' right to stay on the committee was recognized. Read the debates, Mr. President, as to what happened when the question arose as to what was to be done about men such as Ladd, Shipstead, Brookhart, and others after they had supported La Follette as the Progressive presidential candidate in 1924. One was denied a committee chairmanship. All remained on their committees.

On this question the opposition in the Senate has not been able to raise one single precedent that justifies the course of action which was followed in the treatment of me in 1953, save and except the most unfortunate precedent of 1871, during another military administration.

The last argument I make in support of my position, and one that the Senate will hear again, one that I am going to back up and fight for so long as the trust which is now mine is continued to be given to me by the great people of the State of Oregon, is an argument I made last year. There can be no justification for the discrimination against more than a million and a half people in the great State of Oregon, which is what the action of the Senate in this case amounts to. Again, I care not how the question is rationalized. The fact is that the junior Senator from Oregon has been discriminated against procedurally in the Senate of the United States. When the Senate discriminates against me procedurally, it discriminates against the people of my State, and discriminates against their right, against the spirit and the intent of the equal representation clause of the Constitution, under which each State has two Senators sitting here with equal rights. The United States Senate has denied an equality of right to the junior Senator from Oregon.

I am only a medium of representation for the people of Oregon. This is not my seat. The rights that go with this seat and desk are not my rights; they are the rights of the people of the State of Oregon, under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, regardless of the number of times I may be taken to the Republican woodshed by majority vote of the United States Senate, I will come out unscathed, because I will never feel the blows, for the simple reason that political discipline cannot affect me. I will go back to my State, as I have just come from my State, and I will carry on the fight for the exercise of an honest independence of judgment in American politics. I will let the people determine again, in 1956, when I run as an Independent for the United States Senate, whether or not they approve my stand or the stand the Senate of the United States has taken up to this hour on this issue.

The pending amendment simply gives the Senate an opportunity to vote on the question: Do you believe that the Senate should revoke the precedent established last year? If the Senate so believes, say so by the adoption of the amendment. In effect, if this amendment is adopted, the leadership of the Senate on both sides is being told: The Senate, having the right to speak as it has spoken, in accordance with the Reorganization Act, now on the basis of that mandate, an arrangement must be worked out, which the Senate will accept, providing for an assignment, equitable by election of Members of the Senate to the committees of the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], any arrangement may be worked out with respect to membership on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which will make a place for the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

I stated a few minutes ago, when talking about the amendment that I had discussed the matter with the Senator. The Senator's statement about voting with the Republican Party, so that it could carry on the organization of Congress, applied also to committees, I assume, in the event there were 8 Republicans and 7 Democrats on a committee, in addition to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that, although I think it is entirely irrelevant to the principle I am fighting for this afternoon, inasmuch as the Senator has raised the question, there is no doubt as to what my position is. I have stated many, many times that, until after the election of 1954, as an Independent, I consider myself ethically bound to vote to keep the Senate organized by the Republicans, because the people in 1952 elected a Republican Senate. When we consider the total number of votes the people cast in the senatorial races in that year, we find that there were some 26 million votes for Republican candidates as against some 22 million votes for Democratic candidates. There is not any question about what the mandate of the people was. They elected a Republican Senate.

I had not intended to comment on it, because I think it is irrelevant to the principle I am fighting for today, but if the Senator will permit me to refer to it for a moment, since the Senator raised the point before Bob Taft died—and my colleagues in this body know what a tragic loss to the Senate of the United States I believe his death was—there was a rumor that he was so ill that he was considering resigning from the Senate.

Two days before he died I was called off the floor by a reporter. To the reporter who had sent for me and asked me, "What will be your position if Senator Taft is forced to retire?" I said, "I will vote to keep the Senate organized by the Republicans."

The reason I made that announcement was that I had no ethical right to take advantage of a tragedy, which the death of Senator Taft was, in the form of an act of God, by playing cheap politics in the United States Senate, and to use my strategic position, if it is a strategic position, to vote to organize the Senate contrary to the decision of the people of the United States in the 1952 election. After Bob Taft died my statement was made public.

On many occasions when I was asked whether the announcement I had made applied to the organization of the committees, my answer was that it went right down the line, that it applied not only to the organization of the Senate on the floor but to the election of officials of the Senate, and applied also to committee organization and to the staffs of committees on which I might serve.

Mr. President, that has nothing whatever to do with the position I take on the question now before the Senate as a matter of principle. Let me say to any of my colleagues on the floor who do not already know it, although I think they all do know, that, no matter what my position in the Senate may ever be, the Senator from Oregon will never use his position to play politics in the Senate. No Senator can trade a vote with me. No Senator can make a deal with me on any vote. I am sure every Member of the Senate knows that.

Every Member of the Senate also knows, Mr. President, that no matter what course of disciplinary action the majority takes against me, it will not affect my vote on the merits of any issue, because I shall continue to keep faith with the guiding political principle of mine, that I owe it to the people of the State of Oregon to vote on issues in accordance with what I think the facts dic-

tate, so far as the public interest is concerned.

Does that answer the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I wanted to ask the Senator one other question. In one of his speeches last year the Senator quoted extensively from a very fine treatise on the history of the Senate of the United States by Dr. Haynes. Is it not true that in the discussion of precedents in the Senate, which were so well summarized in that book, Dr. Haynes traced those precedents from the beginning of the Senate, and found perhaps hundreds of cases in which a Senator had changed his party affiliation or had refused to vote for the nominee of his party, but in most cases was left in his position on committees? In all cases, with perhaps one exception, was not the Senator allowed to remain on the committees? Have there not been hundreds of precedents of that kind?

Mr. MORSE. I do not think there have been hundreds.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Well, dozens of cases.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. Dr. Haynes does trace that subject. Referring to other writers on the history of the Senate, I would say there would be somewhere between 20 and 30 precedents indicating that Senators rebelled against their parties and became Independents under one label or another, but with the exception of the Sumner case, they were allowed to keep their committee assignments.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Actually what happened in the Sumner case is not exactly a precedent that is adverse in the pending case, is it? I believe that while Senator Sumner was allowed to remain as chairman of his committee for a short time after he had bolted his party, he was not actually thrown off his committee until he assumed some position antagonistic to President Grant. Then the party members not only took the chairmanship away, but actually expelled Senator Sumner from the committee itself.

Mr. MORSE. I think it was a precedent by way of a "delayed bomb."

Mr. KEFAUVER. But it was not done at the beginning of the organization of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. At the beginning of that session there was a great deal of venom toward Senator Sumner. But the Senator from Tennessee is quite correct that for a short period of time he was not removed from his committee. Then he got into the argument with Grant and Republican Senators over the Santo Domingo case.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. It was the Santo Domingo annexation issue that really broke the camel's back.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Actually in the Sumner case, which is the only case that could be used as a precedent against the position of the Senator from Oregon, Senator Sumner was not denied a position on the committee because he had refused to support President Grant when he was a candidate, because when the Senate first met he was allowed to carry on for a short time, until some other matter arose, and that was used as the excuse for expelling him from the committee. Is not that true?

Mr. MORSE. That is factually true. But if the Senator will put himself back into those days, in all fairness he will agree with me that there was a great deal of controversy raging all the time over the Sumner matter. His colleagues were very bitter over what he had done, and, as I have said, they finally used the Santo Domingo incident as a basis for reading him out of the party.

Mr. President, I am sorry to have taken as much time as I have consumed, and I thank the Senate for its courtesy and attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A parliamentary inquiry. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico attempting to amend the resolution offered by the majority and minority leaders, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	McCarran
Anderson	Griswold	McCarthy
Barrett	Hayden	McClellan
Beall	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Burke	Hoey	Mundt
Bush	Holland	Neely
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Payne
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kennedy	Sparkman
Douglas	Kerr	Stennis
Duff	Kilgore	Symington
Dworshak	Knowland	Thye
Eastland	Kuchel	Upton
Ellender	Langer	Watkins
Ferguson	Lehman	Welker
Frear	Lennon	Wiley
Fulbright	Long	Williams
George	Magnuson	Young
Gillette	Martin	
Goldwater	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I regret the situation before the Senate. However, none of us can change the situation confronting us today.

Last year, after this matter had been before the Senate at the beginning of the session, it again came before the Senate in the month of May, in the orderly manner in which it should have, namely, by the submission of a resolution, the consideration of the resolution by the appropriate committee, and the subsequent report of the committee.

At that time I cast my vote in opposition to the adverse recommendation of the committee.

Today I find it necessary to cast my vote in opposition to the pending amendment.

Because the situation would not be very clear to persons who have not followed the matter carefully, I desire at this time to take a moment to explain my view.

Last year the resolution provided for the enlargement of the 2 committees in question by 2 Members, namely, by the addition of a Member representing the majority party and by the addition of my colleague from the State of Oregon. That seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, to have been and to be a sound solution of this problem. Incidentally, I may state that I urged such a thing in the first place, in the first meeting of the Republican conference at the beginning of the last session.

The situation today is different. The amendment now before us would not enlarge the membership of the two committees, except by the addition of the name of my colleague. Although he has in his judgment found it necessary to resign from the party to which I belong and the party which the President of the United States today represents, I do not question either my colleague's sincerity or his judgment. That is a matter which each Member must determine for himself.

However, the situation in which we find ourselves is simply this: We have a two-party system of government in the United States. I am one of those—and I think the vast majority of the people of the United States concur—who believe that a representative government can never continue unless there is a two-party system of government, so that responsible power to act and responsibility for actions can both be had and placed.

That being the case, Mr. President, the situation which we find ourselves is that if this amendment prevails, we shall have added to two committees a Member of the Senate who does not belong to either of those parties, and who, although elected as a Republican, having found by his processes of reasoning and his conscience that he could not continue to be a member of the party which elected him, now stands as an Independent, belonging to neither party.

If we were to increase the membership of these two committees in the manner proposed at this time, Mr. President, we would promote a tie; we would promote the beginning of what, in my judgment, might well lead, in the end, to the type of splinter-party futility which has long plagued the governments of Europe.

I cannot in good conscience vote to create such a condition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand, the vote is upon the Anderson amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Anderson amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Anderson amendment be again stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, the clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add a new section to the resolution, as follows:

SEC. 3. For the remainder of the 83d Congress, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is hereby assigned to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which are hereby enlarged accordingly. These assignments shall be in lieu of his seats on his present committees, whose size shall be adjusted accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—26

Anderson	Humphrey	Long
Case	Hunt	Magnuson
Chavez	Jackson	Monroney
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Fulbright	Kefauver	Pastore
Gillette	Kilgore	Sparkman
Hennings	Langer	Young
Hill	Lehman	

NAYS—59

Aiken	Bennett	Bush
Barrett	Bricker	Butler, Md.
Beall	Burke	Butler, Nebr.
Byrd	Hoey	Payne
Carlson	Holland	Purtell
Clements	Ives	Robertson
Cordon	Jenner	Russell
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Duff	Kerr	Smathers
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Kuchel	Stennis
Ferguson	Lennon	Symington
Frear	Martin	Thye
George	Maybank	Upton
Goldwater	McCarran	Watkins
Gore	McCarthy	Welker
Griswold	McClellan	Wiley
Hayden	Millikin	Williams
Hickenlooper	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—11

Bridges	Green	Murray
Capehart	Hendrickson	Potter
Cooper	Malone	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Mansfield	

So Mr. ANDERSON'S amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the original resolution submitted by myself and the minority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] as amended.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—84

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Griswold	McCarran
Beall	Hayden	McCarthy
Bennett	Hennings	McClellan
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Burke	Hill	Monroney
Bush	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd	Hunt	Payne
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Case	Jackson	Robertson
Chavez	Jenner	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kennedy	Sparkman
Duff	Kerr	Stennis
Dworshak	Kilgore	Symington
Eastland	Knowland	Thye
Ellender	Kuchel	Upton
Ferguson	Langer	Watkins
Frear	Lehman	Welker
Fulbright	Lennon	Wiley
George	Long	Williams
Gillette	Magnuson	Young

NAYS—1

Morse

NOT VOTING—11

Bridges	Green	Murray
Capehart	Hendrickson	Potter
Cooper	Malone	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Mansfield	

So the resolution (S. Res. 180) as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the 83d Congress section (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended—

(1) by striking out "11" in subsection (e) (relating to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service) and inserting in lieu thereof "13"; and

(2) by striking out "11" in subsection (n) (relating to the Committee on Public Works) and inserting in lieu thereof "13."

SEC. 2. During the remainder of the 83d Congress section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as amended, is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "4" and by striking out "14" and inserting in lieu thereof "18," and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(b) In the event that during the remainder of the 83d Congress members of one party in the Senate are replaced by members of the other party, the 21 third-committee assignments shall in such event be distributed in accordance with the following table:

"Senate seats		Third committee assignments	
Majority	Minority	Majority	Minority
48	48	18	3
49	47	16	5
50	46	14	7
51	45	12	9"

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of orders providing for assignments to committees, and request that they be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The Secretary will read the orders.

The orders were read, as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and is assigned to service on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Ordered, That the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and is assigned to service on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Ordered, That the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Ordered, That the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Ordered, That the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and is assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Ordered, That the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration and is assigned to service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Ordered, That the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Ordered, That the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the orders submitted by the Senator from California.

The orders were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order providing for a committee assignment, and request that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the order.

The order was read, as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and assigned to service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and

That the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] be assigned to service on the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the order submitted by the Senator from Texas.

The order was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order for committee assignment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will read the order.

The order was read, as follows:

Ordered, That the majority members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be the following: Mr. JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, chairman; Mr. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas; Mr. JOHN M. BUTLER of Maryland; Mr. CHARLES E. POTTER, of Michigan; Mr. DWIGHT GRISWOLD, of Nebraska; Mr. JAMES H. DUFF, of Pennsylvania; Mr. WILLIAM A. PURTELL, of Connecticut; and Mr. FREDERICK G. PAYNE, of Maine.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In explanation of the order I should like to say that when the committee assignments were made by the majority last year, inadvertently the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] was listed as being senior in service to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER]. Actually, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is senior in service to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD]. The order merely corrects the assignment made last year, and has the approval of the majority conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is entered.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon I released a statement commenting favorably upon the President's agricultural message which he sent to Congress. At this time I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

The President's message detailing his recommendations for the new farm program is a comprehensive and economically sound approach for the long-range stability and prosperity of agriculture. I urge every farmer to read and analyze it thoroughly.

This program has been developed as a result of the most comprehensive survey of farm problems that has been conducted for many, many years. It is based upon a determination to maintain the prosperity of a diversified agriculture production without putting the farmer in a bureaucratic straitjacket. It is a courageous, honest, and completely bipartisan approach to the fundamental peacetime agricultural problems of this country.

Among others, there are three great principles announced in the President's program: One, the determination that agriculture must remain stable, prosperous, and free; another is the proposal for the solution of the growing and almost unmanageable surpluses which confront us; and third, is a recognition of the necessity for enlarged foreign markets and suggestions to accomplish this result.

The President calls attention to the fact that 3½ million small farmers derive little benefit from present programs, and he urges attention to the problem of these farmers as well as to the programs which affect the larger farming units of the country.

I am especially interested in his proposal for the setting aside of surpluses as a reserve under a system whereby this reserve will not cause domestic price disruptions, but on the other hand can be available for use here or abroad if desirable or needed. The question of unmanageable surpluses has always been the threat to and often destructive of adequate prices for farm products, and a proper solution of this problem is essential. The President's proposal merits serious and friendly attention.

The President very wisely recommends that shifts in the program so far as alterations of parity and flexible support prices are concerned must be gradual over a substantial period of time and must be announced well in advance so that farmers can have reliable programs upon which to plan. Above all he emphasizes the necessity for the establishment of a reliable peacetime prosperous economic program for the farmer, with the emphasis on long-range stability and freedom, with flexibility that will meet the changing economic conditions from year to year.

I shall support the general principles of his program because I believe that the rigid and inflexible wartime policies under which we have operated will eventually swamp the farm economy with such prodigious surpluses as to eventually destroy the stability and security of the farm economy in peacetime.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States' share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, we have before us again proposed legislation to provide for participation by this Government in construction of a St. Lawrence seaway. The Congress has repeatedly shown that it cannot see the wisdom of our sharing in the construction of this project, and I sincerely hope that the sound judgment rendered by previous Congresses will prevail in the 83d.

I have studied the hearings of last spring and I can see no new information which makes the construction of this project any more compelling than it has been in the past. What we have before us today is but a shade of the former proposals, but the proponents look upon this as clever strategy. They have lifted out of the overall project one 46-mile stretch and believe that if they gain congressional approval for this limited work at International Rapids they will then have received congressional sanction for the entire multibillion-dollar project. If we approve the bill now before us we can expect each year to be asked to approve appropriations of a few million here and a few million there—all claimed to be necessary because we participated in the construction of the 46-mile canal at the International Rapids.

For the past two or three decades, efforts have been made to have constructed a so-called seaway through the St. Lawrence River. In the present Congress this effort was renewed with the introduction of Senate bill 589, which would provide for the creation of the St. Lawrence Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory. This bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations which, after very brief hearings, limited in scope, has reported a clean bill, S. 2150, to the Senate.

Senate bill 2150 presents a bobtailed version of the St. Lawrence seaway legislation. But there are differences between this and previous legislation which the Congress has considered in the past and did not see fit to approve.

In the past the St. Lawrence project has been put before Congress in several different forms. Back in 1934 it was in the form of a treaty between the United States and Canada, which failed of ratification by the Senate, lacking the two-thirds majority which the Constitution of the United States requires. In 1941 it was submitted in the form of an executive agreement, and was not acted upon. In 1944, a bill approving the agreement, offered in the Senate as an amendment to the Rivers and Harbors bill, was rejected by a vote of 55 to 25. Again, in 1948 and 1952 legislation providing for approval of an executive agreement was recommitted to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The bill S. 2150 reported to the Senate on June 16, 1953, presents the St. Lawrence seaway in an entirely new form, and does not involve the ratification of a treaty nor approval of an executive agreement. In this new form the

question arises whether this legislation should not have been referred to another committee of the Senate for consideration and study. In raising this question, no attempt is made to minimize the work of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the past nor to criticize its action in reporting the bill. However, I believe that in its present form the bill should also have been studied by the Senate Committee on Public Works. The bill as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee sets up a new Government Corporation with authority to issue bonds up to $100 million, principal and interest to be guaranteed by the United States Government, to finance the building of that part of the seaway solely in the United States. It occurs to me that this is a most unusual way of financing waterway improvements, and avoids the necessity of getting an appropriation from Congress, although the total indebtedness of the Government is increased by the amount of bonds which the corporation issues.

The usual procedure in public works for the benefit of navigation, flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors is to first have the project authorized by legislation, either in a general rivers and harbors or flood-control bill or in a separate bill, after which an appropriation of funds must be authorized by Congress for the specific project.

I seriously question whether it is within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee to create a government corporation for the sole purpose of building a waterway within United States territory. I believe that the setting up of a new Government corporation with authority to issue "notes, debentures, bonds or other obligations or commitments": to the extent of $100 million guaranteed by the United States Government should have been also considered by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. And further, I might point out here that under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, among other subjects to be referred to that Committee is the "Issuance of notes and redemption thereof."

During the hearings just a year ago it was estimated that the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project would be some $800 million. The bill reported to the Senate reduces the cost to an estimated $100 million by eliminating the power project and confining the work to United States territory. This piecemeal bite at construction of the seaway, even if approved, is no guarantee that the United States Government will not be called upon in the future to provide additional huge sums in order to complete the seaway, which even the most ardent proponents admit will not be usable 4½ to 5 months out of every year because it will be "iced in."

Once committed to the Government corporation form of financing provided in the bill, future expenditures probably would be authorized through the same device and thus eliminate the necessity of going through the Banking and Currency Committee or the Appropriations Committee, to say nothing of the Public Works Committee which I believe has a duty and responsibility under the law with respect to this project.

Aside from creating a new Government corporation, the bill as reported without the power project is in effect nothing more than a public work for the benefit of navigation within the meaning of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That act in establishing the Senate Committee on Public Works provided that it should "consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects," among others:

1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.
2. Public works for the benefit of navigation, and bridges, and dams (other than international bridges and dams).
3. Water power.
4. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

The House Committee on Public Works—formerly the Rivers and Harbors Committee—has the same jurisdiction as that stated for the Senate Public Works Committee. In fact, identical legislation to S. 2150—House Joint Resolution 104—introduced January 9, 1953, was referred to the House Public Works Committee, not to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee have identical jurisdiction with one exception—the Senate committee's power extends to treaties and the House does not. It is submitted that the approval of a treaty is not involved in the legislation Senate bill 2150 or House Joint Resolution 104.

In my opinion, the construction of part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security as provided in the bill S. 2150 definitely places the proposed legislation within the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee. The project authorized by the bill is not an international bridge, dam, or power plant, but a public work for the benefit of navigation on the St. Lawrence River in United States territory, to be paid for entirely by the United States Government.

Legislation providing for the improvement of every river and harbor and the widening and deepening of connecting channels within the United States, which would be absolutely necessary for the seaway to be of any practical value, must, under existing law, be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Obviously, legislation providing for the building of part of the St. Lawrence seaway in the United States territory and without any participation by Canada in the cost of $100 million falls in the same category as any other river or harbor improvement legislation, and under the law should likewise have been referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. President, there are many reasons for opposing this bill, but one of them is that the approval for participation by this Government should not be given by an act of Congress, but by ratification of a treaty between the United States and Canada.

The St. Lawrence project was originally submitted to the Senate in treaty form. On June 18, 1932, a treaty was signed by the United States and Canada providing for joint construction of the seaway, and on March 14, 1934, this treaty was rejected by the United States Senate. There are others who are much more qualified than I am to discuss this question, but if the proper way to seek Senate approval in 1932 was by treaty, then I ask, What has happened in the last 20 years to make a treaty no longer necessary?

The argument for a treaty in place of an executive agreement was very ably stated in the minority views submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee in 1946. Those views were:

> Above all other questions which may arise in connection with this project, I urge this committee to thoughtfully consider whether this agreement of 1941 and the subsequent and implementing resolution before it may be constitutionally employed as an alternative to a treaty submitted to the Senate for its ratification.
>
> The growing resort in late years of the State Department to agreements, so-called, in the stead of treaties to be ratified by the Senate, in itself demands the consideration of this committee, for it marks a bold assertion of Executive authority and of waning Senate importance in the foreign field. From 1940 to 1944, inclusive, there have been but 38 treaties submitted to the Senate as against 256 agreements, of which we have knowledge, not submitted to the Senate. This tendency warns that we of the Senate must assert our rights in this field, or we shall be guilty of acquiescence in their loss.
>
> History and practice distinguish between treaties and agreements. Our Constitution provides for treaties. It is silent as to agreements save those which our States are permitted to enter into with consent of the Congress. I do not propose to argue this technical question. I do urge this full committee to give it study before we sanction further abandonment of the Senate's constitutional powers. In this connection, I call attention to the long and patient study given this subject by the Commerce Committee of the Senate and its formal conclusion that certain aviation agreements should have been submitted to the Senate as treaties to be considered and ratified as such; that any Executive agreements purporting to grant to a foreign country the right to have airlines dominated by it to operate to or from United States territory without hearings as provided for in the Civil Aeronautics Acts were illegal and void and that this Government is not bound by such agreements so long as they have not been ratified as treaties. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate may well heed this opinion of the Commerce Committee expressed in formal resolution.
>
> I would concede that there are Executive agreements which do not require Senate ratification but authority for which reposes in the Presidential office. Such are agreements made as the diplomatic representative of the United States. As Commander in Chief, the President may enter into armistice and military protocols and arrangements. He may adjust claims against foreign states. Such agreements are generally temporary in time and of relatively minor importance. I do not attempt a more definite statement of what agreements the President may enter into by virtue of his constitutional authorities for manifestly the present agreement is not such an arrangement. It is conceded that at least congressional approval is required.
>
> There is also a class of agreements which the President may enter into under express congressional authorization. This right rests in practice not challenged rather than in express constitutional sanction. In this

class of agreements, the President acts as the agent of the Congress and not as an independent Executive. There are many examples of this type of agreement. International organizations such as postal agreements, U. N., ILO, UNRRA, food and agricultural organizations, Bretton Woods, reciprocal tariffs, are all within this class. As to some of these the Senate waived its functions.

There is, however, no constitutional warrant for an executive agreement subject to later congressional approval. It is sometimes thoughtlessly contended that if the President may enter into agreements with congressional approval first given, the Congress may approve an agreement already made by the President without its sanction. The answer to this argument is, that the latter procedure is an exercise of the treaty-making power and Congress cannot be substituted for the Senate by the mere calling of the original instrument an executive agreement instead of a treaty. The State Department cannot take from the Senate its constitutional rights by calling a treaty something else.

I insist that a project calling for the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, which it will take from 4 to 6 years to complete; which involves long-term obligations by both governments; which gives to each government sovereign rights in the other country, is by every test a treaty and not an agreement and always heretofore, the President and the Senate have held this view. Now we witness the challenge by an executive department of the constitutional right of the Senate of ratification, and in its stead, acceptance of this new theory that the President may enter into agreements of any and every nature with foreign governments and that Congress may by majority vote give its consent thereto and effectuate the same. In what is here proposed is bold evasion of constitutional procedure, and the elimination of the Senate as a part of the treatymaking power under our Constitution. It is an effort to accomplish by indirection what the Senate has twice refused to sanction, first by refusing consent to the proposal in treaty form and later by rejection of an amendment to a river and harbor bill.

Apparently the constitutional question raised by the manner in which congressional approval for this international agreement has been sought is to be avoided by the United States Senate. We may live to regret the precedent which this procedure is establishing, yet it appears that the constitutional question is one which interests neither the executive department nor the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may now suspend my remarks until tomorrow at 12 o'clock, when I may be permitted to continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without obection, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] will be recognized when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not customary at the beginning of a daily session to permit Senators to introduce material for the RECORD and to transact such other business as would be proper in a morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will first observe its customary morning hour tomorrow. When the morning hour has been concluded, the junior Senator from Maryland will be recognized.

RECESS

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 14, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13 (legislative day of January 7), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Frank Brown Berry, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Melvin A. Casberg, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

John Slezak, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT

John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Augustus N. Hand, retired.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Frank Aloysius McKinley, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge, First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Willson C. Moore, retired.

William Z. Fairbanks, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Edward A. Towse, elevated.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Sumner Canary, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio, vice Donald C. Miller, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Jessie Dixon Sayler, of Georgia, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 17, with headquarters at Savannah, Ga., to fill an existing vacancy.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of lights, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, from all the baseness which tempts us in this mortal life and which tends to pull us away from our highest, we would stretch lame hands of prayer to Thee, knowing that every thought of holiness is Thine alone. Since it is of Thy mercy that another day is added to our span of life, we would dedicate anew to Thee, at this national altar of devotion, the unstinted service of all that we have and are. Make our patriotism pure and undefiled. May we know no glory but the good of the Republic and the welfare of all mankind. In the baffling problems of human relationships which face Thy servants in this forum of debate and decision, we beseech Thee, teach them Thy patience and sustain in them the faith and hope that send a shining ray far down the future's broadening way. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 13, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following a quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and the insertion of matters in the RECORD, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 2697. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to make it an unprotected, unconcerted activity within the meaning of this act for a labor organization to call a strike until a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit voting have voted by secret ballot in favor of such strike; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. PURTELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2698. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2699. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the construction of certain public-school facilities on the Klamath Indian Reservation at Chiloquin, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2700. A bill to authorize the modification of the project for Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 2701. A bill to establish The Family Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 2702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that internal

revenue agents may be compelled to testify in certain State courts concerning purchases of wagering tax stamps; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2703. A bill to remove the requirement of automatic periodic reduction of the education and training allowances of veterans pursuing on-the-job training or institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2704. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2705. A bill for the relief of John Kintzig (Janos Kintzig); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2706. A bill to eliminate involuntary membership in a reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States for certain persons inducted, enlisted or appointed in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2707. A bill to authorize John E. Gross to accept the award of the Royal Order of Saint Olav, grade of Commander with Star, tendered by the Government of Norway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 2708. A bill for the relief of Pauls Smits (Paulis Smits);

S. 2709. A bill for the relief of Peter Haberl;

S. 2710. A bill for the relief of Chokichi Iraha; and

S. 2711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jacqueline Broquet Suter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2712. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits with respect to certain veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 2713. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reconvey certain property which the city of Boulder, Colo., donated to the Secretary of Commerce for the establishment of a radio propagation laboratory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution to promote the foreign policy of the United States by fostering international travel and the exchange of persons; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FLANDERS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. I believe this bill incorporates in legislation the recommendations of the President to amend this act, as I so interpret his recommendation.

Strikes affect not only the workers and the management involved, but also the public interest. I believe every reasonable leader of labor and management will agree with me that every proper step should be taken to settle such disputes as may arise without the necessity of resorting to a strike. On the other hand, I wish to see no impediment placed on the right of labor to strike when the workers directly affected by such a strike decide that to protect their interests a strike is necessary; nor do I wish to see enacted any legislation which could in any way be construed as being "union-busting." Organized labor is here to stay. It can play an even greater part in the economic growth of our country.

As you know, Mr. President, the purpose of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 is to provide adequate machinery and rules so that labor-management disputes may be settled fairly and equitably.

I strongly feel that when a strike ballot is necessary, such a ballot should be taken prior to the strike, not subsequent to it. The bill I am introducing so provides. It provides that any strike or work stoppage shall not be a protected concerted activity within the meaning of the act until the following steps have been taken: first, that the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has certified to the National Labor Relations Board that a threatened strike cannot be settled by mediation; second, that adequate notice be given the employee, prior to the voting, of the status of the bargaining at the time of the certification; further, that a secret ballot shall be held under the auspices of the National Labor Relations Board or such other Federal or State agencies as it may deem proper; and that the decision shall be determined by a majority of those voting in the bargaining unit concerned. Mark, Mr. President, that this decision is made by a majority of those voting, and not necessarily by a majority of those eligible to vote.

In this bill the right of labor to use its most effective weapon is not denied it. In simple language, the bill provides that a secret ballot shall be available to the workers in the units involved, to determine whether they wish to strike.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the fact that he is proceeding under the 2-minute rule, and that the 2 minutes available to him have expired.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for an additional minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. PURTELL. The bill provides that the workers shall be informed as to the status of the negotiations when the ballot is cast.

Mr. President, I feel that this bill, if enacted, will resolve the doubt expressed by so many persons as to whether the workers affected by the strike really want to strike. I believe that such a secret ballot will strengthen the hands of those labor leaders who truly represent the will of the workers in the unit involved; and it will permit the affected workers to make the decision—a momentous one, I may say—as to whether they wish to use the weapon left open to them—the right to strike—to obtain what they feel is that to which they are justly entitled.

This bill will provide the means, I believe, whereby the leaders of both management and labor will know beyond any question of doubt the attitude of the workers affected.

I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2697) to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to make it an unprotected, unconcerted activity within the meaning of this act for a labor organization to call a strike until a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit voting have voted by secret ballot in favor of such strike, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN POLICY BY FOSTERING INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND EXCHANGE OF PERSONS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a United States Travel Commission in order to promote international travel and the exchange of visitors into and from the United States. It is the purpose of this bill to encourage and promote travel and the exchange of visitors in cooperation with the domestic travel industry and national, regional, and international agencies already established for that purpose. The proposed commission would be a high level agency but operating within a limited budget to coordinate the activities of the various groups in the travel industry and would be similar to bodies in some 63 other countries.

I may say parenthetically, that I have enjoyed the services of a corresponding agency in New Zealand, which is a government travel bureau there, and I am well aware of the advantages of such an organization.

National and international travel has become a major industry in the United States and it is estimated that for 1953 some 300,000 Americans will have spent approximately $1,200,000,000 for travel outside this country. This is more dollars than earned by any other single United States import except coffee. Effective promotion and stimulation of international travel can I believe add measurably in "trade-not-aid" to the economy of other foreign nations and it is the purpose of this bill to implement this with concrete and constructive legislation in order to assist in the reduction of economic assistance and to replace grants with going business. The potential for the replacement of aid with trade is very great if we can encourage more low fare transportation, call attention to new places overseas for recreation, and learning, and deal with currency and documentary restrictions.

It is the purpose of this proposed legislation to create a commission which can be of assistance and can help our domestic travel industry by stimulating and assisting in the expansion of international travel.

Representative JAVITS, of New York, will today introduce a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

I should like to call attention to the unique character of this particular type of agency, which meets the conditions of the slogan "not aid, but trade," to which, by the way, I do not subscribe completely and with my whole heart for the whole area proposed for it. The proposal in the resolution for trade not aid is unique in that it raises no question of domestic competition. It throws no one out of employment in this country. It does give an opportunity for Americans, in following their own desires, their own hopes, and their own ambitions, to help fill in what has come to be known as the dollar gap, in a way which is satisfactory to everyone concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by fostering international travel and the exchange of persons, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURE BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 187), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) (6) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or the standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1954, and ending on January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committe.

FURTHER EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES FROM WESTERN EUROPEAN NATIONS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 188), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 326, 82d Congress, 2d session, agreed to June 21, 1952, and Senate Resolution 68, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to April 22, 1953, relating to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to conduct a thorough and complete study, survey and investigation of the problems in certain western European nations created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny is hereby increased by $10,000 and such sum, together with any unexpended balances of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution and Senate Resolution 68, agreed to April 22, 1953, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee covering obligations incurred under such resolutions on or before January 31, 1955.

AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with reference to Calendar No. 843, Senate Resolution 185, authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services, I understand that under the rules, inasmuch as the resolution has been on the calendar for 24 hours, a motion is in order to refer the resolution to a committee. Therefore, I should like to move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will inform the Senator from Massachusetts that a motion is not in order. However, a unanimous consent request to do so would be in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be so referred. I may say that the resolution is favored by the minority leader and by the ranking minority member of the committee. So far as I know, there is no objection to its being referred to the committee.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I am constrained to object at this time, until I have had an opportunity to look into the subject a little further. One of the Senators on this side of the aisle, who is not now on the floor, requested that he be notified prior to action on such a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the acting minority leader that yesterday I discussed the subject with the minority leader.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I was sitting here a few moments ago when the majority leader came over to the minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and said to him, "I would appreciate it if you would protect me and yourself by not permitting any unanimous consent request to be agreed to until I return."

Mr. DANIEL. That is my understanding of the situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My request is merely to refer the resolution to a committee. However, if Senators object, I shall not press my request.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure it would be agreeable to everyone, but I heard the majority leader make that request of the minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall not press my request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, on the calendar at page 10 appears Senate Resolution 185, authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services. I submitted it yesterday on the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona, and it is now on the calendar. I have spoken to the Senator from Arizona about it and he has no objection to my request, and the minority leader and the ranking minority member of the committee are in favor of the resolution. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona, with whom I discussed the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—REFERENCE OF RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 182, to investigate problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization, banking policies, and certain other matters within its jurisdiction, and Senate Resolution 183, to study the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio advise the Senate what the resolutions would accomplish?

Mr. BRICKER. They provide funds for the work of the Committee on Banking and Currency during the remainder of the session. They must be reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration by the end of January, because the remaining funds will lapse at that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Are they resolutions which have been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. BRICKER. I am asking that they be referred to that committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. That would be the normal course?

Mr. BRICKER. Under the rule of the Senate they must lie on the desk for 24 hours. Therefore, I am asking that they be referred to the committee so they may be immediately considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I am making the request on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is unable to be present today.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, there is one other resolution, Senate Resolution 173, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce, which was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce yesterday. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CERTAIN OFFENSES—NOTICE OF CHANGE OF DATE OF HEARINGS ON S. 2308

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, on January 11, 1954, I gave notice that a public hearing would be conducted on Friday, January 15, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 2308, a bill to authorize and direct the investigation by the Attorney General of certain offenses, and for other purposes. I wish to bring to the attention of all interested parties that the hearing for the above-mentioned time has been rescheduled for Tuesday, January 26, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee, as originally announced, consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM AND FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 295)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that under the order entered yesterday evening, the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is to have the floor after the morning hour. However, a message from the President is ready to be laid before the Senate. I have spoken to the Senator from Maryland about it, and it is agreeable to him to have that done at this time.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President be laid before the Senate, and that subsequent thereto the order entered yesterday evening be carried out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For President's message, see House proceedings in today's RECORD.)

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2150.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the senior Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, in discussing the pending St. Lawrence seaway legislation——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the regular order of business. I object to any Member of the Senate getting the floor and then passing out time to other Members. Members of the Senate should speak on their own time and not on time granted to them by one of their colleagues.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is called for. The junior Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Maryland yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I object. Either we will have the regular order or we will not have it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is called for. The junior Senator from Maryland can yield only for a question.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Maryland may yield for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Maryland will proceed.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, yesterday I had considered dealing very extensively with the proposal to construct the St. Lawrence seaway, but realizing as I do that the time for logic and persuasiveness has passed, I will conclude my remarks with a general summary of what I believe is a rebuttal of the main contentions of the proponents.

Last night I spoke on the fact that the bill should have originally been referred to the Senate Committee on Public Works, and I think my remarks at that time need not be elaborated upon. I did think of making a motion that the bill be taken from the calendar and referred to the proper committee for further study. However, it is unlikely that any constructive purpose would be served by such a motion, and perhaps the wisest policy is to proceed with the debate and have a vote on final passage as soon as possible.

I am increasingly confident that the majority of the Members of this body will vote to defeat Senate bill 2150.

Mr. President, I also pointed out last night that the proposal should properly be submitted to the Senate in the form of a treaty if this is a truly international project. However, the proponents know that they could not muster the necessary two-thirds vote to ratify a treaty, and therefore hope to obtain congressional approval by getting a mere majority. If for no other reason, S. 2150 should be defeated by an overwhelming vote because the Senate should reject any effort to obtain by legislative act what should be submitted in the form of a treaty.

Mr. President, today I shall conclude by talking briefly on several aspects of the proposal which is now before the Senate.

First, S. 2150 is but a limited part of the total project envisioned by the proponents, and was rightly described during hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee as merely an effort to get the nose of the camel under the tent. The hearings conducted last spring contain ample evidence that the proponents are after the total project which has been before the Congress for more than 20 years. One member of the committee stated that "the aim and the objective of this measure is to take us to the head of the lakes with a 27-foot channel."

In fact, the chairman said:

> I do not want to have it assumed that I have in the slightest degree changed my position as to what I think is the obligation of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Sir, I am a realist. I have lived through this, and I have seen the years come and go. I have now seen the President and his Cabinet say before us all today that they are in favor of this limited project. I am for everything you have said, but I don't think it is the right move at this time if you want to accomplish what we set out to accomplish with Canada. I have to make that very plain, and I am sure that you understand what I am driving at.

Questioned as to whether or not the administration might have supported the total project if the chairman had presented it, instead of "just the bobtailed section of the rapids section," the chairman replied:

> I want to tell you that you are mistaken. * * * I talked with the administration and I talked with the President. He was even against this at the start, as you well know, and he had to be sold the facts. We are not going ahead to accomplish very much if we are going to argue amongst ourselves so that we upset the applecart.

Mr. President, the record of the hearings makes it amply clear that this bill is merely to get a foot inside the door, a hand into the Treasury; it is a political device to get congressional sanction for the total project which will cost millions and millions of dollars. The chairman admitted that it was purely a political move when he replied to a witness by stating, "I think it is still a smart political move."

Therefore, if we are to see through this smart political move, we cannot rely on what is proposed in S. 2150; we cannot rely on the material contained in the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee last spring. We must go back to the original proposal which has been before Congress for years. The information which should interest Congress is the facts on the total project.

I shall not be exhaustive in my review of the total project, which has been studied by Public Works Committees and repeatedly rejected by the Congress. This vast and expensive undertaking is probably well known to every Member of the Senate. The Army engineers, always conservative estimators, in 1950 estimated the cost of the waterway at well above $500 million. In addition, many more millions would be necessary in order to make the harbors of the Great Lakes ports suitable for oceangoing ships. There are more than 100 ports on the Great Lakes which have well-defined areas known as the area of Federal responsibility, and it is obvious that a great number of these would have to be deepened if the benefits of this project, whatever they may be, are to be realized by any substantial segment of the population in the Great Lakes area.

We should keep in mind that Senate approval of S. 2150 is congressional sanction for the original and total waterway. It is argued that the project is necessary in the interest of national defense. In my opinion, it is not necessary to our national defense and it could not be militarily defended if constructed.

The proponents have wrapped this project up in two very acceptable slogans, one being that it is necessary for national defense, and the other, that it would be self-liquidating.

Naturally, everyone is for national defense and it is always easier to spend millions and billions of dollars if we are told the project will become self-liquidating. The national defense argument is based primarily on a contention that our domestic supplies of iron ore are being rapidly exhausted and that a seaway is necessary in order to bring ore from Labrador to steel mills in the United States.

In the first place, Mr. President, the estimates of domestic iron ore were made by a New Deal Secretary of the Interior, and qualified witnesses have appeared before congressional committees pointing out that the iron ore supply in the Lake Superior region is virtually inexhaustible and that reserves are estimated as high as 60 billion tons—sufficient to provide for all foreseeable needs of the future for more than 100 years.

In the second place, the companies which are developing Labrador ore are fully prepared to transport it from Canada to the steel mills in the United States. They have invested millions of dollars in the Labrador ore and they are fully prepared to transport it over existing facilities to steel mills in this country. What they are hoping to get is a Federal subsidy of their operations.

Construction of a seaway would put the Government in the transport business for the benefit of a few steel companies, giving them an advantage over their competitors.

If the Members of this body desire, ample evidence showing that a seaway is not necessary for the movement of Labrador ore, and therefore not necessary to the national defense, can be submitted.

Now to examine the issues.

It would be a mistake to assume that Senate bill 2150, authored by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, is the same measure that has been rejected repeatedly by the Congress. The original seaway bill was designed to allow seagoing vessels to dock at Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee, Duluth, and other ports. That proposal had the energetic support of many sections of business in the Great Lakes area, based on the mistaken belief that it would make possible a vast commerce for oceangoing ships and create vistas of new prosperity. The impracticalities of that proposal have been demonstrated in these legislative halls on many occasions.

Nevertheless it is noteworthy that the bill presently under discussion does not even have those romantic aspects. What is here proposed carries no authority for improvements in the Detroit River or the St. Mary's River or the other improvements necessary to enable oceangoing steamers to proceed beyond Lake Erie. The ports on Lakes Huron, Michigan, and Superior are not touched.

This profound alteration in the legislative scheme is something to arrest our attention and cause us to ponder. There may be several answers to our questions. Perhaps by this time the proponents have come to the long-delayed realization that the original plan was visionary and impractical, or else the new project may have been deep-born in legislative strategy that contemplates the so-called seaway on the installment plan. In other words, under the guise of a bargain, the plan is to get the United States committed. Then let us note, Mr. President, the old adage that all is fair in love, war, and politics. I submit that the American people are entitled to on-the-boards treatment, and this proposition should be considered full square in all its ramifications.

What all this boils down to is that the measure now under consideration proposes a river-deepening project, to be financed by the Nation's taxpayers, designed to enable the shipment of privately owned Labrador ore to five of the smaller Midwest steel companies. This is Candadian ore, held jointly by Canadian interests and the five American Midwest steel companies. I might add parenthetically, Mr. President, that the Canadian Government gets a royalty on every ton of ore produced.

It might be well at this juncture to point out that there is no need for the midwest steel industry to go far afield for a supply of iron ore, and at the taxpayers' expense. There is an adequate supply of iron ore in the Lake Superior district, and also in the vast reserves of taconite, for a long, long time to come. As to the ore produced in Labrador, there is no doubt that it can find a ready, profitable market in the East, an area where it is needed most, and that all of this can be accomplished without financing a sales accessory in the form of a seaway with tax funds from the United States Treasury.

While we are on this point, Mr. President, and in relation to the defense aspect of the project, I should like to assert that should a national emergency in the form of war come upon us, and proceeding on the assumption that the east coast would be cut off by submarine warfare, the Labrador ore to which I have referred would not be moved over the proposed seaway because it would be required for steel mills in the East. The shipment to the eastern steel mills of the United States could best be accomplished by deep-draft vessel to Montreal, where it would be shipped directly south by rail, the shortest and most efficient route and one which would not utilize the proposed waterway.

So from every viewpoint of adequate ore supply, national defense, and practical economics there is simply no good reason why the taxpayers of the United States should be required to finance a luxury ore shipment route for a few steel companies.

Before I leave the ore aspect of the project, Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to the fact that the Labrador ore field will be in operation for a considerable period before the waterway would be completed. This means that ways and means of marketing will have been established without the waterway figuring into the marketing pattern. Expectation of this development is very real for these companies. One of their representatives who testified before the House Public Works Committee, in June 1951 said:

> The further we go without the seaway, the more difficult it becomes to use the seaway without incurring a lot of loss, because in order to use the existing facilities, as I pointed out, we have to build these expensive handling facilities that do not exist today. We get those built and we have got them and the tendency, you know, is that when you have something you use it as long as you possibly can to get what you can out of it.
>
> In addition to that, the type and character of the ship that we build has a lot to do with it, and if we get several oceangoing ships bought that cannot go up the seaway because they will be of a character and size that will not be available to go up the seaway, the tendency will be, of course, to try to use those ships and take the tonnage around the ocean instead of up the seaway.

I have taken the privilege of using this quotation because we are being

asked to build this waterway for the steel companies with the prospect that they will not fully utilize it.

We have noted other statements as to the prospective purchase of vessels, of the oceangoing type, which will not be able to use the seaway, and in this connection I may state that this process is already in operation. It is a matter of public record that one of the concerns of interest, on May 15, 1951, ordered two 30,000-ton ore carriers to be built in England, the 2 carriers to be used for the Labrador ore operation. Another of the group has also ordered 2 similar vessels. It is readily apparent that these vessels cannot use the proposed seaway, and this illustrates a glaring defect in the whole seaway project, the inadequacy of the proposed 27-foot channel. That is another vital factor which I intend to develop fully.

The reason I have brought up the matter of the order-placement of ore carriers is to shed light on the minimum base of traffic projections upon which the Department of Commerce based their alleged self-liquidating financing. To my mind, the estimates of revenue are certainly more imaginative than realistic.

What about the financing plan? This is as good a time as any to give that matter some attention. The bill before the Senate calls upon the Treasury to put up $105 million. So it can be seen at once that the matter of revenue-producing traffic in the form of tolls is of vital concern. It may be assumed that the present traffic on the St. Lawrence would undoubtedly make use of the 14-foot canals on the Canadian side, which, incidentally, are toll free, and are to remain so even if the 27-foot waterway is constructed. I admit, Mr. President, that traffic estimates, tolls, volume, and channel or channels, all become very confusing, and this is not to be wondered at in view of the way the script has been changed.

Although many groups in the Great Lakes area want the seaway extended to Duluth, the bill provides for its extension only to Lake Erie. This is a factor which, as can readily be seen, greatly cuts into the volume of the take from tolls, and hence is a large factor in the alleged self-liquidating financing.

What is equally important for us to realize is that the $100 million debt burden that is proposed to be saddled on the American public for the special benefit of a few companies is only the beginning. If this project shall be launched as proposed, Mr. President, the sun will never set on the recurring requests for more and more millions of dollars to be added to the project. A logical move, if we are aware of the strategy of the seawayers, will be to ask authorization for another hundred million dollars to deepen the connecting channels of the upper Great Lakes, thus bringing that area into conformity with the waterway in the St. Lawrence River. We must remember that the section just referred to has always been considered an integral part of the St. Lawrence Waterway. We may rest assured that its omission in the pending legislation is not an oversight, but rather is considered a well-planned maneuver.

Once construction of the seaway got underway, Mr. President, there would be an endless round of calls for new financing. I can visualize the proponents coming before Congress and saying, "It is an unwise and unsound policy to have proceeded thus far and to have invested millions of dollars of public funds in this feasible project and then to allow it to linger half completed. Double your bets and consolidate and safeguard your investment." That is the way it will go, Mr. President. You know it and I know it, and every other Member of this body knows it. We have heard the same sad song many times and we must admit that it has a tear-jerking appeal.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator agree that the furnishing of the money to deepen and improve the harbors is the type of expense this Nation should be asked to contribute toward such a project? If this type of project were to be built, it is our right to assume that Canada would be expected to build a part of it on the St. Lawrence River; is it not?

Mr. BEALL. That would be the natural assumption. I am glad the Senator has brought up that question, because, naturally, we would assume that Canada would join in building those facilities. Whether or not Canada would, I do not know, and I question it. There has been shown as yet no inclination to do it.

One of the next things we would be called upon to furnish more money for would be to improve the Great Lakes harbors so they would be able to handle the vessels which could use a 27-foot waterway. This would be a natural followup. We have had the testimony that the cost of completing this phase of the ultimate project, that of improving the 17 typical harbors in the Great Lakes area so as to enable them to accommodate vessels utilizing a 27-foot channel, would cost a minimum of $104 million.

Is not this a fascinating business, Mr. President—adding the bits and pieces to this grand design, every bit and piece coming to an approximate cost of $100 million? A somewhat fantastic aspect is lent to this proposal by the fact that when all the elements, the increasing and costly elements, which we have seen run into hundreds of millions of dollars are furnished, the project is still not anywhere in the realm of feasibility and practicability, when it winds up with a 27-foot waterway channel.

No discussion of this question would be complete without the very able and informed testimony of Mr. Gregory S. Prince, general solicitor, American Association of Railroads. I should like to present Mr. Prince's views on this factor of channel depth as he gave them before the House Public Works Committee, of which I was a member at the time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent that I may be able to propose a unanimous-consent request without affecting the right of the Senator from Maryland to the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask what unanimous-consent request the Senator from Louisiana intends to make?

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has a statement he is anxious to make, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada may make his statement without prejudice to the right of the Senator from Maryland to conclude his address.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have never raised any objection to the Senator from Nevada obtaining unanimous consent to make a speech on the floor of the Senate. My objection was to any Member of the Senate getting the floor and then parceling it out, whenever he might desire, to some other Senator. I raise that point in view of the frequently reported determination of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] to filibuster the bill. So far as I am concerned, there will be no filibuster, and certainly not by the parceling out of the time. I have no objection to the Senator from Nevada making his speech. I merely do not want any Member of the Senate to take over control of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator very much. I desire to attend a committee meeting at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

(Mr. MALONE addressed the Senate on the subject of an American contract awarded to an English company. His remarks appear in today's RECORD following the speech of Mr. BEALL.)

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, when the interruption occurred I was referring to the testimony of Mr. Gregory S. Prince, general solicitor of the American Association of Railroads. Mr. Prince further said:

> It is true that most of the emphasis is now being placed on the use of the waterway to bring in ore from Labrador, and for this purpose, using lake vessels, admittedly a 27-foot canal is adequate. But when it is borne in mind that for nearly 30 years this waterway had been advocated on the theory that it would permit oceangoing vessels to ply freely between the ports of the Great Lakes and ports all over the world, it must be clear to you that this original concept will again be reasserted. You will be told of the great economies and benefits to shipping that will be derived from having a canal of adequate depth to permit the new, modern, efficient deep-draft vessels to operate through it. That is the line of argument now being used in connection with efforts to obtain approval for deepening of other waterways, some of which I will make reference to in a moment. I should say that the evidence is clear and convincing that a 27-foot canal is already an obsolete and outmoded waterway for oceangoing vessels. That limited depth makes the "seaway" the name by which this project has been affectionately and almost

reverently designated by proponents through the years one of the greatest misnomers of all times. The works should be known as the Lake Extension Canals.

Mr. Prince then went on to say that back in 1928, a 25-year span, Mr. President, when the St. Lawrence Waterway was first brought forth as a 27-foot waterway, it was suitable for the purpose, but plainly it is now obsolete and outmoded. He then brought out some interesting and pertinent data on canals and their depths. For instance, the Panama Canal has a depth of 40 feet, while the Suez Canal has a 35-foot depth; the Kiel Canal has a 36-foot depth, the Houston ship canal has a 34-foot depth, and the Army engineers have recommended a 36-foot depth so that it can accommodate modern ocean-going vessels. It is equally interesting to note that the Manchester ship canal, which was completed away back in 1894, has a depth of 28 feet, 1 foot more than we are now talking about for a seaway in 1954.

All of us are aware of the reputation of the Brookings Institution and the thoroughgoing way in which it attacks a problem for survey, analysis, and recommendation. It is, therefore, most interesting to recall that back in 1929 the Brookings Institution, after its study of this project at that time, came to the conclusion that a 27-foot project would be completely inadequate. Its findings were as follows:

A channel depth of 33 feet is a minimum requirement if the St. Lawrence Waterway is to serve the purpose for which it is advocated.

In view of this vast array of expert evidence, Mr. President, we must reach the conclusion that the proposal embraced by Senate bill 2150 is already outmoded, that it will not and cannot achieve the objectives claimed for it, that its approval at this time could serve no other purpose than loosen the floodgates for new and larger claims on the National Treasury so that ultimately our country would be confronted with a demand for an adequate channel that by the best and most conservative estimates would cost us at least $2 billion.

That is what we are dealing with here, Mr. President, an opener, so to speak, to get the sponsors in a table stakes game with a $2 billion pot as the prize. And all of this at a time when the need for economy in Government is so pressing. What a farce to present to the American taxpayer who during recent years has manfully faced up to his responsibilities to aid the free world and contest aggression in every quarter of the globe.

Mr. President, my remarks have been intended to show that the proponents of a seaway have not shortened their goal; they are still after their original proposal. What I have said is intended to prove that a seaway is not necessary for the military security of the United States, and that it could not be adequately defended if it were built. My preceding remarks endeavored to show that the project would be an impracticable venture for this Government, and further that it would be a needless burden on the American taxpayer because it could never become self-liquidating. Furthermore, the need of such a seaway as an additional transportation system has been shown, to my mind, to be nonexistent, by the citation of information and testimony demonstrating that the present railroad facilities can meet present needs and can expand to meet future requirements.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. From listening to the debate about the proposal to build the St. Lawrence seaway on the basis of national defense, one of the problems which disturbs me relates to the necessity of having a large number of locks for the passage of ships if the seaway is to be used to its full advantage. The comparison might be used of a chain being as strong as its weakest link. In other words, unless shipping was able to pass through 14 locks, it could not use the seaway.

It would be necessary to pass through about 4 locks to get to the seaway; then it would be necessary to go through the 3 locks which are provided for by the bill, and finally, it would be necessary to traverse the additional 8 locks on the Welland Canal. Everyone of those locks would be subject to sabotage or to attack.

The point has been made that the Soo locks are subject to the same type of attack or sabotage, but the difference is that at the Soo locks there are five parallel canals. If any one of them were knocked out, 4 other canals or 4 other locks would remain for the passage of shipping.

On the other hand, if any 1 of the 14 locks in the St. Lawrence seaway were knocked out, it would not be possible to use the entire project. Is not that correct?

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his observation. Certainly he is correct.

Mr. President, since I represent a coastal State with a magnificent port, I am also vitally concerned with how such a project would effect our existing seaports on the west, east, and gulf coasts. I am particularly concerned with the port of Baltimore.

To my way of thinking, this is not a selfish concern, because the economic conditions of Baltimore City, the State of Maryland, and all our seaports vitally affects the welfare of the Midwest farmer, the rancher, and every industry throughout the United States. In a highly complex economy such as ours, the repercussions of any economic disturbance reverberate across the country like a clap of thunder.

This proposed oceangoing seaway, which in reality would be an iceway in winter, would adversely effect our ports, including the port of Baltimore.

Baltimore is one of the oldest ports in the United States, and for more than 200 years Maryland's economy has been largely dependent upon that port. Every bit of our commercial and industrial activity is closely allied to the port of Baltimore and its shipping. The port has attracted industries and has become the second largest foreign-trade tonnage port in the United States, the port of New York being the largest.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a question?

Mr. BEALL. Certainly.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Would the distinguished Senator from Maryland have objection to my asking unanimous consent to obtain the floor for the purpose of making a few remarks, not to exceed 10 minutes?

Mr. BEALL. I should be glad to accommodate the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] may be permitted to yield to me, for the purpose of enabling me to make a few remarks, with the understanding that the Senator from Maryland will not thereby lose his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

(Mr. SCHOEPPEL addressed the Senate on the use of surplus foods to pay for overseas bases. His remarks appear in today's RECORD following the speech of Mr. BEALL.)

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, as I was saying, the port of Baltimore is the single greatest economic asset in the State of Maryland; and to say that some 40,000 citizens are directly employed in port activities is only to minimize its importance. Forty thousand may be employed, but a community of a million and a half are dependent upon it. Approximately $1 billion of Baltimore's annual income is derived from port activities, and the investment in port facilities is roughly estimated at more than $350 million, with more and more millions being constantly spent in maintenance, improvements, and new facilities. Baltimore's port has served this Nation well, and is expanding in order to continue serving the country and to provide economic security and a higher standard of living for the citizens of Baltimore and Maryland.

A loss of trade would have a direct effect on those directly employed in port activities, such as longshoremen, tugboat crews, ship chandlers, and so forth, but the indirect effect would be felt in every home in Baltimore and Maryland, and by every business, from the corner drugstore to our great railroads.

The Department of Commerce, which has habitually overestimated everything in connection with the seaway, conservatively estimates that Baltimore's loss in cargo to the seaway would be 10 percent. If the Department's estimate for the seaway were proved to be true, its estimate of the effect on Baltimore would prove to be exceedingly low.

The very types of cargo which the Department predicts would be most suitable to the seaway are those which are most important to Baltimore. Indeed, they are the very cargoes which Baltimore is best equipped to handle. They are the bulk cargoes, such as iron ore,

grain, coffee, bulk rubber, chemicals, fertilizers, and sugar. Baltimore's port handles more than 8 million tons of metallic ores, as much as 100 million bushels of grain, and is the leading fertilizer port on the Atlantic coast.

Moreover, much of the cargo moving through Baltimore is destined to or originates at points in western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. The loss of this cargo would have a serious effect on Baltimore.

As was pointed out earlier, a seaway would be usable only a maximum of 7 months of each year, and during the remainder of the year the present ports and transportation facilities would have to do for 5 months the same job they now do during the entire year. Therefore, the facilities in Baltimore would have to be maintained at peak efficiency, in order to take care of traffic when the seaway would be closed. Piers, cranes, wharves, and the labor crews would have to be maintained at a high level in order to carry on the commerce of the Nation during the winter when the seaway would be iced in or fogged in. Is that economy? Is that making full use of our economic resources?

Mr. President, in that event Baltimore's economy would be strictly a winter economy. That is not a pleasant prospect for a people and a city which have built their way of life on the economic prosperity of a seaport.

Our port has been built on the free enterprise system; it was not built by Government subsidy, as this seaway would be. Private enterprise and capital have made the port of Baltimore a success. Individual initiative can continue to expand our port and bring economic security and a higher standard of living to the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland. But our private citizens cannot compete with Government subsidized facilities operating in direct competition. We cannot afford to pay Federal taxes for support of uneconomical projects which rapidly drive us out of business.

Ninety percent of the commerce moving through the port of Baltimore passes over railroad piers. So our great railroads—the Baltimore and Ohio, the Western Maryland, and the Pennsylvania—would be severely affected. These privately owned and operated transportation facilities would be equally affected by Government competition.

What I have to say about Baltimore is, I am sure, true of every other port on the east coast from Boston to New Orleans.

We Marylanders who oppose this project do not do so merely because of narrow provincialism. When the seaway is examined from every aspect of national interest it remains what it was from its conception—a colossal boondoggle not serving our national security; a useless ditch which could not be used by the American merchant marine; a hazardous passage for those who might try to navigate it; a continued drain on the Treasury of the United States.

The proponents have based their argument on one contention—that it is necessary as an additional transportation facility in the interest of national defense. That argument dissolves in the light of fact. The proponents have sought to make the project more appealing by promoting it as self-liquidating; known facts demonstrate that it would instead be a financial liability.

Previous Congresses have shown good judgment by rejecting this proposal, let us in this 83d Congress decisively reject it again and bring an end to this debate.

Mr. President, I think the pending bill will be defeated and at that time I express the hope stated by my good friend Tom Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers, before the House Committee on Public Works in 1951.

He said:

> I express the hope that the committee will decide against this resolution and tell the proponents of the seaway project that they have had their day in court and should now conduct themselves in conformity with the true principles of good sportsmanship, of good government, and that they should gracefully retire, and go 'way back and sit down.

Mr. President, at a later time I intend to elaborate on Mr. Kennedy's remarks before the Public Works Committee of the House in 1951.

I have spoken on a number of issues involved in the seaway proposal. Unfortunately, there are many still remaining.

With regard to the importance of our national defense, we must consider that there would be joint participation by two sovereign nations.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President——

Mr. BEALL. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a statement to the Senate for approximately 15 minutes.

Mr. BEALL. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for that purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, first, I am frank to admit that few issues during my service in the House of Representatives or the Senate have troubled me as much as the pending bill authorizing participation by the United States in the construction and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway. As you may know, on 6 different occasions over a period of 20 years, no Massachusetts Senator or Representative has ever voted in favor of the seaway, and such opposition on the part of many of our citizens and officials continues to this day. I shall discuss the bases of that opposition subsequently, but in initiating a comprehensive study on this issue I limited myself primarily to two questions which have not previously been before those Massachusetts Senators and Representatives opposing the seaway—two questions which are, indeed, facing all Members of the Congress on this issue: Is the St. Lawrence seaway going to be built, regardless of the action taken in the United States Senate on this bill? If so, is it in the national interest that the United States participate in the construction, operation, and administration of the seaway?

A careful and, I believe, thorough and objective study of this issue has fully satisfied me that both of these questions must be answered in the affirmative.

Second. The evidence appears to be conclusive that Canada will build the seaway. Although they frequently overlook this fact, seaway opponents now appear to take this for granted. I have studied the act passed by the Canadian Parliament authorizing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway by Canada, which was dependent only upon the United States participation in the power project. As you all know, such participation is now assured through the license granted by the Federal Power Commission to the New York State Power Authority, subject only to rejection of a final attempt at litigation which is practically assured in the court of appeals. Construction has been delayed only pending this final step. The Canadian law entitled "An act to establish the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority"—volume 15–16, George VI, chapter 24, 1950—and the official statements of the Canadian Government, make it clear that Canada will build the seaway alone and cooperate on the power project with New York, although the door is left open for American participation if we should so decide at this session of Congress. Indeed, the Toronto Telegram stated in an editorial of January 9 following the state of the Union message that "President Eisenhower's call to Congress to get cracking on the seaway arouses only a mild and skeptical interest in this country, because Canadians have made up their minds that the best thing for them to do is to build the seaway themselves." We can no longer doubt that the seaway will be built, regardless of how we vote today.

Third. We are then confronted only with the second question, Is it in the national interest of the United States that we participate in the construction, operation, and administration of the seaway as authorized by the Wiley bill? That question has been answered in the affirmative by every President, Secretary of Army and Defense, Secretary of Commerce, National Security Council, National Security Resources Board, and other administration officials for the past 30 years, including President Eisenhower and other representatives of his administration. The President stated in that part of his message on national defense:

> Both nations now need the St. Lawrence seaway for security as well as for economic reasons. I urge the Congress promptly to approve our participation in its construction.

Mr. President, our ownership and control of a vital strategic international waterway along our own border would be lost without passage of this bill. If Canada builds the seaway alone, it may not only be a more expensive proposition, due to the difference in topography, requiring higher tolls over a longer period of time, but the seaway will still be paid for to a great extent by the American interests whose use thereof will be many times greater than the Canadians. Thus the economy of the

United States will have paid for the greater part of the seaway at a higher cost, but the United States Government will have no voice in the decisions regarding tolls, traffic, admission of foreign ships, defense and security measures, and priorities. Inasmuch as the United States is going to benefit both economically and militarily from the construction of the seaway, and inasmuch as the Wiley bill provides that the seaway will be self-liquidating, and require comparatively small appropriations over a 5-year period, I believe that our participation is in the national interest, and, therefore, should not be defeated for sectional reasons.

Fourth. I refer to sectional reasons because I have been urged to vote against the seaway on two other grounds, neither of which is related to the unchangeable fact that Canada will otherwise build it alone and that our participation is important. These two points of opposition, entirely sectional in nature, are, first, the seaway will work an economic hardship upon Massachusetts; and second, the seaway will be of no direct economic benefit to Massachusetts.

I would like to discuss each of these questions briefly, inasmuch as they not only explain the basis of much of the traditional opposition to this measure in my State and other States, but also, I believe, because they involve the very nature and responsibility of the United States Senate and our Federal Union.

Fifth. Will the seaway work an economic hardship on Massachusetts? Of course, inasmuch as the seaway is to be built anyway, regardless of American participation, such arguments are of necessity only academic; for the issue here is not whether the seaway should be built but whether the United States should participate in that project. However, inasmuch as I have devoted considerable time and effort in the Senate to an analysis and alleviation of some of the economic problems now troubling New England, I am especially concerned with these many predictions of injury to my State and region resulting from the seaway.

Sixth. The port of Boston: The primary attention in this discussion of the seaway's effect upon our economy has centered upon the port of Boston; and I have therefore analyzed carefully figures on port traffic, largely furnished to me by the Boston Port Authority. In the first place, at least 75 percent of the port traffic is coastwise, intraport and local, which no one has claimed will be affected by the seaway. Of the remaining foreign traffic, an examination of imports reveals that practically all of it is coal, fuel oil, petroleum, food products, beverages, and other items for consumption within the New England area. Other raw materials used by New England manufacturers, such as wool and rubber, make up a large part of the remainder of this import traffic. It is obvious that none of this traffic will be diverted by the seaway.

Seventh. With respect to goods shipped by rail out of the New England area, I have had the opportunity to see a comprehensive analysis of New England's chief rail exports, and only a small portion of these were foreign-made imports arriving through the port of Boston; and even a smaller portion of these few items went to the area which the St. Lawrence seaway would serve. Consequently, only an extremely small percentage of foreign import trade will be lost to the port of Boston at most. Even if as much as 22 percent of these imports were lost, as has been alleged by some but which the figures do not support, even if all of this were lost, the total loss in tonnage would be less than 5 percent of the annual traffic handled by the port.

Eighth. With respect to exports, which total less than 2 percent of port traffic, opponents of the seaway have suggested only that the export grain trade might be affected once the seaway is in operation. The analysis of New England rail traffic bears this out. It cannot be denied that some or all of the port's export grain trade may be affected by the seaway. However, in 1952, in terms of tonnage handled, this trade amounted to only nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total traffic in the port of Boston; and due to the mechanical nature of the operation, involved only a small number of employees. Thus, although grain as a bottom cargo has some significance beyond its own tonnage, nevertheless, even if the entire export grain trade was lost to the port, the overall effect upon its traffic, and the economy of Boston and New England, would be almost negligible.

Ninth. In short, even if the port of Boston were to lose all of its export grain, and as much as 22 percent of all foreign import trade as the result of the seaway, a figure which exceeds the claims of its strongest opponents and cannot be supported by the traffic analysis, even under such circumstances the overall decline in terms of total traffic at the port would be less than 6 percent; and since 1945 the variations in the port's traffic from year to year have been practically always greater than 6 percent.

Tenth. There has been some speculation that if the seaway is not built by Canada and the iron ore begins to move out of Labrador, the Boston port would receive this traffic. However, the rail haul from Boston to the steel-producing areas in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois is considerably greater than that from the competing ports in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York; and, although the latter may be affected by a current Interstate Commerce Commission case, it is even clearer that the newer steel developments in Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania will be served by ports considerably closer than Boston. I think it is not only speculative but overly optimistic to hope that Boston would get any substantial share of this trade if the seaway were not built. Of course, as I have already indicated, the seaway is going to be built, and will then provide for the transportation of iron ore over a water haul equal to the haul from Labrador to Boston, and a rail haul of approximately 20 percent the distance from Boston to Youngstown. No Atlantic port would carry such ore then; and it is therefore extremely doubtful whether either the port of Boston or the New England railroads would wish to make considerable expenditures in adapting their facilities to handle this iron ore traffic when it will most certainly be carried by the seaway within a period of several years.

Eleventh. In short, I do not feel that the effect of the seaway upon the port of Boston will be of any lasting significance; and there are some who believe that in the long run traffic at the port will be stimulated. What is more important to the port of Boston, as pointed out by the President's Committee on the New England Economy, is the fact that a 1948 sampling of New England firms showed that 81 percent of their exports were shipped out of New York instead of Boston. If those in New England who have decried the loss to the port of Boston resulting from the seaway would only divert their own export traffic to the port, the gain would be many times as great as any loss suffered by construction of the seaway.

Twelfth. New England railroads: For these same reasons, I have been unable to find any serious injury to the New England railroads resulting from the construction of the seaway. The analysis of New England's rail traffic, which I mentioned before, indicates that New England's chief rail exports were largely consumption goods or highly manufactured industrial products and equipment which have a high unit value in which the cost of transportation is a relatively small portion. It is doubtful that these goods would be shipped over 1,500 miles to the Gaspe Peninsula to go over the seaway instead of the quicker and more direct route via rail. Moreover, only a small portion of these goods go to the area to be served by the seaway; and whenever any goods are so diverted, of course, it will be a further gain for the port of Boston.

Thirteenth. With respect to goods shipped by rail into New England, by far the largest single item is coal from West Virginia, Kentucky, and other coal-producing States; and this, like most of the other items which are shipped into the region by rail, will continue to come by this more direct route. Again, any seaway diversion of goods for consumption in Massachusetts and New England will be a gain for the port of Boston. The only major exception is grain, and I have already discussed the fact that export grain may be lost to the New England railroads and ports, but this represents only one-third of 1 percent of the entire rail traffic handled by the New England railroads. The other 90 percent of the grain shipped into New England would not be affected by the seaway, inasmuch as present routes utilizing the Erie Canal and railroads are considerably shorter and more economical than even the seaway will provide. On the contrary, the increased industrial activities in the Middle West may well build markets for New England manufacturers, and traffic for the New England railroads and ports. But permit me to repeat the one unchangeable fact which makes discussion of possible gain or loss to Massachusetts irrelevant to the pending measure, namely, that the seaway is going to be built, its economic consequences are going to be felt,

whether beneficial or not, regardless of the vote in the United States Senate.

Fourteenth. However, this discussion of the possibilities of economic gain to the port and railroads leads to the other sectional question, namely, How will the St. Lawrence seaway help Massachusetts? There have been a great many claims advanced along the lines that it would be of help to my State; but I have studied them with care and must say in all frankness that I think they are wholly speculative at best. I know of no direct economic benefit to the economy of Massachusetts or any segment thereof from the seaway, and I have been urged to oppose the seaway on these grounds, inasmuch as the initial investment, even though repaid, will come in part from Massachusetts tax revenues.

Fifteenth. But I am unable to accept such a narrow view of my functions as United States Senator; and in speaking on the Senate floor on behalf of the New England economy I stressed my opposition to the idea that New England's interest is best served by opposing Federal programs which contribute to the well-being of the country, particularly when those programs increase the purchasing power of New England's customers. Where Federal action is necessary and appropriate, it is my firm belief that New England must fight for those national policies.

Sixteenth. Moreover, I have sought the support of Senators from all sections of the country in my efforts on behalf of New England, pointing out to them not only the concern which they should have for an important region in our country, but also the fact that an increase in economic activity in New England would benefit the Nation as a whole. For these reasons, I cannot oppose the seaway because the direct economic benefits will go largely to the Great Lakes and middle-western areas. I could not conscientiously take such a position, and at the same time expect support from Senators in the Middle West or any other part of the country for those programs and projects of aid to New England.

Seventeenth. The seaway is going to be built; the only question is the part we shall play in opening our fourth coastline. To those in my State and elsewhere who oppose our participation in the construction of this project for national security merely because the economic benefits go elsewhere, I would say that it has been this arbitrary refusal of many New Englanders to recognize the legitimate needs and aspirations of other sections which has contributed to the neglect of, and even opposition to, the needs of our own region by the representatives of other areas. We cannot continue so narrow and destructive a position. As was so well stated by a famous Massachusetts Senator over 100 years ago, our aim should not be "States dissevered, discordant (or), belligerent"; but "one country, one constitution, one destiny."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a memorandum on documents demonstrating Canadian construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON DOCUMENTS DEMONSTRATING CANADIAN CONSTRUCTION OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

1. Editorial, Toronto Telegram, January 9, 1954:

"President Eisenhower's call to Congress to get cracking on the (St. Lawrence) seaway arouses only a mild and skeptical interest in this country, because Canadians have made up their minds that the best thing for them to do is to build the seaway themselves."

2. Statement by Canadian Cabinet and Prime Minister, January 9, 1953:

"President Truman's observation in his budget message to Congress that there is still an opportunity for the United States to join in building the St. Lawrence seaway has been noted by the Canadian Government. Various other proposals by Members of the Congress for United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway have also come to the attention of the Canadian Government.

"While the Canadian Government is, of course, prepared to discuss, in appropriate circumstances, joint participation in the seaway, the demand for power in the area to be served by the International Rapids power development is so urgent that the Canadian Government is most reluctant to engage in any discussion which might delay the progress of the plan now underway for the development of power in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River at the earliest possible moment.

"Once an entity is designated and authorized to proceed with construction of the United States share of the power works, if the United States wishes to put forward a specific proposal differing from that put forward by the Canadian Government for the construction of the seaway in the international section which proposal would not delay the development of power under arrangements agreed upon in the exchange of notes of June 30, 1952, and approved on October 29, 1952, by the International Joint Commission the Canadian Government will be prepared to discuss such a proposal.

"The Canadian Government would naturally expect the discussion to be such as not to cause any serious delay in the completion of the whole seaway."

3. Statement by the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, Canadian Minister of Transportation, April 30, 1953:

"It is said that this would not be a profitable venture and that therefore it would be unwise for the United States to waste funds on the project. But we are not asking for any funds from you. Canada is not seeking financial aid on the St. Lawrence seaway. On the contrary, Canada is ready, willing, and anxious to proceed with the seaway at her own expense without cost to the American taxpayer. Canada has passed legislation both provincially and federally and could start the project tomorrow."

4. Text of a note sent by the Canadian Ambassador to the Secretary of State, January 11, 1952:

"The Canadian Parliament has recently passed legislation providing on the one hand, for a power development on the St. Lawrence River, to be undertaken by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and an appropriate agency in the United States, and on the other hand, for the establishment of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority to construct the seaway either in cooperation with the United States, as provided for in the 1941 agreement, or as a solely Canadian undertaking. This legislation may now be brought into force at any time by proclamation.

"The Canadian Government is prepared to proceed with the construction of the seaway as soon as appropriate arrangements can be made for the construction of the power phases of the St. Lawrence project as well."

5. O'Hearn, Canada Prepares To Go It Alone, the Reporter, March 18, 1952:

"The St. Lawrence seaway project, calling for both an oceangoing channel from the Atlantic Ocean to the Great Lakes and a hydroelectric-power program, will wait upon the will of the American Congress no longer. The Canadians, whose Parliament voted last December to undertake the project alone if need be, may have been making a forcing bid, but it was not a bluff. They are committed to go ahead."

6. U. S. News & World Report, March 14, 1952:

"Canada is not bluffing in her announced intention to go it alone in completing the St. Lawrence seaway if the United States refuses to cooperate."

7. Fifth session, 21st Parliament, 15-16 George VI, 1951:

"The House of Commons of Canada: Bill 33, 'An act to establish the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, as passed by the House of Commons, December 12, 1951."

8. Fifth session, 21st Parliament, 15-16 George VI, 1951: "The House of Commons of Canada: Bill 34, 'An act respecting construction of works for the generation of electrical power in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River,' as passed by the House of Commons, December 12, 1951."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a question? I did not understand that the Senator from Maryland had the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland may yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to this particular request—I think the general order of procedure is that the Senator who has the floor should proceed with his speech and then yield the floor, after which some other Senator may have the floor, rather than to have a farming out of time on the floor.

I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Louisiana, but I shall have to object to any further farming out of the floor to Senators.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator from California will remember that on yesterday I cooperated with him in getting the bill before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana that the Senator from Massachusetts be given 5 more minutes? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as one who has been strongly in favor of the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and of the participation of the United States in its development, I desire to to

take this opportunity to congratulate very wholeheartedly the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts on his fine and very thoughtful speech. I am happy that he has joined the ranks of those of us who have felt that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, through the participation of the United States, would be of substantial benefit to the economy and the social life of the entire Nation, the East, the Middle West, the West, and the South.

I was very glad indeed to hear the Senator from Massachusetts say that we had passed the stage where we could consider these matters in a provincial or parochial manner and that, as Senators and as Representatives of the people of the United States, we were bound by the responsibility imposed upon us to consider these matters from a nationwide standpoint.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I am convinced that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway will be not only in the interest of the Nation as a whole, but will be in the interest of the State of Massachusetts as, I am convinced, it will be in the broad interest of my own State of New York.

So again I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] has the floor.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

FOREIGN TRADE AT THE EXPENSE OF AMERICAN WORKINGMEN—PROTEST BY GENERAL ELECTRIC CO. OVER AWARDS OF CONTRACT TO AN ENGLISH ELECTRIC COMPANY ON THE McNARY DAM

During the delivery of Mr. BEALL'S speech,

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on January 5 the Associated Press carried a dispatch from Schenectady, N. Y., reporting that the General Electric Co. has protested the award of a $3,651,476 contract to a British company for two giant electric-power generators to be installed at McNary Dam on the Columbia River. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this protest be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the protest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.,
December 24, 1953.

THE DISTRICT ENGINEER,
Corps of Engineers, United States Army,
Walla Walla, Wash.

DEAR SIR: Under invitation Civeng-45-164-54-17 for generators 13 and 14 for McNary Dam, we submitted a telegram November 5, 1953, pointing out that the General Electric Co. was the lowest qualified bidder and should be awarded the contract for these generators. Notwithstanding, award to the English Electric Co. has just been announced. In a telegram December 18, 1953, we protested this award as we do not believe the award is in the best interest of the United States. Our reasons for protest are given in this letter.

TAX AND REVENUE LOSSES

The bid of the English Electric Co. for these generators is $3,651,476 as compared with the bid of the General Electric Co., which is $4,292,701, a differential of $641,225.

In announcing this award it was mentioned that consideration was given to the fact that the English Electric Co. will pay an import duty of approximately $422,000.

Attention should also be given the fact that the total taxes which would be paid by American business and American wage earners as a result of manufacture of these generators in the United States would exceed $1,159,000, as shown in the following estimate, which we believe to be conservative:

Federal, State, and local taxes paid by General Electric in 1952 per dollar of sales: 13.7 percent, or $588,100.

Federal income taxes. The labor content is 37 percent of the sales dollar on which employees paid 13 percent in 1952: 4.8 percent, or $206,050.

Taxes paid by suppliers. The material content is 42.3 percent of the sales dollar on which suppliers and their employees paid approximately 18.5 percent: 7.8 percent, or $334,800.

Taxes paid by shareowners. Approximately 22.2 percent of dividend. Payment which was 3.3 percent of total sales in 1952: 0.7 percent, or $30,050.

Total of these per dollar of sales: 27 percent, or $1,159,000.

This estimate is conservative in that State and local taxes, excise taxes, sales taxes, social-security taxes, etc., paid by employees are not included above.

If these generators are furnished by the English Electric Co., in our opinion the ultimate cost to the people of the United States will be greater than if the equipment is furnished by the General Electric Co., as the amount lost in taxes exceeds the bid price differential and the amount of import duty by $96,000.

TWO-MILLION-DOLLAR WAGE LOSS TO WORKERS

In addition there is, of course, the loss in income of the American workers who would otherwise manufacture these generators. The total labor spent in producing these generators will exceed 1 million man-hours which is equivalent to 500 men working 8 hours a day for a year. The average wage paid in production of this equipment in the United States is more than $2 per hour, which represents a loss in wages of $2 million. Any resulting unemployment will increase expenditures for unemployment benefits.

The ability of the English Electric Co. to bid lower than any American manufacturer is obviously due to the difference in wages paid in the United Kingdom and in the United States. The wages paid in the United Kingdom are less than one-third the wages paid in the United States. The advantage of the English company due to the wage differential is therefore approximately $1,300,000. With this disadvantage, it is evident that American manufacturers are unable to furnish such equipment at prices which equal those which foreign manufacturers are able to quote.

In physical size, the McNary generators are the largest rotating electrical machines ever built. The generator and hydraulic turbine, making a generating unit, are supported by a thrust bearing on which the load is 4 million pounds. The best assurance that such large equipment can be built, installed, and operated on schedule only can come from past experience with similar equipments.

The General Electric Co. has demonstrated its ability to do this by placing the first generator at McNary in operation ahead of schedule. The second generator is ready for operation.

BRITISH INEXPERIENCE MAY COST TIME

On the other hand, the largest generator built so far by the English Electric Co. is less than one-third the physical size of the generators at McNary Dam. To the best of our knowledge, the largest thrust bearing furnished by the English Electric Co. supports a load which is less than 1 million pounds.

The thrust bearing is the most critical part of one of these units. From experience we know that data obtained from operation of bearings with a 1-million-pound load, which we built as long ago as 1922, cannot be extended to design and manufacture of a thrust bearing for a 4-million-pound load with any assurance that the larger bearing will operate successfully. Can there be any assurance that the English Electric Co. with such limited experience can produce and put these generators in operation at McNary Dam in the time required?

Operation of these generators as scheduled is essential to the security of the United States. The President has recognized that power projects, including McNary Dam, are essential to national defense by making all contracts for equipment for these projects subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1951. The enormous amounts of power required for production of weapons, particularly atomic weapons, must be available and must be operated continuously. It is questionable that foreign manufacturers can deliver equipment on schedule under present conditions.

WHO COULD REPLACE PARTS IN WARTIME?

In the event of war, is it likely that foreign manufacturers would either be able to produce and deliver new equipment, or would be able to provide spare parts or the service necessary to maintain equipment in operation in event of damage incurred during war or other emergencies?

From the information presented, we submit that the award to the English Electric Co. is not in the best interest of the United States. In summary, if the generators are purchased from the English Electric Co. the ultimate cost to the American people will be greater, American wage earners will be penalized, and national security will be endangered by lack of assurance that this material essential to national defense will be delivered as needed or maintained in continuous operating condition, if delivered.

In view of the above facts and to serve the best interest of the United States, we request that the award be reconsidered and be given to the General Electric Co., the low domestic bidder.

Very truly yours,

JAMES M. CRAWFORD,
Vice President and General Manager, Motor and Generator Division.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada considers this protest significant and the issues it presents important to the national welfare and security.

The protest emphasizes four vital questions which go to the heart of our foreign-trade policy. They are:

Should the United States Government sacrifice revenues and taxes at the expense of the American taxpayer to further the trade and profits interest of a private foreign company?

Should the United States sacrifice $2 million in wages to American workers and 1 million man-hours of American skilled labor to further the activities of

a competitive foreign company in a foreign country with wage scales less than one-third American wages for the same or comparable work?

Should the United States sacrifice 30 years of American experience and mechanization in constructing huge generators suitable for our giant hydroelectric developments to the inexperience of a foreign company which has built no such large generators in its history?

Should the United States assume the risk—and it is a very real risk—of installing critical elements in important components of the national defense that would not be readily repairable or replaceable, if replaceable at all, in time of war?

QUESTIONS VITAL

Mr. President, these are all pertinent questions. They are pertinent not only to the award of this contract to a foreign firm to furnish generators for a dam 6,000 miles distant from its operations; they are pertinent and vital to the innumerable awards for critical materials and supplies being made to foreign enterprises all around the world in competition with our own labor forces and our own industries.

The award of a United States Government generator contract to the English Electric Co. is but one example of a trade policy which has persisted ever since the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, and which sacrifices American wealth and security to foreign profits and competition.

In its protest to the Government the General Electric Co. offers a conservative estimate showing that the Federal, State, and local governments of our Nation will suffer losses in revenues and taxes by reason of the award to a British company, losses exceeding both the differential in price and import duties.

In other words, the award is going to add to the burden of American taxpayers.

In addition to the loss in revenues to the Federal Government, States, and cities, 1 million man hours of labor will be lost to American workers and in excess of $2,000,000 in wages.

BRITISH-UNITED STATES WAGE DIFFERENTIAL

Recent research shows that the average wage of American workers in the electrical machinery and equipment industry approximates $2.08 an hour. That of British workers in the industry is equivalent in American dollars to slightly under 54 cents an hour.

Mr. President, were the English Electric Co. permitted to establish a plant in the United States and import British labor at 54 cents an hour to man it, there would be a terrific outcry from labor in this country, and properly so.

Yet the same results, adverse to American labor, are accomplished when we ship $2-an-hour jobs across the seas and give them to 54-cents-an-hour British workers, which is precisely what the award of this contract to the English Electric Co. does, and at a loss to American taxpayers who will have to pay for the British product with no return in wages.

In this connection it may be significant that within the past few days the General Electric Co. has been impelled to lay off indefinitely 1,000 electrical workers in New York State alone.

Mr. President, this type of business may account for some of the depressed areas which are bothering the administration, and for the benefit of which the administration suggests that new tax moneys be taken from United States citizens, and be used to foster in those areas new war industries, which are acknowledged to be uneconomic, to begin with. So we cause the depressed areas by our own action, and then we attempt to cure the situation by spending our own money there.

Unfortunate as it may seem, we simply cannot give jobs to Britain and have the same jobs here at home. It is time some of our international world planners began to understand this obvious fact.

The General Electric Co. further points out that there is no warranty that the product itself, if produced in England, will be produced within the time American industry would produce it, or would have the same quality.

This will be a very large generator, the largest rotating electrical machine ever built, and is to be supported by a thrust bearing on which the load will be 4 million pounds. The General Electric Co. has demonstrated for 32 years that it can build huge generators. It has put three decades of American effort and know-how into this specialized field.

Mr. President, I wish it understood at this point that my purpose in rising today to explain the predicament brought about by our policy is not motivated by any interest on my part in a particular company. I recall that about 4 years ago I debated on television with Phil Reed, the chairman of the board of General Electric, about the policy already then established for 15 years for a free-trade arrangement with foreign nations, through trade agreements under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. At the beginning Mr. Reed favored such an arrangement. Toward the last of our debate he wavered just a little. Now we find his company objecting to the application of the same policy to it.

Mr. President, we need to establish a principle which will apply to all workers and investors in the United States—a policy and principle of establishing a basis of fair and reasonable competition—laid down by the Congress of the United States in the manner set down by the Constitution of the United States.

The English Electric Co. to which our Government has awarded this $3,651,476 contract has not had the experience that the General Electric Co. has had. The English Co. has never built a generator one-third the physical size of the McNary generators; and the largest thrust bearing it has produced supports a load of less than one-fourth 4 million pounds.

Of course it may be argued that the present contract award will give the English Electric Co. experience and know-how in building giant generators. This would be sort of an application of the point 4 principle to British industry.

The junior Senator from Nevada sees no responsibility on the part of American taxpayers, American workmen, or American industry—and certainly none on the part of the United States Government—to give the English Co. the benefit of American experience, at the expense of American workers and taxpayers, so that it will be able to compete effectively against them in the future, as it is competing effectively against them now through the somewhat gratuitous contract which has been awarded.

RISKS TO NATIONAL SECURITY

The fourth point raised by the General Electric Co. of America is close to my heart. Asks the American company:

> In the event of war, is it likely that foreign manufacturers would either be able to produce and deliver new equipment or would be able to provide spare parts or the service necessary to maintain equipment in operation in event of damage incurred during war or other emergencies?

The answer, of course, is that it would not.

Voluminous testimony has been presented to the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuel, the economic subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that in the event of war enemy submarines and enemy air power could and would block our sealanes and prevent marterials, equipment, and critical supplies from being shipped to us from overseas, and would continue to block such shipments or destroy them until we ultimately achieved full mastery of the air over the entire world.

Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, Gen. Bonner Fellers, and other military experts have testified before our committee to that effect.

Even if these giant generators could be transported from Britain to our shores in time of war—which they could not be—in a time of war they would not even be built. Anyone with common sense knows that to be so. Assuming that Great Britain was our ally—and I hope she always will be—her manpower in time of war would be occupied in her own defense, and would be too limited in any event to build generators or replacements for McNary Dam.

If Great Britain were neutral she would not build them for fear of offending the enemy, just as today she fears offending the Chinese Communists or Communist Russia and, in fact, defers to them and trades with them.

Mr. President, from an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post, I note that we are about to sell butter by the millions of pounds to Russia, either for gold or for some other material not named. There probably is a sufficient supply of butter for that purpose, if not in the United States, at least in friendly nations in the Western Hemisphere. While we are preparing to whip Russia in case they start anything it could be that we do not want to whip a hungry army. So we shall start selling the Russians foodstuffs for the purpose perhaps of getting their army in good shape and satisfying their people in case they are now dissatisfied because they cannot obtain enough to eat.

If Great Britain were unfriendly, after acquiring the experience and know-how in building giant generators by virtue of American contracts in what

position would we be? We will not speculate about that. We might speculate, however, that if the Russian Army started to move, it would control Europe in a very short time. Mr. President, testimony that I am not at this time at liberty to disclose, proves that point. It demonstrates that we would not long be in that area in case of an all-out world war with Russia.

Whatever role Great Britain would have would be dictated by self-interest and logistics; and any repairs or replacements would have to come from American producers, lacking in designs, manpower, and time.

In view of these circumstances, I am today submitting a number of questions to the Secretary of the Army and to the Office of the Chief of Engineers. As a matter of fact, I submitted the questions yesterday. They are as follows:

First. In awarding a contract to the English Electric Co. for two generators to be installed at McNary Dam, what weight and consideration were given to loss in revenues and taxes to the Federal Government, States, and municipalities?

Second. What weight and consideration were given to losses in man-hours and wages to American workers?

Third. What weight was given to past performance and experience of the competitive bidders?

Fourth. What consideration was given to the factors of repair and replaceability in time of war or other emergency?

Fifth. In view of President Eisenhower's announced policy of encouraging Federal-State-local cooperation, what State or municipal officials were consulted in connection with the award of this contract?

SUSPEND OR CANCEL BRITISH CONTRACT

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada will accompany these questions with a request that the contract awarded to the English Electric Co. be suspended, pending a full and satisfactory reply to the questions; and that if the reply should disclose that no weight or consideration was given to these factors, the contract be rescinded and canceled.

Furthermore, if the reply indicates that losses in revenues, losses in man-hours and wages, and losses in security elements, such as replacement and repair availability, are not being considered in contract awards to competitive foreign industry, the junior Senator from Nevada will feel it his responsibility to introduce proposed legislation setting up such criteria and making the criteria known to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

It will be remembered that last April there was a similar concession to British industry, when the Army awarded a contract to an English electric company in the sum of $1,761,317 for 10 transformers. American industry was denied the contract, under which American investors, workers, taxpayers, and the Government itself would have benefited.

American industry lost the contract because of a misguided foreign trade policy that has persisted for the past 20 years and apparently persists today—a policy of dividing our markets, our taxpayers' money, and our work with the nations of the world at the expense of American taxpayers, investors, and working men and women.

This has been our foreign trade policy ever since the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was enacted, under which the Congress divested itself of its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign commerce and to lay duties and imposts—today called tariffs—on foreign goods competing against American products, and turned that responsibility over to the executive branch, which in this instance means the State Department.

HIGHER TAXES FOR UNITED STATES INDUSTRY—LOWER TAXES FOR COMPETITORS

Since that date we have had two major departments of our Government working at cross purposes, and both to the disadvantage of the American taxpayer.

The State Department has worked diligently to reduce or remove entirely tariffs on foreign goods competing in the American market.

The Treasury Department has been required to progressively increase taxes on American industries, producers, and individuals who are being competed against by tax-favored foreign interests in the American market.

A tariff—the Constitution calls it an impost or duty—is nothing more or less than a tax on imports to make up the difference between American and foreign wages and a fair share of the taxes that foreign industry does not pay here. The same section of the Constitution that applies to imposts and duties applies equally to taxes.

The State Department has successfully lowered taxes on foreign competitors 71 percent since the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was approved by Franklin D. Roosevelt, reducing the national revenues which formerly accrued from tariff taxes or duties.

The Treasury Department, denied these revenues from foreign sources, has progressively recommended and Congress has approved higher taxes and still higher taxes on American workers and enterprise to make up the difference.

In other words, low tariffs on foreign competitors for the American market mean high taxes on American producers since foreign producers pay no part of the taxes here supporting our American market. It is therefore compounding an injury to American taxpayers to award a major contract to a competitive foreign industry paying one-fourth the wages and no American taxes. As the National Industrial Conference Board put it in a recent report:

> Foreign competitors selling into the United States or third markets have sharply lower tax costs than American competitors selling into their own or foreign markets.

Perhaps it was this tax advantage enjoyed by foreign electrical manufacturers that enabled them last year to submit lower bids than American companies on 80 percent of the contracts for heavy electrical equipment in Asia and South America.

That, of course, is no more important than the General Electric Co. losing a major contract to a British company to construct heavy electrical equipment, including generators, for installation at McNary Dam here in the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield at this point?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator a question. It has been urged that in order to enable other nations to trade with us they must be able to sell on the American market in order to obtain the dollars with which to pay us for items which we export to them. Has the Senator taken that problem into account in his thinking on this subject?

Mr. MALONE. Yes, I have; I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. The Constitution of the United States also takes that question into account. It says in so many words, in article I, section 8, that the legislative branch of the Government shall regulate foreign trade and shall adjust the duties, imposts, and excises, which we call tariffs and import fees. There are three branches of the Government. At least there were 20 years ago. They were established under the Constitution, and they were independent of each other. The 3 branches of the Government so set up constituted a system of checks and balances, so that if 1 department should go "haywire" there would be at least 2 checks; and if 2 went the way of all flesh, there would be at least 1 check left. It is provided in article I, section 8 of the Constitution, that the legislative branch, so constituted, shall have power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises—we now call them tariffs and import fees—and that it shall regulate foreign trade.

In 1934 we transferred bodily that constitutional responsibility to the Executive, and, as the system has operated, it has been administered by the Secretary of State, who immediately injected a political factor, which meant that he could consider the overall national good and remake the industrial map of the United States in his own image. No representative in Congress from any area of the United States has one iota to say on this subject, and such remade industrial map is not subject to check or approval by the Congress. Therefore, if the Secretary wishes to do so, he can trade the electrical industry to England or other foreign nations. He has done just that, and we have no recourse whatever. He is authorized to do whatever in his judgment is good for the welfare of the American people. If he wishes he may trade the mineral industry, the watch industry, the crockery industry for some fancied advantage—and all this has been done. The watch industry is no longer on the industrial map of the United States. The crockery industry is closing down. The mineral industry has been closed down for some time, except for Government taxpayers' money in the business. No one in his right mind would put money into a mine, or, in fact, in any other industry which needs protection from the sweatshop labor of the other nations of the world through a tariff or duty, unless the Government were a partner, unless he could borrow money from some agency of the Government.

So all these things have been considered, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. If Congress does not extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the responsibility will revert to the Tariff Commission, an agency of Congress, under section 336 of the 1930 Tariff Act, which provides, in effect, that the Tariff Commission shall determine the cost of producing an article—whether it be a generator or any other article—in this Nation, and the cost of producing a like article in the chief competing foreign nation, and recommend the difference in cost of production as a tariff.

The Tariff Commission represents the Congress of the United States in this field, it is an agent of Congress, just as the Interstate Commerce Commission represents the Congress of the United States in connection with railroad rates. In the Interstate Commerce Act we prescribed certain rules for the guidance of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Commission was ordered to establish railroad rates on the basis of a reasonable return on the investment. In effect we gave the Tariff Commission orders that flexible tariffs or duties should be adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana and his colleague from that State represent the entire State of Louisiana. Louisiana is represented in the House of Representatives by several Members of Congress. So every precinct of Louisiana is represented in the Congress; and no such precinct is represented by the State Department. One can logically reach only one conclusion, and that is that, all things considered, an agency of the Congress must determine the duties or tariffs for the protection of American labor and the American investor are to be on an economic basis.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the problem which concerns the junior Senator from Louisiana is how other countries will be able to trade with us at all unless we arrange to purchase certain articles from them, in order that they may obtain dollars with which to pay us for the articles they acquire from our country. Other countries want what we can produce, but they are not able to pay for them.

I find it is getting to be too much of an imposition on the American taxpayer to expect him to give away his money to balance trade. I wondered how the Senator from Nevada would propose to make it possible for the other nations to earn their way so they could pay for the articles they want to buy from us.

The Senator from Nevada objects to certain foreign commodities being sold in the United States in instances where foreign producers are apparently underbidding American producers of similar commodities. Of course, I realize a foreign producer could not do so unless his country had a lower labor standard.

However, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Nevada how other countries are to be able to buy articles from us unless they are able to pay for what they purchase in our country and if we do not make it possible for them to trade with us.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana that all of us have the same difficulty with respect to paying grocery bills and housing arrangements. We do not ask the groceryman to give us money to buy groceries. What we do is to live up to our own earning power. We have a standard of living based on that earning power. Of course, not every country's living standard is the same and not every individual's living standard is the same.

We have consistently given dollars to foreign nations under the misguided conception that we are making friends. I have stood on the floor of the Senate for nearly 8 years—sometimes it seems impossible that it has been that long—and discussed the question which the junior Senator from Louisiana has brought up, namely, the question of our giving foreign countries cash in order to permit them to buy goods from us.

Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, that at various times the junior Senator from Nevada has offered amendments to various bills, as in the case of the wheat-to-India bill, to sell to foreign nations surplus products and to take in exchange that nation's own money at the current market price in dollars for their money. I did not prevail in writing into the bill a provision that the exchange shall be at the current rate of exchange of the currency on the world market. As it is, the exchange is nearly always fixed at a fictitious price.

I have in mind, particularly, the sterling bloc currency. At various times it has had 28 different values, manipulated for trade advantage. I am speaking of the pound sterling. I would propose that we take the pound, for example, at the current rate of exchange on the world market, for anything we sell to a foreign country or have the foreign country give us credit for the amount involved. It would not be necessary to transfer the money to the United States. Then, when they sold something to us, they could debit our account at the then current world-exchange price for the article we bought.

The difficulty in the past has been that there has been a little catch in all of it, whereby we put up fresh money, for which there is no return. Therefore, we might as well give them the goods, except for one reason, and that is that the American people would understand the process. So, we fool the American people by first giving the foreign countries the money, and, of course, they do not even spend all of that money in our country.

I will further say to the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana that the forebears of a great many people in America left Europe and Asia, especially Europe, a hundred or two hundred years ago because it was just impossible for them to make a living in Europe. The countries have not changed much.

What is not appreciated in the situation—and I see no accounts of it anywhere—is that in Asia and Europe the chief problem is overpopulation. There are too many people, and it is hard, simply impossible for them to make a living. The situation is different in the United States.

Of course, there are people who want to divide our wealth, or our markets, which are the source of our wealth. When that is done it can be seen that there is no future except to live as the other people in the world live, on an average living standard. We cannot maintain our standard of living and permit all manner of foreign foods to come into the United States.

So I will say to the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, with 2½ billion people living in the world, and only 160 million of them living in our country, the average living standard is close to the low standard of living in foreign countries, and not at all like our standard of living.

For the past years we have appropriated money from the Treasury of the United States to help the people of foreign nations, and we are now $275 billion in debt. If we keep it up it means another round of increased wages and more inflation. There is no end to it except by our finally reaching the standard of living of those foreign countries.

Therefore, I believe the junior Senator from Louisiana will ultimately decide, if he studies the subject carefully, that the only way a nation can make progress is by treating its working people better and increase the markets within its own boundaries—they will buy to the limit of their earning power in other nations the goods which they cannot produce themselves. We must protect our own workingmen and investors to maintain our economic structure.

Mr. LONG. I was curious to know how the Senator from Nevada would propose to expand our trade so far as giving other nations an opportunity to sell us certain goods, because it seems to me that, although we want to equalize the difference in trading between this Nation and other nations, in view of the high degree of mechanization it would be impossible for foreign nations to undersell us on the American market on any product that is produced in our country, and certainly there would be very few articles foreign nations could sell us.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, that was the historical situation. The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana has been a Member of the Senate for several years, and I know he is a close observer. Therefore he knows that our machinery and technical know-how is available any place in the world. We do not have the advantage now, since our foreign interests take our machines and know-how goes with them. For example, I was in Japan in 1948. In Japan labor is paid from 12 to 15 cents an hour. Any Japanese can do as much work as any man in America. They can duplicate any kind of machinery or products; all they have to do is look at it. There is nothing they cannot do that we can do. Everything is available to them.

I will not remind the Senator, because he knows it, that we have been paying

for much of the machinery installed in foreign countries. However, those countries retain their low wages. The colonial nations particularly have established a vested right in low wages, because if wages go up, the profit on the article when it is sold on the market is reduced.

Some of our own producers now want to go to foreign countries and locate there. When they go there under present conditions, they too develop a vested interest in low-cost labor.

That prevents the very thing we say we want to do, namely, to raise the living standards of other nations. I know what the distinguished Senator has in mind. The lower they can keep costs by means of our machinery and know-how and the low wages, the more profit they can make on what they sell to us. A great deal of money of our investors is headed that way. They then develop the same vested interest in sweatshop labor.

However, if we had a duty, as is suggested by the Constitution of the United States, and if it were on a basis of fair and reasonable competition through a flexible duty, so that it would go down as the living standards of the chief competitive nations went up, it would take the profit out of sweatshop labor. After a few payments of that differential had been made into the United States Treasury by a foreign nation through a duty it would find that it could just as well raise the wages and create a market at home.

Mr. LONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada takes the position, indeed, he has always taken the position, that unless foreign industry is compelled to pay its fair share in support of its American markets, 1 of 3 alternatives is inevitable. These alternatives are:

First. Still higher taxes will have to be imposed on American industry and labor.

Second. The public debt will have to constantly be increased.

Third. America will be forced to meet the foreign wages and our living standards will be reduced to the lowest foreign levels.

The junior Senator from Nevada rejects each and all of these alternatives.

He advocates the only sound course for American economy and safety, namely, a return to a fair-trade policy that will require a foreign industry to pay an equitable share of the costs for the privilege of enjoying the American market.

The flexible duties or tariffs would be based upon fair and reasonable competition.

If that is done then taxes can be lowered, the public debt reduced, and proper living standards and maximum employment maintained.

It is as simple as that.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I have heard the Senator from Nevada discuss his proposal for a flexible tariff several times, and I know he has given a world of thought to the subject. I am curious to know what imports the Senator would anticipate coming into this country under his proposal.

Mr. MALONE. Any material which is needed will always be imported into the country. A tariff or a duty on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, providing for the difference between the wage standard of living here and abroad would not prevent imports. It would simply take the profit out of the low-cost labor. There is no tariff, of course, on many materials, such as tin and nickel, approximately 50 percent of our imports have no duty. In the case of other materials, when a duty is necessary to equalize the labor cost, the Tariff Commission operating as an agent of Congress can adjust such duties on a basis of fair and reasonable competition.

In my opinion it is a violation of the Constitution of the United States to transfer the responsibility to regulate foreign commerce and the adjustment of duties to the Executive. If that can be done, we could on the other hand take away the powers of the Executive by passing a bill appointing a committee to exercise his responsibilities, pass it over the veto of the President, and he would have nothing left to do. If that were done we would, of course, be violating the Constitution of the United States.

But we give the President the right to rearrange the industrial map of the United States, and he can say that a certain industry is not necessary here; it is better that it be located in a foreign country so that we may obtain their goodwill and raise their living standards, or let some foreign country make money instead of an American company. According to his judgment alone a trade agreement is made which is not subject to check by Congress.

I may say, further, to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that such action does not make a market for any American product. We still have a foreign trade which is approximately 4½ or 5 percent of our domestic trade, if we deduct the money going for national defense and for the Marshall plan, mutual security, and all the other strange plans we have supported for many years. The foreign nations do not keep the spirit of the trade agreements—they manipulate their currency for trade advantage and use quotas, specifications and utilize every subterfuge to defeat the agreements.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. LONG. Yes. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, one of the finest presentations on this point—and I invite the attention of the junior Senator from Louisiana to it—came from the Honorable Robert F. Kennon, Governor of Louisiana, when he testified recently before our subcommittee on the subject of imports of petroleum upsetting the economic structure of Louisiana. Pointing out that imports of foreign oil are hurting his State and cutting domestic production there 10 percent, Governor Kennon said:

> When production comes from the ground in Louisiana it does pay a reasonable tax, it does contribute substantially to the carrying on of governmental functions, particularly education, in Louisiana.
>
> Of course, if oil is imported in quantities and supplies the refineries in our State and ultimately the filling stations in our State, we lose the benefit of that tax. It definitely hurts the operation of the State government.
>
> I am sure that the business community, the workmen and the suppliers of the State are equally hurt by the fact that this oil comes in already produced and packaged, rather than first being sought after, then found, then persuaded out of the ground with modern machinery and modern methods involving the employment of a great many men.
>
> So I feel that it would be only equitable that imported oil or imported metals or imported goods of any sort that are coming to this good industrial atmosphere to supply the American market should pay their share of the costs, both the industrial costs and the private costs, and particularly the Government costs that make this fine market area available.
>
> America is almost a sanctuary, or has been up to now, on account of our fine system of Government and of free enterprise. It has been a place where industry has flourished and where the average man and the average workman has become almost a king, in that he commands the best of services and the best of materials and equipment and appliances and machinery and entertainment.
>
> It is a good place to live and an excellent market and a fine place for anybody with something to sell to make a great deal of money. So when someone comes in and wants to sell in this sanctuary, in this protected area, in this garden that has been built at a great deal of cost and which is being maintained at a great deal of cost, at the door he should probably be charged a concession fee, you might say, to come in and do business in this area.
>
> Let him pay his share of the cost of creating this place to do business in.

Governor Kennon further stated in his testimony:

> Suppose that all the refrigerators, automobiles, wheelbarrows, ladies' clothing, and what-not that were going to be used in America for a year were bought in Europe and delivered to each household.
>
> The American factories and industries would be cut off, and next year you could not sell that foreign-produced goods here, nor American either, because there just wouldn't be anybody to pay for it.

In other words, Mr. President, they would destroy the very market they are trying to get for nothing, with low wages and no taxes. The American factories and industries would be shut down and the American workingmen's income be cut down or eliminated.

At this same hearing the award of a contract to the English Electric Co. to construct two giant generators for McNary Dam was discussed, and Governor Kennon said:

> I somehow have the feeling, without knowing anything about it, that the import duty or tax should be on the basis of what it has cost us, their fair share of what it has cost us to provide them with that portion of the market they are going to use.
>
> For instance, the roads we build that let the customer come in and buy the stuff. The schoolhouse for the kids we have educated to make the money to buy the stuff. It seems

to me that we should charge them in accordance with what it has cost us to give them their share of the privilege of doing business here.

STRANGERS SHOULD PAY FAIR SHARE

It is time, as Governor Kennon said, and as I have been saying for 7 years on the Senate floor, that the stranger coming in our gates with goods to sell make a reasonable contribution, pay his fair share of the cost Americans have paid to make this country the most attractive place in the world in which to do business.

This payment could be the flexible duty or tariff making up the difference in wages and taxes here and abroad.

It is time, too, to consider and weigh the tax losses, wage losses, industry losses, and security risks involved when contracts are awarded for critical items connected with our national defense. It is an obligation of the Congress to see that weight is given to such items before turning over jobs and taxes and contracts to foreign private industry 6,000 miles distant from where the specialized product important to both our military and economic security is destined to be installed.

USE OF SURPLUS FOODS TO PAY FOR OVERSEAS BASES

During the delivery of Mr. BEALL'S speech,

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a ray of hope that was expressed in an important article in last night's Washington Evening Star. A front-page story set forth that the administration is preparing to use farm surpluses to pay for overseas air bases. This adds to the already abundant evidence that farm surpluses can be sold for foreign currencies, which in turn can be used for constructive purposes. It happens to be an article by L. Edgar Prina. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USE OF SURPLUS FOODS TO PAY FOR OVERSEAS BASES STUDIED—COMMODITIES WOULD BE SOLD BY CONTRACTORS FOR LOCAL CURRENCY

(By L. Edgar Prina)

The Eisenhower administration is considering a plan to use part of America's huge $4.5 billion farm commodity surplus to help pay for the maintenance of United States forces overseas and to construct military bases abroad.

The proposal, advanced by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, is under policy study by the Defense and State Departments. It could be carried out in two ways:

1. In the matter of new bases, the American contractor would purchase commodities like wheat, cotton, and soybean oil from the Commodity Credit Corporation. He would sell these products to a foreign government for local currency. With the funds received, the American firm then would pay its foreign subcontractors who, under the policy of using local labor and materials to the maximum extent possible, would be handling most of the actual work.

2. Use can be made of section 550 of the Mutual Security Act, which permits the Foreign Operations Administration to sell surplus commodities, purchased from CCC, to a friendly nation for local currency. This money would be placed in a special fund abroad for use of the United States armed services, which would reimburse FOA.

SEVERAL BENEFITS SEEN

The proposal promises several attractive results. It would help solve the surplus food problem by siphoning off some of the farm products now bulging out of warehouses in various parts of the country. It would bring a measure of relief to the American taxpayer by permitting him in effect to pay for many operations abroad with surplus food rather than dollars. And the foreign nation involved would be able to buy needed food without spending precious dollars.

Obvious possibilities for the plan, both sides being willing, would be where most of the American forces are located abroad: West Germany, Japan, Korea, and Italy.

Also, the United States is about to undertake a $150-million air and naval base construction program in Spain. Wheat and cotton could help cut down expenses there.

Agriculture Department officials say they first put forth the plan about 6 months ago, but that it was received with something less than enthusiasm.

REVISED LAST MONTH

Then, last month, Secretary Benson, harassed by mountains of surplus foods, outlined the proposal in a letter to President Eisenhower. The letter was forwarded by the White House to Defense Secretary Wilson, along with a memorandum asking that consideration be given it. Reports are now circulating that the Pentagon has warmed up considerably to the idea.

The office of Assistant Secretary of Defense Frank Nash said that, while the plan is being studied carefully, no foreign government has as yet been sounded out. The plan depends, of course, on the willingness of foreign governments to cooperate.

West German economic officials in Washington have heard about the plan unofficially and are interested in it. One told the Star: "We need the food anyway, and this offers us the chance to get it without using dollars."

Meanwhile, it is understood that several West German subcontractors may be called in to provide engineers and technicians to help in the Spanish base program—provided the Franco government agrees. The construction project calls for expansion and improvement of air bases at Barcelona, Seville, and Madrid, and naval bases at Cadiz and Cartagena.

The United States Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks, which is responsible for the entire construction job, named the prime contractor—a combination of three firms—yesterday.

The companies are: Raymond Concrete Pile Co., New York City; Walsh Construction Co., Davenport, Iowa, and Brown & Root, Inc., Houston, Tex.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, exchanging surpluses for bases is sound. The men who initiated this program should be congratulated. We should have more of it, providing we exercise great caution. If we force our customers to buy farm products they do not want, we risk not only the loss of our customers but of our allies in the fight to preserve freedom, both of whom are the same.

Furthermore, if we pay for an airbase with $20 million worth of surplus food, which would otherwise be sold and paid for in dollars, there is no gain in exports; there is only a displacement of usual trade. Nevertheless, every department and every agent of Government should be constantly alert to every possibility to use the public investment in surpluses for constructive purposes wherever appropriate. If this is done intelligently and vigorously, surpluses need not be given away, nor hidden in a stockpile, nor allowed to spoil. They can be sold for currencies that are useful to the United States.

The farm surplus problem is the Achilles heel of our prosperity. I know what surpluses mean to farmers. They mean lower farm income, either by way of lower prices or reduced acreage, or both. Farm surpluses have always signaled reduced farm income. The multi-billion-dollar CCC surplus which overhangs the market is a symptom of serious agricultural illness.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I am curious to know whether the Government at this time has the authority, or whether it is necessary to pass implementing legislation to give the Government authority, to use surplus food commodities in order to pay for air bases and defense installations overseas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that I am not sure to what overall extent present legislation might be adequate. I do know that there was a provision in one of the measures passed at the last session of the Congress permitting the use of, I think, $200 million worth of surplus products.

I may also say to the Senator from Louisiana that the senior Senator from Kansas, together with other Senators, introduced a measure with the idea of getting the Foreign Relations Committee to accept an amendment which would have permitted the use of $1 billion worth of farm surpluses which we could sell overseas to be paid for by the currencies of foreign countries, which currencies we could use in a multitude of ways. In the wisdom of those on that committee, charged with the responsibility it was thought that such a provision would not be germane by way of an amendment, but should be introduced as a separate measure.

The Senator from Kansas introduced a separate measure. It was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am sure that the Senator from Louisiana, in following these matters, because his State is a most important agricultural State and has great capacity to produce agricultural commodities, will recall that that measure passed the Senate. The measure authorized $500 million worth of our agricultural surpluses to be used in foreign trade by the various governmental departments. The difficulty has been that the foreign nations did not have the American dollars with which to buy the products. This measure bridged that gap.

I intend to have placed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the opening statement which the Senator from Kansas made at the time when the measure to which reference has been made was introduced. It was passed by the Senate, and now rests in the House of Representatives, which will consider it if and when it gets to it. However, I think legislation is needed which will go as far as possible to take care of the situation

about which the Senator from Louisiana may have some misgivings. We want to get rid of our agricultural surpluses, since the taxpayers' dollars are tied up in them, in a manner which will enable the American people to receive value for the surplus products, and at the same time relieve our domestic economy of a serious burden.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield further?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that the Senator from Kansas has made a very fine suggestion, provided there are sufficient safeguards to assure the people of the United States that there will be a careful accounting, and that an opportunity will be given to Members of Congress, and all others who may desire to inquire into the matter, to know precisely what is being done with the surplus products. The only thing some of us fear is that perhaps some of the commodities might be disposed of loosely. Some of us would want adequate information in order to protect the public interest, and see to it that our people received for the commodities their money's worth.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The remarks of the Senator from Louisiana are appropriate; such an opportunity should be afforded. The activity should be further safeguarded to the extent that full and adequate information and reports should be made. I believe a proviso was placed in the measure passed which required reports to the Congress from the proper departments of Government who are handling these matters, which I think is an excellent provision.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Kansas again yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, there is an advantage in the sale of these surplus commodities, the receipt of which pay for overseas bases, instead of paying for them in dollars. In many instances people overseas tend to hoard American dollars and to get the very best currency they can. There is an old axiom in banking and currency that bad money drives good money out of circulation. When a person has good money he has a tendency to peddle off the money that is not good, which loses its value, and hoard over a long period the money which he knows will be more valuable, and the use of the surpluses in the manner suggested would prevent hoarding of money paid for defense overseas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I appreciate the contribution made by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. To what extent are the food surpluses used by the Armed Forces?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. In the amendment that was placed in the Mutual Defense Act, as I recall, surpluses could be utilized to the extent of $200 million.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator state, if he knows, the reason for that limitation?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I would have much preferred to have the amount made larger, more in line with what the Senator from Kansas had advocated in the measure he introduced. But it was thought that the sum of $200 million would provide a basis for a trial on the part of, let us say, the Mutual Defense Agency, in connection with the State Department and the Department of Defense, to see to what extent the surpluses could be utilized.

Quite frankly, Mr. President, I have not requested detailed information on this matter from those departments, but I expect to do so.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think it would be very interesting to see what the figures show.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, surpluses, like burst appendixes, have to be removed. We have to get surpluses out of the market, if we are to restore its health.

Surpluses sold to the CCC have not been marketed; they have only been swept under the rug, so to speak, and stored. They have not been cleaned out of or away from the market. The CCC is not a market. It is only a market stabilizer. Its operations make gradual adjustments possible. Farm products have not been marketed until they have been eaten, fed, or worn and paid for. The place for agricultural surpluses is either in the stomachs or on the backs of people who need them. Many such people are in foreign countries in which we wish to market our products, and these people need them. They have the capacity to pay, if we will buy and make intelligent use of what they can offer.

I have had a very deep concern over the prospect of mounting surpluses of farm products. Last year I appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of an amendment which would have had surplus farm products used to reinforce our national security program. It was the consensus of that committee that my proposal was not germane to Mutual Security legislation then pending. I then introduced a bill, S. 2127, which was considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The bill was amended slightly in committee and was passed unanimously by the Senate as Senate bill 2475.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). The Chair reminds the Senator from Kansas that under the unanimous-consent agreement he was allotted 10 minutes, which now have expired.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement made by me on July 28, 1953, as it appears in volume 99, part 8, pages 10077–10078 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO IMPROVE THE FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, as will be observed from the report which accompanies the pending bill, it follows to a limited extent sections of other measures which have heretofore been before the Senate. The pending bill is a bill to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, having considered the bill, as it is specifically stated in the report, reports the bill and recommends that it do pass without amendment. Senators who serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and other Senators also, I am sure know that the Senate had before it during this session a number of bills authorizing the barter or sale for foreign currencies, of surplus agricultural commodities.

Farm organizations, various Senators and others have evidenced considerable interest in these proposals; and section 550 was added to the Mutual Security Act of 1951 at this session to provide for such sale. While the Department of Agriculture, as set out in exhibit A of this report, believes that section 550 is sufficient at this time, your committee feels that the additional authority provided by the bill is necessary if we are to make an adequate attempt to discover whether sale for foreign currencies presents a profitable avenue for disposing of surplus agricultural commodities and for expanding world trade.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has in prospect by the end of this year an investment in stocks owned or under purchase agreement of approximately $5 billion. S. 2475 is the only proposal brought before this body this session that comes to grips in a realistic way with this very urgent problem.

In dealing with surplus agricultural products we have 1 or 2 alternatives—either shrink the agricultural plant of this country to existing markets, which we have learned in the last few weeks is a most unsatisfactory approach politically and is dangerous economically. The other alternative is to seek to develop means to increase exports and reinforce the mutual-security program to protect our existing markets and create new ones. S. 2475 with an authorization of $500 million would achieve these objectives. It is a matter of utmost urgency that this legislation be enacted before adjournment in order to start work on the disposal of surpluses immediately.

The recently enacted Mutual Security Act of 1953 contained a provision to authorize the President to enter into agreements with friendly countries for the sale and export of surplus agricultural commodities and accept for them local currency for the account of the United States. It provides that in the negotiation of the agreements, the President would take special precaution to safeguard the existing markets.

The section further provides that the local currencies received by the United States for agricultural products sold are to be used (a) for providing military assistance, such as to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and for Indochina; (b) for the purchase of goods or services needed in other friendly countries; (c) for loans for increasing production, including strategic materials; (d) for developing new markets for agricultural products; (e) for grants-in-aid to increase production; and (f) for stockpiling materials needed by the United States.

Section 550 of the Mutual Security Act sets the framework within which agricultural markets can be expanded. S. 2475, authorizing $500 million, will give sufficient money to give this new concept of expanding agricultural markets a full test.

Senate bill 2475, in addition to providing the half billion dollars to effectuate section 550, establishes a procedure which will assure that the majority of the sales will be made through private traders rather than on a State trading basis.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF SENATE BILL 2475, AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1953

Section 2 declares that the policy of the Congress is to use excess agricultural commodities to expand the free world economies by promoting additional trade and strengthening the economies of cooperating nations.

Section 3 authorizes the President, in accordance with the provisions of section 550 of the Mutual Security Act, to (a) make excess commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation available for sale and (b) direct the Commodity Credit Corporation, in accordance with adequate safeguards to convert into dollars the currency received by exporters for selling agricultural products provided that the total value of the CCC stocks and the dollars used for conversion of local currency do not exceed $500 million.

Under domestic operations of CCC, on receipt of documents that wheat has been inspected and sealed, CCC pays. Under this provision, upon receipt of documents that foreign currency has been deposited to the account of the United States, pursuant to all the conditions prescribed by the President, CCC would pay.

Section 4 defines excess agricultural commodities as those determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of probable domestic and export sales plus a reserve for working stocks.

Section 5 directs the President to administer the provisions of the act so as to export the maximum quantities of agricultural commodities with the funds made available to him for that purpose. This is to avoid the use of the funds for unwarranted processing and other expenses that could be borne by receiving countries.

Section 6 is a congressional authorization for appropriation to the CCC to reimburse it for commodities transferred pursuant to the act and for funds used in the conversion of local currencies. It authorizes any funds or assets available to the CCC to be used in advance of appropriations, for carrying out the purposes of the act.

It also requires that the Mutual Security Administration reimburse the CCC in dollars for local currencies used for, first, providing military assistance; second, for loans to increase production of goods or services including strategic materials; or third, for grants-in-aid to increase production.

Section 7 states that no programs shall be undertaken under this authority after June 30, 1955.

Section 8 directs the President to report to the Congress with respect to the activities carried on under this act at least once each 6 months and at such other times as may be appropriate.

That section was added, I may say, so that Congress could keep informed as to whether the proposed use of the agricultural surpluses would appropriately serve the interests of the United States.

Mr. President, with that explanation, may I say that there were a number of proposals by way of bills before the Senate and the House of Representatives in an effort to do what is provided by this measure.

I say very frankly to my colleagues that I have no pride of authorship in the bill. I am explaining it because I am a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, together with other Senators who have joined in sponsoring the bill.

We seek to provide an opportunity and an avenue for the use of agricultural commodities we have in surplus supply, by sending them to countries of the world that are friendly to us, and whose people are friendly to us. It is proposed that that be done under proper safeguards, as we view them, and under arrangements to accept in payment the currencies of those countries, and use them in the way outlined in the bill. This is a bill to promote trade. In no sense does the bill provide for a giveaway program.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture stated that no additional legislation for the export of farm surpluses was needed at that time. The House Agriculture Committee did not act on the bill before adjournment. We now have in prospect a CCC investment of $6.5 billion in farm surpluses overhanging the market. This distinguished body has a responsibility to its constituents—the American public—to use these surpluses constructively.

The news that consideration is being given to use surplus foods to pay for bases is the first indication that the administration is coming to grips with this problem. Yet there is abundant evidence that large quantities of farm surpluses can be sold abroad for local currencies.

These currencies can be used to increase the capacity of our customers to buy more farm products, and thus enable the highest possible level of farm production with the minimum of Government control. They can be used to reinforce our national security, to purchase stockpiles of strategic materials, and for other constructive purposes which further our national interest. Our farm surpluses represent a capital investment of the people of the United States. We are obliged to assure that that capital is managed well in the public interest.

That interest will be served well, in my opinion, if the surpluses are used as a capital revolving fund of many currencies to build a powerful and sound economic alliance of free nations to reinforce our $50 billion a year military Goliaths who stand in an economic quagmire.

The surpluses must not be given away; they must not be allowed to spoil. They must not be swept under the rug. They are needed in the world. They can be sold. They must be sold, and the proceeds must be used prudently. I hope the news item to which I have referred indicates a decision by the administration to do just that.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state that my senior colleague from Kansas is a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and we in Kansas are very happy that he is a member of that committee. Not only our State but the Nation is fortunate in having the benefit of his services.

I appreciate very much the extremely fine statement he has made in behalf of agriculture. He continually works in the interests of the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I think my colleague.

COMMUNISM IN GUATEMALA—A MENACE TO HEMISPHERIC SECURITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to take the time of the Senate for a few moments to comment on a problem which has long concerned me in the field of foreign relations.

I refer to the problem of communism in Guatemala.

As a matter of fact, the actions of the present leaders of the Government of Guatemala have been cause for deepest concern to this country and to other nations of the hemisphere and the free world.

SMOKESCREENS SHOULD NOT DIVERT US

Guatemala's present leaders have tried to throw up numerous smokescreens. They have tried to portray the United States concern as being solely over the issue of unfair treatment which Guatemala has inflicted on American enterprise doing business there, particularly maltreatment of the United Fruit Co.

Now, it is a fact that the United States is concerned about such unfair treatment. The United States will of course continue to protect the rights of its citizens abroad. It will continue to protect the rights of American stockholders and bondholders and management, as would any other sovereign country seek to protect the rights of its nationals.

But this is not the basic issue. This is not the source of our deepest concern, as regards Guatemala.

THE ALARMING COMMUNIST BEACHHEAD

The source of our concern is that Guatemala has become a serious beachhead for international communism in this hemisphere.

No smokescreen should divert any other people or ourselves from that alarming fact.

The Guatemalan leaders must not be permitted to distort this issue and pretend as if the people of the United States were against internal reform measures in foreign lands.

On the contrary, we are the first to wish the Guatemalan people well in improving their standard of living. My country has demonstrated conclusively for over 10 years, through technical assistance programs, our deep interest in Guatemala achieving more of the good things of life for its people—in city and country—better food, better housing, better health. The inspiring record of the United States stands for all to see in our contributions to similar goals throughout the world.

NO SUCH THING AS "NATIVE" COMMUNISM

But I repeat: What concerns us in Guatemala is international communism. Make no mistake: There is no communism but the communism which takes orders from the despots of the Kremlin in Moscow.

It is an absolute myth to believe that there is such a thing as homegrown com-

munism, a so-called native or local communism. There is no such thing.

Communism does not tolerate dissidents within its ranks anywhere in the world. There is every evidence to prove that there has been no dissent by Guatemalan Communists from the revolutionary party line laid down in Moscow.

INTERLOCKING KREMLIN AND GUATEMALAN COMMUNISM

But now I want to prove by a series of clear facts the interlocking interrelationship between Guatemalan communism and Moscow communism.

I shall cite some 22 facts—in question and answer form. This list could be expanded to 220 facts, because every day the alarming evidences multiply.

Here, however, for everyone to see, are a few of the elements of the stark record of the subservience by Guatemalan communism to Moscow communism.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON RED INFLUENCE—DO COMMUNISTS HAVE IMPORTANT POSITIONS IN THE GUATEMALAN GOVERNMENT?

First. They occupy key spots in radio, press, agrarian administration and the social-security system.

The Director General of Radio Broadcasting and director of the Government radio station, TGW, Carlos Alvarado Jerez, is a Communist.

Second. The Chief of the Press Section of President Arbenz' publicity office, Raul Leiva, is a Communist.

Third. In the National Agrarian Department, which administers the Guatemalan agrarian reform law, the No. 2 official, Waldemar Barrios Klee, Chief of the Lands Department, is a member of the Guatemalan Communist Party.

The chief clerk of the department is Maria Jerez de Fortuny, wife of the head of the Communist Party.

Over 15 other Agrarian Department officials are publicly avowed members of the Communist Party, including at least 4 agrarian inspectors.

Fourth. The Director of the official Guatemalan Government Social Security Agency, Alfonso Solorzano, is a Communist.

Fifth. The Deputy Inspector General of Labor, Hugo Barrios Klee, is a member of the Guatemalan Communist Party.

ARE GUATEMALAN COMMUNISTS PART OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT?

Sixth. The leaders of the Guatemalan Communist Party, including Jose Manuel Fortuny, Victor Manuel Gutierrez, Carlos Manuel Pellecer, Mario Silva Jonama, Jose Alberto Cardoza, have visited Moscow, some of them frequently. Fortuny, head of the party, last went to Moscow in November 1953 and has just returned after 2 months of usual training and instruction.

Seventh. Victor Manuel Gutierrez, a leading Communist Party member and labor boss of Guatemala, after returning in January 1952 from a visit to Moscow immediately disbanded a separate Communist Party he was then leading in favor of the organization still headed by Fortuny.

Eighth. In a message to the Soviet Nineteenth Party Congress held in Moscow in October 1952, the Guatemalan Communist Party saluted the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as its inspiration and as a beacon for the workers of the world.

Ninth. The central Cominform organization, through an article published in its worldwide newspaper "for a lasting peace for a people's democracy" on January 16, 1953, openly adopted the Guatemalan Communist Party under its new name Guatemalan Labor Party.

Tenth. The Cominform journal cited above on December 11, 1953, eulogized the Guatemalan Communist daily newspaper Tribuna Popular.

Eleventh. Writings of Jose Manuel Fortuny, head of the Guatemalan Communist Party, are published in the Cominform newspaper For a Lasting Peace and in the New York Daily Worker.

Twelfth. Pravda on December 14, 1953, published an article openly praising the Guatemalan Government.

HAS THE GUATEMALAN GOVERNMENT ENCOURAGED COMMUNISM IN GUATEMALA?

Thirteenth. The Guatemalan Government furnished a theater to the Guatemalan Communist Party for its first public rally, held on June 21, 1951, and attended by the Minister of Education and other important Government officials.

At this meeting Jose Manuel Fortuny, secretary general of the Guatemalan Communist Party, announced his party would seek official recognition in order to participate in future political elections under its own name.

Fourteenth. On December 19, 1952, the Government officially registered the Guatemalan Communist Party, thus granting it full recognition under the electoral laws in disregard of a constitutional prohibition against "political organizations of a foreign or international character." Five days before being inscribed, the Guatemalan Communist Party changed its name to Guatemalan Labor Party.

Fifteenth. The Government political parties controlled by President Arbenz openly supported the Communist leaders, Jose Manuel Fortuny and Carlos Manuel Pellecer, in the January 1953 congressional elections.

Sixteenth. On May 1, 1953, President Arbenz publicly embraced Victor Manuel Gutierrez and Carlos Manuel Pellecer, Communist leaders who control Guatemala's General Labor Confederation.

Seventeenth. Government agencies advertise in the Communist daily newspaper Tribuna Popular, providing practically its only visible means of financial support.

Eighteenth. The Government's official radio and newspaper have disseminated pro-Communist, anti-United States propaganda for years.

Nineteenth. Communist propaganda films accusing the United States of engaging in "bacteriological warfare" have been exhibited in Government buildings.

Twentieth. The Government publicly donated $10,000 to the Second Continental Conference of the Communist-run International Association of Democratic Lawyers, held in the Guatemalan Supreme Court Building last October. The Minister of Interior and the Chief Justice of Guatemala welcomed the delegates to the conference.

Twenty-first. Sra. Maria Vilanova de Arbenz, wife of the President of Guatemala, is a founding member of the Guatemalan Communist-front women's organization, Guatemalan Feminine Alliance—Alianza Femenina Guatemalteca.

Twenty-second. Several high government officials and the heads of all four pro-Arbenz political parties participated in an event staged in a government school building by the Communist-front National Peace Committee on July 31, 1953, to celebrate the Communist victory over American imperialism in Korea.

CONCERN OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS SUBCOMMITTEE

In the light of these and other facts, the developments in Guatemala will continue to be watched with closest attention, not only by myself, but by my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and elsewhere in the Congress.

In particular, our American Republics Subcommittee, whose expert chairman is the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], will be watching developments very closely, in consultation with the distinguished Assistant Secretary of State for Latin-American Affairs, the Honorable John M. Cabot.

When our able Ambassador to Guatemala, John Peurifoy visits Washington, I expect to discuss with him the problem in greatest detail.

For many years I have been in close contact with the State Department on this problem.

I have supplemented my information by first hand reports from those of my colleagues who have visited Guatemala and from the report of a staff member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee itself whom I assigned specifically on this issue.

I wish to reemphasize now that it is not just the United States alone which views the developments in Guatemala with deepest apprehension. It is the hemisphere as a whole and the free world as a whole.

We in the United States, however, have been particularly singled out by the Guatemalan Communists for attack.

POISON SPREAD AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The bitterest form of hostility has been demonstrated by the Guatemalan Communists in their speeches, in their press writings toward us.

I have in my hand an illustration of the type of evil poster which the Guatemalan Communists have published in trying to defame and smear the United States. This poster or cartoon was published by the misnamed Guatemalan Labor Party—that is, the Guatemalan Communists. It has been spread all over Guatemala. It shows the effort which is being made to arouse the sentiment of the common peon or peasant against Uncle Sam. It is an indication of what the Kremlin is doing at our own back door. It purports to show Uncle Sam reaching out his rifle and bayonet—wielding hands to control Guatemala.

This is a lie which is even lower than the usual level of Red falsehood.

The United States does not seek to exercise dominion over any people. The United States believe in a policy of nonintervention and noninterference. We believe in the equality of sovereign states, large and small. We believe in good neighborliness and cooperation among all nations. We believe in the right of peoples to work out their own destiny in their own way, provided of course they do not harm the rights of others.

I conclude, Mr. President, with the earnest hope and prayer that the Guatemalan situation will not deteriorate further, thus endangering not only the well-being of the Guatemalan people themselves, but the security of the Western Hemisphere as a whole.

Mr. President, let us not forget that this is not in Europe. This is not over in Korea. This is right at our own back door. The situation in Guatemala is truly challenging. For that reason I felt that it was my duty, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, to bring this subject to the attention of the Senate.

AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD THE GOVERNMENT OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, the question of American policy with respect to the government of Communist China, and, indeed, American policy toward Asia in general, continues to be a subject of the most vital concern to our people. And well it should be.

We have fought a bloody war in Korea at tremendous sacrifice, a war which is today mercifully suspended, but a war in which we and our allies nevertheless failed to attain our final objectives.

These objectives, in case anybody has forgotten them today, were the defeat of unprovoked aggression and the unification of the nation of Korea.

Each of these objectives have been thwarted by the military and political policies of the Communist Government of China, which the United States and its allies today face in a prolonged stalemate.

Viewed realistically, there is little satisfaction to be gained from this situation, for the simple reason that we are dealing with one of the most brutal and savage regimes yet to appear on this earth, a government totally lacking in principle of any kind, and absolutely devoid of honor.

Nothing—not one single act or deed—can be pointed to which would afford the least indication that the government of Red China will alter its course of hatred for the United States and the free world. Instead there is all too evident proof that the slightest show of weakness or concession on our part will only encourage the Chinese Reds to be all the more extreme and demanding in their attitude.

This leads me to the specific subject which I have in mind today.

Within recent days statements attributed to Mr. Arthur H. Dean, our Special Ambassador to Korea and our chief delegate in the Panmunjom conferences with the Chinese and North Korean Communists, have appeared in the press. Because of Mr. Dean's official position, his views, as I have read them, are obviously important and would tend to commit this Government to policies which do not have the support of the Majority Leader, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]; of Walter Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs; of Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; or of Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota. I do not know where these views originate, but I do know that similar views are presently being advocated by certain left-wing columnists in the daily press.

I regret to say that Mr. Dean, according to an interview published on January 3, 1954, in the Providence Journal, calls for a review of the policy of the United States with regard to the government of Communist China and the government of Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa.

Mr. Dean offers the view which has long been held by pro-Red China apologists in the State Department that—

There is a possibility that the Chinese Communists are more interested in developing themselves in China than they are in international communism.

I cannot believe anything can be further from the truth.

Mr. Dean raises the possibility of "putting a wedge between the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Union." He does this despite the fact that the leaders of Communist China have, by their statements and their military actions, proved themselves to be complete tools of the international Communist conspiracy and its plan for world conquest.

Left-wing columnists are today calling for more realism in our attitude toward Communist China. In a similar vein, Mr. Dean now demands that we remove our rosy glasses and try another pair in our own tough, realistic self-interest.

I am curious as to what the possible long-range implications of his proposals might be in connection with our announced policy toward Red China.

I ask this question because, setting aside the elaborate and flowery language used by Mr. Dean, it is crystal clear that what he is talking about is nothing less than a need for reversing the existing American policy toward Asia and embarking upon a totally different course of action.

Mr. President, my further question is, By what authority does Mr. Dean take it upon himself to discuss any such proposition at this time? I should like to ask if he is speaking with the blessing of the Secretary of State or the President of the United States. Certainly Mr. Dean was never confirmed as Ambassador by the Senate of the United States and cannot lay claim to its approval. I should appreciate being corrected if I am wrong, but it has been my understanding that our present policy has the support of this Nation, and I am unaware of any determined insistence by the American people that it be changed.

Mr. Dean and others contend that we should look at Asia with more realism. What I want to know is, What is so unrealistic about the administration's present policy? To me, and I am certain I speak for the bulk of the people of my State of Idaho, the refusal of a policy to offer the slightest concessions to the Red Chinese is the absolute height of realism.

It is a real policy because it refuses to offer a bribe to the slave rulers of China. It is a realistic policy because it refuses even to discuss the possibility of United Nations membership for a bloody aggressor whose policies have brought murderous ruin and destruction to millions. It is a realistic policy because it recognizes the sacrifices in blood which American soldiers have paid on the icy hills of Korea.

But today individuals such as Mr. Dean are beginning to question the wisdom of this policy, and in a roundabout manner are chanting the siren song of collaboration with the rulers of Red China.

Chiang Kai-shek, the legal President of China, is tossed aside as ineffective and unreliable. We are asked by Mr. Dean to take a hard, critical stare at his military potentialities, the intention being to point to the President of free China as the leader of a lost cause.

Here, as elsewhere in Mr. Dean's remarks, the clearly suggested alternative is to turn hopefully to the Chinese Reds; the same Reds who have turned the once great nation of China into a land of terror and death; the same Reds who have proclaimed their love for peoples democracy, while exterminating it from the very earth.

Mr. Dean strongly contends that if we do not open up trade relations with Red China immediately, a later offer might be rejected "in an insulting manner." I should like to repeat that: "in an insulting manner."

I wonder what the families of American dead in Korea would have to say today to Mr. Dean's fear that the United States may have to endure "an insulting gesture" from Mao Tse-tung and his band of thugs?

The past record of Mr. Dean fails to show any outstanding shrewdness in his understanding of the devious ways of the Communists. Therefore, with the vital question of our security and long-range policy in mind, I am compelled at this time to take his views with a generous grain of salt, and to ask, again, by whose authority he speaks, if any. I am a member of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, which, during its investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations, has had considerable insight into the career and expressed views of Mr. Dean.

He was chairman of the Pacific Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations from 1925 to 1950, and was a major financial contributor to the organization along with the millionaire Communist, Frederick Vanderbilt Field. He was also a vice chairman of the American Institute of Pacific Relations from 1946 to 1950, and a member of its executive committee from 1927 to 1951.

In its report dated July 2, 1952, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee,

after hearings held for a period of nearly 1 year, found that the Institute of Pacific Relations has been considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda, and military intelligence, and that members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist or pro-Communist.

The investigations showed that Mr. Arthur Dean was a member of an IPR committee which investigated charges of Communist bias made by a member of the organization in 1945 and that he and his committee completely cleared the organization of such charges.

In the course of the subcommittee hearings, Frederick Vanderbilt Field appeared as a witness who invoked the fifth amendment when asked about his membership in the Communist Party. According to the minutes of the Board of Trustees of the IPR dated March 18, 1947, Mr. Dean defended Mr. Field as "one of the most valuable and objective members of the executive committee."

He opposed the proposal to remove Mr. Field and, as a result, the latter continued to serve on the executive committee.

The subcommittee hearings also disclosed a letter from Mr. Dean to Mr. Clayton Lane, dated April 18, 1949, in which the former suggests that the help of Lawrence Rosinger and Owen Lattimore be enlisted to point out the difficulties our State Department is now facing in attempting to get up a constructive policy for China. Mr. Dean's letter further suggests that in the future no mention be made of the Communist attack in relation to IPR publications. At this point I should like to read the entire letter into the RECORD:

SULLIVAN & CROMWELL,
New York, April 18, 1949.

Mr. CLAYTON LANE,
Executive Secretary, American Institute of Pacific Relations, Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. LANE: Thank you for your letter of April 15, 1949, together with its enclosures. I think you are greatly to be congratulated on your success with General Marshall. I think we must be very careful, however, that we do not indicate to him either (a) that he is coming into an institution of financial difficulties and that we are going to use him to bolster up our appeal to the foundations, who I am inclined to think might misunderstand it, or (b) that we are going to use his name to obtain additional funds.

I realize that you have come into an exceptionally difficult situation, but I think we might go back to the publications of the institute and with the help of Larry Rosinger point out the difficulties our State Department is now facing in attempting to get up a constructive policy for China. I think we might make a very real contribution to the subject if we could state very objectively, but explicitly, problems which we now face in China. I am sure Owen Lattimore would be a great help in this.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR H. DEAN.

P. S.—I hope you won't get discouraged. It is tough, but I think worthwhile. You have my complete support but (1) I would not mention the Communist attack in relation to IPR publications, (2) for income tax as well as policy reasons I would not indicate we are engaged in pro- or anti-Communist attacks, (3) I would not indicate you have been brought in, to relieve a bad situation. This has antagonized some of Ned's friends. Some way we must solve the Russian problem. It's up to us to find out what makes them tick; why they are what they are; it's not up to us to fight communism. If we try that we have no function; we must expose how its works, what it is, what it does, when it fails.

A. H. D.

It is significant to note that when Lawrence Rosinger came before the Subcommittee on Internal Security he invoked the fifth amendment in regard to his Communist Party membership.

It is further significant that the subcommittee found that—

Owen Lattimore was, from some time beginning in the 1930's, a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy.

It is also interesting to note that the subcommittee found that—

Many of the persons active in and around the IPR, and in particular, though not exclusively, Owen Lattimore, Frederick V. Field, and Lawrence K. Rosinger knowingly and deliberately used the language of the books and articles which they wrote or edited in an attempt to influence the American public by means of pro-Communist or pro-Soviet content of such writings.

The IPR, of which Mr. Dean was an official spokesman, was largely responsible for spreading certain very harmful myths which affected our foreign policy in the Far East, among them that Chiang Kai-shek was a total reactionary; that the Chinese Communists were really "agrarian reformers"; that they were not subservient to Moscow, in that Mao Tse-tung could be transformed into another Tito.

It would seem that Mr. Dean, without apparent authority from any known responsible source, is today giving out the same kind of propaganda. I, for one, intend to oppose it to the end. Call it by whatever name one may choose, the growing proposals for a new look at our Asiatic policy are the language of appeasement. We have only to look at the fatal record of the past two decades to remind ourselves of the consequences which have always followed a policy of appeasement.

There are those who want us to believe that we can do business with Red China. There will always be those who counsel timidity and expediency, refusing to see as our only hope a posture of uncompromising strength and a refusal to make deals of any sort with a foe completely lacking in honor.

Mr. President, I have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate in the belief that the implications of much of what has been said in past weeks concerning the future of our policy in Asia must be brought under careful and critical examination. I believe it is vitally important that the Congress of the United States quickly determine whether or not there is in progress at this time a thinly disguised effort to condition the American people for a radical change in that policy. I submit that any contention which stresses the possibility of cooperative and friendly action on the part of Communist China today is totally unrealistic and contrary to every evidence existing at present.

What is more, I believe considerable harm can be done to our relations with other nations if the least impression is given that any change is contemplated in American policy. Critical regions such as Indochina and all the south Asian states will be seriously affected. The same contention can be made with regard to anti-Communist strength in such countries as England, India, Italy, and France. Unquestionably the overall effect would be to create widespread confusion and a greater degree of disunity.

Mr. President, I do not believe that this is a matter which can be lightly dismissed or shunted aside at this time. I think we must ask ourselves to what extent special ambassadors, serving without the confirmation of the United States Senate, are to be allowed to express themselves publicly on high policy matters, when there is absolutely no evidence that they are speaking with the official voice of the administration which appointed them. The question is whether individuals such as Mr. Dean are in effect challenging the existing policies of this country, and whether they are determined to attempt radical changes without proper authority.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, yesterday, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in discussing the pending St. Lawrence seaway legislation, made certain statements with respect to the opposition to this project as it relates to the Maryland scene. From my viewpoint, these statements require clarification at this time, despite the fact that I am prepared to speak on the St. Lawrence seaway proposal at great length later.

My interest in this project is twofold. First—and I proudly admit this point—I am dedicated to the further development of Baltimore, which already has become one of the great seaports of the world. Second, I am also interested in the further development of a strong United

States merchant marine as a vital economic and security factor. The two issues complement each other. Baltimore is the Nation's largest ore-importing port. This traditional and growing traffic has been made possible only by costly outlays for the development of port facilities, railroad terminals, and industrial plants.

The deflection of this heavy traffic to other ports not only will result in failure to use economically the facilities in which we have invested so heavily, but will require expenditures of many millions of dollars in an attempt to duplicate these facilities elsewhere.

Port activities contribute, directly and indirectly, approximately half of every dollar of income in Baltimore. A port city can only be as great as the ships which bring the world's goods to its docks and markets. Ships of about 100 different lines in all services trade from Baltimore's 40 miles of deep waterways. They offer at least 10 sailings every day of the year to almost 250 foreign and domestic ports.

Baltimore is served by modern, efficient United States ships, almost none of which could use the St. Lawrence waterway if it were built. Any project which enlarges the trading opportunities for United States ships and stimulates waterborne commerce in areas in which these vessels can operate would advance a national policy to which we of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee are dedicated. If I felt that the completed St. Lawrence seaway would do this, I would appear here strongly in favor of it.

The principal reasons why I feel that the building of the St. Lawrence seaway will not promote American-flag deep-water shipping are as follows:

It is proposed to create a waterway with a depth of 27 feet. Such a draft would not permit utilization of maximum carrying capacity in the operation of an overwhelming majority of our deep-water vessels.

Proponents have stated recently that the 27-foot channel from Lake Erie to Montreal would accommodate almost all the American Great Lakes fleet, which totals 3,600,000 deadweight tons. It should be noted that such tonnage is less than 10 percent of all American deep-water vessels both Great Lakes and oceangoing.

For large oceangoing vessels, the control of their exact trim, under all conditions, is a very delicate matter, and is affected by frequent changes which occur, due to the consumption of fuel, water, stores, or for other reasons. Competent navigators do not consider that it would be safe to send a deep-sea vessel over this waterway unless there were at least 3 feet of water under her keel at its lowest point. This automatically reduces the allowable draft at the lowest point to 24 feet.

It should be noted that in order to obtain a clearance permit in Montreal, large vessels must have a minimum clearance of 21 feet; 3 feet for ships over 10,000 deadweight tons. When fresh water is entered, the 3-foot clearance at tidewater entrance would be reduced by about 9 inches, due to the lesser density of the supporting water.

The Senate may be interested to know that the designed draft of the Liberty-type American cargo vessel is 27 feet 8 inches; the Victory, 28 feet 6 inches; the new Marine type, 29 feet 9 inches. These are average drafts; and in operation the deepest point of draft may be well below mean draft.

It is significant to note that of all oceangoing vessels now building or on order in United States shipyards, only one, a coastal tanker, has a designed draft of less than 29 feet. For economic reasons the trend is definitely to larger and deeper draft vessels.

The United States privately owned seagoing merchant marine as of January 1, 1954, now totals 15,313,861 deadweight tons. Ships having a draft of 24 feet or less total less than 300,000 deadweight tons. Obviously, then, not even 2 percent of our privately owned, American-flag merchant fleet could operate through this waterway with full utilization of weight-lifting capacity.

In contrast with our 2 percent, foreign-flag ships are generally comprised of smaller units; so more than 15 percent of their tonnage would be able to navigate the projected seaway at full draft. Hence, a very distinct advantage would be given to foreign fleets by providing a waterway of much greater usability to their ships than to our own.

Foreign merchant ships are generally smaller than ours, for basic economic reasons. Foreign vessels can operate at approximately two-thirds of the cost of operation of United States vessels, primarily because the wages paid to foreign seamen are far below those paid to American seamen.

Due to this cost differential, America's merchant ships are engaged in a great struggle to remain on the seas. It would be virtually impossible for us to compete other than through larger size units of greater capacity, in order to reduce per-cargo-ton operating costs. The larger the vessel, the less important are the labor and other operating costs reflected in the overall expense per ton of capacity.

International trading is a 12-months-a-year business. The St. Lawrence seaway could, at best, be of use in this endeavor only two-thirds of the year, being closed to navigation during the winter months. Such a situation would call for coastal ports to maintain peak facilities—terminals, lighters, tugs, warehouses, and so forth—the year round but use them on a 4 or 5 months' basis only. There is no assurance that open ports would or could, on an economic basis, assume this responsibility for serving waterborne commerce.

The St. Lawrence Waterway is much farther from most of our overseas trading destinations than are the open ocean ports. The seaway entrance, for illustration, lies 1,000 miles north of Baltimore. In handling an identical volume of cargo, not only the added distance, but the necessity of moving through confined channels and locks at greatly reduced speed necessitates the use of more ships than are at present required to give the same service. During the closed season when routings are to and from ports now being used, a substantially reduced number of vessels will be required and thereby forced into lay-up. Even with a full year's service, capital acquisition for maintaining the privately owned fleet is one of our gravest problems. Revenues from voyages restricted to 7 months of the year could not possibly perpetuate private enterprises operation.

Adjustments required in traffic movements because of the long closed seasons, and the unfortunate location of the seaway as related to the geographic pattern of our foreign trade, would combine to discourage the development of a modern American maritime industry.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Beginning with line 24, on page 6, strike out through line 24 on page 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $105 million, as may be necessary to finance the activities of the Corporation."

On page 12, line 23, strike out "obligations of the Corporation" and insert in lieu thereof "funds appropriated to the Corporation."

On page 13, beginning with the word "the" in line 1, strike out down through line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "over a period not to exceed fifty years the cost to the United States of the seaway."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes."

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the transaction of routine business tomorrow, January 15, I be granted the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not like to object to the Senator's request, but I believe it would set an undesirable precedent in the Senate if we tied up the floor in advance of the beginning of a day's session. I wonder whether the Senator would be prepared to begin his speech today. It was not my intention to have the Senate stay in session too late this evening, perhaps until 5 or 5:30. It is possible that then

there would be no objection to the Senator's request to continue with his remarks tomorrow.

But I am very anxious not to have the Senate close up shop at this hour of the day. We have before us an important bill. Certainly, the majority leader has no desire to cut off discussion. It is a very important subject. It is important to the distinguished Senator from Maryland and to Senators from other States. I think it would be bad practice if at this hour of the day we should undertake to tie up the floor tomorrow. I prefer to go along according to orderly procedure.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished majority leader that I understand the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] wants to speak on the bill probably up to closing time today. I merely wanted to assure the continuity of my speech. I did not want to have it broken into in the middle.

Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I have tried to speak on a number of issues involved in the St. Lawrence seaway proposal, but, unfortunately, there are many still remaining. In regard to the matter of our national defense, we must assume that there would be joint participation by the two sovereign nations involved.

One of the most serious questions which might arise in the future is what would happen if this Nation were to go to war and Canada did not. Of course, our relations with Canada have been extremely friendly and I know of no reason why they should change. Yet we must face the fact that Canada is a sovereign nation just as we are, and the time may come when we may be at war with another power with whom Canada is still friendly. What would be our rights in the Canadian section of the seaway then? Is it not possible that as a belligerent our access to the canal might be interpreted as making Canada a cobelligerent? I have not found the answer to these questions in any of the information now available and I think the problems can be settled only in a treaty between the governments of the United States and Canada.

Mr. President, is there not a possibility that the seaway which this bill if enacted would establish, and in which the United States would be a heavy investor, might not be available to American warships or vessels carrying implements of war? It may be that the executive department already has some understanding with Canada as to how such problems would be handled. Such understandings, if they exist, are, I suppose, in the nature of executive agreements of which the Senate is not yet aware.

Considering that both the United States and Canada are sovereign nations and are to be equal partners in this venture, I think it highly dangerous to leave such matter unsettled and dependent strictly upon the continued friendly relations between the two countries.

A representative of the Department of State is reported in the committee hearings as having stated:

> Before us we have a simple question. Will the United States join with Canada in constructing the St. Lawrence seaway, as proposed in S. 589, or will it abandon by default any control over this natural waterway so important to North America's security and economic progress?

The proponents of the seaway reduce the problem to such a simple question merely in order to rush congressional action. The testimony by our State Department representative gives one the impression that Canada is forcing a decision by this Government and that our national and financial interests are being sacrificed to expediency.

On the contrary Canadian officials give the impression that they are either indifferent to United States participation, or that they would just as soon construct their own waterway.

At a meeting by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association on April 30, 1953, in Washington, the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, Canadian Minister of Transport, is reported as saying:

> From time immemorial Canada has assumed complete responsibility for the provision of the navigation facilities from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Lake Erie; and up until this moment the United States has assumed almost complete responsibility for through navigation facilities from Lake Erie to the head of the lakes.

Mr. Chevrier is reported as having stated that it was quite natural for the United States interest to be in the development of the Great Lakes, and he well continued:

> On the other hand, for over 200 years Canada has been actively interested in and exclusively responsible for the progressive development which has taken place in the St. Lawrence River from the gulf to Lake Erie.
>
> I submit to you therefore that from Lake Erie to the sea the St. Lawrence has been improved and maintained by Canada and paid for by Canada at a cost in the neighborhood of $300 million. Nevertheless ships of every nation have used the present seaway without payment of tolls for nearly 50 years. An international treaty provides that when tolls on shipping are imposed they will bear equally on Canadian and United States registered ships.

Mr. Chevrier insisted that the only cooperation wanted from this country was in the building of the powerplant in the International Rapids section of the river. That question was pending before the Federal Power Commission, and has been resolved by giving authority to the State of New York to build the project in cooperation with the Province of Ontario.

Challenging the arguments being made by the proponents and denied by the opponents, Mr. Chevrier said:

> It is said that it would be a mistake for the United States to allow Canada to build the seaway alone, but if this be a mistake, then we made it sometime ago.

Continuing, he further answered arguments made by the proponents, not the opponents:

> It is said that Canada may not always be a friendly nation. I cannot conceive of our two countries living on other than friendly terms, nor of Canada becoming powerful enough to be able to afford to be unfriendly. However, if it is felt that United States interests would be safeguarded by the construction of a canal on your side of the International Section, why not go ahead and build and let us do likewise on our side? This might appear foolish at this time, but we have done this at the Sault, where there are two canals, one on each side of the boundary line, and both are pretty fully used. I am confident this would soon become true here, too.

Those statements do not sound as if the Canadian Government were so anxious for United States participation as our own State Department would have Congress believe.

If there were no other reason for opposing the pending legislation, I would still oppose it, because I think it should be in the form of a treaty rather than in the form of an act of Congress authorizing a corporation to construct a canal. The proponents are using this means to gain by a simple majority vote what they know they cannot obtain by a two-thirds vote necessary to ratify a treaty.

As originally conceived and promoted, the St. Lawrence seaway was a much more grandiose project than that which is before us for consideration today. The cost to this Government alone was more than five times what is provided for in S. 2150. In 1 year the project was reduced in scope from a scheme to bring ocean-going ships into the harbor at Duluth, to making improvements in certain existing areas of the St. Lawrence River, and the construction of improvements near the International Rapids. All of this is to cost more than $100 million, and while the proponents claim it will be self-liquidating, it will be guaranteed by the United States Treasury. But have the promoters really reduced their proposal to what is contained in the pending bill? Are they actually settling for less than they started out to get? The answer is "No," and we can easily see that approval of S. 2150 makes possible an annual drain on the Treasury by reading the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee last spring.

Here is what one member of the committee had to say:

> I regret that we have had some misunderstanding on this business because to me this is a total project. I don't think anyone would like to have the record read that we do not intend ultimately to get up to the head of the lakes. The aim and the objective of this measure is to take us to the head of the lakes with the 27-foot channel.

In fact, the chairman of the committee, who has long supported the total project, made it perfectly clear that he has not given up, but is merely accepting this bill because he believes it is the best he can get at the moment.

The chairman said:

> I do not want to have it assumed that I have in the slightest degree changed my position as to what I think is the obligation of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Sir, I am a realist. I have lived through this and I have seen the years come and go. I have now seen the President and his Cabinet say before us all today that they are in favor of this limited project. I am for everything you have said, but I don't think it is the right move at this

time if you want to accomplish what we set out to accomplish with Canada. I have to make that very plain, and I am sure that you understand what I am driving at.

Questioned as to whether or not the administration might have supported the total project if the chairman had presented it, instead of "just the bobtailed sections of the rapids section," the chairman replied:

I want to tell you that you are mistaken. I talked with the administration and I talked with the President. He was even against this at the start, as you well know, and he had to be sold the facts. We are not going ahead to accomplish very much if we are going to argue amongst ourselves so that we upset the applecart.

Mr. President, the record of the hearings makes it amply clear that this bill is merely an attempt to get a foot inside the door—a hand into the Treasury; it is a political device to get congressional sanction for the total project which will cost millions upon millions of dollars. The chairman admitted that it was purely a political move when he replied to a witness by stating, "I think it is still a smart political move."

Therefore, if we are to see through this "smart political move," we cannot rely on what is proposed in S. 2150; we cannot rely on the material contained in the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee last spring. We must go back to the original proposal which has been before Congress for years. The information which should interest Congress is the facts on the total project.

The committee report on S. 2150 has this to say about the construction in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence—the dredging of channels in the Thousand Islands area of the river:

Accordingly, the seaway works contemplated in S. 2150 will be carried out in the 46-mile strip called the International Rapids section between St. Regis and Ogdensburg, N. Y., together with lowering of rock shoals in the 68-mile strip called the Thousand Islands section between Ogdensburg and Tibbets Point, N. Y. These areas are indicated in the Department of the Army map of January 1949 entitled "Navigation—Power Data Summary, St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project." A channel at least 25 feet deep now prevails in the Thousand Islands section. The 114 miles between Ogdensburg and Montreal are traversed by a shallow draft waterway with a minimum depth of 14 feet. This facility now moves about 10 million tons annually which approximates its maximum capacity under existing conditions. It is inadequate to handle the substantial quantities of new tonnage which will seek seaway services such as the new ore which is to begin moving from Labrador according to schedule in 1954. This ore will become the largest single block of waterway traffic and will require adequate channels and facilities substantially in excess of those available at the present time. Under S. 2150, modernization of the waterway to 27-foot depth, Lake Erie to Montreal, will be accomplished jointly by the United States doing the construction above described and Canada deepening the Welland Canal and major construction in the 68 miles, St. Regis to Montreal.

The area in which the work is to be done is a part of the great waterway outlet of the tremendous natural reservoir of the Great Lakes. Between Lake Ontario and Montreal, a distance of 182 miles, the St. Lawrence River drops about 220 feet. In the International Rapids section alone, the water level descends 92 feet or on an average of 1.9 feet per mile. The two sections covered by S. 2150 constitute the international boundary between the United States and Canada. The width of the Thousand Islands section varies from 1 to 4 miles, except through the Thousand Islands proper where the channels are narrower. The International Rapids section, however, possesses a very substantial fall and it is in this section that the major construction by the United States is to be carried on.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as it is urged that Canada would build the waterway in any event, and that the only purpose of having the United States spend $100 million of its money is that the United States would have some slight say, particularly with regard to the 3 locks in the International Rapids section, I wish to ask the Senator from Maryland how many locks are proposed to be built downstream from the International Rapids section?

Mr. BEALL. As I read the map four locks are proposed to be constructed downstream.

Mr. LONG. Is there anything in the bill that proposes to give the United States any control over the four locks which would be located exclusively on Canadian territory?

Mr. BEALL. I have never known any other country to give up anything to us; and I know of nothing in the bill that would give the United States any control over those locks.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know whether there is a proposal whereby the United States would have any control over the eight locks in the Welland Canal segment of the St. Lawrence outlet?

Mr. BEALL. On the Canadian side?

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Welland Canal is entirely on the Canadian side.

Mr. BEALL. The United States has no control over those locks.

Mr. LONG. If the only participation by the United States would be to have some say in regard to 3 locks, then it would seem to me that that say would be rather ineffectual, because Canada could, at any time it so desired, require us to pay tolls or could require us to submit to any burden she cared to impose with regard to the 4 locks in the Montreal area or the 8 locks on the Welland Canal. In other words, if all that the United States could gain by participating would be to dredge a canal that opened from Canada into Canada, it would seem very dubious whether there would be any particular advantage to the United States simply to have some say with respect to 3 locks in connection with which there would be some participation by the United States.

Mr. BEALL. That is very true. I think the observation made by the Senator from Louisiana is well taken, and I congratulate him.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BEALL. Certainly.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the project already existing on the St. Lawrence, having particularly in mind the 14-foot channel and the locks associated with that channel through the Thousand Islands section and down as far as Montreal?

Mr. BEALL. No, personally I am not familiar with that section.

Mr. LONG. But the Senator knows there is a project there, does he not?

Mr. BEALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. LONG. There are a considerable number of locks and a 14-foot channel.

Mr. BEALL. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Canada charges no tolls whatsoever on those locks.

Mr. BEALL. And the United States has been using them all these years toll free.

Mr. LONG. Certainly our experience with Canada with respect to the 14-foot channel and all the locks connected with it, and our experience with regard to the locks on the Welland Canal, give every indication that we need have no fear whatsoever. There is no reason why we should fear Canada's going ahead and spending an extra $100 million.

Mr. BEALL. Personally, I do not think Canada will do so.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator have any particular knowledge whether we need fear that Canada intends to go ahead and put up a hundred million dollars?

Mr. BEALL. No. The Canadian Minister of Commerce was here and expressed himself along that line.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

As stated in a later section of this report that the construction of the seaway cannot be undertaken economically, under present plans, except concurrently with or following construction of the power development. The crucial facility in the power development lies at Barnhart Island and it is here that the construction approved by the International Joint Commission last October is to be undertaken. The same plans for construction are now pending before the Federal Power Commission. These are also the same general development plans outlined in the 1941 agreement. They include the powerhouse and spillway dam at Barnhart Island, permitting the creation and operation of a new pool level at elevations of from 238 to 242 feet immediately above those structures, or eighty-odd feet above the present low-water level of the river. This construction will require dikes to assist in retaining the new reservoir and auxiliary locks, including the Iroquois control dam, channel enlargement, highway, and railroad relocation, and so forth.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield for that purpose?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order for the call of the roll is rescinded.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ross Rizley to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The nomination was confirmed.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ross Rizley to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The nomination was confirmed.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of the following members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, nominated for the terms indicated, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Clark L. Brody, of Michigan, for term of 1 year from December 1, 1953, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Harlan Bruce Munger, of New York, for term of 1 year from December 1, 1953, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

John David Anderson, of West Virginia, for term of 2 years from December 1, 1953, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Raymond Sayre, of Iowa, for term of 2 years from December 1, 1953, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

H. W. Clutter, of Kansas, for term of 3 years from December 1, 1953, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Marshall H. Edwards, of Florida, for term of 3 years from December 1, 1953, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Marvin J. Briggs, of Indiana, for term of 4 years from December 1, 1953, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

C. H. Matthews, of Texas, for term of 4 years from December 1, 1953, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Golden F. Fine, of California, for term of 5 years from December 1, 1953, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Elbert J. Hodge, of Alabama, for term of 5 years from December 1, 1953, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Earl H. Brockman, of Idaho, for term of 6 years from December 1, 1953, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

L. V. Ritter, of Arkansas, for term of 6 years from December 1, 1953, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

The nominations were confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before making a motion to recess, I shall make a statement as to the legislative program.

I desire to announce that there will be a session of the Senate tomorrow. I do not expect to ask for a Saturday session this week. This is only the second day of discussion of the important bill, now the unfinished business. I hope—and I merely express it as a hope—that during next week we may complete the debate and be able to get a final vote on the bill, in order that we may proceed with other legislation of importance, looking toward an adjournment of the Congress in July.

About the end of January the Senate will start getting the appropriation bills for consideration at the rate of about one a week. Of course, it will be desirable and necessary to sandwich those appropriation bills into our general legislative program. I believe that it is possible to complete the work of the Senate by the time which has been picked as a target, if the Senate will make good use of its time in January and February. For that reason it is expected that there will be daily meetings of the Senate during those two months. If the Senate can make reasonable progress on legislation, I think it can hit its target date of adjournment.

I ask the cooperation of Senators. I hope that those who have speeches to make on the pending important piece of legislation, which is highly controversial, will be prepared to make their statements when the speakers preceding them have concluded, so that the Senate may do a fair amount of work each day.

It is not my intention to ask the Senate to hold evening sessions. I think it can complete its work without doing that. If evening sessions should become necessary, I would, of course, first consult with the minority leader. I shall do that regarding the legislative program for the consideration of measures which will follow the pending bill, namely, the Bricker amendment joint resolution, and the Korean mutual-security pact, which will be before the Senate in the next week or two.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Would not the distinguished majority leader ask the Senate to hold night sessions if it became obvious that some Senators were endeavoring to prevent the Senate from having an opportunity to vote on the measures he has mentioned? If there is an intention to filibuster, I should like to see night sessions held in order that the Senators who have a desire to filibuster may get it out of their systems as early as possible.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator knows the position which the majority leader has taken over a long period of years, that the Senate should transact its business in an orderly way. There certainly has been no indication of a filibuster to date. In my opinion, the measure under consideration is one which requires wide exploration in order that Senators on both sides may have an opportunity to present their views. Unless it becomes apparent that an effort is being made to prevent the Senate from reaching a vote, I do not desire that the Senate shall hold long sessions when Senators have other business to transact. Moreover, it would not be particularly good for the health of the Senators, who have a long session ahead of them. But we shall cross that bridge when we reach it. Certainly if it is necessary to hold night sessions later on, that matter will be considered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In order to reassure the Senator from Minnesota, I believe it should be pointed out that the debate on the St. Lawrence Seaway bill is proceeding in an orderly fashion. Although one Senator desired to make a speech, and then desired to take a few moments of rest before he continued to speak, and although he had considered debating the motion to proceed to consider, which would have taken only an hour or so, he very willingly decided to forego that right, even though that required him to proceed to make his speech at a greater degree of inconvenience to himself. He acted in that way in order to accommodate both the majority and the minority leader.

Certainly there is no indication that any Senator cares to filibuster this bill; and I regret to observe that the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota has suggested, on the second day of debate on so important a bill, that the bill might be filibustered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield to me——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The only reason why I made that reference was some remarks which have been made in the Chamber about what was proposed. I simply wish to make certain that we shall not give up easily. That is why I asked the question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, Mr. President, I have not been in this Chamber as long as some of my distinguished colleagues have been; but I think we probably shall make more progress by maintaining mutual good will and recognition of the rights of others. So long as I am majority leader, I intend to follow that procedure.

Obviously, after debate has proceeded for what anyone, I think, would consider

a reasonable period of time, if it appeared that more time were needed, we would have to consider holding evening sessions. But certainly to date I think there is no reason to do so.

Personally, I hope—although there is no way to guarantee it—that perhaps in the normal procedure, as we are now running along, we can obtain a vote on the St. Lawrence seaway bill sometime next week. If we do so, I think we shall have made good progress, in view of the length of time this matter has taken in years past, even within my memory.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as it has been suggested, even after the second day of debate on the bill, that some effort might be made to limit debate, I hope the proponents will speak on the bill, because thus far I have not heard advanced a single reason why any Member of the Senate should vote for the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think my colleague has misinterpreted the statement of the Senator from Minnesota. I did not hear him suggest that there should be a limitation of debate. As I understood him, he suggested only an extension of the length of the Senate's sessions. I think those two things are quite different.

I say most sincerely that all the debate to date on the bill has been on the subject, and I think we are proceeding in an orderly fashion. So I see no reason why we cannot continue in that manner.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Did I correctly understand the Senator from California to say that irrespective of the course of the debate on the proposed seaway legislation, the Senate will hold sessions on Saturday, after the coming Saturday?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, I did not say that. I said we would not have a Saturday session this week. I said I should like to reserve judgment, and to see the progress made next week, before deciding whether it might be necessary to request that a Saturday session be held next week.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Very well; I thank my colleague for the explanation.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 15, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 14 (legislative day of January 7), 1954:

In the Army

Brig. Gen. Paul Frailey Yount, O18022, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Transportation, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and sections 513 and 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Francis Hickey, O10362, United States Army, for appointment as commanding general, IX Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, O15004, United States Army, for appointment as commanding general, I Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Conrad Stanton Babcock, O16104, United States Army.

Col. Samuel Roberts Browning, O17081, United States Army.

Col. William Lewis Bell, Jr., O17549, United States Army.

Col. Ned Dalton Moore, O18212, United States Army.

Col. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., O18232, United States Army.

Col. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel 3d, O18655, United States Army.

Col. Maddrey Allen Solomon, O19194, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Nabors Tyson, O19594, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.).

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Arthur Elsworth Stoddard, O371507.

To be brigadier generals

Col. John Nelson Andrews, O150451, Infantry Reserve.

Col. Louis Dalhoff Burkhalter, Jr., O280416, Artillery Reserve.

Col. Harold Vincent Gaskill, O996701, Ordnance Reserve.

Col. William Henry Harrison, O292346, Artillery Reserve.

Col. Gerald Oneill Hodge, O253172, Transportation Corps Reserve.

Col. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., O188725, Armor Reserve.

Col. Perrin Hamilton Long, O492197, Medical Corps Reserve.

Col. Daniel Joseph Manning, O307848, Corps of Engineers Reserve.

Col. Alexander Marble, O241298, Medical Corps Reserve.

Col. Thomas Murray Mayfield, O168962, Artillery Reserve.

Col. Edward Josephus McGrew, Jr., O265015, Corps of Engineers Reserve.

Col. James Clarence Mott, O176119, Infantry Reserve.

Col. Harry Lynn Ostler, O300698, Armor Reserve.

Col. William Christian Otten, O470649, Transportation Corps Reserve.

Col. Elmo Logan Patton, O229128, Transportation Corps Reserve.

Col. Harold Glendon Schele, O341587, Medical Corps Reserve.

Col. Robert Lee Watkins, O244532, Infantry Reserve.

Col. Frank Elmore Wilson, O323557, Medical Corps Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Robert William Crichlow, Jr., O12430, United States Army, for appointment as major general in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Office Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, O7042, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. George Bateman Peploe, O16246, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Cyrus Quinton Shelton, O10784, United States Army.

Col. Oscar William Koch, O10851, United States Army.

Col. Stephen Bowen Elkins, O10913, United States Army.

Col. Hugh Cort, O11592, United States Army.

Col. Paul LaRue Neal, O11684, United States Army.

Col. Harris Fulford Scherer, O12275, United States Army.

Col. Thomas Benoit Hedekin, O12278, United States Army.

Col. Charles Alvin Pyle, O12281, United States Army.

Col. Richard Powell Ovenshine, O12303, United States Army.

Col. Terence John Tully, O12823, United States Army.

Col. Reginald Pond Lyman, O14872, United States Army.

Col. Howard John Vandersluis, O15213, United States Army.

Col. Herbert Davis Vogel, O15520, United States Army.

Col. Harry Van Wyk, O15555, United States Army.

Col. John Gillespie Hill, O15797, United States Army.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 14 (legislative day of January 7), 1954:

Department of Agriculture

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be a member, Board of Directors, Commodity Credit Corporation, appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Farm Credit Administration

To be members, Federal Farm Credit Board, for the terms indicated, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate

FOR TERMS OF 1 YEAR FROM DECEMBER 1, 1953, AND UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE APPOINTED AND QUALIFIED

Clark L. Brody, of Michigan.
Harlan Bruce Munger, of New York.

FOR TERMS OF 2 YEARS FROM DECEMBER 1, 1953, AND UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE APPOINTED AND QUALIFIED

John David Anderson, of West Virginia.
Raymond Sayre, of Iowa.

FOR TERMS OF 3 YEARS FROM DECEMBER 1, 1953, AND UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE APPOINTED AND QUALIFIED

H. W. Clutter, of Kansas.
Marshall H. Edwards, of Florida.

FOR TERMS OF 4 YEARS FROM DECEMBER 1, 1953, AND UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE APPOINTED AND QUALIFIED

Marvin J. Briggs, of Indiana.
C. H. Matthews, of Texas.

FOR TERMS OF 5 YEARS FROM DECEMBER 1, 1953, AND UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE APPOINTED AND QUALIFIED

Golden F. Fine, of California.
Elbert J. Hodge, of Alabama.

FOR TERMS OF 6 YEARS FROM DECEMBER 1, 1953, AND UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE APPOINTED AND QUALIFIED

Earl H. Brockman, of Idaho.
L. V. Ritter, of Arkansas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast entrusted us with the gift of life, gird us with faith and fortitude as we seek to make it a valiant and victorious adventure.

May we be sensitive to the reality of Thy presence and power when we endeavor to bring to fulfillment and fruition those lofty ideals which Thou hast planted within our souls.

We pray that whenever we are confronted and challenged by dangers and difficulties we may be encouraged with the glad assurance that nothing can impede the progress and triumph of Thy righteous purposes.

Grant that having entered into the labors of others we may be inspired with a noble social interest to achieve a blessed inheritance for suffering and struggling humanity.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 11, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1917. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; and

H. R. 6065. An act to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 987. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.;

S. 2474. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York; and

S. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on treaties and executive agreements.

The message also announced that the Vice President had made the following appointments:

Following the adjournment of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Vice President appointed Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. HUMPHREY members of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Following the adjournment of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Vice President appointed Mr. GOLDWATER and Mr. LENNON members to the Joint Committee on the Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary Year of Controlled Powered Flight to fill vacancies caused by the deaths of Mr. Tobey and Mr. Smith of North Carolina.

Following the adjournment of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Vice President appointed Mr. James B. Carey, Mr. Loyd Wright, and Mr. E. D. Crippa members to the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, and as advisory members of the said Commission, Mr. Carlson, Mr. McCarran, and former Senator James P. Kem.

Following the adjournment of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Vice President appointed Mr. LANGER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HILL, and Mr. DOUGLAS as members to the United States Commission for the Bicentennial of Columbia University in the city of New York.

Following the adjournment of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Vice President appointed Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON members to the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission.

Following the adjournment of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Vice President appointed Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. IVES, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. KENNEDY members to the committee to assist in the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Congress of 1754, held at Albany, N. Y.

Following the adjournment of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Vice President appointed Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. BYRD members to the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 54-5.

REREFERRAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION NO. 1106

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Executive Communication No. 1106, being a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy proposing legislation to provide for collection from military and civilian personnel of amounts due the United States and for accounting procedures with respect thereto, be rereferred from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to the Committee on Government Operations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 295)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I submit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a number of recommendations relating to the old-age and survivors insurance system and the Federal grant-in-aid programs for public assistance.

The human problems of individual citizens are a proper and important concern of our Government. One such problem that faces every individual is the provision of economic security for his old age and economic security for his family in the event of his death. To help individuals provide for that security—to reduce both the fear and the incidence of destitution to the minimum—to promote the confidence of every individual in the future—these are proper aims of all levels of government, including the Federal Government.

Private and group savings, insurance and pension plans, fostered by a healthy, fully functioning economy, are a primary means of protection against the economic hazards of old age and death. These private savings and plans must be encouraged, and their value preserved, by sound tax and fiscal policies of the Government.

But in addition, a basic, nationwide protection against these hazards can be provided through a Government social-insurance system. Building on this base, each individual has a better chance to achieve for himself the assurance of continued income after his earning days are over and for his family after his death. In response to the need for protection arising from the complexities of our modern society, the old-age and survivors insurance system was developed. Under it nearly 70 million persons and their families are now covered, and some 6 million are already its beneficiaries. Despite shortcomings which can be corrected, this system is basically sound. It should remain, as it has been, the cornerstone of the Government's programs to

promote the economic security of the individual.

Under old-age and survivors insurance (OASI), the worker during his productive years and his employer both contribute to the system in proportion to the worker's earnings. A self-employed person also contributes a percentage of his earnings. In return, when these breadwinners retire after reaching the age of 65, or if they die, they or their families become entitled to income related in amount to their previous earnings. The system is not intended as a substitute for private savings, pension plans, and insurance protection. It is, rather, intended as the foundation upon which these other forms of protection can be soundly built. Thus the individual's own work, his planning, and his thrift will bring him a higher standard of living upon his retirement, or his family a higher standard of living in the event of his death, than would otherwise be the case. Hence the system both encourages thrift and self-reliance, and helps to prevent destitution in our national life.

In offering, as I here do, certain measures for the expansion and improvement of this system, I am determined to preserve its basic principles. The two most important are: First, it is a contributory system, with both the worker and his employer making payments during the years of active work; second, the benefits received are related in part to the individual earnings. To these sound principles our system owes much of its wide national acceptance.

During the past year we have subjected the Federal social security system to an intensive study which has revealed certain limitations and inequities in the law as it now stands. Those should be corrected.

1. OASI COVERAGE SHOULD BE BROADENED

My message to the Congress on August 1, 1953, recommended legislation to bring more persons under the protection of the OASI system. The new groups that I recommended be covered—about 10 million additional people—include self-employed farmers; many more farm workers and domestic workers; doctors, dentists, lawyers, architects, accountants, and other self-employed professional people; members of State and local retirement systems on a voluntary group basis; clergymen on a voluntary group basis; and several smaller groups. I urge the Congress to approve this extension of coverage.

Further broadening of the coverage is being considered by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, created by the Congress. This Committee will soon report on a plan for expanding OASI to Federal employees not now protected, without impairing the independence of present Federal retirement plans. After the Committee has made its report, I shall make appropriate recommendations on that subject to the Congress.

Extension of coverage will be a highly important advance in our OASI system, but other improvements are also needed. People over 65 years of age who can work should be encouraged to do so and should be permitted to take occasional or part-time jobs without losing their benefits. The level of benefits should be increased. Certain defects in and injustices under the present law should be eliminated. I submit the following recommendations to further these purposes.

2. THE PRESENT RETIREMENT TEST SHOULD BE LIBERALIZED AND ITS DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE WAGE EARNER SHOULD BE REMOVED

By depriving an OASI beneficiary of his benefit payment for any month in which he earns wages of more than $75, present laws imposes an undue restraint on enterprise and initiative. Retired persons should be encouraged to continue their contributions to the productive needs of the Nation. I am convinced that the great majority of our able-bodied older citizens are happier and better off when they continue in some productive work after reaching retirement age. Moreover, the Nation's economy will derive large benefits from the wisdom and experience of older citizens who remain employed in jobs commensurate with their strength.

I recommend, therefore, that the first $1,000 of a beneficiary's annual earnings be exempted under the retirement test, and that for amounts earned above $1,000 only 1 month's benefit be deducted for each additional $80 earned.

To illustrate the effect of these changes: a beneficiary could take a $200 a month job for 5 months without losing any benefits, whereas under present law he would lose 5 months' benefits. He could work throughout the year at $90 a month and lose only 1 month's benefit, whereas under present law he would lose all 12.

Approval of this recommendation will also remove the discriminatory treatment of wage earners under the retirement test. Self-employed persons already have the advantage of an exemption on an annual basis, with the right to average their earnings over the full year. The amendment I have proposed would afford this advantage, without discrimination, to all beneficiaries.

3. OASI BENEFITS SHOULD BE INCREASED

Today thousands of OASI beneficiaries receive the minimum benefit of $25 a month. The average individual benefit for retired workers approximates $50 a month. The maximum benefit for an individual is $85 a month. For OASI to fulfill its purpose of helping to combat destitution, these benefits are too low.

I recommend, therefore, that benefits now being received by retired workers be increased on the basis of a new formula to be submitted to the appropriate committees by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This formula should also provide increases for workers retiring in the future, raising both the minimum and the maximum benefits. These increases will further the objectives of the program and will strengthen the foundation on which its participants may build their own security.

4. ADDITIONAL BENEFIT CREDITS SHOULD BE PROVIDED

The maintenance of a relationship between the individual's earnings and the benefits he receives is a cornerstone of the OASI system. However, only a part of many workers' annual earnings are taken into account for contribution and benefit purposes. Although in 1938 only the first $3,000 of a worker's annual earnings were considered for contribution and benefit purposes, statistical studies reveal that in that year 94 percent of full-time male workers protected by OASI had all of their earnings covered by the program. By 1950 less than half of such workers—44 percent—had their full earnings covered by the program, so the Congress increased the earnings base to $3,600.

Today, the earnings base of $3,600 covers the full earnings of only 40 percent of our regular male workers. It is clear, therefore, that another revision of this base is needed to maintain a reasonable relationship between a worker's benefits and his earnings.

I recommend, therefore, that the earnings base for the calculation of OASI benefits and payroll taxes be raised to $4,200, thus enabling 15 million people to have more of their earnings taken into account by the program.

5. BENEFITS SHOULD BE COMPUTED ON A FAIRER BASIS

The level of OASI benefits is related to the average of a worker's past earnings. Under present law periods of abnormally low earnings, or no earnings at all, are averaged in with periods of normal earnings, thereby reducing the benefits received by the retired worker. In many instances, a worker may earn little or nothing for several months or several years because of illness or other personal adversity beyond his power of prevention or remedy. Thus the level of benefits is reduced below its true relation to the earning capabilities of the employee. Moreover, if the additional millions of persons recommended for inclusion under OASI are brought into the program in 1955 without modification of present law, their average earnings will be sharply lowered by including as a period of no earnings the period from 1951 to 1955 when they were not in the program. I recommend, therefore, that in the computation of a worker's average monthly wage, the 4 lowest years of earnings be eliminated.

6. THE BENEFIT RIGHTS OF THE DISABLED SHOULD BE PROTECTED

One of the injustices in the present law is its failure to make secure the benefit rights of the worker who has a substantial work record in covered employment and who becomes totally disabled. If his disability lasts 4 years or less, my preceding recommendation will alleviate this hardship. But if a worker's earnings and contributions cease for a longer period, his retirement rights, and the survivor rights of his widow and children may be reduced or even lost altogether. Equity dictates that this defect be remedied. I recommend, therefore, that the benefits of a worker who has a substantial work record in covered employment and who becomes totally disabled for an extended period be maintained at the amount he would have received had he become 65 and retired on the date his disability began.

The injustice to the disabled should be corrected not simply by preserving these benefit rights but also by helping them to return to employment wherever possible. Many of them can be restored to lives of usefulness, independence, and self-respect if, when they apply for the preservation of their benefit rights, they are promptly referred to the vocational rehabilitation agencies of the States. In the interest of these disabled persons, a close liaison between the OASI system and these agencies will be promptly established upon approval of these recommendations by the Congress. Moreover, in my message of January 18 to the Congress, I shall propose an expanded and improved program of vocational rehabilitation.

COSTS

I am informed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that the net additional cost of the recommendations herein presented would be, on a long-term basis, about one-half of 1 percent of the annual payrolls subject to OASI taxes. The benefit costs will be met for at least the next 15 to 25 years under the step-rate increases in OASI taxes already provided in the law.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

An important byproduct of the extension of the protection of the OASI system and the increase in its benefit scale is the impact on public-assistance programs. Under these programs States and localities provide assistance to the needy aged, dependent children, blind persons, and the permanently and totally disabled, with the Federal Government sharing in the cost.

As broadened OASI coverage goes into effect, the proportion of our aged population eligible for benefits will increase from 45 percent to 75 percent in the next 5 or 6 years. Although the need for some measure of public assistance will continue, the OASI program will progressively reduce, year by year, the extent of the need for public assistance payments by the substitution of OASI benefits. I recommend that the formula for Federal sharing in the public assistance programs for these purposes reflect this changing relationship without prejudicing in any manner the receipt of public assistance payments by those whose need for these payments will continue.

Under the present public assistance formula some States receive a higher percentage share of Federal funds than others. In the program of old-age assistance, for example, States making low assistance payments receive up to 80 percent Federal funds in defraying the costs of their programs. States making high assistance payments receive about 65 percent of Federal funds in that portion of the old-age-assistance payments which is within the $55 maximum for Federal participation.

This variation in Federal participation is the result of a congressional determination that the Federal sharing should be higher for States which, because of low resources, generally make low assistance payments. In order better to achieve this purpose, I recommend that a new formula be enacted. It should take into account the financial capacity of the several States to support their public assistance programs by adopting, as a measure of that capacity, their per capita income. Such a new formula will also facilitate the inclusion, in the old-age-assistance program, of a factor reflecting the expansion of OASI.

The present formula for Federal sharing in public assistance programs requires adjustment from another standpoint. Under present law, the Federal Government does not share in any part of a monthly old-age assistance payment exceeding $55. Yet many of these payments must exceed this amount in order to meet the needs of the individual recipient, particularly where the individual requires medical care. I consider it altogether appropriate for the Federal Government to share in such payments and recommend, therefore, that the present $55 maximum be placed on an average rather than on an individual basis. Corresponding changes in the other public assistance programs would be made. This change in the formula would enable States to balance high payments in cases of acute need against low payments where the need is relatively minor. In addition, great administrative simplification would be achieved.

A new public assistance formula should not become effective until the States have had an opportunity to plan for it. Until such time, the 1952 public assistance amendments should be extended.

The recommendations I have here submitted constitute a coordinated approach to several major aspects of the broad problem of achieving economic security for Americans. Many other phases of this national problem exist and will be reflected in legislative proposals from time to time to the Congress. The effort to prevent destitution among our people preserves a greater measure of their freedom and strengthens their initiative. These proposals are constructive and positive steps in that direction, and I urge their early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1954.*

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President has just transmitted to the Congress the details of a comprehensive social-security program which contains many basic improvements in the present system. I am introducing immediately two bills which embody all of the proposals made today by the President. One bill contains the recommendations with respect to the old-age and survivors insurance program, and the other pertains to the public assistance program. I have previously introduced a bill, H. R. 6812, which contains the earlier recommendations of the President for expanded social security coverage. The substance of that earlier bill is now included in the legislation I have introduced today.

These recommendations represent a broad program of increased protection for more of our people. I know that they have been developed after many months of intensive study.

The American people have a vital stake in this legislation. It provides substantial increases in retirement benefits both for those already retired and for those who will retire in the future. It provides substantial increases in survivorship benefits for the greater protection of the loved ones of deceased workers. These significant improvements are accomplished within the framework of the existing system.

The Committee on Ways and Means will begin work on this legislation immediately following its action on the tax program. As a result, I expect that the committee will start devoting full time to my two social security bills which embody the President's program early in March, at which time we shall have full public hearings, although it is, of course, too early to set a specific date. It is vital that we act with speed and decision on this major legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a summary of the provisions of these two bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE BILL

The bill contains the technical provisions necessary to carry out the major recommendations of the President for extending old-age and survivors insurance coverage, improving benefits, improving the retirement test, and preserving the rights of disabled individuals.

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

The bill would extend coverage to between 10 and 11 million additional people during the course of a year. About 6½ million of these would be covered on a compulsory basis; coverage would be made available to the others—State and local government employees under public retirement systems and clergymen—subject to action comparable to that now required for coverage of State and local and nonprofit employees.

The bill would—

1. Allow the States to provide coverage under Federal-State agreements for members of State and local government retirement systems (except policemen and firemen) provided a vote were held among the active members of the system and two-thirds of those voting were in favor of coming under old-age and survivors insurance. In addition to these provisions, which are contained in H. R. 6812, the bill provides that after its enactment, coverage of those to whom the two-thirds vote provisions apply can be effected only under these provisions—that is, only if the members of the system vote in favor of coverage. (Under H. R. 6812, as under present law, members of State and local retirement systems could be brought into old-age and survivors insurance by abolishing the system before the group is brought into coverage.) The bill also contains a statement indicating that it is the policy of the Congress in providing for the coverage under old-age and survivors insurance of employees under a State or local retirement system that the protection of the employees

and beneficiaries who are under the retirement system will not be impaired as a result of coverage under old-age and survivors insurance. No such statement of policy was included in H. R. 6812.

2. Cover self-employed professional persons on the same basis as other self-employed now covered and cover internes by deleting the present exclusion of services of internes in the definition of employment.

3. Cover farm operators on a basis consistent with that on which other self-employed are now covered.

4. Cover cash wages earned in hired farm work where they amount to $50 or more from a single employer in a calendar quarter, regardless of the number of days the individual works for that employer, and remove the exclusion of workers employed in cotton ginning and the production of gum naval stores.

5. Cover cash wages of domestic workers where they amount to $50 or more from a single employer in a calendar quarter, regardless of the number of days the individual works for that employer.

6. Allow coverage for ministers and members of religious orders (other than those who take a vow of poverty) on a basis similar to that on which other employees of nonprofit organizations may now be covered.

7. Cover employees engaged in fishing and similar activities who are now excluded.

8. Cover home workers in States without licensing laws on the same basis as those in States with licensing laws.

9. Cover American citizens employed on vessels of foreign registry by American employers on the same basis as other American citizens working outside the United States for American employers.

10. Cover certain temporary postal employees, civilian employees of coast guard post exchanges, and employees of the district Federal home loan banks.

The extension of coverage provided by the bill would, in general, be effective beginning January 1, 1955. Under H. R. 6812 the coverage extension would have been effective January 1, 1954.

IMPROVEMENT OF BENEFITS

The bill would provide an increase in benefits for beneficiaries on the rolls and would raise the benefits of those coming on the rolls in the future through a revised-benefit formula, an increase in the earnings base (also applicable for contribution purposes), and an improved method for determining average monthly wage.

The earnings base is raised from the present $3,600 to $4,200 per year.

One of the features of the bill is the so-called 4-year dropout which permits the elimination of as many as 4 years of lowest or no earnings from the computation of the average monthly wage. Since the benefit of an insured individual is derived from his average monthly wage, the effect of the 4-year dropout would be to increase his benefit amount. The dropout, in effect, places the groups to whom coverage is extended under this bill in a position comparable to that of the groups newly covered in 1950 as far as the computation of their average monthly wage is concerned. Under this provision, although their earnings would be averaged from January 1, 1951, the 4 years of no covered earnings (1951–54) would be eliminated from the computation. In addition, persons who are already covered under the program and who meet the qualifying requirements can have their 4 years of lowest or no earnings dropped from the computation of their average monthly wage, regardless of when they occur.

This provision differs from H. R. 6812 in that 4 years, rather than 3 years, can be eliminated. This change is made necessary by the change in the effective date of the extensions of coverage—from January 1, 1954, in H. R. 6812 to January 1, 1955, under this bill. Certain technical changes have also been made in the requirements to be met before an individual can qualify to drop out low years.

The 4 years of lowest or no earnings will be eliminated from the average monthly wage for persons coming on the rolls in the future where the insured individual (a) has 6 quarters of coverage after June 30, 1953; or (b) first becomes eligible for benefits, i. e., reaches age 65 and is insured or becomes insured for retirement benefits after the effective date, which is the last day of the month following the month of enactment; or (c) in the case of survivors' benefits, dies after the effective date and before becoming eligible for retirement benefits.

These qualifying requirements are the same as those included in H. R. 6812 with the exception that under the first alternative 6 quarters of coverage are required after June 30, 1953, instead of June 30, 1952.

A beneficiary on the rolls prior to the month in which the proposal becomes effective will also become eligible for this revised method of determining his average monthly wage, thereby permitting an increase in his benefit amount, if he acquires 6 quarters of coverage after June 30, 1953. He may also use this revised method if he meets the requirements for a recomputation of his benefit after the effective date as the result of work he has performed subsequent to his entitlement to benefits, or as a result of meeting the requirements for the exclusion of a period of disability from the computation of his average monthly wage.

The revised formula, which will apply to most workers coming on the rolls in the future, provides that benefit amounts will be equal to 55 percent of the first $110 of average monthly wage plus 20 percent of the remainder (up to a total of $350 a month), as compared to 55 percent of the first $100 of average monthly wage plus 15 percent of the remainder (up to a total of $300 a month) under present law. The revised formula will apply to persons who have their average monthly wage computed on earnings after 1950 and who are eligible for dropping out the 4 years of lowest or no earnings.

The minimum primary insurance amount is raised from $25 to $30. The maximum family benefit is raised from $168.75 to $190. With respect to future beneficiaries, no change is made in the provision that benefits paid on a single wage record shall not exceed 80 percent of the average monthly wage, except that the amount below which family benefits will not be reduced by the operation of this maximum is raised from $45 to $50.

Alternative methods of computing benefit amounts are provided in order that all future retired workers will receive a benefit which is at least $5 higher than they would receive under present law, whether or not they qualify for the new formula and whether their benefits are based on an average of their earnings after 1936 or after 1950.

1. Where the 4-year dropout and the application of the new benefit formula to earnings averaged from 1951 do not result in a benefit which is at least $5 higher than the individual would receive under the 1952 formula, his benefit will be computed as at present (i. e., on his average monthly wage without the 4-year dropout) and the resulting benefit amount raised by the conversion table included in the bill. This situation will occur only where the individual has a relatively low average monthly wage and has had little or no change in his earnings from year to year.

2. If it is to the advantage of the individual who is eligible for the 4-year dropout to have his average monthly wage computed on the basis of his earnings from 1937 to date of entitlement (excluding the 4 lowest years) this will be done. Under this circumstance, the 1939 benefit formula will be used with the resulting benefit amount raised through the conversion table.

3. Persons coming on the rolls after the effective date, who are not eligible for the 4-year dropout, will have their benefits computed as under present law (based on earnings from 1937 or 1951) with the resulting benefit amounts raised through the conversion table.

Beneficiaries on the rolls at the time the legislation becomes effective will also receive a benefit increase through the conversion table.

The conversion table is constructed to provide benefits equal to those provided by applying the revised formula to the average monthly wage of the individual on whose account benefits are being paid. Where (as in the case of average monthly wages below $130) the formula yields an increase of less than $5, the amount of increase is raised to $5.

Dependents on the rolls at the time the legislation becomes effective will receive increases proportionate to the amount of increase in the primary insurance amount on which their benefits are based. Where the increase in the worker's benefit brings the total family benefits above 80 percent of his average monthly wage, there will be no reduction in the dependents' benefits even though the total exceeds the regular 80-percent maximum.

The benefits of survivors on the rolls will be increased by amounts proportionate to the amount of increase in the primary insurance amount on which their benefits are based. Where the total family benefits payable to survivors of a worker will be subject to the maximum provision of 80 percent of his average monthly wage, the family benefits are nevertheless increased. The smallest amount of increase in such family benefits will be about $5.

IMPROVEMENTS RELATING TO DEDUCTIONS FROM BENEFITS RESULTING FROM WORK

The bill revises the provisions under which deductions are made from the benefits payable to a working beneficiary if he is under age 75 and has earnings in excess of certain specified amounts. The new provisions apply a single test to all the individual's earnings in his taxable year from employment and self-employment and from noncovered as well as covered work. The application of the test to noncovered earnings is made possible by the wide extension of coverage contained in the bill. Without such a broad extension, there would remain large areas of noncovered work for which reports of earnings would not be received by the administration, and enforcement of the provision would not be practicable.

If the individual's earnings for a full year of 12 months are not more than $1,000, no deductions from benefits are made because of such earnings. Each $80 of earnings in excess of $1,000 may result in deductions of 1 month's benefit for the individual and for any dependent drawing benefits based on his record. No deduction may be made, however, for a month during which the individual neither rendered services for wages in excess of $80 nor rendered substantial services in a trade or business. (Where the individual has a taxable year of less than 12 months, the basic exempt amount is reduced proportionately.)

Placing the test on an annual basis, similar to that now used for the self-employed, provides greater flexibility for wage earner beneficiaries, particularly in relation to part-time or intermittent employment. Thus, a wage earner may, for example, earn as much as $200 in each of 5 months of the year and retain all of his benefits. Under present law, which requires that he lose his benefit for each month in which he earns more than $75, he would lose the benefits for those 5 months. If he earned as much as $90 a

month throughout the year under present law, he would lose all of his benefits; under the revised test he would lose only 1 benefit for the year. If he earned $100 a month throughout the year, he would lose only 3 benefits under the revised test instead of all as under present law. The test is liberalized for the self-employed, as compared to present law, by raising the yearly exemption from $900 to $1,000 and by raising the units causing deduction from $75 to $80.

Earnings include remuneration for services rendered in the year as an employee plus net earnings from self-employment in that year less any net loss from self-employment in that year. All remuneration for services as an employee performed within the United States is included. Net earnings from self-employment, for purposes of the test, are identical to net earnings as defined for social-security tax purposes, except that also included are net income or loss from the performance of the functions of a public office and net income or loss from the performance of service as a minister. Net loss is defined as the excess of deductions over income when such excess results from the computations applicable in determining net earnings.

In addition to removing the anomaly in present law whereby the wage earner has a strict monthly test applied to him while the self-employed person enjoys a yearly exemption, the test removes two other anomalies in present law. The extension of the test to noncovered work removes the possibility that beneficiaries may escape the test of retirement by working in noncovered employment. The application of the test to combined wages and net earnings from self-employment in the year avoids the present special advantage whereby a beneficiary may earn as much as $900 in wages plus $900 in net earnings from self-employment in a year and draw all of his benefits for the year.

The bill provides that beneficiaries under age 75 whose earnings in the taxable year exceed the basic exempt amount in the year must report their earnings for the year and other information that may be required. Failure to report as required subjects the individual to penalties in the form of additional deductions. Penalties are not imposed, however, where it is shown that failure to report is due to good cause.

The individual may also be requested to submit current reports of pertinent information prior to the close of the year so that suspension of his benefits may be made on a current basis.

The bill also makes minor amendments relating to the imposition of penalties for failure to file required reports of events causing deductions from benefits.

The provisions relating to the annual test of retirement become effective with taxable years beginning after December 1954.

Deductions for work outside the United States: The bill also provides for making deductions from the benefits of a beneficiary under age 75 for any month in which he engages in a noncovered remunerative activity outside the United States on seven or more different calendar days. If deductions are made for any month for this reason, deductions are also made from the benefits of any dependent drawing benefits on the basis of the individual's wage record. The test applicable to beneficiaries working within the United States does not seem feasible for beneficiaries who work outside the United States, because earnings in such work are not automatically reported either for income tax or social-security purposes.

This provision will terminate the advantage which beneficiaries now have who are outside the United States and working while drawing benefits. Provision is made, however, so that persons who work outside the United States in occupations covered under the act will not be subject to this monthly test of engaging in a remunerative activity, but rather to the annual test of retirement applicable to wages and net earnings in the United States. This will be true, for example of the American citizens working for an American employer abroad.

The individual is required to report months during which he engages in noncovered remunerative activity, and failure to file a timely report results in a penalty in the form of additional deductions. Penalties are not imposed if the failure to report is due to good cause.

The provisions relating to work outside the United States are effective for monthly benefits for months after December 1954.

PRESERVATION OF INSURANCE RIGHTS OF DISABLED PERSONS

Under the present law, old-age and survivors insurance rights may be impaired or lost when regular workers suffer long-term total disability before reaching retirement age. This bill would preserve the insured status and benefit amount of qualified workers who are totally disabled for an extended period. Under the proposed disability freeze provision, when a disabled worker dies or retires, the period of his disability would be disregarded in determining his insured status. In figuring any old-age and survivors benefits due him or his family, the period in which he was incapacitated for work would be excluded from the computation of his average earnings; hence his total earnings would be averaged out over the years in which he actually worked or was able to work. This provision is analogous to the waiver of premium commonly used in life and annuity insurance policies to maintain the protection of these policies for the duration of the policyholder's disability.

In order to be considered totally disabled an individual must have an illness, injury, or other physical or mental impairment which can be expected to be of long-continued and indefinite duration or to result in death. The impairment must be medically determinable and it must preclude the disabled person from performing any substantially gainful work.

A special definition is provided for the blind. An individual would be disabled, by definition, if he is blind within the meaning of that term as used in the bill. In addition, persons who do not meet this statutory definition of blindness, but who nevertheless have a severe visual handicap, would be in the same position as all other disabled persons, i. e., they could qualify for a period of disability under the general definition of disability if they were unable to engage in any substantially gainful activity by reason of their impairment.

A period of disability could not be determined to exist until it has lasted more than 6 full calendar months. The period would be terminated when the individual recovers or it is found that he no longer meets the definition of disability.

In general, to qualify for a period of disability an individual must have engaged in covered work in at least half of the time (he must have 20 quarters of coverage) in the 10 years preceding such period. In addition, to screen out persons who have not recently been employed, an individual must have engaged in covered work in at least half of the time (he must have 6 quarters of coverage) in the 3 years preceding such period. These requirements are, for the most part, more restrictive than those for retirement or death benefits in order that eligibility will, in general, be limited to those whose reason for leaving the labor force was disability.

The first day on which a disabled person could file an application for a "disability determination" would be April 1, 1955.

A person already disabled when these provisions become effective could establish a period of disability extending from the date of actual onset of total disability if he met the work requirements on that date. Retired workers on the benefit rolls could secure a recalculation of their benefit amount (and of their dependents' benefits) to take into account a period of disability which began before the effective date of these provisions. Benefit increases resulting from the application of these provisions would be effective beginning with the month of July 1955.

A 2-year grace period is provided initially within which a disabled person could file to establish his period of disability with full retroactivity to the date of onset. Persons filing after the grace period would have to file application within a year after onset of total disability to have the freeze of their old-age and survivors insurance record effective on the date they first became disabled.

To administer the disability provisions, the Secretary is directed to enter into contractual agreements under which the State vocational rehabilitation agencies or other appropriate State agencies will make findings of fact and a determination as to whether or not an individual is under a disability, as defined in the law, and as to the date such disability began or ceased. The appropriate State agency, pursuant to the agreement entered into with the Secretary, would also make the necessary arrangements to secure medical evidence or medical evaluation of the individual's disability. The use of State vocational rehabilitation agencies is expected to facilitate referral of insured disabled workers to these agencies for the evaluation of their disability and to stimulate measures for their vocational rehabilitation. The Secretary would have authority to make determinations of disability for individuals who are not covered by State agreements.

The Secretary is authorized to review a determination by a State agency that an individual is under a disability and to determine that such person is not under a disability or that the onset of total disability occurred later than determined by the State agency. However, the Secretary cannot, except on appeal by the individual, review a determination by a State agency that a person is not under a disability. Any individual who is dissatisfied with an unfavorable determination made by a State agency or by the Secretary would have the right to a hearing and to judicial review of such determination in the same manner as provided in present law for decisions of the Secretary with respect to the present program.

TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

The bill contains a technical provision (effective for a limited period after enactment) which would provide greater flexibility in the computation of benefits by permitting the use of self-employment income for the year in which entitlement to benefits was established. This change is designed to minimize any substantial adverse effect on average monthly wage which results from the fact that the law does not now permit such earnings to be used in the benefit computation. This adverse effect is most likely to occur in the year or two following coverage extension when the period over which the average monthly wage is computed might be relatively short. The bill also provides (for a limited time after enactment) for the use, on initial computation, of wages for the period immediately preceding the filing of the application. As in the 1952 amendments, this permits an immediate determination of the individual's benefit on the basis of a special report of his wages up to the entitlement, thus obviating the need for recomputing the benefit after 6 months when all of the wages would be posted on his record. The bill also contains a provision to eliminate an anomaly in present law by permitting a self-employed individual whose divisor closing date is later than his self-employment income closing date, to use the earlier date when this would result in a higher benefit amount.

CHANGES IN INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The bill amends the Internal Revenue Code to effectuate, for tax purposes, the extensions of coverage made by the bill, and to conform the provisions of the code to the change in earnings base from $3,600 to $4,200. It also provides that the ultimate tax rate to go into effect in 1970 would be 3½ percent each for employer and employees instead of 3¼ percent, the maximum rate now provided in the law, with a proportionate increase in the ultimate tax rate on self-employment income.

AMENDMENT TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

The bill amends the Railroad Retirement Act to bring its provisions, where necessary, into conformity with the changes made in the Social Security Act by the bill.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE BILL

The bill is designed to carry out the following objectives: To reflect in the law the fact that the old-age and survivors insurance program is growing toward maturity and, in doing so, is providing benefits to an increasing number of aged persons who otherwise would require public assistance; to reduce the cost of public assistance to the Federal Government on a gradual and progressive basis as the need for Federal grants declines; to relate Federal grants more nearly to the respective fiscal abilities of the States than at present; and to simplify administration for the States. To accomplish these objectives, the bill would amend the formula governing Federal payments to the States in each of the four assistance titles.

The philosophy underlying the bill is that the public assistance programs should be viewed in an integrated manner with the old-age and survivors insurance program, and that the Federal grants in the area of old-age assistance should diminish as more and more of the aged in a State are supported through the social insurance program.

The bill would extend the public assistance portions of the Social Security Act amendments of 1952 from October 1, 1954 (when they would otherwise expire) until March 31, 1955. The 1952 provisions raised the maximum assistance payment in which the Federal Government would participate financially, and also increased the proportion of the assistance payments met from Federal funds.

The new formula contained in the bill would become effective April 1, 1955. The State legislatures meeting early in 1955 would thereby be given an opportunity to adjust their public assistance appropriations as might be deemed necessary prior to the effective date of the new formula.

RELATING FEDERAL GRANTS TO FISCAL CAPACITIES OF THE STATES

The bill would relate the Federal grants made to the States to the respective capacities of the States to finance their public assistance programs. The new formula would establish for each State a Federal percentage of the matchable assistance payments made by the State which the Federal Government would meet. This percentage is derived by relating the State's per capita income to the national per capita income.

For a State with a per capita income exactly equal to the national per capita income the Federal percentage would be 65 percent. For States with per capita incomes above the national average the Federal percentage would be below 65 percent (on an inversely proportionate basis). For low per capita income States the Federal percentage would be proportionately higher, inversely, than 65 percent.

The bill provides that the Federal percentage (prior to the reduction referred to below for title I) shall in no case be less than 60 percent. Based upon current data, the highest Federal percentage would be 83 percent under this bill (for the State with the lowest per capita income).

The calculations of the Federal percentage (prior to the reduction referred to below for title I) would change each 2 years. Regularly issued data of the Department of Commerce on per capita income would be used in making these determinations; a 3-year average of the per capita income of each State would be used.

The bill provides that for Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands the Federal percentage would be fixed at 65 percent.

THE OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE FACTOR

In order to reflect the fact that the expansion of the old-age and survivors insurance program will result in considerable State public assistance savings, the bill contains a factor relating the Federal percentage for each State, in title I only, to the proportion of the aged population in that State receiving OASI benefits. Of the population over 65 years of age in any State, for every 5 percent which is receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits the Federal percentage in title I would be reduced 1 percentage point.

Data prepared by the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce would be used as the basis for the population estimates of the number of persons over 65 years of age in each State. Data is issued regularly by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance on the number of beneficiaries, by States. This calculation modifying the Federal percentage would be made annually.

MAXIMUM LOSS PROVISION

Under the variable matching provisions (modified in title I by the old-age and survivors insurance factor), it is anticipated that some States will receive less Federal public assistance funds. However, it is intended that no State shall suffer a financial loss which would make it difficult to maintain the present level of assistance payments in that State.

For this reason, the bill contains a transitional provision operative for the first 2¼ years. This bridge would limit the loss in Federal funds which a State might experience in those years to 12 percent of the Federal funds received by the State in the base period (the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954), provided the State spends the same amount from State and local funds. Under this provision, for the 2¼ year period, no State would lose as much in Federal funds as it would were the McFarland amendments to expire.

SIMPLIFIED ADMINISTRATION

The bill provides for a simplification in administration long sought by the State and Federal public assistance administrators. The bill replaces the present individual recipient maximum on assistance payments in which there will be Federal financial participation with an average payment maximum.

At present, cash payments made to an individual must be added to any medical payments paid with respect to such individual. Federal financial participation can be claimed only in that portion of the total which, as to each individual, is not in excess of $55 in any month ($30 for the first child and $21 for subsequent children in the same home, in the aid to dependent children program).

Under this bill, the Federal percentage (modified as described above for old-age assistance) would be applied to all assistance expenditures to the extent that in any month they do not exceed $55 ($27.50 in the aid to dependent children program) times the number of recipients. The result would be the Federal share of the total expenditures. States would thus be able to balance their high assistance payments (which occure primarily where medical expenses are involved) with the low payments, and to eliminate much of the elaborate bookkeeping now maintained.

PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The dollar limitation fixed in title XI of the Social Security Act on the amount of Federal funds the two territories, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, may receive would be increased under the bill by 25 percent: to $5,312,500 for Puerto Rico and to $200,000 for the Virgin Islands. This provision would be effective July 1, 1954.

The maximums in the present law on the individual assistance payment for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands would be retained. These are $30 a month in titles I, X, and XIV, and in title IV, $18 a month for the first child in the home receiving aid and $12 for each additional child.

As indicated above, the Federal percentage for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands would be increased from 50 percent to 65 percent.

RELATED LEGISLATION

Section 9, relating to public assistance, of the Navajo-Hopi Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 474, 81st Cong.) would be repealed by this bill.

Section 9 of that act provides that the Federal Government is to pay 80 percent of what would be the normal State share (in addition to the normal Federal share) of assistance payments made to Navajo and Hopi Indians residing on their reservations. These reservations are located in the States of New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah.

Section 9 was included in the Rehabilitation Act in recognition that these Indians are a low-income group among whom need is great and who contribute little to the tax revenues of the States involved. These factors are reflected in the per capita income of these States, which under this bill would be an important factor in determining the Federal share of assistance payments made by the States. It is anticipated that the States involved would all receive a substantial net financial gain under the bill in spite of the repeal of section 9 of the Navajo-Hopi Rehabilitation Act. Thus, the need for section 9 no longer exists.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

This bill would also make several amendments of a technical nature in the computation and payment portions of the public-assistance provisions. These amendments are the same as amendments made on a temporary basis in 1946 (when the original 50-50 matching formula for public-assistance grants was abandoned).

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951 — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 296)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (Public Law 50, 82d Cong.), I hereby submit to the Congress a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing trade agreements.

This report was prepared for me by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1954.*

(Enclosure: Report on trade-agreement escape clauses.)

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 297)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing the condition of the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953, in accordance with section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724), 79th Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1954.*

(Enclosure: Report Concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.)

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague in the other body, Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, and I are introducing today the International Travel Development Act of 1954 to establish a 10-member Presidential-Congressional United States Travel Commission to prepare a program to promote international travel and the exchange of visitors into and from the United States in cooperation with the domestic travel industry and national, regional, and international agencies established for that purpose.

The Commission is required to report its program for the promotion of international travel to the President and the Congress by January 2, 1955, and will expire on December 31, 1955. Its program would, first, recommend means to stimulate and assist the expansion of international travel into and from the United States as well as travel for purposes of study, culture, sport, conferences, conventions, exploration, and similar activities; second, provide for the exchange and utilization of technical information on travel; third, consider official regulations, procedures, and impediments to international travel; and fourth, cooperate in broadening the market for travel by encouraging lower cost and larger capacity transport facilities, means for inviting visitors, means for overcoming language barriers, and the increase and improvement of accommodations and facilities. The aim of the program would be to work within the framework of the American travel industry and to utilize the channels and facilities of the industry.

It is reliably estimated that the effective promotion and stimulation of international travel can add $1,300,000,000 per year in trade, not aid, to the economy of the other free peoples starting in 1954 and coming to full realization by 1957. It is the purpose of this program to implement the slogan of trade, not aid, with concrete and constructive legislation, to reduce the need for foreign economic assistance and to replace foreign grants with going business insofar as possible. One of the best immediate steps to replace aid with trade is through travel. Its potentials are enormous if we can encourage more low-fare transportation, call attention to new places overseas for recreation and learning, facilitate documentary requirements, deal with expanding, improving, and leveling costs for accommodations for travelers and deal with currency restrictions and language and similar barriers. It should be understood that the intention is to help our domestic travel industry as well as to help foreign nations of the free world.

The United States Travel Commission which we propose to be established by the Congress would be a high-level agency although operating on a low budget. It would recommend programs to Congress, work within the framework of the Departments of Commerce and State, and be similar to bodies in 63 other countries as well as regional commissions to stimulate travel like the European Travel Commission, the African Travel Commission, the Asian and Far Eastern Travel Commission, the Caribbean Tourist Association, and the Pacific Travel Association, as well as working with such agencies as the International Union of Official Travel Organizations and the International Institute for Scientific Travel Research. The Commission is to be composed of 10 members, 3 appointed by the President from the executive departments, 2 Senators appointed by the Vice President, 2 Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House, and 3 appointed by the President from the travel industry.

It is estimated that for 1953 some 800,000 Americans will have spent $1,200,000 for travel outside this country. This is more dollars than earned by any other single United States import except coffee. Reliable estimates on the expansion possibilities in international travel based on the disposable income available to the American people, available leisure time, and on standards for expected international travel established as far back as 1929 show that there is a potential of 1,300,000 United States overseas travelers per year and that expenditures of this number of travelers would be at least $1,300,000,000 more than the 1953 expenditure, or at least $2,500,000,000 a year. It is estimated, for example, that the current travel volume of 332,000 to Europe and the Mediterranean in 1952 can be increased to 800,000.

The impediments to travel are official restrictions on visas, customs, and similar regulations for the traveler and for the carrier such as port taxes, excessive documentary requirements, and landing rights, and other operating restrictions, inadequacy of hotel accommodations, inadequacy of development of recreation and sightseeing areas and the costs of transportation. The most remarkable advances have been made in bringing down the costs of transportation, particularly by air-coach fares and reduced off-season travel rates to Europe on ships and planes. This has made for the most extraordinary stimulus to international travel in the postwar era. The greatest impediments have been the absence of adequate hotel accommodations and development of recreation and sightseeing areas which make lower tour costs less attainable.

The vast importance of the stimulation of international travel to domestic travel must also be recognized. The expenditures by United States citizens for domestic travel in 1952, exclusive of business travel, aggregated $16,645,796,700 as estimated by the National Association of Travel Organizations. This represents a very appreciable element in domestic business which will be effectively stimulated and further developed by the encouragement and development of international travel.

BOLTON EQUAL PAY BILL

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide that equal wages shall be paid for comparable work, regardless of the sex of the worker.

The subject of equal-pay legislation is not new. Bills have been introduced in every Congress since 1945. Several bills are now pending before the Committee on Education and Labor.

This bill is simple and direct. It would make unlawful the payment of wages to one employee at a rate less than that paid to another of the opposite sex if their work is of comparable character on jobs requiring comparable skills. But it would not affect wages paid on seniority or merit increase systems.

It directs the Secretary of Labor to establish standards to determine which jobs involve work of comparable character or skills. An employee may sue for wages he was deprived of because his employer violated the act, or he may request the Secretary of Labor to bring such court action. It prohibits an employer from firing or discriminating against an employee who sues or testifies under the act and it provides for injunctions against violators of the act.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the result of a year of intensive study on the subject, including correspondence with about 1,000 leaders in American labor, business, education, and women's affairs. The experts who replied almost all agreed with the principle of equal pay and a

large majority were in favor of a Federal law to enforce it.

Let me add that the practice of equal pay for comparable work is essential to a healthy economy because it protects wage levels of all workers and thereby sustains consumer purchasing power. When large numbers of workers can be hired at lower rates of pay than those prevailing at any given time, the competition of such persons for jobs results either in the displacement of the higher paid workers or in the acceptance by them of lower rates. Over a period of time this pressure tends to depress all wage levels, and unless this normal course is averted by direct action, it results eventually in lower levels of earnings for all, with a resulting reduction in purchasing power and in standards of living.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that although the beneficiaries of this legislation would be primarily women, this bill is not directed solely at them. There are many cases in which a man's pay would be affected favorably.

FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL, ANGELES NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing an emergency appropriation bill for the construction of works for fire prevention and flood control in and below the Angeles National Forest, located almost entirely within my district of Los Angeles County. Last July and September there were two disastrous forest fires in this forest, burning an aggregate of over 45,000 acres of valuable watershed, each of which we are convinced could have been held to a small fraction of their loss and damage had we had a better fire-control and prevention equipment system. One of these resulted in a greatly increased flood hazard to the Littlerock Dam and the important Antelope Valley with its vital jet airfields at Palmdale and Muroc.

I personally made a thorough inspection of the need of improving this fire-prevention service under the direction of the Forestry Division of the Department of Agriculture, together with recommendation for corrections.

But just before Christmas, and before these could be submitted to the Congress, two other fires broke out on the south slopes of the mountains. These could not be brought under control before, without warning, on Sunday the 27th, a 100-mile-an-hour gale, known to us as a santyana, hit, and these disastrous fires spread with lightning-like rapidity, burning a territory on the front watershed of the mountains of approximately 14,000 acres each before being brought under control by the most complete and well-managed fire-fighting cooperation in the history of southern California.

I am asking for $5 million emergency appropriation which provides $3,576,000 capital installation for increased truck trails—fire roads—foot and horse trails, buildings, pieces of fire equipment—trucks, tractors, bulldozers, and so forth—radio installations, both fixed and mobile, telephone lines, water tanks and systems, fire lanes and fire breaks. There is further included $710,000 per year of additional manning which is considered largely adequate for suppressing future fires at their origin, even in the extraordinary dry years, such as we have just had. It should be stressed that the cost of emergency fire-fighting expenditures during 1953 was $1,414,000, so that the $710,000 per year cost of manning presents an actual dollar saving regardless of the value of preventing many millions of dollars' worth of disaster.

By far the more vitally important consideration, however, is the recommended watershed-control measure to prevent disastrous flood hazards including measures for desilting flood-control reservoirs, and in particular to expedite construction of the flood-control improvements proposed by the Corps of Engineers for Saw Pit Wash just above and through the city of Monrovia.

Those not familiar with the disastrous effects of previous floods in these mountains and below them cannot appreciate the danger to cities and towns in the loss of homes and buildings and even lives, resulting from a sudden rush of water, mud, and especially rushing giant boulders. That can happen and actually has happened.

For many years the foothill towns of Monrovia, Sierra Madre, Arcadia, and Altadena have been free from this type of hazard due to the heavy growth of trees and underbrush on the sides of the mountains. Such floods as came have been fairly well controlled by debris dams, concrete-enclosed washes, and so forth, largely paid for by the county of Los Angeles and local funds supplemented by the engineering and funds of the Army engineers.

Suddenly, however, with the south slopes of the mountain blackened and bare, completely denuded of this moisture-retaining undergrowth, disaster threatens.

Immediate improvement of the flood-control systems below the Saw Pit Dam, previously engineered and scheduled for a later date, now becomes urgent. The desilting of the debris dams, most of them on Federal property in the Angeles National Forest, likewise must be done immediately and the stepping-up of the previously engineered and scheduled improvements in the Santa Anita, Sierra Madre, Michillinda, Arcadia, and other canyons suddenly becomes immediate and urgent, together with the stepping ahead of the Rio Hondo connecting flood-control channels to absorb the runoffs. The estimated cost of the Saw Pit improvement approximates $4 million and the accelerating of the other presently scheduled improvements is estimated at $1 million.

It is important for the Congress to know that the participation of Los Angeles County, the State of California, and the local communities in the entire flood-control project has over the years exceeded $600 million, or more than $1.50 for every dollar of Federal appropriation. In other words, the local communities are doing all they possibly can, and the water, debris, and boulders threatening disaster to the communities come very largely from federally owned watersheds in the mountains.

The Los Angeles Board of Supervisors and the California State Forestry Board have both met, planned immediate cooperation, and have both petitioned the United States Department of Agriculture, the United States Forester, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Congress to support this program and make available the necessary appropriations to maintain an adequate level of Federal fire protection in the national forests and take adequate steps for the prevention and control of disastrous floods.

The appropriation of this emergency money is urgent. It is a responsibility of the Federal Government and has been authorized under previous acts. Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate passage of this measure.

AUTHORITY OVER EMPLOYMENT BY HEAD OF AGENCY

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill in the House today providing that the head of each executive agency shall have discretion and control over the employment of all employees of his agency receiving a salary of $10,000 or more, despite any other provisions of law.

It is the right of any administration, whether Democratic or Republican, to carry out the program which it espouses. To effectively do this, an administration must be able to place men in the top positions of the various Government departments and agencies who believe in the party program and can be relied upon to faithfully carry out such a program. If an administration does not have this power it is not capable of efficiently and effectively carrying out the desires of the people as expressed in the immediately preceding elections.

It is often difficult to determine which jobs in the various departments and agencies are policy making and therefore should be subject to control by the administration and which jobs are not policy making and therefore should be subject to protection by the civil-service regulations.

In order to eliminate some of the confusion that exists with respect to the rights of an administration with respect to appointments, I have introduced this bill, which provides as follows:

That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the head of each department

and agency in the executive branch of the Government, in his discretion, may terminate the employment of any person employed in such department or agency whose basic compensation is at a rate in excess of $10,000 per annum. This act shall not apply to any person entitled to veterans' preference for employment with the Federal Government.

I believe it generally can be considered that anyone in the Federal Government earning over $10,000 per year has a policymaking position or at least a position of such importance that it should be subject to the immediate control of the administration in order for it to effectively carry out its program.

Anyone holding a policymaking position which pays less than $10,000 per year should also be subject to removal. But it is the intent of this bill to make it clear that anyone earning over $10,000 per year can be subject to removal. Actually, very few employees would fall within the scope of this proposed law. There are approximately 9,600 Federal employees earning over $10,000 per year out of a total of some 2,200,000 employees. This is less than one-half of 1 percent. The actual figure would be less than this, since these persons entitled to veterans' preference would not be affected.

Federal employees earning over $10,000 a year should have no complaint about this bill, since I do not believe a person should reasonably expect to have both job security and high pay at the same time. Most persons in comparable positions in industry do not have it and high ranking Government employees should not expect it. The purpose of civil-service job security is to protect technically competent personnel of lower income by assuring them of a certain degree of financial security for themselves and families, and thereby create better morale and efficiency among Government workers. Those earning over $10,000 a year, however, should well be able to safeguard their own financial security from their earnings and not be reliant on job security for financial protection.

Furthermore, my bill would replace uncertainty with certainty with respect to positions paying over $10,000 per year. Anyone offered such a position would know in advance that it entails no permanent tenure and could then consider this fact in determining whether to accept or not accept the offered position.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special order heretofore entered.

SHIFT OF NEW ENGLAND INDUSTRIES TO THE SOUTH

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is putting it mildly to say that I was shocked and grieved to read a newspaper release credited to my good friend, THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts. I say I was shocked because it is so unlike Congressman LANE whom I have always considered a gentleman and a scholar, that I cannot believe he wrote it. The statement claims that the South has been "stealing" New England's industries and thus has put out of work tens of thousands of New Englanders 40 years of age and over.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] thinks that the Federal Government should tax bonds which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] alleges are being issued by Southern States and communities to build plants to lure industry from New England to the South; and introduced a bill which would have this effect.

While I see nothing inherently wrong in the offering of inducements by States and communities in the South to get industry to build and operate plants in our favored clime, yet certainly in my own State of Georgia, no such inducements have been offered. As a matter of fact, our State cannot issue bonds because of a Constitutional provision which prohibits it. Furthermore, our local governmental units are so restricted in the amount of bonds that may be outstanding at any time—7 percent of the assessed property values—that they are hard put to it to issue sufficient bonds to build the necessary public buildings such as schools, courthouses and the like. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] says that we "may be chuckling now but it won't last" and he chides us for what he calls "tax evasion and sweatshop wages and failure to abide by decent standards and decent practices." No, Mr. LANE, we are not chuckling or rejoicing at unemployment conditions in New England. It is too serious a matter for that and certainly I, and I am sure most Southerners, are not happy over any unemployment that may now exist in New England. You must remember, Mr. LANE, that after the War Between the States, unfair freight rates were fastened upon the South and a sort of reign of terror imposed upon us by scalawags and carpetbaggers who came into the South to disrupt and hamper our recovery; so much so that that entire era in American history has been called the Tragic Era. I think you will admit, Mr. LANE, that I have not been sectional in my voting record since I have been a Member of Congress and that I have not appealed to sectional prejudices in any way. We people in the South have long since abandoned any feeling of hostility toward the States and the peoples above the Mason-Dixon line, except when we are unfairly attacked as you have done. Our boys during two world wars and during the Korean stalemate have fought side by side with the young men from the North, the East and the West so that there is no longer any hostility in the hearts of our people toward the people of New England or any other section of our great country.

I and others from the South have objected to what the Wall Street Journal calls Boondoggle in Defense, that is, the use of military procurement in an effort to solve the unemployment that exists in New England and a few other localities throughout the country. We have done this, even though there are a few of these areas in our midst, because we consider that, as the Wall Street Journal says, this sort of use of the awarding of defense contracts to try to relieve unemployment is wholly unsound, is merely a temporary expedient and really offers no solution to the unemployment in New England. But we stand ready to vote for measures that will help the unemployment situation in your section of the country provided, of course, it does not at the same time do damage and cause unemployment in other sections.

I have mentioned the fact that we struggled during the days of reconstruction and up until a few years ago under the burden of unfair freight rates. These unfair freight rates made it necessary that industry in the South produce its goods at the lowest possible cost in order to compete upon anywhere near even terms with industry in other sections of the country. Fortunately for the South, one of Georgia's brilliant young men, former Gov. Ellis Arnall, and other southern statesmen who came to his aid, forced the Interstate Commerce Commission to equalize freight rates so that we could compete upon even terms with the industries in other parts of the country. The establishment of a fair freight rate structure is one of the main reasons why industry has moved south. Another reason that the textile and other industries have moved south is to be near raw materials that exist in abundance and to take advantage of climatic conditions which make life in the South somewhat less rigorous and more pleasant for the Anglo-Saxon labor that we have in abundance. Moreover, the workers in the South are independent in their nature, love their freedom, and do not take to organization into labor unions as readily as peoples where the racial structure is not so homogenous.

You speak of indecent standards and indecent practices and sweatshop conditions. Admittedly at one time conditions in our textile mills were not all that should have prevailed but they were caused largely by the unfair freight rates that had been forced upon us. Now our captains of industry are enlightened and intelligent enough to know that they cannot expect the best work from laborers who are underfed, ill-housed, and ignorant. So we have good schools, modern factories, air conditioned and with the temperature maintained at the proper level along with proper humidity. There are playgrounds and decent housing facilities practically everywhere in the South. In those areas where these conditions have not existed, and even sometimes where these conditions exist, the men have organized themselves into

labor unions and the relationship between such unions and management is on the whole healthy and good.

You would be surprised, Mr. LANE, how happy are the people who have moved from Pittsfield, Mass., to Rome, Ga., to work in a plant constructed by General Electric to build transformers. They were surprised that during most of the fall they could go about in their shirtsleeves and to find that in the winter they are not hampered by snow and ice in getting from their homes to their places of employment. Many of them already say they would not go back to living conditions in Pittsfield. They have found our southern labor friendly, intelligent, and alert. I recall that you, Mr. LANE, and others from your State joined in an effort to try to prevent the granting of a tax amortization certificate to General Electric as it planned to establish this plant in Rome. Justice prevailed and the certificate was granted in spite of your efforts and the efforts of the CIO and electrical unions under the leadership of Mr. James Carey. I am not blaming any of you for trying to prevent the establishment of this plant in the South though I think your efforts were unwarranted for the truth is that this has not meant less business for Pittsfield and my information is that at the same time this plant is being built in the South, the facilities of General Electric are being expanded in Pittsfield. No, Mr. LANE, when one section of our country is prospering, it must in the end mean that other sections who meet the necessary conditions will be prospering. We have no desire to take your factories away from you, but we do solicit and invite the establishment of plants and factories in the South and have to offer to those who will consider the establishment of new industries or the expansion of old ones, the many advantages I have already referred to such as skilled and loyal Anglo-Saxon labor, wonderful climate, good working conditions, nearness to supplies of raw materials, favorable location with reference to markets and, at last, fair freight rates.

Mr. LANE, let us forget sectionalism and the making of unfair charges against each other and work together for the improvement of our country as a whole. If you will come to the South, visit our modern factories and mills, talk to our intelligent and happy southern laborers, you will see just how wrong you are about alleged sweatshop conditions and wages. True it is there have been wage differentials because of easier living conditions in the South; but I agree with you that where these still exist they should be eliminated, for our southern workers are entitled to the same wages paid to labor in the North, and my understanding is that whatever differences in wage scales have existed in the past are rapidly being eliminated.

My information is that industrialists in your section are acting constructively to attract new industry to your area and to hold what you have. Surely that is the answer to your problem and not abuse of the South.

Your unfortunate newspaper release is unworthy of you, Mr. LANE, and wholly unlike the splendid gentleman I know you to be.

PLACING OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS IN DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the President entered an order reviving the short-lived Truman policy of placing Government contracts in so-called depressed areas, even though lower and better bids are submitted from concerns located in other sections of the country. The effect of the order is to circumvent the long-established sound policy of letting Federal contracts to the lowest and best bidders.

This new policy will result in terrific pressures, political and otherwise, on Federal administrators to let contracts in certain specified areas and in many instances the contracts will go to those who can put on the greater pressure. Politics will certainly come into play.

The order unquestionably will result in discriminations against the South and West. It will result in increased costs of government, increased national debt, and increased taxes. And it could and probably will result in graft and scandals. To say the least, it leaves wide open the avenue to yield to the temptation of favoring certain bidders ostensibly on the ground that the bidder's plant is located in a so-called depressed area, but in reality because he is a political friend or for some other improper or maybe scandalous reason. No method of letting Government contracts has ever been devised which improves on the policy of letting contracts to the lowest and best bidders.

Legislation has been introduced to set aside the President's order, which I hope is favorably acted upon by the House of Representatives. The power of the President to enter any such order ought to be recalled. While the President was no doubt sincere in entering such an order, it is contrary to the sound policy of Government contracting with and purchasing from the lowest bidders.

As a part of my remarks I include an editorial which appeared in the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., on December 31, 1953, a newspaper which agrees with the above views, and one which, incidentally, supported the candidacy of President Eisenhower. The editorial follows:

DR. EISENHOWER PRESCRIBES

President Eisenhower has called general attention to an Office of Defense Mobilization policy announced nearly 2 months ago for favoring areas of unemployment with purchase contracts. It is a revival of a short-lived Truman policy.

When competitive bidding has established prices, about a quarter of some contracts is to be set aside in case other firms in areas with a large amount of unemployment want work at that price.

The Department of Labor has a short list of centers of unemployment, including Terre Haute, Ind.; Lowell, Mass.; Winston-Salem, N. C.; Altoona, Pa.; and others.

These are spots of maladjustment on a map of business activity at higher levels than have ever been known, with the single exception of a year ago. To the amazement of professional economists and businessmen of long experience, the roaring economy whirled upward year after year to heights that are dizzy from every view except the peak.

It seems to us that finding a flat spot on top of the mountain, an atmosphere of firmer money, a chance for the salaried man to catch his breath, could be managed without the President pointing down the slope to unemployment.

The Eisenhower theme song has been fewer artificial elements in business, a return of business decisions from Washington to the businessmen. This new tone from the White House is slightly out of tune.

It is thoroughly proper for the President to be concerned about the unemployed any year. It is especially good politics in a year of congressional elections, but it will take a firm hand to keep unemployment in districts represented by Republican Members of Congress from getting more attention than districts of Democratic voters.

We also call attention to a probability that a bidder for a defense contract whose plant is in an area of unemployment will make a low bid, and being the normal winner of the contract, he might get through this abnormal procedure.

We will wait on this one. We will wait to see how many defense contracts are actually shifted because of unemployment; where such contracts go, and how well it works.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 7 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE REPUBLICAN CRUSADE

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as the Republican crusade enters its second year, almost every member of the team has been issuing a statement of new promises.

At least one member of the team, however, has seen fit to issue a statement of accomplishment. I refer to the Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, who issued the Treasury statement for December 31, 1953. Mr. Humphrey's statement may not make good reading, but it is factual.

It shows that when the great crusade got under way a year ago this month, the national debt stood at $267 billion. After a 12 months' crusade, the debt has risen to $275 billion. In other words, the Government is $9 billion deeper in the red than it was a year ago.

The Republican Party is now trying to sell the idea that there are two kinds of deficits, one good and one bad. The one that is good is the Republican kind but the one that is bad belongs to the Democrats.

A bad deficit comes about by spending more than you take in, whereas a good deficit comes about by taking in less than you spend. Oh, economy. What sins have been committed in thy name by the Republican crusade.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, of course I may say to my good friend from Missouri that all the Republicans did in running up that debt was to pay off the obligations that you gentlemen contracted. You went ahead and put through contracts, did you not?

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. And the gentleman's party has been in power 12 months.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And then we had to keep your promises to pay and you are sore about it. What do you want us to do about it? Repudiate the debts you made—ignore the contracts you made? Welsh on the obligations we inherited from you?

WATER POLLUTION

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to advise my colleagues that I am today introducing legislation which will provide a three-pronged approach to the solution of a bad national situation concerning the pollution of our streams and inland bodies of water. The approach will be in the nature of municipal, industrial, and mine pollution in the streams of the Nation. I shall, as soon as convenient, put in the RECORD ample data to show the need for this kind of legislation, and that it should be enacted by this session of the Congress.

REPUBLICAN CRUSADE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I notice that my dear friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has joined numerous of his brethren at the wailing wall crying about previous commitments, but you know if those commitments run to certain companies, such as Chrysler, they found that they could just cancel them and they did not have to pay them. They canceled the tank contract with Chrysler, and they canceled the tank contract with the American Locomotive Co. They have not canceled any as yet with General Motors so far as I know. So if it is not too much trouble to cancel a few with General Motors, they do not need to cry about previous commitments, but just cut them off. Then they can keep their 1952 "stump promises" and balance the budget.

Perhaps they could even cancel all the contracts for all the Armed Forces and come up with an impregnable defense. According to their story, they cut down the Air Force and still have a better Air Force than before. If anybody is foolish enough to follow this theory to its ultimate conclusion, why not abolish the Air Force and have a defense for the United States that would be impenetrable.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, listening to the comments of the gentleman from Ohio, if he would only specify and outline some of these charges, perhaps he would not be able to get away with this statement. Those statements that he made were obviously incorrect.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; I certainly will yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The statements were not obviously incorrect. You did cancel the contract with American Locomotive and you did cancel the tank contract with Chrysler.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am stating this, that the overall picture the gentleman tried to present is incorrect, that there is any favoritism to General Motors or anybody else, and if you will look at the contracts you will see it is so.

I am impugning the gentleman's statement.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am out of order, of course, but I do hope we do not start this session in any such form as this, because such incidents have a tendency to snowball. There is a way of saying that a gentleman is mistaken in his figures or statements, but when one says that a certain statement is an untruth, it is a violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Of course, that is exactly what I intended to imply, may I say to the minority leader. As far as saying that the statement was untrue is concerned, what I meant was that there is a disagreement as to whether the statement is correct. I do not intend to impugn the gentleman's motives.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman is anxious to make a reply, but I am sure he would have to revise his remarks very basically to stay within the rules of the House. There is a way out of it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask to revise my remarks to change "untrue" to "incorrect."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. In view of that, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request that the words be taken down.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I conclude by saying that the issue presented here is how many c. o. d.'s have been issued on commitments this Government is obligated to fulfill. That is the issue on this Federal debt, not the question of appropriation. I think the statements of the gentleman from Michigan were entirely in order in refuting the statement of my colleague from Missouri.

And, Mr. Speaker, as an extension of these remarks, may I express my concern that through inadvertence, I trust, the reporter's transcript containing the body of the remarks I made challenging the correctness of the gentleman from Ohio's remarks was not delivered to me for correction. That in spite of diligent effort to find this transcript on the part of the Office of the Reporter of Debates it has not been found. It is for this reason alone that the body of my remarks do not appear in this RECORD at this time.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is all right to take the floor here and make some remarks, but the fact remains that during the last campaign, during 1952, the promise was made to balance the budget. The Republicans knew then what the situation was. They have failed to balance the budget in the present fiscal year, and they are failing to balance the budget in the next fiscal year.

We know that after Congress appropriates the money the President has the power to "freeze" the appropriations. During the past year, if the present administration had desired to do so it could have "frozen" enough money to balance the budget. I am not complaining because they did not, but when we hear these arguments about what could be done and what could not be done, the fact remains that if the present administration wanted to balance the budget they could have done it. They could have taken even more drastic action to carry out their promises.

As I say, I am not criticizing because they did not do it, but I am commenting upon the fact that they made the promises and if they wanted to balance the budget they could have done it, and can do it. What the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] said, as well as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN], is absolutely correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Has the President authority to cancel contracts?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry, in the opinion of the Chair.

THE LATE FRED M. VINSON

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Kentucky has produced a great number of men who have dedicated their lives to public service, but with the death of Fred M. Vinson, Chief Justice of the United States, on September 8, 1953, not only Kentucky but the Nation lost one of its truly great public servants.

He believed in the supreme worth of the individual and in his right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; he believed further that the law was made for man and not man for the law; he believed that Government is the servant of the people and not their master.

Early in life he learned that a real representative of the people is not one which changes principles with every shift of the wind but rather one who while in close communication with his people translates into practical form their opinions and wishes as revealed to his mature judgment and enlightened conscience.

Upon his elevation to positions of trust in our National Government, he laid aside any local prejudice he may have held and was guided only by the democratic principle of the greatest good for the greatest number. He was always a worshiper of liberty and a friend of the oppressed.

Mr. Speaker, the world can ill afford the loss of such a dedicated public servant. The great Commonwealth of Kentucky joins with the Congress of the United States in extending to Mrs. Vinson and her sons our deepest sympathy.

PROCEDURE IN DEBATE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, there was some expression by the gentleman from Texas about how we ought to debate, and that is all right. I am sure everyone feels that way about it.

To get to this particular issue, of course, following that same tenor, we must expect a certain amount of, oh, I would not use the words "needling" or "sniping" because that might not be parliamentary language, but we must expect that our friends on the Democratic side from time to time are going to try to make capital out of things as they see them. Now, we expect that and we applaud them for it. But the plain fact is that the 1st session of this Congress, cooperating with the Republican administration with some help from some Democrats, of course, but with many of them not helping at all, did cut from $13 billion to $14 billion from the Truman-requested appropriations, about which it was said no cuts could be made. The fact that cuts were made resulted in reductions in spending of $5 billion to $7 billion during the fiscal year, which made possible the 10-percent reduction in Federal taxes the people of this country are presently enjoying. But for those savings there could have been no tax reduction this year. If the Truman budget had been accepted, there would have been no tax reduction possible in any foreseeable time in the near future.

When you talk about what was promised, let it be recalled that we promised first of all in our platform to cut the cost of government. That we have done. We promised to balance the budget, particularly as those cuts could be made and could be shown to have their effect on our economy. Balancing of the budget is rapidly approaching. It cannot be gainsaid that the $81 billion of carryovers, carryover obligations which we inherited and which we found on the books when this administration took office, make it impossible to immediately bring government income and outgo into balance. Some of the gentleman who protest so loudly about how we might have cancelled certain contracts and obligations were in the forefront of those people, for instance, who said that the Air Force budget could not and should not be cut. Well, we did reduce that budget, and I might add without the help of some of you who should have helped, and today we have a better Air Force than we would have had if we had not taken the action we did.

DEPRECIATION ALLOWANCE FOR NEW MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to provide that depreciation allowances for new machinery and equipment acquired after December 31, 1953, shall, with certain limitations, be determined by taxpayers. The purpose of this bill is to encourage the modernization of the Nation's productive plant by permitting taxpayers to judge for themselves, with limitations, the period over which their investments in new machinery and equipment will be recovered.

I have long been concerned about the obsolete productive equipment in this country. Much of it is obsolete today. Time and again in periods of national danger it has been found inadequate to produce our defense requirements. In World War II and at the time of the conflict in Korea, emergency tax amortization statutes had to be passed in an effort to expand our facilities. With our Nation's welfare at stake, a permanent plan for the encouragement of plant modernization and a high level of productivity in the machine-tool industry should be enacted into law.

I was very much interested to read the statement of Mr. L. D. McDonald, chairman of the tax-policy subcommittee of the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, before the Committee on Ways and Means on July 22, 1953. Mr. McDonald, speaking on behalf of the machine-tool industry pointed out most ably how the Treasury's restrictive depreciation policy, started in 1934, of permitting the recovery of investments in productive equipment only over an unrealistically long period of useful life, discouraged new investments. Taxpayers did not replace obsolete equipment with modern equipment, since they could not recover their investment over a reasonably short period of time out of foreseeable income to be produced by the new equipment. The bill I have introduced will, I believe, correct this situation.

The effect of the bill, if enacted into law, would be to give taxpayers an election, in lieu of computing depreciation under prior Treasury policy, of determining for themselves the manner in which depreciation deductions would be taken. The bill imposes the limitation that the depreciation allowance for the year in which new machinery and equipment is installed or acquired shall not exceed 50 percent of the adjusted basis of the machinery or equipment. The new election available to taxpayers would apply only to new machinery and equipment, the installation or acquisition of which is completed after December 31, 1953.

In order to prevent the possibility that taxpayers might write off new equipment against income over a short period of time, and then sell it for tax advantage, the bill provides that in the event of a sale of such machinery or equipment held for less than 5 years, the difference between its adjusted basis computed under the new election and the adjusted basis otherwise determined shall be considered as gain from the sale or exchange of property which is neither a capital asset nor property described in subsection (j).

By liberalizing depreciation allowances, investments in new plant and equipment will be encouraged with a resultant expansion of the productive base. This in turn will mean continued output of the machine-tool industry, increased employment throughout the plants of the Nation, and a broadened tax base for future years.

At the same time, there should be little or no adverse effect upon current revenues. For example, let us compare the case of a company with $500,000 invested in old machinery which it is depreciating at a 5-percent—20-year—rate under present Treasury policy, and a company which under the bill replaces $500,000 of old machinery with new machinery costing $1 million, and which determines to write off the new machinery at a 10-percent—10-year—rate.

The first company is permitted an allowance for depreciation of 5 percent of $500,000 or $25,000 per year. The second company will be allowed annual depreciation of 10 percent of $1 million or $100,000. Thus, the depreciation allowance being offset against income by the second company exceeds that of the first company by $75,000. As will be apparent, however, to those in industry, the income which will be produced by the $1 million in new machinery will be substantially more than the income produced by the old machinery. It should be much more than the additional

$75,000 depreciation charge. Thus the second company will be paying more in taxes because the new equipment produces greater earnings.

If in individual cases there is a temporary loss in revenues resulting in the initial period under this new depreciation plan, this would more than be offset by, first, the additional income subject to tax after the new investments had been written off; and, second, the increased earnings subject to tax which would stem from the utilization of the more efficient and productive facilities.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when one Member makes a statement from the well of the House, are all other Members bound to accept that as being accurate or may it be challenged in parliamentary language?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is propounding a question which is a matter for the individual Members of the House to consider and not for the Speaker of the House to decide.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND CALLING OF PRIVATE CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object, is there any legislative program for next week?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, there are a few bills on the Private Calendar and also some on the Consent Calendar. In view of that fact, I ask that it be in order to call the Private Calendar on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. There are no rules outstanding, I may say, that could be put on for action next week. It has been suggested to me that possibly the Armed Services Committee might get out the Air Academy bill. There are 2 or 3 other measures that have been reported or may be reported that may be put on for action. As soon as I determine about them I will inform the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain newspaper articles and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FOLLOWING THROUGH—A PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in his message of January 11, the President proposed certain changes in the Taft-Hartley Act.

After stating that present statutory standards were "not adequate to protect and conserve these funds that are held in trust for the welfare of individual union members," he stated:

> It is my recommendation that Congress initiate a thorough study of welfare and pension funds covered by collective bargaining agreements, with a view of enacting such legislation as will protect and conserve these funds for the millions of working men and women who are the beneficiaries.

WE WERE ON THE JOB

More than a year ago, facts brought to my attention showed conclusively that throughout this Nation there existed a gigantic, wicked conspiracy to, through the use of force, threats of force, and economic pressure, extort, and collect millions of dollars not only from unorganized workers, but from members of unions who are in good standing, from independent businessmen, and, on occasion, from the Federal Government itself. Some of those engaged in this concerted action held high positions in organized labor. They not only held no conception for fair, decent treatment of other members of society, they had no regard for their duties and obligations to members of their own union organizations, but they openly practiced extortion through the use of force and fear in utter disregard of State and Federal legislation.

UNION RACKETEERS FALSELY CLAIM POLITICAL POWER

They claimed to have and to wield great political power. Candidates for public office, political organizations, local, State, and national, fell for and accepted their brazen statements that they controlled the votes of millions of union members.

In truth and in fact, they have no more control over the suffrage of union men than do the heads of fraternal, religious, farm, or any civic organization. The average union member is a patriotic, well informed, independent American citizen, votes as he pleases.

At election after election, the outstanding example being the one in Ohio when Senator Taft was reelected by an unprecedented majority, the absurdity of their claims to political power has been demonstrated.

Their oft-repeated public assertion that the Taft-Hartley Act was a slave-labor law has become an absurdity.

Today an overwhelming majority of the provisions of that law are approved and supported by the rank and file of organized labor.

AN EXPERIENCED STAFF HAS BEEN, STILL IS, ON THE JOB

To expose the activities—as well as others equally vicious—which had resulted in the plundering of health and welfare funds and to suggest remedies which might correct that situation, in June of 1953, as chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, I appointed a special subcommittee to investigate that and similar misinterpretation, maladministration and nonenforcement of other Federal legislation. A request was likewise made by me to the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor that he appoint a subcommittee to act jointly with us to ascertain whether the Taft-Hartley Act was being so interpreted and administered as to carry out the intention of Congress in passing the act.

PURPOSE OF SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEES

In appointing a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, I also had in mind the objective of learning whether legislation guaranteeing civil rights, legislation having to do with interstate and foreign commerce, the Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934, as amended, the activities of the National Labor Relations Board and Federal Conciliation Service, whose duty it was to assist in the settlement of labor disputes, and several other statutory provisions was being interpreted and administered in accordance with the wishes and intent of the Congress.

PRIOR HEARINGS

Hearings were held in Detroit on June 8, 11, 12, and 13. At those hearings individual workers who were receiving a weekly wage of less than $90 testified that they were forced through violence or threat by union officials to pay $2 a week for the privilege of working.

Small-business men testified that, through the use of force and threats of force, because of fear and economic pressure they were compelled to pay tribute for the privilege of exercising their constitutional right to engage in business.

Employers testified that they were forced to join a union, pay initiation fees; and one, that he was compelled to pay a lawyer recommended by a union agent something like $500 for the privilege of joining.

Those hearings did not, as at least one Detroit paper editorially stated, bring to light any radically new activities on the part of some union officials, but they did disclose, but only in part, how widespread these illegal actions were. Because of the publicity given our hearings both in the news stories and editorially by the three Detroit papers,

and only because of that publicity, a State grand jury was called the day after we left the city, and subsequently indictments were returned.

KANSAS CITY HEARINGS

Thereafter the subcommittees went to Kansas City, held hearings, and the Kansas City Star daily published the testimony taken by the subcommittees.

In Kansas City the subcommittees, with the assistance of the Kansas City Star, made public the fact that the construction of three Government defense projects being erected primarily for the defense of the Midwest had been halted for 8 weeks.

An official of the carpenters' union sought the committees' help. It was shown that the teamsters' union, armed with clubs, had driven the union carpenters from their jobs on one of these projects, and that for weeks 9,000 carpenters had been out of work.

Officers of other unions made similar complaints.

FORCED UNEMPLOYMENT ON UNION MEN

Again, it appeared that officers of the International Teamsters Union were seeking to take over the dues-paying membership of A. F. of L. locals and force all others who wanted to work to pay tribute to the teamsters' union regardless of their position in good standing with other unions of the AFL.

Some 25,000 employees were out of jobs and had been for months because of a campaign of intimidation backed by violence, conceived and carried on by officials of the Teamsters International.

That situation, because of the publicity given these unlawful activities by the Kansas City papers, ended shortly after the committee left Kansas City. The hearings were followed by the calling of local grand juries and indictments. The two subcommittees later returned to Detroit and again exposed but a part of the conspiracy still being carried on to extort millions from the taxpayers.

SECOND DETROIT HEARING

At the second hearing in Detroit, the subcommittee went briefly and but superficially into the activities of certain individuals in connection with the misuse of welfare funds.

Now, health and welfare funds grow out of the contributions, primarily, at least, of sums contributed by employers and might be characterized as some of the fringe benefits ordinarily written into contracts between unions and employers. In effect, these contributions are sums which otherwise might be paid to employees in connection with the settlement of labor disputes. When employers contribute to a health and welfare fund they are paying sums which might otherwise have been paid to the employees through a direct increase in wages.

When these funds are wasted or stolen, the loss is that of the union worker.

These funds are customarily administered by trustees chosen in equal number by the union and the employer.

UNION TRUSTEE

In practice, however, the representatives of the union exercise almost complete control over the administration of the fund. Permit an illustration: In one instance an organization in which the teamsters union had purchased $250,000 worth of stock, the insurance of the fund was given to a company officered by friends of the union boss. The premiums received by the union boss' friends over a comparatively short period amounted to more than $1,400,000.

Was there a kickback? We never got that far.

And when the committee sought information which might have traced the connection between the recipients of the millions in commissions and the officers of the union, the fifth amendment was invoked and the committee at that particular time failed to get the information which would have determined whether there was or was not a kickback, either direct or indirect, of a part of that $1,400,000.

THE SQUEEZE PLAY OF THE BOSSES

The second hearings in Detroit also showed that union men in good standing and with dues paid, who were engaged in the operation of trucks hauling automobiles from factory to consumer, were forced out of business. Now listen, their business was taken over by the wives of two of the union bosses, Hoffa and Brennan, on a claimed investment of $4,000. In less than 4 years those two women, without having contributed 1 hour's work to the activities of the company which they formed, collected dividends of $65,000, and still own the company worth, at a conservative estimate, $45,000, and the only employee they had, the only individual who transacted business for the company, received $200 a month and did all the business.

There you have a couple of union bosses, who sometimes yell about the excessive profits officers of corporations receive, whose wives make a net profit of $65,000 on a $4,000 investment—if they ever invested a cent—in 4 years' time, and owning the assets of a company worth $40,000.

JOB NOT FINISHED

Oh, but those second hearings in Detroit but scraped the surface. They did not get anywhere near the bottom of the cesspool of corruption.

OTHER FIELDS OF EXTORTION

Nor is the extortion and the graft, the intimidation and the violence, confined to the collection and the administration of welfare funds.

In the jukebox industry, in the vending-machine industry, a few of these union officials are not only telling the union members that they must pay tribute for the privilege of working—they are telling businessmen where and when they can establish a business, what kind and what quality of merchandise they must use and sell in connection with their businesses.

They are operating not only at the race tracks, but in every conceivable field of human endeavor where dollars change hands.

It was my purpose, through the appointment of a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, to continue our hearings, but my authority to do so, by action of the committee, expired on the 15th day of July, though limited permission to continue for 60 days in two specified areas was graciously granted.

WILL ASK AUTHORITY TO COMPLETE JOB

Because of the continued existence and operation of a nationwide conspiracy to collect, through a disregard of union obligations, of the failure of State and Federal laws, millions of dollars from helpless taxpayers, it is my purpose when our committee meets at a regular meeting on the 20th of January next to ask that committee to authorize me to appoint a special subcommittee to carry on the investigations which we started, which have shown the need for legislation for the protection of the health and welfare funds, for a more accurate interpretation and a better administration of other Federal statutes designed for the protection of our citizens, the welfare of our people.

THE COMMITTEE HAS JURISDICTION

If it be again said, as has been said, that our committee has no jurisdiction over this subject matter, permit me to call attention to the fact that prior to 1927 there were 11 legislative committees of the House which had a similar authority, that the authority of those 11 committees in that particular regard was merged in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments—now the Committee on Government Operations.

Answering those who, for example, say that the jurisdiction over the racketeering practiced by union officials and others belongs to the Committee on Education and Labor, let me point out that the Committee on Government Operations has an overall jurisdiction over all Executive agencies and activities of the Federal Government. As well might it be said that the regular standing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations which has been looking into housing erected abroad by the State Department, has no jurisdiction over that subject because we have a Committee on Foreign Affairs.

As well and with as much force may it be said that the Subcommittee on Military Operations has no authority to inquire into the waste and extravagance, and perhaps illegal activities, of those in the military establishment because we have a Committee on Armed Services.

With as much force might it be said that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has no authority to inquire into the business activities of the Federal Government because we have a Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As well might it be said that the Subcommittee on Public Accounts has no authority to inquire into the activities of the Agriculture Department because we have a Committee on Agriculture.

Nor have I at any time attempted to intrude on the jurisdiction of regular subcommittees or of the full committee by the appointment of a special subcommittee.

As an illustration of how even a regular subcommittee gets over into the field assigned to another regular subcommittee, let me cite this illustration:

The Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee has jurisdiction over all reorganization plans.

The President on March 25 sent up Reorganization Plan No. 2, which provided for a reorganization of the Agriculture Department. The resolution disapproving the plan was rejected by the House on June 3, 1953, and it became effective on June 4. The reorganization plan itself did not become effective until November 2, 1953. Yet we find a regular subcommittee scheduling for November 10—and holding hearings on December 3—on the activities of a department or agency which did not even begin to do business until 8 days previously.

Each and every one of the regular standing committees of the House has jurisdiction over a specific subject. The Committee on Government Operations has no jurisdiction to write legislation, but it does have jurisdiction to check and evaluate the effectiveness of all legislation.

Nor am I asking anything unusual. The chairman of every other regular standing committee of the House has inherent authority and has exercised authority to appoint special subcommittees.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, the Kansas City Times, some of the New York papers, the Des Moines Register and Tribune, the Chicago Tribune, the Detroit News, Detroit Free Press, and Detroit Times have carried editorials which can accurately be construed not only as pointing to the necessity of these proposed continuing investigations, but in substance and effect asking that the continuation of this particular subcommittee be permitted.

Certainly the failure to continue these investigations inures to the benefit of the racketeers and extortionists, and in some cases inflicts incalculable harm on law-abiding, taxpaying American citizens.

One or two editorials showing the necessity for a continuation of this investigation are printed herewith, as are one or two excerpts from wires and letters. Similar information will be inserted in the RECORD from time to time.

EDITORIALS

[From the Detroit News of June 13, 1953]

JUKEBOX RACKET—CASE FOR A ONE-MAN JURY

One day of hearings by Representative HOFFMAN'S congressional subcommittee sufficed to expose conditions of criminality in the jukebox and coin-machine trade that shame local law-enforcement agencies.

It is not a new story. As long as a dozen years ago, there were rumors of a racket in the business, later to be confirmed by sporadic outbreaks of "jukebox wars." The Kefauver committee was to find, only a couple of years ago, that the country's "most vicious criminal elements" had infiltrated it.

Nor is it a novelty to have the Teamsters Union revealed as an ally and partner in this kind of racket. The tactics of intimidation with occasional violence attributed to James E. Bufalino's (jukebox) local 985 are reminiscent of those used by the teamsters in a 1946 effort to organize independent grocers.

Then, as now, the police were criticized for inaction, though again, as now, the criticism was not entirely deserved. Intimidation by threat or even in the quick tossing of a dynamite or stink bomb from a passing car are not kinds of crime that yield readily to police investigation when the motives are rooted in conspiracy. The shame to which the congressional committee has exposed local law enforcement is the shame rather of a failure to recognize the limitations of the most diligent police work. It is the shame of failing to set in motion the agencies that much experience has shown capable of dealing with criminal forces of the kind in question.

It took a one-man grand jury to halt the teamsters' attempted domination of the local food trade. It will take a one-man grand jury to deal with the jukebox racket, whose threat to the peace of the community the congressional inquiry has left clear for all to see.

"Information and belief" that crime has been committed is the condition requisite to the impaneling of such a body. In 1 day the congressional inquiry supplied information of dynamitings, of extortion, and of violations—apparently for profit—of the State labor laws.

The first move toward calling a grand jury lies with Prosecutor O'Brien, who, it appears, should have moved some time ago. He will wisely move now.

[From the Kansas City Star of June 29, 1953]

ONE STEP FOR LABOR PEACE

Today Greater Kansas City and Congress should begin to get a fuller picture of the forces at work in this city. These are the forces that used harassing strikes, intimidation, and reckless demands to bring Kansas City construction to the present impasse.

The general tactics and reckless goals of the teamsters' O. L. Ring are apparent. The hearing by members of a congressional committee and subcommittee is expected to produce addtional information. The committees have wide investigating powers which include the authority to call witnesses by subpena. The spotlight attracted by a congressional investigation is formidable encouragement to witnesses.

Many persons have seen reason to hope that the congressional investigation would bring the local—and possibly the national—situation to a head. If so, it will be done by the impact of the hearing on the thinking of persons immediately involved. The hearing is the important next step. At the very minimum it should focus national attention on the consequences of overreaching union leadership. It might strike wide and deep, all depending on the testimony.

No congressional committee hearing can be expected automatically to end the construction shutdown. Nor does it appear likely that the Kansas City meeting of international union officials will produce a definite working plan. It might help clear the atmosphere at high levels. The congressional hearing should encourage the local union leaders who want to put an end to this disastrous internal strife. If there is evidence of major law violation the hearing should lay the groundwork for a grand jury investigation.

Still essential is the specific plan to put the men back on the construction jobs. To mean anything it will have to be a plan that will end the quick-trigger strikes, intimidation and pressure for 1-union power. For that the first responsibility is on the leadership of the thousands who are paying the price of the strike. No plan is worth anything unless they are both ready to agree to it and to make it work.

Starting today the persons who want a real solution will receive the moral support of congressional committees. It will be given with all the facts that the committees can uncover.

[From the Kansas City Star of July 2, 1953]

GRIM STORY TO THE PUBLIC

The wretched story is unfolding before the eyes of television viewers throughout this area. Such a closeup contact with witnesses from both union leaders and business gives a special force to the ominous purpose and methods that have produced this virtually total shutdown of Greater Kansas City construction.

Over the main line of the testimony loom the figures of the teamsters' O. L. Ring and his allies, particularly Willard Wilkinson of the heavy-construction laborers. From J. O. Mack, president of the carpenters' district council, and others, the public has received a direct report on Ring's drive for power over other unions by strong-arm methods.

From many witnesses the public has been told of reckless actions by arrogant representatives of the teamsters and allies—roving stewards forced on the contractors at fantastic wages, union control of construction, and featherbedding. According to the testimony, the threat is closing the job in a burst of fury. One member of the congressional committee described it as a "form of blackmail." The cost to the public is increased ranging up to 15 percent in the amount of the contractors' bids.

Now, the public is hearing directly from men who have been beaten by the strong-arm boys. These were the demonstrations that punctuated the constant threats of beatings.

The resulting chaos is dramatized by the shattering of the Building and Construction Trades Council. It was set up as a means of ironing out disputes and maintaining order in the construction industry. Now, it is completely wrecked.

A ruthless campaign has been directed against both employers and other unions for the same apparent purpose—complete domination. Greater Kansas City is left with a shutdown that undermines its economy. By investigating Congressmen, it is threatened with losing Government construction jobs in the future. But, any goal of complete domination has been set far back in the process.

Ruthless goals don't thrive in a spotlight such as has been attracted to the congressional investigation. The public, including the thousands of men off the jobs, is getting the story with all the force of direct contact. Congress is putting together a vast story of aggression that reaches into other cities. The forces of law enforcement are finally stirring and so, we suspect, are the top officials at the Pentagon. They are responsible for military construction.

The first big step toward solving a problem is to bring out the facts. They are coming out.

[From the Detroit News of November 30, 1953]

THE TASKS BEFORE US

This newspaper vigorously supported the candidacy of Mr. Eisenhower in 1952, and it very much wants him to succeed as President.

We believe there have been times when he would have been better advised to assert his old habit of command than to rely on time and the course of events to bring others to his side. We believe, also, that his instinct on some occasions has been sounder than the political judgment of those around him. The present would seem to be one of those cases.

We believe, with the President, that the here and now, and the problems that presently confront us, are not less important than what did or did not happen 7 or 8 or 10 years ago. In recent days, almost any front page of the press has offered something in support of that belief.

Evidence, gathered in Detroit by a House subcommittee, of the use of intimidation and terror as weapons for the personal advantage of union bosses has led to the calling of a federal grand jury to dig deeper into charges of labor racketeering and corruption.

Wherever the use of terror offers a way to easy money, the underworld can be expected to move in. Thus in St. Louis, murders and

shakedowns of contractors and the muscling-in of Mafia mobsters have preceded the calling of a federal grand jury in that city.

Racketeering is another name for "the mess" that figured more decisively than any other issue in the voters' rejection of the Democratic Party last year. But a rejection in politics implies a mandate to those who take over control.

"Those fellows down there in the administration talk about cleaning up the Communist mess, but this one is twice as dangerous to the country," says Representative HOFFMAN of the subcommittee. We differ flatly and often with CLARE HOFFMAN, but not about this, nor with his suggestion that here is a job for Attorney General Brownell, "if he wants to do it." And he should want to do it. A Capone mob, alive and functioning, is as immediate a challenge to the present safety as a man named White who is dead.

Elsewhere in the same paper a Senate subcommittee debates the laying out of $100 million in 5 years to combat juvenile delinquency. Whether this considerable sum can be usefully applied to a diffuse problem that has no particular focus and which seems to lie outside the reach of the usual Federal study is a question. At least the proposal is an expression of mounting concern over a problem that is with us, here and now.

The manager of a local movie house tells of an adolescent mob that periodically swarms into his place through the exits, cuts up seats, and makes life hideous for the orderly patron. This—though never mention—could be a reason why people who used to attend the movies don't any more. At any rate, the manager in question is probably given more to wonder how to cope with a pack of lawless jerks than whether a suspected Red once sat at the same table with Eisenhower in London.

Among others that are with us, and mentioned in the same paper, are the matters of an upcoming Federal Budget, and what to do about weaning the farmer from permanent dependence on the Treasury, and in what particulars the labor law should be amended, if at all, and whether our disgraceful apathy to a part in building a St. Lawrence seaway can not be cured.

If any or all of these seem too formidable to consider and solve, then there are of course the Reds—not today's Russians, but yesterday's suspects and wrongheaded characters among us, who are no longer in positions to do whatever it is they are supposed to have done.

Whatever they did—and we wouldn't belittle it if it related to any present crisis—we seem to have survived and to have in the White House a man named Eisenhower who has had some experience in meeting the present danger and who would prefer now to get on with the tasks before us.

[From the Detroit Free Press of December 1, 1953]

AS WE SEE IT—BY ALL MEANS A GRAND JURY

The House subcommittee which last week conducted hearings in Detroit into alleged labor racketeering has departed amid angry charges and recriminations of its members that its work was thwarted by pressures from "higher up."

These charges are rather vague, although that is not to say they lack substance.

But the testimony that was heard by the committee was of a nature that requires further exploration. Particularly is that true of the story, partially unfolded, having to do with the activities of the local Teamsters Union and its boss, James R. Hoffa.

Neither Hoffa nor the public should be satisfied that the charges and implications made by witnesses before the congressional group should be left hanging in the air.

Regardless of how effective the committee was, the next step is a Federal grand jury investigation in which all evidence can be sifted and from which, if the charges are sustained, indictments can be forthcoming.

The matter has gone too far now to be dropped. A grand jury probe, free from pressure of any kind, offers the only satisfactory and effective solution.

WIRES

From Pierre, S. Dak., November 24, 1953:

According to the newspaper headlines you are doing a marvelous job in cleaning up rackets in teamsters union. We hope you will continue and extend hearings into Minneapolis.

F. N. COSGROVE,
South Dakota Republican Chairman.

Consumers in South Dakota are dependent upon Minneapolis wholesalers for a number of commodities manufactured or jobbed in the Twin Cities. Therefore, we are vitally interested in seeing that hearings concerning racketeering in teamsters union be continued in Minneapolis.

C. L. (ROY) DOHERTY,
Public Utilities Commissioner.

From Sioux Falls, S. Dak., November 24, 1953:

Have noticed in newspaper headlines hearings in rackets in teamsters union progressing very well. Hope hearings will be continued in Minneapolis to complete the job.

JACKRABBIT LINES.

From Minneapolis, Minn., November 25, 1953:

Congratulations. Labor subcommittee doing outstanding job. You might also take look at Minneapolis situation.

T. G. HARRISON,
President, Winston & Newell Co.

LETTERS

From Buffalo, N. Y., January 9, 1954:

I am writing to you with hopes that a terrible situation can be corrected. I am a member of Truckdrivers Local Union, No. 449. This union has gotten to be so corrupt and rotten, that it smells to high heaven. There are about 5,500 members in this union. We never have had any accounting of the treasury. The way the officers of the union conduct elections is a farce, thinking only of feathering their own nest.

This is only an example of some of the dirty work accomplished by the officers of this union.

The membership of this union has not been able to do anything about these conditions. We have been stymied at every turn.

The officers and their clique tag anyone that doesn't agree with them as a Communist.

We are all good American citizens and never have asked for anything that isn't proper for an American citizen. The union's goons are apt to beat anyone up if they criticize them too much.

If you or one of your investigators will come to Buffalo, I and others will give proof and will testify to what we say.

I think if this thing is opened up it will take in most of New York State outside of New York City. If we can rid ourselves of these leeches we can get on solid footing for once.

I will close thinking that if you can't help us, nobody can.

FARM PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills relating to farm price supports. One bill— H. R. 7166—calls for an amendment to section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949. The bill provides for the support of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat at 100 percent of parity.

The method of support will be through loans, purchases, agreements to purchase, or parity production payments made directly to farmers. The bill also makes provision for a combination of support price methods.

My reason for introducing this bill is that milk, butterfat, and dairy products have never been considered one of the basic agricultural commodities. It is true that milk, butter, and dairy products have been supported in the past through programs administered at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Frankly, the farmers in my district—and I also believe for the entire State of Wisconsin—have never been satisfied with this type of a support program for milk, butter, and dairy products. According to the farmers, farm leaders, and leaders of the dairy industry in my district—and I wish to say that I have discussed the matter with several hundred individuals—the Secretary of Agriculture has generally exercised his discretionary powers of supporting dairy products after prices have dropped.

The effect of this type of a support program is that the market price remains close to the minimum price support level. This type of a program has led farmers in my district, and other sections of Wisconsin as well, to seek legislation making milk, butterfat, and other dairy products a basic commodity under support price programs.

In commenting on the need for adoption of this type of legislation, I wish to call attention to the fact that the income of dairy farmers in Wisconsin has been steadily declining for a year. The farmers in our State are caught between economic pincers of high fixed costs and declining income.

As the University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture in its bulletin, Economic Information for Wisconsin Farmers, points out in its December issue:

> There has been relatively small reduction in per unit cost of dairy production compared to grain and poultry production.

This single sentence tells the story of the cost-price ratio of Wisconsin dairy farmers.

The same bulletin, in another section, observes:

> In the past 12 months, retail prices for dairy products have declined only slightly while prices received by farmers for milk and butterfat have dropped 13 percent.

It is this situation, then, that has prompted me to introduce the bill to give dairy farmers not only in Wisconsin, but also in other sections of the United States, a support program that will undergird their serious economic condition.

There are some 2½ to 3 million dairy farmers in the United States. The purchasing power of this great segment of the agricultural industry has dropped considerably during the past year. This drop in purchasing power has vitally affected other aspects of the Nation's business and industrial life.

It has affected the farm implement industry, the automobile industry, the steel industry, the appliance industry, and retail trade of hundreds of communities. Statistics bear out this contention. Our dairy farmers also realize that when their buying power drops, it in turn causes unemployment of industrial workers—who furnish the base for the bulk of their customers.

That is why I think this bill is of interest to more than dairy farmers. We certainly do not want another farm led and farm fed depression—and yet that possibility exists.

My second bill—H. R. 7167—which amends title 2 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, covers dairy products as outlined in the first bill. In addition, it also includes hogs, farm chickens, beef cattle and lambs to be supported at 100 percent of parity.

My reason for introducing this bill is that most dairy farmers also engage in farming operations covering hogs, chickens, beef cattle, and lambs. Unless I have been misinformed, I believe that almost one half of the beef consumed in the United States is sold by dairy farmers who cull their herds and sell veal calves. This source of supply provides the beef volume for our cheaper cuts of meat, sausage, and related meat products. Dairy farmers also furnish a large percentage of the vealers.

It is my hope that Congress will give these bills serious consideration and give the dairy farmers of the Nation a long overdue support program that treats their product as a basic agricultural commodity.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on treaties and Executive agreements; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SCUDDER.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. FORRESTER.

Mr. GRANAHAN in two instances.

Mr. MULTER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCKLEY (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE).

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. BAILEY).

Mr. MACK of Washington.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AREND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 18, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1127. A letter from the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled, "A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1128. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal section 307 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1129. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a quarterly report of the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government, pursuant to section 201 (c) of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951, Public Law 150, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1130. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1131. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a temporary partial annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. pertaining to the operations of the company for the year 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1132. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled, "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes,'" approved July 8, 1932; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1133. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanitoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1134. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, transmitting a semiannual report of all programs and activities carried on under the authority of section 603 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 294); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1135. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Southwestern Power Administration, an agency in the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1136. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the second annual report of action initiated and completed by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out saline-water-conservation program, pursuant to Public Law 448, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1137. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Sac and Fox of the Missouri Tribe of Indians located in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, the Iowa Tribe of Indians located in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, the Kickapoo Tribe of Indians located in the State of Kansas, and the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians located in the State of Kansas, and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1138. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana, and the individual members thereof; for assistance in the orderly relocation of such Indians in areas of greater economic opportunity; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1139. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of Indian tribes, bands, and groups in California and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1140. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Seminole Tribe of Indians in the State of Florida and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1141. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relative to the enactment of H. R. 6282 (addressed to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1142. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1143. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1144. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill for the relief of Stanley Rydson and Alexander F. Anderson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1145. A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the court's opinion re: *John B. H. Waring* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 17858), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code and House Resolution 253, 81st Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1146. A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Inc., transmitting a copy of the annual audit report for the period ending March 31, 1953, pursuant to section 15 (b) of Public Law 595, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1147. A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953; a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers supply service for the period from July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953; and a report on the audit of the accounts of the National Future Farmer Magazine for the period from July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 740, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1148. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1149. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes,' approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756)"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1150. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1151. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the requirement of section 3921 of the Revised Statutes that postmasters report to the Postmaster General failure to cancel postage stamps"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1152. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the sale of postage-due stamps for philatelic purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1153. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report concerning the progress made in the improvement of Federal-aid highways and other information as required, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 10 of the act of Congress approved June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 993) also section 14 of the act of Congress approved September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 867); to the Committee on Public Works.

1154. A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting the third annual report of the Subversive Activities Control Board, pursuant to section 12 (c) of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1155. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the 37th annual report of the United States Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: Committee on Appropriations. Report pursuant to section 805, Public Law 207, 83d Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2913. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain lands to Harold K. Butson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7166. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7167. A bill to amend title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 7168. A bill to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act, to authorize additional amounts for construction loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7169. A bill to prevent the contamination of streams and other bodies and sources of water by the escape of sulfur water or other polluting water from abandoned coal mines, to prevent entry of such mines by unauthorized persons or by livestock, and to aid in preventing or extinguishing mine fires; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7170. A bill to encourage the prevention of stream pollution by providing an amortization deduction for facilities built to treat industrial wastes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 7171. A bill to establish effective means to determine Communist domination in unions and to eliminate Communists from positions of influence and control in labor unions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 7172. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 7173. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that depreciation allowances for new machinery and equipment acquired after December 31, 1953, shall, with certain limitations, be as determined by taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 7174. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 7175. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended, in order to restore to certain officers and employees under such act the right to accumulate 60 days of annual leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 7176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to certain rodeos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 7177. A bill to increase the penalty for violation of certain laws relating to the internal security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 7178. A bill providing for the development of a highway and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 7179. A bill to continue in effect the taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel at the present rate of 2 cents a gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 7180. A bill to remove the requirement of automatic periodic reduction of the education and training allowances of veterans pursuing on-the-job training or institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 7181. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds for the construction, in cooperation with local authorities, of a hospital at Mahnomen, Minn., with facilities for the Indians in that area; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7182. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to permit the extension of rural electrification loans for up to 20 years in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 7183. A bill making emergency appropriations for the construction of works for flood control and fire prevention in Los Angeles County, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 7184. A bill to provide for cooperation between Mexico and the United States in preventing illegal border crossings and smuggling of narcotic drugs between the two countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 7185. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7186. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7187. A bill relating to the termination of employment of persons in certain positions in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7188. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that interest on certain obligations issued by States and their political subdivisions shall not be tax exempt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 7189. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the income-tax exemptions allowed for a taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents, and the additional exemptions allowed for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 7190. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that internal-revenue agents may be compelled to testify in certain State courts concerning purchases of wagering-tax stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7191. A bill to require Federal district courts to enforce certain support orders

of State courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 7192. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 7193. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 7194. A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Hermiston and West Extension Irrigation Districts, Oregon, and to authorize their execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (by request):

H. R. 7195. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7196. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 7197. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to readjust the limitations contained in such act with respect to the number of special nonquota immigrant visas authorized to be allotted to aliens of Italian ethnic origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7198. A bill to relieve independent distributors from restrictions on their freedom to compete imposed by section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 7199. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7200. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act so as to provide for a more effective distribution of Federal funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7201. A bill to provide for compensation of certain employees on days when departments, agencies, or establishments of the Government are closed by administrative order; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7202. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended, in order to increase the limitations on the amount of annual leave which may be accumulated under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7203. A bill to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 7204. A bill to increase the income tax exemptions allowed a taxpayer for himself, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7205. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to theaters where the cost of admission is 45 cents or less; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 7206. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 7207. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 so as to increase certain amounts authorized therein for highway purposes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7208. A bill to establish the Family Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 7209. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 7210. A bill to extend the time during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded under Public Law 16, 78th Congress, as amended and extended, to certain disabled veterans who have been unable to pursue such training because of long illness or because of other reasons beyond their control; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 348. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the third week in April of each year as National My Family Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. J. Res. 349. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observances and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 350. Joint resolution to promote the foreign policy of the United States by fostering international travel and the exchange of persons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 351. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 404. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate and study the desirability and feasibility of establishing an island prison for the confinement of persons convicted of crimes involving disloyalty; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 405. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to Daisy M. Maupin, mother of Sarah A. Mitchell, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 7211. A bill for the relief of Anna Prudenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7212. A bill for the relief of Filippo Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7213. A bill for the relief of Virgin Giritliyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7214. A bill for the relief of Jacob (also known as Jack) Preisler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 7215. A bill for the relief of June Hougart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 7216. A bill for the relief of John Kafel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 7217. A bill for the relief of Astor Vergata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 7218. A bill for the relief of Dr. K. A. Peter van Berkum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 7219. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anne Alice Grunow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 7220. A bill for the relief of Jan Hajdukiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 7221. A bill for the relief of Anders Taranger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 7222. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith L. Crow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7223. A bill for the relief of Teresa Jurjevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 7224. A bill for the relief of Edmund P. Gould; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 7225. A bill for the relief of Maurice Kleinman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 7226. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Oneri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7227. A bill for the relief of Caesar Chiarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7228. A bill for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 7229. A bill to provide for the conveyance to T. M. Pratt and Annita C. Pratt of certain real property in Stevens County, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 7230. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Perez-Perez and Magdalena Alvarez de Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7231. A bill for the relief of Thomas Francis Hardman and Mrs. Nellie Helen Hardman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7232. A bill for the relief of Leo Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7233. A bill for the relief of Tomas Calle-Cuadrado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7234. A bill for the relief of Nicholas E. Sarris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7235. A bill for the relief of Paul Rintrona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 7236. A bill for the relief of Lt. (jg) Svend J. Skou; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7237. A bill for the relief of Edward Martin Rasmussen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7238. A bill for the relief of John Kintzig (Janos Kintzig); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7239. A bill for the relief of Sofia B. Panagoulopoulos Kanell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 7240. A bill for the relief of Gerardo Rabanel Luzod; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7241. A bill for the relief of Arthur Guilherme dos Reis Melo Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7242. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Gross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7243. A bill for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7244. A bill for the relief of Charles Matheus Hubertus Hendrix; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7245. A bill for the relief of Miss Martha Kantelberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 7246. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7247. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gisele Marie Louise Mignon MacIntyre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7248. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Motisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 7249. A bill for the relief of Antonio (Antonino) Attardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 7250. A bill for the relief of Olivier Robert Bardet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7251. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon F. Parry, the right, title, and interest of the United States in foreign countries in and to a certain invention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 7252. A bill for the relief of Glicerio M. Ebuna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7253. A bill for the relief of Pauls Smits (Paulis Smits); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 7254. A bill for the relief of Kenneth O. Nordine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 7255. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw Grabowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7256. A bill for the relief of Andrew Bulavczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7257. A bill for the relief of Lothar G. Seeger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 7258. A bill for the relief of the Willmore Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7259. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of Lt. Comdr. Carl M. J. von Zielinski, United States Naval Reserve (retired), to the grade of commander; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 7260. A bill for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 7261. A bill for the relief of Justin D. Hillyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 7262. A bill for the relief of Rosa Maria Vollmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 7263. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ernst Gret Birkholz Seim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 7264. A bill for the relief of Northeast Airlines, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. J. Res. 352. Joint resolution to validate conveyance of a 40-acre tract in Okaloosa County, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

458. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Old Order of Amish Mennonites signed by Bishop Joni F. Byler, of Volant, Pa., opposing social security insurance, or insurance in any form, according to the tenets of their religion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

459. By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania: Petition of Local Union No. 3140, United Mine Workers of America, Vandergrift, Pa., urging revision of social-security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

460. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of the Sauk Lake Cooperative Creamery of Sauk Centre, Minn., urging that the Congress uphold agricultural price supports of 90 percent of parity or better; to the Committee on Agriculture.

461. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of Mrs. Morgan Johnson and the other members and officers of the Joseph Ligon Chapter, DAR, Paris, Tex., favoring the Bricker amendment limiting the powers of treaties; also favoring early action by Congress on said amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congressman Van Zandt Is One of the Great Legislative Leaders of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT visited my district in the State of Washington. He made speeches in four cities in my district. In each of these places many citizens would come up to him and say, "Hello, JIMMIE." Congressman VAN ZANDT as he shook hands with each one would call each greeter by his first name.

I was amazed at the number of people who knew JIMMIE and even more amazed by the number of persons JIMMIE knew by name. Other Congressmen, whose districts JIMMIE VAN ZANDT has visited, tell equally amazing stories of Congressman VAN ZANDT's legion of friends everywhere and of JIMMIE's amazing memory for names and faces.

But people everywhere do not only know and like JIMMIE VAN ZANDT. They also admire him for the fine qualities of ability and leadership he displays in everything he undertakes.

He is known in and out of Congress as one of the Nation's best-informed Congressmen. He is an authority on atomic-energy development, on preparedness and defense, on veterans' matters, and on foreign affairs. Many of us other Congressmen go to him for information and advice on these subjects because his interest in such national problems is wide and varied and his information on them vast.

Yet along with all this, Congressman VAN ZANDT always has time to handle the smallest problem of any constituent in his district, which is a large and active one. Handling these problems takes much time and involves much detail. One of the things one frequently hears about Congressman VAN ZANDT is that he never fails to personally read and answer every letter that comes to his office. He does this despite the fact that his mail is one of the largest of any of the 435 Members of the House.

How is JIMMIE VAN ZANDT able to handle this great amount of mail, attend to all his committee work, and take an active part in almost all activities of the House of Representatives? The answer in one word is "work." JIMMIE VAN ZANDT is a prodigious worker. He works long hours and he makes every minute count. Also, his attendance record is one of the best. Of him it is said, "JIMMIE VAN ZANDT is always on the job."

I was not surprised, therefore, when I read in the hometown newspaper of JIMMIE VAN ZANDT, the Altoona Mirror, of Altoona, Pa., that 400 of his hometown people held a testimonial dinner for him at the Penn-Alto Hotel in that city on January 9. This dinner by his hometown friends, who know him best, was a fitting tribute to Mr. VAN ZANDT for the fine work he has done for them, for his district, for his State, and for his country.

Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, the principal speaker, at this Congressman VAN ZANDT testimonial dinner said, "JIMMIE now belongs to the Nation." That statement is a true summary, I believe, of what JIMMIE's friends in Congress and his multitude of friends throughout the Nation think of him.

All of them will agree with the sentiments expressed by an editorial in JIMMIE VAN ZANDT's hometown newspaper, which reads:

A PATRIOT IN ACTION

Home folks and visitors from nearby counties, as well as guests from Government, labor, and military circles, paid tribute to Altoona's most prominent citizen, Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, at an overflow testimonial at the Penn-Alto Hotel last Saturday.

More than 400 joined in greeting the Congressman from the 20th District and high tribute was paid to his service with the Government.

"Jimmie now belongs to the Nation," said Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, United States Marine Corps, retired, who was the principal speaker. He referred to Jimmie's service being most valuable due to his long association with affairs in Washington and his activity with most important congressional committees.

Friends from Altoona and Blair County and the adjoining counties comprising the 20th District, Centre and Clearfield, joined in extolling Congressman VAN ZANDT and the record crowd heard him praised as "a living American patriot in action."

Mr. VAN ZANDT is now concluding his seventh term, totaling 14 years, as the representative from this district in Washington. He has soared to high posts in the Government and presently holds positions on the powerful Armed Services Committee and the Atomic Energy Commission. He is next in line to head the Armed Services Committee.

The Congressman first entered Congress in 1938, serving in the 76th Congress. He served for the 77th and 78th Congresses and then resigned to enter World War II, serving in the Pacific with the Navy. He also served in the Navy in World War I. He was reelected to the 80th Congress, also serving in the 81st, 82d and 83d Congresses. He has a service of 36 years with the Navy, including both World Wars, and service in Korea and other tours of duty.

The testimonial, planned by his numerous Altoona and district friends, applauds the fine service of Congressman VAN ZANDT. His on-the-job record at Washington is outstanding and he qualifies at each session as the Member most frequently in his assigned seat to answer rollcalls and participate in all sessions. He is one of the best recognized and best known Members of Congress, as well as the best informed.

Congressman VAN ZANDT most ably represents his district and Pennsylvania in the Hall of Congress. His friends are most appreciative of his record.

Pay Raises for Postal and Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1954

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is most important that the Congress recognize the plight of the Federal employee and take immediate action to relieve the strain of his economic distress. During the first session of this Congress much was said, but little was done and absolutely nothing was accomplished in that direction. Congress has reserved unto itself the power to determine the salaries which are to be paid to postal employees and to Federal employees in the classified service. Likewise the Congress has assumed the responsibility for maintaining those salaries at an adequate and just level.

We are all aware of the increase in the cost of living which has continued uninterruptedly during the past few years, yet nothing has been done for the postal employee to cope with that problem and he is suffering untold hardships. The last pay raise which was received by the postal employees and the classified employees was in 1951, thus for more than 2 years they have been unable to meet their expenses because of restricted, inadequate income and now stand with their backs to the wall pleading that we take notice of their problems and grant them the financial relief which they justly deserve.

The New York Federation of Post Office Clerks last year made an economic survey of its members, many of whom reside in my district, and found an appalling situation. Approximately 75 percent of the members were forced to supplement their incomes by working on second jobs or by having their wives take employment outside the home. Over 42 percent of the employees are working on second jobs, and about 33 percent of the wives are working. In addition to this, nearly 70 percent of the employees have had an increase in their debts during the past year, an increase averaging $540. Approximately 25 percent have found it necessary to borrow on their life insurance.

It is inconceivable to me that Congress will allow this sort of situation to go on any longer. These people are forced to rely upon us to secure a fair rate of return for their hours of hard work. By no stretch of the imagination can we say that they are receiving a fair return when they are forced to take other jobs to make ends meet, when they have to borrow on their insurance policies, thus decreasing the security of their families. We cannot say that we are meeting our responsibility to Federal employees when one-third of the wives are forced to take jobs outside of the home, when debts continue to increase—when, in effect, the very existence of the family is being threatened. A pay increase now, not many months in the future, is what the situation demands. We would not expect a man with a broken leg to wait months before a doctor was called, just to see if his leg would knit satisfactorily without medical attention. No more should we expect the postal and classified employees to wait months for aid which they need, and need badly, at this very moment.

We have heard a great deal of talk about the desire of the present administration to improve the civil service and the lot of the Federal employee. Certainly one way to improve it is to pay him an adequate salary. I maintain that there are no more deserving employees, no harder working or more conscientious men and women than those we find in Federal service. There is no need for me to tell you of the importance of the functions they carry out. They collect the revenue, they guard the ports, they carry the mail, they apprehend criminals and smugglers, they keep the records and the books, they give care to our veterans and our aged, they help industry and the farmer. Where would our country be without the men who are responsible for keeping our communications system in operating order? How could we hope to keep our Nation strong and healthy and prepared to lead the fight against world communism without the unceasing efforts of thousands of conscientious Federal employees performing jobs which touch our lives in innumerable points?

The employees who rendered excellent service over the years and are now retired also find that the benefits which they receive, are completely out of balance with the high cost of living demanded at the present time. For this reason the retirement benefits of former Federal employees should likewise be increased in order to permit these persons, in advanced age groups, to maintain themselves with respect and some little security. Many of these people who have no independent means, are compelled to accept family charity as a last resort for otherwise they would be unable to provide for themselves adequately.

My remarks may be summarized in a few words. Postal and classified employees are in serious financial difficulties. These employees are conscientious, hard-working, efficient, and deserving. Congress, and Congress alone, has the power and the responsibility to remedy their financial situation. The financial problem confronting the retired employees should likewise be taken into consideration and their pension benefits increased. It is obvious that immediate action should be taken by Congress to provide adequate salary increases for both postal and classified employees of the Federal Government presently employed as well as those retired.

Unemployment in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1954

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD figures showing the dangerous unemployment situation in Michigan. The situation is becoming progressively worse and should be of grave concern to us here in Washington.

The Michigan Employment Security Commission, a few days ago, published unemployment figures showing that as of December 15, 1953, the number of unemployed in Michigan was 138,000, of whom 82,000 were in Detroit.

Over the past weekend the commission published an estimate bringing these figures up to date. The commission estimates that, at this time, there are 168,000 unemployed in Michigan, of whom 107,000 are in Detroit alone. This amounts to about 7 percent of the entire labor force.

The unemployment situation in Detroit and in Michigan as a whole is today as bad as it was in January 1952, when 107,000 workers were unemployed in Detroit, or 7.4 percent of the labor force. Unemployment at that time was due to material shortages resulting from the defense buildup. Today unemployment is due to lack of buyers and the backing up of cars on dealers' hands.

In 1952 there was good reason to believe that unemployment would be reduced when and as the materials shortage was overcome and as more contracts were placed when plants and trained work forces were available. Today, as of

January 11, 1954, with the announcement last week of a Defense Department cutback in tactical vehicles on order from General Motors, Reo, and Chrysler plants that will mean layoffs of 10,000 workers and general uncertainty about markets if and when peace finally "breaks out" following the present truce in Korea, there is an urgent need for bold, prompt action by the Eisenhower administration to check and reverse the present trend toward more and more unemployment.

To show how deeply this recession has bitten into Detroit already, let me give more facts:

In the Detroit area since July 1953, 22,055 Chrysler workers with seniority have been laid off. In one plant, Dodge Main, over 13,000 seniority employees and over 6,000 probationary employees have been laid off since July 1953.

Last week Plymouth announced cutbacks in production that resulted in layoffs of 2,350 Plymouth workers and 4,200 workers at the Briggs plant and a layoff of 1,000 in a supplier's plant at Evansville, Ind.

The Hudson plant last week shut down production until January 20, throwing 4,500 employees out of work for 10 days.

The Need for Improving Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Social Security Act was adopted during the first administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936, those of us in the Democratic Party who have always supported this legislation have been anxious that it be continually improved to meet new conditions of life in these great United States.

While it is true that this program of helping our people prepare adequately for their needs on reaching retirement age was at one time a straight political party issue—with Democrats in favor and most Republican Members of Congress opposed—we have all been gratified over the years to see that members of both parties by and large have come around to recognize the value of this great idea in social progress. Today, few Members of Congress would deliberately and knowingly vote to end the program.

But we all know that the program is far from good enough to go on any longer without substantial improvement, including the broadening of coverage and the increase of benefits.

I am proud to join with scores of other Democratic Members of the House in proposals we jointly support for adding 10 million more people to the rolls; continuing the present Federal contribution to the States for old-age assistance payments to needy persons outside the insurance system without charging these costs against the social security trust fund—which must be kept sound; increasing the limitation on monthly earning to $100; payment of benefits and waiver of premiums for workers permanently and totally disabled; broadening to $4,800 the present $3,600 base on which contributions and benefits are based; retaining the present 2 percent contribution which went into effect January 1; and also developing a formula for higher benefits based on the increase in living costs.

These proposals, included in the statement authored by the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. JOHN D. DINGELL, one of the architects and builders of the present social-security system, will go far toward bringing social security more closely in line with current needs.

Government Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1954

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago our President directed that Government contracts be awarded to firms in areas of unemployment.

Without any desire to criticize, I am completely convinced that such order is impractical and further, it is in complete defiance of the principle of private enterprise. As a matter of fact, this order falls squarely within the term of "creeping socialism."

If this order is not revoked by Congress, the principle of that order can become a way of life. It is said that this order is for the purpose of aiding New England textile mills. The troubles the New England textile mills are confronted with have not just begun, or are their troubles of a temporary nature, and this statement cannot successfully be disputed. Antiquated machinery in the New England area tells its own story. No one derives any pleasure over this unpleasant truth, and I say it only because it is true. This Congress will have the opportunity and responsibility of determining whether that order will be continued, or whether the principle of private enterprise will be upheld and the order abrogated by congressional action.

Bill H. R. 6864, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], a most distinguished member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and H. R. 6903, by Mr. LANHAM, of Georgia, a distinguished member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, are each for the purpose of annulling that order, and I sincerely hope that one of these bills will be speedily passed. Certainly, our Government should not be the leader in destroying the principle of awarding contracts to the lowest responsible bidder, yet our Government is doing that very thing.

Such an order will not even relieve unemployment temporarily. Giving work to a certain area only means other areas, which can produce as good or better articles at a lower price, cannot get Government work and unemployment will surely result in those areas.

In the district which I have the privilege of representing are many textile mills. It so happens that the owners of those mills, instead of declaring huge dividends, elected to install modern machinery. Further, these mills have plenty of competent, skilled, and loyal American labor steeped in the traditions of Americanism and it is a sad commentary on our American system that our Government has elected that these mills and laborers must remain idle although they can and are doing better work at a lower cost.

In 1952 a Democratic President approved a similar order and I vigorously opposed it, and generally the Republicans opposed it. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] led the fight on that order at that time. The principle is the same now as then, and a shift in Administration in no wise makes the order of President Eisenhower any sounder than was the similar order under President Truman's administration.

If preferential treatment is continued to certain textile industries, it can be applied and no one doubts that it will in the future be applied so as to give preferential treatment to certain areas in all of our Nation's industries.

This order is so serious in its consequences that Congress must act now if we are not to give lip service to private enterprise while seeing that private enterprise is crushed.

Surplus of Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the most valuable asset of national defense that this or any other country can have is a surplus of wheat—bread. That we have a year's supply on hand at this time seems to have unbalanced the judgment of many of our top administrators. All kinds of devices are suggested for the purpose of getting rid of this surplus. Some say, give it away to countries having hungry people. Even this would be a wiser policy than handing out dollars by the billions. No one seriously questions the fact that these billions will never be paid back to the United States. Some say, convey this surplus—of bread—into something else—any scheme to get rid of our greatest wartime asset.

In a state of war, all admit that wheat is a great asset in national defense, but now that we are in peacetime the situation is different. Just when did we suddenly emerge into a condition of peacetime? No peace has been signed, and we are still preparing for a possible war; men are being drafted, and the present moment does not present a peacetime situation, yet we are all wrought up over the possession of the greatest defense asset of all—bread.

Wheat is not perishable, and history shows that all wars in recorded history have finally been settled because one side or the other was short of bread. Our war between the States illustrates this conclusively. The South had to surrender because they ran short of bread. In the First World War, the Allies starved Germany out. In the Second World War Germany was starved out again, and the program adopted by this country to stop the spread of communism will continue until the aggressors run short of food. Just why the present administration is so worked up over a God-given surplus indicates that those piloting the Government are utterly unaware of what a food asset means to freedom.

The President's message seems more concerned on how to get rid of this surplus than it is in the stability of our national economy. Some surprising suggestions were made by the President. He proposes putting us on a sliding-scale support program, but agrees that the change must be gradual, not more than 5-percent reduction of support prices for any one year after 1955. While the support price will be reduced after that date, with the authority in the Secretary of Agriculture to operate this sliding-scale program, the statement is made that this will give the farmers more take-home money. If the President can reduce the supports and at the same time give the wheat producers more money, he would make Houdini look like a novice.

Does anyone want another disastrous depression? We are moving in that direction now. The President thinks that the farmer will be prosperous if the rest of the country is. There never was a more confused statement. Did not the last depression mean anything? Did we not find that when the buying power of the farmers dried up that the whole country went broke? Did not banks close until there was an order issued by Roosevelt to close all banks and start over under a guaranty of bank deposits? Did we not find soup lines in every industrial center of the United States?

Did we not have 15 million people roaming the countryside looking for something to eat? Did we not have to offer work through WPA to avoid a hunger disaster? Have all these acts been forgotten by this generation? When buying power was put back in the hands of the farmers, when interest and mortgages were paid, dispossessions by foreclosure and execution ceased, mortgage holders and coupon owners received their money, banks and trust companies revived, and we emerged from the depression only because the farmers of the Nation, the food producers, again had buying power. Where would we have been if we had done nothing for agriculture and assumed that by some miracle the normal business of the Nation would be resuscitated?

Probably another depression would bring this fact home to the administration and others who want to entirely ignore agriculture.

I am confident, however, that Congress at this session is not going to shut its eyes to the history of the past, no matter how many Houdinis may contrive to do the impossible.

The Federal Gasoline Tax and Its More Equitable Allocation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1954

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a companion bill with Congressman RUSSELL MACK, of the State of Washington, which we feel is necessary in returning more money collected in the form of a Federal gasoline tax to the various States. We are very hopeful that our theory be approved by the Public Works Committee of which we are members, so that the various States will be encouraged to further improve the usability and safety of our highways.

I have taken into consideration the necessity for larger percentages of moneys to be provided the sparsely populated States such as Utah, Wyoming, Nevada, and others, and at the same time return to the larger States a more equitable amount of matching moneys.

DIVERSION OF FUNDS

Last year, the Federal Government collected nearly $867 million in revenues from the Federal gasoline tax of 2 cents a gallon. During that same time, they returned only $575 million to the States—diverting some $300 million for other purposes.

Under the formula we hope to establish in this legislation the various States would receive 50 percent more money than is now allocated. Even with this increased allocation, several millions of dollars would remain unappropriated—but the allocation would be considerably more equitable.

As an example in the present inequity, I would like to cite the case of the State of California which receives $30,269,263 each year as its share under the Federal aid to highways program. During the same year however, motorists of the State of California contribute $78,403,000 in Federal gas tax collections.

PROPOSED INCREASE

Under the bill in discussion at this time, the return to California would be increased by 50 percent—or $15,134,631—to a total of $45,403,894.

Our neighboring States would also receive increases in the same proportion. Oregon now receives $8,661,811 and under the bill would receive $12,992,716. The State of Washington receives $9,240,247 and under the bill would receive $13,860,370. The State of Nevada now receives $5,730,198 and under the bill would receive $8,595,297.

This would mean that those States, where highway transportation facilities are of prime importance, would receive increased allocations amounting to more than $27 million.

AN EXPLORED THEORY

Last year, when the general road bill was before our committee, the theory of allocating Federal gas tax funds to the States was quite well explored. When the matter of increased allocations to the various States was under discussion, a colloquy between Francis V. du Pont, Commissioner of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, and myself, is recorded as follows on page 23 of the hearings:

Mr. SCUDDER. That would indicate that we should give more attention, by authorizing more money to the highway systems of our country, of the gas and oil taxes that accrue to the Federal Government through taxation. One of the problems we had last year (1952) was trying to get a reasonable amount of the money paid in by motorists for highway purposes, although I know it is not earmarked for that specific purpose. Generally speaking, though, a motorist feels when he pays gas tax that he is paying a tax for the construction and maintenance of highways. We had quite a battle last year to raise the amount that had been set by the administration from $450 million to some $550 million. There still remained between 250 million and 300 million unexpended out of the gas-tax receipts. We should allocate all of the money that is collected in taxes from the motorists, on gasoline and motor fuel, to the construction of highways. Has there been a policy set up by this administration?

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Congressman, it is our understanding that our responsibility is one of administration and not of policymaking as to where the best sources of revenue are to sustain the arteries, if you will call it that, for our economic system.

Mr. SCUDDER. Then from an administration standpoint there is no limitation on the amount of money that the Congress might see fit to appropriate for road construction. It becomes our policy to say whether this money is spent for highways, or whether it remains in the general fund and used for other purposes.

Mr. DU PONT. That is up to the Congress.

Owing to the fact that every State in the Union as well as the Territories of Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico will share in this increased allotment, I am quite confident that the proposal we make—or one similar thereto—will be developed to a point where the States will receive a greater amount of money from the gas tax than they do at the present time.

It is my firm belief that moneys paid to the Federal Government in the form of gas tax should be applied to highway construction.

SAFER TRAVEL

Of course, we must always keep in mind the fact that transcontinental and coastal highways are vital to the interest of California and its citizens. Tourist trade is one of the largest industries of our State. Through the construction of better highways we encourage travel and, at the same time, make the highways safer and protect the lives and property of the users. Through this bill greater consideration and attention can be given to the Redwood Highway which consists of Highway 101, and 199. Also, these funds would be available for the secondary highways such as No. 1, No. 12, No. 28, No. 20—and many others.

Better and safer travel can be made available through the equitable and judicious application of funds collected from those who travel the highways and pay the taxes for their upkeep and improvement.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in attempting to garner support for the Bricker amendment to the Constitution seeking to limit the President's treatymaking power, the impression that is sought to be created is that most lawyers who have studied the question are supporting that amendment. Some color is lent to that argument by the fact the American Bar Association appears to have gone on record in support of the amendment.

The fact of the matter is that not all of the members of the American Bar Association are supporting that proposed amendment. Many of them are opposing it.

The statement has been made that the only ones learned in the law who are opposing the Bricker amenment are some professors of law who teach constitutional law, but the statement goes on they have never practiced constitutional law. Those statements, too, are not in accord with the facts.

Many of the most outstanding lawyers of this country, who not only have studied constitutional law but have handled hundreds of cases involving constitutional law and thus have gained their knowledge not only from study but also from practice, are vigorously opposing the Bricker amendment because they believe it is a very bad one and is not in accord with the tradition and history of this country and of our Constitution.

To give support to my statement, I wish to call attention to the fact that there has recently been organized a Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power. The organization is national in its scope and finds among its membership and sponsors some of the best brains of the country.

Its national chairman is Edward S. Corwin; treasurer, Geoffrey S. Smith; executive secretary, Robert B. Eichholz.

Among its sponsors are John W. Davis and Lucius D. Clay, cochairmen; Frank Altschul, of Stamford, Conn.; Charles K. Arter, of Cleveland, Ohio; Laird Bell, of Chicago, Ill.; James T. Brand, of Salem, Oreg.; Harry Amos Bullis, of Minneapolis, Minn.; Stuart Chevalier, of Los Angeles, Calif.; Will L. Clayton, of Houston, Tex.; Charles A. Coolidge, of Boston, Mass.; Homer D. Crotty, of Los Angeles, Calif.; Robert Dechert, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Edwin D. Dickinson, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Robert G. Dodge, of Boston, Mass.; Harry S. Drinker, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Farnham P. Griffiths, of San Francisco, Calif.; Erwin N. Griswold, of Cambridge, Mass.; James P. Hart, of Austin, Tex.; Elizabeth E. Heffelfinger, of Minneapolis, Minn.; Palmer Hoyt, of Denver, Colo.; Sarah T. Hughes, of Dallas, Tex.; Devereux C. Josephs, of New York, N. Y.; Jacob M. Lashly, of St. Louis, Mo.; Monte M. Lemann, of New Orleans, La.; William D. Mitchell, of New York, N. Y.; John Lord O'Brian, of Washington, D. C.; Joseph O'Meara, of South Bend, Ind.; Philip D. Reed, of New York, N. Y.; Owen J. Roberts, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Elihu Root, Jr., of New York, N. Y.; Marcus C. Sloss, of San Francisco, Calif.; Anna Lord Strauss, of New York, N. Y.; Harrison Tweed, of New York, N. Y.; and Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., of Stamford, Conn.

There are many other prominent and just as highly respected patriotic Americans whose names I do not presently have.

Religious Persecution in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in the anxious days preceding the proposed four-power conference, when the people of the free world tend again to be encouraged about the prospects of finding a solution to the problems and threats facing our world, we must once again look back upon the record of Communist performance to see whether that record justifies any optimism on our part. We must look at that record and see if there is anything in it which would encourage us to hope that those agreements that may be reached at the pending four-power conference will be honored by the Soviet Union. This reappraisal of the Communist record is particularly necessary because there appear to be some indications that the people who are in a position to shape our Nation's policy may be inclined to enter into agreements, and accept compromises, even at the cost of direct concessions to the Soviets including tacit acquiescence to the status quo in eastern and central Europe.

That any formal recognition or acquiescence to the status quo in that area can never be condoned by our Nation is a fact which ought to be borne in mind by everyone of us. The enslavement by the Communists of the countries presently behind the Iron Curtain, accomplished in violation of explicit international agreements, must continue to be condemned by our Nation and by all freedom-loving countries. We ought to do all that we can to see that freedom and the right to democratic self-government are restored to those countries in pursuance of those agreements which the Soviet Union had violated.

This consideration ought to warn our Government to proceed with caution in entering into any agreements with the Soviet Union. We have had enough instances of bad faith and of broken promises on the part of the Communists. To confer with them with view to bringing about a solution of the problems which they have largely created is both advisable and necessary in view of the deteriorating international situation. But to commit our Nation to any obligations, or any specific course of action which would have to be taken by us before the Communists show concrete evidence of their good will, would be an entirely different matter.

To test the Communists' intentions with regard to their cooperation with the free world in solving the major problems which confront us today, we can, for instance, urge that they put an immediate end to the religious persecution in Poland, and promptly release from prison the Primate of Poland, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, and the ten or more Polish bishops who have been incarcerated by the Communists. The termination of this reign of terror which has prevailed in Poland and in the other countries behind the Iron Curtain would be an important indication that the Communists are coming to the Four Power conference prepared to talk sense, and not merely to waste our time.

The Communist persecution of the Catholic Church in Poland, just like their activities directed against men of other faiths and intended to suppress the worship of God in the lands behind the Iron Curtain, has aroused considerable resentment and bitterness in this land of ours in which freedom of worship is safeguarded by our Constitution. Only recently, at a mass rally sponsored in my district by Council No. 6 of the Polish Roman Catholic Union and by the Polish Veterans of World War II, over twelve hundred people gathered at Milwaukee's South Side Armory to protest, by their presence there, the persecution of the Catholic Church in Poland and the imprisonment of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. This mass protest meeting was supported by the Most Reverend Archbishop Albert Meyer, the Archbishop of Milwaukee, the Most Reverend Bishop Roman Atkielski, and by members of the archdiocesan clergy, and by many prominent laymen in our city. In the course of the meeting, Dr. Jerzy Lerski, of Washington, D. C., gave a comprehensive and factual account of the religious persecution campaign directed by the Communists in Poland against the Catholic Church, and a resolution was adopted strongly condemning these Communist actions. At this point in the RECORD, I would like to call this resolution to the attention of the membership of this House:

We solemnly protest before the people and Government of the United States, and before the delegations of all free Governments, represented at the eighth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, against the infamous unlawful internment of His Eminence Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, the Primate of Poland, and other representatives of the church hierarchy, whose arrest by the Communist authorities in Poland has been recently reported.

Violence inflicted by the Communist regime in Warsaw upon Cardinal Wyszynski constitutes a climactic development in the continuous struggle against religion, churches and clergy; it is an assault on the highest moral authority in Poland; it is also an outrage against the majesty of the Polish Republic, because for centuries the Primate

was not only the first dignitary of the church, but also represented the nation in times when the head of state was unable to perform his functions.

Through its assault upon the office and person of the Primate, the Communist regime in Poland proved even more flagrantly than ever before its true character of an agency of the Kremlin, bent on the destruction of the best tradition and the spirit of the Polish Republic.

Violating the basic principles of justice and human rights the Communist regime in Poland erased itself from the family of recognized civilized governments irrevocably and in a way which should be obvious to everyone in the Western World.

Appealing to the delegations of the free Governments represented at the eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly to condemn the Communist acts of violence perpetrated on Cardinal Wyszynski and other church dignitaries, we simultaneously express our conviction that these Governments will reconsider their attitude toward the Soviet puppet regime in Poland and its representatives in the United Nations, whom all true Poles in the homeland and abroad refuse to recognize.

We also respectfully request our Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, to take under consideration a suspension of diplomatic relations with the Communist government of Poland at least until such a time when the Primate of Poland is released from prison and free to perform his functions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that similar protest meetings have been held in many other communities in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and other States of the Midwest, as well as in the eastern section of our country. I sincerely hope that the resolutions adopted at these meetings will be heeded by those officials in the executive branch who are entrusted with the task of conducting our foreign relations.

Some months before this popular campaign of protest against religious persecution in Poland gained momentum, I personally urged the President and the Secretary of State to formally condemn the imprisonment of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, and the other contemptible acts of the Communists, directed at the suppression of the freedom of worship. I should like to include my letter to the President, and the replies received from him and from the Secretary of State, at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 14, 1953.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The people of my district, as well as, I am certain, all the people of the United States and of the free world, were shocked and aggrieved by the recent imprisonment of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, the Primate of Poland, and of seven Polish bishops, by the Communist regime of terror which has ruled the people of Poland since 1947.

To all men who respect the freedom of worship and the dignity of man, this most recent Communist perfidy was revolting and contemptible.

It is my purpose in writing this letter to urge you strongly to speak for the people of the United States in forcefully protesting to the Communist regime in Poland this deliberate attempt to deprive the people of Poland of the freedom of worship.

The case of Cardinal Wyszynski follows the pattern established during recent years by the Communist regimes of terror in Europe as well as in Asia. It parallels the Communist treatment of Hungary's Cardinal Mindszenty, of Czechoslovakia's Archbishop Beran, of Yugoslavia's Cardinal Stepinac, and of China's Cardinal Tien. In directing their wrath at these high religious dignitaries who have been the symbols of unyielding resistance to the evils of Marxist communism, the Communist regimes are aiming at the last bastion of the Christian civilization within the lands which they have enslaved: the Christian religion of the Communist-dominated countries.

Free men cannot ignore and by their silence give tacit approval to these deliberate acts against basic human rights. We cannot remain true to our conscience, and to our professed task of working for lasting and just peace in the world, unless we raise our voice in protest against these heinous acts depriving our fellow men, through terror and persecution, of the freedom of worship and belief.

I respectfully urge you to give your earnest consideration to this grave matter.

Respectfully yours,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 29, 1953.

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ZABLOCKI: I have your letter of October 14 regarding the action taken recently against a courageous leader of his church, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, primate of Poland. The arrest and interment of Cardinal Wyszynski is profoundly discouraging to those of us who look for signs of Communist willingness to respect basic human rights of freedom of thought and conscience. Without evidence of such willingness, it is difficult to believe that the Communist governments intend to honor agreements which might be reached to reduce world tensions. You may recall that I spoke of this in connection with the arrest of Cardinal Wyszynski at my news conference of September 30th.

The calculated repression of all religious organization in the Communist states makes it apparent that wherever Communists are in position to use force and violence, they will do so in an effort to win domination not only over the body and mind of man, but over his soul as well. I share very strongly the conviction which was expressed in the condemnation of the action against Cardinal Wysznski issued by the Department of State on September 30th, that the religious spirit of man will never be subdued or extinguished, and that it will remain a sustaining force in Poland during the present tragic suffering of the Polish people. It is my intention that this Government continue to take all appropriate steps to see to it that Communist violations of the inalienable rights of man under God do not go unopposed, and that they are effectively exposed in every forum.

Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 4, 1953.

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,

MY DEAR MR. ZABLOCKI: I have your letter of October 14, 1953, urging earnest consideration of the situation brought about by the continuing repression of religious organization in countries under Communist rule, culminating in the recent arrest and internment of the Primate of Poland, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. I am deeply concerned about the persecution of religion in Poland and the other Communist states. The cause of human freedom is indivisable, and wherever it is under attack, the effects extend to all of us.

In connection with these acts of terror in suppression of religious freedom in Poland, it will be noted that Poland, like all other members of the United Nations, pledged itself to promote respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms. The deliberate steps of the present Communist regime in Poland designed to bring religious organization under the subjection of the police state clearly violate these standards. As such, these acts are resented and condemned by the people of the United States. The United States delegation to the current session of the United Nations General Assembly has been requested to make every effort to see that this flagrant denial of religious freedom is effectively exposed before the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

Mr. Speaker, in closing this address, I again want to urge the Secretary of State to press, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, for immediate and full consideration of this grave matter by a special committee of the United Nations General Assembly. The world ought to know about the full ramifications of religious persecution in Communist-dominated countries. Since this persecution is a direct violation of the pledges made by the Communist regime of Poland as a member of the United Nations, that international organization ought to investigate this matter thoroughly and press for immediate cessation of religious persecution in Poland, and for the release of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, of Bishops Adamski, Baziak, Bednosz, Bieniek, Biernacki, Baraniak, Kaczmarek, Maria Splett, and Rospond, and of the other members of the Polish clergy who have been imprisoned by the Communist regime. I earnestly hope that this will be accomplished without further delay.

Thomas E. Braniff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of Thomas E. Braniff on January 10 brings a sense of profound grief to many Members of the House who were personally acquainted with this distinguished American. It was my privilege to know Mr. Braniff and to be identified with him in matters affecting the life of the great Southwest. His passing is a distinct loss to the Nation's civic, religious, and commercial life. The record of safety of the Braniff Lines, which he organized and actively directed, has not been excelled. It is estimated that his company's airplanes have flown a total of 3 billion passenger-miles without a single fatality.

Mr. Braniff was a much beloved citizen of Dallas at the time of his death

and equally esteemed in Oklahoma, where he lived for many years. His interests were not bounded by regional or even hemispheric lines. His warm human sympathies found an outlet in many splendid enterprises. He and Mrs. Braniff had established a family foundation for benevolences in which they had a special interest, and his generous support of the charitable and religious institutions of this country was widely recognized.

He was a devoted and effective leader in his church, and had received national recognition for his outstanding service in behalf of the Red Cross, Boy Scouts, USO, and the National Conference of Christians and Jews. He was national Catholic cochairman of the last-named organization at the time of his death.

Tom Braniff's influence will live after him. His great talents were expended always in a constructive direction, and the impress of his inspiring leadership will remain.

Statement by Hon. William T. Granahan, of Pennsylvania, on Private Immigration Bill for Former Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, on January 14, 1954, a private bill, H. R. 7221, for the relief of Anders Taranger, a young man who has just completed 2 years of service in the United States Marine Corps, including action in the Korean theater, to give him eligibility for American citizenship—an honor and privilege to which he is entitled by virtue of his service to our country in time of war.

Anders Taranger, a Norwegian seaman, was stranded in the United States several years ago when the Panamanian ship on which he was a radio operator was sold in the United States. He registered under the draft as an alien in the United States, was inducted into the Marine Corps and was honorably discharged on January 6, 1954. He immediately attempted to file citizenship papers, but was rejected because he had lived in the United States only 10 months, instead of the required 12 months, prior to joining the Marine Corps.

Taranger's home address is 5000 Pacific Avenue, Wildwood, N. J. I am interesting myself in his case at the request of veterans organizations in the Philadelphia area, who believe that his case is a meritorious one. I was pleased to read on January 12 an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer endorsing my plans to seek special legislation for Taranger so that he may qualify for citizenship papers, despite the technicality involved in his lacking a mere 2 months of additional residence in this country prior to enlistment.

It would be a shame if such a technicality were to deprive this young man of the opportunity of citizenship.

I have asked Chairman CHAUNCEY REED, of the House Judiciary Committee, to schedule an early hearing on my bill.

Expenses for College Education Should Be Tax Deductible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to urge the enactment of H. R. 1274, introduced by me on January 7, 1953.

My bill is directed primarily to give relief to those parents who are paying more than $600 personal exemption per child for the education of their children. I have had the experience, and I will get no personal benefit from this bill because I have put both my boys through college without any such exemption, and many of by colleagues have done the same thing.

We know if you are sending them to a college away from home you are lucky if you can do it for as little as $2,500 per year per child. You get all of $600 a year exemption.

So I am not talking for myself about this. I am talking for all of the parents of this country, and I think we have now gotten to the point in this country where we believe that just as a primary education is necessary and a secondary or high school education is necessary, we should, if possible, give every child in this country an opportunity to get a college education.

This bill will go a long way toward bringing that about by making it possible for these parents, who if they can get this tax relief, will get at least some help in sending their children through the colleges and universities of our country.

The colleges and universities of our country need help, too, because if they cannot continue to get students to pay the tuition, they are going to be in a bad way. As a matter of fact, many of them are already suffering from lack of students.

The GI bill having practically run out, and our parents of the country in large part not being able to send their children to college, those institutions are beginning to feel the loss of student population.

I might say that the bill introduced by me has received widespread approval throughout the country.

The House Ways and Means Committee has conducted hearings on the bill and on the general principle therein. During the course of the executive sessions of the committee for the purpose of revising the tax laws, the committee has tentatively decided to recommend that a $600 exemption for children should be continued beyond the age of 18 years, if the child is a student attending school or college.

This is a step in the right direction and a recognition of the principle set forth in my bill.

It does not, however, go far enough and we should continue to press for the enactment of the language contained in H. R. 1274, which would allow for the full reasonable expenses for a college education.

At this time, I would like to pay tribute to the many college organizations and publications that are supporting my bill and particularly to the National Student Association which is doing so much to direct the attention of the taxpayers of the country to the fact that expenses for college education should be tax deductible.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Father, as this Chamber is hushed to silence, may we find Thee moving upon our minds, higher than our highest thought, yet nearer to us than hands or feet. Before the toil of a new day opens before us, we would lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts. May they be acceptable in Thy sight. Bring all our desires and powers, we beseech Thee, into conformity to Thy will. As we pray for Thy kingdom's coming to our own hearts and to the whole wide world, awake in us a holy awe of this law-abiding universe which is our home and which so inexorably moves from cause to consequence. Bend our pride to Thy control. Prepare us for the role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day, with its vast issues that concern not only our own dear land but all the continents and the islands of the sea. May our loins be girt and our lamps burning as those who watch for their Lord's coming. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 14, 1954, was dispensed with.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and the insertion of matters in the RECORD, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

INCREASE OF BORROWING POWER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OFFICERS OF AIR FORCE ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY AT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that at the end of the second quarter of fiscal year 1954, there were 2,476 officers of the Air Force assigned or detailed to permanent duty at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 307 of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that commission for the period January 1 to June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3528 OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO PURCHASE OF METAL FOR MINOR COINS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER PROPERTY OF CERTAIN INDIANS IN CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of Indian tribes, bands, and groups in California and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4153 OF REVISED STATUTES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1721, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO SALE OR PLEDGE OF POSTAGE STAMPS

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STANLEY RYDZON AND ALEXANDER F. ANDERSON

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the period July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Future Farmers of America, for the period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSAL OF PAID POSTAL SAVINGS CERTIFICATES

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION ON ESTABLISHMENT OF HIGHWAY POST OFFICE SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT THAT POSTMASTERS REPORT TO POSTMASTER GENERAL FAILURE TO CANCEL POSTAGE STAMPS

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the requirement of section 3021 of the Revised Statutes that postmasters report to the Postmaster General failure to cancel postage stamps (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON PROGRESS MADE IN IMPROVEMENT AND CLASSIFICATION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on progress made in the improvement of Federal-aid highways and classification of highways (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pubic Works.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN (by request):

S. 2714. A bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; and

S. 2715. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2716. A bill for the relief of Nicholas DeClaris (Nick DeClaris); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2717. A bill to remove the time limitations on a period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded to certain seriously disabled veterans of World War II and of service on and after June 27, 1950;

S. 2718. A bill to afford education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the cases of certain seriously disabled veterans, notwithstanding the time limitations of such act, and

S. 2719. A bill to prevent persons who engage in activities contrary to the interest of the United States from pursuing a course of education or training in a foreign country under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (by request):

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to validate conveyance of a 40-acre tract in Okaloosa County, Fla.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference three bills relating to veterans' legislation.

The bills were sent me by the American Legion with the request that I introduce them in the Senate. I am happy to comply. Upon occasion when bills are introduced by request, it is assumed that the sponsor does not necessarily support them. I want it clearly understood that I am sponsoring these bills because I agree wholeheartedly with the Legion that they are good; that they are necessary; and that they are in the national interest.

Two of the bills are designed to correct inequities in existing legislation whereby veterans, simply because of temporary physical or mental disability, have been deprived of rights granted them by a grateful nation.

The third bill is designed to plug a loophole in existing law so as to destroy the possibility that Federal funds under GI bills might be used either to finance study in totalitarian controlled institutions abroad or to finance the activities abroad of individuals pursuing courses of action inimical to the interests of the United States.

I sincerely hope the bills will be considered promptly and acted upon favorably. I shall do all in my power to assure their passage.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that three letters sent me by the American Legion in connection with the proposed legislation be inserted at this point in the record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters presented by the Senator from Montana will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 2717. A bill to remove the time limitations on a period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded to certain seriously disabled veterans of World War II and of service on and after June 27, 1950;

S. 2718. A bill to afford education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the cases of certain seriously disabled veterans, notwithstanding the time limitations of such act; and

S. 2719. A bill to prevent persons who engage in activities contrary to the interest of the United States from pursuing a course of education or training in a foreign country under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

The letters presented by Mr. MURRAY are as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1954.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Enclosed please find copy of H. R. 1840 introduced in the House January 16, 1953, same being a bill to prevent persons who engage in activities contrary to the interest of the United States from pursuing a course of education or training in a foreign country under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

The national organization of the American Legion would be grateful to you if you would be good enough to introduce a companion bill in the Senate.

This amendment pertains to veterans in training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended). Under this provision the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would have authority to deny or discontinue the pursuit of a course by a veteran in a foreign educational or training institution if it were determined that the pursuit of such course was not for the best interest of the veteran or the Government. A similar provision was inserted in the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (see sec. 221, Public Law 550, 82d Cong.).

Thanking you for your cooperation and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1954.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Enclosed please find copy of H. R. 1304, introduced in the House January 7, 1953, same being a bill to remove the time limitations on a period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded to certain seriously disabled veterans of World War II and of service on and after June 27, 1950.

The national organization of the American Legion would be grateful to you if you would be good enough to introduce a companion bill in the Senate.

Under the present law, vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16 must have been completed by July 25, 1956. Veterans with serious disabilities, such as tuberculosis or neuropsychiatric disorders, may be unable to rehabilitate themselves before the delimiting date. This amendment would permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to authorize in certain cases initiation into and completion of training beyond the present termination date.

Thanking you for your cooperation and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1954.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Enclosed please find copy of H. R. 1303 introduced in the House January 7, 1953, same being a bill to afford education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the cases of certain seriously disabled veterans, notwithstanding the time limitations of such act.

The national organization of the American Legion would be grateful to you if you would be good enough to introduce a companion bill in the Senate.

Under Public Law 346, 78th Congress, as amended, education or training must have been initiated before July 25, 1951, and must be completed by July 25, 1956. Certain veterans, because of serious physical or mental disabilities were unable to enter training prior to the delimiting initiation date. The proposed amendment to the law would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to extend the delimiting initiation date so as to afford a reasonable period of time following recovery from the physical or mental disability in which to initiate a course.

Section 2 of the proposed amendment would, in any case where delayed initiation is authorized, permit completion of the course, notwithstanding the delimiting termination date of July 25, 1956.

Thanking you for your cooperation and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 186) authorizing the employment of additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported it favorably, without amendment, and the resolution was placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I report favorably an original resolution providing funds for the investigating subcommittee of that committee. It was unanimously approved by the committee. The resolution requests $192,830 for the next year.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, did the Senator ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, or that it go to the calendar?

Mr. MUNDT. I am merely reporting the resolution from the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

The resolution (S. Res. 189), reported by Mr. MUNDT, was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1954, and ending on January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $192,830, in addition to the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 40, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to January 30, 1953, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

SCRAPPING OF THE U. S. S. "CORN HUSKER MARINER"

Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 191), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas the 81st Congress on January 6, 1951, passed Public Law 911 appropriating $350 million for the construction of 35 high-speed cargo vessels to be known as the Mariner class; and

Whereas these vessels are equipped with special military features and are a necessary part of the defense program; and

Whereas one such vessel, the *Corn Husker Mariner*, ran aground at Pusan, Korea, in July of 1953 after only 6 months service; and

Whereas the Navy expended more than $600,000 to refloat and transport the vessel to Sasebo, Japan; and

Whereas the vessel can be rebuilt in Japan at an estimated cost of $2,500,000; and

Whereas the vessel is only 6 months old and cost the United States $9,500,000 to build; and

Whereas the Maritime Board and National Shipping Authority ordered the scrapping of the *Corn Husker Mariner;* and

Whereas this action would result in a net loss to the United States of $7,600,000; and

Whereas the United States is still constructing more vessels of this type: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby requests and urges the Maritime Board and National Shipping Authority to hold up the scrapping of the *Corn Husker Mariner* until a proper committee of the Senate investigates and reports on this proposed action.

ANALYSIS OF ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS FOR AMENDING THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent and penetrating analysis of the administration's proposals for amending the Taft-Hartley Act. I think it makes it quite clear that the proposals sent us do not in any sense carry out the pledges made to labor by this administration when it sought office.

I hope all the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle will read this analysis. It is by Arthur J. Goldberg, CIO general counsel. Of course, Mr. Goldberg does his analysis from the point of view of the great industrial unions he represents. But I challenge any one of my colleagues of the Senate, Republican or otherwise, after reading the analysis carefully, to point out a single flaw in its logic or to show in it even the slightest departure from fact.

It is a restrained, clearcut citing of evidence respecting the administration's expressions and conduct concerning the Nation's labor problems. The analysis, being based on past experience of the Federal Government in the effort to achieve equity and justice for the workers of our country, at no point fails to face up to reality. In his cool and penetrating report Mr. Goldberg has made a cogent and important contribution to an understanding of a grave set of problems which are of deep concern to our entire population. All of us, relying more than ever in this time of world peril upon the steady production of the workers of our Nation, should give sober, unselfish heed to the reasoning which animates Mr. Goldberg's analysis.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S LABOR MESSAGE AND SENATOR SMITH'S BILL TO AMEND TAFT-HARTLEY BY CIO GENERAL COUNSEL ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG

The President's message and the bill, which Senator SMITH says is the administration's bill, would make Taft-Hartley worse than it is. The few improvements are sugar coating to disguise new antilabor restrictions.

This is not a middle-of-the-road approach to labor-management relations by an administration pledged to justice and fairness. This is not the reform of Taft-Hartley promised by President Eisenhower as a candidate.

The message and the bill are a victory for the National Association of Manufacturers in the undercover struggle in the administration which has been going on during the last year on its labor policy. This is another giveaway to the Republican Party's financial angels.

I

The antilabor philosophy which motivates the administration's proposal is evident from the strike-vote recommendation. As Walter Reuther said, this adds to the antilabor arsenal already provided employers by the law.

The proposal is based on the misconception always harbored by antiunion employers that unions act contrary to the will of their members rather than in response to that will.

This same misconception prompted the strike-vote section of the Smith-Connally Act which Congress abandoned as a demonstrated failure at the end of the war. In fact, Congress refused appropriations for such votes while the law still remained on the books.

Even the 80th Congress, in light of the Smith-Connally experiences, refused to write such a provision into Taft-Hartley.

During Smith-Connally, 2,168 polls were taken by the Government, at great expense. Two million nine hundred twenty-three thousand six hundred and fifty-five workers were eligible to vote in these polls. Of this number, only 332,874 voted against striking; 1,593,937 voted to strike.

Fortunately, strikes of this number and magnitude did not occur, not because of the law, but because of the voluntary and patriotic response of the union membership to the no-strike pledge of their union leaders.

A strike vote repudiated in wartime is now unprecedentedly offered for peacetime.

In light of this experience, the only reason for this proposal must be the false hope that it will weaken unions.

Again, even more recent experience than the war is ignored. Taft-Hartley itself contained a similar misguided attempt to demonstrate that unions do not speak for their membership by requiring a similar vote for a union shop. Here wage earners voted more than 90 percent for union shops. After this demonstration of membership support for union leadership and unions, this provision was dropped from the law at the instance of Senator Taft himself, among others, in 1951, by a unanimous vote in the Senate and a virtually unanimous vote in the House.

It was assumed from the President's message that a prestrike vote was contemplated, an assumption shared by the administration's Labor Secretary. Senator SMITH's bill, however, provides for a vote during the strike.

Whether Senator SMITH's bill is the administration's bill is, therefore, still in doubt. He says it is. The President refuses to say.

It seems to us characteristic of the whole faltering and evasive approach of the administration toward labor policy that at this late date a lack of candor exists as to the precise details of that policy.

A prestrike vote is an attempt to drive a wedge between the union's leadership and its membership. A poststrike vote, in addition, seeks to break a strike.

Such votes intensify industrial disputes rather than solve them. They freeze positions of both unions and management and hamper realistic bargaining.

In a prestrike vote every dispute is conducted in an election-year atmosphere. In a poststrike vote, every election is conducted in an atmosphere of industrial strife.

Experience here, too, demonstrates that union membership will overwhelmingly support their union's position during such a dispute. Both the President and Senator SMITH seem to overlook the fact that Taft-Hartley itself still contains a last-offer-vote procedure in national emergency strikes.

Results under this provision have led both congressional committees and impartial experts to the conclusion that this vote is at best futile and expensive, and at worst hampers, rather than facilitates, reasonable settlement.

Almost without exception, every last-offer vote under Taft-Hartley has resulted in an overwhelming rejection of the employer's last offer.

Indicative of the loaded character of the present proposal is the fact that Senator SMITH's bill provides that a majority of those eligible, rather than a majority of those voting, must vote to continue the strike. We doubt whether the Senator would agree to measure his own acceptability to his constituency by such a test.

Our objection to this proposal is not based on any fear that workers will repudiate their unions. The record proves we have no reason for such fear. Furthermore, by and large, all unions provide for democratic determination of strike action.

Our objection is rather to Government interference in labor-management affairs in such a manner as will hamper, rather than encourage, good faith collective bargaining and the reasonable settlement of disputes.

Moreover, we reject the basic philosophy behind the proposal that the way to improve labor-management relations is by weakening unions.

This philosophy is the direct reverse of President Eisenhower's campaign philosophy that "weak unions cannot be responsible. This alone is sufficient reason for having strong unions."

II

Everybody knows that one of labor's fundamental objections to Taft-Hartley is that it expressly authorizes the States to adopt laws even more restrictive of union security than Taft-Hartley.

The administration itself proposed to eliminate this open invitation to the States to adopt antilabor legislation in the abortive 19-point message during Secretary Durkin's tenure. This significant change in Taft-Hartley is omitted from the present proposals.

By failing to recommend the elimination of this Taft-Hartley provision, the administration has placed its stamp of approval on the "right to work" laws enacted in 16 States under the guise of "State's rights."

The slogan "right to work" is transparently fraudulent. By "right to work" is really meant the right of sweatshop employers to work their employees for long hours and short pay.

When the sweatshop brigade says "State's rights," it means the right of a State to enact harsh restrictions on the rights of workers. Curiously enough, the term "State's rights," as used by these interests, under no circumstances comprehends the right of a State to enact liberal labor legislation. Nor does the slogan "Right to work" include the right of a worker—regardless of race, creed, or color—to a job all the year round.

"State's rights" and "right to work," as used in the present context, mean only one simple thing: The weakening of unions so that an employer can pay his workers less for the same work than organized workers are getting in other States.

The President's message also permits the States to adopt compulsory arbitration as a means of dealing with alleged and undefined local emergencies, thereby overruling a decision of the Supreme Court invalidating such statutes under present Federal law. Here the President is for what he was expressly against in the campaign, namely, the use of compulsory arbitration, or the trend toward it, in the settlement of labor disputes.

The next step is plainly forecast in the President's message. The President states that he has under study and will propose legislation which necessarily will overrule a recent decision of the Supreme Court preventing State and local governments from usurping the authority of the Federal Government in the field of labor-management disputes affecting interstate commerce.

This will intensify the drive for State antilabor laws. Instead of even-handed justice in the field of labor-management relations in interstate commerce, there would be 52 brands—1 for each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia.

III

In the campaign President Eisenhower was against labor injunctions. He said injunctions "will not settle the underlying fundamental problems which cause strikes." The President says it again in his message: "Where a collective-bargaining relationship exists, the issuance of an injunction often has the effect of making settlement of the

dispute which led to the injunction more difficult."

Yet the President would leave in Taft-Hartley all of the types of injunctions now permitted by that statute with only one slight modification—that is, the changing of the mandatory injunction in boycott cases to a discretionary one.

This is a far cry from the pledge implicit in his campaign speeches that the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which he praised as a Republican achievement, would be restored.

IV

Everyone recognizes that the national-emergency provisions of Taft-Hartley are unsound. Yet the President's only proposal in this field would make the national-emergency procedure even more unsound.

The President has proposed that emergency boards of inquiry be empowered to make settlement recommendations after an antilabor injunction has almost run its course and presumably accomplished its purposes.

Whatever virtue there sometimes may be in such board settlement recommendations is lost by this ill-conceived procedure. Moreover, the fundamental defect of Taft-Hartley's emergency provisions—the reliance on the labor injunction—is retained.

The President's message speaks of the right of free speech as fundamental and states that Congress should make it clear that free speech applies equally to labor and management in every aspect of their relationship. Translated into Senator SMITH's bill, this results in further legalization of employer brain washing of employees in captive audiences.

The management-packed Labor Board has already achieved this amendment, except for a 24-hour period of relief from such practices immediately before a Labor Board election. Senator SMITH apparently proposes to abolish the 24-hour relief period.

VI

One of the President's flat commitments in the campaign was to rid Taft-Hartley of its provision prohibiting economic strikers from voting in a Board election—a provision which the President said licensed union busting. His message and the bill fall short of realizing this commitment. They merely postpone this ineligibility for a period of 4 months, after which strikebreakers are free to vote and economic strikers prohibited from voting. The President now proposes not to outlaw union busting, but merely to slow it down.

VII

Everyone familiar with the realities of collective bargaining knows that its essence is maximum freedom of negotiation and discussion. The Wagner Act, based on this reality, permitted the parties to raise and discuss any issue, regardless of whether or not it was covered in the contract. This did not require an employer to concur, nor did it require any change in the terms of a contract mutually agreed upon.

Taft-Hartley, as one of its restrictions, narrowed this area of negotiation and discussion to subjects not covered in the contract. It is now proposed that the law be amended to prevent negotiation or discussion on any subject during a contract's term unless express consent of both parties is obtained. This proposal to stifle discussion of problems of concern to either party during the life of a collective-bargaining agreement is impractical, unrealistic, and can only result in discouraging, rather than promoting, mutual understanding and reasonable settlement of problems of common concern.

VIII

Organized labor and management have worked out satisfactory checkoff arrangements under the present law. It permits an employee to authorize a checkoff of his dues by an assignment irrevocable for a period of a year and renewable from year to year thereafter unless revoked at stated annual periods. In all of the lengthy hearings last year before the Congress no one advocated any change in this provision or practice. Yet, the message and the bill now would change the checkoff provision to require it to be revocable at will. This, in practice, would result in disruption of stable practices already well established.

There are two reasons which underlie this proposal: One, to place in the Federal law the restrictions now found in the worst State right-to-work laws; and second, to weaken unions by providing a means of undermining their security.

IX

The President proposes that a study be made of union welfare funds for future legislation. It is our view that what is required in this field is not legislation but adequate enforcement of existing laws against anyone, be he company officer, union official, or insurance company executive, who is faithless to his trust in the administration of such trust funds.

X

The Taft-Hartley Act, as it now stands, holds a union liable for acts of its members where the union has not actually authorized or participated in or ratified these acts. It repealed the Norris-LaGuardia Act which required actual participation, authorization, or ratification of such acts after actual knowledge thereof. It is doubtful whether the message or the bill on this subject changes the Taft-Hartley Act in any material way and a change is long overdue.

XI

The President's message and Senator SMITH's bill give belated recognition to the fact that the present Taft-Hartley provisions for union security are unworkable in industries where employment is casual or sporadic. The beneficial results which otherwise might accrue from such recognition are substantially vitiated by the fact that the message and the bill leave intact the other Taft-Hartley provision which permits the States to override the union-security provisions of the Federal law. Thus, what is given by this bill for these industries is automatically taken away in the States which have adopted or may adopt such restrictive laws.

XII

The President's proposal to reduce some of the redtape in the filing of union reports is offset by the new requirement that employers file non-Communist affidavits. We have never believed that any good result could be achieved by requiring such affidavits either by employers or union officers.

The proposal does liberalize the Taft-Hartley boycott provisions, but not nearly enough. Still prohibited are justifiable types of union mutual assistance such as refusal to handle goods produced under sweatshop conditions, goods produced during a strike, or goods produced by runaway shops.

Finally, the proposed message does not meet many of the problems in the law needing correction to which numerous witnesses called the attention of Congress during last year's hearings on Taft-Hartley revision.

If there was any theme stressed by the President and other Republican orators during the last campaign it was that the "heavy hand" and "long nose" of government should be kept out of industrial disputes.

The President's proposal for amending Taft-Hartley make the Government's role in such disputes even heavierhanded than heretofore.

We need a sound approach toward collective bargaining and labor-management relations. Taft-Hartley is not such an approach. The President's message is even less so.

Since the hearings of last year unfortunately were conducted in the vacuum resulting from the administration's delay in stating its position, we are confident the labor committees of the Senate and House will afford the CIO and all other interested parties an opportunity to be heard on these proposals of the President and Senator SMITH's bill.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, is the morning hour concluded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no further routine business to be transacted, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] proposing to change certain language on pages 6, 12, and 13.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland obtained the floor.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I received from William Blizzard, president, district 17, United Mine Workers of America, and I ask the Senator from Maryland to yield for that purpose.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall be very happy to yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *January 14, 1954.*

MATTHEW M. NEELY,

United States Senate:

On behalf of members of district 17 I wish to enter a strong protest to St. Lawrence seaway legislation now before Senate.

U. M. W. of A. finds this legislation just as objectionable under Republican sponsorship as under Democrats. You are urged to exert all possible influence in preventing its passage.

WILLIAM BLIZZARD,

President, District 17, U. M. W. of A.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues my remarks in the closing minutes of the last session of the Senate before the adjournment last summer with regard to the St. Lawrence seaway project, and I take this opportunity to address myself to the pending bill, S. 2150.

It is indeed ironical that one of the next items of business to come before the Senate will be the question of raising the limit of the national debt. We were informed before Congress adjourned last August that this step would be necessary, and, in fact, as Senators will recall, an attempt was made to have that matter considered before the adjournment.

It would appear that nothing has taken place in the meantime to relieve us of this necessity. That of course means that we are not yet in a position to balance the budget. It is quite clear in such a situation that every effort must be made to economize in every possible way, and to eliminate all nonessential spending. Balancing the budget is not merely a desirable objective, nor is it just a case of fulfilling a campaign promise, but it is urgently necessary from the standpoint of the welfare of the Nation. An unbalanced budget leads to the continuation of high taxes, adds fuel to the flame of inflation, and generally threatens the economic stability of the country.

In this state of affairs, how anyone could vote for the expenditure of any substantial sum of money to provide for United States participation in the construction of the St. Lawrence Waterway, unless such participation be urgently necessary from the standpoint of our national security, is utterly inconceivable to me. The burden resting upon the proponents in this situation is far more than one of showing that construction of the project would be desirable or that it would be economically sound or that the project could be made self-liquidating and the investment of the United States amortized over the next 50 years. In normal times a demonstration of these things might well be enough, but it is entirely clear that it is not enough under the conditions prevailing today.

At the outset, I think it would be appropriate to set forth in summary form the major provisions of the bill the Senate now has under consideration. It will not be necessary to go into detail.

Senate bill 2150 would create a body corporate, to be known as the St. Lawrence Development Corporation, which would be authorized and directed to construct in United States territory navigation works of 27-foot depth in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, together with necessary dredging in the Thousand Islands section, and to operate and maintain such works in coordination with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada.

The Corporation is directed not to proceed with the construction unless and until, first the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada provides satisfactory assurances that it will complete the Canadian portions of the navigation works; and, second, the Corporation has received satisfactory assurances that the State of New York or other licensee of the Federal Power Commission, in conjunction with an appropriate agency in Canada, will construct and complete the dams and power works approved by the International Joint Commission in its order of October 29, 1952.

In order to finance its activities, the Corporation is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its obligations up to the amount of $105 million. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase such obligations and to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Provision is also made for the Corporation to work out an agreement with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada for the establishment of a system of tolls to be levied for the use of the waterway, or in the event such an agreement is not reached, to establish unilaterally a system of tolls for the use of the works in the United States. Standards are prescribed to govern the establishment of the system of tolls. Among other things, these standards include provisions to the effect that the rates prescribed shall be calculated to cover as nearly as practicable all costs of operating and maintaining the works, payment of interest on the obligations of the Corporation, payments in lieu of taxes, and, in addition, amortization of the principal of the debts and obligations of the Corporation over a period not to exceed 50 years.

I think that constitutes a sufficient description of the bill for my purposes.

My initial interest in this project arose by reason of the fact that substantial elements of the economy of the State of Maryland represented to me that this project would be harmful to their interests and to the State of Maryland. Accordingly, I gave this matter the most careful study, and reached the conclusion that the representations made to me were correct and that this project would be harmful to various elements of the economy of my State.

I make no apologies for my position, for I conceive it to be my duty to protect the legitimate interests of my State. On the other hand, important as those local interests are, I feel they are subordinate to the national welfare. For that reason I have studied this project with a view to determining what its national aspects are, for I wanted to know whether there were any overriding considerations which would cause me to favor this project, regardless of its effect on my State. Of course, national security would constitute such an overriding consideration; and, therefore, I felt it incumbent upon me to study this project without bias or prejudice, in order to determine whether it is necessary from the standpoint of national defense.

In this connection there are two points to consider: first, whether the project as a physical structure is necessary from the standpoint of national defense; and, second, even if one should conclude that it were necessary, whether there is any occasion for the United States to participate in this construction, as provided for in Senate bill 2150.

Let us look into the first question thoroughly. The claimed necessity of this project from the standpoint of national defense has rested almost entirely upon the argument that the Great Lakes steel industry would in the relatively short period of 10 or 15 years be unable to obtain an adequate supply of iron ore from the Lake Superior region; that it would become dependent upon the ore fields of Labrador, now under development, for a large portion of its needed supply; and that such quantities of Labrador ore could not be brought into this area economically without a 27-foot waterway through the St. Lawrence River.

The first scare headlines about our rapidly diminishing supply of high-grade ore in the Lake Superior region came at the time of the testimony of the then Secretary of the Interior before the House Public Works Committee, in the spring of 1951. The Secretary's conclusion was based almost entirely upon a mathematical calculation. He took from the Minnesota tax rolls the figure which purported to show reserves of open-pit, direct-shipping, high-grade ore in the Mesabi Range. He divided that figure by the annual production of such ore, and thus arrived at his conclusion that there was only 14 or 15 years' supply of such ore left. He failed to point out that these figures do not purport to be a true showing of reserves, but represent only the proven ore on which the owners are required to pay taxes.

As an indication of how unreliable such figures are as a true measure of reserves, consider the following figures: As of May 1, 1945, the Minnesota tax rolls showed, as an estimate of open-pit reserves in the Mesabi Range, 487 million tons. From 1945 to 1951, inclusive, 293.3 million tons of that type of ore were shipped, so we would naturally expect the remaining reserve to be 487 minus 293.3 million, or only 193.7 million tons. However, on May 1, 1950, the Minnesota tax rolls showed an estimate of reserves of that type of ore of exactly the same amount as they showed on May 1, 1945, namely, 487 million tons. The Secretary apparently failed to give due weight to the factors of new discoveries of ore, the improvement of equipment for stripping of overburden which has resulted in the reclassification of underground reserves as open-pit tonnage, and advances in the processes of beneficiation for ore.

Consider, for example, the views on this subject of Mr. Wilfred Sykes, chairman, executive committee, Inland Steel Co., as expressed in an article in the March 1950 issue of the magazine Midwest Engineers. Mr. Sykes stated in that article:

> There has been some rather wild talk regarding the possible future of the steel industry due to exhaustion of our present sources of raw materials. It has been suggested by an economist that in the future it will be necessary to concentrate the production of steel at the eastern seaboard where foreign ores could be received. This is based on the assumption that our existing sources of ore are being so rapidly depleted that steps must be taken promptly to maintain an adequate supply of steel. Fortunately this is not a true picture.
>
> At the present time we obtain about 85 percent of our ore from the Mesabi Range. In considering reserves, it is interesting to note that since 1915 about 1 billion tons of ore have been shipped from the Mesabi Range, but during this period the known reserves, as determined by the Minnesota Tax Commission, have decreased only about

300 million tons. This has been the result of—

1. The discovery of new ore;

2. Reclassification as ore of material previously considered of too low a grade to be economically shipped; and

3. Advances in the beneficiation of low-grade ores.

According to the best estimates available we probably have a supply of ore in the Mesabi Range that will last us for the next 30 years or so, after which the annual production will gradually decrease.

There are many varying estimates as to the quantity of reserves of high grade ore in the Lake Superior region, but the evidence that carries the most weight with me is that the men in the steel business think that the supply is adequate. This evidence is not in the form of concrete estimates expressed in millions of tons of reserves but is implicit in the actions of the steel companies.

In the period following World War II, the steel mills of the Great Lakes region of the Midwest have gone through the greatest expansion in their history. To me it is ridiculous to think that they would have taken such action without knowing that they were assured of an adequate supply of ore at economical prices for those mills. This point of view was well summed up by Mr. Elton Hoyt II, senior partner, Pickands, Mather & Co., one of our largest ore companies, in the following concluding paragraphs of an address entitled "Iron Ore in an Expanding Steel Industry," delivered at the general meeting of American Iron and Steel Institute on May 24, 1951. I quote from Mr. Hoyt's address as follows:

It is inconceivable to me that in planning the erection of costly additions to their plants at this time, and without Government subsidy, the executives of the great steel companies and their organizations do not know where the iron ore is coming from to operate their present as well as their new facilities. Unquestionably, if not unduly interfered with by outside influences beyond their control, the increase in pig iron production represented by new extensions now authorized will be forthcoming to meet the requirements of the present emergency, representing another and oustanding instance of the influence of the human element in the industrial picture.

It is my sincere belief that we may count among our blessings as American citizens the continuity of the courageous and far-sighted managements of this industry in the past and, above all, that the same managements for the most part continue today.

To me no other assurance is required that iron ore reserves are available for an expanding iron and steel industry.

In addition to the high grade ore from the Lake Superior region in Minnesota, there is an enormous field of high grade ore in Ontario known as Steep Rock which is being brought into production by United States interests. The chairman of the board of Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., the company developing this field, has stated that the areas under development can comfortably support an annual production of upward of 15 million tons of high grade ore for an indefinite period. The Secretary of the Interior in 1951 placed practically no reliance upon this source.

As a means of bringing into perspective the figure of 15 million tons as annual production, it should be borne in mind that the initial planned production in Labrador by the Iron Ore Co. of Canada and the quantity which the president of that company, Mr. George M. Humphrey, testified would be adequate to make their investment of $200 million pay out, is 10 million tons a year. I should also point out that Mr. Humphrey further stated that this investment had provided fixed facilities which would permit the expansion of production in that field to as much as 20 million tons in 1 year. Thus it appears that in Labrador the production of 10 million tons a year is planned and the hope is harbored that this production may be expanded to as much as 20 million tons a year, but no plans are in contemplation for production in excess of 20 million tons a year.

In addition to the high-grade ore from the sources already mentioned, the steel mills of the Midwest can rely upon an additional source of supply in the form of taconite processed into usable form.

Taconite is the name used to describe the most common form of low-grade mineral, having an iron content of from 30 to 35 percent. The process for concentrating taconite into pellets of high iron content has been perfected to such a point that the steel companies of this country have been willing to invest enormous sums of money in such concentration plants.

According to the best information I have been able to obtain, the investment in such plants approximates $500 million. I have been unable to obtain accurate information as to how much annual production would be realized as the result of such an investment. However, a rough estimate may be made on the basis of statements contained in the lead article in the magazine Steelways for March 1951 entitled "Taconite: Iron Ore Bonanza." The article described the plans announced for the first full-scale commercial taconite plant. The first unit of the plant was designed to produce 2,500,000 tons of concentrated pellets per year. The article went on to say that the plant would be so laid out as to make possible a fourfold expansion for a potential 10 million tons per year at a total expenditure of $160 million.

This gives an indication that the investment of $500 million will probably support an annual production of approximately 30 million tons of ore.

Some people say that taconite is all right as a source of supply of iron ore but that it will be too expensive and will make the cost of steel too high. They do not produce any figures to support these statements, and against that we have the concrete evidence, evidence of the character that is entitled to great weight, that the owners of the steel companies of this country and of the ore companies have bet about $500 million that taconite will be competitive with high-grade ore.

Furthermore, some of the heaviest investors in taconite plants in Minnesota are the very companies that are engaged in developing the Labrador field. Several years ago Republic Steel Co. and Armco, two of the five steel companies interested in the development of the Labrador field, purchased all of the stock of the Reserve Mining Co., which controlled an enormous deposit of taconite. The Chicago Tribune of September 19, 1950, contained an announcement of this purchase, together with the plans of these two companies for construction of a taconite plant at Beaver Bay, Minn. The following is taken from that announcement:

Republic Steel Corp. and Armco Steel Corp. announced today they have purchased equally all stock of the Reserve Mining Co. of St. Louis County, Minn.

The mining company controls a deposit of at least 1,500,000,000 tons of magnetic taconite iron ore at the eastern end of the Mesabi Range. Incorporated 11 years ago, the mine has not been worked extensively.

A Republic spokesman said the mine will provide the two steel companies with a major part of their ore requirements for years to come.

When converted, the deposits will yield about 500 million tons of high-grade iron ore, enough to supply 10 millions tons of ore annually for the next 50 years, he estimated.

Certainly, no one could accuse these two companies of being detractors of the Labrador development, and yet, it seems clear that they plan to place more reliance upon taconite as a source of iron ore for the future than on high-grade ore from Labrador.

The quantity of usable iron ore to be obtained from taconite is practically unlimited, for there seems to be no dispute whatsoever that the quantity of taconite and other low iron content minerals is so great that it would support indefinitely into the future any conceivable level of production. The only limitation is that based on the economic discretion of the owners of the steel mills and the ore producers.

I think at this point it might be well to discuss some of the relative advantages and disadvantages of relying upon Labrador ore as a source of future supply for the steel mills of the Midwest as compared with relying upon increased production of taconite.

All the ballyhoo about the Labrador ore field has caused many people to accept as fact that this is an incomparable source of ore. They point out that there is a large reserve supply of ore, that it will be open-pit direct-shipping ore, and that it will have the advantage of rapid expansibility of production in time of need. They stop at this point.

They do not point out that this field lies 365 miles in the interior of northern Canada in a virtual wilderness, with no supporting population and with no means of the labor force employed there earning a living in the vicinity in the 6 or 7 months when they cannot be engaged in the production of ore. Who knows whether those promoting the Labrador ore development will be able to increase their labor force in time of war when the supply of labor will be very short, on a half-year basis, as would be necessary here? Who knows whether the investors in the Labrador ore field will see fit to maintain standby equipment for the production of the ore,

standby port facilities, and standby rail equipment, all necessary in order to realize on this factor of expansibility?

It must be borne in mind that the 365-mile railroad serving the Labrador field has 2 dead ends and is not connected with any other rail lines anywhere. There will not be available the flexibility inherent in the pooling of all the cars of this country made possible because it is a single interconnected system.

To bring about any substantial expansion of production in Labrador it would be necessary to bring in by boat additional rail equipment in the form of cars and locomotives, unless, as I have said, the investors in the Labrador field are willing to have a part of their investment tied up in the maintenance of such standby equipment.

Of course, all these factors also have a bearing on the cost of the ore laid down at the point of use. Actually, all we have in the way of evidence as to the reasonableness of the cost of Labrador ore is that to be inferred from the fact that certain investors are expending $200 million on the bet that the ore produced in Labrador will be competitive with other existing and contemplated sources of ore.

Let us now consider some of the advantages of producing ore from taconite, located in the Lake Superior region of the United States. The taconite fields are situated in the same region as the high grade ore fields. They have available a supporting population, they have available rail facilities heretofore employed in the movement of high grade ore. They have available also the dock facilities and handling facilities and the existing fleet of ore boats, and the know-how, all of which have made possible the movement of up to 90 million tons of ore in a single year, from the upper Great Lakes to the lower Great Lakes, in one of the most efficiently and economically handled movements of a bulk commodity known to the commercial world.

One other factor to be taken into consideration is that because of the uniform size and quality of the pellets concentrated from taconite, and its high iron content, the production of pig iron from the use of a ton of taconite pellets is expected to be about 20 percent higher as compared with a ton of ordinary high grade ore such as would be obtained from Labrador.

All these factors, of course, enter into the determination of the ultimate cost of steel, and after all, in the final analysis, that is what counts.

Again, as I have already said, I have no concrete evidence of what the cost would be of ore obtained through the concentration of taconite, or what the cost of steel would be made from such concentrated ore, but, as in the case of Labrador ore, we have as evidence the fact that investors have bet at least $500 million that such ore will be competitive with high grade ore.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator from Maryland realizes that in spending American funds to reduce the cost of bringing Labrador ore into the Great Lakes region, we are subsidizing an undertaking which is competitive with the development of our own resources.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is entirely and completely correct, and I point it out later in my remarks.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, development of the vast taconite reserves in the Lake Superior region will cost a large amount of money, and the cost will be greater than the cost of producing high-grade ore. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. When we undertake such an operation, we must realize that it is necessary to find some way of reducing the cost of producing our ore in order to make it competitive with the ore coming out of Canada; and in the event of a grave national emergency, the transportation system from the Lake Superior region to the steel mills of the Great Lakes region will be far more reliable than a system going through Labrador by a long, one-track railroad and on down through 14 locks into the Great Lakes area.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes; and, as I pointed out before the Senator from Louisiana came into the Chamber, the Labrador railroad line is 365 miles long, and at the location of the pits in Labrador there is no labor force and there are no commodities or facilities of any kind; they must all be built. In addition, they must be built on a stand-by basis, because for 4 or 5 months of the year ore cannot be mined in Labrador.

Mr. LONG. If the St. Lawrence navigation project is to be paid for from tolls, it is interesting to note that the American consumer will be the ultimate person who will have to pay the tolls.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Because anyone who brings the Labrador ore into the United States will have to pay the cost of bringing it in and will pass that cost along to the American consumer.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Precisely so.

Mr. LONG. So that in the long run Canada will get back her $500 million, together with any other amount she may invest, from the American consumer.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is perfectly correct.

If the Senator from Louisiana will permit the remark, it seems to me to be another way of giving away America to a foreign nation.

Mr. President, in comparing the advantages and disadvantages of Labrador ore and ore concentrated from taconite as a future source of supply for the steel mills of the Midwest, one other important factor, which I have not yet mentioned, should be taken into consideration.

The Labrador field lies wholly within a foreign country under its complete political domination, whereas the taconite fields upon which we could rely are located entirely within the United States. Bear in mind that the frame of reference within which we are considering this problem at the moment is from the standpoint of national security. From this standpoint can there be any possible question as to the advantage of having the source of supply of a raw material so vital as that needed for the production of steel wholly within our own country and under our own control rather than in a foreign country?

Mr. President, this is one of the crucial points in this case. For that reason I have sought to make a proper evaluation and appraisal of the relative importance of Labrador ore and taconite production in this country as a source of ore from the standpoint of our future national security. On this point, fortunately, we have such an appraisal by the men who should know best, the men in the business.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. In regard to the point that the proposed seaway would be valuable for national defense, it is significant that the more we rely upon Labrador ore at the expense of retarding the development of more than a hundred years' supply of taconite ore in the Lake Superior region, the more vulnerable will be our entire system of producing ore and transporting it to the mills.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is true. We would develop a Canadian resource and if the time comes when we really need it, Canada will have her own steel industry and will need that ore herself. When we need it, it will be in Canada, and Canada will keep it there, and our production in the United States will be neglected.

Mr. LONG. The point has been made that it is necessary to protect the Soo locks in order to be sure that Lake Superior ore will be economically transported in sufficient volume to the steel mills in the Lake Erie region. Nevertheless, the fact remains that at the Soo there are five parallel locks, and in order to bring ore to the steel mills it is necessary to go through only one of those five locks. On the other hand, if this Nation is going to rely upon the St. Lawrence project, there would be at least 14 locks upon which we will be dependent, and it would be necessary to go through all the 14 locks. It would not be possible to bypass a single one of the 14 locks. If any one of them were sabotaged or put out of business, either by breakdown or for any other cause, it would mean that it would be impossible to traverse the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It would not only be impossible to traverse it, but it would be impossible to get out of it the much-needed ships on the other side of the damaged lock. Shipping would be tied up, and we would not get the ore we need.

Mr. LONG. It is very simple to concentrate defenses around anything which is so vital as the Soo locks, but it would be a very difficult undertaking to try to defend 14 different locks.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Louisiana, as I proceed with

my speech, will see that the point he has now raised has been considered by very eminent men in our Defense Establishment, and they have concluded that it would be sheer folly to rely upon the seaway in time of emergency.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator also appreciates the distinction between defending a railroad which runs through heavily populated portions of the United States and defending a railroad which runs hundreds of miles through the wilds of Canada and Labrador.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is perfectly correct.

Mr. President, in June 1951, Director of Defense Mobilization Charles E. Wilson appointed a steel task group to appraise the adequacy and planned capacity of the steel industry to meet military requirements and to evaluate the supply available for all other uses. This task group was headed by Hiland G. Batcheller, chairman of the board of the Allegheny Ludlum Steel Co., of Pittsburgh, and Director of the Iron and Steel Division of the War Production Board during World War II. The task group was composed of 36 members, most of them experts in the field of steel production. According to a release of January 23, 1952, by the Office of Defense Mobilization, the group held numerous meetings with steel industry representatives, other steel experts, steel consumers, and Government officials before arriving at its conclusions; also, according to the release, one of the conclusions with respect to iron ore was that "the need for supplementing present domestic sources of high-grade ores with high-grade concentrates is paramount for developing national security."

That covers exactly the point which the Senator from Louisiana raised.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator realizes that in order to develop and process the taconite which is necessary to be utilized crushing machinery and a vast amount of other heavy machinery are required.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is certainly true.

Mr. LONG. We cannot expand the capacity overnight. It has to be developed as time goes on.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

The release also quoted the following from the report of the steel task group:

> If planned facilities are to produce from 118 million to 120 million ingot-tons of steel, an adequate supply of raw materials is obviously essential. We recommend, therefore, that—
>
> 1. In order to supplement the diminishing supply of domestic high-grade ore, action be taken to encourage and aid in every way possible programs now underway designed to beneficiate low grades of ore (taconite and others) in order that they may be utilized economically, and, further, that encouragement and aid be extended to those who are undertaking aerial surveys with the aid of the magnetometer and gravitometer, with the objective of locating possible new deposits of domestic ore. Any favorable results from such projects would reduce our dependence on foreign sources in case of a global war.

The report of the steel task group has been classified and is not obtainable, but from the release it is quite obvious that the report did not recommend construction of the St. Lawrence waterway as one of the steps necessary to assure us of an adequate supply of ore in the interest of national security.

I wish to point out at this time the utter absurdity of one of the basic arguments of the proponents of this waterway. As Senators know, Canada has expressed complete willingness to build a 27-foot waterway through the St. Lawrence River, entirely on its own, and entirely at its own expense. In fact, it has obligated itself to do so both in an exchange of diplomatic notes with this country and in an application to the International Joint Commission. Thus, if Canada carries out its obligation there will be available a waterway for the movement of Labrador ore to the Great Lakes, this being the use of the waterway deemed to be of the greatest importance from the standpoint of national defense. Yet proponents say that unless S. 2150 is passed and unless the United States participates in the construction and control of the waterway through the St. Lawrence River, Canada through its sole control of this waterway might take action that would impede its usefulness to us in the transport of ore from Labrador in the time of great need.

There are a great many pertinent considerations in this connection that I shall go into at greater length later, but suffice it for these purposes to point out that Canada would in any event have complete control over portions of the waterway that lie wholly in Canada. Furthermore, there is the fact that under treaty rights we are guaranteed equal use of the waterway with Canada and, in the event tolls are imposed, guaranteed complete equality in the matter of tolls with Canadian commerce.

The point I mean to make at this time, however, is that proponents purport to express concern over the fact that we may not have some voice in control of a portion of the waterway, and yet express no concern whatsoever over their prediction that we will become dependent for a vital raw material, such as iron ore, upon a source which lies wholly within Canada and is completely under the political control of Canada. In fact, their promotion of the St. Lawrence waterway is directed at creating a greater dependence upon this source of iron ore to the detriment of the development of an adequate source of iron ore lying wholly within our own borders and under our own control. Thus, if the expressed concern about the complete friendliness of Canada has any substance whatsoever, the interests of national security would dictate the prevention of the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway by anyone.

As a matter of fact, it does not seem to me that it requires the opinion of a board of experts to bring home the realization that it is highly important for the United States to be in a position to supply itself with iron ore from sources within its own borders and under its own political control to the greatest extent possible. It is obvious that it is within our capabilities to become completely independent of any foreign source for vital quantities of this raw material. No matter how friendly the foreign country, it is not consistent with the best interests of our national security to have to rely primarily upon any foreign source where that is avoidable.

While Canada is as friendly as any foreign nation could be, and while if we had to rely upon any foreign country for one of our vital raw materials Canada would probably be the Nation we would all choose first, let me suggest one of the possibilities that might make it unwise to place too heavy dependence upon Labrador as a source of iron ore. This is a possibility also that is entirely consistent with Canada remaining completely friendly to the United States.

Every country that is primarily a supplier of raw materials has aspirations to use those raw materials for the production of finished goods at home rather than to export them in their cheapest state to sustain the production of other countries. The debates in the Canadian House of Commons, in December 1951, when the bill for the construction of the All-Canadian Waterway was under consideration, reveal that Canada does have such aspirations, and the tremendous economic growth of Canada in recent years makes it a definite possibility that such aspirations may be realized in the not too distant future.

The following statements in the course of the debates, by Mr. George A. Drew, leader of the opposition, are worthy of note in this connection. Let me quote from his speech on December 4, 1951:

> However, while we recognize that need, since Providence has placed at our disposal so much of this vitally precious metal, as we make our plans for supplying iron ore to the mills of the United States we should be laying plans now for the construction of mills in Canada to produce steel on a scale we have never contemplated at any time in the past.

At a later point in his speech, after discussing the manner in which Canada had developed from a mere supplier of forest products to the United States to a manufacturer of those products, Mr. Drew stated:

> If it was sound for us to raise ourselves from the position of woodchoppers for the workers of the United States, it is equally sound for us to say that we shall not limit ourselves to the digging of the iron ore, that we shall give to workers here in Canada, and workers yet unborn, employment on a scale we have never even contemplated, through the use of these new resources now available to us.

Again, Mr. Drew stated:

> The plans to which I was referring were plans to expand our own production by the best possible use of our resources, and that is what I am suggesting again tonight.
>
> Once again I want to emphasize the vital role that iron and steel play. No oil would be found without steel. No copper, zinc, or aluminum would be produced without steel. None of the great synthetics that we

are producing today would be produced without steel. It is the basis of modern industrial expansion. That being so, of all the resources we possess I suggest it should be the declared policy to make sure we will use that raw material to the very best advantage of all Canadians when it is actually brought out from the soil.

It seems to me the foregoing indicates the distinct probability that there will be other demands upon the supply of iron ore from Labrador which may have priority over the demands of the United States steel mills.

What I have said thus far leads to the inescapable conclusion, first, that an adequate supply of iron ore for the steel mills of the Midwest is available and will be available from the Lake Superior region for the foreseeable future, and second, that in any event it would not be wise for the United States to become dependent upon the ore fields of Laborador for any vital portion of its supply of this essential raw material.

By what I have said I do not mean to indicate that we should not use Labrador ore if it can be produced and marketed at a price making it competitive with other ore. The developers of the Labrador field are of the view that this can be done without the St. Lawrence waterway. Mr. George Humphrey very freely admitted that the $200 million investment in Labrador was not based on the assumption that there would necessarily be a 27-foot waterway through the St. Lawrence River. He said that in his opinion 10 million tons annually of Labrador ore could be marketed economically without the waterway and at a price competitive with Lake Superior ore.

He said that without the waterway he anticipated that perhaps from two to four million tons would move by deepdraft vessels to east coast ports, and that from six to eight million tons would move to Montreal and there be transshipped for movement either in small vessels through the existing 14-foot canals or by rail to interior points such as Pittsburgh. His only point was that there was some doubt as to whether quantities in excess of 10 million tons could be marketed economically without a 27-foot waterway through the St. Lawrence. It was not contended that amounts in excess of 10 million tons could not be marketed by existing forms of transport and commercial routes, but merely that such amounts, if brought to points adjacent to Lake Erie and to mills in the Ohio Valley, would have to be at a somewhat higher cost that might perhaps make such ore not competitive with ore from the Lake Superior region. If it were not for the fact that most of the steel mills belonging to the five companies engaged in the development of the Labrador field were located in these areas, it is quite clear that there would be no advocacy of the St. Lawrence waterway from any of the steel interests.

Thus, what is at stake is not a question of national security, but merely a question of economic advantage for a small segment of the steel industry. In fact, it is pretty clear that the project proposed in the Senate is almost wholly for the benefit of a handful of private companies constituting a minor segment of the steel industry. From the day the St. Lawrence waterway project was first envisioned it was always on the basis of a uniform depth for all of the Great Lakes, but now the project calls for a 27-foot depth only as far as Detroit, since the steel companies in Labrador have no interest in carrying their product beyond Lake Erie.

Moreover, all through the years the project has been envisioned as one that would permit oceangoing vessels to ply directly between ports of the Great Lakes and European ports without the necessity for transshipment, and was long ago dubbed by its proponents as the St. Lawrence seaway. Now that the economics of shipping have forced vessel operators to turn to the use of oceangoing ships of greater draft than can be operated economically through a 27-foot waterway, particularly those of United States registry, it is still being advocated at that same limited depth, which, it so happens, is entirely adequate for lake vessels of the type used to transport iron ore.

It is hard indeed to escape the conclusion that, so far as American interests are concerned, this project is tailor made to suit the economic needs of this handful of steel companies. Never before, so far as I can recall, have so many been asked to spend so much for so few.

Another fact should be borne clearly in mind. There is no dispute that Labrador ore moving via the ocean route to east coast ports and then inland by rail to Pittsburgh could be marketed at that point as cheaply as the same ore could be marketed at that point after moving through an improved St. Lawrence waterway, or perhaps more cheaply. There is also no dispute that, as to all points east of Pittsburgh, Labrador ore moving via east coast ports could be marketed more cheaply than it could moving through an improved St. Lawrence waterway.

The consumption of ore by the steel mills located in the Pittsburgh area and points east of Pittsburgh is sufficiently great to absorb the production from Labrador. The steel-producing points closest and most readily available for the marketing of Lake Superior ore are those located in Illinois and Indiana, on Lake Michigan, at Cleveland and at certain other points on Lake Erie, and inland points in Ohio close to Lake Erie. These are what might be called the natural market areas for Lake Superior ore. There is no doubt whatsoever that sufficient ore from the Lake Superior region will continue to be produced in quantities sufficient to supply the needs of all the areas mentioned.

In addition to these points, practically all the ore used in the Pittsburgh area has come from the Lake Superior region. This is also true as to Johnstown, Pa., which is east of Pittsburgh, and much of the ore consumed by steel mills located in eastern Pennsylvania and Maryland has come from the Lake Superior region. These are not natural market areas for Lake Superior ore; and the farther east we go in the marketing of Lake Superior ore, the more such areas fall into the category of marginal markets for Lake Superior ore. If there should be any diminution in the supply of ore available in the Lake Superior region, it would be only natural that the Lake Superior region should cease to supply these marginal markets rather than its natural markets.

On the other hand, the marginal markets for the Lake Superior ore constitute the natural markets for foreign ore, such as that from Labrador, Venezuela, Libya, Sweden, and other foreign sources. Therefore, all that could really be accomplished by providing a waterway through the St. Lawrence at Government expense, which inevitably, in my opinion, will constitute a subsidized waterway, would be to permit the developers of the Labrador field to cut into the natural market for Lake Superior ore when they have available to them a natural market of their own.

In short, I say the St. Lawrence project does not make sense economically, but makes sense only as a means of giving a competitive economic advantage to a few steel producers.

I think I might just as well address myself at this point to one of the arguments which has been advanced many times by the proponents of this project. They have said, "Yes, Labrador ore can be marketed economically in peacetime, and there would be no necessity for the St. Lawrence waterway in order to market all the ore that could be produced in Labrador. But what about wartime, when the shipping lanes via the ocean might be cut off by submarine, and Labrador ore could no longer be brought down to the east coast ports with safety?"

Let us leave aside for the moment the question of whether our Navy, using the convoy system as it did so successfully toward the end of the last war, could keep these shipping lanes open. Let us accept for the time being the assumption of the proponents that the ocean lanes would be cut off by reason of submarine activity. If for that reason Labrador ore could no longer be brought to the east coast ports, certainly the same thing would be true of the ore moving to the east coast ports from Venezuela, Libya, and all the other foreign points from which ore is now being received on the east coast.

As my colleagues know, there has been and there is still going on an enormous expansion of steel capacity in mills located on or near the east coast. They will receive substantially all their ore from these foreign sources. If in time of war these sources of ore supply were shut off, what would we do? It is perfectly clear that we could not afford to shut down these mills, and we would be faced with the necessity of finding ore to supply them. As a matter of fact, this did happen during the last war, and it was necessary to bring ore all the way from Lake Superior to Sparrows Point, Md., to keep the Bethlehem Steel plant there in operation. Would we have to do that again, or would there be available any closer supply of iron ore?

Under those circumstances, assuming the Labrador field to be in production, the Labrador field would constitute a closer source of supply. However, in supplying these mills with Labrador ore there would be no occasion whatsoever for the use of the St. Lawrence waterway even if it were in existence. In this situation Labrador ore would move by vessel to Montreal, which it could do in deep-draft vessels, because there is already 35 feet of water as far west as Montreal, and then be transferred to railroad cars and brought due south to the eastern mills, which are on a direct parallel with Montreal. A study of this possible movement has already been made by the railroads, and they inform me that they have the ability to handle the movement. What would be the sense, in such a situation, of carrying Labrador ore an additional 500 miles west of Montreal through the slow and tedious course of the St. Lawrence waterway to Lake Erie points, and there transferring it to rail cars and hauling it back east again? If Labrador ore were not used to supply these mills, there would be no other choice than to move Lake Superior ore all the way to these eastern mills.

Thus, in time of war, under the assumptions made by the proponents of the bill, in order to use the St. Lawrence waterway at all for the movement of Labrador ore, it would be necessary to engage in a wasteful, time-consuming cross-hauling of ore, which could not be tolerated at such a time.

So when we consider that the principal argument for the proposed waterway, from the standpoint of national defense, is for the purpose of transporting Labrador ore, and reason and good common sense indicate that regardless of where Labrador ore might move in peacetime it would not move via the proposed waterway in wartime, the argument of the proponents collapses utterly and completely.

While the use of the proposed waterway for bringing in Labrador ore has always constituted the principal argument for the project as a national-defense measure, I think it would be well to deal at least briefly with the other two arguments which have from time to time been advanced in support of this project from the standpoint of national defense.

One of these arguments has been stated in this way:

> Construction of the proposed waterway would provide shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities, located in a relatively secure area, capable of expansion and conversion for handling deep sea vessels, which could be used to supplement coastal shipyards.

I should like to answer this argument by referring to the testimony of Vice Adm. Russell Willson, United States Navy, retired, presented before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 111, 80th Congress. Admiral Willson held many high positions in the Navy; and during World War II he held such positions as Chief of Staff and Deputy Commander in Chief to Admiral King, naval adviser to the Joint Chiefs of Staff; naval member of the Strategic Survey Committee, and member of the United States delegations at the Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco Conferences.

With respect to the value of the St. Lawrence project as a means of providing shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities in the Great Lakes, on the theory that this area was relatively secure, he had the following to say:

> This reference to a relatively secure area, in my opinion, is a questionable point. There is a traditional idea that in wartime, inland areas are more secure than those on the coast. This is no longer true as regards the United States. In the first place, our only possible enemy—due to national limitations—will always have a relatively insignificant Navy incapable of carrying an attack to the coasts of this country.
>
> * * * * *
>
> As to the shipbuilding and repair facilities' being capable of expansion and of conversion to supplement coastal shipyards, the future necessity for such additional building capacity for oceangoing ships, in my opinion, is not the same as it was on the eve of the last war, when most of the discussion of this subject occurred. It would seem that the shipbuilding facilities which supported an all-out war on both sides of the world should be adequate to do likewise in any war which can be foreseen. I can see nothing in the warfare of the future to change the role which the Great Lakes shipyards played in the last war. They built 510 small vessels, up to and including escort destroyers and submarines. Any additional capacity could be used for similar purposes, as this was only 12½ percent of the number of these types of vessels built during the war.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Had I the decision, I would think long and hard before I counted heavily on shipbuilding facilities for deep-sea vessels in the Great Lakes, when all facilities there could be used many times over for equally necessary small vessels. Nor would I care to lay down Liberty ships, destroyers, and cruisers in that area, where one bomb placed at a critical point in this project could bottle them up, perhaps for the rest of the war.
>
> In my opinion, the concept that this project would make a substantial contribution to national security by providing additional facilities for deep-sea vessels in a relatively secure area has been largely nullified by recent and prospective developments in the field of warfare.

Mr. President, it seems to me the admiral's statement makes the greatest good sense. When we add to it the fact that we have, located on all three of our coasts, a vast quantity of shipbuilding facilities, suitable for the construction of deep-draft vessels, but presently surplus and being held in reserve for an emergency, it is inconceivable that new facilities for oceangoing vessels would be constructed in the relatively vulnerable area of the Great Lakes.

The third, and final, argument for the proposed waterway from the standpoint of national defense has been that it would constitute an additional line of communication, and one which would be safer for the handling of shipments to Europe, because via this route there would be one-third less open-ocean travel.

With regard to this argument, again I should like to quote several statements made by Admiral Willson as to the value of the proposed waterway as an additional line of communication. He had this to say:

> I sat in on a hundred or more meetings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and, I might add, of the combined Chiefs of Staff, and was familiar with the planning of all the large operations. I was Admiral King's representative, particularly in charge of the arrangements for the north African invasion. I know that the great problem was not getting cargoes to the loading ports but getting ships to take them overseas. The question arises whether under such circumstances ships would be used to parallel land transportation. It might well be that the wartime traffic on this waterway would be reduced because the ships would have to be employed elsewhere.

As to its being a safer route, Admiral Willson had this to say:

> The statement has been made before this committee that this route has the added advantage of protection from underwater craft at least a third of the way into the North Atlantic sea lanes. If this statement conveys the idea that as between comparable routes, say Montreal to Liverpool, and Boston to Liverpool, the former is one-third safer from submarines, it should be corrected. Actually, only about one-eighth of the Montreal route is safe from submarines, which operated successfully throughout the war in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, as far west as the Gaspe Peninsula just below Quebec. There is a digression there. While there was not much traffic, relatively, out of the St. Lawrence during the war, six ships were sunk there by submarines, and there were no submarines sunk, the reason being that the conditions there for submarines are very favorable.
>
> But technical considerations, with which I shall not burden the committee unless they so desire, counterbalance even this theoretical advantage of one-eighth. I have recently talked with the officer who ran the operating end of the antisubmarine warfare for Admiral King. There is no higher authority on the subject. It was his opinion, and I fully concur, that due to technical considerations, namely, facilities for diversion, weather for air coverage, and underwater sound conditions, the route from New York or Boston to Europe is as safe or safer than the route from Montreal.

These are the views of a genuine military expert who had investigated and studied the problem thoroughly, and it seems to me his points are very well taken. If they were not well taken, it seems to me it was incumbent upon the advocates of this project to put on the stand military experts to answer these arguments and contradict the conclusions reached by this witness. Yet this has not been done.

Incidentally, Admiral Willson's general conclusion as to the national-defense value of the project was as follows:

> After balancing all factors pro and con, it is my opinion that the St. Lawrence project would make such a limited and uncertain contribution to national defense that the decision to build it must be based entirely on other considerations.

In considering the national-defense value of this project, it is of course highly important to consider the probability of the project's being available for use in time of war. In other words, we must consider the question of its vulnerability. It is all well and good to talk about the theoretical advantages of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway in time of war, but of course they are all completely illu-

sory if in time of war the probabilities are that the project would not be available for use. It is common knowledge that a lock-and-dam project is extremely vulnerable to both sabotage and air attack. Admiral Willson referred to this matter briefly, but I should like to refer specifically to the views of two other experts who testified with regard to the proposed waterway.

One of these was Maj. Gen. Follett Bradley, United States Army, retired. Among other important assignments which Major General Bradley held during the war was that of commander of the 1st Air Force, with the job, among others, of organizing the air defense of our coastwise shipping on the east coast.

The other expert was Vice Adm. Gerald F. Bogan, United States Navy, retired, 26 of whose 38 years of active service were spent in the naval aviation branch. I should like to quote several excerpts from the statement made by Major General Bradley before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 111.

The real question is: Can the project, with its 40 locks, more or less, and its proposed dams and powerhouses be defended against enemy air attack? I answer categorically, "No." Let me remind you that in Europe in 1944 between September 23 and October 14—3 weeks—we interdicted the north German canals, Dortmund-Ems and Mittelland. We closed off the Rhine to enemy traffic at Cologne, and the water movement of coal to southern Germany ceased. An enemy with access to the polar route could and definitely would destroy the project's locks and dams and powerhouses and sink ships in the narrow canals in the St. Lawrence seaway just as effectively as we did in Germany. If he should be successful in establishing and maintaining air bases in northern Canada, Greenland, or Iceland the task would be that much easier.

* * * * *

It is our Air Forces' proud boast that no American bombardment formation, even when suffering heavy losses, has ever turned back from its objective because of enemy action. He is optimistic indeed who believes that our enemy would be any less determined and less willing to accept losses, and that he could be stopped.

It might be said that the weapons of defense have improved since World War II. That is true. But the weapons of offense have also improved, and it is my opinion that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project cannot be defended. Its location in this area might be excused by arguing that there are so many lush targets already existing there, that the addition of a few more will not make any difference. This excuse does not appear reasonable when it is realized that the proposed powerplant will be the largest in the world.

I think you would be interested in a brief description of the destruction of the Ruhr dams to which I briefly referred earlier in my statement. The essential facts were these: Wing Comdr. Guy Bibson, of the Royal Air Force, was notified in March 1943 that he was to have carte blanche in forming a heavy bombardment squadron to execute a top-secret mission of extreme importance and urgency by precise bombing at night from very low altitude. He had complete freedom of choice in his personnel, equipment, and training methods.

On the night of May 16–17, 1943, the attack was made with 16 Lancasters. Eight were shot down, but the Mohne and Eder Dams were breached, with 4 mines effective on the first, and 2 on the second. * * * The millions of tons of water released from the Mohne and Eder Dams ruined the canals, inundated and swept away highways, bridges, and factories, and wrought havoc generally in the valley of the Ruhr.

On this point, Admiral Bogan had the following to say in testifying before the House Committee on Public Works on House Joint Resolution 4 and other measures, in April 1951:

It is my considered judgment that no defense measures could be so effective as to prevent major damage to one or many locks or to the power site dams. With the exception of Alaska, the area of the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway is one of the nearest targets for air attacks launched across the polar region. We do not have now, nor will we in the future, a defense capable of completely aborting a determined attack or series of attacks of this nature.

That defense would require, in the area from the Welland Canal to Montreal and in the dam locales, great numbers of antiaircraft batteries, numerous widely dispersed airfields for interceptor fighters, and in extended radar coverage blanketing the probable direction of an expected attack. The physical security of the installations from sabotage could be assured only by the permanent presence of large numbers of troops, at a time when such men would be sorely needed elsewhere.

It is my conviction that if an enemy considered major damage to this waterway necessary in its conduct of the war, no defensive effort on our part would prevent or abort attacks to a degree that would not permit him to inflict that damage. A recent article by the Chief of the Air Force estimates that only 30 percent of the planes in a massive attack could be destroyed before reaching their objective. That objective in the St. Lawrence Waterway includes 15 locks and 2 large dams. The locks of the Welland Canal extend over a distance of 27 miles. In the passage from Lake Ontario to Montreal are 7 additional locks not concentrated in a manner which permits strong, overall defense, but so separated by distance that each of 5 separate areas would require its own individual defensive measures. The dams for increasing the depth of water and impounding it for power are even more vulnerable, and damage to one or both would be as vital as damage to one or more locks.

It is apparent to you gentlemen, I am sure, that major damage to any one of the installations in the controlled depth area of this project would immediately render the oceangoing feature of the waterway useless until repairs were completed. It is also equally apparent that successful attacks would be repeated. Duplication of lockage facilities, a tremendously expensive operation, would not add security in relation to cost. When and if such attacks took place, all seagoing vessels in the Great Lakes at the time would be limited to operation in those lakes until the waterway was again wholly navigable. I doubt very much that it would become navigable until after the end of hostilities, entailing a protracted significant loss of tonnage at a critical time.

Again, as in the case of the testimony presented by Admiral Willson, the proponents of this project never attempted to answer the arguments of these military experts or to present witnesses to contradict their conclusions.

So far as I have been able to discover, in all the long years that this project has been under consideration, and for the last 10 or 12 years when it has been urged primarily on the grounds of national defense, not one single military expert has been presented by the proponents of the project to testify regarding such crucial points as I have just been discussing. True they have presented general statements setting forth in thumbnail fashion the national defense arguments which I have mentioned, but no military experts have themselves taken the stand so that they might be cross-examined and their views explored with respect to the all-important considerations which were presented so fully and forcefully by military experts called to appear as experts by the opponents of this project. It seems to me that the very absence of these witnesses is a sign of weakness, and if it be conceded, as I think it must be, that the burden of proof rests upon the proponents of a project, it is clear beyond any doubt that the proponents have not met that burden in this case.

In the light of our unbalanced budget, high taxes, and generally unhealthy financial condition, it would almost seem unnecessary to go into any other aspects of this project after disposing of the false claim that the project is necessary from the standpoint of national defense. But, in view of the fact that it looks as though at long last this matter may be up for final disposition by the Congress of the United States, I think it may be well to give the subject the full treatment.

Accordingly, let us take a brief look at some of the economic aspects. What are the principal economic benefits claimed for this project? Aside from the five steel companies desiring to put themselves in a better competitive position with Lake Superior ore in the Midwest steel market, the principal claimed advantages, so far as I can ascertain, seem to be that the farmers in the area tributary to the Great Lakes region would obtain lower freight rates for the shipment of certain grains, principally wheat, and that certain manufacturing interests located mainly around Detroit and to some extent perhaps in the Cleveland area would obtain lower freight rates for the export of their products.

Let us look at the farmers' claim first. To start with, the United States is not a big exporter of grain and a very small proportion of the total grain produced in this country goes for export. In other words, the export business is relatively unimportant to the farmers of the United States compared with their domestic business. Therefore, if by reason of the construction of this project the railroads should be adversely affected, and to the extent that such adverse effect might be reflected in their rates, the farmers of this country as a whole would probably suffer far more than they would gain by reason of any lowered costs of transportation on the export of grain.

In the second place, I am convinced beyond any doubt that the claimed advantage of lower freight rates, even if they should materialize, would not accrue to the benefit of the farmers. For example, in the administration of President Hoover the railroads were prevailed upon to establish special low rates on grain for export. The day those lower rates went into effect the price of wheat in the Liverpool market, which set the

price obtained for this export grain, fell by precisely the amount of the lowered freight rates. Thus the end result of that experiment was that the railroads received less for the transportation of grain for export and the farmers got not one single dime more for their product.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for an insertion?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall be very happy to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from all over our Nation, I have received expressions of individuals and organizations urging the passage of S. 2150, the Wiley bill, for completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

Every type of organization—business, farm, labor, educational—have recommended that Congress remove the final obstacle to the completion of this mighty project.

I have in my hands two such expressions.

One is from Mr. Matt Triggs, assistant legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation. It reiterates the position of that great organization on behalf of the seaway.

The second consists of pertinent excerpts from an editorial carried in the January 12, 1954, issue of Labor's Daily and written by Mr. Willard Shelton.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of both of these items be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1954.

Re St. Lawrence seaway.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: At the most recent annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation the voting delegates representing the member State farm bureaus approved the following resolution:

"We strongly favor the enactment of legislation to provide for the participation of the United States with Canada in the joint construction and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway. The project should be built and operated on a self-liquidating basis."

We understand that Canada is prepared to go ahead with the seaway. The only issue remaining is whether or not the United States is to participate in the construction and operation of the project.

The major portion of the commerce through the seaway will consist of cargoes originating from or destined to United States ports. Since United States shippers will pay the major portion of the tolls to liquidate the cost of the project and since the project will contribute to our national security, it is appropriate that the United States share in the administration and control of the seaway.

Your support for the enactment of S. 2150 is recommended.

Very sincerely,

MATT TRIGGS,
Assistant Legislative Director.

AGAIN, THE ST. LAWRENCE
(By Willard Shelton)

The St. Lawrence seaway bill should get the immediate green light.

The proposal is for a deep-channel dredging of the St. Lawrence, plus some bypasses of rapids, so as to provide a landlocked seaway for oceangoing vessels into the heartland of the American and Canadian Continent.

The seaway was first endorsed by President Harding. It has ben endorsed by every President since Harding's day—Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and now Eisenhower.

The concept invoices a joint operation of Canada and the United States, each contributing a fair share of the cost, each sharing in the benefits and the control.

Many special interests in the United States have blocked the seaway in the past. Eastern railroads, Atlantic seaboard port authorities, have looked on the proposal as a menace to their economic position.

It has always been the viewpoint of this observer that sectional and special interests should yield, in the consideration of major proposed improvements, to the national interest.

There was a time in our early history when the river routes and great canals connecting them were needed for national development. Later the railroads supplanted the canals, and the canal lobby of those times could not be allowed to interfere with the cross-country march of the rails.

The railroads violently objected to the construction of the Panama Canal, but in the early part of this country the rails had to be brushed aside, because a canal across the Central American narrows was vital to our national welfare.

Now the question is whether special interests, including the Atlantic ports and the eastern railroads, can again block the St. Lawrence after 35 years of struggle.

They should not be allowed to block it, no matter how powerful their spokesmen may be in Congress.

The Nation needs for its security a safe approach to the iron ores of Labrador. It needs a covered seaway, running through the center of our continent, by which access to these ores may be guaranteed in war or peace.

The cities of the upper Midwest have a right to access to the wide oceans. Boston, New York, and Baltimore will not wither and fade away if Duluth becomes an ocean seaport. On the contrary, the whole Nation will be stronger, more secure, and more prosperous when the seaway is constructed.

Canada will build the seaway alone if the United States still refuses to participate. But we ought not to refuse. We have our own part to play in the development of the North American complex and we should not leave it to our northern neighbor to do the job alone.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, if I am informed correctly, and I think I am, the transportation charges on export grain are not generally paid by the farmer, and the benefits of any lowered transportation rates would accrue to the benefit of the buyer or some middleman.

It is not anticipated that any other farm products would move via the proposed waterway, and in my judgment the farmers who think they will obtain any benefit from the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway are being deluded.

The proponents of the project have endeavored to create the impression that all the farm organizations have always expressed their unqualified approval of the St. Lawrence Waterway. This is by no means so. The largest and most important of all of the farm organizations, the Farm Bureau Federation, took the position in 1952 that they favored the construction of the St. Lawrence Waterway financed by revenue bonds. That farsighted organization stated that it was unable to evaluate the conflicting claims as to the economic soundness of the project and therefore felt that the only way to test its soundness was by letting the outcome depend on whether a sufficient number of people were willing to risk their own money in support of their judgment that the project would be sound.

So that there may be no misunderstanding regarding this point, let me quote a passage from the statement by Allen B. Kline, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, incorporated at pages 869–871 of the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 27 and Senate Joint Resolution 111 in February 1952. Mr. Kline, after discussing certain of the conflicting testimony and points of view, stated:

> The American Farm Bureau Federation is unable to cut through the conflicting arguments of proponents and opponents and determine of its own knowledge that the project as submitted is economically feasible. However, the history of projects placed under a truly revenue bond type of financing is that they have been successful for the reason that investors will not support them without such projects being on a sound business basis. The American Farm Bureau Federation wants the project to be a success. It seems clear that since revenue bonds cannot be sold unless the project is economically sound, the use of such bonds would be the greatest guaranty that the project would be successful. We do not see how the other proponents of the project can be for anything less (p. 870).

Mr. Kline made one other statement which is of interest. It will be recalled that Senate bill 589, for which Senate bill 2150 is a substitute, provided for financing the project through the issuance of bonds directly to the public but unconditionally guaranteed as to boin principal and interest by the United States. With respect to such an arrangement, Mr. Kline said:

> If the project is put on a sound revenue bond basis investors will not need the guaranty of the United States Government. If the United States Government guarantees the principal and interest, there is no need for the investors to investigate its economic feasibility. In such event, the already overburdened Federal finances would be unnecessarily subjected to additional burdens of an indefinite amount.

This position is in keeping with the best traditions of the American free enterprise system, and I commend the American Farm Bureau Federation for its forthright stand.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that throughout the many long years this project has been advocated, and despite the claims of the proponents that there is no doubt that the project could be made self-liquidating through the imposition of tolls, not once has a proposal been advanced to construct the project by means of funds raised through the issuance of revenue bonds. Such a method of financing the project

would not present any difficulties; that is, if there were sufficient people who believed in the project to back their own judgment by risking their own money. It is extremely easy for people who think they would obtain some direct benefit from the expenditure of Federal money to advocate such an expenditure, for even if it does not pan out as a successful project, the advantages to them would probably outweigh the share of the cost they would pay through added taxes.

Let us next take a look at the manufacturing interests that are supporting this project. So far as I can determine, the only real support for the project from manufacturing interests is from certain automobile manufacturing companies who think that they will be able to ship their products abroad directly from Great Lakes ports. Perhaps there will be some savings to the automobile manufacturers in transportation costs. Perhaps there will be savings to certain other manufacturers located close to the Great Lakes. But if so, I am convinced that it will be not by reason of any true economy resulting from the construction of the proposed waterway, but by reason of the fact that the taxpayers of this country would be paying a part of the legitimate costs of the transportation of such goods in the form of a subsidy, which will be inherent in the construction of an uneconomic project with Federal funds.

Let us look for a moment at some of the broader economic aspects of this question. If economic advantages will accrue from the construction of the waterway, they will be for the benefit of the largest agricultural section and the most highly industrialized section of the entire country. These areas are already served by the finest network of railroad, highways, inland waterways, and air routes of any similar area in the entire world. This has played a major part in bringing these areas into such a dominant economic position. It is utterly inconceivable that anyone could think that the growth of this section had been stunted and held back by any inadequacy of transport. When one has limited funds to expend for charitable purposes, one does not bestow his bounty on those who already have the most and need the least. I might point out also that if this project should have the advantages claimed for it, it could only lead to the heavier concentration of industry in the area which is already the most heavily industrialized in the whole country. A certain imbalance in economic development will always result from the concentration of certain inherent economic advantages in certain localities. But when on top of this we pour artificial advantages at the taxpayers' expense and create further concentration, it seems to me the policy is unwise from a national standpoint.

It is perfectly clear that if economic advantages are to be created by the expenditure of Federal funds, it would be the part of wisdom to expend those funds in undeveloped areas in order to create a better economic balance in this country. Not only is this so from the standpoint of economics, but it is clearly in keeping with the planning from the standpoint of national defense and national security which favors the decentralization of industry.

Thus from this broad economic standpoint it seems to me the construction of the St. Lawrence Waterway does not make sense.

I have given the reason why the producers of certain raw commodities and the manufacturers of certain finished goods have felt that the construction of the proposed waterway would have economic advantages. In that connection I should like to refer to the testimony of a gentleman, who, several years ago, spoke of the economic harm to producers of another raw commodity as well as the manufacturers of finished products. I should like to read a few of the statements made in 1946 at hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 104, to approve construction of the St. Lawrence project, because many Senators may feel that his views are entitled to considerable weight. The gentleman whose testimony I am going to read is that of Mr. R. L. Ireland, Jr., president, Hanna Coal Co., and president, Ohio Coal Association. The Hanna Coal Co. is a subsidiary of the M. A. Hanna Co., of which the president was Mr. George M. Humphrey. Mr. Humphrey was also a director of the Hanna Coal Co., and in testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1952, he stated that the views expressed by Mr. Ireland at the time had his approval and he had been in accord with them.

First, let me quote what he had to say regarding the effect of the construction of the proposed waterway on the coal industry:

> I appear here representing the membership of the association in opposition to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project for the reason that in our judgment the project is a serious threat to the economic welfare of Ohio and the entire Great Lakes Basin area, both to the labor we employ and to the investments of producers who, during a period of many years, have invested large sums of money in the development, building, and maintenance of mines, tipples, and cleaning facilities. In our judgment the completion of the project would mean the displacement of millions of tons of Ohio-produced coals through the opening up of our markets to imported fuels.

Next, let me quote what he had to say about the effect of this project on the manufacturing interests in the area to be served by the proposed project:

> Foreign-produced goods which would come in through the St. Lawrence Waterway may well, because of their low-wage cost, be able to compete with and replace our own domestic products. This may result in total loss of operation to existing manufacturing plants in our market because of their inability to operate in competition with foreign-produced goods. This cannot help but result in a further employment reduction which, in turn, means a further reduced purchasing power.
>
> We in Ohio feel that a large part of the benefit of Ohio's geographic location in relation to its natural markets would be destroyed by the foreign competition created by this project. We have, over a period of years, given much study to the project and we have found it cannot help us, but only hurt us.
>
> Therefore, in consideration of the exorbitant cost of this project and in anticipation of its many ruinous consequences, we ask that you give serious consideration to all the factors, for if you do, we feel confident that the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project will be abandoned.

Finally, let me quote his concluding statement regarding the St. Lawrence Waterway and, in particular, note what he had to say about it in relation to the Labrador ore fields:

> All the St. Lawrence Waterway would do, if it is a success, will be to bring that competition right into the heart of our industrial section, and damage the blast furnace, the steel mill, the finished-products operations, and therefore, the whole economy; so that we in Ohio, and I speak generally of the State of Ohio, because the majority of people in Ohio who have taken time out to investigate this project, are unanimous in the opinion that the St. Lawrence Waterway project would be a detriment and not a help to us; so I can tell you, sir, that insofar as the Labrador project is concerned, my company is much more interested in it as an investment for the future, without a seaway, than with a seaway, even though, of course, with a seaway we could bring the raw material in cheaper. It would be, for a while.

It seems to me that the considerations which I have already brought to the attention of the Senate raise the very gravest doubts as to the economic soundness of the St. Lawrence Waterway from the standpoint of the interests in the United States. In view of the Nation's present financial condition, it is difficult indeed for me to comprehend how anyone would be willing to vote for the expenditure of a single dollar for the construction of the proposed project, much less the millions upon millions of dollars which ultimately will be involved, of which the proponents admit a present expenditure of at least $105 million.

Continuing to consider the economic aspects of this matter, there is nothing more to be put in the balance scale in favor of the project, but there are many more items to be added to the unfavorable side of the balance scale.

First, there is the adverse effect on the ports on the Atlantic seaboard and the gulf coast. The New York Port Authority has estimated that as much as 3 million tons of foreign commerce would be diverted from that port. The port of Boston has estimated that it would suffer a marked decrease. Similarly, the ports of Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Norfolk would suffer. Those directly responsible for management of the ports of Houston, Tex., and New Orleans, La., point out that those cities also would be adversely affected by the construction of the waterway. In a like position are the railroads of this country. Principally, of course, those east-to-west roads in the northeast section of the United States would be adversely affected. How much business and how much revenue they would lose, it is difficult to say, but, as a point of orientation, if the exaggerated estimate of the traffic which the proponents of the waterway claim would be diverted from the railroads were realized, the loss in revenue to the railroads would approximate $175 million a year.

Concurring in the belief that construction of the proposed waterway would be economically harmful are the labor forces serving the coal industry, the railroad industry, and the ports. In addition to these segments of labor, the American Federation of Labor is strongly opposed to the project. As an indication of what the project might mean to labor, the director of port development of the Port of New York Authority testified that about 400,000 of the 4 million people employed in the Greater New York are closely associated with the operation of the port of New York. He estimated that taking into consideration those secondarily affected, as well as those primarily affected, in the neighborhood of 200,000 jobs would be adversely affected by the proposed waterway.

In considering the effect upon the railroads and the ports, it is highly important to bear in mind that even after the expenditure of the enormous sums of money involved in the construction of the waterway, it would constitute merely a part-time, seasonal transportation route. It is uncontroverted that the waterway would be closed entirely for 4 months of the year, and when we consider the slowdown in movement during the first month of the open season and the last month of the open season, it would appear that the waterway would have only a little more than 7 months of full operational utility.

The fact that the waterway would be a part-time competitor of the railroads and the ports on the seaboard does not lessen its harmful effect, but merely adds to it, for quite obviously it would be necessary for these two segments of the economy to maintain as standbys the facilities necessary to handle, during the period when the waterway would be closed, the traffic which would move over the waterway during the open season. Some part of the traffic, such as iron ore, could be accommodated to a seasonal movement as it is today over the Great Lakes, but practically all the other traffic would not be of a seasonal character and would have to continue to move over other routes during the closed season of the waterway. This is an inherent defect of the waterway which cannot be cured.

One other very important segment of our economy, which I have not yet mentioned, is opposed to this project. I refer to the shipowners of this country who make up the American merchant marine. So far as I know, this is the first time the shipowners of the United States generally have been opposed to the construction of a project supposedly for the purpose of creating additional ocean routes.

If the project were, in fact, to be a true "seaway," as it has always been affectionately and reverently designated by its proponents, and if, in fact, it were soundly conceived, one would certainly expect to find the owners of our shipping fleets in the forefront of those urging the construction of the project. Furthermore, it is not merely a case of the shipowners being disinterested in this project, but they are unanimously and vigorously opposed to it. Time and again they have pointed out before congressional hearings that the proposed project with its limited depth of 27 feet would not be usable economically by American oceangoing vessels.

Because of the need for clearance under the keel of the vessel, a 27-foot waterway will permit the loading of vessels only to a depth of 24 feet. Some persons say 2½ feet of clearance is sufficient, while others recommend 3½ feet; but I think a clearance of 3 feet is a fair figure. For instance, the regulations of the port of Montreal require a clearance of 3 feet for all vessels of 10,000 tons or over.

The net result is that very few vessels of United States registry could operate through the proposed waterway with economic loads. That is true as to all of the Liberty and Victory ships built during World War II, and as to all ships which have been constructed since that time. According to the National Federation of American Shipping, only about 2 percent of the privately owned oceangoing vessels of American registry could operate with full loads through a 27-foot waterway.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am happy to yield.

Mr. POTTER. I know the distinguished Senator from Maryland is making a long speech in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway, and that he has spent a great deal of time in preparing it. It happens that his views are in direct contradiction of my own.

Will not the Senator agree that very few of our cargo ships are actually loaded to the draft limit? In other words, most of our ships are based upon not only the weight of the cargo, but also the size of the cargo. Thus, many times, and perhaps in most instances, a full load may be had, but still the ship may have only half the draft that could be accommodated. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I may answer the Senator by asking, If that is so, then why do the American shipping interests, who know more about ships, the loading of ships, the trimming of ships, and the navigation of ships, unanimously oppose the St. Lawrence seaway project?

Mr. POTTER. I think the Senator's question answers itself. Probably they are opposed to it for the same reason the Senator from Maryland is opposed to it. So far as they are concerned, it is a personal economic interest that is involved.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator mean to say that all ships operate out of Maryland?

Mr. POTTER. We who favor the St. Lawrence seaway are greatly concerned not only about economic interests—and those of the Midwest, I am frank to say, would be greatly benefited—but also—and I believe this is the controlling factor—we are concerned about our own national security. In determining this issue, I hope Senators will put aside the economic interests of their own local areas, and will consider the weight to be given to our national security.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Has the Senator from Michigan been away from the Chamber so long that he has not heard what, to me, is conclusive proof that the proposed waterway could never be an effective adjunct to our national defense for it would be frozen over 4 or 5 months of the year, and would be one of the most vulnerable targets for any enemy?

I call the attention of the Senator to page 326 of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations on the proposed waterway. There he will see testimony to the effect that only 2 percent of the privately owned American flag merchant fleet could operate through the waterway. Also, he will notice the testimony of a person who is very capable of giving such testimony, Mr. Alvin Shapiro, to the effect that the loading and trimming of ships is a very exact science. A ship cannot be so carefully loaded that it can be trimmed, reloaded, and retrimmed during the course of its voyage. When it goes from salt water into fresh water, naturally its draft becomes greater, because fresh water does not have the buoyancy of salt water. So all those factors argue against the carrying of part loads or half loads.

Another point to which I wish to call the attention of the junior Senator from Michigan is that the American merchant marine today is faced with a problem of size. To operate the American merchant marine economically, it is necessary that there be large ships, and that a large cargo can be carried in them. Indeed, if the Senator will read the hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in connection with the proposed waterway, he will find that ships are becoming larger and larger, and that the average draft is now 29 feet.

When I was abroad only 2 or 3 months ago, I saw tankers of 32,000 tons laid down in foreign shipyards. Our cargo ships are becoming larger; our tankers are becoming larger. The first thing we know, the average draft of such ships, by the time the proposed St. Lawrence project could be completed, would be 29 feet. The seaway would be obsolete before it was constructed.

I may say to the Senator from Michigan that this is simply an effort to get a foot in the door, and to take from the taxpayers of the United States another $1,500,000,000 to complete a seaway that has been rejected by every Congress as long as I can remember.

If this small 27-foot channel is authorized, then the foot is in the door, and the first thing we know, in order to accommodate American shipping and to appease American shipping interests, we will have to make the channel 30 feet. Then we will have to make it 35 feet, and will also have to enlarge all the dockage facilities on the Great Lakes, and all the channels. So it will cost the taxpayers of the United States billions of dollars. It is the same old story, "Let us get a little bit first; then we can enlarge it later."

Mr. POTTER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I am sure the Senator wishes to be correct. The cost of the construction of the seaway is not several billion dollars, as the Senator has stated, but it is $105 million. Time and time again this body has heard opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway citing fantastic sums as to what the cost of the project will be. Senators should be accurate in their statements. I think it is well for us to stick to the amount in the bill under consideration, which is $105 million.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is a very convenient argument for the men who want to get the nose of the camel under the tent; but, from the standpoint of the betterment and the welfare of the American people, if the proponents of this bill succeed in getting the nose under the tent in this case, the American people will spend billions of dollars before we are through with the matter. I say that this is no time to be boondoggling with $105 million, when the President of the United States is coming before Congress to ask it to raise the debt limit because the Government cannot pay its daily bills.

Mr. POTTER. Will the distinguished Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. We spend billions upon billions of dollars for national defense. I know the Senator may not agree with me, but I think he will have to agree with the National Security Council, and with the President of the United States, who is a man with whose military opinions most people will certainly agree, as they will with officials of the Department of Defense. They all say that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway will enhance our national defense. There is no question of a nose under the tent. I say to the Senator from Maryland that $105 million will pay for the construction of the seaway. It is to be done for national security reasons. I understand the argument of the Senator from Maryland that we can get our iron ore from Venezuela and from other places; but I remind him that in case of war the submarine menace to our offshore shipping will be such that the carriers from South America will not be able to operate in the trade routes to the United States or to some of the inland ports of Canada. So from a national defense standpoint it cannot be contradicted that the seaway is essential.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Michigan has asked a very long question, if it is a question, but I shall try to answer it. I spent an hour this morning proving conclusively, I think, that there is no national-defense feature involved in this project, and that not one military man has appeared before a committee of the Senate and put his reputation on the line by testifying that it is needed for national defense. Not one of them will come to the Senate and subject himself to cross-examination on that question by Senators who are opposed to this project. If it is such a good project from the standpoint of national defense, why do they not come forward, appear before the committee, and give me, the Senator from Michigan and other Senators the opportunity to cross-examine them and to inquire into what they know about it.

I have here the testimony of two of the most able men in the Department of Defense of the United States, who said that it would be folly to build this seaway. There has been no testimony to the contrary.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Maryland yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator aware that one of them is a retired general and the other an admiral, and that one received $1,000 and the other $800 for testifying?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not care if they received a million dollars. Does the Senator mean to stand on the floor of the United States Senate and tell me that simply because a man receives a fee for rendering expert service his testimony is not to be believed?

Mr. AIKEN. I do in this case. They were hired to do it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. They were hired to give testimony by interests opposing the seaway. One received $1,000 and the other received $800.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. My mind does not run in the same channel as that of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is quite correct that our minds do not run in the same channels.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I agree that the Senator is correct that they do not.

Mr. AIKEN. There is more than one channel, and that channel is not the Chesapeake Bay or the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think the Senator has done these men a great injustice.

Mr. AIKEN. They did themselves an injustice.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator honestly believe that those men appeared before a committee of the United States Senate and committed perjury for $600?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe they testified the way they were told to testify. One received $1,000. I do not know whether the other received $600 or $800.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Then the Senator believes that they committed perjury?

Mr. AIKEN. They were not under oath.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If they were not under oath, they should have been.

The net result is that very few vessels of the United States registry could operate through the proposed waterway with economic loads. That is true as to all the Liberty and Victory ships built during World War II, and as to all ships which have been constructed since that time.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I know very little, if anything, about ships. The Senator referred to the Liberty-type ships. Will the Senator explain what is meant by that?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Liberty-type vessel was built to carry our commerce during the World War.

I think my friend, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who does know something about ships—and I have been trying to learn something about the subject—knows that it is the vessel that carried most of our commerce during the war period. It was some 590 feet in length, had a beam of probably 55 feet, had a speed of approximately 13 knots, and had a gross tonnage of probably 10,000.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator state what is meant by the draft of a vessel?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. By "draft" is meant the depth in the water of the lowest part of the vessel.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Would the depth provided for the waterway in the proposed legislation be sufficient, in the opinion of the senior Senator from Maryland, to enable a Liberty-type vessel to use it?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It would not. A Liberty vessel requires a draft of about 27 feet 6 inches. A Victory-type vessel requires a draft of about 26 feet 9 inches. A modern-day vessel, the type being considered on the ways throughout the world today, requires a draft of approximately 29 feet.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I do not desire to interrupt, but will the Senator from Maryland state what sort of vessels will use this waterway?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The only vessels the Senator from Maryland can visualize that will receive any benefit from the so-called seaway are the ore vessels and other vessels plying the Great Lakes, and foreign tramp vessels, which could come right into the heart land of America, preempt the trade of the area, pass through the seaway, and take American commodities abroad.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator from Maryland state whether the foreign tramp vessels are smaller than the Liberty ships?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The foreign tramp vessels are generally much slower and much smaller, and they can afford to operate in the manner they do, because the wages paid to their personnel are very much less than the wages paid in the American merchant marine. It costs us much more to operate a vessel per day than it costs any of our foreign competitors.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to ask one other question, and then I shall not further interrupt my colleague: What sort of vessels will be used on the seaway to haul grain? There has already been some debate on that point.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. They would be bulk cargo vessels, of which there are now very few under United States registry; but those vessels, I would say, would not be of less than 10,000 tons, and they would draw not less than 27 or 28 feet. It would not be economical to operate vessels any smaller in size.

Mr. WELKER. Those vessels could operate in the seaway, though, could they?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; those vessels could not operate in the seaway.

Mr. WELKER. I thank my friend.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, certain theorists appearing in support of the waterway testified that a substantial number of United States vessels could operate through a 27-foot waterway, when loaded to from 75 to 80 percent of their capacity, and that therefore a 27-foot waterway would be entirely feasible and economical.

However, who would rely upon the views of such theorists, none of whom is engaged in the shipping business, in the face of the very definite opinion to the contrary held by all persons who are engaged in the business of operating ships?

In this connection it is very interesting, indeed, to note that the same advocates of the St. Lawrence Waterway who maintain that it would be perfectly economical to operate vessels through the waterway with partial loads, appeared in Detroit, at a recent hearing conducted by the Army engineers who were studying the proposal for the deepening and improvement of the connecting channels in the upper Great Lakes, and gave as one of the important reasons in support of such deepening the great economy that would result from permitting vessels to operate with greater loads.

I hope the Senator from Michigan heard that part of my address.

Mr. President, in further support of the need for the improvement of these channels, they pointed out that a small percent of the vessels already in operation on the Great Lakes were unable to operate through these channels with full loads.

It seems to me that is typical of much of the double talk that has been handed out with regard to the St. Lawrence Waterway. On the one hand, proponents say there is no need for deepening the St. Lawrence Waterway below 27 feet, although approximately 98 percent of United States vessels cannot operate with full load through a channel of such depth; and, on the other hand, the proponents say that other channels in the Great Lakes need deepening because a small percentage of the vessels cannot operate through them with full loads.

There are some other considerations that have a bearing on the inadequacy of a channel of 27-foot depth. The depth of 27 feet was first decided upon back in 1928. The figures indicate that at that time approximately 60 percent of the American oceangoing fleet and approximately 67 percent of the foreign oceangoing fleet could have used a waterway of that depth, while carrying loads. When we consider the change that has taken place in the 25 years since that time in the matter of depth of draft of United States vessels, and yet that there has been no corresponding change in the proposal as to the depth of the waterway, it is quite obvious that the plans for the proposed waterway have not kept pace with changing conditions. The evidence is clear and convincing that a 27-foot channel is already obsolete and outmoded for oceangoing vessels. The limited depth makes the seaway one of the greatest misnomers of all time. Consider the following factors, Mr. President:

All of our important seacoast harbors have depths of at least 35 feet, and most of them have a greater depth than that. For instance, when we consider the ports of our Atlantic and Gulf coasts, we find that in the year 1950, approximately 75 percent of our foreign waterborne traffic entered and left from ports having a depth of 35 feet or more. Including the ports with a depth of 30 feet or more, we find that 91 percent of foreign waterborne traffic was handled by such ports. Ports with a depth of 27 feet or less on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts handled only 6 percent of our foreign waterborne traffic. I think the above figures give a fairly good indication of the depth required if a port is to become a first-class port.

In looking at other canals for ocean shipping, we find that the Panama Canal has a depth of 40 feet, the Suez Canal has a depth of 35 feet, and the Kiel Canal has a depth of 36 feet. Even when the Kiel Canal was first opened, in 1895, it had a depth of 29 feet. The Houston Ship Canal has a depth of 34 feet, and the Army engineers have recommended that it be increased in depth to 36 feet to enable it to accommodate modern oceangoing vessels. The Manchester Ship Canal, completed as long ago as 1894, has a depth of 28 feet.

At the hearings on the St. Lawrence Waterway, it seems to me the Chief of Army engineers or his representatives have hedged on the question of the adequacy of a 27-foot depth for the waterway, neither admitting the inadequacy of the 27-foot channel nor yet denying the advantages of a deeper channel. As having a bearing on the views of the Army engineers on this point when the St. Lawrence Waterway is not involved, let me call attention to several of their recent recommendations on other projects.

In response to the request of local interests for a deepening of the Houston Ship Canal, on the ground that the present 34-foot channels are "not adequate to accommodate, fully and safely, the present merchant fleet of large dry-cargo and tank vessels," the Army engineers have recommended increasing the depth to 36 feet.

A second project involving a proposed deepening of the channel is on the Hudson River to Albany. In a report not yet acted on by the Board of Engineers or the Chief of Engineers, the district and division engineers have recommended deepening the channels of the Hudson River to Albany from 27 feet to 32 feet. The district engineer makes this significant statement in his report:

> The existing 27-foot channel in Hudson River has become inadequate as a result of the increased size of merchant vessels using the waterway.

A third such project involves the channels in Mobile Bay and Mobile River, which in a recent report of the Army Engineers were recommended for deepening from 32 feet to 40 feet. In the report of the district engineers, concurred in by the Chief of Engineers, this significant statement is made:

> The impracticability of providing a channel depth inadequate to accommodate, at full load draft, the larger vessels which are expected to handle a substantial share of the future port tonnage is readily apparent.

Speaking before a group in Mobile, Ala., on March 15, 1952, General Pick, then Chief of Army engineers, is reported by the Mobile Labor Journal to have made the following statements with respect to this project:

> I am going to tell you now that it is time for Mobile to become a first-class port. To those of you who think you already have a first-class port, I say you have not got a first-class port in the sense of other first-class ports.
>
> • • • • •
>
> They have authorized channels into those ports of 40 feet * * * but Mobile has only a 32-foot channel. * * * I remember the channel at Houston was dug before the projects were located; and you are locating them now, and you haven't even a good 32-foot channel. What kind of ship can you put in here? Can you bring a ship drawing 32 feet of water? The answer is no. I expect if you will find out from the shipping public here, you will learn that the use of those that draw over 27 feet is usual.
>
> • • • • •
>
> Colonel Wilson has written a report and I knew a long time ago what he was going to say. He has recommended the project of 42 feet over the bar. He has recommended 40 feet up the channel, thirty-odd miles from the entrance to the harbor, or bridge. That will mean that you can bring in to this harbor the ships of the world.

In other words, it would appear that whenever any project other than the St. Lawrence is involved, the Army engineers clearly recognize the inadequacy of a 27-foot channel and the need for channels of from 35 to 40 feet.

Mr. President, it is also very illuminating to note that back in 1929, the Brookings Institution, after its thorough study of this project, concluded that a channel depth of 27 feet would be wholly inadequate. At that time it reached the following conclusion:

> A channel depth of 33 feet is a minimum requirement if the St. Lawrence Waterway is to serve the purposes for which it is advocated.

The substantial increase in the draft of vessels since that time clearly indicates that under today's conditions 35 feet would be the minimum requirement if the St. Lawrence Waterway is to serve the purposes for which it has so long been advocated.

The conclusion to be drawn from the evidence on this point is so clear and unmistakable that one cannot help but wonder why the proponents have not sought authority to construct a 35-foot channel in the first instance. I believe the answer to this is clear. While from the standpoint of the physical and functional aspects of this waterway, looked

at from the viewpoint of United States interests, nothing less than a 35-foot depth makes any sense at all, the proponents have realized that it would be impossible for them to justify economically the enormously increased costs of a waterway of such depth. Therefore they are following the age-old stratagem of getting the nose of the camel under the tent by trying to get the United States to embark in the first instance upon a project of 27-foot depth.

Just as in the case of the railroads and ports, the shipowners have also expressed the view that even if they were operating through the St. Lawrence Waterway the fact that it would be closed for approximately 5 months of the year would create an economic hardship on them by reason of their having to maintain shipping offices in the Great Lakes ports for operation on a part-time basis. The general conclusion of the shipowners was that the proposed waterway if constructed would, so far as its use by oceangoing vessels was concerned, be used primarily by foreign tramp steamers, inasmuch as a substantially greater number of such vessels are of a draft that would permit their use of a 27-foot waterway at economical loads.

The draft of oceangoing vessels forming the American merchant marine has been steadily increasing through the years, with an exceptional spurt in this direction in the past few years. This has been made necessary by the high level of wages paid to American seamen. The only way to combat the factor of an everincreasing percentage of labor costs per unit of traffic was to increase the size and draft of vessels. Any artificially imposed restrication on the use of the full capacity of the ship would of course do away with all the advantages gained from such increased depth, thus forcing them back into the uneconomical position under which they found they could not previously operate successfully.

Every Member of Congress knows the amount of time that has been devoted to the problem of maintaining the American merchant marine as a strong, vigorous, and economical fleet, both in the interest of our national economy and in the interest of national security. It is absolutely incredible to me that the Congress should be giving serious consideration to a step calculated to do so much to hurt the American merchant marine. Perhaps some have lost sight of the fact that much of the operations of our merchant marine in the field of foreign commerce is already subject to payment of subsidies by the Federal Government. It seems clear that the inevitable result of the construction of the proposed waterway would be to increase the burden on the Federal Government in the form of subsidy payments. In short, to me the conclusion is inescapable that from the standpoint of the economic consequences the construction of the St. Lawrence Waterway has far more capabilities for harm to the various segments of the American economy than it has possibilities of advantage.

Where does the question of self-liquidation of this project fit into the picture? Actually, it seems to me that whether this project could ultimately be made self-liquidating or not is not of major importance in view of the present state of our national finances. However, I think Senators are entitled to be informed as to what kind of a case the proponents have made on the question of self-liquidation.

The principal factors that determine whether a project can be made self-liquidating are the volume of traffic that the proposed waterway would carry, the cost of the project, and, of course, the level of tolls to be levied. When a project is proposed as self-liquidating, the burden of proof should very definitely rest upon the proponents to demonstrate that the project could be made self-liquidating. It is interesting to observe that no careful traffic study for the proposed waterway has been made since 1940. At that time a careful traffic study was made by the Department of Commerce, and the results were published as volume III of a 7-volume study entitled "The St. Lawrence Survey." The traffic study itself was 342 pages long. In it the traffic possibilities of 17 commodities were considered. As a result, the Department estimated that the annual United States traffic through the seaway for these commodities would range between 4,600,000 and 4,750,000 tons. The Department undertook to show the sources from which the traffic would be derived and the points at which the commodities would be marketed, and attempted to give consideration to the influence of factors which might result in certain items of traffic not moving over the waterway despite its availability. The report pointed out that the 17 commodities selected were not exhaustive of the traffic possibilities, and estimated that an additional tonnage of a little more than 2 million tons might move, making a total of about 7 million tons.

Let me read one paragraph from volume III of the St. Lawrence survey, page 34:

> In view of the fact that so many important commodities have been omitted from the present study, it would not be excessive to assume that the potential annual traffic would be much greater than indicated by our figure of 4,600,000 or 4,750,000 tons. For instance, other studies have included in their estimates large items such as petroleum, 500,000 tons; sugar, 500,000 tons; fertilizers, 555,000 tons; coal, 350,000 tons; lumber 41,500 tons; pulpwood, 82,500 tons, or a total of 2,029,000 tons—all of them being items which are not included in our studies. Adding to our studies the items which are included in other studies, but excluded from ours, will yield 7 million.

After the treatment of the specific commodities, the report went on to say, at page 36, that—

> It is not improbable that actual American traffic within a reasonable period will be as much as 10 million tons.

Since that time the proponents of the St. Lawrence Waterway have not seen fit to make a detailed traffic study, but instead have substituted estimates of traffic based on the judgment of so-called experts which for the most part are nothing more than figures picked out of the air. This method has proved much more satisfactory from the standpoint of the proponents because it was much more difficult to analyze and test the results arrived at in this manner.

From time to time since that last careful study various estimates have been submitted, ranging from 38 million tons to 84 million tons annually. This highest and most absurd estimate was relied upon in hearings in 1951 and 1952. Because of the absurdity of these estimates opponents of the project at various congressional hearings were able to demonstrate the thoroughly unreliable basis for the figures. No doubt because of this experience the most recent estimates have been somewhat more modest, ranging between 40 and 50 million tons. I assure Senators that no substantial evidence was submitted in support of these estimates, and they remain little more than figures picked out of the air. It is interesting to bear in mind that at the time when the Department of Commerce was able to find only 7 million tons of United States traffic in prospect for the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway the proposal was not being advanced on a self-liquidating basis. Great pains were taken at that time by the Department of Commerce to point out how low the traffic was and how unlikely it was that traffic of such an amount could have any serious adverse effect upon the railroads or the seaboard ports.

Now, on the other hand, when proponents feel that they are obliged to try to demonstrate that the project will be self-liquidating, they completely ignore the earlier carefully prepared estimates and simply come up with whatever figure they think is required in order to produce the amount of revenue needed to meet the costs of the proposed waterway. The exaggerated estimates seem even more ridiculous in the face of the fact, perpectly clear to everyone, that the effect of imposing tolls for the use of the waterway instead of providing a waterway free of charge could only be to reduce the amount of traffic that would use the waterway. This is just another indication that the traffic estimates presented by proponents of the St. Lawrence project are not worth the paper they are written on and cannot be relied upon at all.

Considering all the time and money its proponents have spent in promoting this project, realizing as they must have that a reliable traffic estimate would be essential in determining whether the project could be made self-liquidating, it seems to me to be utterly inexcusable that a careful detailed study of probable traffic has not been made since 1940. The only conclusion one can reach is that they were afraid of what such a study would show.

On the question of costs we are in a little better position than we are with respect to the question of probable traffic, but not very much better. Because S. 2150 is such a limited bill and takes only a piecemeal approach toward the construction of the St. Lawrence project, we will limit our consideration of cost for the moment to the estimated cost of construction of a canal on the United States side of the International Rapids section

of the St. Lawrence, which is the only construction authorized by this bill.

The estimated cost of construction of these works was stated by the United States Army engineers to be in the neighborhood of $100 million. This, they say, is a careful and firm estimate. The underlying data in support of this estimate have not been available for inspection, which makes it impossible to reach any firm conclusion as to whether the Army engineers may come a little closer to being correct in this case than they usually do. In this state of the record, however, about all one can do is to judge this estimate on the basis of the record for accuracy shown in estimates of cost by the Army engineers for other projects.

As bearing on this point, I should like to read from the report of the House Appropriations Committee on the general appropriations bill, 1951. This is taken from pages 247–248 of House Report No. 1797, 81st Congress, 2d session:

It is desirable to call to the attention of the membership of the House the fact that the original estimated total Federal cost of budgeted river and harbor and flood-control construction projects, including the lower Mississippi, and Sacramento River, Calif., was $4,364,057,750. The present total estimated Federal cost of these same projects is $7,034,408,070, an increase of $2,270,350,320,[1] or 52 percent.

While it is recognized that a portion of this cost is attributable to increased construction costs and to extensions and modifications subsequently expressly authorized for individual projects, the major portion of the increase is due to engineering and constructural modifications permitted under authorizing legislation to be made by the Chief of Engineers. For example, in fiscal year 1949, the estimated total Federal cost of these projects was stated at $6,073,765,580. This total was increased to $6,465,299,990 in fiscal year 1950, and again, as above indicated, to $7,034,408,070 in fiscal year 1951.

In attempting to analyze these increases in estimated total Federal costs, the committee obtained from the Corps of Engineers purported reasons for increased total costs on 63 of the major projects. In only three instances were the increased costs attributed to additional legislative authority. Engineering and construction modifications authorized by the Chief of Engineers seem to account for 58 percent of a major portion of the increased total Federal cost, and for some reason, not quite clear to the committee, over 33 percent of the increase is placed on higher construction costs. No construction-cost index known to the committee substantiates this percentage increase from November 1947 to November 1949. The Department of Commerce composite construction cost index reflects only an increase of approximately 14 percent in November 1949 over November 1947. The same index shows a decrease of 3.7 percent in November 1949, as compared with November 1948. The index quoted includes both labor and materials.

* * * * *

The simple conclusion is that the Chief of Engineers has committed the Government and is continuing to commit the Government to the expenditure of funds far in excess of amounts contemplated by the Congress either at the time of the original authorization of the projects or at the time funds were appropriated for the initiation of construction. As a matter of fact, the committee has reason to believe that very little cost and engineering data with respect to individual projects is on file with the Chief of Engineers, most records being maintained at the offices of the various district engineers. Consequently, these excessive obligations of Federal funds are being incurred by the district engineers and are, it would seem, approved by the Chief of Engineers, as a matter of form.

It will readily be admitted by anyone in a responsible position in the construction industry that continued modifications in design and structure, once construction has been initiated is, to say the least, expensive. It borders on profligacy. The averred necessity for major modification of plans, designs, and specifications after construction is begun on projects, is clearly indicative of the fact that construction of numerous projects has been initiated before adequate surveys, plans, and designs had been developed. Such practice is not proper stewardship of a vital and very expensive public function. Flood control is vital to the public welfare, but other demands upon the National Treasury must necessarily limit annual expenditures for flood control and related activities. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, this committee, and the Congress, to insist that adequate plans and designs be prepared in detail before construction of any project is initiated, otherwise public funds will continue to be wasted.

[1] So in original. House Appropriations Committee advises should be "$2,670,350,320, or 61 percent."

I think the Senate would also be interested in the following from the report, dated August 16, 1951, of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions of the House Appropriations Committee, Investigation of Corps of Engineers Civil Works Program:

The cost of the river-and-harbor and flood-control projects under construction by the Corps of Engineers in fiscal year 1951, generally designated as civil-works projects, has increased inordinately. In dollars the increase between the cost estimate for these 182 projects when they were authorized by Congress, and the cost estimate submitted in connection with the budget for fiscal year 1952 has been $3,273,933,000. In percentage, it amounts to an increase of 124 percent. The cost estimate at the time of authorization of these projects was $2,638,517,000 and their cost for fiscal year 1952 is $5,912,451,000.

When it would be impossible to say by how much the actual cost of the project will exceed the estimates, I think without any hesitation whatsoever we can assume that the final cost of the proposed project would be very considerably in excess of the estimated cost.

I believe that it can be fairly said that if anyone were to make a careful study of the record on the question of self-liquidation, he could reach only one conclusion, namely, that there had been no successful demonstration that there was any reasonable prospect the project could be made self-liquidating.

While S. 2150 provides only for the construction of the canals on the United States side of the St. Lawrence through the International Rapids section, we would be blind indeed if we allowed ourselves to be deluded into thinking that the costs for these works constituted the only costs that the United States would be letting itself in for in connection with the St. Lawrence project.

In the first place, no provision whatsoever has been made for the cost of improving Great Lakes ports and harbors. It is like sticking one's head in the sand to proceed on any other assumption than that as a direct consequence of this project it would be necessary to improve Great Lakes ports and harbors quite extensively. It certainly would make no sense to provide a 27-foot channel through which oceangoing vessels would have access to the Great Lakes if when they got to the Great Lakes they could not complete the transaction of their business by getting into the ports and harbors in that area.

When the proponents of the project were confronted with this question of expense for Great Lakes harbors, their only reply was to express the hope that maybe the local interests at each port would see fit to deepen and improve their own facilities. This is an absurd suggestion, and there is absolutely no foundation for any such hope. All the improvements heretofore in the ports and harbors of the Great Lakes, other than the fixed facilities on land, have been constructed by the Federal Government and at the sole expense of the Federal Government. The only result of not including the cost of such improvements as a part of the project is to eliminate the cost of such improvements from those costs which are presumably to be liquidated through the imposition of tolls. Thus the Federal Government would have to pay these costs in the first instance, and would have no chance of recovering any part of the costs from the users.

Exactly what the cost of making these improvements in the Great Lakes harbors would be it is difficult to say, for no estimates of such costs have ever been submitted. The Army engineers did submit some estimates as to the cost of providing an entrance channel and turning-basin in 17 typical harbors on the Great Lakes, but this, of course, would constitute a wholly inadequate improvement of the channels to serve the needs. The only genuine attempt at an estimate of this cost was that made by Maj. Gen. R. C. Breene, retired. Using the same unit costs employed by the Army engineers on harbor work, Major General Breene arrived at a minimum estimate of $104 million for deepening to 27 feet of 17 typical harbors in the Great Lakes.

In this connection, Mr. President, there should not be left out of the picture the question of the cost of deepening the connecting channels of the upper Great Lakes. If it be asked why this cost should be taken into consideration, I think the answer is obvious. In the first place, up until this year every bill introduced calling for approval of the St. Lawrence Waterway project has included as a part of the project the cost of deepening these channels. For nearly 30 years this waterway has been advocated on the theory that it would permit oceangoing vessels to ply freely between the ports on the Great Lakes generally and ports all over the world. Never, prior to last year, had it ever been suggested that this part of the work should be omitted. The reason for the omission is perfectly obvious. It is certainly not because of any change in concept of what the overall project should be, but is merely a result of the

tactics calling for a piecemeal approach to the construction of the waterway in order to make it look cheap.

It should be perfectly obvious to everyone that S. 2150 is merely being used as a means of getting a foot in the door. It would be very difficult, indeed, to justify providing a 27-foot waterway for those located on Lake Ontario and Lake Erie and denying a waterway of similar standards for those located on Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, and Lake Superior. The Senators from Minnesota have already made it perfectly clear that they have no intention of letting the waterway stop at Detroit, and there are amendments pending before the Senate to S. 2150 calling for the improvement of the upper Great Lakes channels.

The cost involved in this work is even more uncertain than the cost of the work in the International Rapids section, for the estimates previously submitted by the Army engineers for this work, amounting to approximately $100 million, do not even purport to be final and accurate estimates. According to the statements of the Army engineers themselves, much of this work would be performed in areas in which no soundings or borings have ever been taken. The estimates are the result of office studies employing available hydrographic data.

To me it is a shocking thing that the Congress of the United States should be asked to consider authorizing work of this magnitude with little more than rough estimates of the cost, particularly when one has in mind the inaccuracy in the past of even the most thorough and carefully prepared final estimates of the Army engineers.

Not only is S. 2150 being used as a means of getting the nose of the camel under the tent, so far as the geographical extent of the project is concerned, but it is clearly being used in that way in another respect. I have reference to the depth of the proposed waterway. For the reasons I have already outlined it should be obvious to everyone that the proponents of the St. Lawrence waterway will not by any means be satisfied with an obsolete waterway of 27-foot depth. Once a waterway of 27 feet were to be authorized, and probably before the project were even completed, one could rest unhappy but assured that the proponents of this project would be back before Congress seeking authorization for deepening the entire waterway at least to 35 feet, which is the absolute minimum depth for a waterway to serve ocean shipping. Then proponents would point out the absurdity of having a waterway through which the American merchant marine could not operate economically while their foreign competitors, because of lower wage costs, were operating successfully with smaller vessels and taking away all of their business; and they would produce figures to show the great economies to be achieved through the operation of deeper draft vessels.

In view of these facts, I see no point in the Congress going into this situation blindly. For that reason it seems to me to be the part of wisdom to inquire into what the probable ultimate cost would be of a 35-foot waterway before we embark on any part of this project. To do this it will be necessary to rely upon figures submitted by the Army engineers several years ago at a time when they included in their table of costs the estimates for a 35-foot project. At the hearings on S. 2150, no figures were presented having to do with the cost of a 35-foot waterway. This, no doubt, was a part of the strategy of the proponents who did not wish anyone studying this project to have before them the figures which showed what real money would be required if the only project making any sense from a functional standpoint were ever constructed.

Let us now look at the increase in the cost of a 35-foot depth as compared with a 27-foot depth for the various segments of the total project.

In the Thousand Islands section, we find that the cost goes up from $1,593,000 to $23,679,000, or an increase of approximately $22 million. In the International Rapids section, the cost goes up from $475,356,000 to $512,587,000, or an increase of approximately $37 million. These increases are quite moderate, but in the connecting channels of the upper Great Lakes, the cost goes up from $89,845,000 to $516,657,000, or an increase of approximately $427 million. The total of these increases for the United States amounts to approximately $486 million. This cost, of course, includes nothing for the deepening of the harbors in the Great Lakes.

Again, as in the case of the estimate of the cost of deepening the harbors to 27 feet, there has been no study which would justify placing too great reliance on the estimate for this work, but General Breene estimated the cost of deepening 17 typical harbors in the Great Lakes to 35 feet at $577,600,000, or an increase of $473 million over the cost of deepening such harbors to 27 feet. This gives a grand total increase in cost to the United States for a 35-foot project, as compared with a 27-foot project, of approximately $960 million. In view of the fact that most of these costs are based on cost levels for December 1950, there is little doubt that as of today the increase in cost would be more than $1 billion.

This is only the increase to the United States, and, of course, it would be necessary for Canada to increase the depth of the portions of the waterway for which it would be responsible in order to make the project a 35-foot waterway. For the three portions of the waterway in the so-called Canadian section, the cost would be increased from $137,858,000 for the 27-foot project to $224,337,000 for the 35-foot project, or an increase of approximately $86,450,000. In the Thousand Islands section, Canada would be required to spend approximately $2 million for the 35-foot channel as against no cost for the 27-foot channel, and in the Welland Canal the cost would be increased from $1,302,000 to $449,545,000, an increase of $448,243,000. Furthermore, this estimate of the cost of deepening the Welland Canal to 35 feet carries the following footnote which is quoted from a letter of the Department of Transport in Canada:

> The estimate of cost of this project is far from the same degree of accuracy as other estimates of cost for other sections of the waterway. Sufficient data on which to base a reliable estimate for a 35-foot project in the Welland Canal area is not available.

Thus, the total increase to Canada would be approximately $537 million, as a minimum. This, of course, includes no cost to Canada for increasing the depth of its harbors, for which there is no estimate.

While, of course, no one could force the United States to pay any part of the cost of deepening the waterway in Canadian territory to 35 feet, Congress should not overlook the fact that Canada may be thoroughly disinterested in any proposal to increase the depth of the waterway from 27 to 35 feet. I say this for the reason that at 27 feet the anticipated effect of the waterway will be to promote and build up the trade of the port of Montreal, at the expense of United States ports on the eastern seaboard, because of the expectation that at the limited depth of 27 feet the waterway would be largely unusable by oceangoing ships, and most of the traffic moving over the waterway for export would move to Montreal in lake vessels and there be transferred into oceangoing ships for movement across the Atlantic Ocean. On the other hand, if the waterway were deepened to 35 feet, much of this traffic might sail right past Montreal without stopping.

In this connection, I cite the following statement from a speech of Mr. Lionel Chevrier, Canadian Minister of Transport, in the Canadian House of Commons:

> In this connection it may be of interest to note the oceangoing vessels are not expected to play a major role on the seaway.

Further confirmation of this view from a high Canadian source is to be found in a recent statement of General McNaughton, cochairman of the International Joint Commission. I quote the following from an editorial in the Buffalo News of March 28, 1953, entitled "It Won't Be a Seaway":

> Official confirmation comes from Ottawa that the St. Lawrence Waterway which Canada seems intent on building as its own is not designed as a seaway. Gen. A. G. I. McNaughton, cochairman of the International Joint Commission, is authority for the statement. Speaking before the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, he said that the bigger ships have a role of their own in ocean trade, and were not designed for traversing waterways. The general feeling is that far from wanting them in, we want them out, he declared.

It is, therefore, extremely doubtful that the increased benefits from the 35-foot canal would appear sufficiently enticing from the Canadian point of view to justify an additional expenditure by Canada of more than half a billion dollars, and with resultant damage to the port of Montreal.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. Am I to understand from the Senator's argument that he anticipates that if the channel should be eventually deepened to 35 feet, it would probably have to be done entirely at the expense of the American Government, once we begin to participate in the operation of the seaway?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I anticipate precisely that result. That is why I said a little while ago that, in my opinion, this will turn out to be one of the biggest American giveaways in the history of the country. It will make the port of New York look like a second-rate port alongside Montreal. It will take away from the United States traffic we ought to have, traffic we have fought and died for, and will put it in Canada.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator considered the fact that at such time as the traffic is diverted to Montreal and through the St. Lawrence, it would nevertheless be necessary to maintain capacity at Atlantic coast ports, because during at least 4 months of every year the seaway would be frozen, and during that time all cargo originating in the midwestern section of the United States would have to be loaded through eastern and southeastern ports?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that that eventuality would place such a burden on the economic system and on persons who operate the present facilities along the east coast that they could not bear up under it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. I am certain the Senator from Maryland realizes that although it would be necessary to enlarge all the ports on the Great Lakes to enable them to handle the increased cargoes, it still would be necessary to maintain standby capacity on the eastern and southeastern seaboards to handle the traffic during the time when the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system would be frozen.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct. It would be necessary to retain the eastern seaboard facilities, which have been constructed at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, and would have to be maintained only on a standby basis. I do not believe any business could live on that basis.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator realize also that it would be necessary to employ labor for perhaps 8 months in the Great Lakes region, particularly in connection with Great Lakes ports, only to discharge that labor during the other 4 months, when they would be either unemployed or would have to find some other type of employment while the Great Lakes ports were frozen?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is perfectly true. That is why the United States labor organizations are against the project.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. The point has been made that railroads are acting selfishly in opposing the seaway. Of course, the income of railroads is limited by rates fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Railroads are limited to a fair return on their investment. The amount of income to which the railroads are entitled is fixed by law; it is not fixed by their own earning capacity.

When this seaway is opened up, if its tonnage is diverted from the railroads, as the seaway advocates contend will be the case, then those railroads will have to get their income from other hauls where they charge lesser rates. The only way I can anticipate the railroads recovering the money which would be lost would be to raise all their rates on the short hauls.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The rates would be so high that the railroads would price themselves out of the market, and ultimately would not be able to stand the burden.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator has noticed that the Canadian Minister for Transportation has testified, or has certainly made speeches in this country to the effect, that a similar injury would not occur to the Canadian economy.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I just cited that in my address. He said, indeed, that he would rather all of the American oceangoing ships stay out of the waterway. They do not want them there. They want the trade to go to Montreal, and they want us to take our own trade away from ourselves. They want our trade, and they want us to pay the bill for their getting it.

Mr. LONG. Did the Senator notice the statement made by the Canadian Minister of Transport that the Canadian railroads and ports are strongly in favor of the seaway, although the American ports and railroads are opposed to it?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Canadian railroads and ports naturally would be, because they are the ones who would naturally preempt all the traffic.

Mr. LONG. Would not that statement by the Canadian Minister of Transport indicate that the Canadians feel that this diversion of traffic would cause their railroads and their ports to handle more traffic rather than less?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That must follow.

Mr. President, to some persons, the suggestion might seem absurd that the United States would consider paying a large part of the cost of performing work in portions of the St. Lawrence River lying wholly in Canada. It seems to be a little realized fact, however, that that is exactly what was proposed in the 1941 executive agreement between Canada and the United States, and what would have been done if the legislation before the 82d Congress had been enacted.

It is only necessary to look at the table of costs presented by the Army engineers in 1952 to see that this is so. While in that table all the work lying wholly in Canada was shown as a cost to Canada, this was made up for by charging Canada less than one-fifth of the cost of the work in the International Rapids section, including the cost of the powerhouse and all the machinery and equipment for the generation of power which was to be divided equally between the two countries.

The total amount Canada was to have paid under the 1941 agreement was $251 million. When we consider that that is only a little more than half of what the total cost of the power project would have been at that time and less than half of the $517 million at which the cost of the power project is estimated today, without including interest during construction, it is obvious that Canada was in reality paying practically nothing toward the cost of the waterway. Further evidence that this is not a far-fetched idea is to be found in a statement from a letter of the Canadian Department of Transport, which is appended as a footnote to the Canadian estimate of the cost of deepening the Welland Canal to 35 feet, in which it is said:

> Also, it is believed that study should be given to locating such a project (35-foot canal connecting Lake Ontario and Lake Erie) on the United States side.

Therefore, in considering what the United States Government may be embarking upon in the way of an ultimate total expenditure by reason of this venture in the St. Lawrence, it is necessary to consider that should the depth of the waterway be increased to 35 feet, the cost to the United States would be at least a billion dollars above the cost of the 27-foot waterway, plus, possibly, a large proportion of the half billion dollars of added cost that proponents assume would be borne by Canada.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As the Senator well knows, I have offered an amendment, which is at the desk, which would require that in appropriating the money to build this waterway the appropriation should go through the usual channels, and that all the money to build the waterway would have to be recommended by the Appropriations Committees. I wonder whether the Senator has considered that there may be many items of expenditures entailed by the proposed projects which have not up to this time been presented to the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think that is perfectly true, and much of it is in the form of estimates. I went to great pains in my address to point out that the Army engineers' estimates have sometimes proven to be as much as 35 to 40 percent erroneous.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator tell us what committees of the Congress are charged with the responsibility of look-

ing into proposed expenditures, seeing how much money a given item would cost, and what the amount of the appropriations should be?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I know of no other committee of the Congress with the exception of the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator find it passing strange that we find here a bill involving the expenditure of $105 million upon which the Appropriations Committee of the Senate is not given an opportunity to pass?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It is very strange; and, furthermore, the committee will probably have no opportunity to pass upon the other expenditures entailed by this foot-in-the-door method.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Maryland has made the point, has he not, that the interest to make this a real seaway for ocean-going vessels is American rather than Canadian?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is true.

Mr. LONG. The channel for ocean-going vessels should be a 35-foot channel, should it not?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. LONG. In looking into that, does not the Senator agree that the Appropriations Committee should be the one to consider what should be the cost of such a waterway?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator agree that the Appropriations Committee is the one which has made the study in order to see whether the channels should be 30 or 35 feet when a canal project is under consideration?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have never, since I have been a Member of the Senate, heard of any project being handled on any different basis.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know of any bill involving the development of our waterways in the consideration of which the Committee on Foreign Relations has been the committee to pass upon the adequacy of a given channel?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No, I do not. I do not know of any other instance.

Mr. LONG. Did the Senator hear the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to the effect that before this seaway is constructed it is hoped some agreement can be reached with Canada to assure that the United States will have an equal voice as to what tolls shall be charged on the Welland Canal, and on the four locks which are to be on the Canadian side?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes. I was on the floor when he made that statement, and I questioned him immediately after that as to the terms upon which we could use the seaway after it was built. We have no firm commitment from Canada that we can even use it.

Mr. LONG. Does it occur to the Senator that it might be a very good idea for the Congress of the United States to retain control of the purse strings, to the extent of $105 million, until we see what kind of an agreement we have with Canada?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes, and I think that if the time comes when Congress forfeits its right to do that, we will have reached a pretty sad day. This is a very unusual project, I was about to say "put through" in a very unusual way. I do not want to say "put through," because I hope and trust it will not go through, but the attempt is being made to put it through in a very unusual way.

Mr. LONG. Without intending any reflection upon the present administration or any prior administration, I wonder whether the Senator would give me his judgment as to whether it has been the Congress of the United States or the Executive that has been more solicitous in protecting dollar for dollar the investments of the American people.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It has been the Congress all the way through.

Mr. LONG. Whether it has been the Congress or the Executive that has been more careful in protecting the funds of the American people, is it not true that the Congress should not shirk its responsibility, that it should look into expenditures and see precisely what public money is to be spent for?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not believe the Congress of the United States can shirk its responsibility. It is its constitutional obligation to retain control of the purse strings, and that is what the Founding Fathers provided in the Constitution.

Mr. LONG. Is it not also true that if a project cannot be constructed in a single year, it is up to Congress to look at the project year by year, rather than to make an appropriation of $100 million, leaving it to some agency either to accelerate or promote the project as it sees fit?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Louisiana knows, as do I, that that is the common practice; and in some instances the Appropriations Committees have stopped construction right in the middle of a project.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LONG. During the time the Senator from Maryland has served in this body, can he cite me a single precedent for the present control to bypass the Appropriations Committtee and bypass the Congress of the United States in the expenditure of $105 million or in the expenditure of a single thousand dollars?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; I cannot think of any such instance.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield, to permit me to submit a resolution and to make two unanimous-consent requests in connection therewith?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall be very happy to yield for that purpose, provided I do not thereby lose the floor. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my distinguished friend, the Senator from Maryland, who today is making such an effective and enlightening address concerning a problem which is of great concern to all of us.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank my friend.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is of particular concern to some of the Members of the Senate who come from States beyond the periphery of the area contiguous to the proposed project, and, in particular, from west of the Mississippi River.

Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from New Jersey, I now ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution, which I send to the desk for appropriate reference. The resolution is jointly sponsored by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the senior Senator from Missouri, and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

There being no objection, the resolution (S. 190) was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That section 3 of Senate Resolution 89, 83d Congress, agreed to June 1, 1953 (authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The committee shall make a preliminary report of its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate not later than January 31, 1954, and shall make a final report of such findings and recommendations to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1955."

SEC. 2. The limitation of expenditures under such Senate Resolution 89 is increased by $175,000, and such sum together with any unexpended balance of the sum previously authorized to be expended under such Resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject being dealt with by the Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to which the resolution just submitted relates. The statement was prepared by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

During the 1st session of the 83d Congress the Senate approved a resolution directing that a study and investigation be made of juvenile delinquency in this country. In August 1953 a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was organized to carry out this mandate. The junior Senator from New Jersey had the honor to be named chairman of that subcommittee, serving with my distinguished colleagues, Senator LANGER, of North Dakota; Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; and Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri.

The approval of the original resolution, Senate Resolution 89, which created this subcommittee, expressed the grave concern we all have felt about the rising tide of delinquency among our youth.

Our investigations of nearly 5 months demonstrate that this concern is indeed justified.

To that end, I address the Senate today to urge adoption of an amending resolution which would extend the life of this subcommittee from January 31, 1954, until June 30, 1955, and allocate $175,000 for that purpose. In this request for an extension of time from less than 5 months of actual operation, I am joined by my 3 colleagues of the subcommittee.

In these early stages of our work the subcommittee has held public hearings into various national aspects of the problems of juvenile delinquency. It is hearing today, and for the next several days, from the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the belief that we should reexamine our own Federal programs involved in the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

Next week we conduct hearings at which our major church, civic, and national youth-serving organizations will present their approaches to the problem.

Our subcommittee has held community hearings, with the aid and advice of local community leaders, in Denver and Washington, D. C., and near the end of January we will visit Boston for another hearing, prior to issuing a report. This community approach, as well as the basic objectives of our work, has the blessing and support of President Eisenhower. He has written to me, as chairman, pledging the support of his executive agencies, and applauding our plan for an on the scene city-by-city study.

We cannot continue this city phase of our hearings without an extension as proposed in the new resolution. I submit herewith the text of President Eisenhower's letter to me:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: The subject of juvenile delinquency, which you and your colleagues of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate are now studying, is one of the most complex social problems facing the Nation today. Juvenile delinquency is a problem filled with heartbreak. I know that you share with me the fervent hope that your deliberations will result in suggestions for action which will reduce substantially the incalculable unhappiness which juvenile delinquency now causes our children, their parents, pastors, educators, and all who are concerned with the problem.

In your investigation you may count on the wholehearted assistance of those executive departments which are concerned with the problem. For a number of years, the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in particular, has been collecting information about juvenile delinquency and evaluating the proposals advanced from time to time regarding its alleviation, which should be of value to you.

I am happy to know, too, that the subcommittee proposes to hold hearings in various other cities, including some smaller towns, in an effort to ascertain the effects of juvenile delinquency in specific localities. Although it is a problem of national importance, and one in which the Federal Government properly takes a keen interest, juvenile delinquency does vary from community to community in its nature and extent. Your subcommittee in seeking the concrete facts about delinquent children and youth in particular communities has taken note of that important fact.

It is my hope that one result of the present hearings will be to alert our community leaders and all of our parents to the responsibility that is theirs. I wish you every success in this important investigation.

With best regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

I am not an alarmist; nor are my distinguished colleagues. We do not subscribe to the gloomy prophesy that American youth is deteriorating beyond redemption.

But we are disturbed by the results of our investigations.

The experience of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency has been brief but intensive. Our investigations are far from completed, but I would like to give a few highlights of some of the evidence we have received to date.

The evidence received so far conclusively establishes that juvenile delinquency is a problem of sharply increasing severity. Annually, since 1948, both its volume and rate has mounted. Younger children in larger numbers are becoming involved in serious crime.

Although individual communities may be excepted, we find that all sections of our country have experienced an aggravated juvenile-delinquency problem. Measured in terms of volume, we are waging a losing battle against it.

Nationwide juvenile delinquency as measured by offenders in juvenile courts increased almost 30 percent between 1948 and 1952. But even larger rises are occurring in many States and communities. Indeed, I have just been handed a report showing that in 1953 alone, in my own State of New Jersey, juvenile delinquency increased a disturbing 18.6 percent, according to preliminary estimates.

But involvement of younger persons in larger numbers in serious, even violent, forms of crime is equally ominous.

When we think of childhood we think of a carefully sheltered period of youth, learning and playing. It is hard for us to realize that children, sometimes of very tender ages, are actually found ever more frequently involved in such serious crimes as housebreaking, personal assaults, narcotic violations; even murder and rape.

During 1952, 37 percent of all persons arrested for robberies were under 21 years of age. This young age group accounted for 47 percent of all arrests made for larceny, 68 percent of those for auto theft, and 35 percent of all arrests for rape.

Testimony presented to the subcommittee indicates that heroin—the drug which has enslaved thousands of young Americans—is being methodically produced and poured into the world's markets by Red China. This Red tide of dope has reached our west coast and is moving eastward. We have received testimony that New York City has today an estimated 7,500 juvenile addicts, and this city has not yet been hit by the tide from the Far East.

No less than 8 percent of children coming before juvenile courts in Los Angeles County today have had contact with narcotics. Eighty to ninety percent of all Latin-American boys appearing before the juvenile court in Denver have had such contact.

While there is some variance in the testimony of experts, total evidence indicates that during the past 5 years, there has been an increase in drug violations by juveniles in the majority of our large urban centers.

Actually our subcommittee is concerned more about the future; how we may best handle the new situation, and what increased Communist production means for our young people in the next few years, than we are about the current narcotics situation.

Heroin is not the total of the drug menace to juveniles. Iowa is an agricultural State. Yet 25 percent of the girls admitted to its State training school for girls have used marihuana. Still other youngsters in search of a thrill or a "kick," as they call it, have turned to barbiturates and amphetamines.

A recent investigation in Oklahoma City revealed that 250 juveniles between the ages of 13 and 18 were using these drugs regularly. Apartments were rented and used as "pads" for drug or so-called "kick" parties.

The delinquents in these cases all come from the better neighborhoods of the city and not from the wrong side of the tracks.

I am aware that the vast majority of druggists and physicians are reputable representatives of honored professions. But the drugs in this instance were secured by the children from a few of those willing to sell the welfare of youth for a "fast" dollar.

Your subcommittee is now studying proposals which would better protect our young people from this evil practice.

The lawless conduct of juvenile gangs constitutes another serious problem for children in many communities.

I do not refer to innocent play or interest groups of children and adolescents, and thankfully there are many more of these.

I refer to the organized, predatory gangs which children in some neighborhoods must join for their own protection. Gangs in which robberies, extortion, drug traffic, assaults and sexual irregularities are the order of the day.

Certain large cities—New York and Los Angeles for example—have made sound starts to bring this problem under control. But the gang problem is not restricted to large urban centers.

In order to tap grass roots experience on a broad basis, the subcommittee sent letters of inquiry to some 3,000 local police officials, educators, judges, welfare, and mental health officials.

Many reported gang problems.

May I quote as an example from the reply of a police official in a small city in the State of Washington:

"Gang warfare has reared its ugly head in our community and already reports have reached our ears of a number of beatings having taken place." He goes on to say that numerous dangerous weapons, which include whips made from car battery cables, car fan belts, along with a large collection of assorted knives and a home-made .22 pistol or two, have been seized.

Obviously, we must find ways to meet this problem on a broader front than through specialized programs in a few urban centers.

In mentioning New York City, Los Angeles, Iowa, and other specific cities or States, I want to make it clear that I am not implying that their problems are more serious than that of other cities or States.

Juvenile delinquency is a nationwide problem.

Such cities and States are but examples of broadly existing problems and conditions. I could go on at length about the evidence we have received of many other forms of illegal conduct which is assuming larger proportions among our young people.

From those 3,000 grass-root sources throughout the Nation we have received reports of increased school dropouts, increased truancy, increased use of alcohol by juveniles—indeed, an increase in almost every form of delinquent conduct.

But in the last analysis, the exact forms that serious delinquency takes, is unimportant except as it points to what is wrong—what is causing a small but increasingly large percentage of children in our times to become involved in delinquency and crime. This ominous development is not and cannot be without cause.

In less than 5 months the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency has not been able to produce the whole answer but many factors have come to light.

Obviously, juvenile delinquency is symptomatic that something is wrong in the life of a child. Increased juvenile delinquency means that there is something wrong in the lives of more children.

We know that juvenile delinquency has its roots in family life and in the life of the neighborhood of which that family is a part. Many forces are operating in present-day

America which work against stable and satisfying family and community life.

Let me mention a few of these forces.

We have become a highly mobile people. Such mobility is the product of, and in many ways necessary to, our high industrial and agricultural productivity.

But it also uproots families and sends them into new communities among strange people. Our vigorous economy draws many mothers into the labor market where they add to our national production and to the incomes of their own families.

As a result the latchkey children of some of these mothers suffer lack of proper care and supervision. Modern urban life with its impersonal relations among neighbors and its many attractions which pull family members away from the home is also a factor with at least some negatives for the development of strong family life, amidst friendly, interested neighbors.

Because of the strained international situation, young people of today find it impossible to look forward with certainty to higher education, to entering a trade or business, to plans for marriage, a home, and family.

This results in the development of added restlessness, added tension, and encourages a philosophy among our young people of eat, drink, and be merry.

God grant that this be a temporary situation; that international tensions abate, and that the world find the means to live at peace.

In referring to these forces, it should be made clear that neither mobility nor industrialization, nor modern urban life, nor an uncertain future alone creates a delinquent child.

They do, however, add to insecurity, to loneliness, and to fear. They do detract from the care and supervision of children and from the development of the close personal relationships through which we all gain and maintain a sense of acceptance, competency, trust, and confidence in the future.

The evidence before the subcommittee also indicates that we as a society have been deficient in developing and enforcing the laws necessary to better protect children from delinquency. We have been equally deficient in developing the machinery necessary to giving help to children in trouble.

Early testimony before the subcommittee indicates that much of our basic thinking may be misdirected as to prevention and cure. Challenging questions have been raised as to methods and approaches. Are we reaching the truly delinquent child with our programs? Or are they beyond the pale in our society?

Is it just a matter of spending more money, or is it not really a matter of using that money to the best advantage that we must consider as well?

To be sure, many of our programs may indeed be excellently channeled. But if everyone is doing a 100-percent job, why is delinquency among our young increasing?

Juvenile delinquency is primarily a local problem, although there are significant interstate factors to which I will shortly refer.

It develops in a child's own home and community and must basically be prevented at that level. It is no indictment of individual local communities to say that they have not found the answer because the problem is common to all communities.

Neither is it an indictment of old and tested methods to say that they don't meet new problems. What is needed, then, is a new focus upon this problem—a clear-cut and factual definition of the problem and a marshaling of community resources to meet it. Individual communities are experimenting with new techniques and approaches, but no effective way exists for one community to benefit from the successes or failures of another.

I believe that the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency is performing an invaluable and unique service to children by turning the spotlight of public attention boldly and factually upon the problem of juvenile delinquency.

America has both the will and the intelligence to solve this problem. Through this subcommittee the Senate can provide the catalytic agent and the leadership necessary for effective action. Such action on the part of the Senate has, I believe, widespread public support.

The public interest which has been demonstrated in the work of this subcommittee has been most heartening to its members. Thousands upon thousands of pieces of mail have been received. Hundreds of letters and telegrams from organizations and individuals have reached the subcommittee, urging that its work be continued. Invitations to hold hearings have been received from dozens of communities.

The same kind of interest and support has been expressed by various public and private officials. The governors of no less than five States—Maryland, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Washington, and New Jersey—have loaned personnel.

Similar loans have been made by certain private organizations, including the National Probation and Parole Association, the American Public Welfare Association, and the Prisoner's Aid Society of Baltimore.

The problem of juvenile delinquency is not one, however, which can be handled entirely within individual communities or States. Juvenile delinquency crosses State borders, and the solution of certain aspects of the problem will require direct Federal action.

As among States, for example, we permit the deserting father from one State to find refuge in another.

Senator LANGER, joined by the three other members of the subcommittee, has just offered legislation to help combat this serious contributing factor to delinquency.

We permit the runaway child from one State to be committed as a delinquent to the institution of another State because we lack the machinery to return him to his home. Many hundreds of such runaways are apprehended in single States alone, such as California and Florida each year.

Your subcommittee is now studying alternative approaches to the solution of this interstate problem.

Much remains to be done far and beyond what we have been able to accomplish in less than 5 months. A start has been made and, I believe, a sound one. I am convinced that the protection of our children from the menace of delinquency makes it imperative that the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency be enabled to complete its crucial task.

The junior Senator from New Jersey does not believe that admitting to past error necessarily absolves one of all blame. He does believe, however, that confession is good for the soul. He further confesses in all sincerity, at least one error to the Senate of the United States.

I had no idea last spring when I first introduced Senate Resolution 89, just how complex was the problem I had set out to probe. I had little idea of its magnitude. It took me just a month or two with my staff, headed by an eminent lawyer from my State, Mr. Herbert J. Hannoch, to determine the depth of our work.

Unfortunately, I must recite to the Senate from a colloquy during the course of the original debate upon which I entered with the senior Senator from Louisiana.

This is the confession of which I just spoke, and I quote from the colloquy:

"Mr. ELLENDER. Since the Senator from New Jersey is the author of this resolution, I have no doubt that he will be appointed a member of the subcommittee, I hope so; and I hope he will come to the Senate next year without a request for more funds.

"Mr. HENDRICKSON. I sincerely hope that I shall be able to come before the Senate and report exactly the result which the Senator from Louisiana wishes."

The junior Senator from New Jersey recognises his original error, but he sincerely feels that the good work and the good purpose of this subcommittee must go on in the public interest.

Today, we are rightfully concerned about our national security.

But safeguards to our future as a nation of free men, I submit, cannot be adequately measured by the power of our Armed Services or by our skill and tenacity in ferreting out subversives, important though these matters be.

Indeed, self-protection against foreign enemies will achieve little of permanent value if that which we seek to safeguard, the welfare of our future citizens, is destroyed by forces operating within our society today.

Our Nation's future in the last analysis depends upon the character, stability, courage and ideals we are able to impart to our children and to our children's children.

The fight against juvenile delinquency, as I see it, is a crucial one, in our struggle to preserve our American way and I urge the early adoption of this resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that some remarks prepared by me, on the same subject, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

Last September, the first national study of juvenile delinquency ever undertaken by a congressional committee got under way. The importance of this comprehensive survey was reflected almost at once by the attention given it in press and radio from coast to coast. At the same time, a spontaneous avalanche of mail descended upon the committee and its members. I might add that nearly all of these expressions of public interest were favorable, even enthusiastic, in their content.

Speaking as a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee which is making the juvenile delinquency study, I feel that this vast public expression is indicative of a national desire for congressional guidance in the matter of our juvenile problems. There is an acute awareness that a shocking national problem of major proportions exists.

There is also a growing realization that the problem is accelerating at a dangerous pace, despite increasing efforts in some places to provide constructive services to reverse the trend.

There are, as FBI Director Hoover has stated, a myriad of programs to combat juvenile delinquency and in some parts of America a conscientious effort to curb the problem. Yet, our delinquency ratio continues to rise.

It is the primary aim of our committee's study to determine why, as a nation, we have failed to master the delinquency problem to date and how, as a nation, we may end this failure. By no means do I wish to imply that what our committee has done in these months of operation, or what we hope to do in the future, will magically rid America of her social blight of juvenile delinquency. The job is a plodding one. As we probe deeper, new aspects are revealed.

What is the real extent of the tragedy of our youth? Do we really understand its causes? How can we adequately guide those social servants and judges and police officers who are daily confronted with the problems of juvenile delinquency and who must deal with the juvenile offenders? Are our corrective methods and institutions outmoded?

Are our laws too rigid, or not rigid enough? Are new Federal laws needed and are some of our present laws outmoded? What success is a new approach to the youth gang problem meeting with in New York City? What is California doing to cope with its narcotics problem among youth? Why is delinquency among minors rising in the rural areas of our country at an incredible rate? Are we too soft or too tough with our juvenile offenders? Are we overplaying or neglecting psychiatric treatment?

These are but a few of the questions our study is attempting to answer. They are questions that are being asked all over the country.

That is why I believe there has been such a spontaneous and approving response to the activities of the juvenile delinquency subcommittee headed by my able colleague, Senator ROBERT HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey.

In the brief period our committee has been in existence, we have heard a host of witnesses, most of whom are devoting their lives to some one facet of the many-sided enigma of our young people in trouble. Listening to these specialists spell out their findings and their bafflements is an inspiring and a challenging experience. In nearly all cases the witnesses have added considerably to our understanding of the problem. In nearly all cases the witnesses have offered corrective suggestions for us to weigh and report upon.

In many instances the witnesses offer the hope that collectively we of the committee will produce the catalyst for a great national drive against juvenile delinquency which will be successful.

It is this challenge to come up with something worthwhile that makes the work of the committee members gratifying. It is this challenge which makes us want to continue our efforts until we succeed. That is why my colleague, Senator HENDRICKSON, has asked this body to approve the continuation of our work.

If we accomplish nothing more than the tedious compilation of our day-to-day hearings, I believe our cost to the taxpayer will have been at a bargain rate. For, make no mistake about it, I am convinced that the public document we are compiling, which records our hearings, will prove as important as any public document the Congress has produced during the past decade or more. I feel confident it will not become a dead, dust-encrusted sheaf of papers. I see it, rather, as one that will be used for a generation ahead, in all parts of the Nation, by those concerned with the betterment of our youth. I believe it will become the accredited wellspring of guidance for those concerned with the problems of the juvenile delinquent. I also think it will be an important factor in stimulating State, county, municipal, group, and organizational activities—all of which, probably more than anything else, can alleviate the national burden of juvenile lawlessness.

There is an urgent time element involved in the work the juvenile delinquency investigating committee has undertaken. This urgency has to do with meeting an expected crisis in juvenile-delinquency matters by the year 1960.

By that time it is anticipated that 55 million Americans will be under 18 years of age. This vast number of young people is the result of the great rise in birth rate during World War II.

Our war babies are now half-grown youngsters. Tens of thousands of them were born in a calamitous home environment due to our war-shaken social order. The Korean war and the general instability of our postwar world has not been conducive to a quick changeover in our social order from the turmoil of shaken, uprooted homes to the security of a neighborly and stable pattern which we all would prefer.

Our children in too many instances reflect our own instability. That is frequently why they get into trouble.

With these vast millions of young Americans coming along by 1960—our population of minors will equal the population of the six New England States—the more we know about the causes and effects of juvenile delinquency, the better we will be prepared to deal intelligently with the anticipated increase in the number of young people in trouble.

How valuable will our committee findings be to all the specialists and public workers who are in the field of juvenile work? It is my hope that some committee recommendations at the end of our study will result in direct constructive action on the part of many to minimize the anticipated rise in juvenile delinquency during the next half decade.

For 27 years I have been concerned with youth groups and the problems of helping youthful offenders become useful and law-abiding members of the community. The Missouri Crime Survey of 1926, of which I was a staff member, was able to develop for the first time a full and accurate picture of the extent and nature of criminal activity then prevalent in the State. As circuit attorney of St. Louis, it was my duty to deal with hundreds of cases of young people in trouble and seek to conserve these vast human resources. I have been active for the past 25 years in the work of the Big Brothers of America, which work has shown good results. My own experience leads me to the conviction that the efforts of this committee will be justified.

In closing may I say that it is my feeling that the great majority of the Senate on both sides of the aisle are as much interested in seeing that our committee meets with real success in its undertaking as are the committee members and staff. If we are successful, the gain will be the whole Nation's.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield, provided that I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to speak briefly in regard to the resolution which has just been submitted.

Mr. President, I am a member of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, as well as chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, of which the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee is a part.

Very frankly, Mr. President, I do not know of any subcommittee which at the present time is of greater importance to the citizens of the United States than the subcommittee which is the subject of the resolution which has just now been submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

The results, thus far, of the study made by the subcommittee have simply been astounding and invaluable. For example, we have found an interstate trade in babies and little children, who are being sold. At the hearing at Denver, we found that some men desert their wives and little children and will not take care of their families—although even a wild animal will feed its young.

We found that in Denver, in 1 year, 49 men abandoned their wives and children. When such men go to another State, it is found to be almost impossible to return them.

We have already prepared and introduced a nonpartisan bill which all members of the subcommittee—2 Democratic Senators and 2 Republican Senators—endorse; and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has also joined in sponsoring the bill. Two years ago he introduced a bill along similar lines. The bill we have already prepared and introduced will make it a Federal crime for a man to abandon his children.

This morning at a hearing of the subcommittee, we discovered from the testimony of the National Auto Theft Association, of Chicago—by far the largest group, if not larger than all of the others put together, interested in the matter of the theft of automobiles—that from 1948 on, the number of automobiles stolen by young persons under 17 years of age has steadily risen. In 1948, 17 percent of all automobiles stolen were stolen by boys or girls under 17 years of age. In 1952, the last year for which figures are available, 70 percent of all automobiles stolen were stolen by boys or girls under 17 years of age. Such thefts involve, of course, a loss of millions upon millions of dollars to the automobile owners of the United States. I might cite many other details we have found in the process of the work of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, let me say that all the testimony taken by the subcommittee is being printed.

We have had the benefit of the testimony of experts from the large colleges and universities; we have had the advice of the very best experts it has been possible to obtain.

I now ask unanimous consent that a statement by me in connection with this matter may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

The senior Senator from North Dakota is not known by his colleagues as a sentimentalist. Rather, he has a reputation for being a hard-boiled realist. He is certainly hard boiled when it comes to spending the taxpayers' money.

The money Senator HENDRICKSON is seeking in order to extend the life of the Juvenile Delinquency Committee will be as wisely and usefully spent as any money Congress could grant during this session.

Certainly to be a member of the Senate group which is undertaking the war against juvenile delinquency has made me feel good inside. It is a heart-warming undertaking for the betterment of American youth. If we can contribute, as I know we shall be able to, to curbing the disgraceful increase in juvenile delinquency, we will at the same time be curbing adult crime. Fifty percent of our adult criminals—think of it, one-half of our hardened criminals—began their lawless careers as juvenile offenders.

How much does crime cost our Nation? A fabulous sum that runs into the billions. And the cost in terms of lives and homes that have been ruined cannot be measured.

If we can slow up the rise in juvenile delinquency we can reduce our future criminal population. Is it worth while to try? That is what Senator HENDRICKSON's subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee is working

on. I think we would be morally delinquent if we failed to go along with his request for time and money to complete the job.

I think the Nation as a whole wants this study to go on. My mail proves it. The people all over this land are greatly disturbed about the juvenile-delinquency problem.

I believe we can stimulate more and more constructive thought on the matter. This will lead to local action. The rise in the rate of juvenile delinquency in agricultural areas is what I am particularly concerned about, not to mention the serious problem existing on our Indian reservations. Our subcommittee will go into these areas and look into the causes.

That is why I think Senator HENDRICKSON is going to meet with approval in his request for a continuation of his Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. I heartily support it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator from North Dakota that the Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I am very happy to yield for any purpose, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes; if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I desire to say that I salute my distinguished friend, the Senator from North Dakota, for the very fine statement he has made here.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG. Having served with the Senator from North Dakota on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, let me say that I recall very well that there was no other member of the committee, nor, for that matter, no other Member of the Congress, who was more solicitous of the welfare of mothers and children than was and is the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota. So I am delighted to see that he has taken such great interest in proceeding to have something done about, and some study made in connection with, the problem of juvenile delinquency in the Nation.

Mr. LANGER. I thank both the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I am very happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Missouri, if I may obtain unanimous consent for that purpose, and provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to make a brief statement only.

Let me say that I am very glad the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee has given us the benefit of his experience, his views, and his most active interest in the work of the subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be a member. The subcommittee has been investigating the ever-growing and most serious problem of what is commonly referred to as juvenile delinquency, although in effect in fact, and in scope, it is really far broader in import as well as in impact upon not only the youth of the Nation but the entire Nation.

The members of the subcommittee have been working on this problem since last summer. A large part of my time and a large part of the time of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee and of the other members of the subcommittee throughout the summer and during the period of adjournment has been spent in the organization of the subcommittee and in conducting the hearings, which commenced in November. At those hearings there have appeared hundreds of witnesses—not merely persons, ofttimes improperly despised, I think, who sometimes are contemptuously referred to as social workers; but we have heard from judges of long experience, district attorneys, members of the medical profession, and members of the lay citizenry. During the extensive hearings, persons from every class, walk, and condition of life have appeared before our subcommittee, and have given us the benefit of their points of view regarding some of the causes of this problem.

In asking for additional funds for the work of the subcommittee, Mr. President, let me say that I think most of us view this matter not as an effort which will result in either a sensational solution or an easily found solution of the problem, but as an effort which will raise the many questions which bear upon the problem and will help to resolve at least some of the more obvious causes and reasons for such conditions among our young people, upon whom we must depend if our Nation is to continue in greatness, in power, and in strength to carry the burdens of the next generation and of subsequent generations.

I shall not say as much as could be said or might be said at this time. However, I think it appropriate to point out that this is a vastly intricate and complex problem. There is no readymade solution. Only yesterday the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, Mr. William Rogers, appeared before our committee. Mr. Rogers stated that he was empowered and authorized to speak for the Attorney General of the United States as well as for himself, in endorsing the work of this subcommittee as a most necessary and helpful adjunct to the work of the Department of Justice in controlling crime and undertaking the rehabilitation of young men and women who are in the courts or before they reach the courts, and who are thereafter unfortunately subject to confinement in Federal reformatories or penal institutions.

Mr. President, this subcommittee is not operating a sideshow. It is not exploiting the young people by having their photographs taken or bringing them before the committee to humiliate or embarrass them, to characterize them as juvenile delinquents, or to stigmatize them in any way.

Members of the committee have thoroughly inspected the homes for young people in the District of Columbia. On that occasion we asked the gentlemen of the press not to take pictures of any of the young people there, although they were prepared to take pictures of various portions of the institutions, and did so.

I think it can be fairly said that as a result of certain observations which were made at the detention home in the District of Columbia, when Mr. Spencer, chairman of the Board of Commissioners appeared before our committee, it was decided to include the enlargement of that home in the budget.

We are not only receiving information, but we are undertaking to give some advice, counsel, and encouragement to many fine, dedicated men and women who are doing their utmost to cope with the problem of young people who have difficulty with the law and to prevent such problems in all their phases.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] for his courtesy.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent that, without affecting the right of the Senator from Maryland to continue his speech, I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LONG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, as already indicated, the minimum cost to the United States for a 27-foot waterway, according to the figures of the Army engineers, would be approximately $300 million, made up, in round figures, of $100 million in the International Rapids section, $100 million in the channels of the upper Great Lakes, and $100 million for improvement of harbors. Thus the total minimum cost to the United States alone for the 35-foot waterway would be $1,300,000,000, assuming complete accuracy of the estimates of the Army engineers. This figure, of course, assumes no cost to the United States for the Canadian portions of the waterway. It should also be pointed out that this is the cost of constructing a 35-foot waterway if it were planned initially as a 35-foot waterway.

Under the "foot in the door" plan of its proponents, the project would be initiated as a 27-foot waterway. Just how much the total cost of the project would be if it were first built as a 27-foot waterway and then later converted to a 35-foot waterway, I could not say, but it is clear that the cost would be substantially greater than that given as the cost of building a 35-foot waterway in the first instance. For that part of the work which would consist of merely a deepening of the channels by further excavation, the additional cost of superimposing a 35-foot waterway on a previously constructed 27-foot waterway would probably not be materially greater than if constructed to the 35-foot depth in the first instance, but as to such works as the locks, all of the initial work would be practically valueless because since the permanent sills are to be set at 30 feet, deepening to 35 feet, I am informed, would require almost a complete rebuilding of the locks. Note what happens to the estimate of the cost of deepening the Welland Canal from 27 feet to 30 feet and to 35 feet.

The depth over the sills in the Welland Canal is also 30 feet and the depth in the channels is 25 feet. To deepen the Welland Canal to 27 feet, the cost is shown to be $1,302,000. To deepen it to 30 feet, the cost is shown to be $37,744,000, but to deepen it to 35 feet, the cost jumps to $449,545,000.

Finally, but very important, is the fact that approximately 90 percent of the total increases shown for both the United States and Canada for the cost of constructing a 35-foot canal, as compared with the cost of constructing a 27-foot canal, is based on estimates which the Army engineers or the Canadian Government state are of a preliminary nature and cannot be taken to be accurate. Based on experience with cost estimates prepared by the Army engineers for other waterway improvements which were final estimates and presumably as accurate as they could be made, I believe Congress would have to assume that the ultimate cost of a 35-foot waterway, including only the United States portions of the waterway and United States lake harbors, would be at least $2 billion.

Also, it should be borne in mind that under the scheme which calls for self-liquidation only of the works in the St. Lawrence River, the only portion of the enormous cost for a 35-foot waterway which would even be made the object of self-liquidation would be a mere 10 percent of the cost. Accordingly, 90 percent of this vast expenditure would be a total and complete burden on the taxpayer.

In view of the considerations which I have already laid before the Senate with regard to the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway, question might well arise in the minds of Senators as to why Canada seems to be so favorably disposed toward this project.

In the consideration of this question, there is one basic all-important difference which must be borne in mind. Canada is in the very happy position of having had a balanced budget and a surplus of revenues over expenses for the past several years. Compare Canada's position in this respect with that of the United States. We now have a Federal debt of approximately $275 billion, are facing a deficit for the present fiscal year of about $3½ billion, with another heavy deficit in prospect for the next fiscal year, and are faced with the necessity, we are told, of having to raise the Federal debt limit. In such a situation, is it any wonder that Canada might be in a position to consider the expenditure of money for the St. Lawrence project while we, in the exercise of discretion and any degree of commonsense, should not give a moment's consideration to such an undertaking?

Then, too, there are other considerations which might make the St. Lawrence Waterway appear attractive from the standpoint of Canadian interests, while from our standpoint it not only might be considered unattractive but definitely detrimental to our best interests. Consider, for instance, what the effect of a 27-foot waterway might be on our respective seaports. It is admitted that the effect of the construction of the waterway under the joint project would be to divert traffic from United States Atlantic and gulf seaports. On the other hand, it is anticipated that the effect of the all-Canadian waterway would be to build up trade from the port of Montreal.

All but a few impractical theorists have long since realized that a 27-foot waterway would be wholly inadequate for oceangoing vessels, except perhaps for foreign tramp steamers. This simply means that aside from the traffic moving in foreign tramp steamers, most cargo originating in or destined to the Great Lakes area would be transferred at Montreal. This gives a clue as to why the city of Montreal, once a strong opponent of the so-called deep waterway, has joined in its support. Let me quote what the Minister of Transport, the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, said in presenting the Government's case for the St. Lawrence before the House of Commons on December 4, 1951:

> In this connection it may be of interest to note that oceangoing vessels are not expected to play a major role on the seaway. They may very well enter in some numbers, to be sure. But in the circumstances I have outlined it would appear that an ocean vessel would not enter unless it had an inbound cargo as well as an outbound offering.
>
> No doubt there will be those that would have this advantage, but otherwise most of them will find it more attractive to pick up their cargoes at Montreal or some other transfer point.

It was also recognized by certain members of the Canadian Parliament that there was a marked difference between the situation of Canada and that of the United States with respect to the need for a waterway. It was recognized that the existing forms of transportation in the United States much more fully meet the needs of commerce than do the existing forms of transport in Canada. Take, for instance, the following statement made by Mr. Daniel McIvor, of Fort William, in the debate on the St. Lawrence Waterway on December 6, 1951—page 1641:

> Unlike the United States, we are not self-contained. The United States can pretty well get along without the waterways. The tie that binds us to the United States is a tender one. Perhaps in no other place, though I come from the old land, have we so many near relatives as we have in the United States. But the United States can get along without this waterway, while we cannot.

Consider also the statement of December 6, 1951, by Mr. J. W. Noseworthy, of York South—page 1649:

> On the other hand the United States is no longer a frontier country, and there is not the same national need for this type of project. Our neighboring country is well settled and is criss-crossed with numerous means of transportation; it does not depend as we do upon the export of raw materials and natural products. There are many reasons why the United States may be less interested in the carrying out of this development. For these reasons I would certainly support the Government's move to proceed with the building of the waterway, with or without the cooperation of the United States.

Another consideration is that a waterway from Montreal to the Great Lakes is inherently much more of a Canadian project than a United States project from the standpoint of trade and commerce. To the United States almost its sole use would be for foreign trade, whereas for Canada it would also constitute an important artery for domestic commerce. This is clear from an examination of the figures of the present traffic using the existing canals of the St. Lawrence River and the Welland Canal.

Considering first the traffic on the St. Lawrence River: The all-Canadian traffic, namely, that which originates at Canadian ports and is destined to Canadian ports, greatly exceeds the all-United States traffic. According to the Canada Yearbook for 1951, the all-Canadian traffic in the navigation season 1949 amounted to 5,659,698 tons and the all-United States traffic amounted to 108,690 tons.

The total traffic from Canada to United States ports through the St. Lawrence River was 585,701 tons, and the total traffic from United States to Canadian ports was 1,605,505 tons.

Through the Welland Canal the all-Canadian traffic was 5,517,062 tons; the all-United States traffic, 1,375,721 tons. Traffic from Canadian to United States ports through the Welland Canal was 653,375 tons, and from the United States to Canadian ports, 6,146,041.

The combined tonnage for the Welland Canal and the St. Lawrence River amounted to 11,176,760 tons for the all-Canadian traffic and 1,484,411 tons for the all-United States traffic.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. Are the figures which the Senator has given us late figures?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. They are very late figures.

Mr. LONG. Do I correctly understand that there were 11 million tons of Canadian traffic and only 1 million tons of United States traffic through the Welland Canal?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The total traffic from Canada to United States ports through the St. Lawrence River was 585,701 tons, and the total traffic from United States ports to Canadian ports was 1,605,505 tons. Through the Welland Canal the all-Canadian traffic was 5,517,062 tons, and the all-United States traffic amounted to 1,375,721 tons.

Mr. LONG. Does not that indicate that the traffic moving in the present channels, through the existing project, is 5 to 1 Canadian traffic to the United States?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Is there any doubt in whose favor the balance of trade exists?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not think there can be any doubt about that.

Mr. LONG. Do not the Senator's figures indicate that the traffic carried over the existing project is to the advantage of Canada by 5 to 1 as compared to the United States?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is true.

Mr. LONG. If we could work out some project to improve the waterway so as to enable us to sell five times as much as Canada is selling to us, is there any doubt that we would be willing to enter upon the proposed project?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should be very enthusiastic for it.

Mr. LONG. Does not that explain why the Canadians are willing to build the canal at their own expense?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes; and it conclusively indicates why we should not help to construct the project.

So far as traffic which originates in one country but destined for the other country is concerned, there is a combined interest and it is not possible to say which country would benefit the most from such traffic. It is clear, however, that so far as the traffic which is purely Canadian or purely United States is concerned, there is a preponderance of the all-Canadian traffic, which amounts to more than seven times as much as the all-United States traffic.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland further yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is not including the fact that one of the main purposes of the canal is gradually to build up the importation of 5 million tons of Canadian ore, while we reduce American ore production by a comparable amount.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. LONG. In view of those facts, would it not make good sense for Canada to pay us for the privilege of building the canal?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct. I agree with the Senator.

Thus, in view of the differences between the 2 countries, so far as their financial condition is concerned, the need of the 2 countries for additional transport facilities, and the effect which the construction of the project would have on the various segments of their economy, I could not say that from the Canadian standpoint the construction of a 27-foot waterway through the St. Lawrence River would not make sense.

However, the fact that it might make sense from the standpoint of the best interests of Canada would certainly not constitute a reason why we should seek to contribute to the expense of constructing this waterway when its construction from the standpoint of serving the best interests of the United States is not found to be justified.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It is probably interesting to note that lake ships could go to Montreal, although the more efficient oceangoing ships would not be able to carry their maximum cargoes into the Great Lakes system.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. With the result that Montreal would be one of the greatest ports in the world.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is true.

Mr. LONG. It would make good sense, would it not, to say that cargo ships could operate to as far as Montreal, and there load their cargoes aboard deep-draft oceangoing shipping?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is completely true.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Perhaps that is what makes it to the advantage of Canada to advocate a 27-foot channel instead of a 35-foot channel.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is why Canada says she is not interested in any other kind of channel. If Canada can build a 27-foot channel, and can maintain it at that depth, she can take trade away from the United States, which is what she seeks to do.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In view of the fact that this investment has been proposed, at the expense of the American taxpayer, not by force of necessity, but only to prevent Canada from going it alone, it seems rather unfortunate that when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] proposed that the United States should get some benefit from the project, the committee said, "No, United States interests should be left out. It should be for the benefit of the 5 to 1 Canadian traffic."

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator is correct. When a proposal is made to benefit the United States, the response is, "Oh, no."

If Canada has decided to go ahead with the construction of the waterway alone, as it has indicated it has, that is Canada's affair and we should not as good neighbors attempt to interfere with such action by Canada. Beyond that, I see no possible obligation on the United States as a good neighbor, and I believe that is entirely in accord with the official and generally prevailing Canadian view.

This suggests one other facet to the many-sided problem that needs exploration, namely, whether Canada alone will build the waterway through the St. Lawrence, if the Congress of the United States does not pass Senate bill 2150.

There have been a number of occurrences during the past 18 months that have a bearing on the answer to this question. In a note, dated June 30, 1952, to the Acting Secretary of State of the United States from the Canadian Ambassador, the following statements were made:

> I have been instructed by my Government to inform you that, when all arrangements have been made to insure the completion of the power phase of the St. Lawrence project, the Canadian Government will construct locks and canals on the Canadian side of the International Boundary to provide for deep-water navigation to the standard specified in the proposed agreement between Canada and the United States for the development of navigation and power in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, signed March 19, 1941, and in accordance with the specifications of the Joint Board of Engineers, dated November 16, 1926, and that such deep-water navigation shall be provided as nearly as possible concurrently with the completion of the power phase of the St. Lawrence project.
>
> The undertaking of the Government of Canada with respect to these deep-water navigation facilities is based on the assumption that it will not be possible in the immediate future to obtain congressional approval of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Agreement of 1941. As it has been determined that power can be developed economically, without the seaway, in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River and as there has been clear evidence that entities in both Canada and the United States are prepared to develop power on such a basis, the Canadian Government has, with parliamentary approval, committed itself to provide and maintain whatever additional works may be required to allow uninterrupted 27-foot navigation between Lake Erie and the Port of Montreal, subject to satisfactory arrangements being made to ensure the development of power.
>
> Canada's undertaking to provide the seaway is predicated on the construction and maintenance by suitable entities in Canada and the United States of a sound power project in the International Rapids section.

In reply to that note, also dated June 30, 1952, the Acting Secretary of State of the United States stated that "my Government approves the arrangements set forth in your note."

Likewise, under date of June 30, 1952, the Acting Secretary of State filed on behalf of the Government of the United States an application to the International Joint Committee, said to have been filed in contemplation of the filing of a similar application by the Government of Canada. Among other statements in that application was the following:

2. This application is filed with the understanding on the part of the United States.

a. That, in addition to the works specified in section 8 which are covered by this application and which are to be constructed by entities to be designated by the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada, Canada will construct, maintain, and operate all such works as may be necessary to provide and maintain a deep waterway between the Port of Montreal and Lake Erie.

It will be observed that in the Canadian note of June 30, 1952, it was stated that the undertaking of the Government of Canada with respect to the deep-water navigation facilities was based on the assumption that it would not be possible in the immediate future to obtain congressional approval of the Executive Agreement of 1941. I am not informed as to whether a similar statement was contained in the Canadian Application to the International Joint Commission, but, in any event, that would appear to be immaterial, since the International Joint Commission gave its approval to the application on October 29, 1952, and 5 days thereafter the Canadian Government sent another note to the United States Government stating that "the Canadian Government, therefore, considers that agreement"—1941 Executive Agreement—"as having been superseded and does not intend to take any action to have it ratified." Since that date it has become an accepted fact that the 1941 Executive Agreement has been abrogated.

It seems quite clear that the approval by the International Joint Commission of the application, which carried with it the understanding that Canada would construct, maintain, and operate a waterway through the St. Lawrence River on the Canadian side of the river, placed Canada under an obligation to construct such navigation works if it should build the dams and power project in the International Rapids section which constituted the main basis for the application to the International Joint Commission.

As will have been noted in the exchange of notes between Canada and the United States, of June 30, 1952, the Canadian Government conditioned its undertaking to build the waterway upon arrangements having been made to insure the completion of the power phase of the St. Lawrence Waterway. To insure the completion of the power phase of the project, one of the necessary prerequisites was the approval by the International Joint Commission which, as I have said, was given on October 29, 1952. Another prerequisite thereto was the authorization of some entity in the United States to construct the United States share of the power project. The method by which such authorization was sought was through an application to the Federal Power Commission by the New York Power Authority for a license to construct the United States side of the power project. This license was granted in a decision rendered by the Federal Power Commission on July 10, 1953. Furthermore, the President of the United States by Executive order on November 5, 1953, designated the New York Power Authority as the entity to build the United States portion of the power project.

The authority of the Federal Power Commission to grant such a license is under attack by three parties in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. These suits attack the order of the Federal Power Commission on a number of grounds, one of which is that the Federal Power Commission has no jurisdiction to grant a license to construct a portion of a project such as would be involved here. If these appeals should be successful, Canada would not construct any waterway through the St. Lawrence, nor would it be under any obligation to do so, because both its plans to build a waterway and its obligation to do so depend upon the construction of the power project. Likewise, it is perfectly clear that in that event there would be no occasion whatsoever to consider S. 2150, for it is clear from the proviso of section 3 of the bill that it is predicated entirely upon the assumption that the power project will be built. As a matter of fact, it would appear, in view of the indeterminate state of the proposal for the construction of the power project, that consideration of the bill at this time is premature.

However, leaving that question aside, if the appeals taken to the order of the Federal Power Commission are not successful, then it would appear that the last condition precedent to the firm obligation on the part of Canada to construct a waterway through the St. Lawrence River would have been met. Therefore, assuming that the power project will go forward, there seems to be little doubt that Canada is obligated to build a 27-foot waterway through the St. Lawrence.

Evidently there is no debate on this point, for as Senators will see from the following statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 8, 1953, by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that he, too, is of the view that Canada is "unequivocally committed to the construction" of the waterway. The statement of the Senator from Wisconsin was:

The purpose of these hearings is to come to an answer, basically on a single question: Do we or do we not as a Nation want to join with Canada in construction of the seaway canals?

If we do not, the Canadian Government is ready, willing, and eager to go ahead with the project. Just yesterday, the ranking minister of the Canadian Cabinet, the Right Honorable C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce, speaking before a Town Hall forum in New York City, reemphasized the urgency with which Canada seeks to go ahead on its own behalf in this project.

This latest statement by this distinguished official, completely demolishes the arguments of those seaway opponents on this side of the border who have so ridiculously contended that there is or was the slightest doubt as to the intentions of Canada.

On the contrary, the Canadians are unequivocally committed to the construction, as soon as the power license has been granted to New York State and Ontario.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LONG. A very important point, in connection with Canadian-American operations, is to be on our guard when we start deepening this channel below 27 feet, because in my judgment any Senator who desired to have a modern port in his State would want a channel of at least 35 feet.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I believe that is well recognized.

Mr. LONG. If Senators are solicitous for the welfare of their States, when the project is opened up, they will want the channels of the ports deepened to 35 feet.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There are amendments providing for that very thing, offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LONG. To deepen the channels to 27 feet, to meet the channel of 27 feet in the St. Lawrence, and also in the Welland Canal. If we undertook to dredge the channel down to 35 feet, does the Senator have any estimate as to what it would cost?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes. I think it is estimated the cost would be $549 million. That is because the sills are now set at 30 feet, and to put the sills lower down in order to accommodate a 35-foot channel would cost $549 million.

Mr. LONG. Is there any agreement or understanding between the United States and Canada with regard to sharing the cost or with regard to the manner in which tolls will be fixed on a 35-foot channel if one is ever dredged on the Welland Canal?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There is no agreement of any kind, and, indeed, there is no agreement as to how the tolls shall be fixed or how the canal shall be operated, in the case of a 27-foot channel.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is referring to a 27-foot channel on Welland Canal, is he not?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes; and if we construct the canal in the International Rapids section, as is provided in the bill, with a 27-foot channel, we have no agreement as to how the tolls shall be fixed or how the canal will be used. That is all to be decided later, and we have to put our faith in the owner of a big enterprise almost solely owned by Canada, and we will be like a stockholder who owns a little interest in a family corporation. We know what happens to him.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the situation which exists on the existing 14-foot project? Does the Senator know, for example, that through the present 14-foot channel American ship-

ping is allowed to pass without paying tolls?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know of any discrimination made by Canada on that project?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; and I said yesterday that it is inconceivable to me that our neighbor to the north would practice any discrimination.

Mr. LONG. If our neighbors wanted to discriminate against us in regard to the traffic moving through this area, in view of the ratio of 4 to 1 in the matter of traffic moving from Canada into the United States, the Senator can see that this Nation would be well in a position to protect itself, would it not?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It is well in a position to protect itself.

Mr. LONG. With regard to the 14-foot channel, can the Senator tell me whether or not the committee report, or facts presented before the Senate, indicate whether or not the 14-foot channel is to be closed down in the event the 27-foot channel is opened?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; there is nothing in the report about that.

Mr. LONG. In regard to the 14-foot channel, is there a record of the facts available, or did the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations tell the Senate whether or not this 14-foot channel is to be permitted to operate toll-free, in direct competition with the 27-foot channel?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; he did not.

Mr. LONG. Would it not be very well if we had that information when we act upon the proposed project?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think we ought to have that, and much more information, before we act.

Mr. LONG. If someone would like to persuade us to build a waterway on the theory that it would be a self-liquidating project, would it not be desirable to know whether or not the other waterway, side by side with it, not more than a mile or two from it, was going to be allowed to operate toll free?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes; but I do not believe we will know what is happening, and I do not think we will get the facts before the Senate as to the bill at the present time. That is why I say the bill should be defeated, and no action should be taken until Congress has the facts, and can decide whether or not it desires to go into the proposed project.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder if the Senator from Maryland knows that the question of power and navigation on the St. Lawrence has been before either one or both Houses of Congress virtually every year during the past 15 years.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do know that, and I also know that no estimate of tolls has been made since 1940. I cannot help referring to the canny perception of Mr. Kline, the president of the American Farm Bureau, who said, "I do not want to oppose this canal, but let the public decide whether it is workable. Sell revenue bonds, and that will insure its success, because the public will have enough judgment to know before it puts its money into it whether it is good or bad. The public is bound to get the facts, whereas we cannot get them."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not desire to reflect at all on anything the Senator from Maryland has said, or upon his industry, or on his familiarity with a problem which has been before Congress, but I wonder whether the Senator from Maryland has really studied the record of the hearings which have been held. I say to the Senator from Maryland, that I appeared before committees of Congress as long ago as 1941, when I was Governor of my State.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am cognizant of that fact. I have read the Senator's testimony.

Mr. LEHMAN. If the Senator from Maryland will take the trouble to study the record made in those years, he will find that since 1941, I appeared seven times before committees of one or the other of the Houses of Congress. If the Senator will only study the records of those hearings I think he will find the answers to most of the questions he has raised.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. In view of the long study of many years the Senator from New York has made of this matter, does the Senator from New York know whether the 27-foot waterway would be a project which would be in direct competition with a 14-foot toll-free waterway located no more than a mile or two away from it?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not think the Senator from New York can know that, because there is no agreement on that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Maryland indicated that he thought this project ought to be financed by placing bonds on the market and selling them.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I was expressing the opinion of Mr. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who said he thought that would be a good thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator advocate that?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It occurred to me that it would be a good thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then I would assume that, if any work is to be done in the Delaware River or at Baltimore, the same practice should be followed, that the amount of money necessary to do the necessary work should be obtained by financing on a basis that would yield a certain return to investors and that the indebtedness should be amortized.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Of course, to begin with, the Senator from Michigan is talking to the Senator from Maryland and not to the Senator from Delaware. I am not too much interested in the Delaware River.

Mr. FERGUSON. I meant to include Baltimore.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. But, laying facetiousness aside, because this is a serious matter——

Mr. FERGUSON. It is a serious matter.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It is a very serious matter. I am advocating that 1 of 2 things be done in a case of this kind, where the project under consideration is of such doubtful merit.

Mr. FERGUSON. Doubtful in whose mind?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I say that a study ought to be made by the Committee on Appropriations. That is the usual procedure in such matters. When the harbors or channels on the Chesapeake Bay are deepened, the way to proceed is to go before the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations has the Army engineers study the project. Then, if the testimony of other experts is desired, they are called in, if there is disagreement with the opinions of the Army engineers. Very elaborate steps are taken. Then, after the proposal goes through the crucible of debate and public opinion, if Congress decides to approve the project, it allots so much money for it. Congress keeps control over the project all the time. If Congress sees fit to stop granting appropriations for the project, that is done. That arrangement will not apply in this case.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator feel that a Senator who is as interested in economy as the Senator from Michigan has always been would hesitate to urge that the Government rush in and build, at the expense of the American taxpayer, a project which originates in a foreign country and ends in a foreign country, when the foreign country has said that it is going to build the project in any event?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes; and, furthermore, the principal product for which the Canadians say they are building the canal is solely in control of the Canadian Government, and we cannot take out a ton of that product unless the Canadians let us do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am surprised that the Senator from Louisiana would raise that question, in view of the fact that he and his party have advocated the spending of billions of dollars in foreign countries which are thousands of miles away from the United States. Yet in this instance the proposal is to construct a canal which will bring traffic directly

into the United States. I am really surprised that the Senator from Louisiana, in relation to this particular canal, should bring up my ideas of economy, and should claim that all the canal will be outside the United States, and not directly related to it.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Maryland recall the amendment which proposed the deepest cut in the foreign-aid program last year? Does he recall that the amendment was called the Long amendment, and that it proposed to cut by approximately $2 billion the foreign-aid program?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes; and I am very happy to say that I voted for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, I need not describe the geographical location of the St. Lawrence River, or state that it constitutes a part of the northern boundary of the United States, as well as a part of the southern boundary of Canada, or state that the St. Lawrence is the greatest river on the continent, flowing between two nations, that on this continent it is the greatest arterial highway for navigation, and is similar to many other rivers which touch two countries and constitute a common border between them.

I wonder whether the Senator from Maryland has ever known of a case in which a great nation has voluntarily surrendered its control of, and sovereignty over, a river which it has controlled jointly with another nation.

I yield to no one in my admiration for Canada. I think Canada is one of the great nations of the world. I have the highest affection and highest regard for both the Government of Canada and the people of Canada. However, to me it is inconceivable that in the case of this great navigable arterial highway, which flows right by our doors and right by the doors of Canada, a river which has been owned and controlled jointly by Canada and the United States, we shall say to Canada, "We do not want to have any more control of it. We will turn it over, lock, stock, and barrel, to your Government"—to the Canadian Government.

Yet that is what is proposed to be done if we do not pass this bill, which will provide for a joint effort between the United States and Canada.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I have the highest regard for the Senator from New York and for his opinions. I wish to point out to him that alternative proposals are shown on the map which is now attached to the rear wall of this Chamber. If we do not undertake the project to which I am now pointing, namely, that at the Point Rockway lock, and the other one, Canada will build on her own side and on her own property, and will not interfere in any manner with the sovereignty of the United States over its portion of the St. Lawrence River. Then at any time we wish to do so, we can develop our portion of the St. Lawrence River.

So, with all respect to the Senator from New York, I say we shall not be surrendering any sovereignty.

I would be the last Member of the Senate to agree to surrender one ounce of sovereignty of any United States citizen or one ounce of the sovereignty of my country. I am very much devoted to my country, and I would not think of surrendering to anyone any of its sovereignty.

I say to the Senator from New York, in all fairness, that we shall not be surrendering any sovereignty. We are simply proposing to refuse to go along with a project which is not a worthy one, and has not been proved to be worthy.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Maryland familiar with the fact that one of the Canadian Ministers—the Minister of Transport, I believe—has said that if the United States wishes to build a canal of her own, there is no reason why she cannot do so; that the United States can build locks on her side, and Canada can build locks on her side?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes, Mr. President; many persons high in the Canadian Government have said, "If the United States builds locks on her side, we will build parallel locks on our side, because we do not want the United States to participate."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield at this time to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. It seems to me the argument just stated is an argument on our side of the matter.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; it has nothing whatever to do with sovereignty.

Mr. LEHMAN. But it has to do with control.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; it has nothing whatever to do with control. The Canadians cannot control our portion.

Mr. LEHMAN. It has to do with the effort of the two countries jointly to develop a great navigational highway. Certainly I believe we would completely negate any chance for our country ever to develop the St. Lawrence River as a navigational highway, unless we enter this work jointly with Canada. Otherwise the costs would be prohibitive, and we would simply be in competition with a nation which always has been our friend, and whose friend we always have been. Subsequent to the War of 1812, there have never been any differences between the United States and Canada. Except during our joint defensive efforts in World War II, no warship ever has been stationed on the St. Lawrence River, within the memory of any living man, nor has a fort or even a pillbox or a blockhouse been erected between the two countries.

In this instance we have a chance to develop this great resource, for power and navigation, and to develop it jointly with our friendly neighbor, which has the ability and the resources to go it alone, and may be willing to go it alone.

But Canada proposes to us, "Let us work together as partners on this project. We will treat you fairly, as a partner; and we have confidence that you will treat us fairly, as a partner."

For us to close the door to that proposal, does not make sense to me.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I simply do not agree with my colleague, the Senator from New York. Certainly he is entitled to his opinion, and I respect it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I realize that, of course.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I feel that in opposing this bill we are not in any way interfering with the development of this great natural resource. I believe that on the basis of the present scheme or the present plan, the proposed development would be detrimental to the best interests of the United States, and in great degree would enhance Canadian interests over United States interests.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course I respect the opinion of the Senator from Maryland, even though I disagree with him.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Since some reference has been made to the fact that this project has been before the Congress for 30 years, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland a question. Inasmuch as it is the duty, after all, of the Congress to protect the public interest and to act for all the people of the United States, I ask the Senator from Maryland whether he does not feel that the fact that Congress has been turning down this project time after time, for 30 years, might indicate that we in Congress should proceed carefully before we approve such a project?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think the Senator from Louisiana has made a very telling point.

Mr. President, I should like to proceed with my prepared statement, because I have yet some way to go with it. So I should like to proceed a little faster than I have been, if possible.

Thus it appeared that, at long last, the proponents of the St. Lawrence Waterway had accomplished at least a part of their long-sought project. The prospects appeared strong that the power project would be constructed, that the 27-foot waterway through the St. Lawrence River would be constructed, and that the improvements at the Welland Canal, between Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, would be made. The only part of their original objective remaining unaccomplished would be the improvement of the upper Great Lakes channels.

When all these events had taken place, I thought, of course, that Senate bill 2150 and other similar bills would be considered as serving no useful purpose, and would be dropped. It seems to me that was the only reasonable thing to expect in the circumstances. For those

who had clamored that there must be a waterway through the St. Lawrence River in order to provide a new deep-water route for bringing in Labrador ore to the Midwest steel mills, there was to be a waterway of exactly the same size and dimensions they had been seeking. For those who sought the deepening of the waterway through the St. Lawrence in order to ship automobiles and other manufactured products abroad, there was to be such a waterway. In other words, if the United States Congress does not pass Senate bill 2150 or any other similar measure there will still be a 27-foot waterway through the St. Lawrence River of the same size and dimensions and, from a functional standpoint, identical with any waterway that might result from some participation by the United States. And, if there would be any benefits from the construction of the 27-foot waterway through the St. Lawrence, all of those benefits would accrue in full measure without the passage of S. 2150 or any participation by the United States in the construction of the waterway.

The proponents, appreciating the fact that this left them without a leg to stand on in proposing to Congress that it appropriate more than $100 million of money that we do not have in order to get a project that we may have without spending anything, felt that they had to have something to hang their hats on, even though it be the most tenuous and unsubstantial peg. The reed they are leaning on is certainly one without substance, for the only thing that they could come up with was that the United States must participate in some way in the construction of the waterway through the St. Lawrence River in order that the United States may have joint control with Canada over the waterway, which they claim is necessary to protect our national interest.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The more the junior Senator from Louisiana thinks about this matter the more he is concerned about the prospect of this waterway becoming a toll waterway, whereas it is now a free waterway. He certainly hopes that information can be obtained as to whether the construction of this project means that the toll-free waterway on the St. Lawrence is to be closed. Such information would be of great help to us. It would certainly be unfortunate if all the shippers on the St. Lawrence who are now shipping toll-free were to be told that the result of building this project in order to accommodate deeper draft vessels would be that all those who could operate on a 14-foot channel would be denied the benefit of toll-free navigation.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I may say to my dear friend from Louisiana that unless that toll-free passage were closed this project could never under any circumstances be self-liquidating.

Mr. LONG. The thing that amazes the junior Senator from Louisiana is that so important a question as this has not been answered before the Senate. So far as I know, up to this moment we have done nothing toward exploring the answer to that important question.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Is this waterway to operate at 27 feet, in competition with a 14-foot waterway which is toll free? In that event it is difficult to see how the project would ever pay out. Or is this waterway to operate by requiring that tolls be imposed on what is today a toll-free waterway, open to the commerce of the world?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think the Senator has made a very fine point, and it should be answered.

Let me say now, aside from my prepared remarks, that I am simply amazed that the proponents of this project have not told the people of America what they propose to do with a great amount of their money.

None of the proponents has ever spelled out what is meant specifically by such a term, or just how our interests would be adversely affected by reason of the sole control of the proposed waterway by Canada. However, even without the benefit of any such specification by the proponents, let us examine the question of control to see whether there is such reason to fear the consequences of Canada's sole control of this portion of the waterway as to justify the United States in spending more than $100 million of money we cannot afford to spend.

In order to have a proper understanding of the factors involved in this particular facet of the problem it is necessary to have clearly in mind the geography of the St. Lawrence River region in relation to the waterway which would be built by Canada alone and the waterway which would be built if the United States were to construct the only link through the International Rapids section.

The St. Lawrence River forms the international boundary between Canada and the United States for a distance of only 114 miles, 46 miles in the International Rapids section and 68 miles in the Thousand Islands section. To the east of that section for more than a thousand miles to the ocean the existing links in that waterway lie wholly within Canadian territory. First, there is a section of 68 miles to Montreal, where vessels must transit the Soulanges Canal and the Lachine Canal, with their locks. Beyond Montreal, the waterway extends for another thousand miles through Canadian territory, first in the St. Lawrence River and then in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Finally, to the west of the proposed construction there is another link in the waterway which is also wholly in Canadian territory, namely, the Welland Canal, connecting Lake Erie and Lake Ontario.

Under either plan Canada would necessarily have to perform the work in the 68-mile section from Montreal west to the international boundary and the improvement of the Welland Canal, this work lying wholly in Canadian territory. The only difference would be that under the all-Canadian plan Canada would also make the improvements necessary for navigation in the International Rapids section and in the Thousand Islands section, while it is contemplated that under the plan for United States participation the canals through the International Rapids section would lie in United States territory and would be built by the United States, and that the improvements in the Thousand Islands section would be made by the United States.

This assumes, of course, that if Senate bill 2150 were to be enacted by the Congress Canada would not build any canals through the International Rapids section. The question of whether there is any basis for such an assumption will be discussed later, but for the moment we will proceed on the assumption that this is so, for the purposes of considering the significance of control over the waterway, depending upon who performs the work in the International Rapids section.

The question of control over the waterway can have significance only as it might affect our rights to free navigation through the waterway and as it might affect the basis upon which tolls might be imposed on United States vessels and commerce using the waterway. These questions should be considered under the assumptions both of a friendly Canada and of an unfriendly Canada.

First, as to our rights of navigation through the St. Lawrence. These rights are dealt with in the treaties between the United States and Great Britain of 1871 and 1909. Article XXVI of the Treaty of 1871 contains the following provision:

> The navigation of the river St. Lawrence, ascending and descending, from the 45th parallel of north latitude, where it ceases to form the boundary between the two countries, from, to, and into the sea, shall forever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of Great Britain, or of the Dominion of Canada, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

This provision confers perpetual navigation rights upon the citizens of the United States for the purposes of commerce eastward in the St. Lawrence River from the point where the river enters Canadian territory to the sea.

The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 contains the following provision in article I:

> The high contracting parties agree that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open for the purpose of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally, subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation and applying equally and without discrimination to the inhabitants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries.
>
> It is further agreed that so long as this treaty shall remain in force, this same right of navigation shall extend to the waters of Lake Michigan and to all canals connecting boundary waters, and now existing or which may hereafter be constructed on either side of the line. Either of the high contracting parties may adopt rules and regulations governing the use of such canals within its

own territory and may charge tolls for the use thereof, but all such rules and regulations and all tolls charged shall apply alike to the subjects or citizens of the high contracting parties and the ships, vessels, and boats of both of the high contracting parties, and they shall be placed on terms of equality in the uses thereof.

This provision insures our rights of navigation in the St. Lawrence River from Lake Ontario east to the point where the river ceases to form the international boundary, and through the Welland Canal. It is also to be noted that in the second paragraph of article I the rights of navigation through canals covered by this provision are similarly guaranteed and provision is made for equal application to the citizens and vessels of both parties of any tolls imposed for the use of such canals and of any rules and regulations governing the use thereof.

Canadian officials have recognized the existence of this right. Take, for instance, the following statement from a speech by the Right Honorable C. D. Howe, Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, made on April 7, 1953:

It should be noted at this point that the St. Lawrence seaway is, and always has been, a Canadian seaway. Every important improvement has been built and paid for by Canada, from Lake Erie down. The cost of operating and maintaining the seaway is paid wholly by Canada. Nevertheless, ships of every nation may use the seaway without payment of tolls.

That brings me to the question which the Senator from Louisiana asked me a few minutes ago.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the Canadian Minister made the statement that ships of every nation may use the seaway without paying any tolls?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct. I will read the statement again:

It should be noted at this point that the St. Lawrence seaway is, and always has been, a Canadian seaway. Every important improvement has been built and paid for by Canada, from Lake Erie down. The cost of operating and maintaining the seaway is paid wholly by Canada. Nevertheless, ships of every nation may use the seaway without payment of tolls.

Mr. LONG. In other words, up to this time every nation of the world has had the right to use the Canadian improvements without paying any tolls. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, ships of every nation in the world have the right to use the American navigation improvements without paying any tolls. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. So there is no reason to feel that Canada is offering us any special benefit; she is willing to permit every nation to use the improvements on her side of the border. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Furthermore, we have no assurance that the project would be in any way superior if we put our $100 million into it than if Canada built it entirely by herself.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It has been said on the floor that it may even be better without our help.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I conclude the quotation from the speech of the Right Honorable C. D. Howe, Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce:

An international treaty provides that, if and when tolls on shipping are imposed, they will bear equally on Canadian and foreign-flag ships.

It is difficult to believe that our good neighbor Canada would try to deny to us the use of this waterway contrary to the terms of the various treaties between the two countries; but bear in mind that if relations between our countries should ever reach that unhappy stage, the Canadians have complete control and domination over the effective use of the waterway by reason of the fact that its exit and the last 1,000 miles of its course run entirely through Canadian territory, as well as the link through the Welland Canal. Bear in mind also that the construction of the canals through the International Rapids section on the United States side of the boundary line, as proposed in S. 2150, in no way adds to our rights to use the all-Canadian portions of the waterway beyond the international boundary.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator from Maryland realizes that this is not a one-way street.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. He realizes that Canada uses our navigation improvements.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Maryland familiar with the fact that the only deep locks at Sault Ste. Marie are the American locks, and that if deep-draft lake vessels want to go through the locks they have to use the American locks. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Maryland aware of the fact that the United States does not charge the Canadians anything for the use of the locks on the American side of the Soo?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Maryland aware of the fact that the navigation improvements on the Great Lakes system itself, even on the international boundary, have been made by this Government entirely at its own expense, in opening the channels in the St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair, and in opening up the channels at the Soo locks and making them deeper than the Canadian channels?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I did not know it, but I am glad to hear it.

Geography and international boundary lines have made the St. Lawrence River 90 percent a Canadian waterway and 10 percent a joint United States-Canadian waterway, so that in the final analysis, if the existing treaty provisions I have cited are not sufficient to protect our interests, we must rely upon the good will and friendship of Canada.

In this connection let me give the Senate some indication of what the Canadian thinking is on this point. The Canadians, with full right and justification, think that the claims of the proponents that the St. Lawrence is a great international waterway are absurd. Consider, for instance, the following from an editorial of June 25, 1952, in the Ottawa newspaper, the Globe and Mail:

The St. Lawrence, as our American friends need to be reminded, is a Canadian river. For less than one-tenth of its length it happens to be, by historical accident, an international boundary. With a half interest in that fraction of the whole stream, the Americans may be said to own rather less than 5 percent of the St. Lawrence and the Canadians rather more than 95 percent.

If that is not a complete example of buying into a closely held family corporation, I have never heard of any. We have less than 5-percent ownership and the majority has 95 percent or more. I cannot think of any worse situation to get ourselves into.

For a more official expression of this point of view I refer the Senate to a statement made on April 8, 1953, by the Right Honorable C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce, whom the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], described as the ranking minister of the Canadian Cabinet. Mr. Howe said:

It should be noted at this point that the St. Lawrence seaway is, and always has been, a Canadian seaway. Every important improvement has been built and paid for by Canada, from Lake Erie down. The cost of operating and maintaining the seaway is paid wholly by Canada. Nevertheless, ships of every nation may use the seaway without payment of tolls. An international treaty provides that, if and when tolls on shipping are imposed, they will bear equally on Canadian and foreign flagships.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator from Maryland knows that Mr. Howe was 100 percent correct when he spoke of the improvements on the St. Lawrence as being Canadian improvements, and entirely a Canadian project?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. If our Nation were to provide $100 million, as proposed by this bill, we would be paying to construct a channel which would start in Canada and end in Canada. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. We would be caught in the middle, and it seems to me we would be at the mercy of what the Canadian Government might want to do.

To those who think of our participation in the St. Lawrence project to the

extent of constructing the canals in the International Rapids section as the creation of a club to hold over Canada's head in the event of her unwillingness to permit us to use the Canadian portions of the waterway, I should like to point out the fact that we already have at our disposal a number of such clubs. I, for one, am certain their use will never be required, but I point to their existence for those whose support of S. 2150 might be based on such reasoning.

Certain of the channels through the Thousand Islands section of the St. Lawrence River are today in United States territory and will remain so even under the proposal for the all-Canadian waterway. In fact, the Canadian plan calls for a cut through an island all of which is in United States territory. These channels are under United States control and domination, and their use by Canadian vessels is necessary in order to utilize the remainder of the waterway through the St. Lawrence River.

Furthermore, the connecting channels between the upper Great Lakes lie mostly in United States territory and all of the construction and maintenance work on these channels has been performed at the expense of the United States. All of these channels are used by Canadian commerce to and from the upper Great Lakes.

Finally, there is the situation at the Soo where there are 5 locks, 4 on the United States side and 1 on the Canadian side. The deepest and only truly modern lock there is the MacArthur lock on the United States side and it is used freely by Canadian vessels. In fact, the United States canals at the Soo must be used by all large modern Canadian vessels because the only lock on the Canadian side has a limiting depth of 16.8 feet.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, is it not true that we have been going along now for 50 years, with the Canadians developing their part of the project on the St. Lawrence and we developing our part of the project?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. We develop the channels on the American side of the Great Lakes and the Canadians are permitted to use them.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. The arrangement has worked very well. Canada has not had anything to say about what we have done, and we have had nothing to say about what Canada has done. It seems to me to be one of the best examples of international good will that has been demonstrated anywhere in the world.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes; and cooperation.

Mr. LONG. And cooperation; yes. If we proceed to become involved in the proposed general operation, how do we know that the Commission might not have all sorts of friction and all sorts of disagreements.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. They are bound to have them.

Mr. LONG. Instead of having the perfect harmony and good will that has existed for the last 50 years, how do we know that the Commission might not become involved in all sorts of disputes and thus upset the good relations which have existed between this country and Canada, with her running her part of the project and with us running our part of it?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There is a great possibility of that happening.

Mr. LONG. If we become involved in the proposed project does the Senator from Maryland realize it would further complicate matters?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. One segment of the project would be operated entirely by Canada, one segment would be operated entirely by the United States, and the third segment would be operated by the Joint Commission. It seems to me that it would make for all sorts of misunderstanding, which might completely destroy the fine relations we have had with Canada for nearly 150 years.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator is entirely correct.

Each country controls today and would continue to control an important and integral segment of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway. Each country has exercised its control in the past in a nondiscriminatory manner with complete respect for the rights of the other, and I am certain that any independent control that each might have in the future would always be exercised in the same spirit of fairness and friendliness. We have never dealt with Canada before on the basis of who wields the biggest club, and I trust we never will. That suggestion, however, is inherent in the arguments advanced in support of S. 2150. As a practical matter, if it ever should come down to that, the determination of which country wields the biggest stick would certainly not be dependent upon whether we build canals in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

Let me suggest several other considerations with respect to the matter of tolls. For instance, it has been intimated that, notwithstanding the treaty protection we have in the form of a guaranty of equal treatment in the matter of tolls, since different kinds of cargo are of different importance to the two countries, Canada might impose low tolls on traffic of importance to Canada and high tolls on traffic of importance to the United States. In this connection, reference has been made to the iron ore traffic from Labrador, as an example. The fact is apparently overlooked that the source of this traffic is Canada itself, that Canada will derive a royalty from every ton of ore mined in Labrador, and that all factors considered, Canada probably stands to profit more than does the United States by the development of this ore field. Accordingly, it is hardly to be anticipated that Canada would place unreasonable obstacles in the way of its development.

Furthermore, the suggestion of any such discriminatory treatment is certainly attributing to Canada a narrow, selfish, and unfriendly attitude, and to me it is incredible to think that Canada would do such a thing.

Consider this also: In the act establishing the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, section 16 contains provisions setting forth the standards for the establishment of tolls. That section reads as follows:

> The tolls that may be charged by the Authority shall be fair and reasonable and designed to provide a revenue sufficient to defray the cost to the Authority of its operations in carrying out the purposes for which it is incorporated, which costs shall include (a) payments in respect of the interest on amounts borrowed by the Authority to carry out such purposes; (b) amounts sufficient to amortize the principal of amounts so borrowed over a period not exceeding 50 years; and (c) the cost of operating and maintaining the canals and works under the administration of the Authority, including all operating costs of the Authority and such reserves as may be approved by the Minister.

These standards are very much like the standards governing tolls set forth in Senate bill 2150. Canada is a constitutional Government, with a record equal to ours for the preservation and protection of constitutional rights. Again I say that I see not the slightest danger of unreasonably high tolls or of any discrimination against American commerce in the levying of tolls.

The United States exercises sole control over the imposition of tolls at the Panama Canal, but in all the years we have exercised this control we have never seen fit to impose tolls on any such discriminatory basis as it is suggested Canada might do if there were an all-Canadian waterway through the St. Lawrence River.

One more consideration, and certainly an important one, is the manner in which Canada over a long period of years has exercised its control over the Welland Canal and the existing 14-foot canals through the St. Lawrence River. Throughout this entire period of time no instance has been cited by anyone of any discrimination against United States commerce or vessels with respect to the use of these canals. Can anyone suggest any logical reason why there is any likelihood that suddenly Canada's attitude and manner of dealing with respect to the operation of its canals should change simply because the canals are to be deepened from 14 to 27 feet in the St. Lawrence and from 25 to 27 feet in the Welland Canal? There is no substance to proponents' argument, and it just does not make sense.

Furthermore, I would go so far as to say that proponents know it does not make sense and are merely trying to throw up a smokescreen to conceal the lack of any sound basis for their insistence upon the United States making the unnecessary expenditure proposed in Senate bill 2150.

I do not want to labor this point about tolls and the fact it would not be possible for our economy to be seriously affected adversely by reason of the establishment of too high a level of tolls by Canada for the use of the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway, but I do want to mention one more protection we have against any such situation arising.

We have one final protection against any such situation, namely, that afforded by the operation of the law of economics, and, in particular, that facet of the law known as the law of diminishing returns. The proposed waterway would not be an indispensable facility for which there would be no substitute. All of the traffic that would move over the proposed waterway is presently moving by other modes and routes of transportation which will continue to provide sufficient competition to insure a reasonable level of tolls over the waterway.

An illustration of what I have in mind is to be found in the testimony of Mr. George Humphrey before the House Public Works Committee in 1951. He testified, in effect, that his company would never be a guaranteed customer of the proposed waterway, and, as transportation rates and conditions existed at that time, he did not think that his company would use the waterway for the transportation of iron ore from Labrador in the event that the toll rate should be fixed above 50 cents a ton, because it would be cheaper to use existing alternative routes and modes of transportation.

Before leaving the question of control, I want to make a few more remarks on that subject. I know I have dealt with this question at considerable length, but I make no apology for that, for it is a matter of the utmost importance, and it seems to be clear that if there is nothing to this point made so much of by the proponents, there is certainly no possible justification for the passage of this bill and the expenditure by the United States of a large sum of money.

The force of the logic of the statements I have made on this point has apparently not been felt alone by the proponents, but by others as well. The others to whom I refer are not opponents of the project, but include people who are definitely sympathetic to the project or are avowed advocates of it. Their statements were made, of course, not in relation to the use of the argument of control in connection with support of this legislation but in connection with a different situation in which precisely the same argument was advanced.

The Federal Power Commission has recently had under consideration the applications of two applicants for a license to construct the United States share of the power project in the International Rapids section. One of these applicants, the New York Power Authority, predicated its application on the agreement by Canada to construct the entire 27-foot waterway through the St. Lawrence River entirely by itself without United States assistance. This plan included, of course, the construction of the canals through the International Rapids section on the Canadian side.

On the other hand, the other applicant, the Public Power & Water Corp. of Trenton, presented a plan under which the canals through the International Rapids section would be built on the United States side of the line. The Public Power & Water Corp. contended that for this reason its plan gave greater protection to the interests of the United States and was therefore superior to that of the New York Power Authority. The two applications were considered jointly by Examiner Law, of the Federal Power Commission, and in his decision, which was favorable to the New York Power Authority, Examiner Law had the following to say regarding the contention of the Public Power & Water Corp. on this point:

> We would be much more impressed with the importance of maintaining within the United States portion of the boundary stream the navigation facilities necessary for utilization of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River for commerce at 27-foot depths if the portion of the river below the International Rapids section were so located as to be within the control of the United States.
>
> However, the section of the river between St. Regis, N. Y., and Quebec, as well as the entire tidal section of the river and Gulf of St. Lawrence from Quebec to the Atlantic Ocean at Belle Island Strait, lies within the Dominion of Canada, and any utilization of the St. Lawrence River in the International Rapids section as a part of a continuous waterway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic must depend upon forbearance or agreement of the Dominion of Canada in such use.
>
> • • • • •
>
> In view of the fact that, as previously stated, approximately two-thirds of the St. Lawrence River is entirely within the Dominion of Canada and the tidal section below Quebec in the Gulf of St. Lawrence is also wholly under Canadian control, we cannot see any great benefit to American commerce which can arise from the construction of the two locks and the short section of the canal proposed within the United States by Public Power & Water Corp.

I wish to quote next for the benefit of Senators the views of some other persons regarding the matter of control. Listen carefully to their statement:

> Petitioner also expressed fear of Canada's proposal for a seaway in its territory, arguing that the United States would thereby lose control of the St. Lawrence River. But the United States never can have such control, whatever that may mean. The International Rapids section comprises but a small portion of the St. Lawrence River, the major part of which flows through Canadian territory. The Welland Canal, which provides passage between Lakes Erie and Ontario and forms a major part of the contemplated overall Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, is entirely within the Province of Ontario and below the International Rapids section the St. Lawrence River flows entirely within Canada. Moreover, article 1 of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 (36 Stat. (pt. 2) 2448) provides among other things that the St. Lawrence River shall forever continue free and open for the purpose of commerce to the merchants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally.

It will be noted that those views accord precisely with what I have been spelling out in considerable detail. They are not, however, the views of another opponent of the project, but rather they are the written and very recently expressed views of the Acting Solicitor General of the United States. This is taken from the brief filed December 17, 1953, with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit in the proceeding brought by the Public Power and Water Corp. contesting the grant of a license to the New York Power Authority by the Federal Power Commission for authority to construct the power project in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. This represents the views not only of the Acting Solicitor General of the United States, but also of the General Counsel for the Federal Power Commission and of counsel for the New York Power Authority. Therefore, Senators when speaking in a forum where resort to strained and illogical reasoning would not be expected to produce profitable results, even the most ardent proponents recognize that the argument of control is a pure makeweight.

Aside from the question of control, one other argument has been advanced by proponents as to why it would be better if the canals through the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence were built on the United States side. Proponents in general have stated that the construction cost in the International Rapids section would be less on the United States side than on the Canadian side, and, therefore, the tolls could be somewhat lower. In fact, this was one of the reasons set forth by a special Cabinet committee for favoring United States participation in the project. Administration witnesses who testified in support of the project also made the same statement. No one has furnished the basis for it, nor, so far as I know, has anyone even indicated on whose authority such a statement was made, though presumably it would have been on the authority of the Army engineers. I do not believe the matter to be of great importance, because I doubt that the difference in cost would be substantial, no matter on which side of the river the works in the International Rapids section were built. Accordingly, I doubt that the effect on the level of tolls would be material.

However, be that as it may, it is clear that officials of the Canadian Government do not agree with the statement. Not only do they think that the cost of the works in the International Rapids section would be cheaper if built on the Canadian side, but also that if the entire project were built by Canada there would be advantages from the standpoint of overall construction costs and from the standpoint of maintenance and operation of the canal system.

In this connection let me refer to a statement made by the Right Honorable C. D. Howe, Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, in an address delivered in New York on April 7, 1953. This is what Mr. Howe had to say on this point:

> Proposals are now being advanced that the United States should build the new canal in the International Rapids section. It seems to me that such a proposal can only complicate the present situation. Ownership by the United States of a short section of a very long seaway would not only add to the overall construction cost, but would complicate problems of maintenance and operation of the canal system. It seems obvious to me that continued ownership by one national authority of the entire seaway represents the most efficient procedure.

It is obvious that this was no thoughtless or inadvertent statement on the part of Mr. Howe, because it has been specifically confirmed by the Right Honorable Chevrier, Canadian Minister of

Transport, in a debate in the House of Commons of Canada, on May 12, 1953. When asked to comment on the point contained in the United States Cabinet recommendations to the effect that construction of the canals through the International Rapids section on the United States side would be more economical than on the Canadian side, Mr. Chevrier said:

I find myself unable to agree with that statement because it is not in conformity with our information. On the contrary, our information is that it would be as cheap, if not cheaper, to build a canal on the Canadian side of the boundary.

What I have said thus far has been directed toward showing that the project has no significance to the United States from the standpoint of national defense, that no showing has been made that the project would be economically sound or could be made self-liquidating, and that it would have harmful consequences to many segments of our economy; furthermore, that notwithstanding these considerations it appeared that Canada was in any event planning to proceed with the construction of a waterway through the St. Lawrence River as soon as it became an assured fact that the power project would be built, and that the latter fact constituted no reason for the passage of S. 2150.

Let me indicate now why, regardless of what the attitude of some Senators with respect to the various aspects of the situation may be, consideration of the pending bill, S. 2150, is premature and makes no sense at all at this time.

To understand what I am speaking about, certain facts must be borne clearly in mind. S. 2150 authorizes and directs the Corporation created under the bill to construct canals and deep-water navigation works throughout the International Rapids section on the United States side of the boundary. Construction of these works is conditioned only on two points: First, that the power project authorized and approved by the International Joint Commission will be built; and second, that assurances are provided that the Canadian portions of the navigation works will be completed. There is, however, no condition imposed to the effect that the construction of the works on the United States side in the International Rapids section shall not proceed until assurances are obtained from Canada that it will not build similar navigation works on the Canadian side of the river in the International Rapids section.

As I have already pointed out, Canada has submitted a plan calling for construction of a complete waterway through the St. Lawrence River lying wholly on the Canadian side and constructed solely by Canada. This plan was presented to the United States by the Canadian Ambassador in an official note. In a reply, the Acting Secretary of State stated:

My Government approves the arrangement set forth in your note.

Likewise, the application to the International Joint Commission was predicated on construction of all the canals on the Canadian side of the River, and the United States again showed its approval of this plan by joining in that application. Finally, as I have already pointed out, the license granted to the New York Power Authority by the Federal Power Commission was predicated on the construction of all the canals on the Canadian side of the river.

Thus, until the parties backtrack through all the steps to which I have referred, Canada remains obligated to build canals on the Canadian side of the river in the International Rapids section, which will join with the canals on the Canadian side in the purely Canadian section of the river to form a complete 27-foot waterway. Furthermore, not only is Canada obligated to build the entire waterway on its side of the line, but it appears anxious to do so.

In the present state of affairs, all that Congress would be doing if it were to pass S. 2150 would be to authorize the construction of canals duplicating similar canals on the Canadian side of the river. Yet no evidence whatsoever was presented at the hearings on S. 2150 attempting to justify the construction of a duplicate set of canals in the International Rapids section. It is clear beyond any possible doubt that such duplicate works could not be made self-liquidating through the imposition of tolls, and could not possibly be anything other than a gigantic white elephant.

I feel certain there can be no real dispute that if Canada were to build a complete waterway on the Canadian side of the river, including canals through the International Rapids section, no one would advocate construction of the works called for by S. 2150. As a matter of fact, General Robinson, Deputy Chief of Engineers, testifying before the House Public Works Committee, stated in response to a question that he would not favor construction of the works called for in S. 2150 if similar works were to be built on the Canadian side of the river.

I say, therefore, that at least until such time as Canada is relieved of its obligation to build canals through the International Rapids section, and until it has, in some satisfactory manner, given us assurances that it does not intend to proceed with such works, the consideration of this bill is premature.

Bear in mind the steps that must be taken before S. 2150 would do what its advocates claim that it will do, namely, provide for an essential link in the 27-foot waterway through the St. Lawrence River. First, we must withdraw from the approval of the all-Canadian plan which we gave in an exchange of diplomatic notes; second, Canada and the United States would have to make new application to the International Joint Commission to obtain approval for a revised plan; and third, an application for an amended license for the New York Power Authority would have to be obtained from the Federal Power Commission.

Perhaps all those steps could be successfully taken, but why should the Congress of the United States be asked to take a $100 million gamble on the success of those steps? That is precisely what the Congress is being asked to do when it is asked to approve S. 2150 at this time.

Let us go beyond this, however, and consider what the prospects are of Canada's being willing to forbear constructing the works on the Canadian side in the International Rapids section and letting the United States build the only canals through this section. The Canadians have never done more than express a willingness to discuss a proposal under which the United States would join in the construction of the navigation works. A willingness on the part of Canada to go this far was set forth in a note handed to the American Ambassador to Canada on January 8, 1953, in which the following was contained:

While the Canadian Government is, of course, prepared to discuss, in appropriate circumstances, joint participation in the seaway, the demand for power in the area to be served by the International Rapids power development is so urgent that the Canadian Government is most reluctant to engage in any discussion which might delay the progress of the plan now under way for the development of power in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River at the earliest possible moment.

Once an entity is designated and authorized to proceed with construction of the United States share of the power works, if the United States Government wishes to put forward a specific proposal differing from that put forward by the Canadian Government for the construction of the seaway in the International section, which proposal would not delay the development of power under arrangements agreed upon in the exchange of notes of June 30, 1952, and approved on October 29, 1952, by the International Joint Commission, the Canadian Government will be prepared to discuss such a proposal.

As Senators can see, there is nothing very specific in this statement as to how the United States will participate, but presumably any understanding calling for United States participation would have to provide for the steps to be taken which I have already outlined, and include some type of agreement or understanding that Canada would not now or even at a later time complete the waterway on its side of the river. Without such an agreement, of course, the United States would gain absolutely nothing by constructing the works called for by S. 2150. That merely goes to point up one of the inherent difficulties in trying to make a joint project out of the navigation works through the St. Lawrence River, for Canada can at any time complete the waterway on the Canadian side, whereas it is impossible for the United States at any time to do more than provide the works through the International Rapids section.

It is quite clear that certain officials of the Canadian Government are very mystified by the course of conduct of our Government, and particularly as exemplified by the current advocacy of S. 2150. Consider, for instance, the following statement by the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, Canadian Minister of Transport, in an address in Washington, D. C., on April 30, 1953:

It is said that it would be a mistake for the United States to allow Canada to build the seaway alone, but if this be a mistake then we made it some time ago. In 1952 the

Government of the United States agreed to join with Canada in an application to the International Joint Commission for the development of power on the distinct understanding that Canada would at the same time construct the seaway. This we have undertaken to do by an exchange of notes between our two Governments.

It is said that Canada may not always be a friendly nation. I cannot conceive of our two countries living on other than friendly terms, nor of Canada becoming powerful enough to be able to afford to be unfriendly. However, if it is felt that United States interests would be safeguarded by the construction of a canal on your side of the international section, why not go ahead and build and let us do likewise on our side?

Thus, as late as the last day of April of last year, the Canadian Minister of Transport was pointing out to us that the United States had agreed formally to the construction of the entire waterway by Canada, and it was obviously very difficult for him to understand why we felt there was any occasion to back down on this agreement. Further, Senators will note that the Canadian Minister of Transport does not suggest as a possibility that Canada will not construct the works in the International Rapids section on the Canadian side of the river, but only that we construct another set of canals on our side if we feel that would would do us any good—and not even proponents of S. 2150 think that would make sense.

The proponents have tried to convey the impression that Canada was ready, willing, and anxious to have us build a part of the waterway through the St. Lawrence River and that the maintenance of our friendly relations with Canada almost demanded such participation. However, the statement by Mr. Chevrier mentioned previously definitely conveys an entirely different impression, and the conclusion is inescapable that, far from being anxious for the United States to participate in this project, Canada is genuinely desirous of having us not participate in the project. This position is made even clearer by the following additional statements from Mr. Chevrier's address:

But we are not asking for any funds from you. Canada is not seeking financial aid on the St. Lawrence seaway. On the contrary, Canada is ready, willing, and anxious to proceed with the seaway at her own expense without cost to the American taxpayer.

A statement by the Right Honorable C. D. Howe, Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, delivered in New York on April 7, 1953, is equally specific and unequivocal regarding the question of United States participation in the waterway through the St. Lawrence River. That statement is as follows:

Proposals are now being advanced that the United States should build the new canal in the International Rapids section. It seems to me that such a proposal can only complicate the present situation. Ownership by the United States of a short section of a very long seaway would not only add to the overall construction cost, but would complicate problems of maintenance and operation of the canal system. It seems obvious to me that continued ownership by one national authority of the entire seaway represents the most efficient procedure. There are critical channels between the upper lakes that will require deepening to 27 feet at some stage. By assuming responsibility for such deepening, your country can assume a much more logical and valuable role by making 27-foot navigation possible throughout the upper lakes, to conform with depths provided in the all-Canadian St. Lawrence seaway.

It is impossible to express a meaning any more clearly or forcefully than that and still remain polite. To my mind it is perfectly clear that Mr. Howe has said, in effect, "We would prefer to do this job alone and we hope you will not pass legislation such as S. 2150."

The only thing the proponents of the bill have been able to point to as indicating that Canada might consider not building the entire project on its own is the statement twice made by the Canadian Government that it "would be prepared to discuss" a proposal differing from the agreed-upon all-Canadian waterway plan after arrangements for building the power project had been completed. This statement was first made in the previously referred-to memorandum of January 8, 1953, given to the United States Ambassador in Ottawa, and again in a communique issued at the conclusion of talks between the President and the Prime Minister of Canada on May 8, 1953. Let us remember that the above-quoted statements by Mr. Howe and Mr. Chevrier were made some time after the first declaration regarding a willingness to discuss some new proposal; and secondly, let us remember that the second announcement regarding such a new proposal, made almost immediately after the Howe and Chevrier statements, and in the face of their adverse comments regarding any such proposal, went not a bit further than the first statement, still sticking strictly to a willingness to discuss some new proposal.

Mr. President, it is almost too obvious to mention that a willingness to discuss a matter is a far cry from constituting an assurance that the views of one of the parties, which may be at variance with the views of the other, will prevail. In Canada the statements of Cabinet Ministers reflect, even more than would statements of Cabinet members in this country, the views of the Government; and especially is that so of statements by Mr. Howe, whose position is next to that of the Prime Minister.

In short, at no time since June of 1952 has there been any official expression on the part of any Canadian official of a desire to have the United States participate with Canada in the construction of the portion of the waterway through the St. Lawrence River. It is very clear, indeed, to me, that if Canada agrees not to build the portion of the waterway through the International Rapids section, and to make some sort of working arrangement with the United States regarding the joint management of the waterway through the St. Lawrence River, in the event Congress should approve a measure such as Senate bill 2150, such action would have been taken by Canada solely because of pressure from the United States or because of Canada's unwillingness to take a chance of offending the present administration.

Apparently most of the proponents seem to think or pretend to think that it is a foregone conclusion that Canada would be delighted to have the United States build the navigation works in the International Rapids section. I have already pointed out that such a conclusion appears to be contrary to the facts; but the proponents point to the fact that under the 1941 executive agreement Canada apparently was willing to have the United States participate in the construction of the waterway, and so the proponents do not see why Canada should not still be willing to have us participate.

One reason for this difference in attitude may be by reason of the vast difference between the situations under the Executive agreement of 1941 and under Senate bill 2150. The 1941 Executive agreement constituted a partnership between Canada and the United States on a "horse and rabbit" basis. Under the 1941 agreement the United States would have paid the cost not only of constructing the works in the International Rapids section, but also most of the cost of the works on the waterway lying wholly in Canada. Under that agreement the United States would have paid approximately six-sevenths of the total cost of the waterway and Canada only one-seventh. However, under the proposal of Senate bill 2150 the United States would pay, at the most, only a little over one-third of the total cost of the waterway; and Canada would have to pay almost two-thirds of the cost of the waterway, even if she did not do any of the work in the International Rapids section. It seems to me that difference in who pays the cost of the waterway could well account for the difference between the attitude on the part of Canada then and her attitude now, insofar as it relates to United States participation.

There is one other matter to which attention should be called. Under the 1941 agreement provision was made for the maintenance of the existing 14-foot canals on the Canadian side of the river, and such canals were to be maintained toll free. Also, the cost of the works necessary to preserve the 14-foot canals was included in the total cost, six-sevenths of which was to be met by the United States. Under the plan for the all-Canadian waterway, there was no necessity for the provision of the existing 14-foot canals, because they were to be replaced by 27-foot canals. On the other hand, if Canada were not planning to build 27-foot canals on the Canadian side through the International Rapids section, she would probably insist upon the maintenance of the 14-foot canals. Accordingly, if this were one of the conditions imposed by Canada for United States participation in the 27-foot waterway, no one would have authority on behalf of the United States to agree to such a condition, since no provision covering this point is included in Senate bill 2150. This provides one more reason why the approval of the bill at this time would make no sense.

In summation, I believe it has been demonstrated that the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway would be of no consequence from the standpoint of national defense; that no demonstration has been made that there is any reasonable prospect that the project could be made self-liquidating, through the imposition of tolls; that the project would have no broad economic advantages, but would be one primarily to give a competitive advantage to five steel companies; that the project would have a serious adverse effect upon numerous segments of our economy, such as the railroads, the coal industry, the United States merchant marine, the ports of our eastern seaboard, and the gulf coast, and the labor employed in those industries and localities; that from a functional standpoint the project proposed would from the outset be an outmoded and obsolete waterway, and for from 4 to 5 months of each year it would be frozen over and useless; that the ultimate cost of the project would very greatly exceed the estimated cost; that the United States is not in a position financially to undertake any project that is not urgently required in the national interests; that without spending $1, the project—for watever it may be worth—will become available through the efforts of Canada alone; that our right to use such a project, built by Canada, on terms of complete equality with Canadian vessels is fully guaranteed without any participation on the part of the United States; that in view of our formal approval of the plan for construction of the waterway entirely by Canada, and of the Canadian undertaking to construct such a canal, consideration of Senate bill 2150 is premature at this time; that Canada has not only expressed a willingness to construct the waterway at its own expense, but has plainly indicated that our participation is not desired; and that the approval of Senate bill 2150 would constitute nothing more than the authorization of a useless duplicate set of structures in the International Rapids section.

In the light of these facts, Mr. President, I cannot believe that the majority of the Senate of the United States will see fit to give its approval to the pending bill, S. 2150.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the Third Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the year ending June 30, 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 15, 1954.*

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF PRESTON HOTCHKIS TO BE REPRESENTATIVE ON ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nomination of Preston Hotchkis, of California, to be the United States representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Notice is hereby given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Preston Hotchkis, of California, to be the representative of the United States on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NOMINATION OF FRANK H. WEITZEL TO BE ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER GENERAL—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Government Operations, I report favorably the nomination of Frank H. Weitzel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Comptroller General of the United States. It has the unanimous support of the committee. The nomination is accompanied by a letter to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] from Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General, recommending Mr. Weitzel. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Warren's letter, together with a biographical sketch of Mr. Weitzel, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar and, without objection, the letter and biographical sketch will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter and biographical sketch are as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 14, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand the nomination by the President of Mr. Frank H. Weitzel to be Assistant Comptroller General of the United States is pending before your committee.

Mr. Weitzel's appointment has my wholehearted approval. He has served in the General Accounting Office for more than 25 years, the last 11 of which have been in my immediate office. He is steeped in the tradition of the General Accounting Office as the agency of the Congress and a part of the legislative branch of the Government. I appointed Mr. Weitzel in 1945 as my assistant in charge of the legislative program of the Office. In this position he has constantly dealt with committees of both Houses of the Congress, especially the Government Operations Committees. He has worked on much important legislation, including, as your committee knows, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

Mr. Weitzel is well and favorably known not only by the majority of leaders in the Congress, but throughout the Government. On many occasions he has been my direct representative in dealing with members of the Cabinet and agency heads. He has taken a leading part in the joint accounting improvement program being conducted by the General Accounting Office with the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget.

A large part of the duties of the Assistant Comptroller General are of a legal nature, including the rendition of decisions binding on the executive branch. Mr. Weitzel holds the degrees of bachelor of arts with highest distinction and bachelor of laws with distinction from the George Washington University. He is a member of the Supreme Court bar, and a lawyer of outstanding ability. He has a great love and respect for the Constitution and the law. In character and integrity he is without a peer.

Mr. Weitzel is active in the religious life of Washington. I regard him as one of the finest Christian gentlemen I have ever known.

I hope your committee will favorably report Mr. Weitzel's nomination.

With the highest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LINDSEY C. WARREN.
Comptroller General of the United States.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF FRANK H. WEITZEL IN CONNECTION WITH NOMINATION FOR THE OFFICE OF ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

The Congress has always been most jealous of the General Accounting Office as its own nonpartisan and nonpolitical agency in the legislative branch for checking on the financial transactions of the Government and assisting the Congress on fiscal problems. The position of Assistant Comptroller General is the second highest post in the General Accounting Office and was given a statutory term of 15 years, terminable only by the Congress, in order to make its incumbent independent of the executive branch. The Assistant Comptroller General must serve as Comptroller General during a vacancy in that Office or during the absence or incapacity of the Comptroller General. His duties are largely of a legal nature, requiring the rendition of quasi-judicial decisions binding and conclusive upon the executive branch.

It is of paramount importance that a trained lawyer be appointed to this position. It is likewise of tremendous importance that the incumbent of the position be familiar with and sympathetic to the status of the General Accounting Office as the nonpartisan and nonpolitical agency of the Congress and that he be well versed in the many functions of the Office having to do with accounting and auditing in the Government and involving cooperation between the Treasury Department, General Accounting Office, and Bureau of the Budget toward the improvement of accounting on a Government-wide basis.

Frank H. Weitzel, age 46, has been employed in the General Accounting Office since 1923, and permanently since 1927. He has risen through the successive ranks to the post of Assistant to the Comptroller General, GS–18, in charge of the legislative activities of the Office, interagency relationships, and personal representation of the Comptroller General in formulating policies at the highest level within the General Accounting Office and with the heads and key officials of other departments and agencies of the Government.

Mr. Weitzel is a university graduate, holding the degree of bachelor of arts with highest distinction from George Washington University, and bachelor of laws with distinction from the same university. He is a member of the bar of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and of the Supreme Court of the United States. He has had 7 years' experience in the General Counsel's office, General Accounting Office, in the drafting of decisions for the Comptroller General, and more than 11 years in the immediate Office of the Comptroller General in handling legal, organizational, and procedural problems, and since 1945 in his post in charge of the entire legislative program and interagency relations of the Office. During his incumbency in that post he has participated in the legislative processes in the enactment of a great deal of basic legislation, not only strengthening the functions and operations of the General Accounting Office, but laying the foundation for Government-wide improvements in accounting and auditing. Such legislation includes the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945, the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950, and the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Mr. Weitzel has worked with committees of both Houses of Congress, especially the Appropriations, Government Operations, Post Office and Civil Service, Banking and Currency, and Agriculture Committees. He took a leading part in the development of the joint accounting program now being carried on by the General Accounting Office, Bureau of the Budget, and Treasury Department. He is called upon constantly by congressional committees on problems affecting fields in which the General Accounting Office can be of assistance.

While Mr. Weitzel has always administered his duties in a completely nonpartisan and nonpolitical manner, he has been a lifelong Republican. Although he is a native and resident of the District of Columbia, both of his parents, whose origins were in Ohio and New York, have likewise always been Republicans. Mr. Weitzel's brother was one of the original small group which met with Senators CARLSON, DUFF, and NIXON to plan the Eisenhower campaign and participated in the primary campaign in New Hampshire and Maryland, which resulted in a victory for General Eisenhower. He was also president of the Eisenhower-for-President Club of Montgomery County, Md., before the nomination, and of the campaign club of Montgomery County after the nomination; and worked during the campaign, including the national Republican convention for General Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON, campaigning in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Indiana. Mr. Weitzel's wife's father was a member of the Republican State Central Committee for Ohio and a close associate of the late President Harding.

Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren has stated before congressional committees that Mr. Weitzel is recognized by the Government as a whole as one of the ablest men in Government, devoted to the public service. Mr. Weitzel is active in church work in Washington and is an elder of the Georgetown Presbyterian Church.

Since October 12, 1953, Mr. Weitzel has filled the office of Assistant Comptroller General of the United States under a recess appointment by the President.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 18, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 15 (legislative day of January 7), 1954:

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Preston Hotchkis, of California, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou guide of our pilgrim way, through the shadows of another night refreshing sleep has brought new vigor to our fragile flesh. As now reverently we bow at this shrine of the spirit, wilt Thou restore our souls. Solemnly conscious that we cannot hope to give to a needy world that which we do not have, we pray that we may be strengthened by Thy might in the inner man. Purge us, we beseech Thee, from all insincerity; cleanse us from the impurity that blinds our eyes to the high and holy. Break down in each of us the idols of our false pride, and shatter the sophistries of our self-love. And now, for the waiting tasks and perplexing questions of this new week, consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go, and steady us with the assurance that as we follow obediently and patiently the kindly light, the humblest work will shine and the roughest places be made plain. In the Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN M. BUTLER, a Senator from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 15, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills and resolutions, and the insertion of matters in the RECORD, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the order be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement. The Army Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee will start its hearings on Monday, January 25, and it intends to hold hearings January 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and February 1. The subsequent hearing dates will be announced later. I am making the public announcement at this time inasmuch as it has been the custom in the past for the Senate committee to wait until the House Committee on Appropriations had concluded their consideration of appropriation measures. I feel, however, that the Senate could expedite its schedule by having the appropriation bills reported to it at an early date.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 299)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the

United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, approved June 29, 1948, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1954.*

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1954.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of operations, expenditures and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the International Claims Commission, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of the Department of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GRANTING TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ISSUANCE OF NONIMMIGRANT VISA TO CLAUS HEINRICH ARP

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of ar order entered in the case of Claus Heinrich Arp, relative to his admission into the United States on a nonimmigrant visa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS OF CERTAIN ALIENS FOR STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD AND NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report containing the findings and recommendations of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Assembly Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue the maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.

"Whereas many young men of New Jersey are now attending the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point in preparation for service and leadership in our modern merchant marine; and

"Whereas this splendid Academy is the only available one for the young men of this State both presently and in the future who may wish to become officers in the modern merchant marine; and

"Whereas it is reported that attempts are being made to induce the Congress of the United States to eliminate the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.: Now, therefore

"*Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the Senate concurring):*

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to continue the maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and not to eliminate said Academy as an academy to prepare young men for leadership in our modern merchane marine.

"2. The Secretary of State is hereby directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this resolution properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, to the respective presiding officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and to all of the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey in the Congress.

"3. This concurrent resolution shall take effect immediately."

A resolution adopted by the City Commission of Provo, Utah, favoring the enactment of House bill 1555, authorizing the development of the upper Colorado River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TREATYMAKING POWER AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS — BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a telegram, embodying a resolution, which I have received from John G. Linsner, president of the New York Young Republican Club.

I am glad to say that the resolution presents the strong judgment of that club in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1, known as the Bricker amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 15, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a special meeting of the board of governors of the New York Young Republican Club held on Thursday, January 14:

"*Resolved,* That the board of governors of the New York Young Republican Club expresses its grave concern as to the probable effects of the Bricker amendment and emphatically rejects this unfortunate attempt to tamper with the traditional time-tested process of conducting American foreign affairs. It fully endorses President Eisenhower's unalterable opposition to any amendment 'which would hamper the President in his constitutional authority to conduct foreign affairs.' It calls upon all those having responsibility in this matter to bring about its defeat. It pledges its support to this end."

JOHN G. LINSNER,
President.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, knowing the high regard which my colleagues in the Senate hold for the League of Women Voters of the United States, I was greatly

encouraged to note the stand which the league has recently taken in firm opposition to the Bricker amendment.

This outstanding bipartisan group of American women, headed by the distinguished Republican, Mrs. John G. Lee, has climaxed a year's study of the language of the Bricker amendment with the conclusion that the amendment not only is unnecessary but would actually be dangerous to the future security of our country.

In view of the importance of the stand taken by the league, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a copy of the letter which Mrs. Lee addressed to President Eisenhower on January 13. Mrs. Lee wrote on behalf of the approximately 130,000 members of the league in all 48 States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1954.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The League of Women Voters of the United States is opposed to the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1). During the past year leagues throughout the country have studied the issues involved and the weight of opinion expressed is clearly against the Bricker amendment as not only unnecessary but as dangerous for the future security of our country. Our reasons are as follows:

1. The power of the National Government to conduct foreign relations must be maintained as provided in the Constitution. The Bricker amendment would deprive the National Government of its full power to carry out treaty obligations in important areas of national policy and would leave to the States the choice of implementation.

2. The constitutional system of checks and balances between the executive and legislative branches of the National Government must be safeguarded. The Bricker amendment would alter the traditional concept of the balance of power by removing functions from the Executive and transferring them to the Congress. It is essential that the President retain his authority to fulfill his constitutional responsibility to act in times of national emergency as well as in the day-to-day conduct of foreign affairs.

3. The negotiation and ratification of treaties should not be made more cumbersome. The Bricker amendment would hamper our present treatymaking procedure, already surrounded by constitutional and legislative safeguards, by adding steps which would cast doubt on the ability and willingness of the United States to carry out its international obligations.

4 The interests of the United States are best served by a foreign policy based on the principle of international cooperation. The Bricker amendment would impair this principle. It is based on fears that the United Nations Charter and other international agreements could invade our constitutionally protected individual and States' rights. The League of Women Voters does not share this fear.

5. The Constitution should be amended only when need is clearly shown. This need has not been established.

The League of Women Voters urges you to use your utmost influence to prevent passage of the Bricker amendment.

Respectfully,

MRS. JOHN G. LEE,
President.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. Res. 172. Resolution to further increase the limit of expenditures under S. Res. 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States (Rept. No. 853);

S. Res. 181. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary (Rept. No. 854);

S. Res. 187. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary (Rept. No. 855);

S. Res. 188. Resolution further extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations (Rept. No. 856); and

S. Res. 190. Resolution amending the resolution providing for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States, and increasing the limit of expenditures (Rept. No. 857).

ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 852)

Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted a report summarizing the activities of the Committee on Government Operations, during the 1st session of the 83d Congress, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2720. A bill to control the exportation and importation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and related items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 2721. A bill for the improvement of Patchogue River, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2722. A bill for the relief of Margarete Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2723. A bill to provide for a White House Conference on Education; and

S. 2724. A bill to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2725. A bill for the relief of Aldo Conti; and

S. 2726. A bill for the relief of Melitta Elizebeth Rhone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 2727. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of water, land, and other related resources of the Missouri Basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2728. A bill to authorize the collection of indebtedness of military and civilian personnel resulting from erroneous payments, and for other purposes;

S. 2729. A bill to provide for compensation of certain employees on days when departments, agencies, or establishments of the Government are closed by administrative order; and

S. 2730. A bill to authorize the sale of postage-due stamps for philatelic purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2731. A bill for the relief of Jean Cantalini;

S. 2732. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Kropfitsch Pelloski; and

S. 2733. A bill for the relief of John Faizon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2734. A bill to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities to former Members of Congress and others who are convicted of certain offenses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2735. A bill for the relief of Ahmet Suat Maykut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2736. A bill to place State Directors of the United States Savings Bond Division of the Treasury Department under the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2737. A bill for the relief of C-L Electric Co.; and

S. 2738. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1950, relating to the extension of the terms of patents of World War II veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2739. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Romalda Stase Plachows Manley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2740. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the 200th anniversary of the Expulsion of the Acadians from Nova Scotia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2741. A bill to make ineffective a certain requirement of local cooperation with respect to the river and harbor project on the Pearl River, Miss., below Jackson; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2742. A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1951, relating to certain payments out of Ute Indian tribal funds;

S. 2743. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Sac and Fox of the Missouri Tribe of Indians located in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, the Iowa Tribe of Indians located in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, the Kickapoo Tribe of Indians located in the State of Kansas, and the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians located in the State of Kansas, and the individual members thereof; and for other purposes;

S. 2744. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Indians of Texas, and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2745. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians located in the State of Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2746. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes and bands of Indians located in western Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2747. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Seminole Tribe of Indians in the State

of Florida and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2748. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana, and the individual members thereof; for assistance in the orderly relocation of such Indians in area of greater economic opportunity; and for other purposes;

S. 2749 (by request). A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of Indian tribes, bands, and groups in California and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. 2750 (by request). A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 2751. A bill for the relief of Umberto Marandola;

S. 2752. A bill to outlaw and prohibit membership in an organized conspiracy generally known as the Communist Party of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 2753. A bill to allow admission of certain types of evidence in the Federal courts of the United States against defendants prosecuted for treason, espionage, and other crimes involving the national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2754. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Dimitrios Stathopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2755. A bill to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DANIEL:

S. 2756. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the legal guardian of Charles Joe Starnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 2757. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for State and White House conferences on education. This bill incorporates in proposed legislation one of the recommendations regarding education which was contained in the President's recent state of the Union message. I have introduced this bill as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in order that what may be called an administration bill may be immediately before the Senate and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It should be noted that in the President's state of the Union message, he expressed the hope that a conference on education would be held in each State this year, and that those State conferences would culminate in a national conference. The bill which I have just introduced authorizes the appropriation of funds to be allotted to the States in accordance with a fixed formula to help finance these State conferences on education. The bill also authorizes the appropriation of funds to cover the administrative expenses which the Federal Government will incur in connection with the White House conference on education.

It is my purpose to request the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to consider the President's recommendations in regard to educational conferences without delay. I hope that this bill may be reported and passed promptly in order that the educational conferences suggested by the President can begin their work as soon as possible.

Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has consented to act as chairman of a subcommittee to push the hearings as rapidly as possible, and he will have his subcommittee meet promptly.

The bill (S. 2723) to provide for a White House conference on education, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the establishment of a permanent nine-member National Advisory Committee on Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This bill helps to carry out the recommendations of the President in his state of the Union message in regard to education. It authorizes the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Education which will assure, through its efforts, the continuous study and development of suggestions for solving our educational problems of national concern.

It is my purpose to request the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare promptly to consider the bill that I have just introduced for the reason that it is an important part of the administration's approach to our educational problems. I hope that this bill may be reported and passed without delay in order that the Advisory Committee which it authorizes and establishes may come into being as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I have asked the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], to act as chairman of the subcommittee, to consider all these educational bills.

The bill (S. 2724) to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MISSOURI BASIN COMPACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of water, land, and other related resources of the Missouri Basin.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain at the desk for a period of 24 hours, so that the Senators from the other States involved in the proposed compact may have an opportunity to join in sponsoring the bill, if they so desire.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added, as a cosponsor on the bill just introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], with regard to a compact between the States of the Missouri Basin.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] will be added as a cosponsor.

The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will remain on the desk as requested by the Senator from North Dakota.

The bill (S. 2727) to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of water, land, and other related resources of the Missouri Basin, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. CARLSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL SERIES OF STAMPS COMMEMORATING 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF EXPULSION OF ACADIANS FROM NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the issuance of a series of commemorative postage stamps on the occasion of the bicentennial of the expulsion of the Acadians from Nova Scotia.

I am sure that every member of the Senate has studied, or at least read, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's immortal poem Evangeline. That poem, Mr. President, tells the story of an Acadian girl, who, separated from her lover, was transported to Louisiana and there she waited beneath an oak tree until her beloved was found. The story of Evangeline has never been proved, but that it could have been true, I do not doubt, and for this reason, the people of my State have erected a shrine to the faithful maid who kept her vigil on the banks of Bayou Teche. In the city of St. Martinville, there stands one of the oldest

Roman Catholic churches in my State; built in 1765, its records originated in Nova Scotia, and were brought to Louisiana by the Acadian exiles. In St. Martinville there is also an oak tree, which is said to be the tree beneath which Evangeline waited for her lover; and next to the church is a tomb, said to contain the remains of Evangeline.

This, while romantic, may or may not be true in itself. Yet, the story of the expulsion of the Acadians from Nova Scotia is truly factual; but it is far from romantic. One historian has described it as the greatest tragedy of modern times.

In a little more than a year and a half from now, Mr. President, citizens of my State, descendents of Evangeline's Acadian people, will gather to mark the 200th anniversary of the day when the Acadians were driven from their homes in Nova Scotia, separated from their families, loaded aboard British men-of-war, and dumped like so many animals along the eastern seaboard of the United States. This is a chapter of American history of which we know but little, for it has been suppressed by American historians, but the expulsion of the Acadians from Nova Scotia is a deep scar on the countenance of the Anglo-Saxon world. Its only counterpart in modern times can be found in the concentration camps of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia, and in the death houses of the Gestapo and the Communist secret police.

I should like to read to the Senate a passage from a French history book:

> The total of the misery suffered by the Acadians is incalculable, and as we unite all the other cruel and terrible circumstances, the tableau becomes one of the most poignant of the history of human sufferings—peaceable and prosperous people of simple habits, ardently attached to their religion, living in abundance, if not in opulence, suddenly torn from their firesides by military force—their lands confiscated, their house pillaged and burned, their churches destroyed after having been profaned by the occupation of the soldiers.

Philip H. Smith, in his book, Acadia, a Lost Chapter in American History, says of these people:

> There have been instances in the annals of the past in which a country has been desolated in time of actual war and where the inhabitants were found in arms, but we defy all past history to produce a parallel case in which an unarmed and peaceable people have suffered to such an extent as did the French neutrals of Acadia.

On September 10, 1755, Mr. President, more than 5,000 Acadian residents of Nova Scotia were driven from their homes, forced off their lands, and forceably deported from the country of their birth because they refused to abandon their religious belief. Forced to wrap themselves in blankets taken from smallpox hospitals, these people died by the hundreds; the survivors were cast ashore, without money or food, at ports in Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and South Carolina. Choosing their God above their physical comfort, they were thrown among strangers, who spoke a strange language and who worshipped in a strange way. Yet, they survived. They survived to make their way southward, to Louisiana, where they were to find not only their own language, their own people, their own churches, but in which they were to find a new and happier home. In southern Louisiana, along the Mississippi River, along Bayou Teche, and on the flat plains of the western part of my State, these exiles settled, tilled the soil, and reared their families. The first sizable group of Acadians arrived in Louisiana in 1765; they settled along the Mississippi River, near St. Gabriel, and in what is now Iberville Parish. Others moved to St. Martinville and the lands that were then known only as the Attakapas country.

Since 1765, these people have contributed much to my State. Their blood lines have produced hundreds of great Louisianians, members of the legislature, generals in the proud armies of the Confederacy and of the United States, prominent businessmen, doctors, lawyers, agriculturalists, and Members of Congress. But more important, the Acadians have become symbols of a way of life. A peaceful people, they have tilled their lands, reared their families, and lived in a manner which all Americans could well emulate. Their love of the land, of the home, of the family, and their love of their country and their willingness to die for it if necessary, have truly won for the Acadians a place in the Nation's hall of fame. I am pleased that it becomes my privilege to sponsor this bill, the first attempt, to my knowledge, to honor the Louisiana Acadians for their contribution to our way of life.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2740) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the 200th anniversary of the expulsion of the Acadians from Nova Scotia, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LOCAL COOPERATION WITH RESPECT TO RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECT ON PEARL RIVER, MISS., BELOW JACKSON

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to make ineffective a certain requirement of local cooperation with respect to the river and harbor project on the Pearl River, Miss., below Jackson. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by C. Ellis Ott, an attorney at law, of Bogalusa, La., giving the reasons why such requirement should be made ineffective.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2741) to make ineffective a certain requirement of local cooperation with respect to the river and harbor project on the Pearl River, Miss., below Jackson, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter referred to is as follows:

BOGALUSA, LA., *January 6, 1954.*

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: In line with our telephone conversation on yesterday, I am writing you some of the details with reference to the desire of the city of Bogalusa to have eliminated from local requirements, the necessity for the city to maintain ferry service across the canal for the use of those who were isolated by the canal.

As I stated to you over the telephone, the Pearl River project was approved by Congress in the River and Harbor Act of August 30, 1935, House Document 408, 75th Congress, 2d session, and approved by the Board of Engineers on August 23, 1937. In the project document containing the report and approval of the Board of Engineers, the following paragraph was contained in the report of the district engineer relative to requirements for local cooperation, among other requirements, to wit:

"(d) The construction of the proposed lateral canal would leave a narrow strip of territory, varying from ¼ to 1½ miles in width, between the waterway and the river. Although most of this territory is swampland, a few scattered tracts of cultivated land and about 11 small homesites are included therein. Some means of egress and ingress should be provided for the inhabitants of the area which would otherwise be isolated by the canal from highways and markets. Local interests should be required to provide three or more ferries as would be necessary for convenience of egress and ingress of the people living in this area."

The above recommendation was contained in the report of the district engineer under date of July 20, 1937. In the report of the division engineer under date of July 31, 1937, and in the approval of the Board of Engineers under date of August 23, 1937, as well as in the report of the Chief Engineer under date of September 22, 1937, this clause relative to requirements of local cooperation was included as follows:

"(b) That local interests shall give assurance satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will construct, free of costs to the United States, a terminal basin at Bogalusa with suitable terminal facilities open to all on equal terms."

These reports and approvals were transmitted by the Secretary of War to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on September 23, 1937, and these provisions became part of the approved project.

Since these requirements relative to ferries and bridges for traffic across the canal were made and approved, all the people who lived in the area at the time have moved out, except one family and the city of Bogalusa is prepared to arrange with this family to move out and afford the necessary compensation for a complete release from the family for any requirement of maintaining a ferry. It is an unnecessary expense for the city of Bogalusa to maintain ferry service across this canal when there will be practically no need whatever for such service when this one family is satisfied.

Mayor Curt Siegelin is ready to go to Washington at any time to submit necessary proof of the situation and the reason for asking that this particular part of the local cooperation requirements be eliminated. I understand that the district engineer's office will not oppose the elimination of this requirement, but will approve a recommendation to that effect.

I believe the elimination could be effected by an act to delete from the requirements of local cooperation the following clause in said paragraph (b): "the ferries and bridges

required for land traffic across the lateral canal and terminal canals." The remainder of the requirements would not be changed.

I believe you stated that you would draw the necessary act after you have secured the necessary information, and request Representative MORRISON to introduce it in the House. If there is any further information you need from this end, let us know and we will endeavor to furnish same.

With personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

C. ELLIS OTT.

PAYMENTS OF CERTAIN UTE INDIAN TRIBAL FUNDS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act of August 21, 1951, relating to certain payments out of the Ute Indian tribal funds. The act of 1951 contains at the present time language prohibiting the Secretary of the Interior from paying over to the Ute Indians more than one-third of the interest earned by the Ute Indian tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury.

The language of the act does not express the intent of Congress at the time the act was passed or at the present time, and this bill by amendment will remove the misunderstanding arising out of the phraseology of the 1951 act.

This bill requests no additional appropriation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2742) to amend the act of August 21, 1951, relating to certain payments out of Ute Indian tribal funds, introduced by Mr. WATKINS was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER CERTAIN INDIAN PROPERTY

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference eight bills to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain named Indian tribes and the individual members thereof. These bills are one more step toward granting the Indians the first-class citizenship they deserve. During the 1st session of the 83d Congress, House Concurrent Resolution 108 was adopted by both Houses expressing it to be the sense of Congress that certain advanced Indian tribes and people be removed from under Federal supervision.

That these Indian tribes are advanced and ready for immediate emancipation is not a new innovation, for Mr. William Zimmerman, Acting Indian Commissioner, testified before a Senate committee in February 1947 that these and other Indian tribes were ready at that time for the removal of all Federal supervision over their properties and persons. Two of the bills are introduced by request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 2743. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Sac and Fox of the Missouri Tribe of Indians located in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, the Iowa Tribe of Indians located in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, the Kickapoo Tribe of Indians located in the State of Kansas, and the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians located in the State of Kansas, and the individual members thereof; and for other purposes;

S. 2744. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Indians of Texas, and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2745. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians located in the State of Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes:

S. 2746. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes and bands of Indians located in western Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2747. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Seminole Tribe of Indians in the State of Florida and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2748. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana, and the individual members thereof; for assistance in the orderly relocation of such Indians in area of greater economic opportunity; and for other purposes;

S. 2749 (by request). A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of Indian tribes, bands, and groups in California and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. 2750 (by request). A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACT RELATING TO REDEMPTION OF CERTAIN UNSOLD HUNTING STAMPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have received a number of letters from businessmen in my State, including members of the Minnesota Retail Hardware Association, urging me to correct inequities in the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act. This inequity is unncessarily adversely affecting the sportsmen who utilize the excellent sporting and wildlife facilities in our community. I refer you to section 2 of the act which provides that "no stamp sold under this act shall be redeemable by said Department in cash or in kind." In practice, this means that the hardware and other merchants of our State and other States who sell duck-hunting stamps for the convenience of our sportsmen do so at the financial risk of having purchased stamps from the post office, some of which remain unsold at the end of the hunting season and for which they cannot get refunds. These merchants desire to be of service to the sportsmen of our State and, therefore, want to make it easier for the sportsmen to be supplied with the necessary hunting stamps. They should, however, not be penalized for carrying out this courteous and useful service.

I therefore introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would correct the inequity in existing law and provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of the unsold Federal migratory bird hunting stamps.

I hope action may be taken on the bill at this session, because the cost of the stamps runs into hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2755) to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2150) providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes; which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE JUDICIARY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit a number of amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1663) to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes, introduced by me.

The purpose of the amendments is to carry out the recommendations of the Commission on judicial and congressional salaries, which submitted its report on January 15.

The amendments are lettered for identification and I have prepared a brief explanation of each amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments and the explanations may be

printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments and explanations will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendments and explanations referred to are as follows:

AMENDMENT A

On page 4, line 12, strike out "$27,500" and insert "$39,500."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT A

This amendment would change the proposed salary for Associate Justices of the Supreme Court to $39,500, the same amount recommended by the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries. An amendment already proposed by the Committee on the Judiciary, in line 8 on page 4, would make the salary of the Chief Justice of the United States $40,000, which is the amount recommended by the Commission.

AMENDMENT B

On page 4, line 12, strike out "$27,500" and insert "$30,500."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT B

This would change the proposed new salary of judges of the circuit courts of appeals to $30,500, to accord with the recommendations of the Commission.

AMENDMENT C

On page 4, at the end of line 14, insert "where such figure first appears therein"; and on page 4, line 15, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$27,500"; and on page 4, line 16, immediately following the figure "$15,000" insert "where such figure next appears therein"; and in the same line strike out "$25,500" and insert "$28,000."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT C

The purpose of this amendment is to carry out the recommendations of the Commission with respect to district judges, and also with respect to the chief judge of the District Court for the District of Columbia, who traditionally has received a salary differential of $500 above the other judges of that court. This amendment would make the uniform salaries of Federal district judges $27,500, and the salary of the chief judge of the District Court for the District of Columbia $28,000.

AMENDMENT D

On page 4, line 19, strike out "$27,500" and insert "$30,500."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT D

This amendment would increase the proposed compensation for judges of the Court of Claims to $30,500, the figure recommended by the Commission.

AMENDMENT E

On page 4, line 23, strike out "$27,500" and insert "$30,500."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT E

This amendment would increase the proposed compensation for judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals to $30,500, the figure recommended by the commission.

AMENDMENT F

On page 5, line 2, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$27,500."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT F

This amendment would increase the proposed new compensation for judges of the Customs Court to $27,500, which is the figure recommended by the Commission.

AMENDMENT G

On page 5, line 7, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$27,500."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT G

The purpose of this amendment is to increase the proposed compensation for judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska to $27,500, the amount recommended by the Commission and the same amount as intended to be provided for judges of the United States district courts.

AMENDMENT H

On page 5, line 11, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$27,500."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT H

The purpose of this amendment is to increase the proposed compensation for the judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands to $27,500, the amount recommended by the Commission and the same amount as intended to be provided for judges of the United States district courts.

AMENDMENT I

On page 5, line 16, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$27,500."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT I

This amendment would increase the proposed new salary for judges of the tax court of the United States to $27,500, which is the figure recommended by the Commission.

AMENDMENT J

On page 5, line 20, after "(j)" insert "(1)", and between lines 23 and 24 insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) Such article is further amended by adding at the end of subdivision (a) (1) thereof the following: 'Each judge shall, upon his certificate, be paid by the Secretary of Defense all necessary traveling expenses, and also his reasonable maintenance expenses actually incurred, not exceeding $15 per day, while attending court or transacting official business at a place other than his official station. The official station of such judges for such purposes shall be the District of Columbia.'"

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT J

The purpose of this amendment is to make applicable to judges of the court of military appeals the same provisions with respect to necessary traveling expenses that is applicable now with respect to all other Federal judges. This is in line with the recommendation of the Commission.

AMENDMENT K

On page 5, line 23, strike out "$27,500" and insert "$30,500."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT K

The purpose of this amendment is to raise the proposed new salary for judges of the Court of Military Appeals to $30,500, in accordance with the recommendation of the Commission.

AMENDMENT L

On page 6, line 5, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$27,500."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT L

This amendment would make the proposed new compensation for Members of Congress, including Senators, Representatives, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, $27,500, in line with the recommendations of the Commission.

AMENDMENT M

On page 6, immediately following line 9, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(c) Section 601 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is further amended by striking out the figure '$30,000' appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '$40,000'."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT M

The purpose of this amendment is to increase the salary of the Speaker of the House of Representatives to $40,000 per year, in line with the recommendations of the Commission.

AMENDMENT N

On page 6, immediately preceding line 10, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President) is amended by striking out '$30,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$40,000'."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT N

This amendment would increase the salary of the Vice President to $40,000 per year, in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission.

DETERMINATION AND ELIMINATION OF COMMUNISTS IN LABOR UNIONS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on March 9, 1953, the bill (S. 1254) to establish effective means to determine Communist domination in unions and to eliminate Communists from positions of influence and control in labor unions, was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Since Senate bill 1254 was referred to that committee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], who now occupies the chair, introduced the bill (S. 1606) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes, dealing with the same subject. His bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. A reading of the bill of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] convinces me that its subject matter is more properly under the jurisdiction of that committee and it would be appropriate for the Committee on the Judiciary to consider the bill of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] in connection with the bill of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

I therefore ask that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1254) and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

This action is taken at the request of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO COMPOSITION AND JURISDICTION OF SUPREME COURT—NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 44

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, January 29, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 44, proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the composition and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule may be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself as chairman, the Senator from Illinois [Mr.

DIRKSEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

LAUNCHING OF THE "NAUTILUS," FIRST ATOMIC SUBMARINE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, this week the State of Connecticut is to be the host to Mrs. Eisenhower, the wife of the President, and a group of distinguished officials of the Government, in connection with the launching of the first atomic submarine, the *Nautilus*, at Groton, Conn.

Connecticut has been identified with the history of the submarine perhaps as much as has any other State, if not more, and we look forward very happily to this invasion of distinguished officials of the United States Government. My colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and I and our wives will be present to welcome the visitors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with this event, an editorial entitled "Revolution in United States Navy Power," published in the New Haven Journal-Courier of January 14, 1954, and a story entitled "Atomic Sub Makes History at Groton," written by Elton C. Fay, Associated Press military affairs writer, and published in the Bridgeport Sunday Post of January 17, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Haven Journal-Courier of January 14, 1954]

REVOLUTION IN UNITED STATES NAVY POWER

Connecticut will be the theater and a week from today the date of an event that promises to revolutionize naval warfare. We refer to the launching on January 21 at Groton on the Thames of the *Nautilus*, the world's first atomic submarine. Its sponsor will be the Nation's first lady, Mamie Eisenhower.

"Submariners believe that the *Nautilus* and its successors will eventually make the oceans unsafe for any kind of hostile enemy craft—including aircraft carriers," says a feature article in Time.

"But the nuclear submarine," says its admirers, "will not stop when it has swept the sea of all surface warcraft. It can attack other submarines, hunting them when they are on the surface or running them down in the depths (if they are not nuclear, too), with its greater speed and endurance.

"Perhaps their most important mission will be as missile-launchers. There is certainly some doubt that an aircraft carrier can approach an enemy-held coast and survive concentrated attack by land-based airplanes armed with atomic bombs. The nuclear submarine can. It can cruise to the enemy coast submerged, rise to the surface briefly at night, launch its atom-armed missiles at short range, and cruise away under water. It is probable that some missiles can actually be launched from beneath the surface. A missile-launcher of this type would be well-night undetectable."

Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, the brains and driving genius of this revolutionary development, is convinced that nuclear submarines will save the Navy from "near-complete elimination as a fighting arm of the Nation. He also believes that out of them will grow the use of nuclear power for constructive rather than destructive purposes."

The *Nautilus* will make 25 knots, perhaps 30 knots (35 m. p. h.), comparing with the best destroyers that steam only slightly faster, when the sea is not too rough, and "most other escort vessels are sluggards by comparison. If necessary, nuclear submarines can be made faster than any surface-going vessel."

The supreme advantage of the *Nautilus* however, will be her independence of batteries. Rickover was graduated from the Submarine School at New London and spent three seagoing years as a peacetime submarine officer. He knows well the "pig-boats" and the hated villains, the storage batteries, they carry in their bellies, good for less than an hour of propulsion at full speed.

"During peacetime maneuvers, a submarine swimming deep in the sea is at peace with the world. Though a storm may be roaring overhead, the ship does not roll or pitch. But during a wartime attack, the battery is a weak resource. Even when 'fat' (fully charged), it is good for less than an hour at full speed.

"The attack is made; the torpedoes hiss toward their victims. Then comes the bad moment. Down the white torpedo wakes race the enemy destroyers, the sharp pings of their sonars searching for the submarine. It dives for the depths, and then come the crashing depth charges.

"If the submarine survives, there is a desperate, quiet cat and mouse game of search and evasion. If the submarine tries to escape at full speed, it will soon exhaust its battery. If it tries to save its battery by drifting slowly through the depths, the destroyers above may find it by sonar. Usually it compromises, moving at moderate speed as it twists and turns.

"As the deadly game goes on, the chant of the battery man makes the crew's blood run cold. Every time he speaks, he reports a lower reading. Lights and fans are turned off to save trickles of current. The air grows hot and foul. When the battery's last charge is gone, the submarine must rise to the surface, perhaps to destruction.

"A nuclear sub will be entirely different. It could swim submerged at full speed as long as desired. No destroyer could catch it. Rising quickly from the depths it might even destroy destroyers."

Time's story of the development of the *Nautilus*, prototype of atomic propulsion for the Navy, is an absorbing one. Hardly less gripping than the scientific marvel is the human story of Admiral Rickover, son of a Jewish tailor in a Russian Polish village, who has achieved a notable feat in pioneer engineering, against many odds (human and material) but with the backing of some farseeing leaders like Admiral Nimitz, Navy Secretary Anderson, and President Eisenhower.

[From the Bridgeport Sunday Post of January 17, 1954]

ATOMIC SUB MAKES HISTORY AT GROTON

(By Elton C. Fay)

When Mamie Eisenhower smashes a bottle of champagne across the sleek nose of the U. S. S. *Nautilus* at Groton next Thursday, she will be christening a vessel the Navy expects to be the deadliest and most versatile craft in history—the first atomic-powered submarine.

Designed to demonstrate high underwater speed, ultra-long cruising range and elusive skill, the *Nautilus* and other A-subs to follow her will be able to fight with either standard explosives or turn to nuclear missiles, torpedoes or mines if a mission requires them.

She will have a choice of power to drive her propellers—atomic, diesel engine, electric motor.

The Navy is confident the submarine will work, even though no craft or vehicle before it—afloat, on land or in the air—has been propelled by the power of the atom. For months the Atomic Energy Commission and the Navy have been test-operating an exact reproduction of the *Nautilus'* nuclear power plant. Out on the Idaho desert steam from the atomic firebox has been spinning a turbine and driving a propeller like one of the two on the *Nautilus*.

FINAL TESTS TO COME

But it will be sometime next summer, when the *Nautilus* puts out for sea trials, before the designers, nuclear physicists, shipbuilders, sliderule experts and others can be sure how efficiently the first of the atom-powered undersea boats will operate. First she must undergo final fitting out.

Until then, the engineers cannot tell whether she will live up to expectations of an underwater speed of about 30 knots. Nor can they be sure about the flexibility of power, general maneuverability of the boat, exact burn-out rate of atomic fuel under actual operating conditions and the noise generated by the submarine when under way—an important factor in working against an enemy's antisubmarine efforts.

The *Nautilus* most certainly will have "bugs." Most existing conventional military equipment—planes, tanks, and guns—had mechanical or other defects when first tried which had to be corrected. Certainly the world's first seagoing atomic powerplant, for which there has been no precedent, will have its share.

But the Navy is so confident it is preparing for the *Nautilus* all the modern armament needed when she is turned over to the fleet for combat operation.

Built into her are torpedo tubes to fire the new, fast and silent electrically driven torpedoes with target-seeking guidance system. These tubes can handle torpedoes with atomic warheads when such weapons are developed.

CAN RELEASE A-MINES

The same procedure used in planting conventional mines can be used to release atomic mines through the torpedo tubes.

The Navy plans to equip the atomic submarines with gear for carrying and launching the guided missile named Regulus. These missiles already have been fired from submarine decks and could easily be adapted for a nuclear explosive warhead.

Exponents of the atomic submarine claim it is virtually an all-purpose craft. It will have world-girdling range, they say, and ability to remain submerged for weeks or months, limited only by the endurance of the crew; underwater speed matching most big surface ships; hull strength to dive well below the levels attained by any present boats, where detection is difficult or impossible; and it will be able to use its main, atomic engine for full power submerged without resort to the limited speed of electric propulsion.

With these qualities of a true submarine, its proponents say, here are some of the missions the A-sub can perform:

Attack enemy war and merchant ships.

Distribute mines along enemy coasts and harbor approaches.

Patrol for long periods to watch for aerial or sea-borne attackers.

With its high speed, new and still secret underwater detection equipment and homing torpedoes, it is a natural for hunting down and killing enemy submersibles.

MORE LIVING SPACE

With more living space than other submarines, *Nautilus*-class boats can speed in close under water, surface, deliver troops ashore and dart out again—doing what other conventional submarines have done before—but far faster and on a bigger scale.

Shore bombardment: Guided missiles will bring targets even well inland under the gun of the atomic submarine. The Regulus is reported to have a range of about 400 miles.

Under-ice operation: Because *Nautilus*-class boats will operate for long periods completely independent of the atmosphere, the frozen sea capping the northern top of the world will be no obstacle. Using sonar gear to probe under masses of icebergs or thick ice fields, the A-subs can cruise unseen toward the northern coasts and shipping lanes of Eurasia, where Russian shipping and cities heretofore have been beyond reach of attack.

Feats like these were beyond even the rosiest dreams of men like J. P. Holland and Simon Lake, who pioneered workable craft in the nineties.

Inventors experimented with a submersible boat in the American Revolution. By the Civil War the device still was crude but good enough to attempt, in one instance, the sinking of a Confederate vessel. Manpower was used to operate the screw of that clumsy little craft.

FIRST SUB FROM HOLLAND

By the turn of the century, there were power plants and weapons needed to make a submarine practical—internal combustion engines, electrical storage batteries and torpedoes. The United States Navy bought its first submarine from Holland in April 1900.

But for years the submarine remained small—and uncertain. It grew bigger with World War I, when Germany turned to all-out undersea warfare, building 365 submarines.

By 1925 submarines of 4,000 or 5,000 tons were in the fleets of the big powers. When World War II started fleet submarines ranged around 1,500 tons. A few huge submersibles were built, two by the United States, equalling or surpassing the *Nautilus'* approximate 3,000 tons.

This time the German master submariners built 1,162 submarines—and had 751 destroyed during the course of the war they lost.

Not all of the submersibles were big. Japan tried out some midget boats, notably in the strike at Pearl Harbor. Britain built tiny boats for special operations against German naval craft hiding in Norway's fjords. The United States displayed little interest in midget submarines until last year, when an experimental model was ordered from an aircraft manufacturing company.

With losses of conventional-type submarines mounting, Germany brought out the snorkel midway in World War II. Its ability to provide air for its diesel engines while running just below the surface, by use of the snorkel, or breather tube, put the Nazi U-boat fleet back on top for months.

NAZI INVENTION TOO LATE

Eventually improved methods for locating submarines which did not have to resurface to recharge batteries were developed, and the Allies beat back the menace again. When the war ended, Germany had a closed-cycle internal combustion engine that required no oxygen from outside for operation, enabling the submarine to operate at regular diving depth and at speeds substantially above that of battery-electric motor propulsion. It was a fine invention and could have won the undersea campaign for the Nazis—except that, like the rocket-powered fighter plane and the V–1 bomb, it came too late. The war was lost by then.

The United States adopted Germany's snorkel (actually a Dutch invention seized by the Nazis) after World War II.

In some boats they combined the snorkel device with an improved streamlined hull to produce the guppy type boats. (The name guppy derives from the phrase "greater underwater propulsion.")

Two years ago the Navy moved into a new field of design, the hunter-killer submarines. These boats, smaller than fleet or Guppy class submersibles, are designed for the sole purpose of tracking down and destroying other submarines.

The day of the atomic submarine has arrived only by tremendous scientific effort, the expenditure of millions of dollars—estimates of the *Nautilus* cost range to as high as $55 million, including the boat and the atomic power plant—and some family bickering within the Navy.

Although the contract with the Electric Boat Co., to build the *Nautilus* wasn't awarded until August 21, 1951, much sporadic study had been made before that time.

Navy officials had predicted in 1946, a year after the first atomic explosion, that nuclear power could be harnessed to drive a naval craft. Indeed, they say that as early as 1940 the Naval Research Laboratory had organized a nuclear power research group.

In the discussions and planning that followed, the submarine found favor as a test vehicle. One reason may have been the submariners' quest for new and better power, while the rest of the Navy was giving primary attention to aviation, carriers, bigger and faster cruisers and destroyers.

In 1946 the Navy formed another small group and assigned its members to study at the AEC's Oak Ridge, Tenn., atomic laboratory. One was Capt. H. G. Rickover.

Rickover, an untiring zealot, plunged deeply into the subject of nuclear power propulsion. After ups and downs in the program, a nuclear power branch of the Navy's Bureau of Ships was formed, with Rickover as its chief.

His administrative techniques, including bypassing superiors when he decided delays were unreasonable, brought him into considerable disfavor with some high brass. Twice a selection board passed him over for promotion to rear admiral.

RICKOVER PASSED OVER

There is an unwritten, but usually firmly followed rule, that a man twice passed over for promotion is retired. That's what faced Rickover, in the midst of his big job.

But pressure from congressional and other sources kept him on the job, and when his name came up a third time, a selection board made him an admiral.

While the hull of the *Nautilus* was still building, and before the first land-based prototype for her atomic engine had been tested, the Navy recommended to Congress and received approval for the construction of a second nuclear submarine, the *Sea Wolf*.

A third craft, which the Navy says will have significantly higher speed than even the high underwater speeds designed for *Nautilus* and *Sea Wolf*, has been approved for construction.

The *Sea Wolf* still will be built because it will use an atomic reactor of a type different from those in the *Nautilus* and the third sub. The Navy wants experience with all the types it can get.

The *Nautilus'* power plant was built for the AEC by Westinghouse Electric Corporation.

Fuel for the reactor is uranium–235, one gram of which produces the equivalent of about 24,000 kilowatt hours of heat. The heat produced in the reactor is transferred by water in heavily shielded pipes to the steam turbine.

The reactor is heavily shielded in a compartment to stop dangerous radiation from reaching crew members who will live and work within a few feet of it.

Steam pressure in the *Nautilus* will be only about 300 pounds, well below the 500 or 600 pounds used in the conventional turbines of many naval surface craft or the 1,200 pounds designed for the new *Forrestal* class supercarriers. This is not because the atomic reactor couldn't produce almost any temperature, but because the rapid transfer of the water through the pumps and piping of the heat exchange system would wear out the equipment by friction.

Control of power in the plant will be double. Control rods can be inserted into the reactor to dampen or stop the nuclear fission process and thus regulate the atomic fire. And the turbine also has normal steam control equipment.

Built into the submarine is a multitude of safety gadgets, including automatic controls to stop reaction if an emergency occurs, and various instruments to warn of radiation or leakage of contaminated liquid. The designers say valves and pipe fittings are made as finely as watches to prevent even a drop of liquid escaping.

Except for her size and an oddly rounding, blunt bow (to give better underwater speed) the *Nautilus* looks much like a conventional *Guppy* submarine externally. She differs from previous submarines, however, by having only a single-walled hull. The double hull of standard submersibles is used for ballast and fuel storage. The *Nautilus* will use tanks.

FORCES OF CONFORMITY A DANGER TO AN EFFECTIVE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there appeared in the January 17 edition of the New York Times a letter entitled "Forces of Conformity Seen as Danger to Effective Foreign Service," written by five distinguished members of the Foreign Service, Norman Armour, Robert Woods Bliss, Joseph C. Grew, William Phillips, and G. Howland Shaw. These men are among the most experienced, expert, and respected career diplomats we have ever had in our Foreign Service. In their letter they point out that attacks on the Foreign Service from outside sources which have questioned the loyalty and moral standards of its members, as well as the procedures within the State Department, have had sinister and very dangerous results. They write, in part:

> The conclusion has become inescapable, for instance, that a Foreign Service officer who reports on persons and events to the very best of his ability and who makes recommendations which at the time he conscientiously believes to be in the interest of the United States may subsequently find his loyalty and integrity challenged and may even be forced out of the service and discredited forever as a private citizen after many years of distinguished service. A premium therefore has been put upon reporting and upon recommendations which are ambiguously stated or so cautiously set forth as to be deceiving.

That, Mr. President, describes a terribly dangerous situation, particularly at a time when every possible step should be taken to safeguard the integrity of, and to strengthen, our Foreign Service. The letter from these experienced and very distinguished career diplomats should be carefully read and considered by the Members of the Congress and by all other citizens. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKING OUR DIPLOMATS—FORCES OF CONFORMITY SEEN AS DANGEROUS TO EFFECTIVE FOREIGN SERVICE

(The signers of the following letter are present or past holders of ambassadorial or other diplomatic posts.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Since the time when the United States assumed a significant place in international affairs, at the turn of the century, the Foreign Service has been an organization of growing importance. Today it would be impossible to exaggerate that importance, whether it is considered from the angle of the constructive influence of the United States in world affairs or from the more selfish angle of our national security.

It is to the official representatives of the United States abroad that foreign Governments and peoples have the right to look with confidence for the most authentic interpretation of American values and the American point of view, and it is upon these same representatives that the President, the Secretary of State and others engaged in formulating our foreign policy must rely for accurate information concerning persons and events abroad.

At present these demands upon the Foreign Service are more exacting than ever before; not only because the events to be reported on have become more complex, more difficult of analysis, but also—and primarily—because the emotional climate at home has made objective reporting unusually difficult.

QUALITY OF EVIDENCE

Recently the Foreign Service has been subjected to a series of attacks from outside sources which have questioned the loyalty and the moral standards of its members. With rare exceptions the justification for these attacks has been so flimsy as to have no standing in a court of law or in the mind of any individual capable of differentiating repeated accusation from even a reasonable presumption of guilt. Nevertheless these attacks have had sinister results.

The conclusion has become inescapable, for instance, that a Foreign Service officer who reports on persons and events to the very best of his ability and who makes recommendations which at the time he conscientiously believes to be in the interest of the United States may subsequently find his loyalty and integrity challenged and may even be forced out of the Service and discredited forever as a private citizen after many years of distinguished service. A premium therefore has been put upon reporting and upon recommendations which are ambiguously stated or so cautiously set forth as to be deceiving.

When any such tendency begins its insidious work it is not long before accuracy and initiative have been sacrificed to acceptability and conformity. The ultimate result is a threat to national security. In this connection the history of the Nazi and Fascist foreign services before the Second World War is pertinent.

The forces which are working for conformity from the outside are being reinforced by the present administrative set-up within the Department of State which subordinates normal personnel administration to considerations of security.

EVALUATING FINDINGS

It is obvious, of course, that candidates for the Foreign Service should be carefully investigated before appointment and that their work should at all times be under the exacting scrutiny of their professional superiors. But when initial investigation attaches undue importance to such factors as even a temporary departure from conservative political and economic views, casual association with persons holding views not currently in fashion or subscription to a periodical labeled as "liberal"; when subsequent investigation is carried to the point of delaying a promotion list for a year and routine transfers from one post to another; when investigations of individual officers must be kept up to date to within 90 days; when an easy path has been opened to even the anonymous informer; and when the results of these investigations are evaluated not by persons experienced in the Foreign Service or even acquainted at first hand with conditions abroad, but by persons of quite different experience, it is relevant to inquire whether we are not laying the foundations of a Foreign Service competent to serve a totalitarian government rather than the Government of the United States as we have heretofore known it.

Fear is playing an important part in American life at the present time. As a result the self-confidence, the confidence in others, the sense of fair play, and the instinct to protect the rights of the nonconformist are—temporarily, it is to be hoped—in abeyance. But it would be tragic if this fear, expressing itself in an exaggerated emphasis on security, should lead us to cripple the Foreign Service, our first line of national defense, at the very time when its effectiveness is essential to our filling the place which history has assigned to us.

NORMAN ARMOUR.
ROBERT WOODS BLISS.
JOSEPH C. GREW.
WILLLIAM PHILLIPS.
G. HOWLAND SHAW.

WASHINGTON, *January 14, 1954.*

AMENDMENT OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from Malcolm P. McNair, Lincoln Filene professor of retailing at Harvard University, dealing with the amendment proposed to the Robinson-Patman Act.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Boston, Mass., December 21, 1953.

Mr. J. A. SLOCUM,
Association of Independent Food Dealers of America,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. SLOCUM: I am delighted to learn that under your leadership a group of independent food merchants is planning a vigorous fight to regain the natural economic rights and competitive strengths that have been taken away from them under the existing court interpretation of section 2C of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The case against section 2C in its present well-established interpretation rests solidly on the following basic points:

1. Section 2C is in no sense an integral part of the Robinson-Patman Act as a whole, and the anti-price-discrimination provisions of the act are actually quite independent of section 2C.

2. The original purpose of section 2C was to correct certain abuses in buying practices which took the form of dummy brokerage payments, i. e., payments made for services allegedly rendered when in fact no such actual services were rendered. The validity of payment for services rendered was a fundamental part of the original concept. It was only the phony brokerage fees that were sought to be eliminated.

3. But because of cloudy and unskillful wording of the language of section 2C, an interpretation was developed by the Federal Trade Commission and the courts which wholly changed the original intent of the section (actually, in fact, by altering the original punctuation), and converted it into a virtual bulwark of monopoly for food brokers. The services rendered concept was interpreted right out of the section, and in its stead was introduced the quite different concept that payments for services of a brokerage nature, i. e., services of bringing buyers and sellers together, could be made only to brokers and not to any other person who might actually perform these identical services.

4. The notion that any particular type of business enterprise or business institution has the right to monopolize the performance of and the payment for any particular set of services or functions is entirely alien to the American free competitive system. The whole history of the evolution of American business is that business enterprises have in the main been free to experiment in the performance of different groups of activities with a view to finding where these activities could be handled at the lowest cost. Manufacturers have been free to go into wholesaling, wholesalers have been free to go into manufacturing, companies have been free to do their own selling or to employ manufacturers' representatives. Only in this way can progress and evolution take place.

There is nothing sacrosanct about the activities of brokers. The admittedly useful function of brokerage, that is, the bringing together of buyers and sellers, is a business task that can be performed in various ways: by independent agencies, by persons affiliated with buyers, or by persons affiliated with sellers. Essentially, when such business contracts are made, services are rendered to both parties, and the progress of commerce thus is expedited. It is a wholly outmoded economic idea that in a sales transaction one party loses and the other party gains. Actually in a bona fide sales transaction both parties stand to gain through expediting the movement of goods from the manufacturer to the consumer. Hence there is no reason to assume that fraud is involved if the organization performing the sales contact or brokerage function is one that is affiliated with the buyer rather than with the seller. The courts have in fact recognized that services thus performed are genuine and are of benefit to the sellers. Nevertheless, by twisted reasoning the Commission and the courts have denied to cooperative groups of independent food distributors the right to earn brokerage fees for services actually rendered.

5. There has thus been established a monopoly position for food brokers which is entirely contrary to the spirit of our antitrust laws and constitutes a serious injury to the small independent food retailers and distributors in whose interest the Robinson-Patman Act was originally passed. And it is a fact that many of the cases that have been brought by the Federal Trade Commission under section 2C are against these small-business men who were supposedly to be benefited by the act.

6. In the highly competitive situation in the food trades today the only salvation for small independent retailers and wholesalers is to take a leaf out of the chain store book and organize cooperatively to apply the basic principle of integration of the distributive functions, i. e., combination of retailing and wholesaling tasks, which has been the fundamental factor in the success of chains. That such informal integration by means of cooperative efforts can be successful is a well-established fact; but the growth of such cooperative ventures is today penalized by this twisted interpretation of section 2C of the Robinson-Patman Act which denies to cooperative groups the right to earn brokerage fees for bona fide services actually performed and instead confers on a small group of food brokers a cloak of legal

monopoly that is abhorrent to the fundamental principles of the American competitive system and wholly inconsistent with the spirit of the antitrust laws.

7. Since the existing interpretation is thoroughly embedded in law by a whole series of court decisions, the only remedy lies in the amendment of section 2C in order to restore the original intent.

Sincerely yours,

MALCOLM P. MCNAIR.

SALE OF CERTAIN SEED FOR EXPORT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the agriculture program was designed to help the American farmer. However, I have pointed out how this program, in many instances, works to the disadvantage as well as to the advantage of our farmers. For instance, many farmers during the recent years have been compelled as a result of the high prices to stop seeding their farms with certain types of cover crops such as clover and vetch seeds. To offset the high prices of these various types of cover crops the Department of Agriculture has even adopted a program of subsidizing a certain portion of his seed cost. The irony of the situation is that these high prices are a direct result of the same Government program which, for the past several years, has been purchasing and storing these same types of seeds at artificially high prices. There is nothing in the law which made it mandatory that the Secretary of Agriculture should have purchased these commodities.

Recently the Government disposed of several million pounds of these clover and vetch seeds at a small percentage of their original cost with a proviso that they be used for export only. The result is that now the farmers in other countries will be able to buy these various types of cover crop seeds at prices much lower than being paid by the American farmers.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a breakdown of the most recent transactions involving the sale of 21 million pounds which originally cost the American taxpayers $7,356,415.80. They were sold for export for $1,774,002.91, or a net loss of $5,582,412.89.

This is further evidence of the failure of the rigid high support policies of the past administration. It further emphasizes the need of Congress giving prompt attention to the President's recommendation that we adopt a more sensible formula for computing these support prices.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sale to Albert Dickinson Co. (for export only)

Variety of seed	Crop year	Quantity (pounds)	Price f. a. s. port (cents)	Sale value	Less freight and handling [1]	Net proceeds	Cost [2]
Northern alfalfa	1952	6,000,010	10.00	$600,001.00	$42,893.71	$557,107.29	$2,145,489.88
Alsike clover	1952	2,000,041	9.00	180,003.69	19,827.86	160,175.83	510,774.47
Ladino clover	1951	1,998,684	17.50	349,769.70	9,419.98	340,349.72	2,516,642.96
Birdsfoot Trefoil	1951	33,316	10.00	3,331.60	204.35	3,127.25	32,969.35
Do	1952	86,707	10.00	8,670.70	507.99	8,162.71	65,217.19
Total		120,023		12,002.30	712.34	11,289.96	98,186.54
Red clover:							
Basic	1950	527,177	13.50	71,168.90			
Below basic	1950	300,134	8.50	25,511.39			
Total 1950		827,311		96,680.29	7,154.01	89,526.28	321,135.66
Red clover:							
Basic	1951	410,248	13.50	55,383.48			
Below basic	1951	96,085	8.50	8,167.23			
Total 1951		506,333		63,550.71	4,368.03	59,182.68	182,977.10
Red clover:							
Basic	1952	2,775,700	13.50	374,719.50			
Below basic	1952	270,802	8.50	23,018.17			
Total 1952		3,046,502		397,737.67	29,710.93	368,026.74	1,083,518.90
Total red clover		4,380,146		557,968.67	41,232.97	516,735.70	1,587,631.66
Tall fescue:							
Basic	1952	380,615	5.00	19,030.75			
Below basic	1952	119,400	4.925	5,880.45			
Total		500,015		24,911.20	2,674.39	22,236.81	100,880.03

[1] Terms of sale f. a. s. port, delivery in store therefore charges allowed on computed basis.
[2] Average book value as of Nov. 30, 1953.

Sale to Sinason Teicher International Grain Corp. (for export only)

Variety of seed	Crop year	Quantity (pounds)	Price, basic f. a. s. [1] [2]	Sale value	Add inspection and storage [3]	Net proceeds	Total cost [4]
Common vetch	1952	6,000,000	2.77	$163,574.69	$2,532.91	$166,107.60	$396,810.56

[1] Price subject to discounts for below basic purity and germination in accordance with contract.
[2] Terms of sale f. a. s. port, delivery made at port by CCC.
[3] Charges for inspection and November storage for buyers account.
[4] Average book value as of Nov. 30, 1953, plus unpaid charges.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statement by him commenting on President Eisenhower's state of the Union message.

HEALTH PROGRAM — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 298)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States recommending legislation to improve the health of the American people. The message has been read in the House, and the Chair, without objection, will refer it to the appropriate committee without its being read in the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, may cross reference then be made in the RECORD of the House proceedings?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes. The message will be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see proceedings of the House of Representatives for this day.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the President's admirable message on the health problems of the United States again illustrates the care with which the President is preparing his overall, farseeing, and progressive program. As one who was raised in a physician's family, during my years in the Senate and as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have been giving a great deal of personal attention to our national health needs.

I am particularly gratified that the President has emphasized the strengthening of the Public Health Service throughout the country and the further development of our admirable hospital plan.

The really new feature of the President's recommendation is the program for expanding voluntary health insurance and recommending that the Federal Government work out its plans for reinsurance and coinsurance, acting with these voluntary health plans.

I am entirely in accord with the President's position that socialized medicine is not needed in the United States. We can solve our problems while still adhering to this statement in the President's message:

> Freedom, consent, and individual responsibility are fundamental to our system. In the field of medical care, this means that the traditional relationship of the physician and his patient, and the right of the individual to elect freely the manner of his care in illness, must be preserved.

As chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it is my purpose promptly to introduce in the Senate the necessary legislation in the form of what might be called the administration bills

to carry out the President's recommendations.

Mr. President, I might add that the regular Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will take this matter up, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], who had planned to be present this morning to say a word, but I am speaking for him. He asked me to announce that the hearings on this important legislative matter will be started at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to join with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey in the introduction of the bills designed to carry out the President's message.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am happy to know that.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement regarding the anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and I usually collaborate in this effort.

January 17 marks the 248th anniversary of the birth of one of the most illustrious of all Americans—Benjamin Franklin, who was born in Boston in 1706.

In 1722 at the age of 16, Franklin wrote a number of articles over the signature of Mrs. Silence Dogood. They represent Franklin's first literary efforts and were published in his brother's New England Courant. In April 1722, Franklin wrote as follows:

> It is undoubtedly the duty of all persons to serve the country they live in, according to their abilities; yet I sincerely acknowledge that I have hitherto been very deficient in this particular; whether it was for want of will or opportunity, I will not at present stand to determine: Let it suffice, that I now take up a resolution, to do for the future all that lies in my way for the service of my countrymen.

In another 1722 Dogood paper Franklin commented:

> I have from my youth been indefatigably studious to gain and treasure up in my mind all useful and desirable knowledge, especially such as tends to improve the mind, and enlarge the understanding: And as I have found it very beneficial to me, I am not without hopes, that communicating my small stock in this manner, by piecemeal to the publick, may be at least in some measure useful.

He was only 16 years old when he made those statements.

Whether as statesman, inventor, author, printer, moralist, traveler, or humanitarian, Franklin's advice is founded on the premise that a man's ultimate purpose in life is service to, and the love and respect of, his fellowmen.

Today in the solving of the problems which now confront us may we demonstrate the same common sense, courage, loyalty, and abiding faith in freedom that characterized Benjamin Franklin during all the 84 years of his illustrious life.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts in observance of the anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

Benjamin Franklin was a distinguished citizen of both Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. He was born in Boston, but his principal activities for this Nation—and his greatest activity was in behalf of the freedom of our country, as we now enjoy it—were carried on in Philadelphia.

Benjamin Franklin was probably the first American to become a citizen of the world. I am happy to join my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts in observing the anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation to the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] on pages 6, 12, and 13 of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, once again we are debating the question of United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway. This is a problem which I have discussed in the committee room, on the Senate floor, and in conversation with colleagues ever since I have been a Member of this body.

In every discussion I have consistently stated that I was in favor of the power aspects of the proposed development. The obstacles to the construction of the power project have now been virtually removed. I use the word "virtually," because there is a court action pending. That court action, I hope, may be soon decided, so that the joint undertaking of the State of New York and the Province of Ontario may proceed, because I have always believed that this great power resource should be developed by the proper public authorities in the best interests of the Nation. We in New England need lower cost power. While a very large part of the United States share of the power output of this project will be absorbed in the State of New York, I am glad that the order of the Federal Power Commission approving the project provides for a fair share to the New England States within economical transmission distance.

In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower recommended the construction of the seaway itself in the interest of national security. I have great respect for his judgment. It is my firm belief, nevertheless, that there are many questions in connection with the seaway, as such, that have never been realistically and practically answered. These questions first arose in my mind when I was Governor of Massachusetts and when the relationship of the seaway to the port of Boston was under frequent discussion. How much the seaway, as presently contemplated, will affect the port is a question with which I propose to deal briefly later in my remarks. In the main, however, I prefer to raise fundamental questions concerning the project generally that have been on my mind for some years.

It is said, however, that these questions are now beside the point because Canada is going ahead with or without us. If this be so, why is it not wiser to let the Canadian Government proceed? In my opinion Canada will get much the larger benefits from the seaway.

In recent years we have spent billions of dollars to assist other countries. In this instance, our friendly neighbor to the north is willing to undertake the seaway. Why should we not be grateful to Canada for undertaking this major project without insisting upon our aid? The United States built the Panama Canal. The English and the French built the Suez Canal. Those canals have been profitably and advantageously used by other nations.

It is argued, however, that if we do not insist upon building a part of the waterway in United States territory, we cannot have a voice in its management. The basic assumption of this argument apparently is that only physical control of some portion of the waterway will guarantee us such a voice. Accepting this assumption for the moment, I should like to point out that we already control most of the Thousand Islands section of the waterway. In the Sault Ste. Marie, we control all the modern locks.

Quite apart from the question of physical control, we have a form of protection of far greater importance between friendly nations. I refer to the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. That treaty guarantees equality of treatment in access and in toll charges to the vessels of both the United States and Canada where navigational works in the boundary waters are concerned. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the pertinent provisions of the treaty at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE I

> The high contracting parties agree that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally, subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation and applying equally and without discrimination to the inhabitants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries.

It is further agreed that so long as this treaty shall remain in force, this same right of navigation shall extend to the waters of Lake Michigan and to all canals connecting boundary waters, and now existing or which may hereafter be constructed on either side of the line. Either of the high contracting parties may adopt rules and regulations governing the use of such canals within its own territory and may charge tolls for the use thereof, but all such rules and regulations and all tolls charged shall apply alike to the subjects or citizens of the high contracting parties and the ships, vessels, and boats of both of the high contracting parties, and they shall be placed on terms of equality in the use thereof.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If physical control and treaty guaranties are not enough, we have, in addition, the protection given by competing modes of transportation. The willingness of these to take over waterway traffic would, without more, effectively keep toll charges within reasonable limits.

The pending bill, I observe, requires the corporation thereby established to negotiate with the Canadian Seaway Authority rules for the measurement of vessels and cargoes, and rates of tolls to be charged. Nothing is said, however, about permanent machinery for the adjustment of these rules and charges. Is Canada to have a voice proportional to its total investment? If so, Canada will always be in a position to outvote us.

Mr. President, we can hope to obtain agreement on toll charges satisfactory to us only through negotiation. I fail to see how our negotiating position is improved by setting up a corporation and building elaborate locks and canals. If Canada goes ahead, let us negotiate with Canada. The whole history of the two countries justifies complete confidence that Canada will meet us halfway.

I submit, therefore, that the question before us is not merely whether we wish a voice in the management of a project which, in any event, will be constructed. It is, as it always has been, whether or not its construction is of advantage to the United States.

If the United States is not committed to its financial success, we will be in a position to decide on the merits what projects on our side of the international boundary are necessary to enable us to make the best possible use of the waterway at the least possible cost and the minimum interference with other national interests. From this point of view, participation in its management can only distort our perspective and confuse our judgment. If we participate in it and join in its management at this stage, we are forever committed to make it a success if we can. We may find ourselves in the position of spending more and more to shore up an investment we should never have made. This is not good business, when we know Canada is ready to go ahead and feels that it will be of distinct benefit to her.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I regret that I did not hear the beginning of the Senator's argument. However, one fact in connection with this project which is very obvious is that, if it is to be developed into a truly modern waterway for ocean-going vessels it should be developed to a depth of 35 feet. If that were to be done, the additional costs, which are not estimated here, would be approximately $500 million in the Welland Canal segment, and about $500 million in deepening the channels in the Great Lakes. Obviously half of those expenses would be expected to be borne by the United States, because up to this point the United States has been deepening the connecting channels in the Great Lakes. In the long run, if we wanted to join Canada in such a project, would it not be fair for Canada to open up the entrances to the Welland Canal and on the St. Lawrence, to give access to the Great Lakes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to my colleague and friend from Louisiana that I take up the question of deepening of channels later in my discussion. What I have said so far is that if Canada intends to go ahead with the project, we should let her do so. Then we can decide what we should properly do, without making a commitment in advance on our side to make the project a financial success. Certainly there are some channels and harbors on the Great Lakes which would have to be deepened. If we deepen them more than 27 feet, the Sault Ste. Marie canals and Welland Canal will also have to be increased in depth.

My point up to the present time has been that if Canada wants to go ahead with the project, we should let her do so. We went ahead with the building of the Panama Canal, and the British went ahead with the building of the Suez Canal. We should not make a commitment at this time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusettts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Massachusetts has referred to a treaty with Canada concerning fair and equitable treatment. However, if we allow Canada to go ahead with the building of the canal—and Canada has already served notice she will go ahead—we shall have absolutely nothing whatever to say about the administration of the canal or with regard to the tolls, and, what is even more important, with regard to those features of the canal which would lend themselves to the strengthening of our defenses and the safeguarding of our security, which is the very point the President of the United States made in his message, when he emphasized the fact that he is desirous of building the project, as I am desirous of doing, on the ground of security and defense of our country.

I go even one step further than the President. I am in favor of the project for the reason cited by the President and also as a part of our economic development. Great areas of our Middle West will certainly be benefited by the building of the project. In turn, the State of New York, of which I am a representative in the Senate, and the State of Massachusetts, of which my distinguished friend is one representative, will also benefit. I do not believe there can be the slightest doubt about that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from New York that I take up those points a little later in my remarks. Very briefly I will say that with respect to toll charges, the same principle applies to us that applies to Canada. On the question of administration, if Canada builds the waterway, of course Canada will administer it. A 27-foot channel is a 27-foot channel whether Canada builds it or we build it. With regard to the question of security, if the distinguished Senator from New York will permit me, I shall take up that point a little later in my discussion.

I do not deny that the waterway may to some extent help the United States. It may facilitate transportation from the Midwest and the States east of the Rocky Mountains to the sea. It may assist in bringing high-grade iron ore from Labrador to the blast furnaces of our Central States. At certain times of the year it may lower the transportation costs in international trade of our industrial products from the great cities of the Midwest. These possibilities I, for one, clearly recognize.

But whether these are real advantages depends upon a number of questions that I have never seen fairly and properly answered with relation to United States participation in the waterway although I have asked them repeatedly. The first question is:

What will be the real overall cost of the waterway to the United States?

This question does not now involve precisely the same elements presented in previous debates. The cost of the power project is no longer in issue, and the United States is no longer obligated to assume a share of the cost of Canadian sections of the navigational works. Besides, it is now proposed that the navigational works to be constructed within our borders be financed by a bond issue to be amortized by toll charges over a 50-year period or less.

These changes in the proposed undertaking, however, do not substantially diminish the ultimate cost to the United States. The power project has always been assumed to be self-liquidating, and so no net saving results from shifting our share of the initial construction cost from the Federal Government to the State of New York. And while the bonds issue will make unnecessary appropriations for the navigational works in the International Rapids, it covers only a small fraction of the costs which the Federal Government and the States and municipalities will eventually have to assume.

It makes no sense to deepen the channel between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes if the channels connecting the Great Lakes are not also deepened. The cost of deepening these channels must, therefore, be included as a part of the true cost of the waterway. The committee which reported the pending bill has not asked us to authorize this project at the present time, but it is inevitable that we will ultimately be asked to do so. Preliminary estimates based on partial engineering surveys, which did not include borings, put the

cost at $99.5 million. This figure, if we can judge by previous experience, is probably less than one-half the actual cost. As pointed out by the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions of the House Appropriations Committees in a report dated August 16, 1951—almost 3 years ago—the cost estimates for 182 river and harbor and flood-control projects increased by 125 percent between their original submission to Congress and their final stages. The cost estimate at the time of their authorization was $2,638,517,000; the final estimates were $5,912,451,000. Even wider discrepancies between estimates and actual costs have been true of other great canals like the Panama and the Suez.

Again, it would not be sensible to make the whole Great Lakes region accessible to vessels drawing up to 25 feet—I use that figure because that is the maximum draft that could go through a 27-foot channel—without also making it possible for such vessels to get into the Great Lakes harbors. Once in the harbors, the ships must be efficiently unloaded, loaded, and turned around. It is essential for profitable merchant-marine operation to cut down turn-around time to the minimum. This means the most improved dock facilities, and they do not come cheap. I refer to docks and harbors and additional wharves.

No up-to-date estimates of the cost of these improvements are available. The only careful study of the question was made in 1929 by the Brookings Institution. This study put the cost at $340 million which, in terms of modern building costs, would be at least $890 million, less the cost of such improvements in Great Lakes harbors and docks as have been made since 1929. We do have, nevertheless, at least one relatively recent indication that the Brookings Institution survey is not far from the mark. That is a city of Buffalo survey made in 1941, which estimated $47 million as the cost of deepening Buffalo Harbor and port facilities so as to make possible the quick handling of vessels capable of navigating a 27-foot waterway.

What is proposed as a $100 million self-liquidating project of great advantage and no actual cost will be, in fact, a $1 billion project of doubtful value, nine-tenths of which will never be self-liquidating.

I do not for one moment argue that all the projects included in the remaining nine-tenths should be self-liquidating any more than most of the river-and-harbor improvements in our seaboard cities should be, but I believe that we should face the facts and make sure that we understand what obligations will be imposed upon us by the existence of the 27-foot waterway. We should also make sure that the benefits are commensurate.

Second. Is there a real prospect that the International Rapids section can pay for itself? That is the section which the United States would construct under the present bill.

The possibility that our share of waterway construction in the International Rapids section can really be self-liquidating depends, of course, on revenues derived from tolls. The size of these revenues depends, in turn, upon the amount of traffic to be carried. But no thorough study of potential waterway traffic has been made since 1941. Since then, there have been nothing but guesses, some of which are quite surprising. Consider, for example, the case of iron ore. In 1941 the possibility of substantial shipments of iron ore was entirely discounted. By 1947, however, the Department of Commerce had made iron ore the waterway's largest single source of revenue with annual shipments of 20 million tons. Between 1941 and 1947 there was a completely new estimate made of the highest potential traffic so far as iron ore is concerned. In 1948 the Department increased the estimate to between 30 million and 37.5 million tons. That estimate, which is still relied upon, accounts for 40 percent of all estimated waterway revenue. But what would the Department of Commerce estimate today or for the future?

Since 1941, it is true, the high-grade iron ore reserves of the Mesabi have been consumed at an unprecedented rate. Since then, moreover, ore deposits in Labrador and Venezuela have been developed. But these facts do not justify the current estimate of waterway traffic in iron ore. It is hardly likely that Venezuelan ore will reach the waterway at all. In the meantime, half a billion dollars has been spent on developing ways of using taconite, of which there are vast and virtually inexhaustible quantities in the Great Lakes region. New sources of high-grade ore are also being developed in the Steep Rock Lake region of Ontario with scheduled initial production of 3 million tons annually.

That leaves Labrador as the only ore region from which shipments are likely to go by the waterway. But the company responsible for developing these deposits has scheduled annual production of only 10 million tons. Not all of this, moreover, will go by the waterway. The same company is constructing in England two large ore carriers which require a channel depth of at least 36 feet. Surely it is not expected that these will use the waterway; but if such is the expectation will the company ask us to dredge the channel deeper in order to accomodate its ore carriers?

The other remarkable fact about the iron-ore estimate is that it apparently includes shipments in both directions. This conclusion I base on statements in the 1948 report of the Department of Commerce to the effect that its 30-million to 37.5-million-ton estimate includes 9 million tons of iron ore exported by Canada through the waterway. It hardly seems possible that iron ore would be brought into the Great Lakes area, then loaded back aboard ships, and brought out again.

A realistic estimate of iron-ore shipments would thus seem to be a fraction of the current estimate. What, then, becomes of the figures on which the revenue-producing capacity of the waterway is predicated?

A second major item of estimated waterway traffic is petroleum. This item in volume and revenue is exceeded only by iron ore and grain; based on annual shipments of from 6 million to 20 million tons, it is optimistically expected to produce annually between $1,500,000 and $5,000,000 in revenue. There are today, however, two pipelines from Portland, Maine, to Montreal, and the Texas fields are directly connected to Chicago by pipeline. Canadian oil production is increasing rapidly and will undoubtedly be made available to the Great Lakes region by pipeline. On top of all this, I have been assured by our large tanker fleet operators that they have no plans to move oil up the St. Lawrence Waterway even if it should be constructed. How, then, can the estimated revenues from petroleum be justified?

If the other elements of the total revenue estimate relied upon to support the claim for self-liquidation are as much open to question as are those for iron ore and petroleum, the whole structure, in my judgment, becomes pretty shaky.

Third. Can the proposed 27-foot channel be used by our oceangoing merchant marine?

The proposed 27-foot channel is really a waterway rather than a seaway. To this, I believe those who argue in favor of this project will agree. The Committee on Foreign Relations report says that—

> Seventy-five percent of the traffic will be transported in lake-type vessels which can be satisfactorily handled by the 27-foot channel.

In the Canadian House of Commons, the Minister of Transportation emphatically stated that—

> Oceangoing vessels are not expected to play a major role on the seaway.

Furthermore, Gen. A. G. I. McNaughton, cochairman of the International Joint Commission, was quoted in the Buffalo News of March 28, 1953, as saying, with respect to the use of the waterway by oceangoing vessels:

> The general feeling is that far from wanting them in, we want them out.

Mr. President, so far as oceangoing vessels flying the flag of the United States are concerned, the proposed 27-foot depth of the seaway will keep them out. In 1952, when this subject was under debate, I stated that only 6.6 percent of our active merchant fleet, as it was then constituted, could navigate this channel with a depth of 27 feet and carry a payload. That figure included both our Government-owned and our privately owned fleets. Since then, a number of our smaller vessels have been withdrawn from active service. As a result, today, only 2 percent of our entire privately owned merchant fleet could navigate the proposed seaway. Since World War II, the United States has not constructed one single oceangoing merchant vessel which draws less than 29 feet fully loaded. This is because only vessels of that draft are capable of combining the speed necessary to our defense needs with the carrying capacity essential to economical operation.

It is then truly an inland waterway rather than a seaway which we are talking about if we consider the oceangoing merchant marine of the United States.

Fourth. Will the waterway cause severe loss to our Atlantic and gulf coast ports?

No accurate estimate, so far as I know, is available of our immense investment in these ports. Even without the diversion of our traffic to the waterway, many of these ports are having hard financial sledding. Yet the waterway will deprive them of traffic without any compensatory reduction in carrying charges. These charges can be met, therefore, only by spreading them over the remaining traffic, and the result will be still another increase in the operating costs of our merchant marine.

The case of Boston, of course, is the one most familiar to me. If the waterway shall be as successful as its proponents claim, then, I ask them, will it not shift the routing of many overseas imports which today come through Boston for distribution to westward points? Among these are burlap, coffee, rubber, vegetable oils, and wool, amounting to about 22 percent of Boston's total general-cargo imports. Some of these would inevitably be diverted. Among Boston's major exports the one most seriously affected is likely to be grain. Grain is the foundation of the North Atlantic cargo trade because it furnishes the so-called bottom cargo which ships must have in order to load profitably the other high-paying freight. Boston's annual exports of grain now average about 250,000 tons. If Boston gets no grain, it can expect little other export cargo.

Another adverse effect of the waterway upon our ports will be the necessity of maintaining standby facilities, idle during the late spring, summer, and early fall, for use during the 4 or 5 months in every year when the waterway is icebound. Every figure which I have seen indicates that this waterway will be icebound for at least 4 months every year.

What will become of the longshoremen and stevedores needed only during those warmer months? Will they become migrant workers shuttling annually between the lakes and the coast?

The impact of a seasonal demand for men and port facilities will be even more sharply felt in the lake ports where the long winter completely shuts down shipping activity.

The effects upon our Atlantic and Gulf coast ports are dramatized most vividly, perhaps, by contrast with the boost to Montreal as a transfer point. All waterway traffic except the fraction which finds accommodation in small, shallow-draft sea-going vessels will have to be transported in lake-type carriers and trans-shipped at Montreal to deep-water vessels. To make this possible the entrance to Montreal harbor is being deepened to a uniform channel depth of 35 feet. This means that Montreal will attract new traffic at the expense of our own seaboard cities.

Mr. President, at this point, without placing it into the RECORD, I may say that I have before me a long list of channels and harbors on our sea coasts which shows that every important harbor that is presently being deepened is being deepened to a minimum of 30 feet, with some of them being deepened to as much as 40 feet. None of them is being deepened to less than 30 feet. This indicates that navigation facilities in harbors today should provide for a minimum of a 30-foot depth. All the major Atlantic seaboard harbors which do not already have 35-foot channels are being deepened to at least 35 feet, as is being done in Montreal.

Fifth. Will the construction of the waterway make it more difficult than ever for our deep-water domestic merchant marine to survive?

The importance of our merchant marine to the long-term security of the United States is indisputable. President Eisenhower, in fact, has referred to the merchant marine as "the fourth arm of our national defense," and every far-seeing American must recognize the truth of this description. We are dependent today upon imports from abroad for no less than 55 strategic materials. We cannot afford to assume that foreign ships will always be avalaible to transport them to our shores. Moreover, our security depends upon men in American uniform stationed in 50 countries on all the continents. Our links with them must be maintained by dependable seaborne transportation. The thinking of our strategic planners increasingly emphasizes the importance of a mobile force, poised for deployment wherever it may be necessary to repel, or assist in repelling, aggression. This concept reinforces the necessity for a fast, modern merchant marine.

The waterway will inevitably divert cargoes from American vessels. The committee's report on the pending bill estimates 25 percent of seaway traffic as "subject to movement in seagoing ships." Almost all of this will be carried by shallow-draft, foreign-flag vessels directly between the Great Lakes and foreign ports. These shipments will thus be lost to our merchant vessels, whose deep draft will exclude them from the waterway.

What will be the result? One possibility is that our active merchant fleet will shrink to the extent of the business thus diverted to its competitors from abroad; although the Department of Defense has testified that it is already deficient in many respects. To prevent this, we probably would be obliged to increase our operating subsidies so as to make it possible for our fleet to operate at a level sufficient to meet its commercial and defense responsibilities.

The only other course open to us would be to construct new types of shallow-draft ships capable of competing for waterway traffic such as iron ore and wheat. But such vessels are less economical to operate than the large deep-draft carriers which now constitute our fleet. This development, too, would thus make necessary increased operating subsidies.

Sixth. Will not the construction of the waterway bring disastrous competition to our intercoastal Great Lakes shipping?

In giving a greater number of foreign-flag vessels access to the Great Lakes, the waterway will make possible increased competition between our Great Lakes operators and cheaply operated foreign carriers in traffic between Canadian and United States lake ports. The outcome is likely to be a demand for operating subsidies to assist our Great Lakes operators to compete.

This is not a fantastic possibility. Indeed, a resolution already filed by my good friend the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who has at heart the best interests both of our merchant marine and of the lake region, calls for a treaty with Canada which would bar foreign-flag vessels from competition for this traffic with United States and Canadian ships. But what will be the reaction of our friendly allies to such an exclusive international agreement? Are they not in a position to retaliate? Could they not deny our ships the right to carry cargo between their ports? Could they not also exclude our ships from their canals at Suez, Kiel, Manchester, and other places?

Seventh. Will not the waterway increase the operating costs of competing inland transportation systems?

Here again, as in the case of our ports, we have an enormous investment with enormous carrying charges which cannot be reduced in proportion to the traffic lost by diversion to the waterway. Some considerable part of the waterway traffic, to be sure, can probably be accumulated at each end of the waterway during the months when it is icebound.

Other traffic, however, particularly in manufactured goods, will be thrust upon the railroads and trucklines when the waterway is blocked by ice, only to be diverted again when the waterway is open. The same problem of maintaining idle facilities and idle men thus presents itself as in the case of our ports, ports on the seacoast and in the Great Lakes. The inevitable result will be pressure for increases in railroad and truck rates, involving a cost to shippers which will tend to offset whatever they may succeed in saving through shipments by the waterway in warmer months.

Eighth. Will the waterway increase the vulnerability of our inland transportation system to bombing and sabotage?

While I do not place great stress on this point, simple commonsense compels the recognition that the complicated lock system of the International Rapids works will make them highly vulnerable to a single bomb or a single explosive-laden ship.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that a single ship sunk anywhere along the channel would close the channel to navigation for the entire length of the seaway?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think that would be true, as it is true of the Panama Canal and other canals, among them the Cape Cod Canal, with which I am familiar. The extent of interference with navigation would depend on how large the ship was, where it was sunk, and other factors.

Mr. LONG. Is it not also true that an attack upon any of the 15 locks through which a ship would have to pass, if we include the locks on the Welland Canal, all the locks on the Canadian

segment, plus the locks in the International Rapids segment, would mean that the entire project would be closed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct. I do not place a great deal of weight on the argument against our contributing to the waterway in the St. Lawrence because of the likelihood of bombing or sabotage, but what the Senator says is correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as the argument is made that the project is necessary for the national defense, is it not true that a successful attack upon any one of the locks could bottle up a fleet that was inside the Great Lakes, and that those ships, therefore, would be unable to reach the high seas and thus would be unable to serve this Nation in time of emergency?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator says is correct.

The destruction of a lock either by a single bomb or a single explosive-laden ship could easily make the waterway useless for months at a time, for blockage at any point would completely interrupt the flow of traffic. By contrast, railroads and truck lines can very quickly recover from the interruption caused by bombardment or sabotage.

However, the very existence of the waterway will have diminished the ability of other forms of transportation to take over the job of the waterway when it is out of commission. In my judgment, this fact more than offsets its claimed advantages to our national security.

These, then, are the questions which still disturb me about the proposed project. Though I recognize its advantages, they seem to me to be outweighed by the added difficulties it will create for our Atlantic and Gulf ports, our oceangoing merchant marine, and our competing systems of inland transportation and by the tremendous added costs necessary to make it useful to us. I shall, therefore, vote against the pending bill.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I desire to make a few concurrent comments. First, I wish to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts upon his very eloquent statement concerning the issue. Certainly he has made the facts very clear, and I commend him for his most excellent statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to make a few observations concurring in what the Senator from Massachusetts has said, without his losing the right to the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that I have finished, and yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (pro tempore). The Chair had recognized the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from Michigan and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], both of whom desired to obtain the floor. I appreciate their permitting me to have the floor.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me for 2 or 3 minutes?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the conclusions reached by the able Senator from Massachusetts in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway bill. It is of considerable comfort to me, as I am sure it will be to many other Senators, that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Service is able to take the position on the bill he has announced, inasmuch as it has been said that to build the seaway or have it go forward at this time was in the interest of national security.

Mr. President, I have discussed the bill with some of those engaged in the steel industry, particularly those located in the Midwest, because they seem to be the most affected. One of the most reliable men in the steel business, in whose favor I happen to be very much prejudiced, and who I hope will permit me to quote him personally on the Senate floor within a few days, indicated to me that this project is absolutely unnecessary so far as the steel industry is concerned. Perhaps it would help the steel industry; I have no doubt that it would. Perhaps it would afford something in the nature of an indirect subsidy to the steel industry, if the legislation were enacted. But this is no time to be considering an indirect subsidy to the steel industry or to any other industry.

Mr. President, I should like to make one further point. It is my profound belief that at the present time we should defer projects involving large expenditures. They should be delayed until such time as their sustaining influence may be of benefit to the United States. When such expensive public projects are put into competition with all the spending now going on in connection with the military effort, taking into consideration the very high level of industrial activity, they add to the inflationary forces, and also add to the cost of Government. So even if the project were desirable, I would suggest that this is not the time to undertake it. I hope very much that Canada will not go ahead with it.

I thank the Senator from Michigan for permitting me to say those few words.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senate is today considering the St. Lawrence seaway bill (S. 2150), introduced by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], myself, and other Senators. The bill has the unanimous approval of the President, the Cabinet, and the National Security Council.

We are all familiar with the favorable report on the bill submitted by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. Furthermore, my colleagues are aware that it is the considered judgment of the executive branch of our Government that participation by the United States now in the construction and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway "would increase its defense advantages to this country" and "would strengthen our strategic position at all times respecting use of the seaway for transportation of basic materials."

The preponderance of evidence in support of the measure, because of the contribution the seaway will make to our national defense and to our national economy, is in itself sufficient to justify favorable action on the bill by the Senate.

As my colleagues know, I have fought steadily, year in and year out, in the ranks and with our leadership, for endorsement and enactment of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, because of the need for the seaway in furthering the development and progress of our great Nation. There is serious doubt in my mind whether we can continue to expand our great national industrial production and thereby continue to raise our standard of living without having the benefit of the St. Lawrence seaway.

BENEFIT TO MICHIGAN

In the case of Michigan, for example, completion of the seaway will enable Michigan products to reach farflung markets with greater ease and at less cost, thus promoting their sale and stimulating production. In this manner, it will be of great benefit to all segments of the economy of the State of Michigan.

Certainly, without the St. Lawrence seaway, our progress as an industrial Nation would be impeded.

Mr. President, in these days, when we are talking about returning to a peacetime economy, the St. Lawrence seaway is one of the projects which can help us in that effort. About $336 million of work, to be done by private industry, by cities, and by States, is planned in the Great Lakes region. That expenditure will not be contributed to by the United States Government.

The progress of this Nation, and of the world, can be written in the histories of trade and transportation.

Need I mention the Panama and Suez Canals, the transcontinental railroads, the networks of airlines which cover the globe, to bring to mind for a moment the developments, the progress, and the achievements which have been made as a direct result of transportation and trade?

Of course, Mr. President, one of the greatest inventions of all time was the wheel, which enabled the transportation of articles much more easily than upon the shoulders of men. As the efficiency of transportation has increased, and as power has been put to work, replacing the use of men's muscles, of course the productivity of man has increased, the distribution of his production has broadened, and therefore the standard of living has risen.

SEAWAY NOT A REGIONAL PROJECT

From a global view, it would seem at first glance that the St. Lawrence seaway is a regional project, beneficial only to a segment of the United States and Canada. But that is true only at first glance.

Mr. President, I realize that the Senators from the States along the east coast who object to the St. Lawrence seaway project believe that its construction will not be beneficial to their States; they honestly believe that the benefits which would be obtained by their States from construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project would be so slight as not to justify its cost. However, Mr. President, I cannot share those views. I believe it will benefit all States and the Nation as a whole.

Great industrial regions have been built in the Midwest. While it is the heart of our industrial production, that does not mean that all our national production is centered in the Great Lakes area. Along the Atlantic seacoast, in the Far West, and in the South, industry has spawned and expanded beyond the dreams of our forebears to make this Nation great. We speak of these areas as regions, but only to describe them for geographical identification. Actually, they are interlinked, dependent upon one another to survive or to grow. This is one of the principal reasons why America has become great. After all, Mr. President, the existence of highways and other communication facilities, both within the United States and with other nations, has helped make our Nation great.

In all the history of the world, no nation has survived when it ignored the development of its natural resources and advantages to the utmost of man's ability, skill, and knowledge. Those who did ignore that development have passed into an eclipse in history and greatness.

No one can disagree that the present Great Lakes seaway is the finest inland waterway in the world. It has contributed much to the successof our country's position of eminence in the world today. Because of it, the Nation as a whole has benefited, and mankind has profited. Therefore, we, as a Nation, cannot afford to sit idly by and let this great waterway remain in status quo when man is capable of improving it beyond the expectations of the early discoverers of these waters.

SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT MEANS PROGRESS

The development of the St. Lawrence seaway means more than a fourth coastline for the United States. It means progress, a means whereby our Nation will reach even greater heights than those we enjoy today.

I am one who believes that this Nation is still in a pioneering stage, that we have just begun our climb up the ladder of greatness as a nation in world leadership, industrial production, service to mankind, and a better way of life. Our future is bright, not only in terms of long-range thinking, but in terms of short-range thinking as well. The St. Lawrence seaway should be a part of that progress. It is a sound business venture, and is needed for the defense of our Nation.

Its construction will mean more jobs; its operation will provide more employment. The new industries which are more than possibilities are difficult to predict; but, certainly, experience is in my favor when I say that every new development by which man has harnessed natural resources or used his ingenuity to make possible devices or vehicles to facilitate travel and to transport goods has resulted in benefits throughout the world.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to commend my colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan, for making such an able presentation of the reasons why we should take part in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. He represents one section of the Nation where heavy industries, producing heavy machinery and other heavy freight, are located. If the St. Lawrence seaway is developed, it will make it possible for ocean-going vessels to dock at the important harbors in the Great Lakes, there to take on the heavy freight that is produced in that area. That not only would greatly enhance the prospect of developing further the industries of the central area of our Nation, but it would give us an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of an ocean freight rate, not only to serve Duluth and the Lake Superior region, at the head of the Great Lakes, but also to serve the great industrial section which is so ably represented by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

So I am most pleased and happy to be able to listen to the very able presentation he is making of the reasons why the United States should join Canada in the development at this time of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Minnesota, and I thank him for his courtesy.

The lower cost of manufacture as the result of cheaper transportation in itself will save much in terms of effort and money—money that can be utilized to produce and purchase more goods for better living.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] seemed to think that Canada would benefit from the seaway to a greater extent than we would. I cannot conceive that Canada, with a population of approximately 15 million people, could benefit to a greater extent than this nation, with 160 million people. Canada will benefit. There is no doubt about that. Her people would not want to build this project if there were no benefit in prospect for Canada. But the project will greatly benefit the United States. In fact, the project will be of great benefit to both nations.

I am aware that Canada, our sister nation, will build the St. Lawrence seaway regardless of the stand of the United States. Our neighbor to the north is more than anxious to make the seaway a reality and have gone forward with its plans, in the sincere belief that the benefits which will accrue to the nation as a whole are an absolute necessity if Canada is to continue in stride toward a level of greatness that all of us expect of her.

Canada has developed a great deal in the past few years. She is developing every year, because she is looking ahead. We ought to welcome such an attitude on the part of Canada, just as we are pleased to have our own people look ahead and develop.

Yes; the building of the St. Lawrence Waterway is an inescapable conclusion. The workingman wants it, the farmer desires it, and industry is behind it.

We have more than sufficient evidence of the sincerity of Canada's intentions.

Therefore, it is my humble belief that we have before us a bill in which the question is not, Are we going to provide legislation for the construction and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway?

The question is, Should the United States participate with Canada in the construction and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway?

I have said before on this floor—and I repeat it—that if this situation had existed in a far-off foreign land, this nation would not only have insisted upon the project being developed by canals and locks, but would have taken the dollars of United States taxpayers and made a gift of them to the foreign nation in order to accomplish the development. We would have said that the development of the project was of sufficient importance to the over-all progress of the world to justify spending the money of our taxpayers on it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Michigan is entirely correct in his statement. It is inconceivable that any nation on earth should have permitted an opportunity such as that which is afforded by the development of the St. Lawrence seaway to lie unrealized for as many years as this project has remained undeveloped, especially when we take into consideration the benefits which would be derived from the St. Lawrence seaway, which would provide an opportunity for oceangoing vessels to serve the heavy industries located in Ohio, Michigan, New York, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Minnesota, as well as the great grain-producing sections of the Northwest, in the Dakotas, and even Nebraska, Montana, and Idaho. Products from all those States could be shipped to the Great Lakes and there loaded on ocean-going vessels.

There can be no question that our Government would aid foreign countries in developing potential benefits of such magnitude as those represented by the St. Lawrence seaway. The project has heretofore been blocked only by division among our people, as between those concerned with railroads and seaports, and those concerned with other interests.

Mr. WELKER rose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Idaho wishes to have stricken from the RECORD the statement that this project would be of benefit to Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. That is not true. I do not rise to be frivolous or smart.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator yield in order that I may ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I am very much interested, naturally, in the question of how the St. Lawrence Seaway might affect the State of Idaho. I certainly am sincere in that concern.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a clarifying statement?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out that about 25 years ago some 20 States of the Union appropriated $2,000 each for the purpose of promoting the St. Lawrence Seaway. They were not interested in the question of power. I think Minnesota took the lead at that time. The farthest southern State to appropriate funds to promote the seaway was South Carolina. The State farthest west was Idaho. It is quite apparent that neither of those States would have taken the action which was taken had it not been felt that the project would be of benefit to them.

Among the States which appropriated funds to promote the St. Lawrence Seaway was the State of West Virginia, where John L. Lewis, an ardent opponent of the seaway at the present time, holds sway. About 25 years ago West Virginia made an appropriation of $2,000 a year to promote the seaway. I suppose it was felt that coal could be exported through the Ohio ports. I do not know.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield in order that I may ask a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Who was it in Idaho who appropriated $2,000 a year?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe it was appropriated by the State legislature. I think that was true in all the States. There were about 20 of them. I shall be glad to obtain the list of States and insert it in the RECORD. As I say, South Carolina was the farthest south. Presumably South Carolina was interested in selling lumber in the Great Lakes area. I do not know with any certainty just what the interest was.

Mr. WELKER. I am very much interested in hearing about the appropriation of funds by the State of Idaho to lobby for Federal legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a matter of record. I shall be glad to place in the RECORD the names of the States to which I have referred.

Mr. WELKER. Can the Senator from Minnesota tell me how this project would help the State of Idaho?

Mr. THYE. Idaho would derive great benefit if ocean-going vessels could dock at Duluth. Idaho is a producer of dairy products. The great consuming centers are either on the east coast or the west coast. The west coast takes care of its own requirements for dairy products. So dairy products from Idaho would go East. They would go to the harbor of Duluth, for shipment to the eastern markets by way of water.

Idaho is a great producer and shipper of potatoes. That product is classified as heavy freight. Idaho could send its potatoes by truck or by railroad to the head of the lakes, to be transferred there to oceangoing vessels for shipment to eastern consuming markets, where our surpluses from the Midwest must go to find a market. Therefore Idaho, even though it be some distance from the head of the lakes, still could derive benefit, because of the lower freight charges which would be imposed upon its product, which is produced in surplus. Because it is produced in surplus it must go to the eastern markets. They are the natural markets, if the product does not go to a foreign port.

Mr. WELKER. It was my impression that a substantial portion of our dairy products went to California. If the Senator has any information on that subject I should be glad to have it. I have never understood that our dairy products went to Duluth.

Mr. THYE. They would not go to Duluth unless there were an advantage in the form of lower rates on oceangoing vessels. If opportunity is afforded to ship the products of the Senator's State, whether they be dairy products, potatoes, or lumber, on oceangoing vessels, it is quite conceivable that the State of Idaho would be benefited by such opportunity, and by the lower rates available on oceangoing vessels. That is the benefit which I see in the overall project. Some of the dairy products of Idaho have gone east. I am familiar with the movement.

Mr. WELKER. Such products are stored all over the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to say to the Senator from Idaho, it is contemplated that approximately $336 million would be spent by private industry, cities, and States in the Great Lakes area to provide for the development which would follow the construction of the seaway. That expenditure would be made in connection with harbors, docks, and so forth.

The Senator represents a great State. Idaho produces minerals and potatoes, among other products. It is world-famous for its potatoes. As the Midwest develops and as its standard of living goes up, naturally people will eat more Idaho potatoes. Of course, we produce just as good potatoes in Michigan.

Mr. WELKER. Just a minute, please.

Mr. FERGUSON. However, I do not wish to get into an argument with the distinguished Senator from Idaho on the subject of Michigan potatoes and Idaho potatoes. I believe that the construction of the seaway will aid in selling the famous Idaho potatoes in Michigan and in other States, because the people in those States will be able to pay the price asked for Idaho potatoes. As the West develops so will the great State of Idaho develop. As the East develops, so will the great State of Idaho develop.

NATIONAL DEFENSE ASPECTS OF SEAWAY

Mr. President, I should like briefly to discuss some of the principal reasons behind the Defense Department's strong stand in favor of the pending legislation.

These reasons are not based on any sectional point of view. The Department of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and our military planning agencies have the heavy responsibility of preparing for the successful defense of our Nation and its freedoms. They cannot take the narrow view and still be true to their obligation to the Nation. They believe we should approve this bill and permit the United States to share in the control of the seaway for these reasons:

First. The St. Lawrence Seaway will provide better lines of supply for essential raw materials and will also increase the availability of those raw materials. Its construction will make the iron ore of the Labrador-Quebec region available at low cost for use in the smelting operations of the steel mills of the Nation, four-fifths of which are located in the immediate area which would be served by the seaway. If war were to come—and God forbid it will ever come again—all the steel capacity of America would be needed. If the steel capacity were available and used economically it might mean the relieving of great suffering and devastation in our country.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan with respect to a great product of my State, the world-famous Idaho potato. I should like to ask him how the construction of the seaway would affect our potato industry. The Senator from Michigan stated that the potatoes could be shipped to Duluth or other ports and loaded on oceangoing vessels. Is it not a fact that we can now ship our world-famous Idaho potatoes to Portland, Oreg., and there load them on oceangoing vessels? Portland is only 400 miles from Idaho. By like token we can ship the potatoes to Los Angeles. I should like to have the Senator's views on that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. The difficulty would be that if the producers in Idaho were to ship the potatoes to the west coast, for delivery on the east coast, the potatoes would have to be shipped down the west coast, through the Panama Canal, and up the east coast. Certainly the potatoes could be shipped faster and cheaper via a Great Lakes port and through the seaway.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator refers to potatoes shipped to the eastern seaboard and unloaded there, and to potatoes shipped to Europe.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

IMPORTANCE OF LABRADOR ORE DEPOSITS

Mr. FERGUSON. The Labrador ore deposits themselves have a national defense significance because they can be mined by open-pit methods. This makes it possible for their production to be expanded quickly and cheaply in case of an emergency. It is not necessary, as is the case in other mines, for new shafts to be dug at great expense and over a long period of time.

Industry is making very large investments in Mesabi Range to develop taconite. It is also making very large investments in Labrador and in Venezuela to develop other sources of iron ore. It would not be doing so if it felt it could place its whole reliance on taconite.

From a national defense point of view, the Labrador ore deposits are the most valuable of all our foreign sources, because they are the only ones which do not have to be shipped across open water.

The St. Lawrence Seaway offers a safe, inland water route from Labrador to the Great Lakes. Shipments of ore from Venezuela or Liberia would be subject to submarine attack in the Atlantic Ocean. I am sure Senators remember the difficulty we had during World War II in getting tankers through from Venezuela.

As a matter of fact, the years of our lowest ore imports in two decades took place during World War II, when the submarines roamed the sea lanes. Yet it was during those years that our need for foreign ore was the most urgent.

Nor is iron ore the only essential raw materials which the seaway would aid in making available. Titanium and magnesium deposits, found in Canada, would also be more easily available to this country. Likewise the seaway would give a big boost to explorations in the Labrador-Quebec area of Canada which could also result in the development of new sources of minerals essential to the national defense.

ALTERNATE SEAWAY ROUTE PROVIDED

Second. The second reason for the military desirability of the seaway is that it will provide an alternate sea route to the ports of the United States—and Detroit, for example, is a port of the United States, the second largest in the Nation, as a matter of fact—from Europe and other areas of the world. I believe the Defense Department has in mind that we would not have a sufficient number of ports available in case of a national emergency, such as a third world war.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. During World War II certain vessels were constructed at various ports on the Great Lakes—Duluth among them—and shipped in sections and later assembled on the east coast. In that way the industries on the Great Lakes were employed in the defense effort during World War II. Those plants were able to perform such services, which were required for our defense needs during World War II. Therefore, a sufficiently deep channel would be required to permit the passage of ocean-going vessels in the event we should become involved in a world war, because otherwise it would be necessary to again build the ships in sections and assemble them at another point.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is absolutely correct. We had the manpower available during World War II. The seaway would shorten the construction and delivery time.

Third. The seaway would shorten by about 1,000 miles the open-sea route between the ports of the United States and the British Isles and northern Europe. This would be of tremendous value in the event this Nation should be forced into war. It would also free large naval convoy forces for other service. Substitution of a sheltered sea route along the St. Lawrence River for the open waters of the Atlantic could result in the savings of hundreds of lives and millions of dollars worth of shipping. If the seaway had been in existence during the course of World War II, there is strong possibility that more than 70 American and allied merchant ships would not be at the bottom of the sea today.

I hope Senators from the seacoast States who oppose the pending bill will ponder these facts long and carefully before casting a vote against the seaway.

Fourth. The construction of the seaway would also add to the total transportation facilities of the United States, and I believe this would be highly desirable from a military and defense standpoint. Certainly, there can be no criticism of the tremendous job which the Nation's railroads and Atlantic ports did for the Nation in World War II; but no nation has had adequate transportation facilities or too many ports in time of war.

Fifth. United States participation in the seaway will permit an increased utilization of the shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities, as well as other industrial potentials of the Great Lakes area, which were used in the last World War, as was indicated by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

This Nation's experience during the last war showed how urgently those facilities might be required, and how helpful they could be. And make no mistake about it, there are some fine shipbuilding and repair facilities in Michigan and on the Great Lakes.

EUROPEAN LESSONS APPLICABLE

As a member of the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees, I have been impressed by the difficulties in the establishment of infrastructure in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These difficulties have been encountered because of the lack of basic transportation facilities in Western Europe, such as airports, waterways, highways, and railroads, which, once in existence, could be used either for civilian or military purposes.

Development of infrastructure, or the underlying foundation of an economy for either peace or war, has long plagued the buildup of defense in Europe. The United States has infrastructure—in our great transportation network, in our communications system, in our fuel and power developments. The St. Lawrence Seaway would be an addition to this infrastructure of almost incalculable value and significance through the increased capacity which it would give our national transportation system.

SEAWAY HAS LONG BEEN SEEN AS NECESSARY

As long ago as 1927, Herbert Hoover, then chairman of the American St. Lawrence Waterway Commission, strongly emphasized the military importance of the seaway. As Mr. Hoover himself recalled it in hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee 20 years later—

> We had been through World War I and through the intense transportation difficulties of that war. It seemed to us that, as a matter of national defense, this project should be established at once.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have long supported the seaway. In 1946, the then Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, transmitted their views to the Secretary of State. Secretary Patterson wrote:

> The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that it would be in the interests of national security to complete projects, such as these, which would have distinct military advantages and would materially increase the industrial and transportation potential of the United States.

It is significant, I think, to point out that at that time the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were Admiral Leahy, Admiral Nimitz, General Arnold, and General Eisenhower, now President of the United States.

JOINT CHIEFS SUPPORTED SEAWAY IN 1952

The Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs repeated their support of the seaway in 1952 and again this year, repeating the reasons they had stated earlier and adding that the seaway "will facilitate the transportation of munitions to overseas bases." They pointed out, as I have indicated, that it would shorten by 1,000 miles the open-sea route to the British Isles.

Mr. President, anyone who went to the port of New York during the Second World War and found miles upon miles of track, thousands upon thousands of freight cars which were unable to get into the port, knows that the railroad facilities were not sufficient to make that great industrial and port center entirely efficient. The St. Lawrence Waterway, if it had been in existence at that time, would have been of great value in transporting our freight overseas.

In 1953, the National Security Council found that "early initiation and completion of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Seaway is in the interest of national security." And in 1954, President Eisenhower has again called for construction of the seaway.

Mr. President, the importance of the seaway to our national security makes it all the more necessary that we participate in the construction, management, and control of the seaway.

There are those who say, "Let Canada build it," and who apparently do not care about the tolls or operating regulations which may be imposed on American shipping through this canal.

Are those who make that argument indifferent to protecting the defense interests of the United States?

SHARE IN DEFENSE; PRIORITY NEEDED

If Canada builds the seaway alone, we shall have no voice in the defense arrangements for it.

Equally important, and of more immediate consequence in the event of an

emergency, we shall have no voice in the matter of transportation priorities when shipping begins to pile up under the burdens of war.

Let me read from a letter which Gen. Omar N. Bradley, when Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, wrote to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] February 8, 1952:

> It is conceivable even though improbable that at some future time a situation may arise whereunder the United States might find itself in a situation of international tension, with Canada neutral. In such an event United States ownership and operational control of the St. Lawrence Seaway might make an important contribution to the security of the United States. It could be visualized that exclusive Canadian ownership of this seaway might well be embarrassing to the United States under such conditions.

Mr. President, when all the other arguments of the opponents have been answered, they fall back on the old wornout argument that the seaway is vulnerable to attack.

As was said on the floor today, in case of a ship being sunk in the St. Lawrence River, traffic would have difficulty in passing through the channel. If that time comes, Mr. President, we must be in position to remove ships which may be sunk. We must be in position to keep them from being sunk, just as we must be in a position to protect our great cities and, indeed, the entire Nation.

Mr. President, the seaway can be defended as easily as can any other installation in that section of the North American Continent. It is no more open to sabotage than is any defense plant.

No one can give absolute, positive assurance that the seaway will never be blown to bits; neither, in this age of the hydrogen bomb, can anyone give such assurance that Washington or Baltimore or the port of New York will never be blown to bits. However, I have confidence in the ability of this country to defend itself.

Those who oppose this bill argue, on the one hand, that the seaway would be impractical and, on the other hand, they admit it would be so important and would present such an inviting target to the enemy that we could never defend it.

Mr. President, there are also those—and they happen to be on the seacoast—who argue that the proposed seaway will be of little value because it will be only 27 feet deep. They argue that it ought to be 35 feet deep. If the seaway would hurt their shipping and, as some persons indicate, would destroy their ports, certainly it would do more harm if it were 35 feet deep than it would if it were built to a 27-foot depth.

ALTERNATE LINES OF COMMUNICATION DESIRABLE

But let me return for a moment to one of the reasons why the Joint Chiefs of Staff support this project. It would, they have said, provide "an additional line of communication." In other words, it would give us another basket in which to put some of our eggs. These eggs are not in enough baskets now, Mr. President. We have too few lines of communication and too many bottlenecks. The St. Lawrence Seaway, by giving us an additional line of communication, would make us less vulnerable to attack on any individual line because we would have more alternate routes to turn to in case one should be put out of commission.

During the period of World War I and World War II, virtually all of our eggs, insofar as iron ore was concerned, were in one basket. Almost all the iron ore used in America's last two wars has come from the great iron ranges of northern Michigan and Minnesota, and most of that ore was funneled to the mills through the great locks in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. Severe damage to those locks could have cut off much of the vital flow of raw materials to our steel mills. That would be true if another war came. So with the construction of the seaway we would have two ways of getting ore to the vital mills of America. One would be by way of the St. Lawrence; the other would be through the St. Marys locks. Still another route would exist since South American ore would go to east coast seaports. Certainly these alternate routes would be of tremendous value to the defense of this great Nation.

These are but some of the reasons which led to the action by the President's Cabinet last year in unanimously approving a recommendation that the United States take part in the construction of this open door to the heart of America.

THE CONDITIONS OF CABINET APPROVAL

When the Cabinet approved the Wiley bill, it recommended that United States participation be subject to certain conditions. These conditions are set forth in the White House announcement of May 8, 1953. I quote them from the official announcement, as follows:

> 1. Satisfactory assurance that the underlying power project will go ahead, pursuant to appropriate authorization.
>
> 2. Satisfactory assurance that Canada will go ahead with its part of the navigation project, in cooperation with the United States.
>
> 3. Predication of the project on a self-liquidating basis.

Let us turn now to the factual situation of the present moment and examine whether these conditions, which the President and the Cabinet have in their wisdom imposed, are being met or are capable of being met.

THE STATUS OF THE POWER PROJECT

First, what about the power project? We all know that the Federal Power Commission after extensive hearings issued a license on July 15, 1953, to the State of New York to develop the power facilities in cooperation with the Province of Ontario. On November 2, 1953, certain interests who opposed the granting of this license petitioned the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit to review the Commission's action. On November 6, 1953, the Attorney General promptly requested an early hearing on the case because of its national and international importance.

The court, on November 19, 1953, agreed with the Attorney General's position, and on December 23, 1953, the case was argued before the court of appeals. An early decision affirming the Power Commission is expected.

If the opponents seek to carry the matter to the Supreme Court, it is likely that it will reach the highest Court this spring, with final disposition shortly thereafter.

In brief, the power project, from the legal standpoint, is well on its way. In the meantime, on November 4, 1953, the Power Authority of the State of New York accepted a 50-year license from the Power Commission. On the same day, November 4, 1953, the White House, by Executive Order No. 10500, designated the Power Authority of the State of New York as the designee of the Government of the United States to construct our share of the power facilities, and appointed the Secretary of the Army and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission to comprise the United States section of the St. Lawrence River Board of Engineers.

Plans and specifications for the works and programs of construction are being prepared in cooperation with the Canadian Government, so that construction may start when the matter is clear of the courts.

Actual construction of the power project is now scheduled to begin in June of this year—5 months from now.

On November 7, 1953, the New York Power Authority designated the engineering firms of Sanderson & Porter and Charles T. Main, Inc., to direct construction of the United States half of the power project. Therefore, we, have every indication that the power project is being pushed to the utmost. There is satisfactory assurance that the power project is going ahead. The first condition imposed by the Cabinet is being fully met.

CANADA'S INTENTION TO COOPERATE

Second, what about Canada's intentions respecting the navigational aspects of the seaway?

There is no reason whatsoever to doubt Canada's intentions. For many years, Canada has desired a seaway from the Great Lakes to the ocean. The only thing that has held her up has been the economic necessity that the power development of the International Rapids section precede or be a part of the seaway development. I am convinced that that this is the only reason why Canada has not built the seaway long before this.

But the Canadian Government has been making steady progress in its efforts to bring about both the navigation and power developments. Let us review the record briefly.

In December 1951 the Canadian Parliament passed an act setting up the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority to build the navigation project. At the same time, it passed an act authorizing the Province of Ontario to cooperate with an American agency to build the power project.

Furthermore, Canada, has repeatedly asked for our cooperation, and Congress thus far has turned a deaf ear. Now that the power development by the State of New York and the Province of Ontario is well on its way, without the need

of action by Congress, Canada will not only cooperate with the United States in the navigational aspects, but she is willing to build the seaway alone if necessary.

As the Canadian Minister of Transportation, C. D. Howe, said in New York on April 7, 1953:

> Canada can and will proceed to remove the bottleneck (International Rapids section) in her 27-foot navigation channel from Lake Erie to the ocean as soon as competent authorities are authorized to build the power developments.

Canada, therefore, is so convinced of the importance of the seaway to its future economic progress that, once the power development is started, it will not wait any longer. We do not have to worry about Canada not cooperating. Actually, the converse is true. The shoe is on the other foot. This may be the last time that the United States will have a chance to cooperate.

Furthermore, the pending legislation limits any action on the seaway to joint participation. The United States cannot build the seaway alone under this bill.

THE OLD OBJECTIONS ARE NO LONGER VALID

The reality of the power development and the clear intention of Canada to go it alone, if necessary, not only satisfy two of the conditions specified by the White House as prerequisites for United States participation but have had the effect of destroying the basis of the principal opposition to this project.

The railroads, principally the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, and the Baltimore & Ohio, have long opposed the seaway because of the alleged diversion of traffic which they claim would injure them. Actually most, if not all, of the traffic which would be carried by the seaway would not otherwise be carried by the railroads. Why do I say that? The railroads have never introduced evidence of any studies showing the extent of such diversion, despite frequent requests that they do so. The fact of the matter now is that Canada is going to do the job alone, if necessary, and nothing can be done to prevent this real or imaginary diversion of traffic.

Similarly the coal interests have opposed the project for a variety of reasons, chief of which is that the hydroelectric power generated will displace an annual market for 5 million tons of coal, and the seaway will permit the importation of coal. But the power development will take place regardless of any action by Congress.

Furthermore, that the fears of the coal interests are illusory can best be shown by pointing to the fact that historically the growth of new industries attracted by cheap electric power has always increased the demand for other forms of power, including coal. They need have no worry about foreign coal since for many years we have been a coal-exporting, not importing, nation.

THE CABINET'S CONDITION THAT THE PROJECT BE SELF-LIQUIDATING

This brings up the third and last condition specified by the Cabinet for participation by the United States, that is, development of the project on a self-liquidating basis.

Expressed differently, this means that the project will pay for itself, and that any investment by the Federal Government will be completely repaid over a reasonable period of time. In these days of heavy spending for defense purposes, higher taxes, and a mounting debt, it is entirely reasonable and proper that the administration should insist that this project be examined with a view to its economic soundness.

What does S. 2150, the pending bill, propose? This bill authorizes United States participation with Canada in the construction, operation, and control of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

It authorizes the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, with power to issue $105 million in guaranteed bonds and the authority to levy tolls on all traffic using the facility so as to raise money with which to pay expenses of operation, overhead, and to retire the bonds issued to finance the construction.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator explain to the Senate why the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation should be able to reach into the Treasury and borrow $105 million? The Senator is a member of the Appropriations Committee. Would he agree with me that Congress should retain control of the purse strings, ascertain where all this money would go, and what it would be spent for?

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill provides, and I think rightly so, that when the United States goes into an international project such as the proposed seaway, the money for its construction be authorized, as is done in the pending bill, and as is done in many bills in similar cases. The construction of the project will extend over a period of 5 or 6 years. Therefore, the money that is to be raised, and the money that is to be spent on the project, will be advanced on the bonds to be issued. The expenditures will not be made until the Treasury of the United States actually advances the money. Therefore, there would not be a debt until the money was turned over by the Treasury to the projected corporation, which will be a Government corporation.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Tennessee Valley Authority is a Government corporation which spends Federal funds, and every year the TVA is required to appear before the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Michigan is a member, to make its case and to show the need for the millions of dollars it spends annually. Why should not the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation have to make a similar presentation, and obtain the authorization of Congress for contemplated expenditures?

Mr. FERGUSON. The only difference is that, as I have said, in this matter our Government is dealing with Canada. If Canada is to construct the seaway in cooperation with the United States, it should have the right to believe and to know that the authority is granted so that the United States could not, at the end of the first year, for instance, change the route. The proposed seaway will be constructed in part on American soil. Therefore, if the Congress were to appropriate the money for the first year, which would amount to about $6 million, and then the next year should refuse to appropriate any money, what would be the situation as to the canal? The canal would have been started and a course followed different from that which Canada would have used if Canada had been proceeding alone. By the way, Canada is putting more money into the construction of this project than the United States is to contribute. Her expenditures would be entirely lost. Therefore, where there is joint participation, as I see it, there is only one course to pursue, either authorize or not authorize the project.

Mr. LONG. Would it not seem more likely that the type of argument made by the Senator from Michigan is the type of argument which should be made in the event the corporation were coming before the Appropriations Committee and asking for money? Can the Senator see any reason why the Congress should appropriate more money than will be needed year by year and why it should not require the same justification as it requires for other projects?

Mr. FERGUSON. All I can say is that when entering into a joint project with Canada, it is on a different basis than if we were building it alone. Therefore, we ought to be willing to say, when we authorize the project, that we will go through with it. If we leave the completion of the project to appropriations in the future, it must be realized that Congress might refuse to appropriate in a particular year and that then the project could not go forward. In that event Canada could not go ahead. Therefore, Canada would have lost the money she had put into the project and the United States would likewise have lost what the United States had put into the project.

Mr. CASE. Will the Senator from Michigan yield at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I might say first that I shared with the Senator from Louisiana the same feeling with regard to the portion of the bill providing the method of financing; but, in going over the matter, I was advised that the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury were both represented in the hearings on the bill, and that they were consulted. While the method of financing is different from that we adopted in regard to domestic projects, it is true that the financing has to be approved by the fiscal authorities of the Government, which will understand the needs and will proceed as the Senator has pointed out.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from South Dakota is correct; and I thank him.

For reasons of fiscal control, the Budget has recommended that the bonds be purchased by the Treasury, although the funds derived from the sale of the bonds are not in a budgetary sense an expenditure. They are an investment in an income-producing asset which will provide its own revenues, pay for its operation, maintenance costs, interest, and amortization of the bonds.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Would not the same argument apply to all the power dams being constructed in the great western section of the United States, and that the funds expended therefor constitute an investment which is to be paid back, and not an expenditure in the general sense at all?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true with respect to bonds on reclamation projects. They are all to be paid back.

Mr. LONG. Do not representatives of those projects have to come before the Congress year by year and obtain appropriations annually in order to carry on their programs?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct, but, as I pointed out, there is a different situation when we are dealing with Canada. Canada says that, if we are jointly to build this canal project, she cannot proceed alone if we do not authorize the whole construction at one time. Canada would have to rely upon the Appropriations Committees of the United States Congress every year. I say that when we vote on the pending bill we ought to realize that we are voting that $105 million is to be used. I shall give the figures and show how the money is to be used. We should be acting with our eyes open, and at this time, either authorize the construction or indicate that we will not do so.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Should not the Congress know how the money is being spent year by year? Is that not required of other Government corporations annually? Congress has a chance to pass on the amount of money such corporations desire to spend each year, and to ascertain how the projects are coming along.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true, but we are here concerned with a different kind of project.

The funds to be appropriated will not be necessary at one time, but will be spread over the period of construction, a period of from 5 to 6 years. The Corps of Engineers has estimated that the funds will be disbursed according to the following schedule, once the project is approved:

Year:	*Amount*
1st	$5,800,000
2d	29,390,000
3d	36,976,000
4th	15,200,000
5th	708,000

The use of the device of a Government corporation, of course, is not novel. We have had numerous examples in recent years of successful operation by Government corporations. To mention only two, the RFC and the HOLC come at once to mind. It is important to recognize that the corporate device, which S. 2150 proposes, is only a medium for making, managing, and controlling the Government's investment. The economic soundness does not depend on the matter of the mechanics, but on other and deeper considerations. It depends on, first, the overall cost of the seaway development, on the one hand, and, second, the income which can be reasonably expected from the operation of the seaway.

I shall discuss each of these factors separately in demonstrating the soundness of the proposal in the pending bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will allow me to finish, I would appreciate it. I find that I have another appointment which is very important.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask one further question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator tell me whether or not there is in existence any agreement with Canada that Canada will not charge tolls on the four Canadian locks which would be constructed on the river at points before the International Rapids are reached?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I know of no agreement about that. But if Canada is going into this particular project, including the four locks which are to be constructed farther up, by necessity the Commission will be required to regulate the entire toll, because if the Commission did not agree on the toll for the use of the locks contemplated by this bill, the Commission could not operate the other locks successfully, inasmuch as the vessels using the waterway will have to pass through all the locks.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield further to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator from Michigan tell me whether there is any agreement with Canada with regard to the existing 14-foot project, which is a toll-free navigation project? Is that project to be closed, in the event the seaway is opened? Or if the St. Lawrence Seaway is constructed, will the hitherto toll-free traffic moving on the St. Lawrence, to the extent of approximately 11 million tons a year, be required to pay tolls in order to move through the newly constructed project?

Mr. FERGUSON. Is my colleague talking about the Welland Canal?

Mr. LONG. No; I refer to the project already constructed on the St. Lawrence River. There is already a 14-foot channel there, together with a group of locks, which as of today make possible travel to the extent I have indicated on the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know of no agreement about that, and I know of no intention to change the present arrangement.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator from Michigan realize that no vessel navigating the 14-foot toll-free waterway would be operated on the deeper waterway, if the use of the latter would require the payment of a total of 50 cents a ton, when the 14-foot toll-free waterway is already adequate for use by it?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot say whether Canada will wish to divert traffic from the smaller waterway to the new one. I know it is contemplated to make the Welland Canal a part of the new navigation project, but I do not know about the other one.

Mr. LONG. If the United States is to pay $100 million for the construction of the new locks and a 27-foot channel on the St. Lawrence River, in the hope of getting back its money, would not it be well for the United States to determine in advance what will happen with the 14-foot channel which parallels the new project, on the same river?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that would be important. However, I anticipate that in time to come, if a 27-foot channel is constructed, all traffic to or from the Great Lakes will be moved through the 27-foot channel, because of the economy of operation of the larger vessels, as compared with the smaller ones which could use the 14-foot channel. Of course traffic is moving today on the 14-foot waterway, but neither Canada nor the United States believes that to be sufficient.

Mr. LONG. Certainly the operator of a vessel drawing 10 feet of water or less—as in the case of vessels using the waterway which now exists—will not be willing to pay a toll of 50 cents a ton in order to have the privilege of having his vessel traverse a waterway which would permit the passage of vessels of a draft greater than that necessary for the vessels he operates.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that probably what the Senator from Louisiana has said is correct.

THE COST OF CONSTRUCTING THE SEAWAY

First, Mr. President, what does the entire project seek to accomplish, and how much will it ultimately cost? This is a fair question which must be answered before there can be profitable discussion on the income expected.

The project is a navigation development designed to produce a waterway 27 feet deep, from Montreal to Lake Ontario. The United States and Canada will jointly participate in the construction and operation. The United States participation will consist of the building in the International Rapids section of three locks, 800 feet wide, and 30 feet deep over the sills, a guard gate, and performing the necessary excavation and dredging to construct two new, lateral canals, with a length of 11 miles, to a controlling depth of 27 feet.

The United States will also remove rock shoals in the Thousand Islands section, to assure a channel of the same depth. All of this will be constructed in United States territory, in northern New York State, south of the St. Lawrence River, instead of in the Province of Ontario, on the northern side of the river.

The total cost of United States participation, as estimated by the United States Corps of Engineers, may be outlined as follows:

Construction cost:	Amount
Thousand Island section	$1,766,000
International Rapids section	86,308,000
Total construction cost	88,074,000
Interest at 3½ percent during construction period	7,706,475
Total United States investment	95,780,475

The Canadian participation will concern the section from St. Regis, N. Y., to Montreal, where Canada will build 4 locks of the same dimensions and 2 guard gates, and will dig and excavate the entire 68-mile section to a depth of 27 feet.

In addition, Canada will also deepen the Welland Canal, connecting Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, from its present depth of 25 feet to 27 feet. The total cost of Canadian participation may be broken down as follows:

Construction cost:	Amount
Welland Canal deepening	$2,000,000
St. Francis Reach-St. Lawrence River	3,350,000
Soulanges Reach-St. Lawrence River	47,100,000
Lachine Reach-St. Lawrence River	122,500,000
Total construction cost	174,950,000
Interest at 3½ percent during construction period	15,308,125
Total Canadian investment	190,258,125

To summarize, the total estimated cost of these facilities to both countries, including interest at 3½ percent, amounts to $286,038,600. Of this amount, the Canadian share will be $190,258,125, or 66 percent of the total investment; the United States share will be $95,780,745, or 34 percent. These figures have not been "taken out of a hat," but are the official estimates of the agencies of the two Governments which have the fullest information concerning the matter of costs—the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of Transport of Canada. I can think of no more reliable or authoritative sources.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Michigan tell me why the figure 3½ percent is selected? Is that what our Government estimates it will have to pay as interest on a 50-year bond, or something of that sort?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am informed that is what they have in mind, and we are figuring it at that amount, so there will be no question about it.

THE PROJECT WILL BE SELF-LIQUIDATING

These, then, are the probable construction costs, including interest at 3½ percent during the period of construction. Let me turn now to a detailed consideration of the third condition imposed by the administration, that is, construction of the project on a self-liquidating basis.

As Mr. Walter Williams, Under Secretary of Commerce, pointed out before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "the self-liquidation aspect of the St. Lawrence project is of special importance because of its budgetary implications and because of its very substantial potential effect on United States defense, commercial interests, and its relation to transportation policy." I should point out that Mr. Williams has particular knowledge of this condition that the project be self-liquidating because he served as chairman of the sub-Cabinet committee which originally inserted this condition, which the full Cabinet unanimously adopted.

The determination of the question whether the project will be self-liquidating depends on three factors: First, the annual operating costs and carrying charges; and second, the traffic available to be carried; and third, the revenues to be raised by tolls upon this traffic.

ANNUAL COSTS

First. The annual operating costs and carrying charges: The term "annual operating costs" includes the cost of yearly maintenance and operation.

These have been estimated by the Army engineers from their experience to total $3.5 million, of which $1.5 million would be the portion charged to the United States. The cost of annual amortization, on a 50-year, straight-line basis with interest at 3 percent, will mean annual carrying charges of $3.7 million for the United States, and $7.4 million for Canada. The total annual costs to both countries for operation, maintenance, and carrying charges on bonds bearing interest at 3 percent will be $14.6 million. If the bonds pay interest at 3½ percent, the estimated annual charges will be increased to $16.8 million. In either event, these figures indicate the amount which must be raised by tolls imposed on the traffic to be carried by the seaway.

ANNUAL TRAFFIC VOLUME

Second. The estimated traffic to be carried: What is the annual volume of traffic which can be counted upon to raise these necessary revenues? It must be pointed out, at the start of this discussion, that, since the 50-year period of amortization is employed, the traffic potential should be estimated for 50 years. The existing 14-foot waterway on the Canadian side presently handles 10 million tons a year. The Labrador iron ore movement, which will commence within the next year, is expected to reach 20 million tons in the relatively short-term future.

Therefore, we have at the outset a definite volume of at least 30 million tons a year definitely available as a base for making a prediction concerning the self-liquidation aspects of the project. Let us turn now to the estimated traffic which the seaway can be expected to carry.

Several estimates have been made in recent years by public as well as private groups. I shall confine myself to those made by the two agencies of Canada and the United States, the Canadian Department of Trade and Commerce and the United States Department of Commerce. They may be listed as follows:

(a) The United States Department of Commerce, in February 1952, estimated the annual volume of traffic at 64.5 to 83.5 million tons.

(b) The Canadian Department of Trade and Commerce in 1953 arrived at an estimate of 44.5 million tons. This was done on a commodity-by-commodity basis and has so convinced the Canadian Government of the economic soundness of the project that it is willing to undertake the whole project alone, if necessary.

(c) The United States Department of Commerce in May 1953—and bear in mind that it was now under Republican control—estimated the tonnage at 50 million a year. In arriving at this figure, it started with 30 millions, and applying a progressive growth factor, concluded that the traffic would reach 51.75 millions at 15 years; 62 millions at 25 years; and 86.75 millions at 50 years. It then imposed the ceiling figure of 50 million tons a year because of the limitations of the Welland Canal.

The most recent estimates of those official bodies which are in the best position to form a reasoned judgment about this important matter indicate a level of tonnage ranging between 40 and 50 million tons a year.

These figures are not speculative or imagined. They are the conservative estimates of public officials who must set the policy and make the decisions concerning whether their countries should make the investment required.

In the case of Canada, a country far smaller than we are in industrial capacity and resources, the estimate of 44.5 million deserves our special attention, because Canada is willing to do the entire job by itself. The Canadian estimate was based on a detailed and comprehensive study of every commodity which has used the 14-foot channel in the past, and the traffic which a 27-foot waterway could be reasonably expected to attract in the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the breakdown of this estimated tonnage, by commodity and by direction of traffic.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimate of potential traffic on the St. Lawrence Waterway

[Thousands of short tons of freight]

DOWNBOUND

Wheat	6,000
Other grain	2,200
Flour and mill products	2,200
Iron and steel	1,586
Soft coal	3,000
Coke	200
Petroleum and products	50
Autos and parts	790
Fertilizer	75
All other	2,000
Total down	18,101

Estimate of potential traffic on the St. Lawrence Waterway—Continued

[Thousands of short tons of freight]

UPBOUND	
Iron ore	20,000
Paper	850
Woodpulp	300
Pulpwood	865
Lumber	375
Hard coal	500
Soft coal	500
Petroleum and products	1,041
All other	2,000
Total up	26,431
Grand total	44,532

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator could answer a question for me.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the greater portion of this canal is to be built in Canada. I notice that on page 17 of the report it is indicated that the cost to the Canadian Government will be in the neighborhood of $263,024,000, and the cost to the United States $88,074,000. However, when it comes to the costs of operation, the operation and maintenance cost of the United States would be 1½ million, and of Canada $2 million. Why is it that the maintenance and operation costs should be almost the same for the United States as for Canada, when most of the canal is to be built in Canada? I believe that I am correct in that assumption.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has the figures before him from the record.

Mr. ELLENDER. They appear on page 17 of the report. I was wondering what the reason was for that difference. I have been unable to find the answer to the question in the report. I thought perhaps the distinguished Senator could tell us why the costs of maintenance and operation should be proportionately greater for the United States, although, as I have indicated, the greater part of the canal would be in Canada.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have been doing a little figuring, and my result shows 46 miles of construction work in the United States, and 68 miles in Canada. The ratio of the amortization and the operating and maintenance costs is a ratio of a million and a half for the United States and two millions for Canada.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is a 3 to 4 ratio.

Mr. ELLENDER. But there is a large part of the Canadian canal which has already been built. I presume it would be necessary to charge some of the maintenance cost to the shipping, would it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], let me say that it is estimated that United States operation and maintenance costs will be $1,460,000 a year and Canadian costs will be $2 million.

These estimates were independently arrived at, by the Army engineers for the United States and by the Canadian Government for Canada, and, therefore, are not strictly comparable, because of possible variation in wage rates and a host of other factors.

There will be 3 locks in the United States section and 4 locks in the Canadian section, and this fact implies that operation and maintenance costs would be nearly equal.

The largest single item, of course, is the 20 million tons of Labrador ore. This development, in which several American companies are participating and have made heavy investments, is located 365 rail miles north of the St. Lawrence River. It has proved resources of 418 million tons of high-grade direct shipping iron ore and their discoveries are believed to have only scratched the surface.

Why was this development necessary? It was necessary for at least two reasons. First, our production of steel, which was 63 million tons in 1929, is now 124 million tons, having almost doubled in less than 25 years. It shows no signs of diminishing. On the contrary, the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission, the so-called Paley report, in June 1952, estimated that by 1975 an ingot steel production will reach 135 million tons. Second, to meet this growing demand for steel, it has been necessary to look elsewhere than the Mesabi Range. This is because the supply of high-grade ore—50 percent iron and over—has been so depleted that only 1.6 billion tons remain.

We are presently finding it necessary to import ore from Venezuela and Labrador. The discovery in 1948 of this great new body of Labrador ore has improved the picture, and will make us less dependent on ore from overseas. The seaway will be a most logical and the only convenient medium of transportation from Seven Islands, the railhead at the St. Lawrence, to the steel mills on the lower Great Lakes. The Paley Commission report estimates the production of Labrador ore at 40 million tons, of which half would be destined for the furnaces of the Great Lakes region.

Mr. President, the Department of the Interior, after very careful study of the prospective movement of iron-ore tonnage over the seaway, is confident that within 20 years such tonnage will amount to 20 million or more tons a year. This is merely to satisfy the demands of our peacetime economy. In a wartime emergency such traffic would be substantially higher.

When all these considerations are taken into account, we reach the inescapable conclusion that the estimate of iron-ore traffic in the Canadian report is well justified. This single figure represents almost one-half of the total traffic estimate of 44.5 million tons. Every other item in the Canadian estimate was reached after a painstaking analysis of each commodity listed above. To summarize, the Canadian Government and our own Government have made official estimates of the potential traffic. These estimates were made independently of one another and involve different methods of approach. Yet the conclusions reached are substantially the same. They both indicate a traffic potential ranging from 40 to 50 million tons a year.

THE REVENUES TO BE DERIVED FROM TOLLS

What tolls may this volume of traffic be expected to produce? I have previously pointed out that the annual costs of operation and carrying charges including amortization of the bonds over a 50-year period would be $14.6 million, or $16.8 million, depending on whether the bonds pay 3 percent or 3½ percent interest. Let us assume that the higher of two figures, or $16.8 million, must be raised each year. Can this be borne by the 44.5 million tons of traffic estimated in the Canadian report? The answer is emphatically "Yes."

THE PROJECT IS A SOUND BUSINESS INVESTMENT

Representatives of both governments have consistently accepted the reasonableness of a level of tolls ranging from 50 cents to $1.25 a ton, with the weighted average approximately 60 cents a ton. Woodpulp, pulpwood, and general cargo would be charged $1.25, whereas other commodities, including grain, coal, iron ore and petroleum, would pay 50 cents. Applying the weighted average of 60 cents a ton to the Canadian estimate of 44.5 million tons, it is easy to see that $26.7 millions in annual revenues will be raised by tolls. In other words, there is an indicated operating ratio of 1.59 to 1, or $1.59 in potential revenues for every $1 in operating costs and carrying charges.

These figures vividly demonstrate the fact that the seaway is economically justified, and that it will be a sound business investment, and will pay for itself. The whole project, as the Cabinet has specified, is predicated on a self-liquidating basis.

Let us assume, however, that the annual traffic is less than that estimated in the Canadian report, which itself is the most conservative of the recent estimates, and lower than the figures of our own Department of Commerce. What is the minimum amount of tonnage which must be carried to meet the annual costs of operation and carrying charges including amortization? Using the weighted average figure of $.60 a ton as the toll, we find that 28 million tons of traffic are sufficient to provide revenues of $16.8 million each year and make the project self-liquidating.

Expressed differently, the Canadian estimate can be off by as much as 37 percent and the project will still pay for itself. The project is not only self-liquidating but gives every promise of being successful by a very wide margin.

Mr. President, my remarks today have attempted to focus attention on the need for vision in contemplating the St. Lawrence Seaway project, the need for a comprehensive viewpoint, emphasizing the economic benefits and the defense aspects of participation by the United States in the construction and operation of the seaway.

There is little doubt as to the economic benefits which will accrue to the United States through the St. Lawrence seaway, in that it will more readily make

possible the future expansion of the Nation industrially and provide for a comprehensive transportation system to the heart of our Nation. With this new link integrated into our present system of transportation, having a direct line by water to the other countries of the world, all of the people of the Nation will benefit, directly and indirectly.

This is particularly true in the case of the farmer of the Midwest, who will have a direct link with the world markets, thereby putting him in a better competitive position. He in turn, will be in a better position to buy goods and services from other areas of the United States.

It is also true in the case of industries which seek cheaper transportation, thereby cutting their costs of distribution, and in turn providing more jobs for workers through better competitive advantages and greater profits to investors.

Furthermore, in a competitive market such as exists in the world today, the workingman is going to have advantages because price and service are large factors in selling. Because we of the United States produce quality goods on a mass basis, transport them on a mass basis, and likewise distribute them in the same manner, we as a nation are able to produce and sell at costs which enable more people to buy. Because of this, more and more people are able to work, reap earned rewards, and enjoy living.

With the mass movement of readily accessible iron ore and other minerals readily available from the open pits of Labrador at a low cost over an inland route, we will not only provide insurance for our present economy but will also strengthen it.

Moreover, we should not lose sight of the fact that the national security advantages outweigh economic considerations. It was these advantages to the Nation as a whole which first caused the present administration to give its support. It was these advantages to our national security which caused the President to state so strongly in his state of the Union message when he said:

Another part of this foundation is, of course, our continental transport system. Some of our vital heavy materials come increasingly from Canada. Indeed, our relations with Canada, happily, always close, involve more and more the unbreakable ties of strategic interdependence. Both Nations now need the St. Lawrence Seaway for security as well as economic reasons. I urge the Congress promptly to approve our participation in its construction.

It seems to me that little can be added to the President's statement and its far-reaching implication.

Participation with Canada will assure the United States a voice in those matters having to do with construction and operation standards, toll rates on individual commodities, and other aspects I have mentioned, particularly those points with regard to priorities for emergency shipping.

I strongly urge the Senate to approve this bill for the St. Lawrence Seaway in the interest of the Nation and the people throughout the United States.

The facts speak for themselves. The weight of evidence clearly brings into focus the necessity of the St. Lawrence Seaway, not only as an important defense installation but as a growing need from the standpoint of transportation and trade to further develop a peacetime economy in the national interest.

I believe that upon careful study and consideration of all of these facts Senators will voice their approval of this bill which authorizes the participation by the United States in the construction and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly upon the proposed construction and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Many people in Missouri are opposed to the St. Lawrence Seaway. Many are for it, including outstanding citizens of my State and members of both political parties. Those who favor the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway express themselves as anxious to promote the volume of trade to and from Missouri.

Mr. President, the St. Lawrence Seaway is now going to be built by Canada and the United States, if the Congress approves; or by Canada alone, if the Congress does not approve. Why should the United States refrain from participating in the development on its own borders of a seaway that is going to be built anyway?

Even more important, Mr. President, is the question of the seaway and our national defense. In this connection, let me quote from an address delivered on the floor of the Senate last January 14 by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Is it in the national interest of the United States that we participate in the construction, operation, and administration of the seaway as authorized by the Wiley bill? That question has been answered in the affirmative by every President, Secretary of Army and Defense, Secretary of Commerce, National Security Council, National Security Resources Board, and other administration officials for the past 30 years, including President Eisenhower and other representatives of his administration.

I may add that my position in the matter now is the same as it was when I was a member of the National Security Council and Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

The Senator from Massachusetts continued:

The President [President Eisenhower] stated in that part of his message on national defense:

"Both nations now need the St. Lawrence seaway for security as well as for economic reasons. I urge the Congress promptly to approve our participation in its construction."

For many years it has been my conviction that, in this air-atomic age, adequate national defense is the most important issue facing the United States.

Therefore, I am for American participation in this effort to increase the security of this hemisphere.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in discussing the matter of the St. Lawrence Seaway, I feel it appropriate to review my own previous considerations of this subject when it has come up in past years.

On February 27, 1948, the proposal then before the Senate concerning the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project was recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations on my motion by a vote of 57 to 30. My reason for then so moving was that there were a number of questions which I believed required answers before I could in good conscience support or oppose the project. I listed 16 such questions, and, after recommittal, a study committee set up by Senator Vandenberg attempted to secure from the executive branch answers to those questions.

What passed for answers was almost totally unsatisfactory. This I noted on the floor of the Senate in my statement on June 18, 1952, announcing that I would support the motion by Senator O'Conor to recommit the joint resolution on this subject then pending. At that time I inserted in the RECORD the brief statement I had made before the Foreign Relations Committee on April 22, 1952. In this statement I had pointed out that after careful review of the testimony placed before our committee I still had two strong reservations against undertaking the project then contemplated. Those reservations were, first, a question of the feasibility of constructing a channel of only 27-foot depth, and, second, a question as to the necessity of the interrelationship between the power aspect of the project and the seaway proposal. However, I went on to state in the 1952 debate that if a satisfactory scheme of self-financing could be worked out, I would cooperate in trying to have the measure adopted.

Mr. President, some of the questions I asked in 1948 have not yet been satisfactorily answered, and I am still unconvinced that a channel depth of only 27 feet is of the maximum utility. However, the circumstances surrounding the St. Lawrence project, and the project itself, have radically changed since last year.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Many of us have given considerable thought and study to the question of the 27-foot depth to which reference has been made. The fact that no ship coming downstream to the coast would necessarily have to load to full capacity is an important consideration. It would not have to take on the maximum quantity of oil or fuel. Therefore, the ship could be riding high until it got to the lower harbor and then take on its full capacity of fresh water and fuel and add the necessary freight to bring the ship to its maximum load. Therefore, even though it might be desirable to draw more than 30 feet oceanwise, a ship could come down the channel at a 27-foot draft and be absolutely safe.

So I think the Senator from New Jersey can take some comfort with reference to the question of having a deeper channel than 27 feet.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, any statement from the distinguished Senator from Minnesota showing a thoughtful interest in the situation is of great comfort to me. I should be happy indeed if what the Senator suggests should be the solution.

I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I appreciate very deeply the very kind remarks of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, of the two reservations I expressed to the Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate in 1952, one, that of the separation of the power aspect from the seaway proposal, has been disposed of, but the proposal now before us relates to the seaway alone. The power project is, of course, proceeding separately, with the Federal Power Commission having granted a license to the Power Authority of the State of New York to construct the United States' share of the power works. The second reservation, that concerning the 27-foot depth, remains troublesome to me, but the only alternatives, a billion-dollar project or exclusive Canadian control, are even less acceptable.

As I have pointed out, despite my reservations, even last year I was willing to support a self-liquidating project. I still have a question as to self-liquidation within any foreseeable period of time, but I am prepared to yield to the opinion of the experts who have appeared before the committee.

However, Mr. President, I do not wish to imply that my present position on Senate bill 2150 is based on my full satisfaction as to the reservations I had in 1948 and 1952. A new special emphasis has come into the President's message this year. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the National Security Council have recommended to President Eisenhower that the seaway be supported on the grounds of national defense. Under the mandate of the National Security Council its function ceases when it has formulated a recommendation. The decision is up to the President. President Eisenhower's decision was communicated to us in his state of the Union message. In the portion of that admirable statement devoted to national defense the President said:

> Both nations (Canada and the United States) now need the St. Lawrence Seaway for security, as well as for economic reasons. I urge the Congress promptly to approve our participation in its construction.

Mr. President, I emphasize two points in connection with this quotation. The first is the background of the man who made it. Not only is Dwight Eisenhower the President of the United States with all of the resources of information and advice available to that office, but also he is the man who led the armies of the West in their smashing triumph against Hitler and Mussolini. He is also the man who created almost singlehandedly the military organization of the North Atlantic Treaty Powers, which organization provides a framework for a viable defense of Western Europe. There is no living man today whose views on our national security I would respect as much as the expert military views of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, as a layman and without personal expert knowledge on the problems involved in our security, I have come to the conclusion that I must support the President of the United States in this field in which he is so preeminently expert.

It has been argued by the opponents of this bill that even granting the desirability of the seaway for defense, the construction of the seaway by Canada alone—and none can now doubt the Canadian intention so to do—will provide us that safeguard at no cost to the American taxpayer. This is why I emphasize the second point in connection with that portion of President Eisenhower's state of the Union message dealing with the seaway. The President stressed "our" participation in the project. The defense advantages of the joint plan over the unilateral Canadian plan have often been stated. However, the three principal advantages bear repeating:

First. The location of certain facilities under the joint plan apparently provides a more efficient and defensible route than the unilateral Canadian plan.

Second. The construction of part of the facilities within the United States insures our participation in the determination of priorities as to which shipping utilizes the facilities in what order. The critical importance of such transportation priorities has been demonstrated in the Korean war as well as in World War II.

Third. The possibility that Canada could assert complete responsibility for defense planning for the seaway is averted. I realize that some of the facilities, such as the locks, are presumably extremely vulnerable to enemy attack. However, that argument can be applied to any critical spot in the United States and Canada, and of course our defense is predicated upon maximum protection for these critical installations.

Mr. President, this project over the past few years has developed an enormous amount of testimony, both favorable and unfavorable. As I said above, there are certain questions that I am still concerned with, and I sincerely hope that our participation in the project before us may not leave us with unforeseen responsibilities in future years which may again impose unjustifiable fiscal burdens. In my judgment, this project is ultimately inevitable. With the increase in population and a critical need for transportation facilities of all kinds in order to foster trade and to protect us in times of war emergencies, I have come to the conclusion that the overall benefits to our Nation as a whole transcend the alleged immediate interests of the ports on the Atlantic seaboard, or our railroads. It is my own feeling that the opposition from these sources is not justified. I believe that with the world situation our ports will be taxed to capacity, and our railroads in the long run will benefit, rather than lose, by the additional means of transportation.

However, Mr. President, my overriding reason for supporting Senate bill 2150 is recommendation by the President that the Congress adopt this measure in the best interests of the security of the United States. In this matter I am supporting the leadership of the President. I am giving him my full vote of confidence.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to congratulate the senior Senator from New Jersey upon the position he is now taking with regard to the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

As a result of my deep interest in and close study of the project for a period of more than a quarter of a century, I am convinced, in the first place, that the development of the seaway jointly by Canada and the United States will redound as greatly to the economic growth and prosperity of the United States as it will to Canada.

I am also very deeply convinced, as I have been for several years, that the development of the seaway is a matter which, as outlined by the President of the United States, is very greatly to the advantage of the defense and security of the United States.

That is why I have supported it for so long, and I am very happy now that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], representing our neighbor State, is now supporting the project.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. I give the Senator great credit for the many years of study he made when he was Governor of the sovereign State of New York. I assume he went into the question even more fully at that time than he has since, but his complete studies helped confirm my feeling that we are justified in going ahead with the project at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request relative to the pending bill. Before doing so, I wish, under the rules, to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that Senators may be assembled. Therefore, preparatory to propounding the unanimous-consent request——

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am certain that if the Senator from California has in mind a request to limit debate, there would be objection to it on this side, although, so far as I know, there is no desire on the part of any Senator unduly to prolong the debate. I desire to speak on the subject this afternoon, and the time taken for a quorum call at this time would probably only delay the time when the Senate would be in a position to close its business for the day.

I do not believe Senators are prepared to vote on the matter today. Therefore, I suggest to the distinguished Senator from California that he withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, to see if an understanding can be reached with Senators who are opposed to the bill as well as with those who are in favor of it, in order to agree upon a date

for disposition of the measure. I believe that at this moment the Senate is not in a position to do that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the majority leader was not proposing that the Senate vote either today or necessarily tomorrow. But the debate has continued for a week, and I thought that perhaps the field could be explored somewhat. No Senator's rights would be jeopardized in the slightest. We might get a general consensus, at least, because some Senators have other engagements they desire to keep. I am prepared to remain as long as necessary in order to dispose of the bill. We have not held night or Saturday sessions, but I thought that perhaps with a purely exploratory investigation we might at least help to clarify the thinking not only on both sides of the aisle, but on both sides of the question, because this is not a partisan question in the ordinary sense of the word. There are Senators on this side of the aisle who are for and against the bill, and there are Senators on the other side who are for and against the bill. I thought the disposition of the bill might be expedited if I could at least propound the form of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. Some Senators might wish to suggest certain conditions to be attached to the form of unanimous-consent request. I thought it might be helpful to have preliminary exploration of the question, if the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana did not feel that his rights would be jeopardized in the least.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It was with the thought of expediting the debate that I suggested to the distinguished majority leader that, in my judgment, time would not be saved by having a quorum call now, but would only cost the Senate perhaps another 20 minutes or half hour of its time today, by reason of assembling a quorum. I have an amendment at the desk, and I expect to offer a perfecting amendment, which would vitally affect the form of the proposed legislation. So far as I am concerned, I would be willing to have a vote on my amendment tomorrow, after there had been an opportunity afforded to discuss it when there was a rather full attendance of the Senate, and we could discuss the principle upon which the amendment is based.

I should be glad to discuss the matter with other Senators, to see if we could arrive at a solution of the problem.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I certainly wish to oblige the Senator from Louisiana. I have no desire to curtail discussion of his amendment or of the bill itself today. Under the circumstances, I will temporarily withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and shall discuss the matter with the Senator from Louisiana later. I trust that he will meet with Senators on the other side of the question, because I am hopeful that we might agree upon a date that will be agreeable to Senators who hold views on both sides of the question.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 727) to provide that certain costs and expenses incurred in connection with certain repayment contracts with irrigation districts approved by the acts of Congress of May 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 62), October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 941), and June 23, 1952 (66 Stat. 151, 153), shall be nonreimbursable.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois, Mr. BRAMBLETT, Mr. DAGUE, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. MCMILLAN, and Mr. ABERNETHY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, conscious of our heavy legislative obligations in the next 6 months I desire in a nonpartisan spirit to suggest to the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the policy committee of the majority party a way to expedite the business of the Senate between now and the late hour of some disenchanted evening next summer when we shall adjourn, probably with much vital business left unfinished.

Before making the suggestion, let us very briefly examine our situation as Congress resumes its deliberations, and see what the prospects are for debate and for voting upon vital measures immediately facing us, or which are likely to be placed on the calendar early in the second session of the 83d Congress:

We have the St. Lawrence seaway bill before us.

We have a pending request for an increase in the debt limit.

We have statehood for Hawaii and, I would hope, Alaska.

We shall have urgent requests for replenishment of funds for various committees.

We shall have urgent requests for action on supplemental appropriations.

As we go around the first curve into the stretch, late in March and April, we shall have urgent demands for action on President Eisenhower's list of legislative must items, probably including a farm program; social security; taxes; increase and extension of minimum wage; extension and improvement of unemployment insurance; reciprocal trade; foreign military and economic aid with the questions of conditions relating to the European Defense Community and east-west trade; and further governmental reorganization.

Then, as we come around into the home stretch late in June, July, and, perhaps, August, there will be increasing pressure for rapid action on the appropriation bills, confirmations, and measures to meet needs which will develop.

The best evidence we have of the difficulties that may confront the Senate is the message of the President of the United States which he delivered in person on the 7th day of January. I do not need to read from it at any great length, but need only to remind the Members of the Senate of the schedule which the President set forth with reference to the Eisenhower program which would come to the Congress.

For instance, a farm program and suggestions for Taft-Hartley revisions were sent in a message on January 11. On January 14 there was a special message on social-security problems. Today there was a special message on health. On January 21 there will be 25 recommendations with reference to taxes, which are to be included in the budget message. On January 25 there is a special message to come on the subject of housing, and on January 28 an economic report which will deal with the subject of minimum wages.

The Senate is certain to spend a great deal of time on foreign aid, and on January 21, when the budget message comes to the Congress, this controversial matter will be placed squarely before the Congress. On January 28, or sometime thereafter, an antideflation program, the details of which will be in the economic report and subsequent special messages, will be placed before the Congress. The question of foreign trade will presumably come in a special message when the Randall committee finishes its study.

In his speech to the Congress, the President asked that the debt ceiling be raised. No one knows the precise moment at which the request will come before the Congress, but it certainly will come, and we have been promised by some of our colleagues that it will meet with strenuous opposition. How much debate and discussion there will be over the raising of the debt ceiling I cannot predict, but it surely will require many days of time and a great deal of study.

Then there are such general questions as the use of military manpower, internal security, conservation, highway financing, and education. These will be moving along in the near future. But, all in all, the legislative program which the President outlined to the Congress on the 7th day of January indicates that the Senate must be able to act if it is ever going to finish the work which the President will send to it during the month of January alone.

Mr. President, all this means, quite simply, that the heavy legislative docket for 1954 is going to be a happy hunting ground for those who are willing to use the filibuster—or, as is more often the case, the open or implied threat of filibuster—in order to exact changes in, or abandonment of, legislation.

Actually, when the second session of the 83d Congress began, the Senate was confronted with a threat of filibuster. The word "threat" is not my word; it is, as I shall show, the word chosen by the chairman of the majority policy com-

mittee. That threat was quite deliberately placed in the RECORD in the closing moments of the first session, shortly before adjournment early in the morning of August 4, when the Senate clocks had been turned back an hour and stood at about 11:30 p. m., since it had already been agreed the Senate would adjourn as of August 3.

Turning to volume 99, part 8, page 11097 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under date of August 3, 1953, let us briefly review the legislative schedule for the second session of the 83d Congress as it was sketched in by the then acting and now majority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and policy committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Beginning with the heading in column 1, I read.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY BILL

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, we are now in the closing minutes of the session. It is my understanding that the policy committee has authorized the making of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill the order of business for the second session of the 83d Congress, and I wanted to know how that might be accomplished by the majority leader.

In passing, the senior Senator from Michigan has shown today that he is not only much interested in and in favor of such legislation, but also that such legislation is of intense interest and concern to the people of his State and of the other States adjacent to the Great Lakes, who, if the bill were to be amended to extend the seaway to the head of the lakes, would be then directly connected with the arteries of world trade.

Here is the majority leader's response to the inquiry addressed to him by the senior Senator from Michigan:

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is quite correct. The majority policy committee has authorized the setting of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], calling for the issuance of revenue bonds for the construction of the seaway, as the unfinished business of the Senate.

However, we are now in the closing minutes of the session, and I have been given to understand by certain Members of the Senate that in the event such a motion were made, namely, to make the bill the pending business, the absence of a quorum might be suggested.

It may be noted that the majority leader, while acknowledging the authorization or directive issued by his party's policy committee, did not put that authorization or directive into effect by moving to make the St. Lawrence Seaway bill the unfinished business of the Senate.

In fact, he recognized the warning given to him by certain Senators that, if he attempted to do so, they would demand a quorum call, which, in the circumstances, would have been downright embarrassing. In effect, they were able to veto for the time being the implementation of the majority policy committee's decision to make the St. Lawrence seaway bill the unfinished business of the Senate then so that it could be taken up as we began the second session of the 83d Congress.

With understandable anxiety, the senior Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Republican policy committee, persisted in trying to get the strongest commitment that it was parliamentarily possible for the majority leader to put into the RECORD in the dying moments of the first session. Again I quote from page 11097:

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would it be possible to give notice that the bill will be brought up at the beginning of the session and that a motion will be made then to make it the order of business?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator from Michigan can rest assured that the legislation is still on the priority list for consideration, and will have a very high priority at the beginning of the new session.

At this point, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] entered the colloquy and obtained from the majority leader not only a commitment that the St. Lawrence Seaway bill was to have "early action when the second session of the Eighty-third Congress convenes," but also that, first, the Wiley bill is open for amendment on the floor to provide "connecting channels at the Great Lakes, so as to provide a seaway clear to the head of the lakes at Duluth and Superior," and, second, action will be taken on "some of the bills of major importance in the early months of the session" such as the Hawaii statehood bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the full colloquy between the senior Senator from Minnesota and the majority leader be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. THYE. I am indeed very happy to have the assurance from the majority leader that the St. Lawrence Seaway bill will be taken up and discussed at the reconvening of the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, that in the event—and it is unlikely at the moment that it will happen—in the event we should have a fall session, in October, the matter might very well be taken up at that time, rather than in January.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from California will yield further, the Wiley bill proposes to develop only the rapids section of the St. Lawrence seaway. I have offered an amendment to the Wiley bill for the purpose of developing connecting channels at the Great Lakes, so as to provide a seaway clear to the head of the lakes at Duluth and Superior. The amendment could be considered in connection with the so-called Wiley bill, because it is a part of the entire question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. The Senator knows that sometimes some of us think it is unfortunate, but at the same time it is true that there is no rule of germaneness. It so happens that even if there were a rule of germaneness, the Senator's amendment would be germane to the subject matter of the bill in any event.

Mr. THYE. I wish to state that I am very happy at the action of the policy committee on this question, because it has given us assurance that the St. Lawrence Seaway will have early action when the 2d session of the 83d Congress convenes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that not only will this legislation, by direction of the majority policy committee, have very high priority in the next session, whenever that next session may be held, but in any event not later than January 6 of next year, when Congress reconvenes, but, of course, there are many other bills, some of which have passed the House and have not yet been reported by committees of the Senate, and some are either on the Senate Calendar, as this bill is, which have been reported from the committee, while others have not been acted on by the House, and will be acted on very early in the next session.

After all, we have only completed one-half of the 83d Congress, or just the first period of it. I look forward to the session next year when we will be able to act on some of the bills of major importance in the early months of the session, instead of piling up too much legislation for action at the end of the session. I hope we will have bills like the Hawaii statehood bill ready to be acted on early in the next session of Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at this point the chairman of the Republican policy committee again underlined his concern that the St. Lawrence Seaway bill be taken up as soon as the Senate reconvened, whether in special or regular session. I believe that during his statement the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] entered the Chamber and heard the following words of the chairman of the Republican policy committee:

Mr. FERGUSON. As one of the cosponsors of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, I am sure the Senate will appreciate the fact that we are anxious that it be made the order of business so that the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on it. I appreciate the attitude of the majority leader in stating to the Senate where it stands and the action of the policy committee with reference to it, namely, that it will receive early consideration in the next session of Congress, whether it be a special session or a regular session.

At this, the senior Senator from Maryland objected even to the giving of a commitment then that the St. Lawrence Seaway bill would have high priority at the beginning of the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

Because the warning of filibuster made against the St. Lawrence Seaway bill can and undoubtedly will be made against other measures, so that the Senate throughout this session will, in effect, be legislating or failing to legislate with the threat of the filibuster, it seems to me worthwhile to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate and the American people the entire colloquy among the senior Senators from Maryland, California, and Michigan.

Beginning near the top of column 3 of page 11097 and continuing to column 1 of page 11098, I will read the entire passage:

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not like to be the cause of extending the sine die adjournment of this great body, even for a

brief statement. I do not like to run contrary to the wishes of the policy committee of my party. However, I do not believe it is wise to give any commitment tonight that the St. Lawrence Seaway bill will have high priority at the beginning of the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

The legislation in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway has engendered much controversy and debate for more than a quarter of a century. It is no less controversial today, and I have no apprehension that it will be less controversial come January 6 of next year.

In the early days of the next session, to put the Senate in the position of getting into such a controversial measure, when there are many other important measures to consider, such as the debt limitation and a new tax bill, it is not fair to the Senate, or to the country. If we proceed with such a controversial piece of legislation early in the session, many important matters will pile up behind us.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator let me interrupt at that point?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I say respectfully that it is unwise to do it, and I shall vigorously oppose any motion that may be made in the opening days of the 2d session of the 83d Congress to bring up the seaway bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, the distinguished Senator from Maryland is entirely within his rights. Of course, at the time a motion will have to be made, and the Senator from Maryland will be able to oppose it, as any other Senator will have a right to do. I am merely stating, as acting majority leader, the fact that the policy committee had authorized the acting floor leader to move to have that measure set as the unfinished business.

But in view of the lateness of the hour and the viewpoint of the Senator from Maryland, which he had expressed to me earlier, I thought that instead of suggesting the absence of a quorum at this late hour, preparatory to making a motion to have that measure made the unfinished business, I would merely state what was the direction of the policy committee.

I may state to the Senator from Maryland that my observation has been that if there is a controversial piece of proposed legislation the time to bring it up is early in the session, not close to the June or July adjournment date.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have heard it said within the last few days—in fact, within the last hour—that a filibuster in the Senate never has been broken. I leave that thought for the Senator from California to consider.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have never agreed with the point of view that a filibuster could not be broken, if necessary.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I did not say a filibuster could not be broken; I said a filibuster in the Senate never has been broken.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it that that is either a threat or a promise, and we shall have to meet it when that situation arises on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, it is not meant to be as bald as that. I merely mean that if that measure is brought up, there are many Senators who, because of their obligation to their States and their country, will have to fight the measure vigorously; and I am one of those Senators.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I can quite understand that on that bill, as well as on others I can think of, there will be quite an educational campaign. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been attempting to follow the address of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico very closely, and I am not quite sure that I get the precise point at which he is aiming. As I understand, he is having inserted in the RECORD the report of the discussion which took place on the floor of the Senate on the last night of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, which occurred, as I recall, fairly late at night, when the Senate was putting the finishing touches on its business, and waiting for a few conference reports to come in, with no other major legislation set for voting on at that time.

Of course, it is quite correct that at any time during the proceedings, a suggestion of the absence of a quorum could have been made, and would have required the sending for Senators to return to the Chamber.

If the Senator from New Mexico is implying that the majority leader has not followed through on the general policy outlined by the majority policy committee—namely, that the St. Lawrence seaway bill should receive early consideration—I do not think the facts bear that out, because except for several minor bills and the urgent proposed legislation dealing with cotton, with which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, together with a great many other Senators, had great concern, the St. Lawrence seaway bill was set as the unfinished business to be before the Senate.

I think we have made considerable progress with the St. Lawrence seaway bill. From the discussions I have had with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and other Senators on the other side of the aisle, and also with Senators on this side of the aisle, I am hopeful that within the next day or two we may obtain a unanimous-consent agreement in regard to reaching a vote on that measure.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to assure the distinguished majority leader that nothing is further from my thought than to criticize him for any delay which might have occurred in bringing up the St. Lawrence seaway bill. I think he brought it up very promptly. I have not the slightest criticism of that act.

I intend now to comment on the fact that under the existing rules of the Senate, regardless of whether the majority leader wished to have the bill brought up or not, it would have been possible to delay for a long time the vote on that important measure. I do not think that delay will occur now. I think we shall reach a vote on the St. Lawrence seaway bill, and I am glad we shall; and I shall support the bill.

However, I am trying to point out that at the end of a session, it is very difficult for proposed legislation to be considered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from New Mexico will further yield to me, I wish to say that if his remarks are on the general subject of the expedition of legislation—of which I thoroughly approve—again I desire to point out to him that in the little more than 8 years I have been a Member of the Senate, I can recall that in many instances during the month of January, and perhaps during February, the Senate has met on alternate days, and then only for a short time.

On the other hand, in order to prevent the kind of legislative logjam to which the Senator from New Mexico has made reference, I have been trying to schedule—and we shall continue to do so—important legislative proposals in the early days of the session, so we shall not be caught at the end of the session with a great many major measures, at which time a threat of obstructionist tactics could cause undue delay or could be the defeat of such proposed legislation.

I say again that we are trying to meet that situation by holding daily sessions; and I may say I plan to have the Senate meet daily through January and February, including the week during which the Republicans, in connection with Lincoln's birthday anniversary, will, as has been customary, be making some talks, and even during the period when the Democrats will be making talks in connection with their Jackson Day meetings.

So we are going to keep the Senate in session; and, if necessary, we shall have Saturday sessions and evening sessions if there is any indication of an attempt to prevent the Senate from finally reaching a vote, after adequate discussion has been had.

I simply wish to clarify the atmosphere a little, in order to see at whom or at what the Senator from New Mexico is shooting.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am happy to have the distinguished majority leader make that statement. It is, of course, the sort of statement I would expect from him.

I am not in the slightest trying to criticize the way in which he is apparently trying to keep the Senate in session. I happen to approve very much of the way he is doing so.

I do not like, and never have liked, the long period of taking things easy in which we sometimes indulge during January, February, and March, following which we reach a point, as we did some years ago, when, if we wish to discuss a certain bill—as was the case regarding the Alaska statehood bill—we find that only a few speeches need be made by several Senators who oppose the bill, to require those who favor the bill to surrender without firing a shot, and to say, "We shall not try to have the Senate consider the bill."

Mr. President, I am not unmindful that the majority leader should know my purpose in addressing the Senate at this time. I am referring to the hope that we may reach a vote on Senate Resolution 20, which I believe will place in the hands of the majority leader a rule by which he will be able to insure that there will be discussion and consideration of additional important measures, so that they will not be blocked.

Mr. President, in the closing days of the 1st session of the 83d Congress it had been my intention to refer to Senate rule XXII. Had I done so, I would have suggested that at the beginning of the 2d session of the 83d Congress, beginning as soon as practicable thereafter, but in no event later than February 1, 1954, the Senate take from the calendar, for debate and vote, the so-called Jenner resolution, Senate Resolution 20, which the Committee on Rules and Administration reported favorably on April 22. It has been on the calendar since May 12. It was passed over in calendar calls on May 21, June 8, and July 16.

The Jenner resolution would change Senate rule XXII, so as to provide for the breaking of most filibusters by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, instead of two-thirds of the entire Senate membership, as required at present.

I withheld the discussion and the suggestion then out of consideration for the new and heavy responsibilities devolving upon the then acting majority leader because of the untimely illness and death of the late majority leader, Mr. Taft.

I bring the matter up at this time because the beginning of a new session is the best time to examine and make changes in the Senate rules, because we live today under the continual possibility of filibuster, and because with nearly 2 years' work to be done in the next 6 or 7 months, those of us who favor majority rule within the Senate, as elsewhere, believe the Nation's welfare and security require a greater measure of protection against the use of the deadly weapon of the filibuster either to dictate or to veto legislation.

I am not suggesting that the filibuster is the regular order of the day on this floor. It does not have to be. However, infrequently the hammer on the filibuster gun is drawn back and cocked, and this veto power of the minority over the will of the majority is, as all of us well know a factor never overlooked in legislative drafting, appropriations, strategy, and tactics in the Senate of the United States. It affects and conditions every piece of legislation from the time it is a twinkle in the eye of its parent through every stage of gestation and birth.

Considering the fact that, under rule XXII, the majority at all times functions by the consent of a minority, it is surprising that we accomplish as much as we do, dangerously little and tardy though it is when measured against the needs of the Nation and the free world in the age of nuclear detonations, atomic blasts, and hydrogen bombs.

Minority rule is a negation of democracy that we cannot afford and should not continue. It is too costly, too dangerous.

The Senate will recall that on the opening day of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, January 3, 1953, I made a motion, on behalf of myself and 18 other Senators, "that this body take up for immediate consideration the adoption of rules of the Senate of the 83d Congress."

We urged that the proper time for a thorough consideration of the rules was then, at the opening of the new Congress. Not only did it seem to us that this was the orderly method of procedure, but, in addition, there was little else for the Senate to consider at that time. The RECORD bears that out.

The leadership on the other side of the aisle, however, did not share our view. The then majority leader, the late distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, took the position that the question of rules should come up at a later time. To that end he moved to table our motion, and the Senate followed his leadership.

During the course of the debate, the majority leadership assured the Senate that the question of the rules would be considered in due course. This assurance was the sense of statements made by the then majority leader, by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], in a statement and succeeding colloquy with the majority leader, appearing at pages 112 through 116 of the RECORD, which I propose to cite briefly in sequence of delivery.

At page 112, the majority leader said that while he did "not admit that rule XXII is a great abuse, I should like to see it changed and liberalized somewhat."

A few moments later, at page 113, he expressed the opinion that filibusters can be broken, saying:

> I have always felt that if a majority were sufficiently determined and the minority were not too large, a filibuster could be broken. However, I do not maintain that there is any great ease in changing the rules.

The last sentence is a masterpiece of understatement.

In view of his later experience in mustering only 56 votes against 33 on his motion to table my substitute for the bill to give to the States the offshore oil, the following opinion, expressed by the majority leader January 6, 1953, now seems optimistic:

> If a measure is of sufficient importance and its proponents are sufficiently in earnest, particularly if it is an administration measure, it is possible to get 64 votes in favor of breaking a filibuster. * * * It is my honest opinion that action can be taken on any bill if an organized effort is made to insist upon a vote on it.

Equally optimistic was this very sweeping assertion:

> So far as civil rights legislation is concerned, or so far as other legislation is concerned, such legislation can be passed under the present rules. The question has never been tested.

In the course of his remarks, the majority leader went on record in favor of changing rule 22 to require for cloture a vote of two-thirds of those present rather than two-thirds of the total membership of the Senate. In this sequence, it will be noted, it was asserted that, first, a filibuster could be broken, and—possibly I should say "or"—second, 64 votes could be mustered to end a filibuster by invoking cloture.

Later during the discussion on the Holland bill to give the offshore oil to the States, which debate was inaccurately described by some as a filibuster and which was ended by a unanimous consent agreement proposed by me and agreed to by the majority leader on April 28, 1953, as shown on pages 4102–4104, the majority leaders were unable either to obtain 64 votes to limit debate or to wear out the opposition. They admitted, according to a report on page 21 of The New York Times of April 21, that they lacked 3 or 4 votes of the 64 needed. Actually, I think they lacked more than that.

At page 115, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], to whom the majority leader had yielded the floor, argued that a change in rule 22 from two-thirds of the entire Senate membership to two-thirds of those present would mean a reduction from 64 to an average of 56 votes required to limit debate, judging by the arithmetic of past experience. He pointed out that such a change was recommended in the 1952 Jenner report from the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, adding that he was confident that one of the first acts of the Senator from Indiana after becoming chairman of the Rules Committee would be "to try to bring such modification to the floor of the Senate."

Thereupon the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], having obtained the floor from the majority leader, responded to the statement of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] by stating:

> I propose to offer the resolution to which I referred at the first opportunity during the present session of the Congress.

I recognized the undertaking then made by the junior Senator from Indiana, stating, at page 116:

> I appreciate very much the fact that the Senator from Indiana took the floor and stated clearly that he intends to push the matter, because it means that a sincere effort will be made to modify the rule.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] took the first step toward making good on his promise when, during the morning hour the following day, he submitted Senate Resolution 20, as shown at page 164 of the RECORD for that date. I commend him on his promptness.

Now, Mr. President, let us see what has happened since, and where we are now, as we begin the second session of the 83d Congress.

On April 22, 1953, more than 8 months ago, the Rules Committee ordered Senate Resolution 20 favorably reported for posting on the calendar.

However, this was not actually done at that time. To have done so then would have been to make it possible for those of us favoring the establishment of majority rule who were then engaged in thorough debate on the pending offshore oil bill to have made the suggestion that the pending business be laid aside in order to take up the Jenner resolution.

According to the arithmetic of the vote tabling my substitute for the Holland bill, amendment of rule XXII to permit a majority to limit debate would have made it possible for supporters of the bill to have limited debate on the offshore oil bill. Actually, such a proposal to take

up a change in rule XXII was made by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] on April 20, as shown at page 3373:

> At this very moment I would be willing to support a motion to set aside this debate and to proceed immediately to take up a change in the rules which would permit the application of cloture, after fair and reasonable debate, by majority vote.

It was not until May 12, after the Senate had passed the offshore oil bill on May 5, that Senate Resolution 20 was actually reported to the Senate and placed upon our calendar.

On May 21, during a call of the calendar, consideration was objected to.

Again on June 8, during a call of the calendar, its consideration was objected to.

And again on July 16, during a call of the calendar, its consideration was objected to.

So, Mr. President, the hothouse flowers that promised to bloom here in the Senate Chamber last January and which seemed about to open in April and May, actually drooped, faded, and died in the humid air of June, July, and August.

The opportunity to consider changes in rule XXII that exactly 1 year ago was promised by clear implication in the colloquy among the majority leader, the junior Senator from Illinois, and the junior Senator from Indiana, as shown at page 116, has been postponed and denied. We ended the first session without having had such an opportunity.

Likewise, the easy optimism with which new and old Senators were told that extended debate could be limited either under rule XXII or, if that failed, by wearing out the debaters, was deflated by experience in the first session of this Congress.

Those who relied upon assurances given in January 1953 that (a) rule XXII would be taken up for amendment and (b) votes could be had on vital measures returned to their States empty-handed.

Mr. President, Senate Resolution 20 is not the answer to the cloture problem for which many Senators, including myself, have been searching. We do, however, feel that it should be called up on the floor of the Senate for full consideration. At that time—after a probable filibuster launched against a motion to take up even such a mild and ineffectual change has been beaten, as the majority leadership assured us last January it can be beaten—after Senate Resolution 20 has been made the pending business of the Senate, proposals more in line with the thinking of some Senators can be made as floor amendments.

The majority of this distinguished body can then decide whether there should be cloture by majority vote, by a so-called constitutional majority of the entire membership, or by a two-thirds vote, as proposed in Senate Resolution 20. In passing, may I protest the use of the word "constitutional" as applying to a majority of the entire membership; it seems to me plain that, with named exceptions, and with provision for invoking quorum calls, the Constitution clearly intends that a majority of those present and voting shall be able to perform the duties assigned us by the Constitution. The exceptions require a two-thirds majority, not of the entire membership, but of those voting. A constitutional majority of the Senate is a majority of those present and voting.

In addition to making decisions as to the size of the vote necessary to limit debate, the majority of the Senate can at that time also decide whether or not to retain the provision in section 3 of rule XXII, left untouched by Senate Resolution 20, that cloture shall never be applicable to a motion to take up a change in rule XXII or in any other Senate rule. It is my belief that when we once get past that terrible obstacle, erected in a moment of arrogant legislative presumption and folly as an eternal bar to change, the Senate will do away with section 3 which amounts to a requirement of unanimous consent in order to take up any change in any Senate rule.

The immediate point is not whether Senate Resolution 20 is an adequate answer to our problem. The question now is why this matter has not been brought up on the floor of the Senate for consideration, debate, and vote, as was suggested by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] during the debate on the offshore oil bill, referred to earlier in my remarks.

Mr. President, last August, because of the accumulated fatigue and tension under which the Members of this body were laboring, less because of action which has its satisfactions than of talk which has its frustrations, I withheld a suggestion that the majority leadership call up Senate Resolution 20. Senators were tired. We were looking toward the pastures and perhaps the broken fences in our home States.

My concern today is for the development of a procedure and an understanding so that this matter can be taken up properly, fairly, thoroughly and decisively at the very earliest appropriate time, now or not later than February 1, 1954.

Some of us have done considerable research on past revisions of the rules with a view to determining whether there is some method of obtaining Senate consideration of this matter which has been overlooked up to this time.

We went back and studied the action of the Senate the four times in its history when it has made general revisions of its rules. These revisions occurred in 1806, 1820, 1868, and 1884, and we hoped, through a study of these precedents, to find a new approach to this vital problem of revising the rules of the Senate.

In each of these four cases, a motion was made to refer the matter of revision of the rules to a committee, and the committee brought in a proposed revision of the rules which, after thorough consideration and amendment, was adopted by the Senate. In the first 3 cases special committees were appointed for this purpose; in the fourth and most recent case, in 1884, the Standing Committee on Rules, which had been created in 1874, was designated to bring in the revision.

I have given consideration to proposing a motion that a committee be appointed at this time to bring in a revision of the rules not later than February 1, 1954, as a method of getting this question before the Senate. I have consulted others about this proposal and have reluctantly concluded that such a proposal would not further the cause of amending rule XXII.

Such a resolution for the appointment of a committee would be referred to the Rules Committee and I feel certain the members of the Rules Committee would take the position that they have reported to the Senate a proposed change in the rules and that it is up to the Senate leadership to bring that resolution upon the floor for consideration. I think that position would be sustained and I therefore withhold the motion that I had under consideration.

But, Mr. President, I cannot, therefore, sit back and see nothing done. The threat of the filibuster was ever present in the past session of the Congress.

No progress whatever was made on civil-rights legislation.

No bill for the admission of Hawaii and Alaska was brought to the floor of the Senate for debate and consideration. On December 22, the press services carried a story quoting the able senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] as hinting at a southern filibuster against Hawaii statehood legislation. I quote now from the Associated Press dispatch:

> Declaring his opposition to the proposal, EASTLAND said: "It may be necessary to talk for days and this the South must do."

That is plain language. Today is the day to ask the administration leaders what they propose to do about Hawaiian statehood. Will they move to take up Senate Resolution 20 and make passage of statehood bills possible? Or will they beat their breasts in agony if statehood for Hawaii meets an organized filibuster? It will be too late then—as it was during the 81st Congress.

Mr. President, make no mistake about it: Any statehood bill will face rough going in a filibuster. True friends of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska must show their colors by a vote on Senate Resolution 20. If they do not, then a vote to apply cloture against a filibuster on Hawaiian statehood will be meaningless—as will be many other pious votes.

Even the practically noncontroversial bill for home rule for the District of Columbia has not seen the light of this historic floor.

How long will we tolerate the threats of a few preventing such legislation from being considered by the many?

How long shall the Senate continue to operate under the continually overhanging threat of veto by a filibustering minority?

When shall we act to establish majority rule?

How long shall we continue to deny the justice that can be given to all the people only when we substitute majority rule for minority rule in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. President, in all sincerity, let me make this proposal and appeal to the majority leader and to the chairman of the Republican policy committee:

Take Senate Resolution 20 from the calendar, where it has been gathering dust since May 12, 1953, and let us debate, amend, and vote up it at this time or as soon as practicable hereafter, but in no event later than February 1, 1954.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in listening to the speech of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I do not entirely disagree with his earlier statement, that if there is to be a change in the rules it should take place at the start of a Congress, for the reason that at that time all legislation brought up in a previous session is dead, and there is nothing before the Senate and nothing in the process of being enacted by it.

I desire to say, however, that I disagree with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that it would be either wise or appropriate to make the resolution which he has in mind the unfinished business before the Senate, because it seems to me the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is inviting the majority leader, if I may be pardoned for saying so, to have two filibusters prior to a vote on the Hawaii statehood bill, instead of one filibuster.

The Senator from California is a longtime supporter of Hawaii statehood. He believes that if the Senate can come to a vote on the proposal, sufficient votes can be mustered to pass it. However, if we were to engage in a too prolonged discussion we would, in my judgment, jeopardize the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill.

We are making progress. To date I have seen no indication of a filibuster on the St. Lawrence Seaway bill. The discussion has been to the point. The Senators who have talked on it have very sincerely presented their views.

The majority leader has not been in favor of either foreclosing debate or holding the Senate in tiring and very lengthy sessions. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico was on the floor a few moments ago when I announced that I was prepared to propound a unanimous consent request to limit debate on the seaway bill. At the request of the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] I temporarily withheld making that request.

We have a program in the Senate, and I have been endeavoring to advise the Senate of the program as far in advance as possible. It shall be my purpose to keep the minority as well as the majority constantly advised, as early as possible, of the legislative program.

The Hawaii statehood bill has not yet been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. When it is reported it will be taken up in the policy committee, together with other bills which may be before the Senate. Then we shall schedule the consideration of proposed legislation and give advance notice to the minority leader and the the members of the minority.

I must respectfully decline the invitation of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico to bring about a double filibuster prior to the consideration of the Hawaiian statehood bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me first say to the distinguished majority leader that sometimes a double filibuster can be a small price to pay for being able to legislate in March, April, May, or June, or even July.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to add that I have sat in the Senate and have seen Senators try to bring up the Alaskan statehood bill, when every Senator knew that it was to be followed immediately by consideration of the Hawaiian statehood bill, and we had no chance of getting action on it by the Senate. All that was said in favor of Hawaiian statehood was entirely overbalanced by the fact that we had adopted a so-called cloture rule which made it impossible to get the Hawaiian statehood bill up for a vote. If a decision has been reached to filibuster the Hawaiian statehood bill or the Alaskan statehood bill, I believe it will be very difficult to handle the situation unless a modification in the present cloture rule is made.

I may say to the very able and fine majority leader that he does not have a more sincere friend on this side of the aisle—and, I may add, on the other side of the aisle as well—than the junior Senator from New Mexico when he suggests that the majority leader's burden will be very much easier to bear in May, June, July, and August if he has some control over a filibuster, which will be made possible by amending the present cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will permit me to say so, some years ago a great President of the United States—Grover Cleveland—spoke of a condition, not a theory, confronting us. The Senator is familiar with the situation in the Senate so far as amending the rules is concerned. He is familiar with the method of amendment, and he knows what the Senate must expect if it undertakes to make a major change in its rules.

Men may honestly differ on the floor of the Senate, but at least I have always tried not to kid myself. I have learned something in the 6 years I have been in the Senate. I believe we will expedite the great bulk of the program recommended by the President of the United States if we schedule legislation and keep the Senate in session daily. If it becomes apparent that obstructionist tactics are being used in an attempt to tie up the Senate so it cannot function as a legislative body, I will be prepared to ask for evening sessions and, if necessary, morning sessions of the Senate. In the meantime I believe we can expedite legislation in great detail without resorting to such procedure.

When the session has been completed the Senate will have a much better batting average than if I accepted the cordial invitation of the Senator from New Mexico that I immediately precipitate a major debate on the question of a change in the rules of the Senate. I must say, with all due respect, that I decline that invitation at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I assume that the resolution will not see the light of day.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not think the Senator from New Mexico should assume that. But I think, under the general operations of the Senate, the judgment of those responsible for scheduling the legislative program should carry some weight with this body as to how we may best expedite the legislative program with which we are faced. I do not say that the policy committee may not consider the matter and, at some point, feel justified in scheduling the consideration of the resolution to which the Senator refers, but I wish to say, on my responsibility as majority leader, that I must decline his invitation to schedule the resolution for action prior to the first of February.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am sure that if the Senator will read what the former majority leader promised, he will find that it is more than an invitation.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, let me preface my remarks by saying that I know the distinguished Senator from New Mexico did not choose to read the colloquy between the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Michigan in order to embarrass the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to say very quickly that I did not use it for that purpose at all.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I appreciate that.

Mr. ANDERSON. I could have picked out other examples, but that was the last CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I had, and I took what was at hand.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Proceeding with my remarks, I think the Senator from New Mexico has made an unfortunate selection of a base upon which to found his remarks, because if the Senator will read further down the column he will see in the colloquy between the Senator from Michigan and myself—and this is the last word on the subject—that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said to me, "Do you mean that you are going to put on a filibuster here?"

To that question I replied:

Mr. President, it is not meant to be as bald as that. I merely mean that if that measure is brought up there are many Senators who, because of their obligations to

their States and to the country, will have to fight the measure vigorously, and I am one of those Senators.

Mr. President, ours is a constitutional system. Senators come to this body as ambassadors from their States; they are supposed to take a national view of questions. If the Senator from New Mexico really believes in his heart that legislation pending before the Senate is detrimental to the best interests of the country, he would be derelict indeed in his duty if he did not stand on the floor and make his objections known.

Mr. President, I have made but one speech in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway. It is true that it was quite lengthy, but it was the only way that I could get into the RECORD the thoughts which I had on the subject. I had no intention of filibustering on the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, and I do not think any other Senator has such an intention.

To continue the remarks I was making with respect to the duties and obligations of this body and its Members, may I read into the RECORD from pages 10 and 11 of Constitutional Government in the United States, by the late President Woodrow Wilson. I think it would be well for all Senators to give thought to this language. The former President said this:

> We speak now always of legislatures, of lawmaking assemblies, are very impatient of prolonged debates, and sneer at parliamentary bodies which cannot get their business done. We join with laughing zest in Mr. Cariyle's bitter gibe at "talking shops," at parliaments which spend their days in endless discussion rather than in diligent prosecution of what they came together to do. And yet to hold such an attitude toward representative assemblies is utterly to forget their history and their first and capital purpose. They were meant to be talking shops. The name "parliament" is no accidental indication of their function. They were meant to be grand parleys with those who were conducting the country's business; parleys concerning laws, concerning administrative acts, concerning policies and plans at home and abroad, in order that nothing which contravened the common understanding should be let pass without comment or stricture, in order that measures should be insisted on which the Nation needed, and measures resisted which the Nation did not need or might take harm from. Their purpose was watchful criticism, talk that should bring to light the whole intention of the Government and apprise those who conducted it of the real feeling and desire of the Nation; and how well they performed that function many an uneasy monarch has testified, alike by word and act.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Maryland that I listened to a great deal of what he had to say in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway, and it was as far from being a filibuster as it could possibly have been. I am interested in this matter only because I feel that months from now, in June, or July, or even in August, we shall find difficulty in legislating because it will be impossible for some Senators to restrain their natural impulses as well as the Senator from Maryland has done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think we are indebted to the Senator from Maryland for quoting from a great Democratic President, a great philosopher in politics, who had a deep interest in the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I want to thank the Senator for his judicious selection in reading to us that bit of political scripture. The lesson should be taken to heart by all, and I desire to assure the Senator that the spirit of Woodrow Wilson will permeate the votes of those of us who stand for the great St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not know the views of Woodrow Wilson with reference to the St. Lawrence Seaway, but he was a man who understood government. Would there were more Senators who would read his book and put into practice some of the things he has said and written. I should like to have the people of America read that book and thereby gain a greater knowledge of the fundamentals of the American system of government.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am anxious to yield the floor——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to say, in the spirit of fellowship, would that the Republican Party 35 years ago had listened to Woodrow Wilson, and would that they would now listen to his inspirational voice and read the writings which came from his brilliant mind. We quote him only when we want to quote him on our side. He was really a great man.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would remind the Senator from New Mexico that he can yield only for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], namely, that one of the early orders of business should be the consideration of an effective rule for majority rule in the United States Senate. Since the distinguished majority leader has not wholly closed the door I join with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in urging that Senate Resolution 20, which has been on the Senate Calendar since last May 12, be brought up now by motion of the majority leader for consideration and action.

During the last few weeks I have been reading press reports that filibusters will be organized to defeat this or that important legislative proposal scheduled to come before us this session. The distinguished majority leader has said publicly that we may be forced to meet around the clock in order to reach a vote on important measures. Mr. President, it is sad to contemplate that the Senate of the United States in this year 1954 is governed by such archaic rules that threats of filibuster and of all-night sessions must resound here from the very beginning of our convening.

Mr. President, I am as interested as anyone else in avoiding all night sessions, and in expediting the work of the Senate. Yet I am willing to stay around the clock if it becomes necessary. Therefore, Mr. President, I believe we should have our all night sessions now, while we are still reasonably rested, on the basic issue of whether or not there is to be majority rule in the Senate of the United States.

Let us meet the question of an effective cloture rule head-on. I therefore urge upon the majority leader that he call up Senate Resolution 20, already approved by the Rules Committee.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of voting without orderly and adequate debate. I never have been, and never will be. But I shudder at the prospect of long, tedious hours of debate without voting. Yet that is what we are threatened with from time to time. I suggest that these ever present threats be faced, met, and overcome, permanently, now.

I recall that on the closing night of last year's session the distinguished majority leader indicated his belief that a filibuster could be broken. Mr. President, now is the time to confront this dilemma. If the majority leader wants to see his name written large in the legislative annals of this body, he will determine to amend rule XXII to attain an effective cloture rule and lead us, now, in that direction.

Mr. President, I wish to close my remarks with a simple observation. Fundamentally, I hold to the premise that the Senate of each new Congress should be able to adopt its own rules. In January 1953, a sizable group of Senators, of which I was one, launched a long range educational campaign to achieve recognition of this fundamental principle. We are working against the prejudices and misconceptions of years, but we are working toward the day when the Senate convening at the beginning of a new Congress will exercise its right—as does the House—to adopt its rules at the beginning of each Congress.

Mr. President, I plan to be here on the floor when the Senate convenes next January at the beginning of the 84th Congress. I am not at all sure which party will then control the Senate. But regardless of that, I expect that I will be standing here next January with an increasing number of my colleagues in the united demand to exercise our right to pass upon the rules de novo.

I believe firmly, Mr. President, that the day is not long off when the shackles of minority control, forged by the present rules—the filibuster rule—will be cast aside. These are no rules for the present age. The people are already demanding—and they will demand even more loudly—that we put an end to this disgraceful practice. We might as well face it now as later.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence Seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Sea-

way Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I shall not submit the unanimous-consent request at this time, but I believe it might be helpful to have the text of it printed in the RECORD purely for the information of all Senators. It reads as follows:

S. 2150—ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY BILL

Ordered, That, beginning at 12 o'clock on Wednesday, January 20, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the bill, S. 2150, the so-called St. Lawrence Seaway bill, be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. AIKEN: *Provided*, That if Mr. AIKEN is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some other Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That upon the question of the final passage of the bill, debate shall be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, respectively.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. I wish to inform the distinguished Senator from California that I have had an opportunity to discuss the bill with some Senators who are opposing it and we have no objection to the unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that there may be a technicality which should be dealt with, or some language Senators may wish to change. So far as I can determine, there is no Senator who objects to voting on the measure on Wednesday, although there may be a desire on the part of some Senators to change some of the language of the proposed unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will study the proposal during the night, because I desire to propound it tomorrow, perhaps, shortly after the Senate convenes and there has been a quorum call. The printing of the proposed unanimous-consent request in the RECORD today will give all Senators advance notice of it.

Mr. LONG. That is true.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I propose that the Senate continue in session this afternoon until at least 5 o'clock. When the time comes I shall move to recess the Senate until noon tomorrow. Meantime, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence Seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader, since many Senators have been occupied in open hearings of committees, has the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army made a report as to the feasibility of the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. KNOWLAND. My information is that they have.

Mr. MALONE. Is the report available? I called the Corps of Engineers this morning and they were not aware of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will have a check made to determine the correct answer.

Mr. MALONE. I have been unable to find such a report among any of the reports in my possession. I remember that the same question was before the Senate in 1947. At that time I asked the same question, and the answer was in the negative.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say that I cannot answer the Senator's question of my own knowledge. One of the members of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations indicated to the majority leader that there was such a report. However, I have asked him to check immediately. Either later today or tomorrow, I will give to the Senator a precise answer as to whether such a report would be available for his study.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. In the case of flood control and navigation projects for 75 years the Congress of the United States has followed the policy that if the Army Engineers, after full investigation, submit a report stating that the benefits would exceed the cost, then the project may be built. In that event it is generally taken for granted that the project is ready for committee hearings. If the economic benefits and the power derived will, according to the engineering reports, exceed the cost, the project is considered to have feasible status. If irrigation is included, then the money is to be paid back, without interest, by those who will use the project for irrigation purposes.

A precedent was set in connection with the Hoover Dam project, in 1928, that whenever there were certain commercial features, such as power, the Government would be repaid with interest.

The Senator from California will recall that the Hoover Dam paid 4 percent for a considerable time. It is now paying 3 percent interest. It is that kind of a feasibility report on the proposed project the junior Senator from Nevada would like to see, because there has never been any serious question about building a project in the United States, in the construction of which there is participation by Congress in the appropriation of taxpayers' money, when the project comes under some well-established category of feasibility. In the case of an irrigation project, the money is paid back over a definite amortization period, without interest. In the case of a power project, a commercial project, the money is paid back with interest. I should like very much to have whatever information there is available about the proposal now under consideration, because I understood the Senator to say that Wednesday would be the day for voting on the pending bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I said I would propound a unanimous consent request with regard to it on Tuesday, to see whether the Senate could arrive at an agreement to vote on Wednesday.

Mr. MALONE. I have no objection at all to such an agreement. I should like to have such an agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I might say that the Army Engineers recommended the project as being feasible. They have recommended it as a feasible project over a period of many years. When I first came to the Senate I think the commanding officer of the Army engineers was General Robinson, who is now in the Senator's section of the country working for private interests. The Army Engineers very strongly recommended that the project be approved at that time, when there was no talk of putting it on a self-liquidating or self-sustaining basis. Offhand, I cannot lay my hand on the report. I know that the Army engineers have made favorable reports on it from time to time. I am sure that the committee will be able to furnish such a report to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question on that matter?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MALONE. In 1947, when a similar proposal was before the Senate, request was made for such a report, but the report was never received. I recently wrote a letter to the Chief of

Army Engineers about it. I talked to someone in his office concerning the matter. The gentleman who talked with me said he is going to send me everything on the subject that he can. However, that information has not yet reached my office. I thought the committee might have the report.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Labor;

Samuel Miller Brownell, of Connecticut, to be Commissioner of Education; and

Alice K. Leopold, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank H. Weitzel to be Assistant Comptroller General of the United States for a term of 15 years.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified at once.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CONSERVATION AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to a very timely warning voiced near the year-end by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute, that Federal conservation has taken a long step backward by being made subject to political whims.

Protection of the Nation's natural resources and wildlife should not become subject to changing political pressures. During the recess months, many conservationists in Minnesota have expressed deep concern to me over some of the trends being taken nationally toward removing heads of our great conservation agencies from merit system protection.

Dr. Gabrielson's warning cannot be written off as just politics. His career in the conservation field entitles him to respect and consideration. For 30 years he served our Government under Republican and Democratic regimes alike, retiring in 1946 as Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Biological Survey. And I hardly need add that he is the brother of Guy Gabrielson, former chairman of the Republican National Committee. Yet Dr. Gabrielson warns we are taking a step backward that should be halted.

I wish to concur in and associate myself with the concern voiced by Dr. Gabrielson over the backward step of letting Federal conservation become subject to political whims. Great strides forward in the conservation movement have been made in past years under regimes of both major political parties. Traditionally, conservationists have devoted their dedicated energies to issues, not to partisan politics. They have not changed. Yet I know from the concern expressed to me by sportsmen and others interested in preserving our natural resources that a real fear exists about where we are headed today. They feel that taking the positions of Director and Assistant Directors in the Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service, and those of Chief and Deputy Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, out from under the merit system protection of civil service means, in blunt terms, that any or all of these jobs can be filled by political hacks whenever the present or any future administration is so disposed. Now there is reason to fear the same thing is threatened for the position of Chief of the United States Forest Service. Morale among Federal career employees in the conservation agencies is at an all-time low. How can these dedicated public servants stand up firmly against the pressures to which they are continually exposed, if their own jobs are subject to political influence?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release on this issue from the Wildlife Management Institute:

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal conservation has become subject to political whims and has taken a long step backward, it was stated today by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute, of Washington, D. C., who in 1946 retired as Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Biological Survey after 31 years of Government service.

The positions of Director and Assistant Directors in the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service and those of Chief and Deputy Chief of the Soil Conservation Service all have been placed in schedule C, which in blunt terms, means that any or all of these jobs can be filled by political hacks whenever the present, or any future administration is so disposed. The position of Chief of the United States Forest Service is in schedule A, which we understand is being reviewed now to determine how many jobs in that category may be made subject to political appointment. All positions with the Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska also are in schedule A.

Conservation groups for years have been working with considerable success to get the States to fill administrative positions in forestry, parks, and wildlife protection with competent personnel protected by a merit system. The fact that the Federal conservation bureaus were headed by career men was an effective example that helped promote these efforts in the States.

Now the Federal conservation agencies have been placed on the same basis as the politically controlled State agencies, and by an administration that gives constant lip service to the merit system and talks about improving the Federal service to make it more attractive to better qualified personnel. This step backward has been approved by a Civil Service Commission that talks in the same lofty tone while continually approving more political raids on the civil-service system. If it continues, none of the attractive jobs will be left within the merit system.

What a contrast to Canada, where even the Deputy Ministers, whose rank compares with our Assistant Secretaries, are civil servants. It is small wonder that morale among the Federal employees in the conservation agencies is low.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today in introducing a bill, I commented on the conservation programs and the personnel policies being followed in the National Park Service. I should like now to say just a word in reference to an article I saw in the past week's press.

I have noticed a good deal of comment, particularly in the Washington press, pertaining to the program of the administration relating to our national parks. This has been highlighted by articles about the so-called Dinosaur Monument Park, and the argument over power rights and the building of a dam in that particular park. My concern is a little different from that, even though it includes preservation of the facilities of our parks in their natural state.

It has been my privilege to travel to a number of national parks, and I have noticed that there is a sore need of greater improvements in those parks. For example, the budget of the Yellowstone National Park is entirely inadequate, and it seems very peculiar to me our tax laws are designed in such a way as to permit the rich to enjoy their days on the beach, yet our park programs do not provide proper facilities for the average man and his family who wish to go into the national parks. I raise my voice in the Senate today in a plea that the people's recreational facilities in the great national parks be properly staffed and provided with adequate facilities.

There has not been a forward step taken in the National Forest Service for years. One of the important needs in recent years has been that of improving the Park Service to the advantage of

the recreational facilities of the people of the United States.

I wish to pay my tribute to the men and women who work in our National Park Service. They are loyal, devoted, and sincere public servants. I happen to know Dr. Wirth, of the National Park Service. He is one of the finest career servants of the Government. I believe it is fair to say that he does more with fewer employees than almost any other agency of our Government.

In almost every State we have great national parks. Yet park after park is slipping back, in terms of its care, facilities, and area.

In our desire to have a balanced budget—which seems to be a long way off—and in our desire to have lower taxes, I hope we shall not cut down on one of the greatest public-service programs we have, namely, the park and recreational services of the Government of the United States.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States has been deliberating the pending measure—in one of its many varied forms—for over 30 years. It would appear that the proponents of such an undertaking would finally give it up as a hopeless cause, but such has not been the case. Instead, they have changed one aspect of it or another, and have brought it back for another try. It is about the same as those automobiles on which the manufacturers change the chrome every year, although they have as yet to make a basic change in the original design. If the automobile companies had had as little acceptance of their so-called model changes as have the proponents of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the automobile industry would have been bankrupt many, many years ago.

Every time the proponents of the project claim in their advertising to have a truly new model, and this year is no exception. This time their innovations are four:

First. The United States' share of the power project is now to be built in the first instance by the State of New York, rather than by the Federal Government.

Second. The project is to be limited to the works solely for navigation in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, plus the deepening of the channels in the Thousand Islands section of the river, with no provision made for deepening of the connecting channels in the upper Great Lakes.

Third. Canada or the Province of Ontario will now pay a full half of the cost of the power project, plus all the cost of the waterway in the purely Canadian section of the river.

Fourth. A Government corporation will construct, operate, and manage the waterway under a new method of financing which purportedly will make the seaway self-liquidating over a number of years.

These changes in the chrome evidently were intended to make the project appear different and even cheaper for the United States. Granted that this chrome makes the project look cheaper; but Mr. President, I submit that the project is basically the same that has repeatedly been considered by this body; and, furthermore, the cost is even greater than the figures of 2 years ago.

However, events that have transpired in the past year perhaps entitle us to take a new and different look at the necessity of United States participation in this undertaking. Previously, the question had been one as to whether the St. Lawrence Seaway should be built. Now that Canada has announced she is going to proceed with the seaway without the participation of the United States, the question has resolved itself into one as to whether the United States should participate in building the project.

There seems to be little doubt but that Canada intends to proceed alone with the construction of this project.

The Right Honorable C. D. Howe, Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, at the New York Town Hall Auditorium, on April 7, 1953, said in part:

> Proposals are now being advanced that the United States should build the new canal in the International Rapids section. It seems to me that such a proposal can only complicate the present situation. Ownership by the United States of a short section of a very long seaway would not only add to the overall construction cost, but would complicate problems of maintenance and operation of the canal system. It seems obvious to me that continued ownership by one national authority of the entire seaway represents the most efficient procedure. There are critical channels between the upper lakes that will require deepening to 27 feet at some stage. By assuming responsibility for such deepening, your country—
>
> Meaning the United States—
>
> can assume a much more logical and valuable role by making 27-foot navigation possible throughout the upper lakes, to conform with depths provided in the all-Canadian St. Lawrence seaway.

The Honorable Lionel Chevrier, Canadian Minister of Transport, said in Washington, D. C., on April 30, 1953:

> From time immemorial Canada has assumed complete responsibility for the provision of the navigation facilities from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Lake Erie; and up until this moment the United States has assumed almost complete responsibility for through navigation facilities from Lake Erie to the head of the Lakes.
>
> It is quite natural that in the process of the economic development of the United States active interest should have been concentrated upon the upper section of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes system because of certain important factors. These factors were (a) the vast iron-ore deposits in the Mesabi Range just west of Lake Superior; (b) the occurrence of limestone near Lake Michigan; and (c) the occurrence of the large coal deposits in the areas south of Lake Erie. To keep pace with the industrial expansion of the United States, it became necessary to bring these three natural products together and as they were all low-grade commodities, cheap transportation was important, and that cheap transportation was made available only through the improvements made in the upper lakes section of this great system.
>
> On the other hand, for well over 200 years Canada has been actively interested in and exclusively responsible for the progressive development which has taken place in the St. Lawrence River from the gulf to Lake Erie. The first canals in this area provided 9-foot navigation. This was followed by canals and locks allowing 14-foot draft. Later the waterway above the international section was improved to 27-foot draft by the construction of the new Welland Canal below Lake Erie. The river below Montreal has been deepened to provide a channel having a minimum width of 600 feet and a depth of 35 feet. The bottleneck in the seaway—14-foot navigation in the International Rapids section—would have been removed long since had your country extended the necessary cooperation.
>
> I submit to you, therefore, that from Lake Erie to the sea the St. Lawrence Seaway has been improved and maintained by Canada. Every important betterment has been carried out and paid for by Canada at a cost in the neighborhood of $300 million. Nevertheless, ships of every nation have used the present seaway without payment of tolls for nearly 50 years. An international treaty provides that when tolls on shipping are imposed they will bear equally on Canadian and United States registered ships.
>
> Canada proposes to pay on a self-liquidating basis for improvements in the International Rapids section. Why, then, should your country withhold its cooperation and thus delay completion of this vital Canadian transportation outlet? I must confess that I do not know the answer.
>
> It is reported that certain seaport, railway, and coal operators are strong opponents of the seaway. I do not for one moment contest their right to oppose this project, but surely it means something that in my country these same interests are strongly in favor of it.
>
> It is said that it would be a mistake for the United States to allow Canada to build the seaway alone, but if this be a mistake, then we made it some time ago. In 1952 the Government of the United States agreed to join with Canada in an application to the International Joint Commission for the development of power on the distinct understanding that Canada would at the same time construct the seaway. This we have undertaken to do by an exchange of notes between our two Governments.
>
> It is said that Canada may not always be a friendly nation. I cannot conceive of our two countries living on other than friendly terms, nor of Canada becoming powerful enough to be able to afford to be unfriendly. However, if it is felt that United States' interests would be safeguarded by the construction of a canal on your side of the international section, why not go ahead and build and let us do likewise on our side? This might appear foolish at this time but we have done this at the Sault where there are two

canals, one on each side of the boundary line, and both are pretty fully used. I am confident this would soon become true here, too.

This is the Canadian Minister speaking, and saying that Canada does not seek any funds for the seaway. I continue to quote:

It is said that this would not be a profitable venture and that therefore it would be unwise for the United States to waste funds on the project. But we are not asking for any funds from you. Canada is not seeking financial aid on the St. Lawrence Seaway. On the contrary, Canada is ready, willing, and anxious to proceed with the seaway at her own expense without cost to the American taxpayer.

Mr. President, I have heard of foreign aid proposals many times on the floor of the Senate; but in the main, foreign aid proposals are based upon the suggestion that the foreign nation in question is in need of aid, or that something was to be accomplished by it. But here we see the Canadian minister is prepared to say that Canada does not need the help. She is perfectly ready and willing to go ahead and construct the project entirely on her own.

It will be noted that the Canadian Minister of Transport specifically stated that "Canada is ready, willing and anxious to proceed with the seaway at her own expense without cost to the American taxpayer."

Mr. Chevrier went on to say:

Canada has passed legislation both provincially and federally and could start the project tomorrow. The Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission will develop the power jointly with an American entity and the federal government at Ottawa will build the navigational facilities. All that is required is the granting of a license by the Federal Power Commission and the naming of an entity by the American Government, in accordance with their undertaking, to join with the Canadian entity in the development of power.

I should like to repeat the last sentence of the quote from the Minister of Transport's speech. He said:

All that is required is the granting of a license by the Federal Power Commission and the naming of an entity by the American Government, in accordance with their undertaking, to join with the Canadian entity in the development of power.

The license referred to was granted by the Federal Power Commission to the State of New York and the Power Authority of the State of New York has been named by the President as the entity to join with the Canadian entity in the development of power.

Consequently, the way is now clear for Canada to proceed alone with the development of the seaway and there is every indication that she will do so.

Hence, as I stated before, while the proposal before us for our consideration is basically the same as that which has been before this body off and on for the past 30 years, events which have transpired since the last time the matter was considered allow us to now look at it in a different perspective. I repeat the question is no longer one of the desirability of a seaway but that of the necessity and desirability of the United States participating in and spending its money for such a project.

Has our foreign-aid program left us with such a complex that we cannot stand to see another country undertake a large project without our contributing to the project? Foreign aid should be based upon either charity or economic necessity. Canada has not asked us for charity, does not need our charity, and probably would not take it if we offered it. Is there a basis in economic necessity? I can find none. The Canadian dollar is worth as much as, if not more than, the American dollar on the international exchange. On this point I quote a further passage from the April 30, 1953, Washington speech of Mr. Chevrier:

For many years Canada was taken for granted as a country of fields and forests by all but a handful of Americans. That has changed today. At the moment Canada is gathering strength and making great strides forward in wealth and power. The turning point came with the discovery, after many years of disappointment, of a major oil field on the prairies. Since then we have been forging rapidly ahead with the development of our natural resources. In this atomic age the production of uranium is of the greatest importance to any nation. In northern Alberta important deposits of uranium are being uncovered. With the mine at Beaver Lodge in Saskatchewan in production our deposits of uranium will be among the most important in the world. In northern Manitoba we are moving a townsite 132 miles from Sherridon to Lynn Lake, and building a railway which, together with important discoveries and developments being made in the Gaspe Peninsula of Quebec, will increase our base metal production of copper and zinc. On the west coast of British Columbia a vast expansion of our aluminum production is taking place at Kitimat; while at the other extremity of our country we have uncovered vast resources of iron ore in Quebec-Labrador. Thus almost overnight Canada has made good her two most serious deficiencies as an industrial power—oil and iron.

Canada is going to build the seaway and is certainly willing and able to do it alone, Mr. President.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Maj. Gen. Bernard L. Robinson, Deputy Chief of Engineers, United States Army, testified before the House Public Works Committee last year:

The Department of Defense has consistently supported the St. Lawrence project as being important to the national defense, both from a long- and a short-term viewpoint. The reasons may be briefed as follows:

1. A modernized waterway will facilitate the mass movement at low cost of recently discovered high-grade, open-pit iron ore in the Labrador-Quebec field to our central area steel-manufacturing arsenal. This will supplement our present source of Lake Superior district open-pit ore, the reserves of which are becoming seriously diminished. Open-pit ores possess the advantage of ready expansibility in an emergency, in addition to their lower cost, not inherent in underground mining operations or in taconite beneficiation. Without the seaway, delivery of the Labrador ore to our inland steel-producing centers would present serious transportation problems in wartime.

2. The deep-draft waterway will facilitate transportation of munitions to overseas bases. It offers a relatively protected route, reducing by 1,000 miles the open-sea distance to the British Isles.

3. Seaway construction will provide access to additional shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities on the Great Lakes, as well as the tremendous industrial and agricultural potential surrounding and tributary to the Great Lakes.

4. Related power project will provide an additional source of economic electric power in a region with an industrial potential vital to our mobilization.

5. Participation by the United States in the seaway construction will assure us an opportunity to participate in important decisions, such as setting requisite priorities for shipping in an emergency, taking adequate precautions against sabotage, and establishing tolls, commodity by commodity, in such manner as to assure equitable treatment for American interests.

The first three reasons set forth by General Robinson, namely, first, the facilitation of the mass movement of ore; second, movement of ammunition; and, third, additional shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities, apply equally whether the project be constructed by the United States and Canada or Canada alone.

The fourth reason—an additional source of economic electric power in a region with an industrial potential vital to our mobilization—was satisfied by the recent action of the Federal Power Commission as stated before.

The fifth reason stated by General Robinson deals directly with the point now in issue—United States participation. Let us review what the general said. I again quote from his testimony:

(5) Participation by the United States in the seaway construction will assure us an opportunity to participate in important decisions, such as setting requisite priorities for shipping in an emergency, taking adequate precautions against sabotage, and establishing tolls, commodity by commodity, in such manner as to assure equitable treatment for American interests.

Mr. Gregory Prince, general solicitor of the Association of American Railroads, touched upon this point in recent testimony before the House Public Works Committee.

Before I quote from Mr. Prince's testimony, I wish to state that I do not always agree with the position taken by the Association of American Railroads, and I would be the first to concede that Mr. Prince is speaking for the interests he represents. However, I believe, in this instance his logic is beyond refutation and cannot be successfully answered. I quote from Mr. Prince's testimony:

That leaves for consideration the question of whether if Canada builds the waterway through the St. Lawrence alone, without our participation, we will have the right to use it. The answer is that we have that right and that we have both legal and practical guaranties of that right.

Our rights of navigation through the St. Lawrence Waterway are dealt with in the treaties between the United States and Great Britain of 1871 and 1908. Article XXVI of the treaty of 1871 contains the following provision:

"The navigation of the River St. Lawrence, ascending and descending, from the 45th parallel of north latitude, where it ceases to form the boundary between the two countries, from, to, and into the sea, shall for-

ever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of Great Britain, or of the Dominion of Canada, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation."

This provision confers perpetual navigation rights to the citizens of the United States for the purposes of commerce eastward in the St. Lawrence River from the point where the river enters Canadian territory to the sea.

The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 contains the following provision in article I:

"The high contracting parties agree that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open for the purpose of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally, subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation and applying equally and without discrimination to the inhabitants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries.

"It is further agreed that so long as this treaty shall remain in force this same right of navigation shall extend to the waters of Lake Michigan and to all canals connecting boundary waters, and now existing or which may hereafter be constructed on either side of the line. Either of the high contracting parties may adopt rules and regulations governing the use of such canals within its own territory and may charge tolls for the use thereof, but all such rules and regulations and all tolls charged shall apply alike to the subjects or citizens of the high contracting parties and the ships, vessels, and the boats of both of the high contracting parties, and they shall be placed on terms of equality in the uses thereof."

This provision insures our rights of navigation in the St. Lawrence River from Lake Ontario east to the point where the river ceases to form the international boundary, and through the Welland Canal. It is also to be noted that in the second paragraph of article I the rights of navigation through canals covered by this provision are similarly guaranteed and provision is made for equal application to the citizens and vessels of both parties of any tolls imposed for the use of such canals and of any rules and regulations governing the use thereof.

Canadian officials have recognized the existence of this right. Take, for instance, the following statement from a speech by the Right Honorable C. D. Howe, Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, made on April 7, 1953:

"It should be noted at this point that the St. Lawrence Seaway is, and always has been, a Canadian seaway. Every important improvement has been built and paid for by Canada from Lake Erie down. The cost of operating and maintaining the seaway is paid wholly by Canada. Nevertheless ships of every nation may use the seaway without payment of tolls. An international treaty provides that if and when tolls on shipping are imposed, they will bear equally on Canadian and foreign-flag ships."

It is hard to believe that our good neighbor Canada would try to deny to us the use of this waterway contrary to the terms of the various treaties between the two countries, but bear in mind if relations between our countries should ever reach that unhappy stage, the Canadians have complete control and domination over the effective use of the waterway by reason of the fact that its exit and the last 1,000 miles of its course run entirely through Canadian territory. Bear in mind also that the construction of the canals through the International Rapids section on the United States side of the boundary line, as proposed in House Joint Resolution 104, in no way adds to our rights to use the all-Canadian portions of the waterway beyond the international boundary. Geography and international boundary lines have made the St. Lawrence River 90 percent a Canadian waterway and 10 percent a joint United States-Canadian waterway, so that in the final analysis, if the existing treaty provisions that I have quoted to you are not sufficient to protect our interest, we must rely upon the good will and friendship of Canada. To those who think of our participation in the St. Lawrence project to the extent of constructing the canals in the International Rapids section as the creation of a club to hold over Canada's head in the event of her unwillingness to permit us to use the Canadian portions of the waterway, I should like to point out the fact that we already have at our disposal a number of such clubs. I for one am certain their use will never be required, but I point to their existence for those whose support of House Joint Resolution 104 might be based on such reasoning.

Certain of the channels through the Thousand Islands section of the St. Lawrence River are today in United States territory and will remain so even under the proposal for the all-Canadian waterway. In fact, the Canadian plan calls for a cut through an island all of which is in United States territory. These channels are under United States control and domination, and their use by Canadian vessels is necessary in order to utilize the remainder of the waterway through the St. Lawrence River. Furthermore the connecting channels between the upper Great Lakes lie mostly in United States territory and all of the construction and maintenance work on these channels has been performed at the expense of the United States. All of these channels are used by Canadian commerce to and from the upper Great Lakes. Finally there is the situation at the Soo where there are 5 locks, 4 on the United States side and 1 on the Canadian side. The deepest and only truly modern lock there is the MacArthur lock on the United States side and it is used freely by Canadian vessels. In fact, the United States canals at the Soo must be used by all large modern Canadian vessels because the only lock on the Canadian side has a limiting depth of 16.8 feet.

Therefore, gentlemen, I say that we already have precisely the same degree of control both legally and practically over our right to use an all-Canadian waterway through the St. Lawrence River as we would have if the Congress were to adopt House Joint Resolution 104. The construction of the works provided for in House Joint Resolution 104 would be merely giving us one more small club of the type we already have.

House Joint Resolution 104 referred to by Mr. Prince is the same as the bill we are considering today.

Mr. Prince, in his testimony before the House committee raised another interesting question: Is Canada legally obligated to build a 27-foot channel on the Canadian side all the way from Montreal to Lake Erie?

I again quote from Mr. Prince's testimony:

But we don't even get that much out of performing the work called for in House Joint Resolution 104 unless one condition is met which as of this date has not been met and as to which we have very little assurance that it will be met.

That statement requires an explanation and it involves a situation that should very definitely have been brought to your attention by the proponents if there was to be a full revelation of the existing situation. As of this time, Canada is obligated by virtue of its application to the International Joint Commission to build a 27-foot waterway entirely on Canadian soil all the way from Montreal to Lake Erie. This means canals through the International Rapids section as well as canals in the all-Canadian section and the work in the Welland Canal. Until Canada is relieved of its obligation to construct the portion of the waterway through the International Rapids section, all that is proposed by House Joint Resolution 104 is the construction of a duplicate set of canals on the United States side of the boundary in that section of the river. Obviously there would be no sense in doing that for there could be no possible prospect of making such a canal self-liquidating, and clearly it would furnish no club over Canada's head, with a complete waterway at her disposal on the Canadian side of the boundary. I take it there is no dispute on this point, and when questioned, General Robinson, Deputy Chief of Engineers, stated that he would not favor construction of the works called for in House Joint Resolution 104 if similar works were to be built on the Canadian side (transcript, June 11, p. 167).

The Foreign Relations Committee Report on S. 2150 puts forth as the compelling reason for our participation in this project the fact that unless we do so Canada will go it alone. While this evidently appears to the proponents of our participation as a compelling reason why we should do so, to me it is one of the compelling reasons why we should not.

I should like to quote again from Minister Chevrier's speech of April 30, 1953:

However, if it is felt that the United States' interests would be safeguarded by the construction of a canal on your side of the International Section, why not go ahead and build it and let us do likewise on our side?

Control of this small part of the seaway—with an alternate channel available to Canada around this small part—would guarantee the United States nothing.

The peoples of the United States and Canada have enjoyed harmonious relations over a long period of time. Our relations are unmatched by any other two countries. We have a common language. We have common ideals, and a common trust in each other. The boundary between the United States and Canada is crossed by more trade, more tourists, more trains, more cars, more newspapers, more radio, more television, more money, more sports and more good will, than any other in the world.

The 1941 Hyde Park agreement and the 1950 statement of principles for economic cooperation express the determination that the two countries will cooperate in mobilization for defense, furnish supplies to each other, and keep trade barriers from being erected. The Joint United States-Canadian Industrial Mobilization Planning Committee was set up in October 1950 to help achieve these objectives.

I should like to restate my basic contention. The question is no longer whether the seaway will be built but whether the United States will participate in its building. I can see no additional protection that will be granted the United States by participating in the construction of this waterway. We have cleared the way for Canada to proceed by our participation in the power phase of the project. That is all that Canada requested that we do.

On the other hand, I believe there are many very serious questions regarding this project and our participation in it that should and must be decided before money paid by American taxpayers is spent for it.

COST OF THE PROJECT

The basic question, of course, is how much would our participation in this project cost the taxpayers of the United States?

I should like to discuss this phase of the proposed project in two parts: First, apparent costs, and second, hidden costs.

The proponents of the seaway claim to have the cost of United States participation down to approximately $100 million. They further claim that really it would not cost the American taxpayer anything as they have worked it out where the project is to be self-liquidating. That $100 million I like to call apparent costs. Let us assume that the Canadian and Department of Commerce estimates are correct and that it would be possible to liquidate this $100 million over a period of 50 years. However, bear in mind that it is the credit of the United States which is in back of these bonds to be issued. As I stated a few minutes ago, this $100 million is what I call the apparent costs. What about the hidden costs?

HIDDEN COSTS

Primarily the $100 million is for a 27-foot channel in the International Rapids section. What about that American shipping which cannot use a 27-foot channel? What would be the cost to increase the depth to 30 feet or to 35 feet?

Are not the Great Lakes a part of this seaway system? What would be the cost of opening the connecting channels in the Great Lakes to a 27-foot depth? What would be the cost here if the decision were made that the seaway should be more than 27 feet deep?

Are the harbor and port facilities on the Great Lakes able to accommodate vessels that would and could use a 27-foot seaway? What would be the cost of dredging the ports on the Great Lakes to the extent they could accommodate such ships? Again, what if the decision were made that it should be deeper?

All of these are what I have described as hidden costs. I think the term is descriptive of the situation that exists here. The advocates of the seaway have said this project will cost $100 million; we plan to liquidate that cost by charging tolls; hence, the seaway will cost us nothing. They have not brought out these other costs; they have not said they would be liquidated. One thing is certain: when all costs are considered, this project is not a self-liquidating one.

DEPTH OF THE PROPOSED SEAWAY

As mentioned before, it is estimated that the cost will be approximately $100 million for our participation in the deepening of the channel at the International Rapids to 27 feet. As long as this project has been debated, the question as to how deep it should be has been debated. Proponents and opponents have cited numerous figures as to what percent of American oceangoing vessels could or could not use the seaway. When the opponents have used small percentage figures, the proponents have come back with the contention that it is to be used primarily for lake vessels and not oceangoing vessels. I am not going to get into this argument by submitting my own figures. Needless to say that a substantial portion of the American merchant marine as presently constituted could not profitably use the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway.

Needless to say there is a genuine question existing as to the adequacy of a 27-foot seaway.

How valid is this argument that the seaway is to be used primarily by lake vessels and not by the oceangoing type? If I remember correctly, it was not many years ago that the major argument presented for the seaway was to open a fourth seacoast in the heart of America. Have these people given up this dream or are they merely sitting back waiting for us to spend the first $100 million and then come forth to say the seaway is no good, that it is too shallow; it will have to be at a depth of 35 feet to serve any purpose at all, and if we do not dig it to that depth we have lost all the money we have already put into it?

Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, do you really feel that the advocates of this project are going to be satisfied with a 27-foot seaway?

All of our important seacoast harbors have depths of at least 35 feet, and most of them have a depth greater than that. It requires this depth for a port to become a first-class port. Are the chambers of commerce of the cities on the Great Lakes going to let this success slip from their hands when it gets so near? I think not.

Mr. President, to point up the problem here involved, I have prepared a list of the depths of ports along the seacoast of the United States, and have also prepared a list of the depths of the principal ports on the Great Lakes. I ask unanimous consent that these two tables may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Depths of the principal ports of the United States

	Feet
Portland, Maine	35
Boston, Mass	40
Providence, R. I	35
New York, N. Y	45
Philadelphia, Pa	37–40
Baltimore, Md	35–39
Norfolk, Va	40
Newport News, Va	40
Wilmington, N. C	32
Charleston, S. C	35
Savannah, Ga	34
Jacksonville, Fla	30
Tampa Harbor, Fla	30
Mobile, Ala	32
New Orleans, La	35–40
Lake Charles, La	35
Port Arthur, Tex	36
Beaumont, Tex	34
Houston, Tex	34
Texas City, Tex	34
Corpus Christi (Port Aransas), Tex	34
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	35
Richmond, Calif	30–32
Oakland, Calif	30–35
San Francisco, Calif	40
San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, Calif	30
Portland, Oreg	35
Seattle, Wash	34
Tacoma, Wash	29–30
Everett, Wash	30

Depths of the principal ports on the Great Lakes

	Feet
Duluth-Superior, Minn	25–26
Two Harbors (Agate Bay), Minn	26
Milwaukee, Wis	21
Ashland, Wis	25
Chicago, Ill	21
Calumet Harbor, Ill	25–26
Indiana Harbor, Ind	25–26
Gray Harbor, Ind. (private)	27
Muskegon, Mich	21
Detroit, Mich. (in through channel)	25–26
Toledo, Ohio	25
Cleveland, Ohio	25
Sandusky, Ohio	21–22
Buffalo, N. Y	22–25
Rochester (Charlotte) Harbor, N. Y	20
Oswego Harbor, N. Y	21

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, let us look at other canals for ocean shipping.

The Panama Canal has a depth of 40 feet, the Suez Canal has a depth of 35 feet, the Kiel Canal has a depth of 36 feet, and even when first opened in 1895, had a depth of 29 feet. The Houston Ship Canal has a depth of 34 feet and the Army engineers have recommended that it be increased in depth to 36 feet to enable it to accommodate modern oceangoing vessels. The Manchester Ship Canal, completed as long ago as 1894, has a depth of 28 feet.

The citizens of Duluth have dreamed too long about strolling down to the wharf on Sunday afternoon to look at large oceangoing ships to be content with lakers and a 27-foot channel.

What then would be the cost of making this a 35-foot waterway rather than a 27-foot one? The figures are those of the Corps of Engineers in 1952. For the Thousand Islands section, the total cost, including Canada, goes from $1,593,000 to $23,679,000. For the International Rapids section, the total cost, including Canada, goes from $475,356,000 to $512,587,000. Bear in mind, Mr. President, the only costs I am considering at this time are those to be incurred in the Thousand Islands and International Rapids sections. The cost of connecting channels and dredging harbors is not included. Are not these costs truly costs which should be attributed to this project? Is it the intention of the proponents of this measure to make these additional costs, hidden though they may be, self-liquidating, as the apparent costs ostensibly are?

COSTS TO BE INCURRED RELATIVE TO THE CONNECTING CHANNELS OF THE GREAT LAKES

For these same citizens of Duluth to see the large ocean going vessels on Sunday afternoon it is going to be necessary that considerable work be done to deepen the connecting channels between the Great Lakes. What will be the cost of such work? Has the cost of all this work been considered by the proponents of the seaway, or is this cost another hidden one that has remained in the background?

When we consider the interest of Wisconsin and the other States bordering on and west of Lake Michigan and Lake Superior, and the fact that these States in particular were the original supporters of the St. Lawrence Waterway, there seems little justification for considering the project at all without including the cost of this work in the upper Great Lakes.

The attitudes of these States was perhaps exemplified in recent testimony before the House Public Works Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the testimony of Mr. Harry C. Brockell, director of the port of Milwaukee, Wis., before the House Public Works Committee.

There being no objection, the testimoney was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We believe it desirable to authorize the deepening of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes to 27 feet by separate legislation. There are several valid reasons for handling the problem of the connecting channels by separate but simultaneous legislation, and we are gratified to know that this matter is actively before both Houses of the Congress. We believe the separation of the connecting channels from the seaway legislation is desirable for the following reasons:

1. If the St. Lawrence legislation is to meet the test of self-liquidation, the area in which tolls should be assessed should be limited to the new navigation works which will primarily serve as international commerce;

2. The deepening of the connecting channel is already warranted by new shipping trends on the Great Lakes, entirely aside from the seaway development;

3. The connecting channels will in the main serve a tremendous domestic commerce which cannot and should not be subject to tolls. Further, it is impracticable to levy tolls on dredged channels in open waterways, as compared to the simplicity by which tolls may be levied on canal passages; and

4. Maximum support for each proposition can be development on the merits of each, which appears impracticable if both are combined in one legislative bill.

The fact is that the deepening of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes is an imminent necessity, irrespective of congressional action which may be taken on seaway legislation. Approximately 40 ships, most of them of the superfreighter class, have recently entered or will soon enter service on the Great Lakes. Some of these ships represent original construction in Great Lakes shipyards; several have been constructed in seacoast yards, and taken thence to the Great Lakes; and others represent conversion of ocean vessels into large modified-type Great Lakes bulk carriers. It is estimated that the work at the international boundary involves about $200 million, approximating the entire initial cost of the Great Lakes bulk carrier fleet prior to 1940.

The majority of the ships are between 640 and 700 feet in length, and practically all are designed to operate at loaded drafts of 25 feet or more. The steamer *Joseph H. Thompson* of the Hansand Steamship Corp. has an overall length of 714 feet, and is the third longest vessel in the American merchant marine. On its initial voyage in the fall of 1952, this ship could carry only 80 percent of its cargo capacity due to draft limitations in the connecting channels of the Great Lakes, and this despite one of the highest water levels in the history of the Great Lakes.

Much more than a regional problem is presented. There is a valid national interest in the deepening of Great Lakes connecting channels. National policy is aimed at steel production of approximately 160 million tons per year, compared to about 105 million tons, present annual capacity. Whether or not this national objective is achieved and the national security enhanced in proportion will depend in large measure upon the efficiency of bulk carrier operations on the Great Lakes and the productive ability of the steel industry, which, in turn, rests largely upon Great Lakes iron ore movements.

There is widespread support for early action by the Congress for deepening of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes, entirely aside from your consideration of the seaway. Careful study has been given this matter by responsible marine, industrial, and public interests in the Great Lakes region and numerous conferences and groups have gone on record in support of the proposition for deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels separately from seaway legislation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it is readily apparent from Mr. Brockell's testimony that the leaders of these States are already planning and are depending upon the deepening of these canals.

This is estimated, by the Corps of Engineers, to cost at least $100 million. This means that we can double the original $100 million figure to be spent at the International Rapids even before the project is started. Let us not be deceived into believing that this is not a part of the St. Lawrence project. It has always been considered part and parcel of it. Before this year's new economy model came through, the proponents have on occasion attempted to authorize the construction of the connecting channels by the same legislation by which they attempted to authorize the seaway proper.

There are two additional points which should be considered here. The $100 million estimated for the construction of the channels connecting Lake Erie, Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, and Lake Superior is, according to the Corps of Engineers, "therefore of a preliminary nature." The final estimate could be far greater. Secondly: This $100 million refers only to the 27-foot depth. What about the 35-foot depth here? It is estimated that the cost of increasing the depth of the connecting channels from 27 to 35 feet would be approximately $427 million additional.

Have these costs been considered? Are they a part of those to be liquidated by the payment of tolls?

COST OF DEEPENING THE HARBORS OF THE GREAT LAKES

There are about a hundred harbors on the Great Lakes on which the Federal Government has expended money for development. What would be the cost of deepening all of these to 27 feet? To 35 feet?

Maj. Gen. R. C. Breene, retired, a consulting engineer, made a case study of 17 of these harbors, and estimated the costs that would be incurred to deepen them. Although these 17 include the principal harbors in the Great Lakes, they are not all of them, for, as mentioned before, there are nearly a hundred on which the Federal Government has spent money. While all, of course, would not be deepened, it seems certain that more than 17 would. I should like to go into the details of the cost of deepening these harbors.

I now refer to the testimony of an expert witness to demonstrate the manner in which the cost of the project has been made to appear relatively small, while the final cost may cause it to be among the costliest navigation projects in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a portion of the testimony of Maj. Gen. R. G. Breene, retired, a consulting engineer, before the House Public Works Committee, in April 1951.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am a consulting engineer specializing in the field of transportation. I am a licensed professional engineer in the States of Washington and Ohio. I am a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers. I have a modest firm, Transportation Consultants, Inc. Our work consists chiefly of studies of transportation problems and the submission of solutions to the problems studied.

I was retained as a consulting engineer about 2 years ago by the St. Lawrence Project Conference to make studies of the cost of deepening certain Great Lakes ports to various project depths. Due to the time element which was or appeared to be involved, and a lack of funds, my estimates were limited to the ports of Buffalo, Cleveland, and Chicago. This work was completed. I also agreed at the time I was originally retained to present to this or other committees of the Congress the results of my studies on these ports and any overall conclusions which logically result from these studies.

Please permit me to emphasize as strongly as possible that the costs developed are in every case conservative. If there are any proper criticisms of my estimates, it is that they are low. I believe that any other independent engineers would arrive at approximately the same conservative figures.

May I say that I was most generously assisted by various offices of the Corps of Engineers in making this factual survey. I wish to bring to the attention of this committee that I am not appearing as either a proponent or opponent of the St. Lawrence project and will not express any personal opinions on the project. My sole objective is to show to the committee—

(a) The minimum possible direct Federal costs to provide various project depths, conforming to the proposed project depths for the St. Lawrence project for the three Lakes ports studied.

(b) To compare the costs we developed with those submitted during hearings of the committee on House Joint Resolution 271, page 133, and with those submitted to this committee at the current hearings by the Corps of Engineers.

(c) Based on the above comparisons, to submit as approximations of the overall costs to the Federal Government of the harbors selected for study by the Corps of Engineers in both cases.

It appears desirable, before presenting our estimates, to invite your attention to the fact that these costs, if the project were approved, would have to be borne wholly by the United States and there would be no question of division with the Dominion Government. In the same manner, essential improvements to Canadian ports would have to be borne by the Dominion Government. The matter of whether or not costs of harbor improvements have been included in the

costs of the project will be developed later in our presentation.

The three harbors studied—Buffalo, Cleveland, and Chicago—are among those selected by the Chief of Engineers on which he submitted estimates.

It has been necessary to relate my estimates in the first instance to estimates submitted by the Chief of Engineers at the hearing on House Joint Resolution 271, rather than to his latest estimates, because I was given access to the basic data on which the earlier estimates were made but not the later ones. It is therefore necessary to refer to the earlier estimates of the Chief of Engineers in order to indicate to you the difference in the basis of his estimates and of mine.

Later I also raised my estimates by the construction cost index of the Engineering News-Record in order to compare mine with the latest estimates of the Chief of Engineers.

BUFFALO HARBOR

This official United States lake-survey chart of Buffalo Harbor shows, by combining the superimposed black and red portions the area for which the Federal Government has accepted full responsibilities and for which it now has full responsibility. The section shown in red is that small section of the harbor which would be deepened to the selected project depths according to the plans on which the 1948 estimates were based.

Quoting from a letter of the Chief of Engineers, December 7, 1948, page 2:

"In enclosure 2 attached, there are presented cost estimates, on the basis of July 1948 cost levels, by the Corps of Engineers for providing entrance channels and turning basins leading to the outer docks at typical American harbors on the Great Lakes for channel depths of 27, 30, and 35 feet."

In contrast to the wholly inadequate harbor facility thus described, our estimates are based on the area of Federal responsibility now existing and accepted as such by the Chief of Engineers. The thought that the United States lakes ports will accept any such limited harbor areas as those for which the Chief of Engineers has submitted estimates shown in red on this and following charts in the event the seaway is constructed is untenable. Every individual interviewed by us in the ports surveyed stated that there was no question that each port city and all owners of port facilities would demand that the entire harbor be dredged to the project depth of the seaway, if constructed.

It was of interest to note that all of those citizens held the same opinion on uniform harbor depth whether they held opinions favorable or unfavorable to the project as a whole. Unless the harbors are brought to uniform depths, rather than dredging only a small percentage as apparently planned, a majority of the waterfront owners will be unable to bring deep-draft vessels to the area of their docks, thus placing them in an unfair competitive position. The members of this committee know better than anyone else the pressures which will be brought to bear upon them to correct such injustices.

Although there is some rock excavation in the Buffalo Harbor, due to the fact that we were unable to take borings or discover sufficient accurate existing information, we have considered all dredging as soft material. It is true that this has reduced our cost estimate on this to a point somewhat below actual costs, but this should be considered as further evidence of the extremely conservative estimates we are submitting.

We have used a unit price of $1.10 per yard for dredging, the same as that on which calculations by the Corps of Engineers for the Buffalo Harbor were based, submitted in hearings on House Joint Resolution 271, page 133. I personally believe that at that time $1.10 was a little low. I do not know the price used on the estimate submitted during this session.

We found from our estimates as follows:

Estimated costs, Buffalo Harbor

Project depth:	
27-foot	$5,092,000
30-foot	12,617,000
35-foot	21,871,000

In making these estimates we used the present project depths of all parts of the Buffalo Harbor as shown on map Buffalo Harbor, N. Y., Buffalo district, June 30, 1948, as presently existing, although it is realized that an expenditure of many million dollars must yet be made to bring this harbor to project depth. No estimate of this amount was available to us. This expenditure is not, however, chargeable to the seaway project since it is now authorized.

CLEVELAND HARBOR

I would like to go over that. This is the area covered by the estimate submitted to the committee by the Corps of Engineers. That will be the only harbor area which will be deepened to the project depth of the St. Lawrence Seaway, if authorized. This is the area which is now the responsibility of the Federal Government and which we believe that the property owners will demand be deepened to the project depth of the seaway in order that they all have an equal opportunity.

This chart of the Cleveland Harbor shows, by means of the same legend as that previously shown for the Buffalo Harbor, the area of present responsibility of the Federal Government and also that part of the area to be deepened to the selected project depth of the proposed seaway. There is no doubt that in this case, as in the case of Buffalo, the harbor interests will demand the entire harbor area be cut down to the selected project depth. Large steel interests are now located at and adjacent to the upstream limit of the Federal project in the Cuyahoga River. I believe the committee will agree that these interests will insist on a channel as deep as the Federal Government furnishes for any competitive interests.

In this case, as in the case of Buffalo, our estimate is extremely conservative. It assumes it will all be soft material, and we are using the same figure as used by the Corps of Engineers here, in this case 80 cents per cubic yard, which I think is low.

Estimated costs, Cleveland Harbor

Project depth:	
27 feet	$1,908,000
30 feet	4,920,000
35 feet	10,722,000

Again in this case present project depths were accepted as a base, since bringing the harbor down to those previously authorized depths would not be a proper charge against the seaway project.

CHICAGO HARBOR

This is a similar chart of the Chicago Harbor. This chart shows, by the same legend as those previously shown, that section now the responsibility of the Federal Government and that section covered by the estimates of the Chief of Engineers for improvements.

The combined red and black sections are now the responsibility of the Federal Government. Actually the area shown in red is the only area which the estimate of the Corps of Engineers covers.

In this instance, as in those previously discussed, it is evident that local interests will demand the improvement of the entire harbor. These demands will be based on the same reasoning and will, so far as can be foreseen, be reasonable. Failure to accept this proper demand and include it in cost estimates for the project makes the cost estimates as well as the annual charges unrealistic.

The anchorages and turning basins indicated are but reasonable in size. It must be remembered that these are for the use of ocean-going vessels, not of boats especially designed for Great Lakes operation. Consideration must also be given to the fact that seaway traffic which will use this harbor will probably be almost entirely overseas traffic, and exact arrival times will not be known with the accuracy of present Lakes traffic.

In that connection likewise, as a student of the problem, I do not visualize any iron ore entering into the Chicago Harbor. There are other harbors adjacent in the area where iron ore would be delivered.

We invite your particular attention to the fact that, if this project is to be designed for general use and not simply for the use of a few steel companies, all facilities must be designed and constructed for ocean ships and not just Lakes boats. This alone will make ample sheltered anchorage essential. Unit prices per yard used in this estimate are the same as those used by the Corps of Engineers for estimates of Chicago Harbor costs furnished during the previously identified hearings.

Estimated costs, Chicago Harbor

Project depth:	
27-foot	$5,887,000
30-foot	9,620,000
35-foot	15,649,000

Examination of these estimates shows how greatly the estimates of the Chief of Engineers, submitted prior to this hearing, differ from our own.

Now, I have here a chart showing the costs for all three harbors assembled. For the total of the 27-foot harbors, for the three of them, the total by the Corps of Engineers submitted in the earlier hearing was $1,841,000. Our total for the same thing is $12,887,000, or an overall average increase of 600 percent.

For the 30-foot project it is $6,953,000 and $27,157,000 or an average overall increase of 290 percent.

For the 35-foot project the difference between them is $15,855,000 and $48,242,000, or 204 percent.

Now, these are the costs submitted to this committee during the present hearings. You will notice that they are greatly increased in some cases, particularly in the case of the 27-foot project. They are increased from $431,000 to $1,680,000. I am unable to explain that, except that one of them is wrong. They are not both right. One is wrong. These are the figures submitted along with the average for the total of the three harbors. These are our estimates raised by the Engineering News-Record construction-cost index, which amounts to an increase of 13.7 percent in the costs. That is, this figure is raised by 13.7 percent.

Now, the totals that we are interested in at this time particularly are the overall average increase between our estimates and those submitted to you by the Corps of Engineers.

I therefore raised, as I said, mine by the Engineering News-Record cost-of-construction index, and I found the difference here was that ours were 262 percent increased for the 27-foot channel; 250 percent increased for the 30-foot channel; and 180.9 percent for the 35-foot channel.

It is well understood, of course, that these percentages in several cases are extremely large, but it is necessary to emphasize that the estimates of the Corps of Engineers are based simply on an entrance channel—a way to move a ship into a harbor—and proceed to an area in which at some later date docks may be built.

The estimates submitted by us are based on improving and deepening the areas of Federal responsibility and not selected parts thereof.

The estimates of the Corps of Engineers submitted during the hearings on House Joint Resolution 271 are for 10 selected harbors. These vary in tonnage handled from the largest to one of the smallest, the latter handling a total tonnage of less than 500 tons during the last year reported. Also notable on this selected list of harbors is Detroit, on which, according to the testimony submitted, no Federal funds will be expended.

Now please permit me to project our study in order to indicate first what will be the minimum expenditure of Federal funds for the 10 harbors listed and for which estimates were submitted during hearings on House Joint Resolution 271; and, second, what will be the minimum expenditure of Federal funds for the 17 harbors listed and on which estimates were submitted during the present hearings.

The estimate submitted for the 10 harbors, if improved to 27-foot project depths, was $9,172,000. Based on a sample of three harbors, as described in detail, this figure should be increased by 600 percent, making the figure $64,204,000.

The estimate submitted for the 10 harbors, if improved to 30-foot project depths, was $40,937,000. Based on a sample of three harbors, as described in detail, this figure should be increased by 290.6 percent, making the figure $159,899,000.

The estimate submitted for the 10 harbors, if improved to 35-foot project depths, was $82,532,000. Based on a sample of three harbors, as described in detail, this figure should be increased by 204.3 percent, making the figure $251,145,000.

The estimate submitted to this committee for the 17 harbors, if improved to 27-foot project depth, was $28,848,000. Based on a sample of three harbors as described in detail, this figure should be increased by 262.5 percent, making the figure $104,574,000.

The estimate submitted to this committee for the 17 harbors, if improved to 30-foot project depth, was $86,921,000. Based on a sample of three harbors as described in detail, this figure should be increased by 250.1 percent, making the figure $304,310,000.

The estimate submitted to this committee for 17 harbors, if improved to 35-foot project depth, was $205,624,000. Based on a sample of three harbors as described in detail, this figure should be increased by 180.9 percent, making the figure $577,598,000.

Permit me to emphasize that these large sums of Federal money represent estimates of costs of improving either 10 or 17 Great Lakes harbors only—1 of which requires no Federal expenditures, according to the estimates submitted by the Corps of Engineers. There are now 89 harbors on the Great Lakes in the United States on which Federal funds have been and, so far as can be determined, are being expended; that is, which are now Federal responsibilities. All may demand equal opportunity. If all harbors are improved to the project depths selected for the St. Lawrence seaway, if constructed, the expenditure becomes much greater.

There are an enormous number of harbors shown, and so far as size or tonnages handled, certainly the Corps of Engineers did not select the most important ones, since they did select Michigan City, which last year only had 500 tons, or, rather, less than 500 tons.

There can be no question that lake harbors are an integral and essential part of the proposed project. Without harbors on the Great Lakes, usable by the traffic on the project, there can, of course, be no benefits. Although this is clearly the case, the cost of harbors on the Great Lakes have not been included in the cost of the project. These costs must be included in order to give you a true picture of the total cost of the project. As we have shown, the cost of making adequate improvements to United States harbors on the Great Lakes would be enormous.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a portion of the testimony of Mr. Frazer Bailey, president of the National Federation of American Shipping, before the House Public Works Committee on April 23, 1951.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the beginning I would like to make it clear that our organization is composed of American steamship owners engaged in ocean and deep-water coastal trading. If for no other then selfish reasons, we would favor any project which enlarges the trading opportunities for deep-water ships, and stimulates water-borne commerce in the areas in which our vessels could operate. If the members of our shipping federation felt that the St. Lawrence Seaway would serve these objectives, we would be appearing before you as strong advocates. It is our objective to promote in every way possible the largest, most modern and most effective fleet of American merchant ships for the carriage of our domestic and foreign commerce, consistent with sound economics and sound business practices. We do this not only because it is our field of business endeavor, but because of our firm belief that an adequate merchant marine is an important part of our national economy, and a vital part of our national defense system.

After careful study and consideration over many years, and for the reasons which I will hereinafter state, the membership of this federation does not believe that the St. Lawrence Seaway would open the Great Lakes to any substantial amount of ocean shipping, or would otherwise serve the objectives I have just mentioned.

If the committee pleases, we do not propose to take direct issue with the Secretary of Defense as to the national defense value or utility of the St. Lawrence seaway. We are not military experts and we do not wish to pose as such. However, we cannot escape the vision of certain aspects of this seaway project, which to shipowners and operators appear to be in conflict with some of the testimony you have received. There appears to us every reason for serious concern over the possibility of the blocking of this waterway through bombing or sabotage of the locks or of the channel; or the blocking of the channel by the sinking of ships or other obstructions, which would effectively bottle up any fleet of vessels which might be west of the obstruction and would render useless such vessels and the seaway.

The committee must be aware that the military protection of this very expensive seaway has been only lightly touched upon by its advocates. They are aware that the Army engineers have urged a sea-level canal at Panama, because of the vulnerability of any lock system. They know also that the levels of the water bodies to be connected in the St. Lawrence project make a sea-level waterway impossible.

Chairman HART of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in a committee report said recently that a dislocation of the lock system at Panama could render that canal unusable for 2 years, and General Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, was quoted recently as stating that in the event of a concerted enemy bomber attack, we could expect to stop only 30 percent of the attacking aircraft.

The prospect of landlocking a substantial amount of ocean shipping and of the products of lake shipbuilding or other national defense plants cannot be casually dismissed. It is hardly consistent with a policy of dispersal of industrial plants and defense agencies.

The principal reasons why we feel that the building of the St. Lawrence Seaway will not promote American-flag deep-water shipping or the carriage of our waterborne commerce are as follows:

1. It is proposed to create a waterway with a minimum depth of 27 feet. In the operation of a large majority of our deep-water vessels such a draft does not permit utilization of the maximum carrying capacity. The control of the exact trim of a large ocean-going vessel under all conditions is a very delicate one. The average draft of a deep-water vessel rarely ever represents the deepest point of draft, and the relationship is affected by frequent changes which may occur in the trim or the list of the vessel, due to consumption of fuel, or other reasons. Competent navigators do not consider that it would be safe to send a deep-water vessel over this waterway unless there were at least 3 feet of water under her keel at its lowest point. This automatically reduces the allowable draft at the lowest point to 24 feet.

It should be noted that in order to obtain a permit in Montreal, vessels must have a minimum clearance of 2½ feet; and of 3 feet for vessels over 10,500 deadweight tons.

May I say at this point the ocean vessels would be of that size or larger.

The larger the vessel, obviously, the greater the necessary minimum clearance. A 27-foot channel would not permit safe navigation for sizable ocean vessels which draw over 24 feet. Shipowners or marine underwriters who pay the bills for grounding or stranding might easily require a greater margin over an extensive waterway such as is planned. When fresh water is entered, the 3-foot clearance at tidewater entrance point would be reduced by about 9 inches, due to the larger density of the supporting water body.

The committee may be interested to know that the designed draft of the Liberty-type cargo vessel is 27 feet, 8 inches; the Victory 28 feet, 6 inches; the new Mariner type, which has just been authorized for the Maritime Administration to build, is 29 feet, 9 inches. The trend is definitely to larger and deeper-draft vessels for economic reasons.

2. The United States privately owned merchant marine is comprised of 14,844,000 deadweight tons. The number of such ships having a draft of 24 feet or less totals less than one-half million deadweight tons. It is, therefore, obvious that only about 4 percent of our privately owned American-flag merchant fleet could operate through this waterway with full utilization of weight-lifting capacity.

By comparison, the merchant marines of foreign flag are comprised of smaller units. Our best information shows that over 15 percent of the tonnage of foreign merchant fleets would be able to use the 27-foot waterway at full draft. I might say, Mr. Chairman, later research shows it is approximately 19 percent. Hence, a very distinct advantage would be given to foreign shipping in providing a waterway much more usable to their ships than to our own.

The reason foreign merchant ships are smaller is fundamental. Generally speaking, the cost of operating a foreign ship is approximately two-thirds that of a corresponding American ship. Labor is one of the big elements of operating costs. Considering overtime and bonuses, the wage paid to an American seaman is approximately three times the amount paid to corresponding ratings on foreign-flag ships and the aggregate is three times or more. The smaller the vessel, the more important the labor and other operating costs reflected in the overall expense per ton of capacity.

American ships are having a great struggle to maintain themselves in international trading while paying American standards

of wages and maintaining American standards of living. It is impossible for these vessels to compete other than through larger size and capacity with corresponding reduction in our per-cargo-ton operating cost; i. e., a form of mass production.

It is significant that with the present waterway through the St. Lawrence Basin, only Dutch, Swedish, and Norwegian lines operate regular service between the Great Lakes and transoceanic foreign destinations, and these only to north European ports in the most northerly latitudes. Forty-four such vessels—none of United States registry—were engaged in these operations during the 1950 open season. These are small foreign vessels, in the neighborhood of 250 feet in length, and of shallow draft.

Most of these small foreign vessels operate about 2 trips a year during the open season, and I find no one who can make more than 4 trips a year during the open season.

The investment of huge sums of the capital of our Government into a seaway project, which by its physical limitations increases the economic advantages of foreign shipping over American shipping in American commerce, deserves serious consideration by this committee.

3. Testimony has been given before the committee concerning the draft at which American-flag vessels may operate short of their full lifting capacity on a so-called financially successful basis. We find it necessary to caution the committee against such testimony. We have no doubt as to the sincerity of the witness, but based upon many years of private enterprise operation over a broad cross section of deep-water shipping, we can assure you, without equivocation, that the question cannot be so simply solved by any basic computation. Each individual instance must be separately examined. No generalizations are possible. A computation as to the reduced capacity at which a vessel may economically operate involves many factors. It includes:

(a) The point of origin and the point of destination, hence the length of the voyage;

(b) The character of the commodity or commodities transported, including their cubic contents as related to dead weight;

(c) The character and value of the commodity, hence the freight rate which such a commodity may bear without endangering its market position;

(d) Whether the transporting vessel or vessels may obtain cargoes in both directions and of what commodities, and at what freight rates;

(e) Whether or not a ballast, or nearly ballast, voyage is necessary in one direction, requiring that the total cost of the round voyage be borne from the revenues received on a one-direction cargo or part cargo;

(f) The cost of cargo handling and terminal expenses which are not constant as to varying commodities and various ports, and in certain American trades absorb even a majority of the gross revenue dollar.

From these considerations it will be obvious that to settle in advance as to the ability of a fleet of merchant-vessels to operate successfully over such a waterway at some predetermined level of part loads, in one or both directions, is highly speculative. In reality it is crystal gazing of the first magnitude. Even if it could be determined at the moment for a given set of facts, the changing flow of commerce would make such a computation unreliable.

4. It is the belief of our members that the building of a seaway of 27-foot depth might be but the beginning. The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army and the Maritime Administration have already recommended that the depth be increased to 30 feet. Once the work is undertaken, efforts would shortly begin to increase its depth. The ultimate construction cost might far exceed any figure yet mentioned; and the cost of maintaining a deeper channel over so long a route could easily prove prohibitive.

The relationship of estimated to actual cost of similar projects is generally 1 to 3. With present-day unstable costs, it is not unreasonable to anticipate that this experience will be repeated or exceeded. And we cannot ignore the cost of deepening the major Great Lakes ports to 27 feet. The total cost of access channels alone, based upon the estimates furnished by the Army engineers and corrected to reflect the price index from mid-1948 to today for 10 typical ports is $13,684,000.

The city of Buffalo conducted a survey in 1941 as to the cost of port improvements related to such a seaway and found it to be $47 million for Buffalo alone. If the seaway depth is eventually to exceed the 27 feet now contemplated, the access channels to Great Lakes ports must be improved at very substantial increases in cost, as well as other improvements to their harbors. Not only is the question of depth involved, but the width of such a channel is important. If ocean-going vessels are to pass, it must be realized that these vessels will have a beam of 50 to 80 feet; that they must be kept well clear of the bank on either side, and there must be a substantial area of clear water between them in passing.

Iron ore, coal, and grain would be expected to dominate the trade passing through the St. Lawrence Seaway. Petroleum has been mentioned, but we seriously doubt any large volume. We also doubt coal movement to or from any point of the river system, or toll point. Grain is considered to be of equivalent weight and cubic content. But ore and coal are strong weight commodities which immerse the ship to her maximum draft long before the ship's holds are filled.

5. It is a well-known fact that the St. Lawrence and the lake area is closed to navigation for approximately 5 months per year. During such period a suspension of service is obviously required; and, as continuous operation in international trades is necessary, vessels would have to be diverted to open coastal ports during the closed seaway period. Such an arrangement would necessitate the maintenance of warehouses, elevators, terminals, wharves, lighters, tugs, and trained labor in such open harbors capable of taking care of their normal, plus the diverted, tonnage from the St. Lawrence area. It would result in the diversion of the commerce itself, as well as the maintenance of offices and organizations by the shipping companies both in the St. Lawrence area and at the open ports. The open coastal ports are many hundred miles closer to the major overseas destinations. It therefore requires a smaller fleet to accommodate the same volume of traffic over the shorter overseas run and would render idle the additional ships necessary over the more circuitous route through the St. Lawrence Seaway during the open season. This diversion and shifting of commerce is not conducive to its healthy growth and development. It is discouraging to the provision of adequate and modern port facilities and skilled labor.

6. One of the things which must be borne in mind when we consider the St. Lawrence Seaway is the large amount of diversionary steaming necessary to reach certain world markets. To enter the mouth of such a waterway, it is necessary for vessels to steam to 49° north latitude. This is over 800 miles north of Boston, and more than 1,000 miles north of New York. The area which is most advantageous for trading through such a waterway is, of course, the Baltic and British Channel areas, because they lie in northerly latitudes.

It must be considered that of the seaway course approximately 360 miles will represent a confined channel and a series of 17 locks. The locking of vessels, particularly where there is a substantial difference in water level, which over the entire waterway system will aggregate 600 feet and in the case of the lock system connecting Lakes Ontario and Erie amounts to 324 feet, is a time-consuming and delaying operation. Large ocean vessels cannot proceed at full headway in a confined channel. Usually they must reduce their speed to 6 or 8 knots, which is the customary speed limit within harbor areas. Eight hours will be required for locking vessels through the Welland Canal locks connecting Lakes Ontario and Erie.

We have noted with interest the testimony concerning the making of the St. Lawrence seaway self-sustaining through the imposition of tolls. While not posing as experts on lake area traffic, we cannot avoid being impressed with the apparent unreliability of the traffic and the toll schedule submitted by the Department of Commerce."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, Mr. Lionel Chevrier, Canadian transport minister, told the Canadian House of Commons on December 4, 1951, that he did not anticipate any important movement of ocean cargo over the waterway. This cargo would largely be transshipped at Montreal, he said.

The Honorable Charles Sawyer, former Secretary of Commerce, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the Department of Commerce expected more than 75 percent of ocean cargo moving over the waterway would move in lake-type vessels which cannot operate in the ocean. The cargo would thus be transshipped at Montreal instead of at such present transshipment points as Buffalo and Oswego, N. Y.

With transshipment taking place at Montreal instead of Buffalo and Oswego, and with competition from small foreign vessels, Senators can rest assured that the seaway would not remain at only 27 feet very long. American economic interests would see to that.

CANADA'S ATTITUDE

What is the attitude of Canada toward our participation in this project? Does Canada want us to participate? Will it allow us to participate in the Canadian aspects of it?

We have touched upon this point earlier, and a review of recent remarks by the Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. Howe, and the Canadian Minister of Transport, Mr. Chevrier, might add light to it.

The situation was summed up nicely in the previously quoted Washington speech of the Canadian Minister of Transport, Mr. Chevrier. Mr. Chevrier was plainly expressing his dissatisfaction with the agitation that this country "get in on the project" by doing the work in the International Rapids section.

He explained how it was quite natural for our active interest to be in the development of the Great Lakes:

On the other hand, for well over 200 years Canada has been actively interested in and exclusively responsible for the progressive development which has taken place in the St. Lawrence River from the gulf to Lake Erie.

Mr. Chevrier insisted that the only cooperation wanted from this country was in the building of the powerplant in the International Rapids section of the river. That question has been decided by the Federal Power Commission.

Another indication that Canada would not accept the proposition in the pending bill is seen in the utterance on a Town Hall program in New York on April 7, 1953, by the Right Honorable C. D. Howe, Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce. Mr. Howe said:

> Proposals are now being advanced that the United States should build the new canal in the International Rapids section. It seems to me that such a proposal can only complicate the present situation. Ownership by the United States of a short section of a very long seaway would not only add to the overall construction cost, but would complicate problems of maintenance and operation of the canal system. It seems to me that continued ownership by one national authority of the entire seaway represents the most efficient procedure. There are critical channels between the upper lakes that will require deepening to 27 feet at some stage. By assuming responsibility for such deepening, your country can assume a much more logical and valuable role by making 27-foot navigation possible throughout the upper lakes, to conform with the depths provided in the all-Canadian seaway.

In conclusion I would like to summarize my position with respect to this project.

First. The seaway is primarily a Canadian project. Canada is ready and able to build the project and actually has already passed legislation to begin construction.

Second. American participation would initially cost United States taxpayers $105 million, but such additional costs as deepening of channels and dredging of harbors will eventually cost this Nation $4 billion.

Third. Adequate funds are lacking to construct 42 of our own navigation projects.

Fourth. In the final analysis, the project is a "foreign aid" bill to provide economic aid to one of the richest nations in the world.

Fifth. The seaway is not essential to national defense. In fact, it would be highly vulnerable to enemy attack or sabotage.

Remember, Canada, is ready and willing to assume the $105 million cost of this portion of the project. I feel that if we spend this $105 million now we will, in the future, be required to stand all or a major portion of the additional hidden costs.

We have a major item of expense initially in deepening the connecting channels of the Great Lakes to 27 feet. Canada will not pay anything toward this, and we will be required to go it alone. This will cost us $100 million, and Canada will enjoy the benefits at no cost to herself.

At the rate the administration is providing money to continue essential projects of this Nation it will be doomsday before some of our own authorized projects are completed.

Let Canada build her projects and we will build ours. The only people who should complain are those who cannot bear to see other countries spend some of their own money without the help from the American Treasury.

Canada has a balanced budget. Compared to her population, she is not one-third as deeply in debt as we are, and her prosperity is growing by construction of a power dam at the International Rapids section.

By permitting Canada to go ahead with her plans to construct a 27-foot project, we will save the taxpayers of this Nation $105 million for the present, and a possible $3 billion to $4 billion in the future.

Mr. President, in that connection, I should like to refer to the committee report itself, where the committee sets forth a comparison of costs of various projects both in the United States and elsewhere. The committee report sets forth more than 40 projects, to show the cost of the various projects authorized by the Congress. The list appears on page 16 of the report.

It is extremely interesting to note that some of the projects are progressing rather slowly. For example, there is shown in the report a project on the Arkansas River, located in Arkansas and Oklahoma. That project, when completed, is estimated to cost $686 million. Thus far there has been appropriated $3,175,000. The appropriation last year was $700,000. At that rate it will be more than 1,000 years before it is completed.

Last year the Senate heard an eloquent argument made by the Senator from Arkansas regarding work on the Demopolis Dam. The estimated cost for the Demopolis Dam and the work that goes along with it is $20,843,000. Thus far there has been appropriated $3,438,900. I understand that the locks are just about to collapse because they are in such terrible condition. Yet last year Congress appropriated only $900,000. At the present rate it will be another 17 years before that project is completed.

There are other projects which are just as vitally needed. The report does not mention the Keokuk locks in the State of Iowa. Those locks must be replaced over a period of time, because they are inadequate, as the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who sits before me, knows very well.

At the rate at which Congress is providing funds, it will mean 20, 30, or perhaps a hundred years before many of the authorized projects are completed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at this point in my remarks, there be printed from the committee report the projects authorized, with the total estimated Federal cost, the amount appropriated to date, and the 1951 appropriation.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	1951 appropriation
Alabama:			
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida	$42,208,000	$14,949,000	$2,750,000
Buford Dam, Ga	40,225,000	2,300,000	900,000
Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama	20,843,000	3,438,900	2,100,000
Arkansas: Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma	686,370,000	3,175,000	[1] 240,000 700,000
California:			
Sacramento River ship channel	27,000,000	2,208,700	263,000
San Diego River and Mission Bay	10,300,000	6,025,000	1,500,000
Florida:			
Jacksonville to Miami Waterway	24,131,000	8,131,100	500,000
Jacksonville Harbor	12,044,400	9,663,200	800,000
Georgia: Savannah Harbor	9,057,700	8,487,700	540,000
Illinois:			
Illinois Waterway (exclusive of Calumet-Sag Channel)	29,164,800	27,422,300	700,000
(A) Chain of Rocks Canal	39,825,000	33,528,000	3,500,000
(B) Regulating works	55,778,000	42,083,500	330,000
Minneapolis:			
(A) St. Anthony Falls, Minn	20,477,700	3,609,800	494,400
(C) Other work	173,108,300	154,588,500	77,200
Ohio River locks and dams: (D) Work (exclusive of major replacements)	120,223,100	111,614,100	
Ohio River open channel work	21,546,300	15,873,100	200,000
Iowa: Missouri River from Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa	172,112,900	102,555,900	3,750,000
Louisiana:			
Calcasieu River and Pass	12,645,000	6,818,700	600,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: (A) Algiers Cutoff	14,400,000	9,472,000	3,400,000
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico	31,609,000	25,300,000	
Maryland: Baltimore Harbor and channels	10,400,000	6,801,600	650,000
Massachusetts: Fall River Harbor	2,929,800	2,252,800	250,000
Michigan: St. Marys River: Soo Locks	92,228,100	62,020,600	1,300,000
Missouri: Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth	113,297,100	89,136,900	2,230,000
Montana: Missouri River at Fork Peck	156,900,000	131,974,800	885,000
New Jersey:			
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers	9,822,000	7,790,000	1,100,000
New York and New Jersey Channels	53,141,000	22,497,000	2,665,000
New York:			
Buffalo Harbor	16,146,000	4,623,000	900,000
Hudson River Channel	7,074,000	6,528,000	300,000
New York Harbor, entrance channels and anchorage areas	17,900,000	15,776,000	350,000
Ohio: Cleveland Harbor	23,504,000	10,227,900	237,000
Oregon: McNary Dam, Oreg. and Wash	270,000,000	112,185,000	39,610,000
Pennsylvania:			
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.: (C) Locks 2, Pennsylvania, and Morgantown lock and dam, West Virginia	$24,400,000	$18,780,000	$5,780,000
Schuylkill River (culm removal)	12,574,600	400,000	
Tennessee: Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.: Cheatham lock and dam, Tennessee	14,000,000	3,636,500	2,050,000
Texas:			
Brazos Island Harbor	7,759,300	4,709,300	
Houston ship channel	17,405,800	12,058,500	800,000
Gulf Waterway (Galveston District)	29,222,500	22,218,500	880,000
Sabine-Neches Waterway	15,320,500	14,835,500	1,500,000
Washington:			
Chief Joseph Dam	206,000,000	26,700,800	18,529,000
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River	6,922,300	3,991,500	529,000

[1] Planning funds.

Table supplied by the Department of the Army.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I well realize that the Senator from Louisiana is sincerely and conscientiously opposed to participation by the United States in the St. Lawrence seaway program. However, I wonder if he would give me the benefit of his advice, regardless of his opposition; I know he is very objective in these matters.

As the Senator knows, the present project will extend only as far as the head of the lakes, we might say, at Lake Erie. It includes the International Rapids section. It also includes the bypassing of that section and the deepening of lakes and canals over a 114-mile strip. In view of the material from the Committee on Public Works to which the Senator has just referred, would the Senator answer a question of those of us who are interested in the St. Lawrence seaway?

Would my colleague from Louisiana suggest that we include all of them in one bill?

Mr. LONG. I am frank to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I believe he should submit a bill to authorize that these channels be deepened to 27 feet, and that that bill should go through the usual authorization process and should come up for appropriation. The Executive and also the Congress should study that proposal, along with all other proposals for public works, and should ascertain how much money can be made available for the development of all such projects that are important to our Nation, and should determine the share which would fairly be attributable to the Great Lakes, for the improvement of that area.

It seems to me that when Canada deepens the channels along the St. Lawrence River to 27 feet—as I think she is going to do, and as I think she should do—it is properly the United States share to deepen the Great Lakes channels to 27 feet, so that large vessels will be able to travel from Lake Superior into Lake Michigan, and from Lake Michigan into Lake Huron, and from Lake Huron into Lake Erie. That is the part of the system on which United States funds should be spent.

On the other hand, Canada is ready to build the 27-foot locks and thus open the St. Lawrence River to navigation by vessels which will require a clear depth of 27 feet. Canada is ready to do that, and that project will not cost the United States five cents. Therefore the United States can spend her money on the United States projects; namely, on deepening the channels between the Great Lakes.

I am frank to say that if anyone thinks the representatives of the ports along the Great Lakes will not be requesting Congress to provide funds for the deepening of their ports to a depth of 27 feet, he is very little experienced with waterways. I am certain that those States will expect just as much from their Representatives in the Congress of the United States as will the people in the coastal States of the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at this point?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from Louisiana is being extraordinarily fair and objective in his analysis, because I can assure him, and also our absentee colleagues—we have a full Democratic majority here this afternoon, I notice, from the presiding officer, the minority leader, to the acting minority leader and to the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana. [Laughter.]

I merely wish to assure at least the Democratic majority that is now in the Chamber, and also our absent Republican friends, that we shall be proposing—if not to this bill, certainly at a later date—the deepening of the 27-foot channels in the Great Lakes and the deepening of the harbors.

I would not feel that I was properly representing the State from which I come if I did not do everything I could to see to it that the port of Duluth would have an opportunity to use the 27-foot seaway and the 27-foot channel.

We know that at the present time that depth of water is not available, and therefore the port of Duluth will have to be improved. The only question in my mind—and I am speaking to my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, as man to man—is whether we should attempt to have that feature included as an amendment to the pending bill. I am of the opinion that we should; I think all of the work should be done at the same time.

We are going to have the opposition of the Senator from Louisiana to the St. Lawrence Seaway, I understand; but I know he is a strong advocate of improvements, river and harbor, and I know he has a love for the Mississippi River. I know, as does he, that the headwaters of the Mississippi River are in the State of Minnesota. Since that is the origin of the great Father of Waters, I know that if the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana saw submitted to the pending bill an amendment which would benefit the great State of Minnesota, much of his enthusiasm in opposition would be diluted, and would, so to speak, wither away, or evaporate.

So I wonder whether we should submit such an amendment now, and therefore give the Senator from Louisiana an opportunity to cast at least a weak and sort of pleasant and half-hearted vote in favor of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, simply because it would then include provision for the deepening of the channels in the Great Lakes. Would that help the Senator from Louisiana come to a proper conclusion on this matter?

Mr. LONG. That would help the Senator from Louisiana.

Let me say further to my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, that the tradition of the Senate is that when we authorize such vast public works, we generally do so by means of an omnibus public-works bill, because some projects are needed in the State of Minnesota, others are needed in the State of New York, and others are needed in other States, including my own State of Louisiana. So usually all such important projects for the improvement of public works, as needed in various parts of the Nation, are included in one bill, so that no Member of Congress will have to be selfish about the matter, by supporting a bill to authorize only the projects in his own State. Instead, all such projects are usually included in one bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana worried me when he read into the RECORD figures regarding the longevity of such undertakings and the length of time that apparently will be required before some of the projects are realized or completed.

The people in my section of the country live a long time, and we have waited 35 or even 40 years for construction of a piece of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I want my colleague to know that it is just one piece.

So far as the proposed project we are now considering is concerned, the St. Lawrence Seaway now comes to us almost in the nude, so to speak. In the pending measure there is no provision for deepening the channels or the harbors on the Great Lakes. We have before us now a bill which incorporates only the bare skeleton of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Judging from what the Senator from Louisiana has read to us in the last few minutes, if we are to wait until we are able to obtain an authorization for the deepening of the channels on the Great Lakes, I am afraid that by that time the part of the project proposed in the pending bill will be antiquated, because the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out that is has taken or will take from 25 to 40 years before some of these projects have been completed or will be completed.

I desire to point out that I believe the St. Lawrence Seaway project should be constructed and completed in toto.

Of course, Mr. President, I realize it is better to get half a loaf than none; and I realize that it is better to shoot an inch rather than to hope to shoot a mile.

However, I desire to have the Senator from Louisiana know that I shall vigorously support the pending St. Lawrence Seaway project, and I want no one to misunderstand what I believe to be the ultimate objective. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, the ultimate objective is the deepening of the part of the project which is within the Great Lakes and, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, within United States' jurisdiction. I think that should be done.

I believe it is a capital crime that the greatest inland body of water in the world now is only half used. Some of the large iron-ore-carrying vessels are unable to use the present system of locks because the vessels are too large and the present locks are too small.

No nation on earth, save the United States of America, would permit such a

system to be unused or undeveloped, in the way the United States has permitted one of the greatest waterway systems of the world to remain undeveloped.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, my point is that the section on the Great Lakes is the part for which Canada will expect the United States to bear the full cost. Canada has not taken a part in the port projects, nor in the future will Canada expect to spend 5 cents in deepening any of the channels on the Great Lakes or Lake St. Clair, the Mackinaw Channel, or the deeper channel at Sault Ste. Marie. Canada does not expect to pay even 5 cents of the cost of providing for 27-foot navigation in those areas. Nor, if we ever reach the point where there will be a 35-foot channel, will Canada expect to spend her funds for the construction of a 35-foot channel into Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, or Lake Superior.

I have read the statements which have been made by various of the Canadian Cabinet Ministers, and it is obvious that Canada expects the United States to handle that part of the cost and that part of the system.

Canada already has an investment of $300,000,000 in navigation in the St. Lawrence and the Welland Canal. It will not cost Canada much more to make the Welland Canal available to 27-foot navigation, for at the present time that canal is for the most part usable to that extent.

Canada realizes that at the present time she has a navigation project of only 14 foot draft on the St. Lawrence River, and Canada says that project is not adequate for modern commerce. In addition, Canada believes that a power project should be constructed.

Incidentally, the junior Senator from Louisiana believes the power projects should be constructed. That is one of the better power-project sites in the world, namely, the one at the International Rapids. When that power project is constructed, it will be necessary to build locks, in order to make it possible for vessels to pass over the power project dam. When such locks are built, what is the sense in building 14-foot locks, such as are in existence at the present time, when the next succeeding locks, on the Welland Canal, provide 27-foot navigation and 30-foot locks.

The International Rapids section should be at least as deep as the locks on the Welland Canal, and Canada proposes to make them that deep to meet the requirements of lake navigation. There must be four more locks farther downstream before reaching the sea, and Canada proposes to build those locks on her segment. She expects no contribution whatsoever from the United States toward the building of those locks. Canada says, "Give us a permit to go ahead and build the dam, and we will take care of the locks. We will not ask you to pay any of that cost." I have never seen any indication that Canada wants us to pay any part of that cost.

It is clear that some people would like to participate, and to spend our money, thinking that it would give us some additional control over the project if we were to put up $100 million of American money. Yet there is no assurance that we are to have any voice in the Canadian segment, and I doubt that Canada would permit us to have any voice in the Canadian segment. Canada has complete control of it. She agreed to an international treaty as far back as 1909, which provides that all tolls which may be charged will be charged to the United States and Canadian shipping alike. I presume that the charge to foreign nations would be on the same basis.

Up to this point, in improving navigation at a cost of $300 million in this area, Canada has seen fit to make the project entirely toll-free to everyone. Therefore, there is no cause for the junior Senator from Louisiana to worry about Canada discriminating against us. If she were to do so, we would have plenty of opportunity to retaliate against Canada, although among friendly neighbors there is no reason why that should be necessary at all. One of the ways in which we could insist that Canada cooperate with us would be by providing navigation on the Great Lakes, to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred. That is properly the American share of the project, and Canadian ministers themselves have indicated that they wish we would improve that section of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project, because Canada would improve the other segment.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that Canada always has maintained navigation in this area, in view of the fact that she would continue to maintain navigation in this area, in view of the fact that she is ready to spend the money, but all she wants is a permit from the United States to build the dam on the International Rapids section, it seems to me that this bill partakes of the nature of a foreign-aid bill to provide economic aid to one of the richest nations in the world, which is another reason why I oppose the bill.

My fifth reason is that the seaway is not essential to national defense. It would be highly vulnerable to sabotage.

By permitting Canada to go ahead with her plans and construct a 27-foot project, we would save the taxpayers of this Nation $105 million for the present, and possible $3 billion or $4 billion in the future.

I have discussed the proposed figure of $105 million. In my judgment this would not at all be adequate for the project we would be asked to build in the long run. I believe that in the long run, if the project were a fraction as good as its proponents say it is, we would be asked to build a 35-foot project. If we do so, the cost will be an additional $500 million to deepen the channels in the Great Lakes; and it would cost another $500 million to deepen the channels in the Welland Canal section.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana wants the RECORD to be explicit and accurate. As the Senator knows, the bill provides for toll charges, and the Senator knows that those toll charges are to be directed toward the retirement of the cost of deepening the channels in the International Rapids section. We may dispute as to whether the toll charges will amount to the total which the experts now estimate. I make this suggestion to the Senator from Louisiana: In connection with every transportation project we have ever designed or built, the actual traffic has exceeded the wildest estimates. We have an example within recent months in the New Jersey Turnpike. The estimates of traffic by the best highway experts did not come anywhere near the actual volume of traffic. In connection with the Panama Canal, the experts on the traffic movement through the canal came nowhere near what actually happened. What actually happened was far greater than the estimates. I think the same thing is true even of the 9-foot channel on the Mississippi. I recall the estimates made with respect to the upper Mississippi, as to the amount of traffic which would move in that area of the country. The estimates fell far short. I think they were something like one-fifth of the actual tonnage on the upper Mississippi.

The trouble with most of the experts is that they are pessimists. They have no faith in the future. The St. Lawrence will most likely offer an artery of traffic which will permit the movement of water transportation far beyond the most optimistic estimates at the present time.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator will find that there are projects in the United States—and a considerable number of them—on which the traffic is not nearly as great as was estimated when the projects were authorized. I regret that that is true.

Some time ago the junior Senator from Louisiana was asked to go with other Senators to meet with the Army engineers, or perhaps it was the Bureau of the Budget. The junior Senator from Louisiana was not available at that particular time because he was busy on the floor of the Senate. As I recall, the subject upon which we were asked to confer was an effort to persuade the responsible authorities not to close the locks on a particular navigation project and save the Government the expense of lock keepers, because the traffic was very slight on the particular canal. The railroads had so modified their rates as to provide what they called water competitive rates to the community being served by the waterway that it had simply destroyed much of the incentive to use that particular waterway.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted that the Senator brought out that very important point. The truth is that whether or not a waterway is used as it is planned, it stands as a competitor, and serves as a sort of competitive yardstick as compared with rail transportation. We in the upper Midwest know that the very existence of a 9-foot channel on the upper Mississippi River has done a great deal toward easing some of the transportation costs and providing a greater flow

of commerce as well as a greater development of business and industry. I think it is fair to say that water transportation, of which the Senator from Louisiana has been a stanch advocate——

Mr. LONG. And still is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana is still a stanch advocate of water transportation. Water transportation has done as much as any other single development in our country to ease transportation rates and make them more equitable, and to provide for a more general development of industry and commerce throughout the country.

I see the Senator's point with reference to this project being an all-Canadian project. I think the Senator argues his point well. I believe the administration feels—and it has been the attitude of many Americans for some 40 years—that it would be better to have the St. Lawrence Seaway a jointly managed and controlled project and program. I see that there is merit on both sides of the question.

I shall be very candid with the Senator and tell him that I am disappointed that the public-power features are gone out of this project. I wish to register my disappointment. I am very much disappointed that the deepening of the channels up to the Duluth-Superior Harbor has been excluded. That is the second largest harbor on the North American Continent, in terms of tonnage. It is an inland harbor, a part of my own great State of Minnesota.

I regret to see that we have been driven to the position of taking this little stretch of slightly more than 100 miles or nothing. However, I am not going to give up the last little bit merely because we did not get what I considered to be the total project.

I know that the Senator from Louisiana is not going to be convinced by any of my arguments. He has read the record. He is standing here defending his own honorable position. He is not unmindful of the importance of the port of New Orleans. Let me say to my friend from Louisiana that I want to see the port of New New Orleans grow. I want to see it grow by leaps and bounds. I remind him that a great deal of the commerce which comes down to the port of New Orleans originates in the great upper Midwest. It will be a greater commerce as we develop the Mississippi for water transportation. It will be a greater commerce as we develop the harbor at Duluth-Superior. The flow of commerce will extend all the way from the Atlantic, literally speaking, up into the great State of Minnesota and down the Mississippi, with only a very small stretch of some 150 miles, between Duluth and Minneapolis-St. Paul, by rail. In that way we will have actually provided a waterway all the way through the midcontinent of the United States, to the Atlantic, to the Gulf of Mexico, and into the port of New Orleans. I believe in the long run it will be good for both sections of the country. That is my view. Of course I have learned that men can hold to a view very strongly and that other men can hold just as strongly to opposite views, in all consciousness.

There is no effort in my section of the country to favor the St. Lawrence Seaway as against other developments. I believe there is plenty of room for development in all sections of our country. If an economic recession occurs we will have to move forward on the project which the Senator from Louisiana mentioned a while ago. The Government has enough projects authorized by Congress to put a great many people to work and to keep the wheels of industry spinning. I was delighted that the Senator mentioned the projects.

We will not have to depend on the Eisenhower administration to create any new projects. Sufficient projects have already been authorized by previous administrations which saw the light of day and realized what was needed.

Mr. LONG. At such time as 27-foot navigation into the Great Lakes is feasible, if the junior Senator from Minnesota will submit a bill to authorize the channels in the Great Lakes to be deepened, and if the Committee on Public Works will recommend the projects—as any good public project should be recommended—I shall support the project, which would cost approximately $100 million.

That is what the junior Senator from Louisiana believes is properly the American phase of the project. Further, if in the future it should appear that those connections have to be further deepened, and if it should appear that the connections were feasible and if commerce in the Great Lakes developed to the extent that it would justify the deepening of the navigational approaches into the Great Lakes, and if Canada did her share—the junior Senator from Louisiana would not oppose the project, but would be inclined to go along with it.

However, Mr. President, I do not agree that the proposed waterway would be self-liquidating. I doubt it very seriously.

I refer the Senator from Minnesota to page 83 of the hearings on House Joint Resolution 104. On page 83 of the hearings, which I do not believe the Senator from Minnesota has before him, there appears the cost of shipping 1 ton of iron ore from Seven Islands to Pittsburgh, as follows:

Seven Islands to Baltimore via ocean and thence by rail to Pittsburgh, $4.78.

Seven Islands to Ashtabula via 27-foot seaway and thence by rail to Pittsburgh, $4.15. The indicated saving to Pittsburgh is 63 cents a ton. It is proposed on that tonnage to levy a toll of 50 cents a ton, thus leaving a saving of 13 cents on the gross bill. Mr. President, the railroads would not spend even as much as 5 minutes in making application to reduce the rate by 13 cents or 50 cents or even a dollar in order to retain the traffic. Then we would have that much less navigation on the waterway.

In the State of Louisiana we have a 14-foot project on the intercoastal waterway. As I recall, it has handled approximately 14 million tons a year at Harvey lock. That project is in direct competition with coastwise shipping and also with the railroads, which have had to reduce their freight rates to meet the competition. If we were to impose a toll of 50 cents a ton on that waterway anyone in New Orleans or Louisiana would tell you, Mr. President, that it would reduce the amount of traffic that would move on that waterway.

On the other hand, we have before us a proposal based on the assumption that when we deepen a channel from 14 feet to 27 feet and impose a toll of 50 cents a ton, that that will mean an increase in traffic almost overnight from 11 million tons to 30 million tons after the toll is charged.

The charging of a toll reduces traffic instead of increasing it. The only project known to me, operating on a toll basis which is actually paying off at a profit, is the Panama Canal. Of course, everyone is willing to pay the toll in order to go through the Panama Canal, because if he did not use the Panama Canal he would have to go all the way around the Continent of South America. Except for the Panama Canal, the junior Senator from Louisiana knows of no project where the charging of a toll increases traffic. To suggest that the toll, in the face of the lower freight rates which the railroads would ultimately apply, would make the project self-liquidating, seems ridiculous to the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Personally, I have never felt that we should impose tolls on a waterway. I predict that financing the proposed project out of tolls will fail. I expect the present sponsors of the bill to return to the Senate within a very short period of time, in the event the bill should pass, and ask that Congress appropriate the necessary money to make the project a toll-free navigation project just as is the case with every other navigation project in North America with the exception of the Panama Canal.

I have alluded to some extent to the so-called hidden costs, which I believe will be in the neighborhood of a billion dollars, namely, for deepening the channels to get into the Great Lakes, and deepening the Welland Canal. In the long run it will also be necessary to deepen most if not all of the 89 harbors on the Great Lakes.

I realize that the matter would be brought up gradually. We would be asked to deepen first of all the most needed channels, but over a period of time we can foresee that the project could cost as much as from $2 billion to $3 billion for the deepening of the harbors alone.

If we were to spend the $105,000,000 here requested, we would be required in the future to spend a major portion of the additional hidden costs, and I believe we would be required to spend a greater proportion of them than if we were to permit Canada to build the navigation project, as she now proposes to do. If we permit Canada to construct navigation facilities into the Great Lakes, there will be less likelihood that Canada will ask us to pick up the check for deepening the channels from 27 to 35 feet,

if it is decided to undertake that project in the Welland Canal, for example.

Therefore, it seems to me, Mr. President, that Canada should build her projects and the United States should build its projects.

After all, Canada is one of the richest nations in the world. Canada has a balanced budget. Compared to her population, she is not one-third as deeply in debt as we are, and her prosperity is growing by leaps and bounds.

Less than half her budget is devoted to national defense, while the United States spends 70 percent of her dollars for national defense and foreign aid.

Therefore, it seems to me, further, that to rely upon this project as a matter of national defense is the height of folly.

In the first place, the project will be frozen over at least 4 months each year. It will be necessary to go through 14 locks to reach Lake Erie. We would have to erect major defenses for each one.

Successful attack or sabotage of any of the 14 locks would render the entire project useless. It would be 10 times as difficult to defend as would be the Panama Canal, which already ties down large numbers of American Army, Naval, and Air Forces.

If a ship should be sunk anywhere along the 300-mile channel it would prevent the use of the entire project. Every ship caught in the Great Lakes at the time the locks were damaged would be trapped there. Imagine a fleet of destroyers or any other kind of battleships bottled up in the Great Lakes for the duration. The fact that those locks are so hazardous and could be so easily knocked out means that we could not safely rely upon the efficiency of the project. There would be too great a danger of ships being trapped in the event that any of the locks were knocked out.

Mr. President, I offered an amendment which is at the desk, and I desire at this time to offer another amendment and ask that it lie on the desk and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this amendment and the one previously submitted propose that the project receive annual appropriations just as every other project receives annual appropriations. The necessity and desirability of the expenditure of large sums for this project should be weighed against other pressing inland waterway developments and repairs. For that reason I feel that the Congress should, through the proper committee—in this instance, the Appropriations Committee—require justification for the expenditures on an annual basis.

Under the pending proposal, the Seaway Corporation would be permitted to borrow $105 million from the United States Treasury without any further accounting.

It seems to me we should require that every dollar spent for this project be carefully scrutinized by the Appropriations Committee to protect the interests of the Nation.

It is also important to notice that although it is supposed to be a joint endeavor, we are not told in many cases what the agreements are. When we are told that the project is to be self-liquidating, many of us fear that any chance that it might liquidate itself disappears if it is to be operated in connection with a 14-foot project.

We have had no response to our question whether the 14-foot project is to operate toll-free in competition with the 27-foot project which would carry a 50-cent toll, or whether the 27-foot project is going to be self-liquidating by requiring that the 14-foot project be closed.

So far, Mr. President, we have no agreement on that subject. When the matter comes before the Appropriations Committee it would be well for the committee to inquire what efforts have been made to protect our investment. Certain other agreements may be necessary. It is necessary for us to know what the Canadian policy will be with regard to the four locks through which a ship must go in order to get to the free American lock.

There should be an effort to protect the American taxpayers by looking into questions of that kind in the event the project is constructed.

I have offered these amendments and shall discuss them at further length when the Senate decides to vote upon the proposed legislation, because I believe the project should be constructed under the same constitutional and legal protections which have so long been provided in connection with the expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to speak for the RECORD this afternoon, and, through the RECORD, to the people of my State.

During the past several weeks, and again this afternoon, I have been advised by the submission of some statistics, which seem to me to be alarming, that unemployment in the State of Oregon, today, is greater than it has been for some years past. It is so great as to present a frightening situation.

As the people of my State know, I forewarned of this situation approximately a year ago, when the Eisenhower administration started its return to the economic policies of the Hoover administration, which brought on the great depression of the late 1920's. I suggested then, that I did not expect that this big-business administration would learn from the mistakes the Republican Party made in the 1920's. In a series of speeches in the Senate last year, I tried to get the administration to see the light before it was too late. I urged it to make some new starts in the great wealth-creating projects of the Pacific Northwest. In those speeches, I told the people of my State that if the Eisenhower administration did not come forward and provide some starts of that kind, unemployment would begin across the Pacific Northwest.

I am advised today by not only labor leaders but business leaders in my State that department-store sales in Oregon have begun to dip substantially.

I am advised, Mr. President, that on the average, 1 out of 10 formerly employed persons in the State of Oregon is now looking for work. This does not take into account the number of workers in my State whose workweek will be reduced, to say nothing of the loss of overtime caused by shortened weeks.

I wish to say now to the voters of the State of Oregon, "This is what you should have expected when the present administration started its economic program after the inauguration last year."

It embraced the so-called hard-money policy—the policy of making money hard to get—by increasing interest rates throughout the economic structure of the country.

What has been the result? It has brought about a limitation of production and a consequent increase of unemployment in the Pacific Northwest.

Then the administration further paved the way for the unemployment which is now visited upon the State of Oregon by an appropriation bill that eliminated new starts on power and other public projects, that cut out the heart of the REA program, that denied to the REA the much-needed new transmission lines in order to enable power to be transmitted to the wealth-creating areas of the State of Oregon.

It is rather amusing, Mr. President, to find the Republican machine in the State of Oregon these days working at fever heat to try to get the Eisenhower administration, before it is too late, to undertake some new starts in Oregon.

The Republicans in Oregon apparently are now quite concerned about the giveaway program of McKay in the "Department of Private Utilities." I refer to it in that way because it has ceased to be the Department of the Interior, inasmuch as the Secretary of the Interior has been giving away the people's heritage in the power resources of the Pacific Northwest to the private utility companies.

I desire to say to the people of my State, that is what you must expect if you continue to support the kind of a Republican administration now in power, because it is a duplication of the Hoover administration.

The Republican governors of the Pacific Northwest, Mr. President, are now in conference. It is rather amusing to note that their great concern, as the grapevine tells me, is about the appearance of unemployment in the Pacific Northwest. Some of them have been issuing statements of recent date to the effect that it can be explained away on the basis that the situation now developing is merely a repetition of seasonal unemployment.

Mr. President, I always try to be fair. There is some seasonal unemployment in the Pacific Northwest. It is the time of the year when there is always some seasonal unemployment. But no one can alibi and rationalize the extent of

the unemployment which has hit the Pacific Northwest by attempting to explain it as seasonal unemployment. There is too much of it for that.

It is rather interesting to contrast Seattle, Wash., with Portland, Oreg. In the case of Seattle, with its large defense contract which is being operated by Boeing, the statistics on department store sales show much higher buying than in Portland, which has no great defense contracts.

Let me speak to the people of the State of Oregon for a moment, and, from this desk, to the Governors in conference. Let me say to the Governor of my State: "The time has come for you to get off the political fence. Are you for or against Hells Canyon Dam? Tell the people of Oregon. Are you for it, or are you against it?"

I say to the people of Oregon that if the Governor says he is against it, he is against their best economic interests, because the Pacific Northwest needs Hells Canyon Dam, a great multiple purpose dam, which should be built by the Government on a most advantageous site that belongs to the people of the United States. It is sorely needed in order to supply cheap power to the Pacific Northwest. Cheap power is the primary factor needed to assure employment in that region. The economic welfare and future of the Pacific Northwest depend upon such important and necessary projects as Hells Canyon Dam. Yet Oregon has a Governor who has been saying that he does not believe Oregon has a great interest in Hells Canyon Dam. At least the press has so quoted him. Let me say to the people of the State of Oregon: A Governor who says that is the kind of Governor to get rid of. If he does not understand the importance of Hells Canyon Dam to the future economic development of the Pacific Northwest, then defeat him in 1954.

The Governors are in conference. I recommend to them, in addition to Hells Canyon Dam, a few other projects they had better urge upon the Eisenhower administration. This administration has not awakened to the very elementary fact that a return to the law of supply and demand and a laissez faire economy means depression. They are not going to create employment opportunities for the unemployed of America. Those two economic principles are as outmoded in modern industrial society as an ax of the stone age is outmoded in a modern industrial plant. This administration obviously needs an elementary course in economics, and that course ought to begin at the White House with instruction on the economic facts of life.

The Governors, in conference assembled, ought to take steps to interest the Eisenhower administration in working out an agreement with Canada which will make possible a plan for the building of Libby Dam. I think a plan can be worked out, because Libby Dam is another one of the new starts needed in the Pacific Northwest if we are to counteract the effects of the Eisenhower recession which are sweeping across my State.

Then there is need for a new start on the John Day Dam, in Oregon, and regrettable slowdowns on Chief Joseph, McNary, and The Dalles Dams should not be tolerated.

At last, Mr. President, in spite of all the political advertising in which the Republicans are engaged, in their endeavor politically to soap-sell to the American people the idea that things are hunky-dory in America's economic life, we are getting some little inkling from some Republicans that this advertising does not set forth the true state of the facts. Some Republicans, at last, are beginning to refer loudly, not in whispers, to the need of some new starts. It is about time the administration began some of these in the Pacific Northwest.

But let me say to the people of Oregon: "See to it that we get new starts that will promote the development of your interests in the power resources of the Pacific Northwest, and make sure that they are not designed to turn over the electric power resources of that area to the private utilities at the bus bar." It is in that field that it is necessary to watch the Eisenhower administration at all times. I say to the people of Oregon: "Keep your eyes on them, because the Republican machine, nationally and statewide, will sell you short from the standpoint of protecting your interests in the power resources of your State. Watch them, even when they propose new starts, to make sure that their proposals do not contain gimmicks which will turn over power resources to the private utilities at the bus bar."

I shall speak at greater length when I give my second report of the Independent Party in this session of Congress. My first report was the speech I made last week, in my fight on the committee issue.

I shall give a committee report this week, in which I shall discuss the relationship of the fallacious economic policies of the Eisenhower administration to a proper solution of the economic problems which confront the people of Oregon. I wanted, however, to say this much today, because persons from my State who have been in touch with me today have pointed out the serious unemployment situation, the severe drop in sales in the retail stores of my State, and the growing alarm that if we do not act, and act quickly, to reverse the economic policies adhered to by the Eisenhower administration during the past year, we shall have an Eisenhower recession which will take on even more serious proportions—and it is bad enough now.

Before I close, I wish to say something about the Republican propaganda to the effect that we should not mention even in a whisper, let alone actually vocalize, that economically things are not going well in America today. Mr. President, you know about the phony, fallacious bill of goods the Republicans are trying to sell the American public; namely, that anyone who criticizes the economic policies of the Eisenhower administration is talking the country into a recession.

Mr. President, this country cannot be talked into a recession. Do not fall for such political doubletalk. Tonight we are confronted with economic realities in America. One of the economic realities is that the fiscal policy of Eisenhower, when he adopted the high-interest rate proposal, without making a single plea to the American people to live up to their patriotic duty to buy bonds at low-interest rates, started a chain reaction. It caused a series of economic phenomena that are resulting in the loss of purchasing power, a loss that is increasing day by day in thousands of homes in America.

Mr. President, let us hold the Republicans to their responsibility. This is the hour when men representing a free people in the Congress of the United States should speak out and should point out that the Republicans obviously have not learned a single economic fact of life since 1928 and 1929, because they are giving us the same kind of economic treatment that led to the hardships of the late 1920's.

So I pledge anew to the people of my State today that I shall continue to acquaint them with the facts in regard to the maladministration of the Eisenhower administration. President Eisenhower will have been in office 1 year on Wednesday. What a disappointing year it has been from the standpoint of accomplishment by the Republican Party.

What are they trying to sell us, Mr. President? They are trying to sell the propaganda that we have to expect some recession now because there is no shooting war in Korea. Oh, how blind can they be, Mr. President? How can they so lack in vision? What a case of myopia that represents. I say, Mr. President, my faith in an enlightened capitalistic system is obviously much greater than that of the Republican leadership. I would be ashamed of myself if I ever advanced an argument that we have to expect some recession when we are not in a war.

Mr. President, there was no excuse for this administration's not making the economic adjustments it should have made, when the budget was before the Congress last year. At that time there should have been transferred into civilian spending and production the economic power which had been withdrawn to some extent from military production. Of course, it takes some vision and it takes some brains.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Oregon yield at this point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator was making the observation a moment ago that the tight-credit, high-interest policy was also launched at about the same time that the new budget was brought up for consideration.

Mr. MORSE. It started a chain reaction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that when the budget is sharply cut, without making appropriate economic readjustments to take up the lag which may result therefrom, and then on top of that, the arteries of our economy so to speak, are tightened, it is like putting a tourniquet on them. Fiscal and credit ar-

rangements are bound to be seriously affected, and there results a kind of chain reaction in the economic structure.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is absolutely correct; but in the political advertising program, which I have characterized as a case of political soap salesmanship, the spokesmen for the administration have not told the American people the effects of the hard-money policy. For example, merchants have not been able to obtain loans to take care of their inventories without having to pay interest rates which make it uneconomic for them to take the loans.

I have talked to merchants from coast to coast since Congress recessed last August. I assure my colleagues that the small-business men of America know what the effect of the hard-money policy has been. It has had the result of tightening credit. When credit is tightened, there results a restrictive economy. When there is a restrictive economy, we have the ingredients out of which recessions are made.

Of course, when the administration had to reduce military expenditures to some extent, it should not have restricted credit.

The administration should have expanded credit, so that businessmen would have been encouraged to engage in civilian production at a greater rate than they could under the defense program for some years. Any freshman class in economics would know that.

Mr. President, let me say—and it is a sad thing to say, but I believe it, and I am always going to express my beliefs—that I cannot escape the conclusion that the big business forces which dominate this administration knew exactly what they were doing last spring. They knew exactly that the fiscal course of action they adopted would tend to move out of the economic picture those engaged in so-called marginal production. They knew it would increase the opportunities of the big economic combines in America, and that has been the result.

Mr. President, it is shocking that Brownell, in the Department of Justice, has not been exerting himself to the utmost in enforcing the antitrust laws. The Department has a guinea pig case here and there, that is all. Businessmen by the scores have told me in the past few months that there is no question that the "big boys" are taking over the economy of the Nation. The result will be to "Europeanize" the economic structure of our land, if Brownell does not get out of his seat and into court and start prosecutions against economic combines and violators of the antitrust laws.

What kind of economic combinations are developing? The favored few, the big business interests which put up so much of the campaign money for Eisenhower, are the ones who are going to profit from the kind of economic suffering the small-business man and the workers of America will have to undergo if we do not put a stop to this movement quickly.

Mr. President, I did not ask for this fight. The Eisenhower administration did, and it is going to get it. Let me say that in the campaign ahead we must acquaint the American people with the evidence of the economic effects resulting from the policies of the Eisenhower administration. If we do that, the people will at least stop paying so much attention to the political advertising of the Eisenhower administration, and start asking some penetrating questions of the President.

I can suggest one question in the State of Oregon: "When are these new starts to be made? What are you going to do, Mr. President and Mr. Secretary, about Hells Canyon, and Libby Dam, and John Day Dam? Why the slowdowns on Chief Joseph, McNary, and The Dalles Dams? What are you going to do to protect the economic interests and the purchasing power of the consumers of America?"

My faith in the capitalistic system is such that I am satisfied that there is no justification whatsoever for a recession, if this administration will exercise proper leadership and vision.

I discussed certain phases of this matter in the speech I made at Miami, Fla., on January 14, at the 12th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, on the subject "Dynamos for Democracy." I ask unanimous consent that that address be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure to meet with the officers and members of rural electric co-ops—the representatives of local private enterprise in the electric power field.

You and your co-ops at home are the heirs of that great liberal and independent, Senator George W. Norris. Seventeen years ago, Norris fathered the legislation which established the Rural Electrification Administration. It is unnecessary to tell this audience of the battles he waged for natural resource conservation and power development. He prevented the Muscle Shoals giveaway by the Republicans in the 1920's. He succeeded in his fight for TVA and REA with the help of a friendly administration. Norris believed in dynamos for democracy. He waged many a successful battle in his time for the development of our natural resources for the benefit of the people. He recognized that our natural resources belong to all of the people and should not be allowed to be exploited by the private monopolies. Norris fought the false idea that private enterprise means that the people should have to pay tribute to the private utilities for electric energy generated by dynamos in multiple-purpose dams that should always belong to the people.

The battles that he waged are battles that must be fought again.

If those battles are to be won we need what Norris had—a friendly administration. That means a new administration.

As a first step, the American people should elect a Democratic Congress in 1954. The administrative wrecking of the resource development and REA program must be stopped. We need in Congress men who understand that public generation and transmission of power and the continued development of the rural electrification program are powerful forces for the protection and creation of private enterprise and economic farming.

Unfortunately, Eisenhower and McKay, judged by their statements and actions, cannot distinguish between private enterprise and private monopoly.

The Eisenhower administration has carried on a systematic scheme of turning over the magnificent natural and power resources of the people to the private utilities.

You will recall that Candidate Eisenhower demonstrated his lack of understanding of the conservation programs of 50 years when he said in Boise during the 1952 campaign:

"The Government will build the power dams, the Government will tell you how to distribute your power, the Government will do this and that, the Government does everything but come in and wash the dishes for the housewife."

In effect, Candidate Eisenhower (he later tried to backtrack a little) was telling the people that, if elected, the development of hydroelectric power by the Federal Government would cease. So far as I can tell, that is the only campaign pledge he has kept.

A list of actions taken by the Eisenhower-McKay team shows clearly the pattern of demolition:

1. The walkout on Hells Canyon on May 5;

2. The budget for fiscal 1954 which contained no funds for new starts; almost nothing for transmission lines; and inadequate funds for REA;

3. The sabotage of the Southwest Power Administration continuing fund;

4. A series of statements and speeches by McKay, Tudor, Aandahl, and Davis which advertised a phony partnership with "local people"—the McKay synonym for private utilities;

5. The 20-year Bonneville contracts with private utilities which freeze industrial expansion and in effect insure all new public power for years to come to the private companies;

6. The Missouri Basin criteria, which chopped off the co-ops at the generators;

7. The Central Valley negotiations to deliver up a vast project built with public funds; and

8. The establishment of the Manion Committee and the Hoover Commission, loaded with opponents of public power.

PARTNERSHIP

The major policy statement came from Secretary of Interior McKay last August. It is a masterpiece of private utility propaganda. It conceals the real activities of this administration. Great emphasis is put on its determination to give a bigger part to "local interests" in power development.

This has an appealing, neighborly, democratic sound. But who are the "local interests" to be consulted? Is it our REA cooperatives? Is it our public utility districts or people's utility districts? Is it locally owned private enterprise? Is it the municipal systems?

No, the "local interests" for which the Eisenhower-McKay administration stepped aside on Hells Canyon Dam site is a Maine corporation—the Idaho Power Co.

It is understandable that the American people want to give the Eisenhower administration the benefit of the doubt—to believe that it is working for the public interest and that its actions will be good for the Nation's security and economic well-being. I would like to believe that, too.

But the evidence is against it—time after time after time.

We must be realistic. McKay and the administration pay lipservice to the public power policy of two generations. They proclaim that they seek only to foster participation by State and local bodies.

The REA co-ops are local bodies—made up of private citizens in the areas to be served. The Eisenhower administration froze REA loans shortly after it took office. It was

studying the situation. This is a great administration for studying. Studying whether the co-ops needed funds was like undertaking research on whether babies need milk.

The starvation diet continued into the new fiscal year. It is clear that if the co-ops were intended to be partners, they were expected to be silent—dead silent.

The only remaining local folks with whom the administration is forming electric power partnerships are the existing and highly profitable giant electric utilities. But these utilities are neither State nor local enterprises. They are, in almost every case, segments of old holding company empires financed by eastern bankers and speculators. Consider the Idaho Power Co. Its ten largest stockholders are powerful investment houses and affiliates. These are not home folks. They are the symbols of big business.

When asked who the Idaho Power stockholders are, McKay replied—"The people." They may be the people McKay knows, but they don't fit the definition of the rest of us.

THE DEPARTMENT OF PRIVATE UTILITIES

In an interview last fall in the U. S. News & World Report, Interior Secretary McKay allowed that his Department could do irreparable damage to rural electric co-ops. But, he said, it wouldn't think of doing so.

The Bonneville contracts, the Missouri Basin criteria, the public power starvation diet in the Pacific Northwest, and many other actions make it clear that McKay is inflicting great damage upon co-ops and PUD's to the benefit of the private utilities.

To keep the record straight, I suggest that the Department of Interior be renamed the Department of Private Utilities. The position of Secretary would be more appropriate if called the Lord High Executioner.

Listen to what the Secretary had to say in a new year report in the Washington Post on January 3:

"For two decades the Federal Government has overemphasized the development of hydroelectric resources. The Department's recently adopted power policy was directed toward deemphasis"—I repeat—"deemphasis of this effort."

You may remember that a few years ago the University of Chicago decided to deemphasize football. It abolished its team.

HELLS CANYON WALKOUT

Probably the most obvious and tragic action of the Eisenhower administration in this field was the McKay walkout on Hells Canyon Dam.

Years of study brought the Department of the Interior and the Army engineers into agreement that the comprehensive development of the Columbia River Basin requires the construction of a high Hells Canyon Dam as the key multipurpose project on the Snake River.

The Columbia Basin holds some 40 percent of the hydroelectric potential of the Nation.

Half of that potential depends upon upstream storage of water for a simple reason. Downstream dams cannot be operated at full efficiency in winter low-water periods. The heaviest runoff of water occurs in the spring and must be impounded for release to dams downstream to assure maximum output of firm power.

A high dam at Hells Canyon is indispensable to the two best plans for upstream storage, not only for power but for flood control.

But the new Secretary of Interior, with Presidential and Cabinet approval, withdrew from the Federal Power Commission hearings on the license application of the Idaho Power Co. for one small dam which would be placed in the Hells Canyon Reservoir area, thereby preventing construction of Hells Canyon Dam.

Immediately after the Secretary's action, the company filed applications for permits for two other small dams in the same area. Even if all three were constructed, they would produce less power than Hells Canyon alone. They would produce less than half the power made possible by Hells Canyon and the increase of power its reservoir would make possible downstream.

Estimates of power costs at load center show a difference of $41 per kilowatt-year for Idaho Power Co. as compared to $19 for Hells Canyon. Other estimates are for a smaller difference but none I have seen predicts anything but lower costs for Hells Canyon power.

Hells Canyon would provide greater flood-control benefits.

Hells Canyon would provide recreational benefits of enormous value.

Hells Canyon would provide enormous irrigation benefits.

Secretary McKay brushed this aside as a subsidy, because power revenues, which are self-liquidating, would also be used to defray irrigation costs which are too high to be borne by farmers alone. Of course, power revenues for irrigation have long been a feature of Federal law.

But does the Secretary criticize tax amortization certificates for the private utilities? He does not. These certificates permit construction and capital costs to be charged off for tax purposes over a 5-year period rather than the more usual depreciation periods of 20 to 35 years. This means that in the current periods of high profits and high taxes, one-fifth of such costs rather than a twentieth or thirty-fifth is subtracted from profits. The results are enormous tax savings for the utilities—and tax losses for the Government, which every taxpayer must bear. I might add that in emergency periods this method is a reasonable means of encouraging construction of plants which would have no usefulness after the end of the emergency. That criteria does not readily apply to these utilities. One recent example was an enormous steam plant in New York City which would probably have a useful life for decades.

Talking about subsidies then, the Idaho Power Co. has received these certificates covering some $10,800,000 of plant and facilities.

Idaho Power has applied for tax amortization certificates for the low dams which would take the place of high Hells Canyon—even before the Federal Power Commission has ruled on its license applications for the dams.

That, my friends, is "free enterprise" while irrigation partially supported by power revenues is "subsidy." Webster's dictionary will have to issue a special revision to keep up with Eisenhower and McKay.

PUBLIC POWER A BOON TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

We know very well that public power has been a tremendous boon to private enterprise. Let me quote from the Denver Post of September 27, 1953. That paper was on the Eisenhower bandwagon last year. The Eisenhower program has forced it to publish this editorial of sharp criticism entitled "Straighten Record on Public Power." It says in part:

"How about the bugaboo of 'socialism'? A good case can be made, we believe, for the claim that Government power, in areas where it is available in large amounts, has done more to promote free enterprise than private power companies ever did.

"Notably in the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest the building of Government power plants has given birth to new industries by the hundreds—many of them large industries. Those areas are the 'hottest' markets in the entire country for electric appliances. Is it socialistic when the country is short of power to provide the electricity which will turn thousands of persons into customers for electric irons and deep freeze units? We think not."

But you don't need editorials to prove the point. Think of your own farms and homes. You know from personal experience that the availability of cheap power is one of the greatest developers of new private enterprises in your home communities.

Even more important is the fact that Hells Canyon and full development of the Columbia basin are needed to keep pace with the industrial requirements of our ever-growing democracy. Irrigation is needed to meet the food supply of our ever-growing democracy. Irrigation is needed to meet the food-supply problems a century and two centuries from now of a population double or triple what we now have. Defense requires the full growth of the light-metals industry of the Northwest. It is no mere accident that atomic-energy installations have been established only where large quantities of inexpensive power are available—that is where public power is available.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION NOT COMPLETED

The rural-electrification program is far from completed despite the fact that approximately 90 percent of American farms now receive power—thanks in large measure to co-ops.

Rural users require more power. Co-ops need to heavy up their facilities to meet growing use of energy.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION THREATENED BY M'KAY POWER POLICIES

The McKay power policies are of immediate concern to the whole Nation.

The careful plans for expansion of hydroelectric capacity have been greatly damaged by the Hells Canyon walkout and the failure of the Administration to propose—let alone act upon—any new starts during 1953.

In the Pacific Northwest, we are faced with a possible slowdown in completion of The Dalles, McNary, and Chief Joseph generating facilities.

The Northwest power situation has been a matter of concern to the Joint Congressional Committee on Defense Production.

In a recently released report, it stated:

"The availability of electric power generated by the Bonneville Power Administration bears a close relationship to defense production in the Northwest. This area is the source of production of approximately 40 percent of all aluminum manufactured in this country, and approximately 10 kilowatt-hours of electricity are required to produce each pound of aluminum. One of the principal magnesium plants is located there, and ferroalloys, aircraft, abrasives, paper, and chlorine are other important defense products."

The committee reported that it and the Office of Defense Mobilization were very concerned by the Bonneville-private utility 20-year contracts. It urged the inclusion of a national-defense clause to insure the availability of power to defense producers.

McKay did not include such a clause in the contracts. He said, the committee reports, that the desired end could be accomplished by appropriate legislation if necessary. That position is debatable. He sent the executed contracts to the utilities with a letter telling them that withdrawal for defense production might be necessary. But, no such letter overrides contract provisions.

In his haste to conclude the contracts, McKay took an unnecessary chance with our defense requirements.

ALUMINUM STOCKPILE PROBLEM

In September, the Senate Small Business Committee reported that the Government aluminum stockpile program was uncertain because of power problems.

Plans for a domestic stockpile have been hampered by power limitations. The industry has been turning toward plans for the use of Canadian aluminum for this purpose. But the joint committee has been unfa-

vorable to the program because of the role of Canada as the aluminum supplier of the British Commonwealth and the poor strategic location of the Canadian facilities.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER NEEDED TO REVIVE LAGGING INDUSTRY

The national economy is slowing down. We are already in a farm recession. Unemployment is becoming alarming. In the Northwest it is already a major problem.

We need to meet and correct these problems before they become critical and chronic. If the economic water table drops too low, pump priming will not help.

The industrial potential of the Northwest should be capitalized for defense and economic stability. New plants and payrolls in my part of the country would help business, employees and farmers throughout the country.

The Eisenhower administration is tending toward the doctrines of normalcy and scarcity that brought the country to depression under Hoover and Mellon.

That drift must be stopped—yesterday was not too soon to do it.

THE MANION AND HOOVER COMMISSIONS

All the signs are that Eisenhower and McKay will not build upon the power programs of decades in order to bolster the economy with wealth producing projects.

Two "study" groups appointed in recent months are promising just the opposite.

I would like to read a portion of a transcript of a recent television program in which Dean Manion, appointed by President Eisenhower as the head of the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations, was being interviewed by William Wise, former deputy administrator of REA:

"Mr. WISE. Dean Manion, I wonder if you agree with my favorite Republican of all times that the Government should do for the people that which they cannot do for themselves or that which they cannot do so well for themselves. I refer, of course, to Abraham Lincoln.

"Dr. MANION. No; I do not agree with Abraham Lincoln.

"Mr. WISE. Do you agree that the test should be not whether the States should have the power but whether or not it is necessary for the Federal Government to take certain action in what to protect and advance for the general welfare of all the people to the greatest good for the greatest number.

"Dr. MANION. No, I don't.

"Mr. WISE. Do you agree that there is no one other than the Federal Government large enough to do certain things which have been done during this last 20 years to which you have referred? I would like to ask you with respect to certain specific action: One, the TVA?

"Dr. MANION. I think the TVA should be sold to private business.

"Mr. WISE. Do you think private business would have built TVA projects in the first place?

"Dr. MANION. I don't think the Federal Government should have built the TVA in the first place.

* * * * * * *

"Mr. WISE. Do you agree that anyone other than the Federal Government could have brought about the rural electrification program which has resulted in this situation? Back in 1935 when it commenced 1 farm out of 10 had electricity. Today figures released by the present administration very recently show that 9 farms out of every 10 in this country have electricity.

"Dr. MANION. I think that there has been a greater increase than that in television sets, radios and other things. I don't believe that the Federal Government has been responsible for all the per capita increase of things that have accrued to the benefit of the people in the United States.

"Mr. WISE. Do you believe that anyone other than the Federal Government would have brought about that situation?

"Dr. MANION. I certainly do."

That is the man heading a "study" group which will recommend the appropriate areas of activity for the Federal Government—particularly in the power field. Dr. Manion said that his views were well known before his appointment by the President.

It is difficult to see how a commission headed by such a biased man can come up with any recommendations of value.

The new Hoover Commission, unlike the former Hoover Commission, is charged with the responsibility of recommending changes in basic policies, and its work is not confined to administrative reorganization, as was the case with the earlier Hoover Commission. The Commission is directing a major effort toward our public power program.

Mr. Hoover's hostility toward public power is well known. It is a hostility of long standing.

As President, Mr. Hoover in 1931 vetoed the Norris Muscle Shoals bill that was the forerunner of the TVA. Last year, Mr. Hoover made a speech at Case Institute in which he advocated that the Federal Government get completely out of the power business.

With this background, one would hardly expect that Mr. Hoover would show any sympathy toward public power when he appointed in November his task force on water and power. Still, with a membership of 26 men, Mr. Hoover could have afforded to display some charitable instincts by appointing at least one person sympathetic to public power.

But no. According to a statement by the American Public Power Association, not a single one of the 26 members of the task force can be identified as a supporter of public power. On the contrary, there are many known and outspoken enemies of public power on this task force—men such as Governor Lee of Utah; Harry Polk, former president of the National Reclamation Association; Donald Richberg; and former Governor Miller of Wyoming.

The task force also contains experts on valuation and renegotiation of utility properties, and men such as A. B. Roberts, whose report for the earlier Hoover Commission was a blueprint for turning over our valuable hydroelectric properties to the private power companies.

With both the task force and the Hoover Commission itself stacked with men who are prejudiced or special pleaders, it is clear that we can expect only one thing from the Commission: a detailed plan for carrying out Mr. Hoover's own ideas about turning over the Nation's power projects to the private power companies.

A LOOK AHEAD

The Eisenhower big business administration have been giving the farmer, the consumer, and even certain industries the business.

In the long run, its shocking favoritism to the private utilities will only hurt private enterprise.

The administration and utility attack upon orderly and progressive resource development is being made in every part of the country—Niagara, the St. Lawrence, Georgia, the Southwest, the Tennessee Valley, the Missouri Basin, California, and the Pacific Northwest.

But in every area the little people are fighting back. The co-ops, the Grange, the Farmers Union, some local farm bureaus are working for a decent program in the interest of all of the people.

There have been limited successes in the Missouri Basin. The National Hells Canyon Association is waging a magnificent battle against the Hells Canyon giveaway to the Idaho Power Co.

These are battles that can be won. Your national and local organizations are doing an invaluable job.

Keep it up. The little band of liberals in the Senate are working for a power program that will support an expanding economy.

Give us the allies in Congress, and we will help you complete the job. The future welfare of our country calls upon us in our generation to build more dynamos for democracy.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close by saying that it is very interesting to check into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of the late twenties, when Hoover was, as I pointed out in my Miami speech, following policies and economic ideas very similar to Eisenhower's. It is interesting to check into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of those days and read of the warnings, such as the warning I am giving this afternoon, on the part of men who were Members of the Senate in those days, who wanted the American people to recognize, before it was too late, that the economic policies of Hoover and Mellon were going to result to their economic detriment. Unfortunately, we did not learn. How many times do we have to make the same mistake? Mr. President, here is economic history repeating itself.

I wish the Republican machine of my State well. I hope the Republican machine of my State will, from the standpoint of the economic welfare of the people of my State, succeed in persuading this administration to waste not a single day in coming forward with some proposals for some new starts which will help solve the unemployment problem in the State of Oregon. After all, what I seek to do is to help the economic welfare of the people of my State; and while President Eisenhower is in power, we are going to have to try to do it through his administration as best we can.

He has already, by way of unacceptable leadership, demonstrated enough to satisfy the people of my State, if they will study the record, that in the congressional election to be held later this year they should elect Democrats to Congress, so as to provide the votes necessary to pass needed legislation, place it at the very door of the White House, and then say, "Mr. President, here it is. If you want to veto it, we will discuss it with you and with the American people."

Mr. President, we have had enough already, I should think, to demonstrate to the people, not only of my State, but of all the other States, that in 1954 they should elect a Democratic Congress which will check the maladministration of the Eisenhower machine.

Mr. President, I am interested in this matter primarily from the standpoint of doing what I can, so long as I serve in the Senate, to help the people of my State; and I shall continue to fight for their economic welfare.

That is why I take occasion this afternoon to refresh their memory regarding the number of times last year when, from this desk, I discussed the failure of the Eisenhower administration to come through with an appropriation bill that would prevent the kind of economic hardship which is now being visited upon

my State. At that time there were Republicans from my State who tried to explain it away on the ground that I was doing it because I was opposed to President Eisenhower. I say to them again this afternoon that I did it because I had a keener perception of the welfare of the people of my State than the Republican machine of my State has had.

So to the people of my State I say that throughout this session of Congress I am going to fight with all the vigor at my command to do what I can to present the facts to this administration, so that it will have no excuse for repeating the serious mistakes it made in its appropriation bills of last year.

I wanted to make these statements today before the budget message came to the Congress, because I am not one who deals in hindsight, so far as taking my own stand is concerned. A year ago, as I said, I forewarned what would happen, so far as the economic welfare of my State was concerned, if certain inadequate appropriation bills were passed.

If in the new budget message the President does not proceed to correct the great mistakes he made last year in his budget, then let me tell you, Mr. President, the Republicans might just as well concede the election by default, because the people of my State are aware of the fact that what I told them has already come to pass in the case of issue after issue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oregon made an observation regarding his visits around the Nation, in talking with representative businessmen, workers, farmers, and the general citizenry of our country. Would he agree with me that if we were to call the roll in the Senate this afternoon and ask for each individual Senator's observations as to the economic climate in his area, among his constituency, the Members of the Senate would report that farm machinery sales are away down—as much as from 20 to 25 percent—and that automobile sales of new cars and used cars are away down. In fact, the automobile dealers are overloaded with automobiles that literally have been forced upon them, in order to absorb them from the production lines.

Would the Senator from Oregon agree with me that in community after community in the United States, instead of finding a parity ratio for farmers' products that is on a national average of 91, it is found to be in the low 80's?

For example, in my own State, one of the so-called most prosperous agricultural States, instead of a parity ratio of 91, it is less than 85. Indeed, it is below the break-even point for our farmers.

This year I visited 26 counties in my State. I visited more than 150 towns, villages, and cities. I talked to merchants on Main Street. I went to dozens and dozens of county fairs, and there talked to the exhibitors of appliances, farm machinery, fertilizer, seeds, and all the other numerous commodities which are necessary for a diversified agricultural community. I found that every one of them was afraid not only of what was happening then, and not only of what is happening as of today, but of what may happen tomorrow.

Those to whom I talked—not only farmers but others—asked me one question, namely: "What about the farm program, Senator HUMPHREY? Are we going to be sold out? Are we going to have to get along with less?"

Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oregon is making a very valid point, and I wish to commend him for his faith in United States capitalism and democracy—our economic system.

After all, Mr. President, we have a population which is growing at an extremely rapid rate. In fact, the present rate of growth of our population is unprecedented. Yet this administration, in the face of the present heavy public indebtedness, is requesting a $15 billion increase in the public debt limit; and in the face of the present heavy private indebtedness, this administration is saying, "We are asking for just a little adjustment."

Yet, Mr. President, the strange thing is that whenever the Republicans adjust anything, it is always adjusted downward; the operation is always in the middle of the back, pushing down. The Republicans never push up or adjust upward.

I submit that if we are to provide jobs for an additional three-quarters of a million persons every year—which is approximately the number of new persons who come into the employment force of our country every year; from three-quarters of a million to 1 million new ones enter it each year—and if our people are to be able to finance their debts, and if we are to provide for the great economic structure we should have, it cannot be done by making adjustments downward only.

Every time the Republicans have been in power, Mr. President, they have made adjustments downward. Certainly that has been the experience of our businessmen. It seems obvious that it has been most difficult for the Republican administrations to adjust upward.

I read in the newspapers yesterday—and I should be very glad to have the article before me at this time, to place it in the RECORD—that Mr. Burgess, the Deputy to the Secretary of the Treasury, made a statement to the effect that until unemployment reaches approximately 25 percent the Government should not take any action; that that is about the time for the Government to go into action.

Mr. President, I wonder whether he realizes what he is saying. That means 16 million unemployed. That may be all right for the National City Bank of New York, but it will not go very well with the 16 million persons who then will be out of jobs, or with the businessmen and farmers in small communities who depend upon those millions of persons.

So, Mr. President, I wish to say that I think the Senator from Oregon is sending forth a battle cry. It is not a matter of being a prophet of doom.

Recently I read in the newspapers that some of our Republican friends are calling us prophets of gloom and doom because we mention facts—for instance, the fact that 5,000 more workers were laid off today by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. To mention that fact is not to be a prophet of gloom or doom; it is merely to be a student of economics, and only an elementary-grade student of economics, at that, for almost any fourth-grade or fifth-grade student knows that the figure 5,000 represents a very large number.

So, Mr. President, when we point to the change downward which has occurred in the last year—even though the Republicans say that when we mention that change we are using hindsight, I point out that the Republicans are very good at exercising hindsight; they are very good, indeed, at those tactics—and when we say that farm assets have decreased $5 billion this year, that is not being a prophet of doom and gloom; it is merely stating what is happening.

If the Republican leadership cannot "take it," they should change it. That is what the Senator from Oregon is requesting.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. His observations square completely with those I have made. The reports made to him by farmers and businessmen are identical in meaning with the reports which were made to me in the course of my trips across the country.

I wish to close by emphasizing one of the points which I have made, and to express my great concern over the tendency of the economy of this country to be Europeanized under the Eisenhower administration. The situation is characterized by an increase in the power of a few great economic combines to the economic detriment of the small-business man and the independent producer. It is a form of American cartelization. It is a form of use of the cartel which is also based upon the idea of reducing production, so that the seller can obtain higher prices and make greater profits. That is the European idea. There is no place in the United States for that foreign theory of economic life. That is why I say the Attorney General ought to get busy. That is why I have been heard to say that I think many of the contracts which have been let by this administration to various corporations need to be investigated.

I conclude by saying that I think it is very important that the Congress, in this session, proceed immediately to adopt such governmental measures as are necessary to stop the Eisenhower recession and to keep faith with that great economic tenet of Lincoln which I have mentioned many times. It cannot be mentioned too often. It is a tenet which many Republicans now seem to believe constitutes creeping socialism. I discussed it in the Miami speech, and I shall make only brief reference to it at this time.

If we wish to protect the employment interests of the American worker and to protect the purchasing power of the

American consumers—and upon those two elements depends the strength of the American economy—the time has come for the Congress to start doing for the people what they cannot do for themselves, or what they cannot do as well for themselves, but what needs to be done in the public interest.

RECESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 19, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received January 18 (legislative day of January 7), 1954:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Laurence McKinley Gould, of Minnesota, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1956, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Frank C. Squire, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term of 5 years from August 29, 1953, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the 83d Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); Title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

John A. Peterson, AO982083.
Frederick R. Ritzinger, Jr., AO2239414.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Herbert E. Bateman, AO2239908.
Richard C. Burt, AO2238696.
Sam W. Hoskins, Jr., AO1735478.
Oscar R. Quamme, AO2240407.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Wallace W. Bednarz, AO2240463.
Byron G. Brogdon, AO2261825.
Joseph L. Farr, AO2261767.
William J. Feeney, AO2261861.
LeRoy P. W. Froetscher, AO2239135.
Jack C. Griffith, AO2077817.
James T. McCanless.
John W. Ord, AO2261892.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Robert W. Hayes, AO1906508.
Rodeheaver H. Hicks, AO2260538.
LeRoy E. Tindall, AO739870.

To be second lieutenant, USAF (Medical Service)

Bruce A. Butcher, AO2239638.

The following-named person, who was appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the 83d Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 102 (c), Public Law 36, 80th Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947) as amended by section 5, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, and section 2, Public Law 37, 83d Congress; with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated under the provisions of section 307, Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951):

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Women Medical Specialist)

May E. Goodrich, AM2240029.

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the the last recess period of the 83d Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be first lieutenants

James C. Anderson, AO836400.
Richard M. Baughn, AO720747.
John G. Boyd, AO1863791.
Edward C. Champagne, Jr., AO1852215.
Donald M. Faustman, AO2026607.
Jay S. Gaensle, AO752989.
Fred Gluck, AO941478.
Robert P. Ketchersides, AO774661.
William R. Looney, AO1904724.
Harold G. Martin, AO935045.
Donald A. Messick, AO805952.
Robert P. Morris, AO2080430.
Thomas F. Mulligan, AO691620.
Carl L. Preuss, AO1858420.
John W. Rapp, AO833577.
Frederick C. Richards, AO770412.
John B. Sleeman, AO960223.
Donald A. Zeine, AO812528.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Sidney M. Bashore, AO1906713.
Curzon C. Ferris, Jr., AO1727453.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Carlton F. Gosselin, AO1906151.
Charles A. McMahon, AO1725266.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Robert C. Koehn, Jr., AO2240099.
Lester E. McGary, AO2262044.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Raymond J. Loiselle, AO733207.
Burleigh W. Quesinberry, AO2241246.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Veterinary)

William H. Grau, Jr., AO962435.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Chaplain)

Mervin R. Johnson, AO2250797.
Raymond E. Tinsley, AO580480.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Charles H. Burge, AO2047561.
Wesley R. Nowell, AO784927.

To be second lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Jack N. Farmer, AO2239362.
Robert A. Mengebier, AO2240034.
Gregory J. Skandas, AO2232620.
James W. Truelove, AO2239093.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 101 (c), Public Law 36, 80th Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947) as amended by section 5, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, and Public Law 37, 83d Congress; with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated under the provisions of section 307, Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951):

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)

Agnes M. Arrington, AN726659.
Julia M. Burgess, AN755194.
Mary A. Combes, AN774153.
Emma M. Davidson, AN788352.
Rose M. DiBiase, AN1906442.
Edith J. Erb, AN804255.
Bernadette K. Fahrenkopf, AN786238.
Mildred I. Gernus, AN792129.
Mildred R. Glassmeyer, AN1856312.
Nena S. Glenos, AN1906451.
Dorothy A. Greene, AN2243584.
Erythe I. Groves, AN804428.
Louise M. Hardin, AN773875.
Arland R. Henry, AN763433.
Dorothy E. Johnston, AN1906306.
Marian M. Jury, AN2242047.
Charlotte B. Krause, AN752861.
Norma J. Lauderbaugh, AN2241845.
Nan L. Porter, AN796928.
Miriam L. Raynor, AN2212496.
Rita M. Riley, AN2241751.
Ramona C. Rinderknecht, AN797862.
Carolyn H. Ruhe, AN792540.
Ruth M. Shaw, AN2243580.
Billie L. Shiflett, AN776539.
Mary F. Smith, AN2214539.
Dolores Stanley, AN2241988.
Clara B. Thomas, AN774926.
Shirley R. Tittle, AN2244294.

To be second lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)

Christine L. Schaner, AN2241928.
Lyndoll L. Wells, AN2244413.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be first lieutenants

William E. Adams, AO1865370.
Joseph A. Allard, AO1851920.
James E. Armstrong, Jr., AO778366.
Herbert L. Atkins, AO2064776.
Donald R. Bachelder, AO2070920.
Ralph G. Backes, AO767457.
James E. Baldwin, AO1906296.
Lewis V. Barker, AO842286.
Thomas W. Barton, AO2088094.
James R. Bean, AO2099606.
Paul J. Behnke, AO1852506.
Raymond R. Bleau, AO2033343.
George A. Bloomfield, Jr., AO1911537.
Edward W. Borresen, AO816407.
Joseph A. Boyer, Jr., AO834734.
James W. Bradbury, AO710038.
John E. Buchanan, AO831350.
William R. Burnett, AO843091.
James M. Carelock, AO1909006.
James L. Carter, AO1911228.
Rubyen M. Chambless, AO2075106.
Rondal L. Chaney, AO1909013.
Edgar A. Chavarrie, AO2038727.
Lewis S. Clement, Jr., AO2102046.
Dewey E. Coe, AO780521.
William D. Coleman, AO1903060.
Robert G. Colgan, AO1911402.
Roy J. Connor, AO2059743.
Leroy G. Cooper, Jr., AO973786.
Richard M. Corbett, AO1847696.
John Coubrough, Jr., AO932663.
James S. Craig, AO1908830.
Joe C. Cunningham, AO1911083.
Thomas E. Daems, AO1909969.
John C. Danielson, AO2209292.
Stanton G. Daries, AO763514.

Harry M. Darmstandler, AO737015.
John W. Darr, AO788550.
John J. Devlin, Jr., AO771670.
Calvin H. Dickman, AO591117.
Louis A. Dockery, AO2077232.
Walter L. Doerty, Jr., AO1908527.
John P. Doswell, AO823327.
John M. Dowling, AO1851588.
Robert C. Dowling, AO1865644.
John C. Drew, AO590704.
James M. Dunn, AO934749.
Cecil P. Duryea, Jr., AO1863569.
Leslie R. Fels, AO937057.
Neil R. Garland, AO1909038.
Gerald B. Gill, AO842210.
Albert W. Harrison, Jr., AO1910601.
Elbert G. Head, AO1651982.
Robert C. Heath, AO2083731.
Richard D. Hemphill, AO1855903.
T. Booth Holker, AO1911420.
Alfred H. Hopkins, Jr., AO706397.
Paul R. Houser, AO787508.
Homer H. Howell, Jr., AO778814.
Arthur L. Hughes, AO771034.
Carel T. Humme, AO1911758.
Bob M. Johnson, AO2073653.
Robert E. Johnson, AO591366.
Donald G. Jones, AO1903095.
Guy O. King, AO695668.
Henry J. Klisavage, AO2075228.
William A. Komstedt, Jr., AO1910618.
James A. Lastrapes, AO1910621.
Harlan Q. Leonard, Jr., AO1908930.
Joseph F. Leszcz, AO678882.
Robert G. Liotta, AO1911427.
Billy J. Long, AO2094219.
Joseph H. Long, AO1865664.
J. Edward Lorenz, AO1854176.
James F. Lynch, AO2079395.
Robert A. Madden, AO2067018.
Dexter E. Martin, AO1909618.
Fred R. Matthews, AO2079405.
Bedford D. May, AO672650.
Francis G. McCafferty, AO822500.
Clodius M. McCollum, Jr., AO2075257.
Thomas M. McKee, Jr., AO622216.
Kenneth A. McKnight, Jr., AO2067817
Lewis D. McMillan, AO591201.
Harold E. Mercer, AO1909085.
Roy N. Minor, AO1865404.
George H. Morris, AO686579.
Gerald R. Mulberry, AO2074737.
Earle P. Nase, AO556120.
Jimmy L. Nichols, AO957918.
George R. Nicklas, Jr., AO718401.
Russell G. Ogan, AO823131.
Norman A. Parker, AO1910637.
Richard J. Pfrang, AO2102052.
John Prodan, AO840630.
Leonard W. Provance, AO636503.
Joe R. Quintana, AO2089141.
Francis E. Ransford, AO781047.
Edward Ratkovich, AO829553.
John F. Reboit, AO591035.
Robert G. Rilling, AO1860052.
Dale L. Ringwald, AO666710.
Robert B. Roberts, AO834020.
Bernard Rodstein, AO2065681.
Maurice Rosner, AO1853119.
Berry A. Segraves, Jr., AO1903035.
Ernest W. Sharp, Jr., AO1909399.
Paul L. Smith, AO784991.
John R. Sparger, AO1912041.
Garland H. Spicer, Jr., AO826312.
Benjamin F. Starr, Jr., AO2091077.
Freddy L. Steadman, AO828015.
Francis J. Sugrue, AO828587.
Clarence G. Summerlin, AO836517.
Arthur Tave, AO1911615.
Thomas H. Temple, Jr., AO937962.
John A. Thompson, AO837073.
David H. Tittle, AO1911374.
Howard D. Turner, AO862926.
George P. Upright, AO2101833.
Reuben E. Weiss, AO2081294.
Bruce H. Wheeler, AO591448.
Bernell A. Whitaker, AO822300.
Billy P. White, AO1910293.
James H. Withers, AO1854928.
Charles E. Woods, AO1857376.
John D. Wray, AO836057.
Wilfred D. Wright, AO2033600.

To be second lieutenants

Robert L. Andreason, AO1905198.
Albert R. Baker, AO2221977.
Kenneth G. Baker, AO2222176.
Robert W. Bakken, AO2222791.
Arthur F. Bishop, AO1853065.
Oscar C. Bridgeman, Jr., OA933865.
Patrick H. Caulfield, AO1860851.
William J. Clark, AO2079289.
William B. Conine, AO1865028.
David M. Conrad, AO2232554.
Bruce L. Danner, AO2086793.
Richard A. Eubank, AO2216629.
Joseph R. Fallon, AO2218664.
Konrad George, AO2232368.
Paul L. Gray, AO2221842.
Hollis O. Hall, AO2231448.
Charles S. Hanners, AO785629.
Frank B. Harrison, AO1863553.
Harold B. Hart, AO2218299.
Robert L. Hayford, AO2222730.
Thomas L. Healy, AO2218690.
Eugene C. Humphrey, AO2222440.
Samuel R. Johnson, AO2215616.
Sidney F. Johnston, Jr., AO2233022.
Paul A. Kauttu, AO2222677.
John M. Kminek, AO1858656.
William C. Knothe, AO945457.
Joseph D. A. Kuchta, AO2231723.
Richard L. Lawson, AO1907855.
Robert J. Lloyd, AO2228956.
Jack B. Mayo, AO2222328.
Robert J. Mellema, AO2218742.
Exley C. Mixon, Jr., AO1864730.
Billy J. Moore, AO1859002.
Donald W. O'Brien, AO2071674.
Gene J. O'Malley, AO1849718.
Robert L. Reagan, AO2222157.
John H. Reddoch, AO2218766.
James E. Rose, Jr., AO1859008.
James B. Sampson, AO2228626.
Samuel I. Sifers, Jr., AO2218486.
Norman E. Slaughter, Jr., AO2232546.
Paul N. Smith, AO1863774.
Wallace R. Smith, AO2071259.
Alton J. Thogersen, AO2216983.
Hubert E. Thornber, Jr., AO2217722.
Joseph S. Toma, AO2222983.
William R. Yost, AO2234039.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); and section 301, Public Law 625, 80th Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be second lieutenants

Dona R. Harbison, AL2218684.
Arminta J. Harness, AL2218685.
Gilberta King, AL2229165.
Marjory E. Winston, AL2219408.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 18 (legislative day of January 7), 1954:

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Frank H. Weitzel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Comptroller General of the United States for a term of 15 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Richard Irvin, department of public relations, the Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our country 'tis of Thee, O God, our help in ages past, our help for years to come, our eternal home.

In a jet and atomic age may we know Thee as the greatest power of all. The smoothness of performance, the efficiency in speed, the ultimate in accomplishments are in ratio to Thy guidance.

We stand grateful that there was a prayer, a dream, a vision. Help us remember that the prayer became God with us, the dream became our land, the vision became living personalities.

May we climb life's mountain to the peak to dwell in those sweeter, finer upper rooms of life whose windows open on the sunrise and whose name is peace, the peace that passeth all understanding.

In the name of the Christ, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 14, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hanks, one of his secretaries.

THE LATE HONORABLE ELMER HENDRICKSON GERAN

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce to the House the death of a former Member who represented the Third Congressional District of New Jersey in the 68th Congress, Elmer Hendrickson Geran. Mr. Geran died on January 12 at his home in Marlboro Township, N. J., and he was 78 years old.

Elmer Geran led a full and useful life, serving his community and State in many public offices. He received his education at the Greenwood Military Institute in Matawan, N. J., and graduated from the Petty Institute at Heightstown, N. J., in 1895. He attended Princeton University and received his degree in 1899 and while he was there he became one of the charter members of the Canon Club. He studied law and the same year he received his law degree from New York University, in 1901, he was admitted to the New Jersey bar and immediately started practice. Mr. Geran was a Democrat and was elected to the State assembly in 1911 and took a major part in the activities of the assembly. He introduced an election law bill which established direct primaries for party nominations, doing away with the old convention system, and this bill which was highly controversial and received wide notice all over the country was finally passed and today continues as the law of the State.

Former President Wilson, when he was Governor of New Jersey, appointed Mr. Geran to the State water supply commission in 1912 and in 1915 he became assistant prosecutor of Monmouth County. In 1916 and 1917 he was the

Democratic minority leader of the assembly and subsequently was elected sheriff of Monmouth County in 1917. President Wilson appointed him in 1920 the United States attorney for the State, which position he resigned in 1921 before his term expired, in order to return to the practice of law. In 1922 he was elected to Congress, but he was defeated for reelection and he resumed his law practice. In 1927 he became associated in an executive capacity with the New Jersey Gravel & Sand Co. and continued his association with that corporation until his death, at which time he was its vice president and treasurer. He was an active member of the First Baptist Church in Matawan and was associated with many civic and fraternal organizations.

His widow, 3 children and 4 grandchildren survive him and one of his sons operates his father's farm, where prize Guernsey cattle are raised. His death is a loss to the community which he served so well and I extend my warmest sympathy to his bereaved ones.

HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, it is my unhappy duty to tell the House of the recent death of Hon. Edward O. McCowen, of Wheelersburg, Ohio, who represented the old Sixth District of Ohio for 3 terms—from January 3, 1943, to January 3, 1949. During the early morning hours of Wednesday, November 4, 1953, he quietly passed away at his home in Wheelersburg, Ohio, at the age of 76 years. He is survived by his widow, a son, 3 daughters, and 5 grandchildren, to all of whom I wish to express my deepest sympathy for the loss of one greatly loved and respected.

Edward O. McCowen was born in Bloom Township, Scioto County, Ohio, June 29, 1877. He attended the public schools of South Webster, Ohio; was graduated from Ohio Northern University at Ada in 1908; Ohio State University at Columbus in 1917; and from the graduate school of the University of Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1939. When in his teens he was a newsboy, worked in coal mines, in a brickyard, as a farmhand, and as a store clerk. He began teaching at the age of 17 and was successively a high-school teacher, principal, and superintendent. He was superintendent of the Scioto County public schools from 1914 to 1942, also a precinct committeeman and delegate to the Ohio Republican State Convention in 1935 and 1946, a trustee of Rio Grande College, and was elected as a Republican to the 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses.

The life and achievements of Edward O. McCowen are a shining example of the opportunities our country offers to young men and women who are willing to work and who have the ambition to secure an education and better their position in life.

He literally "pulled himself up by his own bootstraps" from an obscure country boyhood to a position of honor and respect as a valuable Member of the United States Congress.

Edward O. McCowen possessed the quality of persistence to a greater degree than most men. He worked and studied during the greater part of his adult life and continued to progress from one position to the next until finally he achieved his lifetime ambition of serving in Congress.

At the age of 65, when most men are thinking of retiring from business and professional activities, he began his first term in the 78th Congress. He was reelected to the 79th and 80th Congresses. During his service here, Mr. McCowen was a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and because of his great knowledge and wide experience as an educator, he contributed greatly to the work of that committee. He also served on the Committees on Flood Control and Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK] who has just preceded me discussed the life and virtues of Hon. Edward O. McCowen, a former Member of this House. Because Mr. POLK now represents the district that Mr. McCowen represented we felt that Mr. POLK should take the initiative in this memorial ceremony.

Mr. McCowen served three terms in Congress and his service was conspicuous because he was a very well qualified man. He lived at Wheelersburg, in southern Ohio, in the district now represented by Mr. POLK.

Mr. McCowen was a schoolman and a very capable one. I remember when I was in the State Senate of Ohio the Legislature passed a very important school measure, of which I was the author. This law provided for the establishment of a State equalization fund which was to be used to aid weak school districts. By reason of this legislation good school facilities have been provided for all those sections that could not provide for themselves and this has cost millions of dollars. But the sections that could afford to pay extra taxes did not object to paying extra taxes when the money was to be used for the benefit of school children who were unfortunately located. Mr. McCowen helped us pass this legislation. He was selected as one of three prominent educators and assigned to the task of assisting me in my efforts to pass this important law. His services were appreciated by me and all who were interested in this important matter. He was a scholarly statesman then. We passed that legislation, which was of great benefit to the rural schools of Ohio. By reason of these activities Mr. McCowen went down in the school history of Ohio as a great friend of the schools.

Mr. McCowen died about 4 months ago. He left a family consisting of a devoted wife and capable children who will live up to their father's precepts. When Mr. McCowen was in his prime, he was probably the best known man in his own county, Scioto County, Ohio. He was the superintendent of the county schools in that county for years, and as such he made a record that established him as a man of ability and of high character. Many of the young men and women of Scioto County that were prominent in the business and social life of Scioto County had gone to school when the schools were under his direction. His son now holds the position of county superintendent of schools in Scioto County.

I am sure that the Members of this House who will speak following me and who knew Mr. McCowen will bear the same testimony in effect as I am giving to you now and that is that a fine Christian, well educated, thoroughly qualified American, who was strong in his own community, has gone to his final resting place. He was buried down there in southern Ohio among his friends, who will long cherish his memory.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when I received the news several weeks ago of the passing of Edward O. McCowen it came as a great shock to me, although I knew he had been in bad health for some time.

Mr. McCowen represented the district adjoining mine. We had been friends for some 30 years. I had the pleasure and opportunity of working with him in the affairs of our State government prior to the time either of us came to the Congress.

Most of you, I am sure, remember Ed McCowen, as he served here with distinction for three terms. He was a very quiet individual, but he was a man of strong character and great courage. I have seen him time after time cast his vote in this House, not in a way that would be of the greatest benefit to him politically, but in a way that would be of greatest benefit to our country and the people he represented. He was a patriotic individual, a man of great mental capacity and unusual ability, one I am sure we all regret to see called from our national scene. We will miss him greatly.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, our Ohio colleague, Mr. McCowen, served here in a difficult period. His quiet, careful, thoughtful approach to our problems was most helpful at a time when too many were contributing more heat than light, more noise than thought, on controversial issues. Gentle and kindly in manner, he was firm in the right as he saw the right, and had a wealth of commonsense and knowledge of human nature, which he applied in analyzing complex questions. He was a pioneer in educational work, but he applied his experience in broader fields as his career involved wider responsibilities. His former colleagues, his family, his friends, his community will miss him, but the memory of his long public service will live.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt athletic games between selected students from elementary or secondary schools from the admissions tax when the entire proceeds inure to the benefit of a hospital for crippled children.

The purpose of my amendment is to exempt the Shrine Bowl game played annually in Charlotte, N. C., and similar games played elsewhere, from admissions tax.

Games between two elementary or secondary schools are now exempt from the tax when the admissions inure to the benefit of a hospital for crippled children, and all my amendment does is change the wording of the statute so that games played between selected students from elementary or secondary schools will likewise be exempt.

I see no reason for the distinction and know of no more worthy cause than hospitals for crippled children which are maintained in part by the proceeds of these Shrine Bowl games.

The entire proceeds of the Charlotte game go to the Shrine Hospital at Greenville, S. C., and all persons connected with the game donate their services, including coaches and officials. It is a charitable affair if there ever was one and I think the Government can well forego the admissions tax in such instances since all of the proceeds go to such a worthy cause.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 406, rept. No. 1103), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5337) to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour, following any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may meet this afternoon after 2 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Attorney General, and following President Eisenhower's recommendation, I have introduced today a bill amending section 349 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to provide for the loss of United States citizenship by persons who are convicted of participating in a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States, or of other acts of treason.

Section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act governs the matter of loss of United States nationality by native-born or naturalized citizens, alike. Under that section, loss of citizenship occurs automatically upon conviction by a court-martial or by other court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, this country is now the prime target of a worldwide Communist conspiracy. Participants in this conspiracy are not entitled to enjoy the highest privilege this country offers—citizenship of the United States.

This legislation does not represent a problem whether or not to put on our statute books a novel provision. The basic concept of what is now embodied in existing law, and broadened by my bill, has been substantiated by the courts of the land which have long recognized the power of Congress to provide that traitors forfeit United States citizenship whether acquired at birth or by naturalization.

We want to remove from our body politic those who have joined enemy forces.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am rising to correct a misapprehension which might arise in the RECORD reporting the debates of January 14, 1954. Unfortunately, the complete transcript of the remarks I made on the floor which resulted in an altercation was not made available to me for review and correction and so was not included in the RECORD.

By an extension of my remarks in the partial transcript which was made available to me I was able to forestall some of the erroneous impression the reader might have. However, the minority leader said in the RECORD, as printed, "The gentleman would have to revise his remarks very basically to stay within the Rules of the House." With my remarks not available the impression might be reached that the minority leader's views were correct.

I now have the transcript of my remarks which will go into the permanent RECORD, without any revision except the one I stated I would make, which was to change the word "untrue" to "incorrect." As a matter of fact, I have found that the precedents of the House cited in Cannon's Procedures—page 278, Questions of Privilege—and reported in Hinds' Precedents—V, 5157-5160—specifically hold that the use of the word "untrue" in relation to another Member's remarks is not unparliamentary and accordingly, even in this respect, I am happy to know I was not violating the rules of the House in the remarks I made.

Be this as it may, I do agree with the minority leader when he stated: "I do hope we do not start this session in such form as this," referring to the sharp words of this debate. But I suggest if Members from his side of the aisle again take the floor to make unfounded statements attacking the integrity of members of this administration, directly or by innuendo, I for one will be on the floor challenging these statements.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, may I say in reply to the gentleman that I have some clippings in my desk. I recall some of the remarks some Members on his side have made about two Presidents of the United States and practically everybody in high position in the Government. There is nobody on this side that is going to attack the integrity of the President of the United States. We have too much respect for that great office and too much respect for the man that is in it. We are not going to attack the integrity of anybody in this administration unless it is based on well-founded evidence.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Wednesday next, the call of the calendar, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to that at present, until I see what happens today.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 7265, which I introduced today, amends paragraph 9 of section 349 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality by any citizen convicted of violating certain specified sections of title 18 of the United States Code.

At the present time paragraph 9 of section 349 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides that any citizen loses his nationality if he is convicted of committing any act of treason against or attempting to overthrow or bearing arms against the United States.

In his recent address to the Congress on the state of the Union, the President recommended the enactment of legislation to provide for the loss of nationality after a citizen has been convicted of conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence. I am heartily in accord with that recommendation, and have so provided in my bill.

My study of this problem has convinced me, however, that not only is the existing law inadequate, but also that the proposal of the President would leave loopholes in the law whereby citizens could be convicted of certain crimes which endangered our national defense and national security and still retain their citizenship with all its rights and privileges.

The rationale of this law is that a citizen who has been convicted of crimes of a treasonable or seditious nature no longer holds allegiance to the United States. Now on our statute books are several crimes in that category which are not included as grounds for loss of nationality, either in existing law or in the President's proposal. My bill includes all such crimes that are contained in title 18 of the United States Code.

I can find no logical basis to provide for loss of nationality for treason and not to so provide after a conviction for espionage or sabotage. A convicted spy, or traitor, or saboteur, or seditionary have beyond any doubt one quality in common and that is by their own voluntary acts they have demonstrated that they bear no allegiance to the Government of the United States. Therefore I believe that all such convicted traitors should suffer the same penalty so far as their nationality is concerned.

Thus, my bill provides for the loss of nationality by both native-born or naturalized citizens upon conviction of any one of the following crimes: a violation of section 794, relating to the gathering or delivering of defense information to aid a foreign government; violation of sections 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, which involve sabotage of war and defense materials; violation of section 2381, the crime of treason; of section 2383, relating to rebellion or insurrection; of section 2384, involving seditious conspiracy; of section 2385, advocating the overthrow of the Government by force or violence; vioulating sections 2387 or 2388, which relate to acts involving the morale, loyalty, and discipline of the Armed Forces.

A violation of each and every one of those sections of title 18 of the United States Code involves activities that are in and of themselves hostile and injurious to our Government. Those actions evince a criminal intent on the part of the perpetrators to betray the Government of the United States and so violate their allegiance to this Government. A combination of such acts and criminal intent can lead to but one conclusion, namely, that such a person has renounced his allegiance to the Government of the United States.

By requiring that the citizen must have been found guilty of one of these crimes by a court of competent jurisdiction before the additional penalty of loss of nationality can be imposed, my bill adheres to those fundamental principles of American criminal jurisprudence such as a fair trial, the presumption of innocence, and all the other safeguards of a defendant's rights.

Under the provision of my bill the loss of nationality would be automatic after the conviction. By predicating the grounds for loss of nationality upon specific sections of title 18 of the United States Code any problems of unconstitutionality for vagueness or generality are obviated. Then, too, the need for any additional litigation is avoided.

There may be some who might question the constitutionality of this bill particularly as it applies to native-born citizens. The question is asked, "Does Congress possess the power to revoke the nationality of a native-born citizen?"

I have no fear in that regard. Under my bill Congress does not revoke the nationality of a native-born citizen, instead Congress merely recognizes the right of expatriation and defines the acts to effect it.

Congress recognized the right of expatriation in 1868: It is the voluntary renunciation or abandonment of nationality or allegiance to this Government that had been acquired at birth.

This doctrine of expatriation is not new to this Government. I refer to the Civil War Statute—Revised Statutes, section 1996—1865:

> All persons who deserted the military or naval service of the United States and did not return thereto or report themselves to a provost marshal within 60 days after the issuance of the proclamation by the President, dated March 11, 1865, are deemed to have voluntarily relinquished and forfeited their rights of citizenship, as well as the rights to become citizens and such deserters shall be forever incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under the United States, or of exercising any rights of citizens thereof.

In 1907 Congress enacted a general expatriation statute—34 Statutes, page 1228. Today, section 349 (a), paragraphs 7, 8, 9, and 10, of the Immigration and Nationality Act, provide for loss of nationality by such acts as the making of a formal written renunciation of nationality in time of war, desertion in time of war, acts of treason, or attempts to overthrow the United States by force or bearing arms against it and by departing from or remaining outside the jurisdiction of the United States in time of war or national emergency in order to avoid military service. The same acts were formerly found in the Nationality Act of 1940—8 United States Code, page 801.

If one keeps clearly in mind that the loss of nationality results from voluntary action of a renunciative nature by the citizen himself in conformity with applicable principles—and is not a revocation of nationality by Congress itself—the fear of unconstitutionality should abate.

Those criminals whose very crimes subvert their allegiance to our form of government and at the same time weaken our national security should forfeit the rights and privileges of the citizenship which they have betrayed. No avenue should be left open to them to pursue their schemes as citizens. All opportunity for them to pursue their subversive activities should be blocked.

My bill will effectuate such objectives with dispatch, under a procedure that is consistent with those rights and privileges conferred upon these traitors by the very Constitution and Government which they seek to destroy.

My bill is designed to preserve and protect the Government from the traitorous acts of those who seek to destroy it while at the same time it permits the self-destruction of the nationality—including the rights and privileges—of those who betray their allegiance to it.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

STABILIZING FARM PRICES

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today covers dairy products and other

livestock products, as outlined in the first two farm bills that I introduced last week. In addition, this third bill, H. R. 7267, applies the same principles to certain other major farm commodities. Enactment of this bill, along with the others, would give the Nation a farm program of definite action to stabilize farm income and prices at not less than 100 percent of parity.

These bills would provide support to farmers when support is needed. My bills do not authorize the sliding scale. I do not think farmers in my district want the sliding scale. I do not think the sliding scale, variable price-support theory will work.

None of the large industrialists, who manufacture the goods that farmers buy, have put any sliding scale on their asking prices during this period of falling farm income. Farm machinery products have been cut, but machinery prices are just as high as they have ever been.

The dairy farmer has had some experience with the sliding scale this past year. Prior to April 1, 1953, he was faced with the uncertainty that supports might be dropped to the bottom of the support scale—now set at 75 percent of parity by law. Although 90 percent of parity supports for milk and butterfat were supposed to be put into effect, the dairy farmer in my district—and in most of the rest of the country—has realized a return of only 84 percent of parity. If the announced supports were dropped to 75 percent next April 1, and the program should be administered as now, the farmer would get only 64 percent of parity. Sliding-scale supports are not good for farmers, and in general they are not good for the public.

Farmers who produce other farm commodities cannot afford to allow the variable sliding scale to go into effect any more than the dairy farmer can. If we allow the sliding scale the opponents of adequate farm price supports will seek to drive wedges between the producers of different farm commodities. They will urge different programs for different commodities. In self-proteotion, farmers must pull together. President Eisenhower has recommended a good wool program. My bills, including H. R. 7267, which I have introduced today, would apply the same principle, at 100 percent of parity, to all major farm commodities.

These bills present a complete price support behind which all farmers can rally. These bills would require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide 100 percent of parity by methods that would reflect the support directly to farmers in markets where they sell. Also, they would not allow the benefits of the support program to get lost in the brokerage houses in Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York.

SITUATION OF COTTON FARMERS OF AMERICA

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the House that the cotton farmers of America are suffering from the effects of inaction, lack of policy, absence of recommendations, and lack of cooperation on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture last July or on the first day of August when Congress was attempting to pass a bill to give additional acres which are badly needed. It seems to me it took the Secretary from July to October or December to realize the condition of the cotton farmers of this Nation. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of Agriculture will be a little more prompt in recognizing the plight of the farmer, be more sympathetic too, and will also offer more cooperation than he has offered in the past.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore entered.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS ADVISORY BOARD

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith copy of the bill H. R. 6900.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II the American people have expressed a concern and expended their resources for the achievement and maintenance of international peace and security to a degree unsurpassed in the annals of history. In this process the President of the United States has the primary role, since he is charged with the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs. While it is true that the Secretary of State is the right arm of the President in fulfilling this responsibility, the President secures his advice from many agencies of the Government and from private sources. Some of the agencies involved in advising the President are in turn advised by special commissions, boards, and private agencies.

However, the widespread mechanism of executive branch and outside advice to the President on foreign affairs lacks cohesion, continuity, and, in a sense, it lacks nonpartisanship. To remove these obstacles and deterrents to effective international leadership by the United States, on the first day of this session I introduced a bill, H. R. 6900, establishing a Foreign Affairs Advisory Board of nine members appointed by the President with Senatorial confirmation, whose function it will be to make a continuing study and evaluation of international conditions for the purpose of advising and consulting with the President. They will devote their full time to this task. Responsible world leadership demands the establishment of this Board.

I hope favorable action will be promptly taken on the measure during this session of the Congress.

H. R. 6900

A bill to provide for the establishment of the Foreign Affairs Advisory Board

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to assist the President in conducting the foreign affairs of the United States, to establish continuity of foreign policy, and to provide a reliable source of information concerning the foreign affairs of the United States for officers of the Government and the public at large, there is hereby established the Foreign Affairs Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

DUTIES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Board to make a continuing study and evaluation of conditions in the United States and abroad which affect the foreign affairs of the United States, and to advise and consult with the President to assist him in formulating the foreign policy of the United States and in conducting the foreign affairs of the United States.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) The Board shall be composed of 9 members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, solely on the basis of their knowledge, ability, and experience in the field of foreign affairs and international affairs generally. No member of the Board shall be less than 40 years of age.

(b) The members of the Board shall serve for terms of 18 years, except that the 9 members first appointed shall serve for terms of 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 18 years, respectively, as designated by the President at the time of appointment.

(c) (1) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Board shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(2) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(3) Any vacancy existing in the membership of the Board for more than 1 year shall be temporarily filled by majority action of the remaining members of the Board. Such temporary appointee shall serve until an appointment is made as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

(4) Upon the expiration of his term of office a member shall continue to serve until his successor is appointed and takes office.

ORGANIZATION OF THE BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of State shall be an ex officio member of the Board, and shall at his pleasure preside at its meetings.

(b) The Board shall select one of its members who shall serve as its chairman and preside at all meetings not presided over by the Secretary of State.

(c) The Board shall meet at regular intervals (not less often than once each month), and at such other times as the Board may decide and as the President may direct.

(d) Five members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 5. Each member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $25,000 a year, and shall in addition be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Board.

STAFF OF THE BOARD

SEC. 6. The Board shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable.

POWERS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 7. (a) The Board, or any member thereof when so directed by the Board, may, for the purpose of carrying out the duties vested in the Board by this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Board or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Board may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Board or before such member.

(b) The Board is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, agency, independent establishment, or other instrumentality such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics as it may require in carrying out its duties under this act; and each such department, agency, independent establishment, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Board upon request therefor made by the Board.

EXPENSES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

WHY WON'T STATE DEPARTMENT TRY TO EFFECT RELEASE OF GI'S AND CIVILIANS ILLEGALLY HELD PRISONER BY THE REDS?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when our State Department was not afraid to demand the release of one American illegally held as a prisoner by any nation.

Now it appears to consider many as mere pawns in the game of power politics.

It is estimated that 944 Americans who fought for our country and were taken prisoner by the Chinese Communists have been conveniently forgotten by their own Government.

Plus an undetermined number of American civilians.

Can it be that the improvisers of our foreign policy are so weak, timid, or confused that they have lost sight of moral values in dealing with the international aggressors?

The silence of the State Department, and its refusal to speak up for all Americans who are held by the Russians and the Chinese on trumped-up charges, is a source of disappointment and dismay to an increasing number of people in the United States.

We may debate the point of trade-not-aid in the economic field, but we bitterly oppose its extension to diplomacy. Americans held behind the Iron Curtain against their will in violation of the Korean truce terms, or stripped of the protection they are entitled to from the Government of the United States, are not surplus commodities to be dumped and abandoned. The State Department will not aid them. This emboldens the Communists in the belief that they can trade back these missing men at a price—the dishonorable and costly price of admitting the aggressor, Red China, into the United Nations, or for other concessions to Soviet Russia.

Where are the rights of these men, when both sides consider them as mere bargaining points?

As the moral as well as the material leader of the free world, it is our duty to work unremittingly for the release of our own citizens, and for the release of non-Russians and non-Chinese who are kept captive without a shred of legality.

Anxious relatives and friends in the United States pray for some sign of leadership by our Government to give them hope that these victims of involuntary servitude will regain their freedom.

In the congressional district that I represent, there is a man who longs for the United States to assume the moral initiative in behalf of the little helpless, isolated human beings who are lost if this Nation does not work for their liberation.

They know we can save them from false imprisonment by the Communists if we will but rouse ourselves from the inertia which has affected the State Department in such matters.

This man is Edward R. Greenwood, wool merchant, of North Andover, Mass.

His brothers, Stephen and Fred, are serving prison terms in Communist Poland, because the secret police found two 18th century English pistols—collector's items of historical value—at their home in Lodz. The Communists maintained that these old guns were evidence of an armed conspiracy against their government.

The charge was absurd, but charge or no charge, the brothers were sentenced to jail for 7 and 6 years respectively, with typical Communist contempt of facts, and in spite of the Greenwoods' British citizenship.

Their mother, Mrs. Lucy Greenwood, 82, now living in Toronto, Canada, has appealed to Polish President Boleslaw Bierut, for their release, so that she may see them again before she dies.

Personally, I do not have much faith that the Communists will be moved by any consideration of human feelings, or even the common precepts of justice.

I fear that personal pleas will not do much good.

At the same time, I believe that we have an obligation to intercede for these prisoners, both military and civilian.

Instead of being silent, we should speak up fearlessly.

The moral initiative—I should say imperative—is up to our State Department. I hope sincerely for the sake of the living missing, and for the integrity of our leadership, that this problem will not be pigeonholed.

My purpose in criticizing the Department is to wake it up from its too-cautious approach to matters involving human rights.

There is no argument of expediency that can gloss over our clear duty toward these hapless individuals.

I ask the State Department to acknowledge its responsibility, and to take affirmative action that will lead to the release of all non-Russian and non-Chinese prisoners now being held without justification by the Communists of these two nations and their satellites.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for today be canceled and that I may address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS FOR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is understood, I am sure, that the House will adjourn over until Wednesday. It has been suggested that I had better announce that we expect to call up the rule just filed today for the consideration of the bill to establish an Air Force Academy. If any other rules are granted I shall inform the minority leader and determine whether anything further is to be called up this week.

THE HEALTH PROBLEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 298)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I submit herewith for the consideration of the Congress recommendations to improve the health of the American people.

Among the concerns of our Government for the human problems of our citizens, the subject of health ranks high. For only as our citizens enjoy good physical and mental health can they win for themselves the satisfactions of a fully productive, useful life.

THE HEALTH PROBLEM

The progress of our people toward better health has been rapid. Fifty years ago their average life span was 49 years; today it is 68 years. In 1900 there

were 676 deaths from infectious diseases for every 100,000 of our people; now there are 66. Between 1916 and 1950, maternal deaths per 100,000 live births dropped from 622 to 83. In 1916, 10 percent of the babies born in this country died before their first birthday; today, less than 3 percent die in their first year.

This rapid progress toward better health has been the result of many particular efforts, and of one general effort. The general effort is the partnership and teamwork of private physicians and dentists and of those engaged in public health, with research scientists, sanitary engineers, the nursing profession and the many auxiliary professions related to health protection and care in illness. To all these dedicated people, America owes most of its recent progress toward better health.

Yet much remains to be done. Approximately 224,000 of our people died of cancer last year. This means that cancer will claim the lives of 25 million of our 160 million people unless the present cancer mortality rate is lowered. Diseases of the heart and blood vessels alone now take over 817,000 lives annually. Over 7 million Americans are estimated to suffer from arthritis and rheumatic diseases. Twenty-two thousand lose their sight each year. Diabetes annually adds 100,000 to its roll of sufferers. Two million of our fellow citizens now handicapped by physical disabilities could be, but are not, rehabilitated to lead full and productive lives. Ten million among our people will at some time in their lives be hospitalized with mental illness.

There exist in our Nation the knowledge and skill to reduce these figures, to give us all still greater health protection and still longer life. But this knowledge and skill are not always available to all our people where and when they are needed. Two of the key problems in the field of health today are the distribution of medical facilities and the costs of medical care.

Not all Americans can enjoy the best in medical care—because not always are the requisite facilities and professional personnel so distributed as to be available to them, particularly in our poorer communities and rural sections. There are, for example, 159 practicing physicians for every 100,000 of the civilian population in the Northeast United States. This is to be contrasted with 126 physicians in the West, 116 in the North-Central area, and 92 in the South. There are, for another example, only 4 or 5 hospital beds for each 1,000 people in some States as compared with 10 or 11 in others.

Even where the best in medical care is available, its costs are often a serious burden. Major, long-term illness can become a financial catastrophe for a normal American family. Ten percent of American families are spending today more than $500 a year for medical care. Of our people reporting incomes under $3,000, about 6 percent spend almost a fifth of their gross income for medical and dental care. The total private medical bill of the Nation now exceeds $9 billion a year—an average of nearly $200 a family—and it is rising. This illustrates the seriousness of the problem of medical costs.

We must, therefore, take further action on the problems of distribution of medical facilities and the costs of medical care, but we must be careful and farsighted in the action that we take. Freedom, consent, and individual responsibility are fundamental to our system. In the field of medical care, this means that the traditional relationship of the physician and his patient, and the right of the individual to elect freely the manner of his care in illness, must be preserved.

In adhering to this principle, and rejecting the socialization of medicine, we can still confidently commit ourselves to certain national health goals.

One such goal is that the means for achieving good health should be accessible to all. A person's location, occupation, age, race, creed, or financial status should not bar him from enjoying this access.

Second, the results of our vast scientific research, which is constantly advancing our knowledge of better health protection and better care in illness, should be broadly applied for the benefit of every citizen. There must be the fullest cooperation among the individual citizen, his personal physician, and research scientists, the schools of professional education, and our private and public institutions and services—local, State, and Federal.

The specific recommendations which follow are designed to bring us closer to these goals.

CONTINUATION OF PRESENT FEDERAL PROGRAMS

In my budget message appropriations will be requested to carry on during the coming fiscal year the health and related programs of the newly established Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

These programs should be continued because of their past success and their present and future usefulness. The Public Health Service, for example, has had a conspicuous share in the prevention of disease through its efforts to control health hazards on the farm, in industry, and in the home. Thirty years ago, the Public Health Service first recommended a standard milk sanitation ordinance; by last year this ordinance had been voluntarily adopted by 1,558 municipalities with a total population of 70 million people. Almost 20 years ago the Public Health Service first recommended restaurant sanitation ordinances; today 685 municipalities and 347 counties, with a total population of 90 million people, have such ordinances. The purification of drinking water and the pasteurization of milk have prevented countless epidemics and saved thousands of lives. These and similar field projects of the Public Health Service, such as technical assistance to the States, and industrial hygiene work, have great public value and should be maintained.

In addition, the Public Health Service should be strengthened in its research activities. Through its National Institutes of Health, it maintains a steady attack against cancer, mental illness, heart diseases, dental problems, arthritis, and metabolic diseases, blindness, and problems in microbiology and neurology. The new sanitary-engineering laboratory at Cincinnati, to be dedicated in April, will make possible a vigorous attack on health problems associated with the rapid technological advances in industry and agriculture. In such direct-research programs and in Public Health Service research grants to State and local governments and to private research institutions lies the hope of solving many of today's perplexing health problems.

The activities of the Children's Bureau and its assistance to the States for maternal and child-health services are also of vital importance. The programs for children with such crippling diseases as epilepsy, cerebral palsy, congenital heart disease, and rheumatic fever should receive continued support.

MEETING THE COST OF MEDICAL CARE

The best way for most of our people to provide themselves the resources to obtain good medical care is to participate in voluntary health-insurance plans. During the past decade, private and nonprofit health-insurance organizations have made striking progress in offering such plans. The most widely purchased type of health insurance, which is hospitalization insurance, already meets approximately 40 percent of all private expenditures for hospital care. This progress indicates that these voluntary organizations can reach many more people and provide better and broader benefits. They should be encouraged and helped to do so.

Better health-insurance protection for more people can be provided.

The Government need not and should not go into the insurance business to furnish the protection which private and nonprofit organizations do not now provide. But the Government can and should work with them to study and devise better insurance protection to meet the public need.

I recommend the establishment of a limited Federal reinsurance service to encourage private and nonprofit health-insurance organizations to offer broader health protection to more families. This service would reinsure the special additional risks involved in such broader protection. It can be launched with a capital fund of $25 million, provided by the Government, to be retired from reinsurance fees.

NEW GRANT-IN-AID APPROACH

My message on the state of the Union and my special message of January 14 pointed out that Federal grants-in-aid have hitherto observed no uniform pattern. Response has been made first to one and then to another broad national need. In each of the grant-in-aid programs, including those dealing with health, child welfare, and rehabilitation of the disabled, a wide variety of complicated matching formulas have been used. Categorical grants have restricted funds to specified purposes so that States

often have too much money for some programs and not enough for others.

This patchwork of complex formulas and categorical grants should be simplified and improved. I propose a simplified formula for all of these basic grant-in-aid programs which applies a new concept of Federal participation in State programs. This formula permits the States to use greater initiative and take more responsibility in the administration of the programs. It makes Federal assistance more responsive to the needs of the States and their citizens. Under it, Federal support of these grant-in-aid programs is based on three general criteria:

First. The States are aided in inverse proportion to their financial capacity. By relating Federal financial support to the degree of need, we are applying the proven and sound formula adopted by the Congress in the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

Second, the States are also helped, in proportion to their population, to extend and improve the health and welfare services provided by the grant-in-aid programs.

Third, a portion of the Federal assistance is set aside for the support of unique projects of regional or national significance which give promise of new and better ways of serving the human needs of our citizens.

Two of these grant-in-aid programs warrant the following further recommendations.

REHABILITATION OF THE DISABLED

Working with only a small portion of the disabled among our people, Federal and State Governments and voluntary organizations and institutions have proved the advantage to our Nation of restoring handicapped persons to full and productive lives.

When our State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation began in 1920, the services rendered were limited largely to vocational counseling, training, and job placement. Since then advancing techniques in the medical and social aspects of rehabilitation have been incorporated into that program.

There are now 2 million disabled persons who could be rehabilitated and thus returned to productive work. Under the present rehabilitation program only 60,000 of these disabled individuals are returned each year to full and productive lives. Meanwhile, 250,000 of our people are annually disabled. Therefore, we are losing ground at a distressing rate. The number of disabled who enter productive employment each year can be increased if the facilities, personnel and financial support for their rehabilitation are made adequate to the need.

Considerations of both humanity and national self-interest demand that steps be taken now to improve this situation. Today, for example, we are spending three times as much in public assistance to care for nonproductive disabled people as it would cost to make them self-sufficient and taxpaying members of their communities. Rehabilitated persons as a group pay back in Federal income taxes many times the cost of their rehabilitation.

There are no statistics to portray the full depth and meaning in human terms of the rehabilitation program, but clearly it is a program that builds a stronger America.

We should provide for a progressive expansion of our rehabilitation resources, and we should act now so that a sound foundation may be established in 1955. My forthcoming budget message will reflect this objective. Our goal in 1955 is to restore 70,000 disabled persons to productive lives. This is an increase of 10,000 over the number rehabilitated in 1953. Our goal for 1956 should be 100,000 rehabilitated persons, or 40,000 persons more than those restored in 1953. In 1956, also, the States should begin to contribute from their own funds to the cost of rehabilitating these additional persons. By 1959, with gradually increasing State participation to the point of equal sharing with the Federal Government, we should reach the goal of 200,000 rehabilitated persons each year.

In order to achieve this goal we must extend greater assistance to the States. We should do so, however, in a way which will equitably and gradually transfer increasing responsibility to the States. A program of grants should be undertaken to provide, under State auspices, specialized training for the professional personnel necessary to carry out the expanded program and to foster that research which will advance our knowledge of the ways of overcoming handicapping conditions. We should also provide, under State auspices, clinical facilities for rehabilitative services in hospitals and other appropriate treatment centers. In addition, we should encourage State and local initiative in the development of community rehabilitation centers and special workshops for the disabled.

With such a program the Nation could during the next 5 years return a total of 660,000 of our disabled people to places of full responsibility as actively working citizens.

CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL CARE FACILITIES

The modern hospital—in caring for the sick, in research, and in professional educational programs—is indispensable to good medical care. New hospital construction continues to lag behind the need. The total number of acceptable beds in this Nation in all categories of non-Federal hospital services is now about 1,060,000. Based on studies conducted by State hospital authorities, the need for additional hospital beds of all types—chronic disease, mental, tuberculosis, as well as general—is conservatively estimated at more than 500,000.

A program of matching State and local tax funds and private funds in the construction of both public and voluntary nonprofit hospitals where these are most needed is therefore essential.

Since 1946, nearly $600 million in Federal funds have been allocated to almost 2,200 hospital projects in the States and Territories. This sum has been matched by over $1¼ billion of State and local funds. Projects already completed or under construction on December 31, 1953, will add to our national resources 106,000 hospital beds and 464 public health centers. The largest proportion of Federal funds has been and is being spent in low-income and rural areas where the need for hospital beds is greatest and where the local means for providing them are smallest. This federally stimulated accomplishment has by no means retarded the building of hospitals without Federal aid. Construction costing in excess of $1 billion has been completed in the last 6 years without such aid.

Hospital construction, however, meets only part of the urgent need for medical facilities.

Not all illness need be treated in elaborate general hospital facilities, costly to construct and costly to operate. Certain nonacute illness conditions, including those of our hospitalized aged people, requiring institutional bed care can be handled in facilities more economical to build and operate than a general hospital, with its diagnostic, surgical, and treatment equipment and its full staff of professional personnel. Today beds in our hospitals for the chronically ill take care of only 1 out of every 6 persons suffering from such long-term illnesses as cancer, arthritis, and heart disease. The inadequacy of facilities and services to cope with such illnesses is disturbing. Moreover, if there were more nursing and convalescent home facilities, beds in general hospitals would be released for the care of the acutely ill. This would also help to relieve some of the serious problems created by the present short supply of trained nurses.

Physical rehabilitation services for our disabled people can best be given in hospitals or other facilities especially equipped for the purpose. Many thousands of people remain disabled today because of the lack of such facilities and services.

Many illnesses, to be sure, can be cared for outside of any institution. For such illnesses a far less costly approach to good medical care than hospitalization would be to provide diagnostic and treatment facilities for the ambulatory patient. The provision of such facilities, particularly in rural areas and small isolated communities, will attract physicians to the sparsely settled sections where they are urgently needed.

I recommend, therefore, that the Hospital Survey and Construction Act be amended as necessary to authorize the several types of urgently needed medical-care facilities which I have described. They will be less costly to build than general hospitals and will lessen the burden on them.

I present four proposals to expand or extend the present program:

First. Added assistance in the construction of nonprofit hospitals for the care of the chronically ill. These would be of a type more economical to build and operate than general hospitals.

Second. Assistance in the construction of nonprofit medically supervised nursing and convalescent homes.

Third. Assistance in the construction of nonprofit rehabilitation facilities for the disabled.

Fourth. Assistance in the construction of nonprofit diagnostic or treatment centers for ambulatory patients.

Finally, I recommend that in order to provide a sound basis for Federal assistance in such an expanded program, special funds be made available to the States to help pay for surveys of their needs. This is the procedure that the Congress wisely required in connection with Federal assistance in the construction of hospitals under the original act. We should also continue to observe the principle of State and local determination of their needs without Federal interference.

These recommendations are needed forward steps in the development of a sound program for improving the health of our people. No nation and no administration can ever afford to be complacent about the health of its citizens. While continuing to reject Government regimentation of medicine, we shall with vigor and imagination continuously search out by appropriate means, recommend, and put into effect new methods of achieving better health for all of our people. We shall not relax in the struggle against disease. The health of our people is the very essence of our vitality, our strength, and our progress as a nation.

I urge that the Congress give early and favorable consideration to the recommendations I have herein submitted.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1954.*

IMPROVEMENT OF THE HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with the closest attention and gratification to the reading of the President's message making certain recommendations for the improvement of the health of the American people.

It is a most timely and most noteworthy message.

It is evidence of the President's recognition of the importance of the need in some way to meet the increasing costs of medical care. It is extremely encouraging that the administration has recognized this major problem facing our people today, and has requested the Congress to do something about it.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce already is working diligently on this matter. Last fall, after the Congress had adjourned, the members of the committee returned to Washington for extensive hearings on the status of the Nation's research into the causes and control of the principal diseases of mankind, such as heart, cancer, polio, arthritis, and metabolic diseases, and the like, and what might be done to hasten success in such research.

The committee last fall also conducted a study both here and abroad on various plans to meet the cost of medical care, and already in this session has held 1 week of a scheduled 4 weeks of hearings, on this subject.

Following these hearings the committee will take up specific legislation covering various phases of a national health program. A number of bills have been introduced hitherto and are before us, and others will stem from the recommendations which are contained in the President's message today.

In this connection it is a pleasure to inform the membership of the House that bills are being prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the direction of Mrs. Oveta Hobby, Secretary, to carry out the recommendations made by the President in his message adressed to the House today. One of such bills has already been prepared and I have introduced it today.

This bill is an amendment to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would extend the machinery of the act used previously so successfully in connection with the construction of hospitals, to the construction of diagnostic or treatment centers, hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, rehabilitation facilities and nursing homes. The bill would authorize the expenditure for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years of $20 million for grants to the States for the construction of nonprofit diagnostic or treatment centers; $20 million for grants to the States for the construction of nonprofit hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired; $10 million for grants to the States for construction of nonprofit rehabilitation facilities; and $10 million for grants to the States for the construction of nonprofit nursing homes.

The provisions with regard to State plans to be submitted by the several States to become entitled to a Federal grant are modified appropriately so as to make possible the extension of the provisions of the Hospital Survey Construction Act to the construction of these additional facilities not previously included under the provisions of this act.

Other bills to make effective the Presidential recommendations are being drafted and will be ready for introduction at an early date.

We shall be most happy, in the consideration of such legislation, to receive suggestions from any and all sources, as health groups, insurance companies, labor organizations, business associations, hospital and medical groups, and the like, most of whom already have been contributing so helpfully to the study now in progress.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—AIR FORCE ACADEMY BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago I stated that the Air Force Academy bill would be called up on Wednesday and disposed of on Wednesday. In the meantime it has been brought to my attention that our former colleague, Thomas B. Stanley, of Virginia, is to be inaugurated as Governor of Virginia on that day, and of course a number of our colleagues want to attend the inauguration. Therefore, it will be our purpose to call the rule up on Wednesday. I am sure there will be no controversy on the rule and no record vote on it. General debate will be had on Wednesday but if there is to be a record vote, further action would be postponed until Thursday.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 301)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the Third Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the year ending June 30, 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 15, 1954.*

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1954.*

REPORT OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 299)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress,

approved June 29, 1948, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1954.*

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PAYMENT OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) to provide that compensation of veterans for service-connected disability, rated 20 percent or less disabling, shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be removed from the Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do, Mr. Speaker, but I do not want to get in any complicated situation. I know my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, does not mean to make a unanimous-consent request that the bill be withdrawn from the calendar unless the committee has acted to withdraw the bill.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the committee has not acted on the withdrawal of the bill, but the committee was not unanimous in recommending the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, might I suggest to my good friend that perhaps it would be better if his request was not put before the House in view of the fact that the committee has not voted to withdraw the bill.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a letter sent by Francis M. Sullivan, national director of the DAV to Members of Congress in connection with this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JUNE 24, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We of the DAV, oppose the passage of H. R. 631. Our organization has become fearful of the trend in Congress toward the reclassification of the service-connected veterans who are drawing compensation checks from the Veterans' Administration. A number of examples occurred in recent years. Only last year the Congress passed Public Law 356, approved May 23, 1952, which increased compensation of service-connected disabled veterans 5 percent for those rated less than 50-percent disabled and increased compensation 15 percent for those rated more than 50 percent. Also, in the 80th Congress, Public Law 877, approved July 2, 1948, provided dependency allowance for disabled veterans rated 60 percent or more in degree. Last year this 60 percent was reduced to 50 percent. Therefore, the dependents of service-connected disabled veterans who have less than 50 percent do not draw compensation under this law.

On June 10, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported the bill, H. R. 631, and it is now on the House Consent Calendar. This bill provides that the compensation of veterans with a service-connected disability rated 20 percent or less disabling shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly. The DAV was invited to present its views at the committee hearing but declined to do so. Since the committee's hearing the situation has been changed. Upon reading the hearings of the House Commitee on Appropriations on the Veterans' Administration appropriation, we have become alarmed that the bill, H. R. 631, is but a forerunner to a movement to change the disability compensation system. Therefore, the DAV must oppose the passage of H. R. 631, and we implore your assistance.

Three of the major veterans' organizations did not support this measure in the committee. The Veterans' Administration, in its report to the Veterans' Affairs Committee, estimated "that there might be savings of about $45,000 a year, insofar as the functions of the VA are concerned and pointed out that in addition the Treasury might save as much as $585,000 a year." This estimate apparently does not take into consideration the administrative costs in making the change to pay veterans on a quarterly, rather than monthly basis. Much of the Treasury's costs will be made up by mailing costs and we all know these mailings are on a franked basis.

The 10-percent rate today is $15.75 per month and the 20-percent rate is $31.50. These amounts may seem small to many persons but our organization knows that many disabled veterans use this amount to supplement their income. Many of them use this amount to pay their Government insurance; some use it to pay mortgage installments, and some use it for food, and some use it for installment payments. The DAV does not agree with the theory of this bill, which is one of the recommendations made by Booz, Allen, and Hamilton, the management firm which recently concluded a survey of the Veterans' Administration, its organization and operating methods.

If the monthly payments are put on a quarterly basis, why does the bill, H. R. 631, stop at 20 percent instead of going to 100 percent? The DAV sees no point in putting the 10- and 20-percent cases on a quarterly basis and the 30-percent cases on a monthly basis.

We believe H. R. 631 is only the first step toward disrupting the present compensation system, and again, we ask you to oppose its passage in the House of Representatives.

We thank you for any assistance you may give us.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

EXTENDING PENSION BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5380) to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman would let that bill come up for discussion later. Judge MACK, the author of the bill, was present to say a word about the bill, but just at this moment he is not in the Chamber. Would the gentleman be willing to have it considered at the end of the calendar?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would be glad to have the gentleman discuss it at the next call of the Consent Calendar. That is all I am asking.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He will be here in a few minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO COMPLETE INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN, N. DAK.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3986) to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DECREE OF COMPETENCY FOR UNITED STATES INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4985) to provide a decree of competency for United States Indians in certain cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF HOSPITAL AND HEALTH FACILITIES FOR INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 303) to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule has been requested for this bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXEMPTION FOR CHURCH MISSIONS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 550

The Clerk called the bill (S. 631) to permit veterans to suspend or delay their programs of education or training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 in order to perform services as missionaries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask that this bill be rereferred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It has been taken care of in another way. Would the gentleman have any objection to that?

Mr. EVINS. I have no objection to its being rereferred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the bill being rereferred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the bill seeks to relax certain requirements under Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress to permit individuals who perform a "mission" for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, commonly known as the Mormon Church, continue a program of training after the completion of their mission. I have letters from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs addressed to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. STRINGFELLOW], the sponsor of the bill in the House, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] indicating that the purpose of this legislation has been accomplished by administrative regulation, which I ask to be inserted at this point.

I have consulted with the sponsors of the bills, both in the House and in the Senate, and it is perfectly agreeable that this bill be rereferred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1953.

Hon. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRINGFELLOW: I refer to your expressed interest in the requirements of Public Law 550, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, as they have to do with the continuous pursuit of a program of education or training, and the conditions therein set out by which a program may be suspended by a veteran for good and sufficient cause.

I have considered the matter thoughtfully and I am moved to conclude that where a veteran who is in active pursuit of a program of education or training is appointed by the responsible governing body of an established church, officially charged with the selection and designation of missionary representatives, in keeping with its traditional practice, to serve the church in an official missionary capacity and is thereby prevented from the continuous pursuit of his program of studies, the veteran will be deemed to have suspended the pursuit of such program for an excusable reason during the tenure of such missionary service.

Of course, there is no authority by which the Veterans' Administration may extend the plain requirements of the statute as they have to do with the time as of which any veteran must initiate—that is, commence—his program of education or training. The foregoing must be premised, therefore, upon situations wherein the veteran has, on or prior to his statutory delimiting date, actually commenced the pursuit of his program of education or training. You will understand also that the law fixes a date beyond which no education or training benefits may be afforded any veteran.

I have directed our interested regional offices to proceed accordingly, and I believe that this will resolve satisfactorily the questions you have presented.

Sincerely yours,

H. V. HIGLEY,
Administrator.

TAX REFUNDS ON CIGARETTES LOST IN THE FLOODS OF 1951

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4319) to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4551) to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 removing authorization of projects by the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of our colleague from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

COSTS AND EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 727) to provide that certain costs and expenses incurred in connection with certain repayment contracts with irrigation districts approved by the acts of Congress of May 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 62), October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 941), and June 23, 1952 (66 Stat. 151, 153), shall be nonreimbursable.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all costs and expenses, not in excess of a total of $100,000, incurred by the United States in negotiating and completing contracts with the Deaver, Prosser, and Belle Fourche Irrigation Districts approved by the act of Congress of October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 941), and with the Willwood, Bitterroot, Kittitas, and Okanogan irrigation districts approved by the act of Congress of May 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 62), and with the Frenchtown Irrigation District approved by the act of Congress of June 23, 1952 (66 Stat. 151, 153) in making the investigation in connection therewith, and in future determinations under said contracts with respect to the productivity of temporarily unproductive lands shall be, to the extent that such costs and expenses have not been included in the restated repayment obligations of the irrigation districts involved, nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF WATER CONSERVATION FACILITIES BY STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6112) to facilitate the development and construction of water conservation facilities by States and municipalities, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection of the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this bill has now become Public Law 27d, I ask unanimous consent that it be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RELEASING RIGHTS TO CERTAIN LAND CONVEYED TO CITY OF CHANDLER, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1081) to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

REUNIFICATION OF GERMANY BY FREE ELECTIONS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con Res. 125) expressing the hopes of the American people for the early reunification of Germany by free elections and for the achievement by the people of East Germany of their basic human rights and freedoms.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this measure passed the House on August 1, 1953, I move that it be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6353) to amend the Merchant Marine Act,

1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING CANAL ZONE CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4881) to amend the Canal Zone Code in reference to the survival of things in action.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are no departmental reports accompanying this measure, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF CANAL ZONE CORROSION LABORATORY TO DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5862) to authorize the Panama Canal Company to transfer the Canal Zone Corrosion Laboratory to the Department of the Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Panama Canal Company is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without exchange of funds and for use as a laboratory for corrosion tests and related studies, all, or so much as may be mutually agreed upon, of the facilities, buildings, structures, improvements and test installations of the Panama Canal Company comprising the Canal Zone Corrosion Laboratory at Miraflores, C. Z., and at the various test exposure sites in the Canal Zone and on Panama Canal Company property in the city of Colon, Republic of Panama.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CASH RELIEF FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5861) to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in section 1 of the act of July 8, 1937 (ch. 449, 50 Stat. 478), which act authorizes the payment of cash relief to such employees of the Canal Zone Government not coming within the scope of the former Canal Zone Retirement Act as may become unfit for further useful service by reason of mental or physical disability resulting from age or disease, is amended, effective as of the first day of the month in which this act is approved, to read as follows: *"Provided*, That such cash relief shall not exceed $1.50 per month for each year of service of the employee so furnished relief, with a maximum of $45 per month, nor be granted to any employee having less than 10 years' service with the Canal Zone Government and its predecessor agencies, including any service with the Panama Canal Company, and its predecessor agencies, on the Isthmus of Panama."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, insert the following new section 2:

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect the first day of the month in which it is enacted."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESERVATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS IN LAND PATENTED UNDER THE NONMINERAL LAND LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3306) relating to the reservation of mineral rights in land patented under the nonmineral land laws.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for agricultural entry of lands withdrawn, classified, or reported as containing phosphate, nitrate, potash, oil, gas, or asphaltic minerals", approved July 17, 1914 (30 U. S. C., sec. 123), is amended by striking out the following: "which patent shall contain a reservation to the United States of all deposits on account of which the lands were withdrawn, classified, or reported as being valuable, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "which patent shall not contain a reservation to the United States of any mineral deposits other than deposits of fissionable materials, notwithstanding such person has consented to the reservation of other mineral deposits. If any mineral deposits on account of which the lands were withdrawn, classified, or reported as being valuable have been leased by the United States such patent shall be made subject to the rights of the lessor, but the patentee shall be subrogated to the rights of the United States under the lease."

SEC. 2. The act entitled "An act for the protection of the surface rights of entrymen," approved March 3, 1909 (30 U. S. C., sec. 81), is amended to read as follows: "That any person who has in good faith located, selected, or entered under the nonmineral land laws of the United States any lands which subsequently are classified, claimed, or reported as being valuable for coal, may, if he shall so elect, and upon making satisfactory proof of compliance with the laws under which such lands are claimed, receive a patent therefor, which patent shall not contain a reservation to the United States of any mineral deposits other than deposits of fissionable materials, notwithstanding such person has consented to the reservation of other mineral deposits. If any deposits of coal have been leased by the United States such patent shall be made subject to the rights of the lessor, but the patentee shall be subrogated to the rights of the United States under the lease."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following language: "That where reclamation homestead entry was made prior to July 17, 1914, pursuant to the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 389, 43 U. S. C., sec. 431), as amended and supplemented, for lands in the Northport Division or the Interstate Division of the North Platte Reclamation Project, and after such entry the lands have been or are hereafter withdrawn, classified, or reported as being valuable for any of the minerals named in the act of July 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 509, 30 U. S. C., sec. 121–123), the act of March 4, 1933 (47 Stat. 1570, 30 U. S. C., sec. 124), or the act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 844, 30 U. S. C., sec. 81), the patent shall not contain a reservation of such minerals. If any such mineral deposits on account of which the lands were withdrawn, classified, or reported as being valuable have been leased by the United States, such patent shall be made subject to the rights of the lessee, but the patentee shall be subrogated to the rights of the United States under the lease."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JAMESTOWN-WILLIAMSBURG-YORKTOWN CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 232) to establish the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that House joint resolution 232 is now Public Law 263, I ask unanimous consent that it be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

GRANTING PREFERENCE RIGHT TO USERS OF WITHDRAWN PUBLIC LANDS FOR GRAZING PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6186) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant a preference right to users of withdrawn public lands for grazing purposes when the lands are restored from the withdrawal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U. S. C., 1946 edition, sec. 315 (m)) is amended by adding the following proviso: *"Provided further*, That whe public lands are restored from a withdrawal, the Secretary may grant an appropriate preference right for a grazing lease, license, or permit to users of the land for grazing purposes under authority of the agency which had jurisdiction over the lands immediately prior to the time of their restoration."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 1 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended by the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976, 43 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 315), is further amended by striking out the following language: "not exceeding in the aggregate an area of 142 million acres."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANASSAS NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD PARK, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5529) to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., the most important historic properties relating to the Battles of Manassas, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to establish satisfactory boundaries for the Manassas National Battlefield Park, in the State of Virginia, and to contain within such boundaries the important historic lands relating to the two Battles of Manassas, the boundaries of such battlefield park hereafter shall contain that area which is bounded, in general, as follows: The south boundary of the park shall be the southernmost limits of the present federally owned lands in the south portion of the park; the east and northeast boundaries shall be that portion of the Bull Run Creek which extends from the south boundary of the park north and westward to the north boundary of the park as hereafter prescribed; the southwest boundary shall be that portion of Compton's Lane from its nearest point adjacent to the south boundary and extending northwesterly to State secondary highway No. 622; the west and northwest boundary shall be State secondary highway No. 622, from the point where it connects with Compton's Lane and extending northward until it reaches the Sudley Church property; the north boundary shall be the northernmost limits of the present Federal park holdings in the immediate vicinity of the Sudley Church property. The boundaries of the park also may include not more than 250 acres of land adjacent to the aforesaid west and north boundaries of the park, which land shall become a part of the park upon acquisition thereof by the United States: *Provided*, That the total acreage which may be acquired for the park pursuant to this act shall not exceed 1,400 acres. Such land or interests therein may be procured by the Secretary of the Interior in such manner as he may consider to be in the public interest.

For exchange purposes, particularly in connection with State and other highway developments, the Secretary is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, any non-Federal land or interests therein situated within the park area herein prescribed, and in exchange therefor to convey park land or interests therein of approximately equal value.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike the word "hereafter" and insert in lieu thereof the word "hereinafter."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, HILL, HOEVEN, SIMPSON of Illinois, BRAMBLETT, DAGUE, COOLEY, POAGE, GRANT, GATHINGS, MCMILLAN, and ABERNETHY.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. JAMES J. O'ROURKE

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 4961, for the relief of Mrs. James J. O'Rourke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $350.95 to Mrs. James J. O'Rourke, of 51 Hopkins Street, Revere, Mass., for reimbursement of the amount of medical and hospital expenses which she incurred after she was admitted to the Revere Memorial Hospital in Revere on February 9, 1951: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LILLIAN SCHLOSSBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2163) for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $30,000 to Mrs. Lillian Schlossberg, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle No. 165460, driven by Lt. Burl J. Brewington, of Fort Jay Army Base, on December 8, 1945, at the intersection of Canal Street and West Broadway, New York, N. Y.; the operator of such vehicle was not acting within the scope of his employment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid, delivered to, or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$30,000" and insert "$15,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEO F. PINDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2876) for the relief of Leo F. Pinder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leo F. Pinder, regular letter carrier in the United States post office at Akron, Ohio, the sum of $607.55. Such sum represents the amount which the said Leo F. Pinder was required to pay to the United States in discharge of his liability for the loss on July 31, 1952, of certain registered letters containing money order business and stamp sales money in the amount of $607.55 which were placed in his custody for delivery from contract station No. 2 to the United States post office in Akron, although he had not received appropriate instructions or equipment for the protection of registered mail matter: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$607.55. Such sum represents the amount" and insert: "$150, and to be relieved of all liability to refund the sum of $457.55. Such sums represent the amount."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDNA V. R. DECKER, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3573) for the relief of Edna V. R. Decker, Barbara P. R. Moore, W. S. Rosasco, Jr., and Gordon Wells, as administrator cum testamento annexo of the estate of Anna I. R. Wells, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following-named persons: Edna V. R. Decker, Barbara P. R. Moore, W. S. Rosasco, Jr., and Gordon Wells, as administrator cum testamento annexo of the estate of Anna I. R. Wells, deceased, the sum of $5,611.56, together with interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from April 16, 1946, in full satisfaction of the claim of each such person against the United States for an estate-tax refund

due as a result of an overpayment on April 16, 1946, of estate taxes with respect to the estate of William S. Rosasco, Sr.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANE: Page 2, line 1, after the figures and comma strike out "together with interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from April 16, 1946."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Anna I. R. Wells, deceased, and others."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD K. BUTSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2913) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain lands to Harold K. Butson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue a patent to Harold K. Butson, of Grant County, Wis., for the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 4 north, range 1 west, fourth principal meridian, Wisconsin.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The tract of land described by the first section of this act shall be conveyed upon the payment by the said Harold K. Butson of the appraised value of the lands, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, if payment is made within 1 year after the Secretary has notified the said Harold K. Butson of the price of the lands. The Secretary shall have the appraisal made on the basis of the value of the land at the date of appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the land by Harold K. Butson or his predecessors in interest. In such appraisal, the Secretary shall consider and give full effect to the equities of the said Harold K. Butson.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall issue patent for said lands without any reservation of minerals."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which, if passed, will enable each of us to do a better job of representing our constituents.

This bill will relieve us of one of the most time-consuming jobs we perform—that of making recommendations for postmaster appointments, leaving us more time to devote to our primary job—that of legislating. Furthermore, I think that efficient postal service requires that the top job in any post office be something other than a political football.

Section 10 of the Civil Service Act of 1883, which has been ignored for many years, makes it illegal for a Member of Congress to make any recommendation for a postmaster appointment except as to the character or residence of the applicant.

My bill will revive and strengthen that statute by disqualifying any applicant who seeks a recommendation for a postmaster job from any Member of Congress and it will also vest the appointing power in the Postmaster General instead of in the President.

I am not trying to avoid my responsibility but I am trying to improve the postal service and give ourselves more time to act as legislators. I respectfully solicit your support for this legislation.

CURB THE USE OF INTERSTATE FACILITIES FOR TRANSMISSION OF GAMBLING INFORMATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to prohibit use of interstate telephone, telegraph, and radio facilities for the transmission of gambling information of the kind necessary for the operation of illegal bookmakers. In recent years the backbone of organized crime has been illegal gambling, and the main stronghold of illegal gambling has been bookmaking. There is nothing deeply shocking, to a large segment of the community, about the citizen who bets a few dollars with a bookmaker. But the trouble is that these seemingly innocent bets have been monopolized by nationwide gangs and parlayed into fantastically big business operations. It has been estimated that as much as $20 billion changes hands every year in illegal gambling. No wonder so many of the Nation's public enemies are well-heeled.

The gang which is able to control national or regional distribution of gambling information through the wire services is able in turn to control all illegal gambling in each area it penetrates. The bookmaker who does not receive the last-minute reports on odds, scratches, winners, and so forth, cannot compete with his rival who does. The single national wire service syndicate of a few years ago—Continental Press—is still out of the picture, but it is believed that a number of regional organizations, using the telephone rather than leased wires, have reemerged and are pulling the old empire together again.

This bill is based on a measure proposed by the Department of Justice several years ago, after the Department and the Federal Communications Commission had made a careful study of the use of interstate communications in connection with illegal gambling activities. Although there have been numerous variations of this original bill introduced since, none have been entirely acceptable to the Department and the Commission. It seems likely that the Department of Justice and other interested agencies will give their full support to this measure.

The bill provides no criminal penalties, depending for its enforcement on the broad regulatory powers vested in the FCC. It therefore avoids the objection must commonly raised against legislation of this type, that the Federal Government should not undertake to punish gambling per se since it is a local offense only.

The measure has been strongly endorsed, in principle, by the section on criminal law of the American Bar Association, which has been urging Congress to take action to drive organized crime out of the channels of interstate commerce.

Under leave granted, a copy of the proposed bill follows:

H. R. 7311

A bill to improve the enforcement of laws pertaining to gambling by suppressing the transmission of certain gambling information

Be it enacted, etc., That the purposes of this act are to assist the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses, and to aid in the suppression of organized gambling activities by prohibiting the use of or the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of communication facilities for the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce.

SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term—

(a) "Communication facility" means any and all instrumentalities, apparatus, personnel, and services (among other things, the receipt, forwarding, and delivery of communications) used or useful in the transmission of writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by wire or radio or other like connection between points of origin and reception of such transmission.

(b) "Gambling information" means bets or wagers or related information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on any sporting event or contest, or transactions or information facilitating betting or wagering activities on any sporting event or contest. In connection with horse racing, gambling information includes among other things entries, scratches, jockeys, jockey changes, weights, probable winners, scheduled starting time of race, actual starting time of race, track conditions, the betting odds, changes in the betting odds, the post positions, the results, and the prices paid.

(c) "Transmission in interstate commerce" means transmission directly or indirectly from any place in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia to any place in any other

State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia.

(d) "Transmission in foreign commerce" means transmission directly or indirectly from or to any place in the United States to or from a foreign country or ship at sea or in the air.

SEC. 3. (a) The use of or the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of any communication facility for the transmission of gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce is prohibited.

(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of information in connection with the news reporting of sporting events or contests, which might be gambling information as defined in this act, if such information is intended, transmitted, supplied, delivered, and received only for printed news publication in newspapers, magazines, journals, or like periodicals, or for radio and television broadcasting as set forth in section 4: *Provided further,* That if such information is intended, transmitted, supplied, delivered, or received for any other purpose, the burden shall be upon the person or persons so transmitting, supplying, delivering, or receiving such information to show that the information is not being used directly or indirectly to circumvent the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. No radio-broadcasting station or television-broadcasting station, for which a license is required by any law of the United States, shall broadcast or permit to be broadcast any gambling information relating to horseracing before the start of any race on the day it is scheduled to be run; or during the 1-hour period immediately following the finish of such race or before the start of the next race at that track whichever period is longer. This section shall not preclude the broadcasting of the progress of, or information concerning, a horse race where such broadcast is carried as a special event and not as part of a regularly scheduled series of broadcasts of races: *Provided,* That no more than one horse race shall be broadcast by any station or chain of stations per day.

SEC. 5. (a) Any person or persons who shall lease or otherwise obtain from a common carrier or other supplier a communication facility to be operated for or in connection with the transmission of news or other information pertaining to sporting events or contests shall file with such carrier or other supplier a statement that the communication facility so obtained is to be used for such purposes. Failure to file such a statement shall create a presumption that such communication facility is being used in violation of the provisions of this act. The statements on file with the carriers or other suppliers shall be open to inspection by appropriate State and Federal law-enforcement agencies.

(b) Each common carrier or other supplier shall maintain a list of the terminal points and drops (receiving and sending) on any communication facility leased or otherwise furnished for the transmission of news or other information pertaining to sporting events or contests, including the address of each such terminal point and drop, and such list shall be open to inspection by appropriate State and Federal law-enforcement agencies.

SEC. 6. (a) The Federal Communications Commission shall require all common carriers subject to its jurisdiction to file appropriate tariff practices and regulations to give effect to the provisions of this Act, and the Commission shall, in accordance with its existing authority, take such steps as may be necessary to insure enforcement of such tariffs. The Federal Communications Commission shall adopt such rules and regulations and make such orders with respect to the operation of radio-broadcasting and television-broadcasting stations as shall be necessary to insure compliance with the provisions of this act.

(b) The interstate or foreign character of any transmission of gambling information in, or intended for transmission in, interstate or foreign commerce shall not create an immunity in respect of any criminal prosecution under the laws of any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses.

(c) Any remedies afforded by this act are in addition to remedies now existing under State or Federal law, including law applicable within the Territories and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. I have previously submitted the question to the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has very kindly given him the opportunity of looking over the question of personal privilege. In one instance it is stated that the gentleman did something illegal in his representative capacity, so therefore the gentleman qualifies to present his question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the Speaker that in one instance I have been charged with doing something illegal as a member of a House committee is true; however, there are several other instances in which that charge is made.

In the Cleveland News of Thursday, January 14, 1954, will be found a news story by Webb Seely, captioned "BENDER To Push Congress Probe of Juke Box Racket—Says Burke, as Mayor, Should Have Cleaned Up."

No comment will be made upon the last sentence nor upon paragraphs of the article which make further reference to the former mayor. To do so would be to inject politics into a nonpolitical situation.

The story lists a number of questions purported to have been put to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable GEORGE H. BENDER, with what are, it is charged, his answers.

Among the purported questions and answers are the following:

Question. Congressman BENDER, will you vote to restore Representative HOFFMAN'S subcommittee authority to investigate labor racketeering in Cleveland and Toledo?

Answer. To begin with, we haven't had a committee meeting yet. The chairman (HOFFMAN) hasn't called one. I will certainly vote to expose and investigate any form of racketeering. However, we certainly don't want power and authority abused.

Question. Has Congressman HOFFMAN abused his power by asking for his own subcommittee to investigate labor racketeering here and elsewhere?

Answer. He has. HOFFMAN has organized special committees at the drop of the hat. He does this without consulting other members of the Government Operations Committee. He has so many special activities he is abusing his power. I won't be a party to anything illegal.

Question. What was illegal about Representative HOFFMAN'S racketeering committee?

Answer. Setting up and obviously abusing his power. I won't be a party to doing anything wrong.

Question. Representative HOFFMAN has stated that there is plenty of wrong being done in Cleveland and Toledo. He says his subcommittee files are loaded with material on union racketeering in the vending-machine business in Cleveland and Toledo. You cross-examined William Presser, AFL Teamsters' czar of Ohio juke boxes, at the Detroit racket hearings last June. From what you picked up at that hearing are you in accord with HOFFMAN on this point?

Answer. I had never seen Presser before that hearing—he appeared from the testimony to be the jukebox-racket organizer. I am 100 percent for investigating the jukebox racket. God bless you and the News and anybody else who publicly exposes any and all rackets within the unions.

Then, answering a question as to holding hearings in Detroit, our colleague is reported to have said:

Answer. If I recall correctly, the testimony indicated the jukebox rackets were being organized by Presser out of Cleveland. I am still in favor of an investigation in Cleveland but I won't go for HOFFMAN'S abuse of power. The proper subcommittee should investigate.

That story purports to list certain questions and answers given by our distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. I have no criticism of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. He is a very handsome gentleman. If he entered a contest to determine, from a physical standpoint, a Mr. America, there is no question but that he would win.

I see a gentleman on my right, a member of the minority, shaking his head in the negative. I suggest that the gentleman enter such a contest with my distinguished colleague. Much as I admire him, great as are his qualifications, I still think the gentleman from Ohio would win.

Not only is he a perfect specimen of physical manhood, but he has unquestioned ability. He is a man of most pleasing personality. I know, because I have dealt with him on the committee, as a Member of the House, and once in a while meeting him in the halls and the corridors of the House and of the House Office Building. There is no question about his ability to charm.

The gentleman is also a man of exceptional determination and courage; nothing frightens him. He has profound convictions on many issues, and when he harbors a conviction he does not hesitate 1 minute; he just goes full speed ahead, letting the chips fall where they may. Some of the chips, of course, you would not distinguish what they were cut from, that they came from the timber being hewn, but nevertheless he goes on his course. His driving force sometimes overcomes the convictions which his colleagues may have entertained.

I have endeavored many times to follow along with his arguments but not always have I been able to accept his suggestions and ideas, not always successful in thinking his way.

But, in any event, the substance of my statement so far is that many of his characteristics I recognize and admire. It is a delightful opportunity always to be associated with him. So much for that.

I am very, very happy to note that he intends to push the probe, if there is a probe ever, into the jukebox racket in Cleveland. That is his home city, the city where he receives a tremendous vote in practically every election, a justifiable tribute which the people of Cleveland pay to him, and I hope my colleagues on the other side will advise their candidate, if they ever have a candidate, who runs against him in this next senatorial election, of the qualifications of my colleague. If they do, perhaps they will withdraw their candidate and there will be no contest in Ohio. That would be very, very pleasant and agreeable to us on the Republican side.

Now, it takes courage, sometimes, to try to probe the racketeers in your own home city, especially a city the size of Cleveland, because they collect a great deal of money up there and sometimes, as Mr. Hoffa, who was in Detroit when we had the hearing there, and the gentleman from Ohio was sitting in on the first hearing, testified under oath that his local 600 had a million dollars in the treasury, and that they had given him—Hoffa—authority to spend such part of that million dollars in elections as he desired. He said that he had spent some of that money to elect judges, to help elect judges, or to oppose judges. Now, that is a tremendous force in any community, and no doubt a somewhat similar situation exists in Cleveland.

Among the questions which were asked in the Cleveland News were these:

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Briefly.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Does that apply to the Democratic candidate or the Republican candidate?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman want to be helpful?

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman should confine his remarks to the violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will endeavor to do so, but I will have to put in a little of the background. I will yield, if it is pertinent.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Does that situation apply to the Democratic or the Republican senatorial candidates in Ohio?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What does the gentleman mean?

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes the gentleman would confine his remarks to the question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I trust the Chair will bear with my ignorance of the rules. I will try exceedingly hard to comply with the rules of the House, even with those which from time to time register a change.

Here is a question:

Congressman BENDER. Will you vote to restore Representative HOFFMAN'S subcommittee authority to investigate labor racketeering in Cleveland and Toledo?

Answer. To begin with, we haven't had a committee meeting yet. The Chairman [HOFFMAN] hasn't called me.

The regular committee meetings are on the first and third Wednesdays of each month. The 20th, next Wednesday, will be the first opportunity for a meeting this session, and the gentleman has notice of that.

I will certainly vote to expose and investigate all forms of racketeering.

That is fine.

However, we certainly don't want power and authority abused.

For that suggestion that the gentleman will vote as stated I personally express the deepest gratitude. I have always tried not to abuse any authority. As a matter of fact, the racketeers do not raise that question at the hearings. One or two Communists did, when we were in Los Angeles, but then they let go of that issue when the hearings showed they were Communists.

Question. Has Congressman HOFFMAN abused his power by asking for his own subcommittee to investigate labor racketeering here and elsewhere?

Now, mind you, he is speaking of the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District in his representative capacity. He is charging that I have abused that authority as a member of the committee. The House should be concerned about that if that authority has been abused.

It might be suggested that the House, if it is a serious abuse, should take it up and study it and, if the Representative of the Fourth District of Michigan is guilty, then he should be reprimanded, maybe something more severe than that; I do not know. It might be well to look into that—if there is any misconduct.

He has. HOFFMAN has organized special committees at the drop of the hat. He does this without consulting other members of the Government Operations Committee.

That is true. I did that. And had authority so to do—authority expressly given by the committee.

He has so many special activities he is abusing his power. I won't be a party to anything illegal.

Well, bless his dear heart, I do not want him to be and I do not want to do it myself. If the gentleman waits for me to suggest that he do something even unethical, not to mention anything illegal, he will be older than I am, yes, older than Methuselah.

If I did want him to do it, I could not do it. I do not have the authority. I am not big enough physically. I do not have the votes to do it. It is just absurd to intimate that I am trying to force him to do something he should not. He needs no suggestions from me.

But now the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District, says the gentleman from Ohio, has appointed special subcommittees illegally. Let me read you the rule. Rule 3 states:

A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum; provided however—

Now listen—

that special committees consisting of two or more members, at least one of whom shall be a member of the minority, may be appointed by the chairman.

Where, Friend BENDER, is or was the illegality?

The committee gave me that authority. In my ignorance, in my innocence, thinking the rule meant what it said, that those who had discussed it and then adopted it did so in good faith, I went ahead and appointed a special subcommittee.

And do you know what? I appointed the distinguished gentleman from Ohio as a member of one of those subcommittees and, bless your heart, he served on it without objection. And so did some 10 other Members serve on similar committees—served without objection.

Then, later, on the 15th day of July, the full committee came along and ruled that I could not appoint any more subcommittees. Some folks know the result of that action. No one claimed my action was improper at that time so far as I know, but on the floor of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] said that I was old and ill and testy, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] said that they had taken enough malarkey from me and that I was constitutionally unconstitutional. Just what he meant by that I do not know, so I cannot enter a plea to that.

My age I admit. I cannot help that. I did not have anything to do with the day I was born, the fixing of my birthday. Some of the Members of this House will some day, if their health continues good, be just as old as I am, undoubtedly better preserved physically and more mentally alert; but for any lack in those lines I have no excuse. If my people are satisfied, the Members should not worry overmuch.

So the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] says he does not want to be a party to anything illegal. He need not worry about me getting him into trouble.

Question. What was illegal about Representative HOFFMAN'S racketeering committee?

Answer. Setting up and obviously abusing his power. I won't be a party to doing anything wrong.

Well, that I know—my good friend would not—not intentionally, not consciously. He is as pure as the snow a thousand feet up. But what was wrong with what was done? Let me repeat, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] was a member of that subcommittee which met in Detroit. I repeat again, he served without objection. He never at any time criticized the action of the committee—never put on the record any objection, and he played a very prominent and helpful part in that investigation.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I am glad the gentleman made that last statement because, if you will recall, when the subcommittee was meeting and the hearing had kind of bogged down, I did help in questioning and in bringing out some of the evidence.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is no question about it—though he never before made that suggestion—that the hearing was bogged down—that he took an active part, especially did he take an active part when the name of Mr. Presser, who was doing a little racketeering not only in Cleveland but, he will recall, in Toledo, you see, down in Toledo, and the gentleman from Ohio got right up and took part and condemned that kind of procedure—at least I assume he did—the record will show.

I want to compliment the gentleman. It was a wonderful, helpful service, for a moment. But for the life of me I cannot understand why now you do not want any more of it, if it is done by your great admirer, your humble and obedient servant, the Member who is speaking. That I cannot figure out.

Of course, I have my own idea. I know what is the matter along a certain line at least—the activities in which I have engaged, not exclusively, and not as a member of this particular committee exclusively, but over the years—for 10 or 15 or 16 or 17 years—have been very displeasing to certain labor leaders, and if I am permitted to go ahead, I have not the slightest doubt but that the hearings will be displeasing to Beck, Hoffa, Ring, and to some who are unlawfully profiting as a result of their activities, which they claim are in behalf of a union but which, in fact, are the opposite in result.

But what some of my colleagues do not understand is that, while in years gone by, Members of the Congress who did what they thought was the right thing to do in the way of voting on labor legislation and in the way of exposing some of these wrongful activities—while in years gone by they were characterized as antilabor and as labor baiters, today the picture has changed, and the letters I get come primarily from members, rank and file members, of unions and from union officials.

Now listen—in Kansas City the officials of A. F. of L. locals came to me personally and wanted our help in our hearings there—to do what? To protect them from the crooked activities of the teamsters union headed by one Beck, who was doing what? He was making a drive to take over the dues-paying membership of the carpenters union and in two others to compel the members of those locals, the 3 of them, and there were 9,000 carpenters, men in good standing, and he wanted those 9,000 to pay their dues—in the A. F. of L. carpenters local—not to the carpenters union—oh, no—but to the union headed by Ring, the teamsters union.

And what did Ring do to enforce that demand? He went down where the carpenters were working on Government projects—there were three out there which were defense projects—he went down there with 100 members of the teamsters union, or hired men, and with clubs and other weapons drove the carpenters off the job. There were 25,000 union men unemployed in Kansas City.

The Kansas City Star took up the issue, as all rightly edited and published newspapers do when they see some great crime being carried on. They took it up and inside of 2 weeks that strike was settled. Do you get the picture? We had hearings; yes. But the real job was done by the newspapers using the information we furnished.

The Republican Party cannot do anything to get it more votes, to be of greater benefit to the country, of more help to the average union worker, and I refer not only to the State of Michigan but to other States as well, than to expose this conspiracy which is collecting millions upon millions of dollars not only from unorganized workers but from union men in good standing, from unions, from businessmen, and from the Federal Government itself.

Permit me to cite one instance in Michigan where, in connection with the manufacture of airplanes, the Government paid $300,000—our committee did not turn that up; a committee in the other body did—they paid $300,000 to roving stewards who never did a stroke of constructive work.

Oh, no. You cannot do a single thing that will get you more votes in the next campaign or that will be more helpful to workers than to pull the lid off of that particular pot, which is a part of the mess which has been going on over the years to the injury of union as well as nonunion workers.

Did the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] say anything more? Sure.

Question. Representative HOFFMAN has stated that there is plenty of wrong being done in Cleveland and Toledo. He says his subcommittee's files are loaded with material on union racketeering in the vending-machine business in Cleveland and Toledo. You cross-examined William Presser, AFL teamsters czar of Ohio jukeboxes, at the Detroit racket hearings last June. From what you picked up at that hearing are you in accord with HOFFMAN on this point?

Now listen to the gentleman from Ohio.

I had never seen Presser before that hearing. He appeared from the testimony to be the jukebox racket organizer. I am 100 percent for investigating the jukebox racket. God bless you and the News and anybody else who publicly exposes any and all rackets within the unions.

Again I say to the gentleman from Ohio: All hail to his good right arm.

If he will go ahead with the same enthusiasm that he showed when Governor Dewey was a candidate for the Presidency, and you put on that big meeting which cost $4,000, so I understand, and Dewey would not even let you sing Onward, Christian Soldiers, we may get somewhere.

If you will give me authority to appoint the proposed subcommittee I will back you up in all of these efforts to expose these people.

As a candidate for the United States Senate, I think it would be mighty helpful to you. Let acts rather than words speak on the issue.

Question. Are you in accord with HOFFMAN on this point?

The gentleman continued his answer:

I had never seen Presser before that hearing. He appeared from the testimony to be the jukebox racket organizer.

I tell you it takes courage to oppose a man like Presser. I compliment the gentleman from Ohio. It takes courage to oppose a man like Presser in Cleveland and Toledo. God help you and God help the ministers who are in that crusade for clean government.

But where the gentleman slides off the beam is in wanting somebody else to do the job, especially when it is somebody who does not want to do it.

I do not know of any other Congressman who wants to do that job. If there are any of them sitting around here I would like to have them volunteer. I do not know of anyone over in the other body who wants to do it. They had a committee over there headed by a distinguished Senator who has since died, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. Tobey). Then they passed it along to another Senator. He apparently either did not want it or did not have the time. And then they gave the job to still another Senator. But other and more important duties took his time.

Bless your heart, there have been four on this job, one who died and the other three who are still living but who have far more important work which engages all their time and effort.

Everybody who knows the situation admits that there is a job to do, admits it should be done, but no one seems to want to do it.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes, yes.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that the same article tells the story of the Cleveland grand jury, the Cuyahoga County grand jury, meeting as of this moment to investigate this racket. Is it not a fact that the same article points out that I said that this is the responsibility principally of the grand jury, the district attorney, the prosecuting attorney, and the sheriff and the police department in our county. Certainly every one of those agencies should be pushed into making the investigation and pursuing it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Pushed is right. And that is what we have—in a sense been doing.

Mr. BENDER. I applauded the fact that the grand jury was considering the subject at the time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. That is fine, too. Apparently you recognize the necessity of pushing somebody into doing the job.

This situation has existed for years, and this situation involves not only violations of law but the necessity for tightening up on Federal legislation other than the Taft-Hartley Act. For example, the conciliators, Federal officials, are engaged in some activities that, in my judgment, will not cast favorable reflection on them or the service if they are exposed.

I saw the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] on the floor a moment ago. I recall when he had a special subcom-

mittee. And who did he have before that committee? The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] was on the committee. He had Edwin S. Smith, a member of the National Labor Relations Board, who refused not long ago, under oath, to answer whether or not he was a Communist. He had the distinguished Nathan Witt, a known Communist, acting as attorney for the Labor Board; and he had the distinguished Lee Pressman, who was attorney for one of the parties in those labor disputes who was acting for the CIO, and who recently swore under oath that he and Nathan Witt were both Communists at that time—members of the same Communist cell here in Washington. Do you see how that dovetails with some of the more recent activities of a few of the union officers?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, our distinguished leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I had not really expected to interject myself into this particular discussion, but I cannot refrain, in view of the fact that the gentleman has mentioned the so-called Smith committee on which I was privileged to serve as the ranking Republican member.

I listened a moment ago to the gentleman's expression of his estimation of his willingness to do something about racketeering in labor. May I say, without regard to controversies within his committee, that I have not been particularly pleased, to put it very mildly, with what appears to me to be an attempt to make it appear that the rest of us in the Congress of the United States, particularly Republicans, have no interest at all in curbing the racketeering that does exist in certain places and to which the gentleman has referred. Certainly that goes for myself because while I recognize the gentleman's position through the years, he has not had exactly a monopoly on all of that work. As he so very kindly pointed out, starting in 1940, I worked as a member of the Smith committee investigating the Labor Board. That committee did most effective work. I do not think I have been guilty of any lack of diligence in the pursuit of similar matters since that time.

I trust that the gentleman will not undertake to condemn all of us, or to lend any impression, through implication, that there is a desire on the part of any Member of this House of Representatives to do anything to stand in the way of the investigation of racketeering, that can be justified under the rules of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that is very fine, and I thank the gentleman. Of course, I understand his position. It would be an absurdity to draw the conclusion from anything I say today, have said in the past, or intend to say in the future, that I have questioned, am now questioning, or intend at any time in the future to question, the sincerity, the ability, the patriotism, or any other good quality of any individual Member of the House.

We all have different views about different things. All I am saying is that there seems to be a certain attitude on the part of some which produces certain unexpected results.

In my own committee, as the gentleman very well knows, I was stripped of any authority to continue those investigations, except for a period of 60 days, and in 2 localities. Why?

I am not challenging the motive of anyone. All I am pointing out is this, and I stand on it today and intend to do so as long as I am here on the floor of the House, if nowhere else, that the liquidation of the special subcommittee of which I was chairman and which was exposing extortion by certain officers of the Teamsters International, had the effect of aiding those racketeers, preventing further adequate exposure of their unlawful, oppressive acts. All I say is that the effect of what they did was to give encouragement to the racketeers and to the extortionists.

I will go so far as to say that I do not believe for one moment that the members of the committee who destroyed my power, took away my authority to call witnesses, take testimony, hold hearings, realized the full import of what they were doing. They had something else in mind and just would not listen to any statement I made. They did not realize the effect of the action which they were taking. At least that was my thought then.

I realize, too, that there has been a determined effort, as reliably reported to me, to cut me down to size. That is all right. But I want to say one thing, that as long as I am a Member of this House, I will exercise my right in behalf of the people who appeal to me, as union members and union officials are doing today. Evidence of that I shall put into the RECORD from time to time.

To quit now, especially when I have the editorial support of papers like the Detroit Free Press, which has always been against me on my attitude on foreign policy; papers like the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which never agreed with my position on many things; papers such as the Minneapolis Times, the Des Moines Register, which always criticized me because of my attitude in connection with our foreign policy, but which are today a unit in supporting this move to expose racketeering, would be craven, cowardly.

No, let me say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], our distinguished leader, the thought that, of all the Members of the House, I was the only one who was opposed to reprehensible conduct on the part of this group, that group; that I was the only one qualified to make an investigation, never for one moment occurred to me.

I have been well aware of the great service which the gentleman from Virginia, HOWARD SMITH, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the other members of the special committee or committees which went into some of these same questions in the late thirties and the early forties, without thought of partisanship, rendered not only to the country as a whole but to the laboring men, union and nonunion, who in those days were being kicked around under a law—the Wagner Act—written primarily by a Communist, Lee Pressman, and then being administered by a board whose sympathies were with those whose apparent design was to destroy free enterprise.

It would be the height of absurdity; it would be intellectually dishonest, for me to claim a higher degree of intelligence; to for one moment even indirectly or by innuendo convey the impression that I had a greater desire to expose wrongdoing than any other Member of this House.

Once more, and I hope for the last time, permit me to repeat—neither the ability, the sound judgment, the lofty purpose, the moral integrity, of any Member of this House has been, is now being, or will hereafter be, questioned by me.

What happened was, in my opinion, most unfortunate. Perhaps I was at fault in suggesting that the activities of certain other subcommittees should, in the interests of economy, be curtailed.

If I was at fault, the reason for that fault undoubtedly lies in the fact that, brought up in humble circumstances, a dollar was to me as big as a cart wheel, and, in the community where I lived as a boy, as a young man, and where I practiced my profession, neither millions nor hundreds of thousands of dollars were involved.

We were a people with small earnings, who, by rigid saving, tried to provide not only for our own old-age security, but for a better start in life for our children than we had been able to enjoy.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman, of course, is a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, on which committee he served some years ago with great distinction. I was happy to participate in the action that again placed him on that committee in this Congress. He is also chairman of the great Committee on Government Operations. It has been suggested from time to time that there might be a question of jurisdiction between these two committees in respect to an investigation of labor racketeering.

Is it true that the gentleman recently in some places in Michigan, as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, held hearings?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is referring to Iron Mountain?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not recall where it was, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have been in several places in Michigan. I think the gentleman is referring to Iron Mountain.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman was there with a Member on this side who was not a member of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. Let me explain that.

Mr. HALLECK. Let us identify it first.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman means Benton Harbor or St. Joseph, Mich.; yes. Iron Mountain; no.

Mr. HALLECK. It was some place where the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH] was in attendance. He, of course,

is a member of the Committee on Education and Labor. I am quite sure he is not a member of the Committee on Government Operations; is that true?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He is a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor. He is not a member of the Committee on Government Operations. Those two subcommittees jointly held hearings in St. Joseph and Benton Harbor, in Kansas City, and in Detroit.

Mr. HALLECK. But that was a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let me explain it. Subcommittees of both the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Government Operations held hearings in Detroit and Kansas City. Then, after July 15, when the subcommittee which I had appointed was liquidated—a few days later given a 60-day reprieve—I did, with the gentleman from Kansas, WINT SMITH, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], serve on a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and, as a member of that subcommittee, participated in hearings held in Detroit beginning on the 23d of November.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that I have only the best faith in this matter, but once in a while it becomes necessary for determinations to be made as to jurisdiction. Maybe some such action will have to be taken again. The gentleman is a member of both of these committees. Having regard to this particular field he is talking about, would he consider it is primarily a matter of jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor or of the Committee on Government Operations?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of the Committee on Government Operations.

Here is what happened. Back in the 80th Congress the same policy was followed. I will try to make it clear. As chairman of the Committee on Government Operations I requested the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor—and as our distinguished majority leader says, I am a member of both committees—the Honorable SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, to appoint a subcommittee from that Committee on Education and Labor to act with a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

That was the practice in the 80th Congress.

At that time I was a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and I was a member and chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, then the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The then chairman of the Labor Committee, Mr. Hartley, of Taft-Hartley fame, sometimes made me chairman of a subcommittee, at times I went on my own appointing a subcommittee, at times the two committees acted jointly and in harmony.

At my request the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] kindly appointed WINT SMITH, your humble servant, and a Democratic Member as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. I thought it would lend weight to our investigation, and I am sure it did, to have both committees report.

We held hearings. I insisted that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH] be chairman of those joint committee hearings, which he was. He presided with great force and ability, there is no question about that, and there was no trouble nor was there discord within the subcommittee. We acted together.

When the Committee on Education and Labor made its first report I signed it. There was no controversy about it at all. That is the way that thing was set up, that is the way it came about, namely, at my request.

Now they want to switch and say that the Committee on Education and Labor shall have sole jurisdiction. I am asking for authority to appoint a special subcommittee—authority given to every other chairman of a standing committee. I have sent a copy of my request and the reasons for it to the Committee on Government Operations, which matter will come up Wednesday—I do not care to quote from it or to make reference to what it contains.

But I want to say to those Members of the House who insist that the Committee on Government Operations does not have jurisdiction over these matters and call their attention to the fact that back prior to 1927 there were 11 committees charged with investigating expenditures in the various 11 departments of Government, 11 expenditures committees in the legislative setup.

For instance, there was a Committee on Expenditures in the Labor Department, another in the State Department. Here is the list:

Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Justice Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Agriculture Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Commerce Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Labor Department.

Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.

Then they were all consolidated, and we had the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with overall jurisdiction as to expenditures and, I quote:

The duty of studying the operations of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

Now, what the gentlemen who said the Committee on Government Operations has no jurisdiction would do is to go back to the days before 1927 and have every standing committee of the House be an investigating committee on expenditures. You see the point?

Long, long ago the House consolidated the investigatory authority; they put it over here in the committee which is now the Committee on Government Operations.

Now, to cut it short, because I have detained you overlong, on this question of jurisdiction, who would know more about what has been done or what should be done than someone who has served on the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor? Here is a letter that was given me this morning, January 18, 1954. After the address it reads:

MY DEAR CLARE: Recently Chairman MCCONNELL, of the House Education and Labor Committee, appointed me as chairman of a special subcommittee to make a preliminary investigation of matters relating to union welfare funds in the Minneapolis area.

And, by the way, I have numerous telegrams. I will put in one or two; some went in last Thursday, though I have many to put in. They come from committee chairmen in two or three States up in the Northwest. Permit me to quote from our colleague's letter:

As you know, it was the highly competent investigative staff of the Government Operations Committee which uncovered much of the data now available on this Minneapolis situation. It is my understanding that they have kept abreast of developments there since the close of the recent hearings held by the Education and Labor Committee in Detroit on various aspects of labor racketeering in the Detroit area.

A preliminary examination of the available evidence shows the possibility that several facets of the Minneapolis inquiry may involve Government defense contracts. It is also possible that the administration and enforcement of Federal statutes other than labor laws may be at issue. It appears to me, therefore, that the Minneapolis matter is one which ought to be handled by your Government Operations Committee, and I hope you will be in a position to follow through on it very soon.

Pretty good, my distinguished colleagues. There is our sound-thinking, delightful, competent, energetic, courageous, determined chairman of the Labor Subcommittee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH], who also sat as chairman of the joint subcommittees. You remember how well he served; what a wonderful job he did twice in Detroit and once in Kansas City? There he says that it should come over to our committee. He wrote:

Further, the staff of the Committee on Education and Labor will undoubtedly be at work shortly on pressing legislative matters. I believe it would not be possible to do full justice to both projects at the same time.

In expressing the hope that your committee will soon be in a position to undertake this Minneapolis investigation, I must add a special word of commendation for your staff. And I speak from the knowledge gained in many years of investigative and law enforcement work. You have at your command not only their personal integrity, but their years of invaluable experience with the FBI. I'm sure I speak for my own subcommittee staff, as well as for myself, when I say that our association with these men in our joint efforts at Kansas City and Detroit has been a very gratifying experience.

Sincerely yours,

WINT SMITH.

The distinguished gentleman from Kansas says that the thoughts just ex-

pressed are also the sentiments of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

So why cut off the authority of the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations to continue that work?

The gentleman from Ohio said that the grand jury was acting in Cleveland. We never interfere with current, present proceedings of any law enforcement agency.

Listen, now. We finished our hearing in Detroit the first time, or recessed our hearing on a Saturday—Monday, the Democratic district attorney called the grand jury and indictments resulted.

We finished out in Kansas City, and I think it was the same day or a day or two afterward, another grand jury was called and 17 individuals were indicted because of the leads we gave them in Detroit and Kansas City.

This last time we did not even get out of Detroit before there was action. We were still there when the United States district attorney announced that he was looking into the question of calling a Federal grand jury.

And please note, the grand jury action was taken after, not before our hearings were held, moreover need for legislation in connection with the administration of health and welfare funds was disclosed—that the Committee on Labor will consider.

So the primary purpose is not to secure evidence to enable convictions to be made. The primary purpose is to ascertain whether not only the labor statutes but the statutes having to do with interstate commerce or matters coming under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, or any Federal legislation, all Federal legislation, is being accurately interpreted and adequately administered. That is one purpose. Another is to check the expenditure of tax dollars.

Both fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations.

If that committee will give me authority, you can be assured, Members of the House, that the investigation will be conducted in a dignified, judicial way; that no one will be abused or misused; that no advantage will be taken because of the authority granted.

An effort will be made to lessen the evil which now exists, which is oppressing most unjustly so many deserving citizens.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to treat this subject in any light vein, because I think it is very serious. I happened to be a member of the special committee over which the gentleman from Michigan presided, with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH], of the Labor Committee. We conducted hearings in Detroit and St. Joe, Mich. I am sure the gentleman has testified that every effort was made to expose racketeering of all kinds. As a matter of fact, I felt that some of the evidence was very flimsy. All members of our committee of both parties pursued this matter as diligently and as forcefully as they could.

I want to have the record straight.

Many of the members of our Committee on Government Operations felt that we had no jurisdiction in some of the matters that our good chairman chose to investigate. Racketeering never entered the minds of members of our committee.

The constant inference being made by our good chairman that the committee acted against investigating racketeering is wholly unfounded. Of course, wherever the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], our good chairman, goes, he consistently infers that we acted to curb him in his right to investigate racketeering. I know my chairman hates racketeering. So do I. I trust our committee will find the way to investigate without violating the rules of the committee or of the House of Representatives. He is a member of the Labor Committee. We have a Committee on the Judiciary here. We have a Labor Committee. We have our own committee. We have all the power to investigate. Possibly, I should not have used the term "illegal." If I offended the gentleman in saying he was doing anything "illegal" I apologize to him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment so I may say to him that he does not need to apologize. I understand how he feels about it. It is all right with me—I just do not want others to get a wrong impression from what the gentleman says. You are one of my best friends.

Mr. BENDER. That is fine. I am glad to have the gentleman testify that I am still one of his best friends; for he, too, is one of my best friends.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. I would much rather have you in the other body than to have a member of the other party there.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman very much. I appreciate the compliment. In any event, I want to say that if there is any racketeering going on in Cleveland, the grand jury today is meeting for the purpose of considering jukebox racketeering. We have a good grand jury foreman in our county and a good grand jury. They are checking into it very carefully. I say if there is any racketeering in jukeboxes, then it is the job of the district attorney, and it becomes the job of the enforcement agency, the police department, the sheriff's office, and the Federal district attorney wherever any Federal laws are being violated to pursue the matter diligently. So far as I am concerned, what I meant by saying "illegal" is that I did not want to violate the rules of the House, and I used that term "illegal" in that connection. Our committee, I am sure, is not interested in protecting racketeers of any kind, and I speak for every member of the committee. That subject came up only casually in connection with the investigations in Detroit and Kansas City. We gave our good chairman authority to look into the matter. I am still on his committee, but he never called me to a meeting. I was on the subcommittee that was authorized for 60 days to investigate racketeering in Detroit, and I waited breathlessly for summons from my chairman to be called to Detroit to pursue the matter, but I was never called.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a moment, he will recall that he had so much business at Benton Harbor and St. Joe and also in Detroit that the first thing I knew he had been called away to attend to this other business. You have been so busy it has been almost impossible to get in touch with you.

Mr. BENDER. I was with the gentleman in Detroit during all the time of the hearings, and I never left him until he excused me.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. You were at your request excused before we finished.

Mr. BENDER. Because he had nothing further to investigate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What? I did not have anything?

Mr. BENDER. That was the gentleman's statement to me.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I venture to disagree with the gentleman. There will never be a time that I do not have something to investigate. And our witnesses continued after he left.

Mr. BENDER. And I have not been called, and I was not called thereafter, to Detroit again to investigate racketeering. That is how the matter dropped. If the gentleman has any facts or any evidence on racketeering, the Cleveland grand jury in Cuyahoga County is now in session, and I beg the gentleman to appeal to the chairman of the grand jury who is investigating this matter, and that the chairman permit him to come forward to submit the evidence of this racketeering. I will take him to Cleveland myself, or pay his way myself so that he can present this matter to our grand jury. Everyone will bless you for it, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], including every citizen in Cleveland who detests racketeering of every kind.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that is very fine and that is the usual alibi. I will put into the RECORD by an extension of my remarks an editorial or two from the Detroit papers which show the necessity for continuing congressional investigations. As the Detroit Free Press said in one editorial—I think it was the Detroit Free Press, or one of the Detroit papers—we did not turn up anything new—so they said—it was an old, old story. Well, I know it is an old story. I know, for example, that some years ago, 5 or 6 or more, James Hoffa was arrested for racketeering, that is by use of threats and force compelling individual businessmen, little fellows, to become members of a union. They are not eligible to join a union. Hoffa objects to that statement. He said he was not convicted of that. No—what happened? After the grand jury indicted him, the prosecuting officials and the court let him plead guilty to a lesser offense. That often happens. Over in the county adjoining mine, in the district of our competent, industrious colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], the Third District, a

member of the Armed Services Committee, members of a goon squad, 200 of them, came over from Detroit into Kalamazoo, and they turned over, burned, and destroyed a truck, and they beat one woman—I saw her—until her face was black and blue. They took possession of the streets of Kalamazoo in defiance of the officers. There was plenty of violence. What happened? They were arrested. They were prosecuted. In the first case there was a hung jury. In the next case what did they do? An outside judge who had not heard the testimony was called in. They put the heat on the prosecutor, a young man, he is not criticized, and they were permitted to plead guilty to a minor offense, fined, given a suspended sentence or probation.

What else happened? Nothing.

The grand jury is no answer to the situation. Is not the grand jury in Cleveland in part due to newspaper activity and the action of Governor Lausche?

Back in 1948 there was a racket right here in Philadelphia. A young marine returned from the war, was beaten up and his truck destroyed. I held hearings as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations; not the Labor Committee. The Attorney General, Tom Clark, said it was no Federal offense. I said, "All right. Send up two men." He sent up one Beaman and another man whose name I do not recall. Those two men sat during the hearings. We asked Clark to come up and he came up. We put the facts on record and two union officers and a union were indicted and convicted. Then what happened? Light sentence. Probation.

Here is where you get relief from those situations—when the newspapers of the country, which are overall honest and conscientious, want decent government; when they come along as they did in Kansas City—in Kansas City the hearings were not only televised, but the full testimony was printed verbatim in the Kansas City Star. Then, you get it before the people. Women would call up at night. They said, "Hold more sessions in the evenings, if you please, so that our husbands can be here and see what is going on." Then you get action, because there is public sentiment back of it.

Grand jury? They have had a grand jury at Cuyahoga County for the last hundred years. But, they have not cleaned up the situation. We can clean it up temporarily, then, in 10 or 15 years, someone will have it all to do over again.

Unfortunately, sometimes it takes a congressional committee to start a grand jury moving.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to thank you, as well as Members of the House, for your kindly consideration.

EXCERPTS FROM EDITORIALS TO WHICH REFERENCE WAS MADE

Detroit News, December 1, 1953, entitled "The Tasks Before Us":

Racketeering is another name for the mess that figured more decisively than any other issue in the voters' rejection of the Democratic Party last year. * * * Wherever the use of terror offers a way to easy money, the underworld can be expected to move in.

Chicago Daily Tribune, dated November 27, 1953, entitled "Loose Money":

Inasmuch as someone is going to be paid, it occurs easily to a labor skate anxious for a fast buck that it might as well be he, or someone he designates. * * * This loose money is the biggest bonanza that has appeared in the history of the labor movement. It deserves congressional attention.

Detroit News, dated June 13, 1953, entitled "Case for a One-Man Grand Jury":

One day of hearings by Representative HOFFMAN'S congressional subcommittee sufficed to expose conditions of criminality in the juke box and coin machine trade that shame local law enforcement agencies. * * * It will take a one-man grand jury to deal with the juke box racket, whose threat to the peace of the community the congressional inquiry has left clear for all to see. * * * The shame to which the congressional committee has exposed local law enforcement is the shame, rather, of a failure to recognize the limitations of the most diligent police work. It is the shame of failing to set in motion the agencies that much experience has shown capable of dealing with criminal forces of the kind in question.

Detroit Free Press, September 4, 1953, entitled "Juke Jury Indicts Seven":

The grand jury investigation was called following revelations regarding the racket-ridden industry at a congressional committee hearing conducted here by Representative HOFFMAN.

Detroit Free Press, December 1, 1953, entitled "By All Means a Grand Jury": The editorial demanded a Federal grand jury investigation as a result of the testimony and disclosures made to the congressional subcommittee.

Detroit News, November 4, 1953, entitled "The Workers Betrayed":

What Detroit is hearing today about widespread extortion, bribe taking and other forms of racketeering by officials in the teamsters union is hardly a new story. * * *

Its leaders continue the same outrageously illegal activities and the sellout of the legitimate collective interests of the rank and file. * * *

If in times past the average worker belonging to the teamsters union was able to deceive himself that the racketeering of the bosses was just a little extra curricular activity, done for pocket money and implying not betrayal of his personal interests, he is no longer in position to hug that illusion. * * * When the bosses accept bribe money to keep a truck fleet operating or to deal workers out of their holiday pay, they pick the pockets of their own following and deprive them of their right to negotiate for a higher wage.

Detroit News, December 29, 1953 entitled "Baring Tolerated Corruption":

Representative HOFFMAN has announced that with the return of Congress in January he will seek authority to extend an investigation of labor union racketeering into every State and city appearing in need of the treatment. * * *

These inquiries have resulted to date in two grand juries, in Detroit and Kansas City, and in 17 indictments of union officials for extortion, embezzlement and illegal "gift taking." * * * Evidently there are those, other than the persons indicted, to whom the inquiry is embarrassing.

There is much speculation about the source of alleged pressure. It is probable the motives are in fact several and of varying degrees of respectability. * * * However, one obvious motive for pressure would be nothing more complicated than the reluctance of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to be shown up as ineffectual or, at any rate, inactive in this connection. It does look odd that a congressional committee can tour about the country uncovering the existence of crime seemingly unsuspected by those whose business is to deal with it.

There may even be a respectable motive for questioning the desirability of Congress, thus assuming, in effect, the role of prosecutor. * * * As long as that role is not being fulfilled, (enforcement by city, State, Federal agencies) the reasons why in themselves, form a sufficient justification for congressional concern with the subject * * * the proposed broadness of his investigation will be welcomed by all who have worried over the spread of lawlessness in the operations of some labor unions.

Detroit Free Press, September 5, 1953, entitled "Juke Racket":

Seven men have been indicted by Circuit Judge Miles N. Culehan, one-man labor-rackets grand juror, on charges of extortion and using the "muscle" in jukebox activities in the Detroit area * * * racketeering has been going on for too many years in the Detroit jukebox industry, with the knowledge, at least, of Wayne County and Detroit law-enforcement authorities. * * * Back in February of 1951 the Senate Crime Investigating Committee (KEFAUVER) questioned some of the men now indicted by Judge Culehan, about Detroit jukebox racketeering and its connection with the national "Syndicate." Local authorities didn't do their duty. * * * Nothing was done.

Then, Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, Republican, Michigan, came here last June as a cochairman of a congressional committee to investigate the jukebox rackets. * * * Judge Culehan, in less than 2 months, and with an expenditure of less than $4,000, which is unusually small for a grand-jury investigation, has been able to unearth enough evidence to indict leaders in the jukebox union, affiliated with the local teamsters union.

Kansas City Times, June 27, 1953, entitled "Congress Moves In":

Now the national implications of the Kansas City construction crisis are recognized by House investigation. * * * This includes the national concern over the closed defense construction and wider applications, as well as any violations of Federal laws. The findings could be used as the basis for amending or writing laws. * * * The joint committee * * * has no enforcement powers and needs none. Most important, it has the means of getting the facts and of presenting the facts forcefully to the public. Public opinion is the powerful force that no organization, or leader of high station, can afford to ignore. Such congressional interest is not hard to understand. In Greater Kansas City alone, some $35 million of defense construction is shut down, and a large part of it is urgent construction. Standing out among all the lesser factors is a reckless drive for power by the construction teamsters. * * * The international is pushing hard to expand its power. What has happened in Kansas City, Detroit, or St. Louis, can happen in any American city. Local defense construction has gone through a long period of harassment with quick trigger shutdowns, arrogant roving stewards, impossible demands, and all the way, jurisdictional pressure against other unions. If such a campaign could succeed on the Kan-

sas City battleground, Congress would have to expect the same attacks in other centers of defense construction.

Kansas City Times, June 29, 1953, entitled "One Step for Labor Peace":

Today Greater Kansas City and Congress should begin to get a fuller picture of the forces at work in this city. * * * The general tactics and reckless goals of the Teamsters O. L. Ring are apparent. * * * The spotlight attracted by a congressional investigation is formidable encouragement to witnesses.

Many persons have seen reason to hope that the congressional investigation would bring the local, and possibly the national, situation to a head. * * * The hearing is the important next step. At the very minimum it should focus national attention on the consequences of overreaching union leadership. * * * The congressional hearing should encourage the local union leaders who want to put an end to this disastrous internal strife. If there is evidence of major law violation, the hearings should lay the groundwork for a grand-jury investigation.

Still essential is the specific plan to put the men back on the construction jobs. To mean anything it will have to be a plan that will end the quick-trigger strike intimidation for one-union power. For the first responsibility is on the leadership of the thousands who are paying the price of the strike.

Kansas City Times, July 2, 1953, entitled "Grim Story to the Public":

The wretched story is unfolding before the eyes of television viewers throughout this area. Such a closeup contact with witnesses from both union leaders and business gives a special force to the ominous purpose and methods that have produced this virtually total shutdown of the Greater Kansas City construction. * * * From J. O. Mack, president of the carpenters' district council, and others, the public has received a direct report on Ring's drive for power over other unions by strong-arm methods.

From many witnesses the public has been told of reckless actions by arrogant representatives of the teamsters and allies—roving stewards forced on the contractors at fantastic wages, union control of construction and featherbedding. * * * The cost to the public is increases ranging up to 15 percent in the amount of the contractors' bids. * * *

A ruthless campaign has been directed against both employers and other unions for the same apparent purpose—complete domination. Greater Kansas City is left with a shut-down that undermines its economy. * * *

Ruthless goals don't thrive in a spotlight such as has been attracted to the congressional investigation. The public, including the thousands of men off the jobs, is getting the story with all the force of direct contact. Congress is putting together a vast story of aggression that reaches into other cities. The forces of law enforcement are finally starting and so, we suspect, are the top officials at the Pentagon. They are responsible for military construction.

Kansas City Times, July 1, 1953, entitled "Strike Peril for the Nation":

Established at the beginning of this Kansas City congressional hearing is a ruthless stab at national defense. Most urgent construction, both at the Sunflower Ordnance Works, and the Lake City Arsenal already has been set back by approximately a half year. * * *

At the very least, this is a case of total irresponsibility, and complete disregard for the national interests. * * * With support of our fighting men at stake, so far no agency of the Federal Government has attempted to cope with it. Government has appeared helpless to protect itself and its Armed Forces against a stab at home. But, through many emergencies, there has always been a point at which the Government has risen to assert itself. In this case the turning may be the present congressional hearing. * * *

For the moment, Kansas City appears to be the battleground of a nationwide war for power, in which the teamsters with their allies are driving hard against the other AFL construction unions. Unless the campaign of intimidation and strikes can be stopped here, Congress can expect other battles to demoralize defense construction in other cities.

We believe that members of the two congressional committees know this Kansas City battle for part of an internal labor war that challenges the United States at home.

Kansas City Times, July 16, 1953, entitled "Grand Jury on the Job":

Through the hearings of congressional committees, Kansas City received a frightening picture. It suggested a breakdown of lawing relations among construction unions, and between unions and employers. Such a situation, involving both Federal and State laws, calls for powerful action on both fronts.

Kansas City Star, July 21, 1953, entitled "Back To Work":

This day that ends Greater Kansas City's worst construction strike should be the beginning of a new era of peace for the long-harassed industry. * * * There should have been a better way to settle the deep-grown issues, but nobody found it. The issues were a bewildering complex—union against union, unions against contractors, challenges against the Government itself.

The chaos caused a general stirring in Congress, in the courts, and in the high levels of the AFL. The AFL meeting laid the groundwork for a settlement and started the movement to restore the building and construction trades council which should be an executive body in the future.

Similar but more insistent comment comes from union officials and union members.

COTTON-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a portion of this time not to discuss any personalities or anything that anybody has said about anybody, but rather to discuss proposed legislation that is now pending, affecting the cotton producers of the United States.

I know that many of you will say, "That does not affect me at all." But, there are more farmers producing cotton than any other crop in the United States. Approximately half of all the farmers in the United States produce some cotton. Anything that affects cotton production is of tremendous influence on the economy of the United States.

Some years ago this Congress passed legislation providing for a system of control of cotton acreage, which contains a provision which the Secretary of Agriculture feels—I know there is some dispute about whether it would require him or not—but, at least, he feels it requires him to fix the minimum acreage for the year 1954 at 17,900,000 acres. That is a tremendous reduction from last year's cotton plantings. In 1953, we planted in the United States approximately 26 million acres of cotton. You can readily understand, when you reduce your acreage by more than one-third, what you have done to the income of people who produce that cotton. I know you will say, "Well, you guarantee that farmer will get 90 percent of parity." Yes. You guarantee him that he is going to get 90 percent—nine-tenths of a fair price—for what he produces. He got that last year. He has received more than that for several years past. Now, we are going to take away one-third of his production, but we are not going to increase his price.

We are going to leave that price ten percent below parity and if, perchance, the income of the dwellers of our great cities drops; if, perchance, the wages of our workers drop; if, perchance, the income of our great corporations drops, then that parity is also going to drop because parity is tied to the income of other sections of our country; and the farmers will not even get nine-tenths of a fair price for the two-thirds of a crop which he is going to be allowed to grow.

I hope we all recognize that the farmer is faced with a desperate situation of trying to make ends meet. The Congress authorized limitations on acreage because we recognized that the farmer owed an obligation to carry part of the burden by controlling his production, if he were going to have the assurance that he would get even 90 percent of a square deal. But it does seem that to require a cut of more than 33⅓ percent at one time is a little more than almost any group can stand.

I do not believe there is a labor union in America that would continue to work if we were to provide that their wages should be cut 33⅓ percent, or that the time that they could put in each year would be cut 33⅓ percent.

I do not think there are many of our manufacturers who would continue in business if their income were reduced 33⅓ percent in one year. Yet that is what we are doing to the cotton farmer.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I would like to point out to the gentleman, as he is well aware, that California, for one State, is being cut 52 percent.

Mr. POAGE. I realize that. The gentleman from California will recall that last summer I was one of those who joined in the passage of a bill by this House that at least sought to ameliorate that condition in California.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is to be commended for his efforts in our behalf. I merely wanted to point out that the situation is even more serious in other parts of the country.

Mr. POAGE. I agree with the gentleman. But I did want him to recall—and the gentleman was present before our committee and we discussed the matter at great length, and there was great

difference of opinion as to how far we could go—but the gentleman will recall that I made some strenuous efforts to bring about a compromise, and we did bring about a compromise last summer.

In this House we agreed that there was too much of a cut at one time, that we would not try to go over the precipice all at once, we would not try to step out over the ledge and go clear down to the floor, but that we would build some steps and that we would go down step by step. We agreed that if we had to go down all the way at one time, we might break our leg. We therefore undertook to do this over a period of time. That is what the House of Representatives did. And I think we passed a pretty sound bill. I believe the gentleman from California will agree that it was about as good as we could expect to get. It was not all that he wanted, and it was not all that some others wanted.

Mr. HUNTER. I should like to say to the gentleman, if he will yield to me, that any bill of this type is in the nature of a compromise. It cannot be otherwise, and for that reason, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has said, I agreed to the bill.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman is right. What we did was this—and this House of Representatives did it, and did it 5 months before the other body seemed disposed to take any action whatever: We took cognizance of the condition that confronted our farmers. We were not sound asleep here as some of our colleagues at the other end of this Capitol Building supposed. We sent over to the body on the other side, last summer, a bill that raised the acreage allotment, and that bill provided not simply for an increase in acres, but it provided further that when those acres got down to the State, they should go on down to the county and when they had gone down to the county, each county in the United States should have the right to decide for itself whether those additional acres were to be distributed on the county factor basis; that is, the basis of the percentage of the total number of acres of tilled land that one owned, or whether they should be distributed on the personal history involved; that is, how much cotton the individual had grown previously. As the gentleman knows, there are some sections of this country where it is considered very desirable to distribute cotton acres on the basis of personal history. That is, all of the farmers are not growing cotton. Some of them have grown cotton and have depended on it solely, whereas others are not cotton farmers at all. I can understand that in many of those regions the personal history approach seems to be the better one.

On the other hand, there are vast areas in the United States in which most everybody has been growing some cotton but where almost all the farmers have been following the teachings of the county agents and the rest of the Department of Agriculture, the teachings of diversification, where those farmers have ceased to plant all of their land in cotton and are growing some corn, some feed, some grain, some alfalfa, some livestock, some fruit and vegetables, growing all of these things they were told they should grow. In those sections it would be very harsh indeed to say to those men who have diversified that we are going to penalize you for carrying out the advice all the agricultural experts of the United States Government have been giving you over the years. However, that is what we would do if we should say we would require all of this acreage to be distributed on the basis of personal history.

So the House bill said that the additional acres might be divided at the county level, either on history or on the county factor as the county local committee thought was best for that particular area. I think that is fair and that it is extremely important.

The House bill also provided that if an individual got an allotment he did not need he could turn it back to the county committee for allocation to some other farmer who did need it. I think that was important, too.

I think the House bill give us a reasonably fair approach to this matter.

The other body paid no attention to the House bill and did not act on it. They knew or should have known that there was a referendum coming up in December; that the farmers were going to have to vote as to whether or not they would submit to a reduction of their acreage. Of course, those farmers should have known before they had to vote in that referendum just how much acreage they were going to get. The House of Representatives tried to give them the opportunity of knowing that. I am not making any partisan appeal, but I say Members on both sides of the House supported that bill. There was not a vote against it in the House of Representatives that I can recall. I know there was none in our committee.

The House felt that it had provided a fair compromise between the viewpoints of different sections of the country and a fair way to allow an expression of local opinion. Most of us have been quite vocal in our statements that we wanted to get the Government back close to the people. There has been no monopoly on those statements on either side of the aisle. We had said that we did not want the Government here in Washington to dictate to the people on matters where they themselves could make their own determination.

So the House bill said that the people in the counties could decide whether they wanted to distribute this cotton acreage on the county factor or personal history basis. I think that is getting it as far back to the people as you can get it.

But the other body did not feel disposed to act. I understand there was one Senator who said he did not want to come back up here to take action on this bill, so he stayed in his State. The committee said that it would not act without their distinguished colleague's presence. So the farmers were required to vote without knowing how much the reduction was to be.

In this session there was a meeting of the committee in the other body. A subcommittee was appointed. That subcommittee met and directed their staff to review the action of some or at least of one of the farm organizations of the country and to bring those suggestions out in bill form. That was done. The bill was reported favorably by the committee before it was introduced. That is right and the record so shows. It was passed by the other body and is now before us.

That bill would increase the acreage allowed to be planted in cotton in the United States. I have no criticism of the action of the other body in reducing the increase that the House provided because we made our increase when we were faced only with an estimate of how much cotton we would grow in 1953. That estimate was slightly over 14 million bales at the time this House acted. Now we know we actually grew over 16 million bales and very properly the other body reduced the increase so that it did not increase the total acreage as much as our bill did.

But then how did they distribute it? And here, to me, is the dangerous thing and the thing of which I think every Member should be aware. That bill from the other body which is now before us provides that all of this increase shall be divided, first, at the State level, so as to go to those farms that do not have at the present time an allotment equal to 65 percent of their average plantings, or 40 percent of their highest plantings at any time in the last 3 years, in no event to exceed 50 percent of their total tilled acreage.

Now that places the distribution on individual history. That means that any man who has been growing a very large proportion of his land in cotton will receive, under the terms of this bill, a substantial increase in his present allotment, and I have no objection to those individuals receiving some help. I understand and appreciate the argument that is made that the man who is geared up to growing cotton has the machinery, the know-how, and the equipment to stay in business and needs a larger percentage of his land than somebody else does. And he will get it under either bill as I see it, because the House bill makes provision for adjustment of hardship cases, and if his falls in the hardship-case category, certainly he would have the opportunity to receive an adjustment. But the House bill does provide that all of the farmers, all of the cotton farmers of America will get something out of this adjustment. It may not be large, but the House bill would give to John Jones and Henry Smith and to all the rest of the farmers of our country something. But the bill that is proposed by the other body would in many States, at least, give absolutely nothing to a great number of our farmers. In the State of Texas—and I quote Texas because I am familiar with the figures there—this bill would give to Texas, of course, more acreage than any other State, because Texas accounts for nearly 40 percent of the total cotton acreage of this Nation. Texas would get, under the terms of the proposed bill, 1,342,000 additional acres, and that is a lot of cotton. But under the estimates that have been furnished me by the Department of Agriculture, it will require 1,411,000 acres

to satisfy this 65–40–50 gadget; in other words, there will not be enough cotton come to Texas to take care of these people who are going to get additional cotton acreage under this gadget. They therefore will get something less than the rest of the farmers of the Nation. They will get, instead of up to 65 percent, maybe up to 60 percent of their average plantings, and maybe up to 37 percent of their highest plantings.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I gladly yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing to the attention of this body some of the problems that are becoming very apparent in connection with this part of the farm program. As I understand, the gentleman recognizes that when, under strict allocations, you begin to cut back acreage allotments too far, it makes it difficult for the farmers to make a living, because their return is the amount of bales of cotton, whatever it may be, that they have to sell, times the price. That is their return. Of course, the gentleman recognizes, as we all do, that presently we have a year's supply of cotton in the carryover of the country.

I will not take too much of the gentleman's time, but again I say in all sincerity and honesty I am glad he has brought up this matter, because I think it is going to be constantly before us as we look over this whole farm situation. When you begin to allocate acres, when you restrict, you run into all sorts of alleged inequities and difficulties and sometimes downright discrimination. It is extremely difficult to make allocations as everyone would think that they ought to be made, which, of course, is the thing the gentleman referred to.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, I have to agree with the majority leader as to the difficulties that arise. Possibly the only difference of opinion I have with the majority leader is that I believe we can solve these difficulties. I believe this Congress can do the thing that should be done; in fact, I think this House did do the thing that should be done in regard to cotton. I do not think it is an insoluble problem that is presented to us, although I recognize, as the majority leader points out, it is a difficult problem. However, it is one to which we should devote our best efforts, and not take the defeatist attitude that it cannot be done, and that we have to deny the farmer a living price for his products because of the difficulty of working the problem out.

I fear that the majority leader proposes to lead me into the proposition of saying that I would favor a reduction in the price that is guaranteed to the farmer, but I will accept no such words in my mouth because I think we can very well continue to guarantee the farmer a full 90 percent of parity for his products, requiring of him only his reasonable cooperation in keeping his production within reasonable limits.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly was not trying to put any words in the mouth of the gentleman nor to prejudice his position.

Mr. POAGE. I beg the gentleman's pardon if he was not.

Mr. HALLECK. Everything I said was in good faith. Certainly I do not think that in anything I said the gentleman can find any fair basis for asserting that I for my part believe that the problems cannot be solved, because I believe they can be solved. As to just how we are finally going to do it, that is a matter we can talk about. But certainly what the gentleman has said does point up some of the difficulties involved. That is the reason I said I am glad he brought them up, because it would not hurt us to be thinking about them a little.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the majority leader because I realize it is a difficult problem. It is one to which we have to give our best thought. It is one to which I wanted to direct the thought of this House this afternoon, particularly as to the inequity of the distribution of the cotton acreage under the proposed legislation.

I realize we might talk here for hours about the support program and I realize how essential the support program is. I want to make it clear that I am in favor of 90 percent support for all of the storable basic commodities whenever the farmers of America are willing to bear a share of the burden by making a reasonable and fair reduction in their production.

The question before us now is, What is reasonable and what is fair? I think the other body has very clearly and very fairly fixed the amount of the reduction, but when it comes to distributing those acres they will have failed to give relief to a very large percentage of the cotton farmers, failed to give any relief to a very large percentage, unless they at least will go far enough to say that we believe in local self-determination at the county level. That is the reason I call the attention of this House now to the basic difference between the approach of the two houses to this important question.

The approach of this body was to leave it to the local people. The approach of the other body is to say that we are going to take care of a group of producers no matter how worthy they may be, a minority group, a small minority of the total, we are going to take care of them in a rather liberal manner, but we are going to do absolutely nothing for the vast majority of the producers.

If any of you anticipate that because you have not so far heard very much about this, that the farmers are not going to be disturbed when they realize what has happened to them, you are due for a rude awakening.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. One of the problems I am sure the gentleman from Texas and the majority leader had in mind was that in south Texas we must plant our cotton in the next few weeks, very much ahead of the rest of the Nation. It is very important for us that the conference committee bring in a report, otherwise we have no relief whatsoever. Relief 2 months from now that might relieve some of the Nation will do us no good whatsoever. Is there any possibility we might get a report in the next day or two?

Mr. POAGE. I recognize the serious problem the gentleman mentions. Yet, I do not think you can hope to get a report in a day or two. The conferees were just recently appointed within the last hour, in fact. There seems to be such a divergency of opinion as to how this should be handled that it would be remarkable if we would get an agreement in a day or two. I can assure the gentleman that the House committee is doing everything it can to get a report out as promptly as possible. We have asked for an immediate conference, but I understand the other body has stated that was impossible. Of course, we have been doing all we could since last spring.

Mr. LYLE. The people of my district have great confidence in your committee, and in the House committee. We hope sincerely that you will advocate our position. We must have a solution within the next few days.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, I do not propose to advocate the proposition that we should accept anything in the world that the other body proposes just in order to get legislation, but I can assure my colleague that the conferees on the part of the House are going to try to get a fair bill just as quickly as possible.

Mr. LYLE. I find that we are in the position that if we do not get something, we will have nothing.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right, but the House of Representatives gave to the American people, subject to the approval of the other body, last summer legislation which I believe you will agree is fundamentally sound. I do not think that the responsibility falls on this body to repudiate all that we have done after months and months of work, simply in order to do something that somebody else proposes. It seems to me there is a responsibility elsewhere other than in this House. I propose, of course, to try to get as close to what the House has suggested as is possible. I recognize, of course, that we must make compromises, and I, as one of the conferees, certainly am prepared to make compromises, but I am not prepared to sell out nine-tenths of the farmers in order to give all of the cotton to one-tenth even if it means that nobody gets any cotton. I want additional cotton acres, but I want them fairly apportioned.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman from Texas stated that this bill would give nine-tenths of the additional acreage to one-tenth of the farmers.

Mr. POAGE. I do not want to be held to any exact figures because I do not know exactly what the figures are, but I feel that in my section that would probably be substantially correct.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is speaking of the State of Texas and he

is not speaking of the entire Cotton Belt south and west; is that not correct?

Mr. POAGE. I am speaking of Texas and, of course, Texas accounts for nearly 40 percent of the Nation's cotton acreage. Any way you figure it, it amounts to a lot of people not getting anything under the bill that is proposed.

Mr. HUNTER. But that is not true of the country as a whole.

Mr. POAGE. I am sure, as I tried to point out that there are many areas where it is highly desirable to use the formula which the other body proposes. I believe the gentleman recognizes, however, that within the State of Texas alone there is the same sort of diversity of situations which exists in the entire Nation, and that some sections of our State would want one formula and some would want another. I certainly have no disposition to impose upon the gentleman from California a formula which might be desirable to my people and would not be desirable to his people. All I am asking is that he give us the opportunity to use either formula we want at the local level because we do have a great diversity of situations and we are simply asking that you give us the right to let the local people determine this rather than to have an edict sent down from Washington.

AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION ON POWERS OF PRESIDENT REGARDING TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEATING). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is to discuss a question of the gravest import to the foreign policy of the country which is about to erupt in the country into what is called a great debate. This concerns a proposed amendment to the Constitution known as Senate Joint Resolution 1 proposed by the senior Member of the other body from Ohio, which deals with the powers of the President to be the sole representative of the United States in respect of negotiations on the country's foreign policy. This amendment, I might say, is not confined to the other body. Nine Members of this House have also introduced the same amendment here.

We all know that this is a matter of the most serious discussion in the country today. The House of Representatives has had a growing importance in foreign policy. This House, insofar as it authorizes appropriations is very important. In addition to that it had a great deal to do with actually working out the policy of the European recovery and mutual security programs. It, too, should be deeply concerned with this matter.

Now it is claimed on the part of the author of this amendment that it is absolutely essential to the country, because there must be greater restraint upon the President in respect of treaties—and in respect of executive agreements; it is sought, says the author, to prevent their becoming the law of the land—by self operation once approved by two-thirds vote of the Senate—including the law of the separate States as they now do under the Constitution, because it is claimed this gives the President who negotiates such treaties, too much power.

The text of the amendment, with which I believe most Members are familiar, provides that no provision of a treaty shall be domestic law except which is otherwise passed as if it were domestic law in the absence of a treaty. That means that when a treaty is ratified by two-thirds of the other body, according to the Constitution, then that treaty must be implemented by law passed by both the House and Senate and signed by the President, and if it concerns any matter of internal law of any State—and many treaties do—it cannot become law in that State unless that State passes implementing legislation itself in accordance with its own constitutional processes. So that treaties which affect any State internally, and these include treaties of friendship, trade, and commerce; treaties affecting the status of military forces abroad; treaties dealing with taxation to avoid double taxation for Americans doing business abroad and foreigners doing business here; treaties affecting narcotics; and, finally, any treaties affecting the control of atomic energy. As such treaties generally concern questions of land ownership, inheritance, local business, or the practice of the professions, the proposed amendment would make the legislatures of the separate States, in effect, coordinate bodies with the Congress in dealing with the treaty power.

This is a very grave restriction upon the power of the President in foreign affairs. It calls to mind the fact that the Articles of Confederation failed in the period up to 1787 when the Constitutional Convention convened, because of the very imperfections which this amendment proposes to recreate.

I am sure there are many men of great distinction who are back of this amendment and who feel sincerely that it is necessary. But I am deeply convinced, and I think so, too, are many other responsible people in the country, that if we pass this amendment it would destroy the division of powers between the executive, legislative, and judiciary under the Constitution, and it would be a return to isolationism in a new guise. It would cause the United States, in practical effect, "to secede from the world," which is not my catechism but that of Dean Joseph O'Meara of Notre Dame Law School as quoted from a reply to an inquiry by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I think it is a situation that is of the most vital importance to the country, a situation which is analogous to the Court-packing bill; which was a similar crisis seeking to change the separation of constitutional powers in domestic affairs. I hope that those who oppose this particular amendment will understand its import, as being exactly that serious in terms of foreign affairs.

There have been a number of suggestions of alternatives to satisfy any reasonable fears of supporters of this amendment. One of the suggestions would provide that when a treaty shall be approved by the Senate, the yeas and nays shall be called on it, that it shall not be contrary to anything which is provided in the Constitution and that the judicial power shall extend to such treaty. Another suggestion which I would make myself is the possibility of recognizing the new importance of the House of Representatives, which has grown so much in respect of foreign affairs and changing the Constitution to require treaties to be approved by both Houses, by a two-thirds majority, the same as is now required only of the other body. That treaties are valid only if not contrary to provisions of the Constitution and are subject to the judicial power is now clearly the law but there is no harm in the reassurance of putting it into an amendment.

Neither of these alternatives makes a fundamental change in the separation of powers, whereas the amendment to which I am opposed which is, as I said before, so much a matter of public debate makes a very fundamental change in the constitutional structure of separation of the powers which has endured for 164 years.

Much is made of the fact that a great many distinguished Members, indeed, a majority of the Members of the other body, have their names on this proposal. That is always advanced as a very important reason why it is a good proposal. I think it is to be hoped that it will soon be made clear what is the actual support for this amendment and what is the support of the idea either of just discussing the suggestion, or of crystallizing existing law for the purpose of reasssuring a great many people who are worried about it.

The responsibility of world leadership by the United States is so great, and this issue is at such a high pitch of discussion, that Members of Congress should as soon as possible no longer leave the free world in doubt as to this particular amendment.

Before we take up other particular objections to it, I should like to take a minute to deduce what we can from the papers as to why this amendment is suddenly brought in. As I see it, it has three reasons. First, a new fear of the United Nations. This is frankly stated by the majority report of the Judiciary Committee in the other body which says that the United Nations, they believe, is preparing to propose to all of its members, including the United States, some 200 separate treaties dealing with many diverse questions of domestic jurisdiction and that therefore this amendment is being set up as a new safeguard to prevent anything being imposed upon the United States.

Another argument which is made is that the examples of the executive actions at Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran in connection with World War II make it necessary to have some greater restraints in foreign affairs put upon the President.

The third argument made is that in a case decided in 1920, some 34 years ago—Missouri against Holland—the Supreme Court said that a treaty could control a matter of domestic law within a State and that it would be paramount. So it

is implied that the Senate could approve some treaty which the President had made changing the Constitution, changing our form of government, or impairing the Bill of Rights.

To start back from that last argument, the Supreme Court has said specifically, as long ago as 1890—Geoffrey against Riggs—that no treaty may be made which is contrary to anything which is stated in the Constitution. That is clear and unequivocal. The Secretary of State and the President have both stated that that is their interpretation, and so has the Attorney General. I do not think there can be any question about that. I think that the contrary is just a "hobgoblin" that is raised in this particular situation.

As to Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran, the argument that has been made by many people on this subject is that there were secret agreements and that they have worked out mischievously. But there is nothing in the amendment which we are discussing, there is nothing in any amendment which we can draw unless we are ready to reduce the powers of the Presidency to those held by an executive such as the President of France—which has, however, the parliamentary form of government—unless we are ready to do that, there is nothing in this amendment that could stop any President from making a secret agreement; and if the Congress would approve an improvident agreement that Congress would have to have its head examined, but as the law stands now it could repudiate it, and that repudiation is effective now without any amendment.

There is nothing to prevent the Congress—and the cases on this are very clear—from passing a resolution repudiating any secret agreement and declaring that it is not law in the United States, whether made at Yalta, Potsdam, Teheran, or elsewhere.

Finally, as to what the United Nations is trying to do. If it tries to do something which the American people are for, the Congress would approve it. And if it tries to do something which the American people are against, the Congress could disapprove it.

We have had enough struggles with respect to treaties, including the turndown of the League of Nations after World War I to know that when the public is aroused, no one is going to impose upon the people of the United States.

Let us look at the other side for a minute and see the errors which are involved in this amendment.

In the first place, it would tie the President's hands in negotiations with foreign governments at a time when we have elected a new President in whom we have the greatest measure of confidence on this issue, at a time when we do not want a world war III and want to carry on negotiations to avoid it. Just when we need an Executive who has power which the Constitution gives him, and when we have an Executive in whom the great majority have full confidence on foreign policy, this amendment proposes to take away the power.

The fact that this amendment is taken so very seriously in our country is itself a factor in world negotiations with respect to bringing about peace through the U. N., regional organization and the control of the atom. It tends to give support to an argument that the spirit of isolation is not dead in this country which we thought for all political purposes it was but a short time ago. I think it is a very inopportune time to bring up this amendment.

In one further point about the need for implementing legislation in order to make a treaty effective which this amendment would introduce. Today a treaty becomes effective when the other body approves it, it becomes effective as domestic law unless contrary to the Constitution. But the Congress may by law invalidate and denounce any treaty at any time that it passes a bill to that effect and the President signs it or it is passed over his veto.

Under the plan proposed in this amendment we will have five separate steps to get anything done about a treaty. The President must make the treaty, the other body must approve it, then both bodies must implement it, then the President has the right to say that he does or does not want the implementation, and finally both Houses have the right to pass it over his veto. This our negotiators say will hamstring our efforts to negotiate with other countries of the world on matters which are so essential to be negotiated today. I need not describe to you in greater detail, also, the mischief and havoc the amendment can work by leaving open to question whether a treaty is effective unless 48 separate State legislatures pass implementing legislation to that effect.

The amendment also gives Congress power in advance to regulate executive agreements. These are very numerous and are concerned with many details as small as fixing the time and place of an international conference and as great as the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces; under which he acted to take the Japanese surrender, lift the Berlin blockade, and repel Communist aggression in Korea. Congress can invalidate any such agreement, the power to regulate in advance only serves to cripple the President's power by putting the Congress into the Executive side—the very thing which is so serious—to substitute for the Executive power in its proper sphere a deliberative body like the Congress.

I think this subject deserves the utmost consideration of this House as it is now receiving in the other body because it is a subject of the greatest importance to our country and of the greatest importance to our country's future. I say advisedly that if this amendment passes there seems little hope for those great developments in foreign policy in our country which are best exemplified by the President's speech on atomic energy control in the United Nations, one of the most significant utterances made by an American President, which has had a most magnificent effect on American foreign policy throughout the whole world and upon the acceptability of our country's leadership throughout the free world.

I am deeply convinced that with this amendment we would put a roadblock in the way of all these efforts, which would, except under another name, make us the victims of isolationism in the world, and do a great deal to keep the world from that kind of cooperation which can avoid world war III.

THE INTERSTATE TRUCKING INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, it will not be necessary for me to use the 60 minutes unless other Members find this subject of the same interest to them, and I believe they will, as it is to me.

I take the floor this afternoon to discuss a resolution I introduced earlier, a resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the barriers to the free flow of interstate commerce on the highways which result when certain discriminatory and unilateral actions are taken by individual States.

Now, first, Mr. Speaker, why did I introduce the resolution? In the 3 years that I have had the privilege of being a Member of this body there is one thing that I am absolutely certain of. That is, that most Members of Congress enjoy being reelected, and in my district the trucking industry is the second largest industry.

There has been considerable interest in the threat of ruining reciprocity between States in our State of Ohio, and I know very well that any of you Members who have received hundreds of wires from your constituents as I have, feel it your moral obligation to take action.

Secondly, I have been a truck driver in interstate commerce and I can appreciate what the trucking industry is up against when reciprocity between the States is threatened.

Third, we have a situation in Ohio which is not a political one regarding the passage of what is commonly known as the axle-mile tax law. In Ohio we have a Republican legislature, both the House and the Senate, and we have a Democratic governor. The law was passed in early 1953 and now there is a question as to whether or not this law is applicable to out-of-State trucks coming into Ohio.

So that those Members who may not be here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, will be more familiar with the subject, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEATING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

House Resolution 407

Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the barriers to the free flow of interstate commerce on the highways which result when certain discriminatory and unilateral actions are taken by individual States

Whereas experience has shown that an efficient interstate truck transportation system is essential to the national defense and to our peacetime economy; and

Whereas the Congress, in enacting the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, adopted the policy of encouraging the development of a truck

transportation system to promote and assist the free flow of commerce; and

Whereas this objective has been advanced by a system of reciprocal arrangements whereby motor vehicles properly registered and taxed in the State of their domicile are allowed the use of highways in other States without payment of additional license plate fees or taxes; and

Whereas these reciprocity arrangements, which have helped to create the most efficient automotive transportation system in the world, are now being threatened by a special axle-mile tax adopted by the State of Ohio and applicable to out-of-State trucks as well as Ohio trucks; and

Whereas the destruction of the reciprocity system will set up barriers which will impede the free flow of interstate commerce and weaken the truck transportation system, and which are contrary to the public interest and inconsistent with the stated objectives of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 as well as contrary to the constitutional objective of preventing undue burdens on interstate commerce; and

Whereas much interstate motortruck traffic moves from, to, and through the State of Ohio, supplying American consumers, industry, and agriculture with raw materials and finished goods; and

Whereas the State of Ohio, through the official pronouncements of its Governor and other State officials, has refused to extend reciprocal exemption from its axle-mile tax to out-of-State truck vehicles properly registered and taxed, despite long-standing and time-honored agreements; and

Whereas at a recent meeting of the signatory States to the Ten-State Reciprocity Agreement, a resolution was adopted as follows: *"Resolved by the Ten-State Reciprocal Committee, comprising the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia,* That it is the further sense of this committe that the reciprocity granted to the State of Ohio, with respect to all trucks, by the States here represented, should be revoked, effective March 1, 1954, pursuant to immediate notice"; and

Whereas the States of Missouri and Wisconsin, and other States, have also notified the State of Ohio that they have canceled portions of long-existing reciprocal agreements between such States and the State of Ohio, in retaliation for the public refusal of the State of Ohio to grant reciprocity to such States with respect to such axle-mile tax; and

Whereas other States are now threatening to cancel reciprocal agreements now in effect or adopt similar taxes in retaliation for the refusal of the State of Ohio to grant such reciprocity; and

Whereas the inevitable result of this chain reaction will be to stifle or destroy interstate commerce via the highways of the Nation, thus (1) injuring one of the most flexible and vital arms of interstate transportation, (2) decreasing the number and availability of national truck carriers for movement of goods for the use of the Armed Forces, (3) weakening the vital truck manufacturing industry, and (4) creating unemployment in an industry which, next to agriculture, employs more workers than any other enterprise in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the barriers to the free flow of interstate commerce on the highways which result when a State unilaterally refuses to grant reciprocal exemption from State taxes and fees to out-of-State trucks properly registered and taxed, with particular reference to the discriminatory and unilateral refusal of the State of Ohio to grant such reciprocal exemption from its axle-mile tax. In conducting such investigation and study, the committee shall consider (1) the character and extent of the barriers to the free flow of interstate commerce on the highways which will result from such actions, (2) the effect of such refusal by the State of Ohio upon all methods of transportation, and particularly upon interstate truck transportation, (3) the effect of such actions upon business and consumer prices, and (4) the best means and methods which are available to the Federal Government to promote the preservation and expansion of reciprocal agreements between all the States in the field of interstate truck transportation.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations (including recommendations for legislation to prevent discriminatory and unilateral actions by States which burden or impede the free flow of interstate commerce) as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

Mr. AYRES. Early in 1953 the State of Ohio enacted an axle-mile tax law levying a new tax on all commercial trucks with more than two axles for each mile traveled on Ohio roads. This tax is in addition to other Ohio motor vehicle fees and taxes paid by truckers within the State. Like the other motor carrier tax laws the new axle-mile law contains a provision for the granting of reciprocal tax exemption to out-of-State trucks using Ohio roads, but thus far Ohio has refused to honor the principle of reciprocity provided for under a long-standing agreement among the States. As a result—and I see many Members from these States present here this afternoon—six States, Virginia, Kentucky, Nebraska, North Dakota, Missouri, and Wisconsin, already have retaliated by applying their motor carrier taxes to Ohio trucks using their roads.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia who, incidentally, ably represents a district which is just as important as is my district in transportation, including the city of Roanoke, Va.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. Did I understand the gentleman to say that Ohio's axle-mile tax rate might affect Virginia truckers bound for or passing through the State of Ohio?

Mr. AYRES. Under the present setup, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia, a truck coming into Ohio from Virginia would be subject to this new axle-mile tax law. By the same token, the State of Virginia has now, as I have stated, retaliated by applying their motor carrier taxes to Ohio trucks using their roads.

Mr. POFF. In other words, do I understand the gentleman to suggest that this new tax might be the hole in the dike for all such economic reciprocity agreements?

Mr. AYRES. It very possibly could ruin one of our basic transportation systems, the trucking industry, if there was a breakdown in reciprocity.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I notice in the press a statement that somebody made that trucks from other States would not now be permitted to drive through Ohio. Is that the gentleman's understanding of the situation, or do we drive through if we pay a tax?

Mr. AYRES. You drive through if you pay the tax.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does that apply only to trucks or does it apply, for example, to a station wagon when you are carrying some of your household goods?

Mr. AYRES. It applies only to trucks with more than two axles.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. More than two axles?

Mr. AYRES. Yes. If the State of Ohio does not grant reciprocity to the trucks coming in from Michigan, you can expect the price of automobiles to go up in every State that buys cars transported through the State of Ohio.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Unless the tax were paid, that then would prohibit the hauling of automobiles from our manufacturing plants in Michigan across Ohio?

Mr. AYRES. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has a bill to remedy that?

Mr. AYRES. That is right, or at least look into the evils of the present situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not much for looking into that particular thing, but I would like to vote for such a piece of legislation.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for being here this afternoon. I am sorry that my discussion will not be as interesting as his was earlier, but I think it will likewise be constructive.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I have that compliment printed for distribution next election?

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman has the right to have printed whatever he chooses.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, who also represents a district in which trucks play an important part.

Mr. RABAUT. I have had an opportunity to study the resolution the gentleman from Ohio has submitted. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time.

Mr. AYRES. That is perfectly all right. The gentleman has been a Member of this body a lot longer than I have, and I am quite certain he is very familiar with this problem.

Mr. RABAUT. I am. In order not to take up the gentleman's time, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to ex-

tend my remarks on this subject following the gentleman's remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. I also support the resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], who is the ranking member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CROSSER. I have here a telegram which I wish the gentleman would read.

Mr. AYRES. I will be happy to read it. It is a telegram addressed to the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Future of our job threatened by breakdown of truck reciprocity between States. Urge you vote for resolution calling for congressional investigation of interstate truck reciprocity.

It is signed by V. Roman, 4127 East 42d; C. Pawlowski, 3960 East 71st; W. Smith, 6519 Fleet; E. Krafcik, 2287 Columbus Road; J. Lisuic, 175 East 32d; W. Degregialo, 4003 East 26th.

I presume all these people are from Cleveland.

Mr. CROSSER. They are. May I say to the gentleman that while I do not want to prejudge the question, in view of the fact that it will come to our committee under the terms of the resolution, on the face of it and from what little I have learned, it seems to be a very serious question that ought to be immediately looked into.

Mr. AYRES. I appreciate the gentleman's statement because I know that in view of his experience on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and his experience in the transportation problems that are involved in interstate actions it will be of tremendous help.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I wish to compliment the gentleman on introducing this resolution, which I think is very important. I wish to announce my full support for it. I think unless some action is taken by this Congress very soon we are going to ruin an industry which is tremendously important to the entire Nation. I shall be very happy to support the resolution.

Mr. AYRES. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

As a result, six States—Virginia, Kentucky, Nebraska, North Dakota, Missouri, and Wisconsin—already have retaliated by applying their motor-carrier taxes to Ohio trucks using their roads. Ten Southern States—members of the Ten-State Reciprocity Committee—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia—have resolved to revoke all reciprocal agreements with Ohio by March 1, 1954. And other States, including Arkansas, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Illinois, are preparing to make similar revocations. Eventually, the reciprocity arrangement may be canceled by all States.

What is reciprocal tax exemption?

The reciprocal tax-exemption system was worked out voluntarily by the States themselves to prevent undue tax burdens on interstate travel.

Using as an example the case of passenger cars, which provided the Nation with its first use of reciprocity: At one time, a motorist traveling from New York to New Jersey in a car bearing New York license tags had to pay the New Jersey registration fee—and for a time he even had to pay for a New Jersey driver's license—before he could use the New Jersey roads. Many States had similar laws, and in one State, Missouri, each county could collect a registration fee from a motorist driving through. The result was chaos, great cost, and inconvenience to the motorist, and a real detriment to large-scale use of interstate roads.

The States soon recognized the absurdity of this tax burden, and by 1928 they had all agreed to exempt out-of-State cars from the tax, provided the car's home State granted a similar exemption to motorists from the other State. Thus each State taxed only its own car owners, and no owner had to worry about the burden of multiple taxes.

Up to now, this system of reciprocal tax exemption has been applied to commercial vehicles as well as passenger cars. But the system is threatened with a complete breakdown unless Ohio rescinds its refusal to grant reciprocity. By March 1, for example, an Ohio farmer moving a truckload of produce into Kentucky would be required to pay a motor vehicle fee of $250 or more, before using the Kentucky roads to reach his market. Conversely, a Kentucky tobacco merchant moving his crop into Ohio would be required to pay the Ohio axle-mile tax.

THE BENEFITS OF RECIPROCITY

By preventing a pyramiding system of multiple taxation, the agreement among the States to grant reciprocal tax exemption has fostered the free flow of goods across State lines, the development of the world's greatest highway system, the expansion of markets for industry and agriculture, and the maximum exchange of products of one State for those of another.

Reciprocity has thus encouraged the growth of the interstate trucking industry as an essential arm of the Nation's transportation system, vital to national defense.

Congress has recognized the importance of a sound trucking industry to promote and assist the free flow of interstate commerce. If a breakdown in the voluntary system of tax reciprocity should threaten the truck transportation industry by imposing unreasonable burdens on interstate commerce, the United States Government may have no choice but to intervene in order to protect the national objectives for a sound motor-transport system as well as the constitutional objective of preventing undue burdens on interstate commerce.

THE EFFECT OF A BREAKDOWN IN RECIPROCITY

A breakdown in the mutually advantageous system of tax reciprocity would have disastrous results throughout the Nation. The entire United States economy would suffer from a decline in the trucking industry, for this industry hauls 77 percent of the total tonnage carried by all means of transportation. The trucking industry is the Nation's second largest employer, with more than 6,200,000 workers. Only agriculture employs more.

The end of reciprocity would threaten all phases of manufacturing and distribution. For example, three-quarters of all passenger cars are shipped by truck. And the effect on the 25,000 communities which have no rail service and are served only by motor transport would be catastrophic.

The strategic geographical position of Ohio in the motor transport system assures that the multiple taxes being applied there will affect consumers and businesses everywhere. Ohio is a centrally located State through which most of the cross-country transportation must be channeled. The current taxing action threatens to make Ohio a bottleneck.

In addition, the wide variety of manufactured goods originating in Ohio and shipped to all parts of the country make the cost of Ohio transport an important factor in the prices charged for commodities everywhere. Ohio-made tires, for example, are shipped to nearly every State, and almost all tires are shipped by truck.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state for the record my full and complete concurrence and support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio, and I wish to compliment him on the timeliness of the presentation of this resolution.

(Mr. OAKMAN asked and was given permission to revise and to extend his remarks in the RECORD following the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio who has handled himself very ably on the floor today.

Mr. BENDER. I commend my colleague for bringing in this resolution. As he knows, he has seen many of the letters and telegrams that have come from our own constituents in Ohio and likewise he is aware of the apprehension voiced by Members from neighboring States regarding this action. Certainly the committee should act promptly on this resolution, so that we are made familiar with

the facts and so that we may pursue this with legislation that will be in order.

Mr. AYRES. I appreciate the gentleman adding his comment, and his support will be most helpful.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. I would like to add my own concurrence and approval of the joint resolution. I have had a number of messages from Knoxville, the largest city in the district that I represent, urging support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I do favor it. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: In view of the interstate commerce provision of the Federal Constitution, does not the gentleman feel that this interpretation of the Ohio statute, if it is an interpretation only, would be contrary to the interestate commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States, as being an undue burden on interstate commerce?

Mr. AYRES. I would not care to voice an opinion on that. However, I will say to the gentleman that was my reason for handling the situation by the introduction of a resolution, where the gentlemen on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who are familiar with the transportation problem as a whole, could determine whether or not the action taken by Ohio was contrary to the Constitution.

Aside from affecting industry in my own district, there is also a threat to agriculture.

THE THREAT TO AGRICULTURE

Farmers would be among the first to feel the adverse effects of a breakdown in tax reciprocity. Almost 2 million farms throughout the Nation have their own trucks; farmers rely on them for shipment of their products.

A survey of the country's major metropolitan markets shows that nearly all shell eggs and live poultry are hauled by truck. Trucks carry 47 percent of all fruits and vegetables shipments; 55 percent of butter; more than 70 percent of milk; over 80 percent of frozen eggs; 80 percent of dressed poultry, and 43 percent of cheese. Trucks now carry 75 percent of all livestock shipments and 11 major markets rely on motor transport for 100 percent of their livestock shipments.

A substantial part of this movement is across State lines. For example, 85 percent of the truck deliveries of fruits and vegetables into the Cleveland market originate outside of Ohio; 86 percent of such deliveries in Boston come from outside of Massachusetts; 89 percent in Baltimore from outside of Maryland, and 95 percent in Chicago from outside of Illinois. These are typical of the interstate movement of farm products that would be imperiled by a breakdown of reciprocity.

The application of multiple taxation to such movements across State lines would close many markets to farmers in every State. The effect would be to balkanize farm markets, to limit many farmers to intrastate sales, to create surpluses in some areas and shortages in others. The breakdown of reciprocity would thus have a serious effect on both the price structure and the distribution pattern of American agriculture.

THE EFFECT ON HOUSEHOLD MOVING

Householders rely on motor transport for over 95 percent of movements of household furnishings. A breakdown in reciprocity would inevitably increase the cost of moving to householders or would force them to use other less convenient and more expensive methods.

THE EFFECT ON BUSINESS

All businesses, and particularly small businesses, would find that the end of reciprocity would raise the costs of the raw materials they buy and the prices of the finished products they sell. A survey of representative companies in Ohio recently showed that firms employing less than 300 people relied on trucks for 77 percent of the materials they used and 60 percent of the finished goods they shipped out. Larger firms, those employing more than 1,000 people, use trucks for 47 percent of their incoming and 52 percent of their outgoing goods.

THE EFFECT ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

Interstate trucking is vital to national defense. The Armed Forces rely on the civilian motor transport industry and on the highway system which a large transport industry has made possible.

In the words of former Secretary of the Navy Dan Kimball:

> Of all the modern forms of transportation on land which we have developed in the United States, trucking is unique. It is the only medium of transportation which can carry most items from the source of manufacture to the point of use. * * * The Armed Forces are geared to the flexibility of the motortruck. Without trucks our Armed Forces could not exist, as we know them.

EFFECT ON OHIO

The repercussions from Ohio's action would hit hardest the citizens of Ohio, who rely in large part on the motor-transport industry for movements both into and out of the State.

The Ohio trucking industry, one of the largest in the country, is being faced with retaliatory taxes that will put it at great competitive disadvantage with truckers in adjoining States. Many Ohio truckers already have taken steps to move their operations into other States that continue to enjoy full reciprocity. This would mean not only an added cost and inconvenience to Ohio truckers, but a substantial loss of tax revenue to Ohio.

The loss of reciprocity to Ohio trucks also means added costs and loss of business to Ohio farmers, who ship by motor transport 67 percent of their fruits and vegetables, 99 percent of their live poultry, and 80 percent of their livestock. Ohio packinghouses report that 95 percent of all incoming animals and 100 percent of all outgoing products move by truck. The burden of retaliatory taxes on these movements inevitably would force many of the shipments into other channels.

Ohio manufacturing firms would be similarly affected, for trucks haul from one-half to three-quarters of their incoming and outgoing shipments. In addition to raising the cost of materials used by Ohio industry, a breakdown in reciprocity would place Ohio businesses at a competitive disadvantage in sales to other markets. An automobile manufacturer in Ohio, for example, would be forced to pay the retaliatory taxes charged by other States, while a manufacturer in Michigan or Indiana would continue to be exempt from those taxes. The inevitable result, therefore, would be either less sales or less profits for the Ohio producer.

CONCLUSION

The economic cost to the Nation of a breakdown in tax reciprocity between the States is incalculable.

How many States the tax pyramid will cover—and how many burdensome taxes will be applied—cannot yet be determined.

But the effects in terms of a decline in the vital trucking industry, unemployment in an industry that is a source of livelihood for 1 out of every 10 workers in the country, higher costs to businessmen and, above all, consumers, and the serious curb on the movement of agricultural products can only spell danger to the national economy.

I believe that covers the problem. If there are those who have questions to ask that I might be able to answer, I should be glad to do so.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. It seems to me that the approach recommended by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] is constructive. The suggestion has been made to me that there might be some method used that would, directly or indirectly, force reciprocity. Pressure is not always the most desirable way to accomplish an end, but when you get to an impasse, there is no other method.

The suggestion has been made to me and I think to others, that in the final analysis, unless something is done to get legitimate reciprocity, the Federal Government might be forced to take a step to withhold Federal aid funds, or Federal grants, in those cases where a State is not cooperating with its neighboring States.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman for his observation. Along that line, part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, commonly known as the Motor Carrier Act, delegates almost complete regulation of the interstate motor-carrier industry to the Interstate Commerce Commission. This regulation includes the right to designate who shall engage in the business, with power to take away this right. It also includes regulation of the methods and the conduct of the business, the rate which must be charged, down to such details as even bookkeeping procedure. The only phase of the business not now controlled by the Federal Government is the charge for the use of the highways of the various States.

Along the same line of thinking, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], these highways have been largely built with Federal aid funds.

Mr. FORD. I certainly hope the gentleman's resolution is approved and that some action is taken to seek a constructive remedy for this very serious problem.

Mr. AYRES. I certainly hope, after you have given the resolution careful consideration that you will contact the proper authorities in the House of Representatives and see that the resolution is given immediate consideration.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to study the resolution introduced by my colleague from Ohio and I feel it represents a sound approach to a serious problem affecting one of the Nation's most vital industries.

I feel this is very properly a matter for the consideration of the Congress. As the resolution of the gentleman from Ohio points out, this is not an action which will have its effect only within the borders of the State of Ohio. The axle-tax law has already set off a chain reaction that may isolate the several States one from another as far as the rapid transportation and communication facilities of the trucking industry are concerned.

Moreover, such action has very serious implications for the tremendous number of employees of the trucking industry and the industries they serve. The unemployment situation in my own city of Detroit and in other industrial centers of the Midwest is already far too serious to allow the continuation of a condition which may well add more persons to the ranks of the unemployed.

It is fairly plain to see, I believe, the competitive disadvantage which this tax law places upon the trucking industry in comparison to other methods of transportation. I do not want to see any industry in our economy enjoy special privileges at the expense of its competitors, and I will likewise resist governmental action, whether State or Federal, which has such discriminatory effects as the Ohio axle-tax law.

We recognize the perfectly legitimate interests of the several States in raising the necessary funds for the construction and maintenance of their highway systems, but when this interest conflicts with the overriding interest of all the States and of the people in the free flow of interstate commerce, then the Congress may properly exercise its constitutional functions and attempt to solve the problem in a manner that is fair to all.

The committee is called upon by the resolution to consider the "best means and methods which are available to the Federal Government to promote the preservation and expansion of reciprocal agreements between all the States in the field of interstate truck transportation." It should be noted that perhaps the system of reciprocity agreements between the States, in this case so easily ignored by the State of Ohio, may not be the best method of insuring the free flow of interstate commerce through the facilities of the trucking industry, and I would urge upon the committee the consideration of what alternative arrangements or methods may assure the stability of these commercial relationships between the several States.

This resolution merits the serious consideration and support of the Members of this House.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution offered by my colleague from Ohio which would authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the barriers to the free flow of interstate commerce on the highways which result when certain discriminatory and unilateral actions are taken by individual States.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called axle-tax law imposed by the State of Ohio is threatening to break down the system of reciprocal arrangements between various States. These arrangements provide that motor vehicles which are registered and taxed in their domiciliary State are exempt from the payment of additional fees and taxes in other States whose highways they may have occasion to use.

I do not know what reasons or motives may have prompted the Governor of Ohio to refuse to extend this reciprocal exemption. But this I do know. We in the State of Michigan have occasion to see many of our trucks pass through the territory of our Ohio neighbor for purposes which are of tremendous benefit to the national economy to say nothing of the value to our Armed Forces. The trucking industry is one of the most valued parts of interstate transportation but its continued existence depends upon the principle of reciprocity as between various States. The truck manufacturing industry, so vital to the State of Michigan, is also being threatened. I am particularly disturbed by the very real threat of unemployment to these industries within Michigan, a threat which has been confirmed by numerous telegrams I have received from various truckers within by district. I certainly believe that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee should have immediate authority to investigate this situation and to recommend legislation which would prevent such discriminatory and unilateral action.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio for introducing this resolution and hope that it will speedily be passed by the Congress.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio, WILLIAM H. AYRES, has performed a real public and patriotic service in offering this timely resolution to the House on the very important subject of truck-tax-exemption reciprocity among the States, which affects a large portion of interstate commerce in our Nation.

The automobile—the truck and passenger vehicles—are the principal products of the workers of the State of Michigan. At least every ninth American today is gainfully employed, directly or indirectly, because of this great industry. The peacetime economy of the Nation as well as our national security is dependent upon it to a very considerable degree.

The Federal Government is presently collecting $910 million annually in motor fuel taxes, in addition to $1,112,000,000 excise taxes on the sale of cars, trucks, parts, accessories, tires, and tubes. In addition, the States and their subdivisions are collecting several billion additional dollars each year from the American motorist in the form of gasoline taxes, weight taxes, and so forth. In spite of all of this, competent testimony shows that our country's roads are wearing out at the rate of 2,000 miles a year—faster than we are building them.

Good roads mean much to the entire Nation in safety, in the cost of transportation of people and merchandise, and most emphatically to our national security. Let me quote from President Eisenhower's state-of-the-Union message. Speaking of how our new nuclear weapons make it possible to reduce the size of our armies, the President said:

> Our Armed Forces must regain maximum mobility of action. Our strategic reserves must be centrally placed and readily deployable to meet sudden aggression against ourselves and our allies.

Maximum mobility means the ability to move quickly over our highways, as well as to move quickly in the air and on water.

The President further recommended:

> To protect the vital interest of every citizen in a safe and adequate highway system, the Federal Government is continuing its central rule in the Federal-aid highway program. So that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 3 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half cent decrease which otherwise will become effective April 1, and will maintain revenue so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken.

During the past 20 years, the Federal Government has collected about $9 billion from federally imposed motor-fuel taxes. About half of this has been returned to the States for road construction on a basis that the States match dollar for dollar the so-called Federal grants-in-aid. The other half of this $9 billion has gone into the Federal Treasury to be spent for other Government purposes, totally unrelated to roads.

If each of the 48 States is to impose arbitrary and precipitous truck-axle taxes, great harm will be done to the trucking-automobile interests of the country. This would be a strong blow to the economy of the Nation. It would be a backward step over 25 years when the matter of reciprocity relative to motor-tax exemptions was worked out among the States. There is no place in this atomic age for a "balkanization" of our American system of highways. I urge the Rules Committee to give this resolution a rule at the earliest possible moment, so that the House may pass the Ayres resolution and that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can consider this measure before the damage is irreparable.

THE GREAT COFFEE MYSTERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, each time the harassed housewife goes into

her grocery store these days the price of a tin of coffee has mysteriously shot up another 5 cents a pound, and it is generally now well over $1 or $1.10 a pound.

Why? Well, we are told it is because of a disastrous freeze in the coffee-growing areas of Brazil. When did these frosts occur in Brazil—last week, or last month, when we in this country were shivering in heavy snows and arctic cold? Not at all.

The seasons in Brazil, of course, are the opposite of ours. Brazil suffered its frosts last July. Yet suddenly, now, today, and since the first of the year, coffee prices in the United States have been skyrocketing.

It is attributed, in the financial journals and business reports, to a shortage of green coffee, due partly to the frosts in Brazil last July, partly growing European demand for coffee—particularly in Western Germany—and partly—and this is the part which intrigues me most—to frantic speculation and to a lot of hoarding in the coffee markets in anticipation of a further series of price increases for the bean.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to know what, if anything, the agencies of the United States Government are doing to protect the American housewife against this profiteering in what we have come to regard as one of the most essential staples in the family diet and family budget.

If this gouging were occurring in copper, or manganese, or nickel, or any of the other materials vital to our industrial production, I am sure the Government would be showing some interest and some concern and undoubtedly getting some helpful results.

But, so far as I can see, it is looking with resignation or unconcern on the holdup of the American consumer and housewife on skyrocketing coffee import prices.

Apparently now even the 10-cent cup of coffee is on the way out, and the price in restaurants in many cities, including St. Louis, has gone to 15 cents.

Many of the Members, Mr. Speaker, have been reporting on the increased unemployment in their congressional districts. I am sorry to have to report that in St. Louis, too, we are feeling the repercussions of reduced production, cutbacks in orders, and layoffs of industrial workers. It used to be that a jobless man out on the streets looking for work could at least comfort himself against the winter cold with a warming cup of coffee for a nickel or a dime. But as this price squeeze on coffee intensifies it is making even coffee one of the luxuries of life beyond the reach of many—and somehow, to me, that seems almost un-American.

Since all of our coffee comes from abroad, Mr. Speaker, we are very much dependent upon the Federal Goverment to represent us in this matter so that fair arrangements are made to assure adequate supplies of this important product at fair prices.

We have certainly been generous enough and fair enough in our dealings with the nations which produce coffee, in connection with the things we provide them. Why cannot we arrange some reciprocity in this respect?

Unless and until some steps are taken to stabilize coffee prices at levels which the average consumer can afford, then I think it presumptuous for spokesmen for the administration to talk about lowering the cost of living, for certainly that has not been done in regard to any of the staple foods, or in rents, utilities, interest charges or other main items of the family budget.

You will never convince a housewife the cost of living has gone down when a tin of coffee goes up 5 cents a pound every few days and the prospect is for further increases in the near future.

It is time for action, Mr. Speaker, to prevent the further deterioration and adulteration of the quality of our cherished breakfast cup of coffee, for certainly if this keeps up we will be drinking such a watered down version of coffee it will not be worth dignifying with the name coffee at all.

Muddy water may be all right in our rivers, Mr. Speaker, but let us not be forced to drink it for breakfast.

I am today addressing a letter to the Secretary of State asking him what steps, if any, this Government has taken or can take to protect our people against further gouging on coffee prices and enable the American housewife to serve a decent cup of coffee to her family without fracturing the family budget. What representations has he made to the producing countries to assure fair prices?

This may not be the weightiest problem he faces at the moment, but to 40 million American families it is the kind of issue they wish he would get busy on right away so that they, in turn, can fortify themselves properly in the mornings to read the newspaper accounts of his other problems and concerns.

Frankly, in my own case, until I have had my morning coffee, Mr. Speaker—and it better be a good cup of coffee—I just cannot get concerned about Big Four parleys in Berlin or budgets or deficits or atoms or anything else. And how can one enjoy that cup of coffee, Mr. Speaker, when the price per pound is over $1 and still rising?

UNEMPLOYMENT AND TERMINOLOGY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, no matter what you call it—a rolling adjustment, or a healthy readjustment, or an orthodox recession—the fact of the matter is that the number of jobs in the Pittsburgh labor market area—the workshop of the world—has been declining steadily since the Eisenhower administration came to power.

Unemployment in this area—the heart of America's industrial system—has doubled in the past year, and most of that increase has taken place since last September.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. The gentleman mentioned that unemployment has doubled in his area. I might point out that I have made a survey of my State, particularly my city of St. Louis, and have found that we have had a similar situation there. Our unemployment today is twice as great as it was a year ago. It is reaching very serious proportions.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It adds a good bit to what I expect to say regarding this unemployment situation.

According to the latest figures, there were 26,100 fewer jobs in the area than a year ago.

When you compare this with a working force of 826,100, which is the number of wage and salaried workers employed in the Pittsburgh area at latest count, it may not sound like a lot to people who look only at the bare statistics and who measure issues of this sort only by slide rules and adding machines.

But 26,100 fewer jobs—most of those in the steel and electrical machinery industry—mean thousands of families in the Pittsburgh area whose standard of living has fallen from a decent level dangerously close to the submarginal level. It spells danger signals to the whole economy—verified by the remarks just made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN]—and like any "disemployment" movement, ever feeds upon itself to cause ever-widening misery.

The administration has talked often of the bold course it will follow if and when this Nation is faced with the threat of a depression. Talk like that is pretty meaningless, if the conditions which lead to burgeoning unemployment are allowed to go unchecked merely because we have not come to the spectre of soup kitchens, wholesale foreclosures, and evictions.

If we have learned anything in the past 25 years about fighting depression, it is that we must not wait for the banks to close doors, the factories to shut down, before organizing the resources of the Nation to counteract serious downward economic trends.

The most distressing factor about the mounting unemployment in and around Pittsburgh is that the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce—which normally is as optimistic as any group of bu inessmen in the country when the circumstances indicate any justification for optimism—carries in its January magazine a report that business conditions in Pittsburgh will probably decline for another 6 months.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Cleveland, a very great industrial city. I hope he is not going to give us the bad news that the situation in Cleveland is bad, too.

Mr. BENDER. No, we are in pretty good shape. The gentleman's remedy would not suggest that we go back into a shooting war, would it?

Mr. EBERHARTER. My suggestion will come a little later in my remarks, but I say we have learned in the past 25 years that we should not wait until we have soup kitchens, until we have wholesale evictions of tenants, until we have bank foreclosures, before we take measures.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt was in office, he taught the country how to cure depressions. The Democratic Administration has given to the country a blueprint of how to prevent these things.

Mr. BENDER. I would like to make one other observation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. My time is limited. As the gentleman knows, there are other speakers. If he will wait and get the benefit of all my remarks, then I will be glad to give him the rest of my 15 minutes to ask questions, and I will try to answer them.

Mr. BENDER. I want to say one word, if the gentleman will yield. We had 11 million people out of work before the war started.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Quoting Bervard Nichols, associate professor of economics research at the University of Pittsburgh, the chamber of commerce magazine Greater Pittsburgh says these factors point to a further sag:

First, steel mill activity has not regained prevacation period level by sizable margin; second, new orders for steel are falling; third, steel scrap prices have weakened; fourth, real estate activity has declined a little more; fifth, wholesale prices have fallen slightly in recent weeks; sixth, mortgage money is hard to get; seventh, the volume of consumer credit is the highest on record, more than $27.6 billion; eighth, inventories are highest on record and some have surpassed safe level lines; ninth, auto production has slackened, stocks are heavy, and the used-car market is slow; tenth, farm income will be reduced further; eleventh, prolonged rise in personal income has almost stopped; twelfth, commercial failures are rising; thirteenth, exports are decreasing; fourteenth, people are showing far more reluctance to buy, for one reason because they believe prices may go lower. Professor Nichols also mentions the stock market tumble in 1953, but adds the market should go back up again for a number of reasons, including the tax cuts.

While this is pretty much only the opinion of an individual professor at a university in Pittsburgh, it is perhaps even more significant that businessmen generally in the Pittsburgh area are equally pessimistic. It is highly significant that in the Pittsburgh area responsible business and industrial leaders—polled by the State's bureau of employment security—see no immediate prospect of restoring employment to previous levels. The consensus is that present levels will be stabilized at least through March, which means that the men laid off by steel and other industries have no prospects under present business conditions of going back to their jobs.

With all the obvious needs here in this country and throughout the world for the products we in the Pittsburgh area manufacture, why is it that orders have fallen off so sharply that thousands of steel workers and electrical workers are now "surplus"?

And when does the situation reach the point where the President and his economic advisers finally acknowledge our economy is in trouble and start taking some affirmative steps to reverse the downward trend?

I notice the advertising industry has come forward with a plan to restore prosperity by plastering the billboards, by filling the advertising columns of newspapers and magazines, and using commercial spots on radio and television with reassurances to the public that everything is just fine and dandy.

The jobless worker whose radio or television set is repossessed because he can't afford the payments is certainly not going to be turned into a customer by a peppy commercial telling him he never had it so good.

Psychology, of course, plays a big part in sales volume, but so far as I know none of the psychologists in advertising agencies have a magic formula for talking a fellow who is broke and jobless into spending a lot of money he does not have.

When people have assurances that their jobs are secure, when they know the paycheck will continue regularly and won't be cut off the day after tomorrow, then they will not hesitate to spend their money for the things they want and need.

This administration has failed miserably in maintaining the kind of general confidence the people had in our economy under the previous administration.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include remarks on seven bills relating to the liberation of the Indians.

Mr. NEAL.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. HALLECK).

Mr. WATTS.

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. RABAUT.

Mr. SHAFER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, January 20, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1156. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, transmitting a report of the findings and recommendations of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, pursuant to Public Law 220, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 300); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1157. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of operations, expenditures and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to the act of June 28, 1939 (50 Stat., 329); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1158. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1159. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the seventh semiannual report of the International Claims Commission of the United States, from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, Public Law 455, 81st Congress, approved March 10, 1950; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1160. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report of the Civil Aeronautics Board covering fiscal year 1953; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1161. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the eighth annual report describing the operations of the Department of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1162. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the 19th annual report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1163. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I., pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1164. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting information relative to the case of Stanislaw Argasinski, who was mentioned by reference in a letter dated January 14, 1954, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, under the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1165. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order entered in the case of the following alien Claus Heinrich Arp, No. 56354/1, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1166. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1167. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1168. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of

orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1169. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 406. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5337, a bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1103). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2326. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 1104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5337. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 7265. A bill to provide for the loss of nationality by native-born or naturalized citizen upon conviction for certain crimes relating to national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 7266. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7267. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 7268. A bill to provide that the Clark Hill Reservoir and Dam on the Savannah River, S. C. and Ga., shall be known as the Paul Brown Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 7269. A bill to provide that the Clark Hill Reservoir and Dam on the Savannah River, S. C. and Ga., shall be known as the Paul Brown Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 7270. A bill to provide that the Clark Hill Reservoir and Dam on the Savannah River, S. C. and Ga., shall be known as the Paul Brown Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H. R. 7271. A bill to provide that the Clark Hill Reservoir and Dam on the Savannah River, S. C. and Ga., shall be known as the Paul Brown Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 7272. A bill to provide that the Clark Hill Reservoir and Dam on the Savannah River, S. C. and Ga., shall be known as the Paul Brown Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PILCHER:

H. R. 7273. A bill to provide that the Clark Hill Reservoir and Dam on the Savannah River, S. C. and Ga., shall be known as the Paul Brown Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 7274. A bill to provide that the Clark Hill Reservoir and Dam on the Savannah River S. C. and Ga., shall be known as the Paul Brown Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 7275. A bill to provide that the Clark Hill Reservoir and Dam on the Savannah River, S. C. and Ga., shall be known as the Paul Brown Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7276. A bill to authorize the modification of the project for Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 7277. A bill to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7278. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 7279. A bill providing for the development of a highway and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 7280. A bill to increase the income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 7281. A bill to provide for the construction and maintenance of a high school for Indian pupils within the exterior boundaries of the Fort Berthold Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7282. A bill to provide for the return to the former Indian owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 7283. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,200 the income-tax exemption allowed a taxpayer for a dependent, and $1,800 for a dependent child (until said child reaches 21 years of age) while attending any recognized college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 7284. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7285. A bill to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7286. A bill to exempt from duty under paragraph 1551 of the Tariff Act of 1930 certain motion-picture film imported into Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7287. A bill to prohibit the shipment or use in interstate commerce of motor vehicles which are not equipped with a device which prevents such motor vehicle from being driven in excess of 65 miles per hour; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 7288. A bill to provide for stockpiling 3 million bales of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 7289. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 7290. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the construction of certain public-school facilities on the Klamath Indian Reservation at Chiloquin, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 7291. A bill to provide that any person aggrieved by a final decision of the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board may bring action on his claim in a United States district court; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 7292. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1932, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to renew for 25 years the lease of certain lands to Phillips County Post, No. 57, of the American Legion, Department of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 7293. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer for himself and his spouse, and the additional exemptions for old age or blindness, from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7294. A bill to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by working mothers in providing care for their children while they are at work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7295. A bill to require Federal district courts and State courts to enforce certain support orders of courts of other States, and to confer jurisdiction on Federal district courts to make support orders in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 7296. A bill to extend to June 30, 1956, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7297. A bill to amend section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to increase the maximum amount in which farm realty loans may be guaranteed thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7298. A bill to afford education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the cases of certain seriously disabled veterans, notwithstanding the time limitations of such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7299. A bill to remove the time limitations on a period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded to certain seriously disabled veterans of World

War II and of service on and after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7300. A bill to provide that where, for 15 years or more, the Veterans' Administration has rated a veteran as totally disabled, and he is age 60 or older, his disability shall be considered permanent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 7301. A bill to eliminate the 4-percent gratuity on loans guaranteed, insured or made by the Veterans' Administration under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 7302. A bill to provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General, subject to the civil-service laws and rules and regulations, of postmasters, at first-, second-, and third-class post offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 7303. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from making, guaranteeing, or insuring loans to or for persons who are members of, or affiliated with, subversive organizations, or who individually advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 7304. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 7305. A bill to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 7306. A bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, to make permanent the authorization for certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 7307. A bill to provide that persons who have been convicted three times of a felony in the District of Columbia shall be sentenced to life imprisonment; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 7308. A bill to repeal section 307 of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7309. A bill to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONAS of North Carolina:

H. R. 7310. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to certain athletic games between teams composed of players selected from elementary or secondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7311. A bill to improve the enforcement of laws pertaining to gambling by suppressing the transmission of certain gambling information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7312. A bill to provide for the forfeiture of United States citizenship of individuals who are members of or assist in organizing the Communist Party or any Communist-action organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7313. A bill to provide that the annual allowance of Members of the House of Representatives for United States airmail and special-delivery postage stamps shall be on a calendar year basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 7314. A bill to amend section 513 (d) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to authorize the allocation of sums to provide direct loans to veterans for construction of homes on Veterans' Development, Small Tracts No. 2, Missoula County, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7315. A bill to provide for stockpiling 500 million bushels of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 7316. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Turtle Mountain band of Chippewa Indians in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana, and the individual members thereof; for assistance in the orderly relocation of such Indians in areas of greater economic opportunity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7317. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes and bands of Indians located in western Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7318. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Sac and Fox of the Missouri Tribe of Indians located in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, the Iowa Tribe of Indians located in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, the Kickapoo Tribe of Indians located in the State of Kansas, and the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians located in the State of Kansas, and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7319. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7320. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians located in the State of Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7321. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Seminole Tribe of Indians in the State of Florida and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7322. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of Indian tribes, bands, and groups in California and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 7323. A bill to provide for advancement on the retired lists of the Armed Forces of individuals who did not receive promotions after having been held as prisoners of war during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 7324. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7325. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7326. A bill to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 7327. A bill to provide that Government surplus property may be donated to 4-H clubs for the construction, equipment, and operation of camps and centers; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 7328. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7329. A bill to repeal section 1174 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the cooperation of medical officers with line officers in superintending cooking by enlisted men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7330. A bill to authorize the long term time charter of tankers by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 7331. A bill to incorporate the Pan American Round Tables of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7332. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 7333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to grant to taxpayers in certain cases an additional income-tax exemption for children attending educational institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEICHEL (by request):

H. R. 7334. A bill to authorize certain property transactions in Cocoli, C. Z., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 7335. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Waycross, Ga.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 7336. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 7337. A bill to outlaw the Communist Party and similar subversive organizations by making it a crime to be a member thereof, to provide for the forfeiture of the citizenship of persons convicted of engaging in certain subversive activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 7338. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 7339. A bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7340. A bill to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 7341. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for

rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 7342. A bill to amend section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to permit the disposal of surplus property to State health departments and publicly owned water districts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H. J. Res. 353. Joint resolution declaring the right of sovereignty of the United States over certain areas of the Antarctic Continent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. Res. 407. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the barriers to the free flow of interstate commerce on the highways which result when certain discriminatory and unilateral actions are taken by individual States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. Res. 408. Resolution relating to the proposed scrapping of the steamship *Corn Husker Mariner;* to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Res. 409. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the barriers to the free flow of interstate commerce on the highways which result when certain discriminatory and unilateral actions are taken by individual States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials, were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 7343. A bill for the relief of Hildegart Liselotte Budesheim and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7344. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Mary Peyton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 7346. A bill for the relief of Gino DeMico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 7347. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wilhem Brandts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 7348. A bill for the relief of Peter Beratis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 7349. A bill for the relief of Anders Taranger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 7350. A bill for the relief of Anna Almo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 7351. A bill for the relief of Dr. Zoltan Klar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 7352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sonja Ries Kock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 7353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Javier (formerly Maria Alvarado Salas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7354. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Music Supply Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7355. A bill for the relief of Dykeman Hank Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 7356. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the appropriate United States district court to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Ottinger Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7357. A bill for the relief of Dieter Wolfgang Kaisenberg, also known as William Brown and William Prieb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7358. A bill for the relief of Garabed Charles Nigolian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7359. A bill for the relief of Stephen Moe Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7360. A bill for the relief of Sun Yue Hien, wife of Chu Tseung, also known as T. B. Chew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7361. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Fahrian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 7362. A bill for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 7363. A bill for the relief of Emelda Ann Schallmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 7364. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Harris, Mrs. Lydia E. Harris, and Olney Elva Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 7365. A bill for the relief of Barbara V. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 7366. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Heinz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7367. A bill for the relief of Eleftheria Wazidele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 7368. A bill for the relief of Sami Akman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

462. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, Washington, D. C., relative to a booklet entitled "Free Trade—A Form of Economic Pacifism"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

463. Also, petition of the secretary, the American Academy of Tropical Medicine, San Juan, P. R., relative to urging the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Congress to increase the annual budget of the Gorgas Memorial Institute, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

464. Also, petition of the mayor, Provo City, Utah, requesting the prompt and fair consideration of the bill H. R. 1555, authorizing the development of the upper Colorado River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

465. Also, petition of the secretary, National Alcoholic Beverage Control Association, Cleveland, Ohio, relative to a resolution adopted by the association at their annual convention in New York City, September 21-23, 1953, requesting the reduction of current excessive Federal excise tax rates on alcoholic beverages which are providing the stimulus to the growth of illicit traffic in such beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

466. Also, petition of Ralph Naylor, Angel City Branch No. 24, National Association of Letter Carriers, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 24, relating to the compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Marbles and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1954

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, at St. Marys, W. Va., Marble King, Inc., has for many years operated a glass industry, producing among other specialties common glass playing marbles. Where previously this product was shipped to west-coast distributors for ready sale, the company now is faced with Japanese competitive products, produced at one-sixth of the prevailing cost of American labor. Needless to say, the trained employees of this plant face unemployment.

This is only one of many instances of work slowdown in glass, pottery, and ceramic industries located in West Virginia, resulting primarily from laxity in administration of foreign-trade agreements and lack of proper consideration of local small-business enterprise on the part of the Tariff Commission.

The administration's full-employment goal cannot be maintained by tariff regulations favoring foreign industries at the expense of hundreds of local enterprises employing skilled workers, most of whom feel that their specialized training eliminates them from jobs they know little about.

Nothing will contribute more to business recession than failure to protect the interests of small industries, which,

in the aggregate, furnish the livelihood for the bulk of our employables.

It is high time our Tariff Commission gives more consideration to the welfare of small industrialists and the wage group of steady, homeowning, loyal citizens who make up and sustain the small communities that grow around such industries.

Comment by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, on President Eisenhower's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 18, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, immediately after President Eisenhower delivered his annual message on the state of the Union, I issued a statement of comment on the message. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President's message and his recommendations deserve and will indeed require the most sober and objective consideration on the part of all of us. He said in his message that both of our great political parties can support the general objective of his recommendations, namely, the building of a stronger America. I concur wholeheartedly in this view. Insofar as his recommendations when translated into specific proposals, contribute toward this objective, I for one, will give them unstinted support. There is a growing awareness that the dangers which confront our Nation both at home and abroad, both in economic and in political matters, cannot be resolved by a partisan approach. They can be solved only through a nonpartisan approach.

I am gratified indeed to note that the President has accepted and endorsed the basic objectives of both the New Deal and the Fair Deal, namely, the responsibility of Government for the prosperity and welfare of the individual citizen. I hope that the proposals which will be made to implement the President's enunciation of these basic principles will measure up to and not pervert these principles.

Despite the almost encyclopedic number of recommendations contained in this message, some of the most important and urgent issues were only sketchily covered. Some were omitted altogether.

Thus, I regret very much that the President saw fit to omit any reference to the need for drastic amendment of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act.

While the President vaguely referred to progress made in the field of civil rights, there is no reference in the message to the need for fair employment legislation and other Federal civil-rights measures. Indeed, his report and recommendations in the civil-rights field are bare and discouraging.

While the President made a number of recommendations, which we must consider very carefully, for cutting down on civil liberties, he made no reference whatever to the need for recovering ground already lost in the field of civil liberties and in broadening the horizons of individual rights and freedoms.

There was regrettably no reference to the need for approving the Genocide Convention. While he did recommend action on statehood for Hawaii, he very eloquently refrained from referring to statehood for Alaska.

I have grave reservations regarding his assumption that we can get more strength for less money, that we can cut taxes, reduce defense expenditures, and still grow stronger. I am open to conviction on this, but I will ask to be shown that we are not sacrificing preparedness to serve political ends.

I look forward with great anticipation to the detailed recommendations which the President has promised in the fields of health, of labor, of housing, and of economic policy. To all these he referred in only general terms and promised special messages. I hope that the specific proposals will actually carry out the generalized recommendations.

This is a message which cannot be digested and evaluated at first sight. This will need not only days but weeks and months of study and evaluation. The proof of this pudding will be in the eating. I am ready to support the President with all my strength in those proposals and programs which go forward to the goals which he described—"the advancement of the security, prosperity, and well being of the American people"; to the achievement of a condition in which "every citizen has a good reason for bold hope; where effort is rewarded and prosperity is shared; where freedom expands and peace is secure."

Toward these goals and the achievement of these objectives, with the reservations which I have suggested—and there are many others—I am prepared to support the program of the President of the United States.

Sale of Canned Fruits to the United Kingdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, most of the canned fruits produced in the United States are grown in California. The largest single item of canned fruits is cling peaches. California produced 17,166,000 cases of cling peaches—2½ basis—last year. My district—the 11th—consisting of the counties of San Joaquin and Stanislaus produces about one-half of the cling-peach crop of California.

Current stocks are considered to be excessive in the amount 2 million cases. California's cling-peach industry operates under State marketing orders which provide means for crop curtailment. Two million cases is the equivalent of approximately 50,000 tons of cling peaches. Therefore, unless the excessive carryover is liquidated prior to harvest, producers will be required to eliminate some 50,000 tons of peaches in order to maintain market stability.

Under the policy established by the 83d Congress under section 550 of the Defense Production Act, opportunities have been created for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities to foreign countries with provisions of converting currency under this section.

The United States Department of Agriculture through its Foreign Agricultural Service and the Foreign Operations Administration under the authority granted to it under section 550 have made canned cling peaches and several other canned fruits eligible under the 550 program. The participating nations have been advised of this action.

British trade has evidenced a great interest in this program and report that there is currently a deficit of 2 million cases of canned fruits in the United Kingdom. Sterling-area sources are unable to furnish supplies of canned fruits in volume adequate to meet the demands. The British people have not had an opportunity to purchase California canned fruits since before the war, in quantities that they would like to. The British Food Ministry requested of California processors in the quantity and range of prices of canned fruits, eigible under the program, that might be offered to the Kingdom. This information has been forwarded through diplomatic channels to the British Ministry of Food. California processors have indicated a desire to supply in excess of 2 million cases to this historic market.

Prior to World War II, the United Kingdom was one of the principal markets for California canned fruits. Between 2 and 3 million cases were sold to that market annually. In the case of cling peaches, approximately 17 percent of the total production went into export channels, most of this to the United Kingdom. Since the war, practically no exports of canned fruits from California have been made to historic outlets, with the exception of a modest volume in 1946.

Under the 550 program, the first real opportunity exists to reestablish historic foreign markets for California producers of canning fruits.

Discussions have been had with various Federal agencies in Washington concerned with this export. All have been most cooperative and have done everything they possibly can to expedite the sale of this fruit.

The Food Ministry is interested. But to get the money required to make the purchase will require the support of the British Treasury.

It seems to us that this matter should be taken up by Mr. Stassen, the head of the FOA. It requires a man of his station and ability to consummate the transaction. Also, it is right down the line that Mr. Stassen has been preaching, namely, to utilize American surpluses where possible to bring about foreign trade and help our friends in foreign countries get back on their feet.

Income-Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1954

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the 83d Congress, in January

1953, I introduced H. R. 1092, which amended the income-tax laws. This amendment provided that each taxpayer should be allowed an exemption of $1,000 for himself and each of his dependents, instead of the $600 as now provided by law.

It was my thought in introducing this measure that $1,000 represented a more realistic approach to a cost-of-living exemption than does the current $600, especially in view of the tremendous increase in our cost of living in the last several years. Although I tried as hard as I could to get some real consideration of this measure, I must admit that I have made little headway, due principally to the fact that the Treasury Department interposed serious objections, claiming that the passage of this measure would reduce the national income $8½ billion—a loss that could not be justified under the necessary expenditure program of our country.

While not abandoning my hope and efforts to secure consideration of the $1,000 exemption for all, I have today introduced a resolution providing that each taxpayer shall be entitled to an exemption of $1,000 for each dependent who is a son or daughter, stepson or stepdaughter, who, during the major part of any taxable year is in attendance at an institution of higher learning.

My purpose in introducing this resolution is to extend some measure of relief to many families in this country who are anxious to see their children obtain the best education possible and upon whom the added burden of sending their children through college and other institutions falls heavily. Many families have serious difficulty in providing the necessary funds to properly educate their children, and the adoption of this resolution would, in some measure, help to alleviate this condition. While I realize that the passage of this resolution would deprive the Government of some tax revenue, yet I feel that it would be a sound investment on the part of our country to stimulate and encourage the education of our young people, and would, in the long run, amount to the accumulation of great wealth in our country, as by far the greater portion of our wealth consists in the educated ability and know-how of our people to properly utilize our natural resources and to deal with the many problems that confront us as individuals and with which our country and the world are faced.

Competent Indians: First-Class Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today seven bills submitted by the Department of the Interior in response to House Concurrent Resolution 108, which was unanimously approved by the House and Senate last session. These bills provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the Indians of western Oregon; certain Indian tribes in Kansas and Nebraska; the Klamath Indians of Oregon; the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.; the Seminole Tribe in Florida; the Indians of California; and the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana.

Careful study has been made throughout the years to ascertain whether these Indians are ready for removal from Federal wardship. In transmitting the proposed legislation, the Department of the Interior advises that "It is our belief that the Indians subject to the proposed bills no longer require special assistance from the Federal Government, and that they have sufficient skill and ability to manage their own affairs."

Thorough hearings will be held on each bill by a joint committee of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs. The language suggested by the Department is not necessarily the language that will be reported by the committee. This is merely the suggested frame-work within which the final details of the legislation may be fitted.

The bills are our honest attempt to put competent Indians in the class of being first-class citizens.

Unemployment a Serious Problem in Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Sunday Star yesterday performed a notable public service by printing an extensive report from Detroit by one of its staff members, William Hines. It outlines the present unemployment distress in Detroit today, with more than 7 percent of the labor force—107,000 out of 1,533,000—jobless and with no immediate prospects for returning to work; with estimates on the future predicting an increase to 7.5 percent by midyear and perhaps as much as 14 percent by next winter.

This article reports how a downturn in automobile sales threatens not only the economy of Detroit but of Toledo and Akron and Pittsburgh and Gary and Cleveland and Youngstown, and, in fact, the entire Nation.

This is nothing new to us in Detroit. It is nothing new here on the House floor, where many of us—particularly those of us on the Democratic side—have been trying to awaken the Eisenhower administration to what is happening to our economy and to urge it into action in meeting the dangers of recession or worse.

It seems, however, that the administration leaders have been too busy decimating our military-preparedness program and canceling contracts for tanks and other equipment to pay any attention to the changes which have been occurring in our economy since the new administration took over a year ago this week.

In several recent speeches the President has forcefully declared his determination to use all the resources of the Federal Government to prevent another depression such as we had in 1929–33. This is encouraging.

But is it necessary to have 15 million or 20 million or 25 million unemployed in this country before the Republican administration takes notice of the fact that something is wrong somewhere?

Perhaps the officials of the administration are not aware that over 100,000 workers walk the streets of the Detroit area today without work, going from $95 or $100 a week paychecks to $27 unemployment compensation checks. It hardly seems conceivable that this information would be unknown to the Secretary of Commerce, or the Secretary of Labor, or the President and his staff of economic advisers.

If that is the case, however, then I am grateful that one of the Washington newspapers has gone out to Detroit and dug up the facts and presented them in a full page of text and charts in the Sunday Star. Perhaps someone in the administration not averse to reading newspapers—at least Washington newspapers—might have seen it.

Mr. Speaker, when the automobile dealers of the country say in desperation that they cannot sell more than 4,700,000 or 5 million cars this year, as against 6 million last year, they are advertising the failure of the Republican Party to maintain prosperity in this country.

Under the Democrats, people actually started to build houses with two-car garages. But where are the cars now?

Request United States Delegation to United Nations and State Department Take Action on Egypt's Arbitrary Restrictions on Israeli Goods Through Suez Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Arab nations, members of the Arab League, are bent upon the destruction of Israel. A series of events confirm this determination. King Saud of Saudi Arabia calls Israel a cancer which must be cut out of the Middle East even at the sacrifice of 10 million Arab lives if necessary. Syria, through the United Nations, seeks to prevent the diversion of the waters of the Jordan for hydroelectric purposes although the area affected lies entirely

within Israeli territory. Jordan refuses, in violation of the armistice terms, to sit down with Israel at a peace table. Iraq proclaims continued war against Israel. Now Egypt tightens up the boycott against goods destined to and from Israel by way of the Suez Canal.

Egypt's action is in violation of the resolution of the United Nations Security Council of September 1, 1951. That resolution stated that Egypt's restrictions on Suez Canal shipments to and from Israel were an abuse of the exercise of the right of visit, search, and seizure on Egypt's part, and that the practice cannot be justified on the grounds of self-defense. It also stated that Egyptian sanctions applied to Israeli shipments through the canal represent unjustifiable interference with the rights of nations to navigate the seas and to trade freely with one another. The resolution firmly called upon Egypt to terminate these restrictions. Heretofore, Egypt proscribed and confiscated what she termed strategic goods bound for Israel, particularly oil. Now she has widened the restrictions to include food and clothing and has actually confiscated vast quantities of these essentials. Though Israel has voiced her protest to the Security Council of the United Nations, there has been no followup by that body.

The United States has a stake in Israel. Our Export and Import Bank has loaned Israel considerable sums of money. We have made grants-in-aid for Israel's economic advancement. Our point 4 experts have helped in technological development. Egypt's action militates against and retards the objectives of our grants-in-aid and our point 4 help. It is pertinent, therefore, to ask what our delegation to the United Nations is doing with reference to this flagrant violation of the Security Council's resolution. I call upon Ambassador Lodge and the other members of our delegation to raise this question before the Security Council. Furthermore, what action has been taken by our State Department?

The United States is included in the terms of a treaty or international convention which goes back to 1888 that guarantees the free use of the Suez Canal by ships of all flags and all nations in time of war and in time of peace. Since 1947 the Egyptian Government has placed an embargo on all traffic on the canal to and from Israeli ports. The United States is one of the largest users of the canal. United States traffic has increased tenfold in the last 15 years. In 1952 we shipped through the canal more than 10 million tons of cargo. The United States, therefore, has a special interest in the integrity of the operation of this canal in accordance with international comity. Today Egypt arbitrarily excludes Israel from access to the canal. Who knows but that the time may come when Egypt would arbitrarily proscribe any other nation, including the United States, from access? This treaty violation is too important for our Government to disregard, and suitable action should be taken by our State Department.

Reversing the Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1954

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's efforts to reverse and correct unsound and dangerous New Deal and Fair Deal trends of the past 20 years are further reflected in his recent messages to Congress on farm and labor policies.

As I have previously remarked in connection with the President's state of the Union message, the inevitable disagreements over detailed methods and the natural impatience because progress is not always as rapid as desired, must not obscure the all-important fact that the Republican administration is dedicated to cleaning up the unholy mess it inherited.

The difficulties and complexities involved in working out the farm problem underscore the fact that it is a great deal easier for a patient to start the dope habit than it is to stop that habit.

Without overworking the analogy, there are certain striking parallels between attempts to correct problems incident to the economic law of supply and demand through price supports and other legislative devices and atempts to ease a patient through a period of severe pain and shock by use of opiates.

In either case the aid which is given is basically artificial. In either case it undoubtedly is sometimes necessary to resort to such treatment. In either case expert application of the artificial aid is required if the cure is not to create more disastrous problems than it corrects. In either case there is the ever-present danger that the fine line between a necessary, temporary aid and a deadly habit will be crossed. In either case the problem of getting the patient off the habit is a difficult and delicate one and, if carried out too abruptly, may also be disastrous.

Perhaps the more telling point of comparison is that administration of narcotics is always disastrous when it falls into the hands of the quacks and the unscrupulous. And that, of course, is precisely what happened under the New Deal and Fair Deal when the price supports and other farm measures were openly and deliberately used to control votes and to sustain the political power of the Roosevelt-Truman administrations.

The most hopeful aspect of the Eisenhower-Benson farm policy is the obvious determination not only to avoid political exploitation of price supports but to make the transition from artificial aids to a sound and healthy free economy as rapidly as can be done with safety. It is an important gain that the administration recognizes and seeks to offset the evils of the economic "dope habit."

The keynote of Mr. Eisenhower's labor message is his determination to strengthen the law's safeguards of the public interest, including the rank and file membership of organized labor itself. This determination is reflected in his secret strike vote proposal, his advocacy of higher standards of regulation for union welfare funds and his insistence that the authority of the States to deal with labor dispute emergencies be clarified and strengthened. The President displays a regard for the public interest in making these recommendations and, in view of the noisy opposition which can be expected from some quarters, he also displays a type of courage which has been lacking in the White House for many years.

Meeting the Increasing Burden of Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in his message to the Congress today, the President rightfully points out that we must take action on the rising costs of medical care. A long-term illness today represents a financial catastrophe to the average American family. Heart disease, cancer, tuberculosis, arthritis, rheumatism, polio, blindness, diabetes, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, muscular dsytrophy, and like diseases represent a crippling burden, even where the best in medical care is available.

With this problem, one of the most serious and important facing our people today, your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce properly has been concerned. We have been trying to see just what might be done about it.

Last October, during the recess of the Congress, this committee conducted hearings in which it received extensive testimony on the present state of research into the causes and control of some of these principal scourges of mankind. The committee had the unstinted and cordial cooperation of outstanding men and women who had devoted their lives to research in the fields of these major diseases, in the committee's effort to find out just where we are in knowing what the causes might be, in preventing or curing the disease, in mitigating its effects, and what further might be done to bring successful culmination to this research.

It is obvious that in many of these fields we do not yet know how we may provide a complete cure, let alone in others know just what we are fighting. On the other hand research activities have produced marvelous results in the prevention and treatment of some of them, and we may be well along the road to a solution in some.

Yet the very fact that we are now able to treat many of these diseases and prolong human lives has resulted in new problems of an economic nature. Extended hospitalization and medical attention prove exceedingly costly, and such costs are mounting astronomically.

While society makes some provision for the very poor to be taken care of, if they require extended hospitalization and medical treatment, and while the very rich are able to take care of themselves in such regard, the large majority of our people does not appear to be protected adequately from the high cost resulting from extended serious illness.

Many plans are in existence in this country which seek to give protection against hospital and medical expenses. Last fall, and again starting the first of last week, this committee has inquired into how extensive the protection afforded by this coverage may be. The committee likewise has had considered plans which are in existence abroad by a survey conducted during the recess of the Congress.

We are concerned with the cost of the protection given by these various plans, and more especially with whether this protection extends to major or catastrophic medical and hospital expenses. We have been interested in the arrangements under these plans which have been made with hospitals and physicians, the experience which has been gained under these plans, the difficulties which have been encountered, and suggestions arising from their operation. Out of such study the committee has hoped to learn of ways and means by which voluntary protection can be improved and broadened.

There are numerous approaches which may be made to the problem of providing protection against such major illness. Some of these approaches, of course, are alternatives. But so significant and far-reaching is this problem that it is probable that it must be attacked on several fronts.

One of these is contained in the bill which I have introduced today, which has been drafted by the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education, under the leadership of its Secretary, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, to meet part of the program advanced by the President in his message today on health.

This has to do with the broadening of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, so as to provide for the construction of facilities to take care of the chronically ill, either through special hospitals, supervised nursing and convalescent homes, or rehabilitation facilities for the disabled. In addition, provision is made for construction of nonprofit diagnostic or treatment centers for ambulatory patients, so that greater help is given in getting at these diseases at their start. The importance of facilities of these types goes without saying, for it is not necessary that these patients all be treated in general hospitals which are more costly to build, and it is self-evident that we do not now have enough facilities to give proper care.

Other approaches to the problem of long-term illness are contained in the 4 bills which I introduced 10 days ago, and more will be presented in bills which I will introduce in the future on behalf of the administration.

To assist in expanding of hospital facilities, clinical and diagnostic centers, and the like, I introduced bills which would provide in one case for loans, and in the other for Government guaranty of private loans, made to associations offering prepaid health-service programs.

To assist in stimulating voluntary health protection through prepaid health plans, I have introduced a bill which would permit an individual to deduct up to $100 payments made to such plans as expenses in the computation of his income tax, in addition to the medical expense deductions now authorized by law.

Also to assist in stimulating a broader coverage in the protection offered by these voluntary prepaid health plans, I have filed a bill which would provide for Government reinsurance of the risk assumed by these plans arising from long, costly treatment.

These and other measures will be considered by our committee in an effort to reach some sort of solution of the problem of catastrophic medical costs. Any solution obviously has with it attendant requirements, such as adequate number of physicians and nurses, strengthening of our medical schools, extension of preventive medical care, intensification and coordination of medical research, and the like.

In this field now, as in the past, the physical and mental health of our people is a subject on which there is no partisan division. From our committee in the past, whether under Republican or Democratic leadership, there has come in the past the Public Health Services Act, the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, the various acts which have created the different research centers on heart, cancer, and other diseases that are now part of the National Institutes of Health, and many others dealing with health matters. Of these we are justly proud.

The program just forwarded by the President on health needs of the Nation, therefore, will receive every consideration at an early day.

What Is United States Delegation to United Nations Doing To Bring Jordan to Terms as in Peace With Israel?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, noting the amazing swiftness with which the United Nations passed resolutions of condemnation against Israel over the Kibya incident, I seriously question its subsequent delay in instituting immediate peace talks between Israel and Jordan. Such peace talks were urgently requested by Israel under the terms of the charter and article 12 of the Israeli-Jordan armistice agreement. Can it be that the United Nations will admit urgency in the tense Israel-Jordan situation only when it is Israel who is to be called to task?

Many weeks have passed since Israel asked that direct talks be arranged with Jordan to discuss the question of peace. Certainly this is a move toward relieving the present impasse. On January 11 the Jordanian Ambassador, Abdul M. Rafai, meeting with Secretary of State Dulles, indicated that Jordan rejects any idea of a conference with Israel on peace talks. The duty of the Security Council, therefore, should be clear. First, it must demand a peace conference under the armistice agreement. Second, should Jordan refuse, a resolution of condemnation would be in order. Third, if Jordan continues its intransigent attitude, sanctions should be invoked.

The United Nations must not evade its responsibility in seeking a peaceful solution to this conflict. Evasion would bring a loss of confidence in the United Nations as an instrument of peace.

What is the position of the United States delegation? It took the lead in offering a resolution of condemnation over the Kibya incident, without making mention of provocation. Why is it so silent now? I believe it is incumbent upon our delegation under Ambassador Lodge to demand immediately that the Security Council act to bring Jordan to terms.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Master of mankind, wilt Thou forgive our feverish ways, our petulant impatience, our lack of perspective. As now, closing our ears to the strife of tongues, we pause in the silence of this dedicated moment, may we listen, not to what the hour with all its din and clamor is saying, but to the more potent voice of the long years.

We bow humbly, mindful of our woeful insufficiency in this hour of the world's poignant need. In a shaken world may we feel firmly beneath our feet the things that cannot be shaken. May that solid rock of spiritual verities give us a faith that will not shrink, though pressed by every foe; for Thine, O Lord, is the greatness and the power and the glory and the majesty and the victory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 18, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its

clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2163. An act for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg;

H. R. 2876. An act for the relief of Leo F. Pinder;

H. R. 2913. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain lands to Harold K. Butson;

H. R. 3306. An act to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen;

H. R. 3573. An act for the relief of the estate of Anna I. R. Wells, deceased, and others;

H. R. 4961. An act for the relief of Mrs. James J. O'Rourke;

H. R. 5529. An act to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., the most important historic properties relating to the battles of Manassas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5861. An act to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government;

H. R. 5862. An act to authorize the Panama Canal Company to transfer the Canal Zone Corrosion Laboratory to the Department of the Navy; and

H. R. 6186. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant a preference right to users of withdrawn public lands for grazing purposes when the lands are restored from the withdrawal.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Transit Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate on January 19, 20, 21, and 22.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Case	Flanders
Anderson	Chavez	Frear
Barrett	Clements	Fulbright
Beall	Cooper	George
Bennett	Cordon	Gillette
Bricker	Daniel	Goldwater
Bush	Dirksen	Gore
Burke	Douglas	Green
Butler, Md.	Duff	Hayden
Butler, Nebr.	Dworshak	Hendrickson
Byrd	Ellender	Hennings
Carlson	Ferguson	Hickenlooper
Hill	Lennon	Robertson
Hoey	Long	Russell
Holland	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Humphrey	Malone	Schoeppel
Hunt	Mansfield	Smathers
Ives	Martin	Smith, Maine
Jackson	McCarran	Smith, N. J.
Jenner	McCarthy	Sparkman
Johnson, Colo.	McClellan	Stennis
Johnson, Tex.	Millikin	Symington
Johnston, S. C.	Monroney	Thye
Kefauver	Morse	Upton
Kennedy	Mundt	Watkins
Kerr	Murray	Welker
Kilgore	Neely	Wiley
Knowland	Pastore	Williams
Kuchel	Payne	Young
Langer	Potter	
Lehman	Purtell	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the number of officers above the rank of major of the Army and Air Force or lieutenant commander of the Navy, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding January 15, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY VESSELS IN THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels in the Coast Guard service, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that System, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on disposals of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER PROPERTY OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians, located in the State of Oregon, and the individual members thereof (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes and bands of Indians located in western Oregon, and the individual members thereof (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO INCREASED PENALTIES FOR CONCEALING CERTAIN PERSONS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1071 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the concealing of persons from arrest, so as to increase the penalties therein provided (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the executive officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that committee, for the period January 1 through December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal-power project, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 858).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HILL, and Mr. IVES):

S. 2758. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. IVES):

S. 2759. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to promote and assist the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and otherwise improve the provisions of that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 2760. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2761. A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Hermiston and West Extension Irrigation Districts, Oregon, and to authorize their execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2762. A bill to prohibit the payment of compensation and Government retirement benefits to officers or employees or former officers or employees of the Government who have refused on grounds of self-incrimination to give testimony before congressional committees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. IVES, Mr. FREAR, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. CASE):

S. 2763. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 2764. A bill for the relief of Alfred Peter Pueizl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland (for Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 2765. A bill to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 2766. A bill to amend section 7 (d) of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WELKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2767. A bill for the relief of Charalampos E. Gabrielides (Harry E. Gabrielides);

S. 2768. A bill for the relief of Lydia Tischler; and

S. 2769. A bill for the relief of Nicole Goldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act popularly known as the Hill-Burton Act. This bill proposes to incorporate into legislation one of the major portions of the recommendations contained in the President's message on health. I have introduced this bill as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare after consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in order that what may be called an administration bill may be immediately before the Congress and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It should be noted that the President's message on health contains a number of recommendations in addition to those incorporated in the bill which I have introduced. I shall offer additional measures to carry forward into legislative form the remaining recommendations contained in the President's health message.

It is my purpose to request the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to consider those aspects of the President's recommendations in regard to health as fall within its purview at the earliest possible moment. It is my hope that the bill which I have introduced may be passed promptly without waiting for legislative action on the other aspects of the President's message.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] requests that he be included as a sponsor of the bill. I invite other Members of the Senate who may wish to become sponsors so to indicate. I am offering these measures as administration measures on behalf of my committee.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] also advises me that he would like to become a sponsor of the bill.

For the information of Senators and the public, let me add that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] has been appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have asked him to proceed as rapidly as possible with the scheduling of hearings for the consideration of this proposed legislation.

The bill (S. 2758) to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HILL, and Mr. IVES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have had prepared a summary of the bill which I have just introduced. I request unanimous consent that this summary be incorporated into the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE BILL INCORPORATING THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

IN GENERAL

The bill provides for grants to States to survey their needs for the construction of diagnostic or treatment centers, chronic-disease hospitals, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes, and also provides for grants to States to assist public and nonprofit agencies in the construction of such facilities.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

The bill authorizes $2 million for State surveys, and a total of $60 million annually for construction grants, including $20 million for nonprofit, diagnostic, or treatment centers, $20 million for nonprofit chronic-disease hospitals, $10 million for nonprofit rehabilitation facilities, and $10 million for nonprofit nursing homes. These authorizations are in addition to those already provided in the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. The authorization for construction grants are limited to the fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957 to coincide with the duration of the authorizations now in the act.

SURVEY GRANTS

Sums appropriated pursuant to the $2 million authorization for survey grants would be allotted to the States on a population basis with a minimum allotment per State of $25,000. To qualify for their allotments States would be required to submit applications in which they undertake to survey their needs for the four types of facilities and develop programs for meeting these needs. The survey money would be matched dollar for dollar by the States. These grants become available to the States as soon as appropriations are made after enactment of the bill.

ALLOTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

The formula for allotment of construction grants is the same as that now included in the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, being one that takes into account both the relative populations of the States and their relative fiscal resources as reflected by per capita incomes. The minimum allotment to each State in the case of grants for diagnostic or treatment centers and chronic-disease hospitals would be $100,000, and in the case of rehabilitation facilities and nursing homes, $50,000.

MATCHING OF CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

All construction projects approved under the new program would have to be matched by the public or other nonprofit agency sponsoring the project. The Federal share in the cost of construction would vary between 50 percent in high-income States and 66⅔ percent in low-income States.

PROJECT APPROVAL

To be approved, construction projects would have to be submitted in accordance with the same procedures and comply with the same conditions as those which are now prescribed for hospital-construction projects under the present act. These procedures have evolved out of experience in administering the original program.

As under the existing act all projects must be approved and recommended by the State agency as in accord with the approved State plan.

ADMINISTRATION

The administrative setup and general procedures under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act are preserved. The act would be administered through the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Regulations would be issued by the Surgeon General subject to the approval both of the Federal Hospital Council and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. No change in the composition of the Federal Hospital Council is provided for. However, the Secretary's approval is required, as well as the Surgeon General's on all projects for rehabilitation facilities.

Likewise no change in State administration is contemplated except that the State agency must include a rehabilitation person on its advisory council or, in the absence of such a person, provide for consultation with rehabilitation organizations and agencies with respect to the survey of the need for, and the construction of, rehabilitation facilities.

AMENDMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have another bill under the same category, which I now introduce for appropriate reference. It is a bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. This bill proposes to incorporate into legislation another of the basic recommendations contained in the President's message on health. As in the case of the bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, which I previously introduced, I have introduced this bill as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare after consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in order that an administration bill may be immediately before the Senate and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It is my purpose to request the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to consider the President's recommendation in regard to amendments in our vocational rehabilitation legislation without delay. I hope the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will be able to report this bill without delay and that it can thereafter receive prompt action by the Senate.

If any Members of the Senate wish to be identified with the measure I invite them to so indicate and to have their names added as cosponsors.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] advises me he wishes his name added as a cosponsor of the bill. I am pleased to have him do so.

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and the public, I wish to say that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] has been appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and I have asked him to proceed as rapidly as possible in the scheduling of hearings and consideration of this proposed legislation.

I have had prepared a summary statement of the contents of the bill which I have just introduced. I request unanimous consent that this statement be incorporated in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2759) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and otherwise improve the provisions of that act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. IVES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The summary is as follows:

SUMMARY OF BILL INCORPORATING THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REHABILITATION OF THE DISABLED

IN GENERAL

The bill would substitute for the existing Vocational Rehabilitation Act a new act authorizing appropriations for the following three types of grants:

1. Grants to assist States generally in meeting the costs of their rehabilitation programs.

2. Grants to assist States in initiating extensions of, and improvements in, their rehabilitation programs.

3. Grants to assist in meeting the costs of projects directed toward the solution of rehabilitation problems of regional or national significance, including temporary assistance to States to help them commence a substantial nationwide expansion in their rehabilitation programs.

The amount of Federal funds to be available for each of the above three types of grants would be specified in annual appropriation acts. The types of rehabilitation services which could be provided by States with the aid of these grants would be broadened to include, among other things, the establishment, and initial equipment, of rehabilitation facilities and sheltered workshops for the disabled, not, however, involving major new construction.

GENERAL GRANTS

The formula for determining each State's allotment for the first type of grant would be the same as that used in the hospital survey and construction (Hill-Burton) provisions of the Public Health Service Act, which take into account both the relative populations of the States and their relative fiscal resources as measured by State per capita incomes. There would, however, be a minimum allotment of $50,000. From its allotment, each State would receive payments equal to a percentage of the cost of vocational rehabilitation services under its approved State plan, the percentage varying inversely with the State's relative per capita income between a maximum of 66⅔ and a minimum of 33⅓ percent.

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

The formula for determining each State's allotment for extension and improvement purposes would be based on relative State populations with a minimum allotment of $5,000. From its allotment, a State could receive, over a 6-year period, varying proportions of the cost of approved projects (included in its approved State plan) for extension and improvement of its rehabilitation services to the disabled—75 percent of the cost for the first 2 years, 50 percent for the next 2, and 25 percent for the last 2.

SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS

These grants would be made on a project basis to States and to public and nonprofit agencies or organizations. They would be available for paying part of the cost of carrying out special projects which hold unique promise of contributing to the solution of rehabilitation problems common to all or several States, or of meeting rehabilitation problems of national significance or concern.

EXPANSION OF REHABILITATION SERVICES

During the fiscal years 1955 and 1956 special project grants would be available for helping the States to plan, prepare for, and initiate a substantial expansion in their vocational rehabilitation programs. In the latter year and in the next few years substantially increased Federal appropriations for extension and improvement grants and for general grants would help and encourage the States to continue, and to assume a greater share of the costs, of the planned expansion of their rehabilitation programs.

STATE PLANS

Payments from allotments for the first type of grant (for general support of rehabilitation services) would be conditioned upon submission of a plan by the responsible State agency or agencies, which meets requirements prescribed in the new act.

ADMINISTRATION

Federal administrative authority would be vested, as at present, in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare subject to her delegation.

State administration would be by the State agency responsible for vocational education or for vocational rehabilitation, at the option of the State. Any State with a separate agency for the blind could elect to have rehabilitation services for the blind administered by this agency, and in this case the State's allotments would be divided between it and the agency administering the rest of the State program.

TRANSITION PROVISIONS

In order to provide States an opportunity to adjust their finances to the new allotment and matching formulas, provision would be made to limit to 10 percent any decrease in allotments which any State would receive in any one year by virtue of the formula change. Also, there would be provision for gradual adjustment over a 2-year period from the present Federal-State matching ratios to those provided for in the new act, and States would be given a reasonable period otherwise to adjust their State programs to the new provisions.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENTS

These amendments to the existing Vocational Rehabilitation Act would become effective July 1, 1954.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION OR RETIREMENT BENEFITS TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES AND FORMER EMPLOYEES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the payment of compensation or Government retirement benefits to officers or employees, or former officers or employees, of the Government who have refused on the ground of self-incrimination to give testimony before a congressional committee. I do so because during the congressional recess President Eisenhower very rightfully announced that it would be the executive policy from then on to remove summarily from the Federal payroll any employee who refuses to testify before any congressional committee on the ground of self-incrimination based on the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Shortly thereafter a distinguished lawyer of my State, Mr. John Murphy, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., called to my attention the fact that such a policy would leave congressional committees in the unenviable position of paying rather liberal retirement benefits to persons who, on the ground of self-incrimination under the fifth amendment, had indicated an unwillingness to cooperate with congressional committees. A great many public schools, including the public schools of New York City, and most of the outstanding colleges, have taken the position that persons who hide behind the fifth amendment are unfit to teach in the institutions of this country.

I commend the bill to the prompt attention of the committee to which it will be referred, and call attention to the fact that there is pending before a committee a bill which would deny to Alger Hiss Government retirement benefits when he is liberated from the Federal penitentiary next November. It seems to me that perjurers and those who conceal

knowledge of treason and subversion should not enjoy retirement benefits from the American Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2762) to prohibit the payment of compensation and Government retirement benefits to officers or employees or former officers or employees of the Government who have refused on grounds of self-incrimination to give testimony before congressional committees, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT—AMENDMENT RELATING TO OIL FOR EDUCATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of 33 of my colleagues and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act so as to dedicate the income from the Nation's undersea oil and gas deposits of the outer Continental Shelf for use in promoting the national defense and national security through grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

Sponsoring the bill with me are the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The bill embodies the principles of the oil-for-education amendment, as it is generally known, which the Senate wisely adopted at the last session and made a part of the Senate bill providing for the development of the outer Continental Shelf.

Senators will recall that in the closing days of the session the House conferees rejected the amendment without a vote by the membership of the House.

Our education system today faces a severe crisis.

The measures which we have taken to meet the crisis are not adequate.

Enrollment records have been broken for the eighth straight year. A veritable tidal wave of 6-year-olds—4,000,000 strong—has this year completely swamped the first grade. Elementary schools have been hit by wave after wave from our huge war and post-war baby crop. This year the elementary grades are filled to overflowing, and the war babies are now overrunning the lower grades of high school. This situation will continue for at least another 6 years, as 1953 produced another record crop of babies.

Thousands of communities find themselves unable financially to cope with the rising tide of enrollments. Three out of five classrooms are so overcrowded as to make effective teaching almost impossible. More children are being crowded into makeshift facilities—barracks, hallways, abandoned store buildings, attics, and basements. Every fifth child in the Nation is going to school in a firetrap.

Surveys of school building needs made by the United States Office of Education and by the National Education Association reveal that if we continue to fully utilize our present old, inadequate, and poorly-equipped buildings, we still need at once more than $5 billion in new construction to relieve the overcrowded conditions in the schools today.

Another $5 billion is needed for the repair, remodeling, and replacement of obsolete and unsafe structures. Another $10 billion must be spent on school construction during the next 6 years if we are to provide adequately for the increased enrollments that will come during these years.

Twenty billion dollars is needed for school buildings alone. Yet, the shortage of teachers—the central figures in the education process—has grown steadily worse. Teachers are still being driven out of the classrooms—unable to live on their low pay. More than 40,000 additional teachers are needed at once merely to relieve overcrowded classrooms.

Our shocking neglect of teachers—those to whom parents look for the building of the minds and characters of their children—is shown by the fact that the teachers are today the lowest paid of all employed groups in America. The only way we shall be able to meet the unprecedented demand for teachers is to halt the alarming drift away from the teaching profession and train more teachers. This means that we will have to stop regarding teaching as a second-class or, should we say, a last-class profession, and pay our teachers adequately.

We are facing a critical situation in the field of higher education.

Nearly all our 1,900 institutions of higher learning are in financial trouble, whether they are State institutions, land-grant colleges, the large private universities, or the small colleges. Recent surveys show that 1 out of every 3 of our liberal arts colleges is operating in the red at a time when the Nation's future strength and security demands the training of more scientific and professional manpower—more scientists, more chemists, more physicists, more engineers, more doctors, more professional and business leaders, more agriculturists, and more skilled workers.

We do not suggest that the oil-for-education proposal will prove a cure-all for every ill and every need that vexes our educational institutions, but we do feel that the revenues which will eventuate from the development of the resources of the outer Continental Shelf can contribute importantly to meeting the needs of American education and to building the future strength and security of our Nation. We believe, Mr. President, that the bill should pass, in line with our historic policy set in the beginning of the Nation in reference to the dedication of public lands for educational purposes.

We therefore urge the Senate to pass the bill promptly, that the House may feel the inspiration of its leadership, and likewise, seize the opportunity to carry on the great American tradition of providing for the education of our children, of strengthening the well-springs of our democracy, of following the policy established by the Founding Fathers of dedicating great natural resources for the development of our precious human resources, the children of the Nation, and of building America strong that we may keep America free.

The bill (S. 2763) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 7 (d) of the Internal Security Act of 1950. This proposed legislation is in accordance with a recommendation made by a task force of the Internal Security Subcommittee after having held extensive hearings regarding Communist underground printing facilities and illegal propaganda. The task force, of which I have the pleasure of being chairman, recommended that the Internal Security Act of 1950, Public Law 831 of the 81st Congress, be amended so as to require registration with the Attorney General by any organization which is required to register under said act of all equipment for the printing or publication of any printed matter. The hearings before my task force clearly pointed out the necessity for legislation of this kind.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred;

and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2766) to amend section 7 (d) of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, introduced by Mr. WELKER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 (d) of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended (50 U. S. C. 786 (d)), is amended by adding after paragraph (5) the following:

"(6) a listing, in such form and detail as the Attorney General shall by regulation prescribe, of all printing presses and machines including but not limited to rotary presses, flat bed cylinder presses, platen presses, lithographs, offsets, photo-offsets, mimeograph machines, multigraph machines, multilith machines, duplicating machines, ditto machines, linotype machines, intertype machines, monotype machines, and all other types of printing presses, typesetting machines or any mechanical devices used or intended to be used, or capable of being used to produce or publish printed matter or material, which are in the possession, custody, ownership or control of the Communist Action or Communist Front organization or its officers, members, affiliates, associates, group, or groups in which the Communist Action or Communist Front organization, its officers or members have an interest."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION (ANNOTATED)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 3,000 additional copies of the 1953 edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States.

A limited number of copies has been made available for distribution thus far. I am sure, however, that every Senator and Representative has found, as I have found, that there are vast numbers of very worthwhile requests for copies of this edition.

It was my pleasure personally to request compilation of the publication away back during the 80th Congress when I was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am profoundly gratified by the excellence of the finished product, as edited by the distinguished constitutional expert, Prof. Edwin S. Corwin, of Princeton University.

Copies of the Annotated Constitution are of course available through purchase from the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office, at a cost of $6.25 a copy. I know, however, that there are many organizations throughout the land, libraries, schools and colleges, in particular, which are not in a position to purchase a copy, and yet which would deeply appreciate receiving from Representatives and Senators a complimentary copy.

I feel that this would be a splendid investment, because reference to the Annotated Constitution is of course absolutely indispensable, not only for attorneys who can afford to buy their own copies, but also for political scientists, teachers, students, and public officials who want to become more familiar with their Government, but whose budgets for such volumes are either limited, or in some cases, nonexistent. It is my earnest hope, therefore, that the Senate Rules Committee will take appropriate favorable action on this resolution to provide an additional 3,000 copies, 2,200 for the House, and 800 for the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 55), submitted by Mr. WILEY, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed 3,000 additional copies of the Constitution of the United States (annotated) prepared by the Librarian of Congress under authority of Senate Joint Resolution 69, 80th Congress (Public Law 95, approved June 17, 1949), and comprising a revision and extension of Senate Document 232, 74th Congress, of which 2,200 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 800 copies for the use of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SERVING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, I report an original resolution, extending the time for a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia, and I submit a report (No. 859) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 192), reported by Mr. CASE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on the District of Columbia may complete the study and investigation of public transportation serving the District of Columbia, authorized by Senate Resolution 140, 83d Congress, agreed to July 28, 1953, hereby is extended to May 1, 1954.

STUDY OF PROPOSALS TO MODIFY EXISTING INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY ORGANIZATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution amending Senate Resolution 126, 83d Congress, providing for a study of proposals to modify existing international peace and security organizations, and submitted a report (No. 860) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 193), reported by Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, was placed on the Calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) section 2 of Senate Resolution 126, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to on July 28, 1953 (authorizing a complete study of proposals to amend or otherwise modify existing international peace and security organizations, including the United Nations), is amended by striking out the date "January 31, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "February 1, 1955."

(b) Section 3 of such resolution is amended by striking out the date "February 1, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "February 1, 1955."

(c) Section 3 of such resolution is further amended by striking out the figure "$35,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$75,000".

RESOLUTIONS PROVIDING FUNDS FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolutions 172, 181, 187, 188, and 190, dealing with the continuation of funds for certain subcommittees, which were reported yesterday from the Committee on the Judiciary, may be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana?

There being no objection, the following resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 172. Resolution to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States;

S. Res. 181. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. Res. 187. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. Res. 188. Resolution further extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations; and

S. Res. 190. Resolution amending the resolution providing for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States, and increasing the limit of expenditures.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I have been discussing a matter with the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, who did not understand, because I had not advised him in advance, that we had a gentlemen's agreement with the Democratic leadership of the Senate that before resolutions are referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration they shall be on the calendar for at least a day. Because I feel we did have such an agreement with the minority leader, and with the consent of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, with whom we have both discussed the subject, I now ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in referring to the Committee on Rules and Administration Senate Resolutions 172, 181, 187, 188, and 190, be rescinded, and that those resolutions be restored to their places on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEVELOPMENT OF PRIEST RAPIDS SITE, COLUMBIA RIVER, WASH.—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill S. 1793, to provide for the development of the Priest Rapids site on the Columbia River, Wash., under a license issued pursuant to the Federal Power Act, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2163. An act for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg;

H. R. 2876. An act for the relief of Leo F. Pinder;

H. R. 3573. An act for the relief of the estate of Anna I. R. Wells, deceased, and others; and

H. R. 4961. An act for the relief of Mrs. James J. O'Rourke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2913. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain lands to Harold K. Butson;

H. R. 3306. An act to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen;

H. R. 5529. An act to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., the most important historic properties relating to the battles of Manassas, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6186. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant a preference right to users of withdrawn public lands for grazing purposes when the lands are restored from the withdrawal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5862. An act to authorize the Panama Canal Company to transfer the Canal Zone Corrosion Laboratory to the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5861. An act to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government; placed on Calendar.

MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD AND MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMIES

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that I have reappointed the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

I have also reappointed to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LAURENCE BALLARD ROBBINS, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, January 21, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Laurence Ballard Robbins, of Illinois, to be Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

FEDERAL COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Standing Subcommittee on Civil Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 26, 1954, beginning at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, and to continue through Wednesday, the 27th, on Senate bill 1, to establish a Federal Commission on Civil Rights and Privileges; to promote observance of the civil rights of all individuals; and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color, and Senate bill 535, to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee, so that a schedule may be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, as chairman, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

I also desire to give notice that a series of hearings on the same and related subjects will be held following the two hearings which I have announced.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and other Senators on the floor to a unanimous-consent agreement request which I shall send to the desk, so as at least to obtain the consensus of opinion of the Senate as to a time for voting on the St. Lawrence Seaway bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That, beginning at 12 o'clock on Wednesday, January 20, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the bill S. 2150, the so-called St. Lawrence Seaway bill, be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. AIKEN: *Provided*, That if Mr. AIKEN is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some other Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That upon the question of the final passage of the bill, debate shall be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, respectively.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object——

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. First, let me state my reason for objecting; and then I shall withhold my final objection, so as to yield to the Senator from Maryland, if the majority leader does not object to such a course.

I think it is only fair to notify the leadership of the Senate, Mr. President, that, as a matter of policy, at this session of Congress the representative of the Independent Party will not agree to limitation of debate in the Senate. I believe the issues which will be before this session of Congress are so important to the public welfare that, as a matter of general policy, I shall take the position that full debate should be held upon each issue—reserving the right in individual cases, if I am satisfied that there has been full debate, to make an exception to the general policy I now state, namely, the general policy of objecting to all unanimous-consent agreements to limit debate in the Senate, at this session of Congress.

Before I file my objection to this particular proposal, let me say that I understand that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] wishes to make a statement on the subject, which statement might be out of order after I had made my objection. Therefore I reserve the right to make my objection later, and, with the consent of the majority leader, I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say at this point that the only reason the majority leader was suggesting a unanimous-consent agreement was in order that Members of the Senate might be accommodated. Some Senators must be absent on one day, and some on another, for various reasons. The majority leader does not expect to be absent from the Senate. I am perfectly willing to remain here, and, as the debate runs out, ask for a vote on whatever amendment or motion may be pending at the time; and if all debate runs out, a vote on the bill itself.

The bill has been under debate for 1 week. I think I have been as regular in my attendance and attention to the debates as has any other Senator. Many committee meetings are in progress during the course of the debate. It seems to me that certainly there has been no effect to curtail debate in any sense of the word. I have stated that if Senators wish to make additional speeches, in order to accommodate them I shall be prepared to ask for evening sessions, or even a Saturday session.

The reason the proposal is being made at this time is that, after consultation with the minority leadership

and with other Senators on both sides of the aisle who are on one side or the other of this important issue, I understand that, so far as they know, we are at least approaching the point when we may consider fixing a time to vote. If a time cannot be fixed for a vote tomorrow, perhaps a time can be fixed on Thursday, Friday, or Monday. Perhaps we can arrive at a general agreement for setting a date certain, which would be helpful to all Senators. I am perfectly prepared to withdraw my suggestion. I shall be prepared, as majority leader, to call for a vote as the debate is completed on any pending amendment or motion. It may be a little difficult for Senators to make their plans accordingly, but if it is the desire of Senators to proceed without an agreement to vote, I certainly will not quarrel with it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. As the majority leader knows, I have been following the debate very carefully. I feel that to impose a limitation on debate beginning tomorrow at 12 o'clock would not give Members of the Senate who wish to speak on the pending measure time to do so. I think it would be unfortunate to have any vote taken on Thursday or Friday of this week, because many Senators are going to Groton for the launching of the atomic submarine. A number of them will not be back in the city by Friday, and I think it would be most unwise to have a vote at any time on either of those 2 days.

I have made a canvass of Members of the Senate who would like to speak on this issue. I feel that every Member of the Senate who wishes to speak on it can do so by Monday at 3 o'clock. We could then vote, if the Senator from Oregon felt satisfied, as I do, that by that time full debate will have been had, and all views will have been expressed so that we could vote at 3 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, apparently, as a matter of principle, the Senator from Oregon is objecting to any unanimous-consent agreement fixing a time to vote, whether it be today, tomorrow, Thursday, Friday, or Monday. I have no reason to believe that the same objection would not be made, no matter which day might be suggested.

It has been my experience in this body that if a date is fixed too far ahead, the limited attendance, with committee meetings being held, becomes even slimmer, and there is a considerable period of waste time. I assume that all Senators are hopeful that we may expedite the business of the Senate so that some time in July—the optimists think the early part of July, and those who are less optimistic, but perhaps more realistic, think the 31st of July—the Congress may adjourn. Even if we are to get away by the 31st of July, we shall find it necessary to make reasonable use of the time of the Senate.

I should have no objection—even if I did, under the very broad rules of the Senate I would not be able to do anything about it—to modifying the request so that we would start to divide the time on Monday.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If I correctly understood the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, he stated that in a given case he would consent to a limitation of debate if he were satisfied that full opportunity had been afforded to debate the issue, and that it had been fully debated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may also say, for the benefit of Senators, that I have already publicly announced that following this measure we plan to schedule for consideration the very important constitutional amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and a number of other sponsors.

In addition, there has been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations today the Korean Mutual Defense Pact. There will be other legislation of importance which will require considerable discussion. I am only trying, in my way, to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I was trying to convince the Senator from Oregon that this case would fit his pattern. I am convinced that by Monday at 3 o'clock sufficient time will have been given every Member of this body to say anything he wishes to say about the pending legislation. That being the case, I hope the Senator from Oregon will allow the vote to come on Monday at 3 o'clock.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I sought only to be exceedingly fair to my colleagues in the Senate by giving due notice as to what the position of the Independent Party would be in this session of the Congress on the entire question of unanimous-consent agreements to limit debate. As a matter of policy, I am against such agreements. As a matter of general policy, I shall object to them, reserving the right in specific cases, if I am satisfied that the facts justify making an exception to the general policy, to make the exception. However, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not anticipate very many exceptions, if any, during this session. Therefore, I object to any limitation on debate on the issue at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I may say that there will be daily sessions of the Senate during the debate on the pending bill. When the debate runs out I shall expect to ask for a vote on whatever the pending question may be at the time. I have tried to accommodate Senators by endeavoring to see if we could find a date upon which we could all agree, so that every Senator would feel reasonably certain that he would be present when the crucial votes were taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

ENDORSEMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER SEAWAY PROJECT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have before me a letter from Joe M. Baker, Jr., of Mayo, Md., dated January 15, 1954, addressed to the editor of the Washington Evening Star, of which he has sent me a copy. It is a letter in endorsement of the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYO, MD., *January 15, 1954.*

EDITOR, LETTERS TO THE EDITOR,
EVENING STAR,
Star Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It appalls me, as a citizen of Maryland, to see the people who represent me in Congress oppose the St. Lawrence Seaway. This is certainly sectionalism at its worst. Any Marylander who would put the benefit of the entire Nation ahead of his State (and, by the way, ahead of the railroads) would not hesitate to support construction of this vital link between the ocean and the Great Lakes.

Maryland is very fortunate in its representation in Congress. It is for that reason that it is so hard to understand just why Maryland opposes the project on the St. Lawrence River. Are we afraid of the competition which might result from opening the Great Lakes to sea-going traffic? If that is the case, then our entire American system should be legislated against and competition in every sense outlawed.

The St. Lawrence Seaway is inevitable. The question is who will build it? If the railroads and the east coast Senators win their fight in Washington, then the seaway will be built by our Canadian neighbors and we will have had no say in its construction or in its future use. Common sense says we should participate in the project with Canada; national defense demands that we should.

I pray that this session of Congress will result in legislation favorable to the seaway.

Very truly yours,

JOE M. BAKER, JR.

FEASIBILITY REPORT BY ARMY ENGINEERS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] raised some question as to whether the Army engineers had made a feasibility report with reference to the St. Lawrence Seaway. I have had prepared a memorandum by a member of the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which gives some information relative to the situation, which I think will be of interest to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 19, 1954.

MEMORANDUM

To: Senator KNOWLAND.
From: Pat M. Holt.

1. When Senator MALONE asked yesterday if the Army engineers had made a feasibility report on the St. Lawrence Seaway, I understood him to mean if the engineers had reported that the project was feasible. They

have so reported on several occasions, and I so indicated to you.

2. As used by the Army engineers, however, the term "feasibility report" has a special meaning—namely, a report based not only on an engineering study but also on an economic study of the project in question. In this narrow, technical sense, the Army engineers have never made a feasibility report on the St. Lawrence Seaway. They have never been asked to make such a report, primarily because the seaway is an international project. The survey of the economics of the project has been the responsibility of the Department of Commerce. When the Commerce Department's economic survey and the Army's engineering survey were combined, both departments agreed that the project was feasible from both an economic and an engineering point of view, and that it could be made self-liquidating, at interest, over 50 years. This was the conclusion reached in May 1953, by an interagency committee, composed of the Commerce, State, Defense, and Interior Departments, which went into the matter thoroughly and made the report on which the subsequent Cabinet action approving United States participation in the seaway was based.

3. In 1932 General Pillsbury and Colonel Markham, of the Army engineers, appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of the project.

4. On January 10, 1934, the Army engineers, Department of Commerce, Federal Power Commission, and Power Authority of the State of New York reported that—

"The navigation project is comparable in economic value and importance to the Panama Canal. * * * Its completion will unquestionably confer important national benefits and stimulate the future growth and development of the United States." (1946 hearings, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, p. 1076.)

5. In 1941, Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers and member of the United States St. Lawrence Advisory Commission, supported the project before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6. In 1946, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, General Robins characterized the net cost of the seaway as "certainly a modest sum for a country as great as this to invest in such a worthy project."

He declared that even on the basis of increased costs between 1942 and 1946—

"It will not affect the economics of the project. The project will still be sound. The costs could go up 50 percent and it would still be economically sound. * * * "The carrying charges on the basis of the present estimate for navigation are about $8 million a year. That is including interest and amortization at 4.33 percent. The benefits of the savings that would result in transportation costs are in the neighborhood of $18 million or $20 million." (1946 hearings, pp. 168–170.) (It should be noted that these figures were for a bigger project than the one now before the Senate.)

7. Also in 1946, Col. P. A. Feringa, resident member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, declared:

"The ratio of costs to benefits for the navigation project based on the costs given by General Wheeler, and benefits estimated in 1941, is as 1 to 2.25. * * *

"Should we apply the costs prevailing in 1945 as indicated by the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index, but not adjust for an attendant increase in benefits, the navigation costs would be increased 20 percent and the resulting cost benefit ratio would be 1 to 1.87.

"From our studies on the board it usually follows that if the costs increase due to the purchasing value of the dollar decreasing, and if benefits are measured by the same unit, the benefits also increase." (1946 hearings, pp. 970–971.)

8. In 1947, Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, set the ratio of costs to benefits as of 1 to 1.46, and he pointed out—

"Even after the increase in costs, the project is still economically justified. We did not increase the benefits. Benefits normally have increased along with the costs. But we, in order to be conservative, compared the increased costs with the previously estimated benefits without increasing the benefits."

And General Wheeler concluded that—

"The navigation phase of the project is economically sound." (1947 hearings, pp. 388–390.)

General Wheeler added that the Corps of Engineers had gone repeatedly on record in favor of constructing the St. Lawrence project, that there had been no dissension to that recommendation, and that the general reason behind it was that "it is believed to be economically justified."

9. In 1952, Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers, testified—

"The navigation investment cost for remaining work for the two countries combined, including allowance for interest, amortization, maintenance, and operation, will result in average annual economic charges estimated at $20,360,000.

"That sum is amply justified by shipping savings estimated to aggregate over $60 million a year. This gives an indicated benefit-to-cost ratio of $2.95 for the navigation phase. Under the bill before you, the cost of the deepwater works in the St. Lawrence River, United States and Canada, is to be made self-liquidating through application of shipping tolls.

"The annual economic charges on that phase of the development for a 27-foot channel for the United States and Canada combined are estimated to total $16,712,000. In comparison, the Commerce Department indicates toll revenues to aggregate at least $36,500,000 a year. * * *

"From extended study * * * I am convinced that the project is sound in engineering and economically justified as a peacetime water resource development. * * *

"I think that this project, both the navigation and the power project, would be a self-liquidating project, and I believe that under those circumstances, it is justified. * * *

"Comparison of the anticipated toll revenue * * * with annual economic charges * * * demonstrates that the navigation facilities on the St. Lawrence can be made self-liquidating." (1952 hearings, pp. 491–525.)

10. In 1953, Brig. Gen. Bernard L. Robinson, Deputy Chief of Engineers, testified—

"With seaway traffic of the minimum order reported by the Commerce Department in its 1951 testimony, shipping savings over a 27-foot through waterway, based upon a study by my staff, are indicated to aggregate over $60 million yearly. Substantial additional savings would accrue to purely interlake traffic. Since the savings of $60 million are far in excess of the carrying charges of either $18,639,000 or $24,525,000, there is clear indication of economic feasibility of the overall navigation phase, Duluth to Montreal. Further, a development from Lake Erie to Montreal only would, in my opinion, be of equal or greater economic feasibility, in view of the origins and destinations of prospective traffic and the present degree of improvement of the upper lakes channels. * * *

"Annual economic charges for the navigation phase, Lake Erie to Montreal, are estimated at $14,612,000 under S. 589. * * * The Commerce Department heretofore has indicated that toll revenue of at least $36 million may be expected from its minimum reported traffic of 57 million tons. In view of that wide differential between charges and toll revenue, there is every prospect that the stated deep-water works can be made self-liquidating. * * *

"Even with traffic volume of the order of 44 million tons, which is within the capacity of single locks, my conclusions regarding economic justification and self-liquidation indicated above remain unchanged." (1953 hearings, p. 45.)

12. The Corps of Engineers' most extensive study of the International Rapids section was made pursuant to Executive Order 8568, October 16, 1940, which directed (1) preliminary investigations of the potential dam site by means of core borings, test pits, soil analyses, and so forth; (2) preliminary surveys of lands necessary for such development, investigation of title to such lands; and (3) preparation of preliminary plans and specifications.

In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, February 20, 1946, Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, described how the Corps of Engineers carried out that assignment:

"The St. Lawrence River district opened its headquarters at Massena, N. Y., on November 4, 1940, and was abolished on May 1, 1942. The records and files have been transferred to the New York district at New York City.

"The district engineer employed Sprague and Henwood for subsurface exploratory work and Harza Engineering Co. to make designs and prepare plans and specifications for powerhouse and necessary equipment. A staff of vital engineering department employees was obtained which made studies, prepared designs, plans, specifications, and so forth, so that the work could be initiated quickly subsequent to authorization. Surface and subsurface explorations were carried out to provide detailed information regarding foundation conditions, not only at the sites tentatively selected but at numerous alternate sites, in order that the best location could be selected.

"Throughout the work it was the aim of the district engineer to perfect the plans, complete the designs, and prepare contract drawings and specifications so that the work could be entered into with the least possible delay * * *.

"As an indication of the type of work engaged in by the St. Lawrence River district, it can be stated that exploratory investigations were conducted at the sites of proposed channels, cutoffs, and structures to determine the nature and condition of the overburden and bedrock. Explorations also were conducted to locate suitable sources of materials for use as concrete aggregate, highway embankments, etc. These operations consisted of extensive geological reconnaissance, drilling in both overburden and bedrock, the determination of bedrock elevation, the excavation of test pits, and drilling of holes. Extensive drilling operations were carried out under contract by Sprague & Henwood, Inc., of Scranton, Pa., which company, for example, drilled in bedrock 10,500 lineal feet.

"To insure proper hydraulic conditions both for power and navigation, a model study has been made at the Vicksburg laboratory of the Galop Island section. That model study has been completed, and it resulted in a change in the plan, saving several thousands of dollars." (1946 hearings, p. 165.)

The district engineer submitted a report in 50 volumes, which was reviewed by a civilian engineering board, including outside consultants.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the purpose of acting on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Preston Hotchkis, of California, to be the representative of the United States on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

Abbott McConnell Washburn, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency;

Mrs. Mildred C. Ahlgren, of Indiana, and sundry other persons, to be members of the Public Advisory Board, Foreign Operations Administration;

Webster Bray Todd, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Morris Wolf, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel, Foreign Operations Administration, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be economic coordinator (special representative for Korea), to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Chile;

Wiley T. Buchanan, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg;

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Panama;

Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Indonesia;

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Costa Rica;

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Czechoslovakia;

H. Freeman Matthews, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of the Netherlands;

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay;

John E. Peurifoy, of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Guatemala;

Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Columbia; and

George Wadsworth, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Yemen.

By Mr. DUFF, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Harmar D. Denny, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1959, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably the following nominations, with the recommendation that they be confirmed:

Robert E. Lee, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the term of 7 years from July 1, 1953, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Lothair Teetor, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Lewis W. Douglas, of Arizona, Alfred M. Eberle, of South Dakota, Joseph J. George, of Georgia, Capt. Howard T. Orville, United States Navy, retired, of Maryland, and Kenneth C. Spengler, of Massachusetts, to be members of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control;

Rear Adm. Alfred C. Richmond, to be Assistant Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral; and

Glenn W. Moore, to be commander, Steven L. Hollis, Jr., to be lieutenant, John B. Watkins, Jr., Jack E. Guth, James D. Hodges, Bruce E. Greene, and Robert E. Williams, to be lieutenants (junior grade), in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state in order the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The Chief Clerk read the name of James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Alice K. Leopold, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Samuel Miller Brownell, of Connecticut, to be Commissioner of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence Seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] on pages 6, 12, and 13 of the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to include in the body of the RECORD a few of the many communications which I have received from West Virginia in regard to the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway legislation.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *January 14, 1954.*

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate:

On behalf of members of district 17, I wish to enter a strong protest to St. Lawrence Seaway legislation now before Senate. U. M. W. of A. finds this legislation just as objectionable under Republican sponsorship as under Democrats. You are urged to exert all possible influence in preventing its passage.

WILLIAM BLIZZARD,
President, District 17, U. M. W. of A.

LOGAN, W. VA., *January 14, 1954.*

HARLEY M. KILGORE:

We, Local Union 9447, located at Verdunville, W. Va., do ask that you oppose the St. Lawrence Seaway situation pending now in the Senate.

LOCAL UNION 9447.

WILLIAMSON, W. VA., *January 14, 1954.*

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building:

Urge you vote and use your influence to defeat the St. Lawrence Seaway program.

CHARLES KISER,
GUS ALLISON,
Representatives, District 17, U. M. W. of A.

WELCH, W. VA., *January 14, 1954.*

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Building:

We vigorously protest the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation and strongly urge your vote in opposition thereto.

OFFICERS AND MEMBERSHIP OF LOCAL UNION 5997, WELCH, W. VA.

WELCH, W. VA., *January 14, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Building:
We vigorously protest the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation and strongly urge your vote in opposition thereto.
OFFICERS AND MEMBERSHIP OF LOCAL UNION 6143, MAITLAND, W. VA.

AMHERSTDALE, W. VA., *January 14, 1954.*
Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE.
DEAR SIR: Local Union 5849, Amherstdale, W. Va., is against the passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway proposal. Urge you to do all you can against this proposal.
J. H. VANNATTER,
President, Local Union 5849.

WELCH, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building:
We vigorously protest the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation and strongly urge your vote in opposition thereto.
OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF LOCAL UNION 5960, CARETTA, W. VA.

HOLDEN, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building.
DEAR SIR: This local is requesting that you use your good office and influence to fight the St. Lawrence Seaway bill that will come up for a vote Monday, January 18, 1954. We feel that this bill, if passed, will be helpful to the few and harmful for many thousands. If you can see your way clear in helping this local and many thousands of other working people by voting against this bill we will appreciate your effort very much.
Yours truly,
HUBERT MUNCY,
President.
C. W. DAVIS,
Vice President.
OTIS HOUSTON,
Recording Secretary.

NORTH FORK, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. H. M. KILGORE,
Senate Building:
We vigorously protest the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation and strongly urge you vote in opposition thereto. Thanks.
OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF LOCAL UNION NO. 6163, ALGOMA, W. VA.

LOGAN, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:
Local union 8217 urges you to use your power and influence to defeat the proposal pending before Senate of the St. Lawrence Seaway. We feel this will be harmful to the coal miners of this Nation.
DENNIE MONTGOMERY,
President.
JOE ELLIS, *Secretary.*

LOGAN, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:
Local Union 5970, UMWA, urges you to use your power and influence against the bill now pending before the Senate on the St. Lawrence Seaway. We feel this will be harmful to the coal miners of this country.
RAYMOND B. HATFIELD,
President.
MANUEL MENDEZ, *Secretary.*

BELLAIRE, OHIO, *January 15, 1954.*
Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building:
The St. Lawrence Seaway legislation is now before the Senate and the mine workers oppose this bill as unnecessary. Its support by this administration is a direct contradiction of their much publicized economy program. Hundreds of worthwhile projects have been dropped, our national-defense program has been slashed, thousands of workers laid off by this administration in the name of economy. Canada has expressed their willingness to build the seaway and we suggest that Congress let Canada do it. In behalf of the mine workers of the northern panhandle of West Virginia, I cannot overemphasize the necessity of your opposition to this bill.
ADOLF PACIFICO,
President, District No. 6, UMW of A.

LOGAN, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Local Union 5850, UMWA, urges you to use your power and influence to defeat the St. Lawrence Seaway proposal now pending. We feel this will be detrimental to all coal miners of this Nation.
C. F. BAISEN,
President.
WODEY STREPES,
Secretary.

BEECHBOTTOM, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Local Union No. 6362, United Mine Workers of America, composed of 600 members, strongly urge you to actively oppose passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation. We feel passage of the bill would result in unnecessary waste of taxpayers' money and would add to the already long list of unemployed in our country.
MICHAEL G. GRETCHEN,
President, United Mine Workers of America, Local Union No. 6362, Windsor Heights, W. Va.

MONTGOMERY, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The officers and members of Local No. 8843 wish to protest to St. Lawrence Seaway legislation now before Senate. United Mine Workers of America finds this legislation just as objectionable under Republican sponsorship as under Democrats. You are to exert all possible influence in defeating passage of this legislation.
HERMAN LEE MYERS,
President, Local Union No. 8843, District 17, United Mine Workers of America.

WELCH, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We vigorously protest the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation and beseech you to vote against it.
OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF LOCAL UNION NO. 6023, HAVACO, W. VA.

MONTGOMERY, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The officers and members of Local No. 6403 wish to protest to St. Lawrence Seaway legislation now before Senate. United Mine Workers of America finds this legislation just as objectionable under Republican sponsorship as under Democrats. You are to exert all possible influence in defeating passage of this legislation.
LOCAL UNION NO. 6403, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, BURNWELL, W. VA.

JENKIN JONES, W. VA., *January 16, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We vigorously protest the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation and strongly urge you to vote against it.
OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF LOCAL UNION No. 6193.

WHEELING, W. VA., *January 16, 1954.*
Senator KILGORE:
In behalf of the 180 members of United Mine Workers of America Local 8169 we urge you to actively oppose the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation now before you. Your opposition of utmost importance to our Nation and particularly the coal industry.
ANDREW JACOB,
Recording Secretary.

MOUNDSVILLE, W. VA., *January 16, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY KILGORE:
Local Union 6271 UMWA composed of 210 members strongly urge you to actively oppose passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation. We feel passage of the bill would result in unnecessary waste of tax payers money and would add to the already long list of unemployed in our country.
GEORGE GREGORY,
Secretary.

WHITESVILLE, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The officers and members of local union 2542 wish to protest to St. Lawrence Seaway legislation now before Senate. UMWA finds this legislation just as objectionable under Republican sponsorship as under Democrats. You are urged to exert all possible influence in defeating passage of this legislation.
ELMER WEBB,
President, Local Union 2542, District 17, United Mine Workers of America.

WHITESVILLE, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The officers and members of local union 6798 wish to protest to St. Lawrence Seaway legislation now before Senate. United Mine Workers of America finds this legislation just as objectionable under Republican sponsorship as under Democrats. You are urged to exert all possible influence in defeating passage of this legislation.
EWELL JORDAN,
President, Local Union 6798, District 17, United Mine Workers of America.

BEECHBOTTOM, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
In behalf of the members of Local Union 6133 U. M. W. of A. we urge you to actively oppose passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation. In our opinion it is an unnecessary waste of taxpayers' money and jeopardizes the employment of hundreds of thousands in the coal industry.
THOMAS M. CAMPBELL,
Secretary-Treasurer, Local 6133.

OAKHILL, W. VA., *January 18, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate.
DEAR SIR: The above-named local union requests that you vote against the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation.
Respectfully,
A. M. KEELY,
Recording Secretary

MONTGOMERY, W. VA., *January 16, 1954.*
Hon. H. M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Officers and members wish to protest to St. Lawrence Seaway legislation now before the Senate. U. M. W. of A. finds this legislation just as objectionable under Republican sponsorship as under Democrats. You are urged to exert all possible influence in defeating passage of this legislation.

EMERY MCCOY,
President, Local Union 7113, District 17, U. M. W. of A.

BLUEFIELD, W. VA., *January 16, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

We, the members of Local Union No. 6036, McComas, W. Va., go on record against the St. Lawrence Seaway project bill. Request you vote against same.

L. R. SHREWSBURY,
President.
H. M. KENNETT,
Recording Secretary.

LOGAN, W. VA., *January 16, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the members and officers of Local Union 6512, located at Ethel, W. Va., have voted by majority against the St. Lawrence Seaway, as we feel it is detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America.

FRANK ROBINETT,
President.
DANIEL PRINCE,
Recording Secretary.

LOGAN, W. VA., *January 17, 1954.*
Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Washington, D. C.:

Local Union 8572, UMWA, urges you to use your power and influence against the bill now pending before the Senate on the St. Lawrence Seaway. We feel this will be harmful to the coal miners of the country.

TOM CLAYTON,
President.
SILAS HUTCHINSON,
Secretary.

LOGAN, W. VA., *January 16, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator:

Local Union 5958, UMWA, urges you to use your power and influence to defeat the St. Lawrence Seaway proposal now pending. We feel this will be detrimental to all coal miners.

JAMES P. WORKMAN,
President.
THOMAS VANNESS,
Secretary.

LOGAN, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Local Union 5956, UMWA, urges you to use your power and influence to defeat the St. Lawrence Seaway proposal now pending. We feel this will be detrimental to all coal miners of this Nation.

LOWE CHAFIN,
President.
CLEARANCE WITHROS,
Secretary.

COALWOOD, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate:

We vigorously protest the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation and strongly urge your vote in opposition thereto.

FRED WOOTEN,
Recording Secretary, Local Union 6026, UMWA.

LOGAN, W. VA., *January 15, 1954.*
HARLEY KILGORE,
United States Senate:

At last meeting of our local union it was voted that telegram be sent to you and request made you vote against the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

JAMES I. BROWN,
President, Local Union 6712, UMWA, Yolyn, W. Va.

LOGAN, W. VA., *January 14, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:

Local Union 5921, UMWA, urges you to use your power and influence to defeat proposal pending before the Senate of the St. Lawrence Seaway. We feel it will be detrimental to the coal miners of this Nation.

WILLIS CRUM,
President.
ERMET MARESKE,
Secretary.

MONTGOMERY, W. VA., *January 14, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The officers and members of local union 677 wish to protest to St. Lawrence Seaway legislation now before Senate. U. M. W. of A. finds this legislation just as objectionable under Republican sponsorship as under Democrats. You are urged to exert all possible influence in defeating passage of this legislation.

R. B. AYERS,
President, Local Union 677, District 17, U. M. W. of A.

LOGAN, W. VA., *January 14, 1954.*
Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:

We urge you to use your power and influence to defeat the proposal now pending before the Senate of the St. Lawrence Seaway because we feel it would be detrimental to the coal miners of this Nation and the workers depending on the coal industry.

MELVIN TRIOLO.
JERRY STIDHAM.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I shall speak exclusively on the question which is immediately before the Senate.

Because my remarks will be comparatively brief, I shall decline to yield until their conclusion for any questioning or for any other purpose pertaining to them. At their conclusion I shall be pleased to yield for questions or for any suggestions in regard to them.

Mr. President, after study and analysis of the latest proposal of the proponents of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, as embodied in Senate bill 2150, I fail to discover that it offers a striking departure from previous proposals which I have strongly opposed. The objections to this project, which have been advanced previously, still remain compelling. In fact, the plan contained in Senate bill 2150 provokes still other serious questions.

As is generally known, I have always been opposed to the seaway proposal. At the same time I have strongly supported the development of the power resources of the St. Lawrence River and have maintained steadfastly that it would be not only possible but practicable to proceed independently with the hydroelectric project. The action of the Federal Power Commission in granting a license to the New York State Power Authority to construct the power facilities in conjunction with the Province of Ontario is, therefore, most welcome. I trust that in the present litigation this action will be upheld and an undertaking of such direct and vital benefit to the power consumers of the Northeast thus will be permitted to move ahead without cost to the Federal Government.

The pending bill provides for the creation of "St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation" as an instrumentality of the United States. Financing is to be accomplished through the sale of the Corporation's obligations to the United States Treasury, but this method of financing in no way lessens the ultimate burden on United States taxpayers. Borrowing from the United States Treasury by a Government corporation adds to our budgetary expenditures, and a corporate obligation of this nature is as much a part of the public debt as is a direct obligation of the Government itself.

The cost to the United States under Senate bill 2150, as estimated in the bill, would be $105 million, which is far below earlier estimates. Presumably this reduction would be brought about through limiting the initial construction work and placing a greater share of the cost on the power project. Apparently the proponents of the seaway expect that future construction work, which may be required, will be taken care of by means of subsequent legislation with subsequent appropriations.

The allocation of these costs is of major concern to the power consumers of New York and New England. The cost estimates submitted in connection with the pending legislation appear to omit the construction costs for navigation facilities, which are of importance to both navigation and power.

Thus, at the hearings on the seaway proposal held during the last session of the Congress, one authority pointed out that—

> The practical effect of this method of cost allocation is to charge to navigation facilities costs less than they actually are, and to charge to power facilities costs greater than they actually are. So far as can be determined from examining the figures of the Army engineers, it appears that all of the cost for the construction of joint-use facilities has been omitted in calculations of navigation costs and apparently charged to the cost of construction for power.
>
> If such a shifting of costs from navigation to power become effective, the consumers of power in New York and New England will in effect, be carrying part of the cost of navigation facilities and will thus be paying for a part of the transportation cost for the shippers and receivers of freight located in the Great Lakes region. Such a shifting of costs is thus a subsidy to navigation—in this case, not a subsidy directly by Government, but a subsidy by the consumers of power in one section of the country. (Statement of Leverett S. Lyon, chief executive officer of the Chicago Association of Industry and Commerce, hearings before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (83d Cong., 1st sess.), on Senate bill 589 and amendments thereto, pp. 306, 307.)

The proponents of this seaway project keep telling us that this is the last

chance the United States will have to "get in" as a party to the undertaking. If we do not jump aboard the seaway bandwagon now, we are told, we shall be neglectful of our responsibility toward our good neighbor to the north, and we shall forfeit completely any opportunity to have a "say" in the construction and operation of the seaway if Canada may finally build and operate it on her own.

I do not subscribe to this kind of specious warning. In the first place, I am inclined to believe that Canada would prefer to do the job herself and alone; certainly she stands in no need of financial assistance from us. In the second place, the minority interest which would be our part of the bargain under the terms of the pending bill would scarcely put us in a position where we would be able to control policy and practice with respect to the seaway's operation. Neither in investment, nor in mileage, nor in locks, nor in any other way, would we be in a position to do more than we should be able to do if this project were to be financed, constructed, owned, and operated solely by the Canadian Government. Any other thought which may be advanced by those who are supporting this proposal is sheer wishful thinking.

The reasons which I have advanced on previous occasions for my opposition to the St. Lawrence Seaway project are still wholly applicable and pertinent. I am still convinced that, far from being a national defense asset, it might well become a distinct national defense liability. I am still convinced that it would not prove to be self-liquidating.

The fact remains, moreover, that only a very small percentage of present-day oceangoing vessels could be accommodated by such a so-called seaway, and the further fact remains that it would be icebound or otherwise unusable for 4 or 5 months of each year.

For these and other reasons, which have been cited during the course of this debate, I cannot in all conscience vote in favor of S. 2150.

In concluding these remarks, I am constrained to make a couple of observations.

In the first place, I resent the charge that we in the Northeast, who may be opposing the seaway proposal, are "speaking for some narrow sectional and vested interests." Heretofore, over the years, I have refrained from referring to the considerable damage which the operation of this project would do to the port of New York and to rail transportation in New York State. My reasons for opposition to the seaway in this and previous statements before the Senate have been based on what I believe to be the welfare of the country as a whole and not primarily on New York State's vital stake in the matter. But I raise the question: To the extent that "narrow sectional and vested interests" may influence the attitude of some of us from areas which would be injured by the seaway, is it not equally true that some of those who may favor it are being influenced by "interests" just as "narrow, sectional, and vested," but peculiar to their own areas? And I raise still another question: Can it be truly stated that on balance a project which would seriously harm one section of the country, even though presumably benefiting another section, can be regarded automatically as a benefit to the whole country?

As my second observation, I point to the fact that, if this seaway proposal is approved by the Congress and the President, such action will require inevitably an increase in the national debt. I am wondering—just wondering—how many Senators, who may vote in favor of this St. Lawrence seaway project bill, will vote also in favor of an increase in the national debt limit when that matter may come before us for our approval or rejection.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, American participation in the St. Lawrence seaway, which is certainly going to be built, is vital to the national security of the United States. It is not necessary to take my word for it, or for that matter, the word of the President of the United States or the word of the Department of Defense or of the National Security Council. All one has to do is remember his high-school geography and visualize just exactly what the St. Lawrence Seaway will be—a through way from the Atlantic Ocean into the heartland of America. This heartland of America was first penetrated by adventurous men who came up the St. Lawrence and proceeded into the Great Lakes.

I have said that the St. Lawrence seaway is a through way into the heartland of America, and so it is, in times of peace and with a friendly neighbor to the north. But in time of war, and with the northern portions of this Continent exposed to attack, this through way will be a great defense artery of this country as well as of Canada. If we do not then have as of right—not of grace, but of right—a say in the control of its operations, this through way into the heart of this country could—I do not say it would, I say it could—become a weak point in the conduct of the defense of this Nation.

That, Mr. President, is one overpowering reason why the United States must participate in the control of the coming St. Lawrence seaway.

I cannot, of course, speak for the National Security Council, but I am quite certain that the geographic facts of this situation were uppermost in their minds when the Council, on April 24, 1953, advised the President that "early initiation and completion of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway is in the interest of national security."

I am equally certain that the President's Cabinet had taken these geographic facts to heart when on May 8, 1953, the Cabinet unanimously declared that—

> Participation by the United States now in the construction and operation of a St. Lawrence River Seaway would increase its defense advantages to this country, and would in time of emergency assure it of full benefits of joint participation.

We must face these geographic facts, and the fact that Canada is going to build the seaway entirely on her own, entirely in Canadian territory, if we do not provide through Senate bill 2150 for our participation in the project. Our friends to the north have passed the necessary legislation and made provisions for obtaining the needed funds to make this an all-Canadian seaway. The last big hurdle to such a project was cleared when the Federal Power Commission granted a license to the Power Authority of the State of New York to build, in cooperation with an agency of the Province of Ontario, hydroelectric installations in the St. Lawrence River. It is unthinkable that this great throughway into the very center of our country should be exclusively controlled by another nation, no matter how friendly our relations with that nation may have been in the past and are expected to be in the future. It is unthinkable that a great nation such as ours should fail to act to provide the basis for joint control of such an artery of traffic and instrument of defense. Senate bill 2150 provides such a basis, and the bill must be passed now.

There are, of course, many reasons other than geographic facts and the Canadian decision to build the seaway which influenced the President, his Cabinet, and the National Security Council in finding that United States participation in the seaway is in the national security interest of the United States.

The first of these considerations is the coincidence of the diminishing supply of high-grade iron ore in the Mesabi area of Lake Superior and the discovery of new high-grade open pit iron ores in Labrador. The depletion of the high-grade Mesabi ores has meant that our steel companies, looking forward, have had to develop foreign ore sources in such far away spots as Venezuela and Liberia. These sources are all right in peace time, but I am sure all of us are fully familiar with what happened to ocean ore boats during the last war, when German submarines sank practically all of them, and our imports went down nearly to zero.

In Labrador, however, we now have an enormous source of ore practically at our doorstep, ore which we will be able to bring to our steel mills in the great midwest through the proposed inland waterway. The important fact about this source of ore is not only its location, but its capability for rapid expansion of output in time of national emergency. We have had authoritative testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee that there is no reason why, in such an emergency, production could not be expanded quickly from 10 or 20 to 30 or 40 or more million tons of ore a year. In this respect, high-grade open-pit ore differs radically from underground ore and also from taconites, which, as my colleagues may know, are low-grade ores which have to be beneficiated in large, specially constructed plants before they can be used in the steel plants. With either underground ore or taconites, any substantial expansion of output of the raw material essential to steel production requires a considerable period of time.

With high-grade open-pit ore, such as that found in the Labrador field, no comparable time element is involved. That, of course, taken together with the location of the Labrador field, is one very important reason—if not the most important reason—why all our top defense authorities urge the construction now of the St. Lawrence Waterway and our participation in it.

Another great advantage from the standpoint of national defense is that the St. Lawrence seaway will create additional transportation facilities by providing an avenue to the Great Lakes region. The Department of Defense has testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that not only will the seaway provide important facilities for the transportation of iron ore and other materials to the Great Lakes, but that it will reduce by about 1,000 miles the open-sea route between the ports of the United States and the British Isles, which obviously would be an important advantage in time of war.

Furthermore, the seaway would augment the capacity of our Nation's transportation system, and provide an increased flexibility in that system which, in time of war, would both relieve the congestion that builds up in our ports, and lessen the very heavy burden on our rail transportation system.

Another important defense factor is that the St. Lawrence Seaway will permit an increased utilization of the shipbuilding and ship repair facilities of the Great Lakes area. It may be remembered that during the last war we attempted to use these facilities and did indeed use them for the construction of submarines. The construction problem was simple, but to get these submarines to the ocean required a very elaborate, complicated, and tricky pontoon system whereby the submarines could be floated from the shores of Lake Michigan down through the Mississippi to New Orleans. There are very important shipbuilding facilities on the Great Lakes that would be much more useful to us if we had the seaway there to supplement them.

It has been argued that the United States would receive all these benefits of the seaway by just letting Canada build it alone. To some degree that is true; an all-Canadian seaway would be better than no seaway at all; but, and I repeat, it is unthinkable that the United States should have no control with Canada over the operation of this great transportation artery running into the heart of our country.

The only way we can cooperate with Canada in the control of the seaway is to cooperate with her in the construction of the seaway. Under the proposed plan, 3 of the 7 locks and a portion of the canals will be in United States territory, and our Government agency will operate and maintain those works. That will most definitely give the United States a continuing voice in the operation of the entire seaway. And what if we fail to join with Canada in this project? For one thing, the admission of foreign ships to United States waters would be in the hands of a foreign, albeit friendly, nation.

For another, the defense of any part of the seaway from sabotage and military action would be beyond our jurisdiction, except as permitted by Canada by mutual agreement.

Again, rights of entry and navigation might well differ as between this country and Canada, if there were a difference between us in respect of neutral and belligerent status.

Moreover, in the event of capacity operation of the seaway, Canada would have control over priorities on seaway use for various ships and cargoes, in wartime or peacetime.

In his recent state of the Union message, President Eisenhower placed the matter of United States cooperation with Canada in this seaway project right where it belongs, namely, as one of the integral parts of the national defense program of the United States. In discussing the foundations of this defense program the President said:

> Another part of this foundation is of course our continental transportation system. Some of our vital heavy materials come increasingly from Canada. Indeed, our relations with Canada, happily always close, involve more and more the unbreakable ties of strategic interdependence. Both nations now need the St. Lawrence Seaway for security, as well as for economic reasons. I urge the Congress promptly to approve our participation in its construction.

Mr. President, cooperation with Canada in the construction and the control of the St. Lawrence Seaway would not represent a new and untried step in our relations with Canada. As far back as 1909, we entered into an agreement with Canada, setting up a joint commission to handle questions involving the waterways on our international frontier; and in more recent years our cooperative ventures have been numerous and successful. At this very moment the United States and the Canadian Governments are busily engaged in additional cooperative enterprises. In this connection, I should like to quote from a letter submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate by Maj. Gen. B. L. Robinson, Deputy Chief of the Corps of Engineers. Under date of April 20, 1953, General Robinson wrote the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], chairman of the committee, as follows:

> While a complete listing of such projects (involving joint United States-Canadian participation) currently under construction cannot be made public because of security considerations, the following examples would indicate the degree of mutual effort obtaining on construction and research projects directly affecting our mutual security: (1) Network of aircraft control and warning stations at classified locations; (2) Ernest Harmon Air Force Base, Newfoundland; (3) Pepperell Air Force Base, Newfoundland; (4) Torbay Airfield, Newfoundland; (5) Goose Bay Air Force Base, Newfoundland; (6) research for development of equipment and techniques for snow compaction.

It is quite obvious, even without studying the above list, that the United States and Canada have joined together in a mighty effort to put the North American Continent in a state of preparedness against possible aggression. It is incomprehensible to me that we can go all out with Canada in these other defense measures, and yet have any question in our minds about cooperating with Canada in the construction and control of this seaway which will run right into the heart of our country.

Mr. President, the Senate has heard and will hear more speeches for or against our participation in the coming St. Lawrence Seaway. Points will be brought up to show that the seaway is or is not economically sound. The question of the cost of the seaway may be discussed pro and con. Opponents will talk of disastrous diversion of traffic from our railroads and ports, and in another breath will say that there will not be enough traffic on the seaway to make it a self-liquidating project. Others may say that the project will work to the detriment of our merchant marine because foreign ships will be able to make better use of the facilities than our merchant ships can. But, Mr. President, most—if not all—of such considerations are beside the point today. Canada will go right ahead with this seaway alone, if we do not join with her. There is no question about that. So the only real question before us is whether this country should participate. For me, the answer to that question lies in the defense considerations I have discussed and in the solemn, considered determinations of the President's entire Cabinet and of all of our highest defense authorities, namely, that our participation, as provided for in the bill before us, is in the interest of our national security. From the President down, they urge us to authorize such participation now. Surely they, rather than some of our grandstand defense quarterbacks, know the essential factors and strategy of our national defense. I, for one, am not going to say that I know more about that matter than they do, nor am I going to be frightened by the fact that this contribution to our national security involves a certain investment by the United States. I think the advantages to be gained will prove to be cheap at the price—if, indeed, there is any ultimate price to this Government. On this national-security matter, my vote—and I hope the great majority of votes in the Senate—will be cast with the President and in favor of the bill now pending before the Senate.

Mr. President, we have heard the debate on this subject for several days at this session of Congress. The question has been debated in this body for the past 20 years, as a matter of fact.

From what source does the opposition stem? Who comprise the hard core of the opposition? I believe it is time that we publicly remove the veneer, and let the public know that the hard core of the opposition stems from the American railroads.

I happen to be one who believes that our railroads have provided a great service to the economic development of the United States and have also served the Nation efficiently in time of war. However, the purpose of the pending bill is not to benefit any one, particular group. This measure is in the interest of the entire Nation—not in the interest of the railroads, not in the interest of the automobile companies, but in the interest of the people of the United States, who

want to provide in a better way for their national security.

The arguments advanced by the opponents of this bill would strike a familiar ring to historians who have followed the congressional debates of the past. I examined the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the year 1902, when the Panama Canal was under consideration in Congress, Mr. President, and I may say that the arguments used then in opposition to the Panama Canal could equally well be used today on the floor of the Senate as arguments against the St. Lawrence Seaway. The hard core of opposition against the Panama Canal was the same as the hard core of opposition which exists today against the St. Lawrence Seaway, namely, the railroads. This great and powerful group feared that if the Panama Canal were built, they would be put out of business and, consequently, such action would have an adverse effect throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, I wonder how many Members of the Senate today would rise and say publicly that it was a mistake for us to build the Panama Canal. Of course, no one would make such a statement. I venture to prophesize that 50 years from now, after the St. Lawrence Seaway shall have been built and in operation for many years, no Member of the Senate will dare to rise and say that we should not have participated in the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. President, I have before me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 6, 1902. I wish to read, beginning on page 6386, a portion of a speech by Senator Hanna, a noted Senator from the great State of Ohio, with reference to the construction of the Panama Canal.

Nearly all my life I have had to do with the navigation of ships on the Great Lakes.

Skipping a few paragraphs, former Senator Hanna pointed out:

I said yesterday that, in common with many of my fellow citizens, I entered upon this question imbued with the same sentiment that has inspired us all for years past, that the time must come, sooner or later, when, if a canal was built to connect the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean, it must be built, owned, and operated by the United States.

I started on the work connected with that committee with the honest and earnest desire to accomplish that purpose; and if the work on the Isthmian Canal is not commenced by the United States Government in the year 1902 it will not be my fault.

I have heard insinuations on the streets and elsewhere as to the motives which have prompted those who, in the progress of this canal subject, have been led at least to believe that after all, and fortunately so, the way was open to us to buy and to finish, a canal at a place recommended by the best talent available in the world as the best, a canal to be constructed for the benefit of all nations.

* * * * *

We have inherited this opportunity. It has come to us without our seeking, simply because the people of the United States had developed a determination to carry to the finish the great work of a canal. I repeat—and I repeat it with pride as an American citizen—that the inspiration of this great work does not come from any selfish or narrow motive.

If a canal is built and is operated, it will be built and operated by the American people.

Senator Hanna continued:

I have heard it urged that we ought not to consider the commercial side of this question. Mr. President, the commercial side of this question is the one side which interests all the people, east and west, north and south.

It is to aid in the development of each section of our country alike.

The opportunities which will be given geographically to one section over another will be to the benefit of that particular section, but we are trying to serve the whole people and the whole country.

It is to be a canal which will benefit the people of the United States and the people of the universe.

If there is any pride or sentiment in this proposition let us carry it to the high level of doing that which will place the United States where she belongs as a leader of civilization and humanity.

Let us not discuss in detail the technique as to whether the mouth of the canal is nearer to New Orleans or to Pensacola or to Norfolk or to Baltimore or to New York.

Commerce will flow in natural channels. Economies will control results. But shall we stop to consider the question as to who will get the best of it? Who will stop to discuss whether in the equation of payments one section of this country will pay more or less than another?

Where will you look for inspiration upon any great public question if you eliminate the necessities of the people by sneeringly calling them "commerce" or "commercial value"?

Mr. President, there is nothing inconsistent from a national and patriotic standpoint with the ambition and the aims connected with this enterprise, if we at the same time consider on parallel lines the material benefits which it is going to bring to the whole people. If we had the canal built today, after passing through all these discussions, and if we found that we had made a mistake in our selection, we would feel, as I have said, that something personal or sectional or otherwise had influenced our decision as against the advice and the judgment and the information furnished us by the highest possible authorities in the United States or elsewhere.

The above excerpt is taken from a speech delivered by former Senator Hanna, from the State of Ohio, in 1902, favoring the construction of the Panama Canal. The arguments in opposition to the canal were to the effect that the construction of the canal would benefit the Southern States, would benefit New Orleans, La., would benefit Mobile, Ala., and other coastal cities and States. We hear on the floor of the Senate today the same type of speeches against the St. Lawrence seaway as were delivered in opposition to the Panama Canal.

I refer now to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 10, 1902, page 6555, where we find a speech delivered by former Senator Turner, of the great State of Washington. Let me read from that speech and see if it does not have a familiar ring as it relates to the debate today. Senator Turner said:

Mr. President, it would be a waste of words to enlarge on the value to this country and to the world of a ship canal at the Isthmus. That is well known and acknowledged by all. If the hope of the country in that regard is defeated, it will not be by reason of any doubt on that point by any Senator. But I will say a word before concluding concerning the point of view from which it is regarded on the Pacific coast. The completion of the canal will at once give that coast relief from the onerous burdens imposed on it by the transcontinental railways, and those burdens have been and still are very great. In saying this I would not be thought unmindful of the benefits which the transcontinental railways have conferred on the Pacific coast. Without them the greater part of that section would still be a barren wilderness.

But the fact that they have been instrumental in building up an empire does not give them the right to blight its expansion, to control its every motion, and to say that it shall have no relief from conditions which were well enough in the formative period, but which have long since become intolerable. With advance beyond the primitive needs of a pioneer people comes the demand for all the aids in industrial progress, including cheap and adequate transportation facilities, necessary to put that people on an equal plane with their brothers, everywhere throughout the length and breadth of the land. The transcontinental railroads either cannot or will not yield to that demand. The truth is, probably, that in some instances they cannot and in others they will not.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I merely wish to say to my distinguished friend from Michigan that it has been my experience and observation—and my study of history confirms the fact—that any great project which helps, benefits, and strengthens one section of our great country helps, benefits, and strengthens the whole country, and that any good project, even though it may be primarily limited to one section of the country is in the interest and to the benefit of the whole country.

Mr. POTTER. I concur in the observations of my distinguished colleague from Alabama. We in Congress have from time to time shown a great interest in projects, such as reclamation projects in the West and flood-control projects in the South, and other projects, which were of great importance sectionally, but from which the people of the entire country have gained through a strengthening and upbuilding of a particular segment of the national territory. The St. Lawrence seaway project is in that category.

While we of the great Midwest are very eager to receive the benefits which the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would bring, because it would provide a waterway into the heartland of our country, by the same token we know that we of the Great Lakes States would not alone benefit from it, but that other sections of the Nation would also profit.

Of course, one of the greatest advantages to be derived from the seaway is the strengthening of our defense and national security.

Mr. President, I have one more reference to the Panama Canal debate in 1902, as this debate relates to the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 10, at page 6543. I quote further from the remarks of former Senator Turner, of Washington. Time for action

is the essence of his remarks in this case. He said:

Men have not yet reached, and probably never will reach, that stage of benevolence and philanthropy which enables them to look with favor on any project, however beneficent, which interferes with their own personal profit and advantage. But aside from this interest, which all can readily identify without specific mention, and which I have no disposition to criticize, because I consider its opposition natural, there is nobody in this country, I venture to say, or at least but few, who do not agree and insist that the United States must build an interoceanic canal at the Isthmus and who do not agree and insist that the period of study and reflection has passed and the period of action has arrived, and that the work must be entered on by this Nation in earnest and at once.

Mr. President, if we change the designation Panama Canal to St. Lawrence Seaway the words spoken in 1902 will ring as true today as they did then.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few moments on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] while Senators who are at lunch are being refreshed and made able to stand on their feet and talk for and against the St. Lawrence Seaway proposal.

The Long amendment designated 1–14–54–A, which we are discussing now, would strike out the authority of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to borrow from the Treasury, and would instead, require appropriations for the construction of the seaway. It would retain the requirement that tolls be fixed at a level to make the project self-liquidating.

Of course we know the purpose of the amendment is to bring the subject up year after year by making it necessary to ask for annual appropriations. It is an effective way by which to interfere with a great, laudable project, and of course puts a stumbling block in the path of the development of this great undertaking.

Under the bill as reported by the committee, the Corporation would borrow money from the Treasury as needed, not exceeding $105 million. The Treasury could procure the money through a public debt transaction. The total, overall cost is estimated as $88 million. However, we ask for authority to borrow $105 million, in order that during the 6-year period of construction the interest on the bonds could be taken care of.

Annual appropriations for the construction would not be required by the committee bill, although the Corporation's administrative expenses would be passed on by the Committees on Appropriations, in the same manner that other Government corporations are dealt with.

Mr. President, judging by the discussion this morning, one would be led to believe that this is the first time in the history of our country that such type of financing has been requested or been used. We have financed billions of dollars in the same manner for other Government corporations.

We are concerned with a great undertaking. As was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], what is good for the economic health of one great section of our country is good for the country as a whole. Any attempt to hamstring or cripple the project indicates the lack of vision that has been commented upon heretofore.

The effect of the Long amendment, as I have said, would be to provide that the funds necessary for each year's construction would have to be appropriated each year by Congress. Such a procedure would give the opponents of the project an annual opportunity to obstruct and delay and delay and obstruct.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] implied on the floor on January 15 that it would be wasteful to provide the Corporation with $105 million to be spent all at once. The bill provides that the Corporation shall pay interest on the money it borrows. It would not have to borrow $105 million at one time. It could borrow it as necessary, 1 year at a time.

On page 15 of the committee report there appears the annual indicated allocation by the Seaway Development Corporation. I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Construction of the seaway on a normal schedule would require 6 years in the International Rapids section, and on an accelerated schedule would require 5 years. The indicated annual allocations by the United States Seaway Corporation would be as follows:

Fiscal year	International Rapids section (share to be paid by United States)	Thousand Islands section	Total
1st	$5,800,000	0	$5,800,000
2d	28,700,000	$690,000	29,390,000
3d	35,900,000	1,076,000	36,976,000
4th	15,200,000	0	15,200,000
5th	708,000	0	708,000
Total	86,308,000	1,766,000	88,074,000

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I say again that the bill provides for the Corporation to pay interest on the money it borrows. To do so will give the Corporation an incentive to borrow no more than is necessary, and to spend the money efficiently. It should be pointed out that the method of financing provided by the bill has the approval—and this is significant, Mr. President—of the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury Department.

In substance, the Long amendment, designated 1–18–54–O, is the same as the Long amendment proposed on January 14, with two essential differences. It would require tolls and other income received by the Corporation to be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and it would fix the interest rate on the Corporation's funds at 3½ percent.

The requirement for the deposit of income in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts would completely destroy the corporate nature of the Corporation, and it would be a corporation in name only.

The bill as reported requires interest to be paid "at a rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on current marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities."

The Secretary of the Treasury has informed the Committee on Foreign Relations that, in the absence of any further indication of congressional intent, he would—

(a) Construe the "current average rate on current marketable obligations" to call for the use of rates provided in the instruments, rather than the yields afforded by them as currently bought and sold in the market.

(b) Use a weighted average in making a determination, taking into account the amounts of the various issues included; and

(c) Interpret the phrase "obligations of the United States of comparable maturities" as referring to obligations having comparable periods from date of issue to maturity—or to call date, if one is provided—rather than obligations having comparable periods yet to run.

Fourth. These provisions give considerably more flexibility in determining the interest rate and in relating it to actual market conditions than does the Long amendment. It can be expected that the Secretary of the Treasury will probably determine a rate which is in the neighborhood of 3½ percent, as provided by the Long amendment, but it might be more or it might be less. It seems more realistic to leave the exact rate to be based on the criteria specified in the bill.

The important point, of course, Mr. President, is that the Long amendment has as its objective erecting a road block to prevent carrying out this wonderful improvement on this great waterway on the American Continent.

Now, Mr. President, I also want at this time to take only a few moments to show how American rights in the seaway are protected, because this matter has been discussed by other Senators. Everything has been thrown into the argument against the project that could be thrown—as someone has said, everything but the kitchen sink—yet, as the great young Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has said, there it stands as one of the great needs of the present, and it will be built by our neighbor to the north if we do not have brains and vision enough to join in the undertaking. If we fail to join, we, of course, give over to the Canadian Parliament and the Canadian corporation the control of the tolls, and so forth.

In order that there may be a clear understanding on the subject of tolls and a clear understanding of our relationship with Canada, I wish to take a moment to speak of how American rights in the waterway are to be protected.

The Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909, between the United States and Great Britain on behalf of Canada provides adequate protection of American rights in the seaway as it requires that—

The navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open

for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally, subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation and applying equally and without discrimination to the inhabitants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries.

Under the treaty which has lasted through decades, we have agreed that there shall be equal treatment of both contracting parties.

It is further provided that this same right of navigation shall extend "to all canals connecting boundary waters and now existing or which may hereafter be constructed on either side of the line." Although either party "may adopt rules and regulations governing the use of such canals within its own territory and may charge tolls for the use thereof," it is required that "all such rules and regulations and all tolls charged shall apply alike to the subjects or citizens of the high contracting parties" and "the ships, vessels, and boats" of both of them, and "they shall be placed on terms of equality in the use thereof."

In submitting the application dated June 30, 1952, of the United States to the International Joint Commission, it was specifically provided that—

The United States expressly reserves all its existing rights in the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, including, among others, the rights mutually extended to the United States and Canada under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I should prefer to finish my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

On the same date, the Canadian Government in a note from the Canadian Embassy to the Secretary of State agreed that—

When all arrangements have been made to insure the completion of the power phase of the St. Lawrence project, the Canadian Government will construct locks and canals on the Canadian side of the international boundary to provide for deep-water navigation to the standard specified in the proposed agreement between Canada and the United States for the development of navigation and power in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, signed March 19, 1941.

These Canadian locks and canals are subject to the requirements of the 1909 treaty with respect to navigation and tolls previously stated.

I shall be glad to yield at this point to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps the Senator from Wisconsin has covered this point, but what is his belief with reference to permitting Canada to construct the locks and the canals?

Mr. WILEY. If we turn down this proposal, Canada will then proceed to build the project. I feel that we are partners on the North American Continent. We have stood side by side, without warships on the lakes and without the boundary being fortified. We have already agreed to engage in the great undertaking of producing power. New York will spend approximately $300 million in connection with it. The navigation project is on the boundary line between two great nations, and I feel that it should be in the nature of a joint undertaking along the lines delineated in the proposed legislation. In this atomic age I feel that we should engage in the great enterprise in self defense.

My answer simply is that I feel it is a matter which, in the very nature of things, calls for a joint undertaking.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the Senator's definite understanding that if we do not approve the proposed legislation, Canada will proceed to construct the necessary locks and dams? Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; on the Canadian side.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is my understanding.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under the treaty which the Senator has described, we already have a guaranty of fair and equal treatment in the matter of tolls. Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. My understanding is that the United States and Canada have agreed, in substance, that there will never be any discrimination between Canadian ships and our ships.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator have any definite evidence as to whether Canada really desires our participation, or that she would just as soon we do not participate?

Mr. WILEY. I heard the argument a few days ago on that point. I am frank to say that I think the record is very clear that we have been engaged in trying to act together through the years, but we have not thus far succeeded, and Canada says to us, in substance, "This is the last chance, because if you will not agree to come in, if you will not see the necessity of becoming a copartner with us, we will go ahead and build the project ourselves."

The argument is, that if Canada is willing to build the seaway alone, then let Canada build it. This would mean that Canada would control the seaway.

Was there ever such a proposal to give away a great natural resource? We might just as well have said, "Very well. Let some other country build the Panama Canal." American shipping will use the St. Lawrence Seaway. Important segments of the American economy will become more or less dependent on it. Unless we participate in constructing the project, we will have no voice in fixing the tolls, or in drawing up operational regulations. In time of war or other emergency, we would have no voice in determining transportation priorities, nor would we have any voice in defense arrangements.

The Senator from Arkansas has asked as to the desirability of construction jointly with Canada. There is no question that the use of the waterway has been and will continue to be of vital importance to the United States. In fact, the use of the waterway by the United States will be greater than that of Canada or any other nation.

If the waterway were constructed as a joint venture, the United States would have a voice in deciding how and where the waterway would be built. In my opinion, the plans for the deep waterway through the International Rapids section, with construction on the United States side, are superior to those for construction on the Canadian side, because of better channel alinement through the lower section of the reach and a greater channel width.

Let me read from the testimony of Brig. Gen. Bernard L. Robinson, Deputy Chief of Engineers, during the 1953 hearings, pages 27 and 28:

We will be vitally affected by decisions as to how the waterway will be operated and maintained. We should not assume that our interests would be fully protected and our needs adequately taken care of if we merely accept use of a waterway built, operated, and maintained by another nation. The needs of our commerce may require operation rules of one type, maintenance of depths in various ways, and changes of channels to suit new conditions. We can protect our interests adequately only by becoming a full partner in the undertaking. We will be handicapped if we must use the waterway merely by sufferance. Further, we should be keenly interested in minimizing the amount of tolls imposed on shipping through an improved St. Lawrence River, inasmuch as most of the traffic will be United States tonnage handled in United States bottoms. Since seaway construction through the International Rapids section will be more costly with construction on the Canadian side than on the United States side, the latter has a decided cost advantage.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I do not know whether the Senator from Arkansas has finished his questioning.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have finished.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I wish to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if the bill is passed, calling for construction of the locks and the works on the American side, whether he can assure the Senate that Canada will agree to let us build the locks and works on our side.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think Canada would have anything to say. After we decide to build on our side, they will go ahead and build their locks, to join with those on our side, as will be agreed upon under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator from Wisconsin mean that there would be duplicate locks?

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Why will there not be duplicate locks?

Mr. WILEY. In the first place, there are a great many Scotchmen in Canada. They know the value of a dollar. Once we build on our side the locks which will take care of traffic, Canada will not duplicate them. If it should, they would simply be cutting off their nose to spite their own face, because the cost would be thrown entirely upon them. It has been stated by opponents of the proposal that there is no assurance Canada will be willing to participate in the joint project. That is what the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland said on January 15. But without congressional authorization for an international agreement, there is no way to attempt to secure such assurance. It is very plain that if the pending bill were passed, Canada and the United States could get together and work out details. That is all there is to it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In other words, the Senator from Wisconsin does not know whether the Canadian Government would agree to allow the works and locks on our side to be the only locks and works, or whether they would duplicate them on their side, as has been suggested by the Canadian Minister of Transport, not later than April 30, 1953?

Mr. WILEY. As the Senator well understands, until all those things are satisfactorily taken care of by agreement, there can be no going ahead with anything.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If the Canadian interests are going to build locks and works on their side, and by treaty between the United States and Canada—not by sufferance, as stated by the Senator from Wisconsin, but by solemn treaty—the United States will have the right to use the facilities on equal terms with Canada, and we will pay no greater toll than Canada will pay, why should we spend $105 million of funds, which we do not have, on the off chance that if we do so, Canada will concede our position and let us build locks and works on our side?

Mr. WILEY. I think I have answered the Senator already quite fully. I realize that probably the answer is not satisfactory to the distinguished Senator from Maryland. But if he cannot see the advisability of the project, after all that has been said, I will not try further to persuade him. A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still.

I realize the argument might go on ad infinitum and get nowhere with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin another question?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Maryland certainly may.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator from Wisconsin feel that an interest of less than 5 percent in the whole project, even if the bill is passed, will afford the United States an equal voice with Canada in the use of the seaway, the defense of the seaway, and the fixing of tolls?

Mr. WILEY. The point is that the United States and Canada would not ship the same products on the seaway. We may have large amounts of certain products of which Canada has but little. If the tolls were fixed exorbitantly, the United States would pay for the canal in no time. That is simply common sense.

But if there is a joint interest in the seaway we will agree to rates of charges or tolls, as provided in section 12 of the bill, as follows:

RATES OF CHARGES OR TOLLS

SEC. 12. (a) The Corporation is further authorized and directed to negotiate with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, or such other agency as may be designated by the Government of Canada, an agreement as to the rules for the measurement of vessels and cargoes and the rates of charges or tolls to be levied for the use of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and for an equitable division of the revenues of the seaway between the Corporation and the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada. Such rules for the measurement of vessels and cargoes and rates of charges or tolls shall, to the extent practicable, be established or changed only after giving due notice and holding a public hearing. In the event that such negotiations shall not result in agreement, the Corporation is authorized and directed to establish unilaterally such rules of measurement and rates of charges or tolls for the use of the works under its administration.

I hope I have made my point clear. It is simply this: It is imperative that we, with the great population on our side of the boundary, when the seaway is opened to traffic and the tolls are fixed, should see to it that they apply uniformly to the commodities of both countries, and not be fixed by the Canadian authorities so as to apply exclusively to commodities shipped from the United States.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. As I understand the wording of the bill, what would happen would be that the United States would negotiate with Canada. To negotiate does not mean that we would be successful in our negotiations.

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If we were not successful in negotiations, then we would establish unilateral tolls on our part of the works. But it should be remembered that the seaway rises in Canadian territory and ends in Canadian territory, and that we have but one very small part in the middle. If we can put tolls on our part of the works unilaterally, Canada can build across the international boundary and make the tolls prohibitive for the United States on other parts of the waterway. Is not that true?

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator tell the American people why it is not true?

Mr. WILEY. Because under the 1909 agreement tolls have to be fair and must apply equally upon shipments, boats, and material of both nations.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator tell us why this country should spend $105 million to obtain that which we can get without spending a penny, especially when we do not have the $105 million to spend?

Mr. WILEY. If, south of the line, we make a great commodity, as we do, and if, in addition, we manufacture a tremendous amount of engineering facilities which Canada does not make, and if there be other products made in the United States which Canada does not manufacture, if the toll is fixed at a certain rate, and our industries ship at that certain rate, we will pay for the canal in that way. If our Government has something to do with fixing the tolls, it will see to it that the tolls are equitably fixed, and that they do not necessarily take the American shipper for a ride.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That goes back to the previous question: Does the Senator think that an interest of less than 5 percent in an enterprise would have any participation in dictating the policies of that enterprise?

Mr. WILEY. I have heard that smokescreen question propounded a dozen times, and it has no application to the pending proposal. That statement befuddles the issue, for the simple reason that this country has the right to receive equitable treatment. The bill under consideration itself provides for an equitable handling of the arrangement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I do not understand is the fear of danger of excessive tolls. There is no compulsion on industry in this country to use the seaway. Let us assume that the toll charges are out of line. If so, industry in this country will ship on the railroads, assuming that the railroads are still in operation. American industries do not have to ship on the seaway.

Mr. WILEY. Of course, the Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then, why does the Senator think there is a danger of excessive tolls?

Mr. WILEY. I do not think there is a great deal of danger. However, I venture to say that if the Senator will notice the difference in the rates charged as between ships on the lakes and the railroads, he will find that one can ship by water a thousand miles for the same charge that one would have to pay for shipping only 100 miles on railroads. One can well imagine that when millions of tons are being shipped, a differential of only a few pennies might make a great difference so far as the tolls charged are concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I desire to reply to the question of the Senator from Arkansas as to why Canada is not permitted to go ahead and build the canal and take over control of the St. Lawrence. I think the question was answered very succinctly by the American Boundary Commission back in the 18th century. The commission was composed of John Jay, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin, who fought valiantly to obtain joint control over the St. Lawrence River for the United States. The Commission held that joint control over the traffic on that river was absolutely essential to the security of the United States. Of course, our country was young at that time, but the arguments used in those days hold good today. It is highly improbable that this country will ever become engaged in a war in which Canada will be involved, but it is entirely possible. I think that perhaps that is one reason why the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, the President, the National Security Council, all the agencies held responsible for the security of our country, are so concerned in having the United States participate in the construction of this greatest of all waterways on the North American continent. I do not except even the lower Mississippi Valley, which has a great waterway, as we all admit. That valley has its

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

own logical source of traffic, which does not compete with the St. Lawrence source of tonnage.

Mr. WILEY. It seems to have its logical source of revenue when it needs it, too.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Canada has not offered to build the necessary construction on the Mississippi River. We would be glad to have some help in such construction. I am not objecting to the seaway; I am only saying that if Canada wants to construct it alone, I cannot see any logical reason why we should not let Canada do it alone. That is different from the situation in the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope that Arkansas and Louisiana will remain a part of the United States whenever the rest of the country is called to engage in war. I hope that those two States will also join with the rest of the country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have no say in it. That was settled for us.

Mr. AIKEN. We all know that there are people who have such great pride in their own ports or in their own arteries of commerce that they would like to divert commerce which naturally goes in some other direction, even though it is uneconomical to do so. I do not think it is in the interest of the entire United States to do that. I do not believe it is in the interest of our country as a whole to try to favor such ports as Boston, New York, Baltimore, and New Orleans. As a matter of fact, Boston does not have a large amount of exports any longer. The very people who are opposing the St. Lawrence seaway have lost most of their export trade.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no doubt, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has said, about the project being built, and so all these questions are academic. We all accept the fact that the project will be built. There is only one question: Why is it insisted that we start out with $105 million, with an unlimited prospect in view, when Canada is willing to do it?

Mr. AIKEN. There is no unlimited prospect in view.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We all know, of course, that the project is going to be built. The only question remaining is as to how much it is going to cost.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Arkansas arguing that it is going to cost more millions of dollars to improve the harbors on the Great Lakes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Everybody believes that will be done. The only question is the one I have stated.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator from Arkansas refuse to build a modern highway because it would cost more money to build gas stations on that highway?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not refusing to build anything. This bill is going to cost the Treasury $105 million. There is no need in arguing about the merits of the project; that is not in issue. Everybody agrees that the project is going to be built.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator from Arkansas agree to let some other country take over the Panama Canal, and have us relinquish our control over it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a purely hypothetical question. I have seen no such proposition as that confronting us. Now that we have had a year of Republican rule, I think we need some help. I do not see any reason for our insisting on giving away $105 million when we do not need to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Arkansas does not see any good in the project because he does not want to see any good in it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The completion of the project has already been guaranteed by the Canadian Government. The only question is as to who is to pay for it. The only thing the Senator has mentioned that might be affected is his pride.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not a bad idea to have a little pride once in a while, especially so far as our country is concerned. The Senator did not object to the work on the Rio Grande, which was done jointly by the United States and Mexico.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, but I do not recall that the Mexican Government offered to do it alone. I think such a project could not have been done without our participation. However, that is not the question here.

Mr. AIKEN. I still have a great deal of pride in the United States, and I think we should not lose joint control.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator think that we have given enough away in the past 10 years to satisfy his pride?

Mr. AIKEN. I have made so many speeches on the St. Lawrence Seaway during the past 15 years that I do not expect to comment much further upon it at this session. Nevertheless, the project is as worth while now as it was when I first began to talk about it; in fact, it is even more worth while now. Today, it has the active and earnest support of the President of the United States.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas would listen to me a little. If he will, I shall present to him a few ideas of some very distinguished men, since my ideas seem to have made no impression upon him. Under these circumstances, the opinions I shall quote may help him.

I quote now from Gen. Omar Bradley:

It is conceivable, even though improbable, that at some future time a situation may arise whereunder the United States might find itself in a situation of international tension, with Canada neutral. In such an event United States ownership and operational control of the St. Lawrence Seaway might make an important contribution to the security of the United States. It could be visualized that exclusive Canadian ownership of this seaway might well be embarrassing to the United States under such conditions.

Mr. President, I notice that my colleague, the junior Senator from Arkansas, has not been listening to what I have just been saying.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sorry.

Mr. WILEY. I observe that he has been conferring with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I realize that I do not have the persuasive voice that the Senator from Georgia has.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I apologize to the Senator from Wisconsin. I am listening now.

Mr. WILEY. Then let me point out to the Senator from Arkansas that, having just quoted the favorable opinion of Gen. Omar Bradley, I wish to quote the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, as follows:

The failure of the United States to provide for its participation at this time in the navigation features of the St. Lawrence Seaway would result in the construction of all of the locks on the Canadian side of the St. Lawrence River wholly outside of the United States. The result would be that no part of the seaway locks and lateral canals would ever be directly under the control of the United States. Consequently, the United States would not have a voice in the control of traffic through the seaway equal to that of Canada. The United States would be wholly dependent upon Canada to evaluate and take steps necessary to protect its interests in the matter of the operation of the seaway, not only in relation to toll charges and priorities in transportation in times of emergency but also in relation to the physical security and control of the seaway. The United States can be assured of an active participation in the operation and control of the seaway only through a participation in its construction at this time.

I quote now from Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior:

The question, therefore, is not whether such a seaway should be made available but whether it is desirable that it should be owned and controlled entirely by Canada, with no voice on the part of the United States in the operation of the waterway and in the tolls to be charged. Considering that by far the greater part of the shipments through this waterway will be for our industries, there is but one answer to the question. It would be highly undesirable to leave any part of the welfare of our great industries to the sole determination of a foreign power, no matter how friendly our relations have been, are, and will continue to be.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me at this time, for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The question I have in mind is this: We do not know for sure what Canada will do. It would seem to me quite simple for us to obtain from Canada a commitment that if we give Canada $105 million for the construction of the locks and the works on our side, at least Canada will not build a duplicate set of locks and works on the Canadian side. I do not see why such a commitment cannot be obtained from Canada.

Mr. WILEY. There is no intention on our part to give Canada $105 million or to give Canada anything.

In this case the proposition is simply one of taking advantage of that long stretch of water, that great natural resource, which now remains undeveloped. In order to take advantage of it, the proposal is that we build the locks on our side.

Mr. President, I have quoted the judgment of, and the reasons which have been advanced by, three outstanding

persons for our joint participation with Canada. I think they know whereof they speak.

The International Joint Commission was established by article VII of the Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909. By article III, the treaty authorizes the Commission to approve "further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line, affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line."

Since its organization in 1910, the Commission has authorized the construction of a considerable number of projects in boundary waters. For example, the great locks constructed and operated in the St. Marys River, at Sault Ste. Marie, were constructed as a result of on order of the Commission; and their operation has been in charge of a joint board of control which reports to the Commission. A similar joint board of control is provided for in condition (h) of the order of approval issued by the Commission on October 29, 1952, with respect to the St. Lawrence power project. The Commission has exercised this beneficent jurisdiction over structures in boundary waters for the past 40 years, and there is no adequate reason for believing that any court will deny the legality of its exercise of jurisdiction in respect to these projects.

Mr. President, I had not intended to speak today. However, I felt that I should seek to answer some of the questions which have been propounded in the course of the previous debate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in regard to the pending measure.

I should like to begin by saying that I agree with the following statement made at pages 26 and 27 of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the pending bill:

> Thus for the first time in the long history of this legislation the real question confronting the Congress is not whether the St. Lawrence Seaway should be built. That has already been decided by the Canadian Government.

Mr. President, the news that Canada is firmly committed to go ahead with this project should, in my opinion, have been greeted with a sigh of relief by the administration, the Congress, and the public of the United States.

Certainly there are many other demands upon our financial resources which can make use of the $105 million proposed to be spent under the authority of this bill. This is evidenced by the demands for tax reduction and by the request of the administration for an increase in the debt limit.

Mr. President, I venture to say that the $105 million is merely a down payment. Even though the $105 million were sufficient to develop the proposed seaway to the presently estimated 27 feet of depth, I cannot imagine that it would be very long before the seaway would have to be constructed to a depth of 35 feet, with the result that large amounts of additional funds would then be sought. A project of this type would probably continue to grow—and properly so, I imagine.

So it is not material whether the item at this time is $105 million or $205 million or $305 million, so far as the argument now being made is concerned. In any event, the amount of money required will be a very large one.

For these reasons I have been surprised and puzzled by the continued pressure behind this proposed legislation, and I have sought an answer to the question of why we insist on contributing an unnecessary $105 million to a project which will be consummated whether we participate or not.

As the Canadians point out, the St. Lawrence Waterway geographically is more than 90 percent Canadian. As the Ottawa newspaper, the Globe and Mail, put it in an editorial of June 25, 1952, less than one-tenth of the length of the St. Lawrence River happens to be, by historical accident, an international boundary. This respected respresentative of the Canadian press goes on to say:

> With a half interest in that fraction of the whole stream, the Americans may be said to own rather less than 5 percent of the St. Lawrence and the Canadians rather more than 95 percent.

Indeed, the newspaper could have made the statement even stronger, for this division of the mileage in the St. Lawrence proper takes no account of the fact that the Welland Canal, an essential link in the project, lies wholly in Canadian territory, was built by the Canadians, is operated by the Canadians, and is in every respect—except that the United States has by treaty full, free, and equal rights in its navigation—wholly Canadian.

The Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. C. D. Howe, was quite explicit on this subject in a public statement made less than a year ago, on April 8, 1953. The St. Lawrence Seaway, Mr. Howe said, "is, and always has been, a Canadian seaway. Every important improvement has been built and paid for by Canada, from Lake Erie down. The cost of operating and maintaining the seaway is paid wholly by Canada. Nevertheless, ships of every nation may use the seaway without payment of tolls. An international treaty provides that, if and when tolls on shipping are imposed, they will bear equally on Canadian and foreign-flag ships."

The seaway to which Mr. Howe referred as being in existence from Lake Erie down consists of the Welland Canal, wholly Canadian; Lake Ontario, a joint international body of water; the 14-foot canals along the Canadian side of the St. Lawrence River between the lakes and the port of Montreal, and the 1,000 miles of the St. Lawrence between Montreal and the Atlantic Ocean. As Mr. Howe pointed out, the improved portions of this waterway have been improved and paid for by Canada. They are today being maintained and operated by Canada, toll-free to the shipping of the world.

There is not the slightest evidence of any intention on the part of Canada to seek any departure from the policy of equal treatment in matters of navigation and tolls. There is, on the contrary, an explicit obligation to continue such a policy, arising from international treaties duly ratified by constitutional governments.

Why, then, should anyone in the United States be so anxious to have the Congress vote to spend a hundred million dollars on a waterway which the Canadians propose to provide?

There are only three possible reasons that might have any validity whatever.

The first is that we do not believe the Canadians will, or can, do the job themselves.

The second is that we are afraid the Canadians would try to discriminate against American shipping, commerce, and citizens, unless the United States had a share in the control of the proposed waterway.

The first question is, Will Canada do the job? To doubt that it will do so is to doubt the good faith of repeated public statements by responsible Canadian Government officials, and to doubt the good faith of official action by the Canadian Parliament. No; there is no doubt of the intention of the Canadians to do the job, as the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] himself stated on the floor a few minutes ago.

Can the Canadians do the job?

The answer to that question covers two phases. Are the Canadians financially able? And is it physically possible to locate the 27-foot canal so that Canada will be justified in paying for its construction?

The answers are so clear that they hardly need be made.

The question as to financial ability to undertake such a commitment might almost be better asked of the United States than of Canada. For a number of years now the Canadian Government has been operating so well within its revenues that it has been enabled to make substantial tax reductions. I wish we could say as much of the Government of the United States which, at best estimates, will have a substantial deficit in this fiscal year and a large and continuing deficit in at least the next fiscal year. At present there are strong requests that we increase the debt limit as soon as possible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the deficit for the fiscal year 1952–53 was $9,400,000,000, the largest peacetime deficit in history?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the daily Treasury reports indicate that the deficit for the current fiscal year, for something more than the first 7 months, was only $200 million less than it was for the corresponding period of last year?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator believe that the Republican Party has made great progress toward its campaign goal of balancing the budget?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see any great evidence of that. That is what surprises me about their insistence on

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

spending another $105,000,00 unnecessarily, which expenditure, so far as I can see, would in no way promote their objectives or ours. I am amazed that they should be the party insisting on paying out this money unnecessarily.

I thank the Senator for putting that very pertinent information in the RECORD at this point.

The answer is that Canada is clearly able to undertake and carry through its financial commitments in the St. Lawrence.

And it is equally able to locate and construct the 27-foot canal so as to make it an all-Canadian waterway, with the exception of the joint arrangements as to power generation and use which have already been agreed to by both countries, and are not involved in this legislation. Not only can the Canadians build the canal on their side of the boundary, they are of the opinion that it can be built in that way more cheaply and more satisfactorily than if the United States built a portion of the canal on the American side of the International Rapids section. This point was clearly brought out by the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, Canadian Minister of Transport, in a debate in the Canadian House of Commons. In response to question, Mr. Chevrier stated explicitly that the information of his Government was "that it would be as cheap, if not cheaper, to build a canal on the Canadian side of the boundary." Again, there is no reason to doubt the correctness of the information, any more than there is to doubt the expressed intentions of the Canadians, or their ability to do what they have said they are ready to do—build a 27-foot waterway through the St. Lawrence.

Perhaps it may be said, as it has been said, that we must build part of the waterway so as to share in its control. Mr. Chevrier touched on this in an address in Washington on April 30, 1953, when he said:

> It is said that Canada may not always be a friendly nation. I cannot conceive of our two countries living on other than friendly terms, nor of Canada becoming powerful enough to be able to afford to be unfriendly.

I submit that that is the answer. All the talk about national security and the possibility of Canada being an enemy is complete nonsense. She cannot afford to be unfriendly, as her own people admit. It is inconceivable that Canada at any time will achieve the strength to afford to be unfriendly to this country.

I believe that is one of the reasons why we should be very careful in our treatment of Canada's feelings. In recent weeks we have said and done a few things which I believe have been untactful, to say the least. In this case, inasmuch as the Canadians desire to build the seaway themselves, and I believe prefer to build it themselves, those considerations ought to have some significance in our discussion of the subject.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is there any indication that Canada is willing to share the control of the Welland Canal segment even if Canada should share with us some control over the International Rapids section?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know of any indication in that regard. However, let me say again that if our country should insist upon participation in the Welland Canal, or anything else—of course we could make such insistence, if we wanted to use force or threats. However, our whole relationship with Canada has been based, at least until now, upon a different basis. Is has been on the basis of friendly, considerate, negotiated treatment. It should continue that way. There is nothing to indicate that we intend to exert any force.

The point I am trying to make is that all the talk about national security and the necessity of having control is not a significant argument on the pending bill. The whole point is, if it is a desirable improvement from the economic standpoint and the development of industry and commerce in a great area, and if it were not going to be built anyway, we would have a real argument on the questions: Is it proper? Is it right? Is it feasible? Is it economically sound? Those arguments have been removed, because Canada will build it anyway.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield further.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Arkansas familiar with the fact that the Canadian Government's idea of the project is not so much in terms of an ocean-going seaway as it is the concept that it would be a seaway built to standards of Great Lakes navigation and with the ports in Canada, particularly the port of Montreal, being transshipping ports?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator means up to the present time that has been the concept. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. That is the way Canada would use the proposed project. Their own ministers have stated that at least 75 percent of the cargo would be transported to Montreal, or a similar port in Canada, and there placed aboard deep-draft vessels to sail the high seas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that would be true certainly in the initial stage. When I said a moment ago that I believe the project would eventually cost more than $105 million, I was basing the statement on the logical assumption that in due time there would arise the plea for a deeper channel to accommodate larger ships that can sail anywhere, and therefore instead of a 27-foot channel it would be necessary to build a 35-foot channel, which would cost an additional $105 million.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If the project were to be used as the Canadian ministers themselves have explained in Parliament, namely, with the port of Montreal being used as a transshipping point, would not that fact be of enormous benefit to the development of the commerce of Canada and of Montreal as one of the great ports of the world?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. That is all the more reason why the Canadians ought to pay for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Canadians are willing to do it. There are many Members on the floor of the Senate who for the past 5 years have complained bitterly about the rest of the world imposing upon the taxpayers of this Nation. We have heard complaints about the give-away programs which are breaking our backs, and we have been told that it is shameful the way the rest of the world picks our pockets.

Here we have a case in which a friendly nation offers to pay the bill, and we say, "Oh, no, we won't have it. We have got to put money into it ourselves." It is ridiculous. The Senator from Louisiana has heard such complaints made endlessly for the past 8 years, ever since the end of World War II. This is the first time when one of our friends has said, "Don't you bother. We know how hard up you are. We will pay for it." We say, "No, we won't stand for any such thing. We will pay for it."

I have indicated that the Canadians themselves cannot afford to be unfriendly. I wish to read one more item on that point. It is a special dispatch to the New York Herald Tribune from Ottawa, datelined January 7, and published in the Herald Tribune of January 8. It indicates what I believe to be the true state of Canada's feelings about the matter. It reads:

> Canada's position on the seaway remains unchanged: It is determined to get on with the project, and while it publicly would welcome participation by the United States if that didn't delay construction, most members of the Government here hope privately the United States stays out. They prefer an all-Canadian seaway, both in the construction and operation phases.

I believe that to be quite true, and I believe there are good reasons for it. So the question of accommodating our friends in Canada is completely unrealistic.

We all rejoice in the long history of friendship between our two nations, and like Mr. Chevrier, I see no reason to anticipate any break in that happy relation. Nor do I see any reason to anticipate that Canada has, or ever will have, any intention of acting contrary to her obligations under the treaties of 1871 and 1909.

In the 1871 treaty it is provided that the navigation of the St. Lawrence "from, to, and into the sea, shall forever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the citizens of the United States." That freedom and equality of navigation rights has now been in effect, under this treaty, for more than 80 unbroken years. Does anyone think that we should be concerned lest Canada seek to escape her obligations in this regard, and restrict our rights? The very thought is absurd.

Under the treaty of 1909 there is the further provision that any tolls charged for the use of canals shall "apply alike" to the citizens and commerce of both nations. Does anyone think that in the

face of this solemn obligation Canada would try to discriminate against the United States?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator from Arkansas feel we have that right merely by sufferance, as stated by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator refer to the right to which I have just referred?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT No; we have the right by treaty.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. We have it by solemn treaty. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Canada cannot escape its responsibilities under the treaty any more than we can. Is that not correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not only is the right conferred by treaty, as the Senator from Maryland so well stated, but the very facts of life—the size and power of the United States, both physically and economically—are such, as I have stated, that Canadians realize they cannot afford to be unfriendly, and everyone knows it. The idea that they might be unfriendly or that we might have a war with Canada is beyond possibility.

The idea is absurd on its face, and its absurdity is heightened by the fact that in the same treaty of 1909, the United States grants to Canada the same right of navigation in Lake Michigan and in all canals connecting boundary waters, plus the further fact that 4 out of 5 of the locks in the vital Sault Ste. Marie are American, and only one small and almost obsolete lock is Canadian. The vessels of both nations use these locks on terms of complete equality, and there is no thought anywhere that it should be otherwise.

But let us suppose that Canada and the United States should someday be on terms of enmity, and that the treaties of 1871 and 1909 should no longer be in force. Would the mere matter of participation in the construction of a few miles of canal in a waterway 1,000 miles long serve to give the United States any control beyond that it now exercises?

Of course not.

There is no thought anywhere that anything which the United States might do, or might not do, in the International Rapids section would give the United States any additional rights whatever in the remaining 90 percent of the St. Lawrence. Passage of Senate bill 2150 would give us no such rights. Acceptance by Canada of our participation under Senate bill 2150 would give us no such rights. Expenditure of a hundred million American dollars, or more, under the provisions of Senate bill 2150 would give us no such rights. For the plain fact is, and the plain fact will remain, that the St. Lawrence through 90 percent of its length is a Canadian river, and not an international stream at all. Of course, it is not necessary to try to establish navigation rights in these Canadian waters on any such basis. The rights are well established, and in no wise threatened. Whatever value there might be to anyone in the United States from the building of the 27-foot channel in the St. Lawrence will be realized just as fully if Canada builds it, as it would be if the United States were to build some part of it.

I shall not go into the question of what these advantages are, nor what the disadvantages are. It is my considered opinion that on balance, the disadvantages to the United States far outweigh the advantages, but if Canada is to build the waterway, that question becomes entirely academic.

We are assured by official spokesmen for the Canadian Government that Canada is going to build the waterway. We are equally assured of the same thing by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of this body, who so declared in his speech of January 13.

We know that the Canadians are financially capable of building the project—more capable financially, for that matter, than is the deficit-ridden Treasury of the United States.

We know that the Canadians are not only not asking for our financial aid or our participation in the waterway construction, but that they have gone as far as politeness permits in making it plain that they do not want our financial aid and participation.

There is another reason which is sometimes advanced for our contribution to and participation in this project. That is that we are a great country and that Canada is a small one, and that our national pride should warrant our participation. This argument has so little appeal to me that I merely say: $100 million is too high a tribute to pay to national conceit.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I oppose the pending bill, and intend to vote against it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I take it, in view of the Senator's statement, that he is against the Long amendment, because that amendment would call for an appropriation each year, instead of financing the project by a bond issue such as is contemplated in the original measure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since I am against this bill, that is true. I do not see any particular merit in that. I think we shall ultimately, if we pass the bill, stand responsible not only for the $105 million, but for untold and unestimated amounts to deepen the channels and improve the project, from now on.

Mr. WILEY. To that I cannot agree, but I should like to have a definite answer as to whether the Senator is for or against the Long amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have it under consideration. I cannot tell the Senator at the moment exactly what I shall do about it.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to compliment the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. He has made a good argument out of nothing, because I may say that the answers which I read into the RECORD from three distinguished citizens, Wilson, McKay, and Bradley, indicate clearly a fundamental reason why we should participate in the project.

The next point is that if it is a good-paying enterprise, as demonstrated by the testimony, we will be only investing—not giving away our money, as has been suggested—in an enterprise which will be for the benefit of 50 million people in the valley of the St. Lawrence and in the region of the Great Lakes, in addition to all the people in the entire country. Please remember that back of the project and feeding it is approximately 1,500 miles of the greatest lake chain in the world, around which is found the greatest industrial center in the world. If we should ignore the opportunity to participate in an enterprise of that kind we would indicate that we are very provincial in our outlook.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I must always come back to the basic fact that the project is going to be built anyway. We are not asking whether it is good or bad. We are going to have the seaway. Why should we insist on putting our money into it? I do not think even the Senator from Wisconsin is seriously urging it as a moneymaking proposition when power is excluded. So far as the canal alone is concerned, it will operate only 7 months of the year. I have yet to hear any responsible person say it is going to make money.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas further yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Arkansas cannot be ignorant of the fact that 95 million tons go through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, and that it is established in the RECORD that we can liquidate the entire enterprise in a matter of years. From 10 million to 30 million tons of ore will be shipped from Labrador; wheat will be shipped from the Middle West; from Detroit cargoes of automobiles will be shipped through the canal. There is set forth in the book which the Senator now has before him a schedule of earnings.

I appreciate fully the acumen manifested in the Senator's argument. Whether Canada builds it or we build it, does the Senator think it is a good thing?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it will be a good thing, for that matter. I would not oppose it on the merits. In the past I have opposed it largely on the ground that it was brought forward in a period of high inflation and of war. As a public-works proposition alone, I think it would be justified. But that is not involved in this program. It is going to be built, and why must we put our money into it if we do not need to do so? That is why all the arguments about people in New Orleans, Boston, Baltimore, and other cities being selfish about the matter are quite irrelevant because everyone agrees that the project is going to be built and will have whatever effect may result on New Orleans or any other port.

How can we influence its effect on New Orleans if it is constructed with Canadian money as opposed to American money? When the Canadians say they are going to build it, why do we insist

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

on putting $105,000,000 into it to start it off? If it is later decided that it should be 35 feet deep, we must go along. The argument has no bearing upon my State or upon New Orleans or Norfork or any other port because the seaway is going to be built. Whatever may be said here has nothing to do with it. It is quite irrelevant to this proposal. It is purely a question of whether we are going to put money into it or whether Canada is going to put money into it.

Mr. WILEY. I wondered whether the Senator agreed with his own associates.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly I believe there is a question whether it would be a good investment, because this canal would be operating only little over half a year. I believe we should consider the overall situation including the effect of the seaway on the railroads. I may say that I can see that point of view, because I have no interest in any railroads in the community; but what will this project do to the railroads, which must be ready to handle all the traffic during the winter months, and then be practically idle in the summertime. I think we must consider where the railroads come in to the picture. I know the Government has done a great deal to help railroads that have been in trouble. We authorize increases in their rates about every other week, it seems to me, and have done so for years, because they get into difficulties for one reason or another. But I do not think there is any point in my going into that situation.

The only question is, If the canal is to be built, should we put our money into it?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not hear the entire speech of the Senator from Arkansas, but I did understand him to say that Canada, although willing to accept the United States as a partner, is not anxious to have us as a partner; that, as a matter of fact, Canada would much prefer to undertake the project alone, without having the United States join them in this undertaking. It seems to me that that is pretty significant. If that statement is accurate, there must be a reason why Canada is anxious to construct this project all by itself but I am not convinced that the Senator from Arkansas was well informed in the statement which he read.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator from New York hear what I read?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, I did. The entire amount involved in the project proposed in the bill is $105 million. We believe the project will be self-sustaining, a project that will be self-sustaining as are the great power development projects in the northwestern area of our country, and far more self-sustaining than, at least, some other projects, for instance, for the widening and flood control of the Arkansas River and similar projects.

The United States has a great stake in the St. Lawrence Seaway. It is to the advantage of the United States to be a partner with Canada in this development. It is a great defense measure. It is a measure which will lead to the opening of vast areas in the Middle West. Certainly it will help to benefit the entire country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from New York is arguing about the merits of the project. I am not arguing the merits. No one disputes for a moment that the project will be built. That is why I have compared it with the Arkansas River development. If Canada would agree to do some of the work on the Arkansas, I guarantee that I would accept it; I would not object.

If the Senator from New York were saying that the St. Lawrence project would not be built without an appropriation of $105 million by the United States, that would be an argument. But there is no question that Canada will build the waterway herself.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I have not the slightest doubt of the merit of the undertaking. I am convinced it is meritorious.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is not in question here.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; the waterway will be built. I believe it would be to the very great advantage of the United States to be a full partner with Canada in the undertaking, and not to allow ourselves to be a reluctant brother of Canada, by not going along with her in the construction of the seaway.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator again comes back to the real point I am making: It is a question of pride and conceit on the part of the United States. That is all there is to it. I agree that it is harder, politically, to spend that much money to satisfy pride and conceit.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I deny that it is a question of pride. I claim it is a question of self-interest—of vital self-interest. We have before us for consideration a great project, which will open up a large area of our country. It is a project which will add to the defense and security of the continent.

We have an opportunity to play a real and very important part in the development of the project. Yet we are saying to Canada, for whom I have the greatest respect, affection, and regard, "You take it and do what you want with it. We are not going to claim any position in the matter. We are not making claim to having any voice in the administration of the seaway. We are not going to claim any voice in the setting of tolls. We will not claim any voice in the building of defenses for the security of the continent."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Merely for the sake of saving a hundred million dollars.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; not a hundred million dollars. The Senator from Arkansas may be very humorous at the expense of the Senator from New York, but I do not think he is at all convincing. We are not admitting that we are throwing away $105 million. We do not acknowledge that we shall be throwing away $105 million, or even $5 million. We believe the project will be self-sustaining. I notice in the report of the committee this statement:

> The following table shows several appropriations for rivers and harbors in excess of $105 million. The amounts listed in the table were expenditures by the Federal Government on a toll-free basis, as contrasted with those in S. 2150 which will be borne by the users of the seaway.

I notice as the second item:

> Arkansas: Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma: total estimated Federal cost, $686,370,000.

I do not know whether or not it is worth while to spend $686 million in that region. I believe it is. I believe that to build up any part of the United States means increased prosperity to every part of the country. We are not quibbling about that. The Senator from Arkansas is willing to spend $686 million on the Arkansas River and its tributaries, why deny the relatively small expenditure for the seaway?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not denying an expenditure for the seaway. The Senator keeps getting off the track. The Senator will have the seaway. If we could make a trade with Canada by saying, "We will give you $105 million if we can persuade you to come up with $105 million for the Arkansas," we would all be satisfied.

The difficulty is that the Senator from New York keeps getting off the subject, by trying to make it appear that we are trying to deny him something. I am not arguing to deny the Senator the seaway.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield for another question, but before doing so I wish to make one comment.

I insist that when Senators begin to talk about appropriations for the Arkansas River, such appropriations must be judged on whether the project is a good one or is not.

But no one questions that the St. Lawrence Seaway will be built. The Senator is going to have it. It will do all the things the Senator says it will do, about opening up this and that. But that is not the question. The question simply is, Who is going to pay for it?

It was to my surprise that I heard that Canada has said she will pay for it. I never dreamed she would. It is hard to convince me that she will. Yet the Senator from Wisconsin has assured and guaranteed me that she will. Everyone else says she will. So how is the Senator from New York injured?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator from Arkansas deny that if we permit Canada to build the waterway without participation by the United States, the United States will have no voice whatsoever with regard to the administration of the canal, with regard to the tolls on the canal, with regard to steps that must be taken for the defense of this Continent and the added security of the country?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hesitate to labor this point before the Senate, because I

covered it in detail, I think, in discussing the question of treaty rights. Our treaty rights are quite clear as to tolls. Canada cannot impose on us charges different from those she herself must pay. As the Senator knows, under the treaty no tolls at all are charged. But further than that, further than the legal rights, the Senator well knows, from the quotation of a statement by Mr. Chevrier, that Canada cannot afford to be unfriendly to the United States. Canada is a country having a population smaller than that of the State which the Senator from New York in part represents. I believe Canada's population is at present less than the population of the State of New York.

The idea that Canada would take an antagonistic attitude and would tell us where to get off is ridiculous.

The entire reason why I think Canada would rather build the seaway themselves is in accord with the item I read a moment ago. I believe they would rather do it themselves so as to have, at least, some freedom of action of their own, and not prejudice their action as was indicated recently in a statement to the effect that their Secretary of State may be a Communist, and in our talking to them about Gouzenko.

But small as Canada is in population, and thus relatively weak, I can see where she would have a little pride and would be delighted to act unilaterally in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway, because Canada happens to be efficient in the operation of her Government, and is a prosperous nation. She can afford to act independently, and I can well understand why she would be willing to do so. If we insist on intervening and bossing and pushing them around, we can do it. If we insist on taking over the canal, we can do it. But we are not going to do that so long as we have any sense at all.

The Senator does not believe for a moment that Canada is going to charge American shippers exorbitant fees. If the fees get out of line in comparison with present charges on the railroads, American shippers will not use the canal. The shippers do not have to use the canal, as the Senator knows. In order to attract the traffic the Senator mentioned a moment ago, Canada is going to keep the fees within reason. Canada is not going to cut its own throat and drive traffic away. That is not a question at all. There are many questions involved, but I do not believe that the Senator in his heart feels that Canada is going to start pushing us around. The sole question involved comes down to that of our own pride and conceit, and the feeling that this country is so rich and big that we cannot afford to let anything be done without using American money. I am perfectly willing to trust Canada to treat us right.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully agree with the statements of the Senator from Arkansas regarding some of the recent comments about our neighbor to the north.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They were very objectionable.

Mr. LEHMAN. They were very objectionable, and I am as critical of them as is the Senator from Arkansas. However, that is not what we are considering at this time. I am not for a moment afraid that this country is going to do anything of an unfriendly nature with regard to Canada. I am not afraid that Canada is ever going to do anything unfriendly to this country. We have lived together in complete harmony for 150 years. There is not a blockhouse or a pillbox or a warship on the St. Lawrence River or on the Great Lakes. I am not afraid of that possibility.

However, I have never known of an instance, in the entire history of modern times, in which any country has willingly surrendered its rights on a river which is a boundary line between it and another country, no matter how friendly that country might be—a river that is a great navigational highway, that carries at the present time, and will carry in the future, scores of millions of tons of freight, and is a means of entry into this country—I have never known of any country's being willing to do that, and I cannot conceive that this country is willingly going to surrender its rights, rights which it has always had and rights which I pray to God it will always have, in connection with the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the floor, if the Senator desires that.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to have the Senator's comment on a thought which for the first time has come into the debate today, namely, that this country should contribute to this project so that it can take part in the financing of the works, not only the works we are going to build with $105 million, but along the whole stretch of the St. Lawrence from Lake Erie to the sea. Has there been any estimate of what part of the seaway this country will be asked to take care of, and, if this country is asked to take care of it, what it would cost the American taxpayers?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know of any estimate. This country has no right to do anything about that. That is fully within the control of Canada. The pending bill gives us no right in that regard.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have heard two Senators say this afternoon that we should spend $105 million so that we could open up the Treasury for the defense, not of the international section, but of the whole seaway. How can this country underwrite an undertaking of that kind unless it knows something about it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think there is much misapprehension and misunderstanding about the whole matter, which I have seen indicated in the newspapers and otherwise, namely, that the St. Lawrence River is an international boundary. That is the impression which has been left. Actually, the river is a boundary for only a very small portion of its length. Canada is quite free to do as she pleases in the portion not so involved. Canada will have freedom of action. I think the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] assumed a moment ago that the entire river comprised the boundary, when they were talking about Canada's possible intimidation of this country, for no valid reason. If we enter into this project, this country will have no control over the great portion of the river that is not a boundary.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not logical to assume that, the first thing we know, American equipment will be taken and American boys will be called from their homes and stationed along the whole stretch of the seaway?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that suggestion is quite irrelevant, as are a good many of the other points made. There is only one real question, and that is whether we should insist on putting this country's money into the project. I see no advantage in doing that except as a little salve to our wounded pride when we think of another country doing something without our assistance.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. A question was asked about the self-liquidating features of the proposed canal. Does the Senator know of a successful toll canal on the entire North American Continent or in the entire Western Hemisphere between North and South America?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I do not know of any, but the aspect that makes me very skeptical about the St. Lawrence project being self-liquidating is the fact that it will be used only a little more than 6 months of the year. If there should be such a canal as the Senator from Louisiana inquires about, I am sure it would not be frozen up half the time.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LONG. There is another point at issue. One of the reasons given to justify the self-liquidating argument was that vast cargoes of iron ore would be moved over the seaway. A second argument was that there would be a competitive rate established. For example, on page 83 of the House hearings figures were set forth to show that in shipping iron ore to Pittsburgh by way of Baltimore, going by sea to Baltimore and from Baltimore to Pittsburgh by rail, the cost by water would be $4.78. On the other hand, it was set forth that by using the seaway it would be possible to reduce the cost to Pittsburgh to $4.15. By going through the St. Lawrence route there would be a saving of 63 cents, of which 50 cents would be erased by the toll, leaving a net saving of 13 cents to transport the iron ore to Pittsburgh.

Senators know that the railroads would reduce their rates to retain their business in the face of such competition as that. All Senators know as well as I do that when a waterway is constructed railroads make enormous reductions in their rates. Sometimes they reduce their rates as much as 50 percent in order to retain business they might otherwise lose. Such reduced rates are called water-compelled rates, because they result from water transportation competition.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Consideration has not been given to the fact that the railroads would reduce their rates because of the water competition, which means that much of the tonnage which it is anticipated will move over the projected seaway will not materialize.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator that it is doubtful whether it would be of financial benefit. There is only one way by which to assure that it would not cost us anything, and that is to withdraw the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have spoken so much on the subject of the St. Lawrence Seaway during the past 10 or 12 years that I doubt that anything I might say now would add anything to what I have already stated heretofore.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Did the Senator hear the last remark of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. AIKEN. No. I did not.

Mr. WILEY. I would like to ask a question, because it simply shows that the Senator from Arkansas is not thinking the problem through. The Senator from Arkansas says that the only way the St. Lawrence project will not cost this country any money is by not joining with the Canadians. I should like to ask who is going to pay the freight on the major portion of the traffic which will pass through the canal? Is it United States shipping?

Mr. AIKEN. In answer to the question of the Senator from Wisconsin, it is estimated that about three-fourths of the freight will be of American origin or destined for American ports. Therefore, regardless of who builds the seaway, it is anticipated that the people of the United States will pay about three-fourths of the cost. Mr. President, even though I had not intended to speak at this time, I desire to express the feeling that we have nothing whatever to gain by being facetious about the security of the United States and the means of obtaining it. Nothing is to be gained by belittling the great nation to the north of us, or by pointing out how small that nation is, or how dependent she is, or by suggesting that that nation would not dare do anything we did not like, anyway. Not only is that nonsense, but it is completely unfair. Canada is one of the great and growing nations of the world. In wealth, Canada is potentially near the top, among all the nations. It is only a matter of a few years before Canada will be more important than most of the countries of the Old World.

Although it is true that there are approximately only 15 million people in Canada today, she can look forward—as Abraham Lincoln did, in looking to the West—and to the St. Lawrence Seaway, and can point to the time when 50 million people will live within her borders. Canada is one of the great, coming nations of the world; and her interests are inextricably interlocked with ours.

Mr. President, it may be said, "Let Canada build the seaway alone, and we will use it." But what honesty is there in such an attitude? Canada and the United States today are working together for the security of the North American Continent. Toward that end, Canada and the United States are cooperating in many projects, including the construction of airports. The United States is cooperating with Canada in the construction of bridges and the development of aviation facilities along our borders and in the planning of international highways. We must cooperate with Canada in every way, including construction of the great St. Lawrence Seaway, because that is for our mutual security—not for Canadian security alone, not for the security of the United States alone.

Mr. President, we have cooperated with Canada in the construction of radar installations all the way from the 45th parallel, which passes through my State of Vermont, almost to the Arctic Ocean. We must continue to cooperate with Canada.

I am very sorry that some of the groups opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway—the construction of which, as has been said, is inevitable, regardless of who constructs it—have taken the position they have. We might say that today the opposition emanates from the ports of Boston, New York, Baltimore, and New Orleans. We may add to them certain railroad interests who have been inveigled into that position by the railroads and the investment houses located in eastern cities.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me make it very clear that the junior Senator from New York, who represents, at least in part, the State of New York and the Port of New York, is in no way opposed to the St. Lawrence Seaway. In fact, as the Senator from Vermont knows, I have been strongly sponsoring the bill, and have been urging the passage of similar bills for a great many years. My interest goes back nearly three decades.

Mr. AIKEN. I have known for years that the junior Senator from New York has always been an ardent supporter of this great development. But, I cannot say the same for some of the banking interests in New York or the New York Port Authority. It is true they have been very successful in getting all the export business away from Boston. I do not know why Boston now stands up and fights the means of recovering some of that business. However, Boston does take that position.

What we find in Boston and New York, we can find counterparts of in Baltimore and New Orleans. All those interests want is to force the export business of the United States to pass through those few ports, which would be extremely vulnerable in case of war. If submarines should be as efficient in another war as they were in the last war, those ports would be almost cut off from traffic with the rest of the world. Such a situation certainly would not be in the interest of our security. Neither would it be in the interest of a sound economy or of a strong nation, to force an uneconomic means of transportation to be used. Mr. President, I am sorry that some persons and some groups, including the eastern railroads, take such a short-sighted view of this situation. Most of the railroads go along with the St. Lawrence Seaway project. Only a few of the eastern railroads take such an unspeakably unsound attitude toward our national development and the furtherance of our national security.

Let us consider for a moment the opposition of the New England railroads to the St. Lawrence seaway. I do not know how stupid they think the Members of Congress may be; but I know that representatives of the New England railroads have communicated with certain Members of Congress from the New England States, to the effect that if they succeed in blocking the St. Lawrence Seaway, it will be possible to have Labrador ore come to Boston, and then be transported on their railroads to the steel plants of the Midwest.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Vermont question the statement which has been made, namely, that the St. Lawrence Seaway will be conducted, regardless of whether the pending bill is passed?

Mr. AIKEN. I agree.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Vermont agree that the St. Lawrence seaway will be built?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I agree.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then what difference does it make what this port or that port thinks about the St. Lawrence seaway? If the seaway is to be built, the attitude toward it of a certain number of ports is quite immaterial, is it not?

Mr. AIKEN. Their attitude has the same significance as United States cooperation with Canada in the defense of the Arctic or United States cooperation with Canada in the construction of airports and radar stations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But if all of us agree that the seaway is going to be built, anyway, why does the Senator from Vermont feel that the people of New Orleans are interested in opposing passage of the pending bill?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe there are more than 100 persons in the city of New Orleans who oppose the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, but I expect that among those 100 persons will be found some of the most selfish persons the Lord ever let live on earth.

Similarly, in Boston, New York, and Baltimore, only a few persons are opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway. I will guarantee that the State of Massachusetts is overwhelmingly in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway. I will guarantee that if the people of New York voted on the question of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the majority of them would be found to be in favor of it.

I do not suppose the people of Maryland have been advised about the seaway. I believe that if the people of Arkansas

knew what the St. Lawrence Seaway will mean, they would favor its construction, and they would say to the Senator from Arkansas, "Get away from the selfish little group of vested interests who oppose the seaway. We want you to ignore them, and to serve the people of the United States. Get away from the selfish groups who oppose the construction of the seaway."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont insists on shifting his ground every minute. He will not keep to the point.

The people of Arkansas are quite aware that the St. Lawrence Seaway will be built, without enactment of the pending measure.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have yielded only for a question; I did not yield to the Senator from Arkansas for an argument. He has had the floor for a long time this afternoon, and I have just begun to speak. If he wishes to ask a question, I shall yield for that purpose, and shall try to answer his question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator from Vermont does not wish to yield long enough to hear a valid argument, I shall take my seat.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, how silly it is for the railroad interests in New England to think they can fool the people of New England and fool the Members of Congress who represent the New England States into believing that if construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway can be blocked, the result will be to force the transportation of the Labrador ore through the port of Boston, overland to Toledo, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Cleveland, and possibly even to Chicago. How ridiculous such a position is. How do they plan to prevent Canada from building the seaway? I do not know.

Those who oppose construction of the seaway said they were going to prevent Canada from approving it. Certain vested interests in the United States sent representatives to Ottawa, several years ago, and boasted they were going to prevent Canada from approving construction of the seaway. Their representatives went to Ottawa, and argued there, but were defeated, because both Houses of the Canadian Parliament unanimously approved construction of the seaway. If the representatives of the same vested interests go again to Canada, in the belief that at this time they will be able to succeed in blocking Canadian approval of construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, they will meet with the same defeat, because they simply cannot succeed in their effort to block construction of the seaway.

Mr. President, only one question is before the Senate. The question is not directed to the merits of the seaway itself. The question is not whether the seaway will be constructed to a depth of 27 feet or to a depth of 27½ feet. The question is not whether the seaway will be constructed to a width of 78 feet or to a width of 82 feet. The question is not whether 300 tons or 3,000 tons of shipping will be diverted from Baltimore or New York or Boston. The question now before the Senate is whether the United States will participate in the construction of what will be the greatest waterway on the face of the earth, and one which will carry the most tonnage of any waterway known. Mr. President, that tonnage will not be taken from existing traffic. On the contrary, it will be new tonnage, created from the strengthening of these two great nations, Canada and the United States.

On the one side we have the President of the United States saying that the St. Lawrence project is necessary in the interest of national security. We have the National Security Council saying that it is needed in the interest of national security. We have the Secretary of Defense saying the same thing. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and members of the President's Cabinet are asking Congress to approve this project because it is necessary to our national security.

On the other hand, we have the president of the Boston & Maine Railroad and, I suppose, the director of the port authority in Boston, and their counterparts in three or four other cities, saying that this project is not advisable.

Whose advice are we to take? One member of the Armed Services Committee spoke yesterday against the seaway, taking as his authority the president of the Boston & Maine Railroad and the director of the Boston Port Authority, rather than the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the National Defense Council, and members of the Cabinet. What in heaven's name are we coming to? Why do we not get rid of those men, put them out of office, and let some railroad president, some port director, or some investment banker come here and serve as our authority on national security. What is the need for all these Government officers if members of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate simply will not take their advice?

Mr. President, the question is, Who is to be our authority? Who are to be our advisers? Are they to be those who have had a lifetime of training in this field—men such as President Eisenhower, Secretary Wilson, and other members of the Cabinet? Or shall we rely upon those who think they can block the project, by insisting that Members of Congress vote against this great development so essential to the defense of the North American Continent?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] repeatedly made the statement in his argument that 6 months was the length of time that the proposed waterway could be utilized.

In 1953 the Army engineers, as shown on page 48 of the hearings, said:

> Based upon records of the last 45 years for the St. Marys Falls Canal, the Welland Canal, and Montreal Harbor, the waterway will be open for shipping on the average of 8 months a year.

All we have to do is to examine the figures showing the tonnage which comes into the harbors on the lakes to see the amount of tonnage which will utilize the proposed waterway.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas questioned the Department of Commerce exhibit found on page 18 of the committee report, which shows the estimated tonnage which will use the St. Lawrence canal. The question was raised as to when the tonnage would come. The testimony shows that even now some of the ore tonnage is coming down using the present waterway. However, the improved waterway will not be open for 5 or 6 years.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. When was that estimate of tonnage made?

Mr. WILEY. In 1949.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Why do we not have a fresh estimate? I thought that estimate was made in 1940.

Mr. WILEY. Certainly as compared with 1949 there would be an increase at the present time.

I have already placed in the RECORD information showing the estimated tonnage of iron ore and grain. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who a few moments ago asked the question, Upon whom are we to rely? Are we to rely upon loose statements by Senators who are not engineers, who do not know what they are talking about when it comes to the question of tonnage estimates, who will not accept the statements of experts in our own Government, who will not take the word of the President of the United States, Gen. Omar Bradley, or anyone else? They are simply raising a smokescreen.

I must leave the Chamber to attend another meeting. However, I wished to place these facts in the RECORD. Again I invite attention to the table found on page 18 of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, showing the estimated potential traffic of iron ore, grain, and other commodities when the canals are opened. The estimate shows a figure of between thirty and thirty-seven and one-half million tons of iron ore. A charge of 50 cents a ton would realize from $15 million to $18 million in receipts.

One further word before I leave. As I previously stated, rather facetiously, there are Scotsmen in Canada. Furthermore, there are businessmen in Canada who know a good thing when they see it. I have no doubt that there are some folks in Canada who would like to take over this project and operate it. I cannot blame them. The question is whether we are going to be so dumb that we are not going to take advantage of this great enterprise which lies at our very feet, the greatest undeveloped potential power and water highway in the world, from the standpoint of commerce, and from the standpoint of population. That is the issue. We should participate in the project as a business proposition.

The exhibit which was placed in the RECORD by the Department of Commerce indicates that this is not a proposal to give money away, as suggested by the Senator from Arkansas. This project represents an investment in an international business enterprise which will operate for the economic health, stability, and safety of this great country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly again on this subject.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], in a colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], debated at some length the question as to whether there would be a few cents greater charge by ship than by rail in connection with the ore which would come down from Labrador. I do not know just what the difference, if any, would be. It probably would not be very substantial. However, the Senator from Louisiana has completely overlooked one very great security and defense factor which is involved in this issue. The ore fields of Minnesota and other northern States are rapidly becoming depleted. There is no question about that. The supply remaining will meet the requirements of our iron and steel mills for only a relatively few years, whereas in Labrador there are tremendous newly discovered iron-ore deposits, rich in content. They can be brought down from Labrador to our steel mills on or adjacent to the Great Lakes, to Cleveland, to Pittsburgh, Chicago, and other northern ports, down the St. Lawrence River on an inside waterway which would not be vulnerable to enemy attack if we should ever get into another world conflict, which we must all confess is a very real possibility.

The only alternative, if those ores are not to have free access to our steel mills of the Middle West and West, is to bring in ore by a long sea route, completely vulnerable to enemy attack. We know the effectiveness of enemy attack, from bitter experience in the First World War and the Second World War.

That is a great factor in our defense. There is no doubt that that was one of the reasons why the President of the United States, our Security Council, and our Chiefs of Staff—not only the present Chiefs of Staff, but the Chiefs of Staff who served before them—laid so much stress on the security angle of this proposal. It is one of the main issues and one that we should not shrink from recognizing merely because a relatively small investment is involved. It is a very small investment in comparison with the toll-free investments which we are making in Arkansas and Louisiana and Florida, and in New York as well. There is also involved the security angle and the economic angle, from which we can profit. There cannot be the slightest question that the opening up to the commerce of the East, to Europe, and other parts of the world of the great resources of the Midwest will be of tremendous benefit to the entire country.

Mr. President, what has somewhat disappointed me during my service in the Senate—I am not critical of anyone, and I want to make that clear—is how greatly parochial and provincial considerations sometimes play a part in the determination of an issue by a Senator from a given State. I have heard time and time again, and have seen evidences of it, that unless a proposal can directly benefit the State which the Senator represents, he may be opposed to it. I do not believe that Senators are elected exclusively to represent their own States or to consider only the immediate effect that certain actions will have on their State. Yes, Mr. President, a Senator's primary duty is, of course, to represent the people of his State. However, he has another and very important duty—that is to represent the people of the Nation as a whole. I have voted time and time again for appropriations which have helped Louisiana, Arkansas, and Florida, and many other States.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall yield in a minute. I have voted for them not because I thought they would directly benefit the State of New York, but because I believed and was convinced that what is good for Arkansas, what is good for California, what is good for Florida, or what is good for Louisiana or Ohio, or Pennsylvania, is good for New York; perhaps not immediately, but certainly in the long run. We are an integrated Nation, not a confederation of little areas, with each one seeking a parochial or provincial advantage. That is why as far back as I can remember I have favored the pending proposal, as I have favored every other proposal which I believed would benefit the Nation as a whole, even though I could not recognize any immediate benefit to my own State, and even though my constituents could not see a direct and immediate benefit from them. However my constituents followed me in support of measures which further the prosperity of the Nation as a whole, believing firmly that when we do so and the Nation prospers, the State of New York will also prosper.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator from New York is familiar with the fact that some time ago when the junior Senator from Louisiana served as chairman of a subcommittee handling authorizations for military bases that subcommittee for the first time reduced appropriations for all except one of the requests for funds, thus saving about $700 million of unnecessary expenditures. If it could be established—and the Senate agreed—that we could achieve a $700 million economy by avoiding unnecessary expenditures, would not the Senator from New York agree that such economies are in the interest of the Nation?

Mr. LEHMAN. No economies are in the interest of the Nation unless they can be demonstrated to be for the benefit of the Nation. I know that we are reducing certain proposed appropriations for the Air Force, as we did last year. We allegedly saved four or five billion dollars last year by reducing our Air Force from 143 wings to I believe 110 wings. However, I am not convinced that that so-called economy was a sound economy or that it was beneficial to the country as a whole or safeguarded the defenses and the security of our country as a whole.

I appraise the value of appropriations on the basis of what they do for the prosperity and security of the Nation, and on no other basis.

Mr. LONG. What I had in mind was the fact that the economies to which I referred were put into effect by the Senate by unanimous vote. Therefore, I assume the Senator from New York agreed that the $700 million in economies which the junior Senator from Louisiana had in mind were perhaps good economies.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not recall the economies which the junior Senator from Louisiana has in mind. I will say, however, that when it comes to reducing appropriations for our defense or other essential purposes it is unwise to do so, as I stated on the floor of the Senate many times. When it comes to widening or dredging certain streams in Louisiana, New York, or Arkansas, and it cannot be proven that such projects are of benefit to the defense of the country or important to the economic well-being of the country, they can very well be eliminated or at least postponed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator well knows by this time in the debate that the attitude of the junior Senator from Louisiana is not that he opposes a 27-foot project but that he feels that Canada will build it anyway, Canada wants to build it, and Canada has already built the existing projects with no assistance from the United States, and that it would be a completely unnecessary expenditure of $105 million by the United States on a project which will be constructed anyway.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to reply by saying that if the Senator from Louisiana had stated on the floor that the project was unwise, extravagant, or wasteful, I would be more greatly convinced. However, when he says that he does not oppose the project on its merits but merely wants to prevent the United States from joining Canada as a partner in the construction of the proposed project and in helping to build up the continent in its economy and security, then I am frank to say I do not agree with the Senator from Louisiana.

I believe this is a project which, in all probability, will be self-liquidating. It certainly will be a great deal more self-liquidating than have been many projects which the United States has undertaken for the benefit of small areas. If it will not be entirely self-liquidating, there is certainly no very great investment involved. The small risk which we take that the revenues will fall short of the cost of operation by a few hundred thousand dollars, or a million dollars a year—and that is all that is involved in the whole issue—should not cause us to say to Canada, "You go it alone. We do not want to have any part of it. We are not interested in it. We have been friends, and hope we shall always be friends, but you control it, and we will surrender our voice and our influence, and our authority in this matter." I do not understand that, Mr. President.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that this is a completely unnecessary expenditure. As has been pointed out, Canada already has a 14-foot navigation project there which she permits the United States to use, and we have opened up channels in the Great Lakes, including Lake Michigan, and we permit Canada to use our channels. It seems to me it

would make better sense if the Senator were asking that we acquire a 50-percent interest in the Suez Canal. The St. Lawrence project is going to be built, anyway, and there is only a small portion of the St. Lawrence River that even borders the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to make one very brief comment on that statement.

If I thought the United States could buy a 50-percent interest in the Suez Canal and have assurance that we would not be involved in dangerous political situations—which assurance we could not get, under the circumstances in the Middle East—I would want to give it very careful consideration.

May I also recall to the mind of the Senator from Louisiana, who, because he is so much younger than I, is much nearer his school days than I am and who, I am certain, recollects history better than I do, that England bought a 50-percent interest in the Suez Canal during the days of Disraeli, which I think were around 1870, and the purchase, which gave a great voice in the operation of the Suez Canal was one of the things which led to the greatness of England.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does not the Senator think that a Senator is well within his rights to register his objection to a project which has not been proved to be beneficial to the United States in relation to the Dominion of Canada? No one can foresee at this time the benefit of the seaway. We do know that it is to be 27 feet deep. We know that 2 percent or less of American privately owned merchant vessels could use it. We know it will be used very extensively by Canada and by shallow-draft foreign ships. But we do not know exactly what the benefits to the United States will be. If there is any real question about it, I think a Senator is well within his rights to vote against the project.

Mr. LEHMAN. I very fully agree with the distinguished Senator from Maryland that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] are entirely within their rights in expressing their opinions. There is no question at all about that.

I also want to say that in arguing with the Senator from Louisiana or with the Senator from Maryland I realize that they are acting in full sincerity on this question, as I know they do on every other question which comes before the Senate. I just do not agree with them. I think they are wrong. And it is also within the rights of the Senator from New York to express his opinion and stand by it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it appears to me that the St. Lawrence Seaway is not quite like the old soldier, who fades away. It neither dies nor fades away.

As I examine the history of the project I discover that the first suggestion about the improvement of the St. Lawrence River was made 125 years ago by a Canadian by the name of James Young. Since that time it has attracted the attention of people on both sides of the St. Lawrence River. I think its history is indicative of the fact that the subject does not die, and the debate on the floor of the Senate at this time, in January 1954, positively proves that it has not faded away.

All sorts of things have happened, including, of course, what I have always regarded as overstatement on both sides of the question.

Before I venture any further and before some Senator rises up to read the RECORD and smite me hip and thigh, I must confess that I helped to lead the fight on this proposal last year through Senate Joint Resolution 27, introduced on the 16th day of June. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] joined me in that resolution which called for more current data.

I am not very much concerned about the record rising up and smiting me in the face. That has happened so often that I have become accustomed to it. But I am always disconcerted when history rises up to smite me in the face, and I find that my feeble judgment was fallacious and in error. In such a case I suppose a man's natural pride is affected.

So I want to make some observations about the St. Lawrence project. I am frank to say that at the moment my notions are still rather fluid, but I find that, at least, my hostility has abated somewhat, and I can state later, when the time comes to go on record, how I shall be disposed with respect to the question.

First, Mr. President, let me address myself to the subject of overstatement. That is probably a congenital weakness in our country. We go into Gargantuan things which are colored by extreme statement and extreme judgment. I think that is true in this instance. I can illustrate it by the fact that many years ago my predecessor in the House of Representatives thought it would be a great thing for my State and for the Middle West to sponsor a project to construct a deep waterway in connection with the Illinois River. I am confident that he was sincere in his effort. I am satisfied that it was an earnest endeavor on his part, and even though he has been gathered to his fathers sometime ago I now pay him tribute for his sincere endeavors.

I became an opponent of his in a primary contest in the State of Illinois, and it became my duty and, I thought, my responsibility, to bring light and edification of my people, to show that it would never be actually a deep waterway in the sense it was then thought of, with people in gaily colored clothing from foreign countries standing on the deck of a vessel waving to the townfolk who lived along the river. I had to explain that they were doomed to great disappointment in that respect. I remember the rather extreme statements which were made. It was to be a deep waterway through the heart of the State and of the Corn Belt. It would be only a question of time until great ocean-going liners in all their majesty and grandeur, would glide over the placid bosom of the Illinois River, and the commerce of the seven seas would be brought to our doors. They were doomed to frustration, as will be apparent when I say that I still reside in a little town on the Illinois River, and I have yet to see an ocean-going liner on that waterway. I have still to see any argosy or any other instrumentality of commerce, of deep-draft or otherwise, on the Illinois River. It still is what I contended it would be, that is, a waterway, of course, that was accommodated, in the main, to barge traffic. I came to that conclusion, not by any theory or by reaching into thin air for a conclusion, but rather from hard experience, because in those days I was a marine contractor on the Illinois River. In the operation of a number of dredging rigs, it was necessary for me to transport coal by boat. I had some of my own barges, and I had boats and launches. They drew, perhaps, 5 feet of water when loaded.

That is precisely what is happening upon the Illinois River today. Coal is being boated in larger quantities than ever before. The Illinois River is becoming an important artery of commerce. But the seagoing liners are not there. That is the point I wish to emphasize. The huge vessels, which I envisioned in my own mind, are not there.

In connection with that waterway we were treated to a good many extreme statements, claims, and representations as to precisely what was going to happen; but, it never happened.

I have been very diligent in going through hearings and noting the pretensions and the claims which have been made in regard to the St. Lawrence project. I doubt whether all of them will eventuate, by any means.

Mr. President, I believe history will bear out the modest estimate I made long ago with reference to the water course in my own State, because shortly after the channel was deepened, and even before locks were built on the Illinois River, the Inland Waterways Corporation was chartered. It was under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. Warehouses and docks were built, and the Corporation acquired some barges and towboats. I remember the representations made then to the effect that Illinois River would develop into a great instrumentality of commerce, under the direction of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, it is interesting to observe the epitaphs written and the monuments built in cases of that kind, for it was only late last year that the Inland Waterways Corporation was sold by the Department of Commerce. I think the rather dismal record is that after 29 years of operation, the people of the United States of America, through their Government, lost $15 million on that undertaking. If there is anyone to challenge that observation, I should be glad

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to hear him; but, I think I am rather familiar with the record.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. GORE. In order that the RECORD may be completely clear with respect to the Inland Waterways barge line, there was a long period of years, prior to World War II, when that Corporation did operate at a consistent profit. Its equipment was taken over by the Government during the war, used, and worn out. Therefore, when it was returned to the barge line, the equipment was inadequate to provide the service needed. Much of the business which the barge line possessed originally, had been dissipated and scattered to other modes of transportation.

The real question for the Government to decide, as I recall—and it was my committee that held long hearings on the subject—was whether to buy new equipment and rehabilitate the barge line, at great expense, so that it could be maintained as a going and prosperous undertaking, or to sell it to private enterprise. The latter decision was made.

I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois will recall that those were the facts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no quarrel with the observations of my esteemed and abiding friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee, for whom I bear deep affection. But the fact of the matter is that when I look at a balance sheet, quite aside from all the corollary incidentals that may beset it, I simply want to see whether a company earned money or lost money; whether the totals are footed up in red ink or in black ink.

The inexorable and inescapable fact, quite aside from any reason which may be assigned—and I may say, parenthetically, that it would be interesting to see the depreciation account and other items on the books—is that the Inland Waterways Corporation lost $15 million of the public's money. I do not believe the public is very much entranced about any operation into which the Federal Government ventures, when it costs money out of the pocketbook of the taxpayer.

The fact remains as I have stated it, despite all the rather roseate pretensions and claims to the effect that in due course, and over a period of time, this would indeed become a successful commercial venture of the Federal Government. But it did not work out that way. I allude to it today for the simple reason that, for myself, I intend to discount, in large measure, many of the things which have been said on the floor, both for and against the pending bill.

I doubt very much whether the railroads will be injured by the seaway to the degree that has been indicated here. I am not at all certain, on the basis of the figures, that the traffic on the St. Lawrence Seaway is going to reach the aggregate of tonnage which has been estimated by the Department of Commerce. I thought their bases were pretty thin, indeed. When they are broken down, they still remain in the field of conjecture. Perhaps it is too much to expect that the Department can look down the corridor of time, for a period of 20, 25, or 30 years, and indicate to us now what the volume of commerce will be. I am certain they cannot do that. So, as I say, I simply take the figures as to tonnage with a grain of salt in coming to a conclusion on this matter.

The instant bill is somewhat different from the measure which was under discussion last year. When I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 27, I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that its purpose was to propose a thoroughgoing study and survey of all matters relating to the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway and power project. In that respect, of course, the measure presently before the Senate is different. We are not concerned at the moment about a power project. We are concerned only about navigation and about a seaway. So I shall limit my remarks to that phase of the subject.

I wish to point out some of the things that distress me a little. In all honor, I think it must be said that I regard this proposal as somewhat of a circumvention of the treaty power. This is an international affair. I am not unmindful of the fact that the bill now pending before the Senate centers about construction within the United States. It is along our boundary. It pertains to the physical interest that we have. It may well be argued that for that reason it does not come within the compass of the treaty power. I am not persuaded entirely by that argument.

Then, as I consider the negotiations which are directed by this bill to be held with Canadian authorities and others, I am quite persuaded that if the matter had been left to me, I should have liked to have the subject covered by a treaty between Canada and the United States.

It may very well be argued that a treaty was submitted in 1932, and that is quite correct. It may be said that the treaty was not ratified by the Senate in 1934. But I doubt whether the assertion that we cannot get votes for a treaty, is a valid argument for circumventing the treaty power.

That does not necessarily mean that I shall not support this proposal. But, at least, I wish to keep the record straight by saying that, in my considered judgment, and because of the international and the intercountry aspects of the project, perhaps it should have been proceeded with by treaty. I think every effort should have been made, and should be made even now, notwithstanding the failure of 20 years ago to cover it by treaty, because that is the durable thing to do.

The Canadian Parliament at Ottawa can repeal and strike from the books of our neighbor country to the north the so-called St. Lawrence Seaway Authority which was created by an act of Parliament. If this bill were passed, a succeeding United States Congress, next year, 1955, could come into this Chamber and the other Chamber and strike this whole measure from the books. In that respect, it is not exactly durable. But when a solemn treaty or contract is entered into by two sovereign countries, it cannot be touched by the whims and the caprices that can develop in a succeeding Congress. So I wish to keep the record straight, and say for myself that the preferable thing to do, the durable thing to do, would have been to take this proposed action treatywise, rather than by a simple legislative act of the Congress.

The second point to which I wish to allude is that I believe the case which has been made thus far has been only a partial case. Sometimes a case is dramatized by omissions rather than by what is revealed. There are only 46 miles of channel involved in the pending bill. That is the channel in the International Rapids section, and, in addition, there is 68 miles of dredging in the Thousand Islands area. That is a total of 114 miles we encompass as our interest, which constitutes the international boundary between this country and Canada.

But if we are to call this a seaway, if we are to adhere to the old title, then it seems to me there should have been included all the necessary adjuncts which actually make it a seaway. I do not want the people in my section of the country to be under a misconception about it, and if it is to be a seaway there are obviously some channels in the upper Great Lakes for which provision should be made.

There is something more. The 17 major harbors of the Great Lakes, so far as I know, do not at this time accommodate vessels of 27 feet draft. Some deepening will have to be done. Obviously if it is not done by the pending bill, it will have to be done through a rivers and harbors bill. I suppose it would be a proper charge upon a rivers and harbors appropriation bill; but when we talk about a seaway, and paint a rather beautiful picture of vessels entering the mouth of the St. Lawrence, passing through 1,071 miles of channel, and, ultimately, I hope, into Lake Michigan, to dock at Milwaukee, Chicago, Michigan City, and other ports, I like to think in terms of a complete rather than a partial seaway. But there is no provision here for that.

It is said, "Oh, do not get the thing confused or complicated." The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has diligently pursued the matter of deepening the Great Lakes channels so that when vessels come down the St. Lawrence Waterway, they will not be obstructed by inadequate channels, channels which are not deep enough in the northern reaches of the Great Lakes, and will not be prevented from being loaded to full draft because the harbors will not accommodate them.

The loading is important and unless a person has at least a little familiarity with marine commerce, he does not appreciate how important it is whether a vessel is loaded to 85 percent of its capacity or 100 percent of its capacity. The difference arises because of the draft of a vessel, whether it can get into a harbor and take on a full load. But 15 percent may spell the difference between a profitable and a losing maritime adventure.

Marine commerce is not all profit. There are plenty of hazards. I see from time to time allusions to the fact that X number of vessels can use the channel if they are loaded to 85 percent of capacity. If I owned a vessel, or if I had a substantial interest in a corporation which owned some vessels, I would want to see them loaded down to the lowest line, in order to carry the greatest cargo, because I would want to see the company make a little money so that I could participate in the profits. So the argument is pretty thin when Senators talk about vessels loaded to 85 percent of draft or cargo space. What I contend is that the whole story should be told.

Of course, the fact of the matter is that we are going to be confronted with that problem sooner or later. If anyone has any doubt about it, he should read Dr. Danielian's testimony. The doctor is a very fine citizen, who is giving direction to the organization in Washington which is in favor of the St. Lawrence Seaway. He said to the conference in St. Paul some months ago that they would use all the resources of the organization to get this project completed; and that they will do it by regular procedures. That is an extremely flighty and nebulous term. But when one has been around Washington for a long time he has a pretty good idea of what Dr. Danielian means. He means that that portion of the job, deepening the harbors and the Great Lakes, will be made a charge on a rivers and harbors bill in due course; and he said as much in general language, and I am confident that he would not deny it. As a matter of fact, he said in his testimony that these things must be done in due course, but that we will do them in several bites.

I allude to that for the reason that if we are to call this project a seaway, in the accepted sense of that term, if we are to leave that impression on the minds of the American people, the whole story should be told. Then would come this question, "Is all of it self-liquidating, or is just part of it self-liquidating?" It makes quite a difference. I am sorry that more emphasis has not been placed upon that point, but I shall do so today. I want the public to know that the bill does not include harbors, it does not include Great Lakes channels. That is work which must be done. The improvement of the harbors may cost as much as $100,000,000. The deepening of the channels has been estimated to cost $99,000,000. So if we are to do the job in its entirety, then of course we should tell the whole story and include everything, because, after all, there is a Great Lake in the northern area of my State known as Lake Michigan, which today is plied by ore boats and other commerce. So I feel that if this project is to be completed perhaps we ought to be a very modest and a very humble part of it.

Let the Senate understand that sooner or later these additional charges will come, and they will either come in the pending bill or in a rivers and harbors bill, and that they will involve more money than is represented here by way of note issuing and debenture power by the Development Corporation.

The next observation I wish to make is that in the bill under consideration last year obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest would be issued. Neither the Budget Bureau nor the Treasury liked the idea, because they do not want guaranteed obligations of the Government roaming around in the market. So a different course has been adopted. The Development Corporation will issue notes and bonds and debentures to the extent of $105 million "from time to time," in the language of the bill, and sell them to the Treasury. But a provision in the bill recites:

> The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligation of the Corporation to be issued hereunder and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations hereunder.

Mr. President, that is wonderful language to include in the bill. To the average citizen it would not mean a thing. But to us it must mean something when this approach is used, and the provisions of the Second Liberty Loan Act are cited. Obviously the Treasury has to find the money somewhere. The Treasury cannot reach up into a pear tree and pull down $105 million, and hand it to the Development Corporation. The Treasury must set up the transaction as a public debt transaction. So, obviously, it is going to have to be reflected in the public debt. It will not even be a contingent debt. It will have to be a part of the recognized, direct public debt of the United States. I think the Senate deserves to be fully advised, if it has not been, and I think the country deserves to be fully advised, on that subject.

Mr. President, the next observation I desire to make is this: Suppose $105 million is not sufficient to do the job. After all, we have been in a rising-cost period; and from time to time we note that an estimate is submitted by engineers of the Government or by some other Government agency, predicated upon certain findings, only later to discover that the cost of labor has risen or that the cost of materials has risen. I assume that the estimate made in connection with this project is a firm one, and I assume that it is a good estimate, and that those who make the estimate honestly believe that with $105 million the 114 miles of work can be done. But if the $105 million is found to be insufficient, then what? Then either it will be up to Congress to expand the debenture power of the Corporation, or otherwise we shall have to resort to direct appropriations, to a rivers and harbors bill, or to some other convenient legislative instrument, in order to provide the necessary funds. Of course, that is not a pressing matter, because it will take quite a while to do the work. I assume it will take as long as 4 years, and it might take as long as 5 years, to do it. However, Mr. President, I think that fact must be manifest as we deal with this matter, and before final action is taken on the bill which is before us.

One other fact that can be disconcerting is that here we are dealing with a 27-foot waterway. I shall not trespass on the patience of the Senate by covering old ground and talking about the number of vessels which will not be able to use a 27-foot waterway if they are loaded to full capacity. I suppose that matter has been freely ventilated. In the report and also in the hearings there is much testimony on the subject.

But I think a matter of concern is this: The tendency is toward deeper channels. The tendency and the trend are toward larger vessels. The reason for that lies in the cost of operation and the cost of maintenance. A large vessel which may have twice the capacity of an older one can be operated with the same crew, and thus the costs of operation can be reduced. Certainly civilian engineers recognize that fact, and certainly the Army engineers recognize it. From time to time I have noticed the suggestions that have been made. As I recall, the Panama Canal has a depth of 40 feet. I believe the Suez Canal has a depth of 36 feet. The Kiel Canal, in Germany, has a depth of 35 feet, probably. I have seen a suggestion by the engineers that the Hudson River to Albany should be deepened to 36 feet. I have seen a suggestion that the Houston ship canal should be deepened to 35 feet. I noted not so long ago a suggestion that the channel to Mobile Bay should be deepened to 35 feet, and perhaps to 40 feet. So a very fair question is this: If this project is going to do what we hope it will do, how long will it be before it will be suggested that the channel of the project should be deepened to 36 feet; and, if so, what will the cost be and what will our obligations be?

That is speculative, to be sure; but the fact of the matter is that the Army engineers are on record in the interest of deeper channels where there is heavier commerce. So, in this instance, we should be sure in our minds that we wish to approve a 27-foot channel.

I know the practical reason for it: If the channel were to be 35 feet in depth, it would cost more; and a request for more funds and for greater authority would have to be made.

I know that ofttimes it is difficult to sell Congress on the idea of providing larger sums, larger appropriations, when Congress can be persuaded to provide a smaller sum, as a result of the generosity of the Members of this body and the Members of the other body of Congress. So, probably, there is a practical reason for it. But, let us not go at it blindly, because at some time in the future someone may say to us, "Look; you were in the Senate of the United States in 1954. You voted for a 27-foot channel. Did you not know any better? Did you not know that the engineers have constantly paraded the idea that the tendency is toward greater channel depths and toward larger vessels? Yet, you were shortsighted enough to approve

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a 27-foot channel, although, as a Senator, you had authority to strike out the figure '27' and insert the figure '35,' and then to take action to increase the amount of money provided."

So, Mr. President, it is apparent that this subject is going to be before Congress for quite a while. I remember a fellow who was in jail in my hometown. The jail was in the middle of the courthouse square. As I went by, he saw me; he knew me. I said to him, "What are you in there for?"

He told me.

I asked him, "For how long?"

He replied, "From now on." [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, this subject will be with us from now on, for quite a long time. Certainly, we do not go back on these projects when once they are undertaken.

So should we support with our voices and our votes a proposal for a 27-foot channel, or should we think seriously of what it will cost to build a 36-foot channel, either now or in the future?

Mr. President, I do not give the Senate the answer to that question. I simply ask what we want to do about that matter now, because, I think, it is important.

Then there is the question of control. I think it has been thoroughly overemphasized in one case, and underemphasized in another. I do not believe there is actually any control we might lose. One cannot lose control he does not have. As you know, Mr. President, 1,070 miles of this waterway and the Welland Canal and the outlet are under the jurisdiction and sovereignty of Canada. I have not seen in the bill or in the hearings or in the discussion anything to indicate that we could get control by dredging for 64 miles and deepening a channel to the extent of 46 miles in the International Rapids section. Nothing like that is before us. So the whole element of control is overemphasized.

If there be any doubt on that score, then let us examine the provisions of section 12 which relate to tolls and charges, because there the Development Corporation is directed to negotiate for measurement rules, tolls, and charges; and then the following is set forth:

> In the event that such negotiations shall not result in agreement, the Corporation is authorized and directed to establish unilaterally such rules of measurement and rates of charges or tolls for the use of the works under its administration.

Mr. President, the word "unilaterally" is a wonderful word. I like such polysyllabic words that trip up my tongue. [Laughter.]

However, unilaterally simply means a one-sided deal or arrangement, and nothing else.

Let us see what would happen. If we did not obtain such an agreement, of course we would have to proceed on our own, but only for so much as comes under our jurisdiction and control. That is the important thing to note, and I think it should be made abundantly clear.

Now I come to a matter which gives me concern, Mr. President. I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, that this matter probably has much to do with weakening my opposition to his bill. It is the question of national defense.

I am no swivel-chair general, and I am no "Quartermaster Corps rest" corporal. I served for several years in the Army as a private, as a corporal, as a sergeant, and as a "shavetail." I served both overseas and in the United States. But I do not pretend to be, and I do not set myself up as being, an authority in the field of national security and national defense. I do not pretend to be a scholarly lawyer, but I do say that if the average citizen wishes to know something about the law he had better go to a lawyer. If one develops logoes on the bogoes, the heebie-jeebies, housemaid's knee, or water on a kidney, he goes to a doctor. When I wish to know something about national defense, there is only one place to go. I go to men who are expert and skilled in that field, and who can speak with a degree of authority.

This is a question which bothers me somewhat.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. What does the Senator do when there is equally good authority on both sides of the question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us consider that question for a moment. Probably the best authority I know, and the man who would necessarily speak with authority, would be Mr. Nash, of the Defense Department. He appeared before the committee of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and his testimony will be found on page 528 of the hearings. He is Assistant Secretary of Defense for National Security Affairs. It is fair to assume that Mr. Nash must have consulted with many experts and authorities in the Department of Defense with respect to the security attributes of this program. They believe that it is, not necessarily indispensable, but conducive to the defense of the country.

Mr. Nash makes manifest a number of reasons. One in particular is that our first line of defense, of course, is the homefront, and that to make the homefront sound and effective in time of conflict we must have material. So the defense experts are obviously looking toward deposits of ore in Labrador which could be brought down to the United States, and which could be pretty well defended and shielded, as distinguished from ore which might come out of the mountain in Venezuela which was opened last week. So we have a defense factor in that situation. One would have a right to assume that those experts speak with authority on the subject. I am always reluctant to place myself in the position of quarreling with those who ought to know very much more about a subject than I do.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator speaks of the persons who hold those positions as of today. However, in the past men who have held very high positions in our Defense Department have come before committees of the Senate and subjected themselves to the most searching cross-examination. They made a very good case against the entire project, on the ground that it would be completely indefensible. On the other hand, the persons upon whom the Senator relies do not come before the committee. They write letters. They did not give me the opportunity to cross-examine them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Nash appeared officially and testified officially before the committee, as recorded in the hearings.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. Nash is the only one who did so. Many others did not come before the committee. In years past persons who have held the most responsible positions in our Defense Establishment have come before committees of the Senate and have told us that this project would be completely indefensible. Indeed, the man who was in charge of knocking out the Eder Dam and the Mohn Dam in Germany was one of those men. He was a very eminent man in the air branch of our defense. He said that if one lock in the proposed canal were to be knocked out—which could be easily done if the enemy felt that it was hurting him in any way—traffic in both directions would be tied up. Ships in the lakes could not get out, and ships outside could not get in.

Moreover, the admiral who was in charge of our submarine defense testified that the Gulf of the St. Lawrence is a haven for enemy submarines. He said that there was a great deal of submarine activity in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence, and, indeed, that the number of kills in that area, considering the number of ships traversing that waterway, was very great.

I say that we must give some credence to the statements of such men. No one doubts that the problem is perplexing. I do not believe that we can assume that all the expert authority is on one side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is an answer to my good friend from Maryland, if he will indulge me as I comment. I remember the lines which Shakespeare wrote long ago, to the effect that the devil can cite Scripture to his purpose. So I suppose anyone can find people with varying degrees of authority to be in his corner, on one side of a proposition or on the other. However, if 100 persons came from the Defense Department, they would not be more persuasive than one person by the name Nash, the Assistant Secretary, who appeared before the committee. He is clothed with authority to speak for the Defense Establishment. He was instructed, directed, and indoctrinated as to the defense aspects of the question. He related the story. As a matter of fact, he probably simplified the testimony by so doing.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Rather than having a man who had been briefed and indoctrinated come before the committee, why did we not have the man who made the first judgment appear. Why was not the head of the Defense Establishment called? Why was not the man who would be charged with the defense of these works summoned to testify?

Why does the Defense Establishment send to the committee an Assistant Secretary, who probably, up to the time he entered the Defense Department, had nothing whatever to do with defense?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I presume that Mr. Nash could testify as competently and as fully as could Mr. Wilson if he were brought before the committee.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. All he could do was to parrot what someone had told him as a fact. Why did not the men who make the final decisions come here and testify?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer is very simple, of course. When all is said and done, our security policy is finally shaped by the National Security Council. The National Security Council has expressed the hope that there will be favorable action on this project, in the interest of national defense. Where shall we go for a better or greater authority than the National Security Council? It involves every component in Government which has some identity with the question of security, defense, and survival.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am interested in this colloquy. If the Senator will yield to me, I should like to read a letter which I have received from the Commander in Chief of the United States, who happens to be the President. The letter is dated April 23, 1953:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 23, 1953.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: At my request, the National Security Council has considered the national security interests in the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway project. The Council has advised me:

1. Early initiation and completion of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway is in the interest of national security.

2. The United States should promptly take whatever action may be appropriate to clear the way for commencement of the project, whether by Canada alone, or, now or as may be later developed, by Canada and the United States jointly.

3. It is desirable that the United States participate in the construction of the seaway; the extent of and limitations upon such participation to be the subject of separate determination by authority other than the Council.

The Council's findings and recommendations have my approval; and I propose now to discuss with the Cabinet the extent of and limitations upon United States participation in the project. I am forwarding a copy of this letter to the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission for his information and such action as he may deem appropriate.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The Senator will remember that it was after that time that the President came out fully in favor of this project.

The point has been made that there are authorities of equal standing on both sides of the question. Let me say that I have been following these hearings for about 15 years. It is true that on one occasion our dear friend, Mr. Prince, of the railroads, and others, including an admiral, got together and testified on behalf of the railroads. There is no question about that. The record so shows. But if we look into the record we find that Mr. Patterson and other Secretaries have testified that this project is needed in the national defense.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois did not limit the discussion entirely to the question of bombardment. He spoke of the imperative need of opening the waterway so that ore could be brought to the Middle West, to Chicago, Pittsburgh, and other industrial centers, in peacetime, in preparation for defense, as well as in time of war.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall not worry the Senator from Illinois after I have asked this final question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The record must show that the Senator from Maryland never worries me. I like his very engaging participation in the discussion.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It is a very unusual procedure for the Department of Defense to say that a given project is in the interest of defense and is a strong adjunct to our national defense, and at the same time not send to the committees of Congress the men who have made the initial finding in that respect. I ask the Senator from Illinois to show me one case in the history of the Committee on Armed Services, whether it be on the question of sending our troops to Europe or on the question of building bases in Africa, India, Pakistan, or wherever we are building them, when the men who have made the ultimate decision that such projects are necessary adjuncts to our defense have not appeared before the committees of the Congress before the projects were authorized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is difficult, of course, to set aside the fact that the National Security Council, which is charged with a grave responsibility in connection with our security and our defense, has indicated not only its interest but has uttered the hope that the project might be advanced to a conclusion in a favorable way at a reasonably early time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In a moment I shall be happy to yield. Of course, that same message comes from the Department of Defense, as indicated in the record of the committee hearings, and the President has indicated his interest in the matter in his state of the Union message.

The President is a military man in the sense that he has been schooled in the miltary field. I would not for a moment, except under the most extraordinary circumstances, seek to set up my judgment against one whose judgment is predicated upon long experience, unless I had arguments and facts and data with which I thought I could rebut and refute his conclusions.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I do not relish disagreeing with the President of the United States on the pending proposal. I have the greatest respect for his ability to judge the value of projects.

However, the simple question I have asked of the Senator from Illinois is this: If we follow a pattern for the building of our defense establishments, why do we forsake that pattern now? If this waterway is to be an adjunct to defense, and if it possesses the defense features which the Senator from Illinois says it does, then the project should be treated as any other similar project is treated. Those who are sponsoring it should tell the committees of Congress why it is needed and what it will cost.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Those answers have been given. The Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. Nash, gave the answers, 1, 2, 3. He was not vague. He assigned the reasons. I thought within the brief compass of his remarks he was quite specific when he stated the impact of the St. Lawrence Seaway upon the defense of the country.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. With all due respect, I say to the Senator from Illinois that we have the solemn obligation of protecting the purse of the American people. Before we spend any money belonging to the taxpayers, we should not take a composite view from Mr. Nash, because the information possessed by Mr. Nash and put into the document which he has sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations is one of the weakest links in the chain of argument advanced in favor of the bill. Men should come before the committee so we can cross-examine them on the facts they present. Cross-examination may show the witnesses to be not too well-informed. I believe Congress has a right to examine into the questions involved in a project of this kind and should determine which projects are in the interest of our national defense. If the project is in the interest of our defense, we should treat it as we treat any other defense project. Let us call the military experts before our committee and ask them to explain it to us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, that very point was examined into. Examination was made into the question of control, into the question of omitted costs, and into the question of overemphasis by statement on one side or the other. I was confessing my difficulties with the subject, until I got to the item relating to national defense.

I hope my good friend from Maryland will not forsake me at this vesper hour, because I need him.

Last year we had before us on the floor of the Senate a bill relating to foreign aid. There was a great deal of hostility shown toward the amount the bill proposed to appropriate. My good friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] carried the laboring oar at that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

time in the Committee on Appropriations and helped to fortify me, as I tried on occasion to fortify him. In due course the committee reported a bill to the Senate. What did it contain? The committee said that in the interest of survival and security it is necessary to appropriate money directly to France and indirectly to Indochina, 9,000 miles from America.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations sent the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself out to the Orient 7 months ago. We were at Haiphong in the Hanoi Delta and we were in Saigon, and we looked at the picture there in order to get some idea of the problem. I thought, "Here I am, persuaded that probably the action taken by us is in the interest of our national defense, even though the country involved is thousands of miles from home." The decision followed the suggestions made by Admiral Radford and by the President of the United States and by a great galaxy of military officers who appeared before the Committee on Appropriations.

When we were through there was included in the bill—and I draw on my memory now—direct appropriations and unexpended balances of approximately $1,100,000,000. I ask the Senator from Louisiana whether that is correct, or approximately correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is approximately correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, when Members of Congress were getting ready to go home, or some time prior thereto, there came an intimation from the White House that an additional $385 million would be required, and that amount was appropriated in the interest of national defense, even though the money would be spent in a country halfway around the world. I believe that if an auger were driven through the earth it would probably come out in Saigon.

I found myself supporting the appropriation. Why? I wanted to save money, as did everyone else. I have always been in favor of saving money. I come from a very frugal family. My mother had to be almost parsimonious in order to raise a large family. On Sunday, if I had been decorous, she would give me a penny and say, "Here, my son. Don't spend it all in one place." When one is reared in that fashion, he pinches a dollar several times and turns it over before he spends it. Therefore, I am very reluctant to spend the people's money unless I believe the expenditure will yield a good return.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Madam President, I love to engage the distinguished Senator from Illinois in colloquy. One of the main points in the argument against the project is that it will be built whether or not we join Canada. Therefore, why should we contribute $105 million to get that which we can get free of charge? If the Senator from Illinois wants to pinch pennies, this is a good time to start pinching them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is said that it will be built anyway.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It may be built. If it is built without our help, it will be built entirely by one country. Certainly, while we would have control over the portion of the project which lies along our boundary, as provided in the bill, what would be the situation with respect to the remaining 1,070 miles?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The remaining 1,070 miles, or the majority of them, lie wholly within Canadian territory.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed they do.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. And we would have no control over them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed not.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. So our interest would be less than 5 percent. Can the Senator from Illinois tell me what would happen to an interest of less than 5 percent in the kind of closely held corporation that is proposed to be created? If he can tell me what would happen, I should like to have him do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a participating venture.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. To what extent? Can the Senator tell me to what extent it is a participating venture?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would not make any difference whether it were 1 percent or any amount so long as the good will were there. If the good will were there, it would be a good investment.

As I stated before, I am not persuaded by the argument with respect to the control of the project. That does not persuade me one way or the other. I am not unmindful of the fact that it is infinitely better to make it a joint venture in good will, if the investment is not too great, and thus pave the way whereby we can sit around a table and reason and work out the problems connected with the operation of the project.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. May I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that there has been nothing but the closest cooperation between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And may that always continue.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Our participation will not have anything whatever to do with that. But, as has been pointed out—I think I first pointed it out, myself, and it was again pointed out on the floor today by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—Canada has, in the most polite terms, told us she does not want us to build the works on our side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not so understood.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It is correct. The Canadian Minister of Transport has said, in almost so many words, that Canada does not want us to do that work. To say that if we do not go in to it to the extent of $105 million Canada is going to breach a treaty obligation does not make any sense.

Mr. WILEY. I did not say that.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It was stated.

Mr. WILEY. I did not say that at all. We are building our own canal.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. On whose side?

Mr. WILEY. On our side. The Senator should know that by this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I simply point out to my friend from Maryland this language:

> Providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence Seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security.

Either I misread the bill or I have been under a terrible misapprehension for a long time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] quoted the exact language of the Minister of Transport of the Dominion of Canada, wherein he said he would rather we did not build on our side. They want to build it over on their side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is probably a personal opinion of the Minister of Transport. The fact of the matter is that there has been created a St. Lawrence Seaway Authority by act of the Dominion Government.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Our participation is what the Senator said it was. If we provide $105 million, we have no assurance who is going to build the locks and the works, and any agreement that may follow the building of them is perfectly nebulous as of this time, and no one knows what is going to happen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I simply say to my friend that long ago I forgot everything I knew about trigonometry and logarithms. Where the works will be built and why is wholly an engineering matter that has to be determined by surveys. I would not pretend to pass upon that question. Suppose they were actually located——

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator contend that we should appropriate $105 million of the taxpayers' money when we do not have any idea who is going to build the works and where they will be built?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am assuming they will be built on our side.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Suppose they are not. Suppose Canada says she has an agreement to build them on her side?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend is speaking about the detailed physical location of these works. How many times has it happened in my State, for instance, when a bridge was to be constructed, and the places for the abutments were described in great detail, the engineers began to make borings and suddenly discovered that the subsoil was not suited to the project. That sort of thing has to be decided by competent engineers.

But I want to pursue the question of national defense. I should feel rather ill at ease if someone said to me, "You voted more than a billion dollars for national defense for Indochina, thousands of miles from home, to prevent that segment of Asia from being cut off, but you

did not do anything for national defense on your own continent when the National Security Council said it was necessary to national defense."

That is rather a difficult position in which to be placed, and, obviously, it gives me some concern.

Mr. President, I was in Formosa, where we made available approximately $100 million to the forces of Nationalist China under the direction of Chiang Kai-shek. Why? Was it because we wanted to throw money to the birds? No. We realized that Formosa is a springboard, and is essential in the defense perimeter of this country. We are building bases in Spain today. We are building bases in Morocco. We are trying to forge a link in the defense chain in Iran and elsewhere in Asia. We have made money available to Pakistan. Why? Because out of the generosity of our hearts we can deal it out freely? Indeed not, Mr. President. It is because we remember that Karachi is one of the great ports of the world and was when we were in World War II, because there were a great many vessels which went to that port which is now the capital of Pakistan, and we are thinking of keeping it within the orbit of the defense of this country.

We are spending money in Europe today. Why? Not because we do not have problems of our own, not because we have a large surplus in the Treasury. Oh, indeed not. It is being done in the interest of survival.

I tried to carry a bit of an oar when the question came before the Congress last year in the form of the foreign-aid bill. I do not know that any member of the National Security Council came to testify before the Subcommittee on Appropriations on which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and I served. There was a great parade of witnesses, but they were mainly people in uniform, and we were dealing with technical questions, but we were pretty well persuaded that at long last it was in the interest of our survival and our security.

So, Mr. President, I point out that we have gone far afield in the world. We have gone over the blue waters of the sea into every corner of the world, islands, peninsulas, and continents, in order to build up a resistive force, not for the mere sake of having bristling rifles over the world, but because of the impact upon the security and the survival of this Nation.

The theory may be wrong; I do not know. Who knows how it will all turn out in a world of hostile spirit and of red marauders? Who can tell us what is down the road? But it at least represents the best judgment of intelligent and prudent men, not only in the executive branch but in the legislative branch of the Government as well. So, Mr. President, notwithstanding our differences which came up on the floor of the Senate, the foreign aid bill was finally passed by a majority vote. It was effectuated into law and translated into action, and those dollars in the form of commodities, supplies, materiel, weapons, and equipment, are now marching into many corners of the earth in the interest of our survival.

How do we get those supplies? They have to be made. There must first be the raw material from which to make them. Of course, the basic raw material is steel. We know now, as we look back to the decision of the late lamented Chief Justice of the United States, that he pointed out a theory as to our responsibilities under an international organization which committed us to put an end to aggression if we could. To carry out our responsibility we had to acquire materiel, which required steel, which meant that the steel plants would have to operate. Consequently, when the furnaces were cold as the result of a strike, the late Chief Justice accepted as a fundamental premise, and so stated in his decision, that the President was within his constitutional powers as Commander in Chief in seizing the steel mills of the country.

I disagreed with his opinion then and I disagree now, but I cannot disagree with the fact that when our defense perimeter is extended we have to have raw material, ore, with which to make iron and steel. So we must be sure that there is a continuous supply of raw material forthcoming. That is one of the things involved in this question.

It has been persuasive to me, Mr. President, I think I can appreciate every one of the other arguments made here; but when it comes to the defense of the country, I do not proposed to set myself up on a pedestal and take issue with those who are far more skilled and experienced in the field of national survival and security than I am. So while I maintain a fluid position on the bill at the moment, I find there is something quite persuasive about it.

I have one other comment to make, and then perhaps I should stop. I have occupied the floor entirely too long.

It has been said that there are taconite ores, low-grade ores, which are finally developed into pellets or nodules, or whatever they may be called, which can be used in making steel and of which there is an almost illimitable supply. That could be. But the fact of the matter is that to build a taconite beneficiation plant would probably cost as much, if not twice as much, as the money involved in the pending bill. After all, suppose there is a world of taconite somewhere in the north. We would still have to be certain in the interest of our own efficiency, that we would always have access to high-grade ore, because if it were accessible to other countries, and not to the United States of America, our costs would necessarily go up. So there I leave the matter for the moment, except to make 1 or 2 other observations about the bill itself.

I have wondered somewhat whether or not an effort would be made to press the Thye amendment for the inclusion of channels and harbors in the bill—whether the dimensions of the bill are to be expanded somewhat.

Then, when it comes to the assurances provided in section 3 (a), on page 4, I wonder whether such assurances should not probably be in writing before construction begins. I would probably think seriously of adding one paragraph on page 5, to the effect that rates and tolls could well be negotiated, if possible, before construction begins, so as to dispel both misunderstanding and any misapprehension that a Member of Congress may have on that subject.

There is one other suggestion I would make to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and it is with respect to the $105 million authority contained in the bill. As I read the hearings, probably not more than $6 million would be expended the first year. I see no reason why we should charge our public debt and burden the Treasury beyond what is absolutely necessary, and a proviso in section 5, at the top of page 7, to modify the language, so as to make it read, "Notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations could be issued at a rate not to exceed 25 percent or 33⅓ percent in any one year," might well take care of the situation, and thus alleviate the burden upon the Federal Treasury and upon the national debt.

Another suggestion I would make relates to section 12. I make the suggestion only because I think perhaps the chairman of the committee may wish to give some attention to it. I honestly believe that an agreement can be negotiated with Canada with respect to the measurement rules, and rates, and charges. Some effort ought to be made to do so in advance. If it could be done, we would have that much assurance before construction begins. That does not mean for one moment that I am in the least bit suspicious about our neighbor to the north, but I realize that since this is an international matter, misunderstandings often can develop. How much better it is when an arrangement is reduced to final and precise form, for all the world to see.

I make one other suggestion to the chairman. If it should happen that rates and charges have to be unilaterally established—and that means we could not negotiate an agreement—there is language at the top of page 12 of the bill to the effect that whatever rates, charges, or tolls are made shall, upon approval of the President, be final and conclusive.

I think, Mr. President, an area of misunderstanding can often develop with respect to whether rules are as uniform as they might be; whether one rate is discriminatory as against another; whether one commodity is discriminated against as against another. So my mind always goes to the idea that when a matter is determined by administrative fiat, there ought, at least, to be some avenue of review in the courts. I do not believe it would be too much to be able to say to our citizens, "When the President has approved these unilateral rates and charges, if you feel aggrieved, if you believe a mistake has been made, if you think you are at a disadvantage with some other shipper or carrier, at least you can march into a court of law and say, 'I feel that, under the law, this is discrimination, and I respectfully petition the court for equity in the matters'."

I have never divorced myself from the idea that an administrative order always must be subject to review, because that is consonant and, I think, consistent with

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the whole theory of American jurisprudence and with our theory of government.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I take it that the Senator's last recommendation related to a situation occurring in the event there were no agreement, and a unilateral policy were established.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator from Illinois has made a very good suggestion. I am certain that if the Senator would simply put in writing the other suggestions he has made, we could accept them. The Senator has made very constructive suggestions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope to do better than that. I hope to have them reduced to amendment form, so that they may be considered when the bill is read. I shall not press them in the sense that I am a crusader for them, but I prefer, at least, to have others look at them; and if the proposed amendments commend themselves to the attention of the Senate, some of them, or all of them, might be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. WILEY. I think we shall have no trouble with them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for almost a week the Senate has vigorously debated a matter which has been an almost annual source of congressional controversy for more than 30 years. The St. Lawrence seaway has been referred to alternately as an urgent and beneficial project, and as a gigantic boondoggle. Since the first publicly constructed canal was completed between Lake St. Francis and Montreal in 1783, various proposals for a channel, or seaway, linking the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean have been subjected to careful scrutiny by the people of this country, by those of Canada, and by the Congress. Since 1932, when the Senate refused by a vote of 46 yeas to 42 nays to ratify a treaty providing for joint Canadian-American construction of the seaway, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has become a veritable depository of St. Lawrence seaway data. The Senate in all cases has refused to approve the measure. Committees have reported it, only to find it returned to them for further study by the Senate.

The sense of the Senate has, therefore, been made abundantly clear. There have been, it is true, instances when pro-St. Lawrence sentiment has waxed strong. Nevertheless, it has never waxed strong enough to override the basic objections to the approval of the seaway project.

It is needless for me to place before the Senate the complete historical background of the seaway project; Senators have heard this undertaking lauded and condemned often on this floor. Debate of the last week has been thorough. However, I should like to appeal to the basic good sense of the Senate; I wish to remind Senators of the underlying objections to the project; and in a brief few minutes, I desire to attempt to sum up, some of the reasons why I oppose this undertaking, and why I am convinced neither the security nor the future development of the United States requires its approval.

We are seeing the St. Lawrence seaway outfitted in new clothes this year; we have the project, grey-headed and bowed with age though it be, dressed in a new, a deceiving, and, to many Senators, an appealing wardrobe, cut from the cloth of national security and trimmed with the lace of self-liquidation. We are being told that all the Senate has to do is pass Senate bill 2150, provide for the creation of a St. Lawrence corporation, authorize the Treasury to purchase its bonds, and then sit back and watch the country absorb the profits and the benefits. This is quite a contrast to previous approaches. In 1932, the seaway was dressed in the treaty wardrobe; the Senate turned it down then. Since 1941, following the signing of an executive agreement, the seaway has come to the Congress under the guise of a navigation and power project. We have seen the seaway wearing a billion dollar price tag. Today, we have navigation alone; we have a so-called bargain basement price; but we still have the same basic project, with the same basic plans, plus some new ones, too. These new ones, plus the older objections, should be, and I believe are, controlling.

The seaway has been sugar-coated and watered down today; it has been marked down in price for a quick sale. But it is still a project which depends for its usefulness upon the goodwill of a foreign land, friendly though it may be, it is still a canal which, because of its depth, would deny the seaway to 90 percent of the American merchant fleet. Only 10 percent of this Nation's oceangoing fleet could use the seaway as it is proposed here, and that 10 percent estimate is on the liberal side. Former Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1952, engaged in the following colloquy with the chairman, former Senator Tom Connally, of Texas:

> The CHAIRMAN. What percentage of American seagoing vessels could navigate the seaway with a 27-foot draft?
>
> Secretary SAWYER. I think 10 percent fully loaded.

The pending measure, then, proposes to construct a channel, using public funds, which only 10 percent of the American seagoing merchant fleet can use. Of course, the proponents answer that, first, more than 10 percent of our merchant marine can use the canal by not completely loading the vessel, and, second, that the channel can be used by nearly 100 percent of the so-called Great Lakes shipping fleet. To the first proposition, I reply that it is uneconomical; it is unreasonable for us to undertake a project which, at its very inception, will force us to adopt uneconomical and inefficient methods to utilize it. To the second proposition, that concerning the so-called lakes fleet, I reply that the Senate has been given no assurance that the canal is not rapidly becoming obsolete in this respect, also. I understand that vessels used in Great Lakes commerce are becoming very large. For example, I noticed in the June 1952 issue of Maritime Reporter an article entitled, "New Ore Carrier for Great Lakes." The article describes a new 647-foot vessel, the *Philip R. Clarke*, which is the first of three sister ships to be used in transporting ore in the Great Lakes. Statistics in the article indicate that the draft of the new vessel is 25 feet and three-quarter inches.

I quote the testimony of the Director of Research of the National Federation of American Shipping:

> Competent navigators do not consider that it would be safe to send a deep-sea vessel over this waterway unless there were at least 3 feet of water under her keel at its lowest point. This automatically reduces the allowable draft at the lowest point to 24 feet.

In other words, Mr. President, the latest type of ore-carrying vessel now under construction for use in the Great Lakes draws 1 foot more of water than the shipping experts themselves deem necessary for safety. We are being asked to construct a seaway which is out of date before the first spadeful of earth is turned. For instance, the harbor at Montreal, Canada, according to data appearing in the 1953 hearings on this project, requires that large vessels have a minimum clearance of 2½ feet; 3 feet for ships over 10,000 deadweight tons. The type of lake vessel to which I have been referring is a 26,000-ton ship and would require 3 feet of clear water beneath her in order to enter Montreal Harbor. She would be too large for the St. Lawrence Seaway, as it is now presented. Any ship which draws more than 24 to 25 feet of water would be too large to navigate the seaway fully loaded.

Mr. President, on page 501 of the 1952 hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway appears a table, prepared by the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce, which indicates that less than 4 percent of the entire United States merchant marine draws 25 feet or less of water when fully loaded. In other words, between 90 and 96 percent of our merchant fleet, if fully loaded—depending on whether the estimate used is liberal or conservative—would be denied use of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] provided the Foreign Relations Committee a table in that same year which indicates that not 1 of the 57 merchant vessels under construction in this country at that time would be able to navigate the St. Lawrence Seaway under a full load. Add to this the fact that the seaway would be frozen over for at least 4 months of the year, and I believe it becomes perfectly obvious that the proposal, watered down, dressed in new clothes, and reduced in price though it be, is still a waste of money as it now stands.

Whom would this channel benefit, Mr. President? Would it primarily benefit the United States, whose vessels would have to be only partially loaded to navigate the channel? I think not. It seems obvious to me that the primary beneficiary of the St. Lawrence Seaway, as the Senate sees it today, would be our neighbors to the north of us: Canada.

Canada wants the project; Canada needs the project; Canada will build the

seaway if we just let her alone. We must not forget that it is Canadian minerals which the proponents of this project desire to move through it. Canadians would benefit by obtaining United States markets. It is true the United States would benefit in some small measure, also, but the advantage flowing to us from the construction of this project would be minute indeed when compared to those accruing to the Canadians.

The proponents of the seaway have placed themselves in a paradoxical situation, Mr. President. They tell us in one breath that the Canadians are our good friends. They say to us, "Do not worry about obtaining a treaty with Canada; do not worry about not having a hard-and-fast international agreement as the basis for the expenditure of $100 million in public funds." Yet in the next breath they tell us that we must invest this money and participate in constructing the canal in order to have a voice in the setting of tolls. The proponents indicate out of one side of their mouths that the Canadians are our friends, and in the next moment they say that the Canadians will charge us exorbitant rates unless we hold a whip over their heads. Frankly, I believe that our neighbors to the north would not levy exorbitant tolls on American vessels using the seaway. I believe the Canadians, following our example with reference to the Panama Canal, would keep tolls moderate. After all, Canadians would desire to keep their markets for raw materials. They would not desire to gouge the United States.

But even if they should, the mere fact that the United States owns a 40-mile or 45-mile stretch of the canal would not guarantee us a controlling voice in the establishment of tolls. If the Canadians really wanted to restrict the use of the seaway, if they emphatically desired to discriminate against United States interests, what would prevent them from digging a connecting link on their side of the border? The Canadians could certainly duplicate very easily the United States section; they would, by no stretch of the imagination, be beholden to this country merely because the United States owned one portion of the waterway.

We have been told, Mr. President, that the immediate participation by the United States in this seaway project is vital or else the Canadians will build it alone. In view of the foregoing, I can see no valid objection to having the Canadians build the project without our aid. As a matter of fact not only have the Canadians indicated that they will undertake the project on their own, but they have told us that they would prefer to build the St. Lawrence Seaway without Uncle Sam's assistance. The Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, speaking in New York in April of last year, said:

> Proposals are now being advanced that the United States should build the new canal in the International Rapids section.

That is the canal under discussion here today, Mr. President.

I continue to quote from the Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce:

> It seems to me that such a proposal can only complicate the present situation. Ownership by the United States of a short section of a very long seaway would not only add to the overall construction costs, but would complicate problems of maintenance and operation of the canal system.

Lord Howe concluded, Mr. President, as follows:

> It seems obvious to me that continued ownership by one national authority of the entire seaway represents the most efficient procedure. Canada can hardly march if it is to be handicapped by a serious lack of internal transportation. I regard an adequate St. Lawrence Waterway as essential to Canada's further economic progress.

There we have it, Mr. President. Canada is going to build the seaway, and Canada would prefer to build it alone. I say let her do so. We can no more control the tolls on this seaway by controlling one small portion of its total length—and a portion which Canada can easily duplicate at any time she so desires—than a dog's tail can wag the dog. To attempt to do so would be only to waste United States money, and, Mr. President, the United States does not have any money to waste.

Boiled down to its essentials, the proposal now before the Senate is to have the United States, with a national debt of $274.8 billion, assist Canada, a nation with a total debt of less than $12 billion, build a seaway which is, in essence, nothing more than a Canadian internal improvement. It is ridiculous, Mr. President. With the Canadian dollar worth over 2¾ cents more, on the world market, than the United States' dollar; with the net Canadian debt standing at only $11.1 billion; with Canada running a budgetary surplus, and the United States running a budgetary deficit, this country is being asked to assist the Canadians. It should be just the other way around, if at all, Mr. President. I cannot emphasize too strongly that the United States Senate is, in the next few months, going to attempt to cut appropriations to the bone. We are going to consider a series of budget requests and later, appropriation bills which, I understand, call for reductions in vital national functions—such as aid to airports, flood control, power development, and so forth. Yet right now we are seriously considering the approval of providing over $100 million to assist a nation, in better financial shape than our own, construct an internal improvement. It is ridiculous, to say the least, Mr. President.

We are being asked to do this, also, because the proponents of this measure have been complaining that the Mesabi Range, the source of the bulk of this Nation's iron ore, is playing out. We are being told that the security of this Nation depends upon constructing the St. Lawrence seaway and making Labrador iron ore available to the steel mills of the United States.

In the first place, Mr. President, Labrador iron ore will flow to the steel mills of this Nation without the expenditure of one United States tax dollar on the St. Lawrence seaway. This will happen purely and simply because the St. Lawrence Seaway will be built by the Canadians, and it will be used to transport the iron ore, without which some Members of the Senate claim this country is going to decline and fall.

In the second place, however, there is no recognized possibility that the steel mills of this country will have to close up shop due to a lack of suitable iron ore, even if the St. Lawrence Seaway is not built.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure my distinguished colleague knows very well that we have almost inexhaustible supplies of taconite, and that with the expenditure of an amount of money equivalent to the amount necessary to develop the St. Lawrence Seaway, our Nation will have more than a 100-year's supply of iron ore; and we also are able to obtain iron ore from Venezeula, as well as from Canada. So we are in no prospect of running out of iron ore.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, my colleague has anticipated me, because the point he has mentioned is the next one I hope to discuss.

The Rotarian magazine of January 1952 quoted Clarence B. Randall, now president of Inland Steel, as follows:

> When the rich ores are all actually exhausted, the plants in Pittsburgh, Detroit, Cleveland, Youngstown, and Chicago will go right on making steel. It will be business as usual because the second-rate ores of the Lake Superior district can and will do the full job.

That is the taconite about which my distinguished colleague has spoken.

Mr. Randall added:

> Let's not add to the national headache by putting up danger signals about a problem that isn't bothering the steel industry at all.

Benjamin F. Fairless, president of the United States Steel Corp., was quoted in the same article as follows:

> How can I become excited by the fact that certain people are only now discovering the problem which individual companies in the iron ore industry recognized years ago? How can I be when the solution for the problem has already been found?

Mr. Fairless was referring, no doubt, to the vast amount of iron ore that United States Steel is now developing in the Cerro Bolivar area of Venezuela. Mr. President, we have been led toward the conclusion, by the proponents of this measure, that Labrador ore alone can offer the hope of industrial salvation to the steel mills of this country. That is an impression which I believe should be corrected, for Labrador deposits, while important, are neither the only source, nor the most important possible source, of future United States ore supplies.

Iron Age magazine of April 20, 1950, indicated that American steel interests will probably look south for their future ore supplies. Here is the way Iron Age

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

estimated supplies of ore available in the largest deposits then on discovery:

In Brazil, about 200 million tons have been proved, but—

There can be little doubt of the probability of several times this amount of high quality ore in the region and of the possibility of much more. (The Iron Age, August 24, 1950.)

In Venezuela, San Isidro deposit:

The official government report states that there are more than 300 million tons of iron ore in San Isidro. This is based on a survey of only one-seventh of the area. Unofficially it is learned that the government thinks there is a great deal more than that there. * * * San Isidro might rival the fabulous richness of Cerro Bolivar. (The Iron Age, April 20, 1950.)

Cerro Bolivar deposit:

More than 500 million tons have already been proven. This dramatic discovery (of this mountain of ore) came about after one of the most thorough, painstaking, and comprehensive explorations in the history of iron ore searches. (The Iron Age, April 20, 1950.)

In Liberia:

Republic Steel has obtained an important new source of ore from Liberia, and has formed the Liberia Mining Co. to exploit it. (The Iron Age, April 20, 1950.)

Mr. President, I wish to say in passing that last December it was my privilege to visit the iron ore deposits in Liberia. There the potentials are in excess of 50 million tons, and the engineers there are still looking for more.

In Labrador:

More than 300 million tons of high-grade ore has already been proven. Five American steel companies have signed up to start receiving this ore. (The Iron Age, April 20, 1950.)

The rough comparable totals of available ore in the deposit areas are: South America, 1 billion tons; Labrador, 300 million tons.

Mr. President, I have not seen the Labrador deposits, but I have had the privilege of inspecting considerable areas of both the Cerro Bolivar deposits and the Republic Steel holdings in Liberia, as I have just stated. The only word to describe Cerro Bolivar is "fabulous." There, ore averages as much as 68 percent pure iron. It exists in abundance, in a veritable mountain of supply. The mountain is 12 miles long, 4 miles wide, and more than 2,000 feet high. The upper third is solid iron ore, testing 68 percent, as I have just indicated. It was my privilege to climb that mountain 2 years ago and to visit this fabulous mountain of ore.

Mining Engineering magazine, in a discussion of Venezuela's Cerro Bolivar, reported in 1950 as follows:

It is probable that the rich Venezuelan ore discovered by the U. S. Steel Corp. will be available in almost any producing center at a better competitive price than units of iron from any other source. This great lode of ore which can practically be pushed onto railroad cars will be available to all who wish to buy. Further, this one body alone could supply the entire American steel industry all through the lifetime of children now being born.

We must not forget, either, Mr. President, that Chile offers another source of iron ore. In 1948, for example, Bethlehem Steel imported 2.6 million tons of steel from this source. Bethlehem also received an Export-Import Bank loan of some 2.7 million dollars several years ago for the development of one of its Chilean mines. Cuba, also, has been under development as a possible source of ore.

Mining Engineering has pointed out that while Labrador iron-ore deposits have attracted a great deal of publicity—

There are some rather formidable obstacles facing the open-pit mining operations and delivery of the ore; * * * the amortization of equipment must, of necessity, take into account use for only about half of each year. Personnel at the mine will also be somewhat of a problem, with the two possibilities of their being idle half the year, or some provision made to bring them out for the nonmining period.

In other words, Mr. President, one of America's largest mining publications says that Labrador ore pits, as well as the St. Lawrence seaway, will be frozen over half the year.

The Liberian deposits, while not as large, are just as rich as those in Venezuela. I understand, Mr. President, that the Brazilian deposits, to which I have already made reference, are extremely large and that their iron content is even higher than Cerro Bolivar, approaching at times 70 percent iron content.

In addition to Labrador, African and South American iron ore, Mr. President, there is also taconite. The February 1950 issue of Mining Engineering stated that "there's iron from which to make steel in the taconites of Lake Superior—plenty of it, many billions of tons."

At any rate, Mr. President, Labrador is not the only source of ore, and I would not be greatly surprised if later developments showed that it ranks second or third in importance to some South American deposits. Therefore, I see no reasons why we should put all of our iron ore eggs in the St. Lawrence basket. If the Senate feels that the expenditure of $100 million on navigation facilities to aid in the importation of iron ore for American mills would be a wise move, then I suggest we spend these funds in areas where the development would not otherwise take place. I suggest that we let Canada go ahead and build the St. Lawrence Seaway alone, since she will do so anyway and since Canada would prefer to go it alone; I suggest that if the Congress wishes to spend a large sum of money on a rivers and harbors project—and there are many such projects which are most worthwhile, Mr. President—the money which would be required by the pending measure be diverted to one or several of the gulf ports. Canada is going to build the St. Lawrence; if the money is to be spent, let us spend it on a project which would not otherwise be accomplished.

Mr. President, I have long advocated that what this country should do is make the Gulf of Mexico our own inland sea, so to speak. We should develop our gulf ports. We should develop the great rivers of this country, the Mississippi, the Tombigbee, and others which offer us the prospect of cheap transportation—transportation which would not be interrupted by the destruction of one lock. If we were to develop the ports of New Orleans, Mobile, Houston, and other cities on the gulf, we would open up a vast, virgin area of natural resources to our hungry American industry.

I have traveled through South America, Mr. President. It is a vast, fertile land, rich in natural resources and crying for development. If these resources could be transported across the Gulf of Mexico, funneled into the gulf ports, and dispersed throughout the Nation on the network of waterways which a bountiful nature has already provided us, I am convinced that the United States of America—indeed, the entire hemisphere—would enter a phase of unbelievable prosperity. I repeat, Mr. President, that if the money is to be spent, we should spend it where we could accomplish something which would not otherwise be done. If $100 million is to be expended upon port development, upon the expansion of water transportation, it should be spent upon projects which one bomb, one act of sabotage, would not render useless. There are no locks on most of the Mississippi River, Mr. President. There are no narrow, tortuous channels to be navigated between New Orleans and Cairo, Ill. The deepening of the Mississippi from its source to its mouth; the opening of this great backbone of our Nation to ocean transportation would work infinitely more toward the well-being of the United States and the world than the construction of a 45-mile segment of a 27-foot waterway, open only 7 to 8 months of the year, and open then to only 10 percent, at the most, of our merchant fleet.

We are being asked today to judge projects on their merits; we are being asked, Mr. President, to balance the budget, reduce taxes, and cut Government spending to the bone. Yet, we are confronted with a request today to spend over $100 million purely and simply as a token gesture.

The proposal should be defeated, Mr. President. It should be cut back to the ground once again. The St. Lawrence seaway will be built by Canada, and I urge the Senate to vote down any form of participation on our part.

Mr. President, I shall not discuss the effect which this seaway would have on the ports on the gulf and in other sections of the country. However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks excerpts from the testimony of Louis A. Schwartz, general manager, New Orleans Traffic and Transportation Bureau, before the House Committee on Public Works in April 1951.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now treating with the harmful effects of the seaway on the city and port of New Orleans, I wish to submit the following:

The important manufacturing territory served by the port of New Orleans and upon which the port largely depends for high-class traffic, high revenue paying cargo for its steamship lines, is that territory referred to generally as "northern Mississippi Valley territory," located on and north of the northern boundary of the State of Tennessee

and on and north of the southern boundary of the States of Missouri and Kansas—and also the important producing, shipping and consuming territory as far west as Colorado, such as Denver, Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Colo., and the territory north and east thereof. From and to this northern Mississippi Valley territory New Orleans now enjoys a substantial volume of foreign commerce both import and export. The volume of this tonnage for the fiscal year July 1, 1949, through June 30, 1950, the most recent period for which statistics are available, is set forth on exhibit 1 annexed hereto, which I respectfully ask be copied into the RECORD.

Commodities produced in southern territory adjacent to New Orleans and moving for export to foreign countries consist principally of raw materials such as lumber, staves, salt, cement, grain, flour, leaf tobacco, cotton and petroleum products. The principal movement of export grain through New Orleans consists of corn originating in Illinois and Iowa and wheat originating in the Midwest. This export movement of corn and wheat would be lost to the port should the seaway project be developed and the predictions of its proponents come true. The development of the St. Lawrence Seaway project would result in New Orleans losing a substantial portion of the foreign commerce that is now moving through this port and that originates in and is consigned to northern Mississippi Valley territory—and this tonnage is very substantial.

The loss of this foreign commerce would seriously and adversely affect the steamship lines and the steamship services operating from New Orleans to foreign ports, particularly to Central America, South America, and Africa. As a matter of fact, in many cases a number of our steamship services would be seriously curtailed and possibly abandoned. The loss of this tonnage and the resulting effect upon our steamship services would seriously and adversely affect producers, manufacturers, shippers, and receivers located in Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Texas, who must depend upon the port of New Orleans and other southern ports and the steamship services now maintained from and to the port of New Orleans and other southern ports as outlets for their goods shipped to foreign markets, and as inlets for goods they purchase in foreign countries. These producers and shippers demand and require frequent and adequate steamship services to transport their goods to and from foreign markets. If New Orleans and other gulf as well as South Atlantic ports are made to depend upon cargo originating only in the States bordering on and adjacent to the Gulf and South Atlantic, there would not be sufficient cargo originating at or destined to this territory to enable steamship operators to maintain adequate and dependable services from and to foreign countries.

Another important fact to be considered is, supposing the steamship lines operating out of New Orleans and the gulf and South Atlantic would lose the high revenue paying cargo originating in northern Mississippi Valley territory—they would be faced with the necessity of charging higher ocean rates on the raw materials which they handle which originate in the territory adjacent to the gulf and Atlantic in order to maintain any sort of steamship service from New Orleans and the Gulf-South Atlantic to Central American, South American, and other foreign countries.

There is cause for concern not merely to the ports located along the gulf and Atlantic, but to interior producing points. Completion of the seaway would make it possible to transport raw sugar to ports located on the Great Lakes.

It takes little imagination to picture the disturbance which the erection of sugar refineries at points like Chicago, Cleveland, or other lake ports would cause in the sugar-producing States of the Middle West, such as Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Utah, North and South Dakota, Minnesota, and other large beet-producing areas, as well as in Louisiana, a large sugarcane-producing State. Ocean transport over the seaway would destroy investments in sugar refineries in Colorado, Maryland, New York, Georgia, Utah, Nebraska, Kansas, and Louisiana because of the refining of imported foreign-produced raw sugar so close to the centers of midwestern population. Imported refined sugars would also monopolize these important markets.

In opposing the seaway we are not motivated by any desire to deprive the Midwest of the benefits of ocean transportation. Should the seaway be constructed not only would New Orleans lose a very substantial tonnage, but a similar loss would be experienced by New York and North Atlantic ports, in fact the entire range of ports from Portland, Maine, to Brownsville, Tex., would be seriously affected, as the Midwest is the principal source of export and import traffic. Those who have told you that the seaway would not harm New Orleans have overlooked or disregarded this important fact.

Mr. ELLENDER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement before the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives on the St. Lawrence project, April 16, 1951, by Mr. Lewis I. Bourgeois, director of commerce, port of New Orleans, La.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is Lewis I. Bourgeois. I am director of commerce of the board of commissioners of the port of New Orleans. Prior to this, I was general agent at New Orleans for the Federal Barge Lines, and was connected with that transportation agency in various capacities for over 25 years.

I appear here today in behalf of the port of New Orleans, and its administrative body, the board of commissioners, an agency of the State of Louisiana, for the purpose of opposing the legislation now before the Congress on the St. Lawrence Waterway project. This project will divert ships and cargo from the port of New Orleans, will create little new traffic, and will add to the enormous debt of this country at a time when taxpayers are struggling under tax burdens they may no longer accept or endure.

The creation of this expensive and high-cost waterway will impair and affect adversely the business, progress, and particularly the revenue of the port of New Orleans and its governing agency, the board, and will depress the economy of the people living in the port area.

New Orleans is an old city as communities are rated in this new country. The city had a great trade before the Constitution was adopted. It has a great trade today, built up by the large number of ocean vessels which are attracted by the splendid facilities which the people of New Orleans and the State of Louisiana created to handle the great volume of commerce which flows north and south, to and from the great midcontinent of the United States. Prior to 1896, the wharves and facilities on the riverfront of the port were leased and privately operated, but this resulted in little or no improvements. There were few wharves, the majority of which were poorly built open wharves. On July 9, 1896, an act of the State legislature created the board of commissioners of the port of New Orleans, the agency which now owns, controls, and operates public wharves and facilities on the Mississippi River near the gulf. Under this law, the board took possession in that same year, and acquired the then existing facilities for the sum of $5,137.92, evidence of how limited these facilities had developed.

In the past 50 years the port has expended a total of over $50 million, plus interest for improvements. Bonds, backed by the faith and credit of the State of Louisiana, furnished the funds for these improvements, and on June 30, 1950, the end of the last fiscal year, the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the port of New Orleans, plus interest, at maturity totaled $30,238,012.50. On June 30, 1951, the port will pay on its debt $2,712,450 and for many years will be paying on this debt over $2 million annually.

The growth and expansion of the port has been steady and gradual, but this could not have occurred without facilities, improvements, and promotion.

I point out now some comparisons which indicate the growth of the port:

The year 1901 saw a total of 1,674 seagoing vessels entering the port, with a gross tonnage of 4,318,223;

The fiscal year ending August 31, 1929, showed 3,157 seagoing vessels entering the port with 12,454,641 gross tons;

The fiscal year ending June 1950 showed 3,212 deep-sea vessels arriving at this port, with a gross tonnage of 19,809,991.

Most of these vessels made use of the port's 7½ miles of wharves and transit sheds, and the dollar volume of world trade which passed over the port's facilities will total more than $1¼ billion when the 1950 statistics are finally compiled.

The facilities and harbor installations of the port of New Orleans represent the investment of the people of the State of Louisiana, but such investments were based upon the location of the port, its relationship to the midcontinent, its anticipation of world trade in this area, and its God-given natural advantages. The people of Louisiana never expected, and had a right not to expect, that the Government of the United States, through its national legislative body, would create a project, at huge costs, to compete with their port facilities and to endanger their important investments therein.

To retire its bonded indebtedness, maintain its facilities, carry on its operations, and promote its traffic, it is imperative that the port preserve its revenues and earn a profit from the operation of its facilities. To do this it must continue to attract the movement of imports and exports. Any serious decrease in ship arrivals and traffic movement would impair an important percentage of its operating revenue and would seriously affect the orderly retirement of its bonds.

A loss of revenue consequently must result in imposing burdens upon the taxpayers, the people of New Orleans, and of Louisiana, because bonds and interest must be paid as they become due, and the income for this purpose, whenever insufficient from operations, must of necessity be realized from taxes. Such tax imposition and burden, saddled upon the people of New Orleans and of Louisiana, by an act of the Federal Government, is unjust in two directions. First, in that the State must impose taxes to replace loss of revenue which must result from the subsidized operation and construction of the St. Lawrence Waterway project; and second, in that the people who are taxed by the State also pay the Federal taxes which must produce the revenue to pay for the huge costs of the St. Lawrence project; because it will take generations to pay tolls sufficient to pay back, if ever, all the funds used by this Government for construction.

This project will divert import-export trade from the port of New Orleans, and particularly that moving in foreign-flag ships. Let there be no misunderstanding about that, because even today, with the shallow draft of the present waterway, ships unload part of their cargo at Montreal and then proceed to ports on the Great Lakes. A deeper waterway will permit fully loaded ships to proceed without stopping at Montreal. We know

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that foreign-flag ships from Europe and South America already are going all the way into Chicago and they will do so in growing numbers. This waterway project will compete with the entire Mississippi-Ohio-Illinois and Missouri barge system, an all-American inland waterway system on which our Government invested millions of dollars for construction and maintenance. These American waterways have yet to reach their capacity. The barge lines have reason to be alarmed about this costly competition; the railroads, by experience, have serious reason to fear what this competition will mean. There is no certainty that today's level of traffic will continue. There must come some day some sort of return to normalcy, and when this occurs the railroads will be the main sufferers, for it is well recognized in the transportation field that cheap inland water transportation thrives during duller times, when such conditions impel saving by shippers wherever and whenever available.

Now I wish to submit how New Orleans Port will be affected by this newly created competition:

During the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, at New Orleans, out of 3,212 ship arrivals from the sea, 1,597 were of foreign flag or 50 percent of the total. This 50 percent of foreign-flag arrivals included 972 of Europe and Africa origin, with the balance scattered, in various number, from other nations. The other 50 percent were American-flag ships. The revenue from the operations of the port's facilities for that year was $5,610,559.94. A reduction of 50 percent of this amount, or $2,805,279.97, would play havoc with the finances of the port, because in that 1 year, the excess of revenue over expense was only $1,484,935.96. The bonds and interest paid out were over $2 million. Diversion of 50 percent of traffic must obviously result in serious deficits. Will the United States Government make up the deficit? If this honorable body is not convinced that American-flag ships will not use the St. Lawrence Waterway, we cite for your consideration the letters of American-flag lines read before the United States Senate by the late Senator Overton, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1947.

In addition to the losses which this project will saddle upon the port of New Orleans, there will be others equally as serious. These will be the losses which will come to private enterprise, the large industry and the small-business man, and labor. Hundreds of business firms and individuals have invested in activities directly and indirectly related to port business. In addition to the railroads, steamship, barge and truck lines, there are located within the New Orleans port area firms engaged in ship repair, drydocks, harbor towing, fuel service, stevedoring, warehousing, ocean freight forwarding, customs-brokers service, car unloading, weighing and inspecting, marine insurance, ship chandlery, and ship's stores, which depend upon at least the present level of port commerce. There are thousands of wage earners who are in the same situation. Any percentage in reduction of ship arrivals reflects upon each and everyone's economy. By way of substantiating this statement, we have reports of steamship agencies which reflect the amount of money which a ship leaves in port. A Liberty ship arriving with 7,500 tons of cargo, unloading this and then loading 7,500 tons of outbound cargo, in 8 days, leaves approximately $105,000 circulating in the port community.

This is made up mostly of labor, some fuel and stores for the ship, minor repairs, and port fees, but does not include the majority of the items of services previously mentioned. If the port of New Orleans loses 900 ship-arrivals this will reduce the income of the area by $94½ million, and no community in this Nation today can stand any such direct loss in its economy. Not only will the people directly engaged in port business activities be affected, but the retailers, the wholesalers, the shopkeepers, the professional men, and the laborers will also feel the blow, and this will come to another $100 million in indirect losses.

All large cities in this Nation are ports located on some lake or river or sea. They have grown and expanded because they are so located. But no port in the Nation can exist only on the import-export traffic of its own community. For its prosperity it must handle a great measure of cargo from its hinterland. Therefore all ports share in the traffic movement of this hinterland, which let us call here the midcontinent. That is the traffic which the St. Lawrence will take away from the ports of the country.

We point here only to the percentage covering foreign-flag ships, because this is the type of origin-flag ship which will use the seaway and which most likely be European in origin. We have not included American-flag ships in our estimates, but we all know that some of them, too, may be forced to use the seaway. Most of the ships which will use the seaway will be tramp steamers, which come in and take the cream of the traffic, leaving little behind when compared to the established lines and routes which maintain port offices, staffs, facilities, and so forth, and which pay taxes.

To assert that the St. Lawrence Waterway would not decrease the tonnage of our port's foreign commerce is to argue in the teeth of irrefutable proof. Already ships from Europe enter the Great Lakes in the face of shallow channels today.

I have read the statement of the honorable Secretary of Commerce before this committee February 20, 1951. His estimates of traffic to move via the St. Lawrence included a minimum of 11½ million tons of grain, 4 million tons of coal, a maximum of 20 million tons of petroleum, and 11½ million tons of general cargo. I certainly failed to find in the statement anything to prove this would be new traffic. If this is new traffic there must certainly be thousands of farms, mines, and factories which we have never heard of before which might warrant a closer examination of the records. Take away this volume of traffic from the railroads and the ports handling it, and you will create a depressed economy in every port city on the Atlantic and gulf coasts. It just means taking commerce away from certain localities and placing it in other areas.

The port of New Orleans is the port of the Mississippi Valley, and the territory it serves reaches to the Twin Cities to the North, to the Rockies in the West, and to the Alleghenies in the East.

Shipments today move in great volume to and from New Orleans, and originate in or are destined to the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, the Dakotas, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, and parts of Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, and Colorado. From this area, New Orleans will lose a heavy volume of traffic; this is a territory we would describe here as the northern half of the midcontinent. Seventy-five percent of our exports originate north of the northern boundaries of Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Tennessee, and 40 percent of our imports eventually terminate in that same area.

Serving that vast territory, the port depends materially upon the foreign commerce which goes and comes from the midcontinent. The St. Lawrence Waterway will tap a major portion of that area and is certain to disturb the normal and natural flow of this commerce which today is in a direction of north and south. For years the railroads, the river barge lines, the motor freight lines, and the gulf ports have depended, expanded, and progressed on this north and south flow of traffic. To disturb this current of tonnage would seriously upset the economy of all of these interests and bring chaos in the entire transportation rate setup of the Mississippi Valley, and eventually affect the normal maintenance and successful operation of all the gulf ports, with the port of New Orleans a major sufferer.

We know of no seaport in this country that favors this project. We do know that the American Association of Port Authorities has resolved against it; and that the Gulf Ports Association has voiced opposition; and all rightfully so because all of the ports will be affected. Ports on the Atlantic and the gulf coasts are going to feel, in a big way, the effects of this Government-created competition; and every ship which is diverted will mean a serious diversion of income from the port communities; and the economy of the port States will feel it. The port of New Orleans and its people, and Louisiana, will have no monopoly in this but that will be no consolation.

The St. Lawrence Waterway project should be rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the statement of Mr. deLesseps S. Morrison, mayor of the city of New Orleans, La., before the subcommittee to study the St. Lawrence seaway project of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, on Thursday, June 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Mississippi Valley Association has estimated that if the seaway is completed and is used to the extent its proponents claim, a considerable percentage of present traffic now moving down the Mississippi River from the great midcontinent region of the Nation will be diverted away from its natural north-south trade route in our own river valley to the east-west St. Lawrence route. If this estimate is correct, then millions in commerce now being handled by the port of New Orleans would flow out to the world through the Canadian port of Montreal. The New Orleans Board of Port Commissioners estimates that realization of the seaway's aims would mean a diversion of much of this natural Mississippi Valley traffic away from the United States ports to a Canadian river.

So I will not go into detail on that subject. But let me stress that 79 cents of every dollar of income in New Orleans derives directly or indirectly from its port activities. The welfare, we believe, of our entire community is at stake here.

It is not plausible for the Federal Government to spend tax moneys for a project which will damage the huge investment which State and municipal governments and private enterprise have in existing port facilities on the three coasts of the United States. This would mean the Federal Government using our tax funds to put us out of business. And if business suffers, we have unemployment, reduced buying power, and depression. It becomes a matter of our own Government computing with Louisiana and other coastal States of the United States, to our detriment.

LOSS OF NATIONALITY BY PERSONS CONVICTED OF CERTAIN CRIMES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced on behalf of the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and myself Senate bill 2757, to amend the Immigration and Nationality

Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes. I wish to make a few remarks on behalf of the sponsors of the bill.

It will be recalled that in his state of the Union message the President called for legislation "to provide that a citizen of the United States who is convicted in the courts of hereafter conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence be treated as having, by such act, renounced his allegiance to the United States and forfeited his United States citizenship."

When we introduced the bill to accomplish this objective, we had in mind that a person who would commit the acts described by the President would be, in effect, transferring his allegiance from the United States to some other country.

Yesterday we introduced a bill to accomplish this objective. Because there has been considerable interest in and discussion of this recommendation of the President, we would like to make a brief statement about the bill in order that it may be better understood.

To us, this bill is a logical and necessary extension of our present laws. It will enable the Government and the Nation to deal with a problem which is a comparatively recent development in history.

The bill we have introduced, S. 2757, would make expatriation, or loss of citizenship, a consequence of conviction of violation of the Smith act, or of certain related statutes.

The Immigration and Nationality Act provides that a "national of the United States whether by birth or naturalization shall lose his nationality by committing any act of treason against, attempting by force to overthrow, or bearing arms against, the United States, if and when he is convicted thereof by a court martial or by a court of competent jurisdiction"—Eighth United States Code, section 1481 (a) (9).

Section 2 of the bill we have introduced would amend this provision of law by including "violating or conspiring to violate the provisions of title 18, United States Code, sections 2383 or 2385, or engaging in a conspiracy in violation of title 18, United States Code, section 2384, if and when he is convicted thereof by a court martial or by a court of competent jurisdiction," as additional grounds for loss of nationality.

Section 2383 of title 18 of the United States Code makes it a crime to incite, set on foot, or engage in a rebellion or insurrection against the authority of the United States or its laws. Section 2384 makes it a crime for any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to conspire to overthrow or destroy the Government of the United States or to levy war upon them. Section 2385, the Smith act, makes it a crime to knowingly or willfully advocate, abet, advise or teach the duty, necessity, desirability or propriety of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States.

These three statutes are related and may in some respects overlap. This bill extends the expatriation provisions of the present law to cover them. The Government has a right and a duty to strip citizenship from those who are convicted of actually attempting to overthrow the Government. Certainly it is proper that loss of citizenship should also result from conviction of conspiring to overthrow the Government by force and violence or teaching such a course of action.

Section 3 of the bill gives the Attorney General the right to deport those who have lost their citizenship as a result of conspiring, advocating, or teaching the overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

A person who knowingly violates the Smith Act, or related acts, has, as is indicated by the President, forfeited allegiance to the United States and demonstrated that he no longer owes allegiance to this country.

This is a nation largely made up of immigrants and their original states have often made claim to the allegiance of immigrants who had become United States citizens. That was the basis of the old claim: "Once an Englishman, always an Englishman." By the second half of the 19th century this problem of dual nationality had grown to one of some significance.

In 1868 Congress declared expatriation to be a "natural and inherent right of all people." This, of course, did not resolve the many problems that continued to arise with foreign nations and in 1907 Congress adopted the first general expatriation statute. That act imposed expatriation as a consequence of naturalization in a foreign country, taking an oath of allegiance to a foreign state, or of marriage by a United States woman citizen to a foreign national. The constitutionality of that act, as it related to a United States woman citizen who married a foreigner was taken to the Supreme Court—*MacKenzie* v. *Hare* (239 U. S. 299). Notwithstanding the lack of an express grant of power in the Constitution, the Court held that the field of foreign relations needs no express grant.

But this case did more than provide a constitutional base for expatriation as a necessary power in connection with the conduct of foreign relations. It indicated that expatriation, while it could not be arbitrarily imposed, could be imposed by the United States as a consequence of a voluntary act of a person.

The bill we have introduced, then, follows that case in setting forth certain conditions which, when voluntarily entered into, will result in loss of nationality and expatriation.

We believe the bill is constitutional, that it contains sufficient safeguards for the protection of the loyal citizen and will enable the Nation to protect itself against those who seek our ruin.

We hope it will receive an early hearing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the text of S. 2757 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Expatriation Act of 1954."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (9) of subsection (a) of section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163, 268; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 1481 (a) (9)) is amended to read as follows:

"(9) committing any act of treason against, attempting by force to overthrow, or bearing arms against the United States, violating or conspiring to violate the provisions of title 18, U. S. C., secs. 2383 or 2385, or engaging in a conspiracy in violation of title 18, U. S. C., sec. 2384, if and when he is convicted thereof by a court-martial or by a court of competent jurisdiction; or."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 241 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 1251 (a)) is amended (1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (18) and inserting "; or", and (2) by inserting after paragraph (18) a new paragraph reading as follows:

"(19) became an alien by reason of loss of United States nationality under paragraph (9) of subsection (a) of section 349 of this act, and is found by the Attorney General to be an undesirable resident of the United States."

POSSIBILITY OF AN EVENING SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about to move a recess of the Senate until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. Because I believe that no evening session of the Senate should be held without first giving advance notice, I wish to put the Senate on notice that we may have an evening session tomorrow, in an attempt to expedite the voting on the St. Lawrence Seaway bill and on such amendments as may have been offered today or may be subsequently offered. Therefore I hope Senators will make their arrangements accordingly. I do not believe that a session tomorrow night would run too late, but perhaps we will meet in evening session tomorrow in order to make some progress on the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 20, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, January 19 (legislative day of January 7), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Labor.

Alice K. Leopold, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Samuel Miller Brownell, of Connecticut, to be Commissioner of Education.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of mankind, to whom all souls are dear and whose tender mercies are over all Thy works: We bow in the stillness of this historic Chamber with the solemn realization that every thought of every heart is fully known to Thee. Cleanse Thou our hearts from all that is petty and unworthy of our best. Through our thoughts, our words, and our actions may there ever shine the spirit of courtesy and kindness, even in differences of judgment and viewpoint, as Thy servants here wrestle with problems that affect the weal or woe of the Nation and the world. In times so fraught with peril and shadowed with the designs of evil men who blaspheme humanity's holy of holies, by Thy sustaining grace may we face the struggle bravely in Thy name, confident that no matter how long the day or how deeply entrenched the wrong no weapon that can be formed can finally thwart Thy holy will. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN M. BUTLER, a Senator from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 19, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 727) to provide that certain costs and expenses incurred in connection with certain repayment contracts with irrigation districts approved by the acts of Congress of May 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 62), October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 941), and June 23, 1952 (66 Stat. 151, 153), shall be nonreimbursable, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following a quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under it be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying reports, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the First Annual Reports of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 1954.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT IN KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession permit to conduct pack and saddle horse operations in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of November 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees, New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs, Keyport, N. J., relating to methods of using pooled fissionable material to serve the peaceful needs of mankind; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Smaller Business of America, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, signed by Max D. Gustin, and sundry other officers, relating to the position of that organization on the St. Lawrence seaway; ordered to lie on the table.

JOINT CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the voting delegates to the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD. This resolution urges the enactment of legislation providing for the joint construction and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway by the United States and Canada.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At the most recent annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation the voting delegates representing the member State farm bureaus approved the following resolution:

"We strongly favor the enactment of legislation to provide for the participation of the United States with Canada in the joint construction and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway. The project should be built and operated on a self-liquidating basis."

We understand that Canada is prepared to go ahead with the seaway. The only issue remaining is whether or not the United States is to participate in the construction and operation of the project.

The major portion of the commerce through the seaway will consist of cargoes originating from or destined to United States ports. Since United States shippers will pay the major portion of the tolls to liquidate the cost of the project and since the project will contribute to our national security, it is appropritae that the United States share in the administration and control of the seaway.

Your support for the enactment of S. 2150 is recommended.

Very sincerely,

MATT TRIGGS,
Assistant Legislative Director.

TREATYMAKING POWER AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—RESOLUTION OF YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Young Republican Club of New York, strongly urging the defeat of the Bricker

joint resolution relating to treatymaking power and executive agreements.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the board of governors of the New York Young Republican Club expresses its grave concern as to the probable effects of the Bricker amendment and emphatically rejects this unfortunate attempt to tamper with the traditional time-tested process of conducting American foreign affairs. It fully endorses President Eisenhower's unalterable opposition to any amendment "which would hamper the President in his constitutional authority to conduct foreign affairs." It calls upon all those having responsibility in this matter to bring about its defeat. It pledges its support to this end.

AUDIT REPORTS OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND AGENCIES—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS (S. REPT. NO. 861)

Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted, pursuant to subsection (g) (2) (A) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, 60 Stat. 812, 816), a report on Audit Reports of Government Corporations and Agencies, which was ordered to be printed.

IMPORTATION OF FEED WHEAT FROM CANADA—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY (S. REPT. NO. 862)

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted a report on hearings held at Minneapolis, Minn., on October 8 and 9, and at Galveston, Tex., on October 13 and 14, 1953, on the importation and disposition of wheat from Canada classified as "wheat, unfit for human consumption," which was ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 20, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 727) to provide that certain costs and expenses incurred in connection with certain repayment contracts with irrigation districts approved by the acts of Congress of May 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 62), October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 941), and June 23, 1952 (66 Stat. 151, 153), shall be nonreimbursable.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 12, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Harry R. Varney, chief of staff	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Harker T. Stanton, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Edward P. Gutnane, investigator	11,646.00	5,823.00
James M. Kendall, chief clerk	8,824.17	4,412.04
Cotys M. Mouser, assistant chief clerk	8,735.34	4,367.64
Harriet D. Wiley, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
Betty M. Mason, from Nov. 16, 1953, clerical assistant	3,996.26	499.53
Frances I. Edwards, clerical assistant	4,283.04	2,014.14
Jean D. Dunning, to Oct. 31, 1953, clerical assistant	4,378.64	1,277.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,749.36
Balance unexpended	5,250.64

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

(Making investigations under S. Res. 127, agreed to July 10, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$15,000.00
Amount expended	10,168.24
Balance unexpended	4,831.76

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Everard H. Smith, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Thomas J. Scott, assistant chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Francis S. Hewitt, assistant clerk	10,732.07	5,365.98
Edmund T. King, assistant clerk	10,732.07	5,255.38
Jarlath M. Slattery, acting director, professional staff	10,732.07	5,294.09
William R. Bonsell, professional staff member (to Sept. 14)	10,068.45	2,069.61
Kenneth J. Bousquet, professional staff member	10,649.11	5,324.52
Earl W. Cooper, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Herman E. Downey, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Richard W. Eddy, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
John J. Gaines, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
G. E. Johnson, professional staff member	8,990.07	4,495.02
H. Maurice Joyce, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,006.53
William J. Kennedy, Jr., professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Cecil C. McDaniel, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Joseph T. McDonnell, professional staff member	$10,068.45	$5,034.18
Harold E. Merrick, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Gordon A. Nease, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Stanley L. Sommer, professional staff member (to Aug. 17)	10,732.07	1,401.12
Ernest R. Underwood, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Lawrence H. Wendrich, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
William W. Woodruff, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Gloria S. Butland, clerical assistant	4,369.81	2,284.86
Pauline T. Connell, clerical assistant from July 20	4,283.04	1,915.47
Leon DeVille, clerical assistant	4,091.85	2,045.88
Elva Glaser, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
Lois A. Glines, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,177.33
Laura A. Hawley, clerical assistant	4,091.85	2,045.88
Carolyn Macy, clerical assistant from Aug. 1	4,091.85	1,704.90
E. Marea Marshall, clerical assistant	4,187.45	2,093.70
Mary T. Savage, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,165.38

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES		
Paul E. Kamerick, staff director	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Eliot U. Wyman:		
Counsel, to Aug. 22	11,646.00	1,682.20
Consultant, w. s. e	[1] 35.00	1,330.00
Leonard E. Edwards, agent	10,068.45	5,034.18
Joseph F. McDonald, Jr., agent	8,644.09	4,322.04
James E. McVea, agent	9,073.03	4,536.48
Leo C. Nulty, agent	9,653.69	4,826.82
William V. Sinnott, agent	10,732.07	5,365.98
Paul J. Tierney, agent	10,068.45	5,034.18
Paul A. Toussaint, agent	8,461.59	4,230.78
Bernard S. Van Rensselaer, agent	10,068.45	5,034.18
Marion G. Robertson, investigator, to Sept. 15	6,003.71	1,250.75
Alice S. Dearborn, clerical assistant	3,996.26	1,998.12
Angela M. Novello, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
Dorothy L. Sankey, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86

[1] Per day.

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report on miscellaneous expenses for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Miscellaneous expenses

Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of June 30, 1953	$24,151.49
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1953	0
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	$24,151.49

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Miscellaneous expenses—Continued

83d Cong.:

Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1953, and Public Law 547, approved July 15, 1952	$291,035.85
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1953	1,868.02
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	289,167.83
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 121	17,117.74
Additional authorization by S. Res. 153	10,000.00
Total available for expenditure	27,117.74
Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1953	22,284.44
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	4,832.30
Amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1954	400,000.00
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1953	56,863.59
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	343,136.41

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

JANUARY 4, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Allen, Philip K., chief clerk	$10,068.45	$5,034.23
Atkinson, Herbert S., assistant chief clerk	7,819.96	3,909.98
Braswell, T. Edward, Jr., professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.23
Dantzic, Maurine K., clerical assistant	4,474.23	2,237.12
Darden, William H., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Earle, Georgia P., clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.89
Mudge, Verne D., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Seeliger, R. Sara, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.32
Thompson, Helen A., clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1953 to Dec. 31, 1953	6,915.44
Balance unexpended	3,084.56

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING STAFF

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Anton, James, special counsel	$9,073.03	$4,536.48
Cooper, Genevieve, secretary	4,474.23	2,221.17
Engle, Wallace L., investigator	5,716.93	2,834.56
Freese, Mary C., stenographer	4,378.64	2,173.35
Gilleas, Benjamin J., investigator	7,533.19	3,734.70
Johnson, Joanne C., stenographer, from Sept. 28	3,613.89	933.56
Linton, Therese W., clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
McGillicuddy, Daniel F., Jr., attorney	7,533.19	3,734.70
Miller, Mary M., clerk-typist	4,187.45	2,069.80
Morse, Frank B., attorney, from July 6	9,570.74	4,652.43
Olson, Sara L., stenographer	4,187.45	2,045.20
Rhodes, Fred B., chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Robinson, Jane K., stenographer, to Sept. 14	3,613.89	742.83
Waldron, Glenn S., investigator	6,396.08	3,169.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee use under S. Res. 86, agreed to Mar. 18, 1953	$167,000.00
Balance unexpended July 1, 1953	148,191.05
Amount expended to Dec. 31, 1953	67,551.33
Balance unexpended	80,639.72
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure under S. Res. 86	167,000.00
Amount expended to Dec. 31, 1953	86,360.28
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	80,639.72

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Ira Dixon, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Ray S. Donaldson, staff director	11,646.00	5,823.00
A. Lee Parsons, assistant clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Joseph P. McMurray, economic consultant	11,646.00	5,823.00
William F. McKenna, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Norman W. Stevenson, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Florence Barr, clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.06
Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.28
Henrietta S. Chase, clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.06
Caro M. Pugh, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$20,000.00
Amount expended through Dec. 31, 1953	8,776.07
Balance unexpended	11,223.93

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 42)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John L. Douglas, staff assistant	$8,644.09	$4,322.05
Carl H. Wilken, from October 1, staff assistant	8,644.09	2,161.02
Pauline Chaternuck, from December 16, clerical assistant	5,047.77	210.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$50,540.29
Amount expended through Dec. 31, 1953	14,448.68
Balance unexpended	36,091.61

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 25)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Dorothy H. Devine, from July 15, clerical assistant	$4,378.64	$1,934.35
Raymonde A. Clarke, from August 1, staff assistant	7,055.23	2,939.65
Donald L. Rogers, from October 1, staff assistant	5,047.77	1,261.92
Marjorie M. Fults, from October 6, clerical assistant	3,613.89	853.26
Henry F. Holthusen, per diem, general counsel	32.33	3,914.35

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$67,000.00
Amount expended through Dec. 31, 1953	23,886.04
Balance unexpended	43,113.96

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Robert C. Albrook, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Jesse D. Coon, professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
William P. Gulledge, professional staff	10,815.02	5,346.66
Arlene Williams, assistant clerk	6,099.30	3,049.62
Ruth W. Bryant, assistant clerk	6,008.71	2,964.27

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended	1,765.70
Balance unexpended	8,234.30

FRANCIS CASE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING TRANSPORTATION SERVING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Albert Conradis, professional staff, Oct. 12, 1953, to Dec. 15, 1953.	$11,646	$2,070.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$35,000.00
Amount expended	18,537.74
Balance unexpended	16,462.26

FRANCIS CASE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Elizabeth B. Springer, chief clerk	$10,649.11	$5,324.52
Betty Mae Tapy, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Rosemary M. Voigt, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86
Jesse R. Nichols, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
Serge N. Benson, professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended (Jan. 1, through Dec. 31, 1953)	1,627.35
Balance unexpended	8,372.65

E. D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Francis O. Wilcox, professional staff member	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, to Sept. 1, 1953, professional staff member	11,646.00	1,941.00
Carl M. Marcy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Julius N. Cahn, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Alwyn V. Freeman, professional staff member, from Oct. 27, 1953	$11,646.00	$2,070.40
C. C. O'Day, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Pat M. Holt, assistant chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Emmett M. O'Grady, clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.04
Morella R. Hansen, clerical assistant	6,194.89	3,097.44
Nancy Hanschman, clerical assistant	5,430.16	2,715.06
William L. Martin, Jr., clerical assistant, to July 15 1953	4,378.64	182.44
June C. Pitts, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Mary Ann Sames, clerical assistant, from Dec. 14, 1953	4,761.00	224.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$59,000.00
Amount expended	14,175.82
Balance unexpended	44,824.18

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1954.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY PROPOSALS TO REVISE THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

(Under authority of S. Res. 126, agreed to July 28, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 28, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

The detail of certain personnel of the Library of Congress to the Subcommittee has been authorized by the Committee on Rules and Administration on a reimbursable basis, for services rendered beginning September 2, 1953.

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure	$35,000
Amount expended	166.40
Balance unexpended	34,833.60

JANUARY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE STUDYING FOREIGN INFORMATION PROGRAMS

(Under S. Res. 74, agreed to June 30, 1952, S. Res. 44, agreed to Feb. 20, 1953, and S. Res. 117, agreed to June 11, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Henry F. Holthusen, special consultant	[1] $32.38	$355.85
Lenore Dowell, clerk	9,238.93	

[1] A day when actually employed.

Balance, July 1, 1953	
Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure	$34,761.90
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1953	15,698.38
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1953	19,063.52

B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Subcommittee Chairman.
ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Francis D. Flanagan, chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Richard J. O'Melia, general counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Glenn K. Shriver, professional staff member	11,312.73	5,656.32
Eli E. Nobleman, professional staff member	10,897.97	5,448.96
Donald F. O'Donnell, assistant chief clerk	9,073.03	4,406.43
Emily I. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Blanche Holder Brox (Mrs.), clerical assistant	5,430.16	2,715.06
Ray Barnett, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Katharine M. Ellis (Mrs.), clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended to date	3,094.47
Balance unexpended	6,905.53

JOE MCCARTHY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION

(S. Res. 56)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

No funds expended for subcommittee personnel. Work performed by staff of Committee on Government Operations.

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure under S. Res. 56	$10,495.02
Amount expended to date	657.18
Balance unexpended	9,837.84

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Chairman, Subcommittee.

Approved:

JOE MCCARTHY.

JANUARY 13, 1954.

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman, assistant counsel to Aug. 3	$9,321.88	$854.50
C. George Anastos, assistant counsel from Sept. 21	7,437.59	2,065.96
Edith H. Anderson, assistant clerk	5,047.77	2,240.21
Karl H. W. Barrslag, research director from July 26	10,068.45	4,334.98
Daniel G. Buckley, assistant counsel	6,864.04	3,432.00
Maxine B. Buffalohide, assistant clerk from Nov. 19	4,187.45	488.53
Francis P. Carr, Jr., executive director from July 16	11,646.00	5,337.75
Roy M. Cohn, chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Margaret W. Duckett, assistant clerk from Nov. 23	3,805.08	401.64
Rosemary Engel, assistant clerk	4,187.45	1,966.26
Ann M. Grickis, assistant chief clerk	6,864.04	3,432.00
Herbert S. Hawkins, investigator	8,005.36	4,002.66
Thomas J. Hurley, Jr., investigator from Nov. 19 to Dec. 15	6,481.67	486.11
James N. Juliana, investigator from Sept. 8	9,673.03	2,771.31
Robert F. Kennedy, assistant counsel to Aug. 31	10,068.45	1,283.57
Pauline S. Larrimore, assistant clerk	4,283.04	2,141.52
Thomas W. LaVenia, assistant counsel	9,985.50	4,806.06
Aileen Lawrence, assistant clerk to Sept. 15	5,334.57	1,111.35
Joseph B. Matthews, executive director to July 18	11,646.00	582.30
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	5,621.34	2,810.64
Frances P. Mims, assistant clerk from July 16	5,047.77	2,313.52
Gladys E. Montier, assistant clerk to Nov. 15	5,430.16	2,036.29
Mary E. Morrill, assistant clerk	4,283.04	2,141.52
Martha Rose Myers, assistant clerk to July 31	4,378.64	364.88
Christian E. Rogers, Jr., assistant counsel to Aug. 21	10,068.45	1,426.35
Howard Rushmore, research director to July 12	10,068.45	335.61
James F. Sheridan, investigator to Dec. 3	7,342.00	3,120.35
Donald A. Surine, assistant counsel	10,732.07	5,345.24
Nina W. Sutton, assistant clerk	5,334.57	2,531.82
Ruth Young Watt, chief clerk	5,817.53	2,890.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$124,171.65
Amount expended	99,878.44
Balance unexpended	24,293.21

JOE MCCARTHY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Kirkley S. Coulter, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Nellie D. McSherry, assistant chief clerk	9,238.93	4,619.46
Stewart French, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Albert A. Grorud, professional staff member	10,649.11	5,324.52
Elmer K. Nelson, professional staff member	10,649.11	5,324.52
George B. Holderer, professional staff member	9,902.55	4,875.20
Marie Mathew, clerical assistant	5,238.97	2,619.48
Rosemary Donnelly, clerical assistant	$5,047.77	$2,523.84
Thelma C. Leach, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Dorothy A. Davis, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.89

Legislative Reorganization Act	$10,000.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, S. Res. 123, July 8, 1953	10,000.00
Total	20,000.00
Amount expended	16,083.31
Balance unexpended	3,916.69

HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE AVAILABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY OF CRITICAL RAW MATERIALS

(Under authority of S. Res. 143, agreed to July 28, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman, assistant counsel, from Aug. 4, 1953	$9,902.55	$4,043.32
Adele R. O'Connor, clerical assistant, from Aug. 12, 1953	3,805.08	1,469.18

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure, S. Res. 143, July 28, 1953	$37,500.00
Amount expended	8,900.59
Balance unexpended	28,599.41

HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE FUEL RESERVES OF THE UNITED STATES

(Under authority of S. Res. 45, agreed to February 20, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Cecelia A. Heban, clerical assistant	$4,761.00	$2,292.86

From prior authority	$3,294.04
Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure from S. Res. 45, Feb. 20, 1953	10,000.00
Total	13,294.04
Amount expended	4,170.92
Balance unexpended	9,123.12

HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Pursuant to S. Res. 41, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce, agreed to Jan. 30, 1953, continued by S. Res. 135, agreed to July 28, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Buts, John R., clerical assistant	$6,003.71	$3,001.80
Chaternuck, Pauline, clerical assistant, to Nov. 30	5,143.38	2,143.05
Davis, Halford G., professional staff member, to July 31	11,646.00	970.50
Drewry, John M., special counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
FitzGerald, Benedict F., special counsel, to Aug. 31	11,646.00	1,941.00
Jackson, Murray E., investigator, to Nov. 30	7,533.19	3,138.80
King, Rufus, consultant	[1] 32.35	857.26
Mack, Joyce W., clerical assistant, to Nov. 30	4,378.64	1,824.40
Plant, Francis X., investigator, to Nov. 30	8,990.07	3,745.85
Radcliffe, Charles W., professional staff member, to Nov. 30	8,005.36	3,335.55
Rice, Downey, counsel, to Nov. 30	11,646.00	4,852.50
Ross, Jeannette F., clerical assistant, to Nov. 15	4,283.04	1,606.14
Woodruff, Franklin, professional staff member	9,238.93	2,463.71
Fisher, Stanley T., investigator, to Nov. 30 (on reimbursement loan from SEC)	6,940.00	2,885.76

[1] Per day.

Balance, June 30, 1953	$39,136.74
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, appropriated July 28	40,000.00
Total	79,136.74
Amount expended	46,413.91
Balance unexpended	32,722.83

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Cecilia M. Cook, clerical assistant	$5,716.93	$2,858.46
Harriet S. Gray, clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,858.46
Edward S. Jarrett, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Edward R. Jelsma, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Frank Keenan, assistant clerk, to Oct. 31	11,646.00	3,882.00
Robert D. L'Heureux, chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Vera B. Rudolph, clerical assistant	6,290.49	3,145.20
Martha P. Shaffer, clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,858.46
Edward C. Sweeney, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Nicholas Zapple, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, balance June 30, 1953	$6,469.51
Amount expended	1,540.18
Balance unexpended	4,929.33

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

(Under authority of S. Res. 245, 82d Cong., and S. Res. 47 and S. Res. 120, 83d Cong.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Donhowe, Charlotte Mae, clerk-typist, to Aug. 31, 1953	$2,598.45	$433.00
Finch, Margaret M., clerk-typist, from Dec. 21, 1953	4,283.04	118.97
Hagan, Robert H., investigator	6,577.27	3,288.00
Kolar, William A., chief investigator	9,155.98	4,577.94
McArthur, Ina W., secretary	4,066.41	2,352.68
Nairn, John W., counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Stevens, William A., clerk	4,474.23	2,237.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$150,000.00
Amount expended	117,647.83
Balance unexpended	32,352.17

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
J. G. Sourwine, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
J. Carlisle Ruddy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Wayne H. Smithey, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
George S. Green, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Thomas B. Collins, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
James Miller, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Mary Rogers, assistant chief clerk	7,533.19	3,766.56
Mildred E. Canon, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Miriam C. Fox, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
H. Joan Sheaff, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Carrie Lee Conner, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Naomi Young Hankins, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Richard Wambach, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
Costas D. Chrimos, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$20,000.00
Amount expended	11,012.51
Balance unexpended	8,987.49

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

(Under authority of S. Res. 89, agreed to June 1, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Hannoch, Herbert J., counsel, from Aug. 19	$11,646.00	$4,270.20
Beaser, Herbert W., assistant counsel, from Sept. 1	10,068.45	3,356.12
Shawn, E. Luise, administrative secretary, from Aug. 16	6,481.67	2,430.58
Hileman, Elsie V., clerical assistant, from Sept. 22 to Nov. 13	4,091.85	591.03
Holloway, Mary F., clerical assistant, from Oct. 5	4,569.81	1,037.22
Lankler, Celeste S., typist, from Oct. 12	2,063.95	672.34
Perlan, Carl L., investigator, from Oct. 26	1,062.30	191.79
Beck, Bertram M., consultant, from Oct. 28 to Nov. 30	750.45	68.78
Edwards, Stanley J., consultant, from Oct. 28 to Nov. 30	750.45	68.78
Elliott, H. Aubrey, consultant, from Oct. 28 to Nov 30	750.45	68.78
Bobo, James H., assistant counsel, from Nov. 2	9,073.03	1,486.96
Tansey, J. Joseph, assistant chief investigator, from Nov. 13	8,005.36	1,067.37
Tompson, Mary E., clerical assistant, from Nov. 16	4,091.85	511.47
Hart, Edward, consultant, from Nov. 20	4,856.61	853.10
Sears, Lillian F., clerical assistant, from Dec. 4	4,091.85	306.88
Christiansen, Jane-Barrie, typist, from Dec. 14	2,827.14	133.50
Schonberger, Claude M., investigator, from Dec. 28	5,238.97	

JANUARY 7, 1954.

Per diem when actually employed at the gross annual salary of—

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Abraham, Joseph W., per diem investigator, from Oct. 16	$5,430.16	$286.41
Fredericksen, Walter A., per diem investigator, from Oct. 16	5,430.16	286.59
Goff, Donald H., per diem consultant, from Nov. 6	3,613.89	20.07
Hagen, Harold A., per diem consultant, from Oct. 19	3,613.89	281.07
Harmon, Maurice A., per diem consultant, from Oct. 19 to Nov. 5	3,613.89	160.60
Harmon, Maurice A., per diem consultant, from Nov. 6	6,194.89	636.09
Haywood, Harry H., per diem investigator, from Nov. 6	3,613.89	289.96
Henry, Verner V., per diem investigator, from Dec. 28	3,613.89	
Klein, Alfred M., per diem consultant, from Oct. 28	3,613.89	40.14
Lacaire, Anthony S., per diem investigator, from Nov. 2	5,430.16	286.59
Leonard, Charles W., per diem investigator, from Dec. 4	6,194.89	
Langlois, Harold V., per diem chief investigator, from Oct. 20	3,613.89	281.07
Longo, Joseph F., per diem investigator, from Dec. 4	3,613.89	
McDivitt, C. Boyd, per diem investigator, from Nov. 10	3,613.89	150.57
Peek, Rulon C., per diem investigator, from Oct. 16	5,430.16	377.08
Rector, Milton G., per diem investigator, from Nov. 10	3,613.89	110.42
Thompson, Lloyd G., per diem consultant, from Nov. 18	3,613.89	
Veney, Lawson, J., per diem consultant, from Nov. 5	3,613.89	200.77

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$44,000.00
Amount expended	29,386.53
Balance unexpended	14,613.47

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES

(S. Res. 326, 82d Cong., and S. Res. 68, 83d Cong., agreed to April 22, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Eleanor C. Guthridge, research assistant	$7,056.23	$3,527.58
E. Luise Shawn, clerical assistant, to Aug. 15	6,481.67	810.19
Louis Marhoefer, special representative, Aug. 1 to Nov. 30	750.45	280.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$45,865.53
Amount expended	8,962.31
Balance unexpended	36,903.22

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

(Under S. Res. 62, agreed to February 20, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$5,000
Amount expended	616
Balance unexpended	4,384

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(S. Res. 48 agreed to January 30, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Arens, Richard, staff director	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Arens, William H., staff member	8,900.07	4,495.02
Bagley, Carole B., clerk	4,569.81	2,284.86
Blair, Drury H., staff member	9,570.74	4,785.36
Burton, Robert R., staff member	8,005.36	4,002.66
Cameron, Betty C., clerk	4,569.81	2,284.86
Fletcher, Edmond C., staff member August 1 to 31, 1953	7,437.59	619.79
McCloskey, Mary J., clerk	4,952.20	2,476.08
Mesmer, Fred M., staff member	9,404.83	4,702.38
Schroeder, Frank W., investigator	9,902.55	4,951.26
Theurer, Gary L., clerk	2,827.14	1,413.54

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$97,000.00
Amount expended	73,063.45
Balance unexpended	23,936.55

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

(Under authority of S. Res. 46 agreed to January 30, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Baker, Dorothy C., clerk	$6,481.67	$3,240.78
Belanger, Roland W., clerk, to Aug. 31	3,709.49	525.80
Cardiello, James A., legal investigator	3,709.49	1,768.49
Connors, Donald D., Jr., investigator, to Aug. 1	9,570.74	797.56
Duffy, Edward R., investigator	8,907.12	4,453.56
Fisher, Herman E., clerk, from Nov. 3	3,422.72	551.43
Fluegel, Edna R., staff member, from August	4,761.00	1,983.75
Franks, George W., clerk	3,709.49	1,854.72
Hauser, Stephen G., research assistant	8,005.36	4,002.66
Humphreys, Marilyn H., clerk	4,856.61	2,428.26
Humphreys, Robert C., Jr., clerk, to Sept. 20	2,432.13	540.45
Lawrence, Aileen, clerk, Sept. 16 to Oct. 31	5,525.75	690.70
Lowell, William E., editorial director	11,646.00	5,823.00
MacDevitt, Mary J., clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
Maher, Maree R., typist	4,856.61	2,428.26
Maloney, Elinor L., clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
Mandel, Benjamin, research director	11,646.00	5,823.00
McDonnell, Yvonne G., clerk, from Nov. 1	5,525.75	920.94
McManus, Robert C., staff member	11,063.87	5,531.88
Mercer, Doris L., clerk	4,569.81	2,284.86
Morris, Robert, chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Somes, Naomi W., clerk	5,334.57	2,667.24
Walker, Marion L., clerk, to Sept. 15	5,525.75	1,151.17
Walter, James H., staff member, from Sept. 28	6,003.71	1,550.93
Whitmore, June D., clerk	4,856.61	2,428.26
Canning, Edna, temporary consultant	[1] 32.35	182.72
Spitzer, Hermann M., temporary consultant	[1] 32.35	452.90

[1] Rate of gross per diem salary.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure:	
S. Res. 314 balance	$69,346.90
S. Res. 46	150,000.00
Total	219,346.90
Amount expended	$153,467.35
Balance unexpended	$65,879.55

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.
WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Roy E. James, staff director (appointed, Sept. 1, 1953)	$11,646.00	$3,882.00
Philip R. Rogers, staff director (resigned, Aug. 27, 1953)	11,646.00	1,843.95
William H. Coburn, minority staff director	11,646.00	5,823.00
Crawford C. Heerlein, clerical assistant	6,290.49	3,145.20
Thelma W. Blankenship, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,906.22
Paul Sample, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,906.22
Patricia G. Caider, clerical assistant (died, Sept. 8, 1953)	5,812.53	1,097.90
Barbara Anderson, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Loretta A. Hogan, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Alice H. Price, clerical assistant (appointed, Oct. 1, 1953)	4,569.81	1,142.43
Helen H. Papps, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Marjorie Whittaker, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Melvin W. Sneed, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Michael J. Bernstein, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Ralph W. Kittle, professional staff member (resigned, Aug. 24, 1953)	8,187.86	1,158.28
William G. Reidy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure		$10,000.00
Amount expended:		
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1953	$3,955.60	
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1953	306.61	
		4,262.21
Balance unexpended		5,737.79

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1954.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

INVESTIGATING THE POSTAL SERVICE

(Under authority of S. Res. 49, agreed to March 6, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to January 3, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Anderson, Ed M., consultant, per diem	$32.35	$161.75
Chapman, Helen, consultant, per diem	32.35	226.45
Compton, Glenn C., investigator-analyst, from Sept. 16, 1953	11,646.00	3,396.75
Doherty, William C., consultant, per diem	32.35	64.70
Fuller, Walter D., consultant, per diem	32.35	64.70
Fadely, Catherine E., clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,201.50
Healey, Frank G., investigator-analyst	6,003.71	2,854.43
Kitchen, Annelle, clerical assistant	$4,856.61	$2,328.68
Linton, M. Albert, consultant, per diem	32.35	226.45
Rubin, Edward B., consultant, per diem	32.35	582.30
Tillotson, John E., consultant, per diem	32.35	970.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$100,000.00
Amount expended to date	39,077.30
Balance unexpended	60,922.70

FRANK CARLSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to January 3, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paschal, Frank A., chief clerk and staff director	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Johnson, R. W., counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Brawley, H. W., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Irwin, Mary, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Bobo, Virginia, clerical assistant	5,525.75	2,762.82
Homan, Colette E., clerical assistant	6,481.67	2,961.96
McElroy, Marty, clerical assistant	5,143.38	2,376.49
Paramore, Mary Anne, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,444.18
Sutherland, Mary H., clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,260.99

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended to date	1,788.80
Balance unexpended	8,211.20

FRANK CARLSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to January 1, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bassett, Ellsworth W., professional staff	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Fox, Thomas F., clerical staff	5,420.16	2,715.08
Kapnic, Charles N., chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Luschyk, Mary, clerical staff	4,569.81	2,264.90
Martinez, John L. (minority), clerical staff	6,481.67	3,240.83
Ortiz, Frances (minority), professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
Porter, Eloise, assistant clerk	7,437.59	3,718.79
Sneed, Theo W., professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$35,000.00
Amount expended	3,705.28
Balance unexpended	31,294.72

EDWARD MARTIN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31 (incl.), 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
W. F. Bookwalter, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Darrell St. Claire, from Aug. 1 to Aug. 31, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Burton S. Hill, Sr., from Oct. 1, professional staff member	10,815.02	3,605.00
L. Stanley Kemp, professional staff member, from Oct. 1	8,990.07	2,247.51
Farley W. Warner, professional staff member, from Aug. 1 to Sept. 30	7,870.74	2,392.68
Mrs. Floye Gavin, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Miss Eleanor Greene, clerical assistant, from Nov. 2	4,091.85	681.96
Mrs. Elaine Jackson, clerical assistant	4,761.00	2,380.50
Mrs. Margaret Kerwan, clerical assistant, to Nov. 30	4,283.04	1,784.60
Mrs. Emma Majeski, assistant chief clerk, from Aug. 1 to Oct. 31	4,665.51	1,070.74
Miss Ann E. McLachlan, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,786.73

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended to June 30, 1953	$361.21
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1953	1,276.05
	1,637.26
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1953	8,362.74

WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bauman, John A., public representative, to Aug. 15	$5,238.97	$654.87
Benson, John W., investigator	7,819.96	3,909.96
Berry, Lewis E., Jr., associate counsel, to July 31	10,815.02	901.25
Bishop, John E., investigator, to Sept. 30	7,819.96	1,954.98
Brewer, Patricia E., clerical assistant, to Sept. 30	3,613.89	903.45
Brown, Betty Lou, clerical assistant, to Sept. 30	3,613.89	903.45
Cervantes, Hector H., investigator, to Sept. 30	3,613.89	903.45
Connelly, James J., court representative, to Sept. 30	5,238.97	1,309.74
Ehrlich, Myron C., associate counsel, to Sept. 30	10,815.02	2,703.75
Florance, Douglas E., special counsel, to July 18	5,238.97	261.94
Florance, James J., investigator, to Aug. 21	3,613.89	511.96
Garcia, Raymond B., guard, to Sept. 30	3,613.89	903.45
Gutierrez, Albert, guard, to Aug. 15	3,613.89	451.72
Hannahs, Fred C., staff representative, to Sept. 30	3,613.89	903.45
Hill, Burton S., Jr., guard, to Aug. 15	3,613.89	451.72
Hill, Burton S., Sr., associate counsel, to July 31	$10,815.02	$901.25
Jack, Alexander J., investigator, to Sept. 30	5,430.16	1,357.53
Kemp, L. Stanley, investigator, to Sept. 30	7,819.96	1,954.98
Kennedy, Philip F., Jr., guard to Aug. 31	3,613.89	602.30
Koenig, James F., clerical assistant, to Dec. 30	3,613.89	1,205.52
Linner, Marvin E., staff representative	3,613.89	602.30
Lord, Samuel, Jr., guard, to July 27	3,613.89	271.03
Majeski, Emma M., clerical assistant, to July 31 and from Nov. 1	4,665.41	1,118.54
Majeski, Robert J., investigator, to Sept. 30	4,091.85	1,022.94
May, James A., staff representative, to Aug. 31	3,613.89	602.30
Miller, Robert B., guard, to Aug. 15	3,613.89	451.72
Philbin, Richard E., investigator	8,005.36	4,002.66
Richardson, Mary S., clerical assistant, to Sept. 30	3,518.30	879.57
Romero, Eliu E., investigator, from Aug. 14 to Sept. 30	3,613.89	471.80
Sanchez, Patricio S., staff representative, to Sept. 30	3,613.89	903.45
Scott, Marilyn E., clerical assistant	4,091.85	1,226.39
Strain, Mary L., clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,643.36
Troiano, Thelma M., clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,189.28
Ware, Wellford H., chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Warner, Farley W., associate counsel, to July 31	9,570.74	797.56
Webner, Ruth M., clerical assistant, to Oct. 6 and from Oct. 12	4,091.85	1,989.04
Woolston, Timothy P., investigator, to July 18	4,283.04	214.15
Alex, Jerrie O., challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	482.66
Austin, Edith E., challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	15.06
Baca, Alfredo M., challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	482.66
Baca, Mary L., challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	407.23
Chilton, Dorothy E., challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	422.33
Ferguson, Columbus, challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	407.24
Ford, Mae A., challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	437.41
Gallegos, John N., challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	422.33
Gallegos, Mike M., challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	407.74
Giannini, Armando Guiseppi, challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	75.41
Gonzales, Alonzo B., challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	437.42
Lopez, Ernesto, challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	15.06
Lopez, Martin, challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	467.58
Marianetti, Yolanda M., challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	407.74
Miller, Robert C., challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	407.74
Ross, Catherine Cornell, challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	422.32
Spitzberg, Sol, challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	90.50
Trujillo, Severino, challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	467.58
White, Mary A., challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	452.50
Wilson, Thomas Leo, challenger, to Aug. 12 [1]	5,430.16	105.58

[1] When actually employed.

Balance, July 1, 1953	$97,416.58
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	37,500.00
Total	134,916.58
Amount expended	106,333.35
Balance unexpended	28,583.23

WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1954.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Byrne, Elizabeth A., assistant chief clerk	$5,621.31	$2,810.64
Forsythe, Robt. A., professional staff	10,807.97	5,448.96
Henderson, Laurance G., professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
Hobbs, Patricia W., clerical assistant, to July 31	4,474.23	372.85
Humphrey, Katherine J., clerical assistant, from Aug. 1, 1953	4,665.41	1,943.90
Jehle, Philip F., professional staff, from June 16	7,150.84	3,575.40
Laskey, Sara Betty, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
Novak, Gertrude C., clerical assistant	4,474.23	2,237.10
Ruppert, Minna L., chief clerk	9,653.69	4,826.82
Stults, Walter B., professional staff	10,815.02	5,407.50
Tucker, Margaret W., clerical assistant	4,474.23	2,237.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure 83d Cong	$10,000
Amount expended	None
Balance unexpended	10,000

EDWARD J. THYE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1954.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

(Pursuant to S. Res. 115, agreed to July 8, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Alfriend, Kate W. B., professional staff, to Aug. 16 and from Sept. 14	$5,047.77	$2,139.29
Amis, William D., investigator	9,321.88	4,660.92
Harvey, Matthew J., professional staff, from Dec. 3	5,525.75	429.73
Humphrey, Katherine J., clerical assistant, from July 1-31	4,665.41	388.78
O'Connor, Blake, professional staff	10,068.45	5,034.18

Balance June 30, 1953	$19,986.28
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure by S. Res. 115	32,000.00
Total	51,986.28
Amount expended	18,756.84
Balance unexpended	33,229.44

EDWARD J. THYE,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2770. A bill to amend chapter 69 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the making of facsimile reproductions of certain naturalization and citizenship papers having historical value; and

S. 2771. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Minardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2772. A bill to provide for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

S. 2773. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 758); and

S. 2774. A bill to repeal the requirement of section 3921 of the Revised Statutes that postmasters report to the Postmaster General failure to cancel postage stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2775. A bill to relinquish the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States over Federal lands within the State of Maryland, and to provide that the United States and the State of Maryland shall hereafter exercise concurrent jurisdiction over such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2776. A bill authorizing the Shilshole Bay Breakwater project, Seattle, Wash.; and

S. 2777. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. HILL):

S. 2778. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. GORE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. IVES, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 2779. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2780. A bill to authorize certain property transactions in Cocoli, C. Z., and for other purposes;

S. 2781. A bill to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land;

S. 2782. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; and

S. 2783. A bill to repeal section 307 of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bills, by request, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2784. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide that, for the purposes of determining benefits under title II thereof, the amount veterans are deemed to have received from wages or self-employment income in each month of active service shall be raised from $160 to $250; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2785. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helga Clara Quarles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. GORE, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NEELY, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. LENNON):

S. 2786. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Southeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2787. A bill for the relief of Antonio Farella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2788. A bill to authorize the long-term time charter of tankers by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2789. A bill for the relief of Gianni Bernardis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2790. A bill to amend the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Cong.) so as to require the consent of the Indian tribes to the assumption of jurisdiction by States over civil and criminal actions arising in Indian country; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution to provide for the continued operation of the Laramie Alumina Plant at Laramie, Wyo., upon the sale of such facility by the General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUNT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO GRANTS FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to grants for public-health services. As I noted yesterday in introducing the bills to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act and the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, I intend to offer additional bills to carry forward into legislative form the remaining recommendations contained in the President's health message.

The bill I am now introducing is another of the bills incorporating into legislative proposals the important recommendations in the President's message on health.

I have introduced this bill as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, after consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in order that the Congress and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have before it an administration bill on this subject.

As I indicated yesterday, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have asked him to proceed as rapidly as possible with the scheduling of hearings for the consideration of this bill, as well as those previously introduced.

Mr. President, if there are other Members of the Senate who would like to join in sponsoring any or all of the bills which have the purpose of carrying out the President's recommendations on health services, I shall be very glad indeed to have them do so. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] just said he would like to be identified with the bill; and I believe that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] would also like to be identified with this clarifying legislation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield to me, let me inquire whether he is referring to the health bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is one of the health bills.

Mr. BUSH. Is it the hospital bill?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes. That bill was introduced yesterday. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Connecticut join as a cosponsor of the bill and thus be identified with it, if he desires to do so.

Mr. BUSH. I shall be glad to be identified as a cosponsor of the hospital bill (S. 2758).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

The bill (S. 2778) to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and for other purposes, introduced today by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. HILL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have had prepared a summary of the bill which I have just introduced. I request unanimous consent that this summary be incorporated into the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF BILL INCORPORATING THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDING THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT WITH RESPECT TO GRANTS FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

IN GENERAL

The bill would replace the present separate authorizations for categorical public health grants for veneral disease control, tuberculosis control, general health, and heart disease control (including the separate programs for mental health and cancer control) with an authorization for the following three types of grants:

1. Grants to assist States generally in meeting the costs of their public health services.

2. Grants to assist States in initiating extensions of, and improvements in, their public health services.

3. Grants to assist in meeting the costs of projects directed toward the solution of public health problems of regional or national significance.

The amount of Federal funds to be available for each of the above three types of grants would be specified in annual appropriations.

GENERAL GRANTS

The formula for determining each State's allotment for the first type of grant would be the same as that used in the hospital survey and construction (Hill-Burton) provisions of the Public Health Service Act—which take into account both the relative populations of the States and their relative fiscal resources as measured by State per capita incomes. There would, however, be a minimum allotment of $55,000. From its allotment, each State would receive payments equal to a percentage of the cost of public health services under its approved State plan, the percentage varying inversely with the State's relative per capita income between a maximum of 66⅔ and a minimum of 33⅓ percent. This contrasts with present law under which the amount of the allotment and the Federal share of the cost are determined by regulations and differ from program to program.

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

The formula for determining each State's allotment for extension and improvement purposes would be based on relative State populations with a minimum allotment of $25,000. From its allotment, a State could receive, over a 6-year period, varying proportions of the cost of approved projects (included in its approved State plan) for extension and improvement of its public health services—75 percent of the cost for the first 2 years, 50 percent for the next 2, and 25 percent for the last 2.

SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS

These grants would be made on a project basis to States and to public and nonprofit agencies or organizations. They would be available for paying part of the cost of combating unusually severe public health problems in specific geographical areas, of carrying out special projects which hold unique promise of contributing to the solution of multi-State public health problems, and of meeting public health problems of national significance or concern.

STATE PLANS

Payments from allotments for the first type of grant (for support of public health services) would be conditioned upon submission of a plan by the State health authority (and mental health authority in connection with mental health), which meets requirements prescribed in regulations of the Surgeon General.

As under existing law, regulations would be issued by the Surgeon General, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and only after consultation with and, insofar as practicable, the concurrence of the State health (or mental health) authorities.

ADMINISTRATION

The grants would continue, as under existing law, to be administered through the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TRANSITION PROVISIONS

In order to provide States an opportunity to adjust their finances to the new allotment formulas, provision would be made to limit to 10 percent any decrease in allotments which any State would receive in any 1 year by virtue of the formula change.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENTS

These amendments to the Public Health Service Act would not become effective until July 1, 1955.

PROPOSED NATIONAL DEFENSE LEGISLATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, two bills relating to the Armed Forces. These bills are recommended by the Department of Defense and are accompanied by letters of transmittal from the Department explaining the purpose of the bill in each case.

Also, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and a bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended. These bills are accompanied by letters of transmittal from the executive branch which explain the purpose of the bills.

I ask that the accompanying letters in each case be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills introduced.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters accompanying the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, by request, were received and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 2780. A bill to authorize certain property transactions in Cocoli, C. Z., and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 2780 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, January 6, 1954.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To authorize certain property transactions in Cocoli, C. Z., and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954. The responsibility for representing the Department of Defense on this legislation has been delegated to this Department by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would authorize the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company, to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without exchange of funds and for occupancy by military and civilian personnel on a rental basis, all, or so much of the facilities, buildings, structures, and improvements of the transferor agencies at or within the town of Cocoli, C. Z., as may be mutually acceptable.

The town of Cocoli, located near the Pacific terminus of the Canal, was formerly maintained and operated as a housing facility of the Panama Canal Company. The improvements to be transferred consist, in large part, of a group of two- and three-story frame structures, most of which are built on concrete stilts, each with a paved area for garage, recreation and laundry facilities. There are 380 one-, two-, and three-bedroom family units contained in 106 buildings, and 160 bachelor units contained in four barracks buildings, a commissary, a clubhouse, a fire house, a police station, a telephone exchange, a gasoline station, an elementary school with gymnasium, a post office, maintenance shops, and a warehouse. The improvements were constructed during the period 1941–43 at an original cost of $1,836,000 and the present value is estimated to be $1,272,000. In general, the condition of all structures, the power distribution system, roads, and sewers is good, although some exterior and interior painting will be required.

The land upon which these improvements are constructed is a part of the original Canal Zone area which is in the custody of the Canal Zone Government. Transfer of the land is not provided for in this proposed legislation but will be accomplished after enactment of this proposal by order of the Secretary of the Army issued pursuant to authority delegated by the President in Executive Order 9746.

In view of the very critical need for additional naval housing at the Pacific terminus of the Canal and inasmuch as the facilities described herein are excess to the needs of the Panama Canal Company, that company and the Canal Zone Government, by license effective as of January 1, 1952, have made these facilities available to the Department of the Navy on a temporary basis. It is most desirable that the Department of the Navy obtain permanent custody of this property. The Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government have consented to such a transfer without exchange of funds. It is contemplated that the housing will be used by the Department of the Navy to furnish civilians with quarters in accordance with the act of March 5, 1928 (45 Stat. 193, ch. 126; 5 U. S. C. 75a) and for occupancy by service personnel on a rental basis pursuant to the act of July 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 316, ch. 227; 37 U. S. C. 111a).

Inasmuch as the Panama Canal Company, one of the transferor agencies, is subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, this transfer of property cannot under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, be made without reimbursement. This proposed legislation is necessary to accomplish the desired transfer in the manner agreed to by the agencies concerned.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy on behalf of the Department of Defense recommends that the proposal be enacted by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. H. SMITH, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

S. 2781. A bill to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 2781 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1954.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army on behalf of the Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of concurrent jurisdiction over lands otherwise under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States so as to enable the State to provide for the establishment, maintenance, or control of roads, streets, highways, or other rights-of-way thereon. This authority is needed primarily to avoid problems that arise out of the policing by military personnel of highways that are situated within a military reservation but used extensively by the civilian public as well as by military personnel. It would provide for the retention, at the same time, of appropriate military control over the area.

This proposal would provide for the creation in a State of jurisdiction over land without any relinquishment by the Federal Government of its jurisdiction of title to the land. Any grant or retrocession of jurisdiction pursuant to its terms would take effect only upon the acceptance thereof by the State concerned. The authority to make the grant or retrocession of such jurisdiction would be vested in the heads of departments, independent establishments, or agencies of the Federal Government, including the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, in much the same manner as such officers are now authorized by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to accept or secure from a State consent to or cessation of exclusive or partial jurisdiction.

Problems involving the policing of a highway transversing a military reservation have arisen at a number of military installations. Among such installations are Quantico, Va.; Fort Belvoir, Va.; Fort Bragg, N. C.; Fort Sill, Okla; Fort Breckenridge, Ky.; Fort Devens, Mass.; and Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. This proposal would provide a means for alleviating the particular problems that have arisen at such installations as well as similar problems that may arise in the future at these and at other installations without the necessity of special legislation by the Congress in each case.

Public Law 522, 81st Congress, provides for the retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over a highway transversing Fort Devens. Public Law 318, 82d Congress, provides for the retrocession to the State of North Carolina of jurisdiction over a highway transversing Fort Bragg. Public Law 38, 83d Congress, provides for the retrocession to the Commonwealth of Virginia of jurisdiction over a highway transversing Fort Belvoir. Public Law 41, 83d Congress, provides for the retrocession to the State of Oklahoma of jurisdiction over a highway transversing Fort Sill.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 2782. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 2782 is as follows:)

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1954.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics respectfully submits for your consideration a draft of proposed bill "To promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research."

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide legislative authorization for the NACA's 1955 construction program as approved by the Bureau of the Budget for inclusion in the President's Budget for the fiscal year 1955.

The NACA has been authorized by the Bureau of the Budget to submit this proposed legislation to the Congress. It is respectfully requested that it be introduced in the 83d Congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. F. VICTORY,
Executive Secretary.

S. 2783. A bill to repeal section 307 of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

(The letter accompanying S. 2783 is as follows:)

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1954.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to repeal section 307 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended," with the request that it be introduced and considered for enactment at the earliest practicable date.

The purpose of the proposed measure is to provide for the continuation of the President's present authority to deal with a civil defense emergency, subject to termination at any time by concurrent resolution of the Congress. Under section 307 of the Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 2297), such authority would terminate in any event on June 30, 1954.

In approaching the problems of civil defense, the Congress recognized that an attack upon the continental United States with modern weapons of mass destruction would thrust many unprecedented problems of vast magnitude upon our Government. Standby legislation was needed to assure adequate legal authority to cope with the immediate emergency conditions which would result from such attack. Accordingly, in title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, the Congress armed the executive branch of our Government with the broad standby authority necessary to meet the civil defense requirements of an attack.

Section 301 of such title permits the declaration of a civil defense emergency whenever an attack on the United States has occurred or is anticipated. The same section also authorizes termination of such an emergency by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress. Since the title III powers can only be exercised under the criteria of section 301, and since they can be terminated whenever appropriate in the manner indicated, there appears to be no need for retention of section 307.

The broad powers contained in title III will be needed in the event of an atomic attack in this country. There will be no time after attack to pass necessary legislation. For civil defense planning purposes at Federal, State, and local level, it is necessary that there be a clear understanding of the legal authority for necessary action. The existence of standby legislation of this type will permit such planning. Civil defense plans and preparations must be maintained at a substantial level of readiness for such period of time as any threat to America exists in the world. It is not a program whose emergency requirements will change as international tensions ease.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that section 307 be repealed.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

KATHERINE G. HOWARD
(For Val Peterson).

SOUTHEASTERN INTERSTATE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in October of 1953, representatives of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, met in Nashville, Tenn., for the purpose of studying the feasibility of setting up a Southeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact.

At the end of the 2-day meeting, the conference unanimously agreed to terms and conditions of the proposed compact, and drafted suggested legislation to obtain congressional approval.

On behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], I introduce a bill for that purpose.

Mr. President, governors from several of the States have already asked their congressional delegations to initiate action to obtain congressional approval. Only last week, I had a letter from Gov. Gordon Persons, of Alabama, in which he said:

> This legislation is certainly in the public interest and if there is anything we can do toward helping it pass please let me know. I discussed the matter yesterday with Director Earl McGowin of our conservation department and both of us appreciate your help very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of the proposed compact, and the resolution approved at the conference in Nashville.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2786) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Southeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The explanation and resolution are as follows:

SOUTHEASTERN INTERSTATE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACT

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The purpose of the compact, set forth in article I, is primarily to promote the "effective prevention and control of forest fires in the southeastern region of the United States." Toward that end the development of integrated forest-fire plans is encouraged. Mutual exchange of fire-fighting services and facilities when needed is authorized and legal barriers to such interchange are removed. Articles IV and V are concerned directly with these mutual-aid features.

Article II sets forth the names of the primary group of member States, stipulates that the compact shall become operative when any two or more contiguous States have ratified it and Congress has given consent; and it makes possible adherence later on of other contiguous States, conditioned upon approval by the legislatures of the member States. It should be noted that this article includes in the primary group of member States Mississippi, Virginia, and West Virginia. The first of these has been included also in the South Central Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact. The latter two States have been included also in the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact. Action of the Nashville conference in including these 3 States here was not intended to—and in fact does not—make it incumbent upon these States to ratify this compact rather than the 2 compacts previously mentioned. Nor does it impair the operating validity and effectiveness of this compact if 1 or more of these 3 States prefer to join the other compacts. In actuality there is no legal barrier to a State's being a primary member of two forest fire compacts. The purpose of including these three "bridge" States here is merely to give them the opportunity of becoming primary member States of the Southeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact if they so desire.

Article III establishes the operational framework of the compact. The State forester of each member State is designated to act as "compact administrator" for that State. This article also declares that there "shall be established an advisory committee," and this committee shall include from each member State a member of the senate and a member of the house of representatives (ordinarily to be designated by the State commission on interstate cooperation), and 2 representatives to be appointed by the governor, 1 of whom shall be associated with forestry or with forest products industries. This form of compact organization was selected partly because it would reduce the need for new central staff facilities.

Articles IV and V, as mentioned above, deal with mutual aid aspects of the compact, and provide a basis for settling in advance any questions of liability, compensation, etc., which might arise in the event that one State goes to the assistance of another. These articles, it should be noted, are substantially the same as comparable mutual aid articles in the other regional forest-fire compacts as well as in many interstate civil-defense compacts.

Article VI clarifies the construction of the compact in its application to programs, activities, and other intergovernmental arrangements of the member States. Article VII authorizes the compact administrators to call upon the United States Forest Service for research and program development assistance. Article VIII, which is based on a comparable article in both the South Central and Middle Atlantic Forest Fire Protection Compacts, contemplates and authorizes interregional exchange of mutual aid to handle emergency fire situations. Article IX specifies the period during which the compact shall remain in force and the manner in which a State may withdraw from it.

RESOLUTION I

CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT TO THE SOUTHEASTERN INTERSTATE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACT

Whereas representatives of the Southeastern States meeting in Nashville, Tenn., October 27–28, 1953, have drafted a Southeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact to promote the effective prevention and control of forest fires within the southeastern region, including the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia; and

Whereas preliminary arrangements have been made for appropriate consideration looking toward ratification of the compact by the legislatures of the Southeastern States by the legislatures of the Southeastern States; and

Whereas early consent to the compact by the Congress of the United States will enable provisions of the compact to go into effect expeditiously and the advantages which will accrue from the compact will be more quickly realized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Southeastern States Forest Fire Protection Conference meeting in Nashville, Tenn., October 27–28, 1953, respectfully request the congressional delegations of the Southeastern States to assist in obtaining congressional consent to the terms of the compact.

CONTINUED OPERATION OF LARAMIE ALUMINA PLANT, LARAMIE, WYO.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to provide for the continued operation of the Laramie Alumina Plant at Laramie, Wyo., upon the sale of such facility by General Services Administration. I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the joint resolution by me be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) to provide for the continued operation of the Laramie Alumina Plant at Laramie, Wyo., upon the sale of such facility by the General Services Administration, introduced by Mr. HUNT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The explanation presented by Mr. HUNT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUNT

I briefly set forth some of the national and local considerations which motivate the introduction of this bill.

The Laramie Alumina Plant was 1 of 4 plants built by the Defense Plant Corporation during World War II when our aluminum production was threatened with disaster. This Nation was critically short of aluminum early in 1941, and during 1942 and 1943 the German submarine campaign was so effective in cutting off our imports of bauxite from the Caribbean, on which the aluminum industry depends for its raw materials, that the Government financed construction of these 4 semi-commercial plants to produce alumina from domestic clays and other ores. Three of the plants—at Salt Lake City, Utah, at Harleyville, South Carolina, and at Salem, Oregon—were sold by the Government after the war at 15, 19, and 6 percent, respectively, of their original cost, and only the latter is being utilized in the production of alumina. The Salt Lake plant is producing fertilizer, and the Harleyville plant is producing cement.

It might be interesting to note here, because it has such bearing on the need for introduction of this bill, that Mr. Oliver C. Ralston of the Bureau of Mines testified in 1947 before the Natural Resources Subcommittee of the Senate Public Lands Committee that—

"We were decidedly embarrassed along at the beginning of 1943 when, of the 60 ore boats that were bringing aluminum ore from the north coast of South America to the United States, we reached a point where 52 out of the 60 had been sunk. No one dared to breathe the situation at the time to the people, or, more important to the enemy."

In addition to these 52 sunken bauxite boats—almost the entire fleet—the record shows that 48 or more naval escort vessels were likewise sunk trying to protect the bauxite cargoes.

The Nation still depends upon bauxite imports for approximately 80 percent of the alumina we consume.

There are practically inexhaustible supplies of anorthosite at Laramie, Wyo., and 7 other States have aluminum bearing clays and anorthosite. These are Oregon, South Carolina, California, Minnesota, Arkansas, New York, and Pennsylvania. While these raw materials are lower than bauxite in aluminum content, the Bureau of Mines will soon conclude 2 years of experimental work at Laramie, which is being watched closely by the entire aluminum industry, and which is expected to show that this country can become practically self-sufficient in the production of alumina by fully utilizing our domestic clay deposits.

General Services Administration will proceed to dispose of the Laramie plant when the Bureau of Mines experimental work is concluded in June of this year.

We in Wyoming, and the Government, should not stand idly by and see this plant offered for sale in such a manner that it could be cannibalized by the purchaser and transferred to some other site in some other State to be put to some other use. We experienced this once before in the case of what is known as the sponge iron plant, also at Laramie. This, too, was a defense plant, and when the experimental work was completed nothing but the burned out shell remained after various Government agencies had taken out equipment they could use.

The Laramie Alumina Plant should remain at Laramie and should be used to produce alumina and to develop our vast natural resources in Wyoming. It offers the basis for a domestic alumina industry which could make us independent of foreign sources of bauxite.

All told, the Federal Government has invested $30 million in this endeavor to prove the feasibility of producing alumina from clay at competitive costs with bauxite. Such a costly undertaking should not be charged off as a failure, and the purchaser of the Laramie alumina plant should be required to use that facility for the purpose for which it was constructed, namely, to produce alumina in the interest of the national defense.

This objective was subscribed to by the Senate Appropriations Committee last year when it sent the Interior Department appropriation bill to the Senate. Its report contained the following language:

"The committee has been advised by the Bureau of Mines that it intends to complete its program within the amount allowed and will release the plant to the General Services Administration by the end of the fiscal year 1954.

"It appears that it is to the best interest of the Government that demonstrated costs, quantities, and qualities of alumina to be produced from such plant be obtained at the earliest moment and the committee is convinced that operation by private industry on quantity basis can be had without expense to the Government.

"The committee believes it to be in the public interest that General Services Administration should, as soon as possible, attempt to negotiate either a lease or sales agreement with an industrial operator with such agreement to take effect upon the release of the property by the Bureau of Mines, retaining for the Bureau of Mines if it so desires and at its expense the privilege of—

"1. Observing operations in the plant for a reasonable time without participating but

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

having access to the experimental data and records pertinent to the operations.

"2. Conducting further reasonable research for a reasonable time in the plant in cooperation with the lessee or purchaser provided such activities do not interfere with operations of the industrial operator, which operations shall be the exclusive venture of the operator.

"3. Occupying suitable office space for a reasonable time."

REGISTRATION AND PROTECTION OF CERTAIN TRADE-MARKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2540) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ROBERT A. TAFT MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIPS FOR CANCER RESEARCH—REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on August 1, 1953, just before the end of the first session of the 83d Congress, I introduced the bill (S. 2571) providing for the establishment of the Robert A. Taft Memorial Scholarships for cancer research. Because of the shortness of time, the bill was not referred to a committee, as the leadership and I thought of the possibility of passing the bill without reference to a committee. The bill has been lying on the desk. I now ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of George Holmes Roderick, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Frank Brown Berry, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Melvin A. Casberg, resigned;

Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense;

Hugh M. Milton II, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army;

Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of the Navy; and

John Slezak, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

REPORT BY SENATOR IVES ON 1953 CONFERENCE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, some of my fellow Senators may recall that late last May, I was excused from sessions of the Senate for the purpose of serving as head of the United States delegation to the 1953 annual Conference of the International Labor Organization at Geneva, Switzerland. Upon my return in early July, I found the Senate to be immersed in activities aimed at adjournment by the end of the month.

I had expected at that time to make a report to the Senate on my work and experience at the Conference. Because of the situation to which I refer, however, I felt that such a presentation on my part would then be inappropriate, and I decided to delay my report until the convening of the present session of the Congress.

I have prepared a statement on the subject, which may be of interest to those who have been or are active in the field of international relations and to those whose attention has been attracted to the field of labor relations at the international level. Because of the length of the statement, I shall not consume the time of Senators by reading it into the RECORD; accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT BY SENATOR IVES REGARDING HIS SERVICE AS HEAD OF THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE 1953 CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION AT GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

As many of you undoubtedly know, the International Labor Organization was an adjunct and in a sense a subsidiary of the League of Nations. In like manner it is now affiliated with the United Nations. It was created in 1919 and among those who were most conspicuous and influential in its creation was Samuel Gompers.

The ILO was established to fill a worldwide vacuum, both as an instrumentality in raising standards of living and working conditions throughout the world and, thereby, as a medium for bringing about better industrial and labor relations. I believe I can best describe its purpose by quoting the preamble of its constitution, which reads as follows:

"Whereas universal and lasting peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice; and

"Whereas conditions of labor exist involving such injustice, hardship, and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperiled; and an improvement of those conditions is urgently required: as, for example, by the regulation of the hours of work, including the establishment of a maximum working day and week, the regulation of the labor supply, the prevention of unemployment, the provision of an adequate living wage, the protection of the worker against sickness, disease, and injury arising out of his employment, the protection of children, young persons, and women, provision for old age and injury, protection of the interests of workers when employed in countries other than their own, recognition of the principle of equal remuneration for work of equal value, recognition of the principle of freedom of association, the organization of vocational and technical education and other measures; and

"Whereas also the failure of any nation to adopt humane conditions of labor is an obstacle in the way of other nations which desire to improve the conditions in their own countries;

"The high contracting parties, moved by sentiments of justice and humanity as well as by the desire to secure the permanent peace of the world, and with a view to attaining the objectives set forth in this preamble, agree to the following constitution of the International Labor Organization."

Without going into unnecessary detail regarding the structure and functioning of the ILO, I would point out that its membership presently consists of 66 nations. Each nation is entitled to 4 delegates to every annual conference—2 delegates representing the government, 1 delegate representing the workers, and 1 delegate representing the employers. At the same time, it has a continuing organizational establishment consisting of a governing body and the secretariat.

The governing body until last year's conference consisted of 16 representatives from governments and 8 representatives each from the employers and workers—a total of 32. The secretariat is headed by a director-general who during the annual conferences acts as secretary-general. Assistant secretaries and other clerical personnel total several hundreds.

In addition to the personnel to whom I have referred, each delegation at the annual conferences includes so-called advisers who are attached to each of the three groups in the delegation. For example, at last year's conference our American advisers totaled approximately 30 and were distributed about equally among our 3 groups. These advisers perform a very important function. They not only advise and counsel with the delegates themselves; they also serve on the standing committees of the conference, where their influence is exceedingly broad and effective. They act, of course, under the instructions of their respective delegates, but without them it would be impossible to conduct the committee activities of the conferences and, in fact, the conferences themselves would become chaotic and futile.

The ILO is in no sense a supergovernment. Although every conference functions as a strictly legislative body, its jurisdiction and authority are limited to the powers granted by the member nations as expressed in the ILO's constitution. Later, in the course of this statement, this condition will become

more clear, as I describe phases of the organization's activities and operations.

I am sure that the ILO's importance and potential value to the United States are no more than slightly recognized in this country; at any rate, I myself in the past have had only a vague conception of its function and activities and an even more limited appreciation of its possibilities with respect to ourselves. As I have stated, the basic purpose of the ILO has been to raise the standards of wages, hours, working conditions, and related matters throughout the world. Obviously, because our own standards of this type are already so high, any general improvement in these standards among the other nations is almost certain to affect us advantageously from the standpoint of competition, both in our own and in the world markets. To the extent that this effort has already succeeded, we as a Nation should have been benefited, although, because of the chaotic economic and social conditions occasioned by the last war and by Soviet Russia's subsequent damnable attitude, it is difficult to ascertain exactly where such benefit may have occurred.

The fact remains that, as a member of the ILO, we are in a position to profit by participating in its programs and activities and especially by contributing to its aims and plans. Unfortunately for us, we were delinquent in joining it, having been a member only since 1934. Our refusal to ratify the Treaty of Versailles or even to join the League of Nations, under which in 1919 the ILO was created, was largely responsible for our delay in becoming a member of it. In the meantime, at least one of the policies and procedures, which were adopted and put in operation by the ILO, has caused misunderstanding both here at home and in our relationship with the organization itself.

I refer to the matter of conventions which are not exclusively a feature of the ILO, but which, nonetheless, have occasioned criticism of the ILO in the United States and criticism against our Government on the part of other members of the ILO. A large majority of these conventions, whether or not supported by our delegates in past years, have been ratified by a substantial number of ILO member nations; most of these particular conventions have tended to bypass our Federal Government and to strike directly at our State laws and regulations, in fact, at States' rights themselves. In many instances they have, in effect, sought to do in our country that which the Congress of the United States has deemed it unwise to attempt to do.

In this connection, in the course of discussions concerning ILO conventions, it has been pointed out that a few years ago the ILO constitution was amended by the addition of language in section 7 of article 19, which purportedly provides protection for States' rights in the case of "Federal States." This provision was aimed to encourage the enactment of implementing legislation by individual States in countries like our own when the convention might be something which was not suitable for ratification by the National Government.

Unfortunately this provision in article 19, instead of clarifying the situation with respect to the position of the United States, actually has confused it. Regardless of the intent in the article itself, its application has caused misunderstanding where our own country is concerned. Our situation has not been fully comprehended by many of our fellow members of the ILO and seemingly we have been unsuccessful heretofore in explaining it satisfactorily to them; at any rate, I discovered there were many delegates who did not understand our problem until I had explained it to them.

It has been interesting to note that many Americans have condemned ILO conventions, not so much because of the question of States' rights as because of the nature and substance of the conventions themselves. Many conventions have sought to accomplish by law or Government directive on the part of ratifying nations that which in many instances in our own country has been left to agreement between workers and employers through the medium of collective bargaining.

As you know, collective bargaining is a basic and vital technique of labor-management relations in our own free, competitive enterprise society; unfortunately it is little understood and even less in operation among most of the other nations in the world. Most of the free nations rely on government to regulate the relationship—including work standards and labor relations generally—between workers and employers.

As a result of this condition, many American employers have taken the position that ILO conventions are, in effect, contrary to American principles and policies; and, because some of the governments preferring the convention or strictly government-control approach are socialistically inclined, these employers have charged that the ILO is itself socialistically dominated and wholly out of line with American policy and practice. I cannot wholly accept this viewpoint, but I do believe that an effort should be made to see that both American employers and American workers are fairly and appropriately represented by our two Government delegates to the ILO conferences.

Too many times in the past our Government's two delegates have been representative primarily of American labor and have not reflected the attitude of American management. I feel strongly that always these Government delegates should be neither pro-labor nor pro-management, but first of all, should be representative of the great American public, whose interest should be their first concern while they are acting justly and sympathetically with regard to the interests of both labor and management.

Because our work standards in the United States are so high—in fact, I dare say, with very few exceptions they are as high as, or higher than, any standard which has been proposed through the medium of ILO conventions—our country's ultimate refusal to support these conventions which deal with strictly State, as opposed to Federal, matters in the United States has placed us seemingly in an anomalous position.

Among the American opponents to the convention procedure there appears to be a considerable lack of awareness that no convention is binding on any nation which does not ratify it. This misunderstanding seems to be in part responsible for the current agitation for greater constitutional restrictions on the treaty-making authority of the Chief Executive and the Senate.

Last year every attempt to submit a convention was defeated in plenary session. On the contrary, proposals emanating from the 1953 conference for world approval are in the form of recommendations.

These recommendations, as the term indicates, are merely statements of principles or policies pertaining to work standards, etc., which are submitted to the member nations in the hope that they will be observed. They are quite sufficient for us because, as I have indicated, they conform generally to standards already in force in the large industrial areas of our own country.

Apropos of the ILO record with respect to conventions and recommendations, I submit the following figures:

Conventions submitted by the ILO prior to 1935	44
Conventions submitted by the ILO after 1935	59
Total	103

Of the foregoing conventions the United States has ratified only 7, and of the 7 ratified, 6 pertained to maritime questions and 1 to wording in the constitution of the ILO, by which the term "League of Nations" was changed to "United Nations" in the text.

Recommendations approved by the ILO prior to 1935	44
Recommendations approved by the ILO after 1935	53
Total	97

As I have suggested, however, there have been cases where conventions not in conformity with our own standards and practices have been approved by ILO conferences. Last year, for instance, a resolution was adopted which calls for a world standard of 2 weeks' vacation with pay after 1 year's service. The adoption of this resolution by last year's conference was a required preliminary step to its submission at this year's conference in the form of a recommendation or convention, on which final action would then be taken; and indications are that there is strong pressure for its ultimate submission as a convention. The vote in its favor as a resolution was 184 to 1, with the sole negative vote having been cast by the United States employer delegate. Happily this was the only instance in which our American delegation did not act in unison.

As head of our delegation, it seemed to me that all of us—representatives of Government, workers, and employers—should act in harmony and as a unit, just as far as possible. After all, all of us were representatives of the United States and, therefore, should present a common front. Pertinent to this observation, I was particularly interested in noting the way in which the delegates from the United Kingdom were inclined to stick together; and the same was true in the case of many of the other delegations.

One thing with which I was particularly impressed was the character or quality of membership of the several delegations. Not infrequently a minister of labor served as one of his government's delegates; labor delegates were often top-ranking representatives of the labor movements in their countries; and often the employer delegates were leading industrialists in their respective nations. I do not emphasize these facts in criticism of our United States delegation. We had a good delegation; I believe it was representative. But I do emphasize the fact that always efforts should be made to see that labor, management, and our Government send delegates to the ILO conferences, who are thoroughly representative of their particular groups in our country and are able to act with sufficient understanding and dispatch when swift action is required; they should be able to speak with independence and authority for the groups they represent. These are most important musts if the United States is to be most effective in exercising the influence which our position in the world should command.

As a prerequisite to this end, it has seemed to me that our Government should have a permanent ILO delegate assigned to Geneva—preferably a delegate with the rank of ambassador or at least minister. Such representation on our part would assure us of being constantly in touch—in fact, a part of—the continual operation of the ILO. If the ILO is as important to us as I believe it is, if we have as much at stake in the ILO as I believe we have, a permanent representative of this type is most desirable and is wholly in keeping with the present policy of not a few of its member nations. Surely, if other countries attach such importance to the ILO, we can afford to do no less.

I firmly believe that the ILO, with a membership of 66 nations and representative not only of governments, but also of the vast cross sections of populations which consist of workers and employers, can exercise an influence on the world economy and world

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

society, which no other international organization—not even the United Nations—is in a position to exercise. It remains for us Americans to determine whether we shall choose to play the role in the field of world worker-employer problems which by tradition, experience, and accomplishment we should be qualified to play to an unusual degree and with great benefit to ourselves and to the world. I only wish that the vast majority of those in Government, in management, and in labor could visualize the ILO for what it is and, most of all, for what it can do—and, I might add, for what it may do if we do not accept our responsibility to it. If such an understanding were to exist among the American people, I should feel less disturbed about the future.

The importance and significance of the ILO to us has more recently become peculiarly apparent through the demand of Soviet Russia to be reinstated as a member, with certain basic and far-reaching reservations. Although under the ILO constitution Russia is at liberty at any time to resume its membership on the same basis as that of other member nations, the fact remains that, if the pending Russian request and proposal were to be approved by the ILO, such approval would require amendment or amendments to the ILO constitution. Because adoption of constitutional amendments requires initially affirmative action on the part of two-thirds of the conference delegates and later ratification by two-thirds of the ILO members, and also the approval of five of the eight members on the governing body representing countries of chief industrial importance, I doubt very much that the Russian request will be granted. Approval of the Soviet Union's proposal, in fact, would mark the end of the ILO as an influential world organization.

At this point I would comment concerning our delegation's informal relationship with the other nations represented at last year's ILO conference. Perhaps, as president of the conference, I may not have obtained a first hand, accurate impression of the attitude of our fellow delegates toward us. Nevertheless, my personal impression seems to have been similar to that which others of our United States delegation—both delegates and advisers—also obtained.

I came away from Geneva with the feeling that, with a very few exceptions, all who attended the conference desired to be friends of the United States and the American people. We of the United States delegation in turn tried to live up to the old adage that "He who would have friends must show himself friendly."

I was impressed with the evidence that, for the most part, the friendliness of representatives of most of the other nations was genuine and not calculated. They did not seem to be seeking primarily to get something from us, but rather to provide us with a better understanding of their problems. They appeared to desire to convey the idea that they seek to do for themselves all that they can do and that they are looking to us only for aid and guidance in those problems which are beyond their present capacity to resolve.

Because you may be interested in a number of my personal experiences and observations, I would mention several matters which do not pertain entirely to the formal operation and functioning of the ILO. These matters, however, do provide an insight into the more human aspect of ILO activities.

Recognizing, as I do, the great need for economy in government in our own country, I was very glad to cooperate in holding down the expenditures of our American delegation. I particularly refer to the reception which, as president of a conference, I was required to give. The head of the Brazilian delegation was president of the 1952 conference, and the reception then provided by Brazil was reported to have cost something like $4,000 to $5,000. Our State Department finally allotted me $1,400 for this purpose and, while it was impossible on the basis allowed to invite all whom I should have liked to invite, nevertheless we had a sufficiently representative number present. In fact, I think the limitation placed on this expenditure was wholly appropriate because it enabled us to drive home to many of the delegates the fact that we ourselves are perforce in a period of strict austerity. They seemed to get the idea—and to like it.

Only in one instance did I feel obliged to take issue on the matter of economy, and this was with our State Department. The conference was virtually unanimous in favor of increasing the size of the governing body from 32 to 40, thereby increasing the number of Government members from 16 to 20, and the number of worker and employer members from 8 to 10 each. It was estimated that, on the basis of this increase, our own Government's share of the additional, annual cost to the ILO would be approximately $1,500. Both our employer delegate and our worker delegate favored the increase and the question was simply whether our two Government delegates should abstain from voting and join with the two South African delegates who were abstaining. Again, regardless of the pros and cons over the wisdom of abstentions, it seemed to me that, in the circumstances, we should be most ill advised in even thus passively opposing the proposed increase in the governing body. Our Government delegates, therefore, joined our employer and worker delegates and voted in favor of the constitutional change, which was approved by a vote of 189 to 0—with the 2 absentions, to which I have referred. This is the only instance in which I felt it necessary to take issue with any of the instructions or directives received by our delegation, and I felt compelled to do so by the force of the conditions I have cited.

Before concluding this rather lengthy recital, I desire to pay personal tribute to Mr. David A. Morse, who has been performing a remarkable service for our country and for the world in the effective and inspiring manner in which, as its director-general and secretary-general, he has been directing the work of the ILO. Mr. Morse is an unusual person, with whom many of you may be acquainted. He possesses great organizing and administrative skill, and withal, his is a personality which attracts and persuades those with whom he comes in contact. I daresay that no public servant of our country has been performing with more conspicuous success in a delicate and sensitive field of operation, which is so vital to the welfare of the United States.

And I cannot bring this statement to a conclusion without expressing appreciation of the loyal and conscientious service rendered in behalf of our Government by our distinguished colleague, the able senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who last year again served as a member of the American delegation to an ILO Conference. His kindness and cooperation were of tremendous assistance, not only to me but to our whole delegation, and I know that, in thus publicly thanking him, I am expressing the sentiment of all who had the pleasure of serving with him.

When President Eisenhower requested me to undertake this mission I was most reluctant to do so. I had considerable misgiving about it. I felt that my first duty was to remain in attendance in the Senate during the important closing days of the session. At the same time I doubted that I could be of any real value in heading our American delegation.

I still have doubt regarding the quality of my accomplishment. Nevertheless, I am now very glad that I went. The knowledge and experience I gained could never have been acquired in any other way.

And I am profoundly grateful to have been the individual through whom our country was honored by the Conference's establishment of the following three "firsts": I was the first American to be elected president of an ILO Conference; I was the first ILO president to be elected unanimously; I was the first ILO president to receive a standing ovation at the conclusion of a Conference. While this recognition was accorded me because of my position as a representative of the United States, I naturally derived a great deal of personal satisfaction out of receiving it as a tribute to my country.

But, above all else, I departed from Geneva firm in the conviction that the International Labor Organization's potential for good, both for the United States and for the rest of the free world, is almost without limit.

THE PRESIDENT'S SOCIAL SECURITY MESSAGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the President's social-security message of January 14, 1954.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON PRESIDENT'S SOCIAL-SECURITY MESSAGE

The President has laid out a fine program for strengthening our social-security system. His recommendations are all progressive and constructive.

I sincerely rejoice in his emphatic acceptance of the principles upon which our great social-security program was founded by President Roosevelt.

Of course, I am interested in seeing the new formulas to be submitted regarding increased benefits, but, on the whole, every suggested change seems a sound step forward. Broadening the coverage, liberalizing the retirement test, increasing the benefits, additional benefit credits, protecting the disabled, and increasing public old-age assistance are all improvements which I have long been seeking. They represent improvements for which I have bills now pending. Naturally, I am extremely pleased at the President concurring so wholeheartedly.

The President deserves commendation and support for his progressive stand on this program. I have not hesitated in criticizing the President when I felt he was wrong, such as in his farm recommendations—but I certainly feel he is entitled to full credit when he is right. This time, he is offering the country constructive leadership. He can count on my full support.

I expect that those who have consistently tried to undermine our social-security program will not give up easily, but with the President's influence and leadership thrown so forcefully behind those of us who have always fought to protect and improve our social-security program, the threat to its future should be eased. I am sure the message will be warmly received by the American people as statesmanlike acceptance of a great concept developed out of the hardships of the last depression, and humanitarian cooperation toward bringing it up to date to meet modern conditions and needs.

MERCHANTS IN FAVOR OF 90 PERCENT OF PARITY TO FARMERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in consistently advocating a strong farm program, I have always been as concerned about businessmen in rural communities and consumers in the rest of our economy as I have for the welfare of farmers themselves. My own experience with a family-owned small business con-

vinced me long ago that everyone suffered when the farmer's purchasing power dwindled too far. My experience as mayor of Minneapolis impressed upon me the stake that larger cities have in the economic health of small towns that primarily serve as agricultural trading centers.

Perhaps it is understandable that in a great agricultural State like Minnesota, our business people begin to feel the impact of a declining farm economy before it is fully felt in the rest of the economy.

However, the warnings voiced by our businessmen in Minnesota should be of concern to other businessmen everywhere. Main Street merchants of Minnesota's rural communities—our important agricultural trading centers—are making it clear that they are strongly behind the appeal of our farmers for a strong and effective farm program. Merchants of Thief River Falls, in my State, have emphasized their concern by placing a quarter-page advertisement in the Thief River Falls Times, urging from 90 to 100 percent of parity for farmers. I want to congratulate them. I ask unanimous consent that the Thief River Falls advertisement, signed by 50 leading merchants of that community, appear in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARITY FOR THE FARMERS

Being the State of Minnesota is a majority agricultural State the businessmen of this city feel that it is most imperative that we work side by side with those attempting to maintain a farm program which will enrich and develop the agricultural activities wherever they are a major industry or source of livelihood.

In view of the above conclusion, we the following businessmen of this city, resolve that we go on record condemning any effort on the part of any Congressman, the Department of Agriculture, or any agency for attempting to disrupt the stabilization program, affecting all farm commodities.

We further resolve that Congress shall not only maintain 90 percent of parity, but shall try to establish 100 percent of parity for all farm commodities. We do not favor any tendency toward flexibility of price support, but urge Congress to maintain a production-control program which is necessary in order to have stabilized price support.

We further resolve to condemn any form of prosperity based on war and bloodshed, but favor genuinely sane and sound economic programs, particularly for the producer, which shall be based on industry, security, and individual initiative.

We further urge all business groups in other cities of this State as well as those of other agricultural States to go on record favoring similar resolutions.

George W. Werstlein; Harley H. Kelly, Hardware; F. A. Rinkel, Minneapolis-Moline; C. D. Gustafson & Son, International & Nash; C. R. Waldera, S. & L., Manager; G. A. Prahm, Mint; A. B. Christianson, Harts Supermarket; L. Gordon Ballingrud, B. & W. Food Market; R. M. Haas, Manager, Red Owl; Frank D. Riley, Manager, Montgomery Ward; Stanley E. Pladson, Manager, Gambles; David Drotts, Insurance; E. O. Peterson, Banking; Cliff Bjorkman, Merchant; Charles Smith, Tire Dealer; O. C. Heen, Food Market; Harvey Anderson, Pure Oil Co.; Stan Wilson, Wholesale Parts; L. M. Furuseth, Consumer's Cooperative Association; Hilmer Lunke, Amundgaard & Lunke Co.; Ole's Northern Supply; E. A. Emanuel; Olaf Solheim, Solheim & Overum Furniture; R. O. Larson; John Vielguth, Falls Shoe Service; Mrs. Jeanette Wright, Manager, Ben Franklin Variety Store; Don Olson, Coast to Coast Store; Eugene Sjoberg, Appliances; Emmett Johnson; O. E. Taxeraas, Implements; Harry Helgenset, Sheet Metal and Heating; L. Dicken, Northern Produce; Thief River Welding Co.; H. L. Schuster, Printer; C. R. Carlson, Farmer's Union Oil Co.; Wennberg Welding, Carl Wennberg; Farmer's Cooperative Grain & Seed; Charles Kotaska; Oscar Ellingson; Peterson-Biddick Co., Merchant; Home Lumber Co., Dealer; Stuart McLeod; Berdeen Nornes, Electrical Appliances; Ace Hardware, Bill Ekstrand; C. H. Jung; S. Lieberman, Merchant; O. G. Ekeren, Druggist; W. M. Larson, Merchant; Robert Lund, Insurance; Alfred Hance, Retailer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, these businessmen have good reason to be concerned. They are among the first to feel the pinch of declining farm purchasing power as the recession in agriculture starts being translated to other segments of our economy.

There can be no doubt that the farm recession is underway, and is continuing. There could hardly be any more authoritative source than the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, which now predicts a further 10 percent drop in net cash income for farmers in 1954.

I now ask consent for an Associated Press dispatch from Tuesday's Washington Star, entitled "Chicago Bank Sees Possible 10 Percent Drop in Farmers' Cash," appear in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO BANK SEES POSSIBLE 10 PERCENT DROP IN FARMERS' CASH

CHICAGO, January 19.—A possible 10 percent drop in net cash income for farmers in 1954 was predicted yesterday by the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.

This would push farm cash income after expenses to the lowest point since 1943, the bank added.

The bank said the causes for declining farm prices so far have been an ever-mounting supply and a decrease in exports. It added, a new source of weakness was developing: total income and employment across the Nation show signs of easing.

"Nevertheless the Nation's economy is still operating at close to a record rate," the bank said. "Business confidence in the future is the brightest spot on the current business scene," the bank added, "with business outlays for new plant and equipment during the first 3 months of 1954 expected to run slightly above year-ago figures."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, consumers are being misled if they think proposals for lowering farm price supports would actually mean lower food prices in the market place. If they need any proof, they need only consider the prices they now are paying in a period of depressed farm prices. Farm income has gone down, but it does not appear that food prices are down proportionately. Dun & Bradstreet now report wholesale food prices at the highest level in 2½ years. It appears that consumers must look elsewhere than to the farmer, to place the blame for rising food prices. I ask unanimous consent that a short dispatch from the front page of the Minneapolis Tribune of January 14, headed "Food Index Rises to 2½ Year High," appear in the RECORD in support of my observations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD INDEX RISES TO 2½-YEAR HIGH

NEW YORK.—Wholesale food prices rose to the highest level in 2½ years on the Dun & Bradstreet index, released Wednesday. It was the 10th consecutive weekly rise.

The wholesale food price index rose 18 cents to $7.03, the highest since June 19, 1951, when it was $7.07. The new figure compared with $6.85 in the preceding week and is 12.5 percent above the $6.25 in the similar 1953 week.

MEETING OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in order that Senators may have notice of it, I announce that the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union which was to have been held on the 18th of this month will be held at 5:30 o'clock p. m. today in the Old Supreme Court room.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, at this time I should like to read into the RECORD a letter which I have received from Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the legislation now pending before the Senate, relating to the St. Lawrence seaway. It is on the letterhead of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and is dated Washington, D. C., January 18, 1954. The letter reads as follows:

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C. January 18, 1954.

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: This is in response to your inquiry requesting my views on the national security aspects of S. 2150 a bill which provides for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory, authorizes the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway, and empowers the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis and to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have carefully considered S. 2150 and have especially noted that, in contrast to previous bills in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway, the dams and power works which have been included as an integral part of former proposals, although still a condition precedent to our participation in the navigation works, will be financed separately by the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada and an entity designated by the State of New York at no cost to the United States Government. Also for the first time, the deepening of the connecting channels in the upper Great Lakes is not included as part of this bill. United States participation under S. 2150 is therefore limited to the construction of deepwater navigation works including 2 canals and 3 locks in the International Rapids Section, together with necessary dredging in the Thousand Island section. It was noted in the Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on S. 2150 that the total estimated cost to the United States for its part in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway is $105 million. It was further noted that the St. Lawrence Development Corporation, which would be created by this bill, is to be self-liquidating.

The construction of this seaway would afford access of a relatively protected route to additional sources of high-grade iron ore. It is well-known that our own reserves of high-grade iron ore were materially depleted in World War II, and as a result we must increasingly rely in the future on alternative sources of supply. With every passing year, the depletion of these reserves in the Mesabi Range continues and the urgency of our need for a dependable, low-cost transportation link to the iron ore deposits in Quebec and Labrador increases. Construction of the seaway would afford the necessary access to these additional sources of high-grade iron ore. Furthermore, the rich iron ore deposits in southern Newfoundland could also be profitably reached by this seaway. The importance of the project increases as accelerated exploration of the areas surrounding the mouth of the St. Lawrence results in discovery of other needed metals. There are rich coal deposits in Nova Scotia and important finds of lead and zinc have been made in northern New Brunswick. Significant deposits of copper are located in Quebec and an important find of titanium has been made in southern Labrador. Labrador also has recently revealed a find of manganese.

It is our understanding that Canada desires, and has made it increasingly clear that she intends, to proceed, unilaterally if necessary, without United States participation. Failure of the United States to participate at this time in the navigation features of the seaway would result in the construction of all the locks on the Canadian side of the St. Lawrence River wholly outside United States territory. As a result, no part of the seaway locks and lateral canals would ever be under the control of the United States. The United States would not have a voice in the control of the traffic through the seaway on an equal basis with Canada. The United States would then necessarily have to depend upon Canada to evaluate and take steps necessary to protect its interest in the matter of the operation of the seaway, not only in relation to toll charges and priority of transportation in times of emergencies, but also in relation to the physical security and control of the seaway. Although the Joint Chiefs of Staff can hardly conceive of a war in which we would be involved with Canada remaining neutral, from a national-security viewpoint we cannot ignore the possibility of such an eventuality. Since it is not customary for neutral nations to permit the use of their inland waters to belligerents, its use could possibly be denied to us at the very time we needed it most by a failure on our part to participate jointly with Canada in the construction of the waterway, thereby insuring joint control to the United States. The concept of unilateral control by a foreign government, however cordial our relations may be, of an inland waterway touching the borders of the United States is inconceivable to the Joint Chiefs of Staff from a defense standpoint. Therefore, from our viewpoint, United States participation in its construction which, in effect, would give us equal control, is just as important from the national-security aspect as the seaway itself.

In amplification of the need for a protected route to additional sources of high-grade iron ore, I need hardly remind you of the difficulties we experienced in World War II in shipping needed oil and bauxite from gulf-coast ports and from South America to the eastern seaboard. Should war ever be forced upon us again, our estimate is that the submarine threat will not be any the less but, on the contrary, present indications are that it will be greater.

This is more clearly illustrated by the fact that Germany entered World War II with a total of only about 50 submarines, and at the present time Russia possesses over 300 submarines. It is our understanding that the only alternative sources of rich iron ore in the Western Hemisphere are located in the Quebec-Labrador area and in Venezuela. In view of the potential threat of the Russian submarine, it would be an unacceptable military risk to rely solely on our ability to safely supply our tremendous steel mills with iron ore from Venezuela.

In addition to assuring the United States, in time of emergency, the full benefits of joint participation in a shorter, more protected overseas route to the British Isles and Europe for transportation of military cargo, our joint participation in the construction of the seaway would also afford access to additional shipbuilding and repair facilities, and would partially relieve our present dependence upon ore delivery through the locks at Sault Ste. Marie. Should we fail to participate jointly with Canada, then admission of foreign ships to American waters would be solely in the hands of, albeit a friendly one, a foreign nation. Defense of the seaway from sabotage and military action would be beyond United States responsibility. Should capacity of space of the seaway become a critical factor, then Canada would have control over priorities on the seaway use and various ships and cargoes in wartime, as well as in peacetime.

The mutual interdependence between Canada and the United States from a strategic standpoint is becoming increasingly more important every day. All of our plans for defense of the Western Hemisphere against the threat of a possible air attack are closely intertwined with those of Canada. Realistic plans for the continental defense of the United States rely heavily on the continued mutual cooperation between the United States and Canada. Although our views in favor of joint participation are based primarily on the military necessity of the seaway as an essential element of our continental transport system, we cannot fail to appreciate the added spirit of mutual friendship and cooperation which joint participation in the construction and operation of the seaway will undoubtedly promote.

In view of the above, the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider the joint participation in the construction and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway as necessary in the interests of national security, and strongly recommend the enactment of the bill now under consideration in the Senate, S. 2150.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR RADFORD.

Mr. President, the date of the letter is January 18, 1954, which is Monday of this week. I know that all Members of the Senate will be interested in reading the letter from the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and therefore I should like to leave the letter on the desk so that it may be examined by Senators in the course of the debate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to have the Senator from Michigan yield to him?

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Senator from Michigan had yielded the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have not yet yielded the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I thought the Senator from Michigan had finished his remarks, and had yielded the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thought the Senator from Oregon was asking me to yield for a question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood that the Senator from Oregon was asking the Senator from Michigan to yield for a question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I should like to speak for not more than 2 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Chair rule that I have released the floor? I have one more letter which I should like to read to the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Michigan has not yielded the floor, very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. The letter, which is written by Charles W. Holman, secretary, National Milk Producers Federation, reads:

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1954.

To Members of the United States Senate:

At our annual meeting in Houston, Tex., November 9, 1953, the voting delegates for the nearly one-half million dairy farmers of the National Milk Producers Federation again adopted a resolution supporting the entire St. Lawrence Seaway project. Although the bill S. 2150 does not provide for the deepening of the connecting channels in the Great Lakes, it represents an important step in the long deferred construction of the seaway. We favor enactment of S. 2150 and earnestly urge your support for the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, National Milk Producers Federation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now yield the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is recognized.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF EVENING SESSION TODAY—REFERENCE OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for an announcement and a motion, which will not take more than a minute?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be very glad to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair

hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it was announced yesterday that the Senate might hold an evening session today. For the information of the Senate, let me say that it is our plan to sit this evening, if necessary, possibly not later than 8 or 9 o'clock.

After consultation with the minority leader and with the ranking minority member on the Committee on Rules and Administration, and with their approval, as well as with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I now move that the following resolutions be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Calendar No. 847, Senate Resolution 186, authorizing the employment of additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Calendar No. 848, Senate Resolution 172, to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States.

Calendar No. 849, Senate Resolution 181, increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Calendar No. 850, Senate Resolution 187, increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Calendar No. 851, Senate Resolution No. 188, further extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from western European nations.

Calendar No. 852, Senate Resolution No. 190, amending the resolution providing for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States, and increasing the limit of expenditures.

Calendar No. 853, Senate Resolution 192, extending the time for a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia.

Calendar No. 855, Senate Resolution No. 193, amending S. Res. 126, 83d Congress, providing for a study of proposals to modify existing international peace and security organizations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the majority leader has agreed with the minority leader with regard to the motion he is making?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It will be recalled that yesterday certain of the resolutions were referred to during the absence from the Chamber of both the majority leader and the minority leader. When I returned to the Chamber I made an explanation, after discussion of the resolutions with the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and I asked that they be restored to the calendar. This morning I was told by the minority leader and the senior Senator from Arizona that it was perfectly agreeable to them that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the several resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS FOOD SUPPLIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a recommendation this morning for the handling of at least a portion of the surplus food which the administration proposes to put in cold storage or take out of the channels of consumption.

I do not know what the experience of other Senators has been since the President sent his agricultural message to Congress, but I know what my mail is saying. I am receiving in increasing quantities letters in protest to the principle that huge supplies of food should be removed from the channels of consumption. My mail points out that there is increasing hunger in America today.

It is so easy for us to forget about our fellow citizens who are destitute. We have many unfortunate brethren in our country who need food. We have many unfortunate brethren in our country who, although they are receiving some sustenance, do not receive sustenance of sufficient nutritional value to restore their health and strength, so they can become productive workers again in our economy.

In numerous places in our country unemployment is on the increase. As a result, many of our fellow citizens, even though they receive unemployment benefits, do not have sufficient food to nourish their families properly.

The mail I am receiving is to the effect that charity should begin at home. We ought to recognize the fact that we have a moral obligation to feed our fellow citizens who need food. We ought to recognize the fact that in local communities in America there are a great many charitable institutions which can distribute the food to the needy and hungry. There is no real danger that the use of this food for feeding the hungry will depress the market. The fact is that by giving this food to the hungry mouths in this country we would benefit the general economy. The market for farm products would in nowise be reduced.

I want to say, Mr. President, that we cannot reconcile with Christian principles the placing of food in storage, thus removing it from consumption, when there are a great many Americans who need food but who do not have the money with which to buy it.

So today I recommend, most respectfully, that the President of the United States and his administrative officials proceed without delay to develop a program whereby charitable institutions, such as the Salvation Army, for example, and a great many of the charity good-will institutions in the neighborhoods and communities of America, will be given adequate quantities of the surplus food. These charitable, humanitarian organizations need the food for the hungry, unfortunate fellow human beings who live in the skidrows of America or who are destitute for one reason or another.

A great moral principle is involved, and an opportunity is afforded through my suggestion to put into effect the principles of Christianity that we are our brother's keeper. I, for one, Mr. President, cannot sit in the Senate of the United States and remain silent when there continues to come to my office mail which makes it perfectly clear to me that there are many persons in this country who are hungry and cannot afford to buy food.

So, Mr. President, I say let us proceed to use as much of this surplus food as may be needed to meet the requirements of the charitable institutions of America. Let us put to practice our humanitarian professings about being a nation in which the unfortunate and destitute are given a helping hand. A child of an unemployed worker is as precious as a child of a wealthy family. Our surplus food should be used to feed our unemployed and destitute and not allowed to go to waste. In the long run the proposal I recommend will strengthen the productive power of our country.

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, for myself and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL,], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], my colleague, the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public and secondary elementary school facilities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2779) to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the construction of public and secondary elementary school facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the need for raising educational standards and for equalizing educational opportunities for all our children throughout all areas of the country has long been recognized. All past efforts to have the Federal Government acknowledge a measure of responsibility in meeting this problem by making a financial contribution to the several States in aid to our educational system have failed. During the 11 years that I have been a Member of the United States Senate, three major bills designed to provide general Federal aid for education have been considered by, and have reached a vote in, the Senate. The first, on October 20, 1943, was, after lengthy debate, recommitted. The second was passed on April 1, 1948, by a vote of 58 to 22, and sent to the House of Representatives. The House took no action on it. The third passed the Senate on May 15, 1949, by a vote of 58 to 15, but, again, the House failed to act.

That record and history, I believe, precludes any reasonable hope or expectation in the foreseeable future for the enactment of general Federal aid for education legislation.

This bill, Mr. President, that I am introducing today and which I am happy to have cosponsored by those Senators to whom I have referred, is not a general Federal aid for education bill in the same scope and sense as were the previous measures to which I have referred. This bill is limited in purpose. It is limited to Federal financial assistance to the several States for the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities. Not one dollar appropriated by the Congress under the authorization here proposed can be used to pay any part of the operating expenses of any school that would be or might hereafter become eligible for the assistance this measure will provide.

Yet its enactment will make possible considerably higher standards of education in many districts and areas throughout the United States. This would include, and in many localities assure, higher pay for teachers where local revenues are presently insufficient to provide both needed facilities and a higher standard of operation. Thus, while the bill provides only for direct financial assistance for the construction of school facilities, such assistance will substantially aid the States and the local school districts in providing a much improved school system.

Each State desiring to participate in this program would, among other things, be required to submit "a statewide public school construction program" setting forth "on the basis of a statewide inventory existing school facilities and a survey of the need for additional school facilities within such State." The State plan would also have "to provide means whereby each school agency within the State shall have reasonable notice of the provisions of this act and opportunity to apply for a project grant or grants, and to be heard in support of such application, before the State plan is approved by the State agency for submission" to the Commissioner of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such plan would further "prescribe the principles adopted for determining the relative priority of projects, and allotment of Federal and State funds to projects, included in such plans, taking into account (a) the relative urgency of the need within the different areas of the State for additional school facilities and (b) the relative financial resources of the several school agencies within the State."

The bill further provides that "in any State in which separate school facilities are maintained for different racial groups, for equitable and nondiscriminatory priorities and for an equitable and nondiscriminatory apportionment of the Federal funds received under this act among such groups."

It therefore is the intent of this legislation to channel the Federal funds, or the major portion thereof, into States where the greatest need for assistance exists and also on down into the areas, localities, and particular school districts where additional school facilities are needed the most and where the local school revenues are presently inadequate to provide such facilities and at the same time to pay the operating costs essential to the maintaining of reasonably high educational standards.

To carry out that intent, the bill sets out a formula for the allocation of Federal appropriations to the several States. This formula is based on the number of school students and the per capita income of the State as compared to the average per capita income of the Nation.

That formula, or some formula very similar to it, must be used in any Federal aid for education law if we are to move toward the desired objective of providing equal educational opportunities for all children, irrespective of the State of their citizenship.

Possibly no formula yet suggested is perfect, but the one here used is workable and is substantially fair and equitable. It surely will operate to channel such Federal assistance as the Congress may be willing to authorize into those areas where school children are today confronted with substandard educational opportunities.

To show how this formula will work and how it will apply to the several States, I asked the Office of Education to prepare a table showing the amount that would be allocated to each State on the basis of each $100,000,000 appropriated annually.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this table, illustrating what each State will receive out of each $100,000,000 appropriated, be incorporated in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, based on the computation of the Office of Education as to how each $100 million will be distributed to the several States, I give as an example figures applying to my own State. Out of each $100 million appropriated, there would be allocated to Arkansas $2,298,620. To secure all of the funds allocated to it, the State of Arkansas, or its local school districts participating in the plan, would have to match that allocation with a total of $1,368,104. The use of Federal funds for any school project in Arkansas would have to be matched at that ratio. In other words, the State or local contribution is $37 for each $63 of Federal aid contributed. The percentage or ratio varies in the different States. Wealthier States with a much higher per capita income would, of course, contribute more and get less of Federal funds under the program. By reference to the table, each interested Senator can ascertain how his State will benefit and what it will be entitled to receive if this proposal is enacted into law.

Much of the opposition to previous bills designed to provide general Federal aid for education stemmed from a fear that Federal aid would open the door for Federal control and supervision of the public-school systems of the several States. Whether such fear was justified in relation to those measures was or is a matter of individual opinion. But there is no basis for such fear or for any anxiety of that nature with respect to the measure which I am introducing. It is patterned in principle after the Hill-Burton Act, which provides Federal aid for the construction of hospitals and mental institutions, and also after the law providing for Federal aid to highways. Those laws have been in operation for a number of years and they have thoroughly demonstrated that we can have Federal aid without Federal control or domination. The Federal Government exercises no control over the highways which Federal funds have helped construct. The Federal Government exercises no control, supervision, or authority over the operation of hospitals which have been constructed with Federal assistance under the Hill-Burton Act.

As a further safeguard, the bill provides that when any of the funds allotted to a State are paid into the State treasury they "become funds of the State to which it was paid." It further provides:

> Except as specifically provided by this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to any State agency, school agency, or school to which any funds have been or may be paid under this act.

So, Mr. President, there cannot be, and there will not be, any Federal authority, control, or supervision of our public-school systems under the proposed legislation.

The need for this character of assistance is universally recognized. Candidate Eisenhower, speaking in Los Angeles on the 9th of October 1952, said:

Another part of the task ahead concerns the conservation of our greatest asset: Our Nation's children. Part of this responsibility belongs to our schools.

American education is a living testimonial to the devotion, the intelligence, the deep concern, and sacrificial service for America's future on the part of tens of thousands of school teachers and school officials. Also laymen and women in thousands of communities have served and are serving the cause of education.

But here, again, we must honestly face the fact that, in too many places, we are not adequately meeting the school needs of America's children. More than 60 percent of all our public school classrooms are now seriously overcrowded. By 1958, it is estimated that our school system will have a shortage of 600,000 classrooms. This year 1,700,000 American boys and girls were without any school facilities. * * *

The American answer is to do—in this field—what we have been doing for a long time in other fields.

We have helped the States build highways and local farm-to-market roads. We have provided Federal funds to help the States build hospitals and mental institutions.

Then, Mr. President, President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message to the Congress on January 7, 1954, stated:

Youth—our greatest resource—is being seriously neglected in a vital respect. The Nation as a whole is not preparing teachers or building schools fast enough to keep up with the increase in our population. The preparation of teachers as, indeed, the control and direction of public education policy, is a State and local responsibility. However, the Federal Government should stand ready to assist States which demonstrably cannot provide sufficient school buildings.

Mr. President, we, the sponsors of the bill, make no claim that it will provide an overall remedy for all of the deficiencies that may exist in our educational system, but it will stimulate and assist construction programs in areas and localities where there is an imperative need for additional and adequate school facilities—a need which cannot be met in any other way.

We recognize that buildings and facilities are not the only educational needs existing in many localities. Improved standards of operation, increased salaries for teachers, and other essentials are also urgent. While this measure does not authorize or permit the direct expenditure of Federal funds for those purposes, it will operate to free local revenues of many school districts from a large part of the future debt service obligations which they would have to incur for the construction of buildings, and the bill will make that part of their own funds available for meeting those other vital and essential needs.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I am glad to have had so many cosponsors of the bill. If enacted it will be sound, progressive, and constructive legislation. It appears to be consistent with the announced policy of the present administration, as indicated by the speeches of the President of the United States to which I have referred.

For the reasons I have given, Mr. President, I trust the bill will have the active support of each Member of the Senate, and that it may be passed at this session of the Congress.

EXHIBIT A

Illustration of the distribution of $95 million to the 48 States under Senator McCLELLAN's proposed bill, revised

State:	Population (5–17) July 1, 1951—sec. 5 (a) (1)	1951 per capita income payments	Need for assistance factor—sec. 5 (a) (2)	Index number (col. 2)× col. 4)—sec. 5 (a) (3)	Federal apportionment [1]—sec. 5 (b)	Total authorized program [1]—sec. 6 (3)	Non-Federal share [1] (col. 7—col. 6)—sec. 6 (4)	Per pupil		
								Federal share	Non-Federal share	Total from Federal and non-Federal sources
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
	Thousands									
48 States	31,479	$1,584	1.0000000	34,358.406777	$95,000,000	$237,500,000	$142,500,000	$3.018	$4.527	$7.545
Alabama	779	950	1.6673684	1,298.879984	3,891,380	5,877,321	2,285,941	4.610	2.934	7.545
Arizona	190	1,432	1.1061453	210.167007	581,115	1,433,493	852,378	3.059	4.486	7.545
Arkansas	486	926	1.7105831	831.343387	2,298,620	3,666,724	1,368,104	4.730	2.815	7.545
California	1,998	1,933	.8194516	1,637.264297	4,527,035	15,074,311	10,547,276	2.266	5.279	7.545
Colorado	285	1,568	1.0102041	287.908169	796,005	2,150,239	1,354,234	2.793	4.752	7.545
Connecticut	370	1,999	.7923962	293.186594	810,635	2,791,539	1,980,904	2.191	5.354	7.545
Delaware	65	2,076	.7630058	49.595377	137,085	490,405	353,320	2.109	5.436	7.545
Florida	581	1,284	1.2336449	716.747687	1,981,795	4,383,471	2,401,676	3.411	4.134	7.545
Georgia	857	1,103	1.4360834	1,230.723474	3,402,900	6,465,808	3,062,908	3.971	3.574	7.545
Idaho	144	1,356	1.1681416	168.212390	465,120	1,086,437	621,317	3.230	4.315	7.545
Illinois	1,603	1,928	.8215768	1,316.987610	3,641,445	12,094,154	8,452,709	2.272	5.273	7.545
Indiana	819	1,649	.9605822	786.716822	2,175,215	6,179,109	4,003,894	2.656	4.889	7.545
Iowa	548	1,531	1.0346179	566.970609	1,567,690	4,134,496	2,566,806	2.861	4.684	7.545
Kansas	390	1,460	1.0849315	423.123285	1,169,925	2,942,433	1,772,508	3.000	4.545	7.545
Kentucky	708	1,066	1.4859287	1,052.037520	2,908,805	5,341,648	2,432,843	4.108	3.436	7.545
Louisiana	659	1,135	1.3955947	919.696907	2,542,960	4,971,957	2,428,997	3.859	3.686	7.545
Maine	198	1,298	1.2203390	241.627122	668,135	1,493,851	825,716	3.374	4.170	7.545
Maryland	489	1,714	.9241540	451.911306	1,249,535	3,689,358	2,439,823	2.555	4.989	7.545
Massachusetts	850	1,738	.9113924	782.886072	2,164,670	6,480,897	4,316,227	2.520	5.025	7.545
Michigan	1,347	1,734	.9134948	1,230.477496	3,402,235	10,162,711	6,760,476	2.526	5.019	7.545
Minnesota	636	1,474	1.0746269	683.462708	1,889,740	4,798,429	2,908,689	2.971	4.573	7.545
Mississippi	584	771	2.0544747	1,199.813225	3,317,495	4,406,105	1,088,610	5.681	1.864	7.545
Missouri	790	1,519	1.0427913	823.805127	2,277,815	5,960,313	3,682,498	2.883	4.661	7.545
Montana	130	1,472	1.0760869	139.891297	386,745	980,811	594,066	2.975	4.570	7.545
Nebraska	274	1,510	1.0490066	287.427808	794,675	2,067,248	1,272,573	2.900	4.644	7.545
Nevada	32	2,029	.7806801	24.981763	69,065	241,430	172,365	2.158	5.386	7.545
New Hampshire	105	1,444	1.0969529	115.190055	318,440	792,193	473,753	3.033	4.512	7.545
New Jersey	883	1,885	.8403183	742.001059	2,051,620	6,661,970	4,610,350	2.323	5.221	7.545
New Mexico	185	1,301	1.2175250	225.242125	622,820	1,395,769	772,949	3.367	4.178	7.545
New York	2,632	1,996	.7935872	2,088.721510	5,775,240	19,857,650	14,082,410	2.194	5.350	7.545
North Carolina	1,045	1,052	1.5057034	1,573.460053	4,350,525	7,884,211	3,533,686	4.163	3.381	7.545
North Dakota	149	1,403	1.1290093	168.222386	465,120	1,124,160	659,040	3.122	4.423	7.545
Ohio	1,567	1,799	.8804892	1,379.726576	3,814,915	11,822,545	8,007,630	2.435	5.110	7.545
Oklahoma	526	1,182	1.3401015	704.893389	1,949,020	3,968,512	2,019,492	3.705	3.839	7.545
Oregon	314	1,652	.9588378	301.075069	832,485	2,369,036	1,536,551	2.651	4.893	7.545
Pennsylvania	2,061	1,663	.9524955	1,963.093225	5,427,920	15,549,627	10,121,707	2.634	4.911	7.545
Rhode Island	143	1,691	.9367238	133.951503	370,405	1,078,892	708,487	2.590	4.954	7.545
South Carolina	583	1,003	1.5792622	920.709863	2,545,715	4,398,560	1,852,845	4.367	3.178	7.545
South Dakota	148	1,529	1.0359712	153.323738	423,890	1,116,616	692,726	2.864	4.681	7.545
Tennessee	790	1,064	1.4887218	1,176.090222	3,251,850	5,960,313	2,708,463	4.116	3.428	7.545
Texas	1,744	1,412	1.1218130	1,956.441872	5,409,490	13,157,957	7,748,467	3.102	4.443	7.545
Utah	179	1,424	1.1123596	199.112368	550,525	1,350,501	799,976	3.075	4.469	7.545
Vermont	82	1,322	1.1981846	98.251137	271,605	618,665	347,060	3.312	4.232	7.545
Virginia	757	1,295	1.2231660	925.936662	2,560,155	5,711,338	3,151,183	3.382	4.163	7.545
Washington	477	1,755	.9025641	430.523076	1,190,350	3,598,822	2,408,472	2.495	5.049	7.545
West Virginia	807	1,174	1.3492334	664.061334	1,891,355	3,825,163	1,933,808	3.730	3.814	7.545
Wisconsin	717	1,614	.9814126	703.672834	1,945,600	5,409,550	3,463,950	2.713	4.831	7.545
Wyoming	64	1,722	.9198606	58.871078	162,735	482,861	320,126	2.543	5.002	7.545

[1] Due to rounding computations, the 48-State total does not equal total United States figures.

NOTES.—Sec. 6 (1) $95,000,000×2½=$237,500,000. Sec. 6 (2) $237,500,000÷31,479,000 =$7.5447 per pupil.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(During the delivery of Mr. McCLELLAN's speech the following interruptions occurred, which, at his request, and by unanimous consent, were ordered to be printed at this point in the RECORD:)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Arkansas on the introduction of the bill and to tell him how glad I am to join with him in its introduction. There is a crying need today for additional school buildings and additional school facilities of all kinds. As the Senator has stated today many children are being forced to attend schools where the classrooms are so crowded and congested that it is practically impossible for such children to obtain the adequate education they are entitled to receive. Today 1 out of every 5 children attend a school which may well be termed a firetrap. Many children are being forced to go to classes held in basements, in attics, in hallways, in old warehouses and garages, in places of all kinds which are not at all fit to be used for school purposes.

The National Education Association and the United States Office of Education estimate that even if we continue to utilize the present old, inadequate, and poorly equipped buildings, we need at this time more than $5 billion worth of new construction to relieve the overcrowded conditions of schools.

So, Mr. President, I am, indeed, highly gratified that the Senator from Arkansas has taken this very timely occasion to present to the Senate a bill to help meet a compelling need.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the senior Senator from Alabama. I know of his keen interest in legislation of this character. I believe he was the author of at least two of the Senate bills to which I have referred, bills designed to provide general assistance to education, and I am happy to have him as a cosponsor with me of this measure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I deeply appreciate the Senator's courtesy. I merely desire to commend him on his leadership in introducing this bill, and I should like to ask the Senator if I may join with the other distinguished cosponsors of the bill. I have long been interested in the Federal-aid-to-education program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am more than happy to have the distinguished Senator from Minnesota join as a cosponsor of this measure. There may be other Senators who would like to cosponsor the bill. I did not have an opportunity to submit the bill in advance to all my colleagues in the Senate, and I know there are other Senators who have not yet had an opportunity to attach their names as cosponsors and who might like to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that other Senators who may wish to do so may be included among the cosponsors of the bill before it is printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Arkansas for introducing the bill, and to say that I am very happy to have joined with him, a few days ago, as a cosponsor, because I have been interested in equalizing the educational opportunities of the young people of the Nation.

I am aware of the great need for school facilities in the State of Tennessee, at least.

I desire to ask the Senator from Arkansas if the formula provided in the bill is not substantially the same formula, of giving grants-in-aid to the States, as was contained in the bill for Federal aid to education which passed the Senate 4 or 5 years ago.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is not the exact formula, but, in large measure, it follows the same pattern. As the Senator will observe from the table which I have made a part of the RECORD, and also from my remarks, the formula is designed, as I have said, to channel Federal funds, first, into the States where the need is the greatest; and then from the State level down into the districts and areas where school facilities are presently inadequate to meet the needs, and where the revenues of the districts are not adequate to provide for the physical facilities which are necessary, and also to permit the districts to have sufficient revenues of their own with which to operate a reasonably high standard of schools.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am certain the Senator's formula has been worked out well to meet the needs. Certainly I hope there may be early action in the Senate on the Senator's bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I am most happy to have him joined as a cosponsor of the measure. I believe we shall find that it will enjoy popular support.

It is understood that the Federal Government cannot take over the whole burden of the educational system of the United States, but there has been much talk throughout the years of equalizing the opportunity of each child in the United States to receive an education, irrespective of his citizenship in a State. The bill is designed to go to the heart of the problem, and to begin that type of assistance which will help to raise the substandard educational facilities of some of our communities to a higher level of efficiency and a better system of education.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas that in the short time I have had the honor of serving with him in the Senate, I have seen few bills which, in my opinion, should be more heartily endorsed for the good of the United States than this bill. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri. I am very happy to have him as a cosponsor of the measure.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I simply wish to express the hope that the Senator from Arkansas will be more fortunate with his bill than I have been with mine. I have had pending in the Senate for 2 or 3 years a bill incorporating the same principle. Likewise, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a similar bill pending. We have been unable to obtain any consideration of those measures. I hope the Senator from Arkansas may be more fortunate than we have been.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada. I shall be glad to welcome him as a cosponsor of this measure; and with the united efforts of all Senators who subscribe to the idea and principle of such proposed legislation, I trust we shall be able to secure some action on the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I desire to congratulate my friend and neighbor, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, for the work he has done on the proposed legislation, and to wish him every success. The bill proposes to help meet one of the very desperate needs of the Nation, namely, adequate schoolroom and educational facilities for our children. I know such aid is needed in the State of Louisiana; I feel certain it is needed in Arkansas, and throughout the Nation generally.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I am happy to have his comments and to have him as an enthusiastic cosponsor and supporter of the measure.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have joined with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and other Senators in the introduction of legislation to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, because I believe it is the best and perhaps the only way to insure that the public-school children of America have safe, decent, and adequate facilities in which to get an education. Every American child is entitled to an opportunity to do this, and the Federal Government has a responsibility to make an appropriate and equitable contribution toward it. We know that juvenile delinquency is increasing at an alarming rate, and those in charge of our educational system are without proper facilities with which to enable them to be fully effective in overcoming this unnecessary evil.

The testimony before the Hendrickson subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary confirms the fact that the local public schools are among our greatest agencies to develop the youth of our country, if given the necessary equipment to do so. They can no more operate in an efficient manner without proper facilities than an industry can.

Four years ago the Senate passed legislation for school construction in areas

heavily impacted because of Federal activity. It also provided $3 million to be given to the State departments of education on a matching basis to finance a nationwide survey to determine the need for school facilities and the financial ability of the several States to meet their respective needs. Thirty-seven States accepted these funds, and matched them dollar for dollar, and, under the direction of the United States Office of Education, conducted such a survey on a uniform basis.

The second progress report reveals some startling facts. Not a single State surveyed has adequate classrooms for current enrollments, much less the increase expected due to the increased birthrate. Neither does any State show financial ability to meet the cost of necessary school construction. The deficit ranges from 9 percent in Connecticut to 97 percent in Alabama, with the aggregate for all States reaching approximately 68 percent. The State of Oklahoma is slightly below the national average, with a 66.5 percent deficit.

Perhaps the present pattern of the several States might be altered to provide a greater potential in local revenues, or further revenues at the State level, and I believe Federal assistance such as that proposed in the proposal now submitted will serve as an incentive to promote this where possible. The local and State revenues cannot, however, possibly meet the overwhelming need alone. Unless we act now we must accept the blame for another tragedy of too little and too late. The Federal Government has a responsibility to the public education program, and can best meet this need through helping provide adequate facilities.

The legislation proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], myself, and other Senators, to provide Federal financial assistance to the States for the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, is designed to accomplish the needed school construction through the joint efforts of the local school districts, the States, and the Federal Government, while at the same time leaving the complete management and control of the public schools at the local and State level. Under the provisions of the proposed legislation, each State will submit a plan of operation to carry out the purposes of the act within the State. Such plans coming from each State in the Nation will serve as a definite blueprint for action, and will be educational, in that each State may study the plans from the other States. Such a comparative study will serve to improve the operation in all States. Especially should this serve to point out possible means of improving the taxing potential at the local and State levels, while at the same time serving as a stimulus for action because of a specifically planned objective in the form of a definite volume of school construction.

The bill provides for grants on an overall matching basis of one dollar of Federal funds for each dollar and a half of local or State funds, through creating a public-school construction program of two and one-half times the Federal appropriation. However, the matching basis of each State is determined by an equalizing factor based on the relative per capita income of all individuals in each State to all States. This will insure that a greater amount of the Federal funds will go to the poorer States, while at the same time insuring an equitable distribution to all States.

The illustrative material which accompanies the draft bill fully points out the plan of distribution. A study of this material shows that 9 States will receive grants on a dollar-for-dollar or better basis, with the highest ratio being 3 to 1. In the more wealthy States, as shown by the per capita income of its citizens, they will receive $1 of Federal funds for each $2.25 of local and State funds. This, I believe, is a reasonable range in the ratio of matching as between the several States of the Nation when the variation of financial ability is considered.

The President in his state of the Union message to Congress stated:

> Youth—our greatest resource—is being seriously neglected in a vital respect. The Nation as a whole is not preparing teachers or building schools fast enough to keep up with the increase in our population. The preparation of teachers as, indeed, the control and direction of public-education policy, is a State and local responsibility. However, the Federal Government should stand ready to assist States which demonstrably cannot provide sufficient school buildings.

It is believed that the bill is in conformity with the President's viewpoint as expressed in his message, and will serve to implement his intent.

I ask that the attached tables be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Public elementary and secondary school enrollments for 1949–50 in the 37 States and Territories included in this report*

State (1)	Enrollment, 1949–50	
	Number [1] (2)	Percent of total (3)
Alabama	690,066	2.65
Arizona	139,244	.54
Arkansas	407,084	1.59
California	1,757,424	6.86
Colorado	229,196	.89
Connecticut	275,015	1.07
Delaware	46,055	0.18
Florida	449,836	1.76
Georgia	718,037	2.80
Illinois	1,153,683	4.50
Indiana	689,808	2.69
Iowa	477,720	1.86
Kentucky	562,883	2.20
Louisiana	483,363	1.88
Maine	158,247	.62
Maryland	335,018	1.31
Michigan	1,069,435	4.17
Minnesota	481,612	1.88
Mississippi	527,440	2.06
Montana	105,917	.41
Nebraska	227,879	.89
Nevada	25,144	.10
New Mexico	148,978	.58
North Carolina	884,733	3.45
Oklahoma	441,263	1.72
Oregon	255,032	1.00
South Dakota	117,675	.46
Tennessee	659,785	2.57
Texas	1,354,167	5.29
Vermont	61,143	.24
Washington	400,867	1.56
West Virginia	438,498	1.71
Wisconsin	493,949	1.93
Alaska	13,910	.05
Hawaii	89,820	.35
Puerto Rico	409,639	1.60
Virgin Islands	4,896	.02
Subtotal for 37 States and Territories included in this report	16,772,461	65.44
Total of all 53 eligible States and Territories	25,626,602	100.00

[1] Statistics of State school systems, 1949–50. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1952, pp. 42–43. (Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1948–50, ch. 2.)

A major factor in creating school plant needs is an increase in enrollments. The enrollments for the first half of the 1950 decade can be fairly well predicted from available live birth records. Prior to 1946 there were only 2 years, 1921 and 1943, when live births exceeded 3 million, but for each year from 1946 to 1951, inclusive, the live births exceeded this figure, reaching a peak of 3,833,000 in 1951. As was indicated in the 1st progress report, these data presage a public-school enrollment of more than 31 million in 1956 and 32 million in 1958.

TABLE XV.—*Current capital outlay needs and deficits (by State)*

State (1)	Total needs (2)	Deficits	
		Amount (3)	Percent of total needs (4)
Alabama	$289,529,007	$282,703,097	97.64
Arizona	44,188,396	15,018,294	33.99
Arkansas	256,871,393	210,925,413	82.11
California	1,169,362,000	348,174,000	29.77
Colorado	124,824,800	53,510,800	42.88
Connecticut	134,237,734	12,381,162	9.22
Delaware	23,491,945	2,974,075	13.22
Florida	208,547,540	64,950,451	31.14
Georgia	237,670,199	178,850,080	75.26
Illinois	412,773,095	185,507,000	44.96
Indiana	257,353,000	181,689,000	70.60
Iowa	123,261,407	47,604,025	38.62
Kentucky	185,965,574	143,005,060	76.94
Louisiana	208,048,500	51,096,530	24.46
Maine	92,630,254	68,231,526	73.66
Maryland	219,428,507	34,966,485	15.92
Michigan	431,134,909	100,281,821	23.26
Minnesota	165,959,305	46,180,551	27.83
Mississippi	144,421,870	63,956,032	44.28
Montana	39,237,723	11,208,130	28.31
Nebraska	$136,922,943	$28,140,172	20.55
Nevada	18,598,267	6,404,467	34.44
New Mexico	88,336,318	51,121,905	87.63
North Carolina	358,237,530	167,963,546	45.49
Oklahoma	103,470,500	68,895,944	66.59
Oregon	68,587,100	14,384,239	20.97
South Dakota	30,440,675	17,606,539	57.84
Tennessee	218,492,539	138,552,378	63.41
Texas	540,294,500	152,093,599	28.15
Vermont	28,879,140	10,635,954	36.83
Washington	284,819,999	254,380,368	89.31
West Virginia	84,091,543	18,833,803	22.40
Wisconsin	171,035,235	69,107,253	40.40
Alaska	16,615,595	6,638,374	39.95
Hawaii	10,519,021		
Puerto Rico	106,289,036	101,388,036	95.39
Virgin Islands	4,402,280		
Total	7,006,667,949	3,204,460,709	

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

TABLE XIV.—*Cost of remodeling and rehabilitation, new construction, sites, and buses and percent each is of total needs (by State)*

State	Estimated needs in thousands								
	Total amount	Remodeling and rehabilitation		New construction		Sites		Buses	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Alabama	$289,529	$4,986	1.7	$269,452	93.1	$6,764	2.3	$8,328	2.9
Arizona	44,188	4,694	10.6	34,533	78.2	4,080	9.2	880	2.0
Arkansas	256,871	7,005	2.7	235,569	91.7	9,543	3.7	4,754	1.9
California	1,169,362	53,572	4.6	1,064,301	91.0	40,386	3.5	11,103	1.0
Colorado	124,825	3,691	3.0	111,878	89.6	5,609	4.5	3,647	2.9
Connecticut	134,238	8,320	6.2	120,076	89.5	5,344	4.0	497	.4
Delaware	22,492	1,049	4.7	19,846	88.2	1,583	7.0	14	.1
Florida	208,548	3,948	1.9	191,074	91.6	12,136	5.8	1,390	.7
Georgia	237,670	6,521	2.8	217,900	91.7	4,293	1.8	8,957	3.8
Illinois	412,773	30,955	7.5	365,033	88.4	10,847	2.6	5,939	1.4
Indiana	257,353	9,524	3.7	230,878	89.7	7,821	3.0	9,130	3.6
Iowa	123,261	2,994	2.4	113,833	92.4	3,701	3.0	2,734	2.2
Kentucky	185,866	4,072	2.2	172,335	92.7	4,733	2.6	4,724	2.5
Louisiana	208,049	15,530	7.5	172,468	82.9	16,394	7.9	3,656	1.8
Maine	92,630	2,104	2.3	86,582	93.5	1,621	1.8	2,324	2.5
Maryland	219,629	4,556	2.1	169,998	77.4	44,603	20.3	471	.2
Michigan	431,135	19,877	4.6	369,933	85.8	36,253	8.4	5,072	1.2
Minnesota	165,959	11,654	7.0	150,126	90.5	2,426	1.5	1,754	1.1
Mississippi	144,422	12,599	8.7	126,742	87.8	2,473	1.7	2,608	1.8
Montana	39,238	2,979	7.6	34,415	87.7	1,331	3.4	513	1.3
Nebraska	136,923	4,199	3.1	130,298	95.2	1,895	1.4	530	.4
Nevada	18,598	909	4.9	16,596	89.2	589	3.2	504	2.7
New Mexico	58,336	1,633	2.8	54,078	92.7	1,988	3.4	637	1.1
North Carolina	358,238	29,706	8.3	309,259	86.3	13,142	3.7	6,130	1.7
Oklahoma	103,471	7,910	7.6	86,674	83.8	7,482	7.2	1,405	1.4
Oregon	68,587	3,531	5.2	59,973	87.4	3,697	5.4	1,386	2.0
South Dakota	30,441	2,108	6.9	26,869	88.3	630	2.1	833	2.7
Tennessee	218,493	12,249	5.6	194,208	88.9	7,493	3.4	4,542	2.1
Texas	540,295	24,532	4.5	471,156	87.2	41,291	7.6	3,316	.6
Vermont	28,879	832	2.9	26,128	90.5	859	3.0	1,060	3.7
Washington	284,819	13,638	4.8	263,468	92.5	3,254	1.1	4,459	1.6
West Virginia	84,092	9,687	11.5	68,069	81.0	3,575	4.3	2,760	3.3
Wisconsin	171,035	17,546	10.3	148,860	87.0	2,130	1.2	2,500	1.5
Alaska	16,616	103	.6	16,487	99.2	26	.2	----------	------
Hawaii	10,519	754	7.2	8,207	78.0	1,517	14.4	40	.4
Puerto Rico	106,289	10,306	9.7	88,334	83.1	7,649	7.2	----------	------
Virgin Islands	4,402	30	.7	4,291	97.5	66	1.5	16	.4

A LOOPHOLE IN THE FEDERAL RETIREMENT LAWS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I wish to make a report in behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and myself in which we call the attention of the Senate to a major loophole in our retirement laws.

Before making this report we wish to emphasize that we are not criticizing the principle of a sound retirement plan as a part of our civil service system; however, unless we insist that these retirement plans be fair to the employees, the Government, and the taxpayers, they will not work.

The loophole which we are outlining today is one of which I am sure the vast majority of the employees would refuse to take advantage. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the loophole is there, it has been taken advantage of, and unless corrected this loophole could cost the taxpayers millions.

As the law is now interpreted, there is nothing to prohibit any or all of the other 10,000 employees of the agency involved from following the same procedure as outlined here provided they have the proper political pull to engineer the necessary transfer of jobs at the right time. The employment record and the procedure followed in the specific case to which we are referring is as follows:

Employment record: February 1, 1915, to September 15, 1934, Department of Agriculture; September 17, 1934, to April 27, 1952, Tennessee Valley Authority; April 28, 1952, to June 30, 1952, Department of Agriculture.

During service from 1915 to 1934, this individual was not subject to any retirement system; he made no retirement contributions, and he acquired no retirement rights.

He came under the TVA retirement system during his employment with the Tennessee Valley Authority. When he resigned from TVA on April 27, 1952, he could have elected to receive an immediate retirement allowance at the maximum rate of $1,918.10 per annum. In lieu thereof, he elected and received a refund of $8,911.23, consisting of his contributions of $7,883.61 plus allowable interest of $1,027.62.

On April 28, 1952, this individual was appointed to a position in which he became subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act for the first time. I might say that he was appointed to a position in the Department of Agriculture. Retirement deductions at the rate of 6 percent of his basic salary of $6,000 per annum totaled $63 from April 28, 1952, to the date of his retirement on June 30, 1952.

All service prior to the date retirement deductions began is creditable under the Civil Service Retirement Act, unless such service forms a basis for annuity under some other retirement system. No deposit is required for any service prior to August 1, 1920. If optional deposit to cover service from and after August 1, 1920, is not made, the annuity otherwise payable is reduced by 10 percent of the unpaid deposit.

Optional deposit, which is equal to the retirement deductions which would have been made had the service been under the Retirement Act, plus interest to date of retirement, in this case would have amounted to $9,264. Since this retiring employee did not make the optional deposit, his total contribution to the retirement fund is $63.

The highest average annual basic salary for any 5 consecutive years of allowable service in this case is $6,969.05, all rates used being earned during TVA service.

If this individual had made the outstanding optional deposit, he could have received a single life annuity at the rate of $3,900 per annum. Without making the optional deposit, he could have received a single life annuity of $2,976 a year.

In lieu thereof, he elected to receive a reduced annuity of $2,748 per annum during his lifetime, and named his wife to receive annuity at the rate of $1,488 per annum if she survives him.

Mr. President, on numerous occasions I have been intrigued by the somewhat dubious schemes devised by some of the high officials of the past administration. However, I have yet to see a more remarkable example of pyramiding something out of nothing and getting paid for doing it than that demonstrated here today.

I join the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] in calling this loophole to the attention of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee with the request that they give prompt attention to the necessary legislation to correct this abuse.

Mr. President, an analysis of the case shows that this employee, who would have been eligible for a retirement benefit of $1,918.10 a year, if he had let his $8,900 contribution remain in the fund, withdrew his $8,900, paid back $63, more than doubled his retirement benefit, and ended up with $9,000 to boot.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in rising to present my views on the proposed legislation now pending before the Senate, I wish first to express my sincere appreciation of the able and comprehensive statement made in this Chamber last week by the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] with respect to the question of committee jurisdiction. I join him in calling the attention of the Senate to the fact

that Senate bill 2150, the St. Lawrence seaway bill, should have been referred to the Senate Committee on Public Works.

The primary purpose of the pending St. Lawrence seaway bill is to create a Federal corporation empowered and directed to construct, maintain, and operate certain navigation works along the St. Lawrence River. The proposed navigation works are to be located in their entirety within United States territory.

Thus, no treaties or relations with foreign nations are involved in this proposed legislation. Under the rules of the Senate, the Committee on Public Works is assigned sole jurisdiction of proposed legislation relating to navigation works in the United States.

The pertinent rule setting forth the committee's jurisdiction reads, in part, as follows:

1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

2. Public works for the benefit of navigation, and bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).

Since the authority proposed in the pending bill is limited to navigation works in the United States, and does not include any international construction, the bill falls in the same category as do bills relating to any other navigation works located in the United States. In this connection I may point to the many Federal improvements along the Great Lakes, the bills for all of which have been considered and approved by the Committee on Public Works or its predecessor committees. The pending bill, therefore, should properly have been referred to the Committee on Public Works.

In 1944 and 1945, there were before the Senate certain measures—Senate bill 1385, 78th Congress; and Senate Joint Resolution 104, 79th Congress—to authorize the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a joint undertaking by the United States and Canada.

The first one—S. 1385, 78th Congress—was referred to the Commerce Committee, predecessor of the Committee on Public Works. Hearings were held in November 1944 on the question of whether the project could be undertaken by executive agreement with Canada or whether it required a treaty. The bill died with the close of the 78th Congress, before any further action by the Commerce Committee.

A similar measure, Senate Joint Resolution 104, was introduced in the 79th Congress; and before it was referred to a committee, the sponsors apparently sought the advice of the Commerce Committee as to whether the joint resolution involved a treaty or executive agreement.

In a letter dated October 8, 1945, the chairman of the Commerce Committee, the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey, advised the then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Tom Connally, that on the basis of previous hearings by a subcommittee, in November 1944, the Commerce Committee agreed in the opinion that Senate Joint Resolution 104 involved a treaty, and that it should be referred directly to the Foreign Relations Committee. The record shows that the joint resolution was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee with the prior consent of the Commerce Committee.

These facts show a precedent in that, before the question of a treaty was raised, the St. Lawrence measures were referred to the Commerce Committee, predecessor of the Committee on Public Works; and that such measures were referred to the Foreign Relations Committee only after a determination by the Commerce Committee that a treaty was involved.

The St. Lawrence Waterway bill which is now before the Senate admittedly does not involve the treaty process, as shown near the bottom of page 25 of the committee report, Senate Report No. 441, 83d Congress.

Since the Foreign Relations Committee itself admits that fact, the precedent to which I have referred, as well as a literal reading of the Senate rules, would call for reference of the bill to the Committee on Public Works.

I agree with the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland that no constructive purpose would be served by submitting a motion to take the bill from the calendar, for reference to the proper committee for further study. I agree, also, that the wisest policy is to proceed as soon as possible to a vote on the question of final passage.

However, I feel I would be remiss in my duty as chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee if I failed to serve notice that in the future I shall resist every attempt to withhold from consideration by that committee any bill which properly falls within its jurisdiction.

In making this statement, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I intend no criticism of the Foreign Relations Committee or of its distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

My sole purpose is to place in the RECORD a statement of the contention, which we believe to be well founded, that consideration of public works measures for the benefit of navigation in United States territory, to be paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, comes within the duty and the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. President, I may state further that I have probably been negligent in my duty; I should have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate several months ago. However, owing to the large amount of work we have had in the Public Works Committee and in the other committees to which I am assigned, I did not do so. For that reason, I am not now moving that the bill be referred to the Public Works Committee; but I wish to make it as clear as possible to the majority leader, the minority leader, and the Presiding Officer that hereafter I shall insist that all such bills be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. President, during the many years in which proposals for the development of the St. Lawrence River have been offered in various forms, I have always been opposed to participation by the United States.

During my term as Governor of Pennsylvania, the opposition of our citizens to the project was brought to my attention by leading representatives of many segments of our economy. Railroad executives and railroad workers, mine officials and miners, directors of our great ports and the workers in the ocean-traffic industry—all warned of the serious threat to Pennsylvania that would arise from the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The same interests—those with substantial investments in existing facilities and those who depend on their wages for a livelihood—have seen no reason to change their position. They contend that no arguments have been presented to make the seaway project more attractive or more desirable than it was when first proposed over 30 years ago.

Of the hundreds of communications which have come to my office asking me to help defeat the seaway proposal, I should like to read just one. It is from J. P. Busarello, president of District No. 5, United Mine Workers of America. Mr. Busarello is a neighbor of mine in western Pennsylvania, and I have the highest regard for his patriotism and his sound judgment.

His telegram to me is as follows:

Western Pennsylvania held first place in the production of coal until just a few years ago. That she has lost to West Virginia. Item in the Wall Street Journal recently stated that Pittsburgh has lost first place in steel production to Chicago, Ill. The St. Lawrence Waterway when completed will make a desert of western Pennsylvania. All the past arguments used by the United Mine Workers of America still hold good today. Please vote against the St. Lawrence Waterway and help the particular section of the State you represent.

J. P. BUSARELLO,
President, District 5, United Mine Workers of America.

One of the serious questions, a question of deepest concern to me, is the future of one of the most valuable assets of our economic and military strength.

I refer to the great ports of the Atlantic and the gulf through which our ocean-borne commerce flows in great volume.

To me it seems of vital importance to our national defense and our economic progress to protect and strengthen our existing ports, and to expand the usefulness of our harbors, our port facilities, our rail, water, and highway transportation systems.

It seems to me that if these great national assets are allowed to deteriorate through diversion of their normal traffic into other channels the national interest would suffer substantial and increasing harm. If these arteries of foreign and domestic commerce are not maintained at their highest possible efficiency we may be sure they will be unable to cope with the situation if and when we are plunged into an emergency.

Our ports and our transportation systems have proved their defense value beyond all question. Let us make sure we do not weaken them to the point where profitable operation under private enterprise is no longer possible. If that day should come, the inevitable result would be Government subsidies or, worse, Government operation, or even nationalization of the railroads.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Those familiar with Government operation of the railroads in World War I know how costly and how inefficient that can be.

In World War I the operation of the railroads by the Government cost the United States taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. Moreover, they did not pay taxes, and did not pay dividends to their stockholders. In World War II the railroads were operated by the owners. They not only paid dividends to their stockholders, but in addition they paid several hundred millions of dollars in taxes.

I do not hesitate to say that I am deeply and profoundly concerned with the welfare of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which I in part have the honor to represent. I will always take a long and careful look at any project which is intended to benefit other States or areas at the expense of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

At the same time I am not unmindful that the interest of the United States as a whole is paramount to any selfish, sectional advantage.

Let us consider the port of Philadelphia from the national standpoint. I emphasize the words "from the national standpoint"—not the standpoint of Pennsylvania, and not the standpoint of Philadelphia.

The port of Philadelphia is shared by three States; namely, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. It serves 13 great States, embracing one-third of the population of the United States. Within that area is contained the world's heaviest concentration of production and wealth. The prosperity and economic stability of this area is dependent, to a large degree, upon the commerce of this port. It is second only to New York in gross tonnage. The city of Philadelphia alone has an investment of $60 million in its piers. Private enterprise has an investment of more than $200 million in direct port facilities. A new iron-ore unloading dock now being completed represents a new investment of $8 million. Two hundred thousand citizens of the area are directly and gainfully connected with the business of the port and its collateral activities.

Is it not proper to ask whether the diversion of a large part of its commerce from the port of Philadelphia is in the interest of a sound national economy?

The answer is obvious. The St. Lawrence seaway commerce which is anticipated by the proponents of the project must go there by diversion from United States ports which are now effectively serving the Nation and which have proved their value as a national defense asset. Such diversion would be injurious to every North Atlantic port without any advantage from a sectional or national standpoint.

So far as the defense aspects of the project are concerned, I have but one brief comment.

Since it is known beyond all question that the proposed seaway would be frozen up for 5 months of the year, its defense value would necessarily be on a part-time basis. In that regard I should like to point out that my own military experience teaches me that a part-time defense is no defense at all.

The question of cost has been thoroughly explored by able Senators on both sides of this issue.

Facts and figures have been presented which give convincing evidence that we have before us a project which would commit the taxpayers of the United States to an expenditure which may eventually reach $2 billion.

Because of the true magnitude of the overall conception of the lakes-to-the-sea waterway and the inland harbor plan there has been one piecemeal approach after another.

The pending bill may be described as another piecemeal approach. It has been suggested that its sponsors dare not present the entire project in one package because of its staggering total cost and its enormous economic implications.

Mr. President, I submit that at a time when there is tremendous public pressure for tax reductions, and at the same time we are asked for an increase in the statutory debt limit beyond $275 billion, we must not enter upon an enterprise of such doubtful value without complete and accurate knowledge of its ultimate cost.

I strongly urge the Senate to vote against the passage of Senate bill 2150.

Furthermore, from the national defense standpoint we must keep our costs within the means of the taxpayers of America. I have made the statement many times that I fear inward financial collapse much more than I fear the overrunning of the country by armies from without. In the history of military operations since we have had railroads, I do not know of any instance in which we did not depend upon railroads. We ride to victory on the rails.

I urge with all the emphasis at my command that the Senate defeat this measure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In his capacity as a Senator, the Chair asks unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Invite Disastrous Foreign Competition?" published in the Maritime Reporter of January 15, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY INVITE DISASTROUS FOREIGN COMPETITION?

We detect a note of alarm from the Great Lakes area as Congress prepares to consider the highly controversial St. Lawrence seaway project again. Has the nationally important American Great Lakes shipping industry at last awakened to the dangers that construction of an ocean ship waterway can bring?

Apparently it has, for the Lake Carriers' Association has begun pressing for a pact to limit lake shipping between United States and Canadian ports to vessels of the two countries. Senator CHARLES E. POTTER, Republican, of Michigan, has already carried to high administration officials his plea for such a treaty. But there has been little real encouragement in this direction from the White House.

Recognizing that these were the very dangers that would occur, Maritime Reporter published on April 1, 1952, an editorial that gained nationwide circulation. At the risk of being acused of shouting "I told you so," we are publishing it again:

"THE SEAWAY AS SEEN THROUGH OUR CRYSTAL BALL

"Some friends in the Great Lakes area feel that our opposition to construction of the St. Lawrence seaway in the February 15 issue of Maritime Reporter was caused by the salt spray of seaports blinding us to advantages the seaway would bring to the fresh water maritime industry.

"So we have endeavored to wash some of the brine from our eyes as we peer into the crystal ball to see what may go on if the seaway is built.

"As the mists clear, we see foreign ships swarming into the Great Lakes through the Canadian waterway. They are carrying all kinds of cargoes to and from the Midwest. An American ship is as rare as a Swiss Navy vessel.

"Some Labrador ore is being brought in, but it is being carried on Liberian, Panamanian, and Honduran flag vessels. The steel companies are not required to use American flag vessels in this trade, because Labrador is part of a foreign country.

"Where were the ore carriers constructed? Did they come from Great Lakes yards, bringing vast wealth to the shipyard owners and workers in that area? We see some built in Britain; some in Japan; others in Germany where labor costs are less than half those of American yards.

"Are Great Lakes repair yards getting all the extra business that was expected? Foreign ships make emergency repairs only in lakes yards. Annual inspections and major repair jobs are postponed until the end of the lakes season. When the annual freeze stops shipping, the Liberian, Panamanian, Honduran, Swedish, Norwegian, and other foreign ships head for foreign yards where repairs cost only a fraction of what they would cost on the Great Lakes.

"What has happened to the towing and barge industries that were flourishing on the Great Lakes before the seaway was built? They are dying out fast. Exporters see no advantage to shipping on barges to coastal ports through the Mississippi and New York State waterway systems when they can ship directly on foreign ocean vessels in lakes ports.

"What about the repair business on tugs and barges? Almost none.

"How about Great Lakes seamen? There aren't many. They refused to sign on for foreign wage scales.

"Oops. Our crystal ball has broken."

Someone else must have glued our crystal ball together again, for here is what the Lake Carriers' Association points out in urging adoption of the proposed trade-limiting treaty:

"In time of war these (foreign) vessels are subject to the control and direction of their respective nations. It would be folly for the United States to rely upon European vessels in the event of future wars to move vital commodities such as iron ore, limestone, coal, and grain over the Great Lakes."

The association also pointed out that with the limited waterway now available, the number of European ships operating into the Great Lakes has already increased from 20, representing 3 nations in 1937, to 144, representing 8 nations last year. So far, however, most of the tonnage moved on the lakes by European ships is either going to or coming from European ports.

But Senator POTTER has warned that foreign interests are looking jealously at the lakes trade and waiting for the time when the seaway will be completed. Most of the lakes commerce is in iron ore. Canada has 197 ships in the trade, the United States 380. While protection is already given to United States shipping between her own

ports, and to Canadian shipping between hers, there is no bar to foreign ships sailing between United States and Canadian ports.

If Great Lakes shipping people think a treaty will give them security against a foreign shipping invasion once the seaway is built, they are naive, indeed. We can hear already the screams of "discrimination" from our foreign competitors. What have these foreign interests been trying to do to the Nation's subsidy and 50-percent trade policies? How sympathetic does anyone think that Britain, with its tremendous merchant fleet, will be with such a treaty?

Let us glance a moment at what is happening to the Canadian salt-water fleet. Unprotected by a Canadian subsidy, it is rapidly being swallowed by the British mercantile navy. Soon it will be no more. With a seaway, can we not expect the same to happen to Canada's fresh-water fleet? In that event, will British ships be accepted on the lakes as substitutes for the Canadian vessels under any treaty?

History has proven time and time again that treaties are often little more than scraps of paper. The best protection for both American and Canadian vessels on the lakes is nature's own barrier. Why destroy that barrier with a seaway? If burglars were coming in your window would you make it easier for them by unbarring the door?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, our self-interest as a nation demands participation with Canada in the construction, operation, and control of the St. Lawrence seaway.

It is no longer a question of whether the seaway will be built or not.

It is now a question of whether it is to be an all-Canadian project or a joint American-Canadian undertaking.

As a long-time advocate of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway, both as Governor of Minnesota and as a Member of the Senate, I should much prefer simply to advocate this great undertaking on its merits.

I have been proud to support it in the past without the implication that Canada is going ahead, regardless of what we do.

It is a project wholly in the national interest, and should be considered without sectional or selfish interest.

It should have been built long ago.

We would have been money ahead had we done so.

Our whole economy would have benefited.

Yet frankness compels me to say that whatever the arguments may be as to national security and the economic benefits of the seaway—and I fully support those conclusions—our failure to share in the initiation and development of this project at this time will prove extremely costly to the American taxpayer.

On the other hand, participation in the project on the basis contemplated in the bill now pending before the Senate eventually will not involve any charge against our taxpayers.

The pending bill authorizes the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, with power to issue $105 million in guaranteed bonds and the authority to levy tolls on all traffic using this facility to pay expenses of operation and overhead, and retire the bonds issued to finance the construction.

In addition to prescribing general principles for Canadian-American control of the seaway, the bill would also authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls and division of revenue.

The construction proposed would be largely limited to the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

The total cost to the United States, to be covered by toll charges paid by users of the seaway, is estimated at $105 million.

Canada's share in the project, involving the part of the river flowing entirely within the boundary of Canada, would be approximately twice that amount.

On the basis of an investment of about $300 million, the annual cost to operate, maintain, pay interest, and retire bonds is estimated at less than $17 million.

Reliable estimates indicate a potential annual revenue from tolls of nearly $28 million. Therefore it will be a profitable venture and is justified as a sound business proposition. It can be compared with the Pennsylvania Turnpike, which is a project administered by a similar corporation. The turnpike is paying its way and is serving the public in a most commendable manner.

Some may say that if Canada can afford it, and it is such a good business proposition, why not let them do it alone?

The fact is that an all-Canadian project would mean that the determination of tolls would be entirely in Canadian hands.

The economy of the United States, because of its greater population and industry, would pay the major proportion of the revenues in navigation tolls.

Eventually Canada would both own and control the seaway, but we would have paid for most of it.

When we contemplate that fact let us not forget that the seaway would be a vital and strategic waterway that would lead directly to the heart of the United States.

It has been suggested that Government traffic be excluded from toll charges, but in the case of an all-Canadian proposition, there is no reason to expect—and certainly there would be no moral grounds on the part of Canada to agree—that United States Government traffic would be exempt from toll payments.

During World War II, every American soldier and every ton of lend-lease and military traffic that went through the Suez Canal, although devoted to the defense of the Western World, had to pay the current commercial toll rates at the Suez Canal.

With the growing responsibility of the United States in the world, we may expect that a large amount of military or Government-owned traffic will utilize the St. Lawrence seaway, and the tolls paid on it will be a direct charge on the American taxpayer.

These are dollar-and-cents considerations of interest to the American people. But what about other factors in the control of the seaway?

Canada is a friendly nation, but what about the admission of foreign ships to American waters?

What about defense of the seaway in case of sabotage or attack?

What about priority of ships and cargo in wartime or peacetime?

The President, the Cabinet, and the National Security Council recognized the importance of these factors to the national security when they unanimously endorsed the seaway in these words:

> Early initiation and completion of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway is in the interest of national security.

This is the present President of the United States speaking, but all Presidents in previous years, during the past 30 years, have likewise spoken in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway.

I read further:

> Participation by the United States now in the project would strengthen our position at all times respecting use of the seaway for transportation of basic materials * * * would increase its defense advantages to this country, and would in time of emergency assure it of full benefits of joint participation.

We have felt justified in spending millions for nonreimbursable investments abroad, including powerplants and navigation facilities, to strengthen the economy of the free nations. We need to be thinking about doing something for the internal and domestic interests of the United States.

Is it not equally in the interests of our national security to make this self-liquidating investment jointly with Canada in a resource that will benefit both our countries?

I am convinced that it is.

It is inconceivable that any nation on earth should have permitted an opportunity such as that which is afforded by the development of the St. Lawrence seaway to lie unrealized for as many years as this project has remained undeveloped, especially when we take into consideration the benefits which would be derived from the St. Lawrence seaway.

It would provide an opportunity for oceangoing vessels to serve the heavy industries located in Ohio, Michigan, New York, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Minnesota, as well as the great grain-producing sections of the Northwest, the Dakotas, and even Nebraska, Montana, and other States.

Products from all those States could be shipped to the Great Lakes and there loaded on oceangoing vessels.

Mr. President, I would say that the railroads of the Nation are shortsighted in opposing this project. They would benefit as the economy of this great Nation developed and more of the heavy industries moved to the central part of the Nation. The railroads would benefit rather than be injured by it.

There can be no question that our Government would aid foreign countries in developing potential benefits of such magnitude as those represented by the St. Lawrence seaway.

The project has heretofore been blocked only by division among our people, as between those concerned with

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

railroads and seaports, and those concerned with other interests.

Having frequently urged that Congress should not permit sectional or selfish interests of any kind to stand in the way of this project so greatly needed for the general welfare, I hesitate to mention the area which has an especially vital interest, but I was greatly impressed by a recently published statement by Mr. Earl M. Richards, vice president of Republic Steel Corp., that the Great Lakes region is "the greatest industrial area in the world."

We hear of the Ruhr in Europe—

He wrote.

The Ruhr is not even a close second.

Consider the States which border the Great Lakes: with only three-fourths of 1 percent of the world's land and only 2 percent of the world's population, these Great Lakes States do the stupendous job of producing 79 percent of all the steel made in the United States, over 35 percent of all the steel made in the entire world.

He points out that this is possible "because we have had iron ore at one end of the lakes, coal at the other, and the waters of the Great Lakes to bring them together."

The St. Lawrence seaway will give access to an inland sea, whose industrial activity is further indicated by the fact that more yearly tonnage passes through one of its bottlenecks, the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, than passes through the Panama, Suez, Manchester Ship, and Kiel Canals combined.

The seaway eventually will give Canada and the United States together a new seacoast more than 8,000 miles long, with such major ports as Montreal, Toronto, Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, Duluth, Milwaukee, and Chicago.

It is true the seaway project embodied in the bill before the Senate contemplates the building of a 27-foot navigation channel, a fact which has been criticized by opponents of the measure on the ground that this would accommodate only a small percentage of our ocean-going vessels.

Competent testimony has been given that a majority of our general cargo seagoing ships could use a 27-foot channel with profitable pay loadings.

A 27-foot channel would accommodate practically all the Great Lakes fleet of some 413 vessels; and much of the increased traffic, such as the Labrador ore, will be transported in lake-type vessels.

The fact that no ship coming downstream to the coast would necessarily have to load to full capacity is an important consideration.

It would not have to take on the maximum quantity of oil or fuel as it leaves the port at the head of the lakes.

Therefore, the ship could be riding high until it got to the harbor and then take on its full capacity of fresh water and fuel and add the necessary freight to bring the ship to its maximum load.

Therefore even though it would draw more than 30 feet when loaded to full capacity, the ship could come down the channel at a 27-foot draft and be absolutely safe, and carry a profitable cargo.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which heard all the testimony in this matter, concluded that the reasoning was sound that the proposed draft of 27 feet is sufficient to meet our security needs respecting the importation of ore from Labrador, general expansion of use of deeper draft vessels for the benefit of our economy in the Great Lakes area, and in connection with increased shipbuilding and repair activities on the lakes as a defense measure.

When we consider the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power projects in their entirety we recognize that the proper utilization and development of these great resources will give five major benefits.

First, such development would strengthen the strategic security and defense of the United States and Canada by increasing the flow of high grade iron ore from needed sources outside the United States, and by providing the two nations with better facilities for mutual defense.

Second, it would furnish additional sources of hydroelectric power for areas which are suffering from a shortage of power and thus increase productive capacity.

Third, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway would enable 50 million Americans to participate directly in world trade, which will mean expansion of industrial activity in the Great Lakes and upper Midwest areas, with more jobs available, and this will help and not injure other areas or other segments of our industrial economy.

Fourth, it would aid in the economical marketing and distribution of agricultural products, and provide savings in shipping costs for food, raw materials, package freight, and defense equipment through use of modernized waterway facilities.

Fifth, all this would bring a deepwater channel from the Atlantic Ocean to the heart of America, assuring an industrial expansion which our growing population requires, and giving a much better balanced inland transportation system than we now have.

All these are compelling considerations of the greatest importance to the defense and security of this country and its long-range economic stability and well-being.

Passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill now before the Senate would be a most vital step not only for the security of the Nation, but for the general development of its industries, and would make possible the removal of important industries of the Nation to areas affording greater security. At present our heavy industries are located in too many congested east coast areas, thus making them vulnerable to bombing attacks. If the St. Lawrence seaway were developed, as proposed by the bill, it would make possible the dispersal of our heavy industries.

We know from our experience in World War II that a number of harbors located on the Great Lakes and on many of our rivers were used for the development of seagoing vessels needed for our national defense. The vessels were built in sections and were then transported to where they could be assembled, simply because there had been objection in previous years to the development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. President, I believe it is high time for Congress to be considering how to secure, for the benefit of future generations, the dispersal of our heavy industries and to make possible a channel for seagoing ships clear to the heart of the United States.

PROPOSED BRICKER AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I propose to discuss Senate Joint Resolution 1 and certain related matters. My discussion will be at some length, so I desire to ask the courtesy of my colleagues that I not be interrupted during the course of my remarks.

This is the resolution offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and other Senators, of whom I have the honor to be one, for the purpose of protecting the traditional and constitutional rights of the people of this Nation against curtailment or invasion by so-called treaty law. To state it very simply, this proposed constitutional amendment would provide for three things: First, that no provision of a treaty which conflicts with our Constitution shall have any force or effect; second, that no treaty shall be effective as internal law unless implemented by legislation which would be valid apart from the treaty; third, that Congress shall have power to regulate executive agreements and that such agreements shall be subject to the same limitations as treaties.

Already there has been a great deal of debate over this amendment. In discussing the points I have especially in mind today, I shall try not to be repetitive.

At the outset, it will be my purpose today to discuss one of the most remarkable documents ever filed with the Senate of the United States. I refer to the document entitled "Minority Views To Accompany Senate Joint Resolution 1," and which is printed in connection with the report on this resolution filed with the Senate by the Committee on the Judiciary.

This remarkable document, commonly referred to as the Minority Report on the Bricker amendment bears the names of four Senators.

I do not contend that the Senators who signed this report are responsible for it. I think, if the truth were known, it would be found that although the report came to the Senate with the imprimatur of a minority of the Committee on the Judiciary, authorship of the report actually rests with State Department personnel operating within or through the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The so-called minority report, Mr. President, is remarkable for several reasons. It is remarkable in the first instance because, as every constitutional lawyer who has given the matter more

than superficial attention will recognize upon a single reading, the document is literally loaded with errors of law and fallacies of illustration. I shall discuss a number of these errors and fallacies a little later.

This document is also remarkable, Mr. President, because, while purporting to deal with a highly technical subject upon which full hearings were had, the minority views nevertheless ignore completely, and in fact do not even consider or advert to, a great deal of clear and unrefuted testimony given by various members of the peace and law committee of the American Bar Association, who have devoted more than 4 years of research and study to all angles of the subject.

The testimony of other witnesses, outstanding experts in the field, is also almost completely ignored in this remarkable expression of minority views, and the whole document follows almost slavishly an old report advanced originally more than a year ago in the name of the Bar Association of the City of New York, paraphrasing and repeating most of the errors of law and fallacies of illustration and reasoning contained in that old report.

Parenthetically, it might be pointed out, the old report was adopted at a meeting of that bar association at which only about 200 were present out of a total membership of more than 5,000. The report was prepared by two lawyers, a Mr. Pearson and a Mr. Backus. Mr. Pearson had formerly been associated with the State Department; Mr. Backus had been present in San Francisco in some capacity in connection with the writing of the United Nations Charter. Those prior associations are, perhaps, immaterial. Entirely apart from that point, it has long since been disclosed that the Pearson-Backus studies were based on international emotionalism and not founded on adequate legal research or on an appreciation or understanding of the American form of government. So much by way of parenthetical comment on the old report, under the imprint of the Bar Association of the City of New York, which has been so often paraphrased and reparaphrased by the Secretary of State, by the Attorney General of the United States, and by the writer or writers of the so-called minority views on Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Another rather remarkable feature of this document is that the so-called minority views are summarized at the beginning under 7 headings, and the report thereafter proceeds to argue all 7 of these points; but at the end, on page 63, the minority's objections have been restated under 5 headings. In the five points so listed, on page 63, it is declared that positive harm would result from the adoption of the amendment. In setting forth their unfounded conclusions as to positive harm, the signers of the minority views clearly disclose that they have not read the record before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Every single one of the so-called positive harms was examined in detail and proved to be false, and to be based on sheer emotionalism rather than on an earnest examination into the law and the facts with respect to each particular matter. I shall deal more fully with each of these five points later on.

One more respect in which this document entitled "Minority Views" is rather remarkable is the attempt it makes to hang on to the President's coattails. The appendix to the minority views undertakes to give the impression that the President is opposed to any constitutional amendment. The fragmentary excerpts from press conferences which are published in this appendix disclose nothing more than that the only positive thing the President had said about that matter up to the time the minority views were filed was that he "did not have to make any decision since the constitutional amendment is enacted by two-thirds of each House and three-fourths of the States, a procedure that ignores the President." It sounds almost as though the signers of the minority views would have us believe that the President was complaining that he had been ignored in the constitutional amendment process; but even in the face of all the errors and misstatements in this document, I would not wish to charge the signers of the minority views with intending to imply any such absurdity.

As to the amendment itself, the record indicates that the President made no statement on his own account, but in reply to a question, merely answered that the Bricker amendment "as analyzed for him by the Secretary of State" would, as he understood it, restrict in certain ways the authority of the President.

Actually, while it is not protocol to quote the President directly, I am absolutely convinced that the President is not in favor of treaties overriding the Constitution of the United States.

More recently, and since the minority views were printed, it has been reported that the President has changed his position and is more receptive to the proposed amendment. In defense of the President, I desire to say, if that is his attitude, it does not necessarily represent a change, for the President never said he was opposed to this proposal.

It has been said that it might be relatively easy to pass the pending resolution if it were amended to eliminate the "which" clause; that is, the provision stipulating that Congress may pass no legislation to implement a treaty which it could not pass constitutionally in the absence of a treaty.

Mr. President, if the provision commonly called the "which" clause is eliminated, there will remain very little reason for passing the resolution. The great danger inherent in treaties at the present stage of development of the law is that they may be used to give the Congress powers which it does not have under the Constitution; and that, through legislation implementing such treaties, the domestic rights of the people of the United States may be affected in a way never contemplated by the Constitution, and perhaps directly contrary to the Bill of Rights.

The whole change in the tenor and direction of law with respect to the scope of treaty powers as overriding, or in effect amending, the Constitution, goes back to the decision in Missouri against Holland, in which decision there was enunciated the doctrine that Congress could, in implementing a treaty, pass legislation which it could not otherwise constitutionally pass. That is the doctrine out of which grows our present danger. The resolution now before the Senate, as reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, is designed to bring an end to this dangerous doctrine. But if the resolution is amended so as to eliminate the so-called "which" clause, this doctrine will not be ended; it will, rather, by action of the Congress, be tacitly reaffirmed.

Suppose we pause for a moment to reduce the matter of the case of Missouri against Holland to its basic essentials. Congress had passed a migratory bird law, which had been declared unconstitutional. Thereafter the United States entered into a treaty for the protection of migratory birds. Pursuant to the treaty, Congress enacted another law, which the Supreme Court, in the case of Missouri against Holland, decided was constitutional. The Court said that, although Congress did not have the power to act on that subject in the absence of a treaty, the negotiation and ratification of the treaty gave the Congress such power.

In other words, the doctrine of Missouri against Holland means that when the executive branch of the Government makes a treaty with a foreign country, and two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present ratify it, that treaty can give the Federal Government a power over the domestic affairs of United States citizens which the whole Congress—Senate and House together—does not have under the Constitution.

Thomas Jefferson once said:

> If the treaty power is unlimited, we have no Constitution.

If the treaty power is unlimited, the Federal Government can do by treaty what the Constitution forbids it to do by statute. That is the precise point raised by three judges of the Supreme Court who handed down opinions upholding President Truman's action in seizing the steel companies. Those judges cited the United Nations Charter as the treaty which gave the President authority to seize private property without due process of law.

The people of this Nation do not want the Constitution reshaped or remolded, chipped away, or altered, or curtailed or expanded, by treaty or by executive agreement. Most of the people want the Constitution protected, so that it may stand supreme, in the future as in the past; the bulwark to protect the guaranties of liberty which make us, in fact, a free people, and to safeguard the principles of government which have made this Nation great.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to recount and explain and refute all of the misstatements or all of the errors or all of the fallacies of illustration or reasoning in this remarkable statement of minority views. But I do want to cite enough of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

them to illustrate the type of thing I am talking about.

I shall not discuss now the specific numbered points in the minority views. I shall come later to a more detailed discussion of them.

On page 41 of the printed report the minority states that—

> The first clause of section 2 of the resolution would give us the most cumbersome treatymaking procedure in the world.

On the contrary, Mr. President, the fact is—and this was testified to at the hearings on this resolution—that the ratification of treaties without the approval of the national legislature is the exception, rather than the rule, in modern constitutional law. Only four nations, in addition to the United States, permit ratification of treaties with the advice and consent of the senate only. These four nations are Mexico, Liberia, Cuba, and the Philippine Republic. Twenty-four nations by their constitutions require all treaties to be submitted to the approval of the national legislature, while 28 additional nations require parliamentary approval of all treaties which affect international law or the rights of citizens, or which need implementation by the legislature. Obviously, in the face of these facts, the proposal contained in Senate Joint Resolution 1 would only put the United States on the same basis as most of the other nations of the world.

On page 38 the minority views contain the statement that—

> Section 2 of the resolution as recommended by the majority of the committee would probably make unconstitutional such things as our own Baruch proposal for joint international supervision and control of facilities for making atomic bombs within the jurisdiction of each country.

The fallacy of that statement is demonstrated by the fact that the Congress passed the Atomic Energy Act of August 1, 1946, in the absence of treaties. That act established an Atomic Energy Commission to control the production and development of atomic energy in the United States, and one of its specific provisions was that the administration of the act is to be consistent "with international arrangements made by the United States." The act defines "international arrangement" as "any treaty approved by the Senate or international agreement approved by the Congress."

Since Congress had the power to pass the Atomic Energy Act in the absence of any treaty at all, clearly it would have the power to pass proposed legislation to implement effective international inspection to guarantee that there would be no violation of disarmament terms and conditions.

The President, the minority views, on page 38, state that—

> One of their chief proponents of this amendment stated that he wanted to adopt the language now appearing in this amendment to stop our own Baruch plan for atomic disarmament.

And there is a footnote to the testimony of Dr. George A. Finch, Sr., of the committee on peace and law of the American Bar Association. Never was a statement more roughly torn out of context, and more rudely tortured. Dr. Finch was testifying before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and subcommittee counsel had read to him a passage from the supplementary statement presented to the committee by Secretary of State Dulles. Counsel said:

> Now, in all fairness to Secretary Dulles, he said he had not read this, that it had been prepared by Mr. Phleger, of his legal staff; but in there this statement appears on page 5:
>
> "The Baruch proposal for atomic disarmament was based on control at the source and inspection by an international agency which would possess powers over the process and ownership of atomic facilities. The United States proposed this solution for the problem created by the progress of atomic science. It met with widespread approval by the free nations, but was blocked by Soviet opposition. Section 2 of the proposed amendment, referring to Senate Joint Resolution 1, if adopted, would not only prevent our advocating such a proposal; it would prevent our agreeing to such a proposal if advanced by others."

Dr. Finch then stated:

> I have not followed those negotiations in detail, and if they make any such proposal as that, I am in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 1 and Senate Joint Resolution 43 stopping it. I think that would be one reason why we should adopt the amendment.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] then asked:

> Would not the adoption of either one of those proposed amendments effectively block it?

Dr. Finch replied:

> Yes; it would effectively block turning over to a supernational atomic commission. I think we ought to have the amendment.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] asked:

> It would not affect in any way the international relationship?

Dr. Finch answered:

> No. I would like to see an international agreement now say we will abandon atomic energy if it means mass destruction in war. I think we ought to be willing to have some system of international inspection to see that not only we carry it out, but that Russia carries it out.

Mr. President, my colleagues will note that Dr. Finch did not say he wanted to stop the Baruch plan. He said that if the plan makes such a proposal as was attributed to it in Secretary Dulles' statement, he would be in favor of stopping it.

What did the Baruch plan in fact provide? The plan is set forth in State Department Document No. 3161 of the general foreign policy series 3. This document contains the second report of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission to the Security Council, dated September 11, 1947. Chapter 3, titled "Location and Mining of Ores," contains the following, as paragraph IV:

> The international agency shall become the sole owner of all source material not containing other important constitutents, from the time the source material is removed from its place of deposit in nature, and shall specify in each case the concentration at which it shall take possession.

Whether that is at variance with the statement presented to the committee by Secretary Dulles, is not precisely the question. The question is not whether the Baruch plan differs from the summarization contained in Secretary Dulles' statement; but rather, whether the provisions of the Baruch plan were in fact fully as broad as the Dulles' statement indicated them to be. All that Dr. Finch testified was that if the State Department was making such a proposal as the Dulles' statement indicated, he would favor stopping it. In order to justify, on that basis, the statement in the minority views that Dr. Finch said he wanted to stop the Baruch plan, it would be necessary to establish that the Baruch plan and the Dulles summary were precisely the same, and that Dr. Finch knew this. The record shows no such thing. Actually, Dr. Finch had just been discussing the Acheson-Lilienthal proposal, which did involve virtual internationalization of all ownership of lands in the United States which contained uranium. That proposal, as Dr. Finch testified, would have taken away from private ownership large areas of land in the United States, and vested that ownership in an international commission. The Baruch plan did not envisage any such thing. Ownership of the land under the Baruch plan would remain in private hands. Under the Baruch plan, the international agency would simply take over processed ore—not all processed ore, but processed ore not containing other important constitutents—at some point of concentration to be named by the international agency. Possession would be taken after the material had been removed from its place of deposit in nature. That is a plan which could be implemented effectively without doing any violence to the Constitution. The United States today maintains rather rigid controls over the production of fissionable materials; and is the sole purchaser of many ores containing such materials. It would be perfectly possible for the Government by treaty to bind itself with respect to the purchase, processing, and use of such ores.

It appears from the record that Dr. Finch understood Secretary Dulles' statement to imply that the Baruch plan was the same in this regard as the Acheson-Lilienthal plan—as, indeed, the Dulles statement does appear to imply. It was this erroneous interpretation of the plan to which Dr. Finch objected, not the plan itself.

Clearly, the facts do not justify the effort of the minority to discredit Dr. Finch.

Parenthetically, it is interesting that the minority views nowhere quote any of the outstanding testimony Dr. Finch gave in support of Senate Joint Resolution 1, and in refutation of the city bar brief against the proposed amendment. Dr. Finch literally tore to shreds the arguments advanced in that report, backing up his testimony with texts and cases. But the minority views do not quote from or refer to any of that testimony. Perhaps it was not to be expected, since the minority views repeat

those same arguments of the city bar which Dr. Finch so ably demolished.

Now let us move on to another point.

At page 46 of the minority views will be found another old canard of the New York City Bar—the allegation that under the proposed constitutional amendment the separate consent of all 48 States would somehow be required before a treaty could become effective. There is nothing in the proposed amendment which by the remotest stretch of language and the imagination could justify such a criticism. Under this amendment, a treaty could become effective as an international agreement without the consent of a single State, and an act of Congress could make it effective as domestic law.

Moving on to page 48 of the minority views, we find the statement, in the next to last paragraph on this page, that—

> If hampering legislation inspired by this spirit were passed, it would reduce the President to a mere figurehead in foreign affairs.

Of course, this is sheer nonsense. If Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 should be passed and the amendment proposed therein should become a part of the Constitution, the President would still be exactly as free in the future as he has been in the past to negotiate any treaties deemed by him to be wise, and the Senate would be as free in the future as it has been in the past to ratify such treaties.

Repeating the same theme, the minority views, at the top of page 49, declare that "the resolution demotes our Commander in Chief." Mr. President, such statements are repeated by the opponents of this resolution without any real investigation of their accuracy. The proposed amendment would not in the least alter or change the powers of the President as Commander in Chief; it would not affect those powers in the slightest degree.

Mr. President, the minority views repeat the fantastic illustration as to an enemy force attacking Alaska or the western United States, and a Canadian army being sent through continental United States, and advances the old charge that such a Canadian army would be subject to local police regulations.

This same fantastically spurious criticism was made by representatives of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York in their testimony before the subcommittee on February 19. This argument was countered by the testimony of Dr. Finch, of the American Bar Association committee on peace and law. As Dr. Finch pointed out, no such situation could possibly arise under the rules of international law. Under international law, a friendly foreign army passing through this country by official permission would not be subject to either Federal or State jurisdiction unless there were conditions in the treaty or executive agreement to that effect. Just as a foreign sovereign himself, and his diplomatic representatives while in this country, and his public ships of war in our waters, have immunity from domestic jurisdiction, so a foreign army passing through our territory with official permission would have the same category of sovereign immunity. As Mr. Chief Justice Marshall said in the famous case of Exchange against McFadden:

> One sovereign being in no respect amenable to another, and being bound by obligations of the highest character not to degrade the dignity of his nation by placing himself or his sovereign rights within the jurisdiction of another, can be supposed to enter a foreign territory only under an express license, or in the confidence that the immunities depending on his independent sovereign station, though not expressly stipulated, are reserved by implication and will be extended to him.

That disposes rather thoroughly of the minority's adopted illustration about the Canadian Army.

Such unfounded and ridiculous fallacies of illustration as this have been repeatedly exposed; yet they show up once again in the minority views on Senate Joint Resolution 1.

By now I have, I believe, touched upon enough of the errors and misstatements and fallacies in the minority views to justify the general statements I made earlier.

I have said that in the course of this talk I would refer in some detail to the numbered points set forth at the beginning of the statement of minority views. As I indicated earlier, there are seven such points listed.

The first numbered point which the minority views make against the resolution is that the final version reported by the committee differs from the original version as introduced.

Mr. President, it is the conception of most Senators, I think, that the function of a committee is to perfect the language of the bills and resolutions which are referred to it. In the process of perfecting language, changes frequently are made. We have here a situation in which changes were made. They were made on the recommendations of expert witnesses. They were made with the concurrence of a majority of the committee. They were made to accomplish certain improvements which the committee felt desirable. I cannot see how that constitutes an argument against the resolution. If anything, it should be a point in favor of the resolution, as reported. If the committee had made no changes, it might be charged that the committee had not carefully studied the resolution, had not sought to improve it.

Of course, the question of the merits of the resolution as reported should be considered without regard to whether the committee made changes or did not make changes; but because the minority raised this as the first numbered point in its report, I have touched upon it.

The second numbered point in the minority views is that no such amendment as this is necessary. The report categorically states:

> The Supreme Court has consistently held that any treaty which conflicts with the Constitution will be held invalid. There is no indication whatsoever that the highest court in the land will ever hold otherwise.

Mr. President, many members of this body are lawyers. I do not believe any lawyer here will challenge my statement that no reputable member of the bar will ever deliberately misstate the law in any brief or argument which he makes. It is, of course, not alone a matter of reputation; it is also a matter of policy. It is very poor policy to misstate the law, because, more often than not, either opposing counsel or the court will discover the error.

It is bad enough to make the mistake which young and inexperienced lawyers sometimes make, of citing a case which has been reversed or distinguished, without knowledge that it has been so reversed or distinguished. That kind of mistake can only be made by a lawyer who has failed to shepardize his cases.

Perhaps I should explain the word "shepardize" for the benefit of those of my colleagues who are not lawyers. There is a series of volumes, most useful in the law, known as Shepard's Citations. Through the use of these volumes, it is possible to learn whether any particular case has been subsequently cited, quoted from, reversed, distinguished, or otherwise referred to. It is the standard practice of lawyers to use these volumes for the purpose of making that determination with respect to any case upon which they intend to rely.

As I said a moment ago, it is bad enough to cite a case which has been reversed or distinguished, without knowing that the case has in fact been so reversed or distinguished. It is far worse—a sin of commission rather than of omission—to cite such a case as authority, knowing full well that it is no longer reputable authority for the point in behalf of which it is cited.

Mr. President, the minority views cite the cases of the Cherokee Tobacco, Geofroy against Riggs, and United States against Minnesota in support of the contention of the minority that the Supreme Court of the United States has consistently been of the view that treaties are not above the Constitution.

It is perfectly true that certain judicial expressions or dicta in early Supreme Court cases, such as the Cherokee Tobacco, an 1870 case; Doe against Braden, 1853; Holden against Jay, 1872; and Geofroy against Riggs, 1889, lend themselves to this view. In those early cases the Supreme Court used expressions to the effect that a treaty cannot violate the Constitution, nor authorize what the Constitution forbids, nor change the nature of the Government of the United States or the relations between the States and the United States. As a matter of fact, if we want to dig up old cases, long interred, we may gain such comfort as we can from the knowledge that in the case of New Orleans against the United States, in 1836, the Supreme Court even went so far as to declare, in complete consonance with Jefferson's view of the treaty clause, that "Congress cannot by legislation enlarge the Federal jurisdiction nor can it be enlarged under the treaty-making power."

But the value of those old cases as authority has been completely dispelled by subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court. Members of the committee on

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

peace and law of the American Bar Association made this perfectly clear in their testimony. Any lawyer can satisfy himself on this point with an hour's reading. The case of Missouri against Holland, in 1920, repudiated the views of Jefferson and the Founding Fathers, and took a completely new tack. This decision in the case of Missouri against Holland, to which I have previously referred, indicated that there may be no limit to what can be done in treaties made "under the authority of the United States." The doctrine of Missouri against Holland is that Congress can acquire legislative power, under treaties, which it does not otherwise have under the Constitution. This is definitely contrary to previous holdings of the Court that the Federal jurisdiction could not be enlarged by the treaty power. Missouri against Holland explicitly holds that the Federal jurisdiction can be enlarged by use of the treaty power.

The late Chief Justice Hughes recognized the implications of this decision at least as early as 1929, and in that year, speaking before the American Society of International Law, he said that there was in the Constitution "no explicit limitation" on the treaty power, and that he would not "care to voice an opinion as to an implied limitation on the treaty-making power; the Supreme Court has expressed a doubt whether there could be such," then referring to the expression of doubt in Missouri against Holland, at page 423 of that decision.

In United States against Reid, a 1934 case, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit also expressed strong doubt regarding any limitation on the treaty-making power; and 2 years later, in 1936, the Supreme Court, in the case of United States against Curtiss Wright Corporation, specifically declared that the treaty power does not depend on a grant in the Constitution but is an inherent power of the Federal Government, and indicated that the treaty power is unlimited.

Thus the old cases have been rendered useless as modern authority; but the minority does not seem to know it. What the court said in the Cherokee Tobacco case was good law then, and I wish it was law today; but unfortunately it is not.

Incidentally, in citing Geofroy against Riggs (133 U. S. 258), the minority rely upon another case also cited by the city bar of New York. Apparently, all those who have cited it failed to read the actual language of the treaty involved in that case. The treaty made it clear that French citizens were only to have reciprocal rights in those States where State laws made the treaty reciprocal. In other words, that treaty in no way purported to override State laws. Therefore what the court said about the treaty power is purely dictum, and nothing more. Failure to recognize this is a legal error of substantial importance.

In footnote No. 8 on page 40, the minority views cite three cases: The Cherokee Tobacco, Geofroy against Riggs, and United States against Minnesota. The cases are cited as authority for the proposition that "treaties, being on a parity with Federal law, are also not above the Constitution." With the first two of these cases, I have already dealt. The third cited case, namely, United States against Minnesota, is a modern case (1936), and not subject to the same point—that is, that it is outmoded—which lies against the earlier cases cited. But anyone who will take the time to read United States against Minnesota will find this case simply is not authority for the proposition in behalf of which it is cited. This was a case concerning certain lands which had been granted to the State of Minnesota by act of Congress, and subsequently patented to that State, but not before the consummation of a treaty with the Indians, subsequent to the original grant, purporting to give the Indians title to certain lands, under a broad and general description which appeared to include the lands previously granted and subsequently patented to the State of Minnesota.

Counsel for the United States—which had sued to invalidate the patents granted to the State—contended that the treaty-making power "has no express limitations", and "therefore extends at least to all matters which, in the intercourse of nations and peoples, have customarily been the subjects of negotiation and settlement by treaty."

Note that this contention was made by the then Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. Mitchell, who was joined in the brief by Assistant Attorney General Parmenter and by a special assistant to the Attorney General. The record of the case thus establishes that it was the official contention of the United States, at that time, that the treaty-making power has no express limitations. In making this contention, the Solicitor General and his associates cited the case of Missouri against Holland as their authority.

However, in the case of United States against Minnesota, the court did not decide this point. The court avoided a decision on this point, saying:

> It next is said * * * that in virtue of the treatymaking power the United States Court, and did by the treaties of 1863, 1865, and 1867, divest the State of her right in the lands and appropriate them to the use and benefits of the Chippewas. The decisions of this Court generally have regarded treaties as on much the same plane as acts of Congress, and as usually subject to the general limitations in the Constitution; but there has been no decision on the question sought to be presented here. The case of *Rice* v. *Minnesota and Northwestern Railroad Company* (1 Black 358), is cited as giving some color to the contention; but insofar as it has a bearing it tends the other way.

Here the Court used a page in discussing the case of Rice against Minnesota and Northwestern Railroad Company. The Court then continued:

> But if the treaty-making power be as far reaching as is contended—which we are not now prepared to hold—we are of opinion that no treaty should be construed as intended to divest rights of property—such as the State possessed in respect of these lands—unless the purpose so to do be shown in the treaty with such certainty as to put it beyond reasonable question. And, of course, the rule before stated, that where lands have been appropriated for a lawful purpose they are to be regarded as impliedly excepted from subsequent disposals which do not specially include them, applies to treaty disposals as well as to statutory disposals. On examining the treaties we do not find anything in them which may be said to be certainly indicative of a purpose to divest the State of her right to these lands.

Thus it will be seen not only that this case cited by the minority—the only modern case so cited—is not authority for the proposition in behalf of which it was cited, but also that this case itself establishes that in 1936 it was the contention of the Government of the United States, through its Solicitor General and an Assistant Attorney General, that the treaty power was unlimited.

The minority says there is no need for this amendment. Mr. President, there is at least as much need for this amendment as there was for the Bill of Rights in 1789. The people did not then wait until their rights were threatened; they demanded protection against any possible future threat. But today the threat that our form of government may be changed, and that the rights of the people under the Constitution may be curtailed or abrogated, by the treaty route, is a clear and present danger.

Now, Mr. President, let me turn to a new thought; but if it appears that I am digressing from my subject, let me assure my colleagues that I have no intent to do so. I simply propose to open a new approach to the specific question I have been discussing, namely, the question of whether an amendment is necessary to prevent treaties from overriding or changing the Constitution.

Not all the Members of this body hold the same views with regard to so-called civil-rights legislation. There are many Senators who cling firmly to the honest conviction that Federal legislation in this field not only would be unwise, but would be also an unconstitutional invasion of the rights of the States. These Senators believe, deeply and honestly, that there is no authority in the Constitution for some of the so-called civil-rights legislation which has been proposed in the past.

Some of the most ardent proponents of civil-rights legislation have seemed to recognize the validity of this viewpoint; and they have urged the use of the treaty power as a means for expansion of the legislative power of Congress, so as to make permissible the enactment of the civil-rights legislation which they advocate.

Mr. President, I have on my desk the volume which is almost a sort of bible, if I may use that term, for those who advocate Federal civil-rights legislation. This volume is the report of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, a report issued in 1947. This report sets forth the objectives of those who seek Federal civil-rights legislation, and the suggested means by which such legislation is to be sought and attained. This is the blueprint of how they intend to go about it.

There is a whole section in this book which deals with the question of how to secure the legislation which the Truman

committee was advocating. This section of the volume has its title on page 97 and concludes on page 135. One of the subheadings in this section is "Constitutional Traditions as to Governmental Protection of Civil Rights." At the outset of this section, the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights makes the claim that effective Federal power does exist under the Constitution but says:

It is true that the Federal Government does not possess broad, clearly defined delegated powers to protect civil rights which it may exercise at its discretion. A detailed examination of the constitutional aspects of the civil-rights problem makes clear that very real difficulties lie in the way of Federal action in certain areas.

In the next sentence, the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights declares that:

There is nothing in the Constitution which in so many words authorizes the National Government to protect the civil rights of the American people on a comprehensive basis.

Then, a little farther along in this section, the President's Committee on Civil Rights discusses what it calls "bases upon which a Federal civil-rights program can be built." Each of these so-called bases for Federal action in the civil-rights field is numbered. There are 11 of them. I desire to invite the attention of the Senate now to the one which is numbered 10, and which has the caption:

Power Derived From the Treaty Clause in Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution, To Protect Civil Rights Which Acquire a Treaty Status.

Under this heading, the Truman Committee on Civil Rights reported:

In its decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland* in 1920, the Supreme Court ruled that Congress may enact statutes to carry out treaty obligations, even where, in the absence of a treaty, it has no other power to pass such a statute. This doctrine has an obvious importance as a possible basis for civil-rights legislation.

The United Nations Charter, approved by the United States Senate as a treaty, makes several references to human rights. Articles 55 and 56 are of particular importance.

The section thereupon reprints the text of article 55 and article 56 of the United Nations Charter, and then continues:

A strong argument can be made under the precedent of *Missouri* v. *Holland* that Congress can take separate action to achieve the purposes set forth in article 55 by passing legislation designed to secure "respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

The report of the President's committee then continues with a warning that—

Some persons believe that article 2 (7) of the United Nations Charter limits the argument of the last paragraph.

This provision of the United Nations Charter is:

Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter.

Then comes the concluding paragraph in the Truman committee's program for broadening the power of Congress so it can pass Federal civil-rights laws. This paragraph says:

The Human Rights Commission of the United Nations is at present working on a detailed international bill of rights designed to give more specific meaning to the general principle announced in article 55 of the charter. If this document is accepted by the United States as a member state, an even stronger basis for congressional action under the treaty power may be established.

In essence, Mr. President, this report of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights very clearly says that, whereas there is nothing in the Constitution to authorize the National Government to control the question of civil rights by Federal legislation on a comprehensive basis, such authority can be claimed under articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter.

In other words, the Truman committee says that the United Nations Charter is a treaty and as such overrides the Constitution and authorizes legislation which the Constitution does not authorize.

Then the Truman committee says that maybe the prohibition against United Nations intervention in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a member state can be raised as an argument against the exercise of unlimited power to pass civil rights legislation, under the theory that the United Nations Charter, as a treaty, authorizes it. But finally, the President's committee points out that the Human Rights Commission is working on "a detailed international bill of rights," and declares that "If this document is accepted by the United States as a member state, an even stronger basis for congressional action under the treaty power may be established."

Mr. President, here is the blueprint of how it is proposed to broaden the powers of Congress so as to permit the enactment of legislation not now within the congressional power to enact. The route by which this is to be achieved is the treaty route; the overriding of the Constitution by a treaty. In the face of this, how can anyone contend there is no danger that this can be brought about, that there is no need for any constitutional amendment to prevent it?

Mr. President, I have been discussing, in order, the numbered points listed in the minority views. Perhaps I have spent too much time on one point. I shall move on to the next one.

The third numbered point listed by the minority is that this resolution "would virtually abolish the treaty-making power." The minority declares that under this resolution—

We could not deal as a coequal with other foreign powers, since there would be many vital international subjects with which we would be constitutionally prohibited from dealing by way of treaty.

Mr. President, this language is intemperate, flamboyant, and wholly unjustified. It is perfectly clear that the proposed amendment to the Constitution will not interfere in any way with the free negotiation of treaties, or with the ratification of treaties. The proposed amendment will not interfere in any way with the effectiveness of treaties as international agreements. The proposed amendment would only interfere with the effectiveness of treaties as domestic law. This is a matter with which no foreign nation has any concern. That point was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1855, in the case of *Taylor* v. *Morton* (2 Curtis 135, 2 Black 484). The United States, as a contracting power, does not have any concern whatsoever with the effect, as domestic law within a foreign nation, of any treaty we make with such a nation. Similarly, no foreign nation has any proper concern with the effect as domestic law, within the boundaries of the United States, of any treaty which it makes with us. To say that this amendment would "virtually abolish the treaty-making power" is fantastic.

This same contention was made by the city bar of New York, in its long-discredited brief against the resolution.

There is something of a paradox here, Mr. President, lurking in the language of the minority views; or if not in the language itself, then between the lines. The contention is made by the minority that this proposed amendment would somehow stop the Government from making treaties which it might otherwise make. But, Mr. President, the only treaties which this proposed amendment would prevent from becoming effective as international agreements are treaty provisions that conflict with the Constitution of the United States. Surely it cannot be within the contemplation of the minority that the Government plans to negotiate a number of treaties which conflict with the Constitution of the United States. But that is the only kind of treaty which would be rendered ineffective, as an international agreement, by the adoption of this proposed amendment. And the minority says this amendment would stop the President and Mr. Dulles from making treaties they might otherwise make. Perhaps it is not a paradox after all; but it is an interesting situation.

The fourth numbered point in the minority views is the contention that "this proposal would probably prevent the United States from entering into an agreement to control atomic energy (the Baruch plan). It would probably invalidate existing international agreements controlling narcotics."

At least the minority had the good grace to insert the word "probably" at two points in this paragraph. In that respect, the minority was more moderate than the city bar of New York, which advanced the same contention without the word "probably."

Of course, as was clearly shown at the hearings on this resolution, the proposed amendment would not in any way interfere with appropriate international arrangements for the control of atomic energy.

I have already discussed this point at considerable length, so far as the control of atomic energy is concerned, and have

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

shown that the contention of the minority in this respect is at complete variance with the facts.

The equally mistaken statement by the minority report that this proposed amendment would invalidate existing international agreements controlling narcotics was also advanced by the city bar of New York, and has also been completely disproved. Listen to the testimony on this point by Dr. George A. Finch, Sr., a member of the committee on peace and law of the American Bar Association; former legal adviser to the American commission to negotiate peace in Paris in 1919; a member of numerous State Department missions in China and Japan, Canada, Mexico, Cuba, and various countries in Central Europe and Great Brtitain; president of the Inter-American Academy of comparative and international law, of Habana, Cuba; a member of the Curatorium of the Academy of International Law at The Hague; a man who served in the State Department under Secretaries Elihu Root and Philander C. Knox; professor of international law at the Georgetown school of foreign service, and lecturer at many other universities, including Michigan and McGill; editor-in-chief of the American Journal of International Law; and one of the outstanding authorities in the world on international law, if not, indeed, the outstanding American authority. Dr. Finch testified—and Senators will find this testimony beginning at the bottom of page 1143 of the committee hearings, as follows:

> I took the trouble to look up that law last year when that same argument was made and again we have statements made by objecting witnesses who have not looked up the law. It was just made from their own emotional feelings in the matter without any basis of law.
>
> An examination of the act of 1942 for the domestic control of production and distribution of the opium poppy, discloses that the purpose of the act was stated to be not only to discharge the international obligations of the United States under the narcotic treaties, but to "promote the public health and the general welfare, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in opium poppies, and to safeguard the revenue derived from taxation of opium and opium products."
>
> From that recitation of the act itself of the powers of Congress, it is perfectly obvious that it did not rest those powers solely on the treaty-making power.

Obviously, the effectiveness or validity of the Narcotic Act would not be in any way affected by adoption of the pending amendment.

The fifth numbered point in the minority views is that this proposed amendment would fundamentally alter the constitutional division of powers between the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and would take control of foreign relations away from the President. The effect of this proposed amendment, Mr. President, will be exactly the opposite of what the minority claims. The effect of this amendment will be to preserve the constitutional division of powers between the legislative and executive branches of the Government. It is failure to adopt this amendment which will leave the way open to fundamental alteration of this constitutional division of powers.

The Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, himself, has pointed up this argument when he said:

> Treaties can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body; and they can cut across the rights given the people under the constitutional Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, it is to prevent treaties from doing that, from in that way altering the fundamental constitutional principle of division of powers between the legislative and executive branches, that this amendment is offered.

The minority seem to think the President of the United States is omnipotent in matters of foreign affairs; or, at least, they want him to be omnipotent in that field. But, Mr. President, the Constitution does not give to the President exclusive control over our foreign affairs. Under the Constitution, the Congress has just as much right to enact appropriate legislation with respect to the President as it has to enact appropriate legislation with respect to every other official of Government whenever it believes such legislation is necessary and proper. The Supreme Court of the United States has held in *Ex parte Cuirin* (317 U. S. 1, 25–27, 29) that the Congress could enact regulatory statutes even in the Commander in Chief area. In the very recent steel seizure case, the citation of which is Three Hundred and Forty-third United States Report, at page 579, the Supreme Court dealt at length on the power of Congress to enact appropriate legislation under the "necessary and proper" clause of article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

The first sentence of section 3 of this proposed amendment is no more than a restatement of existing law. It is nothing new that Congress shall have power to regulate executive and other agreements with foreign nations or with international organizations. Congress has such power today. Senate Joint Resolution 1 restates this power as a matter of precaution.

As its sixth numbered point, the minority views declare that the conclusion of an armistice agreement in Korea would be virtually impossible, without special congressional authority, if this amendment should be law. Mr. President, if there was nothing else fallacious in this report, nothing else absurd, nothing else erroneous, this one egregious error standing by itself would be enough to subject the minority report to ridicule. What the minority is here contending is that recognition of congressional power to regulate executive agreements somehow involves curtailment of the power of the President as Commander in Chief to make truce arrangements with an enemy on the field of battle. Of course, the President has that power. He always has had it under the Constitution and he will continue to have it after this amendment has been adopted. To contend otherwise in good faith appears possible only on the basis of an unlawyerlike misunderstanding of the principles involved. No lawyer would fail to recognize the substantial difference, the essential difference, between the powers of the President as President and the powers of the President as Commander in Chief.

The State Department recognized this in a memorandum lodged with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate during the last Congress. In that memorandum, referring to what it called "certain powers vested in him," the President, "by the Constitution," the Department said:

> Examples are as follows: (1) It may be found desirable, in the exercise of authority as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, for the Executive to enter into an agreement with a foreign nation respecting privileges or treatment to be accorded by that nation to American armed forces temporarily in this territory. (2) An armistice agreement is a type of agreement recognized as coming within the Executive authority.

So we see the State Department recognizes that an armistice or truce comes within the President's power as Commander in Chief. But apparently the minority do not recognize it.

It has been suggested—and I am sorry to say I have no evidence to negative the suggestion—that what the minority really desires is that the President, under the pretext of negotiating an armistice or truce or some other military arrangement, shall have and exercise broad powers such as those which got us into trouble at Yalta and Potsdam; powers to make dispositions of territory, to cede away American rights, or to adjust and settle other matters of a permanent character between the United States and foreign nations.

As its seventh numbered point in opposition to the proposed amendment, the minority states:

> We feel that the proposed amendment should be referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for thorough consideration of its possible effect on our relations with other countries.

Mr. President, this is not an objection to the amendment; it is merely a dilatory gesture. It is an effort to stall for time.

The Judiciary Committee has held extremely full and extremely thorough hearings on this subject. The proposal has been studied for a period of nearly 4 years by some of the outstanding experts on constitutional and international law which this country has produced. There is no new research to be done on this question. In fact, after carefully reading the objections originally made by the city bar of New York to the proposal for such a constitutional amendment, and comparing them with the objections raised by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, by the Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, and by the minority views, and noting the very great similarity between all of these 4 documents, I think these same 4 documents demonstrate that whatever research there may have been on behalf of the opponents to this amendment was nearly all done a year and a half or more ago.

Mr. President, as I pointed out earlier, in the appendix to the minority views five numbered points are listed as the alleged "positive harms" which could result from the adoption of this amendment. Like many of the other state-

ments in this appendix, these numbered points are of extremely questionable accuracy, to put it mildly.

The first point is that adoption of the amendment could "critically weaken the United States in its conduct of foreign affairs."

It has yet to be demonstrated that the United States will be weakened in its conduct of foreign affairs by being prohibited from giving away the constitutional rights of its people at the treaty table. But that is all the proposed amendment would prohibit. I, for one, do not believe the constitutional rights of the people of the United States of America need be bartered away as part of the treaty process in order to make that process effective.

The second "Positive harm" which the minority says could result from the adoption of the amendment is that—

> It could immobilize the President in carrying out many of his major responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs.

This is substantially the same as one of the seven numbered points mentioned at the beginning of the minority views, and which I have already discussed at some length. As I have pointed out, the adoption of this amendment would not prevent the President from carrying out any of his responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs. He could negotiate any treaty he wanted to negotiate and to which he could get another nation to agree. With the advice and consent of the Senate, he could make that treaty immediately effective as a binding international agreement. And, as I have pointed out, since the effect of a treaty as domestic law is no concern of any foreign nation, it cannot be said that the provision of this proposed amendment, that a treaty shall not have effect as domestic law except through an act of Congress which could be constitutionally enacted in the absence of treaty, is a provision that immobilizes the President.

The third of the five harms cited by the minority is the contention that adoption of the amendment "could frustrate any international moves toward the effective control of atomic weapons or disarmament." That fallacy has been fully exploded, and I discussed it at length earlier today. The simple fact is that this statement made by the minority report is not true.

The fourth numbered point in the conclusion of the appendix to the minority views is the charge that if this amendment should be adopted "it could upset the constitutional balance of power between the executive and legislative branches of government." As I have demonstrated, the truth is just the opposite: It is to preserve this traditional constitutional balance of power that this amendment is offered and urged.

The fifth numbered contention of the minority, at the very end of their report, is that adoption of this amendment "could prevent the President from making an armistice agreement in Korea." As I have already demonstrated, that contention is absolutely contrary to fact.

Mr. President, the minority views constitute truly, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, a remarkable document. But it is not a convincing document, Mr. President. The record of the Committee on the Judiciary establishes both the need for this proposed amendment to the Constitution, and the merit of its provisions. The report of the Committee on the Judiciary is clear, soundly reasoned, and fully supported by the record.

Propaganda efforts against Senate Joint Resolution I have been greatly expanded and augmented since the minority views were filed.

The Secretary of State's law partner or former law partner—I am not sure which—Mr. Arthur Dean, has written a powerful piece against the proposed amendment, which repeats most of the fallacious arguments against it, and concludes with an alleged simplification of the issues which I can only regard as a deliberate misstatement. Mr. Dean says:

> The specific provisions of the Bricker amendment are in sum a proposal made to vest this constitutional ordering of authority over foreign relations by augmenting congressional powers and by requiring the necessary participation of the States for the execution of foreign policy in certain areas. The powers of a sovereign State would thus be emasculated.

Contrary to this statement by Mr. Dean, the fact is that the amendment proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 1 does not propose any change in the authority over foreign relations. The fact is that the amendment, if adopted, would not require participation of the States for the execution of the foreign policy. The fact is that the amendment would not emasculate the powers of any sovereign State; quite the contrary, it would operate to prevent the serious curtailment of the powers reserved to the States and to the people under the Constitution. The fact is that the amendment would preserve the traditional constitutional separation of powers which has been one of the strongest pillars of our form of government, and would prevent the continued accumulation of power in a single branch of the Government, contrary to the spirit and intent of our Constitution. The fact is that Mr. Dean's statement is about as wrong and misleading as any over-simplification of this subject could be.

The stepped-up propaganda efforts against Senate Joint Resolution 1 have included the formation of committees obviously controlled from New York, and apparently very well financed, whose letterheads sometimes bear the names of prominent citizens. The main method of operation of these committees appears to be the circulating of misstatements about the amendment and the issues involved. One such committee, which has announced that its objective is collective security, by its own literature has made quite clear that its objective is to further the development of the United Nations as a world government, and that it is afraid that enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would interfere with this objective. The high proportion of famous leftwingers and anti-anti-Communists on this committee is notable.

Also a part of the pressure front against Senate Joint Resolution 1 is the so-called Committee for Defense of the Constitution which has declared that its purpose is to preserve the treaty power. This is just another case of using a fancy name to cloak an objective which, if properly labeled, could not have the support or tolerance of more than a very small proportion of the American people. This is not, of course, a new technique.

This committee, which by its choice of name asserts that it is defending the Constitution, has made it clear, by the literature which it is circulating throughout the country, that it is not interested in the preservation of constitutional rights, but seeks rather in complete disregard of the constitutional rights of individual Americans and of the States to preserve and augment the treaty power as a sort of supreme authority of Secretary of State, to be exercised in the name of the President. This is the power which Mr. Dulles has asserted could override the Constitution, could make domestic law, could take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President, could take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or some international body, and could cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights.

In seeking to protect, perpetuate, and augment such asserted power, the misnamed Committee for Defense of the Constitution has repeated, paraphrased, and embellished the same old long-discredited arguments originally advanced by the city bar of New York.

Mr. President, this body is going to approve Senate Joint Resolution 1 if it gets a chance to vote on the resolution. Whether it will get that chance depends to a substantial degree upon how much pressure the administration now in power can bring to bear upon the majority leadership of this body.

Administration pressure against this amendment—and against letting it come up for a vote in the Senate—is being exerted in many ways. I am not completely confident that this pressure may not yet be successful.

Mr. President, we have seen an interesting parallel in the actions of the Truman and Eisenhower administrations with respect to this proposal. Let me expand on that statement a little, to show what I mean. During the last Congress, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary held hearings on another joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements. That resolution to which I refer was Senate joint resolution 130, of the 82d Congress, introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] on behalf of himself and 58 other Senators, of whom I had the honor to be one. That resolution was the forerunner of Senate joint resolution 1, of the present session.

In connection with the hearings on Senate joint resolution 130 of the 82d Congress, an interesting situation arose. The resolution was pending before the Committee on the Judiciary for 15 weeks

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

before hearings were scheduled. During all of this time, no communication was received from any Government department or any official of the executive branch of the Government, either to ask for an opportunity to be heard on the resolution, or to express any interest in it. After the hearings had been scheduled—they were announced on May 14—and during the 6 days which intervened before the hearings actually started, nothing was heard from any Government department or Government official. But after several days of hearings, at which strong testimony in favor of the resolution was introduced by representatives of the American Bar Association, and others, the President of the United States took notice of the fact that the resolution was pending, and issued a most unusual order to the heads of all departments and agencies, directing each of them to seek an opportunity to appear before the committee and testify with regard to the joint resolution. This Executive order also amounts to a directive to take an adverse position on the resolution.

For the information of Senators, I ask that the clerk may read the text of this order, which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELKER in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read the order.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

MAY 23, 1952.

The President has today sent the following memorandum to all heads of executive departments and agencies:

"Subject: Senate Joint Resolution 122, to impose limitations with regard to executive agreements, and Senate joint resolution 130, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and making of executive agreements.

"The two Senate joint resolutions referred to above have been called to my attention. These resolutions concern matters which directly affect the activities and responsibilities of almost every department and agency of the executive branch.

"A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary began hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 130 on May 21. I am advised that the executive departments and agencies have not been invited to appear before the committee or to present their views concerning the resolution. In a matter of such fundamental importance it is vital that the Congress know the views of the executive branch. Accordingly, I request the head of each department and agency to examine the effects which these joint resolutions would have on matters coming under the jurisdiction of his department or agency, and to prepare an official statement of views concerning them. I also request the head of each department and agency to ask the committee promptly for an opportunity to appear and testify at the earliest practicable date.

"The White House staff will cooperate in any way that may be desired in this matter.

"Any agency which believes that it is not affected directly enough by the resolutions to warrant presentation of its views with respect to them, is requested to send me, at the earliest possible date and in any event not later than 1 week from the receipt of this memorandum, its reasons for not seeking to testify.

"The importance of the issues raised cannot be overestimated. The constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 130 is not routine, and it is not limited in its effect to the imposition of restraints upon the President or agencies of the executive branch. This proposed amendment and the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 122 vitally affect the powers of the Federal Government as a whole and have a bearing on the welfare of every State and every person in our country. Action by the Congress on either of these resolutions should not be taken without the fullest consideration and debate.

"The executive branch has a responsibility to see to it that it does not default on its responsibilities as a part of the Federal structure which was created by all of the States at the time our Constitution was adopted."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, after that directive had been issued representatives of the executive branch of the Government flocked to testify in opposition to the resolution. No less than 12 departments or agencies in the executive branch were heard from in opposition to the resolution. They included the Post Office Department, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Department of Defense, the Mutual Security Agency, the Defense Production Administration, the Agriculture Department, the Labor Department, the Treasury Department, the Economic Stabilization Agency, the Executive Office of the President, Office of the Director for Mutual Security, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and finally, Mr. President, the Department of Justice.

Thus we see how President Truman fought this proposal, and how he instructed the executive departments under him to fight it, after the State Department asked him to take that course. That was the State Department under Dean Acheson. Mr. President, Mr. John Foster Dulles approved of this Bricker amendment when his party was out of power and seeking to win an election. Was it popular to favor this? But after the election was over, he changed his position. This is now the State Department under Mr. Dulles—but, Mr. President, it is the same old State Department, and it is still leading the fight against this proposed constitutional amendment, and still urging the President to use his power against it, and still seeking to exert pressure on Congress against it. The "new" State Department has been carrying on this campaign for a long time, and in a very consistent manner, just as the "old" State Department did. A news story published in the Washington Times-Herald on July 9, 1953, told some of the details of what the "new" State Department was doing at that time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this news story printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CABINET, AIDS ASKED TO FIGHT TREATY CURB—JOHN STATE DEPARTMENT BATTLE ON BRICKER AMENDMENT

(By William Moore)

High officials of the State department, it was learned Wednesday, are calling in Cabinet members and their lieutenants to map strategy for defeating the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution.

The amendment is intended to prevent foreigners from gaining control of American domestic affairs through treaties being written by agencies of the United Nations and the International Labor organization, and to bar such secret executive agreements as those made by the New Deal administrations at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam.

Foes of the amendment, written by Senator BRICKER, Republican, of Ohio, are concentrating on keeping the amendment from coming to a vote in the Senate at this session, which is expected to end about July 31, it was reported.

To this end, it is reported, they are trying to use their influence on President Eisenhower and other heads of the administration. The Senate Republican policy committee, which will decide whether the amendment shall come up at this session, has indicated a willingness to bring the amendment up if the views of administration spokesmen and BRICKER can be harmonized.

PROPAGANDIZE CHURCHES

Conferences are in progress, but the administration forces continue to throw roadblocks in the way of an agreement.

Washington foes of the amendment, it was learned, are cooperating with eastern internationalists, many of them in New York, to delay action. A campaign to propagandize church groups against the amendment is underway.

The church groups have been selected as the first target of the campaign because of their reaction to a scare raised when the amendment was being considered by a Senate judiciary subcommittee.

At the subcommittee hearings, the amendment was attacked on the ground that it would prevent disarmament treaties and agreements to outlaw the atom bomb. The charge aroused considerable alarm.

But George A. Finch, editor in chief of the American Journal of International Law, testified that the charge was groundless.

Senator BRICKER said in a Senate speech Wednesday that there is nothing in the amendment which would prevent such agreements.

BRICKER, who seeks an immediate vote, denounced the opposition to the amendment contained in a report by four members of the full Judiciary Committee who voted against the majority decision to report the amendment favorably to the Senate.

WORK OF GHOST WRITER

These four were Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Democratic Senators KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, KILGORE, of West Virginia, and HENNINGS, of Missouri.

Bricker charged that their report was the work of a ghost writer and said the signers evidently did not even study it.

BRICKER also said that nothing in the amendment could possibly bar an agreement for atomic or other disarmament.

He attacked as "false" the minority statement that the Bermuda Conference would be impossible unless Congress had authorized it in advance or approved it after arrangements had been made.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on July 22 the acting majority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute to Senate Joint Resolution 1, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed. Newspaper reports thereafter indicated that the President had given his unqualified support to this proposed substitute.

This was a rather hasty endorsement, Mr. President. On the same day the Senator from California introduced his substitute for the Bricker amendment, the White House issued a statement by the President which began: "Senator KNOWLAND has today introduced a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States" and then declared, in the second paragraph: "This resolution has my unqualified support."

Near the end of this statement by the President, the following paragraph appears:

> As President I have taken an oath to defend the Constitution. I therefore oppose any change which will impair the President's traditional authority to conduct foreign affairs. Senator WILEY and others who have joined in the defense of these constitutional powers so important to the integrity and safety of our Nation, are entitled to commendation and support for their efforts.

The first two sentences of this paragraph amount to a claim either that the President's oath to defend the Constitution requires him to oppose any constitutional amendments; or else that the President's oath to defend the Constitution requires him to oppose any constitutional amendment which will decrease his own authority. Of course, either proposition is indefensible.

Implicit in these two sentences is also the concept that the Bricker amendment would impair the President's "traditional authority to conduct foreign affairs." This is an unwarranted implication, and contrary to the fact. One principal objective of the Bricker amendment is to protect the traditional separation of powers and keep the President's authority, with respect to the making of treaties, within the bounds of the American tradition—using "tradition" in the sense of the basic principles accepted by usage from the very beginning, and not in the sense of changes made effective within recent years.

In the last sentence of the paragraph which I have just quoted the President praises Senators who have, as he phrased it, "joined in the defense"; that is, Senators who have opposed the Bricker amendment. That makes it perfectly clear where the President stands in this matter, and how he feels about Senators who have supported the amendment.

Even if it were not clear from that sentence, the final paragraph of the statement issued at the White House would leave no room for doubt. This paragraph reads:

> It is my belief that the reasurances contained in the Knowland amendment meet all legitimate demands that have been made in this field of foreign relations.

In other words, the President of the United States has declared that any provisions in excess of those contained in the Knowland amendment are illegitimate demands.

I wonder how all the Senators whose names are on the Bricker amendment feel about being told that some of their proposals are illegitimate? For myself, I can answer that question. I have been a student of constitutional law for nearly 50 years. I am absolutely convinced in my own mind that I am on perfectly sound constitutional ground in supporting the Bricker amendment. My confidence has not been shaken in any way by this endorsement by the President—who is a most eminent general, but not a lawyer—of the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from California, who was a most eminent assistant publisher, and who has been a distinguished Member of this body for nearly 8 years, but who is also not a lawyer.

Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]—who is a lawyer—put the President's statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the same day it was issued. He added his own statement that he was "very pleased" with the President's statement. But however pleased he may have been, the Senator from Wisconsin made it clear that he, himself, has no high regard for the proposal filed by the Senator from California. The Senator from Wisconsin said:

> Section 1 of the Knowland substitute is a restatement of constitutional law, as defined in the Constitution and in the decisions of our courts. Section 2 is, in effect, an amendment to the Senate rules which could be accomplished by simple Senate action. Section 3 provides, in effect, that the Senate can attach reservations to treaties—a power it already has and one which it has already exercised on many occasions.

In other words, Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin said the Knowland substitute for the Bricker amendment would accomplish exactly nothing. Perhaps that is why he was pleased by the President's endorsement of it. Maybe he sees in this substitute an easy route to defeat of the Bricker amendment.

The Senator from Wisconsin also referred to what he called "the need for comprehensive analysis and public discussion of this or any amendment to our Constitution." I doubt very much if the Senator from Wisconsin intended to criticize the President for giving wholehearted endorsement to the Knowland proposal without the comprehensive analysis which the Senator from Wisconsin rightly declares is necessary; but it would not appear the President had much time for any such comprehensive analysis before he rushed into print with a statement in support of Senator KNOWLAND'S proposal.

On the other hand, the Bricker amendment has had comprehensive analysis in the highest and best sense of the phrase by the most competent constitutional lawyers in the country, and has had widespread public discussion to a degree probably not paralleled since the adoption of the original Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, I do not wholly agree with the appraisal by the Senator from Wisconsin of the Knowland substitute. The Senator from Wisconsin certainly did not point out all of the flaws and deficiencies in the proposal of the Senator from California. I shall not attempt at this time the comprehensive analysis of this substitute amendment which the Senator from Wisconsin has declared is necessary; but I think I can demonstrate rather quickly that the substitute is so bad that it cannot be mistaken by any good lawyer for anything but what it is, namely, a hurried, makeshift attempt to achieve, for political purposes, the defeat of the proposal for which it is offered as a substitute.

The second sentence of section 1 of the substitute offered by the Senator from California is as follows:

> The judicial power of the United States shall extend to all cases, in law or equity, in which it is claimed that the conflict described in this amendment is present.

In other words, a mere claim of conflict between the Constitution and a provision of a treaty or other international agreement is to be enough to warrant bringing an action in a court of the United States, regardless of any other factors involved in the case.

But, Mr. President, the 11th amendment, which became a part of the Constitution in 1798, declares that—

> The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state.

If the proposal of the Senator from California should be adopted, the 11th amendment would, in effect, be repealed, to the extent that citizens or subjects of foreign states might sue one of the United States, upon the sole condition that in the complaint it was claimed—regardless of what the facts of the case might show—that the case involved a conflict between the Constitution of the United States and a provision of some treaty or other international agreement.

I shall not labor the point, Mr. President; but it is clear that the implications of this sentence in the substitute offered by the Senator from California have not been thought through.

Now look at section 3 of the substitute offered by the Senator from California:

> When the Senate so provides in its consent to ratification, a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.

This provision, Mr. President, not only fails to close the breach through which the constitutional rights of the people of the United States may be drained off, via the treaty route; it actually seeks to confirm, in the Constitution itself, the odious doctrine that the Congress may enact legislation, on the basis of a treaty, which it could not constitutionally enact otherwise. If we were offered a provision that "Congress shall have the power through the enactment of appropriate legislation to make any treaty or any treaty provision effective as internal law in the United States no matter what such treaty provides," we might think twice before we assented to it, Mr. President. But that is one of the meanings of this proposed provision of the Knowland substitute. Furthermore, this section clearly implies that a treaty becomes effective as internal law in the United States without the enactment of any legislation by the Congress. It makes this implication in providing that "when the Senate so provides in its consent to ratification" an act of Congress shall be

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

required to make the treaty effective as internal law.

I have treated this matter seriously, Mr. President, because any proposal advanced by the majority leader of a Senate and given the unqualified support of a President of the United States must be taken seriously. But I have no fear that this substitute will be adopted by the Senate. What I do fear is that Senate Joint Resolution 1 will not be adopted by the Senate—solely for the reason that it is not permitted to come before the Senate for a vote.

The majority leadership has announced that this resolution is on the legislative program; that it may be called up on Thursday. But it is being noised around the corridors that this is conditioned upon acceptance by proponents of the amendment of some sort of "compromise" proposal. There are whispers that if a compromise is not accepted, consideration of the proposed amendment will be postponed, or that it may not be allowed to come up at all. But no so-called compromise has been offered, so far as I know, except proposals which would render the amendment ineffective to accomplish its purpose.

We have seen the pressure which the administration, at the urging of the State Department, is exerting in an effort to block this proposed amendment. Because of that pressure, some of the Senators who favored this proposal a year ago may vote against it this year, if they get a chance to vote. But there will be enough of us who will vote for it, if the vote is permitted.

So far as that vote has been held off, it is the majority leadership of the Senate which has been responsible for holding it off.

This resolution started out as a bipartisan proposal. It has always been a bipartisan proposal. It will be approved in this body by a bipartisan vote, if a vote is allowed to be taken. But if no such vote is allowed, if the resolution is kept in a pigeonhole or prevented from coming to a vote in either of the two Houses of the Congress, the responsibility for that will not rest with those Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, who would vote against the resolution if they had a chance. It will not rest, in this body, with the 4 Senators—3 Democrats and 1 Republican—whose names are signed to the minority views on this resolution. No, Mr. President; the responsibility for blocking consideration of this resolution, if consideration is blocked, will rest squarely on the responsible majority leadership of the Congress. The majority leadership of the Senate could make this resolution the pending business before the Senate this week, if it chose; could have made it the pending business 7 or 8 months ago; but has been holding it off the floor because the old State Department—that is, the old State Department advisers—and the Department's new Secretary do not want the Congress to have a chance to vote on this proposal.

The American people are watching this spectacle, Mr. President; and they are not being fooled about it. They know what is going on and I do not think they like it. They know what is at stake here, and they have given considerable evidence that they are aroused about it.

The people of America are for this amendment, Mr. President—not just a majority of them, not just two-thirds of them, but 80 or 90 percent of them, unless I miss my guess. The people are for it, and there are a number of Republican Senators who are for it, just as there are a number of Democratic Senators who are for it. But the Republican administration and the responsible Republican leadership of this body have so far refused to allow it to come up.

It is going to be interesting to see who wins. If the people lose, I have a notion they will not take their defeat lying down.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that the majority leader has made it very clear, and as I understand, it is entirely agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] that Senate Joint Resolution 1 be made the order of business immediately following the disposition of the St. Lawrence seaway measure. Certainly there has been no indication, directly or indirectly, that the majority leader was attempting to delay consideration of the Bricker amendment, to put it off to the closing days of the session, or to bring forward a great many other controversial issues ahead of it.

To the contrary, I have made it perfectly clear that the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on the proposed amendment, as I believe they should have an opportunity to discuss it, debate it, and vote on it; and it will be the next business for consideration on the legislative calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very grateful for the expression of the distinguished Senator from California. I am glad to know positively that Senate Joint Resolution 1 is to be the next order of business following the disposition of the business now before the Senate. I have heard the Senator from California make that expression, in substance, in the Senate during the last week or so. But also I have read in the press expressions purporting to come from the Senator from California which did not seem to have the same emphasis.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If I may say so, I do not believe the Senator from Nevada has read in the press anything which indicates differently from what I have just stated, because I am not in the habit of saying one thing to the press and something else on the floor of the Senate. I have said to the press, as I have said in the Senate, that, so far as the majority leader is concerned—and it has had the approval of the Policy Committee—when the St. Lawrence seaway measure is out of the way, the next business to come before the Senate on the legislative calendar will be the proposed Bricker amendment.

I have pointed out that on the executive calendar we may take up the Korean treaty, but I do not believe that measure will take more than a couple of days, at the most. As a matter of fact, the general proposal to follow the procedure just outlined, as I understand, has the complete approval of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. President, let me say further that I have been listening to and following the remarks of the Senator from Nevada as closely as possible. During the course of his speech, I understood him to say, in relation to the "which" clause, that it related to legislation which otherwise Congress could not pass. I wondered if the Senator had reference only to the Congress, or whether the language to which he referred would also have reference to State legislative bodies.

Mr. McCARRAN. It has reference to both.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator mentioned only the Congress, and I wanted it clear whether he was eliminating the States.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not eliminating the States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54) to print additional copies of hearings on treaties and executive agreements,.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 354) amending Public Law 207, 83d Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 354) amending Public Law 207, 83d Congress, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence Seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreement to the amendments offered by the Senator from

Louisiana [Mr. LONG] on pages 6, 12 and 13.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to have the Senate vote fairly soon on the amendment. However, I understand the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] desired to have a quorum call in advance of the vote on his proposed amendments, so that the Senator might have opportunity to make a brief statement to the Senate. Obviously, the Senate would not want to vote on any amendment without having a quorum call.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Gore	McCarran
Barrett	Green	McClellan
Beall	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Burke	Hill	Mundt
Bush	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd	Hunt	Payne
Carlson	Ives	Potter
Case	Jackson	Purtell
Chavez	Jenner	Robertson
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Kefauver	Smathers
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	Kuchel	Symington
Ellender	Langer	Thye
Ferguson	Lehman	Upton
Flanders	Lennon	Watkins
Frear	Long	Welker
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Mansfield	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendments designated "1-14-54-A" and offer in lieu thereof my amendments, which are at the desk, designated "1-18-54-O."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD without reading.

Mr. LONG's amendments were, on page 6, beginning with line 24, strike out through line 24, on page 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $105 million, as may be necessary to finance the activities of the Corporation.

(b) All moneys received by the Corporation as receipts from its operations shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

On page 12, lines 22 and 23, strike out "payment of interest on the obligations of the Corporation" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "payment of interest at the rate of 3½ percent per annum on the funds appropriated to the Corporation which have not been returned to the Treasury."

On page 13, beginning with the word "the" in line 1, strike out through line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "over a period not to exceed 50 years the cost to the United States of the seaway."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence Seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Louisiana whether he desires to have the Senate consider his amendments en bloc, or separately.

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator from Louisiana desire the yeas and nays on his amendments?

Mr. LONG. I should like to have the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the amendments which I offer are designed to protect the constitutional functions of the Congress. Without my amendments the pending bill would permit the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation simply to go to the Treasury and borrow $105 million, without further accounting to the Congress on a year-to-year basis.

Those who drafted the American Constitution required that all moneys spent by the Government should be spent in consequence of appropriations. I read from article I, section 9, of the Constitution of the United States the following provision:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

Without the amendments offered by the junior Senator from Louisiana, the bill before us is an appropriation bill. It is true that some may contend that this money is really being borrowed, and will be paid back in 50 years. Even granting such an argument, the very same argument could be applied, in the same degree, to every public power project in the United States. The Tennessee Valley Authority is required annually to come before Congress and give an accounting of its stewardship of public funds, and to request additional funds needed for the following year.

The same argument would hold good with regard to the Bonneville Dam, the Southwest Power Authority, and all other Government agencies.

Let me reiterate that with respect to every power project in our Nation and all dams for power purposes, the operating agencies are required annually to come before the Congress, and the agencies to which the money is appropriated are required to render an annual accounting of their expenditures, and annually justify additional operating funds for the following year.

The same requirement should be made of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. By the adoption of my amendments we would preserve the responsibilities and the powers of the Congress of the United States. The passage of the bill without my amendments would make it possible for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to go its merry way, disposing of $105 million of American funds, handling them in whatever manner the Seaway Corporation might see fit, without an annual review or report to the Congress. Such a procedure would not be in the best interests of the taxpayers of the Nation. Our people are entitled to a proper accounting of their funds. Those who drafted the Constitution of the United States expected the Congress to require a more scrupulous and careful accounting of the funds of the taxpayers of the United States than is suggested by the proposed legislation.

Therefore I hope that the Senate will require that money for the seaway be appropriated in the same manner as money appropriated for all other projects. Let the Seaway Corporation annually come before Congress and present its case for the money it needs.

Thus far the only logical argument against my amendment has been that made by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. The Senator from Michigan contended that the Seaway Corporation should have $105 million in hand so that it could work with the responsible authorities in Canada. The adoption of my amendment, he states, would impede the construction of the project.

That very argument should be made annually before the Appropriations Committee, when construction funds for the seaway are under consideration. The Appropriations Committee should consider the desirability of moving along as expeditiously as possible in the construction of this project. The Appropriations Committee and the Congress of the United States should consider the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

extent to which the project could be rushed in cooperation with Canada. Certainly the progress being made by the Canadians in constructing their segment of the seaway and the progress being made in the construction of the dam across the St. Lawrence River should obviously be factors considered by the Appropriations Committee in making its annual allotment of funds.

It would be ridiculous for the Congress, for the reason alone suggested by the Senator from Michigan, to surrender its power over the purse strings of Federal expenditure. The same argument would apply logically to the Bonneville Authority. The same argument would apply just as logically to the need for the Southwest Power Authority to have funds to continue from year to year, as a continuing operation. The same argument could be made with regard to all the power projects being constructed throughout the Nation. The same argument could be made with regard to our huge annual foreign aid appropriations. Yet the Founding Fathers in the Constitution have seen fit to require that annual appropriations be provided from year to year, instead of providing for any great amount without any further accounting being required by the Congress.

Congress has wisely seen fit to retain the power to control these vast expenditures and outlay of Federal funds. At present it is contended that the administration will need to raise the national debt limit. When the United States permits this corporation to borrow $105,000,000 which it does not at this moment need, that means that we shall then be $105,000,000 nearer to breaking through the debt ceiling imposed by the Congress. Those of us who desire to keep Federal expenditures within the national debt ceiling will be able to hold down Federal expenditures only if we permit the money to be appropriated as needed, instead of permitting the corporation to borrow at one time $105,000,000 from the Federal Treasury.

Furthermore, the Federal Government would save the interest during the time when the money was not needed. If we give the corporation $105,000,000, much of which is not needed for a few years, we shall be paying perhaps 8 or 10 million dollars in interest which could be saved. By permitting the money to be borrowed as needed, we shall not be paying unnecessary interest charges.

I have another point in mind. Some of the greatest advocates of economy in connection with projects which come before the Congress are among those supporting the Seaway. From time to time we are confronted with proposals for a 5 percent cut, a 10 percent cut, or a 40 percent cut in connection with domestic projects for the development of this great Nation. The argument is usually made that the country is desperately in debt, and that Federal expenditures are running so high that patriotism demands that we save the Nation from bankruptcy. Economies are often urged even though it is conceded that injury to the Nation might result from the reduction.

Assuming the correctness of such arguments, it is conceivable that the situation of this Nation might some day be so desperate that we might have to reduce even the expenditures for the St. Lawrence Seaway below what was originally anticipated. Therefore this project should be subjected to consideration by Congress on the same basis as all other projects. The fact that there is an international aspect to it does not prevent the Congress from considering whether or not this project should be rushed, or whether from time to time it could be delayed in the interest of economy.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for the viewpoint which he has expressed. I think it is very proper that all expenditure items go through the regular, established channels, and be handled by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LONG. I should like to say further that I had the opportunity to discuss this question with the distinguished President pro tempore [Mr. BRIDGES], who is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I regret very much that he is not present in the chamber at this moment, because he assured me that he would not only support the amendment, but would say a few words in behalf of it, in the event he were in the chamber at the time the amendment came up. He has been ill for a few days, and perhaps he is not at his office today. I believe that if he were present he would support my amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I believe that a similar amendment was proposed in the past by our distinguished former colleague, Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, with respect to TVA appropriations. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. It is my understanding that even though it might be convenient for the Tennessee Valley Authority to draw its money and not be required to render an accounting to Congress, but go merrily on its way, spending it as it pleased, the distinguished former Senator from Tennessee, felt that an agency within his own State should be subjected to just such a proposal.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe that that amendment was ever made applicable to the TVA. Still, the Senator's amendment embodies the same basic principle, that the Congress should each year pass upon the funds for this corporation, if it should be established, just as it passes on funds for expenditure by any other Government agency.

Mr. LONG. Of course, it is true that the TVA gets no new money without its being appropriated by Congress, and it does not get steam plants and other projects without first coming to Congress and explaining its needs to Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana would require the seaway authority to come to Congress each year in order to get such part of the authorized $105 million contained in the bill as would be necessary for its expenditure for each fiscal year. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, the Senator from Louisiana would require Congress to appropriate each year, out of the authorization of $105 million, such funds as the corporation could justify as being needed for expenditure during the next fiscal year. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. That is correct. It seems to me, Mr. President, that Congress has its responsibility to discharge in a situation of this kind. I believe Congress would be shirking its responsibility if it did not so provide, and I believe the members of the Appropriations Committees would not be performing the task which the Senate and the House of Representatives have assigned to them, unless they examine the need for the expenditure on a yearly basis.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that I have been and still am an ardent supporter of the St. Lawrence Seaway project. I believe it is very important in the national interest that the waterway be built as early as possible.

However, I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for raising the point he has raised this afternoon with respect to the obligation of Congress to protect its rights in connection with our fiscal policy. I believe it would be bad policy, by the passage of a bill such as this, to appropriate a lump sum to a corporation or any other agency, and allow the agency to spend it over a period of years, in accordance with its discretion, without further check and review by Congress.

Speaking only for myself, I believe that by retaining such responsibility and adopting the safeguards which the Senator from Louisiana proposes with respect to the appropriation of funds, we would strengthen our position with regard to the St. Lawrence Seaway project, so far as public opinion is concerned.

I believe a great victory will be won by those of us who support the St. Lawrence Waterway project when the bill is passed—and I am satisfied that it will be passed—giving legal authorization for it. However, I do not believe that the bill should in form be what amounts to an appropriation bill. Therefore, I shall vote for the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I should like to say further that Congress will not be protecting the taxpayers of the Nation and rendering a faithful public service if it permits the money to be appropriated without taking a look at it as it is disbursed from year to year.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we must enter into certain agreements, which are not now consummated, before the project can be constructed.

In that connection, the junior Senator from Louisiana raised a question which up to this time has not been an-

swered. There is already a 14-foot navigation channel, which carries 11 million tons of cargo. Obviously, the existing project would prevent the new project from paying for itself if the Canadians continued to permit the 14-foot project to operate as a toll-free project. Certainly there would be objection from all the interests using the 14-foot channel if a toll were imposed on the 14-foot channel.

If the United States is to have the benefit of a self-liquidating project, as it is claimed the project will be, although some of us doubt it very much, the Appropriations Committees should insist on knowing what sort of agreements are made which will assure us that the 50-cents-a-ton toll project will not be operating on the same river in competition with a toll-free project.

Many of us have asked the question as to what assurance there is that the locks farther down the river will be free to navigation without the Canadians unilaterally imposing tolls on them.

Congress can protect the United States interest by asking such questions from year to year, if Congress retains control of the purse strings.

The junior Senator from Louisiana does not offer his amendments with any purpose to injure the bill. I am frank to say that I believe it is an unnecessary expenditure of money; but if it is to be spent it seems to me it should be spent in accordance with the traditional manner of making appropriations. Congress should always be in a position to see that the taxpayers are being protected and the money is being carefully and scrupulously spent.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Congress has already made the very provision which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has mentioned.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD sections 846, 847, and 848 of subparagraph II, title 31, of the United States Code.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBCHAPTER II.—WHOLLY OWNED GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

§ 846. Definition of "wholly owned Government corporation."

As used in this chapter the term "wholly owned Government corporation" means the Commodity Credit Corporation; Federal Intermediate Credit Banks; Production Credit Corporations; Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations; Farmers Home Corporation; Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation; Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Defense Plant Corporation; Defense Supplies Corporation; Metals Reserve Company; Rubber Reserve Company; War Damage Corporation; Federal National Mortgage Association; the RFC Mortgage Company; Disaster Loan Corporation; Inland Waterways Corporation; Warrior River Terminal Company; The Virgin Islands Company; Federal Prison Industries, Inc.; United States Spruce Production Corporation; Institute of Inter-American Affairs; Institute of Inter-American Transportation; Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc.; Inter-American Navigation Corporation; Prencinradio, Inc.; Cargoes, Inc.; Export-Import Bank of Washington; Petroleum Reserves Corporation; Rubber Development Corporation; U. S. Commercial Company; Smaller War Plants Corporation; Federal Public Housing Authority (or United States Housing Authority) and including public housing projects financed from appropriated funds and operations thereof; Defense Homes Corporation; Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; Home Owners' Loan Corporation; United States Housing Corporation; Panama Railroad Company; Tennessee Valley Authority; and Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc. (December 6, 1945, ch. 557, title I, sec. 101, 59 Stat. 597.)

(References in text: The "Defense Plant Corporation; Defense Supplies Corporation; Metals Reserve Company; Rubber Reserve Company; and the Disaster Loan Corporation" referred to in text were dissolved and the functions transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by joint resolution June 30, 1945, ch. 215, sec. 1, 59 Stat. 310, effective July 1, 1945.)

§ 847. Preparation of annual budget program; form, content, and manner of presentation.

Each wholly owned Government corporation shall cause to be prepared annually a budget program, which shall be submitted to the President through the Bureau of the Budget on or before September 15 of each year. The Bureau of the Budget, under such rules and regulations as the President may establish, is authorized and directed to prescribe the form and content of, and the manner in which such budget program shall be prepared and presented. The budget program shall be a business-type budget, or plan of operations, with due allowance given to the need for flexibility, including provision for emergencies and contingencies, in order that the corporation may properly carry out its activities as authorized by law. The budget program shall contain estimates of the financial condition and operations of the corporation for the current and ensuing fiscal years and the actual condition and results of operation for the last completed fiscal year. Such budget program shall include a statement of financial condition, a statement of income and expense, an analysis of surplus or deficit, a statement of sources and application of funds, and such other supplementary statements and information as are necessary or desirable to make known the financial condition and operations of the corporation. Such statements shall include estimates of operations by major types of activities, together with estimates of administrative expenses, estimates of borrowings, and estimates of the amount of Government capital funds which shall be returned to the Treasury during the fiscal year or the appropriations required to provide for the restoration of capital impairments. (Dec. 6, 1945, ch. 557, title I, § 102, 59 Stat. 598.)

§ 848. Transmission of budget programs to Congress; amendments; effective date.

The budget programs of the corporations as modified, amended, or revised by the President shall be transmitted to the Congress as a part of the annual budget required by sections 1, 2, 11, 13–18, 20–24, 41–55, 471, and 581 of this title. Amendments to the annual budget programs may be submitted from time to time.

Budget programs shall be submitted for all wholly owned Government corporations covering operations for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1946, and each fiscal year thereafter. (Dec. 6, 1945, ch. 557, title I, § 103, 59 Stat. 598.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana—and I respect the Senator from Louisiana when I say this—has the ostensible purpose of keeping congressional control over expenditures and of insuring Congress an opportunity to review expenditures year by year. But it is wholly unnecessary for this purpose. Section 6 of the bill makes the Government Corporation Control Act applicable to the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. Under that act the Corporation would annually submit a proposed budget program for the forthcoming year, and this program would be subject to congressional review, control, and approval. The Corporation would also be subject to an annual commercial audit by the General Accounting Office. This audit would fully disclose to the Congress the financial results of its operations together with any recommendations which the Comptroller General might deem appropriate.

There is nothing unusual about the method of financing provided by the bill. The same procedure was adopted for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the slum-clearance and community-development program, and the lending authority under sections 302 and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

The proposed amendment would remove the advantages which result from use of the corporate form. Necessary flexibility of operations needed in this construction project involving joint operations with Canada and extended over 5 or 6 years would be sacrificed in adopting the year-to-year appropriation approach.

The Canadians have said that they are willing to discuss joint participation only if the discussions will not result in further delay. By making the progress of the work contingent upon annual appropriations, the amendment would certainly raise at least the possibility of delay.

The amendment is the last gasp of the opposition to the St. Lawrence project. They realize now they cannot defeat the projects; so they want to be in a position to continue to fight delaying actions on appropriation bills, year after year.

Mr. President, something has been said about paying interest. We have set forth in the report a table which shows the amounts that would be involved. Of course, there would be no need to pay interest except on the amount actually borrowed. It is estimated that during the first year the corporation would spend $5,800,000; during the second year, $29 million—these are round figures—during the third year, $36 million; during the fourth year $15 million; during the fifth year $708,000. The total would be $86 million.

Mr. President, in the statute there will be found the language to which I have referred. For example, in section 848, it is provided:

The budget programs of the corporations as modified, as amended, or revised by the President, shall be transmitted to the Congress as a part of the annual budget—

And so forth. Section 847 deals with the preparation of annual budget programs; that is, the form, content, and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

manner of presentation with respect to wholly owned Government corporations.

Section 6 of the bill makes the law which I have quoted applicable to the proposed corporation.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the arguments we have heard on the amendments—and I shall not reply to all the arguments which have been made—are arguments we have heard before. All that would be accomplished by the adoption of the amendments would be to reenact a portion of a law already in effect, and to interfere with the consummation of the project by providing for annual appropriations. Of course, that is what is wanted by the opponents. They want appropriations to be made each year, so that there could be a fight in Congress each year as to the amount, with resulting delaying action.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Was not the Senator from Wisconsin one of those who thought that authorities such as the Bonneville Authority, TVA, and others should annually come before the Congress and make a request for the funds they wished to be appropriated, and did not Senators on his side of the aisle support the principle that such agencies should come before the Congress and ask for the funds as they needed them?

Mr. WILEY. I am sure that I have answered that question. I am satisfied that the bill itself makes applicable the law which I have quoted, and that makes it unnecessary for us to do what the Senator from Louisiana wishes to accomplish.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that the Senator from Wisconsin, in his statement, said that the law to which he has referred provides that Government corporations have to present statements showing what they are doing? But if the Congress does not like the statements, there is nothing it can do except to receive them.

Mr. President, I am not offering the amendment to make the project difficult of construction. I assume it will be constructed as rapidly as may be possible; but, why should not the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Michigan fight for other funds to be used to develop other sections of the United States?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Wisconsin makes a very persuasive argument. I should like to ask him a question or two in order to be sure that I understand it.

If the bill is passed in its present form this afternoon, or whenever we vote on it, what will be its effect so far as the expenditure power of the corporation is concerned in relation to the $105 million?

Mr. WILEY. I think it would be in the same category as are all the other agencies mentioned, covering half a page in this volume, including the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Intermediate Credit Corporation, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, and probably 50 more. On the other hand, the Corporation would be subject to the provisions of the statute which require action by the Budget Bureau and supervision in that respect.

Mr. MORSE. Under that statute, would the Corporation be required to come before the Congress each year and obtain an appropriation for the money which is intended to be expended during the ensuing year?

Mr. WILEY. No. The bill itself provides that what would be done would be to authorize the Corporation to get from Congress each year the needed funds; and, I presume, the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], would apply, in which he suggests not to exceed 33⅓ percent of the $105 million, which would then be expended by the Corporation. It would transmit its budget program to the Congress, and it would be subject to audit by the same institutions which audit all other bills under the Wholly Owned Federal Corporation Act.

Mr. MORSE. Does the law require Congress to take any action at all on any report so submitted to the Congress, or is it simply a case of their submitting a report to the Congress, and Congress simply placing it on file?

Mr. WILEY. I read from the law:

> The budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress shall be considered and, if necessary, legislation shall be enacted making available such funds or other financial resources as the Congress may determine. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing wholly owned Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor shall any provisions of this section be construed as affecting in any way the provisions of section 831y of title 16. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as affecting the existing authority of any wholly owned Government corporation to make contracts or other commitments with reference to fiscal-year limitations.

Mr. MORSE. Does not that mean that so far as the $105 million called for by this bill is concerned, the Corporation has control over it and can spend as much of it next year as it wants to, or in the years after, without any further affirmative action by Congress?

Mr. WILEY. If the Dirksen amendment is adopted, the amount would be limited by that amendment. The Corporation would have control of the money for the purpose suggested, subject, of course, to audit and subject to making a report.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that all the other agencies to which the Senator has referred are agencies which do not deal with public works, but are primarily administrative agencies for carrying out administrative policies of the Government in certain fields?

Mr. WILEY. We have the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the United States Housing Corporation, the Federal Housing Authority——

Mr. MORSE. Are not they, by and large, loaning agencies, save and except the Tennessee Valley Authority, as to which I should like to get further information. My understanding is that the Tennessee Valley Authority comes before Congress for appropriations. But are any of the other corporations operating in the field of public works?

Mr. WILEY. I could not say. They are designated as wholly owned Government corporations. How many more have applicable to them the same provisions of the law I could not say.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator that I am only seeking clarification, and I am thinking out loud as the problem is presented this afternoon. I am looking at it from the standpoint of what is the best and soundest congressional policy. My offhand reaction to the cases cited is that they are not comparable to this particular situation, because they are, in fact, agencies which are not dealing with the functions of public works, but are dealing principally with administrative duties in carrying out policies which have already been determined by the Congress. I do not want to do anything which would jeopardize the St. Lawrence Waterway, but, at the same time, I think it is important that we apply principles of uniformity and also that we protect our appropriation powers. I am inclined to say, offhand, that I think it is bad policy to grant lump sums of money to a kind of Government agency that exercises corporate powers and give it in advance blanket authority to spend for a great many years in the future without a recheck by the Congress.

I think it is true that the general public works policy of Congress is, first, to authorize, and then to appropriate each year. But, as the Senator has pointed out, a foreign country is involved in this measure, which complicates the situation. We have had evidence in the debate that Canada desires some assurance that if the United States goes into the project with her there will be continuity of the programing. I think that desire on the part of Canada has merit.

But on the point of the overall desirability of a congressional check upon the expenditure of funds, I think there is great merit in the argument of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. It disturbs me when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] says there is a strategy of delay in connection with the measure. I am not going to talk about motivation——

Mr. WILEY. I do not make that statement applicable to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. My motivation certainly is not one of delay. I am always disturbed when there comes before the Senate a proposal to relinquish the people's check against the executive branch of the Government, because Congress has a great responsibility to preserve the check and balance system.

As the Senator from Wisconsin is aware, many times in the 8 years of my service in the Senate I have been heard in opposition to any proposal when I became convinced that it involved relinquishing a legislative check on the executive branch of the Government.

Frankly, this argument has disturbed me. If the Senator had spoken to me at breakfast time this morning I would have told him I did not have the slightest idea of this problem. This is an illustration of how a point of view can be changed on the floor of the Senate. Thirty minutes ago I had not heard of this argument. But unless I can be satisfied that we are not giving up the legislative check on the executive branch of the Government, I do not see how I can vote against the amendments of the Senator from Louisiana.

I am trying to be fair to the Senator from Wisconsin by telling him what is troubling me. If he can prove to me that I am mistaken in my point of view, or that there is something to protect the point of view I am trying to protect, my vote will be governed accordingly.

Mr. WILEY. Section 851 of the statute to which I have referred provides as follows:

> A report of each such audit for each fiscal year ending on June 30 shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a statement (showing intercorporate relations) of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expense; a statement of sources and application of funds; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the several corporations, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including a report of any impairment of capital noted in the audit and recommendations for the return of such Government capital or the payment of such dividends as, in his judgment, should be accomplished. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to the corporation concerned at the time submitted to the Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from Oregon has raised a good point, but I do not know whether it has been answered. I think he is substantially correct in saying that the Government corporations whose names have been read by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin are not of a public works type, in general. There may have been some that have engaged in some public works activity; but I think, generally speaking, the Senator from Oregon is correct.

However, I wish to point out that there is another difference in connection with the proposed corporation. It would deal with an international waterway. While it would be organized as a United States corporation, it would be dealing with an international waterway.

Secondly, I think that Congress, with the information before it, would then have due notice, if they desired to take any additional steps, and would still have it within their power to do so.

I also wish to point out that the bonds which would be issued under the bill would be general obligation bonds in the usual sense. They would be revenue bonds, though actually, to be perfectly frank about it, I believe they would have the backing, so to speak, of the Federal Government, so there would be an obligation there.

But I think the factors make it entirely possible, and, it seems to me, entirely wise to pass the bill without the Long amendment. However, the Senator from Oregon is correct. I think the other corporations are not, generally speaking, public works corporations.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to point out that, while it is true that most of the corporations referred to are lending agencies, yet, in the case of the Commodity Credit Corporation, that corporation deals in hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of commodities each year. At present, it owns approximately $2,500,000,000 worth of commodities, which it will sell as the opportunity presents itself. The Corporation will sell them domestically, or it will sell to foreign countries, under proper conditions.

It is an operating agency, one of the largest corporations, I believe, in the world. At one time, during the war, it was the largest corporation in the world. It did the most business of any of the corporations.

So the bill would not establish a precedent in the respect that it would require a borrowing corporation to come to Congress for an appropriation each year. It might be recalled that the Commodity Credit Corporation is given borrowing authority, which it uses; and then, I believe quite improperly, the notes to the Treasury are canceled. Probably there should be an appropriation to cover the loan at the end of each year.

But we have recognized this difficulty with the corporations. Senators may recall that in 1946 the Committee on Government Operations, as it is now called, was strengthened and made a full fledged committee of the Senate. The Comptroller General audits the reports of Government corporations and sends his own reports to the Committee on Government Operations. I think he sends them also to the committees concerned with the activities of the respective corporations. I know the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry receives the reports pertaining to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Then our committee is supposed to go over the reports. The Comptroller General has already gone over them to determine the accuracy of the accounts, and the committee goes over them afterward to determine whether the corporation is functioning as intended by Congress. If it is not, the committee determines what, if any legislation may be necessary to have the corporation function properly.

I wish to point out that this bill does not establish a precedent.

Mr. WILEY. It seems to me there is another distinction. Maybe it will answer the question of the Senator from Oregon. While this would be a public works corporation, it would be different from others, because it would operate on a self-liquidating basis. It would not have to ask the Government for funds year after year. What it would do would be to liquidate the loan. It would not be like the other corporations that have been mentioned.

It seems to me that that in itself is a reason for not classifying it in every detail with some of the corporations that are required to come before Congress every year and to ask for help.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WILEY. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we should consider the authority granted in the bill as being about the same as that given to the REA. Originally the REA receives authority to borrow money from the United States Treasury, and then it lends the money to various cooperatives. Recently that procedure has been placed on an annual basis, so the REA now gets its authority to borrow money each year.

This would not be an appropriation; it would be authority granted to the corporation to go to the Treasury of the United States, as it needed the dollars with which to build. As is set forth on page 7, line 19 of the bill:

> The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended.

Mr. President, what it really does is allow the Corporation to go to the Treasury of the United States and borrow money. The method by which the Treasury receives the money is by selling bonds under a specific act; not the way the ordinary Treasury bonds are sold, but by a particular act, the old Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended.

I think it is essential that there be authorized the amount of $105 million at one time. As a matter of fact, I feel certain that in the budget which will be presented tomorrow there will be included the amount of $105 million for the St. Lawrence Seaway project, because it is essential that the whole amount be authorized at one time.

As I view this matter, I think it is very material that, if we are to ask Canada not to build the seaway on their own land, but to join this country in the project so that the locks will be built on our land, and Canada will give up the project as she was originally going to build it if we had not joined her, Canada ought to have an assurance that the Government Corporation which we are creating will be in a position to proceed to complete the project.

As I view it, the same comment applies to REA. REA says to a cooperative, "We go to the Treasury and borrow the money, and we will give it to you without a direct appropriation for every specific project."

When the budget message is received, the Committee on Appropriations will know that $105 million is provided for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in the budget, that the money can be used, and that bonds of the Treasury will be sold to cover that amount.

When does this obligation become a public debt? As soon as the United States Treasury sells the bonds it becomes a debt against the United States, and it would be subject to the debt ceiling. When does the money start to draw interest? When the bonds are sold. However, the United States Treasury, will be in a position to sell the bonds only as the Corporation needs money with which to pay its bills. Therefore, there will be no difference in the interest, whether the funds are appropriated each year and used as the Corporation wants to use them or whether the money is provided as proposed by the bill.

Under the bill Congress would authorize the borrowing of money as a public-debt transaction, as is indicated in the bill. I believe that under the circumstances that method is justified, instead of saying to Canada, "You will have to rely upon the Congress of the United States appropriating a certain amount of money each year."

The proposed corporation will be self-liquidating, as I argued on the floor the other day. There is some interest involved in lending the $105 million. While the transaction is proceding and the canal is being dug, from time to time some money will be advanced, and there will be interest paid on that money. But, under the plan of the bill the whole amount will be made available to complete the project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I desire a vote on the amendments; therefore I shall speak for only a moment or so on them.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] read from a statute and stated that an accounting or some control is provided for. All the statute provides is that Government agencies shall send to the Congress reports of what they have done and are doing. When the reports are received the Congress is in no position to do anything about them. As a matter of fact, it is the policy of the General Accounting Office not to interfere in such matters. The General Accounting Office prefers the general authority to say, "If you want money, you should carry the burden of proving your need before the Committees on Appropriations. If the Congress concludes that you need the money, it will give you the necessary funds."

If the bill is passed without the Long amendment, it will mean that the corporation will not have to justify its requests for the money it needs from year to year. The corporation will submit a report, but Members of Congress will not be able to determine what is being done with the money. Every Senator knows that if he does not like the way the money is being spent, there is nothing he can do about it once the bill is passed.

Let us consider the great power dams in the West. Those dams are supposed to be self-liquidating projects as the REA is supposed to be self-liquidating. Once the money is appropriated, they do not need to justify their needs for the coming year.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Congress has to appropriate money pursuant to laws authorizing the expenditures.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct, of course. There are 23 members on the Committee on Appropriations. That committee is one of the most responsible committees of the Senate. It has never had an opportunity to examine into the St. Lawrence project, or to look into the cost of the project, or pass on the arrangements which will be made to protect American interests. I find it singularly strange that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. WILEY], considering the great responsibility that is his, has yet to answer the question I asked 5 minutes ago, and a question which I have been asking throughout the debate on this measure. The question is: Where is the agreement to protect the financial interests of the United States in connection with the St. Lawrence project? Such an agreement will have to be obtained. Yet Congress will have no opportunity to examine it and pass on it. There will be no assurance that the interests of this country have been protected. The only time Congress would be in a position to examine into that matter would be at the time appropriations of funds were considered by Congress.

I particularly had in mind that there would be a toll on a waterway 1 mile from a toll-free waterway. As best I can determine, there is no agreement, and no one seems to know what will be done about that matter. That is one of the serious questions which would have to be met when appropriations were sought from year to year. Congress should be in a position to protect the expenditure of public funds. There is no reason why Congress should provide for more money than will be needed on this project in a period of 5 years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first let me say that, in my opinion, the junior Senator from Louisiana is entirely sincere in offering the amendment, and I think, under normal circumstances, that, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I might go along with the position he takes. In the instant matter, however, I shall vote against the pending amendments, and I think I have good reason for so doing. It is provided that construction shall not begin until assurances are received from the Dominion Government, through an appropriate agency, that there will be a concurrent completion of the projects on this side and on the other side of the St. Lawrence River. We are almost asking for an assurance from Canada. If we are going to build in a spirit of reciprocity, Canada would have a perfect right to ask for some assurance on our part.

When the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority was set up in Canada, while normally it required an act of Parliament to provide the money—even as in this country money may not leave the Treasury except by appropriation pursuant to law—Canada does make an exception and provides that, out of moneys that are in the consolidated fund, that expenditure can be made by the Minister of Finance and the Governor in Council. That means that if there is money in the consolidated fund—and there must be—Canada does not have to go through a parliamentary procedure in order to make that money available.

If we are going to ask for assurance from us on that point from Canada, then obviously Canada could ask for some assurance from us.

As I pointed out yesterday, I think the whole arrangement should have been made by treaty in the first place, because one Congress can nullify what another Congress has done. However, since we are dealing at arm's length on an assurance basis, it does seem to me, if we want to play fair, that at least the whole amount should be made available for expenditure.

Having that in mind, and being just as concerned about it as is the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I fashioned an amendment, which I discussed with the chairman of the committee. The text was left precisely as it is, but the amendment then provides, as follows:

Provided, That not to exceed 10 percent of the notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations herein authorized shall be issued during the first year; not more than 30 percent during the second year; and not more than 40 percent during the third year; and the balance thereafter.

It was intimated in the hearings that for the first year they expect to spend only $5,800,000. Ten percent of the amount herein authorized would make available $10,000,000; but it seems to me that at the end of that time there will be a succession of reports, and we shall get a fairly good look at the project.

I am frank to say that, inasmuch as this is an international matter, if it goes to the committee, we shall never get a legislative provision for $105,000,000 passed on this floor without devoting several afternoons to it, and thus we shall go through the same struggle in order to obtain this authorization.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that in order to carry out in good faith on our side the request for assurances from the other side, we should be in a fairly good position to say, "The money is available, on a staggered basis, based on available engineering estimates of what will be required from one year to another. So you in Canada need have no anxiety or concern that a subsequent Congress will throw this into the wastebasket."

On that basis, I believe we can request some assurances from Canada with respect to current completion and with respect to having the money on her side made available.

So, Mr. President, if the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is reject-

ed, as I trust it will be, I shall offer this amendment, because I believe it will find favor with the committee, and it has been discussed with the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is absent on official business. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] has a pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] who is absent on official business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is necessarily absent, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—34

Beall	Hoey	McClellan
Bush	Hunt	Morse
Butler, Md.	Ives	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Ellender	Kilgore	Smathers
Flanders	Lennon	Stennis
Frear	Long	Welker
Fulbright	Magnuson	Williams
George	Martin	
Gore	McCarran	

NAYS—55

Aiken	Goldwater	Monroney
Anderson	Green	Mundt
Barrett	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Pastore
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Payne
Burke	Hill	Potter
Carlson	Holland	Purtell
Case	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Chavez	Jackson	Smith, Maine
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Cooper	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cordon	Kennedy	Symington
Dirksen	Knowland	Thye
Douglas	Kuchel	Upton
Duff	Langer	Watkins
Dworshak	Lehman	Wiley
Eastland	Malone	Young
Ferguson	Mansfield	
Gillette	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—7

Bridges	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Capehart	Kerr	
Griswold	Maybank	

So Mr. LONG's amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me in order that I may offer the amendment which I suggested a moment ago? I have no desire to discuss it. I think it is agreeable to the committee. It is a substitute for the amendment which was previously under consideration. I discussed it at length yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Illinois for the purpose of submitting a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will withhold the request for the moment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for an announcement to the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from New York yield to the majority leader?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the majority leader with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, and because a number of inquiries have been made, I hope the Senate will continue in session until about 9 o'clock this evening to see if we can complete action on the pending bill. So far as I know, only two further amendments are likely to be offered. There may be others, but they are the only ones I know of. I understand that there are not a great many speeches left on either side. I believe we can conclude consideration of the bill tonight, perhaps considerably before 9 o'clock.

If we are able to finish tonight, because of the fact that a number of Senators are planning to be at the launching of the atomic submarine tomorrow, I shall be inclined—although I wish to consult with the minority leader on this subject—to move that the Senate take a recess until Friday. That is contingent on our being able to complete consideration of the pending bill tonight.

It is planned, on Friday, to have a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, and then to have the Senate take a recess until Monday.

I hope on Monday to be able to make the Bricker amendment the unfinished business before the Senate. By that time—I believe tomorrow, and no later than Friday—the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the Korean treaty will be on every Senator's desk, so that Senators will have the weekend to study that subject. I shall propose that the Senate go into executive session on Monday to take up the executive nominations which are now on the desk of every Senator. I have received some request: from the minority side that the nominations be not taken up today. I am glad to accommodate Members of the minority and ask that the nominations be passed over.

The plan is to take up the executive nominations on Monday. I also propose, while the Senate is in executive session, to open the discussion on the Korean Treaty, and continue with that discussion for whatever time may be necessary on Monday, and possibly Tuesday, and then have the Senate return to legislative session as soon as the Korean Treaty is disposed of. At that time the unfinished business will be the so-called Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1.

That is the general program, but it is contingent upon our being able to complete our work on the seaway bill tonight.

Mr. LEHMAN. For the information of the majority leader, I wish to inform him that I do not expect to speak for longer than 15 minutes.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence Seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States' share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] spoke about an amendment. What is the status of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois at the moment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment was not offered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as a preamble to my remarks in support of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, I would like to make clear for the RECORD what my position is and has been with respect to this great project, which I have been advocating for the past 30 years.

During the time I have been in the Senate, I have introduced and supported several legislative propositions designed to bring about the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway. All of the legislation which I have advanced, however, has had a greater scope than the bill which is presently pending before the Senate.

Last year, for example, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 45, which, in my opinion, was the only bill considered by the Senate in 1953 containing a full, comprehensive approach to the development of the resources of the St. Lawrence River.

I have always felt that the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project should be regarded as one project. It is true that there are two separate phases of this project, namely, the power phase and the seaway phase. But any study of the project will show that these two phases are in fact inseparable parts of a united whole.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

For example, the seaway project cannot go forward without prior or concurrent construction of the power dam at Barnhart Island. This power dam, which raises the level of the river some 83 feet, is the heart of the entire project, as is indicated by the fact that the present bill, S. 2150, which refers only to navigation, could not be enacted until after the New York Power Authority had obtained a license from the Federal Power Commission to construct the power dam and works.

As I have said previously, by dividing the St. Lawrence project into two separate parts we may be creating a dangerous precedent that will surely plague us in the future. We may find that this precedent will be seized upon by private utilities in support of their demands for the development of the power phases of other dual-purpose projects—a policy and a practice which we have not followed with respect to other great dual-purpose projects.

I should like to point out further that I have previously expressed the fear that in granting a license to the New York Power Authority to develop the power phase of this international project we have disregarded the safeguards which the Congress has been careful to prescribe in authorizing all other major river-development projects over the past 30 years.

Without the necessary safeguards for the distribution of St. Lawrence power—safeguards which are applied in Federal construction of all power projects—we may find that millions of consumers in New York and New England—domestic and rural consumers, municipalities, rural electric cooperatives, and even national-defense agencies of the Government itself—will be deprived of preferences which have been granted them through previous congressional acts.

In this respect I should like to point out that on February 5, 1953, I urged the Federal Power Commission to include safeguard provisions in the license of the New York Power Authority. At that time I acknowledged that the seaway was going to be built by Canada if the Congress did not take prompt steps to join Canada in this project. I said that I regretted very much seeing the power project separated from the seaway project, but that if such separation were to take place the Congress and the Federal agencies concerned should certainly apply the safeguards to any agency which developed St. Lawrence power. At this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of my letter to the Honorable Thomas C. Buchanan, chairman of the Federal Power Commission, on this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
February 5, 1953.

HON. THOMAS C. BUCHANAN,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have pending before you an application of the New York State Power Authority for a license to construct and operate hydroelectric facilities in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. This application is entitled, I believe, project 2000.

This application has been pending before you in one form or another for several years and your records will show that I have communicated with you on a number of occasions in regard to it. In the past I have endorsed the New York State application, but always with the strong proviso that while there was a chance for congressional authorization of the dual purpose project, I would much prefer to see this great undertaking follow that course.

I feel that the separation of the power project from the seaway project is a tragic error. Among other things it loads on the backs of the users of power considerable costs which should be borne by the seaway and would be borne by the seaway if the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project were constructed as a dual purpose unit. I am, of course, aware of the action by the Dominion of Canada in repudiating the 1941 agreement and proceeding under terms of independent legislation to initiate action which may lead to the construction of the seaway, as a Canadian project, on the northern side of the St. Lawrence. In my judgment, it would be disastrous for this to occur and for the United States thus to lose a voice in a vital aspect of a boundary waterway. It seems incomprehensible that we are even contemplating the abdication of sovereign responsibility.

The question before the Commission, however, has been narrowed down by the inevitable logic of events. Personally, I can understand that if the Commission decides to approve project 2000, it must do so on the supposition that there is no prospect for congressional action on the dual-purpose project. Certainly the Commission will want to be very sure that this is so before it makes its final decision.

The purpose of this letter is to urge that the Commission, in considering the grant of a license to the New York State Power Authority, take into consideration the need to safeguard in every way the broad public interest. The St. Lawrence, of course, is a public resource and the people of New York State must look to the Federal Power Commission as well as to the Congress for the protection of their interests in this resource. In addition, the Federal Power Commission is under obligation to protect the interests of all the people of the country.

I make these general statements in specific reference to the needs for safeguards of the interests of the consumers of the power from this project and of the special groups who, under law, are the special concern of the Government in the disposition of hydroelectric power. I refer, of course, to those agencies of Government engaged in national defense activities, to municipal bodies, to rural electric co-ops, and to rural consumers. If the FPC decides to grant a license to the New York State Power Authority, the preferences and other safeguards already referred to should certainly be laid down as fundamental conditions of that license.

If it is legally possible to include these safeguards in the grant of license, I would urge that the application be approved after the Commission has decided, of course, that there is no prospect for congressional action on the dual-purpose project.

The grant of a license without these conditions would, in my judgment, endanger the public interest and pave the way for the alienation of a public resource without commensurate protection of the public welfare. Especially against the background of the attitude expressed by the present membership of the New York State Power Authority—an attitude directly contrary to the legal mandate of that authority—it is essential that the factors I have enumerated be given the most careful consideration in arriving at a decision which affects the future welfare of all the people of New York State and their rights in this precious resource.

Very sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there is one other aspect of this problem which I think deserves comment. This project, although it will be self-liquidating both as to power and seaway, nevertheless is regarded as expensive. In any such project there are always works which are solely for navigation, works which are solely for power, and works which are common to both power and navigation. To separate the two phases of a dual purpose project means in many cases that some disproportionate allocation of costs may be made to one phase or the other. Speaking from the viewpoint of my own State of New York, the severance of the power project from the seaway will load onto the consumers of the power—in New York State, in New England and elsewhere—a disproportionate share of the costs of the dual purpose project. In a statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 20, 1953, I noted that by this severance, the power development in New York and Ontario would be required to bear an additional capital cost of almost $100 million in excess of the amount heretofore allocated to the cost of the power.

This is certainly not fair to the power consumers of New York State and New England. However, despite my representations and those of other Members of the Congress, the Federal Power Commission did issue a license, without the necessary safeguards, to the New York Power Authority for the construction of the power works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

Last year, in addition to introducing Senate Joint Resolution 45, providing for the dual purpose project, I also cosponsored S. 589, which was the forerunner of the bill which is now before the Senate.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, having considered the various proposals before it in 1953, reported its own bill, S. 2150, by a decisive vote of 13 to 2. I am glad the bill is before the Senate, and I am confident that it will shortly be passed. While I shall strongly support and will vote for this bill, it is nevertheless my conclusion, as I have indicated above, that the St. Lawrence development should have been authorized as a dual purpose project. That, however, is now a closed book.

As I look back over the last 30 years, I think I have always known that one day the St. Lawrence Seaway would be an accomplished fact. It is a dream which many men have held, that one day oceangoing vessels could proceed unhampered from the oceans up the St. Lawrence to the great inland seas in the heartland of America. It is a dream which many of us knew would one day be realized, for we saw it as a natural result of progress.

As with all great undertakings there has always been opposition, originating with those who have no faith in human progress and development. Some opposition also comes from those groups,

which, lacking faith in the resourcefulness and initiative of their own business or undertaking, will seek to strangle any other business or undertaking which might provide competition. But this is not the American way and neither is it the way of free enterprise, for the way of free enterprise is to meet competition head on and through improved services and facilities to bring about continued growth and prosperity.

To those of faint heart and to those who fear the competition which the St. Lawrence Seaway might conceivably bring into being, I say, let them examine our history. Every new development—whether it be by invention, or by the opening up of new frontiers—has always provided more advantages than disadvantages, and has always resulted in increased rather than decreased prosperity for the people of the United States.

Samuel L. Clemens, more commonly known as Mark Twain, in his book, Life on the Mississippi, describes the flourishing trade by steamboat on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers in the 19th century. Before the advent of the railroads, a substantial portion of the Nation's trade and commerce flowed over these natural inland waterways, and flourishing towns sprang up at strategic points along the river. No doubt the famous river captains of those days cursed the railroads as they edged westward and diverted some of the traffic which had previously been carried on by the river boats. But the end effect of the incursion of the railroads was to develop the interior of the country, and today the volume of traffic carried on the Mississippi by boat is many, many times greater than it was in Mark Twain's day.

Now the shoe appears to be on the other foot so far as the St. Lawrence is concerned. If it is more advantageous, cheaper, or more efficient to avoid extra unloading and loadings and to eliminate overland hauls from our Atlantic ports to the great Middle West, why should there be hesitation? Why should we try to hold back progress? But I do not wish to have false inferences drawn from what I have said. I do not believe for a moment that the mighty ports of Boston, New York, and Baltimore will suffer from the St. Lawrence development as far as their port facilities are concerned. I do not believe that the St. Lawrence Seaway will deprive these cities of their economic lifeblood. On the contrary, as I pointed out previously, each advancement in technical knowledge, each development of new means or methods, has meant increased prosperity for all. Our great Atlantic ports will continue to grow and flourish, as our country as a whole grows and flourishes. For every cargo which is diverted from Atlantic ports there will be more coast-bound cargoes born and bred of new or expanded industries.

It is inconceivable to me, as I am sure it must be to anyone who gives serious thought to the matter, that the mightiest Nation in the world should have for so long refused to assign to the St. Lawrence River the importance it merits. Here is the main stem of the greatest storage and drainage basin in the world. Here are the inland seas which form a natural highway of two great nations. These inland seas already carry a staggering amount of the Nation's commerce, an amount which could be hugely increased if we could eliminate the bottleneck of the International Rapids.

In the face of Canada's decision to open the St. Lawrence River to ocean-going commerce, it is inconceivable to me that we should even dream of relinquishing our rights and privileges on this or any other international waterway. How would the course of history have flowed if we had not built the Panama Canal? That tremendous undertaking did not involve a waterway within our boundaries, as does the St. Lawrence. Yet we went to vast trouble and expense to purchase the right to construct the Panama Canal. Does anyone now suggest that we should not have done so? Is there any doubt that we would oppose with every means at our disposal any interference with our management and control of the Panama Canal? The fact that the Panama Canal has been so valuable to us raises the question whether the United States can afford not to be a partner in this present undertaking. If the St. Lawrence Seaway is constructed solely on Canadian soil, who among us can guarantee that we will never regret such folly? Who can say that we will never need the seaway facilities or, what may be even more important, a voice in its management?

Thus it is possible that if the United States should become a belligerent in some international dispute in which Canada were a neutral, we could be denied the use of the seaway. During a national emergency we could, by refusing now to cosponsor the seaway, deny ourselves a vital artery of commerce and a means of transporting goods beyond the capabilities of other facilities existing at that time.

It is high time that we disregard the voices of those who preach sectional self-interest. Let us devote our energy to a more farsighted policy of national interest. Our continued refusal to recognize the importance of developing the St. Lawrence has been myopic. We have shortsightedly buried our heads in the sands of self-interest. We are denying to ourselves partnership in a facility of which our citizens will inevitably be the principal users.

If by a vote in the United States Senate we block the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway in order to prevent alleged loss of revenue to the railroads, why then would it not follow that we should also vote to curtail appropriations for all other canals, rivers, and harbors in order to prevent loss of revenue to the same railroads?

On the other hand, if we vote to block the St. Lawrence Seaway in order to prevent alleged loss of revenue to our ports, then why do we not also shut down the transcontinental railroads in order to force shipment of goods by the sea lanes and prevent loss of revenue by the ports?

No one in his right mind would suggest that we do any of these things. But logically, such moves are but one step removed from an attempt to defeat the seaway on the basis that its construction would hurt either the ports or the railroads.

Mr. President, I am convinced, after a study of three decades, that the building of the seaway will be of tremendous economic importance and value to this Nation as a whole and will greatly increase our opportunities of defense and of safeguarding the security of the United States and of this continent.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in view of what I think will be the fact—that we shall close tonight the controversy in relation to the St. Lawrence River—I shall not speak again except probably briefly to the amendment.

I have diagnosed, with the aid of the staff, the issues as placed before this body by the opposition, and I have put the diagnosis in question-and-answer form. Because it contains factual information, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I think it would be more helpful if it were printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. WILEY. I so modify my request, Mr. President, and ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPLY TO THE CONTENTIONS OF SENATOR SALTONSTALL CONCERNING THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The speech of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on Monday concerning the St. Lawrence Seaway contains so many innuendoes and criticisms of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the pending bill that it seems advisable to clarify the record by making answers on a point-by-point basis.

The Senator opened his address with the following statement:

"President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message recommended the construction of the seaway itself in the interest of national security. I have great respect for his judgment. It is my firm belief, nevertheless, that there are many questions in connection with the seaway as such that have never been realistically and practically answered."

Answer. Does the Senator take exception to the findings of the President, of the Cabinet, and of the National Security Council? If the Senator does disagree with the conclusion of the President, reached after months of consideration, that seaway participation by the United States is needed by us for security as well as for economic reasons, then let him say so unequivocally. Now, I shall take up numerous contentions by the Senator, many of which the record indicates have a railroad ring.

Point No. 2: "Canada will get, in my opinion, much the larger benefits from the seaway."

Answer. With the population of the United States being 161 million as compared to Canada's of 15 million, and with 70 percent of the prospective annual tonnage estimated either originating or terminating in the United States, it is hard to see where the benefits to the United States will be subordinate to the benefits to Canada.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Point No. 3: "Why should we not be grateful to Canada for undertaking this major project without insisting upon our aid? The United States built the Panama Canal. The English and the French built the Suez Canal. Those canals have been profitably and advantageously used by other nations."

Answer. To be sure other nations have use of those canals profitably and advantageously in peacetime. But let us apply the crucial test. Certainly those nations which control the Panama and Suez Canals are in a decidedly advantageous position in wartime. Certainly we are indulging in no efforts to dispose of the Panama Canal. Nor are the British or French interests giving any indication that they are willing to sell the Suez Canal to the Egyptians. The fact of the matter surely is that nations have placed high strategic value on the control of important waterways, and they maintain such control with all their might.

Point No. 4: "It is argued, however, that if we do not insist upon building part of the waterway in United States territory, we cannot have a voice in its management. The basic assumption of this argument apparently is that only physical control of some portion of the waterway will guarantee us such a voice. Accepting this assumption for the moment, I should like to point out that we already control most of the Thousand Islands section of the waterway. In the Sault St. Marie, we control all the modern locks."

Answer. Of course we are here primarily considering the 114-mile section of the St. Lawrence River from Ogdensburg, N. Y., downstream to Montreal where seven new locks are to be built by Canada alone, or three by the United States and four by Canada. Obviously control of even one of these new locks through which all traffic between Lake Ontario and the Atlantic will pass, to say nothing of three such locks, will give the United States a definite advantage in dealing with Canada in decisions of management and control of the new waterway facility that would not otherwise obtain. Having the location of three locks and two lateral canals aggregating 11 miles in length entirely on our mainland in New York State in the International Rapids section gives us a strong negotiating advantage because of the control of the locks and the construction cost distribution between the two countries shown in the committee's report. To contend that we already control most of the 68-mile Thousand Islands section of the waterway between Lake Ontario and Odgensburg, N. Y., which contains no locks, but merely an open-river channel, is surely not a parallel situation. To refer to the channel mileage which the United States controls in the Great Lakes area and that which Canada controls below the International Rapids section does not alter the core of the situation I have outlined.

Point No. 5: "Quite apart from the question of physical control, we have a form of protection of far more importance between friendly nations. I refer to the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. That treaty guarantees equality of treatment in access and in toll charges to the vessels of both the United States and Canada where navigational works in the boundary waters are concerned."

Answer. What the Senator fails to mention here is that while the toll charges commodity by commodity may be the same, that is not to say that our national and commercial interests will receive the equitable treatment that is their due. In other words, there is danger that items of traffic of a primarily Canadian nature might be accorded toll rates more favorable than those items of a primary United States nature. Additionally, other points of concern to us are first, the matter of priorities for shipping during wartime, bearing in mind that Canada might be a neutral in some future conflict confronting the United States; second, the interest rate to be used in amortizing the seaway investment; third, whether the seaway should be amortized in 20, 30, 50, or 75 years; fourth, whether any tolls are to be applied after the amortization period, and so forth. I may remark here that should we not participate in this project there is every prospect that with the investment written off after say 50 years the Canadians could continue to apply the same toll rates or even increase them at a very lucrative advantage to their treasury, and at penalty to United States shipping.

Point No. 6: "The pending bill, I observe, requires the corporation thereby established to negotiate with the Canadian Seaway Authority rules for the measurement of vessels and cargoes and rates of tolls to be charged. Nothing is said, however, about permanent machinery for the adjustment of these rules and charges. Is Canada to have a voice proportional to its total investment? If so, Canada will always be in a position to outvote us."

Answer. Here I believe the senior Senator from Massachusetts is dotting the i's and crossing the t's. As stated in the committee's report, "No action of the corporation in establishing or changing basic rules of measurement or rates of tolls will take effect except upon receiving the approval of the President of the United States." Surely it is better to have this machinery of bringing such matters to the White House for clearance rather than having no such voice at all. As to whether Canada is to have voting strength proportional to its total investment, there is nothing in the pending legislation that so indicates. Both countries will sit down at the negotiating table as partners to work out a mutually satisfactory arrangement of rules of measurement and tolls. If our Seaway Corporation later wishes to change such rules or tolls, section 12 (a) of the bill must be complied with, namely, holding of a public hearing and obtaining Presidential approval of the changes. Of course, section 12 also provides for such determinations to be made unilaterally in the event of disagreement with Canada.

Point No. 7: "Mr. President, we can hope to obtain agreement on toll charges satisfactory to us only through negotiation. I fail to see how our negotiating position is improving by setting up a corporation and building elaborate locks and canals. If Canada goes ahead, let us negotiate with Canada. The whole history of the two countries justifies complete confidence that Canada will meet us half way."

Answer. Here the Senator takes the rather naive position that our negotiating position will not be improved by having a vital portion of the waterway under our physical control. Can he be serious in this? While it is true that we are on the friendliest of terms with Canada it is also true that the Canadians are known as hard bargainers and there is no escaping the fact that our national interests will be most fully protected by participating in the project with three of seven new locks in our possession rather than in sitting on the sidelines.

Point No. 8: "I submit, therefore, that the question before us is not merely whether we wish a voice in the management of a project which is, in any event, going to be constructed. It is, as it always has been, whether or not its construction is of advantage to the United States."

Answer. While I do not accept the Senator's first premise I do accept his second one and I maintain that the two are inextricably related. The entire case hinges on whether the construction of the project is of advantage to the United States; that is the core of the problem. The President has summed up his entire analysis of the matter when he stated in his state of the Union message:

"Some of our vital heavy materials come increasingly from Canada. Indeed our relations with Canada, happily always close, involve more and more the unbreakable ties of strategic interdependence. Both nations now need the St. Lawrence Seaway for security, as well as for economic reasons. I urge the Congress promptly to approve our participation in its construction."

Point No. 9: "If we participate in it and join in its management at this stage, we are forever committed to make it a success if we can. We may find ourselves in the position of spending more and more to shore up an investment we should never have made. This is just not good business, when we know Canada is ready to go ahead and feels that it will be of distinct benefit to it."

Answer. It is extremely difficult to follow the line of the reasoning of the senior Senator from Massachusetts on that point. Surely Canada is known for not undertaking uneconomic and inadvisable projects. Well do the Canadians know that the idea of tolls for the St. Lawrence River project originated in this country in 1946, to meet what was then considered the principal criticism of the railroads, namely, subsidized waterway projects. The Canadians adopted this self-liquidating approach in their legislation of 1951, for they well know that the American public will pay the lion's share of those tolls since the bulk of the traffic will either originate in this country or terminate here. Canada knows a good business proposition when she sees one. I hope the Senate will assert its wisdom in seeing through all of this argumentative haze and get down to the core of the problem since this is the "9th inning" for determination as to whether we shall or shall not maintain physical control of three of the seven new locks in the upper St. Lawrence River.

Point No. 10: "But whether these are real advantages (Labrador ore shipments to the Midwest, etc.) depends upon a number of questions that I have never seen fairly and properly answered with relation to United States participation in the waterway although I have asked them repeatedly. The first question is: What is the real overall cost of the waterway?"

Answer. Before arriving at his contention that the cost of the waterway project will be $1 billion, rather than $88 million for construction involved in the Wiley bill, the senior Senator from Massachusetts touches on a number of points which justify some commentary and correction. Therefore, before taking up the extravagance of the $1 billion estimate I shall treat a number of his intermediate points.

Point No. 10a: "These (recent) changes in the proposed undertaking, however, do not substantially diminish the ultimate cost to the United States. The power project has always been assumed to be self-liquidating, and so no net saving results from shifting our share of the initial construction cost from the Federal Government to the State of New York. And while the bond issue will make unnecessary appropriations for the navigational works in the International Rapids, it covers only a small fraction of the costs which the Federal Government and the States and municipalities will eventually be committed to assume."

Answer. The shifting of the power project construction from a Federal basis to a State basis most certainly was a major change. The railroads have long raised a loud hue and cry about the large construction appropriation that was previously required under the 1941 executive agreement last debated in this Chamber in June 1952. I say here that if we still had that agreement before us today for adoption the cost to the United States for construction of power and navigation works in the international section of the river from Lake Ontario down to Massena, N. Y., would total about $372

million, as compared with the present figure of $88 million. So a radical reduction has been made in favor of the United States Government. Further, Canada in connection with new works for the Lake Erie to Montreal seaway will now invest $2 for every United States dollar, whereas under the 1941 agreement the proportion was the other way around.

Point No. 10b: "The committee which reported the pending bill has not asked us to authorize this project (deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels) at the present time, but it is inevitable that we will ultimately be asked to do so. Preliminary estimates based on partial engineering surveys, which did not include borings, put the cost at $99.5 million. This figure, if we can judge by previous experience, is probably less than one-half the actual cost."

Answer. The matter of whether the Great Lakes connecting channels between Lakes Superior and Erie shall be deepened from 25 feet, which now generally prevails, to 27 feet, is to be considered separately on its merits. That is the position the administration reached after its analysis of this entire matter.

In fact, in March a year ago, the Senate Public Works Committee by resolution called upon the Corps of Engineers to study that problem, to prepare an up-to-date cost estimate thereon, and to recommend on the advisability of the undertaking as a Federal project. That investigation is under way, a public hearing having been held by the Army engineers last November in Detroit. The Lake Carriers Association is vitally interested in that survey and in the further improvement of those channels, because of the expanding character of the Great Lakes shipping fleet since World War II. That association is sponsoring the development on the basis of interlake shipping operations alone. So everything is open and aboveboard. Down through our history we have progressively improved these channels from their original depth of about 12 feet, with each successive survey investigation having been made by the Army engineers. We propose now the same standard procedure of calling for the customary survey report from the Army engineers, and then the Congress can judge that matter separately upon its own merits.

Concerning the allegation that the Corps of Engineers' preliminary estimate for deepening the connecting channels, namely, $99.5 million, will probably later be shown to be double that amount, I shall say just this. The doubling of estimates by the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agenices, as well as State agencies and private builders, applies to those projects which have been caught under the inflation spiral since 1940. It is just as simple as that. Residential construction throughout the Nation today averages more than two times greater than it was in 1940. Consequently, there is no justifiable basis for claiming that the estimate which the Army engineers will come up with in the current survey report regarding the connecting channels will later be found to be only one-half the final amount.

Point No. 10c: "Even wider discrepancies between estimates and actual costs have been true of other great canals like the Panama and Suez."

Answer. Here again is an old argument which has been brought up a number of times by the railroad witnesses before congressional hearings. Initial engineering planning for the Panama Canal, accomplished shortly after the turn of the century, in no way compares with the high degree of planning for the seaway works embodied in the Wiley bill or with the detailed study now under way for the connecting channels. But to set the record straight on the Panama Canal, I must say that the estimate of Colonel Goethals, prepared after final designs were adopted in 1908, aggregated $375 million, and the actual cost to June 1918, after the Canal was in permanent operation, was $372 million, or $3 million less than the estimate of 1908.

Point No. 10d: "Again it would not be sensible to make the whole Great Lakes region accessible to vessels drawing up to 25 feet without also making it possible for such vessels to get into the Great Lakes harbors. Today none of these harbors will accommodate a ship drawing more than 18 feet."

Answer. That statement is flagrantly inaccurate. All of the major Great Lakes harbors handling iron ore already have channel facilities in their principal areas of the order of 25 to 26 feet in depth. I may mention merely a few: Duluth-Superior, Calumet, Indiana Harbor, port of Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Lorain, and Ashtabula. Those harbors are regularly handling ore carriers drawing up to 24 feet of water, and not 18 feet as alleged. I may point out in passing that, based on tonnage handling, Duluth-Superior ranks second to New York Harbor; and other lake ports within the country's first ten are: Chicago, ninth; and Toledo, tenth.

Point No. 10e: "No up-to-date estimates on the cost of these improvements are available. The only careful study of the question was made in 1929 by the Brookings Institution. This study put the cost at $340 million which, in terms of modern building costs, would be at least $890 million, less the cost of such improvements in Great Lakes' harbors and docks as have been made since 1929. We do have, nevertheless, at least one relatively recent indication that the Brookings Institution survey is not far from the mark. That is a city of Buffalo survey made in 1941 which estimated as $47 million the cost of deepening Buffalo Harbor and port facilities so as to make possible the quick handling of vessels capable of navigating a 27-foot waterway."

Answer. Here again an old railroad argument reappears. It is amazing how the Brookings Institution study of 1929 can be called a careful study, inasmuch as it was prepared primarily by a group of economists, some of whom appear to have had earlier railroad attachments. No detailed engineering planning or cost estimating, in accordance with usual practice, was followed. On the contrary, the estimate was prepared fundamentally by taking previous expenditures made in developing certain foreign and domestic ports, and from those data assuming a generalized average cost for developing a port. The Brookings estimate was intended to include all dockside facilities, terminal reorganizations, and similar charges which are a normal responsibility of local interests at any Federal harbor project, but the report frankly confessed the absence of any comprehensive engineering surveys to establish actual requirements.

I may point out that the opposition escalates a Brookings Institution estimate of $340 million of 1929 to $890 million today, or an increase of 2.6 times. Obviously the opposition is not disturbed by increasing one of their estimates by that amount because of price-level changes, but it chooses to impugn the Army engineers and any others advocating the seaway when some of their earlier estimates made before 1940 rise to double that figure at the time of actual construction, for the same primary reason of price-level advance in the interim.

In summary, the projected Brookings figure of $890 million is so exaggerated that it needs no further treatment. It is almost 30 times greater than the $30-million figure of Federal costs for additional dredging testified to by the Deputy Chief of Engineers, General Robinson, for Federal channel improvements at 16 important United States harbors on the lakes (p. 86 of the House committee hearings).

Finally, such additional improvements as are found necessary at Great Lakes harbors will have to be explored by the Army engineers in accordance with the customary survey report procedure. Congress will have full opportunity to pass upon the merit of each individual case. Obviously, such further harbor improvements on the Great Lakes as will arise in the future will come about even if the Wiley bill is defeated, because Canada is prepared to build the seaway alone, and our own shipping interests on the Great Lakes are pressing for deepening of the connecting channels to 27 feet on the basis of interlake operations alone.

Point No. 10f: "What is proposed as a $100-million self-liquidating project of great advantage and no actual cost will be in fact a $1-billion project of doubtful value, nine-tenths of which will never be self-liquidating."

Answer. This charge by the senior Senator from Massachusetts is extravagant and entirely indefensible, for the reasons already given. There is simply no justifiable basis for claiming that the Wiley bill, involving a cost with interest of some $100 million, is the "foot in the door" for a later additional cost of $900 million. That charge was made by the railroads during the hearings held by the Senate and House committees. Because of the deliberate and constant repetition of that theme, I must restate again the issue now before the Senate.

The issue before the Senate is the narrow proposal as to whether or not we shall participate with Canada in the Lake Erie to Montreal seaway at an estimated cost, including financing charges, of $105 million, as contemplated under the Wiley bill.

The issue is not whether the Great Lakes connecting channels shall be deepened at an additional cost of $100 million, or whatever figure may be proved to be the case. That question is to be brought before the Congress for a separate and later decision.

The issue is not whether harbor improvements in the future at Great Lakes ports are to cost $800 million, the extravagant figure cited by the opponents. Each harbor improvement again will be brought before the Congress by separate feasibility report from the Army engineers, and the Congress will have the fullest opportunity to approve or reject.

The question of deepening the connecting channels and additional harbor improvements on the lakes is irrelevant to the Wiley bill, since those issues will have to be faced separately, either because Canada will build the Lake Erie to Montreal seaway if we fail to participate, or because our own shipping interests are now clamoring for improved facilities for interlake shipping operations alone as a result of changed conditions since World War II.

Now as to the statement by the Senator that these facilities in the Great Lakes area are not to be made self-liquidating, the Senator is correct, unless the Congress decides to reverse our traditional policy of toll-free inland waterway improvements. I may say here that no reason is seen for applying tolls to such Great Lakes area improvements, which would be a discrimination unless they would be applied generally on our entire inland waterway system.

Point No. 10g: "Now I do not, for one moment, argue that all the projects included in the remaining nine-tenths should be self-liquidating any more than most of the river and harbor improvements to our seaboard cities."

Answer. Here the Senator begins to back water. Apparently he does not wish to push hard for tolls in the Great Lakes area lest they also be established to recover the huge Federal costs for building and maintaining our seacoast harbors, including Boston Harbor.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Point No. 11: "Is there a real prospect that the International Rapids section can pay for itself?"

Answer. Of course he doubts that the project can pay out, but he finds himself in disagreement with his own Republican administration which, after exploring anew all of the cost and traffic estimates, reached the following finding, as expressed by Commerce Under Secretary Williams on page 465 of the Senate committee hearings:

"The St. Lawrence Seaway, Lake Erie to Montreal section, so constructed and operated, can reasonably be expected to be self-liquidating over a projected period of 50 years."

Again, on page 467, Mr. Williams testified as follows:

"That, after careful consideration of the cost, operating, prospective tonnage and revenue phases of the project from a long-range point of view, its self-liquidation character is adequately established."

Point No. 12: "Can the proposed 27-foot channel be used by our oceangoing merchant marine? In 1952, when this subject was under debate, I stated that only 6.6 percent of our active merchant fleet, as it was then constituted, could navigate this channel with a depth of 27 feet and carry a payload. That figure included both our Government-owned and our privately owned fleet. Since then, a number of our smaller vessels have been withdrawn from active service. As a result, today only 2 percent of our entire privately owned merchant fleet can navigate the proposed seaway. It is then truly an inland waterway rather than a seaway which we are talking about if we consider the oceangoing merchant marine of the United States."

Answer. The Senator prefaces his remarks on this point with the fallacious statement that the proposed 27-foot channel is the deepest that the existing locks at Sault Ste. Marie and the Welland Canal will take without further heavy expense. Actually the locks in the Welland Canal and the MacArthur Lock at the Soo provide minimum depths of 30 feet over the sills—the same as would be provided in the new St. Lawrence locks under the pending bill—so that no change whatsoever would be needed in any of these structures if a project of any greater depth up to 30 feet were subsequently found required to meet expanding needs of commerce.

Without indulging in semantics as to whether the proposed improvement is a waterway rather than a seaway, it is clearly adequate for immediately prospective traffic—traffic which is sufficient to justify the work by a large margin—and a greater depth can be readily provided at a later date, if required, by channel deepening alone. Moreover, it is adequate for profitable use by a preponderance of the American merchant marine. On that score, I fear the Senator waxed overenthusiastic in stating that only 2 percent of our merchant fleet can navigate the proposed seaway. I am sure he meant to qualify that statement by indicating he was referring to vessels loaded to their maximum carrying capacity. And desirable as that ideal situation may be, the cold hard facts of economic life are that vessels must frequently sail with less than capacity loading so that a large percentage of our general cargo vessels customarily move at drafts within the capacity of a 27-foot project in our deepest harbors. For example, more than 70 percent of American-flag general cargo vessels in foreign trade arriving at or departing from the port of New York during 1952 moved at drafts of 25 feet or less. Essentially the same conditions prevailed at the port of Boston. Now, surely the Senator does not wish to contend that such a large percentage of American-flag vessel movements at our seacoast harbors are consistently made at unprofitable loadings. The answer to the Senator's question, stated concisely, is: Yes, the proposed 27-foot channel can be used by a very large segment of our oceangoing merchant marine with profitable loading.

But the cardinal point here is that only one-fourth of the traffic will be handled by oceangoing vessels. The bulk of the traffic, three-fourths of it, will be moved in lake-type ships for which the 27-foot channel is adequate. Yes, the seaway in large measure has become an eastern extension of Great Lakes type shipping.

Confirmation of what I have just said appears in the testimony of Commerce Under Secretary Williams (p. 472 of the hearings).

Point No. 13: "Will the waterway cause severe loss to our Atlantic and gulf coast ports?"

Answer. The answer is obviously no. It seems clear that a very large percentage of the traffic movement over the seaway will be the newly discovered Labrador iron ore together with existing traffic over the 14-foot St. Lawrence canals, neither of which now contribute to the Atlantic and gulf coast ports. Over the next 50 years the seaway traffic is estimated to reach some 50 million or more tons annually. With iron ore averaging at least 20 million tons annually, with a present annual movement of the order of 10 million tons over the existing 14-foot St. Lawrence canals, and with the inevitable generation of new traffic not now existing, it is evident that only a fraction of the 50 million tons could constitute a diversion from seacoast ports. With the expanding economies of the United States and Canada, the seacoast ports as well as the seaway will share in the added traffic. Since Canada has stated it is prepared to build the seaway alone, the Senator's argument is academic at best.

The opponents are intentionally using a fear campaign. But the railroads and the ports generally have yet to place into the record a factual showing of just what tonnage will be diverted and the net revenue loss to them.

Finally, as regards Boston and the New England area generally, the senior Senator from Massachusetts finds himself in sharp disagreement with the junior Senator from his own State, who does not share such fears.

Point No. 14: "Will the construction of the waterway make it more difficult than ever for our deep-water domestic merchant marine to survive? * * * The committee report on the pending bill estimates 25 percent of seaway traffic as 'subject to movement in seagoing ships.' Almost all of this will be carried by shallow-draft, foreign-flag vessels directly between the Great Lakes and foreign ports. These shipments will thus be lost to our merchant vessels whose deep draft will exclude them from the waterway."

Answer. What I have stated previously in answer to the question as to whether the 27-foot channel can be used by our oceangoing merchant marine applies with full force again here, since the Senator's contentions are based on his unsupportable thesis that American-flag merchant vessels could not profitably use a 27-foot channel. The obvious answer is that if a large percentage of American-flag general cargo vessel movements in foreign trade through our deepest seacoast harbors is consistently made at drafts within the capacity of a 27-foot channel, such movements could and would be made through the St. Lawrence seaway. Moreover, even if the contentions were true, which I deny most emphatically, these arguments still would be a tempest in a teapot because any claims made by the Senator would apply with equal force to a seaway constructed solely by Canada. Or does the Senator, for the purpose of this argument, refuse to recognize the fact that Canada most assuredly will build the seaway alone if we fail to take advantage of this fleeting opportunity to participate in the improvement and thus gain a rightful voice in its operation? And, to maintain perspective, let us never lose sight of the fact that all of these arguments concerning seagoing vessels apply to only about 25 percent of prospective seaway traffic—a movement during the early years of the project about the size of the present volume of traffic through the outmoded half-century-old 14-foot canals along the St. Lawrence.

Point No. 15: "Will not the construction of the waterway bring disastrous competition to our intercoastal Great Lakes shipping?"

Answer. Mr. President, the Senator's concern for Canadian and American interests in the Great Lakes area is most commendable. It is gratifying to know that his opposition is not based on any narrow sectional interest or consideration for special interests. His position would, however, be much more convincing if he would explain how an all-Canadian seaway, the inevitable result of our failure to participate now, would have any less adverse effect of this nature than a joint enterprise in which the United States would have a rightful voice in operation.

Point No. 16: "Will not the waterway increase the operating costs of competing inland transportation systems?"

Answer. Let us not accept blindly the exaggerated and unsubstantiated cries of disaster from railroads, because that is an old story repeated time after time in connection with every proposal for major waterway improvement since the Panama Canal was first proposed, and before. History has shown that actually the railroads are major beneficiaries of these far-reaching improvements which stimulate our economic growth and strength. But to answer the Senator's specific contentions we need only examine the type of commodities making up the bulk of anticipated traffic over the seaway. A very large percentage will be commodities such as iron ore and coal, which are well adapted to seasonal movement and which generally are not now moving by rail. Another large class will be the agricultural products for which transportation demands are naturally seasonal, coming at a time when the seaway will be open and existing inland transportation facilities are notoriously inadequate to fully meet the demand, a fact of which our midwestern and western farmers are only too well aware. And again, let us remember that Canada will build the seaway alone if we do not participate, with the same effect on our inland transportation system as if a joint project were provided.

Point No. 17: "Will the waterway increase the vulnerability of our inland transportation system to bombing and sabotage?"

Answer. The Senator's argument is based on the assumption that construction of the seaway will cause great harm to other forms of transportation, a premise I cannot accept for reasons previously stated. Then, too, it ignores again that the seaway will be built by Canada alone, with exactly the same effect on other forms of transportation as a joint project, if we do not take advantage of our opportunity to participate. Actually, no discussion of vulnerability is complete without pointing out that the new seaway locks will be no more susceptible to enemy action than the Soo locks, through which the bulk of our vital wartime supply of iron ore from continental sources must pass, and they would be less susceptible than shipments of ore over exposed sea lanes to coastal ports. With two relatively protected inland routes for large-volume ore movement, successful enemy action causing temporary disruption of movements over one route would not be vital to wartime steel production unless the other route were damaged simultaneously. Such simultaneous damage is far less probable than the possible disruption of the Soo locks alone, with dire consequences, if the seaway were not available. Thus the hazards to the wartime security of our entire Nation are

much greater without the seaway than with it.

Point No. 16: "These, then, are the questions which still disturb me about the proposed project. Though I recognize its advantages, these seem to me to be outweighed by the added difficulties that it will create for our Atlantic and gulf ports, our oceangoing merchant marine and our competing systems of inland transportation, and by the tremendous added costs necessary to make it useful to us. It does not appear to me that this is a sound investment or a necessary expenditure. I shall, therefore, vote against it."

Answer. The Senator and I are, of course, in basic disagreement in our conclusions. Whereas he feels that the advantages of the seaway would be outweighed by certain disadvantages, I am firmly convinced that the purported disadvantages will in actuality be mere trifles when balanced against the tremendous advantages to be realized from the seaway. The difficulties the seaway would create for seaports, our oceangoing merchant marine, and inland transportation system, if these contentions were valid, would still be experienced with an all-Canadian seaway. The United States share of the cost of new navigation works under the pending bill would be very modest as compared to the large economic and strategic advantages we can gain by participating in the enterprise, and those costs will be fully repaid within a reasonable period of time from the revenues. Consequently, I shall certainly vote for the bill and heartily recommend that other Senators do the same.

PRACTICES OF PRIVATE UTILITIES IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST—REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a front-page story from the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News of January 15 and two articles from the Idaho Farm Journal of December 31. All three pertain to an initiative proposed by the Idaho Citizens Legislative Committee, Inc.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News of January 15, 1954]

LEADER OF INITIATIVE MOVE CITES MOTIVE

The initiative proposed by the Idaho Citizens Legislative Committee, Inc., to put Idaho in the utilities business is designed to protect the public against the "abuses of monopolies," according to the chairman of the committee.

Answering the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce attack of the initiative as "State socialism of the worst type," Asher B. Wilson, Twin Falls attorney who heads the committee, declared recourse should be open to citizens when fees charged by privately operated utilities for services become "exorbitant."

The initiative would establish a commission empowered to take over the facilities of privately owned utilities and develop new resources. The committe is circulating petitions to obtain the 27,000 signatures necessary to put the bill on ballots in the November general elections.

In the opinion of Wilson, the extent to which the commission would exercise powers to acquire privately owned systems would depend largely upon the ability of the companies to meet competition from the public power developments which would come about as a result of the bill.

Cheap power holds the key to the growth of the State, he declared. The State of Washington, where he says residents can buy electric power for 40 percent less than Idahoans pay, has had a 60 percent increase in population in the past decade. The savings and the growth have been largely the result of competition between public and private power, Wilson claims.

"The thing we propose is not revolutionary," he said. "It is nothing more than New York has had for 30 years. The same thing exists in California, Arizona and Washington."

If the issue reaches ballots in November, the vote will go a long way toward solving the debate over Hells Canyon, he opined.

If the initiative were to carry, it would place Idaho in a position to enter a compact with Washington and Oregon for the development of Hells Canyon—provided Federal hearings on the question were to rule that neither the Government nor Idaho Power Co., but the States involved should undertake the project, he said.

Cheap power, whatever its source, would pave the way for refining phosphates from deposits in eastern Idaho, he said. At present power rates the project is not feasible, he claimed.

The bill takes in communications systems to give the people recourse against the telephone monopoly as well as the power monopoly, he said. The term "communications systems" is not intended to cover radios, newspapers, and transportation utilities, he said.

[From the Idaho Farm Journal of December 31, 1953]

FARM JOURNAL'S STATE LETTER

GOVERNOR GOT EXCITED

When Gov. Len Jordan read the suggested initiative which would make it possible for Idaho to govern its water, its communications, and its electric power, if such were the wish of the people, he squealed like a stuck pig. Immediately he declared he was opposed to the Government going into business and declared that's just what the initiative would do. That the Governor will fight even having Idaho's citizens sign the petition to put the matter before the voters seems sure. And yet, in the opinion of most observers, Governor Jordan himself is more to blame for the matter coming up than anyone else.

TALK ALONE WON'T CHANGE IT

Ever since he took office, Governor Jordan has been an open and vicious foe of the Federal Government building multiple-purpose dams which would generate power, even when irrigation would be benefited. He has been particularly adamant on Hells Canyon Dam and has fought against a high Federal project all the way, declaring that Idaho Power Co. alone should have the 100 miles of the deepest gorge in the United States. But the Governor has gone even further and has now brought out a partnership plan for building future dams, and that is perhaps one of the biggest reasons for the proposal to give the people themselves a chance to vote on public power. Talk alone, even by a governor, does not change people's minds.

WHAT KIND OF PARTNERSHIP?

What made the public power advocates of Idaho, as well as of all other Northwestern States, so furious at Len Jordan's partnership plan is that it isn't, they maintain, a partnership at all. Public utility districts, REA's, municipalities, and others are not included. As they see it, the plan would provide for the power companies to divide up the rivers of the Northwest, each one taking whatever power sites it wanted. Then the States would cooperate by giving the power company the sites. The Federal Government would cooperate by granting each power company as many licenses as it wanted. But the final bit of partnership by the Federal Government would be to dig up money for the nonreimbursable features of these partnership dams. In other words, a power company could build a dam primarily for power, but it could claim that such a dam, even though a small one, aided in flood control. The United States Government would fork over the money for that. Then it would be found that there were recreational advantages, and Uncle Sam would dig up for that. The taxpayers would probably shell out for navigation benefits too, and there would, no doubt, be other claims on partner Uncle Sam.

RECLAMATION KICKED IN PANTS

There is no provision in Governor Jordan's plan for further irrigation, except by pumping from wells. Public utility districts, Bonneville Power Administration, REA coops and others would be frozen out. The Bureau of Reclamation would no longer be needed, for the Army engineers, who are deft politicians, would be the logical ones to make surveys for the States, the power companies and the Federal Government. Supporters of Hells Canyon, many irrigationists dozens of municipalities and PUD's became genuinely alarmed at the Governor's plan. But they heard rumors that disturbed them more. One such rumor is that Len Jordan, who has only a little more than a year to serve in office, is pushing his partnership plan as hard as he can to complete it if possible so that when he steps out of the State House in Boise he can walk right into a Federal job as coordinator of the partnership plan. That is when public power advocates got down to serious business in Idaho and brought out the petition for an initiative. They want to make Governor Jordan an issue, his partnership plan an issue, and air the whole matter before the people.

WHO IS BACK OF INITIATIVE?

Asher B. Wilson, of Twin Falls, a lawyer and farmer; Elmer F. McIntyre, Boise, labor union; J. G. Bowers, of Nampa; Carl A. Harder, of Buhl; and Frank Atkins, Buhl, all farmers, incorporated the Idaho Citizens Legislative Committee, Inc. Their avowed purpose is to bring government back to the people, especially where natural resources development and utilities are concerned. They point out that Idaho people under Idaho Power Co. and Utah Power Co. pay approximately 40 percent more than is charged in Washington and Oregon where there is Federal power. Because of telephone rates, 60 percent of Idaho's people have no telephones. When charges become oppressive, or better methods can be found, the initiative—if it ever gets on the ballot—would allow the people of Idaho to take over utilities. Such a proposal is bound to be termed socialistic.

WHO OWNS THE WATERWORKS?

As the Idaho Citizens Legislative Committee points out in its letter accompanying the petitions, 40 years ago Idaho's citizens were voting to take over domestic water systems in the cities and towns. That was branded socialistic. Yet today, only Boise, Coeur d'Alene, and Jerome have private companies owning the water systems. All the other towns own their own wells, pumps, water mains, and distributing systems. Perhaps that is creeping socialism, but few towns today would give up their water systems or the revenue they get each year from them. The petition does nothing more than let a group of Idaho citizens put the proposed initiative law on the ballot for next fall. At that time every citizen of Idaho can vote for it or against it. Even if it is put on the books, it does not mean that the State is going into the utility business. But it would give the people of Idaho a pretty strong weapon for controlling utilities and monopolies.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

[From the Idaho Farm Journal of December 31, 1953]

NOW ADMITTED THAT TAXPAYERS WILL DIG UP FOR "PRIVATE" POWER DAMS

(By Ed Emerine)

Under the new "partnership" policy outlined by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, 5 Pacific Northwest private power companies lost no time in filing a joint application with the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit to investigate 2 huge hydroelectric sites in Idaho.

The companies are Montana Power Co., Washington Water Power Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., Portland General Electric Co., and Mountain States Power Co.

One or more other companies may join the group later, J. E. Corette, president of Montana Power, said.

The permit application follows the announcement on December 7 that the companies would cooperate to build new powerplants in line with the Government's "partnership policy."

The sites are in north Idaho. Bruces Eddy is on the north fork of the Clearwater, about 43 miles east of Lewiston, Idaho. Penny Cliffs is on the Clearwater's middle fork, about 80 miles from Lewiston.

ESTIMATED AT $305 MILLIONS

Army engineers have estimated the cost of the 2 projects at about $305 million.

Kinsey Robinson, president of Washington Water Power Co., said the exploration would be on plans worked out by the Army engineers to meet objections to earlier proposals. The new plan keeps the south fork of the Clearwater open for unobstructed fish migration and also makes it unnecessary to relocate Kooskia, which was in the original idea, Robinson said.

The proposed dams would provide 3,730,000 acre-feet of useful storage for power generation, flood control, and other uses, the statement said.

The tentative plans of the 5 companies call for a 576-foot rock-fill dam at Bruces Eddy with a power installation of 244,000 kilowatts. The dam would provide 1,430,000 acre-feet of storage for river control.

A 596-foot dam at Penny Cliffs would have an installed capacity of 292,000 kilowatts and 2,300,000 acre-feet of storage.

HOW PARTNERSHIP WOULD WORK

Under the partnership, the Federal Government would either build the dam or reimburse the power companies for building it. This Federal portion of the cost would be charged to flood-control, recreation, navigation, and other useful purposes for the general public and the welfare or defense of the United States. The power companies would pay only for power installations, generators, lines, etc.

As John Corlett pointed out Tuesday in the Boise Statesman:

"It is presumed that under a partnership arrangement, for example, Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliffs would be built by private enterprise. The Federal Government would contribute to the construction in the amount of costs assessable to flood control, navigation, and recreation.

"The other costs—power, etc.—would be charged to the private power companies.

"After the dam was built, the Federal Government would sell falling water at the penstocks to the private power companies. Over a period of years, even the nonreimbursable costs, never repaid under the present arrangements of building Federal dams, would be paid off."

AS WE HAVE LONG CONTENDED

Just as this writer and the Journal have been telling the farmers, merchants, and others in Idaho for months, the taxpayers, themselves, will build and pay for all of these partnership dams. This admission from the partnership crowd was long in coming, but we're glad at last that they have come out and told the truth.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the initiative proposed by the Idaho Citizens Legislative Committee, Inc., is convincing evidence of a grassroots revolt against those activities of privately operated utilities which are detrimental to the public interest. It should serve as a warning to the Idaho Power Co. and other private utility monopolies that they have more than their own financial interests to serve. These news articles constitute reminders of the fact that such utilities should also function in the public interest and that they cannot expect the public to stand by without protesting when predatory practices are pursued.

I should like to point out that Mr. Asher B. Wilson, chairman of the Idaho Citizens Legislative Committee, has been for a third of a century a highly respected owner and operator of extensive irrigated farmlands on the Twin Falls tract. His interest in the development of Idaho's natural resources is of long standing, well grounded and genuine.

Mr. President, I wish to have the comments I have just made and the contents of the articles which I am offering for the RECORD constitute a short report of the representative of the Independent Party in the Senate in opposition to the growing practices of private utilities in the Pacific Northwest against the public interest.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence Seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have heard many arguments pro and con with reference to the St. Lawrence Seaway project, not only in this session of the Congress, but in the decades which have gone by. This important subject has been debated for 23 years, and a considerable amount of testimony has been taken and many words have been spoken in behalf of it and in opposition to it. I think the time is at hand to apply to the Senate the theme of the great radio and television drama known as Dragnet—"All we want, sir, are the facts; just the facts."

I have substituted the word "sir" for the word "ma'am", making it somewhat more fitting and appropriate, but I might use the word "ma'am" out of respect for the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH.]

What are the facts? Not, What are the fictions? But again in the words of the theme "Dragnet," what are the facts? These are the facts:

It would be a self-sustaining and self-liquidating project; it would not be a burden on the American taxpayer; but, rather, would be an investment for the people, which would produce dividends. That may be summarized as fact No. 1, with supplementation.

Fact No. 2: Those charged with the security of our Nation have consistently and constantly endorsed the St. Lawrence project as being in the interest of the national security.

It is interesting to note that the opposition to this program has not been able to muster one single military authority as a witness to delay or to stop the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Fact No. 3: The building of this important seaway would greatly stimulate economic and industrial development of the entire Great Lakes area, as well as stimulate domestic and foreign trade for the entire Nation.

Fact No. 4: It is economic foolishness to deny access to the sea for the vast traffic of the Great Lakes region, which surpasses all the traffic on the Panama, Suez, and the Kiel Canals combined.

I am certain, to digress for a moment, that that fact alone would have impressed the now world-famous detective in Dragnet. When in terms of volume of traffic 3 canals can be placed in 1, that is a fact, not a fiction.

Fact No. 5: It is not in the interest of our Nation to increase the concentration of every industry on the east coast, where plants, war materials, and supply lines are vulnerable to enemy attack.

Again, I digress to supplement my remarks. I have heard many comments as to the vulnerability of the proposed canals and locks of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Mr. President, if those canals and locks will be vulnerable, I ask Senators who resist and oppose the project, How much more vulnerable is the concentration of heavy American industry on the seaboard of the United States of America? If there is one great weakness in American defense today, it is the failure to decentralize American industrial and productive facilities. We may very well rue the day we fail to make the decision to decentralize.

The St. Lawrence Seaway will offer an opportunity to decentralize, not by Government edict, but by sound economic facts and necessity. Once the arteries of transportation into the heartland of America have been developed, we shall see a decentralization of industry that will be good for the Nation economically, politically, and from the standpoint of security. The Acting President pro tempore at the moment, the distinguished

senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], will see his area of the country grow and thrive, as other areas throughout the midcontinent section of the Nation will grow.

Fact No. 6: Cosponsorship with Canada in the seaway project will strengthen the ties of friendship and cooperation between our countries, unite us in development of the great hemispheric market, and offer an example to the rest of the world of international cooperation in economic development and progress.

Mr. President, the example of a deed performed in the spirit of international cooperation, in the fulfillment of international cooperation, is better than any treaty, any words, or any pronouncement by the head of any state, any foreign minister, or any Secretary of State.

Mr. President, those are what I consider to be obvious, basic facts. It is on the basis of those facts that Senate bill 2150 will be passed by the Senate, will be enacted as a public law, and will become part of the history of the development of the United States of America.

I really feel that we are at a historical moment in the development of this Nation, because I am convinced, beyond shadow of a doubt, that the votes are in the Senate for the passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

I now wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] for his leadership and steadfastness of purpose in giving guidance and direction to the bill, both in the Committee on Foreign Relations and on the floor of the Senate. I think the passage of the bill will be a great testimonial to his statesmanship, to his perseverance, and to his devoted patriotism to his country, because, indeed, he has seen a vision, and he will have made it a reality within a matter of hours.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota in commending not only the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who is in charge of the bill, but also other Senators who, over the years, have never lost sight of the importance of the St. Lawrence Waterway, both for the development of commerce and the improvement of the security of our country, and also for the development of hydroelectric power.

Although the hydroelectric power feature has been eliminated from this particular bill, while previous bills included that feature, nevertheless, I am of the opinion that passage of S. 2150 will prove to be a great impetus for expediting all the power resources of the area, as well. It is an old story that once a start is made upon a very sound improvement in an area, it leads to many other improvements.

Although there are Senators who say it is unfortunate that the power feature was eliminated from the bill, nevertheless I happen to be one of those who believe that passage of the bill will strengthen the power program as well. I have not lessened one whit in my enthusiastic support of the St. Lawrence Waterway, even though I disagreed a few minutes ago with the majority in the Senate as to the fiscal policy which should be followed. My difference with them is a difference in respect to how I think funds under the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States should be handled. In my opinion, it is a mistake for the Congress to follow a fiscal course of action which will have the effect of binding other Congresses, although we know that technically and legally we did not do it and could not do it. Nevertheless, we know the effect of it would be to do just that.

But my difference of opinion with regard to the manner of procedure represents no difference of opinion as to the merits and the desirability of the seaway. I shall vote for the bill, reserving still, in the closing hours of the debate, the right to consider any amendment on its merits. But I shall vote for the bill, because, in my judgment, it is essential for all the reasons which have been advanced by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], to strengthen the economy and the defenses of the United States.

In my judgment, also, the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway will build up an area that will permit, I believe, the early development of the hydroelectric resources, as well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I certainly would be remiss in my responsibility in commenting upon the bill if I did not say that the junior Senator from Oregon has given valuable support to the bill. Coming as he does from a west coast State, far beyond the area to be immediately served by the St. Lawrence Seaway, his statement is a measure of his overall interest in and devotion to the development of the Nation as a whole. The junior Senator from Oregon is supporting a project which he believes will not only benefit what we call mid-America, but also the entire Nation.

It is for that reason that I have many times supported programs such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, and programs for the development of rivers and harbors along the Mississippi River and its tributaries. Even though they may not directly affect the State of the junior Senator from Minnesota, they affect the total well-being of the Nation.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to express my very sincere appreciation for the bouquets which have been thrown at me by two very wonderful Senators. While the Senator from Oregon is from the west coast, he is a product of Wisconsin, and the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota is from the State just across the river from Wisconsin.

I must say that if we are successful this evening in carrying the pending bill to a successful conclusion, it will be due in large measure to almost a 100 years of seeking by men of vision to open up the great St. Lawrence Seaway.

Every Member of the Senate, including the two distinguished Senators who have just spoken, who through the years have consistently supported the idea of this project, I am sure will get an inner satisfaction, because within there will be heard the words, "Well done, thou good and faithful servants of your beloved country, because your country needs this project."

I again thank both the Senators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his contribution to the discussion, and I wish to say that I look just a little way across the Chamber and I see the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who has for more than 20 years been fighting for the St. Lawrence Seaway. I know it will be a happy day in his life when this bill passes, at long last. Let it be known that this measure has had the support of Republicans and Democrats in the White House and in the Congress. The issue we debate today has been debated, as I have said, for 23 years. There has been almost a quarter of a century of long debate about it. During that time hearings have been held before 10 congressional committees of the Senate and the House, and 133 days have been occupied by Members of Congress in hearing testimony from 807 witnesses who submitted 8,977 pages of testimony.

Mr. President, there never has been a project which has been more thoroughly investigated and explored, more strongly approved and opposed, and more fully studied. So we are not legislating quickly, or without adequate evidence and experience. We are legislating with full knowledge of all the many problems which are inherent in the development of such a great program.

The testimony has filled 10 volumes, weighing more than 20¾ pounds. There can be no doubt that the record is complete in everything that can be said with regard to the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The time has come for the Congress of the United States to act. This is the last opportunity any Congress of the United States will have to act on this matter. I am confident that the Senate will not fail to pass the pending measure, as I said earlier, but if we fail in our responsibility, we will not be acting in the best interest of the United States.

The debate this year is in one sense different from the debate of previous years. It is clear that the St. Lawrence Seaway will be built whether or not the Congress authorizes the United States to participate in the construction project. Canada's Parliament on December 12, 1951, by a unanimous vote passed bill 33, an act to establish the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority.

Mr. President, I suggest that Canada may have railroads, private utilities, and other economic interests, yet by unanimous vote in the Parliament the Canadians saw the magnificent opportunity

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

for their great country which was theirs in this seaway.

By the Parliament the authority was authorized to construct the St. Lawrence Seaway entirely within the boundaries of Canada, and borrow $300 million to be used for that purpose. The opponents of the seaway have, therefore, lost their most crucial battle. Since the seaway will be built regardless of our action, the issue facing the Congress is whether or not it is in the interest of our national welfare and national security to participate in the construction project. If we participate, as I urge, then the United States, as a part owner, will have a voice in the determination of its operating policies, its traffic priorities, and its control.

Mr. President, I have heard many arguments made in the Senate to the effect that if Canada is going to build the seaway, why not let her build it, that after all Canada is our friend, and why should we have to help in the construction of the project? There is a very simple reason why a great international highway such as that now proposed, should be under international control.

A highway which is deemed by the highest officials of our Defense Establishment as vital to the security of the United States ought not to be left entirely in the hands of even a friendly power.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate, good a friend as Canada is, would they rely upon the Canadian Air Force alone to defend us? Would they rely upon Canadian oil and Canadian minerals alone, despite the great friendship Canada has for the United States? It would be only prudent and wise, if there were a choice between common ownership, common sponsorship, and common management, and Canadian management and sponsorship, that there be a cooperative program. With both countries joining in the project its success would be assured.

Here is a great water highway which penetrates into the heartland of America. With a few obstructions cleared away, it will literally bring the Atlantic Ocean into the great plateaus, the great plains of America.

We hear the question raised in the Senate, "Why not let Canada do it alone?" If that is to be considered, I ask my colleagues, why not give her the Great Lakes?

Senators could well say, "Oh, no; we have our coownership of the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes are the boundaries between Canada and the United States. Canada does not want us to have them alone, and we do not want her to have them alone, despite our close friendship."

I am confident that we in the United States, who have jealously guarded our ownership of the secrets of developing atomic energy because it is vital to our national security, are not now prepared to give them away.

But here we have a partner to the north, an historic friend, who says, "We are willing to join with you; in fact, we seek copartnership and comanagement, in the general development of the greatest arterial water highway on the face of the earth."

Mr. President, the tragedy of our history is that we have delayed this project far too long, at great expense to the national well-being.

I wish to rebut one other fallacious argument which I believe has been advanced all too often. On the subject of the St. Lawrence Seaway, we hear voices raised saying that it would be a burden upon the American taxpayer. It would not be a burden. This is one of the few great investments the American taxpayer has ever had a chance to make. It is an opportunity to buy a security which is gilt-edged in every sense of the word, security for our national domain, and security for our national prosperity.

It is equally advantageous from the standpoint of Canada. That is why the Canadians were willing to spend $300 million of their own funds, although their country has a population of somewhat less than 15 million persons. Yet, in the United States of America, the greatest industrial and agricultural country on the face of the earth, we find voices raised in this Chamber in opposition to the project, and statements are made to the effect that it may cost too much, even though it will be self-liquidating, self-sustaining, and will be an investment, rather than an expenditure, for American taxpayers.

Mr. President, I know that today the American people are economy minded, as they always have been. Our people are frugal and prudent. If we fail to participate with Canada in the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, we shall be placing an unnecessary burden of millions of dollars upon the economy of the United States and upon American agriculture, labor, and industry, which support that economy.

The St. Lawrence Seaway project bill, for which we urge approval today, provides for a self-sustaining and self-liquidating project which, therefore, in the end will not be any burden at all to American taxpayers. The project is an investment, as I have said, for the people of the United States, and it will produce real dividends.

Mr. President, at this time let me quote from a statement made by a distinguished public servant, to demonstrate the point I have just made. My authority is none other than a man who frequently was called the "businessman's President"; I refer to Calvin Coolidge, who, in his first annual message to the Congress, which was delivered on December 6, 1923, and in referring to appropriations for this project and other water improvement projects, said, in part:

> This is not incompatible with economy, for their nature does not require so much a public expenditure as a capital investment which will be reproductive, as evidenced by the marked increase in revenue from the Panama Canal. Upon these projects depends much future industrial and agricultural progress. They represent * * * the addition of a great amount of cheap power and cheap freight by use of navigation, chief of which is the bringing of oceangoing ships to the Great Lakes.

Calvin Coolidge was a great man, born in Vermont, but gaining stature in Massachusetts. I am delighted that we now have in the Senate of the United States another distinguished public servant from Massachusetts, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who delivered what I consider to be the most significantly important and forceful speech which has been made in behalf of the St. Lawrence Seaway project. He is one who puts his country above section, and who has seen the light of a great vision of a richer and more prosperous United States of America, through the development of internal works, the great systems of transportation and public works which can mean so much to our private enterprise and private economy.

No, Mr. President, the St. Lawrence Seaway project will not be a burden upon United States taxpayers; but if Canada were to construct the project alone, a disproportionate burden would be placed on the shoulders of United States taxpayers. Why is that? It is simply because the ratio between the population of the United States and the population of Canada is 11 to 1. In other words, there are 160 million persons in the United States, as compared to 15 million persons in Canada; and by the time this project is completed, in the next few years, there will be 175 million persons in the United States. Certainly that will be the population of our Nation by 1960. Such a ratio means that from 85 to 90 percent of the potential traffic which will move over this waterway will originate on the farms or be destined for the farms, the factories, and mills, and other great industries of the United States. So, if we do not have an opportunity to participate in the decisions as to the toll charges for the use of this facility, if Canada is to build it alone, the result will be that United States industry and agriculture will be paying a disproportionate amount of the tolls which will repay to Canada her investment in the project.

Mr. President, I know that Congress is proud of the fact that it is filled with men of business experience; but I must say there have been times that I have been somewhat dubious of their business judgment; for instance, when the Congress hesitates to make an investment in a project which will pay for itself, which will be self-liquidating and self-sustaining, and will permit us to have at least a proportionate share of control. When Congress hesitates to take action to do that—as Congress has hesitated for years—is it any wonder that some of their constituents wonder whether the Members of Congress have good business judgment and whether we understand good business practices, because now we are faced with the fact that Canada is going to build the St. Lawrence Seaway project anyway, and, as I have already pointed out, the operators of United States ships and United States citizens owning cargo and merchandise which will move over the waterway will be the ones who will pay the great majority of the tolls. Yet, after all those payments have been made, Canada will have both the toll money and ownership of the project itself. If anyone can figure out how that is a good "deal" for the United States, indeed he has an insight into

business development and business practice far beyond that of the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Canada not only will own this waterway if she builds it, but she will control it, although the economy of the United States will forever be paying the greater proportion of the tolls, or, if we wish to use the word, will be paying tribute in the form of tolls. Such a course of action not only is unreasonable, but it is unwise and uneconomical. Congress must not allow that to happen. Congress must authorize the United States to participate with Canada in the project; and that we shall do.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge that the project be approved.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Is the Senator from Minnesota suggesting that if we enter upon the construction of this project with Canada, United States shippers and shipowners will not have to pay tolls for using the project?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I am not suggesting that at all. I am suggesting that if we join with Canada in constructing the project we then shall have something to say about how much the tolls shall be, the priority of shipments, and the control of water traffic. In that event we shall be in a position of management.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Minnesota does not expect that rules the same as or similar to those applying to the Panama Canal will be applied to this project, does he? Of course, in the case of the Panama Canal, the United States is the owner, and the tolls charged for using that canal are uniform.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have every reason to believe that the tolls charged on the St. Lawrence Waterway will be uniform; but I also have reason to believe that United States shipping and industry will pay, as the record will reveal, approximately 70 percent of the tolls, because United States shipping and industry will be using the project to at least that extent. Thus, after such very large payments have been made by United States concerns, the result will be that we shall have paid for the project, but we shall not have ownership or control of it. That situation is similar to the renting of a house: After a man pays rent on a house for 20 years, the landlord still owns the house, and all the renter has is a number of rent-payment receipts.

Therefore, it will be much wiser for us to arrange to pay for this project in installments. That arrangement would be similar to the one entered into when a person arranges to pay for a house in installments, each of which is approximately in the same amount as the rent he otherwise would have to pay; but at the end of the process of paying the installments, he owns the house.

Mr. FLANDERS. I merely wish the RECORD to show clearly that the Senator from Minnesota is not suggesting that the tolls required of United States ships and the tolls required of Canadian ships might be different.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I am sure the tolls will be uniform. I am confident that the Canadians will be exceedingly fair, because they and their government are exceedingly fair and honorable.

I am only saying that if we have a choice between joint ownership and no ownership, inasmuch as we are going to use the project, it would be much better for us to have joint ownership.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. My distinguished friend and neighbor in this Chamber, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], is making an excellent address. I am happy that he is paying such close attention to a matter which I think has not received sufficient attention in the course of the debate. I have listened to all the debate, I believe; I understand that I have heard every speech which has been made.

I have concluded to support the pending bill. Ranking high among my reasons for supporting it is the friendship between the United States and Canada and what seems to me an impelling reason why the United States should continue that cooperation.

Canada has solicited our participation in the development of this international resource. Does not the Senator from Minnesota think that the United States should pause and think long and hard before declining to enter into a partnership with a nation whose friendship is so dear and precious to us, and whose geographical location is so important to our defense in case of an all-out war?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Tennessee that, in the form of a question, he has made the most powerful argument which can be made in behalf of this project. His interrogation contains its own answer, which is obvious, powerful, and exceedingly meaningful. Here we have a partner, a friend—a friend in arms, in time of war, and a friend in progress in time of peace. Canada is a historic friend. These two great peoples have the mighty St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes, which in a sense are like a chasm between the two Nations, and yet a bridge. What the Canadians have asked us to do is to make this great river and these Great Lakes into a bridge, a highway, so that we can work together more closely, develop our commerce and trade, and grow together as one great economy. As the Senator from Tennessee has so well pointed out, one should not turn away from the hand of fellowship of a great country like Canada and reject her offer or request that we join with her in a worldwide demonstration of what free peoples can do.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the distinguished Senator from Minnesota know of any respect in which Canada has been niggardly either in the development of this resource on her part, or in the use by the United States of that part of the resource which she has already developed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not in the slightest. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that I believe the Canadians have exhibited patience almost beyond human endurance waiting for us, and hoping that, as equal partners, we could march down the road of progress and development together.

Mr. GORE. I have been unimpressed by the argument that the project might hurt this port or that port or that it might operate to the disadvantage of this railroad or that railroad. I believe that the development of this resource may very well be of great national benefit, just as the development of the ports on the Gulf of Mexico has added to the commerce of my State, just as the development of the Tennessee River has been a great national asset. It has helped the State of New York, the Senator's State of Minnesota, and all other States. Whatever makes this country, the United States of America, stronger is a great help to all the people of the United States.

I have been impressed by the argument that this project would open up a fourth shoreline. I have been impressed by the statement that this project would add to the economy of the United States, that it would open up a way to bring ore into the United States. The arguments against it seem to be more narrowly put. I believe that I would place highest on my list of reasons for approving the project the perpetuation of the historic friendly relations between the United States and Canada.

I compliment my distinguished friend from Minnesota for his able address. I consider him one of the greatest debaters and speakers in the United States Senate. I always listen to him with pleasure, and frequently—though not always—with approbation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I suppose at a moment like this the best thing to do is to say, "Thank you" and agree.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course I fully concur in what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has said. I had the privilege of personally working very closely with the Canadian Government during the many years I was Governor of my State. Later, when I became active in international organizations, I also had the privilege and opportunity of working with many representatives of the Canadian Government.

There is another subject on which I wish to dwell for a moment. I mentioned it rather casually in my remarks of an hour ago. In the unhappy event that we should be compelled to engage in a war as a belligerent, if Canada were to maintain its neutrality, which is always possible, and if the canal were under the exclusive control of Canada, rather than under the joint control of Canada and the United States, as is provided for in the treaty and in the bill, would it not be likely, or certain, that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the facilities of the canal would be denied to the United States? I do not think that is going to happen. I hope to God it will never happen. I believe that the United States and Canada will always stand on the same side; but there is always the possibility to which I have referred, is there not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator from New York that the possibility exists. I agree with him that the probability is highly remote, but the possibility exists.

I am confident that the reason our defense officials have been so consistent in their support of the St. Lawrence project is the very reason which the Senator is now bringing forth, plus the economic development of our country and the realization on the part of the defense officials that the economy of the country represents the basis of American security, and its strong foundation.

I thank the Senator from New York, I know of no man who has had more experience with the development of this project. As Governor of the State of New York the distinguished Senator for years led the fight for the full realization of the St. Lawrence Seaway, with hydroelectric power. I regret that that feature is not included in this particular measure. I believe that hydroelectric power will come, but we shall have to fight that battle on the merits when the question is brought before us.

Therefore, I urge this project be approved, however, not for economy reasons alone. I urge it in the interest of the national security of our country. It is significant that for the past 30 years every President of the United States, whether Democrat or Republican, has favored the joint construction of the St. Lawrence project with Canada.

I think it is equally significant that this is one project which represents the national interest, which for a long time has been blocked by special interests. Let me ponder that thought for a moment. This is a project which really represents the national interests, which for far too long a period of time, have been blocked by well-known special interests.

The present Republican administration under President Eisenhower has likewise urged approval of the project. I desire to quote a portion of the President's recent state of the Union message which relates to the question of defense because I consider it significant in view of the President's military background and experience:

> Another part of this foundation is, of course, our continental transportation system. Some of our vital heavy materials come increasingly from Canada. Indeed our relations with Canada, happily always close, involve more and more the unbreakable ties of strategic interdependence. Both nations now need the St. Lawrence Seaway for security, as well as for economic reasons. I urge the Congress promptly to approve our participation in its construction.

I wish to say tonight to the President of the United States that he will have one vote for his program. Without any reference to party politics, we can be happy that we have a President who plainly sees the urgency of this great seaway program.

Those charged with the security of our Nation have consistently and constantly endorsed the St. Lawrence project as in the interest of our national security. With the tension that exists in the world today and will continue for some years to come—with the threat to the free world and our way of life—we must do everything to make our country secure from a military standpoint and from an economic point of view. The best advice that we have is that the St. Lawrence project will accomplish those objectives.

About a year ago I placed in the RECORD information which our Government had obtained as to the great construction projects which are underway in the Soviet Union. Here we are with a natural arterial highway. We have been arguing and fighting about it for years. In the Soviet Union hundreds of millions of dollars are being invested in the development of the Volga River and other great rivers, for the improvement of transportation.

I think it is well known that a nation is no stronger in peace or war, than its transportation system. As the President has appropriately pointed out, this water highway is an integral part of an improved transportation system for our Nation.

Let me quote from former Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Jr., speaking for various defense agencies and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He had this to say about the seaway:

> In time of emergency, it is essential that adequate quantities of iron ore be readily available to meet the needs of the Armed Forces. The Labrador ores are generally recognized as the most important now available within the North American Continent. If the seaway is completed, ore from this area could be brought into the Great Lakes steel-industrial area over a protected inland water route requiring, in time of war, less protective measures than open-sea routes.

I also desire to place in the RECORD at this point excerpts from the brilliant and eloquent study, Resources for Freedom, which is a report by the President's Materials Policy Commission, the so-called Paley Commission, as that report relates to the St. Lawrence Seaway and the need to construct it in our national interest.

> The Commission recommends—
>
> That the Nation's hydroelectric potential be developed as fully and as rapidly as is economically feasible. Priority should be given to projects that promise to contribute most economically to meeting the energy needs of particular regions in light of their present and prospective energy costs, supplies, and needs. Specifically, early action is important in the St. Lawrence, Niagara, and Columbia River areas, where major projects already have been planned and which are among the best sites remaining to the Nation for developing hydropower in the lower cost range.

That excerpt is taken from the Paley Commission report. It is somewhat shocking to me that Congress has literally set the Commission's report aside. We have not listened to the Commission, or, if we have listened to it, we have not acted on its recommendations. The Commission's report outlines the need of energy, the need of power, the need of transportation, and the need for minerals, as well as the need for all the other resources of our great country in the development of our economy.

The Commission noted one serious omission in long-term provisions for meeting the transportation needs of national security—development of the St. Lawrence seaway project. This seaway not only will greatly reduce the distance for shipping iron ore from the new rich deposits in Labrador to the United States inland industrial defense triangle, but this will provide a safe route. The present ocean lanes are exposed to the danger of submarine attacks.

Mr. President, if there is one area in which the Soviet Navy has been developed, it is in the construction of submarines. We have learned enough in two World Wars about the dangers of submarine attack.

In chapter 20, the Commission makes its broad recommendations in the interest of expanding the Nation's energy supply for the early development of a number of major hydroelectric projects. This includes the St. Lawrence project, which thus would provide energy as well as safe, efficient transportation.

The Commission recommends:

> That development of the St. Lawrence seaway be initiated in the near future for transportation purposes. A strong economic case exists for the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the streams' power potentialities, even without regard to national security, but the security aspects of the project make it overwhelmingly expedient to proceed with its development as early as possible.

Let me say a few words about the importance of this project to the State of Minnesota. Construction of the seaway is of paramount importance to the people of the Middle West and to the people of my State. It is not only of great importance to the people of the Middle West, but it is of equal importance in the development of the entire Nation.

As the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] said a moment ago, the development of the great resources in any area of the Nation benefits the whole Nation and all the people of the Nation. The development of the TVA was of benefit to every section of America. We have an integrated economy. We do not have a provincial or parochial economy. We do not have an economy in which areas are isolated one from another. In our country we have a great business system which stretches out its mechanism of distribution, production, and financing throughout the Nation, and we need it to make and keep America strong.

That is why as a midwesterner I have never been persuaded by the line of propaganda which would have us watch out lest our friends in the South develop too fast. Oh, Mr. President, that kind of propaganda is rampant throughout the country. It is running wild like a prairie fire. We are told we must be careful lest we do damage to ourselves

by giving our friends in the Southern States economic justice.

Mr. President, I say that one of the great crimes of America was the way in which the South was for years held down economically. One of the greatest accomplishments of the Roosevelt administration was the way in which it built up the South. As a result there is in the South today great productivity, better industry, better agriculture, better homes, and better schools.

Mr. President, let us look at the Tennessee Valley. What do we find there? We find better markets, and a better economic life, because the people in the Tennessee Valley are living much better. We find much better recreation facilities, better land, and everything else that makes a country and a people great.

Let us look at what has happened in the Columbia River Basin. There we find new industry and great economic development generally. All that I would say to persons who are against the Columbia River development, the Missouri River development, or the Tennessee Valley development, is this: "Come to Congress with your problems so we can work out a program for the development of your area, too."

Last year I listened to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] when he delivered what I consider to be major economic reports on the problems of his particular area, the New England States. I listened to him night after night report on the needs of his area. He was not talking only for the people of Boston or the people of Massachusetts. The junior Senator from Massachusetts was speaking for the whole Nation. I believe it to be the duty and the privilege and the responsibility of Congress to provide the power the New England area needs, and to provide the energy and the transportation it needs, so that it can make its utmost contribution to the national welfare, as well as to its own welfare. I can assure my colleagues that that will always be my view.

There is no room for isolationism, either internationally or domestically. If one is an isolationist domestically, he is bound to be an isolationist internationally, and somewhat vice versa, too. I believe that we either grow together or die separately. I prefer to grow and live.

Duluth-Superior is already the second largest port in the United States in terms of tonnage handled. That is one other Dragnet fact that needs to be known. It should be known that deep in the heartland of America is one of the largest ports in America. It is exceeded in terms of tonnage handled only by the great port of New York.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield gladly.

Mr. WILEY. I believe that at this time it might be well to place in the RECORD a fact with which I know the Senator from Minnesota is familiar. A great deal of misinformation has been put forth in relation to the depth of the harbor at Duluth-Superior. The fact is that the ore boats which use that harbor have a draft of 24 feet.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. It should be noted that Duluth-Superior, Calumet, Indiana Harbor, Lorain Harbor, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, and Ashtabula have a harbor depth of 25 or 26 feet. Those harbors have already been dredged to that depth.

Therefore, the statement that only steamers with an 18-foot draft can use those harbors is nothing but a mirage. It is very significant that, in terms of tonnage, Duluth-Superior is the second largest harbor on the continent, and second only to New York harbor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that anyone who lives in the spirit of Doubting Thomas would do well to come to our section of the country and witness the transportation and the traffic and the size of the ships and the size of the harbors. All doubts would be quickly dispelled. The foolish arguments to which I have referred are designed solely for the purpose of dividing and weakening and confusing.

Six of the remaining fifteen largest United States ports are on the Great Lakes. They are Agate Bay, Toledo, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo. These ports and others on the Great Lakes handle a tremendous amount of shipping. A graphic indication of the volume is afforded when we realize that the Sault Ste. Marie Locks, despite being closed for 4 months of the year, handle more traffic than the Panama, Suez, and Kiel Canals combined.

Mr. President, one can take all those canals, which incidentally are considered to be the great wonders of the world—the Panama Canal, which every schoolboy knows about; the Suez Canal, which plagues the Egyptians and the British, with the British believing it to be great enough and important enough to station troops along it in order to defend it; and the Kiel Canal, which means so much to Western Europe, particularly Western Germany—and put them all in one basket, and they come in a poor second when compared with one system of locks in the Great Lakes. Yet we are ready to believe that the other canals I have mentioned are tremendously important.

Mr. President, to deny the vast traffic originating in the Middle West access to the ocean is economic foolishness. It is like having economic cataracts on our economic eyes.

Minnesota produces many products important to world trade, as do the States of Wisconsin, Illinois, Ohio, New York, and all the other great inland States. We in the Middle West need and deserve our own ocean ports, and we must preserve our inland ports, particularly if it is possible to do so at such small cost.

The Great Lakes area is the greatest industrial area on the globe.

I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] that I had just made some comments about his splendid report of last year on the economic growth and development of the New England States, and I said it was our duty to cooperate and make it possible to increase New England's economic growth and development. I paid him appropriate tribute for leading us, and may I say that he will find in the junior Senator from Minnesota a stalwart friend for his program.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we hear much of the Ruhr Valley of Europe. The great Ruhr is not even a close second to the Great Lakes region. Every Senator who goes to Europe reports on the fantastic production of the Ruhr Valley. It would hardly make a smokescreen for what is produced in the Great Lakes region. We should become excited about what we have at home and try to improve it. The Great Lakes area, with only three-fourths of 1 percent of the world's land and with only 2 percent of the world's population produces more than 35 percent of all the steel made in the entire world. How many times have we heard our colleagues report on the fantastic production of the German steel mills. Mr. President, they do not even rate a good close second to the fantastic steel productive capacity of the Great Lakes area. The German Republic, with all its problems, would never give up the Rhine River and would never hold back appropriations necessary to develop the Rhine River, which the commerce of 60 nations traverses. The peoples of Europe have been slaughtering each other for a thousand years over the control of the Rhine River because it meant so much in terms of transportation and in the development of the economies of the European nations.

Here we are in the United States of America, with the St. Lawrence River, which makes the Rhine River look like a small creek, and we have been so foolish as to permit, for 30 years, special interests to block the national interest. I have often received letters from the folks back home saying, "What do you mean by special interests?" One of my classic answers has been to refer them to what has happened to the St. Lawrence seaway project. It has been blocked by what I consider to be narrowness and selfishness.

What makes possible the great development in the Great Lakes region is the fact that we have the ore at one end of the lakes, the coal at the other end, and the Great Lakes to bring them together. This brings us to the crucial question of iron-ore supply and its availability to the United States. We of Minnesota are very proud of the Mesabi Range and the estimated 49.2 million tons a year of iron ore which it supplies to the Nation. Last year much more was produced. Last year 100 million tons of iron ore was mined in the State of Minnesota. We are proud of the taconite whose development we are increasing, whose utilization for our national security will become more and more effective as the years go by. We realize, however, that the iron-ore supply may someday in the future be limited and that some parts of it may be exhausted. The burden of two world wars has made a deep dent in the supply of those great mines. The Paley commission report to which I have already referred states that the iron ore used in the United States in 1975 should be 200 million more net tons annually, or an increase of 50 percent over our present consumption.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This means that an increasing amount of our iron-ore requirements must come from the great ore deposits of Labrador, which are now being opened up to the Great Lakes region. The St. Lawrence project is essential for our Nation's and our area's proper utilization of these great riches from the bowels of the earth.

Mr. President, I have often heard those who would like to prevent the passage of the bill say, "Do you not know that if the St. Lawrence Seaway comes into being you are not going to be able to sell any more of your Minnesota iron ore?" Those are people who believe the country has stopped dead in its tracks. We have demand for products made from iron ore far beyond what we ever dreamed was possible a few years ago. We are moving uphill. I think everyone should take a look once in a while at history and read the latest census report as to new births, and then we would have a little better idea of what is happening in this country. There are too many people who have lost the zest for living, who think that the population is on the downhill grade and that this great Nation has lost its vitality. I am here happily to report that things still look good.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator from Minnesota also think we have too many officials who are satisfied with the status quo or who think this country can prosper sufficiently by maintaining status quo?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I do not know whether he was present yesterday when the junior Senator from Minnesota commented that there are people who always talk about adjustments. Adjustments are fine, but they are always adjustments downhill. And the kind of adjustments this country needs is an adjustment up instead of down.

Mr. GORE. When our population is growing, a standstill policy is, in fact, an adjustment downhill, is it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It has been said that life is a race; it is competition; anyone who stands still is losing. We cannot win standing still. We have learned that one of the reasons why America has gone so far ahead in technology and agriculture and in other ways is because we have been a forward-looking people, just as we are now in seeking to join with our friends in Canada in building this great project.

Mr. GORE. Measured by that yardstick, the junior Senator from Minnesota will never be defeated, because he never stands still; he is always moving forward.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am told that a moving target is always more difficult to hit, so I shall try to keep on the move.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the point has been made that the St. Lawrence Seaway may bring new ore from Labrador which will be used in place of ore from the Mesabi Range. But a forward-looking policy has been responsible for all the progress we have made. Every new thing that is done usually causes some temporary ill effects, but, as the New England Council says, we all benefit in the long run.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is the rising tide of economic progress that is going to lead us in the world. We have been listening to the doom story for many years. We were told that the building of a certain railroad line would injure the section of the country where it was to be located, and there was opposition to the deepening of certain channels. Instead of being injured, we have been helped. I am convinced that we are going to see a great development of new projects, new industries, new trade, and new commerce because of what is being sought to be done.

Mr. President, the continued utilization in the Great Lakes area of strategic iron-ore supplies is essential not only to the economic welfare of the Nation, but also in the interest of our national safety. It is not in the interest of our Nation to increase the concentration of heavy industry on the east coast where plants and war materials and supply lines are vulnerable to enemy attack.

When I hear the argument that Labrador ore may put us out of business in Minnesota, I am sure that the Republic Steel Co., the United States Steel Co., and the Inland Steel Co. are not investing in the neighborhood of a billion dollars in taconite plants because they are interested in social work. Those great companies are not in the social work business. They are in the business of making steel and making money, and they have a pretty good idea of what will happen to the pending legislation. They have been supporting it in recent years and have been putting their money into the development of taconite because it is needed. Sometimes I think we in Congress would do well to have as much faith in the future as have those great steel companies.

I mentioned the matter of concentration of industry. I think we must be very careful not to overconcentrate in certain areas.

The St. Lawrence River is probably America's last great undeveloped resource. I hesitate to make such a statement; I will withdraw it. It is not the last one. It is one that we know about that is not properly developed. But every time anyone says, "This is the last great undeveloped resource," a brand new one rears its head on the political and economic horizon.

It is a part of our tradition as a Nation and a part of our American way of life to develop and use our resources for the good of our people. I call for the support of the St. Lawrence project in that spirit. The development of this great national resource will aid Minnesota and aid the Great Lakes area and will aid our Nation in our constant striving for great prosperity and national security.

Mr. President, I now wish to address myself to the subject of connecting channels for the Great Lakes. Members of the Senate are aware that my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and myself have each introduced amendments and separate legislation calling for the deepening of existing channels in the Great Lakes to an overall depth of 27 feet, which would allow our area in the upper Great Lakes to participate fully in the transportation benefits which will flow from the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. This channel deepening project has in the past been an integral part of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill considered by previous Congresses. It is not an integral part of this bill because of the deep conviction on the part of the sponsors that every effort should be made to build the St. Lawrence Seaway and to obtain a favorable vote for this construction project without confusing the issue with other projects, however meritorious they may be. I am for extending the 27-foot channel to the harbor of Duluth-Superior. It was my hope that this project would be approved at the same time as the seaway project is approved, but I do not want to be a party to any move which will delay the enactment of the seaway project by the Congress. My colleague and I have discussed this matter and have come to the conclusion that we will jointly not press our amendments at this time. He will speak for himself. We will instead move the adoption of the channel deepening program when the national public works program is before the Congress later in the session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a paragraph from the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on S. 2150, the pending bill, dealing with the Thye-Humphrey amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the paragraph was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THYE-HUMPHREY AMENDMENT

As noted in an earlier section of this report, both Senators THYE and HUMPHREY offered amendments to S. 589, calling for the deepening of the several channels connecting the Great Lakes above Lake Erie. Considerable testimony was presented during the hearings endorsing the purpose of these amendments on the ground that the ever-expanding shipping in the upper Great Lakes area renders essential the deepening of these channels, irrespective of the ultimate outcome of the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation. The committee does not take issue with the underlying purpose of these amendments. It is of the opinion, however, that the appropriate way of obtaining the ends sought is to incorporate the provision in separate legislation to be dealt with on its own merits rather than as a related part of the navigational development of the St. Lawrence River and as a part of United States-Canadian relations in connection with that development. The committee believes that deepening of the channels, while possessed of certain international aspects, is essentially a domestic question to be handled by the appropriate agencies of the Federal Government. Indeed, plans have already been laid for a separate investigative report thereon for later consideration by the Congress. Finally, the committee believes that the inclusion of the amendment in S. 2150

would only confuse the main purpose of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. My colleague has referred to amendments which both he and I had submitted to the pending bill. I introduced my amendment, known as S. 589, last February 16. I appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which my colleague is a member, and he joined with me in the remarks I made before the committee at that time. My remarks can be found in the committee hearings, commencing on page 489.

I stated that it was very regrettable to me that the St. Lawrence Seaway had been divided into two projects; namely, the International Rapids section, the project now before the Senate, to be constructed jointly by Canada and the United States, and the connecting link, the section that will make it possible for the upper regions, such as upper Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, to derive direct benefit from the full development of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I had fully intended, as I intended last year—and I believe my colleague shares the same conviction—to have pressed for the consideration of my amendment. That was my intention when I appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations. But the Corps of Engineers is still at work on the study which was authorized last year, under appropriations made to the Corps of Engineers, and the report will not be available until September of this year, according to the last word I have received. Therefore, in view of the need for early action on the legislation, in order that we may show to Canada our intention to join with her—and I know my colleague feels as I do, because we have discussed the matter—if we press the amendment which would extend the project to include the connecting links for the full distance of the St. Lawrence Seaway, we might well delay immediate passage of the bill while awaiting the report of the Corps of Engineers.

Having received assurance from the chairman of the policy committee and from other leaders of the Senate that they will give us their full cooperation in the future in the development of the legislation necessary to make possible the connecting links, I therefore, Mr. President, at this time withdraw my amendment, S. 589, in order that there will not be any measure before the Senate that would defeat or delay action on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

My colleague and I have both discussed the matter. We are in accord in our views that the withdrawal of the amendment is not to be interpreted as meaning that we have lessened our interest in the connecting links in the St. Lawrence Seaway. We have not. We are more determined than ever that those links shall be developed just as speedily as can be done.

I thank my collegue for yielding to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to underscore everything my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota, has said. He has spent a great deal of time and energy on the subject of the connecting links and the deepening of the channels. Both of us had prepared amendments. I have an amendment now at the desk. It is not my intention to call it up, because our amendments are identical.

I concur in what my colleague has said with respect to the basis for the deepening of channels. On the merits of that issue, we shall appear before the appropriate committees of Congress, seeking the help that can be obtained there.

Mr. President, it was clear to me from the beginning of the Congress last year that the present administration would support only the construction of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence canals, and that no other project could receive majority support. With that in mind, and as a strong supporter of the St. Lawrence project, I joined the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] in the introduction of the bill which is now before the Senate as S. 2150. It also appeared to me to be wise in protecting Minnesota's interests to move separately and immediately for a channel deepening project on its own merits. I, therefore, called upon the Senate Public Works Committee to approve a resolution authorizing a survey by the Army Corps of Engineers for deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels to Duluth. The Senate Public Works Committee approved the Humphrey resolution and authorized the survey "with a view to proceeding at this time with whatever improvements are necessary in the Great Lakes connecting channels to provide a channel depth of at least 27 feet." Similar authorization has been granted by the House Public Works Committee.

Events seemed to have fully justified my desires of last year. Not only did the Congress authorize the survey, but the Congress appropriated funds to the Army Corps of Engineers to begin that survey. Thus the Congress has already taken the first great step toward completion of the seaway all the way up to Minnesota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this point in my remarks a memorandum on the Great Lakes connecting channels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

WHAT ARE THE GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS?

They are the rivers and lake which connect Lakes Superior, Huron, Michigan, and Erie.

The St. Marys River connects Lakes Superior and Huron.

The Straits of Mackinac connect Lakes Huron and Michigan.

The St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair and the Detroit River connect Lakes Huron and Erie.

EXTENT OF CONNECTING CHANNELS

The nautical distance of St. Marys River, St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and the Detroit River combined, but exclusive of the Straits of Mackinac, totals about 154 miles.

STATUS OF EXISTING CHANNELS

Under the presently authorized improvements through these connecting channels, depths of 25 feet generally prevail in the two-way downbound channels. These channel distances total approximately 113 miles.

Upbound only 21-foot channel depths exist at two locations, viz, to the west side of Neebish Island in the lower St. Marys River, and through a portion of the Detroit River, a combined distance for these upbound lanes of approximately 22 miles.

CONGRESSIONAL HISTORY OF CHANNELS

These channels have been progressively improved by the Federal Government since about 1890 as the expanding shipping conditions have necessitated. As shipping interests have felt that new channel improvements were needed they have followed the normal procedure of obtaining necessary authorization for a survey by the Army Engineers. Since 1890 over 20 such investigations and reports have been submitted.

The latest investigation report filed by the Army Engineers concerning the connecting channels is that submitted in 1947, designated House Document 335. It recommended a new Poe lock at the Soo, together with certain isolated channel improvements, all subsequently authorized by the Congress. It contained, however, a negative recommendation for any comprehensive deepening of the overall connecting-channels project.

The finding of document 335 was predicated upon the composition of the Great Lakes fleet existing in 1945–46, when investigations were under way. Since that time the Great Lakes vessel fleet has undergone a radical change due to the expanding introduction into the fleet of new and a much larger type of vessel up to 700 or more feet in length, with 70-foot beam, and a carrying capacity in excess of 20,000 tons. To operate these new ships at capacity and maximum efficiency they must be fully loaded. This is particularly true of the iron-ore carriers which carry the greatest volume of the traffic. It will not be possible for these new carriers to navigate the present connecting channels with full loads when the water level of the lakes are at ordinary, or low, stages.

LAKE AND RIVER WATER LEVELS

Since 1942 the entire Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin has been experiencing a period of unusually high lake and river water levels. Fluctuations in the water levels are both cyclic and seasonal. They result from varying precipitation, the runoff from the drainage area, and surface evaporation. The current unusually high cycle reached its zenith in 1952 and as of now, at least, appears to have leveled off, if not actually turned downward. Great Lakes ship operators know that it is only a matter of a few years when the downward swing of this cycle will bring about water levels which will seriously affect the loading capacity of the lake vessels, particularly the new and larger ones, which have gone in to operation since World War II, and which produce the greatest shipping economies. An example of how water levels affect the carrying capacity of these vessels may be cited, here: For each variation of 1 inch in channel depth the effect on the carrying capacity of the ship is 100 tons. Thus a variation of 2 feet in channel depth means 2,400 tons of carrying capacity. Inability to carry capacity loads during ordinary and low lake level periods will not only affect the operating efficiency of the ships, as can be seen by the foregoing example, but will also seriously interfere with the transportation of the vital iron ore tonnage so necessary to the maintenance of our defense program. Further, increased transportation costs will otherwise inevitably result. Accordingly, it is urgent that steps be taken without further delay to provide for the deepening of these connecting channels. The first prerequisite is a comprehensive survey report setting forth the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

necessary engineering and economic considerations, including up-to-date cost estimates, in order that Congress may be in a position to take intelligent action.

STATUS OF CONNECTING CHANNELS LEGISLATION, 1941–52

Prior to the fall of 1952 the improvement of the connecting channels to a depth of 27 feet was one of the elements in the overall Great Lakes-St. Lawrence development and included as a non-self-liquidating section of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway project. This was due to the obligation the United States assumed to improve these channels at this country's expense in the agreement between the United States and Canada for the joint development of the St. Lawrence seaway in 1941 and known as the 1941 agreement. This agreement was abrogated by Canada on November 4, 1952.

For this reason the Corps of Engineers has never filed a separate, formal report on a project for improving these channels in the light of today's conditions. The cost of deepening the connecting channels to 27 feet, according to the testimony of General Robinson, Deputy Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on April 14, 1953, was placed at $99,584,000 at December 1952 cost levels. He qualified this estimate as follows:

"These 27-foot project estimates are based on a degree of planning and hydrographic information that compares favorably with that which would ordinarily be accomplished for the preparation of a survey report, except for those areas where no previous dredging has been done. For those areas which are over and beyond the areas heretofore deepened no new soundings or borings have been taken. Subject to this limitation, the estimate presented represents the order of magnitude of the cost of the work."

With the abrogation of the 1941 agreement by Canada a new approach to this improvement problem was presented. For many years advocates of the improvement of these channels have felt that this improvement should be divorced from any legislation for development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, as due to its highly controversial nature many interests throughout the country who would support the channel improvement project could not do so as they had already taken a position of neutrality or in opposition to the development of the St. Lawrence. Therefore, when the agreement above referred to was terminated the United States was released from its contractual obligation, and interests throughout the Great Lakes area decided to advance the deepening project independently and let it stand on its own merits.

ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

It is general knowledge that mass movement of heavy tonnage takes place on the Great Lakes at unusually low transportation costs. The general public, however, is not aware of the amount of that tonnage in comparison with that handled elsewhere over our inland waterways and seacoast harbors.

In 1951 commerce moving through the St. Marys Falls Canal, which connects Lakes Superior and Huron, exceeded 119 million tons, as compared with the oceangoing traffic of some 90 million tons operating out of the country's greatest port, viz, New York Harbor.

During the same year, 1951, commerce transiting the St. Clair River and the Detroit River, connecting Lakes Huron and Erie, exceeded even that of the St. Marys.

Among the 10 leading harbors in the country, including all of our coastal ports, based upon tonnage during 1951, Duluth-Superior ranked second to New York, Chicago ninth, and Toledo tenth.

Furthermore, over 119 billion ton-miles of traffic moved on the Great Lakes system in 1951, almost twice that which plied over all of our other inland waterways combined. These statistics dramatically portray the importance of the Great Lakes as a transportation artery.

WHAT IS BEING SOUGHT?

March 25, 1953, a resolution was approved by the Senate Public Works Committee requesting a review of the report entitled "Great Lakes Connecting Waters, Principal Harbors, and River Channels," published as House Document 253, 70th Congress, 1st session, and other pertinent reports, with a view to determining the advisability of proceeding with improvements in the Great Lakes connecting channels necessary to provide a channel depth of 27 feet, and with a view to preparing up-to-date cost estimates of the cost of such improvements.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the supporting organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American Association of Port Authorities.
Great Lakes Harbors Association.
Lake Carriers Association.
Governor's Committee of Minnesota.
Governor's Committee of Wisconsin.
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association.
Port of Detroit.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the text of a statement of the National Milk Producers Federation relating to a resolution adopted at Houston, Tex., November 9, 1953. The voting delegates of the federation represented nearly one-half million dairy farmers, all in support of the entire St. Lawrence seaway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To Members of the United States Senate:

At our annual meeting in Houston, Tex., November 9, 1953, the voting delegates for the nearly one-half million dairy farmers of the National Milk Producers Federation again adopted a resolution supporting the entire St. Lawrence Seaway project. Although the bill, S. 2150, does not provide for the deepening of the connecting channels in the Great Lakes, it represents an important step in the long-deferred construction of the seaway. We favor enactment of S. 2150 and earnestly urge your support for the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, National Milk Producers Federation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the connecting channels program, and the amendments which my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and I have advanced on other occasions, were approved by the American Association of Port Authorities, the Great Lakes Harbors Association, the Lake Carriers Association, the Governor's Committee of Minnesota, the Governor's Committee of Wisconsin, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, and the port of Detroit.

The Great Lakes connecting channels are the rivers and lakes which connect the lakes of Huron, Michigan, and Erie. They are the most important inland waterway system in the world. The only physical obstacle to transportation of this system has been depth limits of the connecting channels. The most important of these channels are—

First. The St. Marys River between Lakes Superior and Huron.

Second. The Straits of Mackinac between Lakes Huron and Michigan.

Third. The St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair and the Detroit River between Lakes Huron and Erie.

The case for constructing this channel is clear. I have in my hands the testimony of Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association at the hearings of the Army Corps of Engineers on this channel deepening project. It is an eloquent case in support of the project, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of these remarks the testimony be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am confident that at the appropriate time, following the report of the Army Corps of Engineers, Congress will see the wisdom of deepening the connecting channels—not only because of the importance of the interlake movements and the great traffic of these lakes, but also because of the increased traffic potential flowing from the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

With that confidence, and in view of the splendid progress already made within the past year, I join with my colleague from Minnesota in withdrawing my amendment to tie the connecting channels project to the St. Lawrence Seaway. I urge the Senate to pass the seaway project without delay, and I fervently pray that the House will follow suit.

Mr. President, a documentation regarding the adequacy of the 27-foot channel depth in the St Lawrence Seaway. This matter has been one of the points which has been highly debated, but I see no necessity for repeating the documentation orally in the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

TESTIMONY OF N. R. DANIELIAN, PRESIDENT, GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE ASSOCIATION, BEFORE DIVISION ENGINEER, DETROIT OFFICE, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, NOVEMBER 17, 1953

My name is N. R. Danielian. I am president of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association with offices at 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, as the name would imply, is representative of the interests of the entire Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Valley area, both official and private, and is concerned with the development of the resources of this large region in the interest of the national welfare and the national defense. Our backing and support come from public and private sources. There are affiliated with us, by membership, contributions, and representation on our board of directors, the principal State and municipal governments and the leading industries of this great area.

The Corps of Engineers has been directed by Congress to make a survey and report of the (a) costs and (b) economic feasibility

of deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels to an overall depth of 27 feet. The association, for which I speak, appears to give testimony in support of the second of these topics, i. e., the economic feasibility of this project. In brief, it is our position which will be developed in this testimony, that the costs of the project will be more than offset by the overall benefits to the national welfare, including the savings in transportation costs.

The Great Lakes and their connecting waterways are the most important inland waterway system in the world. The only physical deterrents to transportation over this system have been the depth limitations of the connecting channels. The most important of these channels are:

1. The St. Marys River between Lakes Superior and Huron.

2. The Straits of Mackinac between Lakes Huron and Michigan.

3. The St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and the Detroit River between Lakes Huron and Erie.

Federal participation in the connecting channels began in 1892, when, pursuant to a report of the Corps of Engineers, Congress authorized the deepening of the channels to accommodate vessels drawing 20 feet. At that time, the average tonnage of lake vessels was 468 tons and the total annual tonnage, passing through the St. Mary's River, was hardly more than 11 million. For 35 years, this basic project remained unchanged, although modifications have subsequently been made at various places mainly for widening, straightening, and providing new channels.[1] During these years, the tonnage through the St. Mary's River had increased to 85 million, almost 800 percent, and the total commerce on the lakes had increased 300 percent. By 1926, 41 percent of the vessels using the St. Mary's River were 5,000 tons or greater. It was not until 1930 that Congress, in response to these expanding shipping conditions, passed the necessary authorization which led eventually to the deepening of the connecting channels to their present depths of 25 feet downbound and 21 feet upbound.[2]

Since 1890, the subject of the connecting channels has had the almost constant attention of the Corps of Engineers. There have been 20 reports submitted by the Corps itself dealing directly with the problem of connecting channels or some phase of the problem. The most recent report filed in 1947, while recommending a new Poe lock at the Soo and certain isolated channel improvements, contained a negative recommendation, however, for any comprehensive deepening of the overall connecting channels.[3]

The present survey to determine the costs and economic feasibility of deepening the connecting channels to an overall depth of 27 feet is the first such investigation of its kind. Such a depth will provide a safe draft of 25.4 feet at low water datum. Previous surveys of this problem have been as a part of the entire St. Lawrence Seaway development and have accordingly been subject to criticism on the part of opponents of the seaway project. The present survey calls for a separate report and, for the first time, will judge the matter of deepening the connecting channels on its own merits. We are glad to see this because we have always felt that the deepening of the connecting channels, as a separate proposition, is self-supporting and is a vitally needed national improvement irrespective of the eventual outcome of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The basic finding of the 1947 report is "that general deepening of the connecting channels at this time would not return benefits commensurate with the large expenditures required."[4] This finding of the Corps of Engineers was predicated in turn on the conclusion of the district engineer, "that, with the Great Lakes cargo fleet as now constituted, the benefits to be expected to accrue to lake traffic, both in time of peace and in time of national emergency, do not justify a deepening of the downbound and two-way connecting channels at this time."[5] At this time was March 15, 1945, the date when the district engineer's report was written, and almost 9 years ago.

However sound the district engineer's opinion of March 15, 1945, may have been, and we are not qualified to pass on this, the facts upon which this opinion were based are no longer true. This is because the composition of the Great Lakes fleet has undergone a dramatic change, not only in the number of vessels being operated but particularly in the size of these vessels.

At the end of 1952, the gross tonnage of the Great Lakes fleet under United States registry had expanded to 2,535,680 gross tons represented by 473 vessels.[6] Of the total of 473 American vessels, 281 are bulk freighters in the iron ore trade of which over 200 range in length from over 500 feet up to 714 feet with a beam of over 70 feet and a carrying capacity in excess of 20,000 tons. During 1952, 12 new bulk carriers were added to the fleet and all 12 are over 600 feet in length. The trend to larger construction has continued in 1953 although final figures are not yet available.[7] According to the district engineer, in March 1945, only 30 vessels of the entire Great Lakes cargo fleet had a summer season draft in excess of 22 feet, 3 inches. In contrast to this, there were, in 1953, 68 vessels in operation, one-fifth of the present fleet of bulk cargo vessels, which are permitted by the load-line regulations administered by the Coast Guard, to load to depths greater than 22 feet, 6 inches.[8] The trend to larger construction, which commenced at the end of the war, is continuing and shows no prospect of diminishing.

The reasons why cargo operators are turning to larger vessels with broader beams and deeper drafts are found in the lower operating costs per ton of carrying capacity. It simply is cheaper per unit to carry cargo in larger ships than in smaller ones. The following figures, taken from the actual 1951 costs of a large operator on the Great Lakes,[9] show this very clearly:

Daily operating costs of Great Lakes ships

Gross tonnage	Amount	Cost per ton of carrying capacity
10,000 tons	$1,450	$0.145
15,000 tons	1,650	.11
20,000 tons	2,150	.1075

The reasons for this lower unit cost in turn are the lower initial capital investment per ton of carrying capacity but more particularly the costs of operation, including crew, overhead and maintenance, which do not rise in the same ratio as the carrying capacity increases.

To operate these new and larger ships at maximum efficiency, they must be fully loaded. This is particularly true of the ore carriers which carry the greatest volume of traffic. Iron ore is also a high density cargo. Each inch of draft on an ore carrier of 11,500 tons represents 85 to 90 tons of carrying capacity. In other words, every foot of draft is the equivalent of approximately 1,000 tons. A vessel, which because of the depth of the channel, is unable to load to its full capacity, may, therefore, have to forego carrying as much as 20 percent of its economical load. The newly added carriers have often been forced to do this because they cannot navigate the presently provided connecting channels when the water levels of the Lakes are at ordinary, or low, stages.[10] They have been aided somewhat by the unusually high lake and river water levels, which have prevailed since 1942. As others will testify, we cannot depend on this abnormal condition, particularly in view of indications that the high water cycle may have reached its peak in 1952. With the advent of lower water, the problem of operating these new and larger ships to their full capacity in the present channels will become even more acute. There is, therefore, a sharp and growing demand for deeper channels and a definite need at this time that this project be authorized.

The national advantages accruing from the deepening of the channels fall under several headings. They include (1) the economic benefits from the incremental capacity; (2) the advantages to the national defense; (3) the benefits to the coming Labrador ore trade and (4) the advantages to our foreign trade resulting from the seaway. These topics will be treated in order.

1. THE ECONOMIC BENEFITS FROM THE INCREMENTAL CAPACITY

In discussing this phase of the problem, it should be kept in mind that the maximum benefit is dependent upon the availability of commerce to utilize the additional fleet capacity to be made available by deepening of the channels.

In 1951 the total lake bulk freight traffic aggregated 190 million tons, of which 89 million, or 47 percent, was iron ore and 51 million, or 27 percent, was coal. The balance consisted chiefly of various grains and stone. It is apparent that in the future as in the past, the bulk of the lake bulk traffic will be in iron ore and coal.

These two commodities are, of course, essential in the manufacture of steel and the demand for them will be governed by the consumption of steel. The production of steel, which was 63 million tons in 1929, is now 117 million tons, having almost doubled in less than 25 years.[11] In the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission issued June 1952, and entitled "Resources for Freedom," it is estimated that by 1975 our steel ingot production will reach 185 million tons.[12] There can be no question but that there will be a continuing and growing demand for iron ore. Where will this come from?

Since 1910, over 80 percent of the ore to provide this steel tonnage has come from the Lake Superior region. While the supply of high-grade ore (50 percent iron and over) is now down to 1.6 billion, vast reserves of taconite still remain. Republic alone is developing a huge beneficiation plant in the

[1] H. Doc. No. 253, 70th Cong., 1st sess., Apr. 30, 1928, p. 38.

[2] H. Doc. No. 335, 80th Cong., 1st sess., June 11, 1947, p. 11.

[3] H. Doc. No. 335, 80th Cong., 1st sess., June 11, 1947.

[4] H. Doc. No. 335, 80th Cong., 1st sess., June 11, 1947, p. 5.

[5] H. Doc. No. 335, 80th Cong., 1st sess., June 11, 1947, p. 77.

[6] Lake Carriers Association, Annual Report, 1952, p. 49.

[7] Among the ships added in 1953 are: *J. L. Mauthe*, 646 feet long, 70-foot beam, 19,500 tons; *Sykes*, 640 feet long, 70-foot beam, 21,000 tons; *E. T. Weir*, 690 feet long, 70-foot beam, 21,000 tons; *Reserve*, 647 feet long, 70-foot beam, 19,500 tons; *Armco*, 647 feet long, 70-foot beam, 19,500 tons; *Marshall*, 643 feet long, 67-foot beam, 18,000 tons.

[8] Testimony of Adm. Lyndon Spencer, of the Lake Carriers Association, before subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations, May 15, 1953.

[9] M. A. Hanna Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

[10] Lake Carriers Association, Annual Report, 1952, pp. 40–41.

[11] Testimony of E. M. Richards, Republic Steel Corp., before Senate Foreign Relations Committee, April 1953.

[12] Resources for Freedom, June 1952, pp. 11–12.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mesabi, at a cost of $160 million, to process this taconite. The Erie Mining Co. and the United States Steel Corp. (Oliver iron mining division) have similar plans. Despite the need to import iron ore from Venezuela, Liberia, and coming huge development in Labrador, to supply the growing needs of our country's steel production, it is clear that the demand for Lake Superior ore will remain high for many years. As the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission has expressed it:

"Production from high grade reserves in the Lake Superior region must eventually decrease; production from taconite may be able to offset this decline, leaving the output of the Lake Superior region close to the present level of 90 million tons."

According to the most authoritative predictions, the supply of Lake Superior ore from the Mesabi range will be available indefinitely in large quantities and will have to be shipped to the steel producing centers in the lower lakes. The extent to which ore from Steep Rock out of Port Arthur will be available is not presently known, except that it will be in considerable quantities.

As steel production increases, requiring iron ore, the already heavy shipments of coal will increase at almost the same ratio. Domestic coal in West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Illinois is present in abundance to take advantage of the low transportation rates offered by water transportation. Similarly, the shipment of grains which has increased from 10 million tons in 1929 to over 15 million in 1952, a gain of 50 percent, can be expected to grow as the population of the Great Lakes areas continues to follow the national pattern.[12] In summary, the prospect is that the tonnage, which will be available for carriage on the Lakes, will continue to increase with each passing year.

To the extent that this tonnage is available and cannot be carried because the limiting factors caused by the present depth of the connecting channels, there is an economic loss. While I do not possess a breakdown of the figures, which I am told will be supplied at a later date by the Lake Carriers Association, some notion of the magnitude of this loss may be gained from the following example. Admiral Spencer testified on May 15, 1953, before the House Subcommittee on Civil Functions that "if the water in the Great Lakes were at low-water datum at the present time, the loss in carrying capacity this year would amount to just under 4 million tons" and that "due to the addition of many large vessels during the past 3 years, this potential loss may easily amount to 7½ million tons per year by 1963." The present cost of carrying ore from Lake Superior ports to the lower lakes is $1.60 per ton. Assuming that a deepening of the channels to provide a draft of 25.4 feet will increase the capacity of the ore carriers by 3 million tons, there will be an annual benefit of $4,800,000. The 1947 report (H. Doc. No. 335) stated that it was unlikely that a margin of justification will exist until such time as the carrying capacity of the fleet, "is increased, by the addition of new vessels of deeper draft, to at least twice that of the fleet as now constituted." It appears that that time has now or will soon arrive and that the incremental capacity, which will result, represents an economic benefit of such proportions as will justify this improvement.

[12] See The Population Boom—What It Spells for Prosperity, Time magazine, Sept. 24, 1953. "By 1975, the United States will need to set a fifth plate for every four persons now consuming."

2. THE ADVANTAGES TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The 1947 report[14] (H. Doc. No. 335) correctly lays down the general principle:

"In time of emergency an improvement may contribute to the national effort to such an extent as to justify its existence without reference to considerations of ordinary economy. The movement of iron ore in Great Lakes commerce is of such vital importance to the munitions procurement program in time of war that any improvement which will materially expedite that movement may be justified on that basis alone."

It then assumes a state of emergency lasting for 5 years of the 50-year economic life of the improvement and concluded that increased capacity of 562,500 tons annually for a limited period of 5 years would not justify the expenditure.

Today the facts are totally different. The incremental capacity is not 562,500 tons but a figure already substantially greater which has every prospect of growing even larger. More important, consider the other assumption in the 1947 report, i. e., the 5-year emergency period. It could not have foreseen the Korean war which began in 1950 and is still far from being concluded. The fact, which some persons in high places appear to accept, that Russia now has the H-bomb as well as the A-bomb, does not augur well for any lessening of tensions. Certainly, there is no reason to believe that, with the present balance of world power, we will not be in a state of emergency for many years to come, perhaps for the rest of our lifetimes. While hindsight has its advantages, the brief 6 years which have passed since the 1947 report was written, have shown it to be a painfully optimistic prediction. We can no longer base any resource mobilization program on the assumption of emergency only during 5 years out of every 50. Happy but deluded is the generation that proceeds on such false hopes.

Furthermore, there are two aspects of this matter of the relationship of deeper connecting channels to the national defense, which the 1947 report did not consider. First, the incremental capacity of the Canadian fleet was not touched upon. While present restrictions prevent ships of Canadian registry from operating between American ports, these restrictions would be lifted in time of war. There are 263 Canadian vessels, having a combined capacity of 1,212,750 gross tons, operating on the lakes.[15] This tonnage is approximately one-third of our own. Included are a number of large bulk carriers, similar to our own, which cannot navigate the presently existing channels when loaded to capacity. While the purely economic benefits of this incremental capacity cannot be considered as bearing on this problem, the importance of such capacity to our national defense cannot be overlooked.

Secondly, the deepening and widening of the channels will increase the margin of safe operation and thereby minimize the possibility of complete or partial stoppage. The channels are so narrow in places that the sinking or grounding of a single large ship can effectively prevent other ships from passing until the obstructions are removed. This has happened in the past and has caused serious dislocations to our steel production. Fortunately this condition has never happened in time of war, when, with overseas supplies cut off, the demand for domestic ore would be at its zenith. The disastrous consequences require little imagination. While others are more competent than I to elaborate on the extent of this peril, I think it fair to say the proposal to deepen and widen the existing channels should also be considered in the light of the insurance such an improvement will provide against a complete cutting off for days or weeks of our vitally needed supply of iron ore. It is not possible to overestimate the seriousness of this threat to our national defense.

[14] P. 76.

[15] Lake Carriers Association, Annual Report, 1952, p. 52.

3. THE COMING SUPPLY OF LABRADOR ORE

We have already referred to the fact that the present demands of the steel industry have made it necessary to import from Venezuela and Liberia a portion of our iron-ore requirements. While the amount of these imports were only 10 million tons in 1950, the President's Materials Policy Commission estimated that by 1975 the volume of such imports from all sources to meet probable requirements may approach 65 million tons.[16]

One of the largest sources of this foreign ore will be the new development in Labrador. This body of ore, located 365 rail miles north of the St. Lawrence River, has proved reserves of 418 million tons of high-grade direct shipping open pit ore, and these discoveries are believed to have only scratched the surface. The railroad from the ore body to Seven Islands in the St. Lawrence is under construction and will be completed in 1954. At the outset, 10 million tons will be brought out, but there is a reasonable expectation that increased requirements in the relatively near future will result in an annual shipment of 20 million tons.[17]

While some of this Labrador ore will go from Seven Islands by water to the east coast, a large proportion will go by bulk carrier up the St. Lawrence to Montreal for transshipment by rail to Pittsburgh or other inland points, or by rail and canal boat to Prescott, or other port at which point it will again be transshipped by bulk carrier to ports on Lake Erie, to the Detroit area for consumption by Ford and National Steel, among others, and possibly to points beyond. At the present time, larger ships of the Great Lakes fleet cannot operate at a full load up the Detroit River, Lake St. Clair, and the St. Clair River, because the upbound depth of these connecting channels is now only 21 feet. The loss of capacity already prevailing in the 25 feet downbound channels, about which reference has already been made, will therefore be a serious factor in the upbound channels when Labrador ore comes into production. The depth limitations in the upbound channels at the present time prevent the bulk carriage of coal from Erie ports at the full capacity of these ships. The benefits from the incremental capacity afforded by upbound channels of an overall depth of 27 feet are again not only economic but, perhaps even more important, will be in the interests of our national defense. These benefits must be calculated on the basis of 6 feet of additional draft.

4. THE ADVANTAGES OF DEEPENING THE CONNECTING CHANNELS TO THE WORLD TRADE OF THE ENTIRE GREAT LAKES AREA

This last point assumes the inevitable construction of the St. Lawrence seaway to provide a depth of at least 27 feet from Lake Ontario to the Atlantic Ocean. I say "inevitable" because I am convinced that Canada will proceed with the completion of this project, regardless of the position the United States decides to take with respect to this matter. The Federal Power Commission has already issued a license to New York State which authorizes the construction of the power facilities. With this important part of the entire problem well on the way to successful conclusion, those in a position to know believe that Canada is determined and even desirous of "going it alone, if necessary" in the construction of the seaway.

[16] Resources for Freedom, June 1952, vol. II, p. 15.

[17] F. M. Richards, Republic Steel Corp., before Senate Foreign Relations Committee, April 15, 1953.

The question is, therefore, not whether, but rather when the seaway will be completed.

It is impossible to forecast with any degree of completeness the effect which the foreign trade, made possible by the seaway, will have on the economic life of the Great Lakes areas. We can be sure of the fact that the cargoes which are carried will be determined largely by the matter of transportation rates and that in this respect the seaway route generally has a competitive advantage over combination rail-water routes, because of the inherently lower cost of water transportation. It is also possible to estimate the type and tonnage of the various cargoes which can be expected to utilize the advantages of the seaway. The Department of Trade and Commerce of the Government of Canada recently made available a comprehensive study of the traffic potentialities of the seaway. It estimated a total traffic on the seaway of slightly in excess of 44 million tons. Of this figure, 18 million tons consisting largely of wheat, other grain, and mill products, fabricated iron and steel products, soft coal, and autos would be downbound cargo—from ports of the Great Lakes to points east. The upbound cargoes of 26 million tons would be iron ore, paper, woodpulp, pulpwood, lumber, hard and soft coal, and petroleum products. The Suez Canal was built on the assumption that it would carry 3 million tons per year; in 1929 the Suez Canal carried more than 11 times the original 3-million estimate. The Panama Canal tonnage exceeded the original estimate of traffic within 10 years of its opening and now carries 3 times as much annually. If these examples are any guide, it is probably safe to predict that the 44 million annual tonnage estimated by the Canadian Government for the seaway will be vastly exceeded after the seaway has come into operation, and the only limitation will be capacity of ships and locks. The traffic is there.

It is clear to see that deepening the connecting channels to 27 feet will tie in very closely with the 27-foot channel contemplated for the seaway. Although much of the St. Lawrence Seaway traffic will be in lake carriers, a good deal will be transported in oceangoing vessels, most of which will require a depth greater than the 25 feet downbound and 21 feet upbound presently provided. Unless the connecting channels are deepened in anticipation of the traffic which the seaway will produce, certainly some of the economic and defense benefits of the seaway will be delayed in realization. The economic and national defense advantages are convincing reasons in support of each improvement standing on its merits. When the deepening of the connecting channels is considered in relation to the inevitable construction of the seaway, these reasons become cumulative and even more compelling.

In conclusion, let me say that I have attempted to set forth, in general terms, the principal considerations, which in our judgment should govern the Corps of Engineers in the findings it is required to make. In summary, these are that conditions, in the light of which the 1947 report was written, have undergone a radical change. The present composition of the Great Lakes fleet is drastically different and the incremental capacity afforded by deepening the connecting channels must now be figured in terms of millions of tons. The world outlook in 1953 has so changed from 1947 that we must set our national policy on the assumption that at least a "cold war" will have to be faced for the indefinite future. Deepening the channels, not only in the incremental capacity which this improvement will provide, but in protecting this vital transportation route from stoppage, is a substantial contribution to our present and long-range defensive planning. In 1947, Labrador ore was not even imagined as a large source of our ore supply; within a year it will be a reality. Again, the 1947 report did not need to take into account the matter of the seaway; today the construction of the seaway is inevitable, either by Canada alone or jointly by Canada and the United States.

The problem of deepening the connecting channels therefore cannot be met simply by a reference to the cost of this improvement and a comparison of that cost with the substantial economic benefits which will ensue. The issue presented is much more complex and must be judged in terms of the interests of national policy and with the overriding considerations of our national defense foremost in mind. Viewed in this frame of reference, this improvement represents an investment in our national security, which we cannot afford to do without.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association is grateful for this opportunity to present its views, and, if we can be of any assistance to the Corps of Engineers in the months ahead, we stand ready to serve.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer, and by agreement with the committee I think it will be accepted. I discussed it both yesterday and today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield to me, I may state that this subject has had the consideration of the chairman of the committee. I have talked it over with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendment should be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 3, after the word "obligations", it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following proviso: *"Provided*, That not to exceed 10 percent of the notes, debentures, and bonds or other obligations herein authorized shall be issued during the first year after the effective date of this act and not to exceed 40 percent during any year thereafter."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have one further amendment to offer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I regret that my attention was diverted, and I did not catch what the first amendment was.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would permit the expenditure of 10 percent in the first year and 40 percent in any year thereafter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is this the amendment the Senator had discussed with the chairman of the committee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My second amendment is somewhat longer, and I will ask that it be printed in the RECORD without reading, if that is desired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe I would prefer to have the amendment read, since we are planning on final passage of the bill tonight.

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield, if I may have assurance that I will not lose the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that all this action be taken without jeopardizing the right of the Senator from Vermont to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to strike out "upon approval of the President, whose action in such matter shall be final and conclusive" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "30 days following the date of approval thereof by the President, and shall be final and conclusive, subject to review as hereinafter provided. Any person aggrieved by an order of the Corporation establishing or changing such rules or rates may, within such 30-day period, apply to the Corporation for a rehearing of the matter upon the basis of which the order was entered. The Corporation shall have power to grant or deny the application for rehearing and upon such rehearing or without further hearing to abrogate or modify its order. The action of the Corporation in denying an application for rehearing or in abrogating or modifying its order shall be final and conclusive 30 days after its approval by the President unless within such 30-day period a petition for review is filed by a person aggrieved by such action in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the works to which the order applies are located or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The court in which such petition is filed shall have the same jurisdiction and powers as in the case of petitions to review orders of the Federal Power Commission filed under section 313 (b) of the Federal Power Act (16 U. S. C. 825*l*). The judgment of the court shall be final subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari or certification as provided in sections 1254 (1) and 1254 (3) of title 28 of the United States Code. The filing of an application for rehearing shall not, unless specifically ordered by the Corporation, operate as a stay of the Corporation's order. The filing of a petition for review shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Corporation's order."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator uses in his amendment the language "specifically ordered by the Corporation." Should not that be "specifically ordered by the court"?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator means, I assume, that in the third line from the bottom the word "Corporation" should be "court."

Mr. FERGUSON. It refers to the filing of an application for rehearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois modify his amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendment is drawn on the lines of the Federal Power

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Act, and is taken almost entirely from it. We have to supply the word "Corporation" where the word "Commission" appears in that act, and the amendment has been carefully prepared by the legislative counsel.

Mr. WILEY. The matter was taken up with me, and I had counsel submit the question to the State and Commerce Departments, who approved the amendment, and therefore I approved it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the St. Lawrence seaway project is before us again. In consequence, my personal responsibility in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway is before me again. This is the way it looks to me:

There are four considerations which have to be taken into account in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway. They are: The effect on the budget; the advantage to the Nation; the harm to New England; favorable or unfavorable effects on national defense.

The building of a seaway and its large-scale and successful operation would be a blow to the local transportation interests of New England. All sorts of arguments contrary to this are made, especially that New England would get some return, due to the increased prosperity of the country. We shall look at that argument again in a few minutes.

My State—Vermont—and the New England States, of which it is a part, are used to getting blows. The first severe economic blow that Vermont received was when its sheep business was destroyed by the building of the Union Pacific Railroad. This moved the whole industry westward to an area where better economic conditions were available than in our small and wintery State. Another blow affecting not merely Vermont but the New England States as a whole was landed on us when, first, the cotton textiles moved south, to be followed, it now seems, by the woolen textiles, as well.

With regard to blows of this sort, let it be said that our region has not survived so much as a result of the improved prosperity of other parts of the country, as it has by our own hard thinking and hard efforts. We have developed our muscles. We have firmed our fiber. We have learned to acquire an adaptability to drastic changes in conditions. We remain as prosperous as we are, not so much because the prosperity of the rest of the country has helped us, as because we are determined to swim and not to sink. Experience teaches us that any blow has to be met out of our own determined reaction to it, and not from any automatic support from the rest of the country.

A successful St. Lawrence Seaway is going to do very serious harm to New England transportation. In spite of this, I shall have to vote for the seaway if it can clearly be shown that we ought to sacrifice ourselves for the rest of the country. Whether or not we should do so is, therefore, the matter which concerns me most seriously.

We must know that the Nation is being really helped, for New England in general, and Vermont in particular, finds itself ordinarily on the paying end of any projects, and not on the benefit end. That certainly will be the case this time.

That New England was paying into the national kitty much more than it was receiving from it, was the subject of a report, made some months ago, which came to the eyes and ears of high officials in the Democratic administration. Their immediate reaction was to chide the people of my region for not getting the benefits. In effect, they said, "There is the gravy train, waiting in the station. Why not get aboard?"

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Vermont have in mind asking for a yea-and-nay vote on the motion he is considering making?

Mr. FLANDERS. I do. I shall move to recommit the bill, and of course I should like to have as many Senators as possible on the floor to hear me state my reasons for making the motion, so they may be as well informed as possible.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator from Vermont permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum, in order that there might be present a sufficient number of Senators to second the Senator's motion, in the event he moves to recommit the bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. I shall be glad to do so, if I may obtain unanimous consent to yield for that purpose without having my right to the floor jeopardized. I request unanimous consent for that purpose, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the proposed quorum call will be for the purpose of having a quorum present at the time of the taking of the vote on the motion which is intended to be made by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes; I propose to make a motion to recommit, and I desire to have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to the motion.

Mr. FERGUSON. How long does the Senator from Vermont believe it will take him to debate the motion, following the proposed quorum call?

Mr. FLANDERS. If the quorum call may be had at this point, I shall require 18¾ minutes. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERGUSON. That is one of the most specific answers I have ever received in regard to the consumption of time in the Senate.

Mr. President, I shall not object to the request which has been made.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I very much desire to suggest the absence of a quorum before the Senator from Vermont has completed his speech. However, if he has no objection, I would suggest that he continue his speech a little longer, and then let us suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Vermont is prepared to yield at this time, I would suggest the absence of a quorum, if it may be understood that in yielding for that purpose the Senator from Vermont will not lose his right to the floor, and if it may also be understood that his subsequent remarks will not count as a second speech, because we have no desire whatever to prejudice his right to the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. I appreciate the suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FLANDERS. I now yield to the majority leader for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, has the Senator from Vermont yet made a motion to recommit?

Mr. FLANDERS. No. I am about to make such a motion. I shall make the motion now and speak to it afterward.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he moves to recommit?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Such a motion will not foreclose the Senator from South Dakota. I should like to have the yeas and nays ordered on the motion to recommit.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I move to recommit the bill S. 2150, as amended, to the Committee on Foreign Relations with the suggestion that the committee request the President to appoint a competent, impartial commission to review the plans for this project and advise the President and the Congress within 3 months as to whether or not the project is in fact economically feasible, and as to whether or not it will be in fact self-liquidating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I shall now continue my remarks.

That New England was paying into the national "kitty" much more than it was receiving from it was the subject of a report, made some months ago, which came to the eyes and ears of high officials in the Democratic administration. Their immediate reaction was to chide the people of my region for not getting

the benefits. In effect, they said, "There is the gravy train, waiting in the station. Why not get aboard?"

We had a specific example of that in my State before I came to the Senate. The Roosevelt administration offered to Vermont a parkway which, in the long range of the Green Mountains, would have duplicated the Skyline Drive, that delightful feature of the Blue Ridge Mountains in Virginia and their extension southward into the Carolinas. The people of Vermont felt that to be an unjustified Federal expenditure even though it was offered to them. They were, and are, budget sensitive. Besides that, they passed the same judgment on the offer that was passed by Laocoon on the Trojan horse. Said he, "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes," which translated into the vernacular would read, "I want nothing to do with the New Deal even if it offers us something for nothing."

Nevertheless I shall feel it my duty to vote for the St. Lawrence Seaway if a case for the national interest can be made clear and definite enough.

The point which is being most strongly stressed at the present time in this matter of national interest is that it is a necessary and important defense measure. This has been certified to by the highest military authorities. Now, I am not going to set myself up against the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force or the Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That would be presumptuous. But it is not presumptuous to ask a humble but important judge of such things to bring these military men before the bar. The bar is the bar of common sense and the judge is Common Sense itself.

The arguments as to national defense seem, in the light of common sense, to be based on warfare that is outmoded, wherein such a means of communication as the St. Lawrence seaway could be easily defended from sabotage or more massive military attack. We are living in the atomic age. Sometimes we forget it. Have the Joint Chiefs of Staff forgotten it? Are they prepared to defend this sensitive and vital artery in addition to all the other places and facilities which they have now to defend?

One A- or H-bomb successfully dropped on this sprawling target and its usefulness is at an end. Then what do have to fall back on? The railroads of course.

Let us look at the defensibility of the railroads. They constitute a network. If Jones Junction is broken up, you go through Smith's Junction. If Smith's Junction is broken up, you go through Robertson's Junction. There are a score of ways to cross the country East and West, North and South by the railroads. The really vital element in defense transportation is not a waterway dependent on cement and earth work structures. The real dependence is on the thousands of miles of interweaving, parallel and criss-crossing north and south, east and west, northeast, southwest, northwest, southeast web of steel and ties and ballast on which this country's defensive transportation ultimately rests. And now it is proposed to weaken an important sector of this fundamental defense in favor of a vulnerable replacement whose defense will be difficult and uncertain.

In respect to the necessity of the St. Lawrence Seaway for national defense, the case is not made.

The logical way to determine the economic usefulness of the seaway to the Nation as a whole is to investigate the possibility of its being self-liquidating. If the defense element were sufficiently great, we might conclude that the project should be carried through even though it was going to be a continuous burden on our finances. If, however, the importance to defense has been overestimated, as I believe it to have been, then the argument gets down strictly to the question as to whether the commercial usefulness of the seaway is sufficient to pay for itself during a reasonable period of amortization.

Now that is just what we do not know. We have had figures and figures and figures. We have had reports and reports and reports. Figures and reports have all come, if I am correctly informed, from estimates of the Army engineers. As years have gone by, as labor costs have risen, as material costs have risen, the original figures have had applied to them various factors and ratios and recalculations to keep them supposedly in line with present conditions.

First let us look at the original source—the calculation of the Army engineers. The Army engineers are a wonderful organization. They build works which withstand the ravages of the elements and the passage of time. Whatever they do is well done. But, to my knowledge, they have never had to design large engineering works to meet a commercial situation. Their projects have not had to have direct assurances of amortization from profits over a reasonable period of time. In calculations of this sort are the Army engineers experienced?

We have, in fact, experience with them of a contrary sort. We have an almost uninterrupted experience of estimates which fall far below the ultimate costs. To some extent this failure to estimate correctly has been due to long-time lags during which the inflation of the previous administration ate away at the estimates themselves. But even under the best conditions we do not have such a record of successful cost predictions as would warrant us in taking the figures at their face value.

If it becomes reasonably clear that the St. Lawrence will pay for itself, then I will vote for it. What is needed to make that estimate and my duty reasonably clear?

Other great engineering projects undertaken by the Federal Government in this century have not been adopted and carried out until they had been carefully studied by an impartial commission, competent engineering and businesswise to advise the people of the United States as to costs and as to financial return. The Panama Canal was not built until a commission had examined it and reported on it in detail. The Hoover Dam was not built until an impartial commission had examined it and reported on it in detail. The St. Lawrence Seaway has never had this treatment.

The change in the financing proposals from last year to this supports some doubt as to whether it is possible to make a good financing case for the seaway. Last year the proposal was that it should be financed by public issue of bonds guaranteed by the Federal Government. This year, through indirect means, the Government is required to finance the whole thing itself. The question naturally arises: Was public financing found impracticable even with the Government guaranty? It is certainly safe to say that without the guaranty the project could not have been bonded in the public securities market simply because it had never had the kind of examination and report that is required of any business undertaking which seeks the support of public financing. If it were proposed to finance the St. Lawrence Seaway by floating a private bond issue, it might even be that the Securities Exchange Commission would turn thumbs down on it.

I will therefore move at the end of these remarks that the project be recommitted to commitee, with the request that the President appoint a competent, impartial commission of the highest character and competency to review the plans of this project and report to the President and to the Senate as to whether or not it is in fact self-liquidating.

Like the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I want to get the facts. Unlike the junior Senator from Minnesota, I feel we do not as yet have the facts.

I do not propose that this commission go into the matter in full detail. I do not propose that they examine every element in the design. I do propose that the investigation be undertaken in the same terms and for the same purposes as would be the case if a board of directors sought advice on a completely worked out engineering proposal which was submitted.

I would want it to be definite in everyone's mind that this is not a filibuster approach to the project. I am satisfied that a commission of the sort I propose could report within 3 months. I then feel sure that the Senate could act on such a report within a matter of weeks with far more certainty than it can possibly act on the seaway proposal in its present form.

The seaway is of course tied up with the power development in which lies the primary interest of northern New England. This seems to be assured by the joint enterprise of the State of New York and the Province of Ontario. An essential part of the investigation by the proposed Commission would be to make sure that the costs are properly allocated as between the power and the seaway. And finally there is the problem of estimating tonnage and resulting tolls.

Canada must not be kept on the hook much longer. Canada must know whether we are going along. We must take the action required to enable us to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

judge whether we can properly go along or not.

Mr. President, I should like to call up my motion, which I have sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). The Secretary will state the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

I move to recommit the bill S. 2150, as amended, to the Commitee on Foreign Relations with the suggestion that the committee request the President to appoint a competent, impartial commission to review the plans for this project and advise the President and the Congress within 3 months as to whether or not the project is in fact economically feasible and as to whether or not it will in fact be self-liquidating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

NO ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY REPORT ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to offer either an amendment to the motion offered by the Senator from Vermont or a substitute for it, which would refer the bill to the Committee on Public Works.

My reason for asking that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Works is that an economic feasibility report has never been made or even requested on the project by the Corps of Army Engineers.

For 75 years Congress has always depended on the Corps of Army Engineers for economic feasibility reports on flood control and rivers and harbors projects, as well as on irrigation and power when connected with such projects.

NO REPORT EVER REQUESTED

I do so move, Mr. President, and in support of the motion I wish to read a part of a paragraph from a letter which was sent to me by the Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers. It is signed by Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis. The letter is dated January 18 and says in part:

Probably because of the international character of the St. Lawrence development, the Corps of Engineers was never authorized to prepare a single overall engineering economic report thereon.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada will not vote against a project on the Senate floor which has been pronounced economically feasible following such a survey unless there are very compelling reasons for doing so.

When the project has been pronounced feasible under the long-established precedents of the Congress, then and only then it is ready to be considered by a Senate committee in accordance with long established precedents of this body.

When a flood-control project or a river-and-harbor-improvement project, or a combination of such projects, together with irrigation or power, has been passed upon favorably by the Army engineers, in accordance with their rule relating to benefits if the benefits are greater than the cost, the project is in the realm of feasibility. It is then considered by the Public Works Committee of the Senate and if it is reported favorably to the Senate—the Senate may or may not concur—but if the Senate approves it and the Appropriations Committee makes the necessary appropriations, then the project is constructed.

But never has there been such a project constructed without a favorable report from the Army engineers, or in the case of a combination of irrigation and flood control, by the Bureau of Reclamation engineers in the Department of the Interior.

In some cases their work overlaps; sometimes they work together; sometimes they themselves decide which agency shall take jurisdiction. But in any case, the two official engineering advisers to the Congress have been the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation engineers with reference to such projects.

Mr. President, on January 18, before writing the letter to the Chief of Engineers of the Army to which I have just referred, on page 353 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date I asked the majority leader this question:

I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader, since many Senators have been occupied in open hearings of committees, "Has the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army made a report as to the feasibility of the St. Lawrence Seaway?"

The distinguished majority leader said that his information was that they had, but that he would get the information.

Mr. President, I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1954, where the Senator from California, true to his promise, presented a memorandum from Pat M. Holt, dated January 19, 1954, from which I now quote:

* * * the Army engineers have never made a feasibility report on the St. Lawrence Seaway. They have never been asked to make such a report, primarily because the seaway is an international project. The survey of the economics of the project has been the responsibility of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I should prefer to complete my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I only wanted to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. MALONE. I shall be glad to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator have the Sturgis letter from which he read one sentence?

Mr. MALONE. I do have it and will put it into the RECORD before I complete my statement.

Mr. WILEY. Very well. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, reading further from the memorandum from Pat M. Holt, dated January 19, 1954:

This was the conclusion reached in May 1953 by an interagency committee, composed of the Commerce, State, Defense, and Interior Departments.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to volume 94 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, part II, 80th Congress, 2d session, February 20, 1948, to March 15, 1948, and I desire to read from page 1841 of that volume.

Senator Revercomb had the floor, and the junior Senator from Nevada said 6 years ago:

I should like to ask the Senator a question at this point. On page 392 of the hearings held by the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from May 28 to June 20, 1947, I note the testimony of General Wheeler. I wish to read a short paragraph from his testimony:

"We have never made an exhaustive study of that kind—

Mr. President, I shall not read further, but I shall ask that the debate be put into the RECORD to keep the record straight. It developed that no engineering commission, with specific reference to the Army engineers, had ever been asked for such a survey.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter addressed to Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Army Engineers, dated January 18, 1954, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 18, 1954.

Maj. Gen. S. D. STURGIS, Jr.,
Chief of Army Engineers,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL STURGIS: In accordance with our telephone conversation this morning, I would like to have the complete history on the St. Lawrence Waterway with particular reference to any studies of feasibility that the Army engineers may have made, together with their reports, including any testimony that they may have given on it.

I recall in 1947 or 1948, when the project was proposed on the Senate floor, I asked that question and the answer was that the Engineers had never studied it from the standpoint of economic feasibility and repayment.

You are generally familiar with the long-established policies of Congress. First, that navigation and flood control projects are constructed without repayment except rights-of-way whenever the Army engineers have testified that the benefits exceed the cost; second, that irrigation projects are constructed when the Bureau of Reclamation or Army engineers report that the project will repay the cost over a reasonable amortization period without interest; and third, a precedent was set on Hoover Dam about 1930 and continued in many instances, that the commercial part of a project be repaid with interest. As you know, Hoover Dam is being repaid over a definite amortization period of 50 years, with 4 percent interest in the beginning, and which now has been reduced to 3 percent, but always more than the money cost the Government.

The Army engineers, in their economic feasibility report, go into the question of feasibility, whether it be navigation, flood control, power, or irrigation, and show the extent of the feasibility on a basis of congressional precedent, and this is the information that I would like to have, as to whether or not the Engineers have in fact made such a study.

I would like to discuss other western projects with you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. MALONE.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the question I asked of the Army engineers specifically was this:

The Army engineers, in their economic feasibility report, go into the question of feasibility, whether it be navigation, flood control, power, or irrigation, and show the

extent of the feasibility on a basis of congressional precedent, and this is the information that I would like to have, as to whether or not the engineers have in fact made such a study.

The answer, received on the same day, January 18, 1954, addressed to me, stated, in part:

Reference is made to your telephone inquiry and letter of this morning concerning the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, particularly the matters of past investigative reports and testimony by the Corps of Engineers on the St. Lawrence proposal.

I again read the paragraph with particular reference to the survey:

Probably because of the international character of the St. Lawrence development, the Corps of Engineers was never authorized to prepare a single overall engineering-economic report thereon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of General Sturgis be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 18, 1954.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: Reference is made to your telephone inquiry and letter of this morning concerning the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, particularly the matters of past investigative reports and testimony by the Corps of Engineers on the St. Lawrence proposal.

On April 24, 1953, the President approved the findings and recommendations of the National Security Council to the effect that the United States should participate in the project. On May 8, 1953, the Cabinet unanimously approved a recommendation that such participation is desirable, provided it is limited to the international section of the St. Lawrence River between Lake Erie and Montreal. Confirming information given over the telephone, the Cabinet acted after consideration of a report by a committee of representatives from the State, Commerce, Interior, and Defense Departments. While that interagency report has not yet been released, reasons for the administration's position appear on page 465 of the Senate committee's hearings (copy enclosed) on the pending bill. Scope of that study is outlined on page 466.

Probably because of the international character of the St. Lawrence development, the Corps of Engineers was never authorized to prepare a single overall engineering-economic report thereon. The corps has, however, handled essentially all of the engineering planning by the United States, jointly with Canada, going back to 1921. More recently, in 1940–42, we developed pursuant to Executive order the plans, specifications, and cost estimates for the International Rapids section power-navigation development, including the seaway-only facilities on the United States side which would be authorized by the Wiley bill (S. 2150) if enacted. Those cost estimates have been revised from time to time, the latest revision being as of December 1952. They appear in the testimony of General Robinson, Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, on pages 42, 43, 50, and 51 of the Senate hearings.

The Corps of Engineers has consistently supported legislation proposing authorization of the St. Lawrence project in its testimony during many appearances before committees of the Senate and House of Representatives. Such testimony includes hearings before Senate committees in 1946, 1947, and 1952, in addition to those of 1953 mentioned above, and hearings before committees of the House in 1941, 1947, 1950, 1951, and 1953.

The latest testimony by Federal agencies is that before the House Public Works Committee in June 1953. I am enclosing a copy of those hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 104 for your convenient reference. It is suggested that you might be particularly interested in the testimony of Hon. Walter Williams, Under Secretary of Commerce, beginning on page 28; that of Hon. Frank Nash, Assistant Secretary of Defense, commencing on page 56; and that of General Robinson, beginning on page 75. Concerning General Robinson's statement with respect to economic feasibility and self-liquidation, attention is especially invited to his testimony on page 82. Summaries of three traffic estimates appear on pages 7 and 8. Pursuant to resolutions adopted by the Senate and House Public Works Committees, the Corps of Engineers now has under way the preparation of an up-to-date cost estimate and report on the advisability of deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels, which are predominantly in United States territory and which have been improved heretofore at the expense of the United States.

Also enclosed is a copy of a seven-page mimeograph statement on St. Lawrence project notes dated January 1954, which you may find useful.

I trust this letter and its enclosures will serve your present needs.

Sincerely yours,

S. D. STURGIS, Jr.,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the marked parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 353–354 of January 18, 1954, be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, as corrected.

There being no objection, the marked parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader, since many Senators have been occupied in open hearings of committees, has the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army made a report as to the feasibility of the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. KNOWLAND. My information is that they have.

Mr. MALONE. Is the report available? I called the Corps of Engineers this morning and they were not aware of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will have a check made to determine the correct answer.

Mr. MALONE. I have been unable to find such a report among any of the reports in my possession. I remember that the same question was before the Senate in 1947. At that time I asked the same question, and the answer was in the negative.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say that I cannot answer the Senator's question of my own knowledge. One of the members of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations indicated to the majority leader that there was such a report. However, I have asked him to check immediately. Either later today or tomorrow, I will give to the Senator a precise answer as to whether such a report would be available for his study.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. In the case of flood control and navigation projects for 75 years the Congress of the United States has followed the policy that if the Army engineers, after full investigation, submitted a report stating that the benefits would exceed the cost, then the project may be built. In that event it is generally taken for granted that the project is ready for committee hearings. If the economic benefits and the power, if any, derived will, according to the engineering reports exceed the cost, the project is considered to have feasible status. If irrigation is included, then the money is to be paid back on a definite amortization period, without interest, by those who will use the project for irrigation purposes.

A precedent was set in connection with the Hoover Dam project, in 1928, that whenever there were certain commercial features, such as power, the Government would be repaid, on the commercial part of the project, with interest.

The Senator from California will recall that the Hoover Dam paid 4 percent for a considerable time. It is now paying 3 percent interest. It is that kind of a feasibility report on the proposed project the junior Senator from Nevada would like to see, because there has never been any serious question about building a project in the United States, in the construction of which there is participation by Congress in the appropriation of taxpayers' money, when the project comes under some well-established category of feasibility. In the case of an irrigation project, the money is paid back over a definite amortization period, without interest. In the case of a power project, a commercial project, the money is paid back with interest. I should like very much to have whatever information there is available about the proposal now under consideration, because I understood the Senator to say that Wednesday would be the day for voting on the pending bill.

* * * * *

Mr. MALONE. In 1947, when a similar proposal was before the Senate, request was made for such a report, but the report was never received. I recently wrote a letter to the Chief of Army Engineers about it. I talked to someone in his office concerning the matter. The gentleman who talked with me said he is going to send me everything on the subject that he can. However, that information has not yet reached my office. I thought the committee might have the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not want to make a point of order on the motion of the Senator from Nevada to recommit, but I believe a point of order would be in order, because the yeas and nays have been ordered on the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

I think the Senator would not lose any of his rights if he would permit a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

vote on the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. Then, assuming for the moment that the motion is not agreed to—although perhaps we should not so assume—I think the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would be in order to make a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Public Works.

It seems to me that in that way the distinguished Senator from Vermont would be able to have a vote on the motion he has made to recommit, and the distinguished Senator from Nevada would not lose his opportunity to make a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from California, that I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. Of course, I suppose my amendment to, or substitute for his motion would be in order by unanimous consent of the Senate. However, I do not consider that to be the important part of the debate.

The important part of the debate is that there never has been an economic feasibility report made by any Corps of Engineers of experience in the United States Government.

I may say further to the distinguished Senator from California that when such an investigation or hearing was held by the Committee on Public Works, of which I was a member for 6 years, an automatic request for a feasibility report would go to the Corps of Engineers of the Army, and there would be no question about it.

In this case, the bill would be returned to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and there is a serious question as to what that committee would do, because they seem to have some kind of special proclivity or ability to order reports from various sources, other than from the long accepted sources and finally to make a report to the Senate that means nothing to anyone, with respect to economic feasibility of a project, or who is responsible for such a report.

Further, I may say that I do not wish to vote against any project, unless there be compelling reasons to do so, that has been pronounced feasible by the Corps of Army Engineers in response to a direct inquiry from a Senate committee.

We are here considering a project that seems to have been thoroughly debated. The only point in the debate remaining in question is with respect to the type of economic feasibility report. A report for which a specific engineering group is responsible.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield, to enable me to comment on the procedure?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I must admit that I prefer my motion to that of the Senator from Nevada. Second, I must say that I prefer the motion of the Senator from Nevada to none.

The first statement means that I would not wish to accept the amendment of the Senator from Nevada to my motion voluntarily.

The second statement means that I think it would be a nice thing, if the occasion should arise, which I hope it will not, for the Senator to offer his motion immediately after mine has been acted upon.

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that where the bill may go for the purpose of securing a proper economic feasibility report is really not of great importance to the junior Senator from Nevada. What I should like to see would be such a report that had been made by a corps of responsible engineers; engineers that had followed the project through from top to bottom, and had stated that the project was economically feasible under the assumed conditions. If we had such a report, we would know where the project might lead us. We would not simply be opening the gate to a blind ending.

As a matter of fact, the procedure to be followed to secure such a report from a responsible source is not of great importance.

Mr. President, I ask that that part of the statement of the distinguished majority leader, which was the memorandum to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] from Pat M. Holt, appearing on page 419 of the RECORD for January 19, be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 19, 1954.

MEMORANDUM

To: Senator KNOWLAND.
From: Pat M. Holt.

1. When Senator MALONE asked yesterday if the Army engineers had made a feasibility report on the St. Lawrence Seaway, I understood him to mean if the engineers had reported that the project was feasible. They have so reported on several occasions, and I so indicated to you.

2. As used by the Army engineers, however, the term "feasibility report" has a special meaning—namely, a report based not only on an engineering study but also on an economic study of the project in question. In this narrow, technical sense, the Army engineers have never made a feasibility report on the St. Lawrence Seaway. They have never been asked to make such a report, primarily because the seaway is an international project. The survey of the economics of the project has been the responsibility of the Department of Commerce. When the Commerce Department's economic survey and the Army's engineering survey were combined, both departments agreed that the project was feasible from both an economic and an engineering point of view, and that it could be made self-liquidating, at interest, over 50 years. This was the conclusion reached in May 1953, by an interagency committee, composed of the Commerce, State, Defense, and Interior Departments, which went into the matter thoroughly and made the report on which the subsequent Cabinet action approving United States participation in the seaway was based.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now ask that the debate on the same subject, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part II, 80th Congress, 2d session, February 20, 1948, to March 15, 1948, beginning on page 1841 and continuing to the bottom of page 1842, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator a question at this point. On page 392 of the hearings held by the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from May 28 to June 20, 1947, I note the testimony of General Wheeler. I wish to read a short paragraph from his testimony:

"We have never made an exhaustive study of that kind"—

Mr. President, the general had been asked if he had made an economic study of the feasibility of this project—

"and I attempted to point out in my presentation a few minutes ago that such a study involves a great deal of field work and a cost that we feel has not been authorized for us to do. In making such a study we have to canvass the field-by-field contact and by questionnaires to find out the potential users; we have to study the boundaries of the area that would be economically affected, the nature of the water-adapted commerce, and the volume of it, which is a study that requires a long time. We estimate that such a study would take about a year to complete."

Mr. President, I ask my friend the Senator from West Virginia if he knows whether the Army engineers have ever been requested to make such a study, which is customary in projects of this kind.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator from Nevada that such a request with regard to this international seaway has not been made by any committee of which I am a member. The able Senator from Nevada and I are members of the Public Works Committee, which deals with waterways within the boundaries of the United States but not with this international seaway. In that connection our committee is in contact with the Army Corps of Engineers and with the able head of that organization, General Wheeler. I do not know whether such a request ever has been made by some other committee.

The statement called to my attention by the Senator from Nevada clearly indicates that the Chief of Army Engineers was reluctant to state a conclusion, because he said an examination and a study which he thought necessary had not been made—a statement which in itself is a further argument that we are going too fast on this proposition, and that the resolution should be sent back to the committee.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I also note in the testimony at the hearings an answer by General Wheeler to a question by the chairman as to whether he would be inclined to make such a survey. General Wheeler said:

No, sir. We are short of money and short of people. We feel that we would need authority of Congress to make it, Senator WILEY, for the reason that all of our surveys are specifically authorized by an act of Congress. And this has not been so authorized.

I further ask the Senator from West Virginia whether it is customary in all cases, so far as he knows, to have such a detailed economic survey made by the Army engineers or by other competent authority.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is very customary and, so far as I know, is prerequisite to any construction upon the inland waterways of this

country, that a thorough survey be made, and that after the survey has been made, and only after is has been made, the conclusion must be arrived at that the construction is justifiable.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator further yield, Mr. President?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I note in the testimony of Mr. Harriman, the Secretary of Commerce, when apparently he was answering a question, the following statement:

"The Department"—

That is, the Department of Commerce—"has not yet made a detailed analysis of potential traffic on the seaway in the light of these revised capacity estimates. Moreover, the Department has been able to make only very preliminary judgments concerning the effect of tolls on traffic which might use the waterway and the level of tolls which can be imposed. My subsequent comments on traffic which might use the seaway must accordingly be considered only as very rough estimates rather than conclusions resulting from careful study. These limitations should be kept clearly in mind in appraising the estimates which are included in the table attached as an appendix to my statement."

Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say I am perturbed to have to cast my vote on this important question at this time without the necessary detailed economic surveys, since the project is very important to the States in the Northeast, according to several of my distinguished colleagues from that area; and of course it is well known that I am committed, and have been for over 20 years, to the development of the type of projects which are well established Federal policy through congressional action over a period of 40 or 50 years. These types of projects include any navigation or flood-control project expenditures to be borne by the Federal Government, without expense to the citizens of the States involved, when it is clearly shown that the benefits are about equal to or greater than the costs.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator at this point, if he will permit me to do so, to say that I have learned to know quite well the attitude of the Senator from Nevada and how forward looking he is and how aggressively he is in regard to the construction of public works and other public improvements which will improve the living and the progress of this country. But I have always found likewise that the Senator insists that they be upon a sound basis.

Mr. MALONE. I thank my colleague from West Virginia. I would further say that I am unqualifiedly on record as favoring the long-established policy of the construction of reclamation projects where the cost can be returned over a period of years without interest. This has been a 45-year policy of the Congress, when costs and benefits have been thoroughly investigated and the estimates of the Bureau of Reclamation have shown that the costs would be returned over a designated period of years. Further, on commercial projects, such as the production of power and other salable products, when that part of a project can return the money plus interest over a stated period, I have no hesitancy in saying that I favor the construction of such projects where their extraordinary size, slow returns, or their multiple-purpose character make them unsuitable for private investments.

That is what perturbs me now when I realize we are faced with an immediate decision and that no investigation has been made by the customary agency, the Army engineers, and in addition, the investigation by the Department of Commerce, which agency ordinarily takes little interest in such projects, has been only "a very rough estimate," to quote the Secretary's own words. The Secretary, whose record is not impressive in this field, says frankly in his final report of November 1947 that he had insufficient personnel and time in order to make a reliable study. If my esteemed colleague from West Virginia could throw any light on the matter or furnish any further authentic data not mentioned in the hearings, it might be very helpful.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall yield in a moment. I am also admonished that our time is limited, and that the Senator from Wisconsin probably will want to speak in his own time, eventually.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to speak in his own time?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 1 minute in my time?

Mr. REVERCOMB. In a moment. I shall yield for that 1 minute on the Senator's time, as soon as I reply to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia declines to yield, temporarily.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know of any further plans being undertaken than the plans set forth in the record, which were called to my attention by the Senator from Nevada. I think his point is well taken. It appears throughout the record that there is not sufficient information, that surveys have not been completed. When the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, who has charge of construction and who would have charge of it from the actual engineering viewpoint on behalf of our country, when he comes before the committee and says that such a survey has not been made, and that they are not yet prepared to make such a survey, I am thoroughly impressed with the fact that we are proceeding a little too hastily. Even if it should ever be justified, we certainly have not at this time reached the point of showing any justification.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, in his own time.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I know of no other altercation in the Senate, so to speak, that indicates how totally ignorant the Senators are of the facts in the case. The undisputed evidence is that the Secretary of Commerce in November 1947 filed a complete report, showing in detail the income that would be derived from commerce. That report is in the record. The Corps of Engineers and the Senator who is now addressing the Senate filed in the record over the years excerpts from reports by the Corps of Engineers relative to the matter. I conclude my remarks by saying that the Corps of Engineers was requested by the Government to estimate the cost of the project. They did so. The distinguished Senator from the South [Mr. OVERTON] brought to the attention of the Senate in the opening days of the debate the fact that in 1941 the Secretary of Commerce had filed his report. But in November 1947, after the hearings had been concluded, as stated by the distinguished Senator from the West, the Secretary of Commerce filed his report. I hand that report to the Senator. It is already in the record, and I may say that one of the Senators is at present studying the report.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. In just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia declines to yield at this time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that when reference is made to ignorance of this, that, or the other figure I read from the record itself. The record states the facts and refutes any such charge. The testimony relates to a survey as to the amount of traffic that would pass through the canal. Certainly no one can soundly charge the Chief of Engineers of the Army with being ignorant. Let us see what he says about it. His testimony was quoted a few moments ago. The Senator from Wisconsin himself asked this question of the Chief of the United States Army Engineer Corps:

"I am informed now that Secretary Harriman will testify to traffic possibilities. I would like you to submit to the committee in writing your views on the type of commodities and amounts that may move over the seaway.

"General WHEELER. Yes, sir.

"Senator WILEY. Can you do that?"

General Wheeler answered as follows:

"We have never made an exhaustive study of that kind, Mr. Coleman, and I attempted to point out in my presentation a few minutes ago that such a study involves a great deal of fieldwork and a cost that we feel has not been authorized for us to do. In making such a study we have to canvass the field by field contact and by questionnaires to find out the potential users; we have to study the boundaries of the area that would be economically affected, the nature of the water-adapted commerce, and the volume of it, which is a study that requires a long time. We estimate that such a study would take about a year to complete."

The statement is there made by the Chief of Engineers that he is in no position to give an answer upon the question until such a study is made, and that it would take a year to complete it. I feel that that statement by the Chief of Engineers, a great engineer, can be accepted at its full value, as it appears in the record. There is nothing of ignorance here. There is solid fact. That is the printed record before us. But one conclusion can be drawn, that he would not give an estimate. He says he could not give an estimate until a survey should be made. We know that that survey has not been made, because it would take a year to do it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. These few remarks I may make are not in the nature of an argument with my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin. I am merely endeavoring to secure further information upon which to base a decision on a question about which I am honestly undecided. The report made by the Department of Commerce, in its preface, states as follows:

"It is the purpose of this study in view of the widespread interest in the pending legislation, to make an economic appraisal of the transportation phases of the project, with particular reference to potential traffic and the possible toll revenue which might be derived from it. Limited time and staff have not permitted undertaking a study of the potential traffic for all commodities. A fairly accurate picture of the total traffic volume which might utilize the waterway may, however, be derived from a study of a few bulk commodities, which it is anticipated will furnish the major share of the traffic. Accordingly, the study has been restricted to an investigation of potential traffic in iron ore, grain, coal, and petroleum."

I further submit that the data seem to be incomplete. Therefore it would seem to me that the thing to do would be to cause the customary study to be made for the benefit of the Congress. It would require approximately a year. When the Senate returns next year the study can be ready for us. That would be my conclusion at the present moment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in conformance with the wishes of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and in conclusion, I withdraw my amendment to his motion.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I would finally remark that it is not important in my opinion, as to which official body of engineers makes such a report. However, I have been in the engineering business for 30 years, and I know how figures can be juggled when no single engineer is responsible for them.

I should simply like to see an economic feasibility report made by an established corps of engineers, whether it be the Corps of Army Engineers or the engineers of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. I know the Secretary of the Interior was a member of the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of clarifying a parliamentary situation?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I understand that the Senator from Nevada at this time is not pressing his amendment to the motion to recommit, with instructions, offered by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MALONE. I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Vermont, but so long as he would rather have his motion voted upon, it is perfectly agreeable to me. Therefore, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to detain the Senate by making an argument at length at this late hour. More than 20 years ago the legislature of South Dakota memorialized Congress to build the St. Lawrence Seaway. South Dakota has maintained an interest in the project from that time until now.

The construction of the Panama Canal, which was a magnificent American achievement, and did a great deal to benefit the Western Hemisphere and the United States, also had the effect, transportation-wise, of bringing San Francisco and Los Angeles closer to New York, from the standpoint of the cost of transportation, than to any point in midcontinent United States.

In the great breadbasket of the country, where South Dakota is located and has its palpitating heart, we find ourselves making a success of farming at the end of the most expensive rail haul in the world, farther from salt water than farmers have been able to operate successfully in any other area of the world or in any era of history.

We believe, however, that it would be easier for us to continue to succeed in the agricultural development of the heartland of America if we had some of the benefits of the comparatively cheap transportation which would be made available by water rates on ocean-going vessels going to Chicago and Duluth. In that way the people of South Dakota would benefit to a considerable degree, from the standpoint of the savings which would be available to them by a lowering of the freight costs on heavy and bulky merchandise, and from the standpoint of increased revenue which the farmers would receive when they sold such products as wheat, grain, and perhaps other commodities.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota whether the canal would be navigable only for small tramp steamers which come from Poland, Latvia, Scandinavia, Greece, and other places, or whether it would accommodate our own merchant marine, based upon a 27-foot channel.

Mr. MUNDT. It is my understanding that the seaway is to be made suitable for transit by oceangoing vessels. We hope they will be the same kind of great oceangoing vesels which now frequent the harbors along the coasts of our country.

Mr. KILGORE. The Plimsoll mark on our oceangoing vessels is well established. My understanding is that a depth of 32 or 33 feet is required in the harbors to take care of those vessels, and a 27-foot depth would not accommodate them.

Mr. MUNDT. I am quite content to believe that the inventive mind of man will construct oceangoing vessels which can navigate the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is speaking of the future; I am speaking of the present. The small coastal vessels of the countries mentioned by me are the ones which will navigate the seaway. I have been on the lakes, and even at the present time we find vessels coming there from Poland, Latvia, and various other places, but we do not find any American vessels. I am wondering whether the Senator from South Dakota has considered the fact that the so-called seaway will exclude American oceangoing freighters.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not believe the seaway will exclude American oceangoing freighters. I am prepared to believe that American oceangoing freighters will utilize the seaway, some of them now being of a draft that could enable them to do so, and, if necessary, new ships will be constructed which will be able to use it. I am prepared to believe that we will be in much better condition to use these seagoing ships than we are without any seaway at all.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot yield further because, as I have said, there is no desire on my part to prolong the debate.

I believe that the proposal before the Senate is a step forward in the development of the great interior sections of the country, a step forward in cementing the friendly relations between Canada and the United States, which are practically an entirety, certainly in this uneasy age in which we live.

I should like to urge my colleagues that they vote to defeat both the pending motion to recommit offered by the Senator from Vermont, and the sequel thereto, if, as, and when, the Senator from Nevada offers his motion to recommit. Certainly in the past 20 years this subject has been studied and surveyed and slide-ruled and examined. I can see no particular advantage to be gained by recommitting the bill so that more mathematics can be applied to the problem. If the engineers found it difficult to make the original feasibility report by reason of the fact that this is an international project, nothing will occur within the next generation which will make it other than international. It will still be a borderline project, and the engineers will find the same difficulties confronting them in the future that have been found in the past.

For the reasons I have given, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote against all motions to recommit, and I urge them to vote in favor of the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway as provided in the pending bill.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared containing some of the reasons why I believe the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway is a very valuable and important project, of special benefit to the farmers of the Middle West.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

There is only one decision that the Congress of the United States must make in acting upon S. 2150, the bill to authorize United States participation with Canada in construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway and that is whether it is in the interest of the national welfare and national security that our country, as a part owner, have a voice in the determination of its policies, traffic priorities, and control. That is all there is to decide. All previous legislation this body has considered has been as to whether or not the project should be built—this is not the case now, the project is going to be built anyway, regardless of whether we participate or not, no amount of argument as to its economic feasibility, reliability of the cost estimates and potential revenues, or adequacy of the proposed 27-foot draft will be of any avail. When Canada builds it the opponents will be confronted with the same set of conditions as to alleged injury to their interests anyway. It could very well be that with the United States as a part owner having a voice in its control, we could very well be helpful to them in the future whereas if we do not participate we will have nothing to say whatsoever.

I am one of those who have never believed that the St. Lawrence Waterway would be harmful to the interests of the railroads and the east coast and gulf ports. I have always looked upon the construction of this project as a supplement to the Nation's transportation system rather than as a factor of competition. This has proved to be the case as far as the Panama Canal is concerned, yet the construction of this vital artery of transportation was fought tooth and nail by the railroads. Who in this country would be without it today? The country needs every mode of transportation that it can obtain—our population is growing by leaps and bounds.

Since the 1950 census our population has grown by 10 million. An article on the amazing population growth of this country in Time magazine, September 14, 1953, stated that by 1975 the United States will need to set a fifth plate for every 4 persons now consuming and that the population is growing so fast that it will reach an estimated one hundred and seventy-five to one hundred and eighty million by 1960. This all goes to prove how sound and prophetic the lead editorial in the Railway Age of June 3, 1950, entitled "Can Optimism About the Railroads

Be Justified?" was. Let me quote verbatim from that splendid editorial:

"The Nation is growing in population and production and its demand for transportation is growing even more rapidly. The railroads can and should relinquish to other agencies of transportation all the traffic that such agencies can handle more economically than the railroads can. With the loss of such traffic there should still remain to the railroads a larger volume of business than they ever enjoyed, even during the recent war."

The Railway Age is the leading spokesman for the rail-transportation industry. Their opinion should carry some weight. But all of this is beside the point, the main consideration is, that the seaway is going to be built anyway and, in my opinion, our country would be distinctly better off as a part owner with a voice in its control, rather than let the opportunity go by default and have the ownership and control of this vital and strategic waterway fall into the hands of a foreign country, no matter how close and friendly our relations may be.

As a United States Senator my first duty is to our country, to uphold its Constitution, and be ever watchful for its interests as a Nation. As as been said before, every President, Republican and Democratic alike, for the last 30 years has endorsed this project as a joint venture with Canada. When President Eisenhower took office he took particular pains to make a special investigation of this project through the National Security Council and by a special subcommittee of his Cabinet. The reports of their studies resulted in the unanimous endorsement of the St. Lawrence project by the President, the Cabinet, and the National Security Council. Last Thursday in his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower said, in the defense section of his message:

"Another part of this foundation is, of course, our continental transportation system. Some of our vital heavy materials come increasingly from Canada. Indeed our relations with Canada, happily always close, involve more and more the unbreakable ties of strategic interdependence. Both nations now need the St. Lawrence Seaway for security reasons. I urge the Congress promptly to approve our participation in its construction."

For no other reason alone, that statement would be enough for me to support this bill, S. 2150. I join our great leader, President Eisenhower, in that statement. After careful study and research by his advisers and out of that vast fund of knowledge and experience as a military man he has seen fit to endorse this project in the interest of national security. That should be enough for anyone as to the strategic value of this project, be he Republican or Democrat, and there should be no hesitancy nor reluctance on the part of any Member of the Congress of the United States to vote for this project from the standpoint of national security alone, especially when you consider that Canada is going to build it anyway, that it is self-sustaining and self-liquidating and will be no burden whatsoever on the taxpayers of the United States.

Secondly, I have in mind in supporting S. 2150 the interests of the great Middle West of which my State of South Dakota is a part. This has been aptly called the arsenal of freedom as well as the breadbasket of the world. For years this great producing section of the Nation, both agricultural and industrial, has been handicapped in transporting its products out to the markets, as well as getting its materials and supplies in from outside markets, by a constantly spiraling rail rate structure which has a distinct effect on our ability to compete in the markets. In addition to that practically every year we are harassed by a shortage of rail boxcars when the season comes for the movement of our crops to market.

The St. Lawrence Seaway will go far toward the solution of these two great problems of the Middle West. First, by having a low-cost, all-water route to the ocean, we can protect ourselves against these constantly increasing rail rates as this alternative mode of transportation will give to the Middle West what is known as a water-compelled rate which will be lower and more advantageous to our farmers and industries. As one of my colleagues recently stated, even if the waterway did not produce revenues that would make it self-sustaining and self-liquidating, it still would be worth it to the country, as the economic benefits from just this factor alone would warrant the investment and participation in the project.

A witness for the National Grange, at the recent hearings, stated that as a result of his study, availability of the St. Lawrence Waterway would bring about a saving of from 5½ cents to 8 cents per bushel on the transportation of wheat to the east coast, and, further, that most of this saving would redound to the benefit of the grain farmer. Just think what this saving alone would mean to the grain farmers of the Middle West. I have recently seen a statement of the Port of Detroit Commission wherein they state that the freight savings on a carload of refrigerators exported from Michigan to anywhere in Europe would amount to $114; on a carload of small machines to the United Kingdom, $262; on an unboxed automobile to the Baltic, $20; and on a boxed automobile to Antwerp, $22. On imports they state that on a carload of bicycles from England the saving would be $160 and on a carload of cocoa powder from Rotterdam, $110. These are all current savings on the existing waterway with a controlling depth of but 14 feet—and on ships limited to 3,000 tons carrying capacity. Think what the savings would be if there was available a waterway with a controlling depth of 27 feet that would accommodate ships with a carrying capacity of 20,000 tons or more. Certainly, the United States Senate cannot overlook and disregard the tremendous economic benefit this great waterway would be to our country, to say nothing of its strategic value as an arm of our national defense, upon which President Eisenhower recommended the passage of this bill.

Finally, you hear the argument that the country cannot afford to participate at this time, with an unbalanced budget and a national debt touching the ceiling. This would be true if the money appropriated for this project was an outright expenditure of funds for a project which would bring in intangible returns. In the case of the St. Lawrence Seaway, S. 2150, this argument just does not apply. Rather than an expenditure yielding intangible returns, the St. Lawrence is an investment that will yield tangible, fiscal revenues, in the form of navigation tolls, in an amount not only to operate it, maintain it, pay the interest on it, but retire the bonds issued to finance its cost as well. Indeed, conservative studies of potential revenues and carrying charges show that the project will yield $1.65 in revenues for every $1 of carrying charges. Far from being an expenditure, this is indeed an investment, and one that will yield a profit, to say nothing of its contribution to our national security. Was this country of ours ever offered an opportunity to participate in a public-works project that was as sound a business investment as the St. Lawrence Seaway?

In closing, permit me to include the following verbatim quotation:

"The time has come to resume in a moderate way the opening of our intracoastal waterways, the control of flood waters * * * the development of the great power and navigation project of the St. Lawrence River. * * * These projects cannot all be undertaken at once but should have the immediate consideration of the Congress and be adopted as fast as plans can be matured and the necessary funds become available.

"This is not incompatible with economy, for their nature does not require so much a public expenditure as a capital investment which will be reproductive, as evidenced by the marked increase in revenue from the Panama Canal. Upon these projects depend much future industrial and agricultural programs. They represent * * * the addition of a great amount of * * * cheap freight by use of navigation, chief of which is the bringing of oceangoing ships to the Great Lakes."

Do you Senators know who said that? It was President Calvin Coolidge in his message to Congress, December 1923.

At that time no one had ever dreamed of ore from Labrador for the steel mills of the Middle West, nor had the proposition of charging tolls for the use of these navigation facilities ever been thought of, much less proposed. Certainly there is no one who can ever charge President Coolidge with promoting wild expenditures of Federal funds; indeed he was the paragon of thrift and economy. Yet at that time, when the St. Lawrence Waterway was a good deal of a "one way street" as far as potential traffic was concerned, he foresaw the necessity for this great navigation project and, on the basis of intangible economic benefits alone, recommended it to the Congress. At that time the population of our country was approximately 105 million; today it is 160 million. Why should we wait longer. I am going to support S. 2150 in the interests of my country and the national security. I earnestly urge you, my colleagues in the United States Senate, to do likewise.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It was not a question of hardship on the part of the Army engineers in making a report. They had never been requested to make such a report. The junior Senator from Nevada has the greatest sympathy and interest in South Dakota's transportation problem and all the other States of the Union. It is with great reluctance that the junior Senator from Nevada may vote against any measure which might help any State, if it is the proper kind of legislation and pronounced economically feasible after reported upon by the proper engineering group.

I will say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that there is being conducted at this time an investigation regarding the availability of critical materials to this Nation in time of war in accordance with Senate Resolution No. 143.

The iron ore in Labrador will be a very great asset in time of war. We all realize that submarines may endanger coastwise shipping.

Therefore, an inland waterway, in the long run, might prove very advantageous. According to the testimony before the committee investigating that matter, it will be practically impossible for ships to cross either major ocean in the event of war.

Even coastwise shipping will be endangered. It does not then seem to be

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

too much to ask that the pending project submit to the criterion of economic feasibility, in accordance with the 75-year-old policy of Congress, which applies to projects which include flood control, rivers and harbors improvement, or irrigation, or power projects throughout the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. I share with the Senator from Nevada the wish that the Army engineers had provided a feasibility report, although the preparation of such a report might have resulted in a long delay. From reports made by economists, I am convinced that the report of the Army engineers would throw no further light or elucidation on the problem. I am convinced that the Army engineers would arrive at the same conclusions.

I may add that the Senator's eloquent testimony, in which he gave reasons why the inland waterway should be completed, was so convincing to one who was already convinced that I hope it may overcome the reluctance of the Senator to vote for the St. Lawrence Seaway, and that he will vote for the project.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I may say, in closing, that the Army engineers have advised that it will take approximately 1 year to furnish such a report. It has been 6 years since the matter was previously before the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. The same question was asked and the same reply was made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	McClellan
Anderson	Green	Millikin
Barrett	Hayden	Monroney
Beall	Hennings	Morse
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hoey	Murray
Burke	Holland	Neely
Bush	Humphrey	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Upton
Ferguson	Lennon	Watkins
Flanders	Long	Welker
Frear	Magnuson	Wiley
Fulbright	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Martin	Young
Goldwater	McCarran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to recommit the bill, as amended, with certain instructions and recommendations.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness, and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is absent on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would each vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are unavoidably detained.

On this vote the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—32

Beall	Hoey	Martin
Bricker	Hunt	McCarran
Bush	Ives	McClellan
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Purtell
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Ellender	Kilgore	Stennis
Flanders	Lennon	Welker
Frear	Long	Williams
Fulbright	Malone	

NAYS—51

Aiken	Douglas	Holland
Anderson	Dworshak	Humphrey
Barrett	Eastland	Jackson
Bennett	Ferguson	Kefauver
Burke	Gillette	Kennedy
Carlson	Goldwater	Knowland
Case	Gore	Kuchel
Clements	Green	Langer
Cooper	Hayden	Lehman
Cordon	Hennings	Magnuson
Dirksen	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Monroney	Potter	Symington
Morse	Schoeppel	Thye
Mundt	Smathers	Upton
Murray	Smith, Maine	Watkins
Pastore	Smith, N. J.	Wiley
Payne	Sparkman	Young

NOT VOTING—13

Bridges	Griswold	Maybank
Capehart	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Chavez	Hill	Russell
Duff	Kerr	
George	Mansfield	

So Mr. FLANDERS' motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not know whether there is to be any further discussion or not, but I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement of my views in opposition to the St. Lawrence Seaway.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIEWS OF SENATOR BYRD IN OPPOSITION TO ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Section 1 of the bill establishes the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation subject to direction and supervision of the President or the head of some agency he may designate.

Section 2 provides for a Managing Administrator at $17,500 a year, a Deputy Administrator at $16,000 a year, and five members of an advisory board (not more than three from the same political party) to be paid $50 per day when they sit at least once each 90 days. All of these are to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Section 3 provides that, when the Corporation is assured of concurrent completion of Canadian sections of the seaway and concurrent completion of the power projects involved, it will construct 27-foot channels and 800-foot locks in the International Rapids section of the river, dredge the Thousand Islands section, and then in coordination with the Canadian St. Lawrence Seaway Authority operate and maintain the seaway.

Section 4 provides that the Corporation shall be "an inhabitant and resident of the Northern Judicial District of the State of New York" for civil suits, bestows upon the Corporation the usual corporate privileges, and then gives it (1) authority to "make and carry out all contracts or agreements as are necessary or advisable in the conduct of its business"; (2) authority to hire and fire officers, attorneys, and employees; (3) authority to acquire real and personal property by purchase, lease, condemnation, or donation, and to sell it, lease it, or otherwise dispose of it, subject only to the order of the Administrator; (4) authority to determine the character and necessity of its obligations and the manner in which they are incurred, allowed, and paid.

Section 5 authorizes the Corporation to withdraw $105 million from the Treasury of the United States in return for its notes, bonds, debentures, etc., and authorizes the Treasury to enter into debt transactions to make the money available.

Section 6 makes the Corporation Control Act applicable to this corporation.

Section 7 authorizes the Corporation to make payments to State and local governments in lieu of taxes where such taxes previously were paid.

Section 8 authorizes the Corporation to use employees and the services and facilities of other agencies on a reimbursable basis, and authorizes it further to make annual payments to the Civil Service Commission to the extent of the Government's share of contributions to the retirement fund and to make annual payments for participation of its employees in the employees' compensation fund.

Section 9 fixes the usual penalties for criminal offenses.

Section 10 directs reports to Congress.

Section 11 is the usual separability provision.

Section 12 authorizes the Corporation to negotiate agreements with appropriate Canadian agencies as to rules for measurement of vessels and their cargoes for toll purposes, etc., to negotiate for equitable division of the proceeds between the United States and Canada; and it provides further that if agreement cannot be reached the Corporation shall proceed unilaterally.

BACKGROUND

The St. Lawrence Seaway proposal, in one form or another, has been before the country for nearly 50 years, and before Congress almost as long.

It has never yet been approved by Congress in any of the various forms in which it has been presented.

It has been before the Senate in the form of a treaty and failed of ratification.

Then it was submitted in the form of an executive agreement which also failed.

Once more it was offered, in agreement form, as an amendment to a rivers and harbors bill. And the amendment was rejected.

Again in 1948, and once more in 1952, the proposal in the form of an executive agreement failed of approval.

It is probable that no proposal has ever been debated more thoroughly both in Congress and around the country. The reasons for its rejection have changed but little over the past 50 years.

It is probable also that no proposal has ever been presented to the Senate with less firm and incontrovertible facts and figures. Proponents of the project have never been able to make their facts stand up undisputed as to the volume of business to be expected, the number of ships which could use the seaway, the depth to be required, the economic advantages outside a relatively small section of the country, or the ultimate cost.

The proposal has always been involved with international complications, with Federal-State complications, and with all the complications which usually attend a combination power-navigation project.

NEW APPROACH

The pending bill is merely a briefed down version of all that has been proposed before. In its brevity this bill merely evades by omission from its provisions most of the problems and complications which are entailed. They still exist and ultimately they must be dealt with. Meanwhile, provisions in this bill are limited to only one segment of the whole project and all of its complications.

The project is still dependent upon international agreement. It is still tied to power development. It still involves Federal-State complications.

This bill deals only with the relatively short International Rapids and Thousand Islands section of the St. Lawrence River. But the whole project is still nearly 2,000 miles long. There is scarcely more than allusion to the power development but the bill indicates this is a necessary prerequisite. The bill provides for American money totaling $105 million, but the ultimate cost of the whole project is just as expensive as it was when the estimates ran to more than $1 billion. International negotiation and agreement is still necessary, but this bill avoids doing it in the orthodox constitutional manner.

The existing channels are no deeper than they ever were, and just as much digging and blasting and construction are needed now as were needed in each of the previous proposals.

The facts presented are just as controversial as they ever were. The need is still disputed; the depth is still questionable. The number of ships which can traverse the waterway is still questionable. The revenue is still a guess.

If, by the optimistic estimates of the proponents, $105 million worth of the project is ever to be liquidated, they themselves say this cannot be accomplished before A. D. 2004.

Actually, $105 million would be only a beginning of the cost, even to the United States. As just one example of further costs I quote from a letter from the Defense Department dated February 19, 1949:

"While there are no harbors on the Great Lakes, at the present time, with channels, or pier facilities adequate to accommodate economically deep-draft oceangoing merchant vessels, port cities on the Great Lakes will no doubt be eager to deepen channels and harbors, as well as provide pier facilities necessary to accommodate the additional shipping business which would be available to them if the seaway were constructed."

This bill calls for construction of 27-foot channels. Actually some of the channels now are only 14 feet. In other areas 25-foot channels go one way and 21-foot channels go the other. It is generally conceded that 35- to 40-foot channels are needed to accommodate American oceangoing vessels of the first class.

Even in dealing with this segment of the ultimate project, the proposal gets all mixed up with additional development which is necessary to the west, power development which is necessary to the east, international agreements which are necessary to the north, and agreements with the State instrumentalities which are necessary to the south.

Whereas previous proposals recognized the necessity for international treaties or conventions, or at least executive agreements, as constitutional requirements for best relations between nations, this bill sets up a corporation—a sort of independent fourth branch of Government—to act instead of the President or Congress. The bill would authorize a corporation operating under a Federal charter, but residing in the State of New York, to negotiate and make agreements with another country if it can. But if it can't, this independent agency would be authorized to proceed unilaterally, in measuring vessels and their cargoes, fixing toll rates, and dividing the proceeds internationally.

Perhaps the Founding Fathers contemplated that sort of international relationship when they so carefully prescribed the constitutional procedure. But in this day it would seem that such a procedure would subject the good neighbor policy to more than a calculated risk, particularly where money is involved.

For 20 years proponents of this project have tried to attach to it some national defense significance. They tried to do it before World War II, and they have tried to do it since. This contention would not even stand up against the hazards of submarine attack before the hydrogen and atomic bomb developments along with high-speed long-range military aircraft. Thinking in terms of Civil Defense Administration pictures of enemy aircraft streaking across the Arctic to unload their deadly cargoes on Detroit and other industrial centers along the Great Lakes, one must regard the St. Lawrence Seaway as a 2,000-mile target.

The debate on this bill to date has proved conclusively that the ultimate objective is still what it was when the proposal was originated. It has proved that the economic situation involved has changed very little if any, certainly since World War II. It has developed that the figures on which the proposal is based are no more firm than they have been in the past.

The bill, on its face, shows that it temporarily deals with only a small segment of what would be required.

There are three new wrinkles. One is the power aspects of the project have been split out to be dealt with separately but still at public expense. The second new wrinkle is that great new emphasis is being put on the alleged self-liquidating possibilities of this small segment. And the third new wrinkle is this relatively small segment would be built, operated, and maintained internationally by a corporation capitalized out of the Federal debt.

The bill sets up a merry-go-round. The power project builds pressure for the river project. And the river project builds up pressure for power projects.

How self-liquidating this segment of the project would be, nobody really knows. If there is one thing that stands out clearly in all the hearings and debates conducted on this subject, it is the fact that nobody knows the extent to which such a seaway would be useful or how profitable it would be either to the users or the operators or—more important still—to the people of the United States.

The fact that this administration is proposing another new Federal agency (business type or otherwise) is in itself most disappointing. If this bill becomes a law there will then be 1 new Federal department which didn't exist before and 2 new Government corporations.

Delegation of international treaty and agreement authority to a corporation is not the only procedure established in this bill which to me is questionable as to its constitutionality. Article I of the Constitution clearly states: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriation made by law." This bill, section 5, pages 6 and 7, says "in order to finance its activities, the Corporation is empowered to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time and to have outstanding at any one time an amount not exceeding $105 million, its notes, debentures, bonds or other obligations." That language merely says that if and when it chooses this Corporation may demand from the Treasury of the United States up to $105 million with no further reference in any appropriation bill or to the Congress or any of its committees, or for that matter not even the Chief Executive has authority to prevent withdrawal of $105 million from the Treasury of the United States so long as this bill should remain a law.

The bill goes beyond this in its unrestrained financing provisions to "authorize and direct" the Secretary of the Treasury to "purchase any obligations of the corporation" issued under the bill, and authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury further "to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities" he can sell under the law to meet this demand by this Corporation.

If such financing of Federal activities has precedence in existing statutes, there are some who believe that the statutes wink at the Constitution. Whatever the answer to the constitutionality of the question may be, one thing is certain: It is precisely this type of financing which the present administration is complaining about when it says it cannot control the expenditure budget because of long-term commitments previously made.

If this provision in this bill is regarded as an appropriation, neither the President

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

nor the Congress can act on it under any of their budgetary procedures. It would be completely beyond any budgetary control. All $105 million could be drawn out by the Corporation on the day of its establishment. Or any part of it could be drawn on any other day or any other year, the availability of the cash notwithstanding.

Enactment of this bill would completely bypass any jurisdiction of the President, of the Congress, and of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress with respect to when and at what rate this money is expended. Until the last dollar of it is drawn out of the Treasury that part of it remaining will be one of the "unexpended balances" of which this administration has complained so bitterly. They actually have been referred to as the "hangover balances" from the irresponsible fiscal policies of the previous administration.

If these are not enough reasons to oppose this bill, then there is one other. It has already been touched upon in this debate. If there is no international treaty or agreement, to come before the Senate for its ratification or other consent, there was no basis for consideration of the bill by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. If it is a works project bill, then it should be referred to the Senate Committee on Public Works. If it is a bill involving the Federal debt, it should be referred to the Senate Finance Committee—and actually it should originate in the House of Representatives.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
VIRGINIA STATE PORTS AUTHORITY,
Lynchburg, Va., January 15, 1954.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This letter is being sent to all Members of the Congress from Virginia. Its purpose is to place the Virginia State Ports Authority on record as unalterably opposed to the St. Lawrence Seaway project, as of neither economic nor defense value to the United States.

The facilities at our Atlantic and gulf ports and the transportation systems serving them can accommodate a far greater volume of traffic of every kind than is now being handled. One effect of the project, therefore, would be to divert traffic from routes through United States coastal ports, which, instead, need the protection of government policy that would aid in the promotion and upbuilding of their traffic.

Because the proposed 27-foot channel of the seaway would foreclose 95 percent of American flag vessels from its efficient and economic use, another effect of the project would be to foster foreign-flag shipping to the great detriment of the American merchant marine. A policy of protection and preservation is needed, instead of the destruction inherent in the seaway project.

The seaway would be open for navigation not more, but probably less, than 8 months of the year. This would force United States ports and transportation systems to maintain facilities adequate to handle a peak load that they would enjoy only during the 4 or 5 months that the seaway would be closed to navigation.

It seems obvious, then, that the economic harm to the port and transportation interests of the United States, and other allied interests, would far outweigh any possible advantages that could accrue to us. Besides, the enormous amount of public funds that would be expended, contrary to the present policy of retrenchment, would bring about destructive results. The national transportation policy prefacing the Interstate Commerce Act condemns destructive competition; yet in approving this project the Congress itself would be providing the most vicious form of destructive competition.

So far as concerns the national defense, it seems apparent that these stated adverse effects of the project would weaken the national defense much more than the seaway as an artery of transportation could be expected to strengthen it. With its highly vulnerable chain of canals and locks and the yearly freezes of from 4 to 5 months, the seaway could serve no real national defense purpose in time of emergency. As is well known, canals and locks are among the most vulnerable objects of air attacks, and the destruction of a single small segment could put the entire seaway out of commission.

For the foregoing reasons, among others, we are firmly of the opinion that the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway project could not possibly serve the best interests of our country. It certainly is not in the best interests of the Commonwealth.

The commissioners request that you oppose, and that you actively enlist the support of your colleagues in opposing, this legislation.

I am, with kind regards and very best wishes,

Sincerely yours,
FRED W. MCWANE,
Chairman of the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

During my past years in the Senate of the United States, I have been bitterly opposed to giveaway programs which have kept our budget out of balance and our taxes at record peaks. My predictions that they would only bring this beloved country of ours much grief and international bad repute have been consistently ignored. Today, after spending and loaning and giving away billions of dollars, the standing of the United States in Europe and Asia is at its lowest point since 1776.

I have personally toured Europe and have seen at first hand the unbelievable waste of United States funds, and I have officially reported on this subject to the United States Senate. Today we are again being asked for another giveaway of American dollars, starting with $105 million and ending God knows where. The Senators from the Great Lakes States are straining at the leash with additional amendments to the Wiley bill providing for many more hundreds of millions to be spent, and for what?

I will tell the Senate for what. Just so that a few steel companies can have the taxpayers of this country pay for a cheaper waterway to haul their ore which is to be brought in from Labrador. The profits these companies will make in a few years could build this waterway but they think it better to saddle it on the taxpayer.

The top officials of Canada have been quoted in this debate as being opposed to United States participation in the construction of this waterway. I quote Minister of Transport Chevrier:

"But we are not asking for any funds from you. Canada is not seeking financial aid on the St. Lawrence Seaway. On the contrary, Canada is ready, willing, and anxious to proceed with the seaway at her own expense without cost to the American taxpayer."

Well, why all this pressure to give money away? We can never hope to get it back and nothing has been said here that will guarantee a return on this investment except to a few steel companies.

I am strongly against this bill, and I suggest that some of my colleagues here should look up the history of the Teapot Dome scandal before they cast a vote in favor of it. So far as I am concerned certain Treasury Department officials are in pretty deep water on this thing.

A perusal of my record as a United States Senator will show me to be very much in favor of programs to provide cheaper power to citizens of this country. However, this current seaway measure has been stripped of all benefits to Mr. John Q. Public and is nothing more than a program for cheaper transportation to Big Steel at the expense of the little taxpayer.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I had intended to make some closing remarks, but I shall not do so. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOSING STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I wish to sum up the principal considerations which are involved in the vote on this bill, S. 2150.

Much of the debate has concerned itself with the merits of the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway and with the effects which construction of the seaway will have on various sections of the country and on various economic interests. I respectfully submit that all of this discussion is irrelevant. Whatever effect the seaway will have, it will have regardless of any action the Senate may take on this bill, because the seaway is going to be built, whether we pass this bill or whether we do not.

There has been no showing that the seaway will be detrimental to any section or any interest; on the contrary, there has been presented abundant evidence that the seaway will be beneficial to the country at large. But, to Senators who are fearful that the seaway may be harmful to their State, I suggest that whatever harmful effects there may be, and I do not think there will be any, could more likely be mitigated by United States participation in operation of the seaway than by unilateral Canadian operation.

The bill has been objected to on the grounds that it will lead to demands for deepening the connecting channels and harbors of the upper Great Lakes. Let me assure the Senate, Mr. President, that it will have to face the issue of the upper lakes channels and harbors regardless of whether or not it passes S. 2150. Because of the trend to bigger ships on the lakes, that question is going to arise quite independently of the St. Lawrence Seaway. In response to a resolution of the Public Works Committee, the Army engineers are now making a study of the matter, and the results of that study will be presented for congressional action in the regular way. I want to remind the Senate again that whatever influence the St. Lawrence Seaway will have on determination of that question, it will have regardless of the disposition of the pending bill.

So we do not have before us the question of what effect, if any, the St. Lawrence Seaway will have on different sections and economic interests of the United States; nor do we have before us the question of the upper lakes connecting channels and harbors.

What we do have before us are the questions:

1. Do we want to join with Canada in construction of the seaway; and, if this is answered in the affirmative,

2. Is the pending bill, S. 2150, an appropriate method to achieve that objective?

It has been argued that inasmuch as Canada is willing to build the seaway alone we should let her do so. But, Mr. President,

for a distance of 114 miles that seaway will be on the border of the United States. It will lead into the Great Lakes. It will vitally affect the United States.

The highest officials of this Government have urged us to take the steps necessary to join with Canada in building, operating, and controlling the seaway. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] earlier today read a letter from Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I would like to read again just two sentences from that letter:

"The concept of unilateral control by a foreign government, however cordial our relations may be, of an inland waterway touching the borders of the United States is inconceivable to the Joint Chiefs of Staff from a defense standpoint. Therefore, from our viewpoint, United States participation in its construction, which, in effect, would give us equal control, is just as important from the national-security aspect as the seaway itself."

Is the pending bill an appropriate method of providing for our joint participation? Certain phases of the bill have been objected to during the debate, but, actually, the method it provides is simple, practical, and constitutional.

The bill sets up a Government corporation to carry out the United States portion of the works and authorizes it to negotiate the appropriate agreements with the Canadian agencies involved. This is in no sense bypassing the treatymaking prerogatives of the Senate. The Congress has on many occasions authorized agencies of the Government to make international agreements under certain conditions. The foreign-aid bills have consistently required such agreements as a condition precedent to aid. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act authorizes such agreements. Various international bridges between the United States and Canada have been built, and tolls charged, under arrangements similar to those provided in this bill. The legality of those arrangements has never been seriously disputed, so far as I know.

So this is the situation we face as we vote on this bill:

1. Canada is going to build the seaway, with or without United States participation.

2. Whatever economic effects the seaway will have, it will have, with or without United States participation.

3. The President, the National Security Council, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff tell us the seaway is in the interests of national defense and that we must participate in construction of the seaway if we are to protect those interests.

With such a recommendation, I strongly urge the Senate to pass the bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is unavoidably detained and cannot be present. He asked me to state to the Senate how he would vote if he were present. He would like to be recorded as wishing to vote in opposition to the passage of the bill. I understand that a pair has been arranged for him with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who, if he were present and voting, would vote for passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WATKINS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness, and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is unavoidably detained, and if present would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—51

Aiken	Gore	Monroney
Anderson	Green	Morse
Barrett	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Murray
Burke	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Carlson	Hill	Payne
Case	Holland	Potter
Chavez	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Clements	Jackson	Smathers
Cooper	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Langer	Thye
Ferguson	Lehman	Upton
Gillette	Magnuson	Wiley
Goldwater	Millikin	Young

NAYS—33

Beall	Dworshak	Ives
Bricker	Ellender	Jenner
Bush	Flanders	Johnson, Colo.
Butler, Md.	Frear	Johnson, Tex.
Butler, Nebr.	Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.
Byrd	Hoey	Kilgore
Daniel	Hunt	Lennon
Long	McClellan	Saltonstall
Malone	Neely	Stennis
Martin	Purtell	Welker
McCarran	Robertson	Williams

NOT VOTING—12

Bridges	Griswold	Maybank
Capehart	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Duff	Kerr	Russell
George	Mansfield	Watkins

So the bill (S. 2150) was passed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, it was my intention to be back in the Senate this afternoon for the vote on the St. Lawrence Seaway. I was absent on official business. My train was 45 minutes late, and I have just this minute arrived in the Chamber.

I want the RECORD to show clearly that had I been present and voting, my vote would have been in the affirmative and in favor of the bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion to reconsider made by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO FILE REPORT ON THE KOREAN SECURITY TREATY DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask permission that the Committee on Foreign Relations may be permitted to file its report on the Korean security treaty during the recess of the Senate, as in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM — PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement before I make a motion. In a few moments I shall move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 408, Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements, thus making it the unfinished business on the legislative calendar.

However, for the information of the Senate, before making the motion I wish to say that I plan to move a recess of the Senate tonight until Friday, in order to give some of the committees and Senators an opportunity to catch up in their work.

On Friday I will propose that there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, from the point where we left off on the last call of the calendar. We will presumably have a reasonably short session on Friday, although some Senators may desire to make some speeches on that day, and I shall be very glad to hold the Senate in session for that purpose.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

On Friday I shall propose that the Senate adjourn until Monday. On Monday the Senate will go into executive session for the consideration of nominations on the executive calendar. Following the consideration of nominations, it will be my purpose to move that the Senate take up the so-called Korean treaty.

When the Senate has completed consideration of executive business, it will be my purpose to proceed with the legislative business of the Senate. I would assume that will be either on Tuesday or Wednesday, depending on the amount of debate necessary to dispose of executive business. Then the Senate will be prepared to debate Senate Joint Resolution 1, the so-called Bricker amendment.

With that explanation I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 408, Senate Joint Resolution 1, in order to make it the unfinished business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that there is a very good prospect that the conference report on the so-called cotton acreage bill will be ready for action tomorrow; which means of course that it could be taken up the next day, unless objection was made to it. Of course there are areas in the country in which it will be necessary to plant cotton within a very short time. Is it the intention of the majority leader to call up that conference report?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I have made inquiry of the majority leader of the House of Representatives. I understand the House will be in session tomorrow. If the conference report is filed tomorrow undoubtedly there will be printed copies of the conference report available, or at least the Senate will have the necessary information with regard to it. Under those circumstances, I would be prepared to ask that the conference report be taken up on Friday.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if it is his intention to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the Korean treaty?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that as long as I occupy the position of majority leader I intend on all treaties that come before the Senate and on all constitutional amendments to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, I appreciate the statement of the distinguished majority leader. As the Senator knows, last year I submitted a resolution which would amend the rules of the Senate to provide for a yea-and-nay vote on every treaty. I know that as long as the distinguished Senator from California occupies the position of majority leader and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] occupies the position of minority leader, I need have no fear that there will be any difficulty about it. I hope very much, however, that the majority leader and the minority leader will join in urging that my proposed amendment to the rules be reported and agreed to by the Senate, so as to make it a part of the permanent rules of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from New York that personally I not only favor such a rule, but I would be in favor of such a provision being added to the Constitution itself, thus providing for a yea-and-nay vote on treaties. Such a procedure is provided for in the Constitution with reference to the overriding of a presidential veto, and has been a part of the Constitution ever since its inception.

While a rule would temporarily take care of the action we propose to take, a future Senate might wish to go back to the old system. I believe it would be a proper precaution to have in the Constitution a provision requiring a yea-and-nay vote on treaties, as is now required to override a Presidential veto.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is why I submitted the resolution. I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator from California is proposing to bring up a motion to impose gag rule on the Senate. I certainly hope the junior Senator from Louisiana will be given due notice, because he wants to address himself to that subject.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am not proposing anything in the nature of gag rule. It has nothing to do with the limitation of debate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I simply want to say, good naturedly, by way of reminder, that the representative of the Independent Party, by taking the position the other day that unanimous-consent agreements to limit debate in the Senate would not, as a matter of policy, be approved by him, saved the Senate 3 days debate. That was the result of the objection, because the agreement which might have been accepted would have delayed the vote on the bill until some time next Monday or Tuesday. That causes me to say that in my 8 years of service in the Senate I have observed that in a substantial majority of cases time actually would have been saved if we had not entered into agreements limiting debate. I am glad to note that the first experience we have had in this session substantiates clearly the position taken by the representative of the Independent Party and convinces him all the more of the rightness of his position and intensifies his determination to carry out that policy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely want to say that I think the basic reason why we have arrived at a vote this evening is that the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle have been willing to cooperate and to stay fairly long hours not only on preceding days, but also tonight, for had they not been willing to stay tonight it is highly dubious that we could have reached a vote tomorrow, with such a substantial number of Senators attending the launching of the new submarine, and that might have precipitated additional debate on Friday, and perhaps on Monday.

So, while I do not mean to discount the statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I think we can express our appreciation to each of the Members of the Senate who have been able and willing to remain and work and transact the public's business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements, thereby making the joint resolution the unfinished business of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 22, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 20 (legislative day of January 7), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

George Holmes Roderick, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal God, the source of all our blessings, fill us now with reverence and humility as we unite our hearts in the sacred attitude of prayer.

We penitently confess that faith and doubt, hope and despair, courage and fear so frequently jostle one another in the multitude of our thoughts as we struggle to find the right solution to our many perplexing problems.

Grant that when we are harassed and haunted by feelings of uncertainty and misgiving we may be inspired by the in-

terpreting and guiding light of Thy divine spirit which will enable us to carry on with confidence and cheer.

To Thy blessed name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 18, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE COFFEE SITUATION

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at a time of leveling food prices, coffee could price itself out of the market at $1.25 per pound that wholesalers now threaten us with. This would be bad for coffee growers in Brazil as well as for the average American who likes his cup of coffee in the morning. It may be that a killing frost in South America has caused the price rise but there also might be other unjustifiable causes that we ought to know about.

At any rate, it should be comparatively simple to find out the basic facts through our American Embassies in Brazil and elsewhere in South America. I am today requesting the Secretary of State to ascertain, through the commercial and economic experts at our Embassies in South America, the real facts, and find out what, if any, part, speculation, or other unjustifiable causes might be involved. A 15-cent cup of coffee seems to me like a luxury that many might not be able to afford.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered; and also to address the House on Monday next for 1 hour, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to announce a meeting of the United States group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union to be held at 5:30 p. m. today in the Supreme Court room located in the Capitol. The agenda will be the same as that announced for the meeting on January 18, 1954. This call is made by direction of the president of the United States group, Senator HOMER FERGUSON.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, GREATER LAWRENCE, MASS.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, as a confirmed believer that the Air Force should be the spearhead of our national defense, and knowing that we must have a service school similar to West Point and Annapolis to train professional officers for this key branch of the Armed Forces, I have spoken on the floor of this House in other years, and in 1954, advocating both.

Now that the House will vote on the committee's recommendation to establish such an academy, and with the prospect that the Congress will certainly approve, I publicly request Harold E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force, to select Greater Lawrence in Massachusetts as the site for the new service academy.

This administration, in the person of the Air Secretary, has the authority to make this decision.

When you compare the vast revenues that Massachusetts is contributing to the Treasury of the United States, with the little we receive in return, and I might mention here, for example, that, of the 156 Federal hydroelectric projects in the Nation, not 1 has been allocated to Massachusetts, it is reasonable to expect that this smaller request will be granted.

In answer to our persistent and continuing pleas that the Government should provide some help to alleviate the labor-surplus areas of our Commonwealth, the response is discouragingly monotonous. "What can we do?" top officials of the Government reply.

Here is an open-and-shut case where the Government can help by locating the Air Force Academy in Greater Lawrence and thus provide some economic stimulus for this region. Not that I predicate my argument on this fact alone. I assert, without fear of contradiction, that nowhere in this Nation will you find a site with so many conveniences of the air age within such a short radius.

Greater Lawrence embraces the area where famous Phillips Andover Academy and Merrimack College are located. Grenier Air Force Base at Manchester, N. H., and the new Air Force research center at Bedford, Mass., are well within an hour's drive. Westover Air Base, Chicopee, Mass., used as a jumpoff for transatlantic ferrying service, and the giant bomber base at Limestone, Maine, are in the pattern of the larger strategic nexus. At Harvard University and at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, just to mention two of our institutions of higher learning, are some of the best engineering and scientific facilities in the world. General Electric and Raytheon, producing jet engines and electronic devices, respectively, for the Air Force, are nearby. Naval bases and Army installations are handy for coordinated training, not to mention the conveniences of the Logan International Airport at Boston. Greater Lawrence, bordering the Merrimack River, has country space for quiet study, with every possible research and operational know-how of the air age almost within view of an airborne pilot.

I believe that no other location can possibly measure up to the factual advantages that Greater Lawrence offers, with their own municipal airport located in North Andover, Mass. Holding the administration to its promise that it would try to help us, I call upon the Secretary of the Air Force to select Greater Lawrence, Mass., for the location of the United States Air Force Academy.

COMMITTEE FOR A NATIONAL TRADE POLICY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask this time in order that my colleagues may be on guard against a new propaganda machine.

The Committee for a National Trade Policy, the so-called Coleman committee, has been formed for the purpose of propagandizing for further reduction in tariffs and for supporting in the Congress proposals toward that end.

The committee, which is headed by John S. Coleman, of Detroit, head of the Burroughs Corp., and which includes many influential industrialists on its roster, is busily engaged in trying to do its job—put America on a free-trade basis.

It has issued statements on behalf of free trade; Mr. Coleman has testified before the so-called Randall commission and many other related activities are in process. There is little question that the efforts of this committee are designed to influence public opinion and to affect legislation.

The committee seems to have overlooked, however, one important matter. It has failed to register under the Lobbying Act, although, if the provisions of the act include anyone, it would seem to include this group.

I find that a group organized to resist further tariff reductions, the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Labor on Import-Export Policy, is registered.

I would suggest that the proper authorities investigate this apparent violation of the law by the Committee for a National Trade Policy.

I am making a special request for time in order that I can give the Members of the House an opportunity to see the names of these men and the interests backing their group.

BILL TO PROTECT CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES AND PREVENT THEIR REMOVAL EXCEPT FOR CAUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the decision rendered by the United States District Judge Keech in the Roth against Brownell case, destroyed the statutory safeguards provided by Congress to prevent arbitrary removal of civil-service employees. In effect, the President, or the members of this Cabinet, or their designees, can now take a position out of the classified civil service and summarily dismiss the employee, even though he has competitive civil-service status.

With this decision, the civil service becomes a political football, with the party in power being given the primary kick-off. No civil-service job is exempted from the whim, the caprice, or the self-interest of the political leader. Understandably, of course, the morale of the civil-service employee has never been so low.

Judge Keech's decision is unwarranted. Congress itself took an emphatic position on the matter of the removal of civil-service employees when it came up for discussion last year, and refused to carry out the suggestion offered by Attorney General Brownell that he be granted the right to dismiss, in his absolute discretion.

Over 40 years ago, in order to protect the rights of Government employees and to establish permanency of tenure in the civil service, and above all, to put an end to the vicious practice of removing employees whenever the appointing power was changed, the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912 was enacted. In doing so, Congress provided that no person in the classified civil service of the United States could be removed except for cause. Congress set up certain safeguards to prevent summary dismissals. It required notice of the charges to the employee, an opportunity to answer the charges, a copy of the department's decision and the reasons therefor, and a review by the Federal courts thereafter. Yet early in 1953, the Attorney General sought to break down these safeguards. In the Department of Justice Appropriation Act of 1954—H. R. 4974, 83d Congress, 1st session, title 2, the Attorney General sought congressional approval to dismiss employees summarily in the following language:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555) (Lloyd-La Follette Act), or the provisions of any other law, the Attorney General may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Justice whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

In the House debate this provision was vigorously objected to on the ground, among others, that the rights of civil-service employees would be wiped out. On the floor of the Senate similar objection was made on an amendment seeking to reinstate the same provision. Even a modifying amendment which would have limited the Attorney General's summary removal powers, to employees in excepted positions—which is the very case involved in Judge Keech's decision—was defeated. Yet in the face of this legislative command, the Attorney General, without notice or hearing, summarily dismissed the employee, Leo A. Roth, who had civil-service status as trial attorney.

To afford an effective remedy to this imperious reversal of congressional intent, I have offered the following bill:

> A bill to preserve the right to removal procedures in the case of certain officers and employees in positions excepted from the classified civil service
>
> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That notwithstanding any law, Executive order, or civil-service rule or regulation to the contrary, any officer or employee who on or after the date of enactment of this act (1) had a competitive status and (2) occupied a position in the classified civil service—
>
> (a) immediately prior to the date on which such position was first excepted from the classified civil service, or
>
> (b) immediately prior to the date on which he was transferred from such position to a position excepted from the classified civil service,
>
> shall continue to be entitled to the same protection against removal or suspension without pay to which he was entitled immediately prior to the date such position was first excepted from the classified civil service, or the date on which he was transferred to a position excepted from the classified civil service, as the case may be.

TREATMENT OF INDIANS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call the attention of Members of the House to a far-reaching and important report which has just been made by a survey team of the Bureau of Indian Affairs which has important and historic implications insofar as treatment by the United States of its Indians is concerned. Some provisions of this report are scheduled to go into effect on February 15, 1954.

A majority of the members of the Oklahoma delegation met this morning with the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lewis, requesting a postponement of the effective date of these far-reaching changes, asking that we have from 60 to 90 days to consider it and to consult with the people back home who are interested in this program. I will certainly appreciate, and I am sure the members of the Oklahoma delegation will appreciate, any Members who are interested in the Indian program joining in this request to the Secretary of the Interior for additional time before this program is made effective.

INCOME TAX

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to revise income tax rates on the first $500 of taxable income—that is, after exemptions and deductions—from the present combined normal and surtax rate of 20 percent to a new graduated scale of rates ranging from 4 percent to 13 percent.

At present the 20-percent rate applies to every dollar of taxable income up to $2,000, when the rate begins to advance in a series of steps. This rate is much too high for persons living at or near bare subsistence levels.

Under my bill, rates would be revised as follows:

First. On the first $200 of taxable income, the rate would be 4 percent—$8—rather than 20 percent—$40.

Second. On the next $200 the rate would be 10 percent—$20—rather than 20 percent—$40.

Third. On the fifth $100 the rate would be 13 percent—$13—rather than 20 percent—$20.

On the full $500 the tax would be $41 instead of $100, or a saving of $59 to every individual taxpayer paying on $500 or more; to married couples filing jointly, this saving would be $118 on the first $1,000 of taxable income.

While this bill would provide tax reductions for all taxpayers regardless of income, its greatest effect would be in the lower income groups where a $50 or $100 reduction in income taxes would really mean something. At the same time it would retain all of these groups on the tax rolls.

I will press for acceptance of this bill, because, unlike many of the proposals our committee will necessarily consider, this is one which will help every taxpayer.

H. R. 7376 proposes the following:

Four percent combined normal and surtax rate on first $200 net income.

Ten percent combined normal and surtax rate on second $200 net income.

Thirteen percent combined normal and surtax rate on fifth $100 net income.

	Present rate	Proposed rate	Present tax	Proposed tax	Proposed saving
	Percent	*Percent*			
1st $200 net income	20	4	$40	$8	$32
2d $200 net income	20	10	40	20	20
5th $100 net income	20	13	20	13	7
1st $500 net income			100	41	59

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I notice that several Members over on my right claim they are primarily interested in civil service, and they mentioned the period of 20 years ago. Actually, 20 years ago 58,000 employees were added to the Federal service in Washington in the first year, and in the 7-year period over 300,000 were added to the Federal service, most of whom had never taken an examination, but all of them subscribing to the philosophy of the gentleman who offered the bill this morning. In a period of years since then those folks have been blanketed into civil service without competitive examinations. Actually, under the rules, and in all fairness as considered by my people back home, true civil service means that you take a competitive examination and you are not blanketed in under any administration.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on a bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 54 to print additional copies of hearings on treaties and executive agreements.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary 2,000 additional copies of the hearings relative to treaties and executive agreements held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress, 1st session.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PANAMA CANAL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the first annual reports of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 1954.*

MRS. DAISY M. MAUPIN

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 405) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives to Mrs. Daisy M. Maupin, mother of Sarah A. Mitchell, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death, and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Sarah A. Mitchell.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 354.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the limitation on the amount available for expenses of travel under the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses" of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, contained in chapter VII of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1954 (Public Law 207, 83d Cong., approved August 7, 1953) is hereby increased to $60,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. CANNON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman what the present limitation is?

Mr. PHILLIPS. This Commission is familiarly known as the Hoover Commission. It was created during the last fiscal year. It has been in existence only about 3 months. The Congress imposed on it a limitation on travel, as we do upon all agencies of the Government. The Commission has discovered that it needs more money for traveling, but asks no more money. This is not a request for more money in the aggregate but is only a request that the Commission may spend more of its appropriation for travel. A great many of the members, advisers, staff members, and other people interested in the Commission are men who serve without pay. They are paid only their traveling expenses. For that reason, the Committee on Appropriations recommends the limitation be increased from $14,700, a nominal amount which was given them last year, to the present figure of $60,000.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman does not think this will involve a deficiency bill later in the session?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is right. It does not.

Mr. CANNON. How many employees are involved here?

Mr. PHILLIPS. About 51 now, but we do not have the figure for next year.

Mr. CANNON. Is this for travel in the United States only?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CANNON. Does it include travel in Europe?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No. Testimony before the committee indicates no travel in Europe. I would see no necessity for travel in Europe by a commission which has the job this one has to do.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, may I take advantage of the opportunity to express my regret, and I am certain the regret of all members of the Committee on Appropriations, at the retirement of one of the oldest in point of service and one of the most valuable members of our official staff.

The Committee on Appropriations is fortunate in having a staff of exceptionally fine men, able, efficient, and dependable. They are always carefully selected and serve a probationary term before permanent appointment to the staff of the committee. When they have proven themselves able to meet the exacting requirements of the committee, they remain there for life. I do not recall the dismissal of a single member of the staff of our committee after permanent appointment.

Mr. Duvall was one of the ablest of the long line of able men who have

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

served on our staff. He came to us in 1927. He first came to Washington with Senator Wadsworth, of New York, and was on Senator Wadsworth's personal staff until the Senator's retirement from the other body. He then came to the House and to the Committee on Appropriations under the chairmanship of Martin B. Madden of Illinois and has been with us ever since.

I am certain I reflect the sentiment of our entire committee in expressing the deepest regret that we are losing Mr. Duvall, and in expressing our appreciation of the long and devoted service he has rendered the Committee on Appropriations and the House. Our best wishes go with him.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 406), providing for the consideration of H. R. 5337, a bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5337), to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 406, which would make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5337) to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy and for other purposes. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 406 is an open rule and would provide 2 hours of general debate on this very important Air Force Academy bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule that I ask the House membership to adopt here today is the first action taken by the Rules Committee at the beginning of this second session of the 83d Congress. I think it is very appropriate that our first action should be such a constructive, worthwhile, and important one. We have only to look at the great traditions, the great men and most important, the fine American military men who have come out of the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy all during our history to realize just how important a thing we consider here today.

I believe the bill is a good one. It has been written and rewritten many times until now it represents the best efforts of the members of the Armed Services Committee. It provides for the use of temporary facilities while the permanent academy is being built, and would relieve the intolerable strain that is presently being placed upon the other two academies in their efforts to provide Air Force officers. The desirability of such an Air Force Academy has been acknowledged for some years now by members of both major parties.

Undoubtedly there will be considerable debate on the location of the Academy. May I be the first to insist that the location be free of politics and that the site be determined solely for efficiency of operation.

I also respectfully request that favorable consideration be given to the selection of Lieutenant General Kuter of the United States Air Force as first commandant of the proposed academy. At the present time General Kuter commands the Maxwell Air Force Base near Montgomery, Ala. This air university is the educational arm of the Air Force. I believe all will admit General Kuter is thoroughly qualified.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the rule is adopted by the House membership. This measure deserves the full and thoughtful consideration of the House and I feel confident that the membership will give it the attention that it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very good bill. In fact I think it has been delayed possibly longer than it should have been. The question of air power in any future war, of course, is momentous. It will outshadow all other forms and segments of our Armed Forces, in my judgment. Therefore, I think this certainly is a very urgent matter. Personally, I am all out for its enactment.

However, Mr. Speaker, in the hearings on the application for a rule there were some questions about the bill which arose in my mind and I think that it might be improved upon.

In the first place, I regret that it is necessary to set up a temporary installation at a cost of several million dollars that may later not be used to good purpose. In other words, we are going to set up a temporary installation and then later a permanent one. It is said that the temporary installation will only cost a million dollars. I doubt that very seriously. I think in the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, it will cost much more than that.

It is also estimated, I believe, that the total cost of a permanent installation will be in the neighborhood of $26 million. I doubt that that amount will anywhere near cover it. However, if it costs 3 or 4 times as much, I think it would be amply justified.

Another question that I wanted to raise was the method of selection of these cadets. They are going to be selected upon the recommendation of Members of the two branches of the Congress. From my meager knowledge of this matter I think that the training of cadets for flying, and for the necessary groundwork, is in a peculiar sense a highly technical matter. Personally, I would prefer to see the cadets selected entirely upon the basis of merit and qualification, where the selection could be much broader. This could be done on a State quota basis. Rather than have Members of Congress make the recommendation I would prefer to see an all-out competitive examination, even upon the basis of State quotas. I doubt that such a suggestion, if placed in the form of an amendment, would carry. But it is something that I think should be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I think the objectives of the bill are splendid. I do not anticipate any great opposition to either the rule or the bill. They should both pass.

I have no requests for time on this side and, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

HEALTH SERVICES BILL

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a second bill which is designed to carry out some of the legislative recommendations contained in the President's health message.

The bill which I am introducing today would amend the Public Health Service Act so as to implement the President's recommendations for the simplification and clarification of the various health and welfare grants now administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. To quote from President Eisenhower's health message:

> This patchwork of complex formulas and categorical grants should be simplified and improved. I propose a simplified formula for all of these basic grant-in-aid programs which applies a new concept of Federal participation in State programs. This formula permits the States to use greater initiative and take more responsibility in the administration of the programs. It makes Federal assistance more responsive to the needs of the States and their citizens. Under it, Federal support of these grant-in-aid programs is based on three general criteria:
>
> First. The States are aided in inverse proportion to their financial capacity. By relating Federal financial support to the degree of need, we are applying the proven and sound formula adopted by the Congress in the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.
>
> Second. The States are also helped, in proportion to their population, to extend and improve the health and welfare services provided by the grant-in-aid programs.

Third. A portion of the Federal assistance is set aside for the support of unique projects of regional or national significance which give promise of new and better ways of serving the human needs of our citizens.

A summary of the bill which I have introduced today to carry out the above is as follows:

SUMMARY OF BILL INCORPORATING THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDING THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT WITH RESPECT TO GRANTS FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

IN GENERAL

The bill would replace the present separate authorizations for categorical public health grants for venereal disease control, tuberculosis control, general health, and heart disease control (including the separate programs for mental health and cancer control) with an authorization for the following three types of grants:

(1) Grants to assist States generally in meeting the costs of their public health services.

(2) Grants to assist States in initiating extensions of, and improvements in, their public health services.

(3) Grants to assist in meeting the costs of projects directed toward the solution of public health problems of regional or national significance.

The amount of Federal funds to be available for each of the above three types of grants would be specified in annual appropriations.

GENERAL GRANTS

The formula for determining each State's allotment for the first type of grant would be the same as that used in the hospital survey and construction (Hill-Burton) provisions of the Public Health Service Act—which take into account both the relative populations of the States and their relative fiscal resources as measured by State per capita incomes. There would, however, be a minimum allotment of $55,000. From its allotment, each State would receive payments equal to a percentage of the cost of public health services under its approved State plan, the percentage varying inversely with the State's relative per capita income between a maximum of 66⅔ and a minimum of 33⅓ percent. This contrasts with present law under which the amount of the allotment and the Federal share of the cost are determined by regulations and differ from program to program.

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

The formula for determining each State's allotment for extension and improvement purposes would be based on relative State populations with a minimum allotment of $25,000. From its allotment, a State could receive, over a 6-year period, varying proportions of the cost of approved projects (included in its approved State plan) for extension and improvement of its public health services—75 percent of the cost for the first 2 years, 50 percent for the next 2, and 25 percent for the last 2.

SPECIAL-PROJECT GRANTS

These grants would be made on a project basis to States and to public and nonprofit agencies or organizations. They would be available for paying part of the cost of combating unusually severe public-health problems in specific geographical areas, of carrying out special projects which hold unique promise of contributing to the solution of multi-State public-health problems, and of meeting public-health problems of national significance or concern.

STATE PLANS

Payments from allotments for the first type of grant (for support of public-health services) would be conditioned upon submission of a plan by the State health authority (and mental-health authority in connection with mental health), which meets requirements prescribed in regulations of the Surgeon General.

As under existing law, regulations would be issued by the Surgeon General, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and only after consultation with and, insofar as practicable, the concurrence of the State health (or mental health) authorities.

ADMINISTRATION

The grants would continue, as under existing law, to be administered through the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TRANSITION PROVISIONS

In order to provide States an opportunity to adjust their finances to the new allotment formulas, provision would be made to limit to 10 percent any decrease in allotments which any State would receive in any 1 year by virtue of the formula change.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENTS

These amendments to the Public Health Service Act would not become effective until July 1, 1955.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, today is the first anniversary of the inauguration of Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States.

On behalf of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I want to extend my heartiest congratulations to the President for the wonderful record he has achieved and to wish him continued success during the remainder of his Presidency.

Speaking for myself, I wish to express the deep pleasure and gratification which have been mine in working with the President. It has been a memorable experience for me to be a part of the team that has labored diligently and sincerely for what it considers to be the best interests of the country.

One accomplishment which is a particular source of pride to the Republican team is the restoration of the Congress to its proper role in our tripartite form of government. Most of us recall the remarks of the Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, when he ascended the rostrum as Speaker a little more than a year ago. On that occasion, the Speaker declared:

> I am proud to tell the House that in the new atmosphere of changing administrations, I think we will find not only a willingness but a will by the new Chief Executive to reestablish the proper working relationship between the executive and legislative branches.

That prediction has been proved to be completely accurate. Congress once more is carrying out the functions and responsibilities that were entrusted to it by the Constitution. As the directly elected representatives of the people, we are striving to carry out their will in enacting the legislation that becomes national policy.

I believe every Member of the Congress is grateful for this new relationship, because we all realize that the American system of checks and balances is the foundation of our liberties. By his determination to have the Congress play its full role in formulating policy, President Eisenhower has performed a signal service in the cause of representative government.

As a result of the harmony and teamwork which have prevailed, we have written a 1-year record of accomplishment that will live long in history. In international affairs we have seized the initiative for peace. The shooting in Korea has been halted, and we have challenged the Soviet to join us in an endeavor to turn atomic energy into the pursuits of peace instead of concentrating exclusively on war. We have worked out a new military strategy that will make us strong and keep us strong for a long period of time if necessary without subjecting us to ever-increasing taxes and the risk of national bankruptcy. The free world as a whole has taken heart and is growing daily in strength and purpose.

Here at home we have just enjoyed the most prosperous year in our history. On January 1, 1954, taxes were lowered, and a substantial increase in both individual and business spending power was injected into the economy. As we move toward a balanced budget, further tax reductions will be made. A new spirit of efficiency and service permeates the Federal Government as waste and unnecessary expense are eliminated. New appropriations were cut by $14 billion, and additional reductions will be made this year.

Honesty, integrity, and devotion to the national well-being have become the watch words of Government employment. The reds, pinks, and the other security risks have been weeded out just as fast as they were uncovered.

These are just a few instances of how the Federal Government is going forward on sound, farsighted principles that will give the American people the kind of government they want and advance their best interests in every way.

I believe the Congress is entitled to strong feelings of pride for its part in writing the record of the last year, and I know the present session will be even more fruitful.

The broad outline of the President's future program demonstrates clearly this administration's determination to lead a secure America toward lasting peace and prosperity.

I am confident the Congress will give prompt and thoughtful attention to the speedy enactment of vital proposals brought before us.

And again, to President Eisenhower and his administration, my best wishes for a happy anniversary and for many more to come.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us, especially the lawyers of this

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

House, have been greatly exercised because of the alacrity with which Government employees hide behind the fifth amendment to the Constitution and every day we see by the papers where some Government official or employee has refused to answer because he claims that he might incriminate himself. If anyone working for the Government, either as an official or employee, should hide behind the fifth amendment with reference to any matters to the detriment of our country that have come to his knowledge because of his employment with the Government and refuses to disclose this information I think he is wilfully doing a disservice to his country and he should be separated from the service immediately. That is the purpose of a bill that I introduced in this Congress today.

The exact language of my bill is as follows:

A bill to provide that failure of any officer or employee of the United States to answer certain questions shall result in removal from his position or office

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer or employee of the United States who refuses to testify upon matters directly or indirectly (1) relating to his office or employment, or (2) relating to any relationship he might have with any foreign government, in any proceeding wherein he is a defendant or called as a witness, upon the ground that his answer may intend to incriminate him or compel him to be a witness against himself, or who refuses so to testify on such ground when called by a grand jury or any standing or select committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or any subcommittee of such a committee, or any joint committee of the Congress, shall be immediately separated from his office or employment and shall forfeit his right to a future retirement annuity based on service in the Government of the United States, and be disqualified from holding any other public office or employment in the Government of the United States.

SEC. 2. If the right to a future retirement annuity is forfeited by any officer or employee of the United States under this act, there shall be paid to such individual a sum equal to the total amount paid by him as contribution toward such retirement annuity, plus any accrued interest attributable to such contributions.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to do is to immediately separate from Government service any person who will refuse to give testimony or information that will be for the benefit of our great country just because he wants to shield some Communist. If he is a good American he will not refuse to give information that is for the best interest of his country. And, on the contrary, if he has any information that tends toward subversion that he has gotten by reason of his work, he should give it to proper authorities immediately. I cannot conceive of any information coming to a loyal American that he cannot safely give to a committee of Congress or to any of the courts of our country. When he chooses to hide behind the fifth amendment then I hold that he should be immediately removed from his Government job. If the Government is his employer, the Government is entitled to his honest services. Verily, he cannot serve two masters. If he has been giving good, faithful service to his country he should not have been guilty of doing or seeing or knowing about anything connected with his work that will make a criminal out of him if he tells about it. When he fails to tell all he knows then he might easily be an enemy to his country. Therefore, I say that any Government employee who is doing something in connection with his work that he is afraid to tell about, lest he be punished criminally, then he should be immediately separated from his Government service because he himself has brought suspicion on himself. We have entirely too many suspicious characters working in the Government in high places and also in lowly places—we must get rid of them and do it immediately when they refuse to stand for our country.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 2]

Abbitt	Gary	Passman
Addonizio	Granahan	Patten
Arends	Green	Patterson
Barrett	Hardy	Philbin
Battle	Harrison, Va.	Pillion
Boland	Hart	Poff
Bolling	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Bolton, Oliver P.	Heller	Radwan
	Horan	Reece, Tenn.
Bonin	Howell	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brownson	Hruska	Richards
Buchanan	Jackson	Robeson, Va.
Buckley	Jarman	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Javits	Sadlak
Carrigg	Judd	Saylor
Chelf	Kelley, Pa.	Scherer
Chudoff	Keogh	Sheehan
Coudert	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Dawson, Ill.	King, Calif.	Stringfellow
Deane	Kluczynski	Taylor
Dempsey	Lesinski	Tuck
D'Ewart	McCulloch	Wainwright
Dingell	McGregor	Welchel
Dondero	Miller, N. Y.	Whitten
Donohue	Morgan	Wigglesworth
Fogarty	Murray	Yates
Gamble	O'Konski	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 356 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee on conference on the bill H. R. 6665 may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5337) to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5337, with Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to consume a great deal of time in asking for favorable consideration of H. R. 5337, a bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy.

My statement will be as brief as I can possibly make it, covering the essentials of this legislation; and if Members will reserve their questions until I have finished, I think perhaps it will anticipate many of their questions.

I would like to say, however, at the outset that we are the only major power in the world today which does not have an academy specifically designed to train its Air Force officers.

In this very Chamber, only 2 weeks ago, President Eisenhower addressed Congress on the state of the Union. Among the many important and significant statements he made was a statement on the military personnel of our Armed Forces. He said:

A professional corps is the heart of any security organization. It is necessarily the teacher and leader of those who serve temporarily in the discharge of the obligation to help defend the republic.

This bill would strengthen the professional corps of the Air Force, since it will establish an institution at which the Air Force would train the men expected to form the nucleus of the professional corps.

The Army, the Navy, and the Coast Guard have long had their own service Academies. The Air Force has none, even though it is the instrument by which we expect to deliver the retaliatory counterblow, should an aggressor attack us.

In a press conference on Wednesday of last week, President Eisenhower explained his concept of balanced military forces. To the President, the concept means forces adjusted to the needs of the times and to the needs of battle. Today air power is the keystone of our military strength. We are spending billions of dollars on aircraft and related equipment—the best that money can buy. It is no less essential that our officer personnel be of the highest type we can possibly produce.

The existing service Academies have consistently produced officers who have been leaders of our peacetime Military Establishment. And they have been leaders not merely of the Armed Forces but of the Nation itself in times of emergency.

In times of peace at least 50 percent of the regular officers of each service are expected to be Academy graduates. In what President Eisenhower calls this age of peril, it is more than ever necessary to insure the caliber of leadership and the availability of trained leaders as the hard core of each of our military services.

Service academies inculcate to an extent impossible to civilian institutions the ideal of service to the country. By this I do not, in any sense, wish to be understood as depreciating the loyalty and the willingness to serve of those who attend or have attended our civilian colleges. It is obvious, however, a service academy by its very nature creates an atmosphere and has a personality which makes an indelible mark upon those who attend.

At an Air Force Academy, our boys will eat, sleep, and dream Air Force. They will be, in the truest sense, airfaring men upon their graduation. It will have been their very life during the highly formative years of 17 or 18 or 21 or 22. We would be unreasonable if we expected the civilian colleges to place this mark upon its graduates—they are not designed to do it—and there is no reason why they should do it. A service academy establishes standards—standards of service—which Americans demand—and rightly demand—of those men who will lead our sons into battle.

During the past 5 years the United States Air Force, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Service Academy Board established by the Secretary of Defense have independently arrived at the conclusion that the Air Force should have its own academy. They have agreed that an academy which would provide approximately 50 percent of the annual regular-officer requirement in peacetime should be established without delay.

Just as it is necessary to train engineers in the engineering schools, or doctors at medical schools, it is likewise necessary to train air leaders of the future at an Air Force school, rather than at an Army or a Navy institution. To do so will not cause a breach between the services. It does not mean the establishment of a new or different code of military honor, with a new concept of duty and responsibility. It means recognition of the highly specialized problems of national defense in the atomic air age. It will guarantee proper training for technically gifted or otherwise qualified youths, as strongly motivated as their brothers in the older services to a lifetime of service to our country.

This country needs a source of highly trained, air-minded manpower that can take up and, in the future, efficiently operate and maintain the United States Air Force with a minimum expenditure of the taxpayer's dollars.

Establishment of such an Academy at the earliest possible date would give this. In doing so it would accomplish two important objectives:

First. It would alleviate the critical career officer procurement situation in the Department of Defense—not only in the Air Force, but in the Army and Navy as well. Initially the Air Force contemplates temporary utilization of facilities at an existing Air Force installation. Therefore, with enactment of this bill, the Air Force Academy could start functioning by the summer of 1955.

Second. Establishment of the Air Academy would further recognize and emphasize that airpower is the keystone of our military strength. The strength we are building is, in the words of our President, "for our own defense and to deter aggression." We must maintain a massive capability to strike back, if an aggressor should attack us. That capability of immediate retaliation lies in our air power. The full potential of our airpower will not be realized unless we have adequately trained leaders to direct it.

The Air Force is entitled to its own Academy where it can indoctrinate its potential leaders with the ideals and proud historical traditions of American military airmen, and where it can give the basic scientific and technical training a modern air force requires of its leaders.

I would be less than fair if I failed to note that some able and sincere educators have expressed the view that the educational needs of the services could be met adequately by institutions under civilian control. They point out that many of our finest military leaders have come from our civilian colleges and universities.

Dr. Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, told our committee that he was of this view himself at one time but that his subsequent experience in close association with large numbers of graduates of West Point and Annapolis and visits to the two Academies led him to a complete change of viewpoint.

Nowhere else but in a service academy are young men exposed to an intense and continued emphasis upon the ideal of service to the country. Loyalty and dedication to this kind of service are hallmarks of graduates of the Military Academies and we would be in a very sorry state, indeed, if the professional officer corps did not have a high proportion of men motivated by just these ideals.

West Point and Annapolis are each furnishing 25 percent of their graduates to the Air Force at this time. This has helped, but it is not enough. Besides the Military and Naval Academies need all of their own graduates. We have made the Air Force a separate department; we have dignified it with the imposition of a great responsibility, and I think it is not only reasonable, but necessary, that we provide it with a source of officers trained specifically for the Air Force. We are spending billions for planes and equipment. I think we should spend a relatively small amount to insure the best utilization of these planes and equipment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee by no means assumed the need for an Air Force Academy—it made the Department make a good case—and the committee was convinced that they did make a good case.

The bill the Department brought up was a good bill. But the committee detected certain weaknesses which it corrected by amendments. Some of the amendments are merely technical. But there are three of them which will be of particular interest to you and all the members.

First, the committee added an amendment to provide actual construction authority. Enunciating the principle that there should be an academy is a worthy and idealistic approach to the problem of supplying the kind of officers which the Air Force so sorely needs. Ideals and principles, however, do not, of themselves, provide officers; do not fly planes. The principle, therefore, of establishing an Air Force Academy was accepted by the committee but the committee wants to see an academy built.

The next amendment by the committee—in section 4 of the bill—makes it clear that while the permanent Academy is building, an existing Air Force base will be used for the first two classes—the first one to start at this temporary location a year from this summer. There is every reason to believe that by the time the third class enters the Academy, it and the other two will be able to occupy buildings at the permanent Academy, although, of course, the whole school will not be completed at that time.

The next amendment at the end of section 5 of the bill relates to appointments to the Academy. The amendment does not in any way change what the Air Force intended to do but does set out—as the committee thought it should—the specific manner in which appointments will be made during the first few years of the Academy's life. Now, the Academy will start with only one class, and this a small one. Obviously, then, appointments cannot be made in the same number and in the same manner as appointments are now made to West Point and Annapolis. Accepting that fact, the question must arise as to how the appointments will be made during these first few years.

The fairest and most workable system, to my mind, and I might say that the committee agreed with me, is that set out in section 5 (b).

I will try to explain clearly and simply how it works because I know this provision of the bill is of particular interest to every Member of the House.

Now, understand that this procedure will obtain only during the first few years; the committee imposed a limit of 6 years. Let us say that the first class to enter the Air Force Academy numbers 300. This is roughly one-half of an entering class at West Point. Your State will have its proportionate share of appointees based upon its representation in Congress. In other words, a heavily populated State such as New York, Pennsylvania, or California will have greater representation in that first class than the less populous States. Let us assume that your State has five Representatives and, of course, two Senators. This is a total of seven. Operating in generally the same way that you operate with respect to appointments to West Point, each Representative and each Senator would select four young men, by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

whatever means he wants. So far, everything is just like it is with respect to the Military Academy. The first difference is that there would be no distinction between principal and alternate. All four would be alike. Your 4 young men and the 4 young men selected by each of the other Representatives and Senators would all then compete among themselves for however many vacancies there are during that year allocated to your State.

With a class of 300, let us say that your State has as its proportionate share 3 appointments, the highest 3 as determined by the competitive examinations will be the 3 who will be appointed. This selection will not be purely on the basis of scholastic attainments. Many other tests will be given also, including the very important one which determines whether the young man does indeed have an aptitude for flying. I am told that this kind of test is actually very effective.

Let me repeat that this system will be used only as a practical answer to a difficult problem and only for the first few years. When the permanent Air Force Academy is built up to full strength then the Air Force cadets will be appointed in the same way and identical manner as cadets to the United States Military Academy at West Point.

Some of you mathematicians will figure out that even this plan, as fair and equitable as I think it is, is going to run into trouble after perhaps a relatively short time. The committee is aware of it but feels that the difficulties can be taken care of as they arise either through administrative action or, if necessary, by whatever legislation appears needed at that time.

Section 6 was stricken since the idea of having four full-blown classes was discarded by the Air Force as impractical—and I agree with them.

The new section 6 is merely technical and is for the purpose of establishing the status of professors and cadets at the Air Force Academy.

The bill, as presented, contained an authorization for $10 million. The committee changed this to $26 million to back up the construction authority which the committee added to section 3. This will allow the Department to acquire the land, make its plans, and actually start construction. This amount of money will allow the Department to go ahead with its construction program without interruptions or costly delays. In brief, if we are going to build an Academy, let us get at it.

With respect to what the Academy will ultimately cost, I can say this: It will probably cost in excess of $125 million. Until detailed plans and architectural drawings have been made and the site actually selected, no one can give a truly valid estimate. The site of the Academy will be decided by the Secretary of the Air Force after a comprehensive, thorough, and impartial survey and study by his Commission. If an airfield is located at the site selected this will effect a saving. If a chapel is donated, that will effect a saving. One hundred and twenty-five million dollars is probably a minimum figure. Many things can vary what might have to be spent in excess of this.

Let me remind you again, Mr. Chairman, that we are the only major power in the world without an air force academy.

Men of the exacting qualifications our Air Force requires, imbued with the philosophy of airpower, are seldom the casual product of their natural environment. They are usually the product of a deliberate design. The proposed bill, to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, is part of a grand design for our own defense, to deter aggression, and to give meaning to our hope for peace for all the world.

I want to conclude on this note: It has been a most refreshing and unusual experience to find such a complete unanimity of opinion with respect to the establishment of an Air Force Academy. The Stearns board on which President Eisenhower—then president of Columbia University—served was unanimous in its recommendations that such an Academy be established. The three services themselves are similarly unanimous. The Army and the Navy as well as the Air Force want it. President Eisenhower, as President of the United States, has again recently put his personal seal of approval on the establishment of an Air Force Academy. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, fully concurs. And the House Armed Services Committee reported this bill to the floor without a dissenting vote.

This is to say, then, that every person or group who has had the chance to study and think on the question as to whether there should be an Air Force Academy has come up with the same answer, "Yes, there should be, and as soon as possible." Members, this is truly the all-American bill long overdue.

I hope—indeed it is my honest expectation—that this vital need will find its fulfillment in the same unanimity among the Members of Congress.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I compliment the gentleman on his speech? The Academy is certainly needed. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. FULTON. I believe, if we are going to have each service represented with good officers, we should expand and probably have some sort of an academy for the women's services, so that they, too, may have the advantages that these men are getting. Why not have an academy for the WACS, the WAVES, and the WAAFS? That is a serious question.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; that is not as ridiculous as it might sound at first. But I do not think we should mix it up with this particular academy.

Mr. FULTON. Oh, I do not mean at this time.

Mr. SHORT. No; it is something to which we should give attention and serious consideration.

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman will yield further, are any plans being made now for the women's services for a school of a similar type?

Mr. SHORT. Not at this time. Right now, we need an academy for the Air Force, a coequal arm of our national defense, which is becoming increasingly important.

Mr. FULTON. My point is this, if the gentleman will permit. Does not the gentleman think, as we have the women's services now as a permanent part of our national defense services, that we should have adequate training facilities for them, and some sort of a service school?

Mr. SHORT. Certainly I cannot disagree with that; I think the gentleman is correct. We should have adequate training facilities. I am for the women always.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I, too, want to commend the gentleman on his very comprehensive statement. I did not understand this too clearly. During this growth period, will the selections be made by each State?

Mr. SHORT. Each State will have its proportionate share.

Mr. VORYS. Each State will have its proportion of the nominees. But how can you guarantee that a State is going to have candidates who are physically and mentally qualified? It seems to me that there are certain basic qualifications. We have all had the experience of nominating a boy who has to go out because of some physical disqualification. Is it possible that there would be varying physical or mental requirements for boys from different States?

Mr. SHORT. No. I cannot imagine that there is any State in this Union, unequal as the advantages may be in some of them, whose Senators and Representatives could not name a sufficient number of boys who could pass an examination to get into the Air Force Academy.

They are going to take very few at first. They start out with a first class of about 300; in the second year the figure may go to 324. So that until the permanent establishment is built to full strength, the appointments will be made by the Secretary of the Air Force on a purely competitive basis. But that competition will be within a State. The boys whom you would name from Ohio, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio, would compete with other boys named by the two Senators and the other Representatives from Ohio. The boys whom I would name from my district would have to compete, within the State of Missouri, with the boys named by the other Representatives and the two Senators within that State. But my State would have its proportionate share. Naturally, we would name more than would be named from the State of Delaware or the State of Nevada, because we have a greater population.

Mr. VORYS. Here is my point. At the present time, as I understand it, as to the existing Academies, if my appointees do not make the grade, either

the principal appointees or the others, those appointments may be filled by other congressional nominees so that you do not have vacancies at the Academy.

Mr. SHORT. Obviously there would have to be some procedure for that.

Mr. VORYS. I wondered whether the same system would apply in this case in the event—which is quite possible—that a small State—a State that had 2 Senators and a Member of the House—named 12 men and they might not have the right number qualify; would they still select from congressional appointees or would they apportion the number——

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman will permit, I think this brief discussion we have had goes to show how complex the problem is. For the first few years it will have to be a matter of administration upon those things that do not lend themselves to legislation.

Mr. VORYS. I hope that we do not draw our legislative lines too strictly.

Mr. SHORT. I might say the committee was apprehensive of that.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I think the Chairman of the Committee should call to the attention of the Members that nominations for the Academy will not be restricted to four; that they can send in as many nominations as they wish.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question for information and clarification?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Does this new Air Force Academy contemplate taking over the training presently carried on by the air wing of the Marine Corps and the Navy?

Mr. SHORT. No. The naval fliers will be trained in the Naval Academy because they have to land and take off from carriers.

Mr. BAILEY. On page 4 it is stated:

> During the same period the vacancies allocated to other sources shall be filled from among qualified candidates—

And so forth.

Mr. SHORT. That refers to the Presidential and other noncongressional appointments. Fifteen percent in all.

Mr. BAILEY. Has the gentleman given any thought that we should restrict the 15-percent appointments to men actively serving in the Armed Services of the United States? I think they should be rewarded. The men who are presently in our Air Force wings should be given a break on some of these appointments. Could we tie this down to that?

Mr. SHORT. Of course, there are a certain number of appointees to Annapolis and West Point that come from the services, as well as Presidential appointments in addition to congressional appointments.

Mr. BAILEY. The majority of them would be servicemen or the sons of servicemen?

Mr. SHORT. It would be in the same proportion as now, I would assume.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to see the boys who are in the air wings now rewarded. A lot of them would like to make it a career. I would like to see them get a break on this if we can by allocating a certain number of appointments to them.

Mr. SHORT. A certain percent of them are appointed to the two old academies now. It is the purpose of the new proposed Air Force Academy to follow the same rules, regulations and methods as the United States Military Academy at West Point.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Do I understand from the gentleman that the matter of locating this academy will be reopened and a new committee formed to survey the country?

Mr. SHORT. The final authority and decision rests with the Secretary of the Air Force, but he is granted permission—it is purely permission, as will be noticed in the language of the bill—to set up a commission. He told the committee that it was his intention to appoint a commission of 5 or 7 individuals, and that he hoped to name 2 who had served on the previous board, to make a resurvey, restudy or reevaluation of the more than 300 sites that have already been studied and examined and perhaps other sites also. He is hoping that that decision as to location will be reached by the 1st of July.

Mr. BONNER. Therefore, if a new locality were to be offered at this time it could be considered?

Mr. SHORT. Oh, yes; absolutely. No commitment has been made to anybody and the whole thing is wide open.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Answering the question asked by the gentleman from West Virgina [Mr. BAILEY] for the record relative to the 85 percent, 89 would be nominated by personal selection of the President, 90 from the Regular Army and Regular Air Force by competitive examination among those nominated by the Secretary, 90 from the Reserve components of the Army and Air Force by competitive examination among those nominated by the Secretary and sons of persons awarded a Medal of Honor in the name of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The selection of a site is somewhat similar to the method followed in the selection of research laboratories by the Quartermaster, is that correct? They recommend the sites from which the Secretary will make the final determination. That is my understanding.

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a very wise course. It would be very difficult for the committee and for the Congress to insert a particular site. We want the best one selected, and there may be several that might be of comparable standing, and in a practical way to make the best selection is the way I think is provided for in the bill by the committee.

Just one more question. Is the chairman in a position to advise us as to what the outside figure will be in the cost of this Academy?

Mr. SHORT. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want it understood that I am favorably disposed toward this bill.

Mr. SHORT. I know the gentleman is, and I appreciate that. But, as I tried to say in my opening statement, it is next to impossible for any individual or any group of individuals to tell exactly what the final cost will be. Certainly we want to make it a fine institution because of its permanent nature and because of its importance. It has been estimated previously, under the previous administration, that the cost would be somewhere in the neighborhood of $171 million. Another estimate was that it would be approximately $148 million. Any individual hates to stick his neck out but Mr. Talbott said in his own opinion he thought $125 million would be a minimum. It may run up to $150 million or $175 million. They want to hold down the cost as much as possible but at the same time make it the kind of institution we must have.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I have consumed more time than I deserve, and I want to give other members of the committee an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further to clear up a statement?

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], when speaking, said there was no limit on the appointments by Congressmen or Senators, as I understood it. Would the gentleman explain what that means? I did not catch the full import of that—nominations of candidates for the Academy. Could the gentleman explain what was meant in that colloquy between you two when it was said there was no limit on the nominations?

Mr. SHORT. During this interim period for the first few years you could name any number of boys, but they will be chosen strictly on a competitive basis by the Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me, is there to be an airfield in connection with this new Academy?

Mr. SHORT. Yes; they will need an airfield in the proximity of the Academy. It must not be too far away, yet, it cannot be too close, because of the noise of modern jet planes. Unless they choose a site where you have an existing runway, they will have to build an airfield.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any estimate as to the annual cost of the maintenance of this Academy?

Mr. SHORT. No.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. GROSS. No estimate as to that cost?

Mr. SHORT. No. I imagine it would approximate what West Point or Annapolis costs. It will be sort of a parallel Academy. It may be a little more, due to the very expensive equipment that is involved in modern airplanes.

Mr. GROSS. Under the terms of the bill I assume there are to be some temporary structures built.

Mr. SHORT. There is $1 million in the bill, or not to exceed $1 million to be used to improve existing buildings on the temporary site. But it is doubtful whether or not they would spend any money at all.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly there is no urgency in the construction of this Academy that would require the building of temporary structures.

Mr. SHORT. No; that is not contemplated at all. We placed a limitation of not to exceed $1 million, but the Secretary of the Air Force is not going to spend any money at all unless he would have to refurnish or repair in a temporary way some of the buildings that are on the existing Air Force base where the temporary academy will be located for the next 3 or 4 years until they can move into permanent quarters. Some minor temporary buildings might also be built.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for that information.

Mr. SHORT. That is all right. That is a very important point, too, because we do not want to waste money on temporary construction.

I thank the Members very much.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly grateful to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for a very exhaustive explanation of the terms of this bill. I am grateful to the senior Democrat on the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], for this opportunity to follow our distinguished chairman and to say a few words in reference to the scope, character, and nature of the measure before us.

In 1947 this Congress passed the so-called unification bill. When it was passed I think there was a general misunderstanding in the minds of many of the Members of Congress as to what the unification included. Certainly it was not the intent of Congress to bring about a merger of the three services or a complete integration of them. The intent was to bring about a complete concord and unification of the three services under the Department of Defense.

Since 1947, when the measure went through, we worked on unification, cutting down here in some services and building up there, so as to bring about the complete picture we want.

Even before the passage of the Unification Act, however, in the minds of many Members of Congress and in the minds of those who studied the national defense it was the thought that to have a complete setup of a defense system with three equal and coordinate branches in the defense system, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, we must have an Air Force Academy. Consequently, a number of bills were presented to the 80th, 81st, and 82d Congresses, and there are a number now pending before the 83d Congress.

We gave attention to the possibility of setting up a United States Air Force Academy even at that early date. I for one was sold on the thought that if you are going to have three coordinate branches in the Department of Defense, of equal prestige and equal rank, you must necessarily follow through with a United States Air Force Academy such as we contemplated in this bill. Consequently, even at this early date, 6 or 7 years ago, we Members of the Congress and the public generally had in mind the thought that the day would come when we would provide for the Air Force an academy such as this now under consideration.

The situation was similar to that when the Constitution of the United States was adopted in 1787. The fact that it was formally adopted and formally ratified by the Colonies did not complete the work. The work had to be completed over a period of years in order to learn how to coordinate the branches of the Government and work together with the several States and work in harmony in building the type of government which was created under the Constitution of 1787, which is our National Constitution.

The presentation of this bill to the House of Representatives today marks in my mind the fulfilment of the dream we had when we provided for the unification of the Defense Department into three coordinate branches of the service.

We need this Academy very badly. There is no disagreement in the Defense Department and there was no disagreement in our committee as to the fact that we need this Academy very badly. At the present time the Air Force is a separate branch of our national defense and a most vital part of our national defense.

It has no means to provide for its own leadership and its own officers. The Air Force must go to other branches of our Defense Establishments, the Army and the Navy for these officers. It must go to the Reserve establishment for these officers in order to get its leadership. At the present time, as the gentleman from Missouri, Chairman SHORT has told you, the Army Academy at West Point and the Navy Academy at Annapolis furnish 25 percent each of officers to the Air Force and they are taken over and used as Air Force officers in the carrying on of the operations of the Air Force. This is a burden upon those two Academies. It is a serious burden upon the Academies at times. The facilities at West Point and the facilities at Annapolis are now used to capacity. At one time they were really bulging over because of a need for naval officers at Annapolis. To expand those Academies will cost money, and that is what is going to have to be done as an alternative if you do not provide for the Air Force Academy, and yet there is no room for expansion at either Academy. To provide 25 percent from each Academy at the present time merely provides a figure equal to 50 percent of the total officer personnel of any one of these Academies. So even at the present hour, the Air Force is getting from the Academies fewer officers than either the Army or the Navy is getting from West Point or from Annapolis. So there is a situation which must be provided for, and if you plan on the expansion of either one of those academies, it is going to cost money and you are going to find no room for expansion available.

There is another reason why I am strongly in favor of the Air Force Academy. When a man goes to West Point or to Annapolis, he is trained and trained well at those two Academies, but he is not trained specifically in the work of the Air Force as he would be trained if he went to an Air Force Academy. He is taught general subjects, like mathematics and history and subjects of that sort, and the Academies do a good job in that respect, but the cadets are not given aviation training.

It is proposed that the entrance requirements for the Air Force Academy provide that an appointee who is sent to the Academy should know before he goes there that he must be an air-minded individual. He must be a man who expects to know that he is going to deal with airplanes and to fly in them at a later date. The first year that he goes to the Academy, it is proposed that he be given the feel of the airplane and that the plane be brought out and he be allowed to examine the airplane and be taught the importance of and the operation of its many parts. He is prepared further in the second year of his training, and is given a more intimate knowledge and acquaintance with aviation, and gradually he will be built up as a man who knows something about flying generally so that when he comes out of the Academy, he will have an education in the actual flying and operation of aircraft. That is a big advantage because a man through the years is gradually taught how to handle himself with reference to airplanes at the same time he gets the academic education. When he comes out of the Academy, the advantage is that he will not lose so much time later on as he does at present in actually going to an air training school for the purpose of being taught how to be a navigator or a pilot or an aviator. That will save a great deal of money and save a great deal of time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to my friend for a question, and I know the gentleman is an authority on such matters.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has said that the touch, feel, and so forth of these aviation matters would be given to the young man in the course of his training. Is there any idea of giving training for the large bulk of Air Force officers who will be required for the maintenance and repair of aviation equipment and also for the electronics equipment which is so widely used and which requires so much special training in the Air Force, and also the other specialties that are used in the Air Force?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Of course, I am sure my distinguished friend the gentleman from California, who has always shown such zeal for aviation, will realize that this is an academy bill. The student body of this academy would normally run about 600 students a year who would be entering the academy each year. Therefore, the training of the type which I think the gentleman has in mind would be more or less covered by general aviation training rather than Air Force education. Does that not answer the gentleman's question? Men in the academy, however, will be given the feel of an airplane, learn something about its parts and the theory of mechanics as he goes along from year to year in the course in the academy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield myself 3 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield briefly.

Mr. GAVIN. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] to the fact that this matter was fully discussed before the committee, and he can receive the information he desires on pages 3050 and 3051 of the hearings.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am going to vote for this bill, not with any too much enthusiasm, because I can see many popular objections that could be advanced to it because someday we will get peace and we will get back to nominating 3 members every 4 years to Annapolis and West Point, and I can see where Annapolis and West Point could work out some sort of a coordinated plan, but I would say that we made a fight last year for 143 Air Force units, and our Republican friends, headed by President Eisenhower, opposed it. They have now come around to seeing our point of view, and have advocated 137 units by 1957, 2 years late, probably costing a billion dollars more. Because of that, I have, without too much enthusiasm, decided that I can vote for this bill because the Republicans have come around to the Democratic policy of building up our Air Force.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I will say that we are coming back to the 143-wing Air Force and we are getting back to the Air Force Academy, a program which we have followed through for 6 or 7 years.

Mr. SHAFER. Let us not forget the time when President Truman cut it back to 48 groups.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to my good friend from Michigan that he is a grand fellow, but he has a habit of thinking in terms of yesterday and not tomorrow.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, may I say in my remaining short time before it is exhausted, we are still a little slow to recognize the value of airpower in the United States. I go back in my mind to the days when Billy Mitchell was here telling us of the vital importance of airpower. There were people at that early date who could not see the value of airpower. In the United States today there are people who still do not fully appreciate the tremendous significance and importance of airpower in our national defense in the world today. We cannot get ultimate results out of the great value of airpower unless we have an academy in which we can train our leadership in the Air Force to carry out and apply the rules of airpower in the national defense as they should be handled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, to me it seems self-evident that the Air Force needs its own Academy.

The United States Air Force is a comparatively new service, established by act of Congress in 1947. Airpower itself is new to the world. Only last December we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the first powered flight in history.

The Air Force, which is the instrument of American airpower, is in a particularly fast-moving phase of development right now. The last 10 years have seen extension of range, altitude, weight, and speed for aircraft. The world's first atomic bomb was dropped from a United States long-range heavy bomber scarcely 8 years ago. Jet aircraft were first used in combat only 4 years ago. At present we are moving rapidly into the realm of supersonic flight, guided missiles, and the hydrogen bomb. Airpower is developing at an accelerating rate.

The technological and scientific genius of more than one great power is being devoted to these problems. The Korean war revealed to what extent the Soviets had caught up with us in aeronautical development. It revealed also how much Russian effort and how much of Russian resources are being devoted to airpower. It is likely that the U. S. S. R. is investing a greater sum in airpower than we are, though the total of our investment is enormous.

The strategy of present defense and security is concerned more and more with airpower. Remarks made by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message, the address of Secretary Dulles in New York on January 12, and other statements by responsible leaders indicate that this Government is placing more and more reliance, for our defense, on the quickly employable, immediately retaliatory air-atomic power of our Strategic Air Force.

While we are planning that defense, and the Air Force we expect to have in the very near future, we should at the same time be giving equal thought to the development of the officers who will be responsible for its operation. Of the three pillars of our Air Force—men, machines, and the bases from which they operate—the first, men, is by far the most important.

All of the studies made indicate that at least 50 percent of the permanent career officer strength of each service should be drawn from service Academies. The amount of catching up with the Air Force—our newest service—has to do is shown by the fact that only 14 percent of Air Force career officers are Academy graduates. In the Army 28 percent of regular officers are West Point graduates. In the Navy, 29 percent are graduates of Annapolis.

At it stands today, 25 percent of the graduates of West Point and Annapolis each year are being commissioned in the Air Force. In round numbers, the figure is about 350 annually. It is plainly inadequate. The Air Force, which is already at a disadvantage in relation to the other services in this matter of service Academy graduates, is falling even further behind under the existing arrangement. Moreover, the arrangement imposes a real hardship on the Army and the Navy at a time when those services urgently need all the graduates their Academies can produce.

Mr. Chairman, we are neglecting a very important aspect of airpower if we continue to neglect the selection and education and training of officers to lead it. an air academy, authorized by Congress, supported by the Federal Government and maintained by the Air Force, is the obvious answer to the need existing. It is essential to the training of men who will lead the Air Force on which so great a part of our defense must be built.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, the members of this committee and the House generally should understand that what you are being asked to do today is to put your stamp of approval upon a program which will cost you—and this guess is no wilder than others that have been made—between 350 and 400 million dollars; a program that will eventually cost you between 22 and 27 million dollars a year to operate. There is no use closing your eyes to it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield briefly.

Mr. GAVIN. I do not want to enter into any controversy with the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, but I just wonder where he arrived at the figure of three hundred or four hundred million dollars.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Let me answer the gentleman. The subject of an Air Force Academy is not new to me. I have heard about an Air Force Academy, as a member of the Appropriations Committee for the Armed Services for a long time. I have seen sketches and listened to many discussions. I expect probably if you talked to some of the other members of the Armed Forces Committee as I have,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

you would find that they have privately admitted the correctness of the figure I have just given. I know what it costs to operate Annapolis and I know what it costs to operate West Point. It is costing you $16.5 million a year for West Point and $20 million a year for the Naval Academy. I know that the Air Force will not underspend them. From some of the comments I have heard, I am surprised that we have been able to do as well as we have, winning the war, as we did, without any Air Academy. Also, I am amazed to find that the Navy fliers will be able to carry on their job so nobly by attending the academy at Annapolis without need for a separate Naval Air Academy. And what about a separate academy for our rapidly growing Army aviation?

When the Academies at West Point and Annapolis were started, there was a reason for them, namely, that 150 years ago we did not have the outstanding educational institutions that we have in this country today. There is no reason why there could not be a cooperative, constructive program worked out with the educational institutions of this country, and then use Air Force special training, which would be much less expensive than you will be able to do it under the program presently proposed here.

According to some of the comments that have been made, it is because of the lack of an Air Force Academy that we cannot do certain things. Some have the impression that we cannot have very much of an Air Force, since we have not had a separate Air Force Academy.

We have an Air Force that is second to none. It is the peer of any air force in the world. And it is today capable of carrying out any mission it may be given to perform without any Air Force Academy. We want the best Air Force—and we have it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Is the gentleman opposed to the establishment of an Air Force Academy?

Mr. SCRIVNER. At the present time I most certainly am; because, while there may be some argument made for it, there can be arguments made against it in this day and age when we are facing the necessity of raising our debt limit to above $275 billion, and we are being called on to undertake another mammoth spending program. This is not the time to take this on.

If we have waited this long and we have the best Air Force in the world, then we can wait until this country is financially and economically able to carry out a huge program such as this involves if the need then exists. If this program is undertaken, it should be done properly; there is no question about that. But certainly, the success that the Air Force has had up to now, without an Air Force Academy, demonstrates that it can get along very nicely without it, for a few years. Especially in view of rapidly growing number of pilotless planes.

Instead of working toward better unification, this will work for more diversification. It will create again another group that will have much of what we have now from the other two Academies. There will be a clannishness, and sometimes it goes beyond that. A man comes in from civilian life, a reserve officer—and the reserve officers are the ones upon whom we must always depend in time of peril—and they run into the things that they all run into when they go into the active service, because of the clannishness of Academy officers from the other two services. And if that is going to happen when they go into the Air Force, it is not going to work for the good of the Air Force, but will hurt it, in my own opinion.

Some questions have been raised and some statements have been made that this should be done in order to boost the morale of the Air Force. I have seen quite a bit of the Air Force in recent months and years. The morale of the Air Force is not so low. Men are quitting it, yes; but not because we do not have an Air Force Academy. They are quitting it because they can no longer tolerate the many rapid shifts in their home life, that they have to face, serving under the conditions that exist today. We have troops and our Air Force scattered all over the world, in 49 different countries. They are quitting because they want to lead a normal home life and be with their families and be able to make some plans for the future, the same as the rest of us.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALE. Is it not true that the cadets at West Point and Annapolis now have the opportunity to get training in aviation?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Each year the Air Force takes 25 percent of the graduate school from both Academies. My own view is that it has worked out very nicely.

We were told some time ago that with the inauguration of Randolph Field, we would be furnished with the fliers and the officers we needed. Then we were told that if we had to go into a huge Air Force, the ROTC was going to be the source of our officers. Now they say that even with those we must have an Air Force Academy to furnish them. I cannot follow the logic of that.

If you want to do something today that will maintain Air Force officer and enlisted personnel morale, then you should do something that will improve the morale of those presently in the Air Force by giving them more Wherry housing and other accommodations that they so badly need in order to lead a normal life and cut down the frequency of the changes of assignment to various stations. You will find men who in a short span of 3 years have been assigned to 5 different stations, where they have had to pick up their homes 5 different times, where they cannot raise their children in the same normal manner we do and have their friends where they grow up or live in one permanent place. You could do far more without any added cost whatsoever by remedying this situation than you can by undertaking a program which you might just as well put down and see when time passes who is nearest right, whether it is $125 million or $350 million.

And, of course, old as West Point and Annapolis are, with old buildings, cramped space, they, seeing the new modern Air Force Academy, will want something as new and modern at still further cost.

There are many things that could be discussed. One of them is the cost of $25,000 to $30,000 to carry a cadet or midshipman through either Academy. From 65 to 70 percent of the studies that they would undertake are those normal academic studies that you can get in any of the standard universities of this country. I am justified in my conclusion, therefore, that there could be a well coordinated program worked out with the universities of this country which would save the taxpayers many millions of dollars without setting up a new educational institution which must of necessity compete with the present universities of today for teachers and in other particulars. The Air Force needs experts in electronics, atom power, and other technical subjects which the curriculum does not provide, but can be found in already existing topflight schools. There is no question about that. All Air officers are not all going to be fliers. In addition to these technical branches, you have to have some businessmen in the Air Force. There are plenty of schools in this country where a good business administration course is given and those men could be commissioned in the Air Force and do just as good, if not a better job, as though they had been graduated from an Air Force Academy.

Mr. Chairman, the need—or desire—is here but the dollars are not now available. This subject should be given further study.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I believe a fair and impartial analysis of the entire situation will lead the vast majority of the Members of the House to the conclusion that an Air Force Academy is essential. To produce the hard core of professional Air Force officers it is my opinion that you are going to have to have an Air Force Academy.

It is true it will cost a good deal of money. National defense comes high, but it provides national existence and the expenditure is essential.

When you go back and review the situation as it existed prior to World War II it becomes even more evident. Up to the year 1939 the total authorized strength of the Army and the Air Force, because the Air Force was then a part of the Army, was 261,000. The officer corps of both services is about 20,000. We never actually reached the 261,000 or the 20,000 because there was never enough money appropriated to pay them. So when you take 25 percent of the cadets of the Military and Naval Academies from the services in which they were trained and turn them over to the

Air Force you will see that you are even further reducing the small number that are available for the services for which they were trained.

It was stated a moment ago in a question asked by the gentleman from Maine that at West Point at this time flight training is available to cadets. I believe the gentleman from Kansas said that that is his understanding. The hearings will show, however, that that is not correct.

Back during the war the Army built Stewart Field. That was at a time when they did not have to get specific authorization. They simply got an appropriation. It cost more to build Stewart Field than it cost to build the Panama Canal. For a short period of time they attempted to train cadets at West Point in flying. But it very soon became apparent that it was impracticable and was abandoned. As a matter of fact, those that came out of West Point with their wings as pilots had their training elsewhere, and during the summer they left the Academy and went to Air Force training bases and there received their training. In the winter it was carried on as ground training, and what-not, and a few days of flying.

That points up one of the questions that the Secretary and the Commission will have to bear in mind in choosing the location for this Academy. Twelve miles is the distance between Stewart Field and the Military Academy at West Point. It was found to be impracticable to transport men for a distance of 12 miles and, of course, it was in the mountains, which were blocked by snow, but there was no point in taking them at that time because they could not fly anyway in that type of weather, so that in choosing the location for this Academy it is incumbent upon the Commission and the Secretary to locate it where an airfield can be within a proper distance and where flying can be properly carried on. This is particularly important.

There has been great delay in acting on this bill. My recollection is that I offered the first bill that was offered to create an air academy in my district, it is true, in the 79th Congress. It may have been in the 80th Congress. After that some 350 locations came in applying for the academy. It has been narrowed down to seven that the Department said were available. Now the Secretary says he is going to open it. The pendency of so many bills fixing the location of the academy resulted in a stalemate, but it is my conclusion that for the welfare of the Air Force, and therefore the country, that those of us who have been attempting by law to establish this academy at a fixed location should go along with this general bill. I think it is highly important that the temporary location be at an existing Air Force base. I have never yet seen an Army base that the Air Force could use or an Air Force base that the Army could use without practically tearing it down and rebuilding it. They have their own fixed ideas how it should be. So, in this bill we tie them down to an existing Air Force base built in accordance with their own ideas of what an Air Force base should be.

The thinking in the Department has gone through many, many changes in past years. Originally the idea of the Air Force was that they wanted a postgraduate school. Later that changed completely and it became the fixed policy of the Air Force that they wanted a purely academic school at which no flying would be taught. And, they proceeded for a number of years on that basis. You will find in the hearings that General Harmon testified to the effect that that was at one time the attitude of the Air Force, and I can tell you very frankly that that delayed the creation of an air academy for a number of years, because there are too many Members of the Congress and our committee who feel that if you are not going to train fliers in an air academy you do not need the academy. General Harmon testified in quite some detail, and he testified that the Air Force is going to be committed to an air flying program within the academy, and I had the Secretary of the Air Force confirm that that was going to be the policy of the Air Force. The question as to the teaching of electronics and things of that kind was raised. That is included in the minimum course to be taught at the academy, and each man, while he is in the academy, will qualify as an observer and will receive his wings as an observer and will have a minimum, I believe, of 55 hours of flight training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, it is established before the committee that that is to be the approximate minimum flying time; that that will be a part of their curriculum; is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then it would be indicated, I presume, from the gentleman's experience and the background of the hearings that have been going on, that in locating the site it would be ideal if they could find a place where they would have 365 days of flying weather a year?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know whether you are going to get 365 days of flying weather, but you would want to get the largest number you could.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If we could get 365 such days it would be ideal, would it not?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes, 365 would be ideal. The fewer nonflying days they would have the less attractive it should be as the location for this Academy

In view of the fact that the thinking in the Air Force has gone through these various changes in the last 6, 8, or 10 years, I think it is incumbent upon the Air Force and it is going to be incumbent upon our Committee on Appropriations, whether they come in here for a reprograming of funds already appropriated or for a new appropriation for an Air Academy, to see to it that it is so located that it would take care of all these various changes in viewpoint that the Air Force has had, first, as a postgraduate school, where they all all would fly, then with no flying, and then back to a minimum; that all of those contingencies should be provided for in the permanent location, and that any other foreseeable change in the policy of the Air Force could be carried out.

It is true they could put this Academy on top of a mountain if they wanted to under the terms of this bill. Notwithstanding the fact that they have had one experience in placing a flying field in the mountains, they could still do that. I think it is going to be incumbent on the Congress and primarily on the Committee on Appropriations to see to it that the academy is not so located.

I do not believe it is necessary to deal further with the necessity for such an Academy, but if you are to have this hard core of professional officers within the Air Force I think you are going to have to start and start very quickly in creating that hard core. I believe that while there are resignations from the regular services of men who have come out of the service academies, you would find them to be a very small percentage relatively.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the very able member of the Committee on Armed Services about the Air Force Academy Board. I refer to the provision on page 3 of the bill reading as follows:

> All appropriate provisions of law, not inconsistent with the purposes of this act, which pertain to the United States Military Academy shall, by the authority of this section, also pertain to the United States Air Force Academy.

Does this provision include the establishment of an Air Force Academy Board appointed by the Speaker and the Vice President?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman means the Board of Visitors?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. I think it does. I think the language we have here is sufficient to make all present laws now applicable to the Military Academy applicable to the Air Force Academy, unless there is a contrary provision on some particular matter in this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to urge on the gentleman that if the committee did not consider that feature new legislation be sought to strengthen the power of the Board of Visitors.

Mr. KILDAY. I agree with the gentleman there should be a Board of Visitors here as there is at the Military and Naval Academies. I believe the language is sufficient. If not, it should be changed to see to it that it is required.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman referred a moment ago to the possibility of placing this Academy on the top of a mountain, which, of course, is an extreme statement. He followed that by saying it should be the responsibility of the House Committee on Appropriations and the Congress to see that that is not

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

done. Will the gentleman please explain to me what authority the Congress will have after this bill passes insofar as choosing the site is concerned?

Mr. KILDAY. I thought I had detailed that in saying whether it was securing permission for the reprograming of funds or for the appropriation of funds. This bill is only an authorization for an appropriation. It contains no appropriations. They will have to come back to the Congress to secure the appropriations or to secure the informal approval for reprograming from the committee if they are to use funds that are already appropriated.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, the gentleman means to say that if the site chosen by the committee authorized in this bill is not satisfactory to the Congress, then there will be no money appropriated for that site?

Mr. KILDAY. The Congress would have the same control that it has in all other instances, and that is the control of the purse strings and the control of the appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the bill should be adopted as amended. I do not think we should have any qualms about how these cadets are to be appointed in the opening years of the academy.

We have to have some arrangement made to get this thing started. You cannot start with four classes at the beginning. It could be done, but it certainly would not be efficient to attempt to organize a faculty and all of the facilities for four years of college at one time. It must be started with the freshman year so that during the first year of the academy's existence, there will be just the first year men, and in the second year of its operation it will have two classes, and in the third year three clases, and in the fourth year the complete four classes. The provision now in the bill is a suggested remedy for starting off with the 300 or 350 with competitive examinations being held within the States for those nominated by the Members of Congress. So that the number to go from the State would be in direct proportion to the representation of Members in the Congress. Of course, that automatically divides the appointments on the basis of population because Members of Congress, of course, are elected on the basis of apportionment and the population of the States, and that should assure a proper distribution throughout the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendments in the bill will be adopted, and that the bill with these amendments will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, during the 50 years of powered flight, the technological developments in the aircraft industry stand as great monuments in the progress of civilization. Today the United States, however, is the only major nation in the world which does not have an Air Force Academy. Certainly, our efforts for mechanical perfection should be matched by equal efforts in the training of our young men.

The establishment of such an Academy is not a new idea. It has been studied and restudied by great leaders in both the military and civilian field. Like any undertaking of significance, this problem was not without alternatives. Strong feelings have been evidenced on both sides of the issue, but it is interesting to note that most men, such as Dr. Hanuch, who originally held considerable reservations on this matter, after careful scrutiny, now approve it wholeheartedly.

The Air Force, as projected, will require more pilots and administrators. Presently, 25 percent of the graduates from both the Naval and Military Academies are assigned to the Air Force. This creates a shortage in both of these other services.

We are living in a world of specialization. The number of years that a pilot can fly is extremely limited. Therefore, it is imperative that these young men attain proficiency at the earliest possible age.

The investment in planes is great and better training will be an investment in saving lives and equipment.

Because of these reasons, as well as those mentioned by other speakers, I urge the establishment of an Air Force Academy.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to our colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, we are faced today, I believe, with the problem of building another educational institution, and just not with the problem of providing an Air Academy. We are working under different conditions today than when we first adopted the principles of educational institutions for our Armed Forces. Today, throughout the country, we have colleges that can carry a man to almost any level or degree of education. In the days when we established West Point and Annapolis, we did not have such institutions. They were not available. There are many things about this academy that I do not like. I had high hopes, and I think all of us did, when we were first working on and adopted the principle of unification for the Armed Forces that we should not only unify them at the level of supplies but at the educational level as well. That does not prevail and I do not suppose it will ever prevail in my lifetime because of certain circumstances and certain things that I, and probably no one else, can resolve. But, I have always felt and I have always acted if I was in a position to act officially that we should try to develop educational institutions wherever and at whatever level they might be whether it was white or black or any other class of people. I feel that this institution falls in this category. I do not fully agree with the curriculum. As Members of the committee well know I raised that question in the committee.

There can be serious criticism of the curriculum we are using today at West Point and Annapolis. I am not an expert on it. But when we are told men are being taught mathematics, physics, and chemistry just as the tools of an education, and not the basic fundamental things; it disturbs me, because tomorrow we are launching a submarine which many said could never be built. That was built more or less out of the minds and brains of men, educated in technical knowledge. They moved into the field by having basic fundamental knowledge of these things today which are coming out all over this world and especially in this country. We feel that the Air Force has to necessarily have trained men if they are going to keep up this tremendous progress that is going to develop in the field of altitude, in the field of speed, and the field of temperature, and many other fields. The whole thing is changing almost daily. In a few days we will run other tests on these weapons which are almost beyond the belief of any human being. That whole field today functions by Air Force. I do not expect them to get men out of this institution with the curriculum they have adopted who can operate a B–47 or a B–52. I think he is going to have to go to some place of higher learning which teaches such things, or some of these other schools we maintain. Of course, we can adopt it in this Academy if we reach that point.

I think our committee ought to give serious attention to the curriculum being taught in the services in this country. I think it is very important, and the quicker we get into this the more advanced we will be.

As to the location and the student body and the selection of the cadets, those things are more or less service matters, and we should not bother with them on the floor of this House. The first thing before us today is whether or not we are going to enter this field and set up an institution on a sound basis and proceed to try to further develop the education of the boys who are going to carry the brunt of whatever trouble starts in the future. We all feel today that that is our chief line of defense, and I do not think there is any argument in the mind of any Member on this floor about that matter. We may differ on the cost or we may differ on some of the other things, but do not forget one thing: A man cannot serve the best interests of his country today unless he has education facilities which qualify him for the present, and more especially for the future.

I tried to raise the question of costs, but we who have the responsibility for the defense of our country have not taken into consideration the cost of all the things we have to consider. I could not get much information as to the cost of this facility. It bothers me quite a bit. I know it will bother members of the Appropriations Committee. They have men there who are qualified to find out.

I would like to say a few words about the curriculum we might expect an air academy to provide.

We are faced in this age of technology and specialization with the fact that our Air Force officer must have both a liberal arts and a technical education. This is one of the strong justifications for an Air Academy—for 4 years of academic instruction of a sort no civilian college can provide.

The problem of the Air Force is to strike the proper balance between two broad areas of learning. On the one hand, the officer who is a true leader must have background in the humanities. But the officer who understands and can employ air power must be trained in science as well.

In the air age, air leaders must know how to handle air weapons. However, the most compelling forces which confront us in this confused world, in this age of turmoil, have to do with ideologies and human relations. The proposed Air Force Academy will not be a trade school, but will provide the sort of broad educational background which, over the years, will enable the graduate to meet firmly, as well as with understanding, tolerance and wisdom, the problems of his age and day. The objective will not be young officers to serve as second lieutenants next year, and the year after, but great leaders 30 years hence.

But many of these leaders must also be specialists. The Air Force has need of a wide variety of specialists. The Air Academy graduate must be well grounded in the basic sciences. It is to be expected that he may pursue his specialization in the great civilian technical schools of this country. If at the Air Academy he can be inspired with the spirit of inquiry, respect, and eagerness for the truth, and a decent knowledge of what the great minds of the past have thought and said, the Air Academy will have fulfilled a high purpose.

Most important, however, from the military point of view, the cadets of the Air Academy will develop an understanding and appreciation of airpower. From the day they enter, they will be exposed to and participate in indoctrinational flights, navigational exercises, airlifts, and tactical demonstrations of all sorts. The graduates of the Air Academy, as air leaders of the future, must be airminded in the fullest sense of the word. We do not expect the Air Academy to turn out even a small group of supermen. We will expect it to produce air leaders needed for the air age.

That the Air Academy can produce such leaders is beyond question. The system of selection that has functioned successfully in regards both to West Point and Annapolis will be employed in enrolling students at the Air Academy. Courses of instruction will be based on courses at the existing military academies, at civilian institutions, and on the experience of the Air Force itself in operating its highly successful training command. Traditions developed and codes of honor maintained can be anticipated. The traditions of the Air Force itself are already a part of our American history and our American way of life. The air officer, like his brother officer of the Navy and Army, can be expected to make honor, duty, and country paramount—or else abandon all thought of a professional military career.

In World War II, in the occupation of conquered countries and especially in the conduct of the Berlin airlift, and in the Korean war, the United States Air Force has shown that it can win battles, produce decision, and set an example to inspire the Nation and the world.

Not only the Air Force, but this Nation needs an Air Academy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have received a number of requests, and so I should like to ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may revise and extend their remarks on this matter at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, to my mind, we will have few bills before this Congress of greater long-term importance than H. R. 5337.

This bill is long overdue. The Air Force needs what the Army and Navy have had all these years, an academy which will turn out graduates educated not only as military men but as well-rounded citizens of the world—turn out men capable of supporting the position of world leadership which our country now occupies and must continue to occupy.

Now, in the past, there have been a number of bills to establish an Air Force Academy in this location or that location. This bill does not establish it anywhere. It leaves it up to the Secretary of the Air Force who will be aided by a commission to decide where the Academy will be. This is the way it should be. Who is better qualified than the Secretary of the Air Force and his advisers to decide where an Air Force Academy should be?

You have heard and I have heard the view expressed that the existing Academies and the civilian colleges ought to be able to supply the Air Force with its officers.

Well, in the first place, the service Academies do not train Air Force officers. They train Army officers and Navy officers. Today's Air Force is so highly specialized, so technical, so complex, that a man needs to start his training as an Air Force officer at a young age—the age at which Army and Navy officers now start their training. Now, as to the civilian colleges—they will, as a matter of fact, through their Reserve programs and otherwise, continue to supply probably 50 percent of the officers in the Air Force.

These men from the civilian colleges and universities will bring with them the special talents and skills that any large organization must have. But there must be that hard core of professional Air Force officers around which the whole organization can be built. We need officers from both these sources.

Right now, the Army and Navy are helping the Air Force by allocating a certain percentage of their graduates to the Air Force. This is hurting them. They just cannot keep giving up these officers because West Point and Annapolis can hardly today train the number of officers that their own services need.

I imagine there are some who would say that we cannot afford the luxury of an Air Force Academy—I would say that we can no longer afford not to have one. If our country and our civilization is to weather the storms of the present and be prepared to meet the problems of the future—if we in America are to survive as a free people, it must be in large measure through our ability to create and apply air power.

We are teetering today on the precipice between war and peace. Our Air Force is our first line of defense and our first weapon of offense. To my mind, Mr. Chairman, it is poor economy to build toward the world's greatest and most expensive Air Force and to skimp on the training of the men charged with running it.

Moreover, there is today an alarming situation in regard to military personnel in all services, of which this Congress will hear a great deal before it ends its sessions. Each of the services is finding it difficult to recruit and retain the number of adequately trained, experienced personnel the Regular Establishment requires.

The Air Force, which has probably a greater need for specialists in many branches of science than either of the other services, is finding the problem increasingly serious. And the hard fact is that the number of adequately educated men now rising through the officer ranks of the Air Force—the men upon whom its operation will depend—is inadequate to meet the great responsibilities the Air Force will have to bear.

The regular services are intended to provide, and in every test they have provided, the hard core, the binding and integrating forces from which our vast and brilliant war machines have sprung.

We are too apt to take all this for granted. With 12 million men under arms, as was the case in the last World War, the Regulars become a drop in the bucket—perhaps 1 percent of the total, but a highly important and vital ingredient in the overall force.

We should take just pride in the magnificent achievements of the great Army, Navy, and Air Force called to arms almost overnight in the tradition of our American Nation, and composed largely of civilians in uniform—citizen soldiers as the old phrase had it. We must not forget, however, the part played by the Regular Establishment in marshaling these forces and setting them on the path to victory.

This permanent core is essential. More now than ever before, it is the one element which cannot spring to arms overnight. It must be in existence, ready and alert, trained to the highest peak of military efficiency.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

There is no question of loyalty, integrity, or devotion to duty on the part of those serving in the Air Force today. Where the fault lies is in the lack of men with broad education and the desire to make a lifetime career in the Air Force. For it is only in this way that we can be assured in the years ahead of enough senior officers with the great talents of leadership which the times will surely demand.

For the last several years the Air Force has been unable to attract to its service enough men of the right educational background and qualities of character and intelligence to enable it to keep pace with the ever-increasing demands of the air age.

This can be at least corrected partly, I believe, through the establishment of an Air Force Academy similar in purpose and comparable in organization and functions with West Point and Annapolis. Such an academy would not supply all the officers the Air Force needs any more than the existing Academies provide all officer-personnel needs of the Army and Navy. But an Air Force Academy would produce a constant flow into the commissioned ranks, year after year, and generation after generation, of superbly trained and qualified men whose influence would raise the officer standards of the whole service.

Annapolis and West Point are the symbol and repository of virtually the entire military tradition of our Nation. From their halls have come most of the great military figures of our history and of our times. These Academies have nurtured the lofty ideals, the code of honor, and the tradition of courage that has always marked American arms. And they have produced in each generation outstanding leaders to direct our Armed Forces, whether in peace or in war.

They have produced through the years a steady source of officer personnel, broadly educated to understand the world in which they live, and trained as specialists in the most modern sciences and techniques of warfare. Their graduates are the leaven that controls the standards of character, outlook, and technical proficiency throughout their respective services.

The Air Force today has no comparable source either for the spiritual or the material qualities I have mentioned. Nearly all of its senior officers have come up through the Army, but only 14 percent of Air Force career officers are Academy graduates. Only a small percentage of its yearly increase of officers come from the graduating classes of Annapolis and West Point. About 50 percent come, and will continue to come, from civilian colleges cooperating in the Air Reserve officer training program. Some come from the aviation cadet training program maintained by the Air Force, but it is regrettable that to attract sufficient cadets to maintain this latter program the Air Force has had to eliminate the requirement for any college education whatsoever.

The Air Force has trained fliers. But it takes more than the ability to fly to produce the well-rounded Air officer. Of some a high level of technical competence must be required. Of all a superior understanding of the concept of airpower must be demanded if our Air Force is going to be adequate to our defense needs.

We cannot depend on chance and the patriotic impulse alone to draw a sufficient number of qualified young men into the Air Force, to be trained and prepared for leadership. In time of peace, or even in times of such half peace and general prosperity as we have known for the last 8 years, civilian pursuits offer too many competing attractions. We can attract qualified young men into the Air Force only through creating a strong motivation for such a career and backing it up with the necessary inducements.

I trust that this Congress will realize that if our Air Force is to maintain its superior state of efficiency, it must have the highest quality of leadership that can be produced. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the best way of getting this quality of leadership is through an Air Force Academy—and one right now. The air age is not waiting on us. Let us not wait or delay the establishment of an Air Force Academy.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me make one thing crystal clear.

I am most emphatically in favor of an Air Academy.

I long ago recognized the advisability of having an Air Academy in order to fill the void caused by the so-called Unification Act, which was supposed to unify all branches of the service, but which actually added another autonomous branch of the service to the previously existing two branches of the Army and the Navy. The fact is that instead of combining the services, the so-called Unification Act spread the services over a larger area and instead of 2 branches of the Army and Navy we now have 3, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

It logically follows that if the Army has its own Academy at West Point and the Navy has its own Academy at Annapolis then the Air Force should have its own Academy to train its own officers. That makes sense to me.

I think authorization for an Air Academy is long overdue. It should be under construction now instead of merely being authorized.

I do hope that when the Air Academy becomes a reality that the Air Force will keep better faith with those young men who enter the Academy than the Air Force kept faith with the thousands of young men who entered various colleges in the United States on the basis of a contract with the Air Force, only to have a rude awakening and find out that the contract was not worth the paper on which it was written.

This is an interesting story and undoubtedly is known to many Members of this body, but it bears repeating at this time for the benefit of the record.

This story of broken faith, broken promises, and broken contracts has a direct connection with the proposal by the Air Force to authorize an Air Academy because it gives an insight into the manner in which the Air Force has previously handled young men who have come under their guidance and direction in quest of a career in the Air Force.

There should be some assurance from the Air Force that the ground rules under which cadets enter the Air Academy will not suddenly be changed in the middle of the term. There is nothing to indicate such an assurance from the action of the Air Force last summer in its conduct toward the young men who have been left dangling on the limb because the Air Force suddenly changed its policy.

On July 29, 1953, Mr. John A. Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense, issued a press release in which he announced that all college juniors in the Air Force ROTC program who were ineligible for flight training would be dropped. Mr. Hannah conceded in the United Press release from Washington on that date that the action amounted to breaking a moral contract with the college students who had signed up for officer training.

Investigation revealed that there were approximately 6,000 young men who had in good faith signed a legal agreement a year or more prior to this release by Mr. Hannah, in which they agreed not only to complete the basic courses of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps, but also to accept a commission to serve on active duty for a period of not less than 2 years after receipt of such commission if tendered, and to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component of the Air Force until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of such commission. This agreement, titled "Deferment Agreement," was signed by these students and was witnessed by the professor of Air Science Training, who also signed this agreement. The escape clause as far as the Air Force is concerned is in the words if tendered, and perhaps justifies a technical legal position. But are we going to justify such an act with these young men of approximately 21 years of age on a legal technicality? Mr. Hannah was superbly correct when he stated a moral contract had been broken. It is entirely possible, however, that the intent of the legal contract is also being broken.

It was obvious that such action was quite arbitrary, so under date of August 5, I wrote to Mr. Harold E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force, as follows:

Hon. HAROLD E. TALBOTT,
Secretary of Air Force,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am extremely distressed over the press releases of a statement by Mr. John A. Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, which have come to my attention regarding the status of 6,000 non-flying Air Force ROTC cadets. I understand that these young men signed a contract in good faith with the Government a year ago to complete the advanced Air Force ROTC course; to serve for a 2-year period of active duty and to be retained thereafter in a Reserve status. There was no inkling when the contract was signed that the Government would arbitrarily and surreptitiously drop these young men out of the Air Force training program. Such a violation of faith with 6,000 young, impressionable men gives me great concern.

This Nation prides itself in treating its agreements with other nations as not mere scraps of paper, and has accused our enemies

of the very breach which is now imposed on its own people. This cannot be brushed aside with the simple statement that this small number of men would cause the manpower ceiling requirements to be exceeded. Nor can it be contended that there is as yet any cutback in the maintenance of national defense. It appears to me that if our Armed Forces, and particularly the Air Force, cannot plan for more than 2 years in advance, then drastic action is needed to insure that this be done.

I hold no brief for the nonflying Air Force officers. I recognize the great importance of having properly trained and skilled flying officers. However, I know that there are a great many chores and duties which can be much more adequately and efficiently performed by trained administrative officers and others trained in logistics and material functions than by the utilization of flying officers in such categories.

Finally and by way of reiteration, I cannot see any justification whatsoever for a department of the military service of the United States to break faith with, and cause such a great handicap to be placed on, a small group of qualified young men for the reason given. What do you expect these young men to do? They are no longer eligible for entry into the other college ROTC programs. They have completed more than 75 percent of the required training, including the month's field training. Are they to be thrown to the Selective Service for induction as privates? Is this effective and efficient utilization of manpower? To me it is quite evident that the United States Air Force has taken impulsive action without justification, which will create unfavorable public reaction in a measure beyond its full realization.

Mr. Secretary, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the United States House of Representatives, I urge you to reconsider this action and avoid the justifiable accusations of not only violating a moral obligation, but as a matter of fact, abrogating a legal contract with this group of young, impressionable men.

I cannot too strongly point out to you the great impact this has made on the people of our country, and anticipate an early statement from you which will nullify the damage which has already been done. I am sure that the action as indicated in the press does not represent the mature judgment of the leaders of our Air Force.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDW. HÉBERT.

Under date of August 31, I received a voluminous answer from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. H. Lee White, which evaded entirely the inquiry made concerning the abrogation of a legal contract with a group of approximately 6,000 young college men, but rather went into a long discussion of the various statutes and legislation, and so forth, concerning the ROTC program. Mr. White's letter follows:

AUGUST 31, 1953.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Representative in Congress,
New Orleans, La.

DEAR MR. HÉBERT: This is in response to your request for information concerning the recent readjustment of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps program.

Initially, I believe it is appropriate to discuss the basic laws which introduced the doctrine of providing military training at civilian educational institutions and established authority for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. As you may know the act of July 2, 1862 (ch. 130 sec. 1, 12 Stat. 503; 7 U. S. C. 301) granted land to the States for establishment of educational institutions and prescribed as one condition of the land grant that military tactics would be included in the curriculum of all such institutions. After enactment of this law, and continuing until 1916, the land grant colleges and universities provided for the military training curriculum from their own resources. The act of June 3, 1916, (ch. 134, sec. 40, 39 Stat. 191; 10 U. S. C. 381) authorized establishment of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and provided authority for the military departments to install professional military staffs at civilian educational institutions for the purpose of conducting the military training program. The stated intent of the law of 1862 was "to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life." The evident intent of the law of 1916 was to provide for the training of commissioned officers for the Reserve Forces against such mobilization requirements as might develop from time to time. The Reserve Officers' Training programs conducted under provision of these laws have, therefore, served the primary purpose of producing officers for assignment to the Reserve Forces. It has been necessary during time of war and during other periods of mobiliaztion or partial mobilization to utilize the entire production from the Reserve Officers' Training Corps to meet the requirements of the active force. Basically, however, the system has always been considered primarily as a source of commissioned officers for the Reserve to be called only in the event of complete mobilization.

Prior to enactment of the National Security Act of 1947, which established the Air Force as a separate military department, the Army conducted the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program for all of its components, including the Air Corps. Although 7 Air Corps units were maintained as a part of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps from 1920 to 1935, the present program has been in existence only since the fall of 1946. At that time, 78 air units were established by War Department authorization, all of them necessarily at institutions where other Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps units were maintained. This total increased to 96 in 1947, 110 in 1948, and 128 in 1949, at which time the Air Force assumed full operational control of the air units. There was a slight reduction to 125 units in 1950 and then an increase to the present total of 188 in 1951. The term "unit" as applied to the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps program is defined as including all detachment personnel and Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadets at an institution. Of the 188 institutions presently in the program, 34 are shared with both the Army and the Navy Reserve Officers' Training Corps; 71 with the Army only; 14 with the Navy only; and 69 are exclusively Air Force. These 188 institutions are located in 46 States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

As before stated, the objective of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program has always been related primarily to the officer requirements of the Reserve Forces as a potential mobilization resource. The officer procurement objective from the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps has been expanded and contracted through several variations in level from 8,000 in 1946 to 11,300 in 1950; to 27,750 in 1951; to 19,000 in March of 1953; and, finally, to the recently adjusted level of approximately 8,000, which is related to the active-duty requirements of the 120-wing Air Force.

The sharp expansion in the program from approximately 11,000 to 27,000 in 1950–51 was generated to achieve several important objectives:

(a) It was at this time that the Air Force began to build up toward the 95-wing force to be achieved by the end of fiscal year 1952. At the same time, a Reserve strength of about 1,600,000 was being planned as the backup necessary for the active force then planned. It was determined that the officer strength associated with the enlarged active force and with the sizable Reserve structure would require this expanded production.

(b) A significant portion of the expanding requirements was in the area of flying officers, and it was considered essential that the Reserve Officers' Training Corps resource be extended to provide the broad geographical and population coverage for procurement of qualified volunteers for flying training.

(c) Based upon the international situation at that time, it was considered that the Reserve should be vitalized with younger officers, capable of performing duties in technical and other skills if needed. It was further considered essential that greater numbers of college trained officers be assimilated into the active force.

It was only a short time later that the Air Force was authorized a force structure of 143 wings to be achieved by end of fiscal year 1954. The Reserve Forces' strength planned to augment the larger active establishment was 488,000.

On April 7, 1952, the policy was announced by the Department of Defense that all nonprior service Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates would be required to serve on active duty for the minimum period of 2 years required of all draft eligibles. It became necessary therefore, to reevaluate the program immediately in relation to the projected officer requirements of an active force of 143 wings and a considerably reduced Reserve Force requirement. After thorough study and consideration of all other officer procurement sources, together with anticipated normal losses, it was decided that the Reserve Officers' Training Corps procurement objectives would have to be reduced to approximately 19,000 as a peak level in fiscal years 1955 and 1956, with a gradual downward adjustment to the level-off objective of 13,500 in fiscal year 1960. The requirement for flying officers became more critical, however, and whereas the 27,000 program was comprised of approximately 37 percent flying officers, the situation was reversed in the 19,000 program with some 60 percent to be flying officers. Ultimately when the program had leveled off at the 13,000 objective, more than 85 percent would have been flying officers.

The reorientation of the program from the 27,000 to the 19,000 level was announced to the presidents of all of the institutions in March of this year. Concurrently, action was taken to place maximum emphasis on the inducement of students to volunteer for flying training. It should be pointed out that the flying officer procurement objective was related to the contemplated expansion of the flying training program to the 10,000 and 12,000 annual production rates. The reorientated program was associated directly with the expansion and replacement officer requirements of 143-wing structure. It was adjusted in such a manner that all 188 institutions would be retained to provide the broad base required as a resource for qualified flying officers. Control over enrollments was to be exercised in the advanced phase of Air Science III and IV without disturbing the enrollment in the basic courses Air Science I and II.

Shortly after the program reorientation was announced, the Air Force was advised that the interim force objective would be reduced from 143 wings to 120 wings, and that the target date for attaining the reduced force structure would be extended from fiscal year 1955 to fiscal year 1956. The officer requirement associated with the reduced force was computed at approximately 30,000 less than that associated with the 143 wing structure and it became apparent that the recently reduced Reserve Officers' Training Corps program must be further reduced to a level compatible with the smaller requirement unless relief from the mandatory active duty policy could be secured. After

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

careful study of the problem, and as a result of several discussions with the Assistant Secretary of Defense (manpower and personnel), the policy requiring that all nonprior service graduates be ordered to active duty for the minimum of 2 years was reaffirmed. To achieve the reduced manpower ceilings required for the 120 wing objective, the Air Force had few alternatives. The entire reduction could be effected through the release of Reserve officers serving in the active service, or the reduction could be accomplished by reducing the output of Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates and refraining from ordering recent graduates to active service. After very thoroughly discussing this problem with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, a decision was made that enrollment in the senior class entering school this fall as well as future classes would be adjusted to meet active duty requirements only, and that the remainder of the reduction was to be achieved through the release of Reserve officers presently in active service. In placing part of the burden of the reduction upon students entering their senior year, the extreme hardship upon career-minded Reserve officers who had several years of active service was somewhat alleviated. In this connection I would like to emphasize that the current program to release several thousand career-minded Reserve officers is causing a severe problem for the Air Force through the loss of personnel often with 10 years or more active service experience. To allow the third year students to continue in their courses under all circumstances would very likely bring about a similar problem in the spring of 1954 when that group would graduate. Additionally, to refrain from calling the 1953 graduates would result either in the revocation of their draft exempt status by selective service or a serious selective service inequity with respect to other groups of young men of draft age.

Actions have been initiated, therefore, to order to active duty all graduates commissioned just prior to and during fiscal year 1954—approximately 9,500—and to restrict the enrollment of seniors in the 1953–54 academic year to those who volunteer and qualify for flying training (except for approximately 1,000 nonrated engineers, and other technical specialists for whom a requirement will exist in fiscal year 1955). It was originally anticipated that approximately 13,000 students would be commissioned for active duty from the 1953–54 senior class. The actual requirement for officers from this class is now projected at approximately 7,700, over 6,000 of whom must volunteer and qualify for flying training. The remaining students will be continued in military deferred status by agreement with the Director of Selective Service until they have entered school in the fall and have had an opportunity to qualify for some type of academic deferment.

As a result of the reduction in the Air Force structure and the policies announced by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, it was necessary that the long range Reserve Officers' Training Corps program be revised completely on the basis of projected requirements for officers in the active force. The program has therefore been adjusted to provide for enrollments by classes as indicated below:

Fiscal year 1954

	Beginning	End	Average
Air science I (freshman)	65,500	54,300	59,900
Air science II (sophomore)	48,500	42,350	45,400
Air science III (junior)	11,240	9,908	10,592
Air science IV (senior)	9,710	[1] 8,540	9,130
(Summer camp, 11,000.)			

[1] Included in this figure are 790 prior service students.

Fiscal year 1955, and annually thereafter

	Beginning	End	Average
Air science I (freshman)	65,500	54,300	59,900
Air science II (sophomore)	48,500	42,350	45,400
Air science III (junior)	11,780	10,343	11,060
Air science IV (senior)	9,440	[1] 8,070	8,755
(Summer camp, 10,600.)			

[1] Included in this figure are 320 prior service students.

You will note that the programed enrollment in the freshman and sophomore classes has been retained at previously established levels. This is in compliance with Section 642 of the Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1954 which specifies that any administrative adjustments in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps enrollment will be effected in the junior and senior classes only. It is also consistent with the requirement that the maximum number of institutions and a sizable basic enrollment be retained to provide a diversified resource of flying training applicants. Because of the drastic adjustment in the enrollment in the advanced course, it will undoubtedly be necessary that certain institutions be eliminated from the system after the end of the 1953–54 academic year according to withdrawal criteria presently being developed. The schools to be affected have not yet been identified; however, this matter is being studied by the Commander of the Air University at this time, and it is expected that a complete report recommending schools to be eliminated will be received at this headquarters in the immediate future. In this connection, consideration will be given to the elimination of units at institutions where Army or Navy units are established in order to lessen the impact as much as possible.

The requirement that all Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates be called to duty further aggravates the manning problem for this fiscal period. The officer strength of the fiscal year 1954 military personnel program is approximately 18,000 below that of the previous plan which was designed to attain 133 wings by the end of the year, and it has been impossible to reduce the planned procurement for the larger force sufficiently to meet only the requirement of the 110 wings now programed without extreme actions. Efforts to reduce the officer intake include the discontinuance of warrant officer appointments, reduction of the Officer Candidate School production from 2,000 to 500 per year, reduction of recall to a minimum flow of critical skills and the abrupt curtailment of the direct appointment program. While further reductions would be necessary in order to preclude the release of officers now serving on active duty, it is believed that further downward adjustments in these areas cannot be accepted. Also, it is highly important that the officers from the Reserve Officers' Training Corps who have applied for flying training be accepted and provisions have been made continuously for the assignments of 3,200 of these applicants who are eligible for commissions and active duty during fiscal year 1954. In spite of the foregoing actions to reduce the planned procurement, the requirement to absorb the remaining 6,300 Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates together with the reduced end strength will necessitate the separation of a great number of trained officers. While some officers serving involuntarily have been given the opportunity to separate from the service, it is apparent that a large percentage of this reduction can be accomplished only with the forced separation of many career inclined and experienced officers, most of them with families, to make room for the new second lieutenants who would serve for only 2 years.

While major fluctuations in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program are regrettable, it is hoped we have arrived at a point in time to implement an acceptable degree of stability.

I am pleased to be of service in furnishing this information.

Sincerely yours,

H. LEE WHITE,
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Obviously, it was necessary that Mr. White be advised that his letter was most unsatisfactory, that it had evaded the basic question, and that it was imminent that some solution to this problem be reached. My letter to Mr. White, under date of September 9, follows:

HON. H. LEE WHITE,
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The detailed presentation of the various statutes and legislation establishing and implementing the ROTC programs as outlined in your letter of August 31, 1953, was done in a most scholarly manner. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, however, I am fully acquainted with such matters and actually participated in much of the legislation concerning the armed services (including ROTC program) to which you referred.

But, Mr. Secretary, the question which I posed to the Honorable Harold E. Talbott in my letter of August 5, 1953, did not request an historical and legislative thesis of the ROTC activities. I simply asked how could the Air Force—or any other branch of the military—abrogate a legal contract with a group of 6,300 young college men? Even Mr. John A. Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, admitted in his press release of the subject "a moral obligation would be broken."

As pointed out in my previous letter, I am greatly concerned when a branch of the Government treats its contracts with its citizens as scraps of paper. Is this in the American tradition of honor and fair play? I do not believe so—nor does all your explanation in your long letter of August 31 change my mind.

You deal at great length and make 3 different references to the necessity of these young men serving 2 years' active duty upon being commissioned. Haven't they agreed to serve in a Reserve status for 8 years? In order for the Air Force to act with honor and integrity, couldn't they be called any 2 years during the 8 years of their Reserve status and not necessarily the first 2 years? This would permit you to get the Air Force house in order concerning manpower requirements. I cannot believe, and I have discussed the matter with many unbiased persons, that the selective-service authorities would not be agreeable to such a solution—especially when it would help the Air Force to avoid the abrogation of a contract and the violation of a moral obligation.

Another point and a suggestion solution, if this drastic action of dropping these 6,300 senior college ROTC students is related to budgetary limitations, come right out and tell these young men so. Ask them to waive their small subsistence, although a small amount per boy, it will total up to nearly a million and a half dollars for the fiscal year 1954. I am certain that a great majority would gladly do so and be proud of a service that recognized its obligations and took steps to solve them—rather than "tear up" agreements and "kick people out."

I am most sympathetic with your problem of "cutting the cloth to fit the man" and believe that you are desirous of accomplishing this end in a fair and equitable manner. To drop these 6,300 young men after they have completed 75 percent of their scholastic and technical training plus a month's field training is neither fair nor equitable. Such

arbitrary action will reflect most unfavorably on our newest and youngest military service, the United States Air Force, which will require many years, if ever, to overcome.

There are solutions to your problem—as I have indicated above. I urge you to consider taking some other course of action than the one which is tentatively planned and outlined in your letter of August 31.

Please be assured, Mr. Secretary, of my continuing interest in this vital matter, and my anticipation of an early reply.

With kindest best wishes.

Sincerely,

F. EDW. HÉBERT.

An Associated Press release from Washington dated September 13 under byline of Russell Brines, stated that a decision was near concerning the Air ROTC problem. This press release stated that colleges and universities should disregard orders that would require students to sign for flight training or drop ROTC. An Associated Press release issued from Washington, dated September 16 gave a magnanimous solution to the problem, which was to the effect that unless Air Force ROTC members who would graduate from college in June 1954 would sign up for flight training, they would be required to serve 2 years as enlisted men in the United States Air Force, or take their chances with the draft. It is sacrilegious to call this a solution to this problem.

Approximately 6,000 young, impressionable men who for one reason or another are unable to proceed with flight training because of minor physical or psychological reasons, having successfully completed 4 years of Air Force ROTC scholastic training, and who have had a minimum of 30 days field training with the Regular Air Force component, and who, in addition have been taught the basic fundamentals of leadership and conduct as officer material will now be relegated to airmen 3d class, which in more common parlance is private first class, in the Air Force. As a choice, mind you, as a wonderful alternative, to an enlisment as a private in the Air Force, they will be allowed the opportunity of being drafted. Being drafted simply means they will be inducted probably as a private in the United States Army. So we have the choice, therefore, of drafting officer personnel who have met all the requirements for being commissioned, who will be relegated to the status of privates of our Armed Forces. How wasteful of manpower can we get? Such waste of money and time and effort staggers the imagination. The exponents of this action are reputed to be experts in the handling of manpower. It is a sad commentary on the direction of our Armed Forces and the lack of planning and foresight and provision for the national security of our country. The above action was taken in the guise of staying within the manpower ceiling as established by the Defense Department.

Within approximately a month after this so-called solution to the problem there appeared in Newsweek of October 26, on page 27, the following statement:

MANPOWER BRIEFS

It's not being mentioned much, but the Air Force is deeply worried over the recruiting problem it faces next year. With Korean enlistments expiring, it will lose no fewer than 200,000 men and officers. Cost of training replacements: more than $2 billion. Look for a sharp fight to turn primary training of Air Force pilots over to the civilian colleges. Senator RUSSELL LONG, of Louisiana, will lead it. (The Periscope, Newsweek, Oct. 26, 1953, p. 27.)

What are we to believe? On the one hand we are told that the Air Force must get under the manpower ceiling both as to officers and men and in effect cast loose these 6,000 students. On the other hand we learn that the Air Force is deeply worried over the manpower problems which it faces next year.

I believe it is an accepted fact that all of us are worried about the lack of interest on the part of our young men in making the military service a career. As long ago as February 20, 1953, the Joint Chiefs of Staff forwarded a memorandum to Secretary of Defense stating that they had become increasingly concerned about the growing lack of confidence among Armed Forces personnel in military service as a worthwhile and respected career. On April 30, 1953, the same concern was expressed by the President in his message to the Congress. The President affirmed the fact that he had directed the Secretary of Defense to study the problem. The result of this was the appointment of the so-called Womble committee. A delineation of the problem resolves it to be, Why has military service lost much of its attractiveness as a lifetime career for inherently capable personnel and what corrective measures are necessary? In a discussion of the responsible factors and recommendations of the Womble committee, a very comprehensive analysis was made and one of the first factors indicated was that public respect for constituted authority has declined.

In light of all the above and particularly in light of the Womble report, Mr. Chairman, is there any wonder that public respect for constituted authority has declined? It is true that 6,000 young, impressionable men are inconsequential when compared to the hundreds of thousands in the armed services, and we are not concerned with this number as individuals who suffer under this decision by the Air Force. What is more significant is the extremely bad impression that these young men must get by being treated in what they consider, and is in fact, a most unfair and arbitrary manner. This viewpoint of the 6,000 young men is transmitted to 6,000 fathers; 6,000 mothers; 6,000 brothers; 6,000 sisters; 60,000 relatives, and perhaps 600,000 friends and acquaintances. And so what appears to be inconsequential as far as these young men is concerned becomes a chain reaction of public distrust and certainly lack of respect for our constituted military authority.

I cannot urge too strongly that some remedial measures be taken immediately to clarify this situation. In a few short months these young men will have been graduated from their respective universities and colleges. At this very moment they know not what their status will be. We cannot, we must not stand by and permit this situation to come to pass. If these young men are eligible for commissions in the Air Force Reserve, they should be commissioned. If the Air Force is not ready to call them to active duty, they can be held in the Reserve until the Air Force is ready to call them to active duty. I am certain that not one of these young men would refuse a commission on the basis that their 2 years of service would be required at any time during the next 8 years, and in the meantime they maintain their efficiency by active participation in organized Reserve units in their communities. There is no other solution to the problem. There is no other fair way. We must not permit these young men to begin their years as citizens of the United States with a feeling that they have been double-crossed by their Government.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, an autonomous military service should not have to draw its officers from the ranks of the other services. Yet that, in effect, is what the Air Force must do to a great extent.

The Air Force needs a continuing, dependable supply of young men who want to make the Air Force a lifetime career. The need is about 1,200 new officers annually. Many studies indicate that we should take 50 percent, or roughly 600 of these 1,200 young officers, from Academy graduates. The balance of approximately 600 should be graduates of civilian colleges. To date, the Air Force has found it impossible to fulfill either of its quotas.

At the present time the Air Force is dependent upon the military and naval academies, upon its own aviation cadet program, and on the Air Force ROTC training as the sources from which to procure officers.

For the past few years, the Army and Navy have been allowing 25 percent of the graduates of West Point and Annapolis, on a voluntary basis, to accept commissions in the Air Force. But this procedure gives the Air Force only a little more than 300 young career officers each year. And while this number does not meet Air Force requirements, it robs the Army and Navy of potential leaders of which those services have need.

Furthermore, those young men have all been trained basically not for the Air Force but for the Army or the Navy. They have been given a specialized training of a sort for which the Air Force does not have need, and they lack training of the sort for which the Air Force does have need.

It seems uneconomical, inefficient, and useless to continue this system any further.

The Air Force is entitled to its own academy. It can become the strong Air Force of which we have such great need only when it is wholly autonomous. Air leaders for the Air Force must not be proselyted from the other services. They must be trained for the Air Force as carefully as aircraft are designed and engineered, and air techniques are developed. Of men, bases, and aircraft, we have long neglected the training of the men without whom both bases and aircraft are useless.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 5337, a bill for the establishment of the Air Force Academy, in order to insure leaders for the future of the United States Air Force.

I have been convinced for some time that in these critical days it is imperative that this country have the strongest and most effective Air Force in the world. To accept anything less than the best would simply be a waste of money and would jeopardize the security of this Nation. Airpower is the dominating factor in modern warfare, and the country with the strongest Air Force holds the ace card, not only as a deterrent to aggression, but also as the best assurance against defeat if war is forced upon us.

Air weapons are effective only if they are in instant readiness. The pace of modern war and the destructiveness of the atomic and hydrogen weapons can decide the victor in a matter of days. We can no longer count on production potential or upon the distance from the enemy to give us a second chance. Our Air Force must be number one on the opening day or there will not be a chance to fight at all, and our civilization, as we know it, may cease to exist.

Of all the elements that combine to create this vital airpower; that is, air weapons, aircraft, air research and development, industry, electronics, we must never overlook the maxim that leaders are still the key to any successful force. We must provide as soon as possible an Air Force Academy which will insure, along with our civilian institutions, that we have unmatched leaders in the development and employment of airpower. Annapolis and West Point have done a splendid job over the years in providing surface generals and admirals, but now is the time to recognize that our survival today and in the future is in the air.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill before us, H. R. 5337. This bill has as its purpose the establishment of a United States Air Academy, one comparable to the Academies at West Point, N. Y., for the Army, and at Annapolis, Md., for the Navy.

As a matter of fact, I feel that this legislation is much overdue. Before I came to Congress, I felt that the Air Force was entitled to have an academy where it could train its key officers. At the present time, I understand, the Air Force must depend on receiving these officers from men graduated from West Point and Annapolis.

Having failed, heretofore, to establish an academy for the Air Force, I think it is appropriate that, in this 50th anniversary year of powered flight, we go ahead and take this worthwhile and necessary step. I think all too often there has been a tendency to play down the role of the United States Air Force. To create this Academy will be to recognize the highly strategic role of the Air Force, especially in this critical year, 1954.

In recent months there has been some newspaper talk to the effect that Russia has a larger, more highly skilled and trained Air Force than we have. Actually, I guess none of us know definitely if either of these allegations is true. I hope they are not true. Regardless, however, of whether these things may have been true in the past, this Congress must face up to the challenge. We must have complete air superiority, as well as superiority in atomic and hydrogen bombs, superiority in the field of radar equipment and its uses, and superiority in many other areas.

Last year, I opposed the cutting of $5 billion from the Air Force budget. While I fully appreciate the necessity of saving every possible dollar of Government expenditures, yet we must not, under the guise of saving the taxpayers money, allow the defenses of this country to become so crippled that we would be in trouble in the event of war. This would be false economy. I will go further; I believe events since we made the huge cut of $5 billion have proven that the cut was too drastic. I am happy to hear that this year's budget recommendation will envision a larger and stronger United States Air Force.

The bill before us places the responsibility for selection of the permanent location of the Air Force Academy with the Secretary of the Air Force. It goes further and authorizes the Secretary to appoint a commission to advise him in connection with the selection of a site or sites. He is also authorized to acquire the necessary land to prepare plans, make surveys, and to construct and equip the academy.

In this connection, I should like to call attention to H. R. 2536, a bill introduced by me a year ago, which had as its purpose the establishment of an air force academy in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. I should further like to call to the attention of the Secretary of the Air Force, Hon. Harold E. Talbott, some of the features of the Seventh District that make it an excellent place in which to locate the Academy.

The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama is located mainly in the north and northwestern section of Alabama, and its topography ranges from mountains to hills to rolling ground to level land. The United States already owns about 180,000 acres of land in the William B. Bankhead National Forest in this region.

In addition, this district is so strategically located that an airfield built there primarily to serve the Air Academy could also form a link in the system of defenses for the great industrial and steel center of Birmingham, the huge power generating installations on the Warrior River, and the hydropower dams on the Tennessee.

I strongly urge that the United States Air Academy be located in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, for a number of years I have supported the bill for the establishment of an Academy similar to that of West Point and Annapolis for the United States Air Force. My great State, the State of New York, has been the location of the United States Military Academy for the past 104 years. It is an institution in which all Americans have been justly proud. The dividends it has paid in leadership of this country have returned its investment a thousandfold.

At the end of World War II the Air Force emerged as an outstanding element of our military strength. In 1947, the Congress recognizing this, created a separate Air Force so that its weapons and leaders could exploit both its offensive and defensive potentialities to the highest degree. For this very same reason it follows that the Air Force should have its own Academy wherein the curricula is designed exclusively for the training of air specialists. While a knowledge of the other services is of good stead toward unified action, primary knowledge of a service, other than one's own, does not especially furnish that service with the best in leadership.

Therefore, in order to insure the men in the Air Force, their wives, mothers, and relatives that the leadership of the Air Force would be the finest, I strongly urge the establishment of the United States Air Force Academy and favor passage of H. R. 5337, 83d Congress, as amended.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the establishment of the Air Force Academy. The hearings convinced me that the education which will be provided is in the interest of our national defense, and that the Army and Navy Academies cannot efficiently and economically provide the required education for Air Force officers. As a matter of fact, it was clear to me, as I sat in the hearings, that the latter two Academies are not performing and cannot perform the job that is needed to be done for the Air Force.

Before I am seated I wish to say that I sincerely hope that the board which makes the site selection will consider two items which the old board apparently overlooked: First, that the Academy should, if possible, include land adjacent to a large body of water; and second, that the records of good-flying weather should be a material factor in the choice of a site. I think the first item is important because Air Force operations in combat will inevitably, at times, include operations over large bodies of water; and practical training should include this experience. I think the second point is important because it has a bearing upon the efficient running of any air training schedule which may be established. A location in Florida would meet both of these tests, I believe, better than anywhere else in our country.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 5337, 83d Congress, providing for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy. I am glad to see that this long-awaited legislation has received favorable action by the House Armed Services Committee. All of us recognize the purpose of the Academy, having seen the products derived from those great institutions in the States of New York and Maryland, the United States Military and the United States Naval Academies.

As you know, on July 21, 1953, I introduced H. R. 6433, to establish a United States Air Force Academy at Henderson Field, Tampa, Fla. Henderson Field's 9,000 acres, its three runways of 5,000 feet each, its easy access to the city and to MacDill Air Force Base, and the housing, cultural, and recreational facilities all add up to an attractive proposition for an air academy. Also the ideal weather in the Tampa area should be appealing to those who make the final selection. Inasmuch as section 3 (a) of H. R. 5337 provides "That the Academy shall be located at such place within the United States as the Secretary of the Air Force shall determine. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to establish a commission, and to appoint the members thereof, to advise him in connection with the selection of a permanent location for the Academy," I hope that due consideration will be given by this commission to the Greater Tampa Bay area.

The establishment of this academy is urgently needed to train the hard core of our future Air Force leaders. Now that an airplane is becoming a million-dollar investment and groups of them cost many, many millions of dollars, I think it just as important that moneys be expended in training the future officers who are to lead and direct the Regular Air Force Establishment. An organization is only as good as the people who are in it, and the people who are in it do deserve the best in leadership.

While we have many fine civilian institutions in this country, such as the University of Florida, Florida State University, the University of Miami, and the University of Tampa, the latter of which is located in my district, that are turning out future businessmen, scientists, engineers, lawyers, and doctors, there are none that are specifically training Air Force combat leaders. An Academy gets young men at the most formative years of their lives and indoctrinates and molds them into skilled Air Force specialists, who are motivated to a career of service with the Air Force. Such men do not seek great financial rewards or to amass great amounts of property. Rather, they dedicate themselves to a life of service for their country and their reward is our continued security.

Additionally, by the passage of this bill, we are being asked to buy an insurance policy on the defense of this Nation. The cost is not cheap, as it is estimated the contemplated Air Academy will, over the years, cost around $125 million. The cost in terms of assurance that this Nation will have an Air Force that is second to none is cheap. When you compare the billions we spent last year for Air Force equipment, bases, and related items to the $125 million that this Academy is going to cost, spread over a long period of years, I think that the returns in leadership well worth the expenditure. This is one thing on which we cannot afford to be pennywise and pound-foolish as our very existence is dependent on the offensive and defensive role of today's Air Force.

I think every effort should be made to get this bill and the necessary appropriations through the Congress this session in order that the Air Force may start construction of the Air Academy without further delay.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to my friend, a member of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, what I shall say will make little impression on many of you, because this bill is going to pass anyway. Let me remind you that this Nation is on the threshold of the most astounding age in man's beginning, man's development, and man's conclusion.

We must have young men trained for the future to learn and to digest flying in the elements. They can only do that through a separate air academy. They have got to read airplanes, they have got to live airplanes, they have got to take airplanes to bed with them. You can only get that in an institution that is run by the Air Force.

I favor this bill because the Air Force will run this institution, and they will not have to take what somebody else does not want.

One of these days somebody is going to take that perilous trip to Mars or to the moon. He may come from this Academy. We cannot have the second-best aviators in this world of stupendous development, with the Communists blowing heavily on our backs day in and day out.

We have got to have this Academy at the earliest possible moment. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] talked about money. A democracy is an expensive proposition. I will take the democracy. I want this Academy even if it costs $200 million, because we need it. We have got to train young men to do everything within the imagination of the inventors. They can only get that in an institution dedicated to the stupendous technological advances which are coming about today.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is only the beginning. Future Congresses will build on the framework of what we do today. It would be shortsighted indeed if we did not create an institution capable of being the best of its kind in the world.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, because I know that most of the Members have not had the opportunity to read much of the basic evidence that was given at the hearings before our committee, I have selected just 7 or 8 statements of qualified witnesses before our committee which I believe is valuable for me to call to the attention of the Members.

First, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Kyes, in his testimony, said to the committee:

> Airpower is the keystone of our military strength. We are spending billions of dollars on aircraft and related equipment, the best that money can buy. It is no less essential that our officer personnel be of the highest type we can possibly produce.

This professional training can best be accomplished by the establishment of an Air Force Academy.

A short paragraph from Dr. John A. Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower and Personnel, reads as follows:

> My subsequent experiences in close association with large numbers of graduates of West Point and Annapolis and visits to the two academies have led me to a complete change of viewpoint. I am now strongly convinced of the wisdom of establishing an Air Force Academy.

And now a quotation of General Bolte before the committee, is as follows:

> The Air Force also should be provided the means of producing the essential nucleus of an officer corps which is imbued early in life with the traditions and concepts of the United States Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, from my years of membership on the Armed Services Committee and the Un-American Activities Committee, and as a result of my 7 years of membership in this Congress, I concluded that I shall probably never feel qualified to set myself up as an expert to say what is necessary for the defense of my Nation, in terms of technical advice or military policy. Therefore, I now again take the position in the matter of establishing this Air Force Academy as advised by the Defense Department, that since the public officials and appointive officials of our great Nation advise us it is necessary in their sound judgment for our national defense, I am going along with their recommendation, regardless of whether it happens to be a Republican or a Democratic administration.

My experience has been such for many years that I have had reason to keep in pretty close touch with the United States Air Force. Granting that it may not now be second to any air force in the world, nevertheless, I feel from my experience on the two committees and the knowledge I have gained through certain travels in the world for the Congress, that I know enough to feel uncomfortable and that my country is unsafe unless my Nation is kept, not only equal with any other nation in the world, but ahead of every other nation of the world so far as an air force is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, on account of the fact that I, as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, was in attendance at an executive meeting of that committee during much of the period of time when some of the testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am also a member, was given on this bill, I did not personally have the benefit of actually hearing some of the testimony given, and questioning the witnesses. But, I have promptly read every word of testimony in our committee hearings, and it should be noted that such distinguished Americans as Roger M. Kyes, Deputy Secretary of Defense; Dr. John A. Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower, and Personnel; Gen. Charles L. Bolte, Department of the United States Army; Rear Adm. Murr E. Arnold, Deputy Chief of Naval Personnel; Harold E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force; Lt. Gen. H. R. Harmon, special assistant for Air Force

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Academy matters; and Gen. Nathan F. Twining were some of the recognized expert and qualified authorities who appeared before the committee in support of H. R. 5337, upon which we are debating this day.

While I have and do now urge the utmost economy throughout the processes and procedures of our National Government, I feel that nevertheless, when the President of the United States, together with the Defense Department authorities, as appointed or selected by the President of the United States, and they being responsible under him for our national security, recommend that the United States Congress authorize this Air Force Academy at this time, I, as a Representative in Congress, representing one of the great districts of the Nation; to wit, the great 23d District of California, must rely upon them, and their leaders, and the expression of their responsible opinion, for my guidance.

In one way or another several Members of this great body have this day suggested that certain geographic areas might well be chosen for the location of this Academy. And because the great States of North Carolina and Texas have been mentioned in such connection I am sure that the natural advantages of my native State of California in all matters pertaining to the training of military personnel are so pronounced and clearly superb that such sites as may be available in my native State will be taken into meritorious consideration by the Commission which is to make the important selection of the location of this important Academy.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, it is quite appropriate in this year when we are celebrating the 50th anniversary of powered flight that the Congress of the United States should establish an institution for the training of officers to serve our Armed Forces. Within these last 50 years we have learned that it is only through powered flight that we can defend ourselves and only by reason of powered flight that we are going to be able to protect our freedoms in this country. Without an air force our country would be practically defenseless.

No one can deny that the Air Force needs men with a very specialized training that such an institution as this could provide.

Radar, guided missiles, remote detection systems, jet and rocket defense mechanisms, aerial atomic warfare and atomic defenses, all these courses must be taught at a specialized training school that only the Air Force could provide, at the same time lifting the morale and teaching an esprit de corps to those who would serve in that Air Force.

None of us wants an Air Force, which is a coequal branch of our Government, to be the stepchild of either of the other branches of the services; yet in truth and in fact that is exactly the position they are in right now. They are a stepchild because they are having to depend upon West Point and Annapolis to provide them with a nucleus of officers from the graduates of West Point and Annapolis. Of course, that is improper, in my opinion, but it has been accepted, since establishment of the Air Force in the reorganization bill of the 80th Congress, as purely temporary. Therefore, this bill supplies a very vital need. My only regret is that we did not insert a provision in the Reorganization Act setting up an air force academy at the time we set up the Air Force itself.

I have not noticed any references in the hearings, and I have heard no one mention the subject here on the floor, to the effect that we have reason to increase or promote academic training within the Air Force officer corps. I was surprised to learn that among our Air Force officers, as against officers in the other branches of the service, there is less academic training. I mean by that, there are fewer college graduates among the Air Force officers and there is less college training among the officers in the Air Force in comparison with officers in the other branches. That is, of course, the result of the calling of these boys from our colleges and out of high schools at the beginning of World War II, putting them into training. Then those boys, instead of returning to school as others did when the war was over to study under the GI bill of rights, have remained in the service and have gradually worked up to positions of greater responsibility. Thus, their actual academic training level is lower than in the other branches.

We are faced now with the fact that our colonels and lieutenant colonels in the Air Force have less education acaddemically than the colonels and lieutenant colonels and the other similar classes of officers in the other branches. I think it is incumbent upon us to remedy that situation, and we can do so only by providing this hard core which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] mentioned, of officers with academic degrees to go into the services and gradually lift the academic standing of the Air Force.

Although I am quite interested in a site for the Air Force Academy, a site which the citizens of Fort Worth and Dallas and of that section of north Texas have endorsed, I want you to know that I am completely satisfied with the provision in this bill giving the Secretary of the Air Force authority to select this site. I think the Secretary of the Air Force is a wise enough man, and the committee which he will choose will certainly consider all the facts in an effort to determine the most feasible site and a site that will produce the best kind of training for those we need in order to provide a higher morale and a better trained officer corps and to carry out the historical traditions of the Air Force as we continue into an air age which is so essential for the preservatien of our country.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I was interested in the gentleman's statement that he had so much confidence in those that are to select this site. I wonder, since he is interested like he is, if he had not better reserve that judgment until after it is located.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, an Air Academy devoted primarily to the training and education of future leaders of our Air Force is long overdue. As Winston Churchill said:

> For good or for ill, mastery of the air is today the supreme expression of military power.

The fact that we are so late in building an air academy is further evidence of our tardy and halting recognition of the supremely important roll of airpower in this air age.

During the past year we have seen a carefully planned airpower program wrecked by false economy. Now the grave error has been admitted. The old program is being reinstated but from one to two billion dollars has been wasted in the process and the completion of the program has been delayed 2 years.

It should be noted that all of this demonstrates the remarkable accuracy of the testimony of Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg. The general vehemently warned the Nation against the rash actions of Secretary Wilson who was presumptuous enough to cut American airpower before even learning the elementary facts about our military position and the need to make important defense decisions free from interservice influence.

Now the defense officials are shouting about emphasis on air atomic power. How can a delayed return to the former air buildup program be honestly called a new emphasis on airpower?

In reality this new emphasis is negative in character. It consists in building the Air Force back toward the nearly identical force level recommended by the former Joint Chiefs while reducing the Army and Navy below those force levels. The new emphasis is nothing more than an attempt to cover up a serious blunder by clever and deceptive propaganda.

The old 143-wing program, toward which we are moving back, gave us a minimum "one shot" Air Force. It is 95 percent short range which means maximum sustained effectiveness is dependent upon our ability to hold exposed bases in close proximity to our potential enemy.

I believe in an American Air Force second to none. Just because our pilots are superior is no excuse to handicap and jeopardize them by compelling them to overcome an enemy's numerical superiority. We should have not only the best but also the biggest Air Force. An air academy is a step in the right direction. California would be a fine place for such an academy. No matter where proper authorities decide it should be located, we need it, and I hope we will build it soon.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side. I yield 5 minutes of the time I have remaining to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. I appreciate very much the generous consideration of my friend from Louisiana in granting us 5 more minutes, which gives us 14 minutes remaining in general debate. I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS] may extend his remarks in the RECORD following my remarks, and that any other member of the California delegation may do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, as one of the first Members of Congress to recognize the importance of establishing an Air Force Academy for the proper training of Air Force cadets, I have a very special interest in this bill.

I introduced my original bill for the establishment of an Air Force Academy, H. R. 80, January 3, 1949, in the 81st Congress. I refer to my remarks on page A1268 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 12, which includes the text of my original bill. I reintroduced it in the 82d Congress, and in the present Congress as H. R. 329.

I have consistently urged the establishment of the Air Force Academy recognizing that with the advent of the atomic age, we must depend more and more upon air power for the protection of our Nation.

Modern warfare requires intensive training for the men who are to assume the responsibility of officers in the United States Air Force, and we need an academy devoted exclusively to this branch of our Armed Forces where air cadets will receive the necessary comprehensive training they require.

In the bills which I introduced, I have specified that the Academy should be located in the State of California. I included this provision because I believe that California offers more advantages than any other State in the Nation.

California, with its ideal climate and diversification of topography, land, ocean, desert, and mountain, can supply more hours per year suitable for flight training. California is also the center of airplane manufacturing and aviation experimental research which can offer practical instruction in these fields for Air Force cadets. And California can offer many sites which would be suitable in location for the establishment of an academy.

Let us not make the mistake in locating the new Air Force Academy that was made in locating the Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., which has overgrown this location to the point that it cannot expand its facilities to meet present-day modern demands and has consequently become so cramped and crowded that its full and complete operation is seriously hampered.

The Naval Academy at Annapolis is in constant controversy with the surrounding community because of its need for expansion.

Here is a list of the present Air Force installations in California:

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville.
Castle Air Force Base, Merced.
Cheli Air Force Depot, Maywood.
Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc.
George Air Force Base, Victorville.
Hamilton Air Force Base, San Raphael.
McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento.
March Air Force Base, Riverside.
Mathis Air Force Base, Sacramento, outside city.
Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino.
Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo.
Palmdale-Los Angeles County Air Force Base, outside Palmdale.
Parks Air Force Base, Pleasanton.
Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield.

There is no other location in the United States which offers as many advantages for the adequate training of the future air cadet as southern California. Southern California is tailormade as a location for the new Air Force Academy. It has all of the necessary facilities to properly educate and train the future air cadet.

In southern California, the future air cadet can learn about the operations of a wide range of successful and significant industries.

He can learn, by direct observation, about the industry which most directly affects him—the aircraft industry. For southern California leads the Nation in airframe assembly and in the production of aircraft parts.

Southern California's aircraft industry will be at the disposal of the future air cadet, no matter where the Air Force Academy is located.

But if the future air cadet receives his education in southern California, that cooperation will be direct and closely integrated. He will develop his understanding of the aircraft industry in close and continuous association with the Nation's most productive pool of aeronautical specialists—designers, engineers, executives, pilots.

He can visit nearby plants—the Nation's largest—and observe the work of these experts. They can come to his campus as guest lecturers and directors of research projects.

In southern California the future air cadet can become an active participant in the development of the Nation's airpower.

The future air cadet should be familiar with the ultimate findings of science and engineering. It is equally important that he understand the scientific method and the techniques of its application.

In southern California, he can work with technicians and with facilities which will train him at both the theoretical and the applied levels. Indicative of its range is the California Institute of Technology at Pasadena, and the associated Guggenheim Aeronautical Laboratory. Research at these institutions includes studies in aerodynamics, structures, metallurgy, computing techniques, jet propulsion, and heat transfer.

Manufacturing research sponsored by the aircraft and petroleum industries in the fields of radar, pressure and high altitude equipment, guided missiles, jet propulsion equipment, fuels, and lubricants. The level of manufacturing research is indicated by the presence in southern California of such organizations as Aerojet Engineering Corp., Airesearch Manufacturing Co., Schwien Engineering Corp, and the Rand Corp.

Official proving grounds are at Point Mugu, Edwards Field, and Inyokern for guided missiles and aircraft.

Nowhere else could the future air cadet share in the development of so advanced and diversified a program of aeronautical research as is being carried on in southern California. Nowhere else could he draw upon so high a level of personnel and facilities for guest lecturers and joint research projects.

Southern California contains a concentration of universities and colleges of high academic standards. These include the University of California at Los Angeles and the University of Southern California, both offering complete professional and graduate training; California Institute of Technology, one of America's finest scientific centers; a group of excellent smaller universities, colleges, and technical schools.

Here the future air cadet can receive his academic training in a community which has a tradition for academic achievement and which has attracted to it some of the world's most learned men.

From this academic pool, southern California's distinguished scholars can collaborate as exchange faculty members and guest lecturers in the academic enrichment of the future air cadet.

Many of the Nation's foremost plane builders, aeronautical engineers and flyers live and work in southern California. More than 20 well-known aeronautical organizations conduct active programs in southern California. Their members are keenly air minded, alert to the position of airpower in America's future.

Southern California's tradition of aeronautic achievement dates back to 1884 when the first glider flight made in the United States occurred here. In 1910 the Nation's first air meet was held at Dominguez Field. Through the years scores of newsworthy events in aviation have occurred in southern California.

In southern California the future air cadet will find that his interests are shared, his problems understood, his future plans supported.

The future air cadet will enjoy, during his training period in southern California, a climate which is both healthful and pleasant. The average temperature over a year's period is 69.6 degrees. Such climate makes it possible for southern Californians to benefit from outdoor activity all year round.

The city of Los Angeles is the urban hub of the entire southern California area. Third largest metropolitan area in the country, it offers the future air cadet well-developed facilities.

The building and operating of an Air Force Academy can be achieved at lower cost in southern California than in other metropolitan areas.

Construction costs are estimated to be 20 percent less here than elsewhere. Further building economies are possible

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

because no air-conditioning need be installed; the heating system need not be a costly one. Once the building is completed, it can be maintained at less cost in southern California than in any other large metropolitan area. This region offers operating advantages in terms of power, fuel, and water.

To a budget-minded Air Force, these savings can be a telling advantage. What the Air Force saves by building and operating its Academy in southern California can be used in the direct training and equipping of the future air cadet.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my colleagues in urging that the new Air Force Academy be established in southern California.

We all agree that the officers of the Air Force should be schooled in military science and the techniques of flying. In addition, we must remember that we are grooming future generals to lead our Air Force at a later date.

In southern California, we have the facilities to insure that these officers have a well rounded background which will qualify them for command. There are excellent universities and colleges which can provide a pool of brain power that can be tapped for ground school training. The aircraft industry of southern California is readily available for the development of engineering skills. There are various bases of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard in the southern California area which could be utilized in developing the concept of joint operations.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I wish to state another compelling reason for establishing the Air Force Academy in southern California. Rather than train these cadets in a monastery-like atmosphere, we should give them their schooling in an area where they can come in contact with a diversified portion of the Nation's populace. The Los Angeles area, for instance, is the third largest metropolitan area in the country with people from all parts of the Nation and all walks of life residing there. In such an atmosphere an air cadet would gain the broadening type of experience which is most essential

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, even though the present bill does not discuss location for the proposed Air Force Academy, I surely hope Members of the House will carefully consider that the efficiency of such an academy can be greatly enhanced if it is located in an area where natural climatic conditions enable 12 months' maximum production and 12 months' clear flying weather as well as proximately to a present extra-large airfield. Mr. Chairman, may I direct the attention of the House to the 2 largest and most effective present natural airfields, the one at Edwards Air Force Base at Muroc and the other at Palmade, known as the jet testing center of the world.

Presently 4 of the major jet airframe manufacturing companies are assembling and testing their planes at this great field at Palmdale in the Antelope Valley in California, and the greatest natural landing field in the world, the 2 dry lakes at Muroc and Rosamonde, are also in this valley, and within Edwards Field—which is 30 miles long and 10 miles wide—approximately 300,000 acres.

Year-round flying weather and many other natural advantages should carry much weight in their consideration.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, the debate today has very completely covered the merits of establishing an Air Force Academy, and they therefore need no elaboration from me. However, I do want to go on record as vigorously supporting this legislation. Additionally, I would like to call attention to the fact that 1 of the 7 sites selected by the commission to make a study of Air Force Academy sites, which was left for final consideration, is at Camp Beale in my district. In fact, that is the only site in that preferential classification on the west coast. My people, of course, are very proud of this distinction, and hope that the Camp Beale site will be selected. Whether it is selected or not, and even if I knew that it was not going to be selected, I would still be for this bill and for the establishment of an Air Force Academy. And I would like to join in the views of my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], that it is our hope that politics will not intervene in the selection of a site, but that the site for the Air Force Academy will be selected on the merits and with the objective of choosing the site which will best serve the interests of the Nation. We believe that Camp Beale has many qualifications toward that objective, and we intend to urge them vigorously before the commission makes its decision.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, we, as representatives of the American people, have assigned the Air Force a major role in the defense of the Nation in this atomic age. To fully meet the burden of this responsibility, it is essential that we provide highly specialized training for the Air Force leaders of the future as we now do for our Army and Navy leaders.

It is unthinkable that the United States, as a major world power—as, in fact, the major airpower of the world—does not have a specialized institution to provide Air Force officers with technical, physical, and general academic training to fit them for their jobs. The bill we are considering will establish that important Air Academy. It will permit a committee to seek out the best location in the United States for an Air Academy and it will permit the Secretary of the Air Force to select the final site.

I am sure nowhere in our Nation can as good a location for the Air Academy be found as Beale Air Force Base in my congressional district. It is a site which offers a maximum in benefits and has the support not only of the communities in the surrounding area but also the support of the State of California.

A previous site selection committee, headed by General Carl Spaatz, selected Beale as one of seven possible Air Academy sites. Recommendations for Beale Air Force Base as the best location for an academy of the air have come from officials of the State of California. The legislature of the State has twice adopted resolutions which point out that Beale eminently fills all of the requirements for an air-academy location. One resolution, filed with the California Secretary of State, says in part:

> Whereas Beale Air Force Base, containing 86,000 acres of land, is owned by the Federal Government, and contains millions of dollars invested by the Nation in installations at this ideal location, facilities including an inexhaustible water and fire-fighting system, sewerage and drainage systems, power installations, streets, access highways, railroad extensions, and numerous other improvements; and
>
> Whereas Beale Air Force Base is visited with a climate most desirable for an Air Force Academy, situated near an abundant supply of water power, adjacent to widespread agricultural and industrial centers, supplied by all various forms of modern transportation, near multiple metropolitan areas, and possessing unlimited recreational facilities; and
>
> Whereas communities surrounding Beale Air Force Base have warmly received and generously aided in the past many large military installations, contributing greatly to the success of military operations in this area; and
>
> Whereas in the interest of the most advantageous location to the Air Force and to the economy of the Nation, this vast and desirable aviation installation should be selected as the location for the Air Force Academy.

Beale Air Force Base consists of 86,000 acres of Government-owned property in the heart of the Sacramento Valley near Marysville, Calif. The area is served by 3 railroads, 6 major highways, 2 bus services, an airline, and has complete public utilities services.

Climatically, the Sacramento Valley is a perfect location with long summer, spring, and fall seasons and a short winter. The average rainfall is 19 inches and the average mean temperature is 69°. There are only 17 two-hour days when there is fog during the year. These facts show that the area would provide an ideal climate for all-year flying necessary for an Air Academy.

There is a plentiful water supply and present plans for development of the area include a program for a dam and reservoir to be constructed by local interests providing not only a firm water source but also an area for aquatic training. In addition to a complete domestic and fire protection water system already installed, there is at Beale Air Force Base a sewage system designed to serve 66,000 persons.

In Marysville and other nearby communities there are excellent housing facilities, fine schools, and recreation of all types. There is an abundant labor supply, plentiful construction materials, and a warm welcome awaiting future air cadets from the fraternal and religious institutions.

While I am certain Beale is among the best possible locations for an academy of the air, I would give my strongest support to the measure establishing the Academy regardless of the question of its future location. The Nation's needs demand that we provide outstanding air defense and to do so we must provide our Air Force leaders with the best available training.

Mr. SHORT. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of my good friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], I just want to say that while I do not intend to engage in any controversy with my good friend, I think I am as economy-minded as he is. In fact, I come, as you know, from Pennsylvania, which is ruggedly individualistic, and I am one of Bob Rich's advocates, you know, "Where are you going to get the money?"—which title he so generously bequeathed to me when he left Congress. So I, too, am very much interested in the cost of this proposed academy. I am very much in favor of the academy. Do not misunderstand me. I think a very definite need for this academy has been proven to us. However, the gentleman mentioned—and, of course, no evidence substantiates his conclusion—that this project is going to cost $300 million or $400 million. That is a great deal of money. I do not know whether the gentleman's object was to possibly panic the Members in their thinking with reference to this air academy or whether he really had some substantial evidence to submit to the House that this is what this academy would cost. I was very much interested in this aspect of the situation during hearings, and I interrogated the Air Force people as to what would be its approximate cost. The plans and the specifications and project report have not been completed. They have proposed $26 million in this bill—$5 million for site preparation, including payments; $11 million for utilities and access; $5 million for land acquisition; $3 million for planning, surveying, and engineering; and $1 million for contingencies, which, I presume, was for the preparatory work and installations for a temporary school which they anticipate using previous to the actual construction of the Air Academy. They could not give us any idea of ultimate cost. I do not know what the cost will be. The gentleman may be right; I do not know. But there is no use for us to jump to conclusions as to what the academy is going to cost until the plans and specifications and a project report is actually prepared. Then we can go into the matter. But the need is here and I hope the gentleman will go along with this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege recently to see a copy of a memorandum signed by the Secretary of Defense on January 4, 1949. The memorandum reads:

> Attached hereto is a copy of a memorandum I have sent the Joint Chiefs of Staff in order to get them started on the problem of the Air Academy.
>
> I would like for you to initiate action to set up a civilian-service committee including obtaining the necessary personnel for this group and the draft of a directive to be given to it.

That brief memorandum is a historic document. It was signed by James Forrestal, that great American who was the first Secretary of Defense. It was addressed to another great American, a former Chief of Staff, who is today President of the United States. As a direct result of that memorandum we have before us H. R. 5337, a bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy. In a very real sense this Academy, when it is established—and I have no doubt that it will be established—will be a monument to the foresight of James Forrestal, and to the patriotic service of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The idea of an air academy was not new in January 1949, however. From the time the United States Air Force was established as a separate service, in September 1947, a realization had been growing that a distinctive service had need of its own service academy, as a source of officer procurement. In 1947 leaders of the Air Force were, in general, transfers from the Army and products of West Point. By 1949 planners and policymakers were looking ahead to the time when the Air Force would have to supervise the training of its own potential leaders, and make sure of an adequate supply of young officers trained for leadership. The Air Force could not draw indefinitely from the Army nor would it be desirable that it should.

The memorandum that Secretary Forrestal sent to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and referred to General Eisenhower, called attention to various proposals concerning service academies. One proposal called for the expansion of the existing academies to provide greater capacity. One called for the establishment of a third academy. Still another called for the creation of a third institution, but—in addition—rotation of students among the three academies, and assignment of graduates from each to each of the services.

But Secretary Forrestal recognized the overwhelming needs of the Air Force. He stated flatly that "immediate attention is required on the question of providing for the interim needs of the Air Force during the years immediately ahead." Therefore, James Forrestal may rightly be called the proponent and the father of the Air Academy.

The Service Academy Board established as a result of Secretary Forrestal's memorandum to General Eisenhower was made up of distinguished civilian and military members. Among the college presidents on the Board were the chairman, Dr. Robert L. Stearns, president of the University of Colorado, and the presidents of Williams College, the University of Missouri, and the University of Illinois, and the executive vice president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. General Eisenhower was himself president of Columbia University at the time. Among the military members were the then superintendent of the United States Military Academy, a former Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy and the commanding general of the Air Force's Research and Development Command.

In January 1950, after exhaustive study, and after hearing many witnesses, the Board made its report to the Secretary of Defense, who was Forrestal's successor, Mr. Louis Johnson. The Board disapproved all suggestions that the basic structures of the Service Academies be changed. It recommended that the integrity and service identity of the two existing academies at West Point and Annapolis be maintained and that an Air Force Academy under the Secretary of the Air Force be established to parallel the existing academies. It also recommended that, in peacetime, not less than 50 percent of the planned annual procurement of regular officers for each branch of the armed services be academy graduates.

Mr. Chairman, the time has long since passed when it is necessary to argue whether the United States Air Force should be treated in all respects as a mature and major security establishment, and therefore deserving of its own service academy. The report of the Service Academy Board, or the Stearns committee, as it is often called, was still news in military and legislative circles when the Air Force was called on to stop aggression in Korea. The Air Force fulfilled its task admirably. Through initial reverses, then amazing victories, and finally through a long stalemate, the United States Air Force supported the United States Army, and spearheaded the United Nations effort to reestablish peace in that unhappy peninsula. Superbly trained pilots of the United States Air Force took part in the first aerial jet combat in history. A new kind of ace, and hero, was developed. And by the time hostilities had ceased, 3 years later, the Air Force had proved to the world its capability as an instrument of American policy in putting down aggression and maintaining peace.

The development and expansion of the Air Force has increased the need for an Air Force Academy. There is also a need for better trained officers, for more officers with technical knowledge, and for officers who understand air power and the employment of it in the air-atomic age.

The Air Force, like the Army and the Navy, has an indisputable requirement for its own system of officer procurement. That system is needed to provide the Air Force an adequate and continuous flow of college-educated, uniformly trained young men possessing the necessary qualities of leadership. They must have in addition a firm and considered desire to become and remain officers. Such a system is necessary to give stability to the officer corps of the Air Force, and unity to the objectives of the Department of the Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, last year we heard a good deal about a new look that would be taken at our defense policies. It took no clairvoyance to perceive that such a new look would reemphasize the need for an air academy. Last March, in a press conference, President Eisenhower stated that he was in favor of an Air Force Academy. The new look has now been taken, and the importance of air power in defense planning has been reaffirmed. President Eisenhower repeated his approval of an air academy only last week.

We will be shortsighted indeed if we build up our Air Force, provide its bases,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and provide its planes, and fail to provide a proper system of officer procurement. The report of the Stearns committee stands as the product of an exhaustive consideration of the problem. Its recommendations carry increased force, in that history has underscored the need of a strong Air Force. The wisdom and the foresight of James Forrestal have been reaffirmed.

Further delay is inexcusable. The Air Force needs a service academy. The Nation needs a strong Air Force. And the strength of our Air Force and our Nation are essential to the peace of the world.

It will reflect great credit upon this Congress to pass H. R. 5337, and thus authorize the establishment of the United States Air Force Academy.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 5 minutes, to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, there is very little I can add to what has been said here today. I think our chairman laid down the idea for the need for the Air Force Academy as well as anyone could. Practically every speech that has been made has been in elaboration of some of the things he said.

I want to point out to you that the problems of a group of men who operate the Air Force present a different problem in personnel, morale, and basic and advanced training than it does in the Army or the Navy. I was in the Army a short time. Later I was in the Air Force, or the Signal Corps as it was then, a longer time. I learned that in the aviation section of the Signal Corps there were entirely different ideas, and that we were a different "breed of cats" than those who served in the Army. From the days of Washington we have had the theory that there should be a solid group of professional soldiers who should be the ones who should devote their life work to the development of our security plans so as to keep them in tune with changing requirements of our national security.

Air power is the great symbol of power in the modern world. That was clearly evidenced in the Battle of Midway. But some American air pioneers saw that in the twenties. Mitchell, Spaatz, Arnold, Eaker, Milling, and others. They attempted to increase the performance of airplanes and to test them out in various ways, which indicated that they thought they had a tremendous future in the military field. The evolution of the Air Force was explained to me by a major general several years ago. I said, "What is the difference between the flying in the First World War and the flying in the Second World War?" He said, "The difference is this. In the first war the pilots flew the planes. In the second war the planes flew the pilots." Today we are flying planes without any pilots at all. God only knows how far we are going to advance in the direction in which we are going. The day of push-button flying may be near. The stupendous power which we have in our Air Force awes one. It has been my privilege, this last fall, to visit some of the power centers of the American Air Force. That is what we are hoping to use as a shield that will finally enable our country to weld the world into a peaceful world. We simply cannot have an atomic war without destroying most of the civilized world. I believe we should have a proper corps of experts and leaders who will represent the great symbol of power in the world today. To get those leaders we must have an academy where men are trained in all branches of aeronautics and who intend to make aviation as a military weapon their life work.

Many of my colleagues on the committee have dwelt on this: that in such a school is where espirit de corps and high morale are developed. Do not think for a moment that having an Air Force Academy means that you will only teach men to fly. That is one of the minor things. You can learn to fly in a few hours, any one of you. But military airmen and officers have problems of weather, logistics, scientific problems, aerodynamics, communications, and so forth, that are not common to the other services. So I say to you I hope you will authorize this Academy. I do not know what it will cost. Nobody else does. But the bill provides money in section 3 for the purpose of drawing plans and specifications, so when money is requested the Appropriations Committee will have full information as to the amount of money necessary to build and equip the Academy. If this Academy helps keep our country as the leading airpower in the world, it will be worth every dollar we pay for it.

I want, in closing, to say one word of caution, and that is this: I hope that Members of the House will not become involved with pressure groups who will be trying to force the Secretary to locate this Academy in their area. He told me the other day that he had been beset by over 75 people since the announcement was made of this Academy. Why not permit him, and permit a group of experts who are going to help him, to lay down the criteria of what we should have in order for an area to qualify for an Air Force Academy? Why not let them work that out and have enough confidence in their intelligence and integrity to know that their answer will be the right one? That is the view that I am going to take. I know that we have sites in California and we have them in Texas and Louisiana and New York and everywhere else, but I want those experts who have the responsibility of maintaining air superiority for America to be the ones to pick out the place which they think best fits what we will need to train the men and give the leadership in airpower that we so sorely require today and in the future.

That is all I have to say. I urge you all to support the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Air Force Academy Act."

SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the Department of the Air Force a United States Air Force Academy, hereinafter referred to as the "Academy," for the instruction and preparation for military service of selected persons who shall be known as Air Force cadets.

SEC. 3. (a) The Academy shall be located at such place within the United States as the Secretary of the Air Force shall determine. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to establish a commission, and to appoint the members thereof, to advise him in connection with the selection of a permanent location for the Academy.

(b) Following the selection of a location for the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized—

(1) to acquire land from other Government agencies without reimbursement, with the consent of such agencies;

(2) to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government owned lands, or otherwise, without regard to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended; and

(3) to prepare plans, specifications, and designs, to make surveys and to do all other preparatory work, by contract or otherwise, as he deems necessary or advisable in connection with the construction, equipping and organization of the Academy at such location.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 13, after the word "otherwise", strike out "without regard to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended; and", and insert "without regard to section 601, act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 365; 40 U. S. C. 551)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 21, strike out "location." and insert "location; and

"(4) to construct and equip temporary or permanent Public Works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, at such location."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make my position clear. If we are to continue to have an academy known as the Naval Academy and another known as the Military Academy, then by all means there should be an Air Force Academy. I feel very strongly on that. Everyone here knows of my great interest through the years in air power and in the United States Air Force.

The Naval Academy and the Military Academy should not be abolished. In my judgment they should be changed to United States Defense Academies, where men who aspire to go to the top in military leadership should have their basic national defense training.

All Members of the House senior to me knew a very able Member who served here, the late Cliff Woodrum of Virginia. At times when it seemed that the House was going all one way, and he felt that a mistake was being made, he would rise and say that he was reminded of some very significant words of Holy Writ, to

this effect: "Join not the multitude to do evil."

This bill and this proposal have given me a lot of concern through the years, as I have sat in committee rooms, month in and month out, year in and year out, and heard the men of our Armed Forces—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—plead for money for their own services and exhibit at times unhealthy and expensive service rivalry. I do not mean to be critical, but at times it has appeared that some of these men had missed the overall national-defense picture. This I have at times attributed to the narrow scope of their service academy training.

I have recommended on the House floor for years—and I admit I have made no progress—that we abolish West Point and Annapolis as the Military Academy and as the Naval Academy and call them National Defense Academies. Graduates of West Point and Annapolis would naturally oppose these suggestions—and in perfect sincerity, I am sure. Such a course would be a break with tradition.

The suggestion which I have made would be making a bold approach to the problem; it would be making an imaginative approach to the problem. I say to you there is not any doubt in my mind from my limited experience in national-defense matters that we would save billions of dollars over the years and perform a great service to the cause of national defense by substituting for this bill one creating national-defense academies. Let us not accentuate and make more permanent, as this bill does, disunity and lack of unification. We cannot have unification and have a Naval Academy, an Air Force Academy, and an Army Academy. Basic things happen to young men in their academy training. They cannot later get away from them. In the Academies is the place to mold service unity and understanding.

Of course, we can use surface arguments. It would be consistent inasmuch as we have a Naval Academy and a Military Academy, to establish an Air Force Academy.

If you are not going to create national-defense academies, I would say, yes, we would have to have an Air Force Academy along with the Naval Academy and along with the Military Academy. But why compound error?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the able chairman, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Does the gentleman entertain any reasonable suspicion or the slightest suspicion that West Point and Annapolis are going to be done away with?

Mr. MAHON. They should not be done away with. They should be expanded and made into national-defense academies, in my judgment.

Mr. SHORT. Does the gentleman in his own sound judgment believe we should destroy the integrity and the identity of any one of those Academies?

Mr. MAHON. I do not think we should destroy any integrity, but I do believe we should submerge identities of the Academies and have national defense academies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, that, in my judgment, is the right way to do it. I know it is not consistent, I know that perhaps it will not be done, yet I believe that it is the way to save billions of dollars and have a better national defense program.

Let me ask, Why should we have a Military Academy on the rocks up at West Point, N. Y., separated from air power, when we consider what air power means in the world of today and tomorrow? Why should not all cadets be well indoctrinated in a defense capacity which takes into consideration Navy power, atomic power, air power, land power, undersea power—all of those things? These young men who go to high positions or low positions in the national defense should get the overall basic picture, and they should get it all together, and in the early stages of their training. They should go out as graduates of those academies properly competent in the basic overall national defense problem.

If you would do that, you would get them all on one team in an early stage of their career. You would do a better job. There can be no doubt, in my judgment, about that. I know the House will have a disposition to say, Well, we ought to be consistent; we have a West Point for the Army, we have an Annapolis for the Navy, so let us just make everybody happy. Let us give the Air Force an academy, too.

A former United States Senator once said something that struck me rather forcibly. He said:

> Whoever in his public service is handcuffed and shackled by the vice of consistency will be a man not free to act as various questions come before him from time to time; he will be a statesman locked in a prison house, the keys to which are in the keeping of days and events that are dead.

My plea is for a new look, a bold approach, a break with outmoded traditions, a forward step toward real unification and greater economy of money and manpower.

So, I rise not to oppose air power. It is the greatest weapon of war. I suspect I have spoken as many words in behalf of air power in this House as anyone present, and I would like to speak them again with increased emphasis, but I would like for air power to be in all the academies. I would like for all of the academies to do this basic training, study all the basic concepts.

Mr. Chairman, I just rise as one who remembers that it is not well to join the multitude to do evil. In my judgment the committee would do a great service by sponsoring a substitute bill to the one before us, along the lines suggested in these remarks.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to the glittering generalities of the gentleman from Texas, I do not know what his position really is. He wants us to be strong. He wants to eat his cake and have it. He wants airpower, but he wants to mix it all up with the naval and the military academies. It would be just as logical to mix up the football players of several different schools and expect them to have a real interest in winning the game. There would be no loyalty for Michigan or Notre Dame or any other school as an individual.

You have to divide and specialize in this modern technological age. I think the Members should draw clearly in their minds the distinction between unification and merger. Those of us who voted for unification never for 1 minute contemplated or imagined in our wildest fancy the day would come when we would destroy the identity, the integrity of the separate services. Merger leads to mediocrity. We do have unification between the three branches of our services as was so ably and convincingly demonstrated in World War II. If we establish an Air Force Academy it does not mean that that is going to be wholly divorced, disconnected, and unrelated to the other two branches. Courses are given today in the Military Academy that deal with naval and air problems. Courses are given at Annapolis in the Naval Academy that deal with ground and military as well as air problems, and I am sure courses will be given, in the newly established Air Force Academy that will deal with many military and naval problems. But, you have got to have a school to teach a particular branch of the service. You might as well teach an engineer by sending him to a medical school or educate a dentist by sending him to study engineering.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that so much of the training of a real officer comes after he leaves the Academy, and is it not true that the former Chief of Ordnance of the Army was a graduate of the Naval Academy, and that these programs could be integrated in such a way that you would get far more for your money and have better unification?

Mr. SHORT. There is some merit in what the gentleman says. We can agree that some of our outstanding military leaders never graduated from either Academy. I am sorry that he takes the stand that he has today to place his judgment against the judgment of General Eisenhower, of Mr. Kyes, of General Bolte, of General Harmon, of all these experts who testified before our committee. The Stearns Board recommended that the identity of the two existing Academies be maintained, and that an Air Force Academy be established that will parallel the existing Academies of the other two services.

In our present setup, a military and naval academy trains men in a concentrated, intensified, and circumscribed way. It has got to be that way. Just as we have these Academies to train the Army and the Navy, I submit that in this

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

atomic age airpower certainly is commensurate in its importance and certainly should be coequal to the other two branches.

The great British Prime Minister says that victory or defeat will depend upon airpower in the future. Certainly we all will agree that airpower has grown and is becoming of increasing importance. Heaven knows, I think the time has long since passed when we should have an Air Force Academy, just as we have one at West Point and Annapolis.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I reluctantly take issue with my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. MAHON], who is very much beloved in my district in Louisiana. In this instance I cannot sit silently by, however, without disagreeing with him. This is a day of vast specialization. Airpower now is becoming so specialized that no one can hope to learn to know airpower in all of its various ramifications and then learn seapower and learn landpower, in one brief career of education at an academy. Therefore I think his plan is not practical at this time.

Proceeding along this line, I might say that the gentleman's own great State of Texas does not follow that example. They have a grand school there, the University of Texas, that gives certain courses with great proficiency. They likewise have a great school down at Houston, Texas A. and M. I daresay those people would not follow through on the idea of consolidating those 2 great schools into 1 great school so that they would turn out first-rate citizens of the State of Texas.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am frankly somewhat perplexed by this subject and this debate because in the first place when you talk about a hard core of officers for the Air Force, let us not forget that there is also an air force in the Navy, there is an air force in the Marine Corps, and there is an air force in the Army. May I ask the gentleman from Missouri if he is intending by this bill to supply trained air officers for the Navy, the Army, and the Marine Corps from this Academy?

Mr. SHORT. We are not; definitely not.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is what I thought. I do not see how you are getting anything like the unification most of us thought of when we passed the Unification Act if you are going to train air officers exclusively for the Air Force in an Air Force Academy, when you have a very large section of the Navy, the Army, and the Marine Corps engaged in the undertaking of air power.

I see my good friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] is here. We congratulate him on his recent promotion in the Navy as carried in the papers, I believe, to the rank of captain.

The Navy has become practically a lot of floating air bases with floating protective forces. The Marine Corps is a ground force and has a very large air section for close support; and now that the Army likewise has begun to use aircraft in close support we can say that they have a very large section also. I just do not understand. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that perhaps we need a superior school, a graduate school for air power rather than an undergraduate school for the Air Force, and train all 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 services in the use of aviation. That seems to me to be the proper way to go about it although, of course, I am as untutored as anyone can be as to that.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. One reason that the Air Force has had so much trouble in the past is that Naval Academy graduates without the proper air background and Army Academy graduates in high echelons of the service without air defense training have not permitted the Air Force to have what it needed. They all need the same basic undergirding in this national defense picture, I believe.

Mr. HINSHAW. All of the various services want to have each its own air force, and they all have it under the present setup. It seems to me it should be a postgraduate school in order to serve all of the services, including the Marine Corps. You might as well say we should have a Marine Corps Academy, and that will probably be the next request to come in, and you might just as well say you must then have a separate air academy for each branch of the service to teach aviation. As a matter of fact, in the Air Force as well as in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps probably one of the greatest subjects of technical education is not how to fly. As my friend, the gentleman from California, pointed out anybody can learn to fly in 40 or 50 hours as far as flight itself is concerned. You have to have more than that, of course, to fly planes in combat. But I recently was told by an Air Force officer having taken B–47 transition training that his total number of hours was 300. He said that he completed B–47 transition training after 300 hours flying time so that can be gotten easily enough. It is the subject of engine mechanics and airplane mechanics and of electronics and all of that sort of thing which requires technical training for the people in the air service. That sort of thing is required by the Army and is required by the Air Force and is required by the Navy—that technical training. To say that to learn to fly and to learn the tactics of flying and to learn the various bylines such as weather, navigation, and so forth and so on, that you have to have an Air Force Academy is to my mind looking at the thing backward. What you need is 1 or 2 great service academies, and then have a specialized academy as a sort of graduate school to teach cadets in the various branches how to fly and the strategy and tactics of air power. The air age is here and we all may as well get used to the idea.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I did not know when I prepared my notes that the distinguished gentleman from Texas and the distinguished gentleman from California were going to buck the trend today, which has veered and yawed a little bit from the question until sometimes it looked like a chamber of commerce brief for either the fogbound coast of California or the tornado-ridden areas of Texas or the pleasant, sunny climate of the Carolinas. I was particularly impressed by what the gentleman from California had to say. I am sure every man in this Chamber wants the best Air Force possible. Certainly I question whether the way proposed is the best way to get it. I have been through both ends of the service in the Navy—at sea and in the high departments in Washington. I think we are all for more unification and not for less unification, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] just said. Everyone who knows anything about the service knows today that the rivalry between the services is at fever heat, with one exception, the Navy and the Marines. If the people of this country were asked to vote today on the one elite service in our country, I think there is no doubt but that the answer would be the Marines. The Marine and Navy officers are educated, trained, and worked together. The Marines in World War II were fighting with the Army, completely aside from the Navy; also in the Korean war. The command for which the corps was fashioned was to be the amphibious group of the Navy. Amphibious warfare was engaged in by the United States Marines long before the landings in the Pacific and at Normandy. They were experts in amphibious warfare two or three generations ago. I sincerely believe, in the light of what has happened, that if the Air Force and the Army were remerged, the effectiveness and the morale of both services would be improved, unless complete unification of all three Academies could be effected.

I do not know how many people are familiar with the Board that was appointed by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard under the late Secretary Forrestal. Dr. Compton, the head of MIT, was Chairman of that Board, and they were to make a survey of the service Academies, West Point and Annapolis, and give Secretary Bard the results of their findings. This Board brought in a report which was of extreme interest to all people in civil life who had come into the war effort, but not of such supreme interest to the men who had graduated from Annapolis and West Point.

May I step aside for a moment to say to my good friend, a man whom I greatly admire, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, when he spoke of engineers and dentists, the greatest force that has come to my part of the South, and certainly I think it is a distinguished State that has moved forward faster than any other State in the Union, was when we consolidated three great institutions of learning, which were entirely separate, into what

is known as the Greater University of North Carolina. State College in North Carolina, Clemson in South Carolina and VPI in Virginia, are doing the best work in our contiguous States. They are giving the basic training to young men who live together in dormitories, who are taking agriculture at State and engineering at State and textiles at State, three completely different branches of education, just like the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, growing up together. The effect has been that when these men go out into business, in textiles, in agriculture, or engineering, for the rest of their lives they work together for the good of the State and for the good of their different branches. I think that friendships would be formed on the basis of the Compton report and cooperation started in their early education that would affect their service. The Compton report says that young men from all colleges and universities of the country should be allowed to choose admission to one of the great service academies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHATHAM. The Compton report said that men who spent 2 years in their college or university and who passed the requirements for the one service academy be allowed to go to that academy for 3 more years of training; really a postgraduate school. You would have branches of air and these basic things that have been mentioned, areodynamics, electronics, weather, and all these things; you would also have individual branches for Army and Navy, which also includes basic education. At the graduation of those men from those academies they would get 2 diplomas, 1 from the service academy and 1 from the college from which they came to the service academy, giving them something that would be not only a matter of great pride, but showing that they had passed their 3 years of cooperation and coordination which, in one generation, would mean that men in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force would have a different sense of rivalry than they have today, where the rivalry has been, as I said, at fever heat. Certainly I think that was one of the soundest recommendations of that committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is that not exactly what they do in the War College? They have people from all branches of the service. They rub elbows even with people in the State Department, and that brings about harmony and understanding.

Mr. CHATHAM. I think that is an argument in favor of what I am saying, because the War College is composed of a small group of the very finest of men who are picked for the top leadership of the services. But I personally think that they should be brought in in their younger days, live together and train together to get the cooperation that they should have.

As to the matter of location, if this bill is passed, I think the planners, the people who pick the site, should do so in the view that some day this unification of service academies will come. It should be on blue water, in the right climate, with plenty of room for airfields and facilities and with the necessary highway and rail transportation.

I do not think any of the services will cotton to this suggestion or to the remarks that were made by the two gentlemen preceding me. I do not think they will be gleeful over what I have been saying, but I think, for the best interests of this country, and to save money, it is a sound proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the distinguished and able gentleman who has just spoken. At one time I was very much impressed with the forcefulness of his remarks.

My colleague from Texas [Mr. MAHON] made a very fine speech in favor of complete consolidation and a merger of all service schools into one great national defense service school. He would send cadets in all branches of the service to the one school, and bring out of the academy a national defense soldier. Then, later on, in a post-graduate course, he would provide later that they would become soldiers, or sailors, or airmen, and serve in the particular branch to which they were assigned.

My colleague who has just spoken, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] refers to the fact that he believes our defense would be best served by returning the Air Force to the Army, and by leaving the Marine Corps in the Navy. In other words, he would have a return to the system that we have recently abandoned of a divided defense. In that event, it seems to me that he would naturally and logically urge that we do away with our Defense Department and return to a system which provides for the Army on the one hand and the Navy on the other as two separate branches of our defense, rather than pursuing real unification which has been the policy that this Government agreed upon 6 years ago. If we follow the gentleman from North Carolina, then there is no need of a National Defense Department with a Secretary of Defense. There is need only of two separate establishments—the Army and the Navy. We would send the Army people to one academy and the Navy to the other academy and out of one school we would take airmen, and out of the other marines. That would be the setup which he suggests.

Logically, I do not believe that the gentleman has thought this out to its ultimate conclusion to feel the full import and effect of what he is urging the Congress to do. I submit that the committee is on the right road with the right program of complete unification with one school for each separate branch of the service—Air Force, Army, and Navy.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is my responsibility at this time to express some of the caution which I feel in my heart with respect to this authorization measure. I suppose it is natural that I should have this feeling of caution because it is the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions and Military Construction that will make the initial decision with respect to the fund of the authorization which is now before you. I think, from a reading of these hearings, that they have put forth a few storm warnings to those of us who are inclined to be cautious, and to make us feel that the old familiar technique of the foot in the door is perhaps being applied with respect to this proposal.

For instance, if the gentlemen will look at page 2998 of the hearings, they will find this statement by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee in connection with testimony being given by the Secretary of the Air Force. The chairman made this statement:

> But if the Appropriations Committee will cooperate and go along with us, and I think Mr. TABER and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH so assured us the other day, you can be given the authority to reprogram your setup in order that you might have—how much would you say, around $30 million, 25 to 30 million dollars?

That, if anything, has been the bane of the construction program of all branches of the armed services. It has been this thing that they call reprograming. They come in and justify an expenditure for certain amounts for military construction before our subcommittee and the next day they have plans for spending that money in other ways completely. This begins to look as if that same type of technique is intended to be applied with respect to this authorization.

There are other indications in these hearings. Turn to page 3019 and you will find that General Harmon, in testifying, said:

> I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the bill as written does not include any authorization for actual construction at the permanent location.

Then on page 3047 you will find the committee interrogating General Washbourne, who is in charge of installations for the Air Force, as to the amount of money required for construction of this Air Force Academy. The amount of $26 million which you will find in the bill is exactly the amount, $1 million for the temporary site and $25 million for construction that General Washbourne testified he would need in order to go ahead with that construction.

The great difficulty, aside from this reprograming I have mentioned, we have had in this military construction program has been the fact they have not had the definite or finite plans for the construction before they spend the money to start the construction program.

They ought to make up their minds on this. Either this is to draw the plans so that we know what we are going to build and where we are going to build, or, Is

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

there a plan to go ahead with construction without these plans? I do not think we have any way of knowing that, although the amount indicated would lead us to believe that, there is an attempt to go ahead with actual construction in this authorization bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not see what is wrong with the fact that you do get your foot in the door. That is the way every single college and university in America has been built. It starts on a small scale and gradually enlarges into a big institution. I cannot see anything fundamentally wrong with that. The Appropriations Committee still has a check. If it feels it is not worth the money that committee may reject it, but the evolution of the plan has to be the method by which we build up what we will finally require.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. My point is, may I say to the gentleman from California, that we should not start construction until we have definite enough plans to know what we are going to build and where we are going to build and what it is going to cost. We should not have to buy a pig in a poke and that is all of the information we have before us now.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I cannot see how they can have all the detailed plans. They want to create an academy. They have certain criteria they are going to develop. When they get those developed they will come to the gentleman's committee in order to get the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

(On request of Mr. SHORT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman heard some discussion here that the cost of this academy might be $125 million. Does the gentleman entertain the slightest or remotest idea that this academy could be constructed for less than 200 or 300 million dollars when you count all the costs in connection with it?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Of course, one does not become an expert on construction by sitting in a commitee room, even though we have spent most of our waking hours in that place for the last couple of years or so; but I think the Secretary of the Air Force was very careful in his language when he said the $125 million would be the minimum. I am as sure as anyone can be, without being an expert, that that is considerably less than the overall cost would be by the time the job is done.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, the gentleman will admit that you have to start somewhere. You have to start with something, and you could not expect to predict, with accuracy, the final cost of an institution of the size, importance, and character as the Air Force Academy. We have placed a limit of $25 million, plus the $1 million, $26 million, in order that they could begin work. The work is the acquisition of the site, the drawing of plans, the engineering, the architectural plans, the building of roads, the installation of utilities which you would have to have at any kind of an institution. That is all preliminary. Then, they would have to come back after they get started for more funds. But, the reason I went over to see the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], 2 weeks ago, was to let them know we were acting in good faith, open, and above board, to seek their advice and their cooperation. And, as I pointed out to them, and as I did in the hearings, if you have to start and stop this project you will suffer costly delays and great waste. When we really begin the thing they should have sufficient funds in order to prosecute it through to its sequence.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. My point, Mr. Chairman, is this: The most wasteful single process that we have found in our experience on our subcommittee has been the beginning of construction before they have the definite surveys and plans completed. That was the original approach to this bill. It is my view that that is the approach that should have been kept, and there should not be a dollar for the actual construction of this facility.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I am rather surprised at the gentleman's attitude and the attitude of my very distinguished friend from Texas. You are both talking about the necessity for planning, specifications, and a complete project report so that the cost can be determined before you get into actual construction and then seek an appropriation; is that right?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the important part.

Mr. GAVIN. What right has the gentleman from Texas to get up here with a $200 million estimate, because he does not know any more than any of the rest of us, actually, what it will cost? But, I think your purpose is to really impress upon the Members that here is a tremendous job.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman kindly address the Chair if he desires to make a speech?

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman yielded to me, and I am calling to his attention the point that I am trying to make, that they are both requesting us not to make any estimate, but both of them are making estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman wanted to ask a question.

Mr. GAVIN. All right. What is the reason for giving us these estimates?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania has planned to build a barn or a palace, would he not want to know what it would cost before he started construction on it? That is the question that the gentleman from Wisconsin is answering.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to say to the gentleman that here are the printed hearings. He evidently did not read them, because here is what I said:

> Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the general could be permitted again to read those items over, slowly, so we can digest them? They are millions. Just go a little slower.
>
> General WASHBOURNE. Be glad to. Five million dollars for site preparation, including pavements. Eleven million dollars for land acquisition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes in order to yield to the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has made an excellent point. I sort of appreciate the thoughtfulness he applies to the appropriations he allows through his subcommittee. In connection with the selection of the site, as I understand your argument, you do not want the $1 million spent in some location that may not become a permanent location for the Air Academy and then have to go some place else and build it permanently and spend another $25 million or $26 million. In view of that would the gentleman from Wisconsin inform me if he will use his influence in trying to obtain a site location where the cost would be considerably less than in other parts of the country? I think in California you can build it for 20 percent less.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not going to make any commitment of that kind whatsoever, but I simply wish to assure the gentleman from California and my other colleagues that our subcommittee intends to find out what is going to be built and where it is going to be built and what it is going to cost before we approve any appropriation for this purpose.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. For the purpose of enabling early operation of the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to utilize, with the consent of the agencies concerned, any available facilities owned by the United States; and to contract with civilian institutions for such operation or instruction as he may deem necessary.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out lines 1 to 4 and insert "For the purpose of providing temporary facilities and enabling early operation of the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized

to provide for the erection of the minimum additional number of temporary buildings and the modification of existing structures and facilities at an existing Air Force base and to provide for the proper functioning, equipping, maintaining, and repairing thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. All appropriate provisions of law, not inconsistent with the purposes of this Act, which pertain to the United States Military Academy shall, by the authority of this section, also pertain to the United States Air Force Academy. All references in these laws to the Secretary of the Army, the Army, or any officer or agency thereof shall, in pertaining to the Air Force Academy, be construed as referring, respectively, to the Secretary of the Air Force, the Air Force, and such officers and agencies of the Air Force as he may designate. The organization of the Air Force Academy shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force. In order to permit an orderly increase in the number of Air Force cadets, the Secretary of the Air Force may, by means of competitive examinations, limit the number to be appointed annually.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 14, after "5." insert "(a)."

Page 3, line 25, after "Air Force.", strike out the remainder of line 25 and all down to and including line 3 on page 4, and insert the following:

"(b) To permit on orderly increase in the number of Air Force cadets during the period ending not more than 6 years after the entrance of the initial class at the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force may limit the number to be appointed during that period by providing for a competitive examination to be held annually in each State, each Territory, and Puerto Rico among those persons nominated to the Academy by Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. During the above prescribed period, the number of vacancies allocated to each State, each Territory, and Puerto Rico, shall be proportional to the representation in Congress from that State or Territory or Puerto Rico. Appointments from each State, each Territory, and Puerto Rico shall be made from among qualified candidates in the order of merit established by the examinations. During the same period the vacancies allocated to other sources shall be filled from among qualified candidates in each category in order of merit established by similar competitive examinatons and shall not exceed 15 percent of the total number of appointments authorized."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Committee on Armed Services on their unification. They are a great committee. They come in with their legislation practically unanimously agreed upon. If the Armed Services Committee could use the influence they have in the House to bring about in the armed services a little unification and economy, it would be one of the great days of America.

No one can stand on the floor of the House and raise his voice and speak against the establishment of an educational institution with any great satisfaction to himself.

This has been an interesting debate, and the debate has brought forth interesting observations from some Members of the House who have not had the advantage the members of the Armed Services Committee have had. I was greatly impressed with the observation of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. I was equally impressed with the observation of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM]. Nowhere in the annals of history has any branch of the national defense of the United States of America performed a more magnificent job than was performed by the Air Corps during World War II when its logistics was supplied by the Army. Therefore, under the Unification Act, it was generally thought that air would be given to the Air Forces. The Army is now creeping and creeping back into the air picture. The necessity of the Army's movement is brought about by the proof furnished by the Marine Corps in their activities in Korea where with their trained air forces operating with their trained ground troops in unison, they proved there was a difficulty in bringing in a foreign element to another foreign element and in getting unity and best results on the ground. The Marine Corps air service in the Korean war proved effective in the highest degree. Therefore, I feel a great deal about this separation of the Army and their World War II element of air power, and now having two different units and a third element of our national defense. All the men who wear the uniforms are great Americans. In my experience in 4 years looking into the economy and efficiency of the armed services, I found the greatest and finest bunch of men I have ever had the opportunity to sit and listen to. Therefore, I am impressed with what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] says.

I sometimes wonder whether or not it was a mistake to separate the air element from the ground element of the Army for the reason that go where you may today, you will find the present air forces building ground forces—ground forces comparable to the Army ground forces. Go into any establishment and you will see it for yourself. We asked about the Engineering Corps. They told us that the engineers of the Army could not engineer an air base and, therefore, they had to have an engineering corps. But all that is beside the point. It is over and it is done. We have the three elements, but instead of unification we have triplification. I am wondering whether the gentleman from California is going to offer an amendment to this bill to establish an air university which will serve all the air forces that are being built up by the three arms of the Armed Services. Certainly, if an air school is necessary for the Air Force, then an air school is necessary for the Marine Corps. It is also necessary for the Navy. The fundamental training—the fundamental mental training is offered at West Point and it is offered at Annapolis. But to get the air training, the cadet must go to an air school. I think it would be a splendid thing to either recommit this bill back to the Committee on Armed Services for further study along that line or here on the floor of this House to determine now whether we are going to have one postgraduate school for all the Armed Services to study the technicalities of air combat and other air flying requirements or whether sooner or later, we will have three air academies.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr HINSHAW] who has been recognized recently as one of the leading Members of Congress for his interest in aviation. Just recently in North Carolina when we were celebrating the 50th anniversary of powered flight, he was recognized there for his outstanding interest in the subject. He was recognized by the National Association here in Washington at a banquet. I am proud that the gentleman came to my State. I want at some future date to put in the record the splendid address the gentleman made on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of powered flight at Kitty Hawk, N C.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I am not prepared to offer any amendment, as I believe it would require considerable more study than has been given to it thus far, but I do think that the gentleman's idea, expressing somewhat my own, is something that should be looked into.

Mr. BONNER. Does not the gentleman think that the committee should give further study to this subject, with that in view?

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course I might think so but the committee does not think so, and neither may the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I wish I could be as certain of anything as several of these experts here this afternoon are certain about everything. I marvel that after this subject has been studied for several years by our highest military authorities—and when I say our highest military authorities, I mean not only men who wear the uniform in our ground forces, our Navy and our Air Force, but I mean civilian men in our Department of Defense, outstanding educators and engineers who have headed the board that made recommendations several years ago, as well as the present occupant of the White House, a former Chief of Staff, who commanded the greatest army perhaps the world has ever known, and conducted the most successful invasion. I wonder why it is that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and all of the different branches of our services, as well as these civilian leaders, the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Departments of Army, Navy, Air Force, have such unanimity of opinion and why the members of the Armed Services Committee, which has devoted much study and interest in this problem, should be challenged as they have been challenged here today. The question of unification is hardly pertinent to the question we have before us. I do not know

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

how the gentleman from North Carolina voted when we established a separate Air Force. I rather imagine he voted to separate the Army from the Air Force.

Mr. BONNER. Is the gentleman speaking of me or the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM]?

Mr. SHORT. I had particularly in mind the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. I will say to the gentleman that I have the greatest respect for his committee. The words that I used, the talks that I made were not facetious in any way. I do not think the thought of Congress has been carried out at all in the Unification Act. As I say, I have respect for the men in the armed services. I have never known a man, in all my experience as chairman of a committee, that I had any question about. So it is not a question of that. It is a question of who is going to train the other two branches of the service if this Air Force Academy is so necessary. Who is going to train them in air functions? I am not setting myself up as an expert. I am merely expressing my views. In the beginning I paid my respects to the ability of your committee.

Mr. SHORT. I regret that the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina were not facetious. What disturbs me is that he is serious. I can only repeat that merger can end only in mediocracy. There is a vast difference between "merger" and "unification." I think there is much benefit in a healthy, wholesome rivalry and competition among our armed services, just as there is in business. I do not think you can have esprit de corps, loyalty to a certain particular branch of the service, if you are going to put the ground force, the Air Force, the naval and marine forces all in the same kettle and stew them up. You cannot have the integrity or the identity of any force. One of the reasons that the Marines have built up such an enviable record is because they are proud to be marines. I can see no harm in the Navy and the Army competing with one another, whether it is in football or somewhere else. The only place you will find these little petty jealousies and bickerings are over in the Pentagon and, thank God, we do not have as many of these jealousies and bickerings today as we had in years gone by.

Those of you who have been out in the field, during World War II, whether it was in the Pacific, in the Mediterranean, or in Europe, and those who have visited Korea and have seen what is going on firsthand, know that we have had unification and have had it in a magnificent way in all those theaters of war. We have had the different branches of the armed services working in the closest cooperation and in a spirit of the greatest harmony in order to bring about victory. So I hope we will not becloud the issue here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. For the purpose of accelerating the establishment of the course of instruction and activation of the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to transfer to the Academy, with the consent of the individuals and departments concerned, cadets and midshipmen from the upper classes of the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 25, strike out all of section 6 and insert a new section 6 as follows:

"SEC. 6. Section 302 (b) of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 329; 10 U. S. C. 1832 (b)) is amended by inserting after the words 'provided by law,' the words 'the professors and cadets of the Air Force Academy,'."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. There is authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended when so specified in the appropriation act concerned, not to exceed $10 million for the purpose of section 3 of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 14, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$26,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 39, noes 18.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Page 5, line 15, strike out "section 3."

Page 5, line 15, after the word "act.", insert "Of this amount not to exceed $1,000,000 may be utilized for the purpose of section 4 of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a clarifying committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 15, following the word "purpose", strike the word "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5337) to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 406, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I shall demand a rollcall vote on the passage of the bill. We have an understanding or gentleman's agreement with the gentlemen from Virginia that there would be no rollcall vote today.

The SPEAKER. That is the understanding of the leadership on the part of the House. Without objection, further proceedings will be put over until tomorrow.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE FOR A NATIONAL TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under order heretofore entered, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, under the 1-minute rule, I advised my colleagues of a newly organized lobby group in the field of international trade relations. The details are as follows:

The Committee for a National Trade Policy is actively engaged in campaigning for a further reduction in tariffs.

John S. Coleman, who is chairman of the committee, testified before the Randall commission urging further trade concessions to foreign countries. Other officials of the commission also have been active on behalf of tariff reductions and published reports say that the committee plans an extensive propaganda and informational campaign in support of free trade for the future.

Obviously, this group is attempting to influence legislation on this question, which will come before the Congress during this session. This is their privilege and prerogative, but there is something about the committee which puzzles me. That is its failure to register under the Lobbying Act. If the information given me by the offices of the Clerk of the House and of the Senate is correct, the Coleman group ignored both the spirit and letter of the law in this regard.

I think the committee should explain why it has failed to register, and, while I do not want to press the point, I am wondering if it has not already violated the law. The proper authorities should investigate.

To those who may think that I am captious about this matter I would point out that there is distressing and growing unemployment in the coal fields of my district. A large part of this unemployment and economic suffering is caused by the dumping on the east coast of residual fuel oil from Venezuela and the Middle East. This oil is displacing coal, and all efforts of the coal industry to get relief have failed thus far.

This matter is a sore subject with me, and so is the altruistic and patriotic attitude taken by many of the free traders, who profess to be primarily interested in the general welfare.

If we look closely at the matter, we are likely to find that the free traders have a pocketbook motive and that they

are serving their own immediate interests.

For example, I wonder whether Mr. Coleman, who is president of the Burroughs Corp., makers of adding machines and other office equipment, is influenced by the fact that around 30 percent of the annual consolidated sales of the Burroughs Corp. and its subsidiaries are being derived from exports. This was shown in the May 25 Dun & Bradstreet report of the Burroughs Corp. The corporation has manufacturing subsidiaries in Canada, Great Britain, France, and Brazil.

With a very substantial portion of its income coming from foreign sales, it is obvious that the Burroughs Corp. has a double-barreled interest in reducing tariffs in the United States: First, to enable foreign countries to get more dollars to buy either completed equipment or parts in the United States; and second, to enable the foreign subsidiaries to get dollars to pay dividends and buy other American products.

Mr. Henry Ford II, has been very active on behalf of the Coleman committee and of the free-trade movement generally. The Ford Motor Co. has stock control of 26 assembly or manufacturing plants outside the United States and 100-percent ownership of those in Mexico, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, and Brazil. However, the primary interest of the Ford Co. so far as foreign trade is concerned is the sale of more American cars abroad and in maintaining these plants a large volume of motorcar exports. The big automobile makers and some other mass production industries have advantages in techniques which enable them to sell abroad in competition with foreign-car makers. But this advantage does not extend to many American industries whose high-wage levels put them at a disadvantage in meeting foreign competition.

Charles P. Taft, of Cincinnati, is president of the Committee for a National Trade Policy. He has spoken out strongly in favor of freer trade and against proposals by the coal industry to curtail the importation of residual oil.

Mr. Taft has been registered as a foreign agent on behalf of the Venezuelan Chambers of Commerce. One of the things for which he was paid was to defeat legislation, or other action, which would interfere with the flow of Venezuelan oil to this country in direct competition with the production of our bituminous coal mines.

Another officer of the Coleman committee is Mr. Harry A. Bullis, chairman of General Mills, Inc., makers of flour and other grain products.

I am surprised at Mr. Bullis' presence on the committee. He should join with those who are trying to get relief from unfair foreign competition. Mr. Bullis' company has full protection against foreign competition, in the form of quotas which keep out almost all foreign wheat and flour. Furthermore, under the International Wheat Agreement, the makers of flour get what amounts to a subsidy and in the year which ended August 1, 1952, this country exported around 35 million bushels of wheat in the form of flour. Mr. Bullis' industry thus has complete protection against foreign competition and an export subsidy. His presence on the Coleman committee then is inconsistent to say the least.

It is high time that this whole matter is brought into the open and the motives of those who are seeking further tariff cuts are analyzed and stripped of their pretenses. Most of the free traders are working in their own selfish interests. This should be clearly understood. It will help in considering this whole question of foreign trade.

STORM SIGNALS OVER THE AIR ACADEMY

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I regret time was not available during the debate this afternoon to ask the chairman of our distinguished Armed Services Committee, Mr. SHORT, one or two small questions on H. R. 5337, dealing with the establishment of an Air Academy. Under the 5-minute rule, I rose to my feet several times, but as my observations would not alter the language of the bill, I did not press for recognition. What I say will change no votes. Perhaps my remarks will, in some measure, prevent storm signals from appearing over the Air Academy.

First, I hope that all concerned will do what they can to spare the Academy from ever being charged with being a feeder line for commercial pilots, however much we desire crack pilots at the controls of commercial planes.

Second, I hope that the dean and the faculty of the Academy ever remember the deep humiliation felt by the Air Force for its questionable performance in support of ground forces in Korea. May its dean and faculty ever be spared the Korean infection of thinking the Corps' mission is exclusively in the great blue yonder away from boys dying, civilians working, transport moving, and homes thriving.

Third. In the use of vocabulary, may the Academy, for its own benefit, its own appropriation grants, tie in as much as possible with lay language and concepts. Squadrons and wings mean little. Fire engines, police sirens, and ambulance gongs tell their story. I hope the faculty sells, in its sphere, a fire-engine, police-siren, ambulance-gong understanding about its corps.

Fourth. I hope that the dean and the faculty of the Academy, in gearing themselves to the twin concepts of surface combat, be it on land or water, the concepts of "fire and maneuver," are not bashful in coming forward with improved techniques for combat effectiveness, no matter where; that it will pirate the brains of industry continuously. One hopes that Americans especially those in the Armed Services continue to develop an eagerness to grasp and try the novel and the new. The story of the magnificent inch-by-inch pioneering by Gen. Bill Twining, Colonel Dyer, and Colonel Krulak to put the helicopter in the Marine Corps—an item which proved so magnificent in Korea, especially in the evacuation of the wounded—kindles that hope. Congratulations to them. Even a "bed-check Charlie" item, it is hoped, will not be snubbed by the dean and the faculty of the Air Academy.

Fifth, in pressing for success, I hope that the dean and the faculty of the Air Academy are able to point out, with conviction, that in this age of cinerama, in this 3–D approach to attack and defense, that the Academy is the missing lens needed to focus our Military Establishment on the broadest possible field. To take a political analogy, if I may; our Voice of America, in its battle against the Reds, in the field of religion: I wonder whether we have ever broadcast the Fourth Commandment, Remember the Sabbath, to keep it holy? Instead, do we not seem like this debate, to have taken a splinter approach? On the Voice of America we have talked of God, of the freedom to worship and of atheistic communism. On this, in Poland, the Reds seem to have outflanked us. Churches are open and people go to them on Sunday, but at night, in Warsaw, especially. During the greater part of Sunday, the Communists schedule political rallies, field trips, and hikes to wear down the people, to destroy the concept of a holy Sabbath. They even work the people on Sunday. Legally, the Reds can say 'you are free to worship in Poland, you have freedom of religion', but actually they do everything to choke its spirit in the Poles. Perhaps a blast on the Fourth Commandment would blow the Reds out of Sunday. Likewise, in this debate, a fragmentary approach to defense seems evident. I hope that the Air Academy locks tight this third lens, giving us that broad, cineramic 3–D, on land, on sea, and in the air, Defense Establishment so we can harness, for our greatest benefit, in or out of combat, the mysteries of altitude, speed, temperature, weather, and pressure.

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that one of our colleagues will be featured tonight on a national network TV show, This Is Your Life. He is the Honorable DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW, of Utah.

Doug left last night for Los Angeles ostensibly to address a JC convention. Actually he will be brought into the program tonight at 10 o'clock not knowing that his life is to be featured on the show.

I hope that those of you who are able will take advantage of the opportunity to see the TV show and see the life of our distinguished colleague portrayed on that program.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. HOPE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 727. An act to provide that certain costs and expenses incurred in connection with certain repayment contracts with irrigation districts approved by the acts of Congress of May 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 62), October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 941), and June 23, 1952 (66 Stat. 151, 153), shall be nonreimbursable.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HINSHAW, for January 21, 1954, on account of official business.

Mr. POFF (at the request of Mr. WAMPLER), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON (at the request of Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON), for today, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. OAKMAN.

Mr. ENGLE.

Mr. PATMAN and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a memorandum from the Library of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 21, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1170. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report by rank and age group the number of officers above the rank of major of the Army and Air Force or lieutenant commander of the Navy, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1171. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the third report covering the operations of the Selective Service System up to the close of the last fiscal year, June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1172. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of the Department of Agriculture regarding the disposal of foreign excess property for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 404 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1173. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of November 30, 1953, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1174. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1071 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the concealing of persons from arrest, so as to increase the penalties therein provided"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1175. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels in the Coast Guard service, which have been settled by the Treasury, pursuant to section 646 (b) of title 14, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1176. A letter from the executive officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting the annual report for 1953 on all tort claims paid by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, pursuant to Public Law 773, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 983; 28 U. S. C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1177. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. Sam B. Davis, Jr., which will, when approved by the regional director, region No. 4, National Park Service, authorize him to conduct pack and saddle horse operations in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., for a period of 2 years from January 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1178. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and finance a program of public works construction for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7209. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955; without amendment (Rept. No. 1106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 405. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to Daisy M. Maupin, mother of Sarah A. Mitchell, late an employee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1107). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 3477. A bill to extend to the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950; with amendment (Rept. No. 1108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee of conference. H. R. 6665. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas (Rept. No. 1109). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 7369. A bill to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act to permit the States to organize military forces, other than as parts of their National Guard units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 7370. A bill to amend the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Cong.), so as to require the consent of the Indian tribes to the assumption of jurisdiction by States over civil and criminal actions arising in Indian country; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 7371. A bill to provide for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 7372. A bill to provide cost-of-living pay adjustments for officers and employees whose rates of basic compensation are determined in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 and for postmasters, officers, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7373. A bill to preserve the right to removal procedures in the case of certain officers and employees in positions excepted from the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 7374. A bill to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of switch-blade knives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7375. A bill to increase from $600 to $750 the income-tax exemptions of an individual taxpayer for himself and for his spouse or other first dependent, and to increase the amount of credit for a dependent from $600 to $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7376. A bill to reduce the tax burden by establishing three new surtax brackets on net income below $500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 7377. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans to eligible veterans for the purchase, repair, alteration, construction, or improvement of farm property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7378. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct housing loans to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7379. A bill to amend section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to increase the maximum amount in which farm-realty loans may be guaranteed thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:
H. R. 7380. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reconvey certain property which the city of Boulder, Colo., donated to the Secretary of Commerce for the establishment of a radio-propagation laboratory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENKINS:
H. R. 7381. A bill to provide that failure of any officer or employee of the United States to answer certain questions shall result in removal from his position or office; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:
H. R. 7382. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend to fruit and vegetable storage facilities the same amortization deduction now provided for grain storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:
H. R. 7383. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTEN:
H. R. 7384. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain automobile seat covers from the manufacturers' excise tax on automobile accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:
H. R. 7385. A bill to extend to ROTC students called or ordered to active training duty certain benefits which have been extended to members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and members of the National Guard, who are called or ordered to active training duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7386. A bill to amend section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that $150 per month of retirement income shall be nontaxable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a deduction for certain expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer for his own education or for the education of any other person; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:
H. R. 7388. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:
H. R. 7389. A bill to authorize and finance a program of public works construction for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:
H. R. 7390. A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1951, relating to certain payments out of Ute Indian tribal funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE:
H. R. 7391. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans to eligible veterans for the purchase, repair, alteration, construction, or improvement of farm property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7392. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct housing loans to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:
H. R. 7393. A bill to provide that the Clark Hill Reservoir, on the Savannah River, S. C. and Ga., shall be known as the Paul Brown Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:
H. R. 7394. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7395. A bill to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7396. A bill to include the Public Health Service in death gratuity benefits; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7397. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:
H. R. 7398. A bill to repeal the requirement of section 3921 of the Revised Statutes that postmasters report to the Postmaster General failure to cancel postage stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7399. A bill to authorize the sale of postage-due stamps for philatelic purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:
H. R. 7400. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:
H. R. 7401. A bill to provide for payments by the Federal Government to States or local taxing units adversely affected by Federal acquisition, ownership, or use of defense-production facilities, to provide for the taxation of certain Federal properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7402. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of St. Joseph, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HYDE:
H. R. 7403. A bill to retrocede to the State of Maryland exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within boundaries of Camp Detrick; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEATING:
H. R. 7404. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:
H. R. 7405. A bill to outlaw the Communist Party or any organization created to overthrow the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:
H. J. Res. 355. Joint resolution amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. D'EWART:
H. J. Res. 356. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to authorize erection of a memorial gift from the people of the Netherlands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:
H. Con. Res. 195. Concurrent resolution relating to the discontinuance of United States post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHEELER:
H. Res. 410. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to investigate and study the alleged mistreatment of patients at the United States Veterans' Hospital, No. 62 (Linwood Veterans' Hospital), Augusta, Ga.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ENGLE:
H. Res. 411. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2982, a bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of Massachusetts Legislature favoring increase of bicycle importation tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the Massachusetts House of Representatives favoring increase of bicycle importation tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to aid employment and save the shipbuilding industry in Massachusetts by insuring the building of a certain aircraft carrier at the Fore River yard of the Bethlehem Steel Co. in Quincy, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAMER:
H. R. 7406. A bill for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:
H. R. 7407. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. R. 7408. A bill for the relief of Gershon, Szyna, and Herz Brook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDON:
H. R. 7409. A bill for the relief of Michael Storm and Susan Storm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:
H. R. 7410. A bill for the relief of Roseen Koury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:
H. R. 7411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:
H. R. 7412. A bill for the relief of Jose Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:
H. R. 7413. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:
H. R. 7414. A bill for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:
H. R. 7415. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judith de Kozarigiou and her minor son, Zindel de Kozarigiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:
H. R. 7416. A bill for the relief of George Constantine Argyris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:
H. R. 7417. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hermina Vidor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):
H. R. 7418. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Bentley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:
H. R. 7419. A bill for the relief of William S. Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7420. A bill for the relief of Elpidio Dosado, Aurelia Dosado, Deanna Dosado, Elpidio Dosado, Jr., and Ambrosia Dosado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 7421. A bill for the relief of Charles James Cresswell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7422. A bill for the relief of Antonio Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 7423. A bill for the relief of Tsumae Takeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7424. A bill for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander P. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (by request):

H. R. 7425. A bill for the relief of Masanori Ikebe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 7426. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Greis Ockenfels Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7427. A bill for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7428. A bill for the relief of Bernhard Butsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 7429. A bill for the relief of Manuel Stephan Derahian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

467. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Women's Missionary Guild of the First Baptist Church, Janesville, Wis., protesting the regulations recently issued by the Army under a directive by Maj. Gen. William E. Bergin, Adjutant General, providing for the sale of alcoholic beverages by the Armed Forces in open messes to commissioned and noncommissioned officers. These regulations are particularly threatening in the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

468. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Trinidad G. Molina, Sampaloc, Manila, Philippines, relative to her request for consideration of the casualty status of her deceased son, Sgt. Carlos G. Molina, guerrilla under the Marking's Fil-American Troops; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

469. Also, petition of Emiliana De Dios Vda de Atancio, Marikina, Rizal, Philippines, relative to her request for consideration of the casualty status of her deceased husband, Sgt. Rafael C. Atanacio, guerrilla under the Marking's Fil-American Troops; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

470. Also, petition of Magdalena Atanacio, Marikina, Rizal, Philippines, relative to her request for consideration of the casualty status of her deceased husband, Sgt. Alejandro D. Atancio, guerrilla under the Marking's Fil-American Troops; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Congressional and Judicial Relief Bill of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Commission appointed by the President to make a study of the needs of Members of Congress and the courts for further salaries have now filed their report, suggesting $27,500 annually for Members of Congress and the Federal courts. With this recommendation before the Congressmen, as a public motive, it is quite likely that the recommendation will be enacted into law.

In the debate on this proposition I propose three things: First, require a rollcall vote on the passage of the bill. In the House last time I could not get a rollcall on final action. Any Member can demand a rollcall vote, but it takes a certain percentage of those present voting for a rollcall vote to get it.

Now it seems to me that any Member wishing to vote more pay should not be ashamed to vote "Yes" and have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD show it. Then when this Member comes home for reelection the voters will know just where he stood on that question. Second, to make sure that an increase is not figured in in making up salaries for this session, there should be an amendment placed in the bill making the raise effective after the next election. In other words, let the people know before a Member is elected just what the pay will be. There certainly ought to be no objection to this. Third, I propose to offer an amendment providing that those citizens now being supported by Government assistance, such as the aged, the blind, and the crippled, as well as dependent children, be voted an increase in pay in the same ratio that the pay of Members of Congress is increased. For example, I now receive $12,500 annually and the pay is increased to $27,500 as suggested by this salary Commission, then an old-age person now receiving from local, State, and Federal assistance say $42 or $58 per month shall have his pay increased 120 percent, the same as the proposed congressional salaries are increased. The man or woman, therefore, now receiving $42 would under this percentage receive $92.40 per month; the man or woman now receiving $58 per month would have his pay increased 120 percent and receive $137.50; if such person were now receiving $90 per month, he would receive under the percentage $198 per month.

There certainly should be no objection to letting the infirm, the blind and the cripples and dependent children in on this congressional and judicial relief proposal.

The point is made by the advocates of this proposal that a high salary would bring to Congress better men. Those who make this argument admit, therefore, that they are not the best men, and I presume will retire if the 120-percent increase in salary passes.

All over the United States, there seems to be evidence of layoffs in labor that may reach alarming proportions. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad normally employs 55,000 workers in the 13 States which the road serves. In the first week in January this year, 6,000 employees were laid off; now on January 18, another 5,000 were laid off. In other words, in this month alone, 20 percent of the normal employment list was laid off.

The reasons assigned are that the business of the road has shrunk. The carloading is now 1,500 cars less per day than last year. At the present time, the officials say, there are 10,000 freight cars idle due to lack of traffic.

If this situation prevails on the Baltimore & Ohio system, other railroads either are or will soon feel the same impact of falling business. I am not citing this case as an alarmist, but to call attention to a situation that is most dangerous if we are to avoid an out-and-out depression.

Word comes from small manufacturing plants in various sections of the United States that employment lists are gradually being cut down. Just how widespread this situation is, I do not undertake to say, but there is sufficient evidence before us now to indicate a drastic drop in business and the consequent increase of unemployed.

This Congress may not avoid having to adopt some widespread-employment program, as we are heading again to the old relief days of the thirties.

If the Republican Congress wishes to retain the confidence of the voters, it will not offer its first relief bill for judges and Congressmen. Congressmen can very well get along on their present salaries until the general picture of unemployment looks more assuring than it does now. They will at least be in a more favorable position than the discharged worker, for the worker will have no job at all. The job of Congressman at $12,500 annually looks better to me than no job at all.

My guess is that if Congressmen vote for this increase of 120 percent in their salaries and the vote is a rollcall vote, that after the next election the unemployment ranks will be increased.

A Coffeeless Wednesday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable talk about the high price of coffee. I think we are all concerned about it. I know that the workingmen in my district are deeply concerned and they are demanding a

good cup of coffee for 5 cents and it should be available to them at that price.

The question seems to be, What can we do about it? I think we can do something about it. We do not want to return to Government price controls again but if the people will voluntarily refrain from using coffee for 1 day a week, supply and demand will compel a reduction in the price of coffee.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose that the people of this country voluntarily agree not to use coffee on Wednesday of each week. My plan is, therefore, a coffeeless Wednesday. If we do that, good coffee will be available at reasonable prices.

The Economic Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps never was there a time when so much publicity was given to the economic forecasts of individuals and organizations as the present time.

It appears to me at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that the preponderance of publicity has gone to the statements of the self-appointed peddlers of gloom and doom.

My home city of Detroit and the State of Michigan have been pointed up by these prophets of gloom and doom, as a prime example of a falling and failing economy.

It appears to me also, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases these harbingers of bad times to come seem to take a wholesome delight in forecasting the collapse of our economy. We do know that there are those few within our shores who are happy at any time to do the bidding of the Russian masters.

Because human nature is so fragile, we find others who would, if they but could, put this Nation through the wringer in order to catapult themselves into power, and thereby give this great country of ours the kind of government they think it should have. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, these are not the people who made America great. Nor will they contribute to its forward advancement in the future.

Progress and the advancement of civilization are dependent upon faith in the future, faith in ourselves, faith in our country, and faith in God. This is the history of America. This is the creed of those who have built our country great and strong.

We are presently in a transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. Inevitably this will create some adjustments. We know that these adjustments are not always entirely painless.

Again, there are those few who would rather that the blood letting in Korea be continued than to undergo economic adjustments that involve them personally. The great preponderance of American people however, I believe, Mr. Speaker, are entirely different. Our future and our destiny are clear. We are not a nation of defeatists or of cowards. We will go forward. We will continue a united nation. Our beliefs and our prayers will sustain us.

Discharge Petition on Alaskan Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am today placing a discharge petition on the Clerk's desk to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the Alaskan statehood bill, because that appears the only avenue left for getting Alaskan statehood before the House of Representatives. Our information is that the Rules Committee does not intend to grant a rule on Alaskan statehood.

It will be recalled that Alaskan statehood has already once passed this House. During the 81st Congress the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with only one dissenting vote reported the Alaskan statehood bill to the House, and that measure passed the House on March 3, 1950, by a vote of 186 to 143. The Senate companion committee voted 8 to 2 to vote the measure favorably in the 81st session of Congress, but the bill did not receive consideration on the Senate floor. On several previous occasions our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has favorably considered and reported Alaskan statehood. The first Alaskan statehood bill to receive committee action was approved unanimously by the House Public Lands Committee and reported to the House on April 14, 1948, in the 80th Congress. On April 3, 1951, in the 82d Congress, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted 7 to 6 to report an Alaskan statehood bill to the Senate. A motion to take up the statehood bill for debate was discussed throughout the month of February 1952, and was finally recommitted to the Senate committee by 1 vote—the vote being 45 to 44.

In June 1953, 83d Congress, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported an Alaska statehood bill favorably to the House. The committee vote on this measure was 19 to 4. This bill is still pending before the Rules Committee and is the subject of the discharge petition which I have placed on the Clerk's desk. I wish to urge those who believe that Alaska statehood should be considered along with, even though not connected to the Hawaii statehood bill, to sign the discharge petition.

The first Alaska statehood bill to receive committee action was approved unanimously by the House Public Lands Committee and reported to the House on April 14, 1948, 80th Congress, with no further action taken.

During the 81st Congress, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs voted with only one dissenting voice to report an Alaska statehood bill to the House, and this was done on March 10, 1949. That measure passed the House on March 3, 1950, by a vote of 186 to 146. The Senate companion committee voted, 8 to 2, to report the measure favorably to the Senate, and the report was filed on June 29, 1950. No further action was taken.

On April 3, 1951, in the 82d Congress, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted, 7 to 6, to report an Alaska statehood bill to the upper House, and the report was issued on May 8, 1951. A motion to take up the statehood bill for debate and vote was discussed throughout the month of February 1952, and on February 27 the measure was recommitted to the Senate committee by a vote of 45 to 44.

On June 26, 1953, 83d Congress, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported an Alaska statehood bill favorably to the House. The committee vote on this measure was 19 to 4. Previously, on May 14, 1953, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had voted, 8 to 7, on Senator ANDERSON's motion to add Alaska statehood as an amendment to the House-passed Hawaii statehood bill and to hold hearings on such a measure.

Hard Money—High-Interest Policy—Control Over Monetary and Credit Policies Should Be Restored to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of the unwise and unnecessary hard-money policy instituted by this administration at the behest of New York bankers, we are now in the middle of a spiraling recession. Production, employment, and incomes are falling. Unemployment is growing. The farm crisis is extremely serious.

In the midst of this recession the New York bankers, thanks to the success of their interest-boosting crusade, are enjoying the most profitable era in recent times. This is the report of the New York Times, Sunday, January 17, 1954:

Earnings of leading New York City banks rose substantially in 1953 to the best levels in many years.

The Times reports that the 15 largest New York banks increased profits "despite heavy taxes, higher operating costs, and an easier tendency in general business late in the year."

The National City Bank of New York, largest in the country, whose former executive head is the administration's debt-management and credit policymaker,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the unconfirmed Deputy to the Secretary of the Treasury, Dr. Burgess, increased its aggregate interest income by $16.2 million in 1953. Ten million dollars in increased interest was earned on business loans, and $6.2 million extra interest came from Government and private-securities investments. Net profits after taxes jumped $2.5 million, or 9 percent. Stockholders' dividends were increased $850,000.

The banks benefited themselves by selling their Government securities at a high price before they went down, and then buying more at reduced prices later, some as low as 89.

Chase National Bank, the second-largest New York bank, whose former head officer is now our Ambassador to England, increased its interest income on business loans by $11.2 million in 1953, or 16.3 percent above 1952. This rise took place because of the rise in interest rates. Loans outstanding on December 31, 1953, were $118,270,441 below a year ago. Net profits after taxes were increased $1,250,000, or over 4 percent above a year ago.

Despite much talk to the contrary, the high interest rate trend has not been abandoned or reversed, although the money managers did take an about face on the scarce-money policy. But the damage had been done before the change in policy, and it has not been repaired yet. Data released by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York show that large New York City banks charged an average interest rate of 3.52 percent on term loans to business during the first 15 days of December 1953. This compared with 3.43 percent in September 1953, and 3.23 in December 1952. It was the highest rate recorded since the bank began collecting such data in 1939. Despite the decline in open market rates on short-term bills and commercial paper, New York bank rates on short-term business loans averaged 3.44 percent in the first half of December 1953, about one-fifth of 1 percent higher than the 3.25 percent charged a year ago, and only two-tenths of 1 percent less than the average rate in September 1953.

EARNINGS OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS INCREASED

The hard-money high-interest-rate policy has also increased the earnings of the Federal Reserve banks. Record earnings of $513 million in 1953 represented an increase of $57 million over 1952. Almost all of the rise was due to the higher average return on Federal Reserve holdings of Treasury securities. What happened to this increase in earnings made possible in the first place by Federal Reserve credit restriction? Current expenses—salaries, and so forth—in 1953 at $114 million were raised $10 million from the year before. The books of the Federal Reserve are not subject to Government audit. Then the Federal Reserve paid $16 million in dividends to member banks. This more than repaid the member banks for the cost of their Federal Reserve borrowings, which amounted to $15 million during 1953. Dividends were also $1.3 million greater than the amount paid in 1952. The rest was turned back to the Treasury. The Federal Reserve once voluntarily assumed the obligation of returning 90 percent of its net earnings to the Treasury. Out of 1953 earnings, which were substantially increased at the expense of the taxpayers, they have been generous, first with their own requirements, then overly generous with their member banks, whose check-clearing expenses are already well paid for by the taxpayers at a cost of over $100 million a year; but when it came to the Treasury, the Federal Reserve paid back 89.5 percent instead of the 90 percent of net earnings they are supposed to pay. Does this mean the Board of Governors is declaring its independence from the 90-percent obligation? I wonder if this is a forerunner to a much bigger reduction for 1954.

PRODUCE A LITTLE DEPRESSION

This Congress owes a responsibility to the people who elected it. That responsibility is to all the people, not just the bankers and bank stockholders. The responsibility which this Congress assumed is that of maintaining full employment, maximum production, and maximum purchasing power. This is clearly required under the Employment Act of 1946. But the high-interest hard-money policy was instituted to thwart the Employment Act's objective and to produce a little depression. The bankers and others seeking to tear down the economic and social gains built up by the people under Roosevelt and Truman in the last 20 years need this little depression to weaken labor, weaken the farmers, weaken the little-business man, and put the country through a wringer so that so-called stronger hands can acquire certain properties.

The only way to stop this conspiracy is for the Congress to wrest away from the power hungry and profit greedy the control over monetary and credit policies which has been given away by this administration. It was started in 1951 when the Board of Governors and the Open Market Committee violated their promises to the President at that time, defied him, and declared their independence from the President. After their declaration, they did not act swiftly to abuse their new powers, but they acted slowly—in low gear—until the present administration was elected, then they got into high gear very quickly. When their hard-money high-interest policies commenced to hurt the present administration, they took an about-face. They will not dare go against the President as long as he is popular with the Congress and the people. If the President should become unpopular, they will defy him, like they did President Truman.

The Federal Reserve System has never been known to take the people's side on any major issue with the big banks when there was a conflict of interest. Control over the growth of the money supply is the way in which the opponents of social and economic advances for the people plan to thwart the will of the Congress. Restriction of growth of the money supply halted the expansion of the economy last spring. Congress must restore to itself power to control the growth of the money supply which is now delegated to a banker-dominated Federal Reserve. In turn, Congress must also reserve for itself the authority to prescribe the maximum rate of interest which the Treasury shall be permitted to pay for borrowed funds. These are crucial powers without which Congress is unable to discharge its responsibility under the Employment Act of 1946.

I ask to have inserted at this point two articles from the New York Times and three from the Wall Street Journal on the growth of bank profits last year.

[From the New York Times of January 17, 1954]

BIG BANKS' PROFITS ARE BEST IN YEARS—GAINS HERE ACHIEVED DESPITE HEAVY TAXES, HIGHER COSTS, AND LATE DIP IN ECONOMY

(By J. E. McMahon)

Earnings of leading New York City banks rose substantially in 1953 to the best levels in many years, December 31 condition statements indicate.

There was also an improvement in incomes in the final quarter over those of a year earlier for most of the banks.

The 15 largest institutions here achieved the gain in earnings despite heavy taxes, higher operating costs, and an easier tendency in general business late in the year.

Higher average interest rates on a larger volume of loans; lower reserve requirements, which made more funds available for lending, and more profitable trust business enabled the banks to more than offset the drains against their incomes.

The net gain in earnings made it possible for the banks to pay larger dividends to shareholders in the year.

While deposits and resources of the 15 banks were mostly higher on December 31 than on September 30, a more mixed pattern was shown in the comparison of these figures with those of December 31, 1952. Most of the banks registered declines.

The combined deposits of the banks were $27,447,759,000 on December 31, 1953, against $26,601,249,000 on September 30, 1953, and $27,859,737,000 on December 31, 1952. Resources of $30,564,830,000 compared, respectively, with $29,652,260,000 and $30,970,423,000.

The National City Bank of New York, with deposits of $5,538,214,000 and resources of $6,049,022,000 on December 31, maintained its leadership as the city's biggest bank. The Chase National Bank, with deposits of $5,062,087,000 and resources of $5,562,462,000, placed second.

Ten of the fifteen banks showed larger loans and discounts at the end of December than on September 30, but declines in the remaining five institutions limited the gain in such outstanding credit to $166,049,000, or 1.3 percent, for the last quarter. The total was $12,609,420,000 on December 31, 1953.

LOANS, DISCOUNTS OFF 1 PERCENT

Eight of the banks had a smaller amount of loans on December 31 than a year earlier, while seven institutions showed gains.

The combined total of loans and discounts of $12,609,420,000 was off $104,925,000, or less than 1 percent, in the year. Loans and discounts of the banks accounted for 41.3 percent of total resources on December 31, 1953, compared with 41.1 percent on December 31, 1952.

The bank's holdings of United States Government bonds increased for the third successive quarter, but the gain in the last 3 months was smaller than in the preceding quarter.

Acquisitions amounted to $293,367,000, or 4.1 percent, against $801,926,000, or 12.6 percent, in the September quarter. The banks held $7,430,124,000 of these securities on December 31, for a gain of $94,393,000, or 1.3 percent, from the level of December 31, 1952. The ratio of such holdings to total resources rose to 24.3 percent from 23.7 percent a year before.

A greater portion of the banks' assets was in cash as the year ended than 3 months earlier. Holdings of cash and related items were $8,006,601,000 on December 31, or 26.2 percent of total resources, representing a rise of $435,300,000, or 5.7 percent, during the quarter. However, cash was down $377,036,000, or 4.5 percent, from the level of December 31, 1952, when it accounted for 27.1 percent of total resources.

RESOURCES BROKEN DOWN

Combined assets of the 15 banks are classified according to percentages of total resources and compared for 3 periods in the table below:

	Dec. 31, 1953	Sept. 30, 1953	Dec. 31, 1952
Loans, discounts, etc.	41.3	42.0	41.1
Cash, etc.	26.2	25.5	27.1
U. S. Government securities	24.3	24.1	23.7
Other securities	6.6	6.8	6.6
Miscellaneous assets	1.6	1.6	1.5

The banks added little to their holdings of securities other than Federal issues in the last quarter. The total of such holdings, $2,026,878,000, was up $12,945,000, or 0.6 percent, in the quarter, but down $32,638,000, or 1.6 percent, on the year.

Miscellaneous assets of the banks—principally banking properties, real estate mortgages and accrued interest and accounts receivable—were $491,807,000 on December 31, 1953. This was $4,909,000, or 1 percent, more than on September 30 and $14,613,000, or 3.1 percent more than December 31, 1952.

[From the New York Times of January 18, 1954]

NEW YORK BANKS CHARGED 3.44-PERCENT INTEREST AS SHORT-TERM RATE LAST MONTH, UP 0.2 PERCENT

Large New York City banks charged an average interest rate of 3.44 percent on short-term loans to business during the first 15 days of December. The Federal Reserve Bank of New York showed the rate compared with 3.46 percent in the first half of September but about one-fifth of 1 percent higher than the 3.25 percent rate in the first half of December 1952.

Fewer short-term loans were granted in December than in the earlier periods, according to the bank's quarterly report. Aggregate dollar volume of loans was slightly larger than in September 1953, although somewhat smaller than in December 1952.

For term loans, those due in more than 1 year, the average rate was 3.52 percent in December, compared with 3.43 percent in September, and 3.23 percent in December 1952. The average rate for December was the highest recorded since the quarterly interest rate survey began in 1939. The increases over previous periods, however, seem to reflect largely changes in the character of loans placed, rather than increases in interest charged for comparable loans, the bank explained.

Both the number and dollar value of term loans made during December were greater than in September. Although the number of term loans made in December was smaller than that of a year ago, the dollar value equaled the record level of December 1952.

The following tables summarized the results of the bank's survey:

Demand and due in 1 year or less

	First 15 days of December 1953	First 15 days of September 1953	First 15 days of December 1952
Number of loans placed	2,165	2,310	2,400
Amount loaned	$625,000,000	$590,000,000	$745,000,000
Average rate charged (percent)	3.44	3.46	3.25

Due in more than a year

	First 15 days of December 1953	First 15 days of September 1953	First 15 days of December 1952
Number of loans placed	235	215	315
Amount loaned	$195,000,000	$120,000,000	$195,000,000
Average rate charged (percent)	3.52	3.43	3.23

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 8, 1954]

FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS' EARNINGS HIT A RECORD $513 MILLION LAST YEAR

WASHINGTON.—The 12 Federal Reserve banks chalked up record earnings of $513 million in 1953, the Federal Reserve Board said.

The earnings total was some $57 million higher than the 1952 record.

Officials explained that the boost in earnings was due mostly to higher earnings on United States Government securities. This reflected a larger volume of holdings as well as a higher average yield on the securities.

Earnings from loans to the 6,800 member banks of the Federal Reserve System rose to a 21-year high in 1953. Earnings from discounts for member banks totaled $15 million—$900,000 over 1952.

Current expenses in 1953 were $114 million, or $10 million higher than in the previous year. This left net current earnings of $399 million—$47 million above 1952.

The 12 "Fed" banks turned over the bulk of their net earnings to the United States Government. In accordance with system policy, the banks turned in $342 million of net earnings to the United States Treasury. This was $50 million more than in 1952.

Dividend payments to member banks, totaled $16 million—about $1.3 million above 1952 payments.

CHASE NATIONAL BANK NET IN 1953 INCREASED $1,250,000 OVER 1952—IT EQUALED $3.56 A SHARE, AGAINST $3.48 THE YEAR BEFORE; DEPOSITS DECLINED

NEW YORK.—Net earnings and profits of Chase National Bank in 1953 amounted to $27,014,000, or $3.65 a share, an increase of $1,250,000 over the $25,764,000, or $3.48 a share earned in the previous year.

Deposits at the end of the latest year amounted to $5,062,087,048, showing a decline of $184,912,984 from the end of 1952.

Loans outstanding on December 31, 1953, were $2,393,667,410 indicating a drop of $118,270,441 from the end of the previous year. Investments in Government securities at the year-end were $926,919,119, compared with $1,053,413,575 at the end of 1952.

Interest on loans during the latest year totaled $79,888,000, an increase of 16.3 percent over the year before.

Chase National Bank (New York) report for the year ended December 31:

	1953	1952	1951
Earned per share [1]	$3.65	$3.48	$2.91
Interest on loans	79,888,000	68,717,000	53,191,000
Other interest, dividends, etc.	45,403,000	45,057,000	43,357,000
Total operating earnings	125,291,000	113,774,000	96,548,000
Operating expenses	63,267,000	56,116,000	49,720,000
Operating earnings	62,024,000	57,658,000	46,828,000
Net loss on securities	3,529,000	2,154,000	[2] 190,000
Provision for thrift incentive plan contributions	3,537,000	3,321,000	
Profit before income taxes	54,958,000	52,183,000	47,027,000
Federal and State income taxes, etc.	27,944,000	26,419,000	25,531,000
Net earnings	27,014,000	25,764,000	21,496,000
Number capital shares	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000

[1] Includes results of securities transactions.
[2] Profit.

Principal items from the bank's statement follow (000 omitted):

	Dec. 31, 1953	Sept. 30, 1953	Dec. 31, 1952
Total assets	$8,562,462	$8,553,147	$8,742,700
Cash and due from banks	1,478,274	1,386,732	1,553,000
Loans	2,393,667	2,378,255	2,511,938
U. S. Government securities	926,919	1,110,553	1,053,413
Other investments [1]	622,573	642,307	488,676
Deposits	5,062,087	5,046,752	5,247,000
Surplus and undivided profits	271,321	272,376	264,108

[1] Excluding mortgages and real estate.

Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal for Tuesday, January 19, 1954, carries an article about the higher net of Chase National in 1953, on page 20, in which it states:

NEW YORK.—An increase in average loan volume and higher rates of interest were chiefly responsible for the rise in net earnings and profits of Chase National Bank last year, according to the bank's annual report.

Award of Government Contracts to Foreign Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand two telegrams I received late yesterday afternoon. The telegrams protest against the Army Corps of Engineers entertaining bids from a Japanese firm on contracts for purchase of turbines and other equipment for the new powerhouse at The Dalles, Oreg., power project. The telegrams read as follows:

Hon. JOHN F. SHELLEY,
House Office Building:

Associated Press release January 12 indicates Japanese firm low bidder turbine governors the Dalles Dam powerhouse invitation CIVENG 35-026-54-58. This company

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

vigorously protests award Government contracts foreign manufacturers while American concerns subject wage and hour regulation that do not apply foreign concerns. To ignore such inequity would mean eventual elimination American concerns from field Government contracts.

CLOYD GRAY,
W. R. AMES CO.

Congressman J. SHELLEY,
House Office Building:

Policy on part of Corps of Engineers of entertaining bids by foreign companies for turbine and allied equipment required for west coast power development is posing serious threat for American industry. Because of differential in wage rates impossible for local industry to compete. Situation brought to head by recent disclosure of bids received by Portland District Corps of Engineers for the Dalles powerhouse in which Japanese firm submitted low bid. If Government adopts policy of awarding such jobs to foreign competition net effect will be to completely destroy local manufacturers because of recognized inability to compete due to factors stated above. Urge your support in formulating policy which will protect American industry. Western States now faced with serious problems arising from increasing unemployment due to cutbacks in Government jobs. Your cooperation in securing for American industry protection it is entitled to will be greatly appreciated.

MILO G. SPAICH,
Vice President and General Manager,
American Forge Co.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time in recent months that I have been forced to protest vigorously to the Corps of Engineers against an award of a substantial contract to a foreign firm. I hope that the proper congressional committees will take action to assure that it is the last. We are spending enough American dollars abroad on our various overseas programs without asking foreign competitors to come over here and compete directly with American industry on Government projects here at home.

The objections raised against this Corps of Engineers policy by Mr. Gray and Mr. Spaich are completely valid. The United States, through the coordinated efforts of labor, industry, and the Government has established the world's highest standards of pay and working conditions for labor in industry. These standards are protected by legislation we ourselves have enacted. There is no excuse for permitting the Corps of Engineers or any other Government agency to be a party to actions which penalize American industry for maintaining these standards. That is exactly what the engineers are doing when they ask low-labor-cost-foreign firms to bid on contracts in competition with the high-pay-scale American firms.

If we were not faced with a critical unemployment problem and a prospective depression there would still be no justification for letting Government contracts on domestic procurements abroad. But what can the Secretary of the Army be thinking of when he even considers sending work out of the country at this critical time? Has he not heard of the many industrial areas in the United States that have been officially classed as depressed areas with heavy unemployment? Has he not heard of the President's recent directive ordering placement of Government contracts in these areas? In the face of these conditions we find the Corps of Engineers placing a contract 7,000 miles away. How inconsistent can you get?

Perhaps there is some consistency in the situation, as far as administration policy is concerned. A great part of their highly publicized economy program has had the effect, if not the aim, of economizing highly necessary programs to death. We now find a Government policy which, if pursued, will economize American industry out of business. It will also build up our unemployment rolls and create more surplus labor areas, and before we know it our so-called recession will have snowballed into a full-scale depression. Perhaps the administration should recall some of the economists they have lopped off the payroll if they themselves cannot grasp the simple economic facts as to how depressions start.

Mr. Speaker, I do not yet have the full facts regarding award of the Dalles power project turbine contract. But if the facts are as stated in the telegrams I have read to the House, the appropriate committees should go into the situation immediately and exhaustively with a view toward nipping this practice in the bud. We cannot stand by and permit our hard won wage-and-hour standards to be undermined. We cannot stand by and let American industry take a kick in the teeth from shortsighted Government officials intent on saving a few dollars today and without the vision to see the effect tomorrow will reveal.

Jurisdiction of Congressional Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I recently asked Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, what the Supreme Court has held in relation to the position taken by any witness appearing before a committee, or investigating committee, that the committee does not have jurisdiction over the subject matter, and that the committee may not exercise power on the ground that Congress, or each branch, has not delegated it to such committee. I have received a memorandum prepared by Frank B. Horn, of the American Law Division, dated January 12, 1954, and as it may be informative to committees, I include it in my extension of remarks.

Recent decisions of the courts indicate that it is very difficult to attack successfully the jurisdiction of congressional committees.

See *Morford* v. *U. S.* (1949, 176 F. 2d 54), *U. S.* v. *Di Carlo* (1952, 102 F. Supp. 597), and *U. S.* v. *Auippa* (1952, 102 F. Supp 609). We believe the writer of the editorial had in mind decisions such as *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (1881, 103 U. S. 168) and *Marshall* v. *Gordon* (1917, 243 U. S. 521). However, we do not believe these Supreme Court decisions are now proper guides, because later decisions have qualified materially the propositions stated in those cases.

With the exception of perjury cases, such as *Christofel* v. *U. S.* ((1949) 338 U. S. 84), courts are disinclined to go beyond the journal entries of the House or the Senate to search for procedural deficiencies. See *U. S.* v. *Ballin* ((1892) 144 U. S. 1, 4) and *Field* v. *Clark* ((1892) 143 U. S. 649, 669–670 and 673). Accordingly, if the Senate Committee on Government Operations reports a failure of a witness under U. S. C. 2:194 and the Senate votes to report the matter to the proper United States Attorney for prosecution, a court is unlikely to substitute its judgment for that of the Senate which, by certifying the case, in effect, certifies also the jurisdiction of the committee. Witnesses challenging the jurisdiction of a congressional committee and refusing to answer on that, or any other ground, even on advice of counsel, do so at their peril. See *Sinclair* v. *U. S.* ((1929) 279 U. S. 263, 299).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, who alone canst minister unto our many needs, may we daily hear and heed Thy voice of companionship and counsel.

Grant that we may give ourselves completely and unreservedly to the leading of Thy divine spirit.

Show us how we may keep aglow the light of faith, and may the legislation which we are proposing and enacting here bring hope and relief to all who are discouraged and in distress.

May each new day be radiant with the glorious promise and portent of the dawning of that blessed time when there shall be an abiding peace upon the earth.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace who went about doing good. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2150. An act providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St.

Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 264)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

The budget message is divided into two parts. The first part is a general statement summarizing the budget and a number of its most important aspects. The second part includes pertinent details of my tax and legislative programs, and of the budget. Together the two parts comprise my budget message.

When this administration took office on January 20 of last year one of its first concerns was the budget for the 1954 fiscal year, which had been sent to the Congress on January 9, 1953, by the previous administration. With the cooperation of the Congress that budget promptly was revised and reduced. This new budget is the first prepared entirely by this administration.

It provides adequately, in my judgment, for the national defense and the international responsibilities of the Nation—responsibilities which we must undertake as a leader of the free world. On the success of this leadership depends our national security and prosperity. The budget also provides adequately for the current needs of the Government and for constructive forward steps in our domestic responsibilities and programs.

The recommended budget continues the strengthening of our military posture; our progress in the development and production of atomic weapons; the expansion of our system of continental defense; assistance in the development of the military strength of friendly nations; and programs for rapid mobilization if an emergency should arise.

Authority is recommended for new and advanced work on the peacetime uses of atomic energy in the earnest hope that present international relations can be improved and the wonders of nuclear power can be turned gradually to the development of a more abundant life for ourselves and all mankind.

The budget contains provisions for legislative recommendations for expanding the coverage and increasing the benefits of our social security system; for promoting better housing conditions and more widespread home ownership in the Nation; for improving our system of education; for conserving our natural resources; for helping prevent the ravages of floods and soil erosion; for encouraging the expansion of adequate health and hospital care for our people; and for other constructive domestic purposes designed to strengthen the foundations of a stable and prosperous economy.

This budget continues the progress that has been made during the past year in reducing both requests for new appropriations and Government expenditures. The reductions in expenditures already accomplished, together with those now proposed, justify the tax reductions which took effect January 1 and the further tax revisions I am recommending. These lower taxes will encourage continued high capital investment and consumer purchases. Despite the substantial loss of revenue caused by these tax reductions, we have moved closer to a balanced budget.

One of the first problems of this administration was to bring the budget under better control. That was substantially accomplished in the revision of the original budget document for the fiscal year 1954. Now an amount approximately equal to the savings made in this new budget is being returned to the public in tax reductions and tax revisions. This amount substantially exceeds the estimated budget deficit.

In preparing this budget the administration has directed its attention to essential activities and programs rather than to those which some might consider desirable and appropriate, at this time, for the Federal Government to undertake. It assumes fairly stable conditions, internally and externally, during the period it covers. It allows for the continuing heavy demands of the national security programs on the budget. But as we continue to reduce and eliminate the less desirable or the unnecessary Government expenditures, it will become possible to turn to other purposes which are the most desirable in terms of their benefits to all of the people.

This budget marks the beginning of a movement to shift to State and local governments and to private enterprise Federal activities which can be more appropriately and more efficiently carried on in that way. The lending activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; the services provided by the Inland Waterways Corporation; certain agricultural activities; and some aspects of our health, education, and welfare programs are examples of this type of action. In those cases where Federal participation is necessary, the effort of this administration is to develop partnerships rather than an exclusive and often paternalistic position for the Federal Government.

This budget also benefits from material savings from the decreased costs of Federal operations resulting from our constant effort to improve the management of Government activities and to find better and less expensive ways of doing the things which must be done by the Federal Government.

The total effect of the recommendations for the 1955 budget, under existing and proposed legislation, is shown with comparable figures for earlier years in the following table. The table also reflects certain technical adjustments for 1955 and prior years which do not affect the budget surplus or deficit and are described in part II of this message. Both receipts and expenditures include, insofar as can be determined, the estimated budgetary results of my recommendations for new legislation.

Budget totals

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1950 actual	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 actual	1954 estimated [1]		1955 estimated
					Budget document	Current	
New authority to incur obligations	$40.3	$82.9	$91.4	$80.2	$71.8	$60.7	$56.3
Receipts:							
Under existing legislation	36.5	47.5	61.4	64.6	68.0	67.4	61.5
Under proposed legislation						.2	1.2
Total receipts	36.5	47.5	61.4	64.6	68.0	67.6	62.7
Expenditures:							
Under existing legislation	39.6	44.0	65.4	74.0	75.6	70.9	65.4
Under proposed legislation					2.3	(3)	1.1
Total expenditures	39.6	44.0	65.4	74.0	77.9	70.9	66.6
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−3.1	+3.5	−4.0	−9.4	−9.9	−3.3	−2.9
Cumulative unspent balances of appropriations at end of year	[2] 14.1	[2] 50.3	68.8	78.7	67.4	66.5	54.1

[1] References to 1954 are to the 1954 budget document of Jan. 9, 1953, as presented to the Congress, and to currently revised budget estimates.
[2] Less than 50 million dollars.
[4] Estimated. Detailed accounting data are not available.

General budget policy: This administration is dedicated to greater efficiency and economy in meeting the Nation's security requirements and the necessary and valid functions of the Government.

The current estimates of the 1954 budget show that the requests for new appropriations were reduced about 12.5 billion dollars, new obligational authority was reduced more than 11 billion dollars, and expenditures were reduced 7 billion dollars below the totals estimated in the 1954 budget document of the previous administration.

Similar reductions continue in the budget recommended for the fiscal year 1955. Recommended new obligational authority is 4.4 billion dollars less than the current estimate for the fiscal year 1954, 15.5 billion dollars less than recommended for that year in the 1954

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

budget document, and 23.9 billion dollars less than in 1953. Estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1955 are 5.3 billion dollars less than the current estimate for the fiscal year 1954, 12.3 billion dollars less than recommended in the 1954 budget document, and 8.4 billion dollars less than in 1953.

Thus, new obligational authority has been reduced 15.5 billion dollars and estimated expenditures have been reduced 12.3 billion dollars since this administration took office.

These reductions justified lower taxes. Without tax reductions, a budget surplus was in sight for the fiscal year 1955.

So that most of the new savings could be passed along to the taxpayers of the Nation as a whole, with beneficial effects on our entire economy, I believed it best to adopt a course leading toward the twin goals of a balanced budget and tax reductions.

The reductions in 1954 expenditures were devoted to reducing the large deficit forecast in the 1954 budget document. The anticipated savings in 1955 budget expenditures already have been reflected in the tax reductions of January 1 of this year and are also reflected in the tax revisions I am recommending in this message.

Together these tax reductions will total nearly 5 billion dollars.

We will still have a budgetary deficit of slightly less than 3 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1955, as now estimated. But we will continue determined efforts for economy to reduce that deficit during the 1955 fiscal year.

Furthermore, despite the loss of cash revenue from the tax reductions and revisions, the total cash transactions of the Government with the public are now estimated to show a small cash surplus for the fiscal year 1955.

Budget totals, fiscal year 1954: The actual budget deficit for the fiscal year 1953 was 9.4 billion dollars. The budget deficit for the fiscal year 1954, indicated in the 1954 budget document, was 9.9 billion dollars. The current estimates of the budget for that year show a budgetary deficit of 3.3 billion dollars.

Total Government cash transactions with the public include the receipts and payments of the social security and other trust funds which are not considered part of the budget. In 1953 the excess of cash payments to the public over receipts from the public was 5.3 billion dollars. The 1954 budget document estimated an excess of cash payments of 6.6 billion dollars. Present estimates indicate an excess of cash payments over receipts in 1954 of more than 200 million dollars, a reduction of 6.4 billion dollars in the cash deficit originally estimated.

Budget totals, fiscal year 1955: The budget for the fiscal year 1955 is estimated to show a deficit of 2.9 billion dollars.

Fiscal year:	*Deficits (in billions)*
1952	$4.0
1953	9.4
1954:	
As estimated January 9, 1953	9.9
Revised estimate	3.3
1955 estimate	2.9

The presently estimated deficit for the 1955 fiscal year is in sharp contrast to a deficit forecast made by the Bureau of the Budget prior to transmission to the Congress of the 1954 budget document. This projection of the programs in existence and contemplated in the 1954 budget document, under the tax laws as they then existed, indicated a deficit for the 1955 fiscal year about five times greater than the deficit now estimated.

Budget receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year 1955 are estimated as follows:

	Receipts	*Expenditures*
	(in billions)	
Under existing legislation	$61.5	$64.5
Under proposed legislation	1.2	1.1
Total	62.7	65.6

Budget receipts allow for an estimated loss of revenue, totaling nearly 5 billion dollars, from the tax reduction which took effect January 1 and from the cost of recommended tax revisions, insofar as these will apply to the 1955 fiscal year. On a full-year basis the revenue loss will approach 6 billion dollars.

The total cash transactions of the Government with the public show an estimated excess of receipts from the public over payments to the public of more than 100 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955.

This record of progress toward a balanced budget is the result of a determined and continuous effort to bring the financial affairs of the Government under control.

New obligational authority: My recommendations for new appropriations and other new obligational authority for the fiscal year 1955 amount to 56.3 billion dollars, a further reduction from the amounts enacted during the last several years.

Fiscal year:	*New obligational authority (in billions)*
1952	$91.4
1953	80.2
1954:	
As estimated, January 9, 1953	71.8
Revised estimate	60.7
1955, as recommended	56.3

New obligational authority includes new appropriations, additions to borrowing authority, and certain adjustments to the authority of agencies to incur obligations. The above figures are on a comparable basis, reflecting certain adjustments in composition and definition made in this budget, partly to conform to congressional practices. Details are shown in the second part of this message.

The accumulated unexpended balances of prior appropriations as of June 30, 1953, of 78.7 billion dollars, will be reduced to 66.5 billion dollars by June 30, 1954, and to 54.1 billion dollars by June 30, 1955, as now projected.

The lower levels of new obligational authority and of accumulated unexpended balances for 1954 and 1955 lead to less expenditures in these and in future years. In the revision of the 1954 budget and in the 1955 budget the trend clearly is toward a balanced budget.

Budget expenditures: Total budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated at 65.6 billion dollars.

Fiscal year:	*Expenditures (in billions)*
1952	$65.4
1953	74.0
1954:	
As estimated, January 9, 1953	77.9
Revised estimate	70.9
1955 estimate	65.6

Proposed expenditure programs for 1955 fall in three broad categories: national security, major programs relatively uncontrollable under existing and proposed legislation, and all other Government programs.

Expenditures for major national security programs—for the military functions of the Department of Defense, the mutual military program, atomic energy, and stockpiling of strategic materials—dominate the budget and are estimated at 44.9 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1955. This compares with a presently estimated 48.7 billion dollars in 1954 and 50.3 billion dollars in 1953. These amounts are about the same percentage of total budget expenditures in each of the 3 years.

Closely related to these major security programs are other activities for national security included elsewhere in the budget. Our foreign economic assistance and information programs are particularly essential to deter aggression and strengthen the world forces for peace.

Proposed reductions in major national security expenditures in 1955 represent the largest single element of reduction from the current year's level of expenditures. I emphasize, however, that these savings result from revisions in programs, from shifts in emphasis, from better balanced procurement, and from improved management and operations. Our security is being strengthened—not weakened. Further, while expenditures for some programs in this category will be reduced, others will be increased.

Of the four major national security programs, proposed 1955 expenditures for the Atomic Energy Commission and for the mutual military program will be at the highest levels since the initiation of the two programs.

Within the Department of Defense the fiscal year 1955 expenditures on behalf of our airpower will be the largest since World War II. Allocations of expenditures for our continental defense program will be greater than in any previous year.

Expenditures for stockpiling—the fourth of the principal programs in the major national security category—will be less than in the fiscal year 1954, as a result of approaching fulfillment of stockpile requirements in certain categories and of lower world market prices for materials still required for the stockpile.

Budget expenditures for certain Government activties are, by law, relatively nondiscretionary, and depend largely on factors outside the annual budgetary process. While relatively few in number these represent a large amount of dollars and the budget each year has to provide funds for them. For example, once the laws are placed on the statute books, grants to States for many purposes depend upon the extent

to which States take advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs; veterans' pensions depend upon the number of qualified veteran applicants; farm price supports depend upon the size of crops and the demand for supported commodities; and interest payments on the national debt depend upon the amount of the debt and the rate of interest.

In the fiscal year 1955 it is estimated that budget expenditures of 14.1 billion dollars will be required to support these programs. This amount is about the same as presently estimated for 1954 and almost 800 million dollars less than similar expenditures in the fiscal year 1953.

Budget expenditures for other Government activities, which contain more elements controllable through the budget process, are reduced an estimated 2.2 billion dollars below the fiscal year 1953 and 1.5 billion dollars below the present estimate for 1954. This is a reduction, over the 2 fiscal years, of about 25 percent in the cost of these numerous day-to-day operations of the Government. These activities cover, in number, a large majority of the items in the budget, although the amount involved is about one-tenth of total budget expenditures.

Some substantial reductions in this category will result from a lessened postal deficit and management and program savings in many other departments. On the other hand, estimated expenditures for the Tennessee Valley Authority, urban development and redevelopment, college housing loans, the National Science Foundation, fish and wildlife resources, the school lunch program, and several other programs of domestic importance will be the largest in our history.

Budget receipts and taxes: Budget receipts under existing and proposed legislation are estimated to be 62.7 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1955. This is 4.9 billion dollars less than presently estimated 1954 receipts; 1.9 billion dollars less than 1953, and 1.3 billion dollars more than 1952.

Total Government expenditures and taxes are now so high that we must choose our path carefully between inadequate revenues on the one hand and repressive taxation on the other. I am anxious to have taxes reduced as fast as that can be done without building up inflationary deficits. It is the determined purpose of this administration to make further reductions in taxes as rapidly as justified by prospective revenues and reductions in expenditures. The objective will be to return to the people, to spend for themselves and in their own way, the largest possible share of the money that the Government has been spending for them.

The start toward tax reductions is justified only because of success in reducing expenditures and improving the budgetary outlook. That outlook permits me to make some proposals for tax reform and reductions for millions of taxpayers at this time which represent much-needed improvements in our tax system. These proposals are directed toward removing the most serious tax hardships and tax complications, and reducing the tax barriers to continued economic growth. The proposals will encourage the initiative and investment which stimulate production and productivity and create bigger payrolls and more and better jobs. The details of these proposals are many and represent much cooperative work by the House Ways and Means Committee and its staff and the Treasury Department. In part II of my budget message, I list and describe 25 important tax revisions.

I do not believe that the budgetary situation will permit further reductions of taxes at this time. Hence, I repeat my recommendations of last May that the reductions in the general corporate income tax be deferred for 1 year; that the excise tax rates, scheduled to be reduced on April 1, including those on liquor, tobacco, automobiles, and gasoline, be continued at present rates; and that any adjustments in the other excise taxes be such as to maintain the total yield which we are now receiving from this source.

Debt management: A sound dollar is the cornerstone of financing policy under this administration. The problem of debt management is not only one of offering securities for cash or refunding which the market will take, but of appraising the economic situation and adapting financing plans to it, so that as far as possible debt management does not contribute to either inflation or deflation.

This means close cooperation with the Federal Reserve System whose duty it is under the law to administer the money supply, with these same objectives in view.

Nearly three-quarters of the debt we inherited a year ago matures within less than 5 years or is redeemable at the holder's option. Too large a proportion is in the hands of banks. This is the result of financing over a period of years too largely by short term issues at artificially low interest rates maintained by Federal Reserve support. These policies contributed to cheapening the dollar.

A start has been made in lengthening the maturities of the debt, as well as obtaining a wider distribution among individuals and other nonbank investors. In our 1953 debt operations, maturities were lengthened in 5 out of 9 times.

There is every reason to look forward with confidence to this country's ability to put its financial house in better order without serious disruption of credits or markets. The stream of the Nation's savings is huge, larger than ever before; the financial system is sound. With a reasonable assurance of sound money of stable buying power there is no better investment than securities of the United States Government.

The national debt is now close to the legal limit of 275 billion dollars. In view of the wide swings in receipts and expenditures and their unpredictability, it is not prudent to operate the huge business of the United States Government in such a straitjacket as the present debt limit.

These difficulties will become worse as we move forward in the year. We shall be close to the debt limit and our cash balances will be dangerously low on several occasions in the first half of the calendar year.

In the second half of the calendar year, when tax receipts are seasonally low, there will be no way of operating within the present debt limit.

For these reasons, I renew my request to the Congress to raise the debt limit.

Proposed legislation: Legislative proposals are reflected in separate messages or are included in the appropriate sections of part II of this message.

A summary of the budgetary impact of the legislative program also is given in part II.

In summary, I emphasize that this budget carries out the policy of this administration to move toward reduced taxes and reduced Government spending as rapidly as our national security and well-being permit.

By using necessity—rather than mere desirability—as the test for our expenditures, we will reduce the share of the national income which is spent by the Government. We are convinced that more progress and sounder progress will be made over the years as the largest possible share of our national income is left with individual citizens to make their own countless decisions as to what they will spend, what they will buy, and what they will save and invest. Government must play a vital role in maintaining economic growth and stability. But I believe that our development, since the early days of the Republic, has been based on the fact that we left a great share of our national income to be used by a provident people with a will to venture. Their actions have stimulated the American genius for creative initiative and thus multiplied our productivity.

This budget proposes that such progressive economic growth will be fostered by continuing emphasis on efficiency and economy in Government, reduced Government expenditures, reduced taxes, and a reduced deficit. The reduced request for new obligational authority promises further that, barring unforeseen circumstances, the budgets I shall recommend in the future will be directed toward the same objectives.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JANUARY 21, 1954.

BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT—PART II

To the Congress of the United States:

This, the second part of my budget message, discusses in considerable detail my recommended program for the Government for the fiscal year 1955.

I now present and describe my legislative proposals for taxes, and summarize my other legislative proposals, indicating their budgetary impact. This is followed by a presentation and discusion of the pertinent details of the budget.

TAX PROPOSALS

Our whole system of taxation needs revision and overhauling. It has grown haphazardly over many years. The tax system should be completely revised.

Revision of the tax system is needed to make tax burdens fairer for millions of individual taxpayers. It is needed to restore normal incentives for sustained production and economic growth. The

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

country's economy has continued to grow during recent years with artificial support from recurring inflation. This is not a solid foundation for prosperity. We must restore conditions which will permit traditional American initiative and production genius to push on to ever higher standards of living and employment. Among these conditions, a fair tax system with minimum restraints on small and growing businesses is especially important.

I believe that this proposed tax revision is the next important step we should take in easing our tax burdens. After it is completed, further reductions in expenditures can be applied to our two objectives of balancing the budget and reducing tax rates.

A year ago I asked the Secretary of the Treasury to undertake a complete review of the tax system and make recommendations for changes. The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives had already started constructive examination of the tax laws with the same objectives. Extensive hearings were held by the committee during the late spring and summer.

The proposed revisions are the result of a year's intensive work. The collaboration between congressional and Treasury staffs in the development of a tax revision bill has been very close. It may, I hope, provide a precedent for similar collaboration in other fields of legislation.

I shall not list here all the detailed points developed for the revision of the tax laws. The following recommendations cover the major points.

They will substantially reduce the more glaring inequities, thereby helping vast numbers of our people in their individual tax burdens. They will reduce the more serious restraints on production and economic growth. They will promote investment, which provides new and better methods of production and creates additional payrolls and more jobs.

The revisions will also make the law simpler and surer, with benefits to both taxpayers and the Government. They will in many ways prevent abuses by which some taxpayers now avoid their rightful share of tax burdens by taking unfair advantage of technicalities.

1. Children earning over 600 dollars: At present, parents cannot claim as a dependent any child who earns over 600 dollars a year. This discourages children in school or college from earning as much as they can to help in their support. I recommend that a parent should be permitted to continue to claim a child as a dependent regardless of the child's earnings if he is under 18 or away from home at school, as long as he is in fact still supported by the parent. Such dependents should, of course, continue to pay their own income tax on earnings above 600 dollars.

2. Heads of families: At present, a widow or widower with dependent children is denied the full benefit of income-splitting available to married couples. It seems unfair to tax the income of a surviving parent with dependent children at higher rates than were applied to the family income before the death of one of the partners in a marriage. I recommend that widows and widowers with dependent children be allowed to split their income as is now done by married couples.

This same tax treatment should be authorized for single people supporting dependent parents. Furthermore, the present requirement that dependent parents must live with their children for the children to qualify for this tax treatment should be removed. It is often best for elderly people to be able to live in their own homes, and the tax laws should not put a penalty on family arrangements of this sort.

3. Foster children as dependents: At present, foster children and children in process of adoption may not be claimed as dependents. I recommend that such children be allowed as dependents.

4. Expenses of child care: Some tax allowance can properly be given for actual costs of providing care for the small children of widows or widowers who have to work outside the home. The same tax privilege should be given to working mothers who, because their husbands are incapacitated, provide the principal support of their families.

5. Medical expenses: The present tax allowances for unusual medical expenses are too limited to cover the many tragic emergencies which occur in too many families. I recommend that a tax allowance be given for medical expenses in excess of 3 percent of income instead of 5 percent as at present. I recommend further that the present ceiling of 1,250 dollars for a single person with a maximum ceiling of 5,000 dollars for a family should be doubled so that the maximum for a family will be 10,000 dollars. However, to avoid abuses in medical deductions, I recommend that the definition of medical expenses be tightened to exclude both ordinary household supplies and certain indirect travel expenses.

6. Medical insurance and sick benefits for employees: Insurance and other plans adopted by employers to protect their employees against the risks of sickness should be encouraged by removing the present uncertainties in the tax law. It should be made clear that the employer's share of the costs of providing such protection on a group basis will not be treated as income on which the employee is liable for tax. This principle should be applied to medical and hospital insurance as well as to a full or partial continuation of earnings during a sickness.

There should be no tax discrimination between plans insured with an outside insurance company and those financed directly by the employer. At present, payments received by a person while sick are entirely nontaxable if made under an insured plan. This makes it possible for a person subject to high tax rates to have a much larger net income while on sick leave than while at work. To prevent abuses, I recommend that a limit of 100 dollars a week be placed on tax-free benefits, but this exemption should be extended only to plans meeting certain general standards.

7. Pension and profit-sharing plans for employees: The conditions for qualification for special tax treatment of employers' pension plans are too involved. Such plans are desirable. I recommend that the rules be simplified and that greater discretion be given in establishing plans for different groups of employees, so long as there is no discrimination in favor of key executives or stockholders.

Under present law, the value of a future pension to a surviving widow or child of an employee is included in the husband's taxable estate, even though the survivors may not live to receive the full benefits and there may be no cash available to pay the tax. I recommend that such value should not be included in an estate but that the survivors continue to pay tax on the pension in the same manner that it was taxed to the person first receiving it.

At the same time, to avoid unfair competition with ordinary taxpaying businesses, I recommend that pension trusts be restricted in the same manner as tax-exempt foundations. They should also be subject to rules in regard to percentage distribution of their assets comparable to those applying to regulated investment companies.

8. Taxation of annuities: Under the present tax law, a person buying an annuity is taxed on a relatively large part of each payment until his cost is fully recovered, at which time the full amount becomes taxable. The tax rule is so strict that often a person is not likely to get his capital back tax free unless he lives beyond his life expectancy. I recommend that the tax treatment of annuities be determined on the basis of the life expectancy of the person receiving it. This will permit the hundreds of thousands of people who buy annuities to recover their capital free of tax over their life expectancies and will avoid any change in the tax status of an annuity during a person's lifetime.

9. Double taxation of dividends: At present, business income is taxed to both the corporation as it is earned and to the millions of stockholders as it is paid out in dividends. This double taxation is bad from two standpoints. It is unfair and it discourages investment. I recommend that a start be made in the removal of this double taxation by allowing stockholders a credit against their own income taxes as a partial offset for the corporate tax previously paid. This will promote investment which in turn means business expansion and more production and jobs.

Specifically, I recommend that the credit be allowed on an increasing scale over the next 3 years. For this year, I recommend that a credit of 5 percent be allowed; for 1955, a credit of 10 percent; and, in 1956 and later years, 15 percent. To avoid shifts in the payment dates of corporation dividends, these credits should apply to dividends received after July 31 of each year. To give the full benefit immediately to small stockholders, I recommend that the first 50 dollars of dividends be completely exempted from tax in 1954 and that the first 100 dollars be exempted in 1955 and later years.

10. Estimated returns: The burden on those required to file estimated tax re-

turns should be reduced by increasing the number of optional ways in which an individual can estimate his tax without being subject to penalty for an underestimate. I recommend also that the penalties resulting from underestimates be simplified by being stated as a 6-percent interest charge on deficiencies.

11. Filing date: To reduce the burdens of preparing and filing returns in the early months of the year, I recommend that the March 15 filing date for individuals be changed to April 15.

In the taxation of business the same objectives of fairness, simplicity, and reduction of tax barriers to production and normal economic growth are important. The present tax law should be revised on the basis of these standards.

Particular attention should be given in the revision of the law to the problems of small and growing business concerns. I cannot emphasize too strongly the social and economic importance of an environment which will encourage the formation, growth, and continued independent existence of new companies.

12. Depreciation: A liberalization of the tax treatment of depreciation would have far-reaching effects on all business and be especially helpful in the expansion of small business whether conducted as individual proprietorships, partnerships, or corporations. At present, buildings, equipment, and machinery are usually written off uniformly over their estimated useful lives. The deductions allowed, especially in the early years, are often below the actual depreciation. This discourages long-range investment on which the risks cannot be clearly foreseen. It discourages the early replacement of old equipment with new and improved equipment. And it makes it more difficult to secure financing for capital investment, particularly for small business organizations.

I recommend that the tax treatment of depreciation be substantially changed to reduce these restrictions on new investment, which provides a basis for economic growth, increased production, and improved standards of living. It will help the manufacturer in buying new machinery and the storekeeper in expanding and modernizing his establishment. It will help the farmer get new equipment. All of this means many more jobs.

Specifically, I recommend that business be allowed more freedom in using straight-line depreciation and in selecting other methods of depreciation. Larger depreciation charges should be allowed in the early years of life of property by the use of the declining-balance method of depreciation at rates double those permitted under the straight-line method. Other methods which give larger depreciation in early years should be accepted, so long as they do not produce deductions which exceed those available under the declining-balance method.

The new methods of depreciation should be allowed for all investments in buildings, equipment, and machinery made after January 1, 1954. This would include farm buildings and equipment and new construction of commercial and industrial buildings and rental housing.

Faster depreciation, it should be noted, will merely shift the tax deductions from later to earlier years. It will not increase total deductions. The change should, in fact, increase Government revenues over the years because of the stimulation which it will give to enterprise and expansion.

In addition to the tax treatment of depreciation, which is important for all business, there are other features of the tax law which are of special importance to small business.

13. Research and development expenses: At present, companies are often not permitted to deduct currently for research or development expenses. This rule is especially burdensome to small concerns because large companies with established research laboratories can usually get immediate deductions. I recommend that all companies be given an option to capitalize or to write off currently their expenses arising from research and development work. Our tradition of initiative and rapid technical improvements must not be hampered by adverse tax rules.

14. Accumulation of earnings: At present, the penalty tax on excessive accumulations of corporate earnings operates to discourage the growth of small companies which are peculiarly dependent on retained earnings for expansion. The tax in some form is necessary to prevent avoidance of individual taxes by stockholders, but I recommend that the law be changed to make the Government assume the burden of proof that a retention of earnings is unreasonable.

15. Taxation of partnerships: The tax law applicable to partnerships is complex and uncertain. I recommend that it be simplified and made definite. It should be possible to form partnerships and make changes in them without undue tax complications.

16. Optional tax treatment for certain corporations and partnerships: Small businesses should be able to operate under whatever form of organization is desirable for their particular circumstances, without incurring unnecessary tax penalties. To secure this result, I recommend that corporations with a small number of active stockholders be given the option to be taxed as partnerships and that certain partnerships be given the option to be taxed as corporations.

17. Corporate reorganizations: The tax law applicable to reorganizations and recapitalizations of corporations is also complex and uncertain. This part of the law should be simplified and made sufficiently definite to permit people to know in advance the tax consequences of their actions.

The owners of small corporations frequently find it necessary to rearrange their interests in a corporation in anticipation of estate taxes, to secure new capital, or to make stock available for a new management group. I recommend that the tax law permit tax-free rearrangements of stockholders' interests in corporations, so long as no corporate earnings are withdrawn. Such changes will remove some of the tax pressures which force the sale of independent companies to larger corporations. At the same time, the law should be tightened to prevent abuses by which corporate earnings are withdrawn through the issuance and redemption of corporate securities. It should also be amended to avoid abuses through the purchase of corporations to acquire their rights to loss carryovers.

18. Loss carryback: At present, losses may be carried back and offset against prior earnings for 1 year and carried forward to be offset against future earnings for 5 years. I recommend that the carryback be extended to 2 years. This will benefit established companies which become distressed. The 5-year carryforward should be continued to permit new businesses to offset their early losses against later profits.

19. Soil conservation expenses: At present, only limited and uncertain tax deductions are allowed for soil conservation expenses on farms. I recommend that such deductions be allowed up to 25 percent of the farmer's gross income.

20. Accounting definitions: Tax accounting should be brought more nearly in line with accepted business accounting by allowing prepaid income to be taxed as it is earned rather than as it is received, and by allowing reserves to be established for known future expenses.

21. Multiple surtax exemptions, consolidated returns, and intercorporate dividends: I recommend that the law be tightened to remove abuses from the use of multiple corporations in a single enterprise. I also recommend that the penalty tax on consolidated returns and intercorporate dividends be removed over a 3-year period.

22. Business income from foreign sources: I recommend that the taxation of income from foreign business investments be modified in several respects. The investment climate and business environment abroad are much more important than our own tax laws in influencing the international flow of capital and business. Nonetheless, our capital and management know-how can be helpful in furthering economic development in other countries, and is desired by many of them. Our tax laws should contain no penalties against United States investment abroad, and within resonable limits should encourage private investment which should supplant Government economic aid.

Specifically, I recommend the following new provisions in our taxation of business income from foreign sources:

(a) Business income from foreign subsidiaries or from segregated foreign branches which operate and elect to be taxed as subsidiaries should be taxed at a rate 14 percentage points lower than the regular corporate rate. This lower rate of tax should apply only to earnings after January 1, 1954.

(b) The present definition of foreign taxes which may be credited against the United States income tax should be broadened to include any tax other than an income tax which is the principal form of taxation of business in a country, except turnover, general sales or excise taxes, and social security taxes. This country, by its tax laws, should not

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

bring indirect pressure on other countries to adapt their tax systems and rates to ours.

(c) The overall limitation on foreign tax credits should be removed. This limitation discourages companies operating profitably in one foreign country from starting business in another foreign country where operations at a loss may be expected in the first few years.

(d) Regulated investment companies concentrating on foreign investments should be permitted to pass on to their stockholders the credit for foreign taxes which would be available on direct individual investments.

23. Payment dates of corporation income tax: Over the past several years, corporation income tax payments have been gradually shifted forward into the first two of the regular quarterly dates. By 1955, the entire tax will be due in two equal installments in March and June.

The irregularity of tax receipts increases the problems in managing the public debt and is an unsettling influence in the money markets. The irregularity of tax payments also may make it harder for corporations to manage their own financing.

I recommend that, beginning in the fall of 1955, a start be made in smoothing out corporation income tax payments by requiring advance payments in September and December before the end of the taxable year. Each of these payments should be made at 5 percent of the amount due for the entire year in 1955, rising to 25 percent each in 1959 and later years.

These advance payments will require estimates of income for the year somewhat comparable to those now required of individuals. Though estimates of profits are difficult to make accurately, no payments will be required before the middle of the ninth month of a business year.

24. Administrative provisions: The administrative features of the tax laws are unnecessarily complex. Different provisions have been adopted over the years to deal with particular problems, with little regard to consistency. Specifically, I recommend that the parts of the law covering assessments, collections, interest and penalties, the statute of limitations, and other administrative provisions be simplified and brought together in one place. This will result in savings to both taxpayers and the Government.

An effective and fair administration of the tax laws is vital to every individual in the country. The Internal Revenue Service has been revitalized during the past year and is being organized and managed on a basis that will assure fair and equal treatment to all taxpayers, maximum realization of taxes from revenue laws, and the contribution by each taxpayer of the share of the cost of Government that Congress intends that he should make.

The regulations and administration of the tax laws are being tightened to prevent abuses by which a small minority of taxpayers avoid their fair share of taxes by misuse of expense accounts and other improper practices.

25. General simplification of tax laws and other revisions: The revision of the tax laws should be comprehensive. Many unnecessary complications have developed over the years. The entire Internal Revenue Code needs rewriting and reorganization.

Jointly, the Treasury Department and the staff of the congressional committees have developed many recommendations for changes other than those which I have described here. Some of these relate to the estate and gift tax, and the administrative provisions of the excise taxes.

The review of the present tax system in the Treasury Department has not yet led to final conclusions in many other situations that require further study before any recommendations for change can be properly made. These subjects include the tax treatment of capital gains and losses, the special problems of the oil and mining industries, the tax treatment of cooperatives and organizations which are wholly or partially tax exempt, as well as the provision of retirement income for people not covered by pension plans.

The tax reforms and revisions covered by the foregoing 25 recommendations make the income tax system fairer to individuals and less burdensome on production and continued economic growth. After their adoption, further reductions in Government expenditures will make possible additional reductions in the deficit and tax rates.

I do not believe that the budgetary situation justifies any tax reductions beyond those involved in the proposed tax revision and in the tax changes which occurred on January 1. Accordingly, I repeat my recommendation of last May that the reduction in the general corporate income tax rate be deferred for another year.

Excise taxes provide a relatively small proportion of our total tax revenues. In the fiscal year 1955, they are estimated to produce 10 billion dollars at existing rates as compared with 20 billion dollars from corporation income taxation and 30 billion dollars from individual income taxes. Of this 10 billion dollars, more than half comes from the excise taxes on liquor, tobacco, and gasoline.

Because of the present need for revenue, I recommend that the excise taxes scheduled to be reduced on April 1, including those on liquor, tobacco, automobiles, and gasoline, be continued at present rates; and that any adjustments in the other excise taxes be such as to maintain the total yield which we are now receiving from this source.

SUMMARY OF OTHER LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The administration has developed a dynamic, progressive, and at the same time wholly practical legislative program. Its major outlines are set forth in the State of the Union Message, which I delivered to the Congress on January 7. Since that date, I have forwarded to the Congress the details of my recommendations with respect to the steps which I believe should be taken: (1) to modernize and make effective our agricultural laws (January 11); (2) to bring up to date and to improve the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (January 11); (3) to extend and make more equitable the old-age and survivors insurance system (January 14); (4) to chart a new course in Federal cooperation and support for putting up-to-date medical and hospital care at the disposal of our citizens (January 18). On January 25 I shall present a program which will, for the first time, bring together into a coordinated and forward-looking set of policies the housing and community development programs of the Federal Government. Within a few days thereafter, I expect to make certain recommendations with respect to amendments to the Atomic Energy Act. These are discussed in more detail in subsequent sections of this message.

These measures, together with the legislative proposals which will be presented in the course of the next several months with respect to foreign assistance and trade, are the foundation stones for the legislative program of this administration. All of them call for extensions of existing legislation or the enactment of new legislation. All of them are necessary. They will help us to protect the freedom of our people, to maintain a strong and growing economy, and to concern ourselves with the human problems of the individual citizen.

Summary of other legislative proposals

1955 BUDGET

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function and program	1954–55	
	Recommended new obligational authority	Estimated expenditures
EXTENSION OF PRESENT MAJOR PROGRAMS		
National security:		
Military public works, Department of Defense	$1,108.0	$100.0
Mutual military program	2,500.0	700.0
International affairs and finance:		
Mutual economic and technical cooperation	875.0	300.0
Surplus agricultural commodities disposal	300.0	----------
Contributions to voluntary international programs	135.0	70.0
Agriculture and agricultural resources: Increase in borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation	1,750.0	----------
Transportation and communication:		
Federal-aid highway program	575.0	----------
Forest highways	22.5	----------
Subtotal, extension of present major programs	7,265.5	1,170.0
NEW LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM		
Social security, welfare, and health:		
Grants to States for public assistance	108.0	108.0
Expansion of grants for hospital construction	62.6	5.6
Program to stimulate wider coverage and greater benefits from private health insurance	20.2	1.1
Expansion of vocational rehabilitation services for the disabled	8.8	7.8
Creation of a National Commission for Health Improvement	.2	.3
Housing and community development: Advance planning of local public works	[1] 10.0	2.0

[1] Recommended for the fiscal year 1954.

Summary of other legislative proposals—Con.

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function and program	1954-1955 Recommended new obligational authority	1954-1955 Estimated expenditures
NEW LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—continued		
Education and general research:		
Program to strengthen the Office of Education	$0.3	$0.3
National Conference on Education	[1] 2.0	[2] 1.8
Agriculture and agricultural resources: Cooperation with State and local agencies on watershed protection	3.0	2.4
Natural resources:		
Aid for non-Federal development of water resources	10.0	10.0
Federal projects	.5	.4
Transportation and communication:		
St. Lawrence seaway	105.0	5.8
Proposed postal rate increases (increased revenues)	−240.0	−240.0
Labor and manpower: Expansion of unemployment compensation coverage: Administrative costs	22.1	22.0
General government:		
Unemployment compensation for Federal civilian employees	25.0	25.0
Increase in Federal payment to the District of Columbia	10.0	10.0
District of Columbia public works program	7.0	5.0
Subtotal, new legislative program:		
1954	12.0	1.5
1955	148.8	−33.0
Total legislative proposals:		
Fiscal year 1954	12.0	1.5
Fiscal year 1955	7,414.3	1,137.0

[1] Recommended for the fiscal year 1954.
[2] Includes 1.5 million dollars in the fiscal year 1954.

Proposed legislation affecting trust funds

1955 BUDGET

[In millions]

Function and program	1955 estimated
Social security, welfare, and health:	
Expansion and improvement of old-age and survivors insurance:	
Additional receipts	$100.0
Additional disbursements	408.0
Net accumulation in reserve	−308.0
Labor and manpower:	
Extension of coverage of unemployment insurance:	
Additional deposits by States	145.0
Additional withdrawals by States	60.0
Net accumulation in reserve	85.0

Keyed to these foundation stones are the other individual measures which I have already recommended or which I shall recommend as soon as the necessary information upon which to base recommendations can be prepared. To some extent these other measures are basically improvements in program and are less precisely definable in terms of new costs attributed to them.

To the extent that it has been possible to assess with reasonable accuracy the cost of major measures in the legislative program, estimates have been included in this budget. These estimates are summarized above. One recommendation, the proposed increase in postal rates, would add to Federal revenues. Other minor measures, in themselves too small to be identified in summary tables, are discussed and recommended in respective summary sections and chapters of this budget. Their total cost is small and has been adequately provided for in the reserve for contingencies.

DISCUSSION OF THE BUDGET

I now present and describe pertinent details of the budget. The figures shown in the budget are careful estimates based on present and foreseeable conditions. Changes in the budget can result from congressional action. Still others can result from economic factors which change the price of goods purchased by the Government or the incomes received and taxes paid by the citizens of the Nation. Changes in international and domestic conditions could alter this budget before the end of the fiscal year 1955.

The presentation of the figures in the budget for the fiscal year 1955 reflects two significant clarifications.

First, the appropriation to the railroad retirement trust fund equal to the taxes under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act has been excluded from the totals of budget expenditures and deducted from the total of budget receipts. This does not affect the budget surplus or deficit, and has been applied to the figures for all the years shown in this budget so that they are on a comparable basis.

This change properly presents an item which has previously overstated both budget receipts and expenditures in an equal amount. The collection of employment taxes on the railroad industry is in effect collections for a trust fund and not for Government operations. Their transfer to the trust fund should be made directly as a deduction from receipts and not shown as a budget expenditure.

The second significant clarifying change in presentation relates to the fact that the budget expenditure totals in the past have understated the scope of the Government's activities in that they included only the net basis of the spending by a number of enterprises which are engaged in business-type operations with the public. In the course of carrying out their functions, each of these public enterprises receives money from its customers or clients—interest and collections on loans or payments for goods delivered or services rendered. By law, most public enterprises may use their receipts and collections to carry on the operations for which they were created. These receipts and collections from the public in the fiscal year 1955 total 11 billion dollars.

The public enterprise activities are carried on through "revolving funds." Some of the enterprises are organized as Government corporations; others, such as the Post Office, are unincorporated.

In the summary tables of previous budgets, the receipts of such funds were subtracted from expenditures and only the difference was reported as a budget expenditure. In those cases where receipts exceeded expenditures for the year a negative figure was included in the summary expenditure tables. While the use of either the gross figures or the net figures produces an identical effect on the budget surplus or deficit, the former method of presenting only net figures in the summary tables did not reveal the full scope of the Government's financial transactions.

When Government agencies engaged in lending activities use their collections on old loans to make new loans, the net expenditure figure fails to disclose the volume of new lending and the new risks involved.

In this budget, the summary tables present the expenditures of the public enterprise funds on both a gross and net basis. The difference reveals the magnitude of receipts from the public in the "revolving funds."

BUDGET RECEIPTS

The estimates of budget receipts for the fiscal year 1955 in the following table are in accordance with my recommendations for taxes, and are based upon the continuation of business conditions, personal income, and corporation profits at substantially the present high levels.

Budget receipts

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Source	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated
Individual income taxes:			
Existing legislation	[1] $22,478	$33,433	$30,908
Proposed legislation			−585
Corporation income taxes:			
Existing legislation	21,595	22,809	19,694
Proposed legislation			570
Excise taxes:			
Existing legislation	9,943	10,038	9,221
Proposed legislation		189	1,018
Employment taxes:			
Federal Insurance Contributions Act:			
Existing legislation	[1] 4,086	4,600	5,369
Proposed legislation			100
Federal Unemployment Tax Act:			
Existing legislation	276	290	292
Proposed legislation			16
Railroad Retirement Tax Act	626	640	640
Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act	10		
Estate and gift taxes	891	955	955
Customs	613	590	590
Internal revenue not otherwise classified	49		
Miscellaneous receipts	1,827	2,313	2,454
Total receipts	72,394	75,857	71,242
Deduct:			
Appropriation to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund:			
Existing legislation	4,086	4,600	5,369
Proposed legislation			100
Appropriation to railroad retirement trust fund	625	640	640
Refunds of receipts:			
Existing legislation	3,120	2,988	2,644
Proposed legislation			−153
Adjustment to daily Treasury statement basis	+30		
Budget receipts	64,593	67,629	62,642

[1] Estimated.

Budget receipts exclude refunds of overpayments made to taxpayers and also exclude the employment taxes which are appropriated and transferred to the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and to the railroad retirement trust fund. Since these items are also excluded from budget expenditures, the surplus or deficit is not affected.

APPROPRIATIONS AND OTHER BUDGET AUTHORIZATIONS

New obligational authority represents the total of all new authorizations

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

enacted by the Congress permitting Government agencies to incur financial obligations. In addition to new appropriations, it includes mainly authorizations to enter into contracts prior to the enactment of appropriations, and authorizations to make expenditures from borrowed money.

New obligational authority by major program

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Major program	1953 actual	1954 estimated		1955 recommended
		Budget document [1]	Current estimate	
National security	$57.2	$49.1	$39.3	$34.9
Veterans' services and benefits	4.1	4.6	4.2	4.0
International affairs and finance	2.2	1.9	1.2	1.5
Social security, welfare, and health	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.8
Housing and community development	1.5	.7	.6	.2
Education and general research	.3	.2	.2	.2
Agriculture and agricultural resources	1.3	1.5	2.3	2.8
Natural resources	1.4	1.4	1.0	1.0
Transportation and communication	1.9	2.1	1.8	1.5
Finance, commerce, and industry	.1	.1	.1	(2)
Labor and manpower	.3	.3	.3	.3
General government	1.4	1.5	1.1	1.0
Interest	6.6	6.4	6.6	6.9
Reserve for contingencies	-------	.1	.1	.2
Total	80.2	71.8	60.7	56.3

[1] Adjusted for purposes of comparability.
[2] Less than 50 million dollars.

In prior years, new obligational authority has included all reappropriations. In conformity with congressional procedures, this budget does not include as new obligational authority reappropriations for two large programs, the mutual security program, and the construction program of the Atomic Energy Commission. These are authorized annually but are in effect continuing programs. The resulting reduction in reported new obligational authority is offset by a corresponding increase in the unspent balances of appropriations brought forward from one fiscal year to the next. New obligational authority in this budget also excludes the appropriation equivalent to taxes for the railroad retirement account, which has been discussed elsewhere. These changes are set forth in the following table:

New obligational authority—reconciliation

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Description	1953 actual	1954 estimated		1955 estimated
		Budget document	Current estimate	
New obligational authority, midyear review basis	$81,373	$72,883	$63,981	-------
Deduct reappropriations for:				
Mutual security program	447	-------	1,944	-------
Atomic Energy Commission—construction	65	404	679	-------
Appropriations for railroad retirement taxes	625	660	640	-------

New obligational authority—reconciliation—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Description	1953 actual	1954 estimated		1955 estimated
		Budget document	Current estimate	
New obligational authority, present basis	$80,236	$71,819	$60,718	$56,283
Deduct authorizations other than current appropriations	7,897	7,504	8,889	9,260
Current appropriations	72,357	64,315	[1] 51,829	47,023

[1] Includes supplemental appropriations estimated in this budget at about 0.5 billion dollars; hence appropriations actually enacted are 51.3 billion dollars.

The Congress enacted increasing amounts of new obligational authority after the beginning of hostilities in Korea in June 1950. This new obligational authority was much greater than the amount of budget expenditures for each year and also greater than budget receipts in each year. Thus it represented commitments for future spending in excess of the revenues then being provided by the tax system.

The estimate of total appropriations and other authorizations for the fiscal year 1954 and, likewise, the total of my recommendations for new obligational authority for the fiscal year 1955 are less than estimated budget expenditures and also less than estimated budget receipts for the corresponding years. This is in direct contrast to the substantial excess of appropriations over revenues in recent prior years. It means we now are reducing the large amount of outstanding unfinanced commitments incurred under past appropriations and are making possible lower future levels of expenditures.

The major national security programs still require the largest part of our new budgetary authorizations. Of the total new obligational authority recommended for the fiscal year 1955, 34.9 billion dollars, or about 62 percent, is for the military functions of the Department of Defense, the atomic energy program, the mutual military program with our allied nations of the free world, and the stockpiling of strategic and critical materials.

In the detailed review which the appropriations committees and the Congress make of the operations of each agency and its budget proposals before enacting new obligational authority it is necessary to have the budget proposals set forth separately for each agency. Part II of the 1955 budget document is organized on such a basis. It presents summary and detailed information on my recommended appropriations for each agency. The individual appropriations are supported by schedules which reconcile the amount of the appropriation recommended with the obligations which are expected to be incurred. The obligation figures are reconciled with the estimated expenditures. The activities carried on within the appropriations and the workloads involved are also described for individual appropriations.

This grouping of the budget proposals by agencies, as contrasted with grouping by program or function principally employed in the budget summaries, is not only required for congressional action but is also the essential presentation for those of our citizens who are interested in following the progress of the budget proposals in the Congress.

The following table is derived from part II of the 1955 budget document. It shows that the new obligational authority I am recommending for the fiscal year 1955 is 56.3 billion dollars. This is 35.1 billion dollars less than the highest post-Korean amount of 91.4 billion dollars enacted for the fiscal year 1952. It is 15.5 billion dollars less than the amount recommended to Congress for the fiscal year 1954, in the budget document dated January 9, 1953, and 4.4 billion dollars less than the currently revised estimate for the fiscal year 1954.

New obligational authority by agency

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Agency	1953 actual	1954 estimated		1955 recommended
		Budget document [1]	Current estimate	
Legislative branch	$76	$85	$83	$87
The Judiciary	28	29	29	30
Executive Office of the President	9	8	9	9
Funds appropriated to the President	1,908	1,532	932	1,188
Independent offices:				
Atomic Energy Commission	4,079	1,893	1,042	1,368
Veterans' Administration	4,191	4,554	4,273	3,893
Other	1,050	1,134	665	692
General Services Administration	317	305	163	158
Housing and Home Finance Agency	1,357	806	454	88
Department of Agriculture	1,510	1,659	2,499	2,935
Department of Commerce	911	1,078	982	973
Department of Defense:				
Military functions	48,776	41,319	34,495	30,993
Mutual military program	4,236	6,119	3,800	2,500
Civil functions	598	688	505	880
Department of Health, Education and Welfare	1,934	1,773	1,863	1,806
Department of Interior	590	664	499	488
Department of Justice	173	187	179	178
Department of Labor	295	332	299	338
Post Office Department (general fund)	660	669	439	89
Department of State	241	332	142	269
Treasury Department	7,279	7,101	7,250	7,471
District of Columbia (general fund)	18	12	16	31
Reserve for contingencies	-------	50	100	200
Total	80,236	71,819	60,718	56,283

[1] Adjusted for purposes of comparability except for reorganization transfers.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES

In some cases, a considerable time period elapses between the enactment of an appropriation and the expenditure of all the Federal funds appropriated. For example, several years may elapse between the time a contract is negotiated pursuant to an appropriation for aircraft

or other heavy military equipment and the time all the equipment ordered has been delivered and paid for by the Government. Thus many of the expenditures being made by the Government in the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 result from obligational authority enacted and from contracts negotiated in prior years.

During the fiscal year 1955, it is estimated that 45 percent of total budget expenditures will be from obligations incurred under appropriations and other authorizations enacted in years before 1955, and 55 percent will be from the new obligational authority I am recommending for 1955.

The reductions in appropriations that were made last year and the further reductions I am recommending for the fiscal year 1955 decrease the accumulated backlog of outstanding commitments which lead to later budget expenditures. Balances of appropriations unexpended at the end of the year and still available for expenditure during the next year are shown in the following table for each fiscal year since 1950. The amounts shown have been modified to reflect related technical changes in handling reappropriation items and to restrict unexpended balances to items of appropriations, excluding, for example, public debt authorizations. For the most part, these appropriation balances have been obligated or committed, but the expenditures take place one or more fiscal years after the enactment of the appropriation.

Unexpended balances of appropriations

[In billions]

Fiscal year	Amount brought forward into the year	Amount carried over to next year
1950	[1] $11.5	[1] $14.1
1951	[1] 14.1	[1] 50.3
1952	[1] 50.3	68.8
1953	68.8	78.7
1954 estimated	78.7	66.5
1955 estimated	66.5	54.1

[1] Estimated. Detailed accounting data not available.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated at 65.6 billion dollars, a reduction of 5.3 billion dollars from the revised estimate of the fiscal year 1954 expenditures, a reduction of 12.3 billion dollars from the expenditures estimated in the 1954 budget document, and a reduction of 8.4 billion dollars from actual expenditures in the fiscal year 1953.

As mentioned earlier, the summary tables in the budget have been made more revealing by the presentation of expenditures of public enterprises on both a gross and a net basis. The difference between the gross and net figures reveals the magnitude of the receipts and collections of the "revolving funds" which are used for making new loans and other expenditures.

Budget expenditures by major program

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Major program	1955 estimated			1954 estimated		1953 actual
	Gross expenditures	Applicable receipts of public enterprise funds	Budget expenditures (net)	Budget expenditures (net)		Budget expenditures (net)
				Budget document	Current estimate	
National security	$44,860	(1)	$44,860	$54,700	$48,720	$50,274
Veterans' services and benefits	4,223	$31	4,192	4,564	4,160	4,298
International affairs and finance	1,885	635	1,250	2,161	1,779	2,216
Social security, welfare, and health	1,807	(1)	1,807	1,919	1,947	1,910
Housing and community development	1,903	2,180	−277	509	57	549
Education and general research	223		223	288	278	277
Agriculture and agricultural resources	6,752	4,386	2,366	1,827	2,654	2,936
Natural resources	1,337	234	1,103	1,381	1,172	1,358
Transportation and communication	4,277	2,859	1,418	2,111	1,856	2,077
Finance, commerce, and industry	917	755	162	150	164	76
Labor and manpower	282	1	281	303	265	281
General government	1,164	4	1,160	1,554	1,175	1,439
Interest	6,875		6,875	6,420	6,600	6,583
Reserve for contingencies	150		150	40	75	
Adjustment to daily Treasury statement basis						−292
Total	76,655	11,085	65,570	77,927	70,902	73,982

[1] Less than 500,000 dollars.

In the summary tables of this budget, these receipts are labeled "applicable receipts of public enterprise funds." The table on the preceding page shows both gross and net figures for the fiscal year 1955, compared with net figures (on the old basis) for 1954 and 1953.

The fuller presentation in the summary tables does not have any effect on the budget surplus or deficit, or upon the changes in the public debt. Nor does it indicate any new method of financing these Government-owned enterprises. However, it does give a more complete disclosure of the Government's financial transactions with the general public.

As indicated in the preceding table, the term "budget expenditures" refers to the net expenditure figures. The term "gross expenditures" will be used wherever the activities of public enterprises are discussed on a gross basis. The table which follows shows the gross figures for all 3 years, reduced to the older net basis by a single deduction for each year at the bottom of the table.

Gross expenditures by major program

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Major program	1953 actual	1954 estimate		1955 estimated
		Budget document	Current estimate	
National security	$50,274	$54,700	$48,721	$44,860
Veterans' services and benefits	4,327	4,590	4,190	4,223
International affairs and finance	2,656	2,604	2,249	1,885
Social security, welfare, and health	1,910	1,921	1,947	1,807
Housing and community development	2,118	1,606	2,357	1,903
Education and general research	277	288	278	223
Agriculture and agricultural resources	6,448	6,362	8,087	6,752
Natural resources	1,499	1,568	1,349	1,337
Transportation and communication	4,474	4,570	4,446	4,277
Finance, commerce, and industry	1,205	897	1,151	917
Labor and manpower	284	306	267	262
General government	1,444	1,558	1,178	1,164
Interest	6,583	6,420	6,600	6,875
Reserve for contingencies		40	75	150

Gross expenditures by major program—Con.

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Major program	1953 actual	1954 estimate		1955 estimated
		Budget document	Current estimate	
Adjustment to daily Treasury statement basis	−$292			
Subtotal	83,207	$87,320	$82,895	$76,655
Deduct applicable receipts of public enterprise funds	9,225	9,393	11,993	11,085
Budget expenditures (net)	73,982	77,927	70,902	65,570

The figures for gross expenditures in this and related tables are derived from the detailed accounts of each Government agency contained in part II of the 1955 budget document. On this basis, both the gross expenditures and the applicable receipts include some transactions relating to private bank loans guaranteed by the Commodity Credit Corporation and by the Export-Import Bank which involve no use of governmental funds. These amounts are:

Gross expenditures and applicable receipts, guaranteed loans

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program and agency	1953 actual	1954 estimated		1955 estimated
		Budget document	Current estimate	
International affairs and finance: Export-Import Bank	$4	$5	$82	$138
Agriculture and agricultural resources: Commodity Credit Corporation	340	263	1,564	274

In the sections of this message discussing international affairs and agriculture, these figures are excluded from

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the totals to make them comparable to the basis used in other public enterprise accounts. This has no effect on net budget expenditures.

My recommendations for each of the major programs of Government listed in the above tables are discussed in detail later in this message. Budget expenditures by agency are described in detail in part II of the 1955 budget document, and are summarized in the table on the following page.

Budget expenditures by agency

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Agency	1955 estimated			1954 estimated		1953 actual
	Gross expenditures	Applicable receipts of public enterprise funds	Budget expenditures (net)	Budget expenditures (net)		Budget expenditures (net)
				Budget document [1]	Current estimate	
Legislative branch	$66		$66	$70	$63	$61
The Judiciary	30		30	28	29	27
Executive Office of the President	9		9	8	10	9
Funds appropriated to the President	1,622	$242	1,380	1,956	1,702	1,828
Independent offices:						
Atomic Energy Commission	2,425	(2)	2,425	2,700	2,200	1,791
Veterans' Administration	4,235	70	4,165	4,494	4,190	4,334
Other	3,795	3,317	478	979	520	830
General Services Administration	753	2	751	1,126	936	1,107
Housing and Home Finance Agency	1,712	2,097	−385	380	−103	385
Department of Agriculture	4,760	2,263	2,497	2,031	2,945	3,217
Department of Commerce	1,028	49	979	1,031	1,080	1,063
Department of Defense:						
Military functions	37,575	(2)	37,575	45,500	41,550	43,610
Mutual military program	4,275		4,275	5,700	4,200	3,954
Civil functions	654	114	540	640	617	813
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1,789	2	1,787	1,904	1,949	1,920
Department of the Interior	562	34	528	659	549	587
Department of Justice	176		176	184	184	171
Department of Labor	362	1	361	321	299	300
Post Office Department (general fund)	2,775	2,686	89	669	440	659
Department of State	214		214	317	159	271
Treasury Department	7,653	208	7,445	7,178	7,292	7,325
District of Columbia (Federal contribution)	35		35	12	16	12
Reserve for contingencies	150		150	60	75	
Adjustment to daily Treasury statement basis						−292
Total	76,655	11,085	65,570	77,927	70,902	73,982

[1] Adjusted for purposes of comparability except for reorganization transfers.
[2] Less than 500,000 dollars.

The analysis on page M37 shows that budget expenditures for the national security program and for those items which are relatively fixed under provisions of existing and proposed legislation amount to an estimated 59 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1955, 90 percent of all budget expenditures.

The remaining "all other," 6.6 billion dollars, or 10 percent of the total, include some items related to the first two categories. For example, those related to our national security effort are the international programs for economic development, the Selective Service System, and civil defense. Examples of programs which are partly controllable through the budgetary process are the mortgage purchases of the Federal National Mortgage Association and a few relatively small grant-in-aid programs. The bulk of this category is made up of expenditures for the day-to-day operations of the Government, such as law enforcement and administration, tax collection, the various regulatory agencies, the administration of other services rendered to the public, and the cost of direct civil public works.

The record of budget expenditures since the outbreak of aggression in Korea in June 1950 shows considerable variation in the relative changes from year to year in the three major categories shown. While expenditures for national security have risen markedly and those for uncontrollable major programs have fluctuated within rather narrow limits, Government spending in all other categories has been steadily declining.

Analysis indicating controllability of net budget expenditures

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Description	1953 actual	1954 estimated		1955 estimated
		Budget document	Current estimate	
National security program	$50,274	$54,700	$48,720	$44,860
Relatively uncontrollable major programs under existing and proposed legislation:				
Legislative and the Judiciary	$88	$98	$92	$96
Interest on public debt and refunds	6,563	6,420	6,600	6,875
Claims and judgments	129	65	148	135
Veterans' compensation, pension, and benefit programs	3,333	3,524	3,232	3,244
Payments to employees' retirement funds	324	430	34	32
Payment to Railroad Retirement Fund for military service credits	33	35	35	
Grants to States for public assistance	1,330	1,340	1,389	1,293
Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration	202	208	199	205

Analysis indicating controllability of net budget expenditures—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Description	1953 actual	1954 estimated		1955 estimated
		Budget document	Current estimate	
Relatively uncontrollable major programs under existing and proposed legislation—Continued				
Veterans' unemployment compensation	$26	$47	$40	$61
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees				$25
Federal-aid highway grants	$509	$540	$541	555
Conservation of agricultural land resources	273	254	225	196
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	82	75	205	233
Agriculture price support	1,943	729	1,404	1,165
Total	14,905	13,765	14,135	14,115
All other	8,803	9,462	8,047	6,595
Net budget expenditures	73,982	77,927	70,902	65,570

Net budget expenditures

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1950 actual	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated
National security program	$13.0	$22.3	$43.8	$50.3	$48.7	$44.9
Relatively uncontrollable major programs	15.6	12.1	12.3	14.9	14.1	14.1
All other	11.0	9.6	9.3	8.8	8.1	6.6
Total	39.6	44.0	65.4	74.0	70.9	65.6

RECEIPTS FROM AND PAYMENTS TO THE PUBLIC

Budget receipts, expenditures, and the budget surplus or deficit reflect transactions of funds which belong to the Federal Government. There are many other financial transactions of the Federal Government which involve funds the Government holds in trust for others, such as the social security trust funds. The transactions of these trust funds are shown separately in part III of the 1955 budget document. They are not included in the budget totals of receipts and expenditures. As a rule, the trust funds are now building up accumulations; that is, as they build reserves for future liabilities, they are currently taking in more money than they pay out.

By consolidating the trust funds with the budget transactions, and by eliminating intragovernmental and certain noncash transactions, it is possible to obtain a measure of the flow of money between the Federal Government as a whole and the public. Such a consolidation is presented and explained in Special Analysis A, "Receipts from and payments to the public," on page 1099. It is sometimes called the "consolidated cash statement."

The trust funds of our social security system reflect the increase in rate pro-

vided under existing law and the expected increase in payments resulting from proposed legislation increasing the coverage and benefits.

Receipts from and payments to the public, excluding borrowing

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	1953 actual	1954 estimated		1955 estimated
		Budget document	Current estimate	
Cash receipts from the public	$71,282	$75,150	$74,932	$70,842
Cash payments to the public	76,554	81,797	75,166	70,727
Excess of cash receipts	-------	-------	-------	115
Excess of cash payments	5,272	6,647	234	-------

If the automatic increase in rate had taken place with no recommendation for increased coverage and benefits, the excess of cash receipts over payments estimated for the fiscal year 1955 would have been a greater amount.

NATIONAL SECURITY

This budget is based on a new concept for planning and financing our national security program, which was partially applied in the budget revision recommended last spring for the fiscal year 1954. Our military planning in previous years had been based on several successive assumed fixed dates of maximum danger, which were extended from time to time with procurement and personnel plans focused to achieve maximum readiness by each such date. This budget is aimed instead at providing a strong military position which can be maintained over the extended period of uneasy peace.

It points toward the creation, maintenance, and full exploitation of modern airpower. Our military planners and those of the other nations of the free world agree as to the importance of airpower. But air forces must be complemented with land forces, amphibious forces, antisubmarine warfare forces, and fighting ships. The added emphasis on airpower complements our plans for improving continental defense against possible enemy attack. We expect to continue to improve the combat effectiveness of our forces by the application of new weapons and new techniques, and ultimately achieve far greater flexibility than heretofore attainable. The reassembly of our strategic reserve forces will be as dictated by world conditions and the forces kept in a high state of readiness to cope with any possible acts of aggression. This budget aims toward building to a maximum effectiveness all of this complex of military strength. It provides greater expenditures for airpower in the fiscal year 1955 than in any year since the close of World War II. The reorientation of our defense strategy makes this possible within a lower level of total expenditures for national security.

With the shift in emphasis to the full exploitation of airpower and modern weapons, we are in a position to support strong national security programs over an indefinite period with less of a drain on our manpower, material, and financial resources.

Today there is a truce in Korea. After 3 years of hostilities, we are now in the first year of an armed peace. But we are a long way from achieving the kind of peace that is our goal. As long as the Communist threat to the free world exists, we must plan to maintain effective military strength in close cooperation with the other nations of the free world.

Our basic security objective is to prevent another outbreak of aggression. We must create the necessary deterrent to any possible aggressor by maintaining a strong military position at home and abroad. To do this takes determination, human and material resources, and careful planning.

The national security section of the budget includes not only the military functions of the Department of Defense, but also the mutual military program, the development of atomic energy, and the stockpiling of strategic and critical materials. These four major programs are related and designed for the basic purpose of our security. They complement each other and must be assessed in conjunction with the long-range planning which underlies the fiscal and legislative programs of this administration.

The previous history of our military budgets has been one of feast or famine, depending upon the state of world affairs. In peacetime, appropriations have customarily been much reduced. In wartime, financial considerations have been largely ignored. Our present budgetary plans represent a departure from these practices. They provide for the continued maintenance of a strong military force which is within the financial capability of a sound economy. We cannot afford to build military strength by sacrificing economic strength. We must keep strong in all respects.

It will be noted from the table on page M42 that expenditures for the Department of Defense and the stockpiling program have been reduced in the fiscal year 1954 and I am recommending a further reduction for the fiscal year 1955. The reduction in the total Department of Defense expenditures will be effected despite the fact that expenditures for aircraft, shipbuilding, electronics, guided missiles, construction, research and development, and many other defense programs will continue at close to record peacetime levels. I am also recommending some increased expenditures in the fiscal year 1955 for the mutual military program and for atomic energy which will bring expenditures for these two programs to record levels. Nevertheless total spending for national security is estimated to decline about 1.6 billion dollars from the fiscal year 1953 to 1954, and an additional 3.9 billion dollars from 1954 to 1955.

This decline in national security expenditures reflects the dynamic long-range plan recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for our military forces, the savings resulting from the economies effected by this administration, the cessation of hostilities in Korea, and the decrease in procurement—particularly with respect to vehicles, ammunition, and soft goods—made possible by the improved supplies and materiel position.

The defense team, both military and civilian, is working hard toward improvement of the organization, procedures, and methods of the entire Defense Establishment. Already much progress has been made. The Office of the Secretary of Defense has been reorganized, and the administrative structures of the three military departments are under review, with the purpose of making the Secretaries of these departments truly responsible administrators and establishing clearer lines of responsibility within this concept. This will help in achieving the maximum economies that can be realized through improved management and administration.

Considerable progress has been made in standardizing military procurement, and it is planned to reduce sharply the present approximately 4 million different procurement items. This alone will ultimately save hundreds of millions of dollars in procurement, warehousing, and distribution costs. The adoption of commercial maintenance practices for aircraft, vehicles, and other equipment is currently saving millions of dollars.

Better transportation methods are being worked out which will produce additional economies. Savings are also being effected in personnel, procurement, and supplies activities. Through these and similar economy programs, more defense for the taxpayers' dollar will be realized.

Consistent with these plans for a sustained military capability at the lowest possible cost is an integrated plan of continental and civil defense. Such planning is necessary in order to hold our civilian losses from possible enemy attack to a minimum.

Last summer I told the American people that "the Soviets now have the capability of atomic attack upon us, and such capability will increase with the passage of time." I made this statement shortly after it was established that the Soviet Union had successfully detonated a thermonuclear device which, if successfully converted into an offensive weapon and if exploded over our American cities, would be capable of effecting unprecedented destruction.

The administration has taken a number of actions to deal with this serious prospect. Funds are included in the Department of Defense budget to expand the system of continental defense which coordinates the actions of our radar outposts and our air, naval, and land forces. It will provide improved early warning of enemy attack and the men and equipment to resist any such attack. Expenditures for continental defense in the fiscal year 1955 are expected to be greater than ever before in our history.

This budget reflects a new concept of civil defense which takes account of the destructive threat of modern weapons and which emphasizes improved warning of impending attack and planning for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the dispersal of populations of potential target cities in advance of enemy attack.

Much planning, organization, and training remains to be done, however, to make this strategy of civil defense fully effective at all levels of government. It will be the Federal responsibility, as reflected in this budget, to provide warning of impending attacks, and to stockpile medical supplies. The Federal Government will not assume the responsibilities which belong to local governments and volunteer forces, but will supplement State and local resources, provide necessary information on weapons effects, and advise and assist States and localities.

Many activities throughout the budget are related, directly and indirectly, to the national security. They are not all classified as national security for many reasons. Civil defense is one of these activities. The major part of continental defense is in the military budget, but, because of the community aspect of the civil defense program, funds for it are included as heretofore in the section on housing and community development.

National security

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	Expenditures					
	1950 actual	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated
Gross expenditures:						
Direction and coordination of defense	$10	$12	$13	$15	$12	$13
Other central defense activities	199	353	379	394	438	562
Army defense	3,983	7,469	15,635	16,242	14,200	10,198
Navy defense	4,100	5,582	10,162	11,874	11,300	10,493
Air Force defense	3,600	6,349	12,709	15,085	15,600	16,209
Proposed legislation						100
Subtotal—Department of Defense	11,892	19,765	38,898	43,610	41,550	37,575
Mutual military program:						
Present programs	130	991	2,442	3,954	4,200	3,575
Proposed legislation						700
Development and control of atomic energy	550	897	1,670	1,791	2,200	2,425
Stockpiling of strategic and critical materials	438	654	837	919	770	585
Total	13,010	22,307	43,847	50,274	48,720	44,860
Deduct applicable receipts	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Net budget expenditures	13,010	22,307	43,847	50,274	48,720	44,860

	New obligational authority					
	1950 actual	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 recommended
Direction and coordination of defense	$11	$12	$14	$15	$13	$13
Other central defense activities	160	432	419	400	762	548
Army defense	4,392	19,588	21,354	15,221	12,777	8,236
Navy defense	4,359	12,484	16,220	12,689	9,526	9,882
Air Force defense	5,428	15,203	22,375	20,451	11,417	11,206
Proposed legislation						1,108
Subtotal—Department of Defense	14,370	47,719	60,382	48,776	34,495	30,993
Mutual military program:						
Present programs	1,359	5,222	5,291	4,236	3,800	
Proposed legislation						2,500
Development and control of atomic energy	704	1,919	1,266	4,079	1,043	1,366
Stockpiling of strategic and critical materials	425	2,910	379	134		
Total new obligational authority	16,948	57,770	67,518	57,225	39,338	34,859

[1] Less than 500,000 dollars.

Department of Defense: The total of the first six items listed in the preceding table indicates the portion of our national security expenditures which is used for the direct support of our military forces. For these items the budget recommends 31.0 billion dollars of new obligational authority and estimates expenditures of 37.6 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1955. These expenditures are 4.0 billion dollars less than the amount now estimated for 1954. The revised estimate for 1954 is 2.1 billion dollars less than the actual spending in 1953—in marked contrast with the expectation in the budget document of January 9, 1953, that such expenditures in the fiscal year 1954 would exceed those in 1953.

The changing military situation following the sudden attack on Korea brought unbalanced programs and uncoordinated financing during the fiscal years 1951 to 1953. Steps have been, and will continue to be, taken by this administration to bring these factors into balance. One result has been the elimination of the previously forecast increase in expenditures in 1954. Because of the long lead-time needed to procure military equipment, the expenditures have not come down to the level of the new obligational authority. In 1954, with new obligational authority of 34.5 billion dollars, the expenditures are estimated to be 41.6 billion dollars. Likewise, in 1955, though I am recommending 31 billion dollars in new obligational authority, the expenditures are estimated at 37.6 billion dollars.

At the outbreak of hostilities in Korea we had about 1.5 million men under arms. The Korean fighting and general defense buildup brought this figure up to an average of 2.4 million in the fiscal year 1951; to an average of 3.5 million in fiscal year 1952 and a peak strength of 3.7 million in the last quarter of that fiscal year; and to an average of 3.6 million in fiscal year 1953.

Recently, I announced our plan to withdraw two Army divisions from Korea and return them to the United States as an initial step in the progressive reduction of United States ground forces in Korea. This withdrawal is made possible by the cessation of hostilities, the increased mobility and striking power of our air and other combat forces, and by the increasing capabilities of the Republic of Korea forces. This action does not impair our readiness and capacity to oppose any possible renewal of Communist aggression with even greater effect than heretofore if this should be necessary. United States military forces in the Far East will be maintained at appropriate levels, with emphasis on highly mobile naval, air, and amphibious units. Funds are provided to the Department of Defense in this budget for the continued support of Republic of Korea forces at a high level of effectiveness.

As the striking power of our combat forces is progressively increased by the application of technological advances and the growth of airpower, the number of military personnel is being reduced. Total military personnel is scheduled to be reduced from the present level of more than 3.4 million to approximately 3.3 million by June 30, 1954, and a little over 3 million by June 30, 1955. On this basis, this budget provides for an average of 3.2 million military personnel during the fiscal year 1955, compared with an average of 3.4 million during the fiscal year 1954.

The efficiency of our combat forces is contingent upon having experienced, well-trained career personnel. In the State of the Union Message I indicated that pay alone will not retain in the Armed Forces, in competition with industry, the necessary proportion of long-term personnel. We must provide a more generous use of other benefits important to service morale.

Under the long-range plan recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the number of Army divisions may be less than those currently organized, but increased mobility and the availability of modern weapons will provide each division with increasingly greater striking power. As part of the program to improve continental defense, the number of guided-missile antiaircraft battalions will be increased substantially.

At the present time, the Air Force, Navy, and Marine air forces have a total active inventory of approximately 33,000 aircraft, of which approximately one-third are jet aircraft. The emphasis on airpower is reflected in the objective of increasing the active aircraft inventory to more than 40,000 during the next 3 years, with more than half of these aircraft to be jets. At that time the Air Force will have 137 wings—of which 126 will be combat wings—augmented by appropriate combat support units. Naval airpower will include 16 carrier air groups and 15 antisubmarine warfare squadrons, while the Marines will maintain 3 Marine air wings. In each case, these units will be supplemented by appropriate combat support units.

The Navy, in addition to increasing its effective air strength, will continue to modernize the fleet, with emphasis on the combatant elements. The Marine Corps will maintain three combat-ready divisions.

The military plan for forces to be maintained in the fiscal year 1955 permits a reduction of approximately 600 million dollars in the expenditures required for military pay, allowances, and other direct military personnel costs. Operation and maintenance—sometimes called housekeeping—is being held to a minimum, and expenditures in this area will be reduced.

Major procurement expenditures as a whole will decline by about 15 percent from 1954 levels, but the 14.5 billion dollars expected to be spent for this purpose will still be almost four times as great as the amount spent during the fiscal year 1951—the first year of buildup following the attack in Korea. Because the capital investment will already have been made for much new equipment and for a considerable portion of the desired mobilization reserve of materiel and supplies, expenditures for vehicles, ammunition, production equipment, and some other major equipment items will be lower in 1955. The accumulation of mobilization reserves is being scheduled over an extended period of time, with a view toward keeping production facilities of key military items in continued production. Provision of capital equipment and modernization of aircraft will continue at a rapid pace in 1955, and expenditures for aircraft procurement for the Air Force and naval aviation will be at the same general level as in 1954. Aircraft procurement expenditures will account for 22 percent of total Department of Defense expenditures in 1955, compared with 20 percent in 1954, 17 percent in 1953, and 13 percent in 1952. Shipbuilding expenditures will continue at approximately the same level as in 1954, but the new obligational authority I am recommending will provide for a slightly higher level of shipbuilding in the years immediately ahead in order to meet the problem of "block obsolescence" of the fleet, a major portion of which was built during World War II.

Expenditures for military public works in the fiscal year 1955 will be maintained at the 1954 level, as work progresses on air bases, antiaircraft and radar sites, and other necessary installations. Expenditures for reserve components are expected to increase by about 20 percent as the buildup of a vigorous reserve program continues. Research and development will continue at a high level.

The following table shows, by major cost category, the elements making up the Department of Defense budget.

Department of Defense

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Cost category	Budget expenditures						New obligational authority
	1950 [1] actual	1951 actual	1952 actual	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	1955 estimated
Military personnel		$7,148	$11,152	$11,556	$10,910	$10,335	$10,673
Operation and maintenance		6,444	11,835	10,335	8,979	8,769	9,107
Major procurement and production		(3,976)	(11,478)	(17,123)	(17,273)	(14,546)	(7,303)
Aircraft		2,412	4,888	7,416	8,425	8,310	4,399
Ships		381	624	1,191	1,005	990	1,159
Other		1,183	5,966	8,516	7,843	5,246	1,754
Military public works		439	1,819	1,913	1,687	1,650	1,109
Reserve components		537	476	521	500	675	710
Research and development		758	1,163	1,412	1,425	1,350	1,352
Establishment-wide activities		621	656	666	735	740	739
Working capital (revolving) funds		−158	299	84	−19	−490	
Total	$11,892	19,765	58,898	43,610	41,550	37,575	30,993

[1] Detail not available.

Mutual military program: Because our own national security is vitally dependent on the continued strength of our allies throughout the free world, we have undertaken over the past several years to assist them in building the military forces necessary to deter Communist aggression from without or subversion from within. Since the beginning of the mutual defense assistance program in fiscal year 1950, when the armed strength of the free world was at low ebb, 18 billion dollars have been made available to furnish military equipment and training to friendly nations. More than half of this amount will have been spent by the end of the fiscal year 1954. This assistance, combined with their own resources, enables our allies and friends to equip and train an equivalent of 175 army divisions, about 220 air force squadrons, nearly 1,500 naval aircraft, over 440 naval vessels, and related combat and logistic units to back up these forces.

These friendly forces located in key strategic areas for the defense of the free world are largely supported by the countries themselves. In addition, substantial forces are exclusively supported by our allies. Without all of these forces the United States would be faced with a potential defense burden so costly that it could well sap the economic vitality of our Nation. These forces constitute an integral part of the military strength of the free world.

Since the mutual military program is so closely integrated with our own military plans and program, it is shown this year in the defense chapter of part II of the budget, and is discussed here as part of our national security program. Because the mutual military program is also an integral part of our foreign policy, the Secretary of Defense will continue to carry out his responsibilities for the mutual military program under the foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State and within the terms of the mutual security legislation passed by the Congress.

In this budget, mutual military program funds are shown under the new obligational authority of the Department of Defense. However, this arrangement is being reviewed and my recommendations will be set forth in connection with the authorizing legislation I shall recommend to the Congress. This authorizing legislation should permit adjustments in the composition of our aid programs to meet changing needs due to new international developments. It is therefore essential that the Congress maintain the present Presidential powers of transferability of all foreign assistance funds, whether for military, technical, or economic assistance.

The recent Paris meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization set realistic force goals for the 14 member nations, which will provide for a substantial increase in the defensive strength of NATO. The mutual military program provides the bulk of the initial equipment and certain mobilization reserves needed to meet these new goals. Meanwhile, our allies are themselves carrying heavy burdens. Their military budgets during the period of this program exceed by many times the value of the equipment we have so far delivered. They have expressed their determination to continue their efforts at high levels.

Despite the progress which NATO has made, we are nevertheless faced with a serious need to achieve the unity in Europe which is necessary for strength and security in the North Atlantic area. As is well known, the treaty constituting the European Defense Community is not as yet in effect. It is not necessary for me to dwell on the reasons why the EDC is urgently needed. However, I am convinced that the Europeans who must decide on this essential next step toward building a European community are fully aware of what is at stake and will in the near future reach their decisions.

NATO is engaged in a reappraisal of strategy and tactics to reflect the prospective availability of atomic and other new weapons. These studies, to be meaningful, require the dissemination of certain information regarding atomic weapons to NATO commanders. This will have a significant impact on NATO planning and provide a greater measure of security for all. I shall recommend that the Congress amend the Atomic Energy Act to permit us to disseminate classified information to our allies with regard to the tactical use of atomic weapons. This, of course, would be accomplished under stringent security regulations. It is essential that action on this matter be taken by the Congress during the current session.

In Indochina, where the French Union and Associated States forces are holding back Communist efforts to expand into the free areas of Asia, the United States is making a major contribution by providing military equipment and other

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

military support. The amount as well as the timeliness of this military assistance will be an important factor in improving the situation. Additional native forces must be trained and equipped to preserve the defensive strength of Indochina. This assistance is required to enable these gallant forces to sustain an offensive that will provide the opportunity for victory.

We have helped the Chinese Nationalist forces to strengthen the defense of the Island of Formosa. This assistance will be continued as will assistance to other countries of the free world such as the Philippines, Thailand, and some of the American Republics.

The mutual military program, like our domestic military program, is now designed to build strength for the long pull rather than meet a given target date. Accordingly, we will concentrate on helping equip forces which our allies can themselves support over a long period of time, with minimum dependence upon aid from the United States. We have succeeded in substantially reducing the need for additional funds in fiscal year 1955 compared to previous years.

Our mutual security program continues in two related parts—the economic and technical program is much smaller in amount than the mutual military program and is discussed in a later section under international affairs. In that section is a comparative summary of the combined program.

Development and control of atomic energy: In my speech before the United Nations on December 8, 1953, I made proposals looking toward a resolution of the atomic danger which threatens the world. My budgetary recommendations for the program of the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1955 contemplate both new efforts to advance peacetime applications of atomic energy and also additional production of fissionable materials. All men of good will hope that these fissionable materials, which can be used both for peace and for military defense, will ultimately be used solely for peace and the benefit of all mankind.

Under the recommendations in this budget, expenditures of the Atomic Energy Commission will rise in the fiscal year 1955 to the highest point in our history. Operating costs will rise significantly as newly completed plants are brought into production. Capital expenditures will continue at a high level as construction goes forward on major new plants authorized in recent years. New obligational authority recommended in 1955 is above that provided in 1954, because of the expansion in operations. Initiation of new construction projects will be at a lower level than in recent years, and they will be limited essentially to facilities directly related to the production program and to several urgently needed research and development facilities. In all areas of activity the Commission is making strenuous efforts to effect economies; results are being accomplished in the reduction of unit costs.

The increase in expenditures for operations from 912 million dollars in the fiscal year 1954 to 1,182 million dollars in 1955 is due primarily to expanded operations at the Commission's facilities at Oak Ridge, Paducah, Portsmouth, Hanford, and Savannah River, as plants are completed and placed in operation. To meet the greater requirements for raw materials for this enlarged productive capacity, increased amounts of uranium ores and concentrates will be purchased. Due to vigorous efforts in recent years to expand our sources of supply in this country and abroad, increased amounts are now being made available to match the increase in requirements.

Atomic reactor development will be focused particularly upon the development of industrial atomic power for peacetime uses. The Commission will move forward on the construction of a large atomic power reactor to be initiated in the fiscal year 1954, marking a significant advance in the technology of peacetime atomic power. Research and development, including construction of experimental facilities, will continue also on several other types of reactors which show promise of ultimately producing power at economic rates.

The launching—this month—of the first atomic submarine, the U. S. S. *Nautilus*, will be followed in the fiscal year of 1955 by the launching of the U. S. S. *Seawolf*, a second atomic submarine of different design. Research on the more difficult problems of aircraft propulsion by atomic energy will continue.

With the advent of various technical developments relating to atomic power and with the greater availability of raw materials and fissionable materials, the time has arrived for modification of the existing atomic energy legislation to encourage wider participation by private industry and by other public and private groups in this country in the development of this new and uniquely attractive energy source for peaceful purposes. Such widespread participation will be a stimulating and leavening force in this important field and will be consistent with the best traditions of American industrial development. The congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy last summer held public hearings which have served a most useful purpose of identifying and developing both the problems and the opportunities which emerge as preparations are made to depart from the Federal Government's existing monopoly in this field. Legislation is being recommended to the Congress which would encourage such participation and yet retain in the Federal Government the necessary controls over this awesome force.

Further amendment of the Atomic Energy Act is needed also to enable us to realize the full value of our atomic energy development for the defense of the free world. I shall recommend amendments which would permit, with adequate safeguards, a greater degree of exchange of classified information with our allies, in order to strengthen their military defenses—as already mentioned—and to enable them to participate more fully in the development of atomic power for peacetime purposes. I shall recommend also an amendment which would permit the transfer of fissionable material to friendly nations to assist them in peacetime atomic power development, particularly those nations which are supplying us with uranium raw materials. This proposed amendment, as well as the previously mentioned amendment, will provide adequate safeguards for the security of the United States. These legislative recommendations are independent of my recent proposal for the establishment of an international agency to advance the peacetime benefits of atomic energy, for which additional legislation would be needed.

It is now feasible to plan to terminate Federal ownership and operation of the towns of Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash. To enable the citizens of these communities to manage their own affairs in a more normal fashion, legislation will be recommended which would permit them to purchase their own homes and to establish self-government in these communities.

Stockpiling of strategic and critical materials: Considerable progress has been made in the fulfillment of the national stockpile goals, and further substantial progress is expected during the fiscal year 1955. By the end of 1955 about 50 of the 73 materials objectives will be virtually completed. Consequently, expenditures will decline sharply from 919 million dollars in 1953 to 770 million dollars in 1954 and 585 million dollars in 1955. The total value of all stockpile objectives is estimated at 7.2 billion dollars, of which about 5.5 billion will be on hand by June 30, 1955, to meet industrial and mobilization requirements in times of emergency. In addition to these direct expenditures from stockpile appropriations, the borrowing authority provided under the Defense Production Act, discussed in the finance, commerce, and industry section of this message, is used primarily for expanding the supply of critical materials. Net expenditures under this authority are estimated at 381 million dollars in the fiscal year 1954 and 308 million dollars in 1955. Therefore, a total of nearly 900 million dollars will be spent in the fiscal year 1955 to assure an adequate supply of critical materials in the event of an emergency.

VETERANS' SERVICES AND BENEFITS

Since 1940 the number of veterans has risen nearly fivefold and it is still increasing rapidly as men are discharged from the Armed Forces. There are now more than 20 million veterans, who, with their families, constitute 40 percent of our people. Over 300 laws provide a variety of special benefits and services to this large segment of our population.

It is our firm obligation to help our veterans overcome the handicaps which they incurred in the service of the Nation so they can return to their normal civilian pursuits. We must first of all do what we can to ease the burdens of veterans disabled in service and the families of those who have died from service causes. This is our primary responsibility, and generous benefits to

them are the core of our veterans' programs.

Secondly, we must make available readjustment aids through well-conceived and properly administered programs for those veterans discharged after service during national emergencies.

Finally, we must remember that the best way to help our millions of veterans is by making it possible for them to share fully in the economic and social gains of our country. This means assuring them adequate job opportunities. It also means assuring them, both during and after military service, of the same protection under the broad social-security programs that is provided for nonveterans. Progress in achieving these objectives will lessen the need for pensions and other special benefits for the vast majority of veterans who, fortunately, did not incur disabilities during their service.

The appropriations recommended in this budget will enable the Government to discharge fully our obligations to veterans in the coming fiscal year. Funds are included to provide for all essential benefits and services, in some cases exceeding the amounts spent in any previous year. At the same time allowance has been made for anticipated savings from improvements in efficiency, resulting in part from a general reorganization of the Veterans Administration.

Veterans' services and benefits

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Gross expenditures:				
Readjustment benefits:				
Education and training	$659	$473	$554	$350
Loan guaranty and other benefits (Veterans' Administration)	112	89	37	37
Unemployment compensation (Labor Department)	26	40	61	56
Compensation and pensions	2,429	2,485	2,535	2,535
Insurance and servicemen's indemnities	102	105	75	72
Hospitals and medical care:				
Current expenses	657	693	694	689
Hospital construction	100	84	60	44
Other services and administration (Veterans' Administration and other)	251	221	207	176
Total	4,327	4,190	4,223	[1] 3,959
Deduct applicable receipts:				
Insurance programs (Veterans' Administration)	1	2	3	----
Other services and administration (Veterans' Administration, primarily canteen services)	28	28	28	----
Net budget expenditures	4,298	4,160	4,192	----

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of 4,132 million dollars in 1953 and 4,229 million dollars in 1954.

Readjustment benefits: Education and training and loan guaranty benefits are provided for veterans of World War II and the current emergency. In addition, special vocational rehabilitation assistance is provided for service-disabled veterans of both periods, and unemployment compensation is available to veterans of the Korean conflict.

Expenditures of 652 million dollars for all readjustment benefits in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated to be about 8 percent higher than in the current year. While expenditures for benefits to veterans of the Korean conflict are increasing, outlays for education and training, rehabilitation, and loan guaranty benefits to World War II veterans are declining. Thus, the proportion of total outlays for all readjustment benefits going to veterans of the Korean conflict is expected to rise from about one-half to about four-fifths in the one year.

During the fiscal year 1955 an average enrollment of 537,000 veterans—more than 30,000 above the previous year—is expected in school, job, and farm training courses. Of this number, an estimated 412,000 are veterans of the Korean conflict.

A decline in expenditures for loan guaranty and other benefits from 1953 to 1955 reflects the discontinuance of payment by the Government of a gratuity up to 160 dollars on each guaranteed loan issued after September 1, 1953.

Unemployment compensation payments to veterans will increase. This is the result of the growth in the number of eligible veterans. While existing legislation was intended to provide benefits during the transition period after discharge, it does not include a limit on the time during which veterans may apply for unemployment compensation. I recommend that the law be changed to provide for a time limit for filing claims after discharge. This should provide reasonable time for veterans to make their readjustment to civilian life and to establish benefit rights under the general unemployment compensation program. Limits are now provided in the Servicemen's Readjustment Assistance Act for other benefits.

Compensation and pensions: The estimated expenditures of 2.5 billion dollars will provide for compensation and pension benefits to an average of 3.3 million individuals and families. This total includes nearly 1.8 billion dollars in compensation payments to service-disabled veterans and families of those veterans who have died from service-connected causes, and 700 million dollars for nonservice-connected pensions. It also includes 45 million dollars for subsistence payments to an average of 20,000 disabled veterans in the vocational rehabilitation program and for 115,000 burial awards.

Expenditures for compensation and pensions have increased sharply in the last decade, and the long-run outlook on the basis of present laws and veteran population is that these expenditures will rise to double their present annual amount within several decades. At the same time, a large proportion of the present or potential recipients of these benefits will also qualify for payments under the Government's old-age and survivors insurance program.

While the conditions under which veterans are entitled to compensation and pension benefits are largely specified by law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs necessarily has important responsibilities for their administration, and the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1955 assume additional efforts to prevent unsound practices and abuses.

Insurance and servicemen's indemnities: The Government reimburses the veterans' insurance trust funds for payments made for deaths traceable to war hazards in the case of policyholders under the national service life insurance contracts issued mostly to World War II veterans and under the United States Government life insurance policies issued to veterans of earlier periods. The Government also pays certain other insurance benefits directly to policyholders. Insurance payments are expected to decline from 84 million dollars in the fiscal year 1954 to 45 million dollars in 1955.

Since the enactment of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 as a substitute for a Government life insurance program, the families of servicemen who die on duty or within 120 days after separation are paid benefits at the rate of $92.90 a month for 10 years. These payments are expected to increase 41 percent from the 1954 level to 30 million dollars in 1955.

Hospital and medical care: The estimates for current expenses of the veterans' hospital and medical programs will provide for an average of 110,200 patients in Veterans Administration and contract hospitals and 25,700 members in Veterans Administration and State domiciliary facilities during the fiscal year 1955. The cost of caring for the increase of about 2 percent in the hospital load compared to the level now estimated for 1954 is offset, however, by lower amounts for the medical and dental outpatient care programs. The lower estimates for the dental outpatient care program are based primarily upon the recommendation that the Congress extend for 1955 the language enacted for the fiscal year 1954 in Public Law 149, 83d Congress, limiting dental treatment for noncompensable disabilities to those cases for which application for treatment is made within one year of discharge.

The budget includes recommended new obligational authority of 44 million dollars for new construction and improvements, including 30 million dollars to complete new hospitals at San Francisco and Topeka, toward which the Congress made an initial appropriation for the fiscal year 1954.

I am recommending increased appropriations to provide for an average employment in the Veterans Administration medical and hospital programs of 136,000 during the fiscal year 1955, an increase of 10,500 from average employment in 1953 and 3,000 more than in the current year. This increase provides for operation of the new hospital facilities which have been constructed.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Other services and administration: General administrative expenses of the Veterans Administration are estimated to decline further in the coming year as the result of declining workloads for readjustment of World War II veterans as well as improved performance resulting from better organization and greater efficiency. Average employment of 35,600 in Veterans Administration nonmedical programs is estimated for 1955, 11 percent below employment in the current year and 17 percent less than in 1953.

Trust funds: Under the United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance trust funds, nearly 7 million policies continue in force, carrying 44 billion dollars of life insurance issued before enactment of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951. The receipts of these funds now roughly balance their disbursements. The transactions of these, as of other, trust funds are not included in the budget totals.

Veterans' life insurance funds

(Trust funds)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated
Receipts:			
Transfers from general and special accounts	$84	$75	$36
Interest on investments	200	208	208
Premiums and other	427	522	485
Total	711	805	729
Expenditures:			
Dividends to policyholders	190	297	217
Benefits and other	470	533	524
Total	660	830	741
Net accumulation (+) or withdrawal (−)	+51	−25	−12
Balance in funds at close of year	6,613	6,588	6,576

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND FINANCE

My budget recommendations for the international programs of the Government will enable us to hold our newly won initiative in world affairs and move toward a lasting peace. The budget for international affairs and finance includes funds required for the conduct of our foreign affairs, for the programs for economic and technical development abroad, and for our foreign information and exchange program.

The mutual military program, which was formerly included in the budget along with these programs under the heading "International security and foreign relations" has been discussed in this budget message as part of the national security program. At the same time, military assistance is intimately related to and must be administered in the furtherance of our foreign policy.

The extent of our assistance under both the mutual military program and mutual economic and technical program is shown in a summary table below. This table covers all components of the present mutual security program. This entire program is directed toward the establishment of conditions overseas which, in one way or another, contribute to our own security and well-being.

Mutual security programs, military and economic

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 recommended or estimated
Expenditures:			
Mutual military program	$3,954	$4,200	$4,275
Mutual economic and technical program	1,702	1,300	1,125
Total	5,656	5,500	5,400
New obligational authority:			
Mutual military program [1]	4,236	3,800	2,500
Mutual economic and technical program [2]	1,907	926	1,010
Total	6,143	4,726	3,510

[1] Does not include reappropriations of 321 million dollars for 1953 and 1,763 million dollars for 1954.

[2] Does not include reappropriations of 128 million dollars for 1953 and 179 million dollars for 1954.

Our national security and international programs are designed to deter would-be aggressors against the United States and other nations of the free world, and to strengthen our efforts for peace by all appropriate means including diplomatic negotiations with the Soviets. With a position of strength, an effective conduct of our foreign relations by the Department of State is the keystone of our efforts to win our way to peace. There has never been a time when the future security and welfare of our country were more dependent upon the exercise of wise leadership in the realm of world affairs. My recommendation for funds for the Department of State will enable it to meet this challenge.

Some countries are still facing such economic conditions that they are not able solely by their own efforts to support the desired military effort or to provide for the economic growth and progress essential to our mutual objectives. It is thus still necessary that supplementary goods, services, and technical skills be provided by the United States. It is for these purposes that funds for economic and technical development are requested for fiscal year 1955.

Through our information and exchange program we are attempting to achieve a clear understanding by others of our aims, objectives, and way of life and a better understanding by us of the aspirations and cultures of other countries. Such mutual understanding increases our ability to exercise strong, sympathetic, and cooperative leadership in the mutual efforts of free peoples to achieve their common goals.

International affairs and finance

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program	Gross expenditures			Net expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Conduct of foreign affairs	$150	$129	$125	$150	$129	$125	$116
Economic and technical development:							
Present program [1]	2,306	1,943	1,105	1,960	1,555	658	15
Proposed legislation			370			370	1,010
Surplus agricultural commodities disposal (proposed legislation)							300
Foreign information and exchange activities	106	95	97	106	95	97	105
Total	2,652	2,167	1,697	2,216	1,779	1,250	1,546

[1] Gross expenditures exclude private bank loans guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank and net repayments thereof in the amounts of 4 million dollars in 1953, 82 million dollars in 1954, and 188 million dollars in 1955. Such amounts are included in table 1 and Special Analysis B.

During the past year progress has been made toward the accomplishment of the objectives of our international programs. Not only have our allies and friends grown in military strength, but also a continued high level of production and increased gold and dollar reserves have permitted European countries to become more nearly self-supporting. This improvement makes it possible for estimates of expenditures for economic and technical programs included in this budget to be significantly lower than the already reduced level of the fiscal year 1954. Significant contributory factors in this progress have been our assistance in past years and the positive and constructive fiscal and other economic measures which have been taken by the other countries themselves. As a result the fiscal year 1955 represents, in a sense, a period of transition from heavy dependence by a large number of countries upon massive bilateral economic assistance from the United States to the use of such assistance in more limited circumstances. Progress in such a transition will generally depend upon the extent to which our own policies, and those of our friends, contribute to increased private investment, increased exports to the United States, internal financial and economic reforms in some countries, and multilateral cooperation for the achievement of strong and self-supporting economies.

Conduct of foreign affairs: The burden of the vastly enlarged responsibility involved in our international affairs falls heavily upon the Department of State since the Secretary of State is the officer responsible, under the President, for the development and control of all foreign policy and for the conduct of our relations with foreign governments and international agencies. Successful discharge of this broad responsibility calls for wise and informed diplomatic support to our national leaders in negotiations carried on at the highest levels as at Bermuda and Berlin. It requires the day-to-day representation of our na-

tional interest through some 273 diplomatic missions and consular offices abroad. We also must continue to give our firm support to the United Nations and other international organizations, and bear a part of the costs of these organizations and their programs. A successful administration of our foreign policy requires the State Department to report and appraise political, economic, and social conditions and trends abroad; to provide foreign policy guidance to all agencies carrying on programs overseas; and to coordinate in the field all foreign policy aspects of overseas programs. Finally, advice must be furnished as to the foreign policy implications of domestic programs.

Net budget expenditures for the conduct of foreign affairs in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated at 125 million dollars. This expenditure represents a decrease of 4 million dollars from 1954, resulting from reduction of personnel and other costs of the Department of State including the curtailment of civilian occupation activities in Germany.

Economic and technical development: Net budget expenditures for economic and technical development in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated at 1,028 million dollars, compared with 1,555 million dollars in the fiscal year 1954 and 1,960 million dollars in 1953.

This budget, as did the fiscal year 1954 budget, reflects proportionately greater emphasis on programs in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It contemplates new appropriations for aid to very few European countries.

In the Far East there is a need for contributions to provide for relief in Korea and, now that hostilities have been terminated, for an expanded reconstruction program for that war-devastated country. Funds are also recommended to maintain the strength and security of Formosa and to support further the effort of our friends combating Communist aggression in Indochina. This budget also provides for technical assistance and economic development in India, Pakistan, the Philippines, and other nations of Asia to encourage continued progress in their efforts to improve the living conditions of their people.

With respect to the Near East the budget provides for helping relieve the plight of Arab refugees through contributions to the United Nations refugee agency, and for technical assistance and supplementary economic development in the Arab States, Israel, and Iran.

Provision is also made in the budget for continuing the technical assistance program for Latin America. This program, which has existed for a number of years, contributes to a reduction of social and economic problems upon which communism feeds and which hampers the development of stable and growing economies.

Surplus agricultural commodities: I plan to request authority soon to use a part of our accumulated surpluses of agricultural products to assist in strengthening the economies of friendly countries, and otherwise to contribute to the accomplishment of our foreign policy objectives. Authority will be requested to use for this purpose over a 3-year period up to 1 billion dollars worth of commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This budget anticipates a request for a supplemental appropriation of 300 million dollars for the fiscal year 1955 to reimburse that Corporation for commodities used.

This program for use of agricultural surpluses is designed to complement our general program of economic and technical development and must be closely coordinated with it. The program for use of surplus agricultural commodities involves the use of stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. No additional budget expenditures will be required for these commodities.

It should be emphasized in connection with this program that it is purely temporary, predicated upon adoption of our domestic agricultural program which should not involve the continued accumulation of large surpluses. Special safeguards will be provided which will require that commodities furnished must be in addition to amounts which otherwise would have been imported and must not displace the usual marketings of the United States and friendly countries.

Foreign information and exchange activities: This budget includes expenditures of 97 million dollars for foreign information and exchange activities, including those functions conducted by the new United States Information Agency. This is an increase of 2 million dollars over the expenditures for foreign information and exchange programs in the fiscal year 1954.

In October, on the advice of the National Security Council, I directed the United States Information Agency to develop programs which would show the peoples of other nations that the objectives and policies of the United States will advance their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress, and peace. I believe that if the peoples of the world know our objectives and policies, they will join with us in the common effort to resist the threat of Communist imperialism and to achieve our mutual goals. It is essential that the United States Information Agency have the tools to carry out this mission.

The United States Information Agency will reach 77 free countries through radio, press, motion pictures, or information centers and will reach 10 Iron Curtain countries through radio broadcasts.

My budget recommendations for information and exchange activities include 15 million dollars of new obligational authority for educational exchange programs. These programs are designed to promote a receptive climate of public opinion overseas through the exchange between the United States and over 70 foreign countries of students and persons who are leaders important to the present or future of their nations.

SOCIAL SECURITY, WELFARE, AND HEALTH

I believe that, along with the essentials of protecting the freedom of our people and maintaining a strong and growing economy, we must make greater and more successful efforts than we have made in the past to strengthen social security and improve the health of our citizens. In so doing, we build for the future, and we prove to the watching world that a free Nation can and will find the means despite the tensions of these times, to progress toward a better society.

The keystone of our social security program today is the system of old-age and survivors insurance, under which nearly 70 million people are insured and 6 million people are presently receiving benefits. The economic protection afforded by this social insurance is now accepted as basic in our society. Yet there are serious defects in the system. In my recent social security message, I submitted specific recommendations to remedy these defects.

The legislation to improve old-age and survivors insurance will not directly affect the budget totals, since this program is financed through payroll taxes which go into a trust fund, and the expenditures are made from the fund rather than from the general budget accounts. However, the legislation should lessen the need for expenditures from the general budget accounts to help the States pay public assistance to the needy aged and to dependent children, as old-age and survivors insurance takes over a larger and larger role in providing them with basic protection.

To reflect this development, legislation is being prepared to reduce Federal grants to States for old-age assistance as old-age and survivors insurance continues to take over an increasing share of the load. My social security message has set forth these recommendations in more detail.

Social security, welfare, and health

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Gross expenditures:				
Public assistance:				
Present program	$1,332	$1,391	$1,187	$1,202
Proposed legislation	.....	.....	108	108
Promotion of public health:				
Present program	316	280	281	234
Proposed legislation	.....	.....	7	89
Aid to special groups:				
Vocational rehabilitation:				
Present program	25	25	21	21
Proposed legislation	.....	.....	8	9
School lunch	83	83	68	68
Indian welfare and other	48	51	54	54
Accident compensation	43	42	43	43
Prisons and probation	29	27	28	29
Retirement and dependents insurance (Railroad Retirement Board)	33	35	.....	.....
Defense community facilities and services	1	4	2	.....
Total	1,910	1,947	1,807	[2] 1,857
Deduct applicable receipts	(1)	(1)	(1)	.....
Net budget expenditures	1,910	1,947	1,807	.....

[1] Less than 500,000 dollars.

[2] Compares with new obligational authority of 1,886 million dollars in 1953 and 1,919 million dollars in 1954.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This administration flatly opposes the socialization of medicine. Under the traditional American approach, private and nonprofit medical and hospital insurance programs have grown steadily and now cover a large segment of the population. Yet there is still a long way to go. Many families are not protected; many health costs are not insured. Positive action to promote the health of all our people has been recommended in my recent message.

The budget estimates for the fiscal year 1955 provide for the costs of the proposed legislation to improve the health of the people and also for the improvements and expansion of vocational rehabilitation services for the disabled. Experience has proved that these efforts pay for themselves many times over.

Including the proposed legislation, net budget expenditures for social security, welfare, and health in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated at 1,807 million dollars. This is 140 million dollars less than estimated expenditures in 1954. The decline results mainly from an expected reduction in public assistance grants to the States.

Public assistance: Under present law the Federal Government contributes, according to a statutory formula, to State expenditures for assistance payments to four groups of people in need—dependent children, the aged, the blind, and the totally disabled. With the expansion of the social security program, it is now feasible to recommend a new formula for public assistance grants which will more adequately recognize the varying financial needs of the several States and the appropriate role of the Federal Government in meeting these needs. The legislation which I am recommending would provide for a permanent formula to replace the present temporary increase in the Federal share which expires next September 30. This new formula includes specific provision for a related reduction in Federal grants to States for old-age assistance as the improved old-age and survivors insurance program takes over an increasing share of the load. A transition period for adjusting both Federal and State procedures will be necessary.

The decrease of nearly 100 million dollars in estimated expenditures for public assistance is made possible primarily by the proposed improvement in old-age and survivors insurance, which will reduce the need for supplementation by public assistance.

Promotion of public health: The budget provides for initiating our new program to help assure adequate medical and hospital services. The main elements of this program are:

(1) Establishment of a limited reinsurance service to encourage private and nonprofit health insurance organizations to offer broader health protection to more families on a basis which would reinsure the special additional risks through premiums modeled on sound insurance principles. The capital for this program will be provided initially by the Federal Government and repaid from fees.

(2) A broadening of the present Federal grant-in-aid program for hospital construction to stimulate provision of diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities, nursing homes, and additional chronic disease hospitals, and to help finance State surveys of their needs for such facilities.

The new program is estimated to require new obligational authority of 89 million dollars for the fiscal year 1955, of which 7 million dollars would be spent in that year.

Budget expenditures for all public health programs under existing legislation, excluding medical care for military personnel and veterans, are estimated at 281 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955. About one-half of this amount will be for grants to universities and medical schools for medical research and training, for clinical and laboratory research conducted by the Federal Government, and for operation of the Public Health Service hospitals. The Public Health Service hospitals primarily furnish hospital and medical care to American merchant seamen. The budget provides funds to continue these special services while the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has this program under review.

Other expenditures will be for grants-in-aid to State governments and local communities for hospital construction, general health services, maternal and child health, and the control of specific diseases, such as tuberculosis, cancer, mental illness, and heart ailments. With the major communicable diseases, including tuberculosis and venereal diseases, diminishing in importance as public health problems, greater emphasis is being given to the chronic diseases which are becoming more prevalent.

Vocational rehabilitation program: The estimate for the present program of vocational rehabilitation reflects congressional action, taken in the 1954 appropriation act, to require that a larger portion of the program be financed by the States. To revitalize the vocational rehabilitation program, I have recommended that we redefine our objectives so as to make possible a substantial increase in the number of persons rehabilitated.

School-lunch program: Budget expenditures shown for the school-lunch program for fiscal years prior to 1955 include funds for the purchase of commodities for distribution to the States, as well as for cash payments to the States. The amount recommended for 1955 will maintain cash payments to the States at the same level as in 1954. In addition, it is expected that larger Federal contributions of surplus agricultural commodities will be made to the program. These contributions are financed from a permanent appropriation to the Department of Agriculture. As a result, total Federal aid for the school-lunch program, including cash payments and surplus foods distributed under the program for the children are estimated at 218 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955 compared with 206 million dollars in 1954.

Railroad retirement: As described earlier, the railroad-retirement program is reported in this budget in the same manner as the old-age and survivors insurance program and appears in the tables on that basis. The change does not affect the budget deficit.

Trust funds: The old-age and survivors insurance system is operated through a trust fund, which receives the payroll contributions and pays the benefits and administrative expenses. The tax rate rose to 2 percent each on employers and employees, effective January 1, 1954. My proposals for expanding and improving the program will raise receipts by an estimated 100 million dollars, benefit disbursements by 400 million dollars, and administrative expense by 8 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955.

Social security, welfare, and health

(Trust funds)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Fund and item	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated
Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund:			
Receipts:			
Present program:			
Appropriation from general receipts	$4,086	$4,600	$5,369
Deposits by States	44	100	135
Interest and other	387	442	477
Proposed legislation			300
Payments of benefits, construction, and administrative expenses, and tax refunds:			
Present program	−2,748	−3,368	−3,899
Proposed legislation			−408
Net accumulation	1,769	1,774	1,864
Balance in fund at close of year	18,364	20,138	22,002
Railroad retirement fund:			
Receipts:			
Appropriation from general receipts	658	675	640
Interest on investments	89	98	105
Payments of benefits, salaries, and expenses	−465	−490	−513
Net accumulation	282	283	232
Balance in fund at close of year	3,183	3,466	3,698
Federal employees' retirement funds:			
Receipts:			
Employee contributions	425	427	427
Transfer from budget accounts and other	321	31	30
Interest	215	227	236
Payments of annuities and refunds, and expenses	−363	−421	−448
Net accumulation	598	264	245
Balance in funds at close of year	5,652	5,916	6,161

The Government also operates separate retirement programs for railroad workers, mentioned above, and for Federal civilian employees.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Good housing and the development of adequate community facilities are essential to the welfare of our people and to the stability and growth of our economy. Over the years the Federal Government has undertaken a wide variety of programs to assist our citizens in obtaining better housing. These programs, however, have been designed in the main to meet short-run emergencies or they have been developed piecemeal without a clear underlying policy. As a result, housing laws have become a patchwork which only experts can understand. Ex-

cessive reliance has been placed on direct participation by the Federal Government in areas where, properly encouraged, local governments or private enterprise could have carried a larger share of the total responsibility. Different Federal programs have too often worked at cross-purposes, resulting in heavy expense without commensurate gains. In some instances, they have aggravated inflationary price increases instead of working toward lower housing cost for the ultimate consumer. Finally, the weaknesses in the organization of Federal housing activities have prevented us from realizing the full potentialities of present programs.

At my request, the Advisory Committee on Housing Policies and Programs, under the chairmanship of the Housing Administrator, has intensively examined all Federal housing activities. After consideration of its report and the Administrator's recommendations, I am proposing a series of changes which have three important objectives: First, they would reorient existing programs to emphasize the initiative of private enterprise and the role of local governments. Second, they would fill important gaps in the present housing program and at the same time eliminate numerous unnecessary and obsolete activities. Third, they would strengthen the administration of these programs to assure the most economical and effective use of Federal funds in improving the housing conditions of the Nation.

To carry out these proposals I shall recommend major changes in legislative authority. I shall also submit a reorganization plan which will permit a more logical grouping of operating programs and give the Housing Administrator appropriate authority to supervise these programs and to determine major policies. Pending final decision on important details, estimates for these proposals are not specifically set forth in this budget. However, they will not have a significant effect on the Federal budget in the fiscal year 1955.

Most housing and community development programs involve both expenditures and receipts. In the fiscal year 1955 gross expenditures will total an estimated 1,903 million dollars, but receipts will exceed these expenditures by 277 million dollars. These net receipts compare with net expenditures of 549 million dollars in 1953 and the revised estimate of net expenditures of 57 million dollars in 1954. The great improvement in the fiscal outlook over the 2 years reflects mainly the fact that purchases of mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association are declining and sales are rising. Increased private financing for the public housing program is also reducing the need for Federal outlays.

Housing and community development

(Fiscal years. In millions)

Program or agency	Gross expenditures			Net expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Urban development and redevelopment	$25	$68	$97	$21	$38	$48	
Aids to private housing:							
Housing and Home Finance Agency:							
Federal Housing Administration	124	118	94	−43	−30	−60	
Federal National Mortgage Association	645	590	488	379	62	−166	
Other	15	16	4	−25	−38	−28	$4
Veterans' housing loans (Veterans Administration)	92	109	84	70	78	44	
Treasury (Reconstruction Finance Corporation)				−6	−50	−11	
Farm housing (Department of Agriculture)	19	17		19	17		
Public housing programs	1,027	1,222	956	1	−220	−234	77
General housing aids:							
Housing and Home Finance Agency:							
College housing loans	14	37	62	14	36	58	
Other	5	3	3	5	3	3	3
Provision of community facilities:							
Present programs	31	53	34	23	43	3	6
Proposed advances for public works planning			3			3	
Defense housing	28	31	1	28	31	1	
Civil defense	78	76	70	51	74	68	86
Disaster loans and relief	15	17	7	12	13	3	
Total	2,118	2,357	1,903	549	57	−277	[1] 176

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of 1,526 million dollars in 1953 and 628 million dollars in 1954.

Urban development and redevelopment: Too many families in our cities today are living in substandard housing in deteriorating and slum neighborhoods. Since 1949 the Federal Government has been providing loans and grants to local governments for clearance and redevelopment of slum areas. Most local projects approved for Federal assistance are still in the planning stage, but by the end of the fiscal year 1955, clearance and redevelopment operations will be completed or underway for 180 projects, compared to 43 projects begun by June 30, 1953. Net expenditures in 1955 are estimated to rise to 48 million dollars, of which 39 million dollars represents grants to local communities to cover two-thirds of the net cost of projects which they have completed, or on which they have made substantial progress.

This acceleration is encouraging, but clearing slums provides only a partial answer. Effective progress in redeveloping our cities will require (1) enlistment of greater local and private participation, (2) slum prevention as well as elimination, and (3) rehabilitation of rundown houses and neighborhoods. To help attain these objectives, I shall recommend legislation broadening the present program to authorize loans and grants for the conservation, rehabilitation, and renewal of neighborhood areas. Important changes should also be made in mortgage insurance authority of the Federal Housing Administration and in the low-rent public housing program, so that these programs can contribute more effectively to sound redevelopment. All of these aids should be fully coordinated and should be provided only in areas where the local community has adopted and is carrying out its part of an effective program to arrest urban decay.

Federal Housing Administration: As one of the major Federal aids to private housing, the Government insures mortgage loans made to finance housing construction or purchase. In the fiscal year 1955 under existing programs the construction of an estimated 190,000 new homes and the purchase of 126,000 existing homes will be financed with the aid of mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration. Receipts from premium income and other sources will exceed expenditures by an estimated 69 million dollars.

To encourage the substitution of private financing for Federal outlays in the areas of greatest housing need, I shall urge the Congress to authorize two new mortgage insurance programs, as well as to liberalize certain existing programs. Specifically, the Federal Housing Administration should now be authorized to insure private credit used for the rehabilitation of obsolete neighborhoods. It should also be given authority, on an experimental basis, to insure mortgages with small down payments and with the balance payable over a long period, to finance inexpensive homes for lower income families, particularly families displaced by rehabilitation and slum-clearance programs. Additional authority should be provided to adjust down payments and maturities for insured mortgages to the extent consistent with overall economic policy. I shall also recommend simplification of the basic housing laws by the elimination of numerous inactive or unnecessary programs and by simplification of the structure and operations of the existing mortgage insurance funds. At the same time, measures will be recommended to strengthen the insurance funds.

Federal National Mortgage Association: The Federal National Mortgage Association buys and sells mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration or guaranteed by the Veterans Administration. Gross expenditures are estimated at 488 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955, mainly for purchase of mortgages to finance military and defense housing under commitments made in earlier years. By 1955 the supply of private funds is expected to be adequate in most areas to provide financing for most other types of mortgages without Federal support.

The policy of this administration is to sell the mortgages now held by the Association as rapidly as the mortgage market permits. Assuming satisfactory market conditions, receipts from these sales and from other sources in 1955 will exceed expenditures by an estimated 166 million dollars. This contrasts with net expenditures of 379 million dollars in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

1953, and 62 million dollars estimated for 1954.

The legislation which I shall propose would provide authority to establish, from time to time, maximum interest rates and other terms on insured and guaranteed mortgages with the objective of encouraging an adequate, but not excessive, supply of private mortgage funds for all parts of the country. This proposal would make unnecessary in the future large Government purchases of mortgages such as were required in the past, whenever interest rates made such mortgages unattractive to private lenders. I shall also recommend the initiation of a new program, financed in large part from private funds, to furnish many of the secondary market facilities now provided by the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Other aids to private housing: Net expenditures for direct housing loans to veterans are estimated at 44 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955, compared with 78 million dollars in 1954. Sales of loans to private investors are expected to rise as a result of the recent increase in the rate of interest on these loans. Under existing law, disbursements will be made during 1955 only on loans for which commitments are made prior to the expiration of lending authority on June 30, 1954.

Authority for farm housing loans under title V of the Housing Act should be permitted to expire on June 30, 1954. Most of the essential needs can be met under other authorities and funds available to the Farmers' Home Administration.

The loans of three other programs will be substantially liquidated in the fiscal year 1954. These include mortgages held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, loans made by the Housing Administrator to the Alaska Housing Authority, and loans to various prefabricated housing manufacturers.

Public housing: As already indicated, I shall propose a new mortgage insurance program and other measures to encourage provision of private housing for low-income families. If these proposals prove effective, the need for future construction of low-rent public housing will be reduced. As an interim measure, however, the present public housing program should be continued at the level considered necessary to meet the needs of low-income families, particularly those displaced by slum-clearance and urban rehabilitation activities. Accordingly, my recommendations for the fiscal year 1955 in this budget would authorize construction of approximately 35,000 low-rent public housing units by local housing authorities, with the assistance of Federal loans and annual contributions adequate to assure the low-rent character of these units.

An estimated 956 million dollars in temporary Federal loans and other expenditures will be necessary to finance the operations of the low-rent and other public housing programs during the fiscal year 1955. Receipts from private refinancing of local housing authority obligations and other sources are estimated to exceed these expenditures by 234 million dollars. All except 8 million dollars of the 77 million dollars in new obligational authority requested is for payment of annual contributions under contracts made in prior years.

College housing: Under the Housing Act of 1950 the Housing Administrator makes direct loans repayable over 40 years to finance student and faculty housing at colleges and universities. Net expenditures for such loans in 1955 will rise to 58 million dollars, largely under commitments made in prior years. By June 30, 1955, over 200 loans will have been approved. These will finance construction of housing accommodations for about 50,000 students and faculty members. Wherever possible, private financing of these loans will be encouraged.

Provision of community facilities: The sharp reduction in net expenditures for provision of community facilities reflects mainly liquidation by the Treasury of loans to public agencies which were originally made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. No appropriations are being requested at this time for new loans to public agencies.

To encourage State and local governments to prepare for possible future expansion in public works construction, I am recommending legislation to authorize Federal advances to them for planning future construction. If the authority is granted, I shall request a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 of 10 million dollars, with estimated expenditures of 3 million dollars in 1955.

Civil defense: Expenditures for civil defense are included in housing and community development because of their community aspects, but the program is discussed in this message under national security. Federal expenditures for civil defense are estimated at 68 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955.

EDUCATION AND GENERAL RESEARCH

The citizen in a democracy has the opportunity and the obligation to participate constructively in the affairs of his community and his Nation. To the extent that the educational system provides our citizens with the opportunity for study and learning, the wiser will their decisions be, and the more they can contribute to our way of life.

I do not underestimate the difficulties facing the States and communities in attempting to solve the problems created by the great increase in the number of children of school age, the shortage of qualified teachers, and the overcrowding of classrooms. The effort to overcome these difficulties strains the taxable resources of many communities. At the same time, I do not accept the simple remedy of Federal intervention.

It is my intention to call a national conference on education, composed of educators and interested citizens, to be held after preparatory conferences in the States. This conference will study the facts about the Nation's educational problems and recommend sensible solutions. We can then proceed with confidence on a constructive and effective long-range program. Pending the outcome of these conferences and the development of our educational program, the Federal Government is providing assistance to those communities where school needs have been greatly increased by the activities of the Federal Government.

Budget expenditures for education and general research activities in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated at 223 million dollars. This figure does not include amounts spent for education and research in connection with the military, veterans', atomic energy, and certain other programs—which are classified in other sections of the budget. A comprehensive report on Federal research activities appears in Special Analysis H, page 1157.

Sixty-two percent of the expenditures for education and general research in the fiscal year 1955 will be for grants to those local school districts that have been burdened by Federal activities. Another 13 percent will be for grants to States to help support their vocational education programs and their land-grant colleges. The Federal Government also assists Howard University and educational institutions for the deaf and blind, and it maintains major library and museum services at the National Capital. Expenditures shown for general-purpose research are for programs of the Census Bureau, the National Bureau of Standards, and the National Science Foundation.

Education and general research

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures (net)			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Promotion of education:				
Office of Education:				
Assistance for school construction and operation in federally affected areas	$201	$199	$139	$99
Vocational education	25	26	25	25
Grants for colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts	5	5	5	5
Educational conference and other proposed legislation		1	1	(1)
Other	3	3	3	3
Educational aid to special groups	7	7	7	9
Library and museum services	11	12	12	12
General-purpose research:				
National Science Foundation	4	7	12	14
Bureau of the Census	13	9	10	10
National Bureau of Standards	8	9	9	8
Total	277	278	223	[2]185

[1] Less than 500,000 dollars.

[2] Compares with new obligational authority of 328 million dollars in 1953 and 217 million dollars in 1954.

Promotion of education: Responsibility for education in the United States belongs to the State and local governments. The Federal Government has for many years provided financial assistance for land-grant colleges and some other educational activities. The Office of Education also disseminates information on educational trends and good practices. In recent years, the problems of education have been increas-

ing in severity while this service has been reduced. My budget recommendations provide for an expansion of this basic activity.

The proposed national conference and preparatory State conferences will be most important steps toward obtaining effective nationwide recognition of these problems and toward recommending the best solutions and remedies. I recommend immediate enactment of the authorizing legislation and appropriations so that preparations for the individual State conferences as well as the national conference can begin at once.

Within the appropriation recommended for the Office of Education in this budget is provision to expand the studies and consultations through which it promotes better practices in education. One problem to which particular attention will be given is the meager education received by children of migrant agricultural workers. Because these children move with their parents from State to State, the problem of providing for their education can be solved only through special effort on a cooperative interstate basis.

In addition, I recommend that legislation be enacted which will enable the Office of Education to join its resources with those of State and local agencies, universities, and other educational organizations for the conduct of cooperative research, surveys, and demonstration projects. Legislation is necessary to make this cooperative effort effective.

An advisory committee on education in the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should be established by law. This recommendation carries forward an objective of the reorganization plan under which the Department was created last year. This committee, composed of lay citizens, would identify educational problems of national concern to be studied by the Office of Education or by experts outside the Government, and would advise on action needed in the light of these studies.

For these new activities directed toward the improvement and strengthening of our basic educational services, I am including 300,000 dollars in the 1955 budget and recommending a 1954 supplemental appropriation of 2 million dollars.

The last session of the Congress enacted legislation to extend temporarily the laws under which assistance has been provided to local school districts burdened by Federal activities, and to improve the original laws so that they will provide the aid economically and to the areas most acutely affected. As a result of these improvements, the recommended appropriation of 59 million dollars for school-operating assistance in the fiscal year 1955 is 14 million dollars below the amount for 1954. This assistance is provided to more than 2,000 school districts, with enrollments of almost 5 million children, of whom almost 1 million qualify for assistance because their presence is related to Federal activities.

The appropriation of 40 million dollars for school construction recommended for 1955, together with the 1954 appropriation of 70 million dollars, will provide for the most urgent classroom needs of the school districts eligible for this aid under the extended program. These funds are being used to help build almost 5,000 classrooms to serve 140,000 children.

Aid to special groups: A construction program now underway at Howard University will provide facilities for double the enrollment in the schools of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, and related health fields. This budget includes funds for the construction of the preclinical medical building, the last unit necessary to make this expanded enrollment possible. Although the university is not limited to any group, it serves as an important center of higher education for Negroes. The expanded enrollment, therefore, will help to alleviate the shortage of doctors, particularly Negro doctors.

Enrollment at the Columbia Institution for the Deaf has been increasing in recent years. Steps now being taken to enable the college to reach an accredited status in the near future include the provision of additional teachers and funds for the construction of a library-classroom building. One-third the cost of this building is being provided by contributions, primarily from former students.

General research: The National Science Foundation was created by the Congress in recognition of the need to formulate an adequate scientific research policy for the Nation. It is now engaged in intensive studies to that end, and is giving particular attention to the size and composition of the research activities of the Federal Government.

The Congress, at its last session, amended the basic act of the Foundation, removing the ceiling on appropriations to this agency in order to permit steps toward increasing the responsibility of the Foundation for the general-purpose basic research of the Federal Government. Approximately one-half of the 6-million-dollar increase I am recommending in the appropriation for the Foundation for the fiscal year 1955 is in reality a transfer of the responsibility and the financing for certain basic research programs from the Department of Defense to the National Science Foundation. The remainder of the increase is needed to expand basic research.

Within the appropriation for the National Bureau of Standards, there is also provision for an increase in basic research.

Additional basic research is needed to build up the fund of knowledge on which will be based the development of new crops for agriculture, new methods of safeguarding health, new tools for industry, and new weapons. A further important result is the training which basic research projects provide for graduate students in our universities. The number of trained scientists graduating each year falls short of the needs of our growing economy and is still declining. Enlargement of the research program and the related fellowship program will help counteract this trend.

Funds are requested for the fiscal year 1955 to permit the Census Bureau to conduct a sample census of agriculture. This census will provide essential data for current needs.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

My recommendations for Federal agricultural programs are designed to help in the solution of pressing immediate problems such as the hardships arising from severe drought in major farm areas, the squeeze on livestock producers resulting from lower cattle prices, and the disposal of excess stocks of wheat, cotton, vegetable oils, and dairy products which have been accumulated under provisions of price-support laws presently in force. They also take into account our long-run goals—promotion of a more stable and healthy farm economy, conservation and improvement of our basic agricultural resources, and provision of an adequate supply of food and fiber to match the needs of our increasing population.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Gross expenditures			Net expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Stabilization of farm prices and farm income:							
Price support, supply, and purchase programs (CCC):							
Existing programs [1]	$2,874	$2,832	$2,951	$1,831	$1,152	$1,105	
Proposed legislation							$1,750
International Wheat Agreement	131	84	89	131	84	89	
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	82	205	233	82	205	233	180
Sugar Act	63	65	65	63	65	65	60
Federal crop insurance	27	37	33	5	9	3	6
Agricultural adjustment programs	13	44	43	13	44	43	42
Financing farm ownership and operation:							
Farm Credit Administration	1,936	2,012	2,164	−83	−1	42	25
Farmers' Home Administration	177	193	168	177	193	168	168
Disaster loans and emergency feed	47	315	66	16	181	−17	
Financing rural electrification and rural telephones	239	250	232	239	250	232	137
Agricultural land and water resources:							
Agricultural conservation program	308	250	196	251	242	165	196
Soil Conservation Service, flood prevention and other:							
Existing programs	66	73	69	66	73	69	66
Proposed legislation			2			2	3
Research and other agricultural services	145	157	167	145	157	167	150
Total	6,108	6,523	6,473	2,936	2,654	2,366	[2] 2,791

[1] Gross expenditures exclude private bank loans guaranteed by the Commodity Credit Corporation and net repayments thereof in the amount of 340 million dollars in 1953, 1,564 million dollars in 1954, and 274 million dollars in 1955. Such amounts are included in table 1 and Special Analysis B.

[2] Compares with new obligational authority of 1,333 million dollars in 1953 and 2,302 million dollars in 1954.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Secretary of Agriculture has recently reorganized the Department to increase administrative efficiency and to make more effective the various services the Department renders. Activities have been grouped into major units consisting of closely related programs, and provision has been made for greater emphasis on research and extension work directed to the improvement of farm products, reduction of production and marketing costs, and broadening of both the foreign and the domestic markets for farm products.

Gross expenditures for agricultural programs in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated at 6.5 billion dollars. Repayments of loans and the sale of commodities constitute most of the receipts of the public enterprises carrying on certain of these programs. These receipts are estimated at 4.1 billion dollars. Hence, net budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated at 2.4 billion dollars. This is 288 million dollars less than estimated net expenditures in 1954 and 570 million dollars less than in 1953.

Stabilization of farm prices and farm income: Price support activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which account for nearly one-half of the estimated 1955 net budget expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources, have dominated the trend of these expenditures in recent years. There is no better evidence of the tremendous budgetary significance of these activities than the increase of about 2.5 billion dollars during the past calendar year in commodities held by the Corporation and in price support loans. Furthermore, present prospects indicate that, under present law, large additional budgetary outlays will be required for these activities in the fiscal year 1955. It is clear, therefore, that a thorough reconsideration by the Congress of the provisions of existing price support laws is needed not only in the interest of farmers, but also in the national interest.

In my recent special message, I recommended improvements in the price support legislation both to deal with the immediate problems arising from our large surpluses of agricultural commodities and to chart a course for the future that will more effectively achieve the goals of farm price supports. In most instances the reduction in budget expenditures which can be expected from improved and more flexible price support provisions will begin to be effective in the fiscal year 1956.

It is impossible, because of many variable factors, to estimate with any certainty the expenditures under these programs. Based upon the best information now available, it appears that the gross price support expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which reflect mainly the loans made and commodities acquired during the year, will be 3 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1955. Anticipated receipts of 1.9 billion dollars from loan repayments and commodity sales will result in net expenditures in the fiscal year 1955 of 1.1 billion dollars. These net expenditures for price supports are expected to be 47 million dollars lower than in 1954, and 726 million dollars below the high level reached in 1953.

The reduction in expenditures from the 1953 level is due primarily to the application of marketing quotas on wheat and cotton and acreage allotments on corn which are intended to reduce production from the 1954 crops. The estimates for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 also reflect greater emphasis given to private financing of price support operations. This, coupled with the customary timing for loan maturities, will result in a substantial proportion of the price supports on the 1953 and 1954 crops not becoming a Government expenditure until the loans held by private institutions mature, which will occur in 1955 and subsequent fiscal years.

All obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, whether in the form of borrowing from the Treasury or commodity loans held by banks and guaranteed by the Corporation, constitute a use of the statutory borrowing authority of 6.75 billion dollars. With the large volume of commodity loans and inventories now held and the increases expected in 1954 and 1955, it is estimated that the obligations of the Corporation may exceed its present borrowing limit during the annual peak, probably February 1954, and rise to a still higher level in the fiscal year 1955. I shall recommend to the Congress early in this session a supplemental 1954 estimate of 775 million dollars to restore borrowing authority to the Corporation, through cancellation of notes owed the Treasury, in an amount equal to the sum of the Corporation's capital impairment as of June 30, 1953, the advances during 1953 for control of foot-and-mouth disease, and the cost of operations under the International Wheat Agreement. This note cancellation will require immediate action by the Congress to insure that the Corporation can fulfill its statutory responsibilities under the present price support program.

I shall also recommend legislation to increase the borrowing authority of the Corporation by 1.75 billion dollars, effective July 1, 1954. This recommended increase in borrowing authority takes into account the increased commitments by the Government which would result from the proposed increase in the minimum 1954 cotton acreage allotment. While these commitments will be made in the fiscal year 1955, the cash expenditures by the Commodity Credit Corporation will not occur until 1956.

The recommended new obligational authority for the Corporation will meet the minimum foreseeable needs, provided steps are taken through new legislation to place our farm price support program on a sound basis for the future. A further request for additional borrowing authority may be necessary at a later date if conditions result in this amount being insufficient to provide for the commitments and expenditures required during the period the presently applicable price support provisions remain in effect.

Under the revised International Wheat Agreement, which became effective in the fiscal year 1954, our export quota for wheat has been reduced because of the withdrawal of Great Britain from the Agreement. Moreover, the maximum export price has been raised from $1.80 to $2.05 per bushel. As a result, expenditures under this program are expected to be only about two-thirds as much as in 1953 when our guaranteed export quota was larger and the spread between the domestic price and the export price of wheat was wider. While expenditures under the Wheat Agreement will be less in 1955 than in earlier years, the loss of wheat exports may increase wheat surpluses and thus cause larger outlays by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program than would otherwise occur.

The permanent appropriation for the removal of surplus agricultural commodities, enacted in 1935, is equivalent to 30 percent of the customs receipts for the preceding calendar year. In the fiscal year 1955 there will be available from this authority a carryover of 241 million dollars from prior years plus 180 million dollars of new authorization. This total of 421 million dollars compares with estimated expenditures in 1955 of 233 million dollars. Of this amount 150 million dollars of surplus commodities purchased under this program is estimated to be distributed to the national school lunch program in 1955, as compared with 123 million dollars in 1954 and 52 million dollars in 1953. This permanent appropriation will be used also to strengthen the work being done by the Foreign Agricultural Service in cooperation with the Department of State in developing new foreign markets for our agricultural products.

Financing farm ownership and operation: The Farm Credit Act of 1953, enacted by the last session of the Congress, restored the Farm Credit Administration to an independent status under the supervision of the Federal Farm Credit Board created by that legislation. It is the policy of this administration, through the Farm Credit Administration, to strengthen cooperative credit services on the basis of sound business-credit standards, and to increase farmer participation in the ownership and control of the Federal farm credit system to the end that the investment of the United States in the federally sponsored agricultural credit institutions may be retired within a reasonable time.

The cooperative credit institutions supervised by the Farm Credit Administration make both long- and short-term loans to farmers and to farmers' cooperatives. Short-term loans by the production credit associations are financed largely through the federally owned intermediate credit banks. Gross expenditures of these banks, which reflect mainly new loans, are expected to be approximately offset by receipts from loan repayments in the fiscal year 1955.

Direct loans to farmers by the Farmers' Home Administration, primarily for farm ownership, production and subsistence, and water facilities, are intended to supplement the credit services provided by private and cooperative credit agencies. The principal purpose of these loans is to help borrowers improve their financial situation so that they can qualify for private or cooperative credit. In the fiscal year 1955, the regular loan program will be continued at about the same level as that provided in 1954. Collections of principal and interest on old loans, which approximately equal new loans made, go directly into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury and are not deducted from budget expenditures of this program.

Existing legislation does not provide adequately for the financing of group water facilities and related small water supply projects. Proposals for legislation will be submitted at a later date to broaden the geographical area within which water facilities loans may be made, and to increase the loan limit.

The volume of special disaster loans to farmers increased sharply during the first half of the fiscal year 1954. This increase resulted mainly from loans made to stockmen and other farmers in drought-stricken areas to help them finance feed purchases and thereby avoid drastic liquidation of their livestock holdings. The Federal Government also contributed emergency feed from stocks acquired in price support operations and absorbed a part of the cost of making other feed available to farmers in these areas.

As of December 18, 1953, the Federal Government under this program had committed 52 million dollars to supply 1.4 million tons of feed concentrates and over 5 million dollars to cover the Federal Government's share of the cost of the hay program which is administered by the States. A recommendation will be made to the Congress shortly to assure a continuation of advances to States for assistance in distributing hay to farmers and ranchers in the drought areas. In addition, meat purchases of 86 million dollars by the Government up to December 16, 1953, financed from the permanent appropriation for removal of surplus agricultural commodities, have resulted in the removal of about 780,000 head of cattle from the market. The disaster loan program, along with provision of emergency feed and purchases of meat by the Department of Agriculture, supported livestock prices at a time when the market otherwise would have been more depressed by forced liquidation of livestock. The need for new loans and other emergency assistance is expected to be greatly reduced by the spring of 1954, and collections during the fiscal year 1955 on disaster loans made in prior years should exceed new loans made.

Financing rural electrification and rural telephones: The need for rural electrification loans has become less as the proportion of our farms that are electrified has increased. About 91 percent of our farms are now electrified. Only about 42 percent of our farms, however, have telephone service. The budget recommendations for these two programs in the fiscal year 1955 provide loan funds sufficient to finance substantial further expansion of electrification and telephone services in rural areas. In order to reduce the need for future Federal aid, this administration also is exploring possible arrangements whereby more private capital can be made available to finance telephone services in rural areas.

Agricultural land and water resources: The need for greater emphasis on conservation and development of our agricultural land and water resources was set forth in my special message to the Congress on this matter on July 31, 1953. The budget estimates provide for 66 million dollars under existing legislation to continue and improve the technical and advisory services of the Soil Conservation Service and for related activities.

Additional work should be undertaken with a view to strengthening our vital upstream conservation activities. Farmers increasingly realize that it is in their own interest to do more of this work. Because the Nation as well as farmers and local communities receive benefits, this work should be a joint responsibility. Existing law, however, does not provide an adequate basis for cooperative upstream development. The 1955 budget, therefore, includes 3 million dollars under proposed legislation to permit the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with State and local agencies in the planning and installation on small watersheds of the necessary protective facilities, and to provide for better conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water. This will supplement the 11 million dollars to be spent under existing law for watershed protection and flood prevention projects.

In conformance with the forward authorization for the 1954 crop year enacted in the 1954 appropriation act, the budget provides 195 million dollars for the agricultural conservation payment program in the fiscal year 1955. A proposed revision of this program will be recommended to the Congress. The proposal involves no expenditures in the fiscal year 1955.

Research and other agricultural services: To achieve a more efficient and stable agriculture and to provide for the future needs of a growing population, increased attention must be given to research and educational work on problems of agricultural production, soil conservation, and marketing. The 1955 budget includes 112 million dollars for research and extension work, an increase of 18 million dollars over the estimate for the fiscal year 1954. This work is done in cooperation with State and private agencies. The budget recommendations will provide for a needed expansion of research on marketing and utilization of farm products and of other scientific research conducted by Federal agencies, and increased payments to States for related cooperative research programs. This budget also will provide greater Federal contributions to the Federal-State extension program.

The recommended increase in Federal appropriations for cooperative research and extension work is accompanied by a recommended decrease in appropriations for certain regulatory activities carried on jointly with the States. The budget contemplates elimination of Federal contributions for tuberculosis and brucellosis indemnity payments and curtailment of Federal quarantine and similar operations in a number of insect and plant disease programs. The shift in responsibility for continuation of these programs is in accordance with the policy of this administration that the Federal Government should withdraw from activities which we believe can be more appropriately carried on by private enterprise or by State and local governments.

A strengthening of agricultural research and the wide dissemination of improved techniques through extension work will contribute to the efficiency of farm production and marketing, benefiting both producers and consumers. This will provide the solid foundation for a more prosperous and stable agriculture and ultimately for less reliance on Government price support and other financial aids.

NATURAL RESOURCES

My recommendations for the natural resources programs of the Government are based on a reappraisal of the responsibility which the Federal Government should exercise in the development of our resources. At the same time, the recommendations have been made with due regard to our overall fiscal position. To keep the Federal financial burden at a minimum while defense expenditures remain high, some improvements and program expansions which might be desirable have not been included in this budget. Emphasis has been given to careful planning to insure sound development of our natural resources. Such development should be timed, whenever possible, to assist in leveling off peaks and valleys in our economic life.

A strong program of resource conservation and development is necessary to support the progressively expanding demands of our increasing population and to contribute to the economic growth and security of the Nation. Achievement of this goal requires a combined effort on the part of States and local communities, citizens, and the Federal Government. To the greatest extent possible, the responsibility for resource development, and its cost, should be borne by those who receive the benefits. In many instances private interests or State and local governments can best carry on the needed programs. In other instances Federal participation or initiative may be necessary to safeguard the public interest and to accomplish broad national objectives.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Natural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Gross expenditures			Net expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Land and water resources:							
Corps of Engineers: Flood control and multiple-purpose projects:							
Existing program	$579	$416	$361	$579	$416	$361	$342
Proposed legislation: Aid for non-Federal development of water resources			5			5	5
Department of the Interior:							
Bureau of Reclamation: Irrigation and multiple-purpose projects:							
Existing program	235	182	167	231	180	164	160
Proposed legislation: Federal projects			(1)			(1)	(1)
Proposed legislation: Aid for non-Federal development of water resources			5			5	5
Power transmission agencies	65	64	53	65	64	53	39
Indian lands resources	32	36	35	29	35	34	27
Bureau of Land Management and other	14	16	15	14	16	15	16
Tennessee Valley Authority	315	366	439	184	195	212	142
Department of State	15	9	5	15	9	5	2
Federal Power Commission	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Forest resources	107	116	110	107	116	110	108
Mineral resources	41	41	39	38	38	36	36
Fish and wildlife resources	34	37	38	34	37	38	36
Recreational use of resources	30	34	34	30	34	34	29
General resource surveys and other	28	28	27	28	28	27	27
Total	1,499	1,349	1,337	1,358	1,172	1,103	[2] 978

[1] Less than 500,000 dollars.

[2] Compares with new obligational authority of 1,396 million dollars in 1953, and 1,026 million dollars in 1954.

Estimated net expenditures of 1.1 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1955 will provide for the management and protection of the resources which belong to all the people and which are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. About three-fourths of this total will be for flood control, irrigation, power, and multiple-purpose river basin development. The remainder will be spent on the management, development, and protection of our national forests, parks, and other public lands, and for mineral and fish and wildlife resources and basic surveys. Activities to advance the peacetime applications of atomic energy, which will be of increasing significance in 1955, are discussed with other activities of the Atomic Energy Commission in the national security section of this message.

Land and water resources: Under my recommendations in this budget, the Federal Government will spend an estimated 858 million dollars for the conservation and development of land and water resources in the fiscal year 1955. A major part of this represents investment in assets which will yield benefits long into the future.

This administration is developing a sound and uniform national policy for the conservation, improvement, and use of water and related land resources, designed to assure that future programs are not only responsive to local requirements but are consistent as well with the needs of the Nation as a whole. As a step in this direction, a statement of principles has been issued on the generation, transmission, and disposal of electric power. Standards for the justification of proposed water resources projects are currently being reviewed by the executive branch. Special attention is being given to requirements for the sharing of costs among private beneficiaries, State and local groups, and the Federal Government. Also, the Congress has established commissions to examine resource programs, as well as other Federal activities, and to make recommendations with respect to them. As the various studies are completed, I shall make specific legislative recommendations to the Congress.

This administration has also taken and will continue to take steps to encourage non-Federal interests to formulate plans and undertake development of water resources, including hydroelectric power, which are consonant with the best use of the natural resources of the area. An outstanding example of cooperation between various levels of government—State, Federal, and international—in multiple-purpose development of a resource is the proposal for the development of the St. Lawrence River. It would also be in the public interest for construction to be undertaken, on a non-Federal basis, to realize the power potential of the Niagara Falls site.

Basic resource surveys and advance engineering and design activities will be carried on in 1955 at rates necessary to provide for further development of our resources. Federal activities in projects or plans will not imply any exclusive reservation of such projects to Federal construction or financing or preclude local participation in them. Needed projects to be constructed by the Federal Government may include those which, because of size and complexity, are beyond the means of local, public or private enterprise.

My budget recommendations also provide for the continuation of river basin work now underway. Less urgent features of the projects, not required for operation of going or completed units, will be deferred. Budget expenditures of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers include an estimated 443 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955 to carry on construction of about 160 river basin development projects. A substantial amount of these expenditures is for multiple-purpose development for irrigation, flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power. During the fiscal year 1955, 20 projects will be completed or substantially completed, including 9 flood control projects, 5 irrigation projects, and 6 multiple-purpose projects with power facilities.

In furtherance of the policies of this administration, I am recommending the starting of some new projects or new units of existing projects by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as the resumption of some previously deferred projects. The budget recommends commencing work on 6 irrigation and water supply projects, 8 local flood prevention projects, and 8 navigation projects, one of which I recommend starting in the fiscal year 1954 with supplemental funds. In addition, it provides for resumption of work on 2 flood control reservoirs and 2 river and harbor improvements. This work is estimated to cost a total of 184 million dollars, with expenditures of 20 million dollars scheduled for the fiscal year 1955. Together with the St. Lawrence Seaway, this totals to 23 new projects and 4 resumptions in the budget. The navigation projects, including the St. Lawrence Seaway, are discussed in this message with the transportation and communication programs. Recommendations for related watershed protection and flood prevention activities of the Department of Agriculture are discussed in the section on agriculture and agricultural resources.

The new local flood prevention works, to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers, are relatively small projects and can be completed within 3 years. The detailed plans preliminary to construction have been completed. Each of the projects has a favorable ratio of benefits to costs and provides for a reasonable degree of financial cooperation by local interests. Resumption of work is proposed on 2 flood control reservoirs, each of which is about one-third completed.

The new projects recommended for the Bureau of Reclamation include 3 projects already authorized and 2 projects under legislation I am proposing. Commencement of work is also recommended on a new pumping unit of an irrigation project now under construction. These are small or intermediate-sized developments. In their selection, consideration has been given to the benefits of supplemental irrigation for established farming areas, to more intensive and beneficial use of existing water supplies, and to the ability of the water users to make a reasonable repayment of the investment. In the case of one of the projects which requires authorization, I have recommended to the Congress that provision be made in the legislation for repayment within 50 years of all reimbursable costs, and that con-

struction of the project be made contingent on the assumption by the State, together with local organizations, of financial responsibility for reimbursable costs beyond the ability of the water users to repay. This principle is in line with the policy of this administration that, to the greatest extent possible, the cost of these developments should be borne by those who receive the benefits.

In accordance with this administration's policy of encouraging State and local undertakings, there is included in the budget an initial appropriation of 10 million dollars under proposed legislation to enable the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to cooperate with States, local governments, or private groups in the development of their water resources. It is thought that there are projects on which State and local interests could go forward with some Federal assistance. Such assistance should be provided on an equitable financial basis and should be limited to projects from which benefits would accrue to the general public.

The power policy of this administration recognizes the willingness of State and local groups to participate in providing additional power facilities. Where the necessary transmission facilities are not being provided on reasonable terms by other public or private agencies, the Department of the Interior will construct and operate transmission lines that are economically feasible and are necessary for proper interconnection and operation of Federal generation plants, and those that are required to carry power to load centers within economic transmission distances. As a result of this policy and the approaching completion of transmission systems required for carrying out arrangements for marketing power from Federal projects under construction, combined expenditures of the Bonneville, Southeastern, and Southwestern Power Administrations in the fiscal year 1955 will be less than in 1954.

Under the Federal Power Act, licensees of hydroelectric projects which benefit from headwater impoundments of other projects, either public or private, must make annual payments to the upstream developer in accordance with benefits received. The Federal Government is not required to make similar payments when Federal projects derive such benefits. In simple equity, this should be done. I recommend enactment of legislation which would require such Federal payments.

Although no appropriations are included in the 1955 budget for new power generation units by the Tennessee Valley Authority, expenditures will increase for continuation of construction of power plants presently underway, and for operation of power plants after they are completed. Expenses for operation of flood control, navigation, and fertilizer facilities will continue at about the 1954 level. Expenditures for power and fertilizer operations are more than offset by the income from sales. In order to provide, with appropriate operating reserves, for reasonable growth in industrial, municipal, and cooperative power loads in the area through the calendar year 1957, arrangements are being made to reduce, by the fall of 1957, existing commitments of the Tennessee Valley Authority to the Atomic Energy Commission by 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts. This would release the equivalent amount of Tennessee Valley Authority generating capacity to meet increased load requirements of other consumers in the power system and at the same time eliminate the need for appropriating funds from the Treasury to finance additional generating units. In the event, however, that negotiations for furnishing these load requirements for the Atomic Energy Commission from other sources are not consummated as contemplated or new defense loads develop, the question of starting additional generating units by the Tennessee Valley Authority will be reconsidered.

In order to carry out the power policy of this administration which requires an interest charge on the Federal investment in power facilities to reimburse the Treasury for the cost of providing funds, a proposal is being developed for submission to the Congress to provide that an adequate rate of interest be paid to the Treasury on public funds invested in power facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority. For this purpose, I have requested that a study be undertaken by the agency in cooperation with other executive agencies.

National forests and other public lands: The development and use of our public lands should be on a businesslike basis with due regard for proper conservation and for the rights and interests of States and private citizens. Programs of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management provide for the management, development, and increasing use of the valuable timber, forage, and mineral resources of the national forests and public lands, and also for the protection and use of these lands for their strategic watershed and other public values. Receipts from the use of these lands, estimated at 154 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955, are shared with the States and counties in which the lands are located.

The budget contemplates the withdrawal of Federal financial participation in certain phases of State and private forestry cooperation, with greater assumption of responsibility by local interests. At the same time, emphasis will be placed by the Forest Service on cooperative research. Increased funds are recommended to complete construction of access roads needed to salvage the timber in the beetle-infested and windblown forest areas of Washington and Oregon.

Expenditures for the management and protection of our national parks, monuments, and historic sites will be somewhat above the current-year level, so as to provide for improved services to the increasing number of visitors. This increase is largely offset by a reduction in expenditures for construction. Federal aid to States for fish and wild-life restoration, financed by special taxes on fishing and hunting goods, will increase.

As a part of the administration's objective of charging reasonable fees for services or facilities provided by the Government for private individuals or groups, consideration is being given to adjustments which would result in increased receipts to the National Park Service, thus returning to the Treasury a larger amount of the costs of maintaining and operating our national parks.

Expenditures on Indian land resources will provide for soil conservation work and further development of water supplies and timber and range resources necessary for their economic development. In the fiscal year 1955 appropriations will be reduced from their level in 1954 as a result of the slowing down or deferring of some construction projects—which will be accomplished without jeopardizing the overall objectives of the Indian programs.

Mineral resources: I have recently appointed a Cabinet committee to establish guidelines for the prudent use and development of domestic mineral resources and to assure our growing economy of necessary mineral supplies in time of emergency. The report of this committee, expected within the next few weeks, should be helpful in resolving many of the problems facing the mineral producers of the Nation.

The Bureau of Mines will continue its basic research programs in the fiscal year 1955 for the aid of private development of resources, with emphasis on expanding the utilization of minerals in abundant supply and the development of suitable substitutes for materials in short supply. The Federal Government will also encourage private development by undertaking basic resource surveys, providing incentives for exploration of high priority minerals, and assisting in the development of oil and gas reserves of the Outer Continental Shelf.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION

Efficient transportation and communication services are essential to the national economy and the national security. At my request, an intensive reappraisal of Federal responsibilities is underway both by the regular departments and agencies and by special commissions. The general principles guiding this reappraisal are that the national interest will usually be served best by a privately owned and operated industry, which is supported by a minimum of Federal funds or Federal basic facilities and services operated at the lowest feasible cost and financed, where possible, by charges levied on the users of the services.

In the fiscal year 1955 net budget expenditures for transportation and communication programs will decline to an estimated 1,418 million dollars, compared with 1,856 million dollars in 1954 and 2,077 million dollars actually expended in 1953. The largest decrease is the anticipated reduction of the postal deficit by operating savings and by increased postal rates. Sizable reductions have also been made in other large programs.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Transportation and communication

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Gross expenditures			Net expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Promotion of aviation:							
Civil Aeronautics Administration	$161	$146	$121	$161	$146	$121	$104
Civil Aeronautics Board (subsidies to air carriers)		54	80		54	80	73
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	78	91	77	78	91	77	58
Promotion of merchant marine:							
Maritime Administration	358	262	156	235	196	107	102
Inland Waterways Corporation	12	1	(1)		−2	−1	
Provision of navigation aids and facilities:							
Coast Guard	230	236	190	230	236	190	181
Corps of Engineers:							
Present programs	113	102	106	113	102	106	103
Proposed legislation (St. Lawrence seaway)			6			6	105
Panama Canal Company	106	102	99	−10	−2	−1	
Provision of highways:							
Bureau of Public Roads:							
Present programs	550	502	582	550	502	582	10
Proposed legislation							508
Alaska roads and other	22	20	17	22	20	17	13
Postal service:							
Present program	2,775	2,775	2,775	669	440	330	329
Proposed increase in postal rates						−240	−240
Regulation of transportation	17	16	16	17	16	16	16
Other services to transportation	45	42	45	15	−40	21	22
Regulation of communication	7	7	7	7	7	7	8
Total	4,474	4,446	4,277	2,077	1,856	1,418	[2] 1,482

[1] Less than 500,000 dollars.

[2] Compares with new obligational authority of 1,925 million dollars in 1953 and 1,756 million dollars in 1954.

New legislative authority is required to move more rapidly toward putting the postal service on a self-supporting basis and to establish a corporation to operate the Washington National Airport. I am also recommending legislation to permit us to participate in the St. Lawrence Seaway, and to continue and strengthen the Federal-aid highway program.

Promotion of aviation: The rapid development of aviation has been materially assisted by numerous services and by direct financial assistance provided by the Federal Government. These aids have included basic scientific research in aeronautics, establishment and operation of airways, enforcement of safety regulations, assistance in construction of airports, and direct provision of subsidies to airmail carriers. While need for some aid continues, the increasing maturity of this industry requires thorough reevaluation of the promotional responsibilities of the Federal Government. At my request, the Air Coordinating Committee is now undertaking a comprehensive review of our aviation policy.

With growing maturity, the airline and aircraft manufacturing industries should assume increased responsibility for air safety. Improved procedures of traffic control, elimination of older-type facilities, and curtailment of less essential services should permit an expanded volume of air traffic to be handled safely with reduced Federal expenditures for operating programs. Expenditures for construction programs are likewise declining.

As a result of these developments, expenditures of the Civil Aeronautics Administration can be reduced and we can still fulfill the basic Federal responsibilities for providing air-navigation aids, traffic control, and safety services. Budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated to be 25 million dollars less than in 1954, and 40 million dollars less than in 1953.

I am recommending appropriations for new airways facilities amounting to 5 million dollars, which will permit further progress on the modern very high frequency system of navigation aids and certain other improvements. Pending completion of current studies, no provision is made in the budget for additional appropriations for grants to State and local governmental units for airport construction.

In addition, the time has come when consideration should be given to requiring the users of the airways facilities to share the costs of providing this service.

Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953, transferring the subsidy portion of airmail payments from the Postmaster General to the Civil Aeronautics Board, makes it possible for the first time for Congress to consider this major aid to aviation as a separate budget item. For both 1954 and 1955, these subsidy payments are estimated at approximately 80 million dollars, based primarily on existing route patterns and mail rates. The subsidy expenditures were included in the Post Office Department through September 1953. The separation of compensatory mail payments, which remain in the Post Office, from subsidy payments is a necessary first step toward a more effective review of expenditures for civil aviation as well as for the postal service.

The scientific research in aeronautics conducted by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics will continue in the fiscal year 1955 to be devoted almost entirely to support of the military programs for the development of new and improved aircraft, guided missiles, and propulsion systems. The budget provides for a strong continuing program in aeronautical research and for initial operation of the three new large supersonic wind tunnels now under construction. Nevertheless, expenditures will be 14 million dollars less than in the fiscal year 1954 because of the sharp decrease in construction expenditures as projects are completed. The superior performance of our jet aircraft in Korea and the even better performance of newer types now in production has been possible because of the basic research and wind-tunnel testing done in previous years. Much of the work will also contribute eventually to improving the performance, safety, and comfort of civil aircraft. Future possibilities are hinted by the recent performance of our research airplanes, one of which attained a speed of over 1,600 miles per hour—two and one-half times the speed of sound.

Merchant marine: Federal aid to the merchant marine consists primarily of operating and construction subsidies to offset the differences between American and foreign costs. This program is designed to promote a healthy merchant marine as a nucleus capable of rapid expansion to meet national-defense needs. The sharp reduction in expenditures will result almost entirely from virtual completion of construction of the 35 Mariner-class vessels authorized in 1951.

Expenditures for operating subsidies have been rising steadily, and in 1955 will account for 85 of the 107 million dollars in net expenditures for maritime programs. These increases reflect not only faster payment of earlier obligations but also higher levels of subsidy resulting from the increased operating costs in recent years. The size and rising trend of expenditures for these subsidies make it essential to consider legislative changes to provide for more effective budgetary control consistent with the basic objectives of the maritime program.

Operating programs of the Maritime Administration show a downward trend. By the end of the fiscal year 1955 the emergency operation of Government-owned cargo vessels will be reduced to about 47, compared to a high of 538 in 1952. Ships withdrawn from operation are being maintained in the national-defense reserve fleet to meet future emergency needs.

The physical assets of the Inland Waterways Corporation were sold as of July 1, 1953, in accordance with this administration's policy of removing the Federal Government from an activity which is appropriately private. The terms of sale fully protect the public interest in the continuance of the common-carrier barge service along the Mississippi and Warrior Rivers.

Navigation aids and facilities: The expanded search-and-rescue facilities of the Coast Guard established in support of Department of Defense activities are being curtailed. Moreover, the fact that our transoceanic civil aviation no longer has a requirement for ocean weather stations has made it possible to reduce the number of these stations to those required by the Department of Defense, which in the future will finance them. These and other realinements will permit Coast Guard financed expenditures to be reduced from 236 million dollars in fiscal 1954 to 190 million dollars in fiscal 1955.

The Corps of Engineers will carry forward at minimum levels the maintenance work required for continued operation of river and harbor projects. Construction will also continue in 1955 at economic rates on 13 channel, harbor, or lock and dam projects, including one project to be initiated by a proposed 1954 supplemental appropriation. Seven other projects will be initiated and 2 deferred projects resumed in 1955. These projects have been selected on the basis of assuring the expeditious movement of traffic in existing harbors or waterways serving important requirements of commerce or national security. Emphasis has been given to small- or intermediate-sized projects for which detailed engineering plans have been completed. Not only do the benefits of these projects exceed their costs, but also, except for four high-priority projects of national interest, local beneficiaries will make a reasonable financial contribution.

In my state of the Union message I again strongly recommended enactment of legislation to create a Government corporation to work, along with Canada, on the construction and operation of the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway. This proposal, now before the Congress, represents one part of a broad development of the great potential of the St. Lawrence River for electric power and for navigation. The power features of the International Rapids section are expected to be constructed in part by the Province of Ontario and in part by the State of New York. The seaway legislation would permit the Federal Government, in cooperation with Canada, to build the remaining navigation facilities needed for ocean-going vessels to reach the Great Lakes. The total amount to be invested by the United States in the seaway is now estimated at 105 million dollars, with first-year expenditures of 6 million dollars. As I have previously indicated, not only would the seaway make a major contribution to national security, but over a period of years the tolls received by the United States from the prospective commercial use should permit the Federal investment to be fully repaid. Joint participation with Canada in this undertaking will assure that all legitimate American interests are taken into account in the construction and operation of this vital transportation link.

Highways: Expenditures under the Federal-aid highway program of grants to States for highway construction have been rising during the past year, and will continue to rise in the fiscal year 1955 under commitments made pursuant to the Highway Act of 1952. The 1955 expenditures will be the highest in history. Emphasis in the selection of new projects will be given to the national system of interstate highways, which comprises the most important routes for interstate commerce and national defense. Of the 555 million dollars of estimated expenditures under the Federal-aid program in the fiscal year 1955, about 150 million dollars will be spent for projects in the interstate system. Other construction programs of the Bureau of Public Roads will involve expenditures of 27 million dollars, mainly for direct construction of forest highways and defense access roads.

We should give increased attention to eliminating the existing inadequacies of the national system of interstate highways. Pending development and review of detailed proposals for extension of the Federal-aid highway program, I am including under proposed legislation the 575-million-dollar level of the existing authorization. Similarly, I am including the prevailing annual rate of 22.5 million dollars for the forest-highway program. No appreciable expenditures will be made under the proposed authorizations in the fiscal year 1955.

Postal service: Measured both in dollars and in employees, the postal service is big business. But, in its management, the modern methods which have so greatly increased the efficiency of private business have too often been ignored.

Last February, I announced "a program directed at improving service, while at the same time reducing costs and decreasing deficits." Progress is being made toward achieving these objectives and will continue.

First, we are speeding the delivery of mail by many new steps without significant change in costs of handling. Later window hours, later pickups, changes in transportation patterns and schedules, experiments in carrying first-class mail by air, and many other projects have been made effective or are now being tested. The results will become increasingly apparent in the next year.

Second, to obtain a clear-cut measure of the cost of operating the postal service, the payment of airline subsidies has been transferred by reorganization plan to the Civil Aeronautics Board, and legislation enacted to require Government agencies and the Congress to reimburse the Post Office for the cost of handling their mail.

Third, we have initiated many economies and are planning others. Reduced mail-handling costs through efficient modern techniques already have resulted in substantial savings. This program is well underway but will take a long time to complete, since the new methods will require employee training and development of new machines.

Fourth, the deficit has been further reduced by increases in rates which the Postmaster General could change. Increases in parcel-post rates, foreign-mail rates, and others subject to administrative discretion have in the main put these services on a self-supporting basis.

The results of these and other improvements are already visible in the financial operations and outlook. Despite an estimated increase in mail volume of almost 2 billion pieces, gross expenditures of 2,775 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955 will remain unchanged from 1954. With higher operating revenues, the deficit under existing postal rates will continue to decline:

	Million
1953 (actual)	$659
1954 (estimated)	440
1955 (estimated)	330

No business, public or private, can prosper unless its management is free to use the best available methods of operation and to set prices adequate to cover the costs of an efficient operation. Legislation is already before the Congress to authorize the Post Office Department to acquire needed modern postal facilities, through long-term leases with title acquired at the end of the term. Other legislation is required to correct archaic administrative and personnel practices, and to enable expanded use of more modern transportation methods.

Most important, prompt and favorable action by the Congress is needed to increase postal rates. I am recommending increases in rates sufficient to yield as a minimum an additional 240 million dollars in revenues in the fiscal year 1955. These revenues would reduce the 1955 postal deficit to 90 million dollars. Adequate rates, together with further major economies in postal operations, are expected to put the postal business on a self-supporting basis. This will continue to be our policy.

Regulation: Three regulatory commissions carry out the Government's responsibility to protect the public interest in reasonable rates and adequate, safe transportation and communication: Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Communications Commission, and Civil Aeronautics Board. Although their duties have substantially increased in recent years, anticipated improvements in management and procedures make it unnecessary to request any significant appropriation increases. For example, the centralization of administrative responsibility and the reorganization of existing activities in the Interstate Commerce Commission should make possible more effective use of available funds. By the end of the fiscal year 1954, the Federal Communications Commission should be substantially current in handling applications for television stations, so that the funds required for its activities, except for a new program of monitoring frequency usage, will be smaller in the fiscal year 1955 than in 1954.

Receipts of public enterprise funds: Two-thirds of the gross expenditures of 4,277 million dollars for transportation and communication programs in the fiscal year 1955 will be financed from receipts of public enterprise funds. Postal receipts account for the bulk of these revenues. Substantial receipts are also anticipated from tolls and other revenues of the Panama Canal Company, and from vessel operations of the Maritime Administration.

FINANCE, COMMERCE, AND INDUSTRY

Within the limits set by requirements of national defense and the needs of the national economy, we are steadily reducing direct banking and business operations of the Federal Government. For example, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is being liquidated, and the Government's synthetic rubber plants are being offered for sale. At the same time, the programs of the Department of Commerce to promote trade and industry are being strengthened and the Small Business Administration has been established to meet the special needs of small business. Regulatory agencies are simplifying their procedures and putting greater stress on cooperation rather

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

than compulsion, without reducing protection to the public.

Gross expenditures for finance, commerce, and industry programs are expected to be 917 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955, a reduction of 234 million dollars from 1954. About 60 percent of these expenditures are for financial assistance provided under the Defense Production Act. Another 30 percent are for the production programs administered by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—primarily rubber and tin. Anticipated receipts of these enterprises as a group will decline about as much as their expenditures. Accordingly net expenditures of 162 million dollars in 1955 will be about the same as in 1954.

Finance, commerce, and industry

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Gross expenditures			Net expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Promotion of defense production:							
Expansion of defense production	$390	$562	$546	$89	$381	$308	----------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	516	349	270	−98	−233	−65	----------
Other	121	27	16	84	−5	−4	$4
Business loans and guarantees:							
Reconstruction Finance Corporation (Treasury):							
Loans	128	44	10	7	−95	−121	----------
Other	18	122	5	−29	97	−19	----------
Small Business Administration	----------	13	31	----------	12	25	----------
Promotion or regulation of trade and industry:							
Department of Commerce	17	17	22	17	17	22	22
Other	9	10	11	9	10	11	11
Promotion or regulation of financial institutions	6	7	6	−3	−20	5	5
Total	1,205	1,151	917	76	164	162	[1] 42

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of 134 million dollars in 1953 and 97 million dollars in 1954.

Expansion of defense production: The Defense Production Act authorizes extensive financial assistance to assure expansion of productive capacity and of the materials supply necessary for our defense. With the help of purchase commitments, loans, and advances already made, much of the needed expansion is now under way. As a result, the aluminum productive capacity of the United States has doubled since 1950 and supplies of machine tools, titanium, copper, nickel, and other critical items have also substantially increased.

These programs are financed under the borrowing authority of 2.1 billion dollars provided in the Defense Production Act. Gross expenditures in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated at 546 million dollars. Of this amount 296 million dollars will be spent for purchases of materials and 165 million dollars for loans and advances to producers. Most of these expenditures arise from commitments already outstanding. Since a large part of the materials to be acquired under this authority will be sold to the military stockpile of strategic and critical materials to meet its objectives, this program is intimately related to the stockpiling program discussed in the national security section of this message. Receipts from these sales and from sales to private industry, together with repayments of loans and advances, are estimated at 238 million dollars in 1955, reducing net expenditures to 308 million dollars.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation—production programs: Expenditures and receipts of the rubber, tin, and abaca fiber programs currently administered by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will continue to decline sharply in 1955, primarily as a result of reduced operations anticipated in the tin program.

By the end of the present fiscal year, the Government will have completed purchases of tin for the national stockpile. World supplies are already adequate to meet current requirements. As a result, there may no longer be a need for continued operation of the Government tin smelter in 1955. Pending outcome of international negotiations, the budget assumes withdrawal of the Government smelter from operations at the end of the fiscal year 1954.

During the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, annual production of synthetic rubber is estimated at about 600,000 tons—a reduction from the 712,000 tons produced in 1953. Present experience indicates that this level of production will meet all of the anticipated national needs for synthetic rubber. Although the Rubber Facilities Disposal Act authorizes sale of Government plants to private ownership before the end of the fiscal year 1955, plans are not yet far enough advanced to include estimated receipts from such disposal in the 1955 budget.

The production programs will be transferred to another agency before June 30, 1954, as provided in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act.

Business loans and guarantees: The regular business loan program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is now in liquidation as a result of legislation enacted last year on the recommendation of this administration. The Treasury Department will administer the liquidation after June 30, 1954. We plan to sell a major part of the Corporation's loans to private financial institutions. To meet commitments previously made, some expenditures will continue, but repayments and sales of loans will result in estimated net receipts of 121 million dollars in 1955.

A new program of loans to small businesses has recently been established in the Small Business Administration. The 1955 budget assumes that about 350 loans will be authorized in the fiscal year 1954, and about 700 in 1955. This would almost exhaust the available appropriation of 55 million dollars by the end of 1955. Loans will be made where private credit on reasonable terms is unavailable, and, whenever possible, they will be made jointly with private banks. The Small Business Administration also assists small concerns in obtaining a fair share of Government contracts, and provides them with technical and financial advice.

Department of Commerce: In accordance with this administration's declared policy, most emergency controls over business have been removed. The business programs of the Department of Commerce have been reorganized to provide a simpler and more effective basis for carrying on both regular business services and continuing responsibilities under the Defense Production Act. The Business and Defense Services Administration provides general services to business, assists in mobilization preparedness, and administers relevant current defense activities. The Bureau of Foreign Commerce assists in promoting international trade, primarily by providing American business with information on opportunities to buy and sell abroad. The Office of Business Economics provides data on the American economy and analyses of economic and business trends for a wide range of business and Government purposes. I am recommending small increases in the appropriations for these programs so that the Department can adequately carry out its responsibilities to foster and promote industry and commerce.

LABOR AND MANPOWER

My budget recommendations for the labor and manpower programs of the Federal Government are designed to help the Nation's productive system function smoothly and efficiently, by providing economic safeguards for workers, by helping bring together jobseekers and jobs, and by helping to recruit the working forces for defense and other industries. Workers will continue to be given protection against substandard wages and working conditions and against income losses due to unemployment. Orderly labor relations will be fostered, and the amicable settlement of disputes will be assisted by mediation.

Including proposed legislation, budget expenditures for labor and manpower programs are estimated at 281 million dollars during the fiscal year 1955, an increase of 16 million dollars from the current fiscal year. Approximately three-fourths of total budget expenditures for these programs is for administering the job placement and unemployment compensation services.

Although many of our workers benefit from the existing Federal-State unemployment compensation system, the present Federal law does not include employees of firms with fewer than eight persons nor does it include Federal civilian employees. I recommend prompt extension of the system to these workers. Seventeen States already provide coverage of most firms with one or more employees, and most other States have legislation which will permit immediate

coverage when the Congress acts. Amendments to State laws to achieve full coverage will be needed in only a dozen States. This preparedness on the part of the great majority of States will permit rapid extension of this valuable protection after the Federal law is amended. Additional revenues will more than offset the administrative costs resulting from such extension. An estimate of the benefit costs for Federal employees is included under general government.

Labor and manpower

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Gross expenditures:				
Placement and unemployment compensation administration:				
Department of Labor:				
Present program	$212	$199	$192	$223
Proposed legislation to broaden unemployment insurance:				
Federal civilian personnel	------	------	2	2
Other workers	------	------	20	20
Labor standards and training:				
Department of Labor	13	12	12	12
Mine safety (Department of the Interior and other)	4	5	5	5
Military manpower selection: Selective Service System and National Security Training Commission	33	30	31	32
Labor relations	13	14	13	13
Labor information, statistics, and general administration: Department of Labor	7	7	7	7
Defense production activities: Department of Labor	2	(1)	------	------
Total	284	267	282	[2] 314
Deduct applicable receipts: Farm labor supply revolving fund	3	2	1	------
Net budget expenditures	281	265	281	------

[1] Less than 500,000 dollars.
[2] Compares with new obligational authority of 282 million dollars in 1953 and 267 million dollars in 1954.

Placement and unemployment compensation administration: Gross expenditures in the fiscal year 1955 for administering the Federal-State placement and unemployment compensation services under present law are estimated at 192 million dollars, 7 million dollars below the current year. A decrease of about 30 million dollars will result from a change in financial arrangements, by which advance payments to each State before the opening of each fiscal year will be reduced from an amount covering three months' operations to an amount for one month. Part of this reduction will be offset, however, by a higher estimated rate of expenditures for this program resulting from increases in salaries provided by State laws to employees who administer the services, some rise in the expected number of unemployment compensation claimants, and provision for weekly filing of claims and weekly payment of benefits. The weekly claims system, replacing the biweekly method currently in use in most States, will provide more satisfactory service to the claimants and, by permitting more frequent contact, should reduce the possibilities of fraudulent or erroneous payments. These factors may make necessary a request for a supplemental appropriation for the current fiscal year.

This administration has already recommended enactment of legislation to transfer annually to a special account in the unemployment trust fund, an amount equal to the difference between the receipts of the Federal unemployment tax and the administrative costs of operating our joint Federal-State unemployment security program. The initial transfer, based on receipts and expenditures in the fiscal year 1955, would be made at the beginning of the fiscal year 1956.

My recommendations in this budget provide for continued operation of the system for recruiting qualified workers from Mexico for seasonal employment on farms in the United States. These workers are needed to supplement our domestic farm-labor supply. The 1954 appropriation for this recruitment program was based on legislation which was to have expired on December 31, 1953. This authority has now been extended until December 31, 1955, and funds are included in the budget to pay for operations during the rest of the fiscal year 1954, as well as in the fiscal year 1955.

The railroad unemployment insurance taxes and expenditures which were previously included in budget accounts are now entirely included in trust accounts.

Labor standards and training: Budget expenditures for the minimum-wage and maximum-hour regulatory programs in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated at about the 1954 level.

The social and economic plight of migratory farmworkers has been studied repeatedly. Up to now, little positive action to better these conditions has been taken by the Federal Government. This budget includes a recommended appropriation of 100 thousand dollars to enable the Department of Labor to provide leadership in establishing a cooperative Federal-State program in the fiscal year 1955.

Military manpower selection: Although a reduction in military personnel is planned, calls by the Department of Defense in 1955 to replace men drafted in 1953 will require an increase of 676 thousand dollars in estimated expenditures of the Selective Service System. This budget provides also for continuing a small staff for the National Security Training Commission.

Labor relations: Budget expenditures of 13 million dollars in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated for the independent labor relations agencies—the National Labor Relations Board and the mediation services. Emphasis will be placed on providing improved services to employers and employees of industries and establishments strategically situated in interstate commerce.

Unemployment trust fund: Under present law, unemployment compensation benefit payments in the fiscal year 1955 are expected to be somewhat higher than in 1954 because of an increase in claims of short duration and liberalization of benefits by States. Receipts in 1955 are estimated somewhat lower than in the current fiscal year. The legislation I am recommending to broaden unemployment compensation coverage will increase both the receipts and the benefit payments. Trust-fund transactions are not included in the totals of budget receipts and expenditures.

Unemployment trust funds

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated
Receipts:			
Deposits by States and railroad unemployment taxes:			
Present programs	$1,391	$1,344	$1,329
Proposed legislation extending coverage	------	------	145
Interest	203	222	216
Payments:			
State and railroad withdrawals for benefits:			
Present programs	−1,004	−1,095	−1,195
Proposed legislation extending coverage	------	------	−60
Net accumulation, including proposed legislation	590	471	435
Balance in fund at close of year	8,244	9,715	10,150

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Net expenditures for general government functions are estimated at 1,160 million dollars for the fiscal year 1955, compared with 1,175 million dollars in the fiscal year 1954. These expenditures are chiefly for the traditional Government activities not specifically classified elsewhere—making and enforcing the laws, collection of revenues, management of the public debt, and custody and management of public buildings and records.

General government

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Gross expenditures:				
Legislative functions	$46	$46	$47	$46
Judicial functions	27	29	30	30
Executive direction	13	13	11	11
Federal financial management:				
Tax collection	269	277	265	266
Customs collection, debt management, and other	173	177	166	165
Other central services:				
Central property and records management	179	158	156	155
Civil Service Commission	21	16	15	16
Other	14	19	21	23
Unemployment compensation for Federal civilian employees (proposed legislation)	------	------	25	25
Retirement for Federal civilian employees	324	34	32	32

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

General government—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Gross expenditures—Continued				
Protective services and alien control:				
Federal Bureau of Investigation	$71	$77	$78	$78
Immigration and Naturalization Service	40	41	39	39
Other	22	20	22	21
Territories, possessions, and District of Columbia:				
District of Columbia:				
Present programs	12	16	20	14
Proposed legislation			15	17
Territories and possessions	48	47	46	42
Other general government:				
Payment of claims and relief acts	137	149	135	
Weather Bureau	27	26	25	25
Other	21	24	16	14
Total	1,444	1,178	1,164	[1] 1,019
Deduct applicable receipts	5	3	4	
Net budget expenditures	1,439	1,175	1,160	

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of 1,337 million dollars in 1953 and 1,033 million dollars in 1954.

Federal financial management: During the past year the Internal Revenue Service has improved greatly the administration of Federal revenue laws. Further economies will be made by cutting overhead expenses. These savings of several million dollars will be used to strengthen the field audit staff and to obtain more effective collection and enforcement. Auditing of tax returns and settlements are being speeded up. Tax collection has been decentralized so that most decisions in individual cases can now be made in district offices near the taxpayer. The reduced staff in Washington is concerned primarily with developing overall policies and assuring uniformity in administration throughout the country. Nevertheless, serious problems remain. For example, despite the improvement in auditing, the backlog of unaudited returns and uncollected accounts has increased for several years. Strenuous efforts are being made to reverse this trend, both to increase collections and to permit a more prompt determination of taxpayers' liabilities.

Further reduction in expenditures by the Bureau of the Public Debt will be achieved in the fiscal year 1955 by revisions in the savings bond promotion program to place greater emphasis on the sale of larger denomination bonds, elimination of uneconomic sales outlets, and other economies. A large volume of savings bonds is now reaching maturity, but redemptions of these matured bonds are relatively low, since most owners are taking advantage of their right to continue to hold them at 3 percent interest.

Central property and records management: Substantial reductions have been made in the expenditures of the General Services Administration for management of Government property and records. The fiscal year 1955 estimate of 156 million dollars is 23 million dollars below actual 1953 expenditures and 2 million dollars below the revised 1954 estimate. These savings primarily result from material reductions in building space rented for Government use, made possible in part by reductions in the scope of Government operations and accomplished through an aggressive and critical examination of requirements. In addition, numerous savings are being achieved by the General Services Administration which reduce the budget requirements of other agencies throughout the Government. Real property requirements and holdings are being reexamined and property determined to be surplus is being disposed of as rapidly as possible. Purchases of new materials have decreased as a result of elimination of unnecessary inventories by reduction in the number of separate types of items carried in inventories and by better utilization of property already on hand. Significant progress also is being made in controlling the volume of records, in their economical storage, and, when they are no longer essential, in accelerating their disposal.

Civil Service Commission: As part of the program for strengthening the merit system of the Federal civil service, the budget provides funds to improve the standards used for the recruitment and transfer of personnel and to further the career development of Government employees. The Civil Service Commission expenditures as a whole, however, will decrease with improved management practices and with a decline in prospective workloads for the examination and placement of applicants and for the investigation of persons employed or seeking employment in the Federal service.

I am recommending legislation to strengthen further the merit system and to provide conditions of employment for Federal personnel more nearly comparable to those in private enterprise. Certain legal restrictions initiated at the beginning of the present national emergency on the appointment and promotion of Federal workers should be removed. The present statutory limits on the number of high-level executive and scientific positions should be raised. Government agencies should be permitted to select employees from among the top five rather than the top three on Federal civil-service registers. Existing inequities in overtime-pay practices should be corrected. Building and maintenance workers should be added to the categories of employees paid at rates prevailing locally in private employment for similar occupations. The incentive-awards program should be consolidated and improved in order to eliminate costly administration and to increase employee interest in greater efficiency and economy. The cost of these changes in the main can be absorbed within the appropriations recommended for the agencies concerned.

Unemployment compensation for Federal workers: I strongly recommend extension of the unemployment compensation system to give Federal employees the same benefits as are now provided to most workers in private employment. This will require an estimated 25 million dollars in expenditures for benefit payments in the fiscal year 1955. This program could be administered under contractual arrangements made through the Department of Labor with existing State unemployment compensation systems.

Retirement for Federal civilian personnel: An appropriation of 30 million dollars is recommended to permit the continued payment to retired Federal workers of temporary cost-of-living increases as authorized by the Congress in 1952. The budget also includes 2 million dollars to pay annuities under special laws.

The civil-service retirement system is financed jointly by employee contributions and appropriations by the Government. The Congress, at its last session, however, did not appropriate for the Government's payments to the fund. The resumption of these payments is not included in this budget. Recommendations for financing this system as well as other retirement programs for Federal personnel will be determined after the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel completes its study and reports to the Congress on or before June 30, 1954.

Protective services and alien control: The Federal Bureau of Investigation, as the investigative arm of the Department of Justice, obtains evidence for use in legal actions involving violations of Federal law. The crime rate throughout the country has put an increasing burden on the Bureau. The Bureau also has primary responsibility for coordinating investigations in the executive branch necessary for the Nation's internal security. Such investigations continue at peak levels. It is essential, therefore, that the Bureau staff be adequate to discharge these responsibilities.

District of Columbia: I strongly recommend enactment of legislation to finance the expanded public works construction urgently needed in the National Capital. This legislation would authorize an increase of 9 million dollars in the annual Federal payment to the general fund of the District of Columbia, and an additional 1 million dollars for full payment for all water and related services. It would authorize 107 million dollars of additional interest-bearing loans to the District over the next decade, of which an estimated 5 million dollars would be spent in the fiscal year 1955. These expenditures by the Federal Government would be accompanied by substantial increases in taxes paid by District taxpayers. This legislation would, for the first time in recent years, place Federal payments to the District government on a level commensurate with the Federal Government's position in and its demands upon the District. It would permit the District to start a long-term program of public works necessary to make the Capital City worthy of our great Nation.

Territories and possessions: The Federal Government also has special responsibilities for administering the various Territories and possessions, including the Canal Zone and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Included in this

budget are certain necessary increases in expenditures for continuing the civilian administration of the Trust Territory, except those islands in the northern Marianas returned to the jurisdiction of the Navy. I recommend that the Congress enact at an early date legislation establishing the basic form of government for the Trust Territory to replace the present temporary arrangements.

Intergovernmental relations: A Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is now studying the proper role of the Federal Government in relation to the State and local governments. It is giving particular attention to fiscal relationships, such as Federal grants-in-aid, tax sources, and intergovernmental tax immunities, and will report shortly on certain aspects of its assignment.

Claims and relief acts: The payment of certified claims makes up the total expenditure figure of 135 million dollars estimated for claims, judgments, and private relief acts in the fiscal year 1955. Most of these payments are for claims resulting from activities of the Department of Defense. The apparent decline of 14 million dollars in expenditures in the fiscal year 1955 is due to the usual omission in the budget year of any specific estimate for other claims, judgments, and relief acts.

Receipts of public enterprise funds: The operations of the Virgin Islands Corporation account for most of the 4 million dollars in receipts of public enterprise funds.

INTEREST

Primarily as a result of the large increase in the public debt during World War II, interest payments now account for about 10 percent of Federal expenditures. Interest payments are fixed primarily by the size of the public debt and by interest rates on debt already outstanding.

Interest

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	Budget expenditures (net)			Recommended new obligational authority for 1955
	1953 actual	1954 estimated	1955 estimated	
Interest on public debt	$6,503	$6,825	$6,800	$6,800
Interest on refunds of receipts	75	70	70	70
Interest on uninvested trust deposits	5	5	5	5
Total	6,583	6,900	6,875	[1] 6,875

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of 6,583 million dollars in 1953 and 6,900 million dollars in 1954.

Interest on the public debt: Interest payments on the public debt in the fiscal year 1955 are estimated at 6,800 million dollars. This is an increase of 275 million dollars over estimated expenditures for the current fiscal year, and 297 million dollars above actual expenditures in 1953.

The increase in 1955 reflects both the higher average interest rates and the larger public debt. The average rate on the interest-bearing public debt rose from 2.33 percent on June 30, 1952, to 2.41 percent on December 31, 1953, primarily because of the refinancing of maturing obligations at the higher market rates prevailing. As the result of the deficit financing during the same period the public debt has increased from 259 billion dollars to 275 billion dollars (including about one-half billion dollars not subject to the statutory debt limitation).

The budget of the United States is the financial expression of the administration's program for the coming fiscal year. An understanding of its scope and content is a high challenge to every citizen.

When I took office a year ago, I promised the Congress and the people that this administration would seek to chart a fiscal and economic policy which would reduce the planned deficits and bring the budget into balance.

I warned that this would not be easy. There still are heavy national security requirements. Substantial expenditures are by law relatively nondiscretionary. The far-reaching activities of the Federal Government are extremely complex.

Despite these inherent difficulties, we have made great progress. Federal expenditures have been cut substantially, tax reductions have been made justifiable, and the budgetary deficit has been sharply reduced.

We have, furthermore, made appropriate provision for our national security and for our international obligations and we have been able to propose certain increases in Federal expenditures to advance our domestic well-being and to foster economic growth.

I firmly believe, therefore, that this budget represents a plan of government which will not only protect our way of life but will also strengthen our economic base and enhance the welfare of all our people.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JANUARY 21, 1954.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the passage of the bill (H. R. 5337) to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there any Member on the Democratic side opposed to the bill who desires to offer a motion to recommit?

Mr. CHATHAM. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman a motion to recommit?

Mr. CHATHAM. Not before the House, but I intended to make one.

The SPEAKER. Is there anyone on the Democratic side who is prepared to offer a motion to recommit? If not, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SCRIVNER moves to recommit the bill H. R. 5337 to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCRIVNER) there were—ayes 25, noes 131.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 331, nays 36, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

Yeas—331

Abbitt	Dempsey	Hosmer
Abernethy	Derounian	Howell
Adair	Devereux	Hunter
Albert	Dies	Hyde
Allen, Calif.	Dollinger	Ikard
Allen, Ill.	Dolliver	James
Andresen, August H.	Donovan	Javits
	Dorn, N. Y.	Jenkins
Angell	Dorn, S. C.	Jensen
Arends	Dowdy	Johnson, Calif.
Ashmore	Doyle	Johnson, Wis.
Aspinall	Eberharter	Jonas, Ill.
Auchincloss	Edmondson	Jones, Ala.
Ayres	Elliott	Judd
Bailey	Ellsworth	Karsten, Mo.
Baker	Engle	Kean
Barden	Evins	Kearney
Barrett	Fallon	Kearns
Bates	Feighan	Keating
Battle	Fenton	Kee
Beamer	Fernandez	Kelley, Pa.
Becker	Fine	Kelly, N. Y.
Belcher	Fino	Keogh
Bender	Fisher	Kersten, Wis.
Bennett, Fla.	Fogarty	Kilday
Bennett, Mich.	Forand	Kirwan
Bentley	Ford	Klein
Berry	Forrester	Knox
Betts	Fountain	Krueger
Bishop	Frazier	Landrum
Blatnik	Frelinghuysen	Lane
Boggs	Friedel	Lanham
Boiling	Fulton	Latham
Bolton, Frances P.	Garmatz	LeCompte
	Gary	Lesinski
Bonin	Gathings	Lipscomb
Bonner	Gavin	Long
Bosch	Gentry	Lucas
Bow	George	Lyle
Bowler	Goodwin	McCarthy
Boykin	Gordon	McConnell
Bramblett	Graham	McCormack
Bray	Granahan	McDonough
Brooks, La.	Grant	McIntire
Brooks, Tex.	Green	McMillan
Brown, Ga.	Gregory	McVey
Brown, Ohio	Gubser	Machrowicz
Broyhill	Gwinn	Mack, Wash.
Burdick	Hagen, Calif.	Madden
Burleson	Hagen, Minn.	Magnuson
Bush	Hale	Mahon
Byrd	Haley	Mailliard
Byrne, Pa.	Halleck	Martin, Iowa
Camp	Hand	Mason
Campbell	Harden	Matthews
Canfield	Hardy	Meader
Carlyle	Harris	Merrill
Carnahan	Harrison, Va.	Merrow
Cederberg	Harrison, Wyo.	Metcalf
Celler	Hart	Miller, Calif.
Chenoweth	Harvey	Mills
Chiperfield	Hays, Ark.	Mollohan
Church	Hays, Ohio	Morano
Clevenger	Hébert	Morgan
Cole, Mo.	Heller	Morrison
Colmer	Herlong	Moss
Condon	Heselton	Moulder
Cooley	Hess	Multer
Coon	Hiestand	Mumma
Cooper	Hill	Natcher
Corbett	Hillelson	Neal
Crosser	Hillings	Nelson
Crumpacker	Hoeven	Nicholson
Cunningham	Hoffman, Ill.	Norblad
Curtis, Mass.	Hoffman, Mich.	Norrell
Curtis, Nebr.	Holmes	Oakman
Dague	Holt	O'Brien, Ill.
Davis, Ga.	Holtzman	O'Brien, Mich.
Delaney	Hope	O'Brien, N. Y.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

O'Hara, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.	Thornberry
O'Hara, Minn.	Rogers, Tex.	Tollefson
O'Neill	Rooney	Trimble
Osmers	Roosevelt	Utt
Ostertag	St. George	Van Zandt
Passman	Schenck	Velde
Patman	Scott	Vinson
Pelly	Scudder	Vorys
Perkins	Secrest	Vursell
Pfost	Selden	Walter
Phillips	Shafer	Warburton
Poage	Shelley	Watts
Poff	Sheppard	Westland
Polk	Short	Wharton
Preston	Sieminski	Wheeler
Price	Simpson, Ill.	Whitten
Priest	Simpson, Pa.	Wickersham
Radwan	Small	Widnall
Rains	Smith, Kans.	Williams, Miss.
Ray	Smith, Miss.	Williams, N. J.
Rayburn	Smith, Va.	Williams, N. Y.
Reed, Ill.	Spence	Willis
Rees, Kans.	Springer	Wilson, Calif.
Rhodes, Pa.	Staggers	Wilson, Ind.
Richlman	Stauffer	Wilson, Tex.
Riley	Steed	Winstead
Rivers	Sullivan	Withrow
Roberts	Sutton	Wolcott
Robeson, Va.	Talle	Wolverton
Robsion, Ky.	Teague	Young
Rogers, Colo.	Thompson, La.	Younger
Rogers, Fla.	Thompson, Tex.	Zablocki

NAYS—36

Andersen, H. Carl	Harrison, Nebr.	Reams
	Jones, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Jones, N. C.	Rhodes, Ariz.
	King, Pa.	Scrivner
Budge	Laird	Shuford
Byrnes, Wis.	Lantaff	Sikes
Cannon	Mack, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Chatham	Marshall	Taber
Clardy	Miller, Kans.	Thompson, Mich.
Cotton	Miller, Nebr.	
Davis, Wis.	Pilcher	Van Pelt
D'Ewart	Prouty	Wainwright
Gross	Rabaut	Wier

NOT VOTING—67

Addonizio	Donohue	Philbin
Alexander	Durham	Pillion
Andrews	Gamble	Powell
Bentsen	Golden	Reece, Tenn.
Boland	Hinshaw	Regan
Brownson	Holifield	Richards
Buchanan	Horan	Rodino
Buckley	Hruska	Sadlak
Busbey	Jackson	Saylor
Carrigg	Jarman	Scherer
Chelf	Jonas, N. C.	Seely-Brown
Chudoff	Kilburn	Sheehan
Cole, N. Y.	King, Calif.	Stringfellow
Coudert	Kluczynski	Taylor
Cretella	Lovre	Thomas
Curtis, Mo.	McCulloch	Tuck
Davis, Tenn.	McGregor	Wampler
Dawson, Ill.	Miller, Md.	Weichel
Dawson, Utah	Miller, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Deane	Murray	Yates
Dingell	O'Konski	Yorty
Dodd	Patten	
Dondero	Patterson	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Jonas of North Carolina with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Miller of New York with Mr. Deane.
Mr. McCulloch with Mr. Durham.
Mr. Sadlak with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Bentsen.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Addonizio.
Mr. Golden with Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Wigglesworth with Mr. Yates.
Mr. Wampler with Mr. Yorty.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Chudoff.
Mr. Cretella with Mr. Patten.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri with Mr. Boland.
Mr. Dondero with Mrs. Buchanan.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. King of California.
Mr. Scherer with Mr. Kluczynski.
Mr. Miller of Maryland with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. McGregor with Mr. Dodd.
Mr. Carrigg with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Hruska with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Seely-Brown with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Brownson with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Stringfellow with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Sheehan with Mr. Regan.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Saylor with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Tuck.
Mr. Lovre with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Murray.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority in favor of the passage of H. R. 5337, providing for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy clearly reveals the conclusion of Congress that the defense and security of our country makes it necessary that our chief line of defense is and will be our Air Forces. The bill we have passed necessarily omitted a specific location for the Air Force Academy for several reasons; however, I would be remiss in my duties if I did not mention that the Sedalia Air Force Base in Missouri offers not only ideal and strategic location with every possible desirable factor and geographic location, but also will provide a savings of millions of dollars in cost of construction.

More than $40 million is now invested in the Sedalia Air Force Base, offering many of the facilities that will be required in connection with the operation of an Air Force Academy. The Air Force Academy or school should not be located in any extreme west, east, north, or south part of the United States. It should, for many good reasons, be located and established in a central location to achieve convenient access to and from all other parts of the country, and the Sedalia Air Force Base location provides that as well as all other facilities and requirements for the location, establishment, and operation of the Air Force Academy.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it is general understanding that some people in the gallery have had a copy of the President's budget and tax message since yesterday, the Members would like to know where they can obtain a copy of the message or whether they should wait until tomorrow when it is printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that there are copies available in the document room for each Member.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, we should go to the document room and obtain copies?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the Speaker.

COTTON AND WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1109)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(m) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"'(1) The national acreage allotment established under subsection (a) of this section for the 1954 crop of cotton shall be increased to twenty-one million acres and apportioned to the States in the same manner in which the national acreage allotment heretofore established for 1954 was apportioned to the States. In addition to such increased national acreage allotment, and in order to provide equitable adjustments in 1954 farm acreage allotments, (A) three hundred and fifteen thousand additional acres shall be prorated as follows: one-half to the States of Arizona, California, and New Mexico, and one-half to the other States (excluding those which received a minimum allotment under subsection (k) of this section), the proration of each half being made to the States participating therein on the basis of their respective shares of the increased national acreage allotment, and (B) such additional acreage shall be added as may be required to provide each State a total allotment under subsection (b) of this section and the provisions of this paragraph of not less than 66 per centum of the acreage planted to cotton in the State in 1953. The additional acreage made available to States under clause (B) of the preceding sentence shall not be taken into account in establishing future State acreage allotments. The additional acreage made available to States under the provisions of this paragraph (1) shall be apportioned to counties on the basis of their respective shares of the State acreage allotment heretofore apportioned pursuant to subsection (e) of this section, and the additional acreage shall be apportioned to farms pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided*, That, if the county committee determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the additional county allotment among farms in the coun-

ty, the additional acreage shall be apportioned by the county committee to farms so as to provide each farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 per centum of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953 (as determined by the county committee in establishing allotments under subsection (f) of this section) or 40 per centum of the highest acreage planted to cotton on the farm in any one of such three years as so determined: *Provided*, That the State committee in each State shall limit such increase based on the system of farming, soil, crop-rotation practices, and other physical factors affecting production in such State, to an acreage not in excess of 50 per centum of the cropland on the farm, as determined under regulations heretofore prescribed by the Secretary. If the additional acreage is insufficient to meet the total of the farm increases so computed, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the county; if the additional acreage available to the county is in excess of the total of the farm increases so computed the acreage remaining after making such increases shall be allotted to farms pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f) (3). Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, if the State committee determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the additional acreage made available to the State under this paragraph (1) it shall apportion such additional allotment directly to farms so as to provide each farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 per centum of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953 (as determined by the county committee in establishing allotments under subsection (f) of this section) or 40 per centum of the highest acreage planted to cotton on the farm in any one of such three years as so determined: *Provided*, That the State committee in each State shall limit such increase based on the system of farming, soil, crop-rotation practices, and other physical factors affecting production in such State, to an acreage not in excess of 50 per centum of the cropland on the farm, as determined under regulations heretofore prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided*, That if the State total of the farm increases so computed exceeds the additional acreage made available to the State under this paragraph, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the State. Any acreage unallotted to farms because of the limitations contained in the preceding sentence shall be apportioned by the State committee to counties on the basis of past acreages planted to cotton and shall be used by county committees for adjustments in farm allotments on the basis of one or more of the following: The past acreage of cotton on the farm, the percentage of cropland heretofore determined under subsection (f) (2) of this section, and the factors enumerated in subsection (f) (3) of this section. Before apportioning such unallotted acreage to counties as provided in the foregoing sentence, the State committee may, if it determines that such action is required to provide equitable allotments within the State, apportion such unallotted acreage directly to farms to the extent required to provide each farm with the minimum allotment described in subsection (f) (1) of this section. Any part of the county allotment heretofore established for the 1954 crop which was not apportioned to farms because of the limitation contained in the proviso in subsection (f) (2) of this section shall be available to the State committee and used as provided above for apportionment of unallotted acreage to farms. The provisions of this subsection, except paragraph (2), shall not apply to extra long staple cotton covered by section 347 of this Act.

"'(2) Any part of any 1954 or 1955 farm cotton acreage allotment on which cotton will not be planted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotment to such farm and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on the basis of past acreage of cotton, land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, and soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton. If all of the allotted acreage voluntarily surrendered is not needed in the county, the county committee may surrender the excess acreage to the State committee to be used for the same purposes as the State acreage reserve under subsection (e) of this section. Any allotment transferred under this provision shall be regarded for the purposes of subsection (f) of this section as having been planted on the farm from which transferred rather than on the farm to which transferred, except that this shall not operate to make the farm from which the allotment was transferred eligible for an allotment as having cotton planted thereon during the three-year base period: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any part of any 1954 or 1955 farm acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm, and reapportioned as provided herein. Acreage surrendered, reapportioned under this paragraph, and planted shall be credited to the State and county in determining future acreage allotments. The provisions of this paragraph shall apply also to extra long staple cotton covered by section 347 of this Act.

"'(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or other provision of law, the acreage allotted to any State for 1954 under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section and the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection which is less than one hundred thousand acres but more than thirty thousand acres shall be increased by an acreage equal to 15 per centum of the acreage allotted to it prior to the enactment of this subsection. Such acreage shall be used by the State committee as a reserve to make equitable adjustments in 1954 farm acreage allotments on the basis of land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop-rotation practices, past acreages of cotton, soil, and other physical factors affecting the production of cotton.'

"SEC. 2. Section 344 (h) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'In any county in which a major flood control reservoir constructed by the United States Government shall have been located wholly or in part, acreage allotments for the production of cotton on the lands within such reservoir, which lands, because of permanent or perennial flooding occasioned by the construction of such reservoir, shall be unfit for further cotton production, may be reallocated, within the discretion of the county committee, to other lands within the county as will in the opinion of said committee best serve the public interest.'

"SEC. 3. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended, effective beginning with the 1955 crop, as follows:

"(a) By striking the period at the end of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding 'or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.'

"(b) By striking out in subsection (f) (3) the colon before the word '*Provided*' and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and adding 'or in making adjustments in farm acreage allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hardship:'.

"(c) By adding a new paragraph '(6)' at the end of subsection (f) to read as follows:

"'(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, the county acreage allotment, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm during such three year period. If the county acreage allotment is apportioned among the farms of the county in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection may be used to make adjustments so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable to farms receiving allotments under this paragraph in relation to the factors set forth in paragraph (3).'

"SEC. 4. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if after investigation the Secretary determines with respect to any class or sub-class of wheat that a substantial difference exists in the usage or marketing outlets therefor and that the supply of such wheat for the 1953–54 and 1954–55 marketing years with respect to the 1954 crop, and for the 1954–55 and 1955–56 marketing years with respect to the 1955 crop, will be substantially short of indicated market demands and carryover requirements for such wheat for such marketing years, the Secretary shall increase the marketing quotas and acreage allotments for such crop of wheat for farms which produced such wheat in one or more of the preceding three years to the extent necessary to make available a supply of such wheat adequate to meet such demands and carryover requirements. The increases in farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall be made on the basis of the acreage seeded to such class or sub-class of wheat during the period of years considered in establishing farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments for wheat. The additional acreage required by this subsection shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment, and shall not be used to increase the acreage allotment applicable to other wheat produced on farms for which such additional acreage has been allotted, nor shall such acreage be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.'

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 5 of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and to price support for potatoes' (7 U. S. C. 1450), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'Operations with respect to Irish potatoes authorized by section 32 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes" (7 U. S. C. 612c), shall not be deemed to be prohibited by this section or, unless marketing quotas are in effect, to be required by section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1446).'

"(b) The parenthetical phrase contained in the sentence preceding the last sentence of section 32 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes' (7 U. S. C. 612c), is amended to read as follows: '(other than those receiving price support under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949)'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
WM. S. HILL,
CHAS. B. HOEVEN,
SID SIMPSON,
E. K. BRAMBLETT,
PAUL B. DAGUE,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
E. C. GATHINGS,
J. L. MCMILLAN,
THOS. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
KARL E. MUNDT,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
HERMAN WELKER,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing positions of the two Houses on H. R. 6665, as originally passed by the House and as amended by the Senate, relating to cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for the House bill and the Senate amendment.

The conference substitute relates to cotton, Durum wheat, and Irish potatoes.

It should be pointed out to the House, prior to a discussion of the agreement reached by its conferees, that the House on July 31, 1953 passed H. R. 6665, intended to deal not only with the special problems in 1954, but also to perfect and facilitate the operation of the cotton acreage allotment and marketing quota program in subsequent years. The House action occurred prior to the allocation of the 1954 national cotton acreage allotment and the referendum of December 15, 1953, under present law. The legislation was sent to the Senate, where action was taken January 12, 1954 in the manner of a substitute for the House bill, dealing only with the emergency acreage allotment problems for the 1954 cotton crop, and with Irish potatoes and special class of wheat. Meanwhile, in the interim of the action between the two Houses, a cotton crop had been harvested which exceeded by approximately 2 million bales the estimate on the 1953 crop that was available to the House when it acted upon H. R. 6665.

The legislation agreed upon by the committee of conference, presented in this report, adopts, subject to certain modifications, the Senate bill's emergency provisions for the 1954 crop and accepts, with some revisions, the House bill's provisions of a permanent nature relating to acreage allotments and quotas for the long range cotton program.

The primary purpose of the legislation, agreed upon in conference, is to provide for adjustments to facilitate a reduction in the production of cotton for 1954 without causing unnecessary hardships, and to revise the basic legislation in a manner to facilitate necessary adjustments in the future.

Except for clarifying minor changes, the substitute bill agreed upon by the conferees is explained below.

SECTION 1. COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The first paragraph of this section embraces the Senate provision increasing the national acreage allotment for the 1954 cotton crop to 21,000,000 acres and apportioning this acreage to the States in the same manner in which the 17,910,448 national acreage allotment heretofore established for 1954 was apportioned to the States. In addition to such increased national acreage allotment, the legislation agreed upon provides 315,000 additional acres of allotment to be apportioned, one-half to the States of Arizona, California, and New Mexico, and one-half to the other cotton producing States, these two prorations to be made to the States sharing therein, other than those receiving the minimum allotments under subsection 344 (k), on the basis of their respective shares of the 21 million acre national acreage allotment. Furthermore, the legislation provides that no cotton-producing State shall receive a total allotment of less than 66 percent of the acreage planted to cotton in the State in 1952. The Senate conferees accepted an amendment proposed by the House conferees that such acreage, under the 66 percent guarantee to each State, would to the extent planted not go into the State history of cotton plantings for purposes of computing future State cotton acreage allotments. The effect of this paragraph is to set a total national cotton acreage allotment of 21,379,342 acres for 1954. H. R. 6665 as passed by the House would have set a national allotment at 22,672,700 acres.

Set out below is a table showing the manner in which the additional acreage allotments provided by the bill agreed upon by the conferees would be apportioned among the States:

Proposed State allotments for 1954 upland cotton and related data

State	1952 planted acreage [1] (1)	1953 acreage in cultivation, July 1 (2)	1954 State acreage allotments, 17,910,448 (3)	State shares of national allotment of 21,000,000 acres [2] (4)	State adjustments on basis of 5-year average [3] 157,500 (5)	157,500 (6)	State acreage added by reason of 66-percent provision [4] (7)	State acreage added by reason of 15-percent provision (8)	Proposed State acreage allotments (9)
	Acres	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*
Alabama	1,605,000	1,630,000	1,139,121	1,335,690	10,711				1,346,401
Arizona	627,000	643,500	288,223	337,958		39,302	36,495		413,815
Arkansas	2,040,000	2,112,000	1,562,684	1,832,343	14,693				1,847,036
California	1,418,800	1,381,600	697,806	818,220		95,298	22,879		936,397
Florida	56,800	71,000	33,122	38,837	311			4,968	44,116
Georgia	1,479,930	1,387,000	1,005,862	1,179,436	9,458				1,188,894
Illinois	2,750	2,400	[5] 4,000	[5] 4,000					[5] 4,000
Kansas	35		[6] 80	[6] 80					[6] 80
Kentucky	10,500	10,500	9,136	10,713	86				10,799
Louisiana	900,000	954,000	634,906	744,466	5,970				750,436
Mississippi	2,435,000	2,554,000	1,759,641	2,063,288	16,545				2,079,833
Missouri	525,000	570,000	391,396	458,936	3,681				462,617
Nevada	1,950	2,000	[5] 2,289	[5] 2,289					[5] 2,289
New Mexico	288,000	301,200	167,243	196,102		22,840			218,942
North Carolina	765,000	781,000	528,638	619,860	4,971				624,831
Oklahoma	1,310,000	1,058,000	929,202	1,089,547	8,736				1,098,283
South Carolina	1,160,000	1,181,000	786,006	921,640	7,390				929,030
Tennessee	865,000	959,000	575,891	675,268	5,415				680,683
Texas	12,287,965	9,656,400	7,376,858	8,649,817	69,361				8,719,178
Virginia	27,000	30,000	18,344	21,510	172				21,682
United States	27,805,730	25,284,600	17,910,448	21,000,000	157,500	157,500	59,374	4,968	21,379,342

[1] Acreage in cultivation July 1, plus abandonment prior to July as estimated by the Crop Reporting Board, Agricultural Marketing Service.
[2] Apportioned to States on basis of acreages used in establishing allotments shown in column (3).
[3] 157,500 acres apportioned to California, Arizona, and New Mexico on basis of their 5-year base one to the other, 157,500 acres apportioned to remaining States (except Nevada, Kansas, and Illinois) on basis of their 5-year base one to the other.
[4] Minimum State allotments, Public Law 272, 81st Cong.
[5] Acreage required to increase State acreage allotment to not less than 66 percent of the 1952 planted acreage.

Two alternative formulas are provided for apportioning the acreage made available to States under the provisions of paragraph (1), as follows:

(a) After the additional acreage is apportioned to the States, if the State committee determines that such action will result in more adequately correcting individual farm allotment hardship cases for 1954, this additional acreage may be distributed directly to farms so as to provide—to the extent the acreage will permit—each eligible farm with an allotment equal to the larger of 65 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in 1951, 1952, and 1953, or 40 percent of the highest acreage planted to cotton on the farm in any one of these 3 years, but with a provision that each State may decide upon a cropland percentage limitation as to the total acres that may be allotted under this provision to an individual farm.

(b) The additional State allotment may go directly to counties on the basis of their re-

spective allotment shares of the State acreage allotment heretofore apportioned, and the county committee may decide to use either, (1) the county cropland factor procedure, or (2) the 65-40 procedure described above.

In the Senate amendment, the additional acres allotted to a farm could not bring the total farm allotment to more than 50 percent of the total cropland on the farm. Because of differences in farming practices in different States, the committee of conference decided to leave the *final* determination of this figure to the State committees, but not to exceed 50 percent of the cropland. The language in the conference substitute will permit each State committee, taking into consideration certain factors, to determine the figure for that State. This will for example permit the Western States—California, Arizona, and New Mexico—if their State committees so determine, to fix the maximum at 50 percent, while the Eastern States, some of which prefer a 40 percent maximum, can adopt that figure or any other less than 50 percent which the State committee may determine.

If the additional acreage allotted a State is not sufficient to provide the proposed increases in farm allotments in full, by use of formula (a), all the proposed farm increases would be reduced proportionately. If the additional acreage allotted the State is more than sufficient, the excess would first be used to the extent required to provide each farm with the minimum allotment described in section 344 (*f*) (1) of the Act, as amended.

The conference committee accepted a proposal that any part of the county allotment heretofore established from the 17,910,448 acres for the 1954 crop, which was not apportioned to farms because of the limitations in the Act, shall be available to the State committee and used to provide additional apportionments to farms.

The bill agreed upon in conference embraces portions of both the Senate and House bills to permit the surrender and reapportionment of any part of any 1954 or 1955 farm allotment which will not be planted for reallocation within the county. If any acreage remains of such released acreage it shall be transferred to the State committee for reallocation within the State. However, such surrendered acreage would be contained in the history of the farm from which it was transferred rather than the farm to which it was transferred. Acreage surrendered, reapportioned, and planted will be credited to the State and to the county in which the planting occurred.

The Senate conferees agreed to eliminate language in the Senate amendment that would have permitted acreages devoted primarily to orchards or vineyards to be used for the first time in determining "cropland."

The conferees agreed to an amendment to the Senate bill to provide that unused acreage allotments heretofore established for extra long staple cotton could be released and reapportioned in the same manner as provided for upland cotton.

Senate conferees accepted the long range features of the House bill that provide that the State acreage reserve shall be used, in addition to the uses to which such reserve may be put under existing law, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardships. Provision also is made to permit the use of county reserve in adjusting farm allotments to correct inequities and prevent hardships.

SECTION 4. DURUM WHEAT

Section 4 of the bill approved by the Conference Committee would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to increase acreage allotments and marketing quotas to classes of wheat determined to be in short supply. At the present time, there is an acute shortage of durum wheat, while production is being unduly restricted by acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

SECTION 5. POTATOES

Section 5 of the bill permits section 32 funds to be used in operations with respect to Irish potatoes. Price supports for potatoes are prohibited by section 5 of the joint resolution entitled "joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended, and to price supports for potatoes." Section 32 operations do not provide direct price supports but, by encouraging exports and consumption, they do have the effect of supporting prices. The bill agreed upon by the conferees would not remove the general prohibition against price supports for potatoes nor reactivate the maximum potato price support provision of title 2 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 but would simply permit section 32 operations for potatoes on the same basis as for other perishable commodities.

Sections of the bill relating to classes of wheat in short supply and to Irish potatoes were not included in the House bill but were agreed upon by House conferees with minor amendments in the original language of the Senate bill relating to wheat.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
WM. S. HILL,
CHAS. B. HOEVEN,
SID SIMPSON,
E. K. BRAMBLETT,
PAUL B. DAGUE,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
E. C. GATHINGS,
J. L. MCMILLAN,
THOS. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will recall that in the closing days of the last session the House passed a bill relating to acreage allotments for cotton. The Senate did not take up that bill before adjournment.

The Senate has now passed the bill after substituting its own provisions for those contained in the House bill. This is a conference report reconciling the differences between the two bills.

The bill which passed the House provided that the national cotton acreage allotment for 1954 should be 22,613,000 acres, and there were provisions for dividing that acreage among the States.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. What would the acreage for cotton have been but for the enactment of this legislation?

Mr. HOPE. The allotment which was made by the Secretary of Agriculture under presently existing law was 17,910,448 acres. That was the maximum amount the Secretary could make. It was recognized by everyone that that was not an adequate acreage, that it would result in great distress among cotton producers, and that it might produce less than an adequate supply of cotton in the event we had a poor crop year.

The bill, as it passed the other body, provided for a total of 21,379,342 acres, and contained provisions for dividing that between the States in the eastern and western areas in the Cotton Belt, under what, I think, is as satisfactory an arrangement as can be worked out. The Senate bill also set up a method for allocating the extra acres. It must be understood that the 17,910,448 acres has already been allocated. No change can be made in that. But the extra acreage will be allocated under a formula set up in the bill as agreed on in conference. In the interest of time I will not elaborate further on the specific provisions of the bill but will be glad to answer questions.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The conference report then provides the overall acreage provisions as provided in the Senate bill; is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, that is correct. The acreage is the same as in the Senate bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman tell us in his presentation of this matter how this disposition of it ties in with the recommendations made by the President for an agricultural price policy?

Mr. HOPE. There is no connection between this bill and the President's recommendations for long-range farm legislation. But I am glad to advise the gentleman that this bill and the acreage carried in it is based upon a recommendation by the Secretary of Agriculture. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture requested the Congress to enact legislation to provide this number of acres for the national cotton acreage allotment this year.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. It might be well if the gentleman would also point out the fact that in July the House passed a bill fixing the minimum acreage at 22,500,000 so the bill now before us is for at least a million acres lower than the bill which we passed in July.

Mr. HOPE. Yes, that is correct. Of course, in July the estimate for cotton production for 1953 was more than 2 million bales below what the final production turned out to be.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman might also point out and I would also like to point out to the House at this time that this bill now provides a minimum which is about 4 million acres less than was planted in cotton in this country last year.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. Will the gentleman advise the Members how much cotton there is now in storage being held by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. HOPE. I do not think I have the figure in mind at the present moment, but I will be glad to insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it not approximately 1 year's supply?

Mr. HOPE. I think the total cotton supply including what is in the hands

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the Government and what is outside, above the amount that will be consumed in this current year, amounts to about a year's domestic requirements.

Mr. HESELTON. Can the gentleman inform the House how much additional cotton there will be in terms of the additional acreage that is provided in this conference report?

Mr. HOPE. That depends, of course, so largely upon weather and insect pests and plant diseases that I would not want to venture a prediction. But, it is 4 million acres less than the acreage which was planted last year. Of course, we had an extraordinarily heavy yield last year, one of the greatest yields per acre, I believe, that we have ever had.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it safe to say that if we pass this conference report this afternoon, there will have to be bought a great many thousands of bales of cotton by the Government which will have to be placed in storage during the next year?

Mr. HOPE. No, I would not be prepared to make that statement.

Undoubtedly there will be cotton put under loan, some of which will get into the hands of the Government. But so far in the cotton program the Government has not sustained any loss, and I do not believe it will under this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say at the outset that I favor this conference report, and I shall vote for its adoption. I would call to the attention of the gentleman, as he has said, that last summer when this matter was before us I worked as best I could as majority leader to bring the measure to passage. Prior to that time, when a similar situation confronted us with respect to wheat, I aided in bringing the matter to passage. I have asked the gentleman to yield only for this purpose: We are operating under certain farm programs that have been enacted in the past with bipartisan support. Members on both sides have tried as best they could to solve the agricultural problems and to develop a sound program. To my mind, the colloquies which have taken place and the explanation of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] offer clear evidence that certain difficulties and troubles are arising under the operation of the program. It appears that with respect to both wheat and cotton we are confronted with huge carryovers. Under existing law the formula provided for requires that the acreage be cut back very, very substantially. With respect to cotton, frequently it has been said to me that if we do not increase the acreage the decrease would be so great as to bring actual distress among the cotton farmers. Of course that is the reason for this legislation. I say again, it points up a weakness, it points up a difficulty which I think the Congress must consider whenever future action is taken.

I appreciate and understand the position of the advocates of a rigid, high, inflexible support price. I supported and voted for it as I did the 1948 and the 1949 acts. But it has also come to my attention that if you have this high support price we are going to avoid serious difficulty, we are going to avoid serious drains on the Government only by the imposition of very strict quota acreage allotments.

I am going to support this conference report. What we are trying to do is to avoid the impact of the very formula we created in the law. May I say this to my colleagues, we cannot continue forever to have it both ways. I think we must recognize that we cannot always reach for the sweet and then, when the bitter comes along, say we are not going to take that. We will just vote a lot more capital for the Commodity Credit Corporation. All I am saying, as I have said before, is that I think certain weaknesses and difficulties are appearing. No one advocates any abrupt, overnight change from what we have, but at the same time I think we would be reckless with our responsibility if we did not recognize the existence of some of these difficulties and weaknesses, and by a gradual process undertake as best we can to make adjustments that would seem to be indicated. As a matter of fact, I think both the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] would agree with me that this is a temporary adjustment in the farm program, indicated as necessary. But, beyond that, again may I say I do not think we can continue forever to have it both ways. In addition, as the Committee on Agriculture begins a study of this very difficult, complex problem, I trust that they will have these matters in mind.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HOPE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like the gentleman to inform the House whether there is anything in this conference report, or in this bill, if we adopt it, that would prevent us from following the kind of agricultural-price program the President has recommended.

Mr. HOPE. I can say to the gentleman that there is nothing in this bill that would in any way affect long-range legislation that may be brought up this year concerning agriculture. This bill has two aspects. One deals with the acreage allotments for this year and the other deals with the method of making acreage allotments in the future. In other words, there are temporary and permanent provisions of this bill. There is nothing in the bill that would interfere with any action that the Congress might take during this session with respect to revising farm legislation.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman to repeat the figure of the additional number of acres that would be brought in; I understood the gentleman to say three or four million.

Mr. HOPE. The number of acres that was allotted under existing law was 17,910,448. Under this bill there would be allotted overall, in total, 21,379,342, or about 3½ million acres additional.

Mr. BARDEN. Here is what the bill did. There had been farmers who had been growing cotton and among them there were those who had 50 acres, 150 acres, 200 acres. They had contractual agreements with their tenants and sharecroppers. But along came this bill and a farmer, in some instances, was cut 65 percent. Of course, that just played havoc with the whole setup. It did not bother the 5-acre man, but the 50-acre man or the 150-acre man, who were small farmers too, it put them on the road looking for another farm for them to go to.

Now, do I understand that these approximately 4 million acres are to be used in bringing up the overall average in a State, or will they be used to bring up the average in the particular counties that were cut the most?

Mr. HOPE. The additional acreage will be distributed under the formula contained in the bill. Certainly it will not take care of every hardship case and give everybody all the acreage he feels he should have. But we think it will help a great deal.

Mr. BARDEN. Here is the thing that is interesting to me. I did not have a single group of farmers approach me who did not say readily, "We are perfectly willing to cut our crop 20 percent, 30 percent, or 40 percent if need be. We are in favor of a reduction of acreage, but we cannot understand why 1 county is cut 65 percent, and another county 30 percent, while maybe the small farmer somewhere is not cut at all."

They did not like the inequity that existed there under the formula that distributed the 17 million acres.

If this additional acreage is to be used to level up allotments, I think that will appeal to the agricultural people because, in the long run, I do not know of any people on earth who have a keener sense of fair play than they do. All they want is to be treated alike.

Mr. HOPE. I will say to the gentleman that this is to be used for the purpose of leveling up, as the gentleman says. I certainly would not want to say that it is going to give everybody all the acreage he thinks he should have, but it will be used for the purpose of adjusting inequities and taking care of those situations the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The report refers to durum wheat. I would like to have it made clear that the Secretary has the authority to increase the acreage allotted for durum-wheat production for this year if he finds there is a shortage of this particular type of wheat, which wheat is used largely for macaroni. Is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct. Under the language now contained in the conference report, that authority will extend for this year and next year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I want to especially address my remarks to sec-

tion 4, paragraph E, wherein the Secretary is permitted to increase the acreage allotment of classes or subclasses of wheat which are found to be in short supply over a 3-year period. I introduced a bill along those lines earlier in this session. That provision in this conference report takes care of the situation, and I appreciate the efforts along these lines made by the conference committee.

There are many classes of wheat, and they are used for various purposes. Under the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture, in applying acreage restrictions, is permitted no discretion, and the same restriction must be applied to all wheat, even though, as is now the case, there exists a very real shortage of certain important classes.

For the past several months I have been working along with Hon. J. Hugo Aronson, Governor of Montana; Hon. Albert J. Kruse, the Montana State commissioner of agriculture; and others in an effort to obtain larger acreage allotments for those Montana and Dakota farmers who produce high-protein wheat. The Secretary of Agriculture has been unable to comply with our request because the present law does not permit him to differentiate.

Montana high-protein hard-winter and spring wheat is necessary to produce the flour for yeast-leavened bakery products such as bread, rolls, and sweet goods. Generally it is not interchangeable with the soft wheats, although it is sometimes mixed with other wheat in order to produce a higher protein product.

During the past year Montana farmers received premiums as high as 50 cents per acre on this desirable and necessary wheat. This, I believe, gives good indication of the demand for our wheat, and the fact is that the hard winter and spring wheat, with its high-protein content, is not contributing to the overall surplus of wheat.

Under these circumstances, while it is necessary to curtail wheat production generally, it certainly is not necessary or in the public interest to curtail the production of high-protein wheat.

The same general considerations apply to the durum wheat, grown primarily in North Dakota, which is used for macaroni and many other products and for which there is no substitute. I note that the report on this measure refers to durum as an example of the class of wheat for which special consideration is required. As I have pointed out, durum is not alone, however, and we are hopeful that the Secretary will now proceed, as soon as this measure is approved, to make the necessary and desirable increases in the acreages for high-protein wheat so that the American people will continue to have adequate supplies of this vital product.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I note in section 5 of the conference report a general discussion of price supports for Irish potatoes. I also note that the language here would not normally be construed to encompass price supports for Irish potatoes. I would like to have the chairman of the Agricultural Committee advise me whether I am correct in assuming that it is not the intention of the committee to include price supports for potatoes?

Mr. HOPE. The language speaks for itself. It does provide for section 32 operations as far as Irish potatoes are concerned. In other words, Irish potatoes may be produced under the section 32 program by authority of this legislation.

Mr. BUDGE. But it is not the intention to place Irish potatoes under any support program other than by the use of section 32 funds?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is true, however, that the rider attached to this bill puts the Government back in the potato business, is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. I will say to a very limited extent.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Only 18 months ago the potato interests that were pushing this were outspoken in opposition to any form of Government participation in the potato business. It is significant, if you watch the futures market, that, since this proposal was made and they figured out how much the Government needed to put into the purchase of potatoes for the starch factories, the speculators on the market have pushed that market up to that same extent, probably 40 cents a barrel. It is quite generous of this Congress to give the speculators that sort of a break.

Mr. HOPE. Let me say to the gentleman that potatoes are the only agricultural commodity not included under the general price support legislation. They are in this bill in a very limited way. The price support program as far as potatoes are concerned, after this bill is enacted, will be a very minor program and will be less than the support of any other type of agricultural commodity. In fact, they stand in a class by themselves in that respect.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Going back to cotton-acreage allocation, as I understand from reading the conference report, there are alternate formulas to be used in the apportionment of acreage in the State?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand that the State committee then, after the national allotment has been made to the States, may determine which formula will be used?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Now, that being true, one State, of course, could have one formula and another State could have another, meaning, of course, that the State committees could make a determination which formula would be more advantageous to that State.

Mr. HOPE. Well, to the farms; that is, the committee would have the latitude to decide which formula might more nearly fit the needs of the cotton farmers of that State.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, the State committee, as I understand from the report, may determine whether or not to allocate acreage direct to the farms or to follow present law and allocate it to the counties, to be in turn allocated to the farms.

Mr. HOPE. Well, there are those alternatives, that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. And that decision can be made by the State committee.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Now, there is a provision, I believe, for the releasing of unplanted acreage.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Does that mean that a farmer in a county can release acres which he does not intend to plant this year back to the county committee to be reallocated within the county?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. If acres are released, does the farm lose that acreage for future consideration or does the farm keep it?

Mr. HOPE. It does not lose any rights that it might have had by reason of existing law; in other words, it has the same rights whether the acreage is released or not as far as future years are concerned.

Mr. HARRIS. If there are acres released back to the county committee to be reallocated which cannot be used within that county, do I understand authority is given to let such unused acres go back to the State for reallocation to some other place where it might be used?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. What is the provision with reference to the releasing of unallocated acres within the county to the State to be allocated somewhere else? Would you explain that provision?

Mr. HOPE. What does the gentleman mean by "something else"?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, for instance, under present law, under the 17,910,000 allocation, a county, for instance, gets a certain allotment which could not be allocated within that county; in other words, the county got more acreage allocated to it than it could allocate to farms under the law. Is it not true that the committee has adopted a provision that such acreage could go back to the State?

Mr. HOPE. Well, there is this provision in the legislation:

> Any part of the county allotment heretofore established for the 1954 crop which was not apportioned to farms because of the limitation contained in the proviso in subsection (f) (2) of this section shall be available to the State committee and used as provided above for apportionment of unallotted acreage to farms. The provisions of this subsection, except paragraph (2), shall not apply to extra long staple cotton covered by section 347 of this act.

Mr. HARRIS. That was the provision that I had reference to, and I asked the question for explanation. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Is it not true that this bill actually provides for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a greater reduction in national acreage than the legislation we passed last year?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, this cotton legislation has my reluctant support. It has my support because of the fact it goes as far, in terms of increasing national acreage, as we can rationally go to relieve cotton farmers beltwide without identifying them by size or type of operation. Moreover, it is a partial answer to the inequity which present application of the 5-year base period for allocations among States imposes upon California. The fact that it is only a partial answer to the California problem reflects the relative numerical voting strength of Western State Congressmen and Senators on the two Agricultural Committees as compared to the numerical representation from other cotton areas. Faced with the hard fact of this disparity of representation on important committees, we compromised.

I am most disturbed about those aspects of the bill which relate to intrastate allocations among counties and farmers.

The bill establishes alternate methods of intrastate distribution. The State committee can assume the function of distributing acres directly to farms according to a formula which is basically a farm history concept, or it can distribute acreages to counties for distribution by county committees according to the same formula or by the use of the cropland concept which governed previous allocation.

In applying the 65–40 history formula, the proposed law reintroduces the once discarded concept of cropland to establish a ceiling on individual farm grants to 50 percent of cropland. This limitation is of no significance in increasing or decreasing any State's acreage, but it can have important effects, insofar as the individual farm is concerned. In my opinion, it will operate in California to the disadvantage of the typical medium or small cotton farmer who purely, because of the necessities of capital investment in California in water, land improvement, and equipment, must get both feet wet in cotton, so to speak, if he farms cotton at all. Larger growers are more diversified, not because they are better farmers, but because they do not need each year's income for food and clothing and debt retirement and can afford to speculate with other more potentially remunerative crops with some of their acreages.

The injury of the reassertion of the cropland concept in this limitation feature is compounded by the fact that a new definition of cropland is adopted which permits, I am informed, the inclusion of some but not all of acres excluded under existing law. This reported uneven repeal of the formula for adjusting cropland will penalize small and medium growers in my area by reason of differential treatment of orchard and vineyard as compared to lands which are nonirrigable or planted to other support program crops.

I also feel that the law proposed is not adequate in defining the basis on which unallotted acres will be distributed among counties in the event the State adopts the direct State-to-farm method of distribution until the 65–40 percent requirements are met. Such distribution should be on a formula closely equivalent to the 5-year acreage history. The law can be so interpreted, but I would prefer that such interpretation be spelled out. Moreover, the alternative method of State breakdown to counties initially for farm distribution should be applied to allocate among counties strictly on the basis of the basic 5-year calculation. The language in the bill indicates that such application would be permitted, but the language is somewhat loose.

I am alerting my growers to insist upon these interpretations, and I am urging them to collect the necessary data to determine their position on the various acts of discretion permitted the State and county committees, to wit, distribution from State to farm versus State to county, dist ibution by county according to history versus distribution according to cropland.

Finally I would like to say that I think the Farm Bureau and Western Cotton Growers Association did an excellent job in securing resolution of the differences of opinion existing among cotton area representatives as to a proper distribution of added acreages among States. It was indicated that no legislation could be secured without beltwide agreement on that subject, and a compromise agreement was reached on that phase of the problem with the active cooperation of these organizations.

The committees of the Congress are to be congratulated for their untiring efforts to arrive at legislation relating to the 1954 crop in a situation of urgency created by the proximity of the planting season. No better testimonial could be secured for the diligence of Congress in support of an argument that most of its Members are overworked and underpaid.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, while this is a bill which has to do with support prices, that part to which I address myself, having to do with cotton, is essentially a redistribution of acreage inside the industry itself, and this bill is, in the opinion of those of us living in the area into which cotton has moved, a great improvement over the original bill.

We think it unfortunate that the conference felt it necessary to write in the prohibition which appears as the top sentence on page 2 of the conference report—actually beginning briefly on page 1—but we are not constrained to make an issue of this. We can only point out that whenever an attempt is made to protect or to force monopolies by legislation, it is the commodity itself which suffers eventually, as cotton will suffer from the development of synthetics if the unwillingness persists, in refusing to recognize the same trend in cotton, which has, in reverse, worked to the benefit of the South, in other commodities.

On behalf of the cotton growers of the area I represent, I thank the members of the committee and of the conference, for an improved bill. I refer to the cotton sections.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It is true that the Federal Government on loans to cotton has not lost any money over a period of 20 years?

Mr. HOPE. That is true.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to ask one question on a subject which the gentleman has partially covered, but my people are very much concerned about it. What is the largest amount of acreage reduction any one farmer can be compelled to take under the arrangement presently agreed to?

Mr. HOPE. There is nothing in the law itself that would enable me to answer that question directly, but the grower is entitled to an allotment equal to the larger of 65 percent of the average acreage for the preceding 3 years or 40 percent of the highest acreage planted in any one of these 3 years.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. He cannot be compelled to take less than that?

Mr. HOPE. No. I should say to the gentleman there are four States where the State allotment they will receive will probably not enable them to carry out that provision in full, but the gentleman's State is not one of them.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I ask the gentleman this question then: Does the gentleman think that under this arrangement every farmer will have a reasonable chance to get an adequate cotton acreage for the current year?

Mr. HOPE. That depends on the gentleman's definition of "adequate," but I think I can say that it does give him an opportunity to get a reasonable cotton acreage, taking into account the need for acreage reduction.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. May I say that this bill is not as good as we would like to have it, but it is much better than the Senate bill and it is better than the House bill was last fall for all cotton areas concerned. I do think more consideration should be given to climatic conditions, green bugs, boll weevils, hail, and diversification. We should give some consideration to working out our surplus—working out some kind of trade. There should be more consideration of family-sized farms and there should be more local control. We should consider the planted acreage rather than the harvested acreage.

I should like to offer congratulations to Mr. HOPE, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. BELCHER, and the two Oklahoma

Senators. I do think we ought to be sure that the reapportionment may be made at any time prior to the end of the planting season. Will that be the case?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas, the chairman of the committee, if he feels that this bill, together with existing law, will enable the Department in making allotments to give reasonably adequate consideration to people in the drought area who were unable to plant their cotton on account of drought conditions.

Mr. HOPE. I think so. It was certainly the intention of the committee that that should be done.

Mr. MAHON. I wonder if the gentleman would agree that perhaps the average farmer feels that the total number of acres by which the national allotment is increased in this bill is reasonably satisfactory. The real problem will come in the administration and the distribution of those acres. Does the gentleman think that is correct?

Mr. HOPE. I think that is true; yes.

Mr. MAHON. The committee recognizes, of course, that this bill will disappoint large numbers of cotton producers because many producers will have little opportunity to participate in the distribution of additional acres. Many producers, of course, will be pleased. I have studied the new bill carefully and I think I can see the weaknesses as well as the good points in this measure. It seems to me a lot of difficulties and misunderstandings will arise. The committee, of course, has had a difficult problem. Under the circumstances is this the best that the committee could work out in conference on this bill?

Mr. HOPE. I always hesitate to say that what we have done is the best, but I feel I am justified in saying to the gentleman that the conference committee did what I believe was a reasonably good job in dealing with the situation confronting us. Of course, we could not do what many Members would like to have seen done.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. We all realize that this bill represents a compromise of conflicting interests in 20 States which produce cotton. There is one question I would like to ask the chairman. The bill which passed the House last July provided approximately 991,000 acres for California, which represented a reduction of 27½ percent below what was grown in 1952. The bill which passed the Senate provided approximately 936,000 acres which was a reduction of 34 percent. But in neither of the bills was there any restriction as far as history up to the total amount provided. But in reading the conference report, I note a number of new additions but one in particular to which I would like to call your attention is the sentence beginning at the bottom of page 1 running over to the top of page 2:

> The additional acreage made available to the States under clause (B) of the preceding sentence shall not be taken into account in establishing future State acreage allotments.

Does that mean that the 22,879 acres allotted to the State of California under that particular clause are not to be counted as history in the future?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. HUNTER. I personally object to that, but, as I pointed out, this is a matter of compromise. But it points out the fundamental fact that this program in general does not recognize trends and the fact that in California and Arizona, where there has been a tremendous growth in population and an increase in land use, more cotton has been produced and it tends to freeze the geographical pattern of planting as it has existed in the past.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas if it is not true that in the last year in which there was cotton-acreage allotment in 1950 that there was a large surplus of cotton being carried over, as we have heard today, and that many people were worried about this large surplus of cotton? Is that not the case?

Mr. HOPE. That is true; yes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not true that by the end of that planting season with the crop that was made, there was actually a cotton shortage and it was necessary to impose export quotas on cotton?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is correct. Of course, it simply illustrates the fact that none of us can anticipate what nature will do in a situation of this kind. All we can do is to enact legislation to make these allocations and allotments on what we think is a sound basis.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In other words, adjustments like this are certainly not immoral—they do not compromise the basic fact at all and these adjustments must be made because no mathematical formula is possible to really figure these things out.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is true.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Kansas and his committee for the work they have done on this very difficult problem. I agree with him that there are certain parts of this which are compromises, and probably do not please everybody, but by and large, I think, they have done a very fine job and I compliment the gentleman and his committee.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, the farmers in Alabama are ready to plant their crop. Some immediate action is necessary. This conference report is a long way from what many of us want and need, but since it does represent the best possible solution we can get at this time, I want to add my endorsement in support of this legislation. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BERRY. May I ask the distinguished chairman a question with reference to section 4, subsection (e), and the durum allotment? Can this allotment only be extended to farmers who produced durum wheat during the past 3 years? Does it only apply where wheat has been produced?

Mr. HOPE. That was the intention of the committee, that it would apply only to farms which had been producing durum wheat. Of course, any farmer who has a wheat allotment can put all of his allotted acreage into durum whether he has grown it before or not. I think there may be a considerable shift to durum, due to the great advantage as far as price is concerned at this time. But the provision in the law itself contemplates only that these allotments for durum wheat will be made only on farms where durum has been grown sometime during the last 3 years.

Mr. BERRY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the South Dakota Federation of Post Office Clerks, relating to salary increases for postal clerks:

> RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT LAKE ANDES, S. DAK., SEPTEMBER 13, 1953
>
> Whereas there was held in Lake Andes, S. Dak., a meeting composed of post office clerks from the States of South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, and North Dakota for the purpose of reviewing some favorable legislation in the 2d session of the 83d Congress; and
>
> Whereas it is a known fact that the cost of living has increased considerably in the past 3 years causing a hardship on people living on a fixed salary or income: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That we go on record in favor of a salary increase of $800 for postal employees to offset the present increased living costs, merit promotion in the postal service and union recognition, legislation now pending in the Congress; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent Senators and Representatives of South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, and North Dakota with a request that they urge the Congress to hold early and favorable hearings on the above-named legislation so that it may be enacted at an early date and it is also requested that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.
>
> MARVIN R. KECK, *President*.
> GEORGE L. CLARK, *Secretary*.
>
> LAKE ANDES, S. DAK., *September 13, 1953*.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks on the conference report in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the cotton acreage allotment bill before this House is far from desirable and, in fact, contains certain fundamental inequities to which I seriously object. The bill we are considering here is somewhat better than the Senate version in that it does provide State and county committees some flexibility in distributing acreage allotments and giving relief in hardship cases. Unfortunately, most of the undesirable elements of the Senate bill have not been changed.

This bill amounts to sectional legislation, where one section of the country is being deliberately favored over another. In this case certain new cotton-producing areas in the West will be given preferential treatment over the established, traditional cotton-producing areas of the South and Southwest. Existing legislation provides that acreage allotments be made on the basis of a 5-year history. I am certainly in agreement that the acreage allotment of 17.9 million acres for the Nation is inadequate; however, the acreage increase from 17.9 to 21.3 million should be handled on the basis of a 5-year history of cotton production, just as the original 17.9 million acres was handled. There is no justification for parceling out special acreage allotments to certain sections of the country. The large cotton surplus on hand at the present time came about because certain western growers ignored the advice of the Department of Agriculture during the last 2 or 3 years and have planted greatly increased acreages in cotton. These western growers expanded their acreage at a time legislation existed to provide for equitable cotton acreage allotments and have no case when they contend that allotments on the basis of a 5-year history is too severe.

The bill which we are considering will result in most of the increased acreage going to these new cotton-producing areas, which have contributed in large part to the present cotton surplus. The bill seems to ignore the fact that certain of the larger producers in the established cotton-producing areas of Texas and the South will be cut severely. This would not be so bad if only the landowner was affected, but in most instances tenant families which derive their livelihood from cotton production will be moved off of the farm. The landowner will probably find a way to turn his productive land to another crop, such as livestock, but the tenant family will suffer for lack of employment.

I consider it a most serious matter, Mr. Speaker, when the Congress of the United States deliberately contrives legislation for benefit of one section of the country at the expense of the other. Most central Texas farms have been producing cotton as a chief crop for 50 years. It seems most unfair to penalize these established cotton farmers for the benefit of western cotton farmers who have moved into newly reclaimed areas and planted large acreages of cotton despite the warnings of the Secretary of Agriculture that they were not protected by law and would receive a heavy cut in acreage allotment on the basis of their 5-year history.

A great deal has been said about the tremendous expense involved in installing irrigation equipment for cotton in certain of the reclaimed western areas.

Advocates of the western cotton farmer have raised a great cry that economic disaster confronts the western farmer if he is not given special consideration, yet it is a fact that these western irrigated areas have a great deal more flexibility in selecting crops on acreage not used by cotton than do the traditional cotton-producing areas, for the simple reason that they control their own water supply and can participate in vegetable production. What it amounts to, Mr. Speaker, is that the taxpayer has spent tremendous sums of money to build dams and irrigation facilities to reclaim these western areas and now the cotton farmers of the South are being expected to relinquish their cotton acreage to these new western farmers.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, when the House adopted this afternoon the conference report on House bill 6665, increasing cotton and wheat allotments and marketing quotas, it took action which I predict will return to haunt those who supported it.

I grant that we were confronted with a dilemma. This is the inevitable result of the existing system of high, rigid price supports. But I suggest that trying to solve a dilemma by compounding it never has worked and never will work.

What are the basic facts? If this report had not been accepted, the 1954 national acreage allotment would be 17,910,448 acres. This report adds 3,468,894 acres, or a total national allotment of 21,379,342 acres.

The Department of Agriculture advises me that the national average of cotton production per acre is 271 pounds. On that basis, we will have 940,070,274 more pounds of cotton.

Measured another way—a bale contains approximately 480 pounds gross weight. So we will have 1,958,480 more bales.

For what purpose? Is there a shortage or a prospective shortage?

The statement accompanying the report does not say so. Rather it says that since July 31, 1953—

> A cotton crop had been harvested which exceeded by approximately 2 million bales the estimate of the 1953 crop that was available to the House when it acted upon House bill 6665.

In his message on agriculture, President Eisenhower said:

> Cotton, like wheat, is an export crop whose price is currently supported above the world price. Carryover stocks in the United States have been accumulating rapidly in the past 2 years. These stocks, probably close to 9 million bales by next August, will approximate a full year's domestic requirement.

What about current inventories? I do not have any information as to amounts in private hands but I assume they are substantial. The last report of the Commodity Credit Corporation is for the period ending October 31, 1953. It shows on hand 235,598 bales of upland cotton valued at $33,167,990.27 and 478,211,709 pounds of cotton linters valued at $47,637,863.

It is significant that reserves for losses have been set up in the amount of $4,264,000 on the upland cotton and of $24,928,000 on the cotton linters—a total of $29,192,000.

In all fairness, I must add that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is characteristically right when he states that the Commodity Credit Corporation has not lost money in its cotton operation. In fact, overall, the record shows a gain of $268,229,114 as of October 31, 1953. But I must add that the gains have been dropping sharply since June 30, 1946. With a gain of only $9,637 in fiscal 1954 through October 31, 1953, a reasonable question may be raised as to the future.

Moreover, when it is placed in the framework of the whole program, there is a principle of great importance involved.

Have we so soon forgotten the excellent and profoundly important question of the President's state of the Union message? Or is it that there is a disposition to avoid facing up to a difficult problem?

Let me remind you of what President Eisenhower said to us just 2 weeks ago in the Chamber. He said:

> Agricultural laws now in effect successfully accomplished this wartime purpose of encouraging maximum production of many crops. Today, production of these crops at such levels far exceeds present demands. Yet the laws encouraging such production are still in effect. The storage facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation bulge with surplus stocks of dairy products, wheat, cotton, corn, and certain vegetable oils; and the Corporation's presently authorized borrowing authority—$6,750,000,000—is nearly exhausted.

All of us recall that the President explained in his message on agriculture 10 days ago that under existing laws and conditions he had to request additional borrowing authority for the corporation in the amount of $1,750,000,000. There is legislation pending to do that.

The President went on to say:

> Some products, priced out of domestic markets, and others, priced out of world markets, have piled up in Government hands. In a world in which millions of people are hungry, destruction of food would be unconscionable. Yet, surplus stocks continue to threaten the market, and in spite of acreage controls authorized by present law, surpluses will continue to accumulate.

Surely, we recall the two alternatives he placed before us.

One, to permit the market price gradually to have greater influence on the planning of production by farmers, insulating existing surpluses, and by building on the agricultural laws of 1948 and 1949, establishing a price-support program with enough flexibility to attract the production of needed supplies of essential commodities and to stimulate the consumption of those commodities that are flooding American markets.

Is what has been done here today a step in that direction? Surely, no one would argue that it was.

Rather, I insist that it was a step to the second alternative outlined by the President—one of imposing still greater acreage reductions for some crops and applying rigid Federal controls on the use of diverted acres, which would regi-

ment the production of every basic agricultural crop, placing every producer of those crops under the domination of the Federal Government in Washington. He added:

This alternative is contrary to the fundamental interests, not only of the farmer, but of the Nation as a whole; neither is it a real solution to the problem facing us.

I grant that no one here supporting this conference report would approve of this second alternative. But, if we persist in these exceptions, we shall be taking that path.

Moreover, as long as we continue to ignore the impact of these artificially created surpluses and this blind insistence that the Government encourages their growth, we are overlooking a vitally important psychological factor.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson pointed this out Monday when he testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee. He said it was about time to ask ourselves a few pointed questions and suggested this one:

At what point will the 140 million Americans who do not live on farms rise up—as they did in the potato fiasco of a few years ago—and demand not revision but outright elimination of all direct aid to agriculture?

Those are plain words, honestly and courageously spoken. They needed to be said and they deserve the most careful consideration.

I represent a district with important agricultural and industrial activities. I know that my constituents who do not live on farms have a sincere interest in the welfare of those who do live on farms and recognize the problems and difficulties peculiar to agriculture. But I am confident that they share the President's belief that there is a better way of solving the problem than the one under which we have operated so far. And I am equally confident that the great majority of my constituents who live on farms recognize the glaring defects in the present programs and are anxious that these defects should be removed as soon as possible.

Therefore, I do hope that as this session progresses, we will not be confronted with a series of added acreage allotments, but rather that our Committee on Agriculture will make a prompt study of the President's recommendations and will report legislation in support of them.

Failure to do that will bring the real possibility of an overwhelming demand for the elimination of the present program. While I know that those who are supporting the present program and opposing the President's recommendations do not intend to bring that result about, it will be they who would have to accept full responsibility for it, if it happens.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nineteen Members are present; a quorum.

So the conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation from the House Government Operations Committee.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. POFF.

Copy to Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration to be effective as of this date.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 412), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Banking and Currency: WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, of Wisconsin.

Committee on the Judiciary: RICHARD H. POFF, of Virginia.

Committee on Government Operations: GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMEMORATING COINS OF THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 1917, an act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out all after "SEC. 3." down to and including line 13 and insert "Such coins shall be disposed of at par by banks or trust companies selected by the Louisiana Purchase One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Association, or the Missouri Historical Society."

Page 2, line 24, strike out "1953" and insert "1954."

Page 3, line 16, strike out all after "hereof" down to and including "sesquicentennial" in line 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question. Does this mean that we will have a chance of getting commemorative coins to commemorate the anniversary of the founding of the city of New York as well?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman will be patient for about 3 minutes, I will answer that question by action instead of words.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATION OF TERCENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Banking and Currency I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 987) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., to be held in June 1954, there shall be coined not to exceed 1 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition, and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval the Secretary of the Treasury; but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for such coinage: *Provided*, That the intial number of such pieces coined shall not be less than 100,000.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date 1954, shall be legal tender to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of the city of Northampton, Mass., or its duly authorized agent, upon the payment by it of the par

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

value of such coins. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium, and the net proceeds from the disposition of such coins shall be used for such purposes related to the observance of such tercentennial celebration as the city of Northampton, Mass., shall direct.

SEC. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver co' s of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the processes of coinage, providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall so far as applicable apply to the coinage herein authorized.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Change the period at the end of the first sentence of section 2 to a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of the 2-year period immediately following the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATION OF THE TERCENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the foundation of the city of New York, there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 5 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the initial number of such pieces shall not be less than 200,000: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the Committee for New York City's 300th Anniversary Celebration.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by banks or trust companies selected by the Committee for New York City's 300th Anniversary Celebration, and all proceeds therefrom shall be used for the purposes of such committee in connection with the observance of said tercentennial.

SEC. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for security of the coin; or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

SEC. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued in such numbers, and at such times as shall be requested by the Committee for New York City's 300th Anniversary Celebration and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins: *Provided*, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of the 2-year period immediately following the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to take a few moments to urge the enactment of this bill S. 2474, calling for the minting of a coin to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York.

In the other body where it received unanimous approval, it was cosponsored by the distinguished gentlemen from New York, Senators IVES and LEHMAN.

It is identical with my bill, H. R. 5921, which was cosponsored here by my distinguished colleagues from New York City, Representatives HOLTZMAN, DELANEY, HELLER, KEOGH, KELLY, CELLER, DORN, ROONEY, POWELL, COUDERT, DONOVAN, KLEIN, ROOSEVELT, JAVITS, FINE, DOLLINGER, BUCKLEY, FINO, and RAY. It has had the support of our good friend, the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and his fellow members of that committee. We are indebted to all of them for their wholehearted cooperation.

I am sure that this House will agree that this is a fitting tribute to the great city of New York on the part of the American people.

Three hundred years ago this community was brought into being as a trading post on the North American continent. It soon became the provincial capital of the New Netherlands.

It later served as the national capital of the United States of America and as the capital of the State of New York. Today it is the capital city of the world.

I do not intend to take the time of the House by at this time recounting the many chapters in the great story of the city of New York. Every American is thoroughly familiar with that history, with the rise of business, industry, and trade that go to make up a part of the city and, certainly, they are thoroughly familiar with the cultural institutions and the civic and charitable endeavors that make it not only a great city, but a city with a great heart.

When Peter Stuyvesant and his council in 1653 proclaimed a grant of municipal government, placing city affairs in charge of two burgomasters, or mayors; five schepens, or councilmen; and a schout, or prosecutor, western democracy was born in America, because this municipal council was the first democratic institution on this continent.

The international significance of the event is emphasized by the fact that the United Nations capital was erected on land made available for that purpose by our city.

Another interesting but little known item in our history is that a Dutch farmer by the name of Klaes Martensen van Roosevelt entered this great country in 1650 through what has since become the greatest seaport in the world, New York Harbor. He little dreamed that he was destined to be the common ancestor of seven Presidents of the United States—James Madison, Martin Van Buren, Zachary Taylor, Ulysses S. Grant, William H. Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

To take a place alongside its great institutions of learning, this year the city will bring into being the first new medical college to be organized in this country in more than 25 years, the Albert Einstein Medical College. That could never have been accomplished except for the cooperation and financial support of our great municipality.

The entire Nation, by enactment of this bill, joins in this splendid historical celebration of what was in turn a Dutch city, a British city, and finally an American city holding high for all the world to see, the beacon light of liberty.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE V OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a summary of the bill incorporating the President's recommendations for amendments to title V of the Social Security Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the President transmitted to the Congress his recommendations to improve the health of the American people. Those proposals included a recommendation for a simplified formula for grants-in-aid dealing with health, child welfare, and rehabilitation of the disabled.

I am introducing immediately a bill which embodies the President's recommendations with respect to the three grants for maternal and child health, crippled children's, and child welfare services now authorized under title V of the Social Security Act. This bill permits the States to use greater initiative and take more responsibility in the administration of their program for these services.

As recommended by the President, the States are aided in inverse proportion to their financial capacity. They are also helped in proportion to their child population to extend and improve children's services for health and welfare provided by the grants-in-aid program. Finally, a portion of Federal funds is set aside for the support of unique projects of regional or national significance. This latter approach may make possible the development of new and better ways of solving child health and welfare problems.

This bill re-reemphasizes the concern of this Nation for promoting and safeguarding the well-being of children.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(The summary referred to is as follows:)

SUMMARY OF THE BILL INCORPORATING THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDMENTS TO TITLE V OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

IN GENERAL

The bill would replace the present separate authorizations for categorical grants for maternal and child-health services, crippled children's services, and child-welfare services with an authorization for the following three types of grants:

1. Grants to assist States generally in meeting the costs of their child health and welfare services.

2. Grants to assist States in initiating extensions of, and improvements in, their child health and welfare services.

3. Grants to assist in meeting the costs of projects directed toward the solution of child health and welfare problems of regional or national significance.

The amount of Federal funds to be available for each of the above three types of grants would be specified in annual appropriations. As at present, a total of $41,500,000 would be authorized to be appropriated annually.

These new grants would be available for the same services as are the present appropriations, viz, material and child health, crippled children's, and child-welfare services.

GENERAL GRANTS

The formula for determining each State's allotment for the first type of grant would be similar to that used in the hospital survey and construction (Hill-Burton) provisions of the Public Health Service Act—in that it takes into account both the relative child populations of the States and their relative fiscal resources as measured by State per-capita incomes—but with a minimum allotment of $200,000 (subject to proportionate reduction if the appropriation is below the amount authorized). The matching required of the States would be on an inverse ratio to fiscal resources basis with a minimum State share of 33⅓ percent and a maximum of 66⅔ percent.

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

The formula for determining each State's allotment for extension and improvement purposes would be based on relative State child populations with a minimum allotment of $5,000. From its allotment, a State could receive, over a 6-year period, varying proportions of the cost of approved projects (included in its approved State plan) for extension and improvement of its child-health and welfare services—75 percent of the cost for the first 2 years, 50 percent for the next 2, and 25 percent for the last 2.

ALLOCATION BY GOVERNOR

Of each State's allotments for extension and improvement, and for support of children's services, 32 percent would be available only for maternal and child-health services, 29 percent for crippled children's services, and 19 percent for child-welfare services. The balance of the allotments (20 percent) would be allocated by the Governor of each State among the three types of services.

GRANTS FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS

A portion of each annual appropriation (10 percent for the first 3 years) would be available for grants to State agencies and to nonprofit institutions of higher learning for paying part of the cost of projects holding unique promise of substantial contribution to the solution of child health and welfare problems of multi-State significance or of special national concern.

STATE PLANS

Payments from allotments for the first type of grant (for support of child health and welfare services) would be conditioned upon submission of separate plans (1 for maternal and child-health services, 1 for crippled children's services, and 1 for child-welfare services) by the appropriate State agency, which meet requirements set forth in the bill. These are substantially the same as those now imposed by title V of the Social Security Act with respect to maternal and child health and crippled children's services. Payments from allotments for the second type of grant (for assisting States in initiating extensions and improvements of child health and welfare service) would be conditioned on inclusion of the project in the approved basic State plan.

ADMINISTRATION

Federal administrative authority would be vested, as at present, in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, subject to her delegation.

State administration would generally be vested in the same agencies as at present—the State health agency in the case of maternal and child-health services, a single State agency in the case of crippled children's services, and the State public-welfare agency in the case of child-welfare services.

TRANSITION PROVISIONS

In order to provide States an opportunity to adjust their finances to the new allotment formulas, provision would be made to limit to 10 percent the decrease in allotment which any State would receive in any one year by virtue of the formula change.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENTS

These amendments would become effective July 1, 1955.

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the first year of the Eisenhower administration I think it can truthfully be said that few administrations in our history has accomplished so much in such a short time. The impossible almost has happened in the interest of the American people. The President's strong foreign policy has stopped the war in Korea and the killing, wounding, and imprisonment of American boys. He is driving hard on a broad front toward the goal of world peace.

TAKES THE INITIATIVE

He has called Russia's bluff, has taken the initiative away from Russia and is now calling the turn of world affairs. All world leaders agree there is much less danger of Russia starting a war now than before this administration came to power. He has stopped the propaganda of fear of Russia fed to the American people for the last few years, unmasked the weakness of Russia and is leading on policies of moral and military strength.

His stronger foreign policy toward Russia and his 15-million-dollar free-food program in Berlin following the East German revolt has shown Russia up before the bar of world opinion. He has revealed the charitable heart of America to the world in contrast to the barbarous, cruel, slave government of Russia.

Its effect on the people of the satellite countries now controlled by Russia in Eastern Europe has been so damaging that Russia can no longer depend on the 40 divisions of satellite troops she boasted of a few years ago. His free food program propagandawise has brought more good will to our country than many millions spent on the Voice of America.

MILITARY STRENGTH

After reducing the cost of the military in the last session of Congress by several billion dollars through a change of policy with greater reliance on the Air Force necessary to modern and atomic warfare, and through better planning and greater efficiency our military strength and striking power is much greater today than it was a year ago.

Air power is being expanded as well as atomic weapons for the military.

REDUCTION OF MILITARY FORCES

Following a policy of greater mobility in our military forces and stronger striking power, substantial reductions of large numbers will be made in the military forces through 1954 and 1955 particularly in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, which will result in further tremendous savings.

These planned reductions, the result of a careful study by the Secretary of Defense, and with the approval of the President, are intended to level our total military forces off to about 3,037,914 men in uniform which will mean a reduction of approximately 500,000 military personnel out of the present force of our 3½ million. Draft calls to service continue to drop.

ON THE DOMESTIC FRONT

We cut the cost of Government during the past year by about $14 billion and through such action in less than 12 months have given all taxpayers of the Nation a substantial tax reduction of about $5 billion. It is estimated further tax reductions of $1½ billion will be given the people during this session, the total amounting to about $6½ billion. Tax cutting is to be the pump primer of the Eisenhower administration.

FURTHER REDUCTION OF COST

Continuing our policy of economy we will cut the cost of Government by another $6 billion for the fiscal year.

FEDERAL PAYROLLS

We have reduced civilian payrolls by close to 200,000 persons during this past year with an approximate saving of $600 million.

HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT

Honesty and efficiency in Government has supplanted extravagance, waste and tax fixing and at times, graft and corruption in Government.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT

Our tougher policy and relentless efforts have driven over 2,200 security risks out of the Federal Government and off of the Federal payrolls.

The Department of Justice has brought deportation proceedings against 714 subversive aliens of whom 219 already have been deported. During the past year 17 Communist leaders were convicted; 20 Communist leaders have been indicted and will be brought to

trial and 12 Reds have been indicted for making false statements under the Taft-Hartley labor law or other Federal laws.

We have the Communists on the last lap of their run.

HIGH PRODUCTION

Government statistics from the Department of Commerce show that 1953 has been the most prosperous year in the history of our Nation. It is shown that the gross national product reached an all time high of $369 billion—highest in history.

EMPLOYMENT

As of December 15, 1953, there was employed 61,614,000 workers and the present unemployment for various and all purposes throughout the Nation is at the low figure of 1,850,000.

FARM PRICES

Statistics show that farm prices which have been going down steadily since 1947 have been checked within the past 2 months and are steadily rising week by week.

INFLATION

Inflation is ended. No longer is the value of the dollar whittled away by steadily rising prices. The dollar now buys more of many things. Living costs which moved steadily upward have stopped their rise. The purchasing power of the dollar is increasing.

BOND SALES REFLECT GREATER CONFIDENCE

Savings bonds sales set 7-year record in 1953. Savings bonds sales in 1953 were $793 million above 1952, while redemptions of unmatured bonds dropped $308 million below the 1952 figure, the Treasury Department announced January 13.

Indicating confidence in the new administration, Americans bought $4,368,000,000 in series E and H savings bonds during the calendar year 1953. This is a 7-year record for savings bonds series sold only to individuals. Redemptions of unmatured series E and H bonds amounted to $2,831,000,000 in 1953, compared with $3,139,000,000 in 1952.

Series E and H bonds sales in 1953 exceeded the total redemptions, including both matured and unmatured bonds, by $211 million. In 1952, total redemptions exceeded sales by $523 million.

With the sound policies being followed by the administration and its constant drive for greater efficiency and economy in Government, it appears we will be able to make the transition from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy and prevent a recession or depression.

If the people will exert patience and support this administration with their confidence we can and will get back into an era of sustained peace and sustained prosperity. We are following the only course to reach that goal.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I interrogate the gentleman as to what the probable program next week will be?

Mr. HALLECK. I may say to the gentleman that at the moment there are no bills out of committees on which rules have been granted or on which prospective rules may be granted which would enable me to announce definitely a specific program for next week. However, there are some measures on which hearings have been held that may be worked out by the committee the rest of this week or the fore part of next week that might be called up for action. We all understand there are matters which must be taken care of as quickly as possible.

The chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has a bill or two that might be reported. The same applies to the Committee on Insular Affairs. However, with respect to those matters ample notice will be given to the minority.

There is one other measure that has to do with a very limited authority to be vested in the FBI which comes at the request of the Attorney General and has to do with the interception of certain communications by wire, such information to be used only in criminal prosecutions involving the security of the country. That matter is before the Committee on the Judiciary. What action may be taken, I do not know, but a measure of that consequence, a measure which, incidentally, was included in the state of the Union message, should be considered promptly and if it is to be brought up ample notice will be given.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, having jurisdiction over legislation on immigration and nationality, is faced with an unprecedented influx of private bills. Two thousand and one of these were introduced in the first session of this Congress, and over 250 more have been referred to us during this session.

The majority of these bills seek to change the status of one or more aliens unlawfully in the United States or temporarily here. Some of them seek waivers of the various provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. There are many among those bills that should never have been introduced.

In order to cope with this situation the Committee on the Judiciary has adopted new rules of procedure applicable to private bills of this type, and my purpose today is to serve notice on all Members of the House that those rules are already in effect and since 418 of the 435 Members have introduced these bills, I ask that you carefully read these rules:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 (JURISDICTION OVER LEGISLATION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY), 83D CONGRESS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. The meeting of the subcommittee shall be held on Monday of each week at 9:45 a. m., unless otherwise ordered by the chairman.

2. All meetings of the subcommittee shall be public except on the order of the chairman or a majority of the members present.

3. A quorum of the subcommittee shall consist of three members.

4. (a) No consideration shall be given to any private bill until a report from the proper Department has been secured.

(b) Requests for reports on private bills from the Departments shall be made only upon a written request addressed to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary by the author of such bill.

(c) In cases of aliens who are physically in the United States at the time of the introduction of the private bill, no reports shall be requested from the Departments unless the author of the bill informs the chairman regarding the date and place of the alien's entry into the United States, his immigration status at that time (visitor, student, exchange student, seaman, stowaway, illegal border crosser, etc.), and the alien's age, place of birth, address in the United States, and the whereabouts of his nearest relatives (spouse, children, parents).

(d) The subcommittee shall not address to the Attorney General communications designed to defer deportation of beneficiaries of private bills who have entered the United States as stowaways, or deserting seamen, or by surreptitiously entering without inspection through the land or sea borders of the United States.

5. Upon the completion of the filing of all evidence pertinent to the case, private bills shall be scheduled for subcommittee and committee consideration in the chronological order of their introduction. Exemption from this rule and from rule 4 (a) may be granted in the discretion of the chairman in cases where private bills designed to waive a ground for exclusion have been introduced for the purpose of uniting or preventing separation of families. However, no such exemption may be granted unless the author of the bill has secured and filed with the committee full and complete documentary evidence in support of his bill.

6. Private bills which have been pending in any of the previous Congresses shall be scheduled for consideration with the least possible delay, and priority for consideration shall be given to bills which have been introduced earliest in any of the past Congresses.

7. Consideration of private bills designed to adjust the status of aliens unlawfully in the United States shall not be deferred due to nonappearance at subcommittee hearings of the author of the bill or persons authorized to represent him.

8. Bills tabled by the committee shall not be reconsidered unless new evidence is introduced showing a material change of the facts previously known to the committee.

9. No private bill shall be considered by the subcommittee unless substantial proof is presented that there is no administrative remedy available in the case covered by the pending bill. Mere inconvenience to the alien who is required to depart from the United States to obtain a visa readily available, except a visa under section 203 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or to utilize other administrative remedy, shall not be deemed to justify the enactment of special legislation.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

AMERICAN COMMUNIST PRISONERS OF WAR IN KOREA

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this morning a newscast reported that the 21 American prisoners of war in Korea who have embraced the Communist doctrine, who in so doing now stand ready to help overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, who have refused to return to duty in the United States Army, and who insist upon remaining with the Communists are to be discharged from our armed services tomorrow. It is reported that these men will receive a discharge reading "released under conditions other than honorable."

Each and every one of these ingrates should receive a dishonorable discharge, and thereby be forever barred from any consideration for war veterans' benefits. A dishonorable discharge is the only kind of a discharge they are entitled to, and it is the only kind of a discharge they should receive.

Permit me to call your attention to the present law declaring eligibility to receive veterans' benefits. I refer you to Thirty-eighth United States Code, section 697C, which provides as follows:

> The discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable shall be a prerequisite to entitlement to veterans' benefits provided by this act or Public Law No. 2, 73d Congress, as amended.

Furthermore, subsection B of paragraph 2 of section 201 of the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952—commonly known as the Korean Veterans Act—provides as follows:

> The term "eligible veteran" means any person who is not in the active service in the Armed Forces and who has been discharged or released from such active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

Therefore, under present law, if discharges reading "released under conditions other than honorable" are delivered to them, every last one of these 21 ungrateful wretches may receive all of the benefits provided by law for our war veterans who have served our country honorably and are loyal to the United States and our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, to give these 21 avowed Communists anything other than a dishonorable discharge is an insult to every war veteran in the United States. I have protested this matter to those in authority at the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and I want to go on record as being opposed to the granting of anything other than a dishonorable discharge to these Commies.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on January 27, following any special orders heretofore entered.

WELFARE FUNDS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like the Members of the House to know that I as one member of the House Committee on Education and Labor am remaining aware of the recommendation of the President regarding the necessity for the investigation of welfare funds.

I do not know whether my colleagues realize that there are within the United States billions of dollars reposing in union welfare funds, as a result of collective-bargaining negotiations that are absolutely unregulated. I mean by that that they are totally within the power of employer and employee representatives. There is a serious question as to whether those who are entitled to protection thereunder are receiving their full benefits. I am told that prohibition was never in it when a comparison is made of the racketeering. Racketeers have moved into the labor unions in order to get control of these vast funds, and, I am told, with great success. I for one am heartily in favor of a thorough investigation in this field.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. SHUFORD) was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to transfer the special order granted him for today to Monday next.

MAIL DELIVERY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as my humble but well-intentioned contribution to the occasion of the first anniversary of the present administration I am presenting to the attention of my colleagues an article by Clayton Fitzpatrick on page 16 of this morning's Chicago Daily Tribune. The Chicago Tribune, as is well known to everyone, is a great Republican newspaper, perhaps the most powerful of the newspapers supporting the late Senator Taft in his presidential campaigns.

The article on page 16 of the Republican Chicago Tribune of today—January 21, 1954—recalls that the Republican national platform of 1952 pledged a more frequent mail delivery and that when the present Postmaster General took office a year ago he renewed this pledge.

The Republican Chicago Tribune as a public service undertook a check-up. It mailed 384 letters in the Chicago area to 16 major cities, just exactly as it had done 1 year ago when the Democrats were running the post office.

The total elapsed time for delivery of all the letters under a Democratic administration was 16,942 hours. The total elapsed time in 1954 under the Republican administration was 17,726 hours, which leaves the writer in the Republican Chicago Tribune to the mathematical conclusion that postal service has slowed about 4½ percent since the Republicans took over.

The article in the Chicago Tribune is printed under a headline reading, "Test Reveals Mail Slower in Last Year." Both the Chicago Tribune and Mr. Fitzpatrick are to be commended, first, for undertaking a valuable and practical public service of this nature and, secondly, for forthrightly printing the result of the test even when it proves the case against the party of the Tribune's affiliation. The article follows:

> TEST REVEALS MAIL SLOWER IN LAST YEAR—TRIBUNE REPEATS 1953 EXPERIMENTS
>
> (By Clayton Fitzpatrick)
>
> A test of the United States mail indicates that service may have slowed about 4½ percent since last year.
>
> The Tribune has repeated an experiment made last year when 384 letters were posted between Chicago and suburbs and 16 major cities. The total elapsed time for delivery of all letters in 1953 was 16,942 hours. The total in 1954 was 17,726 hours.
>
> Reforms introduced by the Eisenhower administration in its first year appeared to have achieved some improvement in service. The gains, however, were more than offset, apparently, by greater delays in sorting and distributing the mail.
>
> NEW POLICY INITIATED
>
> Some first-class mail sent from New York City to Chicago, for example, appeared to have been sent by air under the policy started last October of airlifting first-class mail when space is available. None of the first-class letters from Chicago to New York, however, caught the airlift.
>
> A series of letters mailed in the Chicago Loop at 7 p. m. was delivered more quickly than a similar series last year. This was because the final collection from mailboxes was extended last February from 6:30 p. m. to between 8 and 9:30 p. m. All letters were postmarked at 10 p. m. this year, whereas last year all remained overnight in post boxes and were not postmarked until as late as 3 p. m. the next day.
>
> Postmaster General Summerfield pledged an improvement in service when he took office last January. A plank in the Republican platform of 1952 promised "a more efficient and frequent mail delivery service."
>
> OBJECT OF PLANK
>
> This plank was aimed at the decision of the Truman administration in June 1950 to reduce home delivery of mail to once a day rather than twice. Last May Summerfield estimated that restoring the second delivery would cost $80 million a year to an enterprise operating at $440 million deficit annually.
>
> In making the test mailings every effort was made to make the 1954 test a duplicate of the 1953 test. The same addresses were used in Chicago and suburbs and in all other cities except Houston and Milwaukee. Posting times were the same.
>
> The changes in Houston from one residence to another appeared to have little

effect upon the speed of delivery. In Milwaukee the change was from one business address to another where mail frequently was picked up from a postoffice box. The result was a shortening of delivery time ranging up to 29 hours.

TABLES SHOW RESULTS

Half the mail dispatched to and from Chicago and suburbs was sent at ordinary 3 cent rates. The other half was sent air mail. Tables summarizing the results of the test for each of the 16 cities will be published in this and subsequent reports. Following are the tables for five of the cities:

New York (724 airline miles)—elapsed time in hours

	1953		1954	
	East	West	East	West
AIR MAIL				
Chicago [Tribune]	44	22	25	19
Residence No. 1	41	25	40	45
Residence No. 2	20	23	43	66
Chicago Heights	30	48	24	26
Wheaton	24	51	23	49
Wilmette	20	50	30	44
Totals	179	219	185	249
ORDINARY MAIL				
Chicago [Tribune]	44	46	51	22
Residence No. 1	44	49	40	25
Residence No. 2	41	47	43	47
Chicago Heights	30	48	49	46
Wheaton	49	75	47	44
Wilmette	49	50	45	49
Totals	257	315	275	233

Los Angeles (1,751 airline miles)—elapsed time in hours

	1953		1954	
	East	West	East	West
AIR MAIL				
Chicago [Tribune]	44	45	26	24
Residence No. 1	23	30	49	18
Residence No. 2	21	24	70	23
Chicago Heights	46	26	50	25
Wheaton	48	26	48	24
Wilmette	48	24	49	25
Total	230	184	292	139
ORDINARY MAIL				
Chicago [Tribune]	71	60	50	66
Residence No. 1	71	71	72	68
Residence No. 2	44	87	94	71
Chicago Heights	72	54	74	73
Wheaton	73	52	72	71
Wilmette	73	72	73	73
Total	404	405	435	422

New Orleans (858 airline miles)—elapsed time in hours

	1953		1954	
	North	South	North	South
AIR MAIL				
Chicago [Tribune]	22	22	23	42
Residence No. 1	25	39	25	38
Residence No. 2	23	42	47	41
Chicago Heights	24	23	26	23
Wheaton	27	24	25	45
Wilmette	26	44	25	43
Totals	147	194	171	232
ORDINARY MAIL				
Chicago [Tribune]	46	45	43	42
Residence No. 1	49	64	49	38
Residence No. 2	47	42	71	41
Chicago Heights	48	49	50	47
Wheaton	51	47	49	45
Wilmette	50	44	49	67
Totals	291	301	311	280

St. Louis (251 airline miles)—elapsed time in hours

	1953		1954	
	North	South	North	South
AIR MAIL				
Chicago [Tribune]	24	20	22	22
Residence No. 1	27	38	28	42
Residence No. 2	25	17	50	45
Chicago Heights	26	24	29	27
Wheaton	29	22	28	25
Wilmette	28	44	29	27
Total	159	165	186	208
ORDINARY MAIL				
Chicago [Tribune]	25	44	22	46
Residence No. 1	51	38	28	66
Residence No. 2	49	41	50	45
Chicago Heights	50	23	29	27
Wheaton	29	46	28	49
Wilmette	28	44	29	71
Total	232	236	186	304

Milwaukee (82 airline miles)—elapsed time in hours

	1953		1954	
	North	South	North	South
AIR MAIL				
Chicago [Tribune]	19	22	14	19
Residence No. 1	41	24	12	25
Residence No. 2	16	22	15	47
Chicago Heights	22	32	19	26
Wheaton	21	26	17	26
Wilmette	24	25	39	35
Total	143	151	116	168
ORDINARY MAIL				
Chicago [Tribune]	19	21	14	19
Residence No. 1	37	24	10	25
Residence No. 2	22	22	13	23
Chicago Heights	22	32	19	26
Wheaton	26	26	17	25
Wilmette	18	25	17	25
Total	144	150	90	143

All the letters were posted on January 4, the first Monday of the new year. The letters last year were posted January 5, also the first Monday of the year.

REGISTRATION UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, during the session of the House on yesterday I addressed my colleagues advising them of the formation of a new lobbying group. I accused that particular group of not having registered under the Lobbying Act. I was advised today on my inquiry of the Clerk of the House, who had advised me that they were not registered, that they had registered but under a different title than the one by which I addressed them yesterday. That particular group registered some days ago. However, I would like to say that the information I gave the House yesterday obtained some results. Yesterday after my speech on the floor of the House, Charles P. Taft, Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, and John H. Ferguson registered as lobbyists under the Lobbying Act representing that particular group.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore granted.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF DECEASED CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES—CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Government Operations, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to extend to the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950. I understand that the leadership has no objection. It was cleared with them yesterday.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman spoken to any of the Members on the minority side?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I did not. The bill came out unanimously with the support of all the Members.

Mr. HALLECK. Is any Member here on the minority side who is a member of the Committee on Government Operations?

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is this the bill of which the gentleman spoke yesterday? There was a unanimous report, I might say to the distinguished majority leader, and there was no opposition to it in committee.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 3 of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Accounts not payable under section 3 (a) (with the exception of accounts of employees of the District of Columbia which shall be paid by the District of Columbia, accounts of employees of the Canal Zone Government on the Isthmus of Panama which shall be paid by the Panama Canal Company Zone Government, and accounts of employees of wholly owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations which may be paid by such corporations) shall be payable on settlement of the General Accounting Office except as the Comptroller General may by regulation otherwise authorize or direct."

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the said act of August 3, 1950, is amended by deleting the words: "to the accounts of officers and employees of the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad on the Isthmus of Panama, or."

SEC. 3. This amendatory act shall be effective 2 months from the date of its enactment as of which time section 84 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as added by section 1 of the act of August 10, 1949 (ch. 415, 63 Stat. 593), is repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike the last word of the sentence, the word "Panama."

Page 2, line 3, strike the word "Company."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A BATTLE WON—COMMAND DENIED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain relevant material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the early 1930's, five members of the Capone crime syndicate of Chicago were sentenced to 10 years in prison after conviction of an attempt to extort a million dollars from members of labor unions.

After serving but a part of the sentences, they were paroled, though they long had been known as professional criminals.

Though a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, of which it was my privilege to be chairman, forced a revocation of the paroles, the courts later, apparently accepting the doctrine that a parole once granted was a vested right, held the gangsters were entitled to their freedom.

Since then, a few individuals, using force and violence and economic pressure, have forced themselves into official positions in labor unions. The membership of the unions in some cases has been unable to dislodge them. One result has been that, using their position as union officials and using it without regard to the rights of others, the orders of the courts, or the laws of the land, again a gigantic conspiracy has come into being through which a few have oppressed a large segment of our population, enriched themselves, and perverted the provisions of legislation designed to protect organized labor.

Since 1937, when the sitdown strikes came to Michigan, I have considered it part of my duty as a Representative of the people to call the public's attention to the manner in which equal justice has been denied the people when oppressive tactics by a few union officials have been used.

From the well of the House, on many occasions, specific instances of injurious practices which should be prevented have been called to the attention of the Congress, and, through and because of a press which stands for fair dealing, constitutional government, equal justice under law, in more than a few instances oppressive tactics have been halted.

Notwithstanding the fact that the record of subcommittees of which I have been a member and whose activities I have in large part directed shows a worthwhile service rendered not only to the public but to unions—and that service has been acknowledged by the rank and file of organized labor, as well as by officers of locals—the Committee on Government Operations yesterday denied my request for authority to appoint a subcommittee to continue the work which has been directed by me and which in many instances has been speedily followed by indictments and in some cases by convictions.

A copy of my request and the reasons on which it was based, and which were served last Saturday on the members of the committee, are attached hereto and marked exhibits A and B.

At the suggestion of the House leadership, a revised request was submitted, and that is the one which was rejected. A copy of that resolution is attached, marked exhibit C.

The committee then gave authority to another member of the committee, the Honorable GEORGE H. BENDER, of Ohio, to conduct similar hearings. A copy of that resolution is marked exhibit D. That resolution not only in substance but in language is practically the same as my resolution except that it denies me the authority given the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The action of the committee was apparently either a repudiation of what I had done, the manner in which I had done it, or an expression of personal dislike. Twenty-two members of the committee were present; 9 were absent; 17 voted; 3 proxies were cast; 5 members were present but did not vote.

Long have I been aware that the expression of some of my convictions would not endear me either to the members of my committee or of the Congress.

I was warned—and I realized when on June 29 I suggested to the chairman of the regular subcommittees that it might be well after Congress adjourned and until it met again to reduce their staffs to one professional member and one clerical member—that retaliatory action would be taken. In my opinion our national financial situation warranted that reduction. However, it was rejected and, inasmuch as the dollars are in any event to be spent, it is my purpose to, where necessary, spend economically and judiciously the funds allocated to me.

Another action which especially displeased committee members was the suggestion that travel abroad be limited. Some members of the committee have been on such investigations one or more times, and it seemed to me, a small-town individual, that the information desired could in many instances be obtained from executive offices here in Washington, or at least in this country.

Then, my conviction and the expression of it publicly, that we should not increase congressional salaries at this time brought quite a little resentment from individuals who thought otherwise. It was not that I did not believe Members of Congress earned more money than they were getting, but that I sincerely believe that an increase in congressional pay will make inevitable similar increases in the pay of every Federal employee, and there were in November 1953, 2,365,669 Federal employees.

That would be followed by continued demands for increases in private industry, and then of necessity those who are living on fixed incomes we would be forced to aid by payments from the Federal Treasury.

The result, at least in my humble opinion, would be a new, perhaps unstoppable wave of inflation, which might well, in the end, destroy our economic system.

During the meeting yesterday a Member called attention to the fact that no information of what happened at the executive meeting should be given to the public. Later, a motion was adopted permitting members of the committee to make statements other than the one as to how each individual member voted. The reasons for the vote of an individual are none of my business nor of any concern to me, for free thought and free expression are fundamental principles of our Government and should be of our conduct.

A BATTLE WON

Now to the real purpose of my remarks: Prior to July 15, 1953, there was a contention that there was no need for investigations into racketeering in connection with the movement of interstate commerce, the operation of the antiracketeering laws, activities carried on under cover of the Taft-Hartley Act, and several other Federal statutes.

In my opinion, even those who held those views and those who on July 15, with a 60-day reprieve, liquidated the subcommittee which was investigating extortion and which in the opinion of the press was doing a good job, now believe that there is a nationwide conspiracy carried on by various individuals operating outside the law which should be exposed. That this is true is indicated by the committee's action on yesterday when, after denying me authority to make that investigation, they granted it to another member of the committee.

It is more than probable that I will be able to survive the vote of a lack of confidence. Certainly the acknowledgment, even though it is belated, that the situation needs correction is gratifying to me. That an attempt will be made to expose the situation is encouraging, even though I am denied the opportunity of directing the work.

There is another source of satisfaction which the committee's action of yesterday cannot destroy.

JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE

Long and vigorously has been heard the argument that jurisdiction to make investigations and hold hearings in connection with racketeering growing out of labor disputes or in the jukebox or other industries was not vested in the Committee on Government Operations. Members of the committee who vigorously asserted that such investigations and hearings should be carried on by the House Committee on Education and Labor yesterday reversed themselves, and again that reversal leaves me with the

knowledge—and that is a source of satisfaction—that my contention as to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations has at last been established insofar as that committee can establish it. Both committees have jurisdiction. Yes, I am deeply gratified that after some 5 months the committee has now by its action accepted the arguments which I was making last spring and summer and the acceptance of which if competently and vigorously carried out will do much to remedy an un-American situation.

It has long been my hope that the law-enforcing agencies headed by the Department of Justice would take a forthright position, then vigorously investigate, and if need be make a special effort to implement the legend carved in stone over the door of the United States Supreme Court: "Equal Justice Under Law."

If and when that action is taken, Congress and its congressional committees will be relieved, in part at least, of the duty of holding hearings similar to those which, over the years, it has been my privilege to hold in an effort to protect legitimate union activities, make secure the civil rights of the average citizens.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to say to the gentleman that I never heard anyone, in any of this controversy, suggest that he was taking a position adverse to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] by reason of anything he might have said about a salary raise that Members of Congress and the judiciary might receive. I say that to him in all honesty. If there had been any such conversations as that in any considerable number I think I would have heard of it. However, since he has referred to the fact of a raise at this session for postal employees, so far as our own situation is concerned in comparison I should like to cite these figures, if the gentleman is interested. In 1945 postal employees were given a raise of $400; in 1946, $400; in 1948, $450, the largest single increase they ever had; and that was in the Republican 80th Congress. In 1949, $120; and in 1951, $400, which is a total of $1,770 since 1945.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let me say that I have no fault whatsoever to find—of course, it is none of my business—with what any other Member of the House says or does in connection with any of these legislative matters. I want to repeat that I have not said that Congressmen, as one Member is reported to have said, are overpaid. I have not said they should not have this or that because they did not earn it.

All I am saying is that for myself I cannot see my way clear to vote for it now because I would be deprived of any sound answer which might otherwise be made to those who are asking for an increase in compensation, as so many are. If we once start that ball of salary increases rolling, it will be like an avalanche that comes from the top of the mountain, it will overwhelm us. I voted for the $2,500 expense item some years ago, although I did not at the time take it.

EXHIBIT A

I move that the chairman of the committee is hereby authorized to appoint a special subcommittee consisting of 2 members of the minority, to be designated by the ranking minority member, 3 members of the majority, 1 of whom shall be the chairman of this committee and shall serve as chairman of the special subcommittee;

That said subcommittee is hereby authorized to inquire and determine, insofar as is practicable either by investigation or hearings, or by both:

1. Whether the charge repeatedly and widely made in the press and by individual citizens, that individuals through nationwide conspiracies are operating and collecting tribute amounting to millions of dollars from individuals and business organizations unable to adequately defend themselves under present Federal legislation and through lack of vigilance on the part of the Federal Government itself, has foundation in fact, and, if true, to what extent;

2. Whether, if such a situation exists, it grows out of the ineffectiveness or lack of a proper interpretation or enforcement of Federal statutes designed to protect civil rights, the free movement of interstate and foreign commerce, the Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934, as amended, Federal legislation relating to the collection and distribution of welfare funds created by contributions from employers, legislation relating to the levying and collection of Federal taxes, and the sufficiency thereof;

3. Whether Federal agencies, officers, and employees charged with the duty of interpreting and administering the legislation abovementioned are using Federal funds efficiently and economically;

4. Whether Government activities, at all levels, the purpose of which is to make effective the intent of Congress in enacting such legislation, are effective and economical, and whether, if Federal legislation is not sufficient to prevent or correct the evils of which complaint is made, what, if any, amendments to the Federal legislation above referred to or any other Federal legislation should be proposed to correct the existing situation.

The special subcommittee is hereby authorized to exercise the authority and powers granted to the full committee and the regular subcommittees under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the Rules of the House, and the rules of the committee, as heretofore adopted, and now in force.

Said special subcommittee is further authorized and directed to, when it has completed its investigation or hearings, or both, to report to the full committee its recommendations, if any, as to what specific action, if any, should be taken by the full committee and by the Congress.

EXHIBIT B

AUTHORITY OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Prior to 1927 there were 11 committees of the House charged with checking expenditures in executive departments. At that time the 11 committees were consolidated and the duties and authority were given to one committee, designated as the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, now the Committee on Government Operations.

It is evident from the record and precedents that, while it was not the intention of the Congress to give the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments the primary function of considering or writing proposed legislation, it was the congressional purpose to give to that committee authority to inquire into and report on the interpretation, administration, and effectiveness of Federal legislation which had been considered by legislative committees and adopted by the Congress.

It is also evident from the record and precedents that, while it was not the intention of the Congress to deprive any of the regular standing committees of the House of the power to make investigations, hold such hearings as might assist the various committees in the performance of their duties in considering and reporting proposed legislation, it was the purpose of the House to give the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments authority to determine the effectiveness and the efficiency of such legislation at all governmental levels.

It is also clear that the committee was given the authority to inquire into the expenditures of tax dollars by Federal agencies.

The argument that the Committee on Government Operations has no authority to inquire into the manner in which Federal legislation affecting labor disputes, strikes, racketeering, and extortion growing out of either the ineffectiveness, the maladministration, or the disregard of labor or other legislation, as interpreted and administered, finds no support in either sound reasoning, precedent, or legal decisions.

The argument several times advanced in committee by distinguished members of the committee that subcommittees of this committee have no jurisdiction to inquire into either the effectiveness, the results, or lack of results, or the manner in which Federal agencies spend funds in interpreting or administering legislation which originally came from the Committee on Education and Labor, if applied to the regular subcommittees, would leave this committee and its subcommittees without any field in which to operate.

The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BROWNSON, was appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations. That subcommittee, without being questioned as to its authority, has inquired into the cause of the death of an agent of the State Department, into the use of counterpart funds for the construction of housing by the State Department's representatives in foreign lands—matters clearly falling within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

If the contention that a special subcommittee of this committee has no authority to investigate the interpretation placed upon Federal statutes by the various Federal agencies and the manner in which those laws are administered is true, and that the House Committee on Education and Labor has sole jurisdiction to investigate extortion by a few racketeers who have taken over unions, then it follows as a matter of course that the subcommittee of which Mr. BROWNSON is chairman has no authority whatever to consider issues which might properly fall within the jurisdiction of the regular standing Foreign Affairs Committee of the House—to my mind, an absurdity when the overall picture is considered.

The same might be said of the Subcommittee on Military Operations, headed by the gentleman from New York, the Honorable R. WALTER RIEHLMAN. Accepting at its face value the argument heretofore made as to lack of authority of special subcommittees, what justification is there for the subcommittee of which Mr. RIEHLMAN is chairman to inquire into how the armed services spend their dollars? Why does not what that subcommittee has been doing properly fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services?

With as much force might it be said that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has no authority to inquire into the business activities of the Federal Government which are in competition with private enterprise, because we have a Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. But the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, of which the distinguished

Member from Indiana, Mrs. CECIL M. HARDEN, is chairman, has made extensive investigations, held many hearings, and has ready four separate reports on matters which, if the contention of those who deny the right of a special subcommittee to expose racketeering and extortion be true, it had no authority to consider.

What about the Subcommittee on Public Accounts? That subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable GEORGE H. BENDER, claims jurisdiction and authority to go into the manner in which Federal dollars are spent by the departments over which it was given jurisdiction. If the argument advanced by those who destroyed the chairman's authority to appoint special subcommittees is sound, does it not follow that the Bender subcommittee has been acting wholly without authority? Hardly.

If the argument advanced by those who contend that neither this committee nor a subcommittee appointed by it has authority to investigate the manner in which Federal statutes having to do with labor disputes are interpreted and adminstered is accepted, a logical application of the same rule to the regular subcommittees would destroy the jurisdiction of those subcommittees, from a practical standpoint, and the function of the Committee on Government Operations.

If the construction which it is sought to apply to a special subcommittee, if one be appointed, is applied to the regular subcommittees, not one of them, as the saying is, could "turn a wheel."

The acceptance of the argument that, because individuals have succeeded in obtaining office and positions of authority in labor unions and are engaged in a gigantic conspiracy or conspiracies to extort millions of dollars from citizens and businesses, the House Committee on Education and Labor has sole jurisdiction is an absurdity, as even a casual examination of the situation will disclose.

The hearings at Detroit showed that the racketeers were not only using their power illegally in connection with labor disputes and strikes, but that they had invaded the field of insurance—health, welfare, and life—a field where several House committees have considered legislation.

The racketeers were levying tribute upon individuals and businesses engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, where legislation comes from a regular standing committee of the House—that on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

They were compelling the Federal Government to pay tribute in order to obtain and transport munitions of war—a field where the Committee on the Armed Services has jurisdiction.

Some of the unions—according to their own records and admissions—have been harboring Communists—a matter which might well be investigated by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Some of these conspirators were holding up veterans, as we disclosed 4 years ago in Philadelphia—a matter which might have been considered by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

And so on down the list. It is doubtful if there is a single field where dollars are available that these conspirators have not made an attempt to tap.

Do I hear you suggest, then, why not let these several legislative committees handle the matter? The answer is that it would result in a multiplicity of investigations; there would be no coordination whatsoever—rather a duplication of effort, if effort was made.

When the Congress, in 1927, had before it a situation similar to that which would be created if the argument now advanced by those who attack the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Government Operations was adopted, House Resolution 7, introduced by Mr. SNELL, the Republican leader, at the 1st session of the 70th Congress, provided for the consolidation of the following committees:

Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Justice Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Agriculture Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Commerce Department.

Committee on Expenditures in the Labor Department.

Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.

The resolution was adopted. It established the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, now the Committee on Government Operations. And the jurisdiction of all 11 committees so consolidated is now vested in the House Committee on Government Operations.

Yet those who now would deny to me, as chairman of that committee, the authority to appoint a special subcommittee to correct this conceded disgraceful, unbearable, corrupt situation, would go back to the old way—an expensive, wasteful, inefficient way—which the Congress repudiated more than 25 years ago.

No other committee appears to want the job—the job of cleaning up the "mess." But the cry is, "It must be done, but don't let HOFFMAN do it." That would displease Beck, Hoffa, Ring, the two Brennans, et al.

THE OVERALL QUESTION

The argument presently advanced to the effect that because the House Committee on Education and Labor has jurisdiction over the consideration of legislation having to do, among other matters, with labor disputes, this committee is deprived of jurisdiction over the manner in which legislation which comes out of that committee is either interpreted or administered, cannot be accepted.

Both the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the Rules of the House provide, among other things, that this committee "shall have the duty of * * * studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency."

PRECEDENTS

In the 80th Congress, a subcommittee of this committee made several investigations, held hearings which had to do with the manner in which Federal legislation having to do with labor disputes, with interstate commerce, with civil rights, racketeering, and extortion, was being administered, and the expenditures connected with the interpretation and administration of such legislation.

The Dock Street hearings—February 14; March 6, 10, 13, 14, 19, and 20, 1947; the hearings in connection with the strike in the meat-packing industry—May 20 and 21, 1948; the hearings in connection with the interpretation of the Taft-Hartley Act, which concerned the operations of hotels and restaurants—May 7, 1948—were held, reports were made and adopted by the full committee without protest. Several other threeman subcommittees were appointed.

The Harness subcommittee, in 1948, made investigations in California and held hearings in Washington which had to do with the manner in which Federal legislation relating to housing was interpreted, administered, and Federal dollars spent. That subcommittee made its report to the full committee, and that report was adopted unanimously—Democrats as well as Republicans voting in the affirmative.

Other instances might be cited.

The Holifield subcommittee, in 1952, conducted housing hearings in Alaska and reported on the activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

THE LAW

The authority of legislative committees of the House to make investigations, to hold hearings, swear witnesses, and compel the giving of testimony is no longer an open question. The decisions in *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135, 174, 175, 47 S. Ct. 319, 328, 71 L. Ed. 580, 50 A. L. R. 1), and many other cases, some of which are collected and cited in Senate committee print, Committee on Judiciary, January 6, 1947, "Memorandum on Proceedings Involving Contempt of Congress and Its Committees," are decisive of the issues here raised. Perhaps the most informative decision is that written by Judge Holtzoff in *United States* v. *Bryan* (72 Fed. Supp., 58, 61–62). In that case Miss Bryan was convicted of contempt. The conviction was reversed by the circuit court of appeals, but that decision was reversed by the United States Supreme Court at the October term in 1949, *United States* v. *Bryan* (339 U. S. 323), a decision which affirmed the opinion of Judge Holtzoff.

Anyone interested will find by an examination of the records of the district court for the District of Columbia that in November of 1950 a mandate was presented to the district court and the defendant was committed to jail, and on the 13th day of that month paid a fine of $500.

The rule now is that it is not necessary for the resolution authorizing an investigation to show on its face what the Congress "meditated doing when its investigation was concluded."

Nor is it necessary when the jurisdiction of a committee is challenged that the committee establish its jurisdiction.

The jurisdiction is presumed and the burden of proof rests upon the challenger.

True, a committee may not—and again I quote—"compel the divulgence of information for the purpose of ascertaining whether a crime has been committed as a basis for a criminal prosecution," since this is a matter for the judiciary and the prosecuting arm of the Government. (Judge Holtzhoff, 72 Fed. Supp. 58 (D. C. 1947).)

One who doubts the power of congressional committees to make investigations, hold hearings, compel the giving of testimony, or who believes that the strict rules of judicial procedure apply to legislative committees, has but to read the decisions.

A typical and rather complete, as well as accurate, statement of the law and the procedure to be followed by congressional committees is to be found in the statement of Judge Holtzoff in the Bryan case, heretofore cited, rendered when a motion was before the judge to dismiss the indictment.

In the Bryan case, the court further said:

"(3–6) In connection with the exercise of these powers, however, the Congress is not limited to securing information precisely and directly bearing on some proposed measure, the enactment of which is contemplated or considered. The collection of facts may cover a wide field. Obviously in order to act in an enlightened manner, it may be necessary and desirable for the Congress to become acquainted not only with the precise topic involved in prospective legislation, but also with all matters that may have an indirect bearing on the subject. For example, in connection with the regulation of interstate commerce, it may conceivably become desirable for Congress to secure facts bearing solely on some aspects

of intrastate commerce. Or, in enacting criminal legislation, it may first become desirable to investigate conditions in States and localities involving violations of local law. In connection with appropriating funds and determining what allotments of moneys should be made, it may become desirable to obtain information covering a wide range. While the power of the Congress to carry on investigations is not without limit, nevertheless, the Congress has broad discretion in determining the subject matter of the study and the scope and extent of the inquiry. If the subject under scrutiny may have any possible relevancy and materiality, no matter how remote, to some possible legislation, it is within the power of the Congress to investigate the matter. Moreover, the relevancy and the materiality of the subject matter must be presumed. The burden is on one who maintains the contrary to establish his contention. It would be intolerable if the judiciary were to intrude into the activities of the legislative branch of the Government, and virtually stop the progress of an investigation, which is intended to secure information that Congress deems necessary and desirable in the proper exercise of its functions, unless the lack of materiality and relevancy of the subject matter is clear and manifest."

The chairman should be given authority to appoint a special subcommittee in accordance with the request.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT C

Be it resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations is hereby authorized to appoint a special subcommittee consisting of 2 members of the minority, to be designated by the ranking minority member, 3 members of majority, 1 of whom shall be the chairman of this committee and who shall serve as chairman of the special subcommittee.

That said subcommittee is hereby authorized to inquire and determine, insofar as is practicable either by investigation or hearings, or by both:

1. Whether executive departments, Federal agencies, the officers and employees thereof charged with the duty of interpreting and administering Federal legislation, are using Federal funds efficiently and economically;

2. Whether Government activities, at all levels, which were authorized or exist, and the purpose of which is, to make effective the intent of Congress in enacting legislation, are efficiently and economically performed, and whether, if Federal legislation is not sufficient to create and maintain the conditions, benefits and standards of conduct and welfare sought by the Congress, what, if any, new legislation or amendments to existing Federal legislation should be proposed and enacted to correct the existing situation, attain the objectives proposed by that legislation.

The special subcommittee is hereby authorized to exercise the authority and powers granted to the full committee and the regular subcommittees under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the rules of the House, and the rules of the committee, as heretofore adopted, and now in force.

Said special subcommittee is further authorized and directed to, when it has completed its investigation or hearings, or both, to report to the full committee its recommendations, if any, as to what specific action, if any, should be taken by the full committee and by the Congress.

EXHIBIT D

Whereas matters pertaining to alleged unfair and improper labor practices have been called to the attention of the committee; and

Whereas there is a duly constituted regular subcommittee, to wit, the Public Accounts Subcommittee, which is authorized to study the operations and activities of all Government departments except the State and Defense Departments; and

Whereas the committee is of the opinion that such allegations of unfair and improper labor practices and labor racketeering should be thoroughly and vigorously investigated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Public Accounts Subcommittee is hereby authorized and directed to investigate—

(1) Whether present Federal legislation and Federal agencies, officers, and employees adequately and properly protect individuals and business organizations from extortion;

(2) Whether, if such extortionary payments are made, they arise from ineffectiveness or lack of proper interpretation or enforcement of Federal statutes designed to protect civil rights, the free movement of interstate and foreign commerce, the Anti-racketeering Act of 1934, as amended, Federal legislation relating to the collection and distribution of welfare funds created by contributions from employers, and legislation relating to the levying and collection of Federal taxes and the sufficiency thereof;

(3) Whether Federal agencies, officers, and employees charged with the duty of interpreting and administering the legislation above mentioned are using Federal funds efficiently and economically;

(4) Whether Government activity at all levels designed to implement such legislation is effective and economical; and whether any amendments to the Federal legislation above referred to, or any other Federal legistion, should be proposed to correct the existing situation; be it further

Resolved, That the Public Accounts Subcommittee is further authorized and directed to report to the full committee its recommendations, if any, as to what specific action, if any, should be taken by the full committee and by the Congress.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2150. An act providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to.

Mr. SHEEHAN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK).

Mr. HILLINGS.

Mr. BENDER in eight instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. BOYKIN.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 25, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1179. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1953; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1180. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1181. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession contract to McKinley Park Services, Inc., which will, when finally executed on behalf of the Government authorize the company to provide accommodations, facilities, and services in Mount McKinley National Park for a period of 5 years from June 15, 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1182. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1183. A letter from the Chairman, Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on retirement provisions for Federal personnel, pursuant to Public Law 555, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 7430. A bill to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7431. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 7432. A bill to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to classified substitute clerks in the Postal Transportation Service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 7433. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 7434. A bill to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 7435. A bill to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS (by request):

H. R. 7436. A bill to extend the benefits of the pension laws to certain male nurses who served under contract with the United States between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 7437. A bill to amend section 302, title III, of the act of June 23, 1947, known as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (61 Stat. 157 (29 U. S. C. 186)); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 7438. A bill to protect and conserve labor union health and welfare funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 7439. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of water, land, and other related resources of the Missouri Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 7440. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the community chests throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 7441. A bill to further encourage the distribution of fishery products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7442. A bill to provide for lump-sum payment of excess annual leave of Government officers and employees to the credit of their civil service retirement accounts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 7443. A bill providing for the development of a highway and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7444. A bill to provide that securities, loans, and obligations shall be sold by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at not less than face value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 7445. A bill to define an Indian for the purpose of providing special Federal services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7446. A bill to authorize cooperative research in education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 7447. A bill to amend section 8c (6) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 7448. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of child health and welfare services, to provide for the more effective use of available Federal funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 357. Joint resolution amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7. U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. Res. 413. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to Joseph Rosenthal, son of Abraham Rosenthal, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. Res. 414. Resolution providing that the House of Representatives disassociate itself from participation in or approval of the establishment of a commercial parking lot on square 692, District of Columbia, adjacent to the Old House Office Building; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 7449. A bill for the relief of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 7450. A bill for the relief of Bronislawa Lederman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 7451. A bill for the relief of Erika Jette Lavery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7452. A bill for the relief of Therese Boehner Soisson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 7453. A bill for the relief of George Fusek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 7454. A bill for the relief of Elisa Martinez-Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 7455. A bill for the relief of Raymond Jean-Henri Rombeau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 7456. A bill for the relief of Domenico Scaramuzzino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 7457. A bill for the relief of Henry Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 7458. A bill for the relief of Jan Hajdukiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7459. A bill for the relief of Miss Ingeborg Maria Zoechbauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 7460. A bill to pay Warren P. Hoover for services rendered the Army of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 7461. A bill for the relief of Erich Paul Lohser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7462. A bill for the relief of Rupert Brotherton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7463. A bill for the relief of Theodora Sammartino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 7464. A bill for the relief of Ellinor H. Anthony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

471. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of J. Blair Simmons, supervisor of elementary education, Miss Eleanor S. Ripper, principal, and teachers of the Beaver Area Joint Schools, Beaver, Pa., urging $1,500 a year exemption of retirement income from Federal taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

472. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of the president of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks, requesting immediate action on H. R. 2344; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Uncle Sam and Our States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the earmarks of the Democratic national administrations which dominated our thinking for the 20 years from 1933 to 1953 was an overemphasis upon the Federal Government and a corresponding deemphasizing of our 48 States. On everything from aid to the needy through to airport construction, States, municipalities, and local governments were directed to Washington, and a constant parade of public officials to Federal agencies was not only stimulated but also encouraged.

President Eisenhower is interested in reversing this trend, and many of our States, fed up with the business of conforming to redtape regulations in Washington, are shouting, "Amen." There is evidence of a new feeling of self-sufficiency and reliance in our State capitals. Connecticut has begun its own program to provide $26 million worth of hospitalization facilities. North Carolina is launching a $50 million program of public-school construction. Ohio is projecting a $500 million highway program after approval of the voters last November. The same story comes from Missouri, Oklahoma, and the New England governors' conference. These are healthy signs of life in our Republic. Long may they burgeon throughout the land.

Proposed Strike Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the dynamic, progressive program which President Eisenhower promised to lay before Congress and the people

this year has rapidly been taking shape in a series of major messages to Congress spread over the current month. This is the program on which the President said Republican Members of Congress will be expected to run for reelection.

To say that the President's party supporters in the Congress are disappointed in the program their administration is charting for them to follow is to put it mildly. As each of these messages has come up to Capitol Hill, preceded by a big propaganda buildup as to how dynamic and progressive it was going to be, many of my Republican friends in the House have all but groaned over the lack of anything really dynamic or progressive in the proposals.

Particularly was this true when the President submitted his long-awaited program for revision of labor-management relations legislation on the vital issue of replacing what the President himself has called the union-busting provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act with more equitable and more effective legislation to achieve labor-management harmony and cooperation.

The President's proposals, on the whole, call for little more than minor legalistic changes in the present statute. John L. Lewis, chief of the United Mine Workers Union, has called them "piddling." Other labor leaders have expressed complete disgust with the inadequacy of these suggested changes. Some of the more significant changes drafted and agreed upon within the administration last fall by Martin P. Durkin, then Secretary of Labor, and the President's special counsel, Bernard M. Shanley, were, of course, not included in the final message. It was because of the White House repudiation of these proposed changes that Mr. Durkin subsequently resigned from the Cabinet.

Two aspects of the President's newest proposals on labor-management legislation, however, deserve special attention in any analysis of the administration's approach to what the President said would be a "dynamic, progressive" program.

They are, first, the proposal that the Government hold special strike votes before the members of a union could go on strike; second, the call for a special investigation of union health and welfare programs.

The first of these was based, I really believe, on a complete lack of understanding on the part of the people around the President and advising him on labor-management matters as to how collective bargaining actually operates in the United States. The second, I believe, was put in by the President at the demand of antilabor forces hoping to undermine or wreck the developing system of health, welfare, and pension plans for industrial employees. In either case, the President was not only taken advantage of, he was, you might say, "suckered" by people around him who are doing their best to see to it that the Eisenhower record is neither dynamic nor progressive. They are doing him a bad turn.

THE STRIKE-VOTE PROPOSAL

The President said, in calling for Government-conducted votes before any strike: "In the employer-employee relationship there is nothing which so vitally affects the individual employee as the loss of his pay when he is called on strike." Of course, that is very true. Men belonging to unions are well aware of what it means to strike. It is not something they undertake lightly or irresponsibly. Yet the idea still persists among some antilabor groups that workers can be stampeded into striking as some kind of lark—rushing off the job just for the fun of it.

It was apparently with this misconception in mind that the President accepted the suggestion of Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks—reputedly the real author of this part of the message—and added:

> In such an important decision, he (the worker about to go on strike) should have an opportunity to express his free choice by secret ballot held under Government auspices.

The idea that workers are faceless ciphers pushed around by their union leaders to go on strike or do other things against their will has been exploded so many times in so many dramatic ways that one would think the President or his advisers would know about it.

For instance: During the war, under the Smith-Connally Act, workers did have to ballot in secret on whether they would authorize their union leaders to call a strike. We were at war, and strikes in war production were unpopular not only with the public but among workers, too. They, too, had sons and brothers in the service; they, too, recognized the urgency of defeating the enemy and preserving our freedom.

Yet, in answer to the question required on these ballots: "Do you wish to permit an interruption of war production in wartime as a result of this dispute?" the overwhelming majority of union members polled in 2,168 separate elections involving 26,630 employers said "Yes." The exact figures were: 1,593,937 votes for; 332,874 votes against.

Of course these did not all result in strikes—far from it. But it was plain that the union rank and file, after electing union officers, insisted upon giving to those officers the responsibility and the powers necessary to represent them effectively in collective bargaining.

Even more dramatic was the experience of the National Labor Relations Board in conducting the union-shop elections previously required under the Taft-Hartley Act. A union could not demand a union-shop contract unless a majority of all the employees in any plant voted for it. The NLRB conducted 46,146 separate elections on this issue between August 1947 and October 1951.

The results: Out of 5,548,982 ballots cast, only 475,740 voted against the union shop; the others voted for. In less than 3 percent of the plants involved was the union shop rejected.

And what did these generally useless and unnecessary elections cost the Government before Congress finally decided to drop the whole idea? The cost, in those 4 years, was more than $3 million.

Last year—one of the best in many years in labor-management relations—there were about 5,000 strikes. Think what it would cost each year to determine what any union member already knows—that when negotiations for a new contract break down, union members will empower their leaders to call a strike if that is the only way management can be persuaded to bargain the issues out to a satisfactory conclusion.

No wonder the President's proposal fell like such a dud. Everyone familiar with labor-management relations recognized it as a "smart" idea thought up by someone who didn't know what he was talking about.

HEALTH, WELFARE FUND PROBE

The President's call for an investigation of health and welfare funds will strengthen the hand of forces in Congress which have been attacking the United Mine Workers and other welfare funds for aiding employees to meet the financial hazards of illness, accident, or old age.

Stabilizing Our Labor Laws—About Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is some little while since any major labor leader sounded off in public about the Taft-Hartley "slave labor" act. Most of the responsible people on both sides of the labor-management table have reached the conclusion that stable relations in their highly personal field require the guidance of some legislative formulas based upon experience.

President Eisenhower's recent message to Congress has now crystallized into legislative proposals contained in a bill introduced by Senator SMITH of New Jersey, as chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Under this plan, when a strike threatens to explode into an all-out national emergency, employers and union representatives must sit down for 30 days to talk things over and negotiate. If they fail to agree, Federal mediators then move in for a second 30 days to take a crack at the job. If this doesn't work, the President then appoints a board of inquiry to determine the potential scope of the strike. If the board says that the strike would constitute a national emergency, the Government may obtain an 80-day court decision enjoining the strike. During these 80 days, the board of inquiry has 40 days to report on the progress of mediation efforts. After 55 days of the 80-day period, the Government may poll the workers involved on their willingness or otherwise to accept the last offer proposed by the employer. The results are not technically compulsory so far as the union is concerned. If the offer is rejected on this secret vote, the President may call on his board of inquiry to propose its own terms. After 80 days, if all has failed, the union may call its srike.

Anybody and everybody, could anything be fairer to everybody and anybody?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Japanese American Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, in order that final determination of such claims may be expedited. It is my understanding that as of January 1, 1954, 3,297 claims are pending with a total of $68,165,227.83 claimed. Practically all of these remaining outstanding claims are for considerably larger amounts than the $2,500 limit presently imposed on compromise-settlements, several are for more than a million dollars each.

Since the amendment of August 17, 1951, applied only to compromise-settlements of $2,500 or less, and since virtually all claims that qualify under that formula have been awarded by this time, the problem is to find some method by which the remaining larger claims can be settled expeditiously, lest the program drag on for years, possibly for decades. To expedite this program is the principal object of the proposed amendment.

It provides a threefold election for all the remaining claimants: First, they may elect to compromise and settle their claims regardless of amount up to three-fourths of the total of all compensable items thereof as determined by the Department of Justice; second, they may elect to have the court of claims determine the amount of their claim; and, third, they may elect to have their claim adjudicated by the Department of Justice as under the existing law.

The administrative determination proposed is patterned after the compromise-settlement procedure that proved so effective in the handling of more than 19,000 smaller claims. The most that any claimant may receive will be 75 percent of the compensable items thereof. In order to protect the claimants' interests, however, a floor of 50 percent of the original amount is stipulated in the amendment. If any compromise-settlement offered by the Government is more than this 50 percent floor, and still 75 percent or less of the compensable items, the claimant will be required to accept the offer automatically. If, on the other hand, the offer is less than 50 percent of the total of the original amount claimed, the claimant may reject the Government compromise and have his claim adjudicated by the Department according to the prescribed regulations.

The judicial or Court of Claims alternative allows those claimants who prefer to seek a legal determination of the validity and amount of their claims to do so.

BACKGROUND

Mr. Speaker, in 1942, the War Department, acting under Executive Order No. 9066, ordered the exclusion of all persons of Japanese ancestry from the Pacific coast of the continental United States, Alaska, and a portion of Arizona. Most of them were removed to relocation centers administered by the War Relocation Authority. They were joined later by over 1,000 persons evacuated from Hawaii. For approximately 2½ years, these American citizens and their alien parents, more than 100,000 in number, were exiled from their homes.

After January 2, 1945, the majority of them were allowed to return to the evacuated areas and to pick up the raveled ends of the life they knew before the forced evacuation. By the end of 1945, about half of these people had so returned. The remainder have been scattered throughout the country, or in the case of the thousands who are in the Armed Forces of the United States, are serving with the army of occupation in Europe or Asia. It is too early as yet to make a final estimate of actual financial and property losses sustained by the Japanese-Americans because of the evacuation, but it is well established that the losses have been heavy. Some lost everything they had; many lost most of what they had.

The chief military justification for the removal of these 110,000 persons was the possibility of the existence of a disloyal element in their midst, the critical military situation in the Pacific which increased uneasiness over the possibility of espionage or sabotage, and the lack of time and facilities for individual loyalty screening. The persons evacuated were not individually charged with any crime or with disloyalty and subsequent experience has clearly demonstrated that the vast majority of them were and are good Americans. This is convincingly indicated by the outstanding record of our 23,000 Japanese-Americans who served in the Armed Forces in both the European and Pacific theaters, and by the fact that the records of the intelligence agencies show no case of sabotage or espionage by Americans of Japanese ancestry during the entire war.

The evacuation orders gave the persons affected desperately little time in which to settle their affairs. The governmental safeguards that were designed to prevent undue loss in these circumstances were somewhat tardily instituted, were not at once effectively publicized among the evacuees, and were never entirely successful. Merchants had to dispose of their stocks and businesses at sacrifice prices. In a setting of confusion and hysteria, many evacuees sold personal possessions for a small fraction of their value. A large number had to accept totally inadequate arrangements for protection and management of property. Valuable lease-hold interests had to be abandoned.

Continued exclusion increased the losses. Private buildings in which evacuees stored their property were broken into and vandalized. Mysterious fires destroyed vacant buildings. Property left with "friends" unaccountably disappeared; goods stored with the Government sometimes were damaged or lost. Persons entrusted with the management of evacuee real property mulcted the owners in diverse ways. Tenants failed to pay rent, converted property to their own use, and committed waste. Prohibited from returning to the evacuated areas even temporarily to handle property matters, the evacuees were unable to protect themselves adequately. Property management assistance given by the War Relocation Authority on the west coast, although it often mitigated and sometimes prevented loss, could not completely solve the problem there, complicated as it was by difficulties in communication with absent owners and local prejudice.

In relocation centers the only income opportunities for evacuees lay in center employment at wage rates of $12 to $19 per month, plus small clothing allowances. Many felt compelled to discontinue payment of life-insurance premiums. Some found themselves unable to make mortgage or tax payments and lost substantial equities.

All of the foregoing examples of tangible loss to the evacuees were directly attributable to the evacuation and continued exclusion of these persons from their homes.

As a matter of fairness and good conscience, and because these particular American citizens and law-abiding aliens have borne with patience and undefeated loyalty the unique burdens which this Government has thrown upon them, I strongly urge that the proposed legislation be enacted into law.

As the only member of the Committee on the Judiciary from California, I am pleased to introduce this legislation.

Korean Prisoner Release Victory for Our Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, "Malenkov & Co." may be great hands at the subtle art of making the worse appear the better reason, but they will have to go some to explain what happened in Korea. North Koreans and Chinese prisoners of war, given their choice of returning home or taking their chances in a new coutry have chosen so overwhelmingly against going back to communism that Marx, Engels, and Lenin must be turning double somersaults in their collectivist graves. Somewhere along the line something has sure gone wrong with the Communist ideology.

By sticking to our guns on this crucial issue of the war, President Eisenhower and our advisers have won a major propaganda victory in th. battle for men's minds which will certainly not be lost on the people of the East where the big war of communism versus freedom is now being waged. The 22,000 prisoners who preferred unknown Formosa to their native China or South Korea and Syngman Rhee to North Korea and the Communist "heaven" are the best answer yet to the claims, counterclaims, and endless dialectics of the Marxists. These men saw communism in action

and chose an unknown future in preference to what they had.

Korea may be divided politically for some time to come by reason of the unsettled condition of events in the world today, but the sympathies of the Korean people and the place of their heart's desire are clearly not with Malenkov and Moscow.

Build the Air Force Academy Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I favor the immediate passage of H. R. 5337. The records will indicate that on November 29, 1949, I personally instituted action designed to bring about an Air Force Academy, and I introduced H. R. 6517 in the 81st Congress, 1st session, to establish a United States Air Force Academy in the Mobile Gulf Basin of the Tombigbee River. I am including copies of correspondence relating to this subject which attests my long and continued interest in this highly important matter. Also, I include a request by the then Secretary of Defense, Hon. Louis Johnson, dated July 29, 1949.

We are on the threshold of one of the most stupendously important eras in our Nation's history. A nation without air power is a nation without military power. A Nation without the best air power is a nation without the best military power. If we are to provide the best fliers for the most intricate planes ever designed, it is highly important that there be a separate Academy dedicated to this national proposition.

Mr. Speaker, every conceivable type of plane and of guided missile is coming into being daily, requiring intricate skills and vast technological training and experience. If we are to equip our youth to handle these planes and operate these missiles, we must immediately dedicate an institution to this use. At this very moment there is being launched an atomic submarine. Who knows that in the very near future there will not be an atomic airplane capable of flying the entire distance of the world nonstop? Who knows that with the coming few months missiles will be designed that can traverse the distance to the Moon or Mars?

Mr. Speaker, we are faced daily with the stupendous task of keeping abreast of Russia's growing and astronomical air force, far outnumbering the planes we possess. If we are to meet this growing menace it is necessary that we have superiority of manpower and superiority of plane power. In order to meet all of these commitments with destiny, an institution dedicated to airpower alone is the highest order of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to include the following: A letter from Hon. CARL VINSON, addressed to me under date of November 29, 1949; copy of letter from Hon. STUART SYMINGTON, Secretary of the Air Force, to Hon. CARL VINSON, dated November 25, 1949; a letter from Hon. Louis Johnson to Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, dated July 29, 1949:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., November 29, 1949.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOYKIN: There is enclosed a copy of a report received from the Department of the Air Force on your bill H. R. 6517 "To establish a United States Air Force Academy."

I am also enclosing a copy of the departmental letter on H. R. 5834 mentioned in the Secretary's report.

Sincerely,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, November 25, 1949.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We refer to your recent request to the Secretary of Defense for a report on H. R. 6517, a bill "To establish a United States Air Force Academy." The Department of the Air Force has been designated to present the coordinated views of the Department of Defense on the bill.

The purpose of the subject bill is to establish a United States Air Force Academy in the Mobile Gulf Basin of the Tombigbee River, State of Alabama.

Recently the Secretary of Defense submitted to the Congress, on behalf of the Department of Defense, proposed legislation to establish an additional service academy. On August 1, 1949, this proposal was introduced in the House of Representatives as H. R. 5834 and in the Senate as S. 2355. The cited bills embody the position of the Department of Defense on the needs and requirements for an additional service academy; consequently, it is recommended that action on the subject bill be held in abeyance until the Congress has acted upon H. R. 5834 and S. 2355.

This report has been coordinated among the departments and boards within the Department of Defense, in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Bureau of the Budget has previously interposed no objection to similar reports on various other bills relating to the establishment of an Air Force Academy.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, July 29, 1949.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is attached a draft of a bill to provide for the establishment of an additional service academy, and for other purposes, which it is requested be enacted into law.

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the establishment within the National Military Establishment of an additional service academy to provide undergraduate instruction and training comparable to that provided by the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy for service in the Armed Forces of selected persons. For the purpose of providing permanent facilities for the Academy the Secretary of Defense would be authorized to utilize, with the consent of the heads of the departments concerned, available lands owned by the United States, and to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto or other interests therein, including temporary use, by donation, purchase, or otherwise. The Secretary would also be authorized to construct and maintain such buildings, appurtenances, facilities, and so forth, as he might deem necessary. For the purpose of providing temporary facilities and to enable early operation of the Academy, the Secretary of Defense would be authorized to utilize, adapt, and maintain existing facilities, to contract with civilian institutions, and to appoint classified civilians for the administration of the Academy as circumstances might require.

The bill further provides that all appropriate provisions of law not inconsistent with the purposes of this act which pertain to the United States Military Academy shall also pertain to the Academy established under this act. The organization of the Academy shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, and he is empowered to limit, by means of competitive examinations, the number of cadets to be appointed annually to the Academy, in order to permit an orderly increase in the number of such cadets. Under the terms of the bill the Secretary of Defense would be authorized to effect a transfer to the Academy during the initial year of its operation, and with the consent of the individuals concerned, of certain cadets from the two existing service academies.

One of the great problems confronting the National Military Establishment at the present time is the provision of adequate facilities and services to provide for a system of undergraduate education to prepare officers for lifetime careers in the Armed Forces. While the existing Academies are able to provide for the career officers requirements of the Army and the Navy, their facilities are inadequate to make available sufficient career personnel for the entire Military Establishment, including the Air Force.

The principal sources of career personnel for the Air Force in the past have been the aviation cadet program, the Air Reserve Officers Training Corps, and officer candidate schools, which are presently unable to provide the number of career officers with the educational qualifications required by the Air Force. The Air ROTC is the main source of college graduates, but the dependability of this source, as well as of the others mentioned, varies substantially with changes in economic and world conditions.

The Air Force, like the Army and the Navy, has a definite requirement for a system of officer procurement that will provide an adequate and continuous flow of college-educated, uniformly trained young men possessing the desired character and personal attributes, who have a firm and considered desire to become and remain officers, a system that will give stability to the officer corps and unity to the objectives of the Department.

Currently an attempt is being made to alleviate the problem of officer procurement within the Air Force by the integration each year of a certain portion of each class graduated from the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy. To continue this procedure, however, the existing service Academies would have to be expanded to enable them to meet the needs of their respective services as well as of the Air Force. Recent studies have established that such expansion is not feasible, and that the only practical solution to the problem is the establishment of an additional service academy.

It is contemplated that the Academy will be an undergraduate institution that will confer an appropriate degree upon those successfully completing the prescribed course of instruction. The curriculum will be designed to offer a broad general education and to provide a course of instruction that will (1) equip graduates with the training, experience, and motivation that will prepare them to graduate with the knowledge, character, and qualities of leadership required

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of a junior officer; and (2) provide a basis for continued development of the graduates throughout a lifetime of service to their country, and a preparedness for military responsibilities of the highest order.

An accurate estimate of construction costs can be made only after full investigation of the actual site selected for development and a determination of the type of architecture and materials to be used in the construction. In the absence of this specific information, an estimate based upon national average costs at a hypothetical site and presenting average construction conditions has been prepared. This estimate amounts to approximately $171 million. It is further estimated that the cost of operating such an academy for the first year at a temporary site, assuming full utilization of an existing military installation with minimum modification, pending construction of a permanent installation, would be approximately $5 million.

For the reasons hereinabove enumerated, I strongly urge the favorable consideration by the Congress of the attached draft bill and recommend that the proposal be enacted into law.

The Department of the Air Force has been designated by me as the executive agency of the National Military Establishment to sponsor this proposal in its presentation to the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

Eatin' Will Prove GOP Pudding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the proof of the pudding is still in the eating. From all that appears, the Democrats are preparing to put their campaign eggs in one political basket this year. They are counting—or is it hoping?—on a major decline in employment, and they are doing their level best wherever they go to frighten everyone within the range of their collective voices. No Cassandra ever cried louder or wished harder for the doom they are foretelling.

But the American people and the Republican Party no longer scare so easily as we once did. We have been through a good deal of chaos under Democratic direction. A depression which they blamed on us lasted until World War II. World War II came along and bailed out the Democrats. Since the Eisenhower administration, the Democrats have been trying desperately to find an issue on which to hang their hats.

If this is to be their battle cry, Republicans will have to meet the challenge. At this moment, there are more people gainfully employed than we have ever had in times when no war was going on. Eating will be the test the American people apply to the Democratic bogeyman. But man does not live by bread alone, and the establishment of a lasting world peace, the charting of a program for future world development will also be important to Americans come next November 1954. We are sure they will be eating—and good.

Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the bill by the House today to establish an Air Force academy by the vote of 328 to 36 is significant of the feeling which exists in America today that our country must move forward as a Nation to keep abreast in the air age in which we are living.

The need for the passage of legislation in this regard is long overdue. The establishment of an Air Force academy will serve to provide future officers in the Nation's air arm with full and adequate training in the skills and techniques which today are greatly needed and which will continue to be needed in the future.

It is significant that this legislation is being considered and passed 1 year after the 50th anniversary of the celebration of air-powered flight. In 1903 the Wright brothers at the little spot of Kitty Hawk, N. C., flew the first powered aircraft, and last year—1953—we celebrated the 50th anniversary of that occasion. Today aircraft can circle the globe in the matter of hours and can be refueled while in flight. Today truly we are living in the air age, and no longer is America or any country isolated from the rest of the world.

Other nations of the world have air academies for the purpose of training officers in the techniques and skills of aircraft and we must keep abreast—in fact, America should excel and exceed. Time, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of great importance in the building of America's air supremacy. I want to commend also the action of the committee in recommending the establishment of a temporary Air Academy pending the completion and staffing of the permanent Academy. By such action we can move more rapidly in training skilled officers for the Air Force.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I take pride in pointing to the fact that in my own State of Tennessee and in the district which I have the honor to represent there is being built the great Arnold Air Engineering Development Center, recently dedicated. This great air center is designed to test aircraft at supersonic and hypersonic speed—speed faster than the speed of sound—and it is certainly important that we train adequate Air Force personnel to be able to man aircraft in this modern age and to have a Reserve component of properly trained officers and airmen.

The measure which the House has today passed and which I trust will receive speedy approval by the membership of the other body is certainly a most forward-looking and important measure. The implementing of education and training which this measure provides will mean much to keeping America ahead in aircraft officer personnel and in maintaining our position of defense and strength in the free world.

H. R. 3300: Re Diversion From Lake Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the House Committee on Public Works and a resident of Ohio which borders on the Great Lakes, I am no stranger to the problems arising from the provisions of H. R. 3300. In this connection, I submit the following:

1. Diversion from Lake Michigan by Chicago Sanitary District fixed by Supreme Court decree: After exhaustive consideration of the evidence and of the rights of the people of the Great Lakes region, the Supreme Court of the United States fixed at 1,500 cubic feet per second the amount of water which the Chicago Sanitary District may abstract from Lake Michigan.

2. Waters of Great Lakes owned by all States (not only Illinois) and Province of Ontario: The waters of the Great Lakes belong to all the people of the Great Lakes area; not only to Illinois. The United States has no proprietary interest in those waters and Congress has no legal right to divert those waters from the people of that area for the use of the people of another area.

3. Present stage of Great Lakes levels downward: Although lake levels have been high for several years, the peak was reached in 1952. A downward cycle is underway. In 1953 the general levels were about 7 inches lower than in 1952. All indications are that 1954 will see a drop of an additional 6 inches.

4. Effect of increased diversion contemplated by H. R. 3300: The Supreme Court held that any diversion at Chicago has the same lowering effect upon all the Great Lakes. Diversion of another 1,000 cubic feet per second would lower each of the lakes three-fourths inch. This lowering applies to the water levels at their low points as well as their high points. The result of diversion cannot be turned off and on like a water faucet. Several years are required for the ultimate effect to be reached, whether it be a lowering of the lake levels after diversion is started or a raising of the levels after diversion is stopped. If the diversion proposed by H. R. 3300 were started today, its full effect would not be reached until 1957, a year after the Corps of Engineers would be required to report to the Congress on the effect of the proposed additional diversion.

5. Effect of added diversion upon Great Lakes commerce: If all the vessels owned by members of Lake Carriers' Association (constituting about 95 percent of Great Lakes tonnage under United States flag) had their safe draft reduced by three-fourths inch, the annual loss in carrying capacity would be more than 1.5 million tons of cargo.

6. Relation of Great Lakes commerce to national defense: The cargoes carried over the Great Lakes are always important to the national economy and are of utmost importance in times of war. For example, about

85 percent of the iron ore used in the manufacture of steel in the United States is transported over the Great Lakes.

7. Relation of lower water to safety of navigation: A lowering of the waters in the Great Lakes by further diversion would increase the hazards of navigation as well as reduce the carrying capacity of the vessels. Rocks and shoals would come closer to the surface, channels and turning basins would be made shallower and narrower and movement in and out of harbors would be made more difficult. Congress would soon be deluged with requests for funds to deepen channels and harbors presently maintained by the Corps of Engineers.

8. Control of Great Lakes levels joint problem of United States and Canada under Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909: Under that treaty, Congress has the obligation to cooperate with Canada in the preservation of the waters of the Great Lakes for purposes of commerce and navigation. That obligation is not fulfilled by unilateral diversion which disregards the rights of Canada as well as the bordering States. House Concurrent Resolution 12 and House Concurrent Resolution 82 propose that the matter of the causes of the fluctuation in water levels of the Great Lakes be studied by the International Joint Commission and that the Commission recommend appropriate remedies to the two countries. Those resolutions should pass—not H. R. 3300.

Treaty-Made Law and the Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the big news story of early 1954 will be the debate on the Bricker amendment. My annual questionnaire of May 1953, which was distributed to my constituents, contained this question:

Are you in favor of the Bricker amendment to the Constitution which would prohibit treaty agreements impairing rights of United States citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution?

Of the "yes" and "no" answers, 70 percent voted "yes." Besides this concrete example of the very definite approval of Senator BRICKER'S proposal among the people of the 11th Congressional District, many persons have talked to me, and I have also received a great many letters, urging my support of this amendment. In line with my political philosophy to express the will of the majority of my constituents—assuming, of course, this will is not contrary to the general welfare or the Constitution—and remembering Abraham Lincoln's words in a congressional speech that "the primary, the cardinal, the one great living principle of all democratic representative governments—the principle that the representative is bound to carry out the known will of his constituents," if it passes the Senate and is not materially changed when it comes to the House of Representatives, I expect to support the Bricker amendment.

Article VI of the Constitution says:

And all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

The crux of the matter is whether a treaty affecting the rights or property of our citizens takes precedence over the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. So there will be no possibility that the rights guaranteed citizens under the Constitution could be taken away from them under treaty law, the Bricker amendment seeks to clarify this point of procedure. To illustrate: By treaty, we are now members of the United Nations and are bound by U. N. agreements. Suppose the United Nations passes a law or resolution to the effect that no newspapers can criticize the heads of governments of their member nations. Some people hold that we in the United States are then bound by such an agreement despite the fact that under our Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments to the Constitution—Congress cannot legislate against freedom of speech or freedom of the press. The Bricker amendment provides:

SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

SEC. 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

In no other major country in the world is a treaty self-executing; that is, the treaty does not become effective immediately as does a domestic law nor does it become the supreme law of the land, until enacting legislation is passed by the lawmakers. The Bricker amendment concerns itself solely with the domestic or internal effects of treaties. The framers of our Constitution certainly evidenced their feeling that treaties should not affect our internal life when Thomas Jefferson said:

By the general power to make treaties, the Constitution must have intended to comprehend only those objects which are usually regulated by treaties, and cannot be otherwise regulated. It must have meant to except out all those rights reserved to the States; for surely the President and the Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole Government is interdicted from doing in any way.

Alexander Hamilton, who many times disagreed with Jefferson, concurred with Jefferson's treaty view when, in the Federalist papers, he said:

It relates neither to the execution of the subsisting laws, nor to the enaction of new ones; and still less to an exertion of the common strength. Its objects are contracts with foreign nations, which have the force of law, but derive it from the obligations of good faith. They are not rules prescribed by the sovereign to the subject, but agreements between sovereign and sovereign.

I believe the above views clearly express the principle that treaties were never meant to negate our constitutional guaranties. Until the time of Roosevelt and Truman, our Presidents restricted treaties to agreements between sovereign and sovereign. Only in the last two decades has the Executive sought to enlarge on its time-accepted restrictions. As Mr. Acheson and the State Department bluntly stated in September 1950: "There is no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs." There is urgent need to protect our Constitution and our American citizens against treaty-made law and the Bricker amendment will provide this protection.

Communism at the Guatemala Gate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, while we are fretting about the advances of aggressive and subversive communism abroad, we sometimes look directly past evidences of the same infiltration closer to home. In Central America, Guatemala has become a strange place indeed.

Last October, our Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs declared publicly that Guatemala was openly playing the Communist game. Last December, an association studying the situation reported that Communists have become so deeply entrenched in all phases of life in Guatemala that it might no longer be possible to eliminate them peaceably. This week, two American correspondents were expelled from Guatemala as undesirable and persona non grata to the Guatemalan Government.

There is real cause for alarm here. One of the basic premises of the Communist strategy is to obtain a foothold on the American Continents. In British Guiana recently the appearance of a strong Communist Party occasioned quick action by the British Government to check its rise. The Guatemalan problem seems to be even more serious since it indicates a close cooperation between the administration of President Arbenz Guzman and the Communists. Somebody had better take a good, hard look below the border before we find a hornet's nest buzzing around our heads.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, what's the difference between Republicans and Democrats after 1 year of the big change? In 1933 the Democrats created 56,000 new Federal jobs. In 1953 Ike abolished 183,000 unnecessary jobs created by the Dems for their boys.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Treasury Secretary Talks Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Humphrey, our Secretary of the Treasury, is given to good hard sense and sound reasoning. Speaking to our combined House and Senate Committee on the Economic Report, Mr. Humphrey replied to the charge that the administration's tax proposals are more favorable to big business than to the small enterprise. In no uncertain terms, the Secretary reemphasized the one basic truth which a good many Democrats keep forgetting.

His words are worth quoting, whenever someone talks about overproduction and underconsumption. "Production," he said, "is the goose that lays the golden egg. Payrolls make consumers."

Let no one forget this truth. Consumers consume because they have jobs. They have jobs only because there is production. Without it, there can be no possible maintenance of the American economy. Without the American economy, there can be no world stability.

It is as simple and fundamental as that.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 1954

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our salvation, to Thee we lift our hearts in supplication, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite spirits. From Thy hands we have received the gift of life, the benedictions of home and friendship, and the sacrament of beauty. In the fullness of Thy mercy Thou hast given us work to do and the daily strength wherewith to do it.

Make our consecration, we pray Thee, a channel for the healing stream of Thy grace, so that having been sustained by Thy patience we may be patient, having freely received Thy bounty we may be bountiful, and having been blest with Thy love without measure, we may obey Thy behest, in an earth which is now one neighborhood, regardless of border or breed or birth, to love our neighbor as ourself. We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 20, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 987) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1917) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3477. An act to extend to the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950; and

H. R. 5337. An act to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT (EX. REPT. NO. 1)

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 20, 1954,

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted, on January 21, 1954, a report of that committee on Executive A, 83d Congress, 2d session, the Mutual Defense Treaty With Korea.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the morning hour there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with the order of business reached at the last call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I request that the President's budget message be laid before the Senate, but not read at this time, because it has previously been read in the House of Representatives and printed in the RECORD of the House proceedings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chair lays before the Senate the President's budget message, which, together with the budget, will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of January 21, 1954, pp. 567–569, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY THE COAST GUARD FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, reporting, pursuant to law, that no contracts had been negotiated by the Coast Guard, during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1953, for experimental, developmental, or research work; to the Committee on Armed Services.

INCLUSION OF REPRESENTATIVE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AS A MEMBER OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, dated January 20, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION CONTRACT, MOUNT MCKINLEY NATIONAL PARK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession contract to provide concession accommodations, facilities, and services in Mount McKinley National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CAPITALIZATION OF TREATY ANNUITY PAID TO THE SIX NATIONS OF INDIANS, AND DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS BELONGING TO SENECA NATION AND THE TONAWANDA BAND OF SENECAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation to provide for the capitalization of a treaty annuity paid to the Six Nations of Indians, and for other purposes, and to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the Seneca Nation and the Tonawanda Band of Senecas, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

NEWLY ISSUED PUBLICATION ENTITLED "STATISTICS OF NATURAL GAS COMPANIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1952" BY FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its newly issued publication entitled "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies in the United States, 1952" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by the Department of State, during the calendar year 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF STANISLAW ARGASINSKI

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order issued granting temporary admission into the United States of Stanislaw Argasinski (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commissioner of Education, on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL—CASES HEARD AND DECIDED BY NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers under supervision of that Board, and a report on cases heard and decided by that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT POLICY FOR FEDERAL PERSONNEL

A letter from the Chairman, Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report (pt. 1) of that committee, dated January 15, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

A petition and a memorial were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the American Academy of Tropical Medicine and the American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, at Louisville, Ky., relating to the statutory limitation placed upon the United States participation in the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, at Chicago, Ill., protesting against the proposed Bricker amendment, relating to treaties and executive agreements; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1647. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; with an amendment (Rept. No. 863).

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 172. Resolution to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States (Rept. No. 865);

S. Res. 181. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary (Rept. No. 866);

S. Res. 182. Resolution to investigate problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization, banking policies, and certain other matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 867);

S. Res. 184. Resolution providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 868);

S. Res. 187. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary (Rept. No. 869);

S. Res. 188. Resolution further extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations (Rept. No. 870); and

S. Res. 190. Resolution amending the resolution providing for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States, and increasing the limit of expenditures (Rept. No. 871).

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 179. Resolution continuing the authority for the temporary employment of two additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Foreign Relations (Rept. No. 872);

S. Res. 183. Resolution to study the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Rept. No. 873);

S. Res. 185. Resolution authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services (Rept. No. 874);

S. Res. 186. Resolution authorizing the employment of additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 875);

S. Res. 192. Resolution extending the time for a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 876); and

S. Res. 193. Resolution amending Senate Resolution 126, 83d Congress, providing for a study of proposals to modify existing international peace and security organizations (Rept. No. 877).

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with additional amendments:

S. Res. 173. Resolution to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce (Rept. No. 878).

CONTINUANCE OF EFFECTIVENESS OF MISSING PERSONS ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report an original bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955, and I submit a report (No. 864) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2803) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955, reported by Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

S. 2791. A bill for the relief of Ernesto De-Leon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRISWOLD (by request):

S. 2792. A bill to enable World War II veterans to qualify for benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 of which they would otherwise be deprived because of recall to active service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2793. A bill for the relief of Gerardo R. Luzod; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 2794. A bill to provide for one or more national cemeteries in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2795. A bill for the relief of Anthony Hourzamanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 2796. A bill to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to issue rules and regulations for labeling certain fabrics containing synthetic fibers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2797. A bill to define an Indian for the purpose of providing special Federal services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(See the remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 2798. A bill for the relief of Azizollah Azordegan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2799. A bill for the relief of Lee Bock (Bak) Foo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 2800. A bill to accelerate consideration by the courts of criminal proceedings involving treason, espionage, sabotage, sedition, and subversive activities, and to increase to 15 years the statute of limitations applicable to such offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 2801. A bill for the relief of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BURKE, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. CORDON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 2802. A bill to further encourage the distribution of fishery products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2803. To continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he reported the above bill from the Committee on Armed Services, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2804. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain lands in the Albeni Falls Reservoir project, Idaho, to former owners of such lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR LABELING CERTAIN FABRICS CONTAINING SYNTHETIC FIBERS

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to issue rules and regulations for labeling certain fabrics containing synthetic fibers. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement concerning the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

The bill (S. 2796) to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to issue rules and regulations for labeling certain fabrics containing synthetic fibers, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, it has been brought to my attention that certain concerns have advertised items of wearing apparel for sale as containing 100 percent synthetic materials, which, upon later examination, revealed less than 10 percent synthetic content. In view of the increasing popularity of synthetic fiber garments, it is necessary that some steps be taken to protect the consumer against misrepresentations of this nature.

The bill would require manufacturers of synthetic fiber materials to show on the labels the percentage and content of synthetic fiber and would make it unlawful to retail any such merchandise not properly labeled. Because of similar misrepresentations with wool fabrics some time ago, it became necessary to adopt what is known as the Wool Labeling Act of 1918. My bill would perform a similar function to protect the consumer, as well as the manufacturer, and may be termed as the Synthetic Fiber Labeling Act of 1954.

DEFINITION OF AN INDIAN

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to define an Indian for the purpose of providing special Federal services, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement concerning the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Arizona may proceed.

The bill (S. 2797) to define an Indian for the purpose of providing special Federal services, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It has become increasingly difficult in the last 25 years to answer precisely the question, Who is an Indian? There are various definitions in existence, some imposed by the tribes themselves and others by law, such as the limitation that the Indian Bureau can pay school tuition only for Indians possessing a minimum of one-quarter degree of Indian blood.

This problem of definition involves the related question of wardship or trusteeship, tribal membership and maintenance of tribal rolls. Today many services and privileges intended solely for Indians, as interpreted by the old and accepted definition of an Indian as being a full-blood, are being enjoyed by people who could not be adjudged Indians by any ethnic formula. When the matter of allocation of tribal lands and other properties to individual Indians becomes a question, this definition becomes even more necessary.

The question is a complex one, but until it is settled by law the problem remains open ended, and not even a gradual narrowing of the limits of Federal responsibility will be possible.

The bill I have introduced proposes to define an Indian, and it states, as its definition, that only persons who have one-half degree or more of Indian blood shall be regarded as Indians.

DISTRIBUTION OF FISHERY PRODUCTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my privilege to send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill designed to revitalize the Nation's domestic fishing industry. The bill, which my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and I have worked on together, is sponsored by a genuinely bipartisan group, including 13 Republicans, 13 Democrats, and 1 Independent. My colleague from Massachusetts and I have prepared a statement describing the scope and purpose of the bill. On behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts and myself I request unanimous consent that this summary be incorporated into the body in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2802) to further encourage the distribution of fishery products, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BURKE, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. CORDON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, and Mr. WILEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The summary presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) is as follows:

SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE SALTONSTALL-KENNEDY FISHERIES BILL

The fishing industry throughout the United States is in an increasingly difficult position. Decreased catches, depletion of fishing grounds, and a lack of improved techniques have all harmed this basic American industry. Rising imports have subjected it to particularly severe pressure.

In 1952, the domestic fishing industry caught 4.3 billion pounds of fish and shellfish worth more than $325 million. Directly and indirectly, the industry employed 550,000 people. As a means of overcoming its difficulties, the basic recommendation of all recent studies, including those authorized by the Congress, is an increase in research and development activities. The fishing industry, however, is one composed of individuals and small companies lacking the resources necessary to carry on these activities on a long-term basis. These recent studies have accordingly made the further recommendation that needed research and development projects be carried on by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. For this purpose, additional funds will be needed.

Because the difficulties of the industry so largely stem from competition by imports, the most appropriate source of additional funds for this purpose is the revenue derived from those same imports. Under existing law, however, the only portion of import revenues not turned over to the general Treasury goes to the Department of Agriculture. The law making these funds available to the Department of Agriculture is section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, by which there is appropriated and made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for each fiscal year an amount equal to 30 percent of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws during the preceding calendar year. The Secretary is directed to use these funds to subsidize the export of

agricultural commodities, to make support purchases of such commodities, and to make production payments to farmers. His only authority to use any part of these funds for the benefit of the domestic fishing industry derives from the act of August 11, 1939.

The 1939 act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to use not more than $1,500,000 per year of section 32 funds to purchase and divert surplus fishery products for distribution through relief channels. It also permits him to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior $75,000 to conduct a fishery educational service and $100,000 to develop and increase markets for fishery products of domestic origin. In practice, the authority to purchase surplus fishery products has never been used, although in recent years the funds for a fishery educational service and for market development have been regularly transferred.

Since enactment of the act of 1939, however, gross receipts from duties on fishery products have increased enormously. In 1940 the total amount was $4,772,428; by 1952 it had increased to $11,982,000, an increase of more than 250 percent. During this same period the value of fishery imports increased from $40 million to over $200 million. The domestic industry, in the meantime, by voyaging farther and farther afield at greater and greater expense for every pound of fish caught, has barely managed to hold the share of the market it had at the beginning of the period.

It is thus evident that during a period when the domestic fishing industry has been increasingly in need of assistance in meeting competition from abroad, it has been making increasingly large indirect contributions for purposes unrelated to this need. The proposed bill is aimed at correcting this plainly unfair situation.

To accomplish this the bill would require the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior every year from the funds made available under the act of August 24, 1935, that portion derived from the duties on fishery products. The Secretary of Agriculture would still retain power to make support purchases of surplus fishery products under section 1 of the 1939 act should it ever be deemed desirable to exercise this authority. The Secretary of the Interior would have power under section 2 (d) to retransfer funds made available under the proposed bill to the Department of Agriculture for this purpose.

The remaining funds (ordinarily the entire amount) would be used by the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a fishery educational service and fishery research programs and to develop and increase markets for fishery products of domestic origin. In carrying out these programs the Secretary of the Interior would cooperate with other agencies of the Federal, State, and local governments and with interested private organizations and individuals.

Such functions are, of course, appropriately within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and are seriously required at the present time. To finance them out of section 32 funds would benefit the fishing industry without any sacrifice to agricultural research. The funds available to the Department of Agriculture under section 32 during recent fiscal years have been in the following total amounts:

1950	$125,600,000
1951	111,000,000
1952	159,000,000
1953	181,000,000
1954	172,000,000
1955 (estimated)	180,000,000

The Agricultural Act of 1949 provides for an accumulation of section 32 funds by the Department of Agriculture up to a total of $300 million. Any excess over this amount must be turned back by the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Treasury. In fiscal 1954, $27 million has been turned back—a sum, in other words 7 or 8 times the total which would be made available to the Department of the Interior under the proposed bill to meet the research and development needs of the fishing industry.

In the field of biological and oceanographic research, the most urgent need is to explore the reasons for fluctuations in the supply of fish. Reports from the Great Lakes, Alaska, and the Pacific States, and from all along the Atlantic coast from the Grand Banks to Mexico, confirm the importance of stability of supplies in establishing new markets for fishery products. Hope for overcoming this problem lies in research on ocean currents, changes in water temperature, abundance of fish food, and other shifting conditions. With present knowledge it is impossible to distinguish fluctuations in abundance from fluctuations in accessibility and to advise fishermen accordingly.

In the technological field, development could be undertaken of chemical tests for freshness of chilled and frozen fish and shellfish so as to provide means for control of quality. Study could be initiated of methods of freezing shrimp at sea in the Gulf of Mexico area to prevent spoilage. Methods might also be found of handling, freezing, and packaging Southern oysters to broaden the market beyond the now purely local distribution of the fresh product.

To develop and increase markets for fishery products, much more data than is now being collected would be helpful in determining the proper utilization of our salt-water and fresh-water fishery resources. Receipts and wholesale prices could be collected in eight large consuming cities (Philadelphia, Baltimore, Cleveland, Detroit, St. Louis, St. Paul, Los Angeles, and Pittsburgh) not now covered by the Market News Service. Surveys could usefully be made, too, of the distribution of fishery products in New York and Chicago in order to determine the changes in marketing since the advent of frozen packaged fish and shellfish products.

Among the educational projects beneficial to the industry which a lack of funds precludes at this time is the development of new uses for the underdeveloped and less popular species, both fresh-water and salt-water, so as to provide year-round employment and stabilize market prices for the fishermen, processors, marketers, and consumers of domestically produced fishery products.

Many other examples could be cited of projects beneficial to the fishing industry which the funds provided for in the enclosed bill may eventually make possible. Those mentioned, however, should serve to make clear that the need is great, and adoption of the means of meeting it provided for in the proposed bill would be a long step forward.

TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN POST OFFICES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution, which reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that hereafter the Postmaster General should not discontinue any United States post office until the expiration of 60 days after he shall have reported to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives on the necessity and advisability of such action.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56), submitted by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 848, 83D CONGRESS, ON KOREAN ATROCITIES

Mr. POTTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 194), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to have printed for its use 50,000 copies of Senate Report No. 848, a report pursuant to Senate Resolution 40, 83d Congress, 1st session, relative to an investigation of Korean war atrocities.

INVESTIGATION OF RECENT COFFEE PRICE INCREASES

Mr. BEALL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 195), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation for the purpose of determining the reasons for the recent sharp increases in the price of coffee to American consumers and what legislative or other action may be taken for the purpose of assuring an adequate and stable supply of coffee to American consumers at a reasonable price. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, in no event later than ——, the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 196), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 83d Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 812, 831).

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3477. An act to extend to the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 5337. An act to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

John William Tramburg, of Wisconsin, to be Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Charles O. Parker, of Colorado, to be Assayer in the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.;

Louis B. Toomer, of Georgia, to be Register of the Treasury;

George C. McConnaughey, of Ohio, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board;

Jessie Dixon Sayler, of Georgia, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 17, with headquarters at Savannah, Ga.;

Douglas Butler, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.;

Edward C. Ellsworth, Jr., of Montana, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 33, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont.;

Edward M. Elwell, of Maine, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine;

J. Chalmers Ewing, of Colorado, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.;

Frank W. Hull, of Washington, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 30, with headquarters at Seattle, Wash.;

John G. Kissane, of Vermont, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt.;

Josiah A. Maultsby, Sr., of North Carolina, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 15, with headquarters at Wilmington, N. C.;

Anne A. Mitchell, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.; and

Aleer J. Couri, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a group of nominations covering general officers in the Army and the Marine Corps, and ask that they be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations placed on the Executive Calendar are as follows:

Brig. Gen. Paul Frailey Yount, O18022, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Transportation, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Thomas Francis Hickey, O10362, United States Army, for appointment as commanding general, IX Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, O15004, United States Army, for appointment as commanding general, I Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. John Max Lentz, Army of the United States, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. William Shepard Biddle and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Robert William Crichlow, Jr., O12430, United States Army, for appointment as major general in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, and Brig. Gen. George Bateman Peploe, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Col. Cyrus Quinton Shelton, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Col. Conrad Stanton Babcock, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton, and Col. Wendell Westover, for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Brig. Gen. Arthur Elsworth Stoddard, and sundry other officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Maj. Gen. Homer Oliver Eaton, Jr., and sundry other officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army; and

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE DESK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have a group of 1,232 routine nominations in the Regular Air Force, all in the grades of lieutenant colonel and below. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this large number of names, which have already appeared once in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is requested that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator. In this respect, I wish to state that it is my intention to report these nominations from the Committee on Armed Services on Monday, as in executive session, and at that time ask unanimous consent that they be immediately confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be received and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WHITING WILLAUER TO BE AMBASSADOR TO REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nomination of Whiting Willauer, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador of the United States to the Republic of Honduras. Notice is given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, after 6 days have expired.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EARL WARREN TO BE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 2, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Earl Warren, of California, to be Chief Justice of the United States—now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN A. DANAHER TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 3, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of John A. Danaher, of Connecticut, to be United States circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit—now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF UNITED STATES CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES, AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 4, 1954, beginning at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Carroll C. Hincks, of Connecticut, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit—recess appointment.

Elmer J. Schnackenberg, of Illinois, to be United States circuit judge, seventh circuit—recess appointment.

Edwin F. Hunter, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the western district of Louisiana—recess appointment.

Edward William Day, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge for the

district of Rhode Island—recess appointment.

George T. Mickelson, of South Dakota, to be United States district judge for the district of South Dakota—recess appointment.

Simon E. Sobeloff, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice Philip B. Perlman, resigned.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF UNITED STATES CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 4, 1954, beginning at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, Second Circuit, vice Augustus N. Hand, retired.

James Lewis McCarrey, Jr., of Alaska, to be United States district judge, Division No. 3, District of Alaska—recess appointment.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES FOR THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 5, 1954, beginning at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, Chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Albert M. Felix, of Hawaii, to be third judge, first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii—recess appointment.

Harry R. Hewitt, of Hawaii, to be fifth judge, first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii—recess appointment.

Calvin C. McGregor, of Hawaii, to be seventh judge, first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii—recess appointment.

William Z. Fairbanks, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Edward A. Towse, elevated.

Frank Aloysius McKinley, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge, first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Willson C. Moore, retired.

EXPRESSIONS IN OPPOSITION TO THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously brought to the attention of the Senate a mass of expressions from all over our Nation in opposition to the Bricker amendment which would limit the President's treatymaking power.

At the present time, I have before me further samples of such comment from all over our country. I should like to describe several of these items:

The first is the text of a telegram from the chairman of the CIO international committee, Mr. Jacob Potofsky, opposing the amendment.

The second is a group of editorials opposing the amendment—from the January 14 issue of the Boston Herald and from the January 11 issue of the Long Island Newsday.

The third is the text of a resolution adopted at the 57th annual encampment of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

All of these are, I believe, indicative of the rising tide of views of thinking Americans throughout this Nation who recognize that the glittering generalities behind the Bricker amendment are loaded with the most dangerous implications.

I send to the desk these items, and ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram, editorials, and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 21, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly oppose Bricker amendment and any compromise that would alter present treaty system. This measure would give to Congress and to the individual States the power to destroy the President's constitutional authority to conduct the foreign affairs of our Nation. By making treaties subject to legislative approval by individual States and by barring executive agreements entirely, this amendment would cripple our leadership of the free world and leave us helplessly adrift in the tide of world events. It seriously alters our traditional balance of power between the legislative and executive branches and between the Federal and State Governments, and would return us to the chaotic era of the Articles of Confederation. This amendment, by stripping the United States Government of power over foreign relations can only benefit those who are opposed to a strong America. We urge that you vote against the Bricker amendment.

JACOB S. POTOFSKY,
Chairman, CIO International Committee.

[From the Boston Herald of January 14, 1954]

BRICKER BACKFIRE

The legislative committee on constitutional law has acted wisely in turning down a bill to memorialize Congress in favor of the Bricker amendment.

The usefulness of memorializations by State legislatures is doubtful at best. And in the case of constitutional amendments, which come before the legislatures as a part of the ratification process anyway, they seem particularly pointless.

But quite apart from these considerations the bill was a bad one. The Bricker plan to restrict the treatymaking power does not deserve even the nominal boost which a legislative memorial would give it. And the overwhelming weight of the opposition testimony at Wednesday's hearing obviously convinced the committee of that fact.

Indeed, we hope that the voices which were raised against the memorial bill here will be heard in Washington where the amendment itself is about to be debated again. Such distinguished critics as Dean Griswold, of Harvard Law School; Professor O'Reilly, of Boston College Law School; and Endicott Peabody (who spearheaded opposition to the amendment at the American Bar Association's meeting here last fall), represent a growing public opinion in the country which wants the treaty power left unshackled.

The amendment, which is the brainchild of former American Bar Association President Frank E. Holman, once had wide support from people who feared that some of the freewheeling United Nations covenants on human rights might become United States law, by way of the treaty route, and undermine traditional United States liberties. The American Bar Association endorsed it and some 60 Senators followed Senator BRICKER in lending their names to it.

But public debate on the proposal has proved this fear to be largely ephemeral, and wiser heads, examining the proposed amendment, have declared that its chief effect would be to hamstring the President in his conduct of foreign affairs at a time when he is uniquely in need of freedom of action.

The contest has now unfortunately degenerated into a test of strength between isolationists, who are congenitally afraid of entangling alliances, and internationalists, who believe that we must join ever closer with our free-world allies if we are to find security against the Communist threat. That is not the way the fight started. But that is what it has come to.

Under the circumstances, America cannot afford a Bricker amendment. And our Massachusetts legislators play a useful role in refusing to give it countenance.

[From the Long Island (N. Y.) Newsday of January 11, 1954]

BRICKER'S AT IT AGAIN

According to the usual unidentified Washington insiders, one of the first orders of business for the new Congress will be Senator BRICKER'S proposed constitutional amendment. The Ohio nationalist got his plan through the Senate Judiciary Committee last year, but it met stern rebuffs from President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles, Attorney General Brownell and Mutual Security Administrator Stassen.

BRICKER'S proposal, considerably watered down since he first made it, would severely limit the President's power to negotiate treaties and executive agreements. Specifically it says: 1. Any treaty in conflict with the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect; 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

The indications are that BRICKER is trying again to reach a compromise with the administration. He flew to Washington 2 weeks ago for talks with Dulles and Brownell, and he was at the White House for further talks last week before Congress opened.

What kind of compromise can be reached we do not know. The President said last year that he was willing to bargain, but he would not accept anything that undermined his authority in foreign affairs. This is exactly what BRICKER plans to do.

Section 1 of his plan is harmless, as far as we can see, but completely unnecessary. One of the beauties of our Constitution is that it is not loaded with a lot of meaningless words. To incorporate into it an amendment which says what the Constitution already says is a waste. The point that no treaty in conflict with the Constitution can be valid was settled by the Supreme Court

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

174 years ago, and had been regularly reaffirmed.

Section 2 is the dangerous clause. Although innocent enough to those who want to believe the best of everyone and everything, its purpose is generally recognized as an attempt to turn us back to pre-Constitution days when a State could nullify a treaty made by the Federal Government. Merlo J. Pusey, Pulitzer prize winning biographer of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, writes that this section would forbid the making of treaties concerning many of the matters that are customarily covered in treaties of friendship and commerce unless the administration were willing to seek ratification by the States as well as by Congress.

In these days when quick decisions are vital to our national security, BRICKER wants to give us 49 voices in foreign affairs rather than 1. He wants to extend the time needed to ratify treaties from a few precious days to perhaps years. The effect would be to take from the Nation its decisive role in world affairs. Initiative, which President Eisenhower told Congress Thursday we had finally gained, would be thrown away.

DEFINITIONS NEEDED

BRICKER's sincerity and patriotic intentions cannot be doubted. He was aroused to action, and presumably fear, by such executive agreements as Potsdam and Yalta. Executive agreements do not need Senate confirmation.

But Congress already has control of treaties, and can veto executive agreements by tightening the purse strings. Most agreements take money, and the President is severely restricted on what he can do with funds already appropriated.

What is needed, if anything, is not a restriction on the executive powers, but clearer definitions of what those powers are. Congress can, with a great deal more study than it has so far given the amendment, draw a firm line between treaties and executive agreements. This has never been done.

If properly drawn, such a measure—not being a Constitutional amendment—would not shackle the President, but only help prevent abuses. Congress has plenty of time. Hasty action will do irreparable harm to the United States.

ANTI-BRICKER AMENDMENT RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS, SEPTEMBER 5, 1953

Whereas the negotiation of treaties and executive agreements by the President and ratification by the Senate as provided in our Constitution has on the whole worked effectively in our foreign relations and protected the rights of our citizens and our international interests; and

Whereas the proposed so-called Bricker amendment to the Constitution threatens to interfere with a procedure which has proved its worth during the whole history of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, assembled at 58th annual national encampment in Chicago, Ill., September 2–6, 1953, oppose the proposed Bricker amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES COMMEMORATING THE TERCENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 987) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., which was, on page 2, line 7, after "coins", where it appears the first time, insert "*Provided*, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of the 2-year period immediately following the enactment of this act."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have taken up this matter with the majority leader, the minority leader, and the Senator in charge of the bill. The amendment made by the House of Representatives is entirely agreeable to the proponents of the bill. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment was agreed to.

COTTON AND WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, inasmuch as a number of Senators have other engagements, I ask unanimous consent that a privileged matter, the conference report on the cotton-acreage bill, be submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6665) to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of January 20, 1954, pp. 598–601, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation, for the information of the Senate, regarding the changes which the conferees have recommended to the bill as it passed the Senate?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when the conference committee, composed of 15 Members of the Senate and 13 Members of the House of Representatives, met, it was decided to substitute new language.

The report submitting the new language is signed by all the conferees of both Houses.

We agree that we have done the best that could be done. We have provided for an increase in the cotton acreage to be planted this year—an increase from 17,910,448 acres to 21,379,342 acres.

The conference report seems to be generally approved by all representatives from the cotton-growing areas of the country.

I shall not attempt to go into the details of the report unless it is necessary. If there is a request for a detailed explanation, there are present at this time members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who come from cotton-growing States, and they will go into the details.

However, to the best of my knowledge, there is no objection to the conference report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in behalf of orderly procedure, I believe a statement should be made regarding the changes as finally recommended by the conferees.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], each of whom represents a cotton-growing State, are present at this time. Either one of them is perfectly competent to explain the details.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, insofar as the provisions contained in the Senate version of the bill, respecting the 1954 cotton crop are concerned, no significant changes have been made in conference. The same methods of apportionment to States, as now contained in the Senate bill, have been retained in conference. We have added two gadgets, one which would permit the State committees the option of allotting the additional acreage provided for 1954 to counties in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of the national acreage instead of allotting it directly to the farmer. Should that method be followed the county committees in turn would have the option of apportioning such additional county acreage to farms either in the manner now provided by law or in a manner similar to that provided by the Senate bill for allotment by the State committee to farms. That was done in order to assist in having a more equitable distribution of cotton acreage in the States of Texas and Oklahoma and possibly Arkansas. The other gadget would permit the cotton acreage already allocated to counties but not to farms because all farms in those counties had already received their maximum allotments to be reallotted by the State committee. The purpose is to use these frozen allotments in other areas of the State where they are needed.

The bill has also been amended so as to contain permanent legislation. The permanent legislation has to do with the distribution by the States, as well as the counties, of their respective reserves of cotton acreage, so they can be used by the county or by the State to prevent hardships or inequities.

Another permanent provision was placed in the bill which would make it optional with the county committees, with the Secretary of Agriculture's approval, either to use the cropland basis of distribution as now provided in the law or the historical basis.

There was another provision affecting the States of California and Arizona to a certain extent in respect to future cotton-acreage allotments. Senators

will recall that we provided for a 59,000 plus-acre increase so as to give California and Arizona not less than a 66 percent acreage allotment of the acreage they planted in 1952. The bill provides that this extra acreage of 59,000 shall not be used in the future in computing and determining the amount of cotton acreage which those two States shall receive.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That provision applies only to the extra acreage, does it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I correctly understand that the conference report was unanimously agreed to and signed by all the conferees of both houses?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. This is the first time since I have been in the Senate that the entire membership of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was appointed on a conference committee and all conferees have signed the conference report—a unique situation to say the least.

Mr. President, those are the significant changes. I may say that the 50-percent-cropland limitation as provided in the Senate bill was modified so as to allow the State committees to fix a limitation of less than 50 percent, if they saw fit so to do.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have just this moment received a statement prepared by the counsel for the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which sets forth all the differences between the conference report on House bill 6665 and the Senate amendment to House bill 6665, which was the language of the Senate bill. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD at this point. I would have submitted it earlier, but I have only just received it. We have been working against time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 6665 AND THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H. R. 6665

The conference substitute for the Senate amendment to H. R. 6665 differs from the Senate amendment in the following respects:

(1) The conference substitute provides that the 59,374 acres allotted to Arizona and California to bring their allotments up to 66 percent of their 1952 planted acreage will not be counted in computing future State acreage allotments.

(2) The conference substitute gives the State committee the option of allotting the additional acreage provided for 1954 by the first section of the bill (except the 4,968 acres allotted to Florida under that section) to counties in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of the national acreage allotment instead of allotting it directly to farms in the manner provided by the Senate substitute. If the State committee in any State should so elect to apportion such additional acreage to counties rather than to farms, the county committees under the conference substitute would then have the option of apportioning such additional county acreage to farms either in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of the county acreage allotment or in a manner similar to that provided by the Senate amendment for allotment by the State committee to farms.

(3) The Senate amendment limited the additional acreage to be allotted to any farm for 1954 under the Senate provision mentioned in (2) above to 50 percent of the cropland on the farm. The conference substitute would permit the State committee to fix this limitation at such level not in excess of 50 percent as appears required by various factors affecting production in the State. This would permit the Western State committees, for instance, to fix this limitation at 50 percent, while other State committees might fix it at 40 percent if they felt conditions in their respective State so required.

(4) The conference substitute redefines cropland for the purpose of the limitation discussed in (3) above to make it conform to the definition of cropland contained in the 1954 marketing quota regulations issued by the Secretary (18 F. R. 7530), thereby excluding "any land which constitutes or will constitute * * * a wind-erosion hazard to the community and also excluding bearing orchards and vineyards (except the acreage of cropland therein) and plowable noncrop open pasture." This change enables the Department to use the cropland information that it now has, rather than requiring it to determine acreage devoted to orchards and vineyards, which would delay allotment of the additional acreage.

(5) The conference substitute permits allotment by the State commitee of any acreage in the State which has not been allotted because of the highest planted acreage limitation contained in section 344 (f) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. In certain counties, due to a shift from cotton growing to other types of farming, the county allotment, after deducting the full county reserve, has been more than sufficient to provide each old cotton farm with 100 percent of its highest planted acreage. The conference substitute would permit allotment of the excess acreage in those counties.

(6) The conference substitute makes the following changes in the provision of the Senate amendment relating to the surrender and reallotment of acreage:

(a) It would make it effective in 1955 as well as 1954.

(b) It would make it effective with respect to long-staple cotton.

(c) It would make it unnecessary to determine, for the purposes of computing farm history, whether the surrendered acreage was or was not planted. This determination would involve considerable admistrative difficulty without affecting the total acreage allotted to any State or county. In determining future State and county allotments, the acreage would be counted as provided in the Senate bill only if it were actually planted.

(7) The conference substitute adopts the permanent provisions of the House bill which would be effective beginning with the 1955 crop, and would (a) permit State and county reserves to be used to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship, and (b) permit allotment of the county acreage allotment to farms on the basis of their 3-year history, if the county committee and the Secretary so see fit, rather than on the basis of the small farm and percentage factor provisions contained in sections 344 (f) (1) and 344 (f) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

(8) The conference substitute revises the provision of the Senate amendment which would permit increases in marketing quotas for kinds of wheat in short supply to make several technical changes, limit it to the 1954 and 1955 crops, and limit use of the additional acreage to the production of the class of subclass of wheat in short supply.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make 3 or 4 brief comments.

First, the amount of acreage for 1954 proposed by the Senate bill is left unchanged by the conference report. That amount is 21,379,342 acres. In other words, the conference report does not depart from the amount of cotton acreage fixed for 1954 by the Senate committee and by the bill which passed the Senate.

The second comment I should like to make is that two provisions, which did not apply to cotton acreage, were added in the Senate committee and approved by the Senate. One such provision is applicable to durum wheat. It was offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. The other provision is that section 32 funds may be used in the case of surpluses in the production of Irish potatoes. Those two amendments were placed in the Senate bill by the Senate committee and were approved by the Senate. They were left in by the conference, and are in the conference report.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. There was a slight change in the wheat amendment. The provision is now limited to 2 years. As it left the Senate it would have been a permanent provision. The Department of Agriculture deems it advisable to increase the acreage of durum wheat this year. Durum wheat is in very short supply, and is selling for about $4 a bushel, or approximately double the price support level. As Senators know, durum wheat is used in the manufacture of macaroni and spaghetti.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

A third change which was made, and which has not been referred to, was a very minor one. It was made at the unanimous request and with the unanimous approval of Senators and House Members from the States which produce extra-long-staple cotton, formerly called sea island cotton. That change was to make available and applicable to extra-long-staple cotton or sea island cotton the provisions of the bill for 1954 and 1955 with reference to the surrender of acreage and the reallotment of such acreage by the county committees, so that farmers who produce extra-long-staple cotton will have applicable in their counties the same provision which will be applicable under the bill as to the years 1954 and 1955, in the case of ordinary cotton. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that since the same areas frequently produce both kinds of cotton, a situation should not be left under which the new method of release of acreage and reallotment of such acreage now made applicable by this bill to short-staple cotton would not have been applicable to extra-long-staple cotton. Under the terms of the conference report, that provision will be equally applicable to both types of cotton.

I believe those were the principal changes made in the bill in conference.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

which have not already been mentioned by other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE MINING AREAS OF WYOMING

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a telegram which I received from Mr. William L. Thomas, recording secretary of Local 8078, United Mine Workers of America, Stansbury, Wyo. The telegram deals with unemployment and the resultant economic conditions in that area.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCK SPRINGS, WYO., *January 21, 1954.*

LESTER C. HUNT,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: Due to slow working times in the mines followed by recent reduction working forces by Union Pacific Coal Co. An extreme emergency exists in Rock Springs area, and many of our coal miners are in dire circumstances. This condition is serious. It has been called to our attention that several families, some with as many as 11 children, are on starvation diets. It is a policy of our local union that no one shall suffer, but as our finances are limited we are calling for your help in trying to secure surplus commodities to help remedy this condition. We feel that inasmuch as the stockmen can purchase surplus grain to feed their livestock that we should be allowed the same privilege to feed the mouths of hungry people. It is also our contention that the Government should share in standing that expense of this project as promised in the recent speech of the President where he stated that in cases of emergency immediate and direct action should be taken to meet the needs of the people we wish to impress upon you that this is indeed an emergency and that anything you can do to help us will be deeply appreciated. Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. THOMAS,
Recording Secretary, Local 8078,
U. M. W. of A., Stansbury, Wyo.

STATEMENT BY GENERAL EISENHOWER IN SUPPORT OF ADMISSION OF ALASKA AND HAWAII INTO THE UNION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the statement which General Eisenhower made at Denver, Colo., on September 17, 1950, in support of admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union. The statement appeared in the Denver Post of November 17, 1954.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood will show the world that America practices what it preaches, General Dwight D. Eisenhower said Saturday in a brief talk to 1,500 Denverites gathered at the freedom bell.

The famed war and peacetime leader declared admission of the two Territories is in conformity with the American way of life granting them self-government and equal voice in national affairs.

Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood will serve to the people of the world as a "practical symbol that America practices what it preaches," Eisenhower said. He said he hoped Congress would soon pass admission legislation now pending before it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no resolutions coming over from the previous day, the morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate—and I should add that I have discussed the subject with the minority leader—after the call of the calendar, the Senate will remain in session for the purpose of giving Senators an opportunity to make remarks and submit matters for the RECORD. Because of the heavy snowfall which we have already had and which it is expected will continue during the remainder of the day, it is the intention of the majority leader to move at an early hour that the Senate recess to Monday so that Senators and their staffs and the members of the press and employees of the Senate will not have to contend with the rush-hour traffic in the heavy snow this afternoon.

Therefore, when the call of the calendar has been completed, and when Senators have had an opportunity to speak, it will be the intention of the majority leader to move that the Senate recess until Monday.

On Monday the Senate will go into executive session for the purpose of considering the nominations on the Executive Calendar and the Korean Treaty.

I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the Korean treaty and the printed hearings have been placed on the desks of all Senators, I hope all Senators will have an opportunity to study the material over the weekend so that they may be prepared to begin the discussion of the Korean Treaty on Monday.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). The calendar is now in order. The Secretary will proceed to state the measures on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT TO INCLUDE WOOL—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2313) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish we could have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall ask the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] to make the explanation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I believe the bill should go over until either the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] or the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is on the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I know, Mr. President, there is no objection to the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection to the bill, but I do not believe its title is sufficiently clear to give an accurate account of what the bill provides.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was one of the Senators in committee who asked that the bill be held up until I could have an opportunity to clear it with those in my State who are interested in wool and with certain representatives of the wool trade in other States and to ascertain whether they desired to have the bill enacted into law.

Under the present arrangement, wool tops are subject to future trading, but wool is not subject to such trading. The wool trade and the wool producers thought that all wool products ought to be subject to future trading, as cotton and hundreds of other agricultural commodities are. Because such suggestions came from the wool trade, I had some questions about the bill, as did the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. We wanted to determine whether the bill would in any way damage the producers of wool.

I am satisfied now that it is a good bill and that it would not damage the wool trade in any way. Therefore, I have withdrawn the objection I had to the bill in committee.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Are the various wool interests agreed on the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. They are.

Mr. YOUNG. That does not happen very often, I will say to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2313) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, in line 4, after the word "inserting, to strike out 'wool' and insert 'wool,' "; and after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third sentence of section 2 (a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "wool", after the comma following "(Irish potatoes)."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in the opinion of the calendar committee on this side of the aisle, the bill is of such importance that it should be scheduled for debate by the Senate, and for that reason I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1990) to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1381) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

SALE OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS ON NATIONAL FOREST LAND IN ARIZONA

The bill (S. 1399) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "shall", to insert "if sufficient for the purpose"; and in line 10, after the word "Forest", to insert "If the development and improvement of such ranger station cannot be accomplished without the use of funds in excess of such proceeds, such proceeds shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized in his discretion to sell to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association of Arizona, for cash, at a fair appraised value to be determined by him, the following described improvements on national forest lands situated in an unsurveyed portion of township 4 north, range 12 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, estimated to be within the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 20 of that township in Gila County, State of Arizona.

All buildings and other physical improvements owned by the United States and under the administration of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, situated at the reclamation settlement of Roosevelt, Ariz.

The proceeds of such sale or sales shall, if sufficient for the purpose, be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the development and improvement of a Forest Service ranger station located elsewhere in the Tonto National Forest. If the development and improvement of such ranger station cannot be accomplished without the use of funds in excess of such proceeds, such proceeds shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is present. I believe he would prefer to explain the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we believe this to be a good bill. It provides for the sale at a fair appraised value of certain Forest Service ranger station improvements located near Roosevelt, Ariz. The sale would be to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, and would consist of the following improvements:

1. A 3-bedroom dwelling, built in 1935.
2. A barn, built in 1915.
3. A 2-bedroom house, built in 1915.
4. A shed, located near the barn in (2), built in 1915.
5. A fence, surrounding the house in (1), erected in 1935.
6. A sanitary system for the house in (1), constructed in 1935.
7. Part of the water system of the entire improvement development.
8. A horse corral, located near the barn in (2), built in 1935.

The Salt River Valley Water Users Association desires to use these improvements at the reclamation settlement which was built by the Reclamation Service in connection with the construction of the adjacent Roosevelt Reservoir.

The bill provides that, to the extent the money is paid to the Forest Service, it may be used by it to build a new ranger station in the vicinity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE OF LAND IN EAGLE COUNTY, COLO.

The bill (S. 1577) to authorize the exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the bill provides for the exchange of town lands no longer required by the Forest Service for lands within the White River National Forest which are suitable for forest purposes. The lands to be disposed of are valued at $2,000, while the lands to be acquired are valued at $2,500.

The Department of Agriculture has investigated the situation and has approved the bill. No objection was raised to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1577) to authorize the exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to exchange lots 8, 9, 10, block L, town of Redcliff, Eagle County, Colo., acquired by the United States by deed dated February 19, 1918, recorded in book 66, page 519, Eagle County, Colo., for the following described lands in the same county and within the White River National Forest: Southeast quarter southwest quarter of section 34, township 7 south, range 80 west, and lots 3 and 4 and the south half northwest quarter of section 3, township 8 south, range 80 west, all sixth principal meridian, except that certain strip of land (one and seven hundred and eighty-seven one-thousandths acres) conveyed to the county of Eagle by deed recorded in book 79 at page 197 of records of Eagle County, and the right-of-way of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co., which lands upon acceptance of title shall become part of the White River National Forest and subject to the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to such national forest: *Provided*, That title to the lands conveyed to the United States under this act may be accepted subject to such reservations, exceptions, or outstanding rights as the Secretary determines will not interfere with the use thereof for national-forest purposes.

REQUIREMENT OF BONDS FROM PACKERS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2404) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I withhold it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, after a bill has been introduced, approved by the Department of Agriculture, and no objection to it has been raised, it has been the policy of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to take action on it and to report it favorably if the committee believes the bill proposes sound legislation.

This bill was introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. It was available to all interested parties. It was before the committee for 6 months, and no request for a hearing was heard and no objection was raised to it. Therefore, after it had been approved by the officials of the Department of Agriculture, who recommended its enactment, the committee reported the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to avoid heavy losses which have been incurred in the sale of cattle to packers. The losses were not incurred by the farmers, but by the commission houses and stockyards.

However, after the bill was reported, representatives of packers said that they did object to it and that they did not believe they should be bonded, and therefore they asked that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for a hearing. That would mean delay of many months' time, and, probably, the killing of the bill.

I told the representative of the packers, who said he had discussed the matter with officials of the Department of Agriculture, that if he would submit to us any instances of injustices which he felt were in the bill, any amendments which the Department agreed were desirable to correct such injustices would be re-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ceived and we would allow ample time for that to be done.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would ask the Senate not to take action on this bill for a month. But, Mr. President, we cannot ask all the people of the United States, and particularly those so well-organized as are the meatpackers, whether they are going to object to each and every bill. They knew the bill was before the committee. They had plenty of opportunity during the past 6 months to ask for a hearing, and they did not do so. If they cannot show that it is an unwise and undesirable bill, I hope the Senate will set a time for debating it later in the session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to have it perfectly clear that I have no particular objection to the bill being held on the calendar, and I did not know of the controversy which developed. I do not want to establish a precedent by agreeing to hold the bill for a month's time. I do not think the Senator was asking for a unanimous-consent agreement to that effect.

We would have a very complicated calendar if we had an agreement that one bill would be held up for a month and another bill for 6 weeks. I think it would be taking control of the calendar away from the responsible leadership of the Senate.

So I hope there will be no agreement of that nature entered into. I will take notice that the chairman of the committee is perfectly willing to hold the bill on the calendar. We have other business which I am sure will take us at least a month and which should have priority. By that time we may be prepared to proceed with this bill. It might be 3 weeks or 6 weeks.

Mr. AIKEN. If the majority leader moves to bring it up at the end of the consideration of the calendar, I shall have no objection. I have given the interested parties an opportunity to present their opinions in writing. I think I said we might hold the bill on the calendar for a month. If they do not come up with any legitimate and reasonable objections by that time, I hope that the Senate will proceed to act on the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that I am certain it will not be called up until we have disposed of the proposed Korean Treaty, Senate Joint Resolution 1, and other priority legislation. A time to consider the bill has not been set by the committee as yet, and I shall be glad to give at least 48 hours' notice in advance of any determination to take up the bill. I am sure that time will be at least several weeks from now, but I do not want to be pinned down to any specific period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

INDEMNIFICATION AGAINST LOSS OF INFECTED SWINE

The bill (S. 2583) to indemnify against loss all persons whose swine were destroyed in July 1952, as a result of having been infected with or exposed to the contagious disease, vesicular exanthema, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill with reference to what the cost will be?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this bill provides indemnities for hogs destroyed in July 1952 in an effort to stop the spread of vesicular exanthema. The Federal program did not begin until August 1, 1952, and, consequently, the Federal Government has paid no indemnities to owners of hogs destroyed pursuant to State programs before that date. The destruction of animals in July, of course, contributed to the control of the disease fully as much as the destruction of animals after that date; and it is felt that the Federal Government should share equally with the State in the payment of indemnities for such destruction. The Department has advised that the Federal share of the indemnities under the bill would be about $3,320.

The amendment would make it perfectly clear that the Federal share would not exceed either 50 percent of the loss or the amount paid by the State.

In effect, this is a bill for the relief of hog producers in the State of Oregon. That State started eradicating the disease a few days before the first of August, and it is the only State which did not get proper reimbursement for so doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2583) to indemnify against loss all persons whose swine were destroyed in July 1952 as a result of having been infected with or exposed to the contagious disease, vesicular exanthema, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "indemnify", to strike out "against loss" and insert "in an amount equal to 50 percent of their loss, but not exceeding the indemnity paid by the State", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to indemnify in an amount equal to 50 percent of their loss, but not exceeding the indemnity paid by the State, all persons whose swine were destroyed under authority of law in July 1952 as a result of having been infected with or exposed to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema.

SEC. 2. The payment of indemnities under the provisions of this act shall be limited, in the absence of Federal appraisal, to those losses where required proof of such losses has been made to the State and 50 percent of said loss has been paid by such State.

SEC. 3. Payments made pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be made from funds currently available to the Department of Agriculture.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 171) extending the authority to investigate the accessibility and availability of supplies of critical raw materials was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 189) providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to authorize and direct the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy-Utah power project and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5361) to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar, does it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the calendar has been completed.

FOUR CURRENT MISREPRESENTATIONS CONCERNING THE PROPOSED TREATY-CONTROL AMENDMENT (S. J. RES. 1)

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, prior to the opening of debate on Senate Joint Resolution 1, I am taking this opportunity to expose four current misrepresentations circulated with regard to the purpose and effect of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

First. That the so-called which clause would require most treaties to be ratified by the 48 States.

The first misrepresentation being circulated by opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 is that it would require treaties to be approved by the 48 State governments. Typical of these false statements is the article by Mr. Walter Lippmann entitled "BRICKER's Constitution," which appears in the Washington Post of January 19, and which I ask to have printed in the RECORD following the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 1 would not require any treaty on any subject to be ratified by any State at any time. It would not give any State a veto power over the

conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs. It would not turn back the clock to the old Articles of Confederation. The "which clause" appears in section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 and reads as follows:

> A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

If the treaty concerns only our external affairs, Senate Joint Resolution 1 would make no change whatever in the treatymaking process as it exists today. The North Atlantic Treaty, for example, did not become internal law. The Mutual Security Treaty between the United States and Korea, which will shortly come before the Senate, does not become internal law. No legislation, Federal or State, would be required to make such treaties effective immediately as international law.

If the treaty concerns a subject within the constitutional domain of the Federal Government, and if it is intended to become domestic law, Senate Joint Resolution 1 would require implementing legislation by the Congress. A treaty regulating interstate or foreign commerce would fall into this category. This would also be true of any treaty dealing with any other subject within the constitutional authority of the Congress.

On the other hand, suppose that a treaty is made establishing a uniform period of residence for divorce in all countries. Senate Joint Resolution 1 would not prevent the making of such a treaty even though all lawyers recognize that the subject of divorce is one reserved to the States by the 10th amendment. However, since valid State legislation would be required to make the treaty effective as internal law, the treaty would have to be negotiated with a provision that it would become effective only through State legislation. If that provision were not in the Constitution itself, the treaty situation would be exactly the same. Under no circumstances, however, would any State have a veto power over such a divorce treaty unless the President and the Senate made the treaty in violation of the Constitution, as amended.

Nevertheless, it is contended that the treaty-making power must be capable of depriving the States of all of the powers reserved to them by the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights. That is the doctrine established in the famous case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416). Any other rule, it is said, would make the United States only partially sovereign and would make the President a representative of 48 States rather than of one Union. That is not true. The so-called which clause would protect our Federal-State system against treaty law in exactly the same way that the Dominion-Provincial structure is protected in Canada. Canada is not an isolationist state. She is full sovereign.

The rule for Canada was established by a decision of the Privy Council in *Canada* v. *Attorney General for Ontario* (decided in 1937; 1937 A. C. 326).

In Canada against Attorney General for Ontario, the Privy Council considered three statutes of the Parliament of Canada dealing with minimum wages, maximum hours, and weekly rest in industrial undertakings. The statutes were passed to implement three International Labor Organization conventions ratified by Canada. Incidentally, there are more than 100 other ILO conventions. Many of them deal with such burning international issues as the time that must be allowed for working mothers to nurse their babies at the factory, while at work.

The issue in the Privy Council case was whether or not the Parliament of Canada had power to implement the three ILO conventions. No such power existed in the absence of treaty since the subject matter fell within the constitutional authority of the Canadian Provinces.

The Attorney General of Canada argued that Canada would not be fully sovereign—that is a popular tune we hear now in opposition to the proposed amendment—if the Dominion Parliament could not acquire by treaty, legislative power which it did not possess in the absence of treaty. The identical argument was accepted by the Supreme Court of the United States in Missouri against Holland. But the Privy Council held otherwise. It declared the legislation invalid on the ground that the Dominion could not—and this ought to be good law for the United States—"merely by making promises to foreign countries, clothe itself with legislative authority inconsistent with the constitution which gave it birth."

The gist of the Privy Council's decision is found in this statement:

> It must not be thought that the result of this decision is that Canada is incompetent to legislate in performance of treaty obligations. In totality of legislative powers, dominion and provincial together, she is fully equipped. But the legislative powers remain distributed. * * * [When] Canada incurs obligations they must * * * when they deal with provincial classes of subjects, be dealt with * * * by cooperation between the dominion and the provinces. While the ship of state now sails on larger ventures and into foreign waters she still retains the watertight compartments which are an essential part of her original structure.

That ought to be the philosophy of every Member of the United States Senate today.

Mr. Lippmann and other opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 completely ignore the incontestable fact that for more than a century treaties have been made by the United States with a proper respect shown for the constitutional powers of the several States. For example, the Treaty of 1853 between the United States and France provided that the land-tenure provisions of the treaty should be effective "in all the States of the Union whose existing laws permit." Similar provisions may be found in such recent friendship and commerce treaties as that between the United States and China, signed November 4, 1946, and between the United States and Greece, approved by the Senate only last year. Moreover, all conventions of the ILO provide for implementation by State legislation to the extent that they concern subject matter reserved to the States by the Constitution.

Furthermore, when the Senate ratified the Charter of the Organization of American States in 1951, it attached a reservation reading as follows:

> None of its provisions shall be considered as enlarging the powers of the Federal Government of the United States or limiting the powers of the several States of the Federal Union with respect to any matters recognized under the Constitution as being within the reserved powers of the several States.

Unfortunately, under the doctrine of Missouri against Holland it is doubtful if a reservation to a treaty can be effective to prevent the Federal Government from depriving the several States of their authority over all subjects covered in the treaty. The so-called which clause of Senate Joint Resolution 1 is the only method by which the constitutional powers of the several States over purely local matters can be protected against the danger of treaty law. In other words, the President of the United States and two-thirds of the Senate, when they enter into a treaty, cannot take away from Congress, under the decision of Missouri against Holland, the authority which that decision gives to them.

Opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 falsely contend that the "which clause" would require the State Department to examine the laws and judicial decisions of all the 48 States prior to negotiating any treaty.

I have heard that contention from those who are opposing the proposed amendment until it makes me tired, almost, to hear it any more. Never was a falser premise put forward in opposition to a proposal in the Senate than that one.

All the negotiators would need to know is the constitutional division of power as between Federal and State Governments. All Members of Congress and all officers of the executive branch are presumed to know and to respect the constitutional limits of their authority. In case of doubt, it would only be necessary to insert in the treaty a provision that it should become effective as domestic law "in accordance with the constitutions of the parties."

For the State Department, or anyone else, to contend that they must go to the several States, or understand the laws of all 48 States, before they enter into a treaty simply is not sound and is not true.

Second. The second current misrepresentation is that Senate Joint Resolution 1 would require all executive agreements to be approved by the Congress.

The first sentence of section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 provides:

> Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization.

As reported in the Washington Post of January 18, 1954, Gen. Lucius D. Clay said that the President would be required under the terms of the amendment to secure express congressional approval of all agreements and understandings entered into in the course of the day-to-day conduct of our foreign policy. As an ex-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ample, he cited the inability of the President, under the terms of the amendment, to make agreements to carry out such matters as the Berlin airlift. That is a deliberate misrepresentation of the purpose and effect of section 3. Nothing whatever would happen to the President's power to make executive agreements under section 3 unless and until Congress passed appropriate legislation. It is ridiculous to assume that the Congress would seek to pass judgment on 50,000 or 100,000 minor and routine executive agreements involved in the course of the day-to-day conduct of our foreign policy.

In addition, Congress is already regulating 85 percent of the major international agreements other than treaties. It has, in my judgment, the authority under the necessary and proper clause of the Constitution, to regulate the remaining 15 percent. But since the administration denies that Congress does have such power of regulation, Senate Joint Resolution 1 would resolve this difference of opinion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I respect the state of mind and the opinion of the administration regarding any matter pending in Congress, but I cannot see that any opinion by General Clay, who has never been elected to a single office, who has not gone before the people to find how they feel or what their opinion is on any state of affairs, should have any bearing with an elected Senator, who is sworn to do his duty in this body as he understands it.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I can understand and respect the administration's position, but I do not see why we should be influenced by the opinions of those who have been educated by the people of the United States, who have done their duty by the people, have devoted their all to the people, and then, having retired from their official positions, are trying to tell us what to do.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I have no knowledge as to whether General Clay is a lawyer. I presume he is not. I presume he is not an authority upon constitutional law. Certainly, if General Clay is, his judgment is not very sound in a matter of this kind.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Referring to the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico, I do not think General Clay was purporting to set himself up as a constitutional expert. However, I do think that General Clay, as a distinguished American soldier, as a man who was the commander in Berlin at the time of the Berlin blockade, whose actions in conjunction with the then administration had to be prompt if Berlin was not to fall into Soviet hands, who was involved in the necessary negotiations and agreements which were entered into to prevent the success of the blockade and endeavor to take over Berlin, which would have been a blow to the entire Western World, had both a duty and an obligation to give his opinion, whether he is correct or incorrect. The American people have a right to hear some assertion of his misgivings and his statement that there might be something in the amendment which would prevent the day-to-day handling of executive agreements in the interest and protection of the American people, in such a very critical world situation as existed in Berlin, and which still exists.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from California. I have mentioned General Clay's statement as one of the captious and fragmentary kinds of opposition which are being expressed. We have an example in General Clay of a man who assumes to pass upon a constitutional question. I would not pass upon the manner in which General Clay conducted the Berlin airlift. I would not interfere with General Clay or with the President of the United States in carrying out such a program. The amendment under consideration would have no effect of any kind or character on that type of arrangement. A United States Senator has an obligation to pass upon the legal questions and upon the constitutional questions involved. Although General Clay competently handled the attempted Berlin blockade—and I do not in any way take any credit from him as a soldier or as a commander in Europe after the end of the war—I do say that his objection is a captious one, without any foundation in fact or in law.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, as a practical matter, whether Senate Resolution No. 1 shall be passed or not passed, does any Senator deny that Uncle Sam will still conduct negotiations with other countries, that such negotiations will be carried on?

Mr. BRICKER. There can be no doubt of that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I try to be fair about this matter, but, as I understand the joint resolution, all it seeks to do is to protect an American citizen within the Constitution. Is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. Is there anyone in the entire United States who believes that if this joint resolution shall be agreed to, we will not continue to negotiate with other nations?

Mr. COOPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Ohio will remember at the time of the introduction of the joint resolution, we discussed the proposed amendment, and that I told him at the time that I did not favor it. I oppose Senate Joint Resolution 1 now, but I should like to say that the kind of statement which has just been mentioned indicates the exaggerations which are being made on both sides of the question.

Mr. BRICKER. I hope the Senator from Kentucky does not charge the Senator from Ohio with making exaggerated statements.

Mr. COOPER. No, Senator; I do not.

Mr. BRICKER. I ask the Senator from Kentucky if he has any knowledge of any statement which I have made, either on the floor of the Senate or in public, which was not factual?

Mr. COOPER. I was not referring to the Senator from Ohio when I made the statement. I wanted to emphasize that loose statements such as that on the Berlin-airlift cloud up the issues. It is not an argument for the Bricker amendment, but it is my view that if the amendment had been in effect at the time of the Berlin airlift it would not have had any effect in preventing that operation.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his contribution, because it is very sound.

Mr. COOPER. However, I do raise one question. In considering the many agreements which must be negotiated in the conduct of foreign policy, the Congress would find it difficult to determine whether they involved internal law.

There would be always great doubt as to whether or not the action of the Executive would require the passage of a ratifying act by both Houses of Congress as demanded by the amendment proposed by the Senator. It would be very difficult for the Executive to know the extent of his powers and with confidence to carry on negotiations with other countries.

Mr. BRICKER. On the contrary, I say to the Senator from Kentucky that it would make no difference. It would effect no change in the negotiation of our foreign affairs whatsoever. The question whether internal law would be necessary in connection with our international relationships would not be changed. Congress could pass an internal law if it were necesary. However, the amendment would make it possible to protect the rights of the American people under the Constitution. I am not trying to diminish the President's powers under the Constitution except to this extent: In recent years there has been a tendency on the part of the Executive—and there is always a tendency on the part of the Executive—to grab more power and exercise more power. Such a trend started many years ago.

In lieu of treaties, the Executive has used executive agreements. As I have said, 85 percent of the treaties have been ratified; the other 15 percent have been negotiated on the personal responsibility of one man, the President. Such a situation might not have been so serious had not the United States Supreme Court, in the Pink case, decided that an understanding, a personal agreement, between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Litvinov, in the assignment cases, had the dignity and the standing and the import of a treaty, and that such a personal agreement became the supreme law of the

land. That decision rendered the statutes of the State of New York ineffectual. As John Foster Dulles said in his speech in Louisville, it would knock down the Constitution of the State of New York, and laws passed by the Congress of the United States, and cut right across the rights protected by the preamble, the Bill of Rights, and other sections of the Constitution. I do not know whether Mr. Dulles put the sentence in just those words, but that was the import of the whole speech. Such power has been exercised in a dangerous way and not in the traditional sense of submitting treaties to the Senate for ratification. Such power would apply to domestic law and could be exercised by the President in executive agreements and in personal agreements with other countries.

So I believe that the third section attempts to lodge that power in the Congress, which is the policymaking branch of Government. That responsibility was originally intended to be placed in the Congress, but that responsibility has been abrogated by the case of Missouri against Holland. The amendment will permit treaties to be dealt with in the traditional manner.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Ohio. The point I wanted to make was this: The amendment purports to deal with two separate areas of law. One is the area of international law, and the second that of internal law. As the Senator has said, agreements made by the President, dealing exclusively with international affairs, would not require under his amendment an implementing act of both Houses of Congress. My point is that it is doubtful if there could be many negotiations held or agreements made by the Executive which related exclusively to foreign affairs, or many which would not in some way have some internal effect. It would be very difficult to determine what agreements dealt solely with international law and what matters affected exclusively internal law. I think there always would be a great question as to whether any particular agreement would require an additional ratifying act of both Houses of the Congress.

It is my point that the amendment of the Senator, in addition to altering the division of the powers, would confuse the determination of powers, and make conduct of foreign affairs very difficult.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, ultimately the answer as to whether it would become internal law would be up to the courts of the country; and the question might not arise until an attempt was made to do something contrary to the law of the country, as enacted by the Congress, or contrary to the law of a State. The amendment would have no effect whatsoever on the international treaties or the international effects of any treaty.

Mr. COOPER. It is possible that practically every agreement entered into, might, as the Senator from Ohio says, be questioned in the courts. It is proof that under the Bricker amendment it would be difficult to know where responsibility for foreign policy lies. That is my view.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, there is no way of anticipating that. The same argument might be made against any amendment to the Constitution. There is no way of anticipating the cases which might arise in the future. There is no way to delineate that matter in any way, except to lay it against one pattern; namely, the Constitution of the United States.

For instance, at the present time the Attorney General is asking the Supreme Court to interpret the meaning of the 14th amendment to the Constitution, which has been in the Constitution since 1865.

The only test should be whether the agreement or treaty is in conformity with the Constitution, and whether it supplants either national or local law.

Mr. COOPER. I do not wish to long interrupt the presentation of the Senator's speech. A few minutes ago I said I thought the statement made by General Clay that the Berlin airlift would not have been possible if the Bricker amendment had been in effect was, in my view, not a correct one. On the other hand the statements made by a great many of the supporters of the distinguished Senator's amendment are likewise exaggerated in giving the impression that today a treaty ratified by the Senate can have an unconstitutional effect. To the contrary, the Constitution itself fixes the status of a treaty. Further, after negotiation of a treaty, if the Congress passes implementary legislation which invades the powers reserved to a State which were the subject matter of the treaty, it is not unconstitutional and has never been.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Kentucky is exactly correct, and that is what I am driving at, namely, that article VI of the Constitution says that "all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States"—not under the provisions of the Constitution, but "under the authority of the United States"—"shall be the supreme law of the land." That makes any international agreement, whether it affects domestic rights or whether it affects international rights, the supreme law of the land, wiping out State laws and the Constitution and the laws enacted by Congress.

I wish the Senator would read again John Foster Dulles' statement on that point, as set forth in his Louisville speech.

Mr. COOPER. I think I am the only Member of the Senate who actually heard that speech delivered.

Mr. BRICKER. Was he correct?

Mr. COOPER. I only think he was wrong in regard to his statement that treaties can cut across the Bill of Rights.

Mr. BRICKER. And if article X can be nullified, article I can be nullified.

Mr. President, Ann O'Hare McCormick, in her column in the New York Times of January 18, 1954, also deliberately misrepresented the purpose and effect of section 3. This is what she said:

> The provisions of the proposed amendment require that all international agreements, however routine or urgent, have prior approval of Congress. Gen. Lucius Clay points out that if this requirement had been in force the arrangements made with Great Britain and France for the Berlin airlift would have had to wait for the decision of Congress.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the article to which I referred be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, Congress is given power by the Constitution to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. That does not mean that it must regulate all foreign and interstate commercial activities. As a matter of fact, it does not do so. There are a thousand fields in interstate and foreign commerce which Congress could enter, but which it has not entered.

Congress is also given power to impeach a President. That does not mean that it is required to do so or that the mere existence of the power hamstrings the President in the performance of his Executive responsibilities.

By the same token, the power of Congress to regulate executive agreements does not mean that Congress must approve all executive agreements. Nothing could better indicate the contempt that some commentators have for the Congress than the contention that Congress under section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 might pass legislation preventing the President from taking whatever action might be necessary to protect the lives of American soldiers and citizens in occupied territories.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I noticed that the Senator from Ohio said Congress would not necessarily have to approve all executive agreements. How would determination be made as to which ones should be approved by Congress and which ones should not be approved by Congress?

Mr. BRICKER. That would be up to Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Then Congress itself would have to pass on them, to determine whether it should approve them, would it not?

Mr. BRICKER. No. If Congress did not pass any legislation on the subject involved, this amendment would make no difference. If Congress did pass such legislation in any way controlling or affecting executive or Presidential agreements, whichever we may wish to call them, the President could veto that measure. The affirmative votes of two-thirds of both Houses would be required to override his veto. Unless Congress acted, this amendment would have no effect at all—any more than there is any such effect under the congressional power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. The amendment is written in the same language as that of the provision granting to Congress the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, and intentionally so.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Ohio know how many agreements are made a year?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. BRICKER. I have no idea of the number; but there are many Presidential agreements and many agreements by the various departments of the Government as well as by commanders in the field, as the Senator from Vermont well knows, which would not be affected at all.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the idea of the Senator from Ohio that Congress would enact legislation determining which type of agreements it would approve and which type it would not approve?

Mr. BRICKER. Congress could do so.

Furthermore, in order to get around the Senate, there has been an indiscriminate use of executive agreements to take the place of treaties. That was pointed out very clearly by Mr. McClure, who used to be in the State Department, in a book he published on treaties. In his book he said that hereafter treaties will be used to take care of the unimportant and noncontroversial matters, but that the important and controversial matters will be handled by executive agreements. So the administration, at that time, at least, and the State Department at that time were committed to a program of bypassing the Senate of the United States, by means of the use of executive agreements.

The power must be lodged somewhere to say that the pertinent provision of the Constitution is not nullified, so that, as Mr. McClure has said, and as some of the proponents of this amendment have said, it might become a vermiform appendix.

Third. That conventional treaties of friendship and commerce could not be implemented by the Congress.

The third current misrepresentation concerning Senate Joint Resolution 1 is that it would require State legislation to make effective as internal law provisions of the typical treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation relating to the rights of aliens in the United States. This is a charge made by Mr. Lippmann in his article. I do not know that he is a lawyer or a constitutional authority. He says that if the treaty deals with property rights, commercial rights, fisheries, and the taxation of aliens, it would have to be enacted into law by the legislatures of 48 States. He then asks me, "Can or will Senator BRICKER say that this is not what section 2 means?" I will say that section 2 does not have the meaning asserted by Mr. Lippmann. Mr. Lippmann also asks if I or any other supporter of section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 will explain how such a process can be avoided. I will explain that right now.

Congress has plenary power over the rights and privileges of aliens within the United States. The power stems from the power delegated to Congress over immigration and naturalization. The most recent decision of the Supreme Court on this point is *Takahashi* v. *Fish & Game Commission* (334 U. S. 410 (1948)), which I ask to have printed as an exhibit in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the decision may be printed as requested.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. BRICKER. The Supreme Court in the Takahashi case considered the validity of a California statute denying to Japanese aliens the right to fish off the coast of California. No treaty was involved. The Supreme Court held, however, that the power to determine the conditions upon which aliens are permitted to reside in the United States and earn their living is a Federal power and not a power reserved to the States. Accordingly, under the language of section 2 of the amendment, Congress, and not the 48 States, woud be required to pass the legislation to implement treaties guaranteeing rights to aliens in the United States.

Many other opponents of the amendment have emphasized that the so-called "which clause" would prevent Congress from making effective as internal law treaties dealing with property rights, commercial rights, and fishing rights of all aliens. Among those who have so contended are the former Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and the former Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. Philip Perlman. The American people should know that Mr. Acheson represented the Japanese alien in the Takahashi case; that Mr. Acheson argued that Congress, and not the States, had the power to regulate the activities of aliens in the United States; and that the Supreme Court of the United States accepted his argument.

The American people should also know that Mr. Perlman filed as Solicitor General an amicus curiae brief in the Takahashi case in which he denied that the States had any constitutional power to treat aliens in a discriminatory fashion. The Supreme Court agreed with him. Now, however, Mr. Acheson and Mr. Perlman have taken just the opposite position for the purpose of defeating the treaty-control amendment. That will give some idea of their intellectual dishonesty thus far in the course of this debate.

Fourth. That the President of the United States has a constitutional role to play in the amending process.

Opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 are doing everything within their power to persuade the President of the United States to use every weapon at his command to defeat any adequate treaty-control amendment. It is entirely proper, in my judgment, that the President should express his opinion. The amendment does limit his power as well as the power of the Senate and of the whole Congress to deprive the people of the United States of their constitutional rights, and that is all. Nevertheless, in my judgment, it would be highly improper for the President of the United States to employ extra-legal pressures in an effort to defeat the amendment.

The President is a partner with the Senate in the treatymaking process. He and the Congress are partners in the legislative process. But the President of the United States is not given any authority by the Constitution to participate in the making of an amendment to the Constitution. The debate on a treaty-control amendment does not involve any question of the President's leadership of his party. No one doubts that he is the leader of the Republican Party. The fact remains, however, that the President has no constitutional role to play in the amending process. I hope the President will not be persuaded to try to transform a great constitutional issue into a personal issue.

The amending process brought this question, which is of high import to the people, and perhaps the most serious responsibility any Member of the Senate or House has, as close to the people as possible. What are those provisions? That the Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the Senate and House, and ratification by three-fourths of the legislatures of the States of the country. That was the effort of the Founding Fathers to keep the Government as close to the people as they could when it came to changing the fundamental law of the land.

The governors of the States have no power to veto. Neither must they approve a resolution of the legislature ratifying a constitutional amendment. This, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, is a government by the consent of the governed. In a republic the way in which that consent is expressed, in changing the fundamental, basic law, is by the requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate and the House, and ratification by three-fourths of the States. That is a uniquely constructive arrangement made by the Founding Fathers to protect the Constitution against captious amendments or amendments which might be swept in by a passing passion, and yet to give thorough and adequate consideration to all the needs of the people of the country when the necessity for a constitutional amendment becomes apparent. All we are asking for is that this question be submitted to the States of the Union. Why should anyone refuse to trust the judgment of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States of the Union, which are more responsible and more responsive to the judgment and the will of the people of the States than is any other organization in the country?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, let me say to the distinguished Senator that it is quite true that the Constitution of the United States provided the machinery by which the Constitution may be amended, by a two-thirds vote of both the Senate and the House, and action by three-fourths of the State legislatures. But, as the distinguished Senator knows, a part of that process is that a proposed constitutional amendment is introduced, as the Senator's amendment was. It goes to a committee, as the Senator's amendment did. At that point it was considerably changed by the committee, because in the judgment of that particular group of Senators certain changes should be made in the proposed amendment.

A part of the process is that it will come to the floor of the Senate for discussion and debate, in an effort to obtain a meeting of minds as to what the

amendment should contain, or, in fact, whether there should be an amendment. I happen to believe that an amendment is necessary. It will then go to the House, and presumably the same process which take place there.

It seems to me that the President of the United States, if he believes that an amendment is being considered which might fundamentally change the concept of the balance of powers between the Executive and the Legislative branches of the Government, if he believes that it might be harmful to the Nation in the conduct of our foreign affairs, certainly would have not only the right, but the obligation, to make his views known to the American people. I am sure the Senator would not want to take the position that in a matter of this kind there should be any gag upon the President of the United States in making his views known.

I do not know, of course, what the final form of the amendment which may be passed by the Senate will be. I am sure that the Senator from Ohio would be the last to suggest that the Senate should be compelled to "take it or leave it" on the basis of the amendment reported by the Judiciary Committee, because that amendment in itself is quite different from the one the distinguished Senator introduced, in which I joined, along with 60 other Senators.

Mr. BRICKER. It is the privilege of any individual Member of Congress to propose amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. I am sure the Senator is very sincere. He is a patriotic, distinguished American Senator. He was the Vice Presidential nominee of his party several years ago. I am sure he recognizes that on this great constitutional issue there are honest differences of opinion. Each of us, whether he be on the Democratic side of the aisle or on the Republican side of the aisle, has taken an oath to support, protect, and defend the Constitution against all its enemies, foreign or domestic. The President of the United States has also taken an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. However, I would not want the RECORD to show that the President would be doing anything improper or anything unusual, if he felt that in the interest of the Nation and under the duties he has assumed he should go to the people and discuss the merits of whatever constitutional amendment might be proposed.

I am sure if he feels strongly on the subject he will do it. I hope we may finally pass an amendment upon which all men of good will who feel there is a change needed in the Constitution may be able to agree. However, I believe that the President has every right that a Senator has or a citizen has in expressing himself on this great constitutional question.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the Senator from California will remember that I made that statement in the very beginning of my remarks. It is entirely proper, in my judgment, for the President of the United States to express his views. He has the privilege of going to the people, as does everyone else. That is a privilege of every Member of the Senate and every Member of the House. In fact, all Members of Congress must go back to the people from time to time. I was talking about his making it a personal fight, and taking the positive position that we are invading his powers and rights, which, of course, we are not doing at all, and which a clear analysis of the law will convince the Senator from California we are not doing.

There is one other point I wish to make. No one is more willing than am I to work out an acceptable amendment to our fundamental and basic law, toward which all of us are striving.

I have been very considerate at all times of every suggestion which has been made to me, and I believe the Senator from California will confirm that fact. That is true with respect to suggestions received from him, as well as from other Members of the Senate.

I have on my desk perhaps 25 suggested compromises. Those compromises, of course, have not been worked over, as has the amendment itself. They have not been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, and have not been debated in the country and have not had the seasoned consideration which is necessary in connection with any proposal to amend the basic law of our country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I agree that the distinguished Senator from Ohio has been willing to discuss various suggestions, and I hope his mind is still open, as is my mind, and I hope other minds also. However, I did want to say for the RECORD—and I can personally testify to the fact—that the President of the United States has no arbitrary stand on the subject.

Mr. BRICKER. I hope that is true.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I can say it from my personal knowledge. The President of the United States has made it perfectly clear that he has never maintained and that he would never maintain that a treaty could supersede the Constitution of the United States. I believe he has made it perfectly clear that a treaty would have to be subordinate to the Constitution of the United States. He has been quite willing over a period of time to consider the varying suggestions which have been made, and I know he hopes that an area of agreement may be reached.

I do not believe the President of the United States, if he finally came to the conclusion that the amendment which was being proposed was, in his view, detrimental to the future handling of the foreign relations of our country and to the conduct of his great Office of President, would be doing anything unusual or improper if he made his views known, not only to Senators and to Representatives, but to the American people as well.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Ohio, if he ever came to the conclusion that we were interfering with the President's power to conduct the foreign relations of our country, would support the President.

I am encouraged by what the Senator from California has said about treaties not violating the provisions of the Constitution. That is what we seek. It is only a question of how to do it, and the words that will do it. That is what we have been striving to do for a long time.

In this connection, I should like to have reprinted at the conclusion of my remarks an article written several months ago by Mr. Raymond Moley.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. BRICKER. In this article Mr. Moley quotes from a letter written by Mr. Elihu Root to President Hoover in 1931 when the question of repealing the prohibition amendment was under discussion. The opinion given by Mr. Root to President Hoover is that the Constitution does not contemplate any relation of the President to its amendment; that the President has no veto power in relation to constitutional amendments; that the framers of the Constitution deliberately excluded the President from the amending process; and that, in general, it would be improper for the President to take any action with respect to a constitutional amendment which might at some time be inconsistent with his obligations as President to enforce the amendment.

There are, to be sure, two sides to this question. Eminent lawyers disagree, although it should be noted that the overwhelming majority of American lawyers support this amendment. There is only one body under our Constitution which possesses the authority to resolve this issue. That body is the Congress of the United States and not the President of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not quite sure that I understand the last part of the Senator's remarks. Let us take the case of a law which Congress enacts. In the discharge of their constitutional obligations, many Presidents have exercised the constitutional right of veto. I believe during the course of our history such a veto has been sustained in the majority of cases. In a lesser number of cases Congress, in its judgment and under its constitutional power, has by a two-thirds vote overidden a Presidential veto.

In such a case the bill passed over the President's veto becomes the law of the land. In such a case I believe any President of the United States, who has sworn faithfully to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the Nation, would execute that law regardless of the fact that he had vetoed it. I believe that it would not be his right to ignore the law under such circumstances.

By the same token I believe a President of the United States could vigorously oppose an amendment to the Constitution, but if the amendment were adopted by constitutional processes, certainly, because of the oath he has sworn to support the Constitution, he would support any amendment which had been added to it.

Therefore I do not believe the fact that he might oppose an amendment, if he felt it was necessary to do so, would

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in any way embarrass him or in any way interfere with his constitutional responsibility of exercising the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. BRICKER. I understand as well as does the Senator from California that the Constitution binds everyone—the President, the people, and everyone else. I did emphasize, however, the fact that we had before us the opinion of a very distinguished lawyer and official in the United States Government, a person who is generally regarded as one of the outstanding leaders in constitutional thinking of his generation.

Likewise, as I pointed out in the beginning of my remarks, the President is a part of the legislative process. He is a part of the treaty process. The Senate is a part of the treaty process. Congress is a part of the treaty process.

I pointed out also—and it will be realized if one goes back and reads the debates in the constitutional convention—that Congress is the policymaking body and the State legislatures are policymaking bodies, and that the particular responsibility of amending the Constitution, grave as it is, is left to the Congress of the United States, as the legislative body of the Nation, and to the legislative bodies of the various States, without power of veto or the right to sign by the President. There is a very important distinction between legislation and an amendment to the Constitution with respect to treatymaking.

EXHIBIT 1

BRICKER'S CONSTITUTION

For those who have not yet paid too much attention to the controversy, it must be very confusing to find that the supporters and the opponents of the Bricker amendment both contend that they are trying to preserve the Constitution. Both of these conflicting claims cannot be right, and we may well ask ourselves how this has come about.

When we look at section 1 of the Bricker amendment we read that "a provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect." Now, no President, no Congress, and no court has ever held or suggested that a treaty could be in conflict with the Constitution and could override it. Therefore, in regard to the words of section 1 there can be no dispute.

As it happens, however, the words have a double meaning. When the Bricker amendment speaks of "this Constitution" it is not speaking about the Constitution as it has stood for a century and a half since it was adopted. Senator BRICKER means a Constitution which has been radically altered by the Bricker amendment.

This radical alteration is to be found in section 2, which says that "a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty." This is a radical and in the literal meaning of the words a reactionary alteration of the historic Constitution. For it would restore to the States, to each and every State, that power to nullify treaties which they relinquished when they adopted the Constitution.

There are other features of the Bricker amendment which deal not with the powers of the Federal Government but with how those powers shall be exercised by the organs of the Federal Government. These features are, one may believe, clumsy and inexpedient. But at least they do not subvert the fundamental structure of the Constitution.

But the deep and fundamental objection to the Bricker amendment is that it strikes at the sovereign power of the Nation in its dealings with foreign powers. Section 2 ordains that for almost all treaties the approval of the 48 State governments would be necessary. That is what it means to say, that under the Bricker amendment the Federal Government would lose the sovereign power to negotiate and to agree with foreign governments.

When Senator BRICKER is talking to the public he likes to give the impression that he is out to preserve the historic Constitution under which the Nation has lived for a century and a half. Only last week, for example, he charged the President with believing that by the simple act of making a treaty with another country the Federal Government is "able to clothe itself with authority inconsistent with the Constitution."

But at other times, when he is in the presence of competent lawyers—as, for example, before the Judiciary Committee—he does not pretend that the treaty power clothes the Federal Government with authority inconsistent with the Constitution. On the contrary, he admits that his objection is to the Constitution as the American people have known it, and that what he is meaning to do is not to preserve but to change in a fundamental way that Constitution.

Early in the extensive Senate hearings, which began on February 18 of last year, on page 4 of the printed record Senator BRICKER testified that "from the decision of the Supreme Court in *Ware* v. *Hylton* (3 Dall. 199) in 1796 to the present time, the treaty-making power has been a persistent threat to the liberties of the American people * * * Senate Joint Resolution 1 (the Bricker amendment) would preclude the result reached in that case. *Ware* v. *Hylton* is a good place to join the issue."

If *Ware* v. *Hylton* is where he wishes to join the issue, let us join the issue there, using his own summary of the facts in the case.

In 1774, Hylton & Co. gave a promissory note to two British subjects. To help defray the cost of the Revolutionary War, the State of Virginia passed a law providing that debts to British subjects should be discharged by payment to the State. In 1780, Hylton & Co. paid $3,000 of its debt to Virginia. More than 3 years after this partial payment, the treaty of peace with Great Britain was made. Article IV of the treaty provided: "It is agreed that creditors on either side shall meet with no lawful impediment to the recovery of the full value, in sterling money, of all bona fide debts heretofore contracted."

Ware, an assignee of the British creditor, sued Hylton & Co. for the full amount of the original debt. In the Supreme Court the validity of the Virginia statute was not questioned. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court held that article IV of the peace treaty, having become the supreme law of the land, operated to revive that part of the debt which had been extinguished by valid payment ot the State of Virginia.

Senator BRICKER says, and no doubt truly, that this was a harsh result so far as Hylton & Co. were concerned. No doubt, justice required that the British creditor should be reimbursed by Congress instead of by Hylton & Co. But that is not the question on which the issue is really joined. For there is ample precedent all through our history for the provision of that kind of compensation.

The real question surely—if we are to join issue on *Ware* v. *Hylton*—is whether a statute of the State of Virginia could set up a lawful impediment to the treaty in which the United States had agreed that there would be "no lawful impediment to the recovery of the full value * * * of all bona fide debts."

This is the crux of the controversy which turns upon section 2 of the Bricker amendment. Shall we now restore to each State the power which Virginia and the other States had under the Articles of Confederation but gave up when the Constitution was adopted—namely the power to nullify within its own jurisdiction a treaty made by the Federal Government?

This radical and drastic and reactionary change in the American constitutional system is necessary, says Senator BRICKER, in order to "preclude * * * a persistent threat to the liberties of the American people." How does his amendment go about precluding these allegedly persistent threats?

By making it as difficult as possible short of the outright prohibition of all treaties, to carry out a treaty. Under BRICKER's proposed constitution, a treaty would first, as is the case now, have to be approved by the President and two-thirds of the Senate. Then, in addition, it would have to be enacted as an internal law by majorities of both Houses of Congress. Then if, as is so often the case, the treaty deals with property rights, commercial rights, fisheries, the taxation of aliens, it also would have to be enacted—remembering that Nebraska has a 1-chamber legislature—in 95 legislative chambers of the 48 States and to be approved by the 48 governors.

Absurd as it sounds, can or will Senator BRICKER say that this is not what section 2 means? Will he or any other supporter of section 2 explain how such a process could be avoided?

The crowning argument against the amendment is that the Constitution already has an unquestioned and conclusive remedy against any conceivable abuse of the treaty-making power, against any error be it deliberate or accidental which could in any way threaten the rights and liberties of our people. This is the indubitable power of Congress to pass an act setting aside as internal law the provisions of any treaty.

This power was exercised by Congress in the so-called Chinese exclusion cases, and was completely sustained by the courts. "A treaty," said Mr. Justice Miller, "then is a law of the land as an act of Congress is * * * there is nothing in this law which makes it irrepealable or unchangeable. The Constitution gives it no superiority over an act of Congress in this respect, which may be repealed or modified by an act of a later date."

This power of Congress to repeal the provisions of a treaty, insofar as they are internal law in the United States, provides a remedy which is always available against any of the abuses which the amendment professes to be trying to prevent. Thus, under the American Constitution we now have the power to make treaties and we have a remedy if they go wrong. But under BRICKER's constitution we would have lost the greater part of our power to make treaties, and there would be no remedy available for the evils resulting from our own self-imposed impotence.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times of January 18, 1954]

ABROAD

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

FOREIGN POLICY UNDER THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Other governments have been so concerned with signs of a transformation in United States foreign policy that so far they have paid remarkably little attention to a measure that would make American action in the foreign field slower, more uncertain and more difficult. The Bricker amendment to the Constitution seeks to curb the treaty-making power of the President and to hamper him in the day-to-day decisions that have to be made promptly if policy is to keep

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

up with events. If enacted, the amendment would affect our international operations as much as it would disturb the balance between the executive and legislative branches of the National Government. It is a foreign affair of the greatest importance; yet up to now it has been ignored abroad as a matter of purely domestic interest.

The foreign press is always on the lookout for hints of change in the American international outlook. President Eisenhower's state of the Union message was anxiously scanned in Moscow and New Delhi, Paris, and London, for indications of a turn in our course. The address of Secretary Dulles before the Council of Foreign Relations last week was more illuminating but proved to be something like a time bomb. It received scant notice at first. Only now is the full significance of the statement that the United States has decided to "place more reliance upon community deterrent power and less dependence upon local defensive power" beginning to dawn on the startled capitals of Europe and Asia.

Now that the President has taken up the cudgels against the Bricker amendment and there is prospect of a major fight when the measure reaches the Senate, it will be debated abroad as well as at home as a test of how far we have back-tracked on the road away from isolationism.

Isolationists approve

Certainly the Bricker resolution will appeal to the stubborn remnants of isolationism that have been submerged in the great tides of sentiment supporting the opposite policy. It will appeal to those others who think the United States has gone too far, made too many commitments in defense of the free world, or—and this is an excuse for moving backward—that our allies have not gone far enough.

If there had been no Yalta, there would probably be no Bricker amendment. It is based on the odd theory that the Executive may be fallible, may saddle the country with agreements made on mistaken assumptions, but that the Legislature is infallible. It is presumed that in the same circumstances, with even less firsthand knowledge, with all kinds of local interests clashing with the national interests, Congress would not make the same mistakes.

The immediate importance of the amendment is in the foreign field. It proposes a new way, a more cumbersome, slower and infinitely less effective way, of dealing with international questions and directing foreign policy. We can argue among ourselves about internal agreements, but never was it so vital to our influence and our bargaining position to maintain the power of the Federal Government to conduct foreign relations. The provisions of the proposed amendment require that all international agreements, however routine or urgent, have prior approval of Congress. Gen. Lucius Clay points out that if this requirement had been in force the arrangements made with Great Britain and France for the Berlin airlift would have had to wait for the decision of Congress. It is easy to see that this process, as he says, "would cripple our military strength just as effectively as the loss of a number of our best divisions or air wings."

"Which clause"

At present the President negotiates and signs a treaty and it is then submitted to the Senate and cannot pass except by a two-thirds vote of those present. Senator BRICKER proposes that it have a majority vote of both Houses to become internal law. In addition he would limit implementing legislation to that which would be valid in the absence of a treaty—the controversial "which clause"—and would give Congress power to regulate Executive and other international agreements. These changes, according to the committee of distinguished jurists and laymen opposing the measure, would bring the legislatures of 48 States into the picture and permit Congress seriously to impair the independence of the Executive and leave him helpless to conduct a consistent and rational foreign policy.

It is on the constitutional issue that the big fight looms. The Bricker bill, which passed the Senate Judiciary Committee last June, would upset the delicate balance between Congress and the President, and between the Federal Government and the States, which the Constitution provides. The amendment is a reaction from the international policy of a mature and powerful America. It proceeds from the premise that Congress would restrain and overrule the Executive in his dealings with the rest of the world. The paradox is that we have moved into our present position under the system of safeguards established by the Founding Fathers and that we cannot retreat except by amending their charter and whittling away the powers they entrusted to the President. That is something for today's timid patriots, the men of little faith, to ponder.

EXHIBIT 3

TAKAHASHI *v.* FISH AND GAME COMMISSION ET AL.—CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA—No. 533—ARGUED APRIL 21–22, 1948; DECIDED JUNE 7, 1948

1. A California statute barring issuance of commercial fishing licenses to persons ineligible to citizenship, which classification included resident alien Japanese and precluded such a one from earning his living as a commercial fisherman in the ocean waters off the coast of the State, held invalid under the Federal Constitution and laws.

2. For purposes of decision by this court, it may be assumed that the object of the statute was to conserve fish in the coastal waters of the State, or to protect citizens of the State engaged in commercial fishing from the competition of Japanese aliens, or both.

3. That the United States regulates immigration and naturalization in part on the basis of race and color classifications does not authorize adoption by a State of such classifications to prevent lawfully admitted aliens within its borders from earning a livelihood by means open to all other inhabitants.

4. The 14th amendment and Federal laws, 8 U. S. C., section 41, embody a general policy that all persons lawfully in this country shall abide in any State on an equality of legal privileges with all citizens under nondiscriminatory laws.

5. Whatever may be the interest of the State or its citizens in the fish in the 3-mile belt offshore, that interest does not justify the State in excluding any or all aliens who are lawful residents of the State from making a living by fishing in the ocean off its shores while permitting all other persons to do so.

6. Assuming their continued validity, cases sustaining State laws barring land ownership by aliens ineligible to citizenship, which rested on grounds peculiar to real property, cannot be extended to control the decision in this case. (30 Calif. 2d 719, 185 P. 2d 805, reversed.)

Petitioner brought an action in a State court for mandamus to compel issuance to him of a commercial fishing license. A judgment granting the writ was reversed by the State supreme court, 30 Cal. 2d 719, 185 P. 2d 805. This court granted certiorari. 333 U. S. 853. Reversed, p. 422.

A. L. Wirin and Dean Acheson argued the cause for petitioner. With them on the brief were Charles A. Horsky and Fred Okrand.

Ralph Winfield Scott, deputy attorney general of California, argued the cause for respondents. With him on the brief was Fred N. Howser, attorney general.

Briefs of amici curiae urging reversal were filed by Attorney General Clark, Solicitor General Perlman, Philip Elman and James L. Morrisson for the United States; Arthur Garfield Hays and Edward J. Ennis for the American Civil Liberties Union; William Maslow, William Strong and Ambrose Doskow for the American Jewish Congress; Phineas Indritz and Jacob W. Rosenthal for the American Veterans Committee; Edward J. Ennis for the Home Missions Council of North America et al.; Saburo Kido for the Japanese American Citizens League; and Thurgood Marshall and Marian Wynn Perry for the National Lawyers Guild et al.

Mr. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the court.

The respondent, Torao Takahashi, born in Japan, came to this country and became a resident of California in 1907. Federal laws, based on distinctions of "color and race," *Toyota* v. *United States* (268 U. S. 402, 411–412), have permitted Japanese and certain other nonwhite racial groups to enter and reside in the country, but have made them ineligible for United States citizenship.[1] The question presented is whether California can, consistently with the Federal Constitution and laws passed pursuant to it, use this federally created racial ineligibility for citizenship as a basis for barring Takahashi from earning his living as a commercial fisherman in the ocean waters off the coast of California.

Prior to 1943 California issued commercial fishing licenses to all qualified persons without regard to alienage or ineligibility to citizenship. From 1915 to 1942 Takahashi, under annual commercial fishing licenses issued by the State, fished in ocean waters off the California coast, apparently both within and without the 3-mile coastal belt, and brought his fresh fish ashore for sale. In 1942, while this country was at war with Japan, Takahashi and other California residents of Japanese ancestry were evacuated from the State under military orders. See *Korematsu* v. *United States* (323 U. S. 214). In 1943, during the period of war and evacuation, an amendment to the California Fish and Game Code was adopted prohibiting issuance of a license to any alien Japanese. (Calif. Stats. 1943, ch. 1100.) In 1945, the State code was again amended by striking the 1943 provision for fear that it might be

---

[1] The comprehensive laws adopted by Congress regulating the immigration and naturalization of aliens are included in title 8 of the United States Code; for codification of laws governing racial and color prerequisites of aliens to citizenship, see 8 U. S. C., sec. 703. An act adopted by the 1st Congress in 1790 made "free white persons" only eligible for citizenship (1 Stat. 103). Later acts have extended eligibility of aliens to citizenship to the following groups: in 1870, "aliens of African nativity and * * * persons of African descent" (16 Stat. 254, 256); in 1940, "descendants of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere" (54 Stat. 1137, 1140); in 1943, "Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent" (57 Stat. 600, 601); and, in 1946, Filipinos and "persons of races indigenous to India" (60 Stat. 416). While it is not now wholly clear what racial groups other than Japanese are now ineligible to citizenship, it is clear that Japanese are among the few groups still not eligible (see *Oyama* v. *California* (332 U. S. 633, 635, note 3), and that, according to the 1940 census, Japanese aliens constituted the great majority of aliens living in the United States then ineligible for citizenship. (See concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Murphy in *Oyama* v. *California*, *supra*, at 650, 665, 666, notes 20 and 22.)

declared unconstitutional because directed only against alien Japanese;[3] the new amendment banned issuance of licenses to any person ineligible to citizenship, which classification included Japanese. (Calif. Stats. 1945, ch. 181.)[4] Because of this State provision barring issuance of commercial fishing licenses to persons ineligible for citizenship under Federal law, Takahashi, who met all other State requirements, was denied a license by the California Fish and Game Commission upon his return to California in 1945.

Takahashi brought this action for mandamus in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Calif., to compel the Commission to issue a license to him. That court granted the petition for mandamus. It held that lawful alien inhabitants of California, despite their ineligibility to citizenship, were entitled to engage in the vocation of commercial fishing on the high seas beyond the 3-mile belt on the same terms as other lawful State inhabitants, and that the California code provision denying them this right violated the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. The State supreme court, three judges dissenting, reversed, holding that California had a proprietary interest in fish in the ocean waters within 3 miles of the shore, and that this interest justified the State in barring all aliens in general and aliens ineligible to citizenship in particular from catching fish within or without the 3-mile coastal belt and bringing them to California for commercial purposes (30 Cal. 2d 719, 185 P. 2d 805).[5] To review this question of importance in the fields of Federal-State relationships and of constitutionally protected individual equality and liberty, we granted certiorari.

We may well begin our consideration of the principles to be applied in this case by a summary of this Court's holding in *Truax* v. *Raich* (239 U. S. 33), not deemed controlling by the majority of the California Supreme Court, but regarded by the dissenters as requiring the invalidation of the California law. That case involved an attack upon an Arizona law which required all Arizona employers of more than 5 workers to hire not less than eighty (80) percent qualified electors or native-born citizens of the United States. Raich, an alien who worked as a cook in a restaurant which had more than five employees, was about to lose his job solely because of the State law's coercive effect on the restaurant owner. This Court, in upholding Raich's contention that the Arizona law was invalid, declared that Raich, having been lawfully admitted into the country under Federal law, had a Federal privilege to enter and abide in any State in the Union and thereafter under the 14th amendment to enjoy the equal protection of the laws of the State in which he abided; that this privilege to enter in and abide in any State carried with it the right to work for a living in the common occupations of the community, a denial of which right would make of the amendment a barren form of words. In answer to a contention that Arizona's restriction upon the employment of aliens was reasonable and therefore permissible, this Court declared:

"It must also be said that reasonable classification implies action consistent with the legitimate interests of the State, and it will not be disputed that these cannot be so broadly conceived as to bring them into hostility to exclusive Federal power. The authority to control immigration—to admit or exclude aliens—is vested solely in the Federal Government. *Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States* (149 U. S. 698, 713.) The assertion of an authority to deny to aliens the opportunity of earning a livelihood when lawfully admitted to the State would be tantamount to the assertion of the right to deny them entrance and abode, for in ordinary cases they cannot live where they cannot work. And, if such a policy were permissible, the practical result would be that those lawfully admitted to the country under the authority of the acts of Congress, instead of enjoying in a substantial sense and in their full scope the privileges conferred by the admission, would be segregated in such of the States as chose to offer hospitality." (*Truax* v. *Raich*, supra, at 42.)

Had the Truax decision said nothing further than what is quoted above, its reasoning, if followed, would seem to require invalidation of this California code provision barring aliens from the occupation of fishing as inconsistent with Federal law, which is constitutionally declared to be "the supreme law of the land." However, the Court there went on to note that it had on occasion sustained State legislation that did not apply alike to citizens and noncitizens, the ground for the distinction being that such laws were necessary to protect special interests either of the State or of its citizens as such. The Truax opinion pointed out that the Arizona law, aimed as it was against employment of aliens in all vocations, failed to show a "special public interest with respect to any particular business * * * that could possibly be deemed to support the enactment." The Court noted that it had previously upheld various State laws which restricted the privilege of planting oysters in the tidewater rivers of a State to citizens of that State, and which denied to aliens within a State the privilege of possessing a rifle and of shooting game within that State; it also referred to decisions recognizing a State's broad powers, in the absence of overriding treaties, to restrict the devolution of real property to nonaliens.[6]

California now urges, and the State supreme court held, that the California fishing provision here challenged falls within the rationale of the "special public interest" cases distinguished in the Truax opinion, and thus that the State's ban upon commercial fishing by aliens ineligible to citizenship is valid. The contention is this: California owns the fish within 3 miles of its coast as a trustee for all California citizens as distinguished from its noncitizen inhabitants; as such trustee-owner, it has complete power to bar any or all aliens from fishing in the 3-mile belt as a means of conserving the supply of fish; since migratory fish caught while swimming in the 3-mile belt are indistinguishable from those caught while swimming in the adjacent high seas, the State, in order to enforce its 3-mile control, can also regulate the catching and delivery to its coast of fish caught beyond the 3-mile belt under this court's decision in *Bayside Fish Co.* v. *Gentry* (297 U. S. 422). Its law denying fishing licenses to aliens ineligible for citizenship, so the State's contention goes, tends to reduce the number of commercial fishermen and therefore is a proper fish conservation measure; in the exercise of its power to decide what groups will be denied licenses, the State has a right, if not a duty, to bar first of all aliens, who have no community interest in the fish owned by the State. Finally, the legislature's denial of licenses to those aliens who are "ineligible to citizenship" is defended as a reasonable classification, on the ground that California has simply followed the Federal Government's lead in adopting that classification from the naturalization laws.

First. The State's contention that its law was passed solely as a fish conservation measure is vigorously denied. The petitioner argues that it was the outgrowth of racial antagonism directed solely against the Japanese, and that for this reason alone it cannot stand. See *Korematsu* v. *United States*, *supra* at 216; *Kotch* v. *Board of River Pilot Comm'rs* (330 U. S. 552, 556); *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins*, 118 U. S. 356; *In re Ah Chong*, 2 F. 733, 737. We find it unnecessary to resolve this controversy concerning the motives that prompted enactment of the legislation. Accordingly, for purposes of our decision we may assume that the code provision was passed to conserve fish in the California coastal waters, or to protect California citizens engaged in commercial fishing from competition by Japanese aliens, or for both reasons.

Second. It does not follow, as California seems to argue, that because the United

---

[2] Report of the California Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Japanese Resettlement, May 1, 1945, pp. 5–6.

[3] As amended the code section now reads: "Persons required to procure license: To whom issuable. Every person who uses or operates or assists in using or operating any boat, net, trap, line, or other appliance to take fish, mollusks or crustaceans for profit, or who brings or causes fish, mollusks, or crustaceans to be brought ashore at any point in the State for the purpose of selling the same in a fresh state, shall procure a commercial fishing license.

"A commercial fishing license may be issued to any person other than a person ineligible to citizenship. A commercial fishing license may be issued to a corporation only if said corporation is authorized to do business in this State, if none of the officers or directors thereof are persons ineligible to citizenship, and if less than the majority of each class of stockholders thereof are persons ineligible to citizenship." (Calif. Fish and Game Code, sec. 990.) In 1947 the code was amended to permit "any person, not a citizen of the United States," to obtain hunting and sport fishing licenses, both of which had been denied to alien Japanese and to persons ineligible to citizenship under the 1943 and 1945 amendments. (Calif. Stats. 1947, ch. 1329; Calif. Fish and Game Code, secs. 427, 428.)

[4] The superior court first ordered issuance of a commercial fishing license authorizing Takahashi to bring ashore "catches of fish from the waters of the high seas beyond the State's territorial jurisdiction." After appeal to the State supreme court by the State commission the superior court amended its judgment so as to order a commercial license authorizing Takahashi to bring in catches of fish taken from the 3-mile ocean belt adjacent to the California coast as well as from the high seas. The State supreme court held that the superior court was without jurisdiction to amend its judgment after appeal and accordingly treated the amended judgment as void. California argues here that its State fish and game commission is authorized by statute to issue only one type of commercial fishing license, namely, one permitting ocean fish to be brought ashore whether caught within or without the 3-mile belt, that the superior court's first judgment ordering issuance of a license limited to catches of high seas fish directed the commission to do something it was without authority to do, and that on this ground we should affirm the State court's denial of the requested license. The State supreme court did not, however, decide the case on that ground, but ruled against petitioner on the ground that the challenged code provision was valid under the Federal Constitution and that the commission's refusal to grant a license was required by its terms. Since the State court of last resort relied solely upon Federal grounds for its decision, we may properly review its action here.

[5] The opinion cited the following cases: *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391); *Patsone* v. *Pennsylvania* (232 U. S. 138); *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. 436); and *Blythe* v. *Hinckley* (180 U. S. 333).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

States regulates immigration and naturalization in part on the basis of race and color classifications, a State can adopt one or more of the same classifications to prevent lawfully admitted aliens within its borders from earning a living in the same way that other State inhabitants earn their living. The Federal Government has broad constitutional powers in determining what aliens shall be admitted to the United States, the period they may remain, regulation of their conduct before naturalization, and the terms and conditions of their naturalization. See *Hines* v. *Davidowitz* (312 U. S. 52, 66). Under the Constitution the States are granted no such powers; they can neither add to nor take from the conditions lawfully imposed by Congress upon admission, naturalization, and residence of aliens in the United States or the several States. State laws which impose discriminatory burdens upon the entrance or residence of aliens lawfully within the United States conflict with this constitutionally derived Federal power to regulate immigration, and have accordingly been held invalid.[6] Moreover, Congress, in the enactment of a comprehensive legislative plan for the nationwide control and regulation of immigration and naturalization, has broadly provided:

"All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other" (16 Stat. 140, 144, U. S. C., sec. 41).

The protection of this section has been held to extend to aliens as well as to citizens.[7] Consequently the section and the 14th amendment on which it rests in part protect all persons against State legislation bearing unequally upon them either because of alienage or color. See *Hurd* v. *Hodge*, 334 U. S. 24. The 14th amendment and the laws adopted under its authority thus embody a general policy that all persons lawfully in this country shall abide in any State on an equality of legal privileges with all citizens under nondiscriminatory laws.

All of the foregoing emphasizes the tenuousness of the State's claim that it has power to single out and ban its lawful alien inhabitants, and particularly certain racial and color groups within this class of inhabitants, from following a vocation simply because Congress has put some such groups in special classifications in exercise of its broad and wholly distinguishable powers over immigration and naturalization. The State's law here cannot be supported in the employment of this legislative authority because of policies adopted by Congress in the exercise of its power to treat separately and differently with aliens from countries composed of peoples of many diverse cultures, races, and colors. For these reasons the power of a State to apply its laws exclusively to its alien inhabitants as a class is confined within narrow limits.

Third. We are unable to find that the special public interest on which California relies provides support for this State ban on Takahashi's commercial fishing. As before pointed out, California's claim of special public interest is that its citizens are the collective owners of fish swimming in the 3-mile belt. It is true that this Court did long ago say that the citizens of a State collectively own "the tidewaters * * * and the fish in them, so far as they are capable of ownership while running (*McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391, 394). Cf. *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 38); *Toomer* v. *Witsell, ante* (p. 385)). The McCready case upheld a Virginia law which prohibited citizens of other States from planting oysters in a Virginia tidewater river. Though the McCready case has been often distinguished, its rationale has been relied on in other cases, including *Geer* v. *Connecticut* (161 U. S. 519). That decision, where only the commerce clause was involved, sustained a State law that, in order to restrict the use of game to the people of the State, prohibited the out-of-State transportation of game killed within the State. On the other hand, where Louisiana laws declared that the State owned all shrimp within the waters of the State, but permitted ultimate sale and shipment of shrimp for consumption outside that State's boundaries, Louisiana was denied power under the commerce clause to require the local processing of shrimp taken from Louisiana marshes as a prerequisite to out-of-State transportation (*Foster Packing Co.* v. *Haydel* (278 U. S. 1)). In the absence of overriding Federal treaties, this Court sustained a State law barring aliens from hunting wild game in the interest of conserving game for citizens of the State against due process and equal protection challenges (*Patsone* v. *Pennsylvania* (232 U. S. 138)). Later, however, the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (40 Stat. 755) was sustained as within Federal power despite the claim of Missouri of ownership of birds within its boundaries based on prior statements as to State ownership of game and fish in the Geer case (*Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416)). The Court was of opinion that "To put the claim of the State upon title is to lean upon a slender reed" (p. 434). We think that same statement is equally applicable here. To whatever extent the fish in the 3-mile belt off California may be capable of ownership by California, we think that ownership is inadequate to justify California in excluding any or all aliens who are lawful residents of the State from making a living by fishing in the ocean off its shores while permitting all others to do so.

This leaves for consideration the argument that this law should be upheld on authority of those cases which have sustained State laws barring aliens ineligible to citizenship from land ownership.[9] Assuming the continued validity of those cases,[9] we think they could not in any event be controlling here. They rested solely upon the power of States to control the devolution and ownership of land within their borders, a power long exercised and supported on reasons peculiar to real property. They cannot be extended to cover this case.

The judgment is reversed and remanded for proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.

Reversed.

Mr. Justice Murphy, with whom Mr. Justice Rutledge agrees, concurring.

The opinion of the Court, in which I join, adequately expresses my views as to all but one important aspect of this case. That aspect relates to the fact that section 990 of the California Fish and Game Code, barring those ineligible to citizenship from securing commercial-fishing licenses, is the direct outgrowth of antagonism toward persons of Japanese ancestry. Even the most cursory examination of the background of the statute demonstrates that it was designed solely to discriminate against such persons in a manner inconsistent with the concept of equal protection of the laws. Legislation of that type is not entitled to wear the cloak of constitutionality.

The statute in question is but one more manifestation of the anti-Japanese fever which has been evident in California in varying degrees since the turn of the century. See concurring opinion in *Oyama* v. *California* (332 U. S. 633, 650), and dissenting opinion in *Korematsu* v. *United States* (323 U. S. 214, 233). That fever, of course, is traceable to the refusal or the inability of certain groups to adjust themselves economically and socially relative to residents of Japanese ancestry. For some years prior to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, these protagonists of intolerance had been leveling unfounded accusations and innuendoes against Japanese fishing crews operating off the coast of California. These fishermen numbered about a thousand, and most of them had long resided in that State. It was claimed that they were engaged not only in fishing but in espionage and other illicit activities on behalf of the Japanese Government. As war with Japan approached and finally became a reality, these charges were repeated with increasing vigor. Yet full investigations by appropriate authorities failed to reveal any competent supporting evidence; not even one Japanese fisherman was arrested for alleged espionage. Such baseless accusations can only be viewed as an integral part of the long campaign to undermine the reputation of persons of Japanese background and to discourage their residence in California. (See McWilliams, Prejudice (1944), ch. VII.)

More specifically, these accusations were used to secure the passage of discriminatory fishing legislation. But such legislation was not immediately forthcoming. The continued presence in California of the Japanese fishermen without the occurrence of any untoward incidents on their part served for a time as adequate and living refutation of the propaganda. Then came the evacuation of all persons of Japanese ancestry from the west coast. (See *Korematsu* v. *United States, supra.*) Once evacuation was achieved an intensive campaign was begun to prevent the return to California of the evacuees. All of the old charges, including the ones relating to the fishermen, were refurbished and augmented. This time the Japanese were absent and were unable to provide effective opposition. The winds of racial animosity blew unabated.

During the height of this racial storm in 1943, numerous anti-Japanese bills were considered by the California legislators. Several amendments to the alien land law were enacted. And section 990 of the Fish and Game Code was altered to provide that "A commercial fishing license may be issued to any person other than an alien Japanese." No pretense was made that this alteration was in the interests of conservation. It was made at a time when all alien Japanese were excluded from California, with no immediate return indicated; thus the banning of fishing licenses for them could have no early effect upon the conservation of fish. Moreover, the period during which this amendment was passed was one in which both Federal and State authorities were doing their utmost to encourage greater food production for wartime purposes. The main desire at this time was to increase rather than to decrease the catch of fish. Certainly the contemporaneous bulletins and reports of the Bureau of Marine Fisheries of California did not indicate the existence of any conservation problem due to an excess number of fishermen. (See 38th biennial report (July 1, 1944), pp. 33–36; Fish Bulletin No. 58, for the year 1940; Fish Bulletin No. 59, for the years 1941 and 1942.)

These circumstances only confirm the obvious fact that the 1943 amendment to section 990 was intended to discourage the

---

[6] *Truax* v. *Raich, supra; Chy Lung* v. *Freeman* (92 U. S. 275, 280); see *Hines* v. *Davidowitz, supra* at 65–68.

[7] *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins, supra* at 369; *United States* v. *Wong Kim Ark*, 169 U. S. 649, 696; *In re Tiburcio Parrott*, 1 F. 481, 508–509; *Fraser* v. *McConway & Torley Co.*, 82 F. 257.

[8] *Terrace* v. *Thompson* (263 U. S. 197); *Porterfield* v. *Webb*, 263 U. S. 225; *Webb* v. *O'Brien*, 263 U. S. 313; *Frick* v. *Webb*, 263 U. S. 326.

[9] See *Oyama* v. *California*, 332 U. S. 633, 646, 649, 672.

return to California of Japanese aliens. By taking away their commercial fishing rights, the lives of those aliens who plied the fisherman's trade would be made more difficult and unremunerative. And the non-Japanese fishermen would thereby be free from the competition afforded by these aliens. The equal-protection clause of the 14th amendment, however, does not permit a State to discriminate against resident aliens in such a fashion, whether the purpose be to give effect to racial animosity or to protect the competitive interests of other residents.

The 1945 amendment to section 990, which is now before us, stands in no better position than the 1943 amendment. This later alteration eliminated the reference to "alien Japanese" and substituted therefor "a person ineligible to citizenship." Adoption of this change also occurred during a period when anti-Japanese agitation in California had reached one of its periodic peaks. The announcement of the end of the Japanese exclusion orders, plus this Court's decision in *Ex parte Endo* (323 U. S. 283) made the return to California of many of the evacuees a reasonable certainty. The prejudices, the antagonisms, and the hatreds were once again aroused, punctuated this time by numerous acts of violence against the returning Japanese-Americans. Another wave of anti-Japanese proposals marked the 1945 legislative session. It was in this setting that the amendment to section 990 was proposed and enacted in 1945.

It is of interest and significance that the amendment in question was proposed by a legislative committee devoted to Japanese resettlement problems, not by a committee concerned with the conservation of fish. The Senate Fact Finding Committee on Japanese Resettlement issued a report on May 1, 1945. This report dealt with such matters as the alien land law, the Japanese-language schools, dual citizenship, and the Tule Lake riot. And under the heading "Japanese Fishing Boats" (pp. 5–6) appeared this explanation of the proposed amendment to section 990:

"The committee gave little consideration to the problems of the use of fishing vessels on our coast owned and operated by Japanese, since this matter seems to have previously been covered by legislation. The committee, however, feels that there is danger of the present statute being declared unconstitutional, on the grounds of discrimination, since it is directed against alien Japanese. It is believed that this legal question can probably be eliminated by an amendment which has been proposed to the bill which would make it apply to any alien who is ineligible to citizenship. The committee has introduced Senate bill 413 to make this change in the statute."

Not a word was said in this report regarding the need for the conservation of fish or the necessity of limiting the number of fishermen. The obvious thought behind the amendment was to attempt to legalize the discrimination against Japanese alien fishermen by dropping the specific reference to them.

The proposed revision was adopted. The trial court below correctly described the situation as follows: "As it was commonly known to the legislators of 1945 that Japanese were the only aliens ineligible to citizenship who engaged in commercial fishing in ocean waters bordering on California, and as the court must take judicial notice of the same fact, it becomes manifest that in enacting the present version of section 990, the legislature intended thereby to eliminate alien Japanese from those entitled to a commercial fishing license by means of description rather than by name. To all intents and purposes and in effect the provision in the 1943 and 1945 amendments are the same, the thin veil used to conceal a purpose being too transparent. Under each and both, alien Japanese are denied a right to a license to catch fish on the high seas for profit, and to bring them to shore for the purpose of selling the same in a fresh state * * * this discrimination constitutes an unequal exaction and a greater burden upon the persons of the class named than that imposed upon others in the same calling and under the same conditions, and amounts to prohibition. This discrimination, patently hostile, is not based upon a reasonable ground of classification and, to that extent, the section is in violation of section 1 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, * * *."

We should not blink at the fact that section 990, as now written, is a discriminatory piece of legislation having no relation whatever to any constitutionally cognizable interest of California. It was drawn against a background of racial and economic tension. It is directed in spirit and in effect solely against aliens of Japanese birth. It denies them commercial fishing rights not because they threaten the success of any conservation program, not because their fishing activities constitute a clear and present danger to the welfare of California or of the Nation, but only because they are of Japanese stock, a stock which has had the misfortune to arouse antagonism among certain powerful interests. We need but unbutton the seemingly innocent words of section 990 to discover beneath them the very negation of all the ideals of the equal protection clause. No more is necessary to warrant a reversal of the judgment below.

Mr. Justice Reed, dissenting.

The reasons which lead me to conclude that the judgment of the Supreme Court of California should be affirmed may be briefly stated. As fishing rights have been treated traditionally as a natural resource, in the absence of Federal regulation, California as a sovereign State has power to regulate the taking and handling of fish in the waters bordering its shores.[10] It is, I think, one of the natural resources of the State that may be preserved from exploration by aliens.[11] The ground for this power in the absence of any exercise of Federal authority is California's authority over its fisheries.

The right to fish is analogous to the right to own land, a privilege which a State may deny to aliens as to land within its borders. *Terrace* v. *Thompson* (263 U. S. 197).[12] It is closely akin to the right to hunt, a privilege from which a State may bar aliens, if reasonably deemed advantageous to its citizens.[13] A State's power has even been held to extend to the exclusion of aliens from the operation of pool and billiard halls when a city deemed them not as well qualified as citizens for the conduct of a business thought to have harmful tendencies. *Clarke* v. *Deckebach* (274 U. S. 392).[14]

The Federal Government has not pursued a policy of equal treatment of aliens and citizens. Citizens have rights superior to those of aliens in the ownership of land and in exploiting natural resources.[15] Perhaps Congress as a matter of immigration policy may require that States open every door of opportunity in America to all resident aliens, but until Congress so determines as to fisheries, I do not feel that the judicial arm of the Government should require the States to admit all aliens to this privilege.

Certainly *Truax* v. *Raich* (239 U. S. 33), upon which the majority opinion appears to rely in holding that the California statute denies equal protection in attempting to classify aliens by putting restrictions on their right to land fish, is not an authority for such a decision. The power of a State to discriminate against aliens on public works and the exploitation of natural resources was recognized in that case.[16] And, at the very time that it was under consideration, this Court also had before it *Heim* v. *McCall* (239 U. S. 175).[17] In that case, Heim attacked the constitutionality of a New York statute which provided that "In the construction of public works by the State or a municipality, or by persons contracting

---

[10] *Bayside Fish Flour Co.* v. *Gentry* (297 U. S. 422, 425).

The statute, see note 3 of the Court's opinion for the text, seems obviously to cast no burden on commerce.

A Washington statute similar to the one now before us was considered in *Lubetich* v. *Pollock* (6 F. 2d 237).

[11] Even citizens of other States have been excluded by a State from such opportunities. *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391) (planting oyster beds). Fishing licenses discriminating between residents and nonresidents are permissible. *Haavik* v. *Alaska Packers Assn.* (263 U. S. 510).

[12] The right of an alien to own land is controlled by the law of the State in which the land is located. Such was the rule of the common law. *Collingwood* v. *Pace* (1 Vent. 413, 86 Eng. Rep. 262). That has long been the law of nations, 2 Vattel, Law of Nations (1883), c. 8, § 114, and has been accepted in this country. *Chirac* v. *Chirac* (2 Wheat. 259); *Levy* v. *M'Cartee* (6 Pet. 102, 113); *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. 483); *Blythe* v. *Hinckley* (180 U. S. 333, 341). Whether the philosophical basis of that power, or the power over fish and game, is a theory of ownership or trusteeship for its citizens or residents or conservation of natural resources or protection of its land or coasts is not material. The right to control the ownership of land rests in sovereign governments and, in the United States, it rests with the individual States in the absence of Federal action by treaty or otherwise.

[13] *Patsone* v. *Pennsylvania* (232 U. S. 138). In expressing the conclusion of the Court, Mr. Justice Holmes phrased the rule as follows, pp. 145–146: "It is to be remembered that the subject of this whole discussion is wild game, which the State may preserve for its own citizens if it pleases."

[14] In that case a unanimous Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Stone, said, p. 396:

"The objections to the constitutionality of the ordinance are not persuasive. Although the 14th amendment has been held to prohibit plainly irrational discrimination against aliens, * * * it does not follow that alien race and allegiance may not bear in some instances such a relation to a legitimate object of legislation as to be made the basis of a permitted classification."

[15] The United States limits the rights of aliens as compared with citizens in land ownership in its Territories, 8 U. S. C. secs. 71–86; in disposition of mineral lands, 30 U. S. C. sec. 181; of public lands, 43 U. S. C. sec. 161; in engaging in coastwise trade, 46 U. S. C. secs. 11, 13; in operating aircraft, 49 U. S. C. secs. 176 (c), 521.

It was deemed necessary to limit the benefits of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938 to aliens who had "filed a declaration of intention to become an American citizen. * * *" 52 Stat. 809, 813.

[16] 239 U. S. 33, 39–40: "The discrimination defined by the act does not pertain to the regulation or distribution of the public domain, or of the common property or resources of the people of the State, the enjoyment of which may be limited to its citizens as against both aliens and the citizens of other States. * * * The case now presented is not within these decisions, or within those relating to the devolution of real property * * *; and it should be added that the act is not limited to persons who are engaged on public work or receive the benefit of public moneys. The discrimination here involved is imposed upon the conduct of ordinary private enterprise."

[17] *Truax* v. *Raich*, *supra*, was argued October 15, 1915, and decided November 1, 1915; *Heim* v. *McCall*, *supra*, was argued October 12, 1915, and decided November 29, 1915.

with the State or such municipality, only citizens of the United States shall be employed; and in all cases where laborers are employed on any such public works, preference shall be given citizens of the State of New York." [9] A unanimous court held that the statute, which was attacked on the ground that it denied aliens their rights under the privileges and immunities, due process, and equal protection clauses of the Constitution, was a constitutional exercise of State power as applied to the construction of New York City subways by private contractors." [10] The Constitution that permits the bar of aliens from public works surely must permit their bar from State fishing rights. A State has power to exclude from enjoyment of its natural resources those who are unwilling or unable to become citizens.

If aliens, as I think they can, may be excluded by a State from fishing privileges, I see no reason why the classification established by California excluding only aliens ineligible to citizenship is prohibited by the Constitution. *Terrace* v. *Thompson* (263 U. S. 197, 220). Whatever we may think of the wisdom of California's statute, we should intervene only when we conclude the State statute passes constitutional limits.

Mr. Justice Jackson joins in this dissent.

EXHIBIT 4

DULLES SHOULD KEEP HANDS OFF CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

(By Raymond Moley)

It may well be that the next big Senate debate will be on the Bricker proposal to amend the constitutional provisions relating to the treaty power.

In that debate we may assume that the strange reversal of opinion on the subject by Secretary Dulles will come in for a thorough airing. For seldom has a Secretary of State so weakened his influence in a Senate with which he must deal as Dulles has done in this case.

A year ago, Dulles pointed out the grave danger that treaties can override all our constitutional liberties, since they make new and supreme law.

A month ago, he came before the Foreign Relations Committee and said that it was unnecessary to do anything about this danger since he and the President could be trusted to negotiate no bad treaties.

This faulty reasoning will be thoroughly exposed by the advocates of the amendment which, incidentally, is sponsored by no less than 64 Senators.

NONE OF THEIR BUSINESS

But Secretary Dulles, Attorney General Brownell, Mutual Security Director Harold Stassen, and through them President Eisenhower, should consider the fact that it is no part of the duties or privileges of the Executive Department to take part in the process of constitutional amendment.

Secretary Dulles will have one and only one duty in connection with this amendment if it is proposed by Congress and ratified by the States. He must then proclaim it as a legally adopted part of the supreme law of the land.

Until then he would be well advised to withhold comment.

This constitutional amendment is proposed as a joint resolution. It will require a two-thirds approval of both Houses of Congress. Then it must be ratified by three-fourths of the States. The President's approval of this joint resolution is not required.

ROOT TOLD HOOVER

An exceedingly good statement of this point was made in a letter by Elihu Root to President Hoover in 1931 when the latter was struggling with the question of repealing the prohibition amendment. Root's opinion appears in the second volume of Hoover's memoirs. The following is his advice as paraphrased by Hoover:

"The Constitution does not contemplate any relation of the President to its amendment. You can veto any other form of legislative action but you do not have that power in relation to constitutional amendments. That distinction was made for the definite purpose of holding alterations of the Constitution away from the President, who is solely an enforcement officer in this relation. Furthermore, this law expresses itself in criminal proceedings. If you were to recommend repeal you would be nullifying the Constitution because from that day no jury and no judge would convict. You must not do that. Your sacred duty is to enforce the law with every power you exert."

This opinion by a great lawyer and Secretary of State should be brought forcefully to the attention of Messrs. Dulles, Brownell, and Stassen, who are the subordinates and agents of the President. To be perfectly plain, the Bricker amendment is none of their business.

---

[9] 239 U. S. 175, 176–77.

[10] The problem of natural resources was not directly discussed in the opinion. But it is clear that the Court was not unaware of the relation of its decision to the natural resources cases. See 239 U. S. 175, 194. The fact that this case was before the Court at the same time as *Truax* v. *Raich*, probably explains the careful reservation of the natural resources and public works problems in that case. See 239 U. S. 33, 39–40.

NOMINATION OF ALBERT C. BEESON

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to answer a reckless charge made by the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare against the minority members of that committee. My attention has been drawn to a news item which appeared on the ticker a little while ago, which reads in part as follows:

Chairman SMITH accused Democrats on his Senate Labor Committee of a filibuster to embarrass President Eisenhower and the Republican administration.

He made the charge because Democrats on the committee were unwilling to vote yet on Mr. Eisenhower's nomination of Albert C. Beeson, industrial relations director of a San Jose, Calif., firm, to a vacancy on the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, I cannot permit a charge of this character to go unchallenged. It is unfair, unjust, misleading, and completely inaccurate.

Mr. President, I desire to tell the Senate just what happened in this case.

Two days ago, on Wednesday, the committee held a hearing on the nomination of Albert C. Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board. He appeared before the committee and was interrogated for some time, and at the conclusion of his testimony, an hour later, several of us were still unsatisfied that he would be a proper, adequate, and fair member of the National Labor Relations Board.

I should like to make it clear, Mr. President, that in what I am saying at this time and in my questions which I addressed to Mr. Beeson I did not in any way reflect on his character or integrity. I did question his qualifications for this very important position. We were dissatisfied, and, therefore, we asked the committee to extend the hearings for a further period, and by vote of the committee it was decided to hold further hearings on this nomination today, beginning at 10 o'clock. Mr. Beeson appeared, and, to my great surprise, the hearing, instead of being a public hearing to which members of the press, the radio, and the public would be admitted, it was decided by the chairman of the committee that it should be an executive hearing. I protested strongly, as did some of my colleagues——

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. May I tell the story, first, and then I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Arizona speak.

I protested, as did some of my colleagues, and I offered a motion to make the hearings public. I have been a Member of the Senate for 5 years, and a member of the Labor Committee for the same period of time, and I cannot recall any hearings with regard to the qualifications of an appointee of the President which have not been open to the press and to the public, save where matters of national security were involved, when, of course, there could be no question about it. In every case with which I am familiar, the hearings have been public and the press has been represented.

My motion was defeated by a vote of 7 to 6.

The hearing thereupon continued in executive session. It is true that minutes were kept which were, on motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], later made available. We know that minutes are not available for some time after the conclusion of a hearing.

My associates and I asked many questions. As far as I am concerned, we are still in doubt regarding the qualifications of Mr. Beeson to sit as a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

I shall not go into detail concerning our doubts or the questions which we shall wish to have answered, but I say to the Senate that I am still very seriously in doubt whether the nomination of this man should be confirmed.

I do not say I shall vote against his confirmation or that I shall vote for him, but I certainly am not prepared to cast my vote in the committee and make my recommendation to the Senate until we have more information.

The hour of noon approached, and, of course, we could not continue the hearing past that hour. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] was unavoidably absent. He wanted to ask many questions of the appointee, as did the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who had been prevented, by lack of time, from asking questions. He also wanted to get additional information. A proposal was thereupon made that further hearings be held on this nomination next Tuesday morning. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] objected and claimed that it would interfere with the hearings on the Taft-Hartley Act which had been set for Monday. So averse were we to do anything which would cause delay in the consideration of the amendments proposed by the President of the United States to the Taft-Hartley Act that we agreed, and included in our motion, that the hour at which the committee would meet would not be 10 o'clock or 10:30 o'clock or 11 o'clock, as is

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

usually the case, but 8:30 o'clock in the morning. We did that so that there could be no question whatsoever with reference to a desire to filibuster or to hold up this nomination or any other business of the Senate.

We gave our reasons, Mr. President. We explained that this man still had not satisfied all the members of the committee, and that the members of the committee were entitled to a further look at him. In spite of that, the motion, when it was put, was defeated by a vote of 7 to 6.

Mr. President, I want to repeat that I have never known a case where public hearings were refused before the Labor Committee in regard to the candidacy of a man who had been appointed by the President. I have never known of an instance where the respectful request of the entire minority of the committee, which in this case, is six, was completely disregarded or refused.

Mr. President, there is serious opposition to the appointment of this man. I do not know whether it is justified or not, and I do not want to form any opinion at this time. I want to continue the hearings.

We have received a telegram from the president of the CIO addressed to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and other members of the committee, in which Mr. Reuther says:

> The CIO is strongly opposed to the administration attempt to pack this quasi-judicial board with representatives of industry.

Reading from the press report:

> Reuther said Beeson's testimony before the committee on Wednesday confirmed his industry viewpoint. Reuther added:
> "The confirmation of his appointment would leave the board, which under the statute is supposed impartially to adjudicate disputes between industry and labor, completely under industry domination."

I wish to point out that the purpose of the board is to adjudicate questions fairly and equitably between management and labor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I desire to conclude, and then I shall be very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

So long as I am in the Senate, so long as I am a member of committees of the Senate, I will resist steamroller tactics, whether they be practiced by a Democratic majority or a Republican majority. I have fought against such tactics on the part of both parties, and I shall continue so to fight.

The Senate has a duty to consider carefully the qualifications of a man appointed to one of the most important positions in the Government, in an agency presiding over labor-industry relationships in this country, relationships which affect virtually every man, woman, and child in the entire Nation. I shall insist, so long as I am able to do so, that the hearings on such a nomination be comprehensive and thorough, and that no pressure be brought upon the members of the committee to vote, until they are satisfied that every facet of a man's record concerning which question has been raised shall have been disposed of. I shall insist that such a man's record be considered carefully, judicially, and impartially by the committee.

Filibuster? There is no more of a filibuster in connection with this nomination than there was in connection with the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway bill. I may point out, in reference to the accusation made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], namely, that we are trying to embarrass the President, that the minority members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare backed up the President of the United States on the St. Lawrence bill far more fully, far more impartially, and far more on the merits, than did the majority members of the committee.

Mr. President, I resent a statement of this nature coming from the chairman of a committee of which I am a member. I serve notice here and now that I will not allow myself to be pressured. I will not allow myself to be shut up when I want to have my say in the committee, as well as in the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe the Senator from New York realizes that the name of Mr. Beeson has been mentioned rather conspicuously in the press since the first of the year as being the nominee of the administration for this post, does he not?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know. I do not happen to have seen it. Maybe I do not read the newspapers quite as carefully as does the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would not the distinguished Senator from New York agree that sufficient notice was given of the original hearing on Wednesday to have allowed such gentlemen as the presidents of the CIO, the A. F. of L., and other unions concerned, to register complaints with the committee?

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from Arizona that I do not know how much notice has been given. Perhaps notice was given by the press, but I do not believe that makes any difference. I do not think it justifies an accusation that the minority members of the committee are filibustering.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator from New York inform me if, during the first hearing on Wednesday, and a major portion of the hearing this morning, there was any objection made to Mr. Beeson by anyone connected with a union, or by anyone else, until at the very end of the morning meeting, when a telephone conversation was reported to have been had with Mr. Reuther?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know what telephone calls were made. I know that I was informally notified by labor leaders that Mr. Beeson's record should be carefully and painstakingly examined. That does not make any difference either.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I disagree with the distinguished Senator from New York. I think it does make a difference. I feel that persons whom one might expect to object to an appointment of this type had ample opportunity to do so on Wednesday. No such objection was made. In fact, no one appeared against Mr. Beeson, and no telegrams or letters were received against him. To my knowledge, there had not been one shred of evidence introduced against Mr. Beeson until the telephone conversation was reported at the very end of the meeting this afternoon. I think the distinguished Senator from New York will agree with me as to that.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that it does not make any difference at what particular hour a protest is received. When a protest comes from a great labor organization, or from a large group of people, I believe the protest requires investigation and study.

Furthermore, I may say—and this is something that I really feel most strongly about—we were denied public hearings on the nomination today. Unless public hearings are public, how can people know what is going on and register their objections? There was a 2-hour hearing—perhaps not a 2-hour hearing, but a 1-hour hearing, on the nomination of Mr. Beeson on Wednesday.

The Senator from Arizona will remember that I raised some very important questions with regard to conflict of interest in the case of Mr. Beeson, in connection with the fact that his nomination had been suggested by the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board himself, a most unusual procedure.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator from New York allow me to ask if this is not the Senator's recollection: That on Wednesday, when the meeting was adjourned at the request of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the distinguished junior Senator from New York, the committe adjourned with the agreement that we would resume in executive session this morning; and that the first indication that the Senator from New York desired a public hearing came at the opening of this morning's session?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I deny that very emphatically.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I suggest it is in the record.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say that at the request of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself the hearings were continued until today, but the hearing which was continued was a public hearing; it was not an executive hearing. Naturally, I took it for granted that when there was a continuation of the hearing it would be public in character.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am certain the Senator from New York is well aware of the fact that the committee was in executive session when that request was made.

I may further point out, and ask if the Senator from New York will not agree, that 1 of the 2 Senators who requested that the hearing be held over failed to appear at this morning's session. Am I not correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Arizona is quite correct.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] did not appear, and I am not certain that he did not notify the committee on Wednesday that he would not appear. But still that does not make any difference. The hearing was to have been a continuation of a public hearing, and it should have been a public hearing.

What I am saying, and I am saying it with all the emphasis at my command, is that when 6 of the 13 members of the committee, the 6 representing the minority party, respectfully request that further time be granted, of only 1 day, certainly I think the request should be acceded to. I resent, with all the force at my command, the unfair accusation made by the chairman of the committee that such a request represents a filibuster. It does not represent in the slightest degree a filibuster or an attempt to impede the work of the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will not the Senator from New York agree with me that at the request of the Senator from New York a suggestion was made that the committee meet tomorrow morning at, I believe, 9 or 10 o'clock, and that the Senator from New York said it would be impossible for him to attend because he would be out of town; and will not the Senator from New York further agree that when that statement was made, I made a motion suggesting that the committee meet this afternoon, 30 minutes after the adjournment of the Senate?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad to answer the Senator's question. I have engagements of long standing in New York tonight.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it not the first duty of the Senator from New York to be in Washington?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, it is. I fully agree with the Senator from Arizona, and I hope he will follow that principle very carefully, as I have done for 5 years.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

NOMINATION OF ALBERT C. BEESON

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to reply to a statement made by the junior Senator from Arizona, which was inaccurate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York may proceed. The Chair merely wished to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. LEHMAN. I repeat my statement that I have an appointment in New York this evening. I anticipated leaving on the 2 o'clock train, but I do not think I will catch it. I have said that I told the committee that I had the appointment. When it was pointed out that it was important for me to be here tomorrow, I said, "I will be here tomorrow if necessary."

I, without attempting to quote the distinguished majority leader verbatim, but giving what I am sure was the intent of his statement, may point out further that he announced, 2 or 3 days ago, that after the calendar had been called and after other business had been completed on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, the Senate would recess or adjourn until Monday. It was the desire of the distinguished majority leader to give Senators an opportunity to attend to other matters.

I particularly emphasized the fact that if it was decided to hold a meeting of the committee tomorrow morning, I would be very glad indeed to be present. However, that does not mean that I am willing to be steamrollered in this matter. I have not made up my mind whether I am going to support Mr. Beeson or not. I desire further information. If I am steamrollered into voting on the nomination, I shall, of course, vote as I am compelled to do by the necessities of the situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Regarding the question the Senator from New York has just raised, I think the intent and the words of the majority leader were that he wanted the Senate to adjourn, if possible, in accordance with the announcement the majority leader made several days ago, in order that Senators and the committees might be able to catch up with their work. I think the RECORD will show that I mentioned both Senators and committees.

When the Senate took a recess over yesterday, I was hopeful that both the committees, as well as Senators, who had been in attendance on the Senate floor rather consistently during the last week in debate on the seaway bill, might have an opportunity to catch up with their work.

If the Senator will permit me to say so, the Senator from New York came on the floor while the colloquy regarding the nomination was in progress. Regarding Mr. Beeson, I know that he is a distinguished citizen of California, and that he has a very fine reputation in the State in the civic life of the community from which he comes.

I regret that the Senate had to consider the nomination in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], because the Senator from New Jersey would be more qualified to speak regarding it. Perhaps, if he had had more advance notice that the nomination would be considered at this time, the Senator from New Jersey could have been present. I understand he has a luncheon engagement, and is not able to be here.

I have no doubt that the Senator from New York and the other minority members of the committee will have an opportunity to present facts to the Senate in regard to the nomination. I hope that more effort will be made to expedite action on all nominations. I also hope that if hearings are to be held, and if there is a desire that any testimony be presented by witnesses, the facts will be presented in order that the Senate may move on with its business of acting on Presidential nominations.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not willing to yield to the Senator at this time, as I desire to reply to the distinguished majority leader.

In the first place, let me inform the majority leader that as soon as my attention was directed to what the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had said on the floor, I promptly notified the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and his office that I intended to reply. It is unfortunate that the Senator from New Jersey is not on the floor, since he has a luncheon engagement. I am not at all critical of that. I have not had my lunch, but I do not begrudge the Senator from New Jersey's having his lunch. However, to paraphrase what was said on the floor a little while ago, a Senator's first duty is on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to make just one statement, if the Senator will permit me; then I shall end my part of the colloquy on the matter.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey is meeting with Hon. Harold E. Stassen on a matter of public duty, and the Senator is on his way to the Chamber at the present time.

I hesitate to say whether or not I agree with the words of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey in describing the action of the minority as a filibuster. On the other hand, I feel certain that we have given the opponents of Mr. Beeson, if there be any, ample opportunity to present their case. I doubt that any new evidence was introduced in this morning's hearing. I doubt that there will be new evidence introduced in the hearings this afternoon or next week, or as long as the minority wishes to carry on and enjoys the good will and good fellowship of the majority. There has been shown an extreme reluctance on the part of those on the minority side of the aisle to go along with the administration in this particular instance. I was hopeful that the distinguished Senator from New York might remember his repeated claims of his support of the President of the United States in his administration.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, if I may say just a word in conclusion, certainly I do not desire—and I do not believe that any of the other members of the minority on the committee desire—to delay the pending nomination or any other nomination. What we have done I think simply shows a conscientious recognition of our duties as Senators, and as members of the committee, to ascertain all

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the facts. Certainly what has been disclosed today is not yet a matter of public record. I am strongly against that method of procedure. Every hearing on a nomination should be public, in order that the press and the public and the members of the committee may know exactly what has been disclosed, and know it promptly, and not 2 or 3 or 4 days later.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may inform the Senator from New York that the minutes of the meeting are on the press table and are available at this time.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in recess until Monday next, at noon, as in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BASIC NEW POLICY AND STRATEGY

Mr. GORE obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as I listened to the state of the Union message some 2 weeks ago, I wondered what brought about the decision to cut back our military forces on the ground and sea. In general terms, the President seemed to be enunciating a basic change of policy and military strategy.

On January 12, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, in a speech before the Council on Foreign Relations, spelled out this policy in considerable more detail, and threw light upon the considerations which seem to have prompted the decision.

Secretary Dulles described the basic decision as one which depended primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our own choosing. The Secretary said also that "before military planning could be changed, the President and his advisers had to make some basic policy decisions."

I propose, Mr. President, to express my views with respect to this so-called basic new policy. I do not propose to make charges against anyone. I do not propose to blast the administration. Such is not my purpose. I have not considered this problem in a partisan sense, nor do I voice these thoughts in that spirit. My motivation and my purpose are simple. I am deeply disturbed by what has been said and done, and I am gravely apprehensive of the consequences of the policy. Plainly, I feel a duty as a United States Senator to express the apprehensions I hold, for whatever value they may be to my country.

What is new, Mr. President, in this so-called new policy or strategy? Certainly there is nothing new in placing great reliance upon the ability to render devastating retaliation against an enemy who might provoke war upon us. That has been our policy for several years. That was the purpose for which the Strategic Air Command was organized and supported. That was the principal purpose for which our atomic-energy program was vastly expanded, and which expanded program is now nearing completion.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, it was my privilege and duty, as acting chairman of an appropriation subcommittee, to conduct the atomic-energy appropriation hearings for 5 years, including consideration and approval of the expansion program now under way. It was also my privilege to serve as a member of the Armed Forces Appropriations Subcommittee.

The proposal to augment United States airpower is not new either. Such a recommendation was before the Congress last year. At that time I supported the 143-wing program, even though it was opposed at that time by the administration. This is not the first time that I have taken such a position. I supported the 70-wing program, over the opposition of the Truman administration. In each case it was difficult to oppose the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief. It was even more difficult to oppose the recommendations of President Eisenhower, than those of President Truman, in this case. The reasons are obvious. General Eisenhower, who led the United States and her allies to victory in World War II, is recognized as one of the greatest soldiers of all time. We who opposed President Eisenhower then were by no means in a comfortable position. Our position was made more tenable, however, by the recommendation of Gen. Omar Bradley, who was then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Furthermore, the fact that the administration now recommends virtually the same Air Force program which it vigorously opposed just 1 year ago gives additional cause for question at this time. This is not to say that I am critical of the budget recommendation for the Air Force; I only wish the error had not been made last year. The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who served with such great distinction as first Secretary for Air, has said that the mistake has cost the United States 2 years' precious rearmament time and more than one billion dollars. Even so, I applaud the willingness of the administration to recognize and correct its error in judgment.

So, Mr. President, we cannot find anything new in reliance upon atomic retaliatory power or in a recommendation for augmentation of air power.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that back in 1949 Admiral Radford, in testifying before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, stated in part, as follows:

> I do not believe the threat of the atomic blitz will be an effective deterrent to war or that it will win that war * * * in such a way that it can be followed by a stable, livable peace.

I invite attention to the fact that this statement was made in 1949, at a time when the United States had a monopoly on atomic weapons. It was at a time when the United States was in a position to deliver effective retaliatory blows. I can see some real sense in announcing such a policy back in 1949, when the Soviet Union had not as yet exploded an atomic bomb. Today, however, the monopoly on atomic and hydrogen weapons no longer exists. I raise the question as to the wisdom of a policy being enunciated by the administration which would place chief reliance on atomic and hydrogen retaliation, when we no longer have such a monopoly. I question whether it would be effective, for the simple reason that it is not the kind of retaliation which might of necessity invite peace. It might invite retaliation against the United States by atomic and hydrogen weapons.

I respect Admiral Radford. I believe him to be one of the ablest military men produced by this country. But, as a matter of concern to all the people of the United States, I believe that one has the right to ask the question of Admiral Radford as to why he was opposed to such a policy in 1949, when it really did make some sense from the standpoint of preserving the peace. We now find that he is for this policy at a time when the effectiveness of atomic retaliation is open to serious question.

The junior Senator from Tennessee is making an outstanding contribution by raising these questions in connection with the new policy. I commend him for the constructive approach he is making to one of the greatest problems we face today.

Mr. GORE. I am grateful for the kind words of commendation by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington. I appreciate his contribution. While he, too, was a Member of the other body it was his privilege to serve as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I doubt if there is a Member of Congress who is better informed in this field than is the distinguished and able junior Senator from Washington.

Before yielding to my distinguished friend from Washington, I had asked the question as to what was new in this so-called basic new policy. I had eliminated reliance upon atomic energy and a recommendation for an augmentation of the Air Force. The question I asked was, what, then, is new? I think there are two new basic elements. One element is the highest level decision, if I perceive it correctly, to reduce drastically our ground forces and gradually to withdraw them from the so-called world danger points; the second element

is the open, if implied, threat to retaliate with atomic weapons.

These basic policy decisions were taken, so far as I am advised, with dangerous disregard for the value of consultation with congressional leaders of both political parties. I may say that I did not expect to be consulted. I do not enjoy membership on either the Foreign Relations Committee or the Armed Services Committee. However, in the spirit of bipartisanship, in which I genuinely believe, it would seem that the Democratic leadership of the House and Senate, and the ranking minority members of these two committees, should have been consulted. I call attention to this error of omission in no partisan sense, but out of my desire to see bipartisanship preserved in the field of international affairs. Only in this way, and only in this spirit, can dangerous shoals be avoided.

Secretary Dulles announced this new policy and military strategy as a substitute for the so-called containment policy of the previous administration. Under the policy of so-called containment we prepared to resist whatever kind of aggression the Communists might unloose against any free nation, wherever that nation might be. It was a flexible policy which could take different forms as situations required. When Greece and Turkey were threatened, it took the form of economic assistance and quick military aid. In the community of Atlantic nations, the policy's arm has been NATO and the mutual assistance program and other programs. In Korea the containment policy took the form of armed resistence to armed aggression. In fact, this Korean tragedy followed upon the heels of a premature withdrawal of our Armed Forces from Korea. In my opinion this withdrawal constituted a deviation from a containment policy. The tragic consequences of this deviation render more doubtful the new policy which unquestionably bears similar earmarks.

It is difficult for me to imagine a satisfactory substitute for strength at or near the point of weakness or danger. I seriously doubt if a threat of retaliation will suffice, particularly in those cases which appear on the surface, at least, to be local in nature.

Nevertheless, Secretary Dulles says we must move away from this policy of readiness near the trouble spot and be prepared to reinforce local defenses "by the further deterrent of massive retaliatory power."

As I contemplate the budget submitted yesterday to the Congress, and the reduction in excess of 30 percent for the United States Army, it is apparent that our ground forces are to be reduced to an extent which will require withdrawal of many of the troops now guarding the trouble spots of the world. If, as our own Armed Forces are withdrawn under this policy the ground forces of our allies are built up, then this policy may prove advisable. But I do not believe we can afford to run the risk of withdrawing troops and leaving a vacuum into which, as experience has shown us, enemy elements may move.

I have seen no concrete evidence that the forces of our allies are being built up to a point where they can readily replace our forces overseas. In fact, just the opposite appears to be the case.

In Korea we have been unable even to set up a peace conference. We are still unsure what to expect from Syngman Rhee. Frequent reports indicate a buildup of enemy war capabilities beyond the demilitarized line. Reports indicate movement of Soviet aircraft to the airfields in northern Korea. Yet, despite this tenuous situation, it is suddenly announced that two divisions are to be withdrawn from Korea. Despite our concern and our responsibility, many of us in Congress have not been given one word of explanation.

It is implied that the decision to withdraw these divisions from Korea is based upon the premise that they can be better utilized as a part of a highly mobile strategic reserve. But the Army manpower level now programed suggests that troops will be discharged from the Army faster than overseas troops will be returned to the United States. How is it that our so-called strategic reserve strength here at home, or elsewhere, will be increased if men are discharged faster than they are being brought home?

Is there assurance to be had that these two divisions will be maintained at full strength in the United States or elsewhere, or will they cease to exist as effective combat units? How many troops are to be withdrawn from Europe? What effect will this have upon Allied defense efforts and unity in Western Europe?

It seems but a few months ago that as a Member of the House of Representatives I came to this Chamber and listened to the great debate held in this body over the sending of six divisions to Western Europe. One Senator after another arose, quoting one military leader after another to the effect that the presence of American forces in strength was necessary to bolster the will to resist.

Let me inquire: Has there been any basic change, Mr. President, in the overall national security mission assigned to the Army as a result of the new policy?

Are we to believe, Mr. President, that the threat from Communist Russia has diminished? Is there peace in Germany? Is there a treaty with Austria? Can we find a real optimism for the outcome of the Four Power Conference beginning today in Berlin?

Have we any evidence that the Soviet Union is reducing her military power? Is not Communist China a rising threat? Indeed, Mr. President, are not the Communists pressing harder their advantage in the East while talking more gently in the West?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the very distinguished junior Senator from Missouri, who served with such great distinction as head of our Air Force.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee whether it is not a fact we now have information that there has been a heavy buildup of Communist forces in North Korea since the so-called cease-fire went into effect.

Mr. GORE. That is the information which has come to me. I have trusted it to be reliable. If the administration has information to the contrary, I would be greatly relieved to have it, and I am sure the American people would find it welcome news.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Tennessee yield for another question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that a great general, with whom some of us talked today in the Capitol, Gen. James Van Fleet, stated that previously the lull in hostilities resulted in a heavy buildup of Communist forces, and that he felt, if he had been permitted to push on, he could have successfully destroyed most of the armies in North Korea?

Mr. GORE. As I recall, that is an accurate summary of the testimony given by the general. I believe he went further, and pointed out the tragic cost in blood and life as a result of that buildup in North Korea.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. GORE. I yield to my able friend.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If it were the purpose of the Chinese Communists to further their aggressive actions in North Korea, but they were at a point losing the fight, would it not be logical from their standpoint to agree to a lull in order to build up their forces in North Korea, which we now understand they have done? Furthermore, if there were a plan for America's withdrawal of troops from Korea, would not the Chinese Communists believe even more in the logic of their plans, to establish the buildup they felt was advisable under the cease-fire?

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from Missouri, with his vast wealth of experience, is better qualified to provide the answer to that inquiry than am I. However, for whatever my opinion is worth, I must answer in the affirmative.

I should like to go further and say that late in November 1952, after I began to see the pressures for a change in the budgetary policy with respect to the military strength of this Nation, I made the statement in my home State that I hoped the Soviet Union would not be smart enough to take advantage of the swing of the pendulum in the United States, and by talking in a conciliatory vein in a few instances turn this country's national defense buildup in the reverse.

I am now apprehensive that the Soviet Union has been that smart and that we have not been smart enough to resist the temptation to reduce our strength.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am concerned about one aspect of the policy, and I consider it to be a very serious one. The junior Senator from Tennessee has very ably pointed out the fact

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that the policy of retaliation is not a new one. The fact is that our atomic stockpile, as the distinguished Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Churchill, has said on many occasions, was the main deterrent in the past to Soviet aggression.

What concerns me at the moment is the fact that we have, in effect, told the Russians what kind of aggression to start in the world. In that way the Soviet Union could place us in such a position that we might not be able to deal effectively with such aggression short of all-out retaliation, which could lead to world war III.

In other words, we have, in effect, told the Russians to do their best not to start a war by an overt act on their part. Instead, we have told them to concentrate on indigenous forces everywhere and to support those forces in every clandestine manner possible.

In that way they could very well place us in the position of being labeled, through the Soviet propaganda machine, as being the aggressors. I say that because the United States, having announced its policy, would have no alternative but to drop atomic bombs, not on the center of the fire, but on the source of the fire, namely, the Soviet Union.

If we failed to carry out our promise of retaliation we would lose face, particularly in the Far East.

If I understand the situation correctly the policy of atomic retaliation could, in effect, be world war III.

We have been told by the previous administration and by the present administration that the foundation of America's atomic striking power is our system of allied bases. The reason why that is the foundation of our atomic striking power is simple. If the United States is going to retaliate, as has been announced, we must have bases overseas from which our atomic bombers can take off and strike the enemy.

If that be the case, and with full realization of what the new administration has proposed, I am wondering whether we have consulted our allies to determine if, having announced this policy, we can carry it out. I am wondering if it is wise to make a unilateral declaration of policy which can lead to world war III, and then find ourselves in a situation where we do not have the allies to make it possible to win the conflict.

I think it is quite obvious that the Russians will move in those areas where we cannot drop atomic bombs to stop the enemy. If the Russians provide support to the enemy forces in Indochina, I assume that we shall find it rather difficult to stop the enemy forces from moving through the jungles and taking their objectives. Obviously the arms and supplies will not come from China. Possibly in a small sense they will, but in an effective sense they will come from the Soviet Union.

I raise these questions, Mr. President, not in a spirit of being unfair to the present administration. I desire to cooperate in every way possible. During the time I served in the House of Representatives on the Atomic Energy Committee I believe I was as strong an advocate of an all-out atomic-weapons program as is any other Member of the Congress. I am still of that frame of mind. I am merely submitting that in the kind of world in which we are living today I am not sure that atomic weapons, of which we no longer have a monopoly, are the sole deterrent to aggression. I do not believe it is wise to announce in advance that we are going to use mass atomic bombing as the sole means of deterring aggression. I am not sure in my own mind that that will do the job. Frankly, I would feel a great deal better if the Congress could have the opinion of the man who leads our ground forces, the present Chief of Staff of the Army, Matthew Ridgway.

Mr. President, I again want to commend the junior Senator from Tennessee for the constructive contribution he is making to the problem.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am, indeed, grateful to my distinguished friend and colleague from Washington. It is my genuine hope that this discussion will be a contribution to the thinking of the people of the United States. The distinguished junior Senator from Washington has raised a question which I think naturally arises, when and under what conditions would atomic retaliation be unloosed under this basic new policy?

The distinguished Senator cited instances in which he did not believe such a threat would be resorted to or would be effective.

Let us suppose, for instance, that the Communist Party in Iran, through its native Iranian leaders, suddenly attempted to seize control of the Iranian Government with an armed movement. Within a few days we learn that the native Iranians are well supplied with Russian arms and under guidance of Russian advisers. What do we do then under this new policy? Do we start dropping atomic bombs on Moscow? I do not believe the American people would approve it.

Would the administration order atomic bombs dropped on Moscow in case of a border clash between Bulgarian and Greek troops? I do not believe so. I do not believe the American people would endorse world war III on this basis. Let us suppose that after a few days or a few weeks of sporadic border clashes, still only Bulgarian volunteers or unruly brigands are involved, but, nevertheless, the situation is gradually growing more dangerous. Would atomic bombs suddenly start raining upon Moscow? Stalingrad, Kharkov? If so, world war III, the very thing we have hoped to avoid, would be upon us. If we fail to retaliate, would not this big new strategy be revealed as a big bluff?

The distinguished junior Senator from Washington, and other Senators, may think of certain circumstances in which such action would be doubtful.

The Communists, Mr. President, are far more resourceful in conjuring clever, devious methods of infiltration and indirect aggression than we are; they are masters. From experience, we know that we must not only consider the threat of direct military attack from the Communists, but also that of conquest by subversion, pressure, bribery, default, and by all of the other sinister means of indirect aggression which the Reds have used and stand ready to use again.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. Let me complete my thought on that point, and I shall be glad to yield.

I do not believe we can depend upon a balance of terror, which may perhaps preclude global war, to prevent such deceptive and diabolical local aggression. Nevertheless, one successful local aggression after another steadily enlarges the area behind the Iron Curtain.

I now yield to my distinguished friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I desire to join my colleagues in commending the junior Senator from Tennessee for raising this vital question and asking whether we are committing ourselves to a policy that not only, perhaps, might involve us in world war III but might also affect our determination to bulwark those countries yet remaining outside the Iron Curtain in their resisting various types of diabolical infiltration and covert aggression of which the Senator so wisely speaks.

Even though we felt that there might be a small war starting in Iran or on the border of Greece, even though we perhaps might not feel that we dared at that point to drop an atomic bomb, would it be wise to send our newly perfected and newly tested atomic weapons into that type of border warfare, or border skirmish, thereby making it possible that the secrets which have been developed in our arsenals might immediately become known inside the Kremlin?

It seems to me, in our desire for economy, in our desire properly to find ways of reducing the cost of our defense, we must not omit taking into consideration the great strength of the armies of history made up of the slogging foot soldier, with proper firepower, with good logistical support, working under an effective command, and being able to stop a small war when it was still a small war. Lacking 300,000 or 400,000 doughboys in the Army and members of the Marine Corps, we would rely only on our atomic strength, and risk the starting of world war III.

I think the Senator from Tennessee is bringing to the attention of the Senate the point that by weakening our defenses, in the name of economy, we may also lose our Allies, who can have no hope of freedom if our policy is immediate and instant retaliation at the vitals of a country that may stir up an aggression, which cannot in fact be proved to be an aggression, with their own troops and national armies.

Mr. GORE. Like the distinguished and able junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], I, too, am disturbed by indications that budgetary objectives, rather than military strategy, may have dictated the proposed reduction in our ground forces.

The Senator from Oklahoma raised another question, namely, whether, in

considering the dangerous, tragic plight of the distraught world today, we can afford to gamble with the security of the United States and the free world, which the proposed policy clearly envisions.

The distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma raised a third question or point, namely, the importance of the ground forces. I am not a military historian, but it seems to me, from what I have read, that as weapons become more complex and devastating, more, not fewer, men have been required successfully to resist an aggression or to win a war.

I am not certain that the arsenal of atomic weapons which are possessed, as was pointed out by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], by Russia as well as by the United States, will not require more widely dispersed ground forces and a greater number of ground forces. Of course, much is said about the strategic mobile reserve. Strategic where? Mobile from where? And with what? How do we acquire more strength when we make a 30-percent cut, and drastically reduce the manpower of the United States Army?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I concur in what the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee has said. I believe it is crystal clear that there is not a Member of the Senate, on either side of the aisle, who will not applaud every single effort that can be made for the maximum utilization of the men in our Armed Forces. There should be an elimination of featherbedding and of cushion jobs, such as chauffeurs for admirals, or mess sergeants to cook meals for lieutenant colonels, or even for generals. All of us applaud the efforts to eliminate such jobs, and we hope their number can be reduced.

On the other hand, no one who is reasonably familiar with the budgetary requirements of the Army will believe that $5 billion, or any amount remotely approaching that sum, can be cut from the appropriations in the effort to eliminate unnecessary overhead or waste of manpower.

Does not the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee agree with me that it is not a question of affording a proper defense? We cannot afford to be improperly defended. Although we may feel equal or superior to any other nation in the air or in our possession of atomic weapons, if, on the ground, we are seriously inferior to perform the traditional job of the fighting men, our security still is most questionable in this troubled world.

Mr. GORE. I believe a military term is used to describe the general situation which the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma has discussed. That military term is "calculated risk." In order to arrive at some estimate of the advisability of a calculated risk in drastically reducing the defense forces of the United States of America, I think we must inquire, what change has there been in the Soviet Union? Is there evidence that there has been any change of heart in the Kremlin? Is there any evidence that there has been or will be a reduction in the military power of the Soviet Union or of Communist China? If there has been such a change, then the American people would like to have information concerning it, and so would this Member of the United States Senate. But if there has been no basic change in the Soviet Union and in the Communist conspiracy, then I say that the proposed military policy of the United States would be more risk than calculation.

Such threats and warnings as Secretary Dulles has given or implied could, it seems to me, have real meaning when applied to renewed aggression by the Chinese Communists in Korea, or to a movement by the Russians across the boundaries into western Germany. But, as I have said, we must recognize that the Communists are clever, and that they are not likely to risk starting world war III by such overt acts, as was suggested a few minutes ago by the able junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

If there is no basic change in Russia or in Communist China, then the proposed policy, it seems to me, would tend to invite local aggression which could develop into world war III.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the distinguished, able, young junior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WILEY. And handsome.

Mr. GORE. And handsome.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, now the Senator from Tennessee has me flabbergasted.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from Alabama compliments me on the ability to flabbergast him, but I have seen him under far more trying circumstances, and I know the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama is never flabbergasted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I wish to compliment the able junior Senator from Tennessee, my neighbor, for his very fine exposition of this subject. I am particularly pleased with the statement he made in the very beginning, and which he repeats in the conclusion of his remarks, for I have been reading ahead of him while he has been speaking. He has been addressing the Senate completely in a spirit of bipartisanship. Certainly I share the feelings expressed by the able Senator from Tennessee. I have always tried to conduct myself in such a way as to help build up bipartisanship, or, as the late Senator Vandenberg used to say, "unpartisanship," in the development and the carrying out of United States foreign policy. However, I think it is always helpful to raise these questions, because they relate to matters which are of concern to a great many American people.

The Senator from Tennessee may recall that about a year ago the President of the United States made a statement about the movement of the 7th Fleet which was carried all over the world, and perhaps built up some false expectations. I think undoubtedly that a great many people expected the Nationalist Chinese to start for the mainland of China immediately. We have continued to help the Nationalist Chinese build their strength, and I think properly so, but they have not moved yet.

The Senator from Tennessee may remember that at about this time last year I raised questions pertaining to that activity, just as the Senator from Tennessee is doing today. I think it is always well worth while to raise such questions.

I wish to ask the able Senator from Tennessee 2 or 3 questions regarding the point he made a few minutes ago with reference to mobility. We were told, when the announcement was first made, that two divisions were being withdrawn from Korea for the purpose of enabling greater mobility of our forces.

I do not know how the Senator from Tennessee felt, but I was considerably confused by various statements I read in the press after the announcement as to the movement of the divisions. Some statements indicated that they would be left at Okinawa, or perhaps be brought back to Hawaii. Another statement was to the effect that the divisions would not be moved for 6 months or more. Certainly if they were to be placed at Okinawa or Hawaii, they might be in a position where they could be moved very quickly.

But only a few days ago, when General Ridgway was testifying before the Committee on Foreign Relations, the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], asked him some questions about the withdrawal of the two divisions, and I followed up with some questions of my own.

We were told at that time that it was not the intention to leave the divisions at some half-way point, but that it was proposed to bring them back to the United States. I have read in the press in the last few days that most likely the divisions will be disbanded or taken out of active service. In what way does that contribute to the mobility of our forces? In what way does that contribute to the strength of our mobile reserve, if they are to be brought home, and, in addition, if they are taken out of active service and disbanded and broken up?

Mr. GORE. I cannot answer the inquiry of the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama. As the Senator had done, I had taken the suggestions in the press to mean that the divisions were to be retained intact, perhaps not with exactly the same men. Of course, there is the matter of rotating.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was referring to units in being.

Mr. GORE. Yes, units in being. There appears to be a plan now that the divisions, as effective combat units, will cease to exist.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I expressed my concern as quickly as the announcement was made. While recognizing it as a military problem which I was not qualified to solve, I expressed my concern as

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a layman that the withdrawal of two divisions from Korea meant the lessening of pressure on the Chinese Communists, and thereby made it possible for them to exert a greater pressure, if they saw fit to do so, on the Indochina frontier. Does the Senator agree with that opinion?

Mr. GORE. I do. That raises the further question: Was it a military problem or was it a budgetary problem that prompted the aforementioned policy?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was disturbed by the same question because, as the able Senator from Tennessee has already stated, last year, when a tremendous slash was made in the Air Force, I think the country as a whole was pretty well convinced that it was a budgetary decision rather than a security decision. I believe that the backing up on the part of the administration this year indicates that that opinion probably was accurate.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to continue.

Mr. GORE. I yield further to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A few days ago I asked General Ridgway if he believed that the removal of the two divisions might also give the Chinese Communists a similar mobility. General Ridgway answered:

I think it would give them that capability; yes, sir.

Then I asked General Ridgway:

And the thing that disturbed me was what our situation might be in such event as that. I am judging from the public statement that has been made—speeches that have been made. It is not contemplated that we would move ground forces into Indochina.

The answer of General Ridgway was:

Well, certainly the withdrawal of substantial ground forces from North Korea by Communist China gives it greater freedom of movement to employ those same forces elsewhere at its own discretion.

Mr. GORE. I did not have the privilege of hearing the testimony of General Ridgway, and I am pleased to have his testimony contributed to the present discussion. I trust the remarks I have made, and I am sure the remarks the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama has made, will contribute to a searching inquiry by the American people as to the advisability, the wisdom, and the effectiveness of the so-called basic new policy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When our overall defense program was formulated—I believe the decision was reached in 1951—it was decided that there would be needed for effective defense 21 divisions of ground forces, 408 combat ships to form our Navy, and 143 wings to form our Air Force. Last year, when the drastic cut was effected, we actually had in being 20 of the 21 divisions of ground forces. The administration left it at that figure. We had 408 ships in the Navy. I read in the press the other day that 50 of those ships were being removed from active service and put into mothballs. I do not know which 50 ships they were. The administration has increased the Air Force, not back to the original 143 wings, but I believe the number of wings contemplated is 137.

Now the administration is slashing the ground forces and slashing the Navy. As I gather, the able Senator is expressing the fear which is in the minds of many people in this country; namely, because of what is happening to our defense forces, will we still retain the degree of security to which we are entitled? Another question in the minds of the people of the country is whether a reduction is being made because of the basic consideration of our national security or in the consideration of the requirements of budgetary balancing.

Mr. GORE. Is there any wonder, Mr. President, that the junior Senator from Tennessee and many others, as the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama has pointed out, are concerned when a drastic reduction in the Armed Forces of the United States of America is proposed, indeed, more than proposed, actually enunciated? We are faced with the fact of a reduction of our forces in the troubled hot spots of the world when we are given no assurance whatsoever that there is any basic change in the threat we face or any basic change in the mission of the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been listening with some interest to the speech of the Senator from Tennessee, but I am not quite sure whether he is making a blanket indictment of the speech of the Secretary of State or a blanket indictment of the policy that was enunciated.

I desire to point out that in the period from 1945 to the outbreak of the Korean war, on June 25, 1950, the policies which had been followed under the former administration resulted in about 500 million people passing behind the iron curtain. That is at a rate of about 100 million a year people lost their freedom.

I desire to point out that the Secretary of State, in his speech in New York, made a further significant statement. Secretary Dulles, in that speech, said, in part:

If we rely on freedom, then it follows that we must abstain from diplomatic moves which would seem to endorse captivity. That would, in effect, be a conspiracy against freedom. I can assure you that we shall never seek elusory security for ourselves by such a deal.

I would assume from that language that we would not condone a Yalta or Potsdam Agreement, under which literally hundreds of millions of people lost their freedom.

I am confident the distinguished Senator from Tennessee would not have us believe that it would be in the national interest to telegraph all our plans and strategy to the men in the Kremlin. Certainly I know of nothing that Mr. Malenkov and those associated with him would gain more benefit from than to have the Government of the United States, either through its executive branch, or through its executive branch being forced by the Congress, disclosing matters of great strategic interest. That would set up all over the world a whole series of Yalu rivers. It would serve notice on the Kremlin that, no matter what local operation they undertook, they could be assured that no American plane and no plane of the free world would cross that particular Yalu River, wherever it might be.

I wish to say to the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee that it seems to me the policy of this Government is entitled to receive bipartisan support, and it further seems to me the most effective type of support and the most effective type of policy would be for us to say that in the event of the kind of localized aggression to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred, at that time we would take whatever course of action our national interest might require.

However, certainly we should not assure the men in the Kremlin that if they try a local coup d'etat, such as the one by which the people of Czechoslovakia lost their freedom, the Kremlin would be guaranteed that we would not take any type of retaliation under those circumstances; or that if the men in the Kremlin were to send so-called volunteers to wage war in another country, in the way the so-called volunteers from Communist China were sent to Korea, the Kremlin would be assured that our country would not resort to any kind of retaliation under that circumstance; or that if a local coup d'etat, aided by equipment sent by the Kremlin, were to occur in some other country, there would be assurance that there would be no retaliation in a situation of that kind.

No, Mr. President; I think we should base our policy on the general statement made by the Secretary of State. Then, as Senators of the United States and as citizens of the United States and as a part of the Government of the United States, working in cooperation with the administration, and charged with a considerable amount of responsibility, we could let the men in the Kremlin know that if such types of aggression were to take place, we would take whatever action our national interest might require.

Let those in the Kremlin worry for a while about what we might do. But why telegraph our punches, so to speak, or give them a blueprint of our course of action, or invite them, so to speak, into the sessions of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, and spell out to them precisely what we would do under those circumstances?

I do not claim to be a military expert, and I do not think the Senator from Tennessee does. I doubt that any Member of this body has had the experience of President Eisenhower, who led our armies in World War II and won the great victory in Europe. I am sure there is no one on this floor who has had the experience of Admiral Radford, General Ridgway, Admiral Carney, General Twining or the other officers who have studied this question and have come forward with recommendations to the Security Council, which has taken certain steps under its responsibilities. But above all else, Mr. President, let us not

"telegraph" all of our information to the Kremlin, in advance.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the distinguished and able senior Senator from California, the majority leader of the Senate [Mr. KNOWLAND], has raised several questions.

First, I should like to allay any apprehension on his part that the purpose of my address is to level an indictment against either the Secretary of State or the administration. What I have sought to do is to raise some fundamental questions, which have not yet been answered.

This is not the first time I have raised such questions. The distinguished majority leader referred to some unfortunate events of history. I, too, recall them. During that tragic era, I served in the Congress. At the time when the former Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, proposed a drastic reduction in the Armed Forces of the Nation, I asked questions similar to the ones I have asked today.

I applaud and concur in the fine compliment the distinguished majority leader has paid the President of the United States, but I seem to recall that he recommended the Louis Johnson budget, the Louis Johnson reduction in our military forces, which at that time was motivated by something other than a desire to keep the strength of the United States at the maximum point which the American people could afford.

The distinguished majority leader says he does not believe we should "telegraph our punches" to the enemy. I submit that is what the Secretary of State did. I would be far better satisfied with the statement of the distinguished majority leader, than I am with the statement of the Secretary of State.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to observe that not only did the Secretary of State "telegraph" the news of our "new look" or our new strategy, but he did so without consulting our allies. I do not believe it wise or in the national interest of our own people to announce a policy which involves very clearly the possibility of a third world war, without consultation with the very allies we need in order to win an atomic war. We cannot win an atomic war without allies; we must have bases overseas. In order to retain such bases, we must have allies.

I wish to say to the junior Senator from Tennessee that I concur heartily in his approach to this problem.

I, for one, wish to support the administration, the President, and the Secretary of State in this bipartisan effort of ours to help save ourselves from annihilation.

I do not believe it wise to announce to the Soviet Union that we will rely on atomic bombing or other types of bombing alone as a means of deterring aggression.

I suggest very strongly that it would have been much wiser for the Secretary of State to have followed the policy suggested by the distinguished majority leader in his remarks in the Senate Chamber today. He suggested that we not announce the policy. I believe he said we should let our own national interest dictate the kind of strategy to be followed in a given situation. I should like to suggest that the Secretary of State did the opposite. I think it would have been much better if the Secretary of State had been silent on that point.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. GORE. In a moment I shall yield—first to the Senator from Illinois, and then to the Senator from California.

Before doing so, Mr. President, I should like to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for his contribution in the nature of a reply to the distinguished majority leader.

Furthermore, since the distinguished majority leader read from the speech of the Secretary of State, I should like to point out that he not only seems to have "telegraphed the punch," so to speak, to the Kremlin; but if I correctly interpret the language of the address, he telegraphed to them that the United States of America might, under certain circumstances, tolerate setbacks to our cause or forward pushes on their part.

Let me read from the Secertary's address:

> It is normal that at some times and at some places there may be setbacks to the cause of freedom.

Does that indicate a tolerance? Does it indicate that there are setbacks to freedom which the proposed basic new policy will not successfully resist? I do not know. It may be that I am reading into that language a meaning which the Secretary of State did not intend. I am not sure that the enemy knows the full intention of the Secretary of State, either.

Now I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me say, by way of prelude, that I have read the text of the very able address of the Senator from Tennessee, and it seems to me that the Senator from California has misunderstood what the Senator from Tennessee has been saying.

Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Tennessee is not opposed to a buildup in the Air Force? In fact, he was for it last year, was he not?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee is not opposed to the development of atomic weapons. In fact, I believe, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, he has been very active in promoting the development of atomic energy in all its manifold applications. Is that not true?

Mr. GORE. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But what I take it the Senator is objecting to is the reduction in the ground forces of the United States——

Mr. GORE. Plus the withdrawal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Plus the withdrawal. So that in the judgment of the Senator from Tennessee, what might have been resisted by ground forces as a local attack may instead become transformed into a world war by the application of atomic bombs or hydrogen bombs against the immediately opposing troops that are in the field.

Mr. GORE. If this policy has a real meaning, it is a threat to convert local aggressions into a world war.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the Senator from Tennesse if it is not true that the areas in Asia which are likely to be attacked first are, in the main, jungle areas, where atomic bombs or hydrogen bombs would be, on the whole, inapplicable?

Mr. GORE. I believe that is true of the Asiatic theater. I am not sure it is true of the Middle East, Western Europe, or Africa.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am simply speaking of the Asiastic theater.

Is it not also true that modern attacking forces will undoubtedly spread themselves out in a very thin diffusion, so that trying to check them with atomic weapons or the hydrogen bomb would be more or less like using a 155-mm. shell to destroy a swarm of mosquitoes?

Mr. GORE. That is an apt analogy, it seems to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that from the standpoint of defense, the almost exclusive reliance upon atomic power to check an attack would not seem to be the sole military strategy that could most wisely be used?

Mr. GORE. To answer the question of the distinguished Senator in a broader way, I am deeply apprehensive that this policy is an invitation to the so-called small aggressions by which the Communist Iron Curtain heretofore has been steadiy pushed out, engulfing more and more people, and wiping out their liberty and freedom.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not further true that the great advantage of ground forces is that they can check local acts of aggression without expanding such acts of aggression into a world war?

Mr. GORE. I believe that is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that this was the precise theory of that great American and great general, Omar Bradley?

Mr. GORE. As I recall his testimony before the committee over which I have the honor temporarily to preside, that is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, it should be a basic objective to check aggression, but to seek, if possible, to prevent the local attack from becoming a terrible world war, with all the mutual destruction which atomic warfare would create.

Mr. GORE. I believe so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. While the Senator from Tennessee would not tie the hands of the Government in the slightest degree as regards airpower or atomic energy, what he is saying is that we should not throw away the defense of the Army and the Marine Corps—the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

defense which ground troops permit us to use.

Mr. GORE. I say that and more. I recall, after World War I, the course which this Nation took. I recall the pressures under which actions were taken. I recall the tragedy which ensued. I recall also the tragic course of events after World War II, to which I have already made reference, and which resulted in the great tragedy of Korea. Yes; I am saying what the distinguished Senator says, and more.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may come out of the field of military and diplomatic strategy into a very homely illustration, is it not a fairly good rule of the game of cards known as poker that one should not throw away a pair of aces in order to try to draw for a flush?

Mr. GORE. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has touched upon a subject with which I am wholly unacquainted. [Laughter.] As a loyal member of the Southern Baptist Church, far be it from me to have any acquaintanceship with such an iniquitous sport.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that we have been simply discussing the inadequacy of sole reliance on the use of atomic and airpower for tactical purposes, against troops immediately taking the aggressive and opposing the forces of the free world? But is it not also true that there is apparently in the mind of the Secretary retaliatory strategic bombing, striking at the nerve center of the opposing forces?

Mr. GORE. I believe the distinguished Senator has asked a penetrating question, which requires an affirmative answer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Tennessee say what would be the probable effect upon the loyalties and sympathies of the brown, yellow, and black peoples of the world if, in reprisal for an attack by the Chinese, let us say, in Indochina, we were to bomb Peking? And if white people were to drop bombs which would kill millions of yellow people, what effect would that have upon the people of India, the Malay Peninsula, and Africa?

Mr. GORE. The Senator's penetrating questions prompt me to repeat what I said nearly 3 years ago. After concluding a long series of hearings on the atomic energy program I reached the conclusion, and publicly stated, that I doubted that another atomic bomb would ever be dropped on any other city of the world. We may resort to strategic use, but I still doubt that another atomic bomb or a hydrogen bomb will ever be dropped on an American, Russian, or Communist city. If that be true, then where is the policy? If the negotiations looking toward eventual outlawing of atomic weapons, which I understand are now in the preliminary stages, are successful, where are we left with chief reliance upon a certain weapon, with our ground forces drastically reduced and withdrawn?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that last year the present administration cut our forces by approximately 6 or 7 percent, from something over 3,500,000 to something over 3,300,000?

Mr. GORE. I am not sure as to the correctness of the figures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think those figures are approximately correct. Is it not true that the budget for the military forces for the coming year, as just announced, calls for a 10-percent reduction in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps?

Mr. GORE. As I read the budget, the Army appropriation is reduced from $14 billion to $10 billion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true, but, of course, some of that reduction is because of the fact that we are all caught up on hardware and the further fact that some of the reductions which Secretary Lovett would have put into effect anyway are now being put into effect. But apparently some of this reduction in proposed appropriations is due to the reduction in the total number of armed personnel. I believe the reduction is 10 percent for the ground forces and for the Navy.

Mr. GORE. Indeed, the reduction in manpower was announced in the President's state of the Union message, and also in the address of the Secretary of State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This will represent a reduction of 17 percent in the total number of the Armed Forces, in the space of 2 years.

Mr. GORE. Meanwhile, has the danger diminished, I ask the Senator?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee is a good Yankee when he replies to one question by asking another.

Mr. GORE. I beg the Senator's pardon. I resist that implication. I am no Yankee. I insist that the distinguished Senator from Illinois apologize.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I shall never apologize for saying that anyone is a Yankee. It is a mark of distinction, rather than the reverse.

If we may come back to friendly terms, it seems to me that with Indonesia taking Communists into the Cabinet, with the situation in Indochina deteriorating, with Nehru moving from an attitude of friendliness toward the United States, which he observed when Chester Bowles was Ambassador and Harry Truman was President, into an attitude of near hostility, the situation in Asia is far worse than it was. I cannot understand how it can be claimed under these circumstances that we have the initiative in Asia. It is well known that the situation in Italy has also been deteriorating. The junior Senator from Tennessee, I take it, is saying, in view of those conditions, this is no time to cut our own forces.

Mr. GORE. I am apprehensive of the consequences. I am pleased and complimented that the distinguished, able, and brilliant senior Senator from Illinois should contribute to the discussion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The senior Senator from Illinois has something on his conscience. He sat in the Senate last year and voted for the $5 billion cut in the Air Force. He voted for it on the solemn assurance, given by the Secretary of Defense, by the Secretary of Air, and by the administration leaders on the floor, that no combat planes would be eliminated. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], approached me several times and told me I was making a mistake. On the solemn pledge that no combat planes would be eliminated, however, I voted for the cut.

Then 6 weeks after I had voted for the cut the Secretary of Defense eliminated 736 combat planes from the program. Although they are being restored this year, and although the 137-wing program of Harry Truman is being carried out this year, it is being done only after a year's delay and after thousands of Reserves and ROTC officers have been released from the service.

So I have a little something on my conscience. I was taken in by the assurances which were given that the program would not result in any crippling of the Armed Forces. I do not believe that I should allow myself to be taken in again when the security of the United States is at stake.

I believe I should apologize to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on the floor of the Senate, as I have apologized to him at other places, for not following his word rather than the words which were given to me by others.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I shall be glad to yield in a minute. The senior Senator from Illinois has made a very moving statement, upon which he must be complimented. From his statement I can tell that he, too, holds the type of apprehension which I have expressed today.

Now, with further assurance that I have no partisan motives in my mind or in my heart today but, rather, that I have deep apprehensions, I yield to my distinguished friend, for whom I have an abiding affection and respect, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say again to the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee that in his remarks I believe he has set up a number of premises which are not justified either by the speech of the Secretary of State or by the policy of the present administration. He and those who have joined with him in the general running discussion today build up a strawman to the effect that Mr. Dulles has indicated by his speech that in the event of local aggression a hydrogen bomb would be dropped on point A, or an atomic bomb would be dropped on point B. Of course, Mr. Dulles said no such thing.

Judging by some of the discussion had on the floor today one would be led to believe that the policy of the administration was directed against local defense. I invite attention to the fact that in the Secretary's speech he said:

> Local defense will always be important. But there is no local defense which alone will contain the mighty land power of the Communist world. Local defenses must be reinforced by the further deterrent of massive retaliatory power. A potential aggressor must know that he cannot always prescribe battle conditions that suit him. Otherwise, for example, a potential aggressor, who is glutted with manpower, might be tempted to attack in confidence that resistance would be confined to manpower. He might be

tempted to attack in places where his superiority was decisive.

The way to deter aggression is for the free community to be willing and able to respond vigorously at places and with means of its own choosing.

Therefore, I point out to the Senate and to the country, as well as to the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee, that the Senator is setting up a number of premises which do not exist. I do not know whether the men in the Kremlin, as they read and study the speeches made in the Senate—as I assume they do, or at least have some of their associates do for them—will take some satisfaction from the assurance given by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee that in his judgment, at least, the atomic bomb will never be used.

Mr. GORE. Not judgment, but opinion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In his opinion, then.

Mr. GORE. On cities.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On cities. I believe that could be a dangerous assumption, because certainly a great industrial center, which was producing planes and tanks and guns, as an arsenal of the Soviet world bent on aggression, would be a legitimate target of whatever type of weapon should, in the judgment of our Joint Chiefs of Staff and the responsible officials in the Government, be used.

I would not want the men in the Kremlin to miscalculate to the extent of believing that they should have no fear of a possible strike of that kind.

Many of us on this floor who saw service in Europe during World War II saw rubble of industrial cities which had furnished the sinews of war of the Nazi armies that went forth to overcome Europe. Many such cities had been pretty much beaten into rubble. However, it took thousands of planes and the loss of thousand of pilots in order to bring about the destruction which finally brought Nazy Germany to its knees.

Today, one plane, getting through with one weapon, can do all that perhaps a thousand planes did heretofore, and do it in a way to make it impossible to rehabilitate the ruined industries. That would be true also in the other parts of the world as well. Certainly it seems to me that what the Secretary of State has pointed out——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, before he returns to a discussion of what Secretary Dulles said, I should like to reply to his interpretation of the remarks of the junior Senator from Tennessee with respect to the possible use again of atomic bombs upon civilian cities.

The junior Senator from Tennessee, after hearing a vast amount of testimony upon the possession of such a weapon of devastation by at least two powers, said he entertained serious doubts that it would again be unloosed upon women and children in population centers.

It may be that my doubts, as the distinguished Senator from California infers, are not shared by him. However, I would not proceed upon the assumption that no other power would use it if we did use it, or that such other power would resist using it if we did not possess the weapon.

I am entitled to entertain the doubt that when two great powers have the capacity to obliterate with one weapon the largest cities in each other's domain they will not be so foolhardy as to resort to such use.

I have said so earlier in my speech today, and I repeat, that the balance of terror might be sufficient to prevent global war. The doubt I have expressed is that it is sufficient to prevent local aggression.

If I may proceed a moment further, I happened to see in the course of World War II many containers of poison gas ready for use against the enemy. I know, too, as does the distinguished majority leader, that the enemy we faced in that conflict likewise possessed poison gas which could be as devastating to human life, at least, as could atomic weapons. Neither side resorted to its use. I should not like to see the United States of America place its key reliance in preventing aggression upon retaliatory attacks with poison gas. I feel the same way with respect to atomic weapons.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator——

Mr. GORE. I should like to proceed a moment further before I yield to the distinguished Senator.

He has read certain passages from the speech of the Secretary of State. I have that speech before me. I should like to read the preface to the paragraphs which the distinguished Senator read. Here is a sentence in the preface:

This can be done by placing more reliance on deterrent power and less dependence on local defensive power.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is precisely why I read the paragraphs. He said we should place more reliance upon deterrent power; but that deterrent power might be an air force with the old type of weapons; it might be, under certain circumstances, with atomic weapons; it might be, under certain circumstances, with hydrogen weapons. But the Secretary has in no case said, to borrow a phrase from the distinguished Senator from Illinois, that we would be out hunting mosquitoes with an elephant gun. There is no statement by the Secretary of State that that will be done. On the contrary, the whole effort of the Secretary of State would be to put the Soviet Union on notice so that it would not commit an act of aggression in the belief that there would be created a Yalu River behind which they could remain safe.

It is the desire of the Secretary of State, as I know it is the desire of the Senator from Tennessee, and, I think, of all 96 Senators of the United States, that never again may it be necessary for this Nation to go to war. That is certainly the hope of the American people.

Mr. GORE. I share it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But I think we are sufficiently realistic to understand that if aggression should occur and the Soviet Union took a calculated risk and believed the United States would remain disinterested or immobile, or would create some privileged sanctuary behind which it could be secure, that would be the greatest danger to the peace of the world.

It was in an effort to preserve peace and to make it unnecessary to use these weapons of great destruction that the Secretary of State, on behalf of the Government of the United States, was giving advance notice to the men in the Kremlin that they must not trespass on the dangerous ground of aggressive war of whatever type or character. I think that is basically the situation, and we must not give any assurance to the men in the Kremlin that they will remain safe behind their privileged Yalu.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, again I find more assurance in the position taken by the distinguished majority leader than I can read in the basic new policy. I would I could fully assume that in matters of policy of this magnitude the distinguished majority leader could and does speak authoritatively for the administration. I notice that the distinguished majority leader in his reply made no reference to that second part of the sentence which I quote from the Secretary of State, "and less dependence on local defensive power."

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee has anticipated my question. He has been contending throughout that we should not throw away our present strength of ground forces, but we should retain our ability to withstand local attack and add to that our air power and atomic-energy power, and not put most of our eggs into one backet. Is not that the position of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GORE. That is certainly a part of my position. Further, I am deeply apprehensive of a policy of withdrawal which I clearly perceive in this basic new policy, and I wonder what assurance we have that it does not constitute a unilateral action on the part of the United States. I wonder what effect it will have upon this grand alliance of free peoples, toward which General Eisenhower contributed so magnificently. I think this policy was arrived at without proper regard for the value of consultation with the leaders of the Congress—and I do not exclude the leaders of the Republican Party in that remark.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the announced withdrawal of two American divisions from Korea and the possible withdrawal of additional units might result, if it has not already resulted, in the withdrawal of Chinese divisions from Korea and their transfer to Indochina, so that there may be increasing danger in Indochina as a result of our policy?

Mr. GORE. I am apprehensive that that is the situation.

Mr. President, I desire to draw my address to a close, and in closing I want to make a plea and to express a hope. I plead with the administration for caution and I plead with the administration,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the leaders of my own party, and the leaders of the majority in the Senate to take every precaution to preserve the bipartisan character of this Nation's international relations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I desire to say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I think I can speak for the administration in saying that the President of the United States believes in the bipartisan policy. During the period of a few days more than a year he has been in the Presidential Office he has followed the policy of consultation relative to Korea and other matters of importance to the Nation. I think the Senator can be fully assured that in the great matters which affect not only one party or the other but the very life and security of America, there will be full consultation. By consultation I mean conferences which will take place in advance, and not be merely the calling of a group of leaders together, briefing them, and giving out a press release within a few hours after such conference takes place, as happened on some occasions in years past.

If the Senator will permit me, I should like to make one further observation. The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] suggested that this Nation was losing the valuable support of India, which we previously had under Ambassador Bowles and under President Truman.

I think I know something about India. It is a great nation, a new nation. It has problems which at times make our problems fade into insignificance. Nevertheless, I point out that when the first test came to the free world, the test of combating aggression in Korea, during the administration of Ambassador Bowles and the administration of President Truman, and the free world, through the United Nations, called upon the world community to contribute to the resistance of aggression in Korea, and 16 nations out of 60 of the United Nations responded with something less than 45,000 men, whereas the Government of the United States responded with more than 450,000 men at one time and actually rotated more than a million and a quarter men in Korea during the Korean war, the Government of India, under the policy referred to by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, contributed not a single soldier, not a single sailor, not a single airman, to aid in resisting aggression in Korea, though India has a fine and mighty army. India contributed one ambulance unit.

I say to the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois that, in my judgment, India sooner or later will have to make up her mind whether she believes in a system of collective security, and will stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of the free world, or whether she thinks she can ride out the storm in a neutralist position, waiting on the fence to see which way the struggle goes between the free world and the totalitarian world.

It is my judgment, at least, and my very deep conviction, that if the men in the Kremlin loose the forces of aggression upon the world, and if the infinitely tragic event should happen that they would overcome the armies of the free world, the choice of being a neutralized island in a totalitarian world never will be that of the people of India, or of Mr. Nehru, or of the Government of that country. They will have no more choice to occupy a neutralized, isolated island in a totalitarian world than did the people of the Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway, who had their neutrality respected by the imperial Germany of Kaiser Wilhelm II, but who were not accorded that consideration when the ruthless man of the Nazis, Hitler, determined to strike them. I say neither will India have such a choice.

So, it seems to me that at the time when the first overt act of aggression took place, India might have contributed her forces to the resistance of aggression in Korea. I think that in the series of votes in the United Nations, when we were trying to build a system of collective security, the Government of India might have voted more often with the free world, instead of having compiled the cold, hard record of voting more than 80 percent of the time with the Communist world or abstained—in the decisive votes which were taken in the United Nations.

So, I am not impressed when the distinguished Senator from Illinois tells me about the great job that was done in India by Ambassador Bowles, or by the past administration, because when the chips were down, India was not there. I say, with the deepest sincerity I possess, that I hope India may have learned a lesson. I hope that if aggression ever again breaks out in the world, India will stand on the side of freedom; that she will stand, with her very fine army, shoulder to shoulder with those who are trying to build a system of collective security; that she will recognize her responsibility in trying to build a system of international law and order, so that peace may be preserved in the world, for the benefit of mankind, including India and all other nations.

I believe India has no moral right to sit on the sidelines, to straddle the fence, so to speak, and let other nations take the risk and shed the blood of their sons, when aggression breaks forth; taking advantage of a lawful world that we are trying to create, but not being willing to assume the risks in a crisis.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee may be allowed to yield to me for a few minutes without losing his right to the floor to enable me to reply to the Senator from California, since his remarks were addressed to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield for that purpose to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GORE. I yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I find myself in agreement with much of what the Senator from California has said. I, too, am one who regretted that India did not take part more actively in the resistance to Communist aggression in Korea. I, too, feel that the contribution of one ambulance to the United Nations forces was ludicruously inadequate. I, too, was one who hoped India would recognize the fact that if Korea and the Malay Peninsula went Communist, it would probably be impossible to maintain India as a free nation. I, too, hoped that we would be able to persuade India to take a more active part. With all those points that the Senator from California has raised, I am in most hearty agreement.

What I was trying to show, however, was that under the Ambassadorship of Chester Bowles conditions in India greatly improved. Ambassador Bowles conceived of his task as being Ambassador not merely to the Indian Government but to the people of India as well. Like Mrs. Anderson, our able Ambassador to Denmark, he went directly to the people of India. He built up a great feeling of friendship on the part of large segments of the Indian people toward the American people. He demonstrated to them that the understanding and purpose of America was not world domination, but world democracy. I think it is fair to say that in the 18 months that Ambassador Bowles was in India the attitude of the Indian public and of the Indian Government toward the United States markedly improved. That improvement was not always evidenced by material, tangible acts, but it was real and decisive.

I think it is not an exaggeration to say that during the past 8 or 9 months, since Ambassador Bowles left India, the sentiment in India toward the United States has become much less friendly and much more hostile. I do not blame the present administration for that, because I know it is not possible for us alone to order conditions in every part of the world or to make all countries friendly to the United States. I merely said conditions in India had deteriorated, so far as the United States was concerned.

I shall not at the moment go into the question whether an attempt to arm Pakistan would be wise or unwise. It may be wise, although I have my doubts about it. But certainly the proposal to do so has not been treated by the Indian people as an act of friendship toward them, and is being used by agitators in India as a propaganda weapon against the United States.

I have been critical of Mr. Nehru, although he is a great soul. I have been critical of him as a statesman. But while we are condemning Mr. Nehru, as the distinguished Senator from California has just done, in a somewhat stringent tone, I think we should recognize the fact that, on the whole, the Indian general who has been in charge of the Repatriation Commission performed his task with integrity. I was skeptical of having India made the fifth and decisive nation on the Commission to decide the fate of the prisoners of war. The Senator from California may remember that last spring, on the floor

of the Senate, I spoke about the prisoner-of-war release terms and expressed my doubts. I was afraid India might be coerced by the Soviet Union to force the prisoners of war who did not wish to go back, to return against their will.

But it is simple justice to say that the Indian general behaved, on the whole, with complete integrity and complete bravery. The prisoners of war were not forced to go back. The Communists were not permitted to coerce them. The Indian general, whatever may have been the pressure placed upon him by his home government, carried out literally the exact terms of the cease-fire agreement, and has turned back the prisoners to their respective custodial groups. They have not been forced to go back to their former homes against their will.

I am certain the Senator from California, who is very patriotic, and who wishes to preserve the freedom of the world, does not wish to let himself go so far, as he has just done, in a denunciation of India, because the words he utters on the floor will be carried to India by people hostile to the United States, and will be repeated there.

It is not for me to say to the majority leader what he should say. I think his motives are good. But I think the time has come when he should be extremely careful in his choice of language.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand perfectly that what is said on the floor of the Senate may get to India or elsewhere. What I have said, as the Senator well knows, applies to that period of time when the world was confronted with the first overt act of aggression, at a time when Communist aggression was active. As the Senator knows, I had no reference to the period subsequent to the cease-fire order in Korea, when the Indian Army performed so ably. It happens that I was in Korea on the day when the first Indian troops arrived in the neutral zone. On the following day I went out to our carriers. We were lifting by helicopter the Indian troops from Inchon Harbor to the neutral zone. The Indian Army is as fine an army as there is in the world, as I am sure the Senator recognizes. General Thimayya and his officers are fine soldiers in every sense of the word. General Thimayya, himself, is a courageous man. He followed the instructions and the obligations which he had undertaken in Korea.

Those facts make me feel all the more badly that India was not prepared to contribute to resistance against aggression in Korea. I think that had the same Indian troops which I saw been in Korea during hostilities, they would have been among the stoutest allies the free world could have had. It was a great loss to the free world that India was not prepared to assume its obligation to help establish a system of collective security.

I am sure that many Members of this body, and many people throughout the United States of America, feel precisely as I do about the matter. If India better understands our feelings on the subject to a greater extent than India now does, I think that in the future, over the years, there may be built up better relationships between India and the United States. However, I do not believe that either the Government or the people of India should be allowed to assume that they are performing their full duties as citizens of the world by sitting out the difficulties in the event of aggression, and taking advantage of a collective security system for which others are building, supplying armed forces, and, if need be, shedding their blood, while India sits on the sidelines, knowing full well that if the free world wins the struggle, India will never have to spend a sleepless night, but if the free world loses, India's freedom would not last for a second.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It seems to me that the tendency of discusssions in this Chamber is to start at one point and then move to a wide variety of other points. The original purpose which I had in making reference to India was to point to the fact that the President of the United States, in his messages, and the Secretary of State, in his speeches, have implied that the foreign situation is far more favorable to the United States than it was a year ago, and that we now have the initiative in world affairs. I think it is very dangerous to lull ourselves with that belief. I should like to point out that the situation in Indonesia is far worse than it was; that the situation in Indochina is, at the very least, no better and is perhaps worse; that India, which was at one time emotionally and psychologically coming closer to our viewpoint, is now moving in the opposite direction. In view of all the foregoing facts, we would be living in a fool's paradise if we thought we could greatly reduce our ground forces, which is the particular subject of the address of the Senator from Tennessee. Perhaps this comment of mine will serve to place the recent discussion in a more relevant and enlightened setting.

Mr. GORE. I thank the two distinguished Senators for their enlightening colloquy.

I started to close my remarks a few minutes ago by expressing a hope. I made a plea for caution on the part of the administration in fields which so vitally affect the freedom of not only the United States, but of the free world; and also a plea for bipartisan cooperation.

The distinguished majority leader arose and gave assurances. Again I find comfort in the assurances given by the distinguished majority leader. The Senator said he hoped that never again would the leaders of Congress be called to the White House and read a summary or a press release about a policy which had already been decided upon. He said that such an event occurred a few years ago. Before the Senator said a few years ago, I was sure he was going to say a few weeks ago.

I express the genuine hope that my apprehensions are not well founded. I say to the distinguished majority leader that, in my private personal prayer tonight, I shall pray that my apprehensions are not well founded.

Even though the new basic policy does not bear the bipartisan label, if that be the policy, as an American I hope and pray that it succeeds; for if it fails, destruction may engulf not only America, but all mankind.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Wednesday, January 20, while the subject before the Senate was the St. Lawrence seaway, the debate was interrupted by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who discussed at great length the minority report of the Judiciary Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 1, the so-called Bricker amendment, and today the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] proceeded to discuss his proposed amendment, even though the majority leader stated that the Senate would not consider the Bricker amendment until Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. I hesitate to interrupt other business before the Senate to discuss the Bricker amendment which may be taken up by the Senate in the very near future. But I believe the action taken by the senior Senator from Nevada Wednesday leaves no other course open for me but to reply to the many erroneous comments made, and to point out the thread of fallacy that runs throughout the majority report of the Judiciary Committee on the Bricker amendment.

After the remarks of the Senator from Nevada, I felt that before we really engaged in a discussion of the proposed amendment, I should say something on the subject. I am going to place in the RECORD what I think are some very challenging questions, which, if answered when the debate begins, should determine the results. Here they are:

First. Is the Bricker amendment necessary?

Second. Is it a dangerous amendment?

Third. Does it reverse a policy which was debated and settled in the Constitutional Convention in 1787?

Fourth. Would it, if it were finally adopted, cause confusion and inefficiency in the conduct of our foreign relations by requiring State consent before many types of treaties could be concluded?

Fifth. Where does the support for this amendment come from? Does it come from groups blind to the changed world in which we are living?

Sixth. Does the literature—and I might say the proponents of the amendment have shipped carloads of it into my State—show the isolationist character of the groups which support the amendment?

Seventh. Is there any basis for the smoke screen argument that essential

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

American liberties and institutions are being abrogated by the treaty power?

Eighth. Has the Supreme Court made it clear that a treaty violating the fundamental constitutional rights of a citizen would be invalid?

Ninth. Are there constitutional safeguards against the abuse of executive power?

Tenth. Does the proposed amendment violate the doctrine of separation of powers which is fundamental to our system?

I have another question which I jotted down after listening to the Senator from Ohio.

What are the facts as to the stand of the American bar? The Senator from Ohio has said that the American bar is in favor of the Bricker amendment. I am a member of the bar. The facts are simple. Members of the bar did not have a chance to vote on the matter.

They wanted a chance to vote when the house of delegates met. The significant fact is that the lawyers who understand international law and the import of the Constitution—the bar association's section on international and comparative law—voted against the Bricker amendment. By a vote of 67 to 14 this group approved a recommendation opposing adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Then, what took place in the full house of delegates is well known. After certain weeping before the bar, the house of delegates voted 33 to 117 against the amendment, but 77 members did not vote. But the important point is that the international bar section, which studies and understands these matters, voted against it by a majority of 5 to 1.

In relation to what the Senator from Nevada said, let me observe, in the first place, that the Judiciary Committee was far from unanimous in reporting the Bricker amendment. In fact, four members of the committee signed minority views. They were: the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and myself. We did not hesitate to put our names to the minority views. The majority report I note, however, is unsigned.

The Judiciary Committee has reported the Bricker amendment by a bare two-thirds majority of the members of the committee. It now asks the Senate to give its full support to this amendment. As for myself, it seems to me that any matter so important as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States should not be acted upon unless and until an overwhelming majority of the Judiciary Committee—the body entrusted with careful study of constitutional amendments—has indicated that it believes the Constitution should thus be amended.

Mr. President, a very interesting story in connection with this matter can be told. Approximately 3 years ago the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] got out a suggested amendment. He asked various Members of the Senate to permit their names to be added to the amendment, as cosponsors. Three years ago I put my name on it. I said, "Yes; I would be glad to have it considered."

In the meantime, a well-financed campaign throughout the Nation was begun. That is another matter which should be looked into.

Then, again, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] brought forth his amendment; but not the one we are now considering. Please understand that. It was not this one—oh, no; it was not the present Bricker amendment—not at all. Again he came to me. I said, "No, John; I cannot do that."

He asked, "Why not?"

I said, "Because I really have got my eyes open, since I signed the other one. At that time you indicated that all you wanted was to have consideration of the amendment. That is what every Senator among us who put his name on the amendment put it on for. We put our names to that first proposal so it could be considered, not because we approved it."

Mr. President, I desire to make it plain in the RECORD that when a Member of the Senate attaches his name to a measure of that sort, he does not foreclose the exercise of his mind or of his judgment. I have heard Members of this body state in this Chamber, "I have to vote against my bill because now it has been amended beyond recognition."

Mr. President, what happened in the Judiciary Committee? The advocates of the amendment hung around for months. Mr. Holman came with his resolution. The various resolutions and amendments were mixed up and scrambled together. Then, without the authority of the sixty-odd endorsers of the previous measure, the names of those 60 endorsers were placed on the scrambled amendment. That is the same as saying that if I endorse your note, you can remove my endorsement from that note, and can add it to another note. That is about what happened.

Then in my State, carloads of literature condemning me as having been in favor of the amendment were circulated. What amendment, what measure? Had I been in favor of the Bricker amendment which now is to come before the Senate? No. This amendment never saw daylight until it came out as a mixture, a polyglot of ideas.

Mr. President, endorsement of such a measure by Senators who have the responsibility of preserving that which has stood for 165 years, and has made our Government the oldest government on earth, bar none, cannot be taken lightly. When we were part of the British Empire, the King of Britain had power and the House of Lords had power. Since then, that power has been taken away, and today the House of Commons has all the governmental power in Britain. It is true that some persons would like to have our House of Representatives made as powerful as the British House of Commons, but not I. In part, that is what the Bricker amendment would do, namely, give the House of Representatives a blank check. I do not favor that; I do not endorse it.

So far as the President of the United States is concerned, one can say with authority, because he has said it, that he will not compromise on principle. What does he mean? He means he will not agree to delimit the constitutional power of the Executive or to delimit the constitutional power of the Senate.

Mr. President, Senators should hesitate to vote for any measure which would take away from this august body any of the rights or power it has had for 165 years.

When the amendment was reported by the Judiciary Committee last summer, it was my strong opinion that the Congress ought to have a much wider sampling of expert legal advice, before it took any decisive and irrevocable action. I wanted to find out to what extent the authorities of our great institutions of legal education might agree with me that we should reject this amendment—this drastic, radical change in the traditional balance of powers of the constitutional system under which our Republic has grown to greatness.

Therefore, I asked the Senate Law Library to prepare a list of the deans of America's leading law schools, and I later obtained a list of professors of constitutional law. The names were selected without any indication of why they were sought. I had no way of knowing in advance what opinions would be expressed. I sent these deans and law professors the text of the Bricker amendment, as it was reported from the Judiciary Committee; and I enclosed the committee report and the minority views. My cover letter was impartial. I simply asked the experts for their comments. A few unsolicited letters also came in from other deans and professors of law.

Through the kindness of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, a committee print has been made of my letter and those which I received from the specialists. I hope all Senators will take a look at the replies. Every one was printed in full. My colleagues will find 1 brief letter on behalf of the amendment and 26—yes, 26—against it—26 to 1. As I recall, all of the 26 said, in substance, that the course proposed by the Bricker amendment was not the course to be followed, that it was not the thing to do, that it was dangerous, and they said why that is so.

I realize that this total number of replies is comparatively small. But it does show the thinking of those who cared enough about this momentous question to write and express their views. The replies we received came from every part of the country. Here are a few of the comments:

The dean of law of my own State university in Wisconsin says the amendment would "adversely affect the interests of the American people."

Down South, at Tulane, the law dean makes the point that "it would certainly be inadvisable to modify the Constitution every time we have some temporary fear."

At Northwestern the dean of the law school writes that "this amendment would turn its back upon all that the Founding Fathers and history have taught us."

The Notre Dame dean of law wrote, condemning the backers of the amendment. He said their "talk about saving the Bill of Rights is just so much campaign oratory."

At Harvard the dean of the law school says:

> The national safeguards against mistakes in our foreign policy should remain where they were placed in 1789. The faith of our fathers in this area may well serve us as a sound example.

The law dean at Virginia believes that the proposed amendment—

> would have the effect of crippling the United States in its international relations at a time when the United States must be a leader * * * able to act quickly if it is to act effectively.

Mr. President, these are the considered, written judgments of legal authorities—men not given to extreme pronouncements. They are obviously deeply aroused over this proposed amendment.

PROPAGANDA FOR SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Mr. President, I had to laugh, the other day, when the Senator from Nevada complained of the stepped-up propaganda efforts against S. J. Res. 1. He pointed out the high proportion of famous left-wingers and anti-anti-Communists on this committee. Thank God, that is not true, Mr. President. Do they include the learned deans whom I have just quoted? Let us take a look at the sponsors of the Committee for Defense of the Constitution to which he presumably referred. Of course I heard the distinguished Senator say today that we did not want any personalities to be involved in this matter. The national chairman is Edward S. Corwin—the very man charged by the Congress with preparing the official commentary on the United States Constitution. One of the principal sponsors of the committee is the Honorable John W. Davis—the Democratic candidate for President of the United States in 1924, and the man who successfully argued the recent steel case before the United States Supreme Court. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, one of our great American military commanders, is also a sponsor of this committee. I was glad, today, to hear the distinguished majority leader state what kind of a man General Clay is and what he has done—and of course all of us know that. On the other hand, of course General Clay should not know anything about the Constitution.

Other sponsors include such alleged left-wingers as Owen J. Roberts, former Justice of the United States Supreme Court; the Honorable Elihu Root, Jr.; and the Honorable Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of directors of General Electric. It does not strike me, offhand, that these are United States citizens who can properly be referred to as left-wingers or pro-Communist in their point of view.

Mr. President, I do not want to spend time today, however, in discussing all of the weighty arguments against approval of Senate Joint Resolution 1. I would like, instead, to show some of the fallacies that run throughout the majority report of the Judiciary Committee.

I would like, one by one, to comment on some of the many erroneous remarks made in the majority report of the Judiciary Committee.

RETURN TO ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION

In commenting on the necessity of a constitutional amendment which provides that a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution shall be of no force or effect, the majority report—page 3—quotes Patrick Henry as stating in 1788 that—

> If treaties are made, infringing our liberties, it will be too late to say that our constitutional rights are violated.

Patrick Henry was a great patriot. He was also one of the most vociferous opponents of the document drafted in Philadelphia and adopted by the Thirteen Colonies as the Constitution of the United States. He and a few like-minded persons had numerous fears concerning the Constitution. As history has proved, their fears were unwarranted and the world should be undyingly grateful to the more far-seeing statesmen of the day who insisted upon a strong Federal Government.

As a matter of fact it was dissatisfaction with the loose treaty power of the Articles of Confederation that was one of the principal reasons which led to the drafting of the new Constitution. At the Virginia ratifying convention, where Patrick Henry expressed the fear of treaties infringing our liberties, such statesmen as James Madison and Governor Randolph, in answer to the fears of the doubters, urged that the combination of President and Senate afforded adequate safeguards, that it was necessary to make treaties the supreme law, that it was impossible to define the subjects to which treaties could relate, but that a treaty could not destroy the Constitution, or be repugnant to its spirit.

A TREATY CANNOT SUPERSEDE THE CONSTITUTION

One further question which was asked and debated was whether or not a treaty can supersede the Constitution. I say that it cannot. The authorities are very clear.

The majority report—pages 3 to 8—cites dicta in a number of cases to show that the Supreme Court is ready at a moment's notice to rule that a treaty can amend the Constitution or enlarge the scope of authority of the Federal Government.

There are no Supreme Court holdings directly in point. There are no dicta whatever that would lead to the conclusion that a treaty provision can override a constitutional provision. All of the dicta are exactly to the contrary. No action has been taken by the Supreme Court to shake the confidence of an objective lawyer. It is true that at any time the Supreme Court might change its mind on any issue, but there is no indication whatever that the Court intends to reverse itself on the old and accepted doctrine that the Constitution is superior to treaties.

It is true that the subject matter of treaties has widened over the decades. However, this broadening has been the result of enormous changes in technology which have so greatly shrunken the world. A treaty to control atomic weapons, with its attendant restrictions on certain fields of traditionally domestic endeavor in all countries, not only would have been unnecessary 10 or 20 years ago, it would also not have even been considered. It is possible that an effective scheme of atomic control might require international ownership of atomic facilities. If we are to have hope of not being blown to bits, we may find it necessary to conclude a treaty concerning activities which might traditionally be called domestic.

We must not forego the chance of survival.

MISSOURI AGAINST HOLLAND

The case of Missouri against Holland is a case about which we shall hear a great deal more as we go through this debate. There are none so blind as those who will not see, and those who read legal opinions and mix up the law and the dicta, exchanging the dicta for the law. The courts take cognizance of such procedure. I have done it inadvertently before the Supreme Court, and I was told where to get off.

The report of the majority—page 4—suggests that Mr. Justice Holmes, one of our greatest Justices, indicated in the case of Missouri against Holland that the treatymaking power is a Trojan horse making it possible for the Federal Government to do things by a treaty which it could not do by domestic legislation.

Before deciding whether Justice Holmes' opinion in Missouri against Holland gives any ground for this fear, it might be well to see exactly what Justice Holmes said in that opinion:

> Acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States. It is open to question whether the authority of the United States means more than the formal acts prescribed to make the convention. We do not mean to imply that there are no qualifications to the treatymaking power; but they must be ascertained in a different way. It is obvious that there may be matters of the sharpest exigency for the national well-being that an act of Congress could not deal with, but that a treaty followed by such an act could, and it is not lightly to be assumed that, in matters requiring national action, a power which must belong to and somewhere reside in every civilized government, is not to be found. *Andrews* v. *Andrews* (188 U. S. 14).
>
> * * * * *
>
> The treaty in question does not contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution. The only question is whether it is forbidden by some invisible radiation from the general terms of the 10th amendment. We must consider what this country has become in deciding what that amendment has reserved.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Here a national interest of very nearly the first magnitude is involved. It can be protected only by national action in concert with that of another power. The subject matter is only transitory within the State, and has no permanent habitat therein. But for the treaty and the statute, there soon might be no birds for any powers to deal with. We see nothing in the Constitution that compels the Government to sit by while a food supply is cut off and the protectors of our forests and of our crops are destroyed. It is not sufficient to rely upon the States. The reliance is vain, and were it otherwise, the question is whether the United States is forbidden to act. We are of the opinion that the treaty and statute must be upheld.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Justice Holmes' opinion was dissented from by only two of the Justices on the Court. The Court's thesis that the treatymaking power of the Federal Government is not subject to the limitations of the 10th amendment is a perfectly reasonable one. As Justice Holmes explains in his opinion, to limit the treatymaking power in such a way would create a vacuum of power unknown to modern civilized states. The individual States of the Union are specifically forbidden by the Constitution to conclude treaties with foreign nations. If the Federal Government were inhibited, the United States as a whole would be a seriously handicapped nation in relation to other sovereign nations.

Mr. Justice Holmes says that—

It is open to question whether the authority of the United States means more than the formal acts prescribed to make the convention.

The fact of the matter is that there is a perfectly simple explanation for the difference in language in the Constitution as to "laws" and "treaties." At the time the Constitution was drafted, there could have been no laws previously enacted by Congress, since Congress had not yet been established. Hence it was adequate to specify as supreme "laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance" of the Constitution. However, prior to the adoption of the Constitution, the United States had concluded certain treaties with foreign states. It could not be said that these had been concluded "in pursuance of" a nonexistent Constitution. Yet the framers of the Constitution wished to preserve these treaties as valid international agreements. Hence they used the term "treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States." This was the only reason for the difference of language. As the Supreme Court has repeatedly shown, there was no intent to make either laws or treaties superior to the Constitution.

THE CURTISS-WRIGHT CASE

The majority report—pages 4 and 5—refers to the Curtiss-Wright case as authority for the proposition that the treatymaking power is an inherent power vested in the Federal Government as an attribute of sovereignty.

In regard to the Curtiss-Wright case, one should note at least three things:

First. There is an implication that the theorem that the treatymaking power is not a delegated power but an inherent power of the sovereign Federal Government is a new and novel theorem. This is entirely misleading. As early as 1795 the Supreme Court clearly stated that the various States never possessed the treatymaking power and that the Federal Government possessed it as an attribute of sovereignty. The following quotation is from *Penhollow* v. *Doane* (3 Dall. 54, at 81 U. S. Supreme Court, 1795):

The truth is that the States, individually, were not known nor recognized as sovereign, by foreign nations, nor are they now; the States collectively, under Congress, as the connecting point, or head, were acknowledged by foreign powers as sovereign, particularly in that acceptation of the term, which is applicable to all great national concerns, and in the exercise of which other sovereigns would be more immediately interested; such, for instance, as the rights of war and peace, of making treaties, and sending and receiving Ambassadors.

Second. The evidence adduced by the Supreme Court in such cases as Penhollow against Doane and United States against Curtiss-Wright and by the writers on the subject points to the correctness of the theory that the several States never possessed the treatymaking power and hence could not have delegated it to the Federal Government.

Third. As to the immediate question of limitations upon the treatymaking power, the theories of the source of the power as discussed in the Curtiss-Wright case are irrelevant. What is relevant is the reiteration by the Supreme Court that the power to make treaties is subject to constitutional limitations. The key sentence in that case, and the one that is obviously ignored by the proponents of the Bricker resolution, is as follows:

It is important to bear in mind that we are here dealing not alone with an authority vested in the President by an exertion of legislative power, but with such an authority plus the very delicate, plenary, and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations—a power which does not require as a basis of its exercise an act of Congress, but which, of course, like every other governmental power, must be exercised in subordination of the applicable provisions of the Constitution.

This dictum would seem to strengthen by reiteration the previous dicta that treaties must conform to the Constitution or be invalid. It is difficult, if not impossible, to see how it tends to put the previous dicta in doubt.

THE STEEL SEIZURE CASE

The majority report—page 5—then refers to the dissent in the Steel Seizure case, noting that three Justices in that case seemed to find authority for the seizure of a whole industry in the obligation of the President to carry into effect certain treaties and acts of the Congress.

The statement regarding the Steel Seizure case is purely a statement of opinion and not of fact. The statement that the dissenters in that case felt that the President's right to seize the mills depended on treaties and legislation implementing treaties is categorically rejected by no less a lawyer than Attorney General Herbert Brownell. He clearly pointed out that the dissenting Justices based their conclusions on an inherent right of the President. During the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1, General Brownell spoke as follows:

It is, therefore, fairly clear that, whatever one's views may be on the merits of the dissent, and you will remember I said before this committee that I did not agree with the dissent on the merits, certainly, it rests on the view that the President's alleged power to seize the steel mills arose from his duty to execute the legislative programs of the Congress and not from any implication that any treaty gave the President power to seize private property. The adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 or Senate Joint Resolution 43 would not increase or diminish the chances that the minority's holding might some day become the majority holdings.

UNITED NATIONS TREATIES

The majority report—page 5—states, and I quote:

The United Nations, and its affiliated agencies, have drafted, and are now in the process of drafting, covenants, and conventions to be submitted for ratification as treaties which seek to regulate internationally almost every conceivable facet of American life.

The important words here are "have drafted, and are now in the process of drafting." The number of treaties drafted has no relevance whatsoever. It is only the number and content of those signed and ratified that is of importance. There is no indication that either the President or the Senate is liable to cease to be a bulwark against undesirable treaties. In the past there have been many treaties which have been drafted with United States participation but which have not been signed by the United States. In addition, the Senate has refused to give its advice and consent to the ratification of many treaties which have been signed by the United States. Others have been ratified only with extensive reservations.

The oft-repeated but never-substantiated statement that over 200 treaties are in preparation in the United Nations or its affiliated agencies is, of course, given credence in the majority report—page 5. A recent check by the Department of State shows a total of only 13 treaties in preparation in the United Nations and its specialized agencies—letter of Assistant Secretary Thruston B. Morton to Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, dated June 12, 1953. It is suspected that the alleged 200 treaties are in the main International Labor Organization—or ILO—documents. These documents, for the most part, are not considering treaties by this Government and are not submitted to the Senate. When concluded, they are brought to the attention of Congress, and, when appropriate, to the attention of the various States for whatever action may be deemed appropriate. During the last 20 years the Senate has acted on only 10 ILO conventions, out of 23 submitted to the Senate for advice and consent and 59 drawn up by the ILO.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a statement about the treaties that have been negotiated by the ILO which shows that only four such conventions are now in effect with respect to the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

A. UNITED STATES MEMBERSHIP IN THE ILO

Instrument	Date of United States acceptance	Authorization
Original ILO constitution (1919).	Aug. 20, 1934	Public Res. No. 43, 72d Cong. (48 Stat. 1182).
Revised ILO constitution (1946).	Aug. 2, 1948	Public Law 843, 80th Cong. (62 Stat. 1151).

B. NUMBER OF ILO CONVENTIONS

Total number	103
Number since United States became member	59
Number sent to Congress for possible legislative action	31
Number sent to Senate as treaties	23
Number not yet submitted to Congress or Senate	5

C. NUMBER OF ILO CONVENTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE SENATE AS TREATIES—23

No. 53. Officers' Competency Certificates Convention, 1936.

No. 54. Holidays with Pay (Sea) Convention, 1936.

No. 55. Shipowners' Liability (Sick and Injured Seamen) Convention, 1936.

No. 56. Sickness Insurance (Sea) Convention, 1936. (NOTE.—Advice and consent to ratification requested on a contingent basis only.)

No. 57. Hours of Work and Manning (Sea) Convention, 1936.

No. 58. Minimum Age (Sea) Convention (Revised), 1936.

No. 61. Reduction of Hours of Work (Textiles) Convention, 1937.

No. 63. Statistics of Wages and Hours of Work Convention, 1938.

No. 68. Food and Catering (Ships' Crews) Convention, 1946.

No. 69. Certification of Ships' Cooks Convention, 1946.

No. 70. Social Security (Seafarers) Convention, 1946.

No. 71. Seafarers' Pensions Convention, 1946. (NOTE.—Advice and consent to ratification not requested.)

No. 72. Paid Vacations (Seafarers) Convention, 1946. (NOTE.—Advice and consent to ratification requested on a contingent basis only.)

No. 73. Medical Examination (Seafarers) Convention, 1946.

No. 74. Certification of Able Seamen Convention, 1946.

No. 75. Accommodation of Crews Convention, 1946.

No. 76. Wages, Hours of Work, and Manning (Sea) Convention, 1946.

No. 80. Final Articles Revision Convention, 1946.

No. 87. Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right To Organize Convention, 1948.

No. 88. Employment Service Convention, 1948.

No. 91. Paid Vacations (Seafarers) Convention (Revised), 1949. (NOTE.—Advice and consent to ratification not requested.)

No. 92. Accommodation of Crews Convention (Revised), 1949. (NOTE.—Advice and consent to ratification not requested.)

No. 93. Wages, Hours of Work, and Manning (Sea) Convention (Revised), 1949.

D. NUMBER OF ILO CONVENTIONS APPROVED BY SENATE—10

No. 53. Officers' Competency Certificates Convention, 1936. (NOTE.—Approved subject to understandings defining "vessels registered in a territory," defining "maritime navigation," safeguarding right of United States authorities to inspect and detain vessels violating convention, and excluding Philippine Islands and Panama Canal Zone from application of convention.)

No. 54. Holidays With Pay (Sea) Convention, 1936. (NOTE.—Approved subject to understandings defining "vessels registered in a territory" and excluding Philipine Islands and Panama Canal Zone from application of convention.)

No. 55. Shipowners' Liability (Sick and Injured Seamen) Convention, 1936. (NOTE.—Approved subject to understandings defining "vessels registered in a territory," defining "maritime navigation," and excluding Philippine Islands and Panama Canal Zone from application of convention.)

No. 57. Hours of Work and Manning (Sea) Convention, 1936. (NOTE.—Approved subject to understandings defining "vessels registered in a territory," safeguarding right of United States authorities to inspect and detain vessels violating convention, and excluding Philippine Islands and Panama Canal Zone from application of convention.)

No. 58. Minimum Age (Sea) Convention (Revised), 1936. (NOTE.—Approved subject to understandings defining "maritime navigation" and excluding Philippine Islands and Panama Canal Zone from application of convention.)

No. 68. Food and Catering (Ships' Crews) Convention, 1946. (NOTE.—Approved subject to understanding defining "seagoing vessel.")

No. 69. Certification of Ships' Cooks Convention, 1946. (NOTE.—Approved subject to understanding defining "seagoing vessel.")

No. 73. Medical Examination (Seafarers) Convention, 1946. (NOTE.—Approved subject to understanding defining "seagoing vessel.")

No. 74. Certification of Able Seamen Convention, 1946. (NOTE.—Approved subject to understandings defining "seagoing vessel" and providing that seamen considered as holding an intermediate rating are to be considered outside the terms of the convention.)

No. 80. Final Articles Revision Convention, 1946.

E. NUMBER OF ILO CONVENTIONS RATIFIED BY THE PRESIDENT—7

No. 53. Officers' Competency Certificates Convention, 1936.

No. 54. Holidays With Pay (Sea) Convention, 1936.

No. 55. Shipowners' Liability (Sick and Injured Seamen) Convention, 1936.

No. 57. Hours of Work and Manning (Sea) Convention, 1936.

No. 58. Minimum Age (Sea) Convention (Revised), 1936.

No. 74. Certification of Able Seamen Convention, 1946. (NOTE.—Convention No. 74—Certification of Able Seamen, 1946—will enter into force for the United States 12 months after the date on which the United States certification is registered with the ILO. (Registered April 9, 1953; will enter into force April 9, 1954).)

No. 80. Final Articles Revision Convention, 1946.

F. NUMBER OF ILO CONVENTIONS IN FORCE FOR THE UNITED STATES—4

No. 53. Officers' Competency Certificates Convention, 1936.

No. 55. Shipowners' Liability (Sick and Injured Seamen) Convention, 1936.

No. 58. Minimum Age (Sea) Convention (Revised), 1936.

No. 80. Final Articles Revision Convention, 1946.

G. ANNEX

Provisions of ILO Constitution requiring submission of conventions to appropriate authorities.

ANNEX

PROVISIONS OF ILO CONSTITUTION REQUIRING SUBMISSION OF CONVENTIONS TO APPROPRIATE AUTHORITIES

Article 19

* * * * *

5. In the case of a convention—

(a) The convention will be communicated to all members for ratification.

(b) Each of the members undertakes that it will, within the period of 1 year at most from the closing of the session of the conference, or if it is impossible owing to exceptional circumstances to do so within the period of 1 year, then at the earliest practicable moment and in no case later than 18 months from the closing of the session of the conference, bring the convention before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action.

(c) Members shall inform the Director General of the International Labor Office of the measures taken in accordance with this article to bring the convention before the said competent authority or authorities, with particulars of the authority or authorities regarded as competent, and of the action taken by them.

(d) If the member obtains the consent of the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, it will communicate the formal ratification of the convention to the Director General and will take such action as may be necessary to make effective the provisions of such convention.

(e) If the member does not obtain the consent of the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, no further obligation shall rest upon the member except that it shall report to the Director General of the International Labor Office, at appropriate intervals as requested by the governing body, the position of its law and practice in regard to the matters dealt with in the convention, showing the extent to which effect has been given, or is proposed to be given, to any of the provisions of the convention by legislation, administrative action, collective agreement or otherwise and stating the difficulties which prevent or delay the ratification of such convention.

6. In the case of a recommendation—

(a) The recommendation will be communicated to all members for their consideration with a view to effect being given to it by national legislation or otherwise.

(b) Each of the members undertakes that it will, within a period of 1 year at most from the closing of the session of the conference, or, if it is impossible owing to exceptional circumstances to do so within the period of 1 year, then at the earliest practicable moment, and in no case later than 18 months after the closing of the conference, bring the recommendation before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies for the enactment of legislation or other action.

(c) The members shall inform the Director-General of the International Labor Office of the measures taken in accordance with this article to bring the recommendation before the said competent authority or authorities with particulars of the authority or authorities regarded as competent and of the action taken by them.

(d) Apart from bringing the recommendation before the said competent authority or authorities, no further obligation shall rest upon the members, except that they shall report to the Director-General of the International Labor Office, at appropriate intervals as requested by the governing body, the position of the law and practice in their country in regard to the matters dealt with in the recommendation, showing the extent to which effect has been given, or is proposed to be given, to the provisions of the recommendation and such modifications of these provisions as it has been found or may be found necessary to make in adopting or applying them.

7. In the case of a federal state, the following provisions shall apply:

(a) In respect of conventions and recommendations which the federal government regards as appropriate under its constitutional system for federal action, the obligations of the federal state shall be the same as those of members which are not federal states.

(b) In respect of conventions and recommendations which the federal government regards as appropriate under its constitutional system, in whole or in part, for action by the constituent states, provinces, or can-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tions rather than for federal action, the federal government shall—

(i) make, in accordance with its constitution and the constitutions of the states, provinces, or cantons concerned, effective arrangements for the reference of such conventions and recommendations not later than 18 months from the closing of the sessions of the conference to the appropriate federal, state, provincial, or cantonal authorities for the enactment of legislation or other action;

(ii) arrange, subject to the concurrence of the state, provincial, or cantonal governments concerned, for periodical consultations between the federal and the state, provincial, or cantonal authorities with a view to promoting within the federal state coordinated action to give effect to the provisions of such conventions and recommendations;

(iii) inform the Director General of the International Labor Office of the measures taken in accordance with this article to bring such conventions and recommendations before the appropriate federal, state, provincial, or cantonal authorities with particulars of the authorities regarded as appropriate and of the action taken by them;

(iv) in respect of each such convention which it has not ratified, report to the Director General of the International Labor Office, at appropriate intervals as requested by the governing body, the position of the law and practice of the federation and its constituent states, provinces or cantons in regard to the convention, showing the extent to which effect has been given, or is proposed to be given, to any of the provisions of the convention by legislation, administrative action, collective agreement, or otherwise; and

(v) in respect of such recommendation, report to the Director General of the International Labor Office, at appropriate intervals as requested by the governing body, the position of the law and practice of the federation and its constituent states, provinces, or cantons in regard to the recommendation, showing the extent to which effect has been given, or is proposed to be given, to the provisions of the recommendation and such modifications of these provisions as have been found or may be found necessary in adopting or applying them.

8. In no case shall the adoption of any convention or recommendation by the conference, or the ratification or any convention by any member, be deemed to affect any law, award, custom, or agreement which insures more favorable conditions to the workers concerned than those provided for in the convention or recommendation.

DECEMBER 1953.

Mr. WILEY. The important thing is not how many treaties are drafted, but how many and what kind are signed and ratified by the United States. The proponents are unable to point to a single treaty which has been signed and ratified by the United States and under which "other contracting nations would be given the right to interfere in matters which are essentially local in character." Despite innumerable undesirable treaties drafted in the past, the President and Senate have always refused to make us a party to them. There is no reason to think they will fail us in the future merely because there may be undesirable treaties drafted. No constitutional amendment is necessary to protect us.

In regard to the future course of conduct of the executive branch, Secretary of State Dulles made the following statement in the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1, page 825:

There has been a reversal of the trend toward trying to use the treatymaking power to effect internal social changes. This administration is committed to the exercise of the treatymaking power only within traditional limits. By "traditional" I do not mean to imply that the boundary between domestic and international concerns is rigid and fixed for all time. I do mean that treaties are contracts with foreign governments designed to promote the interests of our Nation by securing action by others in a way deemed advantageous to us. I do not believe that treaties should, or lawfully can, be used as a device to circumvent the constitutional procedures established in relation to what are essentially matters of domestic concern.

* * * * *

Therefore, while we shall not withhold our counsel from those who seek to draft a treaty or covenant on human rights, we do not ourselves look upon a treaty as the means which we would now select as the proper and most effective way to spread throughout the world the goals of human liberty to which this Nation has been dedicated since its inception. We, therefore, do not intend to become a party to any such covenant or present it as a treaty for consideration by the Senate.

This administration does not intend to sign the convention on political rights of women. * * *

These same principles will guide our action in other fields which have been suggested by some as fields for multilateral treaties.

As stated above, the United States does not intend becoming a party to the covenant on human rights. During the early drafting stages of the covenant, the United States made it clear that we could never become a party without the inclusion in the covenant of a non-self-executing clause and a federal-state clause. These clauses would have protected us from the pictured dangers.

THE NON-SELF-EXECUTING CLAUSE

The report of the majority of the Judiciary Committee—at page 9—notes in support of section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 that a recent decision of a lower court—a California district court of appeal—states that articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter relative to human rights were "self-executing and for that reason invalidated certain State laws." It uses this opinion to buttress the proposition that no treaty should have domestic effect unless and until there has been domestic legislation implementing the treaty.

The opinion cited has been overruled by the California Supreme Court on this point. In fact, the lower court opinion does not even appear in the permanent California Reports.

The correctness of the lower court ruling was discussed in an article in the Federal Bar Journal of December 1952. The article points out that the Supreme Court of California not only did not accept the theory of the district court of appeals that articles 55 and 56 of the charter were self-executing, but the court specifically held that the articles were non-self-executing and that the alien land law was unconstitutional under the 14th amendment.

The article in the Federal Bar Journal contains statements which I ask unanimous consent to insert in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The case of *Fujii* v. *the State of California* has caused widespread interest throughout the country. This interest is due at least in part to the fact that the case will have considerable effect on both constitutional and international law. By its decision of April 17, 1952,[1] the Supreme Court of California invalidated the California alien land law as being unconstitutional under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. The court rejected the reasoning of the lower court[2] that the law had been invalidated because of the human rights provisions in the United Nations Charter.

The Supreme Court of California held that the alien land law was invalid under the 14th amendment to the United States Constitution. Although the California Supreme Court split 4 to 3 on the issue of the constitutionality of the law under the 14th amendment, the court was unanimous in saying that the human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter were non-self-executing and therefore did not operate to invalidate State laws. Chief Justice Gibson, speaking for three members of the court, said that it could not be disputed that the United Nations Charter is a treaty, and as such, under article VI of the United States Constitution, is the supreme law of the land. He pointed out, however, that a treaty "does not automatically supersede local laws which are inconsistent with it unless the treaty provisions are self-executing." He then proceeded to show that articles 55 and 56, the human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter, were neither intended to be, nor in fact were, self-executing. The opinion concluded by saying that "the Charter provisions relied on by the plaintiff were not intended to supersede existing domestic legislation, and we cannot hold that they operate to invalidate the alien land law."[3]

In his comments on the Fujii opinion, Mr. Holman assigns great significance to the sentence in the opinion of Chief Justice Gibson which says that courts must give respectful consideration to the humane and enlightened objectives of the United Nations Charter. Mr. Holman makes clear that in his view this undoes the conclusion of the California Supreme Court that articles 55 and 56 of the charter are non-self-executing. He also seems to imply that there is something insidious about the process of reevaluating the constitutionality of the alien land law as of 1952. With no reference to the United Nations—and indeed long before the United Nations was ever dreamt of—it has been an an accepted rule that the constitutionality of a particular type of statute is not determined once and for all by a decision upholding it. The question of equal protection of the laws is not a static one. Equal protection of the laws represents a set of values which have been accepted in relation to the circumstances of contemporary life * * *.

It is interesting to note the two following quotations from Justice Carter's concurring opinion in *Perez* v. *Lippold*. The first quote precedes that referred to by Mr. Holman; the second follows it:

"It is my considered opinion that the statutes here involved (secs. 60, 69, Civil Code)

---

[1] 242 Pac. (2d) 617.

[2] 217 Pac. (2d) 481.

[3] 242 Pac. (2d) 617, at 622; Justice Schauer, speaking for the three dissenting justices, said at p. 650: "I agree that the United Nations Charter, as presently constituted and accepted, was not intended to, and does not, supersede existing domestic legislation of the United States or of the several States and Territories."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

are the product of ignorance, prejudice, and intolerance, and I am happy to join in the decision of this court holding that they are invalid and unenforceable. This decision is in harmony with the declarations contained in the Declaration of Independence which are guaranteed by the Bill of Rights and the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and reaffirmed by the Charter of the United Nations, United States Code Congressional Service, 1945, p. 964, that all human beings have equal rights regardless of race, color, or creed, and that the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness is inalienable and may not be infringed because of race, color, or creed" (198 P. 2d 17, at 29).

"It is my position that the statutes now before us never were constitutional. When first enacted they violated the supreme law of the land as found in the Declaration of Independence. It is further my position that the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States invalidated the statutes here involved" (198 P. 2d 17, at 32).

It is also interesting to note that neither the opinion of the court nor that of the dissenting justices even mentioned the United Nations Charter.

Mr. WILEY. Incidentally, the Attorney General of California announced that he would not seek review in the United States Supreme Court. He said that he was in accord with the legal conclusions of the Supreme Court of California. No review was ever sought and the opinion of the district court of appeal is of no legal force or effect.

The Department of State and the Department of Justice have both concluded that articles 55 and 56 of the U. N. Charter are not self-executing. For the official position of the Department of State see letter to the Attorney General from Ernest A. Gross, the Legal Adviser of the Department of State, November 4, 1947, reproduced in part in volume 36, Virginia Law Review, page 1080. The Justice Department made its position clear in its brief amicus curiae in *Shelley* v. *Kraemer* (334 U. S. 1 (1948)).

Except for an overruled decision by a California court, an unrecorded and unappealed ruling by a judge on a lower Idaho court, and the views of a law professor in Iowa, there is no evidence to support the interpretation that articles 55 and 56 are self-executing. On the other side of the question are the views of almost all of the legal commentators on the subject and the unanimous opinion of all of the judges of the California State Supreme Court which has passed on the question. The question has never arisen in, or been appealed to, the Federal courts.

RATIFICATION AND IMPLEMENTING OF TREATIES

The majority report—on page 10—makes the charge that—

The United States is one of the few nations of the world where a treaty becomes domestic law of the land immediately upon ratification.

It cites as its only authority in that respect a compilation of constitutional provisions concerning the treatymaking power, introduced into the record by Prof. George Finch.

The statement is incorrect even as to the United States. Many treaties by their own terms require action by Congress to give them effect and, of course, all treaties require approval of two-thirds of the Senate before they can be ratified.

As to other nations, the majority report reveals lack of familiarity with foreign practice and exclusive reliance on the formal texts of foreign constitutions.

For example, the British Commonwealth of Nations is cited. I quote:

Until * * * legislation is adopted, the treaty is merely an international agreement which is not binding on the courts of the British Commonwealth in the determination of domestic rights.

One might conclude that the British normally undertake binding international commitments and then decide afterwards whether they will abide by them. This is far from the truth.

It is now the practice in Great Britain and other commonwealth countries to secure necessary legislation prior to ratification of a treaty. Actually, treaties in those countries are ordinarily self-executing by reason of advance legislation, even in cases where the same treaties in the United States might be non-self-executing.

Contrary to the charge made in the majority report—page 10—it is difficult to find a single important country of the world where a treaty does not become domestic law immediately upon entry into force. France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Switzerland, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the various South American countries follow treatymaking procedures which make treaties effective as domestic law upon entry into force.

In France treaties are self-executing by the terms of the 1946 constitution. In the event of conflict with a law, the treaty takes priority regardless of whether the law was enacted before or after the treaty.

In Belgium certain treaties require approval by Parliament. In those cases, the same law which approves ratification gives the treaty internal effect.

In the Netherlands a treaty must be aproved by the States-General before ratification. No legislative action is required by the constitution to make a treaty part of the domestic law. However, legislation approving the treaty in the form of a law is customarily enacted before ratification.

In Italy certain types of treaties must be approved by the legislature before ratification, but there are no specific rules regarding integration of the treaty into domestic law. In actual practice, a law called an order of execution is enacted before ratification if domestic law is to be adapted to the treaty. As a result, treaties are self-executing upon entry into force.

In Switzerland, treaties are approved by the legislature prior to ratification. They are self-executing. If a treaty conflicts with Swiss law, it is the treaty which prevails in Swiss jurisprudence, even when the conflicting law comes later.

In the Federal Republic of Germany treaties are self-executing and prevail over contrary federal and state—Laender—legislation under the 1949 constitution. Treaties are approved by the legislature prior to ratification.

In most South American countries treaties, upon entry into force, become part of the internal law and are so applied. Where approval by one or both houses of the legislature is required, such approval must precede ratification. Argentina and Mexico by their constitutions make treaties the law of the land. In some countries, for example, Brazil, promulgation gives a treaty domestic effect. In several others, the constitution contains no express provision on the subject but the courts recognize treaties as making domestic law—see Proceedings of the American Society of International Law, 1951, page 90, footnote 27, for citations to decisions in Colombia, Panama, Guatemala, and Brazil.

I was very much intrigued today by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] when he told about our Constitution and compared this country with Canada.

The comparison of this country with Canada is particularly inappropriate for the majority report—pages 10–13. Canada is limited in its treatymaking power by the necessity of first getting implementing legislation from all of its Provinces for any treaty affecting matters within their jurisdiction. Canada has 10 Provinces. We have 48 States. Do the majority seriously contend that it would be a simple matter to obtain prior agreement of 48 States before concluding a treaty?

Canadian practice has come under severe criticism as a bar to effective international cooperation. F. R. Scott, professor of law at McGill University, writing in the Canadian Bar Review for 1951, page 1114, states:

Whereas up to 1937 the federal Parliament was able to legislate on all treaties and conventions binding on Canada, and had in fact so legislated so as to override provincial authority in four instances (under the Japanese Peace Treaty of 1913, the Migratory Birds Convention, the Radio Convention of 1927, and the Aeronautics Convention of 1919), after 1937 the treaty-enforcing power in Canada was decentralized and Ottawa was deprived of a power held effectively for 70 years. A major constitutional limitation in international affairs was imposed on the Canadian nation in the very decade in which she finally achieved full national status. No other federal state in the world is so restricted and in an age desperately seeking new bases for international cooperation such national weaknesses become something more than domestic problems.

HAMSTRINGING UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

The report of the majority—page 11—makes the statement that section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, will make it known to "those who negotiate with us that a treaty negotiated by the President and ratified by the Senate will have no internal effect or be binding in that respect on the States and the people until either the whole Congress or the State legislatures enact legislation in furtherance of the treaty."

The fact that foreign states will be left in great doubt whether the United States is obligating itself to implement a treaty or is merely obligating itself to request the 48 States of the Union to implement the treaty will greatly decrease the bargaining power of the United States at the international conference

table. Clause 2 of section 2, the "which" clause, will put other governments on notice that the United States is only partially sovereign and does not have the bargaining power of other sovereign states.

The harmful effect of section 2 upon our foreign relations is clearly shown by a statement submitted by the Department of State to the Judiciary Subcommittee, which reads as follows:

> A treaty is not a one-way street. It represents an international bargain, which history has shown is only effective if and as long as it represents an advantageous arrangement for both parties. We cannot secure advantages or privileges in another country unless we are prepared to grant comparable ones within our own. Our ability to assure those with whom we negotiate that when we seal the bargain, there is reasonable ground to believe that it will be made effective with the advice and consent of the Senate, is an essential ingredient in our ability to negotiate successfully. When approval by the Senate, with whom there can be and is close cooperation with the Executive, is the sole requirement we are in a position to give reasonable, although not absolute, assurances during negotiation. That approval must be given before the treaty is ratified and brought into force with the other nation or nations. But if action by Congress is to be required in addition, it is conceivable, and in fact the amendment would be meaningless if it were not anticipated in some instances, that a treaty would receive the consent of the Senate and yet fail of implementation by Congress. In that event the United States would either lose all benefits of the treaty, if ratification were postponed until after enactment of legislation, or, if ratification took place before the Congress acted, the United States would be in default on its treaty obligations.
>
> It seems reasonable to conclude that such a requirement would prejudice the United States in its negotiations with foreign countries, without compensating advantages. (Hearings, 1953, p. 830, at 836.)

Not a single country in the world has the requirement of parliamentary approval both before and after ratification in order that a treaty can be made binding. This proposal is unique. It is in no way comparable to the widespread system of ratification by the executive branch alone, as in the British Commonwealth and elsewhere, with a requirement of an act of Parliament to implement it internally.

THE "WHICH" CLAUSE

The majority report—pages 13 and 14—in attempting to justify the "which" clause of section 2 propounds a contradiction in terms. After explaining that the Constitution itself provides that Congress has power to make laws to carry into effect the powers vested in the Government, it attributes to Missouri against Holland the creation of that power in the case of making laws to carry out treaties. Missouri against Holland, it claims, provided the mechanism.

The implication is that a court case and not the Constitution itself makes it possible for Congress to enact laws to implement treaties. This is both illogical and inaccurate.

The case is merely an application of the powers already specified in the Constitution. Missouri against Holland did not itself provide any mechanism. It upheld the exercise of a power in the Congress which had always existed under the Constitution.

Whether Congress had previously exercised that power is not relevant, for, as stated by the Supreme Court in *Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* (158 U. S. 601, 629 (1893)):

> Nonuser, for a considerable length of time, of a power under the Constitution does not weaken that power when asserted by Congress.

There is no reason to believe that the result in Missouri against Holland was a result not intended by the framers of the Constitution. The history of the Constitutional Convention shows that treaties were regarded as a basic instrument of national policy. It was recognized that if they were to be effective they would have to deal with subjects having a vital bearing on the States; for example, fisheries, navigation, debts owed to foreigners, and so forth.

At the same time there appeared to be no question in the minds of the framers but that Congress should have all the power "necessary and proper" to carry into effect the powers elsewhere vested in the Government. As the framers were fully aware, one of the most important of these other powers is the treaty power.

This was well stated by Jefferson B. Fordham, dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School in a recent letter to me:

> It was never intended under the Constitution that we conduct our external relations subject to the limitations governing our Federal plan with respect to domestic affairs. This was clearly understood by those who framed the Constitution. Now that many of the problems of Government and of law so clearly transcend national boundaries, it is more important than ever before that we be able to act as a decisive sovereign national unit in meeting the challenge of our times. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Volume 99, Part 12, page 4115.)

LIMITATION ON TREATY POWER

The majority report contends—page 14—that under the treatymaking authority the Federal Government has in its power the means to destroy the present Federal-State relationship.

This ignores the limitation on the treaty power which has always been acknowledged to exist, namely, that a treaty must deal with a true subject of international concern. As stated by the Supreme Court in the case of *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258 (1890)):

> That the treaty power of the United States extends to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and the governments of other nations, is clear.

Moreover, it ignores the history of the treatymaking clauses in the Constitution. One of the principal reasons for calling the Constitutional Convention was to insure compliance by the States with the treaties made under the Articles of Confederation. Early treaties with France and the Netherlands provided for individual rights of inheritance. The 1783 treaty of peace with Great Britain provided that creditors should meet no lawful impediment in the collection of existing debts. These were matters ordinarily within the province of the States and some of the States refused to observe the treaty provisions. The resulting chaos led directly to the adoption of the supremacy clause to make treaties paramount over State laws and State constitutions. Thus the supremacy clause had the express purpose of prevailing over State laws on subjects otherwise reserved to the States.

It was intended that the Federal Government, in matters of international concern, should be superior to the States, even when those matters also affected domestic rights. That result was deemed necessary if this country was to be equal to other nations in its treaty power. As early as 1796 in the case of Ware against Hylton, the Supreme Court held that the 1783 treaty with England prevailed over the laws of the State of Virginia with respect to collection of debts owed the British. Thus from the beginning of our Government, it was recognized that the States must yield to the Federal treaty power even on matters otherwise within their authority.

The treaty power cannot therefore "destroy the present Federal-State relationship." It can and does uphold that relationship as it was deliberately planned by the Founding Fathers and interpreted by the Supreme Court from the earliest days.

It is a misstatement to say that until recently treaties imposed duties and obligations on States and not on individuals. As pointed out by Secretary of State Dulles in his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee April 6, 1953:

> Perhaps the most urgent reason for calling of the Convention which framed our Constitution was the fact that treaties made under the Articles of Confederation were not enforceable because they operated upon the States and not upon individuals. (Hearings, p. 824.)

That treaties under the Constitution were intended, when necessary, to impose obligations on individual citizens is clear from the existence of the supremacy clause. If treaties are to be part of the supreme law of the land, they are necessarily to operate on individuals and not simply on governments.

THE TREATY POWER AND THE 10TH AMENDMENT

According to the majority report—page 14—it was intended that all powers not expressly delegated nor reasonably implied should be reserved to the States or the people.

There can be no disagreement with this statement or with the statement that follows that the purpose of the 10th amendment was to maintain a balance between State and Federal powers, and that it was never intended that the established constitutional balance should be substantially upset by the exercise of the treaty power.

But these statements carry the implication either that the treaty power was not expressly delegated in the Constitution or that article 1, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution—the "necessary and proper" clause—does not apply to treaties. That clause gives Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution "all

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." One of those powers is the treaty power. As early as 1805, the Supreme Court held that this clause is not a limitation or restriction upon the powers of Congress, but an enlargement of them, and that many powers are necessarily implied under the express grants of power in the Constitution. "It would be utopian to suppose that a government can exist without leaving the exercise of discretion somewhere"—*United States* v. *Fisher* (2 Cr. 358, 396 (1805)).

And in 1901, 19 years before the Missouri against Holland case, the Supreme Court held that the power of Congress to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested in the Government of the United States includes the power to enact such legislation as is appropriate to give effect to any stipulations which it is competent for the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to insert in a treaty with a foreign power. *Neely* v. *Henkel* (180 U. S. 109, 121 (1901)).

Thus while the Constitution intended to maintain a balance between State and Federal power, it expressly provided that in matters of international concern, even those having a direct effect on local laws or regulations, the Federal treaty power should prevail. The theory is neither new nor dangerous, as the majority report would imply. It is a result deliberately planned by the framers of the Constitution to insure that this Nation should be completely sovereign.

ALLEGED DANGER OF U. N. CHARTER

The majority report—page 14—asserts that, under the U. N. Charter article 55 and 56, danger exists of altering the Federal-State relationship.

It is noteworthy that the majority report makes no flat statement or even expression of its opinion as to whether articles 55 and 56 give Congress the authority to legislate with respect to social, economic, cultural, civil, and political rights. It uses the phrase, "There are those who maintain."

Congress already has the right to legislate in those areas to the extent of its delegated powers.

Some of those most closely concerned with the international law aspects of the U. N. Charter have argued that the human-rights provision of the charter state only a general objective of the U. N. and its members, without imposing upon the latter a legal obligation to take any specific action. Judge Manley O. Hudson, as Chairman of the International Law Commission of the U. N., maintained this view in voting against the draft declaration on rights and duties of states, on the ground that the provisions of article 6 went beyond the Charter of the U. N. and beyond international law at its present state of development.

In a letter to the Attorney General, Ernest A. Gross, then legal adviser of the Department of State, stated:

> The articles of the charter referred to in your letter (arts. 55 and 56) are not interpreted by the Department of State as imposing a legal obligation to guarantee observance of specific human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Durward V. Sandifer, as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for United Nations Affairs, stated:

> The charter does not impose obligations on the members with respect to the observance of specific human rights. The obligation is to promote their development and observance by joint and separate action. (Proceedings, American Society of International Law, 1949, p. 61.)

In the light of the views stated by representatives of this Government directly concerned with the human rights provisions that they do not impose legal obligations, it is doubtful that the Supreme Court would ever hold that those provisions had created treaty obligations which would support human rights legislation of a type otherwise invalid.

OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The majority report—page 15—quotes from a House committee report in which the case of *Oyama* v. *California* (332 U. S. 633, 673), decided by the Supreme Court, is cited as supporting the theory that the U. N. Charter compels the invalidation, "without more," of State legislation which does violence to its ideals. This is a clear misstatement of the holding in the Oyama case. The U. N. Charter provisions were not controlling of the opinion in the case in any way, although referred to in the concurring opinion of Justice Black as indicating "our policy in the international field" and in the concurring opinion of Justice Murphy as "but one more reason why the statute must be condemned" (332 U. S. 649, 673).

To say that the case represents the opinion of the Supreme Court that "the United Nations Charter compels the invalidation, without more, of State legislation which does violence to its 'high ideals' " is erroneous.

TREATIES EXAMINED BY COURTS FOR CONSTITUTIONALITY

The statement in the majority report—page 15—that there is, to date, not a single instance in which a treaty has been declared unconstitutional is one of the strongest possible arguments against adoption of a constitutional amendment relating to treaties. It is a record of which this Government can well be proud. It attests to the scrupulous care with which treaties have been prepared and entered into by the President and the Senate, not to any inability on the part of the courts to proclaim a treaty provision unconstitutional.

The majority report—page 15—then cites the case of *U. S.* v. *Reid* (73 F. (2d) 153, 155) as indicating doubt as to whether courts can declare treaties void and unenforceable. It is interesting to note that the Reid case was tried in the Circuit Court of Appeals in 1934. Five years later, the United States Supreme Court heard a case in which the facts were substantially similar, *Perkins* v. *Elg* (307 U. S. 325). The opinion of the Supreme Court brought a contrary result, and the Court said, by footnote reference, that it was compelled to disagree with the Reid case as its conclusions "are not adequately supported and are opposed to the established principles which should govern the disposition of this case."

Yet it is the Reid case, whose conclusions the Supreme Court stated are not adequately supported, that is used by the majority to sustain the proposition that courts cannot declare a treaty void or unenforceable.

On the other hand, the very cases cited by the majority on page 3 of the report indicate the Supreme Court of the United States believes it does have the right to pass upon the constitutionality of a treaty. In *Doe* v. *Braden* (16 How. 635 (1853)) the Court said: "The treaty is therefore a law made by the proper authority, and the courts of justice have no right to annul or disregard any of its provisions, unless they violate the Constitution of the United States."

And in *The Cherokee Tobacco* (11 Wall. 616, 620 (1870) the Court said:

> It need hardly be said that a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument.

In the celebrated case of *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137 (1803)), the Court specifically stated: "The judicial power of the United States is extended to all cases arising under the Constitution." If a case should arise on the point of whether a particular treaty made according to constitutional procedures violates the Constitution, it seems obvious that it would be a case "arising under the Constitution" and, therefore, under Marbury against Madison, subject to judicial review.

It is a tenuous line of reasoning that ignores the repeated recognition by the Supreme Court of its right to declare a treaty void or unenforceable, and would look to the dictum in a circuit court case in which, by the Supreme Court's own assertion, the conclusions were "not adequately supported."

Attorney General Brownell, in his statement filed with the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 7, 1953 (hearings, p. 908, footnote 32), upholds the right of the courts to declare a treaty unconstitutional. He asserts:

> Not only does it appear clear that treaties are subject to constitutional limitation but it is equally clear that they are subject to judicial review. To hold otherwise would create the anomalous position that, although the courts could deny enforcement of a treaty on the ground it was inconsistent with a later act of Congress, they were without power to do so on the ground of inconsistency with the Constitution. The power of Federal courts to invalidate acts of Congress contrary to the Constitution was implied from the propositions that a statute could not overrule the Constitution, that the Federal judiciary had jurisdiction over cases arising under the Constitution, and that it was sworn to uphold the Constitution. (*Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137, 176–180 (1803)).) The same reasoning applies to treaties. (Cf. *Taylor* v. *Morton* (Fed. Case No. 13, 799; 23 Fed. Cases at 785 (C. C. D. Mass. 1855)).) But, in any event, from the decisions already cited, it is obvious that the power to examine into the constitutional validity of treaties has been assumed by the Supreme Court.

THE CASE OF MARBURY AGAINST MADISON

The majority report—page 16—cites the case of Marbury against Madison to cast doubt on the right of judicial re-

view of the constitutionality of treaties and to support its assertion that treaties need not be made in pursuance of the Constitution. It notes that the decision in that case—declaring that a law contrary to the Constitution is void—ends with an argument resting on the in-pursuance clause.

The report fails to quote the final argument in Marbury against Madison. It reads in part:

In declaring what shall be the supreme law of the land, the Constitution itself is first mentioned; and not the laws of the United States generally, but those only which shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution have that rank.

Thus the particular phraseology of the Constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the Constitution is void; * * *

That quotation makes clear that it was the order of mention of the Constitution and laws, and not merely the in-pursuance clause, that was used in Marbury against Madison to decide that the Constitution is supreme over laws. By that argument, Marbury against Madison necessarily supports the supremacy of the Constitution over treaties, since treaties are the items last mentioned in the Constitution as being part of the law of the land.

In fact, Marbury against Madison is noteworthy for its expression of the supremacy of the Constitution:

The Constitution is either a superior, paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts. * * *

If the former part of the alternative be true, then a legislative act contrary to the Constitution is not law; if the latter part be true, then written constitutions are absurd attempts on the part of the people, to limit a power in its own nature illimitable.

Certainly all those who have framed written constitutions contemplate them as forming the fundamental and paramount law of the Nation.

No treaty was at issue in Marbury against Madison. But it is difficult to see any reason why the doctrines of judicial review and constitutional supremacy established by that case should not apply with equal vigor to treaties. This conclusion is suported by consistent Supreme Court holdings that treaties are on a parity with laws; for example, in *Chae Chan Ping* v. *United States* (130 U. S. 581 (1889)), the Court said:

The treaties were of no greater legal obligation than the act of Congress.

Marbury against Madison, far from proving, as the majority report would imply, that the judiciary lacks jurisdiction over the constitutionality of a treaty, is an eloquent argument for the supremacy of the Constitution as paramount law and for the right of judicial review over the other elements which under the Constitution comprise the supreme law of the land.

THE "WHICH" CLAUSE CONTINUED

Continuing with its theme of casting doubt on the power of the courts to declare a treaty unconstitutional, the majority report—page 16—launches into its argument for the "which" clause. It acknowledges the view of the Attorney General that the Supreme Court has the power to declare an unconstitutional treaty void, but does so in a way that indicates it is merely a matter of personal opinion. It ignores the repeated assertion of the Supreme Court itself that it has such power:

It need hardly be said that a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument. (*The Cherokee Tobacco* (11 Wall. 616, 620).)

The treaty is therefore a law * * * and the courts of justice have no right to annul or disregard any of its provisions, unless they violate the Constitution of the United States. (*Doe et al* v. *Braden* (16 How. 635, 637).)

Of course, all treaties and statutes of the United States are based on the Constitution; * * * the decisions of this Court generally have regarded treaties as on much the same plane as acts of Congress, and as usually subject to the general limitations in the Constitution. (*United States* v. *Minnesota* (270 U. S. 181, 207).)

We do not mean to imply that there are no qualifications to the treaty-making power. * * * The treaty in question does not contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution. (*Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416, 433).)

To urge adoption of the "which" clause of section 2 as a means of establishing a right already well established by Supreme Court decisions is an argument without validity or reason.

The majority states—page 16—that the purpose of the "which" clause is to negate Missouri against Holland and to negative any inherent-power theory in the Federal Government in the field of international relations. With regard to the doctrine of Missouri against Holland, it is submitted that the result achieved by that decision was both appropriate and desirable, as even Senator BRICKER has attested:

The protection of migratory birds spending part of the year in Canada and part in the United States was certainly an appropriate subject for a treaty calling for implementation by national legislation. * * * I feel there are certain fields in which the treaty power must be protected in the interest of the integrity of our country, and the very sovereignty of our country. (Testimony of Senator BRICKER before subcommittee of Senate Judiciary Committee, hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 130, 82d Cong., p. 28.)

It is not clear how the application of the Missouri against Holland doctrine to other cases is unwise or dangerous. The treaty in that case, as clearly pointed out in Justice Holmes' opinion, does not authorize what the Constitution forbids. As stated by Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Law School of Harvard University, in his letter of June 30, 1953, to me—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Volume 99, Part 12, page 4115—

I find nothing in this decision which indicates that a treaty may overcome the provisions of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution, and I do not believe that the Supreme Court would so hold. I do not see any ground for believing that our basic rights are threatened by the system which has worked so well for the past 150 years.

As for the inherent power theory, it is generally accepted that the treatymaking power is one of the basic powers of external sovereignty which belongs to every duly constituted nation. According to the majority report—page 16—the proposed text negatives any inherent power theory in the Federal Government in the field of international relations. In other words, the amendment would denounce a universally accepted principle of international law and substitute a principle which would leave this Nation powerless to act in some of the most important areas of treatymaking. Our Government would be unable to conclude the most familiar types of commercial treaties because it would be without machinery for their enforcement. By depriving the Nation of the right and power to enforce its treaties, this amendment would render the Nation less than sovereign.

Imagine the chaos if every nation in the world adopted a "which" clause, reserving to its states, cantons, provinces, and other local subdivisions the right to say whether or not each of them chose to abide by that nation's treaty obligations.

LIMITED POWERS OF GOVERNMENT

It is stated in the majority report—pages 16, 17—that our National Government is, and should be, exclusively one of delegated and limited powers and that we do not have such a government if the Congress is permitted to acquire legislative power through the adoption of treaties.

This is misleading. It overlooks the fact that, first, the treaty power is a delegated power—Constitution, article II, section 2—and second, the power of Congress to make all laws necessary and proper to carry it into effect is a delegated power—Constitution, article I, section 8, clause 18. It also overlooks the fact that the treaty power is limited to "proper subjects of international agreement"—Elihu Root, as president of the American Society of International Law—and does not extend "so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids"—*Asakura* v. *Seattle* (265 U. S. 332, 341 (1924)). Further it overlooks the fact that a law implementing a treaty is subject to judicial review of its constitutionality.

In view of these considerations, it is erroneous to conclude that the power of Congress to implement a treaty is neither delegated nor limited.

INSUFFICIENCY OF COMMERCE CLAUSE

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] spoke about the effectiveness of the commerce clause.

It is claimed in the majority report—page 17—that under its power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, Congress can implement treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation.

This would not be the case. With the "which" clause in force, the Federal Government would be powerless to enforce many of the provisions which have traditionally been included in such treaties. Some examples are: Provisions relating to rights of aliens to own, inherit, and transfer property; provisions regarding rights of aliens to engage in trade or business which has no interstate character; and provisions that aliens shall pay no more State inheritance taxes than citizens. These are not matters of

"foreign commerce." Each of these subjects is clearly within the province of the States to control; it is only by virtue of the treaty power under the Constitution that it has been possible for the Federal Government to make and enforce treaty provisions on these subjects.

To assert as the majority report—page 17—does that Congress could implement consular conventions under its commerce power betrays ignorance of the types of provisions ordinarily included in such conventions. For example, these conventions exempt consular officers from all local taxes, except certain real property taxes; from all charges incident to the licensing, registration, and use of vehicles; from the requirement of testifying in criminal, labor, or civil cases regarding acts performed in an official capacity. These are exemptions directly affecting State and municipal law and policy and not actionable under the commerce clause.

It is clear that the framers of the Constitution intended the treaty power to control these subjects when they included in the supremacy clause the provision that treaties should prevail over State laws and constitutions.

Treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation and consular conventions have played an important part in the expansion of American business abroad by assuring that Americans and their interests will receive proper protection in foreign countries. Congress itself in recent legislation has sought to encourage American investment abroad. But few businessmen would risk foreign investment if they could not expect fair and nondiscriminatory treatment. Such treatment is assured through treaties, which of course must give reciprocal rights to foreigners in the United States. These rights are primarily local, and therefore Congress in the absence of a treaty cannot legislate upon them. Under the "which" clause, each State in the Union would have to pass implementing legislation for every one of these treaties. Since the Federal Government could never give assurances regarding State legislation, it could never assure another country that such treaty rights would be enforced in this country. And even if it could give such assurances, there would be nothing to prevent the States from repealing or altering at will such legislation as they might pass.

AMENDMENT WOULD RESULT IN EXPANSION OF FEDERAL POWER

The majority report—page 18—contends that the Supreme Court would find it possible to extend the Congress' power over interstate and foreign commerce to cover the matters included in treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation. If that were true, it would result in an expansion of Federal power over State power more dangerous than any possible abuses of the treaty power. It would constitute a major encroachment on States' rights.

CONTROL OF NARCOTICS TRADE

The majority report—page 18—takes issue with the widely supported view that the "which" clause would prevent this Nation from concluding treaties for the control of narcotics. It objects to placing reliance on the case of *Stutz et al.* v. *Bureau of Narcotics* (56 F. Supp. 810) because that case did not specifically hold that the Congress lacked the power to regulate the growing of poppies under its authority to regulate interstate commerce.

It is significant, however, that in the Stutz case the Court relied solely upon the treaty power to find authority for the Federal Government to regulate the growing of poppies. It did not rely upon the general welfare or commerce clauses, although those clauses had been argued.

The facts of the case were these: In 1942 Congress passed the Opium Poppy Control Act, which forbids the growing of opium poppies except under Federal license for medical and scientific requirements. One of our States thought such a restriction unnecessary, and, relying on the reservation-of-power provision in the 10th amendment, enacted legislation authorizing the growing of poppy plants for seed, under regulation. The Court held that the Federal law prevailed because it was enacted in implementation of a treaty.

The case illustrates how dangerous it would be for the Federal Government, were the Bricker amendment in force, to enter into treaties on narcotics and other subjects which would depend for any part of their enforcement on legislation by the States. The reliance of the States would be vain, for each State would have its own ideas as to the desirability or necessity of legislation.

The majority report asserts that "it is hardly correct to say, on the basis of this case alone, that the Congress of the United States would not have the authority to pass legislation regulating the growing of opium poppies if this amendment were to be adopted." The argument that Congress would be devoid of the necessary power to implement certain narcotics treaties under the Bricker amendment does not rest on the basis of this case alone.

The department of the United States Government charged with narcotics control has opposed the "which" clause for the very reason that it would strip that enforcement agency of some of its present power to curb the narcotics evil. Narcotics enforcement is under the control of the Treasury Department, through its Bureau of Narcotics. Elbert P. Tuttle, General Counsel of the Treasury, testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee, said that under the "which" clause "it is clear that the United States could not become a party to a treaty designed to control the traffic in narcotics drugs"—hearings, page 1015.

Under questioning by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] as to whether narcotics enforcement might not come under the interstate commerce clause, Mr. Tuttle replied: "No sir; there is no possibility of that any more than the present provisions of the Migratory Bird Act"—hearings, page 1000.

The proposed amendment would seriously impair our structure of controls over narcotics according to testimony of the Government officers charged with such controls. It would be a grave disservice to the people of this country to adopt an amendment which could weaken our ability to cope with the illegal drug problem.

TREATY PROVISIONS REGARDING PROPERTY RIGHTS

It is then argued in the majority report—pages 18, 19—that the proposed amendment would not interfere with treaty provisions regarding ownership and disposition of property.

To point out what the present laws are in the various States of the United States with respect to property ownership and disposition is not pertinent to the real issue. The real issue is the fact that control over such matters does lie with the States and not with the Federal Government in the absence of a treaty. Under the "which" clause that control would lie exclusively with the States. The Federal Government would be unable to enforce treaty provisions giving aliens rights to hold property in the United States, in exchange for Americans getting similar rights abroad. The States would be free, to alter or repeal their legislation at any time without reference to any treaty obligations. No foreign government would ever know whether, and to what extent, a treaty would become or remain effective in any part of the United States.

An examination of the State laws on property ownership, as they stand at present, has no bearing on the potential effect of section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1. The argument as used in the majority report is like saying there was no need for a Bill of Rights in the Constitution because most of the States already recognized the right of freedom of speech and religion.

Under the "which" clause this Government could never guarantee to another government that this Nation would honor a treaty commitment to permit aliens to inherit property here. The result—few countries would want to make a treaty permitting Americans to own and inherit property in their territory.

EXTRADITION TREATIES MADE IMPOSSIBLE?

The majority report—pages 19, 20—next takes issue with the point made in the hearings by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State of the United States that the Bricker amendment might prevent the conclusion of extradition treaties.

As its only authority in this regard it cites an article by George Finch, one of the most active supporters of the "which" clause. That article states:

> At international law treaties are not required. Extradition is founded on reciprocity.

Such a statement reveals an inadequate understanding of international law on the subject.

Charles Cheney Hyde, in his International Law Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States, volume II, page 1015, states a contrary role, as follows:

> The almost unvarying practice of the United States has been to decline to surrender fugitive criminals save in pursuance of treaty. It has been frequently declared that the Executive lacks the power under such circumstances to cause the arrest and surrender of the individual. Declared the Supreme Court of the United States in 1936,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

through Chief Justice Hughes: "Applying, as we must, our own law in determining the authority of the President, we are constrained to hold that his power, in the absence of statute conferring an independent power, must be found in the terms of the treaty and that, as the treaty with France fails to grant the necessary authority, the President is without power to surrender the respondents." (*Valentine v. U. S. ex rel. Neidecker* (299 U. S. 5, 18).) That tribunal was, moreover, correct in its declaration somewhat earlier, that "the principles of international law recognize no right to extradition apart from treaty." (*Factor v. Laubenheimer* (290 U. S. 286, 287).)

I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD at this point a few excerpts from John Bassett Moore's Digest of International Law, volume IV, pages 245–246, all of which are directly contrary to the view expressed by Mr. Finch and which would seem clearly to show that under international law extradition is a matter of treaty only.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Although we have the high authority of Grotius and Vattel for the view that extradition is a matter of international obligation, yet the prevalent modern doctrine, which has been adopted in practice, is that which was expressed by Chief Justice Tilghman: "No State has an absolute and perfect right to demand of another the delivery of a fugitive criminal, though it has what is called an imperfect right, that is, a right to ask it, as a matter of courtesy, good will, and mutual convenience. But a refusal to grant such request is no just cause of war." (*Commonwealth v. Deacon* (10 S. & R. 125).)

The laws of nations embrace no provision for the surrender of persons who are fugitives from the offended laws of one country to the territory of another. It is only by treaty that such surrender can take place. (Mr. Rush, Secretary of State, to Mr. Hyde de Neuville, April 9, 1817, MS. Notes to Foreign Legion II, 218.)

No government is understood to be bound by the positive law of nations to deliver up criminals, fugitives from justice, who have sought an asylum within its limits. (Mr. Webster's Works, VI, 399, 405.) (Mr. Webster, Secretary of State, to Mr. d'Argais, June 21, 1842, Webster's Works, VI, 399, 405.)

But the practice of nations tolerates no right of extradition. Whatever elementary authors may say to the contrary, one nation is not bound to deliver up persons accused of crimes who have escaped into its territories on the demand of another nation against whose laws the alleged crime was committed. (Mr. Buchanan, Secretary of State, to Mr. Wise, September 27, 1845, MS. Inst. Brazil, XV, 119.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, here again the proponents of the "which" clause are supporting a long-outmoded and unworkable theory—namely, that extradition can depend upon reciprocity among nations, without the necessity of treaties.

It is clear that the "which" clause would make the conclusion of extradition treaties impossible because their implementation, at least in part, would have to lie with the States. Attorney General Brownell, the chief law officer of this Government, testified thus:

The most usual types of treaties would be invalid if measured by the test of whether they came within the legislative powers of Congress. For example, * * * treaties of extradition—where the crime was a purely domestic one within the foreign state. (*Matter of Metzger* (5 How. 176, 187–188 (forgery)); *Charlton v. Kelly* (229 U. S. 447 (murder).)

It is evident that there is outstanding authority for the proposition that Congress, in the absence of treaty, cannot provide for the extradition of fugitives from justice. Accordingly, under the "which" clause extradition treaties would be unenforceable by the Federal Government. It is probable that no further extradition treaties could therefore be negotiated, and this country could become a haven for foreign criminals.

COLLECTION OF FOREIGN DEBTS

The majority report—page 20—next challenges the argument that under the "which" clause it would be impossible for the United States Government to conclude agreements with foreign countries on the collection of foreign debts without the consent of all the 48 States. It cites the act establishing the World War Foreign Debt Commission as an assertion of the legislative power of the Congress over the subject of foreign debts. That act has no relevance to the point at issue. It was concerned only with "any obligation of any foreign government now held by the United States of America, or any obligation of any foreign government hereafter received by the United States of America" arising out of the World War—Forty-second United States Statutes at Large, page 363. Naturally, the disposition of obligations held by the United States Government itself are within the Federal domain.

This is quite a different matter from the situation which exists where the creditors are individual citizens. For example, in the Treaty of 1783 with Great Britain it was "agreed that creditors on either side shall meet with no lawful impediment to the recovery of the full value in sterling money, of all bona fide debts heretofore contracted." This treaty provision was held to prevail over conflicting State legislation in the case of *Ware v. Hylton* (3 Dall. 199 (1796). Under the "which" clause, however, this treaty provision would have been unenforceable because it would require concurring legislation in each State.

Only recently, the Senate approved a treaty affecting the rights of individual creditors. The treaty with the Federal Republic of Germany regarding matters arising from the validation of German dollar bonds, signed at Bonn April 1, 1953, deals with the rights of holders of certain German dollar bonds and related instruments. It provides that no such bond, dividend, and so forth, will be enforceable unless and until validated as provided in the agreement. Like the 1783 debt collection provision with Great Britain, it deals with subject matter not within the delegated powers of Congress but within the jurisdiction of the States. Under the "which" clause, it would have been unenforceable and therefore could not have been negotiated. This is but another instance of a treaty for the protection of the interests of individual American citizens which would go by the board were Senate Joint Resolution 1 adopted.

PROTECTIVE CLAUSES IN TREATIES

The majority report—page 21—objects to the suggestion that protective clauses, designed to protect our Federal-State relationships, be included in treaties when deemed necessary, rather than adopting a constitutional amendment. Strangely enough, the objection is made to the difficulty in securing the insertion of such clauses. This is an unusual objection to come from the proponents of an amendment which would set up a treatymaking procedure more cumbersome than that of any other country in the world.

It is undoubtedly true that in some instances, principally in multilateral conventions, it is difficult to obtain agreement on such clauses. It should be remembered, however, that the United States is under no obligation to sign any agreement from which essential protective clauses are missing. Nor is there anything to prevent the Senate from rejecting such agreements, even if signed.

To point to the Draft Covenant on Human Rights as containing objectionable clauses is to set up a strawman. This Government, even before the completion of that covenant, has declared that it does not intend to become a party to it nor to present it for consideration by the Senate—statement by Secretary Dulles, hearings, page 825. In objecting to clauses of that draft convention the majority report is aiming its fire at something which this Government has never agreed to and, on the contrary, has declared its intention of rejecting.

RESERVATIONS AND UNDERSTANDINGS

The majority report, at the bottom of page 21, then takes up the contention made by the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 that the right of the Senate to attach reservations or understandings to treaties is a safeguard which makes section 2 unnecessary. Here again it objects to this argument because of the difficulty of attaching reservations or understandings and getting the agreement of other countries.

It is certainly true that the acceptance of the other country or countries party to a treaty must be obtained if reservations or understandings are made. This is accepted international practice conforming to the law of the nations.

As against this procedure, the majority report would prefer a constitutional amendment permitting this country to undertake international obligations it would be unable to enforce. The "which" clause, if made a part of our Constitution, would either prevent us from concluding many types of treaties at all or put us in the anomalous position of violating our freely undertaken international obligations. If we were to conclude ordinary treaties of friendship and commerce, we would be in violation of international law so long as any State in the Union failed to enact concurring legislation.

The majority report—page 22—asserts that it is becoming increasingly difficult for parties to multilateral treaties to make effective reservations, and states that the International Court of Justice has ruled that substantial reservations to the Genocide Convention will nullify

the effect of ratification. Actually, what the Court ruled with regard to the Genocide Convention was that the effect of reservations and of objections to them depends on the circumstances of each individual case.

The proposition scarcely needs defending that a state should have a right to object to a reservation not compatible with the object and purpose of a convention. It is certainly to the interests of this country to be able to consider a reserving state not a party to a convention if its reservation is in conflict with the very purpose and intent of the convention.

The majority report—page 22—next voices alarm over the article of the Universal Copyright Convention which prohibits reservations thereto. That article was adopted at the specific recommendation of the United States because reservations to a convention on copyright could destroy the whole basis of the convention.

Furthermore, it is irrelevant for the majority report to discuss the Universal Copyright Convention in connection with reservations regarding non-self-execution or Federal-State relationships. The convention by its own terms—article X—is non-self-executing. It further provides that by the time of ratification, acceptance, or accession, each State must be in a position under its domestic law to give effect to the terms of the convention. This means there must be legislation on the books before any state ratifies the convention.

As to preserving Federal-State rights, it is apparent to anyone familiar with the Constitution that no reservation is needed in the copyright field. Copyright by virtue of article I, section 8, of the Constitution, is within the delegated powers of the Congress and clearly not a matter reserved to the States.

The nonreservation provision of the Copyright Convention is no indication of any trend toward increasing the difficulty of obtaining reservations. No reservation of the type under discussion in the majority report is needed or desired for this convention. The majority report raises a false issue and then cites a wholly irrelevant case in support of it.

RESERVATIONS BIND THE CONGRESS

I take sharp issue with the next proposition of the majority report—at the top of page 23—that neither a reservation nor understanding affects the power of Congress to set aside State constitutions and laws and existing Federal laws within the purview of the treaty.

A reservation or understanding attached to a duly concluded treaty and accepted by the other party or parties is an integral part of the whole instrument agreed upon. No rights can arise from the instrument which are prohibited by one of its parts. If the reservation or understanding precludes legislative action by the National Government in an area otherwise reserved to the States, the treaty itself necessarily precludes such action.

The right of Congress under the necessary and proper clause to implement a treaty is coextensive with the treaty itself including any of its reservations or understandings.

SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATION CAN ANNUL A TREATY

The majority report—page 23—while recognizing the power of Congress by subsequent legislation to render a treaty inoperative as internal law, questions the adequacy of such power.

It points to the necessity for a two-thirds vote by Congress should the President veto such legislation. The objection is hardly plausible since it applies with equal vigor to all legislation which Congress may desire to enact. The two-thirds requirement is but another example of our remarkable system of checks and balances, whereby neither the executive nor the legislative branch is all-powerful in matters entrusted to both. The objection overlooks also the normal operations of our democratic system. Failure to respond to overwhelming public reaction against a treaty would, of course, become an issue at the polls, and the will of the majority would inevitably prevail.

At the bottom of page 23, the majority report says:

> Also, it is likely that the Congress itself would hesitate to repudiate the internal effect of a treaty because of the international conflicts which might result from such repudiation, and more especially is this true where the treaty is one which involves many other nations.

INCONSISTENCY IN MAJORITY POSITION

The majority profess a new and, for them, unprecedented interest in preserving this country's international honor. The inconsistency of their position is glaring.

On the one hand, they advocate an amendment to permit this country to assume international obligations it knows it could not enforce. They make statements like the following:

> It [the first clause of section 2] will make all treaties non-self-executing, so far as domestic law is concerned, until Congress acts, but the treaty will continue to be effective as an international obligation (S. Rept. 412, p. 11).
>
> The effectiveness of any treaty within the United States will be limited to the extent that appropriate legislation has not been enacted (ibid).
>
> The Department of State, or the President, can negotiate a treaty with any country in the world, and the Senate can promptly ratify it, but the treaty, when ratified, does not supersede any law in this country unless or until legally implemented. (Ibid.)

The distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] knows very well that that is not a fact. There comes to mind a Carolina case. The State had passed a law giving power to a port authority to search foreign ships and take colored people from the ships. They attempted to do it. In the meantime, the United States Government had entered into a treaty with Great Britain and with other nations on that subject. There was a great jurist by the name of Johnson who wrote the opinion in the case. Of course, he was scourged and maligned, but he had the courage of his convictions. To accusations in the newspapers, he replied with what I consider to be one of the finest expositions of the Federal Government's treaty power that any jurist ever put into the English language.

Those statements reveal the majority's indifference as to whether this country puts itself in violation of international law. They are wholly unconcerned with the fact that under the proposed amendment the United States might engage in wholesale disregard of its international treaty obligations because of inability to implement them. They assume that a nation which has undertaken a valid international obligation has a legal right to disregard such an obligation by refusing to enact legislation which is essential to its execution.

But now the majority claim to preserve our international honor against repudiation of our international obligation.

The answer is obvious. In 164 years this Government has found it necessary to abrogate very few of its international obligations. And when it has done so, it has been in conformity so far as possible with accepted international law and practice.

It is highly unlikely that there will ever be "extensive or wholesale repudiation of unwise treaties," for the simple reason that it is highly unlikely that there will ever be many unwise treaties Our record to date, if I may say so, has been very good. There is no reason to believe that the Executive and two-thirds of the Senate will relax their vigilance against unwise treaties.

The further safeguard remains. Should the Congress pass legislation to overcome the internal effect of a treaty, thus preventing the enforcement of international obligations, the Executive would be under a moral obligation to terminate the treaty obligations internationally. This has been done in the past, in complete conformity with international law and practice.

The fact that this Government strictly observes its treaty obligations as a fundamental principle of international law is no reason to assume, as the majority report does, that this constitutes a limitation on the power of Congress to take action against a treaty it considers no longer desirable. That fact is, however, a very strong reason why this Nation should not adopt a constitutional amendment which would encourage the Government to undertake international obligations which it would be constitutionally incapable of fulfilling.

EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT

On page 24 the majority report discusses section 3 of the proposed amendment. The first point of substance is on page 25 and relates to authority for the conclusion of executive agreements.

In stating that there is no express constitutional sanction for the conclusion of executive agreements by the President, the report neglects to mention that recognition of such agreements is implicit in the Constitution. Article I, section 10, provides that—

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.

And—

No State shall, without the consent of Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power.

In referring to instances in which the Supreme Court has recognized the power of the President to make agreements other than treaties the Committee cites only a few relatively recent cases. The citation of such cases implies that the courts have developed a new principle with respect to relations with other nations, whereas the principle involved has long been recognized by the court. For example, in 1852 it was recognized by the Supreme Court in the case of *Kennett et al.* v. *Chambers* (14 Howard, 38, 49, 50).

The failure of the report to take into account the basic problem involved, namely, the making of determinations by the executive, raises a serious question as to the completeness of the preparatory work done with a view to recommending the proposed amendment.

EMPLOYMENT OF TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

After remarking that "Some have gone so far as to assert that treaties and executive agreements are wholly interchangeable instruments of national policy" the report (p. 25) states the broad conclusion that "In view of this attitude, it would be absurd to adopt a constitutional amendment limiting the more difficult treaty method of concluding international agreements without nailing down the power of Congress to control the less difficult method."

The proposal of an amendment to the Constitution on the basis of the views of some persons is surprising. The Constitution would be a shockingly cumbersome and inconsistent document if amendments are to be adopted on the basis of what a few individuals may believe. In its report the committee refers to only three individuals who hold such views.

The view is expressed in the report—page 25—that Congress has the power to regulate all agreements other than treaties "by virtue of the power of Congress to enact legislation necessary and proper to carry into effect any of the powers conferred by the Constitution of the United States." If this were true Congress could render meaningless all powers and authority of the President and of the judiciary under the Constitution. Further on in its report—page 29—the committee points out that the power to regulate includes the power to prohibit. Accordingly, if the clause "necessary and proper to carry into effect any powers" were construed as a basis for any regulation the Congress decides upon, the three coordinate branches of Government would cease to exist as checks and balances with respect to one another; the Congress would be supreme in every respect and the executive and judiciary would be subservient to the legislature.

REGULATING EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The report—page 25—reaches the conclusion that since "there appears some doubt concerning the power of Congress to regulate the making of executive agreements, it is appropriate for Congress and the several States to dispel this doubt by the adoption of an appropriate amendment to the Constitution." This would seem to be an outstanding instance of jumping to a conclusion. Surely the mere existence of a doubt even though no real basis existed for such a doubt as to the extent of the authority of Congress in a given area is not an adequate basis for concluding that the Constitution should be amended. The report, up to the point this conclusion is reached, has not attempted to show any basis for the exercise of such a power by Congress other than, first, that "treaties and executive agreements as instruments of national policy are closely related which obligate the United States to a given course of action," second, the extreme views of several writers in the field, and third, some difference of opinion as to the power of Congress in the premises. These factors as a whole fall far short of a sound basis for the adoption of a constitutional amendment.

The report at this point shows a fundamental defect: the failure of the committee to give consideration to the relative powers of the Congress and of the Executive under the Constitution. Nowhere does the report make any attempt to distinguish between the powers of the Congress with respect to subject matter within the specific powers of Congress, and subject matter with respect to which the Congress may act within the purpose and scope of the "necessary and proper" clause. Nor does the report attempt to distinguish between subject matter in whole or in part within the powers of Congress and subject matter in whole or in part within the powers of the Executive. The report seems based on the assumption that Congress should have full authority to regulate the exercise of the President's powers in the field of foreign affairs without regard to the basic principles of the Constitution with respect to separation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers; and without any information in the report for the Senate as to precisely what powers are or may be affected. On what basis can consideration be given a constitutional amendment aimed at the regulation by Congress of the exercise of presidential powers without consideration of the scope of those powers? The only answer seems to be that a mere intention to control the actions by the Executive in the field of foreign affairs is sufficient, regardless of what constitutional powers possessed by the Executive may eventually be nullified through legislation by the Congress.

NECESSARY POWERS, BY THEIR NATURE, ARE SUBJECT TO ABUSE

While there may have been a few unwise agreements made in the past, and there is no apparent assurance that such agreements will not sometime be made in the future, there remains the question whether the regulatory power sought for the Congress under the proposed amendment would avoid such mistakes. In time of war or other emergency the Congress has always recognized that the Executive must have broad general powers to act expeditiously and effectively to protect the Nation's interests.

THE DOCTRINE OF INTERCHANGEABILITY

On pages 26 and 27 the report goes into a long discussion of the question of the relative interchangeability of treaties and executive agreements. On the more conservative side of the question it quotes Dr. Charles Cheney Hyde. It could cite any number of authorities on this side of the argument. On the other side it quotes Messrs. McDougal, Lans, and McClure. I do not want to take the time of the Senate to discuss in detail the merits or relative weights which should be given to the two sides of this very technical and very complicated argument. I ask unanimous consent, however, to place in the RECORD at this point a quotation from Dr. Hyde's 1945 edition of International Law Chiefly as Interpreted by the United States, pages 1416–1418.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The recourse to executive agreements revealed in the foregoing sections, however impressive in scope and development, fails to show that the Government has in fact acted on the theory that the President, with or without the aid of Congress, may conclude in behalf of the United States any arrangement which could be concluded through the instrumentality of a treaty. There have been, moreover, instances where a Secretary of State has felt that for purposes of agreement the use of a treaty was obligatory. * * *

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution treaties, themselves distinguishable under the then existing practice from arrangements of lesser dignity, were the usual settings that were employed in the making of compacts of largest import and longest endurance. * * * This circumstance strengthens the view that the exact provisions of the Constitution concerning the making of treaties did more than prescribe the manner in which they were to be concluded. The declaration that the President "shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur," * * * sustains the conclusion that it was not to be rendered abortive by recourse to a different procedure for the use of which no provision was made, and that there were to be found tests of improper evasion in the character of what was sought to be achieved despite the absence of a specific textual prohibition. * * * Otherwise, the scheme for the cooperative action of the President and the Senate would have been a relatively valueless injunction, and the solitary constitutional guide for contracting would have been of slight worth.

Acceptance of this conclusion that finds in the provision quoted not merely a ruling as to the method of treatymaking, but also a direction that some arrangements must be concluded as treaties are to be concluded, has vast implications. * * * It demands that the Executive prove in every case the question whether a prospective arrangement falls on one side of the line or the other, and that in so doing he seek and apply correctly the final test of his own freedom. That burden, however difficult, thus rests squarely upon the Executive who must pass on the constitutionality of the procedure which he elects to follow. Accordingly, he must be expected to be influenced by the character or gravity of the sacrifice which in the particular case is sought to be imposed upon the United States. When that sacrifice entails the giving up of title to,

or sovereignty over, something of great value which belongs to the Nation, such as part of its own domain, the President may well deem it necessary to proceed by treaty. Through such action he may, moreover, avoid the danger of raising a regrettable issue with the judicial department of the Government.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the report further states:

The Committee on the Judiciary cannot agree that the President acting alone, or the Congress and the President acting together, should bypass the treaty procedure whenever the approval of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting appears doubtful.

Certainly, there can be no valid disagreement with this statement. We are in agreement on that point. But, can the views of a few isolated writers be taken as evidence of the prevailing law or practice? While there may have been some attempts to bypass the Senate, it is my conviction that the situation is well in hand so far as the Senate is concerned.

STATUS OF EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS AS INTERNAL LAW

The committee seeks to show that the Secretary of State—quoted on page 27 of the report—was in error in his statement with respect to executive agreements that—

The danger to the Nation cannot be great because, without either State or congressional action, these agreements cannot constitutionally become law of the land.

The report—page 27—in rebuttal refers to statements made by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *U. S.* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203 (1942)). A careful analysis of that case shows that it falls far short of being an effective guide for the purpose which the committee uses it. Excerpts quoted in the report—at the bottom of page 27—from the opinion of the court are as follows:

A treaty is a "law of the land" under the supremacy clause (art. VI, clause 2) of the Constitution. Such international compacts and agreements as the Litvinov assignment have a similar dignity. * * *

But State law must yield when it is inconsistent with, or impairs the policy or provisions of, a treaty or of an international compact or agreement. See *Nielsen* v. *Johnson* (279 U. S. 47). Then the power of a State to refuse enforcement of rights based on foreign law which runs counter to the public policy of the forum (*Griffin* v. *McCoach* (313 U. S. 498, 506)), must give way before the superior Federal policy evidenced by a treaty or international compact or agreement.

Examination of the case of United States against Pink shows that the subject matter was the settlement of claims by the United States against the U. S. S. R. and was considered by the Court as interdependent with the matter of recognition of the U. S. S. R.

Settlement of claims and recognition are subjects which have long been recognized as being within the constitutional authority of the President in the conduct of foreign relations. So far as agreements other than those relating to the subject of claims and recognition are concerned, the above-quoted remarks are purely dicta. It should be noted also that the Court went to great lengths to explain the circumstances under which the Litvinov assignment was considered as being important in the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States. Back of the assignment was a policy of determination with respect to which no question has been raised as to the authority of the Executive alone to make that determination. The assignment itself was the mere evidence of that policy. Had the assignment been made to a private American claimant in settlement for claims against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, coupled with a unilateral determination of the Executive as to policy with respect to such claims, the holding of the Court would undoubtedly have been the same with respect to the right of the assignee to receive the property involved. Accordingly, the so-called agreement or compact so far as the assignment was involved was, in one sense, merely a form of evidence rather than a controlling principle. Examination of the Pink case shows that at the time of the above-mentioned decision no private American rights were involved. All claims of American nationals against the property involved had been satisfied. The only remaining property rights involved with respect to third parties were those of foreign claimants.

ERRONEOUS CONCLUSION

Notwithstanding this narrow scope of the case of United States against Pink, the report states as a resulting conclusion that—

Executive agreements then, to the extent that they may override contrary State laws and policies, become the law of the land and this is true whether the agreements are congressional, executive, or Presidential.

Such a conclusion is far too broad and is misleading. Even though the so-called executive agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was the controlling factor involved, the case could not be considered as any credible authority for agreements relating to a different subject matter—particularly a subject not wholly within the President's constitutional authority—and not accompanied by similar surrounding circumstances, circumstances which the Court emphasized in great detail.

To state, on the basis of such a case, a conclusion which implies that by any international agreement the President alone can override State laws and policies, destroying or impairing private or other rights of American nationals under State laws, is misleading. The failure to make a careful analysis of the Pink case appears to have been an unfortunate oversight on the part of the committee.

The report states on page 28 that:

It should be noted that the proposed amendment does not seek to define the area in which executive agreements may properly be made, but instead leaves the matter to be worked out by the more flexible method of statutory definition.

This statement reflects an approach which, instead of being based upon a thorough analysis and effort to delineate the respective powers of the legislature and the executive, is based upon the proposition that Congress shall have complete and plenary power to regulate, when and in the manner it desires, any activity of the executive branch of the Government in its relations with foreign governments and international organizations. The Congress could determine whether or not, as well as when, where, and how the President could agree to meet with the heads of other nations to confer; it could require advance approval, before any arrangements are made for negotiations, as to what could be negotiated. Even an agreement to enter into discussions with a view to determining whether negotiations could fruitfully be undertaken could be made subject to advance approval or any other condition the Congress should choose to impose.

CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS

With reference to the proposal by the Secretary of State of "friendly cooperation between the three departments of Government" the report states:

It should be readily recognized that the friendly cooperation which has been urged upon the committee is hardly possible if "the President alone has the unlimited discretion to decide whether a particular international agreement requires the approval of one, both, or neither of the two Houses of Congress."

The context in which this statement appears gives the impression that the part to which quotes have been added is a statement of fact rather than a matter of opinion which does not take into account the constitutional limitations within which the President must function. The statement is made as though the courts have no authority whatsoever to question the legal basis of an agreement made by the President. The statement likewise ignores the necessity for cooperation by Congress for any President to accomplish any substantial objective; indeed no President could carry on very long the everyday functions of the Government if Congress refused to cooperate, particularly in the matter of appropriations. The statement imputes an unlimited power to the President in an effort to justify a proposal for an unlimited power of Congress to regulate the activities of the Executive in the field of foreign affairs.

CONGRESSIONAL VETO IN FIELD OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The report states at the bottom of page 28 that—

Section 3 of this resolution would not alter the President's role as the sole organ of the United States in the conduct of international negotiations.

Of course, as also stated in the report, the resolution would not give Congress authority to compel that a particular international agreement be made. But it gives Congress such broad and unlimited power to regulate agreements that it could even require that drafts of agreements be submitted to it for approval before negotiations are undertaken. Even though the resolution standing alone may not alter the President's role as sole negotiator, it gives Congress such broad powers that, by legislation, it could impose whatever restrictions or requirements it desires with respect to any negotiations the President may seek to undertake.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The statement on page 29 that "the Congress under this amendment could likewise prohibit the making of certain types of executive agreements" is misleading in that the proposed amendment would give the Congress the power to prohibit the making of any type of agreement, not simply certain types, any time it should choose to do so. The report itself admits that the power to regulate embraces the power to prohibit. The proposed amendment contains no limitation whatsoever on the word "regulate" in connection with the additional authority sought for the Congress.

TIE THE HANDS OF THE PRESIDENT

The statement in the report, page 29, that "the amendment in no way interferes with the President's authority to conduct the negotiations leading to these agreements" is another example of a misleading statement. The power of the President to make authoritative commitments on behalf of the United States would be subject to such conditions as Congress should choose to impose. Other nations would be confused, in their efforts to plan their foreign policy with respect to the United States, by questions as to what changes would be made in American foreign policy through the rigid control that could be exercised by Congress under the new amendment. They would recognize that they would have to negotiate with an executive who was not trusted by his country and was subject to the legislative will as to when and how he would speak.

EFFECT OF SECTION ON OTHER COUNTRIES

The statement in the report to the effect that the differences of views between constitutional lawyers in the United States with respect to limitations on the power of executive agreements, making it ludicrous to presume that other nations are aware of any such limitations, is one of the best reasons for adopting the section regarding executive agreements is unrealistic. The report offers no evidence of any embarrassment ever having been experienced in its negotiations with another country because of a lack of clarity as to the field of executive agreements. Other countries in their negotiations with the United States invariably leave questions as to our domestic requirements with respect to treaties and executive agreements for determination by the United States. They have long ago learned to rely upon such determinations without question.

THE GOOD FAITH OF THE PRESIDENT

The report impugns the good faith shown by Presidents throughout the history of this Nation. The report states on page 30 that unless limitations, comparable to those proposed with respect to the treaty power, are imposed upon the making of executive agreements, "the demise of the treaty method of concluding international agreements would be assured." This statement can have only one purpose, namely, to indicate that the executive branch of the Government has no respect for the intentions of the Founding Fathers of this Nation, the judicial history of the Constitution, or the relative functions of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government. The report mentions only one specific instance in which agreements concluded by the President—those at Yalta—may have required approval by the Senate, and on this basis concludes that no President should be trusted.

ENDANGER NATIONAL SECURITY

The report, at page 31, makes reference to the objection "that congressional regulation of executive and other agreements would so hamstring the Executive as to endanger the national security." The report says that this objection is unsound, but the report's conclusion is not supported by the reasons stated. The reasons given by the committee ignore several fundamental factors. Of course most of the agreements which have been concluded by the Chief Executive in the name of the United States have either been authorized by the Congress or later approved by act or joint resolution. But it should be noted that the agreements so concluded are of a technical or fiscal character and relate to subject matter over which the Congress has primary authority and responsibility. Those remaining, referred to in the report as amounting to 15 percent, are of a purely political, diplomatic, military, or administrative character, relating to subject matter long recognized as being within the President's constitutional authority. It is in this field that the amendment seeks to subordinate the constitutional authority of the Executive power to the will of the legislative branch of the Government. No one can deny that in those areas especially, the authority of the United States must be capable of being exercised expeditiously and in an atmosphere of respect and dignity.

THE POTATO CASE

Whether or not the Executive was acting within his authority in exchanging notes with Canada regarding restrictions on the import of Canadian potatoes into the United States remains to be determined by the Supreme Court. The report, on page 32, in referring to the case of *U. S.* v. *Guy W. Capps* (100 Fed. Supp. 30 (1951)), regarding that exchange of notes, neglects to point out that the courts of the United States consider as being within their jurisdiction the matter of the determination as to the legality of an international agreement. The fact that the circuit court of appeals held the agreement to be invalid—on the ground of nonconformity with procedures established by Congress—is treated by the report as of little, if any, significance. This neglect and attitude of unconcern is especially important in view of the great reliance which the report places upon the Pink case in an effort to show that the President, acting alone, can make law.

LIKELIHOOD OF CONGRESSIONAL ABUSE

The report, at page 32, seeks to explain away any likelihood of congressional abuse of the new power sought over the conduct of foreign policy by referring to, first, the requirement of a two-thirds vote to override a Presidential veto; and, second, the power of the Supreme Court to void "any laws enacted by the Congress not made in pursuance of the Constitution." This solution is not as simple and as effective as it may appears at first glance. For example, what would prevent Congress from including in each appropriation bill a provision which would whittle down the President's negotiating power? A provision which he could not veto without leaving the executive branch without funds to operate? Since the constitutional amendment is necessarily intended to shift power from the executive to the legislative branch of the Government, what limitations would the Court rely upon in view of the unlimited power that Congress would have to "regulate" agreements? The new amendment, if adopted, would become an integral part of the Constitution, upsetting carefully designed and long and jealously guarded powers of the three coordinate branches of the Government.

The report, on page 32, makes the following assertion as a statement of fact rather than as an isolated opinion regarding constitutional restrictions on the President's freedom of action in foreign affairs:

> To circumvent these restrictions, the authority of the Chief Executive to make executive agreements has been exploited to the point where the treaty procedure may ultimately become a historic rule.

Surely none of the examples of executive agreements referred to anywhere in the report constitute a basis for such a sweeping statement. The statement quoted verges on the emotional to emphasize a point of view rather than being an objective statement of fact. So far as the increase in the number of executive agreements as compared with the number of treaties is concerned, it should be noted that both the Senate and the House of Representatives have authorized the vast majority of those agreements. To make such an assertion on the basis of a reference to the Yalta agreement as having been of a type requiring approval by the Senate is to generalize in sweeping terms on the basis of a single specific example.

A further example of a statement, at the bottom of page 32, which the committee undoubtedly did not consider carefully in the preparation of the report is the following:

> Many well-meaning individuals believe that it would be suicidal in a time of world crisis to subject the President to observance of traditional constitutional restraints.

What basis, other than references to a few writers, is given in the report for the point of view that objection exists to a requirement that the President observe "traditional constitutional restraints"? Are the restraints to which reference is made intended to mean that the President should today travel by horse and buggy as was done in the days of the Founding Fathers? Such an intention is of course absurd. It is equally questionable to impute to the Founding Fathers the intention that no procedures would be developed beyond the extent of their development at the time the Constitution was formulated. It is likewise questionable to impute to the Founding

Fathers the notion that no new procedures of government could be developed other than those existing at the time of the Constitutional Convention.

PERILS EXISTING WHEN THE CONSTITUTION WAS DRAFTED

Admittedly, as the report points out, the framers of the Constitution lived in a day of peril and the "infant Nation was well nigh powerless to resist several possible combinations of aggressors." It is also true that the Founding Fathers "did not place their trust in one-man rule of either foreign or domestic policy." They found instances, however, where it became necessary to act promptly and effectively in spite of some existing practices which, if followed literally, might have seriously changed most of the history of this Nation. For example, had President Jefferson's ambassadors to France stayed rigidly within the negotiating power granted them by the Congress with respect to Louisiana they might not have been able to obtain that great territory by purchase.

No case has been made in the report that "complete and exclusive executive direction of American foreign policy" has ever existed or is ever likely to exist. Yet the report suggests not only that such a situation faces us and requires immediate amendment of the Constitution but also that we may be faced with complete executive control of domestic policy. The remedy for this situation as recommended by the report, is a constitutional amendment which would give the Congress far-reaching authority to regulate foreign affairs. The oft-repeated references by the proponents of the amendment to the intentions of the Founding Fathers is as ironical as the conclusions set forth in the report with a view to guiding the reader. The whole purport of the case made by the report is that, in order to express the intention of the Founding Fathers who carefully formulated the most remarkable constitution in the world, the Constitution must be amended; and the amendment will change the delicately balanced separation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers which is designed to form the backbone of that document as an enduring instrument.

Mr. President, I believe the analysis I have presented of the majority report of the Judiciary Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 1 will indicate to all objective students and citizens that Senate approval of this proposal would be one of the most dangerous acts of our generation. This Nation has grown great under our Constitution. I do not want to see it torn to shreds. I do not want to see the Senate in a moment of hysteria undo the delicate balance of power that our Founding Fathers created in this Constitution.

Proponents of the resolution have been talking about how the people of this country demand that the Constitution be amended. What do the people demand? Our greatest legal authorities—deans and professors of our leading law schools—stand 26 to 1 against the Bricker amendment.

The Gallup poll of October 6, 1953, showed that 81 percent of the people had not heard of the proposed Bricker amendment. Of the 19 percent who had heard of the amendment, 9 percent were in favor of it, 7 percent opposed it, and 3 percent had no opinion.

In effect, those who urge that we amend one of the most vital parts of our Constitution, those who demand that we upset the delicate balance of power between the Executive and the Congress, between the States and the Federal Government, and between the House and the Senate, would do so because the people demand it. What people? I ask. Nine percent of the American people.

I am not willing to tear our Constitution asunder because 9 percent of the American people, on the basis of misleading information such as that contained in the report of the majority of the Judiciary Committee, believe such action is necessary. If 50 percent of America wants to amend the Constitution, we should begin to consider it. But the Founding Fathers thought the Constitution such a stable instrument that it should not be amended except if two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and three-fourths of the State legislatures approve the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the Gallup poll results in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINE PERCENT FAVOR BRICKER AMENDMENT, SEVEN PERCENT OPPOSE IT

PRINCETON, N. J., October 6.—Comparatively few voters across the country show interest at the present time in the debate over the controversial Bricker amendment.

Those who have followed the discussions about it show a divided reaction, with slightly more in favor of it than opposed.

Those are the highlights of a coast-to-coast survey by the American Institute of Public Opinion on an issue that has divided the Eisenhower administration and several GOP legislators, led by the Ohio Senator, JOHN W. BRICKER.

BRICKER has said that his proposed amendment to the Constitution is necessary to prevent liberties of the American people from being undermined by means of treaties.

President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, while agreeing to the principle of the Bricker amendment, claim it goes too far and would hamstring the administration in reaching run-of-mine executive understandings with other governments.

Because of the highly complex nature of the issue, the institute survey used a so-called "filter" question to separate voters who have some knowledge of the subject from those who do not.

All persons in the national sample were first asked:

"Have you heard or read anything about Senator BRICKER's proposal of an amendment to the Constitution to limit the President's treatymaking powers?"

A total of 19 percent said they had heard or read about the proposed Bricker amendment, while 81 percent said they had not.

The next question was put only to the 19 percent who had followed the debate:

"Would you favor or oppose this amendment?"

The vote:

	Percent
Favor amendment	9
Oppose	7
No opinion	3
Total	19
Had not followed	81
Total	100

The ratio of approval to disapproval is about the same for both rank-and-file Democrats and GOP voters, as the following table shows:

	Republican	Democratic	Independent
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Favor amendment	12	8	8
Oppose	8	5	8
No opinion	2	3	7
Total	22	16	23
Had not followed	78	84	77
Total	100	100	100

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am informed that petitions are being circulated asking for votes for the Bricker amendment. The amendment itself has not been presented to the people. They are merely instructed to sign the petition.

On one occasion a petition was circulated in a Southern State to abolish the Ten Commandments, and hundreds of people signed it.

I do not discount the provision of the Constitution providing for the right of petition, but when it involves a question of fundamental international law, and the people do not know what it is about, such a petition is of no significance. It is about as valid as a claim which I might make that the Council of Churches, representing a group of 30 million persons, is against the Bricker amendment. We cannot pass the buck by looking at petitions and editorials. We must think about what would be the result with reference to this splendid country of ours, and the Constitution, which is the bedrock of our liberties.

Mr. President, the legal authorities of this country do not want the Bricker amendment. The people do not want the amendment.

There is one other person who does not want the amendment. That is the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

On July 22, 1953, the President said:

I am unalterably opposed to any amendment which would change our traditional treatymaking power or which would hamper the President in his constitutional authority to conduct foreign affairs. * * * As President I have taken an oath to defend the Constitution. I therefore oppose any change which will impair the President's traditional authority to conduct foreign affairs.

I am willing to stand with President Eisenhower on this issue.

Mr. President, I shall say one other word before I conclude. This speech was prepared hurriedly, as I have said. Among the thoughts, emphatically stressing the issues I have enumerated today one stands out preeminently.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Is the proposed amendment necessary? Well, its proponents have scared 9 percent, they say, of those who had heard something about it, into saying, "Yes." That is, that we should change the fundamental, basic law—not statute law, but the Constitution of the United States—because some 9 percent of the folks feel it should be done. To me, Mr. President, it is an exceedingly serious thing.

I remember that the Founding Fathers struggled over this problem. There are those who want to make this a nation of 48 nations. Not I. I am a Senator of the United States of America, even though I represent, in part, the State of Wisconsin. A great civil war was fought to determine whether this Nation should be indivisible.

If the camel's nose is allowed under the tent, to permit a return to the concept of yesteryears, we will be doing what a great constitutional lawyer said would be done: we will be committing mayhem upon the Constitution. Mr. President, I am not for that step.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered into, I now move that the Senate, as in executive session, recess until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate, as in executive session, took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 25, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 22, 1954:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Whiting Willauer, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Honduras.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Simon E. Sobeloff, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice Philip B. Perlman, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Roswell Burchard Perkins, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Robert O. Boyd, of Oregon, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1957. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Maurice Paul Bois, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire, vice John J. Sheehan, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Dewey Howard Perry, of Vermont, to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont, vice Edward L. Burke, whose term expires February 10, 1954.

Edward John Petitbon, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice Louis F. Knop, Jr., term expired.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Bligh A. Dodds, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 7, with headquarters at Ogdensburg, N. Y., to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Eugene Mead Caffey, O9329, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as The Judge Advocate General of the Army, and as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army, and major general (temporary), Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 206 and 308, Army Organization Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 267, 270; 10 U. S. C. 211, 61-1); section 249, Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 643; 10 U. S. C. 61a); and sections 513 and 515 (c), Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 901, 907; 10 U. S. C. 559g, 506d (c)).

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, January 22, 1954)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose loving kindness and tender mercies fail never, and whose fatherly compassion reaches unto the ends of the earth: We come with bowed and reverent hearts at this new dawn of opportunity asking that our attitudes toward each other and toward all men may become the ministers of purity and goodness, of brotherhood and peace.

We thank Thee for this wayside shrine, apart from the clamor of the world, into whose holy precincts no controversy penetrates and where no unworthy rivalries can live within its gates of peace. As we become strangely aware, with all other voices hushed, that together we share our sense of the unseen and eternal, may we be filled with the spirit that makes for unity of purpose amid all the diversities of our thought.

And now, as the week's problems wait with their demanding insistency, we pray that Thou wilt restrain in us every impetuous temper, all ungenerous judgments, all presumptuous claims, all promptings of self-assertion. Grant us the will to contribute our own spirit and influence to remove misunderstanding and suspicion, as we toil and pray for Thy kingdom's coming among all men. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 22, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2474. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York;

H. R. 1917. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; and

H. R. 6665. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and by unanimous consent, the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy were authorized to meet with the full joint committee during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business as in legislative session, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ROLL-CALL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before suggesting the absence of a quorum, I should like to say that following the transaction of routine business, when the Senate reverts to executive session, it will be my intention to ask the Senate first to take up the nominations on the Executive Calendar, which is on the desk of each Senator; that following action on the nominations, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of the Korean Treaty, which is on the Executive Calendar, and continue the consideration of the treaty today and if necessary into tomorrow, until action on the treaty has been had. It will then be my intention to move that the Senate revert to legislative session, in which the business will be the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, the proposal to amend the Constitution.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Is it the intention of the majority leader to have night sessions this week?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I intend to consult further with the minority leader, but I will say to the distinguished Senator from New York that it is my present intention to have the Senate move along with the normal daily sessions this week, without night sessions, but that if the

debate goes over into next week, I should like to have Senators prepared to hold evening sessions. I would not expect to ask the Senate to run to any late hour, but would propose that we proceed as we did last Wednesday night and sit until perhaps 8 or 9 o'clock.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 79)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the 39th annual report of the committee covering the fiscal year 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1954.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNCATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the International Information and Educational Exchange Program, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT RELATING TO PROTESTS OF GRANTS OF INSTRUMENTS OF AUTHORIZATION WITHOUT HEARING

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Wasnington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of House bill 2344, providing for a salary adjustment for post-office employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONTRIBUTION TO WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN ACADEMY OF TROPICAL MEDICINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are all familiar with the reputation of the World Health Organization. In 6 years of effective operation throughout the free world, WHO has stimulated and encouraged the improvement of public health and the control of communicable diseases. Its work is important to Americans because, among other reasons, many of our boys in the Armed Forces must serve in disease-ridden countries abroad.

I know that many of my colleagues have received from the American Academy of Tropical Medicine a copy of its resolution urging consideration of a larger United States contribution to the World Health Organization. This contribution is now limited to $3 million a year. Certainly the American Academy of Tropical Medicine, with its headquarters in Puerto Rico, is in a strong position to see the immediate benefit from WHO operation in that malaria-ridden part of the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution of the American Academy of Tropical Medicine in order to call the attention of the Congress to this vital work.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the experience of the 20th century has shown that good public health in any country contributes enormously to the growth of agriculture, industry, and overseas trade and to political and social progress; and

Whereas the events of the past 50 years have repeatedly demonstrated the deleterious effects upon the United States of underdevelopment and of political and social instability in other parts of the world; and

Whereas the national security of the United States depends to an increasing extent upon basic materials imported from underdeveloped and often disease-ridden tropical countries; and

Whereas the vastly increased volume and speed of intercommunication between the United States and the Tropics have greatly augmented the potential danger which tropical disease presents to our country; and

Whereas throughout the world today our country has political and defense commitments which make it necessary for the United States to deploy its Armed Forces to many regions and, therefore, to maintain a practical interest in reducing the incidence of communicable disease in many overseas areas; and

Whereas the World Health Organization over a period of 6 years has conclusively demonstrated that it is a unique and effective international agency welcomed throughout the free world for its help in stimulating, coordinating, and assisting the development of public health and the control of communicable diseases; and

Whereas there is no doubt that the United States is materially and politically deriving great benefit from the success of the World Health Organization in developing public health in many countries with which we trade, in accelerating the control of such tropical diseases as malaria, and in lessening the chance of an invasion of the United States by disease-producing parasites; and

Whereas the ceiling of $3 million per year fixed by the Congress as the total amount our country may contribute does not now permit a logical expansion of WHO's activities required by its increased responsibilities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Academy of Tropical Medicine and the American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene urge the Congress of the United States to raise the statutory limitation placed upon our financial participation; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretaries of these respective organizations be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Congress and to other interested organizations and individuals and to inform the press about and to otherwise publicize this resolution to the fullest extent feasible.

PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT'S SHARE OF OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE DIRECT TO PERSONS 65 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER—STATEMENT AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement and a resolution adopted by the Lake County Board of Commissioners, in support of a plan for the payment of the Federal Government's share of old-age assistance directly to every person of the age of 65 and over, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY LAKE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Now the Government gives as much as $35 a month to the States for certain old people. Would it not be fairer to give $35 direct to every old person of 65, who applied for it? Of course, there should be a limit on their other income, but make it so high, at least $200 a month, so as to keep administrative costs to a minimum.

Of course, those who need more would get it from the States, as they do now, but the Federal Government would not pay anything to the States for old-age pensions, except for special services, such as for the blind, for medical care, and to medical institutions.

We know $35 a month is not an adequate pension in itself, but is rather to supplement other present income. Besides, we would rather have $35 a month now than a larger amount after we're dead.

The applications could be made through the post office, with the applicant paying a small sum, say 50 cents to the postmaster, as the postmaster should not have to do more for free than he is now.

Mrs. John LeClair again appeared before the county board regarding a plan for the payment of an amount equal to the Federal Government's share of old-age assistance directly to every person of the age of 65 years and over, with reservation as to income.

Resolved, That this board of county commissioners hereby endorses the plan presented by Mrs. John LeClair; be it further

Resolved, That copies of the plan and this resolution be forwarded to Senator THYE, Senator HUMPHREY, and Representative BLATNIK.

Commissioner Houle moved the adoption of the foregoing resolution and the same was declared adopted upon the following vote: Yeas—Houle, Degerstedt, Wiiklund, Sandstrom, and Strom. Total yeas, five. Nays, none.

Adopted January 5, 1954.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
County of Lake, ss.

I, Paul W. Nelson, auditor of Lake County, Minn., do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing resolution with the original filed in my office on the 5th day of January, 1954, and that the same is a true and correct copy of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand and seal of office at Two Harbors, Minn., this 15th day of January 1954.

PAUL W. NELSON,
Auditor, Lake County, Minn.

UNIFORM RULES OF PROCEDURE—RESOLUTION OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE MINNEAPOLIS (MINN.) YWCA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the public affairs committee of the Minneapolis YWCA at their January meeting this year, urging the adoption of uniform rules of procedure, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN
ASSOCIATION OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
Minneapolis, Minn., January 18, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The following is the text of a resolution passed by the public affairs committee of the Minneapolis YWCA in their January meeting:

"Whereas, under the present procedures practiced by some of the congressional investigating committees, irreparable damages and injustices are suffered by American individuals, their families, and associates, all contrary to the protection guaranteed them by our United States Constitution; and

"Whereas, there is a great need for the adoption of uniform rules of procedure by all of our congressional investigating committees to correct abuses violating our accustomed legal guaranties and procedures: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of the public affairs committee of the Minneapolis YWCA urge our congressional delegation to support actively legislation providing for such uniform rules of procedure, or to initiate same, if necessary."

The public affairs committee is made up of 21 YWCA members representing various departments of the YWCA and the community at large. They are home women, business and professional women from broad ranges of age and affiliations. Actions such as this resolution are taken after studying the pros and cons of the problem.

As you are one of our elected Senators, we are vitally interested in your consideration of this matter. It is my privilege to convey to you this resolution, and these pertinent facts.

Yours very truly,

MARIAN DEININGER,
Chairman, Public Affairs Committee,
Minneapolis YWCA.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—LETTER FROM PRESIDENT, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated January 16, 1954, addressed to me by the president of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota, in behalf of the league urging my opposition to the Bricker amendment, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, Minn., January 16, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The League of Women Voters of Minnesota respectfully urges your opposition to the proposed Bricker amendment on the grounds:

That it is not necessary.

That it would disturb the division of powers between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, which our Founding Fathers wisely placed in our Constitution.

That it would greatly impede the conduct of our foreign affairs and treaty obligations, which rightly belong in the hands of the Federal Government, with the result that it would constitute a very grave threat to the security of the United States, as well as seriously handicap the United States in its position of leadership in the struggle for world peace and freedom.

We sincerely hope you will vote against this dangerous proposal.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. BASIL YOUNG,
President.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Minnesota United Nations Association on December 1, 1953, in opposition to the Bricker amendment, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The association reaffirms its opposition to the Bricker amendment expressed in the resolution approved at its annual meeting of May 5, 1953. It considers that the attempt to confine the exercise of the treaty power for practical purposes to subjects within the delegated legislative powers of the National Government would subject the foreign policy of the United States to the special interests and arbitrary attitudes of one or a few States, since legislative implementation by all would be required to give domestic effect to treaties affecting matters within the reserved legislative powers of States. Many such matters are of broad national and international concern, requiring use of the treaty power.

2. In particular the association deplores the effect which such limitations might have upon effective collaboration by the United States in a number of constructive international conventions proposed by organs of the United Nations. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate has wisely eliminated a sweeping and ambiguous section of the original Bricker resolution which would have prohibited all treaties permitting international organizations to "supervise, control, or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States." Nevertheless supporters of the amendment continue to assert in support of their position that the Genocide Convention, the proposed convenants on human rights, and other treaties sponsored by the United Nations would permit it to exercise direct jurisdiction over our nationals. These contentions are unjustified. The association challenges anyone to point out such provisions in these treaties.

3. The association heartily commends Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S vigorous and informed comments in opposition to the proposed amendment. It hereby authorizes the president to appoint a committee to wait upon Senator EDWARD J. THYE in order to represent to him the urgent necessity for his support in the fight against the amendment.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit three reports made by its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. In submitting the reports, I will state that, while the committee authorized me to submit the reports, some of the members of the committee desired to make it clear that submitting the reports does not necessarily mean that they approve of the contents of the reports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin will be received and printed.

The reports submitted by Mr. McCARTHY are as follows:

Report on State Department Information Program—Information Centers (Rept. No. 879);

Report on Waste and Mismanagement in Voice of America Engineering Projects (Rept. No. 880); and

Annual Report of the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 881).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 25, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 2805. A bill for the relief of Der Chuck Yee and Wu Mei On; and

S. 2806. A bill for the relief of Mohammad Hamad Faris (Fares); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2807. A bill for the relief of Theresia Probst Uhl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 2808. A bill to provide for the construction of certain reservoirs on the Kentucky and Big Sandy Rivers so as to provide a year-round supply of industrial water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2809. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles W. McClelland, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2810. A bill to authorize the construction and maintenance of certain harbor improvements at Gold Beach, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 2811. A bill to authorize enrolled members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to acquire trust interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2812. A bill to provide for the return to the former Indian owners and their successors in interest of certain lands acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project of all oil and gas rights and interests in such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2813. A bill to provide for a per capita distribution of Menominee tribal funds and authorize the withdrawal of the Menominee Tribe from Federal jurisdiction; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRICKER (by request):

S. 2814. A bill to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2815. A bill to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes;

S. 2816. A bill to amend section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the imposition of civil penalties in certain additional cases, and for other purposes;

S. 2817. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases; and

S. 2818. A bill to amend sections 4417 and 4418 of the Revised Statutes to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2819. A bill for the relief of Fumiko Sasaki also known as Helen Fumiko Sasaki; and

S. 2820. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Erika Gisela Osteraa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. GRISWOLD, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. HUNT):

S. 2821. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2822. A bill for the relief of Jose Cipriano Arias Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2823. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Hedmark, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2824. A bill for the relief of Insel Ruybal (nee Insel Diener y Grumberg); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2825. A bill making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado when he introduced the last abovementioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 2826. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory repayment contract with the Pine River irrigation district, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SINGLE PACKAGE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference my annual single package streamlined appropriation bill for fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

You will recall that the key under my plan is the total of all appropriations which are to be made for the support of the Government for the year. This total represents 100 percent of all appropriations to be made and so every item in the bill is stated as a percentage of this overall total.

This method is in keeping with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, section 138 (a), which is the statutory law governing appropriations, and that reads as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated overall Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. (Public Law 601, 79th Cong., p. 24.)

It is ironic that while this vital section of statutory law has been on the books for almost 8 years it has never been followed by Congress. In my opinion, the country would have been billions ahead had it been observed.

The exact percentages in the bill which I am introducing today are not intended to be perfected for the next fiscal year. They are the percentages of all of the appropriations voted for the present fiscal year and are used merely to demonstrate how the one package streamlined plan would work.

If this plan were to be used for the next fiscal year the four committees of Congress designated by law to perform that task would determine the overall total of appropriations to be voted in accordance with law. That figure, as I have stated, would represent 100 percent. Then the House and Senate Appropriations Committees would hold hearings in the usual way and express the amount of each item in the appropriation bill in a percentage of the total already determined. Each of these Appropriations Committees would have complete freedom of action provided their total did not exceed the statutory limit determined by the four committees of Congress.

When this streamlined bill was reported out on the floor of either House the only restriction on the Members of either the House or the Senate would be the total which has been agreed upon. If a House or Senate Member desires to raise the amount of an appropriation for a particular function he would have to reduce an appropriation for some other department by the amount of the increase he sought.

Should the Congress adopt this method of voting appropriations, I am certain that the Bureau of the Budget would fall in line and make its overall recommendations in percentages of the total appropriations requested and that would be a tremendous step forward toward simplicity of handling the country's finances.

The Bureau of the Budget, a function of the executive department, is authorized and directed by Congress to control the expenditures of each department except legislative and judicial appropriations and the regulatory Commissions which are arms of the Congress, and, therefore, should not be placed under the direction of the executive department.

It will be noted that my streamlined bill uses only 3 pages as against 300 pages of the usual annual appropriation bills and yet it gives everyone a much better picture of the fiscal policies of the Nation and the relative costs of each function of Government to every other function.

This method, which I am proposing again, would result in a much clearer understanding of appropriations by Members of Congress, the administration, and the man on the street.

I ask unanimous consent that my single package streamlined bill, together with a copy of a statement wherein the percentages of appropriations are reduced to dollars, be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2825) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $64 billion is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for expenditure by the Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

SEC. 2. The sum appropriated by this act for expenditures by the Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is hereby apportioned among the various branches, departments, agencies, and establishments of the Government in accordance with the table contained in section 3 of this act. The sums made available by this act for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, together with any sums remaining available for expenditure from any prior fiscal years, by each branch, department, agency, or establishment shall not be increased by any other act of the Congress.

SEC. 3. The percent of the sum appropriated by this act which shall be available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, by each branch, department, agency, or establishment of the Government is as follows:

Agency:	*Percentage*
Legislative branch	0.109438
The Judiciary	.040772
Independent offices:	
Executive Office of the President	.019284
American Battle Monuments Commission	.014405

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Agency—Continued	Percentage
Independent offices—Continued	
Atomic Energy Commission	1.647370
Civil Aeronautics Board	.005840
Civil Service Commission	.081134
Commerce—Civil Aeronautics Administration	.216141
Commerce—Maritime activities	.054508
Commission on Foreign Economic Policy	.000467
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	.000778
Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government	.000778
Defense Transportation Administration	.000661
Economic Stabilization Agency	.001868
Federal Communications Commission	.011524
Federal Power Commission	.006696
Federal Trade Commission	.006313
Federal Civil Defense Administration	.072457
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	.004999
General Accounting Office	.049806
General Services Administration	.267802
Housing and Home Finance Agency	.037594
Indian Claims Commission	.000182
Interstate Commerce Commission	.017573
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	.000007
Mutual Security Agency	7.057293
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	.097241
National Capital Housing Authority	.000066
National Capital Park & Planning Commission	.000350
National Science Foundation	.012450
National Labor Relations Board	.014211
National Mediation Board	.001657
Renegotiation Board	.008085
Revolving Fund, Defense Production Act	.085656
Securities and Exchange Commission	.007786
Selective Service	.046537
Small Business Administration	.003426
Smithsonian Institution	.006657
Subversive Activities Control Board	.000545
Tariff Commission	.002010
Tennessee Valley Authority	.393638
Tax Court of the United States	.001510
Veterans' Administration	6.193663
Department of Agriculture	1.329093
Department of State	.323697
Department of Justice	.291196
Department of Commerce	1.060955
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	2.816432
Department of the Interior	.676969
Department of Labor	.402202
Department of Defense:	
Civil Functions	.692559
Military Functions	53.904645
Department of the Treasury	.953112
Post Office Department	4.410898
District of Columbia	.018688
Claims and Judgments	.018877
Permanent appropriations for general and special accounts:	
Interest on the public debt	9.889384
Other	6.549506
Grand total	100.000000

SEC. 4. The Bureau of the Budget is authorized to control the amounts actually expended from the sums made available by this act for expenditure by each department, agency, or establishment of the executive branch, except the following arms of Congress: the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the United States Tariff Commission.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado is as follows:

How the Johnson proposal would work if the percentage of appropriations each agency received for fiscal year 1954 were applied to a $64 billion appropriation for fiscal year 1955 ($64 billion equals 100 percent):

Agency	Percent of total appropriations	Reduced to dollars
Legislative branch	0.1094	$70,040,320
The Judiciary	.0407	26,094,080
Independent offices:		
Executive Office of the President	.0198	12,725,760
American Battle Monuments Commission	.1044	9,219,200
Atomic Energy Commission	1.6473	1,054,316,800
Civil Service Commission	.0811	51,925,760
Commerce—Maritime activities	.0545	34,885,120
Commission on Foreign Economic Policy	.0004	298,880
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	.0007	497,920
Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government	.0007	497,920
Defense Transportation Administration	.0006	423,040
Economic Stabilization Agency	.0018	1,195,520
Federal Communications Commission	.0115	7,375,360
Federal Power Commission	.0066	4,285,440
Federal Trade Commission	.0063	4,040,320
Federal Civil Defense Administration	.0724	46,372,480
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	.0049	3,199,360
General Accounting Office	.0498	31,875,840
General Services Administration	.2678	171,393,280
Housing and Home Finance Agency	.0975	62,524,160
Indian Claims Commission	.0001	$116,480
Interstate Commerce Commission	.0175	11,246,720
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	.000007	4,480
Mutual Security Agency	7.0572	4,516,667,520
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	.0972	62,234,240
National Capital Housing Authority	.00006	42,240
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	.00035	224,000
National Science Foundation	.0124	7,973,760
National Labor Relations Board	.0142	9,095,040
National Mediation Board	.0016	1,060,480
Renegotiation Board	.0090	5,174,400
Revolving Fund, Defense Production Act	.0856	54,819,840
Securities and Exchange Commission	.0077	4,983,040
Selective Service	.0465	29,783,680
Small Business Administration	.0034	2,192,640
Smithsonian Institution	.0066	4,260,.80
Subversive Activities Control Board	.0005	348,800
Tariff Commission	.0020	1,286,400
Tennessee Valley Authority	.2936	187,928,320
Tax Court of the United States	.0015	966,400
Veterans' Administration	6.1936	3,963,944,320
Department of Agriculture	1.329	850,619,520
Department of State	.3236	207,166,080
Department of Justice	.2911	186,365,440
Department of Commerce:		
Civil Aeronautics Administration	.2161	138,330,240
Civil Aeronautics Board	.0068	3,737,600
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	2.8164	1,802,516,480
Department of the Interior	.6769	$433,260,160
Department of Labor	.4022	257,409,280
Department of Defense:		
Civil Functions	.6925	443,237,760
Military Functions	53.904	34,498,972,800
Department of the Treasury	.9531	609,991,680
Post Office Department	4.4108	2,822,974,720
District of Columbia	.0186	11,960,320
Claims and Judgments [1]	.0188	12,081,280
Total annual and supplemental appropriations	83.461	53,415,110,400
Permanent appropriations, general and special accounts:		
Interest on the public debt [2]	9.880	6,320,205,760
Other [2 3]	6.649	4,255,683,840
Total permanent appropriations [3]	16.538	10,584,889,600
Grand total appropriations	100.000	64,000,000,000

[1] Claims and judgments stated here is a title appearing in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954, and includes amounts of claims and judgments that were not provided in the regular appropriation acts, and that were not allocated by department in the supplemental.

[2] Estimated.

[3] "Other" permanent appropriations include primarily refunds of internal revenue ($2.6 billion), statutory debt retirements ($0.6 billion), payment to Railroad Retirement account ($0.7 billion). The refunds of taxes were probably omitted from the table for 1953.

Sources: Public laws and Senate reports of the 83d Cong., 1st sess. Congressional Record (Daily Digest), August 14, 1953, p. D661. Data supplied by Maureen McBreen, Economics Section, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH PLACING OF STATUE OF MARCUS WHITMAN IN THE CAPITOL

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations and bound in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the Joint Committee may deem pertinent thereto, upon the occasion of the acceptance of the statue of Marcus Whitman, presented by the State of Washington, 5,000 copies; of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and for the use and distribution by the Senators from Washington; and the remaining 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and for the use of and the distribution by the Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall provide suitable illustrations to be bound with these proceedings.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF POSTAL OPERATIONS

Mr. CARLSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 197), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may complete the study and investigation

of postal operations as authorized by the Senate Resolution 49, 83d Congress, agreed to March 6, 1953, hereby is extended to March 31, 1954.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 198), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, vice Mr. PURTELL, of Connecticut.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 189) providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

By Mr. BUSH:

Statement issued by him relating to the report of the Committee on Foreign Economic Policy.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

List of Minnesota's 4–H delegates to the National 4–H Club Congress in Chicago.

UNITED STATES TROOPS HELD IN SLAVE LABOR CAMPS OF CHINA AND SIBERIA

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, a few days ago the free world rejoiced at the news that more than 22,000 United Nations prisoners were to be turned over to the U. N. Command, which most certainly will promptly set them free—free as God made them, free as man was meant to be: to enjoy life, to bask in the warmth of his family's love, to speak his mind, to read what he will, to earn his daily bread in a job of his own choosing, to offer his talent as he will in service of his fellowmen, to worship his God according to the dictates of his conscience. This is something of what it means to be free. This is the world that awaits United Nations prisoners who, now returned, will soon be free.

But amid the exultation, the shouts, the tears of joy, there are cries of anguish, words full of bitterness, disillusionment, anger, and near despair, and the quiet murmur of desperate, pleading prayer from the wives, the mothers, the fathers, and the children of the "forgotten men"—the American boys, variously estimated as between 700 and 944, who are being held in slave labor camps of China and Siberia, in direct violation of the Korean truce agreement which pledged that all prisoners would be returned. We know this is true from eye-witness accounts of our wounded prisoners who already have been returned, and from other reliable sources.

Our Government has known of this outrage since last fall, but apparently has taken little, if any, action to bring about the return of these enslaved American boys. Why has not action been taken, and when will it be taken? The parents, the wives, the children, the friends of these boys, yes, and the American people, want to know. They want to know whether individual lives have become less sacred in our day, whether in order to please our sometimes spineless allies, we shall remain quiet, whether we shall barter human life for a dishonorable peace. Americans cannot ridicule the patriotism of these boys by leaving them in the lurch, after asking them to risk their lives for their country. In our proper joy over the return of U. N. prisoners, let us not allow the more than 700 American prisoners of the Red slave labor camps to become the "forgotten men" of our day, and the symbols of a betrayed trust, a callous indifference, and a national dishonor which will blacken the pages of world history from here to eternity.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a detailed account of this subject which was printed in the December 18, 1953, edition of U. S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE ARE 944 MISSING GI's?

PANMUNJOM, KOREA.—Behind the Yalu River, the evidence now indicates, are hundreds of American soldiers and airmen, known to be alive in Communist hands but unreported—left as pawns of the Communist Chinese.

These Americans were positively identified as being in North Korean prison camps before the shooting ended. Most disappeared from those camps during the tense weeks just before the truce. Some were taken away at night, ostensibly for questioning. They never returned. Others were members of work parties sent from one camp to another. Work parties "lost" 1 or 2 members each before they returned to their base camps. That attrition was virtually unnoticed during the high excitement of impending repatriation.

Altogether, there are 944 Americans now identified as being alive in North Korean camps, but not returned or reported. These are in addition to the 22 Americans who elected to stay behind. They are Americans who urgently wanted to come home, prisoners known to others who have since been repatriated, or whose names or pictures have been definitely identified in Communist propaganda releases. Most of them are almost certain to be still alive, spirited away across the Yalu by Communist guards.

The United States did not win the war in Korea. As a result, it cannot demand and expect to receive any reliable accounting for those still missing. Americans can only protest.

But so far there has been no protest, except for an Army communique last September. There is a seeming reluctance by American officials to press the case of the GI's who are still missing. Emphasis, instead, is on finding a way to make a deal with the Communist Chinese on terms of peace. There is even pressure to speed a United Nations membership for Communist China. Any emphasis on the missing Americans, apparently, could complicate those proceedings.

Military men, unable now to exert pressure on the Communists under terms of the truce, refer to the missing as a diplomatic problem. State Department diplomats, in turn, say the problem of missing Americans is not yet under their jurisdiction, and won't be until a political conference with the Communists either begins or is definitely abandoned. So they are doing nothing.

Meanwhile, new reports about the missing continue to flow in.

There is substantial evidence now, for example, that a number of American prisoners were marched through the streets of Mukden, deep inside Manchuria, in a victory parade. As far as is known here, none of those men has returned. No repatriated prisoner has said he participated in that parade.

Officials here know for certain that some Americans were sent to Manchuria. Capt. Lawrence V. Bach, a 29-year-old fighter pilot from Grand Forks, N. Dak., spent 4 days in Manchuria, where he was questioned by the Chinese, North Koreans, and the Russians. He was followed by Maj. Gen. William F. Dean, who spent some time in the Communist sanctuary in Manchuria. Both of these Americans were repatriated. Others who were sent there were not.

Most of the evidence, however, comes from reports, now evaluated, of American prisoners repatriated during Operation Big Switch here at Panmunjom. En route to the United States, former prisoners were questioned intensively about men who had died or disappeared either during the lengthy forced marches northward or while they were in camps.

During the long sea voyage, when the repatriates, in the comparative comfort of hospital ships and transports, could relax and tell coherent stories of what they saw, trained intelligence men checked and rechecked each report.

A pattern finally emerged out of this long and intensive probing that showed not only systematic atrocities and deaths but slavery as well.

The Chinese Communists did not merely want Americans to work in salt beds of Shantung or the uranium mines of Sinkiang. They primarily wanted—and got—Americans who could handle the sensitive and complex instruments of modern war, such as radar, airborne and ground, and infrared instruments for night combat. They were particularly interested in airmen with technical training, and in artillerymen who knew the secrets of intricate fuzes.

Communists offered General Dean command of a division or corps if he would fight for them. They could do nothing when he refused. But the lower-ranking technicians were not listed as prisoners, as General Dean was known to be. The Chinese were under no compulsion to explain what happened to these men. Communist record on prisoners of war were slipshod. When United States asked the whereabouts of specific Americans known to have been alive in Communist camps, the Chinese merely replied that they had no records to show these men were ever prisoners.

Reports of returned prisoners are that many United States enlisted technicians disappeared from Communist camps in the final weeks of the war. The fact that they vanished indicates that the Communists could not persuade them to cooperate willingly. The Chinese could not afford to turn these technicians over to the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission and hope that they would refuse repatriation. Instead, those Americans became nonexistent, as far as the Communist prisoner-of-war records were concerned.

Not all of the missing were specialists, however. Of the 944 Americans identified in Communist camps and not returned, 610 were ground-force troops with a wide variety of backgrounds. Air Force fliers numbered 312; 19 served as Marines, and 3 as Navy

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

men. Some were captured as far back as 1950, others as recently as this year. Most of those from the Army and Marine Corps were enlisted men, representing all major ground-force units.

Just where they are now is less certain. There are reports from returning Japanese prisoners, repatriated this month from Russia, that some Americans have been seen in a prison not far from Moscow. War prisoners of many western nationalities are reported to be working in a huge underground project in Siberia. Prison compounds in Manchuria are closed to neutral inspection. So are Communist research and development centers in that part of the world. Some of the 944 may be dead, victims of the torture techniques for "persuasion" widely reported by repatriated prisoners.

But United States intelligence officers believe that most of those missing Americans are probably somewhere in Manchuria. Chinese authorities carefully supervise all travel between Manchuria and the rest of China. Their bases along the Yalu River, at Port Arthur, Changchun, Mukden, and Harbin are closely guarded and restricted for all but the military. There are enough Russians in these areas to make several hundred Americans inconspicuous.

Elsewhere in China, Americans would be noticed and the grapevine would pass the news on quickly. But Manchuria is a closed military area and the Americans could live there, guarded, for years, with no opportunity for escape.

Behind the disappearance of these Americans are reasons that can be inferred, too. The need for technicians in expanding Communist forces accounts for most of the missing specialists, as United States military officials see it. There is conjecture that many of the others, resisting Communist persuasion methods, will be used for an experiment in long-term "brain washing," to see how Americans react. And there are big opportunities for Communists, in withholding some Americans, to enhance their bargaining position or to obtain ransom, as was done with American fliers forced down in Hungary.

What United States will do about Communist withholding of American prisoners, in direct violation of the truce agreement in Korea, is the big question now. Families of the missing men are beginning to wonder if 944 more Americans must be added to the price of going into a war without winning it.

INCREASING OPPOSITION TO THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that some 20 million or more Americans are represented by the organizations which so far have gone on record against the Bricker amendment.

There have come to my attention the names of many organizations opposing the Bricker amendment. The following list is being expanded daily, so that it is possible that I do not have a complete list of the groups representing the millions of Americans who oppose this dangerous, unnecessary amendment:

American Association of University Women.
American Federation of Labor.
American Jewish Committee.
AMVETS.
B'nai B'rith.
Catholic Association for International Peace.
Church Peace Union.
Committee for Collective Security.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Fourth Study Conference on the Churches and World Order, sponsored by the National Council of Churches.
Friends Committee on National Legislation.
League of Women Voters of the United States.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.
Young Women's Christian Association.

LEGAL GROUPS

Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving Treaty Power.
Federal Bar Association.
New York City Bar Association.
Philadelphia Bar Association.
New Jersey Bar Association.
St. Louis Bar Association.
New York County Lawyers' Association, committee on Federal legislation.
Suffolk County Bar Association.

Mr. President, throughout our Nation there is a vast ferment of discussion on the subject of the Bricker amendment. Considerable numbers of letters and telegrams have been pouring in to the Senate on this issue.

The supporters of the Bricker amendment got a head start—as far back as 4 years ago—by getting out to the grassroots their particular side of the story. The opponents of the amendment, on the other hand, have only recently begun to organize their efforts.

I am convinced that, as more and more Americans become familiar with the dangerous implications of the Bricker amendment, vast numbers of messages against Senate Joint Resolution 1 will pour in from the grass roots.

The State of Wisconsin, in particular, for several years has been the target of well-financed barrages of pro-Senate Joint Resolution 1 literature. It has come from organizations which sought to stir up the wildest sort of fears regarding the President's treatymaking power. I have accordingly received a considerable number of messages urging passage of the amendment.

While I do not happen to agree with the views expressed, I welcome the exercise by my fellow Wisconsinites of the right of petition.

Currently, however, I am receiving ever-increasing numbers of messages from those of my fellow citizens in the Badger State who strongly oppose the amendment. They present clear and compelling reasons for their case. At the present time I send to the desk a few of such messages received within the past few days. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD as an indication of the views of thinking citizens of the Badger State.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 20, 1954.*

Re Senate Joint Resolution 1.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: After studying the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1), I find that I am very strongly opposed to it and would like to urge your aid in defeating this amendment for these reasons:

1. It would alter the basic structure of the Government as established by the Constitution.

2. It is contrary to the basic theory of separation of powers among the three branches of the Government.

3. It would seriously curtail the treaty-making authority of the United States, preventing the Government from entering into many treaties which are beneficial and necessary to the interests of the United States.

4. It would so seriously interfere with the historic and fundamental functions of the Executive and the Senate in the field of foreign affairs that it would jeopardize the influence of the United States in the world today.

Yours very truly,
DOROTHY HEDERIK.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 24, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Join the multitude of women in Milwaukee in opposing Bricker amendment. Am grateful for your strong support.
MRS. BERTA GUTMANN.

RACINE, WIS., *January 24, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Nice work. Stay in there and keep pitching against the Bricker amendment.
RACINE CIO COUNCIL,
HAROLD J. THOMPSON,
Secretary.

RACINE, WIS., *January 24, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We attorneys of the city of Racine oppose the Bricker amendment and urge you to continue to oppose it in the Senate. We believe the Bricker amendment would seriously hamper the conduct of foreign affairs and that the Constitution now has adequate safeguards against misuse of Executive power.

Francis Wendt; Kenneth Greenquist; Manny Brown; Dexter Black, Jr.; Charles Constantine; Henry Dorman; Frank Fell, Jr.; Gerald Flynn; Reuben Growsky; William Stroemer; Morris Shovers; Robert Goodman; Vincent Vassallo; Edward Zahn, Jr.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 24, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Milwaukee branch, Women's International League Peace and Freedom supports your stand against Bricker amendment. We believe Senate Joint Resolution 1 would seriously hamper United States conduct in international affairs. We urge you continue firm against this and any compromise bill. Present constitutional safeguards adequate.
MRS. S. A. MORELL, *Chairman.*

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
Madison, Wis., January 19, 1954.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator from Wisconsin,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SENATOR WILEY: Remembering your spirited address at the Madison Lion's Club last fall, may I encourage you to continue your opposition to the so-called Bricker amendment.

Please make no compromises that give in to the idea that we are to attempt isolation from the affairs of the nations.

Respectfully,
RICHARD L. SNYDER.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

THE ROBERTS CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 21, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I should like to express my unqualified opposition to the so-called Bricker amendment.

It would seem obvious to any student of our form of government that this amendment is a deliberate encroachment of the legislative upon the executive branch. There is a liquidity of movement necessary in the handling of foreign affairs by our State Department. To create and freeze a situation in such a way as to hamper all freedom of movement by our Executive in its treaty-making function would appear to be obviously harmful to our foreign relations.

Our Supreme Court very clearly enunciated the doctrine that our Constitution must prevail when any treaty is in conflict with it, and to the best of my knowledge this has never been contradicted. If the laws of any particular State should be affected by a treaty negotiated for the general good of the entire country, surely the latter consideration must prevail. Certainly the contrary cannot be argued for 1 minute—that the good of the country as a whole must be sacrificed to preserve inviolate the laws of any 1 State.

Because of the most excellent and statesmanlike attitude you have manifested on all our other national and international problems, I feel quite sure that it was unnecessary to write this letter. However, I am sure you will not consider it amiss to know how at least one citizen feels about the matter and I sincerely hope you have received many other letters reflecting the same attitude.

Sincerely,

A. F. LUTTER.

MADISON, WIS., *January 19, 1954.*

Re Bricker amendment.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: After giving the matter of the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) to the Constitution prolonged and careful study over a period of approximately 1 year, I have come to the conclusion that I must write to you and ask that you oppose it in its entirety.

My reasons therefor are as follows:

1. I cannot conceive of a need for such an amendment under our well-established form of government. The responsibilities of the several branches of our Government are well defined. They are a check one on the other; and the electorate is a check on all.

2. The safeguards which were placed in our Constitution when it was so carefully drafted by men who were, even then, well aware of the problems and difficulties which this new form of government would face are, in my opinion, sufficient today to protect the citizens of the United States from possible ill-conceived executive actions.

3. We are, after all, a federation of States. The Federal Government was established because there were (and are) areas in which it is essential that we act as one. While we have retained (and I believe rightfully so) the majority of powers in our separate States, occasions arise when it is essential that the President be in a position to make decisions in the international field which affect our collective interests. I firmly believe that the present powers of our Congress (through the Senate's power to ratify or disapprove treaties, and the Congress' power to refuse to implement treaties or executive agreements) are adequate to protect us from possible unwise executive decisions.

I assure you that I have not come to this decision without carefully and thoughtfully weighing the arguments on both sides of this controversy. I am now definitely opposed to the Bricker amendment, nor do I see the value of such a compromise as that suggested by Senator KNOWLAND. I hope you will vote to defeat the joint resolution.

Respectfully yours,

CARYL A. REGAN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 20, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am writing in support of your stand against the Bricker amendment.

In these times when events demand fast, detailed action, it is dangerous to regulate further the President's powers to take action.

In the matter of treatymaking, the Constitution already protects us and Senate Joint Resolution 1 would delay and hamper our ability to carry out our foreign policy.

Further the Bricker amendment would change the system of checks and balances set up in the Constitution. To make this change would in my opinion be a grave and far-reaching mistake.

Yours very truly,

LILLIAN CRANE FULTS.
JACK J. FULTS.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 20, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: Permit me to register my protest against passage of the Bricker amendment.

It seems to me that the most valid argument against permitting the President to exercise discretion in making agreements lies in the abuse of this power through secret negotiations. Inasmuch as the proper place for the ultimate power should be in the will of the people as expressed through public opinion, and inasmuch as public opinion requires that the public be informed, it seems obvious that the fault lies in the secrecy rather than in the power to make agreements. Why, therefore, is the law requiring publication of all such agreements not enforced?

I feel very strongly that the proposed amendment to the Constitution is much too radical a change for conservative people to support. Let us keep the present balance of powers that has stood for so long and eliminate the present abuses instead. A change of such major proportions may only lead to new abuses which we cannot foresee.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. A. B. BEVERSTOCK.

STANLEY MARSACK POST, NO. 442,
JEWISH WAR VETERANS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 20, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I wish to advise that the Stanley Marsack Post of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States is firmly in accord with the position recently stated by our national commander, Harry T. Madison, relative to the Bricker amendment. Commander Madison indicated that enactment of this measure would seriously shackle the executive branch of our Government in the conduct of foreign relations and make vastly more difficult the vital task of rallying the free world for common defense against communism. Our post has every confidence in the Presidency and feels that it would be unwise to limit the power of the President in the conduct of foreign policy.

We are pleased to find you in the forefront of the fight against passage of the Bricker amendment and pledge you our wholehearted support in this issue.

Yours sincerely,

STANLEY MARSACK POST, JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES,
H. L. KASTRUL, *Commander.*

COFFEE PRICES

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in the past week or 10 days, as a result of of the sudden upward spurt in the price of coffee, there has been renewed interest in the question of how coffee is traded on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange and in the possibility that speculation, rather than economic or weather conditions in the coffee-producing countries, may be the chief cause for the price rises.

I have addressed to the Federal Trade Commission a letter urging an examination of the present coffee situation and the development of current statistics on the supply of available coffee and related matters.

My office has been receiving numerous requests for the report on the coffee investigation which was conducted in the 81st Congress by the Agriculture Subcommittee of which I was then chairman. The supply of these reports is nearly exhausted, while the demand for them continues and is growing. I have therefore requested the Joint Committee on Printing to arrange for an additional printing of 1,000 copies of the Coffee Report, which is Senate Report No. 2377, 81st Congress, 2d session, dated August 23, 1950. They will be available tomorrow. Those wishing to obtain copies of the Coffee Report will be able to do so either from the Senate Agriculture Committee or from my office.

It will be recalled that the report made 14 specific recommendations which, if carried out shortly after they were proposed, unquestionably would have gone far to prevent the price gouging which coffee consumers are once again facing today.

I note that the Attorney General has informed the press that his Department is looking into the possibility of violations of the law in connection with the current coffee price rise. Several of the recommendations in our Coffee Report called for action by the Attorney General. If he wishes to make a useful contribution to a permanent solution of the problem of spiraling coffee prices, due to speculation, he might well proceed as proposed under our subcommittee's recommendations. He might, for example, act on the recommendation to investigate the sales and storage practices of foreign coffee interests in the United States, and take appropriate action under the antitrust laws. Up to now the Department of Justice has failed to act on this recommendation. He might also follow the suggestion we made that the Attorney General seek injunctive relief against the continued use of the present D and S contracts on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange as being unduly restrictive of trade in coffee and as tending to create controls far beyond reason.

Other agencies of the executive department could also make important contributions to a cure of this recurring plague. We recommended that the Bureau of the Census undertake to make regular quarterly reports on green and roasted coffee stocks on hand, similar to those prepared at the specific request of our subcommittee in December 1949 and March 1950. Such figures would be in-

valuable in showing how much economic justification, if any, there is for a rise in coffee prices alleged to be caused by shortages.

The Department of Defense could also take useful action if it would adopt our recommendation to change its coffee-buying specifications, so as to permit delivery of any growth equal to or better than Santos 4's.

Likewise, the legislative branch of the Government can take action almost immediately to put trading in coffee under the same kind of regulations as those which apply to trading in domestically produced commodities. Since last March I have had pending before the Senate Agriculture Committee a bill, S. 1386, to which would place trading in coffee under the control of the Commodity Exchange Act. If this bill were enacted, I am sure trading practices in coffee would improve rapidly, to the benefit of all our coffee-drinking consumers.

We further recommended tax legislation which would help curb the undesirable speculation in coffee futures, by requiring taxation of profits gained by foreign interests through trading on our commodity exchanges. The text of a proposed bill to this effect, which I highly recommend for the consideration of the House Ways and Means Committee, is printed on the last page of the Coffee Report of 1950.

Those interested in the other recommendations made by our subcommittee almost 4 years ago, none of which has been adopted, may find them on pages 40 and 41 of the Coffee Report.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, even if all these recommendations were adopted today, none of the hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars which have been gouged from the pockets of American consumers since the great speculative raid of 1949 would be returned to them. But, at the very least, the present gouge could be stopped and future ones prevented.

There is need, not so much for any more investigations of the coffee trade, Mr. President, as for action on the findings and recommendations of the investigation of 4 years ago.

What is needed is action, both legislative and executive, to deal with an inexcusable situation, which is rapidly becoming intolerable. We know, Mr. President, that the economic position of several of our sister Republics of Pan America, is heavily dependent on the production and sale of coffee. We should and shall continue to furnish the principal market for their exportations of coffee. But our primary concern is to see that United States consumers are not made the victims of speculative practices, at home or abroad, which place an unjust burden on American families.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of my letter of January 23, 1954, addressed to the Federal Trade Commission.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 23, 1954.

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: The Commission is doubtless aware of the volume of news and editorial discussion relative to the rapid rise in the price of coffee and the consequent burden on the American consumer.

You will recall that some 3 years ago a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the course of its investigation of price spreads made a rather exhaustive study of another rapid rise in coffee prices which pertained at that time. You will also recall that the subcommittee filed its report of the situation as the subcommittee had found it together with some fourteen recommendations for action to remedy some of the conditions then extant.

For various reasons to which it is unnecessary to refer in this letter no real action has been taken to carry into effect the recommendations the subcommittee made.

I feel there is ample justification for the belief that much of the recent drastic rise in coffee prices is due more to certain gambling and speculative practices than to economic factors of supply and demand. You also are aware that coffee was not included in the list of commodities brought under the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act.

There is pending now in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a bill to bring coffee within these provisions which I introduced almost a year ago but which has not yet received favorable action by the Senate.

I have in mind the limitations on the appropriation made for your Commission relative to its use in connection with investigation of price spreads, but I feel that there is ample authority and I know there is great need for the Commission to investigate the operation of the instrumentalities engaged in the importation and distribution of coffee in the United States.

May I earnestly urge that the Commission take cognizance of this situation and bring its valuable machinery into action for the purpose of aiding and protecting the American people from any unreasonable or unjustified burdens in connection with the great increases in coffee prices.

I am addressing this letter to you as a Commissioner and former Senate colleague with the request that it be called to the attention of the Chairman and the Commission. I am not personally acquainted with the Chairman.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this morning I received from the dean of the Harvard Law School a letter relative to the so-called Bricker amendment. It is brief and to the point, and I shall read it:

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., January 21, 1954.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: My mail is full of extensive appeals, obviously well financed, urging me to write to Senators about the Bricker amendment to the Constitution.

The senders of these appeals are supporting the amendment. As a result, I have no doubt that you will be receiving many letters urging you to vote for the pending joint resolution.

The opposition to the Bricker amendment is not well organized, and not well financed. However, there is strong opposition. As I am opposed to the Bricker amendment, it has seemed to me appropriate that I should write to you and urge you to vote against the adoption of this provision.

I will not trouble you with a long discussion of the reasons for my opposition. In brief, they are as follows: (1) The proposal is not necessary, and (2) its adoption would do far more harm than good. In partcular, the so-called "which" clause would make it impossible for the United States to deal effectively with many important areas long the proper subject of the treaty power, as I have pointed out in a letter which was printed in the Wall Street Journal for January 19, 1954.

You will be told that the American Bar Association favors the Bricker amendment. Actually, the decision was made by the house of delegates of that association, a body of less than 200 persons, with much opposition there. The leadership of the association thwarted an effort to take a vote of the members, after full consideration by the membership. The New York Bar Association, the New Jersey Bar Association, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the Section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association, and many lawyers of my acquaintance, are all strongly opposed to the amend nent.

There can be no doubt that large sections of the public have been led to have fear of the treaty power. Although I believe that these fears are groundless, there would be no objection to a simple amendment which would allay these fears. But the Bricker amendment goes far beyond that. It is, in final analysis, an attack upon the Union itself. Its adoption would, I believe, have very serious consequences. I hope that you will vote against it in the Senate.

With best wishes from Cambridge.

Very truly yours,

ERWIN N. GRISWOLD, *Dean.*

I telephoned the dean and asked him whether he had any objection to my reading this letter on the floor of the Senate. He said that he had not.

I also had the pleasure of informing him that I had long since made up my mind to vote against the Bricker amendment in its present form.

ALLEGED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF VENEZUELA AND CHARLES P. TAFT, GEORGE W. BALL—CORRECTION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. George W. Ball, in correction of an inaccuracy which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 14, 1954.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEARY, GOTTLIEB, FRIENDLY & BALL,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1954.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 14, 1954, an article from the Washington Times-Herald of December 21, 1953, was inserted by Senator MALONE. The article states that both

Mr. Charles P. Taft and I have "filed registration statements with the Justice Department under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as agents of Venezuela."

As the article states elsewhere, my firm was retained for several months last year by the Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, which are private organizations of business firms. However, the implication in the above statement is that we were representing the Venezuelan Government. Such an implication is misleading and inaccurate with respect to my firm, Mr. Taft, and the Venezuelan Government.

I should very much appreciate it if you could have this letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to correct the inaccuracy.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. BALL.

DEATH OF HUME WRONG

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to express my deep sorrow at the news carried in the press this morning of the death of Hon. Hume Wrong, formerly Ambassador from Canada to the United States, and recently Under Secretary of State of Canada for Foreign Affairs.

I had the high privilege of knowing Mr. Hume Wrong personally, having gone to the same place in the summer with him, and having had many opportunities to talk with him about the relations between Canada and the United States. I looked upon him as one of the fine type of statesmen whom we can ill afford to lose. He had a sympathetic interest in people, and, above all, he had a firm grasp of the importance of unity between Canada and the United States, and the necessity for the closest working relations between our two great countries.

I tender my expression of sympathy to Mr. Wrong's family in their bereavement, and to Canada, our neighbor, for Canada has suffered a severe loss. The United States also has suffered the loss of a great and true friend. I appreciate the opportunity to make these few remarks on this sad occasion.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by me entitled "A New Approach to Statehood for Alaska."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW APPROACH TO STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER OF NEBRASKA

On Tuesday of last week the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which was then considering the Hawaii statehood bill, voted unanimously to amend that bill by adding the Alaska statehood bill to it as a title II, thus combining the 2 proposals for statehood for the 2 Territories into a single piece of legislation. Before any motions were made, or votes taken in committee, I stated to members of the committee that I would vote to report the Alaska statehood bill from committee as soon as we could get the bill in proper form.

To make my position clear, I will quote briefly from the statement I made in committee prior to any vote. My statement, in part, was as follows:

"I have decided to vote to report the Alaska statehood bill out of committee.

"As soon as the committee has reported Hawaiian statehood we shall proceed immediately to consideration of the Alaska bill. In committee I shall urge strongly that the committee write a workable bill that will give Alaska control of enough of her timber, mineral, and other valuable resources to be self-supporting, instead of millions of acres of barren tundra.

"This decision to vote for reporting the bill has been reached only after the most careful and conscientious study. I must confess that I still have very grave doubts as to the possibility of the proposed State's raising sufficient revenue to support the functions of State government after the end of the current construction boom. That is why the grants to the State of federally-owned resources are of key importance. Under all the circumstances, however, I believe it is proper that the matter be passed on by the full Senate, not just by the committee."

I believe the statement I have just quoted is clear.

It is plain to me that there is no reasonable position in outright opposition to statehood for either Hawaii or Alaska. The organization of new territories and their ultimate admission to the Union as States has, through the years, become a basic part of our system of government. It would seem strange if the people in these Territories did not aspire to see the Territory become a State. But statehood at any price, which has been the inflexible position assumed by proponents of statehood for Alaska, is just as unsound as outright opposition.

It is time, I think, that a new approach to statehood for Alaska be found. The purpose of that approach must be twofold: (1) To grant statehood on such terms that Alaska will find them workable from an economic and financial standpoint; and (2) to do it now, not in the indefinite future.

The fundamental element of that new approach must be opening up lands, minerals, timber, and other resources of Alaska to development by the residents of Alaska. That means a loosening of the dead hand of bureaucracy which has completely controlled Alaska for nearly a century.

Under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is now perfecting the proposed Alaska Statehood bill along those general lines. I believe all the members of that subcommittee are convinced of the necessity of opening up these resources for development. I hope that subcommittee and our full committee will not hesitate to make sweeping changes in the provisions of the original bill. Alaska must be given control of the most of its land, timber, mineral, and other resources, if it is to make a success as a State.

The bill as presented to us failed to do that; it would have left virtually all the resources of the new State under the control of the Federal Government. It is not melodramatic to say that the statehood bill as originally presented would turn an orphan out into the storm.

In the past, my position has been that the bureaucrats in the Interior Department sought to retain their supreme authority in Alaska affairs by keeping Federal ownership over the oil, coal, timber, and other resources. Meanwhile, they pretended to sympathize with the operations of many in the Territory, by offering a form of statehood without the substance—without the resources that should customarily go with it.

There was a group in the Territory, albeit a small one but a loud one, willing to accept statehood on these terms because of their own selfish desires to control the proposed new State government.

Many of the opponents of past versions of statehood legislation were caught between the play of these two forces. They were attacked and smeared as obstructionists. They have been denounced as enemies of Alaska and Alaska progress.

Speaking as one of the victims of this brand of political demagoguery over a period of years, I believe the time has now come when a workable and an honorable statehood bill for Alaska can and should be written.

I can truthfully say that the attitude in high places in the Interior Department has changed, just as the occupants of those high offices in the Department have been changed following President Eisenhower's victory in 1952.

I know of no high official in the Interior Department today who regards himself as vested with a divine right to control the future of Alaska.

I know of none who believes his mission in this life is to control the Alaska fisheries, one of the greatest of the Territorial resources.

I know of none who desires the Federal Government to hold title to Alaska's land. I do know that the release of that land to private owners where it can be put into productivity is uppermost in the minds of many of the Department officials, just as it is and has been uppermost in my mind.

It may not be an easy task to make all the revisions which should be made in the Alaska Statehood bill in line with this new approach. I am not suggesting that our committee should undertake now to rewrite completely the Federal policies and Federal land laws as they apply to the Territory. I do believe, however, that there are certain fundamental elements which must be taken care of for statehood to be a success.

First and foremost is a sharp cutback in the Federal policy of withdrawing into Federal reservations all those resources or potential resources which might form the basis of flourishing industries if developed by private enterprise. I am referring particularly to such withdrawals as the coal reserves, the oil reserves, and the timber reserves.

Somewhat the same thing must be done to the Federal withdrawals of 300- and 600-footwide rights-of-way for all highways constructed in the Territory. This particular policy seems to me to be the worst possible hindrance to the development of adequate facilities for the growing tourist industry in Alaska.

Perhaps even more important is the necessity of taking definite action to clear up the cloud of native possessory claims. The cloud on land titles created by these claims has threatened every settler's security and every settler's investment. Economic development can never proceed without a system of secure land titles.

Finally, we must work out a system better than that provided in the Federal Highway Act to assist the state of Alaska in the construction of roads to tap its resources. In this day and age, roads are the first necessity in any development program.

On Monday of last week, Territorial Governor Heintzleman released a statement reporting on his recent trip throughout the Territory and telling of the sentiment among the majority of Alaskans for statehood under an equitable enabling act.

The Governor states his position very clearly and in the most sensible language.

Governor Heintzleman's statement as it was released to the press in Juneau on Monday, January 18, reads as follows:

"STATEMENT OF GOVERNOR HEINTZLEMAN

"Statehood continues to be a subject of vital concern to the people of Alaska. I have just returned from a trip to Anchorage and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Fairbanks, the centers of greatest population, and find that people there, as well as elsewhere in Alaska, are anxious to know what Congress is prepared to offer in the way of enabling legislation.

"Statehood has also been of the utmost concern to me since April when I came into this office. The principal question facing us as Alaskans and facing Congress is the economic side of the matter. I have long been interested in helping to build our industrial base to the point where we can adequately support statehood and I am confident that the Territory is making rapid strides toward that goal.

"The progress that has been made in Alaska during the past 8 years, or since our local vote on statehood in 1946, is truly remarkable. In this connection, consider what has been done in expanding our highways and improving tributary roads, the expansion in timber processing and coal production, the increase in surveys of mineral, water power, and other resources, and the establishment of additional and improved schools, hospitals, water supply systems, and other community facilities. All of these things spell present and prospective advances in economic and social welfare for Alaska and thus contribute to a sound base for statehood.

"A majority of the people of Alaska favor statehood under equitable enabling legislation. One enabling bill is now before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. There is anxiety that this bill may not reach the floor of the Senate this session or that it will come out too late for adequate consideration. I respectfully urge that this bill be brought out of committee at as early a date as possible so that it may be considered and acted upon by the entire Senate."

We need a statehood bill which will do two things—foster the economic development of Alaska, and give the proposed state the financial resources out of which she can support the cost of state government. Statehood is expected to nearly double the cost of government for the inhabitants of Alaska, where taxes are already as high or higher than anywhere else in the country. If we give Alaska statehood, we must give Alaskans the resources out of which to raise that additional revenue. We cannot in fairness make Alaska a state in name only, as provided by the bill originally introduced.

I am hopeful that the subcommittee and our Interior Committee can develop and report such a measure. If a proper bill can be developed, I pledge my wholehearted support to the admission of the Territory of Alaska into the family of States.

HOUSING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 306)

The PRESIDING OFFICE (Mr. POTTER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senate now in executive session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair.) Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Laurence Ballard Robbins, of Illinois, to be Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate for consideration the nominations on the Executive Calendar, which the clerk will state.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Preston Hotchkis, of California, to be representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the majority leader that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Operations Administration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Foreign Operations Administration are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Abbott McConnell Washburn, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NORTH ATLANTIC ORGANIZATION AND EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Webster Bray Todd, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ECONOMIC COORDINATOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Economic Coordinator (special representative for Korea).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lothair Teetor, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the majority leader if it is not a fact that all the nominations which have been confirmed by the Senate up to now were approved unanimously by each of the committees to which the respective nominations were referred?

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as I am advised, that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Lee, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, for term of 7 years from July 1, 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, one of the most important constitutional duties of the Senate is the consideration of Presidential nominations to executive positions. After the Senate has satisfied itself that the appointments are in the national interest, it is our duty

to approve them; or, doubting that this is the case, we should vote to oppose them.

Today I wish to speak on the nomination by the President of Mr. Robert E. Lee, to be a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Green	McCarran
Beall	Griswold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bush	Hennings	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Mundt
Byrd	Hoey	Murray
Capehart	Holland	Pastore
Carlson	Humphrey	Payne
Case	Hunt	Potter
Chavez	Ives	Purtell
Clements	Jackson	Robertson
Cooper	Jenner	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Symington
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Lennon	Upton
Frear	Long	Watkins
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Mansfield	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent because of illness.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as I was saying when interrupted by the quorum call, I wish to speak today on the question of the nomination of Robert E. Lee, who has been appointed by the President to be a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission. This is a 7-year appointment and if the Senate approves his nomination today, the new Commissioner will serve on this highly important board and in this sensitive post until 1961.

The questioning of an appointment by the President is not a pleasant task to assign to oneself. If this appointment were not questioned today, it would be gaveled through, as are so many other nominations in this Chamber, without any discussion whatsoever.

An appointment to the Federal Communications Commission is one of utmost importance to the future of this Nation and to its freedoms. No other agency of Government is granted the power to exercise such a vast control over the thought and speech of the people of our country and over the preservation of the freedom of open discussion, and even dissent, as is the Federal Communications Commission.

No longer is freedom of the press the solitary means of preserving liberty. Important as it is, the vast nationwide resources of hundreds of broadcasting stations and TV stations now have as great an impact, or an even greater impact, on the public mind as the printed word.

Obviously, in the public interest, this vast means of communications must be regulated by Government so that the great gifts of radio and television may not become a tower of Babel. But in such regulation lies the inherent danger that this power may be misused. Such vast power of life and death over every broadcasting and television station, which is vested in the Commission by the authority to grant or refuse to grant licenses or to grant or refuse to grant renewals, should, in the public interest, cause us, in the Senate, to be doubly careful that men selected to this Commission be above the abuse of their great power.

To say that this is a sensitive area of Government regulation is putting it mildly. Few stations can operate without at times coming before the FCC for amended orders, for the improvement or change in their facilities, the removal or change in a broadcasting tower, or the installation of extra equipment.

The vast networks, serving hundreds of individual stations, are also subject to the great powers of the Commission. Thus, in the life of an entire industry, cooperation with its regulating body not only is desirable, but an absolute necessity.

Mr. Pfesident, we could have a free press and freedom of individual expression of opinion today, and still not be free. No agency of Government can, in any way, interfere with these great constitutional guaranties. But the new power of communicating with 100 million people by radio, or 60 million by television, makes these guaranties of our older forms of communication only part-time insurance of our liberties.

If the time should come, when the FCC would be packed with men of distinct partisian leaning, with men who would seek unfair advantage in behalf of one line of thought, with men who lack dedication to the great prinicples of freedom of discussion and dissent, or with men whom the broadcasting industry might fear, regimentation of thought and control of comment would become a reality. I dread to think of the consequences to our free society if this should occur.

Yet in the appointment before the Senate today, I believe there is definitely a sense of fear that this situation might be approaching faster than we realize.

A strange silence has been hanging over this appointment. This silence is found especially in the vast radio and television field, which fills the air during most of the hours of each day and evening with entertainment, political comment, news, and drama. To my knowledge, only one large broadcasting company officially has spoken in behalf of this appointee. There have been some rather private communications, I suppose, but, for the most part, the vast industry, usually so vocal, the industry that can receive a life or death decree at the hands of the Commission—has maintained stony silence.

While many large and respected newspapers have criticized the appointment, the sense of fear that hangs over the industry spells one thing, namely, the admission that this power can and might be misused for reprisals. Many of the newspapers which have spoken out boldly know there is no regulatory body that can affect them by enforcing orders against them.

Yet even the long arm of FCC power does not entirely miss the newspapers, either. A packed Commission could, indirectly, impinge upon the freedom of the press, should it finally be faced with a hostile Commission.

In the vast field of newspaper operations, in many towns and cities the newspapers have become owners of radio and television stations. These operations, requiring large investments and a long-time payout, are under the FCC, regardless of whether the stations are owned by newspapers. Still other newspapers, faced with rising production costs, have pending before the FCC applications for such facilities, which can be parceled out as the Commission decides.

The importance of this new link between the operation of newspapers and radio and TV stations can be judged by the fact that, even at present, 485 newspapers operate one or the other. Thus, as their newspaper operations are intermingled with the operations of radio facilities, they are subject, at least in considerable part, so far as their very existence and financial stability are concerned, on the life or death decisions which can be handed down by this Federal Commission.

Only one individual, a friend of the appointee, appeared before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to testify in behalf of the confirmation of the nomination. Not only did the strange silence run through the broadcasting fraternity but the absence of other industry spokesmen and legal lights also was noticeable.

This strange silence seems to run deep even in this august body.

The FCC is an arm of the Congress. It is a regulatory body set up by the Congress to do a job. Has the threat of this great power, which is subject to misuse for reprisals, become so great that even Members of this body cannot consider the appointment on its merits without thinking that something adverse to the interests of our States might occur if we were to vote wrong?

The Senate must consider this appointment as it would any other, regardless of the consequences. The primary question which faces us on the question of confirmation of the nomination—as it should be in the case of all other nominations is the question of the nominee's

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

qualifications. Is Robert E. Lee qualified by experience and training to be a member of the FCC?

Of course, the best judge of a man's qualifications should be the man himself. As he sets his goals, he gives recognition, as no other can, to the field he can best fill.

Mr. Lee's ambitions were in the direction of the specialty which he studied and practiced—as an accountant. He was a candidate, and a well-supported one, for Assistant Comptroller General. Nearly one hundred Members of the House of Representatives who knew him recommended him as eminently qualified for that high position.

Having watched his work as a member of the House Appropriations Committeee investigative staff, I would be inclined to approve his own judgment of his qualifications, and also the judgment of the members he served.

As his supporting witness, Mr. Charles Kress, of Binghamton, N. Y., stated at the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings:

He was then a candidate for the office of Assistant Comptroller General, and I took it upon myself to try to line up some support, and I talked to a great number of people on his behalf.

It was with great surprise and amazement that I learned subsequently that his appointment to the Federal Communications Commission had been made.

I knew that Columbus got east by going west, but I never knew you could get on the Federal Communications Commission by running for Assistant Comptroller General.

I thought the committee would be interested in my opinion that his appointment to the Federal Communications Commission was certainly no schemed or devised plan. It was just a ricochet romance.

So, Mr. President, now we are faced with the results of this "ricochet romance." Is not the job of judiciously and fairly administering the vast powers of the FCC worth more than a consolation prize?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I notice that the Senator from Oklahoma is criticizing Mr. Lee because at one time he sought another job. I am curious to know whether the Senator from Oklahoma always got every job he sought, or if sometimes he met with defeat, and turned to a different job.

As I recall, the Senator from Oklahoma was not always a Senator. I think he also ran for some minor positions. I do not believe he was always successful.

I may say this is the first time I have heard a man criticized because when he lost in one effort, he came back and tried again.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Wisconsin has brought up that point. I ran for only one office, and was defeated the first time only—the office of serving in the United States Congress, in the House of Representatives. But I ran again for the same job and the next time I made it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would my colleague call it "a ricochet romance," when thereafter he came to the Senate?

Mr. MONRONEY. No, because I did not ricochet. On the contrary, I kept going right along on a bee line. After I reached the House of Representatives, I had a very difficult time crossing the 100-yard span to this body.

But I do not believe Mr. Lee's qualifications, which perhaps would make him an ideal man as an Assistant Comptroller General or an administrative officer of the Bureau of the Budget or an administrative officer in the FBI, give him the sensitivity and keen feeling and great urge to protect our basic freedoms of speech and discussion and dissent. That is why I am raising the question here.

I am sure the distinguished gentleman will have some to speak in his behalf; but I cannot find in his record anything which leads me to believe that for this particularly sensitive job, which may require so much to be done in the 6 or 7 years of his appointment, he has the background or the experience or the judicial mind which would enable him, against all odds and against all exigencies, to preserve the basic freedoms as they apply to the radio and television fields.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at this point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. As the Senator from Oklahoma knows, Mr. Lee had a very distinguished record with the FBI, and then served with the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma, before he arose to criticize Mr. Lee, called J. Edgar Hoover and asked him, "Mr. Hoover, was Mr. Lee one of your outstanding men? Does he have good judgment? Do you have complete confidence in his integrity and honesty?"

I also wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma has contacted the members of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, in order to ascertain what they think about the nominee.

Let me say that I have done so; I have contacted a number of the members of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. Without exception, they say this young nominee is one of the most brilliant, one of the most honest, and one of the most dependable assistants they have ever had. They say he has done an outstanding job. He has never played politics. He has rendered just as much service to Democrats on the committee as to Republicans. I am curious to know where the Senator gets any information of any kind which would reflect upon the honesty, integrity, or the good judgment of this young man.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has brought up that question because I should like to advise him that the junior Senator from Oklahoma does not make it a practice, on the floor of the Senate or elsewhere, to reflect upon the honesty or integrity of anyone. I am raising the question of this gentleman's qualifications for a very highly sensitive position. I know that he had a fine record with the FBI. I think the FBI is one of the world's greatest crime-detection agencies. I applaud the great care which, through the years, the great Director, J. Edgar Hoover, has used in maintaining the FBI in the objective field. However, I doubt whether it is good public policy to turn over our Federal communications to the ex-members of the FBI. Perhaps the Senator might wish to have upon that Commission one FBI operative, a graduate of the FBI school of investigation, one who would be most able and well qualified. But, to follow it through, would we want the entire Commission to be composed of FBI members? Would we want other agencies of Government to use only FBI graduates to administer their functions and deal with highly technical and judicial problems such as those which come before this particular Commission?

I wish to advise my friend that in speaking of his very dear friend—and I am sure he is a warm personal friend of the junior Senator from Wisconsin—nowhere in this speech will I attack the integrity, honesty, or ability of Mr. Lee as a detective or as an accountant. I merely raise the question of his qualifications for this particular position, as is my right. In this case are we fitting a square peg into a round hole? Are we not wasting the very great experience which Mr. Lee has had in the field of balancing the budget or ferreting out a few loafers or excess employees on the Federal payroll, through the Appropriations Committee and in other ways? I believe that we have far too few men engaged in that task, men who have the ability in that field which Mr. Robert E. Lee has demonstrated.

As I stated earlier, I would vote in a minute to confirm the nomination of Mr. Lee for almost any position dealing with fiscal affairs. However, in the realm of the mind and the heart, it is the wish of Americans forever to keep unimpaired their great liberties and freedoms. It is with that thought in mind that I raise this question on the floor of the Senate. I am sure I shall lose. I am sure that only a corporal's guard will vote as I shall vote. However, I cannot help but think that it is important at this time, when too clearly we see that the priceless heritages handed down to us since before the Revolutionary War are somewhat in danger of being lost, either by accident, or because we are too busy to pay attention to some of the things which are happening on the fringe.

It has been frequently reported, as I have said, that President Eisenhower, in keeping with his pledge to find the most experienced and best qualified men to fill positions on boards and commissions, would appoint to this Commission someone who was a practical broadcaster. It was generally felt that, certainly in the Federal Communications Commission organization, it was important that a practical broadcaster should have an appointment. In fact, various men with

years of practical experience as individual broadcasting station operators and network officials were prominently mentioned in the press as the likely appointees. I understand that several such persons were endorsed by Members of the Senate for this particular position. Certainly they were not Democrats. They were not persons whom we were supporting. The growing broadcasting and television industry felt that somewhere in this great machinery of control, perhaps a practical, workaday experience at the local level might be of some importance.

Suddenly something happened, when complications resulted in connection with the General Accounting Office position, and the Federal Communications Commission appointment of Mr. Lee was announced. No one knows exactly what happened. The newspapermen mention various rumors. Apparently the particular place in the General Accounting Office was not to be offered to Mr. Lee, as was originally planned.

So his appointment to the Federal Communications Commission was announced. Apparently it was a surprise to him, as well as to many of those who had endorsed him for the other position, for which he had been trained, and for which he was qualified. His entire background has been one of accounting and of service with the FBI. At the time of his appointment Mr. Lee said:

> It is possible that it could be a liability for a man to know too much about the field when he took office.

Certainly Mr. Lee did not know too much about his new field, but if the qualification of lack of knowledge is to be a new hallmark of competence for Government appointment, this places a new twist on the matter of qualifications. It is in strange contrast to the often-repeated goal of the administration to find and use the best-qualified men in their field for important Federal positions.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] asked Mr. Lee the following question:

> Have you had any experience at all in this Federal communication field?

Mr. Lee replied:

> Only since October 6. Well, in my work in the House of Representatives and in the Appropriations Committee, I had occasion to attend the hearings and advise the members on questions asked. I think I would be safe in saying I was reasonably familiar with the organizational setup.

There again we have the mechanical side. This testimony does not necessarily indicate an understanding of the broad scope of control involved in the work of the Federal Communications Commission.

I continue to quote:

> Senator SMATHERS. You have never been in the radio field or the broadcasting field or the technical aspects of it?
>
> Mr. LEE. No; other than a few guest appearances.
>
> Senator SMATHERS. Do you think that experience is desirable or necessary for a Commissioner to do a good job?
>
> Mr. LEE. I don't think so, any more than it might be necessary for the Postmaster General. I don't think he would necessarily have to be a mail man. I do not mean to be facetious.

Certainly, in connection with Mr. Lee's qualifications as an auditor or accountant, he is a man of ability. His work for the Appropriations Committee certainly would qualify him for a position with the Budget Bureau, for the position of assistant secretary in charge of the division of fiscal affairs, or even the position of Assistant Comptroller General, with respect to which the present nomination has become a ricochet romance.

Mr. Lee argued it was necessary, in order to understand any Federal Communications matters, that the Commission should have an accountant who could understand the various reports and statistics, and other documents with which the Commission may deal. He argued that such a man was just as important as an experienced broadcast engineer, or an attorney.

I seriously doubt whether accountancy is such a great asset. The principal duty which the Federal Communications Commission has is not to audit books or submit budgets to Appropriations Committees. The Commission has offices to perform those functions. I seriously doubt whether it is too difficult to understand the balance sheet which is submitted by a man who is applying for a Federal Communication Commission license, whether for radio broadcasting or television. So in considering his qualifications for this particular position, I question whether we should give the top score to the ability which Mr. Lee undoubtedly has as an accountant. The regulatory work of the Federal Communications Commission is quasi-judicial.

I doubt the importance of an expert knowledge of accountancy as a vital prerequisite to this job. What I am concerned with is whether Mr. Lee has the judicial temperament, the background, and the determination to safeguard the air channels in the interest of freedom of speech and freedom of opinion.

I am especially concerned with his former connection and association with Facts Forum, as a moderator, and, more important, as an adviser in the organization of its expanded programs, including television. He was adviser to Mr. H. L. Hunt, of Dallas, Tex.

If he has had any actual radio or television experience it has been with the Facts Forum organization. In his testimony before the committee he showed a considerable understanding of the operational details, and admitted that Mr. H. L. Hunt, its moving spirit, had sought his help in Washington for advice in enlarging the program.

I am certain that this experience was not such as would qualify a man for the important post of member of the Federal Communications Commission. Rather, I think his association with this vast propaganda machine, financed with tax-exempt dollars, raises a big question of the wisdom of the confirmation of this nomination. I should like to read into the RECORD, for the information of the Senate, a few facts about Facts Forum, as developed in a very important series in the well-respected Providence Journal.

I ask the Senate to indulge me as I read a part of the article. I wish Senators to get the whole picture of the importance of what is going on throughout the 48 States. I read from the first of a series of articles which were published on the subject by the excellent newspaper, the Providence Journal:

THE FACTS ABOUT FACTS FORUM NO. 1: A RICH MAN, GROWING POWER

(By Ben H. Bagdikian)

Haroldson Lafayette Hunt, of Dallas, Tex., may be the richest man in America, which, if true, ordinarily would be of only passing interest.

However, in the last 30 months Hunt has created an organization of growing power in American mass communications and public opinion.

This organization is Facts Forum. It is, Hunt says, a nonpartisan, nonpolitical, educational project with strict rules against carrying on propaganda or attempting to influence legislation. Except for anticommunism, and soil and water conservation, it has no opinions of its own, he says.

On this basis Fact Forum has according to its figures, gathered 125,000 participants in its various activities; it has obtained over a million dollars worth annually of free radio and television time; it has presented many famous Americans in various interview and panel shows; it produces one network radio show and one network television-radio simulcast and is considering taking over a third well-known radio show. Its network time is free.

On this same basis of nonpartisanship, it sends out a mass of literature and public opinion poll to newspapers, radio stations, and to every Member of Congress.

On this same basis it has obtained a Federal tax exemption both for its expenditures and for its contributors. Recently, a former moderator for Facts Forum was appointed to the most powerful single body governing mass communications in America, the Federal Communications Commission.

Facts Forum began officially in June 1951. It helps create local discussion groups whose basic information comes from the description of both sides of national issues as interpreted by Facts Forum. These both sides presentations are broadcast over 222 radio stations on recordings made by Dan Smoot, an ex-FBI agent who is now chief moderator for Facts Forum. The material for these broadcasts comes partly from a free circulating library with hundreds of titles and 20,000 books, which are given free to participants who get six other persons to read any given book first. Transcripts from the both sides broadcasts are sent to interested listeners and are reprinted in the organization's house organ, the Facts Forum News, which is sent to 60,000 persons monthly.

Facts Forum also conducts a public opinion poll on certain selected questions, the results of which it releases as news to 1,800 newspapers, 500 radio stations, and every Member of Congress, some of whom introduce it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Facts Forum also pays for certain newspaper and periodical activities by individuals.

It has 20 paid persons on its staff, mostly in the headquarters in Dallas, with branch offices elsewhere. It has a paid organizer and speech instructor for use in localities where Facts Forum activities are being created.

In recent months Facts Forum has branched out into radio and television network shows. It now produces the Mutual Broadcasting system show, "Some of the Nation," a half-hour radio show on 315 stations on free time. It also produces the American Broadcasting Co. television-radio half-hour show, Answers for Americans, also

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

on free time. Both shows have been favorably reviewed by impartial critics.

These are in addition to a half-hour television show filmed by Facts Forum in Washington and sent out free to 58 stations. The basic Dan Smoot both sides program is on 222 radio stations.

Incidentally, although the program is called a forum, I may interject here to say that it consists of Moderator Dan Smoot debating with himself. He debates one side of an issue for a part of the program and then takes the other half to debate the other side of the issue.

Of course, Mr. President, it is rather difficult to tell how well he presents the facts on either side of what he calls the two sides of the issue, or on the same Dan Smoot side; and any connection with the concept of a basic fair debate is rather remote.

I continue to read:

The moderator for Facts Forum on its two network shows is now in negotiation to add the MBS half-hour radio program, Reporters' Roundup to the growing list of Facts Forum activities.

The man behind this growing national organization is probably the most obscure individual among the rich men of the world. He broke his lifelong rule against personal publicity by announcing the formation of Facts Forum but before that, H. L. Hunt was unknown even to many citizens of Dallas.

It is problematical whether Hunt is, as he has been labeled, the richest man in America or the man who comes closer than anyone else on earth to being a billionaire. He abhors such terms.

The article continues with some interesting facts on Mr. Hunt's life. I should like to read one more paragraph which perhaps is quite descriptive. It reads:

Hunt made the bulk of his fortune during the depression, a period which, he feels strongly, marked a deplorable tendency among his fellow Americans to demand welfare services from the Federal Government. He feels that the Democratic Party, except for the Dixiecrat movement, is the instrument of socialism and communism in this country, and that the Republican Party as presently constituted displays dangerously radical tendencies.

* * * * *

Hunt supported General MacArthur for the Presidency in 1948 and later, when the general was deposed by President Truman and visited Texas in a special plane, Hunt was on his plane.

I should like to continue by reading more about Facts Forum as published in the excellent Providence Journal. The article continues:

Facts Forum has existed for 30 months. During the first—and relatively quiet—half of its life, Facts Forum spent about 200,000 tax-free dollars, and the Hunts gave Facts Forum 219,000 tax-free dollars. Facts Forum will not say what its current budget is. But in the second 15 months of its operations, it has expanded enormously. It has added at least 4 regional offices with paid organizers (1 in Hunt's birthplace, Vandalia, Ill.), and entered network radio and television activities on a coast-to-coast scale. So there is reason to believe that the $200,000 expenditures of the early months of Facts Forum is only a fraction of the current budget. In those early months, the Hunts supplied more than 95 percent of the listed contributions.

UNANIMOUS APPROVAL FOR FORUM LACKING

With such admirable aims announced by Facts Forum, one would expect unanimous approval. The town-meeting idea has always been popular in this country. And, indeed, many national figures have expressed publicly their full support of Facts Forum. These include Senator GEORGE MALONE, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, and Senator JOHN W. BRICKER.

But there are some startling demurrers. This is odd for a nonpartisan educational enterprise. One of Washington's better known Washington correspondents, Carleton Kent, of the Chicago Sun-Times, offered money for merely interviewing a Senator on Facts Forum, declared, "I wouldn't touch that organization with a 10-foot pole." Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who appeared in one of the first Facts Forum television broadcasts, said, "I wish I knew then what I know now about that organization." Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, who appeared on the first Facts Forum television show with Senator MCCARTHY, was asked to make another Facts Forum appearance but declined. This is a pattern repeated by others.

Why there should be such unprecedented distrust of a nonpartisan educational organization will be discussed in later articles.

If Senators will permit me to do so, I should like to read excerpts from the second installment of the excellent series of articles published by the Providence Journal. From it we get a picture of the mass production of propaganda, and the articles show how propaganda can be cleverly brought on the air in America under the disguise of being public features of radio and television stations.

This is article No. 2:

One of the most admirable projects a man of wealth could underwrite would be the stimulation of rational debate among Americans on the problems facing them.

With the destruction of civilization a possible penalty for unwise decisions, a calm and judicious citizenry would have a better chance of surviving the perils of the atomic and the totalitarian age.

When H. L. Hunt, the Texas oilman, came out of a lifelong silence to announce such a program—a nonpartisan, nonpolitical educational organization—many persons hoped that this happy occasion had arrived.

Into this organization, Facts Forum, Hunt poured hundreds of thousands of dollars until today it is a nationwide project of 125,000 participants with a number of network radio-television and other public-opinion projects.

The basic coast-to-coast radio program of Facts Forum is a presentation, largely on free time, of both sides of national issues as interpreted by the staff of Facts Forum and given over the air by Facts Forum's chief moderator, Dan Smoot.

As this basic program progressed the Facts Forum version of both sides made many listeners uneasy. They seemed to feel that both sides were not equal in emphasis as interpreted by Facts Forum.

In January of 1952, for example, Smoot gave both sides of a Facts Forum question, "Should we negotiate whatever peace we can get in Korea?" Of Facts Forum members polled, 85 percent had voted to stay in Korea, 15 percent to get out any way we could. To the argument for staying in Korea, Smoot devoted less than 300 words of the broadcast, to the argument for getting out, more than 1,000 words.

A PROGRAM ON THE DEATH PENALTY FOR THOSE WHO WOULD OVERTHROW THE GOVERNMENT

Some broadcasts also seemed to be not so much both sides of a single issue, but merely two versions of the same side.

For example, Facts Forum devoted one program to the question of whether advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence should be punishable by death. Presumably the two sides of this question would be (1) Yes, the death penalty should be imposed, and (2) No, the death penalty is too severe and present laws should remain.

But as presented by Facts Forum, the prodeath penalty argument was that Communists threaten the security of 150,000,000 Americans and therefore are guilty of a crime worse than murder, which in many States is a capital crime.

Facts Forum's argument against the death penalty was made, in part, in these words:

"The real, subtle, accomplishing influence of communism is achieved not by the card-carrying members of the party or by the publicly known fellow travelers, but by the people in the lunatic fringe which surrounds the party.

IT'S NOT THE COMMIES, BUT SOME WHO THINK THEY ARE ANTI-COMMUNIST

"People in this fringe group are never identified as Communist sympathizers and many of them seem to be unaware of it themselves. * * * It is these people and not the Communists who are responsible for all of the first-rate achievements of communism in the United States."

Facts Forum often repeats the thesis that the Nation is in danger of complete collapse because of subversion and that this is the doing, not of Communists, but of certain people who think they are anti-Communist. Facts Forum concluded that to kill these people who think they are anti-Communist would be to abridge their civil rights.

[Laughter.]

A study of Facts Forum presentations of both sides shows that there is a consistent approach to national issues and that this approach involves these factors:

1. Facts Forum regards as on one side in one camp, the liberal, moderate, and conservative views. The other side is the extremist right.

2. In arguing for what it says is the viewpoint of the liberal-moderate-conservative side of an issue, Facts Forum uses dryly rational, subdued style. In arguing for what it says is the other side—the extremist right—Facts Forum uses highly emotional, inflammatory language.

I am sorry I cannot readily imitate the commentator. I have heard several of his programs.

3. Facts Forum presents what is often a fair and factual description of the liberal-moderate-conserative side. Then, in presenting its version of the other side, it devotes much of its time charging the liberal-moderate-conservative element in this country with subversion, betrayal, and treason.

4. On Facts Forum, personalities and namecalling often dominate and facts are forgotten.

An example of how the both sides technique works is the Facts Forum broadcast of both sides of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. It said of those against the act:

"The gallant fight against the bill was led by Senators Humphrey, Lehman, Kefauver, Moody, Benton, and Douglas. These champions of real democracy and international understanding certainly would not have tried to defeat this bill if it had been a good one." The broadcast then listed some of the organizations against the bill which, it said, "include nearly all religious and racial groups, the CIO and most of the A. F. of L. affiliates."

HOW FACTS FORUM PRESENTS OTHER SIDE

Facts Forum then presented the other side:

Those who want to destroy the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act would throw open the doors of the United States to the Socialist hordes of Europe. They are not worried

about the downtrodden people of Europe. They want to flood America with people who have been drenched by the Socialist propaganda of eastern Europe—people who would swell the tide of Socialist votes in our great industrial centers.

This is the purpose of those who know what they are doing—the Americans for Democratic Action, whose aims and ideals are almost identical with those of the Socialist Labor Party of Britain; the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, an officially cited Communist organization; the National Lawyers Guild, another known Communist front; and the Communist Party itself.

And, of course, rallying around these is the usual clique of innocent dupes who don't know what they are doing—the gulliberals—who have always done the work of the Communist Party.

Dan Smoot ended this Facts Forum broadcast with the words:

"I have just given some views of conservatives who look upon the McCarran-Walter Act as one of the best and most generous pieces of legislation ever enacted in America or elsewhere—and of liberals with an opposite point of view."

Another time Facts Forum presented both sides of the question, Should we continue to handle Korea as a limited police action?

The first part of the program was devoted to the arguments of those who favor American intervention in Korea. It quoted the schoolish terms of Gen. Omar Bradley and the relatively unemotional words of Adlai Stevenson. "Korea," it quoted Stevenson, "is the most remarkable effort the world has ever seen to make collective security work. In choosing to repel the first armed aggression of the Communists, we chose to make bitter sacrifices today to save civilization tomorrow * * *" Thus went in style and tempo the argument for handling Korea as a police action.

Then came, as Facts Forum put it, "the other side":

"It is a strange war for a man who has been taught to love the American flag but who now finds himself fighting under a blue flag representing a world organization of which his enemy, the Soviet, is a member.

"He is in a Korean foxhole as the result of a United Nations order, but our Constitution says that only Congress can declare war. It's called a United Nations police action, but the United Nations' only noticeable contribution is the policy of appeasement which keeps the Americans from winning * * *

"It's cold up here in the winter—sometimes thirty below zero. If a boy cries his tears turn to ice. And then there is the enemy. always the enemy. Joe can feel him out there in the blackness, and sometimes he can hear him. And sometimes when a star shell bursts overhead, he can see him—not one, but thousands, moving relentlessly forward * * *

"Presently the third assault wave starts, and then the noise—the screaming, eerie unearthly noise of mindless men in a banzai charge. And a boy from Texas starts firing as fast as he can feed clips into his automatic weapon. He fires until the gun is red hot in his hands. The Commies die. They die by the hundreds, and fall in heaps; but there are endless numbers of them. For every one that falls, ten come up to charge over his dead body; and some of them get through—1, 10, or a thousand.

"Then it is the kind of fight that man fought centuries ago; knives and fists, fingers groping for eyes, the teeth seeking a soft spot in the neck. Maybe Joe will die in the slit trench, and maybe he will live—his hands sour and gummy with half-digested rice gruel ripped out of the stomach of a bleeding bundle of rags and bones at his feet * * *

"Korea. Police action or war? A question for all Americans. This is Dan Smoot for Facts Forum."

Madam President, I wonder if any Member of the Senate, regardless of which side of these issues he might take, would say that these are facts.

Facts Forum has improved on the business of creating propaganda by the device of writing letters to the editor. The Forum offers prizes for letters, which are printed, to stimulate the ability of people to express themselves to newspapers.

One of the most democratic institutions remaining in America is Letters to the Editor, to which any citizen can express his opinion in public print, barring obscenities, libel, or commercialisms.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What connection does Bob Lee have with Facts Forum?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will try to develop that as I come to it. Mr. Lee was the moderator of the first three Facts Forum television shows. He testified, in hearings before our committee, that on at least three occasions he was called into consultation to advise with Mr. H. L. Hunt, in connection with the expanded program of Facts Forum.

I shall discuss a further connection which sufficiently leads at least the junior Senator from Oklahoma to believe that it is sufficiently important to merit discussion in regard to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lee.

Mr. CASE. Did Bob Lee ever have any financial interest in Facts Forum?

Mr. MONRONEY. Only as a commentator, for which he received $400 for appearing in 3 shows, $100 of which, he testified, he gave back.

Mr. CASE. Did he appear as moderator, or did he appear as an arguer on one side or the other?

Mr. MONRONEY. He appeared as moderator on the TV program, and he also testified that in conference with Mr. H. L. Hunt, who apparently was in Washington, he gave advice and discussed programing, talent, and other matters with Mr. Hunt, who has been the guiding genius of Facts Forum, which I am discussing.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that the $300 or $400 which he received——

Mr. MONRONEY. I think that is insignificant. I do not raise that point against Mr. Lee.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that that amount was for either his services or his expenses?

Mr. MONRONEY. I presume it was for his services. I do not raise that matter as a reason for disqualification. The Senator from South Dakota asked me if Mr. Lee had a financial interest in Facts Forum. Many persons, including newspapermen, receive stipends for moderating programs.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that Lee tried for the job Smoot got?

Mr. MONRONEY. The record does not show. I rather doubt that he did.

Mr. CASE. In any event, does the record show that Bob Lee has had any connection with getting radio time for Facts Forum since he has been a member of the Commission?

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish the distinguished Senator would allow me to develop that point. I think, first, it is necessary, at least, to let the Senate know what Facts Forum is. If there shall be only one vote against the confirmation of Mr. Lee's nomination, I think the time will have been well spent to have had the Senate realize what can be done with tax-exempt dollars and having hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars' worth of mass-produced programs sent across the country by means of radio and television stations, programs allegedly giving both sides of a question.

I should like to develop that point in my own way. I think there is definite information which the Senate should consider in connection with the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that Facts Forum was on the air long before the present administration took office?

Mr. MONRONEY. It was, but in a rather feeble and ineffective way. The real purpose of the program, the real business, one might say, was to give the appearance of giving the opposition side of a story. That point of view took on new meaning and a new figure about the time of which I am speaking.

Mr. CASE. Would the Senator say that was before or after Mr. Lee was named to the Commission?

Mr. MONRONEY. No; that was before. That happened several months before he was named to the Commission.

Mr. CASE. Is the junior Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that the junior Senator from South Dakota was the principal supporter and backer of another candidate for the particular position to which Mr. Lee was appointed?

Mr. MONRONEY. I understand the junior Senator from South Dakota even had ready a press release to announce the appointment, at the time Mr. Lee's appointment was announced.

Mr. CASE. That is not correct. The junior Senator from South Dakota was in Europe at the time the appointment was made. Furthermore, I have not been in the habit of giving press release on anything, much less appointments. In any event, I was interested in the candidacy of one Robert J. Dean, a man who was connected with the industry, and who I felt was very well qualified.

In spite of my great friendship for Mr. Dean, and my belief that he would have been the best man for the place, I think it would be unfair to the deliberations of the Senate for me, knowing Mr. Lee as I do, and knowing also the responsibilities that members of the Federal Communications Commission have, to sit in the Senate and not challenge some of the points of view which are being presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma.

For example, the Senator from Oklahoma has mentioned the fact that Mr.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Lee is an accountant. He is an accountant. I was a Member of the House of Representatives, as was the Senator from Oklahoma. I served on the Committee on Appropriations at the time Mr. Lee joined the staff. I am somewhat familiar with his work. Apparently we thought he was a very fine man, and I think the whole record does not indicate anything other than that he is an able accountant.

I am certain the Senator from Oklahoma must know that the Federal Communications Commission has responsibilities that are not confined wholly to radio and television. There are also responsibilities in the field of the regulation of the telephone and telegraph industries.

A few years ago there was a Commissioner by the name of Walker, who performed very valuable service in connection with the regulation of the telephone industry. As a result, certain orders were issued in consequence of which there was a reduction of telephone rates. Obviously, the examination of the telephone and telegraph industries, particularly the telephone industry, as it was carried on by Mr. Walker, called not for experience in the delineation between freedom and nonfreedom in the expression of opinion, but for a person who knew how to analyze the financial corporate structure of a corporation, depreciation, and items of that sort.

Certainly if the contribution of Mr. Walker to the telephone industry meant anything to the country, it ought to be permissible for the Federal Communications Commission to have in its membership someone who knows how to take apart financial statements.

Mr. Lee has such knowledge. The Federal Communications Commission, which deals with radio, the question of rates, the question of depreciation, the question of financial qualifications, with respect to the granting of permits and licenses, would seem to me to justify having at least one accountant as a member, when already there are 2 or 3 lawyers, a couple of engineers, and perhaps 1 person connected with the industry.

I recognize that the Senator from Oklahoma has been very generous in letting me make a few remarks, while not confining myself to questions. I appreciate his courtesy in that regard.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from South Dakota has always been generous with his time. One could do nothing less than to cooperate in any way he could with the opposition.

Mr. CASE. As I say, I disqualify myself from having any special interest in the appointment of Mr. Lee. As a matter of fact, I was much more interested in the appointment of someone else. I think unless there is a definite connection between Mr. Lee and Facts Forum in a malicious or evil way, whatever the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma may be regarding Facts Forum should not operate to reject the nomination of Mr. Lee. Neither do I think the fact that Mr. Lee is an able accountant would be a liability so far as the telephone and telegraph industries are concerned.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am grateful for the observation of my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota. Commissioner Walker had served a full 6-year term as a member of the corporation commission, the regulatory body of the State of Oklahoma that deals with the handling of communications in that State, and as an administrative officer in a quasi-judicial post. I do not believe he ever was an accountant. I think he was an attorney, an experienced man in handling that type of work. I appreciate the high regard in which the Senator from South Dakota holds one of Oklahoma's distinguished former Members of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. CASE. In analyzing an industry like the telephone industry, with the purpose of determining whether interstate long-distance telephone rates, for one thing, should be modified, the ability to analyze financial returns and corporate structures is of value.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would be of some value, but in my opinion, most of that type of work is done by expert accountants at the staff level. I believe the distinguished Senator from South Dakota was right in the first place in opposing Mr. Lee for the nomination, because a certain seasoning and experience in broadcasting is necessary for one who is to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission. I think the Senator was right in the first place.

Mr. CASE. I still think my candidate was a better man.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does not the Senator agree that such practical experience as a broadcaster might be very beneficial to the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. CASE. I think it might be, but I do not think Mr. Lee is not qualified. I think his ability will be valuable. I shall vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. MONRONEY. But it is my understanding that the position was to have been filled by one who was supposed to have ability as a practical broadcaster. I had thought the nomination might be given to the industry instead of to Mr. Doerfer. But when his nomination was announced, the disappointment to the broadcasting fraternity was rather great, because there never had been nominated anyone who had been a practical man in the broadcasting field.

Mr. CASE. I do not know about that. I do know that I urged that it would be valuable to have a man who had grown up in the industry and had been in the industry for something more than 23 years. I still believe he would have been an excellent appointment. I do not retract anything I may have said in his behalf. At the same time, that does not necessarily mean that Mr. Lee is not qualified.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I am going to try to be as brief as I can. However, I think that the letter-writing technique in the public forum of the newspapers is rather illustrative of the same technique which is used in this hitch-hiking method of supplying tailor-made propaganda and so-called opinion.

Newspaper readers in the vicinity of Dallas, Tex., have had many opportunities to read letters by a "J. McCarthy, 1348 Highland Road, Dallas" (presumably no blood relation to J. McCARTHY, of Appleton, Wis.).

Once Mr. McCarthy wrote against Truman's having intervened in Korea, another time against social security, another time against all New Dealers and Fair Dealers, another time accusing Truman of promoting socialism and communism, another time pleading for an end of international giveaways, another time attacking then-Secretary of State Dean Acheson, another time charging the United Nations with being "a rabble of nations," another time urging a low legal limit to all income taxes.

These happen to coincide with the opinions of H. L. Hunt, the multimillionaire Dallas oilman who has created a nationwide voter-education program called Facts Forum. Presumably, however, Mr. McCarthy held these opinions sincerely, as he has a right to do.

But what most readers of Mr. McCarthy's letters in the newspapers do not know is that Facts Forum paid Mr. McCarthy for writing these letters.

Mr. McCarthy received, as a result of writing these letters and other promotional efforts for Facts Forum, close to $600 in the first 15 months of Facts Forum's operations.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish the Senator would make it clear that the McCarthy mentioned as signing the letter is not the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly wish to make that clear. I wish to state that he is not the Senator from Wisconsin and is no relation; yet he received $600 for writing letters to the editor. I know the junior Senator from Wisconsin is not going to bother to write letters to an editor in Dallas, Tex.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say for the RECORD that the name McCarthy was dug up by what the Senator calls the outstanding Providence (R. I.) Journal, and inserted in the headlines of the newspaper for the obvious purpose of trying to create the impression that the McCarthy mentioned was the Senator from Wisconsin or some relative of his. All through the article "Senator McCARTHY" is mentioned. Then an unknown man from Dallas is headlined. McCarthy was paid by Mr. Hunt for writing the letters. I think it is one of the most dishonest and as snide an act as any of which I have knowledge. The article to which the Senator from Oklahoma is referring attempted to create by innuendo the impression that the unknown McCarthy from Dallas was the Senator from Wisconsin, or some relation of the Senator. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma is not trying to create that impression.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not trying to create such an impression.

Mr. McCARTHY. I realize that the Senator is merely reading the article as a part of a very long series. I am not accusing the Senator from Oklahoma of any improper conduct. I am not accusing the Senator of doing what the newspaper was trying to do. However, I repeat that the newspaper was guilty of a very dishonest and snide attempt in endeavoring to create the impression

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that the Senator from Wisconsin was the writer of the letters. I am also sure that the article, again by innuendo, was trying to set forth that Mr. Hunt had contributed to my campaign. If Mr. Hunt had contributed to my campaign, he would have been welcome to do it. I would have welcomed funds from Mr. Hunt or anyone else during the campaign. However, I desire to make it clear that so far as I know Mr. Hunt contributed nothing to any campaign in which I was involved. I may say that he is perfectly welcome to contribute to any campaign, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no "keep out" sign, is there?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; there is no "keep out" sign.

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to my distinguished friend and colleague from Wisconsin that I have other articles which are worse than the ones with the McCarthy headlines, but they do not deal with the citizen from Dallas, Tex.; they are more or less on different matters. The name "McCarthy" on the article I hold in my hand is in 8-point type. There is no headline or even bold-face printing in the article. I merely desire to say that Mr. McCarthy, of Dallas, Tex., has found it very profitable to write letters to the editor and collect money as prizes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to announce that there is to be a meeting with the Democratic members of the Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. Therefore, much as I dislike to do so, I shall have to leave at this time. In the event that the debate is at an end before I return, I desire to make it very clear that I personally have the highest opinion of Bob Lee. He is a friend of mine. However, I had nothing whatsoever to do with his being nominated. Had I known that Mr. Lee was seeking the nomination and could I have been of assistance to him, I certainly would have tried to be of assistance. It happens that I did not help him obtain the nomination. He is a good friend of mine, and I have the highest possible opinion of Bob Lee.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding to me.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to have yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin. I may say to him that Mr. Lee also has the highest possible opinion of the Senator from Wisconsoin. There was demonstrated before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a very warm, close, personal, as well as political friendship.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, getting back to the article, I should like to read further from it:

> Thus, out of every $10 paid to persons who got letters on political issues printed in the newspapers and then sent to Facts Forum for "judging," $9 went to letter writers expressing the view of H. L. Hunt and $1 to those with opposing views.

In other words, $9 out of every $10 went to writers of letters to the editors expressing the views of H. L. Hunt, and only $1 out of $10 went to those writing letters opposing the views of the sponsor of Facts Forum.

In order not to delay the Senate unduly, I should like to conclude as rapidly as possible:

> At one time the one-sidedness of these payments attracted attention and Facts Forum announced that from then on the payment would be equally divided between what Facts Forum called "Liberal" letters and "Constructive" letters, presumably meaning what others have called "Liberal" and "Conservative."
>
> But this, apparently, was soon abandoned. In November 1953, Facts Forum announced payments of $295 for 10 letters, all of them expressing Hunt's opinions. In December 1953, it announced payments of $360 for 11 letters, $275 for 9 pro-Hunt letters, $75 for 1 anti-Hunt letter, and $10 for one non-political letter.
>
> The letters follow closely the Facts Forum political thought in another respect. The letters sent to newspapers are, at Facts Forum's request, on subjects current in the Facts Forum "public opinion poll."
>
> Each month Facts Forum mails out 120,000 postcards with poll questions on them. It says it gets about 12,000 back. All signed cards are counted in the poll. Facts Forum suggests that members fill out the cards together at their meetings.
>
> The results are then incorporated into a news release which goes to 1,800 newspapers all over the country, 500 radio stations and to all Members of Congress. The news release refers to it only as a "public opinion poll."
>
> However, in its own publication, the Facts Forum News, it is described not as a cross-section poll—which most editors, radio newsmen and Congressmen would assume a "public opinion poll" to be—but as a poll of "informed" (that is, Facts Forum membership) opinion.

Madam President, there is much more on this matter which I should like to discuss, but I do not care to delay the Senate unduly.

I recommend the series on Facts Forum as interesting reading for any Member of the Senate who is concerned with the problem of keeping fair and free discussion alive in this great country of ours.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator putting in the RECORD the article in its entirety, so that it may be available to any Member who desires to read it in full?

Mr. MONRONEY. The entire publication has been put into booklet form. If I can receive permission to insert it into the RECORD, I shall do so. I have left out some of the articles which might be considered highly controversial, regarding the relationships of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and Mr. Hunt, and the Senator from Wisconsin being Mr. Hunt's favorite candidate for President. I did not want to include articles which did not seem properly to belong in this discussion.

From what I have personally heard over the air, and from what I have read of its own publications, I would question whether it is either "Facts" or "Forum."

Yet this new propaganda machine, the largest and most ambitious ever set up in the United States to advocate and slant one point of view, under tax exemptions for a charity foundation, rolls merrily on. Its massive station tie-up is creating a new device in slanting so-called free and equal discussion on public issues to promote the line of thought held by H. L. Hunt, of Dallas, Tex.

This is particularly true in the larger radio tie-up and is beginning to show up in their new television program. I have talked with numerous Senators who have had experience with this program, and they have been doubtful about the claim made for its presentations that they are fair and unbiased.

Yet the newly appointed FCC Commissioner recommends this program as a good example of "public service programs" which radio and television stations carry in justifying their wavelengths on the airways. How much of the new policy of "Facts Forum" and its planning and format are the product of the new Commissioner will never be known.

Mr. Lee did serve to launch the television program, and he moderated the first three programs at the personal request of Mr. H. L. Hunt "who called me," said Mr. Lee, "and indicated that he was thinking about embarking on this program. He wanted my assistance, not because I was a moderator, I don't think, but because I was reasonably familiar with what the issues might be and so forth. I agreed to help him get it started."

In answer to a question by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]:

> Do you feel that Facts Forum is a fair and impartial presentation of political issues to the American people?

Mr. Lee replied:

> To the best of my knowledge, I do. I have listened to a number of these recordings that were made, and depending on what time you switch it on, you might wonder which side it is on. I think it has been presented very fairly, in my observation. I am not familiar with their literature. I have not read very much of it. I have listened to a number of their recordings and I have listened to a number of their television shows.

As a private citizen, or even as an ordinary Government official, it is not important whether Mr. Lee likes the program or not. But as a member of the highly sensitive Federal Communications Commission, his activity for and on behalf of "Facts Forum" and his relationship with it, plus his approval of its fairness and objectivity, become important questions to be considered by the Senate, in reaching a determination of whether to confirm this nomination.

Let us bear in mind, Madam President, that all radio and television stations are under the life-or-death control of this Commission, and in the choice of what public-service programs will be run on the individual stations the association and approval of Facts Forum could be important factors in tipping the scales of decision in its favor.

Other programs, either the usual forum program or straight commentary

programs, most of them commercially sponsored by non-tax-exempt businesses, do not have the advantages accorded to Facts Forum. If the programs are slanted one way or another, the sponsor may hear of it from the listeners and his customers, and he may withdraw the program or correct the slanting. Commentary programs by various newscasters must stand or fall on the reception of the programs by the listeners. Either a program loses its popularity with its audience, and the station drops it, or it succeeds in the free-enterprise spirit of competition. Thus, in the long run, the public is—as it should be—the ultimate censor of the general run of programs of this type.

But Facts Forum is different. Not only is it completely tax exempt, but if a radio station does not wish to run the program as a free public-service program, time can be purchased by the foundation itself for as long a period as may be desired by Mr. Hunt and his associates.

In some cases the program, through the help of the Facts Forum agents, acquires sponsors to reach key spots for paid sponsored broadcasts and television programs. This has been done, according to one writer from New York, by advertising oilfield equipment to the audience on Long Island.

The big fear, however, regarding such a mammoth propaganda device as this one—which is without any control over the slanting of so-called unbiased broadcasts—is that Mr. Hunt now has a friend on the court.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is there a difference between Mr. Hunt and the ordinary sponsor of a program who depends upon the listeners for their continued support in a commercial sense? Is Mr. Hunt selling anything? Is there any effect upon him in case he does not appeal to the good sense of his listeners?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Arkansas has grasped the very point I have in mind. In the case of an ordinary broadcast by a commercial firm, if the broadcast is slanted, even though it may purport to be an unbiased forum, and if it is not actually such, the advertiser will hear from the listeners and from his customers, and he will either correct the slant or he will drop the program.

Thus, in the ordinary case the great American public exercises a form of censorship, and it certainly has some influence on what is said on the programs. In the ordinary case, the radio station or the sponsor is the judge. Furthermore, the American people exercise a considerable degree of censorship by means of their expressions of approval or disapproval. Moreover, numerous persons may register complaints about the slanting of the program or about any devious means of short changing all over the lot, in the way that I and other Members of the Senate have heard.

The fear about such a slanting of the programs, about the advice given to Mr. Hunt, and about the compatibility between Mr. Hunt and those who are associated with Mr. Lee, leads me to believe that the Facts Forum will enjoy a very advantageous reception the next time a representative of the Facts Forum calls on the operator of a small radio station and asks him to include the Facts Forum in his programs.

At such a time I do not believe there will be a failure to mention that a member of the Federal Communications Commission was one of the first moderators of the program, and has had a part in it.

As a result, I fear that there will be a loss of freedom of speech and a loss of freedom of discussion on the part of radio-station operators, who may wish to say, "No, I do not wish to carry that program." Under such circumstances, will a radio-station operator be able to say, "No, I do not wish to carry the program"? If the nomination is confirmed, will the average operator of a small radio station, who is asked to carry the Facts Forum as a part of the program of his station, feel, as do most Americans, that he can run his own business in whatever way he may care to do?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know of any other program which might be able to compete with the Facts Forum in presenting the other point of view?

Mr. MONRONEY. I know of no such device.

If the Republican Party or the Democratic Party chose to go on the airways with a political program or an educational program, to be carried on any of the networks, first it would be necessary for that political party to raise funds, by means of individual donations, to pay for the cost of the program. However, the program would be paid for directly; it could not be handled as a tax-free or tax-exempt transaction. None of the funds so donated would be deductible from taxes, as this peculiar privilege enjoyed by Facts Forum.

On the other hand, the device used by the Facts Forum is one which can be used by any wealthy man who wished to have a great impact upon public opinion; and by means of such an arrangement he will be able to write off the cost of the program, because of the tax-exempt feature. In other words, donations to the Facts Forum program can be deductible for income-tax purposes.

As a result, the program goes merrily on its way. An announcer in a very mellow voice declares that he intends to present both sides and give the so-called facts. The program is conducted every week; and if a radio station wishes to carry the program in some of its free time it has the word of the new Commissioner, who seeks Senate confirmation of his nomination, that he considers the program an excellent public service. Thus it will be listed as being a very fine public-service, news-commentary program for a radio station.

Therefore, Madam President, I believe that in this case we are dealing with a new device, one previously unknown in our country, whereby any wealthy man who wishes to adopt such a charity trust or educational scheme could almost monopolize the airways for propaganda.

If a radio station did not choose to carry the program or give time to it—as in the case of one radio station here—then the owners of Facts Forum purchase time for the program. The payment made for that time comes out of some tax-exempt dollars.

As a result, the program would be on the air, regardless of whether it had to be paid for or whether it was carried in free time. If payment were required, it would be covered by a nice, big, tax exemption. That arrangement would allow one man virtually to shout to the millions of American people whatever line of thought he wished them to hear, and in the process he would enjoy a large tax exemption.

Madam President, another item which is quite unusual is that if a radio station does not wish to run the program free, those who operate the Facts Forum program now have agents, so I understand, who go to the operators of radio stations or television stations and say to them, "Let us see if we can find you a sponsor for our program." So instead of spending the money to buy the time, they have employees who go out and sell a sponsor the idea of paying for the Facts Forum program. I have a letter in my files from a man in Long Island, New York, stating that he hears the Facts Forum program. It is sponsored in New York by an oil-well equipment company in Louisiana or Texas. I am sure the oil drillers spudding in the wells on Long Island and the roughnecks and mudhogs will listen every morning eagerly to the advertisement paid for from the income of the oil-well drilling equipment company in Texas or Louisiana. So we have these devices which I believe can smother the voice of freedom and democracy, and of fair, dispassionate discussion and the right of dissent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand that the Senator knows of no precedent for this kind of device for the utilization of tax-free money.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly do not. I do not think it has ever been tried before. It is a good device so far as Mr. Hunt is concerned. Its success will probably result in repetition on other fronts, because the device offers an opportunity for one man sitting in his office to reach tens of millions of listeners and carry on his particular line of thought. I have no objection to his carrying on his line of thought with everyone everywhere with whom he can get in contact. He can go up and down the street, or he can buy his own radio time on the air. However, I do not think such expense should be tax deductible. I do not believe we should encourage and build up the power which I think I see building up behind this operation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The most objectionable thing the junior Senator from Louisiana can see in this picture is a program which tells the public that it is presenting both sides, when actually the entire purpose is to sell only one side, and give the

impression that the other side has been heard when the other side has been only very ineffectively presented. The idea is to present a very weak argument for one side, and marshal many strong—and in many cases misleading—arguments for the other side of the case.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly agree with my distinguished friend that it is deceptive in the utmost to tell people that they are going to hear both sides, and then wink and say, "We certainly short-changed them on the other side."

Mr. LONG. If a station volunteers free time for a program which, in fact, presents only one side of an issue, the station is in good conscience bound to allow an equal amount of free time for the presentation of the other side of the issue.

Mr. MONRONEY. Under this new device they now say, "We presented both sides." So it is not a question whether 100 words of dispassionate discussion took place on one side and 900 words on the other, with inflammable adjectives and descriptions. The station can say, "We presented both sides." So the offended party or political point of view cannot be heard. It is estopped by this very clever device.

Mr. LONG. Then it is actually a device to give the impression that the law which requires that both sides be heard over the air is complied with when actually that law is being violated.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly agree; but it would be almost impossible in a court of law, or before the Federal Communications Commission, or before the Tax Court, to establish the difference because this is a new device. Who is to be the judge of the fairness of the presentation? First, Mr. Dan Smoot. But Mr. Dan Smoot works for H. L. Hunt, who pays his salary. I wonder if any Senator believes that Dan Smoot, in the program commentary as he debates with himself, would say anything that did not give the impression that Mr. Hunt's side was winning in the argument.

This is something for us to think about. I expressed the fear that the smaller broadcasters, when solicited to put this program on the air, might cave in because the operator had friends high up in the Congress or on the Federal Communications Commission. I wonder how many small broadcasters, wishing to discontinue the free time for Facts Forum, will have the courage to do so, after the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Robert E. Lee.

How many will be fearful when solicited to give their time on new stations to this Facts Forum device?

I am not talking in riddles or imagining ghosts under the bed. Whether Mr. Lee would or would not remember unkindly any lack of consideration shown to Facts Forum is not so important as is the fear that he might. It is that fear about which I think we must worry.

We all remember the nationwide broadcast carried by all three major networks to permit President Truman to answer the charges made against him by Attorney General Brownell in the William Dexter White case. During his broadcast Mr. Truman referred to McCarthyism in one paragraph of his 30-minute speech. Immediately the Senator from Wisconsin demanded of the networks equal time to answer the former President of the United States. In this demand telegrams were sent to the managers of the three networks, but copies of the telegrams were also sent to members of the Federal Communications Commission, including Mr. Lee.

Whether because of fear of power resting in the Commission or because of persuasion on the part of the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin, or because of a conception of fair play I do not pretend to know; but 30 minutes of network television and radio time on all networks was forthcoming, and $300,000 in free air time was awarded to the Senator from Wisconsin.

This was only a short time after Mr. Lee had been placed on the Commission. Would this time have been given by all three networks if they had not realized the strategic importance of the placement on this sensitive agency controlling communications of one of the best friends and political associates of the Senator from Wisconsin?

In many instances of broadcasters we shall not be considering the giants in the field, such as the networks. They will be the small 250-watt radio stations or the daytime stations which long for the privilege of broadcasting at night. They will be operators who must come before the Commission for small orders, unimportant in the national scheme of things, but a matter of life and death to the station owner. Delay in approving a new location for a transmitter; tying up for further discussion permission to go forward on a construction permit after the license has been granted; and the threat of new competition by reshuffling of wavelengths to install another station in the owner's area, all cause the station owner to consider that cooperation with the Commission's wishes is almost mandatory, and that discretion is the better part of valor.

This reshuffling is not an entirely new process, as we have already seen. Probably the most celebrated television case is the Milwaukee case. There are two highly sought after VHF channels allocated for commercial broadcasting in Milwaukee. One has been granted to the Milwaukee Journal, and has been operating for some time, while the other is still under consideration in connection with a contested application. A third VHF channel was allocated for noncommercial educational use.

I believe Members of the Senate are aware of the hot fight which has resulted over this third channel, the so-called educational channel, which has been under contest since March 1951. The efforts of Hearst Radio to acquire this educational channel have resulted in one of the bitterest controversies ever before the Federal Communications Commission.

After some eight orders by the FCC, Hearst Radio finally threw the case into court on July 15, 1953, in an effort to open up the educational channel for commercial broadcasts. In addition to the contests before the Commission itself, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCarthy] has demonstrated an interest in assisting in the Milwaukee television situation. On November 17, 1953, the Federal Communications Commission announced that it had turned down the new Hearst bid to get channel 10 in Milwaukee. On November 29, the Senator from Wisconsin announced publicly that the Federal Communications Commission would come under the scrutiny of his Senate Investigations Subcommittee in the new Congress, when he would become chairman.

Senators are probably familiar with the published reports that it was over this question that Acting Chairman Paul Walker, of the Federal Communications Commission, was summoned to the office of the Senator from Wisconsin and questioned in a closed session of considerable length. Apparently he was led to believe that the meeting was an executive session of the Investigations Subcommittee. He found that the whole matter was over not granting a construction order until the change in the control of the Federal Communications Commission had taken place. There has been so much done in this case that it has become a rather celebrated case, which the people are watching.

So it is noteworthy to find that the situation has changed materially in behalf of applicants who have ambitions for a Milwaukee station on the desired VHF band.

On September 30, 1953, almost concurrently with the announcement of the appointment of Mr. Lee to the FCC, whose final appointment was announced by the White House on October 6, Hearst Radio filed a petition requesting the assignment of channel 6 VHF for Whitefish Bay, Wis. This is a suburb that is as near Milwaukee as any good TV station could logically ask to be placed. In other words, although it is called Whitefish Bay, it is literally another channel for those seeking a standard band TV for Milwaukee. Whether Hearst Radio knew of the Lee appointment at the time it petitioned for the location of the new channel is not certain.

However Broadcasting-Telecasting in its issue of October 12, 1953, reported that the Hearst Corp. made its last appeal for a channel in Milwaukee on September 30, 1953. It would appear that Lee was at least under consideration for the post at that time, if it had not already been given him. The following appeared in Broadcasting-Telecasting on October 12, 1953:

> First indication Commander Lee had that he was being considered for the FCC vacancy came in September the day before he left for Europe on an inspection trip of foreign aid activities for the House Appropriations Committee. At that time he was one of two proposed appointees for the vacant post of Assistant Comptroller General * * * a couple of days before the new Hearst appeal. While in Europe September 26, the new Commissioner was directed to return to this country and report to the White House. He reported to Sherman Adams, Assistant to the President, October 1, and was at the White House the rest of that week.
>
> Last Tuesday morning he was called to the White House for a 9 o'clock appointment, at which time President Eisenhower signed the FCC Commission.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Almost simultaneously with the appointment the Hearst application to switch a channel from other places into the Milwaukee area was filed, and then things suddenly started to happen. This chronology of events, of course, would not go unnoticed by the television industry. Neither can the speed with which the FCC acted in this matter. Although most broadcasters and TV applicants wait for a long period of time on such matters, while studies are made and consideration given, it took only from September 30, 1953 to October 8, 1953, before the powers of the Commission on Rule Making assigned the new channel to Whitefish Bay as petitioned for by Hearst Radio.

Thirty days were given for complainants to file their objections to this reshuffle of TV bands. Obviously, if a new television channel is to be assigned to Milwaukee, something else must be done around the circle to make it possible, and shifts must be made in other places. It required a change in channels for Marquette, Mich., which formerly had channel 5. In this reshuffle, Marquette, Mich., was assigned channel 6. In addition, to making available TV facilities for Whitefish Bay and Milwaukee, the allocation of channel 6 to Green Bay, Wis., was changed and in its place it became the allottee of channel 5.

Such changes as these, of course, involve other problems. Lansing, Mich., filed a complaint that the new allocation would interfere with their signals and WOC-TV in Davenport, Iowa, also complained to the Commission.

However, with this new burst of speed, 23 days later the Commission approved the order finalizing the new station allocation. It is now undergoing contest by three applicants who are asking for the grant of the license of this newly created channel for the Milwaukee area.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I expect very shortly to make some brief remarks in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Robert E. Lee. In the meantime, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for the speech he is making. In my opinion, he has rendered a very real public service in disclosing the facts to the Senate and, I hope, to a great segment of the American people. They are facts which have not been understood previously and which should be known. Thanks to the Senator's speech, the situation will be much more clearly and fully understood than heretofore.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his kind remarks.

In closing, Madam President, it should be noted that through the ages the freedom of speech, the right of dissent, and the right of circulation of information have been cherished prizes of a free people everywhere. We need go back only to the case of John Peter Zenger for an illustration of what I have in mind. I have seen the yellow pages of a book, with its oldfashioned s's, dealing with this great historic event, which did so much to assure us freedom of the press and freedom of speech in this country. We are the custodians, not the owners of this great right which many men have died and fought for to give us in America.

As we consider this important nomination in what I believe to be the most sensitive area of Government touching on these priceless freedoms we should ask ourselves: Is this appointment necessary and should the Senate confirm it?

I would vote in a minute to confirm Mr. Robert E. Lee to almost any fiscal post in the Government. I believe in his honesty. No one has heard me use the Maryland election case, with which he was connected, as a disqualifying item in considering his nomination. My objection goes to a much more important question. It is: Is this man truly conscious—I say "conscious," and do not use any other word—of the terrific importance of what rests in his hands in preserving the priceless freedom of speech and the right of dissent?

I do not believe his background as an expert auditor or his fine service as a detective is in the line of thought that would lead me, as a reasonable man, or would lead other Members of the Senate, to believe that he would defend with his very life the right of dissent and the right of freedom of speech.

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. BRICKER. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, may I defer to the distinguished Senator from Ohio? I understand he wishes to leave the Chamber for an appointment downtown. Then, I shall be able to take my time in discussing the nomination before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. BRICKER. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me. I have an important appointment downtown in a few minutes. The nomination of Robert E. Lee came before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and it was at that time that I first met Mr. Robert E. Lee. I had heard of him and knew of his distinguished service in the House Committee on Appropriations, about which my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], will speak shortly. I knew of his accomplishments as an auditor in the field of finance. However, I can say for a majority of the committee that it has been seldom that a man has made a better impression on our committee than was made by Mr. Robert E. Lee.

His nomination was favorably reported to the Senate by a vote of 11 to 1, with 1 member abstaining and reserving the right to speak on the floor, or to vote against the confirmation of the nomination.

I shall not concern myself with the matters presented this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. He opposed the recommendation by the committee of the confirmation of Mr. Lee's nomination, and voted against the recommendation in the committee.

It would seem to me that, acting as a moderator on free programs, for which a man receives expense money only, as the testimony shows, does not so connect him with an organization, whether it be right or wrong—and I am not passing on that subject—as to be a ground of disqualification. I do not believe we need to pass on that question. I have more confidence in the public than the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma seems to have.

I believe that a radio program either meets with the public's approval or with its disapproval, and that a radio program stands or falls entirely on its record. If a radio program presents propaganda in the form of facts, the listening people soon ascertain that to be the case and pay no further attention to it. If the truth is revealed by a program, and I have no reason to believe that that is not the situation in connection with the program under discussion, the public will approve of the program. Therefore, I believe that fact is relatively insignificant and of little importance in connection with the pending nomination.

Not one question was asked of Mr. Lee which he did not answer honestly and straightforwardly, as it dealt with his relationship either on the outside or in connection with the Federal Communications Commission. I doubt if there are many members of Government commissions or boards who could come before our committees and make a more thorough analysis of their responsibilities and duties than did Robert E. Lee. I think anyone reading the report of the committee will come to that conclusion.

After a few months of association in his responsible position he had a grasp of the functions of the commission which to my mind was very unusual. He had an understanding of its functions and its operating philosophy that marked him, I think, as a man of very great intelligence and of great devotion to the duties of his office. It is very difficult, in the short space of time in which he has served, to pick up the technicalities of a commission such as the Federal Communications Commission. There is not a member of the committee who felt that Mr. Lee was not an able, straightforward, honest, and sensible man. I am one of those, and I believe I speak for a great majority of the committee, who think he will do an excellent job and render a constructive contribution.

I desired to bring this much to the attention of the Senate. I do not want the Senate to consider the extraneous matters which I think have been presented, but I do want it to appraise the testimony of Mr. Lee himself, who was asked every conceivable question in the hearing, and his answers were given in a straightforward, honest manner.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in his capacity as a Member of the House of Representatives, has had a personal relation with this man. He knows his qualifications.

The Federal Communications Commission is a commission dealing with the technical relationships of a new and expanding industry. There are lawyers on the Commission; there are businessmen on it. If ever there was a time in any

of the Government departments when there was need for someone who understands figures, who knows accounting, who can read and understand a balance sheet, and can deal with a great public interest in an efficient manner, that time is now.

So, I think, instead of his being disqualified because he has not been a broadcaster and has not owned a radio station, he shows eminent fitness for the position because of the fact that he has an understanding of finance. He has been associated for many years with Government finance. In his Government representation, he has also been on the side of economy, which is very much needed by the boards and commissions downtown, which too often, I think, have spent beyond the needs of the public interest.

So, Madam President, I am very happy to report on behalf of the committee an 11-to-1 vote in favor of the confirmation of the nomination of Robert E. Lee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, notwithstanding the deep affection I have for my old friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], with whom I served so long in the House of Representatives, I thought his argument and analysis constituted indeed a curious exercise in logic. One might say that he expressed an idea of guilt by association. I could not tell whether the name of Mr. Hunt, of Texas, or the name of Robert E. Lee appeared on the Executive Calendar. As I listened to the argument I tried to attach to it some logical thinking in my own mind. It reminded me of the advice an old lawyer once gave to a young lawyer. He said, "When the law is against you, argue on the facts. When the facts are against you, argue on the law. When both the law and the facts are against you, just raise hell generally."

The argument seemed to be sort of a general observation which it was rather difficult to follow. I thought it was rather philosophical in nature. The Senator said there is a fear that Mr. Lee may not be the right person for the position. Where is that fear entertained?

We have more radio and television stations in one county in Illinois than there are in the whole State of Oklahoma. I think that will stand up as a statement of fact. No television station has written me to express a fear about Mr. Lee. No broadcasting station has called me on the telephone or sent me a letter or a telegram expressing some fear about Mr. Lee's capacity or that his thinking or his objectivity is wrong. None of the stations in my immediate area have written to me about it.

I finished today a program for five television stations, which I do every Monday. I finished a broadcast for five radio stations, which I also do on Mondays, and none of my friends there sent me a line to indicate that they entertained any fear about the state of mind or the attitude or the capacity of Robert E. Lee.

So, Madam President, I wonder where this fear lodges. I have not sensed it. Manifestly, it has not come to my attention.

It has been recited by my friend from Oklahoma that there has been rather meager oral testimony in behalf of Mr. Lee, that representatives of the industry did not appear. Is Mr. Lee an advocate of the industry, Madam President? Certainly, if we are going to be objective about it, we do not want someone who has an interest to come before the committee and be an advocate. I should much rather have the testimony which Mr. Lee himself presented to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce than to have the testimony of National Broadcasting Co., Columbia Broadcasting System, or any radio or television station in the United States serve as an advocate for his cause, because I am afraid that, then, some suspicion might arise as to whether he was exactly the right person for membership on a quasi-judicial or regulatory body of the Government.

It was said—and I say this in all kindness—"I am afraid he does not have the necessary sensitivity."

That is pretty nebulous, pretty difficult to put one's finger on. But I hope we shall never reach the time when in passing upon persons nominated for Government positions we ask the question, "What is your sensitivity I. Q." What does it mean? Is it that he has not the right kind of urge?

We have to put these things on solid ground. It may be that Mr. Lee has some moral and spiritual allergies. Maybe he has some peculiar sensitivities. But we are heading for many difficulties if, whenever a person nominated to a Government position comes before a committee, we try to ascertain whether he is on the right spiritual frequency. I suppose that is what "sensitivity" means. I should dislike to be in the position of saying to a person who has been nominated for a judgeship or a United States attorneyship, "I am sorry, my friend, but your frequency is all wrong; your urges are bad; your sensitivity goes in the wrong direction."

Obviously, Madam President, we do not turn down a good American citizen who has been nominated by a great President, on the thin and tenuous and slender basis that possibly his vibrations are wrong.

It has also been said that Mr. Lee does not have the necessary experience. My friend from Oklahoma was in the House of Representatives in the days when a lawyer by the name of Lawrence Fly was Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House at that time. I think my distinguished friend from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was there at that time. I know the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. BARRETT], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] were all Members of the House at that time. There came before the committee a man by the name of Lawrence Fly, sometimes regarded—and I trust I do him no injustice—as being a little leftish. I shall let the description stand right there, but I do not know that Mr. Fly, in the sense we are talking of, had experience in this field, as an accountant or otherwise. In fact he was a lawyer.

I remember when Clifford Durr was a member of the Commission. Could it be said that he had any technical experience? He had none whatsoever.

But Bob Lee has had plenty of accounting experience. Senators may wonder at my interest in him. Bob Lee comes from Chicago. He was educated at DePaul University. He has been an auditor and an accountant for a long time. I remember when he came to the FBI. Later he became chief of the investigating staff of the House of Representatives. Never was there a better or more thorough chief of staff. Never did we have consolidated in one personality such a wide acquaintanceship with the ramifications of government.

So when it comes to the nomination of an accountant, what have we in the book? Look in the directory. The accounting section of the Federal Communications Commission is set up separately, and there is plenty of emphasis on it. Is it not about time that we had on the Commission someone schooled in the intricacies of accounting and auditing, to be able, as an expert, to dissociate the items which appear in applications, and to determine what the assets and the liabilities are, and how long the applicants are likely to remain in business?

My friend, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], will recall that when the Western Union-Postal Telegraph merger was under consideration before our committee, it was almost entirely a legal and an accounting proposition. That merger came under the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission.

Thank goodness, we occasionally get an accountant who has some facility in the rather abstruse figures and statistics which are presented, who is able to tear them apart and make them understandable and clear, and who can make his contribution in this field, as he can in any other.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. I concur in what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said about the importance of accounting work in the Federal Communications Commission. As I pointed out earlier, not merely was accountancy important in connection with the merger of the Western Union and the Postal Telegraph, but there was a very much publicized investigation relating to the regulation of the telephone industry which was carried on by the Federal Communications Commission. That field is comprised within the duties of the Federal Communications Commission. I am certain the Senator from Illinois remembers when Commissioner Walker made his investigation of the telephone industry. It might have been better if he had known a little more about accounting at the time.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Along with broadcasting and television, a knowledge of accounting is indeed a valuable addition to the setup of the Federal Communications Commission.

My friend, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], says that Mr. Lee does not have experience. Sometimes one good accountant is better than a lot of other talent and a lot of other capacity when it becomes necessary to go directly to the heart of a job or to one facet of a job that is expected to be done.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma also says he has some anxiety that Mr. Lee does not have a judicial temperament, and he sought, of course, to implement that premise by referring to Mr. Lee's activities with Facts Forum. The fact of the matter is that I was once on Facts Forum. I appeared with the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. We discussed the Tennessee Valley Authority. It must have been a world-shaking program, because it happened that downtown, just about the time we were in the midst of our discussion, debating back and forth, a great bolt of lightning came across the sky and there was a clap of thunder. I thought the blast would blow out the ceiling. I thought, "At long last, we really must have registered on Facts Forum." That was the only time I have been on Facts Forum. I wonder if Senators would care to hold up their hands, to see how many have been on Facts Forum at one time or another. I suppose a very substantial segment of the United States Senate has appeared on that program. But Mr. Lee has served as moderator on three programs of Facts Forum. What does that have to do with judicial temperament? If Senators appear on the program of Blair Moody, a distinguished former Member of the United States Senate, do they invite the criticism that, suddenly, somehow, by some mysterious force, it has had an impact upon their judicial temperament?

If Senators appear on the program Meet the Press, is that to be used as an argument, one way or the other, as to judicial temperament, or does it have any bearing upon one's capacity to serve on a quasi-judicial body or regulatory agency of the Government?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I think the proper question would be, Because Blair Moody is connected with his program as a moderator, would he be disqualified from acting in a judicial capacity on a Federal board, whether or not he participates in the program?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under the circumstances, I should prefer not to comment on that. I think every Senator is free to comment for himself, and the answer, of course, would be quite obvious.

The strategy is that because Mr. Lee has served three times as moderator, for which he received $400, and turned back $100, suddenly, through the doctrine of guilt by association, he has now become unfit to serve on the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I do not wish to leave the matter quite there. I am not against any moderator simply because he is a moderator. The statement has been made that Mr. Lee was never a participant on the program, but that he was moderator. I do not think that should disqualify him. Neither do I think that Elair Moody, or any other moderator, simply because he is a moderator on a program, should be accused of being partisan. In fact, I think to the contrary. I think many Members of the Senate have appeared on Facts Forum as participants.

The Senator has emphasized, I think, that when Mr. Lee was connected with Facts Forum in those three instances, it was at the outset of the development of that program, and had nothing to do with the operation of Facts Forum under Dan Smoot, who has become moderator more recently. Furthermore, it ought not to be forgotten that Facts Forum was on the air long before Mr. Lee ever was a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from South Dakota is absolutely correct.

Let me speak about the question of experience. Suppose Mr. Lee has not been a technical man in the broadcasting field. Suppose he does not know the difference between an ohm and an ampere in the field of electronics. I can only say that if the Commission is a quasi-judicial body, and if we expect judicial determination from the Federal Communications Commission, then there is even some value in making sure there is no prejudice, one way or the other.

The Senate confirms nominations of appointees to the bench whom we expect to have no prejudice on one side or the other. How many persons who are nominated to the Federal district courts for the first time know very much about patent law, or about other specialized fields of law or litigation? But their minds are open. They are selected because they have some judicial temperament and can resolve questions, not from the standpoint of past experience in a technical field, but because their minds have the capacity to deal objectively with all facets of a case presented to a court.

Mr. Lee is in that happy position, but his position is also implemented by the fact that he is an accountant and an auditor, and in that respect he can bring much ability to the Commission. There has been no reflection upon his integrity; there has been no impeaching of his honesty; there has been no reflection upon his moral outlook. I am glad to note that, as a matter of fact.

I think I may say that on an occasion a long time ago, when I talked to our late beloved and esteemed colleague, Senator Taft, about his attitude upon nominations that came before the Senate, and I told him that some persons had scolded because he had approved the nomination of Dean Acheson, he said:

> If there is no showing of moral obliquity, I do not believe that I can very well contest or set myself up against the nominating power in the Government, namely, the President. So if the President wishes to nominate a particular individual, and if the record shows no moral laches, I do not believe I am in too good a position to object, unless there is some other showing in the record that is very, very persuasive, indeed.

There has been no reflection upon Mr. Lee's character, but I think there has been a rather peculiar imputation. First of all, in the discussion by the Senator from Oklahoma we heard the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] intruded. I probably know Bob Lee infinitely better than does the Senator from Wisconsin. I have known him for years. I saw him in action on the House side, and I believe we could get scores of Members of the House of Representatives to testify in behalf of Bob Lee. So I prefer not to see that imputation in the RECORD go unanswered.

The question of the White Fish Bay station was raised, the implication being that there was involved a tiny element which had something to do with Mr. Lee's being nominated and put on the Commission. In response to that let me suggest that Bob Lee is not the whole Federal Communications Commission. It appears to me that there are seven members on the Commission, some of whom are holdovers. Where were they? This is not a one-man show. We expect matters coming before the Commission to be decided by a vote of the Commission. So it is strange indeed that the White Fish Bay case, about which I know nothing, is trotted out here to indicate that its approval was somehow timed with the appointment of Bob Lee to the Federal Communications Commission. Unless the record can establish the truth of such an imputation, it should not be allowed to stand unimpeached and unrebutted. As I have said, this is not a 1-man Commission with which we are dealing; it is a 7-man Commission, and if there was something wrong with the approval of the application for the White Fish Bay station, why not have the appropriate committee of Congress call all the members of the Commission before it and ascertain what they know, because there is a presumption they knew the facts, and there is a presumption also that they were fortified with all the facts before final judgment and approval was given the application.

When all is said and done, what remains of the argument which has been made? Have the people back home telegraphed Senators, or called them up, and shuddered over the telephone as they said, "We are all apprehensive about Bob Lee going on the Federal Communications Commission." Have they called Senators up and said, "He has not the right sensitivity." That is very interesting indeed. I do not know what my sensitivity is. I do not know what frequency I am on, what my wavelength is, but I have known Bob Lee long enough

to believe that his wavelength is pretty good.

It is said that he is not of the proper temperament. Let those who so assert follow that statement out and say whether they mean moral, spiritual, or what. Then I can make a better answer.

It may be suggested that he has no experience. He has had much experience in the field of accountancy, and infinitely more in a specialized field than others who have gone on the Commission. I think his mental processes are pretty sound, and I have had an opportunity to appraise them for a good many years.

So what is left of the argument that is made? Exactly nothing, and I sincerely hope that the Senate will in due course proceed, if a roll call is insisted on, to give Bob Lee a whacking majority, affirming our confidence not only in him, but also in the appointing power, namely, the President of the United States.

Madam President, I have had some experience with personnel. I have had opportunity to recommend the appointment of a number of judges and district attorneys and United States marshals. I have had opportunity to suggest the names of a few people in the Diplomatic Service, some very high, some not so high. I have had a chance to suggest names for appointment to the various agencies of the Government, and I have been happily surprised, I have been gratefully astonished, by the fact that in every case a thorough investigation is made that the committees look into the records of the appointees with a fine-tooth comb, that the President of the United States, before he sends a name to the Senate for its advice and consent, has had the FBI go through the record so that he can in good conscience send the nomination here and say, "This nomination has been adequately investigated before it has been sent to the confirming body, the Senate of the United States."

When we vote today we not only cast a vote of confidence in a young man in whom I have the highest confidence, but also in an appointment made by the President of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator be good enough to tell us whether he has not heretofore advocated that the broadcasting industry itself should be represented by membership on the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not the slightest idea whether I have or not. My identity with the broadcasting industry, except to speak in the microphone, has been rather tenuous indeed. I know very little about the industry. I have probably broadcast, either with or without a microphone, as much as any other Member of the Senate, but I have no recollection that I have ever gone on record in the field mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Did the Senator endorse someone else for this position?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not that I recollect. I have the names of people on file in my office for nearly every position in the Government, and I am very glad when I can get an appointment.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has no recollection whether he endorsed this applicant or not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may have endorsed three, and if I had had more, I would have probably endorsed more.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has no recollection whether he endorsed Robert E. Lee for Assistant Comptroller General?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no recollection about it, but if I did, I am very glad I did.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator's idea of the relationship between one job and another is that they are all the same——

Mr. DIRKSEN. And that deserving Republicans should have them. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONRONEY. The administration is certainly appointing Republicans, and we are trying to pick out the most deserving Republicans. The Senator was good enough——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me interrupt the Senator before he gets away from that point. I am not timid about the patronage matter. The Republicans are in control, and I have been serving in Congress for 20 years and never before this year have I had the opportunity to recommend the appointment of a postmaster. I am doing my best to get a few offices now and then, and I am going to work harder at it. If we could not get Bob Lee appointed as Assistant Comptroller General—and he would have made a good one—then, of course, when he is nominated for a place on the Federal Communications Commission I am glad to get behind him and push the appointment.

Mr. MONRONEY. It does not make any difference what the job is?

Mr. DIRKSEN. He must naturally have some attribute to fit him for it, and Bob Lee has; and the Senator from Oklahoma knows he has.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have known him as an auditor, and I still question the Senator's statement; but I will not labor that further with the Senator.

The Senator has mentioned some of the radio programs, among others that conducted by former Senator Moody. Does he not think such a program is different from a program that is slanting the news?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator seems to come to the conclusion that because Bob Lee managed three programs for Facts Forum suddenly it has had an alchemical and magical effect upon his mental capacity and judicial temperament. Does the Senator have that experience when he goes on the program Meet the Press?

Mr. MONRONEY. What I said was that we must believe the testimony. He thinks it is a fine program, he thinks it should be given credit as being a good program, which certainly does more than casually to say that it is a program in which he might appear.

As the Senator has said, I believe the case is made, and whether some of us observe what it indicates and others disregard it, that is their business. But I am afraid that some may be rather careless in considering the question of freedom of speech, and some may even go so far as to consider that some political party might consider boycotting a program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator can mention to me a greater and more devoted citizen in the United States than Bob Lee, I shall just hang my head. I am sure my colleague's experience in the House of Representatives, where he had a chance to observe Mr. Lee's work as chief of staff of the House Appropriations Committee, will cause my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, to bear out that statement.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not at all unhappy about Mr. Lee's ability as an auditor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. MONRONEY. But I wonder about his ability as a judge.

Mr. DIRKSEN. After all, Madam President, a fear can arise only if there is within the person concerned something that excites the fear. But one who has served his country as a patriot and as a good public servant certainly should not excite, in the heart of anyone, any fear as to whether he will be a good citizen.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, I was going to ask whether the Senator was confusing the Facts Forum program as conducted under Mr. Lee with the Facts Forum program as conducted under Mr. Smoot. I understand that Mr. Lee was connected with the program in its early stages, and that he acted solely as a moderator in the presentation of questions to be answered by various other persons who participated in the programs.

I do not care to go into detail about the program, because I do not know enough about it. However, the type of program about which the Senator from Oklahoma complains was the type which was carried on after Mr. Lee left the Facts Forum.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have tried to point out clearly that the new vigor and new life and "new look" of the Facts Forum program occurred after three conferences, I believe, which were stated to have lasted approximately 30 minutes each, with Mr. Hunt, the operator and entrepreneur of Facts Forum. Since then the Facts Forum has had the new imprint. Whether the new moderator or the old moderator is responsible, or who suggested the new format, is not clear.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I know nothing about the "new look" or the new vitality, or that sort of thing; but I know that Bob Lee has the capacity to serve in many stations in Government—not only on the Federal Communications Commission, not only in the General Accounting Office, not only in the FBI, where he served with great distinction, but also in many other capacities and stations.

I do not think there is much to the point that he, of his own volition, or because he was urged to do so, became a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

candidate for Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, and then suddenly changed course. I do not believe that is at all material, and certainly it is no reflection upon Bob Lee.

So, Madam President, as the record stands, I think the Senate should confirm the nomination, and should do so without a dissenting vote—although I know that my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] did oppose the nomination in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I shall now surrender the floor, in the hope that the Senate will cast a vote of confidence not only in Bob Lee, but also in the President of the United States, when the Senate votes to confirm the pending nomination.

In that connection, Madam President, I shall be more than delighted if a request is made to have a yea-and-nay vote, in order that Senators will have their votes on this question on record, so that anyone who reads the RECORD will be able to see how the junior Senator from Illinois voted on the question of confirmation of this nomination.

I now surrender the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. LEHMAN. In connection with the pending nomination, let me say that, of course, the Federal Communications Commission exercises functions which are vital to the welfare of our country. Some of its functions include the licensing of radio and television stations and operators; the regulation of interstate and foreign communications by telephone, telegraph, cable, and radio; and promotion of safety at sea, through the use of communication facilities. Mr. President, in my opinion these functions deserve the service of the best men available.

I do not think the nominee, Robert E. Lee, has qualifications which justify favorable action by the Senate on his nomination. Mr. Lee has had no practical experience in any of the media of communication. He has had no technical training in any of the work carried on by the various organizations which are supervised and regulated by the Federal Communications Commission. He has had no training as an engineer; he has had no business experience; he has had little, if any, experience as an administrator; and he has had no judicial experience.

Mr. President, I was not surprised by the remarks of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]—although I was interested in them—when he very frankly acknowledged that from now on all appointments to high positions will be given to Republicans; and that, as a matter of fact, that has been the policy for the last 12 months. I have no particular quarrel with that policy, for I believe that the political party in power, which is responsible for the orderly conduct of the affairs of the Nation, has a right to select persons whom it believes represent the view of the party which has been elected.

But, Mr. President, 30 million of our people, at least—and I believe I am understating the number—voted the Republican ticket last year. It seems to me that among that great number of United States citizens it should have been possible to find someone who is far better qualified by experience, training, and sensitivity to serve in the position to which Mr. Lee has now been appointed. And may I recall in passing, Mr. President, that the two previous Presidents of the United States, Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, frequently appointed Republicans to high office—men like Secretaries Stimson and Knox, Secretary Lovett, Mr. Paul Hoffman, and last but not least, Mr. John Foster Dulles.

Mr. President, the field of communications is obviously ever increasing in size, scope, and, particularly, in influence. It is obvious that television and radio programs can and do greatly affect and influence public opinion. That effect is greatly intensified today by the close connection which has grown up—although unfortunately so, I believe—between the newspapers and the radio and television stations. I do not believe the Congress should ever have agreed to any such concentration of ownership.

I was not a Member of the Senate at the time when the first steps were taken to permit newspapers to acquire radio and television stations. I am not sure what position I would have taken if I had been a Member of the Senate at that time. However, I believe the decision which was reached was an unwise one. Certainly today that decision increases the necessity for intelligent and fair judgment and close, impartial supervision and scrutiny on the part of the Federal Communications Commission.

Accordingly, Mr. President, because of the great influence which the media of communication have on public opinion and on freedom of thought, the operation of such great means of communication and information and their complete independence and fairness are of indescribably great importance. I believe too, that what is of equally great importance is that the members of the Federal Communications Commission have a passion for the preservation of the freedoms of the citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, we do not sufficiently realize the power which is possessed by the Federal Communications Commission. We refer to it as a supervisory or regulatory body, but it has powers greatly in excess of those of most supervisory or regulatory bodies. The Federal Communications Commission has the power of life or death over the various firms which are engaged in radio, television, and other forms of communication. The Commission can grant a license or can refuse to grant a license. If it chooses to do so, it can act arbitrarily. The Commission can do as it pleases. The Commission can show the greatest degree of favoritism and can get away with it. Its powers are almost unlimited. Because that is so, I feel that it is more important than ever that we have men of stature, men broadly qualified to carry out the duties and responsibilities of membership on this commission. The functions of the Commission are so vital to the interest and well-being of all our people that the Commission should be manned by the best men available.

A little while ago I spoke about the importance of having men on the Commission who show independence, fairness, and a passion for the safeguarding of our freedoms. These men must act just as independently, just as fairly, and with just as compelling a purpose in guarding our freedoms as do our courts. I cannot conceive of the President of the United States appointing to a high court any man who has not had what, in the opinion of the President, constitutes sufficient experience, or any man who has not shown himself by his training and by the record of his life to be a man deeply impressed with the need of safeguarding our freedoms.

I do not mean merely giving lip service to the safeguarding of our freedoms. I mean just what I have said. I have used the word "passion" in speaking of safeguarding our freedoms. I use it in its literal sense. I do not know of any governmental body in which that attribute of its members is more necessary than in the case of the Federal Communications Commission.

I do not believe that the qualifications of this nominee, give me confidence that he possesses the necessary degree of judicial temperament and the overpowering desire to do justice to every man, woman, and child, as well as every organization with which he may deal. Such attributes should be peculiarly characteristic of a man who holds a quasi-judicial position.

So, Mr. President, inasmuch as I am convinced that Robert E. Lee does not possess any of the qualifications necessary to be a useful member of the Federal Communications Commission, I intend to vote against confirmation of his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert E. Lee to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LEHMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dworshak	Holland
Anderson	Eastland	Humphrey
Barrett	Ellender	Hunt
Beall	Ferguson	Ives
Bennett	Flanders	Jackson
Bricker	Frear	Jenner
Bush	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Butler, Md.	Gillette	Johnston, S. C.
Butler, Nebr.	Goldwater	Kefauver
Carlson	Gore	Kennedy
Case	Green	Kilgore
Clements	Griswold	Knowland
Cooper	Hayden	Kuchel
Cordon	Hendrickson	Lehman
Daniel	Hennings	Lennon
Dirksen	Hickenlooper	Long
Douglas	Hill	Magnuson
Duff	Hoey	Malone

Mansfield	Pastore	Smith, N. J.
Martin	Payne	Sparkman
McCarran	Potter	Stennis
McCarthy	Purtell	Symington
McClellan	Robertson	Thye
Millikin	Russell	Upton
Monroney	Saltonstall	Watkins
Morse	Schoeppel	Wiley
Mundt	Smathers	Williams
Murray	Smith, Maine	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert E. Lee to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLANDERS (when his name was called). On this vote I have arranged a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Were I to permit myself to vote, I would vote "nay." If the Senator from New Hampshire were to vote, he would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent because of illness, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—58

Barrett	Gillette	Millikin
Beall	Goldwater	Mundt
Bennett	Griswold	Payne
Bricker	Hendrickson	Potter
Bush	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Russell
Carlson	Hunt	Saltonstall
Case	Ives	Schoeppel
Clements	Jenner	Smathers
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Stennis
Daniel	Kuchel	Thye
Dirksen	Lennon	Upton
Duff	Magnuson	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Wiley
Eastland	Martin	Williams
Ellender	McCarran	Young
Ferguson	McCarthy	
Frear	McClellan	

NAYS—25

Aiken	Humphrey	Monroney
Anderson	Jackson	Morse
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Fulbright	Kefauver	Pastore
Gore	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Green	Kilgore	Sparkman
Hayden	Lehman	Symington
Hennings	Long	
Hill	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—13

Bridges	Flanders	Maybank
Burke	George	Neely
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Welker
Capehart	Kerr	
Chavez	Langer	

So the nomination of Robert E. Lee was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harmar D. Denny, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the Advisory Committee on Weather Control.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I do not want to object, of course, to the confirmation of the nominations, but I should like to speak for about 1 minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for that purpose.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the nominations here presented will constitute the first membership of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control. I say for the RECORD that I think the President has chosen an able group of men to serve as the lay members of the Advisory Committee. There are 5 to be designated from various governmental departments and 5 from business and professional fields.

The first name on the list is that of Mr. Lewis W. Douglas, at one time Director of the Budget, at one time Ambassador to Great Britain, and presently engaged in business and in ranching in Arizona. He is sponsoring an institute of business in Arizona at the present time.

Mr. Alfred M. Eberle, of South Dakota, is a native of Montana who has for years been identified with agriculture and knows what it means to conserve the use of water and the importance of rain. As a matter of fact, he has been identified with many of the water-increasing activities and studies during the past few years.

Joseph J. George, of Georgia, is General George, who is known to many because of his connection with the weather-modification activities and research on the part of the Army during the war. He is presently the weather consultant for Eastern Airlines.

Capt. Howard T. Orville, United States Navy, retired, was in charge of weather modification work in World War II.

Kenneth C. Spangler, of Massachusetts, is the secretary of the Meteorological Society, and represents the professional meteorologists in that field.

This is an outstanding group, Mr. President, and I think the country should be congratulated that these men are willing to devote a portion of their time to the various studies necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations to the Advisory Committee on Weather Control are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Alfred C. Richmond to be Assistant Commandant of the United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

FREDERICK A. SEATON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope what I am about to say will not have the effect of a kiss of death. I have always said that whenever I can find anything within the Eisenhower administration that I can praise, I shall welcome the opportunity to praise it. The fact that I have had very few such opportunities makes it all the more pleasant this afternoon for me to rise and compliment the Eisenhower administration for its statesmanship in appointing such a fine person to the Department of Defense as Frederick A. Seaton, a former colleague of ours in the Senate of the United States. I formed a very high regard for Fred Seaton when he was a Senator. I have appreciated very much the courtesies he has extended to me in the past.

I am proud, Mr. President, to say these few words in support of the nomination of Fred Seaton. Although it is a rather homely figure of speech, I consider his appointment to the Department of Defense to be a rather sweet deodrant, very much needed in the Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination in confirmed.

FRANK BROWN BERRY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank Brown Berry, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

JOHN SLEZAK

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Slezak, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

HUGH M. MILTON, II

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hugh M. Milton II, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, for only a few moments, I should like to address a few remarks on the nomination of Hugh M. Milton II, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army. This appointment is one which pleases New Mexico, and I am most happy the President selected a capable executive of General Milton's type for this trying job.

We of New Mexico have known General Milton for a long time. There were thousands of New Mexico boys on Bataan and at various military stations around the world who had gone to school under General Milton and who knew him personally. He has always been the kind of man who liked to know young men and women, who always welcomed them to come to him with their problems, and who has maintained an enthusiastic outlook for youth. He is a career officer and a mechanical engineer by profession, but where his star really shone was in the field of personal relations. He brings to the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army the warmth and understanding which will be needed at the policy levels for the young men pouring out of our high schools and colleges and into the Army today.

By birth, General Milton is a Kentuckian. World War I found him in military service, and the postwar period took him to Texas A. & M. In 1924 he came to New Mexico as an instructor in the engineering department at New Mexico A. & M. He served as dean of the engineering school and then became president of our State college. All the while he was active in the National Guard of New Mexico.

General Milton was a busy and vigorous speaker at commencement exercises at the various high schools in New Mexico during his time at New Mexico A. & M. At one time there was public mention that he should be drafted to run for Governor of New Mexico. But General Milton showed no inclination for politics, and has not to this date, to my knowledge.

World War II found General Milton—then a lieutenant colonel in the Reserves—called back into service. He went to service in the Pacific and participated in five campaigns, rising to Brigadier General. After the war he went back to New Mexico—this time to become president of the New Mexico Military Institute, one of the top half a dozen military schools in the Nation. In 1951 he was called again to Washington to become executive for Reserve and Reserve officers in the Army, and this led to his becoming Major General Hugh Milton. He retired from military service on November 18 of last year and was appointed by President Eisenhower to be Assistant Secretary of the Army. He is the Assistant Secretary for manpower and Reserve forces.

His unbroken line of endeavors in the field of education and his continuous service either actively in the United States forces or its reserves certainly qualifies him, as they would few others, for such a responsible position today. We in New Mexico find no need to wish him well—he has always done everything well. What we do wish is that we had more Hugh Miltons in New Mexico, and in the service of the Nation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I concur fully in what my colleague has said, and express my pleasure also at this very fine nomination which the President has made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Louis B. Toomer, of Georgia, to be Register of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles O. Parker, of Colorado, to be Assayer in the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John William Tramburg, of Wisconsin, to be Commissioner of Social Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George C. McConnaughey, of Ohio, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read sundry nominations as collectors of customs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of Collectors of Customs are confirmed en bloc.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Aleer J. Couri, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise, customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY AND THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to bring up at this time the list of promotions of junior officers in the Regular Air Force, which is in the hands of the clerk and has been lying on the desk since last week, and to ask that these nominations also be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, those nominations are not of flag or general officers.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They are nominations of officers below flag or general rank. This procedure is in accordance with the system which was followed last year, and, as I recall, previous to that in order to avoid a large amount of printing.

I ask that the nominations to which I refer also be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Without objection, the nominations in the Army, and the nominations in the Regular Air Force, referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts, are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 1 year from February 1, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH KOREA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the mutual defense treaty with Korea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the treaty by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. Executive A, 83d Congress, 2d session, a Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on October 1, 1953,

reported favorably with an understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

FORMULA FOR PERMANENT PEACE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on Friday last the very able junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] gave an unusually thought-provoking address on the Senate floor with respect to the new military program. He presented his viewpoint in a very understandable and convincing manner. As a matter of fact, I do not know when I have heard a better presentation of any subject than was made by the junior Senator from Tennessee. He was ably assisted by several other Senators who agreed with him, and who made comments on the proposal which the Senator presented.

I listened to much of his address, and I have read the remainder of it in the RECORD this morning. I do not agree, however, with the conclusions which he reached. In fact, I find myself convinced that the other kind of defense, the one which has been adopted by the Secretary of National Defense, is better. I do not think it entails such expenditures. It is a program which the country can afford to carry on not only for 1 year or 2 years or 5 years, but for 20 years or 100 years. It would be just as effective as the tremendously costly program offered by the junior Senator from Tennessee, and even more so, in gaining peace for this country and the world.

On Saturday last the very able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] made a statement as reported to the Associated Press, and I should like to read into the RECORD some of the comments the Senator from Virginia made in regard to the address by the junior Senator from Tennessee:

> Senator BYRD, a member of the Armed Services Committee, said in an interview he is "strongly in favor" of General Eisenhower's plan to reduce American ground forces while discouraging any aggression with the threat of massive atomic retaliation delivered by air.
>
> • • • • •
>
> "I believe the President is proposing the only program by which we can maintain our defenses without insolvency," Senator BYRD declared.
>
> • • • • •
>
> "We must keep the lead in atomic and other weapons and with the foreign bases which are coming into being we can make this threat of retaliation so real that I don't believe the Communists will dare move toward war."

That is the end of the quotation, though the Senator said more than that. I associate myself with him in his statements. I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Virginia.

On March 22, 1951, almost 3 years ago, I proposed in a Senate address almost the same military program for the United States. I wish to quote a few paragraphs from my remarks, and then to ask that the whole speech, or at least the major portion of it, be printed in the RECORD. I said at that time:

> Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We have defenses here. We are not going to put all of our eggs in one basket.
>
> The eastern Mediterranean is not only the fever spot but it is the foremost strategic spot of the world, and therefore the exact location for the United States to deploy its military strength of the air, of the land, and of the sea. During World War II we built a series of airports in North Africa. These should be rehabilitated and activated at once.

Of course, they have been rehabilitated. Other airfields have been built and they have been activated.

> Antiaircraft guns should bristle from every hillside in Turkey.

I believe that, at least, has partially come to pass.

> New airfields should be constructed in Turkey and sufficient ground troops assigned there to hold them against any eventuality. Acres of jet fighters should be stationed there to insure absolute control of the air. And last, great squadrons of huge bombers should be ready on a moment's notice to spray firebombs, TNT, and atomic bombs on every city in Russia if Russia attempts aggression anywhere.
>
> Iceland, one of the original Atlantic Pact states, might well be converted into a similar series of airbase strongholds, so these bombers could shuttle back and forth from north to south, dropping bombs coming and going. Both of these areas can be served readily from the sea. To protect the whole world against Russian aggression, those and supporting airfields in Africa and the United States are about all the military installations which are required to do the job.
>
> All we need say to the Kremlin after these installations have been perfected is "We want peace and we aim to have it. If you want peace also, you can have peace, and for a long, long time; but if you start aggression in any direction, or against any nation, then every Russian city will be pulverized within a few days' time." It is as simple as that. Thus Russia's cold-war program of frustration and disruption and her carefully concealed hot-war threats would be checkmated at one time and with a minimum of cost and imbalance.
>
> Military establishments of that kind could be maintained and controlled by us for 5, 10, or even 20 years, because their cost could not total more than 10 percent of our national income, and we can well afford to devote that much to permanent world peace. If we take that sensible and necessary step promptly, the world will settle down to a long, prosperous, and fruitful peace. This arrangement will stop Russia's cold war cold. And it will stop Russia's hot war before it starts. It is foolproof, Mr. President. I am positive that the adoption and implementation of this plan would reduce the dangers of war with Russia to an irreducible minimum; but if such a war should develop, the locale would be where it belongs, not in America, not in Western Europe, not in Asia, but in Russia. I repeat, Russia can select the time for world war III and we can do nothing about that, unless we wish to engage in a preventive war; but we must be the masters of the locale. I challenge any diplomatic or military leader of this or any other country to pick flaws of this bold, simple, and direct action in behalf of world peace.

Since then China entered the war in Korea and is now associated with Russia on a full-scale basis in the cold war, and is a threat to world peace. Accordingly the Defense Department needs airfields on Okinawa, Guam, the Philippines, Alaska, and at other points in the Pacific, in addition to those to which I referred 3 years ago.

I ask unanimous consent that the whole speech be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> High school and college boys leave their books, farm boys their plows, and factory workers their bench, to learn the goose step, the victims of Russia's cold war. Their older brothers fought, bled, and died in World War II to give our allies and ourselves permanent peace and now one of those allies has made the United States adopt for itself the garrison state. It's a sad story, colleagues, and the saddest part of it is that the whole weird process is merely in its infancy. By no means has it run its full course. In 5 years Russia's cold war has turned our way of life completely upside down. Unless we find the right antidote a few years more and the same bitter poison well may wreck and destroy the liberty and freedom held sacred by the Founding Fathers, who created this Republic. That is why I say with complete assurance and with confidence that unless we stop underestimating the cold war potential of Russia we are doomed.
>
> The truth is, we have been on the wrong track a long time and it is much later than we think. I watched a plane flying through the air without a pilot. A man stood on the ground; nearby was a strange contraption. He touched a button here and pressed a lever there and the plane dipped a wing or turned to the right or to the left, or went up or went down at his will. The United States is that plane; the Kremlin is the control mechanism and the man pushing the buttons and pressing the levers is the Russian Field Marshal and Generalissimo Joseph Stalin. For the last 5 years we have responded to his slightest touch with slavelike obedience. We have done everything he has wanted us to do exactly the way he has planned for us to do it. That is why the American people are beside themselves with worry, discouragement, and hysteria.
>
> Under the spell which Stalin has cast upon us, we drew a line on the map and called it the 38th parallel. When he pushed the button, we jumped into the mud and the muck, the unbearable heat, and the arctic cold of Korea. We set out to liberate the Koreans south of that damnable imaginary line, and instead, by the burned-earth technique adopted by both sides, we have destroyed their homes and turned them out on the highways with bundles on their backs to wander back and forth with no place to go, dazed and destitute. Millions of South Koreans have died. Million more will die. Sadly too, American dead lie on every hillside and mountain in South Korea. Our hospitals are full of American amputees and boys with shattered and broken bodies.
>
> When Stalin blew the whistle, we—the revered and traditional friend of China—became her enemy. Now the fat is in the fire, and the Orient, with its teeming hundreds of millions of human beings, is pledged to destroy us regardless of the time required or the cost in lives and treasure. Stalin has given us an enemy worthy of every consideration.
>
> A cold war can be just as deadly as a shooting war. Let's get that truth through our thick skulls. And this other truth we must grasp, too—Russia is the greatest expert of all time in conducting a cold war.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Those 14 cruel, icy, calculating, conniving specialists in the Politburo are the masters of psychological warfare and we are its unfortunate dupes.

With unparalleled generosity we have assisted our neighbors in West Europe to rehabilitate their industries and increase the production of civilian goods to an alltime high. Now, due to our frustration over Russia's cold-war offensive, we are saying to these friendly nations "You must forsake civilian production activities and convert your industries to rearmament." We direct them to do this, even though we know that the switch from the production of civilian goods to war production will result in a new and violent rise in inflation for them all. Under Stalin's lash we have adopted a program of international mobilization for the free world, and whether or not it will undo all the accomplishments toward recovery of the last 3 years we will not swerve from that course of disruption.

Theoretically, if all the Atlantic Pact states contribute armies to General Eisenhower by joint action, the free nations will be strong. In reality, however, exactly the opposite is true. A union of weak states adds up only to greater weakness. We are still extending billions of dollars in relief to the West Atlantic States and West Germany. Isn't that positive proof of their weakness? If they are so impotent they cannot combat political and economic difficulties at home without our assistance, by what magic can they subdue communism away from home? But, regardless of their domestic problems, the relief which we have been giving them now must be cut off so that we may rearrange our affairs on a solid enough basis to conduct a really effective cold war against the common enemy.

The greatest danger to the world is that we may spread ourselves too thin and thereby crack up. In these circumstances we must get these friendly powers off our backs. Doubtless it will rock their economies to shut off our relief, but if a common front is to be provided against Russia it must be done. However, let us not add to their economic shock by compelling them to destroy their convalescing economy by a huge program of rearmament. I repeat, nothing is so inflationary as rearmament, and nothing is so destructive of a nation's economy as inflation. Moving too fast too soon in West Europe and on too many fronts is the gravest danger which the free world faces today. America is an impetuous and impatient country, but this is no time for reckless and ill-considered strategy where the risk is so great. I plead with the Congress for solid thinking and caution in this hour of great crisis.

America is naturally not temperamentally qualified nor fit to cope with the Oriental techniques which they employ in conducting this cold war. Is there not some way to make us become realistic before it is too late? We must not underestimate Russia's capacity for making cold war one day longer. The Politburo wants to get an arms race started in West Europe because that will aggravate West Europe's inflationary problem and drive them even farther down the road toward radicalism and revolution. Italy, France, and West Germany are having and will continue to have many impossible economic problems without being compelled to raise and maintain huge armies and without converting their factories and their energies to war production and be driven thereby to severe austerity and extremely low standards of living. Let's face these issues with full consideration of all factors.

Most observers are agreed that Stalin will have the tremendous advantage of selecting the time for starting world war III. Since a preventive war is abhorrent to us there is nothing we can do about its timing. But if we are smart we will select the locale of world war III. More we cannot do; less we must not consider doing.

The incontrovertible truth is that West Europe is not a good battlefield from our standpoint for engaging our foe either in a cold war or a shooting war. Even less so is the Far East. Yet by adroitness Stalin has succeeded in engaging us in a shooting war in the Far East and a cold war in West Europe. No strategy could be devised that would be more advantageous to him and less advantageous to us.

We plan to dispatch four divisions of United States troops to Europe. Perhaps our friends over there will place 16 or 20 additional divisions under General Eisenhower. What a military joke that will be. At best it can only be a token force and if Russia attacks nothing more than a suicide squad. If Russia does not attack, Eisenhower does not need an army and if Russia does attack he needs not less than 200 divisions not 20. By this display of miserable weakness we are inviting him to go to war. Twenty, forty, fifty or even a hundred divisions stationed in Europe is the old Maginot line complex all over again.

In the summer of 1942, Field Marshal von Bock had 225 German divisions in Russia, plus 42 German statellite divisions. Fifty of the German divisions were armored. The field marshal at that time had in Russia under his direction more than 3 million well-trained, battle-scarred veteran combat troops and admittedly the best and largest army the world has ever witnessed. Russia annihilated them.

That history would appear to make Russia an invincible military power and she is if we fight the war on her terms and in her way but she has many fundamental weaknesses if we are but smart enough to capitalize on them. Her great strength is that she recognizes her own weaknesses and ours. That is why I say that we must not commit the cardinal sins of overestimating the military strength of the Red behemoth nor underestimating her tremendous cold-war effectiveness. We should be just as cold, cruel, calculating, and conniving in appraising her strength and her weaknesses as her politburo has employed in evaluating these easy-to-read characteristics of the free world's defenses.

Stalin is not a fanatic like Hitler. He does not resort to astrology or hocus pocus to reach momentous decisions. He depends upon hard facts and accurate information and he has the good judgment to appraise them. He knows much more about us and our idiosyncrasies than apparently we know about him. We must take time out to learn about him.

He respects our production because he knows and has said that production won World War II. In 1946 he announced that Russia must produce 60 million tons of steel a year to "have insurance gainst any eventuality." Today Russia and all of her satellites produce less than 40 million tons against our production of over 100 million tons. Russia cannot have enough steel to fight a successful world war much before 1960. That does not mean we have 1 hour of time to waste but it does mean that we have time to plan well for our defenses.

No one in Congress knows how many A-bombs the United States has. Magazine speculation places the number somewhere between 400 and 1,000. Dr. Harold Urey is quoted as saying that Moscow would need "about 200 A-bombs in order to launch a major war." My guess is that she will not have 300 A-bombs before 1960. That guess could be wrong but she is far behind us in production of this lethal weapon. And we do have the planes to carry our bombs to the target. Furthermore, no nation has such fine targets for A-bombs as Russia. If you think these facts do not send a chill up Red spines, you have no imagination.

In event of war Russia would require vast supplies of oil and high octane gas. All of her war machines move on oil as do most of her vast farming and factory operations. Her production of oil this year is estimated to be less than 40 million tons compared to our current production of 240 million tons. Not only that, but all of Stalin's oil producing areas are splendid bombing targets for Uncle Sam and Stalin knows their destruction would be our primary objective, should he make war on us. He cannot possibly store enough surplus oil in the next 2 or 3 years to conduct a major war. Stalin is a hardboiled realist and not a reckless adventurer. He is certain to count his chicks before he starts a war which could be the end of the great country which he has built.

Russia's food production has been very low and only in the last 2 or 3 years has it exceeded the relatively low production volume of pre-World War II. It still lacks considerable of producing a minimum standard of living much less an adequate food supply for her current needs. It is all the Reds can do to meet Russia's increased demand for food without attempting to stockpile food for war. There is little or no surplus of food in Russia now and only a fool would suggest that it is sufficient to start a war.

Russia has the rough, tough, sturdy, partly trained manpower, but little else upon which she would have even a gambler's chance to win a world war. Her highways, her railroads, and her factories are strictly third class.

But Stalin has many other more dynamic vulnerabilities than supplies of steel, oil, food, and A-bombs. Actually the tyrants of Moscow are sitting on a veritable powder keg of hate and resentment among its own terrorized people. Constant official spying, secret police, and forced labor camps emphasize the precarious situation. Purge trials must operate constantly to afford protection against assassination, plotting, and revolution.

These political problems are multiplied many times in her border satellite states where the vast majority of the people are only biding their time for a chance to start a rebellion. Even the local tyrants ruling these puppet states are imprisoned and executed periodically to keep down the spread of Titoism. If a world war should break out every slave state dominated by Russia would rebel and Stalin knows it. He cannot even trust Mao Tze Tung as far as he can throw a Russian bear by the tail.

The most sensitive section of the globe today is the Persian Gulf portion of the Middle East. Right here the course of history may change its way. In case of another world war its fabulous oil reserves and its current vital oil production will be the coveted prize of the gravest importance to both sides. You may be sure its acquisition will be the primary military objective as the means to the ends sought. Furthermore, the electric sparks which might ignite and touch off world war III are likely to be generated here. The current political trouble in Iran may cast the shadow of things to come. Truly this crucial eastern Mediterranean area has all the ingredients which make it the arena where the greatest military giants of all time will reach a decision.

In modern war in the sea, on the land, and in the air oil provides the energy and the power. Oil is indeed the sinews of war. I do not see how Russia could undertake world war III without controlling these enormous Iranian oil reserves. It is vital, therefore, that this oil be kept from Russia and made currently available to the Allies. For

whoever gains and maintains access to the black gold of the Persian Gulf will win world war III.

The United States has a military alliance with Turkey in which we have agreed to protect their independence against military aggression by Russia. Accordingly, we have assigned military experts to create and bolster their defense establishment in the development of armed strength to repel invasion. We have given them hundreds of millions of dollars to assist in their defense effort, and we have made available to them modern guns and the latest and most effective heavy artillery, including antiaircraft guns. Also highly qualified and expert American engineers were assigned to them to select sites, lay out and construct the airports necessary for their defense. Turkey is not a full member, but is an associate member of the Atlantic Pact states. She is one of the few countries to fight in Korea side by side with us and her troops have given a good account of themselves.

A glance at the map will indicate the highly strategic position Turkey occupies with respect to Russia and the whole Middle East area.

The eastern Mediterranean is not only the fever spot but it is the foremost strategic spot of the world and therefore the exact location for the United States to deploy its military strength of the air, of the land, and of the sea. During World War II we built a series of airports in North Africa. These should be rehabilitated and activated at once. Antiaircraft guns should bristle from every hillside in Turkey. New airfields should be constructed in Turkey and sufficient ground troops assigned there to hold them against any eventuality. Acres of jet fighters should be stationed there to insure absolute control of the air. And last, great squadrons of huge bombers should be ready on a moment's notice to spray firebombs, TNT, and atomic bombs on every city in Russia if Russia attempts aggression anywhere.

Iceland, one of the original Atlantic Pact states, might well be converted into a similar series of airbase strongholds so these bombers could shuttle back and forth from north to south dropping bombs coming and going. Both of these areas can be served readily from the sea. To protect the whole world against Russian aggression, those and supporting airfields in Africa and the United States are about all the military installations which are required to do the job.

All we need say to the Kremlin after these installations have been perfected is: "We want peace and we aim to have it. If you want peace also you can have peace and for a long, long time, but if you start aggression in any direction, or against any nation, then every Russian city will be pulverized within a few days time." It is as simple as that. Thus Russia's cold-war program of frustration and disruption and her carefully concealed hot war threats would be checkmated at one time and with a minimum of cost and imbalance.

Military establishments of that kind could be maintained and controlled by us for 5, 10, or even 20 years, because their total cost could not total more than 10 percent of our national income, and we can well afford to devote that much to permanent world peace. If we take that sensible and necessary step promptly, the world will settle down to a long, prosperous, and fruitful peace. This arrangement will stop Russia's cold war cold. And it will stop Russia's hot war before it starts. It is foolproof, gentlemen. I am positive that the adoption and implementation of this plan would reduce the dangers of war with Russia to an irreducible minimum, but if such a war did develop the locale would be where it belongs, not in America, not in Europe, not in Asia, but in Russia. I repeat, Russia can select the time for world war III and we can do nothing about that, but we must be the masters of the locale. I challenge any diplomatic or military leader of this or any other country to pick flaws in this bold, simple, and direct action in behalf of world peace.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, of course, the plan the Secretary of Defense has presented goes somewhat beyond my recommendations. We have airfields in the Pacific, in Alaska, in Greenland, and we are going to have some airfields in Spain and in other areas of the world. So the administration has gone beyond my proposal; but at least it is in accord with what I suggested 3 years ago. So, naturally, I am pleased that the retaliation plan has been adopted by our Department of Defense, and I believe it will prove to be very satisfactory and will give to the world peace and security.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to interrogate the Senator from Colorado, in view of some of his remarks; and I also desire to comment on them, if I may. My comments will be in line with his discussion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Minnesota do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have listened to the comment of the Senator from Colorado in regard to the very fine address he made 3 years ago. That followed the time of our historic debate on the "troops for Europe" issue, following our action on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I recall vividly the position of the Senator from Colorado regarding a series of key bases around the world, from which we could launch our airpower—a striking force by means of which, as the Senator from Colorado said, we could gain the initiative by way of military retaliation.

As I understand the Senator from Colorado, he has said the Secretary of Defense has more or less adopted or embraced that philosophy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I would not be so conceited as to say that. I do not know whether he ever heard of the speech I made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He should have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am saying that I am in favor of what the Secretary of Defense is now doing, and I am giving this background of having recommended such a policy 3 years ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Colorado is too modest.

The truth is that some 3 years the Senator from Colorado outlined the use of retaliatory airpower from strategically located bases. At that time I disagreed with the suggested policy, I say with all due respect to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado.

I say now that when the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] made his very fine address on the so-called new look and the new military policy of our country, he made a great contribution to the Senate of the United States and to public discussion.

My point is that it is rather peculiar and, in fact, somewhat alarming that a fundamental change in strategy on the part of our Defense Establishment and our national security policy should go without full-scale discussion. I am not drawing the issue as to whether the new policy is right or wrong; but I am saying that if a so-called great debate were required on the issue of troops to Europe, surely we should have full-scale review, survey, and analysis of a basic new defense policy.

I have several questions to ask, and I think they merit the fullest consideration of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

My first question is this: Does the new policy of massive retaliation from various bases mean that we are forgetting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a basis of our defense? I ask this question because I notice that in recent days some of our friends in Western Europe have said, "We do not want to be liberated by means of massive retaliation. We want defense at the point of contact with the enemy."

My next question is this: Does our methodical withdrawal of troops from Western Europe indicate that we may pull out of Western Europe? Does Dr. Hanna's statement indicate that in the future—by 1956, I believe he pointed out—we shall have withdrawn from Western Europe?

My next question is this: If that is the policy of the administration, how does it expect to obtain cooperation from the European community? How does it expect to have the North Atlantic Treaty Organization develop into a meaningful and useful structure?

My next question is this: If we adopt massive retaliation as a means of gaining the initiative, upon whom shall we retaliate? As the Secretary of Defense has asked, Are we to retaliate upon the head of the octopus or upon its tentacles? As he has pointed out, if we pursue a policy of massive retaliation, I think we shall not attack the tentacles of the octopus, but, instead, the head of the octopus, the octopus being merely another name for the Communist conspiracy which is headed at Moscow.

Furthermore, does the new policy mean massive retaliation by the United States in case of an attack upon Pakistan or elsewhere? Does it mean that world war III will then be at hand?

Mr. President, I believe that when there is a major change of policy, such as the one which has been discussed by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], it is time for the Senate and the country to seek some answers.

Last year the Senate asked for greater air power. I am interested in knowing that now the administration finds that what we said last year is correct, namely, that we need to have a projected Air Force of 147 air groups. In April 1952, the Senate decided by unanimous vote that the United States needed 140 air groups. Now, 2 years later, it is rec-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ommended that the United States have 137 air groups.

I am saying that this matter is a very serious one, for it involves much more than dollars and cents.

The main argument which is launched in behalf of the new defense strategy is that it is one we can afford, one for which we can pay. That may be true, but I believe we must take a long look. The Soviet Union may be very well content with permitting us to reduce our basic defense structure and with having us rely upon atomic power and atomic weapons, at the expense of conventional weapons and manpower. But, Mr. President, if our defense system is weakened and if NATO is weakened, from what bases shall we work? Shall we work from French bases in North Africa? Perhaps the French will not want us there. Shall we work from Greenland? We are there now only because of permission from one of the members of NATO. It is increasingly obvious that our operations in Greenland and elsewhere are very largely dependent upon the existence of NATO as a strong and active organization.

Mr. President, it might be well, also, when we speak of massive retaliation, for us to consider what we shall do if there is another Korea. We must ask ourselves whether the American people will permit the Government of the United States to use atomic bombs at the heart of the octopus, and whether that will be economically possible, and whether it will be morally responsible, and whether we shall do it?

I do not have the answers. All I say is that there is a series of questions which need very frank discussion.

Therefore, I wish to pay tribute to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for what I consider to be a very courageous statement in which he explored these many questions.

All we have asked is that there be frank and bold discussion.

Mr. President, in the main I commend the President of the United States for endorsing a mobile and flexible defense structure. I realize that it is extremely important that we have great strength of air power and that we have specific bases from which our air power can operate. But I ask the other questions because such bases will not be available to us unless we have allies.

Furthermore, what does "massive retaliation" mean, and what will be the results of such a policy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is not my intention to engage in debate with the Senator from Minnesota or to endeavor to answer at this time the questions he has asked. However, let me point out that the Senate Committee on Armed Services has held, for 2 days, briefings with Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Those sessions were very full ones. As one member of the committee said, it was one of the most lucid explanations and descriptions of world conditions and our relation thereto that he has heard since he has been a Member of the Senate.

I will state further that the Committee on Armed Services has scheduled for this week the first of a number of briefings with the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy separately, in order to go into the details of some of the problems which the Senator from Minnesota very properly raises in the form of questions.

Also, a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee has spent an entire week listening to and discussing the problem of continental defense, which a subcommittee was appointed to consider. That was a very sensitive briefing, but an understanding of that problem gave me, as one member of the committee, very great confidence in the steps being taken.

The President, in his budget message, found on page 567 and following pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, points out in detail some of the steps which are being taken. As I say, it is not my intention to try to answer the Senator from Minnesota today, but I do intend in the near future to try to point out to the Senate some of the things which the Armed Services Committee has gone into and considered with relation to the questions which the Senator has so aptly asked.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. The Senator is a man in whom we have great confidence. The junior Senator from Minnesota was not speaking in the spirit of acrimony or criticism.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I realize that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was saying only that this is a question of such basic importance to the American people and to our overall security that I think some of the questions which I asked, quite spontaneously, without prepared manuscript, questions which have been running through my mind, are questions which merit not only discussion behind committee doors, but discussion in public, through the press, on the radio, and on the floor of the Senate. We are making a decision here which could well spell for us very serious results, good or bad, in the days to come.

I have made it quite clear that my comment is not a criticism of the emphasis upon the importance of mobility, flexibility of airpower, and the use of strategic weapons. My only point was that in the emphasis of those things—of mobility, airpower, and strategic weapons—we may run the risk, because of the fear of our allies in Western Europe that all we will do will be to liberate and not to defend at the line, of losing the great North Atlantic Treaty alliances, into which we have poured billions of dollars, and which has been represented to us as the one great hope of building a shield of defense against Communist aggression.

I do not say that we necessarily run such a risk. I only ask, as a good citizen—not as a partisan—the question, Do we run such a risk?

I have great faith in President Eisenhower's abilities. Far be it from me to doubt his military judgment. However, I say that we must not at any time overlook the possibility of a political trap, or political difficulties.

I listened to the Secretary of State testify. I know the Secretary of State feels that there is much that needs to be done to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. From all the communications I have been able to hear or read, I learn that it is proposed to make regular withdrawals of troops from Western Europe. I read Dr. Hanna's statement this morning. He was interviewed on Sunday on the famous radio program "Youth Wants to Know." Dr. Hanna indicated that we may withdraw completely from Europe by 1956. He did not say "shall," but "may." So there begins to be doubt. I say that we shall never get the French into EDC unless we make commitments. We shall never get a North Atlantic Treaty Organization which is meaningful if we continuously say that our policy is one of massive retaliation, and at the same time withdrawal from fundamental commitments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make an announcement to the Senate, without his losing the right to the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Several Senators have been waiting for me to make this announcement.

I have already taken the question up with the minority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and the acting minority leader [Mr. CLEMENTS].

While the Senate will be in executive session tomorrow, I wish to ask that, as in legislative session, it take up a series of measures on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 858, Senate bill 2803. With the exception of Calendar No. 858, Senate bill 2803, a bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended to July 1, 1955, the remainder of the measures, beginning with Calendar No. 859, have been on the calendar, under the rule, for a day. They have been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and have been reported back to the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration. It is my intention to ask for their consideration tomorrow. I wanted the Senate to have notice of that fact, because there may be some Senators who are particularly interested. I understand the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is interested in several of these resolutions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was hopeful that the distinguished majority leader would allow us a little more time. I have been most diligent in trying to obtain from the various committees involved, particularly the Committee on Rules and Administration, all the information possible concerning these resolutions.

As the distinguished majority leader knows, last year when similar resolutions

came before the Senate for consideration, I suggested to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration that all committees which make requests for funds should fully justify such requests.

On the 15th of January, in line with the thought I have just expressed, I wrote to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, as follows:

I understand that quite a few requests have been made and will be made in the future to continue the activities of certain investigating committees. So as to save the time of the Senate, I wish you would have each committee applying for funds to furnish a full justification for the request. That would include the sphere of activity in which the committee proposes to operate, the number of employees they propose to hire, and an estimate of expenditures other than salaries. I wish you would also insist on having a statement showing how past funds were spent, giving the name or names of all employees, with their salaries, with a thumbnail outline of their duties and a detailed account of the manner and method in which the funds were expended for travel, per diem, and other purposes. As you recall, I suggested that your committee follow this procedure in the past, and I am hopeful that it will be done in this case.

My office has been in touch with the financial clerk of the Senate in an effort to obtain some of the information I am now seeking from you, but all to no avail. The position is taken by Mr. Ellis that no information will be given out by him except through the request of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee involved, or of the Rules Committee.

As I have stated, I should like to obtain the information requested by me. As the Senator knows, a series of reports from the Committee on Rules and Administration was made last Friday. Only about an hour and a half ago was I able to obtain from the minority secretary copies of these resolutions and the reports attached to them. These reports indicate that about the same type of so-called "justification" we have been obtaining in the past has been provided this year. Because I should like to obtain certain information which has not been furnished by the Committee on Rules and Administration, I suggest to my good friend, the majority leader, that he give me a few days longer. The Senate is to consider more than 15 resolutions. If I had been able to obtain the desired information from Mr. Ellis, who is the Senate financial clerk, I might have at hand a great deal of the desired information, but it seems that no Senator is able to obtain such information. Why, I do not know.

Because of that fact, I ask my good friend to postpone consideration of these resolutions, let us say, until Wednesday. I believe that by Wednesday I could be in a position to look into the subject. I know that if I am given sufficient time, the result will be at least a saving of the time of the Senate, and perhaps the saving of otherwise useless expenditures.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana, that I am always desirous of accommodating Senators on both sides of the aisle in matters of this kind.

I have been asked by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and by other Senators, because of the expiration of a number of the appropriations, to expedite action on the resolutions. I had intended originally to ask that the resolutions be called up for consideration today, with the understanding that ample time be given for a discussion of them. However, at the request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], who is today serving as acting minority leader, I agreed that I would make the announcement on the floor today, but would not move to take them up before tomorrow.

I appreciate the problem of the Senator from Louisiana. I shall consult with and call his remarks to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. He can be certain that consideration of the resolutions will not be the first order of business tomorrow. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will be able to get the information he is seeking, so that we shall not unduly delay the consideration and disposition of the resolutions, or have the appropriations completely expire.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may point out to the majority leader that in June last year the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] requested the adoption of a resolution appropriating $50,000, so that he could proceed to organize a subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency. He made a very good presentation, and he assured the Senate that the amount requested would be ample with which to do the job. The committee cut his request from $50,000 to $44,000.

In answer to a query by me appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 5, page 5801, the Senator from New Jersey made the following reply:

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator give us any assurance that the subcommittee will complete its work on or before January 31, 1954?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I can give assurance, with the understanding, of course, that I shall be a member of the subcommittee—

As a matter of fact, the Senator from New Jersey serves as chairman of the subcommittee——

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Continuing the quotation from the RECORD—

If I have the good fortune to be a member of it—that I shall insist that we complete our work by the time mentioned.

What is the situation today? The Senator from New Jersey has come before the Senate——

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment I shall be happy to yield. He appears before the Senate and requests an additional appropriation, not of $44,000, but of $175,000, to maintain the work of his subcommittee. It may be a good thing, but I believe some of us ought to be given an opportunity to look into the functioning of the committees. Of course, that applies not only to this committee but to many other committees; in fact, to any committee or subcommittee which comes to the Senate requesting appropriations.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment. As I pointed out last year, appropriations for the purpose of conducting various investigations have increased by 1,000 percent during the last decade. I am not opposed to granting necessary appropriations for legitimate investigations, but certainly Senators ought to be given an opportunity to look into the various requests and to insist that those who ask for money should justify their requests, in the same manner that any department of Government is required to do when it requests funds.

The Senate will shortly have before it approximately 15 resolutions. If I had nothing to do from now until tomorrow noon but to look through the resolutions, I would not have sufficient time to give them the study they require. I would be able to skim through them, probably. But I could not study them carefully. As it is, I have some very important committee meetings to attend. I do not believe, therefore, that I am asking the majority leader to do very much when I ask him to postpone discussion of the resolutions at least until I have had an opportunity to look into them.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have the floor, but I shall be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to respond to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to yield the floor, but before I do so I have three resolutions to submit and three items to insert in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to request that the Senator from Minnesota retain the floor so that my request to ask him to yield will remain open; also, I should like to hear the response of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, at the outset, I wish to state that I concur in everything the Senator from Louisiana has stated with reference to my statement on the floor of the Senate during the last session. What I stated in the colloquy to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred is correct, and I meant every word I said.

What I did not know was the extent of the mission upon which our subcommittee was about to embark. Apparently I was in total ignorance of the problems which would confront us. From the preliminary studies which had been made—and they were only preliminary studies—I believed that $44,000 would carry us through. I also thought that we could complete the studies by January 31 of this year.

However, after we began public hearings, and I saw how the problem of juvenile delinquency reaches into every

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

phase of our lives, and that juvenile delinquency was on the increase in all sections of the country, with more than a 60 percent rise in the Nation's Capital alone, I realized that we had to go much further.

In speech after speech in various places in the country, particularly in the States which I visited in the fall of last year, and in discussing the subject with experts and others, I stated that one of the first times that my face would be really red in the Senate would be when I had to return and apologize to the Senator from Louisiana for making a statement concerning a matter about which I knew so little at the time.

Mr. President, I have appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary and I have appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I believe I have justified the continuance of the life of the subcommittee. The resolution was reported unanimously, and I believe I justified, at least to my satisfaction, the amount of money the subcommittee is requesting.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana today that in the last session of Congress the Senate made no better investment than the $44,000 which it appropriated for the use of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. I have seen the results of it as I have gone about the country. I know that in setting up the subcommittee the Senate has stimulated throughout the Nation a new interest in the youth.

If we have any greater asset or any greater national resource than the youth of the Nation I should like someone to tell me what that asset or resource is.

We appropriate money for battleships and air bases and armaments, all of which are meant for use in a war; yet we think too little about the youngsters who may some day be called upon to man the battlements and supply the sinews which win a war.

I am extremely sorry if I misled the Senator from Louisiana in my statement of last year. I made no statement which I did not think at the time was accurate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I anticipated what the committee was going to do. I believe I suggested in the colloquy last year that the Senator from New Jersey would return with a request for more funds. I am not arguing that a good purpose may not be served. All I am asking for is an opportunity to look into the subject.

I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I am a member also of that committee's legislative subcommittee. We recommend the appropriation of various funds, and I believe it is up to us to look into the question of how the funds are spent. The only way we can do it is to have necessary details supplied to us. The Senator from New Jersey may know all about the subject of juvenile delinquency, but I doubt if it has ever been presented in such a way that we could look into it and be in a position to agree with what he says.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I will supply the Senator from Louisiana with complete information.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to confirm what is a fact; namely, that I have yielded the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was not my purpose to go into the merits or demerits of any of the pending resolutions. All I am asking for is a little time so that I can look into the resolutions and evaluate them to my own satisfaction. The Senator knows that last year and the year before, because of the position I occupied on the Committee on Appropriations—I was chairman of the legislative subcommittee before the Republicans came into power—I studied such resolutions carefully. I always try to do a good job and I do my best to be fair and objective. All I am trying to do is to look into these matters and find out what they are all about. When I do so, perhaps I shall be in complete agreement with the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as one Member of the Senate and as a citizen, I am proud of the record of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I am proud of the fact that he has saved money for this country. I salute him for his services in that respect. But when it comes to economy and the saving of the taxpayers' money, I yield to no Member of the Senate. I would not spend one penny unless I thought there was need for it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

THE DEFENSE PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield with the understanding that he will not thereby lose his rights to the floor?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield with that understanding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had an arrangement with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who had a broadcast appointment, that I would make the comments I desired to make regarding his remarks and that he could read them in the RECORD tomorrow.

I commend the Senator from Minnesota for pointing out, as he did, the problems concerning the defense programs of our country.

As one who served on the Armed Services Committee for many years, it appears to me that it is not a satisfactory answer to say as indicated by the Senator from Massachusetts, that, because of the fact that these subjects are under study we have no concern about the points which the Senator from Minnesota raised.

I think it is important that we follow the historic practice of the Senate of holding, upon occasion, executive sessions to consider questions affecting the national defense because in such a matter each Senator bears a responsibility and the decision reached will determine, I think in no small measure, the future history of the United States.

I believe it is a great mistake for us to act, as we frequently act in the Senate, with so little information on the issues involving the defense of our country. The Armed Services Committee, during the period of my service on it, too frequently received too little information about our defense problems. We are going to decide, in my judgment, on a great historic policy, and we are entitled to all the facts that can be obtained. If the only way the Senate can secure them is by holding executive sessions, then let the Senate go into executive session.

I do not need any member of the administration to tell me whether it is still true that if Russia should start an air Pearl Harbor tomorrow, 60 out of 75 of her planes would come through and deliver their load. That was the testimony I last heard, and I have received no information justifying the conclusion that defensively we are in position to protect millions of persons on our own continent. We are in a powerful defensive postion. We can strike terrific blows against Russia, and we should remain in that position and become even stronger defensively.

The figure which the Senator from Minnesota named as 140 groups should be 143 groups. That was the number for which a small minority in the Senate fought, but the administration cut it down.

Mr. President, in my judgment, during the presentation of the case last spring, a great many misrepresentations were made, such, for example, as that we were going to be able to cut down the number of air wings without the loss of fighter craft. But many months later we received information that there was a loss in production of several hundred planes because of the cut.

There was also the misrepresentation that it was going to be done without the loss of fighter personnel. But we lost several thousand pilots from the Air Force, and the excuse given was that the funds were no longer available to sustain them.

Within a few short months the administration has awakened to what some of us were telling it on the floor of the Senate last spring, namely, that such a cut could not be made without weakening the air defense of the Nation.

I am satisfied that that is the case.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his statement this afternoon, and I say to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that his explanation is not good enough for me. We are entitled to the facts. If the only way we can get them is to have an executive session of the Senate, then I say, let us go into executive session. We are trying to determine the facts concerning the defense program of our country.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since the vote on the Lee nomination, in connection with which I did not make a speech, I find that even my silence is subject to misinterpretation. It is bad enough to be criticized for speaking, but now I find that I am criticized for being silent, because some of the gentlemen of the press wanted to know how I could square my vote against Lee with the position I have taken during my 9 years in the Senate on the confirmation of nominations. That, Mr. President, is very easy to do.

Starting in 1945, I have laid down certain historic criteria which I thought should be always followed in confirming nominations under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution. Those criteria included the character of the nominee, his loyalty, his competence to carry out the President's program, and his freedom from self-interest.

In this instance, Mr. President, I do not question this particular nominee on the ground of character or loyalty to the country or competence to carry out Eisenhower's program, but, on the basis of the discussion and of the record, I do question him on the ground of self-interest. The sponsorship behind him, raises grave doubts in my mind as to his freedom from self-interest, and because of those doubts, Mr. President, I did not think he met the historic criteria, and I voted against confirming his nomination on that ground.

Now, Mr. President, there is one other matter to which I desire to advert.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the results of a Gallup poll on the question of increasing the salaries of Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of January 24, 1954]

THE GALLUP POLL—PAY BOOST TO CONGRESS OPPOSED, 3 TO 1

(By George Gallup)

Although many students of Government agree that higher salaries for Congressmen are not only warranted but might make service in Congress more attractive to capable citizens, the idea of raising congressional pay still gets a cool reception from the people back home.

A coast-to-coast poll by the institute finds that for every voter who would approve an annual boost of $10,000 in pay for Congressmen, three would disapprove.

The Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries recently recommended an increase of $12,500 in the salary of Senators and Representatives. This would bring their pay to $27,500 a year.

The salary is now $12,500, plus a nontaxable $2,500 expense allowance. An income-tax deduction of $3,000 is permitted to cover the cost of living in Washington.

From personal interviews with a carefully selected cross section of voters, today's survey indicates the following highlights on this problem, always a touchy one for Congressmen.

People in the business and professional classes are most sympathetic to raising congressional salaries, closely followed by white-collar workers. However, a sizable majority in both of these groups is opposed.

The main opposition to the idea comes from farmers and from workers in the skilled, unskilled, and semiskilled groups.

In short, the problem for congressional leaders, if they want public support for higher salaries, is to explain the situation and give convincing reasons to those segments of the population in which $25,000 seems like a truly bountiful and magnificent sum.

The survey question was:

At present, United States Congressmen receive $15,000 a year in salary and expenses. Would you approve or disapprove of raising this to $25,000 a year?

The vote, nationwide and by occupation groups:

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Nation	22	68	10
Professional and business	33	58	9
White-collar	30	62	8
Manual workers	18	72	10
Farmers	14	76	10

Of particular interest is the fact that the issue is not a partisan one. There is little difference of opinion between rank-and-file Democrats and GOP voters, as the following table shows:

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Democrats	20	71	9
Republicans	24	67	9
Independents	24	64	12

Earlier institute surveys have shown the public consistently tends to resist the idea of raising congressional pay.

In 1945, for example, when President Truman proposed a plan for increasing congressional salaries from $10,000 a year to $15,000, after wartime wage ceilings were removed, the public vetoed the idea.

The vote on the proposed $5,000 increase was: 31 percent approve, 50 percent disapprove, and 19 percent no opinion.

When Congress passed the bill in 1952 to allow Congressmen to deduct the cost-of-living expenses in Washington for tax purposes, an institute survey found public sentiment overwhelmingly opposed to the plan.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Members of the Senate will recall that the representative of the Independent Party asserted a few days ago that the raising of the salaries of Members of the Congress would constitute an affront to the public. I repeat that assertion today. I am pleased to invite attention to the fact that apparently a great many persons agree with me on this issue, because in a poll, which indicated a cross section of opinion, they indicated by a vote of 3 to 1 that salaries of Members of the Congress should not be increased.

In my opinion, it is no justification for an inexcusable increase in congressional salaries to say that we would get better men in the Government by so doing. I challenge that premise, Mr. President. I repeat, that when men and women enter the public service they should do so as dedicated men and women, as having put behind them any aspirations to make money. The salaries we receive are adequate to meet the needs of the average Senator. What we need is an increase in accountable expense allowances by means of which we can better serve our constituents; but let such expenses be an open book.

I hope this drive on the part of public servants to increase their pay will die an early death, Mr. President, because, in my judgment, with increasing thousands of persons in this country losing their purchasing power, we cannot justify putting our hand into the Public Treasury as a grabbag and taking out an unwarranted increase in salary.

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH KOREA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Mutual Defense Treaty with Korea.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider Executive A, 83d Congress, 2d session, a mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on October 1, 1953, which had been reported favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an understanding.

POLITICAL PARTISANSHIP IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, 1953 will be recorded in the annals of Government as the beginning of the "spoils deal" for Federal civil-service employees.

The deceitful manner of those presently directing the personnel administration of our Federal Government has revealed itself through the ugly, distorted, and premeditated actions taken in the past 10 months.

Beginning with the disguised effort early in the 1st session of the 83d Congress to expand arbitrary dismissal authority, a move which was defeated only because of an overwhelming vote by the Democrats of the Senate, for which the Republicans now seek to take credit, and ending with the recent court decision involving nonveteran career employees, the Federal civil-service merit system in a few short months has been stripped of 50 years of progressive and hard-won meritorious gains.

Mr. President, actions taken early in 1953, and greatly emphasized with the President's order designating the new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission as his chief White House aide on personnel matters, very decisively revealed the new administration's lack of confidence in the bipartisan, nonpolitical atmosphere long prevalent in civil-service affairs.

For the first time, so far as can be determined, a member of the supposedly

bipartisan Civil Service Commission recently delivered a partisan address before a politically partisan group. This same member, who has been a great disappointment to me personally, has consistently engaged in double talk during the past few months.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from South Carolina has mentioned the fact that one of the members of the Civil Service Commission has participated in political discussions or speeches. As I understand, tht Civil Service Commission is not a nonpartisan board but is a bipartisan board.

I believe the record will show that one of my personal friends, who was an outstanding member of the Commission some years ago, the Honorable Robert Ramspeck, also participated in some public political meetings, but I would not censure him for so doing. I hope the distinguished Senator from South Carolina will keep that fact in mind.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. Ramspeck made some speeches, but he did not make them on political basis at that time, or not before a political group.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe the record will show that he did speak to groups of Democratic women on some occasions.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, every action so far taken by the administration has been designed to strip civil-service employees of all protection and security.

The complete hypocrisy of those doing the damage is pointed up by the almost daily statements of reassurance. It reminds me of a cartoon showing the boss handing the employee his hat as he boots him out the back door while assuring; "Don't worry, Mr. Civil Servant, you have nothing to fear from me."

Mr. President, a great many laws have been enacted for the protection of efficient, loyal, and hard-working career employees. Adequate safeguards also have been provided to allow agencies to eliminate the incompetent, inefficient, and disloyal employees. Laws do not mean much in this case, however, unless the integrity and feeling of those charged with their administration and interpretation believe in the purpose and intention for which the laws were enacted.

Mr. President, it is how a man feels in his heart that counts.

Many of the actions taken during the past 20 years to strengthen and improve the merit system were taken by administrative action.

Most of the responsibility rests with the executive branch of the Government, and the new administration has authority either to strengthen or destroy the merit system.

Today the morale of the Federal employee is at an all-time low.

Employees so plagued with fear that they hesitate even to repeat their own names cannot be performing their work efficiently.

It is almost impossible to ascertain the cost, the unnecessary waste of millions of dollars, created by this low morale.

This terrible fear is causing many mistakes and low production.

An enlightened new administration would have realized by now that the average civil-service employee is a hard-working, conscientious, loyal, and nonpartisan American.

Yet, not one positive action has been taken so far to encourage the civil servant or to offer him any measure of protection.

Under the new "spoils-deal," a Government employee does not have as much job protection as the average private employee working in private industry under union contract.

The new administration has made many claims of inheriting a government of misfits, incompetents, and inefficient employees. Yet in 12 months of ridding the Government of this type of employee, it has been able to find in this category only less than one-half of 1 percent of the total number of employees who were on the payroll when it assumed control of the Government.

This is 25 percent less than the number discharged for the same reasons during 1951 and 1952.

The administration also claims that it cannot be held responsible for the actions of a government when it cannot control policy by obtaining enough jobs. Since assuming office, the new administration has been able to make more than 380,000 job placements. By the end of 1956 it will have been able to replace 1 out of every 2 employees. This is at a rate in excess of 1,500 each working day.

Figures such as this label as false and misleading the statements of those in control of the Government about not being able to obtain enough jobs through normal channels.

Mr. President, this is just another glaring instance of how they alibi.

The controversy now raging over the completely misleading figures used by the administration of the number of subversives fired by them since February is but another glaring example of the harm and injustice done for political gain. By an association of words, the impression has been left with the average American citizen that the Government was staffed by subversives.

First, the administration claimed it fired 1,456 disloyal employees. Recently the figure was raised to 2,200.

This, Mr. President, is known as the practice of deceit and demagoguery. The administration knows its claim is false and that it cannot be substantiated.

The new program announced in Executive Order 10450 was designed primarily to confuse the American public by authorizing the use of such figures. It has cost the Government millions of dollars in the duplication of investigations and has not been an instrument for starting the dismissal of one single Communist.

I hold in my hand a copy of the oath of office signed by every Government employee when he enters the service of the United States Government. In part, it reads as follows:

[Standard Form 61 (revised April 1, 1948) promulgated by Civil Service Commission—Ch. A6, Federal Personnel Manual]

APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS

B. AFFIDAVIT AS TO SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY AND AFFILIATION

I am not a Communist or Fascist. I do not advocate nor am I a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or other unconstitutional means or seeking by force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States. I do further swear (or affirm) I will not so advocate; nor will I become a member of such organization during the period that I am an employee of the Federal Government.

This oath must be executed before a qualified notary public.

Section 1001 of title 18 of the Criminal Code provides a fine of $10,000 and 5 years' imprisonment for any Government employee who makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement to any department or agency of the United States Government.

If the new administration has found one single Government employee who is disloyal or engaged in subversive activities, or is a member of the Communist Party or a Communist-front organization, then why has it not used the violation of this oath as a basis of prosecuting to the full extent of the law?

If the administration has found one violation, then the Attorney General of the United States has been derelict in his duty is not using the violation of the oath to obtain an indictment.

I firmly believe every means should be used to prosecute. Simply firing a disloyal employee is not sufficient. I think the Attorney General of the United States should immediately tell the public how many indictments he has obtained from among the 2,200 firings claimed by the administration; and if there are none, as I suspect, then he should resign his office.

The answer is very obvious, Mr. President. The word "subversive" is now and has been the political football by which the Republicans have gained control of this Government.

My position on subversives is pretty clear. The records of the Senate will show me to be unqualified in my belief that those disloyal to America, or those engaged in any subversive activities, should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

However, I am not in favor of impugning the character of loyal, faithful, and hard-working American citizens for political gain or for any other selfish motive.

The President of the United States owes it to the American people to cite the true facts in this case, and to release a general breakdown of the figure reported.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, articles appearing in the Evening Star, the Washington Post, and the Washington Daily News, showing the effort which has been

made by the local press to clear up this confused situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. COOPER in the chair]. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, since much pressure has already been exerted on the President to release a breakdown of these figures, without result, I now submit a Senate resolution ordering the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to require that the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission appear before the committee and give such a breakdown. I am glad to say that the chairman of the committee has agreed that we will have some hearings on this matter.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I am in thorough accord with the statement the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has made in regard to a hearing before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. As the distinguished Senator will remember, at the last session of the Senate the matter was discussed, and at that time there was some thought that, in view of the fact that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the House Committee on Un-American Activities were considering the subject, we might let them proceed. I assure the distinguished Senator that the resolution will come to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I shall be very glad to assist the Senator in getting some consideration of the matter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the chairman of the committee for that statement.

The resolution I am submitting reads as follows:

Whereas President Eisenhower, in his address relative to the state of the Union, delivered on January 7, 1954, before a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives, informed the Congress that under the standards established for the new employees security program, more than 2,200 employees have been separated from the Federal Government;

Whereas the President did not disclose to the Congress whether any of such employees were separated because they were disloyal or of questionable loyalty to the United States;

Whereas it is essential that the Congress, in order properly to perform its legislative functions, be informed as to the number of such employees who were separated for reasons relating to their loyalty to the United States, and the number who were separated for other reasons: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary to obtain from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission a detailed statement of the reasons for separation in the cases of the 2,200 employees referred to by the President in his address relative to the state of the Union as having been separated from the Government under the standards established for the new employee security program.

The resolution (S. Res. 199) submitted by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina was received as in legislative session and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am also in possession of certain documentary proof that the Civil Service Commission has been turned into a high-powered searching agency for jobs for the political faithful—proof that will show a member of the Civil Service Commission as a political tool who has twisted law, rules, and regulations to suit the occasion, and the requests of the members of the administration who wish to turn back the pages of progress to the "spoils system."

From time to time during the next several weeks, I am going to have more to say about this situation.

However, in line with my belief that constructive suggestions must always follow criticism, I will in the next few days offer several legislative proposals which will be very encouraging to Federal employees.

First, with respect to displaced career employees, I propose that there be established in the Civil Service Commission a revolving fund for the payment of salaries to displaced career employees who (a) have over 5 years of service; (b) have performance ratings of satisfactory or better; (c) have attained the age of 30 or over; (d) and who are separated through no fault of their own, but because of a reduction in force, abolishment of agency functions, and so forth.

When employees who qualify are attached to the fund, they shall be available for temporary reimbursable detail by the Commission to other Government agencies, Congress, or the judicial branch, until the Commission locates them in a permanent position for which they qualify. The Civil Service Commission would have full authority to effect displacement of "noncareer" employees in Government agencies, to make room for its displaced career employees.

Many thousands of employees who now hold positions in the Government obtained those positions without successfully passing civil service fitness tests, whereas hundreds who came to the Government after passing rigid civil service examinations, without political consideration, are now walking the streets, unemployed. These people had been told they could expect to make the Government service a career.

Second, I will propose legislation that, if enacted would give nonveteran career employees the same right of appeal as that now enjoyed by veterans.

Third, the Congress will be asked to clarify and restate its intentions with respect to the area in which employees may compete in case of a reduction in force.

The Civil Service Commission by a reinterpretation of its rules and regulations has placed severe restrictions of the area of competition. In some instances the limit has been confined to divisions or even to sections within agencies. Congress fully intended that employees be allowed to compete on an agency-wide basis.

Fourth, I intend to propose legislation again to remove the Civil Service Commission from the arena of politics. One of the features of this plan will be to provide for a set term of office for the Civil Service Commissioners, and to establish a civilian Board of Review of Civil Service Activities.

Fifth, I will propose that there be an immediate separation of the Joint Office of Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and White House Adviser to the President on Civil Service Affairs. The Chairmanship of the Civil Service Commission must be as far removed from politics as possible. However, the new administration in combining these two jobs has placed the Commission squarely in the political arena, with the political side having the upper hand and making all the decisions, and with no one left to argue the case from the merit system point of view.

Sixth, I will propose an amendment to the Classification Act of 1949 so as to provide for meritorious and longevity step increases in all grades after 1 year of service. In some instances, an employee must now wait 18 months, while others receive this benefit at the end of 12 months.

Seventh, I will propose an increase in the travel allowance to $12 per day or to the actual expenses, whichever is less.

Mr. President, I have already introduced proposed legislation to provide a more equitable rate of pay for overtime and holiday work, and to provide severance pay for employees who lose their jobs through no fault of their own.

If the President means, as his many statements imply, that he is in favor of a strong civil-service merit system in our Government, then let him give his endorsement to the program I have just outlined. I am sure that if these nine points are given his complete endorsement and if immediate action is taken thereon, there will be no further need for daily statements of reassurance.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Star of January 3, 1954]

GOP TRYING HARD TO JUSTIFY 1,456 SECURITY FIGURE

(By L. Edgar Prina)

The Eisenhower administration, which points with public pride to its new Federal employee security program, is privately embarrassed these days by the ill-considered use it has made of an almost meaningless figure—1,456.

That is supposed to be the number of security risks fired or forced to resign from the Government in the 4 months beginning last May 27, the day the current security program was launched.

What the figure actually signifies, however, has been the subject of heated debate since the White House first used it in an announcement October 23.

CRITICISM BACKED

In attempting to analyze the makeup of this highly publicized sum. The Star has found administration officials extraordinarily reluctant to talk. It also has found evidence supporting two principal criticisms of the disputed figure and the use the administration has made of it.

These are the criticisms:

1. The figure is a catchall—security risks include not only persons believed disloyal but a wide range of other unsuitable types ranging from sex deviates to employees who

falsely word application forms. Yet the administration has used the figure in such a way as to imply that almost 1,500 Reds—perhaps even spies—have been rooted out by the Eisenhower administration after escaping detection in the Truman era.

2. Even on this catchall basis, the administration figure appears to be heavily padded. The Star's survey indicates, in this connection, that included in the 1,456 are cases where the individual concerned had never been confronted with derogatory information.

SOME DEAD INCLUDED

The figure includes, it appears, persons who never were fired or forced to resign, as the White House announcement implied, but who instead were separated through voluntary resignations, reductions in force—even by death—without ever knowing they had been accused of anything. A few apparently had left the Government before the Eisenhower security program was launched.

The arithmetic which produced the 1,456 sum was done at the Civil Service Commission, which supposedly was aided by other departments and agencies in collecting the Government-wide statistics used. Actually, however, the Commission seems to have done a good deal of its own figure-gathering. The embarrassing result has been that several agencies have had great difficulty making their own figures square with those relied on by the White House in making the October announcement.

FIGURES CONFLICT

Thus, when the individual departments were asked to back up the Civil Service Commission by announcing their own figures on security risk dismissals, at least three big ones—Post Office, Navy, and Air Force—came up with different figures than the ones assigned them by the Commission and incorporated in the 1,456 total.

Something of a crisis was reached recently in the administration's efforts to publicize the issue. The Air Force, after lengthy argument with Civil Service as to how many security risks had been removed from Air Force rolls, rebelled against conforming with the already announced official figure. For policy reasons it canceled a press release on the subject.

Privately, Air Force officials tried to get the CSC to announce the Air Force figure—on the ground that only the Commission knew exactly how the October total had been arrived at and what it meant. But the Commission declined to make the announcement itself. And there the matter rests.

NAVY HAS TROUBLE

Earlier, the Navy had run into similar trouble. The CSC which, under National Security Council-White House direction, had quietly set up a press-release schedule for the various agencies to announce their share of the 1,456, asked the Navy to issue a statement on November 2. (Originally it had asked the Navy to be ready on October 31, but the post office, which was the first to announce, also had figure trouble and requested a delay.)

The Navy prepared a release stating that 8 civilian workers had been fired and 12 others suspended as security risks. The Commission immediately replied that it had counted 192 for the Navy and had included that figure in the total reported to the White House. More than a month of wrangling, reexamination, and discussion followed. The result: On December 7, the Navy issued a vaguely worded release, open to a variety of interpretations, which said that 192 persons, against whom a security question existed, had been separated.

An official, conceding that Navy headquarters did not have details from its more than 700 field offices, said the Navy went to the absolute limit to go along with the Commission. "They (the Commission) took advantage of everything the broadest interpretation of the Executive order would allow," he asserted.

ORIGIN OF POLICY

How did the new program and the figure 1,456 actually come about?

In his state-of-the-Union message last January, General Eisenhower announced that a security system, based on the idea that working for the Government was a privilege rather than a right, would be put into effect at the earliest moment.

Attorney General Brownell and his Justice Department lawyers then took over. Robert Minor, first assistant to Deputy Attorney General William Rogers, met with security officers of the various agencies in a series of give-and-take sessions. Out of these meetings came the basis of Executive Order 10450.

The President announced the new program on April 27, to become effective a month later. This ended the old Truman loyalty setup which, in its more than 6 years of life, fired or denied employment to 557 persons about whose loyalty a reasonable doubt existed.

The Eisenhower order was aimed at a much broader target. Besides disloyal persons, it included individuals who are dishonest, untrustworthy, unreliable, or immoral; alcoholics, drug addicts, those with serious mental or neurological disorders, those who conduct themselves disgracefully, and those who may be subjected to coercion or pressure which may cause them to act contrary to the interests of national security.

EXTENDED FIRING POWER

Executive Order 10450 extended provisions of Public Law 733 of 1950 to all departments and agencies of the Government. This law had given the Secretaries of the Armed Services and several other sensitive agencies the power to remove summarily persons suspected of disloyalty or who were believed to be threats to the national security.

The new program gives the accused an opportunity to present his case to a Security Hearing Board, made up of three individuals from agencies outside his own. The Secretary of the accused's department selects these board members from a panel maintained by the Civil Service Commission.

The board recommended action to the department head, who may or may not abide by the recommendation. There is no further appeal. Under the Truman system, a central Loyalty Review Board heard appeals from regional boards and its decision was final.

Executive Order 10450 charges the Civil Service Commission with a continuing study of the manner in which the agencies carry out the security program. Also, the commission is directed to report to the National Security Council at least semiannually on the results of this study.

At a Security Council meeting 3 months ago Philip Young, Chairman of the CSC, and advisor to the President on personnel matters, was asked how many persons had been dismissed as security risks. Mr. Young had no figures available. (Under the order he had until late November to make his first report.) He returned to his office and sent out a call to the agencies for reports. This was on October 5. He asked for replies within 2 weeks. With these, and the Commission's own investigative records, he counted 1,456.

OFFICIALS IN DOUBT

Several security officers have declared that they were not certain as to just what figures the Commission wanted—and still aren't. This undoubtedly explains part of the confusion over figures between the agencies and the Commission. One of the security chiefs asserted that Mr. Young's "extremely hurried" call for statistics, which had to be gathered from thousands of offices in all parts of the world where Government employees are hired and fired inevitably produced numbers with different meanings.

Mr. Young made his report to the National Security Council on October 22. The next day the White House made its announcement that 1,456 persons had been ousted.

Since then, Republicans from Mr. Eisenhower to Senator McCARTHY has referred to the 1,456 often and lovingly. These references, almost invariably have been made in connection with discussions of the Communists-in-Government problem.

BREAKDOWN REFUSED

While administration officials, like Mr. Young, readily grant that the public generally attaches the same odious meaning to "security risk" and "disloyalty," they have declined repeatedly to give a breakdown of the 1,456 cases. And their public statements have not helped to draw the distinction they conceded is there. For example, the President read the following prepared remarks at a press conference on December 2:

"I repeat my previously expressed conviction that fear of Communists actively undermining our Government will not be an issue in the 1954 elections. Long before then this administration will have made such progress in rooting them out under the security program developed by Attorney General Brownell that this can no longer be considered a serious menace. As you already know, about 1,500 persons who were security risks have already been removed. * * *

"By next fall I hope the public, no longer fearful that Communists are destructively at work within the Government, will wish to commend the efficiency of this administration in eliminating this menace to the Nation's security."

M'CARTHY USES FIGURE

And Senator McCARTHY, in a nationwide radio address on November 24, declared:

"For example, while almost daily from the time I mentioned the 57 Communists and 205 security risks in Government, until the time the Truman-Acheson regime was removed from office—almost daily some leader of the Democratic Party would proclaim to the country that there were no Communists in Government, and that my attempt to dig them out was dishonest and a hoax. The new administration has now gotten rid of 1,456, all of whom were security risks and practically all of whom were removed because of Communist connections and activities or perversion."

Chairman Young denies that statements in which security-risk dismissals are mentioned in the same breath with the Communists-in-Government issue confuse the average citizen and give many the impression that the Government is crawling with Reds and fellow travelers.

YOUNG BLAMES PRESS

Instead, Mr. Young blames the press for failing to make the public understand that a person may be a security risk without being a member of the Communist Party or in any way disloyal.

Mr. Young does not seem anxious to aid in this education process. The Star tried for a week to learn from CSC the date Mr. Young sent out his request to the agencies for statistics. Commission information specialists said they would have to check with Mr. Young personally. The answer finally came back: This information is "not releasable." (It was obtained elsewhere.)

This reluctance to talk about the program, in its obviously unclassified aspects, occurs in the face of the President's statement of December 2. Speaking of the security program and the Red issue, General Eisenhower said:

"The people must have the facts on this important subject in order to reach sound

conclusions. As provided for in the liberalized regulations of this administration, established facts, so far as the national security permits, will continue to be made available."

DIFFICULT TO BREAK DOWN

The Star asked Mr. Young how many of his 1,456 security cases involved loyalty. He replied:

"I, as a taxpayer, am not interested in whether a person was discharged for being disloyal or for being a drunk, and I don't think the average person is. They just want to know that we are getting rid of this type of person on the Government payroll."

He also pointed to the difficulty of dividing the cases under headings of loyalty and nonloyalty because some persons may have been charged on both counts.

The Star first called attention on December 8 to the fact that the 1,456 figure had been padded with voluntary resignations, reduction-in-force cases, and other persons not fired after having been proven security risks. Proof of this fact was contained explicitly in the release in which the Navy announced its own contribution to the October total. This is what the Navy said:

"Separations in some instances were affected after preferment of charges and hearings. Others were separated through resignation or reduction in force prior to final processing of derogatory information, or by other administrative action during the employee's trial period."

PROCEDURE IN DOUBT

The logical question, of course, is whether the procedures followed in the Navy case were followed in producing the purge figures for other agencies. No one in the administration will say that handling of the Navy figures was typical of the way the whole list was produced. But, on the other hand, nobody will say it wasn't.

James Hatcher, head of the Civil Service Commission's security appraisal unit, was asked whether the figures for other agencies also included voluntary resignations, reduction in force, and other administrative separations found on the Navy list. He said he was not at liberty to discuss the matter and suggested that Mr. Young was the only one who could. Perhaps Mr. Young could. But he wouldn't.

The same kind of thing is encountered in trying to estimate the percentage of the 1,456 figure which actually has to do with loyalty cases.

NAVY RATE LOW

The bulk of the Navy's security separations were blue-collar workers—laborers and helpers and the like. Navy officials know of only 17 cases involving subversive associations or questionable loyalty. They spot checked civil-service records on the 175 others—every fifth one—and found no additional loyalty cases.

According to an Air Force official, instances of questionable loyalty were no higher in his department, percentagewise, than they were in the Navy. The Air Force employs 289,000 and the Navy 435,000 civilian workers—a total roughly one-third of all Government employees.

The Star has been told by sources it believes to be reliable that the Army and Veterans' Administration also have low rates of loyalty cases. No information on other agencies is available.

One of the reasons for a low percentage of loyalty cases in the military is that for 3 years the Army, Navy, and Air Force have had the authority under Public Law 733 to fire summarily any employee believed to have subversive connections. The State Department, Central Intelligence Agency, and several others also have had this authority.

NEW REPORT FORM USED

Of late the administration apparently has recognized that the reporting system which it has been using has produced confusion and numbers with no clear meaning. The Civil Service Commission, with the advice of the Justice Department and agency security officers, has developed a new monthly report form. This makes clear what statistics are required.

The Commission, however, will not tell the press what information the new report form seeks. Nor will it say whether the form is now in use.

Two weeks ago Mr. Young and Mr. Brownell met with Government security officers at the Justice Department to take critical stock of the program and to discuss, among other things, the new reporting system.

And the Justice Department's Mr. Minor, who perhaps had as much to do with the actual writing of the employee security program as any other, told the Star the administration is not forgetting that dismissals under the Executive order are to be made only in the "interests of national security."

"If the order is being used for any other purpose, we want to know about it," Mr. Minor said.

[From the Washington Post of January 20, 1954]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THE TANGLED WEB

Since he returned from France to seek the Presidency Dwight D. Eisenhower has been sold a good many lemons in the name of "smart politics." But about the worst lemon he has been sold yet is the strategy, worked out by certain of the administration's amateur Machiavellis, for dealing with the Communist issue.

As an example of this strategy in action, take the administration's repeated boasts about the 1,456—now 2,200—people who have been fired from the Government as security risks. The privately admitted purpose of these security firings has been to "grab the Commie issue away from JOE MCCARTHY."

The idea has been to undercut MCCARTHY by broadcasting the notion that the new administration found the Government crawling with subversives; promptly fired the lot; and thus left MCCARTHY with nothing further to do but twiddle his thumbs. The story of the State Department's security firings demonstrates how this was to be accomplished.

A grand total of 306 State Department security firings have been announced. According to reliable report, this impressive—even frightening—total was arrived at in the following manner. In the first place, the word was passed down through Assistant Secretary Scott McLeod's security and personnel offices that what was wanted was the largest possible total of such firings.

Two techniques—both palpably dishonest—were therefore used to swell the total. The files of those State Department employees who were in the process of resigning—always a considerable number, since there is a constant turnover—were carefully scrutinized. In the raw files of any Government worker who is not a zombie, there is pretty sure to be some morsel of gossip which can be labeled "derogatory information." Wherever the raw files provided the slightest excuse for so doing, the names of those who were resigning anyway were added—without their knowledge—to the grand total of State Department security firings.

About half the State Department total was arrived at in this way. If the same proportion holds throughout the Government, there must be more than a thousand Government workers who have resigned with a clear conscience and what they thought to be a clear record, and who were nevertheless listed officially as having been fired as security risks.

The second technique was just as dishonest. Large numbers of people were being transferred from the administrative control of the State Department to Harold Stassen's foreign aid outfit and to the newly independent Information Agency. Many of these people were transferred "with the warning flag up" and then listed as State Department security firings—although the great majority were cleared on further investigation, and never fired at all.

In the vast majority of these cases there was no question whatsoever of disloyalty or procommunism. In about 19 out of 20 cases, the reason, if any, for the firing was heavy drinking, temperamental unsuitability, or the like. Where there was some pro-Communist charge, it was often on the order of the charge against one female Government worker, who was accused of "sympathetic association" with her husband. This woman appealed the charge and on further investigation her husband turned out to be a rather mousy fellow, who had never taken an interest in politics.

In short, there was not a single case of actual subversion in all the State Department's security firings—and it is doubtful if there was one such case throughout the Government. Yet to 99 out of a 100 people, the news that there have been a large number of security firings means that this number of Communists and subversives have actually been uncovered in the Government.

Under the circumstances, it is surprising that any self-respecting person will work for the Government at all. What is even more surprising is that anyone should have thought that this amateurish political fakery should not be exposed for what it is. Apparently it never occurred to the geniuses who thought up the scheme that someone might ask for a breakdown of the security firings. Thus when reporters asked Civil Service Commission Chairman Phillip Young for such a breakdown he could only reply fatuously that he was "not interested" in such matters, and did not believe the "average person" was interested either. The story of the State Department firings make the reason for this awkward evasion perfectly obvious.

But what is downright incredible is that anyone could have supposed that this sort of slick numbers game was an effective way to undercut MCCARTHY. MCCARTHY has already, of course, profited heavily from the whole business—such as he profited heavily from Attorney General Brownell's attack on former President Truman, which was also supposed to steal the show from MCCARTHY. MCCARTHY has used the administration's fake figures to "prove" his own ancient, discredited charges against the State Department.

According to report, the President himself, and Chief Presidential Aide Sherman Adams, are beginning to realize that they were sold a lemon, and are by no means pleased by the realization. If so, this may help the administration's amateur Machiavellis to understand that they are no equals to Senator MCCARTHY, when it comes to slick political flimflammery.

[From the Washington News of December 21, 1953]

THE CASE OF THE LANGUAGE SPECIALIST—INJUSTICES CREEP INTO UNITED STATES SECURITY PROGRAM

(By Anthony Lewis)

The News today begins a series of articles on a subject which, without any real public knowledge about it, has aroused great interest and political controversy—the new security program for Federal employees.

President Eisenhower put the program into effect last May. It replaced suspected disloyalty as grounds for dismissal from Government service with more general grounds of subversive conduct or associations, of loose

talk and immorality which might make an employee vulnerable to blackmail.

The administration recently announced that 1,456 persons were forced from their jobs under the program through September 30. More than that it is difficult to learn.

The Government says it cannot break down the reasons for the 1,456 employees' removal, or the methods used to get them out. And the ousted employees naturally are not advertising their identities.

FEAR DOMINATES

Some surely know removal was justified. Others, though they feel themselves wronged, fear possible damage to their reputations by the mere charge and do not wish to fight through long appeal procedures while suspended without pay.

Nevertheless, through attorneys and friends, the News has learned the stories of some employees brought up on security charges.

Because of the Government's silence—possibly proper silence—these articles necessarily give only the employees' side of the picture. No suggestion is made that the cases which will be described are representative of all cases. They are simply the ones we have found.

FALTERING MACHINERY

The stories do give a peep into the machinery of the security program, and they show a system not working perfectly in the interest of either the individual or the Government.

Bearing in mind that we were given only one side of the story—they still seem to show some injustice, some pressing or farfetched charges which might have been avoided by more preliminary investigation. They show some painful delays—appeals which have been pending for months and are still not decided. In all cases names and identifying clues have had to be withheld or changed.

One afternoon last spring 10 employees of the State Department found a letter on their desks:

"This is to advise you that within 48 hours charges involving immorality will be lodged against you. This notice does not abrogate your right to resign immediately or to reply to the charges."

One who got the notice was Mrs. C, a $6,000-a-year language specialist. The specific charge was that she had slept with her husband before she married him.

She had met Mr. C while he was getting a divorce from his first wife, about 10 years ago. When the divorce became final, they married.

Less than 9 months later a son was born to them.

The Eisenhower security program's strictures on immorality apply not only to sexual perversion, as has been well publicized, but to intimate heterosexual (normal) relations out of wedlock.

KINSEY FIGURES

In the Kinsey report sample, 92 percent of all men and almost 50 percent of women had had such relations, but the theory of the security program is that such an immoral person may be subject to blackmail.

In the case of Mrs. C, the date of her child's birth was public knowledge. Blackmail would seem an impossibility, and she might have pressed an appeal against her dismissal on that ground.

But Mrs. C decided not to fight. The very nature of the charge, she felt, made too great the possible damage to herself, Mr. C and especially the child. She took the strong hint in the Department's notice and resigned.

FORTY DOLLARS A WEEK

Mrs. C left with no favorable reference for her years as a Government worker. The label "security risk" was enough to keep her from private employment in her field, though it is quite short of trained help. She now works for $40 a week in a department store.

"She probably did as much to fight communism as anyone in the field over the years," a friend of Mrs. C said. "But she made the mistake of being too much in love with the guy she later married, so the United States Government deprives itself of her services."

Mrs. C's little boy put it this way: "The State Department stunk."

[From the Washington Daily News of December 22, 1953]

THE SECURITY PROGRAM AND THE INNOCENT—MR. G WAS CLEARED, BUT HIS JOB STILL ELUDES HIM

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is the second of a series of articles based on a few of the 1,456 persons who were separated from their Government jobs as "security risks." The Government has not told the number of loyalty risks included in this total number of security risks. These few cases by no means are presented as indicative of the whole group, or as indicative of the way in which security cases are generally handled. The circumstances as presented here reflect the bias of the defendants themselves, and their lawyers and friends, since the Government properly refuses to enter a public discussion against them. Defendants' names have been deleted. The facts are as told to us. The reason for presenting them here is because they indicate that improvements in the handling of such cases could be made.)

Two and one-half months ago a Government hearing board recommended that Bernard G be cleared of all security charges against him and that he be given back his job.

Since then, nothing has happened. Mr. G is still suspended.

He is waiting for action by his department head, who must make the final decision on every contested case under the Eisenhower security program.

Is there still doubt about Mr. G despite exhaustive hearings and the board's strong recommendation in his favor? Or is there simply a big backlog of cases for the department head to decide?

A MYSTERY

Mr. G can't find out.

He had been a Federal employee for 22 years when the charges were filed against him, and he had never had any charge brought against him under the old loyalty program.

Under a provision of the Eisenhower program, Mr. G was automatically suspended by the bringing of charges this year, and his $8,000-a-year salary was stopped. It was more than 2 months before his appeal reached the hearing board.

Mr. G has earned no salary now for almost 5 months. Lawyer's fees are mounting up.

Why is he still waiting and hoping? For one thing, his 22 years as a Government worker have all been in the same office. That is the job he knows. For another, he believes he has been unjustly accused.

"A LOYAL LIFE"

"I have been dependable and have lived a life loyal to God, to my country, to my family, and to my community," Mr. G said in his appeal. "That life should speak for me now in elimination of any possible stain of being considered disloyal or a security risk."

The security charges against Bernard G stem from two important decisions he made in his life.

The first was to become a lawyer.

"For the better support of my family," Mr. G told the hearing board, "I strove to improve myself and so find some honorable source of supplemental income (while working for the Government). I started law school at night * * * and was admitted to the bar in * * *."

As a lawyer, Mr. G has handled cases in his spare time, with the approval of his Government office. The practice has never amounted to much.

TWO POINTS

The written charges which the security officers sent him when he was suspended included two main points relating to his work as a lawyer. This was the first:

"You at one time were a member of the National Lawyers Guild, an organization cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist organization."

In the written answer he had to file, Mr. G said that some years ago he made an unsuccessful effort to get the lawyer's job in various Federal agencies.

"At one of them, and I do not recall which," he wrote, "the general counsel * * * told me that he was an officer of the National Lawyers Guild and informed me that practically all the top lawyers in the Government belong to it * * *.

"I inferred that I would not be seriously considered for a legal position unless I filled in an application for membership—which he handed me. I filled in the application and paid him, to the best of my recollection, a dollar, which was the only bill I had with me * * *. I did not get the job."

The hearing board met for 3 days on Mr. G's case. It took testimony from him, from his witnesses and from witnesses the Government had called. When the board made its favorable decision on Mr. G, it sent him a "memorandum of reasoning" on each charge.

This is what it found on the Lawyers Guild charge:

"Mr. G became a member of the Lawyers Guild for 1 year. It does not appear that he renewed his membership * * * At that time lawyers of national prominence were members * * * and there is no evidence to indicate that the Lawyers Guild was then considered a subversive organization."

The second charge connected with Mr. G's legal work was:

"It has been reported that (you know) Mr. Z———, a known Communist and subscriber to the Morning Freiheit."

Mr. G answered that he had served as lawyer for Mr. Z and Mrs. Z some years ago in their purchase of a grocery. G's brother-in-law, who was a grocer himself, had referred them to him.

"I saw Z once at the grocery store," Mr. G wrote, "and once with the former owner's lawyer. I have not seen him since, but I have had some indication of his views through a trying incident. * * *

"My brother-in-law was at my home for my son's bar mitsvah (confirmation in the Jewish faith) when Z called him and said he would drop by.

HE REBUFFED MR. Z

"My brother-in-law then told me he had had an argument with Z in which Z had talked like a Communist. Although I disliked being ungracious, I told him I would not have Z in the house.

"In the circumstances my wife put chairs out in the yard, and Z visited with my brother-in-law there while I remained in the house. Since then my brother-in-law has told me that he became convinced of Z's Commie views and is no longer on speaking terms. * * *

"It seems to me, although I am not sure, that I have heard of the Morning Freiheit as a Jewish language newspaper. I have never seen it and know nothing of it. I do not know whether Z was ever a subscriber to it. I gather from the charges that it is a Communist newspaper."

The hearing board found:

"The evidence indicates that Mr. G's association with Mr. Z was solely of a professional nature in connection with isolated legal matters."

If these charges against Mr. G could be dismissed in such a brusque, matter-of-fact fashion, why were they ever brought against him at all?

Shouldn't they have been thrown out before they ever got to the stage of formal charge? Wasn't there any preliminary investigation, any sober judgment cast on their value?

There is no answer.

With those charges aside, the hearing board turned to the other interesting aspect of Mr. G's life—his home in Parkview, a pseudonym the News will use for a housing development built here by the Federal Government.

"Parkview is a small town intensified," Mr. G wrote in his appeal. "Kindliness and good neighborliness abound. But so, too, do pettiness and backbiting."

[From the Washington Daily News of December 23, 1953]

THREE HEARING DAYS SPENT ON GOSSIP—MR. G'S SECURITY TROUBLES TRACED TO LOOSE TONGUES

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is the third of a series of articles based on stories of a few persons charged as security risks under the new Eisenhower security program. President Eisenhower has announced that 1,456 employees have been removed for security reasons, but the Government will not say publicly how many of those cases involved subversion or disloyalty. The cases as presented here reflect the bias of the defendants and their lawyers and friends, since the Government perhaps properly refuses to enter a public discussion about them. The stories are not represented as typical of all security charges or handling of cases. But the facts are as told to us. They offer evidence of thin charges brought, of difficulties faced by employees in appealing, of painful delays in handling of cases. Names and identifications have been disguised at defendants' request.)

For almost 3 days, the security-hearing board listened to testimony about Bernard G before it decided that there was nothing wrong with him at all.

Mr. G, who had worked for the Government for 22 years, has been suspended for 5 months now as a security risk. He still hasn't been finally cleared.

The hearing board spent most of the time looking into Mr. G's life at Parkview (a fictitious name for a housing project here).

Mr. G, whose case was described in part in yesterday's News, has lived in Parkview for more than 10 years.

"I have assisted in various aspects of the community," he wrote the hearing board. "So I have necessarily met many people in Parkview, not all of them my friends."

ATTENDED MEETING

The first formal charge against Mr. G in connection with Parkview was this:

"There is a record of your attending a meeting at which donations were required. * * * The donations were for the United American Spanish Aid Committee which is on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. * * * It is of record that you solicited and requested other individuals to attend the meeting."

In his written answer to that charge, Mr. G said he had never heard of the Spanish Aid Committee, but that his lawyer had told him it had something to do with the Spanish Loyalists.

"Soon after we moved into Parkview," Mr. G said, "we were invited to a party. As new residents we were glad to go. There were many Parkview residents there, including the mayor.

"The party was social. However, some quiz games were played which cost 25 or 50 cents an entry, with a prize for the winner. My recollection is that I was told the money would go for Spanish war orphans. My wife remembers it as in aid of Loyalist refugees in general.

"Like many Americans my sympathies at the time favored the Loyalists, on the understanding that they were democrats fighting a dictator. I probably played 1 or 2 games at a probable cost of 50 cents."

MIXED GROUP

This is what the hearing board decided:

"The evidence establishes that Mr. G was present at a social party, * * * Guests included some reputed to have radical or left-wing tendencies and others whose reputation was unquestioned.

"Money was raised for some Spanish relief organization, the exact name of which is not clear. The Spanish Aid Committee, which allegedly was the recipient, was not placed on the Attorney General's list until 8 years after the party."

That's how curtly the hearing board took care of that charge.

What informer originally made it? Did the security officers investigate before they accused Mr. G formally of soliciting Spanish aid? No one but the security officers knows.

The second charge against Mr. G in connection with Parkview was much broader:

"Several reliable informants have described you as a leader and very active in a radical group in Parkview. Many of this group are thought to be of questionable character concerning loyalty to the United States. Some are described as even willing to defend communism in any discussion of ideology."

Mr. G began his answer by flatly denying that he was a radical of any kind. He said nobody had ever dared defend communism in his presence. He said he had belonged only to organizations like the Lions and the Parent-Teacher Association.

CONSERVATIVE

Then he made clear that he regarded himself as allied to the conservative rather than radical element in Parkview.

"The charge probably arises," he said, "out of the hotly contested issue of home ownership in Parkview. It was originally built, owned, and operated by the Federal Government, and in effect rents for low-income tenants were subsidized.

"When the Government indicated it wanted to sell Parkview, a large majority of the residents favored forming a corporation to buy the homes. A highly vocal minority was opposed. Its core consisted of the low-income group who naturally did not want to lose low, noncommercial rent.

"Parkview was finally sold this year to Parkview Housing, Inc., for which I was an attorney. Rents were raised in the lower brackets because the homeowners could not afford to continue subsidies, and this served to madden some of the minority.

"Last year, incidentally, I spoke in favor of requiring a loyalty oath from every director of Parkview Housing.

"I know that hotheads in the minority there have, in their exasperation, thrown around wild and untrue accusations. * * * But any description of me as any kind of radical is simply untrue."

The hearing board took a long, cool look at Parkview, and decided this:

"From its inception Parkview has been a subject of controversy * * *

"From without it has been eyed suspiciously as a 'queer' experiment. The fact that residents had so many cooperative undertakings was associated with something apart from conventional private enterprise. Rumor and gossip has given Parkview a 'radical' reputation."

EPITHETS

"Within, disagreements over management have resulted in heated disputes that often developed into personal animosities. Such terms as 'crackpots,' 'long hairs,' 'radicals,' 'pinkos,' and 'Communists' have been bandied about loosely by disgruntled individuals. * * *

"In this environment a civic-minded individual—whether conservative or otherwise—is bound to be exposed to criticism. In the case of Mr. G, who took part in many activities, the testimony showed that he was, if anything, a moderating and conservative influence."

Then the hearing board concluded:

"Based on all the evidence heard * * * and the reports of investigation furnished by the Government, the board could reach no other conclusion but that Mr. G's employment is clearly consistent with the interest of national security."

That is not the end of the story. Under the Eisenhower security program the head of Mr. G's agency had to pass on the hearing board's recommendation, and so far he has taken no action. Mr. G is still suspended without pay.

Mr. G's lawyer, who also had some cases under the old Truman loyalty program, said the appeal procedure and personnel in Mr. G's case were fair enough. Certainly no defendant could complain about the board's careful findings.

But the lawyer did express surprise that some of the charges should even have been formally brought. Who were the "reliable informants" who called Mr. G a "radical" at Parkview? Wouldn't any preliminary police work have shown that charge to be absurd?

"G is a pretty conservative guy," the attorney said, "probably a little too conservative for my taste."

The lawyer was also surprised at the time the case has taken—3 full days of hearings and months of waiting—all for a relatively unimportant Federal employee.

"What can it mean for the program as a whole," the lawyer asked, "when they take this long for a case I regard as infinitesimal?"

[From the Washington Daily News of December 24, 1953]

THE CASE OF ATTORNEY D—GUILT BY ASSOCIATION WITH A SECURITY CLIENT

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is the fourth of a series of articles based on stories of a few persons charged as security risks under the new Eisenhower security program. President Eisenhower has announced that 1,456 employees have been removed for security reasons, but the Government will not say publicly how many of those cases involved subversion or disloyalty. The cases as presented here reflect the bias of the defendants and their lawyers and friends, since the Government perhaps properly refuses to enter a public discussion about them. The stories are not represented as typical of all security charges or handling of cases. But the facts are as told to us. They offer evidence of thin charges brought, of difficulties faced by employees in appealing, of painful delays in handling of cases. Names and identifications have been disguised at defendants' request.)

Along with the basic Anglo-American concept that even the worst criminal is entitled to a lawyer goes the understanding that a lawyer must not be judged by his clients. If he defends a thief or a Communist, that doesn't make him one—yet.

A Government employee who was recently suspended as a security risk found among the specific counts against him a charge that he had associated with Attorney D.

"Attorney D was a chief defense attorney in the Amerasia case," the charge said, "and is suspected of having Communist tendencies."

The Government worker, in his answer to the charge, said he had met Attorney D once—in connection with a lawsuit in which D was on the other side.

At this point our story leaves the accused Federal employee to examine the Government's attitude toward the lawyer he had met once, Attorney D, and especially toward D's connection with the Amerasia case.

PAPERS SEIZED

Amerasia was a magazine, later found to have pro-Communist sentiments, in whose offices the FBI seized some secret State Department papers.

Four editors and writers on the magazine and two State Department employees were charged by the FBI with conspiring to commit espionage. Charges against 4 of the defendants were dismissed, and the other 2 paid small fines.

Was Attorney D accused of being part of the Amerasia conspiracy? Of even knowing the defendants before trial? Of doing any spying himself?

No. He was described by a security officer as having communistic tendencies because he had acted as a defense attorney in the case.

When Attorney D heard that he figured in the security case, he decided to file an affidavit with the security hearing board handling it—even though, again, he was not himself a defendant.

INSINUATION DENIED

In the affidavit Attorney D denied that he had ever belonged to any Communist or Communist-front organization or favored Communist aims in any respect. He then went on to tell how he had come into the Amerasia case.

The Amerasia defendants, Attorney D swore, had hired as their lawyers a New York firm in which an influential and well-known Member of Congress was a partner. But the trial was to be in district court here, and rules of the court require that at least one defense lawyer be from the District of Columbia.

A member of the New York firm called him, Attorney D said, and asked him to be attorney of record from the District in the Amerasia case. He agreed, he said, and that was all he did.

What does the Government think of Attorney D as a security prospect now? What would happen if he should seek a Government job himself? Did his one appearance as an attorney in a case involving communism forever brand him as having Communist tendencies?

As of the moment, the questions cannot be answered. The security hearing board which considered the case of Attorney D's casual acquaintance, the accused Federal worker, made no comment on Attorney D. He was just an incidental factor.

Even the conservative American Bar Association has expressed concern over the difficulty a controversial defendant has in obtaining counsel these days, because lawyers feel the defendant's reputation may rub off on them.

In its convention just this year the ABA passed a resolution urging lawyers to take on unpopular cases, as a duty.

What comment would the bar association have on the case of Attorney D?

[From the Washington Daily News of December 28, 1953]

AN UNHAPPY CASE WITH A HAPPY ENDING—MRS. Q WAS CHARGED WITH ASSOCIATING WITH HUSBAND

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is the fifth of a series of articles based on stories of a few persons charged as security risks under the new Eisenhower security program. President Eisenhower has announced that 1,456 employees have been removed for security reasons, but the Government will not say publicly how many of those cases involved subversion or disloyalty. The cases as presented here reflect the bias of the defendants and their lawyers and friends, since the Government perhaps properly refuses to enter a public discussion about them. The stories are not represented as typical of all security charges or handling of cases. But the facts are as told to us. They offer evidence of thin charges brought, of difficulties faced by employees in appealing, of painful delays in handling of cases. Names and identifications have been disguised at defendants' request.)

Mrs. Q, who has a nonsensitive job with the Government here, was handed a slip of paper last summer announcing that she would soon be accused as a security risk. The notice said:

"Specifically, it is charged that you continue sympathetic associations with your husband, ——, who was reported to be a member of —— and —— (two Communist-front organizations)."

Whether in a sensitive position or not, an accused employee must immediately be suspended under the Eisenhower security order. Mrs. Q's superior told her to clean out her desk and leave.

Mrs. Q decided to fight for her job. She hired a lawyer, and 1 week after she received the notice, she filed an answer.

She admitted that she was married to her husband and was "continuing sympathetic associations" with him. She was living with him, to be exact. On his behalf, she denied that he had ever belonged to the two front organizations the charge had named or any others.

NO EVIDENCE

Two weeks later, Mrs. Q had a hearing before a three-man board of the type provided for in the Eisenhower security order—its members drawn from other agencies.

The Government presented no evidence, and at the start the board chairman said to Mrs. Q's attorney: "Your case, Mr. ——."

In effect, Mrs. Q had to prove that Mr. Q was innocent.

The Government never would say when or where Mr. Q was supposed to have joined the front outfits. If it had, he could have testified at the hearing as to what he was doing then, and could have produced witnesses to back him up.

As it was, Mr. Q brought witnesses who testified to his general good character in business and personal life. They also said he wasn't interested in politics and was therefore not likely to have joined the groups mentioned in the charge.

MR. Q QUESTIONED

The hearing board did ask Mr. Q some questions. These indicated that a confidential informant had charged that someone once suggested Mr. Q to the front outfits as a possible member. No evidence about any membership card or a signed application by Mr. Q himself was mentioned.

A week after the hearing, the board informed Mrs. Q it had decided that the charges against her and her husband were without merit. A few days later her department head ordered her back to duty. She got full back pay for her time suspended, about a month.

Mrs. Q's case was similar to that of Milo Radulovich, the Air Force lieutenant who was accused of being a security risk because of his father's and sister's suspected Communist affiliations. He was later cleared after nationwide publicity on the case.

Not all the cases of this kind end so happily. One which is still pending—but which can never have a storybook happy ending—involves a Miss K.

She was accused of having a brother whose activities were questionable. Miss K appealed and got a hearing. The board told her, not directly, but quite clearly:

If you want to continue working for the Government, you must promise never to see your brother again unless and until he becomes persona grata to the United States.

Miss K weighed her brother against her job and chose the job. She promised not to see him. The security hearing board has not yet decided her case.

[From the Washington Daily News of December 29, 1953]

DILEMMA FOR THE INNOCENT—FIGHTING DISLOYALTY CHARGES CAN BE LONG AND COSTLY

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is another in a series of articles based on stories of a few persons charged as "security risks" under the new Eisenhower security program. President Eisenhower has announced that 1,456 employees have been removed for security reasons, but the Government will not say publicly how many of those cases involved subversion or disloyalty. The cases as presented here reflect the bias of the defendants and their lawyers and friends, since the Government perhaps properly refuses to enter a public discussion about them. The stories are not represented as typical of all security charges or handling of cases. But the facts are as told to us. They offer evidence of thin charges brought, of difficulties faced by employees in appealing, of painful delays in handling of cases. Names and identifications have been disguised at defendants' request.)

When a Federal employee chooses to resign rather than fight a charge that he is a security risk, does he tacitly admit that the accusation is true?

Many members of the public would answer yes. As an anonymous letter writer asked the News recently, "Why waste sympathy on someone who does not even appeal?"

But it isn't that simple. Lawyers and others familiar with the problems say an accused employee who feels the charges against him are entirely untrue might nevertheless have many reasons to resign quietly instead of fighting the charges on appeal.

A LONG ROAD

For one thing the accused employee faces an appeal procedure that can run into months and even years of deliberation.

Department security regulations under the Eisenhower program generally give the Government 30 days to tell an accused employee the specific charges against him. And the Government has 30 days more to amend the charges.

The employee himself is allowed 30 days to prepare a written answer to the specific charges, and 30 days more to file amended answers to the amended charges.

Those are maximum times, of course, but they are not merely theoretical.

In one case described to the News, the Government filed specific charges on the 30th day after it had brought its first broad accusation against an employe, and then sent him amended charges—by special delivery letter—on the 30th day after that.

When the employee's final answers are in, the agency must decide whether to clear the man on the basis of his statements or, as happens in most cases, order a hearing. The agency can take as long as it wants to decide.

Many hearing boards have a backlog of cases, because they were set up and cleared for security themselves only this summer. They have no limit on the time they can take to hear a case and then hand down their recommendations.

DELAY AFTER CLEARANCE

The agency head must make the final decision on each accused worker under the Eisenhower program. In a case described earlier in this series, an agency head has had a favorable board opinion before him for 2 months without acting on it.

Even with the best intentions on the Government's part, then, an accused employee must realistically count on long proceedings. And he will be suspended from his job without pay the whole time.

The Truman loyalty program gave agencies discretion to let employees in nonsensitive jobs keep working while cases were argued.

The formal Eisenhower order is not clear on the point, but the Justice Department has let agencies know that they must immediately suspend any employee charged as a security risk, whether janitor or code clerk. A Justice spokesman confirmed to the News that this is policy for the whole Government.

One agency, the National Labor Relations Board, originally issued security regulations in which suspension was not mandatory. But the regulations were withdrawn and revised after consultation with the Justice Department.

An accused employee can seek a temporary job while suspended, of course—but it must be one that allows time for the preparation and appearances he will have to make in his appeal.

HEAVY LEGAL FEES

If he is eventually cleared, he can expect to get his back pay. But much of that may go for lawyer's fees, which have amounted to $1,200 in one still active case known to the News.

The legal process itself presents the difficulties which always face defendants in cases involving security—unknown accusers, shadowy charges, surprise elements which the prosecution would have to list in advance in a regular criminal case.

Written charges against 1 man, for example, accused him of associating with 4 persons. In the hearing, examiners suddenly brought 12 more names—about which the defendant had not been able to check his records or search his memory. The hearing board gave no reason why the names should not have been listed in advance.

"Inevitably the decent people go through the real torture," a lawyer said, "the bewilderment at having to convince your Government. * * * How do you prove you are virtuous? Honest? Patriotic?"

CHANCE OF REPETITION

Last of all, an accused employee trying to decide whether to resign or to fight the charges may fear that standards will change once more in future even if he is cleared this time, that his case will be reviewed again and again, that it will never be closed.

He knows that if and when he wins his fight and returns to the desk he left so hastily months before, some fellow workers will always—if only unconsciously—regard him as a risky sort.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 4, 1954]

A PSYCHIATRIST VERSUS A SECURITY OFFICER—WHEN DOES SEXUAL BEHAVIOR BECOME A BLACKMAIL RISK?

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is the seventh in a series of articles on the new Eisenhower security program. President Eisenhower has announced that 1,456 Government employees have been removed under the program, but the Government will not say publicly how many of those cases involved disloyalty or subversion. Previous stories in the News have presented case histories of a few persons charged as security risks, as related by themselves and their lawyers and friends. Today's article is a discussion of opposing points of view on one controversial aspect of the program.)

What bearing should the sexual behavior of a Government employee have on his rating as a security risk?

Notorious conduct has long been reason for dismissal from Government service, under regular civil-service rules. But immorality has only recently come to be regarded as making an employee a bad security risk.

This concept, introduced by the Truman administration, is based on the idea that an immoral Government worker is subject to blackmail. To put it crudely, a Russian agent might approach the employee and say: "Give me some secrets or I'll tell on you."

In the last administration the concept was applied chiefly to homosexuals in sensitive jobs. Application is now much broader. Many more employees and many different kinds of immorality are being investigated. Enforcement is much more rigorous.

Because the subject is so delicate and so controversial, the relation of sex to security has had little public discussion. To explore the subject the News sought the views of, among others, a psychiatrist and a prominent Republican security officer. Names are withheld at their request.

Critics of the morality-security concept in both past and present administrations say it may lead to a form of blackmail by the Government itself.

"Nearly everyone has done something in his life that he wants to keep secret," one critic said. "He would probably prefer not to argue such private matters before security officers or hearing boards.

"If a department head or security officer wants to get rid of someone he can probably just keep investigating until he finds something of that kind and then threaten to bring formal charges against the employee. Chances are he'll just resign quietly."

TACTICS DENIED

The Republican security officer questioned by the News strongly denied that his own department—or, to his knowledge, any other—was using such tactics.

"Sure, it's possible," he said. "No security system can guarantee against all abuses. But as far as I know we are bringing morals charges only against employees we believe offer a real threat to national security."

The psychiatrist argued that methods used in some Government morals investigations, whether intended as a threat or not, might do great psychological damage to innocent individuals.

LIE DETECTOR USED

He mentioned the case of one of his patients, an unmarried Government girl in her twenties, who, he said, was given a lie detector test and asked these questions:

Have you had sexual relations with a man?

Have you had sexual relations with a woman?

When did you last have intercourse?

"Even we who have been studying human personalities for years do not pry that bluntly," the psychiatrist said. "Imagine the effect of such a test on a sensitive person."

(The security officer confirmed that lie detectors are used in morals cases but said he had no knowledge of this particular case or one like it.)

The basic criticism voiced by the psychiatrist was that the security program casts too broad a net on moral standards—frowning on practices that may be technically illegal but in fact are done by most of the population at one time or another.

LACK OF IMPULSE?

"If we carry this to its logical extreme," he said, "what of the person who has no sexual impulse at all? Is he normal? A good security risk? You are in a dangerous field as soon as you start saying what is 'normal.'

"Even in marriage, you know, there are sexual habits today that would shock Victorians.

"I don't think the fact that a man is a homosexual, or a heterosexual who sleeps with his secretary, proves in itself that he is likely to divulge Government secrets. It's not the sexuality of any person that should worry the authorities, but the indiscretion."

IT IS RELATIVE

The security officer's point of view coincided to some extent.

"If all our laws were enforced," he said, "everyone would be in jail. We do the same thing a cop does. We go after only the flagrant, public abuses.

"I can't define immorality. It's relative. But if a person is indiscreet, he's got to go—and that means if he has done something our investigators discover. If they can find out about it, so can a potential blackmailer. That's why our investigators have to keep looking."

The security officer said he personally was not taking a strict view of illicit male-female relationships in the past unless they had resulted in illegitimate children.

But in the case of homosexuality, he said, one episode in a person's history means automatic dismissal however long ago it happened. The only exception, he said, would be a case in which someone had been taken advantage of as a child.

"By the time you're out of school you know whether perversion is right or wrong," he said. "And suppose we learn that a boy was thrown out of prep school for some homosexual act—should we keep him on the payroll?"

YOU DON'T NEED KINSEY

The psychiatrist noted the Kinsey Report statistic that one-third of American males have at least one homosexual experience in their lives.

"You don't have to draw on Kinsey," he said. "Any psychiatrist will tell you that many men—and women have a single homosexual episode. That does not mean the person is a homosexual.

"Incidentally, watch out for officials who are determined to root out anyone who ever had a homosexual experience. They are like searchers for pornography. They show an unconscious interest in the subject."

OUT, ANYWAY

The security officer maintained that, however normal a person was now, a single homosexual act in the past could lead to blackmail.

But he agreed with a statement by the psychiatrist that some confirmed homosexuals could actually not be blackmailed—because, as the psychiatrist put it, "they have no guilt feelings; they think they are right and the rest of the world wrong, and they don't care who knows they are homosexual."

"I had one high official in here," the security officer said, "who freely admitted he was a homosexual. But he insisted he could not be blackmailed because he had never tried to keep the fact a secret and did not object to anyone knowing.

"He was probably right, too. We decided to force him out on general grounds of immorality."

FEAR

A criticism often made of the security program as a whole—that it creates an atmosphere of fear—was said by the psychiatrist to apply particularly to sexual charges.

"Peoples who have been leading happy lives begin to worry," he said. "A man may have slipped once years ago, and now for the first time he starts wondering: 'Am I normal? Will I pass?' "

In this connection some critics hold it is the Government's emphasis on morals that has actually made blackmail possible.

In past years, this argument goes, a spy who learned of a morals offense by a Government worker would not have known whom he could threaten to tell about it. Today anyone who wants to put pressure on such a Government worker need only threaten to pass the word to a security officer.

"We all want security," the psychiatrist said. "We're all against sin. But one wonders about the methods."

[From the Washington Post of January 1, 1954]

THOSE "SECURITY RISKS"—ANXIETY AND EMBARRASSMENT

(By Murrey Marder)

In its zealousness to show it has been cleaning security risks out of Government, the administration has produced a set of statistics which has been transformed into a seriously distorted political issue.

The statistics, the administration has said, add up to 1,456 "security risks" removed from Government jobs in the first 4 months' operation of President Eisenhower's Federal Employees Security Program, May 27 to September 30.

This 1,456 figure is causing anxiety, and embarrassment, to some conscientious Federal officials. They have been forced to sit by, silently, while this figure—which they privately admit is open to question—is converted into a major political scare issue which implies that it represents that many spies, espionage agents and saboteurs, or potential traitors.

A survey of all available information indicates that many of these cases would have been terminated in a very similar way before the employees security program came into existence last May, but with no such implications.

The difference is that many of the cases would not have been called security risks under previous administrations. They would have been called dismissals "to promote the efficiency of the Federal service," or some related term.

These dismissals would have been effected in exactly the same manner as many of the dismissals now carried out in the name of security; that, through normal civil-service procedures.

Part of the distinction is in semantics. When the present security program was created, it abolished the loyalty program and bracketed into the term "security" everything ranging from a spy to someone of questionable habits.

It overlapped broadly into many grounds for routine civil service removal. It could be used to trip up the employee who misrepresented facts in applying for Government work, or the employee who engaged in "notoriously disgraceful conduct," as well as the employee in a security-sensitive job who gossiped about the work.

The lumping-together of all such persons in the wide category of "security risk," and publication of the total figure without any breakdown of the degrees of security risk involved, however, has led to sweeping political allegations. Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican of Wisconsin, for example, recently made this statement which cannot be substantiated by any available information: "Over 90 percent of the 1,456 security risks were gotten rid of because of Communist connections and activities or perversion."

The only official clarification obtained to date is President Eisenhower's comment last month that not all of the 1,456 could be described as "subversive" or "disloyal." The question of how many could be put in those categories is still unanswered, officially.

The Washington Post has now learned that when called upon to furnish their sets of figures for this total, at least several agencies had no such compilations, and called on the Civil Service Commission to supply figures out of the agencies' recently submitted dismissal statistics.

Thereupon, what was done in some instances, it is reported, was to seek out dismissal cases which would fit the very broad criteria set forth in the security order—without regard to whether the dismissals were made through the security program machinery or by normal Civil Service methods.

The 1,456 figure has been a subject of controversy since it was announced by the White House on October 23. That announcement said, in part:

"These (1,456) separations were for security reasons only; they have nothing to do with continuing reductions in force from the Federal payroll.

"Of the 1,456 employees, 863 were dismissed from Federal service by their various agencies and departments and 593 resigned. In all of the resignation cases, the agencies and departments had unfavorable reports on these employees."

The Washington Post pointed out in its first report on these figures that they gave a "one-sided" view of the program's operation.

The 1,456 employees, in the main, were not workers who had been cleared after hearings under the Truman loyalty program. Many of them were probationary employees on whom investigations had not been completed by the previous administration.

It is apparent that while there may have been unfavorable reports about the 593 who resigned, they cannot possibly all be tabulated as security risks unless the unfavorable reports were found, upon investigation, to be accurate. The fact is that a resignation generally brings an end to such investigations—and it is possible for a person to resign in many instances without ever knowing he was under investigation.

In addition, one official report now directly contradicts the White House statement that the separations counted in the 1,456 figure "have nothing to do with continuing reductions in force from the Federal payroll."

The Navy Department, in announcing on December 7 that it had separated 192 civilians workers out of the 1,456 total, stated:

"Separations in some instances were effected after preferment of charges and hearings. Others were separated through resignation or reduction in force prior to the final processing of derogatory information, or by other administrative action during the employee's trial period."

There is official documentation that at least some of the 863 persons included in the figures on dismissals for security reasons were actually dismissed under normal civil-service provisions rather than as security risks.

The Post Office Department, on October 28, reported that 145 of its employees were terminated and 21 resigned of those processed under the new security program. That statement then added:

"It was pointed out that while the 145 were investigated under the Executive order, the administrative actions taken to effect the terminations were in accordance with regular established civil-service procedure. This latter action is in keeping with the intent of the Department's security regulations which specifically provide that separations under the authority of Executive Order 10450 will supplement and not take the place of normal civil-service procedures where such are adequate and appropriate."

Similar language appeared in the Veterans' Administration's announcement, on December 2, that it had terminated the services of 108 employees under the security program, and that "26 resigned while under investigation."

[From the Washington Daily News of January 6, 1954]

THE NEW POLICY IN PRACTICE—WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE A SECURITY RISK?

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is the last in a series of eight articles on the new Eisenhower security program. Previous stories in The News have presented case histories of some persons charged as "security risks," as told by themselves and their lawyers and friends, and have discussed specific security regulations. Today's article deals with some general questions about the program.)

Administration officials who decided to scrap the old loyalty program last spring criticized its standards as too severe. It was difficult to place the terrible label "disloyal" on a Government worker, they said—and unfair to do so except in the case of a proved spy or traitor.

They argued that under the broader standards of the new security program an employee would be removed simply as "unsuitable for Government service." As Attorney General Herbert Brownell put it, "Many employees could be a security risk and still not be disloyal."

"The new policy," columnist Walter Lippmann wrote, "means the penalty on the individual is much reduced. * * * It should be possible to fire a man without destroying him—without in fact branding him at all."

How has it worked out in practice? Specifically, how has it worked for the 1,456 employees the administration has so far listed as removed on security grounds?

President Eisenhower has cited the 1,456 four times as evidence his administration is cleaning out "Communists in Government." Attorney General Brownell and GOP National Chairman Leonard Hall have used the figure the same way.

Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield referred to the 1,456 as "muddleheads and pinks and fellow travelers." Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY flatly said 90 percent were Communists or perverts.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey put it more colorfully:

"Democrats are afraid the American people will discover what a nice feeling it is to have a Government which is not infested with spies and traitors. In less than 11 months the Justice Department has discovered and dismissed 1,456 security risks planted in the Government."

Whether most of the 1,456 were planted Communists or perverts or spies or muddleheads is impossible to find out officially. The administration has refused to give a breakdown of reasons for their dismissal.

But a few cases reported to the News seemed to indicate that at least some of the Government workers brought up on security charges do not fit such a villainous description.

One man was fired because he had not noted on his job application that he was in an Army psychiatric ward during the war.

Others were charged for having sex relations before they were married.

Several, in various departments, were charged and suspended for having belonged to the admittedly leftist National Lawyers Guild, but for having belonged to it at a time when some of the country's most distinguished attorneys were members.

One was accused of associating with a lawyer who once represented a suspected Communist.

Others were charged because of suspicious relatives.

An even more significant fact about the figure 1,456 is that the Civil Service Commission, in reaching that total, included persons who resigned, died, or were ousted by reduction-in-force without ever being told there were security charges against them.

The Navy confirmed that many of its former employees listed as security removals had security charges placed on their records—charges they might have beaten had they been informed—only after they had left their jobs for nonsecurity reasons.

A Democrat who was a security officer in the last administration argued that the new program has excesses and political distortions brought on by what he called the quota psychology.

"The Republicans campaigned for years on the charge that the Government was full of Communists," this Democrat said. "So once they got into office they more or less had to find some security risks and imply they were Communists.

"Every security officer now knows that he's expected to produce at least some risks, his quota. It's hard enough to keep national security foremost in your mind on these cases anyway, without political pressures."

As examples of what he called political pressures on the security system, this Democrat cited:

Civil Service Commission's listing as security cases many which the departments themselves had not so labeled.

Insistence by the administration that one agency—the Democrat did not name it—classify at least a few of its positions as "sensitive," after the agency first said it had no sensitive jobs.

Threats by Senator McCarthy to call before his committee security officers who cleared an employee of whom the Senator disapproves. (The threat has not materialized so far.)

"It is always easier to bring charges," the Democratic former security officer said, "than to worry about what some official or Senator will say later."

Supporters of the administration program argue that Government employment is a privilege, not a right; that a private business has the right to fire any employee it chooses and the Government certainly has many unsatisfactory workers it should be equally free to dismiss.

Critics give three specific answers:

While some Government workers are doubtless incompetent and should be fired, that is a matter of personnel policy, not security; it is manifestly unfair to brand them "security risks."

For whatever reason, democratic governments around the world have found they attract better workers if they offer more assurance of continued employment—civil service—than private business.

A Government worker fired as a "security risk" these days suffers far more disability than a dismissed private employee. He may have had his Government job for years and know only that work. If he is a professional—a scientist, for example—he may find it impossible to find private employment in his field.

The critics also make this general argument:

An ever-broadening search for security, with heavy political overtones, may in the long run work against the interest of the Government.

For one thing, they say, continued political emphasis on "Communists in Government" will keep the public wrought up about the issue. President Eisenhower himself has several times expressed the wish that the subject would die down and bitter political feelings over it abate.

There is no question either that excitement over the Communists-in-Government issue hurts our standing abroad.

And what effect will an endless hunt for more security have on the kind of employees the Government ends up with?

In some cases reported to the News, hearing boards curtly dismissed charges brought by security officers. These employees went back to work—but only after long periods under suspension, and with the psychological burden of having fellow workers know they were considered risky.

Employees without civil service standing do not even rate appeals to a board. Presumably charges which a board might dismiss would force these employees out automatically. And some workers who rate an appeal resign quietly rather than face the long and uncertain process.

The effect of the security hunt on possible future Government employees was discussed recently by a Wellesley College senior who wants a Government job after graduation—but whose father has been attorney in some controversial security cases. She said:

"I'm a conservative. I don't agree with my father most of the time. I voted for Eisenhower, and I like what he is doing. But I'm afraid when I ask for a job they'll never even get around to my views. They'll find out who my father is and turn me down."

Her fears are at least partly corroborated in the philosophy of the security program regarding new applicants. A Republican security officer once explained it this way:

"When we investigate someone who's been in the Government for years, we consider his whole record and weigh his good service against any minor slips."

"But if a new applicant has anything at all against him, we don't bother weighing his whole history. We just say 'No.' There are plenty more applicants."

As the definition of security risk broadens to take in more and more pople, and security mixes with politics, the question arises whether there will be plenty more applicants—intelligent or sensitive or imaginative one, at least—for jobs in the United States Government.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to enter into controversy with the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina, who has just addressed the Senate. I know of no better friend of the civil-service worker than the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who has served so many years on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, formerly as its chairman, and now as its ranking minority member. It has been my privilege to work closely with him, both at this session and in previous sessions.

I am in accord with the resolution he has submitted, and I hope that much of the legislative proposal he has made will be adopted. I think his proposal is in the interest of the civil-service workers.

I believe it might be well to discuss for a moment the 2,200 positions which seem to have received so much publicity in recent weeks.

Personally, I do not know of anyone who said that all the 2,200 are subversives. As a matter of fact, I know of no one who has used the term "subversive" in connection with them. It has been said that they are security risks; I myself have made that statement.

So I thought it might be well to place in the Record the President's statement on that point, as contained in his message on the state of the Union, delivered before the joint session of the two Houses of Congress on January 7. I now quote from his message on that occasion, as it appears on page 80 of the Congressional Record; and the part to which I refer appears under the heading "Internal Security":

Under the standards established for the new employee-security program more than 2,200 employees have been separated from the Federal Government.

Mr. President, let it be noted that the President used the words "employee-security program."

Then the President said:

Our national security demands that the investigation of new employees and the evaluation of derogatory information respecting present employees be expedited and concluded at the earliest possible date. I shall recommend that the Congress provide additional funds where necessary to speed these important procedures.

Mr. President, the removal of such persons has occurred under what I believe is Public Law 733. That measure was passed, as I recall, during either the 81st or the 82d Congress; and it was signed by President Truman. Those persons are the security risks, and that is the test of those who have been removed from the Federal Government service.

I wish to say very definitely that I have no objection to finding out the number of those who have been removed from the service, or to ascertaining the departments of the Government in which they served.

On the other hand, I am absolutely opposed to disclosing their names. I believe it would be most unfair and unfortunate to those who have been removed from office, several hundred of whom, so I am told, voluntarily resigned. I believe that for them and their families and their future it would be a mistake, and I am violently opposed to it. But I am not opposed to getting a list of the particular branches of the service in which they worked.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the only reason for this inquiry is this: If there were 2,200, it ought to be shown who are the real security risks. The President used the term "security risk." I think probably he used it in a broader sense—I hope he did—but he certainly led the people of the Nation to believe that 2,200 people were let out because they were subversives. I think the Senator will agree that the public has jumped to the conclusion that they were subversives. That being so, the situation should be cleared up.

Mr. CARLSON. I certainly agree with the Senator in that respect. I do not think anyone ever said that, or intended that it should be said. I have been very careful with my words, and I know that everyone with whom I have discussed this question has used the term "security risk" and not the term "subversive." So I am in accord with the Senator on that point. I think the situation needs clearing up.

Mr. President, this administration is determined to remove Communists, subversives, and security risks from the Federal Government, and I think we are making some progress. It has been said that we have done nothing when it comes to removing Communists. I refer to the statement of the Attorney General. He stated that this administration has indicted or convicted 54 Communist leaders. We have acted against 12 Communist-front groups, and we have deported more than 200 subversive aliens. I think that is a good record. It shows a determination on the part of the administration to rid the Government of these undesirable persons, and I know that the effort will continue, because the President is insisting that we have people in the Federal service who are not security risks, no matter what classification they come under.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator know of any employee who has been dismissed by the Government because he was a subversive, because he was a Communist, or belonged to a Communist organization or a front organization? Does the Senator know of anyone who has been prosecuted?

Mr. CARLSON. No; I do not. I have made no inquiry. I have simply referred to the statement of the Attorney General. I have every reason to believe that the Attorney General was making a correct factual statement.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina mentioned the point that this administration was destroying the civil service and getting back to the old spoils system. For the RECORD, I think it should be stated that on June 30, 1932, 80 percent of the Federal positions were in the competitive civil service. By June 30, 1936, 4 years later, the number under civil service had dropped to 60 percent. As of November 30, 1953, the number of Federal jobs under civil service stood at 86 percent, and that is where it stands today. So I do not believe the statement of the Senator from South Carolina was absolutely correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to clear up one point. It will be recalled that in 1933, 1934, and 1935, we were employing a great many persons in the WPA and other organizations. Naturally they were not civil-service employees.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct. That is exactly what happened. That is one of the situations which has been confronting this administration. At that time agencies were filled with persons who were not under the competitive civil service, but who were blanketed in either by Executive order or by legislative action.

Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD 3 tables. First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table designated "Table I," showing the trend of Federal civilian employment from 1932 to 1953. It shows the number in the competitive civil service and the percentage, from 1932, by years, until the end of 1953.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Trend of Federal civilian employment, 1932–53*

Date	Total, all areas [1]	Competitive civil service	
		Number	Percent
June 30, 1932	583, 196	467, 161	80. 1
Feb. 28, 1933	567, 697	[2] 453, 590	[2] 79. 9
June 30, 1933	572, 091	456, 096	79. 9
June 30, 1934	573, 095	450, 592	66. 9
June 30, 1935	719, 440	455, 229	63. 3
June 30, 1936	824, 259	498, 725	60. 5
June 30, 1937	841, 664	532, 073	63. 2
June 30, 1938	851, 926	562, 909	66. 1
June 30, 1939	920, 310	622, 832	67. 7
June 30, 1940	1, 002, 820	726, 827	72. 5
June 30, 1941	1, 358, 150	990, 218	72. 9
June 30, 1942	2, 206, 970	[3]	[3]
June 30, 1943	3, 157, 113	[3]	[3]
June 30, 1944	3, 312, 256	[3]	[3]
June 30, 1945	3, 769, 646	[3]	[3]
June 30, 1946	2, 722, 031	[3]	[3]
June 30, 1947	2, 128, 648	1, 733, 019	81. 4
June 30, 1948	2, 090, 732	1, 750, 823	83. 7
June 30, 1949	2, 109, 642	1, 802, 708	85. 4
June 30, 1950	1, 966, 448	1, 687, 594	85. 8
June 30, 1951	2, 486, 491	2, 175, 668	87. 5
June 30, 1952	2, 603, 267	2, 246, 446	86. 3
Jan. 31, 1953	2, 556, 482	[2] 2, 213, 658	[2] 86. 6
June 30, 1953	2, 470, 963	2, 137, 705	86. 5
Nov. 30, 1953	2, 365, 629	[2] 2, 040, 828	[2] 86. 3

[1] Totals through 1941 are taken from annual reports of the Civil Service Commission. After that date the source is the monthly report of Federal Civilian Employment.
[2] Estimated.
[3] Data not collected during war years.

Mr. CARLSON. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a list of laws enacted by the Congress of the United States during the period from March 9, 1933, the beginning of the 73d Congress, through July 7, 1952, the adjournment of the 82d Congress, carrying provisions authorizing employment of personnel without regard to civil service and classification laws.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*A list of laws enacted by the Congress of the United States during the period from Mar. 9, 1933, the beginning of the 73d Cong., through July 7, 1952, the adjournment of the 82d Cong., carrying provisions authorizing employment of personnel without regard to civil-service and classification laws*

COVERAGE OF THE LIST

The list is not exhaustive, although it purports to be comprehensive within certain boundaries. These boundaries are drawn to eliminate references that would not only add to the bulkiness of the list, but would so becloud its purpose that its usefulness and accuracy could well be questioned.

Therefore, to keep the list within a proper perspective the following kinds of references have been omitted.

1. Laws creating small commissions or committees to exist for a short period of time to perform some specific duty such as "An act to provide for the appointment of a commission to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia."
2. Laws authorizing participation by the Federal Government in celebrations, expositions, and fairs such as the California Exposition Commission, the Texas Centennial Commission, operation of the Freedom Train, and the Paris Exposition.
3. Provisions appearing in the annual appropriation acts appropriating sums to various agencies for the employment of experts, consultants, or other personnel usually on a temporary basis. The amounts of money are usually not very large and the provisions seem to have no degree of uniformity. Sometimes they appear only once; sometimes they appear 2 or 3 times and then are dropped.
4. Laws pertaining to participation in international organizations such as a law providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization.
5. Laws pertaining to the District of Columbia government such as those dealing with policemen and firemen.
6. Laws pertaining to employees outside continental United States.

USE OF THE LIST

The short titles of the laws are used if available; otherwise the long titles are shortened.

The date approved means the date the President signed the law.

The page reference in the citations to the Statutes at Large is to the page on which the provision appears rather than to the page on which the law begins.

The section of the law is listed to make it easier to find.

Some of the provisions examined authorized employment without regard to civil-service laws; some authorize the fixing of compensation without regard to the Classification Act; some authorize both. Therefore, the last column is divided into two parts to indicate from which law the employees are exempt. The symbol X is used to show an exception.

Often the provisions exempting personnel from the civil-service laws and/or Classification Act are limited to certain officers and employees. Where such is the case, the limitation is set out in a footnote.

The footnotes appear at the end of the list.

Title of act	Date approved	Citation to Statutes at Large	Section No.	Exempt from—	
				Civil-service law	Classification Act
Agricultural Adjustment Act	May 12, 1933	48 Stat. 37	10	X	
Emergency Farm Mortgage Act, 1933	do	48 Stat. 49	33	X	X
Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933	do	48 Stat. 56	3 (b)	X	X
Tennessee Valley Act of 1933	May 18, 1933	48 Stat. 59	3	X	
Corporation of Foreign Bondholders, 1933	May 27, 1933	48 Stat. 93	203	X	X
For the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system.	June 6, 1933	48 Stat. 114	2	X	X
Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933	June 13, 1933	48 Stat. 131	4 (j)	X	X
National Industrial Recovery Act	June 16, 1933	48 Stat. 195	2 (a)	X	X
Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works	do	48 Stat. 200	201 (a) (b)	X	X
Emergency Railroad Transportation Act, 1933	do	48 Stat. 211	2	X	X
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act	Jan. 31, 1934	48 Stat. 345	1	X	X
For loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1934	Feb. 23, 1934	48 Stat. 355	4	X	X

TABLE II.—*A list of laws enacted by the Congress of the United States during the period from Mar. 9, 1933, the beginning of the 73d Cong., through July 7, 1952, the adjournment of the 82d Cong., carrying provisions authorizing employment of personnel without regard to civil-service and classification laws*—Continued

Title of act	Date approved	Citation to Statutes at Large	Section No.	Exempt from—	
				Civil-service law	Classification Act
Regulation of cotton industry	Apr. 21, 1934	48 Stat. 606	17	X	X
Securities and Exchange Act of 1934	June 6, 1934	48 Stat. 885	4 (b)	[1] X	[1] X
Communications Act of 1934	June 19, 1934	48 Stat. 1067	4 (f)	[2] X	[2] X
To establish a National Archives of the U. S. Government	do	48 Stat. 1122	2	X	
National Housing Act	June 27, 1934	48 Stat. 1246	1	X	X
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	do	48 Stat. 1255	402 (c) (5)	X	X
Tobacco Control Act	June 28, 1934	48 Stat. 1279	10 (c)	X	X
For loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1935	Feb. 20, 1935	49 Stat. 29	4	X	X
To regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products	Feb. 22, 1935	49 Stat. 33	9 (b)	X	X
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1935	Apr. 8, 1935	49 Stat. 117	3	X	X
Protection of land resources against soil erosion	Apr. 27, 1935	49 Stat. 164	4 (2)	[3] X	[3] X
National Labor Relations Act	July 5, 1935	49 Stat. 451	4	[4] X	
Central Statistical Board	July 25, 1935	49 Stat. 499	4	[5] X	[5] X
Social Security Act	Aug. 14, 1935	49 Stat. 636	703	[6] X	[6] X
Potato Control Act of 1935	Aug. 24, 1935	49 Stat. 790	218	X	X
Public Utility Act, 1935	Aug. 26, 1935	49 Stat. 837	31	[7] X	[7] X
Federal Power Act, 1935	do	49 Stat. 859	310	[8] X	[9] X
Railroad Retirement Act, 1935	Aug. 29, 1935	49 Stat. 972	8 (c)	X	X
Federal Alcohol Administration Act	do	49 Stat. 977	2 (c)	X	X
Rural Electrification Act, 1936	May 20, 1936	49 Stat. 1366	11	[9] X	
Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection	May 27, 1936	49 Stat. 1384	5 (a)	[10] X	
Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission	June 3, 1936	49 Stat. 1399	2 (c)	X	X
For loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during 1937	Jan. 29, 1937	50 Stat. 6	5 (a)	X	X
Providing for the construction and maintenance of a national art gallery	Mar. 24, 1937	50 Stat. 52–53	4 (c)	[11] X	[11] X
Bituminous Coal Act of 1937	Apr. 26, 1937	50 Stat. 73	2 (a)	[12] X	[12] X
Office of Consumers Counsel		50 Stat. 74	2 (b) (3)	[12] X	[12] X
To establish a civilian conservation corps	June 28, 1937	50 Stat. 320	5	X	
Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act	July 22, 1937	50 Stat. 528	41 (a)	X	
To authorize completion, maintenance, and operation of Bonneville project	Aug. 20, 1937	50 Stat. 736	10	[9] X	[9] X
To create a commission and extend further relief to water uses on reclamation and Indian irrigation projects	Aug. 21, 1937	50 Stat. 738	2	X	X
To provide for taking census of partial employment, etc	Aug. 30, 1937	50 Stat. 883	2		[14] X
Federal Crop Insurance Act	Feb. 16, 1938	52 Stat. 73	507 (a)	X	X
To authorize completion, maintenance and operation of Fort Peck project for navigation	May 18, 1938	52 Stat. 406	9	[9] X	[9] X
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1941	June 26, 1940	54 Stat. 622	21 (b)	X	X
Selective Training and Service Act, 1940	Sept. 16, 1940	54 Stat. 894	10 (a) (3)	[15] X	[15] X
Making an appropriation to the United States Maritime Commission for emergency cargo ship construction	Feb. 6, 1941	55 Stat. 6	1	[16] X	[16] X
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1942	July 1, 1941	55 Stat. 404	16 (b)	X	X
National Youth Administration Appropriation Act, 1942	do	55 Stat. 490	Par. 16	X	X
National Archives Trust Fund Board Act	July 9, 1941	55 Stat. 582	8 (b)	X	
To provide for the planting of guayule and other rubber bearing plants and to make available a source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses	Mar. 5, 1942	56 Stat. 127	2 (a)	X	X
To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat packing establishments engaged in intra-state commerce only in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies	June 10, 1942	56 Stat. 351	2 (c)	X	X
National Youth Administration Appropriation Act, 1943	July 2, 1942	56 Stat. 573	Par. 15	X	X
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1943	do	56 Stat. 642	15 (b)	X	X
Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942	Dec. 18, 1942	56 Stat. 1058	2 (b)	X	X
Surplus Property Act of 1944	Oct. 3, 1944	58 Stat. 768	5 (a)	[17] X	[17] X
To amend Bonneville Project Act	Oct. 23, 1945	59 Stat. 546	5	[18 20 21] X	[20 21] X
To establish Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration	Jan. 3, 1946	59 Stat. 679	14 (a), 14 (b)	[22] X	[22] X
Atomic Energy Act, 1946	Aug. 1, 1946	60 Stat. 771	12 (d)	[23] X	[23] X
Veterans Canteen Service	Aug. 7, 1946	60 Stat. 888	2 (e)	[24] X	[24] X
To establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System, etc	Mar. 31, 1947	61 Stat. 32	6 (a) (4)		X
To exclude interns, student nurses, and other student employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation of benefits of Federal employees	Aug. 4, 1947	61 Stat. 727	1, 2		X
Economic Cooperation Act of 1948	Apr. 3, 1948	62 Stat. 130	104 (e)		[18] X
To provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau	June 2, 1948	62 Stat. 286	3	[25] X	[25] X
To authorize establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans Administration	June 19, 1948	62 Stat. 536		X	X
To provide for Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	Apr. 14, 1949	63 Stat. 46	2 (f)	X	X
Classification Act of 1949	Oct. 28, 1949	63 Stat. 954, 957	202, 204, 205		X
Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act	May 3, 1950	64 Stat. 100	4 (a)	X	X
Federal Records Act of 1950	Sept. 5, 1950	64 Stat. 584	503 (c)		[27] X
Renegotiation Act, 1951	Mar. 22, 1951	65 Stat. 20	107 (c)	X	
To confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission	June 19, 1952	66 Stat. 139	1	X	X
Communications Act Amendments, 1952	July 16, 1952	66 Stat. 711	3 (g)	[28] X	

[1] Exemption applies to certain officers, attorneys, and other experts.
[2] Exemption applies to a secretary, a director for each division, a chief engineer, and not more than 3 assistants, a general counsel and not more than 3 assistants, and temporary counsel for performances of special services.
[3] Exemption applies for not more than 8 months after passage of act; thereafter employees are to be appointed in accordance with civil-service and classification laws.
[4] Exemption applies to an executive secretary, attorneys, examiners, and regional directors.
[5] Exemption applies to persons appointed for temporary periods, not exceeding 12 months.
[6] Exemption applies to attorneys and experts.
[7] Exemption applies to attorneys, examiners, and other experts.
[8] Exemption applies to certain officers, attorneys, examiners, and experts.
[9] Exemption applies to attorneys, engineers, and experts.
[10] Exemption applies to technical staff.
[11] Exemption applies to Director, Assistant Director, Secretary, and Chief Curator.
[12] Exemption applies to the secretary, a clerk to each Commissioner, the attorneys, the managers and employees of the statistical bureaus, and such special agents, technical experts and examiners as the Commission may require.
[13] Exemption applies to clerk to the Counsel, the attorneys and such special agents and experts as the Council requires.
[14] Exemption applies to temporary personnel.
[15] Exemption applies to clerical and stenographic employees for local boards.
[16] Exemption applies to personnel engaged in the maintenance, repair, operation, or management of plants or facilities.
[17] Exemption applies to special assistants, certified public accountants, qualified cost accountants, industrial engineers, appraisers, and other experts.
[18] Exemption applies to Assistant Administrator, Chief Engineer, and General Counsel.
[19] Exemption applies to laborers, mechanics, and workmen on construction work.
[20] Exemption applies to physicians to examine the laborers, mechanics, and workmen.
[21] Exemption applies to experts.
[22] Exemption applies generally to medical specialists; however, some of the personnel are subject to the civil-service and classification laws.
[23] The law provides that officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with civil-service and classification laws "except to the extent the Commission deems such action necessary to the discharge of its responsibilities, personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws."
[24] Exemption applies to personnel necessary for the transaction of business at canteens, warehouses, and storage depots.
[25] Exemption applies to not more than 100 employees.
[26] Exemption applies to employees for meteorological investigations in the Arctic.
[27] Exemption applies to National Historical Publications Commission.
[28] Exemption applies to a legal assistant, and engineering assistant and a secretary for each Commissioner and an administrative assistant for the chairman.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table designated "Table III," showing incumbents granted civil-service status noncompetitively under various pieces of legislation, Executive orders, and civil service rules and regulations.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE III.—*Incumbents granted civil-service status noncompetitively under various pieces of legislation, Executive orders, and the civil-service rules and regulations between Mar. 4, 1933, and June 30, 1952, by authority and agency*

BY LEGISLATION

	Number
Act of Congress, Apr. 27, 1935 (Public 46): Soil Conservation Service	10,328
Act of Congress, June 29, 1936 (Public Law 835): U. S. Maritime Commission	894
Act of Congress, May 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 421): The National Archives	293
Act of Congress, June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1076): Post Office Department (postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class offices)	10,271
Act of Congress, July 2, 1940 (Public Law 719, 76th Cong.): District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board	118
Act of Congress, Nov. 26, 1940 (Public Law 880, 76th Cong.): Ramspeck Act	81,618
Act of Congress, Dec. 20, 1941 (Public 363, 77th Cong.): District of Columbia Board of Public Welfare	966
Total, by legislation	104,488

BY EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Executive Order 5817, Mar. 10, 1932: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce	192
Executive Order 5859, June 21, 1932: Treasury	191
Executive Order 6134, May 18, 1933: Farm Credit Administration	965
Executive Order 6758, June 29, 1934: Farm Credit Administration	1,660
Executive Order 7195, Sept. 26, 1935 (as amended by Executive Order 7223, Nov. 9, 1935): Civilian Conservation Corps	809
Executive Order 7458, Sept. 26, 1936: Rural Electrification Administration	288
Executive Order 7732, Oct. 27, 1937: U. S. Housing Authority	388
Executive Order 7852, Mar. 29, 1938: Lighthouse Service	194
Executive Order 7916, June 24, 1938	17,726
Executive Order 8383, Mar. 28, 1940: Interior (Office of Indian Affairs)	456
Executive Order 8699, Mar. 1, 1941: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	475
Executive Order 8811, June 30, 1941: Office of Government Reports (Executive Office of President)	297
Executive Order 8886, Sept. 8, 1941: Coast Guard	181
Executive Order 8939, Nov. 13, 1941: Farm Security Administration	1,104
Executive Order 8952, Nov. 27, 1941	1,282
Executive Order 9807, Nov. 29, 1946	354
Executive Order 10080, Sept. 30, 1949	4,248
Executive Order 10157, Aug. 28, 1950	16,520
Total, by Executive order	47,330

BY OPERATION OF CIVIL-SERVICE RULES AND REGULATIONS (CIVIL SERVICE RULES ARE PROMULGATED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER)

Rule II, sec. 9 (formerly rule X, secs. 11 and 13):	87
Classified status given to citizens of the United States who had rendered faithful service overseas for not less than 7 years in a civil capacity. This regulation was revoked effective May 1, 1947.	
Rule III, sec. 3.101 of the regulations (formerly rule II, sec. 6)	35,324
Incumbents of positions brought into the competitive service.	
The largest groups included in this total are: 7,286 clerks in third-class post offices and special delivery messengers in first-class post offices; and 7,191 employees of Farmers Home Administration processed under this regulation as a result of the act of Congress, Aug. 14, 1946 (Public Law 731, 79th Cong.).	
Rule III, sec. 3.101 (a) (2) of the regulations (formerly rule II, sec. 7)	6,183
Post Office Service: Employees in offices advanced from the fourth class to a higher class, or in a post office consolidated with one in which the employees are classified as competitive.	
This regulation has been suspended effective Dec. 1, 1950.	
Rule III, sec. 3.104 of the regulations (formerly rule X, sec. 4)	47
Employees who have served at least 2 years in the immediate office of the President or on the White House staff and whose transfer to a competitive position is requested by any agency.	
Rule III, sec. 3.2 (formerly rule II, sec. 8)	115
Appointments in the competitive service without competitive examinations whenever the Commission finds that the duties or compensation of the position are such, or that qualified persons are so rare, that, in the interest of good Civil Service Administration, the position cannot be filled through open competitive examination.	
Total, by operation of rules and regulations	47,756
Grand total	193,574

RECESS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, in executive session.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 26, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25 (legislative day of January 22), 1954:

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Kester Lovejoy Hastings, O12219, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as the Quartermaster General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title IV, Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.):

TO BE MAJOR

John H. Swenson, O21143.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 625, 80th Congress, subject to physical qualification:

TO BE MAJOR

Roy A. Highsmith, MC, O527826.
Clement T. Ziegler, MC, O471920.

TO BE CAPTAIN

Elbert B. Fountain, MC, O1918682.
Donald W. Hawe, MC, O469066.
Richard B. Krakaur, MC, O991374.
John G. Lovrien, JAGC, O1055655.
Major W. Rhodes, Jr., MC, O1920036.
Philip H. Welch, MC, O964352.
Charles H. Wells, MC, O977050.
John W. Whitten, MC, O1775768.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Dale R. Booth, JAGC, O949876.
Leland R. Branting, JAGC, O957562.
Claude M. Cupp, MC, O971542.
Mary L. Donovan, ANC, N761997.
William S. Fulton, Jr., JAGC, O2263344.
Jack W. Halstead, DC, O1746761.
William J. Jaffurs, MC, O1928298.
Louise A. Lindegger, ANC, N792201.
Robert J. Millard, DC, O992635.
Dorothy J. Rocovich, ANC, N792865.
John F. Schmitz, DC, O1921371.
Donald E. Schwartz, DC, O959927.
James E. Simon, JAGC, O962288.
Joseph N. Tenhet, Jr., JAGC, O1061564.
Barbara J. Twohey, ANC, N804134.
Marjorie L. Varner, ANC, N792847.
Wade H. Williamson, JAGC, O984541.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Clarke M. Brandt, MSC, O1880870.
Dorothy M. DeLozier, WAC, L1020625.
Sarah J. Dempster, WMSC, M2915.
Dixie L. Gilbert, ANC, N901428.
Ruth M. Ibbs, ANC, N792782.
Barbara E. Lane, ANC, N900354.
Phyllis M. Loucks, ANC, N805110.
Betty L. Simpson, ANC, N804604.
Alice C. Thome, WAC, L1010649.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Thomas N. Britton, Jr., O2204994.
Evan R. Davison, O958328.
Lee R. Roper, O971584.
George P. Shedd, O948865.
Fred D. Smith, O2207084.
Joseph S. Sulenski, O1340950.
Phillip E. Teague, O955863.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Victor L. Allebach, O1935761.
Benjamin H. Anderson, Jr., O1889132.

Sherwin Arculis, O2003404.
Robert M. Bayless, O2211092.
John R. Beers, O4016930.
William C. Benson, O1873727.
Donald L. Biottle, O1937478.
Harold R. Brewster, O1880572.
Grail L. Brookshire, O4011957.
Paul S. Carpinteri, O2200598.
John H. Casey, O2201736.
John P. Casey, Jr., O1925888.
Edwin F. Cavaleri, Jr., O2003167.
William C. Chamberlain, O1931363.
John O. Childs, O1940339.
Glen Clemens, O1918421.
Walter E. Coleman, O2017962.
Nelson P. Conover, O4012402.
John S. Cross, O1885907.
Donald O. Crutchley, O989527.
Frank M. S. Dean, O4013279.
James W. Debo, O1925297.
Walter M. Denton, O4001780.
Thomas E. deShazo, Jr., O2021527.
Ernest J. Dufresne, Jr., O1873785.
James R. Etheridge, O4013072.
Donald D. Fiser, O1874624.
William D. Fletcher, O4002179.
James D. Franklin, O4013208.
Robert G. Friar, O2205642.
Merle W. Fuller, O4003538.
James M. Gabel, O4001430.
John N. Gallaspy, O1879397.
Wright D. Gifford, Jr., O2201720.
Donald I. Goecker, O1872777.
William R. Graham, O996944.
Robert L. Harbuck, O1890245.
Arthur N. Hartman, O968992.
William Q. Harty, O2201538.
Lynn C. Hervey, O2207763.
Russell J. Hopley, Jr., O4016108.
Eli P. Howard, Jr., O2203327.
James G. Humphrys, O2204614.
William M. Ingram, O2003237.
Theodore G. Jenes, Jr., O1936234.
Robert H. Johnson, O4016499.
Joseph L. Kennedy, O2203804.
William W. King, O4023367.
Ernest Kitchens, Jr., O2004400.
John G. Kloke, O1936853.
Robert J. Kuhn, O4005000.
William J. Lawrence, O4019202.
Alfred S. LeBlanc, O1920293.
Howard G. Ling, O1861760.
William H. Mantooth, O2205500.
Floyd M. Maples, O2205906.
Nathan H. Marcus, O1873685.
Willie H. McBee, O4013278.
Sherwood W. McClaren, III, O1939504.
Harold J. McCormack, O1933457.
Robert F. McGuffin, O1888612.
Thomas S. McLean, O3028610.
James H. McMurray, Jr., O1887813.
Edward S. McNulty, O2041811.
Wilbur A. Middleton, O1935976.
Thomas A. Miller, Jr., O4002483.
Alphonso Mitchell, O4002008.
Dan J. Mizell, O4023381.
Robert S. Montgomery, III, O1939819.
Ernest W. Moore, O2028345.
Richard H. Nims, O1885933.
Dennis L. Norell, O2209803.
James R. Oakes, O4011973.
Robert E. Owen, O1701181.
Peter T. Owre, O1925551.
William E. Panton, O1935384.
Wilbur A. Pawson, O2042120.
Forest E. Pierce, O1861860.
Tommie D. Porter, O1914666.
Willard L. Portteus, Jr., O4001700.
Robert W. Price, O1885761.
Edwards M. Quigley, Jr., O1876882.
David M. Rainey, O4002574.
Drew F. Reddish, O4013215.
Robert M. Reuter, O1924832.
Walter G. Riley, Jr., O4011977.
James H. Ritz, Jr., O4001464.
James W. Rowe, O1914745.
John O. Roy, O4001771.
Ciedie B. Russell, O1880040.
James G. Schoebel, O1932366.
Neil W. Schrack, O1890065.
Frank T. Scott, O1939472.
James H. Shaha, O2210559.
Henry R. Shelton, O1873402.
Frank Smith, O1940451.
Noel M. Smith, O1914947.
Charles V. Sorrels, O1940197.
Benjamin G. Spivey, O2205290.
Stephan N. Strauss, O1935817.
Baxter R. Stretcher, O4012123.
Wellington J. Strickfaden, O1936941.
Wallace Tervin, O1935407.
James M. Turner, Jr., O1879403.
Jeremiah T. Walsh, O1886567.
Allen H. Watts, Jr., O4023686.
Howard M. Williams, O4013280.
John H. Williams, O1881015.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provision of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and also subject to physical qualification:

Warren H. Anderson, O1891236.
Francis X. Blouin, O4014642.
Joseph U. Catudal, O1929812.
Ray H. Crown, O1879405.
Prescott Eaton, O4019545.
Jackson L. Flake, Jr., O4012756.
Osvaldo L. Gil, O4018848.
Robert E. Gunnett, O4016970.
Oscar S. Jacquez, O1940174.
Robert L. Kinney, O1940477.
Lary P. O. Lawson, O4003498.
Francis X. Mahoney, O4014671.
Richard J. McCarthy, O1880863.
Gordon E. Moore, O1930809.
Tommy E. Price, O1887033.
Maxwell R. Thurman, O4012601.
Roy J. Young, O1939997.

(NOTE.—These persons were given recess appointment on either September 11, 1953, October 27, 1953, or December 9, 1953.)

The following named persons for appointment as chaplains of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

TO BE CAPTAIN

Joseph R. Andrews, O552887.
David H. Sperring, O933149.
Leonard F. Stegman, O955449.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Charles A. Meek, O990453.
Edward L. Spence, O483254.
John J. Sullivan, O959753.

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, subject to physical qualification:

TO BE CAPTAIN

Robert M. Hall, MC, O975818.
Sam A. Nixon, Jr., MC, O992758.
Glenn A. Washburn, VC, O1744984.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

James E. Anderson, MSC, O962083.
Olga M. Beamon, ANC, N804805.
Joseph E. Beavers, MSC, O554228.
Milton A. Beerwinkle, VC, O991854.
Thomas M. Bethea, MSC, O1825234.
Lyman Blakesley, MSC, O2049948.
Richard R. Buckius, MSC, O2013953.
Robert M. Bynum, III, MSC, O961538.
Hugh J. Clausen, JAGC, O987467.
David S. Cooper, MC, O2042049.
Irven R. Cooper, Jr., VC, O1735062.
Mabel H. Corbin, ANC, N792644.
Malcolm L. Coy, MSC, O959645.
John C. Crimen, MSC, O1544372.
Samuel L. Crook, Sr., MSC, O1701678.
Robert E. Davis, MSC, O986896.
William V. Davis, MSC, O1542954.
Edward J. Egoscue, MSC, O954255.
Charles L. Eveland, MSC, O1340646.
Berniece I. Fairaizl, ANC, N792363.
Dan S. Ferguson, DC, O1878282.
James S. Fields, MSC, O971738.
Alice N. Flagg, ANC, N805231.
Duane P. Ford, VC, O990876.
Matthew Ginalick, MSC, O1544339.
Raymond E. Graham, MSC, O1280120.
James F. Grasiano, MSC, O960745.
Thomas M. Grzesiow, MSC, O2262413.
Charles M. Hare, DC, O1756709.
Thomas J. Hartford, Jr., MSC, O989783.
James A. Hemphill, MSC, O2206028.
Edward P. Holman, MSC, O1650143.
Edward L. Hopper, JAGC, O2005634.
Lewis H. Huggins, MSC, O2050519.
Clarence M. Hurtt, MSC, O2202026.
Alfred E. Lewis, MSC, O545422.
Milton A. Lewis, MSC, O1535019.
Bryan T. Lowe, MSC, O963523.
Paul S. Marshall, MSC, O1342340.
Thomas G. Murnane, Jr., VC, O980934.
James J. Norton, MSC, O1997453.
Erroll W. Pace, Jr., MSC, O2051691.
Roger F. Pratt, MSC, O1542603.
William J. Prescott, MSC, O2047787.
Kathleen E. Quigley, ANC, N804332.
Wallace D. Riley, JAGC, O2264637.
Theodore R. Sankey, MSC, O986410.
Wayne L. Simpson, MSC, O2047829.
John S. Snyder, MSC, O2049109.
Ralph A. Spencer, MSC, O1690874.
Harold Stone, MSC, O994520.
David H. Sudderth, Jr., MSC, O1327679.
Alvin A. Therrien, MSC, O1016722.
Samuel J. Turnbull, Jr., MSC, O2051728.
Bryce C. Walton, MSC, O963234.
William M. Wegner, MSC, O1544749.
George C. Welton, MSC, O1176843.
Kenneth K. Wheatley, MSC, O975384.
Raymond H. White, MSC, O2002153.
Clarence H. Wilkinson, MSC, O2037936.
John J. Wilson, MSC, O966631.
James J. Young, MSC, O1342355.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Joseph K. Allen, MSC, O995381.
Charles Anistranski, MSC, O1917653.
Irving H. Babde, Jr., MSC, O2097029.
William W. Barnes, MSC, O994283.
Theodore C. Beckett, MSC, O998013.
George P. Becknell, Jr., MSC, O2102868.
James C. Burke, MSC, O2264526.
John T. Caskey, Jr., MSC, O948658.
Kathleen L. Charles, ANC, N805547.
Leaton C. Cofield, MSC, O995807.
Helen E. Cruickshank, WMSC, M2927.
Gordon Field, MSC, O533316.
Ellis F. Hall, Jr., MSC, O997923.
Stanley R. Haskins, MSC, O1862000.
Arnold C. Henderson, MSC, O2050253.
Frank K. James, Jr., MSC, O998437.
Aaron B. Johnson, MSC, O2102829.
Charles L. Kelly, MSC, O998320.
Cowan J. McFarland, MSC, O991260.
Robert W. Moody, MSC, O2042065.
Lynn B. Moore, MSC, O1920190.
Harold D. Newson, MSC, O1337076.
Merrill C. Peterson, MSC, O980530.
Roy C. Prince, MSC, O998035.
John E. Rogers, Jr., MSC, O987303.
Aaron Ryan, MSC, O1924770.
George M. Shea, MSC, O1874699.
Dana S. Slack, MSC, O2263450.
Seth W. Spellman, Jr., MSC, O1335703.
Lloyd E. Spencer, MSC, O988141.
Samuel J. Summers III, MSC, O2048704.
Joseph M. Tuggle, Jr., MSC, O1919034.
Peter C. Welsh, MSC, O1876941.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Frederick T. Abt, O2210069.
William A. Ahrberg, O957810.
Julio C. Bae-Murphy, O1340429.
James R. Bailey, O2007173.

Daniel L. Baldwin, O957813.
Ronald R. Baskin, O1342361.
John E. Bell, O2204956.
Myron H. Bengson, O972291.
Tom L. Bing, O973365.
Charles E. Boyle, Jr., O1337269.
Charles W. Bradshaw, O963981.
Wesley D. Bruce, Jr., O2204152.
Walter C. Butler, Jr., O973116
John H. Cain, O2021009.
Robert E. Carignan, O2033813.
Maurice J. Castille, O1913328.
Maury F. Cochran, Jr., O963361.
William R. Cordova, O934751.
Verne P. Craig, O966703.
Ted A. Crozier, O1341324.
John W. Currier, O1913287.
Allen R. Denison, O2033683.
Thomas R. Dent, O1560115.
Rex T. Dittamore, O2014476.
Joseph E. Donahue, Jr., O2201106.
Charles M. East, Jr., O1340167.
Edward A. Ford, O958270.
Wallace M. Gallant, O983996.
Thomas A. Ghormley, O2033785.
Charles E. Green, O1340181.
James C. Griffith, O2207065.
Angelo Grills, O1330919.
Norman W. Hammes, O2206388.
John L. Hastie, O2210631.
Solomon L. Hay, Jr., O966210.
Robert F. Haynes, O2033737.
Michael D. Healy, O1341425.
Hubert H. Henderson, Jr., O955563.
Kenneth L. Henderson, Jr., O2048950.
Harry V. Herlinger, Jr., O956261.
Robert H. Hill, O1054625.
John M. House, III, O2021099.
Harvey W. Huntzinger, O1120685.
Douglas P. Hyatt, O1688486.
Carlton L. Jones, O965258.
Clinton K. Jones, O2014518.
Philip D. Jones, O1342188.
Francis M. Jurgens, O1118748.
Phillip Kaplan, O1913244.
Arthur L. Knipp, Jr., O980534.
Daniel W. Knopp, O1688807.
Donald E. Kooker, Jr., O1341797.
Raymond H. M. Larsen, O2211211.
Pat J. Lindsay, O990952.
Robert A. Little, O1019042.
Owen E. Litz, O1559590.
Gerald A. Ludick, O974611.
Francis W. MacNeill, O1341986.
Harold V. Madden, O2208865.
Edward L. Magill, O2204044.
Wayne C. Mathews, O2210267.
Jack L. McClaran, O1334482.
Earl C. McCrary, O2014812.
Orvil C. Metheny, O971156.
William B. Middlemas, O2204835.
Milton J. Morgan, O983693.
Clifford O. Morrie, O955187.
John J. Morrissey, O2014507.
Edward G. Mundy, O2200164.
James M. Myers, O1340209.
Milford L. Nealis, O1340486.
Kermit A. Nelson, O974179.
Henry C. Norcom, O957915.
Charles R. Norris, O2018559.
Frank D. Oblinger, Jr., O970306.
Norman L. Overton, O767345.
Martin L. Padalino, O2200517.
Harry E. Padley, Jr., O1340685.
James M. Page, Jr., O2014492.
Willard H. Page, O2018744.
Burns I. Perfect, O1686758.
James H. Phillips, O2206305.
William R. Ponder, O2205644.
Richard R. Reardon, O957756.
Glenn H. Record, O1686800.
Raphael A. Reiner, O1688541.
Charles E. Rich, O1540943.
Richard C. Rogers, O2033808.
Donald C. Shuffstall, O2021090.
William T. Singleton, O1340817.
Earl C. Sturm, O557144.
James L. Sutton, O2206602.
Ernest P. Terrell, Jr., O1688591.
Raphael D. Tice, O1341599.
Paul M. Timmerberg, O1688525.
Edward B. Turner, Jr., O969760.
Jean L. Turner, O1339667.
John T. Turner, O948750.
John E. Tyler, O1341727.
William C. Tyrrell, O770016.
Lawrence Valla, O970597.
William G. Walby, O2020492.
John J. Walsh, Jr., O1341732.
James M. Whelan, O975133.
Joseph R. Wisnack, O1903868.
William M. Wright, O2014730.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Benjamin B. Albert, Jr., O1917594.
William L. Albright, O1874584.
Herbert L. Aycock, O2096880.
Stephen W. Bachinski, O1924721.
George F. Backhurst, O1924953.
Harry R. Bailey, O1873250.
Wallace I. Baker, O2030413.
Bob C. Bannister, O1924665.
Ferninand O. Barger, Jr., O2028661.
Sampson H. Bass, Jr., O1873146.
Risden T. Bennett, Jr., O969357.
George L. Bernard, O995486.
Henry H. Bettis, Jr., O2207964.
Normand J. Biglione, O1332571.
James F. Blake, O2028544.
Donald E. Boyd, O2028547.
Edward M. Bradford, O995984.
James L. Brennand, O1939606.
John A. Broderick, O2103725.
Wyndell E. Brogden, O1914524.
Russell L. Brons, O2102530.
John C. Brown, O1924829.
Joseph J. Callahan, O1876540.
William G. Carter, O1878814.
Alfred N. Champion, O2204529.
James N. Chapman, O2200353.
William E. Coleman, O1692420.
James J. Corliss, O994882.
Manley H. Cosper, Jr., O1918916.
Kenneth D. Cowan, O1873961.
Alden L. Cox, O997183.
Eldon L. Cummings, O1924879.
Frank L. Deichmeister, O973435.
Dalston K. Dennis, O2262908.
German D. Donahoe, O953915.
John R. Elliott, O989909.
John M. Fairey, O1873918.
Kermit C. Garner, O1873736.
Frank L. Garrison, O988761.
Raymond L. George, O1861912.
Albert W. Gieseman, O974343.
Darrell L. Gooler, O1920113.
Albert J. Grazioli, O974864.
William A. Green, O2028584.
Philip D. Grimm, O2208255.
Charles E. Hall, O966224.
Donald M. Hamilton, O1876584.
George C. Harrington, O1915444.
Elwood J. Hein, O2209383.
James B. Hemmer, O2102494.
Benjamin F. Hildebrand, O2211592.
Donald F. Hockett, O974702.
Robert A. Holloman III, O2028624.
William B. Holwick, O986172.
John D. Horner, O2063422.
Samuel J. Huffman III, O1873896.
Harvey B. Johns, Jr., O2207741.
Marcus C. Jordan, O1651934.
Noel D. Knotts, O1924793.
Richard S. Krafski, O2004229.
Bert B. Locke, O997958.
John J. Luxemburger, Jr., O991747.
John A. Lynch, III, O1913183.
Richard C. Maiorino, O2004234.
James H. Mapp, O2021287.
Norman R. Maxfield, O2201334.
Guy H. McCarey, Jr., O948061.
Troy E. McGowan, O2211518.
Donald R. McMurry, O2104113.
John J. McNamara, O962012.
Ward W. Miller, O996918.
George J. Mulcahy, O1876779.
Thomas E. Mullins, O4016848.
Angus M. Mundy, O2209755.
James F. Murphy, O2028421.
Lynn O. Murray, O986409.
Robert L. Newburg, O964966.
Robert D. Newton, O2028348.
Thomas E. Nichols, Jr., O2003257.
Ronald P. Ochis, O2028422.
Billie L. Oliver, O2041169.
Bruce E. Patterson, O1924740.
James W. Patterson, O2008259.
Paul F. Pearson, O2206941.
Philip S. Pugh, III, O1924542.
Willie Pundt, O1062047.
Gerald W. Purvis, O1873699.
Richard Pyle, O1872586.
Robert L. Quinnett, O1914550.
Leon E. Rademacher, O1924090.
Willard A. Ramirez, O2004278.
Raymond Reason, Jr., O1874194.
Richard D. Reish, O1919387.
William T. Rife, Jr., O1341120.
Stanley Rodwin, O2203787.
Warren F. Schilling, O2015795.
Donald B. Schroeder, O2103380.
Wade L. Shankle, Jr., O1924921.
Edward L. Shirley, O1924111.
James R. Smith, O2028458.
Frank J. Socky, O1917672.
Robert D. Stevenson, O2028451.
Wilmer D. Stewart, O1339577.
Harry L. Sutton, Jr., O2205876.
William W. Taylor, Jr., O1917550.
Robert Tecco, O1924784.
Robert F. Thomas, O2205374.
Thomas E. Thompson, O970503.
William W. Tombaugh, O1882252.
Horace W. Tousley, Jr., O2104134.
Lowell D. Twitchell, O1918400.
William L. Van Horn, O1913478.
Ernest A. Van Netta, O2204458.
Edward J. Vaughn, O2028643.
Edward B. Vogel, O1924621.
Bruce W. Wallace, O982794.
Gene A. Weaver, O1876674.
Jack C. Webb, O1874038.
James S. Welch, O947499.
Harold H. Whisler, O991718.
James F. Whitmore, O1872447.
Charles G. Willard, O993559.
Fred D. Williams, O1924847.
John E. Windish, O1340146.
Arthur C. Winn, O2203939.
Ralph T. Woodrow, O972062.
William D. Wooldridge, O1920201.
Angus E. Wootten, O1876282.
William G. Wright, Jr., O2003011.
William C. Zabhosky, O2103980.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified:

TO BE CAPTAIN

Harvey S. Boyd, O27504.
Rodney J. Collins, O55519.
Gabriel A. Ivan, O25865.
Richard I. Kothrade, O27190.
Philip B. Polak, O27193.
Karl E. Wolf, O26202.

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Richard L. Conolly, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral.

Adm. Joseph J. Clark, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Alfred M. Pride, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as to fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Arthur C. Davis, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Director, Office of Foreign Military Affairs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Rear Adm. John R. Perry, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

Rear Adm. Frederick R. Furth, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

Lt. Gen. William O. Brice, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant general while serving as Assistant Commandant (Air) of

the Marine Corps, Director of Aviation, Headquarters Marine Corps, and Assistant Chief of Naval Operations (Marine Aviation).

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Walter W. Wensinger

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Robert O. Bare
Raymond A. Anderson
Samuel K. Bird

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Randolph McC. Pate	Merrill B. Twining
Clayton C. Jerome	James P. Riseley
John C. McQueen	Albert D. Cooley
George F. Good, Jr.	Lewis B. Puller

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert O. Bare

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Alexander W. Kreiser, Jr.	Thomas G. McFarland
	Samuel S. Jack
Ion M. Bethel	Henry R. Paige
Nels H. Nelson	Joseph W. Earnshaw
David M. Shoup	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Marion L. Dawson	Alan Shapley
Francis M. McAlister	David F. O'Neill

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel:

Jens C. Aggerbeck, Jr.	Alton D. Gould
John A. Saxten	Hugh M. Elwood
Carl J. Fleps	Daniel C. Pollock
Walter F. Layer	Monfurd K. Peyton
Carlo A. Rovetta	Ralph A. Collins, Jr.
George R. Newton	Edward N. Rydalch
Alfred L. Booth	Raymond G. Davis
Richard D. Weber	Ransom M. Wood
Charles M. Dehority	Walter S. Osipoff
Howard B. Benge	Jess P. Ferrill, Jr.
Hamilton M. Hoyler	Guy H. Kissinger, Jr.
Richard B. Church	Edward H. Hurst
Nathan T. Post, Jr.	Donn J. Robertson

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Margaret M. Henderson
Elsie E. Hill

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Ben A. Day
Mary J. Hale

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Nita B. Warner
Jeanette I. Sustad

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

"C" "P" Clark, Jr.	Donald C. Stanton
Ralph W. Tufts	Joseph L. Sadowski
George B. Addison, Jr.	Winston F. Fontaine
	Charles F. Whitehead
Robert E. Gruenler	

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant for limited duty:

Robert J. Anthony

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary promotion in the Navy:

LINE

Charles A. Buchanan	Elton W. Grenfell
Ralph S. Clarke	Fitzhugh Lee
William G. Cooper	William Miller
Kenneth Craig	Francis D. McCorkle
Robert E. Cronin	Frank O'Beirne
Paul L. Dudley	Schuyler N. Pyne
Clifford H. Duerfeldt	William R. Smedberg III
Laurence H. Frost	
Frederick R. Furth	Paul D. Stroop
Roy A. Gano	Robert L. Swart

MEDICAL CORPS

Walter F. James

SUPPLY CORPS

Joel D. Parks
James B. Ricketts
Lloyd H. Thomas

For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve:

SUPPLY CORPS

Clarence G. Warfield

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary promotion in the Navy:

LINE

Abhau, William C.	Jackson, William G., Jr.
Antonides, Joseph W.	Kail, Robert B.
Bakutis, Fred E.	Karaberis, Constantine A.
Baranowski, John J.	Kauffman, Draper L.
Barleon, John S., Jr.	Kear, Carleton R., Jr.
Barnes, William R.	Keats, Edgar S.
Baskett, Thomas S.	Kilmartin, Alfred D.
Becker, Charles H.	Kirkpatrick, Raleigh C., Jr.
Bennett, Bradley F.	Klein, Irving N.
Bettens, Warren J.	Klinker, Roy C.
Booth, Blake B.	Lee, John M.
Brandt, John H.	Libby, Rawdon
Briggs, Chester A.	Lindsay, Harry M., Jr.
Burdick, Robert S.	Lowther, Robert D.
Carnes, James R.	Lynch, Richard B.
Carpenter, Stephen W.	Mabley, Louis C.
Cassidy, William F.	Mandelkorn, Robert S.
Castro, Luis V.	Maples, Hugh M.
Clark, Charles H.	Maurer, John H.
Clay, Donald N.	McCallum, James L. P.
Cole, Cyrus C.	McClintock, David H.
Conkey, George L.	McCormick, John W.
DeLong, Henry C.	McElroy, Rhodam Y., Jr.
Dodge, Sherwood H.	McGrath, Thomas D.
Doll, Raymond E.	McQuilkin, John H.
Dornin, Robert E.	Merrick, Gorman C.
Fee, John J.	Metcalf, Ralph M.
Fluckey, Eugene B.	Middleton, John R., Jr.
Foote, John J.	Milner, Robert M.
Foster, Clifford S., Jr.	Moore, Walter A., Jr.
Freeman, Mason B.	Moynahan, James T.
Freeman, Ross E.	Murphy, Charles H. S.
Gage, Norman D.	Murphy, Owen B.
Gay, Jesse B., Jr.	Murphy, William C.
Gayler, Noel A. M.	Musick, Kenneth P.
Gerwick, John D.	Nash, David
Griffin, Gordon A.	Neyman, Clinton A., Jr.
Hack, John A.	Nielsen, Homer H.
Harlfinger, Frederick J., II	North, James R.
Harris, Harold J.	Ogden, Herbert L.
Hauck, Philip F.	Osborn, Edgar G.
Hearn, Wilfred A.	Owen, John
Heath, John A.	Paddock, Alton E.
Henry, Thomas H.	Parker, Jefferson D.
Hess, Franklin G.	Petrovic, William F.
Higginbotham, Grover S.	Phillips, Fred N.
Houston, Robert C.	Purdy, Arthur M.
Howard, Ezra G.	Ramirez de Arellano, Marion F.
Hunt, William A., Jr.	Raser, George B., III
Hutchinson, George	Reeves, Malcolm C.
	Reich, Eli T.
	Rhymes, Cassius D., Jr.
	Richardson, Norval R.
	Riera, Robert E.
	Rooney, Carl W.
	Ross, Bruce P.
	Ruehlow, Stanley E.
	Sanger, Kenneth J.
	Sarver, Ben W.
	Schmidling, Matthew S.
	Schock, Lewis L., Jr.
	Schoenweiss, Carl W.
	Scott, James, II
	Sellers, Frank E., Jr.
	Senif, Howard Z.
	Seymour, Jack M.
	Shaffer, John N.
	Shepard, Evan T.
	Sisson, Frank K.
	Smith, Frank M.
	Smith, William R., III
	Solenberger, Earl K.
	Stever, Elbert M.
	Stiesberg, Frederick M.
	Sullivan, George A.
	Sweeney, Vincent A.
	Taylor, William C.
	Thompson, William C., Jr.
	Thomson, James W.
	Tipton, Henry C.
	Veth, Kenneth L.
	Wade, Benjamin G.
	Walker Francis D., Jr.
	Ward, Norvell G.
	Ward, Robert E. M.
	Weldon, Albert R.
	Wesson, Joseph H.
	West, Kenneth
	Wheeler, Frank K. B.
	Wideman, William B.
	Wilson, J. C. Gillespi
	Winkel, Robert P.
	Wulzen, Don W.
	Youngblood, Curtis T.

MEDICAL CORPS

Anderson, Edward A.	Kahn, Gustav M.
Berry, Ralph B.	Koett, John W.
Calvy, George L.	Ocko, Felix H.
Carr, Chalmers R.	Palmberg, Karl J.
Coffman, Delphos O.	Parker, Ralph C., Jr.
Fankboner, Ronald B.	Queen, William F.
Foley, Thomas M.	Rollins, Emanuel
Francis, William S.	Turnipseed, Derric C.
Grant, Roald N.	Wiggins, Howell E.
Greenman, Robert B.	Williams, Sylvester
Jamieson, Robert B., Jr.	Wray, William S.
	Yon, Joseph L.
Johnson, Robert B.	Zuska, Joseph J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Adams, Woodbury S.	Goldberg, Herschel J.
Bottoms, John W.	Hyland, William W.
Brown, Thomas A.	Lamkin, Fletcher M.
Capell, Delmar R.	Lyle, Joseph M.
Cline, John B.	O'Handley, John G.
Detweiler, Louis M.	Oliver, Warren E.
Ewald, Christian L.	Stanley, Emory D., Jr.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Mahler, Walter A.
Peterson, Abbot, Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bathke, Ernest S.	Mann Richard L.
Bentley, James A.	Plichta, Joseph P.
Husband, Alexander C.	Rehler Joseph E.
Johnson, William S.	Silliman, Julian W.
Lofland, John H., Jr.	

DENTAL CORPS

Connell, Clarence R.	Schork, Charles J.
Farquhar, John C.	Smith, Albert T.
Fraleigh, Claud M.	Thomas, Lloyd W.
McIntyre, John R.	

For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve:

LINE

Blanchard, Theodore	Mitchell, Charles W.,
Gilchrist, Norman S.	Jr.,
Hill Lester M.	Sever, Joseph C.

DENTAL CORPS

Eisenhart, Albert V.

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbott, Lawrence W., Jr.	Alexander, James T., Jr.
Abercrombie, Daniel W., 3d	Allendorfer, Harry C., Jr.
Acker, Guilford D.	Allman, John C.
Adami, William S.	Allsopp, Charles A.
Adams, David G., Jr.	Amen, William T.
Adams, Don D.	Amman, Bernard
Adler, Vance W.	Anceney, Charles L.
Aikins, Charles C.	Anderson, Andreas P.
Albrecht, Burton F. J.	Anderson, Elmer D.

Andrews, Clyde C.
Andrews, Frank A.
Arey, Richard W.
Argento, Michael C.
Armstrong, Parker B.
Armstrong, Robert M.
Arthur, William A.
Ashley, James M., Jr.
Atkinson, George O., Jr.
Auckland, Wallace B.
Augustus, Charles V.
Austin, William R.
Ayers, Frank W.
Bachhuber, Joseph A.
Backus, Willard O.
Bahlman, John H.
Bain, John B.
Baird, William D.
Baker, Raymond W.
Balis, Theodore L.
Ball, Mottrom J.
Bannowsky, Clarence J., Jr.
Barackman, Bruce M.
Bargeloh, William H., Jr.
Barker, Jesse T.
Barnett, William R.
Barnhardt, Eugene C., 3d
Barry, William F.
Bassett, Charles A.
Bauer, Carl D.
Baxter, Robert J.
Bear, John H.
Beaudine, Robert J.
Behan, Joseph N., Jr.
Belew, Harold E.
Bender, William C.
Bennett, George S., Jr.
Bennett, Walter F. V.
Bergin, Daniel E., Jr.
Bergquist, Cedric B.
Berkeley, Green R., Jr.
Bernhard, Franklin V.
Berry, Francis J.
Bertsch, Fred S., Jr.
Betzel, Albert F.
Betzer, William E.
Bill, Wells R., Jr.
Binion, Vernon E.
Birch, Thomas L.
Bishop, Charles B.
Bishop, Gary W.
Black, Robert G.
Blair, Alfred F.
Blanchard, Frank M.
Bliss, George L., Jr.
Blocker, Leo B.
Blodgett, Robert B.
Blois, Marsden S., Jr.
Boe, Nils W.
Boland, George T.
Borop, James D. W.
Bowen, John S.
Bower, Eric B.
Boyd, Raymond A.
Brafford, Robert R.
Brandon, Walter B.
Brango, Nicholas
Brink, John D.
Brinser, Harry M.
Britner, George F., Jr.
Brown, Garrison
Brown, Joy E.
Brown, Kenneth B.
Brown, Robert G.
Brown, William S.
Brummett, Joseph D.
Buck, Richard H.
Buell, Harold L.
Buhrer, Gordon C.
Bull, Edward G.
Bunting, Curtis W.
Bunting, Davis E.
Burnett, Robert G.
Burt, John H.
Burton, Charles J.
Butler, David S.
Butt, Lawrence H.
Butts, John L., Jr.
Byers, Alexander D. C.
Byrne, Kevin E.
Cain, James B.
Cain, John L.
Caldwell, Benjamin F.
Calland, Robert W.
Carlson, Harold G.
Carmody, Martin D.
Carr, Leslie J.
Carter, John D., Jr.
Carter, John Q.
Carter, Robert R.
Carter, William D.
Carver, William E.
Cason, Arthur C.
Catlin, Allen B.
Caton, Clifford E.
Cauthen, Columbus F., Jr.
Cheney, Ralph E.
Cipolat, Aldo A.
Clark, Waldo W., Jr.
Clarke, Jared E., 3d
Clarke, Robert C.
Clifford, John K.
Clinton, Jack W.
Clinton, Robert J.
Cobb, Philip W.
Cochran, Robert C.
Cole, Howard
Cole, Philip P.
Coleman, George J., Jr.
Comer, Willard A.
Compton, Raymond P.
Conger, James W.
Cook, James L., Jr.
Cooledge, Aurelian H., Jr.
Copeland, James D.
Coppedge, Thomas N., Jr.
Copple, Hal E.
Copple, James H.
Corkran, Richard L., Jr.
Coulthard, John C.
Cowart, Andrew H.
Craig, William B.
Cramer, Donald S.
Crandall, Hugh L.
Crawford, John W., Jr.
Crawford, William H., Jr.
Creecy, Richard B. L.
Cross, William H.
Crossen, Armand C.
Crow, Claude A., Jr.
Crowe, John W.
Cruze, Jack D.
Culjat, Leonard M.
Cullin, William H.
Culver, Paul D.
Curtis, Archibald W.
Curtis, Richard E.
Daily, James L.
Daniels, Robert J., Jr.
Danner, Harry T., Jr.
David, Floyd J.
Davidson, Edward V.
Davidson, James J.
Davis, Henry C.
Davis, John B., Jr.
Davis, Maxey B.
Day, Robert S.
Dearth, James S.
DeCristofaro, Silvio
de Latour, Lloyd L.
Dennett, Armistead
Deodati, Joseph B.
des Granges, Maino
Devine, Richard O.
Dickerson, Vincent M.
Dierker, John R.
Dietz, Willard D.
Dillard, Chester L.
Dinneen, John H.
Dinsmore, Samuel H.
Disque, Robert M.
Doherty, Robert E.
Doner, Landis E.
Dowler, Jack T.
Doyle, Judson C.
Dozier, William C., Jr.
Drew, John G., 2d
Drozdz, Edward J.
Drum, Henry W.
Duncan, Max C.
Dupre, Marcy M., 3d
Dupzyk, Robert R.
Durand, Paul H.
D'Urso, Daniel L.
Dyer, Bradford M.
Early, Leo W.
Earnest, Albert K.
Eastman, Robert S.
Edrington, Frank R.
Eggeman, Benjamin R., Jr.
Eggen, Arnold W.
Elliott, Ralph E., Jr.
Ely, Don L.
Emmons, James W.
Engelhardt, Sidney
Engemann, Robert L.
Ennis, William W.
Erb, Leonard
Erwin, Virgil A., Jr.
Esler, Clifford M. Jr.
Estes, George G., Jr.
Esworthy, Walter H., Jr.
Ettinger, Raymond L.
Evans, Jack L.
Evans, Richard L.
Fahlgren, Jewell S.
Fair, John W.
Fanning, Clifford E.
Farrell, Eugene H.
Farrell, William P., Jr.
Faust, Elwood B.
Field, Henry C., Jr.
Fink, Christian
Fitzgerald, John N., Jr.
Fitz-Patrick, Edward G.
Flatau, Howard C.
Fleck, Bernard A.
Flint, Lawrence E., Jr.
Flynn, Russell P.
Folta, George W., Jr.
Ford, William R.
Forger, Frederick D.
Forrer, Samuel W.
Forrest, Gaylord T.
Fox, John P., Jr.
Fraser, Leroy B., Jr.
Fraser, Walter R.
Frazier, Claude R.
Fredrickson, Harry A.
Freitag, Robert F.
Friedman, Malcolm C.
Froude, Robert S.
Fry, Harold E.
Gage, Fred H., Jr.
Gainor, Charles E.
Gallagher, Charles P.
Gallagher, Edward P.
Gallagher, Thomas J., Jr.
Gallin, Alvin L.
Gardes, George A.
Garland, Leo A.
Garrett, Wallace H., Jr.
Garrison, William B., Jr.
Garvin, Alfred D.
Gass, Shelby C., Jr.
Gebert, Wesley R., Jr.
Gee, Roy P.
Genta, John L.
Gerber, Theodore E.
Gibbs, Harry B.
Gibson, Robert G.
Gift, Ronald P.
Gill, Alfred M.
Gillette, Robert W.
Glassman, David E.
Goldsmith, George H.
Gommengenger, John A.
Gooding, Robert C.
Gorman, Frederick E.
Gotch, James R. P.
Graham, Max W. J.
Graham, Woodrow W.
Grant, Henry L., 3d
Gray, Charles B.
Green, David H.
Green, Laurence B.
Gregg, Clarence B.
Griber, Peter A. M.
Griffin, William E., Jr.
Griffith, Ward W., 3d
Grimes, Alton B.
Gromada, Matthew R.
Gullaksen, Gilbert V.
Gulledge, Kenneth E.
Gutting, John P.
Hadden, Mayo A., Jr.
Haffey, John J., Jr.
Hager, Donald M. L.
Halpin, Paul D.
Halvorson, George G.
Hamilton, Arthur G., Jr.
Hankey, John R.
Hanson, Eugene R.
Hanson, Robert J.
Harbert, Thomas C., Jr.
Harders, Herman J.
Hargrave, Rahe E.
Harman, John A.
Harrison, Edward W.
Hartley, Gordon E.
Harwood, Robert H., Jr.
Hazzard, Harry A.
Hatch, William N.
Hayler, Robert M.
Hays, Lyle R.
Hazard, James D.
Hazlett, William R.
Henning, Donald A.
Herndon, Edward B., 3d
Heronemus, William E.
Hersberger, Raymond G., Jr.
Hill, Harry E.
Hill, John C., 2d
Hillberg, Albert G., Jr.
Hinchey, John J.
Hinkamp, Maddox N. P.
Hobson, John P., 3d
Hoerner, Helmuth E.
Hollingsworth, Henry E.
Holm, Stanley R.
Holmes, Donald T.
Holmes, Paul L.
Hood, Benjamin E.
Hooper, James L.
Hopkins, Lewis A.
Hopley, Eric E.
Hord, Eldridge, Jr.
Horn, Marcus P.
Hosey, William B.
House, David L., Jr.
Houser, William D.
Howard, Harold S.
Howell, Wiley B.
Hubbell, Charles W.
Hughes, Richard Z.
Humphreys, Frederick C.
Hunt, Robert J.
Hunt, Wylie M.
Hurst, William J.
Hutchinson, John L.
Hyde, Richard W.
Iarrobino, John H.
Imholte, Karl H.
Irwin, Carl B.
Jackson, Clifton E.
James, Angy M.
James, Jack M.
James, William N.
Jeffrey, Joseph D.
Jennings, Lewis B.
Jennings, Robert H., Jr.
Johns, Ralph G., Jr.
Johnson, Ace
Johnson, Clark W.
Johnson, Donald H.
Johnson, Perry W., Jr.
Jones, Arthur W.
Jones, Bennie W., Jr.
Jones, Samuel G.
Jorgensen, John B.
Jorgenson, John H.
Kalin, Morris I.
Kane, John D. H., Jr.
Kedigh, Percy E.
Keegan, John P.
Keister, Harlin M.
Kellett, Orville D.
Kelley, Harry J.
Kelley, Hugh A.
Kelly, Andrew J.
Kelly, William W.
Kendrick, David C.
Kennedy, Thomas W.
Kenniff, James A.
Kephart, Cecil D.
Kersting, Christopher J.
Keys, James E.
Kidd, Isaac C., Jr.
Kilgore, Will H.
King, Richard D.
Kinne, Francis E.
Kintner, Edwin E.
Knight, Francis S.
Knight, Robert C.
Knight, Rose A.
Knox, Robert J.
Knudson, Angus J.
Krantz, Carl D.
Krantz, William F.
Krause, William B.
Kurtz, William R.
Laing, Fred
Laird, William M.
Landua, Oliver H.
Lane, Ariel L.
Lane, Stanley H.
Lange, Robert V.
Langlois, Robert L.
Lape, Wade W.
Larsen, Julius M.
Laughead, Robert W.
Lecklider, Russell P.
Lee, Chester M.
Leffen, John S.
Leidel, John S.
Lemmon, Robert H.
Lewis, Allen L.
Lewis, Francis A.
Liebmann, Howard F.
Lillich, George T.
Lindbeck, John A.
Logan, James W., Jr.
Loomis, David F.
Lowe, Richard L.
Lowell, Robert L.
Lowentrout Jack L.
Lowrie, Robert G.
Lyon, Gaylord B.
MacKown, Alfred B.
Maddex, John W.
Mahler, George H., 3d
Malone, Eugene L.
Malone, John D.
Mansueto, Edmund J.
Marchand, Dwight L.
Margolf, Edgar L.
Marocchi, John L.
Marshall, James M.
Martin Robert A.
Martin, Thomas D.
Mason, Clifford P.
Mason, John W., Jr.
Mattis Johnnie E.
Maupin, Owen L.
Maurer Theodore E.
Mayer, Albert J.
Mayer, Roland G., Jr.
Mayo, Robert A.
McCarty, Lindsay C.
McClintock Ernest L., Jr.
McClure, Nathan D., 3d
McCraney, Virgil H.
McDonald, James J.
McFetridge, George W.
McGarry, Alan R.
McGrath, Raymond C.
McGuire, James F.
McInnis, Alex N., Jr.
McKelvey Thomas R., Jr.
McKenna Charles N.
McKnight, George W.
McLaughlin, John
McLaughlin, William E.
McManus, Joseph E.
McMillan, Franklin B.
McMullan, James J.
McNeal, Horace P.
McNees Richard B.
McQuown, Wymard B., Jr.
McWethy, Robert D.
Meehan, William J. 3d
Meier, Louis L., Jr.
Melhuse Arthur N.
Mendenhall Sy E.
Merchant, Robert E.
Merrill, Milford A.
Merritt, Robert S.
Metke, Harry D.
Micheel, Vernon L.
Milano, Louis L.
Miller, Gerald E.
Miller, Gordon A.
Miller, Jack A.
Miller, James E.
Miller John A.
Miller, Kenneth W.
Miller, Ray H.
Miller, Ward S.
Mills, Richard H.
Mills Robert G.
Minner, Donald A.
Mitchell, John J.
Mohl, Edgar V.
Momsen, Charles B. Jr.
Monahan, Robert J.
Monroe, Edward C.
Montgomery, William M.
Moran, William J.
Morehouse, Harold J.
Morgan, William A.
Morrison, Frank P.
Morrison John A.
Morrissey, Jack L.
Morrow, William B.
Morton, Henry S.
Moss, Elmo L.
Mote John L.
Mottern, Robert E.
Mounts, Dalton C.
Muliane, Leo W.
Mullen, Arthur C.
Muller, Robert E.
Mullins, James D.
Munk, Maximilian W.
Munro, Winfield S., Jr.
Murphy, Harold N.
Murphy, Pleasant L.
Myers, Frederick R.
Myers, Robert I.
Nash, Norman C.
Nasworthy, George F.
Neal, William H., 3d
Newcomb Robert A.
Newcomer, Loyd E.
Newlove, Paul A.
Newton, William L.
Nickerson, Henry J.
Nickerson, James D.
Nott, Dwight D.
Nyburg, Willard L.

Nye, Robert D.
Obey, Ronald J.
O'Brien, Frank H.
O'Bryant, William T.
O'Connor, John C.
Oliver, Frederick W.
Oliver, William B.
Olsen, Leslie R.
Olson, Carl E.
Olson, Robert C.
Olson, Willard W.
O'Neil, Justin A.
O'Neil, Walter B.
Opell, Leonard J.
Orr, Rodney G.
Osborn, James B.
Osborn, John G., Jr.
Osler, Edwin T.
Osterhoudt, Raymond S.
Ostrander, Max H.
Ostrom, Dewey A.
Pardue, Daniel G.
Park, Ernest S.
Paseur, John L.
Patterson, John D.
Payne, Charles N., Jr.
Payne, Robert C.
Pearson, Thomas R.
Peddicord, Gerald E.
Pellett, William H.
Penfold, Jack R.
Peters, Charles O.
Peto, David C.
Pfeil, John H.
Philippbar, Joseph W. Jr.
Pierce, Charles A., Jr.
Pierson, Robert P.
Pittman, Charles W., Jr.
Pittman, William R.
Plate, Douglas C.
Plaxco, Moffatt R., Jr.
Plumer, Ferdinand J.
Poage, Robert B.
Porter, Ralph L.
Porter, Rufus C., Jr.
Powell, Douglas A., Jr.
Powell, William W.
Poynter, Drexel E.
Prescott, Winfred R.
Price, Ogle W., Jr.
Price, Walter W., Jr.
Pugh, Paul E.
Pugh, William M., 2d
Quinn, Frank S., Jr.
Raht, Adolphus G.
Rainwater, Charles W.
Rand, Herbert C.
Randal, Robert G.
Rankin, Robert S.
Rapp, Jerome A., Jr.
Rasmussen, Jonathan Q.
Rau, Robert E.
Rawls, William A.
Rawson, Arthur F., Jr.
Reagan, Lawrence H.
Redding, Lester A.
Reed, Dale C.
Reeves, Claude L.
Reilly, Robert F.
Reinhardt, Charles B.
Reiserer, Russell L.
Rice, Harold E.
Rich, Francis E.
Richards, Donald C.
Richey, Gerald S.
Rickabaugh, John M.
Ricketts, Colin J.
Riddick, Gordon M.
Rief, Chester F.
Riley, George B.
Riley, Joseph A.
Riley, Richard
Riordan, Stephen J., Jr.
Rizza, Joseph P.
Roberts, Francis R.
Robertson, Wilson B.
Robie, William A.
Robinson, Walter P., Jr.
Robinson, William M.
Robison, Roy J.
Rodriguez, Richard
Rogers, Allen R.
Rogers, Chester D.
Romanick, Frank M.
Rosenberg, Edwin M.
Ross, Robert M.
Rountree, Frederick M.
Rowan, John J.
Roy, William E.
Rucker, Andrew J.
Ruehrmund, Paul L., Jr.
Rule, Shelley E.
Rusch, William J., Jr.
Russell, Allard G.
Ruth, Lloyd D.
Rutzel, Robert T.
Saldin, Carl N.
Sallenger, Asbury H.
Satterfield, Loys M.
Savadkin, Lawrence
Savage, Jimmie E.
Saylor, Philip G.
Scarborough, Frank G.
Schaible, Theodore C.
Schlegel, Paul W.
Schoenfeld, William A.
Schoonover, Donald L.
Schreiber, Robert S.
Schremp, James F.
Schroeder, Charles J.
Schub, Walter J.
Schuld, Emil P.
Schweer, William W.
Schwerdt, Harold W.
Scott, Gerald J.
Scott, Ralph C.
Scott, William J., 3d
Scully, Edward C.
Seguin, Robert E.
Seitz, Eugene W.
Sellars, Charles W., Jr.
Senn, Charles C.
Sewall, Richard M.
Shaw, Claude B.
Shaw-Corthorn, George
Shear, Harold E.
Shearon, Bruce C.
Shelton, Sid W.
Shireman, Richard H., Jr.
Shong, John W.
Showers, Donald M.
Siegel, Paul J.
Sigley, Claredon H.
Silberstein, Howard J.
Simmons, Arthur E.
Simmons, Kendall W.
Simmons, William E.
Simonelli, Orazio
Sims, William E.
Skill, Wesley E.
Slater, Mervin O.
Small, James D.
Smith, Armistead B., Jr.
Smith, Charles E.
Smith, Ernest P.
Smith, James W.
Smith, Leroy P.
Smith, Paul B.
Smith, Peter S.
Smith, Ray F.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Warren F.
Soll, Orlan A.
Sorem, Bernard M.
Sorensen, William T.
Sorenson, Harry E.
Spalding, William A., Jr.
Sparkman, John W., Jr.
Sparks, Robert R.
Spears, Ralph C.
Speirs, Carl L.
Spiegel, William D.
Spradling, Warren E.
Squires, Lewis W.
Stafford, Edward P.
Stafford, Leonard M.
Stahl, Robert B.
Stamm, Charles C.
Standring, Frank E.
Stanek, Robert
Staring, Merlin H.
Stecher, Lewis J., Jr.
Stetson, William W.
Stewart, Milton E.
Stirling, Harold C.
Stoinoff, Robert R.
Stokes, Griffith P.
Stone, Howard L., Jr.
Stoppelmann, Renold W.
Strane, John R.
Sturgis, Ivan W.
Suerstedt, Henry, Jr.
Sult, George H.
Swanbeck, James R.
Sweek, Robert F.
Sweitzer, Henry B.
Tabor, Travis O., 3d
Talbot, Wallace L., Jr.
Tanner, Charles S.
Tappan, Benjamin
Tate, Norman L.
Taylor, James D.
Taylor, Lamar S.
Tharp, Samuel M.
Thewlis, Alan M.
Thienes, Robert L.
Thomas, Edwin S., Jr.
Thomas, Jon E.
Thomas, William E.
Thompson, Champ
Thompson, Guy M., Jr.
Thompson, Harley F.
Thompson, Harold R., Jr.
Thompson, Harry M.
Thompson, Robert A.
Thompson, Robert J.
Thompson, William F.
Thompson, Wilbert L.
Thurman, Robert K.
Timmes, Francis X.
Tobin, Louis J.
Tofalo, Francis
Tolivaisa, Homer
Tomlin, Hollier G.
Towle, Barnaby L.
Trawick, James F.
Traynor, Laurence G.
Tully, Joseph M., Jr.
Turner, Carol A.
Turner, Gaines B.
Turner, Thomas A.
Turner, Thomas
Uptain, Edgar T.
Ustick, Perry W.
Vance, Leroy W.
Varley, Richard B., Jr.
Vincent, Manuel D.
Vissat, Paul L.
Vita, Harold E.
Volz, Edward M.
Voris, Roy M.
Vose, William F.
Wallace, John G.
Wallace, Ralph M.
Walsh, Stephen H.
Wanggaard, Lars, Jr.
Ward, Russell D.
Warner, Arthur H., Jr.
Warner, Richard D.
Warren, Harry S.
Waters, Wayne R.
Weary, Neil S.
Weatherly, James F.
Weber, William G.
Weidlein, Leopold
Weiler, John S.
Weiss, Charles F.
Welsh, John R.
Werner, William R.
Werthmuller, Roy W. F.
West, James C.
Westcott, Leon W.
Whatton, James E.
Wheatley, Thomas R.
Wheaton, Thomas R.
Whited, Ciro N. V., Jr.
Whitehurst, William B.
Whitney, Alden W.
Wiggins, Raymond
Wilcox, Wayne T., Jr.
Wiley, Gordon S.
Wilhite, Dewey R.
Williams, Joe W., Jr.
Williams, Thomas H.
Williams, William A.
Williamson, Thomas E., Jr.
Willis, William P., Jr.
Wilson, James R.
Wimbush, Wilford
Winner, Crawford D.
Winslow, Edward H.
Wolfe, Richard F.
Wood, Stanley A.
Woods, Mark W.
Woodson, Walter B., Jr.
Woosley, David G.
Workman, Reginald L.
Wynne, Hal G.
Yeo, Frederick L.
Young, Charles M.
Young, William H.
Zigler, Frederick W.
Zook, Dott E., Jr.

MEDICAL CORPS

Bond, Sidney D., Jr.
Campbell, Robert M.
Childs, Donald R.
Dickson, Alvis B.
Dominey, Joseph B., Jr.
Doolittle, Robert C.
Faucett, Ralph E.
Goebel, John E.
Hennessy, Thomas G.
Holmes, Francis H.
Leach, Edwin M.
Mahin, Harry P.
McArtor, James R.
Price, John J., Jr.
Rusher, Merrill W.
Spencer, James L., Jr.
Sweeney, Edwin C.
Switzer, Robert E.
True, Dewitt S.
Vaupel, George E.
Williams, David J., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Adair, Winston L.
Anderson, Niels H.
Anderson, Scott K.
Balch, Richard S.
Bjorlo, Loyd S.
Botkin, Dwight M.
Bradley, Rex A.
Braun, George J., Jr.
Brogan, James M.
Clark, Harold R.
Colner, John S.
Cook, Paul W.
Corrick, James A., Jr.
Crane, Frank E., Jr.
Culp, John F., III
Dorrance, Sumter E.
Edwards, Robert B.
Gantz, Benjamin S., Jr.
Graham, Jack L.
Gregg, William B.
Harper, George W., Jr.
Hashagen, Ralph L.
Hennessy, James L. F.
Holt, Robert E.
Hughes, Theodore L.
Kennedy, Austin J., Jr.
Kubacki, Edward L.
Leary, William G.
Leonard, Robert E.
Lindsay, Peter M.
Linscott, Henry D., Jr.
Litchfield, Louis H., Jr.
MacDonald, Eugene T.
Mackinnon, Willis T.
Mann, William A.
Mason, Thomas C.
McNeill, Dan C.
Muir, Frederick D., Jr.
Paget, Allen M.
Power, Richard T.
Richardson, William C.
Russell, Bryant W.
Rutherford, Francis C.
Severance, Radford H.
Shaughnessy, Edward J.
Smith, Bert
Smith, John D.
Sorensen, Karl A. N.
Stanton, Rodney A.
Stewart, Hunter W.
Storck, William H.
Tobias, Robert H.
Tynan, John F.
Vaklyes, John W.
Voegeli, George L.
Washburne, Louis P., Jr.
Werner, Sherwood H.
Willetts, Philo P.
Zerfoss, Allan B.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Anderson, Seth E.
Bosserman, Elmer E.
Brooks, William E., Jr.
Craven, John H.
Curry, Matthew A.
Herold, Carl A.
Ingvoldstad, Orla, Jr.
Mullins, Thomas J.
Sporrer, Otto E.
Vosseler, Lawrence C. M.
Wolf, Warren L.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Allegrone, Charles
Bamberg, Edward C.
Braheney, Joseph R.
Cartelli, Anthony R.
Castanes, James C.
Childers, Robert B.
Clampet, William T.
Frate, Lawrence P.
Graham, Robert R., Jr.
Moeller, Griswold L.
Reilly, Charles A., Jr.
Smisek, Joseph J.
Tregonis, Verne M.
Uriass, Charles K.
Wills, Harry C.

DENTAL CORPS

Aldridge, William A.
Chapman, Judge C.
Ashwell, James T.
Cook, Francis W.
Edwards, Irwin G.
Fernandez, Sergio
Flocken, John E.
Fridley, Harry H.
Hall, J. Kenneth
Harris, Clyde A.
Keener, John L.
Losee, Fred L.
Middleton, Robert A.
Manke, Wilbert C.
Miller, John W.
Missman, Byrnes E.
McKinney, Jackson P.
Nutting, Edwin B.
Pruitt, Charles C., Jr.
Richardson, Glenn D.
Rubba, Anthony
Scherer, George F.
Tande, Syrus E.
Tessman, Clarence C.
Thomlinson, Christopher E., Jr.
Wallace, Allen L.
Young, Lawrence

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Dean, Henry T.
Batterson, Frederick E.
Cook, Ellsworth B.
Handford, Stanley W.
Hirst, John M.
Perry, William J.

NURSE CORPS

Jackson, Wilma L.
King, Thelma A.
Seroka, Nell P.
Todd, C. Edwina

For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve:

LINE

Ayer, Irvin E.
Baggett, Marshall W.
Bailey, Charles A.
Bailey, Frederick H.
Baker, Gordon A., Jr.
Barton, Richard C.
Bash, Robert D.
Basye, Wendell M.
Beaugrand, Robert M.
Behr, William A.
Bell, Bruce A.
Benford, Sidney M.
Berg, Norman E.
Berner, George A.
Birdsong, Charles H., Jr.
Bishop, Clarence E.
Black, David A.
Bolen, Richard E.
Bowden, Raymond E.
Bower, William A.
Braden, Charles G.
Buchanan, Robert K., Jr.
Buchanan, Trafton T.
Bufkins, Russell L.
Carr, Howard E.
Carson, Edward B.
Carson, Edwin I.
Cate, Eugene R.
Clark, George F.
Coutts, Charles A.
Cresse, Arthur E., Jr.
Dardis, Thomas S.
Darst, Glenn J.
Deibler, William H., Jr.
Delaney, Edward J. M.
Deneen, Charles S.
DeVoe, Augustus A., Jr.
Dickson, Bernard
Dobbs, Harry C., Jr.
Doherty, Joseph A.
Dugan, John R.
Duncan, Frank G.
Edwards, Jack W.
Elliott, Charles V.
Fischer, Louis W.
Flaherty, Joseph J.
Foote, Horace S., Jr.
Geisinger, Bruce George, Russell W.
Gerdes, Bernard F.
Gilman, Leon
Golds, Harold D.
Goldsmith, Arthur

Grader, Donald L.
Gray, David S.
Greer, Earl M., Jr.
Guinty, Oscar M.
Gustafson, Paul F.
Hamilton, George B., Jr.
Harkins, Paul H.
Hartlein, John, Jr.
Hartmann, William C.
Hartnett, John E., Jr.
Hartwell, Robert W.
Haverty, Philip J.
Hearn, Ormond E.
Heckerman, Dan
Heidger, Norman C.
Heitzberg, Thomas S.
Henson, Robert W.
Herrick, Chester E.
Hewitt, William H.
Hibbard, Samuel B.
Hilton, Hermon G.
Hoaster, Victor S.
Hoblitzell, James J., III
Holleman, James H.
Horne, Sidney L.
Hulbert, Jack W.
Hume, David
Jenkins, Arthur L.
Johnson, Jack O.
Johnston, Thomas M.
Jones, Darrell M.
Jurewicz, Emil L.
Kadel, Joseph B., Jr.
Kane, John E.
Kellogg, Norman D.
Kenney, Lawrence F.
Kimbrough, William H.
Kline, Walter R.
Kohr, Andrew E.
Kopf, Jack, Jr.
Krogh, Evan L.
Lang, Donald A.
Lasser, Warren R.
Laughton, Armine W.
Lena, Thomas H.
Lewis, John R.
Lohman, Robert W.
Long, Ralph W.
Long, Richard L.
Lowe, Richard B.
Luddy, John P.
Macauley, Douglas H.
MacLeod, James J.
Maddox, Richard I.
Martin, Robert W.
Masenich, Jay R.
Melde, Karl P.
Melvin, Charles S.
Miller, Charles E.
Miller, Elmon A., Jr.
Miller, Malcolm G.
Mioducki, Edward L. C., Jr.
Mitchell, Sam W.
Mohler, Robert J.
Montgomery, Baascomb
Moore, James M.
Mosier, David W.
Murch, John A.
Murphy, Henry W.
McCarthy, Robert H.
McGovern, James P.
McGovern, Lawrence H.
McIlvain, John J.
McMahon, Thomas S.
McMillan, James D.
McNeill, David C.
Najarian, Martin A.
Neale, Raphael A., Jr.
Neill, James S., Jr.
Nesseler, Richard A.
Norton, John L.
Nulf, George W.
Nyhan, Stanley L.
O'Connor, Arthur C.
Ostapenko, William M.
Pace, William A.
Palmer, Harold B.
Parsons, Joseph M.
Parsons, Samuel G.
Perry, Kempton J.
Petrie, Benjamin R., Jr.
Phillips, Myron D.
Powell, Jesse L.
Privott, William S.
Puhr, Francis P.
Quillman, Thomas E., Jr.
Randall, John A., Jr.
Ratajkowski, Joseph T.
Ray, William D.
Reese, Donald A.
Roberts, Edward N.
Rockwell, George L.
Rohowits, Gerald M.
Rope, Robert B., Jr.
Saltmarsh, Ernest O.
Sandvigen, Ralph E.
Sautter, Frederick R.
Schroder, William T.
Schwab, John W.
Seaman, Donald P.
Senft, David V.
Shapiro, Joseph K.
Smith, James L.
Smith, Roy C., III
Sneath, Samuel B., Jr.
Sorensen, Jay H.
Sprowls, Paul H.
Strong, Charles E.
Teller, Henry D.
Thoeny, Richard F.
Thomas, Edwin C.
Truesdale, Francis S.
Tucker, Victor L.
VanMater, George C.
Waldman, Joseph R.
West, Fred R.
Wheeler, Howard E.
Whitaker, William B.
White, Ralph C.
Williams, Henry P.
Wolfe, Donald P.
Wood, Edward E.
Wright, Albert C.
York, Charles W.

MEDICAL CORPS

Maxwell, Joseph A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Carlson, Charles G.
Crowl, William F., II
DeWilde, John B.
French, Lawrence H.
Gary, Fred B.
Hahn, William H.
Wikoff, David E.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Cunningham, Bernard V.
Doyle, James J.
Finan, Arthur P.
Henrich, Rudolph M.
Kerrigan, Dennis R.
Lindner, Newell
May, Lynde E., III
Robinson, Charles B.
Walsh, Romuald J.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Brandt, John N.
Brown, Lamonte R.
Hiegel, James A.
Lawrence, Thad B.

DENTAL CORPS

Hohl, Anthony W.
Parks, Clyde R.
Teitel, Allan L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Farnsworth, Dean

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Adams, Henry H., Jr.
Adams, Robert L., Jr.
Adler, Robert E.
Agule, George J., Jr.
Ajemian, Andre V.
Alexander, Henry K., Jr.
Allen, Arnold O.
Allender, Gene T.
Alley, Lester L.
Allison, Cecil J., Jr.
Allsman, Robert L.
Alsager, Richard H.
Alvis, John G.
Anderson, Charles L. R.
Anderson, George H.
Anderson, Leonard J., Jr.
Anderson, Norris O., Jr.
Anderson, Richard A.
Anderson, Stanley J.
Anderson, William J., 3d
Andrew, Neil H.
Angle, Herbert G., Jr.
Ansel, Willits
Antar, Albert
Applegarth, Samuel H., Jr.
Ardell, George G.
Armstrong, John E.
Arn, Robert W.
Arnold, Henry C., Jr.
Arst, Philip L.
Ash, Homer L.
Ashurst, Albert J.
Ashworth, Edgar M., Jr.
Asmus, Paul A.
Aston, William J.
Attebury, William H.
Austin, William M., Jr.
Ayer, Lloyd M.
Bachem, Douglas F.
Bachtold, James R.
Bacon, James A.
Bagot, William C.
Bailey, Richard L.
Baker, Alfred W.
Baker, James E. Jr.
Bakke, Harlan J.
Balderson, Robert P.
Baldwin, Robert A.
Ball, George L.
Ballard, Charles R.
Barbazette, William F.
Barlow, Robert M.
Barnard, John H.
Barnes, Clifford P.
Barnes, James P.
Barnes, Wallace R.
Barnett, Howard J.
Barney, Glenn P.
Barrett, Patrick J.
Bartholomew, John L.
Barunas, George A., Jr.
Bassett, Govert L.
Bates, Cullen F., Jr.
Bauer, Edward C.
Baxter, Robert C.
Beasley, James W.
Beates, James K.
Beattie, Donald A.
Beattie, Thomas T., Jr.
Beck, Donald M.
Beck, Stanley L.
Beck, Stuart M.
Becker, John L.
Belk, Reece G., Jr.
Benedict, Roger W.
Berg, Irving G.
Bergesen, Andrew J.
Bethel, John W.
Bibby, Lowe H., 3d
Bills, Robert S.
Bills, Robert G.
Bingham, Arthur W., 3d
Birdsong, Harold S.
Biron, Joseph E.
Bish, Arthur A.
Bjorke, Arnvid N.
Black, Donald L.
Blair, Donald S., Jr.
Blaze, William F.
Blemker, Berrien B.
Boakes, William H.
Bobbitt, Charles P., Jr.
Bobo, Charles D.
Bobo, Stephen N., Jr.
Bohlander, James W.
Bolt, Leland E.
Booher, James
Boone, Robert R.
Borgaard, John E.
Bottimore, Robert R., Jr.
Bowen, Albert S., 3d
Bowen, Jack W.
Bowling, William H.
Boyce, James E.
Boyd, Joseph M., Jr.
Boyd, Marion S., Jr.
Boyes, William W., Jr.
Boyle, Richard C.
Bradley, Robert R.
Brady, Allen C.
Bramblett, John J., Jr.
Branch, Alvin D.
Breedlove, James E., Jr.
Breen, Matthew J.
Bres, John H.
Brettschneider, Carl A.
Brewer, Glenn M.
Broadwell, Edward A.
Brobst, William A.
Brodie, Robert, 3d
Brogan, Robert C.
Brooks, George G.
Brown, Arnold B., Jr.
Brown, Peter G.
Brumley, Robert J.
Bryan, Gordon R., Jr.
Buck, John A.
Buckley, George F.
Bukowits, Marvin D.
Burbank, Donald D.
Burbank, Ronald E.
Burch, Walter D.
Burgess, Wallace A.
Burke, Arthur J.
Burkhalter, Edward A., Jr.
Burnett, James A.
Burns, Thomas S.
Burton, Herbert O.
Busse, Norman W.
Butts, John L.
Buzzell, Carlis W., Jr.
Byrd, Paul R.
Caine, Patrick R.
Caldwell, Earl L., Jr.
Caldwell, William P.
Callahan, Earle R.
Callahan, Thomas D.
Calnan, Alan S.
Camp, Paul D.
Campbell, Neil V.
Campbell, William E., Jr.
Campion, Robert F., Jr.
Cannon, Robert E.
Cappelen, Albert L., Jr.
Capshaw, Leigh R.
Carden, Marshal B., Jr.
Carius, Robert W.
Carlson, Burford A.
Carlson, Erland N., Jr.
Carlson, James H.
Carlton, Paul F.
Carmichael, George R., Jr.
Carpender, John N.
Carpenter, Harry E., Jr.
Carter, Edward W., 3d
Carter, Robert B.
Casale, Salvatore A.
Caskey, Donald L.
Caswell, Frederic C., Jr.
Catalano, Lee C.
Cauffman, Charles E.
Cericola, Michael P.
Chachere, Robert E.
Chamberlain, John
Chambers, William A.
Chapin, Howard G.
Charles, William O.
Chertavian, Armen
Chesser, Samuel L.
Childers, Donald J.
Childs, John T.
Childs, Richard V.
Chilton, Ralph E.
Christensen, Earl D.
Christenson, Donald A.
Church, Archer E., Jr.
Church, George A.
Church, John H.
Clary, Robert M.
Clausner, Edward, Jr.
Clemens, Robert F.
Clifford, Guy C.
Coale, William A.
Cobern, Ernest L.
Cochran, Sidney A., Jr.
Cochrane, John C., Jr.
Cohoon, James D.
Coleman, Robert I., Jr.
Coleman, William O., Jr.
Colenda, Herbert F.
Collins, Andrew M.
Collins, Charles H.
Collins, Thomas J.
Comella, Joseph F.
Compton, Bryan W., Jr.
Condon, Edward J., Jr.
Conlon, Frank S.
Cooper, James H.
Cooper, Lawrence T.
Corbett, Howard R.
Cornelius, Winston W.
Cornick, Robert P.
Cornish, Edward H., Jr.
Cornwell, Robert R.
Corwen, Albert S.
Costa, William J.
Cotter, Charles L.
Coughlin, Daniel P., Jr.
Coulter, George P.
Cowan, Thomas S., Jr.
Craig, Dennis J.
Crandall, Hal R.
Crawford, Richard N.
Crawley, Don E.
Creech, Fulton H., Jr.
Cress, William R.
Criner, James E.
Cromwell, John P., Jr.
Croswell, Edwin G.
Crowder, James P., Jr.
Crull, William L., 3d
Crum, Arthur Z.
Cullins, Peter K.
Cunningham, Benjaman H.
Cunningham, Richard B.
Cunningham, Melvil D.
Curran, Thomas P.
Currie, Edgar I.
Curtis, Valleau E.
Cusick, Joseph D.
Dahl, Edmund I.
Dallamura, Richard A.
Dallimore, George R.
Damiani, Benny J., Jr.
Danis, Anthony L., Jr.
Danner, William P.
Darling, Roderick J.
Daugherty, Dean D.
Davey, Richard B.
Davidson, Robert L.
Davis, Jay E.
Davis, Robert H., Jr.
Day, Lloyd F.
Dean, Kenneth L.
Dean, Richard W.
Decook, David W.
Deemer, Reed E.
Degnan, Francis J.
Deniston, Lyle E.
Dennis, Frank S.
Dennis, John C.
DeNoon, Joseph H.
DePuy, Newell E., Jr.
Derby, George K.
Derleth, Harley R.
Desrosiers, Roland J.
Dewey, William C.
Dewing, Jay N.
Deyak, John J.
Dickson, Albert M., Jr.
Diers, Charles E.
Dietrich, Henry T., Jr.
Divendorff, Frank
Dillon, Percy M., Jr.
Dion, Paul L.
Dittmar, Louis C.
Dixon, Robert G.
Dobbins, John B., Jr.
Dodd, Charles A.
Doering, Eugene R.
Doggett, Burton L., Jr.
Donnelly, John D.
Dorman, Charles T.
Downs, David L.
Draving, Robert K.
Drew, Roger L.
Driver, Sam N.
Druckenmiller, Robert E.
Duane, Rodman F.
Ducharme, Theodore M., Jr.
Duemler, Louis P.
Duke, Marvin L.
Dungan, John D.
Dunham, Richard M.
Dunn, Robert F.
Dunn, Robert J.
Dunne, Francis X.
Duttweiler, Charles
Duvall, John S., 4th
Dwyer, Laurence A.
Dyer, Philip M.
Earl, William C.
East, Robert C., Jr.
Easterling, Crawford
Eckert, Richard H.

Eckstein, John R.
Eden, Harold E.
Edris, Richard J.
Edwards, William B.
Eifelt, James S.
Ellison, David J.
Elmore, Charles P.
Englehart, Harry J.
Entstrasser, John J., Jr.
Erb, Donald P.
Ericson, James K.
Estes, Dana, 2d
Etchison, Frank L., Jr.
Evans, Carl P.
Evans, Daniel H., Jr.
Evans, George J.
Evans, John J.
Evans, Willard E.
Ewanowski, Stanley J.
Fadeley, Edward N.
Farmer, Peter A.
Farnham, Rob R.
Farrell, John R.
Fasulo, Robert P.
Feasell, Dale H.
Feldhausen, Eugene J.
Feldheim, Robert J.
Fick, William G., Jr.
Findley, Allen
Fithian, Peter S.
Fitzgerald, James J.
Fitzgibbons, Joseph G., Jr.
Fitzpatrick, Joseph A.
Fletcher, Charles D.
Foley, James E.
Fontaine, Richard K.
Forrester, James E.
Forsyth, Robert J.
Fossum, Robert R.
Foster, Robert W.
Foster, William F.
Fowler, John R.
Fox, Kenneth
Fox, Paul F.
Frame, Edward L.
Francis, John P.
Francis, Thomas A.
Franke, Richard D.
Freeborough, Robert M.
Freeman, Warren R.
Fremd, Harry L.
Fricke, Henry G.
Friedman, Arthur C.
Friend, Joseph F.
Frost, William L.
Fry, James W.
Fuchs, Julius E.
Fuchs, Stanley
Fuller, Joe E.
Fuller, Robert B.
Funkhouser, William H.
Furtek, Adolph J.
Gaines, Howard W.
Gale, Robert D.
Galing, Searcy G.
Gallagher, Paul A.
Gamber, Harold W.
Gambke, Frederick C.
Gangloff, Charles A.
Gardner, Richmond
Garner, Charles H.
Garnett, Donald I.
Garrard, Frank U., 3d
Garrett, Bernard H.
Garrett, Charles L., Jr.
Gauldin, Homer C., Jr.
Gebhardt, Robert E.
Geiger, Eugene D.
Gensheimer, David E.
George, James F.
Gergel, John W.
Gifford, Brewster J.
Gilchrist, John F., 2d
Gillen, Thomas W.
Gillespie, Charles R., Jr.
Gilmore, William G.
Ginder, Samuel P., Jr.
Gleason, George L.
Gnos, Kenneth R.
Godfrey, James T.
Goebel, Herman E., Jr.
Goelzer, Henry C.
Goers, Ralph W.
Gold, Robert H.
Goldman, Elmer M.
Gombash, William, Jr.
Goslow, Paul
Gottschalk, Arthur W., Jr.
Goulds, Ralph J.
Govan, George W.
Grace, Homer J.
Grandfield, Francis J., Jr.
Grant, John T.
Granum, Bradford S.
Grasberg, Alexander
Graves, Harold M., Jr.
Graves, Thomas E.
Greason, David M.
Greathouse, David M.
Green, John N.
Green, Robert E.
Greene, Frank F.
Grey, Richard G.
Griest, Richard A.
Grifferty, Thomas F.
Griffin, Jack R.
Griffin, Richard N.
Grimm, Arthur R. Jr.
Gumkowski, Thaddeus R.
Hackett, Robert A.
Haff, William B.
Hall, Harrell W., Jr.
Halleck, William L.
Hallett, Frederick H.
Halwax, Frank K.
Hamilton, John W.
Hamilton, James E., Jr.
Hamlin, Richard J.
Hand, Charles T.
Handley, John A.
Hannah, Richard G.
Hansen, Allen E.
Hansen, David F.
Hansen, Merle C.
Harnden, Charles G.
Harper, Boyd E., Jr.
Harper, Lorren G.
Hart, Donald F.
Hart, William D.
Hartell, Ronald D.
Harvey, William T.
Hatchett, George L.
Haugerud, Albert R.
Hauser, Robert J., Jr.
Hay, Robert W.
Hayden, Glenn M.
Hayes, Murray L.
Hayes, Winston R.
Haynsworth, Donald D.
Head, John L.
Hearn, Gerald D.
Heberer, Earl G., Jr.
Hedrick, William B.
Heffernan, William D.
Heigl, John T., Jr.
Heneberger, Harry B., Jr.
Henkels, Paul L.
Hennessy, William J.
Henrikson, Theodore P.
Heon, Robert H.
Herbert, Robert J.
Herdy, Herschel H., Jr.
Herndon, William J., Jr.
Hibson, Leo A., Jr.
Hiehle, Frank G., Jr.
Hieronimus, Henry M.
Higgs, Donald R.
Highleyman, Searle F.
Hightower, Emmett S.
Hines, Gulmer A., Jr.
Hitchner, Alton J., Jr.
Hobbs, Harold W., Jr.
Hobbs, James B.
Hoddeson, Bernard
Hodnett, Robert A.
Hoffman, James P.
Hoffmann, Carl K., 2d
Hofmockel, John L.
Holbrook, Hilliard B., 2d
Holland, Alfred D.
Holland, James S.
Holler, Edward R.
Holloway, Floyd, Jr.
Holman, Donald R.
Holmes, Kenneth L.
Holt, Henry E.
Hood, Wayne M.
Hooper, Ralph W.
Hoover, Richard M.
Hossfeld, James F.
Hounihan, John C.
Hovater, James D.
Howell, Rogers G.
Huber, Henry A.
Huffman, Robert B.
Hughes, Andrew A., Jr.
Hughes, Peter F. H.
Hunter, Charles W.
Huszar, Louis, Jr.
Hutchins, Christopher T., Jr.
Huyette, Carl W., Jr.
Iacona, Michael A.
Ingram, John W.
Inman, Richard P.
Irby, Charles R.
Ismay, Arthur P.
Jacks, Robert G.
Jackson, Howard L.
James, David L.
Jarvies, John E.
Jarvis, Donald H.
Jaworowski, Thomas R.
Jenkins, Norman L.
Jensen, Robert W.
Jett, William S., 3d
Johns, Forrest R.
Johnson, Alfred W., Jr.
Johnson, Allen B.
Johnson, Cecil B.
Johnson, Jay A.
Johnson, Jeremy E.
Johnson, Joseph J.
Johnson, Robert M.
Johnston, Bayard W.
Johnston, Lawrence L.
Johnston, William A., 3d
Johnstone, Richard A.
Jones, Arthur D., Jr.
Jones, Arthur W.
Jones, Carol W.
Jones, Charles A.
Jones, David L., Jr.
Jones, Ray P.
Jones, Samuel O., Jr.
Katzenmeyer, William G.
Kaufman, Frederick H.
Kaulback, Russell D.
Keach, Donald L.
Keathley, Charles C.
Keegan, Richard J.
Keily, Lawrence J.
Kelahan, John A.
Keleher, Lloyd P.
Keller, Kenneth C.
Kelley, James P.
Kemble, John R.
Kenefick, John M.
Kennedy, Nevin, 3d
Kenning, Robert L.
Kertz, Jacob D.
Kessing, Charles T.
Kieler, Harold E.
Kilburg, Richard P.
Kilmer, Donald A.
King, Cecil
Kinney, Donald P.
Kirchner, David P.
Kirk, John J.
Klett, George J.
Knutson, Donald W.
Kocher, William L.
Koehler, Herman J., 3d
Kolimorgen, Leland S.
Koluch, Nicholas
Kondzella, Frederick J.
Koone, Doyle D.
Kosonen, Charles G.
Kozel, William J.
Kremm, Andrian
Kruse, John W., Jr.
Kuhn, Edwin A.
Kump, Lon R.
Kuzia, Jack R., Jr.
Lachowicz, Michael R.
Laco, Thomas
Lacy, James E.
Laighton, Robert H.
Lake, Charles M., Jr.
Lamb, Derwin T.
LaMontagne, Robert P.
Lancaster, James R.
Landefeld, Emil E.
Lane, Thomas B.
Langenberg, William H.
Larson, Charles D.
Latimer, Samuel E., Jr.
Laubach, John P.
Lauff, John G.
Lautermilch, Paul A., Jr.
Lawrence, William P.
Lawson, Clifton E. R.
Leach, Everett N.
Leach, Ralph W., Jr.
Leahy, John P.
LeCount, Peter L.
Ledbetter, Jack W.
Leenay, Maurice
Lehan, James E.
Leibold, William R.
Leiser, James M.
Leppin, William F., Jr.
Leslie, Maxwell F., Jr.
Levenson, Lewis M.
Levisee, Donald B.
Lewallen, John D.
Lewis, James R.
Lewis, Roger P.
Liberato, Frank A.
Libey, John D.
Light, John L.
Lilienfeld, Joe J.
Lindblad, William J.
Linder, Richard B., Jr.
Lindgren, Charles P.
Lindsay, John D.
Lindsley, Edward G.
Lindstrom, Roland N.
Liston, John M.
Livas, Basil L.
Livingston, Richard C.
Lloyd, James L.
Lockhart, Glenn S.
Loesch, Robert C.
Long, Thomas F., Jr.
Longhi, William J.
Look, Durmond K. M.
Loomer, Arthur R.
Love, Henry H., Jr.
Lowe, Beverley J.
Lowe, George N.
Lowell, William L.
Luine, Arthur
Lukas, Thomas E.
Lukens, Joseph T.
Lutz, Ray M.
Macaulay, Angus
Macauley, George W.
Macfie, Richard B.
Mack, Robert P.
Madden, Raymond A.
Madeira, Edward L.
Maice, Lee, Jr.
Malady, John C.
Malone, Roy W.
Maloney, Andrew
Maloney, Francis H., Jr.
Mangas, Darrel L.
Manion, Donald S.
Marangiello, Daniel A.
Marin, William T.
Markey, George M., Jr.
Markusfeld, Lionel
Marshall, Clifford L.
Martin, Donald C.
Martin, Sam T., Jr.
Mathers, William G.
Matheson, Ralph E.
Mathews, Herbert J.
Matousek, Raymond
Mattioni, Biasco
Maxson, Richard B.
May, Porter E.
Maynard, Donald J.
McAlexander, Robert L.
McBurney, William J.
McCarthy, Frank J.
McCarthy, Francis X.
McCormick, Matthew A.
McCoy, Robert B.
McCune, Howard W.
McDonough, William D., Jr.
McElroy, William J.
McFadden, Grafton R
McGavack, John, Jr.
McGeachy, Francis L.
McGehrin, Edward P., Jr.
McGlohn, Robin H., Jr.
McGonigle, John R.
McGuire, Eugene J.
McIntosh, Charles D.
McKee, Kinnaird R.
McKendre, Earl E., Jr.
McKenney, Thomas W.
McKeon, Richard D.
McKinney, William M.
McLaughlin, Leo A.
McLaughlin, Robert F.
McLay, James L.
McNallen, James B.
McNaught, Earl D.
McNerney, James F.
McQueston, Jack E.
McQuillin, John P.
McRae, Daniel D.
Meade, Bruce A.
Meader, Bruce I.
Meagher, Edward
Medcalf, Gene F.
Meeks, Robert B., Jr.
Mehl, James P.
Melchers, Arthur C.
Melesko, Stephen, Jr.
Meltzer, Harvey J.
Mench, Leland E.
Mendenhall, Charles D.
Mercer, Robert J.
Merritt, Glen C.
Meschke, Karl W.
Metcalf, Joseph, 3d
Middleton, Clyde W.
Mikkelsen, Richard E.
Miller, Albert E., 3d
Miller, Carl M.
Miller, Donald A.
Miller, Forrest A.
Miller, James
Miller, James P.
Miller, Robert L.
Minnigerode, John H. B.
Mitchell, Thomas S.
Moffitt, Russell L.
Moffitt, Thomas P.
Molleston, Jerald G.
Mongrain, Richard O.
Montague, Pendleton R.
Montgomery, Graden L.
Moore, Loren I.
Moore, William P.
Moore, Wilmot H.
Mooshagian, Madieros
Morehead, Ralph C.
Morellato, Teo J.
Moriarty, John B., Jr.
Moriedge, George A.
Morris, Donald R.
Morris, Howard L.
Morrow, Charles D.
Mosley, Aulcey D.
Most, Frank S.
Mow, Douglas P.
Moyer, Donald R.
Mueller, George E.
Mullen, Roger P.
Mullin, James
Muros, Ralph L.
Murphy, Charles H.
Murray, Douglas V.
Murray, Robert W.
Muto, Charles J.
Myers, Clark G.
Myers, Ralph T.
Myers, William B.
Nagle, Robert O.
Nattel, Adolph M.
Naylor, Charles K.
Neff, Richmond B., Jr.
Neiheisel, James
Nelson, Eric A., Jr.
Ness, James W.
Nevius, William B.
Newton, Jefferson P.
Nile, Samuel H.
Nix, Henry B.
Noonan, Patrick A.
North, Sylvester P.
Noyes, Russell L., Jr.
Nunneley, John K.
Nyce, William E.
O'Brien, Henry J.
O'Brien, Richard A.
O'Gara, Patrick E.
O'Hara, Jack F.
O'Kane, Albert E., Jr.
Olmhausen, Thomas R.
Olsen, Ralph D.
Olson, Alexius B.
Olson, Paul D.
Olson, Willard R.
O'Malley, William E., Jr.
Orem, John B., Jr.
O'Rourke, Melrose B., Jr.
Osborn, Donald R.
Osbourne, Donald R., III
O'Toole, Kevin J.
Overdorf, Thomas R.
Owen, Robert A.
Paddock, Charles O.
Padgett, James P.
Palmer, Allan V.
Panciera, Vincent W.
Papuga, John P.
Parker, John G.
Parks, William W.
Parler, William C.
Patch, Irwin, Jr.
Patten, Michael A.
Patterson, William W., Jr.
Peacock, Clifford L.
Peak, Duane E.
Pearlston, Carl B., Jr.
Peck, Edwin C.
Peeler, Philip L.
Pegues, John K., Jr.
Pendell, Carl R.
Pendl, Robert D.
Perlitz, Warner J., Jr.
Perry, Charlie A.
Peterson, Clarence D.
Peterson, Jimmie G.
Peterson, John C.

Peterson, Lloyd G., Jr.
Peterson, Richard E.
Pettigrew, Raymond A.
Peugh, Everett R.
Pfeiff, Robert L.
Pheasant, Alan G.
Phillips, Alan R.
Phillips, Harry E.
Phillips, William R.
Phillips, William E.
Piette, Robert J.
Pinning, Joseph E.
Piraino, Daniel
Plache, Robert J.
Pogue, David W.
Porter, William P.
Pototsky, William J.
Powelson, Richard R.
Powers, William L., Jr.
Powers, Wilbur P.
Pramann, Robert F.
Prelogar, Archie E.
Prescott, Robert
Pressly, William H., Jr.
Proctor, Donald K.
Pugh, David M.
Purse, William B., Jr.
Putnam, John G., Jr.
Quackenbush, Justin L.
Quinton, Paul T.
Quitmeyer, Herman C.
Radford, Grant N.
Radja, James E.
Raison, Robert M.
Raithel, Albert L., Jr.
Ramsey, Walter A.
Rapp, Fred L.
Raulston, James W., Jr.
Rawley, William J., Jr.
Ray, Arliss D.
Rdesinski, Maurice P.
Read, Garlin R.
Reagan, Patrick H.
Reardon, Oliver A., Jr.
Reaves, Joseph C.
Reckert, Richard A.
Redfield, John M.
Reed, John G.
Reed, Robert K.
Reeder, John E.
Reedy, Daniel M.
Reid, Albert R.
Reid, Thorburn, 3d
Reilly, Kevin P.
Reiss, Robert M.
Reitmeyer, Clayton B.
Rentz, Frank L., Jr.
Reynolds, Roy S.
Rhoad, Merritt N., Jr.
Richard, Donald E.
Richard, Harold G.
Richardson, Richard H.
Richardson, John A.
Richardson, Robert L.
Rigsbee, Clifford M.
Rilling, Alexander W.
Robertson, Douglas B.
Robinson, Donald G., Jr.
Robinson, Gray S.
Robinson, Robert B.
Roche, Clinton E.
Rockwell, Nevin L.
Rockwell, Richard F.
Rockwood, Jerry R.
Rogers, James O.
Rogers, Richard J.
Rogers, Robert P.
Rosati, Joseph
Rose, Jerry H.
Rose, Roy W.
Rosenberger, John E.
Rosendale, Robert H.
Rothmann, Warren W.
Rough, Jimmie L.
Rowland, Edgar C., Jr.
Rowley, Reginald C.
Rue, Harland J., 2d
Rugg, William R.
Ruggles, Howard E., 2d
Rush, Thornwell F.
Rushing, Charles F.
Russ, Jack E.
Ryerson, Rogers P.
Safford, Robert D.
Sager, Stanley C.
Salewski, Benno W.
Salin, Robert S.
Sandberg, William G.
Saroedy, Louis R.
Sasseen, Kenneth D.
Sassone, Charles H., Jr.
Savoca, Joseph A.
Saylor, Eugene H.
Schack, Edwin R., Jr.
Schaefer, Erhard
Schaeffer, David A.
Scherb, Carl F.
Schindler, Fred L.
Schleiger, Richard R.
Schoettle, Harry J.
Schuller, Gordon J.
Schultz, Ford J. E.
Schutz, Walter J.
Scott, James T.
Scull, John D.
Sears, Glen R.
Sease, Hugh S., Jr.
Seay, Wesley H., Jr.
Segur, Donald L.
Selfors, Henry J.
Semmes, Oliver J., 3d
Seward, John A., Jr.
Sexauer, Charles R.
Shabe, Gerard P.
Shaffer, Guy H. B.
Shaid, Robert A.
Shamsky, Burton
Shanahan, Thomas L.
Sharpe, James R.
Shaughnessy, William D.
Shaver, Frank T.
Shea, Edward J.
Shearer, Peter S.
Sheely, Donald M.
Shefield, John W., Jr.
Shepard, Clayton V.
Sheppard, Robert L., Jr.
Sherman, Peter W.
Sherman, Roy B.
Sherwood, John G.
Shimer, Melvin G.
Shiver, James K.
Shores, Robert M., Jr.
Shrine, Bertram, Jr.
Shuler Robert L.
Shutty, Michael S.
Sigmon, Harold F.
Silver, Robert C.
Silvestrini, Reno J.
Simmons, Edgar H.
Simonds, Milton R.
Sims, Clifford M., Jr.
Sinclair, Alexander M.
Sinclair, George T., Jr.
Skiles, Frank C., Jr.
Skolaut, Paul L.
Slusher, David L.
Small, Robert H.
Smedberg, William R., IV
Smellie, Rex D.
Smeltzer, John L., Jr.
Smith, David D.
Smith, Douglas J.
Smith, James D.
Smith, Lester R.
Smith, Robert G.
Smith, Wilbur E.
Smith, William A., Jr.
Smith, William F.
Snowe, Theodore E.
Solterer, Carl F.
Sommer, Donald J.
Soracco, David L.
Stader, John F.
Stafford, Richard M.
Stake, Robert E.
Stallings, Alfred K.
Stamey, Claude R., Jr.
Stanley, Richard M.
Stark, John A.
Starn, Harrison, F., Jr.
Steltzer, Wilbur N., Jr.
Stenke, George
Stewart, Henry L., Jr.
Stewart, Rodney L.
Stieren, Oliver B., Jr.
Still, Donald A.
Stiller, Bertram H.
Stine, Leon L., Jr.
St. Lawrence, William P., Jr.
St. Marie, Joseph
Stockdale, Lowell A.
Stocking, Donald E.
Stockman, Charles J., Jr.
Stoddart, James G.
Stodder, Page W. T.
Stoehr, Leonard A.
Stone, Jeff H.
Stornetta, Wakefield S. M.
Story, Travis L., Jr.
Stothard, Ralph B.
Strawmire, John R.
Streightiff, Charles W.
Strella, George G.
Strode, Charles D.
Strohm, James J.
Stump, John S.
Stump, John M.
Sullivan, Donald F.
Sullivan, Joseph L., Jr.
Summers, David L.
Sundry, Arthur P.
Surman, William V., Jr.
Swank, Donald E.
Swart, Robert L., Jr.
Sweeney, Raymond J.
Tallet, Arthur J.
Taylor, Charles M.
Tetrick, Claude J.
Thomas, Gerald E.
Thomas, John K.
Thomas, Preston G.
Thomas, Richard T.
Thompson, Archibald S.
Thompson, David A.
Thompson, Robert M.
Thompson, William S.
Thompson, William J.
Thomson, William O.
Thornton, Raymond H.
Thrasher, Milton F., 2d
Tillotson, Ted K.
Tillson, John G.
Tillson, Roger W., Jr.
Toal, James F.
Tobias, Ralph W.
Tollefson, Norris M.
Tollefson, Charles H.
Tomb, Paul D.
Tomsky, Jackson M.
Tonkin, Norman M.
Trafzer, William H.
Traub, Charles, 3d
Treadwell, Lawrence P., Jr.
Treat, Charles W.
Trens, Mike J.
Tressler, Arthur G.
Trout, Thomas W.
Turnipseed, Elton G., Jr.
Tuzo, Paul B., 3d
Uhrig, William R.
Ulmark, William A.
Updegraph, John M., Jr.
Urban, Frank M.
Utterback, Paul W.
Vail, Harold W.
Vandernaillen, Ralph E., Jr.
VanHook, Gordan
Veenstra, Richard J.
Vercellotti, Joseph P.
Villines, William M., Jr.
Voegelein, Gordon R.
Von Christierson, William W.
Vonier, William H.
Von Readen, Harold W., Jr.
Vrieze, Edwin H., 3d
Wachenfeld, Howard G.
Waddel, Robert C.
Wade, Donald R.
Wageck, Donald R.
Wagle, William E.
Wakelee, David M.
Wales, John R.
Walker, Benjamin S.
Walker, Frank A., Jr.
Walker, William H.
Wall, Joe A.
Wallace, Charles J.
Walsh, Engene J.
Walston, Donald E.
Wandres, Victor C.
Ward, Arthur T.
Ward, Thomas M., Jr.
Ware, Owen H.
Warriner, David D.
Washenfelder, Leroy
Wasilewski, Alex, Jr.
Wassell, James W.
Waterfield, Willard F.
Waterhouse, Charles N., Jr.
Watson, Donald A.
Watson, Thomas W.
Watts, Charles R., Jr.
Wear, James H.
Weaver, Earl J.
Webb, James R.
Webster, James E.
Weeks, Robert H.
Weidenkopf, David W.
Weinbaum, Bennett
Weisheit, Burton A.
Welch, Clyde R.
Welch, William E.
Wellner, Robert F.
Wettroth, John R.
Wheeler, Peter B.
Whelchel, Henry C., Jr.
Whistler, Ralph N., Jr.
Whitaker, Robert M.
White, Arthur C.
White, Douglas C.
White, John E.
Whitehouse, Kenneth R.
Whitman, George W.
Whitner, William C., 3d
Whittemore, Frederick H.
Whyte, Kent E.
Wiita, Richard A.
Wilcox, James C.
Wilkerson, Miles R.
Wilkins, Robert C.
Wilkinson, Raymond O.
Williams, Allen D.
Williams, Alfred J.
Williams, Charles D.
Williams, Charles K.
Williams, Gerald P.
Williams, Gordon D.
Williams, Richard S.
Williams, Ross N.
Williamson, Lee F.
Willings, Thomas H., Jr.
Willis, Francis R.
Willis, John H., Jr.
Wilis, Donald S.
Wilson, Herbert E., Jr.
Wilson, Joseph R.
Wilson, Sheldon R.
Wilson, Warren R.
Winberg, William, 3d
Winkles, Paul F.
Winnefeld, James A.
Wobser, Donald C. O.
Wood, Edward H.
Woodbury, John L., Jr.
Woolwine, Emmon H., Jr.
Wright, Harry W.
Wright, Richard L.
Wunderlich, Robert M.
Wylie, David C.
Wynkoop, Thomas E.
Yarwood, William R.
Yeager, George E.
Yeomans, Franz S.
Yoran, George P., Jr.
Young, Noel S.
Young, Robert A.
Younglove, Benny A.
Youngman, Dean R.
Yourison, James E.
Zerda, Kenneth V.
Ziemba, John C.
Zoehrer, Herbert A.
Zwart, Robert L.
Barrett, Charles W.
Chapman, Howard M., Jr.
Cook, Carroll T.
Duffy, Charles G., Jr.
Durham, Homer G.
Eells, Gerdin D.
Erhart, James W.
Feldman, Harry G.
Fenton, Robert E.
Fitzpatrick William A.
Gaches, John W.
Higginbotham, Leonard H.
Kinsley, Donald T.
Morris, Everett L., Jr.
Novak, Russell S.
Paulk, Joseph M.
Peters, Robert E.
Pittman, Jack R.
Porter, Orland A., Jr.
Rose, James A.
Rylee, James E.
Schubert, Leslie H., Jr.
Schultz, John L., Jr.
Schwarz, Ira N.
Smyth, James M.
Stewart, Merle A., Jr.
Waggoner, Kenneth K.
Wenzel, Robert F.
Wilber, Walter E.
Wilson, Clarence E.
Adams, Joan F.
Arenth, Rosemary D.
Barnett, Mary M.
Beecher, Nancy L.
Bittroiff, Margaret F.
Brenner, Marion C.
Carpenter, Hillewy N.
Casanova, Jean O.
Connors, Mary T.
Forsman, Louise E. G.
Grieve, Nellie M.
Hart, Elizabeth
Hodges, George
Jacobson, Mitzie L.
Kuhnle, Sibyl L.
McNair, Diana
Moore, Mary V.
O'Connel, Camille
Panoff, Kathleen D. B.
Patch, Frances M.
Sheffels, Mary E.
Shera, Suzanne S.
Small, Ethel R. K.
Spiegel, Helen I.
Summers, Doris E.
Thompson, Bobbie J.
Wallace, Myra
Webster, Ann E.
Whitfield, Ruth V.
Whitgrove, Eleanor A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Abbey, Alfred E.
Abraham, Donavon E.
Armitage, Thomas K.
Baker, Clovis M.
Barrett, Roger P.
Barton, Gerald
Bartuska, Anthony J.
Boyce, Thomas A.
Boyd, David T.
Bray, Joseph A., Jr.
Bruch, Herbert W.
Burley, Newton S.
Camfield, Howard M.
Chapman, Allen P.
Chapman, Darrell S.
Clark, Laurence E.
Covey, Richard L.
Daniel, John M., Jr.
Day, Jack R.
Dowdey, James E.
Dreese, Richard N.
Dunlevy, John H.
Ellis, Anthony T., Jr.
Folli, Arthur C.
French, Walter H., Jr.
Ghostley, Gary D.
Ghysels, David G.
Gillette, Claude G., Jr.
Gordon, Donald B.
Grant, Howard M.
Guillo, Louis S.
Hale, Paul A., Jr.
Hannah, Joseph L.
Hassenplug, John P.
Hauser, Derrell B.
Hedrich, Richard H.
Hendershot, Theodore R.
Ingle, John H., Jr.
Innes, Robert E.
Jackson, Alexander, 3d
James, Billy M.
Johnson, Jack G.
Kerwath, Richard C. F.
King, Gerald H.
King, Rufus M.
Kiplinger, Willet B.
Kirms, Frederick O.
Kneece, James F., Jr.
Kohler, John A.
Koller, Bertil R.
Koonce, Calvin B.
Leighty, Gary C.
Lesh, Franklin J.
Lewis, Alan G.
Lewis, John B.
Little, Wilfred R.
Malkemes, Robert P.
Mawhorter, Richard J.
Maxwell, Paul M.
McKenzie, Charles H.
Mitchell, William F.
Mulder, John R.
Murphy, Donal J.
Murphy, Wilford K.
Nalley, John V.
Naughtin, John D.
Nehez, James R., Jr.
Nelson, George W.
Niehaus, Robert J.
Olson, Douglas J.
Patterson, James S.

Praeger, John R.
Reade, Lowell A.
Reed, Clarence E.
Rice, Charles E.
Rixey, Charles W.
Samuelson, Charles H.
Schofield, John S., 3d
Shinn, Leonard M.
Short, Jack L.
Slattery, Hugh M.
Smith, Herbert R.
Smith, James D.
Snyder, Rembrandt B.
Speckman, Herman G.
Stouder, Robert P.
Stratton, Dene B.
Stroup, Floyd O.
Sullivan, John P.
Thrutchley, William E.
Todd, Alexander W., Jr.
Tracy, John J., Jr.
Ulrich, Eugene A.
Umstead, Walter W., Jr.
Urban, Robert
Van Order, Matthew H.
Walsh, Andrew J.
Walsh, John E.
Ward, Allen C.
Ward, Maxwell G., Jr.
Webb, George H.
White, George H.
Young, Bruce C.
Allison, Elizabet L.
Cook, Clair
Tomljanovich, Marianne E.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Biederman, Richard J.
Bodtke, David H.
Courtright, Carl
Davis, Walter E., Jr.
DeGroot, Ward W., 3d
Jones, Robert L.
Martin, Robert A.
Otis, George L., Jr.
Roth, Charles J., Jr.
Stevens, Warren G.
Turci, George P.
Whelan, James A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Akers, Thomas G.
Alexander, Ross D.
Anderson, Kenneth N.
Asche, Clifton A.
Berrian, James H.
Bloom, Henry H.
Boudreaux, Joseph C., Jr.
Brown, Marvin J.
Buck, Charles W.
Caruso, Homer A.
Chansky, Ralph D.
Connery, Horace J.
Cox, Richard M.
Dowling, James H.
Edwards, Billy M.
Ferris, Ezra F.
Feuquay, Donald E.
Haden, Hulot W.
Hine, Charles M.
Holcombe, John T.
Johnson, William H., Jr.
Jonas, Richard S.
Jordan, Robert D.
Kathan, Ralph H.
Ledbetter, Rufus K., Jr.
Lipes, Wheeler B.
L'Italien, Robert V.
Matelk, Edward D.
McConville, William E.
McGuire, Frederick L.
McIntosh, Francis W.
McRae, John D.
Meyer, William J.
Milano, James P.
Mitchell, Thomas G.
Murphy, John S.
Nelson, Mason A., Jr.
Nichols, Lavern E.
Peckham, Samuel C., Jr.
Petoletti, Angelo R.
Pipkin, Donald L.
Puzass, Harper.
Ragle, Philip R.
Rudolph Henry S.
Schindele, Rodger F.
Sedam, Richard L.
Sherin, Paul J.
Summerour, Thomas J.
Tyler, Joseph M., Jr.
Watts, Lloyd A.
Welch, Charles F.
Williams, Daniel N.

NURSE CORPS

Adams, Elise A.
Bair, Betty D.
Beaulieu, Mary P.
Beeman, Ednah M.
Berkman, Virginia O.
Bingham, Mildred E.
Bracy, Edith L.
Brookfield, Barbara E.
Bruce, Martha E.
Carmichael, Ruth M.
Chalker, Emily J.
Cole, Elizabeth E.
Conder, Maxine
Constans, Mary C.
Copeland, Winifred L.
Cowden, Elnora J.
DeAmicis, Betty A.
DeMarco, Delphine
Denison, Beverly J.
DiGiandomenico, Jennie C.
Dwyer, Dolores R.
Elsesser, June M.
Evans, Hilda
Finn, Celine A.
Fogarty, Anna L.
Foht, Evelyn C.
Friga, Elizabeth
Garbutt, Clara A.
Hamlen, Nancy A.
Hanley, Susan M.
Hanson, Dorothy M.
Harper, Harriet S.
Harris, Mary H.
Henen, Mary T.
Hoffman, Jo Ann
Humphrey, Wanda J.
Hundley, Barbara J.
Knapka, Irene C.
Knapp, Dorothy R.
Koebel, Beverly J.
Krause, Dorothy V.
Kvale, Mary L.
Lara, Inez
MacDonald, Patricia H.
Marfia, Virginia
Mason, Essie N.
McCann, Frances A.
McCarty, Elnora J.
Meyer, Lorraine M.
Miller, Alice J.
Miller, Bethel D.
Miller, Blanche O.
Miller, Charlotte J.
Miller, Claire R.
Mongan, Lois J.
Moore, Dorothy I.
Murasheff, Lina D.
Murray, Nancy M.
Nesbit, Mary W.
Niebias, Anna M.
Norris, Barbara
O'Donnell, Mary L.
Osborne, Leah V.
Osborne, Loah G.
Pampush, Ruth G.
Parent, Shirley M.
Piper, Jeannette M.
Pope, Elizabeth
Rigsby, Helen M.
Ristau, Nancy M.
Ritchey, Helen G.
Roberts, Mary Y.
Rundstrom, Frances E.
Saavedra, Berta M.
Scarcello, Julia E.
Shields, Dorothy J.
Simmons, Dorothy L.
Skaggs, Elizabeth S.
Skrinak, Margaret M.
Sossamon, Willie M.
Spears, Lola G.
Spence, Ruth G.
Spencer, Golda R.
Stahr, Delores L.
Steele, Mary L.
Sterling, Elinor B.
Stock, Iris M.
Stratton, Rosalind C.
Taylor, Mazie C.
Tomac, Dorothy A.
Urban, Myrtle E.
Vanatta, Rose L.
Van Cleave, Patricia J.
Venishnick, Anna E.
Walter, Anna L.
White, Dorothy A.
Wienczek, Clara P.
Wilson, Adeline M.
Zimmerman, Nancy V.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grades indicated:

REAR ADMIRAL, LINE

Robert L. Campbell, Jr.
Ralph E. Wilson
Elmer E. Yeomans
Wallace M. Beakley
Ephraim R. McLean, Jr.
Richard F. Stout
Bernard L. Austin
William V. Davis, Jr.
Aurelius B. Vosseller
Marcel E. A. Gouin
Dale Harris
Henry C. Daniel
Harold P. Smith
Thomas C. Ragan
Robert Goldthwaite
Wallis F. Petersen
Ira H. Nunn
Harry B. Temple
John C. Daniel
Peter W. Haas, Jr.
Armand M. Morgan
Robert S. Hatcher
George C. Towner
Lester K. Rice
Howard L. Collins
William L. Erdmann
Hyman G. Rickover
Edward W. Clexton

REAR ADMIRAL, MEDICAL CORPS

Thomas F. Cooper

REAR ADMIRAL, SUPPLY CORPS

Charles G. DeKay
James B. Ricketts

REAR ADMIRAL, SUPPLY CORPS, NAVAL RESERVE

Clarence G. Warfield

REAR ADMIRAL, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Charles L. Strain

REAR ADMIRAL, DENTAL CORPS

Ralph W. Malone

CAPTAIN, LINE

Francis E. Wilson
Leland G. Shaffer
Noah Adair, Jr.
Jesse H. Motes, Jr.
George G. Molumphy
Justin L. Wickens
Porter Lewis
Donald I. Thomas
William R. Wilson
Theodore S. Lank
John H. S. Johnson
William Winter, Jr.
Henry H. McCarley
Lionel A. Arthur
David H. McDonald
Charles E. Perkins
Arthur J. Barrett, Jr.
Thomas M. Davis
Bennett M. Dodson
William R. Sheeley
Philip P. Leigh
Elgin B. Hurlbert
Harold R. Badger
Adolph J. Petersen
Thomas G. Wallace
Harry A. Adams, Jr.
Norman E. Smith
Herbert G. Claudius
Chauncey S. Willard
Morton Sunderland
John H. Kaufman
William M. Ryon
Thomas D. F. Langen
George E. Pierce
Frank A. Dingfelder
Alexander Kusebauch
Walter D. Innis
William C. F. Robards
Isador J. Schwartz
Edgar K. Thompson
Benjamin L. Lubelsky
Easton B. Noble
Robert B. Madden
Raymond W. Thompson, Jr.
Harold G. Bowen, Jr.
Jack W. Roe
James S. Bethea
Thomas H. Morton
Richard L. Mohan
Henry P. Rumble
David Lambert
Nova B. Kiergan, Jr.
Charles A. Curtze
Bernard H. Meyer
Robert E. Garrels
Robert W. Curtis
Luther C. Heins
George H. Laird, Jr.
Robert M. Gibbons
Jay V. Chase
Baxter L. Russell
James R. Ogden
Ignatius J. Galantin
James F. Tucker
Robert H. Solier
Merle F. Bowman
Charles K. Duncan
Paul L. Stahl
Richard L. Kibbe
Thomas F. Connolly
James V. Bewick
Waldemar F. A. Wendt
Edwin S. Miller
Ward F. Hardman
Norman W. Gambling
Willard R. Laughon
Ralph L. Shifley
Kenneth Loveland
James B. Burrow
Charles E. Robertson
James G. Franklin
Enrique D. Haskins
John A. Tyree, Jr.
Wallace A. Sherrill
Elmer H. Conklin
Carter L. Bennett
Julian S. Hatcher, Jr.
Hayden L. Leon
Theodore R. Vogeley
Gilbert L. Countryman
John S. Coye, Jr.
Arthur M. Blamphin
Michael J. Lucsey
Albert L. Shepherd
Earnest G. Campbell
James H. Fortune, Jr.
Frederick H. Wahlig
James H. Campbell
Robert A. Keating, Jr.
William C. Fortune
Jack C. Titus
Lester C. Conwell
Charles L. Moore, Jr.
Hubert E. Thomas
Raymond B. Jacoby
Joseph W. Williams, Jr.
Bruce E. Wiggin
Frederick L. Ashworth
Antone R. Gallaher
James M. Elliott
Ruben E. Wagstaff
Thomas H. Moorer
Warren B. Christie
Joseph F. Enright
Frederick W. Bruning
Roy M. Davenport
Arnold F. Schade
William L. Dawson
Dale Mayberry
Harold E. Cross
John S. Lehman
John Shannon
Henry D. Sturr
Lorentz D. Bellinger
Benjamin B. Cheatham
Philip W. Garnett
Horace V. Bird
Irvin S. Hartman
David L. Martineau
Charles B. Jackson, Jr.
George L. Phillips
Frank D. Schwartz
Martin A. Shellabarger
Charles E. Loughlin
Otto W. Spahr, Jr.
Hugh R. McKibbin
Lemuel M. Stevens, Jr.
Edward E. Shelby
Hugh R. Awtrey
James O. Cobb
James B. Grady
Ralph M. Pray
Merrill K. Clementson
Kenneth S. Shook
Charles T. Fritter
Bernard M. Strean
Frank M. Slater
Thomas A. Christopher
Joseph I. Manning
George K. Hudson
Harold F. Crist
Robert W. Leach
Ray Davis
Carl Tiedeman
Paul Masterton
George H. Miller
Robert A. Macpherson
John T. Blackburn
Raymond L. Fulton
Richard B. Derickson, Jr.
Joseph W. Koenig
Selby K. Santmyers
William S. Howell
Richard C. Gazlay
Stephen Jurika, Jr.
George D. Roullard
William R. Kane
William W. R. Macdonald
Archie T. Wright, Jr.
Carlton B. Jones
James J. Vaughan
Clifford M. Campbell
Ralph E. Styles
James W. White
Donald E. MacIntosh
Everett J. Foster
John L. Counihan, Jr.
George P. Rogers
John B. Smith
Robert S. Riddell
John M. Steinbeck
George M. Price
Harold E. Ruble
Charles F. Garrison
Walter H. Newton, Jr.
Paul D. Buie
Francis J. Blouin
William V. Pratt 2d
Albert C. Ingels
Robert I. Olsen
Edward F. Jackson
Joseph P. Costello
Joseph O. Christian
David A. Sooy

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS

John L. Hatch
Walter Welham
Herbert H. Eighmy
Stephen J. Ryan
Marion T. Yates
Eugene P. Harris
James B. Shuler
John F. Foertner
Robert S. Poos
Thomas Ferwerda
James G. Bulgrin
Roy R. Powell
Murray W. Ballenger
Thomas P. Connelly
Harold R. Berk

CAPTAIN, SUPPLY CORPS

Ralph M. Humes
DeWitt C. MacKenzie
James S. Dietz
Paul L. Weintraub, Jr.
Albert F. Ryan, Jr.
Donald W. Twigg
Alfred T. Magnell
Thomas P. O'Connell
Donald O. Lacey
Charles A. LaFarge
Leland P. Kimball, Jr.
Lamar Lee, Jr.
Howard T. Bierer
Charles A. Blick

CAPTAIN, CHAPLAIN CORPS

John D. Zimmerman
Joseph F. Dreith

CAPTAIN, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Madison Nichols
Clifton B. McFarland
Robert W. Schepers
Harry H. Bagley

Norman J. Drustrup
Joseph A. McHenry
Henry J. Fitzpatrick
Henry C. Shaid
Lewis M. Davis, Jr.
George C. Emery
George E. Fischer, Jr.
John A. Stelger
Joseph White
George S. Robinson
Carl J. Scheve
Raymond Lamoreaux

CAPTAIN, DENTAL CORPS

William R. Burns
Clifford J. Waas
John E. Krieger
Charles F. Hoyt
Emmet L. Manson
William Seidel
Morris C. Craig
John C. Allen
Edward C. Raffetto
Williard J. Goldring
James A. English
Frank E. Frates, Jr.
Karl V. L. Berglund
Walter W. Lippold
Jesse V. Westerman
Charles T. Pridgeon
James L. Wanger
Daryl S. McClung
John J. Hilt
Frank I. Gonzalez, Jr.
Miller H. Cosby
Wendell Naish

COMMANDER, LINE

John W. Shields
Francis W. Deily
Karl H. Stefan
Franz N. Kanaga
George T. Elliott
Cyril G. Griffin
William T. O'Dowd, Jr.
John P. Gleeson
William R. Bottenberg
Earl C. Collins
Page Goldbeck
Noel V. Bird
Harry J. Conway
Arthur Parris
Robert F. Nuttmann
Walter H. Barckmann
Willard W. De Venter
Henry E. Schmidt
Clifford A. Lenz
John P. Fleet
Howard J. Hoffberg
Joe C. Davis
John E. Kennedy
John R. Bowen II
Maxwell "D" McDonald
James P. English, Jr.
Marion A. Mason
Edwin E. Ogren
Frank B. Stone
Ralph M. Bagwell
James O. Brady
James B. Filson
Ernest M. Beauchamp
Joseph C. Anderson
James M. Tippey
Harry A. Jackson
James W. Newhall
Lloyd E. Sloan
Aldred H. Wunderli
Toivo V. Kyllonen
Joseph E. Thompson, Jr.
Frederick R. Hoeppner
William N. Durley
Donald A. Regan
Richard J. Reid, Jr.
John H. Hitchcock
Antoine W. Venne, Jr.
Herbert S. Kienk
Paul Gano
Charles M. Sturkey, Jr.
Oliver D. Compton
Andrew P. Burgess, Jr.
David M. McIntosh
Karl B. Kohler
Charles A. Darrah
Leland S. Denning
Willard J. McNulty
Albert L. Kobey, Jr.
Winton, C. Sharpe
Benjamin F. Worcester II
Jack R. English
George H. Rood
Daniel F. Larkin, Jr.
Frank V. Mason
Henry M. Murphey
Donald A. Dertien
Gene R. LaRocque
Neil B. MacIntosh
Seth T. Howard
Robert A. Scurlock
Jere J. Santry, Jr.
Philip G. Dye
Malcolm G. Evans
John J. Reidy, Jr.
Richard N. Billings
Maurice D. Callahan
James E. Hackett, Jr.
William T. Luce
Meredith L. Scott
Richard W. Parisian
Andrew W. Long, Jr.
Louie W. Barnard
Frank M. Murphy
Harry J. Hulings
Keith T. Shortall
Charles A. Bellis
George P. Sotos
Jacob A. Rinker, Jr.
Harold N. Poulsen
Elmer T. Stonecipher
Stanley R. Craw, Jr.
Wyman N. Jackson
James S. Bryant
Wallace P. Buerschinger
Dana P. French
Dale E. Fairchild
Edward L. Foster
John S. Harris
Morton N. Black
Wilbur P. Collins
Paul H. Shropshire, Jr.
Gerald F. Carney
Daniel V. James
Norman A. Young
Burton L. Bikle
Max E. Cawley
Di J. Dierks
Cornelius J. Smits, Jr.
James R. Kittrell
Coleman H. Smith
William M. Foster
Bernard A. Lienhard
William B. Coley
Edwin H. Kiefer
Jack H. Tripp
David B. Patton, Jr.
Robert H. Wheeler
Robert R. Rodgers
Samuel T. Orme
James J. May, Jr.
Robert L. Abbott
Robert E. Sorensen
John R. McKee
Donald L. Irgens
Joseph O. Buchanan, Jr.
George H. Hedrick, Jr.
Harold J. Kicker
Allan Rothenberg

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

George C. Calderwood
James K. Cunningham
Rufus J. Pearson, Jr.
Carl E. Wilbur
James W. Firoved

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Robert S. Hill
Samuel Y. Walker
Philip W. Evans
Thomas H. Bruno
Joseph L. Howard
Bernard L. McCreery
Irving F. Macey
Frederick A. Lyon
David P. Andross
Evert R. Sharp
Kenneth D. Strickler
Clark O. Martin
Arromanus C. Lyles, Jr.
Arthur G. Beale

COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Prescott B. Wintersteen

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

William J. Valentine
Donald R. Rooke
Victor G. Stevens

COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Harold W. Feder
Gus J. Jerkofsky
George H. Sandman
Leroy R. Frantz

COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Claude V. Timberlake, Jr.

COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Ann A. Bernatitus
Mildred Terrill
Jesse D. Hodge
Minnie O. Overton

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Arthur L. Andrew
Edward L. Ardoyno, Jr.
Hugh T. Boland
William B. Chubb
Howard E. Clark, Jr.
William D. Coats
Eugene W. Coler
George R. Cress
Roger D. Crotteau
George L. Derendinger
Lee W. Douglas
John McD. Duffie, Jr.
Bobby L. Dunn
Walter R. Ebling
Thomas G. Farrell
William J. Funkhouser
Thomas G. Groover, Jr.
Robert A. Gruber
Lloyd B. Hartsough, Jr.
Daniel J. Helbeck
Virgil K. Holland
Frederick B. Hunt
Barry W. Hutchings
John P. Jackson
Paul F. Jacobs
William J. Johnson, Jr.
William A. Jones
John K. Kracha
James A. Loomer
Clyde P. Martin, Jr.
Robert T. Meyer
Ralph P. Michaelsen
George E. Miller
Ronald P. Moore
Thomas J. Murray
David E. Oleson
William R. Pippin
Joseph J. Profilet
Richard C. Pugh
Alexander H. W. Quartly
Charles E. Rambo
Edwin S. Redkey
Lester H. Reinke
Percy T. Rittenhouse
Richard M. Rogers, Jr.
Richard C. Rostmeyer
Harold E. Roush
George S. Schuite
David W. Shenton
Richard H. Six
William P. Speed
Virgil P. Stuart
Richard J. Verbrugge, Jr.
Roger K. Wadsworth
Dexter A. Washburn
William R. Watson, Jr.
Paul J. Weitz, Jr.
Glenn R. Wiggins
Bobby J. Williams
Howard M. Williamson
Richard C. Wise

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy:

Joseph R. Blackshaw
Jack K. Ehlers
John G. Haase
Marvin W. Mog
Alfred B. Nelson
Donald L. Schmidt
Willard M. Schmidt
Russell L. Vance

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Robert J. Allen
Edward M. Armstrong
Gerald P. Barnett
Thomas Bingham, Jr.
Bruce B. Bloomquist
Jerald W. Bucklin
Howard L. Carlson
John G. Cave
Durward C. Cecil
James H. Cochrane
William A. Cody
Charles L. Coffman
James W. Cornwell
Alan R. Cunningham
Charles A. Duffy
Joseph F. Dunn
Alfred C. Eastman III
Richard E. Engel
Marshall E. Ewing
Francis C. Gehres
John E. Gilbertson
Donald R. Gibbs
Forrest D. Goetschius
Robert L. Grappi
Wilbur E. Greenleaf
Neil G. Holt
Frank J. Horstmann
James R. Hughes
Edmund W. Ingley
Maurice M. Johnston, Jr.
John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Milius
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

John M. Campbell
Edward J. Laskowski
David B. Rulon

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Mack E. Allison, Jr.
Richard T. Arnest, Jr.
Howard S. Browne, Jr.
William J. Deegan
William J. Gallagher, Jr.
Thomas S. Johnson
John R. Kane
Nicholas P. Kitrinos
James A. Long
Thomas R. McKinley
Marshall W. Olson
Morgan F. Osgood
Dean J. Plazak
Jean-Maurice Poitras
Philip E. Ramires
Max J. Trummer
Homer P. Wiley

The following-named to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Dale E. Doverspike
Edward P. Hammond
Thomas G. Hawkins
Donald C. LeMaster
Guy M. Leonard, Jr.
Earle F. Lunceford, Jr.
Withers McA. Moore
Bernard N. Morris
William G. Smith, Jr.

The following-named to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Edward G. Hutton
Carl L. Wilhelm

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Gordon P. Baxter
Clem J. Hill
Thomas W. McKeaa
Edward C. Penick

The following-named officers to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Chauncey C. Adams, Jr.
Jack S. Bailey
Alan D. Bauerschmidt
Paul E. Cook
Henry C. DeGrotte, Jr.
Gilbert A. Diaz
George I. Dobbs
Joseph Feith
William R. Furrey
Robert E. George
Vaughn Howard
Daniel "M" Jones
Ray D. Jordan
George A. Nyman
Leon M. Roach
Claude A. Rogers, Jr.
Billie Roller
Dalton A. Rowell
Bill J. Smith
Jack R. Storms
David H. Turner
Carl M. Wagner
Orval B. Wetzel
Clyde O. Wimberly

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Alan W. Ferron
Forbes O. Bryce
William McK. Braybrook

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Lewis C. Bartlett
James M. Ireland
Howard L. Kubel
James F. McRaith
Thomas J. Moriarty
Joseph M. Parsons

LIEUTENANT

Albert J. Bartlett
William J. Coleman
William F. Feely
Cary E. Landis
William B. Murray, Jr.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

James B. Acton
Robert D. Adams
William F. Casper
George V. Eidson
Robert Ennis
Francis E. Field
Eugene I. Finke
Harold J. Fiore
John H. Fitzgerel
Richard E. Flynn
Robert A. Gideon, Jr.
Paul Gonzalez
Raymond W. Gresham
William Hann
Charles R. Hannum
James B. Hardgrave
Harry O. Hellberg
William B. Hooffstetter
Mark Hopkins, Jr.
Warren R. Kiernan
Robert L. Kneedler, Jr.
Will E. Lassiter
Ernest P. Lehnig
William E. Llewellyn
Warren W. Lord
Kirby LaR. McClain III
Donald S. May
Lewis M. Moss
Pehr H. Pehrsson
Henry J. Ray, Jr.
Reuben G. Rogerson
Clayton E. Royce, Jr.
George A. Sayre
Frank A. Smith
Charles R. Stephan
James W. Strobel
Leslie A. Taylor, Jr.
Emmett H. Tidd
Gerald P. Timoney
Leonard L. Tucker, Jr.
Leland J. Underwood
John T. Wells
Gordon H. Wiram

ENSIGN

Alden B. Anderson
Robert J. Anderson
Leon L. Andrews
Donald L. Angier
James J. Arnold
James H. Ayres
Philip A. Barnes
Roy F. Barrett
Robert J. Bova
Russell B. Bridgham
Tandy W. Carter
Albert N. Chandler, Jr.
Howard Chereskin
Eugene T. Connors
Raymond B. Corob
Everett D. Corsepius
Harold E. Dame
Wilfrid Devine
Richard A. Dickins
Laurent N. Dion
Robert F. Dussault
Kenneth W. Echols
Eric N. Fenno
James R. Floyd
Arthur D. Fowler, Jr.
Jack T. French
John E. Gardner, Jr.
Richard E. Gleason
Fredric Gnadt
Harry R. Graf
John Guetschow
William J. Gunn
Thomas D. Hall
Vinton O. Harkness, Jr.
James H. Harrison, Jr.
Robert R. Harvey, Jr.
Lennart G. Holmberg
Willie M. Jones, Jr.
Vernon G. Kidd
Harry B. Knecht
Alan Kvello
David J. McAnulty
Robert P. McBain
Joseph J. McBeth
Harold A. McGrath
Albert S. McLemore
Gilbert H. Maatta
Robert E. Mann
Robert C. Mason
John A. Mazzolini
Joe C. Mitchell
Edward J. Mountford
Austin C. O'Brien, Jr.
Robert L. Obrey
Peter H. Orvis
Morris A. Peelle
Donald C. Pette
William E. Poling
John N. Postak
Jean R. Pouliot
Maurice W. Rea
Benny J. Ricardo
John D. Rodda
Eugene C. Rueff
Jesse E. Sampson
Henry E. Schubert
Patrick J. Sciarretta
George W. Shaffer
John K. Skomp
Sherwin J. Sleeper
Edmund A. Smith, Jr.
Leonard J. Sobieski
George A. Sorg
Stanislaus J. Sowinski
Dean Stocklmeir
Philip S. Talkin
Clinton W. Taylor
Robert L. Thomas
Robert L. Thompson
Hubbard Trefts
Billie C. Tyson
William B. Usilton
Floyd P. West
Howard W. Wilkins
James G. Williams III
Paul W. Williamson
Thomas H. Wood

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the line (aviation) of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Jack D. Martin

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Thomas V. McEnery

LIEUTENANT

John S. Christiansen
Ralph W. Corson
Jack H. Crawford
Alexander Vraciu
James Waddell

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Donald A. Cook
Henry M. Dibble
Richard W. Iligen
Leland R. Jepsen
Charles H. Lindberg
Henry B. McCaulley
Joseph P. Massey
Lee C. Miles
Frederick W. Norman, Jr.
Andrew J. Van Tuyl, Jr.
Glenn W. Ward
Donald McK. Wyand

ENSIGN

John C. Duck
Hugo L. Ecklund, Jr.
James H. Gray
Jerome R. Pilon
Harlan E. Reep
Richard Rich
Fred D. Snyder
Alfred B. Sullivan
Richard C. Winkler

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Glover H. Cook
Jerome J. Scheela
Joe G. Schoggen

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Thomas F. Ball, Jr.
Alyn L. Borchers
Darrell N. Coba
Clifford L. Crook, Jr.
Dick H. Francisco
Walter Garbalinski
Raymond G. Gunn
Jack E. Honsinger
LeRoy E. Hopkins
Kenneth G. McGrath
Joseph F. Ouellette
Raymond C. Stubbs
Gordon E. Welch
Paul V. Westin
James C. Will
William L. Winfrey

ENSIGN

John J. Boyle
John E. Bozewicz
William H. Dickey
Paul M. Gralton
James E. Hammond
Ivan J. Klatt
Thomas E. McCoy, Jr.
James W. Mead
Quinn B. Morrison
William E. Nast
Harold P. O'Neil
Charles B. Paul III
James B. Ramey
Gerald M. Robison
John E. Sandrock
William G. Vroman
William B. York, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Clarence F. Mobley

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Gordon W. Schley

ENSIGN

Curtis R. Williams, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

ENSIGN

Louis R. Kaufman
John P. Quinn
Henry D. Baldridge, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Francis L. McGann

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Hugh C. Embry

LIEUTENANT

Malcolm A. Carpenter

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert F. Barlik
John E. Bell
George T. Boyd
Hal H. Eaton
Joseph A. Frank
Charles E. Hallstone
Victor J. Ivers
Ernest R. Lineberger, Jr.
Peter G. McKnight
Thomas E. Moye
Everett B. Nelson
Edward L. Richardson
Lowell R. Rogers
Robert W. Smith
Charles W. Solomon
John H. Tackett

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Velia C. Covolo
Alene B. Duerk
Juanita F. Hutchens
Dorothy E. Read
Caroline L. Scharf

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Alice M. Crowell
Natalie M. Dewar
Katheryn L. T. Doherty
Barbara Haviland
Dellabelle Herbert
Harriet P. McAlpin
Gabrielle R. Pepin
Elizabeth A. Richardson
Betty E. Rigby
Stanislaus J. Smith
Wilhelmina H. Stafford
Kathryn L. Thompson

ENSIGN

Dona D. Boyack
Rebecca H. Jackson
Rose A. Kirsch

The following-named women officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Margaret J. Gravatt
Mary M. Hill

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Helen A. Chrobak
Charlotte L. Safford

ENSIGN

Mary A. Bachtel
Veronica E. Baker
Margaret L. Barnes
Carolyn M. Beane
Elizabeth A. Black
Alice V. Bradford
Nancy M. Bradley
Joy J. Brisben
Leone B. Brisben
Irma J. Brooks
Julia A. Brown
Elizabeth H. Burgess
Stacy C. Burke
Patricia E. Byrne
Sylvia S. Cass
Mary P. Cauthen
Marion J. Clark
Margaret A. Coder
Jean E. Cummings
Audrey DeF. Dantley
Lois V. DeWitt
Barbara J. Dickey
Patricia R. Donovan
Dixie L. Dunham
Shirley L. Ellis
Mildred J. Frawley
Joan Garoutte
Helen Gautreaux
Amarette N. Gilbert
Mary-Jo Goggin
Elinor F. Hanson
Miriam M. Harris
Loretta T. Higgins
Sarah P. Higgins
Barbara JoA. Hoy
Jean A. Ineson
Mary V. Kalaskey
Patricia E. Kiley
Ethelyn M. Koch
Ruth M. Kohl
Joan Koons
Nadene B. LaBonte
Catherine Lintott
Mary J. Lotspeich
Earlene Lowrimore
Shirley A. McNamara
Barbara A. Mader
Elizabeth A. Maloney
Maxine A. Mandt
Margery E. Masback
Jane Meadow
Nancy J. Miller
Rosemarie L. Nardi
Louise F. Nyman
Shirley M. O'Neil
Elizabeth C. Phillips
Edith E. Prewitt
Martha L. Robnett
Lois J. Rupp
Peggy A. Savage
Georgia L. Shapland
Maureen M. Sheehan
Mary L. Slater
Claire L. Smith
Martha B. Smith
Barbara T. Sullivan
Lloyda L. Thompson
Faris A. Tomlinson
JoAnn E. Watkins
JoAnn E. White
Mary L. Wier
Barbara A. Williams
Mary L. Williamson
Betty J. Windham

The following-named women officers to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

ENSIGN

Nellie K. Allen
Gertrude M. Antolowitz
Cynthia C. Dunne
Ruth M. Tomsuden

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, pursuant to title 34, United States Code, section 1020e (a), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James P. Ahearn
Jefferson Alison III
Tom C. Allen, Jr.
Herbert M. Ammermuller
Donald E. Anderson
James W. Anslow
John C. Antonio
Thomas E. Ashlock
Merle W. Asper, Jr.
David B. Asperheim
Donald E. Ather
Hollis L. Augee
Paul C. Augustine, Jr.
Grady Avant, Jr.
John J. Avignone
Roger W. Badeker
Robert A. Bain
Richard F. Baker
Herbert S. Ball
Peter A. Banker
Vincent C. Banker
Douglas B. Barfield
Charles R. Barnard
Charles R. Barr
Duane A. Baukus
Freddie P. Bayless
Lawrence L. Beason
Richard A. Beatty
David W. Bell
James A. Bernhart
William J. Bibb
Robert D. Bickerstaff
Michael H. Biggs

Arthur Bjorlykke, Jr.
Eustace S. Blair, Jr.
Mord Bogie III
Richard C. Bolesky
Thomas G. Bond
Dale J. Bowen, Jr.
Thomas B. Bowling
Harvey D. Bradshaw
Norman J. Brandes
Jerome W. Brown
Alfred D. Bruce, Jr.
Michael M. Brunner
William C. Bryson, Jr.
Gordon H. Buckner II
Louis H. Buehl III
Robert F. Buntrock
Leland E. Butler
Harvey H. Caldwell, Jr.
Ralph L. Campbell
Norman E. Canfield
Sterling K. Carlow
Richard C. Carmichael, Jr.
Richard D. Carr
Donald C. Carroll
George F. Carter
Raymond Ceragioli
Burr T. Chambless
Michael R. Cheripka
Duane J. Chittenden
Julian H. Clark, Jr.
Walter L. Clarkson
John K. Cochran
Charles P. Coleman
John P. Cousland
Robert H. Cowan
Michael B. Cwayna
Andrew W. Danielson
Thomas B. Davinroy
David O. DeGrandpre
Arthur J. Deichmann, Jr.
Orville L. Deniston
Odilio M. Diaz
Clarence W. Dilworth
Constantine A. Dimarco
James E. Dirlam
Emmett E. Doherty, Jr.
William O. Doll
Joseph C. Donoghue
Joseph P. Dooley
Vincent J. Dooley
Terence J. Dougherty
George E. Dow, Jr.
Edward F. Doyle, Jr.
John M. Drabelle, Jr.
John H. Dreiske, Jr.
Donald Ducoff
John L. Dury
Thomas A. Eastland
William E. Eckhardt
Orville R. Edmondson
Thomas L. Edwards
Charles J. Egan, Jr.
Martin J. Egan, Jr.
Charles H. F. Egger
Robert B. Eldridge
Fred T. Elick
John E. Fant
Joseph L. Felter
Roland B. Field
Kenneth P. Finch
William D. Fletcher
Jeremiah Ford III
Sheldon L. Foreman
William F. J. Fortune
M. P. Frank, Jr.
Peter W. Gage
Joseph M. Gaither
Patrick E. Gallagher
William D. Garner
Richard M. Geisler
John C. Gilliman
Thomas R. Glass
Edwin J. Godfrey
Joseph R. Good
Lloyd E. Goodwine
Henry C. Gordon
Lewis H. Gordon
Robert F. Gore
George S. Gorman, Jr.
Vincent J. Gorman
Donald D. Greek
Schuyler E. Grey, Jr.
Jimmie D. Grimm
John E. Gutknecht
Donald F. Hagan
Frederick S. Haines III
Edward D. Haley
William J. Hallam
Joseph R. Harrington, Jr.
James J. Hart
John A. Harvey III
Leif E. Hatlestad
Dale C. Hawkins
Frank E. Haynes, Jr.
Clyde C. Helmer
Duffern H. Helsing
Wilfred Herrera
Andrew C. Hess
Royl J. Heyl
James R. Hilbert
David V. Holles
Henry A. Holmes
Richard L. Hopkins
Francis M. Horn
Walter D. Hull, Jr.
Donald H. Humphreys
Earl B. Hunt
Samuel W. Ingram, Jr.
James B. Isbill, Jr.
Charles S. Isherwood
John G. Jasper
Warren I. Jaycox
Robert L. Jenkins
Robert B. Johnson
Russell E. Johnson
Victor H. Joliat
Robert Jones
Michael Jordon
Francis J. Kane
Clarence E. Kaufman, Jr.
Leon F. Kazmierczak, Jr.
John J. Keenan
John R. Kennedy
Clair V. Ketch
Homer L. P. King
Robert A. King
William A. Kish
David A. Klopp
Walter W. Knitz
Donald G. Koehlinger
Tristan E. G. Kroglus
Ronald H. Kruse
Larry L. Kurber
Fred E. Lacey, Jr.
Daniel H. Laidman
George L. Lange
Ted L. Langford, Jr.
Ronald L. Larsen
Donald E. Larson
Raymond J. Lavanture
Curtis G. Lawson
Stimson T. T. Lee
Jerry P. Leonard
David A. Lerps
Kenneth E. Lewis
Stanley P. Lewis
William N. Lofroos
William R. Loss
Robert L. Loucks
Candido H. Lucero
Anthony Lukeman
Ronald B. Luther
Robert H. Lutz
Eddie R. Mang
Michael Maas
Robert T. MacPherson
Samuel J. Marfia
Richard E. Marquardt
John A. Marshall
David W. Matthews
Franklin P. Matz III
David B. May
Lewis R. McCann
Donald C. McCarthy
John H. McCarthy
John S. McCarthy
William L. McCarthy
Richard L. McCombs
William C. McCormick, Jr.
Richard K. McCulloch
Robert L. McDonald
Kent A. McFerren
William C. McKeehan, III
William H. McKim
Thomas F. McNichol
David E. Meagher
Peter W. Melhuish
Robert G. Merrick, Jr.
Robert F. Mitrione
James E. Monson
Charles W. Montgomery
Daniel T. Mooney
Austin F. Moore
Jimmie G. Morgan
Bernard A. Morin
Gene S. Morris
Lasse O. Moseley, Jr.
Bartholomew J. Moynahan
John H. Mueller
Bruce U. Munger
Max D. Murray
Curtis S. Murton, Jr.
Joseph J. Musial
James W. Nachazel
James R. Norman
Patrick G. Obeirne
John E. Orton, III
Paul J. Otis
Kenneth G. Patterson
Donald P. Pattee
Ray B. Patton
Homer Paul, Jr.
Fred H. Pearson
James R. Peterson
Russell P. Peterson
John A. Pfeifer
George A. Phelps, Jr.
Howard E. Phifer
Charles G. Pierce
William H. Pierce
Robert L. Pugh
Alexander H. W. Quartly
Joseph J. Quinn
John T. Raleigh
Robert E. Randall
Richard E. Ransom
Thomas R. Reckling, III
John A. Reed.
Henry C. Reister, III
Richard Y. Remley
John V. Reschar
Edward J. Riordan
David L. Roberts
Jay L. Robinson
John R. Rogers
Donald A. Roos
James P. Rourke
Evan W. Rowe, Jr.
Ronald G. Russell
Paul M. Ryan
Norman E. Ryder
Benjamin F. Sands, Jr.
Lawrence H. Schell
Henry W. Schoenlein, Jr.
Martin J. Schubilske
Larry G. Schultz
Howard L. Schuster, Jr.
Gerald A. Scofield
Robert C. Scott
Charles C. Seabrook
Thomas A. Shantz
John J. Shapley, Jr.
Robert N. Shea
Irving F. Sherwood, Jr.
James E. Shildneck
Harold W. Sill
Clarence B. Simmons, Jr.
James D. Skinner
James T. Smith
Park B. S. Smith
Robert E. Smith
Sydney S. Souter
Donald B. Southard
William D. Stephani
James R. Stewart
John D. Stewart
Thomas M. Stokes, Jr.
Russel H. Stolfi
Charles H. Stoy
Adelbert L. Suwalsky, Jr.
Howard C. Sweet, Jr.
William G. Swigert
Dan G. Switzer
Robert D. Thomas
Charles E. Thompson
Raymond M. Tierney, Jr.
Richard H. Tierney
Carl U. Tinnon
Eugene R. Tirk
Robert F. Toalson
James R. Todd
Thomas J. Tomeny, Jr.
Robert W. Topping
John M. Towle
Hugh J. Van Hatten
John N. Vanness
James D. Van Pelt
Richard G. Vass
Richard W. Walker
John K. Walters, Jr.
James R. Warren
John F. Washington
Peter W. Watkins
Barrett S. Wayburn
Bruce L. Weston
Richard V. Whelan
Maurice G. Wilkins
James P. Williams
Willis E. Wilson, Jr.
George R. Wislar
Eugene A. Wodeshick
Ernest J. Woelfel, Jr.
Daniel E. Wojciechowski
Watson B. Woodruff
Rike D. Wootten
Thomas O. York
Thomas C. Zay
Frank W. Ziegler, Jr.
Richard A. Bancroft
Warren H. Barker
Robert M. Bartlett
Willis W. Barton, Jr.
Don D. Beal
George N. Bell
Warren T. Berglund
Robert H. Boynton
Thomas E. Bradley
William C. Bradley
Charles K. Breslauer
Wadsworth S. Brown
Edward J. Burke
James R. Campbell
James H. Carothers, Jr.
Walter C. Cawthon, Jr.
Fred E. Clark, Jr.
James E. Clark
Walter E. Clayton III
William A. Cohn
Henry J. Conlin
James S. Conrado, Jr.
Edward C. Cook
Walter T. Cook
Richard M. Cooke
Francis W. Cooper
Jimmy A. Corbet
Dale W. Criswell
Robert A. Cronk
Thomas M. Culligan
John M. Cummings
Robert P. Cunningham, Jr.
John J. Daley, Jr.
Daniel C. Daly
William F. Damone
Carl F. Dawson
Godfrey S. Delcuze
David K. Dickey
George R. Dietrich
William H. Disher
Richard W. Dockstader
John A. Dowd
Roy Downs
Donald A. Doyle
John C. Duff
Walter P. Dunn
Thomas A. Dutton
John F. Eckert, Jr.
Joseph A. Elliot
Patrick J. Fennell, Jr.
David S. Fine
Arden L. Fink
Farris C. Fisher
George D. Fisher
James E. Floyd
Louis Fojtlin
Wilmer H. Forrey
Richard M. Foster
Arthur D. Friedman
"H" R. Frisbie, Jr.
Joseph I. Gaffney
John H. Gallagher
Ross M. Gamble
James E. Gambrel
Donald J. Garrett
Craig B. Gartrell
Gus J. George
Harold G. Glasgow
Robert A. Goelzer, Jr.
Richard W. Goodale
John D. Gormley
David E. Gragan
Robert O. Gregory
Robert P. Guay
Charles F. Hammel
Robert L. Hardin
James P. Harney
James J. Harp
William F. Harrah
James B. Harris
Richard L. Hatch
Walter R. Hauck
William M. Hayes
Thomas A. Haygood, Jr.
Paul M. Helsher
Clark G. Henry
George A. Hieber
Jack D. Hines
Charles L. Hirlinger
Harry W. Hite
Elmer F. Huizenga
Milton E. Irons
Lee F. Ison
Edwin F. Jackson
James W. Jackson
Merrill M. Jacobs
Douglas T. Jacobson
Harold M. Jellison, Jr.
James D. Jerrell
Herschel L. Johnson, Jr.
Reid L. Johnson
Robert D. Jones
Vernon E. Jones
Lester H. Joy
Edward W. Kain
John J. Karski
James D. Keast
James P. Kehoe
Bradley H. Kelly
David A. Kelly
Gerald W. Keyes
Charles A. King, Jr.
Jacob Kirch, Jr.
Roger W. Kunz
John D. Lenihan
William H. Lightfoot, Jr.
Irvin Lubin
Jackson R. Luckett
Marvin H. Lugger
Donald R. Lundberg
Henry J. McCann
Theodore C. McCarthy, Jr.
Ralph A. McElheny
James F. McGahan
Theodore F. McIntyre
Conrad L. McKay
Herman A. MacDonald
John W. Mann
Preston P. Marques, Jr.
Henry A. Marting
Richard L. Martson
Glenn K. Maxwell
Hurdle L. Maxwell
James W. Medis
Edward R. Modzelewski
James H. Montague
William H. Morgan
Loyd E. Morris, Jr.
Donald L. Murphy
Francis R. Murray
Robert C. Nelson
Charles H. O'Brien
Billy M. Owen
Hosea Owens
Salvatore F. Padilla
Vincent B. Pagano
Richard Peres
Jack A. Peters
Charles F. Pitchford
Robert A. Piamondon
Walter O. Poitevent
George A. Porter
William T. Powers
William R. Pulliam, Jr.
John M. Rapp
Percy D. Ratcliff
Clifford J. Reesman
Harrison L. Richardson, Jr.
William R. Riddell, Jr.
Austin C. Rishel
James D. Roe
Ilow M. Roque
Robert J. Rutherford
Paul H. Sallade
Herbert C. Sanford
Ernest R. Savoy
Ruel T. Scyphers
Walter E. Sears, Jr.
David F. Seiler
Thomas L. Sheets
Edward A. Shields, Jr.
Loyd R. Shoemake

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, pursuant to the provisions of title 34, United States Code, section 1020e (b):

John H. Flanagan
Rodney W. Miller
Charles H. White

The following as second lieutenants, Marine Corps, pursuant to the provisions of title 34, United States Code, section 1020e (b), or title 34, United States Code, section 634 (basic course graduates):

Albert N. Allen
Joseph O. Allweiler
Robert N. Analla
Carl E. Anderson
William R. Andresevic
Clifton B. Andrews
Bruce S. Babski
David H. Balius

James E. Shuttleworth
Gerald J. Slack
Daniel B. Smigay
Bernard B. Smith, Jr.
Conway J. Smith
Harold W. Smith
Kenneth L. Smith
Harold B. Snyder, Jr.
Paul A. A. St. Amour
James H. Stewart
Charles L. Stitt
Charles E. Tayntor
Robert B. Thompson
Paul J. Tighe
Kenneth M. Timmerman
Charles Treble
Rudolph A. Trefny
Robert G. Trout
Charles P. Turner
Willis D. Vey
David H. Wagner
Howard W. Wahlfeld
Gerald J. Waldera
James A. Walsh
Mechael E. Warholak
Frank R. Warren
Leroy E. Watson
Richard M. Weir
Francis J. Werz
Walter E. Weybright
Edwin P. Wilson
Alan E. Wonhof
Dale E. Young

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 347, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (34 U. S. C. 15):

CAPTAIN

Philip N. Austen
William M. Crooks
Ralph F. Estey
James H. Honeycutt
John H. Johnstone
Edward S. Lambert
Theodore Nahow
Willard C. Olsen
James W. Robinson

FIRST LIEUTENANT

William P. Alsop, Jr.
Richard C. Andersen
John F. Barr, Jr.
James D. Barrett
Milton H. Baugh
Darrel E. Bjorklund
Russell E. Blagg
Clarence W. Boyd, Jr.
Joseph J. Brady
Thomas J. Brierton
Charles R. Burroughs
Kenneth M. Buss
Harry E. Carey, Jr.
Norbert D. Carlson
Roland L. Colella
Joseph M. Cullinan
William M. Cummings
Nevin E. Dayvault
John R. Debarr
Grover C. Doster, Jr.
Henry C. Ellenberg
Chester V. Farmer
Robert W. Ferguson
Thomas I. Gerard
Ronald C. Groome
Everett Hampton
James M. Haney
Wilbur V. Hansen
Robert H. Harter
William K. Horn
Richard D. Humphreys
Clyde W. Hunter
Emmett J. Hyde
Alfred L. V. Ingram
Clark V. Judge
Douglas T. Kane
Frederic S. Knight
Robert N. Kreider
George R. Lamb
Charles F. Langley
Harris J. Levert
Gerald L. Lillich
Edward H. P. Lynk
Edward J. Markham, Jr.
Lawrence A. Marousek
Magness W. Marshall
Andrew V. Marusak, Jr.
Donald N. McKeon
Theodore Metzger
John B. Michaud
Theodore J. Mildner
Neil B. Mills
John Misiewicz
Paul B. Montague
Anthony A. Monti
Keith W. Nelson
John J. Nester
Andrew W. O'Donnell
Euclid P. Paris
Robert H. Pearce
Don G. Phelan
James W. Pinkerton
David D. Powell
Lewis A. Rann
Erastus W. Roberts
Kenneth L. Robinson, Jr.
Dwight H. Sawin, Jr.
John C. Scharfen
Charles E. Showalter
George W. Smith
Paul G. Stavridis
Robert A. Strain
Richard B. Talbott
Duke Williams, Jr.
James J. Wilson

SECOND LIEUTENANT

Lewis H. Abrams
Warren L. Ammentrop
Donald W. Anderson
Charles E. Baker
Robert O. Barnes
William G. Bates
Carl L. Battistone
Lester E. Bazinet
James H. Bird, Jr.
Charles H. Bishop
Anthony L. Blair
Louis A. Bonin
Albert R. Bowman II
John R. Bradley
Bruce G. Brown
Joseph B. Brown, Jr.
Richard O. Bruce
Edward D. Cahill, Jr.
John W. Carpenter, Jr.
Charles M. Chidester
James H. Coffin
James F. Conlon
James K. Coody
Henry T. Cook
Joseph A. Corvi
Frank P. Costello, Jr.
Wallace M. Couch
Franklin G. Cowie, Jr.
Richard H. Culpepper
Thomas L. Curtis
John R. Day
Warren H. Day, Jr.
John W. Detroy
Frank Dicillo, Jr.
Alfred N. Drago
Milton D. Drummond, Jr.
John H. Dunn
Gerald W. Eastwood
Ronald P. Eckmann
William F. Erickson
Robert J. Fagot
Francis W. Farnsworth, Jr.
Frederick L. Farrell
Edgar R. Franz
Raymond S. Fry
Leonard E. Fuchs
Samuel J. Fulton
Jack J. Galloway
Richard V. Gamsby
Kenneth C. Garner
Luther E. Gartin
Edward T. Graham, Jr.
Ernest H. Graham
Billy R. Green
David I. Greenstone
Gerald F. Guay
Lewis C. Habash
Harry T. Hagaman
James W. Hanker
Charles L. Harrison
John F. Heiland
William H. Heintz
Howard R. Henn
Maurice S. Hensler
Dwight E. Howard
Robert C. V. Hughes
William K. Hutchings
Robert N. Hutchinson
William R. Hutchisson
Kenneth J. Idol
Leo J. Ihli
Ronald L. Iverson
Robert E. Jenkins
Chester T. Jones
Floyd A. Karker, Jr.
William H. Keith
Thomas J. Kelly
Ralph F. Kenyon
Robert M. Kersbergen
James W. Kirk
Richard H. Kirkpatrick
Robert F. Koehler
Charles R. Kucharski, Jr.
Arthur W. D. Lavigne
Maurice A. Lebas
Robert J. Lyons
Raymond S. Mais
William P. Mason III
Bertram W. McCauley
Charles L. McElheny
Vincent P. McGlone
William D. McKillop
George H. Menning, Jr.
Robert B. Miller
Willard E. Miller
Louis L. Mills
Andrew V. Mincey
Orville L. Mitchell
Paul C. Mogensen
Richard V. Molesky
Robert R. Moody
Wilbur J. Morris
Thomas E. Morrow
Weldon R. Munter
Dwight E. Naylor
Charles E. Newmark
George L. Newton
Jack L. Norman
Edward O. Nugent
Charles E. Pangburn
Kenneth D. Peck
James R. Penny
Burdette H. Peterson
John Phillips
Charles R. Poppe, Jr.
Heaton H. Randall, Jr.
Robert W. Rasdal
Arvid W. Realsen
Herbert J. Recker
Charles M. Reitz
Allan H. Robb
James C. Robinson
Warren C. Ruthazer
Jacque L. Saul
Louis W. Schwindt
Roy A. Seaver
Donald L. Sellers
Charles A. Sewell
Harold G. Shaklee
Whitlock N. Sharpe
Allen C. Shelton, Jr.
Thomas R. Shelton
George H. Shutt, Jr.
Peter A. Soderbergh
Richard T. Spencer
Paul V. Stack
Melvin J. Steinberg
Marvin B. Stevens
Billy F. Stewart
Thomas S. Strickland
Charles W. Tonnacliff
Kyle W. Townsend
Iver W. Trebon
Eugene H. Trescott
James S. G. Turner
Herbert J. Valentine
Claude O. Vann
Ramon S. Villareal
George P. Vorhauer
Arthur J. Wagner
Douglas A. Wagner
Joe G. Walker
Charles F. Wallace
Clarence E. Watson, Jr.
Ivan L. Watts
Frank E. Weitz
Morgan W. West
Ronald M. Westerman
William L. Whelan
Ermil L. Whisman
William S. Wickersham, Jr.
James B. Wilkinson
Lawrence J. Willis
Robert W. Wilson
Joseph P. Wozniak
Earnest G. Young
Robert G. Young
Gary L. Yundt

The following-named to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps pursuant to the provisions of title 34, United States Code, section 105c, or title 34, United States Code, section 625:

Joan G. Bantzhaff
Mary L. Clough
Frances M. DeVos
Mary M. Donahoe
Marie J. Halvorsen
Theresa M. Hayes
Inger Rober
Irene L. Rozzo
Margueritta C. Russell
Patricia A. Watson
Donrue Wever

The following-named for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended:

Chester V. Farmer
Theodore J. Mildner

The following-named personnel of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant for limited duty:

Donald D. Amick
James L. Anderson
Ewell J. Arceneaux
Ray W. Arnold
Jesse G. Baker
Thomas Baker
Monroe L. Bracey
Nicholas Cappeletto
Leslie P. Day
John H. DuBois
Raymond F. Fitzsimmons
Ivan L. P. Fritz, Jr.
John A. Fullinwider
George M. Garner
Ross E. Gidley
Walter E. G. Godenius
Abie Gordon
James H. Graham
Edward E. Grebenstein, Jr.
Elvis G. Hammons
James B. Harris
Daniel F. Layman
Joseph L. Lee
Guy M. Long, Sr.
William G. Luttge
Kenneth S. Matson
Donald E. McAlexander
Joseph E. Mullen, Jr.
Jack W. Newman
Anthony J. Palonis, Jr.
Roy I. Parker
James W. Ratigan
George A. Ridgway
Bernard P. Simmons
Richard F. Skinner
Jimmie L. Stewart
Joe Vuckovich
Robert J. Werder
John L. White
Billy L. Whitley

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25 (legislative day of January 22), 1954:

UNITED NATIONS

Preston Hotchkis, of California, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the countries indicated with their respective names, to which offices each was appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, to the Republic of Chile.

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, to the Republic of Panama.

Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., of Virginia, to the Republic of Indonesia.

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to the Republic of Costa Rica.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, to the Republic of Czechoslovakia.

H. Freeman Matthews, of the District of Columbia, to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.

John E. Peurifoy, of South Carolina, to the Republic of Guatemala.

Rudolph E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, to the Republic of Colombia.

AMBASSADOR AND ENVOY

George Wadsworth, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Wiley T. Buchanan, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg. Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL COUNSEL

Morris Wolf, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel.

The following-named persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, Foreign Operations Administration, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Mrs. Mildred C. Ahlgren, of Indiana.

Richard L. Bowditch, of Massachusetts.

Arthur J. Connell, of Connecticut.
Miss Helen G. Irwin, of Iowa.
Allan Blair Kline, of Iowa.
Mrs. Lucille Leonard, of Rhode Island.
Herschel D. Newsom, of the District of Columbia.
James G. Patton, of Colorado.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Abbott McConnell Washburn, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency.

NORTH ATLANTIC ORGANIZATION AND EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Webster Bray Todd, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations.

ECONOMIC COORDINATOR

C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Economic Coordinator (special representative for Korea).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.
Frank Brown Berry, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

John Slezak, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Army.
Hugh M. Milton II, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY

Louis B. Toomer, of Georgia, to be Register of the Treasury.
Charles O. Parker, of Colorado, to be assayer in the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

John William Tramburg, of Wisconsin, to be Commissioner of Social Security.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Lothair Teetor, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Robert E. Lee, of the District of Columbia, to be a member, Federal Communications Commission, for term of 7 years from July 1, 1953.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Harmar D. Denny, of Pennsylvania, to be a member, Civil Aeronautics Board, for term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1959.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

George C. McConnaughey, of Ohio, to be member of the Renegotiation Board. Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS TO BE MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL, TO WHICH OFFICE THEY WERE APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE

Lewis W. Douglas, of Arizona.
Alfred M. Eberle, of South Dakota.
Joseph J. George, of Georgia.
Capt. Howard T. Orville, United States Navy, retired, of Maryland.
Kenneth C. Spengler, of Massachusetts.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Rear Adm. Alfred C. Richmond, to be Assistant Commandant in the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS PROVIDED BY LAW

To be commissioned commander

Glenn W. Moore

To be commissioned lieutenant

Steven L. Hollis, Jr.

To be commissioned lieutenants (junior grade)

John B. Watkins, Jr. Bruce E. Greene
Jack E. Guth Robert E. Williams
James D. Hodges

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS TO BE COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS FOR CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICT SHOWN WITH THEIR RESPECTIVE NAMES

Jessie Dixon Sayler, of Georgia, customs collection district No. 17, with headquarters at Savannah, Ga., to fill an existing vacancy.
Douglas Butler, of Texas, customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.
Edward C. Ellsworth, Jr., of Montana, customs collection district No. 33, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont.
Edward M. Elwell, of Maine, customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine.
J. Chalmers Ewing, of Colorado, ustoms collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.
Frank W. Hull, of Washington, customs collection district No. 30, with headquarters at Seattle, Wash.
John G. Kissane, of Vermont, customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt.
Josiah A. Maultsby, Sr., of North Carolina, customs collection district No. 15, with headquarters at Wilmington, N. C.
Anne A. Mitchell, of Connecticut, customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE

Aleer J. Couri, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise, customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Paul Frailey Yount, O18022, to be Chief of Transportation, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Francis Hickey, O10362, to be commanding general, IX Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, O15004, to be commanding general, I Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500, to be Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under provisions of sec. 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and sec. 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE V OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. John Max Lentz, O10343.
Maj. Gen. Bernice Musgrove McFadyen, O10384.
Maj. Gen. Riley Finley Ennis, O11854.
Maj. Gen. Joseph Sladen Bradley, O12426.

To be brigadier general

Maj. Gen. William Nelson Gillmore, O16196.
Maj. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, O16755.
Maj. Gen. James Maurice Gavin, O17676.
Maj. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500.
Maj. Gen. Richard Warburton Stephens, O15569.
Brig. Gen. Lawrence Russell Dewey, O15575.
Maj. Gen. Gordon Byrom Rogers, O15620.
Maj. Gen. Joseph Pringle Cleland, O16239.
Lt. Gen. William Morris Hoge, O4437, to be commander in chief, United States Army Europe, with the rank of general, and as general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO POSITION INDICATED AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 504 AND 515 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Maj. Gen. Floyd Lavinius Parks, O10582, commanding general, Second Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.
Maj. Gen. Walter Leo Weible, O11308, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Administration, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER PROVISIONS OF SUBSEC. 515 (C) OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Shepard Biddle, O15180.
Brig. Gen. John Alexander Klein, O7536.
Brig. Gen. John Charles Macdonald, O8402.
Brig. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams, O8425.
Brig. Gen. Albert Carl Lieber, O8884.
Brig. Gen. Philip Edward Gallagher, O11249.
Brig. Gen. John Harrison Stokes, Jr., O12181.
Brig. Gen. John Bartlett Murphy, O12338.
Brig. Gen. Charles Wilkes Christenberry, O8373.
Brig. Gen. Robert Gibbins Gard, O12247.
Brig. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395.
Brig. Gen. John Gibson Van Houten, O16569.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck, O12744.
Col. Emery Ernest Alling, O16545.
Col. Frederick Prall Munson, O16505.

(NOTE.—Above-named officers were appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

Brig. Gen. Robert William Crichlow, Jr., O12430, to be major general in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER PROVISIONS OF TITLE V OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, O7042.

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. George Bateman Peploe, O16246.

FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER PROVISIONS OF SUBSEC. 515 (C) OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be brigadier generals

Col. Cyrus Quinton Shelton, O10784.
Col. Oscar William Koch, O10851.
Col. Stephen Bowen Elkins, O10913.
Col. Hugh Cort, O11592.
Col. Paul LaRue Neal, O11684.
Col. Harris Fulford Scherer, O12275.
Col. Thomas Benoit Hedekin, O12278.
Col. Charles Alvin Pyle, O12281.
Col. Richard Powell Ovenshine, O12303.
Col. Terence John Tully, O12823.
Col. Reginald Pond Lyman, O14872.
Col. Howard John Vandersluis, O15213.
Col. Herbert Davis Vogel, O15520.
Col. Harry Van Wyk, O15555.
Col. John Gillespie Hill, O15797.

Col. Conrad Stanton Babcock, O16104.
Col. Samuel Roberts Browning, O17081.
Col. William Lewis Bell, Jr., O17540.
Col. Ned Dalton Moore, O18212.
Col. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., O18232.
Col. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel 3d, O18655.
Col. Maddrey Allen Solomon, O19194.
Col. Robert Nabors Tyson, O19594.

OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT AS RESERVE COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE ARMED FORCES RESERVE ACT OF 1952 (PUBLIC LAW 476, 82D CONG.)

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton II, O154541.

To be brigadier general

Col. Wendell Westover, O145721.

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Arthur Elsworth Stoddard, O371507.

To be brigadier generals

Col. John Nelson Andrews, O150451.
Col. Louis Dalhoff Burkhalter, Jr., O280416.
Col. Harold Vincent Gaskill, O996701.
Col. William Henry Harrison, O292346.
Col. Gerald Oneill Hodge, O253172.
Col. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., O188725.
Col. Perrin Hamilton Long, O492197.
Col. Daniel Joseph Manning, O307848.
Col. Alexander Marble, O241298.
Col. Thomas Murray Mayfield, O168962.
Col. Edward Josephus McGrew, Jr., O265015.
Col. James Clarence Mott, O176119.
Col. Harry Lynn Ostler, O300698.
Col. William Christian Otten, O470649.
Col. Elmo Logan Patton, O229128.
Col. Harold Glendon Scheie, O341587.
Col. Robert Lee Watkins, O244532.
Col. Frank Elmore Wilson, O323557.

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Homer Oliver Eaton, Jr., O201691.
Maj. Gen. Carl Lawrence Phinney O244577.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Lucien Abraham, O178022.
Brig. Gen. Harold Arthur Doherty, O2270961.
Brig. Gen. Waldo Henry Fish, Jr., O282806.
Brig. Gen. Henry Kimmell Pluck, O415805.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Ward Henry, O1293051.
Brig. Gen. Robert Milliard Ives, O140472.
Brig. Gen. John Rutherford Noyes, O2270935.
Brig. Gen. Maxwell Evans Rich, O323746.
Brig. Gen. John Darrell Sides, O330828.
Brig. Gen. John Walter Squire, O155858.
Brig. Gen. James Edward Taylor, O376731.
Brig. Gen. Edmund Robert Walker, O291567.
Brig. Gen. Raymond Watt, O209364.
Brig. Gen. Oscar Ivy Wrenn, O221793.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of Jack Lawrence McCluskey and other officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 11, 1954, and appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Jack Lawrence McCluskey, which is shown on page 123, and ending with the name of Barbara Merle Hodgkins, which appears on page 128.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 1 year from February 1, 1954.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William H. Huseman, St. Gregory Seminary, offered the following prayer:

We are come, O God, we are come before Thee, we are gathered in Thy name. Vouchsafe to enter our hearts; teach us what we are to do; show us what we must accomplish, in order with Thy help we may please Thee in all things.

Suffer us not to disturb the order of justice, Thou who lovest equity above all things; let not ignorance draw us into devious paths nor partiality sway our minds; neither let bitterness of passion or prejudice pervert our judgment; inasmuch as we are gathered together in Thy name we should in all things hold fast to justice tempered by pity; that in this life our judgment may in no wise be at variance with Thee, and in the life to come we may attain to everlasting rewards for deeds well done.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 21, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hanks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1399. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, and for other purposes;

S. 1577. An act to authorize the exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo., and for other purposes; and

S. 2583. An act to indemnify against loss all persons whose swine were destroyed in July 1952 as a result of having been infected with or exposed to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6665) entitled "An act to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas."

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications, which were read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Government Operations.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. DODD.

JANUARY 25, 1954.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Most sincerely yours,

EUGENE J. MCCARTHY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations will be accepted.

There was no objection.

COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 418) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the 83d Congress the Committee on Banking and Currency shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be composed of 30 members; and

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall be composed of 28 members.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 415) and ask for its immediate consideration:

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Banking and Currency: EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota;

Committee on Foreign Affairs: THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut;

Committee on Government Operations: HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey;

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Kentucky; LESTER JOHNSON, Wisconsin.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy may sit during the session of the House tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISTS IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

(Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation of utmost importance to all citizens in the United States, a bill designed to clear Com-

munists out of the labor movement in America.

I have always considered the hearings in the many industrial areas in the United States among the most important conducted by our Committee on Un-American Activities. As recently as 1 month ago we saw the sorry spectacle of an alleged labor leader, Harry Bridges, calling a strike against a committee of the House of Representatives, in protest against public hearings in which, once again, Bridges and his cohorts were named as Communists.

The seriousness of this situation is evident when you realize that the entire shipping of the west coast of this Nation was held up by this one man.

It must be clear to everyone by this time that the loyalty-oath provision of the Taft-Hartley Act is largely ineffective in meeting the problem of communism in labor unions.

My bill will authorize the Subversive Activities Control Board, after finding a labor organization to be dominated by Communists, to order that the union shall be ineligible to act as a bargaining agent, or to be the recipient of any benefits under the Taft-Hartley Act.

I firmly believe that this bill will be a big step toward effectively ridding unions in the United States of any and all Communist activity.

FORMER RED SYMPATHIZERS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanious consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I note that the Pentagon cannot decide its policy toward former Red sympathizers. Full support should be given to those courageous individuals who have indicated that court-martial proceedings may be instituted against turncoat GI's who played the Red's tune while they were captives. I welcome evidences of a more realistic policy at least to determine whose side they really are on. No harm will come to the innocent.

I consider the fawning publicity that a few reconverted pro-Red American POW's from Korea have been getting just a bit sickening. It has been a waste of good newspaper space and it indicated a lack of moral values on the part of those who indulged in such sentimentality.

We will do well to think more about the thousands of GI's who stood up under the hell of Korea—who stuck by the things they believed in—who kept the faith. No one will ever know how many of the Americans who died in the Communist prison camps died under torture. We do know that in unmarked graves in Korea lie Americans who gave up their lives rather than give in to the enemy. They are the true heroes. They should be getting the publicity and the praise; they and their loyal buddies who were lucky enough to get back alive.

I have but little sympathy for or interest in those who listened to the Communists and agreed to team up with them when it looked like the easy way, then turned again home—when home looked best.

I feel that the rewards should be limited to those who stood steadfast.

PROPOSED SALE OF BUTTER TO RUSSIA—CHARITY BEGINS AT HOME

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, quite a controversy has arisen over the recommendation in President Eisenhower's state of the Union message that we give to friendly nations abroad a billion dollars of surplus farm products now held as surplus by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

While the suggestion is a humane approach, it totally disregards the old adage "Charity should begin at home."

In order that the Congress may have the public's reaction to the matter, I desire to read into the RECORD, at this time, a letter from one the largest districts making up the United Mine Workers of America:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Beckley, W. Va., January 18, 1954.

Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of Congress, Third West Virginia District, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAILEY: In President Eisenhower's message on the state of the Union, he seemed to be disturbed about what to do with the farm surplus. I note in recent newspaper reports that they are proposing to sell 260 million pounds of butter to Russia, at 50 cents per pound. The Government has millions of pounds of surplus commodities, such as milk, butter, cheese, wheat, and meat that they do not know to do with.

We are allowed to get a few crumbs under the present law, through the Department of Public Assistance, for people who are out of employment and destitute, but not enough to sustain life and limb. It seems ridiculous to me that thousands of men, women, and children are going hungry in this country for the want of food, or in other words starving to death in a land of plenty.

The American coal miner is now producing eight tons of coal per man, per day. The highest efficiency of any workman in the world. He produces so much coal that he has worked himself out of a plate at his own table. Other industrial workers and the farmer are doing the same thing. American ingenuity has solved the problem of production.

There are 20,000 coal miners in southern West Virginia who's unemployment compensation will soon run out or has already run out, and no jobs are available. It behooves the Congress of the United States to attempt to solve the law of distribution, so that the American people will not starve to death on account of overproduction.

I urge you to use your good office to see that the surplus commodities that the Government has on hand is distributed to people who cannot find employment. It should be the duty of the Government to either find a job for a man that is unemployed, extend unemployment compensation payments, or furnish him with the surplus commodities which seems to be a drug on the market, so that our people will not starve while our farm surplus goes to waste.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GEO. J. TITLER,
President, District 29, UMWA.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes either on Wednesday or the legislative day next following, after the legislative business of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

EXEMPTION ON DIVIDENDS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, shout it from the heights, declare it in the streets, think not of it in churches. Hear what the President suggests: Tax the earner to the stress, and the non-earner 75 percent less.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore granted, and also to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

PROPOSED COURT-MARTIAL OF COLONEL SCHWABLE

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I speak somewhat reluctantly, but I am concerned about the Army's purpose in convening a court-martial so hurriedly in the case of Colonel Schwable. This man went through many hells

in Communist prisons. If my information is correct, when he finally arrived in this country he gave himself unreservedly to testifying before motion-picture cameras to make possible accurate testimony for the use of the United States to refute the accusations of the U. S. S. R. that we used bacteriological warfare in Korea. You should see the Communist films of the so-called confessions, of which his was one. Then you should see the pictures that we saw at the United Nations taken when he gave his testimony freely. You should read the full testimony before Dr. Charles W. Mayo's committee in the United Nations on bacteriological warfare and then realize what a very real part the colonel's testimony played in making Dr. Mayo's statement effective.

Mr. Speaker, I know nothing about the other men under discussion today. But I hope that we would be humane toward a man who showed great courage in his effort to make amends.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF THE RANDALL COMMISSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the House should take note in Sunday's publications of the Report of Presidential-Congressional Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, the Randall Commission, which has given the country a tremendous blueprint of one of the most critical problems facing our Government probably the most critical—because the prospects for peace are directly connected with America's foreign economic policy which will, in turn, be determined by our trade and investment policy.

Under the law today the Commission will expire on April 25, 1954. Hence I am introducing legislation today to extend the life of the Randall Commission until January 2, 1955, so that it may participate in the implementation of its recommendations and make additional recommendations to the Congress. It is essential that in terms of legislation we get the benefit of the enormous amount of work and experience regarding foreign trade and investment which now resides in this Commission.

Foreign economic policy regarding exports and imports, investments, technical assistance and travel will be a major influence in determining continued high levels of economic activity within the United States, keeping the free world united for freedom by helping it deal with its grave economic problem and assuring strategic material supplies for our country and our allies in free world defense. The grave decline in agricultural exports from the United States is one clear indication of danger in the field of international trade and shows that the whole problem requires urgent attention.

The Commission should be in existence to make its full contribution, not just to write a report, as it has. It has given us a solid middle-of-the-road document. It has shown us the way to do the job our country must do if we are to have peace through a successful free world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

JOINT MEETING TO RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Friday, January 29, 1954, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in a joint meeting the President of the Republic of Turkey, His Excellency Celal Bayar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

OLD-AGE-PENSION SYSTEMS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that foreign nationals who have worked in this country, and doubtless sent back all of their earnings to their homelands, are now retired to their countries of origin, where they are regularly receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits from the United States.

As many European countries have old-age-pension systems that have been in effect far longer and are far more all-embracing than our own—notably in England, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries—it is possible and probable that, under existing statutes, a foreign national residing in one of these countries could collect old-age pensions from the United States, as well as his own country, and go out and earn $75 a month. This would not be a bad deal at all.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that some legislation to prevent what seems a rather obvious abuse of the intention of the law should be considered.

I have checked with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who wrote me on January 21, and I quote:

> Our records show that as of December 1952, the last date for which we have exact figures, 240 individuals residing in France were receiving old-age survivors insurance benefits.
>
> As you know, neither United States citizenship or residence in the United States are requirements for receipt of old-age survivors insurance benefits.
>
> In 1939 a provision which would have prevented the payment of benefits to otherwise eligible persons who live abroad was considered by the Congress but was not included in the law.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this matter had better be reconsidered by the Congress, and the law be amended to correct this unfair, unjust, and ridiculous situation.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL STAMPS FOR OVERSEAS USE

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, millions of letters written by Americans go overseas every day of the year. Many hundreds of thousands of these letters go to relatives and friends of American citizens who live in countries behind the Iron Curtain. They convey a little bit of America wherever they go.

Recently, it came to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that the United States is overlooking an opportunity if it does not have postage stamps for overseas letters that tell something about America and her basic belief in liberty and the dignity of man.

Since November 1, 1953, the rate of postage for an ordinary letter by surface mail to any foreign country in the world has been fixed at 8 cents. Our present 8-cent stamp is an undistinguished adhesive, a dull olive brown in color, picturing President Martin Van Buren—a good President but one of our lesser known Chief Executives. The airmail stamps which carry our airmail letters have pleasant designs depicting airplanes in flight, but they, too, tell nothing of the real story of America. And so it is with our other stamps used on overseas mail.

For that reason, I am today introducing a joint resolution to call upon the Postmaster General to issue a new set of stamps, the designs of which should convey the idea of the basic American freedoms prescribed in our Bill of Rights, such as the freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom to vote for elective officials of our own choosing.

In this way, every letter going abroad from America would carry a stamp telling something about America's unshakable faith in individual rights. It would be a real contribution to the battle of ideas now being waged between the minions of Communist totalitarianism and the defenders of the rights of man.

I might add that this proposal would cost the taxpayers nothing. It is a well-known fact that, thanks to the thousands of stamp collectors in our country and overseas, the Post Office Department makes a net profit on every commemo-

rative or other special stamp that it issues.

I hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the Postmaster General will give his consideration to this proposal.

HOUSING PROGRAM — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 306)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I submit herewith measures designed to promote the efforts of our people to acquire good homes, and to assist our communities to develop wholesome neighborhoods in which American families may live and prosper.

The development of conditions under which every American family can obtain good housing is a major objective of national policy. It is important for two reasons. First, good housing in good neighborhoods is necessary for good citizenship and good health among our people. Second, a high level of housing construction and vigorous community development are essential to the economic and social well-being of our country. It is, therefore, properly a concern of this Government to insure that opportunities are provided every American family to acquire a good home.

In working toward this goal, we must not be complacent. The Federal Government must provide aggressive and positive leadership. At the same time actions and programs must be avoided that would make our citizens increasingly dependent upon the Federal Government to supply their housing needs. We believe that needed progress can best be made by full and effective utilization of our competitive economy with its vast resources for building and financing homes for our people.

The building of new homes provides only a partial solution to the housing problem. The Nation has tremendous assets in its 37 million existing nonfarm homes. The fact that 20 million of these are owner-occupied demonstrates the continuing efforts of our people to have their own homes, where they can raise their families in self-respect and in good surroundings. But 19 million of our existing nonfarm homes are more than 30 years old. We must encourage the conservation and improvement of our existing supply of homes for the important contribution this can make to the raising of national housing standards.

Our housing deficiencies continue to be serious. Millions of our people still live in slums. Millions more live in rundown, declining neighborhoods. The national interest demands the elimination of slum conditions and the rehabilitation of declining neighborhoods. Many of our local communities have made good progress in this work and are eager to make further substantial improvements but are hard put to find the needed resources.

The knowledge, the skills, the resources, and, most important, the will to do this job already exist in the Nation. We have a private home-building industry and home-financing institutions that are strong and vigorous. We have a highly skilled labor force. Savings are high. While some of our communities are financially hard-pressed, they are increasingly alert to the need both for improving their existing physical plants and for sound growth and development proportionate to their expanding populations. We have the unlimited resources which grow from the independence, pride, and determination of the American citizen. I am convinced that every American family can have a decent home if the builders, lenders, and communities and the local, State, and Federal governments, as well as individual citizens, will put their abilities and determination energetically to the task.

To help find the best way to meet our national housing needs, I recently appointed an Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs, consisting of leading citizens experienced in the problems of housing, mortgage finance, and community development. Under the chairmanship of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, this committee has made an exhaustive study of existing Federal housing programs. It has also analyzed numerous proposals for the development of a program better adapted to our present housing requirements. The conclusions of this committee, and the results of our own studies and experience in administering present housing laws, are reflected in the recommendations I am about to propose. Several of these recommendations provide an entirely new approach to the task of meeting our housing needs.

I. NEIGHBORHOOD REHABILITATION AND ELIMINATION AND PREVENTION OF SLUMS

In order to clear our slums and blighted areas and to improve our communities, we must eliminate the causes of slums and blight. This is essentially a problem for our cities. However, Federal assistance is justified for communities which face up to the problem of neighborhood decay and undertake long-range programs directed to its prevention. The main elements of such programs should include:

First. Prevention of the spread of blight into good areas of the community through strict enforcement of housing and neighborhood standards and strict occupancy controls;

Second. Rehabilitation of salvable areas, turning them into sound, healthy neighborhoods by replanning, removing congestion, providing parks and playgrounds, reorganizing streets and traffic, and by facilitating physical rehabilitation of deteriorated structures;

Third. Clearance and redevelopment of nonsalvable slums.

Existing housing programs permit an effective attack on only the third of these essential tasks. A new approach will help our communities to deal effectively with the other two. I, therefore, make the following recommendations:

First. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 should be broadened. It should make available a program of loans and grants for the renovation of salvable areas and for the outright elimination of nonsalvable slums. Under this program, there would be immediately available from existing authorizations approximately $700 million of loan funds and $250 million in capital grant funds. As our communities are enabled by this broadened authorization to increase the scope and pace of their efforts, I shall request such additional loan and grant authorizations as can be effectively used.

Second. The Federal Housing Administration should be authorized to insure private credit used to rehabilitate homes in declining neighborhoods. This new program should be limited to specific areas where the local community has given adequate assurance that it will carry out a workable plan of neighborhood renewal.

Third. A program of matching grants to States and metropolitan areas should be established to enable smaller communities and metropolitan area planning agencies to do the planning job which is necessary to arrest the spread of slum conditions. I recommend that the Congress authorize the appropriation of $5 million for this purpose.

II. CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING HOUSING

Because of the housing shortages that developed during the depression and war years, recent Federal housing activities have been directed mainly to increasing the production of new homes. But while the high demand for new homes will continue, and while private activity will be encouraged to meet that demand, we must also undertake the long-delayed job of maintaining existing homes in good condition. Millions of our people live in older homes in which they have invested their savings; our people and our economy will greatly benefit if these homes can be kept in good repair and are brought up to modern standards of comfort and convenience.

It is not enough, therefore, to rehabilitate homes in obsolete neighborhoods. To encourage the maintenance and improvement of homes wherever located, I recommend the following additional amendments to the National Housing Act:

First. The maximum permissible terms authorized for the insurance of loans on existing homes should be made comparable to those available for new housing. This amendment will end the present discriminatory policy which favors the purchasing of new as against existing homes. It should have the important additional advantage of facilitating the trading in of older homes on new home purchases.

Second. The maximum loan which can be insured under title I of the National Housing Act to repair and modernize single-family homes should be increased from $2,500 to $3,000 and the maximum term should be extended from 3 years to 5 years. Comparable revisions should be made in loan limitations and terms authorized for the rehabilitation of multiple dwellings. Since the terms of such loans have not changed for 15 years, these adjustments are obviously needed to help our citizens repair and improve their homes.

III. HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

The continued lack of adequate housing, both new and used, for low-income families is evidence of past failures in improving the housing conditions of all of our people. Approval of my preceding recommendations will increase the opportunities of many families with low incomes to buy good older homes. But a more direct and more positive approach to this serious problem must be taken by the Government. I recommend, therefore, a new and experimental program under which the Federal Housing Administration would be authorized to insure long-term loans of modest amounts, with low initial payment, on both new and existing dwellings, for low-income families. The application of this new authority should be limited to those families who must seek other homes as a result of slum rehabilitation, conservation, and similar activities in the public interest. I recognize, as did the advisory committee, that this program represents a challenge to private builders and lenders. In order to assist them in meeting this challenge, a greater proportion of the risk should be underwritten by the Federal Housing Administration than it regularly insures. The successful development of this program will afford a much greater proportion of our lower income families an opportunity to own or rent a suitable home.

Until these new programs have been fully tested and by actual performance have shown their success, we should continue at a reasonable level the public housing program authorized by the Housing Act of 1949. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress authorize construction, during the next 4 years, of 140,000 units of new public housing, to be built in annual increments of 35,000 units. Special preference among eligible families should be given to those who must be relocated because of slum clearance, neighborhood rehabilitation, or similar public actions. The continuance of this program will be reviewed before the end of the 4-year period, when adequate evidence exists to determine the success of the other measures I have recommended. In addition to this requested extension of the public housing program, the Housing Administrator will recommend amendments to correct various defects which experience has revealed in the present public housing program.

IV. HOUSING PROBLEMS OF MINORITY GROUP FAMILIES

It must be frankly and honestly acknowledged that many members of minority groups, regardless of their income or their economic status, have had the least opportunity of all of our citizens to acquire good homes. Some progress, although far too little, has been made by the housing agency in encouraging the production and financing of adequate housing available to members of minority groups. However, the administrative policies governing the operations of the several housing agencies must be, and they will be, materially strengthened and augmented in order to assure equal opportunity for all of our citizens to acquire, within their means, good and well-located homes. We shall take steps to insure that families of minority groups displaced by urban redevelopment operations have a fair opportunity to acquire adequate housing; we shall prevent the dislocation of such families through the misuse of slum clearance programs; and we shall encourage adequate mortgage financing for the construction of new housing for such families on good, well-located sites.

V. MODERNIZATION OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

There are certain deficiencies and numerous obsolete and unnecessary provisions in the National Housing Act. The Housing Administrator will present to the appropriate committees of the Congress a number of proposals to modernize this basic law. These recommendations will include a scale of mortgage ceilings more realistically related to the increased cost of both single-family and multifamily structures and complementary revisions in mortgage ceilings for cooperative projects.

VI. ADJUSTMENT OF PERMISSIBLE TERMS OF GOVERNMENT INSURED OR GUARANTEED MORTGAGES

Because inflationary or deflationary pressures can be accentuated or diminished by mortgage credit terms, Government operations in connection with the insurance or guarantee of mortgage loans should be judiciously adjusted to prevailing economic conditions. The Congress has already given the President limited authority to adjust from time to time, in the light of economic conditions, the permissible terms on Government-guaranteed and insured mortgages. I urge the Congress to broaden this authority to cover all loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration and guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. Such authority would permit adjustments, within appropriate statutory limits, in maximum interest rates and in loan-to-value ratios and maturities. This action by the Congress would materially strengthen our ability to stabilize economic activity and high levels of production and employment. A fuller discussion of the importance of this recommendation will be included in the economic report to be submitted to the Congress on January 28.

VII. SECONDARY MORTGAGE MARKET

In recent years the Federal National Mortgage Association has functioned as a primary lender rather than as a secondary source of mortgage credit. As a result the Federal Government now finds itself with substantial frozen investments in guaranteed and insured mortgages. Because of the terms on which these mortgages were written and the prices at which they were purchased, they are not readily salable in the private market. The following changes should therefore be made:

First. The Federal National Mortgage Association should be reorganized to require the users of the facility to invest funds on a basis which would eventually permit the full retirement of Government funds from secondary mortgage market operations. The Federal Government should be enabled to purchase the initial stock of the reorganized association, but private capital funds supplied by the users of the facility should be built up to speed the retirement of the Government's initial investment.

Second. The reorganized Federal National Mortgage Association should be given three basic responsibilities:

First, it should be authorized to issue its own nonguaranteed debentures on the private market. With the funds so obtained, it can perform a desirable service by buying mortgages at market rates in areas where investment funds are scarce, for resale in areas where there is a surplus of funds. There is need for an organization to carry out this true function of a secondary market.

Second, the new Association should be authorized to manage and liquidate present mortgage holdings which are Government-owned assets. It should be made clear that such liquidation is to be accomplished in an orderly manner and in such a way as to protect the interests of the individual borrower. Since Treasury funds were used in the acquisition of these assets, all proceeds of this liquidation should be returned to the Treasury.

Third, the President should be enabled to authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association to borrow directly from the Treasury for the sole purpose of purchasing certain kinds and types of insured and guaranteed loans when the President determines such action to be necessary in the public interest. For this purpose the borrowing authority of the Association should be limited to a reasonable amount to be made available from the present Treasury borrowing authorization of the Association. Although outright primary support for certain types of loans may be desirable in the public interest from time to time, this support should be clearly identified as the direct use of Treasury funds for mortgage purchasing, and the extent of such support should be closely controlled.

Approval of these recommendations will correct the most serious defects of the present mortgage-purchasing operations of the Federal Government and will authorize an effective secondary market facility, relying primarily on private financing. It will also provide flexible authority under which the Federal Government could directly purchase mortgages, should economic conditions and the public interest indicate the need for such action.

VIII. REORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL HOUSING ACTIVITIES

The present organization of Federal housing activities is unsatisfactory. The Housing and Home Finance Agency is a loosely knit federation of separate organizations. Its present structure is cumbersome, inefficient, and lacks clear-cut recognition of administrative authority. The result is confusing to the public. Neither the Congress nor the executive branch can expect it to achieve good and efficient management under its present structure. I shall, therefore, submit to the Congress a reorganization plan to provide a better grouping of housing activities headed by an Administrator with adequate supervisory authority.

I believe that this message offers the means whereby our Nation may provide more and better homes for our families.

By applying these recommendations we shall add to the comfort and the health of our people; we shall strengthen the economic and social fibers of our Nation; and we shall reinforce the freedom and self-reliance which have brought greatness to our land. I urge, therefore, that the Congress give to these recommendations its early and favorable consideration.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1954.*

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a comprehensive housing bill.

The administration is to be commended in its efforts to assume the mantle and some of the program of the New Deal.

However, we must remember that the New Deal concerned itself with the vital problems of a past decade. The present-day housing shortage fills a different page in history, coming, as it does, after no-building war years and growing as a result of the sharp increase in families enlarged by the baby boom.

With the advice of housing expert Taft no longer available, it is understandable but unfortunate that the administration's recommendations fall so far short of past Republican proposals. Today we need not only the benefit of past experience in housing problems, but also new plans to solve a grave, new crisis. Some of the administration's recommendations are fine as far as they go, but the size of the program must match the size of the problem.

My bill incorporates the best of past recommendations and certainly has more right to be described as "progressive and dynamic" than does the largely inadequate administration housing program.

While I do not claim perfection for my bill, I am convinced that in its present form it would help fill two tremendous gaps in administration planning and program. First, it would constitute a real step forward in solving our terrible housing shortage, and second, it would help reverse the present economic downturn—which some are trying to pretend is not there—by encouraging the economic health of our national housing industry.

A brief description of my bill follows:

Title I restores the public-housing program of 1949, authorizing thereby the construction of 810,000 units of low-cost public housing at the rate of 135,000 units per year.

Title II provides a realistic answer to the housing problem of the middle-income group through the use of cooperative or nonprofit corporations, an amortization period of 50 years, a low-interest rate and a low down payment of not over 5 percent. A system of financial aid to cooperative housing would be established and technical assistance as well as loans for the planning of housing projects provided.

Title III would help eliminate the disgraceful, expensive slums, characteristic of so many of our cities. The slum clearance and urban development program is liberalized by reducing from one-third to one-fifth the costs local communities bear in making slum-cleared land available for approved new houses.

Title IV would restore the housing-research program authorized in 1948 and 1949 to assist in reducing housing costs and to increase the production of better housing.

Title V reorganizes the Housing and Home Finance Agency by transferring from the Administrator to its constituent agencies responsibility for administering the operating programs of such agencies. The Administrator would be better enabled to control and coordinate the constituent agencies.

Title VI would provide the future buyer of 1- or 2-family houses, built with Federal assistance, a warranty that the house was built according to the plans and specifications on which Federal assistance was based.

Title VII establishes a new standby direct-loan program in the FHA for loans to low- and middle-income nonveterans for the purchase or construction of homes.

Title VIII extends and expands the Veterans' Administration's direct home-loan program.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 79)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the Thirty-ninth Annual Report of the Committee covering the fiscal year 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1954.*

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and further ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. WHITTEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the unanimous-consent request be broad enough to enable me to offer the amendment which was discussed in our committee? I think it is highly important that it be offered.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly the request is broad enough to include any amendment the Speaker may hold germane to the joint resolution.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think the joint resolution itself is subject to a point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I agree with the gentleman that it is.

Mr. WHITTEN. Unless I can offer the following amendment, I shall have to object to this joint resolution's coming up, until we get a rule, because I think it was understood that I would have the privilege of offering the amendment to the joint resolution. I would like to present here the amendment:

After line 4, page 1, insert the following: "That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the farm-price-support system is designed for the purpose of stabilizing the farm income of American farmers and assuring sufficient return to protect the land and other natural resources. The Congress further finds and declares that all peoples and governments have the inherent right to offer on the world market any and all commodities at competitive prices; and it is therefore declared to be the policy of the United States that our domestic farm program shall not be used to keep American agricultural commodities from being offered on the world market at competitive prices.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to determine what part of present stocks of farm or agricultural commodities in its hands are essential to the national security; and upon such determination title to all such commodities so determined to be essential to the national security shall be transferred to the Defense Procurement Agency, and all commodities so transferred shall be taken off the market: *Provided, however,* That to prevent spoilage or deterioration any part of such commodities may be returned to the Commodity Credit Corporation for sale as hereinafter provided and replaced with a like amount or quantity from Commodity Corporation stocks.

"SEC. 3. In order to make American farm commodities available to users in other countries on the same basis as farm commodities from other nations, all other agricultural commodities of whatever kind or character, title to which is in the Commodity Credit Corporation, and which are not committed for sale, shall be offered for sale for use outside the Continental United States, its Territories, and possessions, at prevailing or competitive world prices: *Provided, however,* That the President by Executive order may restrict or prohibit sales of such commodities for use in Communist dominated countries when in his opinion such sales would be against the interest of the United States."

This will save the Government untold hundreds of millions of dollars and will save our farm program.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will rule on points of order when they are made.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. WHITTEN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 358.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is of the opinion that the request which I made in reference to House Joint Resolution 358 and as to amendments being offered, which you might personally hold germane, is sufficient for his purpose and, therefore, I believe he will withdraw his objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman please, I am not yielding for that purpose. I thought the gentleman wanted to make a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas declines to yield.

Mr. PATMAN. My time is limited and I would not want to yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would inform the gentleman from Texas that if he desires to yield, his time will commence to run, of course, when he is recognized following whatever business is transacted.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield for a unanimous-consent request, but not to take up any legislation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a request.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to withdraw my objection to bringing the matter up at the conclusion of the gentleman's time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not insist on that, because I was on my feet when that question came up before, and because I am interested in that legislation also.

Mr. WHITTEN. I say at the conclusion of the gentleman's time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Minnesota to renew his request after the gentleman from Texas has concluded his special order.

CHANGE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to make certain changes in the Federal Reserve System to carry out part of the original intent of the law. The bill would change the Federal Reserve Board to 12 members, that is, change the board from 12 members on the Board of Governors instead of 7 members as at present. There would be one member from each of the 12 Federal Reserve districts.

The bill would abolish the Open Market Committee which is now composed of 12 members, 7 members of the Board of Governors and 5 presidents of Federal Reserve banks.

The bill, in addition, would make the term of office 6 years for a member of the Board of Governors instead of 14 years, and would permit the present board to remain until their terms expire.

The next thing is that the functions and duties of the Open Market Committee be transferred to the new Board of Governors. I believe this is necessary to get the control of the financial and economic part of our Government back partly into the hands of the people through their Congress.

When the Federal Reserve Act was signed by President Wilson on December 23, 1913, he is quoted as saying at that time that the banks should never be allowed to get control of the Federal Reserve System, and that it would be just as inconsistent for the Government to permit the bankers to operate or influence the Federal Reserve System as it would be to permit the railroad owners who have charge of and administer the Interstate Commerce Commission. President Wilson said it would be absolutely wrong and he warned against it.

I am inserting herewith a copy of this bill referred to:

A bill to increase to 12 the number of members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and to provide that their terms of office shall be 6 years, and to abolish the Federal Open Market Committee and transfer its functions to such Board

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of the first paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended to read as follows: "After the date of enactment of the last paragraph of this section, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board') shall be composed of 12 members, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the terms of office of the members of the Board shall, except as hereinafter provided, be 6 years."

(b) Section 10 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The terms of office of the 5 members first appointed to the offices created by the amendment to the first paragraph of this section which took effect on the date of the enactment of this paragraph shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, 1 at the end of 5 years, 2 at the end of 3 years, and 2 at the end of 1 year, after the expiration of the term of office of the member whose term of office first expires after the date of enactment of this paragraph; and the successor to that member whose term first expires after such date shall be appointed for a term of 5 years. The terms of office of members of the Board in office on the date of enactment of this paragraph shall continue to be the terms for which they were appointed, and whenever a vacancy shall occur, other than by expiration of a term of office, among such members, the term of office of the member appointed to fill the vacancy shall be the unexpired term of his predecessor."

(c) The second sentence of the second paragraph of section 10 of such act is amended by striking out everything down through "and thereafter each" and inserting in lieu thereof "Each."

SEC. 2. (a) All of the powers, duties, and functions of the Federal Open Market Committee are hereby transferred to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Open Market Committee is hereby abolished.

(b) All personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations of the Federal Open Market Committee are hereby transferred to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Over the years amendments have been made to the Federal Reserve Act. It is a great act although it has been abused. It was 40 years old December 23, 1953.

NO AUDIT IN 40 YEARS

The system was 40 years old then and has transacted annually hundreds of billions of dollars of business per year. The Federal Reserve System has never been audited by a Government agency. It has never had an independent audit of any kind that any Member of Congress has ever been allowed to see. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System up until less than 2 years ago had never had an audit of any kind over a period of nearly 40 years.

I raised the point in a joint committee of the House and Senate about 2 years ago, and they ran out immediately and secured the services of a private auditing firm, they claim, and had the System audited. But I have never seen the audit. I do not know what instructions the auditors had. I do not know what they went into. No Member of Congress has been offered the privilege of seeing that audit. At least it has never been filed with the abbreviated annual report they must file each year or filed with any committee of Congress.

So here we have a system that has grown up over a period of 40 years that has absolutely gotten out from under the control of the body that created it. The Board of Governors proudly claim that they are not subservient to the executive branch of the Government, the President of the United States. They boast of being independent of the Executive. They proudly proclaim that they are an agency of the Congress. In other words, we are the master and they are the servant. They run things like we are the servant and they are the master.

They have gotten absolutely out from under control not only of the Executive but of the Congress, so that today we have a situation that is fantastic. No one ever dreamed that Congress would permit such an abuse of powers.

We have a Constitution that says that financial and economic matters shall be administered by the Congress of the United States. The Constitution says that Congres shall coin the money and regulate its value There are 531 Members of Congress; 96 Members of the Senate and 435 Members of the House. They are entrusted with tremendous powers affecting the credit and money policies of our Government.

These 531 Members have not retained jurisdiction over the Federal Reserve System. They, the Members of Congress, have delegated these powers to 12 members of an Open Market Committee. Seven of these members, it is true, should have some obligation to the Government. They are not selected by the people. They are appointed by one who was selected by the people, the President of the United States, but they are selected now for 14 years. They claim not to be under obligation to the President after he selects them. I am referring to these 7 of the 12 members of this committee.

The other 5 members are presidents of 5 Federal Reserve banks out of the 12. How are these five members selected? In the first place, they are selected by the private bankers of the country. There is no doubt about that. No one can dispute what I am saying about this. They are selected by the private bankers of the country.

Are they obligated to serve the public? Well, if they want to serve the public, they may serve the public, but they are not obligated to the public for their selection. They are not obligated to the President for being selected for this position; they are not obligated to the Congress for being selected to fill these important places on this committee of 12 to run our credit and currency and financial affairs. Who are they obligated to? They are obligated to private bankers; they are the only people they are obligated to; so I think it has gone too far. I think it is time for Congress to take another look and see how far we have permitted these people to go and how much power they have and consider getting that power back under the control of the United States Congress where the United States Constitution says it should be.

Those 12 members of the Open Market Committee have delegated that power further; they have delegated it to 5 of their number. These 5 members have all the power that the 12 have. They are composed of 3 members of the Board of Governors and 2 members of the presidents of the Federal Reserve banks.

These 5 members have delegated that power down to 1 of their number, the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

How much power does he have? He has the power to take the money that is printed over here at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, that is non-interest-bearing Government obligations, Federal Reserve notes such as you carry around with you and use for money—and they are money, they are obligations of the United States; each note says on its face that it is an obligation of the United States. But it is not counted in the Government debt transactions; and, therefore, the fact that the ceiling is $275 billion does not make any difference. All right, he has the power to take the money that we have printed over here and trade that money for United States Government bonds that are interest-bearing; and he can get the bonds placed through these 12 Federal Reserve banks—at least he is acting for them and they can get the bonds in their safes, and as the interest becomes due it is paid to them. Pretty soft, is it not? Pretty soft. Particularly when the General Accounting Office is not privileged to take a look at what is going on. The Board of Governors is on record in opposition to an audit by the Comptroller General.

They have accumulated in that way $25 billion and more of United States Government bonds that are interest-bearing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have had considerable difficulty in understanding, or trying to understand, our system of paying out money. Is it true that the only reason for the Government's adopting this course is so that it may guard against counterfeiting and limit the amount issued?

Mr. PATMAN. That part is not necessarily involved here, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. Of course we want to print the money because we want to protect it from counterfeiting, but that part is not a vital issue in what I am discussing, I will say to the gentleman; that part is not. The fundamental principle is that we are delegating the power to handle our money, you might say, to the hands of 12 men—7 members of the Board of Governors and 5 members selected by the private banks of the country and they invest it in United States bonds that bear interest, retain the bonds for the 12 banks, and collect the interest when due. That is the point I am trying to make, and further they are abusing their powers.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield further, I have always had difficulty in understanding why the Government should pay interest to anyone for the privilege of issuing money. Several years ago I read in the Saturday Evening Post the statement that the only reason the Government had control of the amount of money being issued was to prevent counterfeiting and to control the total volume of money which was issued by the authorities.

Mr. PATMAN. Both points are good ones, and as to the gentleman's point on counterfeiting, we should have control. We should also have control over the volume to prevent inflation; but there are plenty of ways to prevent inflation and still let the Congress handle the money through proper delegations of power, many ways.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is something I would like to hear about sometime, because as I understood it I am afraid that if it were left to the Congress to control the volume there would be so many demands on us that we would not be able to control it at all.

Mr. PATMAN. I would be opposed to that. We would not want to have any political distribution of money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who would control it then?

Mr. PATMAN. No one is advocating that to my mind. We have to have it wisely and discreetly handled, but we do not want to turn it over to the private banks any more than we would want to turn the fixing of railroad freight rates over to the railroads.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I can understand that, I can see merit in that, but who should control the question of how much currency shall be issued from time to time?

Mr. PATMAN. Someone who is charged with the duty of performing a public service and representing the public. As it is now, there is too much of a balance in the banks' favor and they are doing what natural ordinary human beings would do. They are looking after their self-interest. It is perfectly natural. It is part of our private enterprise system—selfishness and self-interest—but we should not allow them to do it. Although they would like to do it we should not allow them to do it against the public interest as they are now doing. So we should take it back from them and give it to people who are charged with the duty of performing a public service; in other words, to look at it from the public-service standpoint, instead of from the private interest, private profit standpoint.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Conceding that it should not be given to this group, to just what group would the gentleman advocate we give it, and I am asking that question in good faith.

Mr. PATMAN. I know the gentleman is and I will answer in good faith. The group presently operating has been dominated by the New York banks. The New York banks handle one-third of the business loans in the entire United States. I hope the gentleman understood that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I heard it.

Mr. PATMAN. One-third of the business loans in the entire United States, I repeat. Now, as the situation presently exists, these 12 members delegate their powers to 5 and the 5 to 1. That 1 is strictly a banker's man. The gentleman has always tried to bring up things that might be considered wrong in the light of public service and public duty. When these banks trade this money for interest-bearing bonds they hold the bonds and collect the interest. They are now annually collecting several hundred million dollars interest on those bonds and they are using that money without going through the Appropriation Committees of Congress as other Government agencies are required to do. They are using it without any restraint of any kind whatsoever before letting what is left flow back into the Treasury. In doing that they are paying this man who is head of a New York bank $60,000 a year out of that money. That is paid out of public funds just as much so as the money the gentleman receives as a Member of Congress or that I receive as a Member of Congress. That just goes to show how they are footloose and fancy free with the money of the Government they are handling. There is no proper control over it. That is the point I am trying to make. There is no proper control over that at all. Not only that but they are not charged sufficiently with a public duty. That is the reason I have introduced a

bill to bring this power back to the Congress, to where Congress will have a little more control over it. We should write into the law definite policies this Board should and must be governed by.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right, conceding all that, conceding that that power is used improperly, my question is, To what group would the gentleman give that power at this time?

Mr. PATMAN. I would give it to the 12 members of the Board of Governors, one selected from each Federal Reserve district and appointed by the President for a 6-year term.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Would the gentleman include this present board?

Mr. PATMAN. They would continue to serve.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman would prevent redelegation of that power, is that it?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, to private bankers. That is what I would do. I would leave it to people selected, one from each Federal Reserve district, and there are 12 Federal Reserve districts. I would have one selected from each Federal Reserve district and selected by the President of the United States, not for 14 years but for 6 years. Have a little quicker turnover there.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Would the gentleman permit the banks to continue to get currency and interest on these bonds?

Mr. PATMAN. I presume the gentleman refers to the private commercial banks. That is a point that is separate and apart from this. I want to discuss that at some time when we can go into it a little more fully.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope the gentleman will advise me of that time.

Mr. PATMAN. I think one of the reasons that people cannot get loans, the small-business man and others, is because the member banks and other private banks are loaded down with Government bonds. They are loaded down with Government bonds and outside paper, like the Commodity Credit Corporation. Now, according to the newspapers, they are going to allow the private banks to buy almost a billion dollars of RFC paper and securities. The banks will have an additional good income from that. A friend of mine, J. D. Gillespie, of Dallas, says that to expect these banks to be patient and considerate with the small-business man is asking too much because they are already taken care of. He says it is like feeding your dogs well before you go hunting. The dogs are not so anxious to hunt if you feed them well before you go hunting.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman about that dog business.

Mr. PATMAN. So if you go ahead and you fill these banks up with good Government riskless securities to where they can make several dollars a year to every one dollar invested, pay big dividends on their stock and pretty large salaries to their officials, they do not have the incentive and the desire to make local loans. They are loaned up. They are loaned up with what? United States Government paper, Commodity Credit Corporation paper, Housing paper, RFC paper; all other outside paper.

One of the reasons the Federal Reserve Act was passed was to put a damper on local banks sending their money to New York to be used on the stock market. Now, of course, that was stopped. They quit sending it to New York; at least temporarily they did until the roaring twenties, but now they are investing it in Government guaranteed paper and in United States Government bonds. They are loaned up in Government bonds and other riskless paper, and they do not have the incentive and the desire to serve the people locally as they should. So I think that is one of the biggest questions before us. It affects small business; it affects every kind of business; it affects the ability of the best and most deserving person in your community getting consideration of an application for a loan. How considerate will that bank be when they are already getting all the money that they can possibly make through outside, riskless paper in the form of Government paper and Government-guaranteed paper. So the gentleman has raised a good point.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has introduced a bill to remedy this situation. Will the gentleman tell me what the number of it is?

Mr. PATMAN. It has not been numbered. I just dropped it in the hopper.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Today?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. So, I want to discuss some time more fully the question that the gentleman has asked. And I wonder if the banks now are as active and alert in fulfilling their obligations to the public as they have been in the past for the reasons that I have just outlined. I wonder why the number of banks in this country, although our population has increased tremendously more than any other similar length of time in the history of our Nation, in the last 20 years, have actually gone down 1,500. We have 1,500 fewer banks than we had 20 years ago. Why is that? We have 50 percent fewer banks now than we had 22 years ago. The number of banks are going down. The number of people are going up. Service charges are going up. More bonds are going into the vaults of the private banks. Please understand I am strong for a privately owned commercial banking system. I believe it should be strong. It cannot be strong unless it is profitable. Therefore, I believe in a fair and reasonable profit for the banks.

Mr. Speaker, those are questions that this Congress should look into.

DISCHARGE INDEBTEDNESS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am going to object, I may tell the gentleman, unless an opportunity is given to the Members of the House who are not here and those who are here to know more about this resolution. I will ask the gentleman what information has been made available to the Members of the House for this step involving something over $700 million.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I might say to the gentleman that opportunity will be given every Member who might wish time for asking questions and discussing the resolution. That is about as far as I can go at this time. Might I say as far as urgency is concerned, this matter was brought before the House this morning by an additional budget estimate from the President. I do not think the gentleman or any other Member of the House, if he knew the conditions of urgency which exist, would object to the consideration of this legislation today.

Mr. JAVITS. The difficulty is that we do not know the conditions. There is no real representation made as to the conditions. Is the gentleman representing to us that if this matter comes up on Wednesday and does not come up today a major interest of the country will be compromised? If so, can he tell us why?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not make any such representation. I do say that this is a very urgent matter and that there will be ample opportunity, if I handle the joint resolution, for any Member on the floor to ask questions and discuss the joint resolution when it is being considered.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to inform my colleague that I shall object unless my colleague makes that unanimous-consent request to take effect on Wednesday. I would be willing to see the matter taken up then under fair conditions of debate and amendment and with information made available in advance bearing on the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I feel some embarrassment about this by reason of my position as majority leader. Of course, I understand the significance of the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota as to the importance of this matter. It is important. The very fact that it is important is the thing from which my feeling of responsibility arises, because in announcing the program last week I said that, so far as I knew, there was nothing of consequence that would be called up today, and that if anything of consequence were to develop, ample opportunity would be given Members so that they could be on the floor.

Again, may I say to the gentleman that I appreciate the importance of this matter. It involves the solvency of the Commodity Credit Corporation under its operations involving the purchase of farm commodities. It involves certain

other aspects of our whole situation regarding the Treasury. To many Members who have come to me and spoken to me, particularly many representing urban districts, it is a matter about which they want to be fully informed and on which they might have something to say. Of course, the objection was originally made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] when the request was granted. In the interim numerous representations have been made to me, as I pointed out.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman form New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman would be satisfied with this—that the consent request be amended to read as follows: That it be in order to move on Wednesday next that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 358, with general debate to be not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet when the gentleman from Mississippi reserved the right to object, so I am not a newcomer in this. I can see in this something that I think the Members should more thoroughly understand before voting on it. At least, I would like to know about it. I do not know that I want to take the responsibility of objecting to its coming up. I will not say that I will go that far. But I want to invite the attention of the Members to the fact that I do not think it is a compliment to the House now, or the practice in the past, for things to be brought up here so quickly and suddenly, without giving the average Member like myself, who is not on the committee that is affected, an opportunity to know what it is all about.

In developing that thought just briefly, may I say that last year we had a very important bill that was a bill to raise the debt limit of the United States from $275 billion to $290 billion. If any bill in the world should have been developed fully before a committee, it was that bill. Extensive hearings should have been held before the committee and the hearings should have been printed and made available to the Members.

But if they were available, I do not know anything about it. I was unable to get any hearings. I was told that the testimony of witnesses was taken down and was not printed. The bill passed here without Members knowing too much about it because we had not had the bill up for hearings. Of course, we all go back home to our districts and talk to service clubs and tell the people and point with pride to the fact that bills receive such careful consideration, that witnesses are heard and that testimony is taken down and printed and furnished to all Members of the House and Senate, and that we know exactly what we are doing, and that we have considered every paragraph and every sentence and every phrase and every bit of punctuation, and that we know all about it. We brag about that, but in practice we do not do it. When that bill went over to the other body, they did have a hearing but it was an executive hearing which is just as bad. I doubt if any Member of the House can see those hearings. Newspaper people have seen them. They are all around, all over town, but Members of the House cannot get hold of them. They have some startling, sensational testimony in those hearings, but it is executive—not available to you. The point I am trying to make, is that it is legislation by secrecy. It is not star chamber proceedings, I would not go that far, but it is not advising the Members of the information upon which they can predicate their judgment and vote on a bill. That is what I want in reference to this bill. The Commodity Credit Corporation is something that I have given a great deal of thought and study to, and something has happened in the recent past that I do not like. That is the reason that this bill attracted my attention. I think it dovetails into it. The banks have been loaded down with all kinds of Government paper. I am told, at least through the press I get this information and certainly from the financial journals that they have been getting the banks to take this Commodity Credit Corporation paper so as to keep below the debt ceiling. I would like to ask the gentleman if that is one of the reasons they are selling the Commodity Credit paper to the banks to keep below the $275 billion debt ceiling. Is that right?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, do I still have the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has the floor under his own reservation of objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Then, Mr. Speaker, under the gentleman's reservation, will he yield to me to answer that?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman if that is permissible.

Mr. HALLECK. My understanding is that the question which the gentleman raises is substantially correct. Of course, I did my part in the matter of raising the debt limit last July. I went along as a Republican when Democrats were raising the debt limit, because I thought that it was absolutely essential to the functioning of the Government. If I understand this situation correctly, among many of the things to which those in charge of the fiscal affairs of our Government have resorted, to keep under the debt ceiling by reason of the failure of the other body to act, is this matter to which the gentleman refers. Of course, the CCC has at time borrowed in the open market under the authority of the act.

Mr. PATMAN. That is what makes it look so serious to me. Are we helping them to get around it? I think we should do that sort of thing directly.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman was gracious to yield to me, and I hope that he will permit me to conclude.

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, the Commodity Credit Corporation as a part of the overall operation to keep under the debt limit has borrowed certain sums from private sources which do not figure in the overall national debt, and hence avoid the operation of the debt limit. From that fact alone, the gentleman may, of course, see something of the urgency for action in this matter because he will agree with me, I am sure, that if there is a question about the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation or the attitude of the Congress with respect to it, that might suddenly indicate a situation where these loans would be called. However, may I say again, it is a matter of extreme importance brought on here primarily, because as we were warned quite some time ago that the capital allowance of the Commodity Credit Corporation is rapidly being exhausted, and now we are up against it. That leads me to say again, Mr. Speaker, in view of what I said last week about the program, I would prefer that the request of the gentleman from New York, that this matter come up on Wednesday, be granted. I think that is ample time as I understand the situation. I would prefer that that request prevail if one of these unanimous-consent requests is to prevail. And if not, I would hope that the gentleman from Minnesota would withdraw his request, and we can then proceed under a rule which could be filed in an orderly manner to get this matter up for discussion on Wednesday.

Mr. PATMAN. Now the gentleman has raised the very point I was apprehensive of. This is needed not so much in the matter of the Commodity Credit transactions as it is needed to help somebody get off the spot in the matter of the national debt limit.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is to follow a parliamentary inquiry as to whether this is to continue for any length of time, because if it is then I think we ought to have a quorum in order to get the matter decided.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it will continue until a Member demands the regular order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, of course I shall have to object. I have a statement to make.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] demands the regular order.

Mr. PATMAN. If I cannot finish my statement, I shall be compelled to object.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair states that the regular order has been demanded and other requests are not in order at this time.

Mr NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. My point of order is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] takes this matter out of the hands of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. That may be the result technically, but that is a subject for the House to consider. The regular order has been demanded.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thought I had the floor on a reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded and reservations of objection are not in order. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has withdrawn his request.

Mr. PATMAN. Has the gentleman from New York [Mr TABER] withdrawn his request?

The SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House at this time except a special order granted the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, and I yield back the time granted me for today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE RANDALL COMMISSION REPORT

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order and ask that my remarks may be extended at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman who is now addressing the House [Mr. BAILEY], and that extraneous material may be included.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Economic Policy, the so-called Randall committee, has made its report. I must say that it is a most disappointing and confusing one. Like the old "one-hoss shay," it is wonderfully and fearfully made. I do not think it will please many who are interested in this important matter. It rambles at great length; the members of the Commission are not in agreement and the conclusions in many instances seemingly contradict the facts on which they are based.

I have not had time to study in detail the report but I notice that more than 40 dissents are scattered throughout the report; the distinguished Senator from Colorado is in disagreement generally with some of the report's principal conclusions. In passing, I might call attention to the fact that the Senator is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee which will handle any legislation on this matter of tariffs and trade policy that comes before the Senate. Also, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and another member of his committeee are in sharp disagreement with the report's conclusions and promise to submit alternative recommendations of their own later on.

I am not in the business of prophecy but I cannot see the Congress adopting the principal conclusions of the report with regard to tariffs and trade. When they recommend doing away with our buy-American legislation; when they attempt to tell the American farmers that they can not have subsidies or a parity program; when they suggest to our House Ways and Means Committee that they pass legislation making it more attractive to American capital to interest abroad rather than at home, then I say the Randall report will be the entering wedge to tear asunder this unholy alliance of favored groups that are waxing fat at the expense of our domestic industries and the millions whose jobs are at stake.

Already it has been demonstrated that the real problem confronting this country is not to reduce tariffs further but is to give protection to vital domestic industries which already are hard pressed by unfair import competition.

I will say that the future of my own State of West Virginia is very dark indeed if the report's recommendations are written into law. They would turn a large part of the State of West Virginia into an economic desert.

The principal industries of the State of West Virginia affected by our national tariff policy are mining, which is almost exclusively coal mining, glassware, pottery, electrical appliances, synthetic fibers, chemicals, crude oil, and clothespins. The Kanawha Valley already is a great chemical center and should become an even greater one in the future. But all the industries mentioned here are vulnerable to foreign competition. The coal industry of my State, its greatest industry, today is in a most deplorable condition due in large part to the dumping on the east coast of residual oil from Venezuela and the Middle East. And the fears of the chemical industry over the future are presented in detail to the Randall commission itself. The textile industry of West Virginia, largely the production of synthetic fibers, also could easily be put out of business by imports and today is in a depressed situation. Charges have been made that synthetic fibers from abroad are—like residual oil—being dumped in the United States.

West Virginia, a leader in the production of handmade glassware, marbles, pottery products, and clothespins has seen these industries driven into bankruptcy by the influx of foreign-made articles produced under low-standard wage and working conditions.

Thirty-six percent of all pottery products consumed in the United States in 1952 and 18 percent of certain types of handmade glassware for the same year were imported from abroad.

I propose to return later to a discussion of the situation which confronts domestic industries that are being hurt by imports, but first let us take a look at some of the recommendations of the report.

I must say that I read some of the statements in the sections devoted to tariffs and trade policy with agreeable surprise. For example—and I quote—listen to this section:

> The world, including the United States, has had no experience for any considerable period of time with our present tariffs under conditions which might be termed relatively normal.
>
> The Trade Agreements Act was enacted while we were in the middle of a depression. Many bilateral trade agreements, involving many reductions in our duties, were made during the first 5 years the act was in effect, but there has been limited opportunity to observe their effect before our trade, already distorted, was further disrupted by the outbreak of war. Since the termination of World War II the patterns of both our exports and our imports have been abnormal. There was an unusually large demand for our exports both for consumption and for rebuilding a war-torn world, and an interruption in the growth of our imports, arising out of the same causes. The Korean war resulted in a further distortion. Resulting imbalances were financed largely through our foreign loan and grant programs. During this period we continued to make further agreements involving still further reductions in our tariffs.

This is what many of us have pointed out time and time again. We have said that this is no time to further reduce tariffs because it is beginning to be apparent that the concessions already made are injuring domestic industries and that the volume of competitive imports may increase sharply in the months ahead.

Now let us continue with some quotes from the report:

> We are fully aware of the arguments for free trade. It is sufficient to say that, in our opinion, free trade is not possible under the conditions facing the United States today. Even in moving toward greater freedom of trade we must consider all the rigidities, both here and elsewhere, which negate some of the premises on which the arguments for free trade rest. We must take into account that while the United States employs impediments to trade, primarily through tariffs and in only limited fields through quotas,

other countries also employ these devices. Beyond this, they employ the quota procedure far beyond our use, and against other countries as well as against us, and also employ exchange controls and many other devices not used here.

This is sound reasoning and here is some more good logic from the Commission:

We fully recognize the danger of using averages; yet it seems clear by any test that can be devised that the United States is no longer among the higher tariff countries of the world. Taken by and large, our trade restrictions are certainly no more of a cause of payment imbalances than the rigidities maintained by other nations. Restrictions on import and export trade, in turn, are probably no more important than, and in a measure bound up with, the rigidities maintained inside foreign economies through cartel restrictions, the immobility of labor, and ingrained resistance to technological change; and the rigidities maintained inside the American economy through farm price-support programs, minimum wage legislation, resale price maintenance laws and the like.

There we have it. The Commission says frankly that the effects of the concessions already made under the reciprocal trade agreements are not fully known, that free trade is impractical, and that the United States is not a high-tariff country, and that other nations are guilty of trade restrictions, not only through tariffs, but through many other devices.

This does not jibe at all with the recommendations that the President's authority to negotiate the reciprocal trade agreements be continued another 3 years; that he be authorized to reduce existing tariff rates by not more than 5 percent of existing rates in each of the 3 years; that rates may be reduced one-half on products which are not being imported but are being exported in negligible volume; and that the President should be authorized to reduce to 50 percent, ad valorem, or its equivalent, any rate which is more than 50 percent.

There is a significant difference between the words of the Randall Commission and its recommendations. It is like a physician who tells a patient about the evils of drink and then prescribes whisky.

The retention of the escape clause and the peril point provisions of the existing law are recommended by the Commission, but the report significantly states that the escape "clause has been applied by the President with respect to only 3 products, despite the fact that there have been over 50 applications for the use of that clause in the past 5 years." The Commission also recommends that along with the retention of the peril point and escape clause—which are supposed to protect and give relief to American industry—that the "statute be amended expressly to spell out the fact that the President is authorized to disregard findings under these provisions whenever he finds that the national interest of the United States requires it."

There is little comfort here, for one of the persistent complaints against the reciprocal-trade-agreement program is that it has been almost impossible to get relief for industries injured by foreign competition. I know that has been true so far as the bituminous-coal industry is concerned. That hard pressed industry has tried in every possible way to end the dumping of residual oil along the east coast but to no avail.

The report of the Randall Commission makes out such a good case for protection that I cannot refrain from referring to it again and again. As another instance, it says industry falls into three broad classes, the first being the mass-production industries that have little or no problem with regard to imports. It continues:

The second class is one in which machinery and production facilities, general speaking, are identical or at least similar here and abroad. In some of these the same number of man-hours go into a unit of goods here and abroad; in others the use of labor is less efficient abroad than here and there may be other offsetting cost factors. Whether or not imports may be seriously damaging is dependent on factors which vary industry by industry, but in at least some of these the labor factor is the controlling element.

The third class is the so-called handicraft type where machinery is a minor element. Here quite obviously, with labor the major cost, imports can be not merely serious but destructive to the domestic industry without a tariff.

Then comes this word of warning:

We do not wish it to happen that the wage level in the third class and in some of the second class should be determined or seriously affected by the wage levels abroad in competitive industries.

After these beautiful summaries on the need for protecting domestic industry, I do not understand how the Randall Commission could recommend a program which means further tariff reductions. I do not understand how the Commission could recommend the repeal of the laws which give our merchant fleet preference in the shipment of Government owned and Government financed cargoes. I do not understand how they can recommend repeal of the Buy American Act. I think the Commission overlooks necessity of protecting vital defense industries, including coal.

As I stated, I have not yet had an opportunity of studying carefully all the provisions of the report. Offhand, however, I would say that it constitutes a confession of defeat by those blithe spirits who were repeating "trade-not-aid" and similar slogans. The free traders are in retreat. The report of the Randall Commission actually is a communique of an army in flight.

Now, let us proceed to the formulation and consideration of a trade policy that is in the interests of the United States of America.

I am frank in saying that I do not think the people of this country are going to tolerate indefinitely the dumping of foreign products at the expense of American citizens. The treatment accorded the bituminous-coal industry is a disgrace. Thousands of coal miners in the State of West Virginia today are out of work because markets they had along the east coast have been taken away from them by cheap residual oil from Venezuela and the Middle East. More than 115 major, rail-connected, Southern coal mines, which formerly employed around 15,000 miners, have closed down in the past 2 years. Total production in the southern area is down around 150,000 tons from the peak year of 1947. Families are going on relief and many are moving away in search of work. This situation is being duplicated in many industries. Our wage earners—and voters—are not going to stand this situation indefinitely. Any government and any administration which does not look after its own is not going to last long.

I am in favor of trade with foreign nations. I favor the maximum amount of trade consonant with the prosperity and stability of the United States. We must keep our national economy strong. No worse calamity could happen to the world than for us to have a major depression in this country. One way to prevent that catastrophe is to keep our industries prosperous and our men at work. The best market for our own products is the home market. Let us keep that market and let us keep it in a flourishing and healthy condition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wonder if the gentleman will permit me to extend at the end of his speech an article from yesterday's Star along the lines the gentleman is advocating.

Mr. BAILEY. I will get the consent the gentleman wishes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will send it over to the gentleman for him to read and insert if he cares to, but it is in support of what the gentleman is talking about and in accord with his views.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I recognize the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY]. I would like to have him discuss the question that has so often been raised that we do away with legislation to buy American and the effect it would have on our Maritime Commission.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for extending me this time. I want to say at the outset that unlike the gentleman from West Virginia, I have not gone as far as he has on some of the reciprocal-trade agreements. I have been a supporter of reciprocal trade generally, but I disagree most heartily with one of the recommendations of the Randall Commission in particular, and with several other recommendations of the Commission to a greater or less degree. The particular issue I have in mind is this: In a very weasel-worded way they have made a recommendation that the 50-percent requirement in regard to the carriage of American-aid cargoes to foreign countries in American vessels be eliminated, and any existing legislation pertaining thereto be repealed. Mr. Speaker, this would create and bring about a very disastrous result to the American merchant marine. The Congress of the United States and several administrations have consistently recognized that the American merchant marine needs the support of the Government. The present President of the United States has referred to it as the actual fourth arm of our defense. Our American merchant marine is needed

and its need and usefulness has been proven during two world wars. Contrary to the belief of some businessmen and some starry-eyed people who once in a while creep into Government, and who continue to take the position that we need not have an American merchant marine but can depend upon the vessels of other friendly nations, we have found by experience we cannot so depend.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an issue which the Congress or the American people can afford to take as lightly as the Randall Commission has apparently done. Although it is reported that representatives of the point of view of foreign shipping interests were permitted to testify personally before the Commission, the American shipping industry was forced to confine its presentation to formal written statements—written "in the dark" so to speak, because they did not know just what factors were occupying the Commission's attention. The Commission's report certainly bears evidence that the position of the American merchant marine was not given the consideration due it in analyzing the relative situations and needs of our commercial fleet versus friendly foreign merchant marines.

The Commission report, for instance, places undue stress on the availability in wartime of "the services of the merchant ships of our allies through the operation of an interallied shipping pool." They do not consider that under this arrangement and through lend-lease we gave away 8 tons of shipping for every 1 we requisitioned. The Commission apparently did not know or did not consider it important that to keep that pooled fleet in operation with necessary additions and replacements the American taxpayer spent about $15 billion in ship construction during the war, while the replacement contributions of these friendly foreign nations was insignificant.

As another example of the one-sided view taken by the Commission, the majority report refers to the American merchant marine enjoying "statutory preferences which in effect give it the exclusive carriage of shipments by the defense agencies for American forces." Anyone at all familiar with the true facts would not be misled into making such a statement. The fact of the matter is that the Military Sea Transportation Service, an arm of the United States Navy, enjoys this exclusive privilege and not the private American merchant marine. Our commercial fleet gets some of the crumbs from this military operation but only what the Military Sea Transportation Service feels that it can spare.

In speaking of these statutory preferences with specific reference to the requirement long upheld by Congress that at least 50 percent of foreign-aid cargoes shall be carried in American-flag vessels, the report states that—

> The effect is to compel countries receiving dollar assistance to spend a part of it on freight services which they could render to themselves if permitted to do so.

This is spoken of as a diversion from the purpose intended for foreign-aid funds. Completely overlooked is the fact that since the inception of ECA in 1948 until June 30 of last year, over $170 million of local foreign currency counterpart funds made available as a result of foreign-aid operations were spent by those countries in building up their merchant and fishing fleets as competitive instruments to our own maritime operations.

Mr. Speaker, if the American maritime industry is to be capable of repeating its remarkable performance in World War II we cannot be so foolhardy as to permit those starry-eyed individuals of whom I spoke, by leaguing themselves with a certain segment of the maritime industry, to kill off an already weakened industry. Putting into effect the Randall Commission's recommendation to repeal the 50–50 provisions of law would have just that effect. There are certain maritime interests, nominally American, which stand to profit by such action. I speak of shipping operators who have obtained American vessels by one means or another and then transfer them to foreign flags solely to take advantage of the profits obtainable through operation under substandard foreign working conditions, pay, and sanitary and safety requirements. Rather than encourage that sort of action this Congress should clamp down on it. We should make it impossible for such operators to weaken the American merchant marine and threaten our own high standards by legislating to limit strictly their operations. It is such "cheap" operators whom foreign nations utilize at the expense of our commercial fleet. Repeal of the 50-percent requirement would give them an even greater opportunity to make hay.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the unfamiliarity of most of the members of the Randall Commission with the workaday operations of the maritime industry may excuse them for some of the remarkable conclusions they have reached with regard to the industry. However, that would not excuse us for acting favorably on their recommendations. The Commission seems to feel that in event of national emergency a complete maritime operation, with all its necessary components including an active shipbuilding industry, would spring up full grown. To have such an industry when needed we must maintain it now with every means at our command, including at least as much preferential treatment as the industry now receives. We must keep active a strong nucleus of experienced shipbuilding personnel to build ships and to keep them in repair, and we must keep in active service the men needed to man the ships. We cannot do that by tearing down the American merchant marine and building up those of our friendly competitors at our expense.

The Randall report, to one unfamiliar with the actual situation, would indicate that the merchant marines of our allies were in a bad way and that our own was flourishing. In the short time available to me let me cite a few figures to illustrate how dangerously misleading this impression is. On June 30, 1948, at a time when our own postwar fleet was already decreasing and that of our allies expanding, we had in our total active fleet 1,723 vessels of 1,000 gross tons and over, both Government and privately owned. As of January 1 of this year we were operating 1,203 such vessels. On June 30, 1948, foreign flag fleets consisted of 8,826 such vessels. As of June 30, 1953, the latest date for which figures are available, these foreign fleets had expanded to 10,732 vessels. Thus, in 5 years our fleet has decreased by almost one-third while foreign fleets have built up by almost one-fourth. Does that look as though the operations of our fleet have harmed foreign merchant marines or vice versa? To make the picture complete and more devastating as to the situation of the United States merchant marine, data on ships now under construction are even more indicative. As of July 1, 1953, the United States private merchant marine had no passenger vessels and no freighters under construction. To cite one country only, the United Kingdom at that time had 2,144 freight vessels on order or under construction, with an additional 7 passenger vessels. Sweden, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Japan, France, Italy, and other maritime nations all have active ship construction programs underway, including both passenger vessels and freighters. With our warbuilt fleet rapidly approaching obsolescence, how long will we have any fleet at all—particularly if such recommendations as the Randall Commission has made are to be allowed to dictate its doom.

Mr. Speaker, the American shipping and shipbuilding industry should not be asked to supply a transfusion to competitors, no matter how friendly, when it badly needs some plasma itself in order to keep afloat. When the recommendations of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy are before this body I pray that these facts will be borne in mind.

One of the other features, Mr. Speaker, that the Randall Commission recommends is opening up the purchase by the American Government of machinery and equipment which would be manufactured by foreign manufacturers, for use in Government installations, dams, and Government operations. Imagine this at this time, Mr. Speaker, when we are facing unemployment in our machinery and equipment industries and when this equipment is to be paid for by the American taxpayer with American funds. Right now the United States Army engineers are considering a bid from Japan for the purchase of electrical equipment for a dam being built by the American taxpayers at The Dalles in Oregon. If we pay any attention to this recommendation of the Randall Commission the United States Government is certain to become the No. 1 customer of a lot of our neighboring countries at the expense of a great many American workmen and American businesses and at the expense of the American taxpayer.

At this moment I do not have time to expand sufficiently on the matter of foreign procurement of equipment and supplies for Government projects located within the United States. At the next session of the House, however, I intend to go into that problem at greater length.

In the meantime, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia again for his courtesy in relinquishing time to me.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST] to discuss the question of pottery and glassware products and other industries in Ohio affected by our trade policy.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I will later have considerable to say about the Randall report, but at this time I want to point out to the House that this past year 330 million pieces of pottery came into this country. That is double the amount that was imported into the United States just 3 years ago. Every year, every month, the amount of pottery being brought into this country increases. It does so because in the potteries of the United States an average wage of $1.80 per hour is paid. In Japan, which is our largest competitor, the average wage in the pottery industry is less than 15 cents an hour. Seventy percent of all the cost of making pottery and glassware is in the labor, because it is a handmade product.

It is only a question of time until all the pottery the United States uses will be imported from Japan and other countries. The amount of pottery that came in last year would have furnished 8,000 men full employment for 1 year in the United States. One hundred and thirty million pieces of glassware came into the United States. Over half of all the wool that is used in the United States is imported. The farmers are being deprived of what was once a great source of cash income with which they could buy the products of the factories of this country.

Not long ago an advertisement was issued for the purchase of $450,000 worth of insulators for the Bonneville power project. Those insulators were bought with money raised from the taxpayers here in the United States. The potteries and the glass factories in my district, the farmers all over the Nation, and others who were having their markets at home destroyed by cheap foreign products, paid the taxes to buy the insulators at Bonneville, and the contract was let to a firm in Japan. Their own money was used to purchase the products to drive themselves out of business.

I do not think that any of us are unfair who advocate more protection for segments of our industry in this country that are being unduly punished by the present trade agreement program. We do not want to stop foreign trade but we want quotas or tariffs such as will guarantee to our producers a reasonable and a fair share of the market in the United States. Unless something is done, it is only a matter of time until hundreds of commodities like watches and pottery and glass and all of these things will be produced solely outside of the United States. Many of them will have an adverse effect on the defense of this Nation. It was upon the watchmakers trained in our country that we depended for the people necessary to make the Norden bombsight and other devices used in World War II, without which our conduct of the war would seriously have been affected. So we do ask and hope that in this session of Congress we can get reasonable protection for the people we represent and what we consider to be in the long run the best interests of the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at this time I note the presence on the floor of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] to whom I now yield so that he may discuss the effects upon the independent oil industry of the State of Oklahoma and the Southwest.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, since I represent one of the largest oil-producing areas in the United States, and perhaps represent more independent oil men than any other Member of the House, I feel compelled from time to time to do what I can to bring to the House information which affects this most vital industry. As you will recall, we tried last year in the Simpson bill to bring some protection and relief to this industry against conditions that have been growing steadily worse for the last 2 or 3 years. We were unsuccessful in that effort, but conditions in the oil industry have not improved. As I view it, the effects of the Randall Commission report and its impact on the oil industry will become even worse, probably to the extent of wrecking a great segment of the domestic oil industry in this country.

The foreign trade policy of the United States has been a subject of much discussion recently. It is a subject of vital concern to many domestic industries and to the United States as a whole. Industries with large exportable surpluses naturally advocate complete free trade and the removal of all possible trade barriers so they might develop and expand their export markets.

Such a policy, however, can have serious repercussions here at home. Many industries have already been injured by excessive imports from foreign sources.

The petroleum industry, for example, has been plagued in its postwar expansion efforts by constantly increasing imports which have absorbed a larger and larger share of the domestic market. Oil imports have increased from an average of 377,000 barrels daily in 1946, to about 1,050,000 barrels daily during 1953. In 1946, imports provided 7.1 percent of the total United States demand. Preliminary figures indicate that during 1953, imports supplied about 13 percent of our total petroleum demand. Thus far in 1954 the average is around 1,150,000 barrels daily. In other words, the United States petroleum industry, during this short period of time, lost a substantial portion of its total market outlet. A continuation of this trend could lead only to a weakened domestic industry incapable of supplying the Nation's needs in the event of an emergency.

The argument is often used that by importing vast quantities of oil from foreign areas we provide purchasing power in those foreign countries which, is in turn used to purchase American goods, thus stimulating our export market. Actually, there is no direct relationship between the trend in oil imports from the principal foreign countries which export oil to the United States and our exports of other products to them. For example, more than 90 percent of our oil imports come from Venezuela, Netherlands West Indies, and the two Middle East countries, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Since 1948, the total value of United States oil imports from these four countries increased 62 percent, while the total value of United States exports other than petroleum to them, actually declined 5 percent.

That foreign oil is of little value in time of war is best illustrated by our experience during World War II. During 1942, a year in which we could have used some foreign oil, we were able to bring in less than 100,000 barrels a day from such nearby sources as Venezuela and the Netherlands West Indies because of the enemy submarine menace.

Today we are becoming increasingly dependent on oil from sources much farther away. In addition, we are approaching a period when atom-powered submarines with almost unlimited ranges and armed with atomic torpedoes will create a far worse situation than we experienced during World War II. Also, we are helping develop oil resources in countries much nearer the Iron Curtain than they are to us. The Middle East, for example, with vast oil reserves is directly adjacent to the Soviet Union.

It is the duty and obligation of this Congress to see that the trend of increasing dependence on foreign oil from unreliable sources farther and farther away, is reversed and that a policy of encouragement to our domestic industry is adopted.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. I note the presence on the floor of my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and I yield to the gentleman at this time to give his reaction of what it is doing to the coal industry in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have studied the report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. My first impression, in studying the report, was that an entire section was missing, because I found no reference to the disturbing problems which are confronting the coal industry and which are consequent to the lack of adequate safeguards in our present trade policies. However, upon reading the joint statement of dissent by Mr. REED and Mr. SIMPSON, beginning on page 99, it was easy to understand why such material had not been included; and, in this regard, the words by these two gentlemen are astonishing:

> Witnesses in the United States were allowed 2 days for appearance; those appearing at private hearings in Europe, whose primary interest was to obtain help for foreign countries, were allowed 4 days. * * * There is no evidence in the report of serious consideration of the exhaustive studies prepared and submitted by many affected domestic industries. Spokesmen for industries vitally affected were not permitted to testify.

I am amazed at this fact. Spokesmen for domestic industries, and for whom this report holds the greatest significance, were not allowed to testify.

I am amazed that the report gives no recognition to the subject of so great concern as was expressed and discussed by many Members of this House during the 1st session of the 83d Congress with reference to the disastrous effect which uncontrolled imports of residual oil are bringing to bear upon the coal industry in this country. I am chagrined to find that the sincere pleas which were uttered by Representatives from distressed areas have been ignored. Certainly, some effort could have been made to witness and study the undesirable conditions that are being created in the coalfields by the unregulated imports of foreign oil; especially would one have considered such a study to be warranted and justified in the light of the expressed words of the creative act, to wit:

> The Commission is directed to examine, study, and report on the subjects of international trade and its enlargement consistent with a sound domestic economy.

How can the Commission recommend the extension and expansion of certain existing trade policies in the face of storm warnings which indicate that such policies are incommensurate and incompatible with the building and maintenance of a sound domestic economy?

I do not criticize the Commission for conducting private hearings in Europe if it saw fit to do so; nor do I wish to be misunderstood in my appraisal of the Commission's efforts in any way. I am confident that all of its members were sincere and conscientious in their approach to the problem; but I am disappointed that, with 3 months remaining in which to submit its recommendations, the Commission report was "frozen," and the Commission failed to hold hearings in the coalfields of West Virginia and some of the other States, thus giving spokesmen of the coal industry and other affected industries an opportunity to be heard.

If the welfare of the free world—which seems to be so important, and with which thought I do not disagree—is dependent upon a healthy economy in this country, I should think that the Commission would have looked first at the unhealthful conditions which are threatening that economy, and to which many of us have been calling attention over the past several months.

The report advocates sacrifices by the United States in the field of trade; yet, the report admits that other countries, on the whole, resort to the use of quotas and high tariffs more than does our own country—to say nothing of exchange controls and other devices employed by these countries against us. It would seem to me that America has made enough sacrifices. It has lowered tariffs to the extent that over half of its imports are duty free. Surely the time has come when we must take cognizance of the signs of strain and overwear in our own economic garment before proceeding further in our efforts to clothe the rest of the world with prosperity. If hearings must be held in Europe, that is all well and good, but let us not turn a deaf ear to the protestations of our own people and our own industries.

A few days ago, I extended in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report from the West Virginia Department of Mines which revealed that 170 coal mines closed in West Virginia last year, and that the number of employed coal miners had receded from 125,669 in 1948 to 85,490 as of December 1953. This intolerable situation is not unique in that it is confined to West Virginia. The same situation exists in a greater or less degree in other coal mining areas over the country.

Only last week one of the newspapers in my district reported that over 3,000 families were in immediate need of food in my own county and the adjoining area. I immediately contacted the direct distribution branch of the Agricultural Marketing Service and was promised by the chief that aid would be given in fulfilling the food needs of these families by supplying them from the Federal Government's stocks of food surplus. But this figure does not constitute the total number of families in West Virginia or the United States who have been thrown out of work during the last year; nor is the agreement by the United States Department of Agriculture to assist in feeding these unemployed families the answer to the problem. These families do not want to go on receiving a handout; neither do they want sympathy. They want jobs.

The Randall report implies that American workmen who have become unemployed because of import competition should migrate to other areas and seek new fields of employment, and that affected industries should diversify existing business or convert to new activities of production. How can displaced coal miners, many of whom are past 45 years of age, expect to find new employment elsewhere? Is it fair to ask other industries and other citizens to absorb these displaced workers? How can the coal industry be converted to the basic production of anything other than coal? Can butter, bombsights, or overalls be extracted from a coal mine? No, the coal industry must produce coal. The Federal Government last year acted to discourage the development of processes whereby synthetic fuels and other products might be derived from coal.

Mr. Speaker, the time will soon come when we shall again be asked to extend the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for an additional period of time. I hope that, when that moment comes, this Congress will fulfill its responsibility toward the people and the industries of our own country by creating adequate safeguards in our trade policies for their protection. I am not an isolationist, but I do plead guilty to being concerned more about the welfare of the United States than about that of any other nation, however friendly it may be. Spokesmen for the vested interests in Europe have been given the opportunity to be heard. Our own people—those most affected—have been denied the same opportunity. I think this is undemocratic, and I think it is wrong. I cannot imagine that any jury in this country would attempt to render a decision or make recommendations to the court without first hearing both sides of the case. The same principle is involved here.

There is a philosophy in this country which has been quite popular for many years. It is one which espouses the belief that we should spread our wealth throughout the islands and the continents of the earth in an effort to raise the living standards of other peoples. I am one who believes that the time has come when we must listen to the cries of our own people. I hear them in the morning, and I hear them at night; I hear them in the streets and thoroughfares, and I hear their echoes in my dreams. I hear the pleas of unemployed working men asking for jobs wherewith to feed their children. These are the owners of industry who have made America a colossus of economic strength, and a refuge of succor and comfort for the peoples of other lands. These are the same men whose feet have blazed paths across the mountains and through the valleys founding the sites for cities of greatness. Their's are the hands that have dredged America's harbors and rivers, built her factories, hewed her forests, and worked in her mines. Their's are the sons who have given their lives that America and other nations might be free. These are Americans—men of every race; to them we owe our responsibility. They are the men whose courage knows no royal overseer. They are the men whose strength knows no economic or political bounds. They are the men whose ingenuity knows no limits. They are the men whose vision and whose dreams have built the land of the free and the home of the brave, and they are the men upon whose shoulders rests the hope of the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

> Not gold, but only men can make a nation great and strong;
> Men who for truth and honor's sake stand fast and labor long;
> Real men who work while others sleep, who dare while others fly;
> They build a nation's pillars deep, and lift them to the sky.

Mr. Speaker, let us not be recreant in our duty toward America and her peoples—first, last, and all the time.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I have some 2 or 3 minutes' time to place at the disposal of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, the Randall Commission report was only recently issued. It is rather lengthy; I have not had an opportunity to study and analyze its contents. I assume it contains many constructive findings and recommendations; at the same time my impression is that it also contains certain weaknesses and defects that are quite obvious. In approaching any phase of international trade it is obviously important to consider the policies of foreign countries as well as our own. Any trade is a two-way proposition.

The report does not dwell upon certain trade restrictions and obstruction policies of foreign countries with which we trade. Many of them engage in mul-

tilateral exchange manipulations, in currency controls, and various other practices which have more to do with burdening international trade than does the tariff. In the case of wool, with which I am somewhat familiar, there was a reduction in the tariff of 25 percent a few years ago, from 34 cents per clean pound down to 25½ cents. That fact alone discouraged the wool grower. Many turned to cattle and other uses of their land. Within around 10 years the sheep population dropped from 48 million down to only 28 million. And yet the wool industry is officially recognized as strategic, not only in time of war but also in time of peace.

If a further reduction should take place in this protection to our domestic wool industry, you can understand what would happen.

It seems to me that before foreign countries can complain about our tariff policies, they should get their own houses in order. Actually the United States is a low-tariff nation as compared with all the major countries of the world. We have fewer trade restrictions. If there are adjustments that can properly be made, then well and good. But let us first examine the trade policies of the country involved, compare them with our own, and then determine the effect such an adjustment may have on a particular industry.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Texas. Mr. Speaker, in order that this program may be kept strictly nonpartisan and in order that we may have bipartisan representation, it is my pleasure to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], who has a number of Members of the majority party here who would like to express their grievance on this report.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for making available this time. There are a number of Members here who wish to speak on the matter and because the time is short I am going to make my own remarks rather brief.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to comment briefly on the statements and recommendations of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy with respect to United States tariff policy. The principal proposal of the Commission in this regard, of course, is that the United States further lower its tariffs on imported goods as part of a bold program for exerting American leadership in stimulating foreign trade.

With this recommendation I do not agree. I do not agree because I believe that it would have adverse effects on our domestic economy which would more than offset the advantages to be gained from what increase in international trade might result. This anticipated increase is grossly exaggerated.

Unfortunately, the free traders have been selling a lot of people in this country a bill of goods. They offer tariff reduction as a panacea for most of all of our economic ills. Not only is continued prosperity dependent upon elimination of tariffs, they claim, but peace itself. History does not indicate anything approximating a direct correlation between free trade and peace, or putting it the other way, between protectionism and war.

But what is most questionable about the free traders' activity is that their arguments are so frequently self-serving. They all have something they want to sell abroad and they figure they will have a better chance of doing so if tariffs are reduced or eliminated. If a domestic industry is harmed or destroyed in the process that is too bad, but it cannot be helped. To soften the blow, they suggest that the injured party have his day in court and seek damages, or have his way paid to school so that he can learn to do something else.

Anyone who defends tariffs as a national policy is immediately labeled by the free traders as a protectionist. As if that were not a bad enough word, he is further described as an isolationist and as living in the dark ages as far as economic thought is concerned.

Now I happen to think that tariffs often serve a useful purpose. I believe they can protect American consumers, as well as producers. And I do not think so because I represent a district which is made up of protected industries. Far from it. The district is basically agricultural. The number one cash crop is cotton—and cotton is often associated with the free trade theory. On the other hand, there is a large dairy industry, and the dairy industry, at least the cheese producers, are interested in protection from foreign imports. The milk producers, however, are interested in finding a home abroad for surplus milk in dehydrated form.

The grape industry represents a paradox. Raisins and to some extent, grapes, are exported. To that degree the industry is inclined toward the free trade theory. On the other hand, a large part of the grape production goes into wine, and the American wine industry in order to survive must have protection against foreign imports.

A good example of why tariffs are needed is the plight of the dried fig industry. It is a small industry—over 90 percent located in one congressional district and that happens to be the one which I have the privilege of representing. There are only about 300 growers in the business, so they certainly do not constitute a pressure group. But they are American citizens and entitled to fair treatment by the Government.

The California fig industry was actually stimulated by the United States Government—the Department of Agriculture. Farmers in the San Joaquin Valley were encouraged to plant fig trees. The soil and climate were particularly favorable and there was a market in the United States for dried figs. Consequently a fig industry was born, and still survives, although not as large as it once was—due in large measure to foreign competition and lack of adequate tariff protection. As a matter of fact, what little tariff protection which had been afforded was cut in half, and only recently restored in part by action of the Tariff Commission.

Now these fig growers would like to stay in business if they can. They do not want to put up their trees, even if they have the right to go into court and demand damages. They do not even object to competition if it is reasonable and fair. They do not ask for a complete embargo on foreign figs. They are willing that foreign producers be allowed a reasonable share of the market.

They do ask, however, that their foreign competitors be subject to the same ground rules, or be handicapped, so to speak, to an equivalent extent through imposition of a tariff or a quota.

The California fig industry operates under a State marketing order. Each grower is assessed so much a ton for the purpose of carrying on a program of scientific research aimed at improvement of quality and discovery of new uses for the product. An advertising and marketing program is also carried on so as to stimulate and increase consumption.

The industry is subject to rigid inspection to insure a sanitary and healthful product.

In order to prevent overloading of the market, and also to insure a high standard of quality, a portion of the crop is diverted for other than human consumption.

All of this, of course, costs the growers money which must be added to the ordinary costs of doing business, such as labor for producing, harvesting, and packing.

What then are the conditions under which the foreign competitors operate? Greece and Turkey are the two major sources of foreign figs. In the first place, the cost of labor is nowhere near comparable. Labor costs in Greece and Turkey are far less. There is no research or advertising program for which these foreign producers are assessed. They profit by the advertising program carried on by American growers but they pay no part of it. They are not required under any marketing order to divert a portion of their crop. They do nothing to keep a stable flow of the product into the market. That is one of the worst aspects of foreign competition in this field. American fig growers are never sure how much and when and at what price foreign figs are going to be placed on the American market. This naturally makes for unstable prices and marketing conditions.

Furthermore, foreign figs are not subject to the same requirements with respect to health and sanitation. Despite the efforts of the Pure Food and Drug Administration—which parenthetically may I say, are not effective, and it is more than lack of funds that is responsible—imported figs are placed on the market here in the United States that contain an amazing amount and variety of foreign matter—they are truly foreign imports—including animal hair, sugar mites, and so forth.

On top of all this, as if the American fig grower was not already at a sufficient disadvantage, foreign currencies fluctuate violently—last year the Greek drachma was devalued 50 percent—which makes a tariff rate based on weight almost totally ineffective. And to add insult to injury, the American fig grower is being taxed along with the rest of us to provide foreign-aid money with which to improve and develop fig production abroad. Actually he is being

forced to pay for his own possible extinction.

From what has been said, I hope it is clear that if the American fig industry is to survive, it will have to have protection either in the form of an adequate tariff or some system of quotas on foreign imports. It is well and good to expound on the free trade economic maxim that each nation should produce that which it is best fitted economically to produce and the respective products then be exchanged. The free traders lose sight of the fact, however, that this theory to be at all plausible, must assume certain incident conditions to be equal. Here as I have pointed out in the case of figs, such conditions are not equal. Let the Greek producer pay similar wages, maintain similar working conditions, contribute to a research and advertising program, maintain equal standards of sanitation and quality, and turn over a part of his crop to a diversion program. And then last but not least, let his Government maintain a stable currency and a realistic exchange rate. When all that is done, it will be soon enough to talk about free trade.

Many people wonder why I concern myself with such a relatively small and insignificant industry as the fig industry. The question answers itself. Because it is such a small industry it is in dire need of help. The tree nut industry is in much the same situation. Like a number of other small industries, they get traded away at the trade conferences. The larger industries have sufficient influence to make sure that they are protected in one way or another. This is even true of agricultural commodities.

Both wheat and flour are not only protected by a duty but by an absolute and inflexible import quota, imposed under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The duty on wheat was reduced from 42 cents per bushel to 21 cents and wheat flour from $1.04 per 100 pounds to 52 cents under the trade agreements program.

However, only 800,000 bushels of wheat may be imported annually under the quota, or only about one-tenth of 1 percent of our domestic crop. Also only 4 million pounds of wheat flour may be imported annually. This is equal to about one-fiftieth of 1 percent of the flour produced in this country. In addition wheat has been subsidized under the International Wheat Agreement to the extent of more than $600 million in the past 4 years. But for the rigid quotas on wheat and wheat flour, Canada would ship in millions of bushels of wheat and millions of pounds of wheat flour.

Cotton is also protected by import quotas under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Imports are restricted to less than 1 percent of our domestic production. The world price of cotton is below the domestic price and will probably go lower as world production increases. You can be sure that American cotton producers are not going to stand idly by and see their own market taken away from them.

Under the Sugar Act of 1948, imports of sugar are determined on the basis of allocation which assures domestic producers a definite tonnage each year. While a duty is also levied on imported sugar, the real protection is provided by the quota system. If it were not for this system the American market would be flooded with imported cane sugar, and the domestic sugar producers would soon become ardent protectionists.

The domestic tobacco industry is protected by an ingenious device. The exportation of tobacco seeds is absolutely prohibited. That obstructs the development of production of American varieties of tobacco abroad and hence serves to eliminate competition.

Detroit, the home of the automobile industry, has produced outstanding supporters of the free-trade theory. I find them rather inconsistent, however; last year, after hearing a great deal from that area about eliminating all tariffs, I introduced a bill to remove the 10-percent ad valorem on foreign automobiles, which I discovered had been in effect without change during the last 20 years, while tariffs on agricultural commodities had been reduced by more than half. There has been a strange silence with respect to this bill. Apparently the wrong ox is being gored.

Another disturbing feature of the Commission's report is the conclusion that America must embark on some kind of bold program of tariff reduction and thus influence the rest of the world to do likewise. It might be well to recall that America embarked on such a program over 20 years ago. We have reduced our tariff rates very considerably. As a matter of fact, we are today a free-trade Nation by comparison. What has happened elsewhere? Instead of following our lead, other countries of the world have moved in the opposite direction. World trade today is bogged down in a maze of import licenses, quotas, currency restrictions, and exchange manipulations, not to mention the common garden variety of tariffs. I was surprised at some of the things I discovered while abroad during adjournment. Belgium is heralded as a low-tariff nation, which is true. But, what they do not do with quotas and embargoes. For example, Belgium raises grapes under glass—an expensive hothouse culture. This industry is protected by an absolute prohibition against the importation of grapes.

Belgium also has what is called a quota calendar. To illustrate, when domestic apples are being harvested and on the market, foreign apples are not allowed to be imported.

In concluding my remarks, which at the outset were intended to be confined to a few brief comments, let me say that the elimination of what is left of our tariff structure is not going to bring about world prosperity or a reform in the trade practices of our fellow nations. Failure of foreign countries to sell more in the American market has other causes than tariffs. It is due, to a great extent, to the fact that many of their products we just do not want to buy, tariff or no tariff.

Furthermore, it would appear that the answer to our own economic dilemma is not merely to try to absorb enough imports to balance off what various segments of our economy would prefer to export, but to convert our national-productive capacity to the production of things which can be absorbed in our own domestic market. The demand is unlimited, provided the right articles are offered. We are, in effect, seeking to perpetuate a wartime economy when we are no longer at war—at least an all-out shooting war. That has involved tremendous exports to our friends and allies, most of which has never been paid for. What we have been and are doing is to export our resources with no return in kind. It is not in our country's best interests to continue this arrangement forever. The Commission is right. The permanent answer to the problem of the unbalance of trade is not to give away the difference.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and I want to congratulate him and the gentleman from West Virginia on taking an active part in criticizing this report which I believe is entirely biased and unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the Randall Commission report an affront to the 161 Members of the House who supported the Simpson bill in the closing days of the last session of this Congress. To the many others of our colleagues who withheld their support on the assumption that the Commission's recommendations would include consideration for United States industries and workers seriously injured by unfair foreign competition, the report will be equally repugnant.

As representative of a district that has suffered severely from excessive imports of residual oil, I strongly resent the Commission's failure to give recognition to this problem. Were it not for the promise that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] will submit a substitute foreign-trade policy program, and for the sincere efforts of other individual members of the group who were adamant in dissenting from many of the recommendations in this dismal document, I would suggest the Randall "Omission" as a more appropriate name for this committee.

Briefly let me say that while the Commission's conclusions would obviously implement the havoc that is being imported from foreign refineries, by inference and omission it has in actuality established a consent case for coal. I call your attention to page 43, in which a number of metals and minerals are specifically pointed out as evidence of United States dependence upon foreign sources for raw materials. You see no mention of residual oil in this list. It is not there because even the most naive member of the Commission recognizes that there is not and will not be any need whatsoever for importing large quantities of residual oil into this country. Foreign residual oil serves almost exclusively as a substitute for American-produced coal in our fuel markets, and there is enough coal within our borders to last for a thousand years.

On page 44 is this recommendation:

Also our tariff policy toward the needed materials should be such as to offer them reasonably easy access to the United States market.

No one will take issue with that suggestion, nor should it require months of study to reach such a manifest opinion. It is only logical that we encourage in every way possible the importation of materials essential to the welfare of this country, but I commend your attention to the fact that there is no relationship between needed materials and foreign residual oil.

It is also important that, while the Commission utilizes almost 100 typewritten pages to ignore the miners, railroaders, and businessmen in coal areas whose economy has been damaged by residual oil imports, it inadvertently disposes of the extremists who—by advocating destruction of all protective trade barriers—have loudly protested the quota which we recommend. These quotations from the report—"free trade is not possible under the conditions facing the United States today" and "completely free trade is not feasible"—should provide a final answer to that vociferous cell of so-called economists who have persisted in promoting the most dangerous of all trade theories.

Everything considered, perhaps our best course would be to accept this report for what it is, a hodgepodge of vague and platitudinous piffle that may appeal to the palates of international dreamers but can contribute nothing toward the welfare and security of this Nation.

It should remind us of the wisdom of those who drew up the articles of the Constitution, for it was they who specified that Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. Remembering this function, we must now recover this prerogative from the world meddlers and once again provide by law the protection needed by American industries and American workers against cheap foreign products.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, with permission of the gentleman from West Virginia, who has control of the time, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON], who will make some remarks on the subjects of lead and zinc and wool as affected by the United States tariff policy.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of an area much concerned with the future of lead and zinc mining, I must register my disagreement with the report rendered by the President's Commission of Foreign Economic Policy.

There is nothing contained in that report than can lend encouragement to this industry which has been beleaguered for almost 2 years by rising unemployment and declining prices. There is nothing at the heart of this problem but a mounting flood of imports of these metals at prices which can hardly be characterized as short of dumping. It has been freely conceded by foreign producers, and evidence of this was presented to the Commission, that even foreign production at present prices is unprofitable. In the United States last year we produced less zinc than we have in any year since before World War II when our consumption was at an all-time high.

Trade barriers of various types used by other countries prohibited worldwide surpluses of those metals from being sold any place other than in the United States. Our tariffs presented no barrier to the great volume of imports and were so low that they gave but little support to metal prices, which plunged downward under the impact of the flood.

Most small mines closed shortly after the drastic price drops began. The larger mines have continued operating at break-even or loss figures, rather than to shut down and risk the loss of mine workings and ore reserves.

In 1951, 9 of the 11 Western States produced 635,000 tons of lead and zinc—60 percent of the Nation's total production—worth $206 million.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three production dropped to 482,000 tons of lead and zinc, worth $100 million. This was less than half the worth of 1951 production. The decreased worth reflects both production loss and decreased prices.

A large portion of the decrease in worth of the metals represents a loss to the economic blood stream of the community. The workman, the retailer, wholesaler, farmer, railroader, trucker, service dealer, tax collector, and stockholder collectively bear the entire loss.

Utah's share of the loss in worth of metal production is $10,120,000, comparing 1953 to 1951.

The tax loss to the State of Utah on direct mine taxes—net proceeds, mine occupation, and corporate franchise—will be between $150,000 and $200,000. The loss on State taxes derived from the circulation of $10 million in wages and purchasing power is difficult to evaluate but will be very substantial.

Proponents of free trade, of saving our metals by importing from foreign sources, buying at the cheapest possible source, and so forth, forget or willfully overlook several facts discussed in the following paragraphs:

The dollars spent for domestic mine production are effective to their full value in our economic blood stream. It is questionable that more than a small portion of the dollar spent for foreign metals returns to circulation here. The few cents per pound saved by buying foreign metal, say by the automobile industry, undoubtedly will cost them more than the saving made, through inability to sell cars in the domestic areas suffering the loss of income.

Once closed down, mines would take years and tremendous sums to reopen. This Nation could not disarm more effectively than to lose its power to produce metals in an emergency.

Utah lost $10 million last year and the Western States lost $100 million through failure to properly protect the lead-zinc industry. If present conditions continue more mines will be forced to close, the economy of the West will bear further serious losses, our security will be further jeopardized, and the Nation will have witnessed the completion of a disarming program advocated by none other than the agents of Russia.

If I understand the Randall report, its recommendations amount to the subordination of our domestic interests to a foreign trade policy that is based on fallacious hopes. For the past 20 years, we have steadily reduced our tariffs until we are today one of the low tariff countries. But other nations have not followed our example. They use not only tariffs but quotas, import licenses, multiple exchange rates, and many other devices to stifle trade. The world now is a trade jungle.

I do not believe that we can accept such a report when the policies it advocates have already brought ruin to the domestic lead and zinc industry. The absolute requirement of our Nation for a domestic supply of these metals is above doubt. Yet this supply source is being systematically destroyed by unfair foreign competition which has tremendous advantages in labor and other costs.

It would not seem that we would so soon forget the lessons of the war years when circumstances required the immediate expansion of our domestic supply of these and other critical materials. This need may arise again. We must preserve our domestic supply of these metals, and we cannot do that if we let the industries which mine them perish.

It is difficult to reconcile the thinking in this report with the evident concern about the lead and zinc industry shown by a Select Committee of the House on Small Business, and also by a conference of western governors who requested congressional action to stop the ruinous flood of imports of these materials, and similar sentiments registered by the House Ways and Means Committee—all in the year 1953.

The wool growers of my district are in a similar plight because of imports. As a matter of national concern, I must point out the dangerous decline in the size of the flocks in the United States. A loss of some 45 percent in sheep population in the course of 10 years is reflected also in the figures which show a reduction from about 500,000 to 285,000 in the number of American farms raising sheep.

If we do not make wool growing more attractive to the domestic producers the industry will perish.

There is no future for either of these industries under the recommendations of the Randall Commission. I had, I confess, little hope for this report before it was issued, but I find even less to encourage me after its issuance. There is nothing to do now but for this body to reassert its control over foreign commerce.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], who sought time previously, is still here, and I know that his remarks on this subject will be well received by the Members of this body. At this time I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], and also the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], for this opportunity to say a word on behalf of the miners, the smelter workers, the mine and smelter operators, the supply houses and the related mine

equipment industries which all tie into the great lead and zinc mining industry of the tri-State area, a great portion of which is located in the Second District of Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a concern of mine ever since coming to this House last January to witness the deterioration and the destruction of the lead and zinc mining industry of the tri-State area. There can be no question about the fact that this is a direct result of the mounting imports which have greatly increased during the past several years. Nineteen fifty-two broke all records for imports of zinc. Nineteen fifty-three, the first 6 months, showed a 245-percent increase over the first 6 months of 1952. So, imports continue to mount while more and more men become unemployed in this industry.

I was interested in hearing the figures given by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON] a few moments ago when he told about unemployment and the decreased production in his area in 1953. Let me put into the RECORD here just a couple of very salient facts concerning the lead and zinc industry of the tri-State area. The number of mines operating in the tri-State field in November dropped from about 150 in the first part of 1952 to approximately 20 in November of 1953, directly as a result of foreign competition, according to the head of the Tri-State Lead and Zinc Ore Producers Association, Mr. Harold Childress. Imports of lead and zinc metals produced at a much lower cost than the American metals have depressed the American market to the extent that most operators cannot make a profit on the mining operation.

Here are some figures on production: production of lead and zinc concentrates in the tri-State district has dropped materially during this same period of 1952–1953. The production of zinc concentrates in the early part of 1952 averaged about 15,000 tons a month in this district as compared to about 4,000 tons a month at the present time.

As for lead concentrates, production of 3,000 to 4,000 tons a month in early 1952 has dropped to about 500 tons a month in November of 1953.

The situation is serious. The President of the United States has acknowledged the seriousness of the situation. The Secretary of the Interior has acknowledged the seriousness of the situation. We will not have a gun to fire any kind of ammunition at the enemy if we do not maintain our lead and zinc supply in this country. It seems to me imperative that something should be done about it. Certainly the Randall Commission has done nothing constructive. Other Members have made reference to the problems regarding coal and oil production. Oklahoma is being hit from several directions. It seems to be a special target of adversity in the situation on imports that obtains today. I sincerely hope the House will do something constructive, and that it will not be along the line of the recommendations of the Randall Commission in connection with zinc and lead.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I notice there is now on the floor the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT], who is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and who desires to speak on this subject.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have just struggled through the report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. The Commission, I regret to report, is suffering an evident case of split personality. Its conclusions and its recommendations are at such complete variance that I wonder if this report is not a first draft—made public by one of the leaks for which Washington is so famous.

On the subject of tariff rates and customs administration, the Commission admits that "no other single field produced such directly divergent statements of alleged fact, so many shades of opinion, or such diversity of recommendation."

This diversity of opinion must have been contagious. The report rambles between dissent and contradiction, and ignores the facts which the Commission itself had assembled.

The Commission makes a good case for abandoning the reciprocal trade program which the United States has carried on for the past 20 years. The United States is no longer a high tariff country, this the Commission concedes; exports and imports are now in approximate balance and increased foreign gold reserves have virtually closed the dollar gap; the importance of tariff reductions has been greatly overemphasized while other countries bind the United States with quotas, currency controls, and other hindrances to trade; and free trade is impossible as long as Russia threatens Communist aggression around the world.

But having drawn these conclusions, the Commission turns its back on the facts and recommends a 3-year extension of the President's authority to negotiate new trade agreements and would give him authority to drastically reduce existing tariff rates. The Commission recommends retention of the escape clause and peril-point provisions, but wants expressly spelled out the fact that the President is authorized to disregard findings whenever he finds the national interest of the United States requires it. The Commission would repeal the laws giving preference to our merchant fleet in the shipment of Government-owned and Government-financed cargoes, and would amend the Buy American Act.

The Commission not only ignored its own conclusions in making these recommendations, it turned its back on the hardships that low-cost import competition is already imposing upon American labor, industry, and agriculture.

On the Pacific coast, the tuna-fishing industry is static while the Japanese industry is expanding, with an eye on growing United States consumption of tuna.

Growers, processors, and workers in the fig, walnut, and almond industries see cheap imports cutting into their markets. The wool and beef cattle industries are at an unfair disadvantage because their foreign competitors benefit from lower wage costs, subsidies, and dumping support from their governments. The west coast shipbuilding industry is decaying and the skills of the workers are being lost, while we read advertisements from Japanese shipyards in American nautical magazines.

These are some of the realities the Randall Commission has ignored. Instead of proposing measures to correct them, the Commission has proposed new one-way concessions which would compound the injuries already inflicted. The real need is to protect vital domestic industries from this low-cost, cheap-labor competition.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, there is also present a gentleman from the northern part of the State of California [Mr. SCUDDER], who would like to speak on this subject.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest the Randall report and I cannot find very much in there encouraging to the economy of the United States. What have we done for the past 20 years but cut tariffs? It is charged that we who espouse the tariff program are for high tariffs. That is not true. There is nothing more false than to say that we, who are trying to protect American industry, are for unreasonable tariffs.

The tariff on wine, a great product of my district, 20 years ago was $1.50 a gallon. It has been reduced to 37 cents. Tariffs on numerous other commodities throughout the entire country have been likewise reduced. I wish they would stop criticizing us who have fought to protect the American workingman and our American economy as being for high tariffs.

I have here an excerpt from a speech I made last year regarding the tariffs of other countries. I quoted from the statement of "Casey" J. M. Jones, executive secretary of the National Wool Growers Association, in an article appearing in the California Farmer, to the effect that we are one of the lowest, if not the lowest, tariff countries in the world. The average rate applying to tariffs collected on all imports coming into the United States is about 5.5 percent. In Canada it is 10.2 percent; in Italy, 11 percent; in the United Kingdom, 11 percent; in France, 11.2 percent; in Australia, 17.1 percent; in Mexico, 22.5 percent, and in India, 25.3 percent.

I do not see where we are ever going to sustain our economy if we continuously give foreign countries, with which we are trading, the benefit every time we make a trade agreement.

I believe we should have at those trade agreement conferences people who are interested in their given commodities. I am told there are people vitally interested who are not permitted to sit in on those conferences, while foreign governments rely on advice from such groups who are permitted to be present.

The plywood industry is presently being endangered by imports. Only 2 years ago the tariff on plywood was reduced 50 percent. Plywood, is an important industry of the United States and has been threatened severely by imports.

We have specialty crops in my district like cherries, hops, fish, wool, butter,

cheese, and meat products. Those products are all being discriminated against. We have been sold down the river through nonreciprocal trade agreements. I think it is time we stop, look, and listen and see if we can revise the philosophy of this report in some way to give our own American economy a square break.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman from California for his very fine statement.

Mr. Speaker, I see on the floor of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL], who I know is interested in speaking on this subject at this time.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to put in my little word. I have been very much interested in this discussion. Coming from West Virginia, as I do, of course, one of the principal things I have been interested in is the coal industry and inasmuch as this has been covered pretty well, I shall not take time to say much more. However, I do want to emphasize this fact. West Virginia depends upon coal and largely upon farming and small industries. All over the State of West Virginia we have chemical plants and glass plants and ceramic plants of one sort or another which manufacture and produce materials which are now largely in competition with foreign products coming into the country. We must recognize this one thing—that wherever you have a little factory, wherever you have a little accumulation of industry or industrial organization around that you build a community. These small industries in building these communities create homeowners and good, substantial citizens and taxpayers who support their government and give the type of support to the community that it needs. Every time we interfere by introducing products in this country in competition with the products of these small industries, we naturally interfere with the labor and employment of that group of individuals, which, in a State like West Virginia, constitutes a very great proportion of the labor in that State. We can look at the whole labor situation. About 16 million are organized. The majority of the 16 million are engaged in the production of materials which ordinarily are produced by your streamlined methods. Inasmuch as that is true, those people constitute, comparatively, a small proportion of the ordinarily employed in this country. The biggest majority are employed by these small industries. It is, therefore, necessary, I think, that anything that is recommended in this report, which I have not had the time to go through, should at least give consideration to the basic things upon which many of the very important segments of our national life depend. I am not able to criticize this report because, as I say, I have not gone into it, but I do recognize there is a great need for a study and a recognition of the rights and privileges of small industries to proceed in a manner which will not only render some profit to themselves but likewise create good employment and make good citizens through the process of that sort of operation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. From the adjoining State of Virginia, I notice the presence of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WAMPLER], who seeks recognition to speak on this subject of United States tariff policy.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, may I say I believe the report of the so-called Randall Commission has not been adequate in protecting an industry that is vital to the economy of my district in Virginia. The Commonwealth of Virginia was at one time, and I assume still is, the sixth ranking coal-producing State in the Union. Over 99 percent of the production of the State of Virginia comes from the district I have the honor and the responsibility to represent, the Ninth Congressional District. I think the coal industry is asking of this Congress reasonable protection. I do not think they have ever asked anything except that to which they are entitled—reasonable protection from foreign competition. The coal industry has never received subsidies of any type, and I do not think it is asking for that of this Congress. I have had a chance to travel very extensively through my congressional district during the recess to talk to people from all walks of life and in all economic stations in life. I have talked to coal miners and to owners and operators of coal mines, to railroaders and to independent business people, and everyone who is directly or indirectly affected by coal. I want to report to you today that in my congressional district in Virginia, the economic situation is serious. Unemployment is mounting daily. At one time we had an employment of about 17,000 coal miners. That figure has been cut almost in half. I am aware that the present dilemma in which the coal industry finds itself is the result of a number of causes. But my studies have indicated to me that definitely the importation of cheap foreign residual fuel oil is one of the contributing factors. I think it is incumbent upon this Congress to take the necessary steps to give our basic American industries the protection to which they are entitled.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WAMPLER]. I notice also the presence on the floor of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE], and am pleased to yield to him at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, coming from a State which is noted for its lead, zinc, coal, and oilfields, and representing the district that has the majority of such fields in our State, I want to say that I have read the Randall report almost in its entirety, and I find it entirely inadequate as far as protecting our marginal industries is concerned.

If anyone can show me how we can increase our employment in this country by destroying our industries in this country, I should be most happy to try to follow their reasoning. I have never had anyone show me how, when we destroy an industry in this country by cheap imports of any kind, we increase employment in any other industry in our country.

I am happy to join my colleague from Oklahoma, who joins me in the tri-State mining area, in condemning this report. I want to assure the membership that as far as I am concerned I am going to vote to protect American industry and the American workingman in our high-income and high-level economy in this country.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HARDEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. I now yield back to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. As I understand the import of the argument that has been made here this afternoon in opposition to the Randall report, it is that the gentlemen are concerned only with preserving the jobs of American workingmen and preserving American business.

Mr. BAILEY. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It has been the American workingman and the American businessman who have created this high standard of living that we have in this country.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I say that it is the intention of the group who are critical of the Randall report to continue this policy of giving individual Members of Congress an opportunity to express on the floor of the House their reactions concerning what this report, if it is followed, will do to the industries of their respective States and of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, which is 30 seconds.

THE DOG, MAN'S MOST LOYAL FRIEND, NEEDS AND DESERVES YOUR HELP

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent order of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authorizing the delivery of pets impounded in the District to organizations and institutions for vivisection is receiving the condemnation and opposition of all lovers of animals in my congressional district and I am urging that this proposal of the Commissioners be revoked by them.

The Oregon Humane Society, an outstanding institution in the Nation for the protection of animals, has written

me and I include in these remarks a copy of the letter which is as follows:

OREGON HUMANE SOCIETY,
Portland, Oreg., January 21, 1954.
Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
Representative, State of Oregon,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HON. MR. ANGELL: The recent order of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia enabling the seizure of pets from the pound has caused quite a bit of consternation among the members of the Oregon Humane Society.

The Oregon Humane Society has always been and will always be utterly and definitely opposed to any animal seizure act and takes this opportunity to express its position and policy along those lines.

As a member of the board of directors of the Oregon Humane Society, you know that time and time again resolutions have been passed that the Oregon Humane Society would cancel its animal control contract with the city of Portland should such an act become law in the State of Oregon.

Will you record yourself as being in opposition to such act, as directed in Washington, D. C.?

Yours truly,
OREGON HUMANE SOCIETY,
L. E. WILLIAMS, *Manager.*

Mr. Speaker, I note from the public press that Geoffrey M. Thornett, secretary of the Board of Commissioners, states that the Board officials have received 11,346 letters against this proposal, almost 90 percent of the letters coming from out of the city. In contrast only 881 letters have been received in favor of the order.

I have received many letters from Oregon in opposition to this proposal and none in favor of it. Unquestionably, the reason so many lovers of animals throughout the Nation are wrought up over this order in the District of Columbia is due to the fact that this is the Nation's Capital. It should stand as an example for the rest of the Nation in upholding legislation, not only for humane treatment of dumb animals but for sane and humane legislation in general.

Among the dumb creatures the dog is man's greatest friend. In all literature there is no finer tribute to the dog than that paid by Senator Vest in his short but eloquent eulogy to the dog, which I quote here:

SENATOR VEST'S EULOGY TO THE DOG

Senator Vest, of Missouri, was attending court in a country town, and while waiting for the trial of a case in which he was interested, he was urged by the attorneys in a dog case to help them. He was paid a fee of $250 by the plaintiff. Voluminous evidence was introduced to show that the defendant had shot the dog in malice, while the other evidence went to show that the dog had attacked the defendant. Vest took no part in the trial and was not disposed to speak. The attorneys, however, urged him to make a speech, else their client would not think he had earned his fee. Being thus urged, he arose, scanned the face of each juryman for a moment and said:

"Gentlemen of the jury, the best friend a man has in the world may turn against him and become his enemy. His son or daughter that he has reared with loving care may prove ungrateful. Those who are nearest and dearest to us, those whom we trust with our happiness and our good name may become traitors to their faith. The money that a man has he may lose. It flies away from him, perhaps, when he needs it most. A man's reputation may be sacrificed in a moment of ill-considered action. The people who are prone to fall on their knees to do us honor when success is with us may be the first to throw the stone of malice when failure settles its cloud upon our heads. The one absolutely unselfish friend that man can have in this selfish world, the one that never deserts him, the one that never proves ungrateful or treacherous, is his dog. A man's dog stands by him in prosperity and poverty, in health and sickness. He will sleep on the cold ground where the wintry winds blow and the snow drives fiercely, if only he may be near his master's side. He will kiss the hand that has no food to offer; he will lick the wounds and sores that come in encounter with the roughness of the world. He guards the sleep of his pauper master as if he were a prince. When all other friends desert, he remains. When riches take wings and reputation falls to pieces, he is as constant in his love as the sun in its journey through the heavens.

"If fortune drives the master forth an outcast in the world, friendless and homeless, the faithful dog asks no higher privilege than that of accompanying him, to guard against danger, to fight against his enemies, and when the last scene of all comes, and death takes the master in its embrace, and his body is laid away in the cold ground, no matter if all other friends pursue their way, there by the graveside will the noble dog be found, his head between his paws, his eyes sad, but open in alert watchfulness, faithful, and true even in death."

Senator Vest sat down. He had spoken in a low voice, without any gesture. He made no reference to the evidence or the merits of the case. When he finished, judge and jury were wiping their eyes. The jury returned a verdict in favor of the plaintiff for $500. He had sued for $200.

Under the proposal referred to dogs in good health, and in many instances cherished pets of some household, would be picked up by the pound officials and surrendered for vivisection. In most cases these dogs find happy homes under the existing regulations but under the new proposal they would be all turned over to institutions for vivisection. It is a proposal which violates all humane consideration for which those of us interested in the protection of dumb animals have worked throughout the years.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that every Member of the Congress who is interested in the humane treatment of dumb animals will join me in bringing to the attention of the District Commissioners the necessity, in the interest of the humane treatment of animals, for the quashing of this proposed order providing that all unclaimed animals in the pound be turned over to medical laboratories for vivisection.

THE TRAGEDY OF PRIVATE RICHARD KEEFE UNDER THE NATO TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in days gone by, Americans were proud to say that their rights followed the American flag. Recently we have been getting away from that concept and by treaty and other devious ways we find that our rights do not always follow the flag. Today we cannot be too proud of what has happened, with our people being arrested and held captives on some flimsy pretext. And the State Department takes no action to have them released.

I want to talk for just a few minutes this afternoon about the tragedy of Pvt. Richard Keefe, a soldier from Riverdale, Md.

Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate time to point out the dangers of treaty law that can and does violate the constitutional rights of American citizens. It indicates the necessity of passage of the Bricker amendment without delay. A number of identical bills are pending in the House, one of which is my own.

In July of last year, Mr. Speaker, a treaty was approved known as the Status of Forces Agreement of Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Its official designation was Executive T—82d Congress, 2d session—and it was signed at London on June 19, 1951. Unfortunately very few people in this country, yes, very few Members of Congress were aware that this agreement had been signed by American officials and its real significance has just been revealed by an incident that has recently come to my attention.

Mr. Speaker, the NATO Treaty provides that foreign courts will have jurisdiction over American soldiers who commit offenses while off duty against the laws of the country where they are stationed. To my knowledge this is the first instance in our history where the United States has ever surrendered jurisdiction of the rights of an American soldier, in time of peace or war. The only protection, if any, that a soldier has under the NATO Treaty is the promise that he will be given a fair trial under the law and procedures of the foreign country.

And, Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the point I want to make: The tragedy of Pvt. Richard Keefe, a citizen and soldier of the United States, and serving in France. Keep in mind that Keefe had certain rights under our Constitution, well known to all of us, but those rights did not apply under French law.

Keefe, Mr. Speaker, stole an automobile. He was tried, under this NATO Treaty, by a French court and found guilty. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison. A habeas corpus action was instituted in a Federal court in Washington and District Judge Edward M. Curran dismissed the petition and Private Keefe remains confined to his prison cell in France. He had no right to a trial by jury or to an appeal which is guaranteed by our Constitution. It is true that the treaty has provisions in it that create the impression, for public consumption, no doubt, that all our servicemen and women, stationed in the NATO countries will have full protection in criminal prosecutions.

Mr. Speaker, what protection did Private Richard Keefe get? Here is a conscripted American soldier, sent to France to defend it from its enemies, because, as the New York Daily Mirror has said, so well, editorially, "to defend France from its enemies because France has proved in three wars that she is unable to defend herself." The Mirror goes on

to say, "this has already cost the United States billions of dollars and thousands of American lives."

It has been argued by those who supported the NATO Treaty that the waiver of constitutional rights for our soldiers was reciprocal in nature, that British or French soldiers stationed in the United States would be tried in American courts under our law. But, I ask, Mr. Speaker, where is the reciprocity? Have foreign troops been stationed here to defend us? If so, where are they? Or are we to conclude that reciprocity will be invoked in the dim and distant future? It is a ridiculous contention, of course.

When Judge Curran denied the plea for a writ of habeas corpus he was right. He had no jurisdiction to issue an order to free Keefe? Why?

Mr. Speaker, it was because the Status of Forces Treaty had deprived him of his legal rights under the Constitution. No American judge can order the return of Richard Keefe to his family—his wife, and two small children.

What can be done, Mr. Speaker? I say pass the Bricker amendment. Congress has a responsibility to every man and woman who is a member in our armed services abroad and to our citizens generally to plug a present loophole in our Constitution that allows such treaties and agreements to be enacted without full congressional approval.

Support the Bricker amendment, and do it now.

EXPENDITURES FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, at a time of crisis, when roughly 60 percent of the Government's income, measured in billions of dollars, is going to and for defense, I think we should pause and take stock of the men who are expending this huge outlay of our natural and monetary resources. Let us pause, and see if the armed services, which recently produced President Eisenhower, MacArthur, Marshall, Bradley, Patton, Leahy, King, Nimitz, and Halsey, and the excellent personnel of all grades and ranks who supported them in our time of direst peril, can reasonably be expected to produce others of similar valor and capability should they again be needed, though God perish the thought.

Short of war, Mr. Speaker, the country needs and must have men of the highest caliber of talent and mentality in our Armed Forces. In these days, unlike the past, we have become a global nation and the vastness of the responsibility imposed on our military personnel staggers the imagination. The physical instruments with which they must work are so complicated and costly, coupled with the fact that so much of every tool of defense must come from materials we cannot and do not produce, that their injudicious of incorrect use no longer falls in the realm of allowed error. Rather, it is profligate waste. In the past our military leaders have needed to be, by and large, men principally knowledged in things military. Today, our military leaders and the men under them must know and understand global concepts, the limits of our economy and ability to produce, and be technically conversant with the most delicate, costly, and complex machinery. Mr. Speaker, I warn you, sir, the times are rapidly producing a situation wherein strategy, tactics, seamanship, and airmanship are no longer the yardstick of coming military leaders. The requirements for first class leadership are now close to genius. Certainly, if this glorious country is to survive we must have in our Armed Forces no less than men in all grades and ranks of first class cut and concepts. It will gain us naught to expend billions for the radar screen one hears so much about, or perfect the tools required to cope with undersea warfare, if the man who mans the instrument and sets standards for their use and improvement is second rate. I charge you, sir, no machine can bridge the gap between human mediocrity and necessary standards of performance. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, it behooves us to see if we, the Congress, are living up to the responsibility we have to the people, namely, to give them, now, the best in weapons and the men to man them, the better to insure our peace of mind and security.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that we of the Congress have admirably discharged our obligation to the Nation to obtain the best weapons possible. Conversely, we may—though well intentioned—be destroying the potency of our equipment and, therefore, ourselves, by overlooking, yes, even neglecting the man behind the gun. On every hand one sees or hears signs that unmistakably point to derelictions. General Bradley and others of proven competence and integrity tell us the morale of our armed services is declining from causes from without. Departmental secretaries, and their chiefs or heads of bureaus, report an alarming and growing rate of officer resignations and the loss of the hard core of the trained noncommissioned officer through failure to reenlist. In those Reserve officer-training programs that offer transfer to the Regular service, only 10 percent are now applying. This failure on the part of the Nation's largest employer to obtain and hold what is needed, is, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, due almost entirely to the fact that the service as a way of life is losing its attractiveness unless something is done, we can look forward to a time in the foreseeable future when the services may be manned principally by only those who are serving their time out and those unable to obtain adequate employment outside of the service; or if new to the service, those in uniform because of the draft. Wherein, may I ask, will we then find security? Do we delude ourselves into believing that orders or directives from this august body make for or inspire espirit de corps, or that such a lack can be overcome by sheer numbers? If there be some among us who are so inclined, just let me point to the collapse of the impregnable Maginot line backed by 6 million men under arms, overrun by a few divisions of well trained and spirited Germans. And let me recall, also, that the French Army was beseeched, ordered, and directed to fight to the last man to repel the enemy and preserve their homeland and families.

Now let us examine into just a few of the causes for the condition facing us today. At best, life in the service was and is no bed of roses. By its very nature it was and is a gypsy existence, out of which no man grew or can grow rich. On the other hand, he and his dependents formerly lived fairly well and he could give his children the advantages desired by the average parent, according to his place and station in life. In addition, the dignity and nobility of the service was a powerful lodestone. The reward for a job well done, under anything but ideal conditions, was advancement and more responsibility during active service, coupled with well deserved and adequate retirement benefits for declining years. In short, people in the service felt theirs was an honorable profession coupled with incentive in the form of accomplishment, advancement, and security. That the final reward was death for many was part of the bargain, and though certainly not given gleefully was chanced, willingly and bravely. Can we be assured of that same unselfishness in the future? On every hand we hear criticism of the military as such. Brass hats and stars no longer represent accomplishment—often they are terms of derision. Locker clubs flourish on the perimeter of all military installations so the men of the ranks can get out of uniform before going into town or on furlough. It is to be regretted that the mere wearing of the uniform has led to jibes, derision, insult, and even altercation between servicemen and the civilians they have so magnificently defended. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that our own committees have laid evidence before this House of discrimination against the military by landlords. Where they can obtain rental units, they are often gouged. At a time when the wages of industry largely have been tied to the price index in an inflated economy, the income of the military has remained fixed and stable. By and large, it is not realistic when gaged with present-day costs of living, to say nothing of the responsibility discharged. What a bitter pill it must be, Mr. Speaker, for the military man so often to see his counterpart in civilian life with parallel education and training, with less responsibility, receiving much more than the pay of the service contemporary. In spite of that, and all else that I have enumerated, there was until recently, Mr. Speaker, little cause for real alarm. What made the pill possible to swallow was that there was public respect for the job being done, and emoluments, in addition to pay, were available to the serviceman and his family; hence, they could make both ends meet.

Recently, however, the picture has changed. Lessening world tension may be producing its inevitable drop in America's appreciation for the personnel of our armed services. I fear that we already are going back to the peaks and

valleys of preparedness which previously have been so costly. Surely no thinking person believes the threat to America from communism has become any less real, yet there is a widespread indifference to this threat on the part of our people.

I feel that benefits to the Armed Forces should be increased and that a direct pay boost is a simple, logical, and proper course. Since the Career Compensation Act was enacted in October 1949, pay of the military has had an average increase of only 5.7 percent while the cost of living as of November 1953 was 13.3 percent higher than in October 1949. The hourly wages of production workers or nonsupervisory employees in American industry—the category corresponding most closely in skills to enlisted grades—rose over the period October 1949 to April 1953 by 25.9 percent. Increases for executive positions corresponding to officer grades have received increases which exceed to a considerable degree the increase in the cost of living. Civil-service employees receive an increase of 10 percent, for most grades, effective July 1, 1951.

There are many points which deserve consideration. Today, the widow of a deceased career person receives less benefits than her Reserve counterpart, though the eternal sacrifice is similar for both, the loss just as tragic, and the need as great. We cut accumulated leave accrual for all by one-half. Consequently, hundreds upon hundreds engaged in stemming the surging tide of communism, whether here or abroad, could not or did not take the leave that was theirs as a matter of right. Such persons have not only lost their leave, but all right to or for it. Those engaged in vital and necessary extrahazardous pursuits are enjoying anything but a sinecure in the extra pay they receive. Hardly a month passes without some major attack on this incentive as well as on the principle of hazardous duty compensation.

The case of long-time Reserve officers is one of uncertainty and lowered morale. I cite the case of one Naval Reserve officer as an example. After 1 year of post-high-school education he entered the Navy's V–5 program and was given the equivalent of another year's education, enough to qualify him for training as a naval aviation cadet. He was eventually commissioned and has served as a naval aviator ever since. In the spring of 1950 he was due for release to inactive duty and had enrolled at Georgia Tech in order to complete his education and obtain an engineering degree. But when the Korean "police action" occurred, his separation orders were cancelled and he is still on active duty, 28 years of age, married and with two children, and the equivalent of 2 years of college education. He has always wanted to make the Navy his career, but the Navy will not take him because he has not a college degree, which the Navy has prevented him from obtaining. With close to 10 years of naval service, he is classed as one of the long-time Reserve officers—and there are thousands like him in the Navy alone—serving on a month-to-month basis, at the pleasure of the Navy Department, with no prospect of security for the future.

Service in out-of-the-way locations provides an illustration. It is often necessary to pay civilians a high bonus in order to get them to work at many of the remote bases operated by the armed services all over the world. But service personnel must accept this inconvenience and the consequent hardships with nothing except, in some cases, a few percent of foreign-duty pay.

Decrease in percentage of reenlistments is a serious matter, not only in indicating lowered morale and loss of trained personnel, but financially also. It costs thousands of dollars to train a recruit up to an NCO-technician level, and ties up many valuable men as instructors. Thus the small amounts saved by the fringe benefits and other methods aimed at taking money and privileges away from armed service personnel are wiped out many times over by the loss of trained personnel and the time and money required to train more.

I could go on, and in detail present instances whereby the rules have been changed, sometimes in the middle of the game, in a game wherein the contestants dare not protest too loudly in public, or quit. I am reluctant, however, to impose further on the indulgence of the House. Rather, I would like to sum up now and leave my remarks for my colleagues to ponder. The morale of the Armed Forces and, therefore, the security of this country, is at a disturbingly low ebb. I believe that the great majority of the ills can be overcome by monetary medication. I believe, also, that money so spent will be earned and repaid a thousandfold. I fear further that our military leaders have unknowingly softened discipline in an unconscious effort on the part of the services to save and keep what it has, at almost any cost. I say, too, Mr. Speaker, that all reports I have seen have only lightly touched on an important and the most worried and disturbed segment of all—the service wife. If we can rebuild the spirit of the service wife we have won much of our battle. It has rightly been said, Mr. Speaker, that the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world. Let us hope and strive, therefore, for a happy and contented first-class service family, to the end that we will not have to rely on a service composed of second-class material in a first-class crisis. Let us do all that we can to insure that the billions we are now spending for defense are not utilized and expended by personnel who live and perform solely by the book, and can think only in the millions.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to point out, in closing, that the defense and security the country needs now, and which we must guarantee now, for the future, cannot be found or bought in any bargain basement. We must face the facts. Industry, and other civilian pursuits, are competing with the Armed Forces for men of all grades, ranks, and specialties, of the quality the services are losing, or not obtaining. The country must have these men in uniform. As long as there are insufficient monetary and professional incentives to attract and hold the leadership we need in all grades and ranks, the currently bad morale of our Armed Forces will continue to worsen to our ultimate and early peril.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a cost-of-living pay bill for members of our armed services. This bill contains similar provisions to the one introduced in the last session by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JAMES VAN ZANDT.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee I made an extensive investigation during the last recess into the morale of our servicemen and women. I am convinced that the current morale problem is primarily one of economics. The serviceman and his family have been unable to keep up with the rising cost of living, and consequently our enlistment rates have reached an alarmingly low point. Our highly trained technicians in the various services find outside pay too much at variance with the pay offered to career service people. Low service pay rates, which have not been increased since 1949, combined with a steady whittling-away of benefits that have been judged a part of their pay, has brought about the current alarming situation.

I know that I am expressing the considered opinion of the Secretaries of the services and of high ranking military men when I say that morale of the service is one of the most troubling military problems today. With reductions under way in nearly every branch of the service, we are going to be more than ever dependent on a hard core of trained career service personnel who can keep their minds on their jobs and not on the problem of barely making ends meet.

We have heard testimony by various experts to the effect that it costs thousands of dollars to train the average serviceman today in the highly technical fields of electronics, radar, chemistry, and similar fields. It seems penny wise and pound foolish to train men at great expense and then invite them to leave the service through the device of substantially underpaying them. If we are to depend for the protection of ourselves and of our loved ones on an alert, strong, competent armed force, then it is fundamental that we consider a pay raise bill immediately.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN EASTERN KENTUCKY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak about the serious un-

employment condition that now exists in eastern Kentucky.

The year ending 1953 reflected certain economic developments that cannot be fully evaluated at this time. In many sections, business remains good with employment at a relatively high level. There is one alarming note in the Census Bureau report of a decrease of 700,000 in the number of people employed for the month of December 1953. This is a paradox as the report also indicated an increase of only 422,000 in the number of unemployed. What happened to the 280,000 other persons plus the normal increase in population is difficult to explain.

This increase in unemployment, whether it be 420,000 or 750,000, need not be alarming from a national standpoint, but the increase is not uniform. In some communities there has been little increase in unemployment while in a few there may have been an actual decrease in unemployment. In many instances, however, the increase in unemployment has been rapid and critical. I have personally observed a tragic example of the latter group in my home community in eastern Kentucky. I have also had similar reports of other communities in Virginia, Alabama, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Michigan. I feel that there are many others with conditions somewhat similar to those in the coalfields of eastern Kentucky where more than 1 person out of 5 is unemployed with little or no prospects of finding a job in the immediate future. This does not mean that these workers are permanently unemployed as they have always shown a resourcefulness and initiative in finding work that is almost unbelievable. For the past 3 years they have been migrating to northern industrial areas such as Michigan. However, the large number of recent layoffs in the Michigan area reaching over into Ohio and Indiana has eliminated this source of new jobs so that we now face the problem of a high unemployment rate which is being increased by the return of a substantial portion of those who have left home and obtained jobs in other industrial centers.

The unemployment insurance claims load in Kentucky for the months of November and December of 1953 was the largest of any November or December since the program began in 1939. In March of 1951 the rate of insured unemployment in the Nation was just under 3 percent while in Pike County, Ky., it was just over 7 percent. The national rate was at the same level in March of 1953 while in Pike County, by December of 1953, it had increased to 21.7 percent or approximately 6 times the national rate which is only slightly above 3 percent at this time. The insured unemployment rate for the entire eastern Kentucky area is approximately 18 percent or 5 times the national average. In addition to this total unemployment picture, a large number of workers in the area including practically all the miners are receiving only part-time employment of less than 3 days per week.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] on the subject matter of his address. The serious unemployment existing in several areas of the country should be brought clearly to the attention of Members of Congress. As a matter of fact, I think it would be well that the problem be considered by the entire country.

The question of what should be done by the Federal Government to aid those areas in economic distress has been a problem with which I have wrestled, as the gentleman knows, in recent years.

With the indulgence of the gentleman, and as a background for what he is saying, I would like to revamp some of the facts that stand out in my experience with the problem.

Today, unemployment in Walker County, Ala., my home county, stands at 12 percent. In round figures, I might say that the total civilian labor force of Walker County, Ala., is 16,000 people, and of that labor force 2,000 are presently unemployed.

The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I have the honor to represent here, produces large amounts of coal. As a matter of fact, it customarily produces about 40 percent of all the coal produced in Alabama. The plight of this coal-producing area is illustrated by the fact that just a few years ago Alabama produced 18 million tons of coal annually. Last year its production was 12 million tons. However, these figures do not tell the whole truth about unemployment in the industry. While two-thirds as much coal is being produced as formerly, that two-thirds is being produced with less than half the number of employees formerly required to produce coal. Coal mining is becoming more and more highly mechanized with each passing day. This fact is helping coal to continue as one of our highly used sources of energy. But the mechanization of the mines, whether large mines or small mines, is resulting in fewer and fewer people being employed to produce America's coal.

Coal in substantial quantity is also produced in Marion, Winston, Cullman, and Blount Counties. To a lesser degree, it is produced also in Fayette County, in the Seventh Congressional District. I mention these facts to show that the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama has a most substantial interest in the subject matter of your address. We have suffered to the point that fewer than 50 percent of the people engaged in mining in that area 10 years ago are today so employed.

The Department of Commerce by its survey of 1950 found that Walker, Winston, Marion, and Blount Counties were critical from the standpoint of unemployment. This was related primarily to the severe decline in coal mining. Some time later the Labor Department took over the statistical work of determining areas of greatest unemployment in the United States, and Walker County, Ala., my home county, was placed on that list.

People in my area exerted themselves wonderfully to accomplish more employment. Towns set up housing authorities and built more than 20 housing projects. Hospitals and health centers have been constructed. Roads and highways have been built at an accelerated pace. Business and professional men and women have given of their time and thought in an effort to help solve the problems. Some new industry has been brought to the area, but still we are faced with the same problem of unemployment that is now stalking the coal fields of America. Kentucky is suffering, as you have so forcefully pointed out. West Virginia, southern Illinois, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and other States where coal is produced are beset with the same problems.

I want to say to the gentleman that if those of us who represent the States where unemployment is widespread worked together, perhaps we can evolve a workable plan which will go at least a part of the way toward solving this problem.

I know that the gentleman from Kentucky is a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor and, as such, that he has been active, as have I, in attempting to work out a formula of aid for education in the field of schoolhouse construction. Such a program would be beneficial to his State and to mine. As a matter of fact, I contend and believe that such a program would be beneficial to every State of the Union. I realize that there is opposition to the program, but if the need of the areas of high unemployment could be forcefully brought before the country, I believe that the American people would feel that a program of schoolhouse construction in areas of high unemployment might be one program that the Government at this time could reasonably undertake.

Also, I feel that there should be instituted immediately a full-scale investigation and study of the entire coal industry. On March 13, 1950, I introduced a bill, H. R. 7660, which had for its purpose the establishment of a commission on the coal industry to study the problems of the industry and suggest suitable legislation to bolster, strengthen, and improve the industry. It is my intention to reintroduce this bill on Wednesday next, and I trust that it may have the support of the House to the end that such a commission might get started with its work.

Also, I feel that river-and-harbor improvement projects that are clearly shown to be badly needed in the areas of high unemployment should be given priority for construction at this time. I was disappointed last year when the administration refused to budget new projects. If the Federal Government could proceed now to do the river improvements needed in the 7th Congressional District of Alabama, such improvements would go a long way toward alleviating existing unemployment. For instance, on the Warrior River, which drains approximately 50 percent of the 7th Congressional District of Alabama, there is badly needed at the present time new locks and dams to take the place of existing dilapidated and worn-out locks and dams. In addition, there is badly needed, in my judgment, at least three

dams on the headwaters of the streams making up the Warrior River, so as to regulate the flow of water in the river, improve its navigation, and generate electric power, and perform other beneficial results. On the other side of the district is the great Tennessee-Tombigbee project, the building of which would add so much to the internal strength of this country.

The Government now has a program dealing with purchases from areas of high unemployment. Unfortunately, this program has not brought much relief to coal-producing areas.

As the gentleman goes ahead with his speech, I would like to have him give us the benefit of his well-considered views on some of the questions I have raised. He realizes, as I do, that areas of heavy unemployment are cancerous spots on our economy which must not be allowed to spread.

As one who has worked on this problem of unemployment for several years, I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky that I am happy that he is giving his time, thought, and attention to the matter. The gentleman and I came to Congress at the same time, and I have had occasion to know and observe intimately his work in the Congress. I know of no Member who is more dedicated to the service of his people than is the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to thank the gentleman from Alabama for his contribution. As it happens, the gentleman from Alabama and I both came to Congress at the same time, and at present we are each representing areas with a high unemployment rate. The gentleman's problems are very similar to some of the problems in the district that I represent.

I do not think there is a more conscientious Member in this body than CARL ELLIOTT. He has always worked for the welfare of his country and district, has always been aggressive in trying to find some solution to this unemployment problem in these distressed areas throughout the Nation.

I am of the opinion that we will be unable to get any relief under the present order of the Office of Defense Mobilization. As I understand, that order provided for the allocation of Government contracts in labor-surplus areas up to 30 percent and gave tax relief to defense plants that were constructed in these areas. The present order eliminated the bid-matching features which existed under the former policy. It seems to me that the prohibition against permitting the low bidder in a distressed area to match the low bid in a noncritical area will to all intents and purposes kill the effectiveness of the present order insofar as giving immediate relief to these distressed areas. In fact, I believe that some differential if necessary should be provided for in order to channel defense contracts into these critical areas. The tax-amortization feature, in my judgment, should be modified to include any plant instead of being limited to defense plants. Under the present setup the able and capable gentleman from Jasper, Ala., will not be able to sell any coal to the Defense Department. The rider that was placed in the appropriations bill last year permits the matching of the low bid. The present order does not go that far.

I feel that the suggestion from the gentleman from Alabama in connection with the school construction program is well taken. We all know the need for such a program. There is no necessity to advance any argument for such a public-works program. As it happens, the survey has already been made throughout the Nation of the various needs for school construction by the State departments of education. During the second session of the 81st Congress the Federal Government appropriated $3 million for this survey which was matched by the States on a formula basis. The gentleman from Alabama, along with myself and many others, actively participated in making the funds available for this school survey.

It is my information that these plans have been practically completed throughout the Nation. I know that of the 13 counties which I represent the plans have been completed in 12 of those counties. I recently had a conversation with the school superintendent in the remaining county—Pike County—where the plans have not been reported to the State department. However, the superintendent of schools imparted to me that the report for this particular county would show that $17 million is needed immediately for school construction. He further informed me that 61 one-room schools and 56 two-room schools were still in use in Pike County.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the majority leader the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to say, first of all, that I certainly have the greatest interest in the situation as it has been described here today in the coal mining areas. Reference was made to a survey that was made in respect to school needs. I was just wondering if there has been a survey made of this problem that would indicate how much of this difficulty at the coal mines might be attributable to loss of markets, to competing fuels like oil or gas, or whatever it may be, or through the development of hydroelectric power, as compared with the impact of imports.

Mr. PERKINS. There has been a great loss of markets on account of competing fuels. That fact cannot be denied, and for that reason we have been trying to get assistance, by reason of less importation of so much residual oil which in all probability displaced approximately 35 million tons of coal last year. I think the record discloses that approximately 140 million barrels of oil were dumped on the eastern seaboard from Venezuela.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WAMPLER. I wish to commend the gentleman from Kentucky for his remarks here today. I might say that my district in Virginia adjoins his district in Kentucky for a considerable area and distance. I have great regard for the gentleman from Kentucky and also his people. As a matter of fact, while I was campaigning for Congress 2 years ago I very accidentally got over into his district one day and spent almost a day there not knowing that I was in Kentucky. It was reported to me that I almost carried one of his counties over there.

However, the interests of his district and mine are very similar and the makeup of the people is very similar. As I said earlier on the floor of the House today, the problems that confront my people also confront his people. We have mass unemployment in the coal fields of southeast Kentucky and southwest Virginia.

I think it is well for this House to give due consideration to this very important problem. I think it might be well for us to give consideration to the suggestion the gentleman from Kentucky has made that perhaps in this present dilemma it might be well for our Government and this Congress to give consideration to public works programs to alleviate this situation, that is approaching the disastrous right now.

The gentleman from Kentucky has given much time and thought and study to this problem. I am aware of the fact that he has talked to a number of groups in his district and conferred with people in my district. I believe he will find that the people of the coal-producing areas of this Nation, my district and his district included, would be very receptive to a program of this nature.

It so happens that the terrain of my district and much of it in his district is such that it would be ideally situated for the Government to develop flood-control dams. It is my understanding that the Corps of Engineers have in their long-range planning authorized the construction of these dams, although there has never been an appropriation made for them. I think it is well that we give some serious thought and study to this proposition.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to thank the able gentleman for his contribution. The gentleman represents a coal mining section in southwestern Virginia and has always been concerned with the welfare of all the people in his district. We have talked our problems over on many occasions, and I wish to say to the gentleman that he will receive my wholehearted cooperation in connection with his efforts to get reservoirs constructed in his district. I am hopeful that we will be afforded the opportunity within the next few weeks to present our whole problem to the House Public Works Committee. Both of our areas suffer from the lack of industrial water.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC SECURITY,
Frankfort, January 5, 1954.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: At the request of Mr. O. B. Hannah, Kentucky director of unemployment insurance, I am sending you the following unemployment insurance claims data for November and December 1953: The

average weekly number of continued claims for each county in your district, this average weekly number of claims as a percent of employment covered by unemployment insurance, and the amount of unemployment insurance benefits paid during the 2 months. This information is shown in the table below:

Average weekly number of claimants and monthly benefit payments for selected eastern Kentucky counties

County	Average weekly number of continued claims		Claims as percent of covered employment		Amount of unemployment insurance benefits paid	
	December 1953	November 1953	December 1953	November 1953	December 1953	November 1953
Total	5,010	2,897	17.6	10.5	$306,693	$183,984
Pike	1,974	1,127	21.7	12.3	130,160	72,250
Martin	30	19	11.0	7.1	1,820	1,063
Johnson	240	153	14.8	10.0	14,561	8,614
Magoffin	100	64	45.2	26.8	6,280	3,721
Floyd	995	636	16.6	11.8	68,350	40,504
Knott	316	170	80.2	42.8	15,861	10,729
Perry	852	458	13.5	7.5	44,431	30,032
Letcher	503	270	11.1	6.1	25,230	17,051

The average weekly number of continued claims filed is probably the best indication we can give you of the number of persons filing for unemployment insurance in these counties. Claims as a percent of employment indicates the economic impact of insured unemployment in your area.

You will note that the situation in December seems substantially worse than was the case in November. In November we prepared special labor market reports for use by the Department of Labor in classifying eastern Kentucky areas in the critical labor surplus group. At that time, we estimated that there were 2,700 unemployed in the Prestonburg area which was equivalent to 11.8 percent of the labor force, 1,850 in the Pikeville area which was equivalent to 12.7 percent of the labor force, and 1,970 in the Hazard area which was equivalent to 9.1 percent of the labor force. These latter figures are not strictly comparable with unemployment insurance data as they are more inclusive. However, they are the data used to classify areas as to their labor supply situation. In the light of 6 percent being considered as the beginning of a critical situation, there seems to be very little doubt that these eastern Kentucky areas are in relatively poor economic shape.

We hope that these data will serve your needs, and please do not hesitate to call on us for anything else we can furnish.

Very truly yours,

V. E. BARNES, *Commissioner.*

By DAMON W. HARRISON,
Assistant to Chief, Research and Statistics.

The purchasing power of the area is drastically reduced and business failures are approaching the rate of the depression years in the early thirties. This area was certified by the Secretary of Labor as group IV or critical labor surplus area in July of 1953, but the Department of Commerce has not yet made a report on the production facilities which is required to make this certification effective. At that time, the overall rate of unemployment was approximately 10 percent and the unemployment insurance data indicates that this rate has almost doubled during the last 6 months of 1953. In the meantime, the affected area has spread to include parts of the adjacent States of Virginia, West Virginia, and Tennessee and there are indications that this spread may continue until it overflows into the Ohio and Michigan unemployment area which would constitute the beginning of a major national depression.

It is too early to evaluate this situation or even to predict that the spread will continue but there are no indications that conditions will improve in the immediate future. I, for one, do not propose to stand idly by and say either that prosperity is here to stay or that another boom is just around the corner. The following list of mines that have closed in the past year with the number of men affected in the Hazard, Pikeville, and Williamson, W. Va., areas is far from encouraging:

Hazard area

MINES CLOSED AND MEN AFFECTED

Columbus Mining Co. No. 9	42
Columbus Mining Co. No. 10	46
Meem-Haskins Coal Corp	220
Kentucky Blue Grass Mining Co	220
Black Gold Mining Co	70
Fourseam Coal Corp. No. 4	140
Wisconsin Coal Corp	125
Carrs Fork Coal Co. No. 4	175
Harvey Coal Corp No. 8	100
East Central Coal Co	67
Cutshin Coal Co	181
Bulan Coal Co	43
Kenmont Coal Co	111
Total	1,540

Pikeville area

MINES CLOSED IN 1953 AND MEN AFFECTED

Caudill-Ward Coal Co., Federal	30
White House Coal Co	86
Premium Elkhorn Coal Co	8
Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	239
Top Hat Mining Co	64
HiHat Elkhorn Mining Co	74
Lambert Co	72
Kentucky Fuel Co	105
Total	678

Kentucky mines in the Williamson, W. Va., area

MINES CLOSED IN 1953 AND MEN AFFECTED

Earlston Coal Co	79
Emperor Coal Co., Stone division	295
Emperor Coal Co., Freeburn division	121
Total	495

During the month of December, three coal companies at Hazard, Ky., filed voluntary petitions of bankruptcy. There is no hope that these mines can be reopened for several months nor is there any indication that the other closed mines will resume operations at any time this winter. Others have had repeated layoffs with no recalls. The Mountain States Coal Corp. at Pikeville, Ky., gave me the following report:

During 1947 we sold 1,636,462 tons of coal. In 1949 our production decreased to 140,276 tons and in 1953 our tonnage was only around 40,000, which would be less than 4 days operation at our full calculated capacity of 3,162,500 tons per year of 250 working days.

The national demand for coal has dropped approximately 20 percent from the wartime peak of 600 million tons annually.

STONE, KY., *January 20, 1954.*

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in reference to a condition that exists in not only your district but all over the Nation at the present time.

As you know the unemployment roll is growing day by day and especially in the coal fields. In the Williamson, W. Va., field which includes the Pond Creek section of Pike County, Ky., there is at the present time over a thousand unemployed coal miners. These men are honorable men and are willing to work for a living but work does not exist for them; not in the coal industry or any other field of employment, as we have found out.

There is at the present time, in Government warehouses, a large amount of surplus food. Several proposals have been presented recently by the present administration as to what should be done with these commodities and I think that no better purpose could be served that to use these commodities to feed the needy people of our own Nation especially the disabled and unemployed.

At the present time the Salvation Army, of Williamson, is receiving a small amount of Government surplus which is being used for that purpose by Capt. Harold Davis, who is in charge of the Williamson office, but it is only a drop in the bucket in comparison to what is needed and if something isn't done soon some people in this district will be in destitute condition.

* * * * *

Yours respectfully,

JACK MEADOWS,
President, Local 5728.

The canalization of the Big Sandy River and the modernization of the locks and the development of navigation on the Kentucky River is one of the answers to our economic problem in eastern Kentucky. These long needed improvements can be done now by the utilization of a portion of the labor of the more than 60,000 unemployed persons in these 2 valleys pending a revival of the demand for coal which economists predict will double by 1960. There is also a need for reservoirs on the headwaters of these two streams adequate to maintain a year-round flow of water sufficient for both navigation and industrial uses. These essential public works programs will represent a total cost approximately equal to the wage loss which will accrue to the unemployed workers of these two valleys during the calendar year of 1954. This will increase the earning power of the residents of this area for generations to come and add to the economic strength of the Nation and in particular to the development of the atomic plants now located in the Ohio Valley.

There is also immediate need for the modernization of the school facilities of this area. The survey of the school facilities now in progress as authorized by this Congress in cooperation with the various States has been completed in 12

of the 13 counties in the district I represent. This survey for which the State of Kentucky appropriated $40,000 to which was added a $60,000 grant from the Federal funds appropriated for that purpose, indicates an immediate need for a school building program in these 13 counties to cost $66 million.

I introduce a letter from the superintendent of public instruction:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Frankfort, January 12, 1954.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request, I am enclosing information on a Statewide master plan for a program of school plant construction for each county in your congressional district, with the exception of Pike. The survey in Pike County has not been completed as of this date. Urgent building needs in your district are typical of the building needs throughout Kentucky. We are listing these needs on a form prescribed by the United States Office of Education as part of the report of the nationwide school facilities survey which is being conducted under provisions of Public Law 815. For your information this survey must be completed by June 30, 1954, at which time complete information will be available.

You will note that the total building needs for your district, excluding Pike County, are more than $49 million. These figures include new plants, sites, additions to existing buildings, and remodeling of old buildings. These estimated building costs are for the period from the present to 1960.

The survey further shows that about 1 out of every 4 of Kentucky's children attends a 1- or 2-room school. Over half of Kentucky's children are in overcrowded classes where teachers cannot give adequate time to any child. Two out of every 5 of Kentucky's children attend schools with outdoor toilet facilities. Children in many districts are housed in deplorable buildings. Forty-eight (48) percent are housed in buildings which are fire hazards, and 31 percent are in buildings that should be abandoned.

Enrollment is at an all-time high and will continue to increase in the future. Unless Federal aid for buildings is forthcoming it will be impossible for Kentucky to adequately house her school children. Despite increased local and State effort, Kentucky will continue to rank near the bottom in providing educational facilities for her children.

Very truly yours,

WENDELL P. BUTLER,
Superintendent Public Instruction.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, OFFICE OF EDUCATION—STATE-TO-FEDERAL REPORT ON 2D PHASE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES SURVEY

TABLE 1.—*Statewide master plan for a program of school plant construction*

(1)	(2)	(3)		(4)		(5)					(6)	(7)	
Projects (listed separately, but grouped according to local planning areas)	Definiteness of project (use symbols A, B, or C)	Priority or urgency of need: Should be ready for occupancy by (check)—		This project to be designed to accommodate—		Nature of projects and estimated cost (insert estimated cost in applicable subcolumns)					Total estimated cost of project	Size of new construction	
		(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)		(a)	(b)
		September 1955	Between September 1955 and September 1959	Grades	Pupils	Complete new plant (estimated cost exclusive of site)	New building on site now used as school center	Addition to existing building	Remodeling or rehabilitation of old building	New sites; addition to sites; improvement of sites		Number of instruction rooms	Approximate number of square feet in area or building
Breathitt County and Jackson					3,447	$2,550,500	$440,000	$404,000	$203,000	$45,200	$3,642,700	119	
Floyd County and Prestonburg					7,310	3,979,080	1,975,080	1,788,470	412,700	67,000	8,222,270	249	
Hazard Independent					780		296,000	351,928	166,154	3,750	916,932	26	
Elliott County					1,730	1,095,700		777,000	90,600	22,500	1,985,800	50	
Lee County					1,310	1,271,000		420,000	50,000	35,000	1,716,000	52	
Perry County					6,941	6,169,891	495,000	652,080	293,455	72,100	7,682,526	231	
Wolfe County					1,527	1,281,000		167,900	122,000	12,100	1,582,100	50	
Jenkins Independent					940	760,600	356,400	70,650		31,000	1,218,650	34	
Paintsville, Ind.					840	831,600				8,000	839,600	28	
Knott County					4,925	3,977,300	297,900	842,405	142,600	49,000	4,319,205	135	
Morgan County					1,900	769,200	891,000	247,700	208,000	20,500	2,136,400	60	
Martin County					2,190	1,410,100		627,630	110,000	26,500	2,174,230	75	
Magoffin County					2,580	1,704,100	267,300	824,200	64,500	26,500	2,886,600	88	
Letcher County					6,080	5,079,400	297,000	983,400	90,800	47,000	6,497,300	206	
Johnson County and Van Lear					3,360	1,471,000	949,900	960,325	22,500	37,500	3,441,225	112	
Total					44,960	31,390,441	6,275,550	9,118,888	1,976,009	503,650	49,261,538	1,515	

It is essential that adequate school facilities be established for all our children and it is even more essential in this area where the top skills are needed to revitalize the industrial development of the region. The resources, including more than 5 billion tons of known coal reserves sufficient to maintain the wartime rate of production for the next 150 years, are adequate to maintain any industrial development that it will be possible to attain in the foreseeable future.

The attempts to diversify industry in the area have been limited by the lack of a year-round supply of industrial water, and paradoxically the recurring spring floods. Adequate reservoirs will eliminate both these handicaps to the essential industrial development of the area and a State-Federal school construction program will go far toward making such developments permanent and successful.

I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] on his timely and appropriate statements concerning the need for forthright action on the part of the Federal Government in mitigating the problems of unemployment which are presently confronting the people in many areas of the country.

Each day I receive numerous letters from my constituents asking that the Federal Government take cognizance of the situation that has developed in which thousands of men have been deprived of their jobs as a result of unregulated imports of residual oil and other products of foreign countries. In view of the fact that Congress and the administration have thus far been hesitant to regulate these imports by quotas, I suggest that emphasis should be placed upon a study of the picture as it exists in West Virginia, Kentucky, Alabama, and other States, with a view toward alleviating adverse economic conditions by the installation of defense plants and public works programs in those areas.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two letters from my district which emphasize the seriousness of the growing problem:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF
AMERICA, DISTRICT 29,
Beckley, W. Va., January 18, 1954.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Member of Congress, Sixth District of West Virginia,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In President Eisenhower's message on the state of the Union he seemed to be disturbed about what to do with the farm surplus. I note in recent newspaper reports that they are proposing to sell 260 million pounds of butter to Russia, at 50 cents per pound. The Government has millions of pounds of surplus commodities, such as milk, butter, cheese, wheat, and meat that they do not know what to do with.

We are allowed to get a few crumbs under the present law, through the department of public assistance, for people who are out of

employment and destitute, but not enough to sustain life and limb. It seems ridiculous to me that thousands of men, women, and children are going hungry in this country for the want of food, or, in other words, starving to death in a land of plenty.

The American coal miner is now producing 8 tons of coal per man, per day. The highest efficiency of any workman in the world. He produces so much coal that he has worked himself out of a plate at his own table. Other industrial workers and the farmer are doing the same thing. American ingenuity has solved the problem of production.

There are 20,000 coal miners in southern West Virginia whose unemployment compensation will soon run out or has already run out, and no jobs are available. It behooves the Congress of the United States to attempt to solve the law of distribution, so that the American people will not starve to death on account of overproduction.

I urge you to use your good office to see that the surplus commodities that the Government has on hand is distributed to people who cannot find employment. It should be the duty of the Government to either find a job for a man that is unemployed, extend unemployment-compensation payments, or furnish with the surplus commodities which seem to be a drug on the market, so that our people will not starve while our farm surplus goes to waste.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. TITLER,
President, District 29, UMWA.

ST. ALBANS, W. VA., *January 20, 1954.*

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRD: As I am a member of the City Council of St. Albans, W. Va., I feel that you should be informed of the increasing unemployment in the Kanawha Valley.

This valley which is known the world over as the chemical center of the United States has many industries and usually there is work to be found here when things are slow elsewhere, but in recent months there has been a steady decrease in employment which is causing unrest among the people of this area.

As you know people become disturbed when employment declines as they fear we are going to have another depression. If it is within your power, I feel something should be done to allay their fears.

Sincerely,

REX PRUDEN,
Councilman, Second Ward,
St. Albans, W. Va.

THE LATE HONORABLE DANIEL F. CLEARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HARDEN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the bright noontime of his life, covered with honors far beyond the lot of most men, and in the enjoyment in rare and unusual measure of the affection of family and of friends, he passed from the shore of human visibility to the invisible continent that is the inevitable and inescapable refuge of us all. It is not given to us to fathom the reasons for the pattern of human life.

The Honorable Daniel F. Cleary, the first Chairman of the War Claims Commission, came to Washington in the early days of the Truman administration following the election of 1948. He was only 39. President Truman then was reaching out for the flower of American young manhood to buttress his official family. Dan Cleary was one of the small group, carefully selected from the choice offerings of the Nation, to give the drive and vigor, the dash and the vision of youth to the administration of a President who himself was no longer young.

Dan Cleary came from the district in Illinois which I represent in the Congress of the United States. We were very proud and happy in the Second District of Illinois when the President of the United States, wishing to surround himself with the cream of America's youth, invited Dan Cleary to serve with his administration in a key spot of major importance.

No man ever came to Washington, and did a better job. The War Claims Commission is a quasi-judicial independent executive agency. Its decisions are final, not subject to review by any court or by the Comptroller General. Claims heard and adjudicated by the Commission range in amount from a few dollars to several million dollars. In the administration of the Commission, and the performance of its many responsible duties, Dan Cleary had no guide in precedents since he was the Commission's first Chairman. He blazed the trail by working long hours and applying to the task the genius of a mighty mind and a heart of gold.

It is a lasting monument to the memory of Dan Cleary that under his administration the War Claims Commission not once was subject to the slightest hostile criticism from any source. He gave the flowering years of his prime to the public service of his country.

Mr. Speaker, I have remarked that we cannot understand the pattern of human life. Dan Cleary had so much ahead of him, so much to give in service to a world so much in need of more Dan Clearys. But in the finite intellect is no power to interpret the purpose of the infinite. Ours is not to question, but to accept. I shall continue to feel the presence and the inspiration of this dear friend by denying the finality of a temporary parting.

The Honorable Daniel F. Cleary was born in Chicago, June 4, 1910, was educated in the parochial schools and Loyola Academy; receiving his college and legal education at Loyola University in Chicago. He was admitted to the practice of law in 1937 and remained a member of the Chicago firm of Garvey, Cleary, & Boyle, until June 17, 1942, when he enlisted in the United States Army Air Force. He was a major on leaving the service in November of 1945.

He was on the staff of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, United States Department of Labor, from November 1945 to December 1946, during which time he had charge of the program of disposal of surplus federally owned property to educational institutions of the United States, an activity which involved frequent contact with university and college officials throughout the country.

He was in the staff of the Veterans' Administration as senior attorney—legislative analyst—Office of Legislation; conducted study of escalator clauses in wage contracts based on the cost of living index and their possible applicability to rates of veterans' benefits, December 1946 to September 1949.

On July 28, 1949, he was nominated by President Truman as a member of the War Claims Commission; confirmed by the Senate upon the recommendation of the Judiciary Committee, September 13, 1949; elected Chairman upon organization of the Commission, September 14, 1949.

As Chairman of the Commission Dan Cleary testified before the various committees of both bodies of the Congress, winning from the members thereof high acclaim. He directed an exhaustive study of the problem of World War II damage claims. Moreover, he spark-plugged the work of the Custodian of Alien Property, from the collections of which office came the only funds available for the good purposes of the War Claims Commission. He organized the office of the Commission into a perfect, hard-working, hard-hitting team. Traveling to the Far East he brought by personal contact the office there to the same high degree of efficiency.

Among the many organizations of which Dan Cleary was a valued and beloved member were: Chicago Bar Association, American Bar Association, Disabled American Veterans, American Legion, National Press Club, Catholic Alumni Guild of Washington—president 1951—John Carroll Society, and Democratic Club of the District of Columbia—director 1951–52, Local No. 134, I. B. of E. W.—A. F. of L., Irish Fellowship Club of Chicago, the Cana Conference of Washington, the Catholic Interracial Council of Washington, and St. Peter Claver Center Interracial Friendship House in Washington.

In his busy life Dan Cleary found time to contribute to various periodicals including: The Commonweal, America, and Social Order. He was a frequent speaker before religious, lay, and patriotic organizations and served as Washington correspondent—1948–50—for Today, national Catholic weekly published in Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, may I truly say to the devoted woman who was his inspiration and his helpmate, and to the trio of fine children blessing their union, that to them is extended the deep sympathy of every Member of this body.

SANTA MARIA PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. NICHOLSON, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 416, Rept. No. 1112), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2235) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee

on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TO DISCHARGE INDEBTEDNESS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. NICHOLSON, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 417, Rept. No. 1113), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 358, to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

RESOLUTION ON COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the resolution with respect to the composition of committees of the House was adopted may appear in the RECORD preceding the assignments to these committees heretofore made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REPORTS ON RULES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Reports on two rules have just been filed. I notice here the presence of the minority leader and wish to say this: that one of them has to do with a water project in the West. I shall discuss the matter further, but I make these comments at this point in order that the membership may know of the possibility of that being called for action later on this week.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1399. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1577. An act to authorize the exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2583. An act to indemnify against loss all persons whose swine were destroyed in July 1952 as a result of having been infected with or exposed to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1917. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; and

H. R. 6665. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2474. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1917. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; and

H. R. 6665. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. LONG.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. BOLLING

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. SHELLEY).

Mr. ASHMORE.

Mr. WOLVERTON (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. BAILEY).

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on another approach to the Randall Commission report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, January 27, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1184. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to the fiscal year 1954 for the cancellation of notes issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $741,817,478 (H. Doc. No. 303); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1185. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, transmitting a report which embodies the findings of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, pursuant to Public Law 215, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 290); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1186. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of $4,800,000, and a draft of a proposed provision for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 304); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1187. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 in the amount of $150,000 for the Advisory Committee on Weather Control (H. Doc. No. 305); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1188. A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting a report showing the name of each contractor with whom a contract has been negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, the amount of the contract, and, a description of the work to be performed for the period ending December 31, 1953, pursuant to section 2 (c) (11) of Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1189. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 25th quarterly report on export control, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1190. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 11th semiannual report of the international information and educational exchange program for the period January 1 to June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 1008 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1191. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the third report of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, 2d session, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements, for the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1953; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1192. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the 18th annual report of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1193. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a list containing the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1194. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of a newly issued publication entitled "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies in the United States, 1952"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1195. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the Communications Act in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1196. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting drafts of 2 proposed bills: 1 entitled "A bill to provide for the capitalization of the treaty annuity paid to the Six Nations of Indians, and for other purposes," and the other "A bill to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the Seneca Nation and the Tonawanda Band of Senecas, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1197. A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the court's opinion rendered pertaining to the bill H. R. 3131, for the relief of Raymond B. Jeffrey, pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509, title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with House Resolution 383, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1198. A letter from the Secretary of State transmitting the 6th annual report of claims paid by the Department during the calendar year 1953, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1110. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 358. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 416. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2235, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1112). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 417. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 358, a joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1113). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 373. An act to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act (Rept. No. 1114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7465. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to provide for the prosecution of projects in the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 7466. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory repayment contract with the Pine River Irrigation District, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 7467. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 7468. A bill to amend section 203 (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize regulation, for purposes of safety and protection of the public, of motor carrier transportation between points in foreign countries, insofar as such transportation takes place within the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 7469. A bill to establish an effective housing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 7470. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1950, relating to the extension of the terms of patents of World War II veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 7471. A bill to amend section 203 (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize regulation, for purposes of safety and protection of the public, of motor carrier transportation between points in foreign countries, insofar as such transportation takes place within the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 7472. A bill to provide for a determination by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the advisability of modifying the existing project at New Haven Harbor, Conn., in view of changed shipping and economic conditions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 7473. A bill to authorize the construction and maintenance of certain harbor improvements at Gold Beach, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 7474. A bill to establish a Federal Board of Hospitalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 7475. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 7476. A bill to deny benefits, under any Federal retirement systems, to persons convicted of crimes for any actions related to the holding of Federal employment by such persons; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 7477. A bill to authorize the collection of indebtedness of military and civilian personnel resulting from erroneous payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 7478. A bill to provide for a commission to regulate the transportation of passengers by common carriers operating over regular routes within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7479. A bill to extend the time for the expiration of the commission and for the submission of additional reports by the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 7480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the income-tax exemptions allowed a taxpayer shall in no case total less than $3,500 if he is single or $5,000 if he is married; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7481. A bill to authorize the improvement of Playa del Rey Inlet and Basin, Venice, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 7482. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to provide for the prosecution of projects in the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 7483. A bill to increase the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the municipal court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 7484. A bill to authorize the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to make the determination in proper cases whether prosecution of certain juveniles, charged with capital offenses, those punishable by life imprisonment and other felonies, shall be tried in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 7485. A bill to increase to 12 the number of members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and to provide that their terms of office shall be 6 years, and to abolish the Federal Open Market Committee and transfer its functions to such Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7486. A bill to amend section 1071 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the concealing of persons from arrest, so as to increase the penalties therein provided; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 7487. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 7488. A bill to amend section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to deductions for retirement by banks of certain preferred stocks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 7489. A bill relating to the annual adjustment of the basic pay of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 7490. A bill to authorize the sale of farm commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 7491. A bill to allow certain establishments providing apprentice training to veterans under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to postpone giving credit for previous training and job experience until the veteran has completed 6

months of apprentice training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. J. Res. 358. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution designating the first full week in October, 1954, as National Nurse Week, and providing for the establishment of a central council to coordinate the observance of such week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. J. Res. 360. Joint resolution providing for the issuance of special postage stamps for use on overseas mail to commemorate the freedoms embodied in the Bill of Rights of the United States of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. J. Res. 361. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the admission of new States as sovereign States of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. J. Res. 362. Joint resolution providing that the next cruiser commissioned in the United States Navy shall be named the *Brooklyn*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. Con. Res. 196 Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of Dr. Marcus Whitman; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7492. A bill for the relief of Ludmila and Miroslav Turek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7493. A bill for the relief of Demetrios George Kretikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7494. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Forster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 7495. A bill for the relief of Americo Dos Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 7496. A bill for the relief of Toshi Onodera Berry, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER (by request):

H. R. 7497. A bill for the relief of Roy M. Butcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 7498. A bill for the relief of David Manuel Porter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7499. A bill for the relief of Charles Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 7500. A bill for the relief of Kurt Forsell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7501. A bill for the relief of Irma Elina Vcela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7502. A bill for the relief of Syed Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7503. A bill for the relief of Bassa Mea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 7504. A bill for the relief of Baldomero R. Garcia, Teresa Garcia y Braganza, Francisco Garcia, Teresita Garcia, and Eduardo Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 7505. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Azniv Y. Hasserdjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 7506. A bill for the relief of Serafino Pulvirenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 7507. A bill for the relief of Oather S. Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 7508. A bill for the relief of James Dore, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 7509. A bill for the relief of Jean Isabel Hay Watts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

473. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Boston, Mass., to Congress unanimously opposing the proposed construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

474. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Letter from the Reverend Arthur R. Oates, stated clerk of the Synod of Wisconsin of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., calling attention to the action of the synod in opposing the inherent evils in such systems and doctrines of government as communism and fascism; to the Committee on Rules.

475. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the mayor, city of Chicago, Ill., in support of H. R. 2344, providing for a salary adjustment for post office employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

476. Also, petition of the president, Classroom Teachers Association of New York State, Schenectady, N. Y., supporting legislation for the continuation of Federal assistance for school construction and for current operating expenses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

477. Also, petition of the national legislative director, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., opposing the proposed Bricker amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Report of Commission on Foreign Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1954

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I issued yesterday dealing with the report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH, OF CONNECTICUT

The report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, with its recommendations for positive action to remove obstructions in the channels of world trade, is a stride forward toward a major objective staked out by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message. He described that goal as "the creation of a healthier and freer system of trade and payments within the free world—a system in which our allies can earn their own way and our own economy can continue to flourish."

Achievement of that goal is essential if we are to win the cold war and lay the foundations of a lasting peace. It will require determined action by our allies as well as ourselves, as the Commission has emphasized. If the other free nations sincerely desire to cooperate, and give satisfactory evidence of their intention to do so, I hope that the Congress and the executive departments will act promptly to carry out the Commission's proposals.

Public interest has centered largely on the Commission's work in the area of tariff and trade policy. While this is understandable, it should not obscure the Commission's recommendations in other fields which are of greater importance.

In the broad picture, action taken in other fields than the tariff may be more effective in achieving the objective of stimulating trade in the free world. Of all the impediments to trade which now exist, the American tariff is among the least restrictive.

The report includes proposals for—

1. Continued participation by the United States, under the President's leadership, in trade agreements with other nations.

2. A gradual lowering of American tariffs, especially those in the highest ranges, on a carefully considered step-by-step basis.

3. Amendment of the Buy American Act to place foreign and domestic producers on a mutually competitive basis in bidding for Government contracts.

4. Simplification of administrative procedures in the collection of customs and improvement of tariff classifications.

5. Stimulation of American private investments in friendly nations by increasing incentives both at home and abroad.

6. Establishing the sound principle that, as a general rule, the United States will grant economic aid to other nations only when our own security is involved. (For example, Korea, Formosa.)

7. Continued United States participation in technical-assistance programs in undeveloped nations, with emphasis on our contribution of technical knowledge instead of large sums of money.

8. Removal of conditions which bring our domestic-agricultural programs, including rigid price supports, into conflict with foreign economic policy.

9. Insuring an adequate supply of the raw materials needed by our expanding economy.

10. Encouraging progress toward the convertibility of currencies.

In connection with the Commission's recommendations on the tariff, close attention should be given to the fact that they are subject to essential safeguards. The Commission has properly stressed the fact that the United States no longer is among the higher tariff countries in the world. The average level of our duties has been cut by 50 percent, or more, in the past 20 years.

The Commission has recognized that a careful approach must be made toward further reductions.

Accordingly, the recommendations take into account the necessity of avoiding sudden and severe shocks to communities with industries which are vulnerable to foreign competition.

In my judgment, the Commission did not go far enough in its recommendation for meeting the problem raised by low wages in foreign countries. We should always keep in mind the necessity of maintaining the living standards of American working men and women.

For this reason, Representative JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio, and I joined in the following supplementary statement:

"We believe that in negotiating trade agreements, our negotiators should consider not only substandard and depressed wage levels, as described in the Commission's report and in Mr. McDonald's dissent, but also wage differentials, in order to protect American labor."

Mr. VORYS and I also felt that the Commission should have regarded the maintenance of a strong industrial mobilization base as essential as the availability of raw materials.

We therefore added the following statement to the appropriate section of the Commission's report:

"We believe the Commission should make definite recommendations on the security considerations involved in defense production facilities, as well as in the supply of raw materials.

"Our productive power is our mightiest weapon in war. Defense plants and workers cannot be stockpiled.

"Industries vital to our national defense should be maintained at reserve strength levels. Tariff protection may be necessary. Other steps, such as placement of defense orders, may also be needed. There may be cases where such measures would be more effective for the industry concerned, and better for the economy, than import restrictions."

However, the report recommended the continuation of certain safety valve provisions now contained in the Trade Agreements Act. These safeguards, if wisely administered, will insure that increased imports desirable to help our economy and make our allies self-sustaining can be channeled so as to result in the most benefit and the least harm.

The Commission's report will not satisfy those theorists who advocate unlimited free trade nor those who would have us return to extreme protectionism. I am confident, however, that it will have the support of the great majority of the people who favor a moderate approach. If adopted, the Commission's recommendations can make possible the benefits of an increased flow of imports, with a consequent reduction and eventual elimination of the need for foreign aid programs, and at the same time stimulate a strong and healthy domestic economy.

Personal Income-Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1954

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides each single taxpayer a minimum income-tax exemption of $3,500 and each married taxpayer a minimum of $5,000.

In presenting this proposal, I have several purposes in mind. One of these is to give recognition to the fact that present exemptions are far below what is necessary to insure a minimum decent standard of living. Before we deliberately set out to tax family income, we ought at least to recognize that there is a minimum below which family income should not be taxed. My bill gives such recognition.

To those of you who may think my proposal somewhat radical, I ask you to recall that under the Revenue Acts of 1913 and 1916 exemptions were $3,000 and $4,000. Taking into account the great changes in the cost of living since that time, my proposal is only a mild equivalent of the exemptions enjoyed four decades ago.

I also call to your attention that many taxpayers with low income are paying very substantial hidden excise taxes into the treasuries of the State and Federal Governments. If we are going to have excises at all, it is inevitable that they will fall hardest on the low income group. The least we can do is to relieve them from the heavy burden of income taxes.

Another reason for my bill is to get the Federal Government more and more away from taxing low incomes. The States are finding it progressively more difficult to raise sufficient revenue to support State and local government—the bulwark of our democracy. Let us give them a chance.

Still another point is that my proposal will relieve the Bureau of Internal Revenue from great administrative burdens and also lighten the task of millions of employers and low income taxpayers. If the exemptions proposed by me were adopted, the Bureau could devote its efforts as it should to ferret out the large income taxpayers who are avoiding millions of dollars of taxes every year. At the same time, the small mill owner and shopkeeper will be relieved of the necessity and expense of computing his employees' taxes.

Finally, I know of no other opportunity that this Congress will have which could do more to prevent a depression than this proposal of mine. As a recession approaches or grows deeper with a tendency to become a real depression, it is important that money be placed or left in the hands of potential consumers. That means the millions of low income families. Instead of bringing money to Washington and then dispersing it to the States, let us leave it where it is. Let the people spend their own money. This proposal will leave billions in their hands which otherwise they will lose to Uncle Sam.

Congressional Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, a Mr. Ralph McGill, a columnist writing in the Atlanta Constitution under date of January 18, in his zeal to support the 120 percent raise in congressional salaries, attacks me personally and has many disparaging remarks to make about my personal appearance. He says I go around with patched trousers held together with safety pins. I expected to be attacked. No one ever sat in Congress who tried to represent the people of the United States and opposed unconscionable grabs like an increase of 120 percent in congressional pay, escaped from the vitriolic pen of the opposition. If this reporter thinks this helps his cause, let him put out more of it.

I do not go around with patched trousers held together with safety pins, and everyone with whom I associate knows it. I am not what you would call a dandy in dress, but on the salary I now receive I can and do wear good clothes. I may not wear them well, but they serve the purpose. This garbling reporter probably believes that clothes makes the man, but I think there are other elements to consider besides clothes. That no doubt is the reason he wants higher salaries so that those who, like himself, are lacking in other elements may make up for it in brilliant colors and magnificent imported haberdashery.

This reporter bemoans the fact that I want a record vote when the bill comes up for passage. That is the only true statement he made in his whole tirade against me. Why should he or anybody else object to going on record? Does he not want the people to know how their Congressmen voted? Is he afraid to let them know? I presume he would have a better way—he would have a voice vote, which is unrecorded, and if the bill did pass, no one could tell how a Member voted. This looks like an underhanded method of legislation. This would naturally appeal to Mr. McGill. Well, it makes little difference to me what the gentleman says as long as he follows his present policy of saying so many things that are not so. It will take more than the dribbling pen of reporters like Mr. McGill to stop my opposition to this congressional relief bill.

Minnesota 4–H Club Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 25, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of Minnesota's 4–H delegates to the National 4–H Club Congress in Chicago, together with a brief statement of their activities, be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Minnesota is justly proud of its great 4–H Club program. We have 2,200 4–H Clubs with some 48,000 members—one of the highest percentages of participation among rural boys and girls of any State in the Nation.

Climaxing an impressive record of participation in county fairs and our great Minnesota State fair, our 4–H Clubs sent 34 delegates to the National 4–H Club

Congress near the year-end. They did a very capable job of representing Minnesota.

All of our delegates were selected on the basis of their longtime achievements in 4–H Club work. Leadership plays an important part in their overall record of achievement, even though they may be selected for recognition in a specific project field. Our delegates represented a vast array of different types of 4–H projects.

Throughout the 4–H Congress, Minnesota won outstanding recognition.

Myron Clark, our State commissioner of agriculture, was honored at a special banquet as one of the eight outstanding 4–H alumni in the country. At one time Commissioner Clark was president of the Minnesota 4–H Federation, and was an outstanding 4–H member in our State. He later served as a local 4–H leader for several years, and has continued a very active interest in the 4–H Club program.

We are one of the few States that always includes an extension agent in our delegation. This year, Caroline Frederickson, county home agent at Mankato, was selected to represent the extension agents and to go with our delegation.

In recognition of the outstanding volunteer work being done by rural 4–H club leaders, we are one of the few States that sends a local adult leader along with our delegation each year. In Minnesota we conduct a contest to select the 4–H Club of the year, and an adult leader from this club is chosen by club members in the winning club to represent the more than 6,500 local leaders of Minnesota at the club congress.

The Newhouse Horsemen 4–H Club was our club of the year this year, and it selected Mrs. Harry Lommen of Spring Grove as the local leader to be honored as an official member of the delegation.

Very few States are invited to submit talent numbers for the annual share the fun breakfast on the final morning of the club congress. There are only about 8 or 9 entertainment numbers that are brought in from over the country, yet Minnesota was fortunate in having the first place talent number from our State's search for 4–H talent—a fine quartet from Wadena—was selected to appear on the program this year.

Minnesota was further honored by having one of its participants in the International Farm Youth Exchange program, Marlene Mattila of Sebeka, who recently returned from Finland, speak at the club congress banquet for all the delegates. Marlene spoke on her experiences as 1 of 4 International Farm Youth Exchange delegates from Minnesota going overesas last year.

The delegates were accompanied by Osgood Magnuson, Bernard Beadle, A. E. Engebretson, Gwen Bacheller, and Elaine Tessman from the University Farm as chaperones.

Our 4–H Club work is being effectively carried out under the direction of Leonard Harkness, State 4–H Club leader, to whom I am indebted for the information in this report.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Minnesota's delegates to the 1953 National 4–H Club Congress included: Edward L. Maier, Sauk Rapids; Caroline Frederickson, Mankato; Keith W. Thurston, Madelia; Mary Lee Schotzko, Sleepy Eye; Vernon Kitzberger, New Ulm, route 2; Shirley Demm, Waconia, route 1; LuAnn Lewis, Excelsior, route 1; Janet Swanson, Moorhead, route 1; Janet Grant, Jeffers, route 2; Harris L. Byers, Westbrook; John W. Conzemius, Cannon Falls, route 3; Evelyn Johnson, Blue Earth, route 2; Richard Sample, Spring Valley, route 2; Roland Kohlmeyer, Fountain, route 1; Phyllis D. Hanson, Ellendale, route 2; Ann Therese Busch, 915 N. Boone, Minneapolis; Mrs. Harry Lommen, Spring Grove; Kathryn Stinar, Lakefield, route 2; Ronald E. Johnson, Windom, route 1; Willis Schoemaker, Kasota, route 1; Rodney G. Malo, Fairmont, route 2; Dennis R. Forsell, Twin Valley, route 1; Richard Swanson, Byron, route 2; George Rabehl, Rochester, route 1; G. Dianne Lendobeja, Thief River Falls, route 4; Roger E. Keller, Faribault, route 1; Victorin Ruhland, New Prague, route 1; Jeanne Ellen Deal, Wheaton, route 3; Marlene Mattila, Sebeka; Lavern Eckert, Wadena; Edwin Eckert, Wadena; Eldow Eckert, Wadena; Lola Jean Krueger, Wadena; Ann Bangsund, Montevideo.

Eleventh Report on Legislation of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my 11th report to my constituents in the 2d District of Illinois on the legislation of the 83d Congress. The report follows:

ELEVENTH REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: During the 2d session of the 83d Congress I shall continue to report to you on the new laws of the land. As quickly as possible after bills have been passed by both House and Senate and signed by the President, you will be given (a) a summary of the new laws, and (b) the how and why of your vote as cast by me as your Representative.

In the 1st session of the 83d Congress the public laws enacted reached a total of 288. Many of these were passed by Congress in the closing days so that an unusually large number were left on the President's desk for action after the adjournment of Congress. These are covered in this report, which begins with Public Law 243 and ends with the last act of the 1st session, Public Law 288.

My previous reports were printed for permanent record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

Public Laws 1–45, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 14, pages A4313–A4318;

Public Laws 46–76, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 14, pages A4417–A4419;

Public Laws 77–100, CONGRESSIONAL RDCORD, volume 99, part 15, pages A4795–A4796;

Public Laws 101–124, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 15, pages A5220–A5223;

Public Laws 125–169, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 15, pages A5265–A5268;

Public Laws 170–201, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 15, pages A5381–A5383;

Public Laws 202–242, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 15, pages A5399–A5401;

PUBLIC LAW 243

H. R. 5877. Customs Simplification Act of 1953: Time was (prior to income tax) when duty on imports was one of the four most important sources of Government income. It now brings into the Federal Treasury less than a billion dollars annually—actually about three-quarters of one billion dollars, compared with the $65,218,000,000 annual yield from income tax. To collect the customs tax Uncle Sam has been spending a little less than 20 cents out of every dollar collected. Reason: Too much unnecessary paper work, excessive red tape. Public Law 243, making no changes in classification or rates of duty and avoiding everything of controversial nature, effects a saving of several million dollars a year by striking out obsolete and unnecessary provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930. I am confident you will approve of my support of Public Law 243.

PUBLIC LAW 244

H. R. 6039. College ROTC credit for training in 55c schools: Section 55c is used to describe schools authorized to give junior ROTC training as provided for in section 55c of the National Defense Act. There are 65 of these schools. The only difference between junior ROTC and 55c schools is that junior ROTC schools have their professors of military science and tactics furnished by the Regular Army while the 55c schools select their own military professors from qualified reserve or retired officers and foot the salary bill. Heretofore, however, the training received at the so-called 55c schools could not be credited against the equivalent courses in the senior units at the college level. Public Law 244 corrects this inequity with a good law.

PUBLIC LAW 245

H. R. 6382. Extends period of negotiated sales of surplus property: This is stopgap legislation, extending for 1 year (to June 30, 1954) the authority of General Services to dispose of surplus Government property by negotiation instead of by advertising for sealed bids. It is sound and prudent policy to award public contracts after open competitive bidding (mandatory by law in Illinois). But in the case of Federal surplus property disposals the Congress has felt there is an exception when the property is being taken over (for the public benefit) by State and local governments or is being repossessed by its former owners. Public Law 245, among other things, makes it possible for approximately 1,000 former owners to reacquire at prevailing market values 36,600 acres of farm lands in the installations to be abandoned at Camp Ellis, Ill., and High Point, N. C. Also enables veterans and occupants of housing units in Lemmon, S. Dak., to retain possession of their present homes.

PUBLIC LAW 246

H. R. 6049. School construction assistance: In the 81st Congress I voted for Public Law 815 under which some $341 million was spent in the construction of 14,500 classrooms housing 440,000 children. This met the responsibility of the Federal Government for aiding school construction in communities that had been burdened with large increases in school attendance as a result of the inmigration of defense and other Federal workers. Public Law 246 of the 83d Congress provides for a continuance of this program. About $150 million will be spent in caring for an estimated further increase of over 500,000 children in the school enrollments of federally affected school districts, 230,000 more than can be accommodated in present school buildings. Title IV of the act authorizes $20 million school construction assistance in areas inhabited mainly by Indians. I know

you agree with me that money spent in public education is money wisely invested.

PUBLIC LAW 247

H. R. 6354. Lanham Act housing at Cape May, N. J.: Coast guard and navy personnel can continue in undisturbed occupancy of those 50 Lanham Act houses at Cape May, N. J., thanks to Public Law 247. For a while it was intended to declare the housing units surplus and dispose of them as such. Better plan was adopted of turning them over to the Coast Guard, which maintains a receiving station at Cape May.

PUBLIC LAW 248

H. R. 6078. School maintenance assistance: As a Member of the 81st Congress I supported legislation (Public Law 874) providing financial assistance for the maintenance and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities. Assistance provided under this act served to prevent serious deterioration in the school situation generally and in some Federal projects areas a complete breakdown in the public-school system. Cost: In 1951, $30,100,000 for 442,000 children; in 1952, $47,750,000 for 620,000 children; in 1953, estimated $60,500,000 for 750,000 children. Public Law 248 of the present Congress extends the assistance, with some changes, to June 30, 1956.

PUBLIC LAW 249

House Joint Resolution 250. Bicentennial of founding of Columbia University: Establishes a commission to cooperate with Columbia University in the celebration of its bicentennial. Similar legislation honored Harvard's tercentenary (1936), Princeton's bicentennial (1946), and Washington and Lee's bicentennial (1948). It was in October of 1754 that a charter was granted to King's College, later Columbia University. Alexander Hamilton was an alumnus of King's College, and Columbia has given to the Nation 2 Presidents, a Vice President, and 3 Chief Justices.

PUBLIC LAW 250

S. 1397. Saving atomic energy supply program by validation of mining claims: In Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado is the Colorado Plateau, principal source of our supply of fissionable materials so important to our atomic energy program. Vanadium, with which uranium is often associated, was discovered there some years ago. Urged on by the Atomic Energy Commission (it offered bonuses for new discoveries, pointed out likely locations for prospecting, distributed working manuals) prospectors did a good job in locating new mining claims. But it turned out that many of the places where the much-desired fissionable materials were located was on land known to be valuable for gas and oil. For years the Department of the Interior has ruled that valid mining claims cannot be located on gas and oil land. Hence the uranium miners were in the position technically of trespassers. Congress cleared up the muddle and saved the atomic energy supply by enacting Public Law 250, which with certain limitations and reservations validates all mining claims located between December 31, 1938, and March 20, 1953.

PUBLIC LAW 251

H. R. 5328. Ute Moutain Indian tribe: The Ute Indian tribe in the Ute Mountain Reservation, located in portions of Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah, numbers some 600 people. It is a nomadic tribal group, 97 percent of which is full blood, only 5 members with a high school education and most of the tribe, including all the members of the tribal council, unable to speak English. By virtue of a 1950 Court of Claims judgment and a 1951 act of Congress the tribe now has $6,250,000 cash money. Public Law 251 permits a per capita distribution of $500 and the undertaking of a rehabilitation program under direction of the tribal council aimed at raising social and economic standards.

PUBLIC LAW 252

S. 2383. New Jersey-New York Waterfront Commission Compact: Because the port of New York extends into both the State of New York and the State of New Jersey efficient law enforcement was difficult with the result that the district came under the domination of gangsterism, harmful to labor, to the shipping industry and to the good reputation of the United States throughout the world of commerce.

While it was a situation capable of being handled through concerted action of the two States in which the harbor lies, the States were powerless to proceed until Congress gave the nod. Why? Article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States, reading: "No State shall, without the consent of the Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State."

All that Public Law 252 does is to grant congressional consent, pursuant to the Federal Constitution, to an interstate compact between New York and New Jersey setting up a bi-State agency to improve waterfront labor conditions in the port of New York area. The Senate passed the bill without rollcall, the House on the Consent Calendar.

PUBLIC LAW 253

S. 2220. Natural-gas pipelines: Existing law required that natural-gas pipeline companies crossing public lands must be common carriers and that they must either carry or purchase the oil or gas produced from Government lands in the vicinity of the pipelines. Public Law 253 knocks that wise provision into a cocked hat. This is one of the bad measures rushed through in the closing days of the session. Secretary of the Interior McKay's excuse: "Particular urgency."

PUBLIC LAW 254

H. R. 1383. Money distribution among Indian heirs: Among the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma are some 700 accounts of less than $500 owing to undetermined heirs of deceased members. Public Law 254 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to do the best he can without incurring the usual expenses of probate and formal judicial proceedings.

PUBLIC LAW 255

H. R. 1152. Loans to fur farmers: Following World War II the fur farmers were hard hit by foreign competition and increased production costs. Congress authorized a program, under which over $4 million was loaned by the Government and less than $3 million has been repaid to date. In 1949 it was estimated there were 7,000 bona fide fur farmers in the United States; trade journals say the number now is down to 5,000. Public Law 255 extends the fur loan program for 5 years, largely restricting it to those already indebted to the United States in the hope of helping them to get clear. May be throwing good money after bad.

PUBLIC LAW 256

S. 285. Committee for weather modification study: I was interested to learn from the committee report (H. Rept. No. 1022, p. 3) that rainmaking is big business (one rainmaking contractor had 300 million acres in the United States under contract) and is international in scope. The committee reports that weather control promises tremendous benefits, its activities may have far-reaching and catastrophic effects. Cited illustration: a single pound of dry ice, triggered off a heavy rainstorm, could cause an energy release equivalent in magnitude to the energy of several atomic bombs. Public Law 256 creates a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification. Purpose is to separate the true from the false, encourage scientific advance, protect farmers from the fakirs.

PUBLIC LAW 257

S. 677. National Conference on Citizenship: In 1946 a small group of men and women met at Philadelphia in a conference on citizenship. Since then some 1,000 public and private organizations have joined up. Public Law 257 grants a Federal charter to the conference.

PUBLIC LAW 258

S. 887. Permits exchange of farm units on irrigation projects: Merely modernizes section of existing law providing for exchange of farm units on Federal reclamation projects where original entry was found to be insufficient to support a family.

PUBLIC LAW 259

S. 1105. National Safety Council: This act incorporates the National Safety Council, organized in Chicago in 1913, the only national organization exclusively devoted to the prevention of accidents in all fields of activity. As a Chicagoan, I experienced a thrill of pride at having the opportunity to vote for this measure. During World War II, 100,000 more Americans were killed in accidents within the United States than died in combat. Accidents cause one death in the United States every 6 minutes, an injury every 3 seconds. The National Safety Council works efficiently in an important field. Another Chicago contribution to the welfare of the Nation.

PUBLIC LAW 260

S. 2097. $33 million development project in Alaska: In 1950 the Congress authorized the expenditure of $20,365,400 in the construction of a hydroelectric project in the vicinity of Anchorage and Palmer in Alaska. The project is but 60 percent completed and most of the money authorized is gone. Reason: the high cost of construction in Alaska, actually 2.35 times that prevailing in continental United States. Congress increased the authorization to $33 million, conditional, however, on an agreement with the city of Anchorage turning over to the Federal Government the present hydroelectric facilities of the municipality.

PUBLIC LAW 261

S. 1367. Crop insurance program: Extends authority of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to expand the crop insurance program into additional counties.

PUBLIC LAW 262

S. 671. State taxation of Atomic Energy Commission activities: In 1952 the United States Supreme Court held (*Carson v. Roane-Anderson Co.* (342 U. S. 232)) that under the last sentence of section 9 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 private contractors employed by the commission were exempt from State and local taxation. Public Law 262 strikes out the offending last sentence of section 9 (b) as requested in resolutions adopted by the Conference of State Governors.

PUBLIC LAW 263

Senate Joint Resolution 62. Three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of founding of Jamestown, Va.: This measure creates a commission of 11 members to plan the celebration in 1957 of the 350th anniversary of Jamestown, Va. You will want to mark down this historic celebration in planning your 1957 vacation.

PUBLIC LAW 264

S. 41. Forfeiture and disposal of property seized under the Espionage Act: Statutes governing exports from the United States have increased greatly [narcotic drugs, fissionable materials needed for the atomic-energy program, arms and ammunition],

Because of the increased burden upon the customs personnel, Public Law 264 was enacted at the request of the Treasury Department. It simplifies and brings up to date the procedure for forfeiting property intended to be exported in violation of law and for effecting forfeiture of transporting vessel, vehicle, or aircraft.

PUBLIC LAW 265

S. 2163. Transfer of Cottonfield Station: Authorizes transfer of Cottonfield Station at Statesville, N. C., to State of North Carolina in return for use by Federal Government of certain State facilities.

PUBLIC LAW 266

H. R. 307. Bridge at Ogdensburg, N. Y.: Authorizes the construction and maintenance of a toll bridge across the St. Lawrence River at Ogdensburg, N. Y.

PUBLIC LAW 267

H. R. 1219. Railroad bridge at Hidalgo, Tex.: Another bridge authorization.

PUBLIC LAW 268

H. R. 1245. Armory site for Wisconsin National Guard: Conveys to Wisconsin State Armory Board 8.8 acres located at Truax Field, Dane County, Wis.

PUBLIC LAW 269

H. R. 4151. Amendment to Social Security Act: Under the old-age and survivors insurance system, individuals in the active military or naval service of the United States are provided certain wage credits. Public Law 269 extends this privilege to include service rendered prior to July 1, 1955.

PUBLIC LAW 270

H. R. 5662. Monroe County, Mich.: More than 130 years ago French settlers of Monroe County in Michigan staked out claims along the waterfront of the Raisin River. In 1819 the Federal Government surveyed into townships and sections. Most of the settlers continued to occupy the land as originally staked out, neglected to submit proof of ownership. In 1928 Congress caught up with the unhappy situation, enacted a law providing for the issuance of patents. Public Law 270 extends this for another year. Farms in Monroe County remain in the same family for generations, hence the delay in locating all the legal defects.

PUBLIC LAW 271

H. R. 6185. Preference accorded to veterans in Federal employment: Veterans may have 5 or 10 points added to their earned ratings in civil-service examinations for Federal positions, but only after they have received a passing grade. Under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 veterans who did not actually make a passing grade were placed on the eligible register if their actual ratings plus the 5 or 10 veteran preference points equaled a passing grade. Public Law 271 amends the act in this respect.

PUBLIC LAW 272

H. R. 6252. Girl Scouts of the United States of America: Charter of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America is amended to (1) make it certain that only a citizen of the United States shall be a member of the national council (language in original charter is ambiguous), (2) permit national council to meet once every 3 years instead of 2 years, and (3) change beginning of fiscal year to October 1 instead of January 1.

PUBLIC LAW 273

H. R. 6313. Water supply for Denison, Tex.: Modifies Flood Control Act of 1938 as regards Denison Dam to permit of contract with city of Denison for use of storage space in Lake Texoma for purpose of providing city with a regulated water supply.

PUBLIC LAW 274

H. R. 6402. Abatement of jeopardy assessments: Jeopardy assessment is an arbitrary proceeding by the Bureau of Internal Revenue when it fears that ultimate collection of a tax is in danger. Once such an assessment was made the Bureau had no authority to revoke it even though later it found that a mistake had been made. Public Law 274 permits the revocation of a jeopardy assessment whenever it appears that there is in fact no danger of losing any tax which may be due.

PUBLIC LAW 275

House Joint Resolution 268. Bi-State park on the Big Sandy River: Located in Virginia a short distance from the Kentucky State line is the Breaks area, where the Russell Fork of the Big Sandy River has cut a deep gorge though Pine Mountain. Seemingly perpendicular sandstone cliffs rise 800 feet from the stream bed. It is an area spectacular scenically and of large tourist appeal. Public Law 275 grants the consent of Congress to the negotiation of a compact for the establishment of a bi-State park in this area by Virginia and Kentucky. The two States will foot the bill, but the consent of Congress is required nevertheless in compliance with the constitutional provisions forbidding States to enter into contracts and agreements with one another without first getting clearance from Congress.

PUBLIC LAW 276

Senate Joint Resolution 98. Liquidation of Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration: PRRA was established in 1935 to provide relief and work to Puerto Rico, sadly stricken by hurricane and depression. Some $70 million was appropriated for the work during the intervening years. Since 1942 its activities have been financed out of the revolving fund and have consisted mainly in the management of housing. Public Law 276 requires that the liquidation of the administration be completed within 18 months.

PUBLIC LAW 277

H. R. 1055. Eliminates discriminatory legislation against Indians: This measure, repealing Federal statutes relating to sales of intoxicants to Indians, is in line with the present trend to treat the Indians as all other segments of our population are treated.

PUBLIC LAW 278

S. 2094. State and water conservation facilities: When States and municipalities undertake the construction of water conservation facilities they first must obtain permission of the Federal Government because navigable streams are involved. It is the same procedure required when the city of Chicago builds a bridge over the Chicago River. The Federal Power Act, however, contains a recapture clause under which the Federal Government after 50 years can come into possession of all water power and conservation projects, including those financed and owned by municipalities and States. Public Law 278 eliminates the recapture clause in the case of public facilities.

During the last 6 days of a session of Congress, one of the permitted but extraordinary ways of getting a bill up for a vote is by suspension of the rules. The motion is within the discretion of the Speaker. It was in this manner that Public Law 278 passed the House in the closing hours.

The proponents of the measure said that the recapture clause was making it difficult for the States and municipalities to finance and refinance necessary bond issues.

Nevertheless, the recapture clause for years has been thought an essential protection of the Federal domain. In 1912 President Taft vetoed a bill providing for a dam across the Coosa River because it did not contain a recapture clause, the presidential message holding that to pass such a bill without a recapture clause would be to throw away the assets of the Government.

I did not vote for Public Law 278. It was not in the same major league with the tidelands oil surrender of the Federal domain; it belonged to an affiliated minor league.

PUBLIC LAW 279

H. R. 2062. Coordination of Wisconsin retirement fund with the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system: The Wisconsin retirement system was formulated to dovetail with the Federal system. To meet an unusual situation, not present in any other State, Public Law 279 was enacted. It does not change in any way the principle of existing law.

PUBLIC LAW 280

H. R. 1063. Indian affairs: This confers jurisdiction on California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin in criminal offenses and civil causes of action on Indian reservations within the respective States. It is along the present trend (1) to withdraw Federal responsibility for Indian affairs, (2) to terminate subjection of Indians to Federal laws applicable only to Indians.

PUBLIC LAW 281

H. R. 3409. Terminates Federal restrictions upon Indians: At long, long last the trade barriers are being burned down for our most abused and discriminated against minority group. Public Law 281 repeals some obsolete and ridiculous laws, such as a ban on trading with Indians and the loss to an Indian trader of his license if he traded in guns and ammunition with "uncivilized and hostile Indians."

PUBLIC LAW 282

H. R. 4508. Sale of lands to Oklahoma for park: Oklahoma is planning a $1,300,000 recreational development for the Quartz Mountain State Park. To finance the undertaking with a bond issue the State must have fee title to Federal lands now under lease to the State. To accommodate, Public Law 282 authorizes the sale of 87.5 acres of rocky, mountainous land near Altus, Okla., at $6.50 an acre.

PUBLIC LAW 283

H. R. 4980. Drawback of taxes on distilled spirits: Accelerates refund to manufacturers of non-beverage products of authorized drawback allowances. Administration legislation requested by the Treasury Department.

PUBLIC LAW 284

H. R. 4483. Compensation to Indians for lands of Riverton project: In 1904 the Shoshone and Arapahoe tribes ceded to the United States a large portion of the Wind River reservation in Wyoming. Later the land became part of the Riverton reclamation project. Public Law 284 authorizes a payment to the credit of the Indians of $1,009,500 for the 161,500 acres of land involved.

PUBLIC LAW 285

H. R. 5603. Loans on forest lands: Time may determine this to have been the most important legislation, in a realistic sense, to come from the first session of the 83d Congress. I supported it with enthusiasm in committee (Banking and Currency) and was happy when it passed the House without opposition. All that it does is to permit national banks to make 10-year loans on forest tracts. Its importance lies in the fact that we have a diminishing timber supply, in part responsible for the mounting cost of home construction in Chicago and elsewhere. Some timber can be grown in 10 years. All that is needed to assure a continuing supply of lumber is to give the timber farmers financing to carry over the period of growth. Most of the commercial forest land is owned by small individuals (average acreage about 60) who have not the means to replant. Loans made possible by Public Law 285 (1) will make it unnecessary to cut timber prematurely (2) will facilitate the practice of thinning which takes out the trees that are suitable for removal and leaves others for increased growth (3) encourage fresh plantings.

PUBLIC LAW 286

H. R. 6251. Reimbursement for franked mail matter: This is a typical case of how a record for economy is built up without actually saving the taxpayers a dime. The post office carries about a million and a half dollars of official franked mail annually. There is to be no charge of any sort in the franking privilege, but hereafter each department of the Federal Government (including the Congress) will send in a check to cover what the post office calculates the bill to be at the regular postal rates. It will all add up to reducing the post-office deficit one-fourth of 1 percent (by the method of taking money from one pocket to put it in another.) There of course will be some extra expense in maintaining a system of accounting so that the right bills can be sent to the various departments of Government. The taxpayers can put that down as the price of being orderly.

PUBLIC LAW 287

H. R. 6426. Technical Changes Act of 1953, Internal Revenue: Section 116 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Act was designed to encourage the flow abroad of American technical knowledge. It afforded immunity from United States income taxes for Americans remaining outside the United States for 17 out of 18 consecutive months. Movie stars with other individuals with large earnings seized upon the provision of section 116 (a) (2) as an inducement to go abroad to perform services customarily performed at home, thus holding onto their princely incomes without sharing any part with the Federal Government. Public Law 287 puts an end to the racket by repealing section 116 (a) (2). It makes a number of other changes which the experiences of time in the administration of the income and estate laws have suggested.

Of interest to Chicagoans (if any) who buy their cigarettes by mail is the provision which fixes the venue of action for violation of State cigarette tax law. Please note that the venue is in Illinois, not the State from which the cigarettes are shipped. Thought you would want to know.

House Report No. 894, 1st session, 83d Congress, is an unusually well-prepared document setting forth the background and character of all the various technical changes of the 1953 act.

PUBLIC LAW 288

H. R. 6441. Facilitates private financing of new ship construction: This measure has the distinction of being the last act of the first session of the 83d Congress to become a law of the land. It flew through the Halls of Congress as quickly and as quietly as a summer's zephyr. The House passed its own version on July 31, the Senate amended by substituting its version on August 1, and the same day the House agreed to the amended bill. The President, left with a large basket of bills to read when Congress folded up on August 3, finally cleaned up the job on August 15 with his signature approving Public Law 288.

The purpose of the act is to encourage private financing for new ship construction for operation in the foreign trade of the United States. Since 1936 by far the greater part of ship construction has been financed under title V of the Merchant Marine Act, the owner paying 25 percent of the cost of the vessel and the Government taking a 20-year mortgage on the balance. Public Law 288 liberalizes title XI, which provides government insurance of private ship mortgage, with the hope that to some modest extent it will encourage the utilization of private funds for ship construction. The amount of Government insurance provided for is limited to 90 percent to leave to the private lender some share of the financial responsibility. I hope it is a good bill even though not too much is expected of it. But with your Representative, as with all his colleagues not members of the committee, it was all a matter of faith. You cannot learn much from a summer's zephyr.

BARRATT O'HARA.

The Randall Commission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1954

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Randall Commission recommends that the President be empowered to lower our tariff at the rate of 5 percent a year for 3 years.

This is a strange recommendation.

It represents what the report describes as a gradual removal of remaining trade barriers. What it would actually mean would be stagnation of many industries and a slow death for others.

How can we hope to maintain full production, high employment, and a healthy flow of investment, if we confront many of our industries and agricultural pursuits with an unfavorable market outlook?

If we are to maintain an expanding economy or even one that will hold its own we cannot issue a warrant of economic strangulation to hundreds of our producers. We cannot afford to say to them that they are inefficient and uneconomic and better dead by exposing them to a form of competition that is based on much lower wages and other costs and burdens than our own industries are forced to bear. Not only would it be unfair, since many of the burdens of our producers are the result of conditions and obligations that they themselves did not create but were forced upon them as a result of national policies; but the injury would not stop with just a few industries. It would spread from industry to industry. Distress areas have a way of spreading.

We saw it in 1949 and 1950. The Korean outbreak saved the day. Surely we do not want to depend once more upon such a circumstance.

The question is asked what would happen to our friends among the free nations of the world if we closed our door to imports. That would be a catastrophe indeed; but no one proposes to shut our door to imports. All that anyone asks is that imports be placed on a basis of fair competition, not that they be cut off or materially reduced.

Fair competition in the end will lead to a higher volume of trade than will destructive competition. We have learned that in this country. We outlawed sweatshop competition and we hear no one advocating that it be brought back. Our economy is much better off without it. What is good at home will also be good in our foreign trade. Fair import competition will lead to a higher volume than destructive competition.

What good will it do other countries that sell to us if they break our market and undermine our economy. If they tear us down by underselling our producers in our home market they will ruin the best market in the world. Free trade will be a hollow shell. It is as much in the interest of our friends across the seas as it is in our own interest to keep our own economy on a high level.

Reducing our tariff 5 percent per year or by any other arbitrary figure is at best unscientific and completely out of order. Nothing could be more clear than the difference in the amount of protection needed by different industries. Any across-the-board tariff reduction, even if further reductions might be justified here and there, would be the worst possible approach.

Statement of Hon. Frances P. Bolton, of Ohio, Upon Introducing Resolution Requesting Proclamation of National Nurse Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1954

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a serious shortage of professional and other nursing personnel in this country since World War II. Nurse power has become a health resource of vital importance to military and civilian patient care and other health services. Although it is difficult to estimate accurately the number of professional nurses currently needed, data has been collected on the number of budgeted positions which are now vacant. The vacancies in hospitals reported for the Nation as a whole is 52,000; in the official health departments, approximately 2,700. Additional nurses are needed for private duty, in industry, and for leadership positions in nursing education and administration in the several fields. This poses a serious problem to the people of the Nation, who when ill, need a nurse to care for them, or when well, should be benefitting by preventive nursing services. A solution to the problem is complicated by the fact that schools of nursing are not graduating more than approximately 30,000 nurses a year. On the other hand, the professional nursing organizations estimate that 55,000 should be graduated in order to keep up with increasing demands and annual attrition.

During World War II, this Congress passed the Bolton Act which established the United States Cadet Nurse Corps. During the program which ran from July 1943 to October 1945, 1,100 basic schools of nursing and 57 graduate schools received Federal aid. Under this program schools were partially reimbursed for the cost of room and board for students and received payment in lieu of the amount which students paid for tuition, books, and uniforms. Students were given a small monthly stipend and an official uniform. The program graduated 125,000 basic students and provided advance

instruction to 17,000 graduates. It cost $149 million.

In this resolution we are not requesting an appropriation, but rather a proclamation. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the American Nurses Association, and many citizen groups who are concerned with the seriousness of the nursing situation, believe that a national observance in honor of nurses would be the means to interpret nursing more fully and more interestingly than it has ever been brought to the public before, and would serve as a basis for a wide variety of community-action projects throughout the Nation which would stimulate student-nurse recruitment. Equally important is the opportunity which this national observance would provide to dramatize by radio, television, and in the various other communications media the dramatic service which nurses are performing in all types of health and hospital programs.

Since World War II, the public has been told very effectively that there are not enough nurses of all kinds to meet their needs. National Nurse Week would change this emphasis to the positive one of what nursing really is. For example, nurses today are performing many of the tasks which formerly could be done only by doctors. This is not to say that nurses are practicing medicine but rather to point out how vastly medical practice has grown and how much it has progressed beyond former methods of therapy. As the doctors have undertaken new and more complicated methods of treatment, nurses have had to absorb those which the doctors no longer had time to perform and which did not need their particular medical skills. Nursing has changed vastly since medical and scientific advances have expanded its scope. This is one of the reasons why a nurse shortage has continued so long despite all efforts to overcome it. Among other reasons is the fact that the number of patients admitted to hospitals has increased faster than the population—as a matter of fact, from 11 million in 1938 to 21 million in 1951. Also, each patient leaves the hospital sooner, and thus requires more intensive nursing care during his stay in the hospital and more care at home after discharge.

It is my firm belief that if the public who needs nursing service can be well informed on these significant developments in the nursing profession, we can logically expect that public to give effective support to the recruitment problems of nurse employers, and to accept with some understanding the increasing costs of nursing care and of nursing education.

National Nurse Week will give the citizens of our local communities the opportunity to support the need for nurses and the needs of nurses with the same vigor and enthusiasm annually applied to a large number of other health campaigns. Nursing service is implicit in all the nationwide campaigns which have dramatized cancer, tuberculosis, polio, and heart disease. Yet nursing service has never been given the nationwide attention—the radio marathon, the telethons, the widespread newspaper and magazine publicity—which these campaigns have merited.

National Nurse Week will tell what nurses are doing to meet the demands of modern medical science. It will describe the new responsibilities they are carrying in caring for the sick and the new roles they play in health education. It will portray the drama of the art and science of nursing as it advances to keep pace with the antibiotics, plastic repairs, and radioisotope therapy, as well as the need for nurses to be familiar with such therapeutic wonders as gamma globulin, the giant X-ray, and surgery on the heart itself. It is hoped that by this nationwide program, we can portray nursing as one of the essential elements of health and welfare.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four is the logical year to launch this nationwide observance because, among other things, it is the 100th anniversary of Florence Nightingale's historic work in the Crimea.

I therefore respectfully submit for your consideration and approval this joint resolution proposing the first full week in October 1954, as National Nurse Week. I believe this is an important step for us to take in our effort to provide more and better care for the people of this country.

The Bolling Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1954

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a comprehensive housing bill.

My bill has as its twin objectives a solution of our national housing problem and the restoration of our national economy to the full vigor from which I fear it is rapidly receding. It has as its social objective the providing of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for all American families and as its economic objective a reversal of the present economic downturn, be it labeled depression, recession, or rolling adjustment.

There are those who contend that even to discuss our present economic plight is to aggravate it. They charge that those of us who would discuss these problems frankly and dispassionately and endeavor to find a solution for them are either the prophets of gloom and doom or carping partisans. I am unable to concur in this philosophy. I do not believe that by pretending it is not there the recession will disappear. I do not believe that I can be successfully challenged when I state that all is not well with our national economy. There is certainly room for argument as to the degree of our economic deterioration. There is also room for argument as to what measures should be taken to reverse it. No one, however, can successfully refute the statistics which make it increasingly clear each day that the national economy has moved downhill.

The construction industry is one of the basic mainstays of our economy. The record of what happened to that industry last year is therefore quite alarming. The number of new housing starts declined steadily from 111,000 in April to 88,000 in October. In October 1952, 101,000 starts were made. If construction is to be used as one of our chief antideflationary weapons, as is apparently the hope of the present administration, it is clear that this downward trend must be arrested immediately.

Mr. Cole, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, has stated that about 1 million new starts will be made this year. I believe Mr. Cole is overly optimistic.

But even should Mr. Cole be correct, housing at the rate of a million starts, would fail to act as a brake against our present economic downturn. In 1925 when our population was only about 115 million, 937,000 units were started. Since then our population has increased by over 40 percent. An expanding population requires an expanding economy. If housing is to make its proper contribution to our material economic welfare, we might best return to the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Housing of the Eightieth Congress which found that the construction of 2 million units per year through 1960 should be regarded as a bare minimum national housing program. At the very least, we should follow the advice of the late Senator Taft's postwar Committee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment which urged 1½ million housing starts per year.

I wish it clearly understood that I do not claim my bill to be the complete or final answer to our housing and economic needs. It is offered merely as my idea for the initial step in the right direction.

Title I of the bill would act to restore the public housing program of the Housing Act of 1949. The Housing Act of 1949 was a bipartisan measure, the result of years of exhaustive study of the country's housing needs by both executive and legislative branches of our Government. The most notable investigations were made by Senator Taft's postwar Committee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment and the Joint Committee on Housing of the Eightieth Congress. Their findings acknowledged a clear need for the continuation and expansion of the low-rent housing program initiated in the United States Housing Act of 1937. As it passed the Congress, the Housing Act of 1949 authorized the construction of 810,000 units of low-rent public housing at a rate of 135,000 units per year. Because of riders on various appropriation acts, however, it has been possible to construct only a small fraction of the authorized units. Title I of my bill would repeal those riders and thus reactivate the public housing program authorized by the 1949 Housing Act.

Title II, I believe, provides a long overdue answer to the housing problem of the middle-income group. This is a very large segment of our population which, unfortunately, is not adequately served by our existing Federal housing programs. Their incomes are

too high to make them eligible for admission to public housing projects. Yet the mortgage insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration have tended to produce houses which are beyond the financial ability of these people. The program envisioned by title II would make use of the cooperative or nonprofit corporation together with an amortization period of 50 years, a low-interest rate—probably about 3 percent—and a down payment of not over 5 percent to decent, safe, and sanitary housing within the financial grasp of the middle-income group.

There would be established a system of financial aid to cooperative housing based on the principles of the Federal home loan bank system and the FHA mortgage insurance system. It is designed to channel private investment into cooperative housing. This type of housing is the only form of private enterprise housing as yet devised through which the economies and savings achieved in the financing, construction, and operation of housing are transmitted directly into corresponding reductions in the monthly charges which families pay for housing. It is therefore the most promising plan offered so far for the provision of adequate housing for middle income families. Title II would also provide technical assistance to cooperatives, and loans for planning their projects.

Title III would amend the slum clearance and urban redevelopment title of the Housing Act of 1949 so that local communities would have to bear only one-fifth, rather than one-third as presently required, of the net cost to them of making slum cleared land available at fair value for approved new houses.

In city after city throughout the country extravagant waste of human and other resources arising from slum conditions is apparent. Slums and blighted areas foster delinquency, disease, and crime, the effects of which can only be partly measured in the statistics available. They create demands for welfare, fire, police, and other financial outlays greatly in excess of the revenues which cities receive from them.

An excellent beginning toward the elimination of slums has been made under the Housing Act of 1949. Many smaller cities, however, do not have the resources to provide one-third of the net cost. Increasing the amount of the cost to be borne by the Federal Government from two-thirds to four-fifths will enable those cities to participate in the benefits of this highly necessary program.

Title IV would repeal a provision of the First Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1954 which required the liquidation of the housing research program. The housing research program was instituted in the Housing Act of 1948 and substantially enlarged and broadened by the Housing Act of 1949. The purpose of the program is to assist in reducing housing costs and to increase the production of better housing.

The housing research program fills in the gaps in housing research now conducted by producers of housing materials and the housing industry. It served as a clearing house for ideas, information, and data in housing technology, economies, finance, and administration of adequate local public controls over housing construction, use, and occupancy. Basic research was provided by the Bureau of Standards and other Government agencies, educational institutions, and other organizations. Title IV would fully restore this program.

Title V provides for the reorganization of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It would divest the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of all functions, powers, and duties and place them in new or existing constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The heads of the constituent agencies would be subject to the supervision and direction of the Administrator. I believe that by taking operating duties away from the Administrator and transferring them to the constituent agencies we shall obtain improved control and coordination of the constituent agencies by the Administrator. He then would be able to devote full time and attention to those tasks rather than to administering these programs as is the case at present.

Title VI provides a warranty to buyers of 1- or 2-family houses built with Federal assistance, that their houses were built according to the plans and specifications on which Federal assistance was based. The provision is identical with the bill on this subject introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] last year. It would also direct the FHA and VA local offices to permit purchasers of such houses to inspect or copy the house plans or specifications on file in the FHA or VA local office. Title VI would, as I see it, protect the equity of both the Government and the home buyer. I should like to state that the requirement of a warranty is not a reflection on the honest builder. In fact, providing the buyer with a warranty is a common practice in many other lines of industry, ranging from a popcorn popper to an automobile. When a person buys a house he is, as a rule, making a lifetime investment and he is entitled to protection by the same Government which provides financial assistance to the builder or seller to construct that home.

Title VII of the Housing Act of 1954 would provide a new standby, direct loan program in the FHA for loans to low- and middle-income nonveterans for the purchase or construction of homes. The program would be based on the same principles as the standby, direct housing loan program of the Veterans' Administration. Under the provisions of this bill it would expire at the same time the veterans' direct loan program would expire, June 30, 1957. Like the GI direct loan program, under which loans are made only to veterans who cannot obtain GI loans, the FHA direct loans would be made only in areas where FHA insured loans, or loans on terms equal to FHA insured loans, are not available from private sources. The proposed FHA direct loans would not exceed $10,000 in original principal amount, would be at a rate of interest prescribed by the Commissioner of FHA, and would mature in not more than 30 years. The FHA would be authorized to sell these loans to private lending institutions and to insure those loans sold under the regular FHA sections 8 or 203 mortgage-insurance programs. I believe that title VII should do much to prevent either a "money strike" by lenders such as we witnessed last year, or another unreasonable rise in interest rates on Government-insured mortgages.

Title VIII would extend and expand the VA's direct home-loan program. It would be extended until June 30, 1957, and its authorization would be enlarged by $500 million. The total authorization would become available immediately.

The record of the direct loan program leaves no doubt as to Congress' wisdom in enacting it. It proves that the Veterans' Administration has done an excellent job of administering it. Most of all, however, it is a tribute to the character, energy, and self-reliance of our veterans. As of December 31, 1953, a total of only 54 direct loans had been terminated by foreclosure or voluntary conveyance in lieu of foreclosure, representing about 1 out of every 800 completed loans as of the same date. Of the 39,907 direct loans outstanding on that date, a total of 1,284 were in default by one or more installments, with 158 or 0.4 percent in default by 4 or more installments.

In conclusion may I repeat, my bill is not advanced as a complete or final answer to this Nation's housing or economic needs. I offer it in the belief that it will provide a modest but long over-due step in the right direction. I believe it imperative that this Congress act immediately both to provide decent safe and sanitary housing for all our people and to reverse the present downward spiral in our national economy. I invite all members of this body, without regard to party, to join me in the attainment of those twin objectives.

John Daniel Rust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of John D. Rust of Pine Bluff, Ark., the South loses a respected friend and leader. About 20 years ago he invented and completed the building of the first successful mechanical cotton picker. In 1949 Ben Pearson, Inc., of Arkansas, and the Allis Chalmers Co., of Wisconsin, began manufacturing pickers based on Mr. Rust's patents. This invention represented a notable contribution to the South's progress.

Just as notable was the effort made by this distinguished Arkansawyer to avoid hardship among thousands of people employed in the harvesting of the South's cotton crop. Mr. Rust established a foundation to which he assigned a large portion of the income from this invention to finance various projects designed

to help farm laborers with the adjustments necessitated by the introduction of the machine. Mechanical genius and social idealism were blended in his personality. He and his wife ably developed the policies of the philanthropic and educational organization which bears his name, and we owe him a debt of gratitude not only for a significant invention but for leadership in the field of philanthropy. He will be greatly missed.

A Cruiser in Honor of Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been the custom of the United States Navy to have one of its cruisers named after the Borough of Brooklyn, which is today the second largest community in the country. To be exact, there have been at least 3 ships in our Navy during the past 100 years that proudly bore the name Brooklyn, and every one of them had an illustrious war record.

The first of these ships, bearing the name U. S. S. *Brooklyn*, was launched in 1858. It participated in Commodore Farragut's capture of New Orleans, Galveston, and Mobile, and in other actions during the Civil War period. The second *Brooklyn* was launched in 1895 and served as the flagship of Commodore Winfield Scott Schley in the Battle of Santiago during the Spanish-American War.

The third and most recent of these ships was a light cruiser which was launched in the Brooklyn Navy Yard in 1936. During World War II it saw 15 months of combat in European waters, including 4 landings and 4 major engagements, and served as the flagship for United States Naval Forces in north African waters. The ship returned unscathed to the United States after the war and was subsequently sold to Chile in July 1951.

For the first time in many years the United States Navy has no cruiser named *Brooklyn*. The people of our borough, who are very proud of their community, are keenly aware of this fact and are disappointed that to date the Department of Defense has not seen fit to bestow the name of Brooklyn on another cruiser and thus maintain the glorious tradition of the past 100 years. Various civic groups and veterans organizations have urged that the Navy commission another vessel in honor of our borough.

I am, therefore, introducing a joint resolution into Congress which simply provides that the next crusier to be commissioned in the United States Navy shall be named Brooklyn. I am doing so particularly at the request of the Kings County Council of the Jewish War Veterans, which recently passed a resolution urging that a new cruiser be named in honor of Brooklyn. I urge the committee to give my resolution prompt consideration and take favorable action.

Opposition to Congressional and Judicial Salary Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1954

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose a raise. The Special Commission appointed to make a study of judicial and congressional salaries has made its report, and I am amazed that it has recommended the sum of $27,500 annually for Federal judges and Members of Congress. I, for one, certainly do not favor the adoption of this report.

The Commission, and many others who believe such a raise is reasonable and advisable, seems to feel that the business of our Government in this crucial time is so grave and burdensome that salaries ought to be in direct relationship to the responsibilities. I cannot agree with this theory. Very few officials who hold high Government positions receive pay comparable to the responsibilities of their jobs. I do not think the founders of our Republic ever intended that they receive such pay. In the beginning of our Government, one of the leaders said: "Salaries should be fixed in the middleground where dignity blends with economy." I believe this statement is practical and based on commonsense. The present salary of Congressmen—$12,500 per year, plus $2,500 expense allowance—is a middleground salary, which permits a Congressman to live in dignity provided he is economical. And certainly we should all be economy minded today with exorbitant taxes and a public debt of almost $275 billion.

It takes about all of a Congressman's salary to live, I agree, since it is necessary for him to maintain one home in Washington and another in his district. However, in my opinion, Members of Congress are sent to Washington to make laws and not to make money. Congressmen are supposed to be public servants of the highest caliber. The honor of representing my people in Congress is of great value to me, and pay of this kind cannot be computed in dollars and cents.

The point is made by this special commission that higher salaries would bring better men to Congress. I think this argument is unsound, because throughout the history of this Nation many men and women have served their country admirably and heroically, often without any monetary compensation whatever. For example, during World War I and World War II many patriotic citizens served their country for $1 per year. To be sure, they were men of wealth who did not expect or need any salary, but, at the same time, they made great sacrifices in order to serve. Some members of President Eisenhower's Cabinet gave up jobs in industry, which provided them tremendous incomes, so that they might accept positions of greater honor, trust, and service in Government.

No; it is not money or big salaries that brings the best men to Congress. It is simply love of country and one's willingness to give up some of the material things in life in order to be the people's Representative in this great democratic Government.

Another reason why I object to this proposed raise is because it is out of proportion to the average salary increase in the business world. It is almost unheard of in industry for an employee to get an increase in pay of 80 to 90 percent at one time. Wages and salaries are customarily increased by degrees, not almost doubled in one jump, so to speak. This money belongs to the taxpayers, and it should not be spent so extravagantly.

All over the United States people are complaining about high taxes, and they have a right to complain. But the only way to reduce taxes is to first reduce spending. This Congress, I thought, was pledged to lower taxes and governmental economy in general, yet it appears that many of the leaders expect to vote to nearly double the salaries of Members of Congress. This is inconsistent to me. Therefore, I not only propose to continue my efforts for economy in Government, but I shall practice what I preach and vote against a salary raise.

Why should we raise the salaries of Congressmen when the farmer's income is less than it has been for several years? Why should we raise the salary of Congressmen and Federal judges when thousands of miners in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and several Western States are not working at all? Why should we raise these salaries when numerous New England textile mills are closing up shop and going out of business, and some southern mills are operating only 3 or 4 days per week? Why raise salaries of Congressmen when some postal employees are delivering newspapers to supplement their incomes so as to adequately support their families? Why raise salaries at a time when scores of expert economists predict a recession and probably a depression?

I hope and pray that these economists are wrong and that we will not have a depression or even a recession. However, if we start another series of wage increases, that alone will lead to further inflation, and steps of this kind ultimately bring us to a recession, or worse.

One Senator says, "It would be an affront to the American people if Congress votes itself a pay raise now." And at least one Congressman has said this pay raise would blow the lid off increased Federal spending and definitely accelerate inflation. I believe we have inflation whipped if we will just hold the line and continue to reduce spending and taxes. But if Congress sets an inflationary example by raising the pay of its own Members, then all other wage earners would be justified in demanding more money for their work.

Can we afford to raise the relief checks of the blind, crippled, aged, and disabled? If we do not expect to do that, then let us forget this question of raising our own pay. These unfortunate souls are at the mercy of charity and their Government, with no means of earning a livelihood.

If Congress expects to hold the respect and confidence of the voters, it should not give relief in the form of higher salaries, first to its own Members. A na-

tional poll on this question shows that a large majority of the people in this country are opposed to Congressmen and Federal judges receiving $27,500 annually.

Congressmen can live very well on what they are now paid and, in addition to the salary, they have the high honor of representing the people in the world's greatest deliberative body.

Dr. Walter B. Martin, President-Elect of the American Medical Association, Testifies Before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Inquiring Into Nation's Health as a Basis for a Health Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was privileged to have before it on Thursday, January 28, 1954, as a witness on the subject of the nation's health, Dr. Walter B. Martin, president-elect of the American Medical Association.

Before hearing the testimony of Dr. Martin, Chairman WOLVERTON, of the committee, presented a summary of the testimony that has already been presented to the committee by the several witnesses who have already appeared before the committee in its inquiry concerning an adequate health program.

The statement of Chairman WOLVERTON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, CHAIRMAN OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, INTRODUCING THE WITNESSES FROM THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION AT THE JANUARY 28 SESSION

Last fall after the adjournment of the Congress, this commitee initiated a health inquiry to study what can and should be done to provide additional protection for the American people against the heavy burden—and all too frequent financial catastrophe, arising from the major long-term illnesses.

The first phase of the inquiry last October dealt with what is known today about the causes, control, and treatment of the principal diseases. The committee was concerned specifically with finding out just what has been accomplished, how it has been accomplished, what the problems are, what the future holds, and what additional steps might be taken by way of research or other measures, to hasten relief from these dreadful diseases, mitigate human suffering, and curtail the losses which disease inflicts upon our national economy.

Some 95 distinguished physicians, scientists, and laymen participated in the series of discussions which we had, coming voluntarily and at their own expense, to advise the members on the current status of knowledge in specific fields, to document the extent of public and private efforts to find the causes of and to control disease, and to highlight the health problems and health needs of the Nation today.

Their testimony presented a dismal catalog of the magnitude of the disease problem. Disease by disease the witnesses enumerated the number of people afflicted, the number of premature deaths, the number of people crippled, the cost of illness to the individual and his family, and the cost of the disease to the Nation in terms of lost production, lost manpower, and the tax burden for medical care.

We were told that heart disease is the leading cause of death in the United States, causing more than 1 out of every 2 deaths each year. It is the leading cause of death among children, and exacts a toll from every age group.

At the rate at which we are acquiring cancer, 50 million of the present population of the United States probably will acquire cancer, and about 25 million of them will die from that disease.

The number of mentally ill patients in the United States exceeds the number of patients suffering from any other type of disease, approximately half—662,500 out of 1,425,000 hospital beds in the United States are needed and used for this group of illnesses.

Cerebral vascular disease, while causing some 160,000 deaths yearly, is more serious as a permanent crippler, leaving 1,800,000 now alive and crippled, paralyzing the body, or seriously limiting the powers of movement, speech, and vision. The other neurological and sensory disorders, similarly affecting the brain or spinal cord, are responsible for the disablement of another 8,200,000 persons.

There are 300,000 men, women, and children in the United States who are totally blind, and 300,000 more have visual defects so serious as to create partial or almost total disability.

Arthritis, with a total of 10 million victims today, with over 1 million permanently disabled, afflicts more people, cripples and disables more people, and brings more pain to more people than any other chronic disease.

There are at least 1 million known diabetics in the country today.

Last year more than 250,000 Americans of working age alone were unable to work because of active tuberculosis.

During the years 1938–52, 302,677 cases of poliomyelitis were reported in the United States and its Territories. During the same years 20,916 deaths were caused by this disease. The estimate for 1953 is 35,000 cases.

However, the testimony of these witnesses was not all gloom. They also outlined for us the tremendous progress which has been made in reducing the illness and death rate from certain diseases, particularly those of infectious nature. Infectious diseases have diminished as a national problem, for with the identification of the causes of these diseases, it has been possible to develop means of prevention, control, and, when the diseases occur, their prompt and adequate treatment.

In the case of noninfectious diseases, improvement has not been so marked. There has been an actual increase in the incidence of and death rate from these, especially those classed as chronic. One of the principal difficulties is lack of knowledge, knowledge about the causes of these principal diseases which plague mankind today. Without such knowledge, the prevention, control, or cure of many diseases is impossible.

From the testimony before this committee, it does not seem that adequate treatment is available for such afflictions as heart disease, cancer, arthritis and rheumatic disorders, cerebral palsy and muscular dystrophy. For example, the physician knows that after an attack of coronary thrombosis or a cerebral hemorrhage, he can aid the patient by treating symptons, but he cannot prevent or cure the disorder. He does not fully understand the underlying causes of these ailments and is therefore not able to eliminate them. Similarly, he may completely remove a malignant growth by surgery, or slow its growth by X-ray treatment. But if these treatments are not completely successful, as is too frequently the case, the physician is unable to do much more than to provide palliative treatment. He does not know the causes of tumor growth and is thus unable truly to conquer it.

While it is obvious that in some of these fields we do not yet know how we may provide a complete cure, nor, in others do we know just what we are fighting, research activities already have produced marvelous results in the prevention and treatment of some of them, and we may be well along the road to a solution in some of them.

I would not in anyway wish to disparage the great progress that has been made, nor discourage, nor fail to support to the utmost, even greater research into the causes and prevention of these diseases of mankind.

Yet, it is all too evident that at the present time these diseases continue to be, and probably will continue to be for some time, a tremendous burden upon the families of our Nation as they attempt to meet the costs of providing the medical care which long continued illness places upon them. Indeed, the very fact that we are now able in some degree to treat many of these diseases and prolong human lives but increases the problems of an economic nature. Extended hospitalization and medical attention prove exceedingly costly, and such costs are mounting.

What families today—with one of their number suddenly stricken—can afford from their own resources to pay the $4,380 involved in the hospitalization of a chronic heart patient for 1 year; or the monthly cost at a cerebral palsy center offering the full range of medical, psychological, and social services, averaging as much as $750 per child; or the $10,000 cost per year in keeping a seriously involved polio case in an iron lung?

Or if from their own resources, and those of relatives, they can meet the costs of such illness, at what cost to them in financial readjustment, lowered standard of living, interrupted schooling, uprooted children, loss of layaway for old age, or assumption of the breadwinner's role by someone else?

With such background, accordingly, the committee next undertook as part of its inquiry the study of just what protection against these costs now may be available to the individual American family. Last October we heard from various insurance companies which write insurance on an individual or group basis. This January we have been hearing from the sponsors and administrators of many group plans, from labor unions, from private clinics, from the New York Health Plan, the St. Louis Institute, the Kaiser Foundation, Group Health Association, and others, and next week we shall hear from the Blue Cross and Blue Shield organizations. In addition, we have heard various proposals as to what can or should be done by members of health commissions, foundations, and others.

It has seemed to me, however, that no one should be in better position to set forth for us a concrete proposal of just what can be done to provide a real and adequate protection against these costs than the medical profession itself, as represented in its official organization, the American Medical Association. This is an association of men who have dedicated their lives to the mitigation of human suffering, men devoted to making available the best of medical care to all of our people, regardless of their economic status.

We, therefore, confidently look to them to come forward with a constructive program to meet this problem, one of the greatest facing us today.

We are happy to welcome here today Dr. Walter B. Martin, president-elect of the American Medical Association; Dr. Louis H. Bauer, a past president of the association; and Dr. David B. Allman, chairman of its committee on legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the following is an extract from the testimony of Dr. Walter B. Martin, president-elect of the American Medical Association, setting forth some of the accomplishments that have been realized in recent years in medical science.

It is as follows:

EXTRACT FROM STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY WALTER B. MARTIN, M. D., AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 26, 1954

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as you know, the president of our association, Dr. Edward J. McCormick, of Toledo, Ohio, testified briefly before your group on October 1, and reviewed the activities of the American Medical Association in the field of medical research. Since his appearance, many individuals and organizations have presented their views concerning the condition of the Nation's health. Frequently, in their testimony, these individuals and organizations have decried the many inadequacies in this country's overall medical and health picture.

The American Medical Association would be the first to admit that despite the remarkable record of medical achievement much remains to be accomplished. In practically every instance of recognized deficiency, the AMA has also been the first organization to undertake a positive, constructive program of action. We know full well that certain medical scientific mysteries still must be solved. We are aware that in some areas problems of inadequate supply or improper distribution of medical personnel and facilities exist. We also realize that the best of medical care should be made available to all our citizens, regardless of their economic status, and that every effort should be made to alleviate the financial burden imposed by long-term illness.

We feel, however, that in an effort to create public sentiment in support of a Government-controlled medical-care program, a distorted picture of the health and medical situation in this country has been drawn. At times the magnitude of such problems has been exaggerated while actual progress toward solving them has been minimized. To lose perspective is to lose judgment. For this reason, we would like to clarify certain misconceptions which have arisen in regard to the Nation's health and medical needs.

Many of those who testified before this committee indicated that increased medical costs were proving financially disastrous to families faced with illness or accidents. Medical costs, like all other costs, have risen in the last few years. Statistics presented by the United States Department of Labor for the third quarter of 1952, however, revealed that living costs had increased 90.8 percent since 1935–39, while medical costs had increased only 65.5 percent in the same period. Between 1935–39 and 1950 average weekly wages rose 165 percent, while physicians' fees climbed only 48 percent. As a result, the average person works only 60 percent as long today to pay for the same amount of medical services.

New techniques and new drugs enable physicians to shorten length of illnesses and reduce hospital stays as well as wage loss. As a result, the total medical bill for many illnesses often actually is less than it was 15 years ago.

Proof that the cost of medical care presents no great problem to the majority of American families was given in a survey completed for the Federal Reserve Board last year. Of about 53 million families in the United States, almost 43 million—over 80 percent—reported no medical debts whatsoever. One million families owed from $200 to $1,000, while another 200,000 owed more than $1,000. That would indicate that less than 3 percent of all the people in the survey need help to pay their medical bills. The remaining 9 million families were listed as in debt for medical expenses in amounts varying from $1 to $200.

Some critics point to the increasing death rate from heart disease and cancer as an indication of a medical crisis. Actually, this is a heartening sign of great medical progress. The median age at death in the United States has jumped from 30 years to 66 years. Twenty years from now, although the death rate from certain diseases in our aging population may be higher, the length of life will be greater and the mortality rate for each age will be lower. Health progress and the number of deaths each successive year are simply two different ideas. A physician can never conquer death—he can only postpone it. Persons who are saved by medical advances and skills from death at an early age, later fall victim to the degenerative diseases which now appear to be increasing.

A serious shortage of doctors has been alleged. Actually, we have more doctors than any other nation, and we have more in proportion to population than any other country except Israel, which has an abnormal influx of refugee physicians from Europe. For more than 20 years the supply of doctors has been increasing at a faster rate than the general population. It is estimated that the period of 1950–60 will bring another 30-percent increase in the supply of physicians.

Today we have a total of 220,104 physicians—the largest in our history. Of this number 159,120 are in active practice. All the rest, except for about 9,700 who are retired or not in practice, are serving American health needs in research, teaching, hospitals, and Government service. On the basis of an estimated population of 160 million in 1953, we now have 1 physician for every 727 persons, or approximately 1 physician actually engaged in the practice of medicine for every 1,000 persons.

For the fifth consecutive year, the total number of students enrolled in approved medical schools has established a new record. The number of students graduated constitutes the largest group ever graduated in 1 academic year. Enrollments in the country's 72 medical and 7 basic science schools during 1952–53 totaled 27,688, or 2.3 percent more than the 27,076 enrolled during 1951–52. The estimated number of graduates for 1953–54 based on enrollments reported for senior classes in schools, is even greater (6,831) than last year (6,668) which exceeded by 279, or 4.4 percent, the previous record established in 1947, when at the termination of the wartime-accelerated program several schools graduated more than one class.

It is obvious that in the areas of medical progress, medical cost and doctor supply the picture is far brighter than some would have you believe. We hope that we have clarified some of these misconceptions.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, January 22, 1954)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful Father, in this quiet moment as we hallow Thy name and crave a sense of Thy presence, deliver us, we pray Thee, from all coldness of heart and grant us the grace of true supplication as we draw nigh unto Thee. In this uncertain, troubled day which may determine the fate of Thy children for centuries to ' e, Thou hast called us to battle in the contest between light and darkness, truth and error. Help us to fight the good fight with all our might, to toil valiantly while for us it is called day, in the glorious freedom which belongeth to the sons of God.

With a conscience void of offense may we be given strength equal to the burdens of the day, wisdom sufficient for each problem of the hour, and grant that what we say and do here may be approved not only by our fellow men, but of Thee, O God, our strength, our guide, and the Father of our spirits. Through the struggles of these times lead us to the universal peace for which we work and pray, while we keep step to music not of this earth, as our hearts sing of a victory not ours, but Thine, "Glory, glory, hallelujah, Thy truth is marching on!" Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 25, 1954, was dispensed with.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business as in legislative session, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cooper	Green
Anderson	Cordon	Griswold
Barrett	Daniel	Hayden
Beall	Dirksen	Hendrickson
Bennett	Douglas	Hickenlooper
Bricker	Duff	Hill
Burke	Dworshak	Hoey
Bush	Eastland	Holland
Butler, Md.	Ellender	Humphrey
Butler, Nebr.	Ferguson	Hunt
Byrd	Flanders	Ives
Capehart	Frear	Jackson
Carlson	Fulbright	Jenner
Case	George	Johnson, Colo.
Chavez	Gillette	Johnson, Tex.
Clements	Goldwater	Johnston, S. C.

Kefauver	McCarthy	Smathers
Kennedy	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Kerr	Millikin	Smith, N. J.
Kilgore	Morse	Sparkman
Knowland	Mundt	Stennis
Kuchel	Murray	Symington
Lehman	Neely	Thye
Lennon	Pastore	Upton
Long	Payne	Watkins
Magnuson	Potter	Welker
Malone	Purtell	Wiley
Mansfield	Robertson	Williams
Martin	Russell	Young
Maybank	Saltonstall	
McCarran	Schoeppel	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of activities of the Veterans' Administration, including a report of the Veterans' Educational Appeals Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PARITY PRICES—RESOLUTIONS OF RENVILLE COUNTY (MINN.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Renville County Farmers Union at a recent meeting be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred. One resolution urges the enactment of permanent legislation for mandatory 100 percent of parity, and the other resolution urges the continuation of 90 percent of parity on dairy products and eventual 100 percent.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a recent meeting of the seven locals of the Renville County Farmers Union:

"Be it resolved, That we are not in favor of the so-called flexible supports as proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Benson and President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message. Rather, we favor full 100 percent parity based on the old parity formula. We further recommend that the pledge of full parity as presented by the President at Kasson, Minn., be enacted into legislation at this 83d session of Congress."

Section No. 2:

"Whereas the Hope grassroots hearings which were held in many different States has much useful information on the needs of agriculture, and the true facts are known to a relatively few people; Be it

"Resolved, That we ask Congress to review these hearings and then enact permanent legislation for mandatory 100 percent of parity for agriculture.

"We also urge that the results of these hearings be publicized through a public news release from Washington."

DALE D. HAEN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Renville County Farmers Union, Renville, Minn.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the seven locals of the Renville County Farmers Union at a recent meeting:

"Be it resolved, That we urge the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress to enact a bill to assist in the normal consumption of butter, and so forth, to seek its level in the market and by thus assisting the consumer. The Government should stabilize the agriculture producer by making a direct payment to the producer so that he receives full mandatory parity under the old parity formula. The Government thus to explain that this program helps the consumer equally as much as the farmer; be it also

"Resolved, That we go on record as favoring the continuation of the present 90-percent supports on dairy products until such time as Congress can enact permanent legislation for 100 percent—full parity."

DALE D. HAEN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Renville County Farmers Union, Renville, Minn.

INCREASED CONGRESSIONAL AND JUDICIAL SALARIES—RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, RAMSEY COUNTY (MINN.) BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the executive council of the Ramsey County Bar Association, St. Paul, Minn., on January 13, 1954, concerning the increase of Federal judicial salaries be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAMSEY COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., January 13, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The executive council of the Ramsey County Bar Association on January 13, 1954, adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the council affirms the position of the American Bar Association relative to the increase of Federal judicial salaries as follows:

"District judges to $25,000.

"Circuit court of appeals judges to $27,500.

"United States Supreme Court Justices to $40,000."

As a consequence this council respectfully requests that you support this legislation if and when the same is introduced in Congress.

Very truly yours,

LEONARD J. KEYES,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. Res. 196. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; without amendment.

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. Res. 197. Resolution extending the time for a study and investigation of postal operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 882).

LIMITATION ON AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR EXPENSES OF TRAVEL UNDER CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 354) amending Public Law 207, 83d Congress. The joint resolution was unanimously ordered reported by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2827. A bill for the relief of the Troy Construction Corp. (formerly the Helrich Construction Corp.); and

S. 2828. A bill for the relief of Shahrokh Basseri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2829. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jo E. Inglett and Don Ramon Inglett; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2830. A bill for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL (by request):

S. 2831. A bill to provide for the payment of death gratuity benefits in the case of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. HOEY):

S. 2832. A bill to amend chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to require lists of certain taxpayers paying special taxes under section 3250 to be posted in certain United States post offices; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR:

S. 2833. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to R. R. Crew, A. G. Gibson, C. F. Bliss, Jr., et al.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2834. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer, including the exemptions for a spouse and dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness, from $600 to $800; and

S. 2835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to permit the deduction from gross income of certain expenses incurred by a taxpayer in providing an education above the secondary level for his children; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 2836. A bill to readjust postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2837. A bill to amend the act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO POSTING OF LISTS OF CERTAIN TAXPAYERS IN POST OFFICES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to require lists of certain taxpayers paying special taxes under section 3250 to be posted in certain United States post offices. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me regarding the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2832) to amend chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to require lists of certain taxpayers paying special taxes under section 3250 to be posted in certain United States post offices, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. HOEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement by Mr. CLEMENTS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLEMENTS

Under present Federal law all retail liquor dealers are required to purchase a Federal tax stamp for retail liquor dealers. This stamp must be purchased by every dealer, regardless of whether he is licensed by the State to sell liquor. Any individual is permitted by the Federal Government to purchase the stamp even though the sale of liquor in the purchaser's State or county is in violation of State law.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue defines the Federal stamps as an excise tax. Others call it a license or permit. Call it by any name, but the effect remains the same. A dealer who buys the stamp may sell liquor anywhere without Federal interference. Without the stamp, a dealer risks fines and imprisonment by the Federal Government.

Under the bill which I am now introducing the Bureau of Internal Revenue would list the names of all dealers in dry counties who purchase the Federal retail liquor dealer's stamp. This list would be posted in the main post office in the county seat of each dry county, and would contain the names of the dealers in that county who had purchased the Federal stamp, thus making their identification readily available to the law enforcement officers of the county.

This bill represents no real departure from present law or policy. It merely makes the information to which the public is now entitled more accessible.

RECONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to R. R. Crew, A. G. Gibson, C. F. Bliss, Jr., et al. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me regarding the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2833) authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to R. R. Crew, A. G. Gibson, C. F. Bliss, Jr., et al., introduced by Mr. KERR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. KERR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KERR

The bill will authorize the Federal Government to reconvey approximately 10 acres of land to the former owners.

The Corps of Engineers, who acquired the land for the Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir, have stated that the land to be conveyed is in excess of their need and the reconveyance will not interfere with the operation of the project.

The area to be reconveyed is a parcel of a larger holding upon which the former owners contemplate private development which will in no way adversely affect the Government's interest.

The former owners will pay the full expense to which the Government has been placed in acquiring the land and any additional cost for surveys necessary to reconvey it.

A small portion of the land in question lies below elevation 667 feet, which is the top contour of the Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir. This portion, of course, will not be reconveyed but will remain in title to the Government.

Similar legislation has heretofore been enacted (Public Law 128, 83d Cong., 1st sess., H. R. 5349, approved August 1, 1953).

TAX RELIEF FOR LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills designed to provide tax relief for middle-income and low-income families. The first bill will increase the personal income-tax exemption of the American taxpayer from $600 to $800. The second bill will permit the deduction from gross income of education expenses incurred by a taxpayer in providing for his children an education above the secondary level. It will make it possible for our young men and women who work their way through college to earn the necessary funds without depriving their parents of their status as dependents.

I ask unanimous consent that the bills, together with an explanatory statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2834) to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer, including the exemptions for a spouse and dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness, from $600 to $800, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code are amended by striking out "$600" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$800":

(1) Section 25 (b) (1) (relating to normal tax and surtax exemptions);

(2) Section 51 (a) (relating to requirement of filing returns by individuals);

(3) Section 51 (g) (7) (relating to rules for applying certain administrative provisions);

(4) Section 58 (a) (relating to requirement of declaration of estimated tax);

(5) Section 142 (a) (relating to requirement of filing return by fiduciary); and

(6) Section 163 (a) (1) (relating to credits of estate or trust).

(b) The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953.

The bill (S. 2835) to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to permit the deduction from gross income of certain expenses incurred by a taxpayer in providing an education above the secondary level for his children, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(gg) Certain expenses for education of children.—

"(1) Amounts paid for higher education: Amounts paid during the taxable year by the taxpayer for the education of his child who is pursuing a bona fide course of education above the secondary level at an accredited school, college, or university.

"(2) Limitations: The deduction allowed by this subsection shall not exceed, with respect to any one child, the sum of $1,000, less the amount of the exemption, if any, allowed the taxpayer for such child under section 25 (b) (1) (D). Amounts paid for subsistence shall be allowed under this subsection with respect to any child only while such child is attending an accredited school, college, or university away from home.

"(3) Definition of child: For the purposes of this subsection, a child of a taxpayer means a son, daughter, stepson, or stepdaughter of the taxpayer, and includes a legally adopted child of the taxpayer and a child for which a petition for adoption was filed by the taxpayer in an appropriate court and denied because of mental incapacity of the surviving natural parent to agree to such adoption."

SEC. 2. Section 24 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to items not deductible in computing net income) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "and except educational expenses deductible under subsection 23 (gg)."

SEC. 3. The amendments to the Internal Revenue Code made by this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953.

The statement by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Members of the Senate will recall that last year during the 1st session of the 83d Congress I introduced the first of the bills designed to provide tax relief to the needy in the form of a proposal to allow working mothers to deduct as legitimate business expenses the amounts that they pay to take care of their children while they are at work helping to provide for their families. I am delighted that the House Ways and Means Committee has seen fit to accept this proposal.

We appear to be in the midst of a mild economic recession. It is my fervent hope and prayer that this recession will not deepen into a depression. One way we can prevent the catastrophe of a depression is to stimulate purchasing power in the consumer group of our society. The middle-income and low-income families of America are the great consumers of America. Our tax legislation should be designed, therefore, to pro-

vide benefits to those groups, thus increasing their real income and allowing them to spend more in the market place. My tax program will achieve that objective.

During previous tax debates it was always my position that our National Government's budget must be balanced. At a time of high defense spending, inflationary pressures and greater demand for consumer goods than supply, it was essential that we do everything possible to balance the budget and preserve our economy. With the growing signs of recession, however, the desire to balance the budget must be coupled with the equally vital national good of stimulating consumer purchasing power. That is why even as we strenuously continue our efforts to balance the budget we must introduce tax reduction devices to help the middle- and low-income families of America, and to help the small business men, farmers, and workers.

The House Ways and Means Committee is today studying an overall revision of our Internal Revenue Code. I welcome that revision. It is long overdue. I serve notice, however, that I will not be a party to any revision which perpetuates inequities, widens tax loopholes and otherwise benefits high-income groups at the expense of middle- and low-income groups. During the 81st Congress and during the 82d Congress I proposed to the Senate a tax loophole closing program designed to raise more than $4 billion in taxes without adding any additional burden on the bulk of American taxpayers, but simply by removing inequities. I urge the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to give my proposals serious consideration for I shall once again want to bring them to the attention of the Senate. Such a tax loophole closing program could help balance the budget at the same time as we provide tax reductions for most of the American people.

There is one other method by which we can reduce the burden on the American taxpayer. We should aim at eliminating excise taxes which are an unfair burden on the consumer, place the merchants in the undesirable position of being tax collector, and violate the wholesome democratic tax principle that taxes should be levied on the ability to pay.

In my judgment, we can eliminate excise taxes and raise the personal income tax exemption if we act courageously to eliminate tax loopholes and remove tax inequities.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF INTERNAL SECURITY MANUAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my colleagues are, no doubt, familiar with Senate Document No. 47, of the 83d Congress, the Internal Security Manual.

This document was authorized by the Senate on May 1, 1953.

In view of the fact that the subject matter of the document was changing constantly, during the first session, it was found necessary constantly to revise the contents of the document, supplementing the contents with up-to-the-minute additions and making literally scores of changes wherever necessary.

The document, 285 pages long, was finally published, therefore, in November, during the recess.

Since then, the manual has been the subject of an extraordinary amount of commendation and interest throughout the Nation.

I submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for 2,000 additional copies of the manual, and ask unanimous consent that a statement by me in relation thereto be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 200), submitted by Mr. WILEY, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations 2,000 copies of the publication Internal Security Manual (S. Doc. No. 47, 83d Cong., 1st sess.), containing provisions of Federal statutes, Executive orders, and congressional resolutions relating to the internal security of the United States.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 47

Senate Document No. 47 is a six-part presentation, designed to serve as a reference guide for work in this crucial field.

Part I is a compilation of all United States laws relating to national security.

Part II consists of all provisions for security which apply to Government agencies.

Part III outlines the Federal loyalty program.

It includes a chronological table of statutes and Executive orders as well as a detailed presentation of applicable United States rules relating to the United Nations and other international organizations insofar as employment of American citizens is concerned.

Part IV lists all of the special investigating committees created by the Senate and the House of Representatives since the 71st Congress.

Part V lists all of the hearings held by committees of the Congress investigating subversive activities during the years 1930 to 1953.

Part VI is a 40-page index to current statutes, resolutions, Executive orders, and selected publications in this important field.

This index is, according to reactions received, one of the most helpful of all features of the manual.

For the first time, it brings together, for example, in alphabetical order all statutory references to such subjects as conspiracy, espionage, loyalty, deportation, exclusion, sabotage, sedition, subversion, and every other conceivable subject in this field.

It also includes a handy listing of a series of 15 basic reference publications issued by the Congress on the subject of communism.

PRAISE FROM ALL OVER AMERICA

The favorable reaction to the manual surpasses all expectations.

From all over our Nation I have received letters relating that the manual fulfills a deep need which has long been felt—a need to bring together in one book all of the pertinent material in this crucial field.

Simultaneously, the manual has been the subject of favorable newspaper editorials and articles throughout the land.

Requests have poured in to my office from a great many patriotic groups interested in bulk supplies.

Many of my colleagues in the House and Senate have requested additional copies to furnish American Legion posts, church groups, business, legal, and other groups, as well as libraries in their States.

The Government Printing Office is distributing the document to purchasers at a cost of 70 cents per copy.

But there are a great many Americans who, I believe, might well receive complimentary copies of the document and who should be furnished copies directly through congressional offices.

I feel that it is an exceptionally sound investment of money for the Congress to authorize an additional printing of the manual.

The resolution which I am introducing today contemplates the publication of an additional 2,000 copies.

What has happened, it may be asked, to the small initial printing?

The answer is that the overwhelming bulk of the initial supply of the document has been made available by request to security offices of Federal agencies.

AGENCY HEADS PRAISE DOCUMENT

The security offices have requested an ever increasing number of copies for their official purposes.

The security officers as well as the heads of many agencies have written to me in high praise of the document. This includes messages from every single one of the intelligence and security agencies of our Government, as well as from those agencies outside the regular security field, as such, but interested naturally in the security of their own personnel.

It is my earnest hope, therefore, that the manual will be quickly reprinted so that it can become available to many other interested sources.

Let me conclude by pointing out that work on the manual represents almost a solid year of effort.

I am hoping that from time to time additional fine effort will be expended and that the manual will be brought up to date so that it can be of maximum utility.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS OF COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 201), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the hearings held before the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, pursuant to Public Law 220, 83d Congress, together with certain matter pertaining thereto, be printed as a Senate document with illustrations, and that additional copies shall be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF TASK-FORCE REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 202), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the task-force reports of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, created pursuant to Public Law 220, 83d Congress, be printed together as a Senate document with illustrations, and that additional copies shall be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED SALARIES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE JUDICIARY—CORRECTION OF BILL AND AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the fact that in the bill (S. 1663), to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes, as reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, there was a typographical error on page 4, line 16. The Senate

already has corrected this by an amendment adopted on January 11. I have pending an amendment, lettered C of January 18, 1954, designed to implement one of the recommendations of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, which deals with this particular line of the bill. I now send forward a modification of my amendment lettered C of January 18, 1954, to accomplish the original purpose of that amendment, and at the same time take cognizance of the previous correction of the typographical error to which I have just referred. I ask that there be a star print of this amendment lettered C, so that the amendment, in proper form, may be on the table to be called up when the bill comes before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEON SILVERMAN—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2638) for the relief of Leon Silverman, introduced by me on January 7, 1954, be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. May I inquire as to the nature of the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a private relief bill. Its purpose has been accomplished.

Mr. THYE. Is that the bill dealing with Mr. Silverman that we have been reading about?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is indefinitely postponed.

AIR FORCE APPROPRIATIONS—LETTER FROM THOMAS K. FINLETTER AND ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter, appearing in the New York Times this morning, January 26, signed by the former Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, coauthor of the famous Finletter report. The letter is also signed by Mr. Roswell Gilpatric, former Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. President, I do not believe there are many Americans who know more about the subject of air power in its relation to appropriations and expenditures than do these two gentlemen.

For that reason I read with regret their analysis of the recently published budget of the Department of Defense, in which they state that this budget "does not provide adequate funds for the building of the kind of United States airpower which is so necessary in this time of increasing Russian air-atomic strength."

Mr. President, I do not know whether this criticism is justified. I only know of my respect for its authors.

I am now analyzing the new budget in its relation to statements made by the administration with respect to the necessary emphasis upon airpower. To that end, I am asking questions in the Armed Services Committee, and I shall then take the liberty of presenting my conclusions on the floor of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR FORCE BUDGET EXAMINED—PROPOSED FUNDS DEEMED INADEQUATE FOR AIR-ATOMIC STRIKING POWER

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The impression has been given in new accounts about next year's Federal budget, just submitted to Congress, that there has been a great increase in the amounts available to the Air Force, relative to the Army and Navy. So far as expenditures are concerned, this is true. But to understand the real effect of a military budget we must be aware of the difference between expenditures and new obligational authority.

Expenditures in the fiscal year 1955 are the result of new obligational authority granted for as long as 4 years past. The expenditures in fiscal year 1955 are therefore in large part the result of past policies. If we want to understand what is being planned for the military services for the future we must look at the new obligational authority—the extent to which the services are to be allowed to commit the United States Government for the future.

Looking at expenditures only, as we have said, it does appear as though the proposed budget for fiscal year 1955 gives the Air Force a great emphasis. The estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1955 are: Army $10 billion, Navy $10.5 billion, Air Force $16.2 billion.

ALLOTMENT FOR 1955

But when we look at the figures of new obligational authority in the budget which has just been submitted we find that the figures (exclusive of military public works) are $8.2 billion Army, $9.8 billion Navy, and $11.2 billion Air Force. These figures, it will be noted, carry on the roughly equal division of the defense dollar which prevailed through fiscal year 1952 but was broken for 1 year only, in fiscal year 1953.

This continuance of the roughly equal division of the defense dollar would not be serious were it not for the limitation on air power which is its inevitable product. When the very proper desire to hold total military spending within the lowest limits possible is combined with the roughly equal division of what is available among the three services, we inevitably end up with a budget which does not put the proper top priority on air-atomic striking power.

An example may bring this out. At a time when our retaliatory air-atomic power is being emphasized more than ever as our national policy the amount allowed to the Air Force for aircraft procurement in the proposed budget for fiscal year 1955 is even less than was appropriated under last year's reduced budget. We mention this item of aircraft procurement because it has important bearing on the future volume of our retaliatory striking power.

It is our conclusion that the proposed budget does not provide adequate funds for the building of the kind of United States air power which is so necessary in this time of increasing Russian air-atomic strength.

THOMAS K. FINLETTER.
ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC.

NEW YORK, *January 22, 1954.*

GOVERNMENT-CONDUCTED STRIKE POLLS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement on Government-conducted strike polls heretofore submitted to the Senate and House Labor Committees by William H. Davis, former Chairman of the War Labor Board; Jesse Freidin, former General Counsel; and Theodore W. Kheel, the former Executive Director. The views of these prominent authorities in the field of labor-management relations are based upon the experience of the old War Labor Board in conducting strike polls under the Smith-Connally Act. That experience shows that such elections often encourage strikes, rather than serve as a means of averting them; that the overwhelming majority of employees polled cast their ballots in favor of striking to win their demands; and that oftentimes the mere fact that the Federal Government is conducting a strike poll has the effect of placing the seal of approval on the union's demand, which obviously can be injurious to the interests of management.

I am sure that Members of the Senate will be interested in studying the facts submitted by Messrs. Davis, Freidin, and Kheel in their statement, particularly because of the President's recommendation that such strike polls should be conducted, and for the further reason that there is now before the Senate Labor Committee a bill—S. 2650—which contains a provision that authorizes, after the strike commences, a poll by the Federal Government of employees in industries affecting interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED TO SENATE AND HOUSE LABOR COMMITTEES BY WILLIAM H. DAVIS, JESSE FREIDIN, AND THEODORE W. KHEEL

During the war the National War Labor Board had extensive experience with strike polls under the Smith-Connally law. This and related experience leads us to the firm conclusion that strike polls by Government edict, whether they are conducted before or after a strike begins, are not a useful expedient for minimizing strikes. On the contrary, they have the opposite effect.

American workingmen have consistently construed strike polls as a means of demonstrating their support of their union's demands. Time and again they voted in Smith-Connally elections by overwhelming majorities to authorize a strike. In the years 1944, 1945, and 1946 the Government conducted 2,168 of these costly and time-consuming polls involving 26,630 employers. In 1,850 of these the vote was to strike. Of 1,926,811 valid ballots cast, 1,593,936 favored a strike. Only 332,874 were opposed. These votes were then projected as proof of the employees' determination to win their demands.

The net result was to give the added force of a Government-sponsored election to the union's demands, principally to the prejudice of the employer. For this, among other reasons, these elections acted more as an incitation for strikes than as a means of avoiding them. Thus an atmosphere of tension and conflict was imposed on the negotiations at a time when the emphasis should have been on developing a mutual willingness to be persuaded. Even where no thought of a strike existed unions called for a vote and injected the strike threat into the negotiations, then claiming that the strike enjoyed the dignity of Government sanction.

The same basic misconception of the attitude of the American workingman was formerly contained in the requirement for union-shop elections under the Taft-Hartley

law. It was thought that given a secret and free opportunity to express their views, workers would disavow the demands of their leaders. But precisely the reverse occurred. In polls for or against a union shop under this provision, the result was preponderantly in favor of the union shop in elections involving more than 90 percent of all employees voting. Again this placed a form of Government approval on the union's demand. Senator Taft finally proposed eliminating the union-shop poll from the law. His amendment passed the Senate unanimously and only a handful dissented in the House of Representatives.

The same erroneous concept regarding employees is contained in the requirement for an election on the employer's last offer at the end of an 80-day injunction under the emergency-disputes provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. In every case except one (where special circumstances existed) the employees voted against the last offer. Strike support then crystallized and the difficulty of judgment was enhanced. As a result, the "watchdog committee" of Congress, set up under the Taft-Hartley law, with Senator Ball as chairman, recommended abolishing the poll as futile.

Except for Taft-Hartley emergency disputes elections, what we have thus far described applies only to polls conducted before a strike begins. The bill introduced by Senator SMITH requiring a poll after a strike is under way is even more destructive of labor-dispute settlements. If employees are prone to support union demands before a strike starts, surely it can be expected that they will support them after a strike takes place. Then the union's demands will have received the support of a Government election. The possibility of compromise will have unquestionably diminished. It may be that some strikes would end as a result of such polls. It is far more likely that the majority would be prolonged and rendered far more difficult to solve.

All of this indicates, in our opinion, that strike polls will do more harm than good. To the extent that they impede, as they will, the orderly settlement of labor disputes, they are unfair to the public which would bear the brunt of the additional labor conflicts. They are also unfair to the employers and employees who sustain the direct burden of the strikes. And they are particularly unfair to employers because, in effect, they place a Government stamp of approval on union demands.

For these reasons, we strongly oppose Government strike polls. We respectfully submit our views based on the experience outlined above for your consideration.

PETITIONS IN FAVOR OF THE BRICKER RESOLUTION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the President of the Senate and the attention of my colleagues to the petitions which are at the desk, and which have been gathered by the women of America. "All these petitions are in support of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1. I am told there are approximately 500,000 of them; and they are coming into my office, as well as to my colleagues' offices, very rapidly, even now.

These petitions are submitted in the exercise of a constitutional right, the constitutional right of the American people to petition their Government for a redress of grievances. If this right—and thank God it is their right in this country—were exercised in some places in the world today, the petitioners would be immediately arrested. We wish to preserve that sacred right, as well as all other rights under the Constitution. Senate Joint Resolution 1, supported by these hundreds of thousands of petitions, would do exactly that.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—NOTICE OF MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the basis of my study of Senate Joint Resolution 1, the so-called Bricker amendment, I find myself in complete agreement with the President of the United States. I feel that the proposal deserves a more careful study by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Therefore, as the representative of the Independent Party, I shall place at the desk, and shall raise at the first opportunity when the Senate is debating the Bricker amendment, the following motion:

I move to recommit to the Committee on the Judiciary Senate Joint Resolution 1, the so-called Bricker amendment, for further consideration.

I ask that the motion lie at the desk until such time as I can raise it in the course of debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in legislative session, the motion will be printed and lie on the table.

CONFERRING OF CUBAN DECORATION UPON DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, a citation was recently given by His Excellency, Ambassador Aurelio Concheso, when the envoy of our good neighbor Republic of Cuba invested my friend and constituent, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs and advisory editor of the Americas, with the insignia of the decoration, Carlos Manuel de Céspedes.

Since the editorial headquarters of the world-famous journal of inter-American cultural history, the Americas, is located in the State of Maryland, it is a satisfaction to me and to the other citizens of Maryland to know that a member of our community has been awarded the highest national decoration of our sister Republic of Cuba. Cuba and the Cubans are dear to our hearts. We know that it was Carlos Manuel de Céspedes who raised the cry for independence and who sacrificed his career, his talents, his family, and his life in order to lay the foundations for the Cuban nation. All who are working for the cause of inter-American amity are delighted that the national chapter of the Order of Carlos Manuel de Céspedes voted unanimously to confer this decoration upon Dr. Thorning. It is also gratifying to realize that this unanimous vote was approved by His Excellency, President Fulgencio Batista of Cuba, a loyal friend of the United States of America, and by His Excellency, Foreign Minister Miguel Angel Campa, also noted for his good will toward our country.

I should like to add that, at the same ceremonies which honored Dr. Thorning, high decorations were conferred upon Mr. Robert H. Shields, of New York, president and general counsel of the United States Beet Sugar Association; Maj. Polan Banks, a novelist and film producer of prominence; Mr. George Maurice Morris, executive chairman of the Inter-American Bar Association; and Maj. Gen. Roger M. Ramey of the United States Air Force, a hero of World War II.

The citation given Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, who has also been decorated by many other nations, reads as follows:

The illustrious Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, one of the editors of that splendid magazine, the Americas, doctor, honoris causa, of many universities: writer, orator, and diplomat, who each year on Pan American Day opens the ceremonies in the United States Congress, and who on May 20, 1953, commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Republic of Cuba, in the year of José Martí, had the distinction of opening the session in the United States Senate, is cited.

Cuba decorates him with the Order of Carlos Manuel de Céspedes, for he is one of her best friends in the United States, a personal friend and admirer of our President.

The Order of Carlos Manuel de Céspedes, the highest decoration conferred by the Cuban Government, created to honor one of the founders of our nation, honors also those Cubans and foreign citizens who have served our country and our people in an outstanding manner.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Eugene James Lyons, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Laurence McKinley Gould, of Minnesota, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation;

Edward Steidle, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review;

Robert O. Boyd, of Oregon, to be a member of the National Mediation Board, for the remainder of the term expiring February 1, 1954;

Robert O. Boyd, of Oregon, to be a member of the National Mediation Board, for the term expiring February 1, 1957 (reappointment); and

Albert Cummins Beeson, of California, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, for the remainder of the term expiring December 16, 1954, vice Paul L. Styles, resigned.

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH KOREA

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the treaty, Executive A (83d Cong., 2d sess.), a mutual-defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington

on October 1, 1953, which was read the second time, as follows:

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The Parties to this Treaty,

Reaffirming their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments, and desiring to strengthen the fabric of peace in the Pacific area.

Desiring to declare publicly and formally their common determination to defend themselves against external armed attack so that no potential aggressor could be under the illusion that either of them stands alone in the Pacific area,

Desiring further to strengthen their efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security pending the development of a more comprehensive and effective system of regional security in the Pacific area,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Parties undertake to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations, or obligations assumed by any Party toward the United Nations.

ARTICLE II

The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of either of them, the political independence or security of either of the Parties is threatened by external armed attack. Separately and jointly, by self help and mutual aid, the Parties will maintain and develop appropriate means to deter armed attack and will take suitable measures in consultation and agreement to implement this Treaty and to further its purposes.

ARTICLE III

Each Party recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific area on either of the Parties in territories now under their respective administrative control, or hereafter recognized by one of the Parties as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the other, would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

ARTICLE IV

The Republic of Korea grants, and the United States of America accepts, the right to dispose United States land, air, and sea forces in and about the territory of the Republic of Korea as determined by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE V

This Treaty shall be ratified by the United States of America and the Republic of Korea in accordance with their respective constitutional processes and will come into force when instruments of ratification thereof have been exchanged by them at Washington.

ARTICLE VI

This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely. Either Party may terminate it one year after notice has been given to the other Party.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

Done in duplicate at Washington, in the English and Korean languages, this first day of October 1953.

For the United States of America:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

For the Republic of Korea:

Y. T. PYUN.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, about a year ago this Congress was asked to consider a very serious problem concerning our trade with other nations.

At that time it became apparent that there were two schools of thought—schools so divergent that a practical solution would be most difficult.

It was finally agreed that we should authorize the appointment of a special commission to study thoroughly the entire question of our foreign commerce in order to seek a solution in the best interests of our Nation.

That commission was appointed under the provisions of Public Law 215, 83d Congress, 1st session, approved August 7, 1953. It was given until March 6 of this year to make its report. Even though its available time was admittedly short for a subject so complicated, we now find that the study has ended and the report has already been made, some 6 weeks ahead of the deadline.

Two members of the commission, the distinguished Representative from New York Mr. REED, and the distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania, Mr. SIMPSON, felt impelled to call attention to this in a statement dissenting to the general recommendations.

They further pointed out—and I quote from the joint statement of general dissent by Mr. REED and Mr. SIMPSON that—

> There is no evidence in the report of serious consideration of the exhaustive studies prepared and submitted by many affected domestic industries. Spokesmen for industries vitally affected were not permitted to testify.

Another quotation from the joint statement of Mr. REED and Mr. SIMPSON is equally significant:

> The only witnesses allowed to appear at public hearings held by the commission in the United States were representatives mainly of recognized pressure groups whose views were known in advance. Witnesses in the United States were allowed 2 days for appearance; those appearing at private hearings in Europe, whose primary interest was to obtain help for foreign countries, were allowed 4 days.

Mr. President, these facts alone are sufficient to cast grave doubt in my mind on any conclusions or recommendations the commission may have made with respect to the tariff situation.

The plight of our own industries affected by our foreign trade policies is by far the most important among all the considerations which were before this commission, and I am certain that no action will be taken by this Congress until they have been given an opportunity to tell their side of the story.

I have the honor, in part, to represent a State to which the decisions reached by the Congress on tariff and trade matters are of tremendous moment. Pennsylvania bows to no other State in the Nation in the great variety and importance of its industry. From the Golden Triangle of Pittsburgh to the great plants and factories along its eastern border, Pennsylvania produces thousands of products and items essential to our daily life.

It may surprise Senators to know how many of our great industries are seriously threatened by unrestrained foreign imports made possible by this Nation's current tariff policies.

There are the great chemical plants around Philadelphia, the china and pottery industries in the western area, the widespread coal fields, the steel mills of Pittsburgh and adjoining sections, the industries making glassware, lace, carpets, rubber footwear, wallpaper, hats, cutlery, watches, dairy products, textiles, and the scientific and optical instrument business which is important to many communities of my State.

Spokesmen for every one of these industries have recently gone on record as asserting that they are endangered by foreign competition, largely because of the high wages paid in the United States compared to the low wages paid abroad.

In this connection, I call particular attention to a statement made in the Randall Report's discussion of Labor Standards in International Competition:

> Neither low wages nor low unit labor costs, in and of themselves, constitute "unfair competition".

Mr. President, if slave labor and degrading working conditions do not constitute unfair competition to American high standards of living and working, then I do not understand the words. Yet, although the Randall Report urges the continuation of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements, it also recommends further tariff reductions—without regard to reciprocity.

Mr. President, the people of my State do not want tariffs reduced further. Instead, they need adequate tariff protection if the industries I have enumerated are to remain prosperous and our workers are to hold their jobs and maintain their standard of living.

Strangely enough, the Commission's majority report seems to recognize this fact, even though its recommendations ignore it. I quote from one of the most pertinent paragraphs of the entire report:

> It must be borne in mind that in considering matter of international trade and its enlargement the Commission was required to consider such enlargement as would be consistent with a sound domestic economy. This qualification is as important as the positive part of the directive given us.
>
> Even abroad it is recognized that, national security having been assured, the most important single element essential to the expansion of world trade and strengthening of the free world is the maintenance of a sound and strong economy in the United States.

No statement could be truer.

The report then goes on to consider the different classes of American industry and asserts that, when labor is the major cost of production imports cannot be merely serious, but destructive, to the domestic industry without a tariff.

How, then, can the Commission majority justify its failure to propose legislation which would recognize these facts and provide a practical method for the relief of those industries that are being destroyed?

When I say that industries, or great portions of them, are literally being destroyed, I do not exaggerate. One of the great industries of my State is the textile industry. Today the textile industry is facing serious trouble.

For example, imports of rayon staple made with cheap foreign labor are coming in at the rate of almost 100 million

pounds a year—equal to one-third of our domestic production. Mills in this country are working short schedules, and hundreds of American workers have been laid off.

This could only be expected, however, under a tariff policy which gives our workers and our companies no protection. For the wages we pay our workers are seven times as high as the Japanese worker receives and almost four times that of the textile employee in Great Britain.

My State is one of the Nation's great producers of coal. Our present trade policies have made possible the dumping of enough foreign residual fuel oil along the Atlantic coast today to displace almost 50 million tons of coal each year. The coal industry has appealed for relief, both from this Congress and from the executive branch, but nothing has been done, and mines are closing down, and thousands of miners are idle.

These are only two examples, but they are typical of American business that can no longer maintain wage rates and support living standards from 2 to 8 times higher than those of other countries unless we prevent the unfair competition from low-wage nations which are taking over their markets.

Mr. President, my remarks should not be taken as implying any criticism of the individual members of the President's Commission. All are conscientious men. They have served hard and freely in a task to which they were called by the President and this Congress.

But in all sincerity, Mr. President, I must insist that their conclusions are not only inadequate to solve this problem, but indeed if enacted into law by Congress, would spell economic catastrophe for America and for millions of Americans.

Neither, however, will we serve our country if we simply reject this report and let matters ride as they are.

The time has long been due for positive recognition by the Congress of the critical plight in which many industries and their wage earners find themselves.

Congress must now reassume its responsibility under the Constitution and take back its control over tariffs and foreign trade.

We must recognize that the policies we have followed for the past two decades have been detrimental to America, and if continued will prove even more disastrous now that the world is gradually returning to a peacetime economy.

We owe it to our country to approach this vital matter seriously and sanely, with full recognition that the economic stability of our own country is the most vital factor to the peace of all nations.

It is, indeed, unfortunate that the President's Commission's report has failed to recognize so many elements of this problem and their true impact on our people.

Let us make sure that Congress does not make the same error.

We must do all in our power to encourage full, fair trade among nations. But we must see that this trade is really fair, and we must restrict it when it means the loss of jobs for American workers and the bankruptcy of American industry.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, before I turn to the subject of the Korean Treaty, I am glad to bring to the attention of the Senate additional expressions from all over the Nation in opposition to the Bricker amendment, as follows:

First. An editorial from the Hartford Courant as reprinted in the Milwaukee Journal.

Second. An editorial from the January 30, 1954, issue of the National Catholic weekly, America.

Third. The text of a telegram from Mrs. Irving M. Engel, president of the National Council of Jewish Women.

Fourth. A press release from the American Association of University Women.

Fifth. An editorial from the Colorado Springs Free Press.

Sixth. An editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

I ask unanimous consent that these messages be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

EISENHOWER AND THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

(From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant)

At his press conference January 13 President Eisenhower expressed his opposition to the Bricker amendment, which would restrict the President's historic treaty-making powers. On top of this public affirmation the President has told his official family that he is so unalterably opposed to the Bricker amendment that he is ready to stake his leadership on the issue. Since Senator Bricker lined up 63 other Senators behind his proposed constitutional amendment long before the rest of us took note of the issue, this may mean a first-class fight.

Under our constitutional system it is inevitable that, at some point, there be a showdown between President and Congress. The events of the last year and the looming shadow of next fall's elections have so shaped things that, for President Eisenhower, this showdown must come within the next 6 months. If the Bricker amendment becomes the sticking point, there could hardly be a better issue. This has the makings of a great constitutional debate, and a victory for the President could clear the air and give great purpose and stature to the administration.

The issue itself is intricate. And Senator Bricker has behind him not only popular support from the surviving isolationists, but a considerable and respectable legal backing. It represents, in 20th century form, the 18th century thinking that clung to the Articles of Confederation and resisted the Federal Constitution. This opposition can be overcome only in the great tradition of our political debates. On top of that there is gathering behind the Bricker amendment political resentment at the administration, notably but by no means exclusively in the midwest. The sum total of these forces is powerful.

No doubt because of the political realities, President Eisenhower is willing to accept something like Senator KNOWLAND's compromise amendment. This provides what most of us have long been willing to take for granted, that any treaty or international agreement that contravenes the Constitution is null and void. It also goes beyond the requirement the founders of the Constitution wrote, after careful thought and debate, that treaties must be ratified by two-thirds of the Senators present. The compromise would require two-thirds of the entire membership.

To go further than such a compromise would so tie the hands of the President and Secretary of State as to make this great Nation a stumblebum, incapable of coping with the great and swift-moving forces of this cold-war world. That is why the President says thus far, and no further. And in this the President will surely find the country substantially behind him. Just so Presidents throughout the turbulent years of this century have found the country behind them, in issues recognizing that today's changed world requires that we lead the free world, and stand as first guardian of western civilization. Here, then, is one more indication that President Eisenhower has the makings of a great President.

Before the clash becomes sharper than it is already, those 63 Senators who casually associated themselves with Senator BRICKER might well consider the future. * * * On this issue let them stand by their President. For he is right.

[From America of January 30, 1954]

HOW MUCH TO GIVE BRICKER?

Senate Majority Leader KNOWLAND, after failing to effect a compromise with Senator BRICKER, expressed his belief on January 16 that some sort of amendment regarding the treaty power would be proposed by Congress. Other Senators, impressed by the mountains of mail they have received in favor of the Bricker amendment (America, January 23, pp. 415–417), have been saying that we must give BRICKER something. Since many of them have no fondness for the Ohioan's dangerous proposals, however, they may take a stronger position as more and more conservatives come out against the change. They may also be impressed by the solemn warnings delivered recently by such respected political analysts as Roscoe Drummond, Walter Lippmann, Arthur Krock, and Anne O'Hare McCormick. It is already fairly certain that the Senate will not buy the notorious "which clause" in section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, requiring (in certain cases) action by 48 State legislatures to give effect to treaties and international agreements. So the question has become: "Should we give BRICKER what remains of Senate Joint Resolution 1 in the form of an amendment?" We fully agree with the New York Times editorial contention of January 20: "The Constitution of the United States is so fundamental a document that we think it highly unwise to tamper with it unless a genuine and desirable change in its meaning is to be brought about." We seriously question whether even the Knowland substitute amendment is desirable. It simply reaffirms the supremacy of the Constitution over treaties and provides for a recorded yea or nay vote by the Senate when approving a treaty. A change in the Senate's rules could bring into effect that highly desirable requirement. This reform, and a solemn reaffirmation of our constitutional principles relating to the treaty power such as Senator KEFAUVER proposes, should allay fears of abuses.

COPY OF TELEGRAM SENT TO SENATORS WILLIAM LANGER, LYNDON JOHNSON, AND WILLIAM KNOWLAND

JANUARY 19, 1954.

The National Council of Jewish Women urges you to exert every effort to defeat passage in the Senate of Senate Joint Resolution 1 to limit the treatymaking power of the President. Despite all the protestations of the resolution's supporters to the effect that the resolution will do nothing but protect the status quo, it is clear that the adoption of this proposed amendment to the Constitution would, in effect, strangle the

President's power to make treaties and conduct our foreign relations. United States foreign policy would become subject to the conflicting interests of the various States and the special interests that make themselves felt through the Congress instead of being the function of the executive branch of our Government representing the union of interests of our Nation. May we also call to your attention that while this resolution was considered by many of its original supporters as a way of meeting what they consider to be an important international problem, those interested in killing United States participation in the United Nations have seized upon the Bricker resolution as an easy means of achieving their end. Adoption of the Bricker amendment would, we believe, do irreparable harm to the foreign relations of the United States. In the best interest of our national security and well-being we urgently recommend you to seek the defeat of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Mrs. IRVING M. ENGEL,
President, National Council of Jewish Women.

[News release of the American Association of University Women, Washington, D. C.]

AAUW OPPOSES ANY BRICKER COMPROMISE ALTERING CONSTITUTIONAL POWER BALANCE

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 22.—The American Association of University Women today took a stand against any compromise on the Bricker amendment, which would have the effect of altering the balance of power under the Constitution or which would hamper the President in his conduct of foreign policy.

The AAUW position was stated in a wire to Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, majority leader, signed by Dr. Meribeth E. Cameron, of South Hadley, Mass., chairman of the AAUW international relations committee, and by Dr. Hallie Farmer, of Montevallo, Ala., chairman of the association's legislative program committee.

Today's action reaffirmed AAUW opposition to the Bricker amendment—a stand first announced during the 82d Congress in a statement presented to the Senate Judiciary Committee. A similar statement opposing the Bricker amendment was presented during the first session of the 83d Congress.

The association has consistently opposed the Bricker amendment on the ground that it would destroy the first principle of our republican form of government, namely, the delicate balance of power among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. In addition, it would strip the Federal Government of its power as a sovereign state to make certain treaties and, in effect, transfer this power back to the 48 individual States. AAUW statements have stressed that the effect of the Bricker amendment on the making of executive agreements would be to hamper dangerously the Executive at a time when the need for prompt and dynamic leadership in foreign affairs is a vital necessity.

Back of today's AAUW committee action is the overwhelming vote of the AAUW biennial convention in June 1953 in favor of a resolution to support "existing constitutional provisions for the conduct of foreign policy." The resolution was adopted by convention delegates as one of the guiding principles of the AAUW study-action program for the next 2 years. On the basis of this resolution, the legislative program committee, meeting in Washington, D. C., last November, reaffirmed AAUW opposition to the Bricker amendment.

[From the Colorado Springs Free Press]

HAMSTRINGING THE PRESIDENT

The sincere and lucid supporters of the Bricker amendment believe that they are protecting the United States against abuses of treaty powers.

Their primary fear is that the United Nations might develop into a supranational government which could adopt international agreements in conflict with our own Constitution and local laws.

In addition to this fear of the United Nations, there is also the recollection among many people of a strong President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who on many occasions, at Casablanca, Cairo, Tehran, and Yalta, made commitments to foreign leaders simply as a powerful individual.

With one eye on the United Nations and the other on the Roosevelt record, many Members of Congress and many people throughout the Nation have come to support an amendment which would subject treaties and executive agreements to a rather complex system of legislative control.

The amendment, which would be the 23d to the Constitution, would require majority approval by both Senate and House before a treaty could become law. Present statute requires ratification only by two-thirds of the Senate. The amendment would also prohibit the President from negotiating any treaty that might be contrary to the laws of an individual State.

As President Eisenhower said at his press conference last week, the Founding Fathers of this Republic rewrote the Articles of Confederation under which each State could repudiate a treaty, because they felt that the President should represent only one government.

Secretary of State Dulles has also pointed out that the present system, as worked out by the Founding Fathers, has worked well for 160 years. "No treaty has yet been made," the Secretary has said, "which can be cited as an example of the abuse of the treatymaking power."

Since the beginning of the American Republic it has been the practice to deal in treaties with matters that are appropriate and usual for international agreements, although not within the expressly delegated powers of Congress for domestic legislation.

The section of the Bricker amendment which would give Congress the power to regulate executive agreements goes far beyond the power Congress already has in this field. It would, for example, destroy the President's power to make international agreements to meet emergencies like the Berlin blockade.

We feel that the sincere supporters of the Bricker amendment have performed a patriotic service in bringing their fears to the attention of the American public at this moment in our history. We also believe, however, that this seemingly vicarious desire to limit and hamstring the President in his power to deal with foreign governments can only bring vacillation, indecision, and chaos.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

SENATOR BUSH SPEAKS OUT

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut, has announced the first open break in the serried senatorial ranks which—both incautiously and prematurely—signed up behind the Bricker amendment. Senator BUSH cannot support the amendment in its present form, and has proposed a measure along the lines of the much milder compromise which Senators KNOWLAND and FERGUSON have been trying to promote. A half dozen others among the Bricker forces are known to be wavering; meanwhile, really powerful pressures are being raised by citizens' committees, publicists, and the press in support of the President's resolute position on this issue, and the Bricker drive is getting onto definitely shaky ground.

The truth is that as discussion has more clearly brought out the real meaning of the proposed amendment, its unwisdom has become more clearly apparent. The basic purpose is to transfer effective conduct of foreign affairs from the President to Congress. To this end it makes three proposals. Of these, the first merely declares what is already accepted law; the second, which would in effect repeal one of the fundamental bases on which the Constitution was erected, would be disastrously disruptive and paralyzing; the third, which gives Congress power to regulate executive agreements, is so vague as to be without any precise meaning at all. Even if there were any valid reason for putting Congress in place of President Eisenhower in the control of foreign policy—which there is not—this would not be the way to do it.

Senator BUSH has seen the force of the argument; others of his colleagues must soon do so. If a compromise formula which retains only the first of the Bricker proposals will smooth the way, there seems no compelling reason why it should not be put forward. But Senator BRICKER has been consistent in refusing to take such a substitution and it seems to this newspaper that it is better that the issue should be squarely met and squarely answered. Once it comes under full debate, the answer will surely be plain.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I may say that the petitions referred to awhile ago by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], are sent to the Senate in accordance with an American right, of course. However, I have before me now expressions of sentiment on the part of many other citizens, one church group, alone, representing approximately 20 million people, as I stated yesterday, which indicate clearly that America is waking up to the threat involved in the Bricker amendment. I am glad that as time goes on the atmosphere is being cleared, the smoke of misrepresentation and abuse is being dissipated, and there is coming to the minds of people who think a complete realization of what the amendment would do to our beloved Constitution.

I have received letters filled with emotion and hate because of the position I have taken. They indicate that I want to do something injurious to the Constitution. That shows how utterly erroneous the information has been which has gone forth to certain groups.

Mr. President, I desire now to discuss the pending treaty.

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH KOREA

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the treaty, Executive A (83d Cong., 2d sess.), a Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on October 1, 1953.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I preface my question by saying if anyone who is interested in knowing why the Bricker amendment was presented, will take the trouble to read the debate in the Senate in 1945, when the Senate, unanimously, with the exception of only one Member, voted to ratify the charter of the United Nations, he will find that the people of the Nation, and almost every Senator, were so imbued with the thought that the charter of the United

Nations would be the instrumentality of preventing another world war that the hope was expressed by many, including Members of the Senate who discussed the charter, that posterity would look upon that action as it did upon the work of the Philadelphia Convention of 1787, when the Nation was formed.

Some very eloquent and wonderful speeches were made on the floor of the Senate at that time, but only one minor part of the charter was discussed, and that was done by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who raised the question as to what kind of agreement would be involved if the Security Council called on the President of the United States to send troops abroad in the event of another war, or to stop an aggression which might lead to a major conflict. The Senator from Michigan hazarded a guess that in such a case a treaty would have to be submitted to the Senate. That viewpoint was challenged, primarily on the ground that the Security Council was only a part of the United Nations, that the United Nations was not a super sovereign government, and that never in the past had we negotiated a treaty except with a sovereign nation.

At the time of the debate there was no discussion of the fact that an international FEPC was involved in the United Nations Charter, and also the question of human rights, which some persons claim can, if acted on in a certain way change our Bill of Rights. So, as I say, without any mature consideration of what the Charter meant, but in an impulsive way, all but one Member of the Senate voted for its ratification.

In 1948 we find the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare considering an FEPC bill. That committee reported a bill, with a substantial number of Senators signing their names to the report, stating that, regardless of whether such a bill could be authorized by our Constitution, it was authorized by the Charter of the United Nations.

Again, when a President of the United States seized the steel companies without any apparent authority, so far as the average lawyer or Member of Congress knew, the Chief Justice of the United States and two other judges who agreed with him held that, even if the President did not have the power he claimed under the Constitution, he had it under the Charter of the United Nations. Consequently, many of us felt that it would be quite appropriate to insert in the Constitution, a clear definition of what all good constitutional lawyers said had been the law all the time—and I agree with that viewpoint—that no treaty which violates the Constitution of the United States can be valid and effective.

Another treaty is now brought before the Senate, a treaty with Korea. I find in the report of the committee that the heart of the treaty is article III, which recites:

ARTICLE III

Each party recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific area on either of the parties in territories now under their respective administrative control, or hereafter recognized by one of the parties as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the other, would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

The question I desire to ask my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, which reported the treaty, is this: Will he be good enough to make it crystal clear to us in his explanation of the treaty to what extent under this treaty we are being committed to a future war on the mainland of Asia? The article of the treaty to which I have just referred provides that our aid will be rendered in accordance with constitutional processes.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that, certainly, would clear up the question raised by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] with reference to constitutional processes in connection with the United Nations.

We all know that when the United Nations voted to enter the Korean war to try to stem the communistic aggression of North Korea, the President of the United States furnished troops, and Congress, to this day, has never been asked to vote or given the privilege of voting on the question whether the Congress should carry out the provision of the Constitution that the Nation cannot make war except by an act of Congress.

I wish the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee would discuss this particular aspect of the treaty. Will we be committed to war if, at the end of the stalled negotiations in the Far East, the President of Korea decides he has had enough of such tactics, that North Koreans are in the territory of South Korea, as indeed they are, and that situation justifies South Korea to make war. In that event will we also be at war, under this provision? If that is what we are being committed to, certainly we should not go to war until Congress so votes.

Mr. President, I hope the distinguished chairman of the committee will not leave in doubt any provision of the treaty. Most of us have had little opportunity to consider it. We are all busy with other committees. I had four committee meetings today, and could not attend them all, and from now on there will be constant meetings of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am on five subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, and they will be in constant session. Of necessity I must rely upon the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, when that committee reports a treaty, to explain it fully in order that I may vote intelligently. I frankly admit that I am not one who wants to confess to the Nation that the Senate is incapable of analyzing treaties which it is called upon to ratify. If I thought that such was the case I would say, Change the Constitution and let the House of Representatives approve treaties.

I have pointed out that we ratified the most far-reaching treaty in the form of a charter in our history. We did not know what was in it. We do not yet know everything that is in it in its full application. That is the reason why a change in the Constitution is now being proposed. If something comes out of that treaty which is clearly in violation of our Constitution, I want to be sure that it is not going to be the overriding law of this land.

So I call on my distinguished colleague with reference to this and all other treaties that may come before the Senate for approval to make sure that we are fully advised of what we are doing.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a brief question?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I yielded for a brief question a quarter of an hour ago, and my Jeffersonian friend from Virginia delivered quite a speech which was very challenging. I would prefer to carry on with my statement, and I am sure the answer to the question which was finally propounded by the distinguished Senator from Virginia will be as complete as the English language can make it.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator would rather proceed with his speech I shall withhold my question.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in order that it may appear in the RECORD more clearly, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the very brief Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of Korea be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The treaty is as follows:

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The parties to this treaty,

Reaffirming their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments, and desiring to strengthen the fabric of peace in the Pacific area,

Desiring to declare publicly and formally their common determination to defend themselves against external armed attack so that no potential aggressor could be under the illusion that either of them stands alone in the Pacific area,

Desiring further to strengthen their efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security pending the development of a more comprehensive and effective system of regional security in the Pacific area,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The parties undertake to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations, or obligations assumed by any party toward the United Nations.

ARTICLE II

The parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of either of them, the political independence or security of either of the parties is threatened by external armed attack. Separately and jointly, by self-help and mutual aid, the parties will maintain and develop appropriate means to deter armed attack and will take suitable measures in consultation and agreement to implement this treaty and to further its purposes.

ARTICLE III

Each party recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific area on either of the

parties in territories now under their respective administrative control, or hereafter recognized by one of the parties as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the other, would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

ARTICLE IV

The Republic of Korea grants, and the United States of America accepts, the right to dispose of United States land, air, and sea forces in and about the territory of the Republic of Korea as determined by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE V

This treaty shall be ratified by the United States of America and the Republic of Korea in accordance with their respective constitutional processes and will come into force when instruments of ratification thereof have been exchanged by them at Washington.

ARTICLE VI

This treaty shall remain in force indefinitely. Either party may terminate it 1 year after notice has been given to the other party.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty.

Done in duplicate at Washington, in the English and Korean languages, this 1st day of October 1953.

For the United States of America:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

For the Republic of Korea:

Y. T. PYUN.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Thursday, January 21, the Committee on Foreign Relations reported the Mutual Defense Treaty With Korea—Executive A, 83d Congress, 2d session—signed at Washington on October 1, 1953, unanimously recommending that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification at an early date.

When this body gave its approval to the security pact between the United States and Japan in 1951, one of the primary elements which motivated our decision was the conviction that while such a pact was essential to preserving the safety of this country in the Far East, it was also a prerequisite to the restoration of Japan as a free nation in a divided world community. For we knew, and we know now, that if the Soviet Union and a Sovietized China could encompass Japan within their sprawling, expanding orbit, then the power of world communism in the Pacific, buttressed by Japan's great industrial potential, would directly and gravely menace the security of the United States in the westward approaches to this continent.

Parenthetically, Mr. President, I might say that most of us realize that we are no longer living in yesteryear. This little world has changed considerably, even since the beginning of the Second World War, and has become very small, indeed. We have airplanes that can travel a thousand miles an hour. We now have the A-bomb and the H-bomb. We are now able to cross our own continent in a matter of 4 hours, and we can cross the Atlantic in 4 hours, if it is necessary. The result is that every nation is in every other nation's backyard, speaking figuratively and realistically.

I was speaking a moment ago about Japan. Virtually the same considerations are valid with respect to the Mutual Defense Treaty with Korea which the Senate now has before it. If we learned in the Second World War that the Pacific Ocean was a pathway for Japan to attack our westernmost possessions, we have learned, and we should now realize, that the security of Japan depends upon our preserving a free and independent Korea in the territory across the Sea of Japan—territory which points as a bayonet at the heart of the island empire.

The security of Korea is therefore a matter of the most vital concern to the United States, the United Nations, and the free world. One treacherous attempt has already been made to lay hands upon this bastion of freedom, which came perilously close to succeeding. Have we forgotten the ordeal of Pusan? Have we forgotten what the position of Japan and of our forces stationed there would have been had the Communists from North Korea driven the defenders of the republic into the sea?

Many who are experienced in world affairs are convinced that this aggressive attack against Korea, conceived, prepared, and armed by an outside power, might never have been unleased had the enemy been advised in advance—and this is important—that it could expect the United States to react with immediate and vigorous means in aid of the victims. One of Secretary of State Dulles' principal preoccupations has been to avoid this repetition of past error, that we do not again permit a would-be violator of free territory to miscalculate the intentions of the United States. In the words of Mr. Dulles:

I believe, as one looks back at the wars of this century, that it can be said with a high degree of probability that if the aggressors had known in advance what we would do, that probably they would have not committed the acts of aggression.

I think it is absolutely clear as to what we would do, if Korea were again invaded from the north. We would do what we did before.

The important thing is to let that be clearly known. Then, I think it is not likely to happen, but if there is doubt about that, then it is likely to happen.

In short, the primary value of this treaty consists in giving the Communists notice, beyond any possibility of misinterpretation, that if they embark upon another aggression in Korea, the United States will not sit idly by, but that we can be expected to take prompt and adequate measures to meet it. At the same time, the treaty constitutes an additional link in the system of mutual security thus far developed in the Pacific. It fills a gap in the fabric of treaties which have already been concluded between the United States, on the one hand, and the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand, and Japan. Like the other security treaties with these countries, the Korean Treaty provides for consultation and, when necessary, appropriate action. And it reaffirms the belief of the United States that the greatest measure of security is to be found in collective measures.

The provisions of this treaty evidence our desire for peace. It is not a threat to any nation, but rather further proof of our will to live in peace, and to work toward that end through collective action for the protection of the free nations in the Pacific. This is clearly recognized in the preamble, which proclaims the determination of the parties to defend themselves against external armed attack, and to strengthen their efforts for collective defense pending the development of a more effective system of regional security in that area. It is also confirmed in article I, under which the parties undertake to settle by peaceful means any international dispute in which they may be involved, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations, or obligations assumed by any party toward the United Nations.

Whenever either party is of the opinion that the political independence or security of either is threatened by external armed attack, the parties are required, under article II, to consult together. This article, which, as will be noted, incorporates the principle of the Vandenberg resolution—Senate Resolution 239, 80th Congress—obliges the parties, separately and jointly, to undertake, through self-help and mutual aid, to maintain and develop appropriate means to deter armed attack and to implement the treaty.

The heart of the treaty, as was said by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who recently asked me a question, is contained in article III, which received a most careful examination in the committee. It is worded as follows:

Each party recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific area on each of the parties, in territories now under their respective administrative control, or hereafter recognized by one of the parties as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the other, would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

The unusual phraseology of this article relative to territory under the administrative control of one of the parties, was drafted to take cognizance of the fact that at present the Republic of Korea has effective control only over a part of the peninsula, and to anticipate the day when a settlement unifying the country would be reached through processes recognized as lawful by the United States.

It should be emphasized that the treaty does not become operative unless one of the parties is the victim of an external armed attack. It does not extend to the case of large-scale domestic riots or disturbances instigated by an outside power, nor does it apply to the violent overthrow of the Government or to a coup d'etat. An armed attack initiated by one of the parties to the treaty falls outside it's scope. The instrument, in other words, is not an offensive alliance.

More significant, it does not apply to territories not now under the administrative control of either party, nor to territory which is not at some future time recognized by the United States as having been lawfully brought under the administrative control of the other party. In order to eliminate all possible doubts on this score, it was suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]

that there be included in the Senate resolution giving its advice and consent to ratification an interpretative clause worded as follows:

It is the understanding of the United States that neither party is obligated, under article III of the above treaty, to come to the aid of the other except in case of an external armed attack against such party; nor shall anything in the present treaty be construed as requiring the United States to give assistance to Korea except in the event of an armed attack against territory which has been recognized by the United States as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the Republic of Korea.

The suggestion was adopted in the committee. Such an understanding is altogether consistent with the intention of the parties at the time the agreement was being negotiated; for Secretary Dulles indicated to the committee at the hearings that this very point was emphasized to the representatives of the republic when article III was drafted. The United States, under the treaty, reserves for itself the right to determine whether territory not now under the administrative control of Korea has lawfully been brought under such control.

There can be no question, therefore, of the United States becoming involved under this treaty in hostilities resulting from a unilateral attempt by the Government of Korea to unify the country by forceful means or by any other means not regarded as lawful by the United States. Whatever the practical consequences of such action by the other party would be, we are not warranted in assuming that the Republic of Korea will do other than to abide by the terms of the armistice agreement to which they and we have solemnly subscribed.

Mr. President, I believe it is important to call attention to one other element in the formula of article III, which recognizes that the armed attack referred to would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the parties. Any action we take pursuant thereto would then, under this article, be determined in accordance with our constitutional process.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Wisconsin has quoted from article III the phrase "in accordance with its constitutional processes."

Will the Senator explain fully, exactly what is meant by the phrase "in accordance with its constitutional processes," and also give his opinion as to whether or not constitutional processes were met at the time the United States went to war in Korea?

I ask the question in all good faith, and not in criticism of anyone. I was a Member of the Senate at the time the United States went to war in Korea. I did not raise any objection at the time we sent our troops there. However, I believe we have learned something in a practical way about what the clause can mean, and what it did mean, because it is to be found in article 43 of the United Nations Charter, which is on the subject of the use of troops and force.

So I shall appreciate the opinion, conclusion, and assurance of the Senator from Wisconsin as to what is meant by the phrase "in accordance with its constitutional processes," as used in article III of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea.

Mr. WILEY. My reply to that question would be that any action we take under the terms of article III would then be determined in accordance with our constitutional process. This approach follows the principle of the Monroe Doctrine, rather than the "attack upon one is an attack upon all" principle of the North Atlantic Treaty. I think it will be agreed that the Korean treaty approach, which was previously formulated by Mr. Dulles in the Philippine and Australian-New Zealand pacts, has some advantages over the North Atlantic Treaty formula; and it avoids the constitutional question marks which seem to have been suggested by the latter.

The proposed treaty does not change in any way the constitutional relationship between the President and the Congress with respect to the use of the Armed Forces of the United States. What we do will be in accordance with the constitutional processes.

If the Senator will refer to page 5 of the report he will find this language under the headline "'Monroe Doctrine' Formula," paragraph 6:

The second element to be noted in the formula of article III is its replacement of the specific commitment language used in the North Atlantic Treaty—

Which I have just read—

by what Secretary Dulles has called the "Monroe Doctrine" principle. Thus, each party, in article III, recognizes that the armed attack referred to therein would be dangerous to its own peace and safety. The action to be taken would then be determined in accordance with its constitutional process. By contrast, the North Atlantic Treaty formula makes an attack upon one tantamount to an attack upon all, so that such an attack, which might not take place against the United States itself, is nevertheless so regarded.

That is, in the North Atlantic Treaty.

Because of the constitutional issues which the approach suggests, for example, whether an attack upon another gives the President the same inherent right to act as an attack upon United States territory, the language of President Monroe was regarded by Secretary Dulles as preferable when he negotiated the Philippine and Australia-New Zealand Pacts, and is reproduced in the Korean Treaty.

In short, the phraseolgy of article III of the Korean Pact permits the United States to take any action we deem appropriate by our constitutional processes, and gives adequate assurance of support to the other country which may be the victim of an attack. It has the additional advantage of never having been challenged throughout our history, from the constitutional standpoint, as altering the balance of power between the President and Congress.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for another question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Specifically the clause we are discussing means that before the United States can resort to force or use troops, before it can go to war, it will be necessary that the matter be brought before the Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. I think the constitutional process in the case referred to by the Senator from Mississippi would call for a declaration of war by the Congress. I am not so naive as to say, however, that something might not happen which would be in the nature of an attack upon our forces or upon a part of our territory. In such a case we would not wait for a declaration of war; we would go into battle. Constitutional process might also include, withdrawing our ambassador, by the President, issuing of an Executive warning, cutting off aid, and so forth.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will yield further, regardless of what particular circumstances might exist at the time the question may arise, are we committing ourselves now, in agreeing to this treaty, to go to war if Korea is attacked, without any declaration by the Congress?

Mr. WILEY. In my opinion, very definitely the answer is no, but we enter into an undertaking that if there is an overt act by an aggressor upon our ally, then we will do that which we think is advisable and in accordance with our constitutional processes.

Mr. STENNIS. Who is "we"? Is that the Congress, or is it the President?

Mr .WILEY. It is the Congress and the President who have to determine that question.

Mr. STENNIS. Under that interpretation, then, an act of Congress would be required before American forces could be used, or the United States could go to war under the treaty, as the Senator has explained it. Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. As I understand the question, I agree that if an overt act is committed by an aggressor upon an ally, it then rests with the constituted authority, to wit, the Congress, to decide whether or not we shall regard such aggression as a basis for going to war.

Mr. STENNIS. That is the interpretation the Senator from Wisconsin places upon the pact the Senate is considering today; is it?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. And on article III?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator say that, in his opinion, that was the opinion of the committee which has reported the treaty, and which he represents on the floor today, the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. WILEY. Supplementing what I have said, I would state that of course the President, as Commander-in-Chief, would undoubtedly come to the Congress, he would undoubtedly submit to the Congress a statement of the facts, and Congress would make the decision as to whether it would make a declaration of war.

Mr. STENNIS. It is the opinion of the Senator that that is as far as the treaty or pact goes, and that it does

not authorize an attack by us or obligate us to make an attack unless the Congress so declares?

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I desire to have the Senator from Mississippi to restate the question, because I wish to be very clear about the facts stated in the question. I might say that we always have to be very sure of our facts. As I have said many times, until one obtains the facts, one had better not apply a principle; otherwise one may apply the principle to the wrong set of facts.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am very glad to try to restate my question, because I think it is a very vital question before the Senate. I am referring to article III. The last clause therein reads: "in accordance with its constitutional processes."

Applying that to the United States, and assuming that an attack might be made on Korea, my question is, Would the consent of the Senate to the ratification of the pact, or treaty, authorize the President of the United States to act without action by Congress, and to respond to an attack on Korea by force and send Korea aid, by the use of the Army, the Navy, or airpower, or to go to war?

Mr. WILEY. My answer is that there is nothing in the treaty which would change, delimit, or add to the powers of the President of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. I know the Senator does not mean to be evasive. However, I am asking the Senator to go as far as he can in stating what he thinks the treaty means. The Senator is presenting the treaty to the Senate and asking for its ratification. In my opinion, merely to say that the treaty does not change the authority of the President of the United States does not go far enough to answer the question fully and directly.

Is the treaty a committal by the United States to go to war even though Congress does not so declare?

Mr. WILEY. I think I have answered the question. There is a certain angle to the question of the Senator which has been debated for almost 165 years. The President, as the Executive and as the Commander in Chief, under certain circumstances, in a number of instances, in our relations with countries in South America, has assumed the right and has exercised the power when there was a question of American rights being invaded.

Let me try to be so clear in this matter that there shall not be any suggestion whatsoever that I am trying to evade the issue. I have said that the treaty does not in the slightest add to or attempt to control or delimit the right of the constitutional power of the President of the United States. In substance, it becomes an agreement with an ally that if and when an aggressor attacks that ally, we will go to the aid of the ally only if and when constitutional processes are followed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield further——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Then, Mr. President, let us suppose that such a condition arose that the President honestly felt justified and required the United States to go to war, but that Congress thought to the contrary, or perhaps was not in session. Then we would be directly confronted with the question, What is the President's authority?

I should like to raise a further point for the consideration of the Senator from Wisconsin. This exact language is in article 43 of the United Nations Charter. This language leads most interested citizens to believe that it means the question would have to come before the Congress, and that Congress would have to vote a declaration of war, before the United States could go to war. That would be my interpretation of the language, but there is a precedent to the contrary.

Now it is proposed that we reenact the same language. I think we are entitled to know the bottom rock opinion of every member of the Foreign Relations Committee in regard to exactly how far we are committed, before we vote on the treaty. That is why I am pressing for an answer to this question.

I fully appreciate the very fine sentiments of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I know he is sincere in what he says.

Mr. WILEY. Of course, the courts have held that the United Nations Charter is not self-executing; and, of course, in the case of any obligation which we have undertaken under the United Nations, the meaning is simply that we are obligated to handle it under our own constitutional processes. This, to me, at least, is very clear; I believe it means—as I have said several times—that we have entered into an arrangement with an ally to protect that ally if she is attacked. Otherwise, there is no obligation whatever. But if our ally is attacked, still it will be up to our appropriate constitutional authorities to-wit, the Congress and the President, to determine how the United States will live up to the agreement. If a resort to war is indicated, then clearly Congress will have to take action.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me at this point?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The question which has been raised is that before the United Nations can commit us to use our troops, the United States Congress have a right to act upon a resolution which might be before the Security Council, and we have a right to exercise a veto in the event such a resolution is adopted by the Security Council, and therefore we have that safety insofar as the United Nations is concerned. In the case of the treaty now before the Senate, of course we have a right to examine the various questions.

The only part of the Korean Treaty which seems to me to be dangerous is the part which might affect the troops we now have in Korea. Of course we expect to have them there for some months to come. In the event a conflict between the South Koreans and the North Koreans should arise, our troops would be in the center of the conflict. Then the President would have to have the right and the courage to proceed to protect our troops at the very moment when shellfire broke out. But I believe that within the United Nations we do have the security of having a resolution considered by the Security Council; and we have the right to veto that resolution if we must.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield further to me, I should like to boil down the question, repeating only a part of it: So far as language is concerned, virtually the same language is in the United Nations Charter; and a precedent was established under that language at the beginning of the Korean war.

It seems to me to be good logic and commonsense that if now we reenact virtually the same language, we reinforce the precedent which already has been established, we approve it, and we read into this language the meaning which has been given it. That is very clear; it is both law, logic, and precedent. Therefore, I am raising that particular point. I am not referring to all the conditions now existing in Korea.

As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has said, we already are at war in Korea. It is true there is a truce there now, but it is merely a temporary truce; and if a treaty of peace is not concluded, of course it is possible that our troops will have to resume the fighting. I am not trying to cover that point at all. Certainly our men will be protected.

But now the Congress is asked to legislate for the future, hoping at the same time that the present situation and condition will clear up. We are proposing to legislate for the long-time future, and it is proposed that we establish a precedent in the case of the continent of Asia. All the other agreements or arrangements were in relation to various islands in the Pacific, which at least can be surrounded by our aircraft carriers, submarines, and airpower.

But now we are proposing to deal with the continent of Asia and with a pact which will operate for an indefinite time in the future, unless terminated under its terms.

Therefore, I think this is the very heart of the question. If the language does not mean that the President can act without action by Congress, then what does it mean, and why include such language?

Mr. WILEY. To put it in a little different way, let me say the language simply means that if there is an overt attack by an aggressor upon one of our allies, the United States will simply take whatever action is determined by the President and Congress to be advisable under the circumstances, having in mind the obligations under this treaty, if it is ratified.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator says "the President and the Congress." He means, does he not, that the language would require affirmative action by Congress before the United States could enter into armed conflict or into a war?

Mr. WILEY. I think it means before we could get into a full-scale war; I am sure of that.

But I agree fully with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, namely, that, regardless of wherever our troops may be, if they are attacked, they will not await action by the President in calling Congress into session; or if an attack were made on any of our territory, the President would be obligated, as Commander in Chief, immediately to take the steps which would be advisable under the circumstances.

In that connection, I think the declaration of the 16 nations relating to the armistice is very significant, and I now ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF THE 16 NATIONS RELATING TO THE ARMISTICE, JULY 27, 1953 [1]

We, the United Nations members whose military forces are participating in the Korean action, support the decision of the Commander in Chief of the United Nations Command to conclude an armistice agreement. We hereby affirm our determination fully and faithfully to carry out the terms of that armistice. We expect that the other parties to the agreement will likewise scrupulously observe its terms.

The task ahead is not an easy one. We will support the efforts of the United Nations to bring about an equitable settlement in Korea based on the principles which have long been established by the United Nations, and which call for a united, independent, and democratic Korea. We will support the United Nations in its efforts to assist the people of Korea in repairing the ravages of war.

We declare again our faith in the principles and purposes of the United Nations, our consciousness of our continuing responsibilities in Korea, and our determination in good faith to seek a settlement of the Korean problem. We affirm, in the interests of world peace, that if there is a renewal of the armed attack, challenging again the principles of the United Nations, we should again be united and prompt to resist. The consequences of such a breach of the armistice would be so grave that, in all probability, it would not be possible to confine hostilities within the frontiers of Korea.

Finally, we are of the opinion that the armistice must not result in jeopardizing the restoration or the safeguarding of peace in any other part of Asia.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall read a part of the declaration of the 16 nations. It relates to the United Nations members whose military forces are participating. I read the following:

We affirm in the interest of world peace that if there is a renewal of the armed attack, challenging again the principles of the United Nations, we should again be united and prompt to resist. The consequences of such a breach of the armistice would be so grave that in all probability it would not be possible to confine hostilities within the frontiers of Korea.

Finally, we are of the opinion that the armistice must not result in jeopardizing the restoration or the safeguarding of peace in any part of Asia.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at this point for a brief question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, we protect our troops wherever they may be. However, apart from that, does the Senator from Wisconsin agree that before we would be called on to act under this treaty, affirmative action by the Congress, as well as by the President, would be required? Does the Senator agree to that?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Mississippi now speaks, does he, about the use of force?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; the use of force.

Mr. WILEY. Very well. I think that if the circumstances were such as I have suggested, namely, if there had been an over act of aggression, but our troops were not involved, or if there had not been an attack upon our own troops, but simply an attack upon the troops of our allies, it would necessarily follow, under article III, that we would act to meet the common danger; and our action at that time would be in accordance with constitutional processes. If it did not mean consultation, or something similar, with respect to which the Executive has the power, and if it meant utilization of the Armed Forces, I believe that Congress should and would have to decide.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. COOPER and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. WILEY. I have only a little left of my statement, and then I shall be glad to open myself to general questions, if that is agreeable.

Article IV of the Treaty grants to the United States the right to dispose United States land, air, and sea forces in and about the territory of the Republic of Korea, as determined by future mutual agreement. By contrast with the corresponding provision of the Japanese Mutual Security Treaty, the United States is under no obligation under the Korean Treaty to participate in the internal security of the Korean Republic, or, as I have already noted, to take any military measures as a result of a revolution within Korea. We can, in fact, pull out all our Armed Forces from that area any time we desire to do so; not that there is any such intention. The existing military situation in Korea makes it more than likely that the stationing of United States forces there will be in our national interest for some time. As a consequence, a supplementary agreement to implement the terms of article IV will be needed to regulate the presence of our Armed Forces on Korean soil. Our committee has been assured that we will be consulted by the Department of State concerning the terms of the anticipated agreement.

The treaty is to remain in force indefinitely, although either party may terminate it 1 year from the date that it gives notice thereof to the other party.

Now, Mr. President, let me say just a few words about the United Nations. In our treaties with the Philippines, and with Australia and New Zealand, the parties agree to report to the Security Council any action taken to repel an armed attack. This language has been omitted from the Korean Treaty. Does this mean that the United States is disregarding its obligations under the U. N. Charter?

I want to dispel any doubts Senators may have on this point. The facts of the matter are these. Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which restates the fundamental right of states to defend themselves against attack, specifically refers to members of the U. N. Since South Korea is not a member of the United Nations, it was deemed desirable, during the negotiations, to omit any reference to the Security Council in this treaty. This in no way reflects any change in the warm support of the present administration for the United Nations.

Mr. President, this is not a one-sided treaty. It is not a gesture of altruistic deference to the Korean people; but it is an instrument which is eminently in the best interests of both the United States and Korea. The Korean Army has been tested and tempered in the crucible of battle. It has proven itself to be a valiant, fearless, and able ally. In testimony before our committee, Gen. Matthew Ridgway referred to instances in the history of our operations which demonstrated that Korean troops, under Korean leadership, fought with much the same effectiveness as our own. According to General Ridgway the Korean soldier, if provided with proper training, equipment, and leadership, will fight with very great gallantry and very great efficiency. This military reservoir, which is not negligible, complements the deterrent effect which is the primary purpose of the treaty—to put the world on notice that we intend to defend the peace in Korea.

Prompt ratification of the treaty will prevent doubts from arising in the minds of those who covet the soil of Korea as to just what our intentions are. The treaty itself will be a stabilizing factor in an area which has known little stability for so many years.

Mr. President, the Korean Mutual Defense Treaty is a testimonial to a gallant people, a long-suffering people who bear the scars of a terrible scourging endured through 3 years of misery, 3 years of indescribable devastation, and its accompanying sorrow of hunger, disease, and death. Victims of a cruel and premeditated aggression carefully prepared by the Communist enemies of civilization, they fought a desperate struggle, at first inadequately armed and inadequately supplied but richly endowed with a spiritual resource that enabled Korea to bear up proudly under an adversity

[1] U. N. Document S/3079, August 7, 1953, made public August 7, 1953.

which would have humbled others in more fortunate circumstances and blessed with greater advantages.

We have been proud to call the Koreans our ally; and we are proud to have fought and worked with them. And we should be proud to join with them in this instrument of mutual faith and confidence, which will serve the cause of peace and freedom, and strengthen our Pacific defenses.

I strongly urge the Members of the Senate to accept the recommendations of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and to give their advice and consent to the ratification of this treaty, subject to the understanding which has been described.

In our discussion in the committee there followed, as a result of the contribution made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the understanding, which is made a part of the resolution of ratification. The understanding reads as follows:

> It is the understanding of the United States that neither party is obligated, under article III of the above treaty, to come to the aid of the other except in case of an external armed attack against such party; nor shall anything in the present treaty be construed as requiring the United States to give assistance to Korea except in the event of an armed attack against territory which has been recognized by the United States as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the Republic of Korea.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Wisconsin yielding the floor, or yielding for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. COOPER. I have been very much interested in the searching questions asked by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I should like to say, first, that I do not believe that the wording of the United Nations Charter has relevancy in this situation.

I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if it is not true that the United Nations, contrary to popular belief held by some, has no power whatsoever to commit this Nation to war.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. There is only one situation in which the United Nations might have any power to commit our troops. If under the Charter nations have made available to the Security Council of the United Nations fixed and permanent military forces, consenting in advance for their use to maintain peace, there would be authority to commit the forces. As this has not been done by the United States or any other nation, I say and I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin will agree—that there is absolutely no power in the United Nations, to commit this Nation to war.

Mr. WILEY. I agree.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Mississippi has raised the most searching question that can be addressed to this treaty. As the Senator from Wisconsin has said, it is the age-old constitutional question, "Under what circumstances can the President of the United States take action which, as a practical matter, may have the effect of committing this Nation to war without a congressional declaration of war?"

The phrase, "constitutional processes" must imply the powers of both President and Congress. Under the Constitution the President of the United States can assert under certain circumstances—such as our troops being attacked or our physical area being invaded—his constitutional power as Commander in Chief to take action for the security of the country. Such action could, of course, lead to war.

The important language in this article, it seems to me, in addition to the phrase "constitutional processes," which is difficult of interpretation, is the language defining the area, and conditions in which the United States would be morally committed to take some action under its constitutional processes.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has said that he did not intend to make a statement which would interpret in any way the words "constitutional processes" to exclude the constitutional power of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief to act, under certain circumstances which he might think proper, to protect the security of the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. Yes, of course. Again we get into a field which has been the subject of discussion for some 165 years, as I have said. However, I believe that with the understanding which has been appended as a result of the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] there can be no question as to what the meaning of the treaty is. As I have stated, there is nothing in the treaty which would delimit the constitutional power of either Congress or the President.

Mr. COOPER. We seem simply to speak in a circle and come back to where we started. What does "constitutional processes" mean?

Mr. WILEY. It is not a Bricker amendment, if that is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. COOPER. We come back to the question: What are the constitutional powers of the President and Congress with respect to taking steps toward war? I believe that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has said that, in the absence of such circumstances as demanded the protection of the security of the United States, we would certainly expect that Congress would determine whether the United States should go to war.

Mr. WILEY. I believe that expresses very forcefully the position I take as to what the language means. However, I cannot help but say that, as we discuss the treaty, which relates to a small country, a mere dot on the perimeter of the earth, so to speak, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that in the day in which we are living—and I say this very thoughtfully—I am sure if we could foresee any danger of a third world conflict which would make it advisable for the President not to convene Congress in Washington, where we could be immediately blown out of existence by a bomb, but himself to take the steps which were necessary under the circumstances, Congress should provide the machinery to make it possible to vote, if necessary, by television or in any other way, so that that which happened to Hiroshima could not happen to Washington.

The story has been told that the Commander in Chief was consulted on the wisdom of dropping the A-bomb on Tokyo, and he said, "If we do so, we will kill the Emperor, and kill all the high government officials in Japan. We cannot do that to Japan, because we need the Emperor, around whom the people can gather when we take over."

There will be nothing like that in a third world war. The object will be to paralyze at one time the entire Government—Congress, the Executive, and the courts. Consequently, there should be adequate machinery available whereby Congress could vote by long distance on the subject.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield further to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I know I share the hope of every Senator that there will be no resumption of the Korean war, but if there should be, there will be opportunity for Congress to take proper constitutional action.

But we cannot take away from the President his constitutional powers to protect our security, and I do not believe we ought to give to this treaty any interpretation which would permit any assumption that he would not act to protect our forces or to meet further aggression in Korea.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I feel that the questions which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has asked and the probing he has done are of such significance that those of us who served on the Committee on Foreign Relations at the time of the discussion of the treaty should make our own positions quite clear.

First of all, I concur in the general analysis and interpretation of the treaty as given by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. When we mention the phrase "constitutional processes" we must remember that in article III of the Korean treaty, which is now under discussion, the phrase is preceded by the language: "would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes."

The Government of the United States would determine the action in the area which would be dangerous to its own peace and security.

The truth of the matter is that "constitutional processes" relate to two sections of our Constitution. The phrase relates to article I, dealing with the legislative authority of Congress to declare war. It also relates to article II, the Executive authority, in which article the President is made the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. He takes an oath of office to defend the Republic and uphold the Constitution.

It seems to me that to argue the question of constitutional processes is beyond the point. The fact is that the courts have interpreted, and the President, by effective Executive action, has made it clear and unmistakable, that the Executive, the President of the United States, under the Constitution, within the constitutional processes, can take the action he deems to be necessary in order to protect the peace and safety and security of the Nation.

The only reason we are entering the treaty at all is because we feel it is in the interest of the security of the United States to do so.

I asked the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Stevens, and General Ridgway whether it was their feeling that the defense of Korea was important to our national security. The answer is to be found in the hearings. General Ridgway answered unmistakably, as did the Secretary of the Army, that the defense of South Korea against armed attack was absolutely essential to the safety and jurisdictional integrity of the United States.

I want my friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] to know that I do not interpret the term "constitutional processes" to mean necessarily that there would be an open declaration of war by Congress.

I would hope that the preceding section of article II, which refers to consultation by the parties in case of an impending attack, would give the President time to come Congress. However, it is entirely possible, as we sit here today, now at this very minute, that an attack could be launched against American installations in Okinawa or in the Philippines or in Korea. Surely under such circumstances we would expect the President to take effective action, as the Commander in Chief, to protect our forces and our interests. I want that point to be absolutely clear in light of the important questions which the Senator from Mississippi has asked.

It is important to bear in mind that we have a flexible defense structure, under which, as the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense stated, in answer to questions by Senators, it is the policy of the United States not necessarily to restrict action, in case of aggression in Korea or in other areas, to the immediate geographical area where the combat is occurring, but to pick and choose as we please.

I asked questions along that line of the Secretary of Defense and of General Ridgway, when they appeared before the committee. I asked General Ridgway the question: "Would we be limited under the treaty to confine our military action to South Korea?" His answer was that we would not be so limited, but that we would be able to pick and choose. He did not say where we would pick and choose, but he said that we would use our forces where we saw fit to use them.

I think we all ought to understand that fact when we vote on the treaty, as we should understand what we are voting for. I shall vote for the ratification of the treaty.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I was about to yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. I am perfectly willing to sit down and permit the Senator from New Jersey to speak on the treaty.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I did want to ask a question of the Senator from Wisconsin, but inasmuch as the Senator from Minnesota has made his statement I believe it is only fair to give the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] an opportunity to make a statement.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] referred to the Senator from Mississippi, and I should like to have the opportunity of replying on the time of the Senator from Wisconsin, if he does not object.

Of course, if our troops were attacked in Korea or in Okinawa, or anywhere else, the President of the United States could immediately act to defend them. That, however, is entirely apart from the argument today. The question before the Senate today goes far beyond the sphere of activity of the United States Government in protecting American troops. It goes to the question of saying to a foreign nation: "If you are attacked, under any circumstances, we will come right into the fray."

That is the question before us. I ask now: By constitutional processes is it meant that Congress will be ignored? The Senator from Wisconsin has been very honest and has stated how Congress would enter the picture. Others may be just as honest and yet disagree. However, let us keep our eye on the ball. The question is whether, in certain circumstances, we will commit ourselves unconditionally to go into a foreign country.

It is a new policy. The question is, What does "constitutional process" mean? If it does not mean that Congress is involved, why have that clause in the treaty? If it does not mean that Congress is to declare war, then I believe it is included argumentatively, and I say let us strike it out so that it may be clearly defined and a two-thirds majority of the Senate may give an interpretation. I think we should include the action of the Congress. We are treading on dangerous ground when we commit ourselves to take action thousands of miles from home without giving Congress an opportunity to participate in the decision.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a moment?

Mr. WILEY. I will yield shortly. I do not think there is a great amount of difference between the two Senators who have spoken on the other side of the aisle. The treaty contemplates that an overt act of aggression being committed on South Korea—that is the single fact we will take into consideration—and in that event there is no question in my mind that the phrase "constitutional processes" means action by the Congress. I have said so 3 or 4 times in different ways, but I again refer to the understanding which is made a part of the treaty:

> It is the understanding of the United States that neither party is obligated, under article III of the above treaty, to come to the aid of the other except in case of an external armed attack against such party; nor shall anything in the present treaty be construed as requiring the United States to give assistance to Korea except in the event of an armed attack against territory which has been recognized by the United States as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the Republic of Korea.

That expresses what we think the treaty means in relation to an overt attack by any nation upon South Korea.

Let us assume, as has been suggested, an attack upon Okinawa or upon our Armed Forces in Hawaii, and it comes to the knowledge of the President. He cannot permit our forces to be sitting ducks. His duty is to be alert and to be ready for any emergency, and the forces under him must be ready.

I do not think I can say anything more than I have said, that the treaty does not delimit the power of the Executive or the power of the Congress. Everything remains as is provided for in the Constitution. We are saying to an ally, "You remain at home. If an aggressor attacks you, then, pursuant to congressional authority or constitutional process, we will decide what we are going to do."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at that point?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's comments about the interpretative clause I think should be clearly understood to involve two things: First, to define the scope of the treaty, as the Senator has pointed out; second, if the Government of South Korea should start a unilateral action and try to defend Korea by military means, which was the subject of interrogation of witnesses, under this treaty, because of such unilateral action within the peninsula of Korea, started, let us assume, by our partner to the treaty, we would be under no obligation to furnish military defense. This does not rule out the possibility that, as a result, it may be necessary for us to take action within the area to defend our own installations, our own interests, but it makes it clear that this treaty can be interpreted in no way as

binding the United States to aid in some expedition on the part of Dr. Rhee.

I should like to make it clear, Mr. President, because we are at a point in foreign affairs where we must be mature and, I should say, somewhat bold and frank, that this treaty does not make mandatory a declaration of war on the part of the Congress of the United States. It does, however, require that the President of the United States, following constitutional processes in article I and article II, defend the security, the peace, and the interests of the United States.

Mr. President, I should like to quote what General Ridgway had to say. I said to General Ridgway in questioning him:

Senator HUMPHREY. Do we consider the southern half of Korea as essentially necessary, or essential to our defense in the Pacific—to the defense of our own security and territorial responsibilities that we have in the Pacific?

General RIDGWAY. Positively; yes, sir.

That is a clear-cut answer.

So, finally, it seems to me that the chairman of the committee has given, the only answer that can be given; namely, it bears upon the situation, and the President can surely come to the Congress if it is humanly possible, particularly if the hostilities are of great dimension; but no Congress would want to tie the President's hands in doing what is necessary for the fundamental interests and security of the Nation.

Mr. WILEY. We will determine the action that should be taken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. If there is time for consultation, well and good. But if we should find ourselves in a situation similar to that at Pearl Harbor, where our country took action before it declared war, and the President asked later for a declaration of war under this treaty or any other treaty, we would not expect the President of the United States to stand idly by and see the security of our own country threatened and not take positive action.

I desire to make clear that the military authorities have said they believe the defense of South Korea is essential to our own security.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I said I would yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Suppose a situation exists in which the war which has been raging in Korea is settled, and a peace treaty is entered into. This treaty, I understand, extends beyond such a period.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. It goes on indefinitely.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Suppose Korea were again threatened. Am I to understand that Congress would be required to act before the President could send forces to defend against another attack?

I notice the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is shaking his head. I totally disagree with his interpretation of the powers of the President.

Mr. WILEY. If I understand the Senator's statement as referring to a threatened attack. Does he mean there has actually been an overt attack?

Mr. WATKINS. Suppose another nation should attack Korea and the situation which we now have did not exist——

Mr. WILEY. I read, and I thought the Senator from Minnesota also referred to this language:

Nor shall anything in the present treaty be construed as requiring the United States to give assistance to Korea except in the event of an armed attack against territory which has been recognized by the United States as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the Republic of Korea.

I think that if an armed attack occurred, it would be up to the President of the United States to submit the matter to Congress.

Mr. WATKINS. That is my understanding.

Mr. WILEY. I have said that 50 times.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to be certain. I desired to ascertain what would happen if we were enabled to get out of the present condition, which has never been legally declared to be war, but actually is war. When that situation has passed and there is peace again in the world, then, in the event of another attack upon Korea, or upon South Korea—let me put it that way—under this treaty, what would be the constitutional processes the United States would go through to become a party to that conflict or to decide not to become a party to the conflict?

Mr. WILEY. It would be necessary to follow the constitutional processes. The President would undoubtedly report the situation to Congress; and in such a case, if the attack was simply an isolated attack upon South Korea by an aggressor, I think the language of the treaty is very plain.

Mr. WATKINS. That Congress would have to make the decision whether the United States would go to war or would not go to war?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I wanted to have made clear.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am sorry I have not had an opportunity to follow the debate as closely as I should have. My question may already have been answered.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin if it is the desire of the contracting parties to leave the matter to their own individual constitutional processes within their own countries, why does the treaty provide that we shall perform acts to meet dangers, instead of following the formula as laid down by the Atlantic Pact, which makes it optional as to whether we shall?

Mr. WILEY. I do not have any question in my mind that it is made optional, entirely depending on the act of Congress. Article II provides:

ARTICLE II

The parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of either of them, the political independence or security of either of the parties is threatened by external armed attack. Separately and jointly, by self help and mutual aid, the parties will maintain and develop appropriate means to deter armed attack and will take suitable measures in consultation and agreement to implement this treaty and to further its purposes.

Then article III sets forth:

ARTICLE III

Each party recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific area on either of the parties in territories now under their respective administrative control, or hereafter recognized by one of the parties as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the other, would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

In order to make it absolutely clear—and I have read this three times previously—the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] submitted an understanding to be appended to the treaty, and all members of the Committee on Foreign Relations agreed that it should be appended. It reads as follows:

It is the understanding of the United States that neither party is obligated, under article III of the above treaty, to come to the aid of the other except in case of an external armed attack against such party; nor shall anything in the present treaty be construed as requiring the United States to give assistance to Korea except in the event of an armed attack against territory which has been recognized by the United States as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the Republic of Korea.

As was said by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the committee debated very clearly the issue: Suppose Syngman Rhee started the battle. Would there be any obligation on the part of the United States? The answer was, "No, there would be no obligation whatsoever."

Does that answer the question of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think the Senator has answered my question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to clear up a point in my own mind. I am in accord with what the United States has done in the case of South Korea. But I see Korea divided into South Korea and North Korea. Suppose Syngman Rhee, possibly feeling as did Abraham Lincoln about our own country, that it should not be divided into South United States and North United States, decided to go to war about the division of Korea? What would be the obligation of the United States under the treaty?

Mr. WILEY. There would be no obligation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator will remember that once upon a time Lincoln took the United States to war on the question of a divided country, and many men from Wisconsin and every other State of the Union north of the Mason and Dixon's line fought in battle against those who lived south of the Mason and Dixon's line, who felt the other way about the question. If Lincoln was right,

would Syngman Rhee, likewise, be right, if he declared a war to unite Korea?

I think I am asking a fair question. Should there be a South Korea and a North Korea?

Mr. WILEY. I shall be very happy to try to answer the Senator's question. First, if Syngman Rhee should precipitate a war, there would be no obligation upon the United States under this treaty.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point.

Mr. WILEY. There would be no obligation whatsoever upon our Government.

Second, when Lincoln said there should be one nation, indivisible, he recognized that if the South should win, it would have been the beginning of "dividitis," and the United States would have been merely another country of the Balkan type.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What about Korea?

Mr. WILEY. So Abraham Lincoln was right.

Third, so far as Syngman Rhee is concerned, so far as the United Nations is concerned, and so far as the United States is concerned, we have said that we will take steps, and we are trying to take steps, to bring about a unification of Korea, but we will not go to war for that purpose. I think that policy is definite and certain. I think all of us sympathize with Syngman Rhee and with Korea. All of us hope that if and when the world conflagration simmers down, Korea can again be united and be one people. But that is some distance in the future.

The philosophy of this treaty was stated better than I myself could state it by our distinguished former colleague, Mr. Dulles, who is now Secretary of State. The purpose is to serve notice upon those who caused the devastation in Korea that if they attempt to take South Korea, then we will take such steps, pursuant to our congressional processes, as we deem advisable.

Furthermore, as I have said, the United Nations has said substantially the same thing. Sixteen of the United Nations have declared that to be their policy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his indulgence. The only point I wished to make, and I think the Senator from Wisconsin has answered my question correctly, is that by our preachments we try to sell our ideas of government to other countries. But once in a while I become very much confused. I see South Korea, and I see North Korea. Yet we have the example of Lincoln, who was a peaceful man, permitting Americans to be killed in order to hold the United States together. I do not know for certain, but it seems to me that once in a while we are willing to have people of the same type and kind divided.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to ask the Senator from Wisconsin why a treaty is needed when we already have the United Nations operating. The United Nations is supposed to protect the interests of all the small nations of the world, and that covenant has still a long time to run.

Will the Senator explain why this treaty is needed, even though the United Nations has been and is supposed to be continuing to fight to defend the integrity of South Korea?

Mr. WILEY. I believe I answered the inquiry of the Senator in my opening remarks. I showed quite clearly that the reason for the treaty was given by Secretary Dulles, and by the other witnesses who testified at the hearings. If the Senator will read the hearings, I think he will find the answer to his question.

My own conclusion is that, among other things, we have been precipitated into leadership in the world, and that we ought to enter into the treaty. I felt that, in view of the treaties into which this country had entered with Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, it was necessary to serve notice upon the Kremlin that we would do what is set forth in the pending treaty. After all, the Kremlin is pulling the strings. The Kremlin pulled the strings when we were involved in hostilities with North Korea. After we defeated the North Koreans, the Kremlin induced General Mao and the Chinese Communists to enter the conflict. We fought the Chinese Communists and succeeded in halting them. About 2 million lives were lost in the conflict. We are stating to the Kremlin now, "If you start again, what follows may not necessarily have to be a limited war"—and it may not be a limited war.

In the opinion of that branch of Government which spearheads foreign policy, it was thought that to enter into the pending treaty would be in the interest of peace and security.

In the course of my remarks I called attention to the fact that if South Korea were defeated by the Communists, that country would become a spearhead right into the very heart of Japan. If the Kremlin could gain control of Japan, with its great industrial capacity, it would mean that all of Asia would be lost to the Communists, including the southeast. That area would include Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and the rest of that vital area of the world.

I think it is the judgment of the best military brains—and I do not claim to be one of them—that it is necessary to enter into this treaty with Korea in the interest of America. I think that underlying that foreign policy is the basic principle of self-preservation, the preservation of the Nation itself. When steps are taken such as will be taken in consenting to the treaty, I think it will be the judgment of those who claim to know, who claim to have facts of which we have only a part, that the treaty is vital to the security of this country.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Is not the making of this treaty another confession that the United Nations does not have adequate power to do what it was created to do, and that the United Nations has substantially failed to protect all the smaller countries, and that that failure has required the United States to enter into a series of treaties in the Pacific, as well as to enter into the North Atlantic Pact?

Mr. WILEY. I do not think that the United Nations had, from the nations which constituted that organization, the authority to undertake the job. The United Nations is but an adventure in seeking to create some kind of unity at a crossroads of the world, where the black, white, red, and yellow men can meet and exchange ideas. However, there is no real power in the United Nations as yet. Perhaps when nations begin thinking alike, and dreaming a little more about fundamental spiritual factors, the United Nations may become a truly international force.

I might add the treaty is made pursuant to article 51 of the United Nations Charter, relating to the right of states to defend themselves. In the case of NATO in Europe, an organization of nations was built up for that very purpose. As a matter of fact, the United Nations Charter contemplates just such an organization.

Mr. COOPER. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. While we have an interest in the defense of smaller states against aggression, is it not true that one of the reasons behind the making of the treaty is as stated in article 3, a concern for the peace and safety of this country?

Mr. WILEY. Korea is not a member of the United Nations.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that we consider it important to the security of our own country?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I remember that a year or two ago there were those who stated that the failure of the Government to announce that Korea was of interest to the United States and important to the peace and security of the United States was an invitation to invasion by the Communists and, in fact, helped precipitate the Korean war. Today we are considering a treaty which takes the opposite course, and which gives effective notice to the Communist aggressors that Korea is important to our peace and security. Unfortunately, some of those who complained a short while ago that the United States had not given notice of its intentions now find fault with this treaty which makes it clear.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator. The Senator is stating what I believe is one true reason for the negotiation of the treaty.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. As the Senator from Mississippi has indicated to the Senator from Wisconsin, I have a few more

questions to ask. Some might be involved so far as the time taken to propound them is concerned, and if the Senator will be on the floor of the Senate at some later date in the debate, I should be glad to defer to him now for his lunch hour, and we can take these questions up later.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator has something to ask, he had better ask it now.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to preface my questions by saying that since early childhood I have had a very high respect for the Korean people. I know a little about some of the Christian missionaries who have gone among those people. I have had a most profound respect for the present Ambassador from Korea, and have found him to be a very intelligent and patriotic gentleman. Therefore my remarks will not reflect anything but praise and admiration for the Korean people.

As I understand, it is frequently said in a segment of the press that a promise was made to Syngman Rhee that the pending pact or treaty, or one similar, would be entered into, and that that promise was made to him before he would ever agree to the cease-fire. I was very much disturbed when Syngman Rhee released certain prisoners, and, as I understand, that delayed the cease-fire several weeks, during which time lives were lost.

As I have understood, through segments of the press and otherwise, before the cease-fire was finally obtained, a promise was made that the pending treaty would be consummated. Does the Senator know anything about that, and will he tell the Senate the facts on that point?

Mr. WILEY. The only information I have on the subject is that when Secretary Dulles went to Korea he entered into this agreement, but he said he would have to submit it to the Senate, and that it would then be up to the Senate. He did comply with that promise, and submitted the treaty to the Senate, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings.

As to the other matters referred to in the Senator's question, about what he has read in the press, I have consulted with Dr. Wilcox, of our committee, and we have no distinct recollection about those facts.

There appears in the hearings a letter from President Eisenhower to President Syngman Rhee, in response to a letter from President Rhee. President Eisenhower's letter is dated May 30, 1953, and is found on page 53 of the hearings. In that letter President Eisenhower said:

> You speak of a mutual-defense pact. I am prepared promptly, after the conclusion and acceptance of an armistice, to negotiate with you a mutual-defense treaty along the lines of the treaties heretofore made between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, and the United States and Australia and New Zealand. You may recall that both of these treaties speak of "the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security in the Pacific area." A security pact between the United States and the Republic of Korea would be a further step in that direction. It would cover the territory now or hereafter brought peacefully under the administration of the ROK. Of course, you realize that under our constitutional system any such treaty would be made only with the advice and consent of the Senate. However, the action which the United States has heretofore taken, and the great investment of blood and treasure which has already been made for the independence of Korea, are certainly clear indications of American temper and intentions not to tolerate a repetition of unprovoked aggression.

That confirms everything we have said before.

Mr. STENNIS. What the Senator from Wisconsin has said confirms, then, the article in the New York Times, dated January 22, in which the flat statement is made that—

> The mutual defense treaty with Korea was signed by the two Governments on October 1, 1953, and transmitted to the Senate for approval 11 days ago.
>
> The treaty was one of the conditions demanded by President Syngman Rhee, of South Korea, for his agreement to the Korean armistice. That demand, said the committee report, reflected the legitimate concern on the part of South Korea for its security in the postarmistice period.

Mr. WILEY. I cannot agree that that can be read into the President's letter. I think there were negotiations; and I can imagine that Syngman Rhee, under the conditions confronting him, should have had assurances. The President said in his letter:

> However, the action which the United States has heretofore taken, and the great investment of blood and treasure which has already been made for the independence of Korea, are certainly clear indications of American temper and intentions not to tolerate a repetition of unprovoked aggression.

Now let us back up the President and ratify the treaty.

Mr. STENNIS. But these representations were made, at least partly, in order to obtain a "cease fire." My point is that if the "cease fire" was obtained in that way, in a measure the Senate was largely committed to ratify this treaty.

My question is, Should not there have been some consultation? Of course, there might have been. I shall ask the question whether there was any consultation before this treaty was agreed upon, in substance. Was there any prior consultation with the Senator from Wisconsin or with any other member of his committee, so far as he knows?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; and in that connection I read from page 2 of the committee report:

> 3. COMMITTEE ACTION
>
> Assistant Secretary Robertson, on his return from the preliminary negotiations with President Rhee, appeared before the committee on July 16, 1953, and gave a full report on the course of the negotiations, on the problems encountered, and on proposed future negotiations. This was supplemented by several consultations between the Secretary of State and the members of the Far Eastern Subcommittee during the negotiations.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was the chairman of that subcommittee.

I read further from our report, on page 2:

> In the light of these consultations, and the fact that the treaty was made public almost 2 months before it was signed and 5 months before it was transmitted to the Senate, the committee felt that adequate opportunity for a full consideration of all the issues involved had been offered. Consequently, the committee proceeded to consider the treaty soon after its reference to the Senate.
>
> On January 13, 1954, public hearings began with testimony by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who discussed in detail the foreign-policy aspects of the treaty. The hearings concluded the following day with testimony by Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens and the Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Matthew V. Ridgway, who addressed themselves to the military aspects of the treaty. The committee considered the treaty in executive session on January 19, 1954, and voted without objection to report the treaty to the Senate with an understanding, which is discussed below.
>
> The committee wishes to commend the executive branch for its attempts to keep the committe informed during the course of the negotiations. Such consultations, properly timed as they were, can do much to build a spirit of cooperation between the two branches of the Government.

Mr. STENNIS. I have no particular complaint about that. My point is this: In order to obtain the cease-fire, in order that American boys might be spared the hardships of further military action, we had to make a promise for a mutual security pact of some kind, substantially like this one. Is that a fair statement of the situation?

Mr. WILEY. I do not think it is fair, because the President stated in his letter than he would enter into the treaty; and in the letter he also said:

> Of course, you realize that under our constitutional system any such treaty would be made only with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; I am sure that point was made clear.

My question is this: Was not the agreement originally made—I refer to the agreement to negotiate this treaty through constitutional processes—under duress or semiduress, in order to obtain a cease-fire, after we had been on the verge of a cease-fire a few weeks previously, but suddenly that possibility seemed to be blown up, so to speak, by the release of the prisoners?

Mr. WILEY. I have no information by which I can affirm or disaffirm that statement. But by consulting with the State Department, I imagine the Senator from Mississippi can obtain a very definite answer on that subject. I will say that no such statement was made before the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, in large part the Senator from Wisconsin is my consulter with the State Department, because I know he keeps up with these matters, and I know he will give us an honest report.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for another question?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly.

Mr. STENNIS. The committee report mentions a regional security pact in the Pacific area. It mentions it as a possibility and as something which the committee thinks is perhaps a desirable step. Does the committee have in mind, for the regional pact, a specific pact to which the United States would be a party?

Mr. WILEY. I remember distinctly asking the question whether there was under contemplation a NATO for the Pacific; and I remember distinctly, also, that the Secretary of State spoke on that subject. We include the following in our report:

> The committee, therefore, raised the question of a Pacific pact or Pacific NATO with the Secretary of State. Although he felt that such a development would have certain advantages, the Secretary pointed out that the Pacific countries have cultural and political differences in addition to physical separation, which distinguished that area from Europe.
>
> "I think it would be very fortunate if a Pacific security system could be developed and it certainly is a possibility which we have very much in mind, but it does not seem as though that could be achieved at any early predicable date."
>
> The committee, while concurring in the Secretary's evaluation of the prospects for a Pacific pact, wishes nonetheless to express its belief that such a pact is a desirable ultimate objective of United States policy in the Pacific and hopes that the Department of State will continue to encourage such a development. The security of the Pacific area would be measurably enhanced if the nations of that region would join and work together for their regional and collective self-defense.

Of course, he went into detail, and, of course, what he said was correct. Those nations are somewhat in the same position as the one France and Germany have been in. Their approach to any degree of unity can be brought about, I believe, only by means of the very thing which we hope will bring about unity in Europe, namely, the tremendous pressure of the Communists, which would require those nations to unite in order to save their own skins.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield further, let me say that brings us to another question: Instead of calling on the United States of America alone to enter into a pact with Korea to guarantee Korea against attack, why not make a real effort to obtain adherence to such a pact by some of the other Pacific nations that are close by Korea and certainly are as much bound up with Korea's future as are countries many thousand miles away? Why not make an earnest effort to have such nations join in a pact of that sort—if not in a Pacific pact, then at least in a group in which we would have some helpful standbys.

Mr. WILEY. I have no question that that group has been canvassed. The Secretary of State has said that such a pact does not seem possible in the predictable future. However, I do not think that prevents a future administration or the present administration from trying to bring about an agreement on the part of states which could constitute a real barrier to Communist advance in Asia.

But, again, dealing with that problem is like dealing with the problem now existing between France and Germany, and the Kremlin.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his answers. I shall not detain him further.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I thank all the Senators who have asked questions. I am sure their questions have been directly to the point, and I am sure they have brought into the picture considerable light which I failed to bring in during the course of my discussion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have just had a brief discussion with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I told him there were a few matters which I wished to bring to his attention in reply to his questions. He would like an opportunity to go to lunch. I have a prepared speech on the Korean Treaty. I shall deliver that first and, if he will return to the Chamber after lunch, I shall be glad to discuss further with him the question which he has raised. In the meantime I shall deliver my prepared speech, which takes up some of the points. Later I shall be glad to discuss further the questions raised by the Senator from Mississippi. I shall try to make proper reply to them.

Mr. President, I rise to second and support the convincing argument made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the able Senator from Wisconsin, in favor of the Korean Mutual Defense Treaty.

The future security of the Republic of Korea is a matter of definite concern, and immediately related to the security of the United States. The Secretary of State, when he appeared before our committee testified that our security interests extended to the Pacific island chain of Japan, the Ryukyus, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, a chain anchored by two land bases: Korea and Indochina. He pointed out that we have a security tie with all of these areas.

I may say parenthetically that I have just been to that area, as chairman of the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. At a later date I shall make a report to the Senate on that trip.

The Republic of Korea has demonstrated by its valiant and stouthearted stand against the Communists that it is a firm and dependable link. The magnificent fight put up by the South Korean troops against the northern invaders will not be forgotten by the free world. South Korea's anticommunism is tested and unquestionable. This brave country is a valuable ally for the United States and for the free nations.

So far I have spoken of what the United States will gain from this alliance. Let me say now, that the Republic of Korea will gain a much-needed and well-deserved sense of security from the treaty. Concerned and appalled as we have been by casualties among American forces in Korea, our losses do not compare with the suffering during the past 3½ years of the people of South Korea. Their land has been ravished, their homes destroyed, their sons and husbands killed, their families scattered. South Korea has paid a heavy price for its resistance to Communist aggression. And although the fighting has ceased, under an uneasy armistice, the Republic of Korea has no assurance that it will not be asked to pay the same price again next month or next year.

This brings me to the main point that I wish to stress about this treaty, its deterrent effect upon potential aggression in Korea. I believe that few Senators will quarrel with me if I say that had the Communists known in advance in 1950 that the United States and the United Nations would take firm action to oppose their attacks, they would never have crossed the 38th parallel. A recurrence of this sort of aggression is exactly what this treaty is designed to prevent by giving the Communists a clear warning about United States reaction to such a venture.

I may say that this is one of a number of treaties which we have made with countries in that area to emphasize this warning. We have a treaty of mutual defense with Japan. We have such a treaty with the Philippines, with Australia, and with New Zealand, and now we have before us a treaty with Korea. It is part of a pattern which we are developing in order to give warning to the Kremlin that something will happen if there are any further aggressions in this area. The Communists will be in no doubt about our retaliatory action. The treaty says:

> Each party recognizes that an armed attack * * * on either of the parties * * * would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

We have been discussing that provision for some time.

Article III was prepared with the greatest care. After considering a similar provision in the security alliances which we developed in West Europe under the NATO plan, we decided that, because under the NATO plan the treaty said an attack on one would be considered an attack on all, a difficulty was created, which occasioned a great debate when that instrument was before the Senate for consideration.

The question was whether, if there should be an attack, the President could act without constitutional processes, so we decided upon a different provision. I was in consultation with Secretary Dulles when the treaties with Australia and other countries were being negotiated. It was decided not to adopt the NATO pattern, namely, that an attack on one would be considered an attack on all, but the pattern of the Monroe Doctrine. So if we are now asked the question as to what would happen if one of those treaties were violated by an attack, we can well ask anyone who raises the question, "What would we do if there

were an attack in some area of South America protected by the Monroe Doctrine? What are the constitutional processes which apply to such a situation?"

The same principle applies in connection with the treaty now before us. We have simply said, by this treaty and similar treaties with other countries, that we are giving a warning that we look upon the Pacific area as an area of danger to us—not to anyone else—comparable to the danger we saw when the Monroe Doctrine was first enunciated. Let me make that point clear.

Besides our unilateral guaranty to act to meet the common danger, Secretary Dulles pointed out that the Republic of Korea has also the guaranty of 16 United Nations members having troops in Korea that a violation of the armistice agreement will be met with countermeasures not necessarily confined to Korea.

It has been brought out very properly today that, of course, the present situation, with danger of a possible violation of the truce, is an immediate problem, and that we have very little doubt as to what we would do under those conditions. The United Nations is also committed as to what it would do.

The Korean Treaty looks beyond that, years ahead, and assumes that the Korean situation is to be cleared up. In this treaty we have the declaration of the Monroe Doctrine, that we would view with alarm a threat to our peace and security if there were any attack in the far eastern area.

Secretary Dulles said:

> What we mean by this is, we would no longer feel limited by the boundaries of North Korea and the Yalu River, no longer would there be a privileged sanctuary, as General MacArthur called it, north of which attacks against our forces could be mounted. We would feel free to extend hostilities to areas beyond Korea, if those areas were in fact being used as a base for attack against our forces in Korea.

In other words, we are serving a warning that something definite will happen in case there is a breach of the present truce.

A precise definition of our future action, such as that given by the Secretary of State, should be the greatest possible deterrent to anyone plotting further aggression in that area.

Between these two guaranties Korea can rest secure in the knowledge that it will not face renewed aggression alone.

One guaranty is the United Nations guaranty, with respect to which I have just quoted the Secretary. The other is the mutual-defense arrangement which we are setting up in the treaty with Korea. Korea can rest secure in the knowledge that it will not face renewed aggression alone.

When I was in Korea 2 months ago I observed that the conclusion of an armistice there and the 16-nation declaration had given South Korea a measure of relief and stability. The pledge contained in the mutual-defense treaty will increase this measure and, in my opinion, give Korea a sufficient sense of security to enable it to go forward with the enormous task of reconstruction without the enervating fear of an attack from the north.

This has not been possible yet.

Korea needs a breathing spell desperately to put its homeland in order again.

It is my belief that the Communists will probably not renew their aggression in Korea in the near future. The signs show that they are digging in for a prolonged armistice—an uneasy truce—and not preparing for a renewal of the fighting. In spite of these signs, of course, we must remain on our guard in Korea. I may say that we are remaining on our guard in Korea.

I should like to devote a few minutes of my time now to stress the things that the treaty does not do.

The treaty does not compel the United States to come to the aid of President Rhee should he attempt to reunite Korea by force.

My distinguished colleague, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], read the interpretation which was added to the treaty in the Committee on Foreign Relations, on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in order to protect us by reassurance against any suggestion that we might be called upon to act in case South Korea attempted to move unilaterally to bring about unification of Korea by force.

Much as we can sympathize with President Rhee's desire to see his country united, we cannot allow ourselves to become a party to an unlawful act, such as unification by military might. As a nation, we stand on record as striving wholeheartedly for the peaceful unification of Korea, and we will continue to bend our every effort toward that goal, remote as it may seem to some people at the moment. A violent unification, however, is against the principles and purposes of the United Nations of which we are a member, and against the truce terms. In the event that President Rhee should try such an action, the treaty will not come into play. Article III, which I have already quoted, limits action to an armed attack on either of the parties "in territories now under their respective administrative control, or hereafter recognized by one of the parties as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the other." I have emphasized the word "lawfully" in order to focus the attention of the Senate to this limitation.

In other words, if Korea is united by lawful means—by agreement or treaty or by other means—then the whole of Korea becomes subject to the treaty, and we would be prepared to help defend the whole of Korea. However, we would take no part in uniting it by forceful means.

During the hearings held by our committee, I asked the Secretary of State specifically whether the wording of article III would deter President Rhee from unilateral action to reunite Korea. He answered me, stating that it makes clear to President Rhee that "if he does that, he would then be alone." So we are repeating again and again exactly the limitations of the treaty.

I might add at this point, that when I was in Korea I had a long talk with President Rhee. I feel that it has been made entirely clear that the United States must oppose any attempt on his part to go it alone. For myself, I believe that he will not violate the truce.

I may say parenthetically that I am one of those who are very sympathetic with President Rhee's position, and very sympathetic with his situation, and on the floor of the Senate I have stated that he has dedicated himself to see his country reunited.

One can understand how he felt, in a state of turmoil, when he thought we were going to settle on the 38th parallel or some other place, and leave Korea divided. We are sympathetic, Mr. President, but we are trying to persuade him not to act with force, and we are trying to persuade him that his best chance of uniting Korea is to work with his friends and with his allies, especially the United States, to bring about the unification of Korea by peaceful means.

The second thing this treaty does not do is to run counter to our obligations under the U. N. Charter. The treaty was negotiated under article 51 of the Charter, which preserves for each nation the right of individual and collective self-defense against an armed attack. The only obligation imposed by that article in connection with an armed attack upon members, is that the measures taken to repel such an attack shall be reported to the Security Council. If we do take measures, we must report them to the Security Council, but we definitely do not have to ask the Security Council whether we can take the measures.

We are, therefore, not dependent upon a green light from the United Nations before we can come to the Republic of Korea's assistance in case she is attacked again. This means that a Soviet veto in the Security Council cannot stall prompt action on our part. We are free to do what we think is right and necessary under the circumstances. In the event of another attack, I am sure that our Government would work with the U. N. and report to the Security Council on any action taken.

Finally, the treaty does not go beyond the general type of commitment which we have made in our other Pacific-area security treaties. To those treaties I have already referred.

In providing, as it does, that an armed attack on either party would be regarded by the other as dangerous to its own peace and safety and would be met, by each party, in accordance with its constitutional processes, the treaty remains squarely within the four corners of the Constitution, and is on all fours with the Monroe Doctrine, which has been in effect for a long time and which deals with any possible encroachment by European nations on South America.

So I suggest to my friends who are troubled that they ask themselves: What would be the constitutional process in case there was a threatened attack on

South America by a European or other country? That is exactly the same question we have before us.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask him to outline what those processes are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would prefer to wait until I have concluded my remarks. Then I shall be very happy to yield.

Secretary of State Dulles, who devised this formula when he negotiated the Japanese, Philippine, and Australia-New Zealand treaties, has characterized it as the Monroe Doctrine approach. It uses the exact words of President Monroe in his historical warning to European nations that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. The Monroe Doctrine has stood unchallenged on constitutional grounds throughout our history.

Before I close, I would like to refer briefly to the debate in the Senate last Friday during which a number of my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle took issue with the administration's military strategy. Let me say to them that this question was also raised during the Foreign Relations Committee's consideration of the Korean Mutual Defense Treaty. The committee, in deciding to report the treaty, carefully explored with administration witnesses the defensive capacity of the United States in order to determine whether we have the military strength to shoulder this additional commitment. We, too, had read of the announced withdrawal of two American Army divisions from Korea, of military reductions, and of contract cancellations. I want to pass on to the Senate the assurances we received on that score. General Ridgway told us that the withdrawal of the two divisions would not weaken our position over there. "In fact," he said, "I think it would add to our flexibility."

I would also like to quote Secretary Dulles on this point:

> If we had to try to maintain ground forces, let us say, in Asia, to meet an attack by ground forces at any place where the enemy chooses to attack, then I believe that we are virtually subservient to the enemy.
>
> What we must do is to make clear that if there is such an attack, which involves our vital interests, our reaction will be, as I said last night, at places and by means of our own choosing. We will not necessarily allow the enemy to pick the rules of battle and the place of battle and the conditions of battle which best suit his purposes.
>
> By making that clear, as has been done in relation to Korea, in relation to Indochina, in relation to our vital interests in the Pacific, it is possible for us to protect our vital interests without an overextension.

That is the end of the quotation from Mr. Dulles in explaining the withdrawal of troops and the principle of flexibility and retaliation.

Speaking for myself, I believe that the President's program ensures us sufficient military strength to meet our commitments as well as the new one in Korea that we are considering today. As for the so-called "new" strategy, it is tailored, in my opinion to meet the world situation confronting us, in which we need the utmost flexibility within our economic and military means, to react to any new threat of aggression.

In conclusion, I would like to express some thoughts on the Pacific area in general. Over the past years, I have become familiar with that region through periodic visits there—I made three visits there on three different occasions—and as chairman and formerly as ranking minority member, of the Far Eastern Consultative Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. Over those years, I have noted an improvement in the situation there from the dark days of 1949 when China fell to the Communists. I believe that the nations of that area are becoming more alert to the threat of communism and that our military, economic, and technical assistance has given them a helpful start toward being able to meet that threat effectively. But I also believe that more can be done to encourage the idea of collective security in the Far East.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would prefer to wait until I have finished with my remarks. Then I shall be happy to yield.

I hope the free nations of the Pacific will soon forget their differences and make common cause in a regional security arrangement, which in my judgment should be similar to the so-called American Monroe Doctrine and which would recognize that an attack anywhere in the Far East would affect the safety and security of all of us.

In making this statement I am not unaware of the great cultural, racial, and political differences which exist between the various nations in the Pacific, and I should state that we found that there would be difficulties in bringing about a regional pact among those nations at this time. However, we are still working on it. I am hopeful that their mutual aspirations and interests will override those differences.

Until the time that such a regional agreement is possible, the web of mutual defense and security treaties that we have negotiated with the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, Japan, and now the Republic of Korea, offers the best insurance against future aggression in that area so important to us. I therefore strongly urge the Senate to give its overwhelming advice and consent to this treaty and put the Communists on notice.

I shall be glad now to yield for questions.

Mr. WATKINS rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. While the Senator was delivering his address I asked him if he would outline the various steps in the constitutional process.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We all agree that so far as a declaration of war is concerned, that is a congressional function, but we have two different situations existing. One is the present truce which is a precarious truce, with our men on the line in jeopardy in case of attack. We emphasized previously that in case of attack by the South Koreans, without any action by us, we would have nothing to do with it.

Mr. WATKINS. What would we do if South Korea provoked an attack?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I discussed that with General Taylor at great length. He will have to be governed by the circumstances of the situation. It is very difficult to know just what to do. Before I discuss an attack under those circumstances, I want to consider an attack the other way. The question is, What are our constitutional processes?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. What steps are we to take?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. With our troops in jeopardy I have no doubt that the President of the United States could move immediately. The Senator would agree with that, I am sure.

Mr. WATKINS. I should think so, because of the previous conflict which had been going on, and the temporary truce being only a breathing spell in it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If it precipitated a war, I would myself urge that the matter be immediately brought to the Congress, as I urged President Truman to do when the first attack was made. He should have done that. But the President may be on the spot. Confronted with a sudden danger to our peace and safety that he cannot now foresee. I would say that if the Monroe Doctrine principle came into effect, he would have to act immediately and rely on the Congress to back him up by a declaration of war.

Mr. WATKINS. Suppose there is peace in that area; suppose the armistice results in a peace treaty. This treaty will run on indefinitely. Suppose, then, an attack were made upon South Korea. What, then, would be the situation? Would the President have the power to order our troops into action there before coming to the Congress, or would he make the decision as to whether we should go to war?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We have a great many troops in the area. The Senator is not speaking about the troops being in jeopardy, is he?

Mr. WATKINS. Where the troops have been withdrawn, as they would be if a peace treaty were made.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. What does the Senator conceive to be the duty of the President in case of a violation of the Monroe Doctrine in South America? What has the President done in the past? He has certainly issued stern warnings. He would have to be prepared to move in, and there would be a declaration of war if the situation should reach such

a serious stage. President Cleveland issued a stern warning that we were going to stand by the Monroe Doctrine. Great Britain at that time was the one causing the trouble, if I correctly remember my history. The circumstances would be about the same in this case. The President should be prepared to issue a stern warning and have Congress back of him and ask for the support of Congress. I think President Truman should have done that on the occasion when South Korea was invaded by North Korea.

Mr. WATKINS. I agree with the Senator. I think it is an important right for the men who are going to do the fighting and the dying to have a voice in the matter.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Through the Congress?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; through their representatives.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree.

Mr. WATKINS. No President would have the right, unless we were attacked, to order our forces into action.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator, and I cannot see why the situation cannot be handled in that way. Under our constitutional processes we would handle it in that way. When we debated the NATO pact the question very properly came up as to whether it covered an attack on Paris, for instance, and whether the President, acting alone, could move to defend Paris. We said, "The language is too broad; it is too uncertain. Let us use the words 'constitutional processes' so that everyone will know that there will be at least that approach to the question."

That is my position.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator asked me what I would say the process should be in the event some nation threatened to attack a South American nation. I would say that the issuance of a warning by the President would be one of the first steps, but before he ordered out the Armed Forces I would say that the President, by all means, should come to the Congress to get the power to take that action.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I could not agree more thoroughly with the Senator. I agree absolutely with all the Senator has said. I cannot conceive of a situation where it would not be possible to do that.

Mr. WATKINS. In the case of the NATO agreement it was stated that there was an attempt to increase the war-making powers of the President. What I objected to was that by agreement we were attempting to increase the war-making powers of the President to order our forces into action. In the debate we finally got the legislative history of what occurred when the North Atlantic Pact was drafted. As I remember, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who was present a few moments ago, said that article 11 was drafted in the committee itself, and that he was responsible for article 11 which provided, in effect, that the treaty would be ratified and its provisions carried out by the parties according to constitutional processes. That is, in substance, what was provided. That meant, it was said, that all steps in implementing the treaty should be by the Congress, and particularly the decision as to a declaration of war should be made by the Congress, as should the decision with reference to sending troops outside United States territory in time of peace.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator. I have been advised by the chief of our Foreign Relations Committee staff that in the report on the NATO Treaty we made it clear that it was not intended in any way to enlarge the President's powers in the matter of declaring war. That was in the report which was made at the time.

Mr. WATKINS. Many persons have taken the position, and apparently the Truman administration took the position, that we sought in the NATO Treaty, to give additional power to the President, so that he could order out the troops without the approval of the Congress. In fact, there never has been approval by the Congress to sending troops to Europe under the NATO Treaty. The Senate alone passed an advisory resolution that the President should consult the Congress first.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to read to the distinguished Senator from Utah a quotation from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, when the NATO Treaty was presented to the Senate. I read from a volume entitled "A Decade of American Foreign Policy Basic Documents, 1941–49, 81st Congress, 1st Session, Published by the Committee on Foreign Relations":

> The committee does not believe it appropriate in this report to undertake to define the authority of the President to use the Armed Forces. Nothing in the treaty, however, including the provision that an attack against one shall be considered an attack against all, increases or decreases the constitutional powers of either the President or the Congress or changes the relationship between them.

That was in the report when the NATO Treaty was submitted to the Senate for action.

Mr. WATKINS. When I offered my reservation, which required the adoption of a resolution by Congress to put us into a war in the event that any of the nations included in the treaty were attacked, or to send our forces abroad, the reservation was rejected. It was said by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations at that time that to accept the reservation would be to cut the heart out of the treaty. But all it attempted to do was to say, in specific terms, that before such actions were taken, Congress should have the right to make the decision. Of course, I became suspicious of the whole proposal, and my suspicions were justified when the President did attempt to send troops abroad under the treaty without any authorization from Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That gave rise to the troops-to-Europe issue and to the long debate on the subject. That was the reason for the specific approach to this treaty, which we hoped would provide a sense of collective security in other dangerous areas. We did not use the NATO formula, but we used the Monroe Doctrine formula, which throughout the years we felt had proved to be constitutional and safe.

Mr. WATKINS. I might observe, in connection with this subject, that that presents a far different picture than we had in connection with the NATO Treaty.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I hope the distinguished Senator from Utah feels that we have leaned over backward to try to provide the protections which he was anxious to have, and which all of us are anxious to have, namely, constitutional processes in our difficult, serious international relations.

Mr. WATKINS. I am happy to hear the Senator make that statement. I am glad we finally stopped the trend of attempting to increase the war-making power of the Executive by way of treaty. I may say that that was one of the things that gave rise to the proposed Bricker amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. All of us are aware of that. We may have more debate on that subject before we finish with the general discussion on this subject.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his courtesy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I observe that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is on the floor. I promised him that at the end of my address, I would be glad to answer any questions he might wish to ask. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator from New Jersey yielding. I did not have the advantage of being here during all the time he was making his remarks. At the expense of repetition, may I ask him what is his answer to the question I propounded to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] with reference to the interpretation of the phrase, "in accordance with its constitutional processes," as contained in article III.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I have discussed that question at some length with the Senator from Utah. I should be glad to refer the distinguished Senator to the RECORD, or I shall be glad to restate my position.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator from New Jersey agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that it would require, as the Senator from Wisconsin repeatedly said, an affirmative act of Congress for the United States to use force?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I called attention to the fact that there were two situations. One was the uneasy truce which now exists. If there were a violation of the truce, I believe the President would be justified in acting to protect our troops and, as a part of our obligation in the United Nations, to protect the troops of the United Nations. I assume the distinguished Senator will agree with that statement.

Mr. STENNIS. I do agree with that statement.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Assuming that we pass the Korean truce stage, and that there is a new attack in the future, what I then called attention to was the fact that under this treaty we are virtually, by article III, putting our position in the Far East in the same situation as in the Western Hemisphere under the Monroe Doctrine. We say in article III:

ARTICLE III

Each party recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific area on either of the parties in territories now under their respective administrative control, or hereafter recognized by one of the parties as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the other, would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

As we include the same clause in all our treaties, we are practically saying we are approaching the far-eastern situation in the same spirit as did President Monroe, when he warned the other countries of the world that aggression against the Western Hemisphere would be a matter of concern to the United States. As we know, down through our own history, the Monroe Doctrine has helped to prevent an outbreak of wars in this hemisphere.

We are seeking here the same approach as the Monroe Doctrine approach. Whatever constitutional processes would be required in the case of a violation of the Monroe Doctrine on this continent, I would say the same processes would be followed under this treaty, namely, the requirement of a declaration of war by Congress, except in some emergency in which the President had to act quickly in order to protect the safety of some our citizens.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the answer of the Senator from New Jersey on that point. Then, unless it were necessary to protect some of our own citizens, including the protection of our own soldiers or servicemen who would be in the theater of danger, the Senator is not committing himself in this treaty to any obligation except through the process of a declaration of war by Congress?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is not going any further than that?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator does not think the United States is committed to go any further than that, does he?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Not as I see it.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator from New Jersey agree with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in his point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was not sure I thoroughly understood what was the real difference.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wanted to be certain that the reference by the Senator from Mississippi to the Senator from Minnesota was not a reference to me.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understood the Senator from Mississippi to be referring to the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. STENNIS. The junior Senator from Minnesota is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was not entirely certain what the difference was between the junior Senator from Minnesota and our distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, but my position in the matter is very clear.

I thought probably the Senator from Minnesota had reference to something that might happen unexpectedly, as to which we could not be too critical of the President if he used his discretion. That may be true. But fundamental constitutional processes mean that we follow the Constitution; and under the Constitution, Congress must declare war, if war is to be declared.

Mr. STENNIS. Did the Senator from New Jersey in his address cover the idea of a regional security agreement in the Pacific area, an agreement that might be called a Pacific NATO? Did the Senator speak on that point in his main address?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I discussed the approach of NATO, and the Monroe Doctrine approach, quite extensively. I pointed out that in the negotiation of this treaty I had the privilege of cooperating with Mr. Dulles and with our Far-Eastern Subcommittee in the discussion of these approaches. We considered that we could not adopt the NATO formula, because to do so would cause difficulty on the floor of the Senate, with respect to understanding what was meant by the statement that an attack on one meant an attack on all. In other words, under the NATO formula, would an attack on Paris mean an attack on New York, and could the President act in such a situation? We leaned over backward to use the language of the Monroe Doctrine in formulating the far-eastern treaties, with the result that it is necessary for us to observe our constitutional processes.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to ask 1 or 2 further questions. Did the Senator consider asking some of the other Asiatic nations to come forward and pledge themselves to the security of Korea? Was that considered by the Senator?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to answer that question, because I have taken part in the discussions of that question, too. I have been to the Far East with Secretary Dulles and his associates. I have discussed the question at length with him and with Walter Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. I think there is not one of us who would not favor a collective security pact among all the Asiatic nations, but we have discovered there are differences between those countries. There are difficulties today that cannot be surmounted all at once. Some steps will have to be taken toward security before we can get the whole group into a mutual security pact. There is still very serious friction between the Philippines and Japan and serious friction between Japan and Korea. It will be found that there are some strained feelings between some of the countries which I have visited, as, for instance, between Indochina and Burma. We cannot accomplish our purpose all at once, but we are working sincerely to the end of bringing about a security setup among those nations themselves, which will bear upon that area in the sense that the Monroe Doctrine bears upon the areas of this hemisphere.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator from New Jersey contemplate that the United States would become a member of a so-called Pacific NATO?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have urged that the initiative should come from those countries themselves. They should set up such a mutual security organization among themselves. If the United States can be of help to them, well and good. But I do not believe we should take the initiative by trying to tell them what to do for their own defense. We can advise them, but we should not try to lead them into a pact by insisting that they join in it.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator suggest or think that the United States of America should become a party to it?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think that the treaties which we have entered into were definitely wise, because the treaties reflect our sense of fear and apprehension about the Far Eastern area. I do not think we can avoid our share of the responsibility or avoid going at least as far as the statement in article III, which states that each party recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific area would be dangerous to its own peace and safety.

In other words, if there were to be an armed attack in the Pacific area, this country would be alerted and alarmed, and would have to do something about it, and do it quickly. If there were an attack on Indochina by the Chinese Communists, as Secretary Dulles has given the warning, we will be right there, and the consequences which follow will have to be borne. We have warned aggressors that we are going to be alert to any aggression anywhere in that area, which means so much to our own peace and security.

Mr. STENNIS. Lest the Senator be misunderstood, is it correct that the Secretary favors a Pacific NATO in which we would be a party?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am opposed to a Pacific NATO. I am opposed to anything further than saying that an attack on a nation in that Pacific area would be dangerous to our own peace and safety. I am in favor of saying that we would be glad to consult with a nation which is so attacked, and to take such action as is provided under our constitutional processes and to do what we can to meet the aggression.

This is the Monroe Doctrine approach. At Rio we enlarged the conception of

a unilateral Monroe Doctrine into a multilateral Monroe Doctrine. In the Far East we should be thinking of a multilateral Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator would extend to all other nations of Asia the pact we are now entering into with Korea, would he?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would not even say that. With regard to some, I would, and with regard to others, I would not. We would have to explore the situation which obtained as to each one of the nations. We began with our natural allies, Australia and New Zealand. The Philippines were, in a sense, a ward of ours. The Japanese are, in a similar sense, a ward of ours. Korea, which has become an essential ward of ours, is the last one. As to whether we enter into such a pact with other nations would have to be determined on the merits of each individual case.

Mr. STENNIS. There are at least a few nations of Asia to which the Senator would extend the same pact which we now propose to extend to Korea?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; I would not without investigating each one on its own merits. I would not want to be committed to that policy, because I do not know what the effects would be. I do say that we should be convinced that an attack on any country in Asia would be a danger to our own peace and security. We have given a warning ahead of time, and we would be alerted to it. Anyone starting hostilities would have to take the consequences.

Mr. STENNIS. If I may ask the Senator one more question, referring to the discussion with Syngman Rhee, it was stated in the papers that some promises were made with reference to a pact, subject to ratification by Congress, of course. Does the Senator know whether or not the proposal was made that the United Nations or some other nations should give this guaranty, either without the United States or including the United States, and that it was stated that Syngman Rhee refused to agree, and stated that it would be with the United States or no one?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I cannot answer that at all, but I can refer the distinguished Senator to the Senate document in which appears the message of President Eisenhower on the Korean Treaty. On page 5 of the message of the President of the United States, there is a joint statement by Secretary of State Dulles and President Syngman Rhee. It is erroneously dated October 8, 1953, in the print. Actually, it was released August 7, 1953. I shall read only the beginning of it. If the Senator wishes, I suggest that he read all of it.

I also suggest that the Senator read the statement on page 7 of the message from the President of the United States, which was issued by the Secretary of State after the original initialing of the treaty by Secretary Dulles and President Rhee, on October 1, 1953.

I am now reading in part from what is called the joint statement by Secretary of State Dulles and President Syngman Rhee. The correct date on which it was released is August 7, 1953:

Following is the text of a joint statement by President Syngman Rhee and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles following the conclusion of their talks at Seoul, Korea.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi will remember that just as the Congress was adjourning last summer there was a plan to have some of the Members of the Senate go to Korea. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and I were to go as Members on the Republican side, and two of our colleagues were to go from the Democratic side. We were to go to Korea to discuss the matter with President Rhee. We could not go because of the pending business in the Senate, and because of the lamentable death of our colleague, Senator Taft. However, Secretary Dulles, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Assistant Secretary Walter Roberts, and a number of others did go. They discussed the matter with President Syngman Rhee, following which the statement I am about to read was issued. I quote the beginning:

Our friendly and understanding consultations demonstrate clearly the determination of the United States and the Republic of Korea to stand together in cordial cooperation to achieve our common objectives, including the reunification of Korea.

Of course, what was troubling Dr. Rhee was the question of the reunification of Korea. President Rhee felt that if Korea were divided at the 38th parallel, or any other parallel, it would be permanently divided. He was greatly disturbed that we were not going to carry on until a unification was brought about. In view of those facts our representatives went to Korea to discuss that matter.

The joint statement continues:

We have today initialed a draft of a mutual defense treaty. That treaty is designed to unite our nations in common action to meet danger and it will cement the ties which have brought us together to combat in Korea the menace of Communist aggression.

Our two Governments will actively proceed with the constitutional processes necessary to bring this treaty into full force and effect. These constitutional processes, in the case of the United States, require that the United States Senate consent to the ratification. The United States Senate, having adjourned this week, will not again be in regular session until next January. However, United States Senate leaders have been kept fully informed of the exchange of views which have led to the action we have taken today and it is our sincere hope that this will lead to prompt and favorable United States Senate action.

Mr. President, I shall not read further, but if the distinguished Senator will read the remainder of the statement, he will see what has been accomplished.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi was confused as to the date of the report. Which is the correct date?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The correct date is August 7, 1953. The date in the document is a misprint.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have had called to my attention by Dr. Wilcox the discussion contained in the printed hearings. In appendix II there is contained an exchange of letters between President Rhee and President Eisenhower. The first is a letter from President Rhee to President Eisenhower, dated May 30, 1953, the next is a letter from President Eisenhower to President Rhee, dated June 6, 1953. The next is a letter from President Rhee to President Eisenhower, dated June 19, 1953.

I have not read the letters recently, but, as I recall, they did not involve any commitment or coercion; President Rhee wanted assurance that he would not be left alone with a divided Korea.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I thank the Senator from North Dakota for yielding until I could finish the colloquy.

THE FARM PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, in the past few weeks we have witnessed an extremely vicious and unfair attack on the present farm price-support program and on farm programs in general. That attack has oftentimes been inaccurate and unfair, and it has been more vicious than any other attack which has been made at any time within my memory. In their zeal to discredit the program, some of the opponents of our present farm price-support program have resorted to personal attacks upon the sponsors of the program.

An editorial in the current issue of Life magazine is in point. The editorial seeks, among other things, to draw a parallel between former Senator Bilbo and myself. It is a vicious denouncement of Senator Bilbo as a demagog.

Regardless of whatever Senator Bilbo's record was—good or bad—he can no longer defend himself. He has passed on to his reward, where he will be judged fairly on his own record. I think it is fair to say, however, that editorials and articles such as the one appearing in this week's issue of Life magazine were largely responsible for his election. Most people, no matter where they live, have a strong dislike for unreasonable and bad-tempered attacks upon any individual.

Mr. President, if I were thinking only of reelection, I should like nothing better than to have such an editorial published about me in every newspaper in North Dakota. It would virtually assure my reelection. I would prefer, however, to win or lose the next election, if I should be a candidate, on the record I have established.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the entire editorial entitled, "Getting the Pussyfoot Out of Politics," appearing in this week's issue of Life.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GETTING THE PUSSYFOOT OUT OF POLITICS

According to one cynical theory of United States political practice—to which a consid-

erable number of politicians unfortunately still adhere—the whole science of getting elected to office can be summarized in the most primitive kind of questions and answers:

Question. Mr. Politician, what do you favor?

Answer. Motherhood.

Question. What are you opposed to?

Answer. Sin.

Question. What kind of boy were you?

Answer. Barefoot.

Q. Where did you learn to love America?

Answer. At my mother's knee, the little red schoolhouse, and the little white church.

Question. Why are you running for office?

Answer. Because of the inspiration of my ever-patient wife.

Question. What will you strive for if elected?

Answer. To serve my beloved country to the best of my humble ability.

Question. And when will you disclose your specific program?

Answer. In due time.

Folklore has it that the politician is a cliché-spouting hack who stands foursquare on the principles of democracy and his admiration for the gr-r-and and glor-r-r-rious Fourth or July. He yields to no man in his love for the great American heritage, the memory of the brave men at Valley Forge, the Monroe Doctrine, the Stars and Stripes, babies, dogs, and horses. He deplores murder, arson, cancer, drought, the Japanese bettle, and hoof-and-mouth disease.

HOW TO BEFUDDLE A HECKLER

There is a story about the late Senator Bilbo, the great southern demagog. One day a heckler tried to pin him down on a burning local issue, namely, a proposed law to protect squirrels during the mating season. The Senator said, "I'll tell you how I feel about it. Half my friends are for it and half my friends are against it—and I'm for my friends." This story may be apocryphal, but its implications are sound. Many politicians try in one way or another to stay in all possible camps. The politician of the cynical folklore decries inflation while favoring an easy-money policy; he wants good roads, free colleges, free seeds, and low taxes; he wants a United States Army second to none, and deplores the draft; he wants high wages, rich farmers, and low prices. He favors States' rights and a strong Federal Government.

He is an expert at what the popular historian, Frederick Lewis Allen, once described as Franklin Roosevelt's tactics in the 1932 election—talking about candor while never exercising it. And all this mostly because he has a respect bordering on obsequiousness toward some of the groups of American society. There is a strong and persistent belief among politicians that you cannot possibly be elected to any important United States office if you antagonize either (1) the farmers or (2) the veterans. Also, in some areas (3) the unions and (4) the old folks. If cornered you simply bow down and give the pressure groups—or, rather, the men who make careers out of leading pressure groups—anything they demand, whatever the effect on the United States as a whole.

This may once have been a good theory of pragmatic politics, although no historian could prove it. The Republican Party, it so happens, received its initial great impetus from Abraham Lincoln, who showed no hesitancy in making more enemies and therefore winning a sounder place in his country's heart than any other American politician before him. The party began to fall on evil days when its leaders pussyfooted on questions like prohibition. It was the opposition's Al Smith, who didn't mind standing up, speaking his mind, infuriating the WCTU and delighting the thirsty majority, who set the stage for the Democrat era of the thirties and forties, even before the great depression came along.

Certainly the old mealy-mouth days, if they ever existed, are now dead and gone. Some 9 million adult Americans have been to college, 36 million to high school, 63 million through grade school. They know the score. They aren't going to vote for the best baby-kisser or the most generous dispenser of political pork. This is a new and sophisticated America, the best-educated country in the world. This is a Nation in which good national policy and good politics are becoming synonymous—in which the ambitious politician need not fear to be a statesman first and foremost. Why else should Dwight Eisenhower, a man of no conventional political instincts, training, or experience, have been elected President in such a national landslide?

Which brings us to the fine and statesmanlike new program which the President has submitted to the Congress—a program which could hardly be more dedicated to the best interests of the Nation, the entire Nation that is. The program was in incubation for more than a year. The President appointed the best men he could find in every area of government and told them to grapple with the problems until they came up with the best possible solutions. The farm program, for example, represents the work of 60 separate studies and consultation with 500 farm experts. Similar work went into the proposals for foreign relations, national defense, internal security, economic policy, the budget, taxes, labor, social security, health, housing, and all the rest.

But just because the program is so statesmanlike, a number of politicians reared on the old folklore are frightened to death. Election year is a time, in the minds of the cliché artists, to let sleeping dogs lie. It develops that Congress is even afraid to vote itself a well-deserved and badly needed pay raise just before an election. As for weightier matters, many of the Members would just rather not talk about the Taft-Hartley law right now, thank you, much less make any realistic changes. On the matter of sliding parity—the only sensible attack made on the farm problem in years—a lot of legislators have simply thrown up their hands.

Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, for example, said last week that if somebody should get up in Congress and propose to keep high-price supports instead of a lower parity percentage for farmers, "who is going to vote against it?" In other words Senator YOUNG and other folklore-ridden politicians of his type would let the Government just keep on giving the farmers everything their most fanatic and shortsighted spokesmen might ask—meanwhile letting the surpluses of butter and eggs pile up in the warehouses to the eventual ruin of the farmers.

NEWS FOR THE SENATOR

We have news for you, Senator YOUNG. There are a lot more consumers than farmers in America, and they know all about the farm mess that your kind of thinking has created. Moreover the modern farmer himself is quite capable of seeing beyond the end of his nose. Even though the legislative program was not conceived as politics, even though the President made a little apology to the effect that he was perhaps "not too smart politically," we predict that in this enlightened day and age it will turn out to be the most effective kind of politics. You, Senator YOUNG, and the other old-fashioned politicians who worry so pathetically that the farmers won't stand for progress, or the CIO won't, or the Union Club, this group and that group—you're going to wake up some day to discover that nobody's in favor of statesmanship except the whole darn country.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the editor of Life magazine does not seem to like the position I have taken for continuance of 90-percent farm price supports. In common with the articles and statements of many other magazines, writers, and commentators, the attack on our present price-support program is in most respects inaccurate; and certainly it is not in accord with the record. It is not in accord with the record and the commitments made by the Republican Party in the last campaign. For these reasons, at the Senate Republican Conference, held a few days ago, I was prompted to make some comments as to the record of the commitments of the Republican Party itself.

During the discussion of President Eisenhower's farm message, comments were made as to the position the Republicans would take with respect to farm price supports. Several Republican Senators had stated their opposition to flexible price supports, and had indicated that the farmers in their areas were very much opposed to this kind of a program.

I posed to the Republican Conference this question: If some Democratic Member offered, on the floor of the Senate, an amendment to continue 90-percent supports, which Republican Senators, particularly, which ones from the Midwest, would vote against the amendment? At the time I stated that most Republicans from farm States campaigned for 90-percent supports, as did President Eisenhower himself. It seems to me the question I was asking was a practical one. How could Republicans break their campaign commitments so soon after the election? Lest there be any mistake about President Eisenhower's position, Mr. President, I should like to quote the following statement from his speech at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4, 1952:

> At Kasson, in Minnesota, some weeks back, later in Omaha, and in a number of so-called back-platform speeches, I have tried to make my position clear. The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90 percent.

Mr. President, is there the slightest doubt in the mind of any Senator that this statement would indicate that during the campaign the President was in favor of flexible price supports? I challenge any Member of the Senate to produce a single speech made by President Eisenhower during the campaign in which he advocated flexible price supports at 75 to 90 percent of parity or any other flexible scale.

The editor of Life magazine seems to think I was placing myself in the position of being a demagog, because in the conference I asked the practical question of how the Republicans could be expected to vote against such an amendment.

Mr. President, I do not think farmers are particularly "wired up" to any particular kind of price-support program. All they ask is that they receive a fair price for the commodities they produce. They would be very happy to have some assurance that in the future the prices they will receive for their products will permit them to live as other Americans do—to pay their bills and keep their homes. If the present administration believes the Benson farm program will give the farmers 90 percent of parity or 100 percent of parity in the market place, why not just continue the present program of 90-percent supports?

The editorial states that the Benson farm program represents the work of 60 separate studies and consultations with 500 farm experts. I have no way of knowing how many persons Secretary Benson consulted. Apparently he did not consult with the House Agriculture Committee, as that committee is almost unanimously in favor of 90-percent supports. At least a majority of the Senate Agriculture Committee hold the same position.

I do know that, almost without a single exception, all the members of Secretary Benson's advisory committees and others with whom he has closely associated himself had been on record, before their appointment, as favoring flexible farm price supports. Many of these committees were fairly well "stacked" with processors and representatives of other interests who usually have been identified, over the years, with those who opposed any kind of farm price-support program. The conclusions of these advisers should be no great surprise to anyone.

Mr. President, the editor of Life magazine seems to think it improper for a person such as myself to speak on agricultural matters. It so happens, Mr. President, that the junior Senator from North Dakota is a farmer himself and spent all of the first 47 years of his life on a farm in North Dakota, before becoming a Member of the Senate. My three boys are now in the farming business. We are not exactly wheat farmers, either. The cash receipts from hogs and fed cattle far exceed those of grain, on the land we operate. Moreover, neither myself nor my boys have any other interest whatsoever except that of farming. That has always been our business. We have a keen interest in it. Besides that, I happen to represent a State that derives 83 percent of its income from agriculture.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that I have spent more time on a farm than has Secretary Benson or any of his close associates.

It is sometimes argued that a farmer from North Dakota thinks a little differently than do farmers from other States. That is a completely erroneous conclusion. Farmers think pretty much alike, no matter where they live—whether in Ohio, Georgia, Alabama, California, Iowa, South Dakota, North Dakota, or elsewhere; and they think for themselves.

One of the few differences, if there are any, is the fact that in the last election North Dakota, which is predominantly Republican, gave to President Eisenhower a higher percentage of its votes than did any other State, except one.

Mr. President, as I stated early in this speech, there have been many inaccurate and unreasonable attacks upon our present price-support program. This is particularly true as to the cost of the program. Of all the magazines which I have read in recent months, only one, U. S. News & World Report, gives an accurate report of the cost of the farm price-support program.

Newsweek, in its August 24 issue of last year, stated:

> In the last fiscal year, wheat supports have cost the taxpayers more than $900 million.

This is far from the truth, Mr. President, as I shall point out later by official Government figures.

Mr. President, the January 25 issue of Time magazine also states that these farm programs have cost $900 million. I should like to read a few words from the article:

> There is evidence to support the President's view that it is time for a change in the farm program. The old program of encouraging the production of huge surpluses, keeping the food prices high, and destroying the farmers' market, cost the taxpayers $900 million a year; and yet it is not preventing farm income from falling.

The article states that the program is keeping the prices to consumers high, and is beeping the prices to farmers low. I do not know how the program can do all that at the same time, unless there is a huge "take" in between.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I had reason to try to compile some figures on the point whether the price supports are what have kept the cost of food high, or whether in the Nation's economy other factors are responsible for the high cost of food to the consumers.

The best figures I could possibly compile or obtain on this point showed that in 1947, the realized gross farm income was $34,002,000,000. In the same year, 1947, when the gross farm income was $34,002,000,000, the farmer received, as his net income from farming and from nonfarm sources, 11.6 percent of the total national income.

When we come to the calendar year 1953, just 5 years later, we find that the farmer realized as gross farm income $35,100,000,000, but his net income was only 7.4 percent of the total national income, even though the gross was higher in 1953 than it was in 1947.

Who are the profiteers? If the gross income from agriculture in 1953 was $35,100,000,000, but the farmer received only 7.4 percent of the total national income, neither the producer nor the price-support program can be charged with responsibility for the high cost to the consumer. It is true that in 1947 the farmers' gross income was lower than it was in 1953, and yet the farmer received a net of $16,774,000,000 in 1947, as against a net of $12,500,000,000 in 1953.

Now we find someone writing an editorial condemning a Senator for standing up and trying to protect the national economy against a drastic drop in the agricultural economy. We cannot separate the national economy from the agricultural economy. We must at all times bear in mind that, on the average, the agricultural economy must be multiplied by 7 or 9 to produce a figure representing the national economy. For that reason, if the agricultural economy drops, as it has dropped in the past 4 years, it is inevitable that the national economy will follow in the not too distant future.

The editorial to which reference has been made casts a reflection upon the integrity, sincerity, and wisdom of a member of the legislature who tries to protect the agricultural economy of the Nation. We find figures in the record which prove that it is not the farmer's net take-home pay which is responsible for the high cost of living, because the farmer's net take-home pay dropped by $4,200,000,000 between 1947 and 1953. The drop was gradual. The net income from farming and nonfarm sources of persons living on farms was 11.6 percent of the national gross income in 1947; 9.8 percent in 1949; 9.5 percent in 1951; and an estimated 7.4 percent in 1953.

These figures should be brought to the attention of Senators, because if as a nation we get ourselves in a position in which agriculture is not receiving somewhere near its just share of the national income, it will not be long before there will be a depression in the small communities, and that depression will be reflected in the industrial centers in a very few months.

I commend the Senator from North Dakota for placing in the RECORD some factual statements and figures concerning the situation which exists in the agricultural areas of the Midwest, where this Nation is producing its surplus food. Because we are in the surplus food-producing area we are subjected to a drastic economic squeeze to such a degree that we are not able to realize even 90 percent of parity, regardless of the support programs. With the exception of pork, figures representing what the farmer actually receives from the national economy are down to less than 90 percent by a considerable percentage.

Again I say to the Senator from North Dakota that he is to be commended for carrying the fight to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. What he has pointed out is very true with respect to the tremendous spread between what the farmer receives and what the consumer must pay. The situation has now reached the point where the

farmer receives only 45 cents of the consumer's dollar.

The Senator from Minnesota and I are among the few farmers in the Senate. If we have not the right to rise on the floor of the Senate and talk about agricultural problems as we see them, what is the country coming to? A great magazine, Life, which is highly subsidized by the Government, seems to think it is not right for us to speak up on agricultural matters, or if we do, we run the risk of being classed as a demagog.

In last week's issue of Newsweek, in its Periscope section, we find this statement:

Here, according to recent statistical studies by ANDERSON (Senator ANDERSON), is how much farm-price subsidies have cost since 1929—$14 billion.

I doubt very much if these figures can be attributed to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], as he is pretty well aware of the actual cost of most farm programs. He is a pretty good authority on that subject himself.

I am happy to say also that, while Newsweek has had some very inaccurate articles insofar as the cost of the farm-price-support program is concerned, it is, in my opinion, one of the more accurate of all magazines. It is the one that I read most.

Mr. President, these erroneous stories have been very damaging to the whole cause of agriculture. They have painted a story that does no credit to themselves nor to agriculture.

This $14 billion figure apparently has reference to a report recently released by the Department of Agriculture entitled "Cost of All Agricultural and Related Programs Covering the Period 1932 to 1953." This report, according to Mr. Wheeler, budget officer of the Department of Agriculture, is intended to cover the entire operations of the Department of Agriculture for that long period.

The $14 billion includes almost every conceivable kind of appropriation appearing under the budget of the Department of Agriculture. It includes the cost of the school-lunch program, which undoubtedly is of more benefit to nonfarm schoolchildren than it is to farmers themselves; it includes the cost of the Sugar Act, which is self-financing; it includes the so-called naval stocks program; it includes all the money loaned under the REA program on which farmers have a repayment record of more than 99 percent.

It includes the cost of the Farmers' Home Administration program and all other credit programs carried on by the Department of Agriculture for these many years. Most of this money has been paid back to the Government of the United States, with interest.

It includes all of the research programs over the past 22 years, and, believe it or not, it even includes the cost of the research carried on under the Department of Agriculture which was responsible for the discovery and development of penicillin.

Mr. President, Mr. Beach, of the Department of Agriculture, in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for the fiscal year 1954, stated:

On the basic commodities from October 17, 1933, to February 28, 1953, there has been a realized gain of $4,872,708 (for basic farm commodities—wheat, cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, and peanuts). That was exclusive of any interest expense or overhead expense. That is purely the program cost. Essentially it is the difference between what was invested in the commodities at the time they were sold and the amount that was received for them at the time of sale.

Mr. Beach stated further, in response to a question of mine as to what it cost to support prices on nonbasics:

On the designated nonbasics, there was a loss of $702,939,032. On the other nonbasics, there has been a loss of $375,049,631, or a grand total net realized loss on price supports of $1,073,115,955.

Mr. President, that is an exceedingly small cost to the Government of the United States for the operation of these programs for a 20-year period, taking into consideration all the good they have done in stabilizing prices to the benefit of producers and consumers alike.

Mr. Wheeler, budget officer of the Department of Agriculture, when he appeared before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee on January 19 of this year, testified that these figures, as above stated were correct. This is a far cry from the $14 billion cost as cited by some publications, or $900 million a year as cited by others.

The Department of Agriculture, through its budget officer, Mr. Wheeler, in his testimony before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee on January 19, 1954—that was only last year—gave some later figures on the cost of farm price supports. These were as of July 1, 1953.

Mr. President, I would like to quote a part of this testimony. It is very enlightening.

Senator ELLENDER. Before you get to that, you handed me a table here which indicates that the total losses on price supports for the basics was $20,720,931.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, sir, CCC price-support losses.

Senator ELLENDER. Those are the ones that I have in mind. I notice here with reference to cotton alone the gain on that was $268,219,477.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Senator ELLENDER. In other words, cotton has carried itself and the program has not only carried itself, but it has meant a profit to the Government of $268,219,477.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, sir.

Mr. President, this report which Mr. Wheeler presented to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee discloses some other very interesting figures. The cost of the corn price-support program for this same period of years, October 17, 1933, to July 1, 1953, was only $70,910,347. The loss on peanuts was $92,648,951. Rice lost $1,459,913. There was a gain on tobacco of $1,641,818. Wheat has lost $95,125,450.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Will the Senator repeat the figure for tobacco?

Mr. YOUNG. There was a net profit on the price-support-program operation over that 20-year period, so far as tobacco is concerned, of $1,641,818. That was as of July 1 last.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is the understanding of the Senator from Kentucky, though he may be in error, that the profits of the Commodity Credit Corporation on tobacco were more than $10 million during that length of time.

Mr. YOUNG. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that I will be happy to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the entire table presented to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by Mr. Wheeler.

Mr. President, the sum total, as contained in the testimony presented by Mr. Wheeler shows that during all the years of the operation of the price-support program for all basic farm commodities, there was only a net loss of $20,720,931.

We are undoubtedly going to sustain some sizable losses presently and for some time to come on these farm price-support operations. This is inevitable. We are in a most difficult postwar readjustment period for agriculture. I might also add, Mr. President, that in my opinion there are certain evils attached to all Government programs and farm price-support programs are no exception.

If the alternative of no price-support programs means bankrupt prices such as we had in the late twenties and early thirties—and I am sure it would—then we had better hang on to our present price-support program and try to improve it in every way we can.

We are going to have a problem with surpluses whether we continue our 90-percent supports or whether we have flexible price supports. Producers of basic and other storable farm commodities are perfectly willing to abide by very strict production-control programs. The wheat- and cotton-quota vote certainly gave ample proof of this. It should be noted that this is the first year that anything has been done to try to control surplus farm commodities.

This is the first year that anything has been done in an attempt to control farm surpluses. Indeed, the Department of Agriculture asked the farmers to increase corn production in 1953 by 2,342,000 acres. In other words, the Department of Agriculture only last year got through asking farmers to increase their corn production.

Still lower prices for agricultural commodities would be serious not only for our agricultural economy but for the economy of the entire Nation. Lower prices will help but little in exporting our surpluses. Certainly Canada, with its lower wages, lower taxes, two-price system for wheat under its pool, and lower transportation costs can easily undersell us. The Argentine and Russia can do the same. What is true of wheat is true of many other commodities. Lower support prices and lower cash prices will

help very little in decreasing production at home. Farmers have a tremendous investment in equipment and land that they cannot leave idle.

There are few profitable crops to which farmers can switch their production. Flexible supports might be a little more feasible if there were some profitable crops to which farmers could switch. That is not the case now.

Mr. President, just one more reference to this editorial in Life magazine. It states:

> In other words Senator YOUNG and other folklore-ridden politicians of his type would let the Government just keep on giving the farmers everything their most fanatic and shortsighted spokesmen might ask, meanwhile letting the surpluses of butter and eggs pile up in the warehouses to the eventual ruin of the farmers.

The editor does not seem to know that the egg price-support program was discontinued several years ago. Accuracy does not mean too much to him, however.

Credit for the price-support program for butter and dairy products has usually been associated with other Members of the Senate. I would like to associate myself completely with the objective of this price-support program for dairy products but believe it has some weaknesses that should be corrected. I have been hopeful that the dairy organization leaders and the Secretary of Agriculture could work out a more feasible program. I have always thought that a two-price support program for dairy products proposed by the later John Brandt, president of Land O'Lakes Creameries, had a great deal of merit.

Mr. President, I understand from good authority that the publishing of Life magazine is a very profitable business. One would not think that they would be accepting subsidies from the Government themselves, but they have. According to testimony before Congress by Postmaster General Summerfield during the last session, Life magazine received a sizable subsidy. According to his testimony, the losses to the Post Office Department in carrying Life magazine for the last quarter of 1952 alone was $2,151,009.

Mr. President, I refer to the tabulation entitled "Current Expenses for Aids and Special Services (Subsidies)," prepared by the Library of Congress. It will be noted, according to this study, that for fiscal year 1954 it is estimated that agriculture will receive aids or subsidies in the amount of $520 million. Again, this includes the school lunch program, losses on the price-support program, expenses of the International Wheat Agreement, the Sugar Act, which is self-financing, and other expenses of aid programs to farmers.

For this same period, fiscal year 1954, it is estimated that business will receive in aids and subsidies totaling $1,063 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this report printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YOUNG. Also, Mr. President, I should like to have inserted at the conclusion of my remarks two tables prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture giving detailed information on the costs of all agriculture programs over a period of years as indicated by the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, there is an excellent column in the Evening Star of January 25, 1954, by the noted columnist, Dorothy Thompson, entitled "Why Give Food to Enemies?" Her proposals have a great deal of merit. While Miss Thompson's columns have not always been favorable to all farm programs, she does have an objective and reasonable approach. Columnists like Miss Thompson make a real contribution. People recognize her sincerity of purpose and her tolerant attitude whether they believe what she writes or not.

Mr. President, I have also noted a column by Doris Fleeson entitled "Politics and the Farm Problem" appearing in the Evening Star of January 25, 1954. While I often disagree with Doris Fleeson and her articles with respect to farm problems and others, she, too, writes in an objective way. Her column is widely read and carries a lot of influence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have both of these columns inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

Current expenses for aids and special services (subsidies)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	1952 actual	1953 estimate	1954 estimate
Agriculture	$463	$547	$520
Business	1,041	1,018	1,063
Labor	200	206	222
Homeowners and tenants	−129	−123	−132
Veterans	4,710	4,411	4,445
International aids:			
Civil	4,896	5,886	7,444
Military services		30	100
Other aids and special services	1,364	1,530	1,533
Total, current expenses for aids and special services	12,246	13,206	15,194

Agriculture: Current expenses predominantly for the benefit of farmers consist chiefly of losses realized on the price-support program, expenses of the International Wheat Agreement, Sugar Act payments, payments for removal of surplus commodities, and administrative expenses of loan programs and other aids to farmers.

Business: The major types of current Federal expenditures primarily benefiting business enterprises are the portions of the postal deficits arising from airmail and second-, third-, and fourth-class mail; maritime operating subsidies and navigation and other aids to the shipping industry; various aids to air navigation; and the net losses accruing on defense production aids.

Labor: The largest Federal expenditure in the field of aids to labor is for the Federal-State program of unemployment insurance and public-employment offices, in which the Federal Department of Labor makes grants to the States to cover the full cost of administering these services. Also, in this category is the mine safety work of the Bureau of Mines.

Homeowners and tenants: Net receipts from insurance of mortgages and savings and loan share accounts, as well as from mortgage purchases and other housing-loan programs, exceed all current budget expenditures for housing by over $100 million in all 3 years.

Veterans: In 1954, more than half of the current expenditures for aids to veterans are for compensation and pensions.

International aids: All except $181 million of the $7,544 million in current expenditures for international aids in the fiscal year 1954 will be for the mutual-security program, the great bulk of the mutual-security expenditures as well as of the sharp increase from 1953 to 1954 is to purchase military equipment for our allies.

Other aids and special services: Many other Federal programs involve current expenditures for aids and special services providing major benefits for more than one of the above groups or for other groups. The most important of such expenditures are grants to help provide public assistance to those in need, including the aged, the blind, the permanently and totally disabled, and dependent children. Other major programs include grants to help finance low-priced school lunches, hospital operation and medical care by the Public Health Service, and increasing expenditures for various aids to Indians.

(Source: The Budget for Fiscal Year 1954, Supplementary Tables and Explanatory Analyses. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1953; pp. 1101–1102 (83d Cong., 1st sess. H. Doc. No. 16.))

POSTAL SUBSIDIES

Postmaster General Summerfield in defending his proposed increases in second and third class postal rates was recently quoted in U. S. News & World Report:

"The total I last saw for all subsidies paid for the price-support program for farmers since 1933 was something like $752 million, whereas the loss in handling second-class mail (newspapers and magazines) for the same period has been $2.4 billion."

Farmers' most used postal services (first class and parcel post) are in the black or will be October 1 when a new parcel-post rate set by Interstate Commerce Commission goes into effect, Summerfield told the House Post Office Committee. Losses are on second and third class mail.

Here's his breakdown on losses the last quarter of 1952 for 10 magazines and newspapers, as given in House hearings on H. R. 6052:

	Postage paid	Cost of handling	Loss
Life	$1,273,000	$3,424,000	$2,151,000
Saturday Evening Post	690,000	2,321,000	1,631,000
Ladies Home Journal	215,000	623,000	408,000
Collier's	386,000	1,623,000	1,237,000
Reader's Digest	134,000	1,051,000	917,000
Chicago Tribune	154,000	601,000	447,000
New York Times	211,000	636,000	425,000
Detroit Free Press	17,000	75,000	58,000
St. Louis Post-Dispatch	37,000	150,000	113,000
Los Angeles Times	24,000	69,000	45,000

EXHIBIT 2

Analysis of program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1953 [1] *(realized gains and losses)*

Program and commodity	Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1941	July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1946	Fiscal year ended June 30— 1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1953
Price-support program: [2]										
Basic commodities:										
Corn	[3]$20,078,488	[3]$14,336,509	$278,492	[3]$27,030	[3]$605,187	[3]$17,189,119	[3]$748,839	$1,783,916	[3]$20,526,523	[3]$70,910,347
Cotton	[3]27,401,708	218,328,306	46,536,525	[3]344,914	[3]1,023,816	3,419,604	28,938,218	148,924	[3]381,572	268,219,477
Cotton, Puerto Rican		[3]126,011	[3]4,187							[3]130,198
Cotton, export differential [4]		[3]27,651,360	[3]13,738,415	25,557						[3]41,361,218
Cotton, rubber barter		11,055,451								11,055,451
Peanuts			727,481	[3]2,757,330	[3]23,794,910	[3]40,592,601	[3]14,584,837	[3]8,670,873	[3]2,975,881	[3]92,648,951
Rice					1,786	[3]1,293,780	53,071	57,271	[3]277,861	[3]1,459,513
Tobacco	[3]2,107,589	7,074,300	7,437	59,800	115,524	195,495	71,450	[3]1,014,923	[3]2,759,676	1,641,815
Wheat	[3]6,199,460	[3]11,775,173	605,509	[3]11,727	[3]3,740,046	[3]28,384,123	[3]19,013,932	[3]7,722,262	[3]18,886,296	[3]95,127,450
Total	[3]55,787,335	182,568,944	34,415,902	[3]3,055,644	[3]25,507,649	[3]83,844,524	[3]5,284,869	[3]15,417,947	[3]45,807,809	[3]20,720,931
Designated nonbasic commodities:										
Milk and butterfat:										
Butter						[3]4,111,861	[3]44,216,443	41,571	[3]436,492	[3]48,743,225
Cheese						[3]1,031,078	[3]24,040,464	31,405	14,708	[3]25,025,429
Milk, dried			[3]12,487	415,987	149,335	[3]14,619,145	[3]42,707,738	[3]1,183,459	[3]4,798,735	[3]62,766,242
Honey				[3]404,056	[3]470,414		[3]1,499	107	4,924	[3]870,938
Potatoes, Irish [5]		[3]25,197,222	[3]62,920,977	[3]47,405,542	[3]203,886,603	[3]75,090,315	[3]63,437,281	[3]85,459	[3]73,658	[3]478,097,057
Tung oil				[3]4,747	[3]306,844	30	233,811	[3]1,154	[3]451	[3]79,355
Wool	[3]176	[3]15,834,163	[3]33,484,660	[3]19,501,357	[3]12,707,148	[3]10,755,942	142,596	[3]86,610	[3]15,290	[3]92,242,759
Total	[3]176	[3]41,031,385	[3]96,418,133	[3]66,899,715	[3]217,221,674	[3]105,608,311	[3]174,027,018	[3]1,283,599	[3]5,324,994	[3]707,815,005
Other nonbasic commodities:										
Barley		[3]40,019	80,550	275	[3]672,499	[3]2,008,938	[3]1,760,903	[3]2,807,078	[3]2,105,112	[3]10,063,725
Beans, dry edible		[3]179,753	155	10	3,388	[3]880,329	[3]11,746,232	[3]15,429,183	[3]6,777,410	[3]35,008,754
Castor beans		[3]171,224		31						[3]171,193
Cotton, American-Egyptian		[3]538,573	37,023	6,577	[3]2		14,358	175,206	294,665	[3]10,746
Cottonseed and products						[3]597,728	5,506,631	[3]2,686,612	7,701,799	15,297,314
Eggs [6]		[3]224,002	[3]11,583,784	[3]26,879,017	[3]773,476	[3]41,622,784	[3]76,055,947	[3]29,368,028	[3]4,256,139	[3]180,712,177
Flax fiber			6,100	[3]179,852	[3]155,842	[3]67,464	[3]55			[3]397,113
Flaxseed and linseed oil		[3]22,209	2,727	40,293	1,163,915	[3]3,765,056	[3]57,590,998	[3]4,083,100	[3]1,422,997	[3]66,207,512
Fruit, dried		[3]109,489		[3]15,563,385	445,737	209,337	46,215	[3]855		[3]14,882,320
Grain sorghum		437,456	10,141	[3]15	[3]3,590,174	[3]10,514,934	[3]22,644,554	31,639	674,126	[3]35,396,319
Grapefruit juice				[3]1,732,374						[3]1,732,374
Hemp and hemp fiber		[3]20,201,375	[3]1,267,169	[3]7,702	8,946	[3]98	21	[3]1,778		[3]21,450,155
Hops	[3]162,036	[3]792,164								[3]954,209
Naval stores	[3]4,435,579	5,997,861	[3]400	[3]107,063	[3]429,567	[3]449,795	[3]1,974,111	3,876	30,253	[3]1,355,385
Oats			3,056	287	[3]45,714	[3]413,295	15,238	[3]738,889	[3]194,938	[3]1,374,255
Olive oil									[3]170	[3]170
Peas, dry, edible		[3]3,012	648		140	[3]658,800	[3]227,720	[3]655	[3]31	[3]889,436
Pecans		[3]3,751								[3]3,751
Rye	[3]4,575	60,751	14,932		[3]2,186	[3]223,210	[3]34,759	18,599	7,947	[3]162,501
Seeds		[3]148,193	18,660	[3]13,731	[3]264,337	[3]74,026	295,432	[3]537,879	[3]4,050,655	[3]4,874,709
Soybeans			2,741,090	4,987	26,054	1,754,206	[3]139,442	1,574	[3]24,893	4,363,576
Sugar, Puerto Rican and Virgin Island				23,830						23,830
Sugar beets				[3]11,859,187	[3]4,658,082					[3]16,517,269
Sweetpotatoes			95	[3]138,181	1,985	1,453	[3]773			[3]135,421
Turkeys				[3]3,708	[3]495	44,438	[3]29,185			11,070
Vegetables, canned		[3]6,888	12,631	6,281	[3]89					11,942
Total	[3]4,602,190	[3]15,944,584	[3]9,892,605	[3]55,401,647	[3]9,032,671	[3]59,777,004	[3]166,286,667	[3]50,650,030	[3]10,013,555	[3]381,600,953
Total price support	[3]60,389,701	125,592,975	[3]71,894,836	[3]125,357,006	[3]254,761,994	[3]249,229,839	[3]345,598,554	[3]67,351,576	[3]61,146,358	[3]1,110,136,889
Supply program: [7 8]										
Cotton and linters		1,592,551	24,865	245,904	12,879					1,876,199
Grains and seeds		23,969,000	23,792,977	19,094,286	4,548,038	2,981,607	722,558	437,204	405,837	75,951,501
Oils (bulk)		29,937	67,620	107,442	291,296	363,092	42,136	6,020	9,194	917,337
Tobacco		4,179,335	588,749							4,768,084
General commodities purchase [9]			176,701,759	11,127,662	[3]342,973	[3]1,246,411	[3]1,551,484	[3]195,564	1,314,667	185,807,656
Processed and packaged commodities [8]			26,438,161	10,517,533	1,092,093	752,611	118,439	162,193	23,559	39,104,609
Sugar, Puerto Rican raw						37,157	[3]567		9,439	46,029
Other		[3]2,120,517	[3]420,893	494,601	[3]368,475	[3]2,041	3,185			[3]3,414,050
Total supply program		26,650,306	227,193,238	41,587,512	5,232,858	2,886,615	[3]665,713	409,853	1,762,696	305,057,365
Foreign purchase program: [8 9]										
Cotton		5,439,464	457,029	[3]758			2,617	2,617		5,895,735
Fats and oils		22,543,441	17,985,560	[3]1,491,644	[3]53,306	1,524	[3]37,417	[3]2,550		38,915,608
Foodstuffs		4,620,232	2,441,131	[3]1,555,187	102,305	47,482	17,755	9,770	[3]2,616	5,680,872
Other		[3]274,627	18,102	3,089			24,318	53,378		[3]175,749
Total foreign purchase		32,328,510	20,871,822	[3]3,044,500	48,999	49,006	7,273	57,981	[3]2,616	50,316,475
Commodity export program:										
Cotton [10]		[3]7,098,694	[3]5,490,500	[3]8,120	60,632	1,753	[3]2,729	1,494		[3]12,637,164
Wheat		[3]1,209,445	[3]618							[3]1,210,063
Total commodity export		[3]8,308,139	[3]5,491,118	[3]8,120	60,632	1,753	[3]2,729	1,494		[3]13,747,227
Storage facilities program		[3]10,087,438	721,069	[3]133,209	[3]438,460	[3]91,959	[3]498,980	[3]1,628,947	131,488	[3]12,036,436
Accounts and notes receivable (chargeoffs)		11,134	[3]556,732	[3]106,602	[3]138,717	[3]86,113	[3]454,137	[3]196,247	[3]253,682	[3]1,781,096
Total (excluding wartime consumer subsidy costs) [11]	[3]60,389,701	166,187,348	170,843,443	[3]87,061,925	[3]349,906,682	[3]246,470,537	[3]347,213,840	[3]68,707,442	[3]59,518,472	[3]783,327,808
Wartime consumer subsidy program [12]		[3]2,130,581,589	22,364,160	4,025,128	2,235,782	[3]113,351	[3]258,372	266,423	74,623	[3]2,101,987,196
Grand total	[3]60,389,701	[3]1,964,394,241	193,207,603	[3]83,036,797	[3]247,760,900	[3]246,583,888	[3]347,472,212	[3]68,441,019	[3]59,443,849	[3]2,884,315,004

[1] Allocation of losses and gains as between "Price-support program" and "Supply program" for the period prior to the fiscal year 1947 was made on the basis of an analysis completed in April 1949. Since accounting records maintained prior to July 1, 1946, did not provide for this segregation, it was necessary to analyze program results in detail and in some cases make an estimate of the distribution between "Price support" and "Supply" of the total operating result as shown by the accounting records. This analysis was based on all known factors concerning the operations with respect to each commodity.

[2] Denotes loss.

[3] Includes export differential on owned or pooled cotton only. Differential on exporters' cotton included under "commodity export program."

[4] Includes price support loss of $2,820,639 on the 1943 and 1944 potato programs, which was formerly included under the general commodities purchase program.

[5] Includes price support loss of $11,956,386 on the 1944 egg program, which was formerly included under the general commodities purchase program.

[6] Portion of overall supply and foreign purchase program effective July 1, 1952.

[7] Includes gain of $178,697,602 carried as "Special reserve—general commodities purchase program" as of June 30, 1946, and transferred to income in May 1947. Also see footnotes 4 and 5.

[8] During the period July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1949, activity under this program was reported as general supply program.

[9] Insofar as possible, operating results have been retroactively classified to correspond with current budgetary programs. In some instances, the accounts maintained prior to July 1, 1946, did not make possible a precise segregation of the results of foreign procurement operations.

[10] Includes export differential on exporters' cotton only.

[11] Includes losses totaling $56,239,432 on price-support commodities disposed of in accordance with Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Cong., i. e., transferred to foreign assistance outlets at a price equal to price of a quantity of wheat having equivalent caloric value. The Corporation was reimbursed for these losses by the Secretary of the Treasury.

[12] Subsidy losses on corn for alcohol, wheat for alcohol, and wheat for feed are included on an estimated basis. For detail of subsidy costs by commodities by fiscal years, see Report of Financial Condition and Operations as of June 30, 1949.

Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (sec. 32)—Expenditures by programs and commodities, fiscal years 1936–53

Commodity	Stamp plans	Purchases	Diversion	Exportation	Total
Almonds			$1,713,431		$1,713,431
Apples (canned, dried and fresh)	$10,782,000	$61,192,983	14,300	$9,462,460	81,451,743
Apricots (dried)		1,155,002		143,663	1,298,665
Beans (dry, lima and snap)	12,644,843	12,439,746			25,084,589
Beef		1,489,417			1,489,417
Beets		1,012,940			1,012,940
Blackberries		134,600			134,600
Butter	26,188,453	83,904,601		32,708	110,125,762
Cabbage		4,712,398	425,782		5,138,180
Carrots		1,247,785	65,710		1,313,495
Cauliflower		119,880			119,880
Celery		481,092			481,092
Chard		258			258
Cheese		3,718,905			3,718,905
Cherries		2,227,623			2,227,623
Citrus (juice and salad)		34,062	83,734		117,796
Coffee			622,354		622,354
Corn		94,949		758,466	853,415
Cornmeal	8,023,000	9,498,413		12,625	17,534,038
Cotton	24,017,000	46,490,584	16,529,915	98,629,517	185,667,016
Cottonseed oil		1,705,862			1,705,862
Cranberries		1,187,303			1,187,303
Dates			345,279	33,777	379,056
Eggs	43,568,415	81,061,999		17,225,567	141,855,981
Figs		1,388,431	938,245	281,056	2,607,732
Filberts		223,602	307,118		530,720
Fish		1,159,723			1,159,723
Flax fiber			189,736		189,736
Flaxseed				5,447,985	5,447,985
Grapes		463,503			463,503
Grapefruit (fruit and juice)	3,483,000	21,401,180		1,199,609	26,083,789
Greens		32,313			32,313
Hominy grits	1,449,000	2,010,406			3,459,406
Honey		8,491,593	18,353	2,815,384	11,325,330
Hops			664,839		664,839
Kale		26,674			26,674
Lard	7,024,000	12,290,342			19,314,342
Lemons (fruit and juice)				396,055	396,055
Linseed oil				388,902	388,902
Loganberries		22,117			22,117
Meat, miscellaneous		177,151			177,151
Milk		37,750,688	13,246,524	112,426	51,109,638
Oats, rolled		$3,401,290			$3,401,290
Olive oil		442,616			442,616
Onions		2,928,946			2,928,946
Oranges (fruit and juice)	$12,924,186	19,581,780	$601,405	$18,466,397	51,573,777
Peaches	2,269,000	7,645,676		102,928	10,017,604
Peanut butter		1,705,665			1,705,665
Peanuts			11,240,103	15,602,289	26,842,392
Pears	1,957,000	8,162,055	486,203	1,327,625	11,932,883
Peas (canned, dried, and fresh)		2,270,845			2,270,845
Pecans		3,330,517		514,843	3,845,360
Pineapple		52,840			52,840
Plums		506,368			506,368
Pork products	$36,079,000	29,755,215		141,620	65,975,835
Pork and beans		2,050,062			2,050,062
Potatoes, Irish	18,316,000	51,250,488	34,569,208	1,881,315	106,017,011
Potatoes, sweet		3,746,481	189,514		3,935,995
Prunes (dried and fresh)	4,129,740	16,453,432	2,470,778	13,497,390	36,551,340
Raisins	1,957,000	9,997,820	1,637,708	19,554,844	33,147,438
Rice	1,896,000	5,191,736		25,200	6,612,936
Sauerkraut		15,107			15,107
Shortening, vegetable	99,000				99,000
Sorghum, grains			26,386	5,998,307	6,024,693
Soup		926,625			926,625
Spinach		277,040			277,040
Squash		135,886			135,886
Sugar, beet		110,951			110,951
Syrup		361,608			361,608
Tangerines		1,081,272			1,081,272
Tobacco			9,533,540	8,550,381	18,083,921
Tomatoes		3,807,920			3,807,920
Turkeys		33,373,158			33,373,158
Turnips		7,668			7,668
Vegetables, miscellaneous	30,970,187	5,763			30,975,950
Walnuts		1,456,124	9,940,518	2,365,035	13,755,677
Watermelons		599			599
Wheat		5,555,941	8,034	16,177,084	21,741,059
Wheat cereal	1,248	4,545,739			4,546,987
Wheat flour	38,694,422	37,731,300		30,568,753	106,994,475
Other		12,075,811			12,075,811
Total	285,972,494	669,284,484	105,785,013	271,797,945	1,332,839,936

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 25, 1954]

WHY GIVE FOOD TO ENEMIES?—UNITED STATES SHOULD GIVE AWAY ITS SURPLUS TO THOSE IN NEED BUT CERTAINLY NOT TO HOSTILE COUNTRIES

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Perhaps I am simple minded, but I don't see why the disposal of presently accumulated agricultural surpluses creates such a problem.

All the butter (over a quarter of a billion pounds), wheat, dried milk, dried eggs, and so forth, in proportionate quantities, have been paid for by American taxpayers at above world market prices to give farm producers an assured market at prices approaching those of industry.

These products cannot be dumped on the home market without canceling the purpose behind their purchase.

But meanwhile, the United States continues to aid friendly nations with money appropriations for which we are further taxed. A portion of the money goes to purchase food which the recipients must import. Why not give them the food?

Congress appropriates money for military aid. Part of the cost of maintaining armies is in feeding them. All foreign armies are badly fed by American mess standards, but some are badly fed by any standards. The French army, for example, is badly fed, yet, while we contribute financially to support that army, bread grains are overflowing storage bins and butter is going rancid. Why not raise French and other European army rations by food shipped and earmarked for that purpose?

Last summer the West German Government gave away, at American cost, millions of food packets to underfed Soviet-zone Germans. West German welfare agencies, of which there are five big ones—those of the Evangelical Churches, Catholic, trade unions, the Red Cross, and the so-called "parity group," a pool of smaller agencies—are sending continual aid to their East German brethren, limited only by short supply. Camps and welfare stations are crowded with West Germans and fugitives, many of whom suffer from tuberculosis caused by undernutrition. Why not send bread and butter, milk and eggs to these agencies for their work in both zones?

Seven hundred and fifty thousand Palestinian Arab refugees are living in camps, on United Nations rations, 70 percent of the cost of which is annually appropriated by the United States Congress. Their rations are abominable. Only nursing mothers, children, and the sick ever get a drop of milk (made from dried milk). Butter and other fats are all but nonexistent, and bread flour is often bad. Why not feed them, and decently, with United States surpluses?

India is forever on the edge of famine.

Even rancid butter—tons of which have been destroyed here—is the only butter teeming millions of Middle Easterners ever see, and their tastes are adjusted to prefer it. European working—and even middle-class—families buy rancid butter and purify it for cooking and baking. After purification no unpleasant taste is discernible in the finished product.

It is proposed to ship butter to the Soviet Union, the only objection being, apparently, that the Soviets shouldn't get it below the price paid by American housewives—which nobody else will pay—and that we might undercut the Danish market. Meanwhile, our propaganda agencies are emphasizing low nutrition standards in the U. S. S. R. and its European satellites, and the Malenkov regime is making frantic efforts to improve them by a new import policy, for which it is releasing gold, which cannot be manufactured into either guns or butter.

Why should the United States help get the Communist states out of the jam that is solely due to their own policies? There is no land or population problem in the entire area, which should have large agricultural surpluses. There is no population pressure on inadequate land as there is in Italy, Egypt, Palestine, India—to name only a few—and the Communist governments claim to be people's paradises. Why should America contribute to mollify their peoples and thus strengthen the Communist regimes? And for what quid pro quos?

Give it all away, say I (who, like all other Americans, have paid for it), to friendly peoples, refugees, and nations whose food problems are due to natural causes. But not to hostile governments whose food shortages are self-created.

POLITICS AND THE FARM PROBLEM—GENERAL ANTI-INTELLECTUALISM OF THESE TIMES REFLECTED IN RELUCTANCE TO EXPLORE THE SITUATION FULLY

(By Doris Fleeson)

Who are today's farmers?

Is farming an industry or is it a way of life?

What is to be the attitude of the administration and Congres toward it? Should the marginal farmer be forced out?

These are the basic social questions that are being ignored as an election-year Congress prepares to extend high rigid price supports for another year. All price supports—flexible as preferred by Secretary of Agriculture Benson or rigid in the congressional manner—are palliatives only.

A tendency exists to regard this outcome as "just politics."

In a way it is but in a larger sense, Congress is striking a balance of social forces in favor of what it thinks is the greatest number of individual farmers. That is the way political programs generally develop. It is also part of the American credo that the family-size farm is the backbone of American democracy.

The tragic irony is that while the high supports deemed vital to that farm majority result in great surpluses, its own contribution to them is relatively minor.

One agriculture authority asserts that 10 percent of the producers are responsible for 75 percent of the surpluses. These figures reflect: (1) The mechanization of farming with the correspondingly great increase in corporate farmers. (2) The growing number of city people encouraged by the high income-tax structure to put their profits into farms and ranches with Uncle Sam picking up the biggest part of the tab for their losses. Many cattlemen say the second group is wholly responsible for the recent beef debacle. In many United States counties, city dwellers own virtually all the land.

The corporate farmer who controls thousands of acres or the city dweller whose farm is his avocation has one vote. So has the wool hat in Georgia with 40 acres and a mule and his vote means more than that of the big city dweller.

The paradox is that price supports have probably helped the former group, which needs help least, an enormous total amount, while the wool hat makes relatively little though that little is vital to him.

Most Members of Congress understand human needs and want to help people; otherwise they wouldn't choose so human a trade as politics. Their present reluctance to explore fully and publicly the social aspects of the farm problem is part of the general anti-intellectualism of the times.

Planning, like the toothpick, is not mentioned in polite Washington society and its necessary use is carried on more or less surreptitiously lest the congressional primitives raise the cry of New Dealer.

Senators best acquainted with the farm problem admit, however, that nothing done so far represents a basic approach and that in the meantime the whole face of agriculture is changing, with life more difficult all the time for the family-size farmer. They do not think that Secretary Benson is indifferent; actually the Secretary has raised, though he has not pressed, many of the right questions about what kind of agriculture do we really want and what are we prepared to pay for it.

It is a problem to which partisan politics can make no contribution whatever but harm.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I just read the editorial in Life magazine to which the Senator has referred, and I could not let the opportunity pass without rising and giving my testimony in support of the statesmanship of the Senator from North Dakota. The Senator and I disagree on many things, but I have never found him failing to function according to the tenets which I think represent our primary obligation in the Senate, namely, to arrive at an independent judgment on the merits of issues as we see them and in accordance with the facts as we believe them to be. The Senator from North Dakota calls the shots as he sees them. He has performed his work in behalf of the people of North Dakota on the basis of the principle of intellectual honesty, and I, as one of his colleagues in the Senate, resent the smear in the editorial to which he has referred. But it has become the common technique of the reactionary political forces in America, when they cannot answer on the basis of argument, to smear. It is a foreign technique, Mr. President, and there is no place for it in American politics, even when practiced by Life magazine.

I share the views of the Senator from North Dakota as he has expressed them in connection with this editorial. It was about a year ago that I said on the floor of the Senate that the Luce publications ought to be spelled "l-o-o-s-e," because they are loose when it comes to presenting the facts to their readers. The editorial in question is a good example of exactly what I meant a year ago when I expressed my disrespect to the Luce publications on the floor of the Senate, and during the past year there has been nothing in their editorial policy that has changed my opinion of these reactionary journalistic media and their effort to smear those with whom they do not agree.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oregon. What I say concerning agriculture or anything else, particularly agriculture, I say in dead earnest; make no mistake about that. I am, first, a farmer, and, second, a Republican.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret very much that I was unavoidably detained from the Senate and was denied the privilege of hearing the remarks of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I know from my years of association with him in the Senate, both on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and in enjoying the relationship of a cosponsor with him on price-support bills, that he is always fair and is always reasonable.

I hope the Senator, in the course of his remarks, dealt with the campaign of misrepresentation in regard to rigid price controls which is now being waged throughout the country. I have noticed article after article seeking to arouse the people in the cities against those who live on the farms and supply the necessities of life, and seeking to give the impression that any farmer is entitled to produce any amount of any commodity he desires, and that the Government is required to take it at 90 percent of parity.

That is a direct misrepresentation. I know of no rigid support program for all commodities that would permit a farmer to produce all he wishes to produce. I have never favored a 90-percent support price for commodities which could not be controlled at the source of production. All the blame has been placed on the farmers.

I hope the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, in the course of his remarks, pointed out that the farmers, certainly those who produce cotton and, I think, those who produce wheat—those are the two outstanding surpluses—voted controls for the crop year of 1950, and that controls were in effect at that time, but with the outbreak of hostilities in Korea the Department of Agriculture appealed to the farmers of America as a patriotic duty to produce vastly larger quantities of wheat and cotton, because we had learned from experience in other wars that those commodities were essential to the achievement of victory.

It was at the demand of the Department of Agriculture that those surpluses were accumulated. The farmers are not responsible for it, because they had voted, by more than a two-thirds vote, to impose controls in the crop year of 1950. The farmers have again voted for controls in order to make it possible to dispose of these surpluses without any great loss to the taxpayers and without any exploitation of those who consume those commodities in the cities.

I am sure the Senator likewise pointed out that that part of the consumer's dollar which is received by the farmer has shrunk and shrunk from year to year until, according to the latest available report, the farmer, whom they now seek to make the scapegoat, now receives the smallest proportion of the consumer's dollar he has received in 20 years.

The farmer has always shown himself willing to adjust himself to any plan to work off any surplus that might have been accumulated, whether it was in response to the demands of his Government or because of the accidents of production.

I did not hear the Senator's remarks, but I shall read them with great interest. I salute him again as being an abiding friend of a fair deal for the American farmer. That is all that has been sought in the legislation which he and I have sponsored in the way of a price-support program.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has brought up new and important points not covered in my speech. The very fact that the Senator from Georgia and I have worked very closely together on agricultural programs indicates that there is no politics involved so far as we are concerned. It has been a bipartisan action, and there is certainly no demagogery involved.

I appreciate the Senator's remarks more than I can say.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to comment on the remarks of the able Senator from Georgia whom I consider one of the farmers' outstanding friends in this Nation, I care not whether he is from south of the Mason and Dixon's line or where he is from.

The prices of farm commodities are declining, and the farmer is still faced with inflationary prices of all the things which he buys and uses in all his operations, as well as with higher taxes to pay for the maintenance of township and county schools. Because we are in a transition period, going from the little rural school to the consolidated school, every farmer in the Nation is subject to a heavier tax for school purposes. The farmer is not only paying for the consolidation of school districts, but he must pay for the buses which are furnished for the transportation of the school children, and the township must proceed with road improvements to permit the school buses to travel during the months of the school year.

All of this is heaped upon the producer, and he is still laboring under the

inflationary operating expenses the Korean war imposed upon him. Furthermore, he has suffered a drop of more than $4,200,000,000 in his net income during the past 4 years, even though the gross income was higher in 1953 than it was in 1947. On top of that, when he endeavors to call attention to the fact that there is need to maintain price supports, in order that there will not be a recurrence of the depression of the 1930's, he is ridiculed, and editorials are written about him as if he were a demagog serving in the United States Congress.

I commend the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for having the courage to come upon the floor of the Senate and give some of the facts, and to write into the RECORD the fact that he does not approve such tactics. I commend him for his courage in standing up and fighting for his principles when the need arises. I wish now, as I did earlier, to express my appreciation to him for the service he has rendered to agriculture in his remarks this afternoon. Likewise, I wish to commend again the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for speaking as he has.

I may say to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that, although he and I may differ on some questions, nevertheless, on the agricultural question we have recognized the fundamental conditions faced by the farmers. In the 1930's foreclosures were taking place across the country in such great numbers that the recorders at the county seats could not keep up with the foreclosure proceedings to keep them current. But when farmers complained, the stock answer usually was, "The farmer is a chronic bellyacher." Does the Senator recall those days of the early 1930's?

Mr. YOUNG. I do.

Mr. THYE. The farmers of the Nation are faced with a threat. Frankly, I do not propose to be one who will stand idly by and see our national agricultural economy shrink into nothing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. As the representative of the Independent Party, I wish to say to my good friend, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], that I associate myself not only with his remarks on the farm problem, but also with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I may say that the Independent Party is 100 percent correct in its stand on the farm problem.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from North Dakota is very kind. I wish to add this comment: I love to talk to labor groups about the farm problem, and to farm groups about the labor problem. I think there is a design afoot in America. I find wedges of discord between farm groups and labor groups, although their economic interests happen to be common. They represent, of course, the two great purchasing power groups in the United States. If the purchasing power of the farmers and workers declines, then the cash registers in the stores of America are not going to jingle with the same frequency they do when that purchasing power is high.

With the permission of the Senator from North Dakota, I may say that since Congress adjourned last summer I have discussed in various parts of the United States some of my views on the farm issue. At Bismarck, N. Dak., on November 5, I went into some detail in setting forth my views. Unless the Senator from North Dakota objects, I should like to have incorporated as a part of remarks at this time the speech I made at Bismarck on the subject: Full Production: America's First Line of Defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL PRODUCTION: AMERICA'S FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

(Address by Senator MORSE at North Dakota Farmers Union convention, Bismarck, N. Dak., November 5, 1953)

Mr. Chairman, delegates, and friends, it is a pleasure to be here at the North Dakota Farmers Union convention. When I want to find out about farm problems I find it necessary to consult farmers. As a Senator, it is invaluable to me to attend meetings of this sort to obtain additional information in detail about the farm problems I have been studying.

Secretary Benson's reluctant meeting with the Farmers Union delegation last week is typical of the Eisenhower administration's method of operation. You and I have heard how Soil Conservation Association officers and members have found it almost impossible to discuss conservation programs with United States Department of Agriculture officials of the new administration.

Changes in the Soil Conservation Service, which Secretary Benson has put into effect in spite of growing protests against his reorganization plan, are further evidence of Benson's disregard of the small farmers. He should have consulted very closely with representative groups of dirt farmers and answered their criticisms of his Soil Conservation Service reorganization plan before he put it into effect. This is further evidence that large corporate farm interests, along with the bankers, call the shots in the Department of Agriculture these days. That's no way to run a Department of Agriculture.

Over a year ago Candidate Eisenhower was lavish in his promises to farmers. To hear him then was to hear that 90 percent of parity was not enough; 100 percent of parity was the Eisenhower crusade goal. Ways would be found, he orated, to support perishables. Trust in him and all would be well.

Eisenhower has discovered that a candidate's promises and a President's performance are far different things. In his recent Kansas City speech he was still promising on all 12 Cadillac crusade cylinders. But his slogan has become "Wait till next year." That's all very well for the manager of a baseball team after the end of a losing season. It's no way to run a government.

During the 1952 campaign Eisenhower did not frankly tell the American people that he had no farm program. After over 10 months in office it is clear that this is the case. While prices slide and surpluses mount, the best that Eisenhower and Benson can do is promise great new bold programs that will make everything just dandy. Hoover did a better job in summing up such promises with "Prosperity is just around the corner."

The least this administration can do is take the American farmer and American consumer into its confidence. The least it can do is consult with the farmers and get their views and suggestions. Benson is outdoing the bureaucrat of caricatures in spinning out theoretical approaches to practical problems.

I do not want a farm program which is good only for the farmers. I say this unequivocally—the American people and the American economy cannot afford a farm depression. The first order of business is to lower consumer prices and to stabilize farm prices. Benson's "adjustments" are as helpful as bleeding patients in the Middle Ages when what they really needed was a transfusion.

The Secretary has unsettled commodity markets with his preaching. Until he has an affirmative program—which he does not—the least he can do is stop encouraging commodity speculators from buying in the hopes of lower prices. His false optimism, which only results in scare selling, because farmers feel he will not be of any assistance, is of little help and has caused considerable harm.

The farmer is continuing to buy dear and is selling cheaper every day. If the farmers continue to lose purchasing power, the rest of the Nation's economy will suffer.

The basic difficulty with the present administration appears to be that it looks upon farm surpluses as a national tragedy. That is timid nonsense. The strength of this Nation economically and militarily is its magnificent industrial potential and, equally, its magnificent agricultural production potential. It would be shortsighted to pursue policies designed to discourage farmers from staying on the land and producing abundantly.

This Nation's high standard of living is its greatest bulwark against communism and totalitarianism in any form. That standard of living cannot be maintained and improved under a program of scarcity. A plentiful food supply—yes, a surplus food supply—is an indispensable element to a fuller material life for all of our people.

The major premise of my thesis is based on the fact that one of the greatest assets the American people possess is the surplus food potential of the United States. It is probably true that most of our fellow citizens in America do not fully appreciate the value of that asset to them as free men and women.

However, if the time ever comes when we do not have that potential of surplus food in our country, then I fear that historians will record that on that date American civilization started to decline. It is very easy for people when they consider matters of public policy to overlook the relationship of the land and its production to the standard of living, culture, and quality of the civilization of the people of the entire Nation.

Without farmland able to produce needed food, our industrial production withers; our schools vanish; our life becomes a feeble scramble for enough to keep us barely alive. In this process our civilization goes by the wayside.

It is a conviction of mine that if we do not protect the surplus food potential of the United States, we shall strike a serious blow to the values and standards of our civilization itself. That point needs to be kept in mind as our population as a whole considers the fiscal problems which are connected with the maintenance of a surplus food potential in the United States. The assumption on the part of many persons seems to be that any appropriation related to the surplus food potential is an appropriation for the selfish benefit of the individual farmers of the Nation. I deny that

premise. To the contrary, we should take the point of view that appropriations which are essential to the maintenance of the surplus food potential are appropriations that benefit all of the people of the United States, and are necessary for the promotion of the general welfare.

I care not whether the issue is one of sound soil conservation or one of a support price for some agricultural commodity or one of a fair parity formula, or of a necessary subsidy; the basic truth which should not be overlooked is that we are dealing with an issue which concerns not alone the economic advantage of the farmers, but also the interest and economic advantage and the welfare of every citizen of our country.

I feel that any philosophical or practical approach which we must make to our long-range agricultural operations are based upon the demand for the products of the soil for human consumption. The demands upon our soil are not by any means static.

Our population increase in this country is amazing. Here's our record.

The number of people in the United States is increasing at an average rate of more than 6,000 persons a day, 250 persons every hour, and 4 persons every minute. This is a net increase. The Bureau of the Census estimated in 1950 that, at the present rate of increase, the United States population would exceed 200 million persons by 1975.

In other words, this 38-million population increase means adding the population of the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri.

Today the average person in this country will consume a little more than three-quarters of a ton of food in a year. The average-sized adult eats his weight in food every 6 to 8 weeks, or about 7 times a year. This allows 25 percent for spoilage, waste, and other loss. Per capita consumption in 1951 is estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics at 1,570 pounds, retail weight.

In recent years we have been eating not only more food, but better food and our diets have been more balanced—more milk, meats, fruits, and vegetables, and less of the starchy foods. BAE estimates that the per capita diet for this year will be about 12 percent higher than in the 5 years preceding World War II.

If this amount of food is to be had by those of us who live 25 years longer and by our children and their children, we must calculate on its production now. For there will be one extra person in the average family. For every four people sitting down to a meal in 1950 there will be another person at the table in 1975.

Our present farm production is not enough to fill this formidable fifth plate if our guest is to eat as well as we eat now. Certainly it's not enough to care for our exports, too.

The population of our country and the world will strain our productive capacity for food even more greatly 50 and 100 years from now. We must plan to meet the food needs of future generations of American boys and girls.

We must pursue price policies which encourage reasonable production and maintain our food surplus potential. All of the people of the Nation have a direct and real interest in this. All of the people of the Nation have an interest in maintaining the buying power of farm families.

Two out of five workers are employed one way or another in satisfying our demands upon the soil. Ten million are employed directly on the farms. Another 6 million provide essential raw materials, machines, equipment, other goods, and services. Nine million more are engaged in handling, processing, and bringing the products of the farms to the home.

The farmer uses 50 tons of chemical materials. That is 5 times the amount he used not in 1905 or 1910, but in 1935.

The oil industry must look to the farmer for the farmer is the oil industry's No. 1 buyer. Today's farmer uses 16½ billion gallons of crude petroleum and, ladies and gentlemen, that is more petroleum than is used by any other industry.

Rubber, too, is in demand by our modern agriculture. The American farmer each year buys and uses enough rubber to put tires on 6 million automobiles.

He uses 15 billion kilowatt-hours of electrical power every 365 days. The cities of Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, and Houston, lighting up their bright lights and moving all their power-consuming industries, do not use 1 kilowatt-hour more than the American farmer.

The failure of the price structure of farm products would not affect the farmer alone. Such a failure would strike to the very roots of our economy. It would do so far more than it did even 15 years ago. Here's a quick run-through that brings out this amazing act in unforgettable terms.

As late as 1935 there were only 1 million tractors on farms. Now there are 4 million. There were 85,000 grain combines; now there are more than 800,000. There were about 900,000 trucks; now there are 2,280,000. There were 70,000 corn pickers; now there are 522,000. There were 120,000 milking machines on farms; now there are 655,000.

In 1935, 16,700,000 horses and mules required the production of 54 million acres of land. Today 7 million horses and mules are supplied by 21 million acres.

In 1935, 11 farms out of 100 received central-station electrical power. Today 84 farms out of 100. In 1935, only 1.1 percent of the corn acreage was planted with hybrid seed; today, 84.4 percent.

In 1935, farmers used 3½ million tons of liming materials; today, 27 million to 30 million tons a year. In 1935, farmers used 1,250,000 tons of chemical-plant nutrients; today, nearly 5 million tons. In 1935, farmers spent $28 million for insecticides and pesticides; today they spend $100 million.

All of this means in plain language that in the mid-thirties the farmer could reduce his purchases from industry without serious loss in his own farm production and without throwing millions of men in industry out of work. But today farmers can't produce without materials from industry which must be paid for in cash.

I repeat, the American people and the American economy cannot afford a farm depression—nor a recession.

We have been living on the thin gruel of Eisenhower and Benson promises long enough. We need more solid and palatable fare.

Eisenhower has asked you to have faith—while you continue to get the works. I think the United States Congress should buckle down to this problem. And it should do so immediately. The President should call a special session of Congress to deal with this basic problem.

The Republican Congress adjourned earlier than any Congress since sessions began in January. It has vacationed and politicked enough. Let it get to work on the farm price—consumer-price-squeeze problem—and there are many other major problems which it left on the shelf in August. The most important thing the Republican leadership could think of last session was to adjourn.

HARD MONEY AND HARD HEARTS

One of the first acts of the Eisenhower administration was to raise the interest paid by the Government on the money that it borrows.

So far only a small fraction of the total national debt has been refinanced at new higher interest rates, but the higher rates paid by the Treasury on its borrowings subsequent to January 1953 will, when applied to the marketable public debt that matures between 1953 and 1956, add about one-third of a billion dollars in annual interest payments. This estimate of additional interest charges does not take into account the higher cost on new money that may have to be raised by the Treasury, nor does it take into account the new rates which may have to be paid on the nonmarketable debt—over $30 billion of the United States savings bonds and savings notes—which will have to be refinanced during the next 3 years.

The financial interests have been the beneficiaries of these higher interest rates and they have paid nothing for their fat bonus windfall.

These figures do not tell the story of the total interest costs to the American people. Farmers have begun to pay higher rates on Commodity Credit Corporation loans. Folks who want to buy houses on Federal Housing loans will pay more interest than last year. The same problem face those who want automobiles and household appliances on installment loans.

Eisenhower claimed that the higher rate of interest on Federal borrowing would stabilize the value of the dollar. Instead, the cost of living has climbed to record heights.

Meanwhile the banks are making ever-higher profits as the major purchasers of Government securities and as the chief beneficiaries of the high interest rates which result from the Government interest pace setting. In 1953 Federal Reserve members will make profits at least 6 percent higher than last year.

ILLUSORY TAX RELIEF

Candidate Eisenhower promised national debt reduction, a balanced budget, and tax relief. The political Houdini who could accomplish these inconsistent goals does not live, but the American people were taken in by the political barkers in 1952.

The national debt is creeping to the $275 billion limit. Some $6 billion represents interest payments on the debt. Obviously that has not been reduced—it has been increased. The underlying debt has not been retired and continues to grow. In order to reduce it, taxes would have to be increased or basic Government programs reduced. The principal costs of Government today are for defense and mutual security and the costs of past wars. Any honest candidate should have known that no saving, substantial enough to reduce the debt, could be made in these items this year and next.

Tax reduction can hardly precede debt reduction and a balanced budget. Government income must remain high to achieve either of these ends. It seems likely that there will be tax reduction of a sort next year. Under laws passed by earlier Democratic Congresses the excess-profits tax will expire at the end of this year. There will be a 10-percent across-the-board income tax reduction and a corporation tax reduction. The hitch is that the billions of dollars of lost revenues must be made up or we will go into debt at an even greater rate than in the recent past.

Eisenhower has ruled out a sales tax, but not a manufacturers' excise tax. The only difference between the two is that the second is worse. It is a tax upon consumption. It is the kind that is not only passed along to the consumer, but passed along with a markup at each step between the manufacturer and the consumer. It hits the lower and middle-income groups hardest and these are the groups least able to bear it.

With the expiration of the excess-profits tax, the most profitable corporations will get tax relief. With the 10-percent reduction, the upper bracket taxpayers will get much greater relief than those in the lower brackets. The corporations will have lower taxes. Mr. Consumer will pay the freight. That seems to be the Eisenhower program. The fact that it is rankly discriminatory does not

interfere with the probability that it will materialize—because this administration has proven time and time again that it is the friend and the ally of big business and big banking.

Not only would this action be unfair, it woud be economically unwise. It would soak up widespread buying power and have a long-run adverse effect upon sales, and hence production, and hence jobs, and even taxes.

This Nation has grown great and prosperous by putting enormous buying power into the hands of the lower- and middle-income groups. This has stimulated industry and agriculture. The Eisenhower administration seems to believe in an economy of scarcity and a trickle-down theory of prosperity.

The supposed friends of business may yet prove to be the businessman's greatest enemy as it duplicates the mistakes of the 1920's.

THE THREAT TO RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Private utilities have an important role to play in our economy. But the history of the last 50 years shows that private utilities provide service at low rates only under the spur of competition. That competition can only be provided by public power, public preference, and nonprofit local groups such as co-ops and public-utility districts. That has been the pattern in the Tennessee Valley area; that has been the pattern in my own Pacific Northwest; and it has been the pattern in the great Midwest farm areas.

Only in the Northeast have electric power costs remained high. It is the only area without public power in some form.

Public power has advanced all along the line or been stopped cold, depending upon the dominant philosophy of the party in power and the President in office. In Theodore Roosevelt's time conservation and resource development were given their modern foundation. The first hydroelectric projects were planned and the "public preference" idea was firmly rooted in national policy.

During the 1920's public power was virtually frozen. The Secretary of Commerce, a predecessor of the present Secretary of Commerce, planned to auction off Muscle Shoals, the heart of the original TVA system. Norris blocked that after a tremendous fight. The 1930's saw a different philosophy. Remember that the REA law and the Bonneville Act came in the same year.

The future of rural electrification is bound up intimately with the future of proper public-power development. Public preference, established and followed since 1906, is based upon the sound theory that power generated from publicly owned streams or publicly financed facilities, and transmitted on public lines, financed with public low-interest funds, should be granted first to nonprofit agencies.

The Eisenhower administration pretends to honor the public-preference provisions in existing law.

But the Bonneville Power Administration contracts which the Secretary of the Interior has had negotiated with nine private utilities in the Pacific Northwest would in effect cancel the public-preference clause of the Bonneville Act.

And yet another example:

The new marketing policy for western and eastern divisions, Missouri Basin, Bureau of Reclamation, announced in September, states that at the end of 90 days the Bureau will sign long-term contracts with nonpreference customers for all power not contracted for by preference customers. This will compel preference customers to cancel existing contracts for Bureau power, force them to contract for more power than they now require and pay higher demand charges in order to avoid running out of power within a year or two, will force up their power rates as a result by about 1.5 mills per kilowatt-hour, and will give private utilities a subsidy in the form of dump energy from the preference contracts where full utilization will come only in future years. This will affect Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, the Dakotas, Minnesota, Iowa, and Nebraska.

Obvious results are to increase power costs to preference customers, place a ceiling on their power supply, place Bureau power in the hands of private utilities on long-term contracts, decrease Federal revenues from power, and subsidize private companies until such time as preference use rises to new contract levels.

The Eisenhower administration made the clause a dead letter in the Southwestern Power Administration area by limiting use of nonappropriated revenues which had been used by co-ops for transmission-line rentals and power exchanges.

The Eisenhower administration has refused to appropriate funds for needed transmission lines throughout the country without which co-ops and public utility districts cannot obtain publicly generated power. In Oregon a transmission line that was more than half built, for which most of the remaining right-of-way was cleared and along which materials were delivered, was stopped. An agreement for joint operation was reached with a private utility which received the delivered construction material in exchange for similar material which Bonneville might need some place, some time.

Probably the most obvious and tragic action of the Eisenhower administration in this field has been its walkout on Hells Canyon Dam.

Years of study brought the Department of the Interior and the Army engineers into agreement that the comprehensive development of the Columbia River Basin requires the construction of a high Hells Canyon Dam as the key multipurpose project on the Snake River.

The Columbia Basin holds some 40 percent of the hydroelectric potential of the Nation.

Half of that potential depends upon upstream storage of water for a simple reason. Downstream dams cannot be operated at full efficiency in winter low-water periods. The heaviest runoff of water occurs in the spring and must be impounded for release to dams downstream to assure maximum output of firm power.

A high dam at Hells Canyon is indispensable to the two best plans for upstream storage, not only for power, but for flood control.

But the new Secretary of Interior, with Presidential and Cabinet approval, withdrew from the Federal Power Commission hearings on the license application of the Idaho Power Co. for one small dam which would be placed in the Hells Canyon reservoir, thereby preventing construction of Hells Canyon Dam.

Immediately after the Secretary's action, the company filed applications for permits for two other small dams in the same area. Even if all three were constructed, they would produce less power than Hells Canyon alone. They would produce less than half the power made possible by Hells Canyon, and the increase of power its reservoir would make possible downstream.

Estimates of power costs at load center show a difference of $41 per kilowatt year for Idaho Power Co. as compared to $19 for Hells Canyon. Other estimates are for a smaller difference, but none I have seen predicts anything but lower costs for Hells Canyon power.

Hells Canyon would provide greater flood-control benefits.

Hells Canyon would provide recreational benefits of enormous value.

Hells Canyon would provide enormous irrigation benefits.

Secretary McKay brushed this aside as a subsidy, because power revenues, which are self-liquidating, would also be used to defray irrigation costs which are too high to be borne by farmers alone. Of course, power revenues for irrigation have long been a feature of Federal law.

But does the Secretary criticize tax amortization certificates for the private utilities? He does not. These certificates permit construction and capital costs to be charged off for tax purposes over a 5-year period rather than the more usual depreciation periods of 20 to 35 years. This means that in the current periods of high profits and high taxes, one-fifth of such costs rather than a twentieth or thirty-fifth is subtracted from profits. The results are enormous tax savings for the utilities—and tax losses for the Government, which every taxpayer must bear. I might add that in emergency periods this method is a reasonable means of encouraging construction of plants which would have no usefulness after the end of the emergency. That criteria does not readily apply to these utilities. One recent example was an enormous steam plant in New York City which would probably have a useful life for decades.

Talking about subsidies then, the Idaho Power Co. has received these certificates covering some $10,800,000 of plant and facilities.

That, my friends, is "free enterprise" while irrigation partially supported by power revenues is "subsidy." Webster's dictionary will have to issue a special revision to keep up with the Eisenhower administration.

We know very well that public power has been a tremendous boon to private enterprise. Let me quote from the Denver Post of September 27, 1953. That paper was on the Eisenhower bandwagon last year. The Eisenhower program has forced it to publish this editorial of sharp criticism entitled "Straighten Record on Public Power." It says in part:

"How about the bugaboo of socialism? A good case can be made, we believe, for the claim that Government power, in areas where it is available in large amounts, has done more to promote free enterprise than private power companies ever did.

"Notably in the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest the building of Government powerplants has given birth to new industries by the hundreds—many of them large industries. Those areas are the 'hottest' markets in the entire country for electric appliances. Is it socialistic when the country is short of power to provide the electricity which will turn thousands of persons into customers for electric irons and deep freeze units? We think not."

But you don't need editorials to prove the point. Think of your own farms and homes.

Even more important is the fact that Hells Canyon and full development of the Columbia Basin are needed to keep pace with the industrial requirements of our ever-growing democracy. Irrigation is needed to meet the food supply problems a century and two centuries from now of a population double or triple what we now have. Defense requires the full growth of the light-metals industry of the Northwest. It is no mere accident that atomic energy installations have been established only where large quantites of inexpensive power are available—that is where public power is available.

The Nation has a great stake in Hells Canyon and full hydroelectric development wherever it is possible.

NORTHWEST POWER FOR MIDWEST FERTILIZER

On a more immediate basis, you people in North Dakota and the Midwest farm belt have a direct interest in Hells Canyon.

Two farm organizations, serving 1,600,000 farmers in the 17 Midwestern and Western States, propose to build with private capital two phosphorus fertilizer plants in Idaho if Hells Canyon is constructed. They cannot do so now because the power is not available and even if available from the Idaho Power Co. the rates would be too high to make the manufacture feasible.

The two plants would have an investment of about $30 million, offer employment to 900 workers, produce 275,000 tons of high-concentrate fertilizer, and save farmers $15 to $23 per ton in fertilizer.

Today these phosphate deposits, largest in the Nation, lie practically idle.

Briefly, that is the Hells Canyon story. A similar threat is developing in Montana where the Montana Power Co. has filed for a small dam which would make impossible construction of a large Federal hydroelectric dam with immense storage at Paradise Falls.

When the Eisenhower administration has shown its hand in the power field, it has been the hand of the private utilities. The policies I have described—only briefly and with few details—bode ill for the future of rural electrification. We should now be entering the phase of completing the job of bringing cheap electric power to the farms of America and firming up existing facilities to meet the heavier loads that unprecedented demand had caused.

That job won't be done with Eisenhower in the White House, McKay in Interior, Benson in Agriculture, and Nelsen in REA.

Under this administration any Government aid or assistance is socialistic unless it happens to provide profits for big business and bankers. The trouble is that the Eisenhower crusaders cannot distinguish between private enterprise and private monopoly.

RETURN CONGRESS TO THE PEOPLE

Ten months of the Cadillac crusade have proven that the Eisenhower administration is callous to the needs of the people. We have proof that it is the captive of the moneyed interests of the country which haven't learned a thing since the ruinous twenties. Congress must be returned to the people. It is only by electing a Congress responsive to the will of the people that we can place an effective check upon the Eisenhower big-business program. As an independent in American politics who has always refused to place political expediency and partisanship above political principle, I urge the election in the 1954 campaign of a Democratic Congress because the last session of a Republican Congress offered ample proof that liberalism in the Republican Party is dead. It is obvious that there is only one language the Eisenhower administration understands—and that is the language of votes. The Republicans double-talked their way into the control of the Government last November, and the Eisenhower administration following its victory walked out on the interest of the people in favor of higher interest for bankers. The best way to answer him—and the sooner the better—is to elect a Democratic majority to the Congress in 1954.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, first I desire to comment on the address made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] at Bismarck. I happened to be driving in my car on that day, and I listened to all of his speech by radio. It contains some excellent factual material, and I commend a reading of the address to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to say, first, that I appreciate the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I know that all Senators who represent agricultural sections—and most of us do—have always appreciated the very fine leadership and statesmanship demonstrated by the Senator from North Dakota on farm problems.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] spoke about the effort being made to propagandize the new program and to change the present program into one of flexible supports, as if that would be a cure-all. That is certainly something that should attract the attention of every Senator.

In that connection, I call attention to a report made over the last weekend by the so-called Randall Commission, in which that Commission recommended drastic changes in our farm program. In fact, it recommended changes even beyond, and faster than, those recommended by the President himself in the program he submitted to Congress.

It is quite noticeable from the report of the Randall Commission that there were a number of dissents from the recommendations of the Randall Commission. Among those who dissented were Donald J. McDonald, president of the CIO Steel Workers Union; the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]; the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]; and Representative DANIEL A. REED, of New York.

The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] at least prepared a clarifying statement, as did Representative JERE COOPER, of Tennessee.

If the distinguished Senator from North Dakota will permit me to do so, I desire to read a very brief statement from the dissenting remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado. He said:

As I see it, the report injects itself gratuitously into the highly controversial subject of our domestic programs in aid of agriculture.

He continues by elaborating the point and setting it out very fully and clearly. I think that is exactly what happened in the Commission's report. The Commission apparently tried to do the very thing the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] pointed out as being a concerted movement throughout the United States to propagandize a change in the agricultural program, and injected itself into a purely domestic problem, as the Senator from Colorado has so well pointed out.

Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a United Press article entitled "Report on Agriculture Urges Flexible Props," written by Patricia Wiggins, and published in the Anniston (Ala) Star of Sunday, January 24, 1954. The article deals with the very question now under discussion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON AGRICULTURE URGES FLEXIBLE PROPS—INTERPRETATION OF RANDALL COMMISSION FINDINGS INDICATE DESIRE FOR MORE RELAXED PROGRAM

(By Patricia Wiggins)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Agriculture Department officials today interpreted the Randall Commission's report on agriculture as going even further than President Eisenhower in urging an end of rigid price supports.

They agreed that the 17-member commission asked for a departure from present farm-propping programs, and recommended a move in the direction of the President's program.

Several said they believe the ultimate goal of the commission's recommendations would be even greater flexibility in price supports than asked by the President.

The long-awaited report on foreign trade said the commission believes a "dynamic foreign economic policy, as it relates to agriculture, cannot be built out of a mass of restrictive devices such as inflexible price-support programs * * * open or concealed export subsidies, import quotas at home and abroad, excessive use of tariffs here and abroad."

REPORT CONTINUES

"We must move as rapidly as feasible toward the elimination of such devices as part of, or supplement to, our own agricultural policy," the commission said, "if we are to have a foreign economic policy which will make its best contribution to the strengthening of our long-term development of foreign markets for farmers."

The agriculture part of the report, certain to set off fireworks in the congressional farm bloc, carried dissents from four members—Donald J. McDonald, president of the CIO Steelworkers Union; Senators Eugene D. Millikin, Republican, of Colorado, and Walter F. George, Democrat, of Georgia, and Representative Daniel A. Reed, Republican, of New York.

Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, and Representative JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, filed clarifying statements. HICKENLOOPER said he favored flexible supports as recommended by the President and wrote that "while I am confident the commission does not intend to recommend the elimination of Government farm-price supports, I want to make my position perfectly clear."

BATTLE SUPPORTS REPORT

Cooper said farm programs "should not be subordinated to foreign-trade policy without full and careful consideration. It is with regret that I am unable to agree with some of the views expressed."

Congressional commission members backing the agriculture part of the report included HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, and Representative LAURIE C. BATTLE, Democrat, of Alabama.

President Eisenhower has recommended the current price-support law—guaranteeing 90 percent of parity support on basic crops—be allowed to expire on schedule next December and be replaced by a slightly modified version of the inoperative agricultural acts of 1948 and 1949 which would allow supports be set from 75 to 90 percent. He asked that any lowering of props be gradual.

Parity is calculated to give the farmer a fair price on his crop in relation to the cost of things he must buy.

The Randall Commission held that the strength of American agriculture is being weakened by the inflexibility of the present scheme of price supports. It argued that high support prices keep American prices above competitive prices on world markets.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the remarks of my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are greatly appreciated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit, I desire to ask for comments on another part of the President's program that is not completely in line with this report, but which, nevertheless, relates to

a very important phase of the farm program, in which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has played a leading part. I refer to the farm housing program, which Congress enacted almost 5 years ago. That program has worked well to help farm family units, the kind of families the Senator from North Dakota was talking about a few minutes ago. In his budget message, the President made a recommendation that that program be allowed to die on June 30 of this year.

I wonder if the distinguished Senator from North Dakota would care to comment on the part of the program which he played such a large part in writing into law.

Mr. YOUNG. I feel that the program should be continued, and I am very hopeful that Congres will enable it to be continued by providing additional funds.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have stated before, and I wish to repeat, that when the housing bill is introduced, as I understand it will be within the next few days, if the farm housing section is not included in the bill, I propose to offer an amendment and to do my best to include it in the bill in committee. I submitted the amendment originally, and it was agreed to in the original bill which was passed by the Senate.

I was greatly helped by, and I pay tribute to, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who the year before proposed a farm program, which we were unsuccessful in having written into law. I intend to offer that proposal as an amendment, and I join with the Senator from North Dakota in expressing the hope that Congress will enact such a program.

Mr. STENNIS. I desire to express my deep regret that the news article casts our friend, the Senator from North Dakota, as well as the farm program, in an unfavorable light. Those of us who are concerned with the agricultural situation know of the very fine and unselfish contribution made by the Senator from North Dakota in trying to arrive at a solution of this very perplexing problem, and we all regret the attack of the news article.

I also regret the fact that the article is misleading to the public regarding the farm program and the problems of the farmers. I know that when we went into the Korean war we had only 2 million bales of cotton as a carry-over, which, as the Senator knows, is extremely low. A strong appeal was made to the cotton farmer to produce more and more cotton. The Senate was engaged in a program to help promote cotton production. If there had been a cotton shortage in 1951, we would have been going into what could have been an extended war with a great scarcity of this essential commodity. We had to stop shipments abroad for that reason, even though there was a good crop in 1951.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator will recall that there were short supplies of cotton for a year or two afterward. I understand that the textile mills of Europe are just now recovering from that disastrous shortage situation.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to have that information. The action of the Senate is what brought about this increased production. Supply and demand was very close. If the war had been extended, and if the season had been poor or if the crop had been rained out, we would have been confronted with a great scarcity of cotton. We would not have had sufficient cotton, which is an essential commodity in waging war. Instead of being a liability, the surplus of cotton which is on hand cannot be counted as something lost to the country. It is one of the finest assets the country has in facing an uncertain world situation. The program referred to in the news article led to increased production. The Senator from North Dakota is to be commended for his part in it, instead of having adverse comments given to the public.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank my friend, the Senator from Mississippi. I have always followed the work of the Senator from Mississippi in behalf of agriculture with great interest. He does a fine job of defending the farmers, and has continued to do so right along. It has often occurred to me that the pecple who write the vicious, untruthful, nasty things about farmers would think twice before they wrote the articles if they had to work as hard and go through the misery and sweat and toil the farmers do and get in return for their labors as little as the farmers receive.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desired to make a comment with reference to the address of the Senator from North Dakota which was made this afternoon, and also to make a statement of my own on a matter which I think is of great interest.

I desire to say to the Senator from North Dakota that he need not worry one bit because of the nature of the editorial or newspaper article. His record regarding American agriculture is so good and so well known that, instead of anyone's losing faith in the Senator from North Dakota, one's faith would be increased. The Senator from North Dakota should be very grateful that he has been attacked by a newspaper article, because it is only those who do something who are attacked. I commend the fine Senator from North Dakota for being a real fighter in protecting the rights of the people of North Dakota and of the country at large.

Mr. YOUNG. I appreciate the remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is well loved in the State of North Dakota. I join with my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] in a commendation of the Senator from North Dakota.

I desire to express my thoughts along the same line as those expressed by the Senator from North Dakota. We have before us a proposal regarding farm legislation. The country is being deluged with propaganda about huge farm surpluses, propaganda against the few basic laws which are on the statute books, and, in fact, literally propaganda against the farmers in American agriculture themselves. Make no mistake about it, the propaganda going out of the Nation's Capital is proceeding from the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture, which has as its responsibility the interests and welfare of the American farmer, is now the fountainhead of the propaganda flowing against the best interests of American agriculture.

I desire to thank the Senator from North Dakota for analyzing the facts and figures as to the cost of the Commodity Credit program. The Senator has put into the RECORD evidence which bears out what I have just said.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Distressing as the propaganda is, the thing that disturbs some of us is the accusation that the farmers are a pressure group or a special-interest group. It is most distressing to see the Secretary of Agriculture leading the charge against the farmers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for his statement. That is exactly what I had in mind and exactly what I was referring to.

Here we are concerned about the fact that we have too much to eat. That is a fine thing to be complaining about in a world where three-fourths of the people have too little to eat. Two-thirds of the children in the world go to bed each night with tears in their eyes because they have had nothing to eat. Here we have a mighty nation saying that we have too much. That is a bad situation.

In the month of September, Mr. Malenkov, leader of the Soviet Union, made two announcements, both of them very important. The first was that the Soviet Union has the hydrogen bomb. That took away from the United States the so-called monopoly in nuclear bombs. The second was that the Soviet Union's agricultural system has broken down. If there was any factor which has been revealed in recent months as to why the Soviet Union has not been more aggressive, why it has not moved its armies, it possibly was the fact that they did not have sufficient food. All the generals know what Napoleon knew, that armies move on their stomachs. It requires food for armies to operate.

Every time I have driven along the countryside and seen the fine storage bins with a sign on them reading "Commodity Credit Corporation Storage," instead of getting out of my automobile and saying, "Oh, isn't that terrible?" I have wanted to get out of my car, get on my knees, and thank God that they were there. The Red Cross has a blood bank, so that blood plasma is available immediately in case of an emergency. Our Armed Forces insist upon stockpiles of ammunition. We know that there is being stored ammunition of the caliber of .50, .75, 1.05, 1.55 mm. in case of an emergency. If the Armed Forces find it nec-

essary to have a stockpile of ammunition, should we not consider the need of a stockpile of food? We ought to be grateful that we have such a surplus of food. We should consider it as a blood bank of food for the days that lie ahead.

As we look at the surpluses, we ought to look at the weather signs. I am not saying that because my right knee aches it means that it is going to be dry. I lay no claim to having a special insight into the weather. However, I know that it was dry in Texas and in Missouri, and I know that it has been dry in other sections of the United States. I know, as everyone else well knows, that weather travels in cycles. I desire to make it clear for the RECORD that I believe next year we may be in for a dry cycle. If we are, the food surplus will look mighty good. The time for the country to complain is not when we have enough to eat, but when we do not have enough to eat.

I should like to make a statement in reply to the assertion, which the American consumer has been led to believe, that price supports are the cause of the high price of food.

There never was a more fallacious statement. The truth is that the United States consumer gets a larger variety of food and a finer quality of food at lower prices than does any other consumer in the world. Not only does the United States consumer get food at a lower price than do consumers in any other part of the world, but the United States consumer gets something to eat; he enjoys quantity as well as quality. The percentage of the per capita income of the United States consumer that is spent for food is greater than the percentage of per capita income spent for that purpose by consumers in any other part of the world.

The only trouble with some persons, Mr. President, is that they are trying to sell the idea that if price supports were reduced to 75 percent, the price of food would be reduced. However, in recent years the price of wheat has declined 35 percent, whereas the price of bread has risen 5 cents a loaf.

In that connection I suppose one might say that the way to reduce the price of Wheaties would be to reduce the price of wheat, and in that way it would be possible to increase the sales of Wheaties. However, another radio program would be required in order to increase the sales of Wheaties; and the cost of that radio program would result in an increase in the price of Wheaties. In other words, Mr. President, in the price of a box of Wheaties there is more advertising than there is wheat. [Laughter.] I use Wheaties only as an example. Wheaties are a very fine breakfast food, made in Minnesota; and I advocate that many persons eat and enjoy them.

But let us get the record clear. If the Secretary of Agriculture wishes to give us leadership on agricultural policy, then let him give us leadership in regard to how to use what we produce, and not in regard to how to abuse what we produce. In that connection I have some ideas of how to proceed. I am not an expert on agriculture, but one does not have to be an expert on agriculture in order to have better ideas than some of those we have heard advanced. All one needs in that connection is ordinary, good, common sense. In my judgment, we should brand much of what we hear as outright propaganda against the price-support program as an unfair attack on the farmers and as an actual disservice to the Nation, because of its impact on international relations.

Mr. President, consider what the hungry people of other lands must think when they hear responsible leaders in the United States and a supposedly responsible press bemoan the fact that we have too much food. One can sign alliances until he runs out of ink, and the Secretary of State can be sent to Berlin, Baghdad, and Tokyo, with round-trip tickets, but so long as we tell the rest of the world that we have more food than we know how to eat or use, we shall not make friends in other countries, no matter how charming our Secretary of State may be—and I am sure he is trying to do a good job.

I must reiterate today what I have said time and time again: We should regard our abundance as a blessing, not a curse. It can be a blessing, not a headache, if only we have the imagination and the initiative to use it wisely for the benefit of human beings, both at home and abroad.

Yet I must deplore the fact that responsible officials of this administration seem more inclined to feed the flames of propaganda about the evils of abundance instead of showing real enterprise toward putting our abundance of food to good use for humanity.

Mr. President, this subject is far from a new one for me to discuss on this floor, as my colleagues well know. Repeatedly, during the last session of the Senate, I called for our making use of our abundance of food to help feed hungry people, to support our foreign policy, and to fight communism.

Last March, in speaking on the subject Empty Stomachs and Full Cartridge Belts, when I spoke in support of a resolution which I had the honor of cosponsoring, along with the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]—the resolution being for the purpose of providing for the creation of an international food reserve—I said the following:

> As long as there are empty stomachs in the world, we shall have to keep our cartridge belts full. But full stomachs can replace full cartridge belts, as our greatest defender of democracy. * * * In the struggle against communism, a million dollars for food might equal $10 million for ammunition.

Mr. President, that is what I said on March 5, 1953. In all my life, I never spoke truer words.

During that session, again and again I hammered home that point, in urging greater use of a private agency, such as CARE, in making use of our food abundance to help unfortunate people throughout the world; in proposing and backing the shipment of wheat to Pakistan; in proposing and backing authority for the President to make use of our food surplus to combat famine anywhere.

Last July, when the brave people of East Berlin rose up in rebellion against the tyranny of their Communist masters, I called for the use of food—not weapons—to strike a real blow at the Kremlin.

Let me quote just a few excerpts from my remarks of last July 8, when I said:

> At this very hour, if this country were on the job, if we were doing what we ought to do, we would send word to Germany that some of our agricultural surplus would be sent to the starving people of East Germany. * * * A nation which can afford to send billions of dollars in military assistance can afford to send some bread and butter. What they need in some parts of the world tonight is hope of bread and butter.

Mr. President, that is exactly what is needed in some parts of the world tonight, namely, hope for bread and butter.

In the same speech I also said:

> What it amounts to is an application of Christian democracy. What it amounts to is an application of applied Christianity and a little commonsense, all of which we can well use in this country.

Mr. President, every Member of Congress knows what resulted when limited supplies of food were sent to East Germany. We have sent guns and cannon to Western Europe until we have literally broken our backs delivering them, but we have not seen anyone in the Kremlin fall flat on his face, as a result, and call for quits. However, when we sent only 45,000 tons of food to East Germany, the Soviet Union had to move into that area 3 divisions of troops and 300 tanks, in order to put down the rebellion. If there ever was an act on the part of our Government that resulted in good dividends, it was the sending of that food to the hungry people of Germany. I submit that is a fine example for the rest of the world, and we must never forget that lesson.

The President's authority for use of food in emergencies and to combat famine abroad expires March 31. I was pleased to note that the President is asking that it be extended and broadened, so as to make use of greater amounts for such worthy and humanitarian purposes. I shall support such efforts, along with whatever legislation is needed to make it possible for greater use of private agencies, such as CARE, in distributing food, so that it becomes a real gift from the American people to the hungry people of other lands.

But, great as are the opportunities for making use of food as a part of our policy in dealing with other lands, still greater opportunities confront us here at home, in the case of the use of this food.

Mr. President, I know that the Members of the Senate are well fed; certainly I hope all of them are. I know that most of the persons with whom we talk in the lobbies are well fed, and I know that most of the persons with whom we associate in the city of Washington, D. C., are well fed. But I say to my colleagues that in the United States, even during the richest period of our history, there are millions of persons who are not well fed, through no fault of

their own. Certainly it does not make much sense to this United States Senator to hear that we have 200 million pounds of butter stored in our country, and yet to find that in our country more than 40,000,000 persons are trying to get by on $45 a month. Mr. President, let any of my colleagues try it for size, sometime—$45 a month. One who attempts to live on such an income will not be able to eat even lard, much less butter.

Who are we to talk about warehouses bulging with so-called surplus food, when today in our own country people are going hungry.

Mr. President, one of the real troubles with serving in Congress today is that the Members of Congress do not see enough of the people. We have to go through a real ordeal in order to go home and see the people. When someone from our States is able to pay enough money to come to Washington to see us, we do not then see some of the people, instead, we too often simply see some persons who say they have been talking to some of the people.

It is when we visit our own constituents in various parts of our own States—not only in the large centers, but on the back roads; not only on the highways, but on the byways; not only in the large metropolitan centers, but in the small villages—that we see the people.

Mr. President, I have visited the States that are represented by some of my colleagues in the Senate. For instance, I have visited Louisiana. I know what the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], has done for the people of Louisiana, and I know of the welfare programs he and his family have sponsored for that great State.

Similarly, I have visited the States of Mississippi, Montana, and Georgia; and likewise I am aware that the Members of the Senate who represent those States know of the privations experienced by many persons living in Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, or, for that matter, in California or other States. In fact, Mr. President, let any of my colleagues name any State he may wish to name, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his kind remarks about me and my family. I assure him that the statement he has made is a correct one, namely, that in Louisiana there are many persons who could use some of the surplus butter, but cannot pay for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, when I shall have completed these remarks, I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will have heard me make a proposal or a suggestion, at least, to which he can give some sympathy and, I hope, some support.

Mr. President, what kind of evidence are our warehouses bulging with so-called surplus food, of the humanitarianism that America is trying to prove to the rest of the world?

For one, I am tired of hearing complaints about huge Government stocks of butter, some from Government officials who are so lacking in initiative they have not yet come forward with any proposals for using that butter constructively.

Mr. President, I have come to wonder what is wrong with our country. Supposedly, we are faced with a great problem. What is it? The problem is that we have butter, although hardly anyone else in the world has any. Other people are trying to figure out how to put axle grease, linseed oil, or lard on their bread and call it a spread. Here we are with butter, and we say, "Isn't it terrible?" Let no one try to tell me that sensible, responsible people with creative imaginations cannot figure out a way to use it without doing away with the dairy cow. The dairy cow was here before the Department of Agriculture, and most likely it will be here when the Department has gone through several changes.

Last August I submitted to this body and had inserted in the RECORD a comprehensive study entitled "Dairy Diet Dividends," containing several sound proposals for use of milk, butter, and cheese to raise the diets of people on public assistance. I urged consideration by appropriate committees of the Senate for this study, as the basis for some constructive proposal for using our abundance—not just complaining about it. I repeat that appeal today. The Secretary of Agriculture can scream and holler about the surplus of butter, but that will not stop the cows from giving the milk that they want to give. That is one part of society over which the Government has no real control. So we had better be figuring out what we are going to do with it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to make a comment on the last statement by the Senator from Minnesota.

As the Senator knows, for 10 years or more I have been introducing in this body a bill which would make available at low cost some of our surplus food commodities to people who do not have sufficient money to provide a decent diet for themselves. Last year, in July, I introduced such a bill and called for volunteer cosponsors. The Senator from Minnesota was the only Senator who volunteered, although there was no trouble whatever a couple of weeks earlier in getting 52 cosponsors for a bill for the relief of hungry livestock.

I first introduced such a bill jointly with Senator La Follette of Wisconsin. I thought it had a great deal of merit. At one time we proposed it as an amendment to another bill, and to our surprise there were 29 or 30 votes in favor of it. But after that—I believe that was in 1944—I received no encouragement whatsoever from the Department of Agriculture until very recently.

The officials of the Department of Agriculture are now asking for a meeting with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to discuss the question of making some of our surplus commodities—butter in particular—available to the people of this country. It is very encouraging, after 10 years of failure, at last to find a Secretary of Agriculture, and Assistants to the Secretary, who appear to be interested in making this commodity available to the people of the country. I think it is very encouraging indeed. I thought the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators present would be glad to know about that. I might even go so far as to say that we are meeting with them tomorrow morning to discuss this subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who has rendered valuable service to his country not only in the United States Senate, but as governor, and particularly as a leader in agricultural policy. When the Senator from Vermont asked me to yield I was about to go to the very next paragraph of my prepared statement, which says:

> At the same time I joined with the distinguished chairman of our Agriculture Committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in cosponsorship of his domestic food allotment plan—a food stamp plan for increasing food consumption among the low-income families. Surely it is time to be thinking seriously about such plan for using our food, instead of condemning farmers for producing it.

I say that this plan has within it the possibility of doing much to help people, as well as to help in the solution of the problem which we call the "surplus." It is a very sound approach, and for years the Senator from Vermont has furnished able leadership in that field.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may add that if this proposal should be approved by the Congress and put into effect, it would probably end surpluses in this country, so far as dairy products, meats, and poultry products are concerned, and by so doing vastly increase the market for grains.

It is common knowledge among agricultural authorities that 5 bushels of grain can be marketed through the protein foods for every 1 bushel that is sold directly as cereal. In other words, it requires five times as much grain to feed the people through the use of dairy products, meats, and poultry products as it does through the use of cereals direct. Therein lies probably the greatest potential market for the surplus wheat, which is embarrassing us at the present time, as well as a possible market for other surplus grains. I think the plan has merit, but it requires more than two votes in the Senate to pass the bill. The realization that we did not have the votes to pass that proposed legislation is responsible for the fact that I have not pushed it up to this time. Perhaps if we were sure of two dozen votes, we might do something about it. Two votes only will not get us very far.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I think his leadership will produce much more support than he has calculated up to this time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Lest the Senator from Vermont may feel that his oratorical effort is wasted, I assure him that the junior Senator from Louisiana was not

familiar with the proposed legislation to which he referred. I should like to study it, and if I can approve the mechanics of it, I shall be glad to add my name to the list of those sponsoring the bill. That is the approach we need, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Louisiana, to make it possible for those who need more food to have it, rather than to cut back the production of food.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

I think Senators would be interested in some of the results of the study which I had made on the so-called dairy diet dividends.

The United States now trails Sweden, Switzerland, and New Zealand in per capita milk consumption.

Milk prices are now highest in areas where relief payments for dependent children are the lowest.

Every county in the United States has a certain number of people receiving public assistance, a certain number of old people receiving old age assistance, and a certain number of children receiving aid for dependent children. The social security law has established a system of card filing and indexing, so that the problem is relatively simple from an administrative standpoint.

If each adult receiving public assistance were enabled to purchase a pint of milk a day and each dependent child receiving such assistance were enabled to have a quart of milk a day—the recommended amounts to avoid dietary deficiencies—an annual market outlet would be created for 736,200,000 quarts of milk a year.

By the way, I recommend that we start drinking more milk and stop drinking coffee until coffee prices come down. That would help the country and help the consumer. Besides, we might be surprised to learn how much good comes from drinking milk.

If the program which I have recommended were followed for 1 year, every pound of dry powdered milk in storage would be gone, and we would be calling upon the dairy farmers of the country greatly to expand their production. If we were to supplement the butter diet of the people on old age assistance—only those on old age assistance—by 2 ounces of butter a day, in 1 year the surplus butter would be gone, and we would be wondering where we could get enough butter to go around. Let no one try to tell me that the United States of America cannot afford a supplement to the diet of the people on old-age assistance to the extent of 2 ounces of butter a day.

Mr. WILEY. How about cheese?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Wisconsin asks, "How about cheese?" I remind him that cheese is made from the same product. It is made from milk. If we deal with the problem of milk and the problem of butterfat, we are dealing basically with the problem of the dairy industry, and that will benefit the producers of cheese, as well.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The plan has another advantage. The Senator is advocating greater consumption of these valuable food products, butter and cheese, by those who are really in need. At the same time, he is bringing to the attention of all of us the desirability of consuming greater quantities of dairy products. If in the United States we were to consume only half the dairy products consumed per capita in Switzerland, we would benefit greatly. In Switzerland the people are eating 20 pounds of cheese per capita a year. We eat about 7 pounds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

As I have already stated, milk prices are now highest in areas where relief payments for dependent children are the lowest.

Mr. President, we have a great social welfare system in our country. There is no reason why we cannot supplement it with our surplus food products. The program has been very forcefully brought to our attention by the proposal for outright subsidies through huge sales of butter to the Soviet Union. I noticed that the newspapers of America had headline after headline, stating that we were considering the sale of butter to the Soviet Union. If we are going to sell butter at concessional prices or if we are going to feed hungry people, I have a long list of hungry people that I want to see fed before we sell butter to the Soviet Union at concessional prices. I only wish to add that we should certainly consider subsidizing the diets of American needy and low-income families before we consider subsidizing a country responsible for the world's turmoil and unrest of today.

Before our Government is permitted to sell butter at concessional prices to the enemy of democracy I am sure that every Senator will want to make sure that the products are first made available at reasonable or concessional prices to the needy people of the United States. That is my view.

Mr. President, two thought-provoking articles appeared in the January 25 issue of the Washington Star on this very subject to which I am addressing myself today—an article by Dorothy Thompson entitled "Why Give Food to Enemies? United States Should Give Away Its Surplus to Those in Need, but Certainly Not to Hostile Countries," and another by Thomas L. Stokes entitled "Millions Are Going Hungry—Until Everybody in the World Gets Enough To Eat, Other Problems Will Be Difficult To Solve."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for these two articles to be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is in the spirit of opportunities to take advantage of our blessing of abundance that we should be considering disposal of surplus foods, instead of in the spirit of attacking farm programs that have helped assure us of abundance instead of scarcity in this country, as considerable propaganda now seems directed from within and outside of the Government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator has discussed the question of our surplus commodities, and ways in which we could dispose of some of them. I agree with him that it would be well to attempt to work out a plan whereby the aged could receive additional dairy products, and it might be well to work out a plan whereby people in low-income brackets could receive some of the products also.

However, I wonder whether he has in mind the dependent-children program. It is a program under which widows and orphaned children are provided with welfare aid. I am sure the Senator would not want to overlook that program in his proposal that additional milk and butter and various other dairy products be made available, not only to the aged, but also to growing children in America who, because of the misfortune of poverty or perhaps because of the death of their parents, are not able to obtain an adequate diet. They need such food so that they may have strong bodies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I did mention the dependent-children program, and I suggested in the proposal for a study by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a recommendation that the groups covered by the assistance programs of social security, namely, those who are indigent, those who are sick, and those who are needy, be included. The proposal of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] under his food-stamp plan and the proposal which I have advanced under the dairy diet dividend suggestion are somewhat similar.

Of course, we do not have all the details worked out yet. However, a Congress which can work out the details of a farm-price-support program, the details of a Small Business Administration policy, and details with respect to a law on wages and hours, can, I am sure, work out the details with respect to the proper use of surplus foods.

I am merely raising the storm signals to indicate, before our country decides to dispose of our surplus dairy products to the Soviet Union under some kind of trade pact, that we should spend some time thinking about how we can use our food surpluses right here at home.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is one other program which should be mentioned, namely, the school-lunch program. That program also should be greatly supplemented. We have appropriated for it this year the same amount of money we appropriated last year, but it should be remembered that there are more children in school this year than there were last year, and that there will be even more next year, and still more the following year, and so on.

Therefore, we should certainly be able to supplement and augment the appropriations for the school-lunch program

so as to use surplus foods for that very wholesome purpose, and in that way build up the health of our young people.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In the State of Louisiana sometime ago an effort was undertaken to extend the school-lunch program. It was our experience, as a result, that it had the effect of enormously increasing the consumption of milk throughout the State. Oddly enough, it was necessary for the State of Louisiana, which had been an importing area, so far as milk was concerned, to become a considerably greater milk producer in order to satisfy our own demands. In that way the school-lunch program stimulated the consumption of milk.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The school-lunch program also stimulates good dietary habits. When our young people leave school they are wiser and better consumers of milk, as a result.

Mr. LONG. As I understand, the Senator's proposal contemplates that, instead of cutting back production, or instead of working out a program to ship our surplus food to our enemies, we should first work out a program which would provide an adequate diet for the people who are not now receiving such a diet; and he believes that if we were to follow such a program probably we would not be confronted with any surplus foods at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is entirely probable that we would not be faced with any surplus foods. In other words, if we were to spend the same amount of time to bring about a proper utilization of our food surpluses by our own people at home as is now being given to the question of how we can, in one way or another, work out a deal to get the food behind the Iron Curtain, all of us would be much better off.

EXHIBIT 1

WHY GIVE FOOD TO ENEMIES?—UNITED STATES SHOULD GIVE AWAY ITS SURPLUS TO THOSE IN NEED BUT CERTAINLY NOT TO HOSTILE COUNTRIES

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Perhaps I am simple minded, but I don't see why the disposal of presently accumulated agricultural surpluses creates such a problem.

All the butter (over a quarter billion pounds), wheat, dried milk, dried eggs, etc., in proportionate quantities, have been paid for by American taxpayers at above world market prices to give farm producers an assured market at prices approaching those of industry.

These products cannot be dumped on the home market without canceling the purpose behind their purchase.

But meanwhile, the United States continues to aid friendly nations with money appropriations for which we are further taxed. A portion of the money goes to purchase food which the recipients must import. Why not give them the food?

Congress appropriates money for military aid. Part of the cost of maintaining armies is in feeding them. All foreign armies are badly fed by American mess standards, but some are badly fed by any standards. The French Army, for example, is badly fed, yet, while we contribute financially to support that army, bread grains are overflowing storage bins and butter is going rancid. Why not raise French and other European army rations by food shipped and earmarked for that purpose?

Last summer the West German Government gave away, at American cost, millions of food packets to underfed Soviet zone Germans. West German welfare agencies, of which there are five big ones—those of the Evangelical churches, Catholics, trade unions, the Red Cross, and the so-called parity group, a pool of smaller agencies—are sending continual aid to their East German brethren, limited only by short supply. Camps and welfare stations are crowded with West Germans and fugitives, many of whom suffer from tuberculosis caused by undernutrition. Why not send bread and butter, milk and eggs, to these agencies, for their work in both zones?

Seven hundred and fifty thousand Palestinian Arab refugees are living in camps, on United Nations rations, 70 percent of the cost of which is annually appropriated by the United States Congress. Their rations are abominable. Only nursing mothers, children, and the sick ever get a drop of milk (made from dried milk). Butter and other fats are all but nonexistent, and bread flour is often bad. Why not feed them, and decently, with United States surpluses?

India is forever on the edge of famine.

Even rancid butter, tons of which have been destroyed here, is the only butter teeming millions of Middle Easterners ever see, and their tastes are adjusted to prefer it. European working- and even middle-class families buy rancid butter and purify it for cooking and baking. After purification no unpleasant taste is discernible in the finished product.

It is proposed to ship butter to the Soviet Union, the only objection being, apparently, that the Soviets shouldn't get it below the price paid by American housewives—which nobody else will pay—and that we might undercut the Danish market. Meanwhile, our propaganda agencies are emphasizing low nutrition standards in the U. S. S. R. and its European satellites, and the Malenkov regime is making frantic efforts to improve them by a new import policy, for which it is releasing gold, which cannot be manufactured into either guns or butter.

Why should the United States help get the Communist states out of the jam that is solely due to their own policies? There is no land or population problem in the entire area, which should have large agricultural surpluses. There is no population pressure on inadequate land as there is in Italy, Egypt, Palestine, India—to name only a few—and the Communist governments claim to be peoples' paradises. Why should America contribute to mollify their peoples and thus strengthen the Communist regimes? And for what quid pro quos?

Give it all away, say I (who, like all other Americans, have paid for it), to friendly peoples, refugees, and nations whose food problems are due to natural causes. But not to hostile governments whose food shortages are self-created.

MILLIONS ARE GOING HUNGRY—UNTIL EVERYBODY IN THE WORLD GETS ENOUGH TO EAT OTHER PROBLEMS WILL BE DIFFICULT TO SOLVE

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Our warehouses are stuffed with surpluses of basic food—wheat, corn, butter, cheese, dried milk, and the like.

Throughout the world 500 million people live at or near starvation levels.

Our Government Commodity Credit Corporation holds over $6 billion of food and farm commodities on loan, owning over $2 billion outright. President Eisenhower recommended to Congress that the CCC's borrowing authority be upped to $8.5 billion, as it already is pressing the authorized $6.75 billion limit.

This recalls dramatically a discussion on hunger in the world a few years ago by that doughty, heart-warming Scotsman, Sir John Boyd-Orr, first Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO—of the United Nations. In the course of it Sir John observed that the human race has not yet solved the elemental problem of providing everybody in the world can get enough to eat and, until it did, we were not going to get very far with our other problems.

He recognized that feeding the hungry and getting them healthy would, of itself, start the solution of other problems. The nation which can help toward that problem also will build up good will for itself. We are in a position to do that, and on a far bigger scale than we have attempted hitherto.

The Eisenhower administration and Congress are seeking ways and means. The President recommended a 3-year program for distribution of $1 billion worth of surpluses in his budget message. Valuable advice based on long experience on how to meet the many difficulties involved is being offered by CARE, that joint organization of religious, labor, agriculture, and service groups. Already it has distributed more than $160 million worth of goods around the world. It has won friends for us all over the world as a nonsectarian, nonpartisan agency interested solely in the welfare of people. In the past it has helped with distribution of limited amounts of our surpluses. It is ready to help with the bigger job now planned.

In an exhaustive analysis of the surplus distribution problem, CARE's executive director, Paul Comly French, has outlined for the administration and Congress the hurdles that will be confronted and suggested ways to get past them. As a matter of policy, we cannot distribute the surpluses in a way that will harmfully affect our own export agricultural trade, or exports of our allies, or that will depress agricultural prices in the country where the food goes. That, in fact, is specified already in the Mutual Security Act.

There are also obstacles in financing distribution, among them, the inability of dollar-short countries to pay freight costs from points of storage in the United States to the seaboard for shipment, or to handle reprocessing costs where reprocessing is necessary for perishable items, or even, in many cases, administrative costs. There are, however, a number of countries which can supply their own ships to transport surpluses to their own lands.

To get our surpluses where they are needed and without interfering with established trade and markets, the CARE survey has suggestions of value. It recommends that they be channeled to refugees and other blocks of depressed persons; to those who consume such a meager share of local agricultural products and those who lack income to buy imported farm products to the point that they are isolated from regular commercial markets. There are many millions of hungry people in these categories.

Obviously there is no one simple, easy solution to all the complications involved. Accordingly, Mr. French advises a combination of means in meeting the financial problem, for example. One is to set aside and use some of the money now spent on storage which will not be needed when surpluses are removed. Another is to have private agencies negotiate with recipient governments, as CARE has done successfully, for payment of as much of the prime and handling costs as they can afford in dollars and in local currency. Then there are contributions from our people who have already been so generous with CARE and other private agencies. Finally, Congress could make up the gap by direct appropriations.

This problem deserves public interest and public support exerted actively upon those in a position to do something about it—the administration, Congress, and private agencies of all sorts which can help.

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH KOREA

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the treaty, Executive A (83d Cong., 2d sess.), a Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on October 1, 1953.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am hopeful that we may be able to vote on the Korean Treaty this afternoon. A number of Senators have asked about it. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, and immediately after a quorum is established, if there are no further remarks on the subject, I shall request a yea-and-nay vote on the treaty, so we may have a record of the vote.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to say something about the treaty, and I would prefer to do so before the Senator suggests the absence of a quorum.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not have a prepared speech but I should like to make some remarks on the same subject.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, Senators understand that there is no effort on my part to foreclose any discussion of the treaty.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall not vote to ratify the treaty. The reason I shall not do so is that I believe our Nation could have and should have bargained for a more preferable arrangement from our standpoint.

The proposed treaty would increase the danger of an atomic war. The sponsors of the treaty state that it will have a stabilizing effect in an area which has known little stability for many years.

The fact that the area has not known stability is an indication of the fact that our country may be required under the terms of the treaty perhaps to engage in a full-scale war.

The announced foreign policy of the Secretary of State is that in the event of an attack upon the United States, or upon one of our allies, it is expected that this Nation will resort to atomic retaliation. Undoubtedly such retaliation would bring an attack in kind upon this Nation.

Mr. President, I do not oppose a proper alliance with the Republic of Korea, but I point out that we have already made commitments in the Pacific area. We have made a commitment that we will defend the Philippines if that nation is attacked. We can quibble about whether we would have to go to war without the action of Congress, but the fact is that we are in good faith bound to go to the aid of the Philippines in the event that nation is invaded.

We are committed to go to the aid of Japan if that nation is invaded. We are committed to go to the aid of Australia and New Zealand in the event they are attacked. Under this treaty we shall be committed to go to the aid of South Korea in the event the Republic of Korea is attacked. There is also assurance that in the event this Nation is attacked those nations will show a similar interest in our welfare.

It is important to notice that in no case do those nations assure us that if we are required to go to war pursuant to any of the other treaties we have made, those nations will come to our aid. I see no assurance that the Republic of South Korea is obligated to come to the aid of the United States in the event we feel compelled to fight in pursuance of our commitment to the Philippines. The same would be true if we were compelled to go to war in pursuance of any of the other commitments we have made in the Pacific.

I presume that one of these days we will see brought before the Senate a Pakistan treaty providing for mutual aid to Pakistan. In the event Pakistan should be compelled to fight in her own defense, the United States would likewise be expected to fight. In such an event the troops of the Republic of Korea, together with the troops of Australia and New Zealand and the troops raised in Japan and in the Philippines, could perhaps reduce by one-half the number of deaths and casualties which would otherwise be suffered by this Nation. Are those nations unwilling to make such a commitment? I doubt it.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that we have more to offer and less to gain by such a mutual assistance undertaking than have any of those nations. We have a greater population, more planes, greater fighting power, greater fire power. I would say that the fighting power of the United States is probably greater than that of all those other nations put together. If we are to commit this great Nation to go to war to save them in the event they find themselves in difficulty, it would seem fair that for all we have to offer them we should insist that they be willing to do what they can to help us if we are compelled to go to war somewhere in the Pacific in order to help some nation defend its own integrity and security.

In my judgment, we could have obtained such a commitment if we had asked for it, bargained for it, and insisted upon it. Yet, perilous as is the undertaking, I see no indication that the commitment of the Republic of South Korea is broader than a joint undertaking with the United States that we will help to defend the Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea will be equally interested in the event the United States is attacked. It does not assure us assistance in the event we are forced into war to assist other allies of the Pacific area. Accordingly, Mr. President, I cannot, in good conscience subscribe to this treaty.

It has been announced that through our American foreign policy we shall seek to arrive at arrangements for community defense somewhat similar to those provided for in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. If such an organization should be attempted it seems to me that every bid of logic applying to NATO or to the Organization of American States should apply equally as well to the Pacific area.

For that reason, Mr. President, because this Nation undertakes such grave commitments and receives so little consideration from other nations which should be equally concerned, I do not think this treaty is all that it should be. I should like to see a better treaty arrangement not only with the Republic of South Korea but with Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, seeking to provide community defense for the entire Pacific area.

Because no provision is made for such an arrangement, Mr. President, I shall not vote for ratification of the treaty.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in the very brief remarks I shall make with reference to the pending treaty I want to make it doubly clear in the beginning that what I have to say will not refer to the Korean people in any way to discredit them as a people or as a nation. On the contrary, Mr. President, I have a very high regard for them, based upon what I know about them. I have a very high regard for their fighting ability and for their conduct in the latter part of the recent Korean war, especially as it was explained to me by none other than General Van Fleet who, of course, was commanding officer for a considerable time and had most intimate contact with them and knowledge of them.

As I said earlier today, I have a very high regard for and have been most favorably impressed with the present Ambassador from Korea.

So, Mr. President, my thinking on this subject is altogether favorable to them as a people and as a nation.

What I am concerned about is the general stretching-out of our commitments all over the world. I am afraid the day will come when we shall be stretched out so thinly that we shall not be able to deliver, and that fact will become known to our adversaries before we realize it ourselves.

I wish also to make it clear that I am not talking about our failure to protect our own soldiers in Korea or anywhere else. There were statements in the debate today which indicated that we would not go all the way, but that there would have to be a formal declaration of war before our soldiers or our nationals would be protected. Of course, no one has anything in mind except that in an emergency the President would take whatever action he deemed necessary to protect our nationals or our soldiers wherever they might be.

I am not advocating, of course, the withdrawal of troops from Korea. They were sent there in good faith. So far as I am concerned, I think we should carry out the mission to the extent we can do so. I am not backing up on anything. I am addressing myself to the long-range effect of commitment after commitment that we are making. I have here a list of them. We have NATO. We have agreements with the Philippines, agreements with New Zealand, Australia, and Japan. Now we are going to commit ourselves to go to the main continent of Asia, and after the present situation is cleared up, at any time in the future while this treaty is in operation, if the South Koreans are attacked, we will stand by them and help to fight their battle.

That is going a long, long way in committing ourselves to undertakings which I am afraid it is beyond our ability to deliver.

Last fall, as a member of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Construction, along with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], I visited a number of our military installations. We visited those in northern France, southern France, northern Germany, southern Germany, northwest Africa, portions of central Africa, and Turkey. After seeing on the spot, the enormous installations we are constructing, and realizing the day-to-day mounting cost of sustaining all our military forces all over the world, I began to doubt our ability year after year to continue such a policy on such a colossal scale and to provide, as most unfortunately we have been compelled to do, such a great percentage of the men, the material, and the money.

I have not been too much encouraged by the development of strength I saw in the other nations, outside our own military power.

I did not go to Korea, but I have been more encouraged, I must say, by the local military strength I have heard of there. We have more ground forces in Korea than I think we have in any other nation. But looking at the entire picture, after getting back to the United States, I made up my mind that it was my duty, based on what I had seen, and my realization of all the implications, to call this matter to the particular attention of the Senate.

We talk about balancing the budget and about reducing taxes. I hope those objectives can be accomplished. But, based on the commitments we now have made, we might as well adjust ourselves to the thought that taxes will be high—terribly high—for years and years to come. Similarly, we might just as well adjust ourselves to the thought that, on the basis of the commitments we now have made, our men are going to be drafted for years and years to come.

Some Senators may say, "This treaty will help us solve the very problems to which the Senator from Mississippi is adverting." I think we have to stand by Korea under present conditions, but I believe that a very firm policy announced by the President, a very firm declaration of assurances by the President, would be just as effective in helping to solve the problems facing the United States in Korea, as would a formal treaty, whereby the United States would be committed for an indefinite period. By making a formal declaration of commitment to action on another continent we set a dangerous precedent in many ways.

I am serious when I say I am convinced that we have already spread ourselves out so thin that if we were called upon to deliver in more than one of these places at a time, we could not do it, and at the same time maintain effective defenses in our own homeland.

We have come a long way from the time, a few years ago, when we could not really have had a strong, affirmative military policy in any one place in the world, much less provide, in proper degree, defenses for our homeland.

I wish to say at this point, incidentally, that I am 100 percent behind the so-called new look in our military planning. I hear criticism of the new look. The criticism is honestly and sincerely made, of course. But with criticism of the new military policy, on the one hand, we turn right around and walk into onother binding commitment on a continent thousands and thousands of miles away from home. The only possible way in which we can fulfill such commitments as we have already made is through the system contemplated by the new look, which has been recently proposed.

We may not like some phases of it. I dislike to be driven to it, but our commitments are so far flung, we are stretched out so far and so thin, and may get such little help, that we are driven to a policy of quick and devastating retaliation. That is the only kind of program we can effectively pursue.

What I am saying is by way of warning. I do not have any complete answer; I do not have any complete alternative. I do not want to desert Korea; I am willing to stand by Korea with our forces and our strength; but I am opposed to the idea of continuing our assistance endlessly with, I am afraid, rather scant consideration being given to treaties binding ourselves and tying ourselves down for years and years to come, without proper support from other areas, and without a proper appraisal of our own strength and of our own defense needs.

For that reason, and that reason alone, I shall vote against the treaty.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The argument of the Senator from Mississippi moves me very deeply, because I served with him on the Committee on Armed Services, as did the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. The Senator from Louisiana and I covered, in the main, the same territory the Senator from Mississippi has referred to on the inspection trip which he, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] took last summer.

The Senator from Louisiana and I set forth our findings in the Long-Morse report, which speaks for itself. Many of its conclusions are identical with the principles just enunciated by the Senator from Mississippi.

I heard what the Senator from Mississippi had to say about the so-called "new look" in our military program. He was commenting about the critics of the "new look." But it is true, is it not, that the proponents of the so-called "new look" program represent the very leaders who are urging the treaty against which the Senator from Mississippi is now speaking? I was wondering how he reconciled his position. At one point he says he is behind the "new look" program, and criticizes those who object to that program. His next argument is one of opposition to the very defense program in the Pacific the proponents of the "new look" are advocating.

Mr. STENNIS. I am not particularly critical of the "new look" military program, nor was I approaching it from that angle. My point is that the "new look" military program is operational. We are of necessity considering a great extent of area which must be covered with our relatively limited manpower and striking power.

As I see it, this treaty comes in through an altogether different door. It is true that General Ridgway testified that the Korean Peninsula was important for the defense of Japan. That is a geographical fact and a military fact, as well. We all know that to be so. I shall stand by Korea. I do not want to have the United States get out of Korea. I think we should stand by her. What I object to is this unlimited commitment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Mississippi says there is an inconsistency between the treaty and the "new look" program. I might point out one inconsistency. In the event the Soviet Union should start an attack upon this Nation, the logical bases for an atomic attack by the United States, in the main, are located in the North Atlantic area. They are to be found anywhere from Greenland, Labrador, and Iceland, to the Portuguese possessions in the Azores and in North Africa and Europe. In the main, those are the locations of the bases that would be needed if we are to follow the defense policy announced by the Secretary of Defense. That is, if the Soviet Union should begin a fresh war and we should exercise our right to respond with atomic retaliation.

If such an attack were to be made, it should be launched from the nearby bases. The European countries have signed a treaty with us, which they have been willing to implement by letting us have bases on their soil. They agree to that. I believe it will be found that we have with those countries executive agreements which would permit us to use those bases and to fly from them only to the extent they are involved in a commitment under the North Atlantic Treaty. They are not involved in the treaty with Korea.

So if the United States should become involved in a war because the Soviet Union, in collaboration with Communist China, should decide to renew the fighting in Korea, this Nation might want to make good the threat implied by the Secretary of Defense. But our North Atlantic allies would not be committed to letting us use, and would not permit us to use, the bases we have secured, at the expense of billions of dollars, in the entire North Atlantic area. That is obvious from a study of the situation. I do not believe anyone can produce an executive agreement to permit the North Atlantic bases to be used in such an event. I doubt that there is a Member of the Senate who has seen such an agreement, because I do not believe one exists. Until someone can secure an agreement to permit the North Atlantic bases to be used in such an event, then the idea of community defense and atomic retalia-

tion is inconsistent with the treaty which is now before the Senate.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. If I may finish my answer to the Senator from Oregon, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

I know the Senator from Oregon asked his questions in all good faith with reference to the "new look" military program. It is true that we were more or less committed to the spirit of this treaty on August 7, 1953, in the exchange of letters with the Korean Government, which was just a few days after the new Joint Chiefs of Staff took office, and long before the "new look" military program was evolved. I was not criticizing those who took issue with the "new look" program. I think they made a contribution in stating their positions. But I did reach a different conclusion of my own.

I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I came into the Senate Chamber just a moment ago and heard only a part of the discussion; but it occurred to me that those who appeared to think our country lacked the capacity to carry out a program of going to the defense of Korea by reason of the technique involved in the "new look" might have overlooked the fact that we have certain facilities and bases in Alaska, and in addition have certain facilities which are under development in Okinawa and at other points, from which it occurs to me we could proceed to use the strategic methods embodied in the conception of the "new look."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I made the point, not that we did not have the force to carry out the treaty, but I said we would find ourselves committed at so many places all around the earth that if we were called on to carry out two or three commitments at the same time, there would be serious question whether we could do it with adequate attention to our own defenses.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. What would be the effect of an all-out war on our forces in Korea? Does the Senator think we would be able to keep them there, or would we have to move them out of that area?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not have an opinion on that point. In my judgment, we are presently committed there, and we will have to stick it out.

Mr. WATKINS. Would the Senator say we would have to stick it out in the event of an all-out war, with our troops tied up on a peninsula where nearly all the conditions are against us?

Mr. STENNIS. I cannot advocate a battle plan on the floor of the Senate. I do not have an opinion as to whether we could be pushed out or not. If I thought we could be, I would not say so here.

Mr. WATKINS. It is my judgment that we would have to pull our forces out of Korea in event of an all-out war, on the very theory the Senator has been discussing, that we are spread so thin. It seems to me that should be taken into consideration in connection with the pending treaty. We have agreed to protect the Koreans. We may have to move our troops in spite of that agreement.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the only reason why the treaty is going along so easily, and without any greater numerical opposition, is that we are already in Korea and are committed, and we will have to go along. I say we will have to stick it out, but I do not want our country to make a formal commitment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the argument of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] disturbs me, and in my questions I am seeking only information. I am glad he has come onto the floor, because I was going to ask the Senator from Mississippi for permission to join the Senator from Louisiana in the colloquy.

As I understand, the argument of the Senator from Louisiana is that under NATO our arrangement with our European allies is that we can use the bases in their countries in case of an attack by Russia which involves us really in hostilities in Europe, but that under the NATO agreement we have no understanding with our allies that if we in turn become involved with Russia in the Pacific, without our allies being joined in the involvement, they will be free to use our bases in France, England, and elsewhere, for an attack on Russia.

My question is two-pronged. Is that the position of the Senator from Mississippi, and if his answer is "Yes," is it a further argument the Senator is using in opposition to ratification of the treaty?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not wish to yield the floor just now, but the question of the Senator from Oregon really addresses itself to the Senator from Louisiana, and I ask unanimous consent that he may answer the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I may say, if I correctly understand the question, that it was my theory that this treaty is not related to our commitments under the North Atlantic Treaty, and that the so-called new look defense program implies the threat of a complete atomic retaliation, perhaps against the Soviet Union itself, in the event the Soviet Union started another war in which this Nation should become engaged.

If such an eventuality should occur, the United States bases to which the Soviet Union would be most vulnerable would be those in and near Europe in relative proximity to the places where most of the Soviet industries are located.

It is true that this country has some bases in Alaska. However, those bases are as far away from Moscow as is the State of Maine. The result would be that the intermediate bases could not be useful to us unless the North Atlantic Treaty countries permitted us to use our bases on their soil.

The Senator knows that when he and I joined in our report we recommended that we should have the executive agreements. If we had the benefit of seeing the executive agreement, we would probably find the North Atlantic Allies were careful to obtain a commitment from us that the bases would not be used for waging atomic warfare unless they themselves were involved. Under such a commitment, the bases would be used only if hostilities involved the North Atlantic Community. If this Nation should become involved because of the South Korean commitment and decided that it wanted to use the so-called new look defense, the Senator can very well appreciate the fact that the European nations would not be committed to engage in an atomic war because there had been an invasion of Korea.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Mississippi permit one more question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Louisiana argue that the ratification of this treaty would relieve our allies who are involved with us in the Korean war from any further commitments growing out of that war in case Russia should follow an aggressive course of action in Korea?

Mr. LONG. No; I do not make that argument. If that argument should be made, I would not know whether or not it would be valid. My objection to the treaty was somewhat along the lines stated by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. My objection was that such treaties as this should be community-type treaties, such as the North Atlantic Treaty. The main objection of the Senator from Louisiana is that we already have too many piecemeal commitments. We have made one commitment to South Korea, another to Japan, another to the Philippines, another to Australia and New Zealand, and I suspect we will be asked to make one to Pakistan. Each one of those commitments entails a moral obligation on the part of this Nation to go to war in the event those nations are invaded. Yet those nations would be required to respond to aggression only in the event that either they themselves or the United States were attacked; but if their neighbor were attacked there would be no obligation on them to join us in undertaking to resist the aggression.

The point the Senator from Louisiana makes is that if countries such as Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, and Japan were to join us in a mutual defense effort, the casualties which the United States would be called upon to suffer would not be nearly so great as if we were to undertake resistance to aggression alone and by making these scattered unconnected treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. There was one additional point I wished to call to the attention of the Senate, and which I desired to make of legislative record. After speaking about the action we are obliged to take, article III concludes with the following words: "in accordance with its constitutional processes."

Mr. President, he who runs and reads, or anyone whose opinion one of us might call for at a crossroads store or on the street, would think that meant after a declaration of war by the Congress. That is the same language that is used in

section 43 of the United Nations Charter, as I recall. At the time of the adoption of that Charter it was generally understood that that language meant a declaration of war.

Subsequent events prove—and in that connection a precedent has been established—that we went into war under that clause of the United Nations Charter, but without a declaration of war. I shall not try to "rehash" all of that. I was a party to it. I did not object then, and I shall not object now.

However, I think it highly important that it be clearly understood that we are not adopting what occurred at the beginning of the Korean war as an unquestioned precedent, or that we are reading into those words a meaning, in effect, "Yes, anything the President of the United States may decide to do is all right with us."

I do not agree to that, and I think few other Members of Congress would agree to it.

Mr. President, earlier today I questioned the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. If I correctly understood his answers, he said that ordinarily a declaration of war by Congress would be required, although he pointed out that in case of a direct attack upon our soldiers, the President of the United States would have to act, and could not wait for a declaration of war in every instance.

However, I still think that matter should be submitted to the Congress, under the phrase "in accordance with its constitutional processes," and in each case should be submitted as soon as possible to the Congress of the United States.

So I should be very glad to have the Senator from Georgia give the Senate the benefit of his interpretation of the meaning of those words.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from Mississippi has been discussing the "new look." Has he also read the statement that there would be instant retaliation in the event of any attack or any aggression?

Mr. STENNIS. That is a part of the "new look," as I understand it; yes.

Mr. WATKINS. If there were instant retaliation, it would involve, would it not, action by the Executive alone, rather than by the Congress—although the Senator from Mississippi has been contending for action by the Congress?

Mr. STENNIS. That would be one interpretation of the word "instant." However, that word is rather like the word "ultimate"; it is a rather broad word.

In advocating the new look, I am not saying that in all circumstances the President has a right merely to barge into war, without submitting the question to Congress, although in some circumstances, if an act of war were committed against the United States, the President would have to retaliate for the time being.

Mr. WATKINS. I would agree as to that with the Senator from Mississippi. However, I believe a clarification should be made as to what the President and the Secretary of State mean by the words "instant retaliation"—in short, whether they mean submitting to the Congress, in advance, a request for power to make instant retaliation in such circumstances.

If that is what is meant by the President and the Secretary of State, then the Congress should adopt a measure authorizing them to make such instant retaliation rather than to have them proceed on the theory that they have such power, without resort to Congress.

Furthermore, we must never surrender the power of Congress to decide when the Nation is to go to war. Congress must retain that power.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall not disagree with the Senator from Utah as to the meaning of the word "instant."

What I approve of in the new military policy is the giving of notice that we shall hit back strongly and quickly, and that the power of terrible retaliation is what we have and what we shall use, if provoked.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The argument made by the Senator from Utah has much merit. However, I suspect that the argument is impractical. If we felt compelled to attack another nation with atomic weapons, and waited long enough to call the Congress together and to have it issue a declaration of war, I suspect that by that time we would find that all our bases were destroyed and that most of our plans had been destroyed on the ground. Certainly that is what would likely happen before Congress would ever have a chance to get around to issuing a declaration of war.

Mr. STENNIS. My point is that unless there is some clear-cut circumstance or necessity for quick action, any proposal for our Nation to go to war should be submitted to Congress. If the President has to act in a great emergency, nevertheless, Mr. President, as soon as he can do so thereafter, he should submit that question to Congress.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I think we have previously discussed the point that if an attack were made upon the United States or upon United States forces, the President automatically would respond with a prompt defense.

In the discussion which has occurred today, the question has largely been in regard to what would occur if an attack were made on some of our allies.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Utah is correct, and I made that point earlier in my remarks.

Mr. WATKINS. Under those circumstances, the President would have time to call upon Congress just as rapidly as he would have time to call upon the United Nations.

If instant retaliation is to be our program, then I think Congress should, in advance, give to the President authority to act in that way under certain circumstances. For instance, if aggression occurred against certain nations, particularly against nations whose security we believe to be necessary to our own security, then the President should have authority to act instantly.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Utah for the statement he has made.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Maybank
Anderson	Griswold	McCarthy
Barrett	Hayden	McClellan
Beall	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Burke	Hoey	Murray
Bush	Holland	Neely
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Payne
Capehart	Ives	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Kefauver	Smathers
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	Kuchel	Symington
Ellender	Lehman	Thye
Ferguson	Lennon	Upton
Flanders	Long	Watkins
Frear	Magnuson	Welker
Fulbright	Malone	Wiley
George	Mansfield	Williams
Goldwater	Martin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate for long at this late hour, but I should like to say that during the first overt act of aggression which took place, the Republic of Korea furnished more than 600,000 sturdy allies in the defense of the free world from aggression. Today the Republic of Korea has the sixth largest standing army in the world.

General Van Fleet and others who have had the opportunity of observing the Republic of Korea and its troops speak highly of their courage, their ability as soldiers, their great patriotism, and the fact that they were stout allies. I can only express the wish that we could be as sure of all our other allies as we are of the Republic of Korea.

It is true that, under the terms of the treaty, as was pointed out in some of the discussions earlier in the afternoon, Korea might not be required to come to our assistance if our own soil were not attacked, or, for example, if we entered into war because of involvments in Europe. However, I have no doubt that if this Nation ever became involved in a war anywhere in the world, if any ally came to our assistance the Republic of Korea would be there.

I point out that of the 60 members of the United Nations, only 16 contributed to the resistance to the aggression in Korea. All 16 of them together contributed less than 45,000 in armed forces. The Republic of Korea alone contributed more than 600,000.

I think the testimony has been very clear that it would not be in our national interest to have all of Korea pass behind the Iron Curtain. It has been testified that under those circumstances a completely communized Korea would point like a dagger toward Japan.

It would not be in our national interest to have Japan pass behind the Iron Curtain, for it would endanger our great air bases at Okinawa and jeopardize the entire defense line, which runs from Japan through Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines, to Australia.

The testimony before the committee and the interpretation presented by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], make it perfectly clear that this treaty will come into operation only if the area now under the control of the Republic of Korea is subject to further aggression.

I am inclined to agree at least in part with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] that we are committed in Korea. In other words, we have our troops there and we could not, as a matter of national interest or in the interest of the preservation of a free world, be unconcerned with aggression upon the Republic of Korea, even if we did not have the proposed treaty in effect.

It is perfectly understandable that the people of the Republic of Korea, who gained their independence as a nation under the auspices of the United States of America and of the United Nations, had great faith in the United Nations, and hoped they might gain a completely free and independent country. But, by virtue of the veto exercised by the Soviet Union, and because of the lack of support on the part of the Soviets and their satellites given to the Charter of the United Nations, the Communist world was able to block the United Nations itself from carrying out free elections in North Korea back in 1948 and 1949.

As a result, the only place where free elections could be held under the United Nations Commission was in what we now know as the Republic of Korea, south of the 38th parallel.

The Republic of Korea was subject to tremendous aggression from the Communists in the north, first on the part of northern Communist Korea, and later by the Chinese Communists, at all times supported with equipment and morally by the Soviet Union itself.

Recognizing, as they do, the power of the Communist world to use the veto in the United Nations, it is no wonder that the Korean people should have felt they needed, for their own protection, a treaty of this kind with the United States.

The question has been asked whether the treaty, in effect, lets our other associates in the United Nations off the hook, so to speak. I believe the answer to that question is "No." Certainly every member of the United Nations, which helped to create the Republic of Korea, and every nation that supplied forces, small though they were, to resist aggression in Korea, still has its United Nations obligation to join us in the resistance to aggression, if it should occur again.

Inasmuch as the Republic of Korea, through its constitutional processes, has now ratified the treaty, I hope that by an overwhelming vote today the Senate will advise and consent to its ratification.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] in his address this morning made reference to an understanding which was to be attached to the treaty. Does the resolution of ratification carry such an understanding?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The understanding to which the Senator refers is one which was proposed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. It will be included in the ratification process.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it attached to the resolution of ratification? Is it a part of the resolution of ratification?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; it is a part of the resolution of ratification.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the treaty will be reported to the Senate.

The treaty was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification with the reservation will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive A, 83d Congress, 2d session, a mutual-defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on October 1, 1953.

It is the understanding of the United States that neither party is obligated, under article III of the above treaty, to come to the aid of the other except in case of an external armed attack against such party; nor shall anything in the present treaty be construed as requiring the United States to give assistance to Korea except in the event of an armed attack against territory which has been recognized by the United States as lawfully brought under the administrative control of the Republic of Korea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the reservation to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the resolution of ratification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the reservation to the resolution of ratification.

The reservation was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification with the reservation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] are absent on official business, and if present would each vote "yea."

I announce also that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent on official business, and if present would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 81, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—81

Aiken	George	Maybank
Anderson	Goldwater	McCarthy
Barrett	Green	McClellan
Beall	Griswold	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Morse
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Burke	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Payne
Capehart	Humphrey	Potter
Carlson	Hunt	Purtell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Clements	Jackson	Russell
Cooper	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kerr	Sparkman
Duff	Kilgore	Symington
Dworshak	Knowland	Thye
Eastland	Kuchel	Upton
Ellender	Lehman	Watkins
Ferguson	Lennon	Welker
Flanders	Magnuson	Wiley
Frear	Mansfield	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	Young

NAYS—6

Johnson, Colo.	Long	Smathers
Johnston, S. C.	Malone	Stennis

NOT VOTING—9

Bridges	Gillette	Langer
Byrd	Gore	McCarran
Chavez	Hennings	Monroney

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification, with the reservation, is agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the action taken today by the Senate on the Korean Treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and especially the Senate members of the joint committee, be authorized to sit tomorrow afternoon, during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is given.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider legislative business.

CONSIDERATIONS OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me say that the unfinished business is Senate Joint Resolution 1, the so-called Bricker amendment, but, obviously, at this hour we shall not proceed to debate it. However, there are certain resolutions which have been on the calendar for some time. I have discussed them with the minority leader and with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who asked that they go over. If it is agreeable to the minority, I should like to take up the resolutions and dispose of them at this time, with the exception of two. The resolutions which I have in mind at this time are Calendar No. 845, Senate Resolution 171, extending the authority to investigate the accessibility and availability of supplies of critical raw materials; Calendar No. 846, Senate Resolution 189, providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations; Calendar No. 859, Senate Resolution 172, to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States; Calendar No. 860, Senate Resolution 173, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce; Calendar No. 861, Senate Resolution 179, continuing the authority for the temporary employment of two additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Foreign Relations; Calendar No. 862, Senate Resolution 181, increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary; Calendar No. 863, Senate Resolution 182, to investigate problems relating to economic stabilization, and mobilization, banking policies, and certain other matters within its jurisdiction; Calendar No. 864, Senate Resolution 183, to study the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; Calendar No. 865, Senate Resolution 184, providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations; Calendar 866, Senate Resolution 185, authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services; Calendar No. 867, Senate Resolution 186, authorizing the employment of additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; Calendar No. 868, Senate Resolution 187, increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary; Calendar No. 869, Senate Resolution 188, further extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from western European nations; Calendar No. 871, Senate Resolution 192, extending the time for a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia; Calendar No. 872, Senate Resolution 193, amending Senate Resolution 126, 83d Congress, providing for a study of proposals to modify existing international peace and security organizations; Calendar No. 873, Senate Resolution 198, electing a member on the part of the Senate to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

I have excepted Calendar No. 870, Senate Resolution 190, amending the resolution providing for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States and increasing the limit of expenditures, which, according to the understanding I have with the minority leader, will go over until tomorrow to be taken up after the quorum call.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not hear the Senator refer to Calendar No. 868, Senate Resolution 187, increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think I included Senate Resolution 187. I was going to mention the fact that many of the committees will not be able to function if the funds provided in a number of the resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration are not made available by the first of next month. Then there is one resolution to go to the Committee on Rules and Administration which has not as yet been considered by that committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ACCESSIBILITY, ETC., OF CRITICAL RAW MATERIALS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Calendar No. 845, Senate Resolution 171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 171) extending the authority to investigate the accessibility and availability of supplies of critical raw materials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator who offered the resolution to make a statement explaining it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the purpose of the resolution, it is to extend the life of the committee until April of this year so that it may complete its report.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct; to enable the committee to render a report to the Senate. It simply provides for the committee the money which was lopped off last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. It does not entail the expenditure of more money than the committee asked for last year, does it?

Mr. MALONE. It is the same amount; it is no more.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I think it should be made plain that the committee originally asked for $50,000, but the amount was reduced to $37,500, and the committee was asked to complete its work by January 31. Now it is asking for the entire $50,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that this sum will be sufficient to complete the investigation and to make a report to the Senate?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I have gone over the matter with the chairman of the subcommittee, and I am satisfied the work will be completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 171) extending the authority to investigate the accessibility and availability of supplies of critical raw materials, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, in line 7, after the word "extended", to strike out "to" and insert "through"; and in line 9, after the word "The", to insert "sum of $12,500 in addition to the", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under Senate Resolution 143, 83d Congress, agreed to July 28, 1953 (authorizing a full and complete investigation and study of the accessibility of critical raw materials to the United States during a time of war), and the time for reporting the results of its study and investigation thereunder, is hereby extended through April 30, 1954.

SEC. 2. The sum of $12,500 in addition to the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution shall be available for the expenses of the committee covering obligations incurred on or before April 30, 1954.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, Calendar No. 846, Senate Resolution 189, providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations has been on the calendar. I held it on the calendar at the request of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and other Senators. It has not yet been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Under the normal procedure, it would go to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and then be reported to the Senate. I move that Senate Resolution 189 be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to refer Senate Resolution 189 to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I asked that the resolution be retained on the calendar pending an agreement among members of the committee, which related to the employment of clerical assistance. I understand that the committee has now agreed to abide by that part of section 202 of the Reorganization Act, which provides that—

Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives (other than the Appropriations Committees) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members.

Again, section 202 of the act provides:

The clerical staff of each standing committee * * * shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee.

In conformity with that provision, the appointment blanks used when clerks are appointed indicate that the committee, or subcommittee, whatever it may be, by a majority vote, have appointed the person named at a certain salary. The form is then signed by the chairman. Thus, each chairman must certify that the persons employed have been selected by majority vote.

If that is the understanding in this case, I do not believe it is necessary to offer an amendment from the floor. An amendment might be proposed by the Committee on Rules and Administration to the effect that none of the funds shall be made available unless there is compliance with the law. But I see no necessity for offering such an amendment at the moment.

I understand also that the amount of money sought is desired to be increased.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to address myself to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. I hope that if this proposal is to be considered as an amendment to the resolution, a proviso will be included to the effect that when the Senate is in recess, then, temporarily at least, without the sanction of a majority of the committee, the chairman may make appointments, which can be confirmed when Congress reconvenes. Otherwise, if vacancies occurred on the committee staff, the hands of the chairman would be tied.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could not such a provision apply to all subcommittees?

Mr. HAYDEN. So far as I know, this was the only instance of such a question being raised in a committee. The committee originally delegated to the chairman of the committee the sole authority to hire and fire personnel. That situation has been completely eradicated, and all the members of the committee have agreed to abide by the general rule.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator expects to propose a new rule, why not make it applicable to all committees, and let the Committee on Rules and Administration so indicate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the resolution were to be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which the distinguished Senator from Arizona is a member, that committee might wish to consider a general rule which could apply to all committees, in conformity with the rules of the Senate. But that is a matter on which the Committee on Rules and Administration is better able to determine the policy than perhaps is the Senate as a whole at this hour.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not insist on offering an amendment tonight.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not the Senator from Arizona feel that it might be a good idea to carry out the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that in the event of vacancies occurring on the staff when Congress was not in session, and it was difficult to procure the attendance of members, it might be well, perhaps, to let the chairman, with the advice of the ranking minority member, fill vacancies?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think there is great force in the suggestion made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ELLENDER. That detail could be worked out by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to refer Senate Resolution 189 to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER subsequently said: In regard to Senate Resolution 189, which a few minutes ago was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Chair wishes to announce, that, without objection, the Chair will refer to the same committee an amendment submitted yesterday by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] to increase the amount of funds under the resolution.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, Calendar No. 859, Senate Resolution No. 172, to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, a resolution which, in addition to Calendar 870, Senate Resolution 190, it was asked to have go over until noon tomorrow. So Senate Resolution 173, is the next resolution to be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection Senate Resolution 172 will be passed over.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 173, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 173) to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with additional amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 10, after the word "authorized", it is proposed to strike out "until" and insert "from February 1, 1954, through."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as we do not have the resolution in our files, would it be possible to have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. HUNT. I wish to advise the distinguished Senator from Vermont that at the last meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a request was made of the Committee on Rules and Administration, as the resolution indicates, for the sum of $150,000 to be used for investigations to be made by the committee. The committee intends to go into a very thorough investigation of every type of transportation, land, sea, and air. This is a part of the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is not this the same committee that was created last year for the purpose of investigating maritime conditions in New York, New Orleans, and other ports of the country?

Mr. HUNT. Does the Senator mean the waterfront investigation?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

Mr. HUNT. Oh, no; this would be a different type of investigation altogether. The investigation of last year has ended. It is completed, and there will be no more activity by that committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was not the work of that committee done under the same resolution?

Mr. HUNT. It might have been, but the money which is sought at this time is not to be used for that purpose. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that the pending resolution eliminates the waterfront investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is because, as I understand, reports have been filed by the committee in connection with investigations made in New York, New Orleans, and probably some other ports.

Mr. HUNT. Just what the final action of that committee was, I could not say. At a meeting the other day the committee decided not to go any further into those matters. I am now advised that a report has been submitted.

Mr. ELLENDER. According to the report as I have it, the Senate provided last year for this committee a total of $115,000, of which there is a balance of $30,000. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. HUNT. I cannot answer the Senator; I have not watched the finances of the committee closely.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much in new funds is being sought?

Mr. HUNT. One hundred and fifteen thousand dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then we are not talking about the same resolution, because, as I understand, in this resolution the committee is now asking for——

Mr. HUNT. We are asking for $115,000 and also to utilize $30,000 of unexpended funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the committee is asking for $85,000 in new funds and for the $30,000 unexpended balance.

Mr. HUNT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What was the object of adding a fifth category to the investigation—fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation? Is that within the province of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. HUNT. It is, and we have a subcommittee handling those particular items.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the same subcommittee which conducted the investigations regarding conditions on the New York waterfront and the New Orleans waterfront?

Mr. HUNT. My answer to the Senator from Louisiana is that it is not; it is entirely different.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are there different lawyers and different investigators employed by the subcommittee, or are the same people to continue in these capacities?

Mr. HUNT. I cannot tell the Senator about the personnel, because I had no part in selecting them. However, I can say that of the personnel working on the waterfront investigation, at least the chief counsel will no longer be employed.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the original resolution was before the Senate during the session last year, a request was made for an appropriation of $115,000. It was represented that it was very urgent that the investigation be made. Will the Senator tell what has the committee accomplished up to now by the expenditure of $85,000?

Mr. HUNT. I think the principal accomplishment was a maritime study. I am advised that the report of that investigation is practically completed and ready to be submitted to the full committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that the report in respect to the investigations in New York and New Orleans?

Mr. HUNT. No; the investigation to which I am referring had nothing to do with waterfront conditions. It concerned primarily shipping, fishing, and matters of that nature.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the purpose of the subcommittee to continue similar investigations?

Mr. HUNT. No; it is not.

Mr. ELLENDER. What showing was made before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to justify the request for the proposed appropriation? Were any hearings held to justify the appropriation of the amount asked for?

Mr. HUNT. I desire to state to the distinguished Senator that it was a unanimous request on the part of the committee. The entire committee is of the opinion that there must be made a careful study of all types of transportation in the United States. The money obtained by this appropriation will be applied primarily for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will remember that 2 years ago, I believe, the Senate appropriated about $250,000 to be used in a study, by the subcommittee, of the various forms of communications. Is the subcommittee going to duplicate investigations regarding communications that have been conducted by previous subcommittees?

Mr. HUNT. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that the present very able chairman, who was at that time a member of the committee, would, I think, be very careful not to duplicate activities of the past.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out at the last session of Congress, when these investigating committees are created, they never die; they are continued. I made a suggestion last year, and I renewed it this year, that we endeavor to have the committees justify their requests for appropriations. Those of us who serve on the Committee on Appropriations, I may say, force all departments of the Government to have representatives appear before us and justify the necessity for the appropriations they seek. Why the same procedure should not be required regarding appropriations requested by the various investigating committees is something I cannot understand.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The request is for exactly the same amount appropriated last year. I think the Senator has been advised as to that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. BRICKER. Of the amount appropriated last year the committee saved $30,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. BRICKER. That amount has been added to the lesser amount already recommended by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The money which was appropriated last year was used for various purposes. Two or three investigations which were in process of being conducted have been closed. That was done by cooperation with the senior member of the committee on the other side of the aisle. One of the hearings was the Krebiozen investigation. The committee approved discontinuing that investigation. I recommended that as soon as I became the chairman of the committee, which was in the middle of the session. We also closed out, with the approval of the whole committee, the investigation of the waterfront situation. The New Jersey-New York compact was approved by the Congress. That compact has taken over the investigation of the problem in that section of the country, so the investigation by the committee into that matter was discontinued. There were some other investigations being conducted at the time without the full authorization of the committee, which were also discontinued. In that way we were able to save $30,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Were not those investigations previously ordered by the committee?

Mr. BRICKER. They were ordered by the chairman of the committee. It is my intention that no investigations shall be held unless the authorization of the committee is obtained.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee spent $85,000 last year. Why is it necessary to raise the request to the amount appropriated last year, $115,000?

Mr. BRICKER. The committee will have to continue the investigation of ground transportation. Likewise, there is a committee considering the matter of the merchant marine. That is a very important phase of the activities and deliberations of the committee.

There is also in process a general recodification of all the aviation laws. The bill itself comprises some 150 pages. That matter will involve a very extensive investigation which I believe will be conducted by the whole committee. Considerable travel will be necessary, and hearings will be held in various sections of the country. Every phase of aviation will be covered.

I assure the Senator that he does not have to ask the chairman of the committee to save money. I think the record of the committee last year shows that the committee has saved money, and it will continue to save money. I think the record also indicates that whatever money is to be used will be wisely spent, and with the approval of a majority of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not questioning that phase at all. The point I am trying to make is that once investigating committees are created, they never come to an end. They are always continued and added to.

Referring to the pending resolution, I notice that on page 2 there is reference to fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation. That is an added field which may deserve investigation, but I am wondering why it is that much of the work could not be done by the professional staff of the committee, which has been provided by the Senate.

As the Senator knows, under the Reorganization Act, every standing committee is permitted to employ 4 experts and 6 clerical employees. For that purpose the Senate appropriated $95,000 for each standing committee. The Senator's committee is asking for an additional $115,000 to do further investigative work. I am wondering if it would not be possible to have much of this work done by the experts who are already provided for.

Mr. BRICKER. Every bit of the work which can be done by the regularly employed staff of the committee will be handled by them. The staff is already at work on many bills. The employees will continue to work on them. I assure the Senator that they will be kept at work full time.

The fish and wildlife matter has always been before this committee. Nothing has been done regarding it. I do not know the nature or the status of the committee's activity at the present time. I think that perhaps some investigation will be conducted by the regular staff. Then if the committee determines that something further ought to be done, we shall do it. I think that practically everything done by the committee will be limited to legislative proposals which have been presented to the committee.

There may be on the outside a few fields for which we shall need some additional funds; but the purpose of this resolution is to provide us with the additional help which is necessary in order to conduct the ordinary business of the committee.

I wish to assure my colleague from Louisiana that not 1 cent of this money

will be spent for any additional help to handle work that the regular staff of the committee can carry on.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio is aware of the fact, is he not, that under the Reorganization Act, certain experts are available to each committee? The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for instance, or the Senator's Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or the Finance Committee, or any other committee has available experts who are supposed to furnish to the committees, at their request, certain information.

Does the able chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce use the experts who are available at the Library of Congress, and who are specially appointed in order to furnish such information?

Mr. BRICKER. They will be utilized to the fullest extent.

Mr. ELLENDER. But have they been utilized to the fullest extent in the past?

Mr. BRICKER. I became chairman of the committee only at the end of the last session, and no investigation has been made by our committee in the meantime.

In the last 6 months I have spent my time in saving money and in cutting out any expenditures which I thought were not justified.

Mr. ELLENDER. After the Senator from Ohio has investigated the matter, as he said he did, and in view of the fact that he has curtailed many of the investigations which heretofore were on the committee's agenda, I wonder why we now are confronted with a request for the same amount of money that was requested for the committee last year.

Mr. BRICKER. It is for the simple reason that the full committee thinks that much money is needed—after a thorough study of the pending legislative proposals which come within the province or jurisdiction of the committee.

The Senator from Louisiana will recall that our committee has jurisdiction of all legislative proposals or measures in regard to aviation, and all in regard to communications, and all in regard to maritime matters, and all in regard to transportation. That is a very extensive jurisdiction, covering a number of very broad fields.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that.

Mr. BRICKER. To each one of those responsibilities or to each one of those fields or branches of our activity, there is assigned an assistant who serves on a full-time basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That is why the Reorganization Act provided for these experts to serve on a full-time basis, and that is why the Reorganization Act provided for additional help from the Library of Congress.

Mr. BRICKER. Wherever we can utilize by loan or otherwise the services of any of the personnel of any other department or agency, we shall do so, although that has to be paid out of these funds, as the Senator from Louisiana knows.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the distinguished Senator from Ohio feel that the work contemplated to be done by his committee through the use of the funds called for in the resolution, can be completed by January 31, 1955?

Mr. BRICKER. I certainly hope so. Our committee has before it the aviation bill; and we have a report, which certainly will be submitted during the present session, on the merchant marine. Most of the committee's activities will be finished by then.

If the Senator from Louisiana thinks our committee is going to build up a permanent staff for investigation purposes, he is entirely mistaken.

The committee really recommended that $150,000 be provided, but I have reduced that amount to $115,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee headed by the Senator from Ohio might be an exception if it did not do it.

Mr. BRICKER. That might be, but what I have stated is our policy.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration on page 2, in line 10, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 10, after the word "authorized", it is proposed to strike out "until" and to insert "from February 1, 1954, through".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration, on page 2, in line 19, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 19, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$150,000" as proposed to be amended, and to insert "$115,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 173), as amended, is agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 179, Calendar No. 861, to continue authority for temporary employment of two additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 179) continuing the authority for the temporary employment of two additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "continued" to strike out "until" and insert "from February 1, 1954, through", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under Senate Resolution 146, 82d Congress, agreed to August 6, 1951, Senate Resolution 249, 82d Congress, agreed to January 15, 1952, and Senate Resolution 33, 83d Congress, agreed to January 30, 1953, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ two additional clerical assistants, is hereby continued from February 1, 1954, through January 31, 1955.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 181, Calendar No. 862, to increase the limit of expenditures for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 181) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1954, and ending on January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistance, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $87,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ECONOMIC STABILIZATION, MOBILIZATION, AND OTHER MATTERS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 182, Calendar No. 863, authorizing investigation of problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization, banking policies, and certain other matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 182) to investigate problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization, banking policies and certain other matters within its jurisdiction, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution and the reason why it is necessary to continue the study?

As I understand, the total amount of funds provided at the last session of Congress was $50,000; that only $16,000 was expended, and that a balance of $34,000 remains.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. We were authorized last year to spend $50,000. We spent $16,000. The amount of $50,000 has been automatically allowed to the committee for the past many, many years.

Mr. ELLENDER. What has the committee done? Could not the work be carried on by the regular staff of the committee?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think so. I think my colleague will find that the money has been very wisely spent. It is for additional clerk hire; and for the employment of investigators and attorneys and research analysts and others; and for travel expenses.

Mr. ELLENDER. The investigation is limited to problems of mobilization and stabilization. In view of the fact that we no longer have price control, and so forth, why is it necessary to continue to study that matter, and why is it necessary for the committee to be provided with the $50,000 which was allocated to it last year?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think the committee will spend $50,000. We spent only $16,000 last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then why not provide only $16,000 for the committee this year—in view of the fact that the committee spent only that amount last year?

Mr. CAPEHART. Problems requiring other expenditures may arise; and I think the full amount should be allowed; inasmuch as it has been the standard practice in the past.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the entire $50,000 is not needed, would the Senator from Indiana agree to reduce the amount by half, so as to provide $25,000 for this purpose?

Mr. CAPEHART. So far as I am concerned, the entire amount can be stricken out, because the provision of funds for this purpose only means additional work for the chairman of the committee and for the committee as a whole. The provision of this amount of money means nothing to me personally. So far as I personally am concerned, all these additional funds can be eliminated, because if that were done, it would mean much less work for those of us who serve on the committee.

However, I feel that we wish to carry on properly our part of the work of the Senate, by means of the work of the committee. The work is becoming heavier all the time, and the responsibilities are becoming heavier. Therefore, we need some additional staff; and we need to do some checking, and to ascertain what is occurring.

Mr. ELLENDER. Such a provision of funds may have been necessary when there was price control and when conditions were worse than they are today. But I wonder why it is necessary to continue to provide such funds.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Defense Production Act is still in operation; and we still have to make studies. Furthermore, the cold war is still going on; and many, many other things still are occurring throughout the world.

It is perfectly agreeable to me to eliminate the entire amount. If the Senator wishes to do so, I shall be happy to join with him in eliminating all these expenditures. I do not think we could function properly without them, but we would have less to do. I know that we would all be in better health if we could eliminate a great deal of work.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has been a strong advocate of balancing the budget. Conditions have changed. The committee spent only $16,000 last year for this purpose, and is still asking for $50,000. The request follows the same old pattern. Once these committees are created they never die.

Mr. CAPEHART. We could have spent $50,000 last year, but we spent only $16,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator consent to making the figure $25,000?

Mr. CAPEHART. I should be very happy to consent to eliminating the entire appropriation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I so move, Mr. President.

Mr. CAPEHART. But I want the Senator to know that I shall move to eliminate every other similar appropriation covered by a resolution which comes before us in this way.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course that is the Senator's privilege.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not take precipitate action and eliminate the entire amount. As majority leader, I must assume that this resolution would not have come from an important committee such as the Committee on Banking and Currency unless it was felt that the resolution was necessary and proper for the handling of the business of the committee. The resolution has been before the Committee on Rules and Administration, in the normal process, and is now on the floor of the Senate. I do not know in detail the merits of the request. Some reasons have been suggested, but I assumed that there were basic reasons for suggesting the particular amount.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, $50,000 has been appropriated by the Senate for this purpose for the past 12 or 15 years. That amount was appropriated when our able friends on the other side of the aisle were chairmen of committees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, this is a regular appropriation.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is something that has been done regularly for years.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was during the emergency, when there were price controls and other things of that kind. That is true.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is this the amount which is appropriated each year for the support of the Banking and Currency Committee as a full committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is this for a subcommittee?

Mr. CAPEHART. This is for use by the full committee, for the additional work which arises from time to time, work which must be done, and for which there are no other funds.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I concur in what the Senator from Indiana has said. We have had additional work in the committee. As the Senator from Indiana says, while the amount might be reduced somewhat, I think he did a good job last year in keeping the expenditure down to $16,000. As the Senator from California has said, we should not take precipitant action to eliminate the entire amount, which has already been approved by the full committee. I believe it would be a mistake to eliminate it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not suggesting that.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from Louisiana asked me the question. Personally, as chairman of the committee, I think this amount is needed or I would not have asked for it. I am perfectly willing to go along without any additional funds if the chairmen of other committees will do likewise. If the Banking and Currency Committee is to be treated in this fashion, I assure the Senator that we shall be here very late tonight considering other resolutions.

I do not know why the Committee on Banking and Currency should be singled out. A few minutes ago the Senate permitted the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to receive the full amount which it had last year. It is difficult to stand here on the floor of the Senate and say exactly what the money is to be used for. Many things arise in the operation of a committee for which additional funds are needed from time to time. One never knows.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought all these requests were justified before the committee. For a considerable period of time I have been pleading that we on the Appropriations Committee should force every branch of the executive department to come before the committee and justify any requests it makes for funds. When funds are asked for by Senate committees, I believe the same rule ought to be followed. Did the committee hold hearings of any kind, and ask that this amount be justified? Were witnesses heard?

Mr. CAPEHART. The full committee approved it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not asking that. I am sure it had full committee approval; but what evidence was produced to show the necessity for the $50,000, in the light of the fact that we no longer have price controls and other economic controls which might have required such an expenditure in the past?

Mr. CAPEHART. We have many problems and responsibilities in the Committee on Banking and Currency. In fact, the next resolution on the calendar deals with a study of the Export-Import Bank and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was coming to that. That is the next resolution on the calendar. Inasmuch as the Senator has mentioned it, last year the committee was given $67,000, and, of that amount, there remains a balance of $33,480. The committee is asking for new funds of $83,000, or a total of $116,480.

Mr. CAPEHART. Last year we requested $150,000 and were given $67,000. We spent $34,000, whereas we could have

spent $67,000. All we are asking is that the amount be brought back up to the original amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not have too much objection to that; but instead of asking for $67,000, the amount received last year, the committee is asking for $116,480.

Mr. CAPEHART. Last year we asked for $150,000. The Committee on Rules and Administration broke up the amount into 2 parts—$67,000 and $83,000. We are asking that the amount be brought back up to the full amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the RECORD shows that the amount appropriated in toto was $67,000 for last year.

Mr. CAPEHART. That was up to January 31; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly. It was for the entire year. Of that sum, the committee spent just about half.

Mr. CAPEHART. We spent $34,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why the increase of $83,000 in new funds? What does the committee propose to do with the money?

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot tell the Senator specifically what we are to do with it. I can assure the Senator that it will be spent wisely, and that the committee will not waste it. This year we could have spent $67,000 and we spent $34,000. We intend to make a study of international trade, and of the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. That requires a special staff and special treatment. We are going to make some trips in connection with the Export-Import Bank projects and the International Bank projects, just as we did this year.

Here we are, in the Congress of the United States, operating the largest business in the world. We are the directors of the largest business in the world. The Export-Import Bank has four and a half billion dollars invested or loaned. I do not know how much the International Bank has. This year we are going to spend $65 billion. Congress appropriates money in every direction for the executive branch and every other branch, and yet we, who have the responsibility for the spending of the money, deny ourselves the right to go out and see how it is spent. We deny ourselves the right to have sufficient staffs to check up on what is going on and what is happening to the money. It does not make sense to me. I think we ought to have larger staffs and we ought to pay more attention to what is going on, instead of less attention. It is proposed that we deny ourselves the tools which we need to make certain that the many billions of dollars which we are appropriating are being properly spent and properly administered.

We think nothing at all of appropriating millions and millions of dollars, but when it comes to a few dollars for ourselves, so that we may find out what is going on and how the money is being spent, and whether it is being spent wisely, it is said, "No, no; we do not dare do it. We do not dare have sufficient people to check up on what is going on." Yet we are held responsible for what is going on. I do not think we ought to waste any money, or that we ought to spend any more money than is needed to be spent, but I believe we ought to accept our responsibility and take whatever time is necessary to check into the money in these cases firsthand, not secondhand. Personally I like to go out myself and see what is going on, instead of getting the information from a second or third or fourth source.

That is what we did with respect to the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank last year, and that is what we would like to do this year.

If it is to be the policy of the Senate that we are not to do it, if the Senate does not believe we ought to have additional funds, and the same policy is to be applied to all committees, of course, it is perfectly agreeable to me. However, I do not know why the Committee on Banking and Currency should be singled out for special treatment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, so far as the Committee on Banking and Currency is concerned, under the prior chairmanship of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and under the present chairmanship of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Committee on Rules and Administration has always been very well impressed with the fact that the committee has never expended the full amount appropriated for it.

The fact that the committee was always able to show that it had been careful with the amount of money given to it encouraged us to say, "Well, if the committee is frugal and does not spend all the money, and has no intention to spend it unless it is necessary, we feel much more liberal toward it than toward a committee which has the reputation of spending up to the last cent." Therefore, we have been very friendly to this committee at all times in allowing it even more money than it had spent in the prior year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana desire to send forward his amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I withdraw my prior motion. However, I ask that the amount be reduced to $25,000. I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 182) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the period from February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper relating to (1) economic stabilization and mobilization; (2) domestic and international banking policies, including Federal Reserve matters and deposit insurance; (3) construction of housing and community facilities; (4) Federal loan policies; and (5) securities and exchange regulation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized until January 31, 1955, inclusive, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to expend not to exceed $16,000 in addition to any other unobligated balance of funds made available pursuant to Senate Resolution 42, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to on January 30, 1953.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF OPERATIONS OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 864, Senate Resolution 183.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 183) to study the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 183) to study the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "authorized", to insert "from February 1, 1954", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a thorough study of the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and their relationship to expansion of international trade.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1954, until January 31, 1955, inclusive, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the limits of funds made available by this resolution; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $83,000 in addition to any other unobligated balance of funds made available pursuant to S. Res. 25, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to on June 8, 1953, shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. In this case, as I pointed out a moment ago, the amount of money appropriated last year for this committee aggregated $67,000, and just about half that amount of money was spent. However, the resolution calls for $116,480. I am wondering what is the reason for the increase. I do not believe justification has been shown for the increase.

Mr. CAPEHART. The original request was for $150,000 for 2 years. The Committee on Rules and Administration said, "We would like to cut it down to 1 year at a time." Therefore, they have reduced the amount to $67,500. We are asking that the sum be brought up to the original amount requested.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, $67,000?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; up to $150,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. The committee did not work on the subject during all of last year. We started work on the resolution concerning the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank this week. However, last year, if my memory serves me right, we did not start on the work until June.

Mr. CAPEHART. May 15. We dropped out about a half a year. Mr. President, do you know what I believe we ought to do? In the case of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank, instead of the amount being $150,000, it should be $1,500,000. I would send a group of experts to do a real job of checking into the affairs of the banks. That is what General Motors would do, and that is what Chrysler or any other corporation would do. They would go check exactly what was going on, and they would know what was going on. They would have a staff available to them that understood what was going on, and understood figures and understood balance sheets. They would go all over the world and find out what was going on. It is the responsibility of the Senate to know exactly what is going on. What we ought to do, Mr. President, is to appropriate more money, so that the committee could have a much larger staff to do its work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Inasmuch as the RECORD shows that the Senate provided $67,000 for this operation last year, I move that the amount be reduced to $67,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 184.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 184) providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is not in the Chamber. Last year she asked for $10,000. She is the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Reorganization Act, and so forth.

Last year, by the use of the staff—as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has stated should be done more often—she was able to keep the expenditures of the subcommittee down to a few dollars. As a matter of fact, I believe the amount was not more than a hundred-and-some-odd dollars. She comes to the Senate with the explanation that she did not know what she would have to do this year, but she would like to hold the money in reserve. She stated that she would use the staff wherever she could, unless some emergency arose, but would like to have this amount of money available in order to discharge the duties assigned to the subcommittee by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is this a reappropriation of money which was appropriated last year and the year before?

Mr. JENNER. It is. She used one-hundred-and-some-odd dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 184) providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsections (g) (1) (B) and (2) (C) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1954, and ending on January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed the unexpended balance of the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 56, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to on February 20, 1953, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 185.

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 185) authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 10, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$190,000" and insert "$150,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), the Committee on Armed Services or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized during the period ending January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $150,000 for the period beginning February 1, 1954, through January 31, 1955, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 186.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution, by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 186) authorizing the employment of additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, the hiring of the 4 clerks as requested will do away with the necessity for appropriating the usual amount provided in the past, namely, $280,000. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It will amount to approximately $21,000. There is no additional amount involved.

Mr. ELLENDER. In its operation last year the committee's expenditures were reduced, as I remember, by $280,000. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. We have taken out all of the fancy subcommittees, and we are doing the work as quickly as we can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 186) authorizing the employment of additional clerical assistants by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, in line 2, after the word "authorized" to strike out "until" and insert "from February 1, 1954, through", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, from February 1, 1954, through January 31, 1955, to employ four additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 187.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated, by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 187) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 187) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) (6) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or the standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1954, and ending on January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES FROM WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 869, Senate Resolution 188.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 188) further extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I ask what has been done so far by the committee? During the last session of Congress the sum of $46,500 was provided, and as I understand, $10,000 of new funds is being asked for. What has been done by the committee up to this time?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is not present at this time. I cannot give the details as to how the money has been spent. I know there are some very serious problems in connection with refugees.

Mr. ELLENDER. That situation was explained to the Senate last year, and that is what caused the committee, as well as the Senate, to agree to the sum of $46,500. But, up to this moment, apparently, none of it has been spent except approximately $10,000. I am wondering why, if the appropriation was so necessary, the funds have not been utilized to any extent thus far.

Mr. WATKINS. We have problems coming up in connection with refugees. There must be some leeway provided. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is chairman of the committee, and I do not know what he has done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration was furnished with any kind of statement showing how the expenditures were made, what was accomplished, and why most of the money appropriated since that time was not spent last year.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] appeared before our committee and made his explanation. I know the committee concluded it was a fair and reasonable explanation, and the resolution was reported unanimously for action.

Does the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] recall the explanation?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I remember it was stated that so far as refugees were concerned, under the system which has been in effect many undesirable persons were coming into this country. The Governments of Canada, Australia, and some other nations sent their own representatives to Europe and selected the refugees they wanted, and they were highly pleased with the type of persons they obtained. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] said the matter had heretofore been turned over to some organization which was of a private nature, and that as a result a very poor selection was made. He said it was his intention to see that we had our own inspectors handling our own business in our own way so that we could get the kind of persons who would make good American citizens.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there not a safeguard provided through the commission appointed by the President?

Mr. HAYDEN. Evidently that commission scheme did not work very well. The Senator from North Dakota stated to our committee that there could be a very advantageous reform made in the way the persons were selected. He stated that there was great complaint, particularly from the State of New York, that some of the immigrants were feeble-minded and tubercular and should not have been permitted to enter this country.

Mr. ELLENDER. That same representation was no doubt made last year. I find it very strange that the money which was appropriated was not spent last year.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from North Dakota stated that there is to be a reform and a change in the procedure and that this would be a wise expenditure.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration on this resolution be printed at this point as a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 870) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 188) further extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from western European nations, having considered same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the resolution be agreed to by the Senate.

The purposes and objectives of the inquiries called for by Senate Resolution 188 are set out in Senate Report No. 856, 83d Congress, 2d session, filed on January 18, 1954.

A budget submitted by the Committee on the Judiciary and approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, together with a covering letter from the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 21, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: Your attention is respectfully invited to the attached copy of Senate Resolution 188 and the report thereon, which resolution, as you know, was unanimously approved by the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting held on January 18, 1954.

The resolution as approved would extend the operative life of the Escapee and Refugee Subcommittee until January 31, 1955, and would provide for an additional sum of $10,000.

You will recall that on July 13, 1953, Senate Report 522 was filed in the Senate setting forth the results of a survey conducted by

the Subcommittee on the Escapee and Refugee Problem. During the past session of the Congress further information has been compiled on this subject and following the adjournment of the 1st session, 83d Congress, a study was conducted on the problems confronting various consular offices in Europe and their administration and operation of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. A report on this study is now under preparation.

There remain the continuing duty and necessity of maintaining a close surveillance over the escapee and refugee problem and the operation and administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, which provides for the issuance of 209,000 special nonquota immigrant visas, which includes visas for 4,000 orphans and the adjustment of status to permanent residence of not to exceed 5,000 aliens who lawfully entered the United States.

Enclosed herewith is a copy of a proposed budget covering the period to January 31, 1955.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER, *Chairman.*

BUDGET

Proposed budget of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations, pursuant to S. Res. 188, for the period of Jan. 31, 1954, to Jan. 31, 1955, inclusive

STAFF

Position	Number	Base salary	Gross salary	Monthly salary	Total
Staff expense:					
Staff director	1	$7,320	$11,646.00	$970.50	$11,646.00
Attorney	1	5,640	9,404.83	783.73	9,404.83
Consultant	1	5,640	9,404.83	783.73	9,404.83
Stenographer	1	3,120	5,525.75	460.47	5,525.75
Do	1	3,120	5,525.75	460.47	5,525.75
Total staff expense					41,507.16
Administrative expense: Travel, hearings, stationery, communications					3,296.06
Recapitulation:					
Total staff expense				$41,507.16	
Total administrative expense				3,296.06	
				44,803.22	
Approximate unexpended balance of S. Res. 68, Jan. 31, 1954					34,803.22
Fund requested in S. Res. 188					10,000.00
Total					44,803.22

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I do not want the record to stand as it is now. I am not contending with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in respect to the need of selecting immigrants, but the act provides exactly how they shall be selected. A committee was established to take care of the selection of immigrants under both acts. This resolution has to do with refugees and does not have to do with the Immigration Act. I want to make that clear, because I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration, and I would not want the impression to be created that the refugee committee has to take care of the selection of immigrants, because that is not the fact.

Mr. ELLENDER. How are the refugees selected?

Mr. WATKINS. The law provides exactly how they shall be selected. The emergency act and the regular immigration act take care of that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator feel that we are pretty well protected as it is?

Mr. WATKINS. So far as the immigrants are concerned, yes. But there is a problem independent of that which has been referred to by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The question of how to take care of these refugees must be studied. Congress is appropriating millions of dollars for the care of refugees in Europe, through many agencies, and the Refugee Committee has a real job to study that situation. Incidentally, I was in Europe and studied some of the committee's problems. However, the charge was not made against this particular account. It could have been, but it was not. What the Senator from North Dakota intends to do in connection with the further study of the problem I do not know.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, there has not been much study made of it up to this time, has there?

Mr. WATKINS. Not particularly by that committee. At least, the expenses were not charged against the committee. There has been a great deal of study made. I personally spent months on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 326, 82d Congress, 2d session, agreed to June 21, 1952, and Senate Resolution 68, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to April 22, 1953, relating to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to conduct a thorough and complete study, survey, and investigation of the problems in certain Western European nations created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny is hereby increased by $10,000 and such sum, together with any unexpended balances of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution and Senate Resolution 68, agreed to April 22, 1953, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee covering obligations incurred under such resolutions on or before January 31, 1955.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with reference to Calendar 870, Senate Resolution 190, providing for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States, it was agreed to pass it over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 871, Senate Resolution 192.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 192) extending the time for a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, in line 5, after the word "extended", to strike out "to May 1, 1954," and insert "from February 1, 1954, until April 30, 1954", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on the District of Columbia may complete the study and investigation of public transportation serving the District of Columbia, authorized by Senate Resolution 140, 83d Congress, agreed to July 28, 1953, hereby is extended from February 1, 1954, until April 30, 1954.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

MODIFICATION OF EXISTING INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY ORGANIZATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 872, Senate Resolution 193.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 193) amending Senate Resolution 128, 83d Congress, providing for a study of proposals to modify existing international peace and security organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 193) amending Senate Resolution 128, 83d Congress, providing for a study of proposals to modify existing international peace and security organizations, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 1, line 10, after the word "date", to strike out " "February 1, 1955" " and insert " "January 31, 1955".", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That (a) section 2 of Senate Resolution 126, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to on July 28, 1953 (authorizing a complete study of proposals to amend or otherwise modify existing international peace and security organizations, including the United

Nations), is amended by striking out the date "January 31, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "February 1, 1955."

(b) Section 3 of such resolution is amended by striking out the date "February 1, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "January 31, 1955."

(c) Section 3 of such resolution is further amended by striking out the figure "$35,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$75,000."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to make a statement on this resolution.

The United Nations Charter is to be reviewed in 1955, and our committee has appointed a special subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] to study the whole question of amendments to the United Nations Charter. That is one of our responsibilities, and it includes the Council and the entire waterfront. It is a very important investigation from the standpoint of our relations with the United Nations. The resolution calls for an increase in the appropriation from $35,000 to $75,000, which is more than the original estimate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last year, as I understand, the amount provided by Congress was $35,000. There remains a balance of $23,000. Am I correct in understanding that new funds in the amount of $40,000 are being sought, thereby making a total of $63,000?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am advised that that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What has been done up to now in regard to the studies?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. All I can say to the Senator is that the money was obtained very late last year, as I have just been informed. Hearings are starting now and a staff is being assembled to make a thorough investigation. I am not a member of the subcommittee; I am reporting for the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

I may say that I believe this is an important subject for study.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that and am not questioning it. Does the Senator from New Jersey say that the study is to be made in anticipation of revising the United Nations Charter in 1955?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The charter, which was adopted in 1945, is to be revised in 1955, and the United States will have a very important part in the revision. It is our intention not to leave a stone unturned to have a full investigation made of every activity of the United Nations. So I urge that the resolution be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ELECTION OF MEMBER OF THE SENATE TO JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 198, Calendar No. 873.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 198) electing a member on the part of the Senate to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], who was formerly a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, left that committee to become a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] has been named to fill the vacancy. In order to reorganize the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, it is necessary that the junior Senator from Wisconsin be appointed, by resolution of the Senate, to fill the position formerly held by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, vice Mr. PURTELL, of Connecticut.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW—RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to give notice to the Senate that tomorrow, after the usual morning hour, it is my purpose to call up Calendar 858, S. 2803, a bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended to July 1, 1955, about which I have already spoken to the distinguished minority leader, and which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services, as I understand.

Next, I propose to call up Calendar 859, Senate Resolution 172, a resolution to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States; and then Calendar 870, Senate Resolution 190, a resolution amending the resolution providing for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States and increasing the limit of expenditures.

These measures I propose to call up following the morning hour, and before the Senate begins debate on the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution.

Now, Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this hour, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 27, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, January 22, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, whose paths are mercy and truth, who knowest our downsitting and our uprising, and who understandest the thoughts of our hearts afar off: We pause in the busy rush of the day to ask that the deliberations of these hours may reflect the guidance of Thy spirit. As work and worry and hopes deferred take their constant toll of our human strength, grant us as laborers together with Thee a sense of untapped spiritual resources and restore our souls with the joyous strength of Thy salvation. Search us, O God, and know our hearts; try us, and know our thoughts, and see if there be any wicked or perverse way in us; for we would come to this high and holy hill with pure hearts and clean hands. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 26, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 987) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., and it was signed by the Vice President.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under

the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as the members on the part of the Senate to fill existing vacancies on the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise Committee, established by Public Resolution 124, approved June 22, 1938.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the period November 1, 1952, to October 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON FINAL VALUATIONS OF PROPERTIES OF CERTAIN INTERSTATE CARRIERS

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the final valuations of properties of certain interstate carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, that no tort claims, excluding the military departments, had been paid by the Department of Defense, during the year ended December 31, 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Acting Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Librarian of Congress, together with a supplement entitled "Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions," for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

INCREASE OF BICYCLE IMPORTATION TARIFF—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on January 14, 1954, favoring an increase of the bicycle importation tariff.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions favoring increase of bicycle importation tariff

Whereas the bicycle industry represents the backbone of business in several small towns and represents considerable business to several cities within the Commonwealth; and

Whereas many bicycles are being made and brought into the United States from several foreign countries; and

Whereas the rates of pay in these countries for the fabrication of materials and the building of the bicycles is greatly less than the prevailing rates in the United States, therefore making it impossible for the manufacturer in this country to compete in this business; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has through one of its committees a proposal to further reduce the tariff: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby strongly protest any tariff reduction, and favor an increase on the bicycle importation tariff; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth, and the commission now studying the subject of tariffs.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE ECONOMIC POSITION OF NEW ENGLAND—RESOLUTION OF NEW ENGLAND STATES AND MUNICIPAL FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, BURLINGTON, VT.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the New England States and Municipal Finance Officers Association at their annual meeting in September 1953, relative to the effects of the movement of industry, property, and wealth as affecting the New England region.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING OF THE NEW ENGLAND STATES AND MUNICIPAL FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION AT THE HOTEL VERMONT IN BURLINGTON, VT., SEPTEMBER 19, 1953

Whereas the New England States and Municipal Finance Officers Association are assembled in annual conference at Burlington, Vt., September 18, 19, 1953, for discussion of topics of fiscal interest peculiar to the State and local governments in the region of the several New England States; and

Whereas for some period of time there appears to have been developing a national policy supporting the movement of wealth from area to area as to other regions and States by way of Federal taxation in several forms; and

Whereas it appears that industry and wealth generally in the New England region is affected adversely to a degree that it may be directly and indirectly contributing financial means taxwise through Federal action for use in other areas, which dilutes the wealth of the New England region; and

Whereas there is an awareness on the part of this association of the possibility of a continued trend which, unless altered, will continue to adversely contribute to the economic position of industry, wealth, and the population in the New England region; and

Whereas the 83d Congress of the United States has enacted legislation creating a Federal Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; and

Whereas appointments to this Commission have now been completed: Therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. That the aims and objectives and one of the purposes of the existence of this association and its 400 members shall include constant effort by all orderly means to publicize appropriately the effects of the movement of industry, property, and wealth as affecting the New England region; and

2. That the duly elected representatives of the people in the New England region in our local State and Federal Governments shall have persistently called to their attention the need of a reversal of the effects of present policies to the extent that revenue from Federal taxes of all kinds received from the New England region be returned to the New England region in greater equality, thereby aiding toward the preservation of the long traditional economic position of New England.

H. H. BARTON,
Connecticut.
ALFRED O. POULIN,
New Hampshire.
E. J. LOUCKS,
Rhode Island.
ARTHUR H. MACKINNON,
Massachusetts.
ANDREW L. ORZEL,
Vermont.
EARLE R. HAYES,
Maine.
HOWARD E. MUNROE,
Rhode Island.

A true copy. Attest:
DANA S. BEANE, JR.,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 2772. A bill to provide for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates (Rept. No. 883);

H. R. 5379. A bill to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication (Rept. No. 884); and

H. R. 5959. A bill to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive (Rept. No. 885).

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 194. Resolution to print additional copies of Senate Report No. 848, 83d Congress, on Korean atrocities.

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 189. Resolution providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 887); and

S. Res. 202. Resolution providing for the printing of the task force reports of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries.

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 49. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; with amendments (Rept. No. 886).

(See the remarks of Mr. CORDON when he reported the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2714. A bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; with an amendment (Rept. No. 888).

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 886)

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have been authorized by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to report favorably with amendments, the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The committee's detailed report on the bill has not been completed, the action with regard to ordering the bill to be reported having been taken only this morning. I am reporting the bill at this time so that it may be printed with the committee amendments and placed on the calendar. The detailed report will be prepared and submitted within a few days.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT POLICY FOR FEDERAL PERSONNEL (S. DOC. NO. 89)

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I ask unanimous consent that a report, part I of the findings and recommendations of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on January 22, 1954, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 27, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 987) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2838. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2839. A bill to grant oil and gas in lands and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2840. A bill for the relief of Jonas Dercautan;

S. 2841. A bill for the relief of Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti and Anna Maria Alberghetti; and

S. 2842. A bill for the relief of Dr. Felix de Piniés; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2843. A bill for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2844. A bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, to make permanent the authorization for certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States;

S. 2845. A bill to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States; and

S. 2846. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2847. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion in order to authorize the renewal of such lease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2848. A bill for the relief of the Inland Petroleum Transportation Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2849. A bill for the relief of Elisa-Pompea Roppo (Elisa-Pompea Cardone); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 2850. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2851. A bill for the relief of Jorge Ventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PATENTS IN FEE TO CERTAIN INDIANS ON FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on August 1 of last year I introduced the bill (S. 2551) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior in certain cases to grant fee patents and mineral rights to members of the Fort Peck Indian Tribe of Montana. Since the introduction of that measure, the executive board of the Fort Peck tribal council has reviewed the provisions of that bill and has asked me to introduce another measure which would incorporate additional provisions better suited to the desires of those Indians with respect to this problem. I therefore introduce such a measure and ask that when referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate, it be considered as a substitute for S. 2551.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

The bill (S. 2839) to grant oil and gas in lands and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO ACTS ADMINISTERED BY SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940.

The Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Banking, of the Committee on Banking and Currency, will begin hearings on the bill next Wednesday, February 3, and will continue the hearings through Friday, February 5. Anyone who wishes to testify should wire or write to the clerk of the committee, Ira Dixon, requesting time to appear.

I ask unanimous consent that an introductory statement by me, relating to the bill, together with a summary, a letter from Ralph H. Demmler, Chairman

of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the changes proposed to be made in existing law, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the matters referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2846) to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The matters presented by Mr. CAPEHART are as follows:

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

GENERAL

The proposed amendments would make limited changes in the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940. The proposed amendments preserve existing statutory responsibilities and liabilities of sellers of securities to purchasers.

1. Facilitating the furnishing of information to investors during waiting period

A basic purpose of the Securities Act is to provide investors with adequate information concerning securities publicly offered. The Congress intended that this information would be disseminated during the period between the filing of a registration statement and the time it becomes effective. The statute, however, makes it unlawful to offer or sell securities during this waiting period.

The amendment would permit practices, already provided in substance by rules of the Commission, relating to dissemination of information, during the waiting period. The proposed amendment would remove the difficult concept, inherent in present practice, that it is permissible (and, indeed, obligatory under the Commission's rules) for an underwriter during the waiting period to disseminate information, but illegal to solicit offers to buy. This has long been recognized as a legalistic distinction not understood by the public and without practical significance.

The amendment would permit written offers during the waiting period by means of a prospectus filed with the Commission prior to its use. The amended act would continue to make unlawful sales and contracts of sale before the registration statement becomes effective.

2. Use of prospectuses after the effective date of a registration statement

Existing law requires underwriters and dealers to deliver prospectuses to investors as long as they are engaged in the initial distribution of a security. Moreover, any dealer, even though not a participant in the distribution must deliver prospectuses to his customers for at least 1 year after the registration statement becomes effective. The proposed amendment provides for such delivery during the actual offering period but in no case less than 40 days after the effective date of the registration statement or 40 days after the commencement of public offering, whichever expires last, but does not change the requirement that prospectuses be delivered by underwriters and dealers so long as they are engaged in the initial distribution of the security.

The 1-year provision has long been recognized as unrealistic, since dealers trading in a security publicly offered within 1 year find themselves unable to obtain prospectuses. This fact has rendered compliance by dealers and enforcement by the Commission difficult.

In view of the continuous offering of securities by certain types of investment companies, particularly those commonly referred to as mutual funds, a special provision for mandatory use of prospectuses by dealers over a longer period is provided by a proposed amendment to the Investment Company Act.

3. Simplification of information requirements for prospectuses used more than 13 months after the effective date of a registration statement

Under the present act a prospectus may be used for 13 months after the effective date of a registration statement. If a prospectus is used thereafter, it must contain information as of a date within 1 year of its use. Since a registration statement at the time of its filing may contain financial statements as of a date 90 days prior to the filing date, it is apparent that the original prospectus may continue to be used until a time when the information therein is as of a date as early as 16 months prior to its use. Thus, under the present statute, the requirements for prospectuses used more than 13 months after the effective date of the registration statement are more rigorous than those applicable to prospectuses used immediately after the effective date of the registration statement. The proposed amendments will permit the Commission to prescribe equivalent standards of disclosure for both classes of prospectuses.

4. Raising exemption—facilitating financing of small business

The proposal raises from $300,000 to $500,000 the amount within which the Commission may exempt public offerings of securities from the registration requirements of the act. This should facilitate financing of small business.

5. Extension of credit by dealers on new issues

Section 11 (d) (1) prohibits a person who is both a broker and a dealer from taking into margin accounts new securities in the distribution of which he participated during the preceding 6 months. This was intended in part to restrain distributors from selling new issues of securities to their brokerage customers. The apparent purpose was to provide that new issues would be initially placed with investors rather than with speculators. It is generally agreed, however, that the prohibition against extending credit for 6 months after the end of the offering period is unnecessarily long. The amendment reduces the 6-month period to 30 days, but the amendment will not permit extension of credit by a member of the selling syndicate or group while the selling or distributing process is in progress or for 30 days thereafter. It is believed that section 11 (d) as so amended will be sufficient to assure that new issues will be sold on a cash basis.

6. The offering of institutional type of debt securities

The Commission, in connection with proposed rule changes to provide for more simple prospectuses for use in the public distribution of high-grade so-called institutional-type debt securities, is confronted with provisions of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 which require inclusion in a prospectus of a summary of certain specified indenture provisions, covering such matters as release provisions, default provisions and the like. This requirement seems unnecessary in the view of the Commission's rule making power to deal with disclosure problems. The substantive provisions required to be included in indentures qualified under the act would not be changed.

7. Simplified registration procedure for investment companies

Investment companies which engage in continuous offerings of their shares as a matter of practice file a new registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 about once each year in order to have registered shares available. The proposed amendment will permit such investment companies periodically to increase the number of shares registered under that act by amending their existing registration statements rather than by filing new registration statements. This proposal would require that current information be furnished to investors and would not alter either the disclosure standards or the liabilities imposed upon sellers.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND SECURITIES LEGISLATION

GENERAL

The amendments are designed to make limited changes in the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 and the Investment Company Act of 1940. The proposed amendments preserve existing statutory responsibilities and liabilities of sellers of securities to purchasers and the safeguards which have been established in the public interest. The proposals are intended to further the basic concepts and purposes of the statutes.

1. Facilitating the furnishing of information to investors during waiting period

A basic purpose of the Securities Act is to require that issuers and underwriters of securities proposed to be sold to the public furnish investors with adequate information concerning the securities offered. The Congress intended that this information would be widely disseminated to investors during the period between the filing of the registration statement and the time it becomes effective. Section 8 (a) of the act contemplates that ordinarily there will be a 20-day period between the original filing date and the effective date but gives the Commission authority to shorten the period in appropriate cases. Section 5 of the act, however, in effect prohibits offers or sales of securities during this so-called waiting period by making it unlawful to sell prior to the effective date of the registration statement. Under section 2 (3) of the act "sell" is defined to include both offers and sales.

Representatives of the securities industry have repeatedly urged that dealers and underwriters have hesitated to disseminate information during the waiting period to prospective investors concerning proposed new issues because of a fear that such activities by them may involve the making of illegal offers. The proposed bill will permit freer discussion and communication concerning new issues by removing the present prohibition against offers during the waiting period. Written offers during this period by means of prospectuses filed with the Commission prior to use will be authorized by the bill. The bill, however, will continue to make unlawful sales and contracts of sale before the informational requirements of the registration statement have been met and it has become effective.

In order to accomplish this result, it is necessary to amend three sections of the present statute. Section 2 (3) of the act (sec. 1 of the bill) would be amended to define separately "offer" and "sale." In consequence, section 5 (a) (1) of the act (sec. 8 of the bill) will continue to make unlawful sales prior to the effective date of the registration statement but will not make unlawful offers prior to such date. Section 5 (b) (1) of the act would be amended by section 8 of the bill to permit written offers after the filing of a registration statement and before the effective date by means of a prospectus meeting the requirements of section 10 and filed with the Commission prior to use. A

new section 5 (c) of the act (sec. 8 of the bill) would make unlawful offers prior to the filing of a registration statement. Section 10 of the act would be amended by section 9 of the proposed bill to authorize the use of appropriate prospectuses during the waiting period. The bill would authorize suspension of the use of any such prospectus if the Commission finds that it is deficient or that the filing requirements have not been met.

The bill would authorize and encourage the wider use of "red herring" prospectuses (generally containing all required information except price, underwriting data, and other information dependent upon price), identifying statements (the brief "screening" advertisement, contemplated by rule 132), and such other documents as the Commission may authorize as appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

Also section 3 of the bill would amend section 2 (10) (b) of the act to give the Commission latitude to permit preeffective and expanded use of the "tombstone" advertisement.

Under the bill, the seller will continue to be civilly liable to investors for the adequacy and accuracy of prospectuses employed in the offering or sale of securities.

2. Use of prospectuses after the effective date of a registration statement

Section 5 (b) of the present act requires, without any limitation in time, that all persons use statutory prospectuses in connection with the sale of a registered security. The third clause of section 4 (1) exempts dealers from the requirements of section 5, subject to two exceptions.

The effect of the first exception is that any dealer, even though only casually trading in the security (as distinguished from being a participant in the distribution) must use the prospectus in connection with all transactions in the registered security within 1 year after the commencement of the offering. Under present law offerings ordinarily commence on the same day the registration statement becomes effective or very shortly thereafter.

The second exception to this exemption provides, in effect, that any dealer who is a participant in the distribution must continue, even though the 1-year period has expired, to use the prospectus in connection with the disposition of his portion of the registered issue of securities being distributed.

The effect of these provisions and of section 5 of the act, therefore, is to require underwriters and dealers engaged in the distribution of a security to deliver prospectuses to investors so long as they are engaged in the distribution. Moreover, any dealer, even though not a participant in the distribution, must deliver prospectuses to his customers for at least 1 year after the registration statement becomes effective. Since most issues are sold within a relatively short period of time after the effective date of the registration statement, the present 1-year period is unnecessarily long.

It has long been recognized that the 1-year period should be reduced to a period which gives recognition to the mechanics of securities distribution in this country. Section 7 of the proposed bill, therefore, amends the third clause of section 4 (1) of the act to reduce the 1-year period to 40 days. The proposal, however, maintains present law by requiring each dealer to use the prospectus so long as he is engaged in the distribution of the registered securities.

3. Simplification of information requirements for prospectuses used more than 13 months after the effective date of a registration statement

As pointed out above, an underwriter or a dealer must use the prospectus so long as he is engaged in the distribution of a registered issue. Occasionally this period may extend beyond 13 months after the effective date of the registration statement. There are also other types of offerings which extend over a considerable period of time, such, for example, as those involving long-term options or conversion rights where the issuer at least must continue to use a prospectus more than 13 months after the effective date.

Under the present act, a prospectus in the form in which it appeared as a part of the registration statement on the effective date may be used for 13 months after such effective date. Section 10 (b) (1) of the act, however, requires that a prospectus used after expiration of such 13 months contain information as of a date within 1 year of its use. By reason of paragraph (25) of schedule A to the act, a registration statement at the time of its filing may contain certain types of information, including financial statements as of a date at least 90 days prior to the filing date. Therefore the original prospectus may continue to be used at a time when the information contained therein is as of a date as early as 16 months prior to its use.

As a consequence under the present statute, informational requirements for prospectuses used more than 13 months after the effective date of the registration statement are more restrictive than those applicable to prospectuses used in the 13 months immediately following the effective date of the registration statement. Under section 9 of the bill, section 10 (b) (1) of the act becomes section 10 (a) (3) and, to eliminate the aforementioned anomaly, is changed to provide that where a prospectus is used more than 9 months after the effective date the information therein shall be as of a date within 16 months of such use.

4. Raising exemption—Facilitating financing of small business

Section 5 of the bill would amend section 3 (b) of the Securities Act to raise from $300,000 to $500,000 the amount within which the Commission, subject to appropriate terms and conditions, may exempt public offerings of securities from the registration requirements of the act. The proposal will afford the Commission greater flexibility to adjust requirements to the financial needs of small issues. The present statutory sanctions (as implemented by rules and regulations providing for offering circulars and for Commission action by order to prevent violation of such regulations) relating to small offerings will be maintained.

5. Extension of credit on new issues by firms that act both as broker and as dealer

Section 11 (d) (1) of the Securities Exchange Act was adopted to prohibit a person who was both a broker and a dealer from "taking into margin accounts new securities in the distribution of which he participated during the preceding 6 months." This provision was apparently intended in part to restrain distributors from selling new issues of securities to their brokerage customers who, in the period prior to 1934, had commonly been margin customers. This was to be accomplished by prohibiting the distributor from placing such securities in margin accounts.

Another consideration that may underlie section 11 (d) (1) is suggested in the following testimony of an underwriter in the hearings on the bill:

"If we sell our own underwritings to brokerage-department customers, who often carry securities on margin, the securities are not permanently placed, and we have not fulfilled our obligation to the company whose securities we have been paid to sell." (Stock Exchange Practices, hearings before Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 73d Cong., 2d sess., 1934, p. 6750.)

In other words it is desirable, in general, that new issues should initially be placed with investors rather than with speculators. Section 11 (d) (1) does contribute to this objective.

At present the prohibition on extension of credit continues for 6 months after the distribution. It is proposed in section 201 of the bill to reduce the 6-month period to 30 days. The Commission believes that a 30-day prohibition on extension of credit is sufficient to insure that new issues are sold on a cash basis.

6. "When-issued" trading

The last two sentences of section 12 (d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 deal with the subject of "when-issued" trading on the exchanges. The first of these two sentences provides ample authority for the regulation of such trading under the standards of public interest and protection of investors that are used throughout the act. The last sentence represents an attempt to deal with the problem somewhat more precisely. The last sentence was apparently not fully considered, for where a security is a right or the subject of a right granted to holders of a previously registered security, "when-issued" trading cannot in the nature of things serve to distribute such unissued security to such holders. Rather it provides a market in which such holders may sell the unissued security and others may acquire it. Section 202 of the proposed bill, therefore, would repeal the last sentence of section 13 (d) thereby permitting "when-issued" trading to be regulated under the more general provisions of the preceding sentence.

7. The offering of institutional type of debt securities

The Commission, in connection with proposed rule changes to provide for more simple prospectuses for use in the public distribution of high-grade so-called institutional type debt securities, is confronted with section 305 (c) of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 which requires inclusion in the prospectus of the analysis of particular indenture provisions singled out by section 305 (a) (2) of the Trust Indenture Act. This requirement seems unnecessary in the light of the Commission's rulemaking authority to deal with overall disclosure problems.

Section 303 of the proposed bill would, therefore, amend section 305 (c) of the Trust Indenture Act to make it formally consistent with section 10 of the Securities Act in this respect. Section 304 of the proposed bill makes a similar change in section 306 (b) of the Trust Indenture Act which relates to indentures which must be qualified under that act even though the securities to be issued thereunder need not be registered under the Securities Act.

This proposal, in substance, relates only to the problem of disclosure in prospectuses under the Securities Act. It does not affect the substantive provisions of the Trust Indenture Act which will continue to require that trust indentures contain the statutory provisions for protection of investors, for example, that there be independent indenture trustees with adequate resources and free of conflicting interests, who must report to security holders, and take other affirmative action to preserve investors' rights under indentures and to protect their interests in the event of default.

8. Simplified registration procedure for investment companies

Investment companies which engage in continuous offerings of their shares as a matter of practice file new registration statements under the Securities Act of 1933 about once each year in order to have registered shares available. Section 6 of the Securities Act provides that securities may be registered by filing a registration statement but does

not provide for registering additional securities by amendment. Section 403 of the proposed bill would amend section 24 of the Investment Company Act by adding thereto a new subsection (e) which will permit such investment companies periodically to increase the number of shares registered under the Securities Act by amending their existing registration statements rather than by filing new registration statements. Paragraph (3) of this new subsection (e) will require that current information will be made a part of the registration statement at appropriate intervals and will be furnished to investors. This paragraph (3) also contains appropriate references to sections 10, 11, and 13 of the Securities Act so that there will be no departure from either the disclosure standards or the liabilities imposed upon sellers.

In view of the above-mentioned practice of continuous offering of securities by certain types of investment companies, particularly those commonly referred to as "mutual funds," a proposed amendment to the Investment Company Act would provide for mandatory use of prospectuses by dealers over a longer period than would be required under section 4 (1) of the Securities Act as modified by section 7 of the bill. This provision appears in section 402 of the proposed bill which amends section 24 (d) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 by adding further exclusion to those already contained in that subsection. Section 402 of the bill would require, in effect, that in the case of face-amount certificate companies, unit investment trusts, and open-end management companies (i. e., "mutual funds") all dealers, whether or not participating in the distribution, use the prospectus so long as the registered security is being offered.

Under existing law, a dealer who is not a participant in the distribution need not use a prospectus in connection with a transaction in a security after the expiration of 1 year from the first date on which the security was bona fide offered to the public, which, in most cases, means approximately 1 year after the effective date of the registration statement. Section 402 of the proposed bill would change this requirement by providing that a dealer must use the prospectus as long as the issuer is offering any securities of the same class as the security which is the subject matter of the dealer's transaction.

It is asserted that the continuous offering practices of these investment companies justify a requirement that all dealers be compelled to use the statutory prospectus so long as shares of the same class are being offered. On the other hand, it is argued that this would have the effect of preventing dealers, who are not distributors, from effecting transactions in outstanding investment-company securities unless they are able to get prospectuses from the issuer or an underwriter and able to get them in time and unconditionally, and that the rulemaking power to be conferred by section 402 of the bill would be inadequate to deal with the problem.

In view of the nature of the problem and the difference in views thereon, there is set forth an alternative version of section 402 which would retain existing prospectus requirements applicable to dealers trading in the outstanding securities of investment companies which are engaged in continuous offerings:

"SEC. 402. Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: 'The exemption provided by the third clause of section 4 (1) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall not apply to any transaction in a security issued by a face-amount certificate company or in a redeemable security issued by an open-end management company or unit investment trust, within 1 year after a registration statement or amendment filed pursuant to subsection (e) of this section 24 has become effective with respect to such security if any other security of the same class is currently being offered or sold by the issuer or by or through an underwriter in a distribution which is not exempted from section 5 of said act, except to such extent and subject to such terms and conditions as the Commission, having due regard for the public interest and the protection of investors, may prescribe by rules or regulations with respect to any class of persons, securities, or transactions.' "

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1954.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is enclosed a draft bill proposing limited amendments to the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940. There are also enclosed two memoranda which describe the nature and purpose of the proposed amendments and certain related documents described below.

You will recall that during our conference in July 1953, at which Commissioners Rowen and Adams were present, we advised you that various groups wished to submit proposals for amendment of the statutes administered by the Commission. At that time I suggested that the Commission's responsibility is to administer the law, not to write it, but that the Commission could fulfill a valuable function by cooperating with committees of the Congress and in studying legislation proposed by organizations or groups of citizens. At the time of our interview you referred to the continuing responsibility of the committee of the Congress under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, for appraisal of the Commission's administration of the laws subject to its jurisdiction and in the development of amendments or related legislation. You suggested that we might well work out a program under the guidance of Senator BUSH, chairman of the Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Banking of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, advised us, under date of August 21, 1953, as follows:

"Dr. Stevenson, however, has discussed with me your thought, as well as your letter to him of July 30, concerning your proceeding on a consideration of an amendment program with the stock exchanges and others who may be interested. It seems to me that no harm, and, indeed, much good might arise from a continuation of the discussions which you have had with industry and affected persons over the years in the development of technical changes which might be made to the acts and which you would propose to bring to our attention for consideration.

"On the other hand, you will appreciate, I am sure, that I am most zealous in preserving for the investing public the protection which was envisaged in the statutes when they were passed, both as they apply to investors in new securities and as they apply to purchasers on the exchanges and over-the-counter markets. I certainly would feel that it was unincumbent upon any agency charged with administering these acts on behalf of the Congress for the protection of the general public, to initiate or sponsor any program which would weaken such protection, though conversely, it might well give thought to areas in which it could be strengthened.

"In accordance with your suggestion, I have requested Dr. Stevenson to continue to keep informed of your progress in this matter."

Because of the large number of inquiries coming in from interested groups and individuals, on August 26, 1953, the Commission issued a press release reading in part as follows:

"Industry representatives from time to time have advised the Commissioners that they intend to make suggestions for revision of various rules and forms of the Commission, as well as for amendment of the laws which it administers.

"The Commission will hold itself ready to receive and discuss suggestions by any group of citizens with respect to its rules and forms. Similarly, if proposals are presented for amendment of the laws which it administers, the Commission will hold itself in readiness to render such assistance as the appropriate committees of the Congres may request of it."

During September, October, and November 1953, the Commission received numerous legislative proposals of the American Stock Exchange, the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, the Investment Bankers Association, the National Association of Investment Companies, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., and the New York Stock Exchange. Considered in the aggregate the major proposals of these organizations related to the following subjects:

Amendments of the Securities Act of 1933 to—

1. Permit the making of offers, but not the making of sales, during the waiting period between the filing of a registration statement and its effective date.

2. Reduce from 1 year to 30 days the period during which all dealers, whether or not participants in the initial distribution of a new issue, are required to deliver prospectuses in connection with trading transactions in the new issue.

3. Permit continuous and simplified registration of shares by investment companies which continuously offer shares to the public and require prospectuses to be delivered in trading transactions in outstanding open-end investment company securities so long as securities of the same class are being offered to the public.

4. Simplify the registration and prospectus requirements for the public offering of high-grade bonds.

5. Restore the broker's exemption as provided in section 4 (2) of the act, so as to give relief from the popular interpretation of the opinion of the Commission in the case of Ira Haupt & Co., 23 SEC 589 (1946).

6. Exempt from registration outstanding shares of a listed stock being offered in connection with an employee stock purchase plan and to simplify further the registration requirements for unissued shares of a listed stock being so offered.

7. Exempt from registration all securities which have been registered under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and dealt in for more than 3 years on a registered national securities exchange, and exempt additional issues of such securities.

8. Exempt from the prospectus requirements of the act brokerage transactions in listed securities when the sale is made on an agency basis and the agent's compensation is disclosed to and paid by the buyer.

Amendments of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to—

9. Prohibit the extension of credit by a broker-dealer to a customer on a new issue of securities only if the broker-dealer sold the securities to the customer or purchased the securities for the customer on a solicited order, and only while the broker-dealer was engaged in the distribution of the securities and for 4 days thereafter.

10. Reduce the waiting period from 30 days to 10 days between the filing and effective-

ness of applications for registration of additional issues of listed securities and remove restrictions on registration for "when issued" trading and with respect to securities to be issued or sold in connection with a reorganization under the Public Utility Holding Company Act or the Railroad Reorganization Act.

11. Amend section 16 (b) to limit profits recoverable on behalf of a corporation from officers, directors and 10 percent stockholders in short swing trading in the corporation's stock. The effect of the proposal would be to provide a statutory limit upon liability smaller in amount than now permitted by the courts in construing the statutory term "profits realized."

12. Require the Commission to proceed by an order rather than by a rule or regulation if the Commission changes a rule of a national securities exchange to afford the exchange the right to a court appeal.

Amendment of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to—

13. Permit general use of the title "Investment Counsel" by persons registered as investment advisers even though not primarily engaged in the rendering of investment supervisory services.

In addition three proposals were received from persons other than the organizations mentioned above. A memorandum describing these proposals and indicating the views of the Commission is enclosed.

Following the receipt of these suggestions and proposals, in October and November 1953, Senator BUSH conducted a number of conferences attended by the Commission some of which were also attended by representatives of the proponent organizations. These conferences have been described in memoranda prepared by Mr. McMurray of the staff of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, copies of which have been sent to you. As a result of these conferences and other discussions held in December 1953 and January 1954, between representatives of the organizations named above and of the Boston and the Midwest stock exchanges and the Commission, a number of suggested amendments were incorporated in the draft bill prepared by our staff with extensive participation by members of the Commission.

A comparison of the bill with the proposals submitted to the Commission as listed above will indicate that the bill gives effect in whole or in part to the substance of the suggestions listed in items 1, 2, 3, and 9. The Commission has under consideration the adoption of rules with respect to the suggestions contained in items 4, 5, and 10.

The recommended increase of the maximum exemption under section 3 (b) of the act from $300,000 to $500,000 is already reflected in H. R. 404, now pending in the House of Representatives. We believe the increase in the exemption would facilitate the financing of small business. Because of the Commission's regulation A which requires the use of a processed offering circular in the sale of such issues we believe the increase in the exemption would not materially affect the protection presently afforded investors.

The Commission at the present time is not willing to recommend legislation which would embody the suggestions listed in items 6, 7, 8, and 11. The Commission feels that the suggestion listed in item 12 is unnecessary in view of certain court decisions. The Commission also would not recommend the suggestion listed in item 13 in view of the apparent divergence of opinion about it among various industry groups. The Commission's position with respect to the suggestion listed in item 3 is favorable to the continuous and simplified registration of investment company shares.

The National Association of Investment Companies strongly favors in respect of open-end investment company shares the continuous prospectus delivery requirement embodied in the proposed bill and, as presently advised, the Commission recommends the enactment of this provision. However, in the accompanying summary of the bill, we have included an alternative which would leave the 1 year requirement in respect of the delivery of prospectuses in trading transactions just as it now is. The above recommendation is subject to the reservation that the alternative provision be substituted in case the testimony adduced at the hearings on the bill should persuade the committee of the desirability of maintaining the present 1 year requirement as to the delivery of a prospectus for such securities.

Therefore, after all of the negotiations and discussions outlined above, subject to the last mentioned point, all of the members of the Commission concur in recommending at this time the introduction and enactment of the bill.

For your information, we are enclosing copies of communications recently received from the Investment Bankers Association of America, the National Association of Investment Companies, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., and the New York Stock Exchange, commenting on the proposed bill, and also a letter of the Investment Counsel Association of America. There are also enclosed copies of the proposals and drafts of amendments to the acts submitted to the Commission by various proponent organizations.

Should you wish any further assistance from the Commission, please call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH H. DEMMLER,
Chairman.

COMPARATIVE DRAFT OF BILL SHOWING HOW THE BILL INTRODUCED CHANGES EXISTING LAW

(Deletions from statutes in brackets, additions italicized)

A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO SECURITIES ACT OF 1933, AS AMENDED

SECTION 1. Paragraph (3) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The term 'sale'[,] *or* 'sell' [offer to sell,' or 'offer for sale'] shall include every contract of sale or disposition of [attempt or offer to dispose of, or solicitation of an offer to buy,] a security or interest in a security, for value. *The term 'offer to sell,' 'offer for sale,' or 'offer' shall include every attempt or offer to dispose of, or solicitation of an offer to buy, a security or interest in a security, for value.* [; except that such] *The* terms *defined in this paragraph and the term 'offer to buy' as used in subsection (c) of section 5* shall not include preliminary negotiations or agreements between an issuer (*or any person directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by an issuer, or under direct or indirect common control with an issuer*) and any underwriter or *among underwriters who are or are to be in privity of contract with an issuer (or any person directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by an issuer, or under direct or indirect common control with an issuer*). Any security given or delivered with, or as a bonus on account of, any purchase of securities or any other thing, shall be conclusively presumed to constitute a part of the subject of such purchase and to have been *offered and* sold for value. The issue or transfer of a right or privilege, when originally issued or transferred with a security, giving the holder of such security the right to convert such security into another security of the same issuer or of another person, or giving a right to subscribe to another security of the same issuer or of another person, which right cannot be exercised until some future date, shall not be deemed to be [a] *an offer or* sale of such other security; but the issue or transfer of such other security upon the exercise of such right of conversion or subscription shall be deemed a sale of such other security."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (8) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"(8) The term 'registration statement' means the statement provided for in section 6, and includes any amendment thereto and any report, document, or memorandum *filed as part of* [accompanying] such statement or incorporated therein by reference."

SEC. 3. Paragraph (10) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The term 'prospectus' means any prospectus, notice, circular, advertisement, letter, or communication, written or by radio *or television*, which offers any security for sale *or confirms the sale of any security;* except that (a) a communication *sent or given after the effective date of the registration statement (other than a prospectus permitted under subsection (b) of section 10)* shall not be deemed a prospectus if it is proved that prior to or at the same time with such communication a written prospectus meeting the requirements of *subsection (a) of* section 10 *at the time of such communication* was sent or given to the person to whom the communication was made[, by the person making such communication or his principal,] and (b) a notice, circular, advertisement, letter of communication in respect of a security shall not be deemed to be a prospectus if it states from whom a written prospectus meeting the requirements of section 10 may be obtained and, in addition, does no more than identify the security, state the price thereof, state by whom orders will be executed, *and contain such other information as the Commission, by rules or regulations deemed necessary or appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed therein, may permit.*"

SEC. 4. Paragraph (11) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended by inserting the words "offers or" before the word "sells."

SEC. 5. Paragraph (11) of section 3 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by inserting the words "offered and" before the word "sold."

SEC. 6. Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out "$300,000" where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000."

SEC. 7. Section 4 (1) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The provisions of section 5 shall not apply to any of the following transactions:

"(1) Transactions by any person other than an issuer, underwriter, or dealer; transactions by an issuer not involving any public offering; or transactions by a dealer (including an underwriter no longer acting as an underwriter in respect of the security involved in such transaction), except transactions [within one year] *taking place prior to the expiration of forty days* after the first date upon which the security was bona fide offered to the public by the issuer or by or through an underwriter *and transactions in a security as to which a registration statement has been filed taking place prior to the expiration of forty days after the effective date of such registration statement or prior to the expiration of forty days after the first date upon which the security was bona fide offered to the public by the issuer or by or through an underwriter after such effective date, whichever is later* (excluding in the computation of such [year] *forty days* any time during which a stop order issued

under section 8 is in effect as to the security), and except transactions as to securities constituting the whole or a part of an unsold allotment to or subscription by such dealer as a participant in the distribution of such securities by the issuer or by or through an underwriter."

SEC. 8. Section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Unless a registration statement is in effect as to a security, it shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly—

"(1) to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to sell [or offer to buy] such security through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise; or

"(2) to carry or cause to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce, by any means or instruments of transportation, any such security for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly—

"(1) to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to carry or transmit any prospectus relating to any security [registered] *with respect to which a registration statement has been filed* under this title, unless such prospectus meets the requirements of section 10; or

"(2) to carry or cause to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce any such security for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale, unless accompanied or preceded by a prospectus that meets the requirements of *subsection (a) of* section 10.

"(c) *It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to offer to sell or offer to buy through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise any security, unless a registration statement has been filed as to such security, or while the registration statement is the subject of a refusal order or stop order, or prior to the effective date of the registration statement any public proceeding or examination, under section 8.*"

SEC. 9. Section 10 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) [A prospectus,] *Except to the extent otherwise permitted or required pursuant to this subsection or subsections (c), (d), or (e),*

"(1) [when] *A prospectus* relating to a security other than a security issued by a foreign government or political subdivision thereof, shall contain the [same statements made] *information contained* in the registration statement, but it need not include the documents referred to in paragraphs (28) to (32), inclusive, of schedule A;

"(2) [when] *A prospectus* relating to a security issued by a foreign government or political subdivision thereof shall contain the [same statements made] *information contained* in the registration statement, but it need not include the documents referred to in paragraphs (13) and (14) of schedule B.

"(3) [(b)] Notwithstanding the provisions of *paragraphs (1) and (2) of this* subsection (a) [(1)] when a prospectus is used more than [thirteen] *nine* months after the effective date of the registration statement, the information [in the statements] contained therein shall be as of a date not more than [twelve] *sixteen* months prior to such use, so far as such information is known to the user of such prospectus or can be furnished by such user without unreasonable effort or expense.

"(4) [(b) (2)] There may be omitted from any prospectus any of the [statements] *information* required under [such] *this* subsection (a) which the Commission may by rules or regulations designate as not being necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

"(b) *In addition to the prospectus permitted or required in subsection (a), the Commission shall by rules or regulations deemed necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors permit the use of a prospectus for the purposes of subsection (b) (1) of section 5 which omits in part or summarizes information in the prospectus specified in subsection (a). A prospectus permitted under this subsection shall, except to the extent the Commission by rules or regulations deemed necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors otherwise provides, be filed as part of the registration statement but shall not be deemed a part of such registration statement for the purposes of section 11. The Commission may at any time issue an order preventing or suspending the use of a prospectus permitted under this subsection (b), if it has reason to believe that such prospectus has not been filed (if required to be filed as part of the registration statement) or includes any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state any material fact required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein, in the light of the circumstances under which such prospectus is or is to be used not misleading. Upon issuance of an order under this subsection, the Commission shal give notice of the issuance of such order and opportunity for hearing by personal service or the sending of confirmed telegraphic notice. The Commission shall vacate or modify the order at any time for good cause or if such prospectus has been filed or amended in accordance with such order.*

"(c) [(3)] Any prospectus shall contain such other information as the Commission may by rules or regulations require as being necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

"(d) [(4)] In the exercise of its powers under [paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection] *subsections (a), (b) or (c),* the Commission shall have authority to classify prospectuses according to the nature and circumstances of their use *or the nature of the security, issue, issuer, or otherwise,* and, by rules and regulations and subject to such terms and conditions as it shall specify therein, to prescribe as to each class the form and contents which it may find appropriate [to such use] and consistent with the public interest and the protection of investors.

"(e) [(c)] The statements or information required to be included in a prospectus by or under authority of subsections *(a), (b), (c),* or (d), [(a) or (b)] when written, shall be placed in a conspicuous part of the prospectus and, except as otherwise permitted by rules or regulations, in type as large as that used generally in the body of the prospectus.

"(f) [(d)] In any case where a prospectus consists of a radio *or television* broadcast, copies thereof shall be filed with the Commission under such rules and regulations as it shall prescribe. The Commission may by rules and regulations require the filing with it of forms and prospectuses used in connection with the *offer or* sale of securities registered under this title."

SEC. 10. Section 12 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended by inserting the words "offers or" before the word "sells" in clauses (1) and (2) thereof.

SEC. 11. Section 17 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended by inserting the words "offer or" before the word "sale" in the introductory clause thereof.

SEC. 12. Section 22 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended by inserting the words "offer or" before the word "sale" in the second sentence thereof.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED

SEC. 201. Paragraph (d) of section 11 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended by striking out the words "6 months" where they appear in such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the words "30 days."

SEC. 202. The last sentence of paragraph (d) of section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is hereby repealed.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO TRUST INDENTURE ACT OF 1939

SEC. 301. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 303 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended by deleting the words "as heretofore amended."

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 303 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The terms 'sale,' [or] 'sell,' *'offer to sell,' 'offer for sale,' and 'offer'* shall include all transactions included in such terms as provided in paragraph (3) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, [as heretofore amended,] except that [a] *an offer or* sale of a certificate of interest or participation shall be deemed [a] *an offer or* sale of the security or securities in which such certificate evidences an interest or participation if and only if such certificate gives the holder thereof the right to convert the same into such security or securities."

(c) Paragraph (3) of section 303 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The term 'prospectus' shall have the meaning assigned to such term in paragraph (10) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, [as heretofore amended,] except that in the case of securities which are not registered under the Securities Act of 1933, such term shall not include any communication (A) if it is proved that prior to or at the same time with such communication a written statement *if any required by* [meeting the requirements of subsection (c) of] section [305] *306* was sent or given to the persons to whom the communication was made, [by the person making such communication or his principal,] or (B) if such communication states from whom such statement may be obtained and, in addition, does no more than identify the security, state the price thereof, and state by whom orders will be executed [.] *and contain such other information as the Commission, by rules or regulations deemed necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed therein, may permit.*"

(d) Paragraph (4) of section 303 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended by inserting the words "offers or" before the word "sells."

SEC. 302. Subsection (b) of section 304 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended by deleting the words "as heretofore amended."

SEC. 303. Subsection (c) of section 305 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) A prospectus relating to any such security shall include *to the extent the Commission may prescribe by rules and regulations as necessary and appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors,* as though such inclusion were required by section 10 of the Securities Act of 1933, a written statement containing the analysis set forth in the registration statement of any indenture provisions with respect to the matters specified in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section, together with a supplementary analysis, prepared by the Commission, of such provisions and of the effect thereof, if, in the opinion of the Commission, the inclusion of such supplementary analysis is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, and the Commission

so declares by order after notice and, if demanded by the issuer, opportunity for hearing thereon. Such order shall be entered prior to the effective date of registration, except that if opportunity for hearing thereon is demanded by the issuer such order shall be entered within a reasonable time after such opportunity for hearing."

SEC. 304. Section 306 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 306. (a) In the case of any security which is not registered under the Securities Act of 1933 and to which this subsection is applicable notwithstanding the provisions of section 304, unless such security has been or is to be issued under an indenture and an application for qualification is effective as to such indenture, it shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly—

"(1) to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to sell such security through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise; or

"(2) to carry or cause to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce, by any means or instruments of transportation, any such security for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale.

"(b) In the case of any security which is not registered under the Securities Act of 1933, but which has been or is to be issued under an indenture as to which an application for qualification is effective, it shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly—

"(1) to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to carry or transmit any prospectus relating to any such security, unless such prospectus, *to the extent the Commission may prescribe by rules and regulations as necessary and appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, includes or is accompanied* by a written statement that *contains the information specified in* [meets the requirements of] subsection (c) of section 305; or

"(2) to carry or to cause to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce any such security for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale, unless, *to the extent the Commission may prescribe by rules and regulations as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors,* accompanied or preceded by a written statement that [meets the requirements of] *contains the information specified in* subsection (c) of section 305.

"(c) *It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to offer to sell through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise any security which is not registered under the Securities Act of 1933 and to which this subsection is applicable notwithstanding the provisions of section 304, unless such security has been or is to be issued under an indenture and an application for qualification has been filed as to such indenture, or while the application is the subject of a refusal order or stop order, or prior to qualification any* public proceeding or examination, under section 307 (c)."

SEC. 305. Section 324 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended by deleting the words "issuing or selling" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "offering, selling, or issuing."

TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940

SEC. 401. Section 2 (a) (30) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended to read as follows:

"(30) 'Prospectus,' as used in section 22, means a written prospectus intended to meet the requirements of section [5 (b)] *10 (a)* of the Securities Act of 1933 and currently in use. As used elsewhere, 'prospectus' means a prospectus as defined in the Securities Act of 1933."

SEC. 402. Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: *"The exemption provided by the third clause of section 4 (1) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall not apply to any transaction in a security issued by a face-amount certificate company or in a redeemable security issued by an open-end management company or unit investment trust, if any other security of the same class is currently being offered or sold by the issuer or by or through an underwriter in a distribution which is not exempted from section 5 of said act, except to such extent and subject to such terms and conditions as the Commission, having due regard for the public interest and the protection of investors, may prescribe by rules or regulations with respect to any class of persons, securities, or transactions."*

SEC. 403. Section 24 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) *(1) A registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 relating to a security issued by a face-amount certificate company or a redeemable security issued by an open-end management company or unit investment trust may be amended after its effective date so as to increase the securities specified therein as proposed to be offered. At the time of filing such amendment there shall be paid to the Commission a fee, calculated in the manner specified in section 6 (b) of said act, with respect to the additional securities therein proposed to be offered.*

"(2) *The filing of such an amendment to a registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 shall not be deemed to have taken place unless it is accompanied by a United States postal money order or a certified bank check or cash for the amount of the fee required under paragraph (1) of this subsection.*

"(3) *For the purposes of section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the effective date of the latest amendment filed pursuant to this subsection or otherwise shall be deemed the effective date of the registration statement with respect to securities sold after such amendment shall have become effective. For the purposes of section 13 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, no such security shall be deemed to have been bona fide offered to the public prior to the effective date of the latest amendment filed pursuant to this subsection. Except to the extent the Commission otherwise provides by rules or regulations as appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, no prospectus relating to a security issued by a face-amount certificate company or a redeemable security issued by an open-end management company or unit investment trust which varies for the purposes of subsection (a) (3) of section 10 of the Securities Act of 1933 from the latest prospectus filed as a part of the registration statement shall be deemed to meet the requirements of said section 10 unless filed as part of an amendment to the registration statement under said act and such amendment has become effective."*

ANNA B. MONTGOMERY

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 203), which was placed on the Calendar:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Anna B. Montgomery, widow of William H. Montgomery, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

WINONA BRINGHURST HALL

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 204), which was placed on the Calendar:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Winona Bringhurst Hall, widow of Loren B. Hall, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MARY WOODING JAMES

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 205), which was placed on the Calendar:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Wooding James, widow of Robert W. James, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

INCREASE OF BORROWING POWER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2714) to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES IN MISSOURI RIVER BASIN—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CASE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1572) to recognize a Missouri River States Committee as an advisory group in preparing and executing a unified program for the conservation and development of soil and water resources in the Missouri River Basin based on the public-works program authorized by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944, to establish a State office to serve such a committee and the Congress, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF POSTAL OPERATIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take from the clerk's desk Senate Resolution 197, and that it be referred to the Committee on

Rules and Administration. I have discussed this subject with the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and they have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 197) extending the time for the study and investigation of postal operations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 16, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Louis Gorman Whitcomb, of Vermont, to be United States attorney for the District of Vermont.

George Edward Rapp, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

Robert E. Hauberg, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi.

Donald E. Kelley, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado.

Julian T. Gaskill, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina.

Osro Cobb, of Arkansas, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas.

Eugene Levi Kemper, of Kansas, to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas.

Peter Auburn Richmond, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

Xavier North, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio.

J. Bradbury German, Jr., of New York, to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 17, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Heard L. Floore, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas.

Donald R. Ross, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska.

J. Leonard Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky.

Jack D. H. Hays, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona.

William T. Plummer, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

Theodore F. Bowes, of New York, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York.

Sumner Canary, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio, vice Donald C. Miller, resigned.

Claire A. Wilder, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska.

Fred S. Williamson, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

Albert Fuller Dorsh, Jr., of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

Donald A. Fraser, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut.

Cooper Hudspeth, of Arkansas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Arkansas.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whiting Willauer, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Honduras.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Statement by himself, dated December 6, 1953, nominating the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, as Man of the Year for 1953.

OPPOSITION TO SALE OF LIQUOR AT OR NEAR ARMY POSTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to a letter which I have received from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Watford City, N. Dak. Because of the brevity of the letter, I shall read it:

WATFORD CITY, N. DAK., *January 6, 1954.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Watford City, N. Dak., urge that you do all in your power to get the armed services out of the liquor business by putting package liquor stores off bases, liquor out of officers' and noncom clubs, and beer out of post exchanges and enlisted men's clubs.

We shall deeply appreciate whatever you can and will do to help remove these evils from our military posts, and from our boys.

Mrs. Leah Johnson, President; Mrs. O. A. Becken, Vice President; Mrs. Dora B. Erickson, Secretary; Mrs. Daisy Bergeron, Treasurer; Mrs. Judith H. Olson; Mrs. Mildred Shelley; Mrs. Martha Rolfsrud; Mrs. Jean Borseth; Mrs. Margaret Muri; Mrs. Ella Buell; Mrs. Lillian Ballre; Mrs. Myrl Staley; Mrs. John Skaar; Mrs. Madeline Pierce; Mrs. Agnes Bond, Mrs. Emma Iverson, Mrs. Marie Norstoy; Mrs. Inga Sandsmark.

I may say that I have referred the letter to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

OPPOSITION TO TAXING OF HOUSING BONDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, deep concern has been expressed by many municipal officials throughout the land relative to the proposal to subject municipal housing authority securities to Federal taxation.

There is great fear that such taxation will result in an interest-rate increase of from 1 to 1½ percent, which would place on the taxpayers an added burden of millions of dollars annually. It is felt in many quarters that the impact upon municipal finances might be so severe that even the most essential capital improvement might be priced completely out of possible accomplishment.

The officials of Wisconsin's largest city, Milwaukee, have been in close touch with me on this issue, and I share their concern about the implications of the Treasury Department's proposal.

It is my earnest hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will reconsider this entire subject.

I now send to the desk the text of a telegram I have received from the housing authority, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 25, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Deeply disturbed by House Ways and Means Committee action involving direct taxation of future housing authority bond issues and certain securities of States and municipalities. Federal taxation of housing authority bonds will only result in increasing the Federal annual contributions necessary to maintain the low-rent character of housing projects. Interest rates on housing bond issues will increase an additional 1 to 1½ percent. Housing authority bonds are

local bonds, issued under State and municipal authority, and not Federal bonds issued in a municipality's name. While we believe this measure to be unconstitutional, litigation would be time consuming and would seriously affect the market for housing, State, and municipal bonds. Fundamental constitutional safeguard of municipal immunity from Federal taxation must not be abrogated. Trust reconsideration of this matter will be given prior to submittal to Congress. Would appreciate immediate opportunity for local officials to be heard on this issue.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKEE,
REV. CECIL A. FISHER, *Chairman.*
RICHARD W. E. PERRIN,
Executive Director.

OPPOSITION TO THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Chief Executive of the United States has written unequivocally of his opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1, as reported from the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I, for one, have always had the strongest faith that our great President would speak, as is his right, in his clear, outstanding voice, on this issue. After all, it is his great burden to protect and defend the Constitution. He is the spokesman for all the American people. It is his burden to preserve the office of the Presidency from any danger. He has a right to speak out, and he has soundly exercised that right.

Mr. President, debate has commenced on the vital issue of Senate Joint Resolution 1. It is my hope that the debate will be kept at the highest possible level of discussion.

DIFFICULT TO APPRAISE NEW LANGUAGE

I point out, Mr. President, that at this stage, all sorts of substitute proposals, new language for the "which" clause, and so forth, are apparently under consideration by many Members of the Senate. I point out further that the Senate will find it extremely difficult in the heat of debate to attempt to analyze all the implications of all the new language.

AT LEAST BRICKER, KNOWLAND AMENDMENT REVIEWED

At least the Bricker amendment, as such, has been the subject of intensive scrutiny for many months. The Knowland substitute has been subject to similar analysis. But what of the new language which many Senators are considering? Naturally, no one can be fully aware of all the implications of such new language.

THIS IS NOT A RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

I point out that a constitutional amendment must stand for the ages; it will be interpreted and reinterpreted in decades to come. Language should not be lightly incorporated in it. We are not amending a rivers and harbors bill. We are thinking of amending the Constitution. We cannot do so in an off-the-cuff sort of debate. No Senator can attempt to offer curbstone opinions on totally new phraseology either from the floor of the Senate or anywhere else. I urge, therefore, the greatest caution in the process of considering new language.

I respect the ability and the legal judgment of the Senate. But I point out that not even the ablest lawyers, not even the ablest public servants, can be sure, after but a few days of cursory review, that some new amendment does not contain all sorts of hidden implications.

HASTE IN COMPROMISE WRITING DANGEROUS

There is not a Member of the Senate who does not revere the Constitution of the United States. Let us not, therefore, offer, willy-nilly, all sorts of new amendments to it. If the language previously offered and considered is not acceptable, then let us be extremely careful insofar as offering new compromise language.

I know full well how earnestly my colleagues have attempted to write such new language. I know what great efforts they have put into this process. But I point out to them that it is almost impossible to write in a few days, or even in a few weeks, an amendment which will be so clear to all that it will not raise more problems—1 year, 5 years, or 10 years from now—than it solves.

GRASSROOTS EXPRESSIONS OPPOSE AMENDMENT

Mr. President, I have previously brought to the attention of the Senate a great many expressions from my own State of Wisconsin in opposition to the Bricker amendment.

At the present time, I should like to send to the Senate desk a cross-section of messages which have come to me from all over America on the issue. I congratulate the thinking people of the 48 States for recognizing the grave implications of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

I offer these messages, which come from individuals and organizations, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As the Bricker amendment comes up for debate on the floor of the Senate, I would like to call your attention again to the statement of the subcommittee on juridical institutions of the Catholic Association for International Peace opposing the Bricker resolution last April 5. The statement is based on the original text which was changed in committee, but in general it still covers the new text with the same objections. The last three paragraphs in particular apply to the present situation and as you will note, the subcommittee is opposed to "the adoption of any such amendments [that] would prejudice the domestic security and foreign relations of the United States." We wish to reaffirm our opposition to such resolutions at this time and assure you of our continued support of your efforts to end this threat.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

NORMA ANN KRAUSE,
Committee Secretary.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 11, 1954.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.:

The triennial convention of B'nai B'rith on May 6, 1953, adopted a resolution expressing its vigorous opposition to the Bricker resolution. Subsequently, we wrote to advise you of the adoption of the convention's resolution and urging the defeat of Senate Joint Resolution 1. At this time in view of the impending consideration of the Bricker resolution, we want to reiterate our opposition. The resolution, or any compromise based on it, would be detrimental to the best interests of the United States by hampering the President in the conduct of our foreign policy. Its adoption would be interpreted as a significant retreat from our responsibilities as a great power in the free world and the leader in the collective-security program against aggression.

PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK,
President of B'nai B'rith.

YELLOW SPRINGS, OHIO, *January 20, 1954.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am writing to state my opposition to the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1). This amendment seems unnecessary in the light of the existing system of checks and balances under the Constitution. I do not see a threat to our freedom in article VI, 2 of the Constitution which states: "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby; anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

The United States must assume a role of responsibility in its conduct of foreign relations and removal of functions from the Executive and transferring them to the Congress is a great threat to such conduct.

I am in complete support with the views expressed by Mrs. John G. Lee, president of the League of Women Voters of the United States in opposition to this amendment and join with her in urging you to continue to use your influence in opposition to the passage of the Bricker amendment. I am aware of your fight against this amendment as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and wish to extend my approval of this opposition.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH W. STEWART,
Mrs. Albert B. Stewart.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., January 21, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The provisions of the United States Constitution making treaties the supreme law of the land have always impressed me as being so indispensable—if the United States is to enjoy those sovereign powers that any great nation must of necessity possess—that I am amazed to discover that a number of otherwise responsible lawyers are lending aid to the present movement to amend the Constitution. I will not say that I can conceive of no motives that would prompt this effort to destroy this necessary governmental power so wisely written into the Constitution by the Founding Fathers, but I have difficulty believing that such motives are either patriotic or laudable. I sincerely hope that wiser minds will prevent the adoption of the Bricker amendment; and, as a citizen and a lawyer conversant with the legal matters here involved, I respectfully urge you to use your influence generously to prevent this destruction of essential national sovereignty.

If you should desire an exposition of the precise reasons which underlie my opposition to depriving treaties of their status as supreme law, I would, of course, be glad to supply the information. In general, my reasons are those set forth by Mr. Arthur Sutherland in his article in 65 Harvard Law Review 1305, which I regard as about as good

a treatment of the matter as I have examined.

Please be assured that I will appreciate greatly your efforts to prevent this wanton undoing of the work of those patriots who drafted our Constitution.

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD MORTON,
Colonel, United States Army Reserve;
Professor of Constitutional Law,
University of Oregon.

ARLINGTON, VA., *January 23, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Congratulations on your courageous stand in the Bricker amendment.

May I point out that we are very concerned about this terrible amendment and fear that its passage in any form will aid our enemies.

It truly is a dangerous act.

Very truly yours,

KATHRYN G. TELEP,
WALTER S. TELEP.

WINDY HILL FARM,
Plano, Tex., January 24, 1954.
Senator WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am happy to know that you oppose the Bricker amendment. I can't understand why any Senator would favor diluting his authority to ratify treaties, unless he is an isolationist.

In Dallas, where we lived until recently, there is a good deal of vocal support for the amendment. It has been acquired by speakers who spoke to many groups about the danger of socialism, communism, atheism, world government, etc., that was inherent in the U. N., its specialized agencies, and the treaties emanating from it. After the audience was properly frightened, the speaker assured them that the Bricker amendment would save them from these evils. Of course, those who were well informed about international relations were not convinced.

Since the United States has so many dealings with other countries today, it is natural that Congress would wish to have a closer check on Executive agreements. Would it be practical to define the limits of the area to be covered by Executive agreements? Or might the Senate Foreign Relations Committee be consulted about the more important agreements?

Good luck to you in defeating this amendment or in working out a more acceptable compromise.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. LOREN D. GORDON.

CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Chester, Pa., January 23, 1954.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: I am unalterably opposed to the Bricker amendment. Please speak against it. It will mean a subversion of our basic constitutional guaranties.

Most sincerely,

KENNETH L. SMITH.

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 22, 1954.*
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Congratulations on your firm stand against the Bricker amendment.

Like you, I believe danger lies in its provisions. The President must not be hampered in carrying out our foreign policy in a rapidly changing world.

Sincerely,

NORA B. CUMMINS.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
AT LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, January 23, 1954.
SENATOR WILEY:

On January 21, 1954, in the Los Angeles Times, the society section carried an article stating that a group of prominent southern California women were entraining for Washington, D. C., to vociferously clamor for the Bricker amendment.

Thus I am at a disadvantage in two ways, first the women can act as a group as opposed to me as an individual, and secondly the women are able to present their views at firsthand while I can only voice my opinion from afar.

However much or little of value my opinion is worth I would like to say that I favor your position in regard to the Bricker amendment.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND G. VISSER.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., *January 22, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: May I congratulate you upon the vigorous defense of the Constitution you are making in your opposition to the Bricker amendment.

As a member of the League of Women Voters, I heartily endorse the statement that the National League president has made regarding the proposed amendment. It is objectionable and unnecessary, and as Secretary of State Dulles has said would be "calamitous."

Yours very truly,

HELEN M. YAGER.

LEXINGTON, KY., *January 17, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Bricker amendment is a fantastically reactionary step at a moment when President Eisenhower merits support. Please vote "No."

We trust the Senate and the President to handle foreign policy.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES DUGAN,
Mrs. Hammond Dugan.

DAYTON, OHIO, *January 23, 1954.*
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILEY: It is my opinion that the Bricker amendment is unsound and even dangerous. I hope you will help to defeat it.

Yours sincerely,

(Mrs. Wilbur D.) EVERETT SHAW CONOVER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 22, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER R. WILEY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the present critical stage of world history when we, more than any other nation, stand responsible for what will be written in that history, it is more than ever important to our country and the world that our leaders be free to take swift and decisive action with other nations as the need arises.

The present constitutional limitations to the treatymaking powers of the President have always been sufficient, and perhaps were even too effective in the case of the treaty after World War I. There is no need to further debilitate the executive department by the proposed Bricker amendment.

I have confidence that you are a man of vision as well as loyalty to the spirit of our Constitution. Therefore, I trust that you will use your influence against the passage of the proposed Bricker amendment.

May God be with you in this and in all your decisions.

Very sincerely,

MRS. ISABELLE KETTL.

COLORADO COLLEGE,
Colorado Springs, Colo., January 20, 1954.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Your effective opposition to the proposed Bricker amendment prompts me to write you and express my encouragement at your leadership in opposing the amendment and my belief that your opposition will prove effective. I should like to add my opinion that the amendment should not receive Senate approval because those parts of the amendment that are merely declaratory of the law as it now stands are unnecessary; those parts of the amendment that provide law not now in force are undesirable.

Yours very truly,

ROY O. WERNER,
Department of Economics.

MEDIA, PA., *January 24, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER R. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Although I do not live in your State, I want to tell you you have my full support in your opposition to the Bricker amendment. I hope you will continue in that line and that you will be able to persuade your colleagues to follow your excellent lead in not hamstringing the executive powers of our Government. I feel this amendment is dangerous to the country in these, or any other, times.

Sincerely yours,

ROSEMARY O. HEWITT.

DAYTON OHIO, *January 22, 1954.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am entirely in accord with President Eisenhower's position on the Bricker amendment.

The power of the National Government to conduct foreign relations must be maintained. The negotiation and ratification of treaties should not be made more cumbersome.

I oppose the Bricker amendment.

Sincerely,

MRS. WM. COBER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 21, 1954.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: May I endorse your stand on the Bricker amendment, the passage of which would please a small minority, but would jeopardize our position in foreign affairs, our national security and perhaps, ultimately, our democratic system of government.

Respectfully yours,

HILDA SMITH.

DAYTON, OHIO, *January 23, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Please don't forget that most thinking people are aghast that the Bricker amendment was ever taken seriously enough to come to a vote. Unfortunately, we have been less articulate than the isolationists.

Sincerely,

MARJORIE M. H. STROM
Mrs. Wm. T. Strom.

TACOMA, WASH., *January 19, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Am taking this opportunity to voice my opposition to the Bricker amendment. As I understand it, it would place dangerous restrictions of the treatymaking powers of the President and the Federal Government. In these crucial times when the international situation is in such delicate balance it is imperative that there be no obstacles to the formulating and implementing of peace treaties which would help to promote world order and peace. Have seen a list of organizations for and against this amendment and that is a sufficient argument to discredit it.

Sincerely,

MRS. MAUDE N. RICHARD.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 23, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am against the Bricker amendment, I do not think it is a good thing for the country to tie our wonderful President so he cannot do what is best for us. He would not do anything that was not good for us. We are for him 100 percent. I belong to the national and international affairs committee of our club.

Sincerely,

MRS. DAVID GIFFORD.

BEREA, OHIO, *January 23, 1954.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Congratulations on the stand you took yesterday on the Bricker amendment.

It is my hope that this amendment will be defeated since I consider the two-thirds vote of the Senate, and the right of Congress to refuse to appropriate the necessary money sufficient control of the President's treatymaking power.

Very truly yours.

DORIS RAWLINGS
Mrs. Joseph H. Rawlings.

HEMPSTEAD, N. Y., *January 24, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As registered Republicans, my wife and I want to commend you for your stand against the proposed Bricker amendment. We heartily agree with you that the amendment is one of the most dangerous acts of our generation.

We urge you not to vote for any compromise which would undermine the principles upon which our Constitution is based. We are firmly opposed to the Bricker brand of isolationism and are grateful that forward-looking, intelligent thinkers like yourself are in the United States Senate.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT J. FIELDSTEEL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 21, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Some time ago I read with pleasure your letter to the Los Angeles Daily News in regard to the Bricker amendment. I am happy that you are working so hard against it as I consider it extremely dangerous. That includes any compromise or amendment to the amendment.

Thank you and best wishes.

Yours truly,

LULU W. DRAPER.

NEW YORK, *January 23, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a member of the American Bar Association for over 30 years, I am most definitely opposed to the Bricker amendment in any form.

Sincerely,

FRANK E. KARELSEN.

MISSOULA, MONT., *January 23, 1954.*

Senator WILEY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign
Relations Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I sincerely approve of your opposition to the Bricker amendment.

The Bricker amendment would make treaty negotiation slow and difficult. The rights of States and individuals are well protected by the Senate under the present constitutional procedures. The President and the Senate can be trusted to legislate to the best interests of the United Staes as a whole. This amendment could possibly harm the reciprocal trade program—and increased trade is most important to this country and the rest of the world. I suspect also that this amendment is an insidious attack against the United Nations. I believe we should do nothing which would weaken the United Nations.

I hope you will continue to exert all possible pressure against passage of the Bricker amendment.

Very truly yours,

JEANNE MUELLER.

YALE UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn., January 22, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations
Committee, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: May I offer my congratulations upon, and thanks for, your strong and courageous fight against the proposed Bricker amendment. As one who has studied the constitutional aspects of treaties for many years, I feel very strongly that the proposed amendment is both wholly unnecessary and a positive threat to the security of our country. I am but one of many who admire and appreciate your fight for the national interest and hope that you will continue it to victory, not only against the Bricker proposal but also against all substitutes which do more than restate the present constitutional provisions.

Sincerely yours,

MYRES S. MCDOUGAL,
William K. Townsend Professor of Law.

PASADENA, CALIF., *January 24, 1954.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It is very encouraging to read and hear your forthright opposition to the Bricker amendment. I hope that your efforts will result in its rejection.

This is no time to change the powers of the President and the Senate in their conduct of foreign affairs. Any substitute amendment is likely to cause uncertainty and confusion on the part not alone of the President and the Secretary of State but also of the foreign secretaries with whom they must deal.

Yours very truly,

SYBIL JANE MOORE.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *January 24, 1954.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Your firm opposition to the Bricker amendment has been a matter of genuine satisfaction to many. May I congratulate you on it and express my strong personal opposition to this attempt to curtail United States participation in international affairs.

It is noteworthy that all the arguments for such an amendment are predicated on possible future dangers rather than any demonstrable present need. The Supreme Court having ruled in the past that the treatymaking power does not authorize what the Constitution prohibits, it seems redundant to write such a provision into it. Instead of protecting the Constitution, this proposed amendment would endanger the system of checks and balances which is such an essential element of our Government. It would alter the traditional concept of the balance of powers.

Nothing in the history of the treaty ratifying process of the Senate lessens my confidence in its ability to judge each treaty on its merit. At a time when the world situation makes flexibility in foreign affairs ever more essential the Bricker amendment would place hampering restrictions upon its conduct.

Since no real need for amending the Constitution has been established, and since such a change would be of actual danger to the Nation at this time of world tension, your position against the Bricker amendment is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

BLANCHE S. SPEER
Mrs. James P. Speer II.

NEWTON, MASS., *January 26, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY:

Hope you will continue to oppose the Bricker amendment or any compromise.

MARIE LYONS.

BOSTON, *January 20, 1954.*

The Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am opposed to the Bricker amendment and urge you to vote against it.

I consider this amendment to be a dangerous blockade to the fluidity of executive movement in international affairs.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN A. BEREZIN, M. D.

WOODSTOWN, N. J., *January 20, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am disturbed about the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1), which would limit the power of the President in treaties and executive agreements.

I believe that such an amendment is unnecessary and unwise.

I hope you will use your vote and influence against it.

Sincerely,

CHARLES J. DARLINGTON.

PERRYSBURG, OHIO, *January 21, 1954.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We wholeheartedly endorse your opposition to the Bricker amendment and strongly urge that you accept no compromise version that would include section 2 and 3 of the present bill in any form.

Judging from the reactions at a town meeting on the amendment last night, there is great public support for the President's position. The audience of 120 people was almost unanimously opposed to the amendment. We are writing to other Senators urging them to reconsider their stand on the bill.

Sincerely yours,

NED and VIOLET COFFIN.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7209) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, last evening the majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] announced that following the morning hour today, Calendar No. 858, Senate bill 2803, would be taken up. In fact, it was announced that three orders of business on the calendar would be considered following the morning hour today, before resuming consideration of the Bricker amendment. It will be noted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday that the majority leader stated:

> Mr. President, I wish to give notice to the Senate that tomorrow, after the usual morning hour, it is my purpose to call up Calendar 858, S. 2803, a bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended to July 1, 1955, about which I have already spoken to the distinguished minority leader, and which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services, as I understand.
>
> Next, I propose to call up Calendar 859, Senate Resolution 172, a resolution to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States; and then Calendar 870, Senate Resolution 190, a resolution amending the resolution providing for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States and increasing the limit of expenditures.
>
> These measures I propose to call up following the morning hour, and before the Senate begins debate on the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to inform the Senator from Minnesota that the discussion referred to took place, but that no action was taken. Does the Senator from Minnesota ask unanimous consent that the measures referred to be taken up at this time?

Mr. THYE. I ask unanimous consent that the measures to which I have referred be taken up at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator state the calendar numbers to which he refers? I understand they consist of the bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act and two resolutions.

Mr. THYE. They are Calendar 858, Senate bill 2803, a bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended to July 1, 1955; Calendar 859, Senate Resolution 172, to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States; and Calendar 870, Senate Resolution 190, a resolution amending the resolution providing for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States and increasing the limit of expenditures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the acting leader on this side how long he anticipates it will require to consider the three measures to which he has referred?

Mr. THYE. I do not believe it will require very long. As will be noted from page 829 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, the majority leader brought this question up last evening and stated that he was giving notice to the Senate that he would ask for the consideration of the three measures mentioned by him in the statement I have read.

I notice that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is present and ready to speak on the resolution relating to the investigation of juvenile delinquency.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct. I was assured last evening that this resolution would be taken up the first thing today.

Mr. BRICKER. As I understand, all that is proposed is a continuation of what we were working upon last night, with the exception of order No. 858, Senate bill 2803, which is a bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act.

Mr. THYE. That is my understanding.

Mr. BRICKER. I have no objection.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES RELATING TO INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 859, Senate Resolution 172.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the request is to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 859, Senate Resolution 172.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 172) to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Indiana to tell us whether or not this resolution provides about the same amount of money as was voted by the Senate last year for the work of this committee?

Mr. JENNER. Yes. For the Senator's information, I may say that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee was first organized in 1952. In that year, beginning May 29, 1952, there was appropriated for it $163,800. On a 7-month basis, the subcommittee spent $94,000. So, projecting that expenditure on the basis of a full year's operations, it would have been $161,000.

Last year we actually expended, in a 12-month period, $164,000. We have a carryover of $58,323.75, and we are asking for $170,000, which would be practically the same amount the subcommittee has had since its inception.

Mr. ELLENDER. The total amount, with the unexpended funds, and the new money, would be $228,323.75.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since the committee did not spend all the money appropriated last year, why is it necessary to increase the amount?

Mr. JENNER. In the first place, it is difficult to tell what a committee like this will have to spend. It is difficult to determine the amount of work it will be required to do. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to read the report. However, in the report we have tried to outline the fields of operation. Of course, we will do as we have done this year. We will operate as economically as possible and save as much as we can. We hope we shall not have to spend all the money, but we believe that we need this kind of a budget to do the sort of job we would like to do.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Indiana will recall that last year, when he asked for funds to conduct hearings, the question of duplication was raised. I wanted to ascertain whether there would be any duplication as between the work of his committee and the work of the so-called McCarthy committee. The Senator remembers that discussion; does he not?

Mr. JENNER. I do.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator the colloquy we had on the subject. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 1, page 685. I call particular attention to certain remarks made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who was to become chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. He now heads that committee. I said:

> Mr. ELLENDER. I hold in my hand an article published in the Washington Post, from which I read:
>
> "McCARTHY said he thought the Government has just 'scratched the surface' in attempting to rid itself of subversive influences and that his committee will continue—'very definitely'—efforts to root Communists from the Government."
>
> Not long ago the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin took part in a Meet the Press program. At that time I think he again indicated that he was going to keep a close watch on the subcommittee of which the Senator from Indiana is a member, on the Committee on Un-American Activities in the House, and on all other committees, and that if they did not do a good job of rooting out communism, he proposed to take action through his committee.

The Senator from Indiana said:

> Mr. JENNER. In the first place, I hope we will maintain the fine record established by our subcommittee during the past 2 years, when it has been engaged in the field of

investigation of communism and subversive activities, and has achieved excellent results. Therefore I see no reason for duplication by any other committee.

In other words, the Senator from Indiana, as I recall, agreed with the senior Senator from Louisiana that there should not be any duplication of effort.

I continue to read from the Senator's statement:

As I read the Reorganization Act, I think the Committee on Government Operations, of which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is chairman, has a proper field of investigation without going into the field of communism or subversive activities in the Government. That is the view which our subcommittee intends to take of the situation. It is our understanding with the Senator from Wisconsin that such an arrangement applies to similar activities on the part of the House.

Can the Senator from Indiana inform me whether that intention has been carried out?

Mr. JENNER. I can state to the Senator and to all Members of the Senate that so far as the operations of our subcommittee are concerned, in only one instance did the jurisdiction of our subcommittee come into conflict with the jurisdiction or the work of any other subcommittee, and that related to the so-called McCarthy subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. The one instance, and the only instance of that kind, was the case of the United Nations.

Under the chairmanship of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], before I became chairman of the Internal Security subcommittee, the subcommittee had started an investigation of the United Nations. I was in my home State when I learned that the McCarthy committee was going into that field. I got in touch with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and told him that our subcommittee had been engaged in that field since 1952, that we were in that field now, and that we contemplated holding further hearings in the same field.

He said, "All right, I will get out of the way, if I am in the way," which he did.

That is the only case in which there has been any conflict.

Of course, one might say there is a certain amount of duplication in many of these fields; but I do not believe such duplication has been a hindrance; on the contrary, it has been a help. I say that because the problem is vast, and it is the basis of the Communist struggle, the basis of our tax program, and the basis even of the Four Power Conference which is meeting in Berlin at this time.

Therefore I say, instead of less help we should have more help in that regard.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator from Indiana come to that conclusion in recent weeks?

Mr. JENNER. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. I asked that question because the position taken by the Senator from Indiana on January 30, 1953, is contrary to what he is now saying.

Mr. JENNER. I say that the Subcommittee on Internal Security was set up by resolution primarily to look after the internal security of the United States. However, it must be realized that it is hard to draw a line indicating where the subject begins and where it ends.

For example, this morning before the Committee on Rules and Administration there was presented a resolution by the Committee on Foreign Relations, dealing with certain internal security matters. So far as the McCarthy committee is concerned, their principal jurisdiction is established by the Reorganization Act.

When we consider the subject of inefficiency in the operations of the Government, I wonder whether it is efficiency to permit Communists to penetrate the Voice of America Program, for example.

So far as duplication is concerned, we try meticulously to prevent it. Honestly, though, I must say—and every member of the committee will say the same thing—we have had to work hard to do what we have done, and we cannot possibly cover the entire field.

I will give another example of possible duplication. Last year we started as one of our major projects an investigation in the field of education. The House Committee on Un-American Activities was getting into that field, too. Therefore, although we did not have an agreement with the House committee, we backed out, because if the House committee wanted to go into the educational field, that was all right with us.

We made our main objective the field of subversion. Certainly, our job is to look after internal security, and we have continued to stay in that field.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to continue the colloquy a little further. As I pointed out a while ago, the Senator from Indiana stated specifically:

As I read the Reorganization Act, I think the Committee on Government Operations, of which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is chairman, has a proper field of investigation without going into the field of communism or subversive activities in the Government.

Mr. JENNER. I have not changed my mind on that point.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has not changed his mind?

Mr. JENNER. I have not changed my mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that practically all the investigative work which has been carried on by the so-called McCarthy committee has been in the field of subversive activities?

Mr. JENNER. I would not say so. What is happening is this: Let us take, for example, the fact that the proper jurisdiction of the McCarthy committee is to investigate the Voice of America, in order to find out how it is operating, whether it is doing an effective job, and so forth.

When that committee went into the subject, the investigation led directly into the internal-security field as affected by communism, including the kind of books and the kind of programs the Voice of America was using.

One subject leads to another. Our committee was not engaged in that field. We do not have time to go into all the fields. We welcome that sort of help, and I believe the people of the country welcome it, too.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator from Indiana is familiar with the splendid investigation which was conducted by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] into the same field, through a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I did not intend to discuss this afternoon the duplication which has taken place on the part of the Senator's subcommittee and the McCarthy committee, with any other committee. I have tried to confine my questions to the subject of duplication as between the Senator's subcommittee and the McCarthy committee.

I am not familiar at this moment with all the hearings held by the Senator's subcommittee, nor those held by the McCarthy committee, but I had my office make a little investigation of the subject matters investigated by the McCarthy committee. From what I can ascertain, most of them relate to the subject of subversives. I am not objecting to that at all. As a matter of fact, as I said a year ago, I have no objection to any committee which has a legitimate subject to investigate and is doing an objective job, and I still hold to that view. I wish only to eliminate—or at best—reduce duplication to a minimum.

Mr. JENNER. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will agree that the Internal Security Subcommittee has done an objective job.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes. I am not criticizing the Senator's committee at all. My only purpose is to get these committees to remain within their respective fields and not encroach on the prerogatives of other committees. All I desire is the accomplishment of an objective investigation at the least possible cost to our people.

Mr. JENNER. The committee worked in four main fields. The first was in the field of subversive influence in educational processes.

The next involved the activities of United States citizens employed by the United Nations.

The third, and probably our major work, was concerned with the interlocking activities in Government departments.

The fourth was Communist penetration in the field of labor.

Not only did the full committee work in all four of those fields, but it had a task force which specialized in the same fields. We devoted all the time we possibly could to that work. Although we are jealous of our prerogatives, we realize that the internal security field is primarily left with other committees, or the work of other committees leads directly into it, and we have no objection, because it is so vital that we welcome their aid.

Mr. ELLENDER. The investigations conducted by the so-called McCarthy committee—in connection with subversives and communism—are, I understand, also within the province of the so-called Jenner committee which is the old

McCarran committee. Senator McCARTHY's efforts have been directed primarily toward the Communist issue. In this connection, I should like to make it plain that I am in full accord with worthwhile investigations which have as their objectives the ferretting out of Communists in Government. The issue I now raise is this: Has the McCarthy committee been working the same side of the road, so to speak, as the so-called Jenner subcommittee? I have here a list of the investigations undertaken by the McCarthy committee with respect to subversion, communism, and so forth. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list to which I refer be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed, as follows:

1. Security risks and security procedures in the Government Printing Office.
2. Alleged subversive literature issued by the Voice of America.
3. Employee security files in the State Department.
4. "Espionage phase" involved in the transfer of occupation currency plates of the United States to the Soviet Union.
5. Austrian exchange rate incident.
6. Security in the United Nations (also investigated by the Jenner committee).
7. Investigation of Communist Party Activities, western Pensylvania.
8. "Communist writers" preparing indoctrination material used by the United States Army.
9. Subversion in the defense effort.

Mr. ELLENDER. This list would seem to indicate, Mr. President, that there has been some duplication with respect to the internal security subcommittee. However, I am willing to accept the explanation of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. The only point I wish to emphasize is that there should be no duplication of effort between congressional committees on any investigation.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my distinguished friend from Louisiana. I am sure the American people appreciate his efforts. I should like to advise my distinguished friend from Louisiana of a couple of instances with which, perhaps, he is not familiar. I refer in particular to a task force to which I was assigned by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] to investigate certain propaganda entering the United States through the Communist conspiracy. I want to say to my distinguished friend that I have examined witnesses day after day as long as 10½ hours a day, and I do not even have a secretary. That task force did not cost the Government of the United States 1 cent other than the fees of the reporters. I am sure the Senator appreciates that fact.

Yesterday I learned that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], who heads the subcommittee on Communist infiltration into labor unions, examined witnesses for 7½ hours, without the aid of a secretary or a staff member.

I desire to say that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] has conducted his committee in the most economical manner, and I know he intends to continue to proceed in that way.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not questioning the manner in which the committee has operated. I am not here to ask for a decrease in the committee's appropriation. I believe, though, that every appropriation should be substantiated. The Senator from Indiana well knows that last year, as well as this year, I tried to impress on him that what he should do as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration was to have all committees or subcommittees of the Senate which come before his committee, justify the funds for which they ask.

I am a member of the Appropriations Committee which requires every branch of the executive department to justify every appropriation request they submit. If that policy were followed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, I believe we could save a great deal of the time of the Senate.

I have tried on several occasions, last year as well as early this year, to obtain information as to the amounts spent on special investigations. I asked the Financial Clerk of the Senate for the figures, and I was told that he could not give me the information. I do not understand why. I am hopeful that the distinguished Senator from Indiana will take the matter up with his committee and find out why it is that a Senator cannot go to the Financial Clerk of the Senate and obtain such information. It becomes public information eventually. A great deal of time would be saved if the Senators had access to the figures.

Mr. JENNER. I suppose the Senator from Louisiana knows that my committee does require all money requests to be justified. We have never made a report which has not been unanimous with relation to resolutions requesting funds. We require a uniform budget. The committees must indicates in a uniform budget whom they intend to employ and what work is contemplated to be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. The asking committee simply submits a budget and says, "This is the amount we need."

Mr. JENNER. And we ask them why.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that. Usually those who make up the committee's budget appear, and it ends there. That is all the committees on Rules and Administration requires.

Mr. President, further reading from the colloquy to which I referred a while ago, I quote now from the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]:

Mr. McCARTHY. I think there is no possibility of any duplication of the work of the Committee on Government Operations, the work of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Indiana is to be chairman, and the committee headed by Representative VELDE in the other House.

I think there should be some coordination between the committee headed by the Senator from Indiana, the House committee, and the McCarthy committee. I continue reading:

I have instructed the staff of my committee to work with the staffs of the committee of which the Senator from Indiana is a member and with the House committee, and I feel certain there is no question that that will be done.

The question is to what extent, if any, there has been cooperation—any discussion as to investigations made or contemplated—between the staffs of the various committees I have just mentioned before any attempt was made by the Senator's committee or the McCarthy committee or the Velde committee to enter a specific field. I want the Senate to know that my only objective is to prevent duplication of effort.

Mr. JENNER. I understand the Senator, and I appreciate his efforts.

Let me answer the question in this way: Our staff has cooperated. Before hearings are held the inquiry is made, "What field are you going into?" It is rather difficult for us to tell the Committee on Un-American Activities what they are supposed to do. We started early last year in the field of education, the Communist subversion of the educational processes in this country. We held many hearings in executive session and many public hearings. The record shows there are 712 pages of testimony.

Then we noticed that the House committee was going into the same field. We tried to have an understanding that we would not get in the way of each other. So in that case I agreed to let the House committee move into that field. We said the Senate committee would not abandon it, necessarily, and that in case the House committee should do so, we would pick up our investigation again.

Then the Senate committee undertook an investigation of the interlocking of subversives in the Government. In other words, we tried to avoid doing the very thing the Senator from Louisiana said he does not like to see done. We, too, want to keep away from duplication. Of course, there is bound to be some duplication; it cannot be prevented. But, on the whole, I think it is healthy work we are all doing.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think that if the staffs of the various committees would cooperate more closely with one another, much of the duplication could be stopped.

Mr. JENNER. I agree with the Senator. Of course, that is a goal toward which we are working all the time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator from Indiana that when the Harry Dexter White case came up, there was a tug of war between the Senator's committee and the Velde committee as to which should investigate the matter. I presume that in this case the distinguished Senator from Indiana tried to prevent duplication by taking over the work for his own committee.

Mr. JENNER. We tried to prevent duplication, because that work came within our own particular field.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I have listened attentively to the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana about duplication. Ordinarily, the task force which I head, and which is investigating illegal propaganda coming into the country, has not turned up many Communists; but, just as certain as that we are alive, when we go into the question of illegal propaganda, it involves investigations of Communists, their names, their influences,

and other activities. As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana knows, those things are bound to happen; but the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] certainly covered the matter fully, and I know that the money spent in this work is money well spent on behalf of the American people. I am certain the chairman will continue his valuable work.

Mr. ELLENDER. I say to my good friend, the Senator from Idaho, that I am cognizant of the good work done by the committee. I think the committee has done a fine job in dramatizing some of its investigations in such a way as to let the American people learn what was going on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 172) was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MISSING PERSONS ACT

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 858, S. 2803, a bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 2803) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955.

Mr. THYE. This bill was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, so I shall ask the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to give an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, unless there are questions, I ask unanimous consent that I may file a very brief explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SALTONSTALL

This bill proposes to extend until July 1, 1955, the provisions of the Missing Persons Act of 1942.

The purpose of the Missing Persons Act and its operation throughout World War II is well known to all Senators and perhaps does not require elaboration at this time.

The provisions of the wartime statute enacted in 1942 were reinstated at the time the Selective Service Act of 1948—now referred to as the Universal Military Training and Service Act—was enacted.

Extension of the Missing Persons Act was last considered by the Senate on March 16, 1953. At that time there was discussion as to what action was being taken by the executive branch of the Government and by the Committee on Armed Services to resolve the question of permanent legislation in this field. The bill under consideration at that time was amended so that its expiration date would be fixed as February 1, 1954—Monday of next week. In the meantime it was intended that the possibility of permanent legislation should be further explored, with the hope that such permanent legislation could be made available for Senate consideration rather than a further extension of the 1942 act, as is provided in the pending bill.

The Committee on Armed Services, with the cooperation of the executive branch of the Government, has been engaged in an effort to formulate such permanent legislation, but is encountering a very material amount of technical difficulty in drafting legislation which is responsive to the varied needs of the cold war-hot war situation. The principal stumbling blocks at the moment relate to the accurate definition of what personnel are to be covered, the periods of such coverage, and details involving movement of household goods and personal effects.

I am very hopeful that this rather difficult problem can be solved between now and July 1 of 1955. I do not believe that the present status of the project warrants an assumption that it can be solved this session of the Congress, and for that reason the favorable consideration of the pending bill is recommended.

Details as to the number of persons still carried in a missing-in-action status are contained in the committee's report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15, Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 147, 1093), as amended by subsection 1 (f), act of April 4, 1953 (Public Law 16, 83d Cong.), is amended by deleting the word "February 1, 1954", and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1955."

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the Senate passed by unanimous consent the bill (S. 2803) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955.

At approximately the same time the House of Representatives passed H. R. 7209, an identical bill.

H. R. 7209 has now been received in the Senate, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 7209 and, in the event of its passage, that the earlier action on S. 2803 be reconsidered and that S. 2803 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be stated by title.

The bill (H. R. 7209) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, extended until July 1, 1955, was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 7209?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2803 is indefinitely postponed.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 870, Senate Resolution 190.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 190) amending the resolution providing for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States, and increasing the limit of expenditures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 190) amending the resolution providing for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States, and increasing the limit of expenditures, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] chairman of the subcommittee, will make the explanation concerning the resolution.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, before I proceed to address myself to the subject matter of the resolution, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "January 31, 1954" and in lieu thereof to insert "February 28, 1954."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The purpose of the amendment is to grant the subcommittee additional time in which to file a preliminary report. Under the original resolution, the subcommittee has until January 31 in which to file such a report, but that does not allow sufficient time, because hearings are being held at present in Boston and will continue to be held there for the remainder of this week. The amendment would simply provide an additional month in which the subcommittee may file its report.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey indicate whether any additional money is being requested in the amendment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No additional money is provided for in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, during the first session of the 83d Congress, the Senate approved a resolution directing that a study and investigation be made of juvenile delinquency in this country.

I call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the fact that in August 1953, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was organized to carry out this mandate.

The junior Senator from New Jersey had the honor to be named chairman of that subcommittee, serving with my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Tennessee, [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

The approval of the original resolution, Senate Resolution 89, which created this subcommittee expressed the grave

concern we all have felt about the rising tide of delinquency among our youth.

I may say that at breakfast this morning, with members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars from my State, I had a conversation with a member of the police department of the city of Newark. He said that the situation with respect to juvenile delinquency in Newark was rapidly becoming worse, and that conditions were well-nigh intolerable.

Our investigations of nearly 5 months demonstrate that the concern manifested about the subject of juvenile delinquency is indeed justified.

To that end I address the Senate today at some length to urge the adoption of an amended resolution, which would extend the life of the subcommittee from January 31, 1954, until January 31, 1955, and allocate $175,000 for that purpose.

Under the terms of the amendment just agreed to, a report of the subcommittee will be filed not later than February 28, 1954.

In this request for an extension of time from less than 5 months of actual operation, I am joined by my 3 colleagues of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, in these early stages of our work, the subcommittee has held public hearings into various national aspects of the problems of juvenile delinquency.

It has heard from the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the belief that we should reexamine our own Federal programs involved in the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

We have conducted hearings at which our major church, civic, and national youth-serving organizations presented their approaches to the problem.

Our subcommittee has held community hearings, with the aid and advice of local community leaders, in Denver and Washington, D. C., and later this week we will visit Boston for another hearing, prior to issuing a report.

This community approach has the blessing and support of President Eisenhower, as well as have the basic objectives of our work.

The President has written me, as chairman, pledging the support of his executive agencies, and applauding our plan for a city-by-city study, on the scene.

We cannot continue this city phase of our hearings without an extension as proposed in the new resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of President Eisenhower's letter to me appear at this point in the RECORD. Actually the letter should be read, but I do not wish to impose upon the time of the Senate, because I know the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is anxious to proceed with the debate on his resolution.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: The subject of juvenile delinquency, which you and your colleagues of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate are now studying, is one of the most complex social problems facing the Nation today. Juvenile delinquency is a problem filled with heartbreak. I know that you share with me the fervent hope that your deliberations will result in suggestions for action which will reduce substantially the incalculable unhappiness which juvenile delinquency now causes our children, their parents, pastors, educators, and all who are concerned with the problem.

In your investigation you may count on the wholehearted assistance of those executive departments which are concerned with the problem. For a number of years, the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in particular, has been collecting information about juvenile delinquency and evaluating the proposals advanced from time to time regarding its alleviation, which should be of value to you.

I am happy to know, too, that the subcommittee proposes to hold hearings in various other cities, including some smaller towns, in an effort to ascertain the effects of juvenile delinquency in specific localities. Although it is a problem of national importance, and one in which the Federal Government properly takes a keen interest, juvenile delinquency does vary from community to community in its nature and extent. Your subcommittee in seeking the concrete facts about delinquent children and youth in particular communities has taken note of that important fact.

It is my hope that one result of the present hearings will be to alert our community leaders and all of our parents to the responsibility that is theirs. I wish you every success in this important investigation.

With best regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I am not an alarmist, nor are my distinguished colleagues.

We do not subscribe to the gloomy prophesy that American youth is deteriorating beyond redemption.

But, Mr. President, we are disturbed by the results of our investigations.

The experience of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency has been brief but intensive.

At this point, Mr. President, I might say, as I said on the floor recently in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], that if the Senate ever made one good investment, it made such an investment last August when it adopted the original resolution, which provided an appropriation of $44,000. The Senate has never spent money appropriated by Congress for a more worthy cause and with more wholesome results.

Our investigations are far from completed, but I should like to give a few highlights of some of the evidence the committee has received to date. The evidence received conclusively establishes that juvenile delinquency is a problem of sharply increasing severity.

Annually, since 1948, both its volume and rate have mounted until it has increased by 30 percent or more.

Younger children in larger numbers are becoming involved in serious crime.

Although individual communities may be excepted, we find that all sections of our country have experienced an aggravated juvenile delinquency problem.

Measured in terms of volume, we are waging a losing battle against juvenile delinquency.

Nationwide juvenile delinquency, as measured by offenders in juvenile courts, increased almost 30 percent between 1948 and 1952, notably in the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital. But even larger rises are occurring in many States and communities. Indeed, I have just been handed a report showing that in 1953 alone, in my own State of New Jersey, juvenile delinquency increased a disturbing 18.6 percent, according to preliminary estimates.

But involvement of younger persons in larger numbers in serious, even violent, forms of crime, is equally ominous. When we think of childhood we think of a carefully sheltered period of youth, learning, and playing—learning to live and loving to play. It is hard for us to realize that children, sometimes of very tender ages, are actually found ever more frequently involved in such serious crimes as housebreaking, personal assaults, narcotic violations, and even murder and rape.

During 1952, 37 percent of all persons arrested for robberies were under 21 years of age—a shocking figure, Mr. President. This young age group accounted for 47 percent of all arrests made for larceny, 68 percent of those for auto theft, and even 35 percent of all arrests for rape.

Testimony presented to the subcommittee indicates that heroin, the drug which has enslaved thousands of young Americans, is being methodically produced and poured into the world's markets by Red China. This Red tide of dope has reached our west coast and is moving eastward.

We have received testimony that New York City has today an estimated 7,500 juvenile addicts, and that city has not yet been hit by the tide from the Far East.

No less than 8 percent of children coming before juvenile courts in Los Angeles County today have had contact with narcotics.

Eighty to ninety percent of all Latin-American boys appearing before the juvenile court in Denver have had such contact.

While there is some variance in the testimony of experts, total evidence indicates that during the past 5 years there has been an increase in drug violations by juveniles in the majority of our large urban centers.

Actually, Mr. President, our subcommittee is more concerned about the future, how we may best handle the new situation, and what increased Communist production means for our young people in the next few years, than we are about current narcotics situation.

But heroin is not the only drug menace to juveniles. Iowa, for example, is an agricultural State. Yet 25 percent of the girls admitted to its State Training School for Girls have used marihuana.

Still other youngsters in search of a thrill, or a kick, as they call it, have turned to barbiturates and amphetamines. A recent investigation in Oklahoma City revealed that 250 juveniles between the ages of 13 and 18 were using those drugs regularly. Apartments were rented and used as "pads" for drug or so-called kick parties. I had never heard the term "pad" before it was mentioned in the testimony. The delin-

quents in this case all came from the better neighborhoods of the city, and not from the wrong side of the tracks.

I am aware that the vast majority of druggists and physicians are reputable representatives of honored professions; but as disclosed in the Oklahoma City investigation the drugs were secured by the children from a few of those willing to sell the welfare of youth for a fast dollar. The subcommittee is now studying proposals which would better protect our young people from this evil practice.

The lawless conduct of juvenile gangs constitutes another serious problem for those interested in children in many communities. I do not refer to innocent play or interest groups of children and adolescents. I am thankful to be able to say there are many more of these. I refer to the organized, predatory gangs which children in some neighborhoods must join for their own protection; gangs in which robberies, extortion, drug traffic, assaults, and sexual irregularities are the order of the day.

Certain large cities, New York and Los Angeles, for example, have made sound starts to bring this problem under control.

Mr. President, I might say that, in the short life of the subcommittee, there has been much action all along the line, because we have furnished some degree of leadership for communities and for States. We have made them feel conscious of the need for action to solve the problem.

However, Mr. President, the gang problem is not restricted to large urban centers. In order to tap grassroots experience on a broad basis, the subcommittee sent letters of inquiry to some 3,000 local police officials, educators, judges, welfare, and mental health officials. Many reported gang problems.

I may quote an example from the reply of a police official in a small city in the State of Washington:

> Gang warfare has reared its ugly head in our community and already reports have reached our ears of a number of beatings having taken place.

He says further:

> Numerous dangerous weapons, which include whips made from car battery cables, car fan belts, along with a large collection of assorted knives and a homemade .22 pistol or two, have been seized.

Obviously, Mr. President, we must find ways to meet this problem on a broader front than through specialized programs in a few urban centers.

In mentioning New York City, Los Angeles, Iowa, and other specific cities or States, I want to make it clear that I am not implying that their problems are more serious than those of other cities or States. Juvenile delinquency is a nationwide problem, Mr. President. Such cities and States are but examples of broadly existing problems and conditions.

I could go on at length about the evidence we have received of many other forms of illegal conduct which is assuming larger proportions among our young people.

From those 3,000 grassroot sources throughout the Nation we have received reports of increased school dropouts, increased truancy, increased use of alcohol by juveniles—indeed, an increase in almost every form of delinquent conduct.

But in the last analysis, Mr. President, the exact forms that serious delinquency takes are unimportant, except as they point to what is wrong, what is causing a small but increasingly large percentage of children in our time to become involved in delinquency and crime. This ominous development is not and cannot be without cause.

In less than 5 months the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency has not been able to produce the whole answer, but many factors—to which I shall refer later—have come to light.

Obviously, juvenile delinquency is symptomatic that something is wrong in the life of a child. Increased juvenile delinquency means that there is something wrong in the lives of more children. We know that juvenile delinquency has its roots in family life and in the life of the neighborhood of which the family is a part.

Many forces which are operating in present-day America work against stable and satisfying family and community life. Let me mention a few of these forces:

We have become a highly mobile people. Such mobility is the product of, and in many ways necessary to, our high industrial and agricultural productivity; but it also uproots families and sends them into new communities, among strange people.

Our vigorous economy draws many mothers into the labor market, where they add to our national production and to the incomes of their own families. But "the latchkey children," as I would choose to call them, of some of these mothers, suffer from a lack of proper care and supervision, as a result.

Modern urban life, with its impersonal relations among neighbors and its many attractions which pull family members away from the home, is also a factor with at least some negatives for the development of strong family life amidst friendly, interested neighbors.

Because of the strained international situation, young people of today find it impossible to look forward with certainty to higher education, to entering a trade or business, to plans for marriage, a home, and family. This results in the development of added restlessness and added tension, and encourages among our young people a philosophy of eat, drink, and be merry.

God grant that this is but a temporary situation, that international tensions will abate, and that the world will find a means to live at peace.

Mr. President, in referring to these forces, it should be made clear that neither mobility, industrialization, modern urban life, nor an uncertain future, alone creates a delinquent child. But these forces do add to insecurity, to loneliness, and to fear. They do detract from the care and supervision of children, and from the development of the close personal relationships through which all of us gain and maintain a sense of acceptance, competency, trust, and confidence in the future.

The evidence before the subcommittee also indicates, Mr. President, that we, as a society, have been deficient in developing and enforcing the laws necessary to better protect children from delinquency. We have been equally deficient in developing the machinery necessary to give help to children who are in trouble.

Early testimony before the subcommittee indicates that much of our basic thinking as to prevention and cure may be misdirected. Challenging questions as to methods and approaches have been raised.

Are we reaching the truly delinquent children with our programs? Or are they beyond the pale in our society?

Is it just a matter of spending more money; or must we consider, as well, using that money to the best advantage?

To be sure, Mr. President, many of our programs may, indeed, be excellently channeled. But if everyone is doing a one hundred percent job, why is delinquency among our young increasing?

The testimony shows that juvenile delinquency is primarily a local problem, although there are significant interstate factors to which I shall refer shortly. Such delinquency develops in a child's own home and community, and must basically be prevented at that level.

But it is no indictment of individual local communities to say that they have not found the answer. After all, the problem is common to all communities. Neither is it an indictment of old and tested methods to say that they do not meet new problems.

What is needed, then, is a new focus upon this problem—a clear cut and factual definition of the problem and a marshaling of community resources to meet it.

Individual communities are experimenting with new techniques and approaches. But no effective way exists for one community to benefit from the successes or failures of another.

Mr. President, I believe that the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency is performing an invaluable and unique service to children by boldly and factually turning the spotlight of public attention upon the problem of juvenile delinquency. America has both the will and the intelligence to whip this problem. Through this subcommittee, the Senate can provide the catalytic agent and the leadership necesary for effective action. Such action on the part of the Senate has, I believe, widespread public support. The public interest which has been demonstrated in the work of this subcommittee has been most heartening to its members. Thousands upon thousands of pieces of mail have been received. Hundreds of letters and telegrams from organizations and individuals have reached the subcommittee, urging that its work be continued. Invitations to hold hearings have been received from dozens of communities.

The same kind of interest and support has been expressed by various public and private officials. The governors of no less that 5 States—Maryland, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Washington, and, I am proud to say—New Jersey—have

loaned personnel, without any cost at all to the Federal Government. It has been most heartening to have these able public servants at our disposal. Without them, we could not have carried out the work on the basis of the appropriation we received last August.

Similar loans have been made by certain private organizations, including the National Probation and Parole Association, the American Public Welfare Association, and the Prisoners' Aid Society of Baltimore.

The problem of juvenile delinquency is not one, however, which can be entirely handled within individual communities or States.

Juvenile delinquency crosses State borders, and the solution of certain aspects of the problem will require direct Federal action.

As among States, for example, we permit the deserting father from one State to find refuge in another.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], joined by the three other members of the subcommittee, has just introduced legislation to help combat this serious contributing factor to delinquency.

We permit the runaway child from one State to be committed as a delinquent to the institution of another State because we lack the machinery to return him to his home.

Each year many hundreds of such runaways are apprehended in single States alone, such as California and Florida.

The subcommittee is now studying alternative approaches to the solution of this interstate problem.

Mr. President, much remains to be done far and beyond what we have been able to accomplish in less than 5 months.

A start has been made and, I believe, a sound one. But, I am convinced that the protection of our children from the menace of delinquency makes it imperative that the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency be enabled to complete its crucial task.

The junior Senator from New Jersey does not believe that admitting to past error necessarily absolves one of all blame. He does believe, however, that confession is good for the soul. He further confesses in all sincerity, at least one error to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I had no idea last spring, when I first introduced Senate Resolution 89, just how complex was the problem my colleagues and I had set out to probe. I had little idea of its magnitude. It took me a month or two with my staff, headed by an eminent lawyer from my State, Mr. Herbert J. Hannoch, to determine the depth of our work.

Unfortunately, I must recite to the Senate from a colloquy during the course of the original debate upon which I entered with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

This is the confession of which I just spoke:

Mr. ELLENDER. Since the Senator from New Jersey is the author of this resolution I have no doubt that he will be appointed a member of the subcommittee. I hope so; and I hope he will come to the Senate next year without a request for more funds.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I sincerely hope that I shall be able to come before the Senate and report exactly the result which the Senator from Louisiana wishes.

The junior Senator from New Jersey publicly recognizes his original error, but he sincerely feels that the good work and the good purpose of this subcommittee must go on in the public interest. As I have said, I had little conception of the magnitude of the task, or I certainly would not have committed myself as I did. Again I say that confession is good for the soul.

Today, Mr. President, we are rightfully concerned about our national security.

But safeguards to our future as a nation of freemen, I submit, cannot be adequately measured by the power of our armed services or by our skill and tenacity in ferreting out subversives, important though these matters be.

Indeed, self-protection against foreign enemies will achieve little of permanent value if that which we seek to safeguard, the welfare of our future citizens, is destroyed by forces operating within our society today.

Our Nation's future in the last analysis depends upon the character, stability, courage, and ideals we are able to impart to our children and to our children's children.

The fight against juvenile delinquency, as I see it, Mr. President, is crucial in our struggle to preserve our American way.

I urge that we give more recognition to the needs of our children. I therefore urge the immediate adoption of the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire the floor in my own right.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks on Senate Resolution 190, which was disposed of a few minutes ago.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY,
January 27, 1954.

The subcommittee, on the basis of investigations conducted to date, is in process of developing legislative proposals with respect to the following matters:

1. RUNAWAY CHILDREN

Thousands of children who run away each year are apprehended in other and often distant States. Frequently such children, for lack of a means to return them home, are committed as delinquents to the institutions in the State where they are apprehended or to the Federal Government. In either case, they acquire a lifelong record as a delinquent quite unnecessarily. In either case, the cost of their care greatly exceeds the sum which would be required to return them home.

2. NONSUPPORT OF MINOR CHILDREN

Tens of thousands of minor children are deprived of parental support each year because deserting fathers move out of State. Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, has already, in behalf of the subcommittee, introduced a bill, S. 2662, dealing with this problem, which has already been referred to the subcommittee. Hearings must be had on this vital legislation.

3. INTERSTATE TRAFFIC IN BLACK-MARKET BABIES

The sale of babies for adoption represents a serious and interstate problem. Unscrupulous operators in this traffic sell babies to the highest bidders without regard to the welfare of either child or prospective adoptive parents. Unfortunate mothers, many of whom are teenagers, are induced to surrender their babies, who are then sold without benefit of any protection under law. Federal legislation will be required to bring this problem under control.

4. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUVENILE COURT CODE

During the course of its hearings on juvenile delinquency in the District of Columbia, the subcommittee is preparing certain amendments which should aid the juvenile court in discharging its important role in the control of juvenile delinquency. We will propose, for example, revisions related to the exchange of information between the juvenile court and other community agencies. Of concern, too, are present provisions related to waivers from juvenile to criminal courts.

5. CONTROL OF THE SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES TO JUVENILES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Our investigations revealed such sales to be widespread in the District. We are now preparing legislative proposals which should enable the problem to be brought under proper control.

The subcommittee has under study certain other matters which may lead to the development of specific legislative proposals following further exploration:

1. THE DYER ACT AS IT APPLIES TO JUVENILES

Fifty-two percent of the some 12,000 arrests made for the theft of automobiles for 1952 were 17 years of age or younger. Many of these youngsters were prosecuted under the Dyer Act because they took a car without the owner's permission across a State line. As a result, many of these youngsters ended up in Federal institutions, 100 and even 1,000 miles away from their own homes. Had these youngsters not crossed a State line they would have been cared for by their own State authorities. Certain modifications of the Dyer Act might result in more effective care to the youngsters at a saving to the Federal Government.

2. HANDLING OF JUVENILE VIOLATORS OF FEDERAL LAWS

Responsibility for the handling of these juveniles is presently divided between the United States attorneys, Federal district courts, the Bureau of Prisons and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. It is believed that more effective and better coordinated handling might result from some changes in procedures provided under present statutes.

3. ROLE OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION IN RELATION TO TELEVISION AND RADIO

Nationwide concern is felt about the possible delinquency producing effects of the crime and violence diet provided youngsters through television and radio programs. The subcommittee is in the process of attempting to evaluate the effects of such programs upon

children and to determine whether or not the laws pertaining to the FCC should be altered in relation to this problem.

4. CONTROL OF SALACIOUS AND PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIALS IN INTERSTATE TRAFFIC

We will shortly develop legislation designed to close obvious gaps in present Federal statutes dealing with interstate transportation of materials which are clearly obscene and pornographic.

The public is justly concerned about the relatively unrestricted transportation and sale of comic books and similar materials which are definitely salacious. The subcommittee is giving study to the possibility that legislative proposals should be offered to assist in the amelioration of this problem.

5. HANDLING OF INDIAN CHILDREN WHO ARE DELINQUENT

This is a matter to which the subcommittee has as yet been unable to give any substantial attention. We are aware, however, that the facilities of certain States are denied Indian children who reside on reservations. It is possible that the handling of these children might be improved through Federal legislation.

6. SALE OF NARCOTICS, BARBITURATES, AND AMPHETAMINES TO JUVENILES

Juvenile drug addiction and the sale of certain other drugs to juveniles constitute a serious problem—and one which is growing. The strengthening of Federal statutes may help in meeting this threat.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, when I came to appoint the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency I did a very unusual thing. I kept it entirely out of politics, and named two Republicans and two Democrats.

I wish to say publicly that never in my 13 years' experience as a United States Senator have I seen a subcommittee do a better job than has been done under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who has just spoken.

We held a hearing at Denver. There it developed, from the testimony of Mr. Keating, the district attorney, that 45 fathers had abandoned their children and fled to other States. It was impossible to return them to the State of Colorado because of the inadequacy of the law.

There is no question that the work of this committee will result in a great burden being lifted from the public welfare and relief rolls. If anyone will read the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover, he will be convinced of the absolute necessity of a committee of this kind. If one will read the testimony given a few days ago he will find that in 1947, 17 percent of stolen automobiles were stolen by juvenile delinquents. Today the percentage is 70 percent. Seventy percent of all the automobiles that are stolen are stolen by minors.

I very much hope that the work of this committee will be continued and that it will not be hampered by lack of funds. It is the calm, considered judgment of the senior Senator from North Dakota that, if anything, we are not asking for enough money. In a matter of such vast importance, which involves the homes and the lives of every man, woman, and child in America, we ought to have been spending this money a long time ago. If anyone has been delinquent, among others are Members of Congress, who a long time ago did not see the great importance of this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The business before the Senate now is the resolution. I hope we can complete action on it before proceeding with another subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to address myself to the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to discuss the juvenile-delinquency problem. I know it is a very important subject; it has been with us for a long time. It is my considered judgment that such evils cannot be cured simply by holding hearings. As the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] has pointed out, juvenile delinquency is a local problem, and about all the subcommittee can do is to dramatize the problem.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. When the distinguished Senator from New Jersey submitted the resolution which initiated his investigation and requested $50,000 for that purpose, I pointed out on the Senate floor that it would be almost a miracle if the Senator did not come back for more money this year. I quote from the colloquy which ensued between us last year. The Senator from New Jersey said:

> Mr. President, it is my hope that if I may have the privilege of serving on the subcommittee, we shall not use all of the $44,000, because I think we shall receive aid from agencies of the States and from agencies of the Federal Government, which will make unnecessary the employment of all the contemplated personnel.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I should prefer to continue with my remarks. I shall yield later.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I merely wanted to say that we have not used all of the money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana does not desire to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. All except $1,500. I am now quoting from my own statement:

> Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I will say to my distinguished friend from New Jersey that I shall be the most surprised man in the United States if such a thing shall occur, because, as a rule, every dollar appropriated is expended.
>
> The Senator assures us that the amount of money being sought will be used for the employment of the persons indicated on page 4 of the report, up to January 31, 1954.
>
> Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct.
>
> The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.
>
> Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further?
>
> Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield.
>
> Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator give us any assurance that the subcommittee will complete its work on or before January 31, 1954?
>
> Mr. HENDRICKSON. I can give assurance, with the understanding, of course, that I shall be a member of the subcommittee—if I have the good fortune to be a member of it—

Of course, the distinguished Senator is not only a member of the subcommittee, but he is its chairman. I continue to quote—

> that I shall insist that we complete our work by the time mentioned.
>
> Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator will recall that some time ago, when we were considering resolutions providing money for the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, it was pointed out that that committee leads all other committees in the amount of money used for investigation purposes, and my recollection is that the amount was in excess of half a million dollars.

Mr. President, I wish to point out again to the Senate that each standing committee receives approximately $95,000 yearly for its normal operations. With that amount of money they are empowered to employ 4 experts and 6 clerks. The money asked for by this resolution is in addition to the $95,000. When the figures are added up the Committee on the Judiciary will exceed the basic committee allowance of $95,000 by almost $600,000. That amount of money is over and above the sum provided for each standing committee.

Mr. President, I have never been opposed to any of the so-called special committees. However, unlike the old soldier who never dies but fades away, these committees not only never die but they enliven as time goes on; each year they become bigger and healthier—staff-wise.

This new request for money is made notwithstanding the fact that my friend from New Jersey stated last year that if the Senate granted his subcommittee $44,000 he could complete the job, and he assured us that he would file his report on or before January 31, 1954.

What are the facts? They are just what I anticipated. The Senator from New Jersey now comes before the Senate and asks, not for $44,000, but for $175,000. For what purpose does he ask the money?

The purpose of the subcommittee, as I understand the statement which has been made by my friend from New Jersey, is to bring the problem of juvenile delinquency to the attention of the various communities. I believe the problem is before them now; they know about it. It strikes me that if it is necessary to dramatize the problem further, in order to awaken the people of the local communities to action, it can be done with much less money than $175,000.

I have before me the budget which was submitted by the subcommittee. Legal and investigative costs represent one item. I may say, Mr. President, that the budget is no different from budgets made up by past special committees. The men are all so-called experts. They are professional investigators. We have them on Capitol Hill, and we have had them here for many years. They have a

knack of being able to sell almost any proposal to some Senators in order to create these special committees, replete with lucrative positions for professional investigators. We wake up later to find that the professional investigators are concerned only with perpetuating their jobs. That is what is happening.

As I pointed out on several occasions, the expenses of investigations have increased in the past 10 years more than 1,000 percent. Yet, Mr. President, we hear some executive departments condemned because their expenses have increased 2 or 3 or 4 percent.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Listen to the figures in this budget, Mr. President, made up by these professionals. I am sure this budget was not prepared by my good friend from New Jersey.

Under the heading "Legal and investigative," in order to carry on an investigation, which is more or less dramatic in nature, there are 3 lawyers—a general counsel whose gross salary will be $11,646, an assistant counsel whose salary will be $10,068, and an assistant counsel whose salary will be $9,073.03.

Five investigators whose salary will be $7,055 each.

Listen to this, Mr. President: Under the heading "Editorial and research" there will be an editorial director whose salary will be $10,566 and 4 research assistants at $7,055 apiece.

Under "Administrative and clerical" a chief clerk at a salary of $6,481.

Five stenographers at $4,091 each.

Assistant clerk—file clerk—at a salary of $3,422.

Travel, inclusive of field investigations and field hearings, $25,000.

Hearings, inclusive of reporters' fees, $15,000.

Witness fees and expenses, $2,000.

Let me invite the attention of the Senator from New Jersey to the fact that he indicated, when the original resolution was under consideration last year, that he did not expect to spend the amount of money which the Senate voted because he hoped and felt that he would get full cooperation from the States and from Federal agencies. Evidently he is not getting such full cooperation, since there is an item of witness fees to the tune of $2,000.

Then there is an item for stationery and office supplies amounting to $1,500.

Communications, telephone and telegraph, $7,000.

Newspapers, magazines, and documents, $500.

Contingent fund, $1,000.

The grand total is $176,334.

Mr. President, as I have just pointed out, here is a committee which, following its inception last August, started its work, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee stated, only last October. I do not want to have the committee discontinued. I know it deals with a very popular subject, but I would ask that the amount of money be reduced. The only good which can come from the investigation, as I have pointed out, and as I am sure my distinguished friend from New Jersey will admit, is to bring the subject to the attention of the public, to get radio, television, and newspapers interested in it—focus the spotlight of public opinion on it—in the hope that some corrective measures can be initiated—that is all.

I say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that we could cut in half the amount requested and get the same result. But I shall not ask that. I am simply going to move that the amount requested be reduced to $100,000. I believe that amount is more than ample to carry out the work which the distinguished Senator from New Jersey says is necessary.

Let us bear in mind that this is purely and simply a local problem, and the only thing the committee can do is to bring it to the fore by means of informing the people in the hope that fathers and mothers and others in the various communities will get together and make an attempt to eradicate the evils which may exist in their midst. That is all that can be accomplished through congressional investigations.

Mr. President, I was informed by one of the investigators—I think he was the chief counsel—that one of the main purposes was to hold meetings in various communities in the United States, and that it was the purpose of the committee to hold such hearings and prepare reports concerning conditions existing in those communities. I am satisfied that there are persons in the Government who are well qualified to draft such reports. Why, therefore, cannot representative citizens from these communities present in writing their views as to how the problem can be solved, without the committee having to go into the field to hold hearings? Why bring the mountain to Mohammed, so to speak?

As I have said, I personally believe the funds requested should be curtailed by the amount I have suggested; I believe the sum of $100,000, which I have recommended, will be ample to do the work.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I would not admit for one minute that the sole purpose of the committee is to dramatize the serious conditions in the field of juvenile delinquency. We have already discovered some very important facts which will lead to recommendations for legislation. I should like to mention the fields we intend to cover.

Runaway children, which is an interstate problem.

Nonsupport of minor children whose parents go from one State to another.

Black market in babies. That was an amazing and shocking thing to learn about. I did not think for one moment that such a thing existed in this country. The solution of this problem will require Federal legislation.

Here in the District of Columbia, right under the Capitol dome, we found shocking things which need correction and which can be corrected only by legislation by the Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does the Senator expect to make a Federal problem out of the things he has just mentioned? What is his theory?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. We have not yet started to write the proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has not the Senator sufficient information now to be able to propose legislation and present it to the appropriate committees so that those committees can work on the subject?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The staff is working on a report at this time which will incorporate the recommendations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has not the Senator sufficient evidence now so that lawyers can draft the proposed legislation?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At present the staff is working on proposed legislation. I have not seen the proposals, but I feel certain that they will be submitted to Congress at this session.

Then we are investigating the situation arising from improper liquor control; the absence of control over the sale of alcoholic beverages to juveniles in the District of Columbia. That is a matter on which Congress should act.

The Dyer Act, for example, needs certain improvements. It is necessary to find a way through legislation to handle juvenile violators of Federal law. Also, it will be necessary to legislate, sooner or later, in respect to Federal communications as they affect television and radio.

I could continue to list a number of items which will require legislation by Congress. If the subcommittee is continued, Senators may be assured that sound proposals for legislation will be presented to Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], on page 2, line 2, to strike out "$175,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$100,000."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the question very briefly. Since the creation of the subcommittee and its entrance into the field of juvenile delinquency and its causes, the subcommittee has called to the attention of law enforcement authorities in various large cities of the Nation, and to the attention of other persons concerned with juvenile delinquency, problems within that field, both in the States and in the cities.

I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for being ever mindful of the huge expenditures of Government funds, and for his service in bringing such information to the attention not only of Members of the Senate, but also to the public in general. Nevertheless, in this particular field, it is known that child delinquency is a serious problem and that it is on the increase. Our reformatories are filling up, and we know that reformatories are not the best educational institutions for children. Therefore, the correction of juvenile delinquency is a task facing our communities, and I believe the subcommittee has awakened the law enforcement officials of the Nation, and also parents and school authorities, so that they may take

appropriate action to combat this growing evil.

For that reason, I wish to support the subcommittee in its request for a continuation of its investigation of the problem of juvenile delinquency. At the same time I wish again to commend the Senator from Louisiana for what he is endeavoring to do.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As a member of the subcommittee, I wish to say a few words in support of the request made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, for the amount he is asking for the continuation of the operations of the subcommittee for one year. I am not familiar with the details of the subcommittee's budget, but it is my understanding that it provides for a continuation of substantially the same number of employees with which the subcommittee is currently operating. I know that all the employees now with the subcommittee are busily occupied and are doing good work. I do not see how the subcommittee could operate with fewer personnel.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana first points out the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary has $95,000 with which to conduct its business, aside from the amounts appropriated to special committees, and he suggests that some of the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary might be used by the subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency, or that some of the funds of the Committee on the Judiciary might be made available to the subcommittee.

The Committee on the Judiciary reports more bills, I believe, than perhaps all the other Senate committees combined. Probably it is true that those bills primarily are private claim bills and immigration bills; nevertheless, I think about 50 percent of the total number of bills reported to the Senate are reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I do not mean that all the bills reported by the Committee on the Judiciary are of great importance, but they require a large amount of work on the part of the staff of the committee, which is always very busy.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to call attention to the fact that before the Reorganization Act was approved, I served as chairman of the Senate Committee on Claims. At that time Senators handled all claims bills themselves, without the assistance of a coterie of lawyers. At that time—that is, prior to 1946—the number of bills reported to the Senate by the Committee on Claims was more than 50 percent of the total number of bills reported by all committees.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That may have been the case; but I certainly wish to assure the Senator from Louisiana that the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary is a very busy one. The committee has a large amount of legislation to attend to, and a great many hearings are held. I think it would be very difficult for Senators themselves to handle the bills, without the assistance of the staff we have.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may point out that the bills to which the Senator refers, the private claim bills, were handled by Senators themselves prior to the Reorganization Act. Each Senator was assigned a certain number of bills for investigation. We had no attorneys or clerks to look into them. We had to do the work ourselves. As I have said, the number of bills reported by the Committee on Claims, as a result of the work of Senators themselves, amounted to more than 50 percent of the total number of bills reported to the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In any event, I feel certain the Senator from Louisiana would not want the members of the Committee on the Judiciary to have to do the routine work that is now done by members of the staff. I believe the Senator will agree that the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary is earning its way. If the Senator would examine the work that is being done by the Committee on the Judiciary, I am sure he would reach that conclusion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may point out this difference: Prior to the Reorganization Act, all claims were examined and passed upon by Senators, each Senator having been assigned a certain number of bills. But today the claims are passed upon by 4 or 5 lawyers who work for the committee; they do all that work.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I might call attention to the fact that while the lawyers may get the facts and analyze the evidence that is presented, each claim bill is passed upon by a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who in turn makes a recommendation to the full committee. Each claim bill is explained to the full committee, at least, most of them are.

But that is somewhat beside the point. I brought up the matter in order to make clear that, from the regular staff of the Committee on the Judiciary, there is no assistance available to the special subcommittee investigating problems of juvenile delinquency.

I believe the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who is the chairman, has been economical in the way he has handled the subcommittee. Certainly he has conducted the work of the subcommittee on a nonpartisan basis. The members of the staff who have been secured are experts in the field in which the committee has jurisdiction and is making its investigations. I think that every dollar appropriated to the subcommittee will return dividends many times over. There is no committee of the Senate in which there is more interest today than there is in the subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency.

The subcommittee is looking into a great many matters, is holding hearings, and is taking evidence on questions with which the Federal Government has some concern. For instance, there is on the statute books a Youth Correction Act. The operation of that act, how it can be improved, and how it can be held up as a model that States might wish to adopt for themselves, are factors which have a very important bearing on the question of juvenile delinquency.

Similarly, the Federal Government is concerned in the fields of narcotics, the operation of the Children's Bureau, the question of runaway parents, the Dyer Act, and the White Slave Act.

The committee has also received testimony with respect to the need for schools, because the existence of inadequate school facilities has an effect on the problem of juvenile delinquency. It has been recommended by the President of the United States that there be Federal assistance in the construction of school buildings, and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has introduced a bill for that purpose.

Mr. President, there are many questions in connection with juvenile delinquency, in which Federal problems are involved, and I am sure that the requested appropriation will be well used. The response from the city, county, and State officials to the work of the committee has been great and sympathetic. I hope that the committee will be allowed to continue its work for another year, and that it will secure the requested appropriation, which I am sure will be used to good advantage.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to prolong the argument on the resolution; but I do wish to direct a few remarks to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

If the Senate desires to have the investigation continued, then I am sure the Senate does not want to cripple the committee. If the committee is worth its salt, then it will need the money which is being sought. The subcommittee's budget was presented to the Committee on the Judiciary, which reported the resolution unanimously. The budget was then submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Again a distinguished committee of the Senate reported the resolution unanimously, in each case granting the amount which was requested, namely, $175,000.

I commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his very careful scrutiny of the budget and appropriations in the Congress. I admire the Senator. I know he has contributed much toward bringing about economy in national expenditures. However, when it comes to being economy minded I do not yield to the Senator from Louisiana, for since the Senator from New Jersey entered upon his duties as a Member of the United States Senate his record discloses that he has always favored economy. I would not ask for the amount requested if I did not think the subcommittee would spend it judiciously and in the service of the people. I would not ask the Senate to appropriate any money unless I thought it was going to be spent for very good purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator please justify the request for money for research work? What is the purpose of the research?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The committee cannot do the necessary work in some 13 or 14 large cities without an adequate research staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are not the investigators going to do that work? And why does the committee in addition need three lawyers?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I may state to the Senator from Louisiana that in our work up to date the committee has had about five investigators. Four of those investigators were loaned to us by States on a voluntary basis. The use of the investigators did not cost the Senate of the United States 1 penny. However, the States cannot continue lending a committee of the Senate employees who have other regular duties.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the States are the ones interested in the problem; and the Senator told the Senate last year that it was his intention and his hope to have the States do the work. Are not the States going to continue to do the work?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The States did contribute aid, and they were very generous in giving assistance to the Senate committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are not the States going to continue to be generous? After all, it is their problem.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It is partly their problem. Again I disagree with the Senator from Louisiana, when he states that it is entirely a local problem. All levels of government have a great responsibility in the matter of juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, in order not to prolong the debate, let me say that I hope the Senate will defeat the amendment, because not to do so would hinder the committee in the work which it must undertake.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland obtained the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland defer long enough for the Senate to take action on the pending amendment? The Senate has before it a resolution and a proposed amendment. If the Senator from Maryland will defer, I think the Senate can get action on the pending question. Then I should like to have a quorum call.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Maryland was about to say that if he could yield for the purpose of having a vote taken on the pending question, he would be very happy to do so, provided he did not lose the floor.

Mr. THYE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland be privileged to yield so that the Senate may take action on the pending amendment and also on the resolution, and also for the purpose of having a quorum call.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I object.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I may say to the acting majority leader that I am yielding the floor for the purpose of a quorum call, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the order of business now before the Senate——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry to propound. Has the Chair ruled on the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I ask the Chair which Senator objected?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] objected to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has been recognized and has the floor. Does the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield only upon condition that I not lose the floor.

Mr. THYE. The unanimous-consent request has been objected to. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that if he will withhold his statement, and permit the Senate to act on the resolution, I am confident the Presiding Officer will recognize the Senator from Maryland immediately following action on the resolution and the amendment, because the next order of business will be the Bricker joint resolution. A statement to that effect was made on yesterday. Today the Senate is acting under unanimous consent to complete action on three resolutions and then proceed to consider the Bricker amendment. I am confident that the Chair will recognize the distinguished Senator from Maryland and permit him to proceed with his address on the Bricker amendment, if the Senate may be privileged to proceed with and act on the resolution and the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I accede to the request of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Maryland. I desire to state that I am only carrying out the expressed wish the majority leader made not only last evening, but today.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, in order that Senators may be present when the Senate takes a vote on the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	Knowland
Anderson	Frear	Kuchel
Barrett	Fulbright	Langer
Beall	George	Lehman
Bennett	Gillette	Lennon
Bricker	Goldwater	Long
Burke	Gore	Magnuson
Bush	Green	Malone
Butler, Md.	Griswold	Mansfield
Butler, Nebr.	Hayden	Martin
Byrd	Hendrickson	Maybank
Capehart	Hickenlooper	McCarran
Carlson	Hill	McCarthy
Case	Hoey	McClellan
Chavez	Holland	Millikin
Clements	Hunt	Morse
Cooper	Ives	Mundt
Cordon	Jackson	Murray
Daniel	Jenner	Neely
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	Potter
Dworshak	Kefauver	Purtell
Eastland	Kennedy	Robertson
Ellender	Kerr	Russell
Ferguson	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Schoeppel	Stennis	Welker
Smathers	Symington	Wiley
Smith, Maine	Thye	Williams
Smith, N. J.	Upton	Young
Sparkman	Watkins	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to Senate Resolution 190, on page 2, striking out, in line 2, the figures "$175,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$100,000."

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That section 3 of Senate Resolution 89, 83d Congress, agreed to June 1, 1953 (authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The committee shall make a preliminary report of its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate not later than February 28, 1954, and shall make a final report of such findings and recommendations to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1955."

SEC. 2. The limitation of expenditures under such Senate Resolution 89 is increased by $175,000, and such sum together with any unexpended balance of the sum previously authorized to be expended under such resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on June 18, as may be seen from the Senate calendar on page 13, I entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 1 was agreed to. The parliamentary situation is as follows:

At the time the committee amendment was agreed to, the Senate was proceeding under a unanimous-consent calendar call. The committee amendment was presented and adopted by the Senate at that time. I was then acting majority leader, but was not in the Chamber at the time. When I returned

to the Chamber, I checked with the Parliamentarian my own views as to the situation which would prevail on the floor of the Senate if that action were allowed to stand. The situation would be that the Senate would be foreclosed from amending the committee amendment as it was reported from the Judiciary Committee. In order to give the Senate an opportunity to deal with the situation de novo, I entered notice that I would move to reconsider. Within the past couple of days I have discussed this question with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who agrees with me that in order to give the Senate an opportunity to meet this situation section by section, he will not oppose my motion, but will join with me and will support the motion to reconsider.

With that explanation, I now move that the Senate reconsider the action which it took on June 18 in agreeing to the committee amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a House bill which has just come over? It is identical with a bill which the Senate passed earlier in the day.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield provided I do not lose the floor by so yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the minority leader listen to an explanation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let the objection stand for the present. I shall be glad to discuss the question with the Senator later.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I propose to offer to the pending measure, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table. The amendment is very simple. It provides:

In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the committee on page 3, lines 5 to 19, inclusive, insert the following:

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us to the pending joint resolution, and ask that it may be read for the information of the Senate, and be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place it is proposed to insert the following new section, viz:

SEC. 3. When the Senate consents to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if I may make an explanation, the amendment would follow the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and would be added as another section to the joint resolution as reported.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the debate which opens today revolves around the most important and delicate constitutional question of our generation. The question has engendered sharp differences of opinion. That is because it goes to the basic rights of the people, particularly with respect to their right of local self-government.

The debate will be of a very serious nature, and I hope it will be commensurately profound. It is my hope that all personalities may be avoided and that acrimony may not creep in; to the end that what we do on the floor of the Senate will be constructive, enlightening to our people, and for the good of our country.

I shall attempt to present, in a manner understandable by persons not skilled in the law, the principles involved in the Bricker amendment, to which I wholeheartedly give my support.

Before I proceed, let me say that I regret I am unable to agree with the President of the United States, with many of my colleagues, and with many of my friends with reference to the questions involved. I regret that, but I can only do here what my conscience dictates is right.

What is the Bricker amendment? The Bricker amendment consists of three principal sections, as follows:

SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

SEC. 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

Mr. President, I shall proceed with a section-by-section explanation of the Bricker amendment.

The first section—"A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect"—is a very clear and concise statement. If adopted it would put at rest the contention that the treaty power is paramount to the Constitution of the United States.

Is it necessary to insert into the Constitution of the United States such a provision?

In years past, Mr. President, the Supreme Court of the United States on several occasions, in my opinion, answered that question by saying no; it is not necessary.

For example, in the Cherokee Tobacco case the Supreme Court stated:

It need hardly be said that a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument. This results from the nature and fundamental principles of our Government.

Again, in 1890, in the case of Geofroy against Riggs, the Supreme Court stated:

It would not be contended that it (the treaty power) extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent.

However, in 1920 the Supreme Court decided a case known as Missouri against Holland. That case wrote into the law of the land two new and, I must say, somewhat startling doctrines.

In the first place, it held that the Congress of the United States has the right, under the Constitution, to enact legislation pursuant to treaty which it is unable to enact in the absence of a treaty. In other words, it held that the Federal power could be enlarged by pulling itself up by its own bootstraps.

It also stated, or if it did not so state it very strongly intimated, that the sixth article of the Constitution, the treaty-making article, means that for a treaty to be valid it need only be created or formed under the authority of the Constitution of the United States; whereas for an act of Congress to be valid it must be passed pursuant to the Constitution of the United States.

That case was followed in 1936 by the case of United States against Curtiss-Wright Corporation. In that case, at least by dictum, if not by ruling, it was said that the treatymaking power was not granted by the Constitution, is not a delegated power, but is inherent in the Government.

If that be true, we would have no constitutional government at all, treaty-wise, and the right to make treaties would be without limit and completely unrestrained. It would not be a granted power; it would be a power inherent in the Government itself. I have heard that suggested on this floor within the past 6 months.

Mr. President, in addition to the holdings in these two cases, the late Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, in addressing the American Society of International Law, in 1929, said:

If we take the Constitution to mean what it says, it gives in terms to the United States the power to make treaties. It is a power that has no explicit limitation attached to it, and so far there has been no disposition to find in anything relating to the external concerns of the Nation the limitation to be implied.

Now there is, however, a new line of activity which has not been very noticeable in

this country but which may be in the future, and this may give rise to new questions as to the extent of the treatymaking power. I have been careful in what I have said to refer to the external concerns of the Nation. I should not care to voice any opinion as to an implied limitation on the treatymaking power. The Supreme Court has expressed a doubt whether there could be any such; that is, the doubt has been expressed in one of its opinions. But, if there is a limitation to be implied, I should say it might be found in the nature of the treatymaking power.

It is plain from that statement of the late Chief Justice that he believed the case of Missouri against Holland established the doctrine that if a treaty is made under the authority of the United States it may not be necessary that it abide by the limitations in the Constitution of the United States, which refer to matters other than treaties.

Also, Mr. President, we have the remarks of the Honorable John Foster Dulles, our present Secretary of State, made at Louisville on April 12, 1952:

The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power, liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution, treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are, indeed, more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body; and they can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. What is the date of the Dulles speech?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It was made on April 12, 1952.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in understanding that the Secretary of State, since April 1952, has reversed himself?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Maryland have any notion at all as to what the basis of that reversal might be?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No, I really do not know.

Mr. MORSE. Is the reversal as unequivocal as is the statement of the doctrine which the Senator has just read from the Louisville speech?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In my opinion, it is not.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator going to advise the Senate as to the language the Secretary of State used in what we are calling his reversal of opinion?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should be very happy to supply that language to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I think it should be in the RECORD. I think both dates should be in the RECORD, the date of the enunciation of the doctrine and the date of the reversal of his position. I would not want to imply that an election came in between, but it is, nevertheless, interesting to know the dates.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Maryland does not intend any imputation with reference to the Secretary of State. I shall give for the RECORD the date of his appearance before our committee.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator permit me, goodnaturedly, to say that I would certainly relieve him of any imputation with reference to what the Secretary of State said, but the representative of the Independent Party is willing to assume it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Let me, first, put this into the RECORD, and then I shall be happy to yield.

During the course of the hearings the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] asked the Secretary of State this question:

Senator WILEY. Mr. Secretary, there has been quoted heretofore the statement that you made in Louisville in 1952, that you are pretty well acquainted with.

Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir.

Senator WILEY. I read it. You said:

"The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power, liable to abuse. Treaties make international law, and also they make domestic law."

Do you want to amplify that much of that statement?

Secretary DULLES. Senator WILEY, what I said there is the same thing which I said in the statement which I have given, namely, that all power is liable to abuse. Certainly the treatymaking power, like every other power given by our Constitution, is a power which is susceptible to abuse. I believe that there is required constant vigilance to prevent abuse of this power as every other power. You will recall in that address I also pointed out that——

The CHAIRMAN. Have you a copy of that address here?

Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you like to make it a part of the record?

Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir. I pointed out, "There is room for honest difference of opinion as to whether our Constitution needs to be amended as proposed or whether the President and the Senate should retain their present powers for possible emergency use, and at the same time insuring more vigilance to the end that treaties will not undesirably or unnecessarily encroach on constitutional distributions of power. Whatever one's views on this matter, it is surely in the public interest that the whole problem should be thoroughly explored."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield for a question.

Mr. COOPER. I address my question to both the distinguished Senator from Maryland and the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

I heard the Louisville speech of Mr. Dulles to which reference has been made. I am sure I am the only Member of this body who heard the speech. The reason why I rise is to assure that it is kept in its proper context.

I ask if the Senator from Oregon is suggesting there has been a shift in the position either for or against the Bricker amendment, or whether he asks if Mr. Dulles has changed his position on the effect of treaty law.

Mr. MORSE. It was whether he had shifted the position he took in his statement in Louisville.

Mr. COOPER. There was nothing in his speech at Louisville to indicate approval or disapproval at that time of Senate Joint Resolution 1. He was not speaking on that subject. A reading of his entire speech indicates——

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding that the Bricker amendment was not involved in the Louisville speech. All he was talking about was his notion as to the meaning of the treaty-making power under the Constitution. Subsequently the Bricker amendment came before the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. The speech in Louisville has been quoted again and again, or rather the paragraph of his speech which has just been read has been quoted out of context and some persons may believe that the speech was one supporting Senate Joint Resolution 1. That is incorrect.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will permit me, I desire to assure the Senator from Kentucky that I understand the Bricker amendment was not even before the Senate when the Dulles speech in 1952 was made. The Dulles speech was a discussion by the distinguished lawyer as to his legal views with reference to the treatymaking power under the Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. I wanted to have it made clear that there was no announcement of his position, with respect to the Bricker amendment.

Mr. MORSE. It is also my understanding that, subsequent to his Louisville speech, after the Bricker amendment had been introduced in the Senate, the Secretary of State testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations or the Committee on the Judiciary—I do not know which—and, in his testimony, expressed views as to the legal implications of the treaty-making power under the Constitution which were somewhat at variance with the views he expressed at Louisville.

That was why I asked the Senator from Maryland if I was correct in my understanding; and if I was correct, if he would place in the RECORD what he considered to be an inconsistent statement on the legal theory. That is what the Senator from Maryland has been purporting to do.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I may say to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Kentucky that at the time of the Louisville speech, Senate Joint Resolution 130 was pending before the Senate, but I do not believe any hearings had been held on it.

Be that as it may, my purpose today is to show, through the illustrations I have brought to the attention of the Senate, that this clause is necessary. There appears to be a reasonable apprehension in the minds of very thoughtful men that in the absence of such a clause, the treaty power may be construed to be unlimited.

Section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 provides:

A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

For the purpose of discussing the second section of the Bricker amendment, it is necessary that we break that sentence down and treat it in this manner:

A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation.

The purpose of that provision is to prevent a treaty from becoming effective as internal law in the United States without implementation by legislation. In other words, it is to prevent what are commonly called self-executing treaties which may operate internally from being made by the Chief Executive and the United States Senate.

There are valid reasons why there should be such a provision in the Constitution. In the first place, I think every citizen is entitled to know, when a treaty has been negotiated by the President of the United States and ratified by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate, whether the treaty from that time onward is the law of the land so far as it applies internally.

Let me illustrate that point. When the United Nations Charter was negotiated by President Truman and was ratified by the Senate, section 55 of the Charter dealt very extensively with internal rights within the United States, one such right being the right to hold property irrespective of race or color.

A case arose in the State of California, known as Fujii against California, involving that section of the Charter. The lower court held that the United Nations Charter was a treaty of the United States, and as such was the supreme law of the land and was self-executing. The result was that as to certain land tenures in the State of California, the law in California was not what it had been prior to the ratification of the United Nations Charter, and that aliens could hold land in the State of California irrespective of a law which had been passed after a public referendum in that State.

The Fujii case was appealed to the Supreme Court of California. That court held that the United Nations Charter was not self-executing, but needed legislation by the Congress of the United States to implement it before it could become effective as internal law within the United States. However, the opinion clearly indicates that the court was impressed by what it called the "moral commitment" of the Charter.

Thus we have a case of the people within a State not knowing when a law becomes effective in their State and there can be no way of telling when it becomes effective until a court of last resort has said that a treaty is or is not self-executing.

I think it is in the interest of all the people that no treaty affecting domestic affairs shall be self-executing until it has been implemented by legislation, or that no treaty shall become self-executing unless Congress shall so provide in its resolution of ratification.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did I understand the Senator from Maryland to say, with reference to the case which he cited, namely, the case relating to the right of aliens to ownership of land on equal terms, that under section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, which he is discussing, it would be necessary, after a treaty as a whole had been ratified, that two further steps be taken; namely, first, that Congress, including the House of Representatives, should pass enabling legislation; and second, that the various States, through their State legislatures, should also act?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; I make this statement: That the legislation could be passed either before or after ratification. Ordinarily, it need be only legislation by Congress; but if the States have theretofore legislated on the question, such legislation would be valid and no further legislation would be necessary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand the Senator from Maryland to say that all that would be needed under section 2 would be to have both Houses of Congress declare such a treaty effective as internal law?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No. In some instances, such as the ownership of property by aliens within the United States, it might be necessary to have—indeed, it would be necessary to have—an act of the State legislature to authorize such ownership.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is exactly the point I wanted to get at.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator from Illinois permit me to finish my statement?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. But in days past, the Department of State always went to great pains to negotiate treaties involving those few areas on the basis of internal reciprocity. Indeed, the case of Geofroy versus Riggs, so frequently pointed to by opponents of the proposed Bricker amendment as being in support of their position that the amendment is not necessary, contains such a provision for internal reciprocity.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Suppose the subject matter of the treaty was not covered in the specific delegation of powers to the Federal Government, either directly or by rulings of a court in an implied fashion, and, therefore, presumably under the 10th amendment, was reserved to the States, would it be the feeling of the Senator from Maryland that then not only would an act of Congress be required, under section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, but also action would be required by each of the 48 State legislatures?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall cover that point in discussing the "which" clause.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a very crucial issue.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that it is a very crucial issue. It is the one field, of the many fields which have been suggested, where there may be some legitimate complaint that the proposed Bricker amendment may be cumbersome. I do not know of any other field in which it may be cumbersome.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Maryland say that separate action would be required by each of the 48 State legislatures in order that a treaty dealing with matters not specifically delegated to the Federal Government might become effective as internal law throughout the country as a whole?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I would not say that, because, if the Senator from Illinois will look at the hearings, he will find in the very few instances referred to that in most of the States of the Union laws of that type have already been passed. With the exception of six or seven States, such a treaty would become effective as internal law without any further legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But ownership of property by aliens is only one of the multitude of issues in which jurisdiction has not been granted to the Federal Government by the Constitution, which presumably, under the 10th amendment, unless the implied powers provision is considered, rests in the States.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not know of any multitude of instances, and I do not believe the Senator can point out a multitude of instances. As I have said, the instances are few, indeed.

Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that in the Takahashi case, a very recent case, the Government of the United States contended that all matters concerning aliens were exclusively within the Federal jurisdiction. Certainly one of the principal opponents of the Bricker amendment, Mr. Perlman, was on the brief in that case. The Supreme Court held that matters concerning aliens were within the Federal jurisdiction, and that there need not be legislation by the several States in that field. Now, however, Mr. Perlman is pointing out just the reverse of the contention he made before the Supreme Court of the United States. He now says it is a matter of local concern and would need the ratification by the legislatures of the 48 States.

Mr. President, the all-important "which" clause, which is the second clause of section 2, reads as follows:

A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

The second clause of section 2, commonly called the "which" clause, is designed to reverse legislatively the holding of Mr. Justice Holmes in the case of Missouri against Holland, which, as I have stated, makes it possible for the Congress to legislate on matters after the making of a treaty which it could not have constitutionally legislated upon prior to the making of the treaty.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Can the Senator advise me whether the "which" clause was part of the original Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 before it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

or whether the "which" clause was added in the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The "which" clause was added by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is what I understood.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The "which" clause was a committee amendment. It was not in the original draft of the Bricker amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Maryland for the information.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Although the "which" clause was not in the original amendment when it was introduced as Senate Joint Resolution 1, there was a provision in that amendment, which was stricken out in the Committee on the Judiciary, in regard to the control of domestic affairs by international organizations. Such an amendment would accomplish practically the same objective.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. May I ask my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Ohio, if the language to which he refers reads:

> A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress?

That has nothing to do with the "which" clause?

Mr. BRICKER. No; the "which" clause was not in the original amendment; but I felt that the danger which existed was taken care of by the other language.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, it has been stated by the opponents of the Bricker amendment that the "which" clause would take us back, treaty-wise, to the days of the Articles of Confederation and make it impossible to have a treaty without the concurrence of the legislatures of the 48 States. I know none of us desire that, and I think I have demonstrated that the Bricker amendment would not do any such thing. However, there are a great many people in the United States who, in my humble opinion, need to go back to the days of the Confederation or to the days just prior to the formation of our Constitution, and give thought to the blood and treasure which went into the establishment of the constitutional system under which we live.

Just go back to those days, if you will, Mr. President, and envision the 13 scattered Colonies along the Atlantic Coast of the United States, each one supreme in its own right, each jealous of its prerogatives and rights as a sovereign, each mindful of the fact that the people within its borders had gone through a bloody war in order to gain the right to local self-government.

Never in the history of the world have there been people more jealous of their new-found power than the early colonial peoples of the United States of America. Those people wanted to make sure, above everything else, that when they formed a government it would be a government which possessed no more power than was absolutely necessary to permit it to function properly.

The first feeble attempt at government by those colonial people was the Articles of Confederation. The Articles of Confederation failed because they had not granted sufficient of their new-found power, of which they were so jealous, to their government to make it workable. A plan was then formulated to have a convention meet in Philadelphia to revamp the Articles of Confederation—not to form a new union, but to make the old Articles of Confederation workable. That convention wrote the Constitution of the United States. Under that charter of liberty they set up a government of limited powers, with the express provision that all powers not therein specifically granted to the Federal Government, nor denied to the States, belong to the States or to the people.

Mr. President, if we do not have the "which" clause, we shall be in grave danger of losing the most precious possession of the people of the United States, namely, the right to local self-government guaranteed under the 10th amendment. What more precious right is there in the entire American system than the right to determine for one's self, within his own local community, what is good for that community?

Mr. President, if we do not have the "which" clause or some similar clause, then it will be possible to do what Secretary Dulles said could be done, namely, to make treaties which could cut across the basic rights of the people.

I say the people of the United States should think long and hard about the situation. I do not say to my colleagues that the Bricker amendment is the only solution to the problem, but I say to my colleagues that in our hearts every one of us realizes that a serious problem exists; every one of us knows there is real validity and reason for the Bricker amendment.

Mr. President, the Bricker amendment is not a fly-by-night affair. It represents an earnest, sincere effort to correct a situation which, if disregarded, will sooner or later touch every American.

I say to the people of the United States, "Give heed. You may not want the Bricker amendment; you may think it too restrictive"—although I do not think it is—"but we must have something that will protect the right of the people to local self-determination within the United States."

Mr. President, I hope we can reach agreement; but I will never take the position, and I do not think the Senate should do so, that article VI of the Constitution of the United States overrides the 9th and 10th amendments to the Constitution. To me that would be too much of a price to pay to avoid slight inconvenience.

Mr. President, let me remind the Senators of what Thomas Jefferson said: that if the treatymaking power has no limit, we have no Constitution. I cannot go so far, in honesty, as to say that if we do not have the "which" clause we would have no Constitution; but I do say we are bordering upon that situation, and I say that steps should be taken now to safeguard the rights of the American people. I am certain it can be done without hampering the President of the United States in the legitimate conduct of the external affairs of the nation.

So, Mr. President, I say this can be done, and it must be done. The American people are going to demand that it be done.

Mr. President, I wish to make one more observation in connection with section 3. I shall be very brief, because I have only one point to make in that connection.

Section 3 reads as follows:

> Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

I believe that provision is necessary. In my opinion, and in the opinion of a great many other Senators, the Congress already has the power to regulate executive agreements. Indeed, in the case of United States against Curtiss-Wright Corp., which I cited a short time ago, the Court said that in the conduct of international relations, the Executive may not go contrary to an act of the Congress.

Furthermore, section 8 of article I of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power to implement all of the powers granted by the Constitution of which the treaty power is one. See also the case of *Ex parte Quirin* (317 U. S. 1). But Mr. President, even though Congress already has the power to regulate executive agreements, it might be well to restate that power in such a way that it will be crystal clear that Congress has such power.

In connection with secret agreements, I think it absolutely essential that the people of the United States know that the Supreme Court of the United States has held that so-called executive agreements, some of which are secretly made and do not come before the Senate of the United States for approval, have the effect of law. There may not be a Senator on this floor who even knows what is in an executive agreement; nevertheless, he and all the people of the United States are bound by its terms, as the supreme law of the land.

Section 3 would prevent that situation. In my opinion, that is a good and worthy objective.

Mr. President, the very simple issue which we must decide is this: Shall we have a government of law or of men, a government of appropriate constitutional restraints, or unrestrained power? Our Founding Fathers would have had no difficulty in deciding this question. I am confident that the answer will be as clear to the people of the United States today.

Before I close, Mr. President, I should like to state for the RECORD the names of some of the groups and organizations which favor the Bricker amendment and the names of some which oppose it.

The following are among the groups favoring the Bricker amendment: Two-thirds of the Senate Judiciary Committee; 80 percent of the delegates of the American Bar Association, assembled in the House of Delegates, at their last convention; the State bar associations of more than 20 States; numerous local and county bar associations; the National Association of Attorneys General; the American Legion; the State legislatures of approximately 10 States; the American Medical Association; the Veterans of Foreign Wars; the American Association of Small Business Men and many, many other patriotic organizations.

The following are some of the groups and organizations which are opposed to the Bricker amendment: The Federal Bar Association, the New York City Bar Association, the National Lawyers Guild, the American Association of University Women, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Americans for Democratic Action, the CIO, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the American Association for the United Nations, and the United World Federalists.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, first I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Maryland for what I consider to be a very clearly presented statement of the case for the Bricker amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been giving a great deal of thought and study to Senate Joint Resolution 1, the so-called Bricker amendment. Early in the first session of the 83d Congress, I was one of those who participated with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] in introducing the amendment in its original form. I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to insert the brief text of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as introduced by Senator BRICKER and cosponsored by 62 other Senators besides myself.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE —

SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which denies or abridges any right enumerated in this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

SEC. 2. No treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control, or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in this Constitution or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 3. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.

SEC. 4. All Executive or other agreements between the President and any international organization, foreign power, or official thereof shall be made only in the manner and to the extent to be prescribed by law. Such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties, or the making of treaties, by this article.

SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. At the time I joined the Senator from Ohio in introducing this proposed amendment to the Constitution, I stated to him and others, as I recall, that I was motivated by my feeling of criticism of what I felt had been abuses of the Executive power. These abuses were exemplified by the entering into of secret agreements—by President Roosevelt at Yalta and later by President Truman at Potsdam—in which neither the House of Representatives nor the Senate of the United States had any opportunity to participate. I was disturbed by the lack of precision in distinguishing between so-called Executive agreements and treaties, and I felt that a service could be rendered if the Bricker proposals could be taken to the Judiciary Committee and if the whole situation could be clarified.

It was my sincere hope that in the debates over the Bricker amendment, and especially in the handling of the language by the Judiciary Committee, some formula might have been found that would definitely have prevented any future President from entering into such unfortunate private commitments with foreign rulers as were evidenced by Yalta and Potsdam. I am aware of the fact that at the time of the Yalta agreement, we were in a war, and Yalta might be defended as the exercise of emergency powers by the Commander in Chief. Irrespective of the merits of that debate, however, neither the Bricker amendment, nor any other type of amendment I can conceive of, could insure us against another Yalta, especially if our Chief Executive was insensible to what he should have recognized were the implied constitutional limitations on his executive powers. In my judgment, such agreements were clearly illegal, or if justified under the war powers, the President was clearly insensitive to the public opinion of the United States.

As I recall, the Senator from Ohio at the time of introducing his resolution told the Senate that it was his purpose to present by his resolution a matter which would call for study, and he said distinctly that he was not concerned so much with the words of the resolution as the point he was trying to make in introducing it.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that committee, after many weeks of arduous labor, reported a measure drastically revising the original resolution. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, Senate Joint Resolution 1, as reported by the Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

SEC. 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

SEC. 4. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Some of these changes have caused a great deal of the present misunderstanding and confusion. I refer especially to the "which" clause, which appears in section 2 of the reported version.

Before I discuss further my personal views on this matter, I wish to pay a special tribute to our colleague, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], for having precipitated the discussions which have now reached enormous proportions, and which are reverberating in the north, south, east, and west of our great country. The discussions have stimulated study by bar associations, by teachers of political science, by our institutions of learning, and, perhaps even more important, by small discussion groups that have been set up to debate the issues, and through that process to educate our people in what certain important provisions mean.

The Senator from Ohio and certain of his colleagues who are supporting him in the resolution have persistently and tenaciously stood by their enlarged conception of the function of the amendment. I believe they have attempted sincerely to clarify and express their considered judgment of what the Constitution should have contained when it was first drafted. As I understand, their position is that the internal authority of the Federal Government under a treaty should be no more extensive than in the absence of a treaty. Or, to restate the proposition, that the treaty power, at least insofar as the internal effect is concerned, is an auxiliary, rather than a substantive power.

Whether or not the Bricker amendment or some compromise position is adopted, the development of our constitutional law—indeed, the welfare of the country—has benefited by the intensity of the debate. Again I wish to register my appreciation of the service rendered by my colleagues.

I am one of those who deplore the injection of personalities into any of our debates on the floor of the Senate, and I try to avoid being influenced by the question of who said what, and what the motives may be. Also, I deplore even more strongly any misstatement of fact in a debate or any misrepresentation of the position of those who are propounding or opposing a measure that may be before us. I regret very much that in this particular debate there have been evidences of tendencies to impute wrong motives, and there have been misrepresentations of the positions of those on both sides of this debate.

I will admit frankly that careful reading of the briefs and arguments on both sides of this discussion leaves me uncertain as to the possibly unforeseen and

conceivably dangerous implications of this proposed amendment. When we realize that constituent elements of the American Bar Association are divided in their opinions, and that outstanding leaders of the bar throughout the country are divided, we must concede that the issue is definitely a debatable one, and we are relegated really to a study of history and what the Founding Fathers had in mind when they enacted the treaty clause and gave treaties the position that they have in our Constitution.

In reviewing our history, we must recall the text of the Articles of Confederation. Under those articles our country was torn asunder and was not able to act as a unit because of the lack of sufficient Executive power to lead the country, especially in our dealings with the foreign nations.

An element in the debate which is most unfortunate is the feeling in the popular mind—and reflected in the press—that there is a test of prestige between the President of the United States and one of the leading and most highly respected Members of the Senate. This feeling is as unwarranted as it is deplorable.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to express my deep appreciation to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Jersey, for his last statement. There should be no personalities involved in the discussion of this question. It is too fundamental and too vital an issue to be decided upon the basis of who is popular and who is not popular.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator. We are in complete agreement on that point.

However, the feeling to which I have referred makes it difficult for those of us who believe wholeheartedly in the present leadership of our foreign policy, as exemplified by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, to consider the proposed amendment solely on its merits. But we must consider the amendment on its merits.

Mr. President, I do not know the answer to many of the questions raised by the proposed amendment. I agree that many of the objections that have been raised to the Bricker amendment definitely do not hold water, but on the other hand, I cannot see what imperative need there is for the philosophy embodied in the "which" clause, or why we should feel it necessary to change the historical interpretation of the treaty clause of the Constitution. My colleague and I represent the sovereign State of New Jersey, and all of the other Members of this august body represent, two by two, their respective States. It was because we as Senators have this responsibility that the Constitution provides that treaties with foreign governments made by the Executive must be ratified by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators of all our States. I submit that we are competent to protect our States. I submit that it is a wiser rule to have two-thirds of the Senate called upon to join in the making of treaties with foreign powers than to have a majority of the Senate and a majority of the House. This is no reflection whatever on the House. This simply means that the continuity of the Senate as representing the sovereign States, irrespective of population, makes our body more appropriate to deal with treaties.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I gladly yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I do not want to break into the Senator's remarks if he does not desire me to do so. However, I should like to say that I agree completely with the Senator about not changing the fundamental and basic concept of treaty ratification. That is one of the reasons why I believe it is almost practically impossible to amend Article VI of the Constitution. I want Article VI to stay as it is at the present time with regard to treaties dealing with international questions. I have no desire in any way to change that part of the Constitution by giving the House such authority.

Senate Joint Resolution 1, and my efforts in connection with it, have always been directed toward the domestic effect of treaties which might have attached to them some provision that would change the laws of the Nation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his statement. Such statements help to clarify the issues.

I say frankly to my colleagues that when I read Senator BRICKER's arguments and the various memoranda he has had so skillfully prepared, I am convinced he has an idea that should have been explored long before this. When I read the arguments on the other side with regard to the present setup of the Constitution having to do with the handling of treaties, I am equally convinced that our Founding Fathers had a wisdom that has not been exceeded since their day. However, I say, without hesitation, that any suggestion of change in the Constitution should have to prove its case fully, completely, and without leaving doubts in our minds. The burden of proof definitely is on those who would change this document, and especially the burden of proof is on any individual or group who would question the soundness of the division of power as defined in the Constitution.

I would also like to add that while, of course, we should not take without careful study every recommendation that the President of the United States hands down to us, nevertheless, the President's recommendations, in light of his enormous responsibilities, must be given a positive presumption in our debates, and certainly we Republicans should be eager to follow our President's lead unless some very compelling reasons based on our deepest convictions compel us to take a course against his recommendations.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I gladly yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I agree by and large with what the Senator has said on that point. The President, in his state of the Union message, made a recommendation for a constitutional change with regard to the voting age. Such authority has heretofore been lodged in the States, as the Senator knows. One State has already adopted a provision similar to that recommended by the President.

Does the Senator realize that at the present time—and I am not talking about what would be done or what the President would do, but about the President's power and what he could do—that the President of the United States, with two-thirds of the Senate approving, could enter into a treaty with any country in the world providing that all citizens 18 years of age and older shall have the right to vote within their respective nations?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. A treaty which would be binding on us?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes, a treaty which would be binding, as the supreme law of the land, under article VI of the Constitution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that if I voted to ratify such a treaty as that, I should resign from the Senate.

Mr. BRICKER. I am talking only about the power.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Senators always must face their responsibilities in considering a treaty.

Mr. BRICKER. But the power does exist to amend our State laws by a treaty entered into with another country, if ratified by a two-thirds vote in the Senate. If so ratified, it becomes the supreme law of the land.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. What the Senator has stated is a very good illustration of what he has in mind. Of course, in some cases the power is there, undoubtedly. However, I have in mind the great responsibility which rests on the shoulders of every Senator very carefully to scrutinize every treaty, especially those that might amend our State laws.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not want to interfere with the Senator's speech at this point if he does not wish me to interrupt him, but it is my thought that a discussion of this kind will clear up a few points involved in the debate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. During the last session of Congress there came before us the so-called German bond treaty. I believe it consisted of 200 or 300 pages. The Committee on Foreign Relations examined it. At the time I asked some of the ablest lawyers in the United States to tell me what it meant. I confess to the Senate that when we consider such involved and lengthy treaties, reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations—and incidentally on the German bond treaty the only witnesses heard by the committee were witnesses from the Department of State—Senators are faced with a very heavy responsibility. Before such treaties become domestic law we should have an opportunity to lay them against the Constitution. That is my position.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad again to have the distinguished Senator's statement of his position.

Mr. President, in the course of my studies of this matter, I consulted with an old friend of mine, who for years has been one of the eminent leaders in constitutional law, and was formerly head of the department of politics at Princeton University. I am referring to Prof. Edward S. Corwin, who has given a great deal of thought and study to, and written widely in, the field of constitutional limitations. Professor Corwin has felt that this matter was of such importance that he wished to contribute whatever he could of his background of knowledge to a proper solution of the problem. From many years of knowing Professor Corwin, I have found him to be a man of top integrity and with a keen, legal, analytical mind. At my request he has sent me a memorandum on this important subject.

I may say that the general conclusion reached by Professor Corwin, after reviewing some of the authorities, is that it would be unwise to change the Constitution in the sense that the "which" clause would change it.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at the close of my remarks the full text of Professor Corwin's study as he sent it to me at my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, had it been possible for us to have arrived at a formula which would meet the views of those on both sides of this controversy, I would have been happy to join. I do not even now preclude the possibility that I may find some amendment offered on the floor which will merit my support, though, certainly, writing constitutional amendments on the floor of the Senate is fraught with the greatest danger and should not lightly be undertaken.

I understand some proposals have been submitted or will be submitted which may begin to approach a solution to the problem. I warn against writing a constitutional amendment on the floor of the Senate, and I am sure the Senator from Ohio will agree with me on that point.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I agree fully that it is a very dangerous and difficult undertaking to try to amend even a statute on the floor of the Senate, complicated as many of them are. They must be surveyed by a committee and they must be the subject of testimony, and they must be critically and thoroughly analyzed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, frankly, I do not believe it would be possible to write an amendment which both sides could accept, because the issue is one of two conflicting conceptions of the division of power under the Constitution. Naturally, if there are two fundamentally different concepts it is very hard to arrive at a compromise, if each side insists that its concept is the right one.

I have come to the conclusion that the dangers to which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has called our attention, and which he seeks to guard against by the "which" clause, are the responsibilities of the Members of the Senate. Although I share somewhat the apprehensions of the Senator from Ohio concerning these dangers, I am unable to bring myself to vote for a new approach which would imply that Senators as a group are not able to meet the challenge of the advice and consent clause of the Constitution.

Therefore, Mr. President, I regret to say to my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] that I am opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 1 as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXHIBIT 1

JANUARY 11, 1954

MEMORANDUM ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1 AS REPORTED BY THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Section 1 of the resolution is superfluous. No treaty of the United States has ever been found by the Court to be unconstitutional. This is not because the Court refused judicial review, but because the constitutional objections urged were found to be baseless. In a point of fact, section 25 of the great Judiciary Act of 1789 provided for cases "where is drawn in question the validity of a treaty or statute of, or an authority exercised under the United States." In short, it was recognized from the outset that the constitutional validity of treaties would be a judicial question.

The most frequent challenge to the constitutionality of treaties has been based on amendment X, and it has never prevailed. The principle illustrated by the Court's holdings in this category of cases was early illustrated by Madison, in the following words:

"Interference with the powers of the States was no constitutional criterion of the power of Congress. If the power was not given, Congress could not exercise it; if given, they might exercise it, although it should interfere with the laws or even the constitution of the States." (2 Annals of Congress, 1891.)

The same principle applies, by the explicit terms of the supremacy clause, to the treaty making power. By what logical legerdemain, indeed, can it be made out that powers any active exercise of which is invariably subordinate to the treaty making power, can constitute in their dormant state a limitation upon that power?

The proponents of the Bricker proposal contend, however, that their crusade is based on their concern for the Bill of Rights. Actually, in only one case (In re Ross (140 U. S. 453; 1891)) was it urged by an interested party that his constitutional rights had been impaired by a treaty and legislation passed to make it effective. Said Ross was imprisoned in the penitentiary at Albany, N. Y. for a murder of which he had been convicted 10 years previously in the American consular court in Japan, in accordance with a treaty with Japan (1857) and supplementary legislation by Congress (R. S. 4083–4091). His argument was that the proceedings against him had been unconstitutional inasmuch as he had not been indicted by a grand jury. A unanimous Court, speaking through Justice Field, dismissed Ross' appeal, saying:

"By the Constitution of the United States a government is ordained and established 'for the United States of America,' and not for countries outside of their limits; and that Constitution can have no operation in another country."

Later this position was endorsed by the Court in the famous *Insular* case (182 U. S. 244 (1901)) and has never been disturbed.

Furthermore, there are numerous dicta in which the Supreme Court has asserted that the treaty making power is subject to constitutional limitations. The classic statement of the Supreme Court's position in this regard is that of Mr. Justice Field in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258, 267 (1890)):

"It would not be contended that it (the treaty power) exists so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent."

Like statements have been made in numerous other cases. See *Doe* v. *Braden*, 16 How. 635, 657 (1853); The *Cherokee Tobacco*, 11 Wall. 616, 620–621 (1870); *United States* v. *Minnesota*, 270 U. S. 181, 207–208 (1926); *Brown* v. *Duchesne*, 19 How. 183, 197 (1856); *Prevost* v. *Greneaux*, 19 How. 1, 1 (1856).

In *Missouri* v. *Holland*, to be sure, in which the Court sustained a treaty and implementing legislation by Congress for protection of game birds flying seasonally between the United States and Canada—and which seems to be the chosen whipping boy of the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1—Justice Holmes, while disparaging, and quite properly, Missouri's invocation of amendment X, pointed out that the treaty in question did "not contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution." Later on, in the same opinion he observed that "a national interest of nearly first magnitude" was involved, one which could "be protected only by national action in concert with that of another power"—words which describe treatymaking power compendiously and accurately (252 U. S. 433, 435; 1920).

Section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, strips treaties of their qualities as internal law, except as they are made so by implementing legislation; and then it confines by the notorious "which" clause Congress' power to pass legislation to its specifically delegated powers.

The principal justification offered for this revolutionary proposal is that it is required to protect States rights, and in this connection the decision *Missouri* v. *Holland*, cited above, is chiefly relied upon. The answer is twofold. First, it was precisely the purpose of the supremacy clause, as Madison pointed out (see below) to subordinate State power to the treatymaking power; secondly, *Missouri* v. *Holland* asserts no novel doctrine. In the course of the 19th century the National Government entered into many treaties extending to the nationals of other governments the right to inherit, hold, and dispose of real property in the States, although the tenure of such property and its mode of disposition were conceded to be otherwise within the exclusive jurisdiction of the States. (See *McCormick* v. *Sullivant* (10 Wheat. 192, 202; 1927); *United States* v. *Fox* (94 U. S. 315, 320; 1896); cf. *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. 483; 1879).) *Missouri* v. *Holland* simply follows these precedents.

In other words, it is proposed to strip the treatymaking power of the right to enter effectively into conventions of a kind which have heretofore furnished the ordinary grist of the treatymaking process in times of peace, conventions extending to the nationals of other countries the right to engage in certain businesses in the States, to hold property and, to enjoy access to the courts thereof on terms of equality with American citizens, and so on, all in return of like concessions to our nationals residing abroad. Actually, the proposal bites even more deeply, for it aims to repeal the necessary and proper clause as an adjunct of the treatymaking power. Thus that whole area of power which today rests in the cases on the mutual support which the treatymaking power and the power of Congress under the necessary and proper clause lend one another is to be expunged from the map of national power; and the right of Congress to accord judicial powers to foreign consuls in the United States would become at least

doubtful; so also would its right to accord judicial powers upon American consuls abroad (see *In re Ross*, cited above); its right to provide for the extradition of fugitives from justice (18 USCA, pp. 3181–3195); its right to penalize acts of violence against aliens (*Baldwin* v. *Franks*) 120 U. S. 678, 683; 1887). Nor is this to mention the many novel issues raised by the problem of atomic security.

By the same token the treatymaking power would be demoted from a rank of a substantive power of the United States to that of mere auxiliary power of the other delegated powers.

To be sure, the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 1 assert that many, if indeed not all, of the gap which would be created by the "which clause" can be filled from Congress' powers over commerce, its war power, its power to provide for common defense, and so forth. The question arises: If this is so, what is the fuss all about? Actually the contention cannot be substantiated as to several highly important provisions, for example, of the eight treaties of commerce and friendship to which the Senate, by a vote of 86 to 5, consented on July 21 last. (Parenthetically, it is interesting to note that 55 of the 86 originally backed S. J. Res. 1.) It cannot, in fact, be substantiated as to one of the most ordinary species of treaties, extradition treaties (see *Neely* v. *Henkel*, 180 U. S. 190, 121; 1901).

But apart from all this, the rejection of the doctrine that Congress has power from the necessary and proper clause, and/or from its inherent powers in the field of foreign relations (see *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (299 U. S. 304 (1936)), to implement treaties would force the Court to abandon the juridical results of its labors throughout the past 165 years in this field and develop an entirely new line of precedents and doctrines. This, necessarily, would have to be the work of years, and meantime uncertainty as to the scope of its powers in the field of treatymaking would constantly trouble the Government.

But the defenders of Senate Joint Resolution 1 are apt at this point to bring forward a distinction, entirely valid in itself, between the constitutional and international obligation of treaties, and we are told that actually Senate Joint Resolution 1 would in no wise limit our power to enter into treaties having international obligation. In short, we are told that, having added Senate Joint Resolution 1 to the Constitution, we can then gaily go ahead and contract obligations which we have neither the power nor the intention of discharging unless, of course, the State legislatures can be relied upon to supply the necessary implementing legislation. In this connection the following words spoken by Madison in the Virginia ratifying convention are pertinent:

"Here the supremacy of treaties is contrasted with the supremacy of the laws of the States. It cannot be otherwise supreme if it does not supersede our existing laws so far as they contravene their operation. It cannot be of any effect. To counteract it by the supremacy of the State laws would bring on the Union the just charge of national perfidy and involve us in war. (3 Elliot Debates, 2d edition, 514.)"

Also the words from Justice Story's opinion in *Prigg* v. *Pennsylvania* (16 Peters, 539; 1842), though spoken in a different connection, are pertinent:

"It would be a strange anomaly of forced construction to suppose that the National Government was meant to rely for the due fulfillment of its own proper duties and the rights which it is intended to secure, upon State legislation and not upon that of the Union."

Lastly, Senate Joint Resolution 1 would give Congress the power to "regulate" executive agreements. This totally unguarded proposal could be used to hamstring the President's power to conduct our foreign relations at a time when the qualities of Presidential initiative in this field, power to act with celerity, secrecy, on the basis of superior information, and at all times (see Jay in Federalist No. 64) are absolutely essential. The proposal is utterly preposterous.

Even so, there is one objection which may be urged, on the basis of *United States* v. *Belmont* (301 U. S. 324; 1937) and *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203; 1942), against executive agreements which stem from the powers of the President alone. In these cases the Court held that the Hull-Litvinov agreement of 1933 rendered effective a decree of confiscation by the U. S. S. R. as to the assets located in New York of a Russian insurance company, and this in face of the Court's admission that alien residents of the United States are equally entitled with citizens to the protection of the fifth amendment.

To put the matter briefly, an executive agreement which is not based upon an act of Congress or a treaty, ought not to have force and validity as internal law, capable of affecting private rights, without action by Congress giving it such force and validity. If a constitutional amendment is necessary to this end then the Constitution ought to be amended to this extent, but an act of Congress would probably suffice.

To be more explicit—the line between treaty provisions which are enforceable by the courts as internal law without implementing legislation by Congress ("self-executing" provisions) and treaty provisions which require implementing legislation before they are cognizable by the courts, is today uncertain. The legal test nevertheless is plain enough in theory. It is the ascertainable intention of the treatymaking authority itself. If, therefore, the Senate decides that a treaty, or certain provisions thereof, ought to be sanctioned by Congress before becoming cognizable as internal law, it has only to adopt a reservation to its approval of the said treaty, or treaty provisions, and the reservation becomes a part of the treaty involved upon its ratification by the President and the other contracting government.

For the most part the dangers which Senate Joint Resolution 1 is aimed to meet are either nonexistent or unavoidable in the present state of the world, and are guarded against by the Constitution as it stands today so far as is practicable to human foresight. The two-thirds rule under which the Senate operates in giving its consent to treaties was adopted, instead of consent by Congress, precisely because of the recognition of the framers that the treatymaking power would often penetrate deeply into the State legislative field. The question occurs, furthermore, why should the Senate consider itself especially competent to formulate a revolutionary amendment to the Constitution—one which would take us back to the Articles of Confederation—if it cannot trust itself to handle even treaties with good sense and discretion? Senate Joint Resolution 1 impeaches the intelligence and integrity of the Senate itself.

Furthermore, behind the Senate stands a second line of defense against bad and foolish treaties, namely Congress, which in the words of the Court, can at any time "so far as the people and the authorities of the United States are concerned * * * abrogate a treaty between this country and another country * * * negotiated between the President and approved by the Senate." (175 U. S. 423, 460; 1899.) No proposition in American constitutional law is better established (see also *Head Money Cases* (112 U. S. 580, 589–599; 1884); *The Cherokee Tobacco* (11 Wall. 616; 1871); *Fong Yue-ting* v. *U. S.* (149 U. S. 698, 721; 1893)).

THE TACTICS OF THE BRICKERITES

Mr. WILEY Mr. President, I have been much disturbed in recent days with the tactics and gross misrepresentations of many of the proponents of the Bricker amendment. Let me cite a few.

1. WHO SUPPORTS THE AMENDMENT

The senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] stated last week—January 20—for example, that, and I quote—

> The people of America are for this amendment * * * 80 or 90 percent of them, unless I miss my guess.

Well, he missed his guess.

The Gallup poll of last October which I put in the RECORD on January 22 showed that 81 percent of the American people had not heard of the Bricker amendment. Since October a gigantic publicity campaign has tried to sell the American people on the dangers to our Constitution and the good things the Bricker amendment would do to that magnificent instrument.

Today we have another Gallup poll. It shows that 72 percent of the people still have not even heard of the Bricker amendment. Of the 28 percent who have heard of the Bricker amendment, 15 percent do not know what it is supposed to do. Of the 13 percent who do know what the amendment is supposed to do, only 4 percent favor it, and 7 percent oppose it. Two percent are undecided.

I do not think we should pass an amendment when the Gallup poll shows that only 4 percent of the people who know what the amendment is supposed to do, favor it.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the Gallup poll results in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of January 27, 1954]

GALLUP POLL—BRICKER AMENDMENT CHANCES APPEAR TO BE SLIM IN STATES

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., January 26.—No matter what disposition is made by Congress of the controversial Bricker amendment, the chances of ratification by the legislatures, or by popular referenda, in three-fourths of the States appear exceedingly thin at this time.

Among the relatively few voters who have followed the issue closely in recent months, sentiment has veered around from being in favor of the amendment to the point where sentiment among informed voters is opposed.

Slightly more than 1 voter in 4—28 percent—told institute interviewers that they had heard or read about the Bricker proposal.

To this figure must be added others who may have heard or read about it but have not followed the controversy, at least to the extent of knowing what the main provisions are.

The amendment would restrict the treatymaking power of the President beyond the approval by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, by requiring passage of a concurring bill by both Houses.

Because of the highly complex nature of the issue, the institute survey used two so-called filter questions to separate voters who have some familiarity and knowledge of the subject from those who do not.

Each person in the national sample was first asked:

"Have you ever heard or read anything about the Bricker amendment?"

A total of 28 percent said they had, while 72 percent said they had not.

The second question was put only to the 28 percent:

"Just in your own words, what is the purpose of the Bricker amendment?"

The replies, judged on the basis of correctness, were as follows:

	Percent
Correct	6
Partly correct	7
Incorrect, don't know	15
	28
Not familiar	72
	100

Each voter who had followed the debate and was able to give a reasonably correct statement of the provisions of the amendment was then asked:

"All things considered, would you favor or oppose the Bricker amendment?"

The vote of the 13 percent who could state the provisions of the amendment:

	Percent
Favor	4
Oppose	7
Undecided	2
Informed vote	13

The vote in a similar survey last October, based on those who had heard or read about the amendment, was: Favor 9 percent, oppose 7 percent, and undecided 3 percent.

Two interesting sidelights crop up in today's survey:

1. Among informed voters who have had the greatest amount of education, considerably more are opposed to the Bricker amendment than favor it.

2. The vote among informed GOP voters is substantially more in favor than is the vote among informed Democratic voters.

2. ARE ANTI-BRICKERITES UNPATRIOTIC?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the impression has been created that those who oppose the Bricker amendment are unpatriotic or anti-American. Mr. Holman, the so-called father of the Bricker amendment, said on Tuesday that one of the greatest accomplishments of the Bricker amendment will be to "put some of the Senators on record and find out who's for the United States and who isn't." Mr. President, Mr. Holman tells us that if we oppose the Bricker amendment, we are against the United States. This statement impugns the motive of every Member of this body who opposes the Bricker amendment because he believes it would break the Constitution apart.

Mr. President, who seeks to amend the Constitution which has stood us so well? It is the Brickerites who want to change the instrument.

If every Senator who votes against the Bricker amendment is against the United States, the next step will be to allege that everyone who is not a Brickerite is anti-American.

I do not question the patriotism of those who support the Bricker amendment. But let them support the amendment on grounds of logic and not by abuse of their fellow compatriots who see great danger in the amendment.

3. DO FOREIGNERS CONTROL THE SENATE?

Mr. President, a news story in a local paper stated that the Bricker amendment is intended to prevent foreigners from gaining control of American domestic affairs through treaties being drafted by United Nations agencies and other international organizations—Times-Herald, January 27, 1954. In other words, Mr. President, if a person is in favor of having foreigners control American domestic affairs, he should oppose the amendment. But if he wants to keep Americans in control of domestic affairs, he should support the Bricker amendment.

What a fantasy. I do not think any of us, our children, or our children's children will see the day when the President of the United States, elected by the people, and two-thirds of the Senate will approve a treaty that would turn over control of American domestic affairs, or any other kind of American affairs, to foreigners. It is a gross misrepresentation of the facts to imply that any such action has been taken in the past or might be taken in the future under United Nations auspices or under any other auspices.

If proponents of the Bricker amendment cannot discuss the treaty power and its amendment in terms of the law and of logic, let them at least not engage in setting up big, bad, bogeymen to knock over.

Mr. President, the talk of the Brickerites somehow reminds me of a man alone in a dark room and echoes. The louder he talks, the louder the echoes, and the greater his fears.

I do not object to people scaring themselves to death, if that is what they want. But when they seek to transmit their fears to all America, they go too far.

We did not grow to greatness as a nation on a theme of fear. We have grown great on liberty and freedom and on a great Constitution. Let us keep it that way.

(Manifestations of applause in the gallery.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the occupants of the gallery that applause is not permitted.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the information of the Senate, when the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has completed his remarks, unless there are other Senators who desire to make remarks or submit matters for insertion in the RECORD, it will be the intention of the majority leader to move a recess of the Senate pursuant to the order which has just been entered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during the previous session of the Congress the representative of the Independent Party usually made his weekly report on Friday afternoons as a member of the Committee of the Whole, the only important committee to which he belongs in the Senate. He serves notice this afternoon that during the present session of Congress he will make his reports any time during the week when he thinks it is most appropirate from his standpoint to do so. This happens to be one of the afternoons for one of the weekly reports of the Independent Party as a member of the Committee of the Whole.

Before I proceed, Mr. President, with the major thesis of my remarks this afternoon, I wish to comment briefly on two items.

Some members of the press seem to be very much interested in my reasons for filing at the desk yesterday a motion to recommit the so-called Bricker resolution to the Judiciary Committee for further consideration. I am very happy to give the reasons this afternoon, Mr. President.

Let me say as a former Republican, that I am saddened and disturbed to see so many of my former Republican colleagues committing political fratricide on the floor of the Senate, for I want to see a live Republican Party, not a dead one. Therefore, by moving to refer the amendment to the Judiciary Committee for further study, I think I have really performed a very charitable act for the benefit of the Republican Party.

Seriously, Mr. President, I believe that from a parliamentary standpoint, after debate on the proposed amendment to the Constitution has proceeded for some time and the pros and cons have been presented and various amendments have been offered, as I believe they will be offered, the place, really, to consider those amendments with due care is the Judiciary Committee. I have reason to believe that if the Judiciary Committee were reporting today on the Bricker amendment, the vote on the report would be somewhat different from the vote by which it was sent to the floor of the Senate, because members of the Judiciary Committee have had the benefit of a Nation-wide discussion of the Bricker amendment.

Mr. President, I offered my motion only because I thought it was the proper parliamentary procedure for the Senate to follow after we have held for some days what I think will prove to be a historic debate. With the benefit of speeches and with the benefit of the discussion offered in the course of the debate, in my opinion, we owe it to the Judiciary Committee to say to it, "Now, we should like to have you reconsider

this matter on the basis of the debate and the amendments offered, and to report to us again what your decision is after you have had the time for further committee hearings on the subject."

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS FOOD

Mr. President, the second item to which I wish to refer, other than the major thesis which I shall discuss this afternoon, is in regard to the disposal of surplus food to the indigent—to those who need it because they do not have the purchasing power with which to buy it within our own country. The Independent Party is proud of the fact that it was the first in the Senate to suggest that charity begins at home and that we should practice it by disposal of large quantities of our surplus food to charitable institutions in this country for distribution on a local community level, through such good-will brotherhood institutions as the Salvation Army and other similar charitable organizations. Mr. President, as I have said, I cannot reconcile with my religious philosophy people in America going hungry while Government food bins contain surplus foods which are spoiling by the thousands of tons every month. I think we had better practice our Christianity. My mail shows that there is no question about the fact that many of our brethren in this country are hungry today. There are many people who are not receiving sufficient income to supply their families with the food which they need to keep them in decent health. There are growing numbers who have come to share the view of the Independent Party in this matter. I was happy to learn, from listening to the radio broadcast by Frank Edwards last night, that very serious consideration is being given to the situation by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I pledge to that committee, to the Senate, and to the Congress my wholehearted cooperation in trying to work out a procedure by which quantities of the surplus food can be made available to every person in the United States who needs it and does not have the wherewithal to purchase it.

I think it is almost subject to the descriptive term of being politically immoral for the Congress of the United States to permit surplus food to rot and spoil in Government bins, when families in America, sorely in need of food to feed hungry mouths, do not have the money to purchase food.

Mr. President, I desire to turn, now, to another topic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE EISENHOWER BUDGET WILL DAMPEN AND SHRINK THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the question plaguing every wage earner, farmer, and businessman in America today is: Are we headed for a depression?

Administration apologists are attempting to stifle frank discussion of the economic state of the Nation by warning against "the prophets of gloom and doom." Republican spokesmen and editorialists warn that fear can lead to recession and depression, that frightened talk can precipitate economic crisis.

Yes, fear can discourage spending and deepen our economic difficulties and sharpen economic decline.

I have news for the administration. The people of America are becoming frightened. They need more than soothing words because they see concrete evidence of economic distress—lower farm incomes, growing unemployment, shorter workweeks.

It lies within the power of the administration and the Congress to overcome that fear which could cripple the economy. It takes aggressive action on the part of the Government to do this. Slogans will not do.

There are those of us in public life who will not be silenced when the good of our country demands frank discussion and sober consideration of what can and must be done.

Under the Employment Act of 1946 it is the continuing responsibility of the Government to use all its functions and resources to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. Fiscal policies have been long recognized as the chief means for implementing the objectives of the Employment Act. The annual budget which President Eisenhower sent to Congress last week is the document which embodies the Government's fiscal policies for the year beginning July 1, 1954. This document represents the economic policy decisions taken by the administration and embodies its plan for the American economy for the next fiscal year.

EISENHOWER BUDGET THREATENS MORE DEFLATION

The budget document for fiscal 1955 is a plan for more deflation. It does not meet the administration's responsibilities under the law to promote maximum employment opportunities for those willing, able, and seeking to work. The Wall Street Journal, which I have frequently referred to as the bible of the Eisenhower administration, in its front page column, The Outlook, on December 28, 1953, observed in discussing the budget shift in the next 6 months:

> In view of the recent course of business this change may have noticeable deflationary effects.

The recent course of business has worsened noticeably since the Wall Street Journal article. I submit, Mr. President, these are the facts:

UNEMPLOYMENT GROWS

Unemployment is growing at a faster rate today than in early 1950, when a postwar peak of nearly 5 million unemployed was reached. During the first week of January 1954 new unemployment was at a rate of 467,500 per week. This exceeded the comparable weekly rate in 1950 by 10 percent or 42,000.

Mr. President, I am talking about flesh, blood, and bone. I am talking about brother Americans who are beginning to suffer economically because, in my judgment, the Eisenhower administration is not doing what its responsibility calls upon it to do, by seeing to it that the economic welfare of our people, as contemplated in the general welfare clause of the Constitution, is protected.

New unemployment plus continued unemployment during the week of January 9, 1954, approached 2 million. Our insured unemployment total has risen 1.2 million since Labor Day 1953. Today the national insured unemployment rate exceeds 5 percent. In my own State more than 1 in every 10 workers, covered under unemployment insurance, is out of work. Oregon has the highest rate of unemployment in the country—12.7 percent of covered employment alone in the week ending January 9. During that week there was an increase of 7,710 unemployed. These are not just statistics; these are human beings, many with families and dependents.

A few days ago, the Republican organization in the State of Oregon, speaking through its responsible, or so-called responsible, officials, charged the junior Senator from Oregon with playing politics with the unemployment issue.

I say to the reactionary Republican machine in the State of Oregon today: "What is your answer to the statistics I have just given on the floor of the United States Senate? What do you Republicans in Oregon propose in order to meet the highest rate of unemployment in the Nation, which now exists in our State?"

Mr. President, my reply to the reactionary Republican machine in the State of Oregon, that has always placed selfish interests above human welfare, is that it has no program. It has come forward with no program to meet the unemployment problem in the State of Oregon. Instead, it is giving support to the Secretary of the Interior, a former Governor of our State, the stooge of the private utility combine of America. It is giving support to his program, which contains no new starts for the very much needed development of the electric-power resources of the Pacific Northwest.

What the Pacific Northwest needs is cheap power, because from cheap power we are going to get the economic expansion we need. From cheap power we are going to get the new jobs we need in order to relieve unemployment in the Pacific Northwest.

I say to the reactionary political Republican machine in the State of Oregon: "I am going to meet you at the crossroads of Oregon, all over the State, in the 1954 campaign. We will let the people of Oregon decide whether they are going to give support to the continuation in office of the reactionary Republican machine of the State."

They have asked for a fight, Mr. President, and they are going to get it in every precinct of the State.

PORTLAND, OREG., SALES DROP

Let the Republican machine of the State of Oregon take a look at the sales drop in our State during recent weeks.

In our principal industrial center, the city of Portland, the unemployment rate for insured workers is over 7 percent.

It takes no great imagination to deduce the effect upon business. The New York Times of January 24, 1953, reported the comparison of early January

retail-store sales as compared with the same weeks of 1953. For the week ending January 9 this year department-store sales in Portland were down 5 percent. For the week ending January 16, sales were off 16 percent. Slumps of this sort are not limited to my State alone. What does the budget promise?

THE CHOICE: ECONOMIC GROWTH OR CONTRACTION

The President in his message says of the budget:

> It assumes fairly stable conditions, internally and externally, during the period it covers (p. 6).

In 1953 national unemployment averaged 1.5 million. In 1954 it is expected that average unemployment may total 3 million or more. Even if business activity should level off and the decline in production and employment is halted, the fact that the economy will remain stable and not expand during the fiscal year will still mean a rise in unemployment of 1½ to 2 million. This would reflect, first, the displacement of workers, as increasing productivity enables fewer workers to produce the same volume of goods as before, and, second, the failure to provide employment for new workers. Stability in economic activity is a mirage. Either the economy grows and expands or else it contracts.

DECLINING PRODUCTION

Production of goods and services has been declining since mid-1953. The Federal Reserve Board index of total industrial production has recorded a drop of over 5 percent between July and December. The steel industry operating rate has fallen from 100 percent of theoretical capacity in May 1953 to 75 percent in January 1954, 25 percent in the last 8 months. The annual rate of automobile production reached 6.8 million units in the second quarter of 1953. By the year's end, before the effect of model changeovers and the holidays could be felt, the annual output rate had fallen below 6 million units. For 1954, trade sources have been quoted as expecting output to be geared to 5 to 5½ million car sales. With the industry planning to resume its normal practice of scheduling the greater part of its output during the first half of the year, the rate of auto output by mid-1954 may be 30 percent below the level of a year ago. Preliminary estimates for January, 1954, indicate that 465,000 cars will be produced, 12 percent fewer than the original planned estimate of 528,000. The annual rate of housing production dropped 10 percent, after seasonal adjustment, between March and December 1953. The Government has forecast another 7 percent decline in housing production in 1954.

NATIONAL LOSSES FROM UNEMPLOYMENT

Each unemployed worker represents lost production, lost earnings, lost Government revenue, and higher Government expenditures. The 2 million workers on the unemployment insurance rolls today represent a $10 billion annual loss of goods and services. That is the amount of national income that might have been produced if those hands and minds had been employed rather than unemployed. Failure to provide jobs for another 800,000 new workers, who should have entered the labor force in 1953, has meant an added annual loss of $4 billion of goods and services. The wages, sales, and profits that would have been generated by the $14 billion of goods and services not now being produced represent a loss to the Federal Government of about $2.5 to $3 billions of tax revenues.

I should like to emphasize that each employed worker with the existing stock of capital produces on the average $5,000 of national income annually. Under existing tax rates each dollar of national income yields 20 cents in Federal tax receipts.

However, the unemployment figures only barely begin to tell the entire story of the losses in production and incomes sustained during the last few months. The decline in demand for the goods and services which our economy is capable of producing has only partly been reflected in total unemployment. Many other workers are involuntarily accepting less than full-time employment. Still others have had to accept employment in occupations requiring far less skill than they possess. Short-time workweeks and underutilized skills mean fewer goods and smaller earnings.

EISENHOWER ECONOMIC POLICIES SHRINK ECONOMY

The declines in production, the loss of employment, and the closing of job opportunities for new workers need not have occurred except for the unwise economic policies put into operation by the administration when it assumed office early in 1953. Despite signs that an economic readjustment was in the offing, the administration undertook measures to combat inflation, when the conditions which cause inflation were disappearing. Monetary and debt-management policies purposely restricted the growth of the money supply. Interest rates were raised sharply. Business, farmers, homebuilders, consumers, States, and local governments found it difficult and costly to obtain needed credit to finance planned expenditures. When the Treasury raised the interest rate on long-term bonds this set off a series of rate rises throughout the entire credit system. At the same time it caused the price of outstanding public and private bonds to fall sharply, freezing investors into existing securities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In my judgment, the Senator has touched on a very significant point. As I understand, the Senator is saying that in the early part of 1953 the administration, and the Federal Reserve Board proceeded on the assumption that the great danger was inflation.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I am saying.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that from March 1951 to December 1952 the level of wholesale prices was falling?

Mr. MORSE. The record shows that that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And although the index of retail prices and the cost of living were rising, if one averaged the two in order to arrive at a general index of prices, one would arrive at an almost complete stability of prices, would he not?

Mr. MORSE. Again I say the record shows that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yet in the face of that, the administration assumed that the danger facing us was inflation.

Mr. MORSE. As usual, the Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a matter of record that between December 1952 and May 1953 the total money supply shrank?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Despite the fact that the index of production itself had been rising?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the effect of the increase in the index of production combined with the shrinkage of money available for the purchase of goods inevitably led to business deflation, did it not?

Mr. MORSE. It inevitably led to business deflation, with a resulting increase in unemployment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Is it not true that in the period to which the Senator from Illinois refers the index of the cost of living was rising and that it has also risen somewhat this year?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. Does the Senator desire to draw any conclusion from that fact?

Mr. BUSH. I think the situation speaks for itself, but if the Senator wishes to draw a conclusion from that fact, I shall be glad to hear it.

Mr. MORSE. My conclusion is that the do-nothing program of the Eisenhower administration played into the hands of the bankers and the big business interests of the country, which wanted to charge unconscionable prices and thus add to the unconscionable increase in the cost of living.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator from Oregon will permit me to do so, I should like to draw a somewhat different conclusion from that of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thought that the Senator from Connecticut would.

Mr. BUSH. My conclusion is that with the rise in the cost of living as reflected in the index of prices, which in turn showed the inflationary forces which were in effect in the period mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Eisenhower administration desired to take steps which would check the inflationary forces, and the administration did take such steps.

Mr. MORSE. I most respectfully disagree with the conclusion of the Senator from Connecticut. What was needed in the period of transition from large defense spending to a much-needed increase of civilian spending, was, of course, an increase in the purchasing power of the consumers of this country.

What was necessary was a transfer of production from military to civilian goods at a greater rate. Had that been done, there would have been a more effective check on the increase in the cost of living.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Oregon remember that day in the Senate Chamber early last summer when the Senator from Iowa submitted a resolution which would have required the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the reason why wholesale prices were falling for over 2 years while the cost of living was rising during that time?

Mr. MORSE. We could not get any cooperation from our colleagues on the majority side to appropriate funds necessary to conduct such an investigation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that only one member of the majority party, who unfortunately is now dead, voted for that resolution? The RECORD will indicate that only the junior Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Tobey, of all the members of the majority party, voted for the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I recall very well that we could not get the funds necessary to have a study made, which the consumers of this country were entitled to have, of what was happening to the consumer dollar.

TIGHT MONEY HURT HOUSING INDUSTRY

Mr. President, the restrictive effects of the new policies were especially harmful in the field of housing. A large part of a home's purchase price is borrowed. In no other industry is the cost of capital such an important element of the price as in the housing industry. After the Treasury raised the rate on its bonds, the rates on Government-guaranteed home mortgages were raised one-fourth to one-half percent. Mortgage bankers followed the lead of the Treasury, and raised by one-half percent the rates on conventional mortgage loans.

At the new, higher cost of purchasing a home, it was not surprising that the demand should be smaller. Even the lower level of demand could not be adequately financed, because of the unwillingness of bankers to purchase mortgages whose marketability was uncertain, in view of the new interest-boosting policy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that on the basis of a $12,000 house, each additional 1 percent of the interest rate means an added cost of approximately $120 a year?

Mr. MORSE. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And one-half of that 1 percent is $60 a year, or $5 a month.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. Take the case of a GI, who in many instances has little funds upon which to draw, and may be confronted with a market situation in which he feels he is paying too much for the house to begin with. He may well feel a little insecure and a little in doubt about what he will get for the house 10 or 15 years from then, if he has to buy at a relatively high purchase price. In such an instance this increase in the interest rate becomes a very dominant and prohibitory factor in its effect upon home buying and home building.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Oregon knows as well as anyone else does that the control of the money market, so to speak, lies, if it lies anywhere, in the Federal Reserve Board, which is not a creature of the executive branch of the Government, but reports to the Congress. The Senator from Oregon also knows that all the members of the Federal Reserve Board, as constituted last spring—when the able Senator from Oregon spoke of the rise in interest rates—and as presently constituted, were appointed by the previous administration. Is not that so?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; and so what?

Mr. BUSH. So the attack which the able Senator from Oregon is making upon the fiscal policies of the Eisenhower administration is, I think, not a fair attack, in view of the fact that what he is complaining about is not the responsibility of the Eisenhower administration, but is the policy of a board which was appointed by the preceding administration.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Eisenhower administration disapprove the policies of the Federal Reserve Board? Has the Eisenhower administration sent to Congress a single recommendation or request for a change in the monetary policies of the Federal Reserve Board?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that we are talking about the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Connecticut just got through telling me that the Federal Reserve Board is an agency of the Congress.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does that mean that if the Eisenhower administration finds that an agency which is a creature of the Congress is following a course of action which is contrary to the wishes of the administration, it should not send to Congress a recommendation for a change?

Furthermore, the Republicans had the necessary votes in the last session of the Congress and still have a working majority. So the Republicans cannot get by with the old alibi that because when they came into power they found on one of the Government agencies or boards some persons who were appointed by the preceding Democratic administration, they—the Republicans—do not have the responsibility of changing undesirable policies.

It so happens, in my judgment, that the policies of the Federal Reserve Board have been deflationary; and that is right in line with the Eisenhower theory, and those deflationary trends are working great hardships upon the consumers.

Mr. BUSH. I simply wish to differ sharply with what the Senator from Oregon has said. I would remind him that the Federal Reserve Board is set up as an independent authority and agency. So I think it would be most unfortunate for either the Congress or the administration to meddle with it. I believe it should be left to itself. Of course, we should see that the members of the Board are men we can trust. Frankly, I think most of the appointees who have been carried over there are very good men. The Chairman of the Board, Mr. Martin, is very able. I doubt that we could find a man who would be better suited than that particular gentleman to be Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say most respectfully to my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, that that is one of the strangest theories of representative government I have ever heard recommended on the floor of the Senate, namely, that if there is an agency of the Government that is following a course of action that is contrary to the general welfare, we, as the representatives of the people, should not do anything about it.

It happens to be the duty of Congress to take steps to prevent any agency of the Government from doing injury to the people.

The Senator from Connecticut cannot have this both ways.

Mr. BUSH. Neither can the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Connecticut cannot, in one breath, tell me that part of the problem to which I am directing my attention is one created by the Federal Reserve Board, the members of which were appointed by the preceding Democratic administration; and then, in the next breath, tell me that because the Federal Reserve Board is supposed to be an independent agency, there is no responsibility upon the Republicans, who have a majority in the Congress, to do something about that.

I say to the Senator from Connecticut that he is caught on the prongs of his own non sequitur. If the first premise of the Senator from Connecticut is sound, then he has the duty of doing something by way of bringing about a remedy which will correct the practices of the Federal Reserve Board, upon which he has sought, in the first part of his argument, to place the blame.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Oregon has just expressed a matter of opinion.

Mr. MORSE. I shall let the RECORD speak as to that.

Mr. BUSH. So shall I.

Mr. MORSE. Then we are in agreement on that point.

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

If the Senator from Oregon is so deeply concerned about legislation affecting the Federal Reserve Board, I suggest that in that connection he is at liberty to make some suggestions on behalf of the Independent Party.

Mr. MORSE. But, Mr. President, you see, I did not accept the major premise of the Senator from Connecticut. I did not try to use the Federal Reserve Board as a scapegoat.

I am talking about some specific proposals; I am speaking of what I think we should do in order to handle the unemployment problem. I think it can be done by having an administration that will propose a budget which really comes to grips with the unemployment problem.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon in yielding to me at this point. I suggest to him that the very comprehensive program has been presented and still is being presented to the Congress by the Eisenhower administration goes a long way to answering the doubts and fears in the mind of the Senator from Oregon—which I feel are very largely unfounded, anyway. But I believe that this very comprehensive program is the only answer to the economic situation with which we are faced today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have the Senator from Connecticut and the other Republicans and President Eisenhower tell the increasing thousands of persons who are being let out of their jobs that the present deflationary program is the remedy. Let me tell my colleague that, in that event, he will get a very definite and dynamic answer from them. They know that Republican slogans do not provide jobs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In dealing with the question of the independence of the Federal Reserve Board, does the Senator from Oregon remember the saying of Mr. Dooley, in one of his essays? He was dealing with the question of the Supreme Court and the question of whether the Constitution followed the flag. He remarked, "I don't know whether the Constitution follows the flag, but I do know that the Supreme Court follows the election returns."

Mr. MORSE. I think that is very apropos as applied to the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May not the Federal Reserve Board, in December of 1952, when it put its "tight money" policy into effect, have discovered by a process of osmosis what the economic policy of the incoming administration was going to be?

Mr. MORSE. Not only do I think that is true, but let me say good naturedly and respectfully that even under a Democratic administration I never observed that liberals were appointed to the Federal Reserve Board.

As I noted earlier the rate of housing production—value of new construction put in place—fell by 10 percent after March 1953. The rate of new private housing units started has fallen even more—17 percent. This explains a good part of the economic distress in Oregon where the lumber industry was hurt by the decline in home-building activity.

I plan to make a separate report on the housing problem. Analysis shows that the administration undertook unwise credit policies although there was ample evidence of an underlying weakening of the demand for housing at prevailing prices. The administration is similarly promoting a banker-dictated housing program today, even though it knows—or should know—that a critical test of our ability to avert a serious depression will come in the construction industry.

The economic policies and the political philosophy that has emerged so far from this administration reflect the same old banker economies so fashionable—and disaster-laden—before 1929. Indeed all programs, and all economic policy decisions must now pass the bankers' acid test: Will it promote a sound dollar? I applaud the desirable objective of thrift and economy in government expenditure, and I also acknowledge the worth of incentive as a stimulating force in the process of economic growth. Nonetheless I dissent vigorously from the bankers' view that making the dollar scarce and expensive is what makes it sound.

The policy of scarce and expensive dollars has already led to a contraction of the national economy, a fall in government revenues, and an unnecessary rise in interest payments on the public debt. The President's budget message decries the previous policy of financing over a period of years too largely by short term issues at artificially low interest rates. Yet, the new sound dollar financing policy under this administration has increased fiscal year 1955 interest payments 297 million dollars above actual expenditures in 1953. The budget message explains:

> The increase in 1955 reflects both the higher average interest rates and the larger public debt. The average rate on the interest bearing public debt rose * * * primarily because of the refinancing of maturing obligations at the higher market rates prevailing.

In the interests of completeness the message should have added: The larger public debt was caused primarily by the restriction of credit and the increase in interest rates, which halted the growth of national income and led to a fall in government tax receipts.

HIGH INTEREST RATES TO CONTINUE

The budget message makes clear that there has been no reversal of the deflationary debt-management policies inaugurated last January. I quote from the message:

> A sound dollar is the cornerstone of financing policy under this administration.

The original debt management objectives spelled out in the 1953 state of the Union address are restated in the 1954 budget message. First, contract the Nation's credit base by shifting the debt away from the banks into the hands of private nonbank investors. Second, support interest rates at their new high levels by increasing the supply of long term bonds, forbidding Federal Reserve support—these policies contributed to cheapening the dollar—and thereby permitting the price of bonds to fall.

As I shall show in a separate report on this administration's housing proposals, another aspect of the interest rate support operation is the proposal to terminate the secondary market for housing mortgages now provided by the FNMA and sell the mortgages now held by it.

FISCAL OPERATIONS IN NEXT 6 MONTHS

The budget estimates for fiscal 1954, the period ending this June 30, show that the administration plans for a deficit of $3.3 billions. On the other hand the Daily Statement of the United States Treasury, January 15, 1954, shows that for the first half of fiscal 1954 that is, from July 1, to December 31, 1953, Treasury expenditures have exceeded receipts by $9.9 billions. To paraphrase the Wall Street Journal, if a $10 billion Treasury shot in the arm could not counteract the underlying deficiency of private demand, then terminating the shot and withdrawing $6.6 billion from private purchasing power can only serve to depress the rate of business activity further.

1955 BUDGET ALSO DEFLATIONARY

For fiscal 1955 the planned deflationary trend in the Federal budget is moderated but it continues nonetheless. A planned reduction of $4.5 billion in Federal cash payments to the public will operate to decrease purchasing power in the private sector. The 1955 budget is more deflationary than it appears since, as I shall show shortly, the bulk of the planned reduction in taxes will benefit in the main individuals and businesses who are large savers relative to other taxpaying groups in the economy.

The budget which this Congress is asked to approve proposes a reduction of billions of purchasing power in the economy in the next 18 months. Unless this is offset by a stepup in the rate of spending by consumers, increased business investment, and/or net foreign investment, there will be a further drop in production, employment, income and demand which may degenerate into a spiraling depression.

TAXES HEAVIEST ON LOW-INCOME GROUPS

What are the prospects for offsetting forces emanating from the private sector? An analysis of the distribution of the cash yield from the Federal tax structure during this fiscal year shows that the burden of taxation weighs heavily on consumption, and particularly on the lower income groups. For example, individual income taxes account for $33.4 billions, or 46 percent of the estimated cash tax yield; excises yield $10.8 billion or 15 percent; and payroll taxes $5.5 billion, or 7 percent. Together employment taxes and excises—regressive taxes—yield a total of $17.4 billion, or 22 cents of every dollar of cash tax receipts from all sources. If we add the yield from individual income taxes we find that consumption restricting taxes now produce $50.8 billion, or 68 cents of every dollar of total cash tax receipts.

In contrast, corporation income and excess profits taxes yield $22.8 billion or 31 percent of total cash tax receipts. In the world's wealthiest country, we raise exactly 1 percent of our total cash revenues—$995 million—from the taxation of estates and gifts. There is no question but that a tax structure in which 2 out of every 3 dollars is derived from income destined for consumption and more than 1 out of every 5 dollars raised,

weighs heaviest on the lower income where practically every additional dollar is expended for consumers goods, is consumption-restricting.

That is one of the things I wish to emphasize in my speech, Mr. President. The underlying effect of the Eisenhower fiscal program is one of restricting the economy, when our objective and goal ought to be to expand the economy.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator intend to present an alternative to this kind of tax program, which he finds so unacceptable?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes. The Senator was not here in 1947. In 1947 the Senator from Oregon, then an independent Republican, introduced a tax bill which followed the major recommendations which the Committee for Economic Development, advocated at that time and fought for it on the floor of the Senate. As the RECORD will show, the Republican chairman of the committee in charge of the bill said, "The Senator's proposals go to a matter of tax reform, and the problem before us in the problem of tax revenue."

Of course I laughed, and I have laughed many times since about it. The problem which faces the Congress is a problem of tax reform, going into the whole problem of tax structure and eliminating the inequities and loopholes in the tax structure. That is what the Committee for Economic Development proposed in 1947.

Let me hasten to say that in the main I shall continue to press, as I have every year since 1947, for adoption of the principles of that 1947 program. I do not go along with a subsequent proposal, in which the committee seemed to give a nod of approval to some form of sales tax. On that one they lost me. Whether we sugar-coat it in the form of a manufacturers' tax or whether it is an out-and-out sales tax, it is the same undesirable proposal which discriminates against the poor people of the country and violates the principle of taxes based upon ability to pay.

Let me assure the Senator from Connecticut, if with his usual patience, he will just follow the Independent Party through this session of Congress, I will give him plenty of opportunity to vote on some proposals for amendments to the tax structure of this country which outstanding tax authorities of the country recommend.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I hope I am a good enough lawyer and a good enough student to know that what we ought to do in the Senate is to listen to the experts.

I will offer to my good friend from Connecticut an opportunity in this session to vote on some of the early recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development for the reforms of the tax structure of the country.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I have great respect for his ability as a lawyer, and I shall look forward to his suggestions on tax reform. I know the Senator is very sincere in everything he does and thinks about this subject.

However, I do feel that in making such a sweeping attack on the present policies it is quite proper that we ask for something in the way of suggestions which would do the job better under these conditions.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite right, and I shall make some suggestions before I get through this afternoon. However, we have so much to correct in the Eisenhower administration that I cannot begin to cover all the suggestions in one speech.

That is true particularly—and I say this good naturedly—when we bear in mind that I came back to this session of Congress with the resolve to try to keep my Independent Party reports within an hour's time each week.

Of course, I welcome all interruptions. I will keep my main statement within an hour's time, and the Senators who interrupt me will join with me in responsibility for prolonging the session of the Senate longer than some Senators sometimes indicate they desire.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for reminding me that I am encroaching on his time.

Mr. MORSE. I welcome the interruption.

Mr. BUSH. I did not mean to do it. It must be remembered that the situation which the Eisenhower administration found itself in when it came into power, after 20 years of Democratic rule, is the situation which the Senator from Oregon is talking about, so far as the tax laws are concerned.

Mr. MORSE. And there has been a worsening of the situation since then.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is it not a fact that when the Eisenhower administration came into power America was at its most prosperous period, with virtually no unemployment, that wealth had increased more rapidly than at any other time in American history, that real wages had gone up despite the cost of military preparations, and that America had made its greatest progress not only within the 20 years of the Democratic administration, but during the 8 years following the close of World War II?

Mr. MORSE. I would have to say that statistically it is true. However, in all fairness, there were factors, in part, for that prosperity—and I am sure the Senator from Illinois will agree with me—that we needed to remove, such as war.

However, I refuse to accept—and I am glad to see my colleague the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], who serves with me on that great committee of the Senate, the Committee on the District of Columbia, presiding over the Senate and listening to the discussion of the fiscal policy of his party—I refuse to accept what appears to be one of the alibis of the Eisenhower administration, namely, that the American people must suffer what they call a readjustment because we are no longer in a shooting war.

Mr. President, I have greater faith in the capitalistic system than that.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield in a moment. I will never support the theory that we cannot have full employment within the spirit and intent of the Employment Act of 1946, unless we have a shooting war or the threat of a war. On the contrary, Mr. President, I believe that the economy of an enlightened capitalistic system is the only kind of economy that can give us full employment.

I believe that the economic privilege of choice which characterizes enlightened capitalism is the great instrumentality for guaranteeing to the American people full employment.

I say we should make use of the economic potentialities of the capitalistic system to promote the general welfare. It could be done if we had the vision and the courage to do it. But it cannot be done if we follow the theory of taking care of the big boys first. It can only be done if we have an abiding faith in the economic rights of the little people of America.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. If we take care of the little people first, we will not have to worry about what will happen to the big boys.

With the purchasing power of the little people of America protected, the wheels of industry will turn. However, if we follow a restricting economy, which the fiscal policies of the Eisenhower administration are producing, we will do great injury to the little people of the country, and in the long run to the big boys, too. I cannot understand why they cannot learn from the historical lessons of the late twenties.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin; then to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WILEY. I merely wish to make some insertions in the Appendix of the RECORD. However, I do hope the Senator from Oregon will agree with the administration in his opposition to the Bricker amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I have already indicated my opposition.

Mr. WILEY. That is wonderful.

Mr. MORSE. I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Bearing out the contention of the Senator from Oregon, that we do not need to have a war in order to have full employment, is it not a fact that we made the transition from World War II to peace without very great unemployment?

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Despite the fact that that war was infinitely larger than the Korean war?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was done under a Democratic administration.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Do the fiscal 1955 budget proposals reverse this deflationary tendency and will they stimulate the needed rise in consumption? The administration's tax program has been publicized as designed

to stimulate saving and investment. An analysis of their own estimates of cash yields in fiscal 1955 show little stimulus to consumption and an increase in the relative tax burden on lower-income groups.

In fiscal 1955 the cash yield from payroll taxes is expected to rise $900 million, or 16 percent. This will mean fewer dollars available for consumer expenditures by wage earners who will pay half of the increased yield from payroll taxes.

The necessary increase in the social security payroll tax cancels out the slight decrease in income-tax rates for almost all people who earn under $5,000 a year. There is no net disposable income increase to be expected among this great consumer group—the very economic base of the economy.

Mr. President, I want to say here, as I have said elsewhere, that if we could press a button this afternoon and stop the production of every worker in America who grosses $2,500 or less a year we would in a very short time bring the operation of the American economy to a complete standstill.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] has heard me discuss that problem in the District of Columbia Committee in respect to what happens to the low-income group in the District of Columbia when transit fares are increased by our local transportation company. The functioning of our economy is dependent upon the production by the great mass of people who gross $2,500 or less a year. They are the people to whom Lincoln constantly referred. They are the people whom he called the common people. They are the people for whom he labored.

Yet, Mr. President, the sad thing is that we place on this low-income group burdens out of proportion to the fiscal burdens we expect the people in the higher brackets to assume.

Excise taxes weigh the heaviest on the low-income consumers. By increasing the price of the commodity excise taxes naturally reduce consumer demand below what it would be if the price were lower.

What I say about excise taxes goes for sales taxes generally, because that is what excise taxes really are.

Under existing law some excise taxes will expire April 1, and if this is followed by a corresponding reduction in price it would make available to consumers about $1 billion in extra purchasing power. The administration has recommended that the excise-tax burdens should remain unchanged in the next fiscal year.

I think that is a great mistake, Mr. President. I think that here is a place where the administration should help the people in the low-income group.

There is no doubt about the fact, Mr. President, that the people in the low-income bracket try to escape the excise tax to every extent they can by nonconsumption or nonuse, but that does not help the economy. That does not produce an expanding economy. It produces just the reverse, the thing we should try to avoid, the restricting of our economy at a time when unemployment is increasing.

Individual income taxes have already been reduced 10 percent across the board. In addition the administration has proposed a series of tax revisions including: Extension of income splitting which benefits primarily taxpayers with incomes over $5,000, to unmarried heads of households, reduction of income-tax liability for dividend recipients, increase the amount of medical expenses that may be deducted from taxes, permit minor children to be claimed as dependents though they may earn in excess of $600, permit tax deductions for expenses of working mothers, and so forth. Many of the proposed individual income-tax revisions will give the greatest relative benefit to upper-bracket taxpayers. Of the added income they will receive, a large portion will be added to savings, a lesser amount may be expended on consumers goods.

The proposed tax revisions will provide the benefited groups with $600 million of tax relief in fiscal 1955.

LOWER INCOME GROUP SHARE OF NATIONAL INCOME DECLINING

Department of Commerce data on the distribution of income produced in corporate enterprises show that for the first 9 months of 1953 the before tax share going to compensation of employees fell three-tenths percent as compared with 1952. The before tax corporate profit share comparison for the similar period shows a rise of 6.7 percent.

While these percentages may seem small, it should be realized that they are percentages to be divided into billions of dollars. The employee figures include management salaries and all types of compensation. The actual relative decline of low- and middle-income employees is quite substantial.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table bearing upon the subject, together with explanatory remarks.

There being no objection, the table and explanatory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percentage distribution of national income originating in corporate business, 1952–53

	1952	1953 January–September	Percentage change
Income originating in corporate business	100.0	100.0	
Compensation of employees	75.1	74.9	−0.3
Corporate profits before tax	23.9	25.5	+6.7
Corporate profits after taxes	11.0	11.5	+4.5

Source: Survey of Current Business, January 1954, p. 24.

The article in the survey attributes the shift to the fact that "corporate profits in relation to wages were somewhat depressed in 1952 as a consequence of the steel strike." It then acknowledges that "In the first half of 1953 the share of profits showed an appreciable increase, but this was offset by third-quarter developments when profits declined while payrolls expanded slightly."

I find, however, that the third quarter 1953 profit rate, $43.3 billion, is still substantially higher than the 1952 rate of $39.2 billion.

The combined effect of the employment-tax increase, no change in the excise-tax burden, and the cut in individual income taxes under existing legislation will provide relief from consumption restricting taxes to the extent of $1.6 billion, or 3 percent, in fiscal 1955. This $1.6 billion is of slight significance when compared with the many billions of purchasing power which the administration's policies are denying the American consumer.

MORE TAX LOOPHOLES FOR BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. The underlying economic philosophy of the administration is most clearly reflected in the tax treatment afforded business income. The largest relative reduction in the cash yield from taxes in fiscal 1955, under existing and proposed legislation, is the 11-percent reduction in corporate income and excess profits tax payments. If the proposed legislation to maintain existing corporate income tax rates now scheduled to expire April 1, 1953, is adopted, the effect of the expiration of the excess-profits tax alone will be to reduce cash receipts from corporations by $2.5 billion in fiscal 1955. If the corporate income-tax rate is permitted to decline April 1, the cut in cash receipts from corporate taxable income will be $3.1 billion, or 11 percent.

On balance the planned reductions in cash yields from taxes under existing or proposed legislation will reward the wealthiest businesses and the wealthiest individuals most. This is rationalized in the President's message itself as follows: "The proposals will encourage initiative and investment which stimulate production and productivity and create bigger payrolls and more and better jobs."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator knows, of course, that the administration has asked for an extension of the corporate income tax at the present rates?

Mr. MORSE. I said so.

Mr. BUSH. I did not quite understand the Senator. I thank the Senator. I thought he said that if this tax were allowed to lapse, there would be a very large number of billions of dollars that would be lost.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I say the tax must not be allowed to lapse.

Mr. BUSH. Then the Senator would agree with the administration, that the tax should be extended?

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the part of the message which I have quoted. I want to see some action on it. I want the Senate to know that I am just champing at the bit to ride with the administration in any good cause. I should be delighted to be able to praise this administration. Once in a while I have been able to do so, but I have found that most of the program has been so unpraiseworthy that I have not been able to ride with it.

I hope that perhaps we can get this administration to give us some support in a tax-reform program that will follow the line of the proposals made by the

Committee for Economic Development, several years ago, but I am very sorry the President did not mention it, and the major provisions of it, in his budget message or his state of the Union message.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. If I am not mistaken, the CED recommended that the corporate tax be allowed to stay off or go back to the 1947 percentage.

Mr. MORSE. I have indicated that they have lost me a little bit on some of their subsequent recommendations, but the 1947 report is a good one, and the personnel of the committee has changed somewhat since 1947.

Mr. BUSH. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. It is interesting to note what a change in personnel will sometimes do to recommendations of a committee.

NO STIMULUS TO CONSUMER PURCHASING POWER

Mr. President, there is no awareness that consumer demand must first be stimulated before businessmen will invest their tax savings and expand capacity, output, employment, and payrolls. Otherwise there will be no incentive to invest either by business or upper income savers, and the result of the tax reductions proposed by the administration will be merely to increase gross business and individual saving. Unless there is an increase in net foreign investment, which does not now seem likely, the excess of saving over profitable investment opportunities will tend to cause a further decline in national income and employment. In this event, the balancing of the cash budget which the budget message envisages will not be realized. Not only will the tax yield from personal and business incomes fall below current estimates, but Government outlays will rise automatically as transfer payments, such as those under grant-in-aid programs, increase. A sizable cash deficit, I fear, would result.

It was to be hoped that the budget message would suggest to the big-business beneficiaries of tax relief that tax cuts would help promote jobs and production most directly if they were immediately translated into price reductions and/or wage increases. The absence of any reference to the necessity for price reductions is all the more puzzling in view of the administration's professed concern about the recent cheapening of the dollar. One of the strange characteristics of the recession we are now experiencing has been the rigidity of prices. This is particularly true of the steel industry where the operating rate has been cut 25 percent since midyear while prices, which had been raised 9 percent during the first 6 months of 1953, have remained unchanged.

The Magazine of Wall Street, December 12, 1953, includes an article, The Truth About Advantage of EPT Repeal, which provides some interesting clues to the probable course industry may choose. For example, we are shown that the repeal of EPT will save United States Steel $110 million in taxes in 1954. This $110 million tax saving will enable United States Steel to absorb a 37½-percent decline in pretax earnings in 1954 and still leave their 1954 net income at about $240 million or approximately the same as in 1953.

Or take the General Motors Corp. The same article points out that—

> General Motors pretax earnings could decline by as much as 25 percent in 1954 without bringing about a reduction in 1954 net as compared with 1953.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a table showing similar savings for other large corporations.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Effect of repeal of excess profits on leading companies

	Estimated 1953 earnings per share	Estimated 1953 excess profits tax per share	Estimated tax bracket 1953	(See note)	Recent price	Indicated 1953 dividend	Indicated dividend yield
			Percent	Percent			Percent
Aluminum Company of America	$5.00	$1.50	60	16	53	$1.57	3.0
American Tobacco	5.85	2.00	60	16	66	4.00	6.0
Bendix Aviation	9.00	5.00	70	37½	63	[1] 3.00	4.7
Boeing Airplane	12.00	7.85	70	37½	45	3.50	7.7
Columbia Broadcasting A	3.75	.95	60	16	48	1.85	3.8
Douglas Aircraft	[2] 13.50	8.00	70	37½	75	6.50	8.6
Du Pont	5.50	[3] 2.80	65	30	104	3.80	3.6
Eastman Kodak	3.25	1.15	68	37½	46	[4] 1.80	4.0
General Electric	6.00	3.40	70	37½	85	4.00	4.7
General Foods	4.10	1.00	60	16	60	2.65	4.4
International Business Machine	10.50	2.50	60	16	238	[4] 4.00	1.6
Kroger Co	3.80	1.05	60	16	41	2.00	4.9
Lockheed Aircraft	6.75	3.90	70	37½	28	[4] 1.62	5.7
Lorillard (P.) Co	2.35	.50	60	16	27	[5] .90	3.3
Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulators	3.75	1.20	60	16	66	2.00	3.0
Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing	2.25	1.00	60	16	54	1.00	1.8
National Dairy Products	4.60	1.10	60	16	61	3.00	4.9
Penick & Ford	3.20	1.10	65	30	35	2.00	5.7
Penney (J. C.)	4.75	1.20	55	14	77	3.50	4.5
Reynolds (R. J.) Tobacco B	3.20	1.50	67	37½	40	2.00	5.0
United Aircraft	7.00	5.00	70	37½	42	2.75	6.5
United States Steel	7.50	4.50	70	37½	37	3.00	8.1
Westinghouse Electric	4.60	1.20	65	30	50	2.00	4.0

[1] 7-percent stock dividend payable Jan. 16, 1954.
[2] Includes $1.25 nonrecurrent item.
[3] Includes renegotiation reserve not separately computed.
[4] Plus stock.
[5] Does not include $0.70 payable Jan. 2, 1954.

NOTE.—This column (please see text) indicates the maximum percentage of possible decline in 1954 pretax earnings that could be offset by the absence of excess-profits-tax payments, and, as a result of which, net income for 1954 would be approximate to that of 1953.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we are also told that estimates have been made which show that declines in pretax earnings from 17 to 29 percent could be sustained by companies paying combined 1953 taxes of from 60 to 66 percent without bringing about a reduction in their 1954 net earnings after taxes, compared with 1953.

These are not my contentions; they are the representations of the article in the Magazine of Wall Street, which certainly is a reputable journal in the field of commerce.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I do not know about the Senator's State of Oregon, but the Senator from Connecticut can attest that most of the opponents of the excess-profits tax, which has been allowed to expire, were small-business operators, small corporations who found it such a brutal, oppressive tax that they simply could not live with it.

I hope the Senator from Oregon realizes that in allowing that tax to expire, the administration has made a gesture toward the small-business enterprises and small corporations of this country that is of very great importance to them.

Mr. MORSE. I may say, most respectfully, that I have often observed that small-business men are deluded temporarily by the propaganda of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers; but gradually they get the facts, and their early partnerships in some of these movements, that play into the hands of the big corporations, are dissolved.

It seems to me that the incentives provided under existing tax laws are designed to induce the big corporations to maintain their artificially high prices and let the rest of the taxpayers subsidize the decline in pretax earnings.

Such subsidizing takes places because Government tax revenues lost by elimination of the excess-profits tax must be made up by other taxes or borrowing which results in interest payments to be borne by all taxpayers.

Monopoly prices of building materials were maintained in 1953 in the face of a decline in housing demand. The soft housing market has already contributed to the rise in unemployment in Oregon and Washington and a decline in the market value of Oregon's lumber production of 7 percent in 1953, as compared with 1952. The yearly average

does not show the increasingly steep decline in the last 6 months of 1953.

According to the December 1953 wholesale price report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the following building material price increases over December 1952 are indicated:

	Percent increase
Window glass	11
Finished steel	8
Structural clay products	6½
Gypsum products	4
Concrete products	4
Insulation materials	3

These price increases were made in the face of a decline in demand, by a handful of corporate monopolies dominating the output of each industry. Lumber, however, did decrease in price.

The policy of inflexible 100 percent of parity price supports for industrial monopolists is in marked contrast to the sliding scale flexible price supports that the administration wants farmers to accept. This, notwithstanding that farm cash net income, unlike corporate net income, fell by $1 billion in 1953 and, according to a recent estimate of the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank, may fall another billion dollars in 1954.

The profit results of removing the excess-profits tax makes understandable the recent statement by Deputy to the Secretary of the Treasury Randolph Burgess that Government should not undertake aggressive counter deflation action until the decline had reached the proportion of a spiraling recession. It becomes all the more clear when Mr. Burgess, asked to define a recession, measured it precisely—a 25- or 30-percent decline. The philosophy underlying the budget message reflects the judgment of those whose companies are situated tax-wise like General Motors or United States Steel and may increase their unit profit as a result of a 25-percent drop in demand.

I want to be kind about it, but also I want to be frank about it. I simply find it impossible to reconcile with fairness, to reconcile with a social consciousness devoted and dedicated to the welfare of our people, such a hard-boiled attitude as was expressed by Mr. Burgess when he indicated the administration would not be greatly concerned unless we have a 25- or 30-percent decline. Translate that into human suffering. Translate that cold observation into terms of its effects on human beings. When that is done, Mr. President, one begins to get some idea why the representative of the Independent Party is going to be heard again and again on the floor of the Senate in support of proposals which are directed to prevent the kind of a decline that apparently Mr. Burgess thinks we can let develop without any great concern.

Mr. President, when a government ceases to think in terms of the effects of a policy upon human beings that government loses the right to represent human beings. That is why I have been heard to say that, in my judgment, because of the policies adopted by the Eisenhower administration to date, it has lost the right to represent the people of this country. That is why I shall do what I can in the campaign of 1954 to change the political complexion of the Congress of the United States.

NO MASSIVE RETALIATION AGAINST RECESSION

The administration is speaking these days in the field of foreign policy and defense in terms of massive retaliation. I should like to ask the administration this afternoon what its plans are for massive retaliation against a recession.

It is no surprise to find that, despite high unemployment and the prospect of further increases in unemployment, planned budget expenditures for public works in fiscal 1955 have been cut $400 million, or 8 percent. Compared with fiscal 1953, the fiscal 1955 public-works budget shows a cut of $700 million, or 13 percent.

The budget message notes that—

> Timing of public-works expenditures is one of the means by which Government action may be used to offset a decline in private construction. To be effective as an anti-cyclical measure, however, needed public-works projects must be planned well in advance so as to be available for undertaking when economic conditions dictate. This budget provides for the advance planning of additional Federal projects. It also provides, under proposed legislation, $10 million to institute a program of loans to State and local governments for the advance planning of their public works.

This Government should plan massive retaliation against recession, but the administration has blueprinted an economic popgun.

PUBLIC-WORKS PLANNING PROMISE MISLEADING

It is a little difficult not to be disarmed by a message that acknowledges the importance of timing public works well in advance and proceed to request $10 million for such advance planning. But when the same budget discloses a cut in lending to the States for housing and community development purposes of $265 million, or 22 percent, the screening purpose of the good intentions manifested by the public-works planning token is unmasked.

How ill-prepared the Government is to launch a program of effective public works if it should be needed quickly is shown by the Budget. By June 30, 1954, we are told:

> Federal agencies will have an estimated $1.2 billion of authorized projects planned to a stage where construction could be started.

By June 30, 1955, it is estimated that this standby shelf of ready-to-go public works will total only $1.7 billion.

I think it would be more prudent if we accelerated our activities in this vital area while still hoping for the best.

We are now paying an extra $300 million in interest on the public debt because the administration mistakenly embarked upon a crusade to curb a nonexistent inflation in early 1953.

The administration gets tight-fisted in a very odd fashion. It is economizing on public-works projects, most of which are income-producing and wealth-producing and job-creating.

But actions to curb deflation are not likely to be undertaken quickly by this administration. The Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, in the July 1953 issue of the Guaranty Survey, commenting upon the appointment of Dr. Arthur Burns as the President's new Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors observed:

> It is reassuring to note that Dr. Burns takes a modest view of the role which the Government can effectively play in what he calls contra-cyclical action. Most significant of all is Dr. Burns' emphasis upon the need to control booms, rather than to rely too largely upon measures to check downswings.

Mr. President, of course, an observation of that kind confuses me, because downswings result in great cruelty and suffering to individuals, just as booms do. I say we must prevent both; we must prevent the booms and check the downswings.

Mr. President, continuing with the quotation:

> All in all, these views [meaning Dr. Burns' views] seem to augur well for as sane an administration of the Employment act as statutory requirements and political necessities permit. They reflect a healthy skepticism and an awareness of economic realities that should work against a repetition of the fiscal profligacy and misguided experimentation of the 1930's, the naive faith in continuing full employment through Federal investment and expenditure that prompted the original full employment bill.

Mr. President, I voted for the full employment bill. The majority of my colleagues voted for it. I deny the premise which I quoted last from the Guaranty Survey. I assert on the floor of the Senate today that all have an obligation to use whatever forces of government are necessary, under the Full Employment Act, to make sure that, under our capitalistic system, fellow human beings do not suffer for a want of jobs when they are willing and able to work. If that major premise is not recognized, then an amendment should be offered in the Senate which would seek to repeal the general welfare clause of the Constitution itself.

Naturally, when the administration's chief economic adviser is skeptical about the ability of the Government to counter a deflation and is more concerned with the threat of inflation than deflation, it is foolish to expect the Bureau of the Budget to provide advance antidepression measures. And the Bureau has not in any substantial degree so provided.

This administration had better reevaluate what the Government can, ought, and should do to help wage-earners, businessmen, and farmers in time of national economic distress.

The American people, when looking at the list of planned cash payments by the Federal Government to the public in the fiscal year 1955, will want to know why such outlays as those for agriculture and agricultural resources, natural resources, education, research, and general government have been cut nearly $700 million, while cash outlays for interest on the public debt have been increased $350 million. Other voters might be interested in learning that

Federal cash outlays on roads and communication will be $440 million less in the fiscal year 1955 than in this fiscal year. Does this square with the state of the Union message of an expanded highway program?

The unfortunate fact is that the promises of that message, like the Republican promises of the 1952 campaign, far exceed the administration's actions, and often are quite different from the lure dangled before the electorate.

CONCEALED CORPORATE TAX RELIEF

Mr. President, the political and economic consequences of this budget are of such a character as to warrant having every Member of this Congress scrutinize it very carefully. For example, the budget proposal to permit businessmen to deduct larger sums from their pretax income than is now permitted, and to do so for the ostensible purpose of replacing plant and equipment as it wears out, is going to have political and economic consequences. In the first place, it is a poorly disguised means of granting selective corporate tax relief without reducing tax rates. Voters denied such relief will recognize this, despite its deceptive wrapping. In the second place, only a few big businesses, such as General Motors, that are currently engaged in a race either to regain or to expand their share of the market by enlarging and/or modernizing plant and equipment, will derive the bulk of the benefits.

Other businessmen, not so fortunately situated as these giants, not only will have to stand by and watch their share of the market dwindle as deflation deepens, but their reduced earnings will be taxed at the prevailing (Korean) wartime corporate tax rates. They will not benefit from the tax savings to be permitted on new investment, since the decline in demand will not warrant their making new investments.

This proposal is also inviting a repetition of the oversaving difficulties that impeded recovery after the 1929 collapse.

Business is already experiencing major difficulty in finding entirely new investment opportunities to absorb the excess of financial provision over their current replacement requirements. The Department of Commerce in the October 1953 Survey of Current Business—Financing Business Investment—analyzing sources and uses of corporate funds in the 3 years 1951–53 shows that whereas investment funds available from depreciation allowances increased 43 percent, total plant and equipment expenditures—new as well as replacement investment—increased only 15 percent. Comparing the first half of 1951 and the first half of 1953, the Department estimates that funds provided through depreciation allowances increased by $1.8 billion while total new and replacement investment expenditures increased by only $1.5 billion.

The Machinery and Allied Products Institute of Chicago estimates that replacement requirements on the existing stock of capital total about $14 billion annually. The Department of Commerce estimates that capital consumption allowances taken by business today are about $30 billion annually.

Stimulating a larger volume of financial provision for replacement, as this Budget proposes, will serve only to widen the gap between funds seeking outlets and the actual available investment outlets. Department of Commerce figures, for example, show that in the first quarter of 1954, total planned business expenditures on new plant and equipment are running at a rate 3 percent lower than that during the July–September 1953 period. This is the result of a decline in the annual rate (adjusted for seasonal factors) of such expenditures from $28.82 billions in the July–September period to a planned rate of $27.96 billions at present, a drop of nearly $1 billion in the annual rate of business investment in 6 months. Instead of stimulating consumer demand, which is what the economy needs at present, this proposal will actually diminish the proportion of national income available for consumption expenditures.

WHERE ARE WE HEADED?

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that the economic policies outlined in this Budget document will lead to further deflation, because they proceed from the mistaken assumption that what may be good for General Motors or U. S. Steel is necessarily good for the country. Increasing the business-after-tax profits and the investors' after-tax-dividend income will not necessarily lead to added investment, new jobs, and growing payrolls. If businessmen and investors do not see a prospect of consumer demand that will warrant continued investment in productive capital, they will stop investing. Saving without the profitable investment opportunity provided by a healthy and growing consumer demand can lead to a depression.

The philosophy followed by Mellon and Hoover is the philosophy reflected in this Budget. It can produce the same results today as it did in the 1920's.

AMERICA NEEDS A GROWING ECONOMY AND GOVERNMENT POLICIES TO STIMULATE GROWTH

Mr. President, such a disaster must not be permitted to happen. It need not happen. The administration must recognize that this economy needs to grow from year to year, not merely remain "stable," as the Budget message so complacently predicts. The administration must stimulate the needed growth by giving priority in tax reduction—not to business which is not overburdened by the existing tax structure, nor to upper-income investors who are savers, not spenders—but to the vast majority of middle-income and lower-income groups in the income brackets of $5,000 and below. These spending groups make up the mass market for American output. Their needs have scarcely been met, despite the heavy boom of the last 8 years in consumer durable goods, automobiles, and housing. They will become effective customers if American business lowers its prices, and if the administration frees them from their strangling tax burden.

More investment will be stimulated by an added $100 of sales, than by a reduction of $100 in corporate tax liability.

I suggest a new motto for the administration: "What is good for the American consumer is good for America and business."

RECESS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until noon, tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, January 28, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 27 (legislative day of January 22), 1954:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Malcolm R. Wilkey, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas, vice Brian S. Odem, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Tom Kimball, of Colorado, to be United States marshal for the district of Colorado, vice Maurice T. Smith, removed.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William Hendry Day, pastor, Methodist Church, Yates City, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we come to Thee as we enter upon the duties of this day for Thy blessing and presence. We realize our need of Thee as we meet the complicated problems of the world. We thank Thee for the statement that "Men ought always to pray and faint not." Give us faith to trust and confidence that Thou will respond to our supplications.

We do not ask to be relieved of our responsibilities, nor our obligations be less, but we seek Thee for wisdom to clearly understand the problems, and for guidance as to how to deal with them, and we desire above all that Thou will give the faith to give courage to dare to live and act our convictions.

Give us a clear understanding of the greatness of our Nation, and make us appreciative of the high honor we have as citizens in the freedom and liberty that is ours. May we live such lives as citizens and officials in discharging our duties and filling our place in life that when the evening comes we will have much to rejoice in and little to regret.

Heavenly Father, breathe Thy holy spirit upon these officials, help them to be cooperative in a constructive program for prosperity, expansion of peace, and creative of greater opportunities in freedom and liberty for our Nation and

throughout our Nation for the nations of the world.

Hear us and grant our prayer in the name of the Prince of Peace, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 25, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 987. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 198):

Resolved, That Mr. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, vice Mr. PURTELL, of Connecticut.

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 220 of this Congress authorized the creation of a Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries. Under the law the Commission was charged with the duty of determining "the appropriate rates of salaries for justices and judges of courts of the United States and for the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Members of Congress, in order to provide fair and reasonable compensation to such officials," and to "report its findings on or before January 15, 1954." The Commission, composed of distinguished men and women from the fields of business, the professions, agriculture, and labor, conducted public hearings and designated seven task forces to gather factual material and do extensive research into their respective fields of inquiry.

The Commission's findings and recommendations were incorporated in an excellent report which was submitted on January 15, 1954, and which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed—House Document No. 300.

Public Law 220 further requires that "within 60 legislative days after the submission of the report of the Commission the Congress shall consider the report and enact legislation establishing the salaries of justices and judges of the United States and the salaries and mileage of Members of Congress, including the Vice President and the Speaker of the House."

In order that the Congress may comply with this mandate, as chairman of the Committee of the Judiciary, to which the Commission's report was referred, I have today introduced the bill H. R. 7510, to effectuate the findings and recommendations contained in the report of the Commission. I believe that the members of the Commission, the advisory members, and the staff deserve the thanks and the commendation of the Congress for the excellent work performed by them. I hope that the Congress will give speedy and favorable consideration to the bill.

AMENDMENT TO ARMED FORCES LEAVE ACT OF 1946

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 so as to remove injustices to American servicemen who were held prisoners of war in Korea.

The Leave Act of 1946 prohibits the accumulation of more than 60 days of leave by servicemen. When this act was adopted, it was not foreseen that American servicemen would be held as prisoners of war for months and even years and thereby be denied the opportunity to use their leave as it accumulated.

My bill provides that the 60 days limitation shall not apply to our servicemen who were held prisoners of war in Korea and gives them 3 years after repatriation to take the leave that would have accumulated to their credit while they were prisoners but for the 60 days limitation in the existing act.

The boys who were held prisoners certainly did not have the opportunity to enjoy any leave and I think it is no more than fair to remove the 60 days limitation in their cases.

My bill expressly excludes those who refused repatriation.

THE LATE FRANK SULLIVAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this morning I attended the funeral of Francis M. Sullivan, the national director of legislation for the Disabled American Veterans.

Most of you, I am sure, knew Frank Sullivan for his long years of unselfish service in behalf of the disabled veterans of all of our wars. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am the chairman, has for years sought his advice and counsel upon legislative matters affecting our disabled veterans. He did much to help members individually and collectively.

His work is beyond praise. The country owes him a great debt. The disabled veterans owe him a great debt. We in Congress owe him a great debt.

Frank Sullivan was a disabled veteran himself. He gave his health in the service of his country and his life in the service of disabled veterans. Despite his extremely poor health in the past few years, he insisted upon going to his office at DAV national headquarters each day and doing his regular work. He would not give up, and he never lost his pleasant disposition and his winning smile and his sense of humor.

Mr. Sullivan came to Washington 30 years ago and served here on Capitol Hill as secretary to two Members of Congress from Connecticut. He had a large part in the writing of the so-called GI bill of rights and the Veterans' Preference Act. He was largely responsible for many laws for the disabled. He had a fine legal mind and a knowledge of veterans' affairs that was a most valuable asset to him in his work. I can visualize him now up in the Senate and House galleries watching and helping us with the passage of legislation.

I shall miss him greatly as a close personal friend. Our committee will miss his valuable assistance and his great friendliness.

In speaking of his having given his life for his disabled comrades, the priest at his funeral could have spoken no truer words of appreciation. He also spoke of the devotion of Mr. Sullivan to his beautiful wife and family and of his wife and family's loving care of him and what a wonderful family life they enjoyed, also of all the good he did in the world. He spoke of his fine Christian character and the fact he never complained.

If the large attendance at Mr. Sullivan's funeral this morning is any indication of the value of the man and his sacredness of soul, we need no further testimony.

To his wife Katherine and his four children go the deep sympathies and condolences of all of us. His passing leaves us deeply moved.

THE LATE FRANK SULLIVAN

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to bring to the notice of the Members of the House the untimely death of Frank Sullivan as has just been brought to the notice of our colleagues by the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

It was my privilege to have known Frank Sullivan since 1926 when Frank

was here as secretary to Congressman Glynn of the Fifth District of Connecticut, subsequently as secretary to Congressman Goss from the same district in Connecticut. Mr. Sullivan subsequently became assistant to the legislative director of the American Legion, which position he held for 11 years. For the past 7 years he has been himself the legislative director of the Disabled American Veterans here in Washington.

Mr. Sullivan was a man who was well known on Capitol Hill, having spent some 30 years up here. I want to recognize his acquaintance and give some acknowledgment to the vast work that he has done for the veterans and to acknowledge also his great devotion to his family and his friends.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMITTEE

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Atomic Energy may sit tomorrow, if there is a House session, during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

OMNIBUS BILL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have inquired of me whether or not there would be an omnibus bill in this session of the Congress. We have had no omnibus bill since 1950. There are a number of small projects both river and harbor and also flood control that undoubtedly require and should have consideration. For that reason I am announcing to the House that beginning next Tuesday at 10 o'clock the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, will begin hearings on these various river and harbor projects which are confined mostly to the Eastern and Atlantic States, and part of the Middle West, and then as he goes on he will take other sections of the country until the entire Nation is covered.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a list of the projects that are ready and eligible for hearing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT PLEADS FUTILITY ON COFFEE PRICES

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a week and a half ago when I called the attention of the House to the skyrocketing cost of coffee in retail stores and restaurants throughout the country, I said I was addressing a letter to the State Department asking what it is doing—or can do under present authority—to assure fair supplies of the reduced world coffee crop at fair prices for American consumers.

I have today received a reply from the Honorable Thruston Morton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks. It is a rather remarkable missive, what I would characterize as a plea of futility.

It establishes what we already knew—that Brazil's coffee crop suffered frost damage last July and that world consumption of coffee has been rising in the face of a reduced production.

But what can our Government do, in consultation or negotiation with the supplier nations, to assure a fair share of existing stocks at fair prices? Apparently nothing except stand on the sidelines and cheer for increased plantings which will mean more production 7 years from now.

Why cannot our Government do anything more than that in dealing with these friendly nations—nations whose economies we have done much to support and expand and assist over the past many years? Well, the State Department informs me, after all we have no price control in the United States, so obviously we cannot suggest to Brazil or other exporting countries that they encourage restraint on the world price in order to assure fairness for their best customer—the American consumer.

Perhaps I have oversimplified the Department's position. But I cannot help but be terribly disappointed by this spectacle of our State Department pleading futility on a problem affecting every American household, which is forcing us either to pay exorbitant prices for a decent cup of coffee or drink a watered-down imitation of coffee or no coffee at all.

As I said in my remarks here on January 18, if a similar holdup of the American taxpayer were occurring on vital defense materials which we import from friendly countries, we would, I am sure, see some action—at least we used to see action when a situation of that kind presented itself. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that coffee is a pretty vital commodity, too.

While waiting for the State Department's report on this matter, I have been prodding the Department of Commerce for the actual facts on coffee supply in the United States. Unfortunately, that Department keeps no records on coffee stocks on hand anymore, although it used to.

But it does have figures on imports and consumption. And what those figures show merely deepens the coffee mystery even more.

These statistics show that coffee was imported into the United States during 1953 at or near the same rate as during 1952 and 1951 and at a substantially greater rate than in 1950. Imports have not been out of line with previous years.

Here are the facts: In 1953, we imported coffee at a rate of 20,266,000 bags of 132.276 pounds each. In 1952 we imported 3,000 bags less. In 1951, 50,000 bags more. Certainly that does not show any precipitate drop of a nature to warrant the dizzy spiraling of coffee prices of the past few weeks and months.

True, coffee consumption has been rising. In terms of pounds—not bags—we consumed 2,605,000,000 pounds in 1953 as against 2,574,000,000 in 1952. My arithmetic shows, however, that we imported more coffee than we drank in 1953—75 million pounds more.

So where, Mr. Speaker, is the great deficiency—the great deficit in coffee supplies suddenly put forward as the basis for 15-cent-a-cup coffee in restaurants and $1.05 or $1.15 by the pound?

The answer seems to be that coffee prices today are spiraling largely in anticipation of possible future shortages.

Mr. Speaker, the air has been rent the past week with demands for investigations into the coffee situation by committees of Congress, by the Federal Trade Commission, the Justice Department, and other agencies. I am glad to have the President's word today that the FTC is planning to go ahead on this matter.

But let us have no 5-year probes. Let us get the facts quickly and determine immediately if speculation, manipulation, and hoarding are major villains in this drama of the forsaken housewife. Let us do something about it promptly to get coffee back on the kitchen range.

JANUARY 18, 1954.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The spiraling cost of green coffee on arrival in the United States has led to a tremendous spurt in the price of coffee at retail—so much so that restaurants are now being forced to charge as much as 15 cents a cup, and the housewife is paying from $1.06 to $1.10 or more a pound by the tin. The worst aspect of this unhappy situation is that the trade flatly predicts further, and perhaps even more substantial, increases in coming days.

While it may be true that much of the increase can be attributed to the frosts in Brazil last July, which reduced the 1953–54 harvest by perhaps 7 percent, I also understand from trade reports that speculation and hoarding in the supplier countries, and probably in the United States, too, are also big factors in the great surge of coffee prices.

Since we are completely dependent upon imports for our supply of coffee, and since we are dealing with countries with whom we have enjoyed excellent relations and close ties of friendship and commerce, is there not some way the influence of the Government of the United States, through your Department, can be brought to bear in this situation to assure a better break for the house-

wife and the consumer of this essential product?

Has your Department made any effort to reach agreement with the coffee-supplying nations to assure an adequate supply of the reduced production for our needs? Have you initiated any conversations toward assuring this supply at fair prices?

In other words, Mr. Secretary, what is our Government doing—and, also, what can it do under present authority—to arrange with the coffee-producing nations for fairer marketing of coffee in the United States? I know every American housewife would be interested in your answers to both of those questions. I am certainly one housewife who would be.

As I told the House of Representatives today in announcing that I was writing to you on this subject, I know this would not be the weightiest matter on your mind at this moment. Nevertheless, I do believe that if you want us as a people to concern ourselves actively with the monumental issues which confront you in representing us among the nations of the world, please—please—make sure we can all get a decent cup of breakfast coffee.

Without that solace, how can we possibly face up to the problems you want us to concern ourselves with?

Sincerely yours,

MRS. JOHN B. SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District, Missouri.

JANUARY 26, 1954.

The Honorable LEONOR (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 18, 1954, regarding the recent increase in the retail price of coffee. The latest information received from the United States Embassy in Rio de Janeiro corroborates your information that a major factor in the price rise is the limited supply of coffee which will be available from Brazil as a result of a short crop last year and frost damage to this year's crop. The Embassy has reduced its estimate of the supply available for export from the 1953 crop from 15.6 to 14.1 million bags, a reduction of almost 10 percent. This estimate applies to the crop produced in Brazil prior to the frost damage which occurred last July and August. The crop now on the trees cannot be estimated with any accuracy until later in the season, but the Embassy anticipates a smaller output than last year, even with favorable growing conditions.

The reduction in the Brazilian crop estimate has had an unusually pronounced effect upon prices because it comes on top of an already tight supply position. The world has been consuming more coffee than it has produced for a number of years. The excess of demand has been met by drawing on reserve stocks, which are now very low. World consumption of coffee is estimated to have exceeded 33 million bags last year. Supplies available for export during the current crop year, which began July 1, 1953, are now estimated at less than 31 million bags, or about 2 million bags below the anticipated requirements. If exports from Brazil should be maintained at last season's levels the United States Embassy in Rio de Janerio forsees a reduction in the Brazilian carry-over from 3.2 million bags, at the end of the last season, to 2.3 million bags this year, a record low figure.

Adjustment of supply to demand is very slow in the case of coffee because the tree does not bear until the fifth to seventh year after planting. Low coffee prices during the 1930's and early 1940's made it unprofitable to plant new trees, and it is estimated that Brazil suffered a net loss of some 390 million trees during the decade 1940–50. Planting has been increasing rapidly during the postwar period, but only about one-half of the new trees have yet come into bearing. Much of Brazil's new planting was concentrated in the State of Parana, and this was, unfortunately, the area most affected by the recent frost. The Brazilian Government has allocated funds to assist coffee producers to replant, but it will be several years before these trees can contribute to the supply. New plantings have been increasing in other countries as well as in Brazil, however, and the long run supply picture is better than it has been for some years.

The Department has learned of no speculation or hoarding, either in the United States or in the producing countries. A December 16 report, the latest from the United States Embassy in Rio de Janerio on this subject, states that exports from Brazil during the first 5 months of the current season (July-November 1953) amounted to 7.4 million bags compared with 6.9 million bags during the same period last year, which would indicate that coffee was moving normally and not being withheld from market, at least during that period.

You ask whether the Department of State has made any effort to reach agreement with the coffee-producing nations to assure that adequate supplies of coffee will be made available at reasonable prices to meet the requirements of consumers in the United States. The Department of State takes a great interest in keeping coffee prices within reach of the American consumer, since coffee is one of the principal items of trade between the United States and Latin America, and an expanding trade is in the interest of both. It is my understanding that coffee prices have receded somewhat from the recent peak, and it is my belief that the governments of the producing countries will make every effort to bring prices back to normal. I am informed that exports from Colombia are moving at record levels and that prospects for the 1954 Colombian crop are very good. This will offset, to some extent, the anticipated short crop in Brazil.

As to steps which might be taken to relieve the situation immediately, there does not appear to be any practicable basis upon which the Government of the United States might approach the governments of producing countries with a request that they allocate supplies or impose ceiling prices. Coffee, like most agricultural crops grown in the United States, is produced by thousands of small farmers who customarily sell through private trade channels. The large surplus stocks once held by the Brazilian Government were liquidated several years ago. The United States Government did impose ceiling prices on coffee during the Second World War and during the emergency following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. Coffee was one of the last items to be decontrolled, and there was some criticism from the coffee producing countries because controls were being relaxed on prices of manufactured goods which they customarily buy here while controls were retained on the price of coffee, one of their principal exports. One of the first acts of this administration was to eliminate price controls, in the belief that the free play of market forces, operating through private initiative, would result in the long run in the most satisfactory allocation of the Nation's resources and the best protection of the consumer's interests. The authority for imposing price controls no longer exists in the United States, and this Government would be reluctant to request action by other governments which it is not in a position to reciprocate.

If the United States Government were to undertake to negotiate an agreement with the coffee producing countries which would obligate them to supply a specified quantity of coffee at a specified price it would, necessarily, assume an obligation to purchase the coffee at that price. No agency of the United States Government has authority to assume such an obligation.

The United States Government, through the Department of State, has been represented over a number of years on the Subcommittee on Coffee of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council of the Organization of American States. This committee, on which most producing countries of the Western Hemisphere are represented, considers coffee problems of mutual interest, and the United States representative has repeatedly urged that better statistical information be collected in the producing countries, especially with respect to new plantings of coffee trees, so that an accurate determination could be made of the prospective supply over a period of years, and crises either of shortage or surplus avoided. This committee is purely an advisory body, but it has developed an awareness on the part of the member governments of the need for expanding production, and plantings of coffee trees have increased. The Department will continue to urge producing countries to expand production until consumers' requirements can be met at a price which they can afford to pay.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I rise for this brief moment to remind the House that yesterday, January 26, was the 117th anniversary of the admission into the Union of the great State of Michigan.

During those 117 years, Michigan has grown and prospered beyond the wildest dreams of its early settlers. Her sons have written a glorious record on the field of battle in defense of our freedoms. By her industrial might, by the productive power of her factories and the energetic, hardworking people who man her production lines, she has rightfully earned the title "The Hub" of the arsenal of democracy.

When people think of Michigan they think simultaneously of the automobile—a product whose manufacture draws goods from every corner of the Nation, from every State in the Union—products that range from the massive output of America's steel industry to the wax of the humble honeybee.

When one turns from Michigan's past, however, and considers her present and the prospects of her future, the picture is not so bright.

There are ominous danger signs on the economic horizon of our State, signs that this great productive giant may be brought to its knees by the forces of economic recession or depression, unless positive forceful action is taken quickly to avert them.

In the Detroit area, 7 percent of our labor force is unemployed—107,000 people, according to the Michigan Employment Security Commission walk the streets out of work and the commission reports there are no prospects for an upturn in economic conditions yet in sight.

If we allow this situation to continue to develop for a few more months, God help Michigan.

DROUGHT RELIEF IN MISSOURI

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of the Congress, we appropriated approximately $130 million for a disaster relief program for drought relief in the greater southwest agricultural area. The Federal program was so inefficiently and unfairly administered under President Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture that it was necessary in my home State of Missouri to establish a drought relief program of its own and to appropriate $6½ million for the drought stricken farmers of Missouri. This program was established under the able leadership of our distinguished Governor, Phil M. Donnelly. Last Saturday I received the following telegram from Governor Donnelly, of Missouri, as follows:

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *January 21, 1954.*
Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER,
House Office Building:

For your information I have sent the following self-explanatory telegram to Secretary of Agriculture Benson:

"JANUARY 20, 1954.

"Under the terms of the agreement between the State of Missouri and the Federal Government, the State was to be reimbursed by the Federal Government for one-half of the average transportation cost of hay delivered under the Missouri drought emergency program to farmers determined to be eligible for Federal assistance. Up to this time no reimbursement has been received by the State under this agreement, although the State has expended $3,955,173.09 of its own funds for the transportation costs on 369,192 tons of hay up to January 19, 1954. The State has, pursuant to the agreement, promptly delivered a list of all farmers to whom hay has been delivered under the Missouri drought emergency program to the Drought Committee of the Federal Government for Missouri. Request for payment by the State was to be accompanied by certification of the Drought Committee of the Federal Government for Missouri of the amount of eligible hay delivered to eligible farmers as determined from the list furnished by the State.

"The State is prevented from requesting reimbursement from the Federal Government because the Federal Drought Committee for Missouri has not furnished the State with any certification upon which the State can seek reimbursement from the Federal Government pursuant to the agreement. We ask that immediate action be taken whereby the Federal Government will promptly fulfill its agreement to reimburse the State."

PHIL M. DONNELLY, *Governor.*

ANNOUNCEMENT OF REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to make an announcement to Members on the Republican side. We propose to hold a conference which will be quite important tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock. If the House is not adjourned at that time, the conference will be held immediately after the adjournment of the House.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PEACE AND FREEDOM THROUGH LIBERATION

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 4 I had the privilege of delivering an address before the National Conference on Peace and Freedom Through Liberation, which was held at the Sheraton Park Hotel here in Washington. The purposes of the conference are as follows: To discuss principal phases of the problem of the enslavement of peoples under Communist tyranny, to propose ways and means to encourage and strengthen their resistance, and to aid them in attaining liberation and self-government.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that coexistence with the other half of the world occupied by communism is impossible. All peace-loving people were hoping that Moscow would abandon its war aims and would be prepared to find a way at the Berlin Conference whereby the hopes of all people for peace and freedom could be obtained. But again we are disappointed because the Kremlin looks upon the Berlin Conference as nothing but another opportunity to spread false propaganda throughout the world.

It therefore becomes increasingly important that we, the American people, to whom the heaviest burden of world leadership has been given, find a means whereby the hopes of all the people of the world can be achieved. It is my opinion that the deliberation of the National Conference on Peace and Freedom Through Liberation have provided us with a significant step in that direction. While the work of the conference represents only a beginning toward the accomplishments of our twin goals of preventing world war III and acquiring peace and freedom for all people, it nevertheless points the way and warrants the support of all thoughtful Americans.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the address I had the honor of delivering before that conference on December 4:

FOUR FORCES FOR FREEDOM

(Address delivered by Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Member of Congress, 20th Ohio District)

It is a real pleasure for me to have this opportunity to participate in this national conference for peace and freedom through liberation. I am aware that all of you have given years of service in causes seeking peace and freedom for all mankind. Moreover, I feel that you should be congratulated for the effort you will make in the next 2 days to develop a program which will substantially contribute to the attainment of these noble goals.

The days in which we live have been described as dangerous, yet challenging. They are dangerous because the civilization of which we are a part is threatened by a power born out of the crucible of tyranny and knowing no other way of life except that which is based upon the use of brute force, fear, aggression, and inhumanity to man. The danger of this threat is increased when we are informed that that power possesses the secret of producing weapons and bombs capable of destroying an entire civilization. For a few fleeting years we were able to take reasonable comfort in the knowledge that we could hold this dangerous threat in check because of our superior technological development and industrial capacity to exploit this knowledge to the fullest. Our temporary peace of mind was shaken when we heard of the possibility that the heartland of aggressive imperialism may, in the course of a few years, catch up with us in the production of the most terrible weapons ever known to man.

The United States has never pursued a policy of using aggression as an instrument of national policy. On the contrary, everything about America abhors aggression. We are a peace-loving Nation, bearing goodwill toward all other nations and people and holding malice toward none. Our national aspiration has always been for a peaceful world in which human freedom, opportunity, progress, and an abundance of the necessities of life would be the common heritage of all mankind. There have been times in our history when we have been forced to fight for these noble goals but we have done so only after the forces of aggression have left us no alternative. For the same reason, we have been forced to develop a large defense establishment at home and to aid the still free nations of the world to rebuild their own defenses. The ever-increasing threat of aggression has compelled the leaders of the free world to establish collective security arrangements so that the smaller and less powerful nations could survive. Underlying all this planning has been the belief that a strong defense will deter the aggressor.

The grand strategy of the defensive planning of the free world has been based upon two major premises. The first is that the technical advances and productive capacity of the free world, particularly the United States, would permit us a preparedness program which would make war so costly as to make it prohibitive to the aggressor. This also assumes the aggressor must always be kept convinced that he will not only suffer defeat but is in grave danger of total destruction. The second premise is that should the aggressor, in a moment of madness, gamble on a sudden, all-out thrust, we must be prepared to retaliate quickly and with all the terrible striking force at our command. This also assumes that we have the ability to blunt the sudden all-out thrust of the aggressor while at the same time striking his war machine and productive capacity such crippling blows that it will be impotent to carry out further large-scale operations.

In recent weeks some authorities have been speculating on the possibility that the Russian Communists may soon catch up with us in the production of atomic weapons. Others have hinted that they may be on even terms with us in the utilization of hydrogen power. Still others have speculated that they may even be in advance of us in that field. Whatever the true facts may be in this respect, they have a vital bearing on the validity of our current defensive planning. Perhaps we will never be in a position to make a precise estimate of comparative

strength in the atom and hydrogen fields. The Russian Communists hold their atomic and hydrogen developments in a tight vacuum and being experts in the field of deceptive propaganda have allowed only such news to leak to the free world as would best serve their unchanging plan for world conquest. The recent speech in the U. N. by Russia's Vishinsky serves as a good illustration of this point. Until we are able to solve the vital riddle of who surpasses whom in this field or develop a flawless system of international control, we must continue to look in every other possible direction for national and collective free world security.

Communism has clearly established itself as an aggressor force at work in the world. This is necessarily so because the basic doctrine of communism, as developed by Lenin, and his elite followers, demands constant, unremitting aggression until the entire world is under the totalitarian control of Moscow. This is a basic, unalterable principle of communism. Their tactics and maneuvers may show signs of change and adjustment but the fundamental world objective of communism will never change.

In order to carry out its policy of world domination communism needed a base of operations from which diplomatic, political, economic, military, doctrinal and subversive warfare could be conducted. Until such a base of operations was secured communism was a theory—a subject of debate and discussion among disgruntled, and misguided pseudo-intellectuals. On the smoldering ruins of the Russian Czarist Empire, the Communist theoreticians began their experiment with the doctrine of communism. Starting in Moscow the Communists under Lenin established the first Communist nation in history—the Russian Federated Socialist Republic of Soviets. After their weak opposition had been eliminated the Russian Communists began subjugating the many independent non-Russian nations which sprung up from the wreckage of the old Czarist Empire. With the coming and passing of World War II they have subjugated all the once independent nations of Eastern and Central Europe and have created an empire of tyranny over these once free and independent nations. The same technique expanded the empire of tyranny all the way to the Pacific Ocean.

This record demonstrates beyond any doubt that Russian communism as a force in the world must be countered by superior ideals, superior determination, and dedicated action on the part of all free men. As I see it, there are four moral enemies of imperialistic communism. They are religion, enlightened nationalism, free labor, and private enterprise. All four of these positive forces for good are forbidden fruit in the Communist paradise. All four of these forces are absolute essentials to the attainment and preservation of the basic freedoms, human dignity, and a prosperous, full life. All four of these forces represent the great ideals, the noble goals toward which mortal man has struggled upward through the centuries. The tyrant must smother and eventually eliminate these forces or they in turn will eliminate the tyrant. It is impossible for them to coexist over any period of time. This in the final analysis lies at the core of the present worldwide struggle.

As to which side is winning the worldwide struggle is subject to great disagreement and debate. But as to which side will eventually triumph there should be little room for disagreement because in the balance hangs everything dear to civilized mankind. The Communists have committed two fatal errors in their efforts to enslave the world. The first error was made when they decided to engage in open battle with the moral forces of the world—to eliminate God from the affairs of men. This is impossible because man is a creature of God and God can be eliminated from man's affairs only by destroying all mankind. The second error was made when the Communists decided to try to revolt the nature of man—thereby seeking to reduce him to the status of an animal. This too is impossible because it is not within the power of mortal man to change the nature of man. These are fatal errors because they are doomed to failure from the start. In the process of completing the errors the Communists will inevitably earn the scorn, enmity, and finally the wrath of all mankind. This is the course they have determined to follow and there is not the slightest evidence that they are willing or able to save themselves from destruction.

There are some things we can do to save mankind from the terrible penalties the Communist course of action is bound to produce. But these are the things we can do only in conjunction with a sound, complete, and certain preparedness program. To try to separate them from the need to be fully prepared and alert to possible attack by the enemy would be folly.

First of all we must come to understand more fully the positive forces of religion, enlightened nationalism, free labor, and private enterprise. Having done this, we will be better able to support these forces in their endless efforts to bring all mankind to the promised era of freedom and peace.

Religion provides us with the moral norms without which any civilization will perish. These are the norms which rule out the law of the jungle and make man responsible to his God, and in turn for the dignity of his fellowmen. Religion inspires men to accomplish that which is good and to disdain that which is evil.

Free labor is one of the great accomplishments of a civilization based on morality. Since man is a creature of God, he possesses a dignity which requires that his labor, services, skills, and talents be turned to good works benefiting himself and his fellow men. To do this he must be free to choose the manner and means by which he will perform these good works. If he is denied this God-given right, nothing but strife, dissension, turmoil, and anarchy will result. The classic example of this point is the present-day Communist empire. Free labor is presented a challenge by this condition and we should encourage it to take an increasingly active part in lifting the chains of slavery from the workers behind the Iron Curtain.

Private enterprise is the necessary companion of free labor. One cannot exist without the other. Private enterprise is a principle whereby the individual, according to his talents, courage, imagination, and faith can create great and good times—for himself and for his fellow men. He is not directed by some state authority to perform these creative acts, rather he does them because he, himself, wants to. Statism is opposed to private enterprise and vice versa. These two can no more coexist than can human freedom and communism. Private enterprise has brought wonderful and lasting benefits wherever it has been tried. It is capable of turning back the tide of statism and providing a better life for those who now suffer under the system called communism.

Enlightened nationalism is a force which has been at work in the world for many centuries. It is sometimes confused with aggressive nationalism as practiced by the Nazis and therefore considered dangerous. We in the United States practice enlightened nationalism because we are patriotic; we take pride in our glorious traditions; we do not covet that which belongs to other nations, but we do not propose to allow ourselves to be taken over by any of the isms which could destroy our national heritage. There are two forms of nationalism at work today within the Communist empire. The first is an aggressive nationalism—sometimes called Russian nationalism, and more lately Soviet patriotism. Upon close analysis one finds there is little difference between them though they may wear different hats at different times. The other is enlightened nationalism—representing the natural aspirations of the non-Russian nations to be freed from the Communist prison of nations. We have seen ample evidence of this aspiration in the last 6 months. None other than Lavrenti Beria attempted to associate himself with these powerful forces in order to take over control of the Kremlin. It is a powerful force in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and several other of the non-Russian nations. These nationalist aspirations could very well prove to be the Achilles heel of the Russian Communist empire. Some competent scholars are convinced this eventually will be demonstrated. The free world would do well to support this force because the Achilles heel is exactly what sane people are looking for.

These four great forces for good are necessary to sustain freedom and independence of both nations and men. They gave birth to America and they have sustained and strengthened her through every crisis with each passing generation. But today they are called upon to play a vital role in the affairs of men far beyond our borders. These same forces are fighting for their survival or seeking a rebirth throughout the entire expanse of the Communist empire. They have been called the internal enemies of the Communist empire by the successors to Stalin because they live in constant fear that they will be unable to contain them. The tyrants of Moscow know that once these forces are unleashed against them the results will be more devastating than the dreaded atom or hydrogen bombs. But the new devastation will be of a quite different type because it will wipe out atheistic communism and all the evil it has brought to the world.

We must therefore, for our own survival, find the means to unite these positive forces of the free world with their counterparts within the Communist empire. Once we have done this we will have forged the key to peace and freedom. Moreover, we will have accomplished the goal of liberation while at the same time preventing all-out war.

It is within the power of man to shape the events of the future. We can make the future good and beneficial to all mankind or we can allow the world to drift into certain catastrophe. The choice is ours to make—the decision depends upon just how much or how little we as a nation want to do. If we are willing to make a supreme effort which will carry with it many sacrifices, we can attain the hoped for golden era of freedom and peace. That is the great question before our Nation. That is the question we the people must answer in the immediate months and years ahead. That is the question which will occupy your attention during this 2-day conference. The answer must be found. I wish you every success in your deliberations.

EXEMPTION OF DIVIDENDS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the recommendation of the President covering exemptions from taxation of dividends is a long jump toward the practice prevailing in some countries

where the wealthy pay practically no taxes and the entire burden of government is borne by the small merchant and the wage earner.

Here is one example of the President's proposal: Effective within less than 2 years, an unmarried merchant or employee having yearly net earnings of $2,100—after deductions and exemptions—would pay a Federal income tax of $422; whereas, his neighbor receiving precisely the same amount of $2,100 yearly—all from stock dividends—would pay a Federal income tax of $100—a savings of $322—a 76 percent difference.

Another example: When the proposal is fully effective at the end of 1956, a married taxpayer with two children and $12,000 income will pay a tax of $10, if all income is from dividends; but if all income is from salary, or wages, the same person would pay an income tax of $1,836.

Surely my colleagues in the House and Members of the other body will ponder this Presidential recommendation—already approved by the House Ways and Means Committee.

AIR FORCE GOOD-WILL TOUR IN CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure as a Member of this distinguished body to continue my interest in the Republic of Nicaragua, where as a member of the Marine Corps I was privileged to serve for some time in 1928. Late in 1953 I visited Nicaragua officially as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and just last week I stopped there briefly for a conference with our Ambassador, the Honorable Thomas E. Whelan, of North Dakota.

I feel certain that my colleagues on both sides of the House will be interested in the remarkable story I learned from our Ambassador.

On Thursday, January 21, I talked with Ambassador Whelan in Managua. Our Air Force good-will tour to Central and South America arrived in Managua, the capital of Nicaragua, from Mexico City on Monday, January 18, and was given a rousing welcome by the people of Nicaragua. Under command of Major General Hood the jet pilots started their aerial tactics at Las Mercedes Airport on Tuesday, January 19, and before a crowd of more than 50,000 spectators, Capt. Dean L. Ray, of George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif., came in for a landing after breaking the sound barrier in his F–86 Thunderjet, crashed and lost his life on a pasture adjacent to the airport in full view of the assembled crowd.

The crowd was stunned. A nation was placed in mourning by Presidential decree. An outpouring of sympathy seldom equaled in the history of Latin America was immediately evident.

General Hood received President Anastasio Somoza's emotional expressions of regret that the mission of good will had resulted in the tragic death of a heroic United States Air Force jet ace.

President Somoza took complete charge of the situation. He dispatched guards and rescue battalions, he decreed 3 days of national mourning, he canceled all official functions, and gave orders for highest military honors for the unfortunate pilot.

As 50,000 saddened Nicaraguans returned to their homes from the airport, plans already were being made for military and civilian participation in the final honors to be paid to Captain Ray.

At 8:30 p. m. that evening the funeral procession formed at the chapel of Managua's General Hospital. The casket was placed on a half-track tank of the Nicaraguan National Guard. The band and bugle corps of the guard, followed by four companies of cadets of the Nicaraguan Military Academy, led the procession. The casket was followed by officers and men of the Nicaraguan Air Force, officers and men of the United States Air Force good-will tour, and by the staff of the American Embassy and Nicaraguan and American civilians.

The procession, unannounced by newspaper or radio, somehow had been anticipated by the people of Managua. For more than a mile the streets were lined solidly by a saddened populace. As the procession passed, hundreds joined the line of march and upon arrival at the National Palace the crowd overflowed the Plaza of the Republic, bounded by the Palace, Managua's Central Park, the cathedral and the Managua Club, on the shores of Lake Managua.

As the casket was lifted from the half-track tank and carried up the steps of the national palace to the blue salon named in memory of Nicaragua's great poet, Ruben Dario, hundreds of people from all walks of Nicaraguan life wept openly.

Inside the Dario room of the palace, where the Senate of Nicaragua holds its sessions, a guard of honor which was to include President Somoza, members of his Cabinet, General Hood, and every officer of the Nicaraguan National Guard and Air Force began its all-night tribute to Captain Ray.

Precisely at midnight President Somoza arose from his chair, the music of the Nicaraguan National Guard symphony orchestra was stilled, and the General pinned the Nicaraguan Distinguished Service Cross on the Stars and Stripes over the heart of Captain Ray.

President Somoza then took his place at the head of the casket and stood guard for one-half hour in further tribute to a gallant airman who gave his life on a good-will mission to Latin America after escaping unscathed from more than a hundred aerial missions in Korea where he shot down 11 Migs.

Throughout the night, teams of four men stood honor guard, and as the first rays of the sun came up over Lake Managua on Wednesday, January 20, the body of Captain Ray was started homeward. A motor caravan of more than 100 vehicles arrived at the airport where again awaited the National Guard band and the Military Academy cadets to pay final tribute to an American hero who also had been adopted as a Nicaraguan hero.

Before he could return to his office at the Embassy, Ambassador Whelan informed me, telegrams of condolence by the hundreds were being received. They came from mayors of every town and city in Nicaragua, from private citizens, from military outposts on the borders of Nicaragua, the leaders of the Conservative Party headed by Gen. E. Chamorra and of the Independent Liberals headed by Dr. Enoch Arguado.

Floral wreaths continued to arrive after the departure of Captain Ray's body, and on Thursday, 2 days after the crash, the messages of condolence continued to pour in.

Captain Ray's watch, which was torn from his wrist by the impact and hurled hundreds of feet from the scene of the crash, was brought to Ambassador Whelan's office by a young man who said he had heard the watch had not been found, and made a special trip to the crash scene to find it: "For the little son of Captain Ray." Miraculously the watch had been undamaged save for the loss of the crystal, and the gold wristband, although broken, was still intact.

The newspapers of Managua, representing all shades of political differences and philosophies were united in their editorial expressions, each of them stating that the sacrifice of Captain Ray's life would stand as a monument to hemispheric solidarity, good neighborliness, and united opposition to the forces of aggression.

To: Headquarters, United States Air Force, Washington, D. C.

From: Task force commander, "will tour" for SAFIS–2.

The following release was made to Managua news media at 1600 local time, January 19, 1954:

"Capt. Dean L. Ray, United States Air Force F–86 Sabrejet pilot, George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif., was killed today at Managua, Nicaragua, at 1040 hours. Captain Ray is survived by his wife, Carmen, and one son who reside in the Wherry housing section of George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif.

"The jet pilot was completing his part in the United States Air Force Wings for the Americas aerial display when his aircraft developed trouble. He entered the Las Mercedes Airport traffic pattern for what appeared to be a normal landing. However, while in his landing approach Captain Ray reported over the radio that his aircraft was in trouble. On his final approach to the landing strip and while in his turn, he struck a 100-foot tree about 1 mile from the runway. The impact tore away the right wingtip and the Sabrejet crashed in an inverted position.

"President Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua has decreed a 3-day national mourning period beginning Wednesday in honor of Captain Ray. President Somora also announced that Captain Ray would be awarded a posthumous decoration by the Nicaraguan Government. The body will lie in state in the Nicaraguan National Palace during the night of January 19, 1954, under a Nicaraguan military guard of honor."

JANUARY 22, 1954.

The following are extracts of a dispatch from the Embassy to the Department of State.

"Captain Ray has virtually been made a Nicaraguan national hero. There is not a newspaper in the country that has not published eulogies of him and of all American pilots. He has been held up as a symbol of the courage and power of democracy.

"Hundreds of floral offerings were sent to his plane. Hundreds of telegrams of condolence have been received, and are still being received at the Embassy. Labor groups are collecting contributions for a gold medal to be presented to Ray's widow and son.

"The nation's flags are flying at half mast, President Somoza having issued a decree setting 3 days as a period of national mourning.

"On the night of January 19, Captain Ray's casket was mounted on an Army halftrack, covered with floral offerings and with 2 American and 2 Nicaragua fliers at the 4 corners, wound in solemn procession through the streets of the city. The Nicaraguan National Guard band and the military cadets led, and Nicaraguan National Guard officers. Nicaraguan fliers, American airmen and civilians followed. The streets were lined with thousands of wet-eyed spectators.

"The casket was placed in the congressional meeting room under military guard. The Minister of War and other members of the President's cabinet led in guard honors. Later, President Somoza entered the room and placed on the coffin the Nicaraguan Distinguished Service Cross, the highest decoration this country can bestow.

"The President then took a place on guard at a corner of the casket. This is the first time in history that a President of Nicaragua has stood guard on such an occasion.

"The guard continued through the night. Next morning full military honors were rendered at the airfield in a most impressive ceremony. Nicaraguan Air Force wings were given to 38 officers of the American good-will tour.

"Since President Somoza had decreed a half holiday for the air show, there were at least 50,000 people present. This is the largest gathering of Nicaraguans at one time and at one place in the history of the country.

"Never before have the people of this nation shown such warm and strong friendship for the United States. Not only the Nicaraguan Government, but associations and clubs, the heads of all the political parties, thousands of individuals from the very rich to the extremely poor have gone out of their way to show their personal sorrow. There have been hundreds of examples of their touching thoughtfulness. A priest cut a cross, the name of the pilot, and the date in the tree which the plane struck. A small boy, ragged and obviously poor, brought in Captain Ray's watch, which he had found. Words cannot picture the kindness which has been displayed by the Nicaraguan people."

To Headquarters, United States Air Force, Washington, D. C.

From task force commander, "will tour" for SAFIS–2.

MANAGUA, January 20.—Last planes of the United States Air Force Wings for the Americas aerial display left here at 1100 hours local time today. While the departure was anticlimatic, it marked the final honors paid by a very saddened populace and its President to Capt. Dean L. Ray, F–86 pilot who met death 2 miles from the Las Mercedes Airport yesterday.

The accident came in the closing minutes of aerial display and immediately President Anastasio Somoza declared 3 days national mourning for Nicaragua. A casket was flown from Albrook Field and arrived in Managua at 1800 hours. Captain Ray's remains were prepared and placed on Nicaraguan National Guard halftrack at 2000 hours and one of the largest funeral corteges ever witnessed in Managua formed for procession to National Palace. The Guardia Nacional band, led by Capt. Miguel Solis, headed procession followed by drum and bugle corps and four companies of students of National Military Academy. Guard of honor was composed of Col. Francisco Gaitan, Minister of Defense; Col. Charles Vanegas, commandant of Nicaraguan Air Force; Major General Hood; and Col. Woods Rogers, Chief of United States Air Force mission to Nicaragua.

The caisson was followed by Dr. Leonte Herdocia, Chief of Protocol, and his staff and diplomatic corps. Nicaraguan Air Force furnished 100 men to march beside personnel officers and men of "will tour" group.

Procession marched more than a mile to National Palace, where President Somoza and his Cabinet awaited procession. Casket was placed in state in Ruben Dario room of National Palace and symphony orchestra of National Guard furnished music until midnight.

At midnight, President Somoza pinned Nicaraguan Distinguished Service Medal on American flag draping Captain Ray's casket, then solemnly took his place on the rostrum and stood at attention for 1 hour as honor guard.

General Hood also stood a tour as honor guard. Nicaraguan Air Force officers remained throughout the night alternating as guards of honor. Wednesday at 0600 hours a motorized procession formed in front of the palace to conduct the remains to Las Mercedes Airport. Band and Military Academy student body participated in final ceremony of taps and three volleys were fired as casket was placed aboard waiting plane.

At conclusion of ceremony, Colonel Vanegas, Chief of Nicaraguan Air Force, presented citations to General Hood for himself and 37 officers of "will tour," each to receive honorary pilot wings of Nicaraguan Air Force. Several hundred spectators were on hand to witness takeoff of group for Panama.

From: Managua.
To: United States Information Agency.
No.: TOUSI 15, January 25.

(Pass copy urgently Ambassador Whalen, Department of State.)

During San Sebastian fiesta Sunday at Diriamba, State of Carazo, 30 miles south Managua, President Somoza announced: "Nicaragua renders tribute to memory Captain Ray, who died under tragic circumstances in our country and who to avoid causing disaster of unimaginable proportions sacrificed his life." In address Somoza said Ray sacrificed life to save thousands on Las Mercedes Airport. He added that series of postage stamps will be issued in memory United States Air Force jet pilot and that new Managua Airport soon constructed will be named in honor Korean ace. Twice before North Americans honored by memorial stamps—being Franklin Roosevelt and Will Rogers, who flew Managua shortly after devastating earthquake March 1931 with medicine and supplies. Nicaraguans have never forgotten humanitarian gesture on part famous comedian. "He sacrificed his life so others might live, so it is least we can do to honor his memory," said Somoza, referring Ray.

WINSTEAD.

EXCERPTS FROM EDITORIALS IN MANAGUA PAPERS ON DEATH OF CAPT. DEAN L. RAY

Estrella de Nicaragua:

"CAPT. DEAN L. RAY HAS THE WING OF A CONDOR

"(By Dr. Ignacio Roman, director)

"Captain Ray came to Nicaragua on a mission of good will prepared by the United States to show her brother republics of America the great advances in modern aviation, and through that knowledge to enable us to enhance our confidence in the future of the world.

"He had escaped the death that lurks on all fields of battle. The skies in which he wrote designs of fire had been gentle with him, nevertheless he had to give his life beneath the blue Nicaraguan skies on the fruitful fields of our land. His blood was that of a hero and he is a martyr to whom we will always have a light burning. Dean L. Ray will be always remembered in the everlasting friendship which unites us with the United States, its men and its heroes."

Flecha:

"BRAVO, MY CAPTAIN!

"(By Dr. Hernan Robleto)

"He had explored the highest regions of the ether, the purest zones where peace is never broken by the power of sound. That region is a marvelous plane constituted by that unique substance, birdless and cloudless, which surrounds the Creator who sits placidly in his blue throne.

"He passed by flying his shining armor. Our skies were only acquainted with the gray birds of the commercial airplanes. His aircraft was unique, with back-swept wings as if to embody the decisive sharpness of the flying arrow. He flew over our heads waving his hand at us in a friendly salute. We never imagined that gesture was to be his final salute to life and the earth. The night before we had had the opportunity to listen to his calm and gentle words on the microphone.

"He flew like lightning, before our eyes, and a minute later he had reached an altitude of several miles, always heading his plane upwards. Then a shiny point in the middle of the skies, he left a long trail of foam-like smoke and the pilot and his plane disappeared from sight through the sound barrier and into infinity. Two thunderclaps came down to earth from above like a moan from the lips of mystery. The plane and the pilot's soul were lost in space.

"Perhaps it was a feeling of divinity which made Dean Ray forget the essential requisites of his profession. We know the secret beauty of that supreme solitude. He mastered the secrets, and his soul, as in a trance, was pointed upward, up, up, higher. The eagles, hailed through the centuries by poets and prophets, were left down below this man and his plane. Only the highest Spirit has ever been able to surpass this man and his power.

"Bravo, my captain. Hero of a struggle without enemies by the clear light of my land and among tears of admiration and tenderness."

La Prensa:

"KILLED ON A MISSION OF GOOD WILL

"(By Pedro Joaquin Chamorro)

"Capt. Dean L. Ray gave his life while trying to create a stronger and more positive friendship between the United States and the Latin American countries.

"As far as Nicaragua is concerned, he accomplished his mission better than any other person ever has been able to do.

"On Tuesday, all of the Nicaraguans were spiritually unified with the North Americans in a sorrowful moment of sadness. This is when we know our real friends."

La Noticia:

"POSTHUMOUS HOMAGE PLANNED FOR CAPTAIN RAY

"(By Ramon Aviles, editor)

"Many people have suggested to La Noticia that they wish to contribute to a fund for a bronze plaque in memory of Capt. Dean L. Ray, who died so tragically on his mission of good will to Nicaragua.

"We hope to send the bronze plaque to the widow of Captain Ray for placing on his tomb."

El Gran Diario, Dr. Adan Silva, director:

"With a record of more than 2,762 hours in flight, Dean L. Ray ended his career, not destroyed by bullets of the enemies of liberty and tranquillity, but on a clear day when he had in his plane and in his heart not death and hatred, but a message of peace and friendship for the continent which has taken the friendship of the United States at times with some reserve."

Novedades, Leonardo Locayo Ocampo, director:

"BROKEN WINGS IN LANDS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

"(By Luis Filipe Hidalgo)

"He came to Nicaragua harboring a deep faith in the destiny of his country, and with the hope that all these (Latin American) countries should be saved from the aggression of communism whether it appears with arms or hypocritical political doctrines, for the sole purpose of seducing the ignorant.

"And yesterday, while fulfilling his mission and his duty, he met his death in the most sorrowful tragedy that has befallen a North American flier.

"So it is that Captain Ray died so that we may live in the hope that offers a democracy defended by men of his ilk, whose lives are generously given defending human rights for a decent life so that we may be stronger before the dangers of Communist doctrines."

"HOMAGE TO A HERO

"(By Dr. Luis Manuel DeBayle)

"I was honored to meet Captain Ray personally. He had the characteristics peculiar to a hero. He had aroused admiration by his behavior in action over foreign battlefields. But he was reticent to mention his exploits.

"God willed that he draw his final breath over Nicaraguan soil. His heart stopped beating in a country which always has distinguished itself by its sincere Pan-Americanism.

"We hope the blood spilled by Captain Ray will not be in vain and that this painful tragedy keeps always lighted the flame of brotherhood among the peoples of North, Central and South America."

"REQUIESCAT

"*'O Captain, My Captain!'*

"To the memory of Capt. Dean L. Ray, QEPD

"'O Captain! my Captain! our fearful trip is done!

'The ship has weather'd every wrack, the prize we sought is won.' (Walt Whitman.)

"Captain, this is the last homage of a poet. The flags are at half mast and the hearts are sad because of your tragic departure.

"Captain, now that you have departed on the supreme journey, I wish from my control tower to send you a last message.

"I shook your hand the afternoon previous to your departure; I saw your body, broken and bloody, in the dark sanctuary of the morgue; I saw your generous blood honoring with its purple your military insignia and saw your heart—rose of light—wide open to the world like a symbol of fraternity and a prelude of everlasting hope.

"Captain, gentle warrior of the north, the dark and humble bells of my native land sing out to the winds the fruitful gospel of your death and their song strolls along the wide Nicaraguan roads carrying your message of life to all men of good will.

"You very well know that the show must go on; that the sons of the Land of the Eagle have to carry their message to their brothers of the Land of the Condor, Captain!

"The memory of your blood will strengthen the democratic ideal of our young family of nations.

"As long as men of your courage people our America hatred and violence will never reach our shores.

"Upon your grave a handful of pensive roses and the eternal gratitude of my people.

"'Captain, the ship is anchor'd safe and sound, its voyage closed and done.'

"Your lamp went out in a mute holocaust before the altar of nobleness.

"'O Captain! my Captain! rise up and bear the bells.'

"Farewell, and rest in peace.

—"JAIME PEREZ ALONSO.

"MANAGUA, *January 22, 1954.*"

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The State of Iowa mourns for this heroic man. He comes from Greenville, where his relatives and friends remember him with affection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I think in a day when we are beset on all sides with adversities and obstacles that it is only fitting that this body express the deep appreciation of the people of the Nation to President Somoza, to the leaders of the political groups in Nicaragua, and to the people of that republic.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman from California has called to the attention of the House the tragic death of one of our American fliers, Capt. Dean L. Ray, during a mission to the Republic of Nicaragua. We are gratified to learn of the remarkable ceremonies authorized by the President of Nicaragua noting this misfortune. The actions of President Somoza indicate the depth of feeling on the part of the people of Nicaragua toward the United States. I am sure that the friendship which our people entertain for Nicaragua has been adequately interpreted by our able Ambassador, Hon. Thomas E. Whelan, and that the bonds that unite us will continue to be strengthened.

THE HIGH PRICE OF COFFEE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on the floor of the House, and properly so, about the high price of coffee. I think we ought to review a little history. Back in 1949–50 the free-wheeling spenders in the ECA and the State Department went into the market and bought 61 million pounds of coffee and shipped it over as a giveaway proposition to foreigners. That pried the lid off coffee prices and they have never been the same since.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday, February 4, following any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

CUSTOMS DUTIES IMPOSED BY SOVIET REGIME IN POLAND ON AMERICAN GIFT PACKAGES

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I am this day introducing a resolution requesting the Secretary of State to take all necessary measures to protest and indicate to the Soviet regime in Poland our condemnation of new customs duties imposed by the Soviet regime in Poland on gift packages being sent by the American people to the needy in Poland.

The Soviet Government in Poland has resorted to that tyrannical weapon, misusing the power of taxation. Here, again, is an example of the power to tax being the power to destroy. By taxing the import of these packages, the Soviet regime is destroying whatever opportunity the Polish people may have to receive much needed food and clothing.

In order that the House may have some idea of the type of duty which is imposed upon these gift packages, I submit the following:

One kilo of coffee is to be taxed at 100 zlotys.

One small box of pepper at 100 zlotys.

One pair of shoes—whether new or old—at 150 zlotys.

Other items of clothing—whether new or old—are taxed about the same as shoes.

The value of 1 zloty can best be gaged by the fact that an average laborer in Poland gets about 750 zlotys a month. By this yardstick it would take 1 week's work in order that some unfortunate Pole be permitted to receive an old pair of shoes from an American.

During recent years thousands of Americans have been sending large numbers of packages containing food, clothing, and other necessities of life to many countries the world over. All this has been done to alleviate the hardship through which many people the world over are enduring. It is unfortunate that the Polish people should be deprived of these benevolent acts of individual American citizens.

I urge support for my resolution and request such cooperation as other members of this honorable body can give by submitting the necessary protest through our Department of State.

EXTENSION OF THE MISSING PERSONS ACT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7209) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15, Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 147, 1093), as amended by subsection 1 (f), act of April 4, 1953 (Public Law 16, 83d Cong.), is amended by deleting the word "February 1, 1954", and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1955."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, a brief explanation at this point is in order. I am sure it would be beneficial to Members because they may have questions concerning this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill before the House is to extend and continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act.

This act is the sole authority which allows the heads of executive departments to continue to credit the pay accounts and make, continue, or modify allotments to dependents of service personnel and civilians who are in a missing status.

This law was originally enacted in 1942 and remained in effect until 1947. It was revived by the Selective Service Act of 1948 and has been extended by various acts until February 1, 1954.

Unless the Congress takes some action this month to extend this law, it will expire on February 1, and I do not think that the Congress would wish to allow this to happen.

The Department of Defense is currently carrying 3,205 persons as captured or missing as a result of the Korean conflict. These are the latest figures: The Army lists 2,608 men as missing; the Air Force, 336; the Navy, 74; and the Marine Corps, 187.

There is no way of knowing which of these persons are still in the hands of the Chinese Communists or which have been killed. As you all know, our Government maintains the belief that there are still prisoners of war being secretly held by the Chinese Communists who have not been listed by the enemy as prisoners.

The Missing Persons Act is the only legislative authority whereby the accounts of these men may be continued to be credited with their pay and, further, the only authority whereby their allotments to their dependents may be continued. We must not allow this act to expire. Many of the dependents of these missing or captured servicemen have no other source of income but the allotments which their sons or husbands made for them before being captured or declared missing in action. Furthermore, the executive departments have no way of knowing which of these men should be declared dead because there is no evidence to support a finding of death.

The Department of Defense believes that the Missing Persons Act should be revised and enacted as permanent legislation, but the subject is a complicated one and requires extensive study. Such a study is currently being conducted within the Department of Defense, in conjunction with other interested departments and agencies of the executive branch.

I believe that by extending the law until July 1, 1955, which is what H. R. 7209 would do, sufficient time would be given to the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget to complete their studies and propose new legislation to the Congress.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has explained this bill succinctly and the importance of continuing the act is self-evident. This bill came out of our committee unanimously and I know of no opposition to it.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING THE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2326) to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), as amended by section 3 of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act (65 Stat. 88), is further amended by striking out the date "July 31, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "July 31, 1958."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, just a brief word of explanation. As you all know under present permanent law the total strength of our Armed Forces is limited to 2,005,882. When the Korean conflict broke out we raised that ceiling not to exceed 5 million. We built up our Armed Forces to a strength of approximately 3½ million men. More than 200,000 have been reduced from that number until today our total armed strength is approximately 3,300,000 or 3,250,000. It will be gradually reduced a bit, but for the foreseeable future, certainly for the next 4 years, we will have an armed force of approximately 3 million men. This simple bill is to extend from July 31, 1954, to July 31, 1958, the amended legislation that permits us to have more than the 2,005,882 as provided under present law.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, this, like the preceding bill is an emergency piece of legislation that has come out of the committee unanimously, and the necessity for its enactment is evident.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 417 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 358, to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 358 which was unanimously reported from the Committee on Rules and, as I understand, unanimously reported from the Committee on Appropriations.

I have only one request for time, Mr. Speaker. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I am a little disappointed that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] did not give us the benefit of his usual eloquence. I thought before I got any time on this bill I would hear from him and there would be an explanation of it, and that I would have something to shoot at. Now it may be that I will have to ask for more than 3 minutes to deal with this $750 million that goes to the benefit of a segment of the population that represents, according to the Secretary of Agriculture, some 20 million people, which is a little over 10 percent of our population.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that I represent a district that does not boast a large number of cows or other livestock; in fact, I say with some regret that there probably is not a cow in the district except when the livestock show meets at Madison Square Garden. I doubt that there is any other breeding establishment of animals other than the one that I discovered some years ago in a basement in the district where they raised chinchilla rabbits. So I think I

am qualified by the character of my district and the people in it to say a word for the 140 million forgotten people who pay these farm support subsidies, both in higher prices and taxes.

I speak for them because they represent the 90 percent of the people of this country who have been paying 90 percent of subsidies to 10 percent of the people of the country, and paying ruinous and destructive taxes for the rare privilege of paying that 90 percent of parity to the 10 percent of the people who benefit by it.

This 90 percent of parity business was originally a wartime or emergency measure. It is still going on nearly 10 years after the war. It is in a fair way to wrecking the economy of the country. I am told that the storage cost alone of the enormous volume of agricultural products now gathered in warehouses in Government ownership or on Government loan is something like $14 million a month, a half a million dollars a day, just to keep food products off the markets. If anyone can think of any better evidence of the bankruptcy of a farm program, I'd like to know.

Do not misunderstand me, Mr. Speaker. I am not interested in making a peon of the farmer. I think the farmers are now and always have been part of the bone and sinew and life blood of this Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I certainly would be the last to withdraw farm support completely. I think something has to be done to assure to the farmer a fair return. I think the community as a whole has to keep some kind of ceiling under the operation of agriculture to make sure that the farmer will go on and food will be produced and 160 million people will eat. But I do not think any such fantastic program as is now in effect should be allowed to go forward any longer.

We have come here today to a turning point, a crossroads. The Commodity Credit Corporation is broke. It does not have any more money. It cannot pay its bills. We have to produce $750 million through this curious device to enable it to go forward with its operations.

To be sure, the President of the United States has proposed in a message a program that will in some measure alleviate the great burden on the nonfarm population of the country and at the same time provide fair and reasonable security and protection to the farmer. Personally, I am not too sure that that program will be adopted in this Congress. If it is, it will take a long time to get action. In the meantime, here we are accumulating further surpluses, bulging the sides of the storage bins and paying out tax money for it.

I say there is only one way to stop an undesirable program and stop it in its tracks, and that is to stop the money. This we can do today by voting down the appropriation resolution. Such action will bring this incredible situation to a head and force action now. Failure to act firmly and decisively now may result in renewal of the present ruinous program.

Here is an opportunity for the Congress to take a position—a decisive position to bring this issue to a head and not to wait for the long drawn out struggle which is sure to go on with any effort to modify the farm program. If we stop this now, and if we kill this resolution now, the issue will be brought sharply to a head, and the American people will see clearly where this program has led them, and they will know what the situation is and I have no doubt they will know what to do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman said he does not have any cows in his district. But do the people in his district eat food, and wear clothes?

Mr. COUDERT. Yes; and they pay for them twice. They pay the inflated prices created by the farm program, and they pay the taxes that are needed for the commodities which are kept off the market under the farm program. I think that is enough.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad that they still eat and I am glad that we have the food supplies for them so that they can eat.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. While I agree with the gentleman as to the soundness of the principle he advocates, there are two questions I would like to ask him. The answer to one of them I guess would not make much difference: That is, the question: Who got us into this or how? But the important thing is: How we are going to get out of the situation? That is what is bothering me.

Mr. COUDERT. That is exactly why I am taking the position I am here, I am saying to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not hear the gentleman tell us how we were going to get out of it.

Mr. COUDERT. You are not going to get out of it unless you force the issue by some dramatic action such as refusing to enact this resolution, and then something constructive will have to be done.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you mean that all these farmers who were encouraged during the war to increase their production and who went into debt for farm machinery and so on—just let them hold the empty bag alone?

Mr. COUDERT. May I remind the gentleman that the war has been over for nearly 10 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, and the farmers still have their debts and their machinery, some purchased on installment, and their farms, some with a mortgage to secure the repayment of money borrowed to carry out an administration request.

Mr. COUDERT. I think if this resolution should be killed in this committee, there would be a fair chance of getting the President's program almost at once, and that would take care of the farmers. That is my answer to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. Certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My farmers do not want to be taken care of. They just want to be treated fairly, that is all.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman think or take the view that the President's proposed program is not treating the farmers fairly?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know. I just know that I have at times been unable to learn just exactly what the administration wanted. I will say this to you. My farmers realize the unsoundness of this policy, but at the Government's request, they went along with the war program. Now, does the gentleman want to have them forced into bankruptcy? I do not think he does.

Mr. COUDERT. Would the gentleman from Michigan want to have the present program go on indefinitely, unchanged?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course not. Nor do I think the administration does. I am asking you. I have the utmost confidence in your ability. I am asking you what is the solution because I do not know and my farmers are asking me that vital question.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentleman for the compliment. I do not know the precise solution either, but I am sure there must be a solution, and 140 million people must also be protected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, several questions are involved in this particular bill which comes to us in a rather peculiar way. It is intended, according to the preceding speaker, to increase the amount that the Commodity Credit Corporation can lend on farm commodities, but it comes to us in a way of canceling lending privileges. It came from the Committee on Appropriations. This bill has not been considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency, which should be entitled to consider it, but it has not been considered by any legislative committee. There have been no hearings on the bill, so far as I can find out. We are asked to legislate in the dark. We do not know what we are doing.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman for a correction.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. All right, sir, then for a correction. There are hearings available.

Mr. PATMAN. Where are they?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. They are right there on the desk.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me see them. Let me have them.

I beg the gentleman's pardon. I had asked for a copy on Monday last, and also today, and was told they were not available. Let me ask the gentleman, then, if in the record or in the hearings these questions are answered.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There are many questions answered.

Mr. PATMAN. I will ask the gentleman these questions. The other day the press carried an item that the United States—that is, the Department of Agriculture—allowed the banks to finance $350 million more of its indebtedness, and that thus the Government avoids increasing its debt total, which is already crowding the legal limit of $275 billion. In other words, the object of this is to keep the debt limit under the $275 billion.

[From the New York Times of January 16, 1954]

TO BACK PRICE SUPPORTS—UNITED STATES TO ALLOW BANKS TO FINANCE $350,000,000 MORE IN CROPS

WASHINGTON, January 15.—The Department of Agriculture today offered commercial banks an opportunity to finance $350,000,000 more of Government price supports for surplus farm products. Banks may provide funds and receive certificates of interest from the Commodity Credit Corporation, the price support agency. The certificates will be backed by the surplus commodities and by the Government's guaranty against loss.

By obtaining funds in this fashion, the Government avoids increasing its debt total, which already is crowding the legal limit of $275,000,000,000.

The department, which has nearly $5,000,000,000 invested in farm surpluses under price support programs, already has farmed out $835,000,000 in price support loans to banks. The new certificates will be issued February 2; will mature August 2, and will bear interest at the anual rate of 2⅛ percent. Previous certificates bore interest rates as high as 2½ percent. The money obtained in this way will be used largely to finance support loans on the 1953 cotton crop.

I understood the majority leader to say on Monday that that was one of the reasons for this bill. We are not attacking the problem directly. We are attacking it indirectly. If we were to attack it directly, we would raise the question of the debt limit. This is not a bill to help the farmers. It is a bill that will reward the banks in a way that they are not entitled to be rewarded. Are we going to say that because we would raise the debt limit, that we should give the banks more Government-guaranteed paper?

BANKS LOANED UP NOW

The banks cannot take care of the small-business men now. They cannot take care of the local people on loans, because they are almost loaned up. They are practically loaned up now. And if you give them more paper, it will make it more difficult for local people to get local loans. And those people are the most deserving people in your communities today, and they are being denied the privilege of getting loans or even of getting consideration, because the banks are loaded down with Government-guaranteed paper. Here you are giving them more.

Why should we borrow money when we have in the banks today, according to the daily statement of the Treasury, nearly $4 billion of additional funds? To be exact on January 21, 1954, the United States Treasury had $3,687,443,478. On January 25 it was $3,788,628,828.

Do the hearings before the gentleman's committee bring that out—that we have additional money in the banks to the amount of nearly $4 billion unused? The banks are using that money. They are using it free of charge. The Government does not get any interest on it. The Government used to get 2 percent, but it does not get anything now.

Here you are proposing a bill that will cause the Government to borrow money from banks that are already loaded down with Government paper, and thereby crippling local industries and local businesses and local people in their efforts to get consideration of local loans, when we do not need the money.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is referring to matters of policy regarding basic Commodity Credit legislation. That comes in his own committee and not in the Appropriations Committee. The gentleman ought to know that.

Mr. PATMAN. I know that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is not within our purview, may I say, to bring in recommendations for basic legislative changes.

Mr. PATMAN. But this is a basic change and that is the reason the gentleman's committee should not have brought it in. It should be considered by the Banking and Currency Committee instead.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is up to the gentleman's own committee to bring it in.

Mr. PATMAN. It should be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is where it should go. And adequate hearings on the matter should be held.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is entirely incorrect when he says that this is a new procedure. We have done this very thing for 6 years past, as far as canceling notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned. Why has not the gentleman raised the issue before this? It seems to me more or less strange that he has not.

Mr. PATMAN. There is nothing strange about it. It is strange to me that the gentleman puts himself in a position of wanting the taxpayers to pay with money borrowed from the banks, when those very banks have funds belonging to the Government that could now be used. I cannot understand why the gentleman should be taking that position. The banks already have a 200 percent bonus from the Government. One when the bank creates the money to buy the bonds of the Government and get the interest on the bonds. Next, when it keeps the money on deposit and uses it, making loans with it and drawing interest from these loans.

Under this bill one of these same banks will manufacture more money on the Government's credit and buy some of the CCC securities. The bank will receive interest on the CCC security or certificate of interest and keep the money on deposit—the Secretary of the Treasury says he should have $8 billion in the banks. The money kept on deposit can be used by the banks to make loans and get interest on the loans. It is really a 400-percent subsidy or bonus.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield, briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to ask just two questions.

Mr. PATMAN. Two questions may take some time. May I suggest the gentleman ask just one question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. One question first. What is this money for? What do they want to use it for?

Mr. PATMAN. They want to use it to finance the crop surplus.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is the gentleman going to do with his cotton in Texas if the Government does not buy it?

Mr. PATMAN. We cannot discuss each item, each comodity. We do not have the time to do that. Certainly we cannot do it in 5 minutes.

I am not saying these things to reflect on the bankers. The bankers, of course, are good people. I would not say anything against them at all. They are among the finest and the best citizens in our country. And the banks have performed a great service both in time of peace and in time of war. But in the bankers' interest, they should not be allowed to do this, even though they want to do it. They should not be allowed to keep $3,800,000,000 of the people's money, which belongs to the Treasury and at the same time compel the taxpayers to pay interest on it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will grant me more time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I should be delighted to have the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] do so; I should be glad that the gentleman have whatever time he desires. But am I to understand that the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is coming before the House and trying to kill off price supports here today?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I am for price supports. This is bank support and I doubt many of the bankers are asking for it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman certainly does not show it.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want further to subsidize the banks for the purpose of giving support to commodity loans. Now I do not think it is necessary to do that. It is unnecessary. According to the statement of the Treasury, the last statement that the gentleman received this morning, we have $3,788,000,000 in these very banks. They will buy this

paper and they will get, when you pay the going rate of interest, if we are to judge the future by the past, they will get 2½ percent on that paper that should be 1 percent. That is what you are putting out, and you are putting it out when we have in the banks nearly $4 billion. It does not make sense. If this thing should be done it should be gone into from every angle, testimony should be had as to its effect on the national debt, and everything else.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The gentleman ought not to be critical of this for I remind him that the banks are carrying over $260 billion of obligations of his own party.

Mr. PATMAN. That, of course, is injecting a partisan question in it. This is not political; I do not look upon it as a political question at all, but if the gentleman wants to talk politics for a little bit I will take a little time when possible and talk politics.

We are not ashamed of that debt. That big debt represents something. In the war we decided that we would use money instead of men every place we could. We never sent a man into the field if we could send a piece of machinery to take his place, no matter what the machinery cost. We used money to save lives. Which would you rather have, a high national debt and a low casualty list or a high casualty list and a low national debt?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Three times in my lifetime we have been led into wars when there had been absolute control by one party preceding those wars. Under those wars we had high casualty lists and we had high national debt, until it has risen to a point that it is costing us nearly $7 billion a year in interest to carry it.

Mr. PATMAN. I cannot yield further; my time has about expired. But I will say to my distinguished friend that I have permission to revise and extend and will put further facts and figures in the RECORD.

But I want to state that the question involved here is that we are being asked to borrow hundreds of millions more directly from the banks, and those very banks have nearly $4 billion of the Government's money in them right now. We are already paying interest on this nearly $4 billion at 3 percent, or $120 million a year, and here you want to go out and borrow more money from the very same banks that have our money, and pay more interest. I want you to think about that; it just does not make sense to me.

Secretary Humphrey made it clear to Members of Congress in July and August last year that the Government retains substantial deposits in all 11,000 banks where deposits are kept. One case was cited where a little bank had some $70,000 to $250,000 deposit, with the understanding from the Secretary of the Treasury that it would not be reduced below $70,000.

It should be pointed out that the Treasury does not draw checks on the 11,000 banks, or any of them, to pay Government bills. When the money is needed, the banks are requested to turn a certain percentage of their deposits into the Federal Reserve bank serving the area. Then checks are given on the Federal Reserve bank. Under the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Reserve banks are fiscal agents of the Government. When this was determined the subtreasuries then existing over the country were abolished. It was never contemplated that the Secretary of the Treasury would make deposits in local commercial banks, but it was contemplated that all money belonging to the Government would be immediately deposited with the Federal Reserve banks in the same way it had formerly been held in subtreasuries offices in various parts of the country, which were abolished in favor of the Federal Reserve banks.

The New York Times of January 26, 1954, contained the following news item concerning the call for funds by the Treasury:

TREASURY FUNDS

The United States Treasury issued a call yesterday for funds held in its tax and loan accounts by the Nation's larger banks. Based on balances as of last Saturday, the 6 percent call on the Class B banks requires payment on Friday. Banks in this district will provide $37,177,000 of the national total of $133,438,000.

I repeat, that the funds on deposit in the thousands of commercial banks in the name of the Government are not checked upon at all. They are permitted to remain there with the banks and the banks use them, while the taxpayers continue to pay interest on the funds. When the Federal Reserve Act was passed—I again repeat—it was contemplated that all funds would go directly and immediately to the Federal Reserve banks, where they could be checked upon, to pay the expenses of the Government.

POSTMASTER GENERAL COMMENDED

The same situation exists with the Post Office Department that exists with the Treasury. Postmaster General Summerfield is to be commended for carrying out the law and practicing economy. Under a recent order, all postal-savings money deposited with post offices goes direct to the Federal Reserve banks. The postmasters having postal-savings accounts have orders to deposit them with their nearest Federal Reserve bank. The long-standing policy of permitting postmasters to put these funds in local banks was ended with no public explanation, according to Washington Banktrends of December 14, 1953. The best reason given, according to Banktrends, is to avoid high bookkeeping costs with numerous banks. The Federal Reserve now assumes these costs as fiscal agents.

ARROGANCE OF SO-CALLED SUPREME COURT OF FINANCE

It is my understanding that when the officials of the Post Office Department wanted to make this very fine and money-saving change—it will save the Post Office Department at least $2 million a year and the taxpayers a large sum in interest—the Board of Governors refused to agree to allow the 12 Federal Reserve banks to take on the work. Then the post-office officials tried to make arrangements with certain banks in each large area in the United States to carry the funds without cost to the Post Office Department. This was very unsatisfactory, for obvious reasons. Then, I am told, the Postmaster General demanded—which he had a right to do—that the Board of Governors accept the responsibility for the Federal Reserve banks and perform the service. This is just a sample of the arrogance of the so-called supreme court of finance, as represented by the Board of Governors and the Federal Reserve System. If all the laws they have violated were made known to the people—and their effects—I am sure there would be many unfavorable reactions. At the same time, if all the laws the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System have misinterpreted and failed to observe were disclosed, along with the cost in dollars to the American taxpayers, there would be a considerable clamor from a large percentage of our people for an investigation and a clean-up. The Board of Governors still claim that they are separate and apart from the President and under no obligation to the President. They declare that the Federal Reserve System is an independent agency and is not obligated to carry out the wishes of the President or other agencies. All the good proposals of President Eisenhower cannot be carried into effect without the cooperation of this Government agency which claims to be out from under his control, influence, or jurisdiction.

MANUFACTURED MONEY

It does not seem logical that the Government will allow a local bank to create the funds on the books of the bank, or, in other words, manufacture the money, then and there, with a fountain pen, to buy a certain amount of bonds from the Government and then permit this money to remain in the bank—a substantial percentage of it indefinitely—thereby allowing the banks to use it for lending purposes and at the same time collect interest on the bonds purchased from the Government, with manufactured money.

The Secretary of the Treasury should have all funds in all 11,000 banks sent to the Federal Reserve banks immediately. There is no reason why the Treasury should carry accounts in private commercial banks, as they are not used for checking purposes. If it is necessary to help the banks in order to help them render the maximum public service, it should be done directly, or in a way that would not be so expensive to the taxpayers. Last year the 11,000 banks had on deposit $9 billion. If the Government had collected 2 percent interest, as it always did on these balances, up to a few years ago, the Government would have collected $180 million interest from these banks. As it was, the Government did not collect anything for this money, which was remaining idle in the banks and for which the taxpayers were paying 2 and 3 per-

cent interest, or from $180 million to $270 million annually.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], my longtime friend, knows, of course, of my high regard for him, but on this occasion as frequently happens I cannot quite follow his devious reasoning and thinking.

It is true as came out in the exchange of ideas about the debt the other day, that there is involved here something of a problem with respect to the so-called debt limit. And, before going any further, let me say that last July the House of Representatives upon the showing made by the Treasury Department and by the executive branch met its responsibility and increased the debt limit. It is just too bad that the other body did not follow suit because it soon will be apparent that they must follow suit. It does no good to talk about the reason why that national debt had to be increased, the fact is that it was the result of the obligations that were incurred, debt that came about, and the further fact that the Federal Government cannot renege on its obligations or default on them.

Now, because of failure to increase the debt limit and to realistically meet our situation, the Treasury has had to do in many instances what they indicated they would have to do—and it was not good business—in order to avoid going over the debt limit and creating chaos in this country. One of the things they did was to go back to an earlier procedure in the Commodity Credit Corporation and to say to the Commodity Credit Corporation, "Instead of borrowing all of your money from the United States Treasury, where you can borrow it more cheaply and it can be better handled, you go out and borrow money from private sources."

What effect did that have on the debt limit? If the money had been borrowed from the Treasury, the Treasury in turn would have had to borrow from people and increase the national debt, which would have shoved us over the limit. Now, that is how simple the matter is.

I come now to the reasoning or the argument of the gentleman from Texas. He says, why you have $4 billion in the banks and we are paying interest on it, so why arrange to get any more money—just use that.

Does the gentleman know that the accounts of the United States Government are scattered in 11,000 banks around the country?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. They do not issue checks on those 11,000 banks. They have money in every one of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and they can draw checks on that.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman is again trying to confuse the issue. The fact is those accounts are in these different banks. As to just how many of the 11,000 banks checks are drawn on every day, I do not know, but by and large those accounts must be spread all over the country because in one place you have a big military installation going in and it is desirable to pay bills out of the Government account in that area for that particular installation. I suspect the gentleman from Texas would not urge that all of the Government accounts in the banks in his district be withdrawn. Of course, the argument is a specious one.

Do you know that while our friends on the right and their administration were running the Government they insisted, even in times of a lower level of national spending, that we had to have $6 or $7 billion with which to do the business of this great Government of ours? As Republicans we went along to increase the national debt in order that the borrowing situation of the Government might be protected.

What sort of sense is it to argue that with checking accounts all over the country and the necessity of the Government checking on those accounts to pay its bills, that we draw down to where we do not have any money in the banks? It is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard of. Let me say that by reason of failure to increase the debt limit the Government of the United States in many ways, in order to protect its credit, has had to get money here and there, make arrangements here and there, which have cost the Government money. Instead of it being a wise move to block the increase in the debt limit it was an unsound move.

Mr. Speaker, do you want your great Government of the United States to get down to where its reserves in the banks to meet its bills are less than a 10-day supply? That is where we have been several times.

That has not really anything to do with this particular matter except, as I indicated the other day, the House of Representatives cannot afford by anything it does to create any suspicion as to the ability of the Commidity Credit Corporation to meet its obligations, or the willingness of the Congress of the United States to stand back of the obligations that our Government, either directly or through its agencies, has taken upon itself.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, with reference to being down to where you cannot pay your obligations, the Treasury has the power now to get direct loans from the Federal Reserve bank. And, there is $5 billion unused. So, even if it is broke, it has that $5 billion. May I correct the gentleman that the Treasury does not draw on these 11,000 banks, on your bank or my bank, for any of that money, not one penny. The nine subtreasuries were abolished in 1913 and the Federal Reserve banks made the fiscal agent of the Government. All of this money has got to go into the Federal Reserve System and the checks are drawn on the Federal Reserve System, and the money in the commercial banks can be sent there overnight. So the gentleman is in error when he says that they make checks on the local banks to pay local labor and local service.

Mr. HALLECK. As I think I said one time before in sort of a friendly colloquy with my friend from Texas, that at the University of Indiana, where I majored in economics, I took a course in banking and currency, and the more I studied about money the more I became convinced that I did not qualify as an expert. I have never sought to qualify as an expert, but I say when you draw the account of the Government down to the point where you have less than a 10-day supply, you are getting reckless with the affairs of the Government.

No one here would suggest that any business operation in the country be run on any such margin as that, and we have no right to expect it of our Government.

May I say at this point that a great many of the Members on the Democratic side realize, as we realized when we were in the minority, the necessities of the situation and moved with us to meet what was before us. And, I commend those Members over there for it.

Now then, to get back to what is before us, this bill follows the usual pattern. The Commodity Credit Corporation, created by the Congress, with a lending capacity of $6,750,000,000, is confronted with an impairment of capital for which we are responsible. It involves a loss of the Corporation. Now all the Committee on Appropriations is doing is to replenish the coffers of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent that those coffers have been impaired. We simply meet our obligations, and without regard to what you think about the farm program, it is an obligation that we must meet, and so I trust that we will support this rule and go on to the business of consideration of the measure itself.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman recognizes the fact, I am sure, that this obligation comes as a result of operations from July 1, 1915, through June 30, 1953; in other words, both sides of the House, if the responsibility is to be laid on anyone's door, are equally responsible for, you might say, half of this obligation of $6 billion appraised loss.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that the basic farm law under which we are presently operating is a bipartisan measure. We enacted farm legislation in the Republican 80th Congress. Then in the Democratic 81st Congress there were certain revisions made, so that what we have now is a kind of fusion of the 1948 act and the 1949 act.

Beyond all of that, the measure was supported by Members on both sides, and may I say to my friend from New York not only by Members from so-called rural districts but by Members from city districts. I can well recall the speeches of our late friend, Judge Sabath, of Illinois, representing a Chicago district, who pointed out time and again that he wanted to go along with the farm programs. So they have been bipartisan. I think during the war when the 90 percent was arranged for most of us voted for it. I voted for it.

There is one thing I want to say here further as we approach this particular program and as we approach the whole problem of the farm program. So far as I know, no responsible people are saying that overnight there shall be a radical, complete change from this to that, or that the rug is to be pulled out from under agriculture. No one proposes that. The President has not proposed it. The Committee on Agriculture would not take such an action. But again, may I point out, as I pointed out when we were increasing the acreage on cotton over the formula provided for in existing law, and as we might have pointed out when we increased the acreage of wheat over the formula provided by existing law, that the very fact that we are here replenishing the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation ought to be evidence to us that everything is not just perfect, that possibly the time has come to recognize that certain weaknesses and certain difficulties are making themseves evident, and, recognizing them, that we begin to pay some attention to at least a beginning of such action as would seek to initiate at least some effort, some realistic approach to meet those weaknesses and difficulties and to deal with them.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. There has been so much discussion in the last few minutes about the impact of this matter on the debt limit that I am afraid one essential fact might be lost sight of in the debate. Is it not a fact that the approximately $750 million carried in this resolution has the effect of increasing the available funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of supporting the agriculture of the country?

Mr. HALLECK. That is absolutely correct. If I understand the situation, and I believe I do, the Commodity Credit Corporation is running out of funds to carry on the support-price program the Congress of the United States voted. Insofar as that is true, then certainly we have an obligation which we must meet. In my book, it becomes doubly important that we meet it because of these other considerations that are involved.

May I say again that sooner or later we will be asked to vote a very substantial increase in the capital, the lending power, of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is because it is expected that more of the surplus commodities will have to be taken over by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

As I say, we voted for it. We have to meet that responsibility. But again may I say it is time for us to stop, look, and listen, and fundamentally to deal with the realities of this situation because, may I say, and I have been reading it in the papers and hearing it in the corridors, there is no question but that many of our Members who have been willing, yes, who wanted to go along with a sound farm program, recognizing that agriculture is entitled to its fair share, are beginning now to have hard questions put to them. They want us to help them find the answers. I think they want to stay with us in building a sound farm program and continuing a sound farm program and maintaining it; but at the same time I think there are a few danger signals around to which we should be paying attention.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader mentioned that in the near future a request would come up for a substantial increase in the borrowing limit of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I have asked for this time so that I may inquire why that procedure was not used in connection with this particular amount of money.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to answer that question?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We were informed that that procedure which has already by the way been started in the other body, sir, would take too long and we cannot afford to close off loans relative to the Commodity Credit Corporation as of this date because of no money being available. The other procedure would require at least 1 month's time, and in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture it would be poor business to say that the Commodity Credit Corporation during that length of time can do no further business.

Mr. BOLLING. That answer leads me to my next question. I cannot understand how in the management of a program of this scope what I read in the press the other day could be accurate. I read in the press that testimony had been given that there was in the Commodity Credit Corporation adequate borrowing authority for only a few days more operation. Now the question that occurs to me is, How could the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Eisenhower administration in the operation of so vast and so important a program be guilty of such bad management that they find themselves confronted with only 3 or 4 days of money with which to carry on this program, which we all recognize is extremely important to the farmers?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I regret that the Commodity Credit officials come to us so late as to the need for this action.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, when I moved on Monday to cause this bill to be deferred until today, I did it because I believed the time had come—and, indeed, was overdue—for the city consumer to have an impact upon the farm policy. I have thought that for a long time. Representatives from city districts are beginning to wake up because their people are beginning to wake up and let me assure you that their people will wake up more and more.

Now there are tremendous contradictions in this whole governmental farm price support program. Among them are, first, the fact that the farmers' net income has been falling and falling very seriously. It is down, I believe, by about 15 percent from 1951. Representatives from farm areas, perhaps, ought to examine their own philosophy right here in this House to decide whether they are backing the right policies. Apparently they are neither satisfying the city consumer nor are the figures satisfying the farmer himself.

Second, farm commodity surpluses have been growing inordinately. The President spoke of them in his message. There is a year's domestic supply of wheat on hand. There is a year's domestic supply of cotton on hand and enormous supplies of cottonseed oil. There are close to 300 million pounds of spoilable butter involving $200 million of Government outlay. There are $500,000 a day in storage charges for the surplus the Government holds. There is a $2 billion carryover from the last crop year of price supported farm product surplus, and $2½ billion more in this crop year, making a total of over $5 billion. This cannot go on.

Third, the farmers' export markets are drying up. The farmer generally contributed 25 percent to American exports in years gone by. What has happened to that? Overall farm exports are down in 1952–53 about 30 percent from 1951–52 alone—cotton export is down about 50 percent; fats and oils, about the same or more; tobacco, 13 percent on top of a reduction of 25 percent in 1951–52; eggs and egg products are down heavily, too, in both years.

Everywhere we look there are contradictions. Everywhere we look this picture shows the mischief being done by the present high fixed farm price parity program.

A question was asked by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]: "What should we do about it?" I should like to answer that by suggesting what, representing city consumers, I think we should do about it.

One, we should adopt the President's flexible farm price parity program, because it will result in causing production to go into other items of farm products conditioned by demand and not what the farmer, often though the tendency to continue and not to change, chooses to produce or what this House by legislation apparently thinks he ought to produce.

Apparently, the farmer is producing too much wheat and too much cotton and too much cottonseed oil, butter, and other things. But a program of adaptation to consumer demand does not mean that he has to let his land lie fallow. There is an enormous demand in our country, I understand, for various kinds of dairy products.

Butter is now around 80 to 90 cents a pound in the retail store. What law of nature says that it should not be 50 cents if it will then move into consumption? It is a fact, that in the last 12 years, since 1941, the consumption of butter has fallen off by 50 percent in this country—from 1,872,000,000 pounds in 1941 to 1,206,000,000 pounds in 1952, despite a rise of 23 million in population. What a contradiction. Three hundred million pounds of butter in Government

warehouses and consumption has fallen 50 percent in a little over a decade. Why? Not because my constituents, who earn on the average $3 or $4 thousand a year do not want butter or would prefer something else. It is because they cannot afford it under the over-all cost of living.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman, of course, knows how this Congress unwisely voted to take the tax off oleo, which put butter in the position to which he has referred.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry to differ with the gentleman. My constituents will use more butter and will also use oleo. The standard of living even in this country still has a long way to go. Even 300 million pounds is only 25 percent of 1 year's butter consumption.

We should adopt the President's program of flexible farm price parity support program which would in some way condition farm production by demand.

Second. Those in this House who represent the farm areas ought to be for a liberal export and import trade policy. It seems to me Members can hardly be for the farmer and against a liberal trade policy. That is an innate contradiction in everything that the farmer interests represent, would seem to represent. This goes for his own need for farm exports and for his need for a prosperous industrial community of consumers.

Third. Insofar as free world development is concerned in terms of the struggle against communism, food is a vitally important element in raising the standard of living. Right now it is critically important in this conflict, until other free peoples through technical assistance, private overseas investment, and various other means can come to a higher subsistence level themselves, that on a much greater scale, surplus food which is in store and which can be produced by the American farmer should be used for improving living standards. This is essentially a job which can make our farm production a heavy factor in winning decisively over communism.

This is a three-point program and need only be concerned with the near term. For the farmer's position is perfectly sound for the long term. As our population rises, we will be something like 25 percent to one-third short in the production of food by the end of this century, so that in the long term the farmer needs to produce more.

What is squeezing the farmer and the city consumer is the present governmental policy of high fixed farm price supports which we must change, because it has stratified the whole production picture without meeting the march of farm technology or consumer demand and created all this mischief.

I have studied the figures carefully and I believe that out of the $72 billion food bill of the American people, they are overpaying about $3½ billion to $7 billion for what they get. But they ought to spend that $3½ to $7 billion for more food. This will be important in the matter of what farm products are produced and important for the benefit of the country.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 358, with Mr. ALLEN of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule there are 2 hours of general debate, 1 will be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], and the other by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, I am at a loss to understand how these gentlemen whose constituents must depend on agriculture for their food can rise here and try to kill the Commodity Credit Corporation's effectiveness when because of an emergency we must restore its capital structure today. The gentlemen from New York City represent people who can buy more food today per wage-hour than they could back in 1939; they can buy more butter, bread, more of everything they use in quantity for an hour's wage than they could in 1939. What have they got to kick about? I feel they are very fortunate in having available an ample supply of food at reasonable prices.

Facts and figures which came to me from the Commodity Credit Corporation yesterday show that of the losses which have actually been sustained to last June 30 only $782,327,808 can be charged to the price-support program. Yes, there was an additional $2,101,987,000, a strictly wartime consumers' subsidy, given for the benefit of such folks as the constituents of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and these other gentlemen who protest today so loudly. This price-support program is very important. It affects the basic economy of America. Where would we have been the last 18 years had it not been for the price-support program? Even if we charge the $609 million in addition to the $1,110,000,000 cost as of June 30, 1953, we still have only $1,800,000,000 in cost, or only a little over $100 million a year since the inception of the program back in 1935. Is that a prohibitive price to pay for maintaining the agricultural prosperity of America? I think there are some Members here who should reorient their line of thinking and consider whether or not they want to take the responsibility for irreparably damaging the economy of the United States by insisting on curtailing the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. What would the corn back on my farm in Minnesota have been worth last fall had it not been for the 90 percent support figure provided? Do you think that the millions of bushels of corn raised by farmers like me would have brought $1.50 per bushel in the open market these gentlemen advocate? No; we would have been lucky in that case if we got 75 cents a bushel. This would have meant the loss to agriculture in the corn crop alone this year of $2 billion. You can well see why we cannot afford to tamper with price supports.

This is a serious problem. Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the foundation of the Nation's economy, and do not forget it.

Several Members have made statements which make it clear that they do not understand the facts. All we are doing here is simply enacting legislation restoring the impairment of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, restoring to that Corporation the money lost through the period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, because of declining farm price levels. The only thing we are doing here today that is unusual is that we have brought this item to the floor 4 months prior to reporting the agricultural appropriation bill. We are only meeting an emergency.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert data which will serve to clear up any question as to just what is involved here:

METHOD USED IN APPRAISAL OF CCC ASSETS AND LIABILITIES AS OF JUNE 30 EACH YEAR

The act of March 8, 1938, requires an annual appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation and prescribes the method as follows:

1. The appraisal shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

2. The appraisal shall be as of June 30 each year and shall be completed as soon as possible thereafter and the results reported to the President.

3. The value of CCC assets shall be determined on the basis of cost to the CCC or, insofar as practicable, the average market price in the month of June, whichever is the lower.

The statute requires that the Secretary of the Treasury shall restore any impairment to the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation disclosed by the appraisal, and authorizes annual appropriations therefor. In the event the appraisal indicates the Corporation had a surplus as of June 30 of any year, the law requires such surplus to be deposited in the Treasury.

The Secretary of the Treasury appoints an appraisal committee to perform the appraisal each year. This committee was comprised of the following individuals for the appraisal as of June 30, 1953:

E. F. Bartelt, fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, chairman.

R. W. Maxwell, Commissioner of Accounts, Treasury Department.

Nathaniel Royall, Controller, Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

J. C. Cooper, Jr., Deputy Director, Office of Budget and Finance, United States Department of Agriculture.

This committee conducts a detailed appraisal of all of the Corporation's assets and liabilities and arrives at an adjusted book value of assets in accordance with the method prescribed by the act of March 8, 1938. The adjustments made on the basis of this appraisal are reflected in an adjusted net worth figure for the Corporation as of June 30. The deficit as of June 30, 1953, as shown by the books of the Corporation was $737,534,573.85. This amount included $96,205,161, representing the deficit determined by the June 30, 1952, appraisal, which was restored in accordance with the 1954 appropriation act for the Department in July 1953. Thus the portion of the deficit which was applicable to the fiscal year 1953 was $641,329,413. The adjustments made by the Treasury Appraisal Committee reduced this deficit by $31,398,480 to the amount of $609,930,933. The difference of $31,398,480 results from the fact that the appraisal must be made as prescribed by law, and hence cannot give recognition to considerations other than prices. On the other hand, the Corporation, in establishing valuation reserves, takes into consideration prospective sales outlets, price-support levels, and current market prices. Therefore, differences will always occur between appraised values and the Corporation's carrying values.

ANALYSIS OF CCC CAPITAL IMPAIRMENT AS OF JUNE 30, 1953

The capital impairment of $609,930,933 as of June 30, 1953 as determined by the Treasury Appraisal Committee is made up of the following items:

Net realized losses on CCC price-support program during the fiscal year 1953 (largely losses on disposals of commodities during the fiscal year)	$61,146,358
Net realized gain on other CCC programs during the fiscal year 1953 (storage facilities program, supply and foreign-purchase program, etc)	[1] 1,702,508
Net excess of operating expenses and interest costs over interest and other operating income (applicable to all programs) during the fiscal year 1953	54,839,212
Increase during the fiscal year 1953 in the estimated loss to be sustained on assets (largely estimated loss on inventories and loans)	495,647,871
Capital impairment as of June 30, 1953	609,930,933

[1] Gain—deduct

The first three items listed are applicable to actual transactions in the fiscal year 1953, although, of course, the loans and inventories involved were acquired both prior to and during that fiscal year. The last item represents the Treasury appraisers' estimate, based on the method prescribed by the act of March 8, 1938, of the increase during the fiscal year 1953 in the estimated loss on assets still on hand. These assets, largely loans and inventories, were not all acquired in the fiscal year 1953, and will be disposed of in subsequent fiscal years.

The attached statement shows by commodities and by program, an analysis of the total impairment of $609,930,933.

It indicates that $554,561,064 of the impairment is applicable to the price-support program. Wheat, corn, and dairy products are the commodities on which the larger losses are anticipated.

There is attached a statement of the realized gains and losses on CCC programs which shows the realized results for each commodity in the fiscal year 1953.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.

Analysis of capital impairment per Treasury appraisal as of June 30, 1953

Losses:		
Price-support program:		
Basic commodities:		*Detail*
Corn		$126,680,756
Cotton, upland		2,301,211
Peanuts		8,135,584
Rice		69,344
Tobacco		3,711,676
Wheat		191,359,846
Total, basic commodities	332,258,417	
Designated nonbasic commodities:		*Detail*
Butter		71,497,512
Cheese		28,157,789
Milk, dried		56,087,409
Honey		[1] 4,924
Potatoes, Irish		73,650
Tung oil		451
Wool		15,289
Total, designated nonbasic commodities	155,807,184	
Other nonbasic commodities:		
Barley	912,248	
Beans, dry edible	6,053,268	
Cotton, American-Egyptian	[1] 294,665	
Cottonseed products	$38,479,026	
Eggs	29,346	
Flaxseed and linseed oil:		
Flaxseed	2,969,566	
Linseed oil	4,915,754	
Grain sorghum	[1] 874,126	
Naval stores	287,771	
Oats	3,053,935	
Olive oil	[1] 64,117	
Peas	31	
Rye	54,966	
Seeds	10,655,140	
Soybeans	317,420	
Total, other nonbasic commodities	66,495,463	
Total, price-support program	554,561,064	
Other programs:		
Subsidy program	[1] 74,623	
Supply program	[1] 1,762,696	
Foreign purchase program	2,617	
Storage facilities program	[1] 121,488	
Accounts and notes receivable	2,486,847	
Total, other programs	530,657	
Income and expense:		
Income:		
Interest on loans	9,929,444	
Miscellaneous interest income	6,283,930	
Miscellaneous operating income	226,876	
Total income	16,440,250	
Expense:		
Interest expense	48,479,957	
General overhead expense	22,743,221	
Other expense	56,284	
Total expense	71,279,462	
Excess of expense over income	54,839,212	
Capital impairment per Treasury appraisal as of June 30, 1953	609,930,933	

[1] Denotes profit.

[2] Denotes profit.

SCHEDULE 8

Analysis of program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1953[1] *(realized gains and losses)*

Program and commodity	Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1941	July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1946	Fiscal year ended June 30— 1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1953
Price support program:[1]										
Basic commodities:										
Corn	[2] $20,078,488	[2] $14,336,569	$278,492	[2] $27,030	[2] $66,187	[2] $17,189,119	[2] $748,839	$1,783,916	[2] $20,526,523	[2] $70,910,347
Cotton	[2] 27,401,796	218,328,306	46,536,525	[2] 344,914	[2] 1,023,816	3,419,604	28,938,218	148,024	[2] 351,572	268,219,477
Cotton, Puerto Rican		[2] 126,011	[2] 4,187							[2] 130,198
Cotton, export differential [3]		[2] 27,651,360	[2] 13,735,415	25,557						[2] 41,361,218
Cotton, rubber barter		11,055,451								11,055,451
Peanuts			727,481	[2] 2,757,330	[2] 23,794,910	[2] 40,592,601	[2] 14,884,837	[2] 8,670,573	[2] 2,975,881	[2] 92,648,951
Rice				1,786	[2] 1,293,780	52,071	57,271	[2] 277,861	[2] 1,459,513	
Tobacco	[2] 2,107,589	7,074,300	7,437	59,800	115,524	196,493	71,450	[2] 1,014,923	[2] 2,759,676	1,641,818
Wheat	[2] 6,199,460	[2] 11,775,173	605,569	[2] 11,727	[2] 3,740,046	[2] 23,384,123	[2] 19,023,932	[2] 7,722,262	[2] 18,886,206	[2] 96,127,450
Total	[2] 55,787,333	182,568,944	34,415,902	[2] 3,055,644	[2] 28,507,649	[2] 83,844,524	[2] 5,284,869	[2] 15,417,947	[2] 45,807,809	[2] 20,720,931

[1] Allocation of losses and gains as between "Price support program" and "Supply program" for the period prior to the fiscal year 1947 was made on the basis of an analysis completed in April 1949. Since accounting records maintained prior to July 1, 1946, did not provide for this segregation, it was necessary to analyze program results in detail and in some cases make an estimate of the distribution between "Price support" and "Supply" of the total operating result as shown by the accounting records. This analysis was based on all known factors concerning the operations with respect to each commodity.

[2] Denotes loss.

[3] Includes export differential on owned or pooled cotton only. Differential on exporters' cotton included under "commodity export program."

SCHEDULE 8

Analysis of program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1953 (realized gains and losses)—Continued

Program and commodity	Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1941	July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1946	Fiscal year ended June 30— 1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	Oct. 17, 1933 through June 30, 1953
Price support program—Continued										
Designated nonbasic commodities:										
Milk and butterfat:										
Butter						[2] $4,111,861	[2] $44,216,443	$41,571	[2] $456,492	[2] $48,743,225
Cheese						[2] 1,031,078	[2] 24,040,464	31,405	14,706	[2] 25,025,429
Milk, dried			[2] $12,487	$415,987	$149,335	[2] 14,619,145	[2] 42,707,738	[2] 1,183,459	[2] 4,798,735	[2] 62,786,242
Honey				[2] 404,056	[2] 470,414		[2] 1,499	167	4,924	[2] 870,938
Potatoes, Irish [4]		[2] 28,197,222	[2] 62,920,977	[2] 47,405,542	[2] 203,886,603	[2] 75,090,315	[2] 63,457,281	[2] 83,459	[2] 73,658	[2] 478,097,057
Tung oil					[2] 4,747	30	233,811	[2] 1,154	[2] 461	[2] 79,355
Wool	[2] 176	[2] 15,834,163	[2] 33,484,669	[2] 19,501,357	[2] 12,707,148	[2] 10,755,942	142,590	[2] 86,610	[2] 15,290	[2] 92,242,759
Total	[2] 176	[2] 41,031,385	[2] 96,418,133	[2] 66,899,715	[2] 217,221,674	[2] 105,608,311	[2] 174,027,018	[2] 1,283,599	[2] 5,324,994	[2] 707,815,005
Other nonbasic commodities:										
Barley		[2] 40,019	50,550	275	[2] 672,499	[2] 2,608,939	[2] 1,790,903	[2] 2,807,078	[2] 2,195,112	[2] 10,063,725
Beans, dry edible		[2] 179,753	155	10	3,988	[2] 880,320	[2] 11,746,232	[2] 15,420,183	[2] 6,777,410	[2] 35,008,754
Castor beans		[2] 171,224		31						[2] 171,193
Cotton, American-Egyptian		[2] 536,573	37,023	6,577	[2] 2		14,358	175,206	294,665	[2] 10,746
Cottonseed and products						[2] 597,728	5,506,631	[2] 2,686,612	7,701,796	15,297,314
Eggs [5]		[2] 224,002	[2] 11,532,784	[2] 25,879,017	[2] 773,476	[2] 41,622,784	[2] 76,055,947	[2] 29,368,028	[2] 4,256,139	[2] 189,712,177
Flax fiber			6,100	[2] 179,862	[2] 155,842	[2] 67,464	[2] 55			[2] 397,113
Flaxseed and linseed oil		[2] 22,209	2,727	40,293	1,163,915	[2] 3,795,056	[2] 57,520,995	[2] 4,683,190	[2] 1,422,997	[2] 66,207,512
Fruit, dried		[2] 109,489		[2] 15,563,385	445,757	299,337	46,315	[2] 855		[2] 14,962,320
Grain sorghum		437,456	10,141	[2] 16	[2] 3,590,174	[2] 10,514,934	[2] 22,644,554	31,638	874,126	[2] 35,396,319
Grapefruit juice				[2] 1,732,374						[2] 1,732,374
Hemp and hemp fiber		[2] 20,201,375	[2] 1,257,169	[2] 7,702	8,946	[2] 68	21	[2] 1,778		[2] 21,469,155
Hops	[2] 162,036	[2] 702,104								[2] 864,209
Naval stores	[2] 4,435,579	5,997,861	[2] 460	[2] 107,063	[2] 420,567	[2] 449,795	[2] 1,974,111	3,876	30,253	[2] 1,355,585
Oats			3,056	287	[2] 45,714	[2] 413,293	15,236	[2] 738,886	[2] 194,926	[2] 1,374,255
Olive oil									[2] 170	[2] 170
Peas, dry, edible		[2] 3,012	648		140	[2] 658,800	[2] 227,726	[2] 655	[2] 31	[2] 889,436
Pecans		[2] 3,751								[2] 3,751
Rye	[2] 4,575	60,751	14,932		[2] 2,186	[2] 223,210	[2] 34,759	18,589	7,947	[2] 162,501
Seeds		[2] 148,193	18,660	[2] 13,731	[2] 364,337	[2] 74,020	295,452	[2] 537,879	[2] 4,050,655	[2] 4,874,709
Soybeans			2,741,090	4,987	26,054	1,754,206	[2] 130,442	1,574	[2] 24,893	4,363,576
Sugar, Puerto Rican and Virgin Island				23,830						23,830
Sugar beets				[2] 11,859,187	[2] 4,658,062					[2] 16,517,249
Sweetpotatoes			93	[2] 138,181	1,985	1,453	[2] 773			[2] 135,421
Turkeys				[2] 3,708	495	44,458	[2] 20,185			11,070
Vegetables, canned		[2] 6,588	12,631	6,281	[2] 82					11,942
Total	[2] 4,602,190	[2] 15,944,584	[2] 9,892,605	[2] 55,401,647	[2] 9,032,671	[2] 59,777,004	[2] 166,286,667	[2] 50,650,030	[2] 10,013,555	[2] 381,600,953
Total price support	[2] 60,389,701	125,592,975	[2] 71,894,836	[2] 125,357,006	[2] 254,761,994	[2] 249,229,839	[2] 345,596,554	[2] 67,351,576	[2] 61,146,358	[2] 1,110,136,889
Supply program: [1] [6]										
Cotton and linters		1,392,551	24,865	245,904	12,879					1,676,199
Grains and seeds		23,969,000	23,792,977	19,004,280	4,548,036	2,981,607	722,358	437,204	405,837	75,951,501
Oils (bulk)		29,937	67,020	107,442	201,296	363,692	42,136	6,020	9,194	917,337
Tobacco		4,179,335	588,749							4,768,084
General commodities purchase [7]			176,701,759	11,127,662	[2] 342,973	[2] 1,246,411	[2] 1,551,484	[2] 195,564	1,314,667	185,807,556
Processed and packaged commodities [8]			26,438,161	10,517,533	1,092,093	752,611	118,459	162,193	23,559	39,104,609
Sugar, Puerto Rican raw						37,157	[2] 967		9,439	46,029
Other		[2] 3,120,517	[2] 420,893	494,691	[2] 368,475	[2] 2,041	3,185			[2] 3,414,050
Total supply program		26,650,306	227,193,238	41,587,512	5,232,858	2,886,615	[2] 665,713	409,853	1,762,696	305,057,365
Foreign purchase program: [6] [9]										
Cotton		5,439,464	457,020	[2] 758			2,617	2,617		5,895,735
Fats and oils		22,543,441	17,955,560	[2] 1,491,644	[2] 53,306	1,524	[2] 37,417	[2] 2,550		38,915,608
Foodstuffs		4,620,232	2,441,131	[2] 1,555,187	102,305	47,482	17,755	9,770	[2] 2,616	5,680,872
Other		[2] 274,627	18,102	3,089			24,318	53,378		[2] 175,740
Total foreign purchase		32,328,510	20,871,822	[2] 3,044,500	48,999	49,006	7,273	57,981	[2] 2,616	50,316,475
Commodity export program:										
Cotton [10]		[2] 7,098,604	[2] 5,490,500	[2] 8,120	60,632	1,753	[2] 3,729	1,494		[2] 12,537,164
Wheat		[2] 1,309,445	[2] 618							[2] 1,210,063
Total commodity export		[2] 8,308,139	[2] 5,491,118	[2] 8,120	60,632	1,753	[2] 3,729	1,494		[2] 13,747,227
Storage facilities program		[2] 10,087,438	721,069	[2] 133,209	[2] 438,460	[2] 91,959	[2] 498,980	[2] 1,628,947	121,488	[2] 12,036,436
Accounts and notes receivable (chargeoffs)		11,134	[2] 556,732	[2] 106,602	[2] 138,717	[2] 86,113	[2] 454,137	[2] 196,247	[2] 253,682	[2] 1,781,096
Total (excluding wartime consumer subsidy costs) [11]	[2] $60,389,701	166,187,348	170,843,443	87,061,925	[2] 249,996,682	[2] 246,470,537	[2] 347,213,840	[2] 68,707,442	[2] 59,518,472	[2] 782,327,606
Wartime consumer subsidy program [12]		[2] 2,130,581,589	22,364,160	4,025,128	2,235,782	[2] 113,351	[2] 258,372	266,423	74,623	[2] 2,101,987,196
Grand total	[2] 60,389,701	[2] 1,964,394,241	193,207,603	[2] 83,036,797	[2] 247,760,900	[2] 246,583,888	[2] 347,472,212	[2] 68,441,019	[2] 59,443,849	[2] 2,884,315,004

[1] Allocation of losses and gains as between "Price support program" and "Supply program" for the period prior to the fiscal year 1947 was made on the basis of an analysis completed in April 1949. Since accounting records maintained prior to July 1, 1946, did not provide for this segregation, it was necessary to analyze program results in detail and in some cases make an estimate of the distribution between "Price support" and "Supply" of the total operating result as shown by the accounting records. This analysis was based on all known factors concerning the operations with respect to each commodity.

[2] Denotes loss.

[4] Includes price support loss of $2,829,639 on the 1943 and 1944 potato programs, which was formerly included under the general commodities purchase program.

[5] Includes price support loss of $11,956,386 on the 1944 egg program, which was formerly included under the general commodities purchase program.

[6] Portion of overall supply and foreign purchase program effective July 1, 1952.

[7] Includes gain of $178,697,602 carried as "Special reserve—general commodities purchase program" as of June 30, 1946, and transferred to income in May 1947. Also see footnotes 4 and 5.

[8] During the period July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1949, activity under this program was reported as general supply program.

[9] Insofar as possible, operating results have been retroactively classified to correspond with current budgetary programs. In some instances, the accounts maintained prior to July 1, 1946, did not make possible a precise segregation of the results of foreign procurement operations.

[10] Includes export differential on exporters' cotton only.

[11] Includes losses totaling $56,239,433 on price-support commodities disposed of in accordance with Public Laws 380 and 393, 80th Cong., i. e., transferred to foreign assistance outlets at a price equal to price of a quantity of wheat having equivalent caloric value. The Corporation was reimbursed for these losses by the Secretary of the Treasury.

[12] Subsidy losses on corn for alcohol, wheat for alcohol, and wheat for feed are included on an estimated basis. For detail of subsidy costs by commodities by fiscal years, see Report of Financial Condition and Operations as of June 30, 1949.

Figures before me show that of the $609 million appraised loss, actually only $137 million was lost as of July 1, 1953. The $496 million takes into account the lowering of the inventory of the tremendous stocks on hand held by the Commodity Credit Corporation today. In other words, we are anticipating here and we are charging against 1952 and 1953 a great loss which may or may not occur, Mr. Chairman, but it is necessary under the basic law to inventory these stocks just as a bank would inventory the holdings of any corporation when making a loan.

Let us not get off on a tangent. Let us pass this very simple legislation and not get off our course discussing some other plan or procedure. This is an urgent matter.

Mr. Chairman, if there are any questions I will be glad to reply, but please let us keep to the subject at hand and make these funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation as we have done for the last 7 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Following up the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], if my memory serves me correctly, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture made a trip to New York a couple of years ago and carried on an investigation of food prices in New York and, if my memory serves me correctly again, that committee came back to the House and reported that some items of food doubled in price crossing the Hudson River.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. Can that be charged to the farmers of Iowa or Minnesota?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Not only that, but fruit from California doubled in price from the time of entering the Holland Tunnel until it got to the actual consumer. There is where the gentlemen from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. COUDERT], should be concentrating their attention. They will be well occupied if they investigate what causes that spread. The gentleman from Iowa is absolutely right.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Along the lines of the inquiry started by my good friend from Iowa, can the gentleman state what the cost of the support program has been for the current fiscal year?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Nobody will know until the Treasury makes its appraisal next June.

Mr. COUDERT. What was the cost for the fiscal year 1953?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The cost for fiscal 1953 is the amount, according to the Treasury, that we have before us, $609 million.

Mr. COUDERT. What was the amount lent by the Corporation, expended and put out by the Corporation, in 1953 for price-support-program purposes?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The amount loaned or committed by the Corporation on the 20th of January was within $16 million of its total lending power, $6,750,000,000. I am speaking of commitments also.

Mr. COUDERT. In commitments alone there are outstanding $6,750,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct, if you assume responsibility for all the private money in this particular program.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman realize that the citizens of the State of New York to whom my good friend from Iowa referred pay 14 percent of the Federal taxes, and that, therefore, they are responsible for 14 percent of the total cost of this program?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman should realize that if it was not for this program, the people of New York would go hungry.

Mr. COUDERT. No; I do not realize that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If you want the people of New York to go hungry, go ahead and oppose legislation of this character.

Mr. COUDERT. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the people of New York have been going on for the last several hundred years; they have not gone hungry yet, and they are not going to go hungry just because the farmers do not get 90 percent of parity. The people are going to go on growing food and the people of New York are going to be fed. That is something I have no doubt about.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As much as I respect the gentleman from New York, I cannot agree with him on this basic problem.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman mean to say there are no hungry people in the city of New York?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I believe I can tell the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] where the money goes that the housewife in New York as well as elsewhere pays for food. I would say this to him, and this was several years ago when the farm prices were away above 100 percent of parity, that when the housewife in New York City or any other city purchased a loaf of bread with 20 slices in it, 2 slices of that loaf of bread, the cost of it, went to the farmer, and 18 slices went somewhere else. I would like to know how many of his constituents in the State of New York who are not farmers got the remaining 18 slices.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is a very pertinent question.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I was just going to say to the gentleman from New York that I have always understood that New York City had a great interest in the financial structure of this country, and we are dealing today with an item, with a commodity, that has a great deal to do with the financial structure of this country. I am wondering if the gentleman from New York under those circumstances could afford to impair the security of this country by failing to support this program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am sure the gentleman from New York would answer "No" to that question.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course, the country is interdependent. The farmer borrows money from the banks which have headquarters in New York, and he needs materials that he gets from New York. What we are talking about is how fairly the interdependence operates. I would like to ask the gentleman this question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Before the gentleman asks me his question, may I say this, that if all of the ladies and gentlemen of this House who voted against Mr. PASSMAN'S motion to recommit when we tried to save $12 million last July 31 on the foreign aid bill; I repeat, if those ladies and gentlemen who insisted on $4.5 billion going abroad in one 12-month period are willing to give the farmers of our own Nation just one-seventh of that much, they will come down here and vote unanimously for this emergency measure.

Mr. JAVITS. I am one of those who voted for it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I know the gentleman did.

Mr. JAVITS. The farmer, in common with the city dweller, needs security and peace in the world. We must strike for a reasonable balance between foreign policy, the interests of the farmer at home, and the interests of the consumer, too. I try very hard to strike this balance.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does my friend not feel that he should reorient his line of thinking? Too many of us are overly generous to foreign nations but when it comes to doing something for the basic industry of our own Nation, it is a different story. I want to remind my friend that I gained a lot of firsthand information traveling around the world this fall. I have a fair conception of the returns we can expect for our largesse abroad.

Mr. JAVITS. It is not a question of reorienting my line of thinking. It is a question first of our country's security and the justice between the elements of our people in their participation in the country's total economy.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Your line of thinking is all wrong in my opinion, when agriculture is under consideration here.

Mr. JAVITS. We have to proceed with an even-handed policy in every respect, and we are trying to do that. I feel the views of the gentleman fail to take into adequate account the vital elements in our security of the mutual assistance program, military and economic, and the workers in trade and industry in our country. May I ask a question on this very point?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Surely.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it true, and that is the information, I have, that the $8.5 million proposed increase of the Commodity Credit Corporation authorized borrowing power, meaning $1,750,000,000 in addition, is expected to be entirely utilized in connection with this year's 1954, crops, and that that is the estimate of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentlemen does not mean a $8.5 million increase; he means $8.5 million total authorization.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My answer is "No." I do not expect that much additional in outstanding loans.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. From all I have heard here today, if I did not know any better, I would think that the farmers of this country were the only people being subsidized. The fact of the matter is during the last 12 years the American people have paid $40 subsidy to other segments of this country where they have paid $1 to the farmer.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Well, I might say to the gentleman that I assumed that the Members of the House knew all about that prior to this little talk of mine today. Certainly we gave many billions to business, through one means or another following World War II to get it back on its feet. Yet there are some folks that holler to high heaven, and this includes members of the press, because we are trying to hold up the economy of agriculture by giving a support level of 90 percent of parity beneath our storables.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the matter before us has to do with the cancellation of outstanding indebtedness by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Treasury of the United States.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is an instrument of the Federal Government. It belongs to the Federal Government. Anything it owes in effect the Nation owes in that we underwrite the Corporation up to the limit of its borrowing authority. It is a case of a Government corporation owing the Government, or the Treasury, this amount of money.

The law requires that the Commodity Credit Corporation support some commodities at varying levels. It has an overall borrowing authority of $6,750,000,000. They have extended through the years almost all of their lending authority and, as was testified before our committee, they lack only about $16 million of having reached the absolute maximum of their lending. It means we must give some relief if we are to keep the farm programs in line until such action as may come out of this Congress. We must have some way to meet it.

I started the policy a few years ago when I had the honor of being chairman of this subcommittee of cancelling notes as against appropriating money every year to the credit of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Our action was open and above board. We explained it to the Congress. Since we have had the Commodity Credit Corporation it has been the instrument for the Government to do many things which had no connection with its own business, because it had the organization to do necessary jobs.

During the war we used the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy up huge quantities of supplies for use in World War II. They handled it out of their funds. Then we replaced those funds, and they had no connection with price supports. The Corporation was used to pay consumer subsidies and for other purposes not related to its job.

We spent in excess of $140 million in Mexico to eradicate the foot-and-mouth disease, and the Commodity Credit Corporation was used, it being a corporation and Government-owned, to meet that need.

Then we had the International Wheat Agreement, which was a part of our foreign policy and which had commitments on the part of the Federal Government of several hundred million dollars a year. That, too, was put on the Commodity Credit Corporation because it was a corporation and had the pliability so essential to do that job.

Since a big part of what we were returning to the Corporation each year was for those jobs they did administratively for others, using their own funds, I thought it unfair that the annual cost of those kinds of things be charged up to agriculture. So instead of appropriating in the agricultural appropriation bill each year these amounts, we have carried them for several years as a cancellation of the debt that a Government corporation owed to the Government which owned the Corporation. As I say, that has been done in the regular appropriation bill each year. Insofar as the immediate situation is concerned, I cannot understand myself as to why we had to wait until the last minute to be made aware that they were this close to the ceiling of the debt limit of the Corporation. But, whatever their reason or whyever that has happened, it is true and we must, I think, for the protection of the overall economy, give this relief now. If anything it comes too late. It certainly is not too early.

I have heard all these discussions here about agriculture. I have spent many years working with the subject. Like many of you I was a lawyer before I came to the Congress. But, as you study the situation in this country, it is easy to see why we must of necessity have price supports for farm commodities. I hope I may have the close attention of my colleagues because what I am about to tell you is the result of many years of study in connection with the agricultural appropriations. For many years we have had tariffs and other protections for industry. About the year 1900 we began to have minimum wage laws and bargaining power for labor unions. Early in the history of the Nation we began to provide certain protection and advantages in the law for various segments of our economy and to provide by law certain rights and privileges which have brought many benefits along with them to other segments of our economy. The Congress enacted such laws. But for about 150 years we let agriculture sell its products for what it could get wherever it could get it. In that period of time, your farmers left their farm lands to where now about 15 percent still live on the farms. In that period of time we got by with it because we thought we had an inexhaustible supply of raw materials. But your farmers under those conditions, with advantages written in the law for other segments of our economy, wasted 40 percent of all the fertile soil of this country and wasted 80 percent of the timber, and we are just as much dependent upon that soil and that timber as the farmer who has title to it during his lifetime. Now we have an ever increasing population of about 3 million people per year. In less than 23 years, we will need 100 million acres more of land than we have now. With one man on the farm having to feed five in the city, and a situation where the farmer as a whole spent $24 billion last year to make a crop, we either through law must see that the farmer gets that cost of production plus a reasonable amount to put back into his soil, or he is going to wear his land out first and go into bankruptcy and move to town like the rest of us.

We must realize agriculture and agricultural welfare is not a separate problem, but must be considered a part of the whole. National income has averaged almost exactly seven times agricultural income. The Nation cannot stand a drop of seven times the present drop in farm income. It is not a question of what the Nation should do for the farmer, but it is a quetsion of what we must do to protect the source of our food, clothing, and shelter, the source of practically all the raw materials used by our factories; a question of what we must do to protect the national income so essential to handling the huge national debt. It is a case of determining what assurances we must make to the caretakers of that source, the land, to see that it is taken care of.

We left agriculture out for many years when industry had advantages written into law and when industrial labor was protected by law. Largely as a result, 80 percent of our timber is gone; 40 percent of our land is gone. Farm life had so few returns from the farm share of the national income dollar that farm homes had few conveniences others had. Work hours were longer. Moisture, drought, pest, and diseases meant short crops and high prices with little to sell or good weather conditions, big crops, more work, and little price.

It followed that nearly all who could left the farm and farm boys and girls were pushed by farm families to study hard so they could leave the farm for work where they could have more of life's conveniences. Farm population went down steadily from 84 percent to only 16 percent on the farm. Each person on the farm must feed five in town. Today farming is a commercial operation. Farmers either make money or deplete the land, go broke, and move to town like the rest of us. We had the great depression of the twenties for which many explanations have been offered. At any rate a drastic break in farm prices led off in that depression which carried all down with it—industry, labor, agriculture, and capitalist. We cannot stand another. Finally it was determined by the Congress to put protections for agriculture in the law where the other two major segments were already protected. Thus we have the price-support system in our law.

WHAT IS THE FARM-PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM?

An assurance of 90 percent of the comparative purchasing power the farmer had in 1909–14 as given for 6 basic

commodities, which are storable, because a surplus one year can be kept or stored and will be in the way of the next year's crop, provided the farmers, if called on by the Government, will reduce the next year's production to absorb such extra carryover.

For quite a number of other commodities, much less assurance is given under the law, either because they were not determined by the Congress to be as basic to the overall economy or if perishable, the surplus production of one year was not in the way of the next year's crop. On most of these discretion was left with the Secretary of Agriculture. Remember 90-percent supports for perishable commodities such as butter is not required by law. The act contemplates that effort be made to keep American commodities on the world market.

The price-support law does not stop here. Our commodities are intended to be offered on the world market at world prices for section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provides that 30 percent of the taxes on foreign commodities and products which we let come into this country are set aside by law to enable us to offer on the world market at world prices farm commodities that are surplus to our market here. So far the Government has refused to use that law for many commodities to meet foreign prices.

The whole price-support program for basic commodities is based on enabling the farmer to have some assurance of income if he will make the effort, when demanded by the Government, to hold production and supply to the market but that does not mean the domestic market. What is wrong then? Supply and market is definitely out of balance and whose fault is it?

IN WORLD II AND SINCE, AGRICULTURE WAS LEFT OUT AGAIN

Industry: In World War II, the Government asked industry to produce hundreds of billions of dollars worth of extra production. The Government gave industry outright grants of hundreds of millions of dollars for factories or built them and let industry have them for nothing. They bought what industry produced at cost plus a profit. Labor which produced such products was paid cash at high rates plus time and a half for overtime. The Government paid out more than $4 billion in consumer subsidies. We have built up and now have on hand $129 billion worth of military materiel. And all that cost was charged up not as a payment to industry and labor, but to national defense.

Agriculture: The farmers were asked to produce huge extra quantities of commodities for wartime need. No grants were made to buy farms for farmers. No tractors were purchased and left with him rent free with a contract to buy what he produced. But he produced and what he produced, with a very few minor exceptions, was not taken by the Government at cost plus a profit as with industry, but his extra production was dumped on the market with his normal production and upon a support system geared to work only if supply was kept in line with market and is largely being held off the world market. This was not felt too much when the Government gave money to foreign countries under the Marshall plan to buy from us for that was largely the reason for Government demand for increased farm production. Now we find that much of that production is not being offered for sale, and even when under section 550 of the foreign aid bill money is given foreign countries to buy American commodities, our State Department opposes such sale.

THE WAR'S END

Industry was paid $16 billion by the Government to enable it to reconvert and on the argument that this action was necessary to keep industrial labor from being unemployed. Remember, also, that industrial labor is under social security. Twenty-four billion dollars in quick tax amortization were granted to industry in addition to that when the war in Korea broke out.

Agriculture was paid nothing by way of purchase, but its extra production was put on the local market along with the rest. It was added on the supply side in addition to the regular supply and on a price-support program geared to supply equals market. Of course, with a drop in Mutual Security, give-away programs, and governmental opposition to sale on the world markets, the commodities went to the Government at a percentage of the farmers' purchasing power in 1909–14 under the price-support system. This we did not call national defense cost.

That is not all the Government did. Take the case of cotton. The Secretary of Agriculture announced a cutback to 17,919,448 acres of cotton to get supply and demand in balance. That may be a reduction in acreage for the landowner, but it cuts completely out and puts into the road many working farmers who do the actual work; and farmers are not under social security to help them during unemployment. The Government does not offer to pay $16 billion to farmers to keep farm workers employed as it did to industry to keep industrial labor employed.

Why did we have a large part of that cotton? The Government asked us to grow it and made us keep it. In 1951 when we could have sold overseas enough cotton to put the supply and market in balance, the Government slapped an embargo on exports and said we could not send it out of the country, but must keep it on the local market for national security. In addition in 1951 the Government asked 16 million bales production. Largely as a result we now have on hand more cotton than we can sell or the market can absorb, which we are not offering to world markets at world prices. We have to cut back production and in determining how much cut, the Secretary of Agriculture counted all cotton in sight, including that which the Government would not let us sell and that which they asked us to grow for national security. We have managed to get some relief through the Congress, but at a price.

While an increase in acreage will relieve the farmers for 1 year, it leaves the basic problem of extra supply on a price-support program geared to work only if supply on the market is in balance with the market. We must offer that cotton to those who want it.

There can never be a market as long as 5 million extra bales are kept in the United States and on the local market, but not offered to world buyers. Cotton will have to go through the loan each year that such surplus to the market is left without being offered for sale on the world market.

Let me discuss parity with you for a minute. I hate to see some of my friends from the city, so many of whom are newspapermen, and others get the word "parity" mixed up with fair prices. Parity under the law is 100 percent of the farmers purchasing power or the same comparative purchasing power that he had in 1909 to 1914. You gave him loan programs assurances of 90 percent of parity for basic commodities, or 90 percent of the comparative purchasing power he had in 1909 to 1914. However, back in that period it did not take half of his gross earnings to go into the purchase of expensive farm machinery and other similar cost for making of that crop because the farmland that was in use then was farmed by very simple procedures. But 90 percent of parity is 90 percent of comparative purchasing power the farmer had in 1909 to 1914. There is no other segment of our population that you gave as little as that for increased production asked of them. Did you assure labor or industry anything like 90 percent of comparative purchasing power in the years 1909 to 1914 of the farmers? No, you gave much greater assurances. When World War II came, let me repeat, you gave industry contracts on a firm basis, and many of them were cost plus a fixed profit, or a fixed-fee contract. All of them that I have learned about were given a firm commitment to pay for their products at a price which reflected the cost of production plus a profit. Labor was paid in cash as a result of such firm commitments to pay the cost of what they produced for Government. When it came to agriculture you asked the American farmer to produce these increased amounts. Did you give him any assurance of getting his cost of production? Did you give him any assurance of profit? No; the most that you gave him, with a few minor exceptions, in the way of an assurance was a loan program at 90 percent, for basic commodities, of his comparative purchasing power in 1909–14.

I would like to present here a comparison of what we spent on agriculture

and on other segments of our population to meet similar problems:

Comparison of CCC price-support costs with other Federal subsidies and emergency investment for industry

1. Losses under CCC price-support program:	
Basics	$53,299,009
Nonbasics	1,141,540,014
Total	[1] 1,194,839,023
2. Federal expenditures for—	
Consumer subsidies (losses):	
CCC	[2] 2,102,067,121
DSC and RFC	[3] 2,143,281,385
Subtotal	4,245,348,506
Business reconversion payments (including tax amortization)	40,787,864,000
Subsidies to maritime organizations	[4] 327,500,000
Subsidies to airlines	[5] 302,123,000
Total	45,662,835,506
3. Federal investment in—	
Military materiel	[6] 129,000,000,000
Food and fiber (CCC inventories)	[7] 2,697,103,365
National stockpile of materiel	5,700,000,000

[1] From beginning of program in 1933 through Nov. 30, 1953.

[2] From July 1941 through Nov. 30, 1953. The last CCC subsidy program was ended on Oct. 31, 1947, although claims, refunds, and adjustments continued to be processed after that date.

[3] From July 1, 1948, through June 30, 1949. All DSC and RFC subsidy programs were ended by Oct. 14, 1946, but claims, refunds, and adjustments continued to be processed after that date.

[4] Estimated operating subsidies payable through calendar year 1954.

[5] Airmail subsidies through fiscal year 1954.

[6] Deliveries since Korea total $50 million; balance in pipelines.

[7] As of Nov. 30, 1953. Includes price support, supply and foreign purchase, and emergency feed programs.

You did not buy the farmers' commodities at cost plus a profit as you did with industry and with labor. But you put his production on a price-support system where supply and demand were supposed to stay in balance. You dumped it on the domestic market along with what you already had, but you do not offer it on the world market at competitive prices.

With the end of World War II, we left untold billions of dollars of wartime built-up industrial output wherever it was all over the world. We did not bring it back here and dump it on the domestic market. We awarded to industry $16 billion in reconversion payments so that industrial labor would not be unemployed.

Then, to expand industrial plants in order to meet the Russian threat, we awarded in excess of $29 billion in quick tax amortizations; we allowed them to mark it off in 5 years. In the first 8 months of 1953 $4.2 billion in quick tax amortizations were given to industry, to get them to meet the needs of the war.

During several of these years, when the farmer was producing at the instance of his Government, the Government not only did not buy what he produced, but issued export restrictions so that he could not ship his products out of the country at any price, when he could sell them, and held them here for the benefit of the consumers in our own country.

May I point out the number of places where this occurred?

Agricultural commodities under export control

Commodity	Added to positive list	Deleted from positive list
Wool and mohair	Nov. 24, 1950	July 3, 1952
Cotton	Sept. 8, 1950	Sept. 19, 1951
Cotton wastes	Nov. 9, 1951	Oct. 11, 1951
Cotton linters	Sept. 8, 1950	Nov. 28, 1952
Sugar	Sept. 1, 1950	July 31, 1952
Inedible molasses	Sept. 15, 1950	Do.
Palm oil	Mar. 20, 1951	Oct. 11, 1951
Castor oil	do	Apr. 14, 1953
Coconut oil	Mar. 20, 1951	Mar. 20, 1952
Tung oil	do	Mar. 5, 1953
Oiticica oil	do	Mar. 13, 1952
Rice	Sept. 11, 1952	Oct. 21, 1953
Tall oil	Jan. 30, 1951	Nov. 8, 1951
Rosin and turpentine	do	May 1, 1952
Sperm oil	Mar. 20, 1951	Aug. 2, 1951

Now we have come to the end of the fighting, I hope. At the moment, at least, there is no all-out war. We have these wartime buildups of farm commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I was interested in what the gentleman said about twenty-billion-odd dollars in subsidies to industry paid since the war. I was interested in what the gentlemen from New York [Mr. COUDERT] said, that they have 14 million people in that State, almost one-tenth of the population. I suppose the people of New York have gotten their fair share of subsidies. They generally get theirs. I should like to ask, how much of the $20 billion or $30 billion do the people of New York get in the way of subsidies? It will figure out more than all the subsidies that have been paid the farmers in the last 18 years.

Mr. WHITTEN. I dislike for anybody to be dependent upon this or that or the other. But if you are going to have written into law protection for organized labor, protect industry, then the best you can do is try to have some balance. We do have protective tariffs. We do have minimum wage laws. We do have bargaining powers in labor unions. We have these things. We did waste a great part of our country when we left agriculture out for 150 years. We have come back a long way since agriculture has had somewhat equal treatment under the law.

There have been 13 freight rate increases since World War II. Other costs of labor have been advanced. They show up in more costs being attached to many farm commodities after they cross the Hudson River to New York from California than the farmer and everybody en route from California, to the point across the Hudson River, got out of them. They show up when you find only 20 cents worth of raw cotton in a shirt that costs the consumer $4. They show up when only 2.7 cents goes to the farmer out of the loaf of bread for which you pay 19 to 21 cents. These things do show up in what the farmer buys and he is one of the great consumers. The farmers had an investment of more than $100 billion and spent more than $24 billion making a crop last year. Since they show up where they increase the cost you are going to have to see that the man who is the caretaker of the soil gets his balance in law so that his return is sufficient to enable him to put back into that land a fair share of what he takes out. We must see to that in defense of the consumer. After all the farmer is going to eat first. It is the rest of us who are dependent upon what he grows to sell.

I want to say that when the war was over, we did not make these payments to the farmers. We did not give him the $49 billion of benefits that went to labor and industry in an effort to readjust. But we have extended through the Commodity Credit Corporation $6,734,000,000 with which to make loans on commodities including the war period. We do have these commodities. What are they doing with them? Are they offering them to the world for sale? No. They are holding them. And nearly every time we find a chance to sell some of those commodities in foreign countries, your State Department, or your Commerce Department, or somebody else says, "Oh, no, we cannot afford to sell these things because somebody else is already selling farm commodities to that country."

I would like to list here the commodities the Commodity Credit Corporation has but did not offer for sale on the world market at prevailing prices in 1953 nor does it offer them now.

Cotton, American-Egyptian; cotton, upland; cottonseed; cotton linters; cottonseed oil, crude; cottonseed meal; tung oil; peanuts; barley; beans, dry edible; corn; tobacco; rosin; turpentine; flaxseed; linseed oil; grain sorghums; oats; rice; rye; seeds, hay and pastures; seeds, winter cover crop; soybeans; wool; mohair.

Now the State Department does not issue an order, it merely stymies the department in getting clearance. I am told its representatives merely pass the word out in some foreign countries who are beneficiaries of our foreign-aid program that they should not buy from us but buy elsewhere.

Do you think it is time that we broke the shackles loose that are really ruining the farm program and offer on the world market these commodities at whatever the world market will bring? I am not talking about breaking the backbone of world market prices. Our farm program was started and was intended for the purpose of giving some protection to American agriculture. It is being used to take American agricultural products off the world market and

to take away from the American farmers the right to move their commodities at the world price whenever folks want them, by this failure to offer such commodities for sale at competitive prices. As long as you have that policy, the Government instead of being able to cut down its losses in the support price involved in this program, has got the entire amount of money they have in it tied up. If we sold such supplies the Government would be out only the difference between the support price and the sale price. By holding all these commodities off the world market and in warehouses we are footing storage bills of $14 million per month. That will continue as long as you do not move commodities to the world market where the farm commodities from other countries are being offered not at a market-breaking price but at a competitive world price. After all to earn such support price, the farmer in so far as basic commodities, must limit his production but it was never intended to limit the farmer to the domestic market which in effect you are doing now.

Even under section 550 of the Commodity Credit Act in which we give foreign countries the money with which to buy these agricultural commodities we have been able to get only about $60 million worth of them sold, and you can never move to sell any of them except when the State Department or some other department comes in and says you can, even though you are giving the purchasers the money with which to buy. They say we cannot afford to sell, that we have got to let our farmers hold it in the United States so other nations can sell. If we are going to hold such supplies because of the State Department, if we are going to hold them because of national affairs, if our international relations require us to hold it, let us put the title to it in whoever is causing us to hold such supplies off the market and not let the full cost be saddled on the farmer when only a small percentage should be. Let these other agencies be charged for these supports of from 60 to 90 percent of the purchasing power the farmer had from 1909 to 1914 which is what parity is, if they prevent us from salvaging from sales what the commodities are worth on the world market.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. There are those of us in the middle ground who want to see the farmer successful because we want to be able to sell to the farmers and we want successful customers. We in this group favor using these farm surpluses abroad, instead of giving them guns, putting guns in their hands. We say we should put food in their hands and let them get their guns somewhere else.

Last year the House adopted my amendment requiring the use of surplus farm products where feasible in the foreign aid program, charging it to the program for foreign aid. The gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. COOLEY], also said he was for the amendment. Why could you not work with some of us who want to get rid of these surpluses, using them in the foreign aid program? The gentleman will remember that when the conference report on the bill came back the amount was limited to about $250 million. We would like to move it that way if we could.

Mr. WHITTEN. Unless you can shake the State Department or the Commerce Department and various others loose we cannot do much. Although last year over $200 million total was appropriated for these purposes we have been able to get only $60 million of that money used for the purpose, although the requests from other countries are certainly several times the $60 million. We have got to do something to change the policy of the State Department and these other departments so that every time we get an opportunity to sell some of these commodities they do not step in and object on the ground that it would interfere with some other country's program. The trouble is that the Department of Agriculture is being surrounded by other interests within our own Government. It is not a new problem that has risen just since the first of the year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I give the figure on that? They have used $238 million of surplus farm agricultural products in the program this year. It is up to $200 million instead of $60 million as the gentleman said. The latest figures we have just received is that $200 million are now in process.

Mr. HUNTER. Under section 550?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Surplus farm products.

Mr. HUNTER. Practically $60 million has been obligated of the $200 million program. A representative of the State Department has stated it will obligate more than $60 million. We have not been able to obligate more than approximately $60 million.

Mr. WHITTEN. So if you and I agree, it will not count unless we get the folks who are really blocking this program to cease and desist.

Mr. FULTON. The $200 million is now programed and is now going ahead and is not being blocked by the State Department.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think our situation requires legislation. I have offered a bill to correct this situation. I shall offer such proposal as an amendment though doubtless a point of order will be sustained against it. I shall present it for your thought and study for the legislative committee should give us such legislation. I believe such legislation would do much to save the farm program and to save the stability of this country.

May I present you this bill:

A bill to authorize the sale of farm commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the farm-price-support system is designed for the purpose of stabilizing the farm income of American farmers and assuring sufficient return to protect the land and other natural resources. The Congress further finds and declares that all peoples and Governments have the inherent right to offer on the world market any and all commodities at competitive prices; and it is therefore declared to be the policy of the United States that our domestic farm program shall not be used to keep American agricultural commodities from being offered on the world market at competitive prices.

SEC. 2. The Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to determine what part of present stocks of farm or agricultural commodities in its hands should be held as essential to the national security or in the national interest, and upon such determination title to all such commodities so determined to be essential to the national security shall be transferred to the Department of National Defense, and all commodities so transferred shall be taken off the market: *Provided, however*, That to prevent spoilage or deterioration any part of such commodities may be returned to the Commodity Credit Corporation for sale as hereinafter provided and replaced with a like amount or quantity from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

SEC. 3. In order to make American farm commodities available to users in other countries on the same basis as farm commodities from other nations, all other agricultural commodities of whatever kind or character, title to which is in the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless already committed for sale, shall be offered for sale for use outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, at prevailing or competitive world prices: *Provided, however*, That the President by Executive order may restrict or prohibit sales of such commodities for use in Communist-dominated countries when in his opinion such sales would be against the interest of the United States.

Now, once again, we have to give this relief to the Commodity Credit Corporation if the farm program is to continue until the Congress acts on increasing the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation. If we want to save the farm program and save the Government hundreds of millions of dollars, we will offer these commodities for sale on the world market and charge up to American agriculture and the Nation only the difference between the support price and what we sell them for. As the situation now exists, we are charging up to agriculture the entire amount we are investing in farm commodities. It is unsound to do that. The answer is, if the State Department wants to hold these commodities off the market for any purpose of its own, transfer title to that Department and let them hold it. There may be some reason in certain cases for doing that.

I hope the House will go along with this resolution.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say that the gentleman has a good basic idea with reference to something that should be done for the good of the future of agriculture. The only reason I will have to oppose him today so far as his amendment is concerned is not because I do not think he has something very worthwhile but I think even he will acknowledge that our authority under this bill is limited to appropriations and that we on this subcommittee on appropriations have no right to legislate.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to my friend that I respectfully differ with him. What we are doing here is legislative and our committee knows the great amounts of money that we are spending

through the Commodity Credit Corporation, much of which we should be recovering. In other words, we should be getting it back by selling these commodities once they get in the hands of the Corporation. When something comes before me and I get my hands on it and it needs correcting, I am going to do my dead-level best to correct it. This legislative measure before us is our best opportunity. While my amendment may be subject to a point of order, I hope its presentation will lead to corrective legislation. I know for 5 or 6 years we have been trying to get remedial action. We have not been able to get relief. I think you are missing a mighty good opportunity, because this may be the last chance that we on our committee will have at it.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I have been exceedingly interested in the gentleman's discussion and wonder whether he had seen or prepared any set of figures as to what the loss to the United States Government would be today if those crops presently covered by the Commodity Credit Corporation were sold at prevailing international prices.

Mr. WHITTEN. As long as our commodities in this country are kept at the support price plus 5 percent in most cases, foreign nations who are competitors, or would be, if we do not bottle our own production in this country, are just barely underselling us by about 2 to 5 percent. I do not know that we could sell all of these commodities, offhand. It would take time for the world markets to absorb them but we would be getting our normal markets back. But why say that because some foreign country does not want us to sell our commodities that the American farmer should have them held on his hands or be charged up to him in our warehouses? But, insofar as a comparison of prices, from 2 to 10 percent would be amply broad enough to cover what our investment is as against what the present prevailing market price is in most cases.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to say that the district which I have the honor to represent contains both substantial industrial and agricultural activities, and I certainly am not taking the floor this afternoon to do any injury to agriculture. Rather, I want to attempt to express a point of view which I think needs to be considered most seriously and very soon.

I want to start by quoting from the speech of the President here a matter of 2 weeks ago. He said:

> Agricultural laws now in effect successfully accomplished this wartime purpose of encouraging maximum production of many crops. Today, production of these crops at such levels far exceeds present demands. Yet the laws encouraging such production are still in effect. The storage facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation bulge with surplus stocks of dairy products, wheat, cotton, corn, and certain vegetable oils; and the Corporation's presently authorized borrowing authority—$6,750,000,000—is nearly exhausted.

Next I want to remind you of something that the Secretary of Agriculture said to the Senate Committee on Agriculture a week ago Monday. He said that it was about time to ask ourselves a few pointed questions and suggested this particular one:

> At what point will the 140 million Americans who do not live on farms rise up, as they did in the potato fiasco—

And we all remember that—

of a few years ago, and demand not revision but outright elimination of all direct aid to agriculture?

That concerns me and I think it should concern everyone here who has the interest of agriculture at heart. I know there are many on this floor this afternoon who sincerely are concerned about this today.

I call your attention to certain specific figures out of the budget because they raise a very real question as to where we are going if we do not do something constructive in this field.

The inventory in wheat was actually $1,187,484,921 at the end of June of this year. It is estimated it will reach $1,830,400,000 next year. And finally we have the staggering figure of $2,151,000,000 in 1955. That is an overall increase of $963,515,079.

The corn inventory figure is equally staggering. At the end of June of this year it stood at $371,215,346. It is estimated to be $776 million in 1954 and to reach a high of $1,108,400,000 in 1955. This is an overall increase of $737,184,654.

As of the end of June of this year the inventory for cotton was $32,796,449. For 1954 it is estimated it will be $19,696,449 and will reach a high in 1955 of $148,783,825, or an increase of $125,987,376.

In all, the budget, reflecting the losses that are on the books today, indicates that there will be a jump in the entire program between June of this year and June of 1955 of $1,876,011,317, broken down as follows:

1953	$2,338,736,567
1954	3,537,368,003
1955	4,214,747,884

I know of no other alternative which has been suggested by anyone than the one suggested by the President of the United States to us. I hope our Committee on Agriculture will schedule as early hearings as possible and will come to us with recommendations which will solve or tend to solve this problem of these mounting surpluses.

Certainly what has been said here on the floor today about the use of these foods rather than their storage, their deterioration, is significant. It has already been suggested that the carrying charges alone, almost a complete dead loss, run better than $14 million a month. The last statement of the Commodity Credit Corporation became available a couple of days ago. From June 30 of this year to November 30, it showed that the total carrying charges alone were $94,832,308.84. That is broken down as follows:

Inventory transactions by program and commodity, fiscal year 1954 through Nov. 30, 1953

PROGRAM AND COMMODITY—CARRYING CHARGES	
Price support program:	
Basic commodities:	
Corn	$17,772,862.82
Cotton, upland	490,573.00
Peanuts, farmers' stock	858,548.97
Peanuts, shelled	
Rice	2,495.68
Tobacco	10,315.61
Wheat	56,352,944.29
Total basic commodities	75,467,740.37
Designated nonbasic commodities:	
Milk and butterfat:	
Butter	3,317,652.75
Cheese	2,392,642.10
Milk, dried	2,422,947.67
Honey	163,596.00
Tung oil	51.90
Wool	650,366.67
Total designated nonbasic commodities	8,947,257.09
Other nonbasic commodities:	
Barley	731,344.79
Beans, dry edible	539,034.96
Cotton, American-Egyptian	42.86
Cottonseed and products:	
Cottonseed meal	1,448,836.88
Cottonseed oil, crude	
Cottonseed oil, refined	1,751,985.84
Cotton linters	1,822,348.72
Flaxseed	907,632.50
Grain sorghum	146,568.60
Linseed oil	329,606.90
Naval stores:	
Rosin	127,827.06
Turpentine	22,421.17
Oats	1,210,017.77
Olive oil	4,324.44
Rye	23,410.76
Seeds, hay and pasture	406,778.06
Seeds, winter cover crop	597,940.14
Soybeans	347,189.93
Total other nonbasic commodities	10,417,311.38
Exchange commodities:	
Strategic and critical materials	
Other commodities	
Total exchange commodities	
Total price support program	94,832,308.84

I grant that not a great many people know all the details of this program, but I suggest to you that more and more and day by day they are going to know about it, and they are going to demand that something be done about it.

I suppose this resolution will have to be passed. It is in the nature of an obligation already incurred. I would like to vote against it, but I do not believe I would be justified in doing so.

But I do not believe the responsible people representing agriculture in this House can ignore what the President has recommended, what the majority leader has been saying over and over so

effectively, and what is troubling so many of us.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to make this comment. The gentleman from Massachusetts was foresighted enough about 6 years back, as I recall, to help fight through this House then a provision which would make available surplus foods to the poor people of this Nation who otherwise would not have the money to buy these surplus foods. If I recall rightly, the gentleman joined me in that effort at that time to help get something done toward disposing of our perishable surplus commodities so that they would really do some good. I compliment the gentleman on the years of work he has done along this line. He has done immeasurable good to thousands of old folks in our Nation.

Mr. HESELTON. I appreciate that. May I add, too, that had it not been for the very effective help the gentleman from Minnesota gave there would have been no consideration of it.

In conclusion, if that program had been really implemented as it is suggested now it should be implemented we would not be confronted with this problem. The surplus commodity program would probably by now be in very satisfactory shape.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting House Resolution 358, to cancel the indebtedness of Commodity Credit Corporation. While I have some doubts in my mind concerning the handling and management of some Commodity Credit price-support programs, it would be unthinkable to permit any doubt to rise in the markets as to the ability of Commodity Credit Corporation to meet its price-support commitments. To permit such doubts to exist would create a temporary disruption in commodity markets that would be extremely harmful to farmers, and would prove of no benefit whatever in reducing the cost of food to consumers in urban areas. I am sure that no Member of this body would wish to take an action that might endanger the economy of this country by placing the farmer at the mercy of forces which would drive his prices down still more, throw additional people out of work, and lead us down the road to national recession.

The matter at hand does not involve the question of whether a person is in favor, or not in favor, of price supports for agriculture. That is a question that will be brought before a legislative committee of the Congress, and ought to be carefully gone into, debated, and deliberated by members of that committee and the Members of the House. The present resolution involves living up to commitments which we have made, and keeping the faith of the people in their Government. It is a responsibility which I am sure no Member of this body would knowingly seek to evade. At the same time, there are a number of things involved in this resolution to which I wish to call the attention of Members.

The basic situation is this: Lower farm prices have resulted in such a need for Commodity Credit loans that CCC has been forced to obligate its funds faster than officials had anticipated. It is further evidence that Department of Agriculture officials have underestimated the value farmers attach to price-supporting loans in a time of lower prices and at a time when efforts are being made to reduce the effectiveness of these programs.

Another point that ought to be understood is that cancelling the CCC indebtedness now has the same effect as borrowing a like amount of money from the Treasury. It simply enables CCC to obligate funds in the amount of the cancellation. Normally, this bookkeeping transaction would take place near the end of the fiscal year and the expenditures would be charged to the 1955 budget instead of the 1954 budget. The Congress could meet its responsibility, and CCC could meet its obligations just as well by adopting legislation to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation, but the Department of Agriculture feels there is not enough time to handle this situation by new legislation.

There is another aspect involved in this resolution which I feel ought to be understood by the members of this body. The failure of the other body to raise the statuatory debt limit has resulted in some of our Government departments resorting to methods of financing which, if not questionable, are certainly not designed to make the most economical use of the taxpayers' money. I regret that the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to engage in a practice of this kind, which I feel is not only costing the taxpayer money but also is a subterfuge to get around the debt limit.

It has been the normal practice of the Commodity Credit Corporation to borrow money from the Treasury. Such funds, of course, come under the statutory debt limit. Since last fall the Department has offered Commodity Credit paper to banks in the amount of more than $1 billion as a means of financing a part of its operations. Such funds are not subject to the debt limit restrictions. The practice is nothing more than a means of getting around the debt limit.

This CCC paper is issued in the form of certificates of interest. The interest rates have been attractive, as evidenced by the amount of over-subscription for each issue. The first offer was on October 28, 1953, in the amount of $360 million at an interest rate of 2½ percent. The banks offered to buy over $2 billions worth of this paper because of the attractive interest rate. The second offer was on December 7, 1953 in the amount of $450 million at an interest rate of 2¼ percent. The banks offered to buy $1.2 billion worth of this issue. The last two offers were on January 15 of this year in the amount of $350 million at an interest rate of 2⅛ percent. The banks wanted over $1.8 billion of this paper.

During this period the Treasury could have borrowed the money on 91-day bills for approximately 1½ percent interest or less. Commercial call money in New York was only about 2 percent at the time of the issue last fall.

In fact, on October 1, before this kind of financing started, CCC borrowed $500 million from the Treasury for 9 months at 2 percent interest. In other words, had CCC borrowed these funds from the Treasury at the time, it would have saved the taxpayers one-half of 1 percent interest on the first $360 million; one-fourth of 1 percent interest on the second issue of $450 million; and one-eighth of a percent interest on the last issues of $350 million, and the Treasury would have been able to make one-half percent.

Can it be denied that this fat interest rate on CCC notes had no effect on interest rates in the country? In all fairness, I am bound to ask if this administration is not more interested in finding ways of benefiting the banking industry than in helping agriculture or in protecting the taxpayer who carries these costs.

I hope that the handling of this financing will be gone into thoroughly by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I hope that this loophole by which the Department of Agriculture is getting around the debt limit will be plugged when the committee considers the legislation to increase the borrowing authority of Commodity Credit Corporation. We are forced to handle this problem today as an emergency situation. The responsible way would be for the appropriate committees and members of Congress to handle it in the normal course of events and with enough time to consider all the factors concerned. Your Committee on Appropriations has gone into this matter as thoroughly as it could within the time allowed. The chairman of my subcommittee has been fair in every way with the members of the committee. I regret to say that in my opinion the Department of Agriculture has not treated the Congress in as fair and open a manner as it might have.

In all frankness, I cannot feel that officials of the Department of Agriculture are mentally equipped to carry out price support programs as the Congress intended them to be carried out, because of their opposition to such programs. Had I been responsible for handling some of the agricultural programs as they have been handled in the last year, I am certain that I would be reluctant to come before a congressional committee with an open book on some of these transactions. There has been too much of uncertainty and disruption of markets, and distrust created among farmers and tradesmen alike, by untimely announcements, lack of understanding and know-how, adherence to theory rather than fact, discrediting of farm programs and turning the city consumer against the farmer.

My colleague the gentleman from Mississippi has gone into the international trade aspects of the Department's activities. The gentleman from Mississippi is well informed on this subject and has stated the case in his usual straightforward manner. It clearly points to a

lack of vision in the Department of Agriculture, or an inability to act. I have no way of assuring my colleagues that any of these matters may be corrected by the Department. I do not accuse them of bad faith and dishonor. I think rather it is a lack of understanding and an inability to meet situations in a practical way. However, I still have some hope that through their various study clubs and seminars the Department officials eventually will come forward with practical answers to the problems of agriculture.

In the interest of all the people of this country, I hope that this resolution will be passed, and I hope the Department of Agriculture will take note and make a determined effort to pursue a policy of greater frankness, and even adopt a little more know-how in its future operations.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that the 2½-percent offering which was oversubscribed by between 8 and 10 to 1 was about twice the going rate of interest for short-term money of that type at that time?

Mr. MARSHALL. In this last month's issue of a national business magazine, comment was made that the Treasury was making loans for short-term periods at an interest rate of 1.2 percent. So these figures are well over twice the amount.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I have been interested in the gentleman's description of the powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I want to assure myself concerning whether or not the money that would be appropriated here can be used for any other purpose than as set forth in the bill.

Mr. MARSHALL. What did the gentleman have in mind?

Mr. METCALF. I am concerned about the Department of Agriculture using the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for furnishing administrative offices or establishing weekend resorts or something of that sort. Could any of this money be used for that purpose?

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to say to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] that I was amazed and shocked at some of the disclosures concerning some expenditures of research funds. At least, I understood that they were research funds, which were used to do some of the things which the gentleman has mentioned, such as providing a rest cottage for the Secretary. It is true the amount of money involved was small. However, the people of this country have confidence in research. They have felt that the funds that Congress appropriated for research have been put to a worthwhile purpose. It seems to me unfortunate that the Department of Agriculture has used funds as they have according to the newspapers, if those stories are true.

I want to assure the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] that the subcommittee on Appropriations of the Department of Agriculture will go into that very thoroughly when the Department officials come up to testify concerning their requests for funds.

As to what the gentleman asks about the funds in this bill we are considering, I think I can assure the gentleman that no funds in this bill we have before us today might be used in the manner suggested.

Mr. METCALF. That question would come up in some subsequent appropriation?

Mr. MARSHALL. It would come in the regular appropriation bill when the various divisions of the Department of Agriculture come up concerning their appropriation requests.

Mr. METCALF. And the gentleman's committee can make inquiries as to how expenditures were made from last year's appropriation for research funds?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is correct. And I can assure the gentleman that no members of your subcommittee on agricultural appropriations were aware in any way whatsoever that research funds found be used for purposes such as the gentleman has mentioned. I do not know whether the newspaper stories were accurate. We shall check that also. It is not the purpose of your subcommittee, as I am sure every Member of the House would agree, to take any of these stories that are just hearsay. We shall want to go into the matter and check it carefully and thoroughly. We shall want to be sure that the taxpayer gets as much as he possibly can for the money that is spent.

Mr. METCALF. I am sure that that is so, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. As I remember, one of our colleagues from New York City raised the question of why these farmers should not produce this butter at 50 cents a pound. I would suggest that if he would get up at 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning, go out and feed those cows and milk them, then churn this butter, he would know the reason why.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am the gentleman from New York to whom the gentleman from Nebraska has referred. The thing I would like to point out to the gentleman is that the genius of American industry is that costs have been brought down so that the people are able to consume more. I want the farmers to be more, not less, prosperous. Therefore, I suggest that in view of the enormous technological advances that have been made upon the farm just as those that have been made in the factory, should result in greater volume at lower prices. I think that has been the secret of the economic success of our industry as it should be of our farmers.

Mr. MARSHALL. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and, having served in the House with the gentleman, I am sure that he is interested in not driving a wedge between the city consumers and the farmers.

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly not.

Mr. MARSHALL. But I wish the gentleman would study more fully the effects of farm programs on the consumers he so ably represents.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] 5 minutes.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, it is with some hesitation that I inject myself into this discussion because of the fact that I represent a city district and make no claim to be an agricultural expert. I think it is very important that all of us in this Congress should understand that while city consumers recognize that there are a great many more subsidies and aids to business than there are to the farmer; recognize also that the farmer is in a difficult situation today, for he has absolutely no control over the price at which he sells his products; and recognize finally that processors and middlemen are responsible for a tremedous percentage of the final price that consumers pay, the city consumer is impatient of waste.

I think it is very important that the representatives of rural areas recognize that while city consumers may be willing to pay their share in terms of tax money for a sound and effective price-support program, and in addition to that the city consumer may be willing to tolerate rather high prices of food and fiber products, yet the city consumer will not tolerate these two conditions plus a third condition, and the third condition is that of waste. We all remember the potato fiasco of which so much political capital was made a few years ago. From my knowledge of agriculture and the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, it seems to me that it may well be that we will face a similar fiasco not only in butter and dairy products but also in other commodities unless we are able to find a market for these surplus goods.

I am very much impressed by the proposal suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] in this regard. I wonder, however, if he will be willing to vote for the appropriations which might be needed to support the economy of other countries which we might undersell in the field of cotton or wheat—countries in which we would desire to maintain a strong economy as a part of the free-world alliance.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I can see the point that the gentleman makes, but I would like to ask him this question: If it is essential that the United States shall protect those economies by preventing American agricultural products from being moved in world trade, does he not think that should be charged up to our foreign policy as against being charged up to agriculture?

Mr. BOLLING. I am perfectly happy to accept that approach. I think it makes good sense. In addition to the approach suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi, I have been studying a bill similar to the one discussed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]. We must try to find outlets for these products, but I think that we in the House must recognize we must find some solution to the problem. If we cannot find a use for the abundance we now have, we will then have to turn to the perhaps less agreeable approach of developing effective production controls. The city consumer is increasingly aware today that when the Congress acts to control the production of cotton or of wheat there is inevitably a tendency to compromise the permissible production figure upward, which results in overproduction, barring most unusual weather factors.

I have not yet made up my own mind what I will do in the coming year on this very perplexing problem. I should be much happier when I do vote as the Representative of a city district if I have the feeling then that the great Committees on Agriculture in both the House and the other body have approached this problem objectively and without a vested interest in this or that program which may or may not have succeeded in past years. Not only is the city consumer entitled to the best possible thought that can be given to this very grave problem but also the farmer is entitled to that kind of thought.

Often as I have listened to the discussion between the proponents of the flexible price-support approach and those who believe in 90-percent farm-price supports, I have not had the feeling that there is a real desire to find the best solution. Rather, I have had a strong feeling that there is a desire to find a solution which might be, at least temporarily, politically viable.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The distinguished gentleman has referred to dairy products, as have all of the Representatives from the metropolitan districts on the floor today. But, from the standpoint of the record, it should be pointed out what the latest obligation figures are as far as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned: Corn, $852,100,000; wheat, $2,055,600,000; cotton, $1,013,500,000; all dairy products, $381,900,000.

Mr. BOLLING. Of course, most dairy products, and butter especially, are a great deal more perishable than corn, wheat, and cotton.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am against this bill. I expect to vote against it. Although I am very much in favor of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I believe it has done a splendid job and should be encouraged, I will vote to increase the lending power and I will vote to increase the national debt limit in order to take care of this situation. That is what is involved here; that is all that is involved, more lending power for Commodity Credit and the debt limit raised. Under this arrangement the Congress will probably be charged with refusing to raise the debt limit so as to give an excuse to further benefit the banks.

Last year I voted against raising the debt limit not because I wanted to just be in opposition, but because the banks had $9 billion in Government funds on deposit that the people were paying interest on. They were idle and unused funds and I knew if we stopped the raising of the debt limit they would have to spend that money and would not need to raise the debt limit for the next year, and that is the reason I voted against it. Personally I think it is hypocrisy; certainly intellectual dishonesty for a Member of Congress to vote for appropriations and cause the expenditure of money and funds and then not vote to raise the debt limit as necessary to take care of it. It should be done when necessary. It is just like a Member voting for appropriation bills and against all tax bills to pay them. I do not believe in that, so I will vote to raise the debt limit if it is necessary.

But, today's daily statement, which you have this morning, discloses that there are $3,788,628,000 in the banks of the country on deposit to the Treasury of the United States. Now, that money can be spent. The way it can be spent is not to give checks. The majority leader was in error. He was in error when he said that these banks would take this money and the check would be given to people working in national defense plants or defense industries around these banks holding the deposits, and the money would be kept there locally. He made a mistake when he said that, when he made that statement. It is not correct. The Treasurer of the United States does not give a check on any one of these 11,000 banks holding these funds. When the money is needed, the Secretary of the Treasury calls on the banks to send a certain amount of what they have into the nearest Federal Reserve Bank, and all checks are given on the Federal Reserve Bank, because the Federal Reserve Banks are the fiscal agents of the United States Government.

QUADRUPLE BONUS TO BANKS

Now, the reason I am not in favor of this bill is this. I am not in favor of a double bonus or triple bonus or quadruple bonus to the banks. We are giving the banks a double bonus now on this $3.8 billion. We have permitted them to buy bonds, and in buying those bonds they created money on the Government's credit to do it, on their books. They are keeping that money and they are keeping the bonds that they bought. Now they are not only drawing interest on the bonds they bought with that manufactured money but they are also keeping that money there and they are using it, lending it out to Tom, Dick, or Harry, and making money there. So, they are getting two bonuses on that. No one within the sound of my voice can tell of any substantial service that a bank renders when it buys a Government bond.

It is unworked for and unearned interest it receives; nobody can contend otherwise. I am for the banks having a generous amount of bonds, because I believe in a strong and a profitable banking system and I am not objecting to it up to a point. But, there is a limit beyond which we should not go.

Now then, we give them a double bonus on this. If we, in order to keep raising the debt limit allow the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell more of these Commodity Credit securities to the bank in the same way and manner as I have said they bought the bonds, you will not only subsidize them a third time, but by letting them keep the money there you will subsidize them a fourth time. So, it is not only a banker's bonus bill—it could be referred to as that—of course, I will not call it that because it is a policy and practice that has been carried on so long it is traditional—but at the same time it could be referred to as not only a banker's bonus bill but a 400 percent banker's bonus bill.

The majority leader said the argument made did not make much sense to him. Does it make much sense to you for the Government of the United States to have $3.8 billion on deposit and leave it idle and unused, and then go back and borrow money from the very same banks that have that money? That does not make sense at all. This money should be sent into the Federal Reserve banks and should be used and then it would not be necessary to make these loans or these borrowings.

All right. The majority leader said they need a lot to go on, that the bills are very heavy. Everything he said about that is doubtless true. The turnover is very rapid. Congress has very wisely provided against that contingency. Congress has provided that when the well goes dry, when there is no more money there, the Secretary of the Treasury can get $5 billion from the 12 Federal Reserve banks by direct loans. They do not even have to do it through an open-market transaction. They can do it directly. Therefore, there is no danger of this well going dry to the extent that our Government will be embarrassed. Out of that $5 billion the most that has been used recently was $312 million, and now less than $3 million out of $5,000 million is in use. So when we use this money I have been telling you about, and we get a little tight, we need more money, we use that borrowing power provided by the Congress of the United States, where the Secretary of the Treasury can go to the Federal Reserve banks and borrow $5 billion extra and use it any way he wants to. So there is no danger of our country getting in bad condition because of the financial well going dry.

For that reason I am voting against this joint resolution. It is not for the farmers, it is for the banks. The banks do not need it. They have plenty of the Government's money. Let us use some of the Government's money that they have in some of these same banks that would buy these bonds.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as to the last statement the gentleman made, he is entitled to his opinion. Insofar as the lending rates and the rates they are paying for money outside of borrowing from the Treasury, the gentleman may be right as to that. Certainly we should give no one a windfall in interest rates. However, insofar as the farmer is concerned, there is no question but that the testimony is uncontradicted that the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation lacks only about $16 million of being exhausted.

The law says these loans in certain cases shall be made. In the absence of the Commodity Credit Corporation having its authority increased to meet the requirements of the law, there would be a breakdown in the farm price support system, in my judgment, and it is uncontradicted by the record, for at least 60 or 90 days, until the Congress could take action.

As to the facts that the gentleman from Texas raises with regard to the sources of money, things of that sort, if his facts be right of course I agree with him. I have had no opportunity to determine and claim to be no expert on the Federal Reserve System, but I do say that it is highly essential for the operation of the farm price support system that this relief be given and be given now.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that we could consider a bill to raise the limit just the same as we are considering this bill, and we could get it through Congress just as quickly as we can get this bill through?

Mr. WHITTEN. You considered that, of course, and I believe it lies in the other body now. You can do it all over again but I do not know how you can control the other body. However, be that as it may, the thing I am trying to do is to meet the farm problems which exist. While these things the gentleman discusses may be involved collaterally, the major thing is to give relief to the Commodity Credit Corporation to meet the requirements the law places upon it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. There are two bills in the other body to increase the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation. They are before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. I understood the gentleman to refer to increasing the limit of the national debt. I did not understand him to refer to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have today introduced a bill which is designed to do the two following things:

First. Reduce the present perplexing stocks of surplus commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Second. Give a substantial relief to every Federal income-tax payer in the Nation.

I propose that every person who is required by law to file a Federal income tax return, and who does so, be issued Commodity Credit certificates which the taxpayer may exchange for commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. These certificates would be issued in amounts equal to, but not in excess of the following:

Every person filing a return, even though paying no tax, or each person filing a return and paying a tax of $25 or less, shall receive certificates in amounts not to exceed $25, plus an additional $25 for each dependent lawfully claimed.

Each person filing a return and paying a tax of more than $25 shall receive certificates in the amount of the tax paid, not exceeding $50, plus an additional $25 for each dependent.

Persons filing joint returns would get certificates equal to the tax paid, but not in excess of $50 for each person making the joint return, plus $25 for each dependent.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe the necessary rules and regulations for orderly and systematic distribution of these surplus commodities through regular business channels.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi have any further requests for time?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I have. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota have any further requests for time?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read the bill for amendment, as follows:

Resolved, etc.—

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury (1) in the amount of $609,930,933 for the capital impairment determined by the appraisal of June 30, 1953, pursuant to sections 1 and 4 of the act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–1, 4); (2) in the amount of $129,553,795 for the net costs during the fiscal year 1953 (including interest through the date of enactment hereof) under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641–1642); and (3) in the amount of $2,064,060 for the funds transferred and expenses incurred through the fiscal year 1953 (including interest through the date of enactment hereof) under the head "Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals and poultry" pursuant to authority granted in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: After line 4, add the following:

"That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the farm price support system is designed for the purpose of stabilizing the farm income of American farmers and assuring sufficient return to protect the land and other natural resources. The Congress further finds and declares that all peoples and governments have the inherent right to offer on the world market any and all commodities at competitive prices; and it is therefore declared to be the policy of the United States that our domestic farm program shall not be used to keep American agricultural commodities from being offered on the world market at competitive prices.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to determine what part of present stocks of farm or agricultural commodities in its hands should be held as essential to the national security or in the national interest, and upon such determination title to all such commodities so determined to be essential to the national security shall be transferred to the Department of National Defense, and all commodities so transferred shall be taken off the market: *Provided, however,* That to prevent spoilage or deterioration any part of such commodities may be returned to the Commodity Credit Corporation for sale as hereinafter provided and replaced with a like amount or quantity from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

"SEC. 3. In order to make American farm commodities available to users in other countries on the same basis as farm commodities from other nations, all other agricultural commodities of whatever kind or character, title to which is in the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless already committed for sale, shall be offered for sale for use outside the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions, at prevailing or competitive world prices: *Provided, however,* That the President by Executive order may restrict or prohibit sales of such commodities for use in Communist-dominated countries when in his opinion such sales would be against the interest of the United States."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is not in order in that it is not germane to the joint resolution.

The joint resolution has only one proposition in it. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to cancel the notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation and restore the capital structure of the Corporation in the amount of its capital impairment as determined by appraisal on June 30, 1953, in accord with law.

The amendment seeks to introduce proposals which not only are not included in the joint resolution but are foreign to the basic act establishing the Commodity Credit Corporation. In effect it is an amendment of the law establishing the Corporation and therefore is in no sense germane to the proposition included in the joint resolution.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order so that I may make a statement?

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order so the gentleman from Mississippi may speak.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point which the gentleman makes. We are dealing here with the overall operations of the Commodity

Credit Corporation. We are having to replace approximately $741 million, which it is said the Commodity Credit Corporation has had its capital stock depleted. Yet this action today is necessary because of the fact that while the Corporation has gone out and invested in farm commodities as directed by the law, yet those commodities have not been offered on the world market nor have they been sold. Had they been offered and had they been sold, the overall operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation would be much, much less expensive and your annual or your monthly warehousing costs would be greatly reduced. Not only that, but you would have charged up to the farm program and to the country a much smaller percentage than you now have charged up to the price support system. I have offered this amendment, which I have today introduced as a bill, to point up the basic weaknesses as I see it in the present farm program, and that is the fact that the American nation is not offering these commodities for use but is storing them up in warehouses and paying an annual charge, and there can be only two reasons for so doing. One is that they ought to give the foreign markets to other nations so that their agriculture can prosper and so that ours will not. The only other reason for not offering these commodities for sale in foreign markets is that the very backup of these commodities will give them a bigger hammer to strike at the present farm program. Lots of folks are against it. They have been against it from the start. One of the best ways to break it in half is to buy these commodities, or advance money on them, put the commodities in warehouses, and give the farmers no chance to offer them on the markets of the world. There they have got their greatest weapon.

This amendment points out exactly why it is that your farm program is not working better than it should. If it be true that we do not need to offer these commodities on the markets of the world on the same terms and conditions that other agricultural countries offer their commodities, that is something that has to do with national defense and should be charged up to national defense and not against the farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Before the semicolon, line 5, add the following: "*Provided*, commodities of at least an equal value are offered for sale by the Commodity Credit Corporation from its stocks at prevailing or competitive world prices, for use outside the continental United States, its possessions or Territories."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to make the point of order against this amendment on the same grounds as against the amendment previously ordered.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

This resolution before us today authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to cancel certain notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the amount of $741 million.

The amendment which I have offered would authorize that action only under certain conditions. Those conditions are that commodities of an equal value be offered in world markets at prevailing prices, by the Commodity Credit Corporation. I respectfully submit the amendment is germane.

To carry the matter further that I have tried to raise here, I should like to point out that this says to the Commodity Credit Corporation, "You have reached your ceiling, but you are holding onto the commodities into which you have put this money. If you will offer for sale to the markets of the world such an amount of those commodities as is equal to the notes you are asking here to have canceled, then the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to cancel those notes."

So I say that in the resolution we direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cancel notes in this amount provided that commodities of equal value are offered on the markets of the world. We are just granting the same authority, but we are granting it on condition.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to make the point again that the amendment just read goes beyond the authority inherent in the joint resolution and therefore is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is not germane and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think before this debate closes the RECORD ought to show something about the loans in commercial banks that have been made over the past number of years, which matter has been so ably expounded by one of the Members in opposition to this resolution. The gentleman from Texas has been careful not to mention that past administrations consistently followed this same policy for years past.

He would have one think that we are adopting a new policy, that we are almost committing a crime in favor of the big interests of this country, the banking interests of this country. Why does he not give all the facts? There is nothing irregular about this procedure.

Of course, most of us in the House understand well his specious arguments, but the public might be deceived. For that reason I asked for this time to make this one point: that this is not a new route of subterfuge on the part of those of us who are supporting this resolution. It is a regular procedure. We are only following a pattern that we have learned to follow from the past administration for the last number of years; the pattern of diffusing some money out into the commercial banks of the Nation.

May I say to the Members of this House that in 1945 $24 billion had been placed by the prior administration with these thousands of commercial banks in this country, and I never heard the gentleman from Texas or anyone make an argument against the policy at that time, that we were borrowing money at double the interest rate we should pay, or at exorbitant rates of interest in order to favor the banking interests of this country. Everyone knows, and this will be confirmed by the Treasury Department, that for years 6 or 7 billions of this kind of money have been distributed by the administrations among the commercial banks of this country. That was the ordinary plan and the ordinary procedure at that time. Why so violently object to some three billion dollars now on deposit in these same banks? It is a hollow argument.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUNTER. Is it not true that for years it has been the policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with this price-support program to follow this method? This is nothing new; it is a policy that has been carried on for a number of years.

Mr. VURSELL. Certainly it is nothing new. We in the Congress have brought this situation about; it is an obligation that we placed upon the Commodity Credit Corporation, and certainly we should stand up and say that we will protect the financial solvency of this country and not place the Commodity Credit Corporation in a position where they fail in honoring the drafts that come in against them. Should that take place it would hurt the entire credit of this Nation. Let us be, all of us, for our country first and try if we can in these critical times to solve these problems as they should be solved, face up to them like men honestly and sensibly and do our duty.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

SHOCKING ATTITUDE OF SECRETARY OF TREASURY

Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed about the attitude of the Secretary of the Treasury. He seems to have the idea that he must cater to the banks in order to get them to buy Government bonds, that the Government must in some way favor the banks at all times in order to get them to buy Government bonds. I regret very much that he has that opinion. The truth is that the best way in the world to sell bonds is first to individuals who have actual money, genuine savings. There is where we should place every bond it is possible to place. When you have exhausted that source, then the insurance companies and the surplus funds of corporations and business firms and industries should be called upon. They should come in and invest their unused funds in United States Government bonds; and then only should the banks be permitted to invest in Government bonds. I have gone along with the theory for years that we should permit the banks to have a lot of Government bonds—up to a point. I favor a sound banking system, I believe in a good privately owned sound

profitable banking system, and for that reason I have gone along with it. But this idea of the Secretary of the Treasury that we have got to sort of favor these banks to get them to buy bonds is wrong; we do not have to. The Federal Reserve Banks can buy all the bonds that the private commercial banking system has today. They can buy every one of them. We do not have to go to the private banking system to sell bonds unless we just want to give them that money. We can sell them to the 12 Federal Reserve Banks. We do not have to depend on the private commercial banks for one penny of bond sales, not one penny.

I am going to read a sensational statement, something that is startling. I heard about it the 1st of August last year and did not believe it, it was so startling and so sensational. But I checked on it last August before I left here to go to Texas and upon my responsibility as a Member of Congress I say it is true.

STARTLING ANSWER OF SECRETARY OF TREASURY

I will read it to you. A Member of Congress, while the increase of the debt limit was under consideration, asked the Secretary of the Treasury this question:

> We have to keep these balances in the bank upon which they pay no interest and on every dollar they loan the United States Government we pay them interest on it. We do not have to bribe them or subsidize them to buy Government bonds, do we?

That is the question a Member of the United States Congress asked the Secretary of the Treasury. Do you know what his answer was?

> Secretary HUMPHREY. Yes; we do.

Three words. "Yes; we do."

I say to you upon my responsibility as a Member of Congress that question was asked and that reply was given.

So I say that the Secretary of the Treasury is going too far if he believes we have got to bribe or subsidize banks in order to sell Government bonds. I do not charge that he means to corruptly bribe the banks. It is fundamentally wrong and fallacious. We can sell all the Government bonds we want to sell after we have exhausted the market where savings are invested, where endowment funds are invested, where the social-security fund is invested, as well as other funds, life insurance funds, funds of corporations, and the unused funds of individual business and industrial concerns. We can sell them to the 12 Federal Reserve banks just as safely and without any dislocation or adverse effect upon our economy, as by selling them to private commercial banks. Incidentally the taxpayers could save a billion or two a year in interest on the public debt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I made points of order against amendments offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. I want to assure the Members of the House and my colleague from Mississippi that I was not necessarily opposing the merits of his argument. But I did feel that his amendments were far-reaching and that it was legislation on an appropriation bill.

On yesterday I discussed the matter of foreign markets with the Secretary of Agriculture himself and he assured me of his interest in achieving real progress in that field. I have also spoken with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. I know that committee is working on legislation to achieve what was included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Shortly we are to have a report from the Randall Commission on foreign trade. I think probably we will be better off if we go about this matter in an orderly way and not through legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Washington. May I say that I was not surprised at the ruling or that the point was to be made. I understood it would be made, not that I was agreeable to having it made. I would like to have had my way about it because I think it is vital.

This problem goes deeper than the Secretary of Agriculture, whoever he may be, Democrat or Republican. I have been on the Appropriations Committee for quite a long time and I have dealt with this farm program for a long time. Any time that you have a farm program under which you have a system of supports that after you support commodities and put them into the hands of the Government and they are bottled up within the United States because of the opposition of the State Department, the Commerce Department and other branches of the Government other than the Department of Agriculture, you invite trouble, cause the Government to be out much money that could be recovered. Any time you use that system to keep such commodities from following normal channels of trade in the world markets it can only have the effect of increasing tremendously the cost to the American people. It can only seriously endanger the farm program, and the major problem is that those that stifle and hold up the offering of these American-produced commodities to the world are not in the Department of Agriculture, but they are in other Departments of this Government. Now, they can make a very sound argument, some of them, if you do not look behind it, as to why our international relationship at the present moment is not what it should be under these conditions, and that that might cause us not to want to do this, that or the other. In most cases I think they are wrong about it. But, if they are right, and if these commodities are held in our own country at 100 cents on the dollar cost to the American people, with the threat that it offers to our whole price support system, if it is held here for national defense, international relationship, foreign aid, or whatever it is, it should be so tagged, so identified, and they should be held responsible for it. As it now is, the farmer has to carry the load from letters that are in the press about what the farm program is costing, and it is costing four times as much as it would if they would let us sell.

Now, to answer some questions that were raised on the floor from the city districts. It is also said that if the farmer would just give these commodities at a greatly reduced price that a whole lot more of the commodities would be consumed. For the last month I have been driving up and down Independence Avenue, seeing hundreds of new 1953 model Chevrolet automobiles on parking lots, with apparently no buyers; brand new cars belonging to one of the local agencies. If that agency wanted to sell all of these automobiles they are not selling very well right now, and the same is true of refrigerators and other appliances, if they overlooked minimum wages they have to pay, if they overlooked the wage rates that come under contracts, if they overlooked the interest rates that they have to pay and the dividends that they pay and ignored costs but offered them at what the rest of us can afford to pay, I could well use a new car if you could get them down low enough. Many without a car could do likewise. It is true that farm commodities would be used more quickly if they were sold below cost, but the American farmer exhausted 40 percent of the land and 80 percent of the timber when he sold in an unprotected market for what he could get, and if today we were to offer all of these commodities at cut-rate bargains on the domestic front in our own country, we could move a whole lot of them, but in the doing of it you would seriously jeopardize the future of our very high standard of living. As I have said before, the total cost of cotton in a shirt retailing for about $4 is 20 cents and the total cost of wheat going into a loaf of bread is about 2 out of 20. If you were to cut out the entire amount that the farmer gets out of many of the commodities that you use, you would never know the difference. The cost is largely added from the time it leaves the producer's hands until it gets into the hands of the consumer. That is a matter of record.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. It seems to me in some of the debate this afternoon a point has been overlooked, that the farmer is one of the largest consuming groups we have in this country, and that the income to the farmer is an important thing. While the farmer may represent only approximately 15 percent of the population, he consumes approximately one-third of the goods.

Mr. WHITTEN. The American farmer spent last year $24 billion making his crop. He has to get that cost back.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Along the line of the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota, I desire to follow that up and say to the gentleman that 20 years ago there were 33 million people on the farms in this country and today there are about 28½ million, as I understand. There has never been a time in the history of America when the farm population was prosperous enough to pay their debts and have a buying power that the economy of this country has not been upon a solid basis, that labor has not been employed and business has not been good, making the things that these 28 to 30 million people buy.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to say this, if you study the income of this Nation over any 5-year period, the national income will average almost exactly 7 times the farm income. We cannot stand as a nation seven times the drop that has already happened in farm income. Every depression we have ever had was led off by a drastic break in agricultural prices. Wherever the responsibility lies, we have had that break in agricultural prices. We need to keep the situation fully as good as it is and hope we improve it. But the most serious threat, again, because we try to support the prices our farmers get, does not justify us as a nation in bottling up these commodities we do support and preventing their being offered on the markets of the world in the same way the production of other countries is offered. We need to break that logjam which is not only jeopardizing the Commodity Credit Corporation but, because of the big buildup and the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation continues to hold these commodities, is endangering the farm price-support system, which actually, as my friend from Texas says, is the basis, is the bottom. Food, clothing, and shelter are today and will remain the first things in life. We need to keep that in mind.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I asked the distinguished gentleman from Texas to yield to me for a question because as a young man new in this body I was seeking information. He refused to yield, and then proceeded to quote from a letter which he suggested contained a question and the answer to it by one of my constituents.

I feel it my beholden duty to rise to speak for that constituent on this occasion because, if I understood the gentleman's quotation correctly and if I understood the feelings he desired to get from that quotation, he was indicating that the Secretary of the Treasury of this great United States was willing to take the position that we, the Government of the United States, had to bribe any part of this great country of ours. I consider this to be a reflection not only upon our country but upon that distinguished gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not intend any reflection upon him as an individual, but it is the system that is being used, which he has adopted, of favoring and catering to the banks, expecting them to buy Government bonds because of that, when I say it is not necessary.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I am glad to have the gentleman take that position. When I originally rose to my feet I rose for two purposes: First, to comment on the fact that when I first listened to the gentleman expound upon the fiscal policies of this country with respect to its bonds, he was taking the position that raising the interest rate on the bonds was a calamitous move for our fiscal policy, yet I heard him this afternoon indicate that we should do all we could to urge private investors, such as private individuals and insurance companies, to purchase bonds, not because the Government was forcing them to, not because political pressure was being extended, but because we were offering them better savings.

The thought occurred to me that the figures which I believe I have seen recently indicate that personal payroll savings purchases of bonds and other individual purchases of bonds today are higher than they have ever been. I intended to ask the gentleman how he could put those two statements together.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The investors are putting their money into Government bonds as they should. That is where the Government should get its money, and it should be attractive for them. In fact, if it were possible to do so, I would give the genuine savers a better interest rate, but I would not give the people who just create the money on the books of the bank this increased interest rate. The genuine savers should have an increased interest rate. I would not object to that.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman is correct. More individuals are buying and there is a very simple reason for it. It is that the buyer today under the present policies of our Government realizes and knows that the dollar he puts in today will in the future have about the same purchasing power that it had when he put the dollar in. That is the real incentive. It is an incentive that too often in the past has not been with us because the investor, the person whom we asked to buy bonds realized the policies of the Government were such as would one day so diminish the value of the dollar that he put in that he could not get a comparable return. As I say, it is to the credit of this administration under whose policies we are presently operating that the currency has been stabilized and hundreds of individual purchasers are coming into the market as they should.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. May I state to the gentleman that the dollar is worth less today than it was a year ago. That answers the gentleman's argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, pursuant to House Resolution 417, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 323, nays 27, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—323

Adair	Bonin	Cole, Mo.
Alexander	Bonner	Cole, N. Y.
Allen, Calif.	Bow	Colmer
Allen, Ill.	Bowler	Condon
Andersen, H. Carl	Boykin	Coon
	Bray	Cooper
Andresen, August H.	Brooks, Tex.	Corbett
	Brown, Ga.	Crosser
Andrews	Brown, Ohio	Crumpacker
Angell	Brownson	Cunningham
Arends	Broyhill	Curtis, Mass.
Aspinall	Budge	Curtis, Mo.
Auchincloss	Burdick	Curtis, Nebr.
Ayres	Burleson	Davis, Ga.
Bailey	Busbey	Davis, Tenn.
Baker	Bush	Davis, Wis.
Barden	Byrd	Dawson, Utah
Bates	Byrnes, Wis.	Deane
Beamer	Camp	Dempsey
Bender	Canfield	Derounian
Bennett, Fla.	Cannon	Devereux
Bennett, Mich.	Carlyle	D'Ewart
Bentley	Carnahan	Dies
Berry	Carrigg	Dodd
Betts	Cederberg	Dollinger
Bishop	Celler	Dolliver
Blatnik	Chatham	Dondero
Bolling	Chenoweth	Dorn, N. Y.
Bolton, Frances P.	Chiperfield	Dowdy
	Church	Doyle
Bolton, Oliver P.	Ciardy	Durham
	Clevenger	Edmondson

Elliott	Krueger	Rivers
Ellsworth	Laird	Roberts
Engle	Landrum	Robeson, Va.
Evins	Lane	Robsion, Ky.
Fallon	LeCompte	Rogers, Colo.
Feighan	Lipscomb	Rogers, Fla.
Fenton	Long	Rogers, Mass.
Fernandez	Lucas	Rogers, Tex.
Fine	McCarthy	Rooney
Fisher	McConnell	Roosevelt
Ford	McCulloch	Sadlak
Forrester	McDonough	St. George
Fountain	McGregor	Saylor
Frazier	McVey	Schenck
Frelinghuysen	Mack, Ill.	Scherer
Gary	Mack, Wash.	Scrivner
Gavin	Madden	Scudder
Gentry	Magnuson	Secrest
George	Mahon	Seely-Brown
Golden	Mailliard	Selden
Goodwin	Marshall	Shafer
Gordon	Martin, Iowa	Sheehan
Gregory	Matthews	Shelley
Gross	Meader	Sheppard
Gubser	Merrill	Short
Gwinn	Metcalf	Shuford
Hagen, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Sikes
Hagen, Minn.	Miller, Kans.	Small
Haley	Miller, Md.	Smith, Miss.
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Va.
Hand	Miller, N. Y.	Smith, Wis.
Harden	Mills	Spence
Hardy	Mollohan	Springer
Harris	Morano	Stauffer
Harrison, Va.	Morgan	Steed
Harrison, Wyo.	Moss	Stringfellow
Hays, Ark.	Moulder	Sullivan
Hays, Ohio	Mumma	Talle
Heselton	Natcher	Teague
Hess	Neal	Thompson, La.
Hiestand	Nelson	Thompson, Mich.
Hillelson	Nicholson	Thornberry
Hillings	Norblad	Tollefson
Hinshaw	Norrell	Trimble
Hoffman, Ill.	Oakman	Tuck
Hoffman, Mich.	O'Brien, Ill.	Utt
Holmes	O'Brien, N. Y.	Van Pelt
Holt	O'Hara, Ill.	Van Zandt
Horan	O'Hara, Minn.	Velde
Hosmer	Osmers	Vinson
Howell	Ostertag	Vorys
Hruska	Passman	Vursell
Hunter	Patten	Walter
Hyde	Patterson	Wampler
Ikard	Pelly	Watts
Jackson	Perkins	Westland
James	Pfost	Wharton
Jarman	Phillips	Whitten
Jenkins	Pillion	Wickersham
Jensen	Poff	Widnall
Johnson, Calif.	Preston	Wier
Johnson, Wis.	Price	Wigglesworth
Jonas, Ill.	Priest	Williams, Miss.
Jonas, N. C.	Prouty	Williams, N. J.
Jones, Ala.	Rabaut	Willis
Jones, N. C.	Radwan	Wilson, Calif.
Judd	Rains	Wilson, Tex.
Karsten, Mo.	Ray	Winstead
Kearney	Rayburn	Withrow
Kearns	Reams	Wolcott
Kee	Reed, Ill.	Wolverton
Kelley, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	Yates
Kersten, Wis.	Rees, Kans.	Young
Kilburn	Regan	Younger
Kilday	Rhodes, Ariz.	Zablocki
King, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.	
Kluczynski	Richlman	
Knox	Riley	

NAYS—27

Barrett	Fogarty	Keating
Bosch	Friedel	Lantaff
Buchanan	Fulton	Latham
Byrne, Pa.	Garmatz	Machrowicz
Cotton	Granahan	Mason
Coudert	Green	O'Brien, Mich.
Cretella	Holifield	Patman
Eberharter	Javits	Thomas
Fino	Kean	Wainwright

NOT VOTING—84

Abbitt	Buckley	Gamble
Abernethy	Campbell	Gathings
Addonizio	Chelf	Graham
Albert	Chudoff	Grant
Ashmore	Cooley	Hale
Battle	Dague	Harrison, Nebr.
Becker	Dawson, Ill.	Hart
Belcher	Delaney	Harvey
Bentsen	Dingell	Hébert
Boggs	Donohue	Heller
Boland	Donovan	Herlong
Bramblett	Dorn, S. C.	Hill
Brooks, La.	Forand	Hoeven
Holtzman	Merrow	Sieminski
Hope	Morrison	Simpson, Ill.
Jones, Mo.	Multer	Simpson, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.	Murray	Smith, Kans.
Keogh	O'Konski	Staggers
King, Pa.	O'Neill	Sutton
Kirwan	Philbin	Taber
Klein	Pilcher	Taylor
Lanham	Poage	Thompson, Tex.
Lesinski	Polk	Warburton
Lovre	Powell	Weichel
Lyle	Reece, Tenn.	Wheeler
McCormack	Richards	Williams, N. Y.
McIntire	Rodino	Wilson, Ind.
McMillan	Scott	Yorty

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Taber with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Simpson of Illinois with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Lanham.
Mr. Becker with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Belcher with Mr. Thompson of Texas.
Mr. Graham with Mr. Addonizio.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Yorty.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Jones of Missouri.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Grant.
Mr. Hope with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Boggs.
Mr. Smith of Kansas with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Williams of New York with Mr. Forand.
Mr. Merrow with Mr. Sutton.
Mr. McIntire with Mr. Holtzman.
Mr. Dague with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Bramblett with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Hill with Mr. Boland.
Mr. Warburton with Mr. O'Neill.
Mr. Lovre with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Hale with Mr. Klein.
Mr. Harrison of Nebraska with Mrs. Kelly of New York.
Mr. Harvey with Mr. Multer.
Mr. King of Pennsylvania with Mr. Heller.
Mr. O'Konski with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. BOSCH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LATHAM changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. JAVITS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FRIEDEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE ON THURSDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to announce again to Members on our side the Republican conference here tomorrow afternoon.

JOINT MEETING TO RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

Mr. HALLECK. I want to call the attention of all Members to the fact that the President of Turkey will be here on Friday for a joint meeting of the House and the Senate. The President of Turkey is the President of a great, friendly, and strong power, representing people whom we respect and admire. I sincerely hope that as many of the Members as possible will be present on next Friday to greet him and to listen to him.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in the wish and the hope expressed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] concerning the visit of the President of a great, free, and friendly people who will be here on next Friday. I trust that the membership will be here to show our respect and our reciprocal feeling of friendship for these people.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday and Thursday of next week, after the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore granted.

Mr. OAKMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes tomorrow, January 28, after the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore granted.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House on the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, February 15, for 1 hour, after the close of the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore granted.

USE OF COUNTERPART FUNDS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, for several months there have been requests for information about the counterpart funds and how the counterpart funds have been expended, particularly with reference to committees investigating conditions abroad, and how much money has been used of those counterpart funds by those committees. I have had requests for such information from my colleagues, from private citizens throughout the country, from newspapermen and from radio commentators.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I will include as part of my remarks a statement with respect to the history of the counterpart funds, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of State listing the names of the countries in which counterpart funds exist, and a series of tables telling about the expenditure of counterpart funds during the period since the Congress adjourned in August.

Pursuant to section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as

amended, there has been created in each participating country in Europe receiving economic or defense-support assistance under that act a special local currency account. Analogous arrangements have generally been provided for in other areas in which the Foreign Operations Administration provides such aid, although variations exist, particularly in economically underdeveloped areas, where Congress has provided for flexibility in the application of the Economic Cooperation Act in order to carry out the objectives of different types of programs. In countries where the typical European pattern prevails the recipient country deposits in its special account amounts of local currency commensurate in value to the dollar grant aid it receives. These deposits, which are called counterpart funds, are used in general by the depositing country to carry out mutual security objectives agreed upon jointly with the United States. In such countries there is reserved for United States use at least 5 percent of these counterpart funds, and in cases where section 115 (h) of the Economic Cooperation Act applies, 10 percent has, since 1952, been reserved for such use.

The United States portion of counterpart funds has been used to defray certain costs payable in local currencies, including administrative expenses of the foreign aid program, certain expenses connected with technical assistance and informational activities, and the cost of acquiring strategic materials or developing their production. Funds not required for these and related mutual security purposes were made available for purchase by other United States Government agencies for use in meeting their local currency costs.

In addition, section 527 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951—Public Law 165, 82d Congress—amended section 115 (h) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 to permit the use of these funds for "local currency requirements of appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946." Under this authority, these foreign credits were made available for travel of congressional committees without dollar reimbursement to the Treasury, and supplemented other funds available for such travel, including appropriations to the various executive departments for "examination of estimates in the field."

In 1952, however, Congress enacted a provision—section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, Public Law 547, 82d Congress, approved July 15, 1952—requiring that after June 30, 1953, such foreign credits could not be utilized except as provided for in appropriation acts. It was generally understood that, as was ultimately provided in section 1313 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954—Public Law 207, 83d Congress, approved August 7, 1953—section 1415 would be carried out by requirements for the payment of dollars to the Treasury for the use of such foreign credits. Pursuant to this policy, the executive branch proposed, in section 706 (f) (2) of the Mutual Security Act of 1953—Public Law 118, 83d Congress, approved July 16, 1953—that the Mutual Security Act of 1951 be amended by adding a new section 548, providing for the appropriation of additional dollars to cover the expenditure of foreign currencies.

While this provision was enacted, the Congress inserted, by section 708 (c) of the Mutual Security Act of 1953, a special waiver in section 115 (h) of the Economic Cooperation Act, providing that the United States share of the counterpart fund could continue to be used for the expenses of congressional committees "without regard to section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953." Foreign credits, therefore, could continue to be available for travel of congressional committees without dollar reimbursement to the Treasury.

Subsequent to receipt of requests from various Members of Congress for authorization to use counterpart funds, a meeting was arranged by representatives from Treasury, Foreign Operations Administration, and the Department of State. On August 4, 1953 an agreement was arrived at by these agencies whereby the Foreign Operations Administration would transfer from the counterpart funds under its control sums which would be deposited in a special account, No. 19 FT 561, which fund would be disbursed, administered, and accounted for by State. It was further agreed that, upon request by this Department, additional sums would be transferred to this fund, as required and when balances became low.

The procedure set up by this Department required an authorization in writing, signed by the chairman of an appropriate congressional committee, in order for the Department to authorize the use of counterpart by any Member. Upon receipt of such written authorization from the committee chairman, the Department would then set up a credit in fund 19 FT 561 in the various countries which the Member indicated he contemplated visiting. Subsequently, the disbursing officers at the posts which the Member contemplated visiting would be notified to advance counterpart against receipt signed by the Member authorized or a committee representative traveling with him, who was required to be authorized in writing to sign for counterpart on behalf of the member or the committee.

It was agreed by representatives of Treasury, Foreign Operations Administration, and State that pursuant to provisions of law no detailed accounting would be required for sums drawn by Members of Congress. In order to cover his expenditures, a disbursing officer was required only to submit the voucher signed by the Member or the duly authorized agent.

In some instances travel expenses were covered by committee funds. In other instances, and at the request of the committee chairman, the Department authorized the payment of ceratin congressional travel expenses, subject to reimbursement from committee funds.

In many instances, Government travel requests were issued to the various carriers to cover the cost of travel by Members authorized to use counterpart funds. These TR's were, in many cases, payable in local currency through a draft on various disbursing officers. Because of the administrative procedure whereby these TR's had to be transmitted to the carrier, then forwarded by the carrier to their appropriate local office for presentation to the disbursing officer for payment, a considerable delay resulted. Therefore, it will probably be several months before all of these TR's have been presented for payment and the resulting disbursement shown in the statements submitted by disbursing officers. Eventually, however, there will be available a complete statement showing the amount of expenditures made against account No. 19 FT 561.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 27, 1954.

The Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 6, 1954, addressed to the Secretary, concerning the use of counterpart funds by committees of the House of Representatives traveling abroad. Enclosed is a statement showing the use by committees of the House of Representatives of counterpart funds, on a nonreimbursable basis, for the period from July 1, 1953, to November 30, 1953, inclusive, with additional adjustments for travel credit on unused portions of tickets of which the Department is presently cognizant.

Because of the fact that this information is compiled from the accounts of disbursing officers overseas, we are unable at this time to give you an accounting for the month of December 1953. This additional information will be embodied in a final report as soon as it becomes available within the Department.

I should like to invite the committee's attention to the fact that the totals shown herein are not, in many instances, final. For example, several Members surrendered unused portions of tickets purchased through counterpart funds and also surrendered currency after their return to Washington. Because of the administrative routine involved and the necessity of returning these items to the various overseas posts where drawn, there is usually a delay of several months before the item is credited against the committee account.

In your letter you inquire as to the amount of counterpart funds available and in what countries. Counterpart funds were available in the following countries, either as a result of the country's participation in the mutual security program or through conversion: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, England, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong, Iceland, India, Indochina, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, New Zealand, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Taipei, Thailand, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

The amount available in each country was the unobligated balance of the administrative portion of the matching counterpart funds contributed by the participating countries.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

(Enclosure: Preliminary report on expenditure of counterpart funds, fiscal year 1954.)

Use of counterpart funds by committees of the House of Representatives (August–November 1953)

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON EXPENDITURE OF COUNTERPART FUNDS, FISCAL YEAR 1954

Committee	August	September	October	November	Total
Appropriations		$11,380.64	$19,290.74	$5,428.12	$36,099.50
Armed Services		1,541.86	8,613.54	3,300.52	13,455.92
Foreign Affairs		1,863.29	8,367.95	10,884.06	21,115.30
Interior and Insular Affairs				280.00	280.00
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	$175.36	$586.50		$2,920.13	$3,681.99
Judiciary	3,513.43	4,547.02	$25,305.38	3,544.85	36,910.68
Total	3,688.79	19,890.31	61,577.61	26,357.68	111,523.39

Country totals of counterpart withdrawals

Countries	August	September	October	November	Total
Austria		$297.18	$226.91	$300.00	$824.09
Belgium	$55.20	673.00	388.78	800.00	1,926.98
Burma			287.60		287.60
Denmark	162.22	367.97			530.19
Egypt		584.34	1,412.17		1,996.51
England	1,594.65	4,067.46	254.80	1,400.00	7,316.91
France	722.28	4,415.27	14,436.12	8,599.31	28,172.98
Germany	805.01	2,665.82	3,846.89	650.00	7,967.72
Greece		127.75	220.30	97.53	445.58
Hong Kong		761.65	1,903.68	446.86	3,202.19
India			994.03	238.74	1,232.83
Indochina			1,352.31	702.86	2,055.17
Iran			188.88		188.88
Iraq			192.14	106.40	298.54
Israel		166.24	486.21	367.58	1,020.03
Italy		1,132.17	22,140.47	3,438.41	26,711.05
Japan		1,208.53	2,155.89	1,429.20	4,793.62
Jordan		$15.32	$602.00		$617.32
Kuwait			120.00		120.00
Lebanon		453.56	2,682.41	$665.11	3,801.08
Netherlands	$118.42	1,009.63	202.84	4,539.47	5,870.36
Pakistan			1,627.32		1,627.32
Philippines			776.40	92.15	868.55
Portugal		93.21		524.47	617.68
Singapore			701.25		701.25
Spain	221.01	351.15	472.41	1,034.48	2,079.05
Sweden		445.53		392.89	838.42
Switzerland		779.07	1,393.02	57.44	2,229.53
Syria			455.74		455.74
Taipei				223.13	223.13
Thailand		163.03	1,125.91	251.65	1,540.59
Turkey		121.43	841.07		962.50
Total	3,688.79	19,899.31	61,577.61	26,237.68	111,523.39

NOTE.—No withdrawals made from August to November 1953, inclusive, from counterpart funds available in the following areas: Australia, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Iceland, Ireland, Kenya, Liberia, New Zealand, Norway, and Yugoslavia.

Committee on Appropriations

Countries	September	October	November	Total
Austria		$226.91		$226.91
Belgium	$673.00			673.00
Denmark	247.53			247.53
Egypt		578.18		578.18
England	2,555.46			2,555.46
France	4,024.84	8,453.26		12,478.10
Germany	2,625.82	408.33		3,034.15
Greece		220.30		220.30
Hong Kong		735.00	$252.83	987.83
India		589.20	238.74	827.94
Israel		403.78		403.78
Italy		2,024.64		2,024.64
Japan		1,111.11	335.31	1,446.42
Jordan		$602.00		$602.00
Lebanon		959.01		959.01
Netherlands	$909.90	37.39	$4,340.00	5,287.29
Pakistan		959.69		959.69
Philippines			92.15	92.15
Spain		472.41		472.41
Sweden	344.09			344.09
Switzerland			57.44	57.44
Syria		280.11		280.11
Thailand		388.35	111.65	500.00
Turkey		841.07		841.07
Total	11,380.64	19,290.74	5,428.12	36,099.50

Committee on Armed Services

Countries	September	October	November	Total
Burma		$287.60		$287.80
Egypt		634.03		634.03
France			$571.43	571.43
Hong Kong	$333.33	1,258.68		1,592.01
India		404.89		404.89
Indochina		1,352.31		1,352.31
Italy		1,000.00	976.49	1,976.49
Japan	1,208.53	81.67		1,290.20
Lebanon		711.52		711.52
Pakistan		$667.63		$667.63
Philippines		776.40		776.40
Portugal			$524.47	524.47
Singapore		701.25		701.25
Spain			1,034.48	1,034.48
Taipei			193.65	193.65
Thailand		737.56		737.56
Total	$1,541.86	8,613.54	3,300.52	13,455.92

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Countries	September	October	November	Total
Austria			$300.00	$300.00
Belgium		$341.00	800.00	1,141.00
Denmark	$120.44			120.44
Egypt	484.03	199.96		683.99
England	364.00			364.00
France	149.29	2,640.00	5,198.99	7,988.28
Germany		358.33	650.00	1,008.33
Greece			50.00	50.00
Hong Kong			194.03	194.03
Indochina			702.86	702.86
Iran		188.88		188.88
Iraq		192.14		192.14
Israel		82.43		82.43
Italy	100.00	1,258.40	1,355.20	2,713.60
Japan		$406.28	$1,093.89	$1,500.17
Kuwait		120.00		120.00
Lebanon		1,011.88	170.14	1,182.02
Netherlands	$99.73		199.47	299.20
Portugal	93.21			93.21
Spain	351.15			351.15
Sweden	101.44			101.44
Switzerland		1,393.02		1,393.02
Syria		175.63		175.63
Taipei			29.48	29.48
Thailand			140.00	140.00
Total	1,863.29	8,367.95	10,884.06	21,115.30

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Country	November	Total
Italy (total)	$280.00	$280.00

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Countries	August	September	October	November	Totals	Countries	August	September	October	November	Totals
Austria		$62.69			$62.69	Iraq				$106.40	$106.40
Denmark	$75.36				75.36	Italy		$262.67		421.20	683.87
England				$1,120.00	1,120.00	Lebanon				494.97	494.97
France		241.14		337.14	578.28	Sweden				392.89	392.89
Germany	100.00				100.00						
Greece				47.53	47.53	Total	$175.36	566.50		2,920.13	3,661.99

Committee on the Judiciary

Countries	August	September	October	November	Totals	Countries	August	September	October	November	Totals
Austria		$234.49			$234.49	Japan			$556.83		$556.83
Belgium	$65.20		$47.78		112.98	Jordan		$15.32			15.32
Denmark	86.86				86.86	Lebanon		453.56			453.56
Egypt		100.31			100.31	Netherlands	$118.42		165.45		283.87
England	1,594.65	1,148.00	254.80	$280.00	3,277.45	Spain	221.01				221.01
France	722.28		3,342.86	2,491.75	6,556.89	Switzerland		779.07			779.07
Germany	705.01	40.00	3,080.23		3,825.24	Thailand		163.03			163.03
Greece		127.75			127.75	Turkey		121.43			121.43
Hong Kong		428.32			428.32						
Israel		166.24		367.58	533.82	Total	3,513.43	4,547.02	25,305.38	$3,544.85	36,910.68
Italy		769.50	17,857.43	405.52	19,032.45						

NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE WEEK

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this week Federal officers and employees in thousands of cities, towns, and hamlets from Maine to California and from the State of Washington to Florida are celebrating National Civil Service Week in commemoration of the approval of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883.

Seventy-one years ago, when the Civil Service Act was placed on the statute books, America was just emerging from two decades of strife and dissension—the aftermath of the bitter struggle between the States—and flexing its muscles, unified once more and ready to take its place as a world leader. Much of the West was yet to be won—a golden opportunity, with our pioneering heritage. There were only 38 stars in our flag, but great States were being carved out of the wilderness to add more.

An aroused and indignant citizenry was still seething with anger and alarm at the wanton slaying of President James A. Garfield by a disappointed jobseeker 2 years earlier. Public interest had been focused on the situation by a series of nationwide editorials and stories exposing the decadence of the Government's method of filling jobs. Impatience had given way to implacable public determination to end the outmoded and costly "spoils rule" and replace it with a permanent system of appointments to Federal employment based on merit.

The enactment of the Civil Service Act marked the first step toward return, after more than three-quarters of a century of the dogma of spoilism, to the concept of merit in the public service which originated with the first President.

Washington himself set the highest of standards in this respect. Where a lesser man might have been more careless, Washington uniformly selected appointees after careful inquiry establishing their ability and character. John Adams adhered to this policy, though perhaps not so carefully. There are many who feel that Jefferson—the first President of a different political persuasion—through retaliation against Adams' "midnight appointments" started the trend away from merit in Government appointments.

Lincoln, besieged by jobseekers, said:

> I seem like a man so busy letting rooms at one end of his house that he has no time left to put out the fire that is blazing and destroying at the other end.

During my 16 years as a Member of Congress I have always felt deeply the need of maintaining the highest of standards in our Federal civil service. This applies to integrity and moral conduct as well as ability. Many of you will recall that as far back as the 79th Congress, realizing the danger of disloyal persons in Government posts in the critical wartime and the postwar periods, I arranged for executive hearings on the question of Federal employees' loyalty. That hearing developed the pattern, well known by now, as to how Communists had infiltrated our Government.

It has always been my view that the Federal employees' loyalty program should be passed upon by Congress. Legislation which I introduced in the 80th Congress for this purpose passed the House with the support of all major veterans' and Federal employees' organizations.

This administration acted wisely when it took prompt steps to review Federal employees' loyalty cases where there had been previous full field investigation. We are nearing the end of this emergency, however, and should have legislation on this all-important subject.

The loyalty program should be separate and apart from the program dealing with suitability of employees. Those who are separated for disloyalty should not be lumped together with those who are separated for other reasons which do not reflect on their loyalty to the United States. I have introduced legislation in this Congress which embodies these principles and will, I feel, supply the necessary statutory safeguards to keep disloyal persons off the public payroll.

The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is diligently studying the many problems involved in strengthening and improving the administration of our civil-service system and keeping it abreast of the ever-changing and broadening needs of the public service. At the beginning of this Congress I appointed special subcommittees on the Federal civil service and manpower utilization to conduct studies with respect to means of improving our civil service and making more effective use of our Federal manpower. Also, I appointed a Subcommittee on Postal Operations which, among other duties, is studying personnel problems in the postal service. These subcommittees have developed a great deal of information and evidence, through reports, hearings, and field investigations, which already has paid dividends in improved operating procedures and recommendations for new legislation.

For example, one of the first recommendations of the postal operations subcommittee was that the authority and responsibility for personnel matters in the postal service—where over 70 percent of all expenditures go for personnel—be vested in a top official who would have a position and rank comparable to that held by individuals with similiar responsibilities in private business. A bill which I introduced, and my committee reported, became law on July 20, 1953, creating an Assistant Postmaster General for personnel administration in the postal service. Thus, for the first time this largest of all Government business enterprises has a modern, up-to-date, and truly effective management set up with the necessary means to deal with the all-important matter of personnel administration.

In addition to the broad fields of study covered by our three standing subcommittees, our Post Office and Civil Service Committee also is conducting a number of special studies. These studies cover Federal employees leave systems, in connection with which I have introduced a bill (H. R. 7202) to provide a more equitable basis for accumulation of annual leave; performance rating systems; incentive awards programs; appeals and grievance laws, regulations, and pro-

cedures; promotion programs; supervisor training and selection methods; laws, regulations, and procedures relating to the establishment, staffing, and liquidation of temporary agencies; and pay and classification laws.

These studies represent an extremely broad field, covering the most important phases of personnel administration in which there is need for action to provide greater efficiency and economy in Government and to remove inequities.

I have also given careful personal study to the situation with respect to the fixing of pay of over a million Government employees by local wage boards. While on the whole these wage boards have been effective, there is no specific statutory authority governing them or their activities. They are administrative creatures.

I have always felt that the wages of this large group of Federal employees directly concerns Congress and that the machinery for setting such wages should be placed under control by legislation. At such times as legislation on this subject may be introduced it will, of course, become the concern of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Our committee, and every member of it, has a full realization of the importance to our public service of a strong and militant merit system in civil service. We are, we feel, alert to the ever-changing needs of management as well as the interests of our employees.

This annual celebration of National Civil Service Week is brought to the special attention of the House of Representatives, because I know of the Members' increasing awareness of the importance of a strong civil service to the execution of the great governmental programs which are instituted by Congress.

I think it is most appropriate for us as Members of Congress and as Federal officers and employees to salute those farsighted pioneers who wrote the Civil Service Act, on this anniversary, by renewing our own determination to hold the many gains that have been made and to contribute our utmost to further strengthening of the principle of merit in the civil service.

I believe that in this way we will best serve the public interest. We will be helping to carry out more effectively the broad public policies and programs laid down by the Congress as the elected representatives of the people. At the same time we will be providing the men and women who carry out those programs assurance of a modern and enlightened personnel policy and the measure of dignity which our public servants deserve.

TAXATION OF INTEREST FROM GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 20 the House Committee on Ways and Means announced agreement on a recommendation to permit taxation of interest income from bonds issued by State and local governments under certain circumstances. This is a radical departure from the time-honored practice of exempting all such bond issues from Federal taxation.

I have now received from the Honorable Elmer E. Robinson, mayor of San Francisco and president of the United States Conference of Mayors, a telegram protesting against this action by the committee. I ask that the telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point:

JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of the United States Conference of Mayors and as mayor of the great city of San Francisco, I vigorously register my protest to the action of the House Ways and Means Committee in approving the addition to the proposed revenue revision bill of 1954 of municipal securities of any type to Federal taxation. This closed-door action is completely in opposition to the best interests of all the citizens of the United States and is unprecedented in any legislative action involving as it does the sovereign and constitutional power of the 48 States and their political subdivisions. It is respectfuly requested that your honorable committee reconsider this action and that those duly elected officials of States, counties, and cities who are desirous of so doing be given opportunity to present testimony in opposition to the committee's position in public hearing.

Sincerely,

ELMER E. ROBINSON,
Mayor of San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal to tax income from bond issues of States and their political subdivisions raises serious constitutional problems. The question of Federal interference with the sovereign powers of the States will most certainly rise should we implement this proposal by the Ways and Means Committee. It seems to me that such action now would be hasty and ill advised. May I remind the committee and the Members of the House that the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which we set up last year is now studying the delicate problems involved in the relationships between the Federal Government and the States and their political subdivisions. The respective rights of the different governmental levels with regard to taxation is one of the primary issues under study. We certainly should not complicate the problem further at this time by taking a step which can only be regarded as an encroachment on the political sovereignty of local governments.

The least that should be done is to heed Mayor Robinson's request for full public hearings before going further. Although the question was touched on briefly during last year's hearings the committee's recommendation puts a different aspect on the matter which, to my mind, deserves thorough study.

THE SANTA MARIA DODGE

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, there is an old axiom among practical politicians—"if you can't get away with it wholesale, then try it retail."

I want to call to the attention of the House of Representatives that an attempt at such practice is about to be slipped-on-for-size in connection with the measure to be debated designated as H. R. 2235. It is a bill to authorize the Santa Maria water project in Santa Barbara County in my State of California for construction as a Federal reclamation project.

This is a worthy project and I want to see it built. It would cost about $16 million, largely reimbursable from the beneficiaries, and by impounding flood waters of the Santa Maria River that now do considerable damage, permit their release as needed primarily for irrigation use. The area in which this water, amounting to some 18,500 acre-feet annually, will be used is now being badly retarded for lack of water. The plan is soundly engineered and the people who will use the water can and will pay for it when the works to be authorized are built to catch and use the flood waters that now rush by the fertile but dry lands to waste unused into the sea.

The project is all right but the authorization bill is wrong. It is headed toward this floor with a nice little built-in joker in the language of the legislation that would nullify and betray a basic principle of reclamation law. That policy is the antiland monopoly requirement put there by Congress to prevent anybody from spending Federal money on irrigation projects which would benefit large corporate farming by big land owners and reserving those benefits for small farmers irrigating 160 acres or less in individual ownership.

This is an old story to the people in California and to some of you in Congress. In the 80th Congress legislation was presented to knock out this antiland monopoly requirement wholesale in California by turning the precious waters of the vast California Central Valley reclamation project over to a lot of big land owners. This time the boys are trying the same thing on a lesser scale—just on a retail basis on a smaller job just for a few excess landowners.

Perhaps somebody will tell me why this is always slipped-on-for-size during Republican Congresses? We licked the move to hand over the Central Valley project to the monopolists in the 80th Congress. But then we had a Reclamation Commissioner, a Secretary of the Interior, and a President who fought the giveaway to big business and my people fought the good fight with them. We'll have to see what the present administration downtown does about this new raid. I have not heard a peep from them yet. But we do not have to wait to hear from important groups in my State.

California labor, both the A. F. of L. and the CIO, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, church groups of various faiths, the California State Grange, stormed

into Washington to kill off the proposed wholesale giveaway in the 80th Congress. They tell me their feelings have not changed and neither have mine. This is a matter of principle whether it is a big wholesale raid or on a retail basis—project by project on the installment plan. So you will have your chance to stand up and be counted when a proposal is made to wash out the hidden jokers in the Santa Maria project authorization bill. Then we will see who is for the family-sized farmers and who is for the "Big Deal."

PROBLEMS OF THE COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a coal commission to examine into the problems of the coal industry and make recommendations for action by our Government.

Unemployment stalks the coal fields of America. In its wake there follows hunger, and misery. Tipples stand gaunt and still. Commissaries are closed. Abandoned coal mines close their mouths, and where there was activity, there is now darkness.

The economic problems of the coal areas threaten to spread throughout our economy. A great industry is sick. Its symptoms need diagnosis and treatment. My bill will set the process in motion. I hope the Congress will pass it.

SALARY INCREASE FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, last year in the first session of the Congress, I introduced a bill (H. R. 3692) to provide for a salary increase for postal employees. In my opinion, a pay increase such as provided for in my bill is as important today as it was in March of 1953 when I introduced this legislation.

We all know what has happened to our cost of living and how it has continued to rise for the past several months. We all know the plight of our postal workers. The postman is being squeezed harder and harder by the struggle to supply his family with the necessary quantity of goods and services which we have come to appreciate as our American standard of living.

Let us look at the facts that show so clearly that postal salaries must be raised in all fairness to these loyal and devoted Federal servants.

Let us look back to the year 1940 in this consideration of the situation of the postal employees today. No one would contend seriously that postal salaries were out of line or were too high in 1940. As a matter of fact, there were many suggestions that salaries were too low in several categories to attract the type of employee that the Government wanted, and needed to hold.

I do not want to make a voluminous statement at this time, analyzing each different grade or classification of postal employee, but, rather, I have chosen, to my mind, one classification which is representative of the overall picture of inequity in pay schedules of postal workers.

The salary for a fourth-grade letter carrier in 1940 and the salary for the same type of employee now has increased only 74.7 percent while for the same period, the cost of living has increased 95.6 percent. The postal employee has been attempting to catch up with this rapid rise in living costs ever since.

This example of the inequity which has developed during the past 13 years between what postal employees actually are receiving in annual salaries and what they should be receiving for purchasing power parity is merely an example of the situation throughout the Post Office Department.

It must be the will of Congress that these men and women who serve their country so loyally and faithfully in the postal service should be paid at least as adequately as they were in 1940. Therefore, it seems to me that the only thing for Congress to do is to pass this proposed pay increase as rapidly as the legislative process will allow. Federal employees' salaries are fixed by Congress. Government workers do not bargain concerning their wages; they do not have the power to strike; they do not present their problems to any bargaining agency. But in this case they do have a just cause, based on the simple equitable principle of retaining purchasing power parity with their salaries in 1940.

The National Association of Letter Carriers and the National Federation of Post Office Clerks have both conducted a survey of their members—many of whom live in my district—and those surveys showed that from 42 to 45 percent of the employees are working on second jobs, or doing parttime work. Thirty-three to thirty-eight percent have their wives working to supplement the employee's income. Sixty-nine to seventy percent had to increase their debts during the past year or so; and 14 to 24 percent were forced to borrow on their life insurance. These figures portray more graphically than words the economic plight of postal employees today.

There are many other reasons, which we all know, why postal employees should receive additional compensation for their services—but I do not feel that it is necessary at this time to burden you with a long compilation of them. I simply want it understood, however, that it is my firm conviction that salary increases for postal employees must be provided as a matter of justice and equity to them as individuals and as loyal servants of our National Government.

I am not insistent that my bill be reported favorably—any bill that will give these forgotten men of the Federal service a fair and decent increase in salary will be satisfactory to me. However, to be in the same relative purchasing power position as he was in 1940, this man's salary should be increased from $800 to $1,000 over his present salary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to compliment my colleague from New York on bringing to the attention of the House in such a detailed and studious way this very serious matter regarding urgently needed increases in the salaries of postal workers. He and I know these fine men. We represent middle-class areas and many postal workers, and we are able to see at first hand just what pressure is being put upon them—the need for outside jobs, wives working, and borrowed money given to make ends meet. The postal rate structure is in the hands of Congress. We can make it what we want it to be, but it is no reason for not trying to do justice to the people who operate the post office at our behest. There is no other way of doing justice to the postal employees except through us.

I am delighted to see my colleague from New York taking up the cudgels in this way.

Mr. FINO. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

DEBT OR CASUALTY LIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain other material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day when the gentleman from Texas was discussing the question as to whether a rule should be granted on the bill we proposed to bring before the House, among other things he said, after referring to the national debt:

> We are not ashamed of that debt. That big debt represents something. In the war we decided that we would use money instead of men every place we could. We never sent a man into the field if we could send a piece of machinery to take his place, no matter what the machinery cost. We used money to save lives. Which would you rather have, a high national debt and a low casualty list or a high casualty list and a low national debt?

Obviously the answer that any good citizen might make would be the same. Then without addressing the Speaker and asking the gentleman if he would yield, I said:

> Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, his party has given us both.

In revising the remarks, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] struck out my statement, as he had a perfect right to do, because I transgressed the rules. I did not first address the Speak-

er and ask the gentleman whether he would yield. But I take this opportunity of getting the question and the answer in the RECORD.

I want to add to and go along with remarks previously made on the floor today which were to the effect that these wars each time came under a Democratic administration and I want to emphasize the point that we had not only a big debt as the result of those wars but we had a high casualty list.

I am not from a political standpoint critical of that. Perhaps there was no other way. I thought there was and I still think there was.

I call to the attention of the gentleman that he should not chide the Republicans and suggest that we prefer to follow a course which would give us a big casualty list just to save our pocketbooks. I do not know of anyone who does hold that thought, and I am sure the gentleman did not mean to intimate we over here would rather have a big casualty list and fill the cemeteries, give business to the undertakers, than to incur a debt. I am sure he did not mean that.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES PAY INCREASE

With reference to what the distinguished gentleman from New York, who just left the floor, said about postal employees pay, I expect to vote for some increase in postal pay, not too much, but for some increase because undoubtedly they need an increase. But they are not the only group which needs something.

I have heard from my colleagues, and I have read in the papers, and I have read the report of the commission that was appointed, that Congressmen need an increase in pay. I have no doubt about their need. But this is the point I want to make: The postal employees—and I might add Congressmen—are in a position where their difficulties and their problems are not as great as are those of some others.

When the delegation from the post office employees' organizations came to my office, I told them that I would support some increase, but I could not let it rest there. Politically unwise, I had to add that in my judgment they were not as grievously affected as some other groups. I could not help but cite, and call to their attention, the fact that 107,000 industrial workers in Detroit were not arguing about an increase in compensation. They were arguing their need for a job of some kind. The unemployment compensation funds were running out.

So it was my privilege to try to impress—I doubt if it will help me politically very much—upon the postal workers that there was much truth in that old thought and sometime saying that if we would look about us we would always find that no matter how grievous our own troubles seemed to be there were others whose suffering was just a little more severe.

A CHAIRMAN IN NAME ONLY

Now I will speak on the matter which I had in mind before I heard the gentleman from Texas. Some will recall reading some years ago stories entitled "Wife In Name Only." Permit me now to tell you about a chairman in name only, or my own experience as a chairman since some ambitious newcomers arrived in Washington.

When I came here 19 years ago I looked with a great deal of respect upon the Members who were chairmen of standing committees of the House. I thought it was a position of honor, of authority. I have read in different publications that selecting a chairman by seniority was a very poor way of getting a good chairman. I agree that it is not a perfect way, that that method may produce an incompetent chairman. There is this to be said for it, whether a man knew very much or knew very little when he came here, if he knew anything at all, if he had any inclination to listen and learn after a term of 10 or 15 or 20 years, he really ought to know, could not help knowing, something about the Nation's business and how it should be transacted. If the House selected a chairman through a little group of leaders, you would have logrolling or, as the Yankees call it, horse trading, and I doubt very much whether the result would be any better. There is no assurance that it would.

So I say—and I hope some of the Members who have come into the House during the last 5 or 6 terms will read it—if we are to have any discipline in the House, if the leadership is to have any control over the legislative program, eventually the House will have to permit a chairman to have some authority.

Now, under the rules of the House, a chairman is supposed to be elected by the membership. In practice and in effect, the chairmen of permanent, regular committees are selected by the leadership of the House, and on the day when the question comes up the Speaker nominates, and the House elects the nominee, usually without any vote.

In practice, the member who has served on the committee for the longest period of time is nominated and elected as chairman. I have no fault to find with that method. There may be a better one, but no one has yet found it.

This brings me to the question: What authority has the chairman? Is he supposed to direct the activities of the committee? Has he authority to appoint subcommittees? Has he authority to name the members of the subcommittee?

Is he supposed to indicate what proposed legislation shall be considered? And when?

Or is the committee as a group, which would be the democratic way, the town-meeting way, to decide what subcommittees shall be created and who shall be members of each and what jurisdiction each shall exercise?

That is the issue that is before the Republican leadership today. It is an important one. That is the issue which, if the now minority party is fortunate enough to win control of the Congress when we vote in 1954 and they come in in 1955, is going to be up to them.

My point is this: What is the need for a chairman if the committee members, acting as a group, are to direct committee activities?

While the Reorganization Act limited the regular standing committees to 19, by the practice followed by the Committee on Government Operations of transferring or giving to five regular subcommittees the same power that is given to a full regular committee of the House, thereby adding to the 19 regular committees 5 more regular standing committees—if we are to do that, then the purpose of the reorganization bill to economize, to contract, to lessen the number of committees and committee staffs to get direction and uniformity of procedure and practice is out.

Under that method, there is no possible way of establishing either economy, efficiency, or consistency in House procedure.

But that is just the method that the Committee on Government Operations in their wisdom saw fit to do.

They not only on July 15 grabbed for themselves full authority to act as regular standing committees of the House, they slapped me down as chairman—that on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

They not only passed the resolution that I as chairman should no longer appoint special subcommittees but they have taken for themselves the whole jurisdiction that was given to the full committee. That is according to their theory. I think they have left a small loophole or two through which I may still be able to do a little effective work, to aid in safeguarding union health and welfare funds. To—and I quote—"cut me down to size" was their purpose.

Why did they do that? I called on them here publicly from the well of the House 3 or 4 times and I shall continue to ask them, Why did you do it? What was your purpose?

They destroyed my authority to continue investigations which were exposing racketeering, extortion, the misuse of welfare funds. They refused on two occasions to permit me to continue hearings which the press everywhere we held hearings had approved. Sure, they threw a roadblock in my way and the extortionists were pleased.

Then after we had demonstrated by the actions of that committee and another subcommittee acting jointly that there was and is an absolute need, a need which the President in his message recognized when he said that we needed an investigation of the administration of the welfare funds, a need which they had for 6 months denied, then on the 20th, last Wednesday, a week ago today, they came along and admitted a proposition which they had before denied strenuously. There was no need, they had said, for these investigations, but Wednesday they admitted the need.

They admitted another proposition which I had advanced and which they had denied. They had contended that the Committee on Government Operations had no authority to conduct those hearings. Then Wednesday they passed a resolution giving to the Bender subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations the authority to continue the investigations which I had started and which they had halted.

They denied me the authority to hold hearings in connection with abuses which I have been working to lessen for 15 years and gave it to the Bender subcommittee—Why? You guess. 1. They did not like me? 2. There was some publicity to be gained? 3. Would it help elect a Republican Senator in Ohio?

If they had said that the investigations which I had been conducting or in which I had participated were improperly conducted, or that the witnesses had been abused; if they had said that a witness called before the subcommittees had been ill-treated or a right had been denied him, a charge that has often been made against chairmen of committees, had they said that then I would have said, "All right, if that is the fact we will remedy it. We will quit it. We will have no more of it." But they did not—they do not say that.

Had they said that the investigations had not turned up anything, that the money was being wasted; had they said that the committee was spending money needlessly, or that we had not accomplished anything, I would have said, "All right, then we will quit it."

But they found no fault with the method or manner in which the investigations and the hearings had been conducted or held. No; they found no fault with the procedure followed nor with results obtained. But without any reason given they came along and stripped me of my authority without—well, talk about a right to be heard, to be confronted with the witnesses, with the accuser—did they do it? Oh, no; I was handed a liquidation. Why did they do it? Let them answer.

Then on top of it, they followed the procedure—I will admit such procedure is frequently followed—that the hearing at which they did the job should be considered such as an executive session and the record of how the individual members of the committee voted should not be given. Thus it is made to appear that all members approved of what they did.

I do many things that are a little, well, I will not say improper but unwise—I am very frank in admitting my mistakes, but I have yet to see the day when I will hide behind the cloak of secrecy. I have yet to see the day when I will not be willing to give an answer for what I do. I have yet to hide behind an executive session.

I want again to call this to your attention, and to the attention of the newer Members of the House, that if a slapping down of a chairman—and they did it three times to me—is to be the reward of a Member who has served for 19 years, 10 years or even 5 years, if that is the reward for service rendered, which is to be given to you after faithful, effective service, and if you are to be penalized without a hearing, without any just criticism or charge on which they are willing to stand up and fight it out on the floor of the House, then what is the use of trying to fearlessly serve your people or the country. What is the use? Is it not better from your own personal standpoint to go along as a good fellow?

The answer is, and I see 4 or 5 members of my committee here—my answer is "Not in my case." I will go along and take whatever humiliation and whatever public scorn may be heaped upon me, but I will follow my own convictions when I think I am right.

And for good measure, I hope I will never hide behind the curtain of an executive session, let members of a committee who were not present when action was taken be charged with participation in the result of a vote where they did not vote either in person or by proxy.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted briefly to answer the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. He said that the Democrats had caused the expenditure of the $265 billion or the $275 billion for wars which the Democrats caused. That is the way I understood him. I take issue with him on that. I feel that the isolationists caused those wars. The reason we had World War I was because our country was weak militarily. It was weak because a nationalist and isolationist sentiment had swept the country and Congress had been persuaded to let our military defenses get down low. Because we were weak, the international desperadoes thought we could be taken over and we had to go into that war to defend ourselves. When in 1941 the isolationists and the nationalists had again become so strong that Congress was persuaded to permit our military defenses to get down again and we were weak again by reason of that weakness caused by isolationism, we were forced into that war. The Democrats are not isolationists. I said last Friday, and I reiterate that "the Republican Party basically is isolationist but the President is not." I really believe that. In fact, I believe it is true. And right now we have the ugly head of isolationism rearing itself in our country. I hope that we are not swept aside and that our defenses become so weak that we will be forced into world war III because of this isolationist sentiment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I intend to use part of the 60 minutes allotted to me to speak against the so-called Bricker amendment.

The human mind reacts in many ways when confronted by perilous and difficult problems.

One way, of course, is to confront these problems directly to try to find the answer and, when one attempt fails, to make another try. But that is easier said than done.

Naval Leadership, a textbook for midshipmen, says:

> Adults, when confronted with frustrations, also go in for other childish symptoms. They sometimes pout. They sometimes cease thinking and go in for broad emotional, childish generalization. They feel and articulate a desire to return to the "good old days." When any adult starts wishing for the bygone days, the days when life was simple, you can generally bet he is finding his present problems a little beyond his ability to solve.

As with individual problems, so with national problems. The world today is a frightening place in which to live. We are confronted with the real possibility of an atomic destruction that could exterminate every human on this planet. Our adversaries alarm us, our friends sometimes irritate us, our leaders cannot give us the assurance we would like to have.

Is it not natural then, that a large number of frustrated people have turned away from things that are hard to comprehend and have sought to return to the days of their protected infancy when nothing ever went wrong?

In public affairs such people often become isolationists. As a group they have made powerful attempts to influence the direction of our foreign policy. In general, they have failed in these attempts because the American people have known that we could not afford the luxury of infantile regression.

The great debates to which we have listened in recent years have reflected these attitudes. Beneath the surface of our debates on foreign aid, on point 4 or U. N. appropriations, have been some underlying, basic divisions. As a people we are divided on practical questions like "Do we need friends—or can we go it alone? Can we ever trust other nations?"

We are also divided by moral questions like "Do we as a Nation have any obligation to help other nations and people who are in need?"

When we debate the various bills which are before us, these basic and underlying problems seldom come up for discussion because each issue has its own set of pros and cons which lie on the surface.

At last, however, all of these underlying questions are coming to the center of the stage. The Bricker resolution, to amend the United States Constitution, is the great legislative expression of the back-to-infancy school of thought. It calls us back to the shell. The resolution has been drafted upon one great premise. That is that great harm can befall us as a result of our cooperation with other nations, while no harm could come to us if we could only squeeze back into our cradle.

The Bricker resolution would accomplish this purpose by amending the Constitution so as severely to restrict the treatymaking power of the President. It would also restrict the treaty powers of the Senate by providing that treaties shall no longer override State legislation when necessary to effectuate the national purposes of the treaties. So under the Bricker plan, many treaties would not be effective until 48 State legislatures enacted implementing legislation.

I use the words "Bricker amendment" in a broad sense, as most people do, to include not only the original Senate Joint Resolution 1, but also the committee bill, the Watkins bill, and the Knowland bill.

Until the present controversy regarding the Bricker amendment arose, the major criticism directed against the treaty provisions of the Constitution has been that the two-thirds requirement makes the ratification of treaties too difficult. At times it has enabled a small minority to thwart the clear national will. Some feel that had the Senate adopted the Treaty of Versailles after the First World War, United States participation might have made possible a League of Nations with sufficient strength to maintain the peace.

The Versailles Treaty was widely supported by leading citizens throughout the country. It had the support of more than a majority of the Senate when it came up for a vote, and also had the support of more than a majority of the House. Nevertheless it was rejected. This would clearly indicate that it is by no means easy to obtain ratification for a treaty. It is an extremely difficult and cumbersome procedure.

John Hay, who was personal secretary to Abraham Lincoln and Secretary of State under Theodore Roosevelt, bemoaned the ratification process in these rather exaggerated terms:

> No treaty on which discussion was possible, no treaty that gave room for a difference of opinion, could ever pass the Senate.

Hay's view is extreme but it is not unique in diplomatic history.

The Senate is traditionally cautious in considering treaties, and is sometimes called the graveyard of treaties. Of the nearly 1,200 treaties submitted from 1789 to March 24, 1953—excluding those then pending—29 percent either failed of Senate approval because of rejection, failure to take action, or withdrawal, or were approved only with reservations or understandings.

The rejection of so many treaties, often with a majority in favor of ratification, has been criticized as government by minority. An alternative proposal has been that treaties be ratified by a simple majority vote of both Houses. All of these proposals failed of enactment, though in 1944 hearings were held on six constitutional amendments that would have permitted treaties to be made with the concurrence of a simple majority of each House.

Perhaps the fact that the treaty clause has been criticized so strongly from both sides illustrates that it was a pretty sound middle-of-the-road arrangement after all.

The Bricker supporters do not repudiate the Founding Fathers who wrote the present constitutional provisions. They say that they were all right for 1789. But they say that the development of the United Nations and of the close relationship that is growing up between the nations of the world now makes it dangerous to continue to operate the old Constitution. We can trust the present Senate, they say, but future Senates may be less wise and the perils will be greater. The only safe course, then, is to strap us tightly into our baby carriages to be sure we do not fall out.

Let us examine Senate Joint Resolution 1, section by section.

Section 1 of the proposed amendment to the United States Constitution reads:

> A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

The best that can be said of this section is that it is meaningless, that it merely restates constitutional doctrine as it now exists. From the statements of the President, of the Attorney General, and of the Secretary of State, and of the legal counsel of the State Department, I gather that the administration also views this as meaningless.

The Supreme Court has already on many occasions held that treaties must conform to the Constitution of the United States.

The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, in its adverse reports on the Bricker and related proposals, in both 1952 and 1953, cited an impressive list of authorities in support of the well-established rule that the Constitution is supreme over treaties. The association's 1953 report says on page 21:

> The Constitution is the source of treaty power just as it is the source of all Federal power. As between a treaty and a Federal law, the one that is later in time controls, thus further emphasizing the subordinacy of treaties to the Constitution.
>
> The Supreme Court has affirmed this subordinacy of treaties to the Constitution on many occasions. Thus in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258 (1890)) the Supreme Court said: "It would not be contended that it [the treatymaking power] extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the government or in that of one of the States."
>
> In writing for the Supreme Court in *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416, 433 (1920)), Mr. Justice Holmes was careful to avoid any implication that there were no provisions of the Constitution that could affect treaties, stating:
>
> "We do no mean to imply that there are no qualifications to the treaty power. * * *
>
> "The treaty in question does not contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution."

And the Attorney General of the United States has told the Senate Judiciary Committee at pages 909, 910 of the 1953 Hearings, that—

> If there is one argument which should be put to rest it is that there is need for this constitutional amendment because the constitution does not protect against a treaty which might impair rights of free speech, press or religion * * *. No amendment of the constitution appears to be needed to prevent abridgement by treaty or executive agreement of the essential liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights or by the Constitution as a whole.

At present the Constitution makes treaties along with Federal laws and the Constitution itself, "the supreme law of the land. Anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Supreme Court has interpreted this to mean that an act of Congress which might otherwise be invalid might be valid if it carried out the terms of a treaty. For example, the courts held a 1913 Federal migratory-bird-protection law invalid because it violated article 10 of the Constitution, which reserves to the States the powers not delegated to the Federal Government. But after the President signed, and the Senate ratified, a treaty with Britain to protect migratory birds, Congress reenacted the 1913 law. The Supreme Court then held it valid in the famous case of Missouri against Holland. The decision stated that the Congress was carrying out the terms of a treaty, and a treaty may override the individual States' powers. That decision was a just and sound one. But the language of the Court went beyond the holding. The simple fact, whether one likes it or not, is that our Constitution has been a growing and evolving one, and by the time the migratory-bird-protection law came up the second time it was clear that this was indeed a function of the Federal Government. The fact that, even more, it was a subject of concern to diplomats of foreign countries as well was certainly evidence of the breadth of the problem. This provision of law is important not only for the protection of migratory birds. Under the "which" clause, the Federal Government would be unable to cope with the international dope trade and to do many other things it should and must do.

Section 2 of the Bricker resolution provides:

> A treaty shall become effective as internal law only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

The first change which would be effected by this section is the requirement that in every instance legislation would be required to carry out a treaty as part of internal law. This change would deprive us of the flexibility which is now possible in choosing to make a treaty self-executing or dependent upon legislation. If the Senate is so minded, it is now perfectly free, without a constitutional amendment, to attach a rider to every treaty providing that the treaty shall not be self-executing, but will require further legislation to be effective internal law. When one remembers that in every treaty where appropriations are needed, a further act of Congress is already required, one realizes that the procedure is already complicated enough. And, as I have pointed out before, a later act of Congress can always supersede a treaty as law within the United States. With all of these safeguards, plus our requirement of ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, it is clear that the proposed change is unnecessary and is a threat to the efficiency of our Government in the highly critical field of international relations at a perilous time in history.

The second change which would be affected by section 2 is the requirement that the legislation carrying out a treaty internally must be valid in the absence of treaty. This would destroy our ability to reach reciprocal agreements with other countries for the protection of our nationals. It would make it necessary to seek legislation in every State to carry out international agreements thus reached.

Let me illustrate. At the present time, our Nation can negotiate a treaty with a foreign country whereby our citizens will be able to conduct their business in that country without discrimination in return for reciprocal protection

to their nationals here. To be effective at all, such a treaty must not be thwarted by State laws discriminating against such nationals. The effectiveness of such treaties was settled way back in 1796, when the United States Supreme Court, in the case of *Ware* v. *Hylton*, (3 Dall. 199), enforced the treaty ending the Revolutionary War and held that it invalidated a confiscatory statute which Virginia had passed during the war, providing for the discharge of debts owed to British subjects.

In so deciding, the Court knew well that this very situation was one of the reasons why the Constitution was called into being just 7 years before.

For under the Articles of Confederation while the Congress had the power to make treaties, it did not have the power to compel the States to observe them. While the treaty ending the Revolutionary War provided that creditors should not be legally barred from collecting their debts, some States passed laws obstructing the collection of British debts. The British retaliated by continuing to occupy our forts in the Northwest, in violation of the treaty.

This inability to make and enforce treaties was one of the factors which proved the need for "a more perfect Union." It was one of the difficulties the Constitution was intended to correct.

Now, at a time when it is more necessary than ever that we, as a Nation, speak with one voice, there are those who would loosen the bonds of our union—who would say that a treaty must be negotiated by the President, ratified by the Senate, then supplemented by implementary legislation and then sent separately to each of the 48 States for ratification. They would restore the Articles of Confederation. Imagine, if you will, the new procedures. Needless to say, each of the State legislatures will want authoritative information before they pass implementing legislation, so the Secretary of State will have to make a circuit—several times a year—of 48 State capitals. And, to answer questions and work with committees, the State Department will need branch offices in every State capital and possibly also in some city halls.

I state this as a fact, not as humor. This is the kind of grim reality that seems less funny the longer you look at it.

In a brilliant article in the January 23 issue of America, the national Catholic weekly, Father Edward A. Conway summarizes the situation with wit and profound understanding:

> The Bricker amendment says, in effect: "You can make treaty law effective internally only if the legislation making it effective would be valid apart from the treatymaking power." This is like saying: "You can now get drugs if your doctor gives you a prescription; henceforth, you can get drugs only if you would have that right in the absence of a prescription." This would simply nullify the authority of a doctor to carry out the purpose of a medical prescription, which is to enable you to procure drugs you couldn't get without a prescription.
>
> The Bricker amendment nullifies the purpose of the treatymaking power, which is to enable the Federal Government to do things (i. e., make treaties effective) it couldn't do and would have no need to do if it couldn't enter into treaties.

The New York Times of January 27 reports that the State Department has compiled a list of the treaties which were ratified by the Senate during 1953, but which would never have been effective if the Bricker amendment were on the books.

Among these, to quote from the Times, were:

> Among the 12 treaties listed by the State Department as understandings that would have been impossible under the Bricker amendment are these:
>
> (a) One with the German Federal Republic concerning the validation of German dollar bonds.
>
> (b) One defining the right of foreign countries to try resident United States military personnel for crimes in some circumstances.
>
> (c) One fixing the legal status of the International Military Headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
>
> (d) Five routine commercial treaties, and other routine agreements.

The third section of the Bricker amendment deals with executive agreements. It provides:

> Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

At the outset, let us remember that Congress now possesses the power to supersede both treaties and executive agreements as internal law. And let us remember too, that Congress has a firm hold on the Nation's purse strings.

What then, would this amendment aim to do? Would it aim to have committees of the Congress take over the functions of the President and his chief ministers in the delicate field of diplomacy? Would it have Congress authorize and limit in advance the position of our Ambassadors in every negotiation? Would it want to publish in advance to the entire world exactly where our weaknesses and strengths lie—to tell everybody, before we enter every dealing, every secret of our bargaining power? Is this not sheer madness?

Executive agreements made by the President frequently involve negotiations of the most delicate and unanticipated kind; to require that these agreements conform to prior authorization and to subject them to congressional control would gravely hamper the President in discharging his constitutional duties.

To illustrate: General Clay has stated that the Berlin airlift never could have been arranged if the Bricker amendment were in effect.

Some kinds of agreements, like those relating to trade and tariffs, can be effectively regulated in advance, and, indeed, this is exactly what we have been doing. So no constitutional amendment is needed to give Congress the authority to regulate executive agreements in those fields which are not peculiarly within the President's responsibility.

The present attack on the treaty-making power emanates largely from an extreme isolationist group which hates the United Nations and wants to secede from the 20th century. Typical of the mail which has been sent out in favor of the Bricker resolution is a letter which I received last week from the United Mothers of America, Inc., whose address is P. O. Box 6084, Cleveland 13, Ohio. I am sure that other Members of the House received the same letter, but I think that it is so typical of the kind of letter that is being sent out that I am going to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

> "To remain silent, when we should protest, makes cowards of men."
>
> THE UNITED MOTHERS OF AMERICA, INC.,
> *Cleveland, Ohio, October 15, 1953.*
> *To the Congress of the United States:*
> Re Senator JOHN BRICKER'S constitutional sovereignty-preserving amendment.
>
> Ever since the United States became a participant in the affairs of foreign nations, especially through the United Nations and NATO organizations, an avalanche of treaty and executive agreement proposals have been hatched that would, if ratified without safeguards, abolish our Republic.
>
> The language of the National Constitution at present recognizes the supremacy of treaties and international executive agreements, even to the nullifying of basic rights and guaranties now enjoyed by our citizens. Our Republic, therefore, can be destroyed just as effectively through sovereignty-delegating proposals as if our national gates were thrown open to the armed forces of an enemy.
>
> Events have revealed that conspirators in many fields of life, particularly in Government itself, have for the past 35 years been waging a war against our national independence. Not content with having permitted such treason as the giveaway of our A- and H-bomb and radar secrets to our so-called allies America's enemies would cap their treachery by the surrender of our national sovereignty by subterfuge.
>
> To protect the American people from this peril, Senator JOHN BRICKER has introduced a measure to amend the Constitution, so as to prevent any treaty or other international instrument from superseding our Nation's laws or the Constitution itself.
>
> When the above bill will have been voted upon in the legislative halls of America, the Nation will know who are the Republic's defenders and who are its enemies. Abstention from voting or attempting to modify the protective provision of the amendment will stamp such persons unfit to hold public office.
>
> In the spirit of the patriots who through much sacrifice have established and maintained our political independence, we appeal for your vigorous support of the above Senator Bricker amendment. You will thereby not only have contributed to our Republic's survival, but have earned the undying gratitude of millions of Americans.
>
> Patriotically,
> UNITED MOTHERS OF AMERICA, INC.,
> SUE E. BRAUN, *President.*

I think, also, Mr. Speaker that the Members will be highly edified by the attached report of a meeting which was held on Monday, January 25 in the city of Washington by a group of about 500 dedicated ladies who style themselves "vigilant women for the Bricker amendment." The report appeared in Tuesday's New York Times.

I insert it in the RECORD at this time:

> "VIGILANT WOMEN" ENDORSE BRICKER—SOME 500 VISIT WASHINGTON WITH PETITIONS SUPPORTING CURB ON TREATY POWER
>
> (By James Reston)
>
> WASHINGTON, January 25.—About 500 Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment visited Washington today.

They presented Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, Republican, of Ohio, with over 200,000 petitions favoring the proposed amendment, limiting the President's treatymaking powers.

The women spent the morning appealing personally to Senators to support the Bricker amendment. They took tea this afternoon at the headquarters of the Daughters of the American Revolution and listened to two rousing speeches by Senator BRICKER and Frank E. Holman, of Seattle, Wash., former president of the American Bar Association.

Senator BRICKER told them at one point that they represented the heart and soul of patriotic America and at another point he said they represented the fundamental spirit of 90 percent of the American people.

Mr. Holman, a tall, bespectacled man with close-cropped gray hair, charged certain sections of the American press with suppressing information favoring the Bricker amendment and remarked:

"If you're on our side, you're a propagandist, and if you're on the other side, you're in education."

The meeting was held in the hall of nations of the Washington Hotel, a vast hall full of pillars and gold murals of various foreign scenes, including one of the Kremlin.

ATTACKS ON U. N. CHEERED

The women applauded all remarks critical of the United Nations. They cheered Mr. Holman when he criticized John Foster Dulles, the Secretary of State, or took issue with President Eisenhower for saying that the Bricker amendment might revive some of the weaknesses of the old Articles of Confederation.

And they cheered him at the end when he told them to fight "for 8 or 9 years," if necessary, in order to win approval of the principle of the Bricker amendment.

The 200,000 petitions were headed with this language:

"Since article VI of the Constitution of the United States provides that treaties shall become the supreme law of the land, and proponents of world government are using this clause in our Constitution in a way never foreseen or intended by the Founding Fathers—to destroy our national sovereignty, States' rights and individual rights—we the undersigned do petition President Eisenhower and the Congress to support and work for early adoption of the Bricker-American Bar Association amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which has as its purpose the preservation of our basic freedoms."

RED, WHITE, BLUE BUNDLES

The well-dressed women, some of them wearing badges of the Minute Women of the United States, gave Senator BRICKER a standing ovation when he arrived from Capitol Hill, and presented him with eight fat bundles of petitions, tied with red, white, and blue ribbon, when he left.

He told them his amendment was not a partisan or personal matter, but a fundamental question of preserving the domestic law and States' rights of the Nation. He argued that it should be submitted by Congress to the States.

The Senator said "we will need every bit of help we can get" in the floor fight about to begin in the Senate, and added that he had been "threatened" this morning with the opposition of organizations representing 20 million persons.

This didn't bother him, however, he said, because his audience represented the true feelings not of a part of the people but of the great majority of the people. Besides, he added, "intriguers," whom he did not identify, had found a loophole in the Constitution that was a menace to the rights of the American people.

"I was not elected to the Senate to destroy our liberties," he remarked. This was loudly cheered.

While Senator BRICKER was talking a man who identified himself as Dr. Emanuel Josephson, of New York, was passing out a small handbill entitled "Wake Up America," one of which he gave to the Senator.

It said that "to defeat the Bricker amendment the Rockefeller interests have set up a new foundation-supported front—the Committee for the Defense of the Constitution by Preserving Treaty Rights."

The handbill added that this foundation-supported lobby with its allied Rockefeller- and Communist-supported fronts quickly went to work on Congress with subversive letters, telegrams, etc., and concluded:

"Within a few days after the committee opened up, early in January 1954, the Rockefeller-controlled uptown Daily Worker—The New York Times—exultantly boasted in a dispatch by Wm. S. White (January 19, 1954) that the Bricker amendment which previously had been regarded as certain to pass in some form, was already defeated."

The handbill also advertised a book written by a man with the same name as the man who handed out the handbill.

HOLMAN DESCRIBES VIEWS

After Mr. BRICKER left Mr. Holman told the women how he had become interested in amending the treatymaking section of the Constitution and why he was so worried about the present situation.

In January of 1948, he said, he had read an article by a Canadian lawyer, John P. Humphrey, of Montreal, who was on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. This article, he declared, contained the suggestion that the Commission on Human Rights try to expand the concept of treaties so as to cover the democratic laws of the member states.

Mr. Holman, turning to the press and complaining that he had been misrepresented in the past, said that he never had made a speech against the United Nations, but this particular aspect of it worried him profoundly.

He recalled that he had written former Secretary of State George C. Marshall while he (Mr. Holman) was president of the American Bar Association, asking for assurances that the Secretary should not approve of any United Nations resolution that in any way violated the constitutional rights of the American people.

Such assurances, he said, had been given, but in the closing hours of the United Nations meeting in Paris the Genocide Convention had been passed, and this, he said, was a very dangerous document.

It was dangerous, he said, because it might give the World Court in The Hague jurisdiction over matters that properly belonged in no foreign court. He gave this example of how it would work:

If an Irishman got into an altercation with a colored man in Mississippi, he (the Irishman) could be transferred overseas for trial under the Genocide Convention.

CALLS CONVENTION FRAUDULENT

Mr. Holman said the Senate never had approved this convention, but he added that it was a fraudulent document, which could be brought up in a hurry by the State Department and slipped through on the pretense that there was an emergency. He said that 1 treaty had gone through the Senate last year when there were only 2 Senators on the floor and another when there were only 6.

Mr. Dulles came in for some criticism by Mr. Holman. The latter recalled that at one time Mr. Dulles had approved the principle of the Bricker amendment, but later had switched and told the American Bar Association that it was not necessary, since the United States now had a good administration.

Despite all the assurance from the Government that there was really no need for the Bricker amendment, Mr. Holman said he had found a State Department document (unidentified) that had said there was "now no longer any difference between domestic and foreign affairs." Thus, said Mr. Holman, the very concept he feared the most was how official doctrine.

Mr. Holman, again turning to the reporters, said he was being smeared by some people, but added that if anybody could find anything on him, they were welcome to it.

He said he had never received a penny he didn't work for and had never worked at anything of which he wasn't proud. He said his mother was born in a covered wagon east of St. Louis, and that he had reared four sons all of whom, like himself, had fought for their country.

I want particularly to call your attention to the distorted description of legal facts which appears in the statements of this group. One of the participants was Mr. Frank Holman. He is reported to have said that if an Irishman got into an altercation with a colored man in Mississippi, he (the Irishman) could be transferred overseas for trial under the Genocide Convention. As a practicing lawyer and a former president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Holman should have far more devotion to legal accuracy than to permit his name to be associated with loose talk of that kind—a misstatement so blatant that it repudiates itself. The whole atmosphere which surrounds the propaganda and support of the Bricker amendment is very reminiscent of the preconvention attacks upon Gen. Dwight Eisenhower from lunatic fringe groups in the spring of 1952.

I think it is also significant that one of the groups which has been supporting the Bricker amendment has plastered stickers on its mail as well as on walls and fences. These stickers say "Wake up Americans. Get the U. S. A. out of the United Nations. Get the United Nations out of the U. S. A. Pass the Bricker amendment."

Since protection of our civil liberties, as vouchsafed in the Bill of Rights, is the professed purpose of the proponents of this new constitutional system, I am rather amazed at the new flock of converts who have been converted to the cause of civil liberties.

The chief proponent of the Bricker amendment is this same Mr. Frank Holman of Seattle. Indeed, at the hearings Mr. Holman not only testified but sat with the committee and cross examined, challenged, and debated witnesses. He was the professor. He had the final word; he marked their answers right or wrong. Now I have never before noticed Mr. Holman's name among the defenders of civil liberties. I have not heard his voice lifted in behalf of oppressed individuals or groups. I have not seen his name signed to the briefs supporting the downtrodden before the courts. No, if civil liberties involves defense of the underdog, it does not number Frank Holman among its supporters. Mr. Holman then appears to be concerned exclusively with the liberties of the upperdog. And it is important and interesting here to note that the American Civil Liberties Union is opposed to the Bricker amendment.

Mr. Holman has been particularly concerned about three measures under discussion in the United Nations, only one of which has come before the Senate for ratification. All of them purport to limit the powers of governments and to increase the rights of individuals. The first of these is the Genocide Convention. Genocide has been recognized as a crime under international law by the Nuremburg judgments and by the resolutions in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I am unhappy about the fact that we are powerless to help the victims of tyranny behind the Iron Curtain, the Poles, the Ukrainians, the Hungarians, the Rumanians, the Greeks, the Germans, the Chinese, the Lithuanians, the Slovaks, the Estonians, and the Latvians. I wish there were some court to which we could bring the mass of evidence we have about Soviet slave labor camps. I wish we had a strong and foolproof genocide convention in operation. I wish we were not powerless to stop the inhuman cruelty and the human slavery that goes on behind the Iron Curtain. I wish that we were not powerless today to prosecute the perpetrators of the Katyn massacre. Our country must stand for justice, our flag must be a banner to the oppressed. If we abandon those ideals, we shall have quenched the spark that helped us move forward, and is the inspiration for the anti-Communist free world today.

Another measure which has given concern to the Bricker supporters is a proposed treaty on the freedom of information. The executive branch of the United States Government has already rejected that treaty. I am glad that it did, because the other nations were not willing to go far enough to make the treaty worth while. But the fact that we have failed in our first attempt to get a good treaty is no reason to put ourselves in the position that we would not join in a good treaty if one could be obtained. Nor is it any reason to suspect that the Members of the Senate would not be able to deal wisely with it. A third source of great worry to the Bricker supporters are the Covenants on Human Rights. These have not been completed, or presented for ratification. I doubt that they could achieve Senate ratification. Further, Secretary Dulles has announced that the administration would not sign them. Why then this great haste to amend the Constitution to prevent their possible acceptance when in fact, they will not be presented and will not be accepted under present procedures?

Mr. Holman, although he talks of civil liberties, is concerned only about the rights of States to restrict equality and liberty. He has made an unblushing appeal to what he conceives to be the prejudices of one sectional bloc. He has threatened that if the Human Rights Covenant is adopted, it will affect their customs and practices.

There are several answers to this. In the first place, the Human Rights Covenants have not been completed, and probably never will be.

They have not been presented for ratification and the Secretary of State has advised that they will not be.

When any treaty is presented for ratification, it needs the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate for passage. Surely there is no better safeguard against back door changes of existing practices.

I may say that I have my differences on civil rights questions with many Representatives, but I am convinced of their sincerity and their sincere desire for progress. And I am sure they are convinced of my sincere desire to move forward by direct and constitutional means. Let me say to Mr. Holman that so long as Russia stands as the lowest common denominator in any human rights equation, no State in this country need fear that its civil rights score is below that lowest common denominator.

The Bricker resolution has a surface plausability that is misleading. As great a lawyer as former Supreme Court Justice Roberts said that he was deceived by its language and did not come to understand its full implications until he read it carefully. Today he opposes the Bricker amendment.

The resolution has had the benefit of a carefully contrived propaganda campaign. It comes with the apparent approval of the American Bar Association. But the experts in the Bar Association—the section of international and comparative law, speaking through its council, have strongly disagreed. And when asked for their views by the staff of a Senate committee, 25 of 27 leading law school deans and professors emphatically opposed any tampering with the present language of the Constitution.

The Association of the Bar of the City of New York and the New York County Lawyers Association are vigorously opposing all amendments to curtail the treatymaking powers. The Hon. John W. Davis, one of the great leaders of the American bar, is vigorously opposing the Bricker amendment as is former Republican Attorney General William Mitchell.

One of the few law teachers to support the Bricker amendment is former Dean Manion, who is now in Washington as chairman of a commission. He is the gentleman who announced on television in advance of his study, that one of his main recommendations would be that the Federal Government sell TVA.

His successor as dean of the College of Law of the University of Notre Dame is Joseph O'Meara. Dean O'Meara is a stanch opponent of the Bricker amendment, and is actively exposing its fallacies. This is what he wrote to Senator WILEY, a leading opponent of the attempt to restrict the treaty power:

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
THE COLLEGE OF LAW,
Notre Dame, Ind., October 20, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: • • • As my predecessor here is one of the more vigorous of the partisans of the amendment, I think you should know that I am in complete accord with your views on this subject.

I think it a pity that the real issues involved in this controversy receive so little attention. Those who are working so hard for the adoption of the Bricker amendment, for the most part at any rate, are people who want to secede from the world. To accomplish this they propose, in effect, to overrule the supremacy clause and transfer the conduct of foreign affairs to Congress. This is really what the Bricker amendment is about. Talk about saving the Bill of Rights is just so much campaign oratory.

Our law review, the Notre Dame Lawyer, expects to publish two feature articles on the amendment, one by Senator BRICKER himself and the other taking the opposing side.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH O'MEARA, *Dean.*

Almost every speech in favor of the Bricker amendment contains a dire warning of some 200 treaties which are being hatched in the dark recesses of the U. N. Building. Yet Assistant Secretary of State Morton reveals that the number of conventions under consideration by the U. N. and its specialized agencies amounts to 13 drafts. That is quite different from 200. I mention it to show the technique that is being employed.

It is worth mentioning that the draft of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 which has been reported out by committee is entirely different from the resolution which was first introduced, and which has the signatures of sixty-odd Members of the other body. The only resemblance between the two is that they both concern the treaty power.

The present resolution is based on an entirely different concept. No Member need feel committed to it because he signed the other. I urge all Members who find themselves in this position carefully to compare the texts.

Indeed, the present resolution is one which received no attention from most witnesses at the hearings. The procedure at the open hearings was a rather peculiar one.

As I have said, they took on the aspect of a schoolroom with Mr. Frank Holman as the schoolmaster. I do not know what went on in executive sessions. I do not know how much consideration was given to the final report by the members of the committee. I do not know to what extent Mr. Holman participated in them. But I do know that the result was a surprise to many of the cosponsors of the original Bricker resolution.

What applies to the committee bill applies doubly to the various compromises that have been submitted. Apparently they are hasty solutions that were drafted on the back of envelopes while riding in taxicabs.

They are skillful, but superficial attempts at political compromise and soft soap. They are hardly the stuff of which enduring constitutions are made.

In this connection I am amused by the dual role which is being played by Herbert Brownell. As Attorney General and as a responsible lawyer he has testified strongly against the bill. He has warned against tampering with the constitutional treaty power. But Mr. Brownell also regards himself as the White House's political brain. In this capacity, he has been assiduously bargaining clause for clause and phrase for phrase, patching together a new hodgepodge constitutional amendment in smoke-filled rooms. The big job seems to be to keep both halves of the Republican Party together.

Mr. Speaker, all this is hardly the way to tamper with a document which has been written for the ages, and which, for 164 years, has been able to produce the best Government in the history of the world. I submit that all of these hodge-podge bits and patches must be recommitted to committee for careful reconsideration.

Mr. Speaker, we have lived with our present Constitution for 164 years and it has served us well. It contains a delicately balanced separation of powers. The years have illumined the great wisdom of the men who drafted it. I respectfully submit that any tampering with its language might seriously injure the fine adjustment of the governmental mechanism which it created. An amendment to the Constitution is a serious matter. It should not be done for light or transient motives.

I submit also, that if ever there were a time when we need to have an Executive clothed with the power to negotiate as an equal with heads of other States, it is in the second half of the twentieth century.

The supporters of the campaign to reduce the treaty power are quite frank in stating that they want to prevent the adoption of an armament control treaty like the Baruch plan to control atomic energy. That admission by the chief sponsor of the bill would be enough for me. If there is anything the world needs, it is arms control. I was proud, as an American, of President Eisenhower's proposal for universal disarmament which was made twice during 1953. The people and the Congress applauded those speeches, and the Senate passed a resolution in support of the proposal for world disarmament which he advanced on April 16. I do not distrust President Eisenhower. I do not think he should be stripped of the powers which his predecessors had. I do not think we should send him, or any President, out to deal with field marshals with only a sergeant's stripes upon his sleeve. It is his duty to protect his office, because that office, as created by our forefathers is indispensable to our Constitutional Government.

I hope that President Eisenhower will put thoughts of compromise aside. A Constitutional amendment is either needed or not needed. If it is not needed, let us not weigh the Constitution down with new provisions, merely to save faces. Let us not solemnly assert, as the lunatic fringe wants us to assert, that the United Nations is fraught with danger.

In asking for firmness from President Eisenhower, I realize that I am asking him to change a basic tenet of his party. For the Republican Party has traditionally stood for a weak President and a dominant Congress. They have espoused this with consistency, regardless of whether the President was of their party or not. Lincoln, the only vigorous Republican President besides Theodore Roosevelt, was under constant fire from the radical Republican Senate throughout the Civil War. And in the midst of his presidential campaign in 1864, the Republican majority leaders of both Houses of Congress issued the notorious Wade-Davis manifesto, warning Lincoln that "if he wishes our support he must confine himself to his executive duties—to obey and execute, not to make laws."

Now what is the nature of the great office that the Republicans so distrust? It is the office for which more popular votes are cast, district for district, than any other in the United States. In a presidential year, from 6 to 10 percent more votes are cast for the Presidency than for all 435 positions in the House of Representatives combined. In off years, the combined vote for all candidates for Representative usually drops by about 35 to 40 percent. And we do not need a public opinion to tell us that our own constituents are more familiar with their President than their Congressman. They observe him more closely, they know who he sees and what he does. We can truly say that the President does and should represent all the people. The American Presidency has never been an instrument of tyranny—it has rather been a protector of the people.

I am confident that the American people will support President Eisenhower if he takes a courageous position. Though the night may be dark our people want brave leaders. They do not want to retreat to the protective shelter of a dream world of imaginary childhood. They do not want to join the Vigilant Women for the Bricker amendment in their frenetic hissing and booing parties. They do not want to hate foreigners, fear the United Nations, suspect their own officials, and ultimately, distrust themselves. That way lies national insanity and national suicide. It is not the way our people want to go.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution favoring international agreements for limitation of armaments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 987. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GRAHAM (at the request of Mr. GAVIN), for 1 week, for reason of medical checkup.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina.
Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts.
Mr. PATTERSON.
Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.
Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. PRICE).
Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.
Mr. OAKMAN and Mr. ENGLE.
Mr. BENDER two instances.
Mr. HESELTON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 28, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS, AND DELEGATES

JANUARY 26, 1954.

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 83d Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress, entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: WILLIAM H. NATCHER, 2nd District, Kentucky; GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, 24th District, California; HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., 6th District, New Jersey; LESTER R. JOHNSON, 9th District, Wisconsin.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1199. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of $550,000 for the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 308); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1200. A letter from the Acting Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report of the affairs of the Library of Congress, including the copyright business, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; to the Committee on House Administration.

1201. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal in accordance with the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1202. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of final valuations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1203. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the 67th Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1204. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of an agreement between the United States and Canada entitled "Agreement for the Promotion of Safety on the Great Lakes by Means of Radio," and submitting certain proposed amendments to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1205. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1206. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a report that no amounts were paid from the appropriation "Claims, Office of the Secretary of Defense" for tort claims arising from the acts or omissions of employees of the Department of Defense, excluding the military departments, during the year ending December 31, 1953, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1207. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting the report of activities of the Veterans' Administration as of June 30, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 536, 71st Congress, and the annual report of the Veterans' Educational Appeals Board, pursuant to Public Law 610, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 257); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2175. An act to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch; with amendment (Rept. No. 1127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7398. A bill to repeal the requirement of section 3921 of the Revised Statutes that postmasters report to the Postmaster General failure to cancel postage stamps; with amendment (Rept. No. 1128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7399. A bill to authorize the sale of postage-due stamps for philatelic purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7395. A bill to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 758. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Barney; with amendment (Rept. No. 1115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1647. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Mae Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 1116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2616. A bill for the relief of Generosa Bonet; with amendment (Rept. No. 1117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2617. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Morales Chacon; with amendment (Rept. No. 1118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4340. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Abarno and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 1119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5025. A bill for the relief of Paul G. Kendall; with amendment (Rept. No. 1120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5461. A bill for the relief of Wah Chang Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5572. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Cook Cleland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6033. A bill for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6452. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie; without amendment (Rept. No. 1124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6698. A bill for the relief of Alexei Frank; without amendment (Rept. No. 1125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6808. A bill for the relief of Col. Samuel J. Adams, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7510. A bill to effectuate the finding and recommendations contained in the report of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries pursuant to Public Law 220, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 7511. A bill to establish an effective housing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 7512. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Armory Board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 7513. A bill to amend section 203 (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize regulation, for purposes of safety and protection of the public, of motor carrier transportation between points in foreign countries, insofar as such transportation takes place within the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 7514. A bill to appropriate money for the construction of the Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 7515. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses incurred for the education of his children, and to allow the taxpayer an exemption for a dependent child attending school regardless of such child's gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 7516. A bill to provide for distribution to American taxpayers of surplus commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7517. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honoloulu, a municipal corporation, to issue public improvement bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7518. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue public improvement bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 7519. A bill to allow an additional income tax exemption of $1,200 to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is permanently disabled or blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GWINN (by request):

H. R. 7520. A bill to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 7521. A bill to provide for exemption from land limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws as applied to projects situated in an area of an existing agricultural economy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONAS of North Carolina:

H. R. 7522. A bill to provide that the leave accruing to a member of the Armed Forces while he was held a prisoner of war in Korea shall not be subject to the 60-day limitation on the maximum amount of leave which might be accrued by such member; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 7523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a taxpayer shall be considered the head of a household if his home constitutes the principal place of abode of one or both of his parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 7524. A bill to authorize the modification of the project for Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 7525. A bill to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 7526. A bill to enlarge the canal connecting the Hudson River and Lake Champlain, the canal connecting Lake Champlain and the St. Lawrence River, and the channels at the head and foot of Lake Champlain, in order that oceangoing vessels may pass between the St. Lawrence River and New York City via the Hudson River and Lake Champlain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 7527. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents from $600 to $700; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7528. A bill to increase to $1,200 the amount a dependent may earn without loss

of exemption to the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7529. A bill to allow widows and certain other persons to deduct for income tax purposes amounts paid in providing for the care of children under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7530. A bill to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that gain from the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will not be taxed whether or not he replaces it with another residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 7531. A bill to establish a Medical Advisory Committee on Alcoholism in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7532. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that the retailers' excise tax on luggage shall not apply with respect to certain articles produced or manufactured by physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7533. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 7534. A bill to liberalize the payment of non-service-connected pension in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7535. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 7536. A bill to authorize the issuance of national service life insurance to disabled veterans under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7537. A bill to authorize the issuance of national service life insurance to certain service disabled veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 7538. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to increase the penalties presently applicable, and to authorize the imposition of the death penalty, in the case of persons convicted of certain subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 7539. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Treasury to replace certain arms and equipment loaned for the use of the Armed Forces, in cases where the arms or equipment so loaned cannot be returned to the owner; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 7540. A bill to increase the rates of compensation for disability incurred in combat; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 7541. A bill to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 7542. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7543. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 7544. A bill to aid the drought-stricken areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7545. A bill to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 7546. A bill to authorize the sale of farm commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 7547. A bill to authorize the sale of farm commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 7548. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the 200th anniversary of the expulsion of the Acadians from Nova Scotia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7549. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 7550. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 7551. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to certain rodeos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7552. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes, bands, and colonies of Indians in the State of Nevada and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7553. A bill to establish a Commission on the Coal Industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7554. A bill to provide for compensation of certain employees on days when departments or establishments of the Government are closed by administrative order; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. J. Res. 363. Joint resolution providing for the creation of an international food reserve; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DODD:

H. J. Res. 364. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the admission of new States as sovereign States of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 365. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the ratification of treaties by the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Res. 419. Resolution providing additional funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by clause 8 of rule XI, incurred by the Public Accounts Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Res. 420. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses of Bertha Kehoe, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 421. Resolution creating a select committee to study costs of coffee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. Res. 422. Resolution condemning action of the Soviet regime in Poland in taxing gift packages from the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. Res. 423. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the 31st and 32d Annual Reports of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Funds; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Res. 424. Resolution condemning action of the Soviet regime in Poland in taxing gift packages from the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress against passage of legislation depriving States of the power to regulate the discontinuance of railroad services in intrastate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts against passage of legislation depriving States of the power to regulate the discontinuance of railroad services in intrastate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 7555. A bill for the relief of Dominick Ducato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7556. A bill for the relief of Michael Alexis Melgunow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 7557. A bill for the relief of Johanna Rampitsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 7558. A bill for the relief of Sister Luigia Pellegrino, Sister Angelina Nicastro, and Sister Luigina Di Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7559. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine Alice Aquarone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 7560. A bill for the relief of Andrew DiMartino Cataline and Frances DiMartino Cataline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 7561. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Albino Sanchez and his legal guardian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 7562. A bill for the relief of Carmine Borriello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 7563. A bill for the relief of Alfred P. Pueisl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7564. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands

to R. R. Crew, A. G. Gibson, C. F. Bliss, Jr., et al.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7565. A bill for the relief of Luise Isabella Chu, also known as Luise Schneider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7566. A bill for the relief of Birgit Camara, also known as Birgit Heinemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7567. A bill for the relief of certain Samoans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7568. A bill to authorize and direct the Farm Loan Board of Hawaii to convey certain land and to ratify and confirm certain acts of said farm loan board; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7569. A bill to authorize the removal of a restrictive covenant on land patent No. 9628, issued to the Board of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association on January 18, 1929, and covering lots 5 and 6 of the Waimea town lots, situated in the county of Kauai, T. H.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 7570. A bill for the relief of Eugene Paul Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 7571. A bill for the relief of Ashot Mnatzakanian and Ophelia Mnatzakanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 7572. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 7573. A bill for the relief of Thomas Andrew Guckian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 7574. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Klar, Mrs. Vilma Hartmann Klar, and their minor son, Tibor Klar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 7575. A bill for the relief of Gisele Jeanne Rosas-Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 7576. A bill for the relief of Hal A. Marchant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 7577. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Stafford Ordnance Corp., a corporation, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 7578. A bill for the relief of Ralph Michael Owens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7579. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD (by request):

H. R. 7580. A bill for the relief of Miss Claudia Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 7581. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Conti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7582. A bill for the relief of Ariadna Dickinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7583. A bill for the relief of Francesco Messano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 7584. A bill for the relief of Angele Maria Boyer (nee Pieniazeck); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 7585. A bill for the relief of Calvin Randles Bogga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7586. A bill for the relief of Millard F. Blanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 7587. A bill for the relief of the estate of Neil McLeod Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 7588. A bill for the relief of Dominick Lucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 7589. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Connecticut to the North Stonington Volunteer Fire Company, Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 7590. A bill for the relief of Erwin Franz Braun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 7591. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred H. Clary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VORYS:

H. R. 7592. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty Grundstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 7593. A bill for the relief of Theresia Probst Uhl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 7594. A bill for the relief of Yin Mow Moy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

478. By Mr. HART: Petition of Albert L. Quinn Post No. 52, American Legion, Department of New Jersey, urging the Congress of the United States to object to proposal of sale of surplus butter and cottonseed oil to Soviet Russia and its satellite members; to the Committee on Agriculture.

479. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 122 citizens of Lincoln and Spokane Counties of Washington, in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

480. Also, petition of 152 citizens of the Spokane County WCTU of Washington, in support of Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

481. By Mr. MACK of Washington: Resolution of the Washington State Sportsmen's Council requesting establishment of the Columbia national wildlife management area as presently proposed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

482. By Mr. REAMS: Petition of more than 5,000 employees, former employees, and widows and wives of former employees of American railroads, now citizens of the 9th Congressional District of Ohio, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act so that a widow of a deceased railroad employee may receive a full pension at the age of 60 instead of the present provision of 65; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

483. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Resolution of the city of Middletown, N. Y., opposing the repeal of the traditional exemption of State and municipal bonds and securities from Federal taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Ohio Axle-Mile Truck Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, a crisis is developing in the motor transport business.

One of the 48 States has passed a law which, if carried to its ultimate possibility, would wreck the trucking industry, hurt other industries, and above all, cost American consumers incalculable sums of money. This State law could seriously disrupt our mobilization program and our defense preparedness in case of a national emergency.

I am referring to the axle-mile tax law enacted by the State of Ohio which levies a new tax on all commercial trucks with more than two axles for each mile traveled on Ohio roads. This is over and above all other Ohio motor vehicle fees and taxes paid by persons operating trucks within that State.

Already, repercussions have been felt in the form of retaliatory measures by surrounding and nearby States. Missouri, Wisconsin, Nebraska, North Dakota, Virginia, and Kentucky have made their motor carrier taxes applicable to Ohio trucks using their roads. This is a reversal of the reciprocity principle that Ohio trucks used to enjoy in those States and is an example of how Ohio's axle-mile tax law could touch off a chain reaction, resulting in an outrageous pyramiding of transportation costs.

I come from the very heart of the automotive industry. Hundreds of thousands of motor trucks are built every year in Detroit and Michigan, the motor capital of the Nation, and the automotive transport business is a vital cog in the manufacture and sales of these vehicles. Truckers transport approximately 90 percent of all automobiles manufactured in the United States from assembly plants to dealers. In 1952, trucks hauled 4⅓ million passenger cars out of the 5 million produced.

More than 6 million persons are employed in manufacturing, selling, servicing, and operating motor trucks in the United States. Trucks haul more than 11 billion tons of goods a year, or more than three-quarters of the total tonnage transported by all forms of transportation.

If Ohio's unfair and short-sighted axle-mile tax is allowed to remain and other States continue to retaliate by cancelling reciprocal tax benefits, it takes

no soothsayer to predict that a cataclysmic outcome is in store for the trucking industry and American consumers. As truckers refuse to cross Ohio boundaries, and Ohio truck operators are discouraged from operating in other States, it is easy to see that thousands of persons who have depended on trucks will be out of work.

Historically there is a precedent which would indicate Ohio's axle-mile tax law is unsound. In 1951 the State of Illinois enacted such a law and met stiff opposition from consumers and truckers alike. Two years later, under tremendous voter pressure and the opposition of hundreds of companies and the Illinois trucking industry, the Illinois Legislature repealed the law.

In my opinion, Congress should consider the possible need for Federal action ahead of the catastrophe that may confront us. To this end my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] has introduced a resolution—House Resolution 407—authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the barriers to the free flow of interstate commerce on the highways resulting from enactment of a unilateral State tax law and a refusal to grant reciprocal exemption to out-of-State truckers.

I again wish to announce my support of this resolution. I sincerely hope that the Rules Committee will report favorably on the proposal and that the House will speedily approve the investigation. We must act with dispatch and determination to save the system of reciprocity which has prevailed for more than 25 years among all our States. The matter is of utmost importance to the American consumer and the Nation as a whole.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 25, 1954]

GOVERNORS BACK AWAY FROM TRUCK-TAX BATTLE

(By Lowell K. Bridwell)

ATLANTA, GA., January 25.—A plan to force a showdown fight between States over truck taxes was falling apart here today.

This become evident after the executive committee of the Governor's Conference voted to hold a special meeting of all 48 governors in Washington in the spring—probably in April—to discuss highway taxation policies.

Seven governors decided fights among States over truck taxes and reciprocity were becoming so serious they are threatening the highway taxation programs of the States and the welfare of the trucking industry.

The executive committee members, including Conference Chairman Dan Thornton, Governor of Colorado, said the States must settle the fight themselves or risk the Federal Government stepping into the truck-tax field.

A committee on 10 Southern States at first refused to heed the hopes of the governors for a calm discussion of the problem without "rows, controversy, or retaliation." But, 1 by 1, the States indicated they were backing off from a plan for immediate action.

IT STARTED IN OHIO

The crisis was brought on when the 10-State group decided to declare economic war on Ohio because of a new Ohio tax charging all truckers for the use of Ohio's highways—regardless of what State they were from. The 10-State committee demanded that truckers from the 10 States be exempted from paying Ohio tax.

Ohio refused to grant any exemptions and the 10 States announced they would cancel all reciprocal truck-tax agreements with Ohio on March 1. This would mean Ohio truckers would have to buy license tags and pay other taxes in each of the 10 States in which they might operate.

The Governor's executive committee meeting was called at the request of Ohio Gov. Frank J. Lausche in an attempt to stop an economic war which, he said, would be the same as inviting the Federal Government to step in.

Governor Lausche charged that the crisis was brought on by the trucking industry which, he said, propagandized the 10-State committee into threatening action against Ohio. He said it was done in an attempt to force Ohio into granting exemptions under the new axle-mile tax.

A Bill To Amend the Pension Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to revise and amend the laws relating to pensions.

In effect, it provides that for all veterans in the future who may qualify for the pension rolls their entitlement will be determined by the entitlement today applicable to veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korea. That means that a man must be disabled to a specified degree depending upon his age; must earn less than $1,400 income if single, or $2,700 if with dependents. And in addition, the veteran must generally be unemployable.

It should be emphasized that this bill would not, in any way or manner remove any person who is now on the pension rolls or who qualifies between now and the time the bill would become effective—1 year after the date of enactment. It would not raise the pension of any individual and neither would it lower the pension of any individual.

If there are any Spanish-American War veterans who have thus far not qualified for a pension, they will have 1 year from the date of enactment to so qualify under the present law.

Perhaps the most important feature of this bill is that it would place in one law nearly all of the applicable pension features as they relate to veterans of the Spanish War, World War I, World War II, and Korea. It should make for simplified administration in the Veterans' Administration and may possibly save some money. Certainly it will not involve the expenditure of any greater amount of funds than presently available for pensions.

I am hopeful that the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions will hold hearings on this matter in the near future, and that we may see its enactment prior to the adjournment of the 83d Congress.

Randall Commission Ignores Crisis in Coal Resulting From Residual Fuel Oil Import Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, headed by Inland Steel's Clarence B. Randall, this week submitted to Congress its long-awaited report on the whole broad problem of foreign trade, foreign aid, tariffs, and related matters. It is, to say the least, a disappointing document.

I examined it first, of course, in search of some discussion and recommendations on the issue I raised in my letter to Chairman Randall of October 12 in which I had asked for a full-scale investigation into the dumping in this country of foreign residual fuel oil to the great detriment of the American coal industry. In the entire 107-page report there was not so much as a single sentence devoted to this problem—one of the most acute facing the coal-producing areas of the country.

In asking Chairman Randall to set up a special task force within the Commission to study the impact on the American economy and on our defense and security position of the crippling blows to our coal industry from this dumping process, I wrote:

This is not just a minor instance of foreign imports reacting a little unfavorably against a particular isolated industry. It is, rather, a case of a far-reaching threat to the progress of our whole economy, and a danger to our future security.

Such a task force should not only examine ways of protecting the American coal industry against further crippling blows from unrestricted oil imports but also methods of expanding our coal markets abroad in friendly nations which need coal for industrial expansion but which are handicapped by dollar shortages and by high transportation costs in getting the supplies they need. I believe both types of studies come within the jurisdiction of your Commission.

Mr. Randall, for some reason or other, never had time, personally, to acknowledge my letter. I would not have minded that if only he had paid some attention to it. But, when I discovered the Commission report, covering all phases of foreign economic policy as a guide for the Eisenhower administration's future program in this field, devoted not a word to this problem of the unrestricted flow of foreign residual fuel oil, I could not help wondering about this key paragraph of the report itself:

Responsible behavior on our part (in foreign-trade policy) requires that we recognize our own limitations and restrict our commitments to our capabilities. Our first obligation to the world, as well as to ourselves, is to keep the United States strong. Only from that firm base shall we be able, intelligently and worthily, to measure up to our great responsibility in world leadership.

That is all well and good, of course. But how can the strength of the United States be maintained if our basic coal industry is allowed to decline sharply because of unfair competition from abroad?

ANTIDUMPING INQUIRY

Since the Randall Commission report failed even to consider this important problem, I have this week addressed a letter to Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey asking what studies his Department has initiated in examining into the residual fuel oil import situation under the Antidumping Act of 1921. This act calls for substantial tariff penalties on the import into the United States of merchandise at prices below a fair market value or below the cost of production abroad.

Has Coffee Become a Luxury?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the National Restaurant Association, representing 180,000 eating places in the United States of America, has just finished 4 days of meetings in New York City. One of the main topics under discussion was the unprecedented rise in the price of green coffee since the middle of December.

It was reported that the 5-cent cup of coffee was practically extinct. As we all know, coffee costs 10 cents per cup in most instances and the prospect is that the price will soon rise to 15 cents.

Most food dispensers are watching the fluctuations of the New York coffee market with more than casual interest. In fact, they are becoming alarmed at the predictions that roasted coffee may reach $1.50 per pound in the near future. At the moment roasted coffee of most brands is selling at approximately $1 per pound all over the United States of America. Yet these prices are currently being charged for coffee already in stock and bought at much lower prices. What will happen when the green coffee currently being bought reaches the roasters and finally the grocers' shelves?

We have seen the extreme consumer reactions to the current capers in the coffee market. Housewives, alarmed at the sudden increase, are stocking up. Most grocery chains report that long lines of customers are buying from 6 to 10 pounds each. To be sure, neither the increase in the price of coffee nor a request for abstinence has resulted in less coffee being sold. Housewives are complaining, but they are still buying.

The pyrotechnics in the raw coffee market are intriguing. The United States of America is the No. 1 coffee market. From mid-November the price of a pound of green coffee beans from Brazil shot from about 57 cents to 74 cents earlier this month. Currently, the cash price in the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange is 70½ cents per pound.

It is stated that heavy frosts in July nipped the coffee buds in Brazil, which supplies 50 percent of the world's supply and 50 percent of United States coffee imports. News of this damage immediately began pushing coffee prices up. It was not until November that the full extent of the coffee damage began to clarify. On top of the frost damage, there were heavy insect inroads. Approximately one-fifth of Brazil's coffee crop was destroyed. Colombia, the second biggest supplier, cannot step up its output materially because it takes at least 5 years for a coffee tree to begin bearing. Brazil's total coffee crop in 1952–53 has been forecast by the Brazilian Coffee Institute at less than 14.2 million bags—133 pounds apiece. Brazil will have available for export approximately 13.3 million bags as compared to 15.2 million bags in the previous year.

One coffee authority says that each year since World War II global consumption of coffee has actually exceeded production with the difference coming out of stocks piled up during the war. At the same time, Europe is increasing its purchase of coffee from Latin American countries. Current rate of consumption in the world is at the rate of 33 million bags a year. That is 700,000 bags more than during 1952. This is about a million bags over expected exportable production in the current crop year. As a result, coffee men look for further dwindling stocks. By mid-1954, Brazil's reserve supply used to even out exports before the crop year begins may be down to about 1 million bags. Ordinarily, Brazil has always kept a 3 million bag reserve supply. Many dealers feel that Brazil might try to hold its stocks at the 3 million level thereby tightening the already tight supply.

Just what are the reasons for the sudden current rise in coffee prices? Many experts say it is due to the frost damage in Brazil. Exporters in Latin America advance the theory that the large coffee importers in the United States wanted to increase their inventory at year end for tax purposes. Others lay the increase directly to speculative rumors circulating in the United States that the Central American coffee crop during 1953–54 would be considerably less than last season and that there would be a shortage.

Yet the scare buying began in mid-November with the resultant rise in prices. The reaction to the rise brought in its train heavy profit taking. It seems as if many traders have been unloading heavily on the current market because the stock exchange shows that the average daily number of trades during December has been 92,000 bags. The buying splurge in November pushed the price of raw coffee from 54 to 74 cents and a new buying splurge is in the offing again. One aspect that concerns me is that the growers in Central America have had their most prosperous year in history but that the wages of the average plantation worker have not increased materially during the last 2 or 3 years although export prices have soared.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore this rise in coffee prices. It seems to me that there are certain unexplained forces at work in this extraordinary profit taking in a commodity that is so essential to us Americans. I deplore the fact that so many of the average citizens will have to pay more for an average cup of coffee. I deplore the fact that the housewives are being pushed into scare buying. It seems to me that it is urgent for us to investigate this problem immediately. I am therefore introducing today a House Resolution that an investigating committee be immediately set up under the aegis of the House Agriculture Committee. This problem concerns all of us and the quicker we settle it the better.

Francis M. Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, we face the sobering realization here today that once more the heavy burdens of public service have exacted their tragic toll. Last Sunday, Francis M. Sullivan, national legislative director for the Disabled American Veterans, left this life for a greater one.

It has been my good fortune to have known Frank for many years. I have always held for him the highest regard and warmest affection. He was a man of vision, a great humanitarian, a man who gave his health and life in the service of his country. He labored incessantly and indefatigably for our disabled veterans. Yes, and all our veterans of both World Wars and the Korean conflict. There is no doubt in my mind that it was his assiduous and unceasing labors in their behalf that ultimately broke his health and resulted in his untimely death.

Frank Sullivan was born at Forge Village, town of Westford, Mass., December 18, 1897. He graduated from Westford Academy, Westford, Mass., June 1916 and from the National University Law School, Washington, D. C., June 1929. He was admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court and United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on October 19, 1929; the Court of Appeals for the State of Maryland, September 16, 1936; and the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States in May 1936.

His auspicious career began as a newspaper reporter for the Wooster (Mass.) Telegram Gazette from 1920 to 1921. From 1921 to 1924 he was a reporter for the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican American and served as secretary to the late Congressman James P. Glynn, of Winsted, Conn., from 1924 to 1929. Later Mr. Sullivan served as secretary to Representative Edward W. Goss, of Waterbury, Conn., from 1930 to 1933. From 1933 to 1936 he practiced law in Washington, D. C. During this time he served as associate counsel for one of the large code authorities; general counsel for the General Economic Council; general

counsel for the Reserve Officers Association for Public Health Service; and associate counsel for National Association of Storekeepers Gaugers. In March of 1936 he was employed by the American Legion national organization, and from April 15, 1947, to the time of his death he served as national legislative director for the Disabled American Veterans.

In his busy life Frank Sullivan found time to author many publications which included Legal Rights of Servicemen and Women; National Defense and Universal Service, published by the American Legion; numerous other publications written for the American Legion; series of articles entitled "I Saw the GI Bill Written," published by the American Legion magazine in September, October, and November 1949. Additionally, numerous references are made to Frank in the enactment of the so-called GI bill or the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Among the organizations of which Frank was a valued and beloved member were the American Legion; Disabled American Veterans; Regular Veterans Association; National Press Club; past president of the Parents Guild, Dumbarton, District of Columbia; committeeman for the Cub Pack 96, Boy Scouts of America; Holy Name Society; Fathers Club of Gonzaga School, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Speaker, may I truly say that I join with his multitude of friends in extending my deepest sympathy to his widow and to his children.

Man of the Year: Robert A. Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 27, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my statement of December 6, 1953, nominating the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, as Man of the Year for 1953.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

My nominee for the man of the year in 1953 is the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio. Sometimes a nation's illustrious dead remain among its most influential men. Their character and personality are sometimes so strong and all pervading that their influence continues to endure after death.

I sat on a different side of the aisle in the Senate from Senator Taft and across the table from him on the Labor Committee. As a member of a different party, I did not agree with him on all issues, but we could always rely on him to state his views ably and frankly. His greatest value, however, was in his integrity as a leader of diverse elements, as one whose responsibilities of leadership were fulfilled with such fidelity and fairness that his loss was a heavy blow to all Americans.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three brought to the forefront those shining qualities which place him for all time in the company of Webster, Clay, and Norris and the other great leaders of the Congress. For his valiant effort to be to America what Churchill is to Great Britain, for being so right in his mind that he kept the respect of those of us who thought him wrong in some of his ideas; for showing the Nation how a man who is big enough to deserve victory knows how to take defeat; for the inspiration his career must be to all those who share in his patriotic aspirations—I nominate for the man of the year the late Senior Senator from the State of Ohio—Robert A. Taft.

The Recession Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when can we expect action by the administration for a program to develop employment opportunities so that people can be assured against hardships which continue to grow because of the present economic situation?

Unemployment throughout the Nation continues to rise. Congress has plans which were made so that immediate action could be taken to launch a public-works program in the event of recession. They are gathering dust in the Nation's Capitol. Administration leaders refuse to act or to admit that the economic situation is bad. But people are hurt, not only the jobless but others. Small business and farmers suffer. Part-time employment and loss of overtime pay for wage workers also cut deep into the family's living standards. These people find little comfort in statements by administration leaders that we are in a period of healthy readjustment.

Big business wants recession, or the so-called period of adjustment. The GOP hard-money policy, its unwillingness to act promptly on public-works programs, and the refusal to lift tax burdens on low-income families all contribute to the desired readjustment.

More and more people are getting hurt. Even that does not cause a change in economic policies of this big-business administration. The objective of the GOP leaders, their speechwriters and publicity men, is to continue with their readjustment but put the blame of unemployment and recession on their critics whom they call apostles of gloom and bust.

TAX PHILOSOPHY

A look behind the scenes shows that the big-business philosophy is also the dominating factor in determining policies on taxes and all other issues. The Presidential speechwriters painted a rosy picture on taxes and the budget. But what is happening is anything but good for the average citizen.

The House Ways and Means Committee approved lower taxes on dividends which help big stockholders, but it unanimously refused to raise tax exemptions on individuals and dependents.

The GOP tax policy contributes to economic decline. More purchasing power for the lowest income group is an effective method in promoting business and prosperity. But the administration moves in the opposite direction.

Here again GOP publicity experts are telling the people that a tax reduction for the little fellow is bad for the economy and that it is demagoguery to even suggest it.

There is sharp disagreement within the Eisenhower administration on these matters. Some fear public reaction to growing economic ills and the shift of the tax burden to low income folks. Others feel that Republican public relations men can successfully place responsibility for any adverse conditions on the liberal minority in Congress.

NOW OR NEVER

Some of my colleagues seem to believe that big business sees its one big chance to gain economic advantage now. It is now or never with them. It envisions a change in administration and wants prompt action on policies which will give it increased power to control the economy. Special interests want to grab the vast public domains, water resources, and great natural wealth in oil, timber, and minerals, now controlled by the people through the Government. They seek to cripple Federal regulation which has been designed to protect the public against gigantic trusts and monopolies. And as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], a champion of small business, told Congress last week, "big financial interests which seek to tear down economic and social gains of the last 20 years need a little depression to weaken the farmers, labor, and the little-business man." Big business wants to accomplish all it can before any effective change takes place in the Government at Washington.

It is an enterprising program. If successful, it will result in the greatest concentration of economic power in all history. Since politics is a reflection of conflicting economic interests, this trend could be a very serious and dangerous one. The best antidote is an alert and understanding public. And there are many favorable signs pointing in this direction—despite the slick speech writers in the White House and on Capitol Hill.

Charlotte Observer Wins National Homebuilders Association Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1954

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, with great pride I call attention to the national recognition recently won by a great newspaper in my own 10th Congressional District of North Carolina, the Charlotte Observer.

At the 10th annual convention in Chicago of the National Association of Homebuilders January 18, 1954, it was announced that the Charlotte Observer had been selected by a committee of judges as first prize winner in the association's national home week special section contest of 1953. One hundred and ten of the leading daily newspapers of the country competed.

The award, a much-sought prize, was presented to Hayward M. "Hayti" Thompson, the Observer's Sunday editor, who edited the winning special section of 64 pages, published September 20, 1953. The judges were Donald W. Krimel, department of journalism, University of Maryland; Richard R. Bennett, director of public relations, National Association of Manufacturers, Washington, D. C.; and James Butler, Washington correspondent of Editor and Publisher magazine.

Winning the award is even more noteworthy in light of the fact that only twice before had the Observer staff worked on such a special section. Its first effort in 1951 was only 5 pages; its second was 20. In 1953 with the Parade of Homes sponsored by the Charlotte Home Builders Association headed by Mr. George Goodyear, the Observer paid special attention to a group of 14 model houses forming a little community around a cul-de-sac. Despite a sizeable hurricane that blew in during the exhibition week, a crowd of 17,000 visitors was attracted.

Skillful newspaper work, like that of the Charlotte Observer, by focusing public attention on new designs, techniques, and equipment, are a potent stimulation to our national economy. The Observer's prize-winning special section presented a profile of American industrial ingenuity, imagination, and enterprise, and in so doing excited a consumer desire for a higher standard of living. Thus new markets were opened, contributing to a growing, prosperous economy.

I am very proud that the prize newspaper performance in this field was not only in my State of North Carolina, but in my own 10th Congressional District.

Postmaster General Urges All-Cargo Air Carriers for First-Class Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that on January 21, 1954, the Postmaster General of the United States filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board by amicus curiae petition for the reconsideration by the Board of an opinion and order handed down December 21, 1953.

This petition has to do with the flying of the 3-cent, or surface, mail which the Post Office Department began on an experimental basis last September. It presents a request that the scheduled all-cargo airlines be made available for use by the Post Office Department in this new type of service. The petition states that results on the two original segments, New York–Chicago and Washington–Chicago, have been most satisfactory, and consideration is now being given to expanding the experiment on a more nearly nationwide basis.

The certificated all-cargo airlines have for years been advocating a cargo rate for long-haul mail. Following application by these carriers to the CAB to participate in the experiment, the Board, according to the petition, decided on December 3, 1953, that it was empowered by section 416 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act to grant the requested authority. However, in its order dated December 21, 1953, the request was denied.

The Postmaster General now says:

> The experiments are being undertaken in the interest of improving the mail service; the objectives are to provide a basis in actual experience for determining the extent of the economies and efficiencies that may be realized from the use of air transportation for surface mail and to test the practicability of such an operation.

The petition further points out that the all-cargo carriers will make their nationwide certificated services available to the Post Office Department at the rate of 18.66 cents per ton-mile or whatever rates may be fixed by the Board. "In the opinion of the Department, such rates are fair and reasonable on an experimental basis," the petition declares.

The petition asserts that the granting of the authority requested by the all-cargo carriers is without question in the public interest and requests that it be done forthwith.

I might add that this rate of 18.66 cents a ton-mile for regular first-class mail is in contrast to the lowest rate now being paid to the passenger airlines for the carriage of airmail, which is 45 cents per ton-mile.

Appropriations of public funds is a matter of much concern to me, and there is great need for effecting economies in our postal service wherever costs may be feasibly reduced. It is especially desirable to effect these savings where at the same time improvements in service can be made.

This is a matter that is of vital concern to every Member of Congress, since the transport of first-class mail by air could benefit every section of the United States. The Postmaster General is to be commended for initiating an experiment which he believes will result in both better service to the public and economies to the post office.

Since he is the authority who best can know the requirements for flying the first-class mail, I consider it entirely fitting and proper that the situation be called to the attention of the House.

In the event that this further request of the Post Office Department for inclusion of the services of the all-cargo carriers is denied, it is my belief that an investigation should be undertaken and it is for this purpose that I am briefly at this time bringing the issue to your attention.

Under unanimous consent, I include a copy of the Postmaster General's petition to the Civil Aeronautics Board:

PETITION OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, AMICUS CURIAE, FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE BOARD OPINION AND ORDER OF DECEMBER 21, 1953

Comes now Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, amicus curiae, by his undersigned counsel, and respectfully petitions for reconsideration of the Board's opinion and order denying exemptions[1] adopted in the above-captioned proceedings on December 21, 1953, insofar as said opinion and order denied the applications of air carriers certicated to engage in the air transportation of property only. In support hereof, the Postmaster General shows to the Board as follows:

The Board, in opinion No. E–7937, dated December 3, 1953, held that the Board is empowered by section 416 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt air carriers not holding mail certificates from the requirements of that act relating to the transportation of mail, and to fix rates for such services under section 406 of said act. However, in its opinion and order dated December 21, 1953, the Board denied the request of the certificated cargo carriers for appropriate exemptions which would permit them to transport mail in conjunction with the experimental services being operated and proposed to be operated by the Postmaster General for the transportation of first-class mail and other preferential mail by air, holding:

"In summary, it does not appear that there is any need at this time for the participation of noncertificated-for-mail carriers in the movement of first-class and surface mail in order to insure the success of the Post Office experiment."

It would appear that the Board's remarks were directed to the experimental services now in operation between New York and Chicago, and Washington and Chicago. The results of those experiments have been very satisfactory. But it must be reemphasized that the Board's decision was apparently based only on considerations pertaining to the New York-Chicago and Washington-Chicago segments where the experiment is being operated by four mail-certificated carriers. Additionally, a question has been raised as to the fitness of many of the applicants to perform the mail service.

The applications of the certificated cargo carriers present an entirely different question. They include considerations broader in scope than the question merely as to whether additional carriers are needed in conjunction with the presently authorized experimental services to Chicago. Moreover, no question of fitness should exist as to these carriers who are already certificated by the Board. The Postmaster General's experiments are being undertaken in the interest of improving the mail service; the objectives are to provide a basis in actual experience for determining the extent of the economies and efficiencies that may be realized from the use of air transportation for surface mail and to test the practicability of such an operation.

Slick Airways, Inc., The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., and Riddle Airlines have requested exemptions which would not only permit them to participate in the New York-Chicago and Washington-Chicago experiments at the rates already prescribed by the Board for the experimental services over these segments, but make the remainder of their certificated serv-

[1] Order No. E–7985.

ices available to the Post Office Department at the rate of 18.66 cents per mail-ton mile. In the opinion of the Department, such rates are fair and reasonable on an experimental basis.

The rates offered by these carriers over their entire system or any part thereof present a firm basis upon which the Department could proceed to determine whether the experiment should be expanded and whether they could be utilized on the grounds of economies and efficiencies. Such determinations for expanded experiments could, therefore, include various segments comprising the systems of these certificated cargo carriers which are being offered for the use of the Department.

Of the scheduled airlines, only the certificated cargo carriers have offered their whole system for experiment by the Department at the lowest rate now being paid for the present segmentary experiment. Thus, it would appear to the Department that the public benefits that could flow from the requested grant of exemption would outweigh any objection.

Subsequent to the inauguration of the initial surface-mail-by-air experiment on the Chicago-Washington and New York segments, the Department has used to advantage similar system-wide services offered by the various local service air carriers during the past Christmas season, pursuant to Board approval. The Department has just filed its letter of January 18 supporting additional motions of these local service carriers to extend their own experimental period for carrying surface mail by air throughout the balance of 1954.

As stated above, the experimental mail services performed by the mail certificated carriers over the New York-Chicago and Washington-Chicago segments have been completely satisfactory. However, it is the opinion of the Post Office Department that since the experimental exemption requested by the certificated cargo carriers will make their services available at the rate of 18.66 cents per ton-mile over the remainder of their systems as well as the New York-Chicago and Washington-Chicago segments, their requests should be granted as being in the public interest at least insofar as the other points are involved. To this extent, the need exists for their services at the rate offered, in that they could be used to advantage in circumstances similar to those existing in connection with the feeder lines.

If the Board grants these requests for a temporary exemption, these services, too, will be used in those instances where in the judgment of the Postmaster General there would be improvements in the present postal service commensurate with the transportation charges. These services could and will be used, as stated in our letter of December 14, in those instances, emergency in nature, where the movement of surface mail would otherwise be delayed; and in other instances where pilot tests are deemed proper by the Postmaster General for additional data as to the advisability of expanding the present experiments involved in the surface-mail-by-air program. It is not presently contemplated, however, that the Department will conduct experiments with these certificated cargo carriers on the same scale and with the same regularity as is presently being conducted with the trunkline carriers operating on the New York-Chicago and Washington-Chicago experimental segments.

The basic purpose of the exemptions requested by the certificated cargo carriers is not to meet any presently established need because, in fact, the Postmaster General by his present experiments is only attempting to determine whether a need in fact does exist for such service, considering the economies and efficiencies so involved. Rather, the purpose of the requested exemptions is to offer the services of these types of certificated cargo carriers to the Postmaster General so that he may obtain data, both of a financial and operating nature, on such operations to be conducted as an adjunct to the present conventional airmail service.

Therefore, the experimental exemption requested should be granted in the public interest and the Board should find that the enforcement of the mail-certificate provisions of the act, in view of the experimental nature of the services being offered and the uncertainties as to the type of operations that may ultimately prove feasible, would be an undue burden on these certificated cargo carriers at this time by reason of the unusual circumstances affecting these operations. Reasons similar to these were adopted by the Board in a most recent order granting temporary exemption to National Airlines to conduct experimental helicopter operations. National Airlines, Inc., docket No. 6406, order E–8034, adopted January 14, 1954.

Wherefore the Postmaster General, amicus curiae, respectfully requests—

(1) That the Board reconsider and set aside its opinion and order (order No. 7085) dated December 21, 1953, insofar as said opinion and order relate to air carriers certificated to engage in the air transportation of property only.

(2) That the Board adopt an appropriate exemption order exempting the certificated cargo carriers from the provisions of title IV of the act, to the extent that such provisions would otherwise prevent such carriers from engaging in the transportation of first-class and other preferential mail in such experimental operations as the Postmaster General may desire to utilize their services, between all points on the respective routes of such carriers.

(3) That if the Board finds that the services of the applicants are not needed in conjunction with the New York, Washington, and Chicago experimental segments, that the exemption be granted at least for the remainder of their systems at the requested rate of 18.66 cents per ton-mile, and for a period of time coextensive with the present trunk-line experiment.

Respectfully submitted.

LOUIS J. DOYLE,
Acting Solicitor, Post Office Department.

JULIAN T. CROMELIN,
Attorney, Office of the Solicitor, Post Office Department.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the foregoing petition upon all parties of record in this proceeding by mailing a copy thereof, in a franked envelope and properly addressed, to each such party or their attorney.

JULIAN T. CROMELIN,
Attorney, Office of the Solicitor, Post Office Department.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 21, 1954.*

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the American Federation of Labor which has become a political appendage of the Democratic Party in contravention of its original attitude toward political problems just cannot find anything good about the Republican Party, it seems.

They do not like the Taft-Hartley law. They do not like President Eisenhower's proposed amendment to it. Now they do not like the President's housing program.

Quaere: Are they just plain ornery?

Answer: We hope not.

Solution for Surplus Farm Products a Critical Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1954

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us remember the events leading up to the potato fiasco of a few years ago.

Many reasons were offered to justify support of that important agricultural product and a good many of them were sound.

Yet, for a number of reasons, the program got completely out of hand; the public became thoroughly disgusted; and the fiscal result was the elimination of price support for that product. Very few felt that any kind of a revision would be satisfactory. The practical result was the wiping out of every trace of support.

Now again we are confronted with the increasingly difficult problem of mounting surpluses of many farm products being taken off the domestic market and excluded from the export market. They are simply bought and placed in storehouses. Then the Government incurs staggering carrying charges and our problems are multiplied.

No one can doubt that such items as dairy products and feed grains are subject to deterioration and spoilage, even with the exercise of the utmost care. And audit reports of recent date indicate the probability that a large portion of these stored agricultural products have not only failed to receive adequate care but have been subjected to grossly negligent management, resulting in some instances in both criminal and civil action by the Federal Government.

I do not believe anyone can criticize fairly the efforts on the part of the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation to estimate the application of existing laws in terms of budgetary requirements.

Congress, itself, must soon accept and discharge its own responsibility in this field or it will be subjected to the most violent kind of widespread criticism, to which there can be no effective reply.

The President has recommended a reasonable program, based upon sound economic principles intended to bring about fair and equitable results to producers of agricultural products and to consumers of those products alike.

I am confident that most Members of Congress have become increasingly aware in recent days of the nature and extent of the criticism which is being expressed through every medium of public opinion. Newspapers, magazines, and radio commentaries have been full of

comment upon the situation which confronts us and most of it is critical in the extreme.

Some feeble attempts have been made in certain quarters to reply to this criticism, but I am certain that instead of informing the public and providing answers to this criticism, they have simply added fuel to the fire which is beginning to rage throughout this country.

I have noticed with real concern one phase of this public commentary which is beginning to repeat itself in terms of the potato fisaco. It is the increasing use of most effective cartoons. All of us recognize that a well-conceived cartoon can and does have a tremendous effect upon the shaping of public opinion and when it is multiplied by a series of cartoons, developing the theme in the mind of the artist, the results can be devastating.

Frequently I have wished that the techniques in publishing the RECORD would make it possible to utilize reproduction of certain of these cartoons under carefully devised regulations as to their use.

In any event, I would like to describe in words my impression of a cartoon by Carmack which appeared in the January 27 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, which has undoubtedly been seen by most Members of Congress. It is entitled "Something To Think About," and it most assuredly describes one important phase of the problem confronting us most accurately. In the foreground is a gentleman labeled "consumer." He is struggling and sweating over a tremendous burden in a wheelbarrow labeled "taxes to pay for losses on surplus crops." In the background is a dignified figure labeled "United States farmer." The drawing seems to indicate a person of responsibility and intelligence who is really concerned about the plight of his neighbor, the "consumer." The "consumer" is saying to the "United States farmer": "The bigger this gets, the less I will be able to buy from you."

There are many, particularly in the House, who have a direct and pressing obligation to the consumers, since they represent largely metropolitan areas. There are others who have an equally important obligation to those engaged in agriculture because their constituency is largely made up of such fine Americans. I suspect that a majority of us here have a mixed constituency in the sense of substantial and responsible industrial and agricultural activities. But I cannot subscribe to any idea that any one of us, whatever our constituents' main interest may be, can afford to overlook or ignore the prime importance of a realistic, objective, and immediate appraisal of this problem of daily increasing losses on surplus crops. President Eisenhower has courageously and intelligently presented his recommendations. They have been based upon an honest and comprehensive survey of those problems, during which he has had the advantage of the sincere advice of scores, if not hundreds, of able persons who understand the difficulties of arriving at a sound agricultural program.

I cannot stand idly by or fail to meet the challenge the President has offered to us. In doing what I am trying to do, I certainly am not urging anything which I believe would be detrimental to the best interests of those engaged in agriculture. I recognize the vital importance of their contribution to our overall national economy. I think I know something of their realistic thinking, their honesty of purpose, and their anxiety that Congress should accept and discharge its responsibility in this field; nor do I overlook the fair and just interests of the some 140 million other Americans who are not directly connected with agriculture as such but who are vitally concerned about a sound agricultural program in the best interests of their friends and neighbors engaged in agriculture and also of the national economy.

Every day which goes by without a real effort on the part of this Congress to meet the challenge before it will jeopardize, in my opinion, the continued existence of any kind of an agricultural program which will meet with the approval of the American people.

Going back to the cartoon, I hope and I believe that those who are responsible for the development of a program which can be submitted very soon to the House will recognize not only the growing concern of a great many fine people engaged in agricultural pursuits but the equally growing concern of the consumer and taxpayer, not directly engaged in agricultural pursuits, but who are most anxious that we should discharge our full obligation in this field.

Light and Not Heat—Literally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when much of the furore in Washington seems to be shedding plenty of heat with little light, the electric light and power industry comes along with a reverse pattern; 1954 is the 75th anniversary of the invention of the first practical lamp. It is difficult to imagine what the world was like before the incandescent light bulb became part of the pushbutton world. Back in 1879, Thomas Edison illuminated a section of Menlo Park. A short time thereafter, he sold the first electric light system to the *Columbia*, a steamship. Appleton, Wis., installed the first community lighting program early in 1882.

We are often forgetful of the extent to which we have come to take electricity for granted. Most of the world is still in darkness, despite the presence of the necessary fuel, engineering know-how, and technical capacity everywhere on the earth to install electricity. Whole areas of the Soviet Union, despite its boasted incease in scientific development, are unilluminated. India, China, and many of the remote regions of Europe are still in the Dark Ages, so far as light is concerned.

Progress has a way of becoming accepted rapidly. It is easier to look back on the amazing achievements of these past 65 years than to look ahead, but the next generation may well make us look as if we had been sitting still.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, January 22, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, at whose word man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor until evening, we come to these spiritual springs of restoration asking that we may be given strength to match the tasks we face. O Thou who didst guide our fathers in the founding of this Republic, and dost in this Chamber surround us with a cloud of witnesses, watching from heroic yesterdays, still by Thy pillar of cloud and of fire lead us on through disturbed days that test the souls of all men. When our most precious beliefs about man's dignity and destiny are denied and blasphemed by those who would lead the race to enslavement, cleanse, we beseech Thee, our own hearts and the practices of our own democracy so that we may be worthy to be the instrument of Thy purpose for the protection of the weak and the exploited. Undergird us with Thy might to exercise the potent ministry to all the world to which, in Thy providence, we believe Thou hast called us in this age on ages telling. We ask it in that Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 27, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2326) to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 7209) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy were authorized to meet with the full joint committee during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I understand that on tomorrow there is to be a session in the House of Representatives, where the President of Turkey is scheduled to make an address. I understand the Senate will be invited to participate in the ceremonies there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At what time will they be held?

Mr. KNOWLAND. At 12:30, I believe. I shall check on the time during the day. Of course, that ceremony will be held tomorrow.

I should also like to say, for the information of the Senate, that, of course, we shall continue with the unfinished business, Senate Joint Resolution 1, today and tomorrow, for whatever length of time is necessary in order to complete our work on that measure.

There may be some appropriation bills which will be ready for Senate action tomorrow or early next week. As is customary, we shall wish to take them up as soon as they come to us.

We also have Senate Resolution 189, which has been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration. I had hoped we might be able to take it up today. However, at the request of the minority leadership, who said some of the Members on that side of the aisle wanted a little additional time to obtain information, I have agreed that we shall not take up that resolution until tomorrow. On the other hand, because of the expiration date in connection with the funds to which the resolution relates, it will be necessary for us to proceed to the consideration of that measure by tomorrow. As I have previously stated, it is Senate Resolution 189, Calendar No. 880, and it provides for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. How late on tomorrow does the Senator from California expect to have that resolution taken up?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall try to have it taken up as late as possible, in order to meet the convenience of the Senator from Louisiana, who, I understand, wishes to have an opportunity to obtain some additional facts in the meantime.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Would it be taken up later than 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Inasmuch as tomorrow will be Friday, I had hoped the Senator from Louisiana would be able to expedite his study somewhat, because 4 o'clock would be a little late for Friday afternoon. However, after a quorum call, I shall delay consideration of the resolution as much as possible, in order to meet the convenience of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have also conferred with the minority leadership and with Senators on both sides of the aisle regarding the situation with respect to the Executive Calendar. Some nominations have been on it for several days. I had hoped we might call the Executive Calendar tomorrow, also. It has been the general policy to postpone calling the Executive Calendar for a sufficient length of time to enable Members to have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the nominations and also with whatever other information relative thereto they might desire to have.

Request has been made that Members be given a little additional time. So it will be my intention—and I have discussed the matter with the minority leadership and also with Senators on this side of the aisle—to have the Senate take up the nominations on Tuesday and, I hope, early on Tuesday, at which time it is expected that an executive session will be held for the purpose of considering executive nominations.

Some other measures may be scheduled for consideration. When the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration enters the Chamber, there are three resolutions which I should like to request to have taken up. I have already discussed them with the minority leadership, and I feel certain there will be no objection to them. They are Senate Resolution 203, Calendar 883; Senate Resolution 204, Calendar 884; and Senate Resolution 205, Calendar 885. Each one of them deals with a gratuity to a widow, I believe. So we shall wish to have those resolutions considered during today, as soon as the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration enters the Chamber.

I desired to make this information available to the Senate, so that Senators would be acquainted several days in advance with our program.

Mr. President, I ask that the usual routine business be now transacted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 289)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 490, TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "COAST GUARD"

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting proposed amendments to the Communications Act of 1934 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the United American Veterans, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of legislation to establish a Gaming Corporation of America empowered to operate lotteries and numbers gaming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AGAINST PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION DEPRIVING STATES OF THE POWER TO REGULATE THE DISCONTINUANCE OF RAILROAD SERVICES IN INTRASTATE COMMERCE

"Whereas there is pending in the Senate of the United States, Senate bill No. 281, which is a bill to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to prescribe the discontinuance of railroad services in intrastate commerce; and

"Whereas local regulatory authorities are in a far better position to determine matters

of this nature, insofar as the welfare of the public is concerned; and

"Whereas Senate bill No. 281 constitutes a dangerous threat to the welfare of the citizens of all the States and represents a dangerous and indefensible extension of Federal powers to matters, jurisdiction over which should remain in the local areas involved: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States against the passage of Senate bill No. 281 and all similar legislation which would deprive State regulatory bodies of the power to prescribe the discontinuance of railroad services in intrastate commerce; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of state to the presiding office of each branch of the Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 197. Resolution extending the time for a study and investigation of postal operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 890).

DISCHARGE OF INDEBTEDNESS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I submit a report (No. 889) thereon. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

The Chair expresses the hope to the majority leader that the bill may be considered tomorrow.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2852. A bill to provide for the appointment of qualified male persons as nurses in the United States Army Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRICKER (by request):

S. 2853. A bill to amend the Communications Act in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2854. A bill to improve the civil-service system by providing for the retention and reassignment of career employees subject to reduction-in-force actions; to reduce the overall replacement costs of recruitment, examination, investigations, and training that result from excessive and unnecessary turnovers; and to provide a plan that will permit better utilization of career employees in the interest of national economy and general efficiency; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIEL:

S. 2855. A bill to provide for exemption from land limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws as applied to projects situated in an area of an existing agricultural economy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 2326) to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. BRICKER, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2776) authorizing the Shilshole Bay breakwater project, Seattle, Wash., and it was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS BEFORE SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE HIGHWAY STUDY COMMITTEE, ARIZONA STATE LEGISLATURE, RELATING TO FEDERAY EXCISE TAX ON GASOLINE (S. DOC. NO. 90)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in the course of his recent address on the state of the Union before a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives, President Eisenhower said:

> To protect the vital interest of every citizen in a safe and adequate highway system, the Federal Government is continuing its central role in the Federal aid highway program. So that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half-cent decrease which otherwise will become effective April 1, and will maintain revenues so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken.

I had occasion to express my views with respect to the Federal excise tax on gasoline before a special committee of the Arizona State Legislature and now ask unanimous consent that the statements made at that time be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HEARINGS ON BILLS DEALING WITH COMMUNIST PENETRATION OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, as chairman of a task force of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that over the course of the last several weeks the task force has been engaged in an intensive investigation of the facts pertaining to Communist penetration of labor organizations. Virtually all of our investigatory work has been in executive session, and we propose to continue this work. It is contemplated that in due time some, if not all, of the material which we have been accumulating will be made public.

In the meantime, I announce that public hearings on the several bills which are pending before the task force, and which are designed to cope with the problem with its many ramifications, will begin on Wednesday, February 17, at 10 a. m., and will run, intermittently, for 2 or 3 weeks thereafter.

The bills which are currently pending before the task force include S. 1606, introduced by myself; S. 1254, introduced by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]; and S. 23, introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. The task force consists, in addition to myself as chairman, of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

All persons who desire to testify are requested to communicate with the counsel to the task force, Mr. Richard Arens, room 449–B, Senate Office Building, as soon as practicable, so that a schedule of witnesses may be prepared.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

John A. Peterson, and 264 other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Glen A. Lloyd, of Illinois, to be Deputy to the Director, Foreign Operations Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF GLEN A. LLOYD, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE DEPUTY TO THE DIRECTOR, FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there was received by the Senate today the nomination of Glen A. Lloyd, of Illinois, to be Deputy to the Director, Foreign Operations Administration. Notice is given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION COTTON OPERATIONS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, day before yesterday, before the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Postmaster General testified, in answer to questions by members of the Subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, that the Post Office Department had run up a deficit of $3,800,000,000 over a period of years, as was

stated on this floor by other Senators. This deficit is chiefly occasioned by second- and third-class mail, some $2,300,000,000 being lost by carrying second-class mail, and some $1,300,000,000 being lost by carrying third-class mail.

I have no thoughts as to what to recommend with respect to these losses, as I am not a member of the Post Office Committee. I wish only to bring out the fact that the losses represent subsidies paid by the taxpayers. Yet some of the metropolitan press, and some of the same magazines, use their subsidized newspapers and periodicals to condemn the farmer.

I desire at this time to have placed in the RECORD a table showing that, so far as cotton is concerned, from 1934 through 1953 the United States Government made $214,356,000 in CCC profits. With pool profits, in the overall cotton program under the 90-percent parity, the United States Government made $299,011,000. The total subsidies paid to cotton were only $61,000,000, covering cash payments and allowances under export programs.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ON COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION COTTON OPERATIONS

1. Crop years from which CCC cotton operations (including pools) realized over $4.5 million profits. (Administrative and interest charges have not been deducted.)

[Thousands of dollars]

Crop year	CCC profits	Pool profits	Total
1934	$46,640	----------	$46,640
1937	146,885	----------	146,885
1941	2,308	$3,113	5,421
1942	19,514	1,919	21,433
1943	6,722	6,184	12,906
1944	735	3,838	4,573
1948	29,992	67,254	97,241
Total profit from 1933 to date	214,356	84,655	299,011

NOTE.—CCC export subsidy cash payments and allowances have been deducted in the above figures.

2. CCC and pool profits realized from cotton (fiscal-year basis).

[Thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year	CCC profits	Pool profits	Total
1933 through 1941	[1] $27,402	[3] $772	[1] $27,402
1942	63,335		63,335
1943	25,526		[2] 26,298
1944	27,374		27,374
1945	19,990	0	19,990
1946	47,355	12,046	59,401
1947	27,372	3,531	30,903
1948	[1] 319	0	[1] 319
1949	[1] 1,024	246	[1] 778
1950	3,420	2	3,422
1951	$28,938	$67,357	$96,295
1952	149	697	846
1953	[1] 382	4	[1] 378
1954	24	----------	24
Total profits 1933 through November 1953	214,356	84,655	299,011

[1] Indicates loss.
[2] 1939 through 1944.
[3] The total $772,000 pool profits realized in fiscal 1939 through 1944 are included in this figures for totaling purposes.

NOTE.—CCC export subsidy cash payments and allowances have been deducted in the above figures.

3. Number of cotton bales sold by CCC during each marketing year and stock left on hand at year end—July 31.

[Thousand bales]

Marketing year starting	Sales	On hand end of marketing year
1934-38	----------	----------
1939	278	6,643
1940	517	6,126
1941	2,479	3,681
1942	786	2,895
1943	660	2,569
1944	1,626	4,690
1945	5,490	577
1946	535	44
1947	39	8
1948	36	----------
1949	640	3,137
1950	3,145	76
1951	73	6
1952	6	235
1953	----------	----------

4. CCC has no way of knowing what portion of the cotton sold by the Corporation is exported. However, export subsidy programs were carried on under CCC operations in 1942, and 1945 through 1947 marketing years. These payments and allowances were as follows:

CCC Export Subsidy Programs

[Thousands]

Marketing year starting—	Cash payments to exporters by CCC (see note)		Export differential allowed by CCC		Total	
	Bales	Dollars	Bales	Dollars	Bales	Dollars
1941	------	------	407	7,123	407	7,123
1945	1	29	146	2,922	147	2,951
1946	353	7,069	1,236	24,729	1,589	31,798
1947	272	5,430	687	13,735	959	19,165
1948 net adjustment	------	------	------	−26	------	−26
	------	12,528	------	48,483	------	61,011

NOTE.—Cash payments to exporters are classified by the Agriculture Department under the commodity export program rather than under the price-support program.

5. In addition to the above export subsidy programs, CCC purchased cotton, principally in the 1941 through 1944 marketing years, to close out existing pools which was allocated for later foreign shipment. CCC realized $29,857,000 profit on the sale of this cotton. This profit is included in the total CCC profit figure of $214,256,000 shown above.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I bring up this subject merely because of the abuse practiced by some of the metropolitan newspapers and magazines in an effort to discredit the 90 percent parity, in which I believe. I am glad to report to the taxpayers that, so far as cotton is concerned, they have earned $300 million. I wish to call this fact to the attention of the taxpayers. The people forget too soon.

In 1945 there was a sale of 5½ million bales of cotton by the Government. Shortly after that the Department of Agriculture had to stop the exportation of cotton by order. Because of the stopping of the exportation of cotton, cotton mills which would have closed and which are among the largest taxpayers in the country, both in the State of the distinguished President pro tempore [Mr. BRIDGES] and in the South, were able to continue operations. At the same time, Mr. President, as the President pro tempore well knows and as mill interests in New England and the South well know, the price of cotton went to 75 cents a pound in South America and in Mexico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may continue.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wished to bring out the facts that the consumer was the great beneficiary, because had American cotton gone to 70 cents, which it would have done had it not been for the Government stocks which were sold at prices between 35 and 45 cents, mills in New England and the South would have had to pay 70 cents, and the price of dresses would have materially increased. The price of overalls to the working people would have gone sky high.

Through the Commodity Credit Corporation and through the 90 percent loan, the taxpayers have saved $300 million. The consumers have saved untold amounts of money in the purchase prices of dresses, overalls, and other products, and the newspapers have been subsidized by means of profits made from the farmer.

Mr. President, what I have tried to show by these figures is that the Commodity Credit Corporation cotton operations have netted the taxpayers nearly $300 million profits of which $85 million went to the cotton producer as his share of the profits from the sale of pooled cotton and $214 million representing a benefit to the taxpayers generally.

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH KOREA—TELEGRAM FROM SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation is following with deep interest the Big Four Foreign Ministers Conference now being held in the city of Berlin.

Our hopes and prayers are with our great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, in his splendid efforts to make of this conference a constructive milestone on man's path toward a just and enduring peace.

The Nation read with gratification of the strong position taken by our Secretary of State in combating the Soviet effort to misuse the Berlin conference as a means of wedging Red China into a completely undeserved position in the community of nations, through a proposed Big Five Conference.

We subscribe wholeheartedly to the insistence by our Secretary of State that the Russians get down to the specific business at hand, namely, the conclusion of genuine arrangements for a free, united, democratic Germany and a free, united, democratic Austria.

Mr. President, yesterday afternoon I was profoundly gratified to receive a telegram from our Secretary of State commending the Senate's action in approving the Mutual Defense Treaty

with the Republic of Korea. I should like to read the message now:

JANUARY 27, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY:

The news this morning of the prompt and decisive action by the Senate on ROK Mutual Defense Treaty was good indeed. My congratulations to you and to the Foreign Relations Committee for such prompt and decisive action. It is good moral tonic for us here in Berlin.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

The telegram congratulated the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. But I was simply the instrument of my committee in reporting the treaty.

I know that the Secretary would want me, in turn, to extend his congratulations to the Members of the Senate as a whole, who so overwhelmingly and speedily approved this sound treaty.

Lastly, I may say that I think it is a remarkable commentary on the ability and thoughtfulness of the Secretary of State himself that he should have taken time out from his busy labors in Berlin to have sent this gracious message to us here in Washington.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a letter which I received from Mr. Herbert J. Hansell, of Cleveland, Ohio. The letter encloses a communication addressed to the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] expressing opposition to the Bricker amendment and signed by 50 attorneys in the Cleveland area.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Hansell and the one addressed to the junior Senator from Ohio be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *January 23, 1954.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am writing to express my wholehearted support for your efforts to defeat the Bricker amendment. The Nation has good reason to be extremely grateful for your wisdom and courage on this issue, and if Senate Joint Resolution 1 is defeated we shall all be indebted to you and to your colleagues who have joined you on this issue.

I am a lawyer and wish to advise you of my personal belief that a great many lawyers are opposed to the Bricker amendment. As one indication of this, I am enclosing a copy of a letter sent today to Senator BURKE by a member of one of Cleveland's leading law firms, to which is attached a list of 50 other lawyers in other leading law offices in Cleveland who are in substantial agreement with the enclosed letter.

With very best wishes for success in your actions against the Bricker amendment.

Respectfully yours,

HERBERT J. HANSELL.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *January 23, 1954.*

The Honorable THOMAS A. BURKE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BURKE: According to newspaper reports, the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) will be called up for debate on the Senate floor in the very near future.

The changes in our present constitutional framework for conduct of foreign policy which would be made by sections 2 and 3 of the Bricker amendment seem unwise to many lawyers. The need has not yet been shown for amending the Constitution to deprive the Federal Government of power to affect local matters where necessary to fulfill our treaty obligations. Occasional abuse of the President's power to make executive agreements does not justify subjecting this power to congressional regulation.

In the belief that many lawyers are opposed to the Bricker amendment in its present form, I have shown this letter to lawyers in several Cleveland law offices, and the names of those who have seen the text of this letter and have signified substantial agreement with it are listed on the attached sheet.

Sincerely yours,

CARTER KISSELL.

LIST OF LAWYERS

Richard B. Ainsworth, Fred J. Ball, Charles E. Bodurtha, Howard F. Burns, Crede C. Calhoun, Hugh Calkins, Norman W. Colquhoun, John J. Conway, Victor DeMarco, John C. Dieffenderfer, Jr., Arthur L. Dougan, Raymond J. Durn, Bruce W. Eaken, John V. Fels, Sam S. Fitzsimmons, Eugene H. Freedheim, Alan S. Geismer, William D. Ginn, Eli Goldston, Albert P. Hadley, Edgar A. Hahn, Herbert J. Hansell, Thomas M. Harman, Henry C. Harvey, James C. Havighurst, Frank C. Heath, Allen C. Holmes, Brooks M. Jones, William C. Keough, Walter C. Kelley, Jr., Henry Kutash, Charles D. Leist, William A. Lowry, James T. Lynn, Bayless A. Manning, Ivan L. Miller, Thomas P. Mulligan, William B. Norris, John S. Pyke, John W. Reavis, Nelson P. Rose, Robert W. Stevens, Richard H. Stewart, Edgar P. Stocker, Seth C. Taft, William J. Vesely, Forrest B. Weinberg, Donald D. Wick, George B. Young.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Tuesday evening a talk prepared by Mr. Edward S. Corwin for delivery before the Foundation for Study of Treaty Law was read to that group by Mr. Robert Eichholz. Mr. Corwin is the man on whom the Congress has relied for a number of years to prepare its annotation of the United States Constitution.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to one statement made by Mr. Corwin which I think deserves our most careful attention. Permit me to read this paragraph:

The question occurs, furthermore, why should the Senate consider itself especially competent to formulate a revolutionary amendment to the Constitution—one which would take us back to the Articles of Confederation—if it cannot trust itself to handle even treaties with good sense and discretion? Senate Joint Resolution 1 impeaches the intelligence and integrity of the Senate itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Corwin's statement be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WILL TO BELIEVE AND SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

(By Edward S. Corwin)

Disraeli remarked of Gladstone that he could "convince most people of most things and himself of anything." This talent in the art of self-persuasion—"will to believe," William James called it—is frequently encountered; but I doubt if it has often been displayed on a grander scale than it has recently by the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 1—the so-called Bricker amendment.

This characteristic appears at the very outset of the resolution, section 1 of which provides that "A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect." The supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 1 have evidently persuaded themselves that such a provision may today be of force and effect.

No idea could be more completely erroneous. No treaty provision of the United States has ever been held to be unconstitutional, but this is not because the Court refused judicial review. It is because the constitutional objections urged were found to be baseless. In point of fact, section 25 of the great Judiciary Act of 1789 provided for cases "where is drawn in question the validity of a treaty or statute of, or an authority exercised under the United States." Thus, it was recognized from the outset that the constitutional validity of treaties would be a judicial question, no less than that of statutes.

The most frequent challenge to the constitutionality of treaties has been based on the 10th amendment, and it has never prevailed.

The principle illustrated by the Court's holdings in this category of cases was early illustrated by Madison, in the following words:

"Interference with the powers of the States was no constitutional criterion of the power of Congress. If the power was not given Congress could not exercise it; if given, they might exercise it, although it should interfere with the laws or even the constitutions of the States." (2 Annals of Congress, 1891.)

Why should not the same rule apply to treaties?

At this point the Brickerites take an appeal from "the Father of the Constitution" to Jefferson, who had no part in making it, and who, in fact, expressed the opinion at the time that the Federal Convention would have done better to add "three or four" amendments to the Articles of Confederation and then have gone home. They appeal, I say, to Jefferson, who said in his Manual that "It (the Constitution) must have meant to except out of these (the objects usually regulated by treaties) the rights reserved to the States: for surely the President and Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole Government is interdicted from doing in any way." But just what is it that 'the whole Government is interdicted from doing in any way'? Presumably, Jefferson had in mind the 10th amendment and which reads as follows: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people." But, the power to make treaties is delegated to the United States; no power is delegated to the United States in more explicit terms. And by the supremacy clause all treaties "made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Jefferson did not stop with "excepting out" the powers of the States from the treatymaking power; but continued as fol-

lows: "And also to except those subjects of legislation in which it gave a particpation to the House of Representatives. The last is denied by some, on the ground that it would leave very litle matter for the treaty power to work on. The less the better, say others." (Manual, p. 110 (1876 ed.).)

The careless ease with which Jefferson thus eliminated the treatymaking power is characteristic of the Jefferson who, pen in hand, delighted to let himself go. But he could talk sense too, and did, when as Secretary of State he advised Washington that "the transaction of business with foreign nations is executive altogether." Here spoke the voice of experience. Others also have corrected earlier errors after becoming Secretaries of State.

The proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 assert, however, that their crusade is based also on concern for the safety of the constitutional rights of the individual. Actually, I have found one sole case, *In re Ross* (140 U. S. 453 (1891)), in which it was suggested by an individual that his constitutional rights had been impaired by a treaty and legislation passed to make it effective. Said Ross enjoyed a life tenancy, at the expense of the United States, in the penitentiary at Albany, N. Y., for a murder of which he had been convicted 10 years previously in the American consular court in Japan in accordance with a treaty with that nation (1857) and supplementary legislation by Congress (Rev. Stat., secs. 4083–4096). His rather belated complaint was that the proceedings against him had been unconstitutional inasmuch as he had not been indicted by a grand jury. A unanimous court, speaking through Justice Field, dismissed Ross' appeal, saying that the Constitution could have no operation in another country.

Furthermore, there are repeated dicta in which the Supreme Court has asserted that the treatymaking power is subject to constitutional limitations. The classic statement of the Supreme Court's position in this regard is that of Mr. Justice Field in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258, 267 (1890)):

"It would not be contended that it (the treaty power) extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent."

Like statements have been made in numerous other cases. See *Doe* v. *Braden* (16 How. 635, 657 (1853)); *The Cherokee Tobacco* (11 Wall. 616, 620–621 (1870)); *United States* v. *Minnesota* (270 U. S. 181, 207–208 (1926)); *Brown* v. *Duchesne* (19 How. 183, 197 (1856)); *Prevost* v. *Greneaux* (19 How. 1, 7 (1856)).

In *Missouri* v. *Holland*, to be sure, in which the Court sustained a treaty and implementing legislation by Congress for the protection of game birds flying seasonally between the United States and Canada—and which seems to be the chosen whipping boy of the Brickerites—Justice Holmes, while rejecting, necessarily, Missouri's invocation of the 10th amendment, pointed out that the treaty in question did "not contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution." Later on, in the same opinion, he observed that "a national interest of nearly first magnitude" was involved, one which could "be protected only by national action in concert with that of another power"—words which describe the treatymaking power compendiously and accurately (252 U. S. 416 at 433, 435 (1920)).

And so much for section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 1. Section 2 is a much more formidable proposition. It would strip treaties of their quality as internal law, except as they are made so by implementing legislation; and then it confines, by the notorious "which clause", Congress' power to pass such legislation to its specifically delegated powers—which powers their mentor Jefferson excepted from the treatymaking field.

The principal justification offered for this revolutionary proposal is that it is required to protect States rights, and in this connection the decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland* is played up no end. The answer is twofold. First, it was precisely the purpose of the supremacy clause to subordinate State power to the delegated national power including the treatymaking power; secondly, *Missouri* v. *Holland* asserts no novel doctrine. In the course of the 19th century the National Government entered into many treaties extending to the nationals of other governments the right to inherit, hold, and dispose of real property in the States, although the tenure of such property and its mode of disposition were conceded to be otherwise within the exclusive jurisdiction of the States. (See *McCormick* v. *Sullivant* (10 Wheat. 192, 202 (1825)); *United States* v. *Fox* (94 U. S. 315, 320 (1876)); cf. *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. 483 (1879)).) *Missouri* v. *Holland* simply follows these precedents.

In other words, it is proposed to strip the treatymaking power of the right to enter effectively into conventions of a kind which have heretofore furnished the ordinary grist of the treatymaking process in times of peace, conventions extending to the nationals of other countries the right to engage in certain business operations in the States, to hold property there and to enjoy access to the courts thereof on terms of equality with American citizens, and so on, all in return for like concessions to our nationals residing abroad—the very kind of rights which are extended by no fewer than eight treaties which were approved by the Senate on July 21 last. Curiously enough the Senate vote approving these treaties was 86 to 5, and of the 86 no fewer than 55 had, at one time, signed up with Mr. BRICKER in support of his original proposal, which, however, did not contain the "which clause."

But, in fact, section 2, thanks to the same "which clause", bites much more deeply. For it aims to repeal the necessary and proper clause as an adjunct of the treatymaking power. Thus that whole area of power which today rests in the cases on the mutual support which the treatymaking power and the power of Congress under the necessary and proper clause lend one another is to be expunged from the map of national power; and the right of Congress to accord judicial powers to foreign consuls in the United States would become at least doubtful; so also would its right to accord judicial powers upon American consuls abroad (see in re *Ross*, cited above); its right to provide for the extradition of fugitives from justice (18 U. S. C. A. secs. 3181–3195; *Neely* v. *Henkel* (180 U. S. 109, 121, (1901))); and its right to penalize acts of violence against aliens (*Baldwin* v. *Franks* (120 U. S. 678, 683 (1887))). Nor is this to mention the many novel questions raised today by the problem of atomic security.

By the same token the treatymaking power would be demoted from the rank of a substantive power of the United States to that of mere auxiliary power of the other delegated powers.

To be sure, the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 1 assert that many, if indeed not all, of the gaps which would be created by the "which clause" can be filled from Congress' powers over commerce, its war power, its power to provide for common defense, and so forth. The question arises: If this is so, what is the fuss all about? Actually the contention cannot be substantiated as to several provisions of the above-mentioned eight treaties of commerce and friendship to which the Senate consented last July 21. It cannot, in fact, be substantiated as to one of the most ordinary species of treaties, extradition treaties, to wit.

But the defenders of Senate Joint Resolution 1 are apt at this point to bring forward a technical distinction between the constitutional and international obligation of treaties, and we are told that actually Senate Joint Resolution 1 would in no wise limit our power to enter into treaties having international obligation. In short, we are told that, having added Senate Joint Resolution 1 to the Constitution, we can then go gaily ahead and contract obligations which we have neither the power, nor the intention, of discharging unless, of course, the 48 State legislatures, the majority of which meet only every 2 years, can be relied upon to supply the necessary implementing legislation.

Lastly, section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would give Congress the power to regulate executive agreements. The potentialities of this utterly unguarded proposal are impossible to fathom. The argument in support of it on the part of the self-persuaders comprises a single word, "Yalta." President Roosevelt's concessions to Russia in order to bring her into the far eastern war may have been unwise, even absurd. But both Yalta and Potsdam were wartime agreements and stemmed directly from the President's powers as Commander in Chief, which Mr. BRICKER assured us over the radio only a few days ago his proposal does not touch.

And over against Yalta and Potsdam should be set some achievements of the executive agreement. Thus, as General Clay has testified, the Berlin airlift was brought about by executive agreements with our West European friends. And more than half a century ago President McKinley, by entering into executive agreements with Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy, under which we supplied 5,000 troops and a naval squadron to a joint force of these powers, helped to prevent our legation staff in Peking from being slaughtered by the Boxers and having their heads stuck up on pikes to decorate ancient walls.

What would Congress have done in either of these situations? Doubtless the self-persuaders would answer, in Mr. BRICKER'S words, that section 3 does not touch the President's powers as Commander in Chief to enter into executive agreements. Unfortunately, section 3 itself contains no such assurance. In fact, however, it specifically gives Congress power to regulate all executive agreements.

In Jefferson's words, quoted above, "the transaction of business with foreign nations is executive altogether," and in Federalist No. 64 Jay points out why this is so. The President can act with secrecy, celerity, and on the basis of the widest information obtainable, besides which he is always in session, whereas Congress frequently is not. And of the President's initiative in the conduct of foreign relations the executive agreement is an indispensable instrument. This has been shown repeatedly in our past experience, and certainly world conditions today do not make it less essential.

To sum up—for the most part the dangers which Senate Joint Resolution 1 is aimed to meet are either nonexistent or unavoidable in the present state of the world, and are guarded against by the Constitution as it stands today so far as is practicable to human foresight. I do not admit to the Brickerites having clairvoyant powers though they seem even to have persuaded themselves of that attainment. The two-thirds rule under which the Senate operates in giving its consent to treaties was adopted precisely because of the recognition of the framers that the treaty-making power would often penetrate deeply into the State legislative field. The question occurs, furthermore, why should the Senate consider itself especially competent to formulate a revolutionary amendment to the Constitution—one which

would take us back to the Articles of Confederation—if it cannot trust itself to handle even treaties with good sense and discretion? Senate Joint Resolution 1 impeaches the intelligence and integrity of the Senate itself.

Furthermore, behind the Senate stands a second line of defense against bad and foolish treaties, namely, Congress, which in the words of the Court, can at any time, "so far as the people and authorities of the United States are concerned * * * abrogate a treaty made between this country and another country which had been negotiated by the President and approved by the Senate" (175 U. S. 423, 460 (1899)). No proposition in American constitutional law is better established. (See also *Head Money Cases* (112 U. S. 580, 598–599 (1884)); *The Cherokee Tobacco* (11 Wall. 616 (1870)); *Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States* (149 U. S. 698, 721 (1893)).) What more can we reasonably ask?

A concluding reference to the "will to believe"—in reporting out Senate Joint Resolution 1, the majority of the Senate Judiciary Committee asserted:

"The committee is informed that over 200 treaties are in various stages of preparation in the United Nations or its affiliated agencies" (report, p. 5).

The source of this ominous item was apparently Mr. Frank Holman, of Seattle, pioneer concocter of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

"It is odd," comments Edward A. Conway in his excellent article in America, entitled "Darling Daughter Amendment," "that no one has ever challenged the accuracy of his figures. I have it on the authority of the United Nations general legal division that the number of conventions under consideration by the United Nations and its specialized agencies amounts to about a dozen drafts. Twelve is a far cry from 200."

But I don't think it was odd at all; in fact, it is just what one should expect of the "will to believe."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously brought to the attention of my colleagues many expressions from the grassroots of Wisconsin opposing the Bricker amendment. I have welcomed these manifestations from thinking Americans all over the land.

I have pointed out that it is a fact that I have received numerous communications and petitions from those who have an opposite opinion on this subject—those who happen to favor the amendment.

These individuals, of course, have a perfect right to express their views and to send petitions to their representatives in Congress.

I have carefully considered the reasons which the proponents have presented to me, and I have found those reasons invalid.

MY DUTY—TO WEIGH THE FACTS

As a United States Senator in a constitutional republic, I have the duty to weigh the facts in the case, to weigh the judgment as expressed to me on both sides of the issue, and then to come to a conclusion. That conclusion is based on what I feel to be the best interests of the people of my State and Nation.

MORE AND MORE HIDDEN DANGERS COME TO LIGHT

Acting on that basis, I have come to the conclusion that the Bricker amendment is unsound and that it must be defeated.

No argument which has been presented to me since the start of this debate has justified a change in that position.

Indeed, as more and more of the hidden implications of the Bricker amendment come to light, I am more firmly convinced than ever that its decisive defeat is necessary in the best interest of our country—and of future generations.

TOO MANY ALTERNATIVES UP FOR CONSIDERATION

I point out, moreover, that all of the various alternatives to the amendment raise serious constitutional questions in turn.

The situation seems fast approaching where the 96 Members of the Senate will be considering 96 different alternatives to the Bricker amendment.

While I feel that the earnest efforts of my colleagues in trying to arrive at compromise language is to be commended, still I point out the dangers of the effort. I do not believe that out of all of the confusion of rival versions, out of the confusion of brandnew language being drafted in a matter of hours and days without adequate consideration—out of such a maelstrom—can come a constitutional amendment which the Senate would want to submit to the House and to the people of the 48 States.

To rush prematurely into amending the Constitution on the basis of suddenly drafted versions is to run the gravest of risks.

WHY NOT MERELY RESTATE CONSTITUTIONAL SUPREMACY?

The plain fact of the matter is that our entire purpose could be served by simply passing a joint resolution to the effect "A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect."

Such a joint resolution should calm any fears. It would merely restate existing constitutional law.

It would restate a fact which has prevailed since the founding of this Republic.

No treaty has ever contravened the Constitution. No treaty could conflict with the Constitution. No treaty will conflict with the Constitution.

No one would be opposed to a statement that these three facts must always be the case.

No new amendment is necessary to avoid new Yaltas or Potsdams. We have ample safeguards now—if we will but use them.

At the present time, I have assembled a series of messages from the people of my State expressing their continued firm opposition to the Bricker amendment.

I particularly call attention to the very first letter which points out that some organizations which are nominally listed as allegedly favoring the Bricker amendment did not, apparently, consult with their own membership at the grassroots before announcing their supposed stand.

I send these messages to the desk now and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANESVILLE, WIS., *January 25, 1954.*

Hon. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator from Wisconsin,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have received the information sent by you on the Bricker amendment and for which I thank you.

It is ironical that in the same mail delivery I received an appeal from Women for the Bricker Amendment with a copy of Frank E. Holman's Primer on Treaty Law, etc. This latter was sent to me because I am serving this year as National Americanism chairman of the Marine Corps League Auxiliary, which I notice is listed as one of the important lay organizations agitating for passage of the Bricker amendment.

I would like to point out, Senator WILEY, that I am a member of two of those so-called important lay organizations and to my knowledge the Bricker amendment has never been discussed at meetings. I am informed that the Marine Corps League Auxiliary went on record against the amendment in national convention at Savannah, Ga., in 1951, and at that time there was little information available on the Bricker amendment.

I am also a member of the Navy Club Auxiliary and at no time has any information been given to local auxiliaries on this issue.

The reason I go to this length, Senator, is because I am president of the Janesville League of Women Voters. We have studied the Bricker amendment pro and con, held an open forum with local attorneys taking negative and affirmative positions. After much discussion so that we understood the issues we took a ballot vote and our organization voted 2–1 to go on record in opposition to the amendment.

It is my opinion that most of those organizations who are screaming their support of the Bricker amendment are not the views of their membership, but a few misguided leaders.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend you for your courageous stand on this most important question. Keep up the good work, you have lots of support.

Respectfully,

MRS. PAUL CORBIN.

MILWAUKEE COUNTY SYMPOSIUM ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 23, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Our group discussed the Bricker amendment, after listening to a talk pro and con, and decided, by a large majority, that it is an undesirable piece of legislation and ask you to vote against it.

In a world fast growing smaller, we should not limit our elected head of Government to a position of isolation. Our present Constitution balances the powers of the three bodies of Government and this has operated very satisfactorily.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. R. E. ADAMS,
Secretary.

RACINE, WIS., *January 27, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building:

Unalterably opposed to Bricker amendment. Keep up with your opposition.

Executive Board of American Association of University Women: Miss Eva Hall, Mrs. E. A. Hanson, Mr. J. H. Shirk, Mrs. C. A. Siler, Miss Elizabeth Williams, Mrs. D. Wakefield, Mrs. Alex Dorman, Mrs. Allen Porter, Mrs. David Haddow, Mrs. Gordon Melvin, Mrs. James Colburn, Mrs. Lester Garver, Mrs. R. F. Haumerson, Mrs. Harris Russell, Mrs. Harry Evans, and Mrs. Paul Drummer.

BELOIT, WIS., *January 21, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I appreciate very much your consistent support of the United Nations. My husband and I wish there were more Eisenhower Republicans like yourself.

Although negative, isolationist forces are making a big noise, I am sure the majority of people realize we cannot go it alone, and favor a positive, cooperative approach to world problems.

We support you in your stand opposing the Bricker amendment.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. JERVIS D. SWANNACK.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 22, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As two Wisconsin residents we wish to strongly compliment and encourage you on your fine stand on the Bricker amendment. We strongly urge you to vote against the Bricker amendment and the Knowland substitute. Such legislation would do untold harm to our Constitution and our American traditions.

Again, congratulations on your position. Wisconsin can certainly be proud of you.

Yours very truly,
Mr. and Mrs. ALVIN F. FRIEDMAN.

MILPRINT, INC.,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 22, 1954.
United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This is to advise you that we are absolutely opposed to the Bricker amendment. We do not want to have our President shackled, so if Russia ever dropped a bomb on us here in America the President can act doubly fast without interference.

If any head of any of our large corporations were to be shackled, the same as the Bricker amendment would shackle the President, most of our corporations could not work properly. I hope that you will do everything in your power to kill the Bricker amendment.

With my very warmest personal regards and best wishes, we are

Most sincerely,
WM. HELLER, Sr.,
Chairman of the Board.

RICE LAKE, WIS., *January 25, 1954.*
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Please continue to oppose the Bricker amendment or any modified form of it.

Mr. and Mrs. HOWARD W. CAMERON.

SPRAGUE, BOWMAN ASSOCIATES,
Madison, Wis., January 22, 1954.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Not being a lawyer, I find the proposed Bricker amendment confusing. It may well be that the concurrence of the Senate on treaties needs to be spelled out in greater detail, but the ability of the Executive, in this instance the President, to act in the daily dealings with other nations must not be impaired. To revert to any sort of pre-Constitution Continental Congress is an impossibility. I am afraid far too many people are buying a pig in a poke in their endorsement of this amendment. We live in a fast changing world. No amount of sentimental wishing for the simplicity and problem-free area of pre-1914 will solve anything for we cannot return to the horse and buggy by the voters fiat.

With all good wishes for your continued success as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am,

Very truly yours,
F. F. BOWMAN, Jr.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 23, 1954.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: After studying Senate Joint Resolution 1, I am definitely opposed to it, and I hope you will use your influence against it.

Yours truly,
MRS. VIRGINIA MILLER.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 7, 1954.*
Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin,
Washington, D. C.:

I am opposed to the Bricker amendment and urge you to do everything in your power to oppose and defeat said amendment and prevent its adoption.

MRS. MARION S. GALIN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 20, 1954.*
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY.

DEAR SIR: This is to inform you that I am opposed to the Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Sincerely,
MRS. J. BOEDECKER.

WAUWATOSA, WIS., *January 19, 1954.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am writing to express my opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1 or the Bricker amendment. I feel that it encroaches on the executive powers of the Government and weakens the balance we have always had of the three branches of Government. It ties the hands of the President just when he needs to negotiate. I commend your stand on this bill and on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Yours truly,
MRS. ROBERT BOWEN.

RACINE, WIS., *January 18, 1954.*
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I wish to express my sincere appreciation for your leadership in opposition to the Bricker amendment. Such an amendment would seriously hamper the conduct of our foreign affairs by the Executive in an age when continuing efforts toward international cooperation are so extremely important.

Respectfully,
MRS. ARNOLD GOODMAN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 19, 1954.*
Hon. Senator A. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am against the Bricker amendment and hope you will vote that way. I feel we need to have faith in our President and leaders, and we would not show it by passing Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Thank you.

A. RANFTL.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 20, 1954.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I venture to address you in reference to the Bricker amendment. I feel very strongly that this amendment should be opposed.

Yours truly,
MARGARET WOODS USHER.

WAUSAU, WIS., *January 24, 1954.*
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I just heard on the radio that the Bricker amendment will come up for Senate debate on Tuesday, and I want you to know that I am very much opposed to it, and sincerely hope that you will be successful in your efforts to defeat it.

I appreciate very much the literature you sent me, and which I have read. I have also read the arguments of the proponents of the amendment, and have come to the conclusion that the portions of Senate Joint Resolution 1 which are not actually dangerous are at best unwise and unnecessary.

I am particularly concerned lest this Nation be prevented from taking needed action in international affairs which can no longer be severed from domestic affairs. It seems to me that it would be very probable that under the provisions of section 2, one State could hamstring our foreign policy and jeopardize the welfare of all the rest.

I do think that the Congress has a responsibility to keep careful watch on treaties and executive agreements, and to make wise use of the present checks and safeguards in our present treatymaking system. But I am convinced that the restrictions of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would have damaging effects far beyond the intent of most of its supporters.

Sincerely yours,
VIRGINIA M. WILLIAMS.

JANUARY 22, 1954.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am writing to urge you to stand firm on your opposition to the Bricker amendment in its present form.

I am aware of the well-organized campaign being waged by many in our Republican Party for its support, and of the many petitions being circulated. It is my impression that the Republicans who are opposed to it are not making their views known.

I believe that the second and third sections of the amendment are too restrictive and would hamper our President and Secretary of State immeasurably. Knowing the isolationist background of supporters of this amendment, I cannot dispel the belief that the main objective of this restrictive amendment is aimed at the United Nations.

Therefore, I would like you to know that there are many Republicans who support you on your stand against the Bricker amendment.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. MAURICE EASTIN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 19, 1954.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As one of your constituents I wish to protest against the Bricker amendment. I am sure you, as a supporter of our present foreign policy, will not hamstring the Government and Department of State as well as the President with this vicious amendment.

Very sincerely,
LORNA H. WARFIELD.
(MRS. L. M.)

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 19, 1954.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As I do not know your opinion of the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1), I am writing to express my opposition to it—after careful study of both sides—to me it is a step backward, and I feel you have been looking ahead. I am in support of the administration on this issue.

Cordially,
AGNES J. RINGO.

JANUARY 19, 1954.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I wish to commend you on your admirable fight against the proposed Bricker amendment. There are many in Wisconsin that feel as you do, although

they are not as vocal as the State Republican Party. Keep up the fight.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Howard Dahl.

Milwaukee, Wis., *January 19, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Wiley,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Wiley: I should like to add my voice to the many citizens who oppose the Bricker amendment. We want foreign affairs leadership residing in our Chief Executive.

I hope there are enough voices heard to defeat Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Respectfully,

Barbara G. Spaulding.
(Mrs. James C.)

Milwaukee, Wis., *January 19, 1954.*

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I am unalterably opposed to the Bricker amendment. I believe it is unwise and foolhardy to tie the hands of the President—any President of the United States—in his daily dealings with foreign governments. Decisions on one course of action or another have to be made when an untoward or propitious act occurs and the Executive must be free to decide what, with God's help, is best for the Nation at that particular time. I hope you will vote against this amendment.

Sincerely yours,

May Kreuz
Mrs. Louis G. Kreuz.

Milwaukee, Wis., *January 19, 1954.*

Senator Wiley,

Dear Sir: While the world is in such an unsettled state, it seems to me it would be a tragic mistake to curtail our President's power in regard to treaties with other countries; to be obliged to wait for decisions of Congress before anything could be done.

Therefore I register my opposition to the Bricker amendment.

Sincerely,

Julia S. Ross.

Green Bay, Wis., *January 20, 1954.*

Senator Alexander Wiley,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Keep up the fight for the St. Lawrence Waterway, and please continue to vote against the Bricker amendment as it stands.

Sincerely,

Mrs. L. H. Wagner.

Wauwatosa, Wis., *January 23, 1954.*

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: It is my considered opinion that the proposed Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) is unnecessary and might actually prove dangerous to the future security of our country.

As you are well aware, this proposed amendment would destroy the balance of power between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

It would prevent swift action by the President in his dealings with foreign powers. A time might arise when such a curb might be fatal to the safety of this Nation.

It would apparently hamper our work in the United Nations.

Furthermore, there appears to be a considerable difference of opinion between the experts as to what the complete and ultimate effect of this proposed amendment would be, if adopted, as evidenced by conflicting statements by various lawyers, various bar associations, and various members of our political parties. We know what we have now in our Constitution. This troublous period seems scarcely the time to attempt a change the effect of which is so controversial.

I, therefore, urge your opposition to the Bricker amendment. If there must be a face-saving compromise, the Knowland amendment would appear to provide all the safeguards necessary to the Constitution.

Very truly yours,

Evelyn Bloye
Mrs. Norman C. Bloye.

Milwaukee, Wis., *January 23, 1954.*

Senator Alexander Wiley,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: After studying the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1), with several groups, I find it to be a very undesirable piece of legislation and think it should be voted against being made into law.

The three bodies of the Government must remain as provided for in the Constitution to keep a proper balance.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. R. E. Adams.

Milwaukee, Wis., *January 24, 1954.*

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Wiley: I write to commend you for your leadership in opposing Senate Joint Resolution 1—the so-called Bricker amendment.

Cordially yours,

Ernest T. Clough.

La Crosse Wis., *January 22, 1954.*

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Wiley: I think a constitutional amendment such as the Bricker amendment would be a disastrous mistake for our country, and I sincerely hope that you will do all in your power to prevent the passage of such a measure.

It would appear that substantial numbers of the American public have been purposely misled into believing that a danger exists to their constitutionally granted rights through the membership of the United States in the United Nations, and that, plus the fear hysteria of secret executive agreements, has led them to consider a plan which well might hamper the functioning of our Government in the future.

Very sincerely yours,

Harriet Leinfelder
Mrs. Flavian Leinfelder.

Milwaukee, Wis., *January 21, 1954.*

Dear Senator Wiley: I wish to state my opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1, the Bricker amendment. After careful study of the pros and cons of this proposal I feel that it would be unwise to tie the hands of our President in this way, and to slow down our ability to make agreements with foreign powers.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Robert J. Houlchen.

January 23, 1954.

Dear Senator Wiley: If protests from concerned citizens mean anything, I should like to add my support to your position against the Bricker amendment.

It seems unbelievable that at this precarious time in our world's history that a Member of Congress should want to do anything that might be detrimental to our relationship with other nations, to say nothing of the disrupting of our own country.

Please know that there are many who do oppose such seeming stupidity, whether we be Republicans or Democrats.

Opposed to Bricker amendment.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. E. Allen.

Milwaukee, Wis., *January 26, 1954.*

Senator Alexander Wiley,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your continued opposition to Bricker amendment or any compromise measure limiting constitutional powers of President.

Stella Kenzy, John Bohmrich, Hans Nestlbichler, August Backus, Irma Estes, J. Martin Klotsche, Robert Notestein, Philip Person, Adele Holtz, Samuel Morell.

Marshfield, Wis., *January 22, 1954.*

Dear Senator Wiley: May I express to you my opposition to the Bricker amendment as a bad and dangerous bill to change our Constitution. I presume you will vote against it, as presently written.

Also my congratulations on your stand on the seaway. Your stature as a Senator has risen greatly in the last 3 years in my estimation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Clark Abbott.

Milwaukee, Wis., *January 26, 1954.*

Dear Senator Wiley: I certainly want to tell you how much I appreciate your taking the stand you do against the Bricker amendment.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Miriam Marden.

Wausau, Wis., *January 24, 1954.*

The Honorable Alexander Wiley,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: I wish to commend you for your courageous stand on the Bricker amendment. We can only hope and pray that other Congressmen may be led to see where such an amendment would lead us as a nation. I know that you will continue to work against this piece of legislation.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. M. A. Schilling.

Wausau, Wis., *January 27, 1954.*

Senator Alexander Wiley,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have faith in our present system of checks and balances; strongly oppose Bricker amendment.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles Manson.

Madison, Wis., *January 25, 1954.*

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Wiley: Thank you for valiantly fighting the Bricker amendment. Keep up the good fight until it is won. History will be extremely grateful for your fearless fight against this extraordinarily backward-looking notion. You have the firm support of the people who believe in the Constitution.

Sincerely yours,

Philip J. Staudenraus.

Racine, Wis., *January 26, 1954.*

The Honorable Alexander Wiley,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Wiley: It is with pleasure that I have observed that you are opposed to the Bricker amendment of the United States Constitution. I certainly agree with the editors of the Milwaukee Journal in their opinion that this would be the first amendment which would disturb the checks and balances among the three departments of government that were so carefully worked out by the Founding Fathers. The least we can do is to understand the wisdom of their plan and so not disturb the very foundations of a solid state.

One wonders what the 22,000 POW's would have done if they had to wait for legislative sanction for their release.

Yours very sincerely,

Miss HARRIET A. HARVEY.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 26, 1954.*

Honorable Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It takes great courage to do what you believe to be right in the face of the State of Wisconsin Republican Party opposition.

We are with you in your stand against the Bricker amendment.

We will take our chances on the judgment of our elected President in matters of foreign policy, where time and facility of action can be so important.

Respectfully yours,

HANNAH M. GRINKER,
(Mrs. Sidney).

THE WESLEY FOUNDATION
OF MILWAUKEE,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 24, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We the undersigned, members of the Kenwood branch of Wesley Foundation of Milwaukee, commend you for your leadership against the Bricker amendment.

We feel that present constitutional safeguards are sufficient, and that more congressional control in the negotiation of treaties would hinder our efforts toward peaceful negotiation.

Richard H. Black, Robert Vest, Keith A. Burgess, Shirley Wilson, John M. Lean, Swaraj V. Paujratan, Richard Hinkelman, Robert Houghton, Dean Smith, Ronald Giese, Louise H. Burgess, Jean Hasty, Joe Bender, Lynn E. Giese.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 24, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: After studying carefully all the material I have been able to read pro and con regarding the proposed Bricker amendment to the United States Constitution, I should like to express to you my opposition to this resolution.

I object to it on the grounds that it changes the present constitutional emphasis with regard to the powers of the executive and legislative branches of our Government, and affects the Executive's ability to negotiate international agreements most effectively. It is an attempt by indirection to weaken our position in the United Nations, and to change the powers of the President.

It is my hope that you will continue your opposition to this amendment when it is voted on by the Senate.

Respectfully,

MRS. R. R. TESCHNER.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 24, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I heartily approve your vigorous opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1. I trust you will keep up the fight and I believe you will win. Certainly there are enough intelligent, right-minded men in the Senate to defeat this resolution.

With cordial good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

CARRIE B. EDMONDSON.

HALES CORNERS, WIS., *January 24, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: We whole-heartedly support your stand in opposition to the Bricker amendment. We feel the amendment would restrict the conduct of the foreign affairs and impede the United States in international cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

WINIFRED L. STOELTING.
GUSTAVE J. STOELTING.

RACINE, WIS., *January 24, 1954.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are to be congratulated on your position in regard to the Bricker amendment. I have read all I can on the bill and conclude that it is not only unnecessary but would even be dangerous to the future security of our country by paralyzing the conduct of the United States foreign policy. The Constitution already provides the essential safeguard to the people in requiring treaties to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

It is gratifying to know you will be using your utmost influence to prevent passage of this measure.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN JENSEN
(Mrs. Richard).

WAUWATOSA, WIS., *January 25, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Congratulations on your successful seaway endeavor. Your heart must be rejoicing after so much hard work and excellent leadership.

Many of us here in Wisconsin are deeply troubled at the misinformation and half-truths being circulated by the proponents of the Bricker amendment. The original proposal didn't even contain the "which clause" and Senator BRICKER himself publicly disapproved the thesis of such a clause. The intent of the original proposed amendment was to protect the Constitution—not change it—but a study of the present proposed amendment shows a dangerous, subtle change which, as you point out, would wreck the balance of power between the legislative and executive branches of our Government. Then too, do you think Congress would have time to legislate if it got itself embroiled in regulating executive agreements?

Stand firm—many Wisconsin Republicans are admiring you for your courage and integrity in the face of unwarranted criticism. Keep explaining the issue so that we have full public understanding. Our Constitution shouldn't be amended unless wide public demand calls for such a move. I want my children to grow up in a world of law and order—hopefully expanding to law and order internationally.

Sincerely yours,

GRACE WANGERIN.

MADISON, WIS.

The Honorable Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I want to take this opportunity to commend you for your opposition to the Bricker amendment. I too believe it would be a serious mistake to take such a step. It would seem that the changes in our Nation and the world have confirmed the wisdom of the authors of the Constitution in placing foreign policy exclusively with the National Government and giving the President a leading role.

Sincerely,

CLARA PENNIMAN.

JANUARY 25, 1954.

Senator WILEY:

We want to tell you we think you are doing an excellent job on backing the President against the Bricker amendment. We also think you are doing a fine job on promoting the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

You are our one great Senator from Wisconsin. Our prayers are with you.

Sincerely,

REX and JANE MINCKLER.

MADISON, WIS., *January 24, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: According to the propaganda received from the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., you are listed as uncommitted or opposed to the Bricker amendment. May we congratulate you on your stand against this amendment and urge you to resist all pressure for approval of this dangerous interference with the Executive's freedom in the conduct of foreign affairs.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. and Mrs. HANS J. VAN BAAREN.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the past several days we have witnessed a strange phenomenon. Proponents of the Bricker amendment have been purchasing advertising space in the press blasting what they call the misconceptions and misstatements being made about the Bricker amendment. These advertisements are, in effect, an attack upon the President of the United States. In almost every case the statements which this advertisement brands as untrue are statements made by President Eisenhower.

Mr. President, the President of the United States is well able to defend himself. His position makes it unwise for him to respond to these unworthy attacks upon his motives and his judgment.

In order that the attack upon the President may not go unanswered I feel it is my duty to put the statements of the people who have bought this advertising space before this body and to contrast those statements with the statements of the President of the United States. Proponents of the Bricker amendment have set up the craziest bunch of straw men and scarecrows I have ever seen.

Let us take a look at some of the scarecrows.

First, the advertisement says that it is false to charge that those who oppose the Bricker amendment are seeking "to prevent the United States from speaking with clear authority in conducting its foreign relations." Who says the amendment would interfere with the conduct of foreign relations?

The President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, wrote a letter to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] on January 25 in which the President stated:

> Such an amendment would make it impossible for us to deal effectively with friendly nations for our mutual defense and common interests.

I leave it to my colleagues to say whether the President is right or whether the ad writers are right.

Second, the advertisement says that opponents of the Bricker amendment falsely say the amendment "will handicap the President in his power to make treaties."

What does the President have to say on this matter? He wrote the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] on

January 23 that the Bricker amendment "would so restrict the conduct of foreign affairs that our country could not negotiate the agreements necessary for the handling of our business with the rest of the world. We cannot hope to achieve and maintain peace if we shackle the Federal Government so that it is no longer sovereign in foreign affairs."

Who said this? Not the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], but the President of the United States who has had more experience in negotiating with foreign governments than any Senator on this floor, including the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Third, the advertisement says that the Bricker amendment in giving power to Congress to regulate executive agreements "would hamstring the President in the ordinary conduct of our foreign relations." "This is untrue," says the ad.

Then this strawman is knocked down by saying that the Bricker amendment does not say that Congress shall regulate executive agreements, but that the amendment "merely gives Congress the power to do so."

If Congress is to be given power to regulate executive agreements, but does not intend to regulate them, then why should we amend the Constitution?

Apparently President Eisenhower thinks that if Congress has the power it is likely to exercise it. He said early this week:

I am unalterably opposed to the Bricker amendment.

Next, the advertisement says that it is false to state that the Bricker amendment will "cripple the United States defense program, particularly international control of atomic energy."

Mr. President, President Eisenhower last Monday stated that the Bricker amendment "would impair our hopes and plans for peace and for the successful achievement of the important international matters now under discussion. This would include the diversion of atomic energy from warlike to peaceful purposes."

Who is right? The President or the Brickerites?

THE TIMING OF THE ADVERTISING

President Eisenhower made the statements which I have quoted on last Monday, January 25. The advertisement from which I have been quoting appeared in Washington newspapers on Wednesday, January 27, and on today.

The advertisements impugn the motives and the judgment of President Eisenhower. I cannot let such an unworthy attack on President Eisenhower stand without rebuttal.

I ask my colleagues to take a good close look at those who support the Bricker amendment with so much money and emotion and so little logic. Why do they attack President Eisenhower by indirection?

I have opposed the Bricker amendment on constitutional grounds. I wonder if the time has not come for us to look more closely at those who demand that we take the Constitution apart and redistribute its powers. What do they really want?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO THE PEOPLE MAY KNOW THE MISCONCEPTIONS AND MISSTATEMENTS REGARDING THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

A certain segment of the press and certain columnists and spokesmen have persisted in making incorrect statements regarding the purposes and the effect of the Bricker amendment. All of these erroneous notions were presented during the hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee and found wanting. According to the testimony of experts in constitutional and international law, as made in the record of these hearings, the principal incorrect statements are listed and answered as follows:

1. It has been stated that under the Bricker amendment treaties would need to be ratified by all 48 States. This is untrue.

The majority of the Senate Judiciary Committee has found it to be untrue. A State can't make a treaty.

2. It has been stated that the Bricker amendment will prevent the United States from speaking with clear authority in conducting its foreign relations. This is untrue.

Under the Bricker amendment every treaty ratified by the Senate will, as now, become immediately effective under international law as an international obligation. A treaty affecting internal domestic law, however, would not become effective within the United States unless and until implemented by legislation.

This is exactly the situation in every other important country of the world, including Canada and England. Why do the opponents of the Bricker amendment object to our being put on the same basis as other countries in this regard?

3. It is stated that the Bricker amendment will handicap the President in his power to make treaties. This is untrue.

The President will be left as free as now to negotiate treaties, and the Senate as free to ratify. The Bricker amendment provides only that a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution "shall not be of any force or effect," and that its provisions as to domestic law must be implemented by legislation before becoming law for American citizens binding within each State of the Union.

4. It is stated that the Bricker amendment, in granting power to Congress to regulate executive agreements, would hamstring the President in the ordinary conduct of our foreign relations. This is untrue.

The Bricker amendment does not say that Congress shall regulate executive agreements. It merely gives Congress the power to do so.

5. It has been stated that the Bricker amendment will cripple the United States defense program, particularly international control of atomic energy. This is also untrue.

The Federal Government possesses today, under its war powers and its power to provide for national defense, ample constitutional authority to legislate control of atomic energy. Furthermore, it has done so under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

6. Why all this rumpus about section 2 of the amendment, which provides that a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty?

What makes a statute "valid in the absence of treaty"? Assuredly, its conformity to the Constitution. Why should a statute passed to carry out a treaty be in any different position?

"This amendment will (1) render void any treaty, or provision of a treaty, which conflicts with the Constitution of the United States; (2) require that a treaty shall not become effective as internal law in the United States unless made so by the adoption of legislation implementing the treaty; (3) prevent the Congress of the United States from acquiring legislative power under a treaty which it does not otherwise possess under the Constitution; and (4) subject executive and other agreements to regulation by the Congress and to the limitations imposed on the making of treaties.

"On the other hand, this amendment will not affect the present method of negotiating and ratifying treaties. Treaties will continue to be negotiated by the President and ratified with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. This amendment will not interfere with legitimate activities of the United Nations. The amendment will not prevent the President and the Senate from concluding a treaty otherwise valid under the Constitution on any subject whatsoever, nor will it affect in any manner treaties which do not make internal law in the United States, but it will make impossible the participation of any foreign nation by the treaty method in the prescription of laws for the regulation of the conduct of the citizens of the several States of the United States." (Senate Judiciary Committee report approving the Bricker amendment.)

American citizens everywhere object to the campaign of distortion, exaggeration, and untruth which has been conducted by the opponents of the amendment for the purpose of confusing the issues and misleading the public.

Why is the State Department so opposed to this amendment? Are there treaties or executive agreements affecting internal law within each State of this Union, now in the making, the terms of which the State Department would be afraid to submit for the consideration of both the House and the Senate?

VIGILANT WOMEN FOR THE BRICKER AMENDMENT,
Assembled in National Conference at the Washington Hotel, January 25, 1954.

National coordinators: Mrs. Lewis Barker, Chicago, Ill., and Mrs. Robert A. Murray, Oshkosh, Wis.

State coordinator for California: Mrs. John L. Martin, Pacific Palisades, Calif.

State coordinator for Pennsylvania: Mrs. E. Webster Wanner, Germantown, Pa.

State coordinators for Michigan: Mrs. Raymond Olson, Jackson, Mich.; Mrs. Merrill Starr, Jackson, Mich.

State coordinator for Tennessee: Mrs. Willis Ayres, Memphis, Tenn.

State coordinator for Nebraska: Mrs. Myles Standish, Omaha, Nebr.

State coordinator for Texas: Mrs. Willard Hedrick, Houston, Tex.

State coordinator for West Virginia: Mrs. Tom L. Horn, Charleston, W. Va.

State coordinator for Wyoming: Mrs. Abbott Pond, Basin, Wyo.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which was addressed to me by the President of the United States on January 25, 1954.

Inasmuch as the letter has been mentioned by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, I desire to call particular attention to the second paragraph of the letter in which the President refers to the Bricker amendment as reported by the Senate Judiciary.

In the fourth paragraph the President says:

Adoption of the Bricker amendment—

And I invite particular attention to the following words—

in its present form.

In the final paragraph the President says:

I fully subscribe to the proposition that no treaty or international agreement can contravene the Constitution. I am aware of the feeling of many of our citizens that a treaty may override the Constitution. So that there can be no question on this point, I will gladly support an appropriate amendment that will make this clear for all time.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 25, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In response to your inquiry, I give the following as my attitude toward the proposal for amending the treatymaking functions of the Federal Government.

I am unalterably opposed to the Bricker amendment as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee. It would so restrict the conduct of foreign affairs that our country could not negotiate the agreements necessary for the handling of our business with the rest of the world. Such an amendment would make it impossible for us to deal effectively with friendly nations for our mutual defense and common interests.

These matters are fundamental. We cannot hope to achieve and maintain peace if we shackle the Federal Government so that it is no longer sovereign in foreign affairs. The President must not be deprived of his historic position as the spokesman for the Nation in its relations with other countries.

Adoption of the Bricker amendment in its present form by the Senate would be notice to our friends as well as our enemies abroad that our country intends to withdraw from its leadership in world affairs. The inevitable reaction would be of major proportion. It would impair our hopes and plans for peace and for the successful achievement of the important international matters now under discussion. This would include the diversion of atomic energy from warlike to peaceful purposes.

I fully subscribe to the proposition that no treaty or international agreement can contravene the Constitution. I am aware of the feeling of many of our citizens that a treaty may override the Constitution. So that there can be no question on this point, I will gladly support an appropriate amendment that will make this clear for all time.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE FEDERAL RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on January 20, speaking on behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and myself, I called the attention of the Senate to the case of an employee of the TVA who resigned from the Government service on April 27, 1952. He withdrew all of his contributions to the retirement fund, amounting to $8,911.23. The following day he was employed by the Department of Agriculture, where he worked until June 30, 1952, contributing a total of $63. By so doing he increased his retirement benefits from $1,918.10 to $2,748 per annum for his lifetime, plus an annuity of $1,448 per annum for his wife, if she survives him.

He withdrew $8,911.23, paid back $63, and doubled his benefits by so doing.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point a letter dated January 21, 1954, sent to me by Mr. P. V. Kepner, Deputy Administrator, United States Department of Agriculture, in which Mr. Kepner confirms the fact that the gentleman in question was appointed to a new position in the Department of Agriculture, which was created on the day on which he was appointed to the position, and abolished, because the position had apparently served its purpose, on the day of his retirement.

Mr. Kepner takes 2 pages to explain the situation. I know of no better way to explain it than by paraphrasing a recent statement in which it was wisely said: "These things do not happen; they are planned that way."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
EXTENSION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Further reference is made to your letter of December 16, and our acknowledgment of December 21, regarding the appointment of Mr. ——. We regret that we have not been able to provide you at an earlier date with detailed information regarding this case, because of delays in obtaining information from the Extension Service in Tennessee and the Federal Records Center in St. Louis.

We have been informed by J. H. McLeod, Director of Extension Service in Tennessee, that Mr. —— was employed to assist in working out plans and methods for making a study to evaluate the agricultural development in Henry County. Work on the study is still in progress with the end of the current year scheduled for completion of the project. It appears that Mr. —— was employed in the initial planning stage of the project because of his special knowledge of the agricultural situation in Henry County.

We have received the following comments from Director McLeod on the specific questions raised in your letter:

1. "Mr. —— made no formal application for this job. This appointment was made due to the fact that we were stepping up our economic program in this State and there were certain phases of the work with which Mr. —— was familiar. During his tenure with TVA he worked quite closely with personnel in our Extension Service, and other States within the Tennessee Valley, on the unit test demonstration farm program which was a cooperative arrangement between the TVA and the extension services of the various States. There was certain information we wanted analyzed with which Mr. —— was thoroughly familiar. He was, therefore, employed for this work."

2. "There was no reason for having anyone recommend Mr. —— to us. He was well known to this organization, since he started working with the Extension Service in 1915. He became associated with the TVA, with headquarters in Knoxville, soon after the organization of that agency. As stated above, there was close association between the TVA and the Extension Service from its inception. In fact, there was hardly a day that at least a telephone conversation between Mr. —— and some member of our Agricultural Economics Division did not occur. We employed Mr. —— for this work upon the basis of our acquaintance and knowledge of his qualifications for this particular job which needed to be done."

3. "The position to which Mr. —— was appointed was a new position."

4. "Since the part of the work for which Mr. —— was most needed had been finished, he was released effective July 1, 1952, at which time he went on retirement status, and the study was continued by research and extension workers of the University of Tennessee. Since this was a special assignment, made to fill a specific need, no appointment was made to replace Mr. —— upon his retirement."

Enclosed for your information is an outline for making the proposed Henry County study. You will note that this outline was based upon a discussion led by Mr. —— at Paris, Tenn., on May 8, 1952.

Very truly yours,

P. V. KEPNER,
Deputy Administrator.

ANNA B. MONTGOMERY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent—and I may say that the request has been previously mentioned to the minority leader—that the Senate proceed to the consideration of three resolutions: Calendar No. 883, Senate Resolution 203; Calendar No. 884, Senate Resolution 204; and Calendar No. 885, Senate Resolution 825.

First, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 883, Senate Resolution 203, to pay a gratuity to Anna B. Montgomery.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 203).

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this resolution involves a routine matter coming from the Committee on Rules and Administration. An employee of the Senate, William H. Montgomery, who had been in the service for 56 years, died. Under the rules, theer is a graduated scale in connection with the payment of gratuities. The beneficiary in this case is his widow, Anna B. Montgomery.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 203) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Anna B. Montgomery, widow of William H. Montgomery, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

WINONA BRINGHURST HALL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 204, to pay a gratuity to Winona Bringhurst Hall.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this resolution involves the death of an employee of the Senate who had been employed for more than 18 years, and the beneficiary, his widow, is entitled to 1 year's full pay.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 204) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Winona Bringhurst Hall, widow of Loren B. Hall, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MARY WOODING JAMES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 205, to pay a gratuity to Mary Wooding James.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this resolution involves an employee of the United States Senate, whose widow is entitled to 1 year's full pay.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 205) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Wooding James, widow of Robert W. James, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. BRICKER obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield in order that I may make a statement which will consume about 35 minutes?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for whatever period is necessary for the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to make a statement, without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

PRESENT DANGER TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to talk about a clear and present danger to the Constitution of the United States. This danger stems from the fact that the traditional balance of powers and separation of powers, under the Constitution, have been upset by the growing doctrine of the supremacy of treaties and the authority of the Congress, under treaties, to take action not otherwise open to it.

I am not talking about a possible future threatened danger, but about a danger which exists today. I am not talking about any fancied future possibility that the Executive might take some undesirable action; I am talking about an existing fact; the fact that today, under the present state of the law, the Congress of the United States is no longer a legislature of constitutionally delegated powers, to be exercised within prescribed limits, but a legislature of unlimited and undelegated powers.

The Congress of the United States today, because of power granted to it by treaty, could enact laws to control and regulate all education; to control and regulate all types of commerce, whether interstate or intrastate; to control and regulate all public health; to control and regulate all civil rights; to control and regulate all communications, whether interstate or intrastate, including rates and service; to control and regulate all public power, including rates and service; or to control all production of foods on farms and in factories.

Adding these powers to its constitutional power to tax, the Congress of the United States today has virtually omnipotent legislative power.

I do not want the Congress to have this dangerous power. History teaches that the very existence of a power is a strong impelling force toward the exercise of such power. If Congress is permitted to retain the power it has today, power given to Congress by treaty, power to infringe rights which most of the people think are still protected by the Constitution, the day will surely come when Congress will exercise this power. Then it may be too late for the people to do anything about it.

Any Federal judge, sitting down today to pass upon the validity of any legislation by the Congress in any of the fields I have indicated above, would have to begin his deliberations with the Constitution of the United States on one side of him and the United Nations Charter on the other.

Mr. President, in my opinion, that is an intolerable situation.

I want to see the powers of the Congress brought back within the four corners of the Constitution; I want to see the Congress once more a legislature of limited and delegated powers. Adoption of the Bricker amendment will accomplish this.

Let me go into this matter in a little more detail.

Under the present state of the law, a ratified treaty confers on Congress unlimited power to legislate on the subject matter of the treaty without any other enumerated and delegated power whatsoever.

The Charter of the United Nations is a ratified and approved treaty. Articles 55 and 56 of that treaty have conferred on Congress the unlimited power to legislate on the subject of civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights. The duty to carry out those articles is obligatory on the United States as a party to the treaty, according to the Attorney General of the United States, who so testified before the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate. This obligation certainly would include the passage of legislation necessary and proper to carry out the purposes of the treaty.

The question of what is necessary and proper, in such a case, is for the Congress to decide, so long, at least, as it stays within the bounds of reason. Thus, legislation which the Congress will say is necessary and proper to carry out any of the purposes of article 55 of the United Nations Charter, in the field of civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights, if not clearly unreasonable, is within the power of the Congress to enact.

Article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations provides:

> With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:
>
> a. Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;
>
> b. Solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; and
>
> c. Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Article 56 of the Charter of the United Nations provides:

> All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55.

Testifying before the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, the Attorney General of the United States, on April 7, 1953, took the position that action under article 56 is obligatory. The Attorney General's exact words were:

> A notable example is articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter, obligating the parties to promote stated social and economic objectives and pledging themselves to take joint and separate action for the achievement of these purposes.

Every phase of the daily life of our people is within the scope of the broad purposes enumerated in article 55 of the United Nations Charter: Civil, political, cultural, social, and economic. This broad power is not limited by any provision in the treaty. There was not even any attempt to circumscribe it by any reservation added at the time of ratification by the Senate.

Under this treaty the Congress of the United States therefore has, today, full power—absolutely complete power, though unenumerated and undelegated—to legislate in the fields named in article 55.

This is not a future threat. This is not a situation possibly to be brought about by some unlikely future action.

This is the situation today. This is the state of the law at this moment.

When Mr. Justice Holmes was considering the question of the validity of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, he had to consider it with the Constitution of the United States on one side of him and the treaty on the other. When he could not find anything in the Constitution to support the law, he had to look in the treaty. He found there a power of enactment sufficient to support the law.

Today any judge seeking to test the validity of any statute dealing with education, or commerce, or public health, or civil rights, or communications, or public power, or the production of foods, is in a similar position. He must sit down with the Constitution, on one hand, and the treaty which we call the Charter of the United Nations, on the other hand. Other treaties also must be consulted. If the judge does not find power of enactment for the law in the Constitution, then he must look in the treaty; and in many, many fields, he will find the power there; because in these fields, the power conferred on the Congress by treaty to legislate, and by legislation to regulate and control, is limited only by what the Congress may reasonably consider necessary and proper.

Bear in mind that the standard of "reasonable and proper" does not mean that the legislation has to be good legislation, or that it has to adopt the best means for achieving its purpose; it is sufficient to meet the test if the legislation is such that a reasonable man would conclude that it might have the effect Congress intends it to have. If it meets that standard, the legislation must be held to be reasonable and proper if the Congress chooses to enact it.

In the migratory-bird case, the Supreme Court overrode the 10th amendment of the Constitution by holding that, in spite of it, Congress can legislate on the subject matter of a treaty without delegated authority for the legislation. If Congress may override the 10th amendment of the Constitution, in legislating on the subject matter of a treaty, then Congress is equally free to override other provisions of the Constitution, such as the first amendment. Mr. President, the first amendment is not a direct guaranty of freedom of religion, or freedom of speech, or freedom of the press, or freedom of assembly; it is only a prohibition on action by the Congress in derogation of those rights.

The Senate and the President, in making and ratifying treaties, are acting as partners, but not as Congress. So the making and ratifying of a treaty respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, would not be in direct violation of this constitutional provision. Should such a treaty be enacted, would not Congress have just as much right to implement the treaty by legislation, under the existing state of the law, as it had to implement the migratory-bird treaty by legislation? That is the type of danger we face today.

Now, let me restate a basic principle which is important.

An international treaty cannot be safeguarded by a clause in a treaty or by reservation or understanding against the expansion of the limited power of the Federal Congress in the United States to such extent as necessary to fulfill the obligation under the treaty if Congress determines to exercise such power. No action of the parties, or of the Senate and the President, at the time of ratification of a treaty, can take away the constitutional power of Congress to execute the treaty and to fulfill the national obligation under the treaty if Congress decides to do so.

That is not merely my conclusion. It is a conclusion approved by the Committee on Peace and Law through United Nations of the American Bar Association. It is a conclusion approved by a subcommittee of a committee of the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association. It is a conclusion approved, in a recent report, by a distinguished committee of the New York State Bar Association. It is a conclusion approved by the house of delegates, the governing body of the American Bar Association.

Mr. President, similarly approved are these conclusions: That a ratified and approved treaty in executed form becomes supreme law and domestic law of the United States; that an executory treaty becomes domestic law when implemented by Congress; and that domestic law created by a treaty or by implementation by act of Congress supersedes State constitutions, laws, and decisions of the States.

This is the state of the law as it is today. It is not something to look forward to with fear; it is a condition present now. If a treaty has been negotiated and ratified, Congress may act to fulfill any obligation under that treaty, regardless of any attempted limitation by reservation or understanding which the Senate may have placed upon the treaty. Not even a provision in a treaty purporting to restrict the power of the Congress to implement that treaty will be effective; if the treaty imposes any obligation on the United States, Congress will have power to act to fulfill that obligation, in such reasonable and proper manner as it shall determine, regardless of the treaty provision seeking to restrict the right of Congress so to act. A reservation in international law is only the withholding from a contracting party of a right stemming from the treaty. Thus, a reservation can have no effect on the form of a government which is a contracting party, and cannot limit the existing powers of such a government.

In August 1950 the Senate ratified the charter of the organization of American States, a treaty negotiated at the Bogota Conference during the spring of 1948. In ratifying this treaty the Senate did so with a reservation that—

> None of its provisions shall be considered as enlarging the powers of the Federal Government of the United States or limiting the powers of the several States of the Federal Union with respect to any matters recognized under the Constitution as being within the reserved powers of the several States.

Now, why was this reservation adopted by the Senate?

Article 29 provides that one of the bases agreed upon by the member States as desirable in the development of social legislation is as follows:

> Work is a right and a social duty; it shall not be considered as an article of commerce; it demands respect for freedom of association and for the dignity of the worker; and it is to be performed under conditions that insure life, health, and a decent standard of living, both during the working years and during old age, or when any circumstance deprives the individual of the possibility of working.

Article 30 of the treaty provides:

> The member States agree to promote, in accordance with the constitutional provisions and their material resources, the exercise of the right to education, on the following bases:
>
> (a) Elementary education shall be compulsory and, when provided by the State, shall be without cost.
>
> (b) Higher education shall be available to all, without distinction as to race, nationality, sex, language, creed, or social condition.

Thus it will be seen that this treaty, without the reservation, lays numerous duties upon the United States; among them, the duty to promote "education without distinction as to race, nationality, sex, language, creed, or social condition." If the reservation is not effective as a limitation, then it must be obligatory upon Congress—in line with the testimony of the Attorney General—to implement this treaty.

Unless the power of Congress to legislate in these enumerated fields is effectively limited by the reservation adopted by the Senate, it is without limit at all. But the Senate, by a reservation in the ratification of a treaty, cannot deprive Congress of its constitutional right to legislate on the subject matter of the treaty. The treaty becomes an empowering law. The Senate alone does not have the power or the authority to say to Congress as a whole that Congress shall not have power or exercise its constitutional power to legislate on the subject matter of a treaty.

The reservation of the Senate clearly was aimed at accomplishing substantially the same result which is sought by the proposed constitutional amendment now before the Senate. But this reservation of the Senate actually amounted to little more than a pious hope. At most, it represented an expression by the Senate of its own intention not to participate in any such legislation as the reservation purported to condemn. But this expression of intention was not even binding upon the Senate itself, and by no stretch of the imagination could it be considered binding upon the whole Congress.

Only a constitutional amendment, such as proposed in the joint resolution now before the Senate, can give the full measure of protection which the Senate was trying to achieve by its reservation to the charter of the organization of American States.

I have said that under the grant of power contained in articles 55 and 56 of the treaty which we know as the United Nations Charter, the Congress today has

unlimited power to enact legislation in many fields. That power would include legislation for complete control and regulation in any of those fields, or in any part of any one of those fields.

One of the fields is education. The Congress today could enact legislation taking over all private and parochial schools, destroying all local school boards and all local school administration, and substituting a Federal system. Let me repeat, Mr. President, because of the United Nations Charter, which is a ratified treaty, the Congress today has unlimited power to legislate in the field of education.

If the Supreme Court should decide the pending segregation case against the rights of States to maintain separate but equal facilities, and the State of Georgia or the State of South Carolina or any other State should thereafter decide to abandon its public-school system, the Congress could pass a law under which the Federal Government could step in and take over and administer the entire school system in that State, on a nonsegregated basis.

The field of public power, including rates and service, is another area in which the Congress has unlimited legislative authority under the United Nations Charter. This broad power of the Congress probably includes even the power to provide by legislation for the federalization of all power-producing facilities. To do this Congress would only have to find such legislation necessary to promote higher standards of living, or to bring about conditions of economic and social progress and development. Broad exercise of this power of the Congress, plus application of the doctrine of paramount rights, which the Supreme Court adopted in the Tidelands case, might even result in federalization of all power-producing and power-distributing facilities without paying any compensation to the present owners.

Communications, whether between States or within States, is another field in which the Congress has unlimited legislative power under the United Nations Charter. This power includes regulation and control of telephone, telegraph, and radio communications, including rates and services. To give an extreme example, if Congress should find that international cultural cooperation required international control of all radio communications, it could by law subject all radio communications in the United States to such control. Congress could by law provide for censoring all radio programs. Congress could go further; it could provide for censorship of all press telegrams, or even censorship of all telegrams. The variations of legislation possible under the now unlimited power of Congress in this field are almost infinite.

Another field in which Congress has unlimited legislative power, under the United Nations Charter, is civil rights. No longer can it be contended that enactment of certain civil-rights legislation must depend upon prior approval of a constitutional amendment. Today the power of Congress to legislate in this field is unlimited. This fact has been recognized by those who are trying to get Congress to take over control in this area from the States.

When the Lesinski comprehensive civil-rights bill was presented by the Labor Committee of the House, it came to the floor with a bald statement that the bill did not need constitutional authority for its enactment, because it was based on the charter of the United Nations. A proposed Federal Antilynching Act, S. 462, sponsored by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for himself and other Senators—is pending now before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. This bill contains the proposed congressional finding that the enactment of such a law is necessary in order to comply with treaty obligations assumed by the United States under the United Nations Charter.

One of the fields over which Congress today, under the power granted in the United Nations Charter, has complete and unlimited legislative authority, is commerce. This power embraces all types of commerce, both interstate and intrastate. Under this power, Congress could pass a law requiring all truck operators to pay so much per mile for all travel on any highway; or a law creating a Federal commission with power to allocate all freight and traffic among and between the various types of transportation, and fixing arbitrary rates which should be charged for different types and kinds of traffic; or a law requiring that airlines be operated as adjuncts of major railroads. If Congress should pass any such law, the Supreme Court would be unable to declare it invalid as an exercise of a power not delegated under the Constitution. That would not make any difference, because the power of Congress in this field is unlimited today, having been expanded by United Nations treaty.

Today all production of food, on farms and in factories, including all stages of processing, is subject to absolute control and regulation by the Congress, through legislation which it may enact as a result of the power granted to it under the United Nations Charter. All that Congress would have to do to justify any legislation in this field would be to find such legislation necessary in the interest of a higher standard of living or in the interest of economic and social progress and development.

Another field in which Congress today has unlimited power to legislate, under the treaty we call the United Nations Charter, is public health. Congress could utilize this power to put into effect in this country a complete system of socialized medicine, from the cradle to the grave. Make no mistake about it, Mr. President: The pressure on Congress to do this will continue and increase so long as Congress retains the power to do it.

Maximum as well as minimum wages, and minimum as well as maximum hours of labor, could be fixed by the Congress under its grant of legislative power stemming from the United Nations Charter, if Congress should find such legislation necessary in the interest of full employment. Under this power, Congress could even legislative compulsory labor, if it found that the goal of full employment required such legislation or would be served by it.

Do you think this is fantastic, Mr. President? Russia has compulsory labor today because the Soviet Government has the absolute power to decree it. What I am saying is that today the Congress has the power to decree compulsory labor in these United States. I do not think Congress will exercise that power today or tomorrow; but can we leave that dangerous power in the hands of Congress with complete assurance that it will never be exercised?

One of the great, basic principles of our constitutional system has been the doctrine of the separation of powers. One of the great sources of the strength of our Government has been the fact that our State legislatures and even our national legislature must govern under the law, must stay within the boundaries of constitutional limitations. Only while the legislative branch of Government conforms to constitutional principles, and the executive and judicial branches of Government do likewise, will our Government as a whole continue to afford protection for individual human freedom and to guarantee enjoyment of individual human rights.

As Dean Manion has said:

> One of our proudest concepts of Government has been the power of the Supreme Court to declare acts of Congress to be beyond its delegated powers and invalid.

In the broad fields I have outlined, the Supreme Court no longer has that power; for when the Court finds that some particular act of Congress is beyond its delegated powers, that is not the end of the matter today. No; the Court must turn to the growing list of treaties, which now must be regarded as giving Congress unlimited and unenumerated powers which it did not have under the Constitution; and in these treaties, the Court will find, more often than not, the power which, under the Constitution alone, the Congress does not have.

Mr. President, this is the situation we face today. This is the situation we must do something about, if our traditional form of government is to be preserved.

Even Prof. Edward S. Corwin, so often quoted as a leading opponent of the Bricker amendment, recognizes this existing situation. In his note to clause 2, section 2, of the Constitution annotated, in the new edition which he edited, and which was published in 1953, with a preface by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, in which he expressed the hope that the Constitution will remain the blueprint for freedom, Professor Corwin said:

> In a word, the treaty power cannot purport to amend the Constitution by adding to the list of Congress' enumerated powers, but having acted, the consequence will often be that it has provided Congress with an opportunity to enact measures which independently of a treaty Congress could not pass; and the only question that can be raised as to such measures will be whether they are necessary and proper measures for the carrying of the treaty in question into operation.

Mr. President, a great change has been brought about in our form of government. It has been brought about by a combination of factors, and entirely within our own time. These factors include the growing doctrine laid down in Missouri against Holland, a doctrine which permits the Congress to gain, through a treaty, power denied to it under the Constitution in the absence of the treaty. Another factor has been the increasing trend toward the negotiation of treaties designed to affect domestic law. Such a treaty is the Charter of the United Nations. Such a treaty is the charter of the Organization of American States.

This change which has been brought about in our form of government has sadly disturbed the separation of powers. The safety of this Nation demands that we get back the kind of government the Constitution provided—a government of enumerated and delegated powers.

I do not think the Congress wants this vast power. I believe the Congress will be willing to surrender this power to the people. The way to do that is by submitting to the representatives of the people, in their State legislatures, a constitutional amendment adequate to restore the power of government to the people of the United States and to the several States. The proposed amendment now pending before the Senate will accomplish this purpose.

Mr. BRICKER obtained the floor.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BRICKER. I yield for that purpose provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Bricker Amendment: This Is the Crucial Week," published in the Morning World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., of January 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT: THIS IS THE CRUCIAL WEEK

In a speech last week opposing the Bricker amendment, Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said:

"This Nation has grown great under our Constitution. I do not want to see it torn to shreds."

The sentence expresses the current party line of those who oppose the amendment. They say Senator BRICKER is trying to shatter the Constitution. Following this line, the opposition organization which was formed in New York recently, under the leadership of John W. Davis and other internationalists, called itself "The Committee for Defense of the Constitution."

This implication, that an amendment to the Constitution—properly submitted and ratified—can destroy that document is ridiculous on the face of it.

Did the Bill of Rights, which was adopted in the form of amendments, harm the Constitution in any way? Did the woman's suffrage amendment? Did the newest amendment, which limits a President to two terms?

Obviously not. They strengthened free America, in ways suggested by the people's experience.

And that is precisely what the Bricker amendment proposes to do.

In brief, the Bricker amendment forbids the enactment of what is called treaty law. It states that a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only if it is validated by legislation passed in the usual way.

The need for this protection became apparent some 3 or 4 years ago when various offshoots of the United Nations began drawing up covenants, or treaties, which appeared to change or interpret the rights guaranteed to the American people by their Constitution.

For example, the Constitution now says:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

That is a simple and straightforward guaranty.

However, a draft of the Covenant on Human Rights which was being urged on the American people about that time (3 or 4 years ago) said:

"Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others."

There is quite a startling difference between what that covenant said, and what the Constitution says.

Concerning freedom of the press, this same covenant said:

"The right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities, and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities, and restrictions, but these shall be only such as are provided by law and are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals, or of the rights, freedoms or reputations of others."

Compare those fuzzy words with the direct statement in the American Constitution, as quoted above.

Would such treaty law, if ratified, supersede the laws passed by Congress?

Might it even override the Constitution itself?

Senator BRICKER and many other able constitutional lawyers in Congress answer "Yes."

The American Bar Association gives the same answer.

These Americans and millions of others believe that an amendment of the nature of the Bricker proposal is imperatively needed to defend—not to destroy, but to defend—the American Constitution.

Their aim is to make certain that the Constitution will not be nullified because of a loophole which the Founding Fathers could not possibly have anticipated.

If you as an American citizen take the same view, if you want to make sure beyond possibility of doubt that your rights will not be signed away in international agreements, you should write or wire your Senators at once.

You should tell them plainly and forcefully, in your own words, that you want the Bricker amendment submitted to the 48 States for their consideration.

The Nebraska Senators are HUGH BUTLER and DWIGHT GRISWOLD.

The Iowa Senators are BOURKE HICKENLOOPER and GUY GILLETTE.

The Kansas Senators are ANDREW SCHOEPPEL and FRANK CARLSON.

The South Dakota Senators are KARL MUNDT and FRANCIS CASE.

All Senators may be addressed at Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

There is no time to waste. This week may decide the fate of the Bricker amendment in the Senate.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in the very beginning of the discussion I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that article VI of the Constitution, the so-called supremacy section of the Constitution, was drafted primarily to take care of a problem peculiar to that day and age. That problem was the payment of debts by American citizens to citizens of England and to the English Government. The treaty of peace provided that those debts should be paid.

Virginia and some of the other States, however, absolved their citizens from the payment of those debts, provided they had paid their money, with respect to the debt obligation, into the Treasury for the purpose of conducting the Revolutionary War.

The Constitution was drafted to make the obligation on the part of those debtors secure. Therefore, such power was taken away from the States in article VI of the Constitution.

Subsequently that article of the Constitution was litigated in the Supreme Court, and it was held that the obligations were fixed obligations and that the State of Virginia could not absolve them.

However, the debts were never paid by the individuals. They were paid, not by the State of Virginia, but by the Federal Government, by an appropriation. From that time on the supremacy clause in the Constitution has had no importance in any comparable situation, and was never considered as bearing upon anything except international obligations. That was true until 1920.

Those issues I shall discuss during the next few minutes, so that there may be a clear understanding of the purpose of the joint resolution and of the unsound and unfounded objections of many persons to it.

There is only one issue in this debate. Shall the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States be protected against abuse of the treatymaking power?

There are only two sides in this debate. Favoring the general purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 1 are those who deny that the perils of the atomic age require the scuttling of our constitutional Republic. Generally opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 1 are those who rely for safety in an atomic age on unhandicapped and untrammeled executive power. Reconciliation of those conflicting philosophies of government is impossible. The Senate of the United States must now make its choice.

During the past few months I have been exploring with officials of the executive branch of the Government the possibility of developing a mutually satisfactory text for a treaty-control amendment. In the main, my discussions have been with Attorney General Brownell, Secretary of State Dulles, and with some other representatives of the administration. Those discussions have now ended with no agreement reached. It is unlikely that the discussions will be resumed, or that new discussions could be fruitful; although I am willing to consider anything which might be suggested on which could be based a constitutional amendment to bring about the purposes sought in the joint resolution reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I wish to say to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary that in all these consultations, which were held in an effort to find something that would be acceptable in carrying out the purposes of the original amendment as drafted and submitted, as well as the purposes of the Committee on the Judiciary in submitting its report to the Senate, I have at no time had any idea except that if something were found to be acceptable I would bring it to the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary for its consideration after consultation. I know of no other way that any Member of the Senate has any authority to act, except through a committee.

In their early stages, the discussions held promise that an agreement could be reached. Attorney General Brownell proved receptive to the explanations offered and worked earnestly to help find a text that would adequately protect the American people against encroachments of treaty law. Secretary of State Dulles was less receptive, and offered a succession of texts that afforded no protection.

If the Secretary of State had been willing to suggest any reasonable compromise, I would, of course, have discussed further the matter with members of the Senate Judiciary Committee and other interested Senators. No reasonable compromise appealed to Mr. Dulles. Every suggestion made by him would have given express constitutional sanction to abuses of the power to make treaties and other international agreements.

I have been at a loss to understand the unbending and unyielding attitude of the Secretary of State. However, I have before me a telegram from the Secretary of State which gives me some indication of his feeling. I shall explore the subject further as the debate on the floor proceeds. It is a telegram from Mr. Dulles before he was Secretary of State, and was addressed to the Atlantic Union Committee. It reads:

I am quite familiar with the work of your committee. I feel that it has an understanding of the nature and infinite capabilities of the Federal system. It is important that this be understood in connection with the development of the NATO, because NATO can hardly succeed if it is merely a political alliance of temporary expediency.

Mr. President, I know that the Atlantic Union group are opposed to this amendment. I do know that those who support the philosophy of world government bitterly oppose the amendment. In fact, in my judgment, those are the only groups that have reason to oppose the amendment as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

That amendment was intended to prevent—and, in my judgment, it would prevent—the surrender of the sovereignty of the United States to an Atlantic Union, or any other form of world government, in full, or in part.

I now wish to refer to the head of the Atlantic Union group in our country. Believe me, Mr. President, I have no complaint with those who support the group. Many of our good friends are supporters of one or another of the world-government philosophies. I do ask, however, that they work in the open; that they suggest a constitutional amendment, if they intend to change the inherent character of our Government, and go before the American people in order to secure the ends which they seek. I do not want it done by indirection, subterfuge, or treaty.

Of course, in opposing the joint resolution the effort is revealed to bring about the group's accomplishment by treaty law, so that the American people will not realize what is going on.

Mr. President, I want to recall a statement of Mr. Justice Owen Roberts, a former distinguished Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, an honored citizen, and the head of the Atlantic Union movement at the present time. It is his right as an American citizen to become a protagonist of any union.

Speaking in Ottawa, Canada, on April 30, 1952, Justice Roberts said:

We must decide whether we are to stand on the silly shibboleth—

Note that, Mr. President—

of national sovereignty.

He went on to explain, further, that national sovereignty must be surrendered to some higher authority.

Mr. President, the war for American independence was fought for what Justice Roberts calls "the silly shibboleth of national sovereignty."

I debated with Justice Roberts a year and a half ago on the subject of the first constitutional amendment proposed in the last Congress in Senate Joint Resolution 130. I had explained it, and this debate was over the radio for public information. Marquis Childs was the moderator. I explained what the proposed amendment would accomplish, and then Mr. Childs turned to Mr. Roberts and said:

I would like to hear Justice Roberts comment whether he thinks such an amendment would prevent or would hinder the movement toward world federation.

Justice ROBERTS. No; I'm going to surprise Senator BRICKER worse than he's been surprised in years. I agree entirely with his amendment and I would be for its adoption.

Now, why? I'll tell you why. The United Nations is an intergovernmental treaty. In the United Nations, they've set up certain committees which are just committees appointed by the United Nations organization. Those committees are submitting treaties that affect the conduct of individual citizens in the countries. Now my liberties and my rights can't be affected except I have a chance to vote, and all my fellowmen have a chance to vote, and I don't want any ad hoc committee specifying what my rights are, and my Government, so I agree entirely with the Senator.

Mr. President, in entering into these conversations, I had no thought of surrendering any basic objective of the amendment. Such action would betray a solemn trust to the cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 1 and the millions of patriotic Americans who urge its adoption. I hoped that a change in language might overcome administration objections and at the same time vindicate the efforts of those who have done so much to expose the danger in treaty law.

A constitutional amendment to protect the American people against abuses of the treatymaking power will be passed. Millions of Americans now recognize that there is a loophole in our Constitution, one through which could come a tyrannical world government and a Marxist covenant on human rights. The Congress must decide in what form to recognize the widespread and growing demand for adequate constitutional protection. In my judgment, the best form is Senate Joint Resolution 1 as recommended by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The President and the Senate under the Constitution are partners in treatymaking. It is appropriate, therefore, that the administration should participate in this momentous constitutional debate on the issues involved. But it would be highly improper, in my judgment, for the administration and the State Department to use patronage and other types of pressures in an effort to defeat the proposed amendment.

The American people will not be content with an inadequate or spurious treaty-control amendment. They will not accept a constitutional amendment that confirms past abuses of the executive agreement power. On such an issue, political expediency and party loyalty should not be considered. The Constitution of the United States and the rights it guarantees to the American people are more important than the political fortunes of any person or any party.

The primary opposition to this treaty-control amendment stems from the avowed enemies of the concept of national sovereignty. Before this issue of a constitutional amendment came to the attention of the public, these opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 were openly advocating a massive surrender of national sovereignty to a quarter, a half, or a full world government to be established immediately or eventually. These same people now pose as defenders of national sovereignty in fighting this treaty-control amendment.

In this debate on Senate Joint Resolution 1 there has been far too much doubletalk, confusion, and misstatement. For example, Mr. John Foster Dulles, in his Louisville speech of April 12, 1952, vividly described the danger of treaty law, but, after assuming the high office of Secretary of State, has denounced all treaty-control amendments as inspired

by imaginary dangers. In his Louisville speech Mr. Dulles said—and I quote from it, because I think it is known now by supporters and opponents of the resolution:

> Under our Constitution, treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are, indeed, more supreme than ordinary laws for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away • • • from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, I posed these questions to the Secretary of State: What rights do you want to take away from the States and give to the Congress? What rights do you want to take away from the States and give to an international body? What rights do you want to take away from the Congress and give to the President of the United States? What powers of the President do you want to take away and give to some international authority? What powers of the Supreme Court do you want to take away and give to some superinternational court sitting somewhere in the world?

Mr. President, the questions have not yet been answered, and the Secretary of State has not yet disavowed the statement he made in his Louisville speech. He believed it then and he believes it now, and he wants to exercise unlimited, unhaltered, and unbridled power to do the things he says can be done.

Scores of United Nations treaties in various stages of preparation would, if ratified, produce the tragic results referred to by Mr. Dulles in Louisville. Many of those treaties conflict with the Constitution of the United States. For example, the U. N. draft statute for an international Criminal Court would permit an American citizen to be sent overseas for trial before an international tribunal without the constitutional protections to which he would be entitled in Federal and in State courts. Many opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 have advocated the adoption of this treaty and other United Nations treaties just as dangerous as that one.

Senate Joint Resolution 1 would merely apply to the treatymaking power the constitutional restraints that the Founding Fathers intended to govern its exercise. Prior to this nationwide debate, opponents of the amendment boasted of their plans to revolutionize the treaty power.

The traditional scope of the treaty power was thus described by Alexander Hamilton—and even today many constitutional authorities refer to his thinking:

> The power of making treaties • • • relates neither to the execution of the subsisting laws, nor to the enaction of new ones • • •. Its objects are contracts with foreign nations, which have the force of law, but derive it from the obligations of good faith. They are not rules prescribed by the sovereign to the subject, but agreements between sovereign and sovereign.

No responsible student of international and constitutional law has ever challenged Hamilton's statement with reference to the traditional functions of treaties. With the formation of the United Nations organization, however, the concept of treaties was revolutionized. The departure of the U. N.'s human rights program from traditional treaty concepts was explained by Mr. John P. Humphrey, then the Director of the U. N. Division of Human Rights. In an article in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science for January 18, 1948, Mr. Humphrey said:

> What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationships between the state and individuals, and therefore a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of states. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supernational supervision of this relationship between the state and its citizens.

Mr. Humphrey is the head of the committee that was then considering the covenant on human rights. It is important to understand what they were intending to do.

The argument that the traditional treaty power has worked well for more than 150 years should be given no weight whatever in this debate. Treaties are being used for an entirely different purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Ohio think the fact that the United States has become a great Nation under its Constitution has no significance at all?

Mr. BRICKER. It has much significance, and that significance sustains me in wanting to keep it the way it has been traditionally kept.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How does the Senator think he would keep it that way by the amendment he is proposing?

Mr. BRICKER. I seek to preserve the traditional concepts of the Constitution of the United States as it was intended and as it was interpreted, until the philosophy I mentioned a moment ago was advocated in the suborganizations of the United Nations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But in what instance has the Senate accepted that theory?

Mr. BRICKER. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What some persons in the United Nations advocate seems to me to have little relevancy to what the Senate is likely to accept in the way of a treaty. In what single instance has the Senate approved such a theory?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senate approved the treaty with Great Britain, which was interpreted in Missouri against Holland, which set aside the tenth amendment of the Constitution, so far as the rights of the States are concerned.

The Senate also has been holding in committee the genocide convention; and there are other treaties today before the Committee on the Judiciary that are being considered. The covenant on human rights was advocated by the President of the United States, and the Senate was asked by the Secretary of State to give favorable consideration to it. In the light of the statement of former Secretary of State Acheson, there is today no difference between international law and domestic law. The advocates of such a theory combine them, and then want to control them by treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have asked the Senator, In what instance has the Senate approved such a treaty? If I understand the Senator from Ohio correctly, the only one that has been so approved was the treaty with regard to migratory birds. Is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. The United Nations Charter, sections 55 and 56, if interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States—and it came very close to doing so in one case recently—as it has been interpreted by some inferior courts, would already have transferred all powers of the States, in practically every realm of human relationship, to the Congress of the United States, to be determined by treaty power.

The preceding speaker, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], pointed out, further, that the United Nations organization has tended in the same direction.

Let me suggest to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that when the Constitution of the United States was drafted, it was generally understood that there would be a Bill of Rights submitted to the States for ratification. The drafters of the Constitution did not wait until the right of free worship and of free speech had been taken away by Congress; they did not wait until soldiers had been harbored in the homes of American citizens, to put into the fundamental law prohibitions against such acts. They adopted them because to do so was everlastingly right and was for the protection of human liberty.

That is all we are asking at this time. There are threats on the horizon. Dangerous treaties are now before the Senate. Already, in many of them, although we thought we were protecting the rights of the people of the United States, those rights have been taken away and given to the power of Congress in an unlimited degree.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield further.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to the treaty about migratory birds, which is the only treaty the Senator from Ohio cites as having actually been approved by the Senate, does the Senator from Ohio believe that that treaty was inimical to the best interests of the United States?

Mr. BRICKER. I think the results of the treaty were salutary and might well have been sustained under the commerce clause, as it would be sustained. There is no doubt in my mind about that. That is the clause on which it should have been based at that time.

But the Supreme Court picked out a provision intended to require the payment of debts to England at the time of the Revolution, and interpreted that, as

the Justice who wrote the opinion said, with a "new look." There are certain things which are eternal, including right and justice, and many of them are written into the Constitution.

But the Justice who wrote the opinion said we must take a "new look" and must interpret the provision in the light of facts developed many years after the Constitution was adopted. So he says the laws of Congress have to be under the Constitution. They have to comply with its provisions; but no, not a treaty that is made in pursuance of the authority of the United States. What is that authority? The President of the United States and two-thirds of the Senate voting to ratify a treaty. In that case there does not have to be compliance with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States at all. A treaty can cut Congress off, as John Foster Dulles said in Louisville. It can cut across it, as John Foster Dulles said in Louisville. It can cut across the Bill of Rights. It can override the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

How dangerous does such an action have to get before there is a need to protect the rights of the American people?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I understand the Senator correctly, there was one instance in our history in which the Senate approved a treaty, which the Senator has said overrode the Constitution. In that case the Senator said the treaty was beneficial to the United States. The only other instance he has suggested is the United Nations. Does the Senator believe that it was against the interests of the United States to approve the United Nations Charter?

Mr. BRICKER. The United Nations Charter was approved only upon assurance by the State Department that article II, paragraph 7, if it had a binding effect, would never be used to affect the internal rights of the citizens of the United States.

We also had a letter from the Secretary of State substantially to the same effect.

If Members of the Senate at that time had believed that the revolutionary philosophy and doctrine I have just quoted from Mr. Humphrey's article would have pervaded and completely dominated the thinking of those in the United Nations, I doubt very much that there would have been the sustaining vote there was when the Charter was ratified.

I believe the United Nations has a great place to fill. I think it has a service to render. I hope it can preserve the peace of the world. That is what it was organized to do.

But the easiest way for the United Nations to destroy itself is to begin dabbling in the domestic rights of the people of the participating countries; and that is what it is doing at present.

I only want to protect the United States against any supranational authority; I care not where it may be.

I desire to cite one more instance to the Senator from Arkansas. Not only has there been a dangerous treaty ratified and interpreted by the Supreme Court, not only is there a threat imminent because of the enlarged power in the subcommittees or agencies of the United Nations to dabble in the local rights of the constituent countries, but also the President of the United States entered into an agreement, not a treaty, and submitted it to the Senate, or to Congress, for approval or ratification. Under the language of that agreement, which takes away the property rights of people, the Supreme Court of New York, in the Fink case, said, "You cannot do that. Our laws require that the owners of money are entitled to it. We are going to distribute it to them."

The Supreme Court, in a rather dangerous opinion, I think, said that the Presidential agreement between the President of the United States and Mr. Litvinov, of Russia, sets aside the fifth amendment, deprives people of their property, and rises to the dignity of a treaty, and becomes the supreme law of the land. What more on that point does the Senator desire?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I read the opinion in that case yesterday, and it did not involve a treaty. It was a political decision to recognize a sovereign State, which is an entirely different thing. It was not considered on the basis of a treaty. I do not look on that as a precedent in any degree for what the Senator has said. The Supreme Court of the United States held in that case that what was concerned was a political decision to be made by the President of the United States, and not the State of New York, or the commissioner of insurance of the State of New York. Furthermore, that it was to protect the interests of the United States as against foreign creditors of a Russian insurance company. I would again say, with all due deference to the Senator, that the results of that case were beneficial to the United States of America, just as in the Migratory Bird case.

What I am interested in having from the Senator is an answer to my question, whether in 165 years has there been one case in which a treaty was entered into, with the approval of the Senate, which was inimical to the interests of the United States. If the Senator from Ohio can cite one single case in which he can say a treaty was entered into which was injurious to the interests of the United States, and that it should never be repeated, I think he should cite that case.

I do not see why we should throw the Constitution overboard or amend the Constitution when it has served us so well. If the United States were not the strongest and the most prosperous country in the world, if the United States were in as bad straits as are some of the other countries, I would be looking for some method to change the basic law. But why the Senator should desire to change the basic law when he cannot cite a single instance in which a treaty was entered into which hurt the interests of the United States, I cannot understand.

Mr. BRICKER. Perhaps the Senator will understand before the debate is over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So far as what Mr. Humphrey said in New York is concerned, I do not think the Senate should engage in debating a matter that borders on the lunatic fringe. It would seem to me that the Senator is saying that he has no confidence in the Senate, and that we are merely soft-hearted fools, and that we will take anything that comes to us.

Mr. BRICKER. If the fathers of this Government, the founders of the Constitution, had taken the attitude the Senator from Arkansas is now assuming, we would never have had a Constitution of the United States. Likewise we would never have had a Bill of Rights, because Congress had passed no law at that time which infringed upon individual rights or which sought to exercise any powers over the States. A recognition of a principle in that instance was vital, and sufficient to insure the adoption of the Bill of Rights at that time, which was opposed by those who spoke as the Senator speaks today, who said it was unnecessary, that the power is not given to the Federal Government; therefore, why restrict the Federal Government in any way, shape, or form? That was the argument of Hamilton. He stated it was an anomalous situation, unnecessary, and dangerous. Yet in numberless court cases the interests of the people of the United States have been protected because the philosophy of Jefferson, Henry, and Lee prevailed in that fight.

I might continue and discuss the Pink case, but I shall do that a little later in my argument.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to preface my question by saying, as others have done, that, in my opinion, the Senator from Ohio has rendered a great service to the country by raising his questions incident to the treatymaking powers.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio this question: Does he take the position that the treatymaking power is superior to the Constitution itself or to the Bill of Rights?

Mr. BRICKER. There is not any question about it now, under the interpretation of the Supreme Court. The Secretary of State appeared before the bar association and so stated.

Mr. COOPER. As I said yesterday, I heard the speech. With regard to the Secretary of State's statement, that the treaties could supersede the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, I must respectfully disagree with the Secretary.

Mr. BRICKER. Does not the Senator realize that I have quoted exactly from the Secretary's speech? The Secretary sent me a blue-penciled copy of it.

Mr. COOPER. As I said before, I do not agree with that opinion.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator not agree with me, or with the Secretary of State?

Mr. COOPER. I do not agree with the opinion that the treaties supersede the Constitution. I say further that if I believed that the treaties were superior to the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, I would vote for the amendment provided for in the joint resolution. I think the Senator will agree with me that there has never been a case decided by the

Supreme Court of the United States holding that a treaty superseded either the Constitution or the Bill of Rights. I know the Senator is going to answer that statement.

To the contrary, there have been several cases decided by the Supreme Court, stating at least by dictum that a treaty could not supersede the Constitution or the Bill of Rights. The Court gave its reasons for so stating. Moreover, I do not know of any case, with the exception of one, where the question has been raised.

Mr. BRICKER. The reasons of the Court to which the Senator has referred were very sound reasons.

Mr. COOPER. The Court stated that the treatymaking power itself is a creature of the Constitution, that it is a delegated power of the Congress and, as one of the delegated powers of the Congress, it could not be superior to the Constitution which created it.

Mr. BRICKER. It was not a delegated power of Congress; it was a delegated power of the President and two-thirds of the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. I accept the correction; I should have said a delegated power of the Federal Government.

I now return to my point, and ask the Senator if there has ever been any case holding that a treaty superseded the Constitution or the Bill of Rights.

Mr. BRICKER. In the case of Missouri against Holland the Court set aside the 10th amendment to the Constitution. In the Pink case they set aside the fifth amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I do not desire to take up the time of the Senator from Ohio, but I point out that in the case of Missouri against Holland, which involved the question of whether or not, because of a treaty, the Congress could enact a law which affected matters coming under State jurisdiction, it was held that the sixth amendment stated that the treatymaking power was the law of the land——

Mr. BRICKER. I desire to correct the Senator. It was the sixth article, not the sixth amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I meant article 6. The opinion stated that article 6 gave a treaty supremacy as the law of the land on a subject which was ordinarily left to State legislation. The holding was not against the Constitution, but under it.

Mr. BRICKER. I shall state the effect of the treaty. A law had been passed by the Congress which had been declared unconstitutional in two circuit court cases, and it then went to the Supreme Court. The Solicitor General was fearful of the outcome of the case. The Department of Justice desired to have the law sustained. They conceived the idea that, under the treaty clause, the 10th amendment was not affected. A treaty with Great Britain had been entered into. Congress had passed the law at substantially the same time as the treaty was negotiated. The Supreme Court upheld the law, under the theory announced by Justice Holmes, that a treaty becomes the supreme law of the land. They said a treaty can transfer powers from the States to the Federal Congress.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that one of the first cases ever decided on the point, long before the case of Missouri against Holland, was the case to which the Senator referred at the beginning of his remarks?

Mr. BRICKER. That is the case of Ware against Hylton.

Mr. COOPER. That is the case which long ago decided that very question.

Mr. BRICKER. That case decided the question of the supremacy of section 6. As I stated, that was the real reason why the supremacy clause of the Constitution was adopted. It was adopted only 8 days before the end of the Constitutional Convention. The discussions held at that time show very clearly that the section was adopted in order to require American citizens to pay their debts owing to England. Neither the citizens nor the States paid the debts to England, but the Government appropriated $3 million to pay off the debts.

Mr. COOPER. It seems to me that the statement made by the Senator assumes that the Supreme Court has ruled in the Holland case that the treatymaking power supersedes the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I do not think so. I respectfully again ask the Senator whether any case has been decided which affords any basis for that statement.

Mr. BRICKER. I have cited the cases which are the basis for that statement, and I have read the very language of the decision of the Supreme Court. Between 75 and 90 percent of the lawyers agree with me on that interpretation, and agree with Secretary John Foster Dulles. There is no question at all in my mind that it is a supreme power. I am not one of those who want liberty to be lost before we find out how it was lost. If we were to do that, it would never be regained.

We can spend our money and we can send our troops abroad and we can deplete our resources, and we can still "make it back." The people of the United States have ingenuity and a great deal of creative ability. But if human liberty is lost in the United States at this time, it will be gone; and it will not be recaptured in the lifetime of any Member of the Senate today, because power over people is the most dangerous thing in the world.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, any agreement which might be negotiated would be subject to constitutional approval by the Senate. It seems to me the field with which the distinguished Senator from Ohio is concerned is that subjects reserved for State legislation may become subjects of congressional legislation after a treaty has been approved dealing with such subjects.

My point is that there is nothing new about this, that shortly after the Constitution was written, one of the first decisions of the Supreme Court held that after a treaty has been negotiated and ratified, in order that the Federal Government could have power to speak for all the States, the treaty would be supreme and the Congress could legislate on the subjects which ordinarily were properly the subject of domestic legislation. That decision has been followed since that time. All kinds of treaties and particularly the ordinary treaties of commerce and friendship, dealing with subjects which ordinarily are the subject of domestic legislation, both State and Federal, have been approved by the dozens.

The fact that they have been approved by the Senate over so long a period of years is the answer, and is a proof that the framers of the Constitution intended that the Federal Government could act and should act in those fields for the entire Nation.

Mr. BRICKER. The Federal Government should act in all matters involving foreign affairs or relationships between States or between sovereigns. But I respectfully submit that treaties of commerce and friendship and treaties of good will and treaties of transportation, which have been ratified by the Senate, have, in practically all cases—or, at least, within the last few years—included a provision guarding against usurpation of the powers of the States.

I may say further that if the Senator from Kentucky will read the presentation I made several days ago of the Takahashi case, he will realize that it comes under the commerce clause of the Constitution, and within the last year, has been sustained by the Supreme Court as being within the power of Congress. So States' rights are not involved at all in that question.

Mr. COOPER. I desire to respond by saying that it is true that many of the provisions of such treaties touch the delegated powers of Congress; but in treaties there are many other provisions touching subjects which are purely subjects of State domestic legislation, for example, matters affecting property rights, the right to conduct business, and other subjects which are ordinarily reserved for domestic legislation.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Kentucky think we should deprive the States of those rights which are theirs under the Constitution?

Mr. COOPER. I think the Constitution itself, in article VI makes treaties the law of the land, and, insofar as the subjects of treaties are concerned, and no further, makes them superior to State law.

Mr. BRICKER. Insofar as they deal with international matters——

Mr. COOPER. Certainly.

Mr. BRICKER. Insofar as they deal with international matters, I am in perfect agreement with the Senator from Kentucky; and I am one who at all times throughout this debate has insisted that there is only one person to speak for this country in respect to foreign affairs, and that matters in the field of foreign relations should be handled through the medium of treaties.

There has developed a tendency to substitute executive or Presidential agreements for treaties—a tendency which I deplore, and which I believe to be very dangerous.

When treaties begin—although this never happened for the first 150 years of our history—to deal with the rights between individuals and their government or between several individuals, for instance, relationships between employer

and employee, relationships between individuals and insurance companies, with the control of the public-school systems of the various States, the building of highways, the marking of roads with signs—and the International Labor Organization is dealing with all those subjects at the present time, and UNESCO is dealing with some of them—all I wish to make sure is that when they are submitted, legislation must be enacted, and such legislation must be measured against the provisions of the Constitution, just as all other acts of Congress are.

Mr. COOPER. I point out that I do not think any of the agreements described by the Senator from Ohio have become the law of this land except by the constitutional process of ratification. If they are negotiated by the President they would not become the law of the land until approved by the Senate.

Mr. BRICKER. But if they were approved by the Senate, they would become the supreme law of the land, and they would wipe out State laws and acts of Congress, and they would cut across the constitutional provisions, including the Bill of Rights.

Mr. COOPER. There would be another guardian, the Congress itself. If it desires, it can pass legislation superior to the treaty.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, is the Senator from Kentucky advocating having Congress go into the field of annulling treaties and breaking our word? After all, treaties are a matter of national honor, and they should be kept. That is why they are entered into; and certainly I would never be one to advocate that Congress should ever go into the field of breaking treaties which have been made between the United States and other countries.

All of us remember a very dangerous force which existed in the world at one time, and the leader of that force said that a treaty was only a scrap of paper; and Russia has so treated treaties during her history. I do not wish the United States to get into that class.

Mr. COOPER. I make a further comment: The Senator from Ohio has raised, among others, one very interesting point, "What is the proper subject matter of a treaty?"

The Senator from Ohio, said, in discussing various types of agreements, that some have been drafted by international organizations which unlike usual international arrangements, deal with matters of concern to both the country and the other contracting party or parties, deal primarily with the rights of our citizens. I believe that former Chief Justice Hughes said a new question might arise concerning treaties, whether certain subjects were properly in the scope of treaties.

It is possible that if a treaty of that type should be approved, the Supreme Court might decide that certain treaty did not come within the scope of the treaty power and could not be approved under the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. But the Supreme Court never has taken that position.

Mr. COOPER. On the other hand, the Supreme Court never yet, as I understand, has held that a treaty can supersede the Constitution, including the Bill of Rights.

Mr. BRICKER. But the Supreme Court has never nullified a treaty as being in violation of the Constitution.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. The whole tenor of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky seemed to me to be to the effect that there is no imminent danger that the provisions of a treaty may supersede a provision of the Constitution of the United States. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and also the Senator from Kentucky, whether the minority or dissenting opinion in the steel company case, in which the Chief Justice and two of the Associate Justices seemed to hold that such was the case, is not a red light or a danger signal which this body and, in fact, all the people of the United States should take cognizance of? If two other Associate Justices had joined with the minority in their opinion, certainly we would have had a decision of the type which the Senator from Kentucky seems to believe to be an impossibility.

Mr. BRICKER. That is absolutely true. Three judges of the Supreme Court, including the Chief Justice, took that position. When we strip their dissenting opinion and their discussion of all extraneous details, we return to the basic, fundamental principle that the President of the United States has, under the United Nations Charter, been given powers which he did not otherwise have, powers which the Constitution of the United States did not authorize him to have, powers or authority which had not been given to him by the Congress. Yet he had those powers under a treaty, according to the view of those three judges of the Supreme Court of the United States.

If 2 additional Justices of the Supreme Court had agreed with those 3, our Republic would have been ended, and we would have been under some kind of oligarchy.

Mr. BARRETT. And no protection, under the Constitution, would have been afforded the citizens of the United States.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct; and property would no longer have been safe. After all, if the President could take the property of the steel companies, he could take the ranches of the farmers of the West, or he could take over labor unions, or he could do almost anything else, without regard to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. It seems to me, if the Senator will further yield, that the decision in the steel case should be sufficient warning for the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who spoke a moment ago, that there is great danger that we may find ourselves, at some time in the future, in a position in which that principle will be enunciated. I am convinced that the people of this country do not subscribe to any such theory. People may disagree about the effects of the amendment which the Senator is proposing, and they may have various substitutes for it; but it seems to me that all agree that the people of America are entitled to the protection of some provision which would make it impossible for the court ever to agree that the provisions of a treaty should supersede and override a provision of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution. What he has suggested is exactly what we are seeking to do. We are seeking to write down in the basic indelible law of our country, protection of the inalienable rights of our people.

For the first 150 years of our history, no one ever dreamed that treaties might be used to make laws governing rights between individuals and their own Government. When the treatymaking power was written into the Constitution, it was for the purpose of enabling the United States to join in the making of laws applicable only between sovereign nations.

Most of the opponents of this resolution seek to elevate treaty law above domestic constitutional law. They seek to codify all fundamental human rights—civil, political, economic, social, and cultural—in a law superior to that of sovereign nations. The Constitution of the United States is a generally effective barrier against such revolutionary proposals. In our Constitution, however, those who would revolutionize the world by treaty have found the loophole about which we have been speaking.

The fears of Mr. Dulles expressed in Louisville are shared by the overwhelming majority of American lawyers. A treaty-control amendment substantially in the form reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee has been advocated by the American Bar Association. It has been endorsed by the National Association of Attorneys General. More than 20 State bar associations have gone on record to endorse a constitutional amendment substantially similar to Senate Joint Resolution 1, as reported by the committee.

Basically this concern of the American legal profession stems from an ambiguity in the treaty supremacy clause. Article VI, paragraph 2 of the Constitution reads as follows:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

In order that the RECORD may be complete, I wish to discuss briefly the case of Missouri against Holland.

In *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416 (1920)), Mr. Justice Holmes pointed to the language of article VI requiring laws, but not treaties, to be made in pursuance of the Constitution. He suggested that "under the authority of the United States" might mean "nothing

more than the formal acts required to make the convention."

Following the decision in Missouri against Holland, Charles Evans Hughes, a former Secretary of State and Chief Justice of the United States, and a great public servant in both capacities, stated that the treatymaking power "has no explicit limitation attached to it, and so far there has been no disposition to find in anything relating to the external concerns of the Nation the limitation to be implied." He went on to say: "I should not care to voice any opinion as to an implied limitation on the treatymaking power." In early dicta, the Supreme Court said that the treaty power does not extend "so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids," and that Federal jurisdiction cannot "be enlarged under the treatymaking power." Those reassuring statements were repudiated in Missouri against Holland. To prevent treaties, in the words of Mr. Dulles, from "cutting across the rights given the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights," section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 provides:

> A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

With such a provision in the Constitution, the United States could never become a party to the U. N. draft covenants on human rights except, of course, by further amending the Constitution. Many provisions in the human rights covenants contravene express constitutional prohibitions. Freedom of speech, press, assembly, and the right to public trial are dangerously qualified and, in addition, article II (1) permits those rights to be withdrawn completely during a state of emergency officially proclaimed by the authorities.

When we realize that for the past 20 years, until this administration, we had been living under an emergency about three-fourths of the time, we can realize the unlimited, unbridled, and uncontrolled power which would be given to the authorities. The chief authority would be the President of the United States.

Section 1 would make it impossible for the United States to join a world or regional government by treaty or by executive agreement. It writes into the Constitution the following statement by the Supreme Court in the Chinese exclusion cases:

> The powers of government are delegated in trust to the United States, and are incapable of transfer to any other parties. They cannot be abandoned or surrendered. * * * The exercise of these public trusts is not the subject of barter or contract.

That is what we want to put into the Constitution, because that principle has been reversed since that time.

Most of the opposition to this treaty-control amendment comes from those who yearn for the domination of a supranational government. Some of them would surrender national sovereignty immediately, others would destroy it gradually by means of U. N. treaties and by less formal agreements. Some would organize a suprastate on a global scale, while others would first establish a regional government. All these groups have one thing in common. They oppose Senate Joint Resolution 1 which would preserve the sovereignty they are seeking to destroy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know whether I understood what the Senator just said. Does he mean that all those opposed to his amendment yearn for a supergovernment?

Mr. BRICKER. No. I said that the common cause of all those who are yearning for a supergovernment is that they oppose Senate Joint Resolution 1. There are many people who have a legitimate objection, in their own judgment, and for them I have only the highest regard and the highest appreciation of their opinion. Anyone has a right to oppose the amendment who wishes to do so, and I am making no accusations, except to say that those who do want world government, regional government, or Atlantic Union now, are all opposed to it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then the Senator admits that there is room for an honest difference of opinion on that question?

Mr. BRICKER. If there were not, we would not be here.

Section 2 of the resolution makes all treaties non-self-executing if they are intended to become internal law. The provision does not apply to treaties dealing exclusively with the Nation's external affairs. Section 2 would have no effect whatever on treaties such as the North Atlantic Treaty.

The American people do not want United Nations treaties to make the laws under which they live. The process whereby scores of nonelected U. N. representatives from Socialist, Communist, and Fascist countries presume to write laws for the whole human race is wholly undemocratic. Senate review of United Nations treaties does not afford adequate protection. It is often impossible for the Senate to know whether or not, and to what extent, a treaty supersedes Federal and State laws. More than a century ago, the Supreme Court of the United States held a treaty to be non-self-executing and then, 4 years later, in a decision involving the same treaty, held that it was effective as domestic law in the absence of legislation. In other words, it was self-executing. However, the problem of self-executing treaties did not become acute until novel treaties began to roll off the U. N. assembly lines.

The typical United Nations treaty has scores of signers. The language is ambiguous. The ambiguity is designed to obscure radically different concepts of human rights in order to insure the maximum number of ratifications.

The other day I had the privilege of attending an exhibition at Kitty Hawk, N. C., in celebration of the 50th anniversary of powered flight. On my way back I happened to ride with a very distinguished general of the late war, who held a highly responsible position in the European organizational scheme. He told me they were trying to get together, on a military basis, to discuss some of the military problems of our allies. He said they had decided first of all to appoint an executive secretary of the committee. For 1 week, he told me, they haggled over what to call the official who was to have charge of the papers and to act, as we understand, as an executive secretary.

Finally, he asked, "What is your objection?"

The translator said, "Our objection is that an executive secretary in our country is an executioner who cuts off people's heads." [Laughter.] He said, "This is a peaceful organization, and we do not want anything like that."

They finally ended up by calling the man a master sergeant. [Laughter.]

That is one of the problems we meet in connection with language interpretation. It was the interpretation of language which caused the Supreme Court in 4 years' time to reverse itself in the case to which I have referred.

In passing on such treaties, the Senate does not have, as a practical matter, a free hand in writing reservations. In many cases, the making of substantial reservations to the treaty would require renegotiation with all other parties. In addition, the treaty itself may expressly forbid reservations. Moreover, the International Court of Justice has held that substantial reservations to certain treaties, such as the Genocide Convention, will nullify the act of ratification. Thus, in dealing with many United Nations treaties toward which this amendment is directed, the Senate must give its consent to ratification on an all-or-nothing basis under the Constitution as it stands today or interpreted by the Supreme Court. The Senate, therefore, runs the risk of later judicial interpretation contrary to its understanding of the treaty at the time of its approval.

Members of the Senate who served in the 79th Congress will recall the Senate approval of the United Nations Charter. The Senate was advised by President Truman and by all other supporters of the charter that no reservation could be made modifying any of its provisions. Moreover, no opponent of this amendment has ever suggested that the Senate will be able to attach reservations to any charter amendments that may be adopted at the United Nations Charter Revision Conference, which will be held in 1955.

Our treaty-supremacy clause is dangerously unique. Only in Mexico, and possibly in France, and, to a limited degree in the Netherlands, do treaties become internal law without legislative action. With these two exceptions, treaties make domestic law only for the American people. The citizens of other countries are not bound by a treaty unless and only to the extent that the treaty is made domestic law by their own legislative bodies. I see no reason whatever why the American people should be subjected to the danger of far-reaching changes in their way of life depending on how the Supreme Court may eventually interpret the obscure verbiage of a self-executing treaty.

Articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter, which the Senator from Nevada discussed a while ago, contained

some extremely vague human-rights provisions. They emphasize the need to make all treaties non-self-executing as domestic law. At the present time it is uncertain whether articles 55 and 56 radically change the laws of the United States or whether they are merely statements of high aspiration and purpose. If the Supreme Court should hold that articles 55 and 56 are self-executing, thousands of Federal and State laws will be nullified, even though not 1 of the 89 Senators who voted for the charter anticipated any such result. Many opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 believe that articles 55 and 56, notwithstanding their ambiguity, and without legislative implementation, alter radically the rights and obligations of the States and of the people. For example, one of the leading organizations opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 1 is the American Association for the United Nations. In *Shelley* v. *Kraemer* (334 U. S. 1 (1948)), the association filed a brief in the Supreme Court on the proposition that articles 55 and 56 had transformed—I ask Senators to note particularly this—the fundamental human rights of the American people from matters of purely domestic concern to matters of international concern. This remarkable brief was written by Alger Hiss and five other lawyers. It is reprinted in the committee hearings beginning at page 659.

This amendment will not hamper effective and proper United States participation in the work of the United Nations. It will merely give substance to article II, paragraph 7 of the charter which prohibits the United Nations from intervening in the purely domestic affairs of its member nations. Had it not been for that provision, I doubt that the United States Senate would have ratified the charter. However, that protective clause in the charter has been by-passed on the theory officially endorsed by the State Department in 1950 that there is no longer any distinction between foreign and domestic affairs.

Section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 not only requires legislation to make a treaty effective as internal law, but further requires that the legislation must be that "which would be valid in the absence of treaty." The "which" clause would no longer permit treaties, in the words of Mr. John Foster Dulles, "to take powers from the States and to give them to the Federal Government or to some international body." The "which" clause places on the treatymaking power the restrictions originally intended to govern its exercise. For example, Thomas Jefferson said in his Manual of Parliamentary Practice:

> By the general power to make treaties, the Constitution must have intended to comprehend only those objects which are usually regulated by treaties, and cannot be otherwise regulated.
>
> It must have meant to except out all those rights reserved to the States; for surely the President and the Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole Government is interdicted from doing in any way.

The principal argument advanced against the "which" clause is that it would require some treaties to be ratified by 48 State legislatures or that it would give each State a foreign policy veto power. The charge is utterly without any foundation. Under no circumstances would any treaty or any subject require State ratification at any time. The Constitution prevents the States from making treaties. Nothing in the proposed amendment would remove that impediment. However, if a treaty is made establishing a uniform divorce law, for example, the treaty would have to contain a provision making its effectiveness in the United States dependent upon State legislation then in effect or thereafter enacted.

The same would be true with respect to the public-school system and every power reserved to the States.

It is said that the adoption of the joint resolution would take us back to the days of the Articles of Confederation. Mr. President, under the Articles of Confederation a treaty could not be entered into unless it was approved and ratified by 9 States. That was the reason why treaty authority in the field of international relations was given to the Federal Government.

The "which" clause would not force a return to the treaty practice under the old Articles of Confederation. Under the Articles of Confederation treaties were actually submitted to the States for ratification. That would not be required under the terms of this amendment. The fact is that the United States has made scores of treaties in the past 100 years which dealt with local matters and which became effective as internal law only through State legislation.

During all that time we were a sovereign Nation. Canada now has the same provision. Canada is a sovereign nation, and has no difficulty in getting along with her neighbors.

The most frequent argument advanced in opposition to the "which" clause is that it would prevent the Congress from making effective in all of the 48 States the provisions found in the typical treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation. In my speech on the Senate floor on January 22, I pointed out that Congress has plenary power over the rights and privileges of aliens in the United States. Under the "which" clause, Congress could implement all treaties dealing with the property rights, commercial rights, fishing rights, and taxation of aliens. The decision of the Supreme Court in 1948 in *Takahashi* v. *Fish and Game Commission* (334 U. S. 410) proves conclusively that Congress has plenary power over the rights and privileges of aliens within the United States. That power stems from the power delegated to Congress over immigration and naturalization. Congress, and not the States, has the power to determine the conditions upon which aliens are permitted to reside in the United States and earn their living.

I am confident that the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee who voted to report Senate Joint Resolution 1 with a favorable recommendation would have no objection whatever—certainly, I would not—to an amendment to the committee text excluding aliens from the scope of the "which" clause.

I have said time and time again that I did not think it necessary, but I would be agreeable to it.

I have already indicated to the Secretary of State and to the Attorney General that I would be willing to accept this change in the amendment. Nevertheless, this proposed change has not overcome their objections to the "which" clause. I challenge any Member of the Senate to produce one example of a desirable treaty which Congress should be able to implement but which Congress could not implement by reason of the "which" clause. If only one such example can be produced, I will move to strike the "which" clause from the committee text.

In my judgment, treaties dealing with the rights of aliens in the United States are not affected by the "which" clause and it is unnecessary to exclude them by express language. But inasmuch as there has been some honest doubt on this point, I would be perfectly willing to make the exception. However, as this debate proceeds, Members of the Senate will discover that the differences between myself and the administration or those speaking for it, are not textual. The differences grow out of a fundamentally different philosophy of government. I do not believe that the Federal Government, merely by making a promise to a foreign country, should be able to clothe itself with authority which is inconsistent with the Constitution which gave it birth. That proposition the administration seems unwilling to accept.

In opposition to the "which" clause it is frequently asserted that the Senate can, and will, protect the powers reserved to the States by the Constitution through appropriate reservations to treaties. This has been attempted, but under the doctrine of Missouri against Holland, it is constitutionally impossible for the Senate to take away from the whole Congress its power to invalidate the reserved powers of the States in implementing a treaty. For example, the Senate in 1951 was much concerned by the Charter of Organization of American States. That treaty dealt with many matters of purely local concern. Accordingly, the Senate's advice and consent to the treaty was accompanied by this reservation:

> None of its provisions shall be considered as enlarging the powers of the Federal Government of the United States or limiting the powers of the several States of the Federal Union with respect to any matters recognized under the Constitution as being within the reserved powers of the several States.

That reservation, it is true, relieves the Congress of any obligation to enact legislation with respect to matters reserved by the 10th amendment to the several States. However, if the Congress wishes to exercise its full power under Missouri against Holland, the reservation cannot prevent the Congress from doing so. This point is conceded by such opponents of the amendment as Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. William D. Mitchell, and Mr. Harrison Tweed. In a report of the New York State Bar Association in which they joined, it is pointed out that a reservation to the

human rights covenants attempting to deny to the Congress full power to implement the covenants would be ineffective. This report points out that while the Congress might be excused from its obligation to enact Federal legislation, Congress under the rule in Missouri against Holland would still have the power to fully implement the covenants.

We now come to other cases which involve executive agreements.

In *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203 (1942)) the Court stated:

> A treaty is a "law of the land" under the supremacy clause (art. VI, cl. 2) of the Constitution. Such international compacts and agreements as the Litvinoff assignment have a similar dignity. (*United States* v. *Belmont, supra* (301 U. S. at p. 331) (p. 230).)

In a recent decision by the United States Court of Claims it was said at page 195—and if this is not dangerous, I do not know how we can find anything that is dangerous:

> The Byrnes-Blum agreement between the United States and France (not ratified by either House of Congress) is the type of agreement which has been recognized as a treaty within the meaning of article VI, clause 2, of the Constitution and thus is a part of "the supreme law of the land."

I challenge anyone to defend the proposition that the President of the United States should have power by executive agreement to make domestic law for the States contrary to the laws of Congress and of the several States.

That is the situation which exists now, under decisions of the Supreme Court.

If one single person can make domestic law by decree, we live in a dictatorship and not in a constitutional Republic as planned by the Founding Fathers. In the long series of conferences which I have had with the President and with his advisers, they have never at any time been willing to concede that the President should not have the power to override State laws and constitutions by executive agreement, and have it written into the Constitution.

They have not been willing to concede that all executive agreements should become internal law only through legislation, Federal or State, or whichever is appropriate. They have insisted upon the unhandicapped and unrestricted Executive power conferred by the Pink case, but, in my judgment, never intended to be conferred by the framers of the Constitution.

It is argued that section 3 of the amendment, in confirming the power of Congress to regulate executive agreements, would hamstring the President in the day-to-day conduct of foreign relations.

The amendment does not say that Congress must regulate or approve all executive agreements; it merely recognizes in Congress power to do so, which may, in fact, never be exercised; if exercised, it must be assumed that Congress will exercise reasonable judgment for the welfare of the country, as it does in all other matters.

The amendment does not turn our foreign relations over to Congress. It does not require Congress to examine the multitude of executive agreements of a daily housekeeping character and to authorize them in advance or validate them afterward.

No sillier claim has ever been made than that, with the amendment in effect, the Berlin airlift agreement could not have been made. The amendment does not require Congress to do anything; but merely confirms its power to pass laws with respect to executive agreements, if it chooses to do so.

Under this power, Congress can only pass a statute regulating executive agreements, subject to the veto power of the President. In case of an improper regulatory statute, any President, if he is right, can unquestionably have his veto sustained by one-third of one House of Congress. On the other hand, if two-thirds of both Houses override the veto, the regulation must be presumed to be sound. There is thus a great restraint on Congress in any regulation of executive agreements, and there is no basis whatever for the charge that Congress will run the foreign relations of the country.

Let me emphasize this.

In the last analysis, if the choice is between trusting one-man government, and trusting two-thirds of both Houses, the choice must inevitably lie with the direct representatives of the people in Congress. The people have not forgotten the long-range permanent commitments in the Teheran and Yalta agreements which Secretary Dulles said in the Senate hearings were illegal and should have been presented to the Senate as treaties.

Many able lawyers and judges, including members of the Senate Judiciary Committee and Chief Judge John Parker of the fourth circuit—hearings, pages 711, 712—believe that Congress now has power to regulate executive agreements under the "necessary and proper" clause of the Constitution, and that section 3 is unnecessary. In view, however, of the doubt registered by some persons, it was deemed proper, as long as the treaty power was to be amended, to confirm the power of Congress to regulate such agreements at all events. Congress has already so widely exercised the power to authorize and regulate executive agreements, that it might be concluded that any doubt is so lacking in substance as to render the first sentence of section 3 unnecessary.

The second sentence of section 3 is needed to prevent executive agreements from becoming domestic law unless made so by legislation. This is what Secretary Dulles thought the law was at the Senate hearings, page 828, although he completely overlooked that the Pink case—*United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203 (1942))—is to the contrary, holding, over the vigorous dissent of Chief Justice Stone, that the Roosevelt-Litvinov agreement was, like a treaty, the supreme law of the land, not affected by the fifth amendment, and that it superseded the law of New York.

I now wish to comment on the President's letter to the majority leader dated January 25 expressing his opposition to the amendment.

I read from the President's letter:

> I am unalterably opposed to the Bricker amendment as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The Senate Judiciary Committee reported Senate Joint Resolution 1 with only 4 of its 15 members dissenting. The committee is made up of extremely able lawyers. The President is not a lawyer, although he has been a great soldier, and I think is honestly approaching this problem; but I think some of the advice he has received has not been sound.

The second paragraph of the President's letter reads as follows:

> It would so restrict the conduct of foreign affairs that our country could not negotiate the agreements necessary for the handling of our business with the rest of the world.

This statement is utterly without foundation. There is nothing whatever in the amendment that concerns treaties insofar as the foreign affairs of this country are concerned. The amendment is concerned only with those treaties that become internal law. The President's power to make executive agreements in the field of foreign affairs is not affected by this amendment until the Congress passes appropriate legislation which it is already doing with respect to 85 percent of the major international agreements other than treaties, and they have not handicapped the President in his legitimate carrying out of foreign affairs.

I read from the President's letter:

> Such an amendment would make it impossible for us to deal effectively with friendly nations for our mutual defense and common interests.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Ohio said a minute or so ago that the statement of the President was incorrect in saying that it would make it impossible for the United States to carry on much of its business with other nations if section 2 of the Senator's amendment were adopted. I believe the Senator said that such an assertion was without foundation.

Mr. BRICKER. That is what I said.

Mr. COOPER. I differ with the Senator. Let us look at the statement. Today the United States carries on much of its business with other nations because of arrangements made through treaties.

Mr. BRICKER. Such treaties would not be affected in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. COOPER. Supporters of the amendment seem to proceed upon the assumption that treaties are made to give aliens benefits in this country which they ought not to have, and treaties perhaps wrongfully permit them rights in States which, other than for the treaty clause, they would not have.

Let us consider another side of the question. Why are such treaties negotiated? They are negotiated in order to secure for American citizens and American businesses rights in other countries. We can secure rights for our citizens in other countries by affording reciprocal rights in the United States.

A great many of these treaties are negotiated, called treaties of commerce

and friendship. They may provide that in return for other countries giving to our nationals the right to conduct business, rights in connection with taxation and protection in their countries, we will afford the citizens of the foreign countries the same rights in the United States.

If it were not for article VI, making treaties superior to State laws, the United States could not speak for all 48 States, and, of course, we would not be able to secure rights for our own citizens in other countries.

I think the President was perfectly well justified in saying that if section 2 should be adopted, it would interfere with the ability of the United States to transact its business with other countries.

Mr. BRICKER. Did the Senator hear my discussion of the Takahashi case?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; I did. At the time, the Senator from Ohio said that if anyone could cite a case wherein the "which" clause would interfere with or prevent the execution of a treaty, he would withdraw section 2.

I have pointed out that the purpose of many treaties is to secure for our citizens certain rights in other countries; to expand commerce; and even to protect the security of our nationals. If we cannot assure reciprocal rights to other countries, we cannot expect to obtain them from other countries for our citizens abroad. Section 2 would prevent the Federal Government from giving such assurances. State action would be required, perhaps of all the States.

The Senator from Ohio has contended that Congress can legislate with respect to all the rights of aliens. I do not agree, because many subjects are reserved to the States. The States reserved those powers; they did not delegate them to the Federal Government under the Constitution. For example, the right to hold property, to conduct business, to inherit property, to transfer property rights relating to civil and criminal jurisdiction. There are other rights which are reserved to the States. I am certain the Senator from Ohio would be the last Member of the Senate who would say that, without a precise delegation by the Constitution, such rights could be transferred to Congress.

Mr. BRICKER. It can be done now. The Senator from Kentucky knows that the Senate ratifies such treaties frequently. We ratified several of them last winter. We have written into them provisions to protect the rights of the States.

Mr. COOPER. That is an argument, why section 2 is not necessary. The Senate can protect the States by reservations today because it has constitutional powers to approve treaties even though they deal with State powers. I return to my point that without the treaty power, many subjects are reserved to the States. They could not be dealt with by Congress through any other power. Treaty power, I repeat, is not for the benefit of other countries, as is suggested by some, but is for the primary benefit of the United States.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Kentucky wish to give aliens more rights than are possessed by citizens of the States?

Mr. COOPER. No. I wish to make that very clear. I think that another assumption, and a wrong one held by some supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 1, is that treaties are entered into for the purpose of taking away the rights of our citizens or of encroaching upon the rights of the States. If we desire to secure rights for our citizens in other countries, we must be able to assure similar rights to aliens within the entire United States. Under our Federal-State system, the Federal Government could not ordinarily assure any rights except in those fields where power is granted to Congress. No rights of citizens or of the States can be invaded unless permitted by the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. That covers the whole field of rights to aliens.

Mr. COOPER. I would not agree with the Senator, because rights are reserved to the States, and cannot be invaded or any rights granted to aliens, by treaty, except constitutionally.

Mr. BRICKER. Under the reserve clause, every right could be taken away from the States by treaty.

Mr. COOPER. Not unless it were ratified by the Senate, and further, treaties cannot disturb the constitutional structure of a State.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I correctly remember the Senator from Ohio saying a few minutes ago that with respect to the rights of aliens, he was perfectly willing to make an exception in the "which" clause, although he thought it was not necessary?

Mr. BRICKER. I do not think it is necessary, but I have said so all along. Six months ago I said the joint resolution might be returned to the Committee on the Judiciary, where that matter could be acted upon.

I repeat the statement which I read from the President's letter:

> Such an amendment would make it impossible for us to deal effectively with friendly nations for our mutual defense and common interests.

That is untrue. The amendment would place the United States in exactly the same position as Canada, which seems to be able to deal most effectively with other friendly nations, including our country, in matters pertaining to mutual defense.

I read another paragraph from the President's letter:

> These matters are fundamental. We cannot hope to achieve and maintain peace if we shackle the Federal Government so that it is no longer sovereign in foreign affairs.

Under the proposed amendment the Federal Government would continue to be fully sovereign in foreign affairs. The Federal Government would not be fully sovereign in domestic affairs, and that is the reason for the opposition.

I read further from the President's letter:

> The President must not be deprived of his historical position as the spokesman for the Nation in its relations with other countries.

There is absolutely nothing in the proposed amendment which would change the present method under which the President negotiates treaties on his own initiative and makes them by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The proposed amendment would require implementing legislation only if the treaty or executive agreement should become internal law.

The President's letter continues further:

> Adoption of the Bricker amendment in its present form by the Senate would be notice to our friends as well as our enemies abroad that our country intends to withdraw from its leadership in world affairs. The inevitable reaction would be of major proportion.

All I can say about that is that it is a purely emotional argument, because I do not see how any government on the face of the earth could complain if the United States put itself on a parity with other governments, so far as treaties or executive agreements are concerned. That is what we are doing with all other countries, with the exception of Mexico, and partially with respect to France and the Netherlands.

The President's letter continues further:

> It would impair our hopes and plans for peace and for the successful achievement of the important international matters now under discussion. This would include the diversion of atomic energy from warlike to peaceful purposes.

Mr. President, I do not know who advised the President about that, but that statement is 100 percent wrong. The amendment would in no way prohibit the President from carrying out his proposal for the creation of an atomic-energy pool dedicated to peaceful purposes.

Let me read the law. In some of these matters it is always wise to read the law. I do not know that the Department of State is involved from occasionally reading the law. I read from the Atomic Energy Act:

> SEC. 8. (a) Definition: As used in this act, the term "international arrangement" shall mean any treaty approved by the Senate or international agreement hereafter approved by the Congress, during the time such treaty or agreement is in full force and effect.
>
> (b) Effect of international arrangements: Any provision of this act or any action of the Commission to the extent that it conflicts with the provisions of any international arrangement made after the date of enactment of this act shall be deemed to be of no further force or effect.

I do not know how the law could be written any more definitely than that. I have gone over the language time and time again. I have followed this law from the beginning.

This is the law:

> In the performance of its functions under this act, the Commission shall give maximum effect to the policies contained in any such international arrangement.

Yet the contention is made that the proposed amendment would prohibit or interfere with the President's making a pooling arrangement for peaceful purposes. If that were true, I would be the first to exempt the President. However, the assertion is utterly without founda-

tion, and the terms of the law itself disprove that contention.

Although the President's motives are, as always, sincere, as I have proclaimed time and again, his advisers have sold him a bad bill of goods. If his reference to atomic energy is to be taken as the test of the validity of his opinions on the amendment, its exposure as unsound should undermine his whole position. It was deemed unsound by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and will again be exposed as unsound in this debate.

Congress has already exercised its power in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as I have read, establishing a national commission to control the ownership, production, and development of atomic energy in the United States. This was done, under the power of Congress, to provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and establish world peace. We are not in any way attempting to take any of that power away.

The States of the Union have no power whatsoever in the field of atomic energy. Congress has plenary power. Therefore, any treaty or executive agreement made by the President with respect to the pooling of atomic energy could be made internal law through implementing legislation by the Congress, and it does not even take legislation, under the provisions which I read to the Senate a moment ago. The President has already announced that if a treaty or agreement for an atomic energy pool can be worked out, he will seek appropriate legislation from the Congress; and I think that is proper. The making of these erroneous charges proves that there is no valid objection to the purpose or effect of the amendment.

In December, Mr. Adrian Fisher, former General Counsel for the Atomic Energy Commission and former legal adviser to the State Department, and a strong opponent of any amendment to the treatymaking power, admitted in a statement in this city that the amendment, as presently written, would not in the slightest affect the President's atomic-energy pooling proposal which the President himself said needed the approval of Congress.

The President's letter continues:

> I fully subscribe to the proposition that no treaty or international agreement can contravene the Constitution.

Secretary of State Dulles also subscribes to the proposition that no treaty or international agreement can contravene the Constitution. The sentence I have just read may be interpreted in two ways. Under one interpretation, the power to make treaties and other international agreements is unlimited. As Secretary of State Dulles pointed out in Louisville, Ky., on April 12, 1952: "Treaties can override the Constitution and cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights." But, said Mr. Dulles, this extraordinary power was "deliberately intended by our founders in order to give the Federal Government untrammeled authority to deal with international problems." Thus it was Mr. Dulles' view in Louisville, and it may be the view of the President today that a treaty can cut across the Bill of Rights without contravening the Constitution. That is the danger to which the whole amendment is directed.

On the other hand, the President's statement may be interpreted to mean that a treaty or other international agreement that contravenes the Constitution shall be of no force or effect. If the President is willing to concede that every provision of the Constitution should be supreme over the treaty power, then we are in complete agreement, because that is all that Senate Joint Resolution 1 provides.

I quote further from the President's letter:

> I am aware of the feeling of many of our citizens that a treaty may override the Constitution. So that there can be no question on this point, I will gladly support an appropriate amendment that will make this clear for all time.

The provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 1 are interrelated and interdependent. The amendment has been considered in the American Bar Association for more than 4 years. At its last annual meeting in Boston the association reaffirmed its support for the amendment by a vote of 4 to 1. Section 1 of the amendment cannot be isolated. The loophole in our Constitution must be completely closed and not partially closed. Our Constitution was designed to curb any extraordinary power liable to abuse. To that principle there can be no exceptions, not even in an atomic age, unless we are prepared to exchange a government of men for one of constitutional restraints.

Many opponents of the amendment are inspired by an overweening zeal to transfer legislative authority from the States and the Congress to some international body. They consistently support all measures designed to consolidate the power of government in fewer hands and at a greater distance from the people.

Supporters of the amendment do not want their God-given, inalienable rights to depend on the beneficence of one man, or even on that of the President and two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. The American people, I am convinced, want a Bill of Rights against the treaty power—a Bill of Rights required to meet a new theory of treaty law not anticipated in 1787, when the Constitution was wrtten. They do not question—and neither do I; I never have—the high integrity or sincere purpose of President Eisenhower. On the other hand, they are not disturbed by the unfounded claim that this amendment indicates mistrust or suspicion of the President. They know that the greatest restraint ever placed on any American President, and the most beneficial, was the Bill of Rights, submitted by the First Congress during the administration of our first President, George Washington.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the course of my discussion of the pending question, I shall refer to certain legal citations and other technical matters. In order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that the entire citations may be printed and inserted in the RECORD, without being fully read by me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose Senate Joint Resolution No. 1—the so-called Bricker amendment. In the course of this address, I hope I shall show to the satisfaction of most of my colleagues that this proposal calls for a dangerous invasion of the sovereignty of our Nation.

I shall attempt to show—

First. That the fears which led to the drafting of this resolution, no matter how sincerely they may be held by the sponsor, are not founded on fact.

Second. That the method he uses to obviate this nonexistent, imaginary danger, produces other and overriding dangers which are not imaginary at all, but are very real.

Third. That this resolution is based on a misunderstanding, or a lack of understanding, of both history and law. I say this with the utmost humility, for I, myself, was not fully aware of the historical significance of the treaty clause in our Constitution, or of its later interpretation by the courts, until, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I was forced to give it the most searching examination in connection with the pending resolution.

Mr. President, I think it is well that we realize clearly that the real climate of opinion in which the Bricker resolution was born and nourished is one which would have us as a nation withdraw again from the world. It is an atmosphere which looks with suspicion on the United Nations and on the efforts of men to work out some sort of common meeting ground where they can live together at peace in the world.

We are told that the times in which we live are troublesome ones. So they are. We are told that because of the world forces whirling around us, we need to take unusual precautions to protect our institutions against them. Mr. President, that is the counsel of fear.

The foundations of this Republic were laid, not in fear but in faith and courage. Those who set forth from foreign shores to make a home on this continent were not a fearful group. Those who challenged the might of the British Empire, and founded this Republic, were not a fearful group. Those who signed the Declaration of Independence—knowing

full well that if they should lose in their quest for independence they might well find a firing squad awaiting them—were not a fearful group. Neither were those who wrote the treaty clause in the Constitution. As I hope to show conclusively in a few minutes, they knew exactly what they were saying in that clause. They threshed out among themselves the arguments which now are made in favor of the Bricker amendment; and they rejected them.

Mr. President, the present troublous times and the unusual forces now loose in the world do not constitute a reason for retreat into isolationism. Instead, they are a challenge to world leadership.

The world is looking to us for such leadership. The great hope and dream of men everywhere is for peace. The United States is the great bulwark and leader of freemen. A timid withdrawal from the world will not protect the institutions we cherish. An enlightened position in the world will protect them.

Shall history say of us that we were so frightened by the position in which we found ourselves in the world that we were not equal to the challenge to our leadership; that we dropped the mantle, and fled; that we sought the sand in which to bury our heads?

Our Constitution has now been in existence for 164 years. During all that time there has not been negotiated, and approved by the Senate, one treaty which the sponsors of the pending resolution say was a bad one, or one in which constitutional power was exceeded. After 164 years, shall the Senate now vote that it has no confidence in two-thirds of the Senate and in the President of the United States? On the basis of the hypothetical argument that some day, in some way, some how, there might be a bad treaty, shall the sponsors of the Bricker amendment now succeed in tying our hands, and in making this Nation less than equal at the bargaining table with other nations?

Mr. President, we have grown to greatness under our present Constitution. Now that we are great, why can we no longer place our trust in it?

Following the examination which I made as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I became convinced, and I am convinced today, that the founders of our Government knew exactly what they were doing when they outlined how this Nation would enter into treaties and what the effect of those treaties would be.

I find myself somewhat resentful, therefore, not for myself, but for them—for Thomas Jefferson, Madison, and Hamilton, and the others of that band of dedicated men who gathered at Philadelphia and presided at the birth of our Nation, when I hear of those of us who are opposed to the Bricker resolution berated as "left wingers" or "soft on communism" as was done in a speech on this floor the other day.

I find myself somewhat resentful on behalf of another group—on behalf of Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi; Alexander Stephens and Robert Toombs, of Georgia; Robert Hunter, of Virginia, and those others who gathered at Montgomery, Ala., almost a century later to form the Confederate States of America.

Today, those who would change our Constitution as it applies to treaties wrap themselves in the cloak of States rights and pose as the defenders of the States against a Federal, or, they now add, an international government.

I know of no more sincere advocates of States' rights than the band gathered at Montgomery, Ala., to form the Confederacy. But I have in my hand a copy of the constitution that they formed—the constitution of the Confederate States of America. I want to read section 3, article VI, of that constitution. It states:

> This constitution and the laws of the Confederate States, made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the Confederate States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. President, it is not by chance that the language of the constitution of the Confederate States of America is identical, word for word, with the exception of the identifying term "United States," with that of our own Constitution. Article VI, clause 2, of the United States Constitution, reads:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

These leaders of our Southland knew that if they were to form a separate nation upon this continent they must be prepared to live in a world of nations. They knew that no matter how great might be their allegiance to their individual States—to Mississippi, Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, South or North Carolina, Texas, or the others of the Confederate States—that in external matters they, as individuals, would have to defer to the National Government.

There is no other way for a nation to exist in the world.

The constitution of the Confederacy was written some 76 years after the Constitution of the United States. We had had a great deal of experience during that time; yet an examination of the history of the constitution of the Confederacy shows that among the men who had had experience in the National Government, the Government of the United States, there was not one suggestion that the treatymaking power of the Central Government should be diminished or taken away. Bear in mind that the gentlemen assembled at Montgomery, Ala., including eminent scholars, legislators, and statesmen, were dedicated to the States' rights. However, they knew, as did the Founding Fathers, after the experiences with the Articles of Confederation, that a government could not operate unless it had power to deal as a nation. It could not operate under limitations such as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], through the Bricker amendment, is trying to place around the hands of our Chief Executive.

The Bricker resolution is the culmination of a series of proposals for constitutional change based on the assumption that in the drafting of the Constitution the Founding Fathers did not envision the broad scope of authority given to the Federal Government by the treaty power. This viewpoint is clearly stated by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], in his speech introducing his first proposal before the Senate. He said:

> The joint resolution just introduced is designed to plug a growing loophole in the Constitution. * * * The menacing loophole we see in the Constitution today was simply not visible in 1787. * * * The Founding Fathers did not dream that the relationship of the American people to their Government could be altered by treaty. (NOTE.—BRICKER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, vol. 98, pt. 1, Feb. 7, 1952, p. 908.)

On the other hand, both the experience of those who participated in the drafting of the Constitution and their public statements concerning that document demonstrate that they were fully aware and intended that the relationship of the American people to their Government could be altered by treaty.

The best evidence of this is a literal quotation of the pertinent sections pertaining to treaty power of the Federal Constitution and of the Articles of Confederation.

First, the articles of our present Constitution:

Article I, section 10, clauses 1 and 3:

> No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation * * *.
>
> No State shall, without the consent of Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power.

Article II, section 2, clause 2:

> He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Article III, section 2, clause 1:

> The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority.

Article VI, clause 2:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

These are the clauses in the Constitution which refer specifically to the treaty power of the United States. It will be noted that the treaty power as such is completely denied the States by clause 1 of section 10, of article 1, and the making of any agreement or compact by any State is subject to the consent of Congress. This prohibition, together with the other treaty clauses, makes it clear that the States delegated to the Federal Government complete authority and control over the exercise of the treaty power.

I have heard a great deal of oratory from the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and other Senators who have

spoken in favor of this amendment, bemoaning the fact that treaties cross State lines and conflict with State constitutions and State laws. It is said that that is something that should not be tolerated, and that that is the reason why we must eliminate any effect of treaties upon State laws and State constitutions. It is said that the Founding Fathers never contemplated that a treaty should ever contain anything in conflict with a State constitution or a State law.

The answer to that argument is in the Constitution itself. Article VI, clause 2, of the Constitution says that the Constitution and laws of the United States, and treaties, shall be the supreme law. The last important clause in that language is "anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." Of course that language would never have been written into article VI, clause 2, unless it had been contemplated — and, indeed, foreseen — that there would be treaties which might conflict or would conflict with State laws, or even with State constitutions. Indeed, as I shall point our presently, that was one of the main reasons why the Federal Constitution was written, namely, that there could be a provision under which the Central Government could enter into a treaty which would contravene State law and State constitutions, so that the Nation could speak with one voice, instead of speaking with, at that time, the voices of 13 separate States.

No limitations or restrictions are mentioned in any of those clauses with respect to the power of the President and the Senate to enter into treaties. That this was the deliberate and considered intention of the Founding Fathers is apparent from a survey of the experiences under the Articles of Confederation from which the Constitution was developed.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain material with reference to the Articles of Confederation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREATY CLAUSES IN THE ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION

A brief perusal of the treaty clauses in the Articles of Confederation may be helpful in determining the intention of the Founding Fathers when they agreed upon a revision of those clauses in formulating the Constitution.

The treaty clauses in the Articles of Confederation are as follows:

Article VI: "No State, without the consent of the United States in Congress assembled, shall enter into any conference, agreement, alliance, or treaty, etc."

Article IX: "The United States, in Congress assembled, shall have the sole and exclusive right and power of determining on peace and war; * * *.

"Entering into treaties and alliances, provided that no treaty of commerce shall be made whereby the legislative power of the respective States shall be restrained from imposing such imposts and duties on foreigners as their own people are subjected to, or from prohibiting the exportation or importation of any species of goods or commodities whatever. * * *

"The United States, in Congress assembled, shall never engage in war, * * * nor enter into any treaties or alliances; * * * unless nine States assent to the same."

Other clauses of the Articles of Confederation of particular interest in this connection are the following:

Article II: "Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled."

Article V: "Each State shall have one vote."

Article XIII: "Every State shall abide by the determination of the United States, in Congress assembled, on all questions which by this Confederation are submitted to them. And the articles of this Confederation are submitted to them. And the articles of this Confederation shall be inviolably observed by every State; and the Union shall be perpetual."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Dissatisfaction with the operation of the treaty power under the Articles of Confederation was one of the principal reasons for the adoption of the Constitution. In presenting the Virginia plan at the Constitutional Convention of 1787, Governor Randolph enumerated the defects in the Articles. An abstract of his speech, at set forth in Madison's notes of the Constitution, reads:

He then proceeded to enumerate the defects: 1. That the confederation produced no security aga[inst] foreign invasion; Congress not being permitted to prevent a war nor to support it by th[eir] own authority—Of this he cited many examples; most of whi[ch] tended to shew, that they could not cause infractions of treaties or of the law of nations, to be punished: that particular States might by their conduct provoke war without controul; and that neither militia nor draughts being fit for defence on such occasions, enlistments only could be successful, and these could not be executed without money. (NOTE.—Farrand, Records of the Federal Constitution, vol. 1, p. 19.)

That the framers of the Constitution intentionally refrained from stating any limitation on the scope of the treaty power is indicated by Madison's statement in the Virginia Convention in which he said:

I think it [the treaty power] rests on the safest foundation as it is. The object of treaties is the regulation of intercourse with foreign nations, and is external. I do not think it possible to enumerate all the cases in which such external regulations would be necessary. Would it be right to define all the cases in which Congress could exercise this authority? The definition might, and probably would, be effective. They might be restrained, by such a definition, from exercising the authority where it would be essential to the interest and safety of the community. It is most safe, therefore, to leave it to be exercised as contingencies may arise. (Elliot's Debates, vol. 3, p. 514.)

Mr. President, let me say at this point that nearly all the commentators upon our basic law have agreed that the genius of the Founding Fathers was such that, without spelling out in detail how the provisions were to apply, they made it possible for the Constitution to provide general guidance in a way to meet almost any conditions which might arise. That was done very carefully in connection with the treatymaking power.

Knowledge derived from their experience of the treaty of peace with Great Britain made the leaders of the constitutional period aware that treaties could, and that it was necessary that treaties should, effectively alter the relationship of people in America to their Government. Article 6 of the treaty provided that there was to be no further confiscation of property or persecution of persons for their part in the war.

It has been stated that Missouri against Holland was the first case which recognized that a treaty could contravene State law. The Founding Fathers understood that a treaty must at times contravene State law. In 1796, in Ware against Hylton, the Court had before it the treaty with Great Britain. At that time certain properties of British citizens, or debts owed to them, were being confiscated in the State of Virginia by State law contrary to the terms of the treaty. The question presented to the Supreme Court in 1796 was whether the treaty, which overrode the laws of the State of Virginia with reference to the property of aliens, was valid. The Supreme Court held it was valid. That was one of the reasons why the Constitution was adopted in the first place.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this section of the treaty gave both economic and political rights to people in America which State laws had denied. For example, South Carolina in laws of January 1782 banished some people, confiscated estates of others, and fined others 10 to 12 percent of their total estates for pardons (Jensen, The New Nation, 275–7 (1950)). Pennsylvania had Test Acts which "required that all the white male inhabitants must take an oath renouncing fidelity to George III, pledging allegiance to Pennsylvania, and agreeing to expose conspiracies. If they refused to take the oath, they could not hold office, vote, serve on juries, buy, sell or transfer real estate, or sue for the collection of debts. Thousands of Pennsylvania residents refused to take the oath" (ibid. at 272–4). In addition New York had passed laws in 1784 which disenfranchised all who had been British officials, who had helped the British in any way during the war, who had left the State, or who had joined the British (ibid. at 271–2). All of these State laws purported to regulate the relation of people to their government, and the British Treaty was by its provisions intended to change the relationship the laws had established. It nullified or changed all of those State laws.

This practical lesson was not lost on the leadership of the period and the Constitution was drafted and ratified despite statements that clearly indicate recognition of the possibility that a treaty could have an impact on the people's relationship with their government. The following quotations are only a few of the times in the State Ratifying Conventions that the issue was raised.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of statements, which are only a few of the statements made in the States when the Constitution was being ratified. They show that the States, in ratifying the Constitution, understood full well that treaties made by the central Government possibly, and in some cases necessarily would, cut across State laws, and that they understood that was one of the prime reasons

why this Government could not exist under the Articles of Confederation, back to which the Senator from Ohio would have us go, and why a new Constitution had to be written.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pennsylvania ratifying convention, written dissent of minority:

"The Senate has, moreover, various and great executive power, viz, in concurrence with the president-general, they form treaties with foreign nations, that may control and abrogate the constitutions and laws of the several States. Indeed, there is no power, privilege or liberty of the State governments, or of the people, but what may be affected by virtue of this power." (NOTE.—McMaster and Stone, Pennsylvania and the Federal Convention, 476; reported in I Butler, Treaty Making Power of the United States, 342 (1902).)

South Carolina ratifying convention, Mr. Pringle, speaker of the convention, advocating ratification of the convention:

"The treaties will affect all the individuals equally of all the States. If the President and Senate make such as violate the fundamental laws, and subvert the Constitution, or trend to the destruction of the happiness and liberty of the States, the evils, equally oppressing all, will be removed as soon as felt, as those who are oppressed will have the power and means of redress." (NOTE.—Elliot's Debates, vol. IV, p. 269.)

Virginia ratifying convention, Patrick Henry opposing ratification:

"How do the rights of persons stand, when they [Senate and President] have the right to make any treaty?" (NOTE.—III Elliot's Debates, 512–14.) And at the close of debate, Henry added: "Another thing which they have not mentioned, is the power of treaties. Two-thirds of the Senators present can make treaties; and they are to be paramount to the State constitutions. We wish to guard against the temporary suspension of our great national rights." (NOTE.—III Elliot's Debates, 514.)

North Carolina ratifying convention, Mr. McDowall urging participation of the House of Representatives in the treatymaking process, said:

"These 10 men who constitute a quorum may make treaties and alliances. They may involve us in any difficulties, and dispose of us in any manner they please." (NOTE.—IV Elliot's Debates, 119.) Subsequently, Mr. Davie, a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, in supporting the Constitution pointed out, "[Although] treaties are mere conventional acts between the contracting parties, yet by the law of nations, they are the supreme law of the land to their respective citizens and subjects." (NOTE.—3 Farrand, 347–348.)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in a second important area, the Senator from Ohio is trying to revive an issue which had been thoroughly considered and rejected by the framers of the Constitution. He advocates making the House of Representatives pass, along with a majority of the Senate, an act or joint resolution before a treaty or executive agreement shall alter or abridge the laws of the United States or the laws or the constitutions of the States.

The history of the Convention shows that full consideration was given to the problem and the proposal was twice soundly defeated. A proposed amendment provided:

The Senate shall have the power to treat with foreign nations, but no treaty shall be binding on the United States which is not ratified by law.

This amendment was defeated, 1 for, 8 against, 1 divided.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me finish my statement on this point, and then I shall be happy to yield.

The amendment was offered by Gouverneur Morris at the Constitutional Convention. On September 4 the committee of 11 reported the following proposed draft:

The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall have power to make treaties. * * * But no treaty shall be made without the consent of two-thirds of the Members present.

In the discussion Wilson moved to amend the section by adding the words "House of Representatives" after the word "Senate." He argued that since treaties were to have "operation of laws" they should also require the "sanction of laws." This amendment was defeated and the committee's proposal was then adopted. The vote on Wilson's amendment was a conclusive 1 for and 10 against.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. As I understood the statement of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], he said the reason for the insertion of article VI was to be sure that certain domestic debtors would have to pay their debts, and that article was placed in the Constitution for that specific purpose only 2 or 3 days before its final adoption. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That was one of the reasons. The framers of the Constitution had seen that, with each State having separate laws, dealing differently with the people and business matters, confiscating property, and so forth, and having different penalties against citizens of Great Britain or persons who were loyal to Great Britain during the war, the United States could not operate unless one central government could speak for it, in the field of foreign affairs, for all the States. That was one of the principal reasons, as we all know, why the Constitution was adopted. It was impossible to operate the Nation under a "Bricker system," which was the system under which it was operated under the Articles of Confederation. The reason given by the Senator from Ohio was one of the reasons.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am certain the Senator from Tennessee does not mean to say that they wanted permanently to provide for the overriding of the fifth amendment. It was a matter of expediency. They knew that several States had passed laws forgiving debtors the payment of their debts, because they had already paid them into the Treasury of their State under authority of law to aid in the conduct of the Revolutionary War. They wanted to have the English creditors paid, because they were fearful that otherwise they would not get a favorable peace treaty with Great Britain. I think that is the reason why that section was included. I think that is the only reason.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the reason why the clause was added to article VI was to prevent the States, which were operating differently, getting the Central Government into all kinds of difficulties. It was understood then, just as it has always been understood, that in the field of external matters, foreign affairs, the Central Government had to speak for the whole Nation, whether or not its actions contravened State laws.

The Senator cannot point to any one case in which it has been held that a treaty has violated any constitutional rights.

One of the most remarkable things I know of is the fact that no abuse of the presidential power has been shown; no abuse by the United States Senate has been shown, and no case has been shown of our courts having violated constitutional rights. Citizens are entitled to protection not only by the first amendment, but by the fifth and fourteenth amendments, and no abuses have been shown, but only hypothetical claims of abuses.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is the Senator familiar with the Cunard case?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am somewhat familiar with it. I have a digest of it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it proper to say that it involved a treaty made in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is not.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator please explain it, then?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will come to that case and explain it in a few moments. I shall come to those cases a little later on in my remarks.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee one further question, if he will yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator contend that article VI of the Constitution overrides in cases of peculiarly local matters? Could we make a treaty with Great Britain regulating traffic laws within the States?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Why can we not do that?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Ohio referred to that yesterday, and said that if we had an agreement with Canada relative to lowering the voting age to 18 years, it could be done by treaty, whereas, otherwise, a law would have to be passed. Our jurisprudence has been built up around the treatymaking clause, placing treaties in the category of external matters having to do with the foreign affairs of our Nation. If the President and two-thirds of the Senate should attempt to make a treaty which tried to deal with something which was strictly an internal matter, it would be ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. It is a great tribute to our Presidents and our Senates that over the years we have not encountered any difficulties because of their use of the treatymaking power.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If the Government can make a treaty regulating the flight of migratory birds from Canada to South America, why can it

not regulate the flow of traffic to the south? What is the difference?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I would say there is a great deal of difference.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. What is that difference?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It was quite apparent that if migratory birds were to be saved at all there had to be a treaty between Canada and the United States. As to traffic, there has not been any showing that any great number of persons are going to be wiped out of existence or that relationships between this Nation and any other nation will be affected by it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is there any doubt in the Senator's mind that if such a treaty were made, the Congress would have a right to pass implementing legislation on the subject that is to make traffic laws for the individual States?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is a very difficult question to answer. I am not trying to be a supreme court, to pass upon the question whether all traffic conditions are local matters, or whether, at some time or other, they might be the subject of international treaties. My opinion is that, if a treaty of that type were negotiated and ratified by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present and voting, and it were contested in the courts, the courts would say it was a local matter; that there was no external problem which would justify the making of that sort of treaty.

On the other hand, if the question related to radio waves or dealt with the airways, or dealt perhaps with a code for the protection of the people of both nations, I think a different situation probably would be involved.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Let us talk about airways for a moment. Has not the United States already entered into a convention which has the effect of depriving a citizen, who may be riding on an international airline, of the protection afforded to another citizen who may be sitting alongside him simply because he is riding on an international ticket?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not think so.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Such a treaty is of record. It was ratified by the Senate. I think the Senator from Tennessee probably was a Member of the Senate at the time. I did not happen to be.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the treaties which have been ratified have been fully reciprocal. If any provision such as that mentioned by the Senator from Maryland is contained in a treaty, certainly it ought to be brought out.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It is well known that the treaty to which I am referring, which is the Warsaw Convention, limits the amount which an American citizen may recover, and it has this result: If two people board an airplane in San Francisco, and the destination of one passenger is London, while the destination of the other is New York, and if the plane should crash at takeoff, the man bound for London could recover appproximately $8,300, whereas the passenger going to New York could recover whatever amount a jury might award. This is a serious abridgment of his right to a jury trial.

Does the Senator from Tennessee think that is a proper subject for a treaty?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the first place, I do not know that that is the case. But even if it is, I do not see how the Senator reaches the conclusion that it is an abridgement of his right to a jury trial. I understood you to say that the treaty provides the United States citizen is entitled to recover whatever the jury awards.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I can assure the Senator from Tennessee that that is the case. I will place the treaty in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If that be the case, then perhaps the treaty should be renegotiated, or its constitutionality should be tested in the courts. If in part it relates to a purely local matter, the courts will say that that part of it is unconstitutional.

But I may say to the Senator from Maryland that it is necessary that power to enter into agreements that will bind the Nation in foreign affairs be vested somewhere. It is now vested in the President, with two-thirds of the Senate concurring. I think that is the best way to handle such matters.

Although mistakes may have been made in the treaty field, they have been very few. Whenever authority is vested somewhere, mistakes will be made. Sometimes objectives which are sought at present are not achieved in the years to come.

I think that, on the whole, our Presidents and the Senate have been very careful and have done an excellent job in exercising their treatymaking power.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. If, as was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], a treaty were entered into between the United States and Canada, which involved the control of traffic in New York, Minnesota, New Jersey, or Georgia, on any but a mutually advantageous reciprocal basis, does not our experience of 164 years clearly indicate that the common sense of the Senate would assert itself, and that such a treaty would not receive a two-thirds vote for ratification?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the Senator from New York is exactly correct.

I believe that in the Federalist Papers there is a statement to the effect that if the President and two-thirds of the Senate intended to let the people of the United States down, no laws or changes in the Constitution could alter the situation. We shall be done for and gone whenever the President and two-thirds of the Senate shall not properly have looked after the best interests of the United States.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURKE in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield very happily to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I listened with interest to the exchange of comment between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. With respect to the identical treaty referred to by the Senator from Maryland, I cannot recall the facts; but I know that the States of the United States have limited the amount that may be recovered by reason of death, and recently the amount has been increased. But the point is that in 165 years of treatymaking, there was only one treaty which the Congress of the United States set aside. That was a treaty with France. If there is such a treaty as was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, a joint resolution of the Senate and the House could set it aside very quickly. So a remedy exists.

I do not know how we have ever lived through the past 165 years without the Bricker amendment. Does the Senator from Tennessee? [Laughter.]

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin; that is unquestionably so. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and everyone else, admits that if a majority of Congress, reflecting the will of the people, feels that any treaty which has been entered into has become outmoded, or if Congress, for any reason, desired to terminate the treaty, all that would be necessary would be to pass a joint resolution by majority vote. That has been done on one occasion. I think the fact that such action has been so rare—and the United States has entered into more than 900 treaties—shows that great care has been taken in connection with treaties.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator from Tennessee believe that the United States should conduct its foreign relations on the basis of entering into treaties, and then having Congress nullify them?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No one is advocating such a procedure.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That seems to be the remedy the Senator from Tennessee is suggesting. The Senator knows that in 95 percent of all cases, such a measure would be vetoed, and it would be necessary to procure a two-thirds majority of both Houses in order to override the veto, which is far more than a simple majority.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the first place, no one is advocating that a treaty should be ratified with the idea that it would be nullified by an act of Congress. The point is that with the checks and balances provided in the Constitution, it is within the power of Congress by one method or another to nullify a treaty or to change a law. The ultimate power rests in Congress. It may be true that in some cases the President might veto a bill to repeal a treaty, but still Congress has a right to pass such a bill over the President's veto.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee if I am correct in my understanding with relation to the mechanics of formulating a treaty. First, the President negotiates a treaty. He may do it through a convention, though his ambassador, or in some other way. He would then submit the treaty to the Senate.

The treaty then would be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which would hold hearings on it. If there were anything in the treaty to which the Committee on Foreign Relations did not agree, the committee need not even report the treaty to the Senate. If the committee should agree to approve the treaty, it could suggest reservations.

Next, the treaty would be reported to the Senate, where it would be debated. Then this distinguished body, upon which authority was conferred by the Constitution, would consider the treaty. If there were something contained in the treaty that was not correct, the Senate could append a reservation. The treaty then would have to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senators present.

But that would not be the end. Many people might think that was the end. Oh, no. The treaty would then go to the President, who would consider it. If he did not like the reservation, he could table the treaty. If he did not sign the treaty, there would be no treaty; that would be the end of it. If he approved of the treaty and thought the reservations were justified, he would then sign it.

If the other party to the treaty objected and did not like it, the treaty would die. If they did not accept the reservation, there would be no treaty.

I might say that in the period from 1787 to 1908 there were some 50 treaties as to which that process was followed and the treaties never became operative.

We have that long series of steps to protect the people's interests; and in all the history of America only one treaty was set aside by the Senate, and that was a treaty with France. I repeat, in heaven's name, how did we live the past 165 years without the Bricker amendment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure that if we had had the Bricker amendment our Nation would never have taken a leading part with other nations in world affairs. We would have tried to struggle along, just as we did under the Articles of Confederation, and we would not have had the United States as we have it today.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I desire to express my high respect for him, and to compliment him upon the very able presentation of arguments against the proposed amendment. They have been brilliantly presented to the Senate and to the American people.

Mr. President, what was accomplished in the formation of the Constitution was fully recognized by both friends and opponents of the Constitution. In Federalist Paper No. 64 Hamilton fully considered the treatymaking process, and defended it with words that should be heeded today:

> Some are displeased with it, not on account of any errors or defects in it, but because, as the treaties, when made, are to have the force of laws, they should be made only by men invested with legislative authority. These gentlemen seem not to consider that the judgments of our courts, and the commissions constitutionally given by our governor, are as valid and as binding on all persons whom they concern as the laws passed by our legislature. All constitutional actions of power, whether in the executive or in the judicial department, have as much legal validity as obligations as if they proceeded from the legislature; and therefore, whatever name be given to the power of making treaties, or however obligatory they may be when made, certain it is that the people may, with much propriety commit the power to the distinct body for the legislature, the executive, or the judicial. It surely does not follow, that because they have given the power of making laws to the legislature, that therefore they should likewise give them power to do every other act of sovereignty by which the citizens are to be bound and affected.

Mr. President, I point out that in Federalist Paper, No. 75, Hamilton dealt with the same problem again, and his objections to including the House of Representatives in the treatymaking process are fully explained. Generally he felt that body was ill-equipped because of its large size and fluctuating composition, and its lack of an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of foreign policies, a lesser concern for the total Nation as apart from local allegiances, the need for secrecy, and the desire to prevent the consumption of the added time necessary, and complication of the ratification process.

The proposals of the Senator from Ohio are thus seen to be nothing more than a reconsideration of matters fully considered and decisively rejected by the farsighted founders of the Constitution. If in their day they deemed it wise to keep the treatymaking power unencumbered, today, with the added complexities of the problems to be met and the greater need for rapid action, a flexible treatymaking power is even more necessary and prudent.

Mr. President, not only was the power to make treaties, which can override the laws or constitutions of the States, purposely written into the Constitution, but the matter was brought up for reconsideration in the House of Representatives at the very first session of that body after the Constitution had been written and adopted. It was presented in the House by way of an amendment offered by Patrick Henry, who felt that the treatymaking power should not override State laws or State constitutions, and that there should be some limitation in that regard. He offered an amendment for that purpose, which was not accepted, but voted down.

I desire now to make an analysis of section 1 of the Bricker amendment. The section, as reported by the Judiciary Committee, reads:

> SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

The proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 say that this provision is necessary to get rid of a doubt which exists as to whether or not a treaty can override a provision of the Constitution. I believe that all the proponents admit that this section of the proposed amendment is declaratory of existing law, that is, that the courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, have consistently held that treaty provisions must conform to the Constitution or be declared invalid. The proponents insist, despite this long history, that such a principle of law must be imbedded in the Constitution itself in order to make it safe; that it must be protected against some vague and indeterminate assault which may be made against it in the future, an assault which, according to the proponents, will engulf the good sense and the constitutional duties of the President, both houses of Congress, and the members of the Supreme Court.

A perfectly logical question for anyone to ask is, From whence is this alleged assault upon our Constitution to be launched? What evidences are there that any such assault will take place in the future? What form will the assault take?

The real hard-core proponents of the amendment have spent a great amount of time, effort, and money in disseminating tons of literature and making hundreds of speeches in an attempt to create a bogey man in the minds of the American public. This bogey man consists, in the main, of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. An attempt has been made to convince the American public that the United Nations is just one gigantic evil organization, with both the desire and the ability to impose foreign ideologies upon us without our knowledge or consent. As Senators know, as imperfect as it may be, the United Nations is the only organization at the present time standing between us and international chaos. There is no question that in the United Nations there are members who would like to subvert our liberties. There is equally no question that most of its members have no such desire, or that the United Nations, as an organization, has any ability to impose any ideologies, foreign or otherwise, upon us.

In my mind, the truth is that some, although not all, of the proponents of the Bricker amendment are against the United Nations and all that it stands for. They want to kill all international cooperation, and rely on the ridiculous idea of "fortress America." They know full well the faith the American people as a whole place in the future of the United Nations. They dare not attack it head on. They resort, as an alternative, to flanking attacks, with the intention of killing it off by indirection.

One such flanking attack is the one employed in connection with the Bricker amendment. The proponents attempt to show how the various activities of the United Nations will inevitably lead the American people to lose their liberties, that they must erect a shield against the evil designs of the United Nations, and

this shield consists of the Bricker amendment.

Let us get down to specifics. What activities of the United Nations are pointed to as a threat to our liberties?

Far and away, I think that the prize scapegoat is the Covenant on Human Rights. Not a speech is made by the proponents of the constitutional amendment, not a pamphlet is disseminated, that does not devote a great deal of space to the Covenant on Human Rights. The report of the Judiciary Committee makes numerous references to it. It is always painted as just about to gobble up all our rights, and in particular those contained in the Bill of Rights. The inference is always made that the covenant can somehow be imposed upon us without our consent.

What are the facts? First, the United Nations has not even completed its drafting of the covenant. No one knows if the document will ever be finally finished by the United Nations, and if so, when; second, the covenant, when finished, will be put in the form of a treaty. The United States does not have to sign it if it does not desire to do so. The United States Senate does not have to consent to the treaty, if it does not so desire; third, the Secretary of State, with the full authorization of the President, has announced in advance that he does not intend to sign the covenant, if and when it is finished, and does not intend to present it to the Senate for its advice and consent.

I ask, in all seriousness, just what kind of a threat does the Covenant on Human Rights present to us and to our cherished liberties? The facts speak for themselves. It represents no threat, potential or otherwise. The proponents of constitutional amendment know this as well as I. They prefer to ignore the facts and to incorrectly paint the unfinished covenant as a huge conspiracy which may engulf our Bill of Rights. This is intellectual dishonesty at its worst, in my opinion.

Mr. President, my guess would be that the Genocide Convention is the second most popular bogeyman that is used by the proponents of the Bricker amendment as an argument in its favor. I have no intention of discussing at this time the merits or the demerits of this convention. It has been discussed at great length both within and without the Senate. The point I wish to make is that although the previous administration sent the convention to the Senate, for its advice and consent, 4 years ago, the convention has never even been reported from the Foreign Relations Committee. I do not know whether it will ever be reported. This is the means by which the Senate became known as "the graveyard of treaties." But, Mr. President, whatever the ultimate fate of that convention, I am sure the Senate will examine it very closely, to see that it is both constitutional and desirable, before it approves it.

The point for us to remember is that the Genocide Convention, like the Covenant on Human Rights, regardless of its merits, presents no threat to our sacred rights. It cannot be imposed upon us by the United Nations. The Senate is free to approve it or not, as the Senate may see fit. No constitutional amendment is necessary to protect the people of the United States. No constitutional amendment is necessary to make the Senate fulfill its historic role of the protector of the people's rights.

Other bogeymen are conjured up by the proponents of the amendment. There is constant reference to the two-hundred-odd treaties being drafted by the United Nations and its agencies. This matter has been exploded time and again, the last time very competently by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in his very complete demolition of the majority report, in which such an allegation was repeated. The real truth is that the State Department checked very recently and could find only 13 treaties that were being drafted by the United Nations or any of its agencies. However, even if there were 1,300 or even 13,000 treaties in the process of being drafted, it would make no difference. We would not need a constitutional amendment. If we do not like the treaties, we do not have to become parties to them. Even if the Secretary of State signs them, the Senate can refuse to approve them. There is no threat in numbers, not even if the false numbers given by the proponents were multiplied by 100 or by 1,000.

Another favorite bogeyman is conjured up from the human-rights provisions in articles 55 and 56 of the Charter of the United Nations. I am sure everyone has heard of the famous case of Fujii against California. In that case, an intermediate California court held that articles 55 and 56 were self-executing, and that, under them, the California alien land law was invalid. The proponents seized upon this rather obscure ruling as a cause celebre. They blew it up to tremendous proportions. They said the human-rights articles could undermine all our liberties, although one can maintain that the alien land laws, far from being a liberty, are the opposite. The one thing that the proponents of the constitutional amendment now proposed have refused to recognize is that the Fujii decision was appealed to the supreme court of California, and that court promptly overruled the lower court's holding that the human-rights articles were self-executing. The supreme court of California was unanimous on this point. There has been no appeal to the United States Supreme Court, the California authorities having agreed with their supreme court on this point. The proponents of constitutional amendment refuse to recognize the latter events as having any bearing on the question. However, they are determinative. No court in the land, Federal or State, has held that the human-rights articles are self-executing, and can be applied as domestic law. Here, again, we find a bogeyman conjured up out of thin air—a bogeyman which is supposed to justify the making of changes in our most treasured document, our Constitution.

One other alleged threat to our liberties is worth analyzing. As nebulous as are the threats which are alleged to arise out of the Covenant on Human Rights and the Genocide Convention, they are quite well defined in comparison to the one I now have in mind. It is a very vague and ill-defined sort of threat that, by some unexplained means, our individual rights will be bargained away by treaties. It is never explained exactly how this is to take place.

With all its vagueness—and perhaps this is one of its advantages, as an alleged threat—it seems to have created a certain amount of fear in the minds of some persons. I think a short review of the cases bearing on this point will dispel any fears or doubts which may have arisen. There is no doubt in the mind of any constitutional lawyer that all treaty provisions, to be valid, must conform to all the provisions of the Constitution, including those which guarantee our personal liberties. This conclusion is not too difficult to demonstrate; so let us look at the jurisprudence on the subject.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

The first nine amendments to the Constitution, commonly referred to in conjunction with the tenth amendment as the Bill of Rights, are directed in specific terms toward preservation of various individual rights. The Bill of Rights is aimed against the Federal Government.

Not one right guaranteed to individuals by the Bill of Rights has been denied, abridged, or taken away by any treaty which the United States has made with foreign powers.

Many treaties, including a large number referred to generally as treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation, have dealt with certain of the matters to which the Bill of Rights relates, but have done so only on the international level so that in the United States the treatment of aliens with respect to certain matters would be governed on a basis of reciprocity, whereby United States citizens would be accorded certain treatment in foreign countries.

However, in no case has an effort been made by treaty to govern the relations between the United States and its citizens, with respect to matters exclusively of domestic concern. It may be true that foreign countries sometimes enter into treaties of the latter kind, but the United States has not joined in them.

Question has been raised as to the possibility of the making of a treaty which would subvert or derogate from the guaranties in the first amendment. Whereas the other amendments in the Bill of Rights are limitations in general terms upon the authority of the Federal Government, the first amendment is a specific limitation upon the authority of the Congress. Question is raised as to whether it is possible for the President to make and the Senate to approve a treaty which would abridge the rights guaranteed by the first amendment, since the limitation therein appears to be only on the Congress. The first amendment reads:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and

to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Leaving aside the larger question as to whether a President, with the concurrence of the Senate and the sanction of the Supreme Court, would ever lose faith with the people to the extent that a treaty would be made and enforced denying or abridging freedom of religion, speech, or the press or the rights of peaceable assembly and petition, it is necessary that we view the first amendment in the light of judicial interpretations.

The first amendment must be read together with the fifth amendment, which reads, so far as it is pertinent to the matter under consideration:

No person shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.

As stated in the case of *Den ex dem. Murray* v. *Hoboken Land and Improvement Co.* ((1856), 18 How. 272, 277), the fifth amendment is a restraint on the legislative, executive, and judicial powers of the Federal Government and cannot be so construed as to leave the Congress free to make any process "due process of law."

In *French* v. *Barber Asphalt Paving Co.* ((1901), 181 U. S. 324, 329), the Court followed the view that the general scope of the prohibitions of the fifth amendment as against the Federal Government was to be measured by the settled scope of the fourteenth amendment as against the States and based its decision on the premise "that the legal import of the phrase 'due process of law' is the same in both amendments." That case and other cases answer the argument suggested by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] a few minutes ago, that the rights of the people under the 5th and 14th amendments might be violated by a treaty. These cases show conclusively that such rights are protected by the Constitution and cannot be violated, just as they are protected under the first amendment.

In *Twining* v. *New Jersey* ((1908), 211 U. S. 78, 101), the Court said:

If any different meaning of the same words as they are used in the 14th amendment can be conceived, none has as yet appeared in a judicial decision.

In *Farrington* v. *Tokushige* ((1927), 273 U. S. 248, 299), after citing certain Supreme Court precedents, the Court stated:

Those fundamental rights of the individual which the cited cases declared were protected by the 14th amendment from infringement by the States, are guaranteed by the 5th amendment.

Proceeding, therefore, on the principle as expounded by the Supreme Court that the 5th amendment, as applied to the Federal Government protects individuals against infringement of the same fundamental rights as those which are protected, as against the States, by the 14th amendment, we have only to determine what those fundamental rights are.

In *Twining* v. *New Jersey, supra*, the Court declared that some of the personal rights safeguarded by the first 8 amendments against national action may also be safeguarded against State action, because a denial of them would be a denial of due process of law, and that this is so, not because they are enumerated in the first 8 amendments, but because they are of such a nature that they are included in the conception of due process of law.

In *Meyer* v. *Nebraska* ((1923), 262 U. S. 390, 399), the Court said:

While this Court has not attempted to define with exactness the liberty thus guaranteed (by the 14th amendment), the term has received much consideration and some of the included things have been definitely stated. Without doubt, it denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraint but also the right of the individual to contract, to engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, establish a home and bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and generally to enjoy those privileges long recognized at common law as essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free men.

Directly on the point here under consideration, the Supreme Court stated, in *De Jonge* v. *Oregon* ((1937), 299 U. S. 353, 364):

Freedom of speech and of the press are fundamental rights which are safeguarded by the due process clause of the 14th amendment. * * * The right of peaceable assembly is a right cognate to those of free speech and free press and is equally fundamental.

Can it be doubted, therefore, that the due process clause of the fifth amendment safeguards, as against all branches of the Federal Government, all those fundamental personal rights which are enumerated in the first amendment, and more? It is unrealistic to suggest that, merely because the first amendment refers to the Congress only, the President, and Senate are left free to make a treaty which would deny or abridge freedom of religion, speech, or the press, or the right of peaceable assembly and petition.

OTHER INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

Some of the other amendments to the Constitution embody guaranties of individual rights. The 13th amendment prohibits slavery and involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime for which an individual shall have been duly convicted. Section 1 of the 14th amendment precludes any State from abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, and from denying to any person within the State's jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. The 15th amendment guarantees the right of citizens to vote irrespective of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The 19th amendment guarantees the right of citizens to vote irrespective of sex.

None of those individual rights has ever been denied, abridged, or taken away by any treaty between the United States and foreign nations.

The treaty process has been used in many instances to extend certain of those guaranties internationally, with the objective of assuring to American citizens rights, privileges, and treatment in foreign countries which might not be accorded otherwise than by treaty. We cannot, of course, expect foreign countries to enter into agreements with respect to such matters without guaranties that similar treatment will be accorded their nationals in the United States.

In no case, however, is an alien accorded, by treaty, rights or privileges more favorable than those enjoyed by American citizens, and in no case is any one of the constitutional rights of our citizens denied, abridged, or taken away.

It has been argued also that constitutional amendment is necessary to preserve the 10th amendment, but the 10th amendment was never applicable to restrict the treaty power. The language of the 10th amendment is very clear. It says that—

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The treaty power was delegated to the Federal Government in article II and was specifically prohibited to the States. Its exercise was clearly contemplated by the 10th amendment and could not result in violation of that amendment.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] stated this afternoon that the case of Missouri against Holland repealed the 10th amendment. In Missouri against Holland the Federal Government was merely carrying out the treatymaking power which was given to it, and which says specifically that it may deal in matters which are in contravention of State laws or constitutions.

The foregoing résumé should make it clear that there is no need for a constitutional amendment to prevent abridgement by treaty or executive agreement of the essential liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights or the Constitution as a whole.

What conclusion do we reach from our examination of the alleged threats to our liberties? Are there really any threats from the treatymaking power as it has existed for 164 years? Is there any indication anywhere that the United Nations can impose any undersirable treaties upon us? Is there any indication anywhere that a treaty provision which violated a provision of the Constitution, and especially the Bill of Rights, would be upheld in the courts? My answer to all of these questions is "No." There is no case in any appellate court in the United States that is to the contrary.

The threats to our liberties do not exist in the treaty power. These alleged threats are myths; they are the figments of the imaginations of the proponents of constitutional amendment. They are bogey men created by those who are opposed to our making treaties in general, because treaties are the instruments by which we forge our foreign alliances, and because they want us to give up these alliances and withdraw into "fortress America."

The threat to our liberties, if one exists, lies not in the treaty power as established by our Founding Fathers and as successfully practiced for a century and a half, but in the lack of treaty power

as envisaged and planned by the sponsors of the amendment. Our liberties will not be lost by the making of treaties; they may be lost if we are unable to make treaties. Our danger lies not in walking like a man, but in being forced to crawl like a baby. The Bricker sponsors know full well that the free world will not depend on a crawling baby for leadership in its fight against communism.

OUR PRESENT SAFEGUARDS ARE ADEQUATE

I hope that I have been able to demonstrate that the alleged threats to our liberties through operation of the treaty power are not realities. Their lack of substance detracts radically from the appeal of section 1 of the proposed amendment. In my mind another detractor consists of the safeguards which have been built into our treatymaking process and which have served us so well in the past. It seems logical that we should examine these safeguards very carefully before we decide that they are inadequate and require a change.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] spoke about these safeguards a few minutes ago, and explained them. I shall hurry over pretty much the same ground.

There are four basic safeguards: First, the President must negotiate and sign the treaty; second, two-thirds of the Senate must consent to its ratification; third, the Congress can overcome the domestic effect of a treaty by subsequently enacted legislation; and fourth, the courts have the power and the duty to declare invalid any treaty provision which runs afoul of a provision of the Constitution. Let us examine these safeguards very briefly.

THE PRESIDENT

The first safeguard lies in the fact that the President of the United States, or an official acting on his behalf, negotiates and signs all treaties for the United States. The President is an elected official and the fact of his election shows that at least a majority of the people of this country have confidence in him. They elect him with the confidence that he is a person who will defend their liberties to the best of his abilities. When he is sworn into office he takes an oath to uphold the Constitution. It seems quite reasonable to me that we should assume that such a person would never knowingly sign a treaty which bargained away any of our constitutional liberties.

The proponents of the constitutional amendment cannot point to any treaty signed by past Presidents and consented to by past Senates which have bargained away any of our liberties. They say that they are not worried about President Eisenhower. They seem to be worried about future Presidents, as though they are bound to be lesser men than those that have held the office thus far.

Mr. President, power must be imposed somewhere. In the field of foreign affairs there is no place that we can impose power to execute except in the President. Power to ratify has been imposed upon the Senate. The people of the United States, if they feel that the President has made a mistake, have a right every 4 years to elect another President. The people of the various States, if they feel a Member of the Senate is not doing a good job, every 6 years have the right to elect another United States Senator.

The statement made by the advocates of the amendment, that some future President might sell America short, seems to me to be based upon a rather weak assumption. It does not seem to be a sound basis upon which to form a constitutional amendment.

If we are to enact a constitutional amendment on the theory that a future President might not live up to his expectations; if we are to pass a constitutional amendment every time obiter dicta of a court does not look right to all of us here in the Senate, or every time some professor writes an article for a law review—and some of those are cited by the proponents; or if we are to enact a constitutional amendment every time a Justice of the Supreme Court writes a dissenting opinion, then I submit we would be passing in the Senate and submitting to the people of the United States constitutional amendments every year.

If our only safeguard rested upon our reliance upon our Presidents not negotiating and signing an unconstitutional treaty, I might agree that we are not properly safeguarded and that we should change our Constitution. However, the integrity of the office of the President of the United States is just one in a long series of safeguards.

Even if the President should negotiate and sign an unconstitutional treaty, he could not ratify it and put it into effect without the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate. In addition, the Senate, in giving its advice and consent to ratification, can annul any unconstitutional or even undesirable provision by appending a reservation to that effect to its advice and consent.

The constitutional requirement that two-thirds of the Senate must approve the ratification of treaties is one of the greatest safeguards any country has against abuse of the treaty power by Government. This is in fact a more difficult requirement than that of a simple legislative majority which is all that is required, for example, in Canada or the United Kingdom.

The Senate has scrupulously exercised its responsibility as guardian of the treaty power. No treaty which the Senate has approved has abridged the liberties of American citizens or has violated our Constitution.

The proponents of the amendment cannot point to one occasion when the Senate let the people of America down in connection with the ratification of a treaty. Are we to pass a resolution which expresses lack of faith and confidence in the United States Senate?

Of all the organs of the Federal Government, the Senate, where every State has an equal voice, is the most jealous guardian of the rights of the States. This is true, because the Senate is organized on the basis of the constitutional principle of equal representation of the 48 sovereign States. This makes it all the more important not to impair its constitutional role as guardian of the treaty power.

It is important to remember that for 150 years the complaint about the treatymaking power has never taken this form. The objection has been that the Senate interfered too much and that it was not in the best interests of the country that just one more than one-third of the Senators present could block the ratification of a treaty.

All of us remember the former Secretary of State, Mr. Hay, in the early part of this century, who was unable to get certain treaties ratified by the United States Senate. He very bitterly stated that to place a treaty in the United States Senate was like putting a bull in an arena. One could always tell what it looked like when it went in, but no one could tell what its appearance would be when it came out.

It is clear that any proposal to curtail the Federal treaty power is entirely unwarranted by the record of the Senate. Any such proposal necessarily assumes that the Senate cannot be trusted to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities in the future. There has been nothing in the history of the Senate to justify such a fear. All the fears are based upon what might speculatively happen. It is improbable that the Senate in the future would approve any treaty that violates the Constitution or abridges the constitutional rights of American citizens or alters the fundamental structure of our Government. It is unrealistic to assume that the Senate would approve any treaty that permits the regulation of the lives of American citizens in purely domestic matters or threatens the sovereign integrity of the several States of the Union.

To put the matter as forcefully as possible: It is inconceivable that the Senate would ever participate in any attempt to abuse the treaty power of the United States.

Substituting a constitutional amendment, for which no real need is shown, but which would prove a stumbling block in foreign affairs, in place of the traditional integrity, alertness, and caution of the Senate in considering treaties can hardly produce any beneficial results.

The Senate is the last body in the world that would give up any God-given rights of man.

Before I get into the third protection I should like to revert to a matter I mentioned a few minutes ago. For over 150 years the complaint has always been that it has been too hard to ratify treaties in the United States because of the two-thirds provision. Secretaries of State and Presidents have complained that the Senate is a graveyard for treaties. Resolutions have been proposed for constitutional amendments to have treaties ratified by only a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

Even such eminent constitutional lawyers as the former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable Hatton W. Sumners, of Texas, has over a period of many years proposed that treaties should be treated as legislation and that they should be approved by a majority vote of both Houses of

Congress. That has always been the objection in the past to the treatymaking clause of the Constitution.

However, during the last 2 or 3 years the argument has been turned around a bit. The objection now is not that it is too difficult to make treaties. Some people now want to make it even more difficult to ratify a treaty.

I believe that the arguments on both sides of the question are very good evidence that the treatymaking power is just about right as it is.

The third protection is that even if the President signed and the Senate consented to the ratification of a self-executing treaty containing a provision which violated the Constitution, the internal effect of the provision could be annulled by a subsequently enacted act of Congress.

The law on this point is uncontroverted. Not only are treaties subordinate to the Constitution, but they are generally of the same dignity as statutes. Insofar as a treaty is self-executing, so as to become the law of the land, it can be deemed in that particular only the equivalent of a legislative act—*Chae Chan Ping* v. *United States* (130 U. S. 581, 600 (1889)). Hence, a treaty can be modified or repealed by a Federal statute so far as its domestic effect is concerned—*Head Money* cases (112 U. S. 580, 597–599 (1884)); see *Moser* v. *U. S.* (341 U. S. 41, 45 (1951)).

This safeguard was very well summed up in a memorandum submitted by the Department of State to the Senate Judiciary Committee when it was holding hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1:

> Thus there presently exists a veto power in Congress, whereby it can, in the event it finds as a result of actual experience that the internal operation of a treaty is undesirable, erase it by statute. Such was the action which is reported in *Chae Chan Ping* v. *United States* (130 U. S. 581), the Chinese exclusion case, where the Supreme Court held that the right of Chinese to enter our country, given by the terms of an existing treaty with China, were overcome and annulled by a later act of Congress, the Chinese Exclusion Act of October 1, 1888. This action is not only an illustration of the exercise of the veto power presently possessed by the Congress over the internal effect of treaties, but also shows that treaties only rank with statutes as internal law, and obviously, therefore, cannot override or violate the Constitution.

Another interesting point was brought out by ex-Solicitor General Philip Pearlman, in an address to the Washington Chapter of the American Association of University Women, November 10, 1953:

> Senator BRICKER, arguing in the 83d Congress for the passage of his resolution as introduced, told the subcommittee (hearings, p. 5) that the Senate could not vote intelligently on the Genocide Convention until such time as the supremacy of the Constitution over treaties is firmly established.
>
> But Senator BRICKER, when he made that statement, must have forgotten that Senate Joint Resolution 2, which he sponsored with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], states in the preamble "the right of Congress to set aside and vacate a treaty was recognized early by the Supreme Court."

I have here Senate Joint Resolution 2. The argument that a treaty might be superior to the Supreme Court or superior to the Constitution is answered in Senate Joint Resolution 2.

POWER OF THE COURTS TO INVALIDATE TREATIES

Even if the President signs an unconstitutional treaty, even if the Senate consents to its ratification, and even if the Congress does nothing to supersede it, anyone who is injured by the treaty can go into court and have the treaty declared of no effect domestically as violative of the Constitution.

The power of the courts stems from section 2 of article III of the Constitution:

> The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority.

So far as I know, no one has doubted the power of the courts to pass upon the validity of treaties; if so, it has been a very, very long time ago, because the courts have been doing so almost since the beginning of the Republic. Anyone that is interested in this point should read *In re Dillon* (7 Fed. Cas. 710), and *The Cherokee Tobacco* (11 Wall. 616). Incidentally, the case which has raised so much trouble, Missouri against Holland, is a good example of a case in which the Supreme Court of the United States has passed upon the constitutionality of a treaty.

The Department of State, in its memorandum to the Judiciary Committee, made an interesting point on this subject:

> It is urged that these authorities are not controlling, and that no treaty has ever been declared unconstitutional, the inference sought to be drawn being that a treaty may be supreme over the Constitution. The expressions by the Supreme Court on the subject were germane to the matter in issue and were not mere dicta, and they are uniform. That no treaty has ever been held unconstitutional may be ascribed to the fact that there has never been a treaty which has offended the Constitution, and therefore, no occasion for the Supreme Court so to declare. It is a tribute to the wisdom of the Executive and the vigilance of the Senate that in the 164 years of our history, no treaty offending the Constitution has ben ratified. Rather than constituting evidence that treaties may override the Constitution, this record is persuasive evidence that there is little basis for belief that the treaty power will be abused in the future.

Although the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] did a magnificent job in showing the tremendous number of errors in fact and law, and the multitude of false inferences upon which the majority report and its conclusions are based, he did not mention one in regard to safeguards which seems particularly important to me.

In an attempt to show that present safeguards are inadequate, the Senator from Ohio, in his testimony before the Judiciary Committee—hearings, page 6—made the flat statement of fact that "In one case, the President and Senate deliberately achieved by treaty a result which the Constitution expressly forbids." Since Senator BRICKER'S statement was repeated in the majority report—pages 7–8—and seems to contain the only available incident in which the safeguards are alleged to be insufficient, it might be well to read it; it is short.

> In one case, the President and Senate deliberately achieved by treaty a result which the Constitution expressly forbids. The Supreme Court in 1923 held that the 18th amendment prohibited the importation of intoxicating liquor under seal into the territorial waters of the United States (*Cunard S. S. Co.* v. *Mellon*, 262 U. S. 100). To overcome that effect of the 18th amendment, President Coolidge negotiated in secret and the Senate in 1924 approved in secret, a treaty authorizing such importation on British ships. The validity of the treaty was challenged in one case which was dismissed on procedural grounds, and it was never further interpreted (hearings on S. J. Res. 1 and 43, p. 6).

There are two things of importance to note. First, this seems to be the lone example of what the proponents allege to be "unconstitutional treaties" in 164 years. Second, the Senator from Ohio states as facts that the treaty is unconstitutional, that the treaty was negotiated and approved "in secret," and that the President and the Senate "deliberately achieved" this unconstitutional result. The Senator does not state them as possibilities or opinions, but as facts. Let us examine these facts.

The case of *Cunard S. S. Co.* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 100), cited by the Senator from Ohio, does not stand for the proposition for which it is cited. The case did not hold that the 18th amendment itself prohibited the importation of liquor under seal into United States ports by foreign ships. It held that the National Prohibition Act, which was in implementation of the amendment, prohibited such importation. The distinction is of importance because the amendment itself is very brief and very general in terminology. Its implementation was carried out in great detail in the National Prohibition Act (41 Stat. 305).

At least one exception regarding importation was made in section 20 of title III of the act (41 Stat. 322) whereby liquor in transit through the Canal Zone or on the Panama Railroad was not prohibited although the 18th Amendment was generally construed as applicable to the Canal Zone. The Court in the Cunard case cited *Anchor Line* v. *Aldridge* (259 U. S. 80) and quoted as follows from p. 89:

> When Congress was ready to permit such a transit for special reasons, in the Canal Zone, it permitted it in express words.

The Court thus construed that the exception made for the Canal Zone was within the power of Congress and did not run afoul of the general language of the 18th amendment. The clear implication is that the Congress would have had the constitutional power to prescribe another exception regarding the importation of liquor under seal into United States ports. It was because the Congress had not prescribed such an exception that the Court in the Cunard case held that such importation was prohibited.

If a congressionally prescribed exception for liquor under seal would not have contravened the 18th amendment, it is clear that a treaty provision to the same effect also would not contravene the

amendment. This was the effect of Article III of the treaty of May 22, 1924 with Great Britain.

The purpose of the treaty, as discussed in great detail in *Ford* v. *United States* (273 U. S. 593) and *Cook* v. *United States*, (288 U. S. 102), was not to circumvent the 18th amendment but to contribute to its enforcement. In return for the concession permitting importation under seal, Great Britain agreed to interpose no objection to search and seizure of British ships on the high seas within one hour's sailing distance of United States shores.

As to the question of negotiation in secrecy, there would have been nothing unusual or underhanded if the treaty had been negotiated in private; for obvious reasons most treaties are so negotiated. However, the negotiation of this treaty was subject to public discussion every step of the way. The negotiations received an unusual amount of publicity in the newspapers of both the United States and Great Britain. The New York Times, for instance, had a whole series of articles and editorials on the subject. Between June of 1923 and June of 1924, the New York Times alone published 98 articles on the negotiation and approval of the treaty. This is a strange kind of secrecy. I do not want to bore the Senate with a recitation of the references in the Times, but I would like unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD, so that the Senior Senator from Ohio, and others, can see the ridiculous nature of the assertion that the treaty was negotiated and approved in secret.

There being no objection, the statement of references was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Articles in the New York Times; references are to days of the month, page, and column:

June 1923: 3, 1:8; 4, 14:4; 14, 1:8; 15, 18:7; 16, 4:1; 17, 1:7; 17, VIII, 2:2; 18, 12:6; 24, VIII, 20:1; 27, 12:4; 29, 1:6; 30, 10:1.

July 1923: 2, 3:2; 3, 17:6; 4, 1:7; 5, 14:5; 7, 4:2; 8, VII, 8:7; 11, 3:3, 18:1, 22:3; 12, 1:7; 15, 2:5; 17, 4:2; 18, 4:4; 20, 3:3; 24, 1:6; 25, 10:1, 19:5; 26, 4:2.

August 1923: 1, 21:3; 2, 1:7, 5:1; 12, VII, 16:1; 17, 1:4; 21, 19:4; 28, 3:4; 30, 17:7.

September 1923: 20, 1:4.

October 1923: 5, 3:1; 6, 3:7; 9, 11:1; 27, 1:1; 28, 1:2; 29, 5:3; 30, 3:1, 18:4; 31, 1:2.

November 1923: 1, 1:8; 2, 8:1, 16:1; 3, 13:5; 4, I, pt. 2, 6:4; 7, 16:2; 8, 1:2; 9, 16:1; 10, 1:5; 11, II, 6:7; 12, 2:6, 19:4; 16, 19:1; 18, II, 2:3; 29, 23:2; 30, 1:2.

December 1923: 1, 15:7; 3, 16:3; 5, 21:4; 7, 20:6; 17, 4:3; 21, 10:1; 23, 3:2; 27, 15:4.

January 1924: 3, 19:3; 8, 14:2; 9, 23:6; 16, 3:5; 23, 1:3; 24, 10:7, 10:2, 16:1; 25, 16:5, 10:1.

February 1924: 16, 24:1.

March 1924: 5, 19:5; 6, 16:3; 7, 17:2; 8, 5:2; 14, 1:2; 15, 12:1; 22, 8:1.

April 1924: 5, 17:3; 10, 19:2; 11, 23:8; 20, 13:1.

May 1924: 6, 1:4; 11, IX, 4:6; 23, 33:1.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, after the treaty was signed on January 23, 1924, it was submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. It was sent to the Foreign Relations Committee where it was considered and approved on February 15, 1924—see New York Times of February 16, page 24. The text of the treaty was printed in the New York Times of March 5, 1924, page 19. At the request of Senator Lodge the Senate considered the treaty in an executive session on March 13, 1924. At the request of Senator Sheppard, and by unanimous consent, the injunction of secrecy was removed from the vote by which the treaty was approved. The vote was 61 yeas, and 7 nays—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 65, part 4, page 4084.

On April 19, 1924, Mr. Tucker, of Virginia, introduced House Resolution 267. This was a resolution to have the House Judiciary Committee examine and report whether the treaty was constitutional and, if not, what legislation would be necessary and proper to effect the objects of the treaty and to make the same conformable to the Constitution.

The resolution was sent to the Judiciary Committee. No further action was taken on it—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 65, part 7, pages 6723–6725, 6930.

Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes—later Chief Justice of the United States—had this to say in regard to the constitutionality of the treaty:

> It is hardly necessary to observe that there is no intention on the part of this Government to violate, in the negotiation of such agreements, the provisions of the Constitution. The purpose is to facilitate their enforcement. I know there are some who have expressed doubt whether such an international agreement can be made under our Constitution. This doubt I do not entertain. As the Supreme Court of the United States has said, "It is not lightly to be assumed that in matters requiring national action, a power which must belong to and somewhere reside in every civilized government is not to be found." *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 415, 433). It would be most extraordinary if the United States were in such a situation that such causes of international friction could not be removed by an exercise of the treatymaking power which in no way impaired the efficacy of our policy, but, on the other hand, greatly aided in preventing the illicit introduction of intoxicating liquors.
>
> But, viewing the question in its technical aspect, it is quite sufficient to point out that the 18th amendment has expressly confided to the discretion of Congress the determination of penalties and forfeitures, and it is manifest that this discretion can be competently and wisely exercised in maintaining the morale of enforcement and in providing that just and adequate enforcement which does not interfere with the appropriate freedom of commerce, an interference with which would serve no interest of the United States, but would be to its most serious injury. Congress in the exercise of its discretion is undoubtedly entitled to protect the substantial interests of the country. Congress has already appreciated this authority and has acted accordingly in exception from penalties and forfeitures transit through the Panama Canal, an exception which the Supreme Court in its recent decision has fully recognized as being within the competency of Congress. What Congress has thus done can equally be accomplished through the treatymaking power, which, under adequate restrictions, may put such cargoes as those to which I have referred, not destined for our ports or to be delivered within the United States, in the same status as those passing through the Panama Canal. (18 American Journal of International Law 229, at 234.)

Certain American shipping interests brought an action in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York against the Attorney General and others for injunctive relief, alleging that article III of the treaty was unconstitutional, and that its enforcement, that is, lack of prosecution of British shipowners who imported liquor under seal, discriminated against American registered vessels and in favor of British vessels. The court dismissed the bill for want of equity, saying that it was unnecessary and, therefore, improper to pass on the constitutional issue. The decision was affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and certiorari was denied by the United States Supreme Court. The plaintiffs did not pursue the litigation further, and despite the fact that the courts were open to further challenges, there is no record of any such challenge to the constitutionality of the treaty.

Summarizing this point:

First. The treaty did not achieve a result which the Constitution forbade expressly. This was one treaty which, it is said, violated the Constitution.

Second. In Cunard Steamship Co. against Mellon the United States Supreme Court held that the 18th amendment, as implemented by the National Prohibition Act, forbade the importation of liquor under seal.

Third. The negotiation of the treaty was subject to an unusual amount of publicity; although Senate consideration was in executive session, the usual injunction of secrecy was removed to record the vote of 61 to 7 in favor of the treaty.

Fourth. As to the constitutionality of the treaty, the following points can be made:

(a) Its constitutionality was hinted at in the Cunard case when the Court spoke with approval of the Canal Zone exception to importation under seal.

(b) No action was taken by the House of Representatives on a bill to challenge the constitutionality of the treaty.

(c) Although the courts were open to any challenger, no one believed sufficiently in the proposition to present an effective challenge in any court in the United States. When the treaty became moot with the passage of the 21st amendment, it remained unchallenged.

Thus the myth out of which one more bogeyman was made seems to go up in smoke when brought out into the open and examined by the light of day.

HARMFUL ASPECTS OF SECTION 1

I believe that I have demonstrated two excellent negative reasons why we should not approve of section 1 of the proposed constitutional amendment; first, the fears which it is supposed to guard against are mythical fears, existing only in the minds of the proponents; and second, our present safeguards are perfectly adequate to protect us against any loss of our liberties through the operation of the treaty power as it has traditionally existed.

Now I would like to point out a few of the affirmative objections to the adoption of section 1. I would like to show how its adoption would be positively harmful.

First. The Constitution should not be amended by declarations of existing law, unless some danger is pointed out. Not

only is the amendment process a long and hard one, involving the time of both Houses of Congress and those of the 48 States, it is also a very deliberative process. The Constitution is a fairly short document; this is not accidental. It does not contain many propositions of law which are sacred to our traditions. These propositions have been developed and guarded by our courts. Unless the Constitution were a thousand pages long it could not contain all of the propositions of law which are really of importance to us. It was not meant to contain all of them. There is certainly no reason to amend the Constitution in order to include one that is unquestioned and indelibly imprinted in our existing law.

Section 1 would nullify a provision of a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution. There is no question that that is the law as it always has been. The Constitution is supreme over all laws and all treaties. In one form or another the Supreme Court has stated that rule time and time again. For example, it has said that all treaties and statutes of the United States are based on the Constitution and treaties, like acts of Congress, are subject to the limitations in the Constitution. *United States* v. *Minnesota* (270 U. S. 181, 207–208 (1926)). A treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it is in violation of that instrument. *The Cherokee Tobacco* (11 Wall. 616, 620–621 (1870)). A treaty cannot do what the Constitution forbids or alter the character of the Government or that of one of the States. *Geofrey* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258, 267 (1890)). On specific issues, such as the divesting of rights of property or the taking of private property without compensation, the Supreme Court has stated that treaties cannot violate the express constitutional guaranties. *Prevost* v. *Grenaux* (19 How. 1, 7 (1856)); *Brown v. Duchesne* (19 How. 183, 197 (1856)).

I could also cite *New Orleans* v. *U. S.* (10 Pet. 662 (1836)), *Doe* v. *Braden* (16 How. 635 (1853)), *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. 483 (1880)), *Head Money Cases* (112 U. S. 580, 598), *Chinese Exclusion Case* (130 U. S. 581, 600), *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416), and *Asakura* v. *Seattle* (265 U. S. 332).

The conclusion seems inevitable that section 1 is supposed to be merely declaratory of existing law. The Supreme Court has pronounced on the subject time and again. There is nothing whatsoever to indicate that it is about to change its mind. To clutter up the Constitution with such propositions of existing law is harmful in itself.

In my mind it would be anomalous to adopt a constitutional amendment which instructs the President and the Senate not to violate the Constitution. It is illogical to adopt an amendment instructing the Supreme Court to interpret the Constitution in a manner that it has consistently followed.

President Eisenhower summed up the situation very logically as reported by the New York Herald Tribune of March 20, 1953, as follows:

> In reply to a question at his press conference on March 19, 1953, the President said that he believed all that the proponents meant by section 1 was to put into the Constitution a provision which would make it impossible to break the Constitution. He went on to say that to him there seemed to be an anomaly in that kind of reasoning, and that there was no reason to amend the Constitution in order to show that it was going to remain the same.

Someone compared the first section of the proposed amendment with an imaginary 11th commandment, which said, "Thou shalt not break the first 10 commandments." I prefer the law unto Moses to the law unto BRICKER.

SUPREME COURT INTERPRETATION

The Bricker amendment, if adopted, will be the subject of frequent interpretation by the courts, including ultimately the Supreme Court of the United States. A grave danger lies in the possibility of misinterpretation by the courts of an amendment that does not amend anything. The problem was pointed out in the memorandum which was presented to the Judiciary Committee:

> It is urged that since the question has been raised, and since no one advocates that treaties may violate the Constitution, no harm could result from an amendment to that effect, thus settling the question for all time. The proponents argue that since those opposed to a constitutional amendment agree this is the law, no harm can result from so declaring.
>
> The answer to this argument is that it is impossible to draw an amendment intended to be declaratory of the present law without running danger of changing the present law. In the first place, constitutional amendments are not adopted to declare existing law, but to change existing law, and the Supreme Court at some future time would no doubt be searching for a reason for the change. Idle acts are not to be presumed. In the second place, no matter how artfully the words are chosen, their ultimate legal effect or their interpretation cannot be anticipated with certainty.

Ex-Solicitor General Perlman summed up the point very succinctly:

> Section 1 of the proposed amendment is not only unnecessary; it is dangerous, for the reason that it fails to state that it is declaratory of existing law, and therefore it might become open for interpretations of various kinds. It would prompt a search for hidden, and perhaps yet unthought of meanings, for the courts will not lightly assume that so serious and difficult a project as an amendment to the Constitution was engaged in solely to arrive at the same result which existed before the amendment was made.

The real problem arises out of the fact that a constitutional amendment is supposed to amend something and not to be declaratory of existing law. The first 10 amendments, comprising the Bill of Rights, were adopted almost simultaneously with the Constitution itself; they could not have been declaratory of existing law simply because there was no United States law of which to be declaratory.

Three of the amendments—13th, 14th, and 15th—were the result of the Civil War, and also were largely concerned with civil rights. Two of the amendments—18th and 21st—related to the adoption and repeal of the prohibition against the use of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. This accounts for 15 of the amendments. Of the other 7, 1—11th—gave the States immunity from suits by citizens of another State or of any foreign State; 1—12th—changed the method of electing the President and Vice President; 1—16th—authorized Congress to enact income-tax laws; 1—17th—provided for the direct election of United States Senators; 1—19th—provided for women's suffrage; 1—20th—did away with the lame-duck session of Congress, and provided that the terms of Senators and Representatives should begin on January 3, and of the President and Vice President on January 20; and 1—22d—provided that no person may be elected President for more than 2 terms.

All of these amendments change something; they are not declaratory of existing law. Section 1 of the proposed amendment changes nothing. There is a very grave danger that the courts will try to read into this provision, if it is adopted, some meaning which is not intended. Certainly the long and confused legislative history of the proposal will contribute toward this result.

UNDO JURISPRUDENCE

I do not think that there is any question but that the adoption of section 1 would necessarily result in the erasure of the most useful (if not indispensible) constitutional jurisprudence regarding treaties and other international agreements which has been developed in our 164 years of government under the Constitution. It is virtually impossible to attempt to state, in the form of a declaratory constitutional amendment, the whole of the protective body of law that has attached to the Constitution. Many areas of treaty law which have been satisfactorily settled and unchanged for as long as 150 years will be unsettled and open to question. Adoption of section 1 will invite a flood of litigation—needless litigation.

To my mind, and evidently to the minds of most constitutional lawyers, we are confronted with no legal deficiency or imminent dangers warranting our taking so serious and so unprecedented a step.

AMBIGUITIES

Section 1 would be objectionable enough if it were properly drafted * * * although I might add parenthetically that this may be an impossible task, and thus constitute another reason not to tinker with the Constitution on this point. Anyway, section 1 is not well drafted. It contains certain dangerous ambiguities. Some of these are pointed out on pages 40–41 of the minority views:

> The revised draft still has certain ambiguities. The meaning of the word "conflicts" is far from clear. Even more ambiguous is the term "shall not be of any force or effect." Does this mean internally or externally? If it means internally, the matter would seem to be adequately covered by the provisions of section 2 of the final draft which require implementing legislation; the implementing legislation must be constitutionally valid before it can be given force and effect internally. If it means externally, it is doubtful if the section would be of any validity under the usually accepted rules of international law. Under these rules, sovereign states are bound by their solemn contracts, which have been concluded and ratified according to the normal

rules of procedure, whether or not the treaties conflict with some internal law. If we insist that the validity of all the treaties to be made by the United States must await some final determination as to their constitutionality, most nations will be most reluctant to make even essential treaties with the United States, and the treatymaking power will be dealt a death blow.

There are additional ambiguities. Here are a few.

Does it apply to existing treaties or only to future treaties? Would the United States be unable, because of possible retroactive effects of the amendment, to fulfill its existing treaty obligations? Would this point have to go to the Supreme Court for decision?

Could section 1, standing alone, be interpreted as subjecting the treaty power to the 10th amendment?

Mr. President, this applies even to the reenacting as a constitutional amendment of something that is already a law, and it applies to all the substitute amendments which have been offered, including the one offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and perhaps to others that may be offered.

The following statement is contained in the majority report at page 7:

> Most of the witnesses who testified in opposition to this section of the amendment objected to it on the grounds that it was unnecessary or that it might be misconstrued. The necessity for this section of the amendment has already been examined, and it should be entirely clear to the Supreme Court or to any other agency which interprets this section that it is intended only to state what most of the American people have always felt should be the law. In plain words, this section is designed to make it inescapably clear that a treaty may not override the Constitution or be in conflict with it. The argument that the Supreme Court might construe this proposal in a manner not intended and that such construction might lead to possible undesirable limitations on the treaty power is strikingly similar to the argument which Alexander Hamilton made against the Bill of Rights when its inclusion in the Constitution was under consideration.

The reason why section 1 might be misconstrued is very well illustrated by this paragraph in the majority report which belittles the possibility or probability of such misconstruction. The report states:

> In plain words, this section is designed to make it inescapably clear that a treaty may not override the Constitution or be in conflict with it.

These are not very plain words and are in themselves ambiguous. Do they intend to mean that if a treaty is in conflict with the Constitution, the treaty cannot override the Constitution, but conversely that the Constitution will override the treaty and invalidate its internal effect? If that is what is meant, it is not unequivocally stated in the majority report. Is section 1 to apply to all treaties—past, present, and future—or just to future treaties? Neither the language of the section nor its legislative history makes this point clear.

As to Alexander Hamilton's opposition to the Bill of Rights, several points should be observed. As I pointed out before, the Bill of Rights was adopted almost contemporaneously with the body of the Constitution—it is almost an integral part of it. These amendments were really interpretations, and, because of the time of their passage, were not declaratory of any existing body of law. Since the adoption of the Bill of Rights no amendment has been adopted which is declaratory of existing law. All of the amendments following the Bill of Rights have made changes in the Constitution and have had the purpose of changing existing law. Even though section 1 is alleged to be merely declaratory of existing law, there is always the danger that the courts, following their normal rules of interpretation, will construe it as something other than declaratory on the theory that Congress would not propose such an amendment at this time. If section 1 is meant to be more than declaratory, this purpose has always been disclaimed.

I am not trying to belittle the drafters of section 1. I am sure that they have tried to eliminate all of the ambiguities. However, this is a very difficult, if not impossible, job, and they have not succeeded. Adoption of an ambiguous amendment would be bad enough if there were some compelling reason for its adoption. Adoption of an ambiguous amendment is downright foolhardy when there is no reason for its adoption, and it is merely supposed to be declaratory of a whole body of existing law.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS ON SECTION 1

I shall now discuss a summary of the arguments regarding section 1:

First. Some of the proponents are isolationists who have dreamed up mythical threats to our liberties through the exercise of the treaty power.

Second. Upon examination, some of the threats, such as the Genocide Convention, or the Covenant on Human Rights, have been shown to be mythical.

Third. Present safeguards against abuse are perfectly adequate. They include: The integrity of the President; the requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate; the power of the Senate to make binding reservations to treaties; the power of Congress to annul the domestic effects of a treaty provision by the enactment of subsequent legislation; and the power of the courts to invalidate and render unenforcible in the United States any treaty provision which contravenes the Constitution.

Fourth. Not only is section 1 unnecessary; it has several important substantive drawbacks. The Constitution should not be cluttered up with amendments which do not amend. The Supreme Court may read meanings into it which are not intended by the Congress as a whole and by the people of the whole country. It inevitably will put in doubt all of the constitutional jurisprudence which has grown up over a century and a half. It is full of ambiguities which will cause doubts and endless and unnecessary litigation.

The Senate should think long and hard before it advocates the inclusion of this section in our Constitution.

Mr. President, I desire now to proceed to a discussion of section 2 of the Bricker amendment.

The first clause of section 2 reads:

> A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation.

There are a number of reasons why I believe it would be unwise to adopt this clause as an amendment to the Constitution. I shall discuss those reasons briefly.

First. It is too cumbersome.

In the minority views it is stated:

> The first clause of section 2 of the resolution would give us the most cumbersome treatymaking procedure in the world. Under its terms, wherever any internal effect was involved, a treaty would have to receive five separate approvals: A two-thirds vote of the Senators present, (2) ratification by the President, (3) a majority vote in the House, (4) a majority vote in the Senate, and (5) the President's signature on the resulting act of Congress.

I believe this statement is accurate. Even if it could be argued that someone had discovered a country in which the process was more cumbersome than the one proposed by the Senator from Ohio, there can be no doubt that the proposed system would be cumbersome in the extreme.

Mr. President, I have examined the constitutions of a number of nations. The only one which I find to be as cumbersome as our Constitution would be if the Bricker amendment were adopted, is perhaps that of Brazil, in which country the people have an extremely difficult time with their constitution, because of the inclusion of the very kind of provision which the Senator from Ohio is seeking to have added as part of our Constitution. I shall show later in my remarks that the British and the Canadian constitutional treaty provisions are not any more cumbersome than is that of the Constitution of the United States as it presently exists.

There is no doubt in my own mind that many of the proponents of the amendment want to achieve the result of making the treaty process cumbersome in order to discourage us from negotiating treaties in general and to discourage other nations from negotiating with us. The more difficult the treatymaking process is, the better the isolationists like it.

The proponents say that the proposed amendment would merely put us on a par with almost all other countries. I believe that the basis of such a contention was adequately exploded by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] the other day in his thorough refutation of the majority report. I shall have something more to say on that later. However, I should like to state at this juncture that I am somewhat puzzled to find any relevance to such an argument. Why should the internal processes of other countries be relevant? Why do we have to be on a par with them? Not only do most of them have a different type of government from ours, that is, so far as the parliamentary system is concerned, but we had the genius to construct a form of government which, in practice, has proved superior to all others. While other countries have declined in power under their forms of

government and their forms of treaty-making, we have grown into the leading power of the world. Why should we imitate their processes when ours have worked so well? Why should we throw away the genius of the Founding Fathers in a fit of temerity?

UNNECESSARY PROVISION

Second. The provision is unnecessary. A treaty need not have a self-executing effect. The nature of the treaty obligations and the intention of the contracting states, evidenced in the agreement, are determinative factors. (*Foster* v. *Nielsen* (2 Pet. 253, 314 (1829).) But it should be borne in mind that even a treaty that is self-executing by its terms has such an effect only when the Senate in approving it does not otherwise provide. The Senate can make a reservation to any treaty to the effect that it shall require implementing legislation before it becomes effective as internal law in the United States. If the other party or parties to the treaty do not acquiesce in such a reservation, there is no agreement.

The present system, whereby the Senate has the option of permitting a self-executing treaty to remain self-executing, is infinitely more sensible than the adoption of a rigid system under which the Senate would be given no choice. Frequently there come to Senate treaties which logically do not call for a second legislative step. Why tie the Senate's hands?

THE FIRST SECTION REQUIRES THE PARTICIPATION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Third. The proposal contained in the first clause of section 2 should be distinguished from those which have been made in the past to the effect that the House of Representatives be brought into the treatymaking process by requiring consent to ratification by a majority of both Houses instead of two-thirds of the Senate alone. These proposals were intended to make it easier to ratify treaties.

As I said a few moments ago, there has been effort all along to substitute ratification by majority for ratification by two-thirds of the Senate. At one time even President Truman advocated ratification by a majority instead of by two-thirds of the Senate. I do not think that President Truman included the House of Representatives' participation in ratification.

The present proposal is intended to make it more difficult, because, instead of substituting the consent of a majority of both Houses for the consent of the Senate, it merely adds the consent of both Houses as an additional obstacle.

Under existing law there are at least three means by which participation of the House of Representatives may be obtained where appropriate.

First, as drafted, the treaty may stipulate or require that it be regarded as not self-executing.

Second, the Senate in its exercise of its power to impose reservations may impose as a condition that the treaty should not be considered self-executing.

Third, there stands as a check on the President and Senate the power of Congress by subsequent statute to override the treaty insofar as its effect on domestic law is concerned.

Such safeguards, without the inflexible requirement of a double legislative step in each case, have worked well and have occasioned no particular need for change.

The double step would debase the present constitutional function of the Senate in the treatymaking process. We have been warned by the Attorney General that, as a precaution against legal attacks on provisions of treaties which might have some internal effect, it would become advisable as a matter of practice to submit all treaties for legislative approval by both Houses of Congress if this provision should be adopted. The separate two-thirds approval of the Senate would become merely an obstacle rather than an act of treatymaking.

NOT A NEW PROPOSAL

This is not a new proposal. The direct effect as internal law of treaties intended to be and capable of being self-executing was not an accidental or casual result, but one deliberately written into the Constitution by the Founding Fathers.

As Prof. Henry Steele Commager has pointed out:

> This section repudiates the treatymaking arrangements written into the Constitution and substitutes for them arrangements that were considered and rejected by its framers. The first part of it introduces what would prove to be intolerable delays and complications in treatymaking. To the two steps at present required—negotiation by the President and ratification by the Senate—it adds three more: Enactment by the House, reenactment by the Senate, and approval of the President—who by that time may be a different President.

DIFFICULTY OF APPLICATION

One great difficulty that will inevitably arise if we adopt the first clause of section 2 is the question of how to tell what treaties should be implemented by legislation. There may be many treaties which would not ordinarily have any application as internal law. But how can we be sure? How can we know in advance that some litigation which will make a treaty relevant as internal law will not arise? The Attorney General has pointed out that, to be on the safe side, we shall have to pass enabling legislation for all treaties.

This problem is brought out in the report of the section on international and comparative law of the American Bar Association when it asks—

> What does "effective as internal law" mean? If, pursuant to treaty or executive agreement, the United States and Great Britain agreed on a blockade of a third country and an American steamship company asserted the blockade as a defense in a court in the United States for nonperformance of a contract, would the defense be unavailable if the treaty or executive agreement had not been supplemented by act of Congress?

There is the equally puzzling problem of the type of enabling legislation which would be called for under the provisions of section 2 of the proposed amendment. Take, for example, the hypothetical treaty mentioned in the ABA report, a blockade treaty between the United States and Great Britain. What would the enabling legislation provide? Would it simply provide that the treaty could be enforced as internal law? Would this satisfy a court, or would the court require that the enabling legislation implement the treaty in detail? This is a very difficult question, and one we can easily avoid by sticking to our present workable system.

EFFECT ON EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. President, an even more serious problem arises out of this part of section 2 because of the provision of section 3 which makes executive agreements subject to the same disabilities as those proposed in section 2. This means that no executive agreement could have any effect as internal law in the United States until it had been implemented by legislation. This is a very serious matter in view of the literally thousands of executive agreements concluded by the United States every year.

As a practical example, let us consider the Korean armistice, an executive agreement which, under our present system, requires no congressional implementation. If the Bricker amendment were in force, and if no enabling legislation had been enacted, the Korean armistice agreement would have no validity in a United States court. Suppose—and this is a very practical supposition—there were in Korea a United States soldier who had a life insurance policy which contained a "war clause." Suppose he survived the fighting in Korea, but after the armistice went into effect, was run down and killed by a jeep. Of course, his heirs would like to collect on the policy. To do so they would have to show that he was not killed during the hostilities. The obvious way to show that would be to bring into court a copy of the Korean armistice agreement. They would be barred from that course by the Bricker amendment, if no enabling legislation had been passed. So, Mr. President, in that case the executive agreement providing for an armistice in Korea would be of no effect. Here again we run into the problem of what type of legislation would be effective if Congress wanted to implement the agreement.

I chose for example a very well known executive agreement. How about the the myriad others which never receive any publicity, and are completely unknown to the average citizen? Secretary Dulles said there were 10,000 executive agreements in connection with NATO, alone—many, many of them almost every day. How would Congress ever keep up with all the executive agreements? How would Congress find time to implement all of them? Would litigants be barred from using all unimplemented agreements? As we can see, this is a very practical problem, and one which the proponents of amendment seem to have overlooked.

MORE IMAGINARY DANGERS

As in the case of the other sections, the proponents have dreamed up some unrealistic situations to justify the adoption of their proposals. With regard to the first part of section 2, they have dragged out the old bogey about the self-executing nature of articles 55 and 56 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The following quotation is taken from page 10 of the majority report, and is supposed to justify adoption of the proposition that all treaties must be made non-self-executing, in order to save us from ruin:

While the Supreme Court of the United States has not yet decided whether articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter are self-executing legal obligations, some lawyers maintain that articles 55 and 56 must be judicially enforced as the supreme law of the land. For example, a professor of law at the University of Iowa wrote:

"We are now in a period of transition in which provisions of the United Nations Charter as well as treaty provisions, both of which are undoubtedly binding on our courts, can be held to apply to nations, but can also be applied to other entities including individual citizens. In point here are the equality provisions of the preamble and article 55" (Sayre, Paul, *Shelley v. Kraemer and United Nations Law*, 34 Iowa Law Review 1, 4 (November 1948)).

If this interpretation is correct, it will require decades of litigation before such general phrases as "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms (civil, political, economic, social, and cultural) for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion," can acquire any definite meaning. It seems reasonably certain that if articles 55 and 56 represent self-executing legal obligations, thousands of Federal and State laws have been superseded. No such possibility would exist if the proposed amendment had been in effect at the time the Senate gave its consent to ratification of the United Nations Charter.

While Professor Sayre, and possibly 1 or 2 other commentators, have concluded that articles 55 and 56 are self-executing, the overwhelming majority of legal writers have reached the opposite conclusion. The following quotations are but a few examples of the statements made by eminent authorities and published in well-known legal periodicals:

A case in an inferior court has little weight, and this one [in an intermediate California court] is very probably wrong. Even if it should be affirmed by the United States Supreme Court, that would not make non-self-executing treaties impossible. (Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Federal and State Power Under the U. N. Covenant on Human Rights, Wis. L. R. 1951, p. 389 at 399.)

It seems to me that the U. N. Charter, which is primarily a great political instrument, afforded very slim basis for the Los Angeles court's demarche * * * [By] article 56 "all members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55." To contend that the Los Angeles court has a commission from the United States to act as its representative for the purpose of cooperating with the organization would be absurd. (Prof. Edward S. Corwin, in a letter reproduced, in part, in 36 Va. L. R. 1081.)

Clearly, however, the charter's provisions on human rights have not been incorporated into the municipal law of the United States so as to supersede inconsistent State legislation, because they are not self-executing. (Judge Manley O. Hudson, Charter Provisions on Human Rights in American Law, 44 Am. J. Int'l L. 543, 545.)

It is already the law, at least for members of the United Nations, that respect for human dignity and fundamental rights is obligatory. The duty is imposed by the charter. * * * The expansion of this duty, its translation into specific rules, requires further steps of a legislative character. (Jessup, A Modern Law of Nations, p. 91.)

These purposes are stated in terms of "promotion" and "encouragement," and consequently if there is to be the mandate of a legislative act, the signatory state must supply it in the form of implementing legislation. (Prof. James J. Lenoir, note, 13 Ga. Bar J. 112.)

Thus, on the basis of these three tests [e. g., language, subject matter, and legislative history], it is submitted that there is but one compelled conclusion that articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter are not self-executing. (Comment, 20 Fordham L. R. 96.)

Since the human-rights program of the charter is in itself ineffective to abrogate State law, it is submitted that the [California intermediate] court's basis for its decision is incorrect. However, it would seem that both this court and the United States Supreme Court could strike down such discriminatory legislation as violative of the "fundamental human rights" expressed in the 14th amendment. (Report on decision, 25 N. Y. U. L. R. 924, 932.)

It seems proper to deny self-executing effect to the human-rights provisions in view of their language. (Case comment, 100 U. Pa. L. R. 1247, 1249.)

It is submitted that articles 55 and 56 cannot, in and of themselves, operate to override any State law or serve as a rule upon which the courts can adjudicate private rights. (Comment, 23 Rocky Mt. L. R. 197, 204.)

The United States is, at the very least, to have the choice of where and when to strike down discriminatory practices in its own way. This decision more properly belongs to the political branches of the Government than to the courts. The articles cannot be said to be self-executing. (Comment, 2 Stanford L. R. 797, 807.)

Thus it would seem that [the human rights provisions] require legislative implementation before they can become rules for the courts. (Comment, 25 St. John's L. R. 41, 45.)

The opinion of those in the Government and experts in the field of international law seem to agree that the charter is merely a statement of aims and aspirations, rather than a self-executing treaty on human rights. (Report on decision, 36 Va. L. R. 804, 806.)

We may conclude, then, that there is only a slim basis for considering the United Nations Charter as a self-executing treaty. Neither the language of the document, nor the intention of the parties, nor the views of the Departments of State and Justice, nor most legal authorities support this view. (Note, 36 Va. L. R. 1059, 1062.)

Mr. President, once again we find that the bogeyman turns out to be only a figment of the imagination. The overwhelming weight of evidence and legal thought is that the articles of the United Nations Charter are not self-executing, as alleged. They present no threat. They warrant no change in our treaty-making process.

Incidentally, unless the amendment is retroactive, I do not see how the United Nations Charter has any relevance, since this treaty was ratified by the United States almost 10 years ago.

THE SECOND CLAUSE OF SECTION 2

Having dealth with the cumbersome procedural obstacles and other drawbacks inherent to the first clause of section 2, I should now like to turn my attention to the second section, which contains a provision of substance which is infinitely more serious and more objectionable. This is the famous, and now infamous, "which" clause.

This clause specifies that the implementing legislation required to give effect in this country to a treaty must be "valid in the absence of a treaty." The substantial effect of this clause is to delete from the Constitution the treatymaking power of the United States.

When the Constitution was framed, a careful delegation of powers was provided for. Certain Federal powers were conferred by article I of the Constitution upon the legislative branch of the United States Government. Other Federal powers were conferred by articles II and III on the executive and judicial branches of the Government. The legislative powers of Congress are set forth in article I. Under article II, the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Thus, the Constitution confers upon the Federal Government certain legislative powers to be exercised by the Congress, and in addition, a treaty power to be exercised by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. As pointed out so clearly by Solicitor General Perlman in 1952, and by Attorney General Brownell in 1953, the framers of the Constitution designed the grant of treatymaking power in the Constitution so that the United States would be able to enter into whatever treaties the proper conduct of foreign relations would require.

The effect of section 2 of the revised Senate Joint Resolution 1 would be to eliminate from the Constitution the treatymaking power so deliberately granted to the Federal Government. If the amendments proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 1 were adopted, the United States could, if it chose, make international agreements within the scope of the delegated powers of Congress under article I of the Constitution, but it would no longer have the additional treatymaking power specifically provided in article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

Mr. President, let me emphasize this point, by repeating it: If the "which" clause of the Bricker amendment were put into effect, the United States could, if it chose to do so, make international agreements within the scope of the delegated powers of Congress, as set forth in article I of the Constitution; but the United States would no longer have the additional treatymaking power which is specifically provided in article II, section 2, of the Constitution. The need of such a power was one of the principal reasons for adoption of the Articles of Confederation.

It has been argued that such a drastic change in our constitutional structure is necessary, or at least salutary, to prevent violations of the Constitution by treaty. This argument is baseless. As I have already pointed out, the Supreme Court in an unbroken line of opinions has said that the United States cannot do by treaty what the Constitution forbids.

It has also been argued that such a constitutional amendment is necessary in order to preserve from obliteration

the provisions of the 10th amendment. The language of the 10th amendment is very clear:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The treaty power was delegated to the Federal Government in article II. Its exercise was clearly contemplated by the 10th amendment and could not result in violation of that amendment.

The minority report—at page 44—makes a very telling point in regard to the Federal-State aspects of this problem:

> Taking the treaty power away from the Federal Government, as contemplated in Senate Joint Resolution 43 (and now included in Senate Joint Resolution 1), would not give it to the States. Although in respect to general legislative powers those not delegated are retained by the States, the same is not true of the treatymaking power. Article I, section 10 of the Constitution directly provides:
>
> "No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation."
>
> Although it is the object of the framers of Senate Joint Resolution 43 to cut down on Federal prerogatives by depriving the Government of its treaty power, the adoption of the proposal would probably have a contrary result, because, out of sheer necessity, the courts would be forced to construe much more broadly the delegated powers in order to find authority for essential treaties. Chopping off the treaty power would inevitably result in an unwarranted expansion of the other powers of Congress. It seems obvious that the present constitutional situation, with a normal treaty power, is highly desirable.

Taking the treaty power away from the Federal Government, as contemplated in Senate Joint Resolution 1, would not give it to the States. Article I, section 10 of the Constitution directly provides:

> No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.

The result of the adoption of section 2 in Senate Joint Resolution 1 would be to leave the United States as a nation stripped of a part of the normal attributes and necessary powers of sovereign nations. This country would be disabled in international relations from dealing with other countries on a footing of equality. I should like to analyze briefly some of the matters which could not effectively be dealt with by the United States as a nation if section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 were to be adopted.

First, let us define what we mean by "effectively dealt with." To me, that term means that a particular treaty could become effective as the law of the land only through implementing legislation on the part of the 48 State legislatures, who would deal with us on the basis that implementation by the United States consisted of a request to the 48 States to put the treaty into effect, with a complete option on the part of the 48 States to implement or not as they pleased, with complete power on the part of the 48 States to repeal their implementation or change it at any time.

Let us examine different types of treaties which could not be effectively dealt with if the "which clause" were adopted—in other words the types of treaties which could be implemented if at all by the State legislatures. I say "implemented if at all" because it is very doubtful if many countries would deal with us on these subjects if we cannot speak and act as a single nation. There just is not a sufficient quid pro quo for them.

There are a number of traditional types of treaties which deal with subjects that do not fall within the delegated powers of Congress. These various types of treaties form the very backbone of our foreign relations. Not only do they cover a wide variety of subjects, but also they are very large in number. Under the Bricker amendment we could conclude such treaties only if the foreign country with which we were negotiating would grant our citizens rights on the promise that their citizens would receive reciprocal rights only if the State legislatures of our 48 States decided that they should have them. I will not discuss all of the various types of treaties that fall into this category, but I would like to mention a sufficient number to show the seriousness of the impediment which is proposed in the Bricker amendment.

Extradition treaties are a good example of what I am talking about. There are about 80 such treaties in effect today between the United States and other countries. The problem of the extradition of criminals is not one which falls solely within the delegated powers of Congress. Many of the crimes which are covered by extradition treaties fall within the criminal jurisdiction of the 48 States. Implementation of the extradition treaties—as far as these crimes are concerned—would depend on the 48 State legislatures. Let us take an example. The crime of murder is one that falls within State jurisdiction. Suppose we wanted to conclude an extradition treaty with France. We would want France to return to the United States—and by that I mean the 48 States of the United States—for trial anyone accused of murder committed in the United States but who is located in France. France, of course, would want the return to France from the United States of all persons found here who had been accused of murder in France. However, under the Bricker amendment we could not say to France that we would return the accused for trial in France; all we could say to France would be that we would ask the 48 States to pass legislation requiring extradition to France of suspected murderers. Does anyone seriously think that France would deal with us on that basis?

Some of the supporters of the Bricker amendment have claimed that the proposed amendment will not interfere with extradition processes, on the theory that they are based on reciprocity and not on treaties. Not only the State Department, but also almost all international lawyers, differ with them on this point. I would like to read to you a short quotation from Charles Cheney Hyde's authoritative book, International Law as Interpreted and Applied by the United States, volume II, page 1015:

> The almost unvarying practice of the United States has been to decline to surrender fugitive criminals save in pursuance of treaty. It has been frequently declared that the Executive lacks the power under such circumstances to cause the arrest and surrender of the individual. Declared the Supreme Court of the United States in 1936, through Chief Justice Hughes: "Applying, as we must, our own law in determining the authority of the President, we are constrained to hold that his power, in the absence of statute conferring an independent power, must be found in the terms of the treaty and that, as the treaty with France fails to grant the necessary authority, the President is without power to surrender the respondents" (*Valentine* v. *U. S. ex rel. Neidecker* (299 U. S. 5, 18)). That tribunal was, moreover, correct in its declaration somewhat earlier, that "the principles of international law recognize no right to extradition apart from treaty" (*Factor* v. *Laubenheimer* (290 U. S. 286, 287)).

EXTENSION OF PERIOD DURING WHICH COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS MAY INCUR EXPENSES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me, provided he does not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be read. I also ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELKER in the chair). The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 206) was read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the period during which expenses may be incurred by the Committee on Government Operations under Senate Resolution 40, agreed to January 30, 1953, is hereby extended to February 15, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation.

A resolution providing funds for the Committee on Government Operations is now on the calendar. That is the resolution with respect to which there was colloquy on the floor earlier today. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] desired additional time. I told him that we would put it over until tomorrow, but because of the expiration date of the funds for the committee we did not feel that we could delay beyond that point.

I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] have had some discussion of the subject. The Senator from Louisiana desired a few more days. It was agreeable to the Senator from Wisconsin that action on the resolution now on the calendar might go over until the first of next week. That would be agreeable to the leadership.

I have discussed this subject also with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas]. I have shown him a copy of this resolution, which would merely permit the Committee on Government Operations to use the leftover funds it now has on hand, which I

think are somewhere in the neighborhood of $7,000, until the 15th of February, which I understand will take care of the bills and payrolls which must be met when the normal authority expires at the end of this month. This is merely a resolution permitting the use of left-over funds until that time. It would not, therefore, either embarrass or prevent the committee from functioning. It is perfectly agreeable to the Senator from Wisconsin. As I understand, it is agreeable to the Senator from Louisiana.

I repeat that I have discussed the matter with the minority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas]. I have shown a copy of the resolution to the acting minority leader, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

With that explanation and that background, I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution heretofore read?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 206) was considered and agreed to.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will further yield, the hour is now 5:30. If it would meet with the approval of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I am prepared to move a recess of the Senate, with the understanding that the Senator from Tennessee will not lose the floor when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, with the exception that I would expect to have the usual morning hour. I may say further that, as I am sure the Senator understands, there is to be a joint meeting in the House tomorrow, at which the President of Turkey will speak. So there will be some gap, perhaps, before the Senator from Tennessee will again have an opportunity to proceed with his remarks.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator that that arrangement is perfectly agreeable to me. I should be able to finish in about 45 minutes after I resume my address tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 29, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 28 (legislative day of January 22), 1954:

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

Glen A. Lloyd, of Illinois, to be Deputy to the Director, Foreign Operations Administration.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Clyde Funkhouser, St. John's Methodist Church, Edwardsville, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O God who art the Father of us all and who doth continually bless us with Thy love and mercy, we pray Thee to draw near and bless Thy servants in the Congress of the United States.

We give humble thanks for this assembly of freemen who share the heavy responsibilities of great tasks and who give leadership to a mighty nation. Endue them with wisdom to perceive the truth, courage to do what is right, and faith to follow the leadership of Thy holy spirit.

Enable them to rise above petty factions and strife and to labor together in harmony and peace, ever keeping before them the hopes and aspirations of all citizens of this land. Cause them to be ever mindful of their stewardship of the life, liberty, and resources of this people. Through their actions may our country continue to guard and preserve those principles and ideals that will inspire men everywhere to build a world wherein we may dwell in peace and brotherhood.

Grant Thy benediction upon all our people and through us may all the nations of earth be blessed.

We pray in the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7209. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 54–6.

LOUIS E. GRAHAM

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, recently an editorial appeared in the News-Tribune of Beaver Falls, Pa., about my very good and able friend and colleague, LOU GRAHAM, and under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the editorial in the RECORD.

We all know LOU as a hard-working, conscientious, sound, clear-thinking American, and admire his stanch support of the fundamental principles and ideals of our constitutional form of government.

The people of his district are indeed fortunate in having him represent them in the Congress of the United States.

[From the Beaver Falls (Pa.) News-Tribune of January 26, 1954]

SUCH HIGH RECOGNITION CAN ONLY BE EARNED

Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN, Democratic Member of Congress from Albany, N. Y., and a newspaperman, recently wrote and published the following in the Watertown Daily Times:

"My choice for an award of merit, based purely on personal observation, would go to a Member of the House whose name probably is not known to a single reader of the Times. He is Representative LOUIS E. GRAHAM, Republican, of Beaver, Pa.

"He was first elected to the 76th Congress and he has been reelected every 2 years since. His margins of victory usually are small, but his standing in the House of Representatives is very great, indeed.

"That's probably because the Judge, as he is known, is a sort of Congressman's Congressman. Loyal to his own party, he commands tremendous respect from Members of the other party. It is a common sight, when an involved or controversial bill is being debated, to see a Democrat lean over and ask advice from LOU GRAHAM. I have done it myself."

Senator EDWARD MARTIN, in an address last Friday at a banquet held in New Castle, Pa., by the New Castle Junior Chamber of Commerce, likewise, had the following to say about Mr. GRAHAM:

"I don't believe there is a man in Congress from any State who works harder or more conscientiously than he does."

Said the Senator at the conclusion of his formal address:

"I am glad to come into this congressional district because it is represented at Washington by my good friend, LOU GRAHAM, one of the most valuable public servants in the Congress of the United States.

"You know down in Washington a Congressman, and a Senator as well, has more work to do and more duties to perform than most of his constituents know anything about. Many seem to think that the work of a Member of Congress is done altogether on the floor of the House or Senate, as the case may be. But I assure you that is not so.

"The business of Congress has expanded to such an extent that hard work and long hours cannot be avoided if the job is to be done right. Committee meetings take up a large part of a Congressman's time. Correspondence with constituents has increased tremendously in recent years. Contact with Government agencies to take care of a great variety of problems are a large part of the daily routine.

"I mention these things because I want to tell you something about your distinguished Congressman, LOU GRAHAM. I don't believe there is a man in Congress from any State who works harder or more conscientiously than he does. He believes in getting an early start, so you can find him in his office every day at 6 o'clock in the morning, and

many, many times his day's work is not finished until long after everyone else has gone home.

"LOU GRAHAM is regarded in Washington as an authority on Government, a great scholar, a great lawyer, and a man of upright Christian character. Lawrence County is fortunate to have a man of his outstanding ability as its Representative in Congress."

Such high recognition can only come to one who through diligent, honest, and sincere effort earns it. We are, indeed, fortunate in having Mr. GRAHAM as our Congressman. Let us be wise enough to keep him on the job.

ILLINOIS MINES SAFETY RECORD

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There were no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, it is in a spirit of gratification and pleasure that I take my place in the well today. I rise to pay tribute to a great Governor of a great State, William Stratton; his associates in the State bureau of mines; the 82d Congress; our colleague, the Honorable SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., and the operators and coal miners of the State of Illinois.

The reason for my enthusiasm, of course, is the recent great safety record established in the mining industry of the Nation and particularly the State of Illinois. A United Press dispatch recently issued states:

MINES SET BEST SAFETY RECORD IN HISTORY IN 1953

SPRINGFIELD.—State Mines Director Ben H. Schull said today Illinois coal mines chalked up their best safety record in history during 1953.

Twenty-eight men died in mine accidents, termed by Schull a record low. With preliminary figures placing coal output at 44,177,503 tons, the number of tons dug per fatality set another record at 1,577,768.

Schull said 16 of the deaths resulted from roof falls, 6 from haulage, 3 from railway cars, and 1 each from machinery, electricity, and falling objects.

Mr. Speaker, anyone reared in the mining camps of Illinois would be selfish indeed if they failed to revel in this remarkable record. Any person who has ever been wakened in the middle of the night by the wild shriekings of mine whistles or has followed a coal wagon down a dusty street as it brought home the broken body of a friend and neighbor, can well appreciate this wonderful achievement.

As an examiner, I do appreciate it. I would be laggard in my duty if I did not extend my appreciation to the Members of the 82d Congress who, with very few dissenting votes, passed this vital legislation. I know that all Members, myself included, voted for this law with our fingers crossed hoping against hope that it would solve this most distressing problem and end the slaughter in the coal mines of our Nation.

Every miner in America, I am sure, is grateful to our colleague, SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, from the 13th District of Pennsylvania, for the patient skill and human understanding he displayed in writing this remarkable law and steering it through the committee and House. For the first time in the history of mining legislation, the interested parties sat down together with the Bureau of Mines and the Congress and drew up a bill mutually agreeable. I must confess many moments of anxiety and worry about the outcome. I salute a real humanitarian, a good legislator, and a great Republican.

The people of Illinois have good reason to thank Gov. William Stratton and his efficient bureau of mines staff. Upon taking office Governor Stratton selected the most qualified men in the State to man the bureau of mines. Headed by Director Ben H. Schull, this staff set about to make the coal mines of Illinois as safe as humanly possible. Plagued as we have been by three major mine disasters in recent years, it was no easy task, but thanks to the utmost cooperation from the coal miners and operators they have made a great beginning. Wholehearted acceptance of Federal mining legislation by all parties and a willingness to work together has brought us this wonderful record. I have no illusions that the problem has been fully solved. We will still have disasters and killings. But we are at last on the right path, I am sure, and with 1953 as an inspiring example we can look forward with high hope to better and better records.

PERMISSION TO CLERK OF HOUSE TO RESPOND TO SUBPENA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 28, 1954.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received a subpena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representaives, to appear before said court as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Ernest King Bramblett* (No. 971–53, criminal docket), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicate that the Clerk may not either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

(NOTE.—Report to new courthouse between Third Street and John Marshal Place on Constitution Avenue NW., courtroom No. 8.)

Spa ad test: Court of Chief Judge Laws.

United States District Court for the District of Columbia—United States of America v. Ernest King Bramblett

(Criminal case No. 971–53)

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
TO CLERK, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
United States Capitol.

(And bring with you certified copies of all clerk-hire allowance forms, personnel affidavits, withholding exemption certificates, permanent mailing order cards, and applications for retirement benefits for all clerks hired by Congressman ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT from January 1, 1947, to December 1952, inclusive, certified copies of oaths of office of Congressman BRAMBLETT for 1947–53, inclusive.)

(Please report to Assistant United States Attorney William Hitz, at 9:15 a. m., room 3400G.)

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Tuesday, February 2, 1954, at 9:30 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the district attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 27th day of January A. D. 1954.

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By JOHN C. COOGAN,
Deputy Clerk.

Marshal's return

Summoned the above-named witnesses ...

W. BRUCE MATTHEWS,
United States Marshal.
By ----------
Deputy.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 425) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the United States against Ernest K. Bramblett (No. 971–53, criminal docket) pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, a subpena duces tecum was issued by the said court and addressed to Lyle Snader, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 2d day of February 1954, at 10 o'clock antemeridian, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Lyle O. Snader, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of said

Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN AID BOOSTS COFFEE PRICES

Mr. GROSS. The Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There were no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in 1949 I called attention here on the floor of the House—as I did yesterday—to the purchase by the ECA of 61 million pounds of coffee as a giveaway to foreigners.

I said then, and I repeat, that this unwarranted and unthinkable Government purchase, in the name of foreign aid, provided the lever by which the speculators originally pried the lid off coffee prices.

It is of record that a subcommittee of the other body, investigating coffee prices at that time, charged that three commission men, representing some 100 speculators, manipulated an initial investment of $151,000 into $3,363,333 between July 31, 1949, and March 30, 1950. That same subcommittee estimated that American housewives were gouged $670,000,000 in excessive coffee prices in the 1 month of November 1949.

What action did the President of the United States or the Justice Department take in 1949 or 1950 to punish those guilty of this fraud on the American people? The answer is nothing.

I respectfully suggest to President Eisenhower and Attorney General Brownell that if the statute of limitations has not run that they initiate legal action against these manipulators.

It appears that only substantial fines or jail sentences will put a stop to this glorified racketeering and victimizing of American housewives.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 289)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 28, 1954.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am herewith presenting my economic report, as required by section 3 (a) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the assistance and advice of the Council of Economic Advisers. I have also had the advice of the heads of executive departments and independent agencies.

I present below, largely in the words of the report itself, what I consider to be its highlights.

OUR OBJECTIVES

A great opportunity lies before the American people. Our approach to a position of military preparedness now makes it possible for the United States to turn more of its attention to a sustained improvement of national living standards.

Our economic goal is an increasing national income, shared equitably among those who contribute to its growth, and achieved in dollars of stable buying power.

Sustained economic growth is necessary to the welfare and, indeed, to the survival of America and the free world.

Although American living standards on the average are now higher than ever, there are certain groups whose consumption is much less than it should be. We can in our lifetime go far toward eliminating substandard living.

A steadily rising national income is the best assurance of harmonious social and economic adjustments. There can be no lasting harmony in a nation in which competing groups and interests seek to divide a constant or shrinking national output.

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

The demands of modern life and the unsettled status of the world require a more important role for government than it played in earlier and quieter times.

It is government's responsibility in a free society to create an environment in which individual enterprise can work constructively to serve the ends of economic progress; to encourage thrift; and to extend and strengthen economic ties with the rest of the world.

To help build a floor over the pit of personal disaster, Government must concern itself with the health, security, and welfare of the individual citizen.

Government must remain alert to the social dangers of monopoly and must continue vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Government must use its vast power to help maintain employment and purchasing power as well as to maintain reasonably stable prices.

Government must be alert and sensitive to economic developments, including its own myriad activities. It must be prepared to take preventive as well as remedial action; and it must be ready to cope with new situations that may arise. This is not a start-and-stop responsibility, but a continuous one.

The arsenal of weapons at the disposal of Government for maintaining economic stability is formidable. It includes credit controls administered by the Federal Reserve System; the debt-management policies of the Treasury; authority of the President to vary the terms of mortgages carrying Federal insurance; flexibility in administration of the budget; agricultural supports; modification of the tax structure; and public works. We shall not hesitate to use any or all of these weapons as the situation may require.

THE CURRENT SITUATION

The year just closed was very prosperous with record output, widely distributed incomes, very little unemployment, and prices stable on the average.

In the second half of the year there was a slight contraction in business leading to unemployment in some localities. This was due mainly to a decline in spending by businesses for additions to inventory. Other categories of spending, notably retail sales, have been well sustained.

Our economic growth is likely to be resumed during the year, especially if the Congress strengthens the economic environment by translating into action the administration's far-reaching program.

BASIS FOR CONFIDENCE

The removal of wage-and-price controls, the stopping of price inflation, the development of new products available to consumers, and the improved economic condition of the nations of the free world constitute an unusual combination of favorable factors for the future.

While Federal expenditures were being cut in many directions during the past year, outlays on research and development grew and came to $2½ billion out of a total national expenditure on research of $4 billion. Research has already given us many new industries and products, including atomic energy, radioactive isotopes, electronics, helicopters, jet engines, titanium and heat-resistant materials, plastics, synthetic fibers, soil conditioners, and many others. Outlays on the building of new knowledge must continue since they are our surest promise of expanding economic opportunities.

Because of billions of dollars of savings in Government spending made in this administration's first year, major tax cuts went into effect on January 1. More than $5 billion of tax savings are now being left with the American people to increase their purchasing power this year. More will be released to taxpayers as rapidly as additional savings in Government expenses are in sight.

Also favorable to the maintenance of high consumer expenditures growing out of high personal incomes is our wide diffusion of wealth and incomes and the strong urge of Americans to improve their living standards.

Expenditure plans of American business for plant and equipment constitute a powerful support for economic activity.

Despite the record volume of home building in recent years, there is still a good market for housing in this country. Vacancies in our cities, with few exceptions, are below the level necessary for a healthy competitive market.

A continued rise in State and local expenditures may be expected. There is still, in most parts of the country, a vast backlog of needed schools, highways, hospitals, and sewer, water and other facilities. Federal expenditures will remain a significant sustaining factor in the economy.

Our financial institutions are fully capable of meeting all reasonable credit demands and are in condition to withstand successfully any strains to which they may be exposed.

MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN THE ECONOMY

To protect and promote economic stability we should take bold steps—by modernizing unemployment insurance; by broadening the base and benefits of old-age insurance; by permitting a longer carryback of losses for tax purposes; by granting broad discretionary authority to the Executive to alter, within limits and appropriate to changing circumstances, the terms of governmentally insured loans and mortgages; by establishing a secondary home-mortgage market; and by making improvements in the planning of public-works programs.

To stimulate the expansive power of individual enterprise we should take action—by revising the tax laws so as to increase incentives and to remove certain impediments to enterprise, especially of small business; by improving credit facilities for home building, modernization, and urban rehabilitation; by strengthening the highway system; and by facilitating the adjustments of agriculture to current conditions of demand and technology.

CONCLUSION

Employment in January 1954 is somewhat lower than in January 1953. There seems to be a connection between this fact and the fact that in January 1953 we were still fighting in Korea and are not doing so today. We can make the transition to a period of reduced mobilization without serious interruption in our economic growth. We can have in this country and in the free world a prosperity based on peace.

There is much that justifies confidence in the future. The Government will do its full part to help realize the promise of that future in its program to encourage an expanding and dynamic economy.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules reported the following resolution (H. Res. 426, Rept. No. 1131), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3300) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR TOMORROW

The SPEAKER. Tomorrow the Congress in a joint meeting will receive the distinguished President of Turkey.

At the last joint session there was considerable confusion and many could not secure seats. The Chair therefore, after having consulted with the majority and minority leaders of the House, wishes to repeat the statement he has made on previous occasions: On tomorrow the doors immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other. No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

If this is complied with there will be no confusion. Furthermore the Chair hopes that Members will not take seats that have been reserved for guests, for that also adds to the confusion.

THE GOVERNMENT'S FISCAL POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, first I want to invite the attention of the Members to two excerpts from the President's message. I think the President's message on the economic report is a very fine one. Much depends, of course, on how it is carried out. It is not spelled out in detail; no bills are suggested, and no detailed program is recommended. The words used by the President are fine and I hope that it is carried out in the spirit in which I know it is offered by the President.

One sentence to which I wish to refer is this:

Our financial institutions are fully capable of meeting all reasonable credit demands.

Another statement reads:

To stimulate the expansive power of individual enterprise * * * to remove certain impediments to enterprise, especially of small business.

That is the part to which I desire to invite your attention.

Today the RFC through its liquidator has offered for sale notes and securities held by the RFC to private commercial banks. You may ask, How does that fit into the President's message? I will tell you. How can we have strong financial institutions capable of meeting the reasonable—I believe the message said "responsible"—credit demands, although it says "reasonable" here unless you have financial institutions locally that are capable of meeting the credit demands of that locality?

The President is mistaken, I believe, about the capability of our financial institutions to meet present credit needs. Or, possibly, they are so well taken care of with Government bonds or Government guaranteed paper that they do not have the desire to expand further. In other words like feeding your dogs before you start on a hunt.

BANKS "LOANED UP"

Over the years we have permitted the banks to be loaded down with Government securities and Government guaranteed paper to the point where they are practically loaned up and it is almost impossible for a local deserving citizen to get consideration of an application for a loan. Now, then, this aggravates the situation and goes absolutely contrary to the President's declaration in that these notes and securities are being sold to the local banks, which causes them to be loaned up more than they are now. In other words, the local money will be taken out to buy these RFC securities, making it more difficult for local people to get local loans, and particularly small business, as referred to in the President's message.

I view with concern and alarm a trend that is now evident among officials to violate our existing law and to go against the known will of Congress.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KILBURN. I do not know where the gentleman gets the idea that the banks do not want to make local loans. As a matter of fact, the banks have been advertising for local loans.

Mr. PATMAN. Generally that is not true.

Mr. KILBURN. The gentleman says it is not true, but I say it is.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, there is a difference of opinion. The gentleman has his information and I have mine. Sometimes we can be honest in our views and still differ. I know I am, and I am sure the gentleman is. But that is his conviction in the matter, it is not mine. I get letters every day complaining about the banks being loaned up and that a local person cannot get consideration for a loan. I do not say that the banks are asking for this extra benefit provided through the sale to them of certificates of interest in the assets of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Commodity Credit Corporation. I say it is being offered to them in such a way that they would not be acting with proper judgment and discretion if they were to turn down the proposition. Therefore, acting in their own self-interest, as we all do, they will accept the RFC proposal and the Commodity Credit Corporation proposal, and make it more difficult and harder for the local people to get consideration of their applications for loans.

Mr. KILBURN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KILBURN. I do not know who is writing the gentleman that they cannot get a loan. Of course, they cannot get a loan if they are no good. They have to be good in order to get a loan.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not suggesting that a person is entitled to a loan unless he has good collateral. Character is the best collateral on earth. Unless they have good bankable collateral or good credit, they are not entitled to a loan. I am talking about people who are entitled to a loan and who have good security and good collateral to offer.

RFC IGNORES AND GOES AGAINST WILL OF CONGRESS

Now, the RFC is going against the will of Congress in selling assets to banks. I want to invite your attention to the fact that last year, when the Small Business Administration bill was up—H. R. 5141—and when it went to the Senate and the Senate committee reported it out, and the Senate considered it on July 20, 1953, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, Senator CAPEHART, introduced an amendment to that bill which would permit the banks to do exactly what they are doing now. That amendment was adopted, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 7, page 9217. The entire text of the amendment is there. It went into the bill and the House refused to accept it. It is as follows:

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5136, United States Revised Statutes (12 U. S. C., sec. 24) and section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C., sec. 335), any national bank or State member bank of the Federal Reserve System (as defined in section 1 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C., sec. 221)), may acquire and hold stock in, or may make loans to, private corporations formed solely for the purpose of acquiring from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation all or any part of any loans or securities owned in whole or in part by it and of liquidating such loans or securities in accordance with such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C., sec. 371), any national bank, acting alone or with one or more other financing institutions, may purchase from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation all or any part of any loan owned in whole or in part by it: *Provided, however*, That the total amount of the investments of any national bank or State member bank in stock under authority of this sentence shall not exceed at any one time 1 percent of the capital and surplus of such bank, and the total amount of the investments of any such bank under authority of this sentence in stock and loans and purchases shall not in the aggregate at any one time exceed 10 percent of the capital and surplus of such bank.

We had a conference on that bill and I was one of the conferees who opposed that provision. It was absolutely wrong, fundamentally wrong, basically wrong, and therefore we convinced the conferees it should be stricken out and it was stricken out in our conference July 22, 1953. Therefore, the Congress has passed upon the very thing that the RFC has done and has turned it down. I am inserting herewith two excerpts from the conference report, No. 943, 83d Congress, 1st session, July 24, 1953, on the small business administration bill, in which it is stated:

A provision is also contained in the Senate amendment which would authorize National and State member banks of the Federal Reserve System to (1) acquire and hold stock in, or make loans to, private corporations formed solely for the purpose of acquiring from the RFC all or any part of the loans or securities owned in whole or in part by the RFC and of liquidating such loans or securities in accordance with terms and conditions agreed upon with the RFC and (2) to purchase from the RFC all or any part of a loan owned in whole or in part by the RFC notwithstanding the provisions of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act. Limitations were placed upon the amount of such bank investments in stock, loans, and purchases to a certain percentage of a bank's capital and surplus.

* * * * *

Except for the following changes, the conference substitute retains the provisions of the Senate amendment:

(1) The provision authorizing National and State member banks to purchase stock in and make loans to corporations formed solely for the purpose of acquiring and liquidating RFC loans and investments, and to authorize such banks to purchase RFC loans in whole or in part notwithstanding the provisions of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act is not retained in the conference substitute.

This conference report was adopted by the House of Representatives, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 8, page 9998, and by the Senate, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 8, page 10253.

Not only that, but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, about the last day of the session—July 21, 1953—introduced a bill to permit the RFC to sell these securities to the banks, and that bill has never been considered. It is as follows:

H. R. 673

A bill to authorize National banks and State banks, members of the Federal Reserve System, to acquire and hold stock in, or make loans to, private corporations formed solely for the purpose of acquiring loans or securities from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 5136, United States Revised Statutes (12 U. S. C., sec. 24) and section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C., sec. 335), any National bank or State member bank of the Federal Reserve System (as defined in sec. 1 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C., sec. 221)), may acquire and hold stock in, or may make loans to, private corporations formed solely for the purpose of acquiring from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation all or any part of any loans or securities owned in whole or in part by it and of liquidating such loans or securities in accordance with such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C., sec. 371), any National bank, acting alone or with one or more other financing institutions, may purchase from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation all or any part of any loan owned in whole or in part by it: *Provided, however*, That the total amount of the investments of any National bank or State member bank in stock under authority of this act shall not exceed at any one time 1 percent of the capital and surplus of such bank, and the total amount of the investments of any such bank under authority of this act in stock and loans and purchases shall not in the aggregate at any one time exceed 10 percent of the capital and surplus of such bank.

What I am talking about is this: Here is an agency of the Government absolutely ignoring the known will of the Congress. If they did not know the will of the Congress, that would be different, but they know the will of the Congress in this instance, and Congress has expressed itself as being in opposition to exactly what the RFC is doing today, and I deplore the action that is taken in view of Congress being defied. I do not claim there is any effort to have a totalitarian government in our country now, and I know that our President is not trying to be a dictator; I know that. I have confidence in the President. He is a great American, trying to make a great President, and I intend to cooperate with him in that effort in trying to be a great President, but he should not ignore these laws and he should not permit them to be ignored. The first thing that a dictator would do would be to ignore the law or to willfully violate the law.

INVITING ATTENTION OF PRESIDENT

Now then, not only in the RFC matter, but I respectfully invite the attention of the President of the United States to the fact that the law says that the President shall—it is not a "may" deal; it is "shall"—fill the vacancy on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Now, that vacancy has been existing over a year, ever since the present administration has been in power and before, and it is not filled. It is a dangerous thing. There is a case where the law is absolutely ignored. I know the President did not willfully do that; he did not do it with malice. It probably was not called to his attention. But, I humbly and respectfully now invite to his attention that that vacancy should be filled, and when there is another vacancy in a few days that should be filled, because the laws passed by Congress say that these vacancies shall be filled by the President of the United States, and I hope that our laws are not ignored. It is a bad trend; it is a dangerous trend; it is trends like that that have gotten other countries into serious trouble.

ANOTHER CASE INVITED TO PRESIDENT'S ATTENTION

Furthermore, I invite the Executive's attention to the fact, respectfully and humbly, that the Secretary of the Treasury, in selecting the architect of the administration's money policy, Dr. Randolph Burgess, selected in a way that I consider an evasion of the plain letter of the law. He—Burgess, the unconfirmed Deputy—has all the power and authority that the Secretary of the Treasury has, yet a position has been created in a way that he claims he does not have to submit his name for confirmation to the United States Senate. Yet, unconfirmed Burgess is hired and people in that same executive branch that he is over and superior to do have to be confirmed by the United States

Senate. That is an evasion of the law. It looks like a direct, positive evasion of the law, and I know the President would not permit it to be done if it was brought to his attention; therefore I am humbly bringing it to his attention.

Since Dr. Burgess had so much power and was almost ruining our country by his hard-money, high-interest policy, I wanted to know more about him. I am attaching herewith my correspondence with Secretary Humphrey. It is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 5, 1953.*

Hon. GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.:

It will be very much appreciated if you will furnish me at your earliest convenience the name of the position held by Dr. Randolph Burgess in the Treasury Department, his general duties, when he took office, and how long his appointment runs. Thank you very much for an early reply.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, June 10, 1953.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATMAN: This is in reply to your telegram, dated June 5, 1953, requesting information concerning Mr. W. Randolph Burgess.

Mr. Burgess was appointed an Assistant to the Secretary, with operating title of Deputy to the Secretary, on January 21, 1953. This appointment was made under schedule A of the Civil Service Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Burgess has general supervision over the functions at the Office of International Finance (including Foreign Assets Control), United States Savings Bonds Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Bureau of Accounts, Bureau of the Public Debt, and Office of the Treasurer. In addition, he serves as my principal adviser and assistant on fiscal and monetary matters.

I trust that the above information will meet your needs.

Very truly yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Please notice how much power he has been given. A lot for an unconfirmed Deputy. Particularly one that is over an Under Secretary and four Assistant Secretaries who must be confirmed.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, June 12, 1953.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Thanks for your note of June 11.

It gives me great pleasure to advise you that in my opinion Mr. Randolph Burgess is the most able and the best qualified man in this country to advise and consult with me. I would rather have him and his advice and knowledge at my disposal than any other man in the world on the subjects which are within his care. That is why I asked him to come with me.

I am also glad to tell you that he has qualified himself in every respect and has divested himself of his bank stock and complied with all the provisions of the law.

Sincerely yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY.

Eventually this question of qualifications and adverse interest will probably be looked into by the other body when unconfirmed Burgess is given consideration.

JUNE 24, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want to thank you very much for your reply of June 12 to my letter of June 11.

I would like to have additional information about the qualifications of Dr. Randolph Burgess. In your reply you state that Dr. Burgess has qualified himself in every respect, has divested himself of his bank stock and has complied with every provision of the law. I would like to know if you took into consideration any benefits now received by Dr. Burgess from any banking institution or any benefits that he may be entitled to receive in the future from any banking institution.

If you will advise me his status with reference to any retirement allowances or benefits, insofar as they may be connected with any banking institution, it will be appreciated.

Thanking you very much for the prompt attention that you have given my requests, and hoping to hear from you on this one at your earliest convenience, I am

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, June 29, 1953.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of June 24.

I am pleased to advise that Mr. Burgess retired from the National City Bank under their regular retirement plan on December 31, 1952. That plan is a contributory insured plan with the Equitable Life Insurance Co. under which neither the company or the beneficiaries have power to alter its terms.

A further part of the plan provides that in case of retirement before 65, the bank will pay the equivalent of social security until age 65. In Mr. Burgess' case, under this provision the bank will pay him $72.70 per month until May 7, 1954. This is a definite commitment with no power to alter.

Mr. Burgess has no connection with any other banking institution other than being a regular customer. He has resigned all business directorships and severed all business connections.

The trusteeships retained are in education or philanthropic organizations.

I trust this gives you the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY.

If and when Mr. Burgess' name is submitted for confirmation, many questions will probably be asked about what is in this letter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How long has that situation existed?

Mr. PATMAN. Ever since Mr. Eisenhower has been in office.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just since he went in?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This is something that the other folks did not have?

Mr. PATMAN. We have been accused of a lot of things, but not that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Never been accused of that?

Mr. PATMAN. Not even by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I usually have some foundation for my accusation.

Mr. PATMAN. That is the reason, I think, that we have not been accused.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I am mighty glad to hear that. I thought the President had not done anything wrong yet. Is this the first thing that the gentleman found was wrong with the administration?

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When are you going to tell us about those so that we can fix those up?

Mr. PATMAN. I have another instance now of the RFC violating the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When are you going to tell us about those?

Mr. PATMAN. Just a moment. You asked me a question.

That action of the RFC's liquidator, Mr. Cravens, is contrary to what Congress turned down last year, flatly turned down, but he is going ahead doing it. That is a bad trend.

The next I will state to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is the present need for filling the vacancy on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. It has never been brought to his attention, I am sure, but I do not like this matter of the laws being violated and ignored, that is what I am talking about, and the Deputy of the Secretary of the Treasury not being confirmed. He ought to be. His name should be submitted and the Senate should confirm it. There should not be any evasion. Not only the spirit of the law but the direct letter of the law I believe is being violated. I am bringing this to the attention of the executive branch of the Government respectfully and humbly because I am a friend of the President and I want to help him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to congratulate the gentleman. I want to say I want to join with him in prosecuting anyone or everyone, even if it happens to be a Republican, which it seldom is.

Mr. PATMAN. I am just inviting this to the attention of the President. It is not prosecution.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just want them to obey the law.

Mr. PATMAN. That is what I want to do, so you help me on it. You are a member of the majority party and a distinguished leader of the majority party. You can have great influence and be a lot of help.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The point is this, that I think the statement the gentleman is making is so important and so far-reaching that perhaps we ought to have a quorum present.

Mr. PATMAN. I have agreed not to take up so much time here because a Republican conference is called for 2 p. m., and I know they want to discuss this

thing themselves because they do not want the law violated. I want to quit my talk in time so they can meet, and I hope they bring up the question of the law's being ignored and what a dangerous trend it is, and the necessity that all laws be rigidly and faithfully observed and enforced.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope we will have the gentleman's cooperation.

One other point, if the gentleman will let me alone, and I will be through and the gentleman can go into the private caucus with his party, and I hope he brings it up.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, I want to know——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas declines to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you decline to yield?

Mr. PATMAN. No, Mr. Speaker, I beg your pardon. I cannot decline to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan address himself to the Chair?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the Chair mean that I should?

The SPEAKER. If he wishes the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did, and I asked, Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman yield? That has been my request. I understood the gentleman to say that he would. Then the moment I started to say anything he began to talk. I again inquired. Whether he yields to me or not, I do not care.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. PATMAN. For a question, not a speech.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My question was whether, if you yielded to me, you were going to permit me to speak or whether you were going to evade the question.

Mr. PATMAN. I will answer your request by answering your question. The answer is, I am not going to permit you to speak. I will permit you to ask a question and I will not evade it, but will answer it.

AUDIT FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

I am today introducing a resolution, and I hope the gentleman listens to this, because I know he will not take this up in the Republican caucus, to direct the Comptroller General to audit the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Open Market Committee, and the Federal Reserve banks—that is, the Comptroller General. I am not charging any corruption. I am charging mismanagement, and I am charging violations of the law. That is what I am charging. It is as follows:

A bill to direct the Comptroller General to audit the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Open Market Committee, and the Federal Reserve banks

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Comptroller General shall make, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, an audit for the year ending December 31, 1953, of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Open Market Committee, and the Federal Reserve banks and their branches.

(b) In making the audit required by subsection (a), representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the agencies being audited, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians of such agencies.

(c) The Comptroller General shall, at the end of 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, or as soon thereafter as may be practicable, make a report to the Congress on the results of the audit required by subsection (a), and he shall make any special or preliminary reports he deems desirable for the information of the Congress. A copy of each report made under this act shall be sent to the President of the United States, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Open Market Committee, and the Federal Reserve banks. In addition to other matters, the report shall include such comments and recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including recommendations for attaining a more economical and efficient administration of the agencies audited, and the report shall specifically show any program, financial transaction, or undertaking observed in the course of the audit which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on without authority of law.

(d) The Comptroller General is authorized to employ such personnel (including attorneys and accountants) as may be necessary to carry out the audit required by subsection (a), and he is authorized to employ by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, professional services of firms and organizations for temporary periods and for special purposes. The expenses of the audit shall be paid out of assessments made under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act.

The Board of Governors, the Federal Reserve banks, and the Open Market Committee has never been audited by the Comptroller General. They have never been audited by an independent auditor who had the power and authority under proper direction to make that audit. They are 40 years old except the Open Market Committee and it is over 20 years old and they have never had an audit. So I am asking that the Comptroller General be allowed the privilege after being directed by Congress, of going in there and discreetly auditing the books of the Board of Governors and the 12 banks and their branches and the Open Market Committee. I promised that shocking information will be brought to light.

ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], pointed out to the Members of the House that January 26 marked the 117th anniversary of the great State of Michigan's admission to the Union. The gentleman from Michigan is to be complimented for bringing this important event to the attention of the House and I applaud his action.

Then, Mr. Speaker, lo and behold, the same gentleman from Michigan proceeded to bury our great State for the present and the future in a morass and abyss of depression and gloom and doom. I was too shocked to answer him at the moment. But today I am forced to answer the challenge of his remarks and I welcome the opportunity, for every action of the depression-philosophers must have a reaction. If this is not true, if the statements of my colleague are not refuted, then I can visualize a boundless joy breaking loose in the Kremlin—that den of hate where the economic collapse of our Nation is the fondest hope for advancing their criminal conspiracy of world conquest. The disseminators of bad tidings among us accuse the administration of closing its eyes to economic trouble, of turning a deaf ear to so-called signs of disaster.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see if this administration is unaware of the economic conditions that obtain throughout this great country.

Only a few minutes ago we received the economic message of the President of the United States which, I am sure, after careful study, most fair-minded Americans will agree was the result of long preparation, intensive study and sound recommendations. The President stated:

Our economic growth is likely to be resumed during the year, especially if the Congress strengthens the economic environment by translating into action the administration's far-reaching program.

Because of billions of dollars of savings in Government spending made in this administration's first year, major tax cuts went into effect on January 1. More than $5 billion of tax savings are now being left with the American people to increase their purchasing power this year. More will be released to taxpayers as rapidly as additional savings in Government expenses are in sight.

Our financial institutions are fully capable of meeting all reasonable credit demands and are in condition to withstand successfully any strains to which they may be exposed.

There is much that justifies confidence in the future. The Government will do its full part to help realize the promise of that future in its program to encourage an expanding and dynamic economy.

Tomorrow the Joint Committee on the Economic Report will begin its hearings. This committee will meet almost daily until the end of February, when its report will be drafted and presented to the President. The staff of this important committee has been doing a far-reaching job during the recess of Congress and is completely ready for the hearings of the committee.

I deeply regret, Mr. Speaker, that my distinguished colleague does not reflect the strength of our economy or the faith in the future of America. I say there are no signs on the horizon that justify the predictions of these prophets of gloom and doom that America is in danger. The only danger lies in the fact that we can talk ourselves into a depression. Like the human body, which can wither

away under the stresses of a deranged mind, our economy can be made to deteriorate from this poison being dumped into its life stream. It is indeed regrettable that there are those who persist in taking a pessimistic attitude toward the future and who succeed in planting the seed of fear in the minds of some of our citizens.

Some of these men of little faith seem literally to have become crusaders for this tragic cause. It makes one wonder if many of them are not motivated by some ulterior resolve. I am sure the membership is familiar with the address of our distinguished Speaker made in Philadelphia last Saturday night and his remarks, which follow:

> Today we are in the unfortunate position of having a small but hard-core group of people in this country who are trying to promote us into hard times for political reasons. Identification of the majority of these four-alarm prophets discloses that they are of a political persuasion that is either downright left wing or friendly to it.

Be that as it may, loose talk of a recession could result in the very condition we seek to avoid. Permitted to grow, it could become a cancer which might destroy the key factor in maintaining a dynamic economy-public confidence.

It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, in view of the facts, to understand the thinking, or perhaps the lack of it, on the part of some of our citizens in their depressed approach to our economy today. And I ask them to look at those facts. Then I would like to know who are the blind and who are the deaf.

First, look at the tremendous increase in our population and remember the relationship between the population factor and consumer demand. Since 1940 our population has leaped by approximately 22 percent. It is authoritatively estimated that this growth will continue, so that by 1975 the population may reach an approximate total of 220 million. What a market potential this represents.

I would like to call specific attention to the situation in my own State of Michigan. There actually are more people gainfully employed today than the average for any year prior to 1953.

The year 1951 was our second biggest year on record.

Except for 1953—the first year of the Eisenhower administration—we would be at an alltime peak in employment. There are more people working now than there were at any time during the Korean war or World War II.

Mr. John Stewart, statistician for the Detroit Board of Commerce, estimates the employment situation in metropolitan Detroit, consisting of Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb Counties, as follows: During the first 6 months of 1954 there will be an average of 690,000 persons employed in manufacturing; 603,000 employed in nonmanufacturing; and 114,000 self-employed persons, for a total of 1,407,000 nonfarm workers employed.

Mr. Stewart further estimates that the average unemployment for this same period will be approximately 70,000, which is equivalent to 4.7 percent of the total work force. This again could be the highest average employment in the Detroit metropolitan area in history—aside from the all-time bumper year of 1953.

I said 1951 was the second biggest year. But on January 15—just 2 weeks ago—manufacturing and nonmanufacturing activities in metropolitan Detroit were employing 1,277,000 workers, compared with an average of 1,263,000 in 1951—that No. 2 year.

We have been, Mr. Speaker, experiencing a period of inventory adjustment from war to partial peacetime economy and from previous abnormal periods. One year ago we had rationing, wage, price, and rent controls. The peddlers of gloom and doom predicted dire consequences if these controls were removed. They have been removed with the result that prices have stabilized as has the cost of living. But income and the stock market continue to rise.

Another of my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, recently described this adjustment period in these words:

> Before we can have real stability, it is to be expected that we will go through a stabilization recession. Everyone knows we cannot continue on the inflationary escalator without disastrous results. However, we can step off that escalator onto a stable platform, which we're doing now. I would hate to think—

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] said—

> that we have to continue our prosperity at the expense of American lives on the battlefield.

There you have it. Is it better to continue a mad slaughter to buoy up an ill-fated economy, or to suffer the pains of redirecting our tremendous industrial machine into an area of sanity and hope for every American for permanent prosperity?

Look again at these facts—employment is setting records, there is a high volume of savings and purchasing power, an all-time high in national production of goods and service, and great population growth.

Just 4 weeks ago—on January 1—$5 billion in savings were passed on to the American taxpayer through a 10 percent reduction in personal income taxes and the removal of the excess-profits tax. That certainly should be a stimulus to industrial growth and consumer purchasing. If not, the hard-headed businessmen who run General Motors Corp., the greatest manufacturing enterprise in the world, would not risk $1 billion expansion program. Here in his own words is the way Mr. Harlowe Curtice, president of General Motors, looks at the future:

> A growing population means a growing labor force and a highly active technology results in a tremendous and mounting production potential. Balancing this production potential will be a high level demand for goods. With population growing, employment continuing at a high level, and output increasing, we can anticipate a steady climb in national income. Disposable income per capita, which is currently about 40 percent above the 1940 average expressed in terms of buying power, may well be 70 percent above by 1960.

But Mr. Curtice, too, warned against that one insidious danger—the fear of depression being spread by the gloom-mongers.

Let us remember that the economy of this Nation is based upon payrolls. In order to put a man or a woman on a payroll, it is necessary to invest anywhere from $7,000 to $25,000 in capital. So often, Mr. Speaker, those who shed crocodile tears because of unemployment are the same who would thwart the orderly development and expansion of business initiative. Unless we have expansion of industry and business there will be a point at which jobs could become static and this is not a healthy prospect. It does not spell a growing and expanding economy, nor does it take care of our rapid and continuing growth in our Nation's population. Let us go forward with confidence. Confidence in ourselves. Confidence in America—and confidence in our destiny.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. COOPER asked and was granted permission to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority on next Tuesday, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

TALK OF RECESSION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a column.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, although I heard only the last few moments of the comments of the gentleman from Michigan I did gather his meaning. I intend to insert at this point in the RECORD a very excellent column by J. A. Livingston, the financial writer, which is carried in the Washington Post of this morning.

It is very interesting that gentlemen who take the position that those who express concern about the present economic situation are prophets of doom whose purpose is to induce a depression, forget that in this country ever since the close of World War II there have been a great many people, particularly in the business community, who felt quite sure and expressed themselves freely to the effect that there would inevitably be a deep post-war depression. That has not come to pass and it need not come to pass, but I do not think that we in Congress can afford to adopt the attitude at any time that we should ignore facts, and the facts are that unemployment has increased.

I am not one of those who believe that our present situation necessarily will lead to a depression but timely action at this time or in the immediate future by the administration and the Congress may have a great deal to do with whether or not the present economic downturn continues. It is imperative that all of

us in the House and in the other body pay very strict attention to the economic facts and be alert to take any steps which may be necessary to prevent what is now a recession with increasing unemployment developing into a serious depression. I cannot find it in my heart to believe that anybody would criticize Members of the House or of the other body for a due concern and a proper regard for a continuation of a full-employment, expanding economy.

Mr. Livingston's column follows:

HOOVER'S SUNSHINE CAMPAIGN IN 1930 DIDN'T STOP DEPRESSION

(By J. A. Livingston)

Sh-h-h. If you have a doubt about business in 1954, don't mention it. Recession is a naughty word. People won't like you if you have misgivings. Everything is going to be all right.

You don't usually meet that sentiment in so many words. But William C. McKeehan, Jr., vice president of J. Walter Thompson advertising agency, came right out and said it. He has urged the Advertising Council to wage at multi-million-dollar prosperity campaign to offset gloomy forecasts of a recession.

And Speaker of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, has come forth with an attack on "leftwing eggheads" who are trying to "yell the country into a depression."

MARTIN assured an audience of 700 at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel in Philadelphia that good times are certain. True, we've been in a period of readjustment "for many months—but our people have remained calm," and "there is not a valid economic sign, recognized by qualified economic experts, pointing to anything like the unemployment of 1949–50."

All this has a familiar ring. A group of newspapermen were sipping highballs in the National Press Club just after a high-up Government official had described President Eisenhower's budget message as a "bullish document, based on prosperity."

One of the newspapermen said: "This makes me think of 1930."

Another said: "How do you think of that? Economics isn't your field."

The first newspaperman replied: "I lived through it. I wasn't born yesterday."

For persons who weren't there, 1930 was the year of President Hoover's sunshine campaign. The country was just emerging from the shock of the 1929 Wall Street crash. The President called on the Nation's public utilities, railroads, and industrial companies to spend money on plant and equipment. That would check the business decline.

For a while, hopes were raised. Business turned up in the spring. Stock prices rallied. Wall Street cheered. Then plop. It was a false boom. The letdown was—well—quite a letdown. Coueism—think well and things will turn out well—doesn't work in economics or medicine.

Economically, this isn't 1930. This country has powerful economic props to prevent a depression. As Harlow H. Curtice, president of General Motors Corp., said recently, we have many "reasons to expect a strong and healthy economy," namely, high defense expenditures; need for schools, highways, hospitals, and other public works; need for new housing; need for new plant and equipment; lower taxes.

However, Mr. Curtice sees one danger we must guard against—and that is psychological. If those who persist in taking a pessimistic view of the future succeed in planting fear in the minds of the public, those seeds of fear could take root.

The record does not bear Mr. Curtice out. Throughout the postwar period, talk of a recession has been persistent and recurrent. Mr. Curtice, himself, noticed that. Yet the only decline worth mentioning took place in 1949 and that was minor.

Surely, if gloomy talk could cause a business break, we'd have had it long ago. And if brave talk could have stopped a depression, then the depression of the thirties would never have happened.

If the prophets of good business really felt secure about the outlook for this year, would they try to shut up the prophets of recession and resort to name calling? Or would they shrug them off as well-meaning fellows shouting economic gibberish into the wind?

It doesn't make sense to enter into a Pollyanna conspiracy. It isn't subversive to talk about the possibilities of a recession. Indeed, it's beneficial. If a slump comes, people will be prepared for it psychologically. And if it doesn't, the talk will shut itself up.

COMMUNIST YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to say a few words about the current situation in Yugoslavia. Yesterday in Parliament Marshal Tito said that he was going to normalize relations with Russia which, in effect, means that now they are friends and the dispute with the Soviet is about all over.

The United States citizens have invested almost half a billion dollars worth of aid in that Communist dictatorship in Yugoslavia, which I have consistently opposed, tried to reduce, and tried to tie down by placing conditions upon its use that would help the poor oppressed people of Yugoslavia. The United States is shipping, under the aid program, jet planes to Tito's Yugoslavia. I have been on the floor here time after time warning the country—and doing it in one small way—that Tito was undependable, that he would move toward Russia. As a matter of fact, as you know, I tried to block the aid to Tito on the last foreign aid bill, and I was able, by my amendment adopted by the Foreign Affairs Committee, to cut a hundred million dollars off the aid that was going in jet planes to Yugoslavia. With the committee's approval, the Congress did reduce this aid by a hundred million.

At this time I wish the Congress would consider on its own motion separate and apart from the Executive, as it can under the provisions of the act, either suspending aid to Tito for 90 days until Congress can make an investigation, or completely blocking aid at this time to see where Tito's Communist Yugoslavia stands.

There is no doubt in this world that a Communist is a Communist. When the United States is supporting a Communist government on the basis that it will stand with us and the West, for the free nations against the other Communist nations, we are certainly making a mistake and are going to be terribly fooled. We should all remember that it was Georgi Malenkov, the present dictator of Russia, who was friendly with Tito over in Paris in the early days. It was the same Georgi Malenkov who helped Tito get in as Secretary General of the Communist Party in Yugoslavia. So, of course, they are friends. Tito was knocked down just when he was getting to the peak of his power in the Kremlin hierarchy, and Stalin did not want him.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House and to say that the gentleman who is now speaking has on innumerable occasions pointed out the difficulties that we would eventually have with Tito. Does the gentleman believe that it is impossible to do business with the Communists?

Mr. FULTON. I certainly believe that is right.

CHIEF JANITOR

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 427) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 1, 1954, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to the chief janitor, Doorkeeper's department, at the basic salary rate of $800 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTANT CHIEF JANITOR

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 428) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective September 1, 1953, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic rate of $2,700 per annum for the services of an assistant chief janitor, who shall be designated by the minority leader subject to the approval of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on S. 15 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ARE WE LOSING A CONTINENT?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Admiral Byrd.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, "Are we losing a continent?" is a question raised by an excellent article written by Rear Adm. Richard Byrd and published in the American Weekly on January 17, 1954. I shall insert it in the RECORD and I trust that all Members of the House will read it.

Rear Admiral Byrd has made four expeditions to Antarctica for our country and each time he returned, so he states, with a conviction that the frozen real estate at the bottom of the world is actually a storehouse of fabulous riches.

Our Nation has explored more territory in the south polar region than all the other nations combined. Great Britain, Argentina, Chile, Norway, France, Australia, each claim a portion of Antarctica. Russia claims all of it. Yet, despite the fact that United States has explored more territory and has contributed greatly to the opening of Antarctica, our Nation has claimed nothing and has taken no action. As Byrd has said, the rest of the world has stuck their fingers in the Antarctic pie while Uncle Sam is still sucking his thumb.

I hope Congress will act favorably upon my bill, House Joint Resolution 353, which is one step in the direction of the United States declaring its sovereignty over certain portions of Antarctica.

ARE WE LOSING A CONTINENT?

(By Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd, U. S. Navy, retired)

Not long ago a Russian naval officer masquerading as a crew member of the whaling ship, *Slava*, peered intently at the shoreline of the world's seventh continent, Antarctica, where a team of his comrade scientists were exploring the vast stretches of ice and rock. Before the 6 months of continuous sun had set that summer of 1947–48, this Russian expedition to the South Pole had returned to Moscow with 824 whales, 10,000 metric tons of whale oil—and, more important, with invaluable clues to the secrets of Antarctica.

The Communists must have been pleased with what they saw, for their fleet of whaling ships and arctic-trained scientists have made the 30,000-mile round trip from Vladivostok several times since.

"Why all this interest in an icy wasteland? Could a Communist-controlled Antarctica be a threat to the free world?" someone might ask.

Twenty-five years ago, when I made my first trip to the South Pole, I might have found it difficult to answer these questions. But during the past quarter of a century—in 1928–30, 1933–35, 1939–41, and again in 1946–47—I have been connected with four expeditions to Antarctica for our country and each time we returned with new conviction that the so-called useless frozen real estate at the bottom of the world is actually a treasure-house of fabulous riches. Its wealth is waiting to be used when our own resources—which we have been and still are expending so recklessly—are exhausted.

Unlike the North Pole, Antarctica is no sea of floating ice, but a continent of 6 million square miles of land—almost as big as the United States and Europe combined. A sheet of glacial ice covers most of the rock except where mountains that rise as high as 15,000 feet pierce the icy landscape.

It was on the side of one of these mountains, in the Queen Maud Range, 180 nautical miles from the Pole, that I saw a vein filled with enough coal to supply the whole world. Other explorers and I have also brought back to America evidence that invaluable deposits of oil, copper, silver, molybdenum, iron, gold, and even uranium lie beneath the age-old ice just waiting to be tapped.

With new mining techniques and possibly with the help of atomic energy to melt the snow and ice, we could uncover this hidden wealth.

This untapped reservoir of natural resources is vital to America's future. But perhaps as important is the strategic value of Antarctica. As any astute military planner now knows, the nation that controls Palmer Peninsula at the northern tip of the continent could strangle America's lifeline in case of another world war.

Should the easily disabled Panama Canal be knocked out by an A-bomb, ships traveling from the Atlantic to the Pacific would have to sail around the toe of South America between Cape Horn and Antarctica. At present we have no defenses in that area and our ships would become easy prey for enemy jets and submarines that might some day be based on Antarctica.

American sweat, money and ingenuity have contributed greatly to the opening of Antarctica. In fact, we have explored more territory in the south polar region than all the other nations combined. During Operation Highjump alone [commanded by Admiral Byrd in 1946–47—Editor), our naval task force—composed of 4,000 men, over 20 planes, 12 ships and a submarine—charted 1,700,000 square miles of the continent—900,000 of which had never before been seen by human eyes.

Yet, for all our work, the cagey Russian officers aboard the *Slava*—indeed most of the nations of the civilized world—seem to know the value of Antarctica better than we do. Yes, America has been caught napping, and today when we need it most, we are in danger of forfeiting our hard-won right to the forgotten continent.

Ask any schoolboy: "Who owns the South Pole?", and he'll turn to an American geography book or a world atlas, where the map of Antarctica is cut up into some half dozen pie slices that start from the Pole. The name of the nation claiming each slice is plainly printed. Yet nowhere is the proud name of the United States.

Palmer Peninsula (named after young Nathaniel Palmer, a Yankee sealer credited with discovering Antarctica in 1821), a 750-mile-long toe that stretches up toward South America, is claimed by three nations—Great Britain, Argentina and Chile.

Adjacent to the peninsula is Queen Maud Land, claimed by the Norwegians on the basis of the work of Roald Amundsen, the first man to reach the South Pole. East of Queen Maud Land, where the Indian Ocean washes ashore, is the large Australian sector. The Australians claim approximately half of all Antarctica, including a lot of territory explored by us. The French section, Adelie Land, is a small five-degree slice that splits the Australian claim in two.

Directly west of the Australian sector lies Little America, the settlement of 4 villages complete with post office and radio station that was our base headquarters during our last 4 expeditions. Strangely enough, Little America, the only touch of civilization in the area, lies completely within the so-called Ross dependency, a large slice of Antarctica claimed by New Zealand. In 1939–41 we established a base on Palmer Peninsula, 1,200 miles east of Little America. Other Americans, Lincoln Ellsworth and Comdr. Finn Ronne, have also explored this area, a sector claimed by three nations—Britain, Chile, and Argentina.

The Soviet Union has, of course, unofficially claimed all of Antarctica, basing their case on the voyage of Admiral Bellingshausen, a German, who sailed to Antractica in the pay of the Czar.

Personally, I don't think 40 percent of these claims would hold up before an impartial tribunal. But in the meantime, the rest of the world has stuck their fingers into the Antarctica pie while Uncle Sam is still sucking his thumb. Our Government does not recognize any of these claims and has repeatedly stated that we reserve all our rights to Antarctica. But thus far we have taken no action.

The only unclaimed portion of the white continent lies between Little America and Palmer Peninsula, an area of almost a million square miles. In 1929, I named a portion of it Marie Byrd Land in honor of my wife, and unofficially claimed it for the United States. I like to think I'm acting as its custodian until such time as our Government decides to act.

To the uninitiated, the glacial ice seems forbidding. But I have discovered many areas on the fringe that are ice free. We have seen fresh water mountain lakes warmed by ocean currents, and at least one hot, active volcano.

Amid the icy wastes, we found a hidden Shangri-La, a small green valley of grass and lichens surrounded by high, protecting cliffs. It was there we discovered the continent's only permanent inland inhabitant—a one-half inch long wingless insect. There may be many other such valleys on Antarctica.

Antarctica is so well suited for plane travel that over the years we have walked away from more than a half dozen forced landings on snow and ice. In the case of sudden engine trouble a trained pilot could bring a ski-equipped plane down safely on the ice 9 times out of 10.

In fact, with work and foresight, Antarctica could some day be made into a large strategic American bomber base and A-bomb arsenal guarding the entire southern world. Bombers based there could effectively nullify any Soviet threat to South America, Australia, New Zealand, the southern Pacific islands, and parts of Africa.

During the years I have spent in the service of our country, I have noticed that the first comment about Antarctica that people often make to me is: "It must be awfully cold down there!"

Well, it is. Antarctica is the coldest place in the world. Our scientists have recorded temperatures as low as 85° Fahrenheit below zero. And even during the December to March Antarctic summer the temperature never rises above the freezing point.

But like almost everything else about Antarctica, its unwelcome climate is a paradox. For the same unrelenting, biting cold that keeps the white continent uninhabited has blessed it with a purity known nowhere else on earth. Time seems to stand still in Antarctica. There is no rot, no rust, no mold, in fact, no bacteria that we know of.

This startling fact was brought home to me quite graphically one day while traveling over the glacial ice. We stumbled on a camp abandoned by early explorers 35 years before. It looked as if they had just packed up and left. The boards on the shack looked new. The nails were gleaming bright without a trace of rust. Near the shack was a dog standing in the snow looking just as alert as our huskies—yet dead over 35 years. We picked up a piece of rope they had once used to hitch their horse. It was as taut and strong as ever and we hitched our helicopter with it.

Today I believe that this preserving quality of the Antarctica cold might well be its most valuable asset. The thought struck me one day when we were returning to Little America after a 4-year absence.

Our old weather hut was buried under winters of Antarctic frost. We dug through 14 feet of packed ice and snow and made our way into the little hut. On the table was a meal I had half finished 4 years before—a piece of roast beef and a half a loaf of bread.

It looked quite frozen but as fresh as ever. We warmed the food and ate it for lunch. It was as tasty a meal as I've ever had.

I realized that frozen Antarctica is actually a vast permanent storehouse for perishable foods of all kinds. Our surplus production could be carried down in deep freeze ships and stored until it was needed—either for civilian or military use or to feed starving peoples any place in the world. Such a tremendous job could never be handled in the States by our artificial deep freeze facilities.

I have been doing research on the idea and recently became associated with Arnold Bakers, a forward-looking firm that is deep-freezing bread in order to help eliminate the great problem of stale bread. As honorary chairman of the International Rescue Committee, I was proud to be connected with the shipment of 10,000 loaves of such deep-frozen bread to the hungry refugees in West Germany.

America's work in Antarctica has opened the world's eyes, but it has also sharpened the competition. For a long time this international rivalry was polite, but only recently it flared up.

On February 2, 1952, a group of Englishmen sailed toward Palmer Peninsula. They were returning to a base they had left in 1949—an Antarctic outpost that had since been occupied by Argentina. But as they approached shore they were greeted with a volley of shots that whistled overhead—a warning not to land on Argentine territory.

This affront to British dignity was salvaged 3 days later by the appearance of a 40-gun Royal Navy frigate from the Falkland Islands and a subsequent Argentine apology. But it did little to settle the question of who actually owns the strategic Palmer Peninsula.

This is not the first time that Britain, Chile, and Argentina have quarreled over Antarctica. Both the Latin-American countries refuse to recognize Britain's claim to northern Antarctica on the grounds that the land is a logical extension of the original Spanish claim to the new world and, therefore, rightly theirs.

Chile spurred both her competitors to action a few years ago when President Dr. Gonzales Videla stepped ashore on Antarctica and buried Chile's claim under a newly erected military building.

The Argentines quickly dispatched 5 ships and 5 admirals to the scene. The British sent a cruiser from South Africa to show the Crown's colors. Fortunately there was no gunplay.

Hitler recognized the strategic value of Antarctica quite early, and in 1938–39 sent Dr. Alfred Ritscher there to establish a German claim. Ritscher named hundreds of inlets and mountains after prominent Nazis and claimed 600,000 square miles.

When Hitler occupied Norway in 1940, he used his Norwegian puppet, Vidkun Quisling, to claim all of Antarctica on the basis of the early exploration of Roald Amundsen.

Today, no one really owns Antarctica even though seven nations have pseudo administrations and some try to levy taxes on whales caught in their sector. It's not too late for America to press her rightful claim, but as of now we are not even officially in the race.

I am reminded of the time when few people could foresee the value of Greenland, another supposedly frozen wasteland. Today, we have invested billions of dollars in Greenland air bases that some experts consider the most important in the world. [Admiral Byrd was instrumental in convincing our Government of the strategic value of Greenland.—Editor.]

We can't afford to underestimate Antarctica.

I am planning to make another expedition to Antarctica in the near future. With God's will, my work there will help strengthen America's right to the continent and keep it safely in the hands of the free nations of the world.

ANTIRECESSION—THE PRESIDENT'S POLICIES AND BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have heard my colleagues on both sides of the aisle engage in something of a running and good political fight about whether there is or is not a recession and about the significance of present unemployment figures incidentally and happily among the lowest in our peacetime history. This is all perfectly legitimate politics; we understand it here in the House and I think in the country, but I think the country expects us to vote very differently.

The President has proposed very real measures with respect to expanded and increased unemployment insurance, expanded and increased social security, housing and health programs, mutual security and foreign trade and investment, construction of roads and other great public works, all of which will go far to determine whether or not there will actually be any material economic slipping off in our country. I hope that when the time comes to vote both sides of the aisle will forget about these discussions as to who, if anyone, is trying to talk us into a recession for political purposes and vote in the interest of the whole country—the basis on which the President's program is built. The President has, in addition, pledged all the power of Government, including other measures if those proposed are not enough, to keep our economy healthy and prosperous. I think the country understands what is happening now but expects that when the showdown comes we will be acting to support the President's approach which seems so promising for all our people. The best things done here we must remember have generally been bipartisan.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday next for 15 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7209. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALEXANDER.

Mr. DODD and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOWELL and to include an article.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VORYS (at the request of Mr. SCHERER).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 29, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1208. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, entitled 'Coast Guard,' and for other purposes," was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 426. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3300, a bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway; without amendment (Rept. No. 1131). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee of conference. S. 15. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1133). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CRUMPACKER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3041. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Frederick W. Lee the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention; without amendment (Rept. No. 1132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. R. 7595. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount

which an individual may earn without suffering deductions from benefits payable thereunder, and to provide that in the computation of such deductions wages shall be placed on an annual basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 7596. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, so as to extend the benefits of such act to persons captured or interned by, or in hiding from, the Japanese Government in China during World War II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 7597. A bill providing that there shall be equal pay for equal work for women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 7598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a deduction from gross income for losses sustained by reason of the voluntary demolition of a building by a taxpayer operating a trade or business, effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 7599. A bill to provide for a 1955 White House conference on education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. R. 7600. A bill to provide that a surplus of an agricultural commodity shall not be a factor in determining possible deferment of certain individuals from service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. R. 7601. A bill to provide for a White House conference on education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 7602. A bill to direct the Comptroller General to audit the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Open Market Committee, and the Federal Reserve banks; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 7603. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 7604. A bill making emergency appropriations for the construction of works for protection against beach erosion at Seal Beach and Surfside, Orange County, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 429. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the proceedings at Kitty Hawk, N. C., and at Washington, D. C., celebrating the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 7605. A bill for the relief of Ignacz Englender and Mrs. Olga Englender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 7606. A bill for the relief of Michael Henry LaFleur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 7607. A bill for the relief of Mauro Rana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7608. A bill for the relief of Rose Masur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 7609. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Peterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7610. A bill for the relief of Clarence Christensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 7611. A bill for the relief of Chokichi Iraha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 7612. A bill for the relief of Enrico Intravaia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7613. A bill for the relief of Aleksandra Borkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7614. A bill for the relief of Guglielmo Iacono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7615. A bill for the relief of Maria Concetta Cosenza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 7616. A bill for the relief of Andrea Hernandes Montes Rocha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 7617. A bill for the relief of Angela Botthos de Karady, Laslo Karady, Gyongi Karady, Lazlo Karady, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Amendment to Title II of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 28, 1954

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a statement relative to a bill I introduced in the House today to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount which an individual may earn without suffering deductions from benefits payable thereunder, and to provide that in the computation of such deductions wages shall be placed on an annual basis.

The Social Security Act now provides that insurance benefits payable under title II shall be withheld if the recipient of such payments is earning outside income in excess of a certain amount; however the manner in which the deductions are made is not the same under present law if the outside earnings constitute wages as it is if the outside earnings come from self-employment. If the outside earnings are wages the entire benefit payable for any month is withheld if the outside wages exceed $75 for the month. On the other hand if the outside earnings come from self-employment no deductions are made at all until the end of the year and even then only if the total earnings from self-employment in that year exceed $900—$75 times 12 months. The bill I am introducing, in addition to increasing the amount which an individual may earn without suffering this deduction from $75 to $100, places outside income from wages on exactly the same annual basis as in the case of outside earnings from self-employment under the present law. That is to say under my bill no deductions for social-security benefits will be made until the end of the year on account of outside earnings, whether those earnings come from wages or self-employment and at the end of the year the deductions made will be only in the total amount by which the outside earnings exceed $1,200—$100 times 12 months. The most important practical effect of this change is that it will be the annual rate rather than the monthly outside earnings, for wages as well as for self-employment earnings, which determines whether there will be a deduction and if so the amount of the deduction; individuals who receive social security benefits and in addition perform seasonal labor will not lose their benefits unless their earnings for that labor are so great that their average monthly earnings for the entire year exceed $100, and then only to the amount of their earnings in that year in excess of $1,200. Under present law they would probably lose their entire benefit while seasonably employed.

One of my main purposes in introducing the bill is to permit working people to earn a larger amount of money and still draw social-security payments in keeping with increased living costs.

Buy American Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 28, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last year on July 17, I introduced House Resolution 342 for the investigation by the House Education and Labor Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, of the Buy American Act. The reason I did this was to correct a situation which has been prevalent for some time, and that is that under the formula of this act Government agencies have been purchasing millions of dollars' worth of equipment from foreign sources. The formula was established in 1947 and permits a differential of 25 percent. But, if the differential exceeds 25 percent, the order is placed abroad with a foreign manufacturer.

This 25 percent is outmoded today because since 1947 costs of manufacturing in this country have increased. Therefore, this matter should be given paramount consideration. Here we are, confronted with a situation wherein the manufacturers need the business today. Many of them are operating on a slowdown schedule, and many thousands of men have been laid off in these industries.

Two industries in my own congressional district have been severely hit. These were companies manufacturing electrical equipment. The first company, the Elliott Co., which suffered the first offense that was called to my attention, lost a purchase of over $600,000 made by the Bureau of Reclamation and placed by them with a Swiss concern. The other company was the Westinghouse Corp., which lost an order for high-voltage insulators. This plant also was operating in my district.

I learn now that the Randall Commission's report has recommended the total abolition of the Buy American Act. If this occurs, I predict that no American manufacturer will be able to compete with the foreign manufacturers in bidding on Government projects.

I have been pressing the Rules Committee to consider this resolution in order that we may familiarize ourselves with the operation of this formula, and see what remedial action can be taken to correct this most unfair condition to our own American industries.

Imports of Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 28, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, my State of West Virginia has been the Nation's leading producer of bituminous coal for almost a quarter century. In 1954 about 133 million tons of bituminous coal were produced, and since the end of World War II production has amounted to 1,194,000,000 tons.

But production of bituminous coal in West Virginia in 1953 was considerably less than for 1952. Why? Because foreign residual oil is allowed to come into the United States in an unchecked flood.

Increased production of steel and electricity last year took enough coal to have raised 1953 mine output—under normal conditions—above the level of 1952. Instead, there was a drop in production directly traceable to the flood of foreign residual oil that poured into east-coast ports.

The east coast region normally is one of West Virginia's best markets for her coal. But with cheap foreign residual oil available, industrial consumers have been turning away from coal. The result has been quite plain in my State. Reduced tonnages at the mines means fewer days of work for the miners. This means increased relief loads.

But all this apparently means nothing to the authors of the Randall Commission report, which was published last weekend. Nowhere in that report was there any attention given to the problems created in the coalfields by the importation of residual oil. Nor were the opponents of unbridled imports of such oil ever given a chance to state orally to the Commission their viewpoints.

It made little difference, apparently, that last year 134 million barrels of foreign residual oil came into the United States. This was more than ever before and meant the loss of 32 million tons of coal production; the loss of $155 million in revenue for coal-producing companies; the loss of $79 million in coal-mine wages. In addition, the railroads lost $88 million in revenues; railroad workers lost $44 million in wages; and the Federal, State, and local governments lost $40 million in taxes.

But we are not beaten yet. We do not intend to stand idly by and see American workers thrown out of employment by unnecessary concessions to foreign countries. We will continue to fight for restrictions on the flood of foreign residual oil and the protection of the jobs of Americans. This flood must be halted.

John P. Rode: Outstanding Federal Administrator for the Year 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 28, 1954

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 27, 1954, at a banquet in Detroit, Mich., of the Federal Business Association of Detroit, an award was made to John P. Rode as the outstanding Federal Administrator for the year 1953.

This reward was well-deserved and merited by him. As manager of the Detroit field office of the United States Civil Service Commission, he is, without doubt, one of the most popular and hard-working members in Detroit's Federal community. Since his transfer there in 1950, he has applied a boundless energy and faculty for getting things done, not only to the important work of the Commission, but to just about every field affecting and benefiting Federal agencies and Federal employees in the Detroit area.

He helped lead the way in the establishment of the Federal executive development program at Wayne University. The program consists of courses in the latest techniques of management and human relations, given at nominal cost to employees of Federal agencies in supervisory positions. This program has aroused a great deal of interest throughout the country.

He was chosen for the award by a committee headed by the district director of the Internal Revenue Service, which had as consultants a group of top businessmen and representatives of the Detroit Board of Commerce.

Mr. Rode, who is only 38, is possessed of that innate loyalty to the Government's interest which allows him to take part in varied activities and yet preside objectively and with utmost fairness in his official capacity with civil service.

The Detroit area is proud of his record, and I join in the expression of that pride as represented in the official citation which reads as follows:

In presenting this award the Federal Business Association wishes to recognize Mr. Rode for his outstanding administrative abilities in organizing cooperative effort and providing leadership in the development of programs to improve management and personnel administration in Federal agencies.

President McKinley and the Randall Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 28, 1954

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, January 29, is the birthday of Ohio's martyred President, William McKinley. He first won national fame as chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and author of the McKinley tariff bill. Many present-day protectionists invoke the spirit of William McKinley. Perhaps they forget President McKinley's last words on this subject, in his last public utterance, at the Pan American Exposition in Buffalo, N. Y., on September 5, 1901:

Isolation is no longer possible or desirable. * * *

By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. * * * We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. * * * We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet and we should sell everywhere we can, and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor. * * *

The period of exclusiveness is past. * * * Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of our times, measures of retaliation are not. If perchance some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?

Mr. Speaker, the so-called Randall report, containing the recommendations of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, has just been made public. I was a member of that Commission. I believe that the recommendations on tariff and trade policies are in the true spirit of McKinley's last words.

False Ideas That Befog India and Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 28, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the New York Times Magazine of January 24, 1954, by Robert Trumbull, Times correspondent in India since June 1947, analyzes the false ideas that hinder understanding about the people of India and the United States.

Mr. Trumbull's article is itself a notable contribution to an understanding of India and contains many excellent recommendations for furthering mutual respect and mutual good will. Among other things, he suggests that—

> Personal contact through interchange of travelers, official and otherwise, could stand greater encouragement. Along with the scholars, lecturers, and others sent to India under sponsorship of our State Department, why not send a few concert artists who could make India aware of the cultural strain in American life? There is a worth-while audience for them.

When we see the immense cultural offensive of the Soviet Government which attempts to depict Russia as the cradle of culture, and shows the citizens of the United States as gum-chewing, insensitive, materialistic barbarians, it is high time that we become concerned over our own paltry efforts in this field of cultural diplomacy. When our concert stars go abroad they go on their own. In most instances they are amazingly successful ambassadors. We can be proud of the reception accorded the New York City Ballet, the Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra, and the opera Porgy and Bess in their foreign tours. Isaac Stern's appearance in Bombay, we are told by the Times' music critic, Howard Taubman, "had the effect of a Metropolitan Opera opening or a world series. Prospective customers lined up outside the hall 48 hours in advance of the concert. In New Delhi, where Mr. Stern played for one of the major national charities, his visit was regarded as sufficiently momentous to cause Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru to invite him in for a long, private chat."

Dr. Vergil D. Reed, vice president of J. Walter Thompson Advertising Agency, had some interesting things to say on this point in his address before the American Association of Advertising Agencies' annual meeting in 1953. His speech, Us Uncultured Americans, appears in the November 1953 issue of Think, the magazine issued by the International Business Machines Corp. says in part:

> Only yesterday we were cast in the role of world leader. The success of that leadership will depend largely upon a proper balance between material and nonmaterial values. Frankly, it will be largely a problem of the wealthiest country in the world learning to win the respect and cooperation of the less fortunate nations who are sensitive, resentful, and afraid. Ideas and not commodities, understanding and not dollars, culture and not boastful materialism must be our means of leading.

Howard Taubman says there have been reports in the newspapers recently of the powerful cultural delegations that the Soviet Union is now dispatching to India. These are officially chosen parties officially sent, and they include the finest dancers and musicians Russia has. They are designed to serve as ambassadors of good will. We may feel, he says, that we do not wish to adopt a policy of sending out Government-sponsored teams of artists and that we do not wish to engage in competitions of this sort. And yet it remains true that our friends in all parts of the world are eager to become acquainted with the best of our art and artists.

> Should we—

He asks—

> continue to respond to this eagerness sporadically and haphazardly? Or should we find some way to fill the demand coherently?

His conclusion regarding our artists is as follows:

> Since they are national representatives, willy-nilly, when they do go, should we not take some responsibility as a Nation?

Federal encouragement of efforts in this very important field of cultural diplomacy would come with passage of any of the several bills now before both the House and Senate to establish an American National War Memorial Arts Commission.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the article from the New York Times Magazine of January 24, 1954:

FALSE IDEAS THAT BEFOG INDIA AND US—GOODWILL EXISTS BUT MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING IS HAMPERED BY MISAPPREHENSIONS THAT RESULT FROM VERY DIFFERENT BACKGROUNDS

(By Robert Trumbull)

NEW DELHI.—One of the writer's closest Indian friends is a westernized member of Parliament from a North Indian state. Whenever India and the United States are engaged in a long-distance debate, as they have been over the future of Korea and projected American aid to Pakistan, we also quarrel—amiably and at length—over Indian misconceptions of the United States and American misconceptions of India. Summing up the argument the other night, he demanded, "Why the hell do Americans know so little about India, when we Indians really understand the United States?" I assured him that his argument was completely insupportable.

Like my friend—who, incidentally, has never been to the United States—a great many cultivated Indians are under the impression that a majority of Americans of their own educational background still look upon India as a land of snake charmers, jeweled maharajahs, fakirs who sleep on beds of nails, and ferocious wild beasts.

On the other hand, an American in India could easily gain the impression that over here the United States is generally regarded as predominantly a land where the dollar is God, and where there is little interest in nonmaterial things. It seems that the material side of American culture stands out in the movies and literature that come over here, while other aspects, such as the deep strain of religion that runs through American life, are overlooked.

The typical American tourist, now coming here in increasing numbers, with his flashy clothes and apparently unlimited funds, does little to dispel popular Indian misapprehensions as to American character, or to understand the Indian. Too many of these travelers are impressed by the sordid in Indian life, completely overlooking the finer aspects. Just as tiresome to an American resident of New Delhi, however, are those who depart starry-eyed with the wonder of it all, full of spiritual values.

Misapprehensions on both sides are not without foundation. India does have snake charmers; their reedy piping is to be heard outside every tourist hotel; there are sadhus (not fakirs, please) who do drive nails through their flesh; maharajahs do possess jewels, though displays of princely wealth are toned down now, and if statistics are correct, three Indians are killed by tigers every day.

On the other side, Americans who visit here briefly do throw their money around, and are often too outspoken, too definite, and, above all, too loud for the Indian taste in their expressions of opinion about practically everything. And boasting of material advancement and prosperity, as many Americans do, makes no hit in a poor country.

But possibly it has not occurred to many Indians, as I told my friend, that Americans today may well be the best-informed people in the world (barring the British) on India. They should be—so many of them come here. There is a continual procession of Congressmen, officials of various kinds, writers, lecturers, photographers, journalists, technicians and experts, businessmen, students, and plain tourists. In some of the more popular hotels one will find more Americans signing the registers than citizens of any other nation, including India.

However, some Americans go away more misinformed than when they came, like a certain famous personage who remarked contemptuously, at the end of a 3-day visit, that "if India went Communist tomorrow, it would be a hundred years before it made any difference." This celebrity, whose name happens to be a household word, saw only dirt and squalor, poverty and superstition in his brief inspection. But what would an Indian see on his first walk through Times Square? He might well come away convinced that the United States is overly preoccupied with a tawdry scramble for the buck.

I am reminded here of the Indian student who returned from the United States and wrote of the numerous daredevil stunts like going over Niagara Falls in a barrel; the 100-foot dives into a tank, a carnival standby; and so on. "Never," he concluded, "never have I seen a country where human life is so cheap." This sounded odd in an Asian.

Christine Weston, an India-born novelist who lives in the United States, admirably summed up the average educated Indian's appreciation of the typical American in one penetrating sentence. In her novel, The World is a Bridge, she quotes a Maharajah as reflecting that the American who piloted His Highness' private airplane showed a uniformity of opinion which he, the Maharajah, was beginning to think must be the standard intellectual equipment of Americans, combining as it did an obsession with hygiene, a tendency to generalize about everything, an almost hysterical impatience toward procrastination in any of its inevitable oriental forms, and a weird but engaging mixture of sentimental idealism and stark ignorance.

Most arguments between Americans and Indians these days concern the divergent paths of foreign policy in our two countries. Apparently, or so the Indians think, most Americans consider this country pro-Communist. A lot of Indians believe that the United States is leading the world to war.

Lately India has outdone herself in orientalism by succeeding in antagonizing both sides in Korea and at the same time appear-

ing to sidestep her responsibility to the world of making a clear disposition of the disputed prisoners. All this she did by the single stroke of announcing the intention of returning the captives to their former detaining powers instead of either letting them go free or holding them herself. To the forthright American of the "fish or cut bait" school of thought this is a triumph that only an Indian could pull off.

On the political plane relations between India and the United States plummeted to a new low with the disclosure that Washington was considering military aid to Pakistan. From the Pentagon's point of view as well as that of the average American who welcomes any ally in the life and death struggle against the Communist aim to dominate the world, it is understandable that we would be glad to arm a friendly country that is willing to stand up and be counted on our side, which India apparently isn't. But any American official who has anything to do with policy in Asia and who fails to appreciate India's dismay at this move simply reveals an astounding ignorance of the political facts of life on this subcontinent.

Let it be granted that India, by refusing to join the other nations of the free world in open opposition to Kremlin expansionism, is temporizing with evil, is appeasing an aggressor, or is just naively foolish. But when we offer to arm Pakistan what we are doing in Indian eyes is offering to arm a country that most Indians think of as the closest enemy.

No amount of Prime Minister Nehru's idealistic oratory about keeping Asia a third area of peace and so on can obscure the fact that Indians just don't want Pakistan, of all countries, to increase her armed strength. It is as if some European power had set out to arm Mexico in 1846, when we had disputes with that country which led to a shooting war. Granted that India's attitude may be shortsighted, she still thinks her nearest enemy is Pakistan, not Russia. And she, therefore, doesn't want Pakistan armed. But in general India is on our side.

The truth seems to be that Americans and Indians arrive at the same conclusions through different thought processes. This makes the road to agreement a rocky one. But it would be a stranger phenomenon if Americans and Indians did think alike, considering the difference in their backgrounds.

Americans have come from every land, including India, but are principally of European background. The culture of Europe has been derived from everywhere, again including India. But India, cut off from the rest of the world by the Himalayas and the sea, developed largely within herself. Invaders from other lands were mostly absorbed into the body of Hindustan.

The American Nation, as it is today, was hewn from the forests in comparatively recent times, when brilliant and complex civilizations had already existed in India for many centuries. The sense of urgency that must have activated earlier Americans has been intensified to this day, whereas the Indian remains at heart the contemplative creature of a very old and tolerant culture. No doubt the American hustle and bustle irritates the easterner, who has been conditioned to calm acceptance of fate. It is true that the new India is changing as her people become more aware and desirous of a better standard of life. As Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru has said, India is trying to run before she can walk, and Nehru himself is the driving force behind the national effort to modernize this ancient and backward land.

But on the question of communism the American sense of the immediate runs headon into the Indian confidence in the inexorability of time, that rights all wrongs. That is why India refuses to rush into the anti-Communist group of nations, although there is no doubt that most Indians want no part of communism for themselves, and abhor the movement on both intellectual and material grounds.

The American thinks that the way to beat communism is for the free nations to combine forces. Indians, generally speaking, feel that this method is calculated to stiffen the opposition. In Nehru's view the United States disinclination to allow Communist China into the United Nations, for instance, is bound to drive that country more firmly into the Soviet bloc, thus accomplishing the very opposite of our ultimate goal of preventing the Russian power from growing.

All the principal Hindu festivals, with origins in prehistoric time, emphasize the inevitable triumph of good over evil. So Hindus—85 percent of Indians are Hindus—who believe as we do that communism is evil are not inclined to share our fears for the immediate years ahead. If communism is bad, they think it cannot survive. So why get so excited?

It may well appear to many American observers that Indians simply have failed to understand the great danger inherent in communism. They are not on the firing line—yet. Russian expansionism has not yet directly touched this country's interests, aside from some small uneasiness about Tibet. And Communist influence inside India is believed by most Indians to be exaggerated abroad. When the Red wave sweeps into southeast Asia to India's borders, or when the indigenous Communists become a serious threat to the democratic regime headed by Nehru, a sense of urgency may develop here also. But meanwhile there is that difference between the American and the Indian approach. It is bound to involve the two countries in disagreement from time to time.

Apart from politics there are many other directions in which our ways of thought channel apart. The Indian is inclined to scoff at the American obsession with mechanization, possibly because there is little chance of his getting it in his own country for a long time. But observation in India's big cities indicates that the Indian's contempt for material comfort is of doubtful validity, because Indians who can afford luxuries enjoy whatever is available.

It is only natural that Americans irritate the Indian by dwelling, too often in a patronizing way, upon the superior standard of living at home. The Indian doesn't need to be told. In fact, if the American doesn't beat him to the punch, he is likely to express admiration for American advancement. But the assumption of superiority, which the Indian is all too likely to read into the American character even when it isn't there, is bound to annoy a sensitive and proud representative of an ancient race.

The Indian, on his side, is too frequently inclined to assume an intellectual superiority that drives the American into defensiveness. Aside from his pride in his ageless heritage of a high indigenous culture, the educated Indian whom the traveling American meets is likely to have several degrees from leading English as well as local universities. He is often conscious of a far superior grounding in classic studies than most Americans have, and this does not raise the American in his esteem.

A further point of mutual conflict may arise when the American discovers, as many do who are here on jobs, that the highly cultivated Indian with all sorts of academic qualifications is often sadly deficient in what we call know-how. On the other hand, it must be admitted that some leading Indians, including Nehru, recognize this and upbraid their own people while gladly hiring American engineers to take up the slack.

To many Indians, Americans seem naive in basic matters. Take sex. A Hindu gazing at the bookstalls in his own cities, where a great variety of American magazines and pocket books may be seen, may well wonder if Americans have just discovered sex. The writings of some of our sex experts were anticipated here by a couple of thousand years.

Like all races with long cultural backgrounds, the Indian has some characteristics peculiar to himself that may annoy or puzzle others. One of these is a quality that can only be described vaguely as indirect thinking. An exasperated English official, an expert on India, once exclaimed, "You can always depend on the Indians to miss the main point." American critics may reflect on this in many a political context. Another Indian quality in the same general category is that which has been described by an English writer as "litigiousness," or a love for exploring the convolutions of the law. Together, these habits can infuriate the American accustomed to an abrupt, direct "yes" or "no" to a question.

On the other hand, the American in India who demands action and demands it right now is likely not only to be frustrated in whatever it is he is after, but probably also will leave the contemplative Indian shaking his head in sad bewilderment at these brash people from the West who don't seem to know the proper way of doing things.

American efforts to help India raise her standard of living through point 4 and so on often multiply personal frictions. The expert from the United States sometimes irritates his Indian associates by adopting an air of superiority. Or he may try to impose the American way of doing things without bothering to adjust to Indian tradition. And sometimes the American learns, to his surprise, that there is something to be said for Indian methods, considering local circumstances.

There would be less mistrust between Indians and Americans if the latter could go out into the Indian villages, away from the sensitive urbanites who do most of the criticizing of the United States over here. The Indian villager—and he is the bulk of the population—is basically the same sound fellow as our own traditional farmer type, whatever the differences in background and way of life. There is no fundamental basis for conflict there, as a few Americans, working on Indian farm extension projects, are learning today.

It is unfortunate, from one point of view, that the average American working in India lives on the scale of a minor rajah, with a big American car, modern house, and squads of servants. Naturally the comparison with the lot of the Indians with whom he comes in contact every day begets envy and ill will. But the American usually has little choice in the manner of his living, and in fact is more inclined to think that, except in the matter of servants, he was much better off at home. And these platoons of low-paid servitors—a bearer or combination valet, messenger boy, drink mixer, and baby sitter, may be had for as little as $12 a month—are an institution of the East, unknown at home except to the extremely wealthy. But any American or British housewife in India will tell you that they can be a terrible nuisance, too, what with breaking dishes, spoiling clothes, losing things, and general inefficiency.

Anyway, the American resident of India lives no better than an Indian of the same economic station, and pays a great deal more. On services and many commodities there are three scales of prices: For the Indian, for the Briton or other European, and for the American. Guess which is the highest. Right. Unfortunately, the Americans, with their generous or careless ways with foreign money, must largely blame themselves if Indians look upon them as suckers.

The most damaging factor of all in relations between Indians and Americans is the

old race bogey. Any instance of race discrimination that comes to light in the United States is widely publicized here. Some of the most polished of Indians seem to have racial antagonism always in the backs of their minds when westerners are around, whereas, in my observation, the traveled American tends to forget all about differences in skin color when in Asian company. All of this, of course, can be understood in the context of recent history.

Many westerners, and Indians, too, have mentioned that the Indian's backgrounding in the Hindu religion and way of life, with its intricate philosophy, strange taboos, caste system, and countless gods of multiple arms and faces, raises a mental barrier that the less complicated monotheistic foreigner finds difficult to penetrate. I was first told this by a highly westernized Indian diplomat as we devoured, together, a beefsteak dinner. His orthodox mother, he remarked, not only would be shocked and revolted at the idea of eating the meat of the sacred bovine, but would object to dining in the same room with a westerner. Obviously, the new generation is growing away from old prejudices, but the inherited sense of difference from others is still present.

In these many-sided considerations, the matter of immediate importance is how to improve understanding between Indians and Americans, since obviously we cannot ignore each other, and any widened cleavage can only benefit our enemies. A healthy start toward better relations has been made, no doubt. Many contacts between Americans and Indians, perhaps even a majority of them, have resulted in fine friendships and respect. But much more remains to be done on both sides to erase mutual distrust. It is admitted by many Indians themselves that they are extremely weak in public relations, otherwise India would not, they say, be under such suspicion in the United States. The remedy for this is certainly something for New Delhi to consider.

Is it not possible that India can differ with the United States on a topical question without appearing to be pro-Communist? It is the conviction here that India is more friendly to America than to Russia, but a great many Americans seem convinced of the opposite. Could not some technique be found, in public exchanges between New Delhi and Washington, to make the inevitable differences appear in the light of honest disagreements between friends, instead of on the present false basis of hostility that is so often accepted by ill-informed opinion on both sides?

Uncounted Americans here as well as at home have ventured to suggest that Mr. Nehru could assist more than anyone else in dissolving this distrust. There can be no doubt of American goodwill toward India, in the face of our efforts to aid this country through economic difficulties, with no expectation of tangible return. If more Indians understood the extent of existing friendliness toward India in the United States, some beneficent chain reaction might well begin. They can best be made aware of this through the lips of their own leaders. Some steps might be taken, on an official level, to curb the apparent defensiveness on both sides, Americans being equally guilty with Indians. Often unwarranted resentment is caused by unfortunate phrasing or poor timing of statements.

Personal contact through interchange of travelers, official and otherwise, could stand greater encouragement. Along with the scholars, lecturers, and others sent to India under sponsorship of our State Department, why not send a few concert artists who could make India aware of the cultural strain in American life? There is a worthwhile audience for them.

American athletes would be welcomed in India, for this country is anxious to develop in world competitive sports. India might be impressed concurrently with the fact that Asians make good in America if the visitors included the Nisei swimming star, Ford Kono, or—an extraordinary opportunity to make another point—Maj. Sammy Lee, of the United States Army, Olympic diving champion, who happens to be of Korean extraction.

Indian filmgoers are well acquainted, screenwise, with Hollywood's leading personalities. How would it be, as an experiment, to send Bing Crosby on a tour among India's youth, instead of some unknown lecturer explaining the American way in academic terms?

Viewed from here, interest of Indians in Americans, and vice versa, seems to be growing almost by the day. It is for the experts to decide how this interest can be channeled toward wholesome results. It may take time, but the eventual outcome should be worth the effort. India is still the most populous democratic nation in the world.

Mental Health and the Individual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 28, 1954

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, it is traditional, historic, and clearly a responsibility for the Congress to consider those matters which are of immediate and serious concern to the people of this Nation. Therefore, I deem it fitting and proper, as well as timely, to direct attention to a vital and highly commendable effort in my home district toward the solution of a problem of impressive significance.

I refer, first of all, to the matter of health—more particularly to mental health. For years an unfortunate veil of misunderstanding and ignorance has shrouded, distorted, and confused the public conception of this subject. It has handicapped and delayed the valiant efforts of heroic men and women to impart clear understanding and authentic information as essential parts of their attack on what has become one of the country's most serious health problems.

I refer, secondly, to an outstanding and effective effort toward public education in mental health by the Institute of Living, a private, nonprofit mental hospital in Hartford, Conn., that is dedicated to the care, treatment, and study of mental illness and the mentally ill.

The institute is in every respect a hospital whose staff and facilities are devoted not only to current care of the mentally ill but also to intensive and successful scientific research and to the training in psychiatry of exceptionally qualified men and women. It was founded in 1822 at the request of and with the wholehearted assistance of the Connecticut Medical Society. It was the third mental hospital to be established in the United States, and for 132 years it has maintained and well deserves a position of eminent leadership in that branch of medical science that concerns itself with illness of the mind.

From the day it first opened its doors until this moment the Institute of Living has been a nonprofit organization. Not one penny of its revenue from patients or benefactors goes into the pockets of the business, professional, and civic leaders who serve as its directors. Every penny of revenue from any source is applied to the performance of its duty as a hospital for the mentally ill.

The institute has compiled a splendid record of achievement and contributions to its profession, to its patients, and to the families of patients. Like most mental hospitals, especially those in the category of pioneers, the Institute of Living has suffered throughout the years from a public misunderstanding and misconception of its work and its place in the community, due in very large measure to a lack of awareness, even by its home community, of the true nature of its 132-year struggle for better mental health for those who seek its aid. Frank recognition of this fact was responsible for the institute's decision to promote and develop a better and improved public knowledge of mental health.

The president of the institute is Mr. Staunton Williams, a lawyer and industrialist of Hartford. The psychiatrist in chief is Dr. Francis J. Braceland, a man internationally recognized as one of the great authorities on mental diseases and the administration of mental hospitals.

There is no need to recite the record of Dr. Braceland in his profession. Suffice it to say that the United States Navy, back in the days of World War II when it sought the best qualified person to head its vital Division of Neuropsychiatry, unhesitatingly selected Dr. Braceland. When the justly famous Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., sought the best qualified person to head its neuropsychiatric section, Dr. Braceland was its choice.

From personal knowledge, I know of his great work. While I was at Nuremberg prosecuting for this Nation and her allies the archcriminals of World War II, it was Dr. Francis Braceland who was assigned to Nuremberg for the psychiatric examinations of the defendants.

It was the initiative and alert leadership of Mr. Staunton Williams and Dr. Braceland that produced the commendable effort that inspires my request for the attention I am now receiving. Mindful of the alarming growth of mental illness, aware that between 600,000 and 700,000 persons at this moment are patients in mental hospitals and that their number will be increased by another 100,000 within a year, and convinced that an awakened American consciousness can play a vital role in the ultimate control and victory over this menace to national and local health, these two men, with the blessing of their board of directors, inaugurated in Hartford a series of public lectures on mental health.

These lectures are designed primarily and exclusively, I understand, by the Institute of Living as a public service to its community. The lectures are concerned with the aspects of mental health that people daily encounter in ordinary life. They were prepared specifically for lay audiences in language of the laymen.

The lecturers are men whose word is authority—Dr. Braceland and 2 of his associates on the staff of the institute, Dr. John Donnelly and Dr. John I. Nurnberger, and 1 guest speaker, the well-known and widely read Dr. Howard C. Rusk, associate editor of the New York Times.

True, this is only 1 series in 1 community, but to me it has a deep significance because it brings to the people of that fortunate community an opportunity to acquire knowledge and an understanding of mental health that will replace ignorance with information and substitute peace of mind and confidence where only fear and temerity prevailed before.

So great was the public acceptance of this gesture of community service, so eager was the public for this knowledge, that at Dr. Braceland's opening lecture extra accommodations had to be arranged for the overflow audience. My congressional duties made it impossible for me to be there, but I am well acquainted with Dr. Braceland's lecture, for the distinguished Hartford Courant, also as a gesture of admirable public service, devoted several columns to printing that lecture in full and intends to accord the same generous treatment to the forthcoming lectures. That, I am quite sure, is ample proof of the success and value of the lectures and the public's evaluation of their importance and timeliness.

So that Dr. Braceland's lecture in particular shall be preserved in fitting and permanent form, so that we in the Congress can add a measure of encouragement to a truly worthwhile effort, and so that a greater segment of the Nation's population may benefit, I insert Dr. Braceland's lecture in the West Middle School, Hartford, Conn., on January 19, 1954, in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

My task is to introduce you to the overall picture of mental health and disease. My colleagues, who are to follow me, will go into details in the succeeding lectures.

If we were to define mental health in general terms as the full and harmonious functioning of the whole personality of an individual toward a satisfactory goal, the definition would not stand the scrutiny of the philosophers but it would meet our purposes tonight. Before we can discover the principles for the maintenance of mental health, which implies the absence of mental disorder, however, we must understand as clearly as we can the status of these disorders. This is the approach to the consideration of mental health that we shall use in this presentation, involved as the plan may seem to be, for any other approach would lead us to interminable discussion. Moreover, by this approach we intend to convey the idea that we regard the abnormal or the mental illness not as a separate entity but as an aberration from and exaggeration of the normal.

The psychiatrist who is called upon to discuss mental disease before a legislative group or a public gathering is sometimes in a quandary. If he approaches the problem by discussing its widespread incidence as a prelude to a plea for understanding, he is in danger of appearing as a prophet of doom and of overwhelming his audience with figures, thereby calling forth the reaction that the problem is so large that there is no use trying to do anything about it. On the other hand, should he be zealous in avoiding this pitfall, he risks the danger of minimising and oversimplifying the problem to the point where his hearers might conclude that there is no need to do anything as the situation is well in hand.

Tonight, I shall try to avoid both of these extremes and speak to you as a neighbor and a fellow citizen, one who has been entrusted with the care of one of your hospitals and its precious burden of human lives. Incidentally, this hospital is the first and oldest of any type in the State of Connecticut. For 132 years it has been witness to the changing manifestations of the illnesses which we are about to consider. I shall try to tell you how the problem of mental health and mental disease is of importance to each one of us, as human beings, as citizens, and as taxpayers, and in so doing I shall try to correct some of the false ideas which are abroad regarding mental illness and shall try to dispel some of the aura of fear which surrounds it. It is fear, dread, consequent hostility and lack of understanding which have held back the advancement of our knowledge of this important subject. We are justified in spending this time on mental disease, for just as our culture and economy have changed, so too has the practice of medicine and the occurrence of disease.

It is by now a commonplace to say that mental disease is an illness, even as heart disease is an illness, and, like the latter, it has many causative factors and no one is immune to it. It is not due to demons or to wraiths or visitations of spirits. It is akin to all other diseases and it has its predisposing and exciting causes, many of which are well understood and can be predicted. It should appeal to all of us as human beings because of the suffering which it engenders in families as well as in patients and it should call forth understanding and compassion for we are our brothers' keepers, cynical philosophers to the contrary notwithstanding.

The false belief abroad that mental disease is alien to and entirely unlike the world in which we live and that it is peopled with strange and awesome things, totally unlike those encountered in our daily life, is untrue. The differences between the people who are mentally sick and those with whom we live and work are differences in degree and not in kind. Each one of us knows and encounters in his daily life people who exhibit the same symptoms as do mentally ill patients but they are in a lesser degree and the individual has been able to continue at home or at work because of various supports or strengths which have been built up and which enable him to function outside of a hospital. Any illness which is so widespread should scarcely call forth fear or dread but rather it should engender a desire to assist in discovering the basic laws of good mental hygiene.

As citizens, this subject merits our attention, for the problem of mental disease at present is the Nation's No. 1, most extensive and most expensive, health problem. A few statistics at this point are necessary. Between six and seven hundred thousand patients are in State and Federal mental hospitals tonight. Before this year is out this number will be augmented by an additional hundred thousand admissions, over half of which will have the symptoms of one illness, schizophrenia. Many of this latter group will be adolescents and young adults; most will be individuals who are bright and show promise and will be the beloved of families who have high hopes for them.

As taxpayers, we are interested because in 1951 the direct expense of this illness for the Nation was $1½ billion, to say nothing of the funds and man-hours lost by reason of it. One and a half billion dollars equals one-third of the Nation's entire bill for medical care and equals nearly one-half the cost of operating our public schools. The operating budget of our neighboring State, New York, was $498 million in 1952. Thirty-five and a half percent of the budget for State purposes (i. e., excluding interest on debts, etc.) went for the care of patients in its State hospitals, while in Massachusetts the mental health department used 27 percent of its general funds in the same year for the same purpose. If, in addition to all of this, we realise that the disordered emotional states of employees are responsible for a greater loss in time and in man-hours than accidents and contagion and that we have not yet mentioned alcoholism, drug addiction, nervous symptoms masquerading as physical illnesses, and so forth, we begin to get an idea of the scope of the problem.

Before going too much further, we should say a few words about the specialty of medicine which is charged with the maintenance of mental health and the prevention and cure of mental disease. Actually, this specialty has only emerged in the last three decades. Prior to this time the role of psychiatry was a limited one. Its practitioners remained behind the large stone walls of institutions, which were sometimes actually and usually theoretically isolated from the community, and they were aptly named alienists. Interested only in the gross mental illnesses which they encountered, they had little to offer toward the understanding of psychological problems and thus they remained out of contact and were usually depreciated by their fellow practitioners. Two world wars and a few economic and cultural upheavals changed all of that, however, and the specialty and its practitioners were precipitated into a rapid and none too healthy prominence.

Actually, it was the Second World War which more than anything else brought psychiatry into the public eye and to its present place in medicine. Here were thousands of young men either rejected or sent home quickly because of new manifestations of illness called psychoneuroses and psychoses. It was soon apparent that behind the jokes, the cartoons, and the raised eyebrows about the men who were charged with the care of these patients there was an urgent desire and need for help in understanding them, for the problems which they presented had many distressing aspects. Naturally, in some instances the pendulum swung too far and psychiatry and its practitioners were endowed with qualities and abilities which they did not have. Extravagant claims and statements were made regarding the efficacy of psychiatric treatment, occasionally by its practitioners, but more often by its enthusiastic popularizers. Fortunately, much of this has disappeared and the specialty is now recognized for what it is, namely, an extremely important medical discipline. Its practitioners now take on fewer of the habiliments of the men from Mars as the public comes into closer contact with them. Psychiatry is an important branch of medicine and it has its intimate relationship with every medical specialty, for no matter what the illness may be, it is a person who is ill and each person has various emotional reactions.

The question might arise as to why the psychological aspects of illness so recently have come to the fore and why we did not hear more about them before this present time. Many of these conditions were certainly present, particularly the neuroses, but they were unrecognized because they were carefully disguised in organic raiment and physicians sought explanations of them in terms of disordered physiology alone. Though Selective Service examinations brought many of these conditions into sharp focus and into the public eye, they really only pointed up something dramatically which was well known to the medical profession. The men who broke down immediately upon entering the military service were often those who had made a tenuous adjustment in civilian life and had been able

to get on because of the support of their families and the security and knowledge of their job. When these individuals were precipitated into the new barracks life in the service, these supports were removed, their anxieties came to the fore, and they were rendered unfit for service.

It must be admitted that the conditions in the world around us today are not conducive to security feelings. With wars and rumors of wars, threats of atomic attack and of hydrogen bombings, in addition to the complexities of daily living, there is an increasing lack of security as the old familiar order changes. These pressures give rise to anxieties and insecurity, and fear and anxiety are the precursors of emotional upset in those who are already predisposed.

Halliday, in speaking of the rise of psychosomatic illnesses in England in the last 80 years, attributes it roughly to the following factors:

Increasing urbanization of the population, which removes people from the emotional security inherent in closeness to the land.

Expansion of the machine age, rapid developments in transportation, heating and lighting, the latter in some instances literally turning night into day.

Changes in industry. Formerly the individual craftsman had a pride of accomplishment as he saw the finished product as a work of his own hands; now he becomes a part of a larger plan and loses the satisfaction of the guildsman.

Changes in the structure of English society. Formerly each individual had a place, knew it, was secure in it, and played his part in his alloted portion of the stage.

Standardization and mass production in entertainment, in education, and in other important areas.

Aim and direction in the lives of many families vanished with the decline of religious faith and this recession took away a meaning and a significance from life which had hitherto sustained it. There was an interesting resurgence of morale in wartime when people under inspiring leadership did get some sense of direction and purpose toward a clearly envisaged goal. They were unified and worked together and this experience all but emptied the psychiatric outpatient departments of their caseloads of insecure and frightened people. With the necessary correction for cultural differences these statements made about England might also be ascribed as the causes of the increase in frank nervous and psychosomatic conditions in this country in the last half century.

Thus it becomes apparent that the background of various psychosomatic symptoms is in some manner understandable and these conditions are removed from the realm of the unknown and the frightening. Just as the background of the psychosomatic conditions can be seen, so also the frank neuroses which are everywhere manifest can be traced in their origin to the abnormal conditions and insecurities of the early years of life. Inasmuch as all of us have neurotic conditions in some degree, it stands to reason that fear of them is not justified. Much of the great work of the world has been done and is being done by people who are frankly and obviously psychoneurotic. It is only when the pressures get too heavy for people to live or work with some degree of efficiency and comfort that medical and psychiatric assistance is indicated.

As to the psychoses or the major mental disorders, what is the outlook and what are the prospects for the future in those people who become ill? In other words, what is the prognosis of mental disease in general? In 1937, at the time of the advent of the newer forms of treatment, a survey was made of the records of the Pennsylvania Hospital. The records of this institution date back to 1751. From 1751 to 1928 there had been 23,146 patients admitted to the hospital because of mental disease. Of this number 7,755 were discharged as recovered and 6,753 were discharged as improved. Thus it is evident that even before the usage of modern treatment over 50 percent of this particular mental hospital's patients were well enough to return to the outside world. One cannot compare these consecutive admissions with general hospital statistics because the statistics of the latter are rarely maintained as consecutive admissions. It is apparent, however, that these statistics do not bear out the fearsome tales that are broadcast about mental disease and they belie the shibboleth that "all ye who enter here leave all hope behind."

What about present day statistics? Appel and his colleagues in Philadelphia collected data from 14 reports which indicate that in schizophrenia recovery and improvement occur with insulin therapy in the ratio of 44 ± 11 percent. In combined treatment (i. e., insulin and electro-shock) the figure is 38 ± 18 percent. Unfortunately, some of these patients will relapse, as they do in all other illnesses, but a large proportion of them will remain outside of a mental hospital henceforth. In the affecting group, i. e., the manic-depressive and involutional states, under nonspecific treatment the ratio is 58 ± 20 percent, but with electric shock it is 71 ± 10 percent. We may conclude from these statistics that, while there is a great deal more to be done and we have only literally begun to scratch the surface of this vast treatment problem, nevertheless marked progress has already been made. Even serious, long-standing mental illness is sometimes reversible and this reversibility can be enhanced by properly selected treatment procedures. Frequently multiple forms of attack upon the problem are indicated and this is the genesis of present day approach to the problem. In some cases insulin, electric shock, psychotherapy and educational and occupational therapy are all required in order that inroads may be made upon the disease.

It is usually not the neuroses that people stand in fear of; yet these are the conditions which bring the anxieties and the depressive moods that result in the gnawing unhappiness which is so prevalent. It is the psychoses that frighten the populace, though insanity is a meaningless term and has lost all usefulness. The incidence of psychoses is much lower than that of the neuroses. Even in the military service the psychoses furnished less than 10 percent of the psychiatrist's patient load and the percentage is markedly lower in civil life. The unfortunate thing about it all is that there is a tyranny of terms, a sort of diagnosis by epithet, and once a name has been put on the illness the individual will sit by and worry about all sorts of awesome things which are never going to happen.

A good example of this is the worry about the so-called change of life, which is passed on from one generation to another. Stories are told of people who became mentally ill during this so-called change. The fact is lost sight of that all life is a constant change. True enough, the change is somewhat more dramatic at the ages of puberty and the involutional period, but both phenomena are natural and normal and nature does not penalize normal things as such. The fact is lost sight of that most men and women pass through middle life with little or no emotional difficulty beyond that due to the vicissitudes of everyday normal living. There are people who show mental and emotional symptoms at this period, of course, just as there are those who break down at other periods of stress. The fact remains that those individuals who do develop symptoms do so because of a combination of outside stress and a predisposed personality makeup. So certain is this that even the type of illness the individual is prone to can be predicted from a survey of his attitudes and mental reactions in his earlier life. Thus, the rigid, meticulous, circumscribed, difficult, supraconscientious, and ultrascrupulous person would naturally become more so in middle life, for there is a loss of adaptability and elasticity as we grow older. The result here might be, and sometimes is, agitation and depression. The difficult, the suspicious, the hostile, and the quarrelsome need only show an exaggeration of their normal makeup at this time of stress and the result will be ideas of persecution and the conviction that they are being militated against.

Every doctor knows of the emotional unrest of some women in middle life. Frequently the children have been raised and the husband is about his business; there is now no longer the great demand for the woman's ministrations as there was earlier. There arises an unrest due to what I have called a need to be needed, a need to fuss over someone whom she can mother. If the individual be one who is without outside interests which are gratifying, some bizarre physical and emotional symptoms might evidence themselves. None of these symptoms are due to hormones or lack of them. There are, of course, physical conditions in which these substances are called for but glandular changes have never been proven to be responsible for the emotional upsets of middle life. Changing glandular conditions are additional elements in the natural stresses of that period of life and this fact has always presented itself as a handy prop upon which emotional troubles might be hung.

The lordly male has difficulties at this time of life also, but usually it appears a decade later than in the female. His depressions of this period have been blamed on glandular changes but again we have no proof of this. We do have proof, however, of marked psychological pressures in this life period. They occur in all of us, for they are the normal concomitants of living in this culture.

Illness, business reverses, rebuffs, disappointments in family or friends, failure of promotion, loss of face in business or in the community—all of these problems assume different proportions when they occur in men in middle life. They are more serious now for there is a feeling of the rapid passage of time, which precludes setting these reversals to right as was possible in earlier years.

In the mild depressions which inevitably accompany any serious disappointment a period of morbid introspection ensues and this is accomplished through the dark glasses of melancholy. The man wonders whether he will attain the goals he has set for himself in his earlier life. Worse yet, has he attained these goals and found them empty of satisfaction? Psychiatrists encounter this phenomenon in many men whom the world adjudges successful. Some of them have attained their objectives but the cost has been too high, for in the process they have lost the meaningful relationships of family life. Sometimes men get depressed because there are no more worlds to conquer. William James in his Death and the Value of Life states that the sovereign cause of melancholy is repletion. Nietzsche, contemplating the same type of reaction, calls it the "melancholy of all things completed." Occasionally a man in middle life becomes depressed after having been promoted to the top position in his business or profession. Having reached this height he finds himself alone and he fears he will fail and lose caste in the eyes of his family and friends. These reactions are not always severe; they may merely be physical symptoms, anxiety or depression, which take the pleasure out of the promotion.

In this group also may be placed the men who are thoroughly dissatisfied in their jobs, with their health, their homes, their accomplishments. The tendency arises to speculate whether another job might not bring more satisfaction. Even worse, the man might wonder whether another marital part-

ner might not be the answer to his unrest, someone who appreciates him more. Actually, however, these manifestations are only evidences of the individual's inner dissatisfaction, seeking a new outlet with the hope that it will solve his problems.

Neither the men nor the women whom we have discussed have trouble because of glandular changes. The causes of their difficulties are evident. Neither group needs the ministrations of psychiatrists unless things get out of hand. They need the help of the good general practitioner or the physician who knows them best and whom they trust the most. They have shaken loose from their moorings and have forgotten some of the eternal verities. They have separated themselves from the solidity of good family life, of their religious beliefs, and the ideals which formerly sustained them. The outlook for both groups is very good. They need direction over the rough places, and with time, patience, and understanding they will recover spontaneously.

I am sorry that time will not permit us to discuss the older age groups. We need some reorientation in this sphere. This becoming old by fiat at 65 results in a calendar neurosis which is affecting our population. One look at the ages of the world's prime ministers, statesmen, diplomats, and jurists shows us the futility of putting men on the industrial and business shelf the night after they have ended their 64th year. The whole question of retirement needs a going over. Some men should be retired at 30, while others should not be retired at 90.

It is useless, also, for the demographers to calculate the number of aged we will have in our population in 1960 and then by sleight of hand, change these statistics into potential economic problems at that time. One year ago we were worried because in 1980 about 22 percent of our population would be over 65 and this would have marked changes upon our culture. Today we find that 1953 produced a bumper crop of babies, nearly 4 million of them, and our age statistics come tumbling down roughly from 22 percent oldsters to 10 percent in 1980. Among other things this indicates that:

"There is a destiny which shapes our ends,
Rough hew them as we may."

Though I have wandered rather far afield in these rambling remarks, they are all pointed in one direction, namely, to indicate that much of the supposed mystery in mental illness is due to fear and lack of understanding. Mental illness is a problem, a serious one, but it is a medical problem and it is not demonic. A large percentage of the mentally ill will respond to present-day treatment measures if they are applied in time but this proverbial locking of the door after the horse is stolen should not be our only action, for valiant efforts should be made toward the prevention of mental ills. All manner of measures are taken to teach physical hygiene in schools and in colleges. Men are exhorted to have a physical check-up once a year; chests are X-rayed; women are examined for cancer. Yet, with all of this there is an ominous silence regarding the most important thing of all, the intellect and the emotions which will guide the individual either to a useful productive life or a broken unhappy one. Much of this conspiracy of silence regarding things emotional is due to lack of knowledge and the fear that someone might elevate his eyebrows at a person who was under emotional stress and admitted it.

The cost of mental hospitalization has already been discussed. These funds are sorely needed and should be spent but, along with this spending, should go an effort in another direction, that of prevention. As yet, there is only a pittance spent in this important field. One report from this State in 1941 indicated that $28,641 had been spent in a mental hygiene clinic for 477 children, 66 percent of whom were saved from institutions. The cost of their hospitalization would have been $199,000. In other words, there was a saving of $170,000 for an investment of $28,000. Dr. Robert Felix, of the United States Public Health Service has estimated that $5,600 is saved every time a patient is kept from entering a State mental hospital by means of preventive out-patient care. This is in addition to the amount of human suffering which is likewise prevented. A series of clinics for the prevention of mental illness should be set up in every community of any size. They will pay off in profusion in human lives and in economic savings.

It is obvious that research in this field must be stepped up many times over the meager efforts of the present day. Numerous groups exist for the collection of funds for many other illnesses and this is right and proper, but here again there is an ominous silence where mental disease is concerned for reasons we have already discussed. The dimes which you give this week, when added up, will produce a sizeable sum for research in polio and the previous campaigns are already bearing fruit. By means of the research paid for in this manner investigators are today very near to solving this difficult problem and we hope and pray that the scourge will soon be eliminated. This is an example of concerted effort and well directed research. Mental disease could respond to the same kind of attack.

Do you remember the railroad advertisements of a few years ago which told us that a pig could travel from the east to the west coast without changing trains? It had an illustration of a porker in a boxcar to illustrate the point. I would like to give you another illustration. In 1950 the United States Government appropriated $3½ million to the National Institutes of Health for grants-in-aid fellowships and a little later the Department of Agriculture marked from its budget $40 million for research into and eradication of hoof-and-mouth disease. No criticism of the latter—it has to do with food that will nourish the Nation—but one cannot help but wonder just what price can be put upon a human being. Incidentally, one bomber costs about $2½ million.

What practical things can we do, as citizens, to help with this problem? The first thing we can do is to do all in our power to dispel the fears and the mystery which supposedly surround this illness; to spread by all means in our power the knowledge that mental illness is a medical problem, just as is pneumonia and the mumps. It can be cared for medically and it will frequently respond to treatment, if the treatment is enough and in time. Those illnesses which at present do not respond readily should be made the object of serious scientific study and research backed by Government and private funds.

2. We can strengthen the hands of our legislators and our mental hospital boards and superintendents in their efforts to meet the problems and treat scientifically the patients who are now in our hospitals. Connecticut can be proud of its State hospitals; they are good ones and they are in capable hands but they need your backing.

3. We can join our local and our State mental hygiene societies. They do excellent work under difficult circumstances and they richly merit your support and your assistance as members.

4. We can give moral support to those who are in charge of educating our children. Here again we are fortunate in having this forward-looking group which has the whole problem of mental hygiene and its teaching under careful scrutiny at present.

In closing, I feel I would be derelict in my duty if I did not pay rightful tribute to the members of another group who work quietly and effectually in a related field. I speak now of the parents and friends of the mentally retarded children. This brave group has refused to be downhearted, but instead it has set about to do something tangible by organizing classes, by working with educational authorities, by collecting funds, and making every effort to arrive at a workable solution of a difficult problem. I respectfully salute them and wish them every success. If we could excite a similar group action by backing the local and State mental-hygiene societies, we would be fortunate indeed.

There is a town in Belgium called Gheel, and since the 11th century it has been dedicated to the care of the mentally ill. There is room in this new world for a community dedicated to the prevention of mental illness and emotional distress, and we could make a great contribution to mankind if we, as a community, were dedicated to this purpose. We could well take a leaf from the energetic and dedicated book of those parents who are daily fighting the battle and meeting the problems of mental retardation.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, January 22, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, beset by the perplexities of these calamitous days, with all their fury and terror, let not our strength fail nor the vision fade. As in the heat and burden of this epochal day we are called to serve the Nation and the world, lead us for Thy name's sake to the abiding springs of fresh hope and confidence for a better tomorrow, a new faith in Thy goodness and in the unrealized possibilities of Thy erring children, in spite of the stupid folly by which they have devastated the good earth which Thou hast given. May our own lives, freed of pettiness and prejudice and radiant with the good will which leaps all barriers, be open channels through which Thy saving grace may flow for the healing of the nations. We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 28, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate returns to the Senate Chamber from the joint meeting with the House to

hear the address of the President of Turkey, there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce that the House has requested, through the Speaker of the House, that Members of the Senate be in the House Chamber at 12:15 o'clock, which means that we should leave here at 12:10. There obviously will not be time for the routine morning hour now, but, as I have suggested, we will have one immediately following the return of Senators to the Senate Chamber.

DISCHARGE OF INDEBTEDNESS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have discussed with the minority leader the desire of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], that Calendar No. 889, House Joint Resolution 358, to discharge the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, be taken up during this afternoon. I believe that copies of the joint resolution and the committee report are available. If they are not on Senators' desks at this time, the secretaries to the majority and minority will see that Senators are furnished with them when the Senate returns to its Chamber.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, I shall yield, but I may say, incidentally, that I did not see the Senator from Delaware on the floor, and I sent word to his office that it was my intention to have the joint resolution taken up this afternoon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before it is definitely decided that it will be taken up, I may say to the majority leader that I am awaiting certain information which I requested from the Commodity Credit Corporation, and if that does not arrive in time, I should like to have the joint resolution go over until next week. I shall discuss that with the majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to discuss with the Senator and with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations the question of the deadline situation the Commodity Credit Corporation may have to meet.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that the Committee on Appropriations took action on the joint resolution yesterday. We are told it is very essential that it be passed and be signed by the President and become law before the 31st of January, and it would have to be acted on today in order to bring about that result. I am sure the distinguished Senator knows that this matter was under discussion and consideration by the Committee on Appropriations yesterday; nevertheless, carrying out the action and the recommendation of the committee, I should like to have the joint resolution acted on today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from California will yield, that I might reply to the Senator from New Hampshire, I may say that yesterday, after the joint resolution had been ordered reported, I requested of the Committee on Appropriations a breakdown, and I understand that the breakdown by commodities is on the way to the Capitol at this time. The material which appears in the report does not show a breakdown of the industrial items involved in this $741,548,788 appropriation request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will pardon me, we can continue this colloquy after we return to the Senate Chamber.

CORRESPONDENCE ON TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, at the request of the Honorable Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a series of correspondence having to do with trade relations between the United States and the Philippines.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 26, 1953.

The Honorable EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman, Finance Committee, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MILLIKIN: I wish to advise you that a note from the Philippine Government of May 5 officially requested "that a joint committee be created to study and recommend a definite form of readjustment of the trade relations between our two countries." The trade relations between the United States and the Philippines are at present governed by the trade agreement of January 2, 1947, which was negotiated as an executive agreement pursuant to the terms of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 (Public Law 371, 79th Cong.). Any revision of the trade agreement would, therefore, require appropriate legislation by the Congress.

In the past 2 years there has been a great deal of interest in the Philippines in revision of the trade agreement. The President of the Philippines, Elpidio Quirino, first gave formal expression to this desire for revision in a letter of March 7 to President Eisenhower setting forth his views as to the necessity of reexamining the trade agreement. Copies of President Quirino's letter and of President Eisenhower's reply are attached.

The Philippine Government, in connection with its note of May 5, submitted a report of a special committee of its executive branch "* * * which in the opinion of this (the Philippine) Government can be used as the basis for the readjustment to present conditions of the executive agreement * * *." The Philippine Government's note, together with the committee report attached to it, are now being studied by the interested agencies of this Government. No reply, other than an acknowledgment of receipt, has so far been sent to the Philippine Government.

This matter is in the exploratory stage at the present time. The Department would like, however, to discuss it with you or your committee at a later date, but prior to taking any definitive action.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

MALACANAN PALACE,
March 7, 1953.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Now that the important problems facing your administration may have already received your immediate attention, allow me to submit for your consideration an important matter that affects vitally the economic stability of my country and perhaps, to an equal degree, the permanent interests of the United States in her trade relations with the Philippines. I refer to the necessity of reexamining the present United States-Philippines trade agreement.

While there are many other problems which, under the present circumstances, require our early attention for the continued beneficial relations between our two countries, I consider the readjustment of our trade relations to be of more immediate concern since by July 4, 1954, the tariff duties to be imposed by both countries under the trade agreement will alter materially and seriously the trade between them.

Many unforeseen changes and difficulties have arisen since we signed the trade agreement in 1946. In view thereof, even the United States economic survey mission that came to the Philippines in 1950 on my request stressed in its report the need of a reexamination of the agreement.

During the last 2 or 3 years we have been fully occupied with the problem of restoring the balance of our economy. We had to adopt a number of temporary corrective measures. Although so far these have worked out reasonably well, our experience has convinced us that a permanent solution can be achieved only if the trade agreement between our countries were to be revised or put up to date to suit prevailing conditions and tendencies in our economic ties.

Knowing the continued and sustained concern of the United States in the economic and political future of the Philippines and her sympathetic attitude toward the strengthening of the institutions that we have established in order to insure the full enjoyment of the freedom that she has granted us, I did not hesitate to bring this matter to your attention with the request that our two countries take such necessary and early steps as would secure a new meeting of our minds toward a more reasonable and adequate readjustment of our trade relations.

I would therefore appreciate your opportune consideration of this problem which gravely affects the economic stability of the Philippines.

Sincerely yours,

ELPIDIO QUIRINO.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 16, 1953.

His Excellency ELPIDIO QUIRINO,
President of the Philippines,
Manila.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I thank you for your good letter of March 7, 1953, in which you set forth your views as to the necessity of reexamining the present United States-Philippine trade agreement. In reply, I am pleased to inform you that the Government of the United States stands ready now, as in the past, to give prompt and sympathetic consideration to any specific proposals for the revision of the present trade agreement

which the Philippine Government may wish to advance.

I suggest that those proposals be communicated to Ambassador Spruance to facilitate their study by the appropriate authorities of this Government in order to determine whether they provide a basis for renegotiation of the agreement.

I am most grateful for the cordial expressions contained in your letter regarding United States-Philippine relations and I take this opportunity of assuring you of my continuing interest in the development of those relations for the mutual advantage of our two countries.

With assurances of my highest regard and personal good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JULY 10, 1953.

The Honorable EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MILLIKIN: Reference is made to the Department's letter of May 26, 1953, informing you of the receipt of a note dated May 5 from the Philippine Government which requested creation of a joint committee to study and recommend revisions in the agreement of 1946 on trade and related matters between the United States and the Philippines. The note made three major proposals for revision of that agreement.

After careful consultation with interested United States Government agencies regarding various possible procedures for handling the Philippine request for revision, the Department decided that this Government should inform the Philippine Government, which it did on July 1, as follows:

1. As indicated in President Eisenhower's letter to President Quirino, dated March 16, the Government of the United States stands ready now, as in the past, to study any specific proposals advanced by the Philippine Government for revision of the agreement of 1946 on trade and related matters between the United States and the Philippines to determine whether such proposals provide a basis for renegotiation of the agreement.

2. Having noted the careful study given by the committees appointed by the Philippine executive branch to economic relations between the United States and the Philippines, the executive branch of the Government of the United States is now establishing a special United States executive committee to examine the three substantive proposals advanced by the Philippine Government, as well as other aspects of economic relations between the two countries.

3. In order effectively to conduct its study, the United States executive committee may find it necessary to request additional information from the Philippine Government.

4. The activities and recommendations of the executive committee on United States-Philippine economic relations will necessarily be closely correlated with those of the commission which the President has proposed be established to study the foreign economic policy of the United States.

5. Following and pursuant to the executive committee's study, a determination will be made by this Government whether in its view a basis exists for renegotiation of the agreement on trade and related matters, and the Philippine Government will be advised accordingly. Any revision of the agreement to become effective would also require action by the United States Congress.

The Department was prompted in its decision to establish an executive committee (1) by the desirability of affording the executive branch an opportunity to make a technical appraisal of the Philippine Government's proposals for revision of the agreement on trade and related matters, and (2) by the desirability of correlating any action which might be taken with respect to the agreement, with findings of the proposed commission on foreign economic policy which it is expected will be reassessing this Government's total foreign economic policy. The Department recognizes that any modification in our long-range economic relations with any country should be consistent with our overall foreign economic policy objectives.

In view of possible widespread public interest in this matter, it is suggested that it may be desirable to have copies of this letter, and our letter of May 26 on the subject, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES — ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF TURKEY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, so that we may proceed as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives, to hear the address to be delivered by the President of the Republic of Turkey.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (J. Mark Trice), its special Deputy Sergeant at Arms (C. A. Bottolfsen), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address to be delivered by His Excellency, Celal Bayar, President of the Republic of Turkey.

(For the address delivered by the President of the Republic of Turkey, see pp. 1034–1035 in today's RECORD of the proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

The joint meeting of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

THE ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE PRESIDENT OF TURKEY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to express, for the RECORD, my very deep thanks and my great debt of inspiration to the President of the great Republic of Turkey, who has just spoken to the world at a joint session of Congress. When we realize that Turkey lives under the outstretched claws of the Russian bear, I think we can take great inspiration from the words of the President of Turkey in the address he delivered to the Congress today. He represents a people who are dedicated to freedom and peace; a people who are willing to fight if necessary to defend freedom. I, for one, wish to express to the President of Turkey my deep appreciation for the great call to the support of freedom and peace which he issued to the world in his masterful speech of today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AFFIRMATION OF TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to affirm the temporary appointments of certain officers of the Navy, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF DISPOSITION OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposition of foreign excess property, for the calendar year 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID BY COAST GUARD CAUSED BY CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid during the 6 months' period ended December 31, 1953, on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON BANKRUPTCY STATISTICS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of that company, for the year ended December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

A letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of that company, for the calendar year 1953, together with a balance sheet as of December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures by that company, for the year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMPARATIVE GENERAL BALANCE SHEET OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet of that company, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary

of state to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to enact legislation whereby Korean veterans may receive the same educational opportunities and advantages granted veterans of World War II

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing the same educational opportunities and advantages for veterans of the Korean conflict as were granted to those veterans who served our country in World War II; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A letter from ex-prisoners of war in Federal civil service, Cayucos, Calif., signed by Arthur G. Fisher, enclosing a petition signed by sundry members of that organization residing in California, relating to claims for extra compensation for overtime duty, loss of employment, and promotion opportunities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Federation of Government Employees Post 446, Oteen, N. C., signed by Herman W. Dunnette, president, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a pay increase for all Federal employees, classified and postal, and so forth; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Resolutions adopted by the Tau Epsilon Rho Fraternity, at Chicago, Ill., favoring the inclusion of members of the legal profession under the provisions of the social security law, etc.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge the Department of Defense, through the Air Force, to establish a troop-carrier squadron at the Lawrence Municipal Airport

"Whereas it is essential that this country maintain a strong defense system; and

"Whereas the existence and readiness of trained troop-carrier squadrons in strategic areas are a vital part of any effective defense system: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to instruct the Department of Defense to establish and activate, through the Air Force, a troop-carrier squadron at the Lawrence Municipal Airport under the Massachusetts Air National Guard, said squadron to be part of the 102d Fighter Interceptor Wing of the Massachusetts Air National Guard; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress to extend the statute of limitations for prosecuting persons acting against the security and safety of the United States

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to extend the statute of limitations for indicting and prosecuting persons acting or conspiring to act against the security and safety of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2856. A bill to authorize cooperative research in education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. WILEY):

S. 2857. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill (for Mr. WILEY), which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2858. A bill to modify the authorized plan for flood control in the Rio Grande Basin, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Office of Education to engage in cooperative research in the field of education. This bill incorporates into legislation one of the President's recommendations for legislative enactment in the field of education. The President recommended this proposed legislation in his budget message in which he pointed out that this measure would enable the Office of Education to join its resources with those of State and local agencies, universities, and other educational organizations for the conduct of cooperative research, surveys, and demonstration projects.

I have introduced this bill as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in order that an administration bill may be immediately before the Congress and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I should like to add that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2858) to authorize cooperative research in education, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is unavoidably absent on official business. In his behalf, I am pleased to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would enable permanent residence in the United States to be enjoyed by the seven Czechs who fled last year in a homemade tank from behind the Iron Curtain. The Crusade for Freedom has arranged in the city of Springfield, Mass., a comfortable home for these refugees from Communist tyranny. My State is proud to welcome these people.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Wisconsin concerning his bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2857) for the relief of certain aliens, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. WILEY) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The bill is a demonstration of the friendship of America for the harassed peoples behind the Iron Curtain. It is a message to the enslaved peoples of the world that we welcome them sympathetically to the United States and freedom.

Last December the Crusade for Freedom, which is one of the projects sponsored by the American Heritage Foundation, brought to the United States 7 of the 8 heroic Czechoslovakians who had escaped from behind the Iron Curtain in a homemade tank made over from the remnants of a British command car. For 3 years, one of the men had secretly worked to prepare the way for the dramatic escape of his family and friends from his Communist-dominated homeland.

These seven Czechoslovakians are here in this country on visitors' visas. They are presently living in the typical American community which the Crusade for Freedom selected for them—Springfield, Mass. In the best of America's traditions that community has opened its arms to these victims of Russian communism. Jobs have already been offered them, and they are comfortably settled in a house furnished for them by their new friends in Springfield. The residents of Springfield will help them to know America, to appreciate our free institutions, and the democratic way of life for which these people sacrificed every physical asset

they owned for the most valuable possession of all—personal freedom.

In bringing these freedom-loving Czechs to the United States, Crusade for Freedom is focusing attention on the work which Radio Free Europe is doing in keeping alive the hope of liberty in the hearts of those who are enslaved by godless communism. Crusade for Freedom helps to support the work of Radio Free Europe and the National Committee for a Free Europe, which are privately operated agencies.

It was Radio Free Europe's day and night "truthcasts" which kept up the spirits of Vaclav Uhlik, the mechanic who built the car, and of his wife, Marta. Together they schemed for 3 years to rescue their small son and daughter from behind the Iron Curtain.

Listening to the "truthcasts" with the Uhlik family were the others who accompanied them in their dash to freedom: Tailor Vaclav Krejcirik and mechanics Joseph Pisarik (who had spent the Christmas of 1952 rotting in a Red prison cell for his anti-Communist activities) and Walter Hora. Heartened and inspired by Radio Free Europe, they decided they could no longer serve a regime that was only a puppet of the Kremlin tyrants. In their prayerful dash to freedom, they carried with them the Czech wife of an American soldier, Mrs. Leonard Cloud. She is now living in Sioux City, Iowa, having rejoined her husband from whom the Czechoslovakian Communists had forcibly separated her some years earlier.

The successful escape of these eight individuals is more than a mere personal achievement for them. It offers hope to other enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain who yearn to live again in peace and freedom.

These eight Czechoslovakians reached the free world of the American Zone of Western Germany during the summer of 1953. Seven of them were brought to the United States by the American Heritage Foundation as a dramatic example to the American people of the value of such privately financed, hard-hitting broadcasts as Radio Free Europe's. Radio Free Europe is keeping alive in the hearts of the 70 million people who can hear its "truth casts" that love of liberty that bears its greatest fruition in the determination of individuals to turn aside all they own in favor of the one greatest possession of all—individual freedom. The President of the United States has on numerous occasions called attention to the splendid work which Crusade for Freedom is doing for our friends behind the Iron Curtain.

Since their arrival here in America, just prior to last Christmas, our Czechoslovakian guests have given unstintingly of their time and effort to the American Crusade for Freedom. Through public appearances they have devoted their every effort to helping to bring the message of RFE's purposes and accomplishments to the American people on whom RFE must depend for financial and moral support.

I personally, in my capacity as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, have had numerous occasions to see the value of the Crusade for Freedom program. I believe that I express the sentiments of the American people when I pay tribute to the people who have made possible this voice of truth that is beamed behind the Iron Curtain. In order to continue to keep hope and courage alive in the hearts of the 70 million people held captive by the Kremlin puppets in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Albania—Crusade for Freedom seeks $10 million in freewill gifts from the American people. We are asked to contribute "truth dollars"; so-called because each 1 will buy 100 words of truth on Radio Free Europe to nail a Communist lie.

This is an important task. I am confident that the American people will not fail this crusade.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO YEA-AND-NAY VOTES ON RATIFICATION OF TREATIES

Mr. GILLETTE (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 207), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That section 1 of rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end of the last paragraph the following:

"The final question to advise and consent to the ratification shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote; the yeas and nays shall be considered to have been ordered upon any such question."

COMPACT RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT OF WATERS OF MISSOURI RIVER—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2821) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF INTERIM SUBCOMMITTEE ON PREPAREDNESS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES RELATING TO STATUS OF RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD FORCES (S. DOC. NO. 91)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the experience of our Reserves in the Korean War, and the necessity of World War II veterans being recalled, has been repeatedly brought to the attention of the Senate Armed Services Committee and all Members of the Congress, not only by the men themselves, but by their families and friends all over the United States.

In order to get facts which might be helpful in leading to a rotating Reserve, a subcommittee of Senators STYLES BRIDGES, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, and myself, following the close of the last session, decided to investigate the training programs of our Reserves. This was done by the investigating staff of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The conclusions, which we have unanimously agreed upon, I feel are of such importance and of such interest, not only to the Senate and the boys who have served in our Armed Forces, but to the public at large, that I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have this report published as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO SUBMIT REPORT ON INFORMATION PROGRAM

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the life of the Special Subcommittee on the Information Program ends on January 31. We shall have a short summary and final report, which are not ready as yet, and will not be ready for a few days.

I ask unanimous consent that, without extending the authority for the study beyond January 31, the Committee on Foreign Relations may submit to the Senate such final report and recommendations during the next 2 weeks. That will not entail any added expenditure or involve any additional amount of money.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that is a very reasonable request, and I see no reason to oppose it.

Mr. LANGER. Is the request for an extension until next week?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No, during the next 2 weeks.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF MRS. OSWALD B. LORD, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE ON HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION OF ECONOMIC SOCIAL COUNCIL OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I give notice that a nomination will be considered by the committee at the expiration of 6 days from this date. The nomination is that of Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, for a term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1956.

STUDY ON DISCRIMINATION IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a report by the Pacific Northwest Committee on Human Relations in Higher Education. The report has been sent to me by one of the gentlest of men but one of the foremost defenders of human rights in the entire western part of the United States. I refer to a fine leader in the field of civil liberties and rights in Oregon, Mr.

David Robinson, assistant national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. This study of the entire problem of human relations in higher education is worthy of the attention of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC NORTHWEST COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RELATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION,
Portland, Oreg., December 4, 1953.

I wish to invite your attention to the enclosed tabulation of a study on discrimination in institutions of higher education in the Pacific Northwest.

This study was by way of follow-up on the American Council on Education-Sponsored National Student Conference on Human Relations in Higher Education, held at Earlham College, Richmond, Ind., March 29–31, 1951, in cooperation with the following organizations: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Federation of Catholic College Students, Newman Club Federation, United States National Student Association, YMCA (student division), YWCA (student division).

Representatives of these organizations met in Portland, Oreg., in April 1952 to discuss implementation of the recommendations of the Earlham conference that regional studies be made. The following participated, and for the purpose of the study formed the Pacific Northwest Committee on Human Relations in Higher Education:

Dr. Stephen E. Epler, chairman, City of Portland Commission on Inter-Group Relations; director, day program, Portland State Extension Center.

Paul Keyser, YMCA regional secretary, Pacific Northwest student division.

Gladys Lawther, YWCA regional secretary, Pacific Northwest student division.

Joan Long, 1952 regional chairman, United States National Student Association.

Otto G. Rutherford, president, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Portland Branch.

Rabbi Julius J. Nodel, 1952 Hillel Foundation Counselor at the University of Oregon.

David Robinson, assistant national director, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Questionnaires were sent to administrators and to students in 40 institutions of higher education in Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, to ascertain the existence or the extent of discrimination in this area. Names of these institutions are contained in this report. Tabulation of replies was completed in June 1953 and the committee met again on September 29, 1953, to discuss the facts presented in the report and to determine what next steps should be undertaken. It was decided to send copies of the report to the administrators of all colleges and universities to whom the original questionnaire had been sent, asking them to study the result of this survey and to send us a letter of comment that could be released to the press. The attached report includes copies of all letters of comment received. It should be noted that several of the presidents of church-related colleges deny that employment of teachers, fully in sympathy with the religious principles and practices of such church, constitutes discrimination.

It is this committee's opinion that publication of this report of study on discrimination in institutions of higher education in the Pacific Northwest, will prove of value and interest.

Sincerely,

DAVID ROBINSON,
Chairman.

REPORT ON STUDY OF DISCRIMINATION IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

I. Questionnaire directed to administrators

Total number of questionnaires sent 40
Total number of replies received 35
Questionnaires sent to State-supported institutions 18
Questionnaires completed and returned 16
Questionnaires sent to other institutions 22
Questionnaires completed and returned 19

STATE-SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS (16 REPLIES)

	Discrimination		No reply
	No	Yes	
1. Admission policy	16		
2. Discrimination in—			
(a) Service organizations	12	1	3
(b) Honoraries	12	1	3
(c) Fraternities		6	[1] 3
(d) Sororities		4	[2] 5
3. Discrimination in—			
(a) Campus housing and boarding	15		1
(b) Off-campus housing	15	1	
4. Have students representing school in athletics, forensics, etc. been denied eating or sleeping accommodations when traveling?	12	1	3
5. Placement bureau, difficulty in placing minority groups	12	4	
6. Hiring of teachers without regard to race, religion, or ethnic origin	16		
7. Intergroup and intercultural courses	[3]	[3]	[3]

[1] 7 replied: No fraternities on campus.
[2] 7 replied: No sororities on campus.
[3] 55 percent state they have such courses.

NON-STATE-SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS (19 REPLIES)

	Discrimination		No reply
	No	Yes	
1. Admission policy	19		
2. Discrimination in—			
(a) Service organizations	16	3	
(b) Honoraries	13	2	4
(c) Fraternities	4	4	11
(d) Sororities	5	2	12
3. Discrimination in—			
(a) Campus housing and boarding	19		
(b) Off-campus housing	16	3	
4. Have students representing school in athletics, forensics, etc., been denied eating or sleeping accommodations when traveling?	16	2	1
5. Placement bureau, difficulty in placing minority groups	14	5	
6. Hiring of teachers without regard to race, religion or ethnic origin	10	[1] 8	1
7. Intergroup and intercultural courses	[2]	[2]	[2]

[1] Church supported institutions report discrimination on religious grounds.
[2] 75 percent state they have such courses.

II. Questionnaire directed to students

Total number of questionnaires sent (10 questionnaires to each institution) 400
Total number of replies received (from 30 institutions) 204
Questionnaires sent to State-supported institutions 160
Questionnaires completed and returned 98
Questionnaires sent to other institutions 140
Questionnaires completed and returned 106

[In percent]

	Discrimination			
	State-supported institutions		Non-State supported institutions	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
1. Admission policy	100		100	
2. Social organizations		50		25
3. Discrimination in—				
(a) Campus housing and boarding	98		100	
(b) Off-campus housing		10		6
4. Is job placement bureau helpful to all students regardless of race, religion, or ethnic origin?	100		100	
Has placement bureau experienced difficulty in placing students because of race, religion, or ethnic origin?	98		100	
5. Are there any faculty members in institution who are members of minority groups?	98		70	
6. Does the college offer courses or specific programs in intergroup relations, race relations, etc.?	[1] 75		[1] 80	

[1] Report such courses.

Total questionnaires sent to administrators 40
Total replies received 35
Total questionnaires sent to students 400
Total replies received 204

I. ADMINISTRATORS

1. No discrimination reported in admission policy.

2. Service organizations and honoraries practically nondiscriminatory. Fraternities and sororities discriminatory.

3. Campus boarding and housing nondiscriminatory.

4. Only a few report off-campus housing and boarding discrimination.

5. Wherever there exists a job placement bureau on the campus, it is nondiscriminatory.

6. Twenty-five percent report difficulty in job placement of students belonging to minority groups.

7. State-supported institutions report no discrimination based on race, religion, or national origin when hiring faculty members. non-State-supported institutions report discrimination on religious grounds.

8. Intergroup education courses reported in 55 percent of the State-supported institutions, and in 75 percent of the non-State-supported institutions.

II. STUDENTS

1. No discrimination reported in admission policy.

2. Social organizations are reported to discriminate in 50 percent of the responses from State-supported institutions, and 25 percent of the responses from other institutions.

3. Reports indicate practically no discrimination in campus housing and boarding.

4. Ten percent of the State-supported institutions and 6 percent of the non-State-supported institutions report discrimination in off-campus housing and boarding.

5. Job placement bureaus practice no discrimination.

6. Ninety-eight percent report no difficulty in job placement of minority group students.

7. Ninety-eight percent of the State-supported institutions report no discrimination in hiring faculty members. Seventy percent of the non-State-supported institutions report no discrimination.

8. Seventy-five percent of State-supported institutions report intergroup education courses, and 80 percent of the non-State-supported institutions report such courses.

EXCERPTS FROM ADMINISTRATORS' QUESTIONNAIRES

"We have a rather unusual situation with regard to fraternities and sororities. Fraternities and sororities are not wanted because no social or class distinctions are permitted. Same goes for religious clubs. Students sit and vote on all college committees. Also sit with the faculty in planning practically all college policies. A real attempt is being made to operate on a democratic basis—which is not the case in about 99½ percent of our colleges and universities." (Tax-supported teachers' college.)

"In the case of social sororities and fraternities action is determined by the bylaws or constitution of the national organization." (Tax-supported technical college.)

"Some school boards do not want Catholic teachers. Others do. We have no difficulty placing all our people." (Tax-supported teachers' college.)

"We find it almost impossible to place a Negro except in a large city. Education must start with local school boards and superintendents." (Tax-supported teachers' college.)

"The student council does not recognize any fraternities or sororities that have discriminatory statements in their constitutions; however, in practice, some of these groups have few or no members who are representatives of minority groups." (Tax-supported college.)

"Our area is conservative and of the Old South origin so we cannot, or I should say dare not, as yet to employ a Negro. Someday, I hope, I may. I doubt if we would have trouble with any other race or subrace. To date we haven't and maybe our forebodings are not in order." (Tax-supported teachers college.)

"Have difficulty placing Negro students. Some stores and business houses will take them. We commend these, make a quiet protest to those who do not.

"No discrimination on race or ethnic origin. As a protestant church-related college, we are required to employ as faculty members those who are members of one of the evangelical Christian denominations. We hope for a change in this ruling." (Independent arts and sciences college.)

"We boast of the fact that a special point is made in hiring faculty, to hire in such a way that the staff is made up of an assortment of talented people from many religions, ethnic origins, etc." (Independent university.)

"We do not have Negro students. Here is some prejudice in the community which must be acknowledged, but nothing to prevent their entrance in college. We have had and do have Japanese, Hawaiians, Mexicans, Indians, Jews, and many other religions." (Independent college.)

"We have not had any faculty members of oriental origin, chiefly because of circumstantial factors. We have employed a Negro, though in a part-time program. We are interested in the faculty being actively Christian, but have Catholic and various Protestant sects in our regular faculty, and have employed a Jew, although that was in a part-time position." (Independent arts and sciences college.)

"Our restrictions are not racial; we do have strict requirements for the religious faith and practice of our teachers since we are a denominational college." (Independent arts and sciences college.)

"University employs teachers on the basis of their qualifications. Religion and ethnic origin is not a consideration. Race has not yet entered into the matter of hiring teachers. There are no Negro or oriental instructors on the staff, but we have no applications for employment from members of these groups. The policy of the university would depend upon the need, the qualifications of the applicant, the relative merits of one applicant for the job as opposed to another." (Independent university.)

"Our placement work consists mainly of teacher placements. In this area we have had some difficulty in placing Negro students, to the extent that considerable more effort was necessary to secure a position for such a person. Evidence pointed to racial consideration being a deterrent to placement. Aside from asking for consideration for all students, there is little we are able to do.

"Racially, there is no discrimination. Concerning religion, we maintain a distinct Christian emphasis which demands that only those persons of evangelical Protestant persuasion be considered eligible to teach." (Independent arts and sciences college.)

EXCERPTS FROM STUDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRES

"Confraternity of Christian Doctrine—a Catholic organization for purpose of furthering that religion, excludes candidates because of race, religion, etc." (Independent teachers college.)

"Some races are excluded from social fraternities and sororities. There is a fraternity that is exclusively Catholic and excludes all others."

"All fraternities and sororities excludes students because of race, religion, or ethnic origin. There are several organizations specifically for religious and racial groups—Jewish, Japanese." (Tax-supported university.)

"The entire fraternal system—sororities included—have excluded worthy students because of race. The mere fact that there are no colored or semicolored young women in sororities proves this fact—assuming there are some good colored people my fraternity and several others on the campus have admitted semicolored people, Japanese, Hawaiians, Chinese.

"Students should feel wanted where they live, therefore any people who have prejudices would cause hard feelings. So roommates, etc. should be chosen from broad-minded individuals—so there is justification for question on application concerning race, etc.—it aids that student really." (Tax-supported college.)

"These nationally affiliated Greeks try to make the local chapters discriminate." Last year this rule was abridged.

"In jobs off-campus they have trouble placing Negroes." (Tax-supported arts and sciences college.)

"This is my first experience in a college where I was the only student of a different race and I can truthfully say that there is no racial prejudice or any prejudice. * * * I have had more offers for apartments and was unable to accept any of them because of arrangements made ahead of time. * * *

"Students of other religions rather than L. D. S. must first obtain a statement from the presiding officer of their church stating that they will live up to L. D. S. standards while attending our college." (Independent arts and sciences college.)

"Sigma Mu discriminates. I'm sure of and I believe all of the other fraternities do likewise." (Tax-supported university.)

"Ours is a very broad-minded institution and has never discriminated in any way to my knowledge." (Tax-supported teachers college.)

"One fraternity has no Asiatic, Negro, Jewish, or South American members.

"Students do not live in boarding houses, however, existing boarding houses discriminate especially against colored people. Nothing can be done by anyone at the school." (Tax-supported technological school.)

"Exchange Latin-American students have had a little difficulty in getting placed. Perhaps other reasons. Local workers will not work with colored men. To avoid labor friction, company has policy of not sending Negroes. One student from Nigeria was refused work. Eventually rule was waived and he was permitted to work. * * *

"There may be a Catholic or two faculty members." (Tax-supported trade school.)

"The student legislature felt that the evidence of interracial relations in this college was obvious enough that we answered one questionnaire and are returning it to you. Mr. William Berry, due to your authorization, was a member of our faculty during the summer session, 1952, and was very well received by students and faculty alike. We think this is a fine indication of the feeling that exists here. * * *

"We have no fraternities or sororities. No exclusions enter into our social groups. Any student may enter into these activities. * * *

"Our campus housing is open to all students. * * *

"We have two Jewish faculty members. We have also several Catholic faculty members." (Tax-supported teachers college.)

"The town is very race-minded. Pressure from the college at this time may cause unjust treatment of our minority students; i. e., there are no Negroes living in the community as a result of community pressure, but they are suffering two Negro students attending college." (Independent arts and sciences college.)

"We have members from all races and religions. This is not considered when organizations vote in new members.

"My Phi Epsilon, national woman's music honorary, cannot accept members from other than the white race until around June 1953, when the amendment for acceptance of all races becomes legal upon a year's wait." (Independent arts and sciences college.)

"Omega Delta—race clause—optometric fraternity—the local group has appealed to the national that this clause be removed; if not, they (local) will withdraw from its organization.

"Several years ago a cross was burned in front of the men's dormitory when a Negro moved in; nothing else was done, though." (Independent university.)

"Most national fraternities and sororities discriminate.

"Most organizations are making an attempt nationally to correct this. Sororities still do exclude for race." (Tax-supported university.)

COMMENTS FROM ADMINISTRATORS ON REPORT OF STUDY ON DISCRIMINATION IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

The College of Idaho, Caldwell, Idaho:

"Your study presents a very different picture from that obtained 20 years ago. Very encouraging. The College of Idaho is proud of its stand in relationship to discrimination. We are all Americans.

"PAUL M. PITMAN,
"President."

Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont.:

"The most striking thing that comes to my mind on studying the report is the fine agreement between the answers given by college administrators and by students. It appears that both administrators and students feel that there is little discrimination in any of the areas covered by the questionnaire except in the opportunity for joining social organizations. I am assuming that the classification social organizations does cover fraternities and sororities as shown on the questionnaire addressed to administrators.

"I believe that it will be difficult to move at all rapidly in removing discrimination insofar as social organizations, particularly

sororities and fraternities are concerned. It seems that the qualifications for membership in sororities and fraternities are determined by the national organizations and for this reason sectional prejudices will be of considerable influence until such sectional prejudices have been eliminated.

"It does appear that private schools, which I suspect are largely denominational schools, do reject potential staff members because of religious beliefs much more commonly than do the State schools. I think this is only natural and I do not believe that this situation will be entirely overcome in the near future. I believe it is a goal to be achieved as soon as possible.

"The Montana State College has had very few Negro students, which may have some bearing on the answers given by us. We do have quite a number of foreign students representing many different races. These students fit into the pattern at Montana State College in all respects. They are made to feel at home both by our faculty and students, and made an integral part of the student body.

"It is my belief that prejudices based upon color, race, or religion are not, nor will likely become a problem at this institution.

"ROLAND R. RENNE,
"President."

College of Great Falls, Great Falls, Mont.:

"Having read the report, I see no reason why this report cannot be released to the press. In releasing the report the word 'discrimination' should be accurately defined.

"JAMES J. DONOVAN,
"President."

Montana School of Mines, Butte, Mont.:

"I wish to say that we are sorry that we do not have sufficient personnel to make the search for data to fill out extensive questionnaires but we do appreciate your sending us a copy of the results of your study.

"You can be assured that our practices are enlightened. We have students from many countries and races and we have little or no evidence of discrimination. These foreign students are chosen officers of various student organizations regardless of race or creed.

"J. R. VAN PELT,
"President."

Portland State College, Portland, Oreg.:

"The Pacific Northwest Committee on Human Relations in Higher Education has made an important study on discrimination in higher education. The study indicates colleges and universities in the Northwest have made progress in eliminating discrimination even though some discrimination unfortunately still exists.

"My own observation of college students at Portland State, and elsewhere, leads me to conclude they are sincerely interested in eliminating discrimination against minorities.

"The following incident happened to our basketball team some time ago on an out-of-State trip. One boy, a Negro, entered a restaurant to join several teammates who were already served. When service was refused, the teammates all walked out. On another occasion, the student council refused to charter a social organization with discriminatory membership practices. Students can be counted on to continue to improve human relations and to further eliminate racial and religious discriminations.

"STEPHEN E. EPLER,
"Director, Day Program."

Reed College, Portland, Oreg.:

"It seems to me that your research has done the region a great service in pointing out the achievements and deficiencies of our universities and colleges in the field of racial and religious discrimination. It is certainly encouraging to learn that none of the institutions which replied to your questionnaire has a prejudicial admissions policy. And while it may be somewhat discouraging to discover the extent to which fraternities and sororities will adhere to discriminatory practices, at least we now know where our efforts ought to be directed.

"Reed College is most grateful for the efforts of your group and we look forward to continued improvement in this field.

"DUNCAN S. BALLANTINE,
"President."

Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oreg.:

"The current situation as tabulated in the report shows a marked improvement over that obtained only a few years ago. But actually, of course, the big change is in attitude and that is merely reflected in the data you present. The general consciousness of the race discrimination problem coupled with the desire to do something about it augur strongly for more improvements to come.

"I believe that the greatest change that has come over campus life in this country during many, many years has to do with race and other human relations including the realization of differences in religion and philosophy. This has been brought about not by organizations such as yours, valuable as most of them may be, but by the presence on the campuses of America of thousands of foreign students representing all the major religions of the world as well as all the races. Indeed, what can be furnished by the university that is more valuable than a situation where students of different races and religions live and work together? If one wishes to get historical about this, the present mingling of students might be compared to the situation thousands of years ago when man first developed herds that took him out on the plains where he met up with other herdsmen belonging to different tribes. The clash of ideas and superstitions that took place is reasonably assumed to be the real beginning of general education.

"As far as colleges and universities are concerned, the race discrimination problem is but one phase of a much broader development in our understanding of human relationships.

"Finally, I'd like to call attention to the fact that discrimination of one kind and another is inherent in organizations that are self perpetuating. As a matter of fact, regardless of who makes the selection, there will be some discrimination. Selection and discrimination are inseparable. The best we can hope for is that selection be on a worthy basis.

"A. L. STRAND,
"President."

Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oreg.:

"It is good to have the facts to support our general knowledge that discriminatory practices are gradually being eliminated in higher education. The figures seem to show that there is relatively little discrimination in the official practices of the colleges or universities themselves even though some discrimination does exist in the social organizations established in the college world. There are evidences that favorable changes are coming here also, and it is certainly true on this campus. We discover through correspondence with the national social fraternities that favorable changes are taking place there also.

"The fact that our church-related colleges seek to employ persons fully in sympathy with their religious principles and practices is hardly to be regarded as a matter of discrimination against a person because of his racial background. Our church-related colleges are established not merely for intellectual training, but also for the general promotion of Christian religious and moral principles. Nevertheless, it is to be hoped that there may be an increasing willingness to employ persons of other religious faiths who would honor the general religious purposes of the particular church-related college.

"MORGAN S. ODELL,
"President."

Marylhurst College, Marylhurst, Oreg.:

"In answer to your letter of October 8, which requested my comments on the results of the survey on human relations in higher education, I am writing to say that I think the committee received excellent cooperation from the colleges, as seven-eighths of the college administrators responded. The proportion of answers from students was not so satisfactory, as slightly more than 50 percent responded. This may indicate a lack of interest on the part of students in the field of human relations.

"The fact that the survey could not report a 100-percent achievement in human relations in the college population does not surprise me. A perfect report would have caused me to be suspicious of the accuracy of the statistics. I believe that 'discrimination' is given as a positive condition when this should not be reported as such. An attorneys' association which excluded all except men trained in the law would not be considered 'discriminating' as we use the word in human relations. Similarly, a religious group which has for its purpose the strengthening of religious belief and practice of its members, should not be considered as discriminating if it sets up certain conditions for membership. My impression after reading the statistics was that this survey includes such selection as 'discrimination.'

"I question one statement by a student in an independent teachers college that the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, a Catholic organization for the purpose of furthering religion, excludes candidates because of race, religion, etc. Candidates who were not Catholics and who were not interested in joining the Catholic Church would not want to belong. They would be bored by the instructions, unless they were missionary-minded from a non-Catholic religion and wished to learn our methods. Then they would be most certainly welcomed now as they have been in the past. Bishop E. V. O'Hara is practically responsible for establishing the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, and I think that the mention of his name is enough to ensure that no distinction would be made as to race in the admission of members.

"The percent of colleges which offer specific courses on inter-group education can be raised—75 percent in State-supported colleges and 80 percent in independent ones. There are colleges which emphasize human relations in certain courses, however, although they may not have a special course; these will do excellent work in promoting in the student's mind the inescapable obligation of granting to all men equal rights.

"Sister M. ELIZABETH CLARE,
"President."

Southern Oregon College of Education, Ashland, Oreg.:

"It is most gratifying to see that discrimination in the Northwest is practically nonexistent. I am sure this study will do much to increase the broadmindedness of our Northwest group.

"ELMO N. STEVENSON,
"President."

Cascade College, Portland, Oreg.:

"I am glad to note the progress which has been made in many schools toward ending policies of racial discrimination. While I do not have comparative figures from earlier years I judge that the picture has improved greatly and that an end to most discriminatory practices may be anticipated in the near future.

"I am inclined to question the appropriateness of applying the word discrimination to situations such as our own, in which a school has been founded by the sacrificial efforts of those holding a particular religious viewpoint and desire to see it perpetuated and to provide for the higher education of those who hold it. Such institutions are very properly obligated to engage staff mem-

bers who will promote this objective. The fact that they do so is in no sense a denial of the right of any person to hold a different viewpoint, and one who does so should not feel discriminated against because he cannot qualify for the support of a doctrine different from his own.

"PHILIP S. CLAPP,
"Dean-Registrar."

Seattle University, Seattle, Wash.:

"Thank you for your letter of October 8, 1953, together with the report of your committee's survey of colleges and universities in the Northwest. In your letter you requested a statement or letter of comment from my office which, together with the comments of other college administrators, can be released to the press. You further state that it is your committee's opinion that much good will follow publication of the tabulated results of the study.

"May I urge that the publication of the data be presented with extreme caution. I recommend this for two reasons: (1) the statistical data presented in the study indicates that discrimination in our Northwest colleges is not a major problem. There is room, certainly, for improvement, and educational institutions should give leadership in this important area; (2) some of the excerpts chosen for inclusion in the report which supposedly reflects student conditions involving discrimination, do not distinguish clearly between instances of discrimination and the right of groups to foster specific and legitimate purposes. For example, the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine has been cited as an example of discrimination.

"Actually, the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine is specifically a religious organization with membership made up of Catholic students for the purpose of giving these students an opportunity of studying the teachings of their church, and religious problems, while attending a State university. Non-Catholics certainly would be welcome, but the organization is set up for a specific purpose, clearly defined and recognized by our Constitution under the article of freedom of conscience. The Catholic fraternity has a similar limited objective, namely, to provide Catholic students who are attending a State university, and which institution cannot permit the teaching of religion as part of its curriculum, with facilities for studying their religion on their own time. The American Council on Education in its recent publication, Religion in the Public Schools, not only points out the importance and need of religion, but encourages such types of interest in religion.

"It is my hope that the work of your committee will have far-reaching influence in its good work of combating the problem of discrimination in the field of higher education.

"A. A. LEMIEUX, S. J.,
"President."

Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland, Wash.:

"The results of the study were enlightening, informative and challenging.

"PHILIP E. HAUGE,
"Dean."

University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.:

"It is heartening to know that discrimination is virtually nonexistent in the educational institutions of the Pacific Northwest. It is especially gratifying to realize how much progress has been made by student organizations to eliminate formal barriers to membership within their own organizations.

"HENRY SCHMITZ,
"President."

NEGOTIATIONS WITH CANADA ON ALASKAN PROBLEMS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I have a brief statement which I ask permission to have printed in the body of the RECORD. It pertains to the proposed Alaskan statehood legislation which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs hopes to report to the Senate during the coming week. I am sure that this statement will be of interest to Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask my distinguished friend a question. Is it the intention also to bring up for consideration in the Senate at this session the bill providing statehood for Alaska?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. The only answer I can give the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is that I am not a member of the policy committee, and I have not the slightest idea as to how to answer the question.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has the Senator from Nebraska reported a bill for Hawaiian statehood?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. The bill for Hawaiian statehood is on the calendar. I believe it was placed on the calendar last Wednesday. Members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am chairman, have a mutual agreement that the Alaskan statehood bill will be reported very shortly. We hope to report it during the coming week.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

NEGOTIATIONS WITH CANADA ON ALASKA PROBLEMS

The Territories and Insular Affairs Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. CORDON, is now engaged in a concentrated effort to improve and perfect the proposed Alaska statehood bill so that the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have a chance to reach a decision whether to report that bill to the Senate in the near future. Our committee has set up a target date of February 4 as the date on which we will try to have a committee vote on this perfected bill. I hope that we shall be able to reach a vote in committee on the bill on that date or shortly thereafter and I anticipate that our committee will vote to report it.

The principal aim of the subcommittee is to amend the Alaska statehood bill in such a way as to give the proposed new State the resources it will need to survive and to make a go of statehood. Along that line the subcommittee has been attacking energetically the problem of excessive reservations and withdrawals of land, mineral resources and the like by the various Federal agencies. I am very hopeful that the subcommittee will be able to recommend changes that will permit these resources to be opened up for development instead of being withheld from human use as many of them are at present.

There is another range of problems for Alaska, however, with which the subcommittee has not concerned itself, to date at least, and to which I hope our Government may address itself through the appropriate channels. I refer to the various problems that require cooperation or negotiation with the Government of the Dominion of Canada.

Our Nation happens to be peculiarly fortunate in having the Dominion of Canada as its immediate neighbor to the north. For over a century it has been possible for this country and Canada to live in peace and on the friendliest of terms with each other. Our people and the people of Canada have a mutual respect and liking for each other. Through the years we have found, generally speaking, that our purposes and theirs ran along parallel lines and that much could be accomplished by mutual cooperation.

Several of Alaska's most pressing problems can be solved only with the cooperation of Canada. At the same time, I believe there may be one or more Canadian problems on which the Government of Canada may desire concessions from us. In any negotiations with Canada I would hope we would give sympathetic consideration to those needs or desires of the Canadians which arise from our geographical position in Alaska.

Two of the problems I have in mind relate to our overland communications with Alaska. One of the most important things we could do to further the development of Alaska would be to pave the Alaska Highway the length of its entire route through Canada. That portion of the highway which lies in Alaska is already largely paved. I believe we should attempt to work out an arrangement with Canada for the paving of the portion which lies within Canada's boundaries. In such a project, I would even be willing to have the United States Government pay a portion of the cost, although I certainly feel that Canada should be willing to pay a fair share of this expense. As a matter of fact, right now Canada's financial situation is probably better than ours.

Another project which I hope to see realized before too long is the construction, probably by private capital, of an overland-rail connection, joining the Canadian railroad system with our Alaska railroad. Such a project would, of course, require negotiations between United States and Canada with respect to rights-of-way and other matters. I would hope our neighbor to the north would be interested in approaching this problem in a cooperative spirit.

A third great need, from the standpoint of Alaskan development, is access to the headwaters of the Yukon River for the production of power through diversion of some of that water through the mountains into the southeastern section of Alaska. The configuration of that area is such that tremendous quantities of water are caught behind the Alaska coastal range and from there flow thousands of miles north and west through the Yukon before emptying eventually in the Bering Sea. The diversion of some of this water through power-generating units to the Alaska side of the mountains would represent an extremely efficient method of generating low-cost power. I do not believe there is any way that Canada could make an equally efficient use of such potential waterpower through installations located on Canadian soil. Under such circumstances, I would hope that Canada would agree to some arrangement for diversion of the water. The situation is such that the development probably cannot proceed at all without approval by the authorities of both nations.

As many Members of the Senate may know, the Aluminum Company of America proposed such a trans-mountain diversion project a year or two ago at a site known as the Taiya Valley in the northern part of the Alaska Panhandle. Alcoa is willing to undertake the expenditure of approximately $400 million in the development of an aluminum-smelting plant and related facilities at Skagway, Alaska. The operation would create permanent full-time employment for approximately 4,000 people and a new community of 20,000 people. It would create a

resource of the greatest value in the development of the entire northwest part of this continent and in the defense resources of both nations.

I do not know the exact status of the plans of Alcoa at this time, nor do I know precisely what has been holding them up from going ahead. I do hope that some such project can go ahead, since it could be of tremendous benefit to both Alaska and Canada. Certainly any agreement that might be negotiated with Canada should be on a basis whereby both nations can share in the benefits.

Before I close, there is one problem troubling many Canadians on which I believe we could properly be of help to Canada. That is the question of Canadian access to the Pacific Ocean across the Alaska Panhandle. It happens that the Alaska Panhandle extends down the coast, cutting off Canada's access to the sea as far down as 54° north latitude. That is an unusual situation which might well give rise to conflict and bitterness between any two nations not on friendly terms with each other. Every Member of the Senate is familiar with the problems that have arisen in European history when a nation has found its access to the sea controlled by another, unfriendly nation. Certainly, no American would be disposed to take advantage of Canada merely because of our strategic position preventing her access to the ocean. It is a situation where I feel we have a positive obligation to be sympathetic and generous to Canada's need. I am not sure just what kind of an arrangement Canadians might desire. It occurs to me, for example, that we might grant Canada one or more free ports at points along the Alaska coast. I can see no objection to such an arrangement. I do not believe we would consider permanently alienating any American territory to Canadian sovereignty.

It is my feeling that both Alaska and the Canadian Northwest offer a tremendous frontier for future development. Certainly the industrial development of Alaska should be a definite policy of our Governments. I do not believe either Alaska or the Canadian Northwest can be fully developed without the closest kind of cooperation between our two nations. I hope the appropriate officials of our Government will give serious consideration to these problems so that we can proceed toward joint development of such projects with Canadians to the mutual benefit of both our countries.

THE CRITICAL SITUATION IN THE MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, repeatedly Senators from the West, and, in fact, Senators from all over the Nation have called the attention of people of the United States to the dilemma and the disaster existing in the mining areas of the West, indeed, in the mining areas throughout the Nation.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter entitled "Why a Cut in Production." The letter was written by J. B. Haffner, general manager of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan plants, and was published in the North Idaho Press, of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, on January 20, 1954. The letter presents to the American people the reasons why men are out of work today in the great Coeur d'Alene mining center of my State, as well as in other mining centers all over the Nation. The letter is most important and impressive, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY A CUT IN PRODUCTION

To Employees of Bunker Hill Plants and Sullivan Zinc Plant:

Because of the effect it will have on you, we have delayed any plans to cut production for as long as possible. All other lead-zinc districts curtailed in 1953. Many mines and smelters closed down entirely. We had some hope that after January 1 there might be some improvement in our sales. This has not happened—on the contrary, our stocks of pig lead and slab zinc increased and are still increasing. To make matters much worse, both lead and zinc prices dropped further on Monday, January 18.

Cutting production in our plants will also affect those operations which ship concentrates to us. These other operators will be told that we can only accept a certain portion of their former production and our imports of concentrates have been drastically curtailed. Our inventory of finished metal is very large and our inventories of concentrates out of balance. It will require several months to get the concentrate stocks properly adjusted. We have no idea when stocks of metal will be reduced to normal.

Since we treat some foreign concentrates at our plants, we would like to be certain that you understand about these imports of concentrates. At the Tariff Commission hearings last November it was proved that imports of pig lead and slab zinc, not concentrates, determine the United States price.

Take the case of zinc for instance. In 1953 American production of zinc concentrates, together with imports of foreign concentrates, produced 1 million tons of slab zinc. This was just about the amount the consumers used. The damage was caused when an additional 250,000 tons of slab zinc, which was smelted in foreign countries, was dumped on the American market. The same thing happened to lead when 150,000 tons of unneeded pig lead was similarly dumped. This dumping caused the complete collapse of the United States market. This means that our regular markets for pig lead and slab zinc have been taken over by foreign pig lead and foreign slab zinc. So, it is no wonder that prices have been driven down so low and smelter stocks become so large. Unless this dumping of unneeded foreign pig lead and slab zinc is controlled there is little hope for either better prices or greater sales.

You are probably asking, "How long will this cut in production continue?" It is impossible to now set any future date to go back to full production. All we have to work from are some indications. March 31 is the date by which the Tariff Commission reports to Congress. Other agencies and commissions will be reporting by the same date. We also hope by March 31 the Tariff Commission will report favorably to the President on our escape-clause petition which will increase the tariff on lead and zinc. If approved, this would increase the United States price and discourage unneeded imports. Therefore, March 31 is the first time we will know what these Federal commissions will recommend. Even if their reports are favorable, it will take some time after March 31 for Congress to put any recommendations into effect. For these reasons, we cannot possibly predict what the future will hold.

One thing seems certain. If nothing is done about unneeded imports of pig lead and slab zinc the situation can get a lot worse. Present plans are to go to a 5-day workweek on February 1, and notices will be posted immediately.

Yours very truly,

J. B. HAFFNER,
General Manager.

JANUARY 20, 1954.

THE SECURITY RISK PROBLEM

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the following:

First. An editorial entitled "Light on the 2,200," from the New York Herald Tribune of January 28, 1954.

Second. An editorial entitled "Secrecy on Security," from the Washington Post of January 28, 1954.

Third. An article entitled "Security Risk Problem," written by the distinguished columnist, James Reston, and published in the New York Times of January 28, 1954.

I commend these editorials and the article to the attention of the Senate and the people of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 28, 1954]

LIGHT ON THE 2,200

The administration is standing firm in its refusal to make any distinctions among the 2,200 Federal employees separated from the Government under security procedures. Given all the circumstances, this does not seem the best course. The administration's motives are understandable; it has not wanted to imply that all those leaving Government employ are Communists or disloyal persons. The Eisenhower security regulations were based on the sound idea of surveying Government personnel in relation to their tasks, letting those go whose continuing service, for one of any number of reasons, was deemed adverse to the national interest. The objective was to minimize and deemphasize the harm done to individuals by their severance from public jobs.

In practice, the reverse seems to have happened. Excited by widespread charges that the Government was "crawling with Reds," the public has tended to suppose that all those who resigned or were dismissed must be in the worst category of undesirables. Many public figures have been moved by political considerations to further this belief. The statement that 2,200 subversives have been kicked out of Government jobs comes to be taken for granted. Yet actually—as any one knows who stops to think—most were let go for reasons which have nothing to do with disloyalty or subversion. They were men and women who were considered security risks because of poor moral habits. Some of them may have been entirely without personal fault—as one who becomes a security risk in a certain post because of the action of relatives over whom he has no control.

The public has a real interest in knowing the facts about Communist infiltration and about subversive influences. Congressional inquiries have spent much time and money trying to find out these facts. It is important that no drastic misconceptions on so vital a question confuse or corrupt the popular mind. A breakdown of the figures relating to dismissals and resignations would be of the greatest help in keeping the record straight. How many of the 2,200 were considered security risks? How many were held to be of doubtful loyalty? To be guilty of drinking too much while in a highly responsible position is certainly ground for dismissal; but it is harmful if such a dismissal is allowed to be taken by the public as substantiation of unfounded rumors about the degree of Communist influence in the Government.

In a calmer, more reasonable atmosphere the administration's refusal to classify the 2,200 who have left Government employ would undoubtedly be justified. With things

as they are, we believe a classification and explanation would serve the public interest.

[From the Washington Post of January 28, 1954]

SECRECY ON SECURITY

President Eisenhower at his press conference yesterday did little to dispel what he termed the confusion over security dismissals from the Government. The President is obviously concerned over the stigma that may attach to virtually anyone who leaves the Government these days, whether or not the departure has anything to do with security. Mr. Eisenhower mentioned letters of commendation as one possible means of differentiating those who leave the Government under honorable conditions from those who are regarded as security risks. But this would not avoid the stigma on persons who, while undesirable in Government jobs, had not the slightest taint of disloyalty and might be well qualified for private positions. Indeed, a person now may be categorized as a security risk without his knowledge.

The basic trouble, it seems to us, is that the Administration is mixing secrecy and publicity. It has broadened the old loyalty program to include under the heading of "security risks" instability and undesirable traits of character and personal habits, qualities that might be more happily described as bearing on unsuitability instead of security. The implication was that this program would be carried on quietly. But the President himself, possibly to justify promises of a cleanup as well as to forestall attacks by the witch hunters on Capitol Hill, announced with evident pride that more than 2,200 employees had been separated from the Government under the new security program.

There is a lot to be said for the Canadian system of handling security in government. Absolute secrecy is imposed, there is no attempt to differentiate between security dismissals and those for inefficiency or reduction in force, and an employee is not told why he has been fired. That system denies altogether the right of an accused employee to know the charges against him, but it does protect against stigma. On the other hand, there is real question whether it would be feasible in the United States, particularly in view of the history of the loyalty program. Changes of administration are accomplished with far less disruption under a parliamentary system. If a policy of absolute secrecy on security cases were adopted here, there would be grave danger that it could be used to mask wholesale firings for political reasons.

But the Administration cannot have it both ways. It cannot make political reference to the number of cases, leading some flannelmouths to assert that many of the cases involve Communists, without incurring justified demands for a breakdown. One reason the Administration is reluctant to break down the figures, it may be inferred, is that few of the 2,200 cases involve actual or suspected disloyalty, and that the total includes some perfectly routine departures. If that is the case, would it not be far better to say so frankly, giving detailed figures as to how many of the 2,200 were separated for suspected disloyalty and how many for alcoholism, perversion, etc.? The stigmatizing which worries the President has been intensified by the Administration itself, and disclosure, rather than buckpassing, is the way to correct it.

[From the New York Times of January 28, 1954]

SECURITY-RISK PROBLEM—REPORTERS AND CONGRESSMEN VAINLY SEEK A BREAKDOWN ON 2,200 DISMISSED BY UNITED STATES

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 27.—President Eisenhower was visibly embarrassed at his news conference today by what is becoming almost a weekly question: How about an explanation of the 2,200 security risks discharged by the Government in the last year?

For 3 months now the reporters, and more recently Congress, have been trying to get the President to explain how many of these 2,200 were dismissed as Communists, former Communists, or fellow travelers, and how many were ousted for lying, drinking, or other character defects.

At the start of this period the President referred the questioners to Herbert Brownell, Jr., the Attorney General, who referred them to Philip Young, the head of the Civil Service Commission, who referred them back to the White House. That is where they were this morning.

"We are going around in circles, are we not, sir?" asked Robert L. Riggs, of the Louisville Courier-Journal. The President smiled and said he didn't know whether there could ever be the kind of breakdown the reporters wanted.

SYSTEM IS REVISED

This issue illustrates the genius of Washington for making simple things complicated. When the Republicans took over here last January, they abandoned the Truman loyalty program, and adopted the system of lumping subversives or suspected Communists with congenital liars and drunkards as security risks.

The President, himself, on at least one occasion, has stated publicly that it is wrong to assume that a man dismissed as a security risk is tainted with disloyalty. Nevertheless, prominent Republicans have discussed the 2,200 security-risk dismissals in such a way as to imply that most of these persons were subversives rooted out by the Eisenhower administration after they had escaped the attention of the Truman regime.

The press has been blamed by the Civil Service Commission for failing to make clear that a security risk is not necessarily a Communist or a Communist sympathizer, but in the growing political fight over Communists in Government, the 2,200 figure has been discussed almost wholly in terms of the problem of Communist subversion.

For example, President Eisenhower, in his news conference on December 2, remarked:

"I repeat my previously expressed conviction that fear of Communists actively undermining our Government will not be an issue in the 1954 elections.

"Long before then, this administration will have made such progress in rooting them out under the security order developed by Attorney General Brownell that this can no longer be considered a serious menace. As you already know, about 1,500 persons who were security risks have already been removed. * * * [The number at that time was 1,456; it was later raised to 2,200.]"

M'CARTHY BROADCAST CITED

Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, in his nationwide television broadcast of November 24, said:

"For example, while almost daily from the time I mentioned the 57 Communists and 205 security risks in Government until the time the Truman-Acheson regime was removed from office, almost daily some leader in the Democratic Party would proclaim to the country that there were no Communists in Government, and that my attempt to dig them out was dishonest and a hoax. The new administration has now gotten rid of 1,456, all of whom were security risks, and practically all of whom were removed because of Communist connections or perversion."

Though the President made a distinction today between persons outside his administration using subversives and security risks interchangeably, his own legal counsel in the White House, Bernard M. Shanley, told an audience in Newark that "1,456 subversives had been kicked out of the Government."

Similarly, Arthur E. Summerfield, the Postmaster General, publicly lumped the traitors and the others together in these terms:

"Almost 2,200 people who were security risks are no longer using your tax money. I am here to tell you we are not hiring any new ones. * * * Somehow I do not feel too amiably inclined toward people who make treason a preoccupation."

As a matter of fact, the 2,200 figure includes not only many persons dismissed for character faults other than subversion but also, at least in some departments, Government employees who resigned voluntarily and others ousted merely as part of the administration's reduced-force program.

NAVY DEPARTMENT REPORT

For example, the Navy Department stated in its official release on its contribution to the October total of 1,456 security risk dismissals:

"Separations in some instances were affected after preferment of charges and hearings. Others were separated through resignation or reduction in force prior to final processing of derogatory information, or by other administrative action during the employee's trial period."

The requests for a breakdown of the 2,200 figure continue because every week seems to bring more evidence that the public thinks security risks are pro-Communist and tends to measure the Communist-infiltration menance in these terms.

Mr. Brownell has refused to give the breakdown on the ground that he is not authorized to do so and also because he thinks it would be unfair to the persons concerned.

Members of Congress now are asserting, however, that the unfairness lies in the present system, which elevates the misfortune of drunkenness to the crime of conspiring to overthrow the United States Government.

Moreover, Congress has a duty to measure the extent of Communist infiltration in the Government, and it cannot do so as long as the disloyal Communists are lumped together with the loyal liars and incompetents.

DISCHARGE OF INDEBTEDNESS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the agreement entered into yesterday evening, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] was to have the floor today, following the morning hour. However, with his approval, I should like to reopen the discussion of the Commodity Credit Corporation situation, which was in process just prior to our going to the House of Representatives, to hear the address by the President of the Republic of Turkey. I make this request in order to see whether at this time we can clear up the legislative situation regarding that matter.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That arrangement is quite satisfactory to me, provided I may be recognized when the discussion referred to shall have been concluded.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee be permitted to yield under the condition stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, just before Members of the Senate went to the Hall of the House of Representatives, we were discussing Calendar No. 889, which is House Joint Resolution 358, relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The distinguished Senator from

Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was having a colloquy with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], at the time we left the Senate Chamber.

In order to bring the Senator up to date, let me say that immediately upon our return to the Chamber I discussed the matter with the Senator from New Hampshire and told him that it did not seem to me to be unreasonable to give the Senator from Delaware additional time over the weekend to study the figures for which he had asked, and that, so far as I was concerned, if there was no deadline situation facing us, I would be glad to ask that the joint resolution go over until Monday.

The Senator from New Hampshire, who is chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who was presiding over the Senate at the time, asked the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, to contact the Commodity Credit Corporation as to the exact situation which exists there. I believe that if the Senator from Vermont would inform the Senate as to what the facts are, it might help us to determine the necessity of proceeding today, or whether consideration of the joint resolution might well be postponed until Monday.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last Monday the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in connection with the consideration of Senate bill 2714, a bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. At that time he stated in his testimony that, according to their best estimate, the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, amounting to $6,750,000,000, had all been obligated except for $16 million. He stated that requests for loans were coming in at an unprecedented rate. The Commodity Credit Corporation is having to buy an unprecedented amount of dairy products for this time of year. Huge quantities of cotton, wheat, corn, and possibly other commodities are being put under loan faster than had been anticipated. He estimated that the money on hand would last through this week.

I then tried to call Mr. Gordon. I could not find him. I talked with his executive assistant, who stated that, according to his information, it was not felt that the money on hand would last longer than through the day. It had been thought that it would last for some time in the future, but because greater loans are being made than had been anticipated, the money is running out earlier than was expected.

There are only two ways by which the Commodity Credit Corporation can obtain additional lending power. One is by increasing the borrowing authority of the Corporation. It has requested $1¾ billion, which it is thought will take care of its operations through the 1954 crops, but not beyond that point.

The other way is by the enactment of the House joint resolution which is now before the Senate, House Joint Resolution 358, a joint resolution to discharge the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation. If it is approved, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be given $740 million of additional money with which to work.

Frankly, I do not like the method of financing any agency of Government by the cancellation of notes. In this case, however, the House has already passed the joint resolution. It appears to be the only way by which we can give the Commodity Credit Corporation money to continue its program without interruption.

The bill to increase the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation is now on the Senate Calendar. It has not passed the Senate. I understand that it probably will not be taken up in the House for a month or so. So the joint resolution now before the Senate is the only way the Commodity Credit Corporation can quickly obtain funds with which to continue its programs without interruption. That is my understanding.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to go along with the Department and with the chairman [Mr. AIKEN] of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am a member. However, I point out that in the testimony of the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation before our committee in connection with Senate bill 2714, the purpose of which was to increase the borrowing authority of the Corporation, the statement was made that as of the first of the year it was estimated that the money would not be needed until the 1st of July. That testimony was taken upon the bill which was introduced by the chairman of the committee. The bill was introduced at the request and upon the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture. It carried an effective dateline of July 1, 1954.

Throughout the testimony the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation did point out that perhaps the money of the Corporation was running out. I think to that extent the chairman of the committee is correct. But I have yet to hear any suggestion made anywhere that the Corporation will be out of money as of this week. I should like to know where the chairman of the committee obtained that information, and when it was delivered to the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I think if the Senator will read the testimony of the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation he will note that he stated that the Commodity Credit Corporation had left only an estimated $16 million, and that that would not last beyond the 1st of February.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. As I remember the testimony, it was to the effect that the Commodity Credit Corporation had used up $4 billion out of $6,750,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. As of November; not as of the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I further understand that if all the loans now pending were to be finally granted, and there were no sales from stocks, the fund would then be down to $16 million. But there is no showing anywhere that their cash is down to $16 million. They have more than $2 billion on hand.

I am not opposed to clearing up this indebtedness, but I am sure that the figure is not $16 million, but is more than $2 billion.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not anticipate that the discussion would arise at this time. I do not have before me the testimony of the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but the records show that the obligations of the Corporation as of November 30 were between $4 billion and $5 billion, and they have been making loans at an unprecedented rate since then. It was estimated, as of last Monday, that there was $16 million left which was unobligated. As the Senator from New Mexico says, the money probably had not passed, but the loans were being processed. Therefore, the money could not be used for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Knowing the Senator from Vermont as I do, and his desire always to help us get the facts, I ask the Senator from Vermont if he would not be willing to go to the telephone and call the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation and ask what the facts are with regard to this conflict of argument on the floor of the Senate. If the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is correct, that is a very relevant factor to consider before we vote.

Mr. AIKEN. I attempted to call the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation about half an hour ago. He was at lunch. I talked with his executive assistant. I did not get much information that we did not already have. It was to the effect that as of the beginning of the week the Commodity Credit Corporation had $16 million left unobligated, and it was his feeling that the Corporation would not be in a position to accept applications for loans after tonight. The procedure would be to send out notices to their committees all over the country not to accept loans after tonight.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the majority leader further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I most respectfully suggest that we seek an answer to this question of fact. There is no sense standing here and arguing about a question of fact. Let us find out what the fact is and postpone action until we get the facts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that I had already talked with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and suggested that he get in touch with the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation on the telephone and obtain a statement of fact from him as to the exact situation in regard to the fund.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. ANDERSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at the hearings before the House committee

and before the Senate committee the same figures were used. According to the hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations, at page 8, the borrowings as of January 21, 1954, were shown to be $4,063,000,000, out of a total borrowing authority of $6,750,000,000, plus capital stock of $100 million.

The difficulty is that the Corporation has on file applications for loans which must be recognized and which will be made. The Corporation makes sales, too. For example, cotton moves out very rapidly. I would be willing to say that what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has stated is correct, namely, that they do need the additional money, and will need it very shortly. However, I do not believe we would be justified in saying that the Corporation would have to stop making any loans because it did not have the money with which to make them. That is not correct. They have more than $2 billion left. Nevertheless, they do need additional money.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from New Mexico will look at the committee report on S. 2714, he will find on the second page the statement that as of November 30, 1953, a total of $5,673,000,000 was actually in use.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was reading from page 8 of the House hearings.

Mr. AIKEN. I am reading from the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture, which says:

> As of November 30, 1953, the Corporation had outstanding borrowings of $4,148 million and it was obligated to purchase $1,525 million of loans and certificates held by banks and other lending agencies participating in the loan programs of the Corporation. This made a total of $5,673 million of its statutory borrowing power actually in use. It also had other obligations already contracted in the amount of $259 million, some part of which will require additional borrowings to liquidate (such as purchase agreements, accounts payable, accrued liabilities, etc.) making a grand total of $5,932 million of its borrowing authority in use as of November 30.

The Department told us on Monday that the applications which have been received since November 30 and the loans which have been made brought the total within $16 million of the statutory authority, and that the Commodity Credit Corporation did not expect to have sufficient money to carry on beyond February 1.

If they have money left on hand, and no harm would be done by not acting on the joint resolution until Monday, that is one thing. But, if they actually are out of money as of today, and they notify the county committees not to accept any more applications for loans, it does not take very much imagination to realize what would happen to the commodity market, once that kind of notice goes out from the Department.

Mr. BRIDGES and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire; then I shall yield to other Senators.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], it is my understanding that he is correct so far as he goes, but he does not go far enough. The law provides that the Corporation must have funds with which to cover the bank loans, and so on. If he will look at page 8 of the House hearings, from which he has quoted the figure $4 billion, and go down to the next 2 items, he will see the 2 items of $1,215,000,000 and $1,451,000,000, which represent bank loans, certificates of interest, and so forth. The law provides that the Corporation must have enough money to cover such loans and certificates. That is why the Corporation is down to $16 million in borrowing authority.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not question that statement, and I am not opposed to the joint resolution; but I do strenuously object to the statement that the Corporation is down to $16 million. While it is true that they may have applications for additional loans, anyone who has observed the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation must know that while cotton moves rapidly under loan, it also moves out from under loan. There never comes a time when all of the money is actually used.

Mr. President, I regret that we have run into this situation, because I fully agree that the joint resolution should be passed. However, I believe that we ought to be given some time to take a look at it first. Perhaps it may be agreed to on Monday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I next yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The apprehension of the Commodity Credit Corporation was the possibility of operating in violation of the law. I say that even though I believe the Senator from New Mexico is correct when he says that probably it would not be actually out of money.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is on that basis that I have no objection to the joint resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I agree with what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has stated, that the Commodity Credit Corporation has as much as a billion dollars of cash on hand. But that money is obligated. Because it is obligated, except for $16 million, the Corporation cannot service any further loans. Unless the proposed cancellation takes place there is no doubt that within the next few days the Corporation may run out of money and therefore will not be able to make further loans, which it is bound to make under the law.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I next yield to the Senator from Delaware, who has been trying to make a statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from California that the estimates of both the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Vermont are probably correct. The statutory borrowing authority has not been used up. If the obligations as they have been surveyed in the field were all put up to the Department of Agriculture at one time, unquestionably the money would be gone. However, that is not possible. That does not happen. The Department knows it does not happen.

I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that we must give more money to the Corporation, and I will go along with the proposal. I am not disputing that point. Whether we approve of the farm program as of today is beside the point. The law provides that we must give the Commodity Credit Corporation the money, and we are obligated to appropriate the money to implement the law. However, that does not relieve them of the responsibility to render an accurate accounting. But, in the meantime, I believe we have every right to examine the joint resolution which came before the Appropriations Committee. Incidentally, it was before the committee only yesterday afternoon, and it was rushed out of the committee within a few minutes as emergency legislation. There was no breakdown of commodities presented to the Committee on Appropriations at the time action was asked of the committee. I went to the Committee on Appropriations about an hour after the resolution was reported out, and at that time the committee had not yet been able to get a breakdown of the figures, and they were not brought to the Senate until 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. President, while I am sympathetic with the needs of the Department, I shall insist upon getting the answer to several questions before action is taken.

If the Department is threatening that either we will act on the resolution today or they will send out telegrams stopping loans, they had better get ready to send out the telegrams, because I will not consent to act on the resolution under such a threat. I will not consent to legislation on 24-hours' notice which says to us, in effect, "We have to get $700 million for a Government Corporation, but we do not have the time to tell you what we need the money for."

If the Corporation is in bankruptcy, let us declare it bankrupt, and let us tell the American people where we stand. I venture to say that will not happen.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I next yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. This exceptional and unprecedented and unanticipated demand on the Commodity Credit Corporation reached to its height about 2 weeks ago. I believe they did communicate with us when they realized that they were going to be left high and dry and without any funds with which to carry on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am willing to agree that the resolution should be considered, but I see no reason why it cannot be made the pending business on Monday. There would be no undue delay, it seems to me, if the resolution were taken up on Monday.

I believe it is wrong, however, to ask Congress to appropriate $714 million on 1 hour's notice, when the Department that needs the money in such a great hurry does not know what it needs the money for. Unless a satisfactory breakdown is furnished I certainly shall not support the request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say, if I may, that there is a breakdown to which I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Delaware and other Members of the Senate, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 27, at pages 886 and 887, dealing with the commodity-credit situation. I do not know whether the Senator from Delaware has yet had an opportunity to go over it. I think we may make progress if we may have the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, or someone designated by him, get in touch immediately with the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I may say to the Senator from Delaware that if it is possible, without damaging the program, to hold the joint resolution over until Monday, I think the requests of Senators to have a little more time are not unreasonable. If we are faced with a situation requiring quick action in this particular case, we shall have to meet it, even if we have to hold an evening session. I hope that will not be necessary, and I also hope that in the future the executive departments will get their requests to us as early as may be possible, so that we shall not be faced with a time limit, because I fully agree with the Senator from Delaware, and I do not like to be faced with a close time limit. Insofar as the majority leader of this body is concerned, he can make his views known to the executive departments, but as Grover Cleveland once said, "We have a condition and not a theory confronting us." I want to get the facts so that we can make a decision on accurate information.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I had not noticed the insertion in the RECORD to which the Senator has referred. It may be accurate, and I am willing to assume that it is; but why was it not submitted to the Appropriations Committee before, and why did it take until yesterday afternoon to get that information?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has the information which the Senator from Delaware requested been delivered?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; but that is supplementary information along the same lines, which I think could be dispensed with if it is not all here.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there is no question that Congress must make the funds available. The president of the corporation stated that applications for loans are being received in unprecedented numbers. If that is the situation, and if we stay here this evening in order to make the funds available to the corporation, there is no question that every chairman of a county committee will have to be notified and information will have to be sent to the county officers and also to the producers who have filed applications for loans.

I think the majority leader has well stated the situation by suggesting that we defer action for the moment. I am sure we all agree that when the department has given us accurate information about the shortage of funds we can resume the discussion and take action.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a matter such as this normally comes to the Appropriations Committee when that committee acts on the agricultural program in the normal course of events. Practically every year, so far as I can recall, we have had to do just what we are asked at this time to do, namely, to provide money with which to cover the losses brought about by the difference between the value of the commodities and the amounts which have been credited.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As the Senator from Michigan understands, what does this item represent as it was presented to the Appropriations Committee? Does it represent losses sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not absolute losses, because the corn or wheat or butter or cotton may be in storage.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the difference between a loss and an absolute loss?

Mr. FERGUSON. There is involved a restoration of capital.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Where does the capital go? Has the capital been lost? I want to get a clear indication of the difference between a loss and an absolute loss.

Mr. FERGUSON. Some of it has been lost by sales; some because of a decline in the value of the inventory.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I notice the Senator from New Mexico shaking his head vigorously, and I wish he would help us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELKER in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may be absolutely wrong, but I do not agree with the Senator from Michigan on that point. I think the Corporation has sustained losses, and I think the restoration of capital under those circumstances is a perfectly proper procedure. All I objected to was the statement that if we did not pass this measure today, the Department would send out telegrams. I say, let them send out telegrams if that is the way they feel about it. The information set forth on page 886 of the RECORD does not contain the other items of individual loans, which are the basis for saying that all the capital except $16 million may be obligated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. There is a statement which shows net realized losses, and a credit for net realized gains and operating expenses, but it does not cover shrinkage in any way.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The loss is not entirely due to CCC operations. The cost of the wheat for Pakistan will come out of CCC operations. The money still has not been repaid, the Corporation has not yet been reimbursed for many more price-support operations.

The CCC also furnishes supplies for our Armed Forces. The repayments are not always up to date.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the colloquy on the floor during the past hour has demonstrated the validity of my position. Why can we not defer action on the joint resolution until Monday after we determine what it is all about? As representatives of the people, I do not think we have any right to pass a large appropriation without the Members of the Senate being informed any more than they seem to be today. I think the request is a perfectly reasonable one.

With respect to the threat of the Department that if we defer action they are going to send out telegrams, if that is done, I am perfectly willing to submit a resolution asking for the resignation of whoever sends out such telegrams, I care not who he may be.

The Senator from New Mexico is correct that, technically speaking, if all these applications were submitted to Washington at the same moment, the Corporation would not have the money with which to continue operations; but that is not practically possible.

We have a ceiling on our national debt of $275 billion. There are obligations amounting to forty or fifty billion dollars. If every one of them was presented to the United States Treasury for payment before sunset this evening, the Government would be bankrupt unless we raised the debt limit proportionately. We are told that the CCC must have this money or they will have to close down overnight. That is nothing but a threat to the Congress, and I am not going to yield to anything like that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senate, and particularly to the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that a few moments ago I had a member of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations talk on the telephone with Mr. Gordon, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I shall quote to Senators his statement, for what it may be worth:

The problem is that some 3,000 county officers and as many as 7,509 lending agencies involved either must have a restoration of capital at this time, or else it will be neces-

sary to telegraph to them to suspend operations immediately, until action is taken. Otherwise, we shall be in violation of the act which requires us to keep within the borrowing authority.

I do not like shotgun marriages any more than does the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. However, that is exactly the dilemma that faced the Committee on Appropriations yesterday, when the Commodity Credit Corporation appeared and said, "This is a 'must' action. It requires 'must' legislation."

I am not enthusiastic about it. I do not like to enter into it. Nevertheless, I am simply presenting to the Senator from Delaware and to the Senate a statement made by the head of the agency, in which he said that if the agency does not obtain the funds necessary, then, over the weekend, it will be necessary to send telegrams to every county office and every CCC lending agency in America, stating that the Corporation is out of money and, therefore, has had to stop operations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to make an explanation in relation to the need for the funds, and I should like the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to hear what I have to say.

Let us consider the item of $126,680,756 for corn. One of the experts on the staff of the Committee on Appropriations has received from the Commodity Credit Corporation information which I was trying to give to the Senate. The item consists of an actual loss on the sale of corn, represented by the difference between the actual sales price and the purchase price, plus a valuation by the Treasury Department last year on the basis of June 1953 prices as to the value of corn then on hand, as compared with the purchase price of the corn.

The Treasury valuation differs from the valuation of the corn by the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is based on the price that might be obtained at a probable sales time in the future. That is how that particular item has been figured by the CCC. I was simply trying to explain to the Senate of what the loss consisted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To use that item as an example, the Senator from Michigan says that $126 million worth of corn represents an actual loss. Do I understand correctly that a part of the amount represents the prospective loss for this year and the year following?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a further question. He has given a figure of $126,680,756. Why was not the figure $226 million, or $326 million? Or why was it not a plain $126 million? How did the Commodity Credit Corporation arrive at the exact figure of how much loss is expected on corn this year, next year, or the year after? That is the point I want to have explained. We are not simply writing off the Corporation's losses of last year; we are being asked to write off the loss of last year and also what might be lost next year and the year after.

We are being asked to do that by the passage of this joint resolution, and thus to put those losses behind us, so that the situation can be described on the floor on the basis that the losses are not actual losses; and, then, when they are sustained later, they will be written off, and the people will have forgotten about them.

Mr. FERGUSON. We have followed the same procedure in the past.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and I have notified the Committee on Appropriations many times previously that I shall oppose this method of financing. I am strenuously opposed to it, when we do not have even 24 hours in which to consider it.

Mr. FERGUSON. To use corn as an example, it appears to me that if corn were allowed to remain in the bin, and we knew it was not of the value that could be obtained later, we should allow the Commodity Credit Corporation to reflect anticipated losses. Everyone anticipates as of the present what his future inventory will be worth. I do not see anything wrong in saying that the Commodity Credit Corporation can include some prospective losses.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELKER in the chair). The Senator from California has the floor, and he has yielded to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, perhaps I can clear up the situation. I have just talked with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Rather than continue the debate on the measure, since it appears obvious there is a great difference of opinion among Senators as to what the facts are, the majority leader is willing to take the responsibility to state to the Commodity Credit Corporation, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, that this measure will be considered further on Monday.

I can fully understand that the Commodity Credit Corporation, in order to comply with the law, may have to protect itself, by sending telegrams, if the facts are as stated by Senators. But it seems to me that if the facts require the Commodity Credit Corporation to do so, they might also say that the matter is to be taken up in the Senate on Monday next.

I may say very frankly, and I would say it whether the administration were Republican or Democratic, that I do not believe the Congress of the United States should be presented with such proposals within a period too short in which to legislate properly.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Commodity Credit Corporation came before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and stated its fears, telling us that applications for loans were being received at an unprecedented rate. We were warned of that. We were informed on January 22 that the best calculation that could be made, after information had been received from local banks that had made such loans, which would obligate the Commodity Credit Corporation, was that there would be outstanding indebtedness of $4,063,000,000 as of this particular time. The latest figures we have obtained, which were as of January 28, showed that actually the amount of loans that had been made was $4,096,000,000, or above the anticipated figure by $33 million.

The best figures the Commodity Credit Corporation can give as the result of current information, received from local banks, as reported by State production and marketing administration committees, is that borrowings as of the present time are more than $130 million in excess of the figures given us as concrete obligations.

Mr. President, the only reason why I rise to caution the majority leader is that we cannot, in any sense, ask the Commodity Credit Corporation to make themselves liable by incurring indebtedness beyond their authorization. That is the first point.

Second, we should visualize the chaotic situation which will occur the Nation over if the Production and Marketing Administration committees are informed by telegraph to stop all execution and adjudication of loans in the districts, because it is necessary to make contracts all the way down to the county level.

There is no question in my mind, nor, I believe, in the minds of other Members of Congress, that Congress will authorize the additional lending. I think we have obtained from the Department the closest estimates possible. I have just talked with the budget officer of the Commodity Credit Corporation, who is outside in the retiring room. He called the Department to obtain the latest figures.

There is no way by which we can get any closer estimate this afternoon than that which has been given us, namely, that commitments are running higher than the amount reported on January 22. Certainly we were warned at that time what to expect.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The fact remains that the joint resolution was reported from the Committee on Appropriations only yesterday, and today is the first time it has been on the desks of Senators. In the orderly, normal course of legislative procedure, I think it would not be an unreasonable request on the part of any Senator, be he on the Democratic side or the Republican side of the aisle, to have at least sufficient time in which to procure facts with which to make his presentation to the Senate.

I have tried to make it perfectly clear that on Monday next I shall be prepared to move to lay aside the unfinished business in order to take up this joint resolution and to give it priority. I am prepared to give further assurance to the Senate that, if necessary, the Senate will be kept in session all day Monday and Monday night, if necessary, in order to meet the situation affecting the Commodity Credit Corporation. So, it seems to me, in view of the circumstances, that the request of the Senator from Delaware

is not unreasonable. Frankly, I would not be prepared to seek any further delay, but I assume the Senator from Delaware is not trying to prevent the Senate from reaching a vote, and if he is prepared to proceed on Monday, so far as I am concerned, the Senate may take the matter up as the first order of business on Monday, immediately following the quorum call and the routine morning business.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Since the debate on this joint resolution started, I have talked with Mr. Gordon, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I am advised that as of January 22, $16 million of unobligated funds remain in the borrowing authority of the Corporation. That was just a week ago today. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been purchasing dairy products alone at the rate of more than $1 million a day, I understand, so that the Corporation cannot have any money left as of today. Therefore, if the Senate does not take action, there are only two courses which can be followed. One is to send out telegrams to the agencies in the States stating that they are not to accept any more applications for loans. The other is to go ahead and violate the law. If they were to violate the law, I am sure the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would be the first Senator on the floor to object. So I think that the suggestion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is the best course the Senate can follow.

I am informed by Mr. Gordon that if telegrams are sent to the representatives of the Corporation in the States, as will have to be done, they will not constitute a threat but will merely state a fact. The Corporation cannot violate the law and accept applications in excess of their authorized borrowing authority.

I think the only course to follow is that suggested by the Senator from California. In order to avoid chaos, when the telegrams are sent, they should also include a statement that the Senate has agreed to consider the joint resolution on Monday. There is no question, at least there is none in my mind, that the joint resolution will be passed. It is unthinkable that it will not be. By taking that action we might be able to prevent conditions arising which would lead to a price decline in the market which otherwise might occur. I believe the course suggested by the Senator from California is the best the Senate can follow, in view of the fact that the Senator from Delaware will not consent to action on the joint resolution today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I completely approve of the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader that the matter go over until Monday. If telegrams have to be sent out, I personally think it would be a fine thing for the Nation, and particularly for the farmers throughout the Nation, to realize what is happening because of the 90 percent rigid price-support program, which is largely responsible for the situation in which the agricultural program now finds itself.

Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has, within the last few days, held hearings upon the request to add one and three-quarter billion dollars to the financial structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation in order that it may see itself through this year's lending, with the careful warning given, in connection with the request, by the Department of Agriculture that the granting of such an amount of increase would be merely temporizing with the problem; that by this time next year the department will be back again with another request for an additional increase of the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless we terminate this wholly extravagant 90 percent price support structure which is responsible for the existing condition.

Mr. President, calling attention to the resolution under discussion, there are two provisions with regard to which the Congress is required to act. One is the expenditure by the Commodity Credit Corporation of more than $129 million in connection with the international wheat agreement, which the Commodity Credit Corporation, of course, is carrying on under legislative direction. Congress also must act on reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for the amount which it has advanced for the handling of the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, which is a relatively minor amount of more than $2 million.

What I believe the country ought to realize is that the major portion of the restoration involves $609 million, not representing the present spoilage, not representing the present heavier loss, but representing largely the estimated spoilage and loss in inventory as of July 1, 1953. In other words, the most of the $609 million covers the loss accrued in the inventory of the 90-percent-price-support-held products prior to the end of June 1953.

Mr. President, it means that not only must we put up $1¾ billion more at once, just to handle the matter through this year, but now we are informed that the corporation is about bankrupt and that we have to put up $741 million for immediate restoration so that the Commodity Credit Corporation can operate for the next few weeks. Yet we are told by the Commodity Credit Corporation that $609 million of that total is needed largely because of spoliation, because we have had to keep in storage huge quantities of corn, wheat, and butter. Incidentally, the committee was told the other day that more than $350 million will be for butter and other products under the 90-percent milk-products-support program.

Mr. President, how much longer is this Nation going to swim through that sea of butter and not see that in trying to carry out such a program we are riding to destruction? I am not afraid of the Nation's ability to carry on; I am afraid that the program will so thoroughly disgust the average citizen of the country that he is going to insist upon restrictive, punitive, and destructive measures being taken with respect to the whole agricultural price-support program, much of which is beneficial.

We have in this instance a demonstration of rushing through an appropriation of $609 million, which is based largely on an estimate of how much stored products had gone down in value, due to spoliation, up to the middle of last year.

I hope that the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will insist upon his request. If not, I shall make such a request. I hope that the distinguished majority leader will insist upon his suggestion that this matter be carried over until Monday. In the meantime I hope telegrams will be sent out to the public, because I think the public, and particularly the agricultural public, needs to realize just how disastrous the cost of the program is becoming and what huge expenditures are being requested in order to continue a price-support program which was a war measure, and a war measure pure and simple, when all the other war measures affecting every other group of citizens in our Nation have long since been discontinued.

I hope the distinguished majority leader will insist upon the consideration of the measure being carried over until Monday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware, who I understand has a suggestion to make.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as I told the Senator from California very early in the discussion, I was perfectly willing the joint resolution should be brought up on Monday; that so far as I was concerned there would be no effort to delay, and that it could be voted on within an hour or two. All I wanted was information as to the items on which the money would be applied.

As the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has pointed out, I do not believe the American people know how much the program is costing. We have had varying statements from Senators representing different States regarding the cost of the program. The statement was made that the cost of the program since 1933 has been as low as $20 million. I am not going to debate that question at this time. All I say is that we should put a price tag on the operations of the Corporation and see what we are paying.

I suggest to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that, frankly, I do not see that there is any great need of emergency action. I am not going to back down on my request that consideration of the resolution be deferred until we have had a chance to study the figures. But, in order to avoid controversy, I shall go along with this proposal, for I am not trying to be arbitrary about the matter.

If the Senate wishes to take up Senate bill 2714, the purpose of which is to increase the borrowing power of the

Commodity Credit Corporation, and if the Senate is willing to reduce the amount of the proposal to $500 million, I will go along with the bill in that form, on the question of its passage by unanimous consent. In that way we shall send the bill to the House of Representatives, and thus enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry on until Monday.

I do not think that is necessary at all; I do not think the House has to do it. Nevertheless, I am not trying unduly to handicap the Commodity Credit Corporation.

However, as one Member of the Senate, I will not vote for a $774 million appropriation bill, when I, at least, as one Member of the Senate, do not know what the items of the bill are. I want that information before I cast my vote on the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have recently been informed that the House of Representatives has just taken a recess until Monday. Of course, in that case the House will not be able to act today on the amendment suggested by the Senator from Delaware.

However, because of the importance of this matter and because the majority leader must ascertain whether a quorum of the Senate is available and whether a quorum of the Senate would be in the city tomorrow, in case I ask for a Saturday session, I shall now suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from California withhold the suggestion for a moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to ask the Senator from California a question, if I may do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Would it be a possible solution of this problem if we were now to pass an emergency appropriation bill in the amount of $100 million, in order to tide over the Commodity Credit Corporation until the House of Representatives can pass on this matter on tomorrow?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; the House of Representatives has taken a recess until Monday, so I have been informed.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENT TO COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I desire to speak briefly on the situation regarding the Bricker amendment.

Mr. President, I have been asked whether my position on the Bricker amendment was a matter of form or a matter of substance. Perhaps I should take offense at the question, but I prefer to give it an honest answer. So I say to my colleagues, and for the record, that I am interested in substance, not in form.

My position is one of principle.

I have not argued for the so-called "which" clause because of what it is, but because of what it does. I do not insist on retaining that clause in precise words if my basic purpose of restoring the original intendment of the Constitution can be served by the adoption of other words. I have studied various proposals offered by my colleagues, and I feel perhaps this can be done.

A constitutional amendment is a serious matter, and I do not feel it is the best procedure to try to write one on the floor of the Senate. But I fear that is what may happen if matters go along in the present state of conflict and controversy.

Therefore, in hope that it may be possible even at this late date to achieve some meeting of the minds; in the sure knowledge that the present opponents of the amendment, as reported from our Committee on the Judiciary, are good and loyal and sincere Americans who will meet reason with reason; and as evidence of my own attachment to principle and substance, rather than form and phrase, I send to the desk a draft of an amendment to our committee amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 1. I ask that it may be read by the clerk for the information of the Senate, and that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment to the amendment was received, ordered to be printed and to lie on the table, and was read, as follows:

Amend paragraphs 1 through 4 of the committee amendment to read as follows:

"1. After the ratification of this amendment no treaty shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.

"2. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"3. No international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States except through legislation.

"4. Any vote in the Senate on the question of ratifying a treaty shall be determined by the yeas and nays."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this amendment may contain defects. If so, I think it is safe to say they are latent defects, not patent, and the other body will have full opportunity to study this matter for itself, as it should, and perhaps can improve the Senate version.

I recognize that the Senate itself may change its views between now and the time when this resolution comes back to us from the other body.

For myself, I want to say that I think it is important for the Senate to recognize at this time the need for a constitutional amendment of this nature, and to approve a resolution upon which the other body may proceed to deliberate. It is in this spirit that I have brought forward the amendment just sent to the desk.

DISCHARGE OF INDEBTEDNESS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall now suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before the Senator from California does so, will he yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will opportunity be given, following the quorum call, to continue the discussion of the Commodity Credit Corporation matter?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. That is why I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, I should like to continue the discussion with the Senator from Florida.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I, as one Member of the Senate who favors 90 percent of parity, cannot remain silent when various other Senators suddenly blame the so-called deficit in the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation upon the 90 percent of parity program.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that we now have a Republican administration. Yet I wish to cite some figures as to what has occurred since July 1. From July 1 until December 30, 1953, there were imported from Canada 11,512,000 bushels of rye. The net result has been that the price of rye has dropped nearly $1 a bushel, and the farmers all over the Northwest have placed their rye under loans with the Commodity Credit Corporation. At Chicago the price of rye has dropped and dropped and dropped—with the result, of course, that the Commodity Credit Corporation has been short of just that much funds.

At various times my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and I have taken up this matter of imports.

To show, Mr. President, the contrast between the situation in 1953 and the situation in 1952, let me point out that from July 1 to December 30, 1952, there were imported only 1,304,000 bushels of rye. So, it will be seen that in 1953, nearly 11 times as much rye has been imported from Canada as was imported during the corresponding 6 months of the previous year, 1952.

Mr. President, that is not all. There was not one day when the importation of rye could not have been stopped. Every Senator from an agricultural State knows that because of the acreage quotas which have been adopted, hundreds of thousands of acres have been seeded to rye, and will continue to be seeded to rye. Many acres will be seeded to barley, but the rye acreage will be larger than it has been in a great many previous years.

Mr. President, that is not all. The average amount of rye produced annually in the United States has been between 23 million and 25 million bushels. Yet, we find that in a period of 6 months, 11 million bushels of rye have been imported. As the Wall Street Journal stated in one of its editions, 250,000 bushels of rye came into the United States in 1 day.

I am very anxious to know what the Department of Agriculture has been doing about this matter.

Finally there was a hearing with regard to oats, after my distinguished colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], had fought for a long time. After there had been a hearing to determine whether or not a monopoly was being created, the Department finally did something about rye, but even that action has not been

concluded, because the Tariff Commission is making an investigation.

During a 6 months' period in 1953 there were imported from Canada 40,414,000 bushels of oats. During the same period of 6 months, there were imported from Canada 21,760,000 bushels of barley. I wish to invite the attention of Senators who are today blaming the 90 percent of parity for the present condition to the fact that, apparently, the Department of Agriculture has not taken very energetic steps to protect the farmers in the Northwest.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. YOUNG. My distinguished colleague knows that about five times as much barley is going under loan this year as a year ago. In other words, about 35 million bushels have gone under loan, which would be totally unnecessary if we were to give the American markets to Americans.

Mr. LANGER. I ask my distinguished friend if it is not true that that means that the money appropriated for the Commodity Credit Corporation, the very money we are debating about this afternoon, is used to make these loans.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct, and I want to add that my colleague has been doing a fine job of getting action to stop imports of unneeded farm commodities.

Mr. LANGER. The opposition to 90-percent parity is trying to make capital of the fact that these loans must be made, thereby causing a shortage of money; yet, nothing is being done to stop the importation of grains from foreign countries.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have listened with great interest to the Senator's comments. I wonder if he understands that this particular measure does not relate to any losses sustained after July 1, 1953, but relates solely to losses sustained and estimated to be sustained on July 1, 1953, for the fiscal year 1953, which began on July 1, 1952; and that therefore the matters which he has recited as taking place last fall and this winter have no application whatsoever to the measure under consideration.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota understands that perfectly.

I invite attention to the fact that this is a part of a pattern. Next year more money will be requested, in spite of the fact that apparently nothing has been done during the past 6 months to keep grains from other countries out of the United States, with the result, as my distinguished colleague says, that loans have been made to farmers to get the support price, in spite of the fact that grain has been imported from foreign countries.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not a fact that barley has been going under loan unnecessarily, thereby using up the Commodity Credit Corporation's money? That is why it is short.

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have the indulgence of the Senate for a few minutes in order to correct some statements which have been made with reference to the mandatory 90 percent of parity price program for basic commodities.

Since last year, no good word has come from the Department of Agriculture as to this great program. The Secretary of Agriculture has found no good in the program. His comments have not dealt with the many favorable aspects, Mr. President; they have all been derogatory to the program for basic commodities—a fine program, Mr. President, one which is deserving of praise not censure. When Mr. Benson appeared before the Senate Agriculture Committee on January 18 in order to explain to us the President's program to the committee, he had this to say, as appears on page 8 of his statement:

> At what point will the 140 million Americans who do not live on farms rise up, as they did in the potato fiasco of a few years ago, and demand, not revision, but outright elimination of all direct aid to agriculture?

When the Secretary appeared on that day, he presented to the committee a table showing that the cost—not of the program under discussion today, but of the entire agricultural program, from the fiscal year 1932 to 1953—was $16,214,000,000.

What did he include in that figure? Did he confine his presentation to the price-support program? No, Mr. President. The table was padded with other material. Although the Secretary indicated that the price-support program was all wrong, the evidence he submitted to prove his allegation included costs of the program for soil conservation, and conservation of natural resources—work which includes flood control, and things of that character. He charged all these costs to agriculture, although the subject before our committee dealt solely with price-support programs. In my opinion, the table to which I refer was brought in merely to do an injustice to the great price-support program which has been on the statute books since 1937.

While the Secretary was before us as a witness, I asked him for a true picture; I asked him for the facts as applied to price supports alone. He did not have them, but he said he would produce them the next day, which he did.

That picture, as subsequently shown in the later figures, is one the American people should understand, with particular reference to the farm price-support program. These are figures which were furnished to us by the Department of Agriculture, after I had specifically requested them.

Mr. Benson and his assistants had these statistics available, I am sure, and could have made them available to the committee on the same day that this large table indicating a $16 billion loss was submitted; but did he present them? No. We had more or less to pry it out of him. This is the picture:

In connection with the price-support program for basic commodities, from October 17, 1933, to June 30, 1953, a span of 20 years, the losses on the basic commodities totaled $20,720,931.

Taking each of the basic commodities, the table shows that the profit which the Government earned on cotton was $268,219,477. With respect to tobacco, the operations during that period showed a profit of $1,641,818. On peanuts, rice, wheat, and corn, we had some losses. Those losses are as follows: On corn, $70,910,000; on peanuts, $92,648,951; on rice, $1,459,000; on wheat, $95,127,450.

So the profits on cotton almost offset the combined losses on all the other commodities I have mentioned. Therefore I repeat—and I want the American people to know—that total losses on the price-support program for the 6 basic commodities for the past 20 years has not been $16 billion, but $20,720,931. It has cost us slightly more than $1 million a year to maintain agricultural prosperity.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understood the Senator's figures, they show a profit on cotton of $268 million. Is it not a fact, and does not the Senator from Louisiana know it to be a fact, because he was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and prior to that the ranking Democratic member under the former chairman, Senator Thomas—that not only was there a profit on cotton, but the Department of Agriculture had to ban exports of cotton so that the cotton could be used in this country? In other words, by keeping the Government CCC cotton in this country the cotton mills were able to operate in the south, in New England and in other places, and the mills, in turn paid tremendous amounts of taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that the workers and consumers of America benefited by the use of the Government stocks of cotton, which sold at from 35 to 45 cents a pound in this country, as against prices of 70 cents a pound and more, for a time, in Mexico and in South America during our crop failure?

Mr. ELLENDER. Those prices were as high as 80 cents a pound.

Mr. MAYBANK. The consumers of the country saved by purchasing their goods made out of the Government-stored cotton. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. And the taxpayers saved because of the profit of $268 million on cotton, is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was possible to make that profit because the farmers were able to get the cotton under loans in the bumper years.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point the Senator is making is that the program has assured the people of the United States food and fiber at a reasonable price. As a matter of fact, while wages have been

increasing, it is possible for a worker today to buy more food per wage-hour than in 1939.

Mr. MAYBANK. It has made it possible for the manufacturers of this country to stay in business. For example, a great deal of corn was stored. Certain factories would not have been able to stay in business if it had not been for the CCC corn. It is also true that the loss in corn was easily made up by the profits made by the people who used the corn, in taxes, and so forth.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The charge has been made that large sums of money have been lost entirely due to the 90-percent parity price and the rigid price-support program on the various commodities which have been mentioned. I wish to refer to the basic commodities which have been under the price-support program, particularly cotton. I understand the $268 million mentioned by the Senator is the profit on cotton handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and that the figure of $268 million was taken from the official records of the Secretary of Agriculture. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I am reading from the figures furnished by the Government. They are furnished by the Commodity Credit Corporation, which handles the price-support program.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator from Louisiana state the period it represents? What is the period covered by the figures?

Mr. ELLENDER. From October 17, 1933, to June 30, 1953, a span of nearly 20 years.

Mr. STENNIS. I hope the whole country will know about those figures. Since the other word has gone out all over the country, I hope this word will go out, too, so that the country may have the entire picture with reference to the program.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, based on the figures given by my distinguished colleague—and I understand he received the figures from the Department of Agriculture itself—the statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture, indicating that a program which has worked well for the farmer should be abandoned, was a statement to the effect that the program had cost a thousand-fold more than it has actually cost the taxpayer. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield in a moment. As I stated in my opening remarks, I do not know of one kind word that has come from the lips of Mr. Benson with respect to this program. On the contrary, he has spent much time in criticizing it. Instead of taking the present program—a good program—and trying to improve it, he has condemned it; called it all bad.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall yield for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator place the chart in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall gladly do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not that chart show that the loss on the price-support program was only a part of the $16 billion the Senator has mentioned?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is not correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator put the chart in the RECORD?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will put the whole chart in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. There are two charts, I believe.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will put both charts in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. The difference in the figures is due to the totals being made up at different times. There is a gap between the two figures, I believe.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall put both charts in the RECORD. As I indicated, the chart which shows a loss to agriculture of $16¼ billion includes the cost of the soil conservation program, the REA electrification program, the REA telephone program, the farm credit system, and almost everything else connected with agriculture.

The Senator from Vermont will recall that the subject matter which was before our committee when Mr. Benson appeared was the price support program in particular. Why the other chart showing cost of overall agricultural programs was presented to us I cannot understand. I could see no reason for its being presented at that time except to muddy the waters.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana please tell the Senate how much on the chart is represented by processing taxes during the past 20 years?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have that figure before me.

Mr. AIKEN. That figure is not on the chart?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I shall be glad to put the whole chart in the RECORD.

The point I am trying to make is that the program has been unduly and unjustly criticized. If it had not been for the fact that during World War II we had these surplus food and fiber products on hand, there is no telling what the ultimate cost to the consumers of this country would have been in money and in hardship, for in both instances I feel sure that if we had not had large stocks on hand, we would have had to pay high prices on world markets for them—if they could have been obtained—and imposed harsh food rationing, too. There is no telling what it would have cost the consumers of this country during the recent Korean war. The Senator well knows that if it had not been for the fact that we had the surpluses on hand, American consumers would have had to pay substantially higher prices for many essential food products, as well as for cotton textiles.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Louisiana will put the two charts in the RECORD, I shall be very happy.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the people of the country can read the charts for themselves and see how much of the $16 billion cost has gone for each item on the chart.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall do so. I shall also put into the RECORD the chart supplied by the Secretary of Agriculture which includes the $2 billion subsidy program that was made available to the consumers. The Senator is familiar with it. He knows that under the program, American consumers were able to purchase meat, for example, at low prices because of a Federal subsidy. The Senator knows this item did not benefit the farmer alone. That is not the point, however. The point is that it is absolutely wrong for any Senator or for Mr. Benson or anyone else to undertake to lead the public into believing that the 90 percent price support program has cost these enormous amounts of money, when as a matter of fact it has not cost anywhere near that much.

Mr. LONG, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the debate. I merely felt that the time was opportune to present these facts to the country.

I should now like to refer to the nonbasic commodities, such as milk, butterfats, butter, cheese, dried cream, honey, potatoes, tung oil, and wool.

The total losses on the nonbasics was $707,815,005. The greatest loss was incurred on the potato program, which we abandoned about 2 years ago. The loss on potatoes was $478,097,057. As to the other nonbasics, which include barley, beans, castor beans, and so forth, that program cost $381,600,000.

The entire price-support program for the period of 20 years, from October 17, 1933, to June 30, 1953, for both basics and nonbasics, cost $1,110,136,889.

Those are facts, Mr. President. That is the story. So far as I am personally concerned, I shall continue to support the present farm program. If there is anything wrong with it, I want to try to make it better. I think we have a good program. I think we are on the right track. Why should we discard a program which has worked well, one which is tried and true, for one which is untried? But, above that, if any change is to be made, it must be a change or an improvement based on fact and not misleading figures.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a tabulation from the Department of Agriculture entitled "Realized Cost of Agricultural and Related Programs, by Function or Purpose, Fiscal Years 1932–53." This is the table submitted to the Agriculture Committee by Secretary Benson and which shows the misleading cost total of price-support programs.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

U. S. Department of Agriculture—Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932–53

The basis for the costs reflected in this table is as follows: (1) For activities financed from appropriated funds, the expenditures less receipts arising from the activities so financed; (2) for noncorporate loan funds, the losses on loans and the net interest cost or income; (3) for Commodity Credit Corporation and Federal Crop Insurance Corporation corporate funds, the net gains or losses from operations and the interest cost to Treasury on Government-subscribed capital; and (4) for corporations of the Farm Credit System, the interest cost to Treasury on Government-subscribed capital and payments made by Treasury on account of reductions in interest rates on mortgages less dividends and franchise taxes paid to Treasury. Interest cost to Treasury on noncorporate loan funds and on Government-subscribed capital of corporations has been computed on the basis of the average rate on the public debt paid by Treasury in each of these years.)

[Millions of dollars]

	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	Total
Programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income:																							
Commodity Credit Corporation:																							
Program operations:																							
Price-support programs	------	------	------	------	8.7	5.3	0.4	4.6	7.4	34.0	[3]69.1	[3]49.9	[3]5.9	29.4	[3]30.1	71.9	125.4	254.7	249.2	345.6	67.4	61.1	1,110.1
Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	[3].1	2.0	[3]12.4	5.8	[3]35.9	[3]242.7	[3]38.4	[3]4.7	[3]2.7	1.64	1.3	6.4	[3]319.8
Administrative and other general costs	------	------	[3].6	[3].9	11.7	3.9	2.1	[3]3.0	8.7	2.2	[3]9.6	12.1	10.4	26.1	33.2	13.9	[3]8.5	15.9	48.1	42.0	34.6	55.3	299.6
International Wheat Agreement [1]	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	75.6	180.4	171.3	130.8	558.1
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities [2]	------	------	------	------	32.2	35.2	35.2	211.6	143.9	226.1	196.3	112.0	63.4	24.9	19.2	78.4	51.2	75.6	96.6	46.0	37.5	82.3	1,567.6
Sugar Act	------	------	------	------	------	------	[3]27.4	[3]6.5	[3]25.2	[3]30.0	[3]32.7	[3].6	[3]21.3	[3]32.9	[3]5.2	[3]7.4	[3]13.1	[3]23.3	[3]14.5	[3]14.8	[3]21.8	[3]19.4	[3]296.1
Federal crop insurance	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	4.4	7.7	9.8	14.8	14.6	18.1	2.9	21.5	36.9	[3]1.8	[3].4	9.6	4.6	8.7	6.4	157.8
Acreage allotment payments under the agricultural conservation program	------	------	------	------	------	313.6	217.4	350.7	380.2	326.7	332.5	218.1	103.1	------	22.5	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	2,384.8
Other, including Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, parity payments, and other adjustment and surplus removal programs	297.8	75.1	[3]43.2	179.6	417.3	84.9	[3].5	28.0	224.1	197.2	202.7	203.7	156.7	[3]6.1	[3]1.5	[3]2.2	------	10.9	25.0	18.9	7.2	7.7	2,078.3
Total	297.8	75.1	[3]46.8	178.7	469.9	442.9	277.2	589.8	746.8	766.0	634.8	512.0	402.1	80.1	23.7	[3]51.2	116.8	328.7	486.9	624.3	306.2	330.6	7,510.4
Programs primarily for conservation of resources:																							
Agricultural conservation program (exclusive of acreage allotment payments)	------	------	------	------	.5	55.1	88.8	119.8	202.0	132.7	126.6	212.0	228.6	278.9	273.3	329.2	230.6	167.6	237.2	275.5	262.0	270.3	3,500.7
Soil Conservation Service programs [4]	.2	.2	.1	.2	3.5	21.0	24.2	25.7	30.9	23.0	23.4	23.4	25.1	28.2	34.6	43.1	41.3	47.9	52.8	52.1	56.0	59.6	616.5
Forest Service programs [5]	19.6	12.2	6.8	8.3	9.5	14.2	17.9	21.4	24.3	18.9	17.8	18.5	18.3	21.0	28.0	36.4	37.7	33.8	33.5	9.8	7.6	6.2	421.7
Flood-prevention program	------	------	------	------	------	------	.3	1.4	2.3	2.9	1.5	.4	.1	.1	.6	2.6	3.8	5.9	6.7	7.5	7.8	6.3	50.2
Total	19.8	12.4	6.9	8.5	13.5	90.3	131.2	168.3	259.5	177.5	179.3	254.3	270.1	328.2	336.5	411.3	313.4	255.2	330.2	344.9	333.4	342.4	4,589.1
Credit and related programs for electrification and telephone facilities, and farm purchase, maintenance, operation, and housing:																							
Lending programs:																							
Rural Electrification Administration	------	------	------	------	------	.3	.7	1.3	------	2.5	1.0	[3]1.9	[3]4.4	[3]1.9	[3].9	2.5	6.5	9.7	14.4	20.2	23.2	26.7	99.8
Farmers' Home Administration	13.7	13.2	13.7	14.5	9.5	14.5	12.2	17.7	11.4	9.3	7.1	[3].3	[3]9.8	[3]7.6	[3]2.6	[3]4.9	[3]4.6	[3]4.8	[3]3.2	[3]5.4	[3]5.3	[3]5.1	83.2
Farm credit system	5.4	6.5	22.3	33.5	49.9	55.2	60.0	61.1	58.5	51.5	50.9	48.1	45.2	18.1	9.4	7.3	7.0	[3]7 82.3	[3]11.2	[3]8.0	[3]7.8	[3]2.6	806.0
Grants and other expenses, including salaries and expenses related to the above lending programs	4.9	6.6	9.1	12.7	77.3	157.7	110.8	72.5	72.9	69.8	67.3	51.3	39.8	36.0	37.6	42.5	28.4	29.0	33.8	35.4	37.1	36.5	1,067.3
Total	24.0	26.3	45.1	60.7	136.7	227.6	183.7	152.6	142.8	133.1	126.3	97.2	68.8	44.6	43.5	47.4	35.3	[3]18.4	33.8	42.2	47.2	55.8	1,756.3
Research and education:																							
Research	20.6	18.1	15.3	15.6	18.4	20.9	22.6	25.7	30.2	31.2	31.6	30.9	28.2	29.7	31.6	37.1	42.4	52.6	56.8	55.2	54.8	55.2	724.7
Extension Service, including payments to States	10.1	9.9	9.4	9.3	17.4	17.0	17.9	18.5	19.2	19.2	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.4	23.9	27.4	27.2	31.1	32.1	32.3	32.6	32.6	465.0
Total	30.7	28.0	24.7	24.9	35.8	37.9	40.5	44.2	49.4	50.4	51.1	50.4	47.7	49.1	55.5	64.5	69.6	83.7	88.9	87.5	87.4	87.8	1,189.7
Other, chiefly school lunch, marketing services, control and regulatory activities:																							
School lunch program [6]	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	1.0	33.7	45.4	56.6	77.5	68.4	75.0	53.2	82.8	83.6	82.8	690.0
Other	23.9	22.2	18.0	37.1	41.5	34.7	35.6	33.7	32.8	30.9	31.1	31.0	35.8	36.3	40.3	48.5	40.5	48.1	52.8	55.2	53.9	57.4	841.3
Total	23.9	22.2	18.0	37.1	41.5	34.7	35.6	33.7	32.8	30.9	31.1	32.0	69.5	81.7	96.9	126.0	108.9	123.1	126.0	138.0	137.5	140.2	1,531.3
Programs primarily for wartime, defense, and other special needs	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	5.3	14.1	73.8	54.7	31.1	31.3	41.3	45.9	31.5	1.6	8.2	5.4	344.2
Total, above items	396.2	209.3	53.2	313.5	680.0	824.4	609.0	989.1	1,231.6	1,158.2	1,028.2	1,000.5	934.7	564.5	589.8	629.5	672.8	808.6	1,107.3	1,238.5	919.9	962.2	16,921.0
Wartime consumer subsidies on agricultural commodities:																							
Paid by Commodity Credit Corporation	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	8.3	145.5	390.1	741.7	845.1	[1]22.4	[1]4.0	[1]2.2	.1	.3	[1].3	[1].1	2,102.1
Paid by Reconstruction Finance Corporation	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	.9	23.4	570.4	626.3	924.8	[1]3.0	.1	------	------	------	------	------	2,142.9
Total	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	9.2	168.9	960.5	1,368.0	1,769.9	[1]25.4	[1]3.9	[1]2.2	.1	.3	[1].3	[1].1	4,245.0

Other special activities not a part of the agricultural programs of the Department:																						
Special activities conducted by the Department under transferred funds as a service for other agencies (chiefly for purchase of commodities for lend-lease, UNRRA, mutual security and other foreign-aid programs)	2.1	3.1	32.1	161.8	72.3	64.0	26.1	30.0	20.6	20.9	698.4	2,031.2	2,139.9	1,382.1	1,610.8	579.1	744.6	1,018.4	611.4	447.6	331.8	118.7	12,147.0
Government procurement of agricultural commodities for foreign-aid programs other than through the Department of Agriculture																		1,425.9	1,236.3	741.8	312.4	351.3	4,067.7
Total	2.1	3.1	32.1	161.8	72.3	64.0	26.1	30.0	20.6	20.9	698.4	2,031.2	2,139.9	1,382.1	1,610.8	579.1	744.6	2,444.3	1,847.7	1,189.4	644.2	470.0	16,214.7

[1] The expenditures under this program are for payment of the difference between the price specified in the International Wheat Agreement and the domestic market price of wheat. The program is essentially international in nature, and is included in this classification with the kinds of items to which it most nearly relates.
[2] Excess of credits, deduct.
[3] Exclusive of cash payments for school-lunch programs.
[4] The amounts shown include the purchase of 9,643,738 acres of submarginal land at a total cost of approximately $30,061,000.
[5] The amounts shown include the purchase of 14,459,711 acres of land at a total cost of approximately $68,532,000.
[6] Includes costs under the National School Lunch Act and sec. 32 funds used for cash payments for school-lunch programs.
[7] Includes $9,300,000 representing the cumulative net loss of capital subscribed to the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations which were liquidated in 1949.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation from the Production and Marketing Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, entitled "Analysis of program results from October 17, 1933, through June 30, 1953," and which was submitted at my insistence.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHEDULE 8

Analysis of program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1953 [1] *(realized gains and losses)*

Program and commodity	Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1941	July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1946	Fiscal year ended June 30— 1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1953
Price support program: [1]										
Basic commodities:										
Corn	[2]$20,078,488	[2] $14,336,569	$278,492	[2] $27,030	[2] $66,187	[2]$17,189,119	[2] $748,839	$1,783,916	[2]$20,526,523	[2] $70,910,347
Cotton	[2] 27,401,798	218,328,306	46,536,525	[2] 344,914	[2] 1,023,816	3,419,604	28,938,218	148,924	[2] 381,572	308,219,477
Cotton, Puerto Rican		[2] 126,011	[2] 4,187							[2] 130,198
Cotton, export differential [3]		[2] 27,651,360	[2]13,735,415	26,557						[2] 41,361,218
Cotton, rubber barter		11,055,451								11,055,451
Peanuts			727,481	[2] 2,757,330	[2] 23,794,910	[2] 40,592,601	[2] 14,584,537	[2] 8,670,873	[2] 2,975,881	[2] 92,648,951
Rice				1,786	[2] 1,293,780	53,071	57,271	[2] 277,861		[2] 1,459,513
Tobacco	[2] 2,107,589	7,074,300	7,437	59,800	115,524	195,495	71,450	[2] 1,014,923	[2] 2,759,676	1,641,818
Wheat	[2] 6,199,460	[2] 11,775,173	605,569	[2] 11,727	[2] 3,740,046	[2] 28,384,123	[2] 19,013,932	[2] 7,722,262	[2] 18,886,206	[2] 95,127,450
Total	[2] 55,787,335	182,568,944	34,415,902	[2] 3,055,644	[2] 28,307,649	[2] 83,844,524	[2] 5,284,869	[2]15,417,947	[2] 45,807,809	[2] 20,720,931
Designated nonbasic commodities:										
Milk and butterfat:										
Butter						[2] 4,111,861	[2] 44,216,443	41,571	[2] 456,492	[2] 48,743,225
Cheese						[2] 1,031,078	[2] 24,040,464	31,405	14,708	[2] 25,025,429
Milk, dried			[2] 12,487	[2] 415,987	149,335	[2] 14,619,145	[2] 42,707,736	[2] 1,183,459	[2] 4,795,735	[2] 62,756,242
Honey				[2] 404,056	[2] 470,414		[2] 1,499	107	4,924	[2] 870,938
Potatoes, Irish [4]		[2] 25,197,222	[2]62,920,977	[2] 47,405,542	[2]203,886,603	[2] 75,090,315	[2] 63,437,281	[2] 85,459	[2] 73,658	[2] 478,097,057
Tung oil				[2] 4,747	[2] 306,844	30	233,811	[2] 1,154	[2] 451	[2] 79,355
Wool	[2] 176	[2] 15,834,163	[2]33,484,669	[2]19,501,357	[2] 12,707,148	[2] 10,755,942	142,596	[2] 86,610	[2] 15,200	[2] 92,242,759
Total	[2] 176	[2] 41,031,385	[2]96,418,133	[2]66,899,715	[2]217,221,674	[2]105,608,311	[2]174,027,018	[2] 1,283,599	[2] 5,324,994	[2] 707,815,005
Other nonbasic commodities:										
Barley		[2] 40,019	50,550	275	[2] 672,499	[2] 2,608,939	[2] 1,700,903	[2] 2,807,078	[2] 2,195,112	[2] 10,063,725
Beans, dry edible		[2] 179,753	155	10	3,988	[2] 880,329	[2] 11,746,232	[2]15,429,183	[2] 6,777,410	[2] 35,008,754
Castor beans		[2] 171,224		31						[2] 171,193
Cotton, American-Egyptian		[2] 538,573	37,023	6,577	[2] 2		14,338	175,206	294,665	[2] 10,746
Cottonseed and products						[2] 597,728	5,506,631	2,686,612	7,701,799	15,297,314
Eggs [5]		[2] 224,002	[2]11,532,784	[2]25,879,017	[2] 773,476	[2] 41,622,784	[2] 76,055,947	[2]29,368,028	[2] 4,256,139	[2] 189,712,177
Flax fiber			6,100	[2] 179,352	[2] 155,842	[2] 67,464	[2] 55			[2] 397,113
Flaxseed and linseed oil		[2] 22,209	2,727	40,293	1,163,915	[2] 3,765,056	[2] 57,520,995	[2] 4,683,190	[2] 1,422,997	[2] 66,207,512
Fruit, dried		[2] 109,489		[2]15,563,385	445,757	290,337	46,315	[2] 855		[2] 14,882,320
Grain sorghum		437,456	10,141	[2] 18	[2] 3,500,174	[2] 10,514,934	[2] 22,644,854	31,638	874,126	[2] 35,396,319
Grapefruit juice				[2] 1,732,374						[2] 1,732,374
Hemp and hemp fiber		[2] 20,201,375	[2] 1,257,169	[2] 7,702	8,946	[2] 98	21	[2] 1,778		[2] 21,459,155
Hops	[2] 162,036	[2] 792,164								[2] 954,200
Naval stores	[2] 4,435,579	5,997,861	[2] 460	[2] 107,063	[2] 420,567	[2] 449,795	[2] 1,974,111	3,876	30,253	[2] 1,355,585
Oats			3,056	287	[2] 45,714	[2] 413,295	15,238	[2] 738,889	[2] 194,938	[2] 1,374,255
Olive oil									[2] 170	[2] 170
Peas, dry, edible		[2] 3,012	648		140	[2] 658,800	[2] 227,726	[2] 655	[2] 31	[2] 889,436
Pecans		[2] 3,751								[2] 3,751
Rye	[2] 4,575	60,751	14,932		[2] 2,186	[2] 223,210	[2] 34,759	18,509	7,947	[2] 162,501
Seeds		[2] 148,193	18,660	[2] 13,731	[2] 364,337	[2] 74,026	295,452	[2] 537,879	[2] 4,050,655	[2] 4,874,760
Soybeans			2,741,090	4,987	26,054	1,754,200	[2] 139,442	1,574	[2] 24,805	4,363,576
Sugar, Puerto Rican and Virgin Island				23,830						23,830
Sugar beets				[2]11,859,187	[2] 4,658,082					[2] 16,517,269
Sweetpotatoes			95	[2] 138,181	1,965	1,453	[2] 773			[2] 135,421
Turkeys				[2] 3,708	[2] 495	44,458	[2] 29,185			11,070
Vegetables, canned		[2] 6,888	12,631	6,281	[2] 82					11,942
Total	[2] 4,602,190	[2] 15,944,584	[2] 9,892,605	[2]55,401,647	[2] 9,032,671	[2]59,777,004	[2]166,286,667	[2]50,650,030	[2] 10,013,555	[2] 381,600,953
Total price support	[2] 60,389,701	125,592,975	[2]71,894,836	[2]125,357,006	[2]254,761,994	[2]249,229,839	[2]345,598,554	[2]67,351,576	[2] 61,146,358	[2]1,110,136,889
Supply program: [1] [6]										
Cotton and linters		1,592,551	24,865	245,904	12,879					1,876,199
Grains and seeds		23,969,000	23,792,977	19,094,280	4,548,038	2,981,607	722,558	437,204	405,837	75,951,501
Oils (bulk)		29,937	67,620	107,442	291,296	365,692	42,136	6,020	9,194	917,337
Tobacco		4,179,335	588,749							4,768,084
General commodities purchase [7]			176,701,759	11,127,062	[2] 342,973	[2] 1,246,411	[2] 1,551,484	[2] 195,564	1,314,667	185,807,656
Processed and packaged commodities [8]			26,438,161	10,517,533	1,092,093	752,611	118,459	162,193	23,559	39,104,609
Sugar, Puerto Rican raw						37,157	[2] 567		9,439	46,029
Other		[2] 3,120,517	[2] 420,893	494,691	[2] 368,475	[2] 2,041	3,185			[2] 4,414,050
Total supply program		26,650,306	227,193,238	41,587,512	5,232,858	2,886,615	[2] 665,713	409,853	1,762,696	305,057,365
Foreign purchase program: [9]										
Cotton		5,439,464	457,029	[2] 758			2,617	2,617		5,895,735
Fats and oils		22,543,441	17,955,560	[2] 1,491,644	[2] 53,306	1,524	[2] 37,417	[2] 2,550		38,915,608
Foodstuffs		4,620,232	2,441,131	[2] 1,555,187	102,305	47,482	17,755	9,770	[2] 2,616	5,680,872
Other		[2] 274,627	18,102	3,089			24,318	53,378		[2] 175,740
Total foreign purchase		32,328,510	20,871,822	[2] 3,044,500	48,999	49,006	7,273	57,981	[2] 2,616	50,316,475
Commodity export program:										
Cotton [10]		[2] 7,098,694	[2] 5,490,500	[2] 8,120	60,632	1,753	[2] 3,729	1,494		[2] 12,537,164
Wheat		[2] 1,209,445	[2] 618							[2] 1,210,063
Total commodity export		[2] 8,308,139	[2] 5,491,118	[2] 8,120	60,632	1,753	[2] 3,729	1,494		[2] 13,747,227

[1] Allocation of losses and gains as between "Price support program" and "Supply program" for the period prior to the fiscal year 1947 was made on the basis of an analysis completed in April 1949. Since accounting records maintained prior to July 1, 1946, did not provide for this segregation, it was necessary to analyze program results in detail and in some cases make an estimate of the distribution between "Price support" and "Supply" of the total operating result as shown by the accounting records. This analysis was based on all known factors concerning the operations with respect to each commodity.

[2] Denotes loss.

[3] Includes export differential on owned or pooled cotton only. Differential on exporters' cotton included under "commodity export program."

[4] Includes price support loss of $2,829,639 on the 1943 and 1944 potato programs, which was formerly included under the general commodities purchase program.

[5] Includes price support loss of $11,956,386 on the 1944 egg program, which was formerly included under the general commodities purchase program.

[6] Portion of overall supply and foreign purchase program effective July 1, 1952.

[7] Includes gain of $178,697,602 carried as "Special reserve—general commodities purchase program" as of June 30, 1946, and transferred to income in May 1947. Also see footnotes 4 and 5.

[8] During the period July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1949, activity under this program was reported as general supply program.

[9] Insofar as possible, operating results have been retroactively classified to correspond with current budgetary programs. In some instances, the accounts maintained prior to July 1, 1946, did not make possible a precise segregation of the results of foreign procurement operations.

[10] Includes export differential on exporters' cotton only.

SCHEDULE 8

Analysis of program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1953 (realized gains and losses)—Continued

Program and commodity	Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1941	July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1946	Fiscal year ended June 30—							Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1953
			1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	
Storage facilities program		[2] $10,087,436	$721,069	[2] $133,209	[2] $438,460	[2] $91,959	[2] $498,980	[2] $1,628,947	$121,488	[2] $12,086,436
Accounts and notes receivable (chargeoffs)		11,134	[2] 556,732	[2] 106,602	[2] 138,717	[2] 86,113	[2] 454,137	[2] 196,247	[2] 253,082	[2] 1,781,006
Total (excluding wartime consumer subsidy costs)[11]	[2] $60,389,701	166,187,348[1]	70,843,443[1]	87,061,925[2]	249,996,082[2]	246,470,537[2]	347,213,840	[2] 68,707,442	[2] 59,518,472	[2] 782,327,808
Wartime consumer subsidy program [12]		[2] 2,130,581,589	22,364,160	4,025,128	2,235,782	[2] 113,351	[2] 238,372	260,423	74,623	[2] 2,101,987,196
Grand total	[2] 60,389,701	[2] 1,964,394,241	193,207,603	[2] 83,036,797	[2] 247,760,300	[2] 246,583,888	[2] 347,472,212	[2] 68,441,019	[2] 59,443,849	[2] 2,884,315,004

[2] Denotes loss.

[11] Includes losses totaling $56,239,432 on price-support commodities disposed of in accordance with Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Cong., i. e., transferred to foreign assistance outlets at a price equal to price of a quantity of wheat having equivalent caloric value. The Corporation was reimbursed for these losses by the Secretary of the Treasury.

[12] Subsidy losses on corn for alcohol, wheat for alcohol, and wheat for feed are included on an estimated basis. For detail of subsidy costs by commodities by fiscal years, see Report of Financial Condition and Operation as of June 30, 1949.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not correct to say that the 90 percent price-support program did not apply to the early years of the price support, but came into being only after we were in World War II and as a war measure?

Mr. ELLENDER. As a war measure the support level was increased; the support price was increased, for example, in the case of cotton, to 95 percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. From 75 percent, was it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. So it had been 75 percent up to the time we became involved in World War II?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. And that is also true with respect to the other basics, is it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. As to them the 90-percent support program came into being during the emergency, under the sponsorship of Representative Steagall, of Alabama and Senator Bankhead, also of Alabama. The program was made to apply to certain nonbasics in a mandatory form.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is correct to say, is it not, that prior to World War II the program applied only to basics and that the rate of support was very much lower than that which was written in during the war?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The fact that there were no heavy losses sustained in the early days is in no sense a defense of the 90 percent price-support structure now, is it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am wondering what the losses would have been to the American people were it not for the fact that there were large supplies of these commodities on hand when war broke out. The Senator well knows that prior to World War II and prior to the conflict in Korea, had there not been large surpluses on hand there is no telling what it would have cost the consuming public to obtain precious food and fiber.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask this question: Is it not a fact that the very heavy losses now being sustained, particularly as to wheat and corn, on the 90-percent price-support basis, are something new, and which could not have occurred either under the old program prior to the war or during the war when there was, of course, need for all the food we could produce?

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator talks about enormous losses, let me say that I thought I had pointed out that the greatest loss during the entire period on all six basics was only $20,720,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit one more question, I think he will have to recognize the fact, will he not, that the pending measure to restore over $700 million of capital to the Commodity Credit Corporation due to its losses is because of losses sustained in 1953 alone, and that the major part of the losses was sustained in the field of wheat and corn?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. As was pointed out, it was due to the heavy inventories. As the Senator knows, we have now on hand some corn which has been in storage since 1948.

Mr. HOLLAND. It went into storage under a 90-percent program, did it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That corn could have been sold at a profit 2 years ago, but it was not sold. It was considered advisable then not to deplete our reserve stocks of food, for no one knew what the future would bring.

I want to go back to the losses prior to 1953. The Senator asked about them, and I have the information before me.

The loss on the program from October 17, 1933, to June 30, 1941, which is about the time the Senator has mentioned, was $55,787,355.

The losses sustained on corn at that time amounted to $20 million plus; on cotton, $27 million plus; on tobacco, $2 million plus; on wheat, $6 million plus.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator knows, of course, that after we were in the war and there was an increased need, those losses were written off, because the surpluses on hand were used in pursuance of the obtaining of war supplies.

Mr. ELLENDER. The statement does not show that. It shows the entire losses as against the gains, and it is well indicated on the chart which I have just inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator know that more than $200 million profit was gained by the Government from the sale of cotton which had been taken over during prewar years and which was in surplus and which found an immediate demand when we got into the war?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. It took World War II to prevent what would have been a disastrous surplus under the small support-price program which made 75 percent the normal basis of support.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Florida is correct. But can he imagine what would have happened to our war effort, to our economy, to our people, if there had not been a surplus on hand of cotton, corn, and other commodities when war broke out in 1941, and in 1950 when the Korean conflict began?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the reason for the surplus was because there were no American exports. We could not export any cotton from New Orleans or any wheat down the St. Lawrence River, because of the tieup in shipping. If World War II had not occurred, there would have been a normal amount of exports, and the situation would not have been so bad as my good friend from Florida thinks it might have been, because we were exporting 5 million bales of cotton and millions of bushels of wheat before the war.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there is something else we should not forget. Only 2 years ago, after the Korean war started, the cry was, "Food will win the peace. Produce all you can." That was what the administration told the farmers, and the farmers responded—they proceeded to plant and to produce enormous amounts. If it had not been for the war, there is no question but that the law on the statute books could have been put into effect by reducing the acreage in wheat and reducing the acreage in cotton and in other commodities, and I am satisfied that the program for cotton, wheat, and other basics could have been made to respond in the same manner as it did with respect to tobacco. If our administrators, our planners, had not pressed the American farmer, if they had not kept telling him that vast stocks of these commodities would be needed, I feel certain we would not be faced with burdensome surpluses today.

Mr. President, to me the strange thing about the President's recommendations and Mr. Benson's recommendations is that they want to continue the tobacco program. Why? Because it lost no money, they say that program worked well. Why did it work well? Because the farmers who produced tobacco agreed to limit their production to meet the demand. I say the same thing could have occurred with respect to other basics.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. At this time I shall not go into the reason why the tobacco support price is on a vastly sounder basis than in the cases of other commodities.

I could not more thoroughly agree with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] in his statement that we are all happy that there was a surplus of cotton on hand when we got into World War II. The point of my remarks, which I wish to call especially to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, is that that surplus was created under a 75 percent price-support program. What I objected to, and what I think the Nation must realistically come to grips with, is the fact that the artificial 90 percent rigid price-support structure which was enacted as a war measure, and necessarily and properly so, has no place in the present picture. It is simply bringing destruction to the very cause it is trying to serve, because it is piling up huge surpluses which, under the bill now being considered, are shown to have sustained tremendous losses, simply from deterioration, during the fiscal year 1953.

The whole point of my remarks was that the support-price program as now set is a wartime program, but is being continued in time of peace.

I wish to address one more question to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. Does the Senator know of any other war program that was initiated during World War II, and I am thinking of price controls, wage controls, rent control, limitation of shipments, quota programs, and the like—does the distinguished Senator know of any other program, affecting any other large groups of citizens in our Nation, and enacted as a war measure, which is still in force and is being insisted upon as a continued part of the peacetime economy?

Mr. ELLENDER. Those programs no longer are necessary. But I say this to the Senator from Florida: World War II and the years since have brought us increased wages, increased living costs, increased everything. Only in the price of food has the increase been slowed. It is possible today, for example, for a worker to buy more food per wage hour, than was possible 15 years ago. So the Senator's proposition boils down to putting the skids under the farmer while the other workers keep reaping increased wages. It would mean that price supports would be lowered while the minimum wage remains at 75 cents an hour, and believe me when I say that I have no bone to pick with the American worker. However, the theory advanced by the Senator from Florida boils down to reducing price supports for agricultural products to pre-World War II levels, while prices, wages, all the farmers' costs—remain at levels much higher than those prevailing before World War II, during World War II, or immediately after World War II.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from Florida understands that farmers are still paying wartime prices and more for the things he has to buy. Everything farmers have to buy is at an all-time high. There has not been a scintilla of evidence presented to prove the flexible price supports—75–90—will do any more to solve the problem of surpluses than 90-percent price supports.

I may add that in 1950 wheat farmers and cotton farmers wished to curtail their production. They had voted for quotas. But because of war needs, the quotas were again abandoned, and the farmers were asked to increase their production. Only last year the Department of Agriculture, which is now crying about the surplus of corn, asked the farmers to increase their corn production for last year. It simply does not make sense.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Green	McCarran
Beall	Griswold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bridges	Hill	Morse
Burke	Hoey	Mundt
Bush	Holland	Murray
Butler, Md.	Ives	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Jackson	Payne
Byrd	Jenner	Potter
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Purtell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Thye
Eastland	Langer	Upton
Ellender	Lehman	Watkins
Ferguson	Long	Welker
Fulbright	Magnuson	Williams
George	Malone	Young
Gillette	Mansfield	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). A quorum is present.

ATTITUDE OF SENATOR MORSE REGARDING AGREEMENT TO VOTE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 358

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say now, because I have to leave the city to make a speech elsewhere tonight, that I have entered into an agreement with the majority leader that if he should ask for a unanimous-consent agreement to consider and vote on the joint resolution proposing to discharge the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation on Monday, the Senator from Oregon would consider it one of the rare exceptions to his policy of not agreeing to unanimous-consent requests. I think it is only right that I make this statement at this time.

The measure happens to be of a minor nature, but it is an emergency measure which calls for the immediate attention of the Senate and does not call for any considerable debate. I desire to make it very clear that I shall not, as a matter of policy, agree to any unanimous-consent request to vote on any matter which I consider to be of major importance. As I said good naturedly a day or two ago, but very truthfully, perhaps 7 out of 10 times when there is a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on a certain issue on a certain day, time is lost rather than saved. A few days ago I objected to a unanimous-consent request to vote on the St. Lawrence seaway matter when it was suggested that a vote be taken on a Monday or even on a Tuesday, and my objection resulted in the Senate saving from 3 to 4 days' time, because the vote was taken on the next evening instead of some 3 or 4 days later.

Furthermore, Mr. President, because I have been subjected to some criticism with reference to my policy, let me say that agreements to set a certain time at which to vote are one of the great causes of inefficiency in the Senate. When an agreement is entered into to vote on a certain date, not a corporal's guard remains on the floor during the intervening days. Senators are attending to other matters. The place to decide major issues before the Senate is on the floor of the Senate, and not off the floor. The people of the Nation sent us here to deliberate in this parliamentary body and to be on the floor of the Senate when issues are before the Senate. My vote has been changed a great many times on the floor of the Senate by evidence, information, and argument presented on the floor during debate.

Whether or not any Member of the Senate likes it makes no difference to the junior Senator from Oregon. I think I know what the purpose of debate in the Senate should be, under the

historic development of our Government, and I intend, as a general policy, with reference to any major issue in the Senate, to agree to vote when we have finished debate and not until we have finished debate. If it is shown to me that there is an exceptional situation which warrants a modification of that policy, the representative of the Independent Party will not hesitate to modify it.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that House Joint Resolution 358 is an emergency measure, minor in nature, and, as I have said, my policy is not in any way jeopardized by making an exception in this instance, and I shall make an exception in this instance.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I am going to propound a request unanimous-consent agreement relative to the Commodity Credit Corporation measure which was before the Senate a short time ago. However, before doing so, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, in order that Senators may be advised of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and ask that it be read, for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That beginning at 1 o'clock p. m. on Monday, February 1, 1954, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation be limited to not exceeding 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. BRIDGES: *Provided*, That if Mr. BRIDGES is in favor of any such amendment or motion the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of said joint resolution shall be received.

Ordered further, That upon the question of the final passage of the joint resolution, debate shall be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. WILLIAMS, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say, for the information of the Senate, that I have discussed this matter with the minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], with the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and with various other Senators who have been interested in the subject matter. I have also discussed the proposed agreement with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I understand that subsequent to my discussion with him, and while I was absent from the Chamber, he indicated he would have no objection, because of the emergency nature of the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly willing to go along with the unanimous-consent agreement. I suggested it earlier this afternoon, because I have no desire to delay the Senate's action on the joint resolution.

I thought it proper that action on the measure be deferred until we had a chance to study it and to obtain a breakdown of what was requested. Now that has happened, so I have no objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. If no amendments are to be submitted, I believe that 2 hours' time on the joint resolution will be a little short. If a series of amendments are submitted, I would not worry about the length of time to be provided.

Earlier today, after the prior discussion, I telephoned the Department again, to make inquiry regarding what happened the last time there was a replacement of capital, because of impairment. It was on June 30, 1952; and the total capital impairment at that time was $96 million. I asked them how it jumped in 1 year to $609 million, when the inventory was less than $2 billion. They are trying to put together some figures. I think the matter is worthy of complete discussion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator from New Mexico prefer to have 3 hours provided?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall not object if the majority leader prefers to have the allowance remain at 2 hours, because I am not trying to hold up the proposed agreement. However, I should like to have the majority leader propose that 3 hours be allowed, if that will be agreeable to him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now modify the proposed unanimous-consent agreement so as to provide that upon the question of the final passage of the joint resolution debate shall be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, to be fully divided and controlled in the way previously proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request, as modified, of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as entered, is as follows:

Ordered, That, beginning at 1 o'clock p. m. on Monday, February 1, 1954, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. BRIDGES: *Provided*, That if Mr. BRIDGES is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of said joint resolution shall be received.

Ordered further, That upon the question of the final passage of the joint resolution, debate shall be limited to not exceeding 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. WILLIAMS, respectively.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until noon, on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION ON MONDAY OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets on Monday, the unfinished business, the so-called Bricker amendment, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 358, Calendar 889, to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY N. K. CARNES BEFORE AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on January 14, Mr. N. K. Carnes, president of the Central Cooperative Livestock Marketing Association of St. Paul, Minn., delivered a very excellent address before the National Cattlemen's Association at Colorado Springs, Colo. I believe this address would require a little more than 2 pages of the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Carnes' address be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Hyatt, members of the American National Cattlemen's Association, ladies and gentlemen, I sincerely appreciate, the very generous introduction that has been accorded me this morning, by my good friend, and your capable, efficient, hardworking, and courageous president, Sam Hyatt. I assure you, that I am not unmindful of the special privilege that has been extended to me, through the invitation to appear on an annual meeting program of your great association, representing a very high percentage of the cattle producers and growers of America.

It would seem to be a waste of time, at this point on your program, for me to attempt to outline to you people, the numerous accomplishments of your splendid organization over a period of years, but in passing, I wish to congratulate your officers, directors, management, and members on the most excellent service that it has rendered, not only to the livestock and meat industry of this country, but to our entire economy, during the 57 years of its existence.

During the past several years, it has been my privilege and pleasure to meet, and work with many of the leaders of your association, including Sam Hyatt, Jay Taylor, Albert Mitchell, Frank Boice, L. M. Peyton, A. D. Brownfield, Joe Montague, William Wright, Loren Baemert, Ray Willowby, Jack Roach, F. E. Mollin, Radford Hall, and many others. It is definitely my opinion, that these men have always worked diligently, tirelessly, honestly, and courageously, for what they considered to be the best interests of your association, and the cattlemen of this country in general. You are, indeed, fortunate, ladies and gentlemen, to have men of this type actively interested in the affairs of your association.

When I informed a close friend of mine a few days ago, that I had accepted the kind invitation extended by your able executive-secretray, Mr. F. E. Mollin, to appear on your speaking program, to discuss the subject assigned (and not selected by me), he suggested that I proceed with my presentation in about the same manner as a porcupine makes love. Of course, I asked him how a porcupine makes love, and he answered, "cautiously."

I informed my adviser, that I considered the leaders of the American National Cattlemen's Association my very good friends and coworkers, and that I welcomed an opportunity to speak frankly and openly to this representative group of sound-thinking farm and ranch people, concerning some of the present-day problems of the livestock and meat industry, and the possible sound and practical solutions of them. I should like to make clear at this time, that it is not my desire or intention to make (and I will not make) a prejudicial, biased, or partisan talk on the subject assigned, and that I come before you today only as an American citizen, with an agricultural background, who is primarily interested in the livestock and meat industry of this country, and the general welfare of our Nation.

If we are to carefully and properly analyze the present-day situation in the livestock and meat industry, we must briefly review some of the developments of the past. I am certain that everyone in attendance here today fully realizes that during the 4 or 5 years prior to 1952, cattle production in the United States was stimulated by a rise in the general level of all prices, by a rise in the cattle price cycle, and by favorable weather and growing conditions, that resulted in the production of an abundance of feed. Quick and handsome profits, occasioned by comparatively high prices, encouraged the in-and-outers, the inexperienced operators, and the speculators, to enter the cattle production and marketing business in large numbers. It was appropriately said by Prof. Don Paarlberg, formerly of Purdue University, and now an adviser in the United States Department of Agriculture, that about all one needed to be a successful cattleman during those lush years, was a "western hat and a line of credit."

The Office of Price Stabilization, with its unworkable rules and regulations, including ceilings, rollbacks, and compulsory grading, interfered with the orderly marketing and merchandising of meat, and caused many producers to hold their livestock, including breeding stock, off the markets of this country. On January 1, 1953, cattle on the farms and ranches of the United States had reached the record number of 93,700,000 head, with what appeared to be about 2 more years to go in the upward trend of a normal cattle-production cycle, with 98 to 99 million cattle a possibility by 1955 or 1956. In 4 years, the cattle population increased 22 percent, from the 77 million head on the farms and ranches in 1949. As a result of these several developments, that materially increased cattle numbers, cattle prices traveled downward quite rapidly for a period extending over 2 years. The average prices received by farmers and ranchers for all grades of cattle in April 1951 were at an all-time record high of $30.30 per hundredweight. By December 15, 1953, the average price had declined to $14.80 per hundredweight. This represents a price decline of 51 percent. I should like to point out, in fairness to all concerned, that approximately 67 percent of this decline in cattle prices occurred prior to January 1, 1953.

The result of this drastic price decline, without an accompanying drop in production costs, has been tremendous financial losses for a large number of cattle producers and feeders. Definitely, they have been the victims of a vicious price-cost squeeze. While the prices of live cattle were declining, the prices paid by farmers and ranchers for the things that they found it necessary to buy to carry on their operations were steady, or higher.

I should like to point out that this drastic slump in cattle prices did not occur as a result of general recession, or depression conditions. It occurred during a period of record employment and extremely high consumer incomes. It was simply a situation where we had produced, and were moving, too many cattle to be cleared, or marketed, at satisfactory prices for the producers with their comparatively high feed, labor, and other costs, supported to some extent by the Federal Government.

To further aggravate an already bad situation, drought conditions in the South and Southwest forced the heavy liquidation of many cattle from those areas. However, I should like to mention at this time that representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture called a meeting of the Livestock and Meat Industry Advisory Committee and asked for recommendations as to how to proceed to meet this situation. In brief, the committee recommended a program of liberal credit to the established growers, who were deserving of credit, but were unable to secure it from private or cooperative sources, a release of stored feed by the Commodity Credit Corporation at prices the eligible grower could afford to pay, lower freight rates on feed moving into the distressed areas and livestock moving out, and, finally, a Federal-State hay supply program. I am happy to report that the recommended program was readily accepted and developed by representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Federal administration. I have been informed that a high percentage of the breeding herds and foundation stock in the distressed area was saved. The deplorable and devastating drought conditions, which definitely threatened disaster to the livestock industry in the Southwest, and indirectly to the country as a whole, clearly justified in the minds of everyone the assistance given by the Federal and State Governments. I understand that some rain has come to the distressed areas of the Southwest, and that conditions in that part of the country have improved materially. I assume, however, that much moisture is still needed.

Now, let us study and attempt to soundly and practically analyze, without prejudice, some of the proposed suggestions for improvement of the present situation in the livestock and meat industry, where we have large supplies of cattle and low prices compared to a few years ago. There are some people who sincerely and honestly believe that direct Government price supports are the answer to our problem. It would seem to be inadvisable and unnecessary for me to attempt to outline to the members of the American National Cattlemen's Association the development of the well-known Government price support program that extends back through the years to the depression of the 1930's. I am certain that we will all agree that there have been times in the history of American agriculture when direct price supports for some commodities seemed to be desirable and necessary to prevent complete disaster in certain segments of the agricultural industry. However, the application of high direct supports under the congressional acts of 1938, 1948, and 1949 has been accompanied by many difficult and intricate problems. I think it is quite generally recognized that prices supported above the level which a free market would establish will stimulate production and generally create surpluses unless such a program is accompanied by restrictions on the rights to produce and sell, which is definitely contrary to our American traditions. High rigid price supports can result in pricing the supported commodities out of the domestic and foreign markets (butter, eggs, and potatoes are splendid examples) and may necessitate the raising of tariff walls to prevent supporting those commodities on the markets of the world, and this at a time when the State Departments of two different Federal administrations, representing different political faiths, have thought it advisable and desirable to encourage foreign trade rather than direct dollar aid.

The leaders in the livestock and meat industry of this country, including your great American National Cattlemen's Association, the American Meat Institute, American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Livestock and Meat Board, the National Livestock Producers Association, Central Livestock Association, and many others, do not believe that direct price supports should be applied to live animals because they know very well, from past experiences, that they are not practical and will not work. Such a program would necessitate a different support price for each class and grade of cattle. There are many classes and grades, and each grade represents different values, which fluctuate seasonally and by areas. If such a program were attempted, who would do the grading? Direct price supports on cattle would require a tremendous army of Government employees to administer, and where could the thousands of trained men be found? The program would necessitate large appropriations by the Congress of the United States of the taxpayers' money. The farmers and ranchers would be placed in a position where they would be dependent upon Government appropriations for a fair return on their cattle. The level of price supports would have to be changed constantly to avoid market gluts and famines. Direct price supports on live cattle would tend to become the ceiling price rather than a floor, just as it did when applied to hogs. There would be very little incentive for the grower and feeder to attempt to improve the quality and grade of cattle.

Direct price supports on cattle would ultimately lead to Government control and regimentation of the entire cattle industry, and would undoubtedly be another step toward complete socialization of American agriculture. It is an economic impossibility, ladies and gentlemen, to have supports without controls. Although careful studies have been made by several governmental agencies and many individuals, both inside and outside of Government, no practical or satisfactory plan for direct price supports of live animals has been devised, offered, or suggested. A plan of direct price supports was applied to hogs during and following World War II without success. Markets were badly disrupted as a result of that program.

During the winter of 1951–52 and the spring of 1952, the hog producers of this country found themselves in a rather difficult and serious situation because hog numbers were in large supply and corn prices at a comparatively high level. The hog receipts at 8 of the large Midwest market centers during February 1952 were 42 percent greater than in February 1951, and the March receipts were approximately one-fourth greater than the same month in the preceding year. With No. 3 yellow corn selling at $1.82 per bushel on the Chicago mar-

ket, and barrows and gilts at an average price of $17.49 per hundredweight, the corn-hog price ratio was 9.6 to 1. This situation made it impossible for even the most efficient hog producers to operate at a profit. Some political-minded individuals of both major political parties advocated Government price supports for hogs at 90 percent of parity to relieve the unsatisfactory situation. In place of accepting the suggestions of the political price fixers, the hog producers voluntarily cut the 1952 spring pig farrow 9 percent and the fall pig crop 11 percent when compared to the year 1951. The results from this procedure were most gratifying to all directly concerned. Despite increased beef supplies and substantially lower prices for beef, hog prices advanced from 76 percent of parity in April 1952 to approximately 113 percent of parity at the present time.

If the hog producers of this country had yielded to the temptation of Government price supports on live hogs, the size of the 1952 spring and fall pig crops undoubtedly would have been maintained at the 1951 level, or increased, and the prices for hogs in 1953 would have been substantially lower, and at unprofitable levels. The continued high production of hogs, accompanied by lower pork prices, would have had an adverse effect on cattle and beef prices in 1953. It was, indeed, fortunate for the cattlemen of this country, that the hog producers did not accept a Government price-support program in 1952. Also, it was fortunate for the regular hog producers that many of the in-and-outers, marginal producers, and inexperienced operators in their field of activity discontinued business. Fortunately, a large majority of cattle producers, fully realize the threat to their future incomes and their freedoms, that price supports on live cattle would engender. The situation in the hog business in the winter of 1951–52 and the spring of 1952 should serve to remind the cattlemen of their own situation today. I am certain that their final decision on suggested Government price supports is, and always will be similar to the one made by the hog producers in 1951–52.

Livestock men generally, possess the opinion that direct price supports of live animals will create new problems, that will far overshadow those which now confront their industry. They sincerely believe that their problems can best be solved in a free market. They have opposed price ceilings, slaughter quotas, compulsory Federal grading, price supports, subsidies, and other Government regulations in the past, and have supported wholeheartedly self-help programs. I am certain that they fully realize, that our generation has for solution, problems more complex than have faced any preceding generations, and that our responsibilities are correspondingly great. If we meet these problems courageously, yet with understanding—with faith in our Republic and the traditions of the past, with a willingness to return to habits, industry, and hardihood of preceding generations, that never knew the meaning of ease and indolence, with a willingness to rely on ourselves and not admit dependence on any governmental agency for help, except in real emergency, then the future will be ours and we cannot fail.

Livestock producers and feeders in the United States today, are experiencing difficulties in developing a sound and practical production program, because the prices of some feed grains and concentrates are being supported by the Government, through loans and purchases, at levels that appear too high to be profitably fed to livestock. However, there are some livestock men who sincerely and honestly believe that direct Government supports on feed grains, will tend to decrease livestock production and feeding, with beneficial results to those staying in the business year after year. We should constantly bear in mind, that when the price of any commodity is supported by the Federal Government, the prices of other commodities, and other segments of our society, are certain to be disrupted.

The livestock and meat men, representing all important segments of the industry, connected with the production, marketing processing, and distribution of meat, have expended a tremendous amount of time, effort, and money to increase the consumption of meat and thereby supply effective indirect price supports in lieu of unworkable direct supports for the livestock and meat industry. The success attained can best be shown by a direct quote from a recent issue of Cow Business, published by your splendid organization, the American National Cattlemen's Association. I think it effectively tells the whole story, and I wish to quote: "The beef-promotion program is now in full swing with retailers, both chain and independent packers, livestock associations, and other groups pushing the sale of beef. Indications of the results of this campaign are seen in the reports of those merchandising beef; beef sales since the first of January 1953, have increased more than one-third compared with a year ago. There have been large increases also in the sale of veal.

"Samples of promotional material are coming to the office from all sides—pamphlets, releases, newspaper clippings of advertisements, beef stickers, posters, circulars of various kinds from all segments of the industry, including the United States Department of Agriculture, Western State Meat Packers Association, American Meat Institute, National Livestock and Meat Board, National Association of Food Chains, National Association of Retail Grocers, Cow Bell organizations, State cattle associations, and county and regional groups." This statement clearly portrays what the composite segments of a great industry, with confidence in their own ability, and faith in the future, can accomplish by working together.

Cattle slaughtered at federally inspected plants during 1953 increase 30 percent over 1952. Due to lighter slaughter weights, beef tonnage increased 27 percent. Largely as a result of the cooperative effort on the part of all segments of the industry, beef consumption increased from 61 pounds per capita in 1952 to 75 pounds for every man, woman, and child in this country in 1953. This rate of consumption is 2 pounds above the record of 73 pounds established in 1909. The total amount of beef that was consumed by the people of this country during 1953 is estimated to be around 12½ billion pounds, or 2½ billion pounds more than in 1952, and 2½ billion pounds more than in 1947, the record consumption year up to that time. We are now succeeding in our efforts to eat our way out of the beef problem. In this process we are not creating burdensome surpluses to be held in storage at Government expense, and as a threat to future markets as is the case with some other commodities.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, as you know, is capitalized at $100 million, is authorized to borrow $6,750,000,000 from the United States Treasury to cover loans on, and purchases of agricultural commodities. With only the basic agricultural commodities, and a few additional commodities, including dairy products, now directly supported by the Federal Government, the present administration finds itself in a position where it is forced to ask for the authority to raise the borrowing limit by $2 billion. I should like to ask the question, Can our American economy endure and prosper, and at the same time maintain and expand a program of this type? I am certain that you know the answer.

We in the industry are fighting to increase meat consumption and prevent substitutes from taking over at the consumer level. Increased consumption now is building good will and customers for the future.

The annual per capita consumption of all meat in this country has averaged around 145 pounds for the past 10 years, with a yearly high of 153 pounds. We have demonstrated our ability to produce in excess of 25 billion pounds per year. It is well known to all of you that over a period of many years the consumers of this country have spent from 5½ to 6½ percent of their disposable income for meat. This figure has remained almost constant in the absence of wars. The livestock men are, therefore, greatly interested in consumer income and welfare, and believe that the consumers can be induced to spend a higher percentage of their disposable income for meat, if they are told over and over again how nutritious, how delicious, and how inexpensive it really is compared to other foods. It is the responsibility of the representatives of the livestock and meat industry to do a more effective selling and merchandising job in the future than has been done in the past. We must move more meat into consumptive channels at a price the consumer thinks he can afford to pay. In other words, we must convince the consumer of the superiority of meat over other foods, and that meat is not expensive comparatively. This sales program is a challenge to the industry that must be met.

In furthering our self-help program, the housewife must be taught that beef and quality cuts are not synonymous. The housewives, with tremendous purchasing power behind them, are buying the expensive steaks and roasts, while the less desirable cuts have become a drag on the market and must be sold at a discount.

The elimination of mandatory Federal grading, shortly after the first of last year, has tended to improve this situation to some extent. The retailers are now in a position to sell a product under a trade name rather than a Government grade. In addition, representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture and the livestock and meat industry arranged for the armed services to purchase more beef and for a broadening of the school lunch and other institutional outlets during 1953. The Office of Foreign Operations Administration, in recent months, procured through the United States Department of Agriculture over 25 million pounds of meat products for export to foreign countries, including Greece and Germany. It seems ridiculous and inexcusable for this country to supply American dollars to foreign countries and permit them to use those dollars to buy food in countries other than the United States at a time when it appears that this country has an immediate surplus problem.

When it became generally apparent late in June of last year, that lower grades of cattle, including many old cows, were to be marketed last fall, the plans of the United States Department of Agriculture to purchase beef for canned beef and gravy, utility grade carcasses, and hamburger were greatly expanded. The general results of this buying program have been quite helpful, as shown by a recent report from the United States Department of Agriculture, which clearly portrays contracts for beef purchases that were made from March 26 to December 24, 1953. This beef represents approximately 865,000 head of the lower grades of cattle, which had been directed from the normal trade channels. The Government contracts were placed and scattered to bring the strongest demand into play during the months of October, November, and early December. These orders have provided an outlet for approximately one-half of the canner and cutter beef produced in federally inspected establishments during the period from October 1 to December 15. The orders have aggregated around 250 million pounds of beef. This demand has strengthened the market and maintained and improved the price level despite liberal receipts of cows and recent holidays that have disrupted killing operations.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in answer to questions raised by producers and consumers concerning costs and spreads in the industry, last September ordered the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to make an investigation of margins in the livestock and meat industry from the farmer-producer to the ultimate consumer. The prices paid by consumers represent the aggregate of many service costs, including those of the grower, the transportation agencies, the feeder, the market man, the processor, the laborer, the wholesaler, and the retailer. The Bureau found no evidence of widespread above-normal profitmaking by cattle and beef processors and distributors in the past 2 years. This investigation should convince all of us in the industry that economical and efficient methods must be practiced in the production, marketing, processing, and distribution of meat.

Recognizing this to be a fact, the Federal Government is working with the land-grant colleges of this country on many research projects. The grassland project that is being carried on by the University of Minnesota, working with various business interests, is definitely a step toward a realization of more efficient methods of production.

I predict that the producers of livestock in the Corn Belt, and elsewhere, will find that they can lower their production costs materially by making greater use of grass and forage crops in their production programs. I am certain that producers realize that they must pay more attention to consumer demand in the future than they have in the past. This is evidenced by their development of the meat-type hog that supplies the type of chops, bacon, ham, and roasts most desired by the consumers, as evidenced by their willingness to pay more for them than for cuts from a strictly fat hog. This statement can be supported by the results of research projects carried on at the University of Missouri and elsewhere.

The farmers of this country are also making real progress in producing more efficient types of cattle and sheep, although much work in this field still remains to be done.

Undoubtedly, transportation agencies, processors, retailers, and other groups can improve materially in their efficiency and thereby cut production costs. A research program for agriculture is a very important procedure and must be encouraged. The Federal and State Governments, supplementing the work of the agricultural people, are spending in research, to determine new uses for agricultural products, only one-ninth as much per unit of income as industry. These expenditures must be increased. The research findings must be taken to the people in understandable form, if the desired results are to be attained. I am happy to be able to report that much progress has been made in this field of activity during the past year.

Without desiring to appear overly optimistic, I should like to suggest that it now appears that we have passed through the worst phase of the adjustment period in the livestock and meat industry and that the future appears some brighter. In recent months there has been a noticeable improvement in practically all cattle prices.

The movement of stocker and feeder cattle into the 9 Corn Belt States for which records are available, from July to December 1953, was 21 percent smaller than a year ago. This fact, accompanied by a rise in the price of slaughter cattle, has encouraged and stimulated the regular cattle feeder, as indicated by the present improved demand for stockers and feeders. Cattle and calf slaughter for 1953 totaled about 36 million head, which is roughly equal to the number of calves raised, minus the death losses.

Therefore, contrary to early predictions for 2 or more years of increased production of cattle, it now appears that the top of the cattle production cycle has been reached. The continued large slaughter, and more price stability for cattle, is definitely in prospect for 1954. This cutback in cattle numbers represents tremendous progress toward solving our problem.

I should like to emphasize that the present storage stocks of meat and meat products appear to be in small volume when compared to last year: beef, —11 percent; pork, —17 percent; lamb, —28 percent, with an overall decline of 13 percent.

Another bullish factor is that on January 8, 1954, there was still a total civilian employment in this country of 60,800,000 with only 1,900,000 unemployed. Despite the recent declines, these figures portray almost complete employment. In average years, unemployment will be around 3 million. If people are gainfully employed, they will continue to buy meat. Our population is now increasing at the rate of around 2.7 million a year, or around 7,400 per day. It has been predicted that by 1960 we will have around 175 million meat-eating people living within the confines of the United States.

This is the type of support needed by the livestock industry.

General economic conditions in this country appear to be fairly satisfactory. At the present time our economy seems to be drifting, but the trend is slightly downward. It is the composite opinion of many of our leading economists that this country will experience a mild recession during 1954, with possible improvement in late 1955 or early 1956. There are few facts in today's records to support pessimistic projections. It is true that we are experiencing some cutback in the production for defense, but this is not of great magnitude. Steel production has declined slightly, due primarily to a cutback in demand for automobiles, machinery, and appliances. Leaving out the recent holiday period, when steel production was down to 64 percent of capacity, the industry is still producing at 80–85 percent of capacity, despite the facts that some companies are closed for repairs, and others are experiencing labor difficulties. Benjamin Fairless, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., is optimistic for continued high steel production in 1954. He estimated, just a short time ago, that production for 1954 will equal 91 percent of the annual production capacity, which has increased to 122 million tons. There has been a slight decline in the construction business, which may continue well into 1954. I single out steel production and construction for special mention, because for many years they have quite accurately supplied the indexes of general trends.

I am sorry to be obliged to say, that I find it rather difficult, and almost impossible, today, to draw a hard and fast line between economics and politics. I feel it very difficult to square sound economics. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that the year 1954 is definitely a political year, and those in positions of responsibility and authority in Government will undoubtedly put forth every effort possible to prevent a serious setback in our economy at this time.

In developing an agricultural program now, and for the future, let us not forget that it was the spirit of initiative and enterprise that built America and that typifies America today—the go-ahead spirit that permeates the vast majority of our farmers, our laborers, and our businessmen, and that will steadfastly continue to refuse to accept the doctrine of defeatism. In the light of this spirit, and of its fruits during the past 175 years, we should continue our progress in the future. Political parties and partisans may come and go, but the American system of initiative and enterprise, backed by the might of achievement, and the right of service to mankind, should push onward in spite of all obstacles. We must carefully guard against the numerous proposals for the Government operation of our natural resources, or Government control of industry, labor, and agriculture. We in the livestock industry must continually employ sound economic principles, and constantly bear in mind the best interests of the country as a whole. We must realize that the Government of the United States is the people of this country, and that it cannot subsidize and support individual segments of our society, except by the use of funds it collects from its citizens in the form of taxes. We must realize, and continually bear in mind, that the Government has as its primary functions those of defense, the preservation of law and order, and the regulation of industry and trade. If these duties are conscientiously and harmoniously performed, there will be little occasion for complaint about the misuse of concentrated power and wrongful business and labor practices. We must not ask, or permit, the Federal Government to do for us the things that we can do for ourselves. If we do so, we are asking for a controlled and regimented society and the loss of a free America. Let those of us engaged in the livestock and meat industry of this country think constructively, soundly, and independently. If this is done, I am certain that our generalizations, conclusions, and actions will be sound and right, and that we will enjoy prosperity and happiness in a free America.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me at this time?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have asked the Senator from Tennessee to yield to me, so that I may clarify the record.

Mr. President, toward the end of the session yesterday, just before the recess was taken, I asked the Senator from Tennessee a question. I do not believe he thoroughly understood it. Furthermore, in my answer to him, regarding a question he asked me, in return I am afraid I confounded the confusion. So I feel that at this time the record should be clarified.

Therefore, Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will permit me to do so, I shall begin all over again and ask my question anew.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for that purpose to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think I asked the Senator from Tennessee whether the Warsaw Convention, which is a treaty ratified by the Senate, and now effective, militates against United States citizens, insofar as their right to trial by jury is concerned. I think I stated the case yesterday somewhat along the following line: That if in the city of San Francisco the Senator from Tennessee and I boarded an airplane which was going on an international flight and I held an international ticket,

but the Senator from Tennessee held a local ticket, inasmuch as he was only going to New York; and if the plane crashed almost immediately after the takeoff, just outside the city of San Francisco, was it not a fact that insofar as my dependents would be concerned, they could recover only $8,300, whereas the dependents of the Senator from Tennessee could recover any amount a United States jury, impaneled for the purpose, saw fit to award?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the Senator from Maryland that since our colloquy of yesterday, I have examined the treaty which commonly is referred to as the Warsaw Convention. The conclusion the Senator from Maryland reaches is, I think, substantially correct—with this explanation: I believe that in some States there is a limitation upon the amount which anyone may recover for damages suffered as the result of an airplane accident.

However, assuming there were no such limitation, one could recover as much as a jury allowed, whereas the other would be limited to a certain amount, by the Warsaw Convention. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think that is a vital point. In my opinion, it shows conclusively that we have already, by treaty, cut across the right of the American people to a full jury trial in the event of accident or death in a case such as that stated. For the information of the Senate I should like to read into the RECORD from the hearings, on page 139, the following:

It now transpires that this treaty—

That is, the Warsaw Convention—

deprives American citizens of their full and proper right to trial by jury. In the fine-print provisions of the Warsaw Convention there is a provision limiting the tort liability of air carriers for personal injuries or death of passengers in aircraft disasters to the sum not of American money but of 125,000 francs.

The witness, who was Mr. Frank Holman, a past president of the American Bar Association, cited this example, which I think it would be helpful to read into the RECORD:

The opposition says that we have not been hurt. Senator Smith—

I think he was referring to our late colleague, the dearly beloved Willis Smith of North Carolina—

Senator Smith might come out to visit me in Seattle. I have invited him. I think he has been there once. And we could take transportation on a United Airlines plane which is going from Seattle to Vancouver, but I am going to get off at Bellingham. The plane might go down in Mount Vernon. But he has an international ticket. That is on the same plane, the same accident. His widow is limited to 125,000 francs when she sues, but my widow can get something more. Maybe the jury might think I was worth $9,500. That is what the Warsaw Convention is.

I say that if that is the result of the Warsaw Convention, that is a clear-cut case of a treaty, already ratified by the Senate, which very definitely cuts across the rights of the individual within his own State. Senators have been asking for an example. That is one, and I have no doubt there may be others.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I say, I think the Senator has properly interpreted the provisions of the Warsaw Convention. The Senator was trying to give one example of what might be termed a bad treaty. The Warsaw Convention, which was approved by the Senate in 1934, is the example which the Senator from Maryland has given. However, I believe that upon a thorough examination of the Warsaw Convention the Senate today would certainly sustain the judgment of the Senate back in 1934 that it is a good treaty. In any event, there is a provision in the convention whereby, upon 6 months' notice, the convention may be terminated. I do not believe that the Senator from Maryland, or any other Senator, after considering the rights which American citizens and American airlines gain under the convention, would want to exercise the option provided in the convention itself, to terminate it upon 6 months' notice.

Yesterday I called the State Department and asked the Department to send me a memorandum as to just what was accomplished by the Warsaw Convention. I have received a letter from Mr. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, which I should like to read at this time:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 29, 1954.

The Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: In response to your inquiry, there is enclosed a copy of the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rights Relating to International Transportation by Air, which was signed at Warsaw on October 12, 1929, and which is commonly referred to as the "Warsaw Convention."

The convention was approved by voice vote of the Senate on June 15, 1934, and the United States instrument of adherence thereto was deposited at Warsaw on July 31, 1934. The convention came into force for the United States in accordance with article 38 of the convention on October 29, 1934, on which date the President proclaimed it. It has been ratified or adhered to by 40 states throughout the world.

The convention establishes regulations relating to the liability of air carriers engaged in international transportation by hire with respect to the injury or death of persons, or damage or loss of property carried on board the aircraft. Since the contract is important in establishing the rights of the parties, the convention contains specific provisions relating to the passenger ticket, the baggage check, and the air waybill governing the transportation. The carrier is liable if the death or injury of the passenger or damage to goods occurred in the course of the international transportation. However, the carrier can escape liability if he proves the defenses set forth in the convention. On the contrary, if willful misconduct is shown, the limits of liability contained in the convention are not available to the carrier.

The convention provides for a limitation of liability of the carrier to a sum of 125,000 francs liability for passengers and 250 francs per kilogram of baggage or goods carried. These sums are expressed in a French franc consisting of 65½ milligrams of gold at the standard of fineness of nine hundred one-thousandths. Converted into United States currency in round figures 125,000 francs equal $8,300. In recent years the Warsaw Convention has been criticized in the United States because the $8,300 limit now contained in the convention does not appear adequate to recompense a passenger who has been severely injured or to provide for damages in the event of the death of the passenger, particularly in view of the fact that injury or death benefits in the United States frequently far exceed $8,300.

In considering the Warsaw Convention, it should be borne in mind the conflicting interests of United States citizens with regard to it. There is on the one hand the interest of the United States citizen who as a passenger on board the aircraft would be interested in obtaining adequate compensation in case of liability of the carrier. There is on the other hand the interest of the United States carriers and insurers of carriers who will be subjected to payments of liability in accordance with the provisions of the convention. In all cases covered by the convention, the operation of the carrier will be international and therefore claims against the carrier will in many cases result in action for liability being brought in foreign countries.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Planes fly over the various States of the United States. It is certainly possible to attach a plane when it lands. I do not see any validity to the point which the Senator makes. An execution could be levied on the plane. Where would it go? It would have to stay right there. I think the argument advanced is not sound.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is therefore desired that the limited liability should represent an equitable compromise between the desires of the passenger for high limits and the desires of the carrier for low limits.

By establishing the terms of the liability of the air carrier as well as the limits of that liability, the convention has created a basis for settlement of the majority of claims without litigation thus enabling prompt disposition of claims to be made and saving both the claimant and the carrier the expense of court action. The limitation of liability has provided an indication of the insurance necessary to meet possible claims for compensation, thus assuring the potential claimant that the carrier will be able to meet any obligation that may arise and enabling the carrier to protect itself against the possible financial disaster that might follow an accident not covered by insurance. The convention is therefore of benefit to United States air carriers operating in international services and so constitutes an economic benefit to the United States.

It is apparent that the limitation which may prevent one claimant from obtaining the full compensation for injury suffered, which might be allowable under the laws of the States of the United States, has on the other hand enabled others to obtain quick compensation without litigation. Likewise the strict liability provisions which prevent the carrier from escaping liability as it might well do in a suit brought against it in a court in a State of the United States are balanced by the fact that the liability is limited to a known sum for which insurance may be obtained. It is also important to note that the convention establishes a uniform system which enables citizens of one contracting country making claims in another contracting country to obtain redress up to the limits provided for in the convention even though the limits of liability of

the country where the claim was made might otherwise be lower than the limits established in the convention. On the other hand, carriers of one contracting country need not fear excessive verdicts in other contracting countries though in the absence of a convention there might be a tendency to penalize a carrier from another country when either the carrier or the country was considered to be rich. It may also be noted that the limits of liability contained in the convention are higher than the limits of liability applied in many countries in the absence of the convention and that therefore when United States citizens, or other persons having claims as a result of air transportation, seek compensation in such countries they are benefited by the limits contained in the convention.

In summary, the convention assures United States international air carriers of a uniform liability which is insurable and minimizes the possibility of large verdicts in foreign courts which might desire to penalize the rich American carrier. The American traveling public benefits from the convention by assurance of a specified liability for injury or death suffered on a United States or foreign carrier. This assurance is particularly valuable in cases where the limits of liability contained in the convention are higher than the limits of liability under local law where a foreign carrier might have to be sued in a jurisdiction where law damages are normal.

Notwithstanding the fact that the countries parties to the convention have considered that it forms a desirable balance of advantages and disadvantages for the carriers, passengers, consignors, and consignees, it has been recognized that some revision is desirable. For some time the legal committee of the International Civil Aviation Organization has been studying possible amendment of the convention, including the limits of liability. It is not possible to foresee to what extent an increase in the limits of liability would be widely accepted by countries now parties to the Warsaw Convention. In the event such a revision is formulated, the agreement amending the convention would, of course, be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the situation with respect to the Warsaw Convention is that American citizens and American carriers gain some benefit in other nations. There is a provision as to the amount of compensation to Americans if they are injured in some other country; otherwise, they might not get anything. There also is a limit to liability.

Most of the planes flying under the Warsaw Convention are American planes, so this treaty is a great protection to American airlines against excessive judgments or liabilities which might be imposed upon them in other nations.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me finish.

Somewhere, of course, there must be a distinction between an international flight and a domestic flight. When a passenger starts on an international flight, with a ticket to a foreign nation, he is covered by this agreement. He might be a passenger on the same plane, but destined to a place inside the United States, in which case he would not be on an international flight, and would not be covered under the terms of the Warsaw Convention. Balancing one side against the other, the benefits against any possible harm or limitations that might be placed upon American citizens, the Senate in 1934 felt that it was a good treaty. I do not understand that the Senator from Maryland feels that the treaty is not worth while. He is critical of some provisions of the treaty; but, taking the treaty as a whole, I have not heard him say he would like to see it abrogated.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I cited the Warsaw Convention for only one purpose. The Senator from Tennessee said that he would like to see submitted befor the Senate one case in which through a treaty the rights of the American people have been violated. This is that case.

Let us talk about the treaty. The treaty is like all other international agreements that have come to affect the daily lives of the people of America. There are 160 million people in this country. We make a treaty such as that with a country that has about 15 or 20 million people. They will have perhaps 1,000 people riding in airplanes while we will have 10,000. The balance is all against us. It is a bad treaty for America, and we all know it. That fact, however, has no bearing on the question.

It is not very much satisfaction to the widow of a man who has been a big producer of income to get $8,300.

I do not believe the subject is of any concern to the Federal Government. I believe a State should have the right to deal with such cases through a jury impaneled within the State, in which the accident occurred, and thus establish the damages resulting from an airplane accident.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the viewpoint of the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I still say that the Warsaw Convention is not an example. I do not know of any case which can be cited to show that the domestic rights of any person have been violated by a treaty. The Warsaw Convention is not such an example.

When dealing with international airplane transportation, it is of course, necessary to have some kind of agreements with other nations. When a citizen of this country buys an international transportation ticket, he places himself under the terms of the convention, and he is then being transported under the terms of the treaty, not under the laws of his State. The contract is not made in his State; it is made under the terms of the Warsaw Convention. Therefore, in a matter dealing with foreign affairs, I do not believe such an agreement violates the rights of a citizen of any State.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not agree with the Senator that it is a matter of foreign affairs. If I get into an airplane in the United States and start off on a flight in this country and the plane crashes in the United States and kills me, my widow has a right to be protected by the laws of the United States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then, of course, the Senator from Maryland takes a view about the importance of international aviation different from that of most other Senators.

I believe 40 nations have adhered to the convention. Perhaps many more have done so by this time. Therefore, among the nations of the world it is generally felt that international aviation is properly a subject of treaty between the nations.

In any event, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator to article 39 of the convention, particularly subsection 2, which reads:

> Denunciation shall take effect 6 months after the notification of denunciation, and shall operate only as regards the party which shall have proceeded to denunciation.

Therefore, Mr. President, at any time the United States wishes to withdraw from the convention and go it alone, and not have a treaty with reference to signal systems, the use of airports, and other provisions covered in the treaty, which are all very helpful to international aviation, all that the United States has to do is to give 6 months' notice, and the country is no longer a party to the treaty.

I would say that if the United States Government were to follow the advice of the Senator from Maryland I am sure we would hear a great protest from private citizens, who stand a chance of losing by such a withdrawal. We would certainly hear a great deal of criticism from the airplane companies of the United States, who transport most of the people in international aviation and who are protected in many ways by the convention.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator has made a great many self-serving declarations, but there is no proof in the record about it. The Warsaw convention is much more favorable to foreign nations than it is to America, and I think the time has come for us to start to think a little bit about the people of America.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not believe that the Warsaw convention operates any more favorably to foreign countries than it does to America. I believe we have come out very well under the treaty. If at any time we feel it is more favorable to some other nation than to the United States, all we have to do is give 6 months' notice and withdraw. I do not believe the Senator has ever recommended to the State Department—until perhaps today—that we should withdraw. I submit that anyone who reads the treaty will learn that instead of its being disadvantageous to the United States it is very helpful to our citizens who travel in international commerce, and to the American companies who operate in international commerce. It is of great benefit to operate under the rules and regulations prescribed in the convention.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. With all due respect to the Senator from Ten-

nessee, whether a treaty is a good treaty or a bad treaty is not the question we are discussing. The question is whether the United States has a right to make a treaty which cuts across the right of individual citizens in the respective States to a full and fair jury trial. That was the only purpose for citing the Warsaw Convention. I believe the Warsaw Convention is complete authority for what I cited it.

The Senator from Tennessee can talk all he wants about the benefits to this person or that person, but such talk begs the question. The question is a constitutional one. The question is, Does the United States of America have the right to barter away the rights of a citizen of the respective States by an international agreement? I say it does not. The Senator says it does.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the Senator's own conclusion. I say the treaty does not barter away the rights of our citizens. A citizen who buys a ticket in international commerce agrees to the provisions contained in the treaty. It is the same as when a man buys a ticket on a railroad. The ticket is subject to certain conditions set forth in laws pertaining to the operation of railroads, and those conditions are automatically a part of the ticket contract.

Therefore it is not a breach of the rights of any citizen under any State law.

In order that the readers of the RECORD may judge for themselves whether the treaty is a good treaty, I ask unanimous consent that the Warsaw Convention be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the colloquy with the Senator from Maryland has been very interesting because the question arose yesterday, in discussion with him, as to whether any 1 treaty, among the more than 900 treaties which have been entered into between the United States and foreign nations, was a bad treaty or violated the rights of any citizen of the United States.

The Senator from Maryland and I have a different attitude as to what this particular treaty may do. He believes it does violate the domestic rights of American citizens, or might do so. I believe it does not.

In any event, Mr. President, even if the Senator should be right about it, it is only 1 out of more than 900 such treaties, and I submit that that is a pretty good record. Even if the Senator should be right, all that this Nation has to do to withdraw from the treaty is to give 6 months notice, and at the end of 6 months the United States is no longer a member of the Warsaw Convention.

Mr. President, yesterday, just before the Senate took its recess, I was undertaking to show the type of treaties which I felt should not be entered into if the "which" clause, the second part of the proposed Bricker amendment, were made a part of the Constitution. There are a number of traditional types of treaties which deal with subjects which do not fall within the delegated powers of Congress.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] stated on the floor yesterday that he would move to strike out the "which" clause from the committee text if any Member of the Senate could produce one example of a desirable treaty which Congress could not implement by reason of the "which" clause.

I am endeavoring to show a number of treaties which most constitutional lawyers, and, certainly, the Supreme Court, have many times said did not come within the power which has been delegated by the States to the Federal Government and, therefore, would be impossible of execution and enforcement under the "which" clause of the Bricker amendment.

I spoke yesterday about extradition treaties, of which there are more than 80. I referred to Charles Cheney Hyde's authoritative book on international law, and in the citation which I placed in the RECORD the subject is discussed. Several cases decided by the Supreme Court are referred to which hold that there is no right of extradition except by treaty; that the right to hold a person in a State for a violation of the law of that State is a State matter, and that the Federal Government cannot extradite a citizen from a State in the absence of a treaty.

The cases cited, which seem to be directly in point, are *Valentine* v. *U. S. ex rel. Neidecker* (229 U. S.) and *Factor* v. *Laubenheimer* (290 U. S.).

Mr. President, without treaties, extradition does not take place. If the "which" clause of section 2 of the Bricker amendment were adopted, the conclusion of adequate treaties would, at the very least, be very difficult to achieve; there is good reason to believe that they could not be concluded at all, because we would have no quid pro quo to offer the other country.

So, I think, Mr. President, that extradition treaties, which are so necessary, and which are a customary part of international agreements, are of the kind of treaties that could not be accomplished under the "which" clause.

An even more important treaty is a narcotics treaty. Narcotics treaties are another good example. It has been discovered over a long period of time that if the international traffic in narcotics is to be effectively dealt with there must be control of the source of the narcotics, that is, of the production of the narcotics.

I have heard the head of the Bureau of Narcotics testify many times as to the very great progress now being made in international control of the production of narcotics through the United Nations and through treaties. He has also stated that there is really no way of preventing a larger traffic in narcotics to this country except through the operation of such treaties.

Probably the most well known of all narcotics is opium. As we all know, opium is made from poppies. To control the traffic in opium we must control the growing of poppies in all countries where they can be grown in quantity.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but does he mean to tell us that under the general welfare clause, with reference to protecting the health of the people of America, and under the commerce clause, which affects all commerce between the States and foreign nations, Congress cannot legislate on the subject of opium and other narcotics?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is unbelievable.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is my opinion that the growing of poppies—and poppies are grown to some extent in the State of Maryland—is a local matter over which the State has control. The Federal Government has jurisdiction only when it can be exercised through a treaty. I do not think we can stretch the commerce clause to include the growing of poppies. Furthermore, if the arguments of the Senator from Maryland and of the Senator from Ohio are valid, that such matters can be taken care of by stretching the commerce clause, or by stretching the immigration provision of the Constitution, then I do not see why Senators desire to bother with the "which" clause in any event, if it is proposed to achieve some of the objectives under other provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not think it is at all necessary to stretch any of the clauses. There is adequate authority in the Constitution of the United States, granted to Congress by the first article, to do everything in the field of narcotics by statute that can be done by treaty.

Mr. KEFAUVER. All I can say is that although the Senator from Maryland may have that opinion, the General Counsel of the Narcotics Division, who is charged with the enforcement of the law, Mr. Tuttle, testified at great length before the committee, and pointed out in language which I think is much more convincing than is the Senator's, that that is not the case. For instance, at page 1015, he said:

> If the amendment proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 1 were adopted, the executive department of Government would be unable, in practice, to negotiate for effective international agreement to control the narcotic traffic because it could not be reasonably sure that, in assuming what it considered to be necessary obligations involving national control measures, it was not impairing a right enumerated in the Constitution.

He continued with his statement at great length.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. Tuttle naturally would make such a statement. There had been several witnesses ahead of Mr. Tuttle, all of them constitutional lawyers, every one of whom said

there was ample authority under the Constitution of the United States to do exactly what had been done by a treaty.

To me, it is unthinkable that our Government could not control traffic in narcotics. If we can not do that, I do not know how we can preserve the health and welfare of our people. If it is necessary to negotiate a treaty in order to do that, then our Constitution is deficient in the first place.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The weight of the opinion in cases and references set forth in the hearings is to the effect that there could not be a treaty to control narcotics if the Bricker amendment were adopted. But assuming there is some doubt about it, and even assuming the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is correct, that under the general welfare clause or under the commerce clause, control might be given over what is grown in a State, why take the chance? Why does the Senator want to put any impediment in the way of the operation of the treaty clause of the Constitution, which either may or may not prevent the Government from exercising control over narcotics? We know that under the treatymaking clause as it now stands, there can be treaties affecting this very vital matter. If the Bricker amendment is adopted, we may be able to have them or we may not be able to have them. My opinion is that we could not have them. The Senator from Maryland believes we could have them. But I still ask, Why take that chance?

None of the so-called producing countries can be omitted if the control is to be effective. Many of these countries are in the Middle East. But one such country is the United States. We must control poppy growing in the United States, as well as in Turkey, Iran, and China. But how would this be done if the Bricker amendment were adopted? We could conclude a treaty to regulate the growing of poppies only if Congress could pass the implementing legislation, and Congress could pass such implementing legislation only if it could find some delegated power under which to do so. What delegated power does Congress possess that would give it the right to tell a citizen of California that he may not grow poppies? I know of no such power. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] claims he knows of some such power.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If the Senator from Tennessee will take the trouble to read the hearings, he will find plenty of authority for the proposition stated by the Senator from Maryland. I have not found one witness who has taken the position the Senator from Tennessee is now taking.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the Senator from Maryland that I have read the statements of most of the witnesses who appeared at the hearings. I have read the views of some outstanding persons, but I do not know of anyone who is better qualified to discuss the question than is the general counsel of the Narcotics Bureau himself. I have also heard Mr. Anslinger either testify or state that this type of treaty could not be entered into if a provision like the "which" clause were adopted.

If it is contended that Congress would have power under the interstate commerce clause, this would be a result the exact opposite of that which is intended by the Bricker amendment supporters. It would amount to a great stretching of the commerce clause from its present bounds. In other words, we are on the horns of this dilemma, if we adopt the "which" clause: Either we could not enter into treaties for the effective control of international traffic in narcotics, or, if we did so, it would have to be through a great stretching of the commerce clause, at the grave expense of States' rights. If we want to control such things as narcotics, we should do so under the present treaty power, and not force ourselves to do it through the back door of expanded delegated powers, because once stretched for treaty purposes, the delegated powers of Congress would be stretched for all purposes, a result which must be especially abhorrent to the sponsors of the Bricker amendment themselves.

Mr. President, another example of a series of treaties which would be made much more difficult of negotiation, if possible at all, is the whole series of friendship, commerce, and navigation treaties. We have such treaties with about 35 countries at present. They represent the basic structure of reciprocal rights of citizens of one country in another country. They regulate a whole series of activities which, for domestic purposes, fall within the jurisdiction of the States. I have here a list of a number of such treaties.

One is a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation with Israel; another treaty is with Germany. We have similar treaties with Ethiopia, Japan, and Finland. They are very important international agreements.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator from Tennessee believe the commerce clause could be stretched any further than it already has been stretched? Has not the Supreme Court held that a man who lives in Baltimore City, for instance, and who happens to wash the windows of a building in which goods are manufactured for interstate commerce, is engaged in interstate commerce?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the Senator that I am surprised that he should want to have the commerce clause stretched any further.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not desire to have it stretched any further. But does the Senator believe it could be stretched any further without breaking it wide open? I think it has been stretched as far as it can be stretched.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the "which" clause of the Bricker amendment should be adopted, the only way the treaty power could cover a great many things which all of us wish to have covered would be by stretching, completely beyond any reason, the commerce clause of the Constitution. I agree with the Senator from Maryland that the commerce clause already has been strtched as far as it should be. I am somewhat surprised to find that the Senator from Maryland, and others, who do not like the fact that it has been stretched as far as it has been, are now advocating that, in order to enable the United States to enter into necessary treaties, the commerce clause ought to be stretched to cover activities to which it was never intended it should apply.

I do not believe the commerce clause should be stretched to such a point that the Government could tell the Senator from Maryland what he could grow in his State.

Mr. President, I was speaking about treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation. They cover the inheritance of property. As is known, many countries discriminate against aliens regarding the right to inherit property.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more? Then I shall leave the Chamber.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I want the Senator from Maryland to remain in the Chamber.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No. If the Senator will yield once more, I desire to read a statement from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 20.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I very happily yield to the Senator, if he will agree to stay a little longer.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I wish to quote a statement by Dr. Finch, whose testimony appears at page 1143 of the committee hearings.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Dr. Finch is the only real international lawyer I know of who is supporting the Bricker amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to hear the Senator from Tennessee say that Dr. Finch is a real international lawyer, because I think he is probably "tops" among international lawyers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The main point I make is that he is the only real international lawyer I know of who is supporting the Bricker amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I quote Dr. Finch's testimony:

> I took the trouble to look up that law last year when that same argument was made and again we have statements made by objecting witnesses who have not looked up the law. It was just made from their own emotional feelings in the matter without any basis of law.
>
> An examination of the act of 1942 for the domestic control of production and distribution of the opium poppy, discloses that the purpose of the act was stated to be not only to discharge the international obligations of the United States under the narcotic treaties, but to "promote the public health and the general welfare, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in opium poppies, and to safeguard the revenue derived from taxation of opium and opium products."
>
> From that recitation of the act itself of the powers of Congress, it is perfectly obvious that it did not rest those powers solely on the treatymaking power.

If the Senator will read the list of those powers, every one of which is enumerated in the Constitution, he will

see that the Congress has ample authority to deal with the opium trade and with all narcotics, and that a treaty is not needed to enable Congress to deal with such matters.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Professor Finch is the only international lawyer of whom I know who believes that all worthwhile objectives such as the control of narcotics by treaty, treaties of friendship and commerce, treaties of extradition, and treaties relating to quite a number of other matters, which we all admit must be the subject matters of treaties, can be accomplished through some delegated right in the Constitution, either by virtue of the commerce clause or by virtue of the jurisdiction of Congress over immigration. Professor Finch holds such opinion in the teeth of the decisions of the Supreme Court and despite contrary opinions of a number of other eminent international lawyers. Why does Professor Finch and why do others desire to stretch the commerce clause to cover matters which the clause was never intended to cover?

The second point I desire to make is that even if everybody desires to have such treaties made—and we all recognize that they are necessary—why not let them be made as they have always been made, as a part of the treaty-making power, without having to bring about such results in an indirect way?

Mr. President, as I have shown, under the provisions of the "which" clause of the Bricker amendment it would be impossible to enter into treaties on friendship, commerce, and navigation such as the United States has entered into with other nations, and which are very important and necessary in the conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs.

As I have said, some of these treaties cover the subject of the inheritance of property. Many nations discriminate against aliens in connection with the right to inherit property. Suppose a citizen of the State of Tennessee should be left some property by a citizen of France, and he wanted to inherit the property in France, but under French law it would not be possible for an alien to inherit property in that country. Suppose further that under Tennessee law it would not be possible for an alien to inherit property in Tennessee. The United States Government would then make a treaty with France which would enable the citizens of Tennessee to inherit property in France, but, of course, the French Government would insist upon its citizens having the same right in the State of Tennessee.

That is the type of treaty which today has been entered into with practically every nation in the world which we recognize diplomatically.

Under the Bricker amendment, Congress would be unable to pass the requisite implementing legislation, because the question of inheritance of property is one which is strictly reserved to the States, and Congress has no delegated power in this field whatsoever.

This is just one example of a huge number that I could cite in the field of commerce and navigation treaties.

There was an excellent article in last Sunday's New York Times on this subject. It was writtend by Mr. Cabell Phillips. Mr. Phillips describes in some detail the provisions of the commerce and navigation treaty with Israel that would be made impossible of achievement under the "which" clause. He illustrates very well the point that I am trying to make here. I recommend it to anyone who has any doubt as to how seriously our treaty relations would be impaired by the "which" clause.

A few days ago Mr. Arthur Krock, in the October 16 issue of the New York Times, documented the treaties which were entered into or approved by the Senate during the last session of Congress, and pointed out 12 treaties which would not be possible under the "which" clause of the Bricker amendment.

Mr. President, I have before me the treaty of commerce and navigation with Israel. I think it is well to call attention to the fact that this treaty covers all sorts of things. It covers the right to bury their dead according to religious customs, and in suitable and convenient places. It covers the right of citizens of Israel who are aliens in the various States to engage in arbitration of disputes. It covers the right to come under compulsory insurance plans, the right to own stock, and to be incorporators in the various States, the right to dispose of property, and many other subject matters with respect to which it would be impossible to enter into treaties under the Bricker amendment.

Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]—and I wish he were present to discuss the subject at this time—said that he felt that the treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation would be possible under certain delegation provisions or clauses in the Constitution, and that it was not necessary to have the treaty clause in order to make desirable treaties such as the treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation to which I have referred. He based his argument upon the decision of the Supreme Court of 1948 in the case of *Takahashi* v. *Fish and Game Commission* (334 U. S. 410). He contends that that case proves conclusively that Congress has plenary power over the rights and privileges of aliens within the United States; that that power stems from the power delegated to Congress over immigration and naturalization, and that Congress, and not the States, has the power to determine the conditions upon which aliens are permitted to reside in the United States and earn their living.

I have the Takahashi case before me. In my opinion, and in the opinion of many who have written on the subject, it does not sustain the proposition for which it was cited by the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Yesterday the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] said that he would move to strike the "which" clause from the committee text if any Member of the Senate could produce one example of a desirable treaty which Congress should be able to implement but which Congress could not implement by reason of the "which" clause. Later in the presentation of my objections to the Bricker amendment as a whole, I can and will show a whole series of desirable treaties which would be ruled out under the "which" clause.

However, I am not at all interested in having him strike out the "which" clause alone, because I think that the whole of the proposed amendment is harmful. The "which" clause is just one objectionable feature of it. What I am interested in showing is the very flimsy nature of the legal basis of the whole structure which underlies the case which is made for constitutional amendment.

A little later I shall show how all sorts of treaties will be outlawed under the "which" clause. For example, I will show how it will be impossible to conclude effective extradition treaties and treaties for the control of the international trade in narcotics. In regard to most of these, I imagine that Senator BRICKER and his supporters will claim that there is some delegated power which will cover these various types of treaties. I must say, however, that he interprets the delegated powers of Congress, as they presently exist, as being infinitely broader in scope than they are as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States and almost all constitutional lawyers. Although the senior Senator from Ohio claims to be fighting for States rights, he seems to be giving most of them away in advance.

Yesterday he challenged any one of us to show a desirable treaty the provisions of which could be put into effect by the Congress in the absence of the treaty. Just prior to making this challenge, he illustrated his contention concerning the innocence of the "which" clause by referring to treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation. I would like to read one paragraph from his address as mimeographed for the press:

> The most frequent argument advanced in opposition to the "which" clause is that it would prevent the Congress from making effective in all of the 48 States the provisions found in the typical treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation. In my speech on the Senate floor on January 22, I pointed out that Congress has plenary power over the rights and privileges of aliens in the United States. Under the "which" clause, Congress could implement all treaties dealing with the property rights, commercial rights, fishing rights, and taxation of aliens. The decision of the Supreme Court in 1948 in *Takahashi* v. *Fish and Game Commission* (334 U. S. 410) proves conclusively that Congress has plenary power over the rights and privileges of aliens within the United States. That power stems from the power delegated to Congress over immigration and naturalization. Congress, and not the States, has the power to determine the conditions upon which aliens are permitted to reside in the United States and earn their living.

I wonder if the Senator from Ohio has any other authority than the case cited, the Takahashi case, for his contention that the Federal Government, in the absence of treaty, has the delegated powers necessary to implement all of the provisions of a typical treaty of friendship,

commerce, and navigation. The reason that I ask this question is that the Takahashi case does not substantiate the proposition for which he cites it. The case might be some authority—but rather weak authority—for the proposition that the Federal Government currently possesses power, in the absence of a treaty, to implement some of the provisions of a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation. It certainly provides no authority at all regarding a number of important provisions within such a treaty. As a matter of fact, it specifically denies that the Congress has such power.

Briefly, the case concerns the right of the State of California to legislate to the effect that fishing licenses will not be granted to aliens who are ineligible for citizenship. Takahashi, who was a Japanese citizen and who had been a fisherman in California for many years, was denied a commercial fishing license. On a writ of mandamus the Superior Court of California declared the law invalid and ordered the fish and game commission to issue a license to Takahashi. The case was appealed to the Supreme Court of California. With three justices dissenting, that court reversed the holding of the lower court and held the license law to be valid.

The case was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, which held that the lower court of California was right. In the first place, the case involved fishing out in the ocean, and, in the second place, it involved the right of an alien to make a living. Therefore the State of California could not deny him a license. But, Mr. President, the case does not hold—and it expressly recognizes other cases—that there are not many things which a State can prohibit an alien from doing legally within the State.

The United States Supreme Court's decision, which the Senator from Ohio is citing as authority for his contention, appears at page 410 in volume 334 of United States Reports. Only one Justice, Justice Reed, dissented from the Court's opinion which reversed the holding of the supreme court of California, that the California license law was valid.

In general, the United States Supreme Court rested its opinion on the theory that the California law was a violation of the 14th amendment of the United States Constitution. The Court said that the classification of aliens ineligible to citizenship was unreasonable and contravened the 14th amendment.

There is some language in the case about the powers of the Federal Government to control the admission, naturalization, and residence of aliens. I will read you this language:

> Under the Constitution the States are granted no such powers; they can neither add to nor take from the conditions lawfully imposed by Congress upon admission, naturalization, and residence of aliens in the United States or the several States. State laws which impose discriminatory burdens upon the entrance or residence of aliens lawfully within the United States conflict with this constitutionally derived Federal power to regulate immigration, and have accordingly been held invalid. Moreover, Congress, in the enactment of a comprehensive legislative plan for the nationwide control and regulation of immigration and naturalization, has broadly provided:
>
> "All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other." (16 Stat. 140, 144, 8 U. S. C., sec. 41, 8 U. S. C. A., sec. 41.)

This quotation shows that the Court feels that the Federal Government does have the constitutional power to make certain regulations regarding the residence of aliens. However, these regulations are narrow in scope. It also shows that aliens get the benefit of the 14th amendment.

However, the Court goes on to point out specific fields in which the States retain the right to legislate regarding aliens when there is no treaty on the subject. For example, the Court said:

> In the absence of overriding Federal treaties, this Court sustains a State law barring aliens from hunting wild game.

I continue to read from the decision:

> This leaves for consideration the argument that this law should be upheld on authority of those cases which have sustained State laws barring aliens ineligible to citizenship from land ownership. Assuming the continued validity of those cases, we think they could not in any event be controlling here. They rested solely upon the power of States to control the devolution and ownership of land within their borders, a power long exercised and supported on reasons peculiar to real property. They cannot be extended to cover this case.

In his dissenting opinion, Justice Reed points out a number of other fields in which the States, in the absence of treaties, retain the power to legislate regarding aliens.

What the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is saying is that the State of Ohio either does not possess today or is willing to give up, insofar as aliens are concerned—where there is no treaty giving the citizens of Ohio reciprocal rights abroad—its power to regulate such things as the ownership of land, incorporation of businesses, the inheritance of property, and many other subjects. I cannot escape this conclusion, since all of these subjects are contained in treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation.

I have here in my hand official copies of the eight treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation which were overwhelmingly consented to by the last session of this Senate. They contain all sorts of provisions which, in the absence of a treaty, would not fall within the delegated powers of Congress. The Senator from Ohio may be willing to give up the rights of Ohio to legislate in these fields, but as a representative of the people of the sovereign State of Tennessee I am unwilling either to give them up or to admit that, by some unknown process, they have already been given up.

The Senator from Ohio poses as the defender of States rights. But the amendment which he proposes would deny to the States many of the rights which they possess today. For example, he would deny them the right to control the devolution of property within the State. They have this right today. The Supreme Court of the United States says exactly this in the only case which the Senator from Ohio has cited for the proposition that the States have already given up their sovereign rights.

The Senator from Ohio has said that he is willing to exempt aliens from the "which" clause. This would cure some of its defects regarding treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation. However, the objections would remain in regard to many other types of treaties, such as extradition and narcotics treaties. I have gone through this rather lengthy analysis of the Takahashi case with no view to getting Senator BRICKER either to withdraw the "which" clause or to amend it. I have gone through this analysis with the purpose of clearly demonstrating the flimsy nature of the whole legal structure underlying the proposed amendment.

So, Mr. President, the Takahashi case, as stated in the opinion of the court, recognized the right of the States to control, as to aliens, the ownership and inheritance of property, and even the issuance of licenses for the purpose of hunting wild game.

The treaties of friendship and commerce have to do with a great many things which the case cited by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] himself says are still reserved to the States and which the Federal Government would have no power to reach by treaty under the "which" clause.

There are a number of types of treaties, other than those dealing with extradition, narcotics, and commerce and navigation, which would be very adversely affected if the "which" clause were to be adopted. Some would be made completely impossible. To name a few: treaties dealing with wildlife conservation, for example. A treaty such as the one involved in the case of Missouri against Holland probably could not be entered into if the "which" clause were the law. I doubt very much that the commerce clause could be stretched to cover such a situation.

There are also treaties dealing with the collection of debts and with double taxation.

These treaties are of traditional types. They are not new inventions. They are the backbones of our foreign relations and without them it would be next to impossible to get along in the world. I believe that it is the sombre realization of this fact that has led President Eisenhower to "unalterably" oppose adoption of the amendment, even at the risk of splitting the Republican Party down the middle.

It might help us to grasp the significance of the "which" clause if we examine the effect that it would have had upon our treatymaking process during a single session of Congress. Since the last session is clearest in our memories, let us examine the effects that it would have had on treaties dealt with at that session—assuming that it had been in effect at that time.

During the first session of the 83d Congress the Senate approved 23 treaties, of which 12 would have been outlawed under the "which" clause, since they dealt with subjects reserved to the States, and they had been negotiated on the basis that they would be implemented and made effective by the Federal Government. There is little hope that we would have been able to conclude these treaties at all if we could have promised, as our part of the bargain, only that we would ask the 48 State legislatures to implement them.

What were these 12 treaties?

Eight of them were the usual type of friendship, commerce, and navigation treaties. They were with Italy, Finland, Germany, Israel, Denmark, Greece, Japan, and Ethiopia. Although their terms varied, all of them dealt with subjects which do not fall within the delegated powers of Congress. For example, they deal with residence, rights of individuals to engage in business, the protection of property, and exemption from taxation.

Another of these treaties related to the status of forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Powers. This agreement deals with such things as the jurisdiction over crimes and the carrying of arms, both of which are subject to State regulation.

Another dealt with the status of international military headquarters set up pursuant to the NATO Treaty.

Yet another dealt with the rights of the holders of certain German dollar bonds.

The yeas and nays were taken in the Senate on many of these treaty ratifications. In each instance they were adopted by an overwhelming majority. Most of the so-called sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 1 voted in the affirmative on most of them. For example, on the commercial treaties, there were 86 yeas, including 55 of the 64 so-called sponsors of the Bricker amendment, and only 1 nay. On the NATO Status of Forces Treaty the vote was 72 yeas, including 45 sponsors of the Bricker amendment, to 15 nays. This would seem to show that in practice the Senate favors our treaty powers and procedures as they have traditionally existed. They would have been precluded from giving their consent to ratification to more than 50 percent of the treaties actually consented to if the Bricker amendment had been in effect. This alone should show the folly of adopting the Bricker amendment.

The principal justification given for the "which" clause in the Bricker amendment is the case of Missouri against Holland. The proponents of the amendment have held it up as a terrible aberration, as a judicial monster which threatens our very liberties. Their final and crushing damnation is the allegation that the Founding Fathers would never have approved of the holding in this case if they had lived to be a thousand. In this connection, I should like to read a few paragraphs from a letter written by Prof. Maurice H. Merrill, of Oklahoma University Law School, to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and published in the compilation prepared by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], which was issued as a committee print by the Judiciary Committee:

The proponents of this amendment either distort or are unfamiliar with American history. They argue that *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416, 64 L. Ed. 641, 40 S. Ct. 382 (1920)) was an innovation and an encroachment on State rights under our constitutional system, and that, if it had been decided in the early years of our national life would have been immediately overruled by a constitutional amendment just as *Chisholm* v. *Georgia* (2 Dall. 419, 1 L. Ed. 440 (1793)) was overruled by the 11th amendment. Actually, the record is all to the contrary. All that *Missouri* v. *Holland* did was to hold that it was legitimate exercise of the treaty power for Canada and the United States, having a common interest in preserving the birds which migrate over their territories, to agree by treaty to protect them, and that Congress had power under article I, section 8, of the Constitution (giving it power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution * * * all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof") to pass a law for enforcement of the treaty.

There was no more interference with States rights by Congress in passing the Migratory Bird Act than there would have been by the President and the Senate in putting the same provisions directly in the treaty. And that treaty provisions could set aside State law, even in areas in which Congress had no general legislative power, was decided expressly by the Supreme Court of the United States 3 times in the first 30 years under the Constitution. The cases are *Ware* v. *Hylton* (3 Dall 199, 1 L. Ed. 568 (1796) (State confiscation law superseded by treaty of peace with Great Britain, as made effective and confirmed by art. VI of the Constitution)); *Hopkirk* v. *Bell* (3 Cr. 454, 2 L. Ed. 497 (1808) (State statute of limitations superseded by treaty)); *Chirac* v. *Chirac* (2 Wheat. 259 (1817) (State law as to capacity to hold realty superseded by treaty)). *Ware* v. *Hylton* was decided only 3 years after *Chisholm* v. *Georgia* and just after the ratification of the 11th amendment. Every judge who wrote in the case expressly stated that treaties set aside conflicting State law. Judge Chase said: "The people of America have been pleased to declare that * * * laws of any of the States, contrary to a treaty, shall be disregarded." Judge Paterson said: "* * * the Congress (referring to Congress as the treatymaking power under the Articles of Confederation) could by treaty, repeal the act, and annul everything done under it." Judge Iredell said: "I consider, therefore, that when this constitution was ratified, the case as to the treaty in question stood upon the same footing, as if every act constituting an impediment to a creditor's recovery had been expressly repealed, and any further act passed, which the public obligation had before required, if a repeal alone would not have been sufficient." Judge Wilson said: "* * * the treaty is sufficient to remove every impediment founded on the law of Virginia." Judge Cushing said: "But here is a treaty, the supreme law, which overrules all State laws upon the subject, to all intents and purposes; and that makes all the difference." With such pronouncements, if the framers of the Constitution, and the people of the country, had considered the doctrine set forth to be contrary to their intent, would not there have been immediately framed and submitted a correcting amendment, just as was done in the case of the 11th amendment? Obviously, the answer is "Yes." Yet no such resolution even was introduced. The reason is that the decision was in accordance with the intent and the expectations of those who framed and ratified the Constitution.

Note that 2 of the judges who framed these statements, William Paterson and James Wilson, were members of the Constitutional Conventiton and that similar decisions were made shortly before this date by 2 other judges who sat in the convention, Oliver Ellsworth, in *Hamilton* v. *Eaton* (Fed. Cas. No. 5,990 (C. Ct. N. C. 1792)); and George Wythe in *Page* v. *Pendleton* (Wythe, w11 (Va. 1793)). Unquestionably the statement that *Missouri* v. *Holland* is an innovation which would have been repudiated by the generation which adopted the Constitution is a distortion of history.

Senators might also be interested in the views of Dean Erwin Griswold, of Harvard Law School, published in the same document:

Great reliance is placed by the proponents of this measure on the otherwise unimportant decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416). I find nothing in this decision which indicates that a treaty may overcome the provisions of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution, and I do not believe that the Supreme Court would so hold. I do not see any ground for believing that our basic rights are threatened by the system which has worked so well for the past 150 years.

I give also the views of Dean Jefferson B. Fordham, of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, published in the same document:

As pointed out by the minority of the Judiciary Committee, Senate Joint Resolution 1 is much more objectionable than the original version. Section 2 of the committee draft would deliberately limit our national sovereignty insofar as international relations are concerned. I have been a student of government and public affairs during all my adult years, and it is my considered opinion that this section 2 is as bad a proposal as has emanted from a congressional committee in our time. I believe that the real explanation for it is a combination of unreasoning fear and lack of faith in and understanding of our basic political system as we have known it all these years. It would be fantastic for this great Nation deliberately to limit its own sovereignty through constitutional amendment for fear that the President and the Senate might so abuse the treaty power as to flout the Constitution and jeopardize our national and individual interests.

* * * * *

The proponents of the proposal do not appear to recognize at all an extremely important distinction between the Federal character of the United States in internal matters and our essential national unitary character in the realm of external relations. It was never intended under the Constitution that we conduct our external relations subject to the limitations governing our Federal plan with respect to domestic affairs. This was clearly understood by those who framed the Constitution. Now that many of the problems of government and of law so clearly transcend national boundaries, it is more important than ever before that we be able to act as a decisive sovereign national unit in meeting the challenge of our times.

Mr. President, since as we are speaking of the views of different constitutional lawyers, let us see what the Senator from Ohio himself has said about this matter. Until very recently he preached against the evils of the "which" clause. The clause was purposely omitted from Senate Joint Resolution 130 of the 82d Congress. In testifying before the Judiciary

Subcommittee on May 21, 1952, the Senator from Ohio said that under his resolution:

> Congress, in implementing the provisions of a treaty, could enact legislation which, in the absence of a treaty, would be invalid as infringing upon the powers reserved to the States by the tenth amendment. Section 3 of my proposed amendment confirms the doctrine of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416). In that case, the taking of migratory game was assumed to be a State rather than a Federal problem in the absence of a treaty.
>
> At the same time, the protection of migratory birds spending part of the year in Canada and part in the United States was certainly an appropriate subject for a treaty calling for implementation by national legislation. (Hearings on S. J. Res. 130 (82d Cong., 2d sess.) before subcommittee of Senate Judiciary Committee, p. 28.)

So the Senator was not for it then. Also, the minority views point out, at page 47:

> We believe that Senator BRICKER correctly anticipated and shared the serious objections to the proposal to limit the treatymaking power in the manner of the last clause in the revision of section 2. This clause definitely reverses, not confirms, the holding in *Missouri* v. *Holland*.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is extremely difficult to argue with the decision on its merits and we believe that Senator BRICKER was correct last year in confirming the doctrine of the case. As he then said in discussing whether the elimination of this doctrine would not unduly restrict the treaty power—
>
> I feel there are certain fields in which the treaty power must be protected in the interest of the integrity of our country, and the very sovereignty of our country. (Hearings on S. J. Res. 130 (82d Cong.), p. 28.)

Mr. President, what conclusions can we reach in regard to the "which" clause?

The amendment as written would make every commitment in foreign affairs by the President subject to such restrictions or approval as the Congress may require. It would also impose upon the Federal Government limitations which, while intended to prevent certain anticipated abuses, would place in question the authority to make treaties on many subjects. The framers of the Constitution deliberately avoided the placing of any specific limitations upon the treaty power of the Federal Government. They intentionally made that power broad and enforceable to avoid the embarrassments and difficulties experienced with treaties under the Articles of Confederation. Our history demonstrates the wisdom of this decision. The President would not only be in a quandary as to what commitments he could make as the head of state or as Commander in Chief of the armed services or as to which Congress would approve; other nations would become alarmed as to what force would be given our present or subsequent agreements with them.

The United States cannot act effectively in its foreign relations if it cannot speak with a single voice, or if it is unable effectively to negotiate and satisfactorily honor its international commitments. The United States cannot make and hold allies except on the basis of reciprocal rights and obligations.

We cannot afford to freeze into the Constitution limitations which prevent our doing all of the useful and constitutionally lawful acts of the past, or which preclude our similar use of the treaty power for the unforeseen problems of tomorrow.

Any danger feared from possible future abuse of the foreign-relations powers of the Federal Government is more than offset by the very real and imminent danger to the safety of this Nation which would result from such weakening of the Federal Government at this time.

ANALYSIS OF SECTION 3

The text of section 3 is as follows:

> Congress shall have the power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

(A) INTRODUCTION

Just as the "which" clause of section 2 contained a change in the basic balance of power between the States and the Federal Government, section 3 contains a drastic change in our constitutional balances, but in this case it is the balance between the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

It should be clearly understood that the proposed amendment is an attempt to shift a large part of the traditional constitutional authority of the President in the field of foreign affairs over to the Congress. The amendment would give the Congress absolute control over the negotiation and all other matters involved in the making of international agreements by the President.

Some proponents of the pending constitutional amendment either fail to realize or refuse to admit that the Government of the United States is organized upon the principle of separation of powers. The conduct of the foreign relations of the United States is primarily an executive power, since this Nation must speak with a single voice in its relations with foreign countries.

The President represents this country and directs its representation in the foreign relations of the United States. This principle was recognized by the First Congress, which, by the act of July 27, 1789 (1 Stat. 28), establishing the Department of Foreign Affairs, provided that the President shall direct the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States. This principle was recognized by the United States Supreme Court in the historic case of *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137 (1803)). In that case Chief Justice Marshall said:

> By the Constitution of the United States, the President is invested with certain important political powers, in the exercise of which he is to use his own discretion, and is accountable only to his country in his political character and to his own conscience.

To illustrate this, the Chief Justice noted that under the act of Congress establishing the Department of Foreign Affairs the Secretary of State "is to conform precisely to the will of the President; he is the mere organ by whom that will is communicated." An early report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations—February 15, 1816—states:

> The President is the constitutional representative of the United States with regard to foreign nations. He manages our concerns with foreign nations and must necessarily be most competent to determine when, how, and upon what subjects negotiations may be urged with the greatest prospect of success. For his conduct he is responsible to the Constitution. The committee considered this responsibility the surest pledge for the faithful discharge of his duty. They think the interference of the Senate in the direction of foreign negotiations calculated to diminish that responsibility and thereby to impair the best security for the national safety. The nature of transactions with foreign nations, moreover, requires caution and unity of design, and their success frequently depends on secrecy and dispatch." (8 United States Senate, Reports, Committee on Foreign Relations, p. 24.)

I ask the indulgence of the Senate while I read another paragraph from the recent speech of Mr. Perlman's before the AAUW. It is very pertinent to the point under consideration:

> Section 3 of the Bricker amendment would give Congress power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. It would make all such agreements subject to the limitations imposed on treaties, so that all that has been said about those restrictions apply with equal force to executive agreements. As with the treaties, there is no history of abuse of the executive authority. The reverse is true. Many of the agreements have been made with express authority of Congress, and others after consultation. In many instances executive agreements need implementation by Congress, either by appropriation or otherwise, and are followed by formal treaties, subject to ratification by the Senate. Section 3 seems to ignore the fact that the President is the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and the head of a separate branch of the Federal Government. To subordinate him in the conduct of foreign affairs is to change the basic design of our form of government. Modern discoveries and problems have made foreign affairs more important than ever before. If leadership in this field is to be taken over by Congress there will no longer be a single voice authorized to speak in the conduct of foreign affairs. As has been pointed out, there will be the President, and there will be 96 Senators and 435 Members of the House; and the President will have 531 assistants or the 531 authorities on foreign affairs will have one rather sad and disconsolate official to carry out their orders.

One point which must be constantly borne in mind is that the proposed constitutional amendment would give the Congress the power to regulate all executive agreements: and the power to regulate is the power to prohibit. In other words, Congress could prohibit the President from making any more agreements of a certain variety, or could prohibit him from making agreements with one or more foreign countries, or even prohibit him from making any more agreements of any kind with any foreign country.

The proponents loudly protest that Congress would never do a foolish thing such as that. I am not so sure, if the majority in Congress were of a different party and thoroughly disagreed with the President's foreign policy, they might very well follow that course. But the

question here is not what Congress might or might not do. We are dealing here with constitutional powers. What is relevant is what Congress would have the power to do under the proposed amendment. My point is that under section 3, Congress would have the power to prohibit the President from making any further executive agreements. This would bring our conduct of foreign relations to a complete standstill, which would be nothing short of catastrophic. I urge most strongly that the Senate consider long and hard before it recommends such a basic shift in our constitutional balance of power.

(B) PURPORTED NEED FOR SECTION 3

The Bricker amendment supporters say that section 3 is essential to prevent abuses of the President's power to get around section 2 by substituting executive agreements for treaties. In addition, they say that the power to make Executive agreements has been abused in the past, and that precautions must be taken to prevent future abuses.

In regard to an "end run" by future Presidents if section 2 were adopted without the addition of section 3, the proponents are probably correct. Section 2 would so complicate the conduct of foreign relations that future Presidents would rely more and more on executive agreements and less and less on treaties, to the detriment of all concerned, but out of sheer necessity. The real answer is that we should never adopt the harmful provisions of section 2; thus we can avoid the whole question of the necessity for section 3.

As to past abuses, the only references that I have heard are to the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. There may be more examples of alleged abuses, but if so, I have not heard of them. I have no intention of going into the merits of Yalta and Potsdam at this time. Even if we assume that they were horrible mistakes from one end to the other, they would not justify the constitutional changes suggested in section 3. If we shift the power to Congress, is there any guaranty that Congress will never make any mistakes in its use? Is there any guaranty that Congress will never abuse the power? I agree with Justice Story, who said that the only way to prevent mistakes in the use of power and abuses of power is to abolish the power altogether. Transferring the exercise of the power will not accomplish this result.

Mr. President, while I think Yalta and Potsdam Agreements have been considerably misunderstood, and the troubles that arose from them were not so much due to the part played by the United States as they were to refusals to cooperate and violations by the Soviet Union, I think that, on the whole, Presidents have made a rather good record in the kinds of agreements they have entered into. We now have a treaty with Korea. It may turn out to be good. I hope it will. In the years to come, it may develop that the President made a bad agreement.

But agreements must be made. The Executive must act. After all, if we do not like the way in which a President has acted, we have a right to elect another President in 4 years. That is within the right of the people. We shall not avoid abuses of power by transferring power to a body that does not have the capacity, and was not set up, in the first place, to enter into executive agreements. It is not within the reasonable ability of Congress to keep in touch with the day-by-day transactions which occur in the field of foreign affairs, which must necessarily be possessed by the body or the person who is to have the authority to enter into executive agreements.

I wish to stress once more that what is involved in section 2, as in the "which clause" of section 2, is a drastic change in the constitutional balances of power between the different branches of our Government. The great genius of our Constitution is that no powers are absolute; all powers are subject to checks and balances. The basic power to conduct our foreign relations has always rested with the executive branch, with the Congress possessing very stringent checks and balances. Section 3 of the Bricker amendment would take the power away from the President and give it to Congress. If any checks or balances existed at all, they would be both vague and weak. Who could prevent the Congress from abusing its power? The answer is: No one. But the more immediate question involves the sufficiency of the present checks and balances over the President's power to conduct foreign relations as it has existed throughout our history.

At present both the legislative and judicial branches of the Government exercise very potent checks and balances over the President in this field of executive agreements: First, Congress has the power of the purse and the power of investigation, and the senatorial requirement for confirming Presidential appointments; second, Congress has the power to control executive agreements through legislation which authorizes or implements executive agreements; I believe that more than 80 percent of all formal executive agreements are made in pursuance of congressional legislation, or require such legislation for implementation; third, Congress has the power to overcome the internal effect of executive agreements by subsequently enacted legislation; fourth, the courts have the power to declare invalid any executive agreement which is not in accordance with existing legislation or the President's constitutional authority.

In my judgment, these checks and balances are sufficient to prevent abuse of power by the President. The only way to prevent abuses is to abolish the power. Transferring it to Congress, where there are no checks and balances, would not only not prevent abuses; it would probably greatly increase the chance of abuse. At the same time, it would put the power in the hands of a branch of the Government which, by its very nature, is incapable of making effective use of it. We would have 532 Secretaries of State instead of 1. The Founding Fathers very clearly saw the impossibility of such a system. It is unfortunate that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] does not have just a fraction of their insight.

(C) SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS TO SECTION 3

In addition to the objection that section 3 would completely unbalance our Constitution, there are a number of specific objections to it. In a sense these objections are just a reflection of the primary objection. Let me mention a few of the harmful effects of the section in practice.

First. The President of the United States is both the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and the head of our foreign-affairs department. Many agreements which are of the greatest importance to the national interest and security of this country must be negotiated and executed with dispatch. Pages 48–51 of the minority report show the various ways in which the President's hands would be tied if section 3 were enacted. I should like to read two paragraphs from that report:

> The spirit of the first sentence of section 3 is to strip the President of one of his most important functions. If hampering legislation inspired by this spirit were passed, it would reduce the President to a mere figurehead in foreign affairs, unable to deal effectively or with dispatch in matters which may be of the utmost urgency. Under such legislation, a Congress at odds with the President might tie his hands completely and bring the conduct of foreign affairs to a stalemate, perhaps at a time of great international emergency.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Yet if section 3 were adopted, the defense of United States territory would be strangled in redtape. Let us suppose an enemy force invaded Alaska and a joint American-Canadian army was sent through the continental United States to meet it. Any agreements between the two commanders could not become effective as internal law in the United States save through legislation. Thus, the Congress would have to go through the time-consuming process of enacting laws so that the Canadian force could carry pistols (without State license), could rush supplies to the front (without violating State speed laws), and could deploy on a battlefield (without being trespassers). In addition, some "delegated power" would have to be found upon which to base such legislation. The enemy (not being hampered by the proposed constitutional amendment) would not meet these impediments. Certainly the proposal is a poor way to protect our country.

Second. Implementation of section 3 by the Congress. As I have stated previously, this is basically a question of the transfer of power, and the method of implementation by the recipient of the power is a secondary question. Yet the secondary question is of great importance in and of itself.

It is impossible to predict with any accuracy at all the manner in which Congress might implement section 3 if it were ever given such power under the Constitution. Of course, the proponents of the Bricker amendment tush tush any predictions that Congress will ever implement such a power in a harmful manner. They say that Congress could never succeed in passing such implementation over the President's veto. Have we any assurances, except their rather colored predictions?

Certainly we have some indications of the kinds of implementation that would

be tried by some of the sponsors of the Bricker amendment. All anyone need do is to take one quick look at Senate Joint Resolution 2 of the present Congress, which was introduced on January 7, 1953, by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], for himself and on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. It would impose the most stringent limitations upon the President's power to make executive agreements and conduct our foreign relations. One should also notice that the two sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 2 are none other than the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] himself and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. The very existence of Senate Joint Resolution 2 should disenchant anyone who has been lulled into a false sense of security by the assurances of the sponsors of the Bricker amendment that they have no intention of implementing section 3 in a harmful manner. What they consider harmful and what is harmful to the country may be two entirely different things.

I think it might be well to read 1 or 2 sections of Senate Joint Resolution 2. Referring to treaties and Executive, it provides:

(1) They shall be of no force or effect either as laws or as authorizations until and unless they shall have been published in full in the Federal Register;

(2) They shall be subject to such legislative action as the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, shall deem necessary or desirable; and

(3) They shall be deemed to terminate not later than 6 months after the end of the term of the President during whose tenure they were negotiated, unless extended by proclamation of the succeeding President.

SEC. 2. Hereafter agreements or compacts entered into by the President with foreign governments or officials thereof requiring secrecy shall be submitted to the Congress as treaties in accordance with the requirements of the Constitution, otherwise they shall be of no force or effect except as personal undertakings of the President.

Mr. President, I submit that it would be impossible, particularly during time of war or great national emergency, for the President of the United States to operate the Government if the provisions of this kind of regulation of executive agreements were in effect.

One aspect of implementation of section 3 which has received little or no attention concerns the psychological harm which would result from the very fact that the manner of implementation is unspecified. The State Department has difficulty enough today in the conduct of our foreign relations. An unimplemented section 3 would add another almost insuperable obstacle, because it would be a Damocles' sword hanging over the Secretary's head at all times. The President and the Secretary of State could exercise no initiative at all, because they would be constantly worried as to whether or not their activities would prompt Congress to tie their hands further by new and more harmful implementations of section 3 of the Bricker amendment.

Third. Regulation entails definition.

If Congress is going to regulate executive agreements, Congress has to define the term "executive agreements" for the purpose of regulation. It is extremely difficult to do that successfully. Even the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has admitted that "it is probably impossible to draw a satisfactory line of demarcation even in a statute." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 1, page 914.)

I believe that Secretary Dulles hit on the nub of the question in his testimony before the Judiciary Committee:

It has long been recognized that difficulties exist in the determination as to which international agreements should be submitted to the Senate as treaties, which ones should be submitted to both Houses of the Congress, and which ones do not require any congressional approval.

Differences of opinion resulting from these difficulties have given rise in the past to disputes between the executive branch and the Congress concerning the handling of international agreements. It must be recognized that it would be extremely difficult if not impossible to fit all agreements into set categories. At times there may be disagreement as to the manner in which agreements are to be dealt with. While recognizing this, the Executive cannot surrender the freedom of action which is necessary for its operation in the foreign-affairs field. In the interest of orderly procedures, however, I feel that the Congress is entitled to know the considerations that enter into the determinations as to which procedures are sought to be followed. To that end, when there is any serious question of this nature and the circumstances permit, the executive branch will consult with appropriate congressional leaders and committees in determining the most suitable way of handling international agreements as they arise.

The President should consult with the Congress and keep the Congress advised as much as possible with respect to foreign affairs. He should seek legislative authorization for many, if not most, of the formal international agreements that he makes. He should not be straitjacketed by new constitutional requirements. The Congress should not attempt the almost impossible task of defining exactly which international agreements fall into the category of treaties and which fall into the category of executive agreements.

Fourth. The interplay of section 2 upon section 3. The second sentence of section 3 reads:

All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

This sentence has two very harmful effects.

In regard to executive agreements which have been concluded in pursuance to prior legislation, it would seem that section 3 required double authorization to make them effective as the internal law of the land. As an example, let us consider the trade agreements field. Let us assume that after much deliberation the Congress passes the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which authorizes the President to conclude certain executive agreements relating to tariff reductions. Under our present system, such agreements become the law of the land when they are made effective internationally; no new implementing legislation by the Congress is necessary, the Congress having given its consent in advance. Under section 3 of the Bricker amendment, the Congress would have to pass a second piece of legislation implementing the agreement before it could become effective as the internal law of the land. What a terrible waste of time. What a monument to inefficiency.

I have pointed out heretofore the very grave difficulty that will arise in trying to determine exactly which executive agreements might have some relevance to internal law and which would require implementation. It is next to impossible to tell whether any particular executive agreement will have some internal effect and will become a point in some domestic litigation. To be on the safe side, the administration will have to request the Congress to implement thousands of agreements, in order that possible litigants will be able to use them in court. It is not at all clear just what form this implementation will take or must take to satisfy the courts.

The second difficulty which arises in the interplay is the effect of the "which" clause. The President will be precluded from concluding executive agreements which are to have internal effect and which do not fall within the delegated powers of Congress, because the legislation which implements an executive agreement is limited by the "which" clause.

Fifth. There are certain ambiguities in the language of section 3 which have been very clearly pointed out by Professor Paul Freund, of Harvard Law School, in a letter to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], dated August 19, 1953, and published in the aforementioned Committee on the Judiciary print, as follows:

The first sentence contains certain ambiguities. It is not clear whether the power of Congress is intended to describe the ordinary lawmaking power or to exclude the President from any participation in the action of Congress. Nor is it clear whether the power to regulate includes only the power to authorize and limit in advance or extends to a control over agreements which are already in force.

(D) CONCLUSIONS REGARDING SECTION 3

My conclusions regarding section 3 can be very simply stated. I am aware of the fears which have been expressed in recent years concerning the possibility of abuse of the power of the President to make agreements with foreign powers and organizations. I submit that there is no substantial basis for such fears, and that history does not support the arguments which have been advanced in support of the proposal to undermine and limit the authority of the President to act in time of grave emergency. We are living in dangerous times, when the power to act must sometimes be exercised without delay to protect the national safety. We keep repeating to each other that the power to act in time of emergency must be vested somewhere, especially under conditions where other nations do act without debate and without notice to the rest of the world. The Constitution has given it to the President, and nobody suggests any other agency. I submit that we ought not—we must not—limit the power of the Chief Executive to make such agreements with foreign powers or organiza-

tions as have been made in the past. Congress has authority to decline to be bound by any such agreements, to refuse whatever appropriations may be necessary to put them into effect, or to repudiate and nullify them entirely by appropriate action. There is more reason to fear that the absence of such power, or the limitations and handicaps upon the exercise of such power by the President, may in the long run prove more detrimental to the people of the country than the continuance of the present situation—a situation which has been unchanged since the Republicans first began to function.

Mr. President, I think I should point out again that the Bricker amendment is not based upon what has happened in the past, and actually the proponents of the Bricker amendment do not point to any treaty in particular. Perhaps a certain Senator may object to a particular treaty, just as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] objected to the Warsaw Convention. But, as a whole, the sponsors of the Bricker amendment do not point to any particular treaty which they say was not a good treaty. More than 900 treaties have been entered into by the United States since the beginning of its history, and I think it is rather remarkable that the proponents of the amendment are not unanimous on any one treaty being a bad treaty. They fear what might happen in the future. The fear is based on conjecture as to what some other President or what some other Senate might do.

Likewise, Mr. President, the sponsors of the proposed amendment do not point to any time when two-thirds of the United States Senate acted unwisely, but they fear that some future Senate might not be so careful as the Senate has been in the past.

Mr. President, in Washington's Farewell Address, very good counsel is given in connection with matters of this sort. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from Washington's Farewell Address.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in that section of his Farewell Address, the Father of our Country, in advising about amendments to the Constitution, said the Constitution should not be amended unless a very clear case was shown in favor of amendment. He said the Constitution should not be amended merely upon hypothesis, merely upon what might happen in some contingency. Yet a hypothesis or a contingency is exactly the basis upon which the sponsors of the proposed constitutional amendment are asking the Senate to pass Senate Joint Resolution 1—not because of what has happened in the past, but on the basis of a fear regarding something which might happen in the future.

Mr. President, our Nation did not become great by following a doctrine of fear. The Senate has never passed proposed legislation on the basis of fear. On the contrary, the Senate has always operated on the basis of confidence. I see no reason why the Senate cannot have confidence in the Presidents in the decades to come or in the Senate that is to be elected in the years to come.

It is quite obvious to anyone that the treaty provision of the Constitution was very, very carefully worked out. The Founding Fathers weighed every word. They devised a system which has served us well during these 164 years. They anticipated the growth of our Nation. They anticipated that it would have to deal with other nations in the field of foreign affairs. I think everyone will admit that they gave most careful and almost divinely inspired attention to every section of the Constitution.

Mr. President, compare the careful consideration which was given to the Constitution by the Founding Fathers with the kind of consideration which has been given to the Bricker amendment. Even the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] himself has not been satisfied, over a period of years, with the kind of amendment he wants. Today we have various kinds of amendments before the Senate. Imagine trying to write the Constitution of the United States by offering amendments here and amendments there, in an attempt to change the basic law of the land.

In this connection, Mr. President, let me point out that I have before me the various proposals which have been brought forward. At one time the Senator from Ohio introduced Senate Joint Resolution 130 in the 82d Congress. That joint resolution is very different from the measure the Senator from Ohio has before the Senate today. Senate Joint Resolution 130 is very different, also, from the constitutional amendment proposal of the American Bar Association.

In the 82d Congress, hearings were held on Senate Joint Resolution 130. The Senator from Ohio himself must have thought that resolution did not meet all the criticisms which were made of it, because when the 83d Congress convened, he did not reintroduce Senate Resolution 130, as he had introduced it in the 82d Congress. Instead of reintroducing Senate Joint Resolution 130 of the 82d Congress, in the 83d Congress the Senator from Ohio abandoned the former joint resolution, and introduced the original Senate Joint Resolution No. 1.

At the time when Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 was being considered by the Judiciary Committee, long hearings were held on it. The committee struck out the entire joint resolution. I have it before me now, and we see that the entire joint resolution was stricken out.

Incidentally, Mr. President, at first the joint resolution had many sponsors—some 60-odd Senators. Much is made of the point, as alleged, that all those Senators sponsored the joint resolution which is before the Senate today. Many persons attempt to make much of that point. But that is not a valid point, for the reason that the Senate joint resolution which those Senators sponsored is far different from the joint resolution which is now pending before the Senate. Of course, the main difference is that the original joint resolution did not contain the "which" clause that is contained in section 2 of the joint resolution now before us.

Furthermore, Mr. President, many Senators who joined in sponsoring the original joint resolution, did so in order that it might be given consideration and might be debated. They have said so themselves. In other words, they were not unconditionally in favor of the joint resolution, and they were not indicating that they would vote for it when it came before the Senate.

Furthermore, whatever approval they gave to the original Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 does not carry over to the measure now before us—as any of my colleagues will see, for the original joint resolution has been stricken out, and an entirely different joint resolution has been substituted for it.

There was also the so-called Watkins joint resolution or the American Bar Association joint resolution. The joint resolution which has been reported is entirely different from it, also.

Mr. President, I am a member of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary. I shall never forget a meeting of that subcommittee held some time ago. A number of us were sitting in the subcommittee at that time. The purpose was to rewrite the constitutional provision pertaining to treaties. I stated to the others present that I would not participate. There was much discussion as to whether the subcommittee should use the words "character of government" or the words "nature of government," or what phraseology should be used. At that time I said I did not think I should participate in that procedure, because I was opposed to the whole thing. I said I thought the present treaty provision of the Constitution was satisfactory. So I did not participate.

However, Mr. President, with all due deference to the good lawyers who were in attendance at that time, when attempt was being made to change this section or that section, I say they were not giving the matter the kind of consideration which was given to this original section of the Constitution by the Founding Fathers.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that the inability of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] himself to agree upon the kind of constitutional amendment he wants to present to the Senate, the fact that he has had 2 or 3 different versions

of it, and the fact that many different proposals for amending the joint resolution are pending before us today, show that it has not received the kind of consideration which would meet the test that is required of a proposal to amend the basic law of the Nation. Such a procedure does not meet the test which was referred to by President George Washington in his farewell address.

The proponents of the amendment have not carried the burden of proof. In order to convince the Senate and the people of the United States that the basic law should be changed, the proponents must carry the burden of proof; they must show convincingly that a wrong is being done to some citizen, or they must show convincingly a difficulty into which the Government has gotten by virtue of the Constitution. However, no such showing whatsoever has been made.

Those of us who are trying to prevent the making of a change in the Constitution, and are trying to preserve the Constitution, hear a great deal of oratory. To me it is very remarkable that some sponsors of the amendment wrap themselves in the American flag, so to speak, and say, "We are trying to preserve constitutional rights and we are trying to preserve the Constitution." However, Mr. President, they are trying to preserve the Constitution by amending it. They are trying to preserve the Constitution by upsetting the balance of power and the system of checks and balances. They are trying to preserve the Constitution by taking the power to make executive agreements away from the President and giving it to the Congress, which is not qualified or organized to handle executive agreements.

The sponsors of this amendment are trying to change the Constitution in many, many ways. They are not trying to preserve the Constitution. They are trying to tear up parts of the Constitution in a way which would very adversely affect the future of the United States.

Mr. President, I hope that no such amendment will be adopted. The Constitution does not need to be changed. I have given notice that I propose to introduce a plain joint resolution which would reaffirm the supremacy of the Constitution over any laws or treaties, which would reaffirm, by statute, the fact that reservations may be placed upon treaties by the Senate whenever it desires to do so. It also would call for a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate on treaties, and in both the House and Senate on constitutional amendments. It would change the rules of the Senate and House so as to require yea-and-nay votes on treaties and constitutional amendments.

While I do not believe that it is necessary to adopt any resolution for a constitutional amendment, I believe that if anything is to be adopted, a plain joint resolution along the lines I have suggested would be sufficient.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

CONVENTION FOR THE UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORTATION BY AIR

The President of the German Reich, the Federal President of the Republic of Austria, His Majesty the King of the Belgians, the President of the United States of Brazil, His Majesty the King of the Bulgarians, the President of the Nationalist Government of China, His Majesty the King of Denmark and Iceland, His Majesty the King of Egypt, His Majesty the King of Spain, the Chief of State of the Republic of Estonia, the President of the Republic of Finland, the President of the French Republic, His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, the President of the Hellenic Republic, His Most Serene Highness the Regent of the Kingdom of Hungary, His Majesty the King of Italy, His Majesty the Emperor of Japan, the President of the Republic of Latvia, Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg, the President of the United Mexican States, His Majesty the King of Norway, Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, The President of the Republic of Poland, His Majesty the King of Rumania, His Majesty the King of Sweden, the Swiss Federal Council, the President of the Czechoslovak Republic, the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the President of the United States of Venezuela, His Majesty the King of Yugoslavia:

Having recognized the advantage of regulating in a uniform manner the conditions of international transportation by air in respect of the documents used for such transportation and of the liability of the carrier, have nominated to this end their respective Plenipotentiaries, who, being thereto duly authorized, have concluded and signed the following Convention:

CHAPTER I. SCOPE—DEFINITIONS

Article 1

(1) This Convention shall apply to all international transportation of persons, baggage, or goods performed by aircraft for hire. It shall apply equally to gratuitous transportation by aircraft performed by an air transportation enterprise.

(2) For the purposes of this Convention the expression "international transportation" shall mean any transportation in which, according to the contract made by the parties, the place of departure and the place of destination, whether or not there be a break in the transportation or a transshipment, are situated either within the territories of two High Contracting Parties, or within the territory of a single High Contracting Party, if there is an agreed stopping place within a territory subject to the sovereignty, suzerainty, mandate or authority of another Power, even though that Power is not a party to this Convention. Transportation without such an agreed stopping place between territories subject to the sovereignty, suzerainty, mandate or authority of the same High Contracting Party shall not be deemed to be international for the purposes of this Convention.

(3) Transportation to be performed by several successive air carriers shall be deemed, for the purposes of this Convention, to be one undivided transportation, if it has been regarded by the parties as a single operation, whether it has been agreed upon under the form of a single contract or of a series of contracts, and it shall not lose its international character merely because one contract or a series of contracts is to be performed entirely within a territory subject to the sovereignty, suzerainty, mandate, or authority of the same High Contracting Party.

Article 2

(1) This Convention shall apply to transportation performed by the State or by legal entities constituted under public law provided it falls within the conditions laid down in Article 1.

(2) This Convention shall not apply to transportation performed under the terms of any international postal Convention.

CHAPTER II. TRANSPORTATION DOCUMENTS—SECTION 1—PASSENGER TICKET

Article 3

(1) For the transportation of passengers the carrier must deliver a passenger ticket which shall contain the following particulars:

(*a*) The place and date of issue;

(*b*) The place of departure and of destination;

(*c*) The agreed stopping places, provided that the carrier may reserve the right to alter the stopping places in case of necessity, and that if he exercises that right, the alteration shall not have the effect of depriving the transportation of its international character;

(*d*) The name and address of the carrier or carriers;

(*e*) A statement that the transportation is subject to the rules relating to liability established by this Convention.

(2) The absence, irregularity, or loss of the passenger ticket shall not affect the existence or the validity of the contract of transportation, which shall none the less be subject to the rules of this Convention. Nevertheless, if the carrier accepts a passenger without a passenger ticket having been delivered he shall not be entitled to avail himself of those provisions of this Convention which exclude or limit his liability.

SECTION 2. BAGGAGE CHECK

Article 4

(1) For the transportation of baggage, other than small personal objects of which the passenger takes charge himself, the carrier must deliver a baggage check.

(2) The baggage check shall be made out in duplicate, one part for the passener and the other part for the carrier.

(3) The baggage check shall contain the following particulars:

(*a*) The place and date of issue;

(*b*) The place of departure and of destination;

(*c*) The name and address of the carrier or carriers;

(*d*) The number of the passenger ticket;

(*e*) A statement that delivery of the baggage will be made to the bearer of the baggage check;

(*f*) The number and weight of the packages;

(*g*) The amount of the value declared in accordance with Article 22 (2);

(*h*) A statement that the transportation is subject to the rules relating to liability established by this Convention.

(4) The absence, irregularity or loss of the baggage check shall not affect the existence or the validity of the contract of transportation which shall none the less be subject to the rules of this Convention. Nevertheless, if the carrier accepts baggage without a baggage check having been delivered, or if the baggage check does not contain the particulars set out at (d), (f), and (h) above, the carrier shall not be entitled to avail himself of those provisions of the Convention which exclude or limit his liability.

SECTION 3. AIR WAYBILL

Article 5

(1) Every carrier of goods has the right to require the consignor to make out and hand over to him a document called an "air waybill"; every consignor has the right to require the carrier to accept this document.

(2) The absence, irregularity, or loss of this document shall not affect the existence or the validity of the contract of transportation which shall, subject to the provisions of Article 9, be none the less governed by the rules of this Convention.

Article 6

(1) The air waybill shall be made out by the consignor in three original parts and be handed over with the goods.

(2) The first part shall be marked "for the carrier", and shall be signed by the con-

signor. The second part shall be marked "for the consignee"; it shall be signed by the consignor and by the carrier and shall accompany the goods. The third part shall be signed by the carrier and handed by him to the consignor after the goods have been accepted.

(3) The carrier shall sign on acceptance of the goods.

(4) The signature of the carrier may be stamped; that of the consignor may be printed or stamped.

(5) If, at the request of the consignor, the carrier makes out the air waybill, he shall be deemed, subject to proof to the contrary, to have done so on behalf of the consignor.

Article 7

The carrier of goods has the right to require the consignor to make out separate waybills when there is more than one package.

Article 8

The air waybill shall contain the following particulars:

(*a*) The place and date of its execution;

(*b*) The place of departure and of destination;

(*c*) The agreed stopping places, provided that the carrier may reserve the right to alter the stopping places in case of necessity, and that if he exercises that right the alteration shall not have the effect of depriving the transportation of its international character;

(*d*) The name and address of the consignor;

(*e*) The name and address of the first carrier;

(*f*) The name and address of the consignee, if the case so requires;

(*g*) The nature of the goods;

(*h*) The number of packages, the method of packing, and the particular marks or numbers upon them;

(*i*) The weight, the quantity, the volume, or dimensions of the goods;

(*j*) The apparent condition of the goods and of the packing;

(*k*) The freight, if it has been agreed upon, the date and place of payment, and the person who is to pay it;

(*l*) If the goods are sent for payment on delivery, the price of the goods, and, if the case so requires, the amount of the expenses incurred;

(*m*) The amount of the value declared in accordance with Article 22 (2);

(*n*) The number of parts of the air waybill;

(*o*) The documents handed to the carrier to accompany the air waybill;

(*p*) The time fixed for the completion of the transportation and a brief note of the route to be followed, if these matters have been agreed upon;

(*q*) A statement that the transportation is subject to the rules relating to liability established by this Convention.

Article 9

If the carrier accepts goods without an air waybill having been made out, or if the air waybill does not contain all the particulars set out in Article 8 (*a*) to (*i*), inclusive, and (*q*), the carrier shall not be entitled to avail himself of the provisions of this Convention which exclude or limit his liability.

Article 10

(1) The consignor shall be responsible for the correctness of the particulars and statements relating to the goods which he inserts in the air waybill.

(2) The consignor shall be liable for all damages suffered by the carrier or any other person by reason of the irregularity, incorrectness or incompleteness of the said particulars and statements.

Article 11

(1) The air waybill shall be *prima facie* evidence of the conclusion of the contract, of the receipt of the goods and of the conditions of transportation.

(2) The statements in the air waybill relating to the weight, dimensions, and packing of the goods, as well as those relating to the number of packages, shall be *prima facie* evidence of the facts stated; those relating to the quantity, volume, and condition of the goods shall not constitute evidence against the carrier except so far as they both have been, and are stated in the air waybill to have been, checked by him in the presence of the consignor, or relate to the apparent condition of the goods.

Article 12

(1) Subject to his liability to carry out all his obligations under the contract of transportation, the consignor shall have the right to dispose of the goods by withdrawing them at the airport of departure or destination, or by stopping them in the course of the journey on any landing, or by calling for them to be delivered at the place of destination, or in the course of the journey to a person other than the consignee named in the air waybill, or by requiring them to be returned to the airport of departure. He must not exercise this right of disposition in such a way as to prejudice the carrier or other consignors, and he must repay any expenses occasioned by the exercise of this right.

(2) If it is impossible to carry out the orders of the consignor the carrier must so inform him forthwith.

(3) If the carrier obeys the orders of the consignor for the disposition of the goods without requiring the production of the part of the airway bill delivered to the latter, he will be liable, without prejudice to his right of recovery from the consignor, for any damage which may be caused thereby to any person who is lawfully in possession of that part of the airway bill.

(4) The right conferred on the consignor shall cease at the moment when that of the consignee begins in accordance with Article 13, below. Nevertheless, if the consignee declines to accept the waybill or the goods, or if he cannot be communicated with, the consignor shall resume his right of disposition.

Article 13

(1) Except in the circumstances set out in the preceding article, the consignee shall be entitled, on arrival of the goods at the place of destination, to require the carrier to hand over to him the air waybill and to deliver the goods to him, on payment of the charges due and on complying with the conditions of transportation set out in the air waybill.

(2) Unless it is otherwise agreed, it shall be the duty of the carrier to give notice to the consignee as soon as the goods arrive.

(3) If the carrier admits the loss of the goods, or if the goods have not arrived at the expiration of seven days after the date on which they ought to have arrived, the consignee shall be entitled to put into force against the carrier the rights which flow from the contract of transportation.

Article 14

The consignor and the consignee can respectively enforce all the rights given them by Articles 12 and 13, each in his own name, whether he is acting in his own interest or in the interest of another, provided that he carries out the obligations imposed by the contract.

Article 15

(1) Articles 12, 13, and 14 shall not affect either the relations of the consignor and the consignee with each other or the relations of third parties whose rights are derived either from the carrier or from the consignee.

(2) The provisions of Articles 12, 13, and 14 can only be varied by express provision in the air waybill.

Article 16

(1) The consignor must furnish such information and attach to the air waybill such documents as are necessary to meet the formalities of customs, octroi, or police before the goods can be delivered to the consignee. The consignor shall be liable to the carrier for any damage occasioned by the absence, insufficiency, or irregularity of any such information or documents, unless the damage is due to the fault of the carrier or his agents.

(2) The carrier is under no obligation to enquire into the correctness or sufficiency of such information or documents.

CHAPTER III—LIABILITY OF THE CARRIER

Article 17

The carrier shall be liable for damage sustained in the event of the death or wounding of a passenger or any other bodily injury suffered by a passenger, if the accident which caused the damage so sustained took place on board the aircraft or in the course of any of the operations of embarking or disembarking.

Article 18

(1) The carrier shall be liable for damage sustained in the event of the destruction or loss of, or of damage to, any checked baggage or any goods, if the occurrence which caused the damage so sustained took place during the transportation by air.

(2) The transportation by air within the meaning of the preceding paragraph shall comprise the period during which the baggage or goods are in charge of the carrier, whether in an airport or on board an aircraft, or, in the case of a landing outside an airport, in any place whatsoever.

(3) The period of the transportation by air shall not extend to any transportation by land, by sea, or by river performed outside an airport. If, however, such transportation takes place in the performance of a contract for transportation by air, for the purpose of loading, delivery or transhipment, any damage is presumed, subject to proof to the contrary, to have been the result of an event which took place during the transportation by air.

Article 19

The carrier shall be liable for damage occasioned by delay in the transportation by air of passengers, baggage, or goods.

Article 20

(1) The carrier shall not be liable if he proves that he and his agents have taken all necessary measures to avoid the damage or that it was impossible for him or them to take such measures.

(2) In the transportation of goods and baggage the carrier shall not be liable if he proves that the damage was occasioned by an error in piloting, in the handling of the aircraft, or in navigation and that, in all other respects, he and his agents have taken all necessary measures to avoid the damage.

Article 21

If the carrier proves that the damage was caused by or contributed to by the negligence of the injured person the Court may, in accordance with the provisions of its own law, exonerate the carrier wholly or partly from his liability.

Article 22

(1) In the transportation of passengers the liability of the carrier for each passenger shall be limited to the sum of 125,000 francs. Where, in accordance with the law of the Court to which the case is submitted, damages may be awarded in the form of periodical payments, the equivalent capital value of the said payments shall not exceed 125,000 francs. Nevertheless, by special contract, the carrier and the passenger may agree to a higher limit of liability.

(2) In the transportation of checked baggage and of goods, the liability of the carrier shall be limited to a sum of 250 francs

per kilogram, unless the consignor has made, at the time when the package was handed over to the carrier, a special declaration of the value at delivery and has paid a supplementary sum if the case so requires. In that case the carrier will be liable to pay a sum not exceeding the declared sum, unless he proves that that sum is greater than the actual value to the consignor at delivery.

(3) As regards objects of which the passenger takes charge himself the liability of the carrier shall be limited to 5,000 francs per passenger.

(4) The sums mentioned above shall be deemed to refer to the French franc consisting of 65½ milligrams of gold at the standard of fineness of nine hundred thousandths. These sums may be converted into any national currency in round figures.

Article 23

Any provision tending to relieve the carrier of liability or to fix a lower limit than that which is laid down in this Convention shall be null and void, but the nullity of any such provision shall not involve the nullity of the whole contract, which shall remain subject to the provisions of this Convention.

Article 24

(1) In the cases covered by Articles 18 and 19 any action for damages, however founded, can only be brought subject to the conditions and limits set out in this Convention.

(2) In the cases covered by Article 17 the provisions of the preceding paragraph shall also apply, without prejudice to the questions as to who are the persons who have the right to bring suit and what are their respective rights.

Article 25

(1) The carrier shall not be entitled to avail himself of the provisions of this Convention which exclude or limit his liability, if the damage is caused by his wilful misconduct or by such default on his part as, in accordance with the law of the Court to which the case is submitted, is considered to be equivalent to wilful misconduct.

(2) Similarly the carrier shall not be entitled to avail himself of the said provisions, if the damage is caused under the same circumstances by any agent of the carrier acting within the scope of his employment.

Article 26

(1) Receipt by the person entitled to the delivery of baggage or goods without complaint shall be prima facie evidence that the same have been delivered in good condition and in accordance with the document of transportation.

(2) In case of damage, the person entitled to delivery must complain to the carrier forthwith after the discovery of the damage, and, at the latest, within three days from the date of receipt in the case of baggage and 7 days from the date of receipt in the case of goods. In case of delay the complaint must be made at the latest within fourteen days from the date on which the baggage or goods have been placed at his disposal.

(3) Every complaint must be made in writing upon the document of transportation or by separate notice in writing dispatched within the times aforesaid.

(4) Failing complaint within the times aforesaid, no action shall lie against the carrier, save in the case of fraud on his part.

Article 27

In the case of the death of the person liable, an action for damages lies in accordance with the terms of this Convention against those legally representing his estate.

Article 28

(1) An action for damages must be brought, at the option of the plaintiff, in the territory of one of the High Contracting Parties, either before the Court of the domicile of the carrier or of his principal place of business, or where he has a place of business through which the contract has been made, or before the Court at the place of destination.

(2) Questions of procedure shall be governed by the law of the Court to which the case is submitted.

Article 29

(1) The right to damages shall be extinguished if an action is not brought within 2 years, reckoned from the date of arrival at the destination, or from the date on which the aircraft ought to have arrived, or from the date on which the transportation stopped.

(2) The method of calculating the period of limitation shall be determined by the law of the Court to which the case is submitted.

Article 30

(1) In the case of transportation to be performed by various successive carriers and falling within the definition set out in the third paragraph of Article 1, each carrier who accepts passengers, baggage or goods shall be subject to the rules set out in this Convention, and shall be deemed to be one of the contracting parties to the contract of transportation insofar as the contract deals with that part of the transportation which is performed under his supervision.

(2) In the case of transportation of this nature, the passenger or his representative can take action only against the carrier who performed the transportation during which the accident or the delay occurred, save in the case where, by express agreement, the first carrier has assumed liability for the whole journey.

(3) As regards baggage or goods, the passenger or consignor shall have a right of action against the first carrier, and the passenger or consignee who is entitled to delivery shall have a right of action against the last carrier, and further, each may take action against the carrier who performed the transportation during which the destruction, loss, damage, or delay took place. These carriers shall be jointly and severally liable to the passenger or to the consignor or consignee.

CHAPTER IV. PROVISIONS RELATING TO COMBINED TRANSPORTATION

Article 31

(1) In the case of combined transportation performed partly by air and partly by any other mode of transportation, the provisions of this Convention shall apply only to the transportation by air, provided that the transportation by air falls within the terms of Article 1.

(2) Nothing in this Convention shall prevent the parties in the case of combined transportation from inserting in the document of air transportation conditions relating to other modes of transportation, provided that the provisions of this Convention are observed as regards the transportation by air.

CHAPTER V. GENERAL AND FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 32

Any clause contained in the contract and all special agreements entered into before the damage occurred by which the parties purport to infringe the rules laid down by this Convention, whether by deciding the law to be applied, or by altering the rules as to jurisdiction, shall be null and void. Nevertheless for the transportation of goods arbitration clauses shall be allowed, subject to this Convention, if the arbitration is to take place within one of the jurisdictions referred to in the first paragraph of Article 28.

Article 33

Nothing contained in this Convention shall prevent the carrier either from refusing to enter into any contract of transportation or from making regulations which do not conflict with the provisions of this Convention.

Article 34

This Convention shall not apply to international transportation by air performed by way of experimental trial by air navigation enterprises with the view to the establishment of regular lines of air navigation, nor shall it apply to transportation performed in extraordinary circumstances outside the normal scope of an air carrier's business.

Article 35

The expression "days" when used in this Convention means current days, not working days.

Article 36

This Convention is drawn up in French in a single copy which shall remain deposited in the archives of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Poland and of which one duly certified copy shall be sent by the Polish Government to the Government of each of the High Contracting Parties.

Article 37

(1) This Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited in the archives of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Poland, which shall give notice of the deposit to the Government of each of the High Contracting Parties.

(2) As soon as this Convention shall have been ratified by five of the High Contracting Parties it shall come into force as between them on the ninetieth day after the deposit of the fifth ratification. Thereafter it shall come into force between the High Contracting Parties which shall have ratified and the High Contracting Party which deposits its instrument of ratification on the ninetieth day after the deposit.

(3) It shall be the duty of the Government of the Republic of Poland to notify the Government of each of the High Contracting Parties of the date on which this Convention comes into force as well as the date of the deposit of each ratification.

Article 38

(1) This Convention shall, after it has come into force, remain open for adherence by any State.

(2) The adherence shall be effected by a notification addressed to the Government of the Republic of Poland, which shall inform the Government of each of the High Contracting Parties thereof.

(3) The adherence shall take effect as from the ninetieth day after the notification made to the Government of the Republic of Poland.

Article 39

(1) Any one of the High Contracting Parties may denounce this Convention by a notification addressed to the Government of the Republic of Poland, which shall at once inform the Government of each of the High Contracting Parties.

(2) Denunciation shall take effect six months after the notification of denunciation, and shall operate only as regards the party which shall have proceeded to denunciation.

Article 40

(1) Any High Contracting Party may, at the time of signature or of deposit of ratification or of adherence declare that the acceptance which it gives to this Convention does not apply to all or any of its colonies, protectorates, territories under mandate, or any other territory subject to its sovereignty or its authority, or any other territory under its suzerainty.

(2) Accordingly any High Contracting Party may subsequently adhere separately in the name of all or any of its colonies, protectorates, territories under mandate, or any other territory subject to its sovereignty or to its authority or any other territory under its suzerainty which have been thus excluded by its original declaration.

(3) Any High Contracting Party may denounce this Convention, in accordance with

its provisions, separately or for all or any of its colonies, protectorates, territories under mandate or any other territory subject to its sovereignty or to its authority, or any other territory under its suzerainty.

Article 41

Any High Contracting Party shall be entitled not earlier than two years after the coming into force of this Convention to call for the assembling of a new international Conference in order to consider any improvements which may be made in this Convention. To this end it will communicate with the Government of the French Republic which will take the necessary measures to make preparations for such Conference.

This Convention done at Warsaw on October 12, 1929, shall remain open for signature until January 31, 1930.

For Germany:
R. RICHTER.
Dr. A. WEGERDT.
Dr. E. ALBRECHT.
Dr. OTTO RIESE.

For Austria:
STROBELE.
REINOEHL.

For Belgium:
BERNARD DE l'ESCAILLE.

For Brazil:
ALCIBIADES PEÇANHA.

For Bulgaria:
——— ———.

For China:
——— ———.

For Denmark:
L. INGERSLEV.
KNUD GREGERSEN.

For Egypt:
——— ———.

For Spain:
SILVIO FERNANDEZ VALLIN.

For Estonia:
——— ———.

For Finland:
——— ———.

For France:
PIERRE ETIENNE FLANDIN.
GEORGES RIPERT.

For Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
A. H. DENNIS.
ORME CLARKE.
R. L. MEGARRY.

For the Commonwealth of Australia:
A. H. DENNIS.
ORME CLARKE.
R. L. MEGARRY.

For the Union of South Africa:
A. H. DENNIS.
ORME CLARKE.
R. L. MEGARRY.

For Greece:
G. C. LAGOUDAKIS.

For Hungary:
——— ———.

For Italy:
A. GIANNINI.

For Japan:
KAZUO NISHIKAWA.

For Latvia:
M. NUKŠA.

For Luxembourg:
E. ARENDT.

For Mexico:
——— ———.

For Norway:
N. CHR. DITLEFF.

For the Netherlands:
W. B. ENGELBRECHT.

For Poland:
AUGUSTE ZALESKI.
ALFONS KUHN.

For Rumania:
G. CRETZIANO.

For Sweden:
——— ———.

For Switzerland:
EDM. PITTARD.
Dr. F. HESS.

For Czechoslovakia:
Dr. V. GIESA.

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
KOTZUBINSKY.

For Venezuela:
——— ———.

For Yugoslavia:
IVO DE GIULLI.

ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL (WITH REFERENCE TO ARTICLE 2)

The High Contracting Parties reserve to themselves the right to declare at the time of ratification or of adherence that the first paragraph of article 2 of this Convention shall not apply to international transportation by air performed directly by the State, its colonies, protectorates, or mandated territories, or by any other territory under its sovereignty, suzerainty, or authority.

For Germany:
R. RICHTER.
Dr. A. WEGERDT.
Dr. E. ALBRECHT.
Dr. OTTO RIESE.

For Austria:
STROBELE.
REINOEHL.

For Belgium:
BERNARD DE L'ESCAILLE.

For Brazil:
ALCIBIADES PEÇANHA.

For Bulgaria:
——— ———.

For China:
——— ———.

For Denmark:
L. INGERSLEV.
KNUD GREGERSEN.

For Egypt:
——— ———.

For Spain:
SILVIO FERNANDEZ VALLIN.

For Estonia:
——— ———.

For Finland:
——— ———.

For France:
PIERRE ETIENNE FLANDIN.
GEORGES RIPERT.

For Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
A. H. DENNIS.
ORME CLARKE.
R. L. MEGARRY.

For the Commonwealth of Australia:
A. H. DENNIS.
ORME CLARKE.
R. L. MEGARRY.

For the Union of South Africa:
A. H. DENNIS.
ORME CLARKE.
R. L. MEGARRY.

For Greece:
G. C. LAGOUDAKIS.

For Hungary:
——— ———.

For Italy:
A. GIANNINI.

For Japan:
KAZUO NISHIKAWA.

For Latvia:
M. NUKŠA.

For Luxembourg:
E. ARENDT.

For Mexico:
——— ———.

For Norway:
N. CHR. DITLEFF.

For the Netherlands:
W. B. ENGELBRECHT.

For Poland:
AUGUSTE ZALESKI.
ALFONS KÜHN.

For Rumania:
G. CRETZIANO.

For Sweden:
——— ———.

For Switzerland:
EDM. PITTARD.
Dr. F. HESS.

For Czechoslovakia:
Dr. V. GIESA.

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
KOTZUBINSKY.

For Venezuela:
——— ———.

For Yugoslavia:
IVO DE GIULLI.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understood the Senator from Tennessee had yielded the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] had said that he wished to follow me, and I had told him that if he were not present when I concluded I would suggest the absence of a quorum. I do not see him in the Chamber. He wished to speak this afternoon.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that if the Senator from Nevada desires to speak this afternoon he will be afforded an opportunity to do so.

I understand that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who is present, has a brief speech of 20 minutes or so which he would like to make this afternoon. I shall be glad to telephone the Senator from Nevada immediately, and if he wishes to make his speech this afternoon I shall not make the motion to recess until after he reaches the Chamber.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is satisfactory to me. I merely wished to carry out my agreement with the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know precisely what the agreement was, but I assume the Senator wished to be sure that the Senate would not take a recess without the Senator from Nevada being notified to that effect. I will assume the responsibility of not making a motion to recess until we have had an opportunity to communicate with the Senator from Nevada. I do not like to put all Senators to the inconvenience of answering a quorum call. In any event, as soon as the speeches are out of the way, the Senate will take a recess, under the order previously entered, until Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is quite satisfactory, so long as the Senator from Nevada may have an opportunity to deliver his speech this afternoon before the Senate takes a recess.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, with the exception of the speeches to be delivered, there be no further business transacted this afternoon. I think Senators on both sides of the aisle are entitled to assurances that there will be no resolutions adopted or business of the Senate transacted, other than speeches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I note that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is now present in the Chamber. I wonder if we can consult with the Senator from Nevada and see if he is willing to follow the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

REPORT BY HENRY FORD II ON THE CONSEQUENCES OF AMERICA'S $41.7 BILLION IN GIFTS ABROAD

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, during the past 7 years the junior Senator from Nevada has stated time and again on the Senate floor that the friendship and respect of foreign peoples cannot be bought by bribes, grants, or turning over to them American jobs and markets.

Today our global handouts since the war aggregate $41.7 billion. Eight billion eight hundred million dollars more await delivery to them. This makes an overall total of $50.5 billion in global handouts.

Despite this largess the foreign peoples we have aided most neither like us very much nor respect us.

Confirmation of this fact, although possibly not so intended, comes from Mr. Henry Ford II.

MR. FORD ONLY AN EXAMPLE

Mr. Ford, in an address at Philadelphia, recently reported on his experience as a recent delegate to the United Nations. This experience, he said, gave him "a rather revealing picture of how the United States of America appears to others." It was, as he put it, a black picture. Mr. Ford said:

> Three things generally stand out in sharp relief as they [meaning foreign peoples] look at us.
>
> First, is the view that we have been so preoccupied with military defense that we are overlooking the most positive approaches to peace—in effect, that we are prepared to spend billions for defense against Soviet Russia, but only pennies for world progress.

This is Mr. Ford reporting. Mr. Ford continues:

> Second is the feeling that the present economy in government drive, which he says he favors very strongly, has been taken over by an isolationist wrecking crew, which runs under the slogan, "No trade, no aid, no cooperation, no nothing."

Mr. President, this is the reaction Mr. Ford reports among foreign peoples after we have spent over $41 billion of American taxpayers' money in their behalf, pledged almost $9 billion more, showered them with help through UNRRA, ECA, MSA, and other alphabetical agencies, financed out of all proportion with other countries, the United Nations, and NATO, subsidized foreign shipping and trade, and sacrificed to them many American jobs and markets in giveaway trade concessions.

This is the reaction Mr. Ford reports to the efforts of this administration and this Congress to achieve economy in Government while bolstering a military security in Europe that Europe seems reluctant to accept, and of questionable value to America in the event of war.

Mr. Ford has a third report to make on what he calls a foreign view.

UNITED STATES REDS VIEWED AS FRIGHTENED MICE

Mr. Ford says:

> Third is what many people regard as an over eager, blunderbuss pursuit of the Reds and a rather hysterical attack upon freedom of thought.

Mr. Ford continues:

> Apparently the world sees us as a giant peering nervously under the bed, and occasionally bashing with a huge cudgel, a small and frightened mouse.

Mr. President, Mr. Ford boasts that while serving as a delegate at the United Nations he kept his eyes and ears open.

It would be of interest to the junior Senator from Nevada to learn who, in Mr. Ford's sight and hearing, voiced the criticism, deprecations, and slanders about the United States, our economy, our foreign aid programs and campaigns against Communists dedicated to overthrowing our government by force and violence. Who are these foreign detractors? What do they want us to do—coddle communism as they do in France or Italy, and did in Czechoslovakia before the Red coup? Will Mr. Ford be more explicit?

More important, what were or are Mr. Ford's reactions to these calumnies?

Does Mr. Ford accept or reject foreign views that as we siphon off billions of the Nation's wealth to other countries we are offering only pennies for world progress?

Or what he describes as a feeling among foreigners that our economy program, the program of this administration and this Congress, has been taken over by an isolationist wrecking crew?

Or what he reports—many people regard as an overeager, blunderbuss pursuit of the Reds?

Having advertised what he calls standout foreign views, feelings and regard, what is Mr. Ford's view, feeling, and regard on these aspersions of American deeds and motives?

Perhaps Mr. Ford should suggest how he would combat communism or Communists?

Perhaps Mr. Ford should suggest an American program for America and Americans.

Mr. Ford suggests a foreign program.

MORE FOR OVERSEAS: LESS FOR AMERICA

Mr. Ford's version of a foreign program consists of more aid, more concessions, more handouts of various kinds, and more giveaways of American jobs, markets and capital, which are the very things that foreign peoples, by his report, scorn and disparage. More for foreigners, of course, means less for Americans, but Mr. Ford does not expound on that.

Mr. President, for the past 20 years the American people, and even a majority of the Congress, have been pressured and propagandized and frightened into taking actions against the national interest by stories that other people do not like us and do not like the way we run our shop here in America.

For 20 years we have been told, and we are still being told, that to win the affection of foreign people we would have to give them money, or industries, or arms, or trade concessions enabling them to invade and capture our own markets with the products of low wage and sweatshop labor.

We were told 20 years ago that we would have to recognize Russia, and we did. Before many months no doubt we will be told by some of our world planners that we will have to recognize Communist China or some other nation will not like us, and if this view prevails that mistake will be made also, but never with the assent of the junior Senator from Nevada.

Over two decades we have had a procession of poor prophets propagandizing for giveaways to foreign nations on the pretext this would buy eternal friendship.

Today we have fewer friends than at any time in history. Our closest friends today, it seems, are people we were at war with less than 10 years ago. And some of the nations and peoples that were our allies then now are bitter enemies, or at best neutrals aiding and trading with the Communists.

THE GLOBAL GIVEAWAY CULT

Mr. President, we can have more friends and we will have more friends when we stop patting and patronizing foreign peoples and exercise our own independence and self-respect.

We can win more friends when we return to American principles and turn away from the giveaway policies and programs of the world-planning cult dedicated to the theory of one economic world and believing that to achieve peace we must make ourselves as poor as other nations.

It is an amazing cult, as amazing as its sequence of bellwethers, the Henry Wallaces, Willard Thorps, Harry Hopkinses, Dean Achesons, and many others. They come and go, changing like the names of the successive agencies set up to spread our wealth and substance around the world, advancing always the same stale giveaway program but under different labels.

It is a cult limited in numbers, but in two previous administrations it has wielded great power and influence. Congress on many occasions has bowed to its global policies and programs, to the cost of American industries and resource development.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada is not prepared as yet to include Mr. Ford in his list of cult leaders. Mr. Ford is young. He is not, as he admitted in his recent speech at Philadelphia, a "seasoned statesman." A "seasoned statesman" such as we have in the State Department might not have been as candid as Mr. Ford in reporting how foreign people view us despite the help we have given and are still giving them.

Currently, however, Mr. Ford is a world planner, or at least he is talking like one. He talks like the world planners who flash across the scene year after year planning the future economy of the world at the expense of American taxpayers, American workers and industries,

particularly industries that cannot afford to finance and establish subsidiaries and plants in low-wage foreign countries as Mr. Ford has done.

He has adopted the mannerisms and characteristics of the professional world planner, such as peering down his nose at fellow Americans with amused tolerance and considering them befuddled.

At Philadelphia Mr. Ford told his audience:

> Like an old prospector who suddenly strikes it rich, we [meaning Americans] are a little befuddled by our fortune. We don't know what to do with ourselves.

Mr. President, if Mr. Ford knows as little about world affairs as he does about prospectors, he should get out of the world planning business.

The junior Senator from Nevada has known many prospectors. All are good Americans, with their feet on the ground. Some struck it rich, as Mr. Ford puts it, after years of struggle and back-breaking toil, such as I doubt Mr. Ford ever experienced.

From the earth and by their own labors these prospectors brought wealth in the form of oils and minerals, American wealth, from and for America.

SUBSTITUTES AND SUBSIDIES

Prospectors built cities and churches, and museums, and colleges, and many of our most distinguished and public-spirited citizens in the West today are old prospectors or their descendants.

Mr. President, it seems a trait of our world planners always to disparage wealth, particularly American wealth, when it is earned by hard work, exploration, and development of our own resources. We are told that it makes us "a little befuddled by our fortune" and that "we do not know what to do with ourselves."

But another characteristic of world planners is far more harmful than that. They disparage not only our prospectors, young and old, but America's resources and natural wealth.

They advance programs to substitute the foreign products of 20-cent, 40-cent, and 50-cent foreign labor for the products America can produce.

They subsidize the exploration and development of foreign mines, minerals and oils, subsidize production, and subsidize their importation to the detriment or destruction of American mineral industries and new petroleum industries.

They put old prospectors, whom they consider befuddled, out of business, and discourage young Americans for prospecting our own underdeveloped areas for the critical and strategic metals that may mean the Nation's survival if there is another war.

They prefer manganese from India or Russia, oil from Iran, uranium from Africa—all of which would be denied us in the event of war—to the manganese, oil, uranium, and other critical materials Americans will discover and develop, given bare security for their investment and toil after new wealth has been uncovered and production begun, not as in the case of foreign competitors, before, for our very survival, into prospecting for uranium so that our atomic program does not starve should enemy submarines cut off supplies from Africa.

Mr. President, I wish these world planners who are always talking about foreign programs at American taxpayers' expense would somehow, some day, talk about a program for America and Americans. They never do. If they need guidance on a program for Americans they would do well to talk to a few old prospectors, who have lived Americanism all their lives.

I think Mr. Ford should retract his aspersions against western prospectors and apologize to the entire mineral- and fuel-producing industry.

We need here in America, and I hereby propose, an association of card-carrying Americans.

I suggest, also, that members of this association of card-carrying Americans purchase an American flag to be installed in their homes so that they may face it each morning as they recite the pledge of allegiance or the Bill of Rights.

What we need, Mr. President, is fewer world planners and more planners for America.

MR. FORD'S FOREIGN SUBSIDIARIES

World planners, apparently, show small concern over the welfare of American workers or American industries they are selling down the river, or about American security, both economic and military, or about our precious American sovereignty which is being dissipated and diluted.

Let us look at the company Mr. Ford heads.

According to the Pennsylvania Employer Wage Earner Job Protection Association, the Ford Motor Co. at the time of its latest report operated 26 active subsidiaries in foreign countries.

Ford Motor subsidiaries were located in England, Canada, Australia, India, Malaya, New Zealand, South Africa, Italy, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Spain, Portugal, Egypt, France, Germany, and Brazil.

The company with which Paul Hoffman, another world planner, is connected, has plants in South Africa, Brazil, Belgium, the Philippines, Mexico, Denmark, Argentina, Egypt, Canada, and Ireland, according to the same Pennsylvania group.

Mr. President, if our world planners were content to mind their own foreign business without interference in United States affairs, I would not have too much objection, although these foreign factories, owned by American interests, do invade third markets abroad in competition with the products of our own factories and automobile workers.

Their foreign products win foreign markets by reason of low wage scales of foreign workers, a third or less what American workers justly earn over here.

This is bad enough, as the recent layoffs in American auto factories attest, but it is not all our world planners want.

They want duties lowered or removed so that low-wage, low-taxed, low-production-cost foreign products can invade our American markets and take them over.

Mr. Ford calls this a liberalized trade policy.

I CALL IT ECONOMIC SUICIDE

Mr. President, we have an administration that is going to succeed or fail on the basis of how well it meets its responsibilities to Americans, on how or whether it meets the expectations of people who elevated it to office.

In this connection, there is a recent poll conducted for the Boston Post by Crossley, Inc. It reports that the principal reason cited by citizens who voted this administration into office is that they felt need for a change.

The junior Senator from Nevada welcomes reports on the views, feelings, and regards of American citizens, Mr. President, much more than he does the views, feelings, and regards of foreign peoples, even when reported from the United Nations.

TIME FOR CHANGES IN FOREIGN POLICY

The junior Senator from Nevada shares the views of American citizens polled on the reasons why they voted in this administration. It was and is time for a change, and particularly for a change in our foreign policy.

To date we have not had a change in foreign policy, and a change is overdue. It is time to change from a policy that puts its emphasis on foreign prosperity and foreign jobs to a policy that looks first to the domestic welfare of the United States, its industries, investors, and employees.

Technical assistance that we have been and are sending abroad and which Mr. Ford would continue sending abroad to countries including some in which he has subsidiaries could well be used here at home advancing our own research and development and our own underdeveloped areas.

There are roads, harbors, and other projects right here in the United States, self-helping, self-sustaining, reimbursable projects, enough projects to absorb all the money that the Congress may consider it wise to expend.

Private investments at home, discouraged by high taxes and insecurity of markets in the face of foreign imports, would be greatly encouraged by a program giving protection to these markets, and by lower taxes which would result if the American taxpayer were relieved of supporting foreign critics who call our billions of dollars to them only pennies.

All of the above could be achieved if we were to revert to the sound trade policies which for a century and a half encouraged American enterprise, American employment, and American investment, and developed our Nation from a wilderness to the richest, most secure Nation in the history of the world.

Most of all, an American program for America would strengthen our national security.

Under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, the State Department has made this Nation dependent for many critical materials on foreign sources.

We have been manipulated into a dependency on these sources to an extent that at any time we could be endangered through a foreign nation's manipulation to end export permits on such critical materials.

A case in point is the peacetime refusal of India to allow exportation of Manozite sands needed in the atomic energy field.

When such dependency becomes fixed we are already subjected to a form of blackmail to enter into some form of an agreement or understanding on terms of the foreign nation's choosing. Either we must submit to blackmail or we are denied the goods we need for our military and economic security.

Why we need them is because for 20 years there has been a well-planned program or scheme to curb or hold back our own resource expansion to a point where we have now become dependent on foreign sources for materials we have ourselves. We have had our sovereignty over our own resources sold out to foreign interests and cartels.

The quintessence of this scheme was the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, the act primarily responsible for bringing the Nation to its knees, dependent on foreign countries across one or more major oceans for many materials and minerals without which we cannot fight a war or prepare for our own defense.

SPREAD THE WEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. President, for 175 years we were the greatest "have" nation in the world. Our resources as a "have" Nation made us the richest and most powerful nation in the world, the mecca of millions of immigrants and many millions of dollars of foreign capital, eager to share in our natural wealth, and willing to share the costs, through taxes, of its development.

We are still the greatest "have" nation in the world, but here is the difference today, the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, and other global programs for spreading our wealth and fortunes to the four corners of the earth, have succeeded in depriving us of the fruits of what we have.

When persons talk about getting minerals and materials at a lower cost to the consumer, they are talking about patronizing lower-wage-scale labor.

There is no question that with our materials, machinery, and know-how being made available to any foreign nation and any domestic investor, a resident of this Nation can take with him into a foreign country, such as Mr. Ford has done, his know-how, his superintendents, his foremen, and his machinery.

So the difference in the labor cost is the cost of production. That is the reason we find such men advocating the scheme proposed by the economic one-worlders, so that they may be able to go behind the low-wage curtain and deprive citizens of the United States of the high wage standard of living which has been established here.

In some foreign countries, wages are of such a nature and so low that more is actually provided the worker in the United States by way of industrial insurance, social security, and unemployment insurance than is paid by way of wages to workers in foreign countries. Yet people talk about competition.

We have been prevented by the State Department and by the various foreign-aid agencies Congress has set up, from developing and using the resources we ourselves possess, and have been demoted, temporarily I hope, from a proud, strong, and independent Nation, to a Nation dependent on other countries for much of our prosperity and strength.

This may not be, for the time being, too great a hardship to an American industrialist who can maintain 26 active subsidiaries in foreign countries, as does Mr. Ford. It is, however, a definite hardship on the unemployed auto worker in Detroit, who is forced to maintain his familiy on an unemployment compensation check of $27 a week for 20 weeks, and is wondering what will happen when the 20 weeks are up.

Of course, it is said that the State Department plans to set up industrial training schools, in order to train workers in new skills. Whether the workers be miners or employees in clothespin factories, they will be taught new work. I am not exactly clear what other work will be left if such a policy is finally adopted permanently.

It is a hardship on the 107,000 workers in Detroit's metropolitan area who are out of jobs; on the 119,000 coal miners displaced by foreign oil imports; on the 48,041 woolen and worsted textile workers of the 132 American woolen mills which have been liquidated and closed down while foreign textile mills boom at sweatshop wages and swamp our markets with, as was the case last year, a billion and a half dollars worth of foreign goods.

It is a hardship on glass and crockery workers, watchmakers, and employees in the chemical industry. I could name 50 other crafts in which employees have been bumped off their jobs, not by other Americans, but by 50-cents-a-day, dollar-a-day, $2-a-day, and $3-a-day workers overseas, who are using the same machinery as is being used in the United States, and are getting one-fifth or one-tenth the wages.

Mr. President, any and every American industry has to weigh two major factors: wages and taxes. The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and the global cult in the State Department ignore these factors in their deals with foreign nations.

These factors were recognized in the first 150 years of the Republic.

They were recognized by our forefathers, who drew up the Constitution. Congress, as directed by the Constitution, for 150 growing years imposed tariffs to equalize the difference in costs and taxes between products manufactured or produced in low-cost and low-tax areas of the world, and the products of American workers in American industries.

The Constitution called this a duty. Our Founding Fathers and our Government up until 1934 considered it a duty of foreign manufacturers and shippers who enjoy our markets to compete with our products on a fair and equal basis.

In other words, Mr. President, tariffs represented the wages lost and the revenues lost when foreign products were imported to compete with our own goods. They did not penalize foreign producers, but did compel them to come into our rich markets on a fair competitive basis.

When such products come into the United States, when they cross the boundary of our Nation, there should be paid into the Treasury of the United States, in the form of a duty or a tariff, the difference between the taxes and the wages paid in a foreign country and those paid in the United States, in order to help support the market of which advantage is sought to be taken.

STATES RIGHTS DISSIPATED

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 repealed these safeguards to American industry and labor, and in effect granted foreign manufacturers and shippers a preferential subsidy.

That act deprived our 48 sovereign States of any representation in matters dealing with State industries wrecked or damaged by foreign imports.

The constitutional responsibility of Congress, which represents every precinct, every district, and every State, was turned over to the global theorists of the State Department, who feel their first responsibility is to guide the rest of the world up the prosperity ladder, and our own Nation down.

Congressmen are elected to represent their constituents and the interests of constituents.

Nobody in the State Department is elected, and their field is foreign, not domestic affairs. Yet today the State Department has power to consign entire domestic industries to the gas chamber, and, in effect, blacklist workers from jobs in which they are trained and skilled.

Congress in 1934 gave the foreign experts of the State Department the authority to remake the industrial and the economic map of the United States, to subordinate and subjugate industries, cities, and even States to the interest of foreign competitors, to close plants and throw people out of work, and the State Department has been doing that very thing and is doing it now.

Apparently there are world planners and foreign program proposers who want the State Department to continue doing that, with the view that after 20 years of failure we may win the love of some sweatshop-labor foreign state.

Mr. Ford has a foreign program, as the junior Senator from Nevada pointed out earlier. He has a program for foreign nations in which, as I stated, he reputedly has 26 or more Ford subsidiaries.

Assuming that Mr. Ford is sincere in wanting to help these foreign countries and foreign peoples, and I have no doubt of his sincerity, it might not be amiss to suggest a foreign program for Mr. Ford and other American industrialists who have subsidiaries in foreign countries.

A PROGRAM THOUGHT FOR MR. FORD

Mr. Ford could, if he chose, raise the wages of automobile workers in the foreign plants to the same scale he pays his automobile workers in the United States. This would have two advantages:

It would raise the living standards of the foreign workers and would enable them to buy the automobiles they make, instead of having to ride bicycles to work, as many of them do now. It would put the products of their labor in more equal competition with the products of American labor in our own and foreign markets.

Mr. Ford is reputed to be able to make a Ford in England for $700, while American Fords cost $1,700 and up.

If Mr. Ford paid American wages in England, or Germany, or the other countries in which he has subsidiaries, more Britons, Germans, and other foreign automobile workers would be able to buy Fords, and more American-built Fords could be sold in the third markets of the world.

A skilled adult male automobile worker in England, I am advised, has average hourly earnings, which of course includes bonuses and overtime, of the equivalent of 69 cents an hour. Women in the same classification can earn 41 cents an hour. Boys and youths under 21 can earn 28 cents an hour, and girls 26 cents an hour.

These average earnings are based on an average workweek of 46.3 hours, which is 5 hours longer than the average workweek in the American automobile industry.

Wage rates, as distinguished from earnings, are of course much lower, 40 to 47 cents for men over 21, in contrast to the $2.17 or more paid for comparable work in American plants.

I desire to say, Mr. President, that the industrialists in the low-wage, sweatshop labor countries and their colonies have already acquired a vested interest in sweatshop labor, because, since they can get free trade in the great market of America, the lower they can hold their wages down and the more the traffic will bear here, the greater will be their profit.

Mr. President, as our industrialists move to Europe, to Asia, and to low-cost, low-wage nations elsewhere, they acquire a vested interest in low-cost labor, because the feasibility of their undertakings is based on low-cost labor. We shall not witness Mr. Ford's raising the wages voluntarily, because if he raised wages, such action would reduce his profits. If he paid the same wages and the same taxes in Canada that he pays in the United States it would automatically be free trade, on the basis of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. If we do not extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and allow it to die on June 12 of this year, fixing the rate of tariff duties would revert to the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. The act simply states that the Tariff Commission shall determine the cost of producing an article in this country as compared with the cost of producing a like article in the chief competitive foreign nation, and shall recommend a tariff to compensate for the difference. So, if Mr. Ford paid in one of his foreign subsidiaries in the chief competitive nation wages equivalent to those paid in the United States, there would automatically be free trade.

However, Mr. President, that is not what is sought. Wage rates for women in the British motor-vehicle industry are much lower than the rates for men, which is likewise true of other foreign nations. I am told this presents one advantage to American industrialists who are able to operate plants abroad to produce products in competition with the product of American labor employed here at home.

The equal-pay-for-equal-work principle has not caught on in foreign lands, I am informed, which makes foreign operations desirable to some American industrialists who, by training women workers abroad, can shave wages even lower than the forty-odd cents an hour they pay to skilled male adult craftsmen.

That the motor industry abroad has taken advantage of this is indicated by employment figures. In Great Britain at the end of August 1953, 295,000 persons were employed in the manufacture of motor vehicles, 43,000 of them women.

German workers in vehicle construction earn 44 to 47 cents an hour. In Milan, northern Italy, where automobile manufacturing is centered, wages of skilled metal mechanical workers range from 26 cents an hour to 29 cents, but family allowances may supplement this by an equivalent of about 65 cents a day.

Skilled and highly skilled workers in the Paris machinery manufacturing industry, which includes automobiles, are paid at a rate of 48 to 58 cents an hour, supplemented by family allowances, which may run to $32 monthly.

These are general figures from official records of wages in those countries, either in motor-vehicle manufacture, as in Great Britain and Germany, or covering an even broader field, as in France and Italy. If Mr. Ford will supply me with Ford wage rates in his foreign subsidiaries, I shall be glad to put them in the RECORD, and I also offer this opportunity to Mr. Paul Hoffman, former ECA Administrator and now with the Studebaker Corp.

Mr. President, I well remember that in 1949, I believe it was, when Mr. Paul Hoffman was administering the ECA, he wrote a very enlightening article for the American magazine. The junior Senator from Nevada was furnished an advance copy, on which he commented on the Senate floor.

I shall not review all of Mr. Hoffman's recommendations, but one of them was for free trade in butter. Mr. President, he succeeded in obtaining reduced rates on butter, and now we have butter all over the landscape. We are now trying to sell it to Russia at a greatly reduced price, or give it to some other foreign nation, just to get rid of it.

Why is that? It is because of the possibility of foreign butter being imported, and also because of the guaranteed prices. So all we have done has been to pile up butter. I remarked on the Senate floor about a week ago that I supposed the reason why we wanted to sell the butter at a greatly reduced price was that we were getting ready to whip Russia—as is said—and we do not want to fight a hungry army.

Mr. President, poor wages mean poor countries. Will Mr. Ford accept my suggestion that he pay foreign workers in foreign factories the equivalent of American wages? Then he would not have to worry about the tariff, because the question of wages is considered by an agent of Congress, the Tariff Commission. If there is no difference between the cost of a product manufactured in this country and the cost of a like product in the chief competitive nation, then there is no tariff. That is the way for Mr. Ford to reach his objective, instead of trying to hold the wage standards down in foreign countries where his subsidiaries are located, and accepting the profit as the difference between what he pays abroad and what the traffic will bear here.

Or does Mr. Ford prefer to keep foreign wages low, and lower tariffs still further, to enable foreign Fords to make inroads in the American market, after driving the products of American workers and American factories out of the foreign markets of the world?

So instead of bringing up wages and living standards in the countries where he has so carefully built his factories, he would tear down our wages and living standards to their level. I wish he would take a leaf out of his grandfather's book. I well remember when Henry Ford I woke up one morning and said, "My mechanics in Detroit can't buy my Fords if we pay them $2.50 a day. The minimum wage henceforth will be $5 a day." That is what Mr. Ford's grandfather said. That is not what Mr. Ford II is saying.

And how about Mr. Hoffman, Mr. President?

The Wall Street Journal of January 7 reported:

> Studebaker Corp. will shortly lay off between 3,000 and 3,500 workers, but officials expressed confidence they still expect to produce and sell more cars this year than they did in 1953.

Produce where? In the foreign countries in which Studebaker has subsidiaries? Mr. President, when those subsidiaries are well established, and some of the workers in Detroit do not like the wage cuts which may be imposed or do not like the working conditions, they will simply be stalled, because the production in foreign nations can be increased, and if the producers in those nations are successful in securing the free trade which they seek, they can pit the low wage, sweatshop workers against the American workers and win any strike. It is a smart job that is being done on the workers of the United States of America, and only a few seem to realize it yet.

From Detroit the Wall Street Journal reported:

> Chrysler Corp.'s Plymouth plant, after dropping its second shift 10 days ago, worked only half shifts yesterday (Wednesday) and Tuesday. The auto firm sent home 14,000 employees after they had done a 4-hour turn.

In Britain automobile workers are working overtime.

The same newspaper reports:

> Packard Motor Car Co. is to close down auto-assembly operations for a week and furlough 7,500 workers.

While the same issue quoted Henry Ford II as characterizing reports of large-scale unemployment as "a snare and a delusion."

Mr. President, whom is Mr. Ford kidding? Is it Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers Union and also president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations? This same Mr. Reuther is urging President Eisenhower to call a conference to discuss ways and means of maintaining full production and full

employment, while he goes along with Ford and wants to give both our domestice and export markets in automobiles over to automobile workers in England, Germany, and points east.

Mr. Ford advocates the encouragement of private investments abroad. How better could he practice his preachment than by raising wages in all his foreign subsidiaries to the level of wages paid in United States factories to men and women of the same or similar skills?

Fair wages paid in American-owned foreign factories would improve the living standards in those countries, and would increase, in some measure, through taxation the revenues that foreign governments require. Such wages might even reduce the amount of aid in the form of either commodities or services or dollars, that we are called on by these foreign nations to provide from time to time.

Fair wages paid in American-owned foreign factories would, in fact, increase the general wage standards in those nations, just as the wage increases Mr. Ford's grandfather gave to Ford workers in America three decades ago raised wage standards throughout the motor industry and had a marked effect on the wage standards in other industries.

Such fair wages would end United States subsidies abroad.

Such fair wages paid in foreign industries also would remove the excuse for trade agreements, for then we would have worldwide competition on an equal basis, instead of subsidizing foreign industries to free-trade us out of the world's markets and our own.

I do not presume, Mr. President, to counsel Mr. Ford on how he should run his business abroad, nor do I counsel any other American industrialist who is operating abroad, in competition with our own citizens. The junior Senator from Nevada believes firmly in the American principle of letting American enterprise run its own business. He does not believe in world socialism or socialistic controls, such as the State Department has imposed on American business in America, through the Trade Agreements Act, by which entire industries and innumerable jobs can be eliminated at the whim of a so-called foreign expert.

What I would appreciate, Mr. President, is that the Fords and the Hoffmans and the Colemans leave America's economy to Americans, instead of trying to trade it away or give it away or spread it away over the outside world, to the distress and disadvantage of the wage-earners and the investors of the United States of America.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I note that it is now 15 minutes past 6 o'clock. Announcement has been made that at the close of the session today, the Senate will take a recess until Monday. I observe that at this moment the floor of the Senate is quite a lonely place; but I am very glad that my good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] occupies the chair, and that another of my good friends, the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], is present.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Whenever my able and distinguished friend and neighbor, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], speaks, I shall always seek to be present.

Mr. COOPER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, ordinarily I would not speak at this late hour of the day, particularly late on Friday afternoon, and thus require certain of my colleagues and various of the officials of the Senate to remain; but I desire to address myself to the subject matter before the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1. During the greater part of today and yesterday, the Senate has heard a very exhaustive discussion of the joint resolution, by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]; and I have been waiting to obtain the floor. As I said a moment ago, I would not speak at this late hour of the day unless there were some good reason. That reason is that I know that a series of negotiations are occurring, in an attempt to reach a compromise version of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 which may be acceptable to a great many of the Members of this body and may be acceptable to the distinguished chief sponsor of the joint resolution, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and other Senators who have been working upon a compromise. As other Members of this body have done, I pay tribute to the zeal, the great ability, and the sincerity with which the Senator from Ohio has brought the important subject of the treatymaking power to the attention of the Congress and the country. I need not say that all of us know the deep patriotic feeling that has prompted him in this undertaking.

Because I do not know what the compromise which may be drawn will include, if one is reached, and because certainly I might not be able to support it, I wish to place upon record, while there is an opportunity to do so, my substantive reasons for opposing Senate Joint Resolution No. 1.

I shall divide my remarks into two parts. In one part, I shall direct my remarks to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, the so-called Bricker amendment, as reported by the committee.

Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], whom all of us hold in great respect, sent to the desk a proposed amendment to the pending joint resolution. We know it is an important and significant amendment. For that reason, I shall direct a part of my remarks to it.

In fact, in view of the lateness of the hour, perhaps I shall begin the presentation of my views by referring to the proposed amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1. Later, I shall discuss what has been called the Bricker amendment, which I have opposed.

In fact, Mr. President, the position I hold regarding Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, known as the Bricker amendment, is the same as that I have held ever since its introduction. I am not one of the sponsors of the joint resolution, and almost one year ago I announced my opposition to it.

At the beginning of my remarks I should also like to say that I hope that if a compromise version or revision is agreed to, it will not contain provisions which will carry with them the same uncertainties and doubts which are inherent in the so-called Bricker amendment.

I also hope that the proposal to include in a constitutional amendment the rules of the Senate will not be adopted.

I hold that the Constitution is the basic instrument of our Government, an instrument of dignity; and for no reason should we trifle with it, by writing, or attempting to write into it provisions which do not properly belong in the fundamental law of the land.

Mr. President, at this time I shall address myself, for a few minutes, to the proposed amendment of the senior Senator from Georgia. In a sense, it really presents for our consideration the same questions which are raised by section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, of the Senator from Ohio, that section being known as the "which" clause.

The third section of Senate Joint Resolution 1 deals with executive agreements and would require that they be regulated by the Congress. On Wednesday, January 27, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] moved to amend Senate Joint Resolution 1 by offering a substitution. His amendment reads as follows:

SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of Congress.

Section 1 of the proposed substitute provides that a treaty or executive agreement may not conflict with the Constitution. Later in my remarks I shall express my view that this is the law already.

If the proposed amendment of the Senator from Georgia should be adopted it would eliminate section 2 of the "which" clause of the Bricker amendment. His amendment, therefore, reduces the question to be decided to one issue—whether the Constitution should be amended to require that executive agreements be made effective as internal law only by an act of Congress.

Section 2 of this amendment does not by its terms refer to executive agreements. It refers to international agreements other than treaties. While many international agreements are really treaties in the constitutional sense, in the sense that they are submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, they

may not formally bear the name of treaties. Sometimes they are called by such names as conventions, protocols, or acts, even though they have been approved by the Senate by the constitutional two-thirds vote. I am sure that the proposed amendment considers these agreements as treaties, and not international agreements other than treaties. I mention this to avoid any confusion in my discussion.

There is another question which is suggested, at first impression, by a literal reading of section 2 of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. Many executive agreements are made under preexisting legislative authority. It appears that in some cases executive agreements have been entered into pursuant to preexisting authority not granted by statute, but by treaty. For example, the compilation of various executive agreements prepared by the Department of State and enumerated on pages 855 through 861 of the hearings by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 1, states the authority for 114 agreements relating to civil air rights and services in the following terms:

> Agreements made within the framework of International Civil Aviation Convention, a treaty (TIAS 1591; 61 Stat., pt. 2, 1180), and in pursuance of duties of civil aviation authorities under existing law; also Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. app. 1611–1646), as applied to air-service facilities.

It will be observed that by far the greatest part of the executive agreements named in the compilation are agreements made under legislative authority or implemented by legislative authority. The question presents itself if section 2 of the suggested amendment of Senator GEORGE would require an executive agreement made under preexisting authority of a statute or a treaty properly ratified, to be implemented by subsequent action of Congress before it could become effective as internal law. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Georgia, whose judgment and profound knowledge we respect, will discuss fully all of these points when he speaks upon his amendment.

I raise the point that from a literal reading of the amendment it might be considered that even an executive agreement which had been entered into under preexisting authority might also require an additional act of Congress.

My questions are perhaps questions of wording and do not go to the heart of the situation with which this amendment would deal. I am sure that the real issue is whether an executive agreement entered into by the President under his constitutional powers and not by legislative authority—an executive agreement which the Senate or the Congress may never have the opportunity to examine, act upon, or even know of its existence prior to its execution is effective as Federal internal law and internal law of the States, and, if so, should the situation be permitted to continue.

This issue is pointed up by the decisions of the Supreme Court in *United State* v. *Belmont* (301 U. S. 324) in 1937 and *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203) in 1942.

The Belmont and Pink cases, the Senate will recall, involved the so-called Litvinov assignment, an executive agreement which Secretary Hull entered with Litvinov which provided that the Soviet Union should assign to the United States all amounts due the Soviet Union from American banks or corporations.

The United States in turn was to make such funds available for the satisfaction of claims of American citizens against the U. S. S. R. for injuries accruing to them from the expropriation of their property by the Communist regime. The question involved in the case was whether the United States could take for the satisfaction of these claims bank deposits and other property owned by Russian corporations prior to the revolution which had been nationalized by the U. S. S. R. and assigned to the United States by the Litvinov assignment. I have said throughout the debate that I do not believe that any international agreement can supersede the Constitution or the Bill of Rights. I am certain that the Pink case—and certainly the Belmont case—did not hold that such an agreement could supersede the fifth amendment. The Court itself said that the contest was "between the United States and creditors of the Russian corporation who, we assume, are not citizens of this country and whose claims did not arise out of transactions with the New York branch." It will be remembered that the fifth amendment protects only our citizens and those aliens who are present in this land.

On this state of facts the Court said:

> A State is not precluded, however, by the 14th amendment from according priority to local creditors as against creditors who are nationals of foreign countries and whose claims arose abroad. By the same token, the Federal Government is not barred by the fifth amendment from securing for itself and our nationals priority against such creditors.

The Court did not hold that the international agreement, the executive agreement which had been concluded by President Roosevelt, superseded the Constitution or the Bill of Rights. But the Court did hold—and I think perhaps this precipitated the entire debate, or is, perhaps, the chief cause for precipitating the debate upon Senate Joint Resolution 1—that the executive agreement took precedence over State law. I think the decision is a bad precedent. It certainly would have been better if the interest of the American claimants had been protected by implementing statute. Perhaps if at that time the Congress had been asked to pass an implementing statute, which would have been enacted for the benefit of American claimants, we would not be debating this question today.

I turn again to the list of executive agreements to which I have referred above. In looking at the titles of those which were made without legislative authorization, implementation, or approval, it does not strike me that they were intended to be effective as internal law of the United States. Of course, executive agreements which refer only to international or external affairs are not the concern of the proposed amendment of the Senator from Georgia. During this debate it has been said that 85 percent of executive agreements are regulated now by act of Congress, and that the proposed amendment is concerned with only the small group which remain. If the list is typical, the amendment of Senator GEORGE would not hamper the ability of the Federal Government to conduct its foreign relations and would protect against abuse. It has just been presented, and I think it is necessary that the executive branch advise the Senate if there are reasons, in their experience, which lead them to believe that this amendment would hinder the conduct of foreign relations.

The same question has arisen as to whether or not, by the use of the term "international agreements," the amendment would go so far as to include some powers of the President which he might employ even as Commander in Chief. I do not know. The proposed amendment has just been presented. I think it is necessary that members of the executive branch, including the Secretary of State, advise the Senate if there are reasons in their experience which lead them to believe that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia would hinder the conduct of foreign relations. Of course, it would be safest if further hearings could be held and a thorough and exhaustive study made of the effects of his amendment. However, the responsibility to make the final determination is ours. Yet, the views of the executive branch as to the practical effects of this amendment are certainly relevant. Unless the response discloses reasons which I cannot now see, I will support the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], for its purpose is sound.

It would close the one gap which I believe may really threaten our country. I refer to a situation in which the executive, or an agency of the executive, such as the State Department, acting alone, acting under constitutional authority, but without the authority of Congress, might negotiate an executive agreement which would supersede State laws, with Congress never knowing of it until after it had been executed.

I turn now to what I intended to be the first part of my remarks, namely, the part dealing with Senate Joint Resolution 1.

A searching debate has been taking place on this resolution in the Congress, in newspapers and in public forums throughout the country. Hundreds of explanatory articles for and against it have been published. Many organizations have taken positions of enthusiastic support or strong opposition to its provisions. Yet, despite this broad debate, I believe that the nature and effect of the proposals offered in the Bricker amendment are not clearly understood by a great many people throughout our country.

I am one of those who have found this question complex and difficult to understand. Today, I would like to outline briefly some of the problems which have

seemed important to me in its consideration, and to state my own conclusions as to its effect, if it should be adopted. I do this to state the reasons that lead me to oppose the Bricker amendment, and with the hope that they may be of some help in informing the people whom I represent.

I begin my argument with the proposition that the Constitution is our basic national instrument of government and ought not to be amended, unless the most persuasive reasons for change can be established. The arguments for Senate Joint Resolution 1 must be thoroughly examined within this framework. They must be weighed against the interest of preserving the Constitution as a workable and effective instrument of government in both national and international affairs. This principle needs no further discussion.

My second proposition is that treaties are not superior to and cannot invade the Constitution or the Bill or Rights or any amendment to the Constitution.

My third proposition is this: The purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 1 is not to preserve but to make far-reaching changes in the Constitution. Contrary to popular misconceptions held by many of the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 1, it would change the Constitution as it was adopted by our Founding Fathers, and which has served so well for 165 years.

SECTION 1, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

I would like to deal first with section 1 of the proposed amendment. It reads as follows:

> A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

I stated as the second proposition of this speech that treaties are not now superior to and cannot invade the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, or any other provision of the Constitution. The treaty power is created by the Constitution. Treaties executed as a result of it are of equal dignity with laws of the Federal Government passed by the Congress in the exercise of its other delegated powers. Treaties executed pursuant to the treaty power, like any other action of the Federal Government taken under its other delegated powers, are superior to State constitutions and State laws, but are subject to all the limitations imposed on the Federal Government by the Constitution and particularly by the Bill of Rights.

If I believed that the treaty power had been construed to be superior to the Constitution or would permit the nullification of the Bill of Rights, I would, of course, vote for a correcting amendment to the Constitution, but a series of judicial decisions going back to the very beginning of the Republic make it perfectly clear that this is not the case.

From time to time, the Supreme Court of the United States has examined the treaty power. The Court has consistently held the treaty power is of the same dignity as any other delegated power of the Federal Government. The Court has consistenly made it perfectly clear that a treaty which violated any of the prohibitions of the Constitution against governmental action, particularly those contained in the Bill of Rights, would be declared invalid. In 1890, in the case of *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258), the Supreme Court was considering a treaty which had been negotiated with France in 1853 by Secretary of State John Marshall under the authority of President John Adams. Mr. Justice Field, speaking for the Court, described the treaty power in the following terms:

> It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent.

The key phrase in Mr. Justice Field's opinion is that the treaty power does not "extend so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids." The Bill of Rights forbids the Federal Government or any agency thereof to invade the individual rights which it guarantees. Mr. Justice Field's opinion, therefore, makes it perfectly clear that a treaty which contravenes the Bill of Rights is null and void.

The views expressed by Mr. Justice Field have been universally applied by the Supreme Court by both liberal and conservative Justices alike. In the much discussed case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416 (1920)), Mr. Justice Holmes stated that a treaty must not "contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution." This seems to me to say exactly what Mr. Justice Field said. The Bill of Rights clearly expresses "prohibitory words" against action by the Federal Government in violation of the rights its guarantees. Mr. Justice Butler, a noted conservative Justice, speaking for a unanimous Court in the case of *Asakura* v. *Seattle* (265 U. S. 332), stated that the treaty power does not extend "so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids." We thus have three Justices representing a variety of shades of view, but all speaking for unanimous Courts. They have made it clear that the treaty power does not override the Constitution, and more particularly does not override the Bill of Rights.

Yet in the face of the decisions by the Supreme Court it has been argued persistently during the debate that a treaty can override the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. That argument is being made despite the expressions by great Justices of the Supreme Court, who have stated exactly to the contrary.

Because of the statements which have been made in support of the amendment, there are in the United States today people who believe that the treaty power can override the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Yet, as I have said, we have the statements by great Justices of the Supreme Court to the exact contrary. It has been argued that no treaty has ever been declared unconstitutional and that, therefore, it is necessary to give the Court power to make such a decision in the event it should seem necessary. The decisions from which I have quoted make it perfectly clear that the Supreme Court considers that it does have the power to declare a treaty unconstitutional, if it should violate any of the prohibitory words of the Constitution including the Bill of Rights. In view of this clear assertion of power by the Court, the fact that no treaty has ever been held unconstitutional does not seem to me to show that the treaty power has been particularly susceptible to abuse. During the 165 years of the Constitution, 73 Federal statutes have been held unconstitutional and many more State statutes under standards no more strict than those which the Supreme Court has indicated it will apply in the case of treaties. If these many Federal and State actions have fallen under the Constitution, while no treaties have been stricken down, this does not make me feel that the chief danger to the individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution is to be found in the treaty power. To the contrary, it indicates that the treaty power is not liable to abuse but it is one which has been carefully exercised with scrupulous regard to the limitations of the Constitution.

SECTION 2, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

I should like to turn now to section 2 of the resolution, known as the "which" clause. In my judgment, this clause would without question cause a drastic change in the constitutional division of powers now established by the Constitution. It reads as follows:

> A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of a treaty.

My next proposition is that the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 1, is not to preserve but to make far-reaching changes in the Constitution.

Section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would alter the historic concept of a division of powers between the branches of the Federal Government. It would alter the separation or division of powers between the Federal Government and the States. Both of these divisions of power are distinctive marks of the American Constitution and system.

In the first instance, Senate Joint Resolution 1 would change the relationship or separation of powers between the Federal Government and the States so far as treatymaking is concerned.

Today, there is no question where the treatymaking power resides under the Constitution.

Article 2, section 2, paragraph 2, clause 1, of the Constitution provides that the President of the United States shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Article 1, section 10, clause 1, declares:

> No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.

With these two clauses, the Constitutional Convention and the ratifying States denied all treatymaking power to the States, and delegated to the Federal Government, and particularly to the President and the Senate, the exclusive power to make treaties.

Then, to make certain that there should be no question about the intent of the above provisions, which was to estab-

lish the supremacy of the Federal Government over the States with respect to the treaty power, as well as the other delegated powers, the Convention wrote in article 6, paragraph 2, this statement:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judes in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any States to the contrary notwithstanding.

These sections declare the treatymaking power to be a delegated power of the Federal Government, to be exercised by the President and the Senate. It is not, as I have said, superior to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, or any other amendment to the Constitution; a treaty is only of equal dignity with a law of the Federal Government; it is, when properly ratified and implemented, superior to State constitutions and State laws.

It is my view that section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would destroy the treatymaking power as it was conceived by the makers of the Constitution and delegated to the Federal Government.

It would do this by depriving the Federal Government of its present power to conclude an effective treaty on subjects not delegated to the Congress, and about which only the States are empowered to pass legislation in the absence of a treaty. It is true that the "which" clause deals only with the effect of treaties as internal legislation. It does not by its terms deal with the ability of our Government to sign such treaties or indeed with the power of the Senate to give its advice and consent on them. The United States Government, however, is a Government which must, and does, keep its word. Today, the United States can live up to its treaty obligations because the Constitution makes a treaty superior to State law, and enables the Congress to pass implementing legislation effective throughout the Nation. As the "which" clause will make it impossible for the Federal Government to take such action, the United States will be effectively limited in entering into any such treaty. It would be limited just as clearly as if the "which" clause contained a prohibition against the United States entering into any such treaty unless it was ratified by the 48 States.

I know that at first impression it seems to be a reasonable position that if a subject matter is one which is normally the subject of State rather than Federal action, the Federal Government should not enter into a treaty concerning it.

Something has been said about the invasion of States rights or giving aliens greater rights than our own citizens enjoy, which has absolutely nothing to do with the consideration of this question. While this appears to be a reasonable position at first blush, it falls down on closer analysis. The United States is a federal system, it is true. In this federal system, the rights, for example, of persons to engage in many businesses, to inherit land and collect debts are rights which in the main are determined by State law. If the United States, however, wishes to secure these rights for its citizens in foreign countries, it must be prepared to give the same rights to the citizens of foreign countries who are residents here.

There has been a good deal of discussion about the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416), the so-called migratory bird case.

The supporters of the Bricker amendment give the impression, at times, that this was the first case in which it was held that a treaty could give authority to the Congress to legislate on subjects contained in the treaty, which otherwise would be reserved to the States. Because of that, there are many persons throughout the country who believe that until the decision in the case of Missouri against Holland the law was otherwise. Of course, it is my view that the power is granted in the Constitution and that the courts have so recognized since its adoption. In the case of Ware against Hylton, the Supreme Court decided that the Treaty of Peace of 1783 with England prevailed over the laws which Virginia enacted, interfering with collection of debts owed the British.

A short time after the adoption of the Constitution the Supreme Court rendered a decision which is a precedent for the decision in the case of Missouri against Holland.

On this point I should like to direct attention to a case which, in my judgment, is very illuminating. It is the case of *Asakura* v. *Seattle* (265 U. S. 332), decided by the Supreme Court in 1924. I take it, there could be no subject matter which would be more clearly reserved to State powers and which would be more clearly prohibited by the "which" clause from the treaty power as the subject of carrying on a pawnbroking business. In the absence of treaty power, the Federal Government certainly has no right to deal with this subject. Yet, the treaty between the United States and Japan, which was negotiated in 1911 by Philander Knox, the Secretary of State, and ratified by President William Howard Taft, provided that the citizens or subjects of both the United States and Japan should be free in the territory of the other to carry on trade or to own or lease or occupy shops, to lease land for commercial purposes, and generally to do anything incident to trade on the same terms as the citizens of the home country. Seattle, however, passed an ordinance which undertook to confine pawnbroking to citizens of the United States. The Supreme Court of the United States in a unanimous opinion written by a great and conservative judge, Justice Butler, struck this ordinance down as contrary to the treaty. In so doing, Mr. Justice Butler stated his reasons as follows:

> The treaty was made to strengthen friendly relations between the 2 nations. * * * Treaties for the protection of citizens of 1 country residing in the territory of another are numerous, and make for good understanding between nations. The treaty is binding within the State of Washington. (*Baldwin* v. *Franks* (120 U. S. 678, 682–683).) The rule of equality established by it cannot be rendered nugatory in any part of the United States by municipal ordinance or State laws. It stands on the same footing of supremacy as do the provisions of the Constitution and the laws of the United States. It operates of itself without the aid of any legislation, State or Nation; and it will be applied and given authoritative effect by the courts.

That was a case which held that treaty power can invade even the ordinances of a city.

Mr. Justice Butler stated that treaties for the protection of citizens of one country residing in the territory of another are numerous and make for good understanding between nations. In fact, these matters have been a traditional subject of treatymaking from the earliest days. Today they are as important, if not more important, than ever if we are to protect American citizens, American business and investments abroad, and promote strong economic and security relationships with friendly nations. I am informed that there are 30 basic treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation now in force—governing our friendly relations with all important countries of the world. At the last session, the Senate approved 8 treaties of this general type by a vote of 86 to 1—treaties with Israel, Denmark, Greece, Japan, Ethiopia, Germany, Finland, and Italy.

Under the Bricker amendment, the Federal Government would be deprived of its power to conclude and to make effective treaties of this type. Any agreement about these matters between our country and other countries would have no effect until the States had enacted implementing legislation.

It is argued by its supporters that section 2 would not prevent Presidential negotiation and Senate approval of such treaties. In his speech last Friday, January 22, our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], stated:

> It would only be necessary to insert in the treaty a provision that it should become effective as domestic law in accordance with the Constitution of the parties.

I submit that the statement is not a realistic one. This country would not enter into a solemn contract with another country if it could not carry into effect its obligations under that contract. And no country, knowing that we were powerless to enforce treaty provisions, could be expected to negotiate with us.

In this connection, I think it is advisable to consider a little history which casts light on why the Founding Fathers wanted a treaty to be the supreme law of the land. The treaty of peace with Great Britain provided that "creditors on either side shall meet with no lawful impediment" to the recovery of their debts. It was all very well for the United States to make such a promise. It was something else for the United States to be able to enforce its promise. The suits brought by British creditors were suits which had to be brought in the State courts. The State courts would not give judgments for British creditors. In fact many States passed statutes prohibiting the payments of debts owed to British creditors and requiring instead that the debts be paid to the States themselves. Under the Articles of Confederation there was nothing that the United States could do about this, and the United

States could not live up to its end of the treaty.

Since the United States did not live up to its end of the treaty, the British did not feel obligated to comply with the portion of the treaty requiring them to evacuate the forts on the Northwest frontier. Similarly, because it was clear that the United States could not live up to its treaty obligations in matters of this kind, our negotiators had trouble in their attempts to negotiate treaties of commerce, friendship, and navigation with France and Spain. An aura of chaos and confusion developed around the foreign policy of the young Nation. It was one of the situations the Founding Fathers wanted to correct when they met in Philadelphia. They did this by providing that a treaty should be the supreme law of the land with respect to State constitutions and laws.

It would have been no answer to the concern which the Founding Fathers felt over the breakdown of our Treaty of Peace with Great Britain to say that it could have been negotiated differently with a provision which made it clear that it would be effective as domestic law in accordance with the Constitution of the parties. That was the situation, and under the Articles of Confederation there was nothing the United States could do to live up to this essential provision of the treaty.

Nothing has happened in the past 165 years that has made it less important for the United States to be able to live up to its treaties. For example, our Government has recently taken action which reaffirms promises to Japan, similar to those made by Secretary Knox and President Taft, and upheld by Mr. Justice Butler in the case of Asakura against Seattle.

Treaties are not made for the sake of negotiation and ratification. They are made to be enforced and observed. If the United States were to ratify treaties it could not enforce, we would risk the danger of being in constant violation of the letter and spirit of international law.

The real meaning of the statement of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the meaning of section 2 is that no treaty dealing with subjects ordinarily reserved to the States, except for the treaty power negotiated by the President and approved by the Senate, could have any constitutional validity until every one of the States had enacted some sort of approving, consistent legislation.

In the same speech, the Senator from Ohio said:

> Senate Joint Resolution 1 would not require any treaty on any subject to be ratified by any State at any time. It would not give any State a veto power over the conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs. It would not turn back the clock to the old Articles of Confederation.

It is true that his amendment does not return the treatymaking power to the States. It does not give the States the power of formal veto. It is true that the amendment does not require formal approval of a treaty by the States in the sense that the Senate now approves a treaty. But it is true also that section 2 provides that legislation is necessary to carry into effect a treaty as internal law. For this type of treaty, legislation would have to be enacted by the States or there can be no treaty. In effect, therefore, section 2 gives the States a complete veto over this part of the treatymaking power of the President and the Senate. As the Constitution in article 1, section 10, clause 1, denies to the States any power to initiate treaties, the adoption of section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would create a no-man's land in which it would be difficult, if not impossible, for any arrangements containing provision affecting subjects reserved for State law to be made with other countries.

Section 2 would effect a second change in the constitutional division of powers. As we know, certain powers are delegated by the Constitution to the Congress.

Many treaties carry provisions which affect fields delegated to congressional legislative power. For example, treaties relating to telecommunications, aviation, shipping, and copyright protection affect matters within the delegated powers of Congress. The Congress has the power, of course, to limit the proper execution of such treaties by legislation or through appropriations, but nevertheless, the treaty itself is a valid constitutional agreement when it has been properly approved by the Senate.

But section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would change the Constitution and add a new and additional requirement for the approval of this type of treaty. Before such a treaty could become constitutionally effective, it would be necessary for legislation to be passed by the Senate and House, and to be signed by the President. The power of the President and the Senate to effectively conclude such a treaty would be taken away. Their power would be shifted to the Congress as a whole.

All of us have great respect for our colleagues in the House of Representatives, but the question must be raised—Why is it necessary for the Senate, perhaps for the first time in its history, to propose the divestment of its power and suggest its inability now or in the future, to properly evaluate treaties and to protect the interest of the Nation and its people? The specter of strange agreements being negotiated, and drafted by subsidiary organs of the United Nations, or other international bodies, intended, it is claimed, to invade the constitutional rights of our citizens or destroy the jurisdiction and power of the States to provide appropriate institutions for their people, may be the chief reason for desiring the additional approval of the House of Representatives.

Again, I digress to say that a great many persons in the United States believe that such treaties have been negotiated and ratified, and are now effective. I know that to be so from letters I have received and from conversations I have held.

In answer to this fear, we can say that such a treaty has never been approved by the Senate and ratified. Standing guard against the ratification of such a treaty is the President, who like us, is sworn to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution. Standing guard also is the constitutional provision that such a treaty could not become effective until approved by the Senate.

If such a treaty should be ratified, we have the Supreme Court, which has said that "The treaty power does not extend so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids." Then, there is always the voice and opinion of the people which, if we trust our system, is ultimately heard.

Mr. President, at the beginning of my remarks I discussed the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. As I conclude my remarks I desire to repeat that I oppose Senate Joint Resolution 1. I particularly hope that no compromise provision will be approved which will contain the same elements of doubt which Senate Joint Resolution 1 contains. I also hope that matters relating to Senate procedure will not be offered as a constitutional amendment.

As I said at the outset, the Constitution is basic in substance and dignity and should not be compromised by trifling amendments. I do not mean to call the rules of the Senate unimportant or trifling, but I do believe that they are not proper subjects for inclusion in a constitutional amendment.

I have stated also that if there is no contrary valid reason advanced, of which I am not now cognizant, I believe that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] reaches the one weak spot in the treatymaking power under the Constitution. Unless there are strong reasons to the contrary advanced by the Executive, or by others who may have profound knowledge of this subject, it is my intention to support the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

I conclude with the statement with which I began my remarks, that the Constitution ought not to be amended unless there are persuasive reasons for change.

The arguments for adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 are based upon assumptions which I do not believe to be valid, the incorrect assumption, for example, that the treatymaking power can invade the Constitution. They are based upon fears which have not materialized. The Presidents of the United States have not negotiated and the Senate has never ratified any treaty with which I am familiar which has cut across the rights and the interests of our people. The amendment is based upon fears of the future. But the Constitution provides safeguards against treaties which may be unwisely negotiated, and we must believe that future Presidents and Members of the Senate will be as jealous of the Constitution and of individual rights as those who form our Government today. We should not try to impose upon those who will live in the future limitations which have not been imposed on American citizens during the past 165 years. If in the future new conditions arise which demand change, it will be their day of decision.

I thank the Chair and my distinguished friends for showing me the courtesy of listening to my remarks.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday, February 1, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 1, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29 (legislative day of January 22), 1954:

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1956. (Reappointment.)

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Morton P. Fisher, of Maryland, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1944, vice Eugene Black, retired.

Arnold R. Baar, of Illinois, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1948, vice Samuel B. Hill, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Clarence Edwin Luckey, of Oregon, to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon, vice Henry L. Hess, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, at this noonday as we lift our hearts in prayer we are beseeching Thee that we may be more eager and earnest in our search to know Thy way and will for ourselves and all mankind.

Help us to meet our tasks and responsibilities with a brave and gallant spirit. May we be wiser because of the mistakes and failures of yesterday.

Take from us those fears which darken our vision and dwarf our capacities. Deliver us from all uncertainty and obscurity in our thinking about right and wrong.

Evoke in us a greater faith and teach us to trust Thee always, everywhere and to the uttermost.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord whose divine character is our noblest incentive to right living and heroic service. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WILLIAM McKINLEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Members of Congress from the State of Ohio I wish to thank the Speaker for giving us this opportunity to conduct our annual observance of the birthday of our great Ohioan, William McKinley.

Today is McKinley's birthday. We appreciate that the House of Representatives will, in a few minutes, meet in joint session with the Senate, the members of the Supreme Court, the diplomatic corps of foreign countries, the President's Cabinet, and other dignitaries. We will curtail our birthday services to conform with the time limitation so graciously permitted to us by the Speaker of the House.

I have said heretofore, on a number of occasions, that Mr. McKinley is generally considered to be one of the greatest Congressmen who ever served in the House. He was in many ways. He was a great legislator. He was heroic and great on the field of battle, as attested by the large monument that has been erected to him by the State of Ohio on the battlefield of Antietam. He is great in the hearts of the people of Ohio, as attested by the action of the people of Ohio when they elected him to be their governor. He was great in the hearts of the people of the United States when they elected him President of the United States. He was great in the affection of the people of America who showed their great grief when he was shot down by the hand of a vicious assassin. When he was killed it was said that the grief of the American people was so great that "the children cried in the streets."

Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, I ask, if it meets with the approval of the Speaker, that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] be given such time as he may require to give us a short eulogy of former President McKinley.

I also ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House be permitted to extend their remarks with regard to former President William McKinley following the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my thanks, as well as the gratitude of the Ohio delegation, to the leadership of the House for permitting us to devote a portion of today's session to the memory and achievements of one of Ohio's most distinguished and favorite sons. I also wish to pay my respects to the gentleman from Ohio, TOM JENKINS, because it is through his efforts that this fine custom of observing McKinley day on the floor of the House has been kept alive. I recall that, on similar occasions in past years, praiseworthy remarks concerning William McKinley have come from both sides of the aisle, and I take this as an indication that both the man and his service to the Nation are, as a matter of history, accepted not in a partisan sense, but as a contribution to the welfare of the country as a whole without regard to section or party.

In this connection, it is interesting to call to mind the reason for wearing the red carnations which have become traditional on McKinley's birthday.

When McKinley first ran for Congress in 1876, his Democratic opponent was a florist from Alliance, Ohio. The two men were close personal friends, in spite of their political opposition. During the campaign, the Democratic candidate sent gifts of red carnations to McKinley, who always wore one of them as a boutonniere. Because of this bipartisan gesture of friendship, the red carnation became McKinley's favorite flower and followed him throughout his life and into the White House. In 1904 it was adopted as Ohio's official flower.

William McKinley was born in Niles, Ohio, January 29, 1843. He was an officer in the Union Army, practiced law, became prosecuting attorney of Stark County, served 6 terms in Congress, 2 terms as Governor of Ohio, and was elected twice to the high office of President of the United States. This briefly, is the professional and political life of the Nation's 25th President.

But I have always felt that little can be gained by scanning the biographical data of great men unless we search for the reasons that made them great so that we may study them and profit thereby. Certainly there is no more appropriate place to do that than here in this historic Chamber.

It is significant to note that more than one-half of the Nation's Presidents have been Members of Congress. Here, then, has been throughout the life of the Republic, a virtual training ground for the great tasks of the Presidency. William McKinley is a typical product of this school of experience in state affairs. It is said that he, himself, recognized his services in this body as among his greatest contributions to the welfare of the country. During his six terms, he became a leader of his party. Although he was not an orator, he was recognized as an able Member and spoke on most of the great issues of his day. In many respects he left an indelible impression on American economic affairs. It was through his leadership that tariff legislation was passed. Probably no more controversial subject has appeared on the national political scene than the tariff question. Early in his public career McKinley realized the impact of this subject on the economy of the country and made it his business to become thoroughly acquainted with it in all of its ramifications. The measure which was finally adopted bore his name and forever identified him with the principle of the protective tariff.

Some of the personal problems which bother us now were apparently present in those days. After he had served in Congress three terms, he is reported to have advised a friend not to run. "Before I went to Congress," he said, "I had $10,000 and a practice worth $10,000 a year. Now I haven't either." Yet he continued to serve because he found in such service to his Nation something more exciting and important than simply making money.

As Governor and President, McKinley was a safe and sound administrator. He was never a rabble rouser or the crusading type. His approach to the problems of his office were strictly in the quiet manner.

It might almost be said that the issues which faced him can find a parallel in modern times. Then we were emerging as a world power. Today we are the world power. The tariff, trade treaties, and international commerce were beginning to be the order of the day and remind us of the reappraisement and restudy which we are giving to the same subject matters today. The increase in the size of the Navy and the annexation of Hawaii were as prominent then as building an Air Force and admitting the Pacific Islands to statehood are on the present agenda. With ability and calm deliberation McKinley led the Nation from the 19th century of growth and development into the 20th century with its undreamed-of opportunities for expansion which have made us the richest and most powerful country in the world.

As a man McKinley was a model which anyone might be proud to follow. I am reminded of a eulogy which Ramsey MacDonald delivered in Parliament at the time of the death of Queen Alexandria:

She represented to us—

Said the Prime Minister—

not only the emblazoned life of courts, but the domestic affection of humbler places.

The same words might well have been said of the martyred President. Though destiny led him to positions above the ordinary walks of life, he never lost the common touch. In official life his temper was marked by a quiet, calm, and dignified approach which is so necessary to the solution of great problems. He had a lovable personality which made it easy for him to meet people and for people to meet him.

Throughout most of their married life, Mrs. McKinley was an invalid. During his years as Governor they resided at a hotel directly across the street from Ohio's statehouse. It is legend in Columbus that every morning on his way to his office the Governor stopped as he entered the statehouse yard and waved to his invalid wife. Today a lifelike monument of the martyred President marks this spot as a tribute and token of admiration and respect for one of the State's most famous sons.

On this occasion Ohio is proud to have you share with us a common recognition of the greatness of William McKinley.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the last remaining veteran of the Spanish-American War in this body, I am deeply moved by this observance of the natal anniversary of William McKinley. In the lapel of the coat of the Speaker is the red carnation. In coat lapels of clerks near the well of the House and of Members on both sides of the aisle within the Chamber itself the red carnations extend row upon row. It is a beautiful tribute to the memory of a great American, especially enshrined in the loving memory of Spanish-American War veterans. He was our war President, and the smashing victory over Spain was won when he was the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. Mr. Speaker, President William McKinley was truly beloved by the men who answered his call for volunteers to man the Army and the Navy in a war that was to carry the United States ultimately to world leadership. It was an Army and Navy composed entirely of volunteers, and the fact that McKinley himself had been a volunteer soldier in the Civil War more endeared him to the boys of 1898.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess.

RECESS

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT CELAL BAYAR OF TURKEY

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Vice President took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Excellency the President of Turkey into the Chamber the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RAYBURN, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. GORDON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND, the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON, the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, and the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. GREEN.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the members of the President's Cabinet, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced His Excellency the President of Turkey.

His Excellency the President of Turkey, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my pleasure and high privilege to present to you the President of a people who in a critical period have proved their devotion to the cause of freedom, and really a friend of the United States: His Excellency, the President of the Republic of Turkey. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY, CELAL BAYAR, PRESIDENT OF TURKEY

The PRESIDENT OF TURKEY. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, honorable Members of Congress, I am highly honored to address the Congress of the United States while in your country as the guest of the great soldier and statesman, President Eisenhower. His sincere and untiring efforts are now dedicated to the preservation of world peace to the extent they were dedicated to the victory in World War II in days gone by. [Applause.]

The hospitality extended to me since my arrival in New York has impressed me profoundly.

In expressing the pleasure I feel from this manifestation of friendship, my first words as President of the Republic of Turkey are that the people of Turkey are filled with gratitude for the generosity shown us by your country. I assure you and the people of the United States that the memory of your noble deeds will live forever in the heart of every Turk. [Applause.] The extension of military and economic aid to the peace-loving countries of the world by the United States Government has no parallel in the history of the world, either in essence or in quantity. I am convinced the significance of your action will be recorded in history as the most important event of the post-World War II period. [Applause.]

The benefits and the material importance of the program are many but I believe the most striking and admirable feature of it is the new world concept of international morality. [Applause.]

My country has utilized this assistance to the utmost by combining it with the means at our disposal.

Your aid has been used entirely in the effort to resist the destructive forces which threaten our civilization. I can assert without equivocation that my country has been at least one of the recipients who put your aid to the best possible use. [Applause.]

In these days of turbulence and danger, Turkey occupies an extensive area on the ramparts of the peace front. From every point of view it presents a position of vital importance to our common cause.

The Republic of Turkey possesses all the requisites of a strong and stable structure from a political and social point of view. It has also achieved a record for speedy economic development. [Applause.]

We possess a military establishment whose importance cannot be denied. Our moral strength as a nation is inflexible.

With these attributes and qualifications, Turkey is developing day by day as an even more important military and economic force for our common peace front. [Applause.]

It is our constant duty to increase our material and moral efforts to enable our military program to match our swift economic development.

American military aid has made it possible to equip our forces with modern weapons and to train the troops in their use. [Applause.] Your economic aid has constituted a valuable factor in supporting our efforts to strengthen our economic structure so that we may maintain a strong army. [Applause.]

The tremendous technical progress of this century has had the effect of shortening distances which makes the world seem smaller. Today, distant and separate parts of the world have been brought together. The political concept of separation of continents has become obsolete. Accordingly, a danger which confronts one country, no matter where located, is a danger which confronts our whole world. [Applause.]

That being the case, the slightest hesitation to act or the slightest weakness of willpower can bring catastrophe to the peace-loving community.

For this reason, it is imperative that all nations dedicated to peace be morally and materially strong and united. [Applause.]

It is because my country, in whose behalf I have the honor to speak here today, knows these facts very well that she is so fervently attached to the principle of collective security upon which the free world has so completely put its faith. [Applause.]

When unprovoked aggression, kindled by the false belief that the United Nations would neither act nor intervene, occurred in Korea, Turkey did not hesitate for a single moment to join those countries which showed the fortitude to send their sons to faraway battlefields. [Applause.]

The devotion of my country to the ideals of mankind and to peace are not confined to the pursuit of a steadfast and resolute policy within the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, excellent as those bodies are as a means of maintaining peace.

It would be equally appropriate to stress in this connection that in accordance with the principles set forth in the charter of the United Nations, Turkey has sought to fill in the gaps existing in the peace front. [Applause.] The Tripartite Balkan Pact which was signed last year between Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia is clear evidence of how strong barriers can be set up by realistic and resolute states united in a sincere desire for peace. This pact has simultaneously set a new and fine example in the application of the rights and principles of self-defense for the preservation of peace as recognized by the charter of the United Nations and contributed to its consolidation. [Applause.]

I would like, in this connection, to allude to Greek-Turkish relations. The friendship established between Greece and Turkey is the best example of how two countries who mistakenly mistrusted each other for centuries have agreed upon a close and loyal collaboration as a result of recognition of the realities of life. [Applause.]

My country feels justified pride in its ties, within the framework of the Tripartite Balkan Pact, with Yugoslavia, who valiantly safeguarded her honor and independence after a bitter and dangerous ordeal, and with Greece, with whom our friendly relations have become fraternal. [Applause.]

As you can see, Turkey is doing her utmost within the peace front to fulfill the duties incumbent upon her. The Turkish Nation, faced with a danger common to us all, remains upright, steadfastly holding to her material and moral forces at one of the most critical spots of the world. [Applause.]

I would like to express to you the hope that the sacrifices incurred for the sake of common ideals may be rewarded by the long-expected peace in the Far East. However, should peace not be attained, the United Nations resolution about Korea should remain in full force. The security of the future depends on this fact. Korea is an example. This example may be repeated anywhere in the world. New fires may break out. [Applause.] The duty of the free and peace-loving nations is to try untiringly and relentlessly to turn the period of relative peace in which we live today into a stable and real peace. The attainment of that aim calls for a great degree of patience as well as physical and moral strength. [Applause.]

In the face of all these dangers, I am convinced that the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organizations are the strongest and most effective organizations possible to provide the free and independence-loving nations with the greatest opportunities for self-defense and the preservation of peace. [Applause.]

It is for this reason that Turkey is fighting to the best of her ability against the subversive efforts which try to paralyze the one and undermine the other of these two organizations. According to our way of thinking, unless the efforts we dedicate toward peace are sincerely reciprocated by deeds, our desire for peace will only be a mirage. [Applause.]

It is obvious that no one can doubt the good intentions of the community of free nations. However, should the policy followed be marked by uncertainty and indecision regardless of our good faith, then such a course would not only be fruitless but also dangerous. [Applause.]

I am aware that I am speaking before the representatives of a Nation which has set an example to all by the course it has taken and which it will follow in the preservation of indivisible world peace in the face of aggressions against the independence of nations.

My purpose is merely to emphasize, in your presence here that with a sincere belief in the righteousness of our common cause, Turkey thinks along exactly the same lines as do you.

Thank you. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m. His Excellency the President of Turkey, accompanied by the Committee of Escort, retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Chief Justice and the Associated Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 46, section 1126c, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. WAINWRIGHT, of New York, and Mr. KROGH, of New York.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 14, section 194, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. SADLAK, of Connecticut, and Mr. DODD, of Connecticut.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, sections 1055 and 1056, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. FORD, of Michigan; Mr. BECKER, of New York; Mr. THOMAS, of Texas; and Mr. PRICE, of Illinois.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, sections 1083 and 1084, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. OSTERTAG, of New York; Mr. HYDE, of Maryland; Mr. RILEY, of South Carolina; and Mr. PATTEN, of Arizona.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 28, 1954.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1954: Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., California; Hon. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, Illinois; Hon EDWARD J. HART, New Jersey.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Very sincerely yours,

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 28, 1954.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public Law No. 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.), I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1954: Hon. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., Connecticut; Hon. WALTER M. MUMMA, Pennsylvania; Hon. EDWARD J. HART, New Jersey.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Very sincerely yours,

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight tonight to file a supplemental report on the bill H. R. 4881.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

THE HIGH PRICE OF COFFEE

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, everyone seems to be talking about the price of coffee, but despite the investigations of commissions and committees of Congress, little is being done right now beyond talk.

The law of supply and demand has not been repealed, and the prices are up because there is a short supply of coffee. Whether this is because of the Brazilians or somebody else here at home, it is an existing fact. We can use that same law to force the prices back down by cutting demand.

Therefore, I have today introduced a resolution that no coffee shall be sold on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays in restaurants, cafeterias, and other places where food and beverage are sold in the House wings of the Capitol and in the House Office Buildings until the national average retail price of standard brands of coffee does not exceed 90 cents a pound.

This House can do something about coffee prices by passing the resolution and setting the pace for a coffee boycott on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays throughout the Nation. You have heard from your constituents and received their demands that you do something about this price of coffee. This offers you the opportunity.

There has been some ridicule of the idea of substituting milk for coffee on these strike or boycott days. Some people say the price of milk is too high; but even so, it is a lot cheaper by the glass, cups, or gallon than coffee, it is good for the health and we could drink up the dairy surpluses while driving down the price of coffee.

This resolution offers a chance for us in the Congress, and for the American people, if they will join in the boycott, to get together and solve a problem that seems to have the experts baffled.

A similar boycott a few years ago succeeded in driving coffee prices down, and you will recall that some pretty definite action on the part of the people of Boston about a tea a couple of centuries ago brought results.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday next for 20 minutes, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, were I present the day before yesterday, I would have voted for the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. I was ill and could not be here.

CALL OF CONSENT CALENDAR ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar in order on Monday next be in order on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only for the purpose of finding out what legislative program we may expect next week.

Mr. HALLECK. The two calendars will be called on Tuesday. Then, on Tuesday and for the balance of the week, and for whatever time may be necessary, there are two rules that have been reported. One is H. R. 2235, the Santa Maria project in California; and the other is H. R. 3300, having to do with the study of diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PRINTING PROCEEDINGS IN THE RECORD DURING THE RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had in the House Chamber during the recess may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE AND AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO SIGN ANY ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Tuesday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. OSTERTAG.
Mr. BOLAND.
Mr. SIEMINSKI.
Mr. SELDEN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 2, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1209. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering claims paid during the 6 months' period end-

ing December 31, 1953, on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel, pursuant to section 207 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by Public Law 220, 82d Congress (5 U. S. C. 275 (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1210. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled, "A bill to affirm the temporary appointments of certain officers of the Navy, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1211. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report relative to the disposition of foreign excess property for the calendar year 1953, pursuant to section 404 (d), title IV, of Public Law 152 (81st Cong.), as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1212. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting the proceedings of the 54th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Milwaukee, Wis., August 2–7, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 309); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TOLLEFSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Part II, supplemental report on H. R. 4881. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code in reference to the survival of things in action; without amendment (Rept. No. 1039). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7305. A bill to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 1134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 7618. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code by reducing excise taxes on communication services and facilities and on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 7619. A bill to provide for exemption from land limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws as applied to projects situate in an area of an existing agricultural economy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 7620. A bill to provide for exemption from land limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws as applied to projects situate in an area of an existing agricultural economy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7621. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 7622. A bill to provide for exemption from land limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws as applied to projects situate in an area of an existing agricultural economy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 7623. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 35th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 7624. A bill to amend section 4 (e) of the Natural Gas Act, approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 7639. A bill providing for the development of a highway and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. Res. 430. Resolution restricting the sale of coffee in restaurants, cafeterias, and other places in the House wing of the Capitol and the House Office Buildings; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress of the United State to urge the Department of Defense, through the Air Force, to establish a troop carrier squadron at the Lawrence Municipal Airport; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress against passage of legislation depriving States of the power to regulate the discontinuance of railroad services in intrastate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to extend the statute of limitations for prosecuting persons acting against the security and safety of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to enact legislation whereby Korean veterans may receive the same educational opportunities and advantages granted veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge the Department of Defense, through the Air Force, to establish a troop carrier squadron at the Lawrence Municipal Airport; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend the statute of limitations for prosecuting persons acting against the security and safety of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to enact legislation whereby Korean veterans may receive the same educational opportunities and advantages granted veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7625. A bill for the relief of Audrey Vera Chapman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 7626. A bill for the relief of Frank LaRosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 7627. A bill for the relief of Vaclav Uhlik and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 7628. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adriana M. Truyers Aretz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7629. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Gruschka Krug; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 7630. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands within the Huron National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7631. A bill for the relief of Chung Herp Youn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 7632. A bill for the relief of Maria Katherine Theresa Monck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7633. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 7634. A bill for the relief of Constancio Loyola Abracia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 7635. A bill for the relief of Martti Ilmari Timonen, Maj-Lis Timonen, and Marja Timonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 7636. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Aldridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 7637. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Peter Benezis, also known as John Benezis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 7638. A bill for the relief of Antonio DiSarro, Mrs. Maria DiSarro, Nicola DiSarro, and Rita DiSarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 197. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

484. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of employees of the city of Pasadena, Calif., opposing any social-security legislation that would make mandatory the inclusion of public employees, or that would permit integration of public employees' existing retirement plans with social security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

485. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Irvin J. Kopf, Tau Epsilon Rho Fraternity, Philadelphia, Pa., requesting favorable consideration to the proposal of the President of the United States that members of the legal profession be included under the provisions of

the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

486. Also petition of the national commander, United American Veterans, Washington, D. C., relative to being placed on record as requesting the Congress to take the necessary steps to set up a Government corporation to be known as Gaming Corporation of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

487. Also, petition of Richard Bladel Mossman, Betendorf, Iowa, relative to stating a grievance relating to his attainder case against the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Notable Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the announcement this week of the resignation of Senator A. O. Stanley as chairman of the International Joint Commission's United States Section will be a source of sharp regret to many thousands of people in the United States. Senator Stanley has served the American people in one public capacity or another for more than 50 years. He is a brilliant lawyer, a resolute and courageous fighter, and a gallant gentleman. In his capacity as chairman of the United States Section of the International Joint Commission, he has worked with unflagging zeal to understand and equitably solve the innumerable problems which arise along the international boundary line between the United States and Canada; and the friendly relations we enjoy with our good neighbor to the north are in no small measure due to the high sense of equity and justice in international relations which suffused his work.

Senator Stanley was born in Shelbyville, Ky., while Andrew Jackson served as President of these United States. He was designated as a presidential elector for the Democrats in 1900, when William Jennings Bryan and Adlai Stevenson were their standard bearers.

He was first elected to Congress in 1903, when Teddy Roosevelt was President, and "Uncle Joe" Cannon was Speaker of the House. After five terms in the House, he became Governor of Kentucky, and then went on to the United States Senate, where he served until 1924.

President Hoover appointed him to the International Joint Commission in 1930, and 3 years later he was elected chairman of the United States section, which post he has held continuously for almost 21 years.

Now approaching the age of 87, Senator Stanley has earned a respite from his labors. Nevertheless, he was still, this week, using his very great talents as a negotiator to work out an equitable method of regulating the water levels of Lake Ontario, and he has left, in this, as in all his other undertakings, a record of solid achievement.

The people of the Great Lakes States will miss him, and will wish him many years of happy retirement.

A Salute to the Unsung Heroes Who Fixed Salaries by Law From 1789 to 1949 for Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, cited below, under unanimous consent, is a schedule of salaries fixed by law from 1789 to 1949 for Members of Congress.

Perhaps it would be equally interesting were the names known of the unsung heroes who played key roles in the pay hikes, what arguments they used, and whether they won reelection. Those who were defeated because they voted to increase congressional pay surely deserve our salute. Credit for much of the compensation of Congress rests on the shoulders of those brave men.

To whom, I wonder, in the present Congress, will future Members owe their gratitude for gearing congressional compensation with job value and cost and price indices? Perhaps a story should now be told. It might deflate demagoguery on the issue.

Once upon a time, about the turn of the century, a Representative voted to raise the pay of Members of Congress from $5,000 to $7,500 a year. For doing this, he was defeated by a candidate who later became Speaker of the House, now deceased. To his last breath, the young and eager candidate was never proud of the way in which he defeated the man who voted for the pay increase. He said so. The details of his assault ran something like this:

The Member of Congress who voted for a pay increase listed his mailing address as the Willard Hotel, though he lived in a boarding house. The young and eager candidate who defeated him hammered home this apparent extravagance by pointing to a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD listing the Congressman's regal residence; then he would hold up a menu from the Willard Hotel and call out, "Pomme de têrres, eh? To us home folks, that is just plain potatoes." The people ate it up. Did the people want to send back to Congress a Willard Hotel, pomme-de-têrre man who voted to raise his salary from $5,000 to $7,500 a year? They sent the Congressman to the cleaners. The new Member of Congress pocketed his $7,500 and cheerfully, too. So it goes, Mr. Speaker.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE.

Salaries fixed by law from 1789–1949

Salary	Statutory authority
MEMBERS OF CONGRESS	
Senators: $6 a day during attendance prior to Mar. 4, 1795, $7 a day, after Mar. 4, 1795.	Sept. 22, 1789, 1 Stat. 70-71.
Representatives: $6 a day during attendance.	Sept. 22, 1789, 1 Stat. 70-71.
Senators and Representatives:	
$6 a day during attendance.	Mar. 10, 1796, 1 Stat. 448.
$1,500 per annum (specifically repealed by act of Feb. 6, 1817).	Mar. 19, 1816, 3 Stat. 237.
$8 a day during attendance after Mar. 3, 1817.	Jan. 22, 1818, 3 Stat. 404.
$6,000 for each Congress.	Aug. 16, 1856, 11 Stat. 48.
$5,000 per annum (to be computed from the 1st day of the present Congress).	July 28, 1866, 14 Stat. 322, sec. 17.
$7,500 per annum (including those in the 42d Cong. holding office at passage of act).	Mar. 3, 1873, 17 Stat. 486.
$5,000 per annum	Jan. 20, 1874, 18 Stat. 4.
$7,500 per annum	Feb. 26, 1907, 34 Stat. 993.
$10,000 per annum	Mar. 4, 1925, 43 Stat. 1301, sec. 4.
$12,500 per annum [1] (beginning with the 80th Cong.).	Aug. 2, 1946, 60 Stat. 850, sec. 601.

[1] Plus a tax-free, nonaccountable, expense allowance of $2,500 a year (60 Stat. 850, sec. 601) and mileage allowance at rate of 20 cents per mile to and from each regular session (14 Stat. 323, sec. 17, July 28, 1866; U. S. C. 2:43) • • Sec. 619 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (Public Law 183, 82nd Cong.) removed the tax-free and no accounting provisions, effective, as to the President, on Jan. 20, 1953, and as to the Vice President, the Speaker, and Members of Congress, on Jan. 3, 1953.

Also listed as of possible interest, Mr. Speaker, are the salaries of the President, the Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, President Pro Tempore of the Senate, United States Supreme Court Justices, Cabinet officers and Foreign Service officers, historically developed:

Salaries fixed by law from 1789–1949

Salary	Statutory authority
PRESIDENT	
$25,000	(Sept. 24, 1789, 1 Stat. 72 ch. 19. Feb. 18, 1793, 1 Stat. 318 ch. 9.
$50,000	Mar. 3, 1873, 17 Stat. 486.
$75,000	(Mar. 4, 1909, 35 Stat. 838; 62 Stat. 678, sec. 102.
$100,000 [1]	Jan. 19, 1949, 63 Stat. 4, sec. 1 (Public Law 2, 81st Cong.).
VICE PRESIDENT	
$5,000	(Sept. 24, 1789, 1 Stat. 72 ch. 19. Feb. 18, 1793, 1 Stat. 318, ch. 9.
$8,000	Mar. 3, 1853, 10 Stat. 212, sec. 4.
$10,000	Mar. 3, 1873, 17 Stat. 486.
$12,000	Feb. 26, 1907, 34 Stat. 993, sec. 4.
$15,000	Mar. 4, 1925, 43 Stat. 1301, sec. 4.
$20,000	June 25, 1948, 62 Stat. 678, sec. 104.
$30,000 [2]	Jan. 19, 1949, 63 Stat. 4, sec. 1 (Public Law 2, 81st Cong.).

See footnotes at end of table.

Salaries fixed by law from 1789–1949—Con.

Salary	Statutory authority
SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES	
$12,000	Feb. 26, 1907, 34 Stat. 993, sec. 4.
$15,000	Mar. 4, 1925, 43 Stat. 1301, sec. 4.
$20,000	Aug. 2, 1946, 60 Stat. 850, sec. 601.
$30,000 [3]	Jan. 19, 1949, 63 Stat. 4, sec. 1 (Public Law 2, 81st Cong.).
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE	
When there is no Vice President, the salary of the President pro tempore is the same as that of the Vice President (R. S. 36; U. S. C. 2: 32).	
U. S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICES	
Chief Justice:	
$4,000	Sept. 23, 1789, 1 Stat. 72.
$5,000	Feb. 20, 1819, 3 Stat. 484.
$6,500	Mar. 3, 1855, 10 Stat. 655.
$8,500	Mar. 3, 1871, 16 Stat. 494.
$10,500	Mar. 3, 1873, 17 Stat. 486.
$13,000	Feb. 12, 1903, 32 Stat. 825.
$15,000	Mar. 3, 1911, 36 Stat. 1152, sec. 218.
$20,500	Dec. 13, 1926, 44 Stat. 919, ch. 6.
$25,500	July 31, 1946, 60 Stat. 716.
Associate Justices:	
$3,500	Sept. 23, 1789, 1 Stat. 72.
$4,500	Feb. 20, 1819, 3 Stat. 484.
$6,000	Mar. 3, 1855, 10 Stat. 655.
$8,000	Mar. 3, 1871, 16 Stat. 494.
$10,000	Mar. 3, 1873, 17 Stat. 486.
$12,500	Feb. 12, 1903, 32 Stat. 825.
$14,500	Mar. 3, 1911, 36 Stat. 1152, sec. 218.
$20,000	Dec. 13, 1926, 44 Stat. 919 ch. 6.
$25,000	July 31, 1946, 60 Stat. 716.
CABINET OFFICERS	
Secretary of State:	
$3,500	Sept. 11, 1780, 1 Stat. 67.
$5,000	Mar. 2, 1799, 1 Stat. 730.[4]
$6,000	Feb. 20, 1819, 3 Stat. 484.
$8,000	Mar. 3, 1853, 10 Stat. 212.
$10,000	Mar. 3, 1873, 17 Stat. 486.
$12,000	Feb. 26, 1907, 34 Stat. 993, sec. 4.
$15,000	Mar. 4, 1925, 43 Stat. 1301, sec. 4.
$22,500	Oct. 15, 1949, 63 Stat. ——, sec. 1 (Public Law 359 81st Cong.).
Secretary of War. (See note under Secretary of Defense.)	
Secretary of the Treasury:	
$3,500	Sept. 11, 1780, 1 Stat. 67.
$5,000	Mar. 2, 1799, 1 Stat. 730.[4]
$6,000	Feb. 20, 1819, 3 Stat. 484.
$8,000	Mar. 3, 1853, 10 Stat. 212.
$10,000	Mar. 3, 1873, 17 Stat. 486.
$12,000	Feb. 26, 1907, 34 Stat. 993, sec. 4.
$15,000	Mar. 4, 1925, 43 Stat. 1301, sec. 4.
$22,500	Oct. 15, 1949, 63 Stat. ——, sec. 1, (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.).
Secretary of Defense: [5]	
$15,000	July 25, 1947, 61 Stat. 507, sec. 301.
$22,500	Oct. 15, 1949, 63 Stat. ——, sec. 1, (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.).
Attorney General:	
$1,500	Sept. 23, 1789, 1 Stat. 72, ch. 18.
Increased $500	Mar. 2, 1797, 1 Stat. 497.
$3,000	Mar. 3, 1799, 1 Stat. 730.[4]
$5,500	Feb. 20, 1819, 3 Stat. 484.
$6,000	Sept. 30, 1850, 9 Stat. 532.
$8,000	Mar. 3, 1853, 10 Stat. 212.
$10,000	Mar. 3, 1873, 17 Stat. 486.
$12,000	Feb. 26, 1907, 34 Stat. 993, sec. 4.
$15,000	Mar. 4, 1925, 43 Stat. 1301, sec. 4.
$22,500	Oct. 15, 1949, 63 Stat. ——, sec. 1, (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.).
Postmaster General: Same as under Articles of Confederation.	Sept. 22, 1789, 1 Stat. 70.
$2,000	Feb. 20, 1792, 1 Stat. 235, sec. 8.

Salaries fixed by law from 1789–1949—Con.

Salary	Statutory authority
CABINET OFFICERS—con.	
Postmaster General—Con.	
$2,400	May 8, 1794, 1 Stat. 358, sec. 8.
$3,000	Mar. 2, 1799, 1 Stat. 730.[4]
$4,000	Feb. 20, 1819, 3 Stat. 484.
$2,000 additional	Mar. 2, 1827, 4 Stat. 239.
$8,000	Mar. 3, 1853, 10 Stat. 212.
$10,000	Mar. 3, 1873, 17 Stat. 486.
$12,000	Feb. 26, 1907, 34 Stat. 993, sec. 4.
$15,000	Mar. 4, 1925, 43 Stat. 1301, sec. 4.
$22,500	Oct. 15, 1949, 63 Stat. —, sec. 1 (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.).
Secretary of the Navy. (See note under Secretary of Defense.)	
Secretary of the Interior: Same as Secretaries of other Departments (i. e., $6,000).	Mar. 3, 1849, 9 Stat. 395.
$8,000	Mar. 3, 1853, 10 Stat. 212.
$10,000	Mar. 3, 1873, 17 Stat. 486.
$12,000	Feb. 26, 1907, 34 Stat. 993, sec. 4.
$15,000	Mar. 4, 1925, 43 Stat. 1301 sec. 4.
$22,500	Oct. 15, 1949, 63 Stat. —, sec. 1 (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.).
Secretary of Agriculture: Same as Secretaries of other departments) (i. e., $10-000).	Feb. 9, 1889, 25 Stat. 659.
$12,000	Feb. 26, 1907, 34 Stat. 993, sec. 4.
$15,000	Mar. 4, 1925, 43 Stat. 1301, sec. 4.
$22,500	Oct. 15, 1949, 63 Stat. —, sec. 1 (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.).
Secretary of Commerce:	
$8,000	Feb. 14, 1903, 32 Stat. 826, sec. 1.
$12,000	Feb. 26, 1907, 34 Stat. 993, sec. 4.
$15,000	Mar. 4, 1925, 43 Stat. 1301, sec. 4.
$22,500	Oct. 15, 1949, 63 Stat. —, sec. 1 (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.).
Secretary of Labor:	
$12,000	Mar. 4, 1918, 37 Stat. 736.
$15,000	Mar. 4, 1925, 43 Stat. 1301, sec. 4.
$22,500	Oct. 15, 1949, 63 Stat. —, sec. 1 (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.).
Secretary of the Army. (See note under Secretary of Defense.)	
FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS	
Minister: $9,000	{May 10, 1800, 2 Stat. 78. {May 1, 1810, 2 Stat. 608.
Minister resident: $6,000	Aug. 26, 1842, 5 Stat. 525, sec. 9.
Ambassador: $7,500 to $17,500	Mar. 1, 1855, 10 Stat. 619, sec. 1.
$10,000 to $17,500	Aug. 18, 1856, 11 Stat. 52, sec. 1.
Envoy: $4,000 to $17,500	July 11, 1870, 16 Stat. 219.
Ambassador: $10,000 to $17,500.	Mar. 3, 1875, 18 Stat. 483.
Ambassador, Minister, or Career Minister: $15,000 to $25,000.	Aug. 13, 1946, 60 Stat. 1002, sec. 411; 1007, sec. 591.

See footnotes at end of table.

[1] Plus a tax-free allowance of $50,000 a year for expenses connected with official duties, for which no accounting shall be made.[6]

[2] Plus a tax-free, nonaccountable, expense allowance of $10,000 a year. The Legislative Appropriation Act for 1949 appropriated $5,000 for the purchase, maintenance, etc., of an automobile for the Vice President, and this amount was supplemented by an additional $2,500 under the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949.[6]

[3] Plus a tax-free, nonaccountable, expense allowance of $10,000 a year.

[4] Originally enacted for 3 years but continued by subsequent legislation until Feb. 20, 1819.[6]

[5] Position established by National Security Act of July 26, 1947 (sec. 202). Under the act the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are without Cabinet rank. Salary changes for the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy were essentially the same as those for the Secretary of State. The office of Secretary of the Air Force was established by the 1947 act. The salary for each of these offices is fixed at $18,000 under the act of Oct. 15, 1949 (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.).

[6] Sec. 619 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (Public Law 183, 82d Cong.) removed the tax-free and no accounting provisions, effective, as to the President, on Jan. 20, 1953, and as to the Vice President, the Speaker, and Members of Congress, on Jan. 3, 1953.

Permanent Residence in United States for Escapees From Behind Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 29, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill granting permanent residence in the United States to Vaclav Uhlik, his wife, Marta Uhlik, their two children Vaclav Uhlik, Jr., and Eva Uhlik; Joseph Pisarik, Walter Hora, and Vaclav Krejcirik.

In introducing this bill to legalize the entry of the seven Czechs who had the courage and initiative to crash through the Iron Curtain to freedom, I do so both to make it possible for them to become American citizens and to show something of the admiration and sympathy which all Americans feel for the freedom-loving people who still suffer under Communist tyranny. The successful escape of the members of this group will be an encouragement to all of their compatriots to carry on the fight against communism wherever they may be.

I am sure that the time will come—and I hope soon—when those still under Communist rule will find it possible in their own way, to throw off the yoke of communism, and again find freedom under a government of their own choosing. The dramatic circumstances under which those named in my bill made their escape proved to the whole world that the spirit of freedom cannot be crushed. We welcome them to this country and I know that they will make good citizens. I am particularly pleased that, with the assistance of those active in the Crusade for Freedom, they have decided to make their future home in Springfield. As time goes on, I am confident that they will not only become good citizens but, as they have an opportunity to do so, they will continue to give encouragement to those whom they left behind.

A Special Postage Stamp Proposed to Commemorate the 35th Anniversary of the Founding of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 29, 1954

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 35th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion.

This great veterans' organization was founded in Paris, France, during a caucus held at the Cirque de Paris on March 15–17, 1919. The credit for envisioning

the American Legion is given to Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., who surrounded himself with capable citizen soldiers in France to make this vision a reality. The need for such an organization at that time was based on the tremendous surge of unrest that came over the United States expeditionary forces following the armistice on November 11, 1918. The uncertainty of the future, the need for care of the disabled, protection of widows and orphans, and Americanism, were motivating factors.

The Paris caucus determined that the next organizational meeting should be held in the United States and such a meeting was held in St. Louis, Mo., on May 9–10, 1919. At this time a temporary organization of the American Legion was established. Congress was petitioned to grant a charter to this new organization, and the charter was approved by President Wilson on September 16, 1919.

From that modest beginning 35 years ago, the American Legion has attained its present stature, and its name and works are known in every home across the land. Over this period of years, the Legion has gained nationwide recognition in the fields of Americanism and national security and worldwide recognition in the field of child welfare.

I, therefore, believe it most apropriate that the Post Office Department be authorized and directed by the Congress to issue a special postage stamp in commemoration of the founding of the American Legion, the world's largest patriotic organization.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, January 22, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, at whose word light shineth out of darkness and who with a new dawn in a world drenched with beauty hast awakened us again to toil and praise and friendship, grant us now, we beseech Thee, a sustaining realization that our labor is not in vain in the Lord. So teach us to number these days, so crucial for our own Nation and the whole world, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

As Thou hast called Thy servants, who here minister at the altar of public affairs, to serve humanity in a stern day of judgment, when men's hearts fail for fear and for looking at the things that are coming on the earth, save them from pessimism and cynicism. Gird them with fortitude. Illumine them with the light of Thy truth, and make them more than conquerors in the faith that the kingdoms of this world are to become the one and radiant kingdom of Thy redeeming love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 29, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on January 30, 1954, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 727) to provide that certain costs and expenses incurred in connection with certain repayment contracts with irrigation districts approved by the acts of Congress of May 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 62), October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 941), and June 23, 1952 (66 Stat. 151, 153), shall be nonreimbursable.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, following the transaction of routine business, the unfinished business, Senate Joint Resolution 1, will be laid aside temporarily in order that the Senate may proceed with the consideration of House Joint Resolution 358, to discharge the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with the limitation agreed upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is correct. As the Senator knows, the limitation of debate will begin at 1 o'clock.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	Knowland
Anderson	Frear	Kuchel
Barrett	Fulbright	Langer
Beall	George	Lehman
Bennett	Gillette	Lennon
Bricker	Goldwater	Long
Bridges	Gore	Magnuson
Burke	Green	Malone
Bush	Griswold	Mansfield
Butler, Md.	Hayden	Martin
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Maybank
Byrd	Hennings	McCarran
Carlson	Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Case	Hill	McClellan
Chavez	Hoey	Millikin
Clements	Holland	Mundt
Cooper	Humphrey	Murray
Cordon	Hunt	Neely
Daniel	Jackson	Pastore
Dirksen	Jenner	Payne
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Potter
Duff	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Eastland	Kefauver	Russell
Ellender	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Ferguson	Kilgore	Smathers
Smith, Maine	Symington	Welker
Smith, N. J.	Thye	Wiley
Sparkman	Upton	Williams
Stennis	Watkins	Young

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, dated January 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated January 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions urging the Congress of the United States to investigate fully the unjust annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and the atrocities committed therein by the Communist leaders

"Whereas credible evidence has revealed that the annexation of Lithuania to the So-

viet Union was based on terror, intimidation, and fraud; and

"Whereas hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, freedom-loving people whose centuries of struggle for independence culminated in the establishment of the Lithuanian Government, which was enjoyed only for a few years, have been deported to Siberia by the Communist rulers since the beginning of the Soviet occupation; and

"Whereas the same Communist rulers, as part of a tragic and vicious plan to destroy a noble race, have been sending thousands of Mongolians into Lithuania; and

"Whereas the annexation of Lithuania was based on terror and fraud, as was the request of the Lithuanian Parliament for admission into the Soviet Union: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to investigate fully the unjust annexation of Lithuania, the atrocities committed against the Lithuanian people, and the fraudulent government imposed upon the Lithuanians by Communist leaders, so that the people of Lithuania will know that the struggle for Lithuanian independence will have the sympathy and support of the people of the United States and of freedom-loving people throughout the world; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmited forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States, and to all Members of the said Congress from this Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, and the American Academy of Tropical Medicine, favoring an increased budget for the Gorgas Memorial Institute; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the American Academy of Tropical Medicine and the American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, favoring an increased contribution to the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FULL PARITY FOR FARMERS—RESOLUTION OF LEEDS (N. DAK.) CIVIC CLUB

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a circular embodying a resolution adopted by the Leeds, N. Dak., Civic Club, relating to full parity for farmers.

There being no objection, the circular was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEEDS BUSINESSMEN SAY "FULL PARITY FOR FARMERS"

The Leeds Civic Club at its regular meeting held Monday, January 11, 1954, declared their absolute support of, and passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we go on record as favoring no less than 100-percent parity for the basic farm commodities. This is essential because, there must be provided adequate price and income protection to the producer if we are to reach the goal of agricultural equality with the rest of the economy.

"We further resolve to condemn any form of prosperity based on war and bloodshed.

"We do not favor the present proposed flexible price-support system.

"We urge continuation of production control and continuation of the soil-conservation program."

Copies of this resolution have been sent to our United States Senators and Representatives in Washington, D. C.

LEEDS CIVIC CLUB,
Representing the business and professional people of Leeds, N. Dak.

WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM FIELD OF GASOLINE TAXES—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, one relating to the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation, and the other relating to the receipt by Korean veterans of the same educational opportunities and advantages granted veterans of World War II.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received and referred; and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to enact legislation whereby Korean veterans may receive the same educational opportunities and advantages granted veterans of World War II

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing the same educational opportunities and advantages for veterans of the Korean conflict as were granted to those veterans who served our country in World War II; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

REMOVAL OF LIMIT ON EARNINGS UNDER SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution memorializing Congress to remove that part of the social-security law limiting the earnings of a recipient of benefits, which was adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to remove that part of the social-security law limiting the earnings of a recipient of benefits

Whereas the living conditions of retired persons who receive benefits under the social-security law would be greatly improved if the limitation in said law denying the right of a recipient to earn more than $75 a month was removed; and

Whereas in most cases the earned income of persons over 65 years of age would, in all probability, be subject to income tax, and result in an added income to the Government; and

Whereas the recipients of social-security benefits who continue to work would also continue to pay social-security taxes; and

Whereas work and expense would be lessened if this limitation was removed; and

Whereas the efforts of experienced workers are needed and they should not be excluded from employment altogether; and

Whereas a removal of the $75 limitation would make it unnecessary for many recipients to obtain direct relief: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to remove the limitation on earnings of recipients of social-security payments; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 54. A bill for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra (Rept. No. 923);

S. 60. A bill for the relief of Fawn S. Louie (Rept. No. 891);

H. R. 685. A bill for the relief of Walter Carl Sander (Rept. No. 892);

H. R. 1129. A bill for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fiflis and Theodore Panagiotou Fiflis (Rept. No. 893);

H. R. 1496. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb (Rept. No. 894);

H. R. 1516. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clemtine De Ryck (Rept. No. 895);

H. R. 1674. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Motobara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler (Rept. No. 896);

H. R. 2021. A bill for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad (Rept. No. 897);

H. R. 2618. A bill for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez (Rept. No. 898);

H. R. 2683. A bill for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu (Rept. No. 899);

H. R. 2813. A bill for the relief of William E. Aitcheson (Rept. No. 900);

H. R. 3027. A bill for the relief of Tamiko Nagae (Rept. No. 901);

H. R. 3228. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges (Rept. No. 902);

H. R. 3280. A bill for the relief of John James T. Bell (Rept. No. 903);

H. R. 3390. A bill for the relief of Eiko Tanaka (Rept. No. 904);

H. R. 3619. A bill for the relief of Rufin Manikowski (Rept. No. 905);

H. R. 3728. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Bonanno (nee Koubek) (Rept. No. 906);

H. R. 3733. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder (Rept. No. 907);

H. R. 4254. A bill for the relief of Aneta Popa (Rept. No. 908);

H. R. 4439. A bill for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham (Rept. No. 909);

H. R. 4577. A bill for the relief of Edith Maria Gore (Rept. No. 910);

H. R. 4972. A bill for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho (Rept. No. 911);

H. R. 5195. A bill for the relief of Max Kassner (Rept. No. 912); and

H. R. 5945. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States (Rept. No. 913).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 364. A bill for the relief of the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz. (Rept. No. 914);

S. 931. A bill for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar (Rept. No. 915);

S. 989. A bill for the relief of Jean Jing Peo Feng (Rept. No. 916);

S. 1137. A bill for the relief of Utako Kanitz (Rept. No. 917);

S. 1184. A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State (Rept. No. 922);

S. 1208. A bill for the relief of Andrew D. Sumner (Rept. No. 918);

S. 1231. A bill for the relief of Franz Gerich and Willy Gerich, his minor son (Rept. No. 919); and

H. R. 1160. A bill for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo (Rept. No. 920).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1112. A bill for the relief of Lo Bianco Letizia Maria Genoveffa (Rept. No. 921).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. CARLSON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2859. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2860. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Stafford Ordnance Corp., a corporation, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2861. A bill to provide for stockpiling 500 million bushels of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2862. A bill to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special nonquota immigration visas available to certain skilled alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD PROGRAM

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, last year more than 100 people per day died from accidents on our highways. In November, as chairman of the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Roads, I was invited to speak at the annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials, in Pittsburgh. There, I ventured to offer six suggestions for safer highways. First on the list I placed the need for more funds for highway construction.

Today, suiting action to words, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would provide $1 billion per year for the 2 fiscal years that are to be covered by the Federal Highway Act of 1954.

This proposed billion dollars per year would be the Federal Government's contribution toward improving the Nation's highways. This compares with $712 million in the existing biennial highway act.

On the principal Federal-aid systems where funds are matched by State and local agencies, this bill proposes $835 million against the current total authorizations of $575 million.

This increase of $260 million on a matching basis would thus mean an increase of more than one-half billion per year for new construction on these recognized highway systems, or more than one billion for the biennium. The startling fact is, however, Mr. President, that this will only be a fraction of what the President's economic report last week said was needed to meet the backlog in this field.

The authorization for roads on Federal lands would be increased from the current $127 million to $157 million.

In addition, four new legislative features are incorporated in the bill as drafted for consideration.

First. The authorized interstate system would be increased from 42,000 to 50,000 miles. In addition, $100 million of the $360 million for the Federal primary system could be expended on segments of the interstate system on a 60-40 matching basis instead of the existing 50-50; and, likewise, $65 million of the $200 million proposed for the urban system if applied to arterial and circumferential routes could be on a 60-40 basis. These routes were recognized as access roads in the Biennial Highway Act passed 2 years ago—but the provision has not been implemented to any great extent.

Second. The entire amount for the farm-to-market roads of the secondary system would be made available for disbursement to the States on certification that State agencies had expended matching amounts on approved secondary systems on appropriate specifications. Thus, the States would have an opportunity to prove their oft-stated claim that they could get more mileage in the secondary system if they were freed of the standards required by the Bureau of Public Roads and were permitted to vary specifications to fit local traffic requirements.

Third. Administrative funds of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads would be made available for studies on the economics of toll roads as well as for safety practices in engineering. This would be in line with recent recommendations of the administrative branch of the Government.

Fourth. Authority would be established by this bill for the President to advance by one year allocations from authorizations provided in the bill if he finds that such would be desirable in the interest of spreading employment.

Mr. President, during his pre-election campaign, Mr. Eisenhower said—and I quote:

> Next to the manufacture of the most modern implements of war as a guaranty of peace through strength, a network of modern roads is as necessary to the defense as it is to our national economy and personal safety.

This bill implements that declaration.

Then, in his budget message to the Congress early in this session, the President said:

> We should give increased attention to eliminating the existing inadequacies of the national system of interstate highways.

This bill does that.

Again in the economic report of the President transmitted to the Congress only last week on January 28, 1954, we were advised that the largest current requirements in the field of public works is streets and roads.

The report then goes on to say that it is estimated an annual expenditure of $3.5 billion would be required for 10 years to eliminate the existing backlog for federally aided systems and another one to two billion dollars for other roads and streets.

The economic report adds to that the amount required to replace wear from normal traffic and finds that the total annual expenditure required to provide an adequate road system within a decade "is apparently over $8 billion which would compare with the current outlay of about $5 billion."

This bill does not go that far but it is a very definite step in that direction.

I earnestly invite the consideration of the Senators to the provisions of this bill which, I understand, is being given the number S. 2859.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks a short table to give the authorizations under the existing highway act and those under the new bill.

There being no objection the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Comparison of current biennial highway act and proposed bill

[In millions of dollars]

	Old	New
1. Federal primary system	247.5	[1] 360
2. Federal secondary system	165.0	240
3. Urban system	137.5	[2] 200
4. Interstate system	25.0	35
5. Access roads	50.0	50
6. Forest highways	22.5	30
7. Forest roads and trails	22.5	30
8. Park highways or parkways	10.0	15
9. Park roads and trails	10.0	15
10. Indian reservation roads	10.0	15
11. Inter-American Highway and Rama Road	10.0	10
12. Public lands	2.5	2
Total	712.5	1,002

[1] Of which $100 million could be matched on a 60 to 40 basis if on segments of the interstate system.
[2] Of which $65 million could be matched on a 60 to 40 basis if applied to arterial or circumferential routes as authorized under access roads.

The bill (S. 2859) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

STOCKPILING OF WHEAT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to transfer 500 million bushels of wheat to an emergency stockpile.

This bill will direct the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, to transfer 500 million bushels of wheat to a stockpile, in the same manner as strategic and critical materials are already being stockpiled.

A similar bill has already been introduced in the House of Representatives by my colleague, Representative LEE METCALF, who stated in his introduction of the measure that he was doing exactly as the President suggested in his farm program message to Congress in which "he recommended that a substantial part of the present excessive wheat carryover be set aside a. an emergency reserve and removed from the market."

I agree with my colleague, Representative METCALF, that the Commodity Credit Corporation should not bear the burden of this presidentially recommended need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a copy of the bill I have introduced.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2861) to provide for stockpiling 500 million bushels of wheat, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, shall transfer 500 million bushels of wheat, which is now or may hereafter be owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation (excluding wheat held as security for a loan), to the stockpiles provided for in the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U. S. C., sec. 98–98h). Such act shall apply with respect to the wheat so transferred in the same manner as it applies with respect to strategic and critical materials purchased under such act. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed for such wheat, from the funds available to carry out the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, in an amount equal to the fair market value of such wheat, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but the amount so determined shall not be less than the minimum price prescribed in section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C., sec. 1427), for the sale of such wheat.

EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF PRODUCTS FROM POLAND

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution asking the President immediately to embargo all importations of products from Communist Poland. I shall seek speedy approval of the resolution.

I have requested the Attorney General to proceed against an official Communist Polish trade organization in New York.

In spite of Communist control of Poland, Americans of both Polish and non-Polish extraction have been generous in sending millions of dollars worth of food, clothing, and other relief supplies to the Polish people. More than 100,000 relief packages have been sent every month for many months.

I am advised that on February 8, the Communist Polish Government will begin collecting prohibitive taxes on all shipments from the United States, under a ministerial decree issued December 23. The taxes are confiscatory: $125 on a new or used dress; $1.50 per pair of stockings; $37.50 on a pair of men's shoes; $15 on a pair of children's shoes; $25 on a pound of coffee; $75 on a pound of pepper. The taxes apply to some 400 items, including all food and clothing supplies.

Only the Communist elite of Poland, wringing their funds out of an enslaved population, could pay such taxes. The taxes will be collected from the recipients. That the Polish Government's primary aim is to cut off actual relief to the starving people, is proved by the fact that they exempt from these taxes all persons connected with official agencies. There is a further purpose in this tax program. That is to further the Communist propaganda that there is shortage of goods in the United States, by preventing the Polish people from receiving a wide variety of foods and clothing, as gifts, from the United States. The "big lie" of a collapsing economy here can never make headway with Poles so long as American goods have entry into Poland.

I am advised that the Communists are not placing such taxes on shipments from other countries.

This tax is a direct blow at American relief. But there is a still more sinister purpose behind it, according to my Polish-American informants.

The Polish Government will not tax relief packages ordered through its official PKO—pronounced Pekoe—Trading Incorporation, 25 Broad Street, N. Y. Americans who place orders with this agency are feeding dollars into a controlled organization which could use those dollars to finance Communist activity and groups in this country.

Such a system amounts to international blackmail and should be stopped forthwith. I am asking the Attorney General to use all legal means to close this agency.

The President has authority, under acts of 1890 and 1930, to embargo all imports from Poland. I hope he will do so at once.

Our trade with Poland is not large, but it is critical to Poland's economy. And it is rising.

Imports from Poland amounted to in 1951, $10,300,000; in 1952, $10,246,000; and from January to October 1953, $12,518,000.

The largest item of import is canned ham, shoulders, and bacon: $3,956,000 in 1951; $7,244,000 in 1952, and $9,905,000 in the 1953 10-month period.

In that same 1953 period, other imports included: raw hides and skins, $986,000; bristles, $369,000; feathers, $694,000; poppy seed, $130,000; baskets and bags, $163,000; and Christmas-tree ornaments, $279,000.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter I sent to Attorney General Brownell today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD, and the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The letter referred to is as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1954.

Hon. HERBERT BROWNELL,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWNELL: I am enclosing a copy of a Senate resolution which I have introduced relative to confiscatory taxes imposed by the Communist Polish Government on American relief parcels, and my statement explaining this situation.

You will note that there is named an official Polish Government agency, PKO Trading Incorporation, 25 Broad Street, New York, which is authorized to accept orders for relief packages for Polish citizens. Packages ordered through PKO would not be taxed. Through this operation, the Communist Polish Government seeks to cut off all relief except that ordered through its own agency.

If this is permitted, American dollars can be wrung from relief purposes, and used to finance subversive activities in the United States.

This agency of a foreign power is required to be registered and licensed under United States law.

I ask you to ascertain the facts in this case, and if they are as I have stated, to proceed to withdraw the license and effect closure of the agency, as a retaliation against Communist discrimination toward our relief efforts. If the agency is presently operating illegally, I suggest the prosecution of those involved.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

The resolution (S. Res. 208) submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Whereas the Senate is reliably advised that the Government of Poland has imposed taxes

at confiscatory levels upon all merchandise sent by American citizens to their relatives and friends residing in Poland, such taxes being imposed upon the recipients of such merchandise; and

Whereas it is understood that such taxes are not imposed by the Government of Poland upon merchandise sent to residents of Poland from certain other countries; and

Whereas in the past American citizens have transmitted such merchandise in large volume to recipients in Poland to provide necessary material relief and assistance; and

Whereas the imposition of such taxes will effectively prevent the rendition of further aid by American citizens to residents of Poland; and

Whereas under present law the President is empowered to exclude from importation into the United States products of any foreign state which practices unjust discrimination against the importation into such foreign state of any product of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should (a) direct the appropriate agencies of the Government to conduct forthwith such investigation as may be required to ascertain fully the nature and extent of the discrimination practiced by the Government of Poland against the importation into Poland of merchandise originating in the United States, and (b) upon the completion of such investigation, take promptly such action under section 5 of the act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 415; 19 U. S. C. 181), or section 338 of the act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 704; 19 U. S. C. 1338), or both, as may be required to exclude from importation into the United States all products of Poland until such time as he shall receive from the Government of Poland satisfactory assurances that such discrimination has been terminated and will not be practiced again with respect to products originating in or sent from the United States.

STUDY OF CERTAIN EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for a study of certain executive agreements. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter which I have today addressed to Hon. Walter Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 209), submitted by Mr. KNOWLAND, was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is directed to make a full and complete study of executive agreements negotiated between the United States and foreign governments or other international organizations. Such study shall include investigation into the number and nature of executive agreements operating as internal law in the United States and shall include the authority for such agreements.

The letter presented by Mr. KNOWLAND is as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1954.

The Honorable WALTER BEDELL SMITH,
Under Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the discussions on Senate Joint Resolution 1, there has been a difference of opinion expressed as to the number of executive agreements involved in any constitutional provision that in order for such agreements to have the effect of internal law congressional action would be required.

Article I of the Constitution states:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States * * *."

The Constitution also gives the Congress power: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Please furnish me with information showing for each year 1943 to 1953 inclusive the number of executive agreements entered into with foreign governments or international organizations and the number of such agreements which "have the effect of internal law." Also list those agreements affecting internal law which were based on prior or subsequent congressional action and those which had no congressional authorization.

I believe that it is essential that such information be made available prior to the submission to the States of the proposed constitutional amendment. Your early reply will be appreciated.

It is also my intention to introduce a Senate resolution requesting the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to make a complete study of this question. It is my belief that in the past the executive department has used executive agreements when the Constitution intended the treatymaking power to be used, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following historic principles are solemnly affirmed: (a) That the Constitution of the United States is superior to all domestic laws and to all treaties and other international agreements; (b) that neither a treaty nor any other international agreement can prevail over subsequently enacted laws of the United States intended to alter the domestic effect thereof; (c) that the courts of the United States, in deciding cases before them, have not only the power but also the duty to declare unconstitutional and invalid any provision of such domestic law, treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution; and (d) that under its Constitution, the United States, as a completely sovereign state in the community of nations, must always retain and exercise all of those attributes of sovereignty incident to the making of treaties and other international agreements which are possessed by independent states under the law of nations.

SEC. 2. That it is the sense of the Congress that the Senate, in giving its advice and consent to the ratification of a treaty has the power to provide that the treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of legislation by the Congress.

SEC. 3. In view of the extremely important nature of treaties and constitutional amendments, subsections (1), (2), and (3) of this section are enacted by the Congress: (a) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and (b) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(1) Rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end of the last paragraph of section 1 the following:

"No vote upon the final question to advise and consent to the ratification shall be had unless immediately prior to such vote, it has been ascertained, by a rollcall ordered for such purpose, that a quorum of the Senate is present. The final question to advise and consent to the ratification shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote; the yeas and nays shall be considered to have been ordered upon any such question; and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate."

(2) Rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"5. No vote upon the question of engrossment and passage of any joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be had unless, immediately prior to such vote, it has been ascertained, by a rollcall ordered for such purpose, that a quorum of the House is present. The question of engrossment and passage of any joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote; the yeas and nays shall be considered to have been ordered upon any such question; and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the House."

(3) Rule XII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"No vote upon the question of engrossment and passage of any joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be had unless, immediately prior to such vote, it has been ascertained, by a rollcall ordered for such purpose, that a quorum of the Senate is present. The question of engrossment and passage of any joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote; the yeas and nays shall be considered to have been ordered upon any such question; and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate."

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William A. Kimbel, of South Carolina, to be representative to the ninth session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF WILLIAM A. KIMBEL TO BE REPRESENTATIVE TO NINTH SESSION OF ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nomination of William A. Kimbel, of South Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America to the ninth session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Notice is given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Release regarding the Bricker amendment, issued by him on January 31, 1954.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorials and correspondence relating to the St. Lawrence seaway.

FORD Q. ELVIDGE, GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the United States is fortunate in its representation in the Territory of Guam in the person of Gov. Ford Q. Elvidge, who was inaugurated in mid-1953. Governor Elvidge has won the respect and support of mainlanders and Guamanians alike in the Territory for the intelligent and vigorous manner with which he has met the many serious problems existing on the island.

On last January 11, Governor Elvidge addressed the second regular session of the Second Guam Legislature, and, among other recommendations he made to that body, called for a reduction of the budget for the next fiscal year and an act to outlaw taxi dancing. I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the full text of Governor Elvidge's address to the Guam Legislature. The wisdom of his two recommendations which I have mentioned will be apparent to all, from a reading of his address.

A less forthright and courageous man would not have faced the necessity for action on these two problems.

Fortunately, Mr. President, I am able to report that Governor Elvidge's recommendations have the solid support of all the people on the island who have only the best interests of the Territory and its inhabitants at heart. They, I may assure you, constitute an overwhelming majority of both Guamanians and mainlanders. Nevertheless, at the conclusion of his address, Governor Elvidge was subjected to vicious attack—for reasons best known to themselves—by two members of the Guam Legislature for his requests that taxi dancing be outlawed and the Territorial budget placed in balance.

I may safely assure this body that Governor Elvidge will not be swayed by such personal attacks from his determination to assure the people of Guam a decent moral climate and a solvent government. In turn, Governor Elvidge and the people of Guam may be assured that, in their commendable fight against the forces of evil and greed which have risen in their midst, they have the admiration and support of the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of Governor Elvidge's address to the Guam Legislature printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, members of the 2d session of the 2d Guam Legislature, I have a deep feeling of personal pride on this the second occasion of my appearance before your honorable body. Pride in the fact that I hold the position of chief executive of the Territory of Guam, for which government I have developed a deep and abiding interest. Pride in the fact that I am an integral part on an equal basis with your body in the operation of this government. Pride in the fact that with you, we are helping to make history in the western Pacific in a very important spot. Pride in the fact that we are making progress and that what we have thus far done seems to have the approval of the President of the United States, Congress, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Notwithstanding the pride which I experience, I approach you humbly because I recognize that the Legislature of Guam occupies an equally important place with the executive in the building of this government, and that we both bow in recognition of the equal importance of the judicial branch.

Such is the pattern of government under the Stars and Stripes. A government of balanced powers. A government of laws and not of men. A government by constitutional processes. I say to you again, as I have on other occasions, that it is the greatest form of government ever designed and established in the history of mankind.

Our pride in being a part of it is justifiable. But in our pride we must not overlook our obligations of performance.

Public office in our country is a public trust.

When I arrived on this island on the 23d of April last, I did not know a soul on Guam. During the intervening 8 months, Mrs. Elvidge and I have met many people and have made many friends. I am privileged to call many of them by their first names. It warms our hearts.

When I addressed you on my first occasion last June, I had been on the island less than 4 weeks. I have found to be true what I then suspicioned. The basic laws of this government are sound and have been prepared with care, skill, and foresight. They need little in the way of basic alteration. The greatest need for legislation is the polishing off and streamlining of some of that legislation in the light of 3 years' experience in self-government.

I shall, early in your session, cause to be submitted to you a few pieces of legislation which I think, if passed, would materially improve the operation of this government in the best interests of the people.

At the time of my arrival on Guam last spring, I first engaged myself with attention to the Guam Memorial Hospital. As you well know, that problem was messy and was critical. I am now able to report that as a consequence of much patience, tolerance and cooperation and much effort on the part of many people that situation has been much improved. I shall not take the time to go into detail here. I think the members of your body are familiar with what has been done. The medical staff has been improved. The administrative phase has been organized and improved. The physical plant has been improved. I hope we shall now be able to render adequate service at a lesser cost.

But there is room for further improvement. We need more doctors, particularly in the TB and public-health branches. We are still in need of improved facilities. I think the problem of facilities will be largely solved when the new hospital wing is opened, but that may be a year or two. In the meantime, we are confronted with the problem of maintenance and rehabilitation. So far as personnel is concerned, the problem is one of recruitment. I doubt if you realize what difficulties confront me and the department heads when we are endeavoring to recruit personnel to come to this island. We cannot win in the battle against tuberculosis until we have been able to obtain what is needed in both prevention and cure branches.

On December 30 of last year there were 151 tubercular patients in the hospital, which compares favorably with 167 on a given day last summer.

On December 30 there were 79 nontubercular patients, as compared with 87 on a given day last summer. Of this 79, 29 were recently delivered mothers and babies; or, in other words, there were only 50 medical nonobstetrical cases. Of the 50 cases, only 1 or 2 were contagious. In other words, the health of the island of Guam, speaking generally, but not considering tuberculosis, is very good. Our main problem remains tuberculosis.

The foregoing should enable us to keep the rendition of hospitalization to the people of Guam within reasonable financial bounds.

Because of the many reasons for nurturing the health of the people, I inaugurated and conducted a sanitation drive on the island during the fall. In connection with this matter, I had splendid cooperation from the district commissioners and the various residents. Speaking generally, I am very happy about the health condition of the island, always leaving out of consideration however the matter of tuberculosis.

I think I should make the following comment for the record. During the period of travail in connection with the hospital, we have enjoyed most generous assistance and cooperation from the United States Navy. The people of Guam have reason to be most thankful to Commander Naval Forces Marianas and to the Navy hospital personnel for their help. There have been times when our people would have suffered seriously if it had not been for the opportunity and privilege of calling upon the Navy hospital personnel for aid.

I believe that education is functioning as smoothly and efficiently as can be expected. It is in good hands, and the island people

should be proud and grateful for what the administrative and teaching staff is doing for the younger generation. Facilities are woefully inadequate in many places. But we are doing all we can to improve them. The department of education is confronted with an expanding economy. For instance, when the Adelupe School was first placed upon the trestleboard it was designed to accommodate 700 children. Today, with the addition of quonsets it cares for 964. Last year the Hilaan School accommodated 618 children. Today the Wettengel School cares for 995. The overall enrollment in elementary schools this year exceeds last year by 470, an increase of about 6 percent. The enrollment in the high school last year at this time was 1,606. It is now 1,937, an increase of over 20 percent.

But notwithstanding the needs of education it must be borne in mind that our desires and ambitions to provide education must be limited by our capacity to pay. Education and hospitalization stand in the same position in this regard.

I believe that the pattern of instruction in the high school and Territorial college should conform rather closely to fundamentals and to the immediate requirements of the local people.

Public safety and law enforcement: I was most fortunate to secure the services of an able official in this branch of government to succeed an able official. Crime poses a serious problem on this island. Too many forms of gambling are sanctioned by law. The presence of an overwhelming number of unattached males with loose money in their pockets and too much time on their hands has provoked the importation of prostitutes. I need not labor that point. You have a full consciousness of the situation. This evil has spread its poison into the homes of our island people to the extent that all decent people on the island have become greatly alarmed and are demanding remedial action. Fortunately, our new director of public safety has had much experience in this line of police work and can be depended upon to enforce the existing laws to the extent possible.

In the opinion of many—and I share it—a vicious major contributing factor to the evils of the day is the so-called profession of "taxidancing." This island is too small to absorb or be unaffected by the evil influence of that occupation. It disturbs me greatly to see the sober-minded, decent, and law-abiding Guamanian people seduced by this form of commercialized modern entertainment. The stateside people alone are not to blame. A few of the local people are participating in the procurement and the exploitation.

Research and investigation conducted over a period of months concerning taxidancing on the island of Guam discloses (1) that the environment of taxidance halls breeds prostitution and (2) that taxidancing cannot remain profitable to a dancer for more than a short period of time unless the dancer is willing to engage in prostitution. The director of public safety informs me that it is impossible to control prostitution on Guam with the continued existence of taxidance halls.

I have on my desk letters, resolutions, and petitions signed by several thousand people demanding drastic action, including the presidents of all the units of the vicariate of holy name societies.

I urge you to outlaw taxidancing. I shall submit legislation for that purpose. When that opportunity for contact and enticement has been eliminated, the prostitutes will soon go home, for prostitution without taxidancing will not thrive on the island. It has not done so before.

Unquestionably, the Government has the power to outlaw as inherent in the power to preserve and protect the public health, public safety, and public morals.

Juvenile delinquency is one of the sordid evils following in the wake of taxidancing, prostitution, and unrestrained gambling. I have been asked to support legislation to handle this situation. I shall do so and will recommend the appropriation of a reasonable sum of money to make it function. But the only satisfactory cure for juvenile delinquency is removal of the causes. The disintegration of the family relationship and the breakdown of parental discipline and control are the major factors.

As to agriculture, I hope to have an opportunity, with your cooperation, to reorganize this branch of the government during the next 6 months. It offers one of the greatest fields for island development.

I have heard a great deal of criticism of the operation of the commercial port. Some of it is justifiable. In my opinion, most of it is unjustifiable. I think none of it is justifiable on the ground that there has been a failure of honest, vigorous, good-faith effort on the part of the director to make it function successfully. The failure of the port to function more efficiently arises out of a lack of experience in efficient, modern, up-to-date terminal operation. In an effort to improve this situation, I am negotiating a contract for stateside supervisory management for a period of 1 year. In this move, I have the approval and cooperation of the director.

Public utilities: Here again we have suffered from a lack of many things. In the development of public-utility services we are starting almost from scratch. The sudden demand in service arising out of a rapid business development and an increased availability of power has put us in the position of the small boy who, suddenly jumping into adolescence, has outgrown all his clothes. But again I believe I have recruited to the island a man who by reason of his experience and background can in a reasonable time meet the situation. We must have patience and forbearance.

I have had splendid cooperation from the heads of the departments in administering the affairs of the government. We realize that there are many operations in administration that require improvement and much improvement, so much so that in some instances the dignity and prestige of the government are in jeopardy. That is a condition which has been inherited by this administration. But I assure you that the administrative heads and I are working hard to bring about improvement and that great strides are being made. We realize that the obligation of the people to support the government is met by a counterobligation on the part of the government to serve the people. There are those on the island that would minimise or flaunt the power of the government of Guam. I have reference to the nonpayment of government obligations. The day of reckoning will surely arrive.

Now, as to budget: When I addressed you in June at your last sitting, I promised you I would save out of expenditures for the current year the sum of $428,435. I made that promise in order that the government might have approximately $2 million preserved for capital expenditures. I will have saved more than $428,435. I will have saved a sum approaching $650,000. However, as it has turned out, I am not saving this so that you would have more money for capital expenditures. I have had to save it in order to protect the sum already appropriated for capital expenditures. The chief of budget and management informed me last September, after he had had time to study the situation, that the government was running behind in that its expenditures, if continued at the current rate, at the end of the fiscal year, would exceed the income by the sum of over $762,000. I therefore ordered a 15-percent cut across the board in order to keep the budget in balance. I have had splendid cooperation from all department heads in that effort, although I told each department head that I was not asking any amount below the point of efficient operation. I wanted every effort made to the point where the department was operating on an efficient basis with no waste. Those cuts are being made in all departments except education. It will not be possible for education to reduce its expenditures by 15 percent and continue to operate efficiently. As I stated before, education is confronted with an ever-increasing demand for its facilities. If the birth rate on this island continues unabated, the cost of education will continue to mount.

In January of 1953 the income for fiscal 1954 was estimated at $10,442,700. In September we reestimated the actual income for fiscal 1954 at $9,457,700, a shrinkage of $985,000.

Our appropriations for the current fiscal year 1954 were $10,220,305. We have shrunk that figure by savings in the operating budget of the sum of $650,000. Unless there is a further saving between now and June or an increase of income over the estimte, the government will be in the red on June 30, 1954, by about $112,000. Although I have saved more than I promised, I have not been able to save enough out of the operating budget to preserve the full capital improvement program and remain in the black.

The budget for fiscal 1955, which you will have for consideration at this session will be presented to you early in the session. Roughly speaking, it will provide for an expenditure of $6,841,973 for the executive branch of the operations of the government, as against an estimated income for fiscal 1955 of $8,785,330 leaving a margin of only $1,943,357. Out of this margin of $1,943,357 must come first the expenditure of necessary funds for the operation of the legislative and judicial branches and in addition, $1,250,000 already committed for the new hospital. I see almost no money for capital improvements such as new schools, public buildings, and highways.

I have asked all department heads to be very careful and explicit in the preparation of their respective budgets. It is quite possible that one or two of the department heads will be very unhappy in the amount that I have influenced them into submitting as their budget requirements, such as the Departments of Medical Services and Education. However, if the people of Guam demand additional services in the way of education and hospitalization, the money for the additional services must be raised and provided for by this legislature. It is idle and ineffectual to appropriate money for the expenditure of sums for which there is no income. The budget which will be presented to you is all that the people can afford under the present income and tax setup.

We are a solvent government. So far as I know, we are the only solvent government in the world. Let us keep it so.

It must be borne in mind that as the Federal income-tax rate goes down, the income of this government will shrink. Your estimated income for this current year is about $9½ million. Of that about 7 million is derived from the income tax. The day may be coming when the people of this island will be obliged to supplement the revenue from the income tax by substantial local taxation, as is done in other Territories, assuming of course, that Congress continues to permit the income-tax revenues to be covered into the Guam treasury.

While we are thinking in terms of expenditures, let me call your attention to the degree of paternalism which this government has already assumed. My purpose in casting up the total of the items is to call your attention to a trend which unless reversed, will result in pure socialism. I do not think the Congress of the United States will view the continuation of such a trend with favor.

First. The Guam Memorial Hospital is costing this government in this current year $1,515,557 (less the sum of about $200,000 for fees to be collected) for operating expenses alone. This includes free care for all tubercular patients regardless of station in life and also includes $50,000 for free dental care for all schoolchildren through high-school grades, regardless of their station in life. The reason for such liberal dental care no longer obtains and the program should be curtailed.

At the same time, $1,250,000 will be spent next year for construction of the TB wing of the new hospital. I have not mentioned the cost of a nursing school and its equipping and operation.

Second. The cost of education this current year will approximate $2,200,000. This is exclusive of $100,000 for interim capital improvements for schools and, of course, exclusive of capital appropriations for the Umatac and Inarajan schools.

Third. The government's annual current retirement program for government employees requires an appropriation of $500,000 per year, or more than 5 percent of our total annual income. We are now reviewing the actuarial tables to see if this cannot be reduced.

In connection with liberality toward government employees, quite aside from retirement benefits, it may be mentioned that by reason of very liberal personnel rules and regulations the cost of annual leave is approximately $650,000 and the potential liability of annual sick leave is over $350,000, with the privilege of accumulation of sick leave for 6 years. The liberality of this program of benefits for government employees far exceeds the normal or average. A committee is now studying a revision of these rules and regulations.

Fourth. The current outstanding loans for students studying stateside is $85,000.

Fifth. It is the policy of the administration to be liberal in granting the privilege to employees of in-service stateside training, the cost of which is substantial in the course of a year.

Sixth. The government has now taken on a welfare program that will cost us $30,000 this current year.

The for-free program of this government is extremely liberal. It seriously prejudices any program for capital improvements.

Now, one last word before concluding. On occasions I have been conscious of a subtle philosphy of Guam for Guamanians. The spread of this un-American propaganda on the island would be most unfortunate. It is unfair to the best interests of the Guamanian people. Such a philosophy is as sensible as Hawaii for the Hawaiians, California for the Californians or New York for the New Yorkers. The people of Guam have sought American citizenship. The people of Guam have been adopted by the American people. The so-called statesiders and Guamanians have merged into a common people. The people of Guam cannot now, by subtle pushing, edge the Americans out of their bed. The United States of America and its Territories have waxed strong upon the principle of united we stand, but divided we fall. The idea of divided citizenship was extinguished for all time by the war between the North and South in the sixties. We out here are a part of America. We should make no distinction among Americans based upon place of birth or color of skin. We will earn and deserve our citizenship in Guam by encouraging the good will of the American people, not by alienating it.

In conclusion. The Island of Guam is a beautiful island. It is populated by fine people. Let us do all we can through long-range thinking and unselfish planning to make Guam the outstanding Territory in the composit of Americanism.

I promise you all my cooperation.

I thank you.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO MEET DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the work of the Appropriations Committee, as the distinguished occupant of the chair realizes, is very heavy; and the holding of many sessions by the committee is essential.

In order to expedite the work of the committee in the remaining months of the present session of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to meet, when necessary, during the sessions of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object—I wish to say I do not believe in giving blanket authority to any committee to meet at any time it may choose. When a committee wishes to meet, if it can show good reason for doing so, then I believe it is perfectly proper for it to meet at that time.

On the other hand, if the Appropriations Committee is to have the right to meet at any time, then certainly the Judiciary Committee should have the same right.

Today in the Judiciary Committee we had a great deal of important business. Yet we adjourned the meeting of the committee, in order that the members of the committee would be able to be in the Senate Chamber at 12 o'clock. Therefore I object. I shall not object if the distinguished Senator will make a request that the committee be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate on any particular day.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am sure that any Senator who is a member of the Appropriations Committee will realize the amount of testimony it is necessary to take and the amount of work to be done by that committee. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee for about 12 years, and so far as I know, it has always been the custom to permit that committee to meet during sessions of the Senate. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will withdraw his objection, because I think it would be impossible for the committee to get its work done unless an order such as the one proposed were entered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I know what is in the heart of the Senator from North Dakota. I point out to him that a similar request has been made every year. This is not an unusual or new request. Such a request was made on February 23 last year, and similar requests were submitted in previous years. Without such permission, the committee would have difficulty in functioning. There are 10 subcommittees operating. I do not believe the Congress could get away from here until next December if we did not have this permission. Under the peculiar circumstances, will not the Senator from North Dakota withdraw his objection? If the permission is abused by the committee, let him raise the point later.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I rise to corroborate the statement just made by the chairman of the committee. To my certain knowledge, it has always been the practice to permit the Appropriations Committee to meet during sessions of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire says that the Appropriations Committee has 10 subcommittees. The Committee on the Judiciary has more subcommittees than has the Appropriations Committee. I wonder if the Senator from Michigan would have any objection to including in his request the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to include them.

Let me state another reason for the request. Appropriation bills do not come over from the House until the House has had time to complete consideration of them. Then it is essential that we work practically night and day in the Senate Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees in order to dispose of the bills.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this morning 30 bills came over from the House and were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not see why there should be any distinction between the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on the Judiciary or the Foreign Relations Committee. I do not see why the Senator should be unwilling to include both the committees I have mentioned, together with the Appropriations Committee. Would the Senator have any objection to including them?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not wish to submit a request to include the other committees.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if I may answer the Senator from North Dakota, let me say that I should like to see the request granted with respect to the Committee on Appropriations. If the Senator from North Dakota wishes to ask for similar permission with respect to the other two committees, I shall not object.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall not object if the Senator from North Dakota wishes to make such a request.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if other committees are to be included within the request, I should like to ask for inclusion of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if this permission is not granted to the Appropriations Committee, we shall be here until next December. It has been the practice every year to grant such permission. Every year since I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee the committee has had that right. It has never been abused, either by Republicans or Democrats. I should like very much to have the pending request granted. However, if the Senate does not see fit to give its consent, I can remain here as long as any other Senator, even until next December.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I will say to my distinguished friend from New Hampshire that the La Follette-Monroney Act specifically prohibits any committee from doing what is requested here.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know that provision is in the rule. That is why we are asking for unanimous consent.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, let me say that in order that we may obtain information on the basis of which to act intelligently in connection with what the military proposes to spend, in view of the huge sums of money involved, we must hold long sessions and hearings, at times even into the evening. For that reason I hope the Senator from North Dakota will withdraw his objection to the unanimous consent request. I do not know how the committee could function without this permission.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, is it not true that any committee can meet at any time it desires, so far as the mere meeting is concerned, so long as no business is transacted? As I understand, a subcommittee can meet and hold hearings when the Senate is in session. Is that not true?

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say that we have never so interpreted the rule. We have always lived up to the spirit of the law. We have always considered that it meant no meetings of committees or subcommittees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Chair whether it is true that a committee may meet at any time, so long as it does not transact business. As I understand, a committee may meet at any time for the purpose of holding hearings and gathering information, but not for the purpose of making a report to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). The rule which applies to full committees applies also to subcommittees. Subcommittees may not meet without specific permission.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it true that they may not meet at all?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They may not meet during sessions of the Senate unless they have permission.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the practical problem is that there is no way of challenging any meeting of a committee unless some action is reported to the Senate. If action is reported to the Senate, then a point of order can be made against the bill or resolution reported.

Mr. FERGUSON. Furthermore, if a witness were testifying under oath at a hearing which was held without permission during a session of the Senate, he could not even be prosecuted for perjury.

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

I should like to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota to this fact: It is true that the Reorganization Act contemplated that committees would not meet while the Senate was in session; but I know, as a matter of record and from personal experience, that it has been customary at the outset of sessions in the House of Representatives for two committees of the House always to be granted the right to meet during sessions of the House. One of them is the Appropriations Committee and the other is the Committee on Ways and Means. The reason for that practice is the very great amount of time required for detailed hearings and examination of requests for appropriations, as well as the time required for the consideration of prospective tax schedules.

In view of that fact, and in view of the fact that Senators must serve on more than one committee, they could not possibly have time to serve on other committees in addition to the Appropriations Committee if hearings were confined to forenoon or night sessions. As a matter of fact, many night sessions are held anyway.

I hope the genial Senator from North Dakota will withdraw his objection in this instance and allow the pending request to be granted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I still object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there is one thing I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota and other Senators. I wish to have it distinctly understood that no Senator on either side of the aisle can blame the chairman of the Appropriations Committee if we are held here month after month. If that is what the Senate wishes to do, it is all right with the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend from North Dakota that on the House side it is the accepted rule to grant a dispensation to the Appropriations Committee to meet at any time, at any place, and under any circumstances. If that could not be done, the work would never be completed.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator believe that I am making a reasonable request in asking that the Committee on the Judiciary be included?

Mr. DIRKSEN. All the time?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I doubt whether such a request should be made. I try to be reasonably regular in my attendance on the Judiciary Committee, and I think we get along very well under the leadership of our distinguished and esteemed chairman, for whom I have a great affection. It is scarcely necessary to make such a request on behalf of the Judiciary Committee. As a testimonial of our esteem for our chairman, we try to be present on every possible occasion.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wonder of it would not be possible to arrive at some sort of compromise with the Senator from North Dakota. I can see his point with regard to granting permission indefinitely, but why could not the request be made for 1 week or 2 weeks? At the end of that time the Senator from North Dakota might wish to raise the point again. If we do not grant such permission, we shall encounter a great deal of trouble on the Appropriations Committee by reason of its not being able to meet. If necessary, permission could be limited to 1 week at a time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota stated that the La Follette-Monroney Act specifically prohibited meetings of committees while the Senate was in session. By inference, I think I concurred in what he said. However, I find that I am slightly mistaken, and I wish the RECORD to be clear. Section 135 (c), at page 62 of the Senate Manual, reads:

> No standing committee of the Senate or the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session.

It does not say that a standing committee shall be prohibited from sitting; it says it shall not sit without special leave. Of course, there are exceptions to the rule.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has no objection if a request is made for a committee to sit during an afternoon while the Senate is in session, but to ask for permission to have a committee sit for 4 or 5 months in advance seems to me to be a little unreasonable.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to say to my good friend from North Dakota that in order to schedule hearings on military appropriations in the various fields of defense it is necessary that certain military authorities appear before the committee and testify. It would be impossible to schedule such hearings if it were necessary each morning to ask unanimous consent for the committee to sit during the afternoon or the following day. It is for that reason that I ask the Senator from North Dakota to please not object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations and its various subcommittees have on occasion held evening sessions, which sometimes have extended until midnight or 1 o'clock in the morning. It has to be done in order that we may finish our work. If we were to spend only 1 day on each agency, bureau, or division, it would take 6 years to hold hearings on all of them. That would be the result if we devoted only 1 day to each agency, bureau, or division. We do not do it. Of necessity the hearings must be rather superficial in many respects.

The practical situation is that last year we met on Sundays, during the evenings, and on many days continued until midnight or 1 o'clock in the morning. We could not perform the work of our committee if we did not have the permission which has been requested.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to add my urgings to those of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] with respect to the unanimous-consent request. I invite attention also to another situation, with which I shall be faced as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior. During last week I had a request from Mr. Clyde Ellis, executive director of the National Rural Electrification Association, for advance notice of hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations to be given to representatives of rural electrification groups throughout the United States. Mr. Ellis is the executive director in Washington.

Unless we can sit in the afternoons it will be utterly impossible to grant the requests of many of those who want to be heard, and it will be impossible for us

to hear their testimony during morning sessions only. They come to Washington from all over the United States. They are very deeply interested in appropriation items with respect to rural electrification.

We have always tried to give adequate time to at least one representative of every group, in order to present what the group desires to have the committee consider. I should like to continue to do so. However, if we are to be limited to morning sessions only, we will have to limit the testimony of representatives of various groups which are interested in these appropriation items other than the Government officials to printed or typewritten statements which is always a very unsatisfactory approach.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, after conferring with the Senator from North Dakota, and realizing the amount of work which the Committee on the Judiciary must do, having been a member of that committee, I wonder whether the Senator from North Dakota would accept a compromise request by providing that 1 day a week be granted the Committee on the Judiciary, the date to be selected by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. That would be very satisfactory to me.

Mr. FERGUSON. I so modify my request.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent request, as modified, is agreed to.

REQUEST OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE FOR PERMISSION TO MEET DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW AFTERNOON

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet to take further testimony with regard to the nomination of Mr. Beeson, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if the Senator from New Jersey intends to hold full and open hearings tomorrow afternoon?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As I stated this morning to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], it is our intention to have an open hearing. That is why I am asking for permission to hold the hearing in the afternoon rather than in the morning.

Mr. MURRAY. Am I to understand that the minority will be able to call witnesses, introduce proof, and to cross-examine Mr. Beeson, in order to bring out any matters the minority may have in mind?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to avoid calling a great many witnesses before the committee, but if they are there, I shall not object to hearing them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Reserving the right to object, is my understanding correct that the Senator from New Jersey intends to close the hearings tomorrow afternoon, or will he provide for additional hearings if the minority should wish to bring further witnesses to testify regarding the fitness of the appointment?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from New Jersey does not feel called upon to commit himself on that point at this time. The nomination of Mr. Beeson is now on the Executive Calendar. It has not been withdrawn. A special situation was developed by a telegram which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] sent to a newspaper in California, and the newspaper's reply. Mr. Beeson has asked for the privilege of being heard to explain what appears to be a discrepancy in the record. I told him he would have that privilege. That is the object of the hearing. However, I will not deny anyone the right to ask questions.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I merely wish to state—and I believe the record will show it to be a fact—that at the meeting this morning I questioned the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I established to my satisfaction that these hearings would be unlimited and free, and that no one would be estopped from asking such questions as might be appropriate, or to develop such facts as may seem pertinent.

We have been denied in the past the right to question certain persons. Some of my colleagues may recall that at the hearings I made the charge that the nomination was being steamrollered because we were denied the right to have open hearings, the right to continue our questioning, and the right to adduce such evidence as we believed to be appropriate. The developments of the past few days have amply justified my accusation, in which I was joined, I am glad to say, by some of my colleagues on the committee. We do not intend again to be steamrollered. It is an important nomination. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has an important duty to perform, and the Senate also has an important duty to perform in connection with the nomination.

I want to make it very clear that it is my understanding that when we resume hearings there will be no limitations placed on the power or authority of the members of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to make it clear that the nomination is still before the Senate. It was to come up for consideration tomorrow afternoon. Charges were made against Mr. Beeson reflecting on his integrity, and he asked that he might be heard. It is for that reason that I am asking that the meeting of the committee be held. I said this morning to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] that the meeting would be open and that any questions could be asked that Members desired to ask, but I hope there may not be any indefinite postponements. I trust an opportunity will be afforded to decide on the confirmation of the nomination. I ask the Members of the Senate to read the entire record on the nomination. We are not trying to "steamroller" it. The record shows that the Senators on the other side of the aisle said there were no more questions. At the executive session I was asked if I would postpone the voting, and I did so. Then, again, I was asked for a postponement, and it was finally decided that there had been enough postponements, and the nomination was reported to the Senate. I think we should expedite action on this important matter in the light of the fact that the President has asked us to move ahead so that the vacancy can be filled.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, I should like to point out that this is not merely a matter of the veracity of the man whose nomination is now before the Senate, but it is a matter involving a possible conflict of interest. I am not accusing Mr. Beeson at this moment, but there is certainly a very grave question with reference to the matter of conflict of interest. I certainly shall insist that the hearings be maintained for such length of time and under such circumstances as may make it possible to develop all the facts in the case. If we are not afforded such an opportunity, I certainly intend to protest on the floor of the Senate with all the force at my command.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would ask the distinguished Senator whether he would prefer to have the matter come before the Senate so that we may debate the whole subject. I have done my best to proceed with the hearings, and I have done my best to have the nomination confirmed. If Senators desire to conclude the matter, that is all right with me, and I shall ask to have the nomination brought up tomorrow afternoon. I shall leave it up to my colleagues to do whatever they prefer.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the views of the minority members of the committee with reference to the nomination of Albert C. Beeson to the National Labor Relations Board, and I ask unanimous consent that the views be printed separately from any majority report and that they may lie on the desk.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, there is a previous unanimous-consent request before the Senate. I am anxious to know whether my colleagues are objecting to that request.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, is saying that he reserves the right to close the hearings tomorrow afternoon and to foreclose further action on the nomination by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield at that point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on Saturday the distinguished Senator

from New Jersey, the chairman of the committee, asked me whether at his request I would be willing to let the nomination go over and not take it up on Tuesday as we had originally given notice we intended to do. He told me there was a desire on the part of Mr. Beeson to appear before the committee to clarify a misunderstanding which apparently had developed.

I told the Senator from New Jersey that, so far as the majority leader was concerned, in order to give both the majority and the minority members of the committee an opportunity to have Mr. Beeson before them to explore the situation with reference to which I think there apparently is an honest difference of opinion, I would be perfectly willing to hold over the entire list of nominations until opportunity could be had to proceed with the matter. I assume that if a hearing is to be held, ample opportunity will be given for minority members to clarify the point which apparently is at issue.

I merely wanted to give assurances to the Senate that I did not intend to call up the nominations on the Executive Calendar tomorrow, because I wanted the committee to have an opportunity to examine the subject matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may say that if the majority had originally been willing to consent to further hearings on this nomination, this particular issue could have been brought out in committee and disposed of in an orderly way. It was because of the fact that hearings were shut off by the majority and that the minority subsequently could not be heard in committee that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] made his statement to the press as of last Friday, January 29. We feel that the majority prevented a full hearing on the nomination. I hope very much that they will not do so a second time, but that the majority will now permit a full hearing to be held, including not only this specific matter, but also other objections which have been raised to Mr. Beeson's nomination. I believe the credibility of statements also needs to be probed.

I hope the majority will have learned its lesson from the previous occasion and will not again try to steamroller the nomination.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will further yield, I suggest that in any event it would seem to me that the orderly procedure should be followed. The Senator from New Jersey has made a unanimous-consent request that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may be permitted to sit tomorrow during the session of the Senate. In my opinion, that is not unreasonable, if we desire to expedite the public business. I think there will be far more opportunity to the minority members to gather information with reference to the apparent misunderstanding which has developed, if the Senate committee is permitted to meet in pursuance of the request of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. It may be that the minority members will be amply satisfied on the point. But the best way to find out would be to permit the committee to meet. I hope the minority members will not object to that orderly procedure.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from California. I think that is perfectly sound.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

I wish to correct one statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. It was last Friday that the difficulty arose. The members of the committee had to come to the floor because the Senate had convened. The minority members said they would not do any more business because of the rule of the Senate. I sustained that objection and set a meeting for that afternoon, for one-half hour after the Senate adjourned. I regret to say that none of my colleagues on the Democratic side appeared. We waited 15 or 20 minutes, and then I postponed the hearing until the following Tuesday morning at their request.

So I do not believe it is fair to come to the floor and say that the majority shut off the minority. The majority has gone right along with the minority. The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was not present during a considerable portion of the hearings. I am sorry he did not understand that we had called the meeting for Friday afternoon, in order to continue the examination of Mr. Beeson. Mr. Beeson was there. Then, we postponed the meeting as was requested by the minority, although Mr. Beeson was present. Those who had asked to be heard, were not present. I could not simply continue postponing the meetings indefinitely.

I have before me page 13 of the hearings, a copy of which all members of the committee now have. At that point in the hearings, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] said:

> I have no more questions.

That was after the hearing last Wednesday. Later, other questions were brought up. I am not complaining of that. I am glad to accommodate the Senators in that way. I think the distinguished Senator from New York has had every opportunity to examine the witness that he wanted to have.

But now everyone is becoming excited. Persons desire to come before the committee and say things they imagine about Mr. Beeson. It is very embarrassing to him, and embarrassing to me. I am trying to protect him against attacks. Everyone had an opportunity to come to the open meetings, but evidently all of them did not come.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is perfectly true that at the Wednesday meeting, to which the chairman of the committee referred, I said, "I have no more questions." Every Senator in the Chamber, who is a member of a committee, knows that time and time again when a member of a committee may say, "no more questions," what he actually means is that he has no more questions at that particular time. Certainly he does not surrender his right to ask further questions or to seek to have further matters developed.

I certainly hoped and expected that there would be an open meeting on Friday, but on Friday morning it was denied, and on Tuesday it was also denied.

I shall not object to the hearing tomorrow. I believe the suggestion made by the distinguished majority leader is sound. But I do not wish to take a chance upon the slightest misunderstanding.

The issue in the case is not alone a question of the veracity of Mr. Beeson, but of his fitness to serve as a member of a very important Board. So far as I am concerned, I shall pursue the inquiry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I think it is important that the time sequence be cleared up. It was a week ago last Friday, namely, January 22, that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] called a meeting to be held a half hour after the Senate adjourned, which was at approximately 5:30 in the afternoon. Many Senators, not knowing on the previous day, that the meeting was to be held, had made engagements to be in their home States. I was on a train, returning to Illinois. So it was impossible for me and for a number of other Senators to appear.

At noon it had been said, by the majority, that there would be no adjournment until the following week; that action had to be taken that day.

I may say that on that day, January 22, we had not yet developed the evidence which later came into the hands of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. We did not even wish to make our doubts a matter of public record, lest they even inadvertently reflect upon Mr. Beeson.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The information was released to the press.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it was not released on that day. We had hoped further hearings would be permitted at which various kinds of evidence could be developed. But on Tuesday, January 26, the nomination was pushed through, despite our requests for a further hearing. On Wednesday, January 27, Mr. MURRAY received the telegram denying pointblank certain statements which Mr. Beeson had made to us. We had been trying to settle the whole question within the borders of the committee itself, so as to cause as little damage as possible to the reputation of Mr. Beeson, and, indeed, to accommodate the long-run interests of the majority. For we believe that, in such matters, the more haste, the less progress.

The minority were voted down consistently, and the report of the nomination was forced out of the committee. It was only after the nomination had been forced out that the evidence came into the hands of the Senator from Montana. He then produced it—2 days later, on Friday, January 29. In so doing, I think he was performing a public service. He

could have withheld it until the nomination had actually been reported to the Senate, and then have sprung it on the majority. That would not have been fair either to Mr. Beeson or to the majority. Instead, he did the honorable thing. He produced the evidence so that Mr. Beeson might have the chance to reply. But I hope the majority has learned from the course of events that our objections to closing the issue immediately were not captious and that our desire for a delay was not an attempt to filibuster, as the chairman of the committee has ungenerously said it was. It was instead an attempt to obtain a more deliberate consideration of an important appointment, which was unfortunately denied.

I hope that we will not be shut off again, but that the hearings may be free and open, and that we may present all the evidence which may be pertinent to the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The immediate question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] that the minority views be printed and lie upon the table.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Was not the immediate question whether there was objection to having a meeting of the committee tomorrow afternoon, which was the subject of my unanimous-consent request? That question has not been settled. Senators have reserved the right to object to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. While the request of the Senator from New Jersey was pending, the Senator from Montana——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, because the hour of 1 o'clock is fast approaching, when the Senate will be operating under a limitation of debate, may I ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and the distinguished Senator from Montana if they will not agree to having the two requests for unanimous consent granted, namely, the one asking permission that the committee may hold a meeting tomorrow, and the other that the minority views be printed and lie upon the table, both in one request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the merging of the two unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the minority are opposed to having a hearing tomorrow afternoon, unless it shall be an open hearing, at which additional evidence may be presented.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I withdraw my request for a hearing tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I renew the request that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be given permission to hold a hearing tomorrow afternoon during the session of the Senate, and also that the distinguished Senator from Montana may be permitted to have the minority views printed and lie upon the table—in other words, that both requests be granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The views of the minority submitted by Mr. MURRAY were received and ordered to be printed as Executive Report No. 2.

REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before unanimous-consent agreement for the control of time beginning at 1 o'clock becomes effective, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar 874, Senate Resolution 196, a resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I consulted on this matter today with the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and I understand that the proposal is acceptable to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. What I have suggested is the customary procedure, the resolution having been on the calendar for several days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, because the minority has requested me to do so, I wish to give advance notice that on tomorrow I plan to have called up Calendar 880, Senate Resolution 189, a resolution providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations. I understand the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] desired to have at least 1 day's notice of the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, would the Senator from California suggest a time tomorrow when the resolution might be considered?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wanted to keep the matter a little flexible, in order to try to oblige the Senator from Louisiana and the chairman and the other members of the committee, but I should think it would be brought up perhaps following the morning hour.

DISCHARGE OF INDEBTEDNESS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, in pursuance of the unanimous-consent agreement entered into last Friday, the Chair lays before the Senate House Joint Resolution 358, relating to the discharge of the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The clerk will read the unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That beginning at 1 o'clock p. m. on Monday, February 1, 1954, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. BRIDGES: *Provided*, That if Mr. BRIDGES is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said joint resolution shall be received.

Ordered further, That upon the final passage of the joint resolution, debate shall be limited to not exceeding 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the measure under consideration is the joint resolution which the Committee on Appropriations reported to the Senate on Thursday last, providing for the discharge of indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The joint resolution, which was considered by the Senate on Friday last, calls for the cancellation of notes which are owing by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the United States, totalling $741,548,788, broken down as follows:

CCC capital impairment, $609,930,933.

International Wheat Agreement, $129,553,795.

Eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, $2,064,060.

As the Senate knows, the Commodity Credit Corporation is the agency which the United States Government uses to support farm prices under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which is on the statute books. The Commodity Credit Corporation is an instrumentality of the Federal Government; it belongs to the Federal Government; and whatever it owes, in effect the Federal Government and the people of the United States owe.

The arrangement regarding the Commodity Credit Corporation is an unusual one. A Government corporation owes to the Government the amount of money I have mentioned. The law requires that the Commodity Credit Corporation support a number of commodities at various price levels.

When witnesses on behalf of the Commodity Credit Corporation appeared before the Senate committee last Monday they testified that all credit except an amount of $16 million had been exhausted, and pointed out that, at the rate at which the credit was being used, in supporting the market by purchases and by loans, probably by the time the joint resolution was passed by the Senate, which we thought would be Friday, their credit and funds would be exhausted.

However, there was a certain amount of indefiniteness regarding the situation. The Committee on Appropriations felt that it had been put in a very unusual and very embarrassing position because the Commodity Credit Corporation appeared before the committee on the previous Thursday, the joint resolution having passed the House on Wednesday, and

demanded action on a measure involving more than $761 million, with the statement that if the joint resolution were not passed immediately—and the committee was told subsequently, the next day, by Friday—the Commodity Credit Corporation would be forced to send 7,500 telegrams to banks and 3,000 telegrams to county organization committees throughout the country, stating that the Commodity Credit Corporation had no more money, and that the loan-support program of the Federal Government, as represented by the Commodity Credit Corporation, would have to end.

As a result, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] objected to the consideration of the joint resolution on Friday last and stated that he desired more time.

The Senator from New Hampshire conferred with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, who, I assume, indirectly has supervision over the Commodity Credit Corporation. We were successful in getting the Commodity Credit Corporation to withhold sending the telegrams, certainly until today. We also succeeded in obtaining a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the joint resolution today.

Technically and physically, that is the situation which we face as the measure comes before the Senate today. The Senator from New Hampshire, speaking for the Committee on Appropriations, believed that we should have accepted figures identical with those passed by the House for the following reasons:

First, because our action, at best, was superficial; second, because the committee felt that, if there was the urgency mentioned, if the Senate should accept figures identical to those passed by the House, after the House had considered them, the joint resolution would not have to go to conference, and could go directly to the President for his signature.

The situation is the same today. The Senator from New Hampshire, speaking for the Committee on Appropriations, states that the desire is to have the joint resolution passed as it now stands. If the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] have other plans or amendments to offer, the Senator from New Hampshire will yield the floor in order that they may present them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. First, Mr. President, I should like to say that there has been no thought on the part of anyone to have funds withdrawn from the Commodity Credit Corporation or to handicap them in carrying on their functions. What we were objecting to was the manner in which on last Friday it was demanded that the joint resolution giving them $741 million be passed, with the threat that if it was not passed that day they were going to send out 7,500 telegrams authorizing a closing down of the program. Included in this request for $741,548,788 was an item of $609,930,933, of which an accounting could be made for only $114,283,062. That left a request for $495,647,871, which was described only as prospective losses expected to be taken at some later date. It is rather interesting to note, and I think the RECORD should show, that the two gentlemen from the Department of Agriculture who last Friday were quoted on the floor of the Senate, Mr. Lionel C. Holm, the executive assistant to the Administrator, and Mr. J. J. Somers, the Budget Director, both held exactly the same positions under the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles F. Brannan. Those two gentlemen were some of the holdovers from Mr. Brannan's administration of the Department of Agriculture, and those are the two gentlemen who told the Senate, in effect, that if the Senate did not take immediate action they would shut down the entire program.

I serve notice now to this agency and to any other agency of the Government not to try again in such a manner to have a measure passed by Congress.

In regard to the need for studying this matter, I wish to say that as of the present moment I do not have—and I do not think the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] or any other Member of the Senate who has been trying to obtain the facts has—a digest of the figures which have been submitted. I received at only 10 minutes before 12 today the report from the Department of Agriculture. I hold it in my hand at this time. My colleagues can see how voluminous it is. Certainly it is physically impossible for anyone to study these figures in 10 minutes. However, such figures as we have show that the program will stand a great deal more study.

I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to several of the items shown in the breakdown.

I am now referring to the breakdown as finally submitted to the Appropriations Committee and as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 27, 1954, page 886. I notice the Commodity Credit Corporation has asked Congress to write off various amounts of losses. For instance, in the case of dried milk, the suggested writeoff is $56,067,409. That is the item for capital impairment in the case of dried milk. Accompanying the same report is schedule 14, which appears on page 30 of the June 30, 1953, report, listing the various commodity inventories. There my colleagues will find that the inventory of dried milk was $55,648,163.19. In other words, if we accept the tentative figures which have been submitted to the Appropriations Committee, the Commodity Credit Corporation is asking Congress to write off approximately $1 million more than the inventory even shows. If we are to accept that as being a fact, evidently the Commodity Credit Corporation is going to give away all the milk it has on hand and is going to pay someone approximately $1 million to take it.

I believe my colleagues will agree that that figure requires some further explanation. Let me say that if I am in error regarding these figures, I shall be glad to yield, in order that any of my colleagues may point out my error and give the correct explanation.

Again I call attention to the fact that the same thing is true in the case of rice. According to the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of June 30, 1953—a copy of which was sent along with the same schedule, accompanying the explanations—the Corporation has $7,418 invested in rice. The Commodity Credit Corporation is asking Congress to write off notes totaling $69,344 in order to take care of the loss on the $7,418 worth of rice. Those are the figures which have been submitted to us today.

Let me refer to another item, namely, tobacco. According to the inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which were submitted in support of the pending measure, the United States has a total of $1,214,749.26 invested in tobacco—page 30, schedule 14 of the report dated June 30, 1953. Yet the Commodity Credit Corporation is asking Congress to authorize the writing off of notes to the extent of $3,711,676, to offset the loss it may take on approximately $1 million worth of tobacco. In other words, I suppose the agency is planning to lose three times as much as the tobacco cost. Those are not my figures. I am reading from the Corporation's own report dated June 30, 1953.

The same thing is true of butter. The May 31, 1953, report indicates that the Commodity Credit Corporation made a profit for the first 11 months of fiscal 1953 amounting to $161,946. One month later on June 30, 1953, they asked to write off a prospective loss accumulation as of that date in the amount of $71,497,518.

Frankly I doubt the figures indicating that they ever made money on this commodity, but, regardless of the results, at least both reports should tell the same story.

Mr. President, I think there has been entirely too much hurry on the part of the agencies affected to get this measure passed by Congress before we could have an opportunity to examine it properly.

The total losses sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal 1953, as reported by its own books, are $61,146,358. The administration expenses were $54,839,262, or a total of a little more than $115 million. Against that total, the Commodity Credit Corporation is asking Congress to write off $609 million; and the other $495 million plus is to take care of some prospective losses on commodities which the agency cannot as of this date identify. I have always objected in the past years to this loose method of financing this agency and I shall continue to object.

For that reason, Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself, I now send to the desk an amendment to House Joint Resolution 358, as follows: On page 1, in line 9, strike out "$609,930,933" and insert in lieu thereof "$114,283,062."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 9, after the words "amount of", it is proposed to strike out "$609,930,933" and insert in lieu thereof "$114,283,062."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the amendment is adopted, it will leave the

joint resolution in the following situation: We would then be providing the Commodity Credit Corporation with the $129,553,795 which represents the loss under the International Wheat Agreement. We would also be providing for the $2,004,060 for eradication of the hoof-and-mouth disease, an item about which there is no question.

Mr. THYE. No, Mr. President; I think the correct item for eradication of the hoof-and-mouth disease is $2,064,060.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct; I am sorry I read the figure incorrectly. These figures are shown in the committee report, and there is proper support for the request.

In addition, it would reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the losses sustained in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, totaling $61,146,358, as shown on its own books, and would also reimburse that agency for its administrative expenses, totaling $54,839,212. Those figures are taken from their books and are fully supported.

We would be eliminating entirely the item of $495,647,871 which is described as representing prospective losses. When they are prepared to support these items I will in turn support them in their request for reimbursement.

Mr. President, I now shall yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who would like to speak regarding the same amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, before the Senator from Delaware yields to the Senator from New Mexico, will he yield briefly to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Delaware spoke of losses. Did he include reimbursement for the outlays by the Commodity Credit Corporation for the International Wheat Agreement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, I included the losses for the International Wheat Agreement, because those losses are supported; and the report on them was submitted to the committee, and can be verified. The amendment includes allowance for those losses, in their entirety.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, at this time will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator from Delaware has pointed out the discrepancy between the actual losses and the request for funds that is before the Senate today. Does the Senator from Delaware have any explanation for the anticipated losses or the need for the full amount of approximately $600 million?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. The Commodity Credit Corporation submits an explanation and a breakdown; but I disagree with some of the figures, as I looked over them rather hurriedly.

To my mind there is no question that the Commodity Credit Corporation will take some losses; I think all of us recognize that. Frankly, I doubt very much if the $495 million will meet its losses unless we get prompt action repealing the 90-percent support formula. But I believe we should let the Commodity Credit Corporation establish its losses, and thereafter come to Congress and tell its committees what commodities are involved and how much has been lost. Then the Members of Congress will know what they are doing. We should not simply give a Government corporation $500 million with which to pay losses on whatever commodities the corporation may see fit to handle, and particularly when the agency's justification, as I have pointed out, in several instances represents prospective losses of even more than its inventories were at the time when it was making the estimate. Such a procedure simply cannot be justified. The American taxpayers are entitled to know how their money is being spent. If we can put an accurate price tag on some of these programs we will get action toward eliminating some of the extravagant and wasteful procedures.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I understand that the Commodity Credit Corporation has not yet been reimbursed for the wheat which was supplied to Pakistan under Congressional authorization last year. Does the Senator have the figures for that transaction?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I know the Senator from North Dakota made such a statement last Friday, and I assume he was correct about it. I have not checked on it. However, regardless of that, that item is not included in the figures before us today. The Commodity Credit Corporation will have to request a separate authorization for it. So far as I know, the Corporation has not been reimbursed. If not, when the Commodity Credit Corporation presents the bill to Congress, reimbursement will be in order.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware a question, before he yields to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Minnesota. However, I do not wish to yield more than half the time available, because I should like to give the Senator from New Mexico his share of the time.

Mr. THYE. The question I should like to ask is this: There is no doubt in the Senator's mind, is there, that some dried milk which does not now appear upon the inventory has already been the subject of transactions? In other words, the Commodity Credit Corporation acquired the milk and disposed of it under some international relief plan, and it sustained a loss. The present inventory is only the balance of milk on hand. Is not that the fact?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. It reported a loss of $4,798,735 on milk for fiscal 1953. What the Commodity Credit Corporation is asking us to do is to write off $56 million as a prospective loss on future sales of milk when, in reality, all that it had on hand in the inventory as of the time the appraisals were made, June 30, was $55 million worth of milk.

Mr. THYE. However, we are now giving consideration to a contemplated loss, expected to be disclosed by the figures of June 30, 1954. Is the Senator from Delaware now speaking about what took place in the calendar year 1953?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. The measure now before the Senate deals with inventories and appraisals for fiscal year ending June 30, 1953. This proposed legislation has nothing to do with the fiscal year 1954, in which we are now operating. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that there will be losses this year. Under the law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is not allowed to estimate a prospective loss on something which it has not yet even purchased. According to a memorandum which I have received from the Agriculture Department, the following is the method of financing prescribed by law:

1. The appraisal shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

2. The appraisal shall be as of June 30 each year, and shall be completed as soon as possible thereafter, and the results reported to the President.

3. The value of CCC assets shall be determined on the basis of cost to the CCC or, insofar as practicable, the average market price in the month of June, whichever is the lower.

This proposed legislation deals with the month of June 1953.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] at this point. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana later.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wished to ask a question in connection with what the Senator was discussing.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there is no disposition on my part to be in the least degree critical of the manner in which the Appropriations Committee handled this item. Knowing something of the burdens on the Appropriations Committee, I wonder that it gets as much work done as it does. I certainly would be the last one to say that in presenting this matter on the floor of the Senate the Appropriations Committee has not acted properly. I tried to make that clear the other day. I wish now to make it very clear to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and other members of the committee.

This situation arises from a question which I think possibly is raised by recent interpretation of the law. I believe that the first thing which ought to be done is to determine exactly what the law is. The document which we have before us is rather lengthy. I should like the guidance of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I feel that if the table which I have before me were to be inserted in the RECORD it would be helpful to Members of the Senate who are trying to understand this question. Would there be any objection on the part of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to having this table inserted in the RECORD?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it would be very helpful.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, does the Senator intend to read the table for the information of the Senate?

Mr. ANDERSON. I intend to read the substance of it. However, in connection with questions which may arise later, I think the table would be of great assistance to Senators if it were placed in the RECORD at this point. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Analysis of CCC capital impairment as of June 30, 1953, as determined by U. S. Treasury appraisal, showing related investment in commodities and other assets

Commodity and item	Unit of measure	Total investment in loans and inventories						Treasury appraisers' estimate of loss on investment [1]			Realized losses during fiscal year 1953	Appraisers' estimates of impairment to capital during fiscal year 1954
		As of June 30, 1953		As of June 30, 1952		Change in investment during fiscal year 1953		June 30, 1953	June 30, 1952	Changes during 1953		
		Quantity (thousands)	Cost value (thousands)	Quantity (thousands)	Cost value (thousands)	Quantity (thousands)	Cost value (thousands)					
PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM												
Basic commodities:												
Corn	Bushels	527,371	$839,405	351,724	$555,064	+175,647	+$284,341	$106,154,232.91		+$106,154,232.91	$20,526,523.50	$126,680,756.41
Cotton, upland	Bales	2,101	322,831	354	48,700	+1,747	+274,131	1,932,718.18	$13,078.61	+1,919,639.57	381,571.57	2,301,211.14
Peanuts, farmers' stock	Pounds	178,789	21,216	199,609	23,141	−20,820	−1,925	8,500,962.02	3,341,259.68	+5,159,702.34	2,975,881.13	8,135,583.47
Rice	Cwt	7	35	272	1,612	−265	−1,577		208,517.04	−208,517.04	277,360.85	69,343.81
Tobacco	Pounds	500,291	219,839	384,275	195,193	+116,016	+24,646	4,174,000.00	3,222,000.00	+952,000.00	2,759,676.20	3,711,676.20
Wheat	Bushels	514,399	1,284,210	165,628	411,124	+348,771	+873,086	212,815,413.10	40,341,863.21	+172,473,549.89	18,886,293.62	191,359,845.51
Total basic commodities			2,687,536		1,234,834		+1,452,702	333,577,326.21	47,126,718.54	+286,450,607.67	45,807,868.87	332,258,416.54
Designated nonbasic commodities:												
Milk and butterfat:												
Butter	Pounds	231,034	154,490			+231,024	+154,490	71,041,019.58		+71,041,019.58	456,492.26	71,497,511.84
Cheese	Pounds	160,302	64,744	560	221	+159,742	+64,523	28,172,496.39		+28,172,496.39	[2] 14,707.51	28,157,788.88
Milk, dried	Pounds	328,422	85,648	29,889	5,043	+298,533	+50,605	51,483,765.63	215,091.20	+51,268,674.43	4,798,734.74	56,067,409.17
Honey	Pounds	6,707	798	73	8	+6,634	+790				[2] 4,924.37	[2] 4,924.37
Tung oil	Pounds	6,635	1,782			+6,635	+1,782				451.20	451.20
Wool	Pounds	119,350	75,586	7,189	3,081	+112,161	+72,505				15,289.61	15,289.61
Potatoes											73,658.12	73,658.12
Total designated nonbasic commodities			353,048		8,353		+344,695	150,697,281.60	215,091.20	+150,482,190.40	5,324,904.05	155,807,184.45
Other nonbasic commodities:												
Barley	Bushels	3,489	4,467	11,836	17,312	−8,347	−12,845	553,658.70	1,836,522.89	−1,282,864.19	2,195,111.91	912,247.72
Beans, dry edible	Cwt	1,535	13,499	4,330	34,123	−2,805	−20,630	5,494,907.01	6,159,109.29	−734,142.28	6,777,410.06	6,053,267.78
Cotton, American-Egyptian	Bales										[2] 294,064.77	[2] 294,064.77
Cottonseed and products:												
Cottonseed meal	Pounds	1,013,425	31,378	78,476	14,010	+934,952	+17,368					
Cottonseed oil	Pounds	783,426	143,723	53,593	5,335	+729,833	+138,388	50,615,741.79	4,434,916.73	+46,180,825.06	[2] 7,701,798.87	38,479,026.19
Cotton linters	Pounds	487,609	46,069			+487,609	+46,069					
Eggs, dried	Pounds			5,307	5,309	−5,307	−5,309		4,226,792.15	−4,226,792.15	4,256,138.53	29,346.38
Flaxseed	Bushels	5,472	21,671	337	1,122	+5,135	+20,549	2,930,299.67	92,394.80	+2,837,904.87	131,661.09	2,969,565.96
Grain sorghums	Cwt	755	1,899	1,190	3,209	−435	−1,310				[2] 874,126.09	[2] 874,126.09
Linseed oil	Pounds	189,507	55,022	198,627	56,891	−9,120	−1,869	27,543,667.56	23,919,249.29	+3,624,418.27	1,291,336.11	4,915,754.38
Naval stores:												
Rosin	Pounds	327,952	24,394	209,856	15,253	+118,096	+9,141	365,821.80	47,798.42	+318,023.38	[2] 30,252.58	287,770.80
Turpentine	Gallons	2,413	1,241	1,343	662	+1,070	+579					
Oats	Bushels	22,328	19,274	7,299	6,535	+15,029	+12,739	3,770,15.80	911,418.80	+2,858,997.00	194,937.92	3,053,934.92
Olive oil	Gallons	743	1,747	353	840	+390	+907	64,286.71	−64,286.71	170.03	[2] 64,116.68	
Rye	Bushels	141	223	105	154	+36	+69	62,813.20		+62,813.20	[2] 7,946.81	54,866.39
Peas											31.16	31.16
Seeds, hay and pasture	Pounds	85,040	40,988	17,650	12,661	+67,390	+28,327	16,532,999.71	9,928,514.70	+6,604,485.01	4,050,654.58	10,655,139.59
Seeds, winter cover crop	Pounds	297,642	19,830	354,667	19,962	−57,025	−132					
Soybeans	Bushels	3,865	10,327	274	691	+3,591	+9,636	292,527.10		+292,527.10	24,892.64	317,419.74
Total other nonbasic commodities			435,746		194,159		+241,587	108,102,912.34	51,631,003.78	+56,481,908.56	10,013,554.91	66,495,463.47
Total price-support program			3,476,330		1,437,346		+2,038,984	592,377,520.15	98,962,813.52	+493,414,706.63	61,146,357.83	554,861,064.46
OTHER PROGRAMS												
Subsidy program											[2] 74,622.70	[2] 74,622.70
Supply program			73,114		56,697		+16,417				[2] 1,762,695.84	[2] 1,762,695.84
Foreign purchase program			1,154		944		+210				2,616.31	2,616.31
Storage facilities program [3]			183,647		152,817		+830				[2] 121,488.06	[2] 121,488.06
Accounts and notes receivable			392,881		448,657		−55,776	12,935,746.35	10,702,581.23	+2,233,165.12	253,681.83	2,486,846.95
Total other programs			630,796		659,115		−38,319	12,935,746.35	10,702,581.23	+2,233,165.12	[2] 1,702,508.46	530,656.06
Excess of overhead and interest expense over interest and miscellaneous other income											54,839,211.88	54,839,211.88
Grand total			4,097,126		2,096,461		2,000,665	605,313,266.50	109,665,394.75	+495,647,871.75	114,283,061.25	609,930,933.00

[1] Includes estimated loss on dairy and cottonseed products under contract to purchase.
[2] Indicates realized gain, or decrease in impairment.
[3] Investment reflects cost value of fixed assets plus loans outstanding on facilities and drying equipment.

Mr. ANDERSON. The problem which arises is this: Always there is the desire to return to the Commodity Credit Corporation the amount of money which it has lost. It has sustained losses; and with respect to the calculation of those losses, I think a very wise provision has been placed in the law, namely, that the Treasury Department shall take a look at the quantities of agricultural commodities and appraise them, not only as to their original cost, but as to the market price during the month of June in the preceding year, and shall determine their value on the basis of whichever price is the lower, thereby making it impossible for the Commodity Credit Corporation to mislead itself or anyone else as to the situation concerning its stocks.

In my opinion, it would be useful to go further. I think we should allow the

representatives of the Treasury and representatives of the Commodity Credit Corporation to anticipate what might happen because of deterioration of stocks, and a great many other things of that nature.

The table which I have before me indicates actual, provable losses of $114 million. The amendment which the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] proposes in behalf of himself and the junior Senator from New Mexico would give that money to the Commodity Credit Corporation immediately. Certainly it is entitled to the $114 million, representing $61 million of actual losses, $51 million of administrative expense, and about $1,700,000 of small miscellaneous items.

Next we come to the question as to what happens to the $495 million, which represents the changes in value of inventories during 1953. Let me refer to the question of butter, cheese, and dried-milk solids. With respect to butter, the table shows that the Commodity Credit Corporation had on hand as of June 30, 1953, 231,034,000 pounds of butter, of the cost value of $154,490,000. Since that time the Commodity Credit Corporation has acquired some additional butter. I think the stocks are now higher than the figure I have mentioned, and I think they may go still higher. However, the representatives of the Treasury and of the Department of Agriculture, in asking for the restoration of capital, are limited to that figure, because they must deal with the June 30, 1953, situation.

The average price for butter in December 1952, when a great deal of this butter was being acquired, was 57 cents. The Department of Agriculture announced a program to buy in November, and started to buy in November or December. The price as of June 1953, was 65 cents, so there seems to have been a gain of approximately 8 cents a pound on this butter. That gain of 8 cents, I think, could properly be applied against the 231 million pounds, which would give a gain of approximately $16 million. But instead of doing that, the representatives of the Treasury Department and of the Department of Agriculture have calculated that there will be marketing difficulties in connection with the butter, that if it were all to be thrown on the market at once it would depress the price greatly.

Therefore, they have charged off $71,041,019.58 as a loss. That is not in accordance with the law. The law is reasonably plain. The law says that in establishing values, the value of the Commodity Credit Corporation assets shall be determined on the basis of cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation or, insofar as practicable, the average market price in the month of June, whichever is the lower. The law does not take into account what the Commodity Credit Corporation will finally receive.

I do not question the figure which has been used here if we are seeking a final result. I think if the Commodity Credit Corporation does not take a final loss of $71 million on this butter it will be lucky indeed. However, the law does not permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to be reimbursed at this time for anticipated impairment of capital. We take care of that the following year.

Therefore, I say that the question which involves the $495 million ought to be carefully considered by the Appropriations Committee, or referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that somewhere a decision should be reached as to what are the actual provisions of the current law.

I am not trying to question anyone's judgment. I am trying to question the application of the law.

Let me come now to the question of dried milk. The document which has just been submitted shows that 328 million pounds of dried milk had been acquired. Everyone knows that disposition of dried milk is very difficult. Once or twice before the Department has tried to dispose of quantities of dried milk, and has found it almost impossible to do so.

The cost of the dried milk was $55,648,000, and the Department of the Treasury has suggested that, of that amount, $51,483,765 should be written off. In other words, it wants to drop the value to less than 2 cents a pound. Eventually, when the dried skimmed milk is disposed of, it may be necessary to dispose of it for only a few cents a pound; but to say now that that is the current price of dried milk solids would have a very bad effect on the farmers' market, because a great deal of dried milk solids move to bakeries and into other commercial uses. Therefore it is not the wisest thing in the world to indicate that the dried milk solids are of no actual value. The commodity is a good food. Although it is not wisely used in our country, it is used in other areas. It is greatly wanted in some other areas. I am thinking particularly of such areas as Korea, for example.

However, whether my judgment is right or whether the judgment of the Treasury is right is not the question. The question is, What is the law? The law provides that the Corporation must use the actual market price as now expressed and that is far more than 2 cents.

The same situation exists as to cheese. The Department had on hand, last June 30, 160 million pounds of cheese. That amount has moved up to 260 million pounds, and within a very short time will reach a much higher figure than that.

I should dislike to see us adopt a policy under which we would practically give the cheese away. Cheese is a good food; it is a very valuable food. I can remember the time when various other nations of the world were pleading with our Department of Agriculture to make cheese available to their people.

The cheese has cost $64 million. The Treasury Department has suggested that $28,172,496.39 in the value of that cheese be written off at this time as sustained losses. That is not the law.

Again, I do not question the fact that the losses may finally take place, but they have not taken place as yet. I believe that the action taken should be in strict accordance with the law. The market price has not yet dropped 50 percent. I hope it will not drop 50 percent, because of the serious damage that would inflict on the farmers of this country.

We now come to another problem, and that is whether the Commodity Credit Corporation is out of money. I do not intend to argue that point except to refer to the testimony which was given to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the 25th of January 1954 in connection with S. 2714. A statement was made with respect to the amount of the loans which had been made. The amount of the loans as of November 30 was $4,148,000,000. That figure appears at page 16 of the hearings. Four billion one hundred and forty-eight million dollars was borrowed as of November 30, 1953.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the chain of thought of the Senator from New Mexico, but will he yield for a question at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to finish with this point first. Then I shall yield. Not only were the borrowings as of November 30, 1953, $4,148,000,000 but if you look at page 53 of the hearings, you will see that they had dropped—not increased but dropped—by January 21, 1954, to $4,063,000,000. There was a situation which I shall come to subsequently, which has to do with certificates of interest which were issued.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico a question and in doing so I am not attempting to put him on the spot. As a former Secretary of Agriculture, he has been in close touch with these operations and under oath has administered the law. As a layman, and because I am confronted with a law which has been called to my attention as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the amount of money the Commodity Credit Corporation say they must have, I ask the Senator from New Mexico, whether he feels the act of March 8, 1938, as amended April 12, 1945, which says, "this shall be the established price as of June 30 of each year," and so forth, would be violated if the Commodity Credit Corporation failed to come before the committee and asked for exactly and specifically and precisely what they need each year?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I do not know that it would be in violation of the law. As I say, I do not believe they can come before the committee and ask for a restoration of funds because of future anticipated losses. I do not know what has happened in the Department. I am not trying to be critical of what is happening, I want that to be clearly understood. I believe the Department of Agriculture realized it was running short of money and felt that that amount of money ought to be legitimately returned to it, so its representatives very properly came to the committee and asked that it be done.

I am only trying to say that I would much rather do what the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] suggested the other day, namely, give the Corporation promptly the additional amount of

money, which I believe they will need anyway, and then find out whether the money has been used in accordance with what I believe the law to be. It is entirely possible that this is the old practice, and that it may have been going on since 1938. I do not know. Certainly never before have we had that much of a shift in values, running into $500 million.

Mr. BRIDGES. What the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the distinguished Senator from Delaware would propose to do, then, is to take the International Wheat Agreement and the hoof-and-mouth disease eradication programs, in connection with which the actual loss amounted to $114 million, which is established and pass over it, and say, in effect, to the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture, "Forget for the time being the June 30 act; this will take care of your losses; but we will hold up until we have had a chance to review the matter before providing the increased borrowing authority."

Mr. ANDERSON. No. Perhaps I did not state my position clearly. I am in favor of providing $129 million for losses under the wheat agreement and I am in favor of providing the money for the hoof-and-mouth disease eradication program, about $2 million, and then this $114 million, and I am in favor of doing it this afternoon. I am in favor of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, if it has the time, going into the question of whether the $495 million item has been properly presented. If it has been, I am in favor of adopting a validating resolution tomorrow, but I do not believe there has been sufficient time to consider it up to now.

I do not question at all the desirability of reporting a measure taking care of the $495 million tomorrow, next week, or the week after. I do not intend that it should be held up until we vote on the question of increasing the borrowing power of the Corporation. I said I will be in favor of increasing its borrowing power when that bill comes along, just as I will be in favor of allowing many of the items, and possibly all of the items in this measure when the proper time comes.

I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, because he once held the importance position of Secretary of Agriculture, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico whether, in his judgment, if we were to permit the Department to have $114 million plus, it would enable the Department to carry on, in his judgment, until such time as the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry can look into the items.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that I would give them three things:

First. The necessary money for eradication of the hoof-and-mouth disease, which I think has always been well spent.

Second. Give them the necessary amount under the International Wheat Agreement because we are obligated to do that.

Third. Give them the money for all sustained losses, about $114 million.

There is a loss of approximately $4 million in connection with dried milk. Give them the necessary administrative funds and the amounts which represent small subsidy programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware or the Senator from New Hampshire yield half a minute to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield whatever time the Senator from Minnesota may desire.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, with reference to the dried milk question, the Department has made an estimate of what the losses may possibly be. It estimates the losses to be almost 90 percent of the quantity which remains in the inventory. I would say that is a greater loss than I believe will be sustained. Therefore, I agree with the argument which the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from New Mexico have presented. Nevertheless, it is an estimate of what the losses will be. The Department is doing what it has done in the past. It is operating under the law.

The best possible estimate the Department has is that it will probably sell the inventory of butter for possibly a loss of 40 or 50 or 60 percent of what it has invested. It has been declared that it expects to have a greater loss than that. I raise the question that, in view of the great number of applications for commodity loans being received, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be able to make loans only for possibly 3 weeks before they exhaust their funds. Whether we can get the measure through conference and have it signed by the President within 3 weeks is a question the answer to which I am not able to find. I have been in communication with the Department of Agriculture with reference to it.

I suggest that it may be possible for the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee to accept the amendment on the floor, seek further information in conference, and then resolve the question in the conference. In that manner we can solve our own problem this afternoon, and finally answer the question in the minds of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Delaware as to whether the Department has made a conservative estimate or too high an estimate of actual losses. I would say, let the amendment go to conference and iron it out, and then we shall have more time to find the real answers to the questions involved. I do not have the answers. I have been trying to find them over the weekend.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Minnesota. No one is trying to hamstring the Commodity Credit Corporation. We only want to know that we have the proper answers.

Speaking of dried milk, they have admitted that what they did was to write down the sale on the basis of 1 cent a pound. However, I know of 2 sales of milk made at a nickel a pound approximately 2 months ago. We need a more realistic approach to these subjects, and I do not think we have the answer to the question that is now before us.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I do not think they will sustain the loss on dried milk which they have shown as their calculation. I think the advisable thing to do is to take the joint resolution to conference and try to get the final answers while it is in conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By accepting this revised figure in the conference, we will have time to get the answers we need. As the Senator from New Mexico said, the Appropriations Committee could report a new resolution providing for additional funds if they are later substantiated. It should be done in a businesslike manner. We do not know the facts as the matter is now before us. If the chairman of the Appropriations Committee would accept this amendment, I should appreciate it. I think it would be a more constructive way to legislate and in the long run I think such full disclosures will benefit all concerned.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, having made the suggestion which I made, that the amendment be taken to conference, I have awakened to the realization that we have only this afternoon to make final decision on the entire question. We were faced with an emergency on Friday, and it is just as acute, if not more so, on Monday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the reason why I made my second suggestion was because I recognized that problem. If we do not have the necessary information when we get to conference, we should let the bill go through as it is amended. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from New Hampshire will accept the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I must leave the floor at this time to answer a telephone call.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has suggested the absence of a quorum. May I inquire as to whose time it will be charged?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it would be agreeable to charge it to my time. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has just been called to the telephone to speak with the Secretary of Agriculture and we would not want to act until he returns. I am hoping he will accept the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the quorum call be taken out of neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be withdrawn, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we have had a great deal of discussion of the amendment. I desire to be fair to the sponsors of the amendment. I desire to be fair also to the Department of Agriculture and to the agricultural industry of the United States.

I am just as disgusted as are the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and other Senators, with the approach which has been made to the matter, which has resulted in our being virtually up against the wire, or under the gun, before we were given an opportunity to pass upon the measure.

I will admit very frankly to the distinguished Senators that the examination into the matter by the committee, because we received the bill on Thursday morning and reported it on Thursday noon, had to be superficial, since we were told that action was needed not later than Friday.

I know I am assuming a great deal, and I should like to have any members of the Committee on Appropriations who are present on the floor, and who feel differently than I do, raise an objection if they wish to do so; but, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to take to conference the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. The amendment would provide $114 million-plus for impairment of capital; $129 million for the International Wheat Agreement; and $2 million plus for foot-and-mouth disease eradication.

It is my understanding that at the present rate of lending, these amounts would carry the Commodity Credit Corporation for an indefinite period, perhaps 3 weeks. In the meantime, either of two courses of action could be followed. Either an act could be passed for the restoration of capital, under the borrowing power measure now pending before the Senate, or the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations could proceed immediately to conduct a thorough investigation of the other $495 million, and then, if necessary, to report a second resolution covering that amount.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection to the proposal of the Senator from New Hampshire. However, there is a showing of the impairment of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and Congress is actually mandated under the law to make good the losses by repairing the capital of the Corporation. In other words, Congress simply picks up the chips for the losses. If it is felt that there should be a more thorough exploration of the matter by the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, that procedure is quite agreeable to me. But it ought to be understood that if there is a market dip, and if it becomes necessary for the Commodity Credit Corporation to go abroad under its present program and to make purchases or commitments for loans—and after all, they are commitments, whether the money is actually disbursed or not—we ought to lose no time in giving attention to the other needs, whatever may be the desires of the agency in the matter.

To be sure, the matter has come on apace, and there has been rather meager justification. As the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, will well remember, I asked the gentlemen from the Commodity Credit Corporation whether they had ever been in such a "squeeze" before. Their answer was "No."

I said it seemed singular and very strange to me that now, after all the years of operation by the Commodity Credit Corporation, they should come to the doorstep of Congress, at the last moment, after getting themselves into a squeeze, and say that the measure proposed was absolutely necessary and urgent in order to enable them to get themselves out of a difficulty.

We shall not be solving the problem at all; we shall be simply kicking it into the future a short distance, to say the least.

I shall go along with the idea, with the understanding, of course, that further action in the matter will be taken without delay.

But there is something to be said on the side of the Commodity Credit Corporation. They said they knew perhaps as early as December what their difficulty would be. Congress was not in session at the time. They made their representations to the Bureau of the Budget, and it took a little while for the Budget Bureau to come to a conclusion about the matter, and then to approve the bill which is before the Senate at present. But that is the normal course of legislation. If is not done overnight. So no time can be lost if the Commodity Credit Corporation is to exercise its full responsibility in the price-support field.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that, as a member of the committee, I should be perfectly willing to follow the procedure the chairman has outlined, and I express the hope that the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations will proceed forthwith to hold hearings, so that the full facts in regard to the Commodity Credit Corporation situation may be established, and that proposed legislation may be reported to the Senate as early as possible, so that we shall not again be faced with another deadline problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has clearly stated the situation that existed when hearings were held last Friday. Action was taken rather quickly. Speaking for myself, I was not present during the entire period of the hearing because I was in attendance at another committee meeting. It strikes me that our differences can be settled very easily in conference after we have the actual facts at hand.

The report shows specifically the amount of the actual losses and there seems to be no differences of opinion as to them. The real question at issue is whether the losses by way of inventories were made in accordance with law. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] questions that. Speaking for myself, I believe he is correct. The method of appraisal is prescribed by law. The assets of the Corporation must be determined on the basis of the cost or the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year, whichever is lower. All of that was clearly pointed out to my distinguished colleague from New Mexico. I note that the leases taken on dried milk alone is over 90 percent. That may reflect the losses that may be sustained—that is, we may collect but 10 cents on the dollar—but until that happens the law does not permit such a chargeoff. The same method has been applied as to corn and wheat. I repeat it should be an easy task to determine whether or not the law was followed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. THYE. There is no question about any of the inventory figures. The only question is, Has there been shown an anticipated loss at the end of the fiscal year greater than will be sustained as a loss? I think some figures have been shown that indicate an anticipated loss much greater than the figures indicate ever will be realized. That is my frank opinion.

That is why I suggested taking the matter to conference. I believe that during the 3 or 4 additional hours that will be afforded to discuss the matter in conference, we may be able to determine the matter satisfactorily.

When I look at the item for powdered milk, I cannot believe the Commodity Credit Corporation has suffered a loss on that item in the manner they have listed it on the chart. That is what leads me to say that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] might be entirely justified in trying to obtain some additional information on the question, and I agree with them. That information can be obtained during the few hours we shall be in conference on the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have previously stated, I have no doubt but that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has correctly stated the law on the subject of how inventories should be made. It strikes me that we must abide by the law. We have no other course to pursue.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, none of us questions the inventory figures; we question only the anticipated losses as listed in the chart.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation of the attitude taken by the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, which I think shows rather clearly that he feels that the whole question of agricultural support-price financing must be very carefully scrutinized. I am glad that is the case. I am glad also that it has shown up so clearly in this discussion that this matter is not being kept on a partisan basis.

I recall that the last time a similar question was raised, it was raised by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] during the preceding administration, when there was a question as to the amount to be charged off by Commodity Credit Corporation due to losses during war operations. I remember how aggressive the Senator from Delaware was in pressing his point at that time. I am glad to see that he is equally aggressive in pressing his contentions at this time. He has thus demonstrated that he is nonpartisan in his approach, as I believe all of us are in this matter.

If I may, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to two other matters briefly. First, there is no reason why the matter under consideration cannot be yet handled ahead of the time when it would ordinarily come before the Senate for consideration. Senators had this morning for the first time the report of the Senate committee. They had the report of the House committee last Friday, and the debate in the House occurred last Wednesday. Frequently repeated is a statement I now quote from the debate in the House, appearing at page 886 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 27, 1954:

> The only thing we are doing here today that is unusual is that we have brought this item to the floor 4 months prior to reporting the agricultural appropriation bill. We are only meeting an emergency.

Such matters are generally handled in the agricultural appropriation bill. If there is an emergency, there will be ample time to again consider the matter, long prior to that time. If there is no emergency, there is ample time for the matter to be studied and considered at the customary time, when it is considered as a part of the appropriation bill for agriculture.

The second matter to which I call the attention of the Senate is that the whole subject matter shows so clearly what may arise under an excessive price-support program.

If the Senators will study the reports, they will find that of the amounts proposed to be restored as of July 1, 1953, the three principal items relate entirely to 90 percent support price commodities, two of them mandatory and one of them permissive, but actually operating on a 90 percent basis.

I refer again to the report of the United States Department of Agriculture, which appears on page 886 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 27, 1954.

The three principal items are as follows:

Corn, a claimed loss as of June 30 of last year of $126,680,756.

Wheat, a claimed loss as of June 30 of last year of $191,359,846.

Both of those commodities, corn and wheat, are under the mandatory, fixed, rigid 90-percent price-support program.

The other large item is a loss of over $155 million for milk and milk products, resulting from the losses in butter, cheese, and dried milk, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953.

Mr. President, if these figures do not operate to make us all stop, look, and listen, I shall be greatly disappointed. If they operate to make agriculture in the Nation stop, look, and listen when it observes the downgrade, toboggan slide in prices and in prices of inventories resulting from the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, they will see that commodities are being kept, under existing law, on an artificially high level, and that therefore we are building up these huge surpluses, which themselves have forced Commodity Credit to take over more and more of the current production.

Mr. President, I do not desire to elaborate on that particular point at this time, but I shall do so at a later date.

I close my remarks by reminding my colleagues that the exorbitant price-support programs do not, by any manner of means, affect all agriculture; but we find that the high-level price-support programs plus all other price-support programs affect only 43.5 percent by value of the agricultural production of this Nation, and that 56.5 percent of the agricultural production of this Nation has no price support, mandatory, rigid, high level, or otherwise.

The Senate and the general public may as well realize that this program, which affects less than half of our agricultural production, and Congress is responsible for permitting the program to continue, no one else—is at such extravagant levels as to threaten self destruction and as to jeopardize the existence of the whole price-support program.

The Senator from Florida for one does not feel that we should sit by and see the program fall under its own weight because he thinks it is greatly to the interest of agriculture and greatly to the interest of the Nation to continue with a reasonable and a fair price-support structure. Not only because it is important to producers and consumers, but also because it will help this Nation fulfill its international obligations for the production of abundant food and fiber, which are so heavy at this particular time.

It seems clear to the Senator from Florida that unless we do stop, look, and listen, and revise the whole structure, we are running the risk of its collapsing under its own weight.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the suggestion the Senator from New Hampshire has made. I think it is important that whatever temporary action is taken by the Senate be taken immediately. I sincerely hope that the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire will be adopted, and that then we can proceed to study the matter further.

I am as much interested in the matter before the Senate as is any other Senator, and I desire to concur in what the Senator from Illinois has stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate. I might suggest that in addition to the chairman of the committee, the Chair appoint the conferees in the order of their seniority on the Agricultural Subcommittee on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. ELLENDER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR A STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF POSTAL OPERATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 197, calendar 890, extending the time for a study and investigation of postal operations. The resolution has been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, and has been discussed with the minority leader and also with the ranking member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I understand it is perfectly satisfactory to both of them to have the resolution considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 197) extending the time

for a study and investigation of postal operations, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may complete the study and investigation of postal operations as authorized by Senate Resolution 49, 83d Congress, agreed to March 6, 1953, hereby is extended to March 31, 1954.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to certain misrepresentations which have been made by partisans of the joint resolution now under consideration by the Senate. One such misrepresentation, I am happy to say, is soon to be publicly acknowledged and corrected.

The first misrepresentation appeared in the January 15 issue of the National Legislative Bulletin, published in Washington, D. C., by the National Legislative Committee of the American Legion. The names of Mr. Jerome F. Duggan, of Missouri, as chairman, and Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, as director, appear on the masthead of the publication, which states that—

> The Legion has been mandated to support * * * the Bricker Resolution (S. J. Res. 1) which would safeguard the Constitutional rights of individuals against encroachment by Treaties with Foreign Governments.

It then goes on to say:

> The Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1, reported to the Senate by the Senate Judiciary Committee during the last session and is now on the calendar. Indications are that Senator BRICKER'S amendment will be considered by the Senate early in the session. It is important that you—and all who favor the amendment—immediately write to your Senators, telling them that you want them to vote its passage. Great volumes of material for and against the amendment have been written; countless speeches have been made. We cannot go into detail on all of this. Here are some high-points.
>
> Mr. President, I direct the attention of the Senate, in particular, to the following statement:
>
> The Constitution contains this provision: "All treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND, anything in the Constitution or the laws of the United States to the contrary, notwithstanding."
>
> The United Nations is a ratified treaty. There are some 200 more proposed treaties, covenants, and pacts in the hopper of the U. N. and its affiliated agencies—many of which are socialistic in concept and would do violence to our Bill of Rights. Many of the proposals jeopardize every phase of our traditional American freedoms—of the press, speech, assembly, education, rights of labor, and private enterprise.
>
> The United States is the only major participant in the entire U. N. which permits ratified treaties to become the supreme law of the land. It is high time we gave ourselves the same protection other nations provide for themselves.
>
> There is talk of compromise but let us not weaken our position. Make your voice heard in the Senate. Get your letter off today—ask your friends to write.

Every member of the American Legion has taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States; and, being certain that no member of that great veterans' organization would knowingly approve of mutilating the text of our basic law, on January 19, I addressed the following letter to Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

> MY DEAR MR. KENNEDY: While it is true that your Commission has been mandated by a National Convention of the American Legion to support the Bricker amendment, I am impelled to protest that you have been given no mandate to misrepresent the true meaning of article 6 of the Constitution of the United States which reads as follows:
>
> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of the State to the contrary notwithstanding.
>
> At the top of the third page of the National Legislative Bulletin for January 15, 1954, you have grievously misquoted and garbled article 6 by stating that:
>
> The Constitution contains this provision: All treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or the laws of the United States to the contrary, notwithstanding.
>
> The entire text of this article correctly quoted makes it evident that the Constitution is supreme because by a majority vote in each of its branches, Congress can immediately repeal any law or abrogate any treaty but has no such summary power to change the Constitution. A law, to be valid, must conform to the Constitution, and, under the terms of the section, a treaty has exactly the same status as a law.
>
> No Federal Court has ever decided that a treaty is superior to the Bill of Rights or any other article or provision of the Constitution. On the contrary, as long ago as 1854 Chief Justice Taney of the Supreme Court decided in *Doe* v. *Braden* (16 How. 635, 656) that a treaty is therefore a law made by the proper authority, and the courts of justice have no right to annul or disregard any of its provisions, unless they violate the Constitution of the United States.
>
> Typical of other cases where the Supreme Court has uniformly held that a treaty may not violate the Constitution or authorize what the Constitution forbids are *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258) and *Asakura* v. *Seattle* (265 U. S. 332) where Justice Butler stated:
>
> The treatymaking power of the United States is not limited by any express provision of the Constitution, and, though it does not extend so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, it does extend to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and other nations.
>
> Let me repeat that it is a long established principle of constitutional law that an act of Congress which conflicts with the Constitution is inoperative. *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cr. 137). It is an equally well-established principle of constitutional law that an act of Congress which conflicts with a provision of a treaty, ratified before the date of the act, supersedes and repeals the conflicting prior treaty provision. *Hijo* v. *United States* (194 U. S. 315) and numerous other cases.
>
> I can add that at his news conference on January 13, 1954, in the course of giving reasons why he is opposed to the Bricker amendment, President Eisenhower is reported to have correctly pointed out that the power of Congress by subsequent action to nullify any article of any treaty has never been questioned. Yet, what was printed under your direction in the National Legislative Bulletin would have all members of the American Legion believe that a treaty provision, which cannot even override an ordinary law, enacted by Congress after the date when the treaty was ratified, nevertheless, has such standing that, upon ratification, it can amend or become paramount to the Constitution of the United States and thereby jeopardize every phase of our traditional American freedoms.
>
> Having been a member of the American Legion in good standing for some 30 years, I feel that I have a right to make this protest. In fairness to you, I must express my belief that you have acted with no deliberate intention to deceive, but merely followed a bad example set by others who by omission and wrongful substitution have brought about a flagrant misrepresentation of a basic fact.
>
> Yours very sincerely,
>
> CARL HAYDEN,
> *United States Senator from Arizona.*

What was done in the extract that I have quoted from the Legion's Legislative Bulletin was to omit from the second section the sixth article of the Constitution the words, "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof," and later to omit the words, "and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby," and to substitute the "Constitution or the laws of the United States" for the "Constitution or Laws of any State."

If the Constitution actually read that way there would be complete justification for the assertions which were made that treaties could "do violence to our Bill of Rights" and "jeopardize every phase of our traditional American freedoms."

Under date of January 25, I received the following reply from Mr. Kennedy, an honorable gentlemen well known to many Senators:

> THE AMERICAN LEGION,
> NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
> *Washington, D. C., January 25, 1954.*
>
> Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
> *United States Senate,*
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: Thank you for your letter of January 19 relative to the Bricker amendment. The delay in replying to your letter is due to the fact that I have been absent from the office on Legion business.
>
> I have read your comments with a great deal of interest and would like you to know that I appreciate your writing to me as you did.
>
> As I stated during our telephone conversation, there was absolutely no intention on our part to misrepresent the meaning of article VI of the Constitution of the United States. The item which appeared in the Legislative Bulletin was taken from some literature issued by an organization supporting the Bricker amendment. Nevertheless, the fact remains that I should have checked same word for word with the Constitution, and I regret very much this was not done.

Again thanking you for your interest in the matter, and for having written me as you did, I am

Sincerely your,

MILES D. KENNEDY, *Director.*

I am advised that Mr. Jerome F. Duggan, a very able and reputable attorney in St. Louis, Mo., and chairman of the Legion's National Legislative Commission, and Mr. C. H. Olson, assistant director of the commission, which publishes the Legion's Legislative Bulletin, were interviewed by a representative of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on January 26, at which time Mr. Duggan is reported to have said that the misquotation of the United States Constitution was a grievous typographical error which will be corrected in the first February edition of the Bulletin.

Mr. Duggan and Mr. Olson both contended that the error was strictly unintentional and due entirely to the error of a stenographer.

Mr. Olson said the misquotation occurred in the following manner:

In preparing the January 15 edition of the Bulletin, a good deal of outside material was used although no outside help was employed. One of the pamphlets consulted was issued by an organization calling itself the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment and giving this address: Post Office Box 98, Hinsdale, Ill.

The 16-page pamphlet issued by that group contained the following paragraph:

Why does our Constitution have a dangerous loophole? Because it contains this provision: "All treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND, anything in the Constitution or the laws of the States to the contrary, notwithstanding."

The quotation from the Constitution was in quotation marks and is an abbreviation of the actual constitutional provision. It is correct as far as it goes with the exception that the Constitution says "Constitution or Laws of any State" rather than "Constitution or the laws of the States."

In transcribing this quotation for use in the Legion Bulletin, Mr. Duggan and Mr. Olson maintain, a stenographer inadvertently wrote "the laws of the United States" instead of "the laws of the States" or "Laws of any State."

Mr. Duggan said he intends to correct the error in full under his own signature. The Bulletin, he said, was prepared at the Washintgon office of the Legion and not in St. Louis. Mr. Olson said the Bulletin proofs were read by him before publication but he missed the typographical error. Both men emphasize their belief that it was not intentional. Both acknowledge that "a lot of propaganda" was used in preparing the section on the Bricker amendment.

Neither of them knows anything about the Vigilant Women, their officers or backers. Mr. Olson said the group's pamphlet gave no indication as to the nature of the organization beyond the post office box address.

About 5,000 copies of the twice-monthly Legion Bulletin are distributed, Mr. Duggan said. Distribution is almost entirely confined to Legion members, but copies are sent to Congressmen and to "about 200 other interested persons."

I have here a copy of a widely distributed 3½ by 8 inch, 16-page pamphlet, sponsored by the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment, which says "Our Constitution has a dangerous loophole," and then proceeds to justify that assertion by misquoting and trimming down the second section of article VI by omitting any mention of the Constitution itself or any reference to the laws made in pursuance thereof, leaving nothing but the words:

All treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND, anything in the Constitution or the laws of the States to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Regardless of whether there ever was a loophole in the Constitution the Vigilant Women have done their very best to make the American people believe that one exists by this deceptive change in wording.

A letter from the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment, signed by Mrs. Robert Murray, of Hindsdale, Ill., lists Mrs. Lewis Barker, of 10036 Longwood Drive, Chicago, Ill., and Mrs. Robert Murray, of route 4, Oshkosh, Wis., as national coordinators. I suggest to these lady vigilantes that they owe it to the Senate to state who it was that advised them to trim down, if not to butcher, a section of the Constitution of the highest importance or whether they themselves made the deletions and changed the text.

I hope that as good citizens they will not only correct the half-truth as thus publicized but will make known that the Constitution is supreme over both laws and treaties, and that after a treaty is made Congress, by law, can do away with it or modify it in any way that it sees fit.

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for that purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am delighted to see so large and such an enthusiastic attendance in the Senate this afternoon as I proceed to devote myself for a little while to Senate Joint Resolution 1, commonly known as the Bricker resolution.

Mr. President, at the outset let me say, in my judgment, when the history of this period is written it will pay high testimony to one crusader who has always been devoted to the protection and the safeguarding of the rights and freedoms of the American people. While the discussion in connection with the Bricker resolution may have taken on a quality of passion and heat, notwithstanding all that, history will still pay testimony to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] for the valiant work he has done in alerting our people at a time like this and crystallizing a constitutional issue.

The question may be regarded by some as something of a transient constitutional squall, but I have grave doubt about it. I believe the issue is here, and as history unfolds and as developments in the world scene take place we will have occasion to refer to the debates in the Senate on this question and to conclude later, if not now, that in truth and in fact there was involved a great and important challenge to the people of our country.

Of course, Mr. President, whenever there is some feeling of apprehension about our rights, I think it is healthy to go back to the people, because the people are sovereign. I sometimes think we forget that in the Senate; at times it seems to me it is forgotten in the entire Congress, as a matter of fact. But let no man who represents the people in this distinguished body ever forget that he is here by the grace and by the sufferance of the American people. They are the sovereign, indeed. There have been some to remind us of it now and then.

One occasion which sharply comes to my recollection was in the House of Representatives, in 1939, when we were observing the sesquicentennial anniversary of the founding of this Nation and its onward march under the Constitution of the United States. The occasion to which I refer was on the 4th of March, 1939. In the House Chamber there was assembled a great galaxy of distinguished persons. The Senate and the House were in joint session. The members of the Cabinet were there, and likewise the members of the Supreme Court. I believe some ambassadors were our guests on that day.

The concluding speech on that anniversary occasion was delivered by a distinguished lawyer and jurist, the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes. I was so impressed by his address that I laid it away against the day when it might recur to my recollection. It comes back today in connection with what is at stake in the present constitutional debate. I shall certainly not worry the Senate with a long recital from the remarks of former Chief Justice Hughes, but two or three paragraphs, I think, are pertinent to the occasion.

In his speech he said, among other things:

We have a National Government equipped with vast powers. It has proved to be adequate to the development of a great Nation, and at the same time maintaining the balance between centralized authority and local autonomy. It has been said that to preserve the balance, if we did not have States we should have had to create them.

That comes, Mr. President, from a very distinguished student of American government. He said, further:

> In our 48 States we have the separate sources of power necessary to protect local interests and those also to preserve the central authority in the vast variety of public concern from breaking down under its own weight.

That is, indeed, an appropriate statement for a rather fluid time, Mr. President, as we think in terms of balance in our government.

Chief Justice Hughes also said on that occasion:

> If we owe to the wisdom and restraint of the fathers a system of government which has thus far stood the test, we all recognize that it is only by wisdom and restraint in our own day that we can make that system last.

That has a bearing, of course, upon the necessity of restraint at a time such as this, to approach our problems, and particularly a constitutional issue, in a rather dispassionate frame of mind.

Mr. President, I quote one final excerpt from the address of the Chief Justice:

> We are here not as masters, but as servants, not to glory in power, but to attest our loyalty to the commands and restrictions laid down by the sovereign, the people of the United States, in whose name and by whose will we exercise our brief authority.

Mr. President, there is a shifting membership in the Senate from one season to another, because the will of the people is still sovereign.

So it is healthy, indeed, Mr. President, in my judgment, that on occasion we go back to the sovereign and submit some of our problems and find out what is the will of the sovereign.

If dissidence crops up on an occasion of this kind, so long as it is restrained and dispassionate, if a difference of opinion and a divergence of viewpoint develop, what is so radically wrong with that? I suppose there are some persons who are quietly gloating a little over what they sense to be in connection with the so-called Bricker amendment a division in the Republican Party. I sense no such division. There is room enough for all sentiments in this party. As a matter of fact, it was born out of a crucible established a hundred years ago this year. One need only go back to that little schoolhouse in Wisconsin in February of 1854 where the foundation of the Republican Party was laid. I ask, Mr. President, who was present on that occasion? Free Soilers, who had one concept of government, were there; Democrats, who had another concept of government, were there; Whigs were there. Abraham Lincoln was a Whig before he was a Republican. But Whigs were there to contribute to a common cause.

When the Republican Party, no matter how divergent the views may be, addresses itself to a great challenging issue, there will be little comfort for those who feel that out of that difference there will come an unhealable division.

I point out also, Mr. President, that when the Constitution was formulated and submitted to the people of the country Alexander Hamilton had to appear before the convention in New York and spend nearly 6 weeks in order to convince those who were delegates to that convention of the wisdom of approving and ratifying the work that was done at Philadelphia. I understand that in the course of ratification in Philadelphia itself there were persons who were called out of their beds and out of their offices because a deep feeling and an intense conviction went along with the very adoption of the Constitution itself.

Is it, then, so strange that when an issue of this kind is presented to the country and to the Senate of the United States men should have deep convictions on the subject? I have a conviction on it. I served on the subcommittee which took all the testimony, nearly 1,200 pages. I heard more testimony than did any other member of that subcommittee. There developed within me then, and even before that, a very deep and abiding conviction upon the question of safeguarding certain fundamental rights under the Constitution of the United States, and I became a cosponsor of the Bricker resolution.

Let me say now, Mr. President, that unless some effective substitute is found upon which we can agree, I shall not forsake the cause of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. I want to be sure that we understand fully what we are doing and that we have before the Senate all the facts.

So, as I have said, it is not strange that there should be different convictions.

Let me say for the President of the United States, for whom I have great esteem and in whom I have profound faith, that he also has a conviction on the subject.

So, Mr. President, with dispassion we can beat out upon the anvil and discuss some solid truths and conclusions and certainly find a ground, I trust, on which we can all stand in order to bring the debate to an ultimate conclusion.

I go back, Mr. President, to one more historical fact to indicate the sentiment in the hearts of people a long time ago when amendments to the Constitution were suggested. We speak passionately of the Bill of Rights and the 10 amendments. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, there were 12 amendments offered in the First Congress, but two of them fell by the wayside. So we finally had 10 incorporated into that great organic act.

With respect to the Constitution, one of the things in the hearts of people was written in the very first clause of the preamble. I became so enamored of that preamble and so interested in it that I ran down, or tried to run down, its history. I found it to be extremely meager. A preamble is something that goes before. I draw on my feeble knowledge of Latin. "Pre" means before, and "amble" means to walk. So the drafters of the Constitution rendered a fine service to the people by writing a preamble, something that walks before the body of the Constitution. In the preamble they wrote, "In order to form a more perfect Union."

Every year the President of the United States either delivers in person or sends to Congress his message on the state of the Union. So the people of those days when the first 10 amendments were adopted were thinking about a more perfect Union.

It is interesting to note, Mr. President, that in the resolution proposing the first 10 amendments it was said, "In order to expand the ground of public confidence." That is what the drafters said when they submitted the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. What did they mean? They meant there was fear and anxiety even at that time as to whether the rights of the people would be safeguarded without the inclusion of the Bill of Rights. Even in that early day, there was anxiety and apprehension about the Constitution as it then stood.

If that be true, is it so surpassing strange that there should be some apprehension in the year of our Lord 1954, when history is so fluid, when there is an acceleration of human events, when there are so many pressures, both at home and abroad? Is it strange that people should begin to think very earnestly about their rights which have been intact so long?

It is an amazing circumstance that it remained for a Missouri mallard to disturb the equanimity and the constitutional serenity of the country back in 1915. I wish the story of Missouri against Holland and its background had been ventilated earlier on the floor of the Senate, because within the body of fact itself will be found a tremendous conclusion. What is the story of the decision written by Mr. Justice Holmes in Missouri against Holland that has had something to do with the amendment now before the Senate?

The fact is that Congress had enacted a law dealing with migratory waterfowl at a time when Missouri had a law of its own on the books. So a game warden, or shall I say a game supervisor, by the name of Ray P. Holland was sent to Missouri to enforce the Federal law. There he arrested a man for shooting an unhappy mallard out of season, a mallard which probably had gotten off the line of flight; and there, peradventure, was a Federal game warden to apprehend the hunter and take him into Federal court. What happened? John Pollock was Federal district judge in Missouri in 1915. He laid down a very solid and a very well-reasoned opinion, in which he said there was no power in Congress to authorize a warden to go into Missouri and to apprehend one of its citizens for shooting a wild mallard out of season.

The case went to the Supreme Court of the United States when, I believe, Edward Douglass White was the Chief Justice, who, as I recall, came from Louisiana. The vote in the Supreme Court on that issue was 3 to 3. Why was the decision permitted to stand? Because the legal consultant and the librarian of the Court, a distinguished constitutional lawyer and student by the name of Edwin Borchard had said to Chief Justice White, "You are on sound ground."

So no effort was made to disturb the decision which was rendered in the Missouri case, involving the shooting of a

wild mallard and the apprehension of the hunter under Federal law. The decision meant, of course, that Congress did not have the power under the Constitution as it then obtained to pass a law providing for arrests in such cases. So the conviction could not stand.

Then something happened. Very quickly President Wilson submitted a treaty to Great Britain and to the Dominion of Canada. It did not take long to contrive that treaty to deal with wildfowl. As soon as the treaty had been ratified by the Senate, Congress simply repassed the old act. Then what happened?

The attorney general of Missouri then went out with a group of friends to hunt redheads, canvasbacks, mallards, and other wildfowl, and he shot a duck out of season. He was apprehended by Mr. Holland, the game warden who had made the earlier arrest and precipitated the case that went to the Supreme Court of the United States.

That, then, was the basis for Missouri against Holland, and that case went to the Supreme Court of the United States. It was then that Justice Holmes, whether in the words I have expressed, or in other words, laid down the law that if there had been no authority in Congress before, the treaty gave Congress authority. That is where the matter stood. When we consider the body of facts which lie behind Missouri against Holland, we then begin to understand what is involved in the so-called Bricker amendment, because the authority vested in Congress by the Constitution was clearly expanded by that decision by virtue of a treaty in the opinion of the junior Senator from Illinois as a humble member of the bar.

In the light of that decision perhaps the real meaning and purpose of the "which" clause will also be understood. The "which" clause says that a provision in a treaty shall not be valid in the absence of legislation which would have been valid without a treaty. I know that my friend the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] agrees that that is what was designed to be done, namely, to make sure that there would not be an expansion of a power that did not otherwise exist.

That goes back to what? To fear on the part of the States. When the first 10 amendments to the Constitution were submitted, and it was said to the Congress then in session that it was intended to expand the ground of public confidence, what was submitted? There was submitted the 10th amendment, which reserves unto the States and unto the people the rights that either have not been delegated by them or have not been prohibited to them.

When we go back to the case of Missouri against Holland and explore the history of a hapless mallard which was, in the language of Justice Holmes, transitorily in the Commonwealth of Missouri, we begin to sense what really is involved.

In the year 1920, when the case of Missouri against Holland was decided, the United States was a Nation of few fears. There was serenity everywhere in the land. I went back into history to dig out for myself a few highlights.

The year of the decision in Missouri against Holland was the year when the League of Nations began to function. It was the year when prohibition went into effect, and the name of Andrew Volstead was a household word, not only in the United States, but, I think, all over the earth. Nineteen hundred and twenty was the year when the 19th amendment to the Constitution, the women's suffrage amendment, was ratified. When the doctrine in Missouri against Holland was laid down, the railroads had just been returned to their owners. In that year our troops had come back from Europe. I think it was only a short time before that, Mr. President, that I came back from Europe in the uniform of my country.

Nineteen hundred and twenty was the year, oddly, when the peace conference was asking Holland to release the Kaiser for trial. That was to have been one of the great trials of history. The judges had been selected, and all the necessary arrangements had been made. But the trial never took place.

The year of Missouri against Holland was the year when Pussyfoot Johnson went abroad to Norway, Sweden, and elsewhere, to carry on the crusade in behalf of a nonalcoholic world. It was the year in which Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks were married. It was the year in which Jack Dempsey was found not guilty of draft evasion.

When the decision in Missouri against Holland was handed down by the Supreme Court, it was the year the Black Sox were indicted in Chicago, and the scheme of our friend Ponzi blew up and he went to jail.

Mr. President, I point out that in that year of serenity and equanimity in this country, Alger Hiss was a healthy boy in knee pants. He had not yet gotten in his licks.

In the year when that decision was handed down the United Nations had not been conceived, let alone become a beautiful dream; it was not even in the embryo stage.

There were few split decisions of the Supreme Court in those tranquil and serene years. There were only a few hundred persons in the Department of State. The Department spent about $12 million a year. If one wants to draw a contrast with that, look at what is provided in the budget for the State Department for the fiscal year 1954–55.

Finally, when the doctrine of Missouri against Holland was laid down, there were no Reds in this country. Russia had not been recognized. There was no Dies committee. There was no Committee on Un-American Activities. I was a Member of the House of Representatives when those committees were formed after this Government recognized the Soviet Union.

Missouri against Holland was enunciated as a legal doctrine at a time when there were sweetness and tranquillity in our country, and there were no besetting fears to disturb and agitate our people into thinking that there was any danger of their rights being sacrificed. Mr. President, it was 25 years later when the "business" really began, which would be in 1945, only 9 years ago.

I desire to say to my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] that I was watching the program, Meet the Press, on television last evening when Lawrence Spivak kept asking the Senator from Ohio, "What liberties have been lost?" I fairly shouted at the Senator from Ohio, who appeared on the television screen, because I wanted the Senator to say, "Do we have to wait until the horse is stolen before we lock the stable?" That is the matter which is in issue at the present time.

So now we go from the serene period of Missouri against Holland, when the Missouri mallard made history, to a contemporary scene 25 years later. What happened then?

First, Mr. President, there was a little conference on the shores of the Black Sea, on what is known as the Crimean Peninsula, in a little town called Yalta. We were not even prepared for such an event. If one has any doubt about it, read the book, Speaking Frankly, written by one of the distinguished and illustrious former Members of this body, "Jimmy" Byrnes. In that book he says that no preparation had been made by those who went to Yalta to sit down with Churchill, Stalin, and all the others, and engage in a great gamble in which the peace of the world was at stake, and in which we failed. When Missouri against Holland was written, there had not been a Yalta.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator from Kentucky mind if I do not yield at this point, but continue for a while?

Mr. President, what happened at Yalta? I examined the white paper of the State Department pretty well. That was before I came to the Senate. In those days I had some time to read. I could do something more than read Dean Acheson's letter of transmittal. I had time to look through all the documents. In the Senate one does not have much time to study such matters. I shall go into that subject after a while, after a couple of hours.

Mr. President, what happened at Yalta? Did we sell a friend down the river? We not only sold China down the river, but we undertook the bitter duty of telling her about it. I invite the attention of anyone who is interested to read the language in the letter of transmittal, and I will stand on my recollection of what is in that white paper.

What did we do regarding Poland? We permitted the brutal Red ideology to penetrate into the heartland of Europe when we made it possible for the Red heel to be put on the necks of an ancient and cultured people like the Poles.

Then there was the "deal" at Potsdam whereby Germany was wiped out. Thus the enemy penetrated farther into the heartland of Europe. What further grisly testimony is needed than the fact that today thousands of young Americans are back there in the land where I stood at Versailles on VE-day, in a moment of reverie and meditation, think-

ing of the failure of an earlier generation to find the answer to armed conflict and arbitrament by the sword, and therefore a later generation had been forced into another world conflict? And now, 9 years later, American boys are back in Europe in great numbers, because somewhere, somehow, there has been a failure to realize the earnest hopes for peace which we had cherished. There has been failure because a deal was made, and whether we are aware of all the details of the deal even now, I do not know. I merely say to the Senate that in the sweet and halcyon days when Mr. Justice Holmes was writing the opinion in Missouri against Holland, there was no Yalta and all the evil consequences that flowed therefrom.

In 1920 there was no meeting in San Francisco, where men of good will gathered from all corners of the earth to frame a charter and write into its preamble high hopes, glorious sentiments, and an ennobling idealism to which everyone could subscribe.

I keep the charter handy. I read every once in a while the glorious things recited therein. The men who gathered in San Francisco in 1945, representing their governments, finally affixed their signatures to the document in the hope that at long last the lion could lie down with the lamb, and that, through cessation of war, the golden dream of peace might finally be realized.

We should not forget that when the charter was signed, Mr. President, contained therein were articles 55 and 56, which were written for good and wholesome objectives, but a reading of the words they contain will disclose difficulties inherent in them.

When the charter was finally written, specialized agencies and commissions were established. One of them is the International Labor Organization, to which 60 countries belong. I shall show in a short time how they obtained the treaty power and what the eager beavers of the ILO are doing at the present time. They ought to hang a sign on the door reading "men working," because they are working, early and late, day and night, and they are cooking up a dish. Let no one be fooled. The International Labor Organization was one of the agencies that affiliated itself with the United Nations.

Then the charter provides for the Commission on Human Rights, the Economic and Social Council, and others. There is also the WHO. "WHO" would be good call letters for a TV or radio station, but it really means World Health Organization. Then there is FOA—the Food and Agricultural Organization; and IRO, the International Refugee Organization; and then all the agencies and commissions which deal with weather, civil aviation, the rights of women, and so forth.

Mr. President, there were no such organizations when the doctrine in Missouri against Holland was written in 1920. At that time the country was tranquil and there was no shadow of fear upon the thoughts of our people. Mr. President, when that decision was written in 1920, there had been no troops-to-Europe issue before the Senate. We must remember it so well. I had some rather deep convictions about it, and it was rather roundly debated on the floor of the Senate.

One of the astonishing things which came out of that debate, and which has not yet received full cognizance, was the statement of the then Secretary of State that—and I think I quote him exactly, although I have not seen the words for some time:

> Constitutional doctrine is molded largely by practical necessity. For example, the congressional power to declare war has fallen into abeyance because wars are no longer declared in advance.

Mr. President, who said that? Was that said by the junior Senator from Illinois? Indeed, not. The former Secretary of State said it, and said it formally. It will be found in the proceedings of this body, as we debated the question of troops to Europe, in 1951, when I first came to the Senate.

Mr. President, we did not have that issue in 1920, and we did not have it before 1920, to agitate and to bewilder the minds of the American people and to make them wonder whether in this fluid and hostile world their rights might yet be destroyed.

One other thing we did not have in 1920 or before it, Mr. President: We did not have the seizure of an industry in the United States by the President of the United States. I need hardly allude to it; but in 1951, as we remember, the President seized the steel industry. At that time, I was a member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, along with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. He, too, remembers how diligently we went through the entire procedure of trying to bring stability of wages to the steel industry; and I am sure he also remember the persons with whom we had to deal at that time. Sometimes I wonder, I may say to the Senator from Ohio—as I think back to the efforts of Dr. Feinsinger and others—whether they actually wanted any stability in the steel industry, and whether their foibles, failures, and mistakes—every one in the book—were not made deliberately, to precipitate that issue.

Well, Mr. President, they did; and the industry was seized. Thank God for David Pine, whom I have known for 20 years—a fine, upstanding American—who would roll back the President of the United States, from the District bench, here in the District of Columbia, in a well reasoned and very illuminating opinion. Then the case went to the Supreme Court. If two more of the associate justices of the Supreme Court had at that time voted with the Chief Justice, what would have happened, Mr. President?

If my colleagues wish to read something fancy, let them read the dissenting opinion of the late, lamented Fred Vinson, the then Chief Justice of the United States. I knew him well, and knew him as a friend. We served together for 10 years in the House of Representatives. I think he was a good American. But he got "off his base" at that time, because of his fidelity to his chief. We can forgive him much for that.

Mr. President, let me read a few things that appear in his dissenting opinion in the steel case, in the October 1951 term of the Supreme Court of the United States. In that dissenting opinion, he said, among other things:

> In passing upon the question of Presidential powers in this case, we must first consider the context—

Mr. President, that is a honey of a word—

> in which those powers were exercised.
>
> Those who suggest that this is a case involving extraordinary powers should be mindful that these are extraordinary times.

Mr. President, there, you see, he was laying the foundation for what was to appear later.

Then he went on to say:

> A world not yet recovered from the devastation of World War II has been forced to face the threat of another and more terrifying global conflict.
>
> Accepting in full measure its responsibility in the world community, the United States was instrumental in securing adoption of the United Nations Charter, approved by the Senate by a vote of 89 to 2. The first purpose of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.

Mr. President, I pause for a moment to say that I hope sometime we can persuade the Government Printing Office to print this material in type sufficiently large to be read by a person like myself, who wears bifocal glasses. [Laughter.] I have an extremely difficult time reading such small type.

I continue to read from Mr. Vinson's dissenting opinion:

> In 1950, when the United Nations called upon member nations to render every assistance to repel aggression in Korea, the United States furnished its vigorous support. For almost 2 full years our Armed Forces have been fighting in Korea, suffering casualties of over 108,000 men. Hostilities have not abated. The determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression has been reaffirmed. Congressional support of the action in Korea has been manifested by provisions for increased military manpower and equipment and for economic stabilization, as hereinafter described.

Then he went on to say:

> Further efforts to protect the free world from aggression are found in the congressional enactments of the Truman plan for assistance to Greece and Turkey and the Marshall plan for economic aid needed to build up the strength of our friends in Western Europe. In 1949, the Senate approved the North Atlantic Treaty—

Mr. President, I shall not read the entire dissenting opinion; but thereafter he referred to treaties, and said this:

> Our treaties represent not merely legal obligations but show congressional recognition that mutual security for the free world is the best security against the threat of aggression on a global scale.

Then the Chief Justice proceeded with his opinion.

Mr. President, I say frankly that I have never been able to read that dissenting opinion without reaching the conclusion that Chief Justice Vinson first laid the foundation of a global concept, and then stood upon it, in trying to find in the Constitution of the United States an inherent power for the seizure of an entire industry in the United States. If any of my colleagues can find in that decision a better and more sympathetic determination than that, then, of course, I am willing to be corrected. But I have never been able to find one.

The then Chief Justice was not the only one who moved in that direction. There were other matters which brought it into focus, and I shall allude to them a little more in detail as I proceed.

Out of all that, out of all the fears that are moving across the firmament, is it strange that people became fearful about their rights? Is it strange that there exist in our country an anxiety and an overriding fear as to whether rights which long ago were vouchsafed to us by very rugged, heroic, and able men, are in danger? That fear is as understandable as anything I know. When we go abroad and take a look and observe what has happened to freedom elsewhere in the world, then, of course, our fear is increased.

When I came back from Indochina I sat with our very gracious President. He said, "What did you see out there?" I said, "I saw a country that did not have a constitution. I saw a country where there is no guarantee of rights. I saw a country for which I could not understand why young men were willing to die, because there is not even a target of freedom somewhere in the future."

Thank God, the President of the United States lifted his voice, and on the Fourth of July 1953, there was a dispatch from Paris to the effect that, at long last, negotions were underway, and that a target of freedom was finally to be developed for the people of a humble country which is now smitten with conflict.

Fear brings caution. If we accept the premise that people are concerned today—and I do—then, of course, there comes caution, not only among the people, but among men who are charged with public responsibility in this body.

I invite attention to certain matters which appear in the printed record of hearings before the committee. The first relates to the International Labor Organization. What is it? Sixty nations belong to the ILO. The International Labor Organization holds its meetings in Geneva, Switzerland. We have an employee representative, usually from the Labor Department, but not always, who goes there with a staff. We have an employer representative who goes to Geneva to attend the International Labor Organization. Finally, we have a senatorial contingent which sometimes goes. Several years ago the distinguished former Senator from Maryland, Senator O'Conor, was in attendance. Some time later the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was in attendance.

In the International Labor Organization, which meets in Geneva, each nation has four votes. With 60 nations in the Organization, we have one-sixtieth of the vote in ILO.

One may wonder how the International Labor Organization got its treaty power. Let me tell the Senate how. In 1934 Congress passed a joint resolution, but at that time, in giving authority to the ILO, we made a reservation to the effect that whatever came out of ILO in Switzerland would be considered only as a recommendation. However, in 1948 we approved the present constitution of the International Labor Organization, and so our country became subject to the conventions which are drafted and which can be submitted to this country for ratification.

What are some of the activities of the International Labor Organization? They are pretty well published in the hearings, I think. If I can find the text, I think I ought to regale the Senate with an account of some of the things that have been done. This is from the testimony of Mr. Will McGrath, of Ohio, who testified for a good many hours before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

First of all, the International Labor Organization has drafted 93 or more conventions. One may call them "conventions" or "treaties." I suppose the difference is that a treaty is normally regarded as a contract on a high level, with all solemnity, between two sovereigns, whereas a convention may be some kind of agreement at a lower level. So these instruments are rather felicitously and sometimes guardedly referred to as "conventions."

What are the subjects of the various conventions which the International Labor Organization is tinkering up in Geneva at the present time? I shall give only a part of the list.

One such convention deals with safety provisions in the building industry. I do not know what the safety provisions are in India. I did not look when I was there. I do not know what the safety provisions are in Japan. I did not look when I was there last year, but I have a pretty fair idea that safety in the building industry is essentially, and first of all, the responsibility of the people in my home town, my county, and my State, and then the responsibility of the people of the United States. But that is one of the conventions; and so in due time it may be submitted for our consideration, for aught I know.

Another convention deals with the gathering of statistics on wages and hours in mining, manufacturing, building, and agriculture. If those are not internal and domestic affairs, our own concern, I do not know what is.

Another deals with Government regulation of hours of work and rest periods for bus drivers and truck drivers. The authorities may have one idea in Norway and another in Czechoslovakia. But I have an idea that not only the Greyhound bus line, but the union of bus drivers, by collective bargaining, will do pretty well in that field. I doubt whether we need to have standards of that kind set up for us, because I think we can handle that question ourselves on the domestic scene.

Another deals with Government regulation of written contracts of employment of indigenous workers.

Another treats of medical examination of children employed in industry. If other countries were anywhere near us in that field, I would not say so much; but here is the International Labor Organization, tinkering around at Geneva, drafting conventions to prescribe all kinds of happy guide lines for the regulation of the American people, American enterprise, and American labor.

Another such convention deals with freedom of association of employees and protection in the right to organize. Take a good look, Mr. President, because if that were being spelled out from Geneva to the United States, or wherever it was to be ratified, I suppose collective bargaining and the things we have built up from the days of the Wagner Act on might be tinged with that sort of thing. But is it someone else's business or is it our business?

Another convention deals with the regulation of night work of women employed in industry. That is a matter of concern. Perhaps it ought to be dealt with, judging from the long hours I have seen people labor in some of the humble countries in the world.

Another such convention deals with labor clauses in public contracts; still another with the regulation of methods of payment of wages. There was much argument over the question of whether a man should be paid in cash or by check.

I had a long visit with Will McGrath on this subject after he had concluded his testimony. Do we need a convention or treaty, or must we have some extraordinary agency from the outside to tell us about these things which, on their face, are apparently only of domestic interest?

Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to continue for a little while. Then I shall be glad to yield.

Another convention deals with minimum wages in agriculture; another with holidays with pay in agriculture; still another with social security; another deals with Government benefits for maternity.

Another such convention deals with equal pay for men and women for equal work. That sounds like the old equal rights proposal which was under consideration on the floor of the Senate last year.

The foregoing represents only a part of what the International Labor Organization is doing. I might add to the list. For example, there is one convention with respect to fee-employment agencies. One looks down the road and says to himself, "This will be the end of such agencies unless they come under strict Government regulation and control. Otherwise the employment agencies will finally become nothing more than the instruments and vehicles of the Federal Government itself."

I could continue for an hour reciting the remaining items on the list, but there

would be no point in doing so. In the hearings there is a wealth of factual testimony to indicate that the fear which exists in the country is not unfounded by any means, because there is so much of time and attention on the part of eager men and women with large concepts which they would impress upon our country by means of a convention.

As I understand, a great many of these conventions have been submitted to our country. Not all of them have come to the Senate. Some of them have been withheld. I suppose some of them have come to the Senate. On the other hand, others have been submitted to Senate committees. So when we refer to fear in the country today, do not the people have good foundation for a little fear as they see what these agencies abroad are doing at the present time in tinkering up conventions which cover essentially domestic situations?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to go on for a little while until I have finished my general statement. Then I shall be very happy to yield.

Judge John J. Parker, of South Carolina, came before our committee. He is an eminent jurist and a great lawyer in his own right. He did not come essentially to testify along the lines I interrogated him. He came to testify on Senate Joint Resolution 1. I said to him, "Judge Parker, in the last issue of the American Bar Journal, if I remember correctly, I saw an article dealing with an international court of justice."

He said, "Well, with modesty I must admit the impeachment and say that I am the author of it."

We had a lengthy discussion about a subject which is now being proposed. It is the establishment of an international court of justice, which probably would sit in some foreign land. If one of our own citizens should be apprehended and brought before such a court, he would not be accorded a jury trial.

Mr. President, let us not kid ourselves about it. The testimony is clear. Judge Parker said, "There cannot be a jury trial in proceedings of that kind." There would be nine justices sitting on the court, as I remember its constitution, and they would have tremendous authority, the details of which would have to be worked out later.

Mr. President, I become a little alarmed about these things. I cannot forget the fact that the Nuremberg trials were held. I was in Nuremberg when the trials were being held. I remember the feeling the great and lamented Bob Taft had about the Nuremberg trials. An international court of justice would spell out its own jurisdiction. If we should agree to it, and one of our citizens should become amenable to the jurisdiction of the court, he would be tried in the way it prescribed. Then what about the safeguards that come so trippingly to the tip of the American tongue? Mr. President, the testimony on this matter is contained in the green book I hold in my hand. It will still make history, I believe, before we get through with the debate.

It is not only that ILO is always working on treaties and conventions which have a domestic impact, and it is not only that we are always being given a push in the direction of a possible international criminal court, but there is also the situation with respect to the Covenant of Human Rights. If I can find the text of it in my papers I will recite what claims are made.

I refer first to page 1109 of the hearings. I find there a very interesting statement. I believe every American citizen should read it. I shall read a quotation from Mr. Joseph Malik, who was the Chairman of the United Nations Human Rights Commission. Let us fasten that fact in our minds. Mr. Charles Malik, a very eminent citizen of Lebanon, is quoted as saying:

I think a study of our proceedings—

He is talking about the proceedings of the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations, of which he was the Chairman—

will reveal that the amendments we adopted to the old texts under examination responded for the most part more to Soviet than to western promptings.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Illinois did not say that. That was said by Mr. Charles Malik, former Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations.

What is contained in the Covenant on Human Rights? I do not want to read it, because the text will be found in connection with the remarks of Prof. George A. Finch. Both the Convention on the Political Rights of Women and the Covenant on Human Rights are contained in the hearings. If Senators have the time to spend an evening to read the texts they will realize how far they go.

We did not have any of these situations in 1920 when there was laid down the case of Missouri against Holland by a very sweet and classical and scholarly justice—a doctrine that disturbs me so many years later, because of the developments which have come about since that time.

If Senators desire to indulge in a little mental exercise I suggest they send to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ask for a copy of the Genocide Convention. It makes very interesting reading and from it Senators will be able to spell out a few things. I asked a great many question about it of people who I thought knew much more concerning it than I did.

As I read the language of the Genocide Treaty, an editor who wrote an inflammatory article would be subject to the terms of the Genocide Convention. There need not be a conspiracy or concerted action. An individual comes within the terms of the Genocide Convention if he makes an inflammatory statement, or joins with others in making a statement which is interpreted as being aimed against a group of a certain national origin, or of a certain race or color or creed. If an international court of justice were in existence, what would happen?

So I believe there is some basis for the fears which are besetting our people today.

One could pick out of the record a good many things which bring the situation down to a practical point. That is what is happening on the horizon today.

I spoke a moment ago about domestic affairs. The clause in the United Nations Charter referring to matters being essentially within the jurisdiction of the States is of no concern to the eager beavers I have in mind, because they do not pay very much attention to that kind of language anyway.

So we come to the meat in the coconut, which is the effect of treaties as internal law. I am very much concerned about it. If the things that are being cooked up in the conventions are not internal law, I ask in all conscience and commonsense what are they? If they do not have an impact upon our domestic affairs where is their impact? I cannot spell it out in any other way than that all the conventions which are being cooked up will have a definite effect on the internal and domestic affairs of the United States.

If anyone has any doubt about it let me call his attention to the fact that people are now going around in many of our States, telling the citizens thereof, "These things have got to be adopted. We will have to put on some pressure." That is another action that adds to the fear in the country. Such pressures are being put on groups and agencies of one kind or another, even though the Senate may stand as resolute as the Rock of Gibraltar and resist them.

Let us go now to the question of internal law. If the treaties become self-executing, then what? That is one of the issues involved in the subject.

What about the Fujii case? Apparently the law of California held that Fujii could not own land. Fujii bought some land, I suppose. At long last his case went to the Circuit Court of Appeals in California. What did the court hold? In its decision it went back to article 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is a great lawyer, and I am confident he will bear out that statement. The Supreme Court of California finally resolved that case on grounds of the 14th amendment, but the Circuit Court of Appeals of California acted on article 55 and article 56 of the United Nations Charter.

What about the Oyama case? It finally got into the courts and was resolved on constitutional grounds, but four justices said: "In addition to the reasons assigned"—and then went back to article 55 and article 56 of the United Nations Charter, which pledges us to recognize the basic freedoms, the fundamental freedoms in respect to national origin, race, creed, and all the rest. Is it their business, or is it our business?

There was the Perez against Lippold case involving interracial marriage. How long before the decision in that case will become the broad concept of the juridical mind of America—and then where will we be?

When we speak of internal law, what is the situation with respect to other nations? Let us be sure we get that matter completely and thoroughly nailed

down, because there should be no mistake about it. I have asked this question many times: "How can I go to the State of Illinois and say to my constituents, 'Look, it is perfectly all right in Great Britain when they make a treaty that it shall not have internal effect until there has been an implementing act of Parliament. That is all right for them, but it is not all right for you folks.' "

Tell me, Mr. President, how I can go back home and say to the people of Illinois, "It is perfectly all right for your neighbors in the Dominion of Canada that the Canadian Parliament must first implement a treaty by legislation. That is all right for them, but it is not all right for you."

That brings up the question of parity or equality with other countries with respect to internal law. Beginning at page 496 of the hearings the whole list can be found. First, I would set down only the cases which are absolutely clear cut, where a treaty can have domestic effect only when it is implemented. That would include Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Ecuador, San Salvador, Greece, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Norway, the Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, and many other nations.

Then there is Liberia, in west Africa. So we say, "Look, folks. We will put you on a parity with Liberia, because it requires no implementing statute there to give a treaty the effect of internal law."

What are Senators going to say to their people when they go home? I have been thinking about the matter, because it concerns me. My people are very fundamental, and they want to be very sure that their freedoms shall not be taken away.

I have endeavored to recite some of the things that are being tinkered with and that have the effect of internal law. Tell me how we can finally escape that issue? We are not going to do it, I care not what may finally be resolved. It will still be there, and we must deal with it.

We then come to the main issue. One side of the controversy has been talking about the power of a treaty, and the other side has been talking about the treatymaking power. The real issue involved is not the treaty power. I think we can manage that all right. The real issue is the power of a treaty with respect to the affairs of this country. That is what we are dealing with; and we are not going to shrug it off very easily in a day and in an age when there is a very broad international concept in the world that would have us go infinitely further than probably more restrained and conservative souls would go.

Mr. President, I would be the last to interfere with the President's treatymaking power and its effect in the international domain. My concern is with respect to our rights, our internal affairs, and domestic matters when the power of a treaty begins to manifest itself.

That is the issue which is before the Senate. It seems to me we have been moving along on different tracks, one going one way, discussing the treatymaking power, and another going the other way, discussing the power of a treaty. It is the latter of those two that I think is the important one at the moment. Incidentally, Mr. President, that is the issue, at least, which, even if it cannot be exactly phrased and made definitive in the minds of humble people, yet I think intuitively they somehow understand.

When we take note of the number of persons working in agencies and commissions all over the world, the fears of our people are not unfounded. It was said on television, I think, on Sunday night, "Well, the Constitution has worked for 160 years." That is correct. I admit it freely. It has worked up to this time. But do not forget that we are living in a somewhat different world from the world in which we had been living for a long time. We did not have the "eager beavers" in ILO and in UNESCO, in the Economic and Social Council, and all the other international agencies that are digging up things to be presented to us.

Mr. President, we have mass production of treaties. There are treaty factories working. I am told that there are 200 being prepared with reference to one line or another. If that is not mass production of treaties and conventions, I never heard of it. Of course they are just as illimitable as the concept of the human mind.

Yes, the Constitution has worked for 160 years; that is agreed. But now, in the year of our Lord 1954, people clothed with power are working in New York, in Geneva, and all over the world, cooking up little dishes we may not like.

The fears stem also from the fact that pressures are on. I have become positively amazed by some statements I have seen. A man by the name of Humphrey, the former Director of the Commission on Human Rights, of the United Nations, has said:

> What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character.

He is telling us.

> Human rights are largely a matter of relationship between States and individuals, and, therefore, a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of States.

That was the concept I took in with mother's milk, on the prairies of Illinois. But Mr. Humphrey says:

> But what is now proposed, in effect, is the creation of some kind of supranational supervision of this relationship between the States and its citizens.

If he were just an ordinary person not schooled in this subject, we could laugh off his statements, but he is the Director of the Commission on Human Rights. They have money to spend; they can set the pressure engines going, and the first thing we know we shall begin to feel the pressure, first from one side and then from the other side.

That is something we did not have in those gorgeous halcyon days of long ago when a Missouri duck got into the way of a hunter's gun and precipitated the decision in Missouri against Holland.

We are told we should not concern ourselves about it because, after all, the Supreme Court, consisting of nine very distinguished men on whom we can rely, is just across the plaza.

It seems to me that the Supreme Court has been a pretty weak reed on occasion, if Senators are interested in knowing it. I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that I gave them my vote on the tidelands issue because I thought they were right. But there was a Supreme Court sitting across the plaza that has frowned on 100 years of decisions and had thrown the whole concept into an ashcan, saying, "The people of Florida, Texas, and California have claimed this right for a hundred years, but this is a new day, so we must proclaim the condominium of the Federal Government over submerged land."

Were Senators from those States content to rely upon the Supreme Court then? It remained for the legislative branch, Congress, to roll back the Supreme Court, which has been a pretty weak reed.

I did not like the Supreme Court decision in the Dred Scott case of long ago, when Roger B. Taney was Chief Justice. However, a man from my own State, Abraham Lincoln, said, "I do not accept the decision politically. I shall abide by the decision of the Supreme Court, but I shall labor to have it undone."

The whole destiny of America would have been altered if it had not been for the fortuities of history, and, I might say, the ordinations of God Almighty, that whereby a situation came to pass when we were brought once more into sweet and happy unity; but Abraham Lincoln did not rely upon the Supreme Court decision in the Dred Scott case.

The Supreme Court may be a pretty weak reed, considering that in the case of Oyama against California four Justices of the Court said there were additional reasons, besides those assigned, with regard to the 14th amendment and the equal protection clause. Then they brought up articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter. Mr. President, if that Charter is considered to be self-executing, we are going to have a quite different country.

But, Mr. President, I am not content to rely upon the foibles and the frailties of humankind. I am like old Tom Jefferson. I like to see the law written in durable letters, seared upon the consciences of people, so that, no matter what the time or the circumstances, people can go to bed at night with easy consciences, knowing there is a constant law, an unending safeguard, a real citadel of freedom in this country, and that, by the very solemnity of the law, it is going to be enforced. People say, "The Supreme Court can pass on it"; but I would much rather see something written into the organic law of the land.

The other night Dr. Corwin was to have attended a dinner. I read some of the statements he made. He was not present himself, but his address was read for him. Dr. Corwin is a great classical scholar in the whole broad field of jurisprudence; I have great esteem for him; but it did not make me feel very good to hear Dr. Corwin's statement that by the kind of action contemplated by the Senate on the amendment pending

before it the Senate demeans itself. Let us see about that.

On the 29th of January 1952 a treaty was before the Senate. Mark the date well—January 29, 1952. The Senate was passing on the protocols that brought Greece and Turkey into the orbit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. According to the RECORD, who brought that about? Six Senators were on the floor on the 29th of January 1952, and those six Senators brought about that result, with all the responsibilities and all the duties that may flow from the action taken on that day.

If Senators are content with a safeguard of that kind, I do not think the people are.

Let us consider what happened on June 13, 1952. Do Senators know what was before the Senate on that day? The Irish treaty. Good old Ireland. I have tried to hold up the flag for Ireland. I introduced a resolution to try to memorialize the whole wide world, if that could be done, to compel Great Britain to give to Ireland her undivided freedom. That is the way I feel. I take my freedom straight.

I am like little Johnny. His teacher asked him, "How do you spell 'straight'?"

He said, "S-t-r-a-i-g-h-t."

The teacher then asked, "What does it mean?"

He said, "Without ginger ale."

That is the way I take my freedom. I take it without ginger ale. I take it straight.

So I am for the Irish people, who want their united freedom.

Mr. President, not that particular kind of treaty, but a treaty with Ireland was before the Senate on June 13, 1952. Do you know, Mr. President, how many Senators were in the Chamber at the time?

Two, Mr. President—one on the floor and one in the chair of the Presiding Officer. That was a great safeguard for the American people; was it not?

The distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] were the only two Senators in the Chamber. The Senator from Minnesota told the Washington Star that night that he did not object to the treaty, although he did not vote for it.

So JOHN SPARKMAN, Senator from Alabama and former candidate for the Vice Presidency of the United States on the Democratic ticket, probably holds a distinction that will stand in the history of this country of having ratified a treaty between the United States and Ireland. [Laughter.] If there is any Senator who wishes to quarrel with the record, I am ready to answer him because that is the record.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I prefer to finish my remarks before the clock runs around again. I have an engagement for a meeting downtown shortly, so I wish to conclude my remarks.

A moment ago I was alluding to the vague, nebulous character of treaties and provisions contained in them.

Mr. THYE entered the Chamber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a moment ago I mentioned the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]—all for good.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am sorry I was not present to hear the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had referred to the time when the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Alabama were the only Senators present in the Chamber when a treaty was ratified.

Mr. THYE. I was in the cloakroom taking a long-distance call from a constituent in Minnesota; I am sorry I did not hear the Senator's remarks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Minnesota that among the men I have known in public life he is one of the Members of the Senate who is most diligent and attentive to his duties.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe the people of Minnesota are entitled to know that.

Mr. THYE. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was speaking of the vague and nebulous character of provisions that get into treaties. When the Japanese Treaty was before the Senate, I came into the Senate Chamber with a colleague, and I asked him, "How are you going to vote on the Japanese Treaty?"

He said, "I guess I will vote for it."

I said, "Do you know what is in it?"

He said, "No."

I asked, "Have you read the hearings?"

He said, "No; there are a good many things around here that we have to take on faith."

Mr. President, there are also a good many things we do not have to take on faith. There are some things I shall not take on faith. I sat up and read every word in the hearings. I went through that treaty very carefully. It took until half past two in the morning, but when it was time to vote on the treaty, I voted against it.

Seven months ago I told the Prime Minister of Japan, in Tokyo, "I suppose you know, Your Excellency, that I am one of the few Senators who voted against the treaty with Japan. There are certain provisions of the treaty I do not understand. There are certain things the treaty does not do that probably it should do."

How in the world can 87 million people in an island country be sustained without something better, by way of subsistence, than what they now have? I do not know. The junior Senator from Illinois was not quarreling with anyone; he was simply dissatisfied with the treaty. In the press of circumstances, in the welter of work, I sometimes wonder how we ever get to know the contents of some of the documents that come to our attention. How do we spell out the implications of treaties? How are we able to tell what is likely to happen? Does not such action logically add to the fears of the people of the country? Certainly it is not conducive to my own serenity of mind, when I think about it.

Mr. President, the conditions in our country today, the trends and tendencies we are noting, excite in me a kind of disturbing feeling. I shall add one more word, then we will get down to fundamentals.

I have before me Senate bill 462, which was introduced in the Senate on January 13, 1953, by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE.

I shall read the title:

To declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes.

Section 2 is pretty well spelled out in detail.

Section 3 has to do with the purposes of the bill. It sets forth a number of them.

I now read a part of the purposes, namely, the paragraph appearing at the top of page 5. The following is set forth in a bill which is before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate:

To promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, language, or religion, in accordance with the treaty obligations assumed by the United States under the United Nations Charter.

The Charter is beginning to creep into the consciences of the lawmakers of the country. How easy it is now. We go back to duties and responsibilities and treaty obligations assumed by the United States under the United Nations Charter. Then there is the statement: To define and punish offenses against the law of nations.

It is pretty vague, is it not? The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is acting as the minority leader, is a great lawyer in my book. I like to come and sit at his feet as an humble disciple and gather juridical wisdom from him. I ask him if the language I have just read is not pretty broad.

There are punitive clauses in that language. They bear an impact upon our domestic affairs.

Where do we go from here? My name is on the Bricker joint resolution. It is going to stay there, too, unless something in its place which will be pretty effective can be found, because I still have a feeling of responsibility for that document which I held up my hand and took an oath to support and defend eight times in the other body, and once on this side of the Capitol. One does not take that oath lightly.

Mr. President, I have detained the Senate far too long, but this is not a transitory constitutional squall. Conditions are different today from what they were.

I grant to anyone who makes such a contention that 10 years ago perhaps such a problem would not have been before the Senate. However, there have been developments in the international field which have changed conditions. Men who I assume are of good will, but whose sense of direction is different from mine, are now tinkering in our affairs and taking us down a course which I may not want to follow and which I may not want to see my country follow.

So I simply say that, because there are sufficient wisdom and sufficient genius in the minds of Senators and in the minds of those in the executive end of the Government, I hope we can still arrive at a solution which will be durable and which will meet, in large part at least, the fears which have ascended on the horizon of America; and that we can bring an assurance to our people that, notwithstanding the agencies and the commissions that exist in so many sections of the world, the United States constitutional safeguards in the domestic affairs of our people, when they are strictly domestic, will still remain the concern of those who have for so long lived with and who have shaped what I am pleased to term the more perfect union.

My name as a cosponsor is on the joint resolution, and I intend to go through with my support of it, unless there is introduced an effective substitute. So I give my blessing to those who are "tinkering" around with the subject. May they be guided with rare wisdom and perhaps the blessing of the Deity as they seek to find an answer to this knotty problem.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I do not think anyone could sit as I have in the Senate for the last several hours and listened to the remarkable fluidity of my distinguished associate from Illinois without feeling that the Lord has given the Senator great gifts. I am happy that in the Senator's remarkable talk this afternoon he has refrained from impugning the motives of those who oppose him in the very serious matter now engaging our attention. However, Mr. President, I cannot agree with the conclusions of the Senator from Illinois. I have for many months very intently followed the statements which have been made in behalf of the proposed constitutional amendment.

The Senator from Ohio, as I understand, is in favor of the proposed amendment for five reasons:

First. Fear and distrust of the United Nations.

Second. A distrust of the President of the United States and the ability of the Senate.

Third. A complete misconception of article VI, clause 2, of the Constitution of the United States, the so-called supremacy clause.

Fourth. A complete misunderstanding of the decision in the case of Missouri against Holland.

Fifth. A complete misunderstanding of the decision in United States against Pink.

Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Illinois have followed the pattern which has heretofore been developed on the floor of the Senate by those who are in favor of the so-called Bricker amendment. I desire again to make it clear that the pending measure does not propose the original Bricker amendment. What the Senate is discussing now is an amendment which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, not the amendment on which the sixty-odd names were signed, but an entirely different amendment.

At this point I desire to discuss briefly the subject of fear and distrust of the United Nations. I think that as the matter has been developed very clearly up to this point the question is whether or not we are going to crawl into our shells and live as we might have lived 25 years ago, before our country came so close to other countries. Because of scientific developments, every country is now at every other country's backyard. We have airplanes which travel at a speed of more than 1,000 miles an hour. Yet there are those who feel that we can live alone.

Today again the attitude of those people has come into the open. It is, "the hell with the United Nations. Step back and try it alone again." For a long time there has been an attempt to camouflage the recessive characteristic of the illegitimate Holman thesis that has been developed by shouting concern for the Constitution of the United States and the need for protection of the Federal Government. Let us make the situation clear. The opponents of this amendment are not those who want to change the Constitution. We say the Constitution has stood for 165 years. During that time what has happened to our liberties? Our liberties have become stronger and firmer, and we have become the leading nation on the earth under that Constitution.

Now, who wants to change the Constitution? The President? No. His advisers? No. Why? Because the President thinks it would be dangerous to do so.

We have a good Constitution. It has been demonstrated to be a good Constitution. And, Mr. President, this is no time to change it, because the world now is full of challenges. If we attempted to blunt the arm of the Executive, as the adoption of the amendment would do, if we attempted to delimit the power of the Executive, as the adoption of the amendment would do, and if we attempted to delimit the power of this body, we would be blind to the consequences of our act. Many of us have seen through that deceptive argument.

As is the usual case, truth will out, and on January 23 the Senator from Ohio clearly showed this fear and distrust. The United Nations, and all the hopes and aspirations for world peace that it stands for, are under attack. Instead of sponsoring a forthright resolution for the repudiation of the United Nations and for withdrawing from membership, the tactic has been to try to create hysteria and fear concerning the Constitution, and then to try to deprive the Nation of vital treatymaking powers.

Mr. President, we are told that the people have a fear and a distrust. However, the polls in October and January indicate clearly that the percentage of those who favor the Bricker amendment is constantly decreasing. The most recent poll shows, as I recall, that a total of only approximately 19 percent of the people have heard of or have read about the Bricker amendment; and that of that percentage, only approximately 4 percent or 5 percent favor the Bricker amendment, and 7 percent or 8 percent do not favor it; and the rest of the people do not know about it. Mr. President, a great fear crisis cannot be built upon such statistics.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. No, Mr. President; I prefer to proceed as my colleague from Illinois did. Afterward, I shall yield.

2. FEAR AND DISTRUST OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE SENATE

The Senator from Ohio claims that Senate review of United Nations treaties does not afford adequate protection. It is often impossible, he says, to know whether or not, and to what extent, a treaty supersedes Federal and State laws—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, page 943.

Mr. President, for 165 years this body has passed upon treaties. If the Senate makes a mistake in approving a treaty, the mistake can be corrected by repudiating the treaty, which can be done by means of a joint resolution passed by both the House and the Senate. On one occasion in our history that was done; I refer to our treaty with France. Such action was taken after France broke the treaty. So, Mr. President, we see that in this case the tactic of the proponents of the Bricker amendment seems to be to build up a strawman of fear.

It is often impossible, so we are told, to know whether and to what extent a treaty supersedes Federal and State laws.

Mr. President, I say that the Bricker amendment implies that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate itself do not have the intelligence or the courage or the judgment to consider treaties.

I remember one occasion when a Democratic Senator from one of the Western States addressed the Senate. A little later, one of his colleagues began to deprecate his speech and the Senate. The Senator who had made the speech rose and said, "Mr. President, one should not befoul the nest in which he is raised."

Mr. President, I have only pride in and honor for the great body of which I am a Member. I have faith in it, Mr. President. I have faith, too, in the Constitution; and I do not wish to poke it full of holes. That is why I have gotten into this fight. I promise to remain in it until it is ended. All the words of mice and men will never, I trust, change the Constitution in the respect that is desired by some persons.

Mr. President, the Senators who favor the Bricker amendment and who have engaged in sweeping generalizations are in great error. Either they have not bothered to read the treaties which have been entered into, or they are taking the word of some persons who do not know the facts regarding treaties. A mere inspection of treaties will show that most of the provisions are clear and unambiguous, and, therefore, are readily understood by persons trained or interested in the subject. As in the case of any law, contract, or compact, disputes can arise. If disputes did not arise, there would be no need for persons to

be trained in the law. The mere fact that a dispute can arise once in a while concerning a statute, does not argue that Congress should propose to the Constitution an amendment destroying its grant of legislative power. The same is true of treaty law.

3. COMPLETE MISCONCEPTION OF THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE—ARTICLE VI, CLAUSE 2

Mr. President, at this time I wish to speak emphatically in regard to the complete misconception of the supremacy clause, article VI, clause 2. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Illinois have said the supremacy clause was drafted primarily to take care of problems peculiar to that day and age. The Senator from Ohio has said that the pending problem was the payment of debts by United States citizens to citizens of Britain and to the British Government—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, page 937. That is a complete distortion of history and fact, Mr. President.

The impelling requirement for that clause of the Constitution was the refusal of responsible foreign governments to treat further with the acephalous government of the confederation on pressing problems of friendship, commerce, and navigation. The enforcement of the provisions of the Treaty of Paris—Eighth Statutes at Large, page 80—particularly articles IV and V, was important, but not of preclusive importance. In Randolph's first presentation on May 29, 1787, he pointed out that one of the great defects of the weak Congress under the Confederation was that it "could not cause infractions of treaties, or of the law of nations to be punished." See the Madison Papers, 1840, volume 2, page 730. The very first resolution of his plan proposed the correction and enlargement of the Articles of Confederation to correct the defects whereof he spoke.

Mr. President, let it be remembered that I am speaking about the complete misconception of the supremacy clause by the distinguished Members of the Senate who have spoken on that subject.

Pinckney's plan, submitted on the same day, had provisions bearing notable resemblance to the final draft of the Constitution and it contained a supremacy clause reading:

All acts made by the Legislature of the United States, pursuant to this Constitution, and all treaties made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and all judges shall be bound to consider them as such in their decisions.

I repeat that that was on May 29, 1787.

Mr. President, I need not trace through the convention, to its final form, the idea or wording of the supremacy clause. The idea was widespread, and preceded the convening of the delegates. This clause was not placed in the Constitution solely for the specific purpose of requiring the settlement of British claims only 2 or 3 days before its—the Constitution's—final adoption, as suggested by the Senator from Maryland—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, pages 949–950. Let us not ignore history and fact. Let us at least read the Federalist, No. 44, written by Madison, wherein he explains the supremacy clause, pointing to the fact that without it—

The world would have seen, for the first time, a system of government founded on an inversion of fundamental principles of all government; it would have seen the authority of the whole society everywhere subordinate to the authority of the parts; it would have seen a monster, in which the head was under the direction of the members.

Mr. President, the quotation I have just given is from James Madison, himself.

I shall return briefly to the supremacy clause later. Let us not be misled by any false claim that the supremacy clause had or was intended to have only one application. Its use is extensive, current, and proper. As proof, look to the citations to cases contained in any annotated discussion of article VI, clause 2.

Some of us are used to what we call Shepherdizing matters of this kind. Look it up in Shepherd.

4. COMPLETE MISUNDERSTANDING OF MISSOURI AGAINST HOLLAND

The Senator from Ohio has said that the results of the Migratory Bird Treaty were salutary and might well have been sustained under the commerce clause—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, page 939.

I cannot understand how human minds can see things so differently. I remember well that on an occasion when former Senator O'Mahoney was a Member of this austere body, some rather simple language was under discussion. One Senator said it meant one thing, and other said it meant something else. Senator O'Mahoney said, "Is not the human mind a peculiar contraption?"

Let us look into Missouri against Holland. The Senator from Ohio—and I heard him last night—also mistakes the meaning of this decision. The Senator from Ohio has said that the results of the Migratory Bird Treaty were salutary and might well have been sustained under the commerce clause.

Today I heard a great flow of words from our distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. When he was through I saw that bird flying out from Louisiana, over various States, through Missouri, and, behold, it was shot. I heard the gun. [Laughter.] Such was the power of the magnetic voice of the Senator from Illinois. However, he did not get me off the track, because I said, "I will explain Missouri against Holland so simply that those who want to read can understand."

I have heretofore placed on record an analysis of this decision—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 12, page 4469 and the following—and I have detailed the legislative proposals and steps taken with respect to this problem. I have pointed out that there were considered by Congress from the outset to be two approaches to solutions of the problem. One was by direct legislation, which the Senator from Ohio obviously thinks was the proper approach, and the other was the treaty approach. I have yet to hear a refutation of the proposition that migratory ferae naturae crossing international boundaries are not proper subjects of international concern. I believe there is one Member of the Senate who recalls the debate on the migratory bird problem and if I have been incorrect in my analysis or presentation, I wish he would clarify the record for me. I refer to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who was a Member of the House of Representatives at the time the problem arose.

The Senator from Ohio has said that the Migratory Bird Treaty with Great Britain "was interpreted in Missouri against Holland, which set aside the 10th amendment of the Constitution, so far as the rights of States are concerned"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, page 939. Later, he states even more broadly that in this case the Supreme Court "set aside the 10th amendment to the Constitution"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, page 941. These statements are completely false. Nowhere in the decision are any such results either enunciated or inferred. In the decision of the lower court, Judge Van Valkenburgh had specifically stated that the general rule, concerning the treatymaking power, was most comprehensively set forth in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* ((1890) 133 U. S. 258, 267). If this pronouncement, he said, in any view could be regarded as obiter, nevertheless it had been so frequently and approvingly restated that it must be regarded as the settled rule for the courts of the United States. I wish to read this settled rule, which was enunciated earlier by Mr. Justice Fields in the Geofroy case:

That the treaty power of the United States extends to all proper subjects of negotiations between our Government and the governments of other nations, is clear. It is also clear that the protection which should be afforded to the citizens of one country owning property in another, and the manner in which that property may be transferred, devised, or inherited, are fitting subjects for such negotiation and of regulation by mutual stipulations between the two countries. As commercial intercourse increases between different countries the residence of citizens of one country within the territory of the other naturally follows, and the removal of their disability from alienage to hold, transfer, and inherit property in such cases tends to promote amicable relations. Such removal has been within the present century the frequent subject of treaty arrangement. The treaty power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the government or of its departments, and those arising from the nature of the government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent. *Fort Leavenworth Railroad Co.* v. *Lowe* (114 U. S. 525, 541). But with these exceptions, it is not perceived that there is any limit to the questions which can be adjusted touching any matter which is properly the subject of negotiation with a foreign country. (*Ware* v. *Hylton* (3 Dall. 199); *Chirac* v. *Chirac* (2 Wheat. 259); *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. 483); 8 Opinions Attys. Gen. 417; *The People* v. *Gerke* (5 California, 381).)

The rule is, then, that the subject of treaty negotiation must be proper, but

that no treaty can authorize what the Constitution forbids.

The Senator from Ohio has said:

In early dicta, the Supreme Court said that the treaty power does not extend "so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids," and that Federal jurisdiction cannot "be enlarged under the treatymaking power." Those reassuring statements were repudiated in Missouri against Holland. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 100: 908.)

The Senator from Ohio is again absolutely wrong. Nowhere in Missouri against Holland will you find such a statement, nor is it the effect of that decision. The majority affirmed the decree of Judge Van Valkenburgh and specifically cited Geofroy against Riggs. See page 435. Further in Asakura against Seattle, just 4 years later, and with Justice Holmes still firmly sitting on the bench, the Supreme Court, said:

The treatymaking power of the United States is not limited by any express provision of the Constitution, and, though it does not extend so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, it does extend to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and other nations.

There is the rule which the Senator from Ohio falsely states had been "repudiated" 4 years earlier. What authority did Justice Butler cite for this repudiated rule? He cited *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258, 266); *In re Ross* (140 U. S. 453, 463); and *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416).

I need not remind Senators that the Constitution of the United States specifically denied to every State, including the State of Missouri, the power to make a treaty with Canada on migratory birds or any other subject—article I, section 10, clause 1. Destruction of migratory birds did become a proper subject of international concern, and therefore a proper subject of treaty negotiation. Only the Federal Government through the President and the Senate could make this treaty covering this proper subject—article II, section 2, clause 2. Having done so, it properly became part of the supreme law of the land, but not equal in that respect to the Constitution of the United States. Its equality, if comparisons are necessary, is only that of an ordinary act of Congress—article VI, clause 2.

The Senator from Ohio said:

I do not believe that the Federal Government, merely by making a promise to a foreign country, should be able to clothe itself with authority which is inconsistent with the Constitution which gave it birth. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 100: 944.)

I say to the Senate that it never has so clothed itself, and it never will so long as our government of laws, and not of men, continues to exist under the present Constitution of the United States.

5. COMPLETE MISUNDERSTANDING OF UNITED STATES AGAINST PINK

The Pink case is another case from which the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] tore a shred and left the rest of the cloth entire.

The Senator from Ohio has stated:

The Supreme Court * * * said that the agreement between the President * * * and Mr. Litvinov, of Russia, sets aside the fifth amendment, deprives people of their property, and rises to the dignity of a treaty, and becomes the supreme law of the land. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 100: 940.)

This agreement did not set aside the fifth amendment and it did not deprive people of their property. If it became part of the supreme law of the land, to the extent that it achieved that standing as applied in this case, it achieved it on the basis of an implementing act of Congress—the act of August 4, 1939—Fifty-third Statutes at Large, page 1199—providing for the adjudication, by a commissioner, of claims of American nationals against the Soviet Government. The State of New York insisted on ignoring all of this, and in attempting to distribute the assets of former Russian companies, which had operated in that State, according to her own ideas. She even passed a law intended to thwart the efforts of the United States Government. See *U. S.* v. *Belmont* ((1937) 301 U. S. 324) and New York Session Laws, 1936, chapter 917.

I think the Senate will agree with the majority of the Supreme Court in its holding that there was no constitutional reason, under these circumstances, why the United States Government needs to act as the collection agent of aliens when it takes steps to protect itself or American citizens on external debts.

There is no reason—

Said the Supreme Court—

why it may not, through such devices as the Litvinov assignment, make itself and its nationals whole from assets here [in the United States] before it permits such assets to go abroad in satisfaction of claims of aliens made elsewhere and not incurred in connection with business conducted in this country.

I suppose the Senator from Ohio preferred that New York permit these meager assets which the United States sought for the payment of claims of its citizens, to be paid to aliens. Has anyone denied that settlement of such claims is not a proper subject of international concern? The fact that it was done by agreement implemented by an act of Congress may be unusual. But the United States was negotiating with an unusual situation.

The 5th amendment was not set aside. As so clearly indicated in the opinion, the President had the constitutional power to determine the policy which was to govern recognition. That included settlement of claims. The resulting agreement was implemented by valid legislation. Accordingly, due process was satisfied.

Last Friday the Senator from Ohio, in referring to the Steel Seizure case, said—page 942:

If two additional Justices of the Supreme Court had agreed with those three Justices, our Republic would have ended and we would have been under some kind of oligarchy.

Mr. President, I am afraid that was not the Senator's voice, but the voice of his good friend, Mr. Holman, who has prepared, as some of us have seen, a primer which is chock-full of mistakes. It has gone out by the carload into my State because I conscientiously took the position that we should not attempt to cut a vital portion out of the Constitution. Instead of arguing the issue, the proponents undertake a campaign of propaganda of the kind referred to by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], including even a misquotation of the Constitution itself, which has the effect of causing some people to see red and others to be filled with fear and distress. The propagandists are making people distrustful of their Government and of the Senate. They do it all under the guise of pursuing a noble policy.

Mr. President, it is a serious time, but I repeat it is not a time for us to be jumping the gun. It is no time for us to put a stilleto into the Constitution, or, as Professor Corwin has stated—and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] referred to Professor Corwin—to commit mayhem on the Constitution by adopting the amendment.

Mr. President, in my opening statement on the floor of the Senate I stated it was very evident that Senators differed as to the advisability of doing anything. When a situation like that exists, it is better to stop, look, and listen, and do nothing until we can get substantial agreement on action, particularly when it relates to something very precious, something very dear, and something we do not want to lose.

Therefore I spoke on the floor today, to point out that the technique of fear and distrust of the United Nations, fear and distrust of the President, and the Senate and, yes, fear and distrust of the courts is not making a contribution to a discussion of the subject.

I also stated that there was a complete misconception of article VI, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, the so-called supremacy clause. I shall have more to say about that at another time. However, I am satisfied that what is being put forth consists of a great deal of misinformation as to the real issue which is involved.

Mr. President, the longer the debate on the Bricker amendment proceeds, the more evident it becomes that some of the proponents of the amendment are arguing with themselves and with their own fertile imaginations. I regret to say that there is also becoming more evident a resort to propaganda techniques which have the effect, whether by design or not, of misrepresenting the opponents of the amendment.

There is only one issue in this debate—

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] proclaimed last Thursday—

Shall the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States be protected against abuse of the treatymaking power?

The implication, of course, is that the opponents of the Bricker amendment favor abuses of the treatymaking power.

The Senator from Ohio—whether intentionally or not—likewise imputed such a motive to the Secretary of State. Every suggestion for a compromise made by the Secretary, said the Senator, "would have given express constitutional sanction to abuses of the power to make

treaties and other international agreements."

There are only two sides in this debate—

The Senator from Ohio declared—

favoring the general purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 1 are those who deny that the perils of the atomic age require the scuttling of our constitutional Republic. Generally opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 1 are those who rely for safety in an atomic age on unhandicapped and untrammeled executive power.

The Senator could scarcely have been more blunt if he had said that opponents of the joint resolution favor scuttling our constitutional Republic.

MISLEADING ARGUMENT

The Senator from Ohio repeatedly made it appear that the opponents of his amendment are engaged in some designing plot to destroy the sovereignty of the United States.

Those who support the philosophy of world government bitterly oppose the amendment—

He said.

And again:

Many opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 have advocated the adoption of the U. N. draft statute for the international criminal court and other United Nations treaties just as dangerous as that one.

And again:

Most of the opponents of this resolution seek to elevate treaty law above domestic constitutional law. They seek to codify all fundamental human rights—civil, political, economic, social, and cultural—in a law superior to that of sovereign nations.

And again:

Most of the opposition to this treaty control amendment comes from those who yearn for the domination of a supranational government. Some of them would surrender national sovereignty immediately; others would destroy it gradually by means of U. N. treaties and by less formal agreements. Some would organize a suprastate on a global scale, while others would first establish a regional government.

And again:

Many opponents of the amendment are inspired by an overweening zeal to transfer legislative authority from the States and the Congress to some international body. They consistently support all measures designed to consolidate the power of government in fewer hands and at a greater distance from the people.

Mr. President, the ultimate effect of all these statements is to question the motives of those of us who oppose the Bricker amendment. Who is included among "most of the opposition" or "many of the opponents" to whom the Senator referred?

OPPONENTS OF THE AMENDMENT

There is, first, the President of the United States.

There is the Secretary of State.

There are 26 out of 27 deans and professors of law in our leading law schools.

There is the American Federation of Labor.

There is AMVETS.

There is the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

There is the League of Women Voters of the United States.

There are many other national organizations, such as the American Association of University Women, the American Jewish Committee, B'nai B'rith, Catholic Association for International Peace, Friends Committee on National Legislation, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Negro Women, Young Women's Christian Association, and many distinguished legal groups throughout the country.

I am sure that all of these fine groups resent the implication that they are parties to a movement to undermine the sovereignty of the United States.

SOME CONTRADICTIONS

Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to invite the attention of the Senate to some of the contradictions in which the proponents of the Bricker amendment have involved themselves as the debate has thus far progressed.

Last Wednesday, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] said that adoption of the first section of the Bricker amendment "would put at rest the contention that the treaty power is paramount to the Constitution of the United States."

No one is making such a contention except the proponents of the amendment, who contend that it is necessary to pass the amendment to put to rest the contention which they themselves have made.

The Senator from Maryland also stated that, if the amendment were adopted—

In some instances, such as the ownership of property by aliens within the United States, it might be necessary to have—indeed, it would be necessary to have—an act of the State legislature to authorize such ownership.

The very next day, the Senator from Ohio declared that—

Congress has plenary power over the rights and privileges of aliens in the United States.

MISSOURI AGAINST HOLLAND

Mr. President, the proponents of the Bricker amendment place great reliance upon the case of Missouri against Holland. That case was decided in 1920, and the Senator from Maryland found in it last Wednesday what he described as "two new and somewhat startling doctrines." Yet in all the years since 1920, an entire generation of Americans managed to live with Missouri against Holland, through the most turbulent foreign relations of our history, and until very recently none of them felt at all threatened by it.

The Senator from Ohio, indeed, said on Thursday that he agrees with the result of the decision in Missouri against Holland. But he disagrees with the reasoning by which it was reached. It should have been based, he said, not on the treaty involved but on the commerce clause of the Constitution.

On other occasions, as I recall, the Senator has also pointed to the commerce clause as a means of mitigating some of the consequences which would flow from his amendment.

This is strangely inconsistent, Mr. President. The effect of the amendment would be to restrict the power of the Federal Government to make and implement treaties. But the expansion of the commerce clause which the Senator from Ohio suggests could be far more dangerous to States rights than the expansion of the treaty power which he fears.

There are some, and I know that the Senator from Ohio is not one of them—and I am not either—who hold the view that there is no such thing as intrastate commerce any more, that all commerce is interstate commerce. If that view ever prevails, the 10th amendment and States rights will be as extinct as a dinosaur. But I do not hear anyone advocating a limitation on the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce for that reason.

I do point out, however, that to the extent the Bricker amendment leads to an expansion of the commerce clause, to that extent it will be hastening the complete dominance of the Federal Government over all aspects of our domestic affairs.

Mr. President, I have a few words with reference to executive agreements. I think there is a good deal of misunderstanding regarding executive agreements. They fall into four classes, as we all know. There is a class which comes under the Constitution, which gives the President power to receive ambassadors, and so forth. That is a constitutional provision.

There are executive agreements with respect to which the President must exercise his power as Commander in Chief.

There is a classification according to which the President, under authorization of the Congress, fulfills certain legislative pronouncements.

There is, of course, a fourth class, under which the President, after a treaty is made, must make a number of executive agreements.

When we consider the large field in which the President deals in relation to the affairs of 160 million persons, we begin to understand what we are involved in when we attempt to take some authority from the President and even limit the authority of the Senate and pass some of it over to the other branch of the Congress.

EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

There is also a curious contradiction in the argument of the Senator from Ohio for section 3 of his amendment, which has to do with regulation of executive agreements by Congress.

He said:

The amendment does not say that Congress must regulate or approve all executive agreements; it merely recognizes in Congress power to do so, which may, in fact, never be exercised; if exercised, it must be assumed that Congress will exercise reasonable judgment for the welfare of the country, as it does in all other matters.

Why, then, Mr. President, can it not also be assumed that the Senate will exercise reasonable judgment in regard to treaties? The Senator from Ohio himself said that Congress exercised reasonable judgment "in all other matters," which include treaties. I simply cannot understand what he is afraid of.

Mr. President, the only sure guaranty that there will be no unwise treaties is

to make it impossible to conclude any treaties at all. By making it more difficult to conclude treaties, the Bricker amendment would simply make it more difficult to conclude good treaties as well as bad ones.

The proponents of the amendment make a great point of the provision in article VI of the Constitution that treaties are the supreme law of the land. That same article also says that acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land.

UNWISE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Acts of Congress can be very unwise and still be within the constitutionally delegated powers of Congress. Hundreds of ill-advised bills are introduced every year, and sometimes some of them pass, but I have not heard anyone advocating a constitutional amendment to limit the powers of Congress because of that fact. Yet as soon as an ill-advised treaty is suggested in the United Natons, a great hue and cry goes up that we must amend the Constitution to guard ourselves against it.

So horrendous are the fears conjured up by the proponents of the Bricker amendment that I sometimes get the feeling of being with Alice in Wonderland. Indeed, Mr. President, the other day I read Alice in Wonderland again and got the feeling of being in the United States Senate.

The proponents of the Bricker amendment remind me of the queen in the following passage:

"I can't believe that," said Alice.

"Can't you?" the queen said in a pitying tone. "Try again: draw a long breath, and shut your eyes."

Alice laughed. "There's no use trying," she said: "one can't believe impossible things."

"I daresay you haven't had much practice," said the queen. "When I was your age, I always did it for half an hour a day. Why sometimes I've believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast."

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. President, on last Thursday, after noting some of the inaccurate statements being made by proponents of the Bricker amendment and that they are indirectly attacking the motives and judgment of the President, I asked if the time had not come for us "to look more closely at those who demand that we take the Constitution apart and redistribute its powers." I asked, "What do they really want?"

I got my answer sooner than I expected. That very afternoon the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] made it unmistakably clear that he is not as worried about the Constitution as he is worried about American membership in the United Nations.

He made this statement, and I quote:

A ratified treaty confers on Congress unlimited power to legislate on the subject matter of the treaty. * * * The charter of the United Nations is a ratified and approved treaty. Articles 55 and 56 of that treaty have conferred on Congress the unlimited power to legislate on the subject of civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights.

Well, I am thankful that the courts of this country are not likely to rely on this interpretation of the charter and the authority it allegedly gives to Congress. I certainly could not support the United Nations if it had the effect that the Senator from Nevada fears.

Fortunately we have some other competent people who have expressed themselves on the impact of the United Nations Charter on our Constitution.

Let us take a look at what the report to the President had to say on this point when the charter was before the Senate for approval. Referring to article 55 of the charter, the report noted that this article, and I quote, "pledges the various countries to cooperate with the organization in the achievement of the economic and social objectives of the organization without infringing upon their right to order their national affairs according to their own best ability, in their own way, and in accordance with their own political and economic institutions and processes." Further on, the report notes that the charter "safeguards the right of nations to live their own lives free from unwarranted interference."

Does this sound like the United Nations Charter is a diabolical instrument to turn America over to foreigners, as many supporters of the Bricker amendment claim?

Mr. President, when Secretary of State Stettinius appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to support the United Nations Charter, he said:

The organization * * * is not authorized to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. (See art. 2, par. 7, U. N. Charter.)

Does this sound like supergovernment?

Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Ohio have made much of the case of Sei Fujii against California. The Supreme Court of California in that case made it absolutely clear that it rejected any suggestion that the Charter of the United Nations operates to overthrow domesic law. It approved specifically the language I quoted earlier to the effect that national affairs continue to be controlled in accordance with each nation's own political and economic institutions and processes.

The court added:

We are satisfied that the charter provisions relied on by the plaintiff, were not intended to supersede existing domestic legislation.

Mr. President, what is happening in connection with our discussion of the Bricker amendment is that forces who oppose the United Nations, forces who want America to retire behind an ocean curtain, people who say "get the United States out of the U. N. and the U. N. out of the United States," are drawing together to back the Bricker amendment. They see that device as a way to cripple the United States in the conduct of its foreign affairs. They see it as a device to put the United States in the back seat instead of keeping the United States in a position of world leadership.

Day by day it becomes clearer that we are fighting forces that seek to turn back the clock. The effect of what they want to do would be to surrender the United Nations to the Russians by getting the United States out of the U. N. The senior Senator from Ohio said as long ago as May 1952, "the United Nations seems destined for an early demise—it is suffering from a disease which affects every bureaucracy, an unsatiable lust for power." Mr. President, it is not the United Nations that lusts for power. Rather the Soviet Union in its lust for power seeks in the U. N. and elsewhere to woo the nations of the world away from the paths of freedom.

Well, I have had enough of pulling out of areas where we are face to face with Russia. I am willing to pit our free way of life against the Soviet way of life in the arena of the United Nations. We have not done so badly in daily U. N. debate. Ambassador Lodge is slugging it out with the Russians day after day in the United Nations. Time after time he gets 55 nations to line up with the United States in opposition to Communist proposals put before the U. N. Is this a time for a move that would weaken our leadership in the U. N. and in the world? Is this a time for us to disengage ourselves from the U. N. cold-war arena—leaving a gigantic stage for the Communist tragedy to play before the world?

Ambassador Lodge said recently in New York:

There is not anything in the United Nations Charter that makes it necessary to amend the Constitution.

"The Soviet Union," he said, "has a bear by the tail." It cannot destroy or control the U. N. and it does not dare to leave the U. N.

I do not think the American people will be behind any plan that would directly or indirectly wreck the U. N. That is what some of the Bricker proponents want—but not what the people want. In fact, a recent poll conducted by Mr. Elmo Roper indicates that 35 percent of the American people want to strengthen the U. N. Another 21 percent believe we should work along with the United Nations pretty much as it exists. And another 17 percent want to work toward creating an organization stronger than the present United Nations. In other words, some 73 percent of the American people—and that includes the great Middle West—go along with President Eisenhower in believing that the United States must continue to work with other peoples through existing international organizations or better international organizations.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message had this to say about the United Nations:

It has given uniquely valuable services in many places where violence threatened. It is the only real world forum where we have the opportunity for international presentation and rebuttal. It is the place where the nations of the world can, if they have the will, take collective action for peace and justice. It is a place where guilt can be squarely assigned to those who fail to take all necessary steps to keep the peace.

Mr. President, I do not think the President of the United States would be

a strong supporter of the United Nations if it were as dangerous as many of the Bricker amendment proponents seem to believe it to be. He strongly supports that organization because he believes it serves American interests to participate in it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PROPAGANDA ATTACK BY GUATEMALA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on last Friday, according to the press, the Government of Guatemala launched another vicious propaganda attack upon the United States and some of its citizens. Apparently the Communist-dominated Government of Guatemala is preparing a propaganda background for further confiscation of private American investments and also preparing to launch an all-out effort to destroy the effectiveness of the Inter-American Conference scheduled for March 1.

Mr. President, it is very discouraging that in spite of our efforts to be reasonable and patient with our smaller neighbors to the south, Guatemala should persist in its antagonistic policies. This is especially regrettable in view of the report of the Randall Commission. As everyone knows, I am deeply interested in freer trade among all nations, and as a background for trade I have always favored more investment abroad by private capital. I know that such investment can be mutually beneficial as it has proved to be on so many occasions.

Mr. President, the report of the Randall Commission has underlined very sharply the prominent part which must be played by American foreign investments in extending to other less developed countries the capital outlays, modern machinery, and technical skills that are indispensable for their economic betterment. This goal is truly bipartisan, one on which both major parties are in substantial agreement, as is clearly demonstrated by the fact that various of the programs and measures to stimulate foreign investments set up under the administration of President Truman have been actively aided and pushed under the administration of President Eisenhower.

In this hemisphere, American investors have made significant contributions to the economies of other countries. With courage and foresight they have spurred the development of mineral resources, petroleum deposits, agricultural enterprises, air and surface communications networks, and centers of commercial trading and financial exchange. We believe, on both sides of the aisle, that these investments have been beneficial not only to the American investors, but to an equal, if not larger, degree to the peoples of the countries to the south. But we must recognize that they have had to cope with special problems, ranging from minor discriminations to outright confiscation. If the program so well sponsored to date is to succeed in bringing its solid benefits to other countries, it must enjoy the firm and decisive support of all branches of our Government and all shades of political opinion.

Let there be no doubt that it has such support. We have observed recently the betterment of relations with Argentina, which makes possible the renewed interest of American capital in that country. At the same time, we must observe with real concern the harassment and outright attack on American investments by the Communist-influenced government of Guatemala, which has so unwisely permitted a program of social reform to be dominated by the agents of Moscow, whose primary objective is always the elimination of friendly American private enterprise. Of special interest to me has been the course followed by the government of Costa Rica and the United Fruit Co., the largest American enterprise in that country, in seeking an orderly and agreeable solution for differences between them. I have observed that in the preliminary letters exchanged between Don José Figueres, President of Costa Rica, and the United Fruit Co., both sides have emphasized respect for the sanctity of existing contracts, to which amendments can properly be made only by mutual agreement, while at the same time each recognizes the rights and responsibilities of the other in making such amendments as will eliminate any inequities and misunderstandings between them. This should be a model course for solution of difficulties, and I may say that it should be regarded as the all-American way of doing things, which is the way based on our traditional respect for law and agreement as the very basis of relations between individuals and nations, while at the same time keeping before our minds the wisdom of mutual accommodations to changing needs and conditions. It is the opposite to the method of threat and intimidation which is the characteristic note of totalitarian systems, so unhappily imitated by the government of Guatemala in its dealings with American business, to say nothing of its own private enterprise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an Associated Press dispatch from Guatemala, dated January 29, entitled "United States Denies Backing Plot in Guatemala."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DENIES BACKING PLOT IN GUATEMALA

GUATEMALA, January 29.—Guatemala's presidency charged today that the United States was supporting a plot by four Latin American countries to invade Guatemala.

A statement from the office of President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman said seized documents showed that planes with napalm bombs and infantry with heavy arms were to be used.

It named Nicaragua, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, and Venezuela as the four countries implicated.

Ringleaders of the plot were listed as Gen. Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes and Col. Carlos Castillo Armas, Guatemalan exiles.

The statement said its information came chiefly from intercepted correspondence.

Security officials said early this week that an antigovernment plot had been broken by a number of arrests, but refused further information.

The official statement came less than 24 hours after Victor Manuel Gutierres, Secretary General of Guatemala's pro-Communist General Confederation of Labor, accused the American-owned United Fruit Co. of fostering an armed plot against the Guatemala Government.

United Fruit has constantly been under attack by Arbenz' leftist regime. The company's once large land areas have been reduced greatly through expropriation and redistribution.

The presidential office said one intercepted letter stated that the plans have the acquiescence of the government of the north (United States).

In Washington, a State Department spokesman called the charges ridiculous and untrue. He said the administration, from the moment of President Eisenhower's inaugural address, had made it perfectly clear that we would not intervene in any other nation's internal affairs.

This is additional proof, if proof is needed, of the length to which the international Communist conspiracy will go to break up hemisphere solidarity on the eve of the tenth inter-American conference.

The conference will meet in Caracas, Venezuela, March 1.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish, very briefly, to commend the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for his very fine discussion of the subject matter of the Bricker amendment. The Senator from Illinois has demonstrated on his part an excellent knowledge of many of the major points involved. His address also reflects his close study of the question as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not know that I agree with all his statements, but certainly I heartily agree with some of the very excellent points he has made.

I wish the Senator from Illinois had discussed at greater length the subject of executive agreements, and had told us when an executive agreement leaves the line of being an executive agreement and becomes a treaty. Of course, I understand there is a formality to a treaty, but what is the proper subject matter of a treaty as compared with an executive agreement? I wish the Senator from Illinois had developed a little further his thinking along that line.

At any rate, I believe the Senator from Illinois has rendered a very fine service to the Senate in documenting and presenting specific instances and illustrations of a great number of questions that give deep concern to a number of Members of the Senate and to a great many people in the United States.

After the Senator from Illinois had left the Chamber, while he was not criticized personally, nevertheless some of his points were questioned rather sharply, particularly the expression he used about turning the Constitution over to lunatics.

I do not suppose those expressions were intended to apply to his use of the term, but, at the same time, I believe something should be said to offset it.

I commend the Senator from Illinois sincerely for his excellent address.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am simply curious. I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi would indicate which of the examples cited by the Senator from Illinois really give him concern. It is a matter of interest to me as to which of the various examples cited by the proponents of the amendment really concern the Senator from Mississippi, or which of them really cause him difficulty in sleeping at night.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Senator from Arkansas heard the speech of the Senator from Illinois, did he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I heard a great deal of it. I may say that some of the suggested proposals give me no concern whatsoever, so long as the United States Senate continues to function. I still have faith that at least one-third plus one, if not more—I merely say a minimum of one-third—of the Members of the Senate have sufficient intelligence, I presume, to prevent the ratification of such proposals.

I cannot understand how anyone could have such a low estimate or such a low opinion of the intelligence of the Senate as to be greatly concerned that any of the examples cited by the Senator from Illinois would be adopted as treaties. That is really the point that bothers me. Why should any person suddenly have such a poor opinion of the discriminating intelligence of the Senate of the United States as to be concerned that the various proposals cited as being threats to the United States would be adopted?

I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi really is concerned that the Senate would be foolish enough to ratify treaties containing such proposals.

Mr. STENNIS. Since coming to the Senate, the Senator from Mississippi has been considerably disillusioned by the readiness with which very important, far-reaching treaties glide by the Senate with what I consider to be scant attention. However, I do not wish to enter into a discussion of that subject. I do not propose to discredit the body to which I have the honor to belong. I do not think there is any question of not having faith in any individual Member of the Senate, his integrity, or his intelligence. Neither is it a question of not having faith in any member of the executive branch of the Government, from the President down, or in not having faith in the members of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Thomas Jefferson said:

> On questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

I believe that is a very wise statement, applicable today in this great time of change. When Supreme Court precedents are brushed aside and ignored, as if they were scraps of paper, I think it is time for a reevaluation of a number of our principles.

Unless there were a check on the part of the Senate, at some time there might be an administration which would endeavor to enter into many agreements of the type referred to by the Senator from Illinois.

I hope the Senator from Arkansas will remain in the Senate for a long time, so that he may continue to be the good guardian that he is. I do not wish to extend the debate; I appreciate the fact that it is desired to have the Senate recess. I shall be glad to discuss the matter later with the Senator, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I sought to be recognized primarily for the purpose of commenting on the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I hold the Senator from Mississippi in the highest regard. I know of his sincerity and his great concern for the country. The only time I have ever known of a treaty's going through the Senate without a great deal of discussion was when it came to the Senate floor with a unanimous report from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Knowing that the Committee on Foreign Relations has within its membership some of the most able and distinguished senior Members of the Senate, when a treaty comes to the floor of the Senate with a unanimous agreement from the Committee on Foreign Relations, many of the Senators will accept the action of the committee, and will not raise a question as to what may be contained in the body of the treaty. I have been on the floor of the Senate when a treaty was approved under such circumstances. I merely desire to say that if a treaty was ratified in that manner it was because there was no objection.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator think that is a good practice?

Mr. THYE. No, the Senator from Minnesota does not think that is a good practice, and we have amended the procedure to make certain that a yea-and-nay vote will be taken. However, at the time such action took place, it was on the basis that the Committee on Foreign Relations had unanimously approved the treaty; therefore every Senator was willing to accept it on the recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I wish to comment to this extent so that those who read the RECORD will know that we are not so careless and negligent a legislative body as to permit a treaty to be ratified without raising any question in connection with it. The only reason why I ever acquiesced in action on treaties without ample debate was primarily because of the high regard in which the Committee on Foreign Relations has been held by me.

Both the Senator from Mississippi and I know that a Senator can become a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations only upon application because of seniority. We know that otherwise Senators take lesser assignments.

Mr. STENNIS. I may say for the RECORD that, of course, the Senator from Minnesota knows that I said nothing reflecting in any way upon the membership of the Committee on Foreign Relations; but the fact that the Senator from Minnesota himself suggested a change in the procedure and practice I think bears out my point.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. When the Senator from Kansas addressed the Chair a moment ago, if the Senator from Kansas understood correctly, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], occupying the majority leader's seat, asked for recognition, and the Chair informed the Senator that he had the floor.

Does the Senator from Kansas understand that the Senator from Minnesota, acting as majority leader, had the floor previous to the time the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was addressing the Chair?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, perhaps I can be of assistance to the Senator from Kansas. I had raised a point, and desired to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question, and the Senator from Mississippi desired merely to complete his statement. I was standing on the floor, waiting for the Senator from Mississippi to complete his statement before I interrupted. However, if I interfered with the desire of the Senator from Kansas to get the floor, then I beg his pardon.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection to the Senator from Minnesota's occupying the majority leader's position. However, the Senator from Kansas addressed the Chair, the Chair recognized the Senator from Kansas, and the Senator from Kansas was then informed by the Chair that the Senator from Minnesota had the floor. I desire to apologize if when the Senator from Kansas asked for recognition recognition already had been granted to the Senator from Minnesota. I desire to keep the RECORD straight regarding the rules of the Senate, which are satisfactory to me. I wish to accord my colleagues every courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to advise the Senator from Kansas that the Chair erroneously recognized the Senator from Minnesota, who was in the majority leader's seat, the Chair presuming that the Senator from Minnesota was making a point as the majority leader. Nevertheless, the Senator from Kansas is entirely correct, and the RECORD should show it. The Chair should not have recognized the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I desire to say to the Chair and to the distinguished Senator that I had no objection to the Chair's recognizing the Senator as being the majority leader. However, the Senator from Kansas had thought that he

was on his feet before the Senator occupying the majority leader's seat had risen and had been recognized. I did not want to interrupt if the Chair had previously recognized the Senator from Minnesota as having the right to the floor.

Mr. President, I had desired to make some remarks on the unfinished business, but I realize the hour is late, and I shall defer them until tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. THYE. I move that the Senate now stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 2, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 1 (legislative day of January 22), 1954:

UNITED NATIONS

William A. Kimbel, of South Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America to the ninth session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release I issued yesterday regarding the Bricker amendment.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am opposed to any amendment to the Constitution, including the Bricker amendment and the so-called compromises thus far proposed, which would unduly restrict the President's authority in world affairs without convincing evidence of the need for such an amendment. Amending the Constitution is a serious and complex process, which makes a fundamental change in the legal foundations of this Nation's sovereignty and governmental organization. Such an amendment should be considered only after the precise wording has been thoroughly studied by Congress and our highest legal authorities, and only after the desirability and necessity of such an amendment is clearly demonstrated.

The Constitution of the United States, as it now stands, gives us the following lines of defense against an unwise treaty:

1. The President may refuse to sign it or decline to submit it to the Senate.

2. Its ratification can be prevented by one-third plus one in the Senate.

3. The Senate is empowered to make any reservations relating to any treaty provision.

4. The Senate at the time of approving it may add the qualification that it not be self-executing internally without further implementing legislation.

5. The President in negotiating a treaty, or the Senate in agreeing to its ratification, may provide that such treaty shall be effective only in those States whose existing laws so permit.

6. Once it is ratified, if it is found to have undesirable effects, Congress can modify or eliminate by statute, requiring only a simple majority, its internal operation, or refuse to enact the implementing legislation or appropriations required for its execution.

7. Any President or Members of the Senate who are not faithful to their constitutional oath to uphold the Constitution may be impeached.

8. If the treaty does impair rights provided by the Constitution, the Supreme Court may declare it null and void in whole or in part.

The Supreme Court has consistently held that any treaty which conflicts with the Constitution will be held invalid, and there is no indication whatsoever that the highest Court in the land will ever hold otherwise. In its decision in *The Cherokee Tobacco* case (11 Wall. 616 (1870)), the Court stated:

"It need hardly be said that a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument."

The need for amending the Constitution cannot be shown by pointing to particular treaties, not yet ratified or even submitted for ratification, which rightly or wrongly are said to be objectionable. Nor has the constitutionality of any present or past treaty ever been attacked in the United States Supreme Court. With the constitutional safeguards listed above to protect us, I think it would be unwise to take any hasty or ill-considered action with respect to our basic document of government, and to abandon our trust both in the constitutional and traditional methods which have served us well and in the highest officers of our Government. Even if the constitutional amendment did no more than to restate the constitutional authority already held by the Congress with respect to treaties, it would be unwise to require the exercise of such authority with respect to every treaty and executive agreement, regardless of their nature or significance; and it would be unwise to suggest to the courts that a constitutional amendment was necessary to change the law as it exists today. I have no objection to a congressional resolution restating the understanding of the Senate with respect to the existing law as I have set it forth above; and further insuring that no treaty shall be approved without a rollcall of all Senators.

Moreover, the Congress not only lacks a sufficient demonstration of the need for any constitutional amendment on treatymaking, but it has also been shown the irreparable damage which such an amendment could bring to this Nation's role in world affairs. To permit an individual state to nullify the effect of a treaty, as Senator BRICKER proposes, would virtually abolish the treaty-making power given to the Government under the Constitution, and would prevent this Nation from dealing as a coequal with other foreign powers. To require as a necessary step in all treaties a passage of Federal and State legislation which would be possible in the absence of treaties would prohibit the United States from entering into agreements on many vital international subjects, including the effective control of atomic weapons or disarmament. If every treaty or executive agreement had to meet the multiple tests and procedures set forth in the Bricker amendment and many of the proposed substitutes, the business of the Senate and the Federal Government as a whole would be completely bogged down. There are, for example, thousands of executive agreements concerning our position in NATO alone, most of which have already been authorized by law. To immobilize the President and critically weaken the United States in our conduct of foreign affairs would be ill-advised at this time. It would be unthinking to take such a step unless its proponents thoroughly documented the proof of its necessity. On the basis of all the debates on this issue in and out of Congress, I must say that the necessity for any constitutional amendment of this nature has not been proven.

For these reasons, I am unalterably opposed to any constitutional amendment containing restrictions on our treatymaking power. Few issues which will come before the Senate will have such far-reaching and potentially dangerous implications. When it comes to amending the Constitution we would do well to apply the traditional rule of conservatism as expressed by Viscount Falkland:

"Where it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relating to the recent bill passed in the Senate providing for participation of the United States in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, together with newspaper articles, editorials, and correspondence relating to the same subject.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The resounding victory of St. Lawrence seaway legislation, S. 2150, in the United States Senate has been a source of deepest gratification to the people of our Nation.

The 51-33 vote is a victory which partially climaxes 30 long years of struggle.

Now, this fine initial victory must be consummated in the House of Representatives.

A TRAGEDY UNLESS HOUSE ACTS

If the House were not to approve the bill, its failure would be a tragedy for this Nation.

It would be a tragedy for the Midwest, heartland of America.

It would be a tragedy for Canadian-United States relations.

It would be a tragedy for future generations of Americans whose precious birthright would have been thrown away.

UPHILL BATTLE IN THE HOUSE

I earnestly hope, therefore, that the House Public Works Committee under the able chairmanship of my distinguished friend, Congressman GEORGE DONDERO, of Michigan, will find it possible to take prompt action on this issue and that it will report favorably to the House of Representatives.

I trust that shortly thereafter, the House Rules Committee will approve the Wiley bill and that its action will be concurred in by the House, itself. I know that the fight will be a difficult one in the House. It will be an uphill battle. But win it must.

From all over our country, I have received editorial expressions from leading newspapers on the seaway fight.

WISCONSIN APPLAUDED ACTION

In addition, great numbers of letters and telegrams have come to me from the 48 States and in particular from my own State on this issue.

Many of the kind letters expressed personal congratulations to me for this victory—an objective for which I personally have been working since coming to the Senate back in January 1939.

I am humbly proud and deeply grateful for these personal expressions. I know that they come from the heart of the people of my State—a great State whose economic future will be determined in considerable part by the final outcome of the seaway battle.

I am grateful for the privilege of having served as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when this vital legislation came up, and for having been in a position to redraft the Wiley bill so as to win the final Senate support for which we have fought so long.

I have sent to the desk excerpts from the texts of several of the newspaper editorials, a few of which were forwarded to me prior to the decisive Senate vote, as well as the text of many of the heart-warming letters and wires.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 21, 1954]

SEAWAY NEARS—AFTER 50 YEARS

Senate approval of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, capping more than half a century of study and debate, came finally in recognition of a fact: The seaway is going to be built.

Canada has made that plain and has started work. Our only chance to share in seaway control is to give the project approval now. Speedy House action is needed to help obtain a seaway voice—for Canadian officials are even now doubting whether they any longer want us as seaway partners.

The Senate vote of 51 to 33 gave the seaway a greater margin of victory than anyone would have dared hope for only a few weeks ago. It is a tribute to Senator WILEY. He led the fight and has worked hard at it for several years. It was his compromise bill which attracted several wavering Senators.

* * * * *

The fight in the House still remains to be made. It may be tougher than in the Senate. It will take good leadership. Wisconsin has the right to expect that every one of its 10 House Members will be in the thick of the battle. Senator WILEY has set a fine example for them to follow.

[From the Two Rivers (Wis.) Reporter of January 22, 1954]

SEAWAY SEEMS ASSURED

After almost half a century of indecision, United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway appears certain. The approval voted by the Senate this week, 51 to 33 and a greater margin than even the stanchest supporters hoped for, seems to have launched this country on the joint undertaking with Canada.

However, the House must also give its consent. This body of legislators may provide uncertain opposition. Because the House has never considered the bill, observers are at a loss to predict its chances. The House Public Works Committee will give the measure its first severe test, and then it must get by the Rules Committee, which will decide whether or not the issue will go before the full House.

This community and the rest of Wisconsin, understandably, is happy about the outcome of the proposal in the Senate. The entire State had watched its progress in the upper Chamber, knowing that the fight was being waged almost singlehanded by its senior Senator, ALEXANDER R. WILEY. It was he who, in spite of setbacks and an almost solid wall of opposition from eastern legislators and big business, had forged, link by link, the chain which was to result in favorable action.

Obstacles did not deter him and when the cause seemed about lost WILEY teamed up with Representative DONDERO, of Michigan, on a bill which, as events proved, obtained the support of enough wavering Senators to insure passage by a comfortable margin.

Canadian officials who doubt they want the United States as a partner in the seaway must also be convinced that teamwork on the vast project is not only the best course but in the end will be the most satisfactory. Informants said Canada had already decided to go it alone and now question whether United States participation is necessary.

But of immediate concern is favorable House action. What Senator WILEY has accomplished should be an inspiration to Wisconsin's 10 House Members. They should be able to pick up and carry the ball so that 50 years of preparatory work can be brought to a successful conclusion.

[From the Chicago News of January 25, 1954]

SEAWAY VICTORY

The historic struggle to build the St. Lawrence seaway, which eventually will give inland Chicago and the Middle West easier access to the sea, has taken a mighty step forward.

It passed a major congressional hurdle last Wednesday night when the Senate voted 51 to 33 in favor of United States participation with Canada in the multi-million-dollar project.

It was a dramatic victory for the Eisenhower administration, which managed to effect a surprising switch of sentiment among enemies of the proposal, among them Illinois' own Senator DIRKSEN, Republican.

That it was achieved by a Republican administration was especially fitting. For the original seaway proposal was primarily a Republican policy and project.

The early negotiations were carried on by the Harding and Coolidge administrations, and the seaway treaty itself was negotiated under the Hoover administration. Both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations pressed in vain for its adoption.

Wednesday's victory is especially impressive, since the backers of the seaway had never been able to get it through the Senate before.

Its next test, which we hope will be its final one, will come in the House. Stiff opposition is expected, although the House has several times given its approval in the past.

* * * * *

Over the years the principal opposition to the seaway has come from the Atlantic and Gulf States, where inland bids for port facilities have always been opposed by jealous interests.

Midwestern Senators and Representatives often joined in this opposition under the persuasion of inland commercial interests. These included railroads and major coal and power producers, who protested that the seaway would adversely affect their welfare.

That opposition to the project would dwindle in the face of its world necessity was inevitable.

The impetus which brought about the change in senatorial temper came with the discovery of vast new ore deposits in Labrador, a factor that focused attention on the need for a water pathway to the steel mills of the Great Lakes region.

As we have noted before, the St. Lawrence is a part of the world's longest undefended boundary between two nations. Canadian-United States cooperation in its development would be a significant symbol of the type of friendly cooperation the whole world is seeking.

It is up to the House to bring this unity into being.

[From the Idaho Statesman of January 22, 1954]

SEAWAY APPROVAL

The quick, decisive Senate approval of the St. Lawrence seaway bill was a snapping surprise. Only Wednesday the Republican floor leader, Senator KNOWLAND, had said he hoped for a vote sometime next week. This was the first test of the long-argued proposal in the present Congress, but the last time a test was made in the Senate, about a year and a half ago, the supporters of the seaway project were two votes short of a majority. And now they turn up with a voting strength of almost 2 to 1.

* * * * *

The large margin of approval in the Senate seems to be a significant legislative victory for the Eisenhower administration. Presidents Roosevelt and Truman had both tried repeatedly to get approval of the seaway project, in Congresses overwhelmingly dominated by their own party, with no success at all.

The seaway vote suggests that the Eisenhower administration has unexpected strength in Congress. If similar strength is evident in another test or two, opponents of the President's legislative program will have to revise their thinking.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 22, 1954]

STATESMANSHIP IN A YOUNG SENATOR

JOHN F. KENNEDY is the junior Senator from Massachusetts, now just beginning the second year of his term. He is also the youngest Member of the Senate. Yet he not only showed himself * * * a statesman on the St. Lawrence seaway vote * * *; he stood up above many Members who are in their second or even third terms. Because Senator KENNEDY was not only on the winning but the right side, we reprint in today's Mirror of Public Opinion extracts from his splendid address in the Senate explaining why he was breaking with the traditional prejudice of Massachusetts political figures against the seaway. The young Senator's words have the mark of statesmanship on them. Many of his elders ought to think over what he said.

[From the Benton Harbor (Mich.) News-Palladium of January 16, 1954]

DO WE WANT A CANADIAN SEAWAY?

If Congress again fails to enact legislation providing for the St. Lawrence seaway, jointly built and operated by the United States and Canada, it will be the first time that this country has voluntarily relinquished control over a waterway so vital to the Nation's security, defense, and prosperity.

This is in the words of a bulletin issued by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, "a vital and strategic waterway that leads

directly to the heart of the United States. No nation has ever voluntarily forfeited control over a major waterway. Witness the Dardanelles, Suez, and Panama, because control of such a waterway means control over commerce, a major bargaining point in international relations."

The waterway will be built, regardless of congressional action, for the simple reason that Canada is going ahead with the project, in conjunction with the State of New York, regardless of United States participation.

The issue now before Congress is the seaway and not government construction of power dams. If the waterway is Canadian, it will mean that a foreign power, even though friendly, will exercise exclusive jurisdiction and control over all future foreign shipping entering and leaving the Great Lakes. And in the event of a capacity operation, Canada would have control over priorities on seaway use for various ships and cargoes.

The funds that go into the seaway are an investment in an income-producing asset and will pay its own operational and maintenance costs. It may be true that the seaway would be unused for intervals in winter, but these would be, we believe, offset by the volume of traffic during the lengthening navigation season.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen of January 22, 1954]

WE SHOULD HELP WITH ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

It took more than 20 years for the Senate to approve American participation in construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. Perhaps it would not have done so this time if it were not for the imposing fact that the seaway would be built anyway. Canada has declared it will go it alone if necessary. Some Senators who might have preferred that it not be built felt apparently that the United States should have a voice in its operation.

* * * * *

If the seaway benefits our Middle West as much as its proponents say it will, our railroads and our seaport cities will share, as well as will the whole Nation, in the added prosperity. To take the optimistic view, these seaway opponents may obtain more business as an indirect result of the seaway than they will lose in the short run.

* * * * *

In approving American participation in the seaway, the Senate made a difficult decision. We believe it was the right one, and hope the House of Representatives will concur.

[From the New York Times of January 27, 1954]

CANADA AND THE SEAWAY

Now that the House of Representatives is about to take up the Wiley-Dondero bill for American participation in the St. Lawrence seaway a great deal is suddenly being made of the fact that the Canadians are willing to go it alone and build the seaway without our help. Canada's attitude is being treated as if it were something new, whereas the Canadian House of Commons voted more than 2 years ago that if the United States continued its refusal to take part Canada could and would construct the seaway without us.

The point that is being overlooked by these new arguers is that it is to the advantage of the United States to take part and that it will be better for both countries on the score of security and engineering, as well as neighborly relations, to make it a joint undertaking. When Lionel Chevrier, Minister of Transport, opened the debate in Parliament on December 4, 1951, that led to the Canadian decision he made the point several times that "We would prefer to have full United States participation in the project under the terms of the 1941 agreement, perhaps with some modification along lines already discussed in Congress, provided the agreement is approved at an early date."

These lines are embodied in the Wiley-Dondero bill and Senator WILEY, long an advocate of the seaway, has always been convinced they are acceptable to the Canadians. In fact, the official position of the Canadian Government is that Ottawa will welcome United States participation in the seaway providing that the American proposals do not entail any serious delay.

Naturally, Canadian public opinion has ben reconciling itself to the thought of building the seaway alone. Canadians are only human, and the idea of showing their big and sometimes annoying brother to the south that they have come of age and do not need help is attractive. All the same, a joint undertaking would be better for them, too. For one thing, it will save at least $35 million to build canals on the American side of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River instead of building them all on the Canadian side.

The seaway is a great continental project reaching into the heart of both our countries, and it should be developed jointly. Here is a combination, probably unique in the world, of large reserves of power, cheap transportation, and vast material resources—along and on both sides of the border. For the United States to let Canada expolit this opportunity alone is not sensible.

[From the Indianapolis News of January 16, 1954]

OPEN THE ST. LAWRENCE TO INDIANA

Joint United States-Canadian participation in a St. Lawrence waterway is definitely in our national interest. And it is especially in the interest of the Great Lakes States, of which Indiana is one.

* * * * *

This is the critical year for settling the St. Lawrence question once and for all, and affirmatively. If we don't participate, Canada will build the waterway anyhow. Then our shipping will be using it, and we still will have no voice in its control, or revenue from the tolls.

Once opponents had a valid argument against a Federal electric power monopoly in connection with the project. That has been taken clear out of the picture. The Federal Power Commission has granted the New York State Power Authority permission to construct the American portion of the hydroelectric project. It will be leased to private companies.

Once opponents said our Government should not spend the money to build the dams and deepen the channels. That has been taken care of in the Wiley bill in the Senate. The waterway would be financed by bonds—made as self-liquidating as a toll road. Not a cent would come out of the Federal Treasury.

Once opponents said the waterway would not serve the national defense. The National Security Council has gone on record to the contrary.

Once opponents said the waterway was not economically sound. The members of the Eisenhower Cabinet are unanimous in favoring it for its obvious economic benefits.

Once Indiana agricultural and industrial interests were lukewarm about the project. Now they have reversed themselves. They see this State's producers benefiting enormously through use of a lakes-to-ocean shipping route of which this State would be an important terminus.

They see Labrador iron ore brought to our Calumet region to be smelted into steel. They see our farm products moving to export markets at much more reasonable rates than now.

President Eisenhower has stated that "the ways and means for assuring American cooperation in this great project should be authorized and approved during this session of Congress."

With this we heartily agree.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of January 17, 1954]

ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

The St. Lawrence seaway project once more occupies the attention of the United States Senate. For more than two decades a heated topic for Congress, the project once more is being debated. This time there is a new angle, however. It is not whether or not the seaway should be constructed, but whether or not this country should share in that construction.

For Canada has announced that she is going ahead with the project to link the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean, with or without American participation as a partner.

This introduces a new element into this debate. The question now arises as to whether or not this country can afford not to participate in the St. Lawrence project.

There is a point where sectional interests must give way to national interests. The opposition to this project has come in the main from east coast and Gulf States, who feel their own commerce would suffer from the project.

The late Henry J. Allen of Wichita, former Kansas governor and United States Senator, was long one of the prime backers for the project. He saw, years ago, the advantages to the United States as a whole from such a project, and he devoted much time and energy in the fight to bring the advantages of such a joint project to the attention of the country.

The legitimate needs and aspirations of all of the States are tied up in the project, and the time for sectional considerations is passing. The times have changed, and with that change come new problems and new technical advances. These must be faced up to, not arbitrarily pushed aside.

For to adopt the latter course would be to penalize our own future. This was the courageous attitude of Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, who this week alined himself with the proponents of the seaway project.

Senator KENNEDY thus became the first legislator from his State to break away from Massachusetts' traditional opposition to the seaway. His action might well have been the move that will assure passage of the measure to make this country and Canada partners in the project.

Our own Kansas Senators should weigh carefully the move by Senator KENNEDY and his reasons for taking that step. So should those other Senators who might be inclined to feel that inland States need give the matter little consideration.

CIO MARITIME COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Improving a waterway which nourishes the industrial hearts of two free nations is a project which would stimulate the United States. In the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project, working men and women—particularly the Middle West and New England—have a vital stake.

The undertaking of the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway is a great opportunity to increase the prosperity of industry and agriculture in the Middle West. Also, it will provide the necessary stimulant required by New England's declining economy. Here lies the opportunity to realize great dollars-and-cents savings on transportation costs between the Middle West and the Atlantic seaboard and on low-cost electric power in the Northeast, where presently it is expensive.

During World War II many moderate-sized merchant and naval ships were built on the Great Lakes and floated down the Mississippi River on pontoons. This was expensive, time consuming, and limited. A St. Lawrence seaway with a 27-foot channel would permit us to decentralize our shipbuilding industry by constructing seagoing ships on the Great Lakes. These shipyards would afford us greater security because they would be located 1,000 to 1,500 miles from the coasts.

During World War II, German submarines were successful in sinking many of our ships off our immediate shores. Some of the ships they sank were ore-carriers which carried ore from South America to our coastal seaports. The St. Lawrence seaway would provide a secure passageway for the transportation of iron ore from Labrador to the United States. This would mean a saving of ships, valuable cargo, and the lives of our seamen.

The seamen belonging to the maritime unions affiliated with the CIO respectfully urge you to vote in favor of constructing the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Very truly yours,

HOYT S. HADDOCK,
Executive Secretary.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 21, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Senate passage of seaway bill is testimonial to your able and vigorous leadership. State of Wisconsin and entire Nation owe a debt of gratitude to you and your colleagues of all parties for a monumental farseeing action in the national interests. Our warmest thanks and congratulations.

HARRY C. BROCKEL,
Governor's Seaway Committee, Wisconsin Deep Waterways Commission, Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners.

BOGUE & SANDERSON,
Portage, Wis., January 21, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND WILEY: We want to congratulate you on your excellent work in attaining the progress as of this date in the deep-sea project. Keep up the good work.

This, I believe, is one of the greatest issues that America has for security and economic development, especially for the good of the Midwest.

With best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

T. H. SANDERSON.

HILLCREST SCHOOL,
Beaver Dam, Wis., January 20, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to congratulate you for your hard work in getting the St. Lawrence seaway through the Senate.

I never thought that you would be able to make it, but your tireless and persistent efforts put it over.

Many thanks to you.

Yours very truly,

A. K. DAVESON.

WISCONSIN MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.,
Madison, Wis., January 21, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER M. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: My hearty congratulations on the success of your efforts to obtain Senate approval of the St. Lawrence seaway. Everyone in Wisconsin joins me in hoping for early affirmative action by the House.

Sincerely,

D. C. LYNN,
Secretary.

MENOMONIE, WIS., *January 21, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just received your weekly newsletter and note the opening sentence where you state that "our hopes have never been higher," and I wish to congratulate you upon your successful campaign in the Senate to have the bill passed there yesterday. You certainly are deserving of a great deal of credit for the way this has been handled. Certainly hope now that the House will go along with the bill.

With regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

G. E. SIPPLE.

MARINETTE, WIS., *January 22, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator, Wisconsin,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my congratulations on your initial victory on the St. Lawrence seaway. More power to you as the legislation moves to final vote.

Very truly yours,

JAMES E. DUNN,
President.

PROSPECT HALL,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 25, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: My congratulations on the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill. I well know how much credit for its passage belongs to your many years of diligent efforts.

We shall follow your advice and write to our Congressman, hoping that the House will also pass this important measure.

Respectfully,

ELIZABETH S. DODGE,
President.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, January 22, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, for the varied tapestry of beauty which the changing seasons unfold, for the glories of day and night, summer and winter, seedtime and harvest, we lift our grateful hearts to Thee. As all that we see and feel on the earth and in all the spinning spheres of Thy creation exists only as it obeys Thy mandates, so may our wills be bent to Thy control, for only in Thy will is our peace. May our deepest concern be not to claim that Thou art on our side, but that we are on Thy side and moving in the direction of Thy kingdom's majestic purpose for all mankind.

Deliver us this day, we pray, from irreverence in the presence of the holy, from any betrayal of Thy truth as it is revealed to us, from all motives that poison our integrity, from all postures which are unreal and insincere. In the voicing of our convictions save us from harboring malice or resentment, and let not the sun go down upon our wrath. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 1, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HORAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. TABER, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. MARSHALL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION TODAY OF SENATE RESOLUTION 189

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I may announce, for the information of the Senate, that following the transaction of routine business, in accordance with the prior notice I have given to the Senate, I hope to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 880, Senate Resolution 189, providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations. We had agreed that that resolution should go over until today.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1954.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF OPERATION OF RENTAL HOUSING UNITS

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of rental housing units provided by departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government, as of November 1, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL ON LAW ENFORCEMENT

A letter from the Chairman, Council of Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Council, dated February 1, 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON BUREAU OF MINES ANTHRACITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the Bureau of Mines Anthracite Research Laboratory, Schuylkill Haven, Pa., for the calendar year 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be benefited initially within the exterior boundaries of the Kansas-Bostwick Irrigation District, Bostwick Division, Missouri River Basin Project, Kansas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the period January 1 to December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE, UNITED STATES COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year 1953, including reports of the annual and special meetings of the Judicial Conference of the United States held in 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INVESTIGATION OF ANNEXATION OF LITHUANIA BY SOVIET UNION—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to an investigation of the annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on Feb. 1, 1954, pages 1040–1041, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

VETERANS' BENEFITS—RESOLUTION OF ELLINGSON-BRENDEN POST 376, THE AMERICAN LEGION, ROTHSAY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Ellingson-Brenden Post 376 of the American Legion at Rothsay, Minn., on January 18, 1954, concerning veterans' benefits, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas during the past several months veterans' benefits have been seriously curtailed and limited by administrative action of the Veterans' Administration, Civil Service Commission, and by Federal legislation; and

Whereas such curtailment of benefits does and will work serious hardship on veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korean veterans unless such benefits are immediately and fully restored; and

Whereas these benefits which have been curtailed are principally the following:

1. Hospitalization: By the requirement of the filing of a financial statement (in effect a pauper's oath) with every application by a veteran for hospitalization in a veterans' hospital except in so-called service-connected cases.

2. Dental treatment: By the elimination of the 1-year presumption as to dental defects and granting of treatment only on a one-time basis.

3. Veterans' preference: By the elimination of the five points granted to veterans in Civil Service examinations, except for those attaining passing grades.

4. Institutional on-the-farm training subsistence: By the periodical reduction in subsistence allowance for Korean veterans taking on-the-farm training: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Ellingson-Brenden Post No. 376 of Rothsay at a regular meeting duly convened on the 18th day of January 1954, That this veterans' organization record its disapproval and indicate its grave concern in the curtailment of these benefits for veterans and register its protest in such curtailments and by this resolution petition the Congressmen representing the veterans of this organization to commence immediate action and institute the necessary legislation to reinstate these benefits which have been curtailed and which are and will work a serious and grave hardship on the veterans who should receive these benefits; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution signed by the commander of this organization and attested by its adjutant be forwarded to the Representative and Senators of the State and district wherein this post is located to apprize them of our concern and interest in this regard and for the purpose of receiving from such Representatives and Senators an answer as to the position they now take or intend to take in restoring these benefits to the veterans.

Dated January 25, 1954.

GERALD HAUGEN,
Commander.

Attested:

ELROY JURGENSON,
Adjutant.

AGREEMENT PERMITTING CANADIAN BOATS TO OPERATE BETWEEN AMERICAN PORTS—LETTER FROM FEDERATED TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY, DULUTH, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Federated Trades and Labor Assembly of Duluth, Minn., concerning the agreement permitting Canadian boats to carry ore and other commodities between American ports, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERATED TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY,
Duluth, Minn., January 24, 1954.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The delegates to the Duluth Federated Trades and Labor Assembly on Friday, January 22, 1954, instructed me to write requesting that the agreement with Canada permitting Canadian boats to carry ore and other commodities between American ports be rescinded.

This agreement was entered into as a wartime measure and labor at the head of the lakes made no objections so long as the war was still going on.

However since the Second World War American shipping companies on the lakes have added a number of 700 foot and longer carriers to their fleets. These vessels hauled over 90 million tons of ore in the 1953 season and some boats started laying up in September and the main part of all fleets laid up early in November although the weather was perfect for shipping into the latter part of December. This cut down the earnings of our American seamen considerably.

In the meantime Canadian boats whose seamen are paid less than half the wage of American seamen carried a large tonnage of iron ore between our American ports thus cut into the earning of our seamen.

We feel that with the added tonnage of the Great Lakes fleet American shipping can handle all the tonnage necessary for the lower lake ports thus giving our seamen a longer season.

Will you please contact the proper officials and see what can be done to cancel this agreement.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK T. MCCAULEY,
Recording Secretary.

EXEMPTION OF AMUSEMENT TAX—RESOLUTION OF STATE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY, MINNESOTA STATE FAIR, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the State Agricultural Society, Minnesota State Fair, St. Paul, Minn., on January 13, 1954, concerning exemption of the amusement tax, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY,
MINNESOTA STATE FAIR,
St. Paul, Minn., January 26, 1954.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: As you know, prior to World War II, based upon their educational function, agricultural fairs were granted an exemption of the amusement tax at the outside gates and for grandstand performances staged for the benefit of the fair.

When the exemption was restored, the entire exemption was not activated and was limited to the outside gates.

The rulings of the Internal Revenue Department have not been uniform in various sections with reference to the grandstand. The International Association of Fairs and Expositions representing more than 3,000 agricultural fairs will seek to have this clarified at this session. Any advice, counsel, or assistance that you can give in this matter will be appreciated by the thousands of volunteer workers in the fairs of Minnesota, as evidenced by the following resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the State Agricultural Society.

"Be it resolved by the Minnesota State Agricultural Society (Minnesota State Fair) in annual meeting assembled this 13th day of January 1954, That thanks be extended to the Members of Congress who passed the legislation granting exemption from tax on admissions to the outside gates of agricultural fairs, in accordance with the program presented by the International Association of Fairs and Expositions; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge upon all Members of Congress to give favorable consideration to the request of the International Association of Fairs and Expositions calling for restoration of the former tax exemption on admissions to grandstand performances, staged by agricultural fairs for the sole benefit of extending their educational programs."

Sincerely,

D. K. BALDWIN,
Secretary.

EXTENSION OF PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF MARSHALL (MINN.) FARMERS UNION LOCAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Marshall Farmers Union Local, Marshall, Minn., concerning public power and in support of extending the present price-support program for at least 2 years, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF MARSHALL FARMERS UNION LOCAL, MARSHALL, MINN., JANUARY 14, 1954

I. POWER

Whereas the Federal Government has built and is building power dams with Government funds; and

Whereas electric cooperatives (REA) and municipalities need the use of this power: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Marshall Farmers Union local go on record urging the Federal Government to make the power available to the REA cooperatives and the municipalities to fill their requirements as needed.

II. PRICE SUPPORTS

Whereas the national economy is primarily dependent on agricultural prosperity—channeled through the small-town merchant and businessman and through the city wholesalers and manufacturers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Marshall Farmers Union local go on record urging Congress to extend the present price-support program for at least 2 years; that meanwhile its committees be directed to develop a program of permanent farm legislation which will convert into actuality the many promises and pledges looking to the realization of full parity prices and incomes to producers.

VICTOR E. SCHILLING,
President.

ROBERT A. PEHRSON,
Secretary.

ROY W. HERRING,
Legislative Director.

DISCONTINUANCE OF CERTAIN RAILROAD SERVICES—LETTER FROM MINNESOTA RAILROAD AND WAREHOUSE COMMISSION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission, of St. Paul, Minn., opposing Senate bill 281, relating to discontinuance of certain railroad services, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA RAILROAD AND
WAREHOUSE COMMISSION,
St. Paul, January 21, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: On February 4, 1953, this commission requested the cooperation of the entire Minnesota delegation to oppose Senate bill 281, which, if enacted, would apparently authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to take jurisdiction over the abandonment of passenger trains and station services.

It is the understanding of the Commission that this bill failed of passage in the last session and that the same bill is now on the calendar for a final vote by the Senate.

We are still of the opinion that the enactment of this bill will be detrimental to the best interests of the people of the State of Minnesota and would be a further encroachment on State rights. In Minnesota all parties who may be adversely affected by a decision of this commission have the right of appeal to the district court and so are amply protected under our State law.

We trust that you will vote against this bill when it is brought up for a final vote.

Very truly yours,

CLIFFORD C. PETERSON.
EWALD W. LUND.
PAUL A. RASMUSSEN.
OLIVER A. OSSANNA,
Secretary.

REVISION OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA BRANCH, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF AMERICAN PEN WOMEN, INC.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Minnesota branch of the National League of American Pen Women, Inc., concerning revision of the Internal Revenue Code, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF
AMERICAN PEN WOMEN, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., January 21, 1954.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senator from Minnesota,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: The Minnesota branch of the National League of American Pen Women calls your attention to the following resolution adopted by the national board of directors:

"Whereas the income-tax law in the main provides for taxation of steadily recurring income, such as dividends, interest, wages, etc.; and

"Whereas creative workers may in 1 year attain a success out of all proportion to their usual income, thus being subject to an increased rate of taxation out of all proportion to the tax rates; and

"Whereas the Western Writers of America, whose chairman is Mr. Noel M. Loomis, have proposed a plan of taxation for such cases, viz.: to substitute for section 107 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, a provision which would allow a professional person, whose writing income from a single book exceeds $10,000 in any year, to defer payment of income tax on so much of the income of that one book, as exceeds his regular income, to invest such excess in an annuity or savings account and report in later years the income from the deferred yield, and so much of the principal as is used—all of this subject to the Bureau of Internal Revenue check.

"Resolved, That the National League of American Pen Women endorse the plan proposed by Mr. Noel M. Loomis, on behalf of the Western Writers of America, and urge its extension to all creative workers, in the revision of the Internal Revenue Code.

"Respectfully submitted.

"ANNA KELTON WILEY,
"Chairman, Legislation, NLAPW."

The Minnesota branch wishes to advise you that its own board of directors has endorsed this action of the national board, and take this means to urge its earnest consideration.

Sincerely yours,

MINNESOTA BRANCH, NLAPW,
INGEBORG STOLEE,
Corresponding Secretary.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX ON FUTURE ISSUES OF MUNICIPAL OR STATE BONDS—RESOLUTION OF ST. PAUL, MINN., CITY COUNCIL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolu-

tion adopted by the St. Paul City Council on January 26 in opposition to any legislation which would impose Federal income taxes on the income from future issues of municipal or State bonds be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers has reported that the Ways and Means Committee of the National House of Representatives has under consideration an amendment to the general revenue revision bill of 1954, which amendment would impose Federal income taxes on the interest received from future issues of municipal housing authority bonds and upon interest received from bonds issued by States or municipalities for industrial development purposes; and

Whereas such action would be merely another attempt to insert an opening wedge in the long-attempted effort by certain groups to destroy the constitutional tax immunity of State and municipal bonds, thus requiring States and municipalities to pay a much higher rate of interest upon such bonds, with resultant financial difficulties, particularly for the units of government on the municipal level: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of St. Paul., Minn., hereby voices its vehement objection to such legislation, and the city clerk is hereby directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the United States Senators from Minnesota and to all United States Representatives of the State of Minnesota and to the President of the United States.

Adopted by the council January 26, 1954.
Approved January 26, 1954.

JOHN E. DAUBNEY,
Mayor.

PER CAPITA PAYMENT TO INDIANS—RESOLUTION OF GENERAL COUNCIL, RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS, RED LAKE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the general council of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, Red Lake, Minn., requesting the enactment of the so-called per capita payment bill, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

Resolution No. 9

Whereas, under date of February 15, 1953, a request was made by the general council that a $50 payment be made to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, resolution No. 1, Serial No. 716; and

Whereas bills were introduced in the last session of Congress by Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN for the payment of $50 to each member of the Red Lake Band; and

Whereas the chiefs believe they are entitled to be granted any request pertaining to their own funds on deposit with the Treasurer of the United States for the welfare of the Red Lake Band: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the council requests the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Congress of the United States to approve the $50 per capita distribution of the timber fund belonging to the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians for the relief and benefit of the individual members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians as follows:

1. The majority of the Red Lake workers are woods workers, and it will be impossible for them to work through the spring breakup which usually lasts for a period of 30 to 60 days.

2. Funds are needed to buy seed, prepare for the planting season and for purchase of commercial fishing equipment.

3. Tribal relief funds will be saved if said period of critical unemployment can be alleviated by this payment.

4. The snow is deep in the woods, and this causes extra hardship among the Indians; it is further

Resolved, That the general council requests enactment of the per capita pay-bill in order to relieve unnecessary distress among the Indians.

Unanimously requested.

We, the undersigned, do hereby certify this to be an exact copy of Resolution No. 9, in council proceedings dated January 17, 1954.

JOSEPH GRAVES, *Chairman.*
[SEAL] PETER GRAVES, *Secretary.*
RED LAKE, MINN., *January 25, 1954.*

CONTROL OF SOIL EROSION—RESOLUTION OF EAST FILLMORE SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT, PRESTON, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the East Fillmore Soil Conservation District of Preston, Minn., concerning the control of soil erosion, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF EAST FILLMORE SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT, PRESTON, MINN.

Whereas control of soil erosion and reduction of runoff can be only partially controlled by individual farmers applying conservation measures to their land because other problems such as gully erosion, streambank erosion, silting of public roads, flood damage to bridges, streams, bottomland, and towns, and similar difficulties require attention to all the land and community problems of a drainage area: Be it

Resolved, That these problems that are common to all parts of southeastern Minnesota and the rest of the Nation be solved on a watershed basis and that, because of the public nature of much of this work in reducing flood damage, Federal funds be provided to assist in applying watershed protection programs.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—RESOLUTION OF FEDERATED TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY, DULUTH, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Federated Trades and Labor Assembly of Duluth, Minn., in opposition to the Bricker amendment, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERATED TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY,
Duluth, Minn., January 25, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Duluth Federated Trades and Labor Assembly at its regular meeting on Friday, January 22, 1954, took unanimous action opposing the Bricker amendment requiring congressional approval of all treaties and agreements.

The delegates are of the opinion that passage of this amendment would tie the President's hands completely.

We ask that you oppose this amendment and do all in your power to help defeat it.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK T. MCCAULEY,
Recording Secretary.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—RESOLUTION OF TEAMSTERS JOINT COUNCIL NO. 32, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution in opposition to the Bricker amendment, adopted by the Teamsters Joint Council No. 32, Minneapolis, Minn., be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF TEAMSTERS JOINT COUNCIL NO. 32, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., IN OPPOSITION TO BRICKER AMENDMENT

Whereas the Constitution of the United States outlines the powers and responsibilities of the President among which is the power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties with foreign countries in behalf of the United States; and

Whereas a campaign by isolationist forces in Congress threatens to pass the so-called Bricker amendment limiting the treatymaking powers of the President of the United States; and

Whereas limitation of the President's powers to make treaties would seriously handicap the administration in whatever efforts it may take in maintaining a solid coalition of Democratic nations against communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Teamsters Joint Council No. 32 express its wholehearted opposition to the Bricker amendment, and commend President Eisenhower for his forthright stand in this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the two Minnesota Senators and the press.

REPEAL OF TAX ON FURS—LETTER FROM CONRAD'S, LA CROSSE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the most difficult decisions we face in this session of the Congress is how far we can go in lessening the tax burden.

I am hoping that necessary economies in Government operations will permit us to achieve a number of tax reductions this year, especially in excise taxes that threaten to put certain industries out of business.

In this connection, I believe my colleagues will be interested in a letter I received this week from a Wisconsin firm

of manufacturing furriers, urging repeal of the 20-percent tax on furs. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LA CROSSE, WIS., *January 28, 1954.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The fur industry is on the brink of disaster as a result of the discriminatory 20 percent fur excise tax.

A few of the facts and figures that testify to this dismal picture follows:

Since 1943 the disposable personal income in the United States has more than doubled. During that same period fur sales have decreased by more than 50 percent.

While all other manufacturing in the United States has shown a continual, healthy rise in employment, the fur industry has shown a steady decline. Whereas American industry as a whole now employs about 60 percent more people than in 1940, fur manufacturers employ about 60 percent fewer people than in 1940.

Between 1948 and 1952 the fur industry recorded 731 insolvencies with a total liability in excess of $39 million.

It is significant that the National Retail Dry Goods Association speaking for America's leading and largest retailers last week stated that although it favors continuation of current excise taxes, it singled out for exception only the tax on furs. According to the NRDGA, the 20 percent Federal excise tax on furs has "almost destroyed the trade."

That is why they propose that the 20 percent tax on furs be repealed. NRDGA feels so strongly in favor of repeal of the fur tax that they are obviously prepared to continue to suffer the burden of excise taxes on other items inasmuch as they realize that only the fur industry is on the verge of ruination and requires repeal of the 20 percent excise tax.

Over the past few years the fur industry has consistently yielded a smaller revenue to the Government from excise tax than any other industry because of the depressive effect it has had upon it. During the same period Government revenue from personal and corporate income tax in the fur industry has been equally inconsequential. 1953 registered an all-time low in fur excise tax yield.

The fur excise tax is discriminatory. It works to the special detriment of furs because the existing discriminatory law has made for the consumer an alternative—namely, lavishly fur-trimmed cloth coats which are free of excise tax. Such is not the case with any other products on which an excise tax has been imposed. A woman cannot turn from cosmetics, jewelry, or luggage to "something else" and thereby avoid the tax.

It is crystal clear whether it be from the angle of economics, business morality, political judiciousness or fiscal advantage, the Government should relieve the fur industry by repealing the discriminatory fur excise tax since the yield is microscopic. By retaining the tax the Government will court the responsibility of erasing America's oldest industry from the business scene.

I hope you will use all your influence possible to repeal the discriminatory 20 percent excise tax. The fur industry in the whole will be thankful.

Yours very truly,

CONRAD FURS,
FRITZ K. KESSELRING.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—RESOLUTION OF INDIANA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Indiana Council of Churches which is in opposition to the Bricker amendment.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRICKER AMENDMENT

Whereas there are before our Congress proposals (S. J. Res. 1, S. J. Res. 43, H. J. Res. 376, and H. J. Res. 390) which would basically alter the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; and

Whereas the net effect on treaties of these proposals would be to seriously limit our ability as a nation to cooperate with other nations of the world in increasing international trade, in arriving at common agreements with regard to navigation, extradition, collection of foreign duties, etc., in arriving at the implementing common agreements regarding mutual disarmaments, in improving world health and international economic conditions, and in general in taking our place cooperatively in the family of nations; and

Whereas the President and Secretary of State have clearly indicated their opposition to such resolution, indicating that it will make responsible participation in international affairs difficult, if not impossible; and

Whereas Christian people must recognize their responsibility to do all within their power to increase the possibility of cooperation and mutual participation among nations as a basis for the development of a true sense of community among the peoples of the world upon which alone may be based a just and durable peace; and

Whereas representatives of the Protestant churches meeting at Cleveland, Ohio, October 27–30, 1953, to study Christian faith and international responsibility have clearly stated their conviction on this matter as follows:

"The principle of cooperation and mutual concern implicit in the moral order and essential to a just and durable peace calls for a true community of nations. The United States can best insure its own peace and security by strengthening, and not weakening, the processes by which our Nation exercises its rightful influence within the family of nations.

"The power of our Government to negotiate treaties and to make executive agreements should be so maintained as to insure (a) that the United States will not be hampered in taking expeditious and effective action in fulfilling our responsibility as a member of the world community of nations, and (b) that the United States should be in a position to make its full contribution to the continuing development of international law and to bring international relations into greater harmony with the moral law. Convinced that adequate safeguards respecting the making of treaties and executive agreements are already provided, we express our opposition to any constitutional amendment which would hamper our Government in carrying forward and making effective a responsible foreign policy"; Therefore be it

Resolved

1. That the Indiana Council of Churches express to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to the Senators sponsoring the resolution, and to our Indiana Senators our conviction that such legislation would not only be inappropriate and useless, but actually dangerous to the welfare of the country and the position of the world and out of harmony with the fundamental religious concepts common to the people of our Nation.

2. That we urge the churches of our State to study this proposed legislation in the light of the influence which gave rise to it, and in view of the concern of the churches to encourage these political, economic, and social arrangements which may provide for a peaceful and just world order. We urge further that the churches then take action to register their convictions in the appropriate offices of our Nation.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—RESOLUTIONS OF BOSTON, MASS., AND DELAWARE STATE BAR ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received expressions from two additional bar associations opposing the Bricker amendment.

These add to the many other bar groups which have already expressed themselves strongly against Senate Joint Resolution 1.

The two latest such groups are the Delaware State Bar Association and the Boston Bar Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the messages which have come to me from officers of both groups be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILMINGTON, DEL.,
January 28, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Office Building:

The following resolutions were adopted today by the Delaware State Bar Association:

"*Resolved*, That the Delaware State Bar Association expresses disapproval of Senate Joint Resolution 1, as reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on June 15, 1953; and it is further

"*Resolved*, That this association recommends that the amendment as reported be resubmitted to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and it is further

"*Resolved*, That the president of this association is instructed to send copies of this resolution to Delaware's United States Senators JOHN J. WILLIAMS and J. ALLEN FREAR, and Delaware's United States Representative at Large HERBERT B. WARBURTON, and the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee."

WILLIAM H. FOULK,
President, Delaware State Bar Association.

BOSTON BAR ASSOCIATION,
January 27, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This letter is to bring to your attention a unanimous vote of the council of the Boston Bar Association at a meeting held January 26, 1954, which reads as follows:

"Voted: That the council of the Boston Bar Association be recorded as opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 1, known as the Bricker amendment, and that this opposition be made manifest to the two Senators from Massachusetts and to the Members of the House from Massachusetts."

The subject matter of the Bricker amendment was referred to a special committee of

the association. After hearing both sides, the committee reported to the council 4 to 2 against the proposed amendment at a special meeting which was held yesterday. The meeting was attended by 21 members, substantially over a majority. The unanimous vote in opposition to the amendment was taken following the report from the committee and a discussion of the subject.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD BANCROFT.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; without amendment:

H. R. 2839. A bill to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands (Rept. No. 924); and

H. R. 2885. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle (Rept. No. 925).

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H. R. 4030. A bill to repeal section 4 of the act of March 2, 1934, creating the Model Housing Board of Puerto Rico (Rept. No. 926).

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H. R. 2846. A bill authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress (Rept. No. 927).

NOMINATION OF ALBERT CUMMINS BEESON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], as in executive session, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a report on the nomination of Albert Cummins Beeson, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board. I have previously discussed the subject with the minority leader. As Senators will recall, yesterday the Senate gave permission for the minority members of the committee to submit their views. This is the report of the committee, which I desire to have made available to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the report will be received and printed.

The report submitted by Mr. KNOWLAND (for Mr. SMITH of New Jersey), was ordered to be printed as Executive Report No. 3.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2863. A bill to amend section 47 of the National Defense Act to relieve State-operated educational institutions, under stated conditions, from giving bond for certain property issued by the United States for use by ROTC units maintained at such institutions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2864. A bill to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the North Unit Irrigation District, to authorize construction of Haystock Reservoir on the Deschutes Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2865. A bill to authorize the improvement of Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (by request):

S. 2866. A bill to provide for the distribution of the funds belonging to the Seneca Nation and the Tonawanda Band of Senecas, and for other purposes; and

S. 2867. A bill to provide for the capitalization of a treaty annuity paid to the Six Nations of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2868. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2869. A bill to authorize the preparation of rolls of persons of Indian blood whose ancestors were members of certain tribes or bands in the State of Oregon, and to provide for per capita distribution of funds arising from certain judgments in favor of such tribes or bands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2870. A bill to amend certain eligibility requirements in connection with the payment of benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to certain officers and enlisted men of the Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. LONG, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 2871. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 2872. A bill to provide for the disposition as surplus property of Camp Pickett, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2873. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Union National Monument, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 2874. A bill to provide that title to certain school lands shall vest in the States under the act of January 25, 1927, notwithstanding any Federal leases which may be outstanding on such lands at the time they are surveyed; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution granting the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the States of Alabama and Florida with respect to the location of the boundary line between those States at the mouth of the Perdido River and adjacent thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT, RELATIVE TO ISSUANCE OF BONDS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 47 of the National Defense Act. The amendment is designed to resolve a very difficult problem which has developed concerning the ROTC program in institutions of higher education operated by the State of Oregon. It is possible that the same problem has arisen in other States.

Section 47 has long required that each institution participating in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program must, in order to assure the care and safekeeping of certain United States property in its possession, give bond in the value of such property.

Until recently this provision caused no problem. State institutions apparently encountered little, if any, difficulty in meeting the bond requirement of section 47. However, in recent years, items of highly technical nature and other valuable property and equipment have been delivered by the Federal Government to participating educational institutions.

Information supplied by the Oregon State Board of Control indicates a ruling by the Department of the Army to the effect that a bond must be furnished to cover the full value of such equipment in possession of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps units at the University of Oregon and Oregon State College. If the bond cannot be furnished, it will be necessary to cancel this training program in those institutions, and thus they will not be available for the training of future officers for the Military Establishment.

The Constitution of Oregon provides:

> The legislative assembly shall not lend the credit of the State nor in any manner create any debt or liabilities which shall singly or in the aggregate with previous debts or liabilities exceed the sum of $50,000. * * *

The Federal property and equipment now located in the university and the State college, for use in the ROTC program, is valued at over $611,000. The very able attorney general of Oregon has rendered an opinion holding that the State of Oregon cannot supply the bond required under section 47 in this case, because its issuance would be in an amount which the State is by its constitution unable to give.

The bill I have introduced would amend section 47 of the National Defense Act by eliminating the requirement that a bond be given by any State-operated institution, but this would be

conditioned upon the participating institution's compliance with all requirements of the Federal Government concerning care and safekeeping of Government property. Periodic inspections by representatives of the Military Establishment would enable the Government to make certain that the equipment in question is handled properly and maintained in good condition.

This proposed legislation would enable the University of Oregon, Oregon State College, and similar institutions throughout the country, to continue their ROTC programs without interruption attributable to any legal inability to supply bond. At the same time, it would protect the interest of the United States with respect to very valuable property delivered to these State institutions for an extremely important use.

Mr. President, I am advised by the Governor of Oregon, the secretary of state of Oregon, and the State treasurer that this is an emergency matter. So I respectfully request the Armed Services Committee, to which committee I assume the bill will be referred, to take the most speedy action possible on the bill, so that the Senate may consider it at an early date. I am satisfied that its merits are so clear that the Senate will pass the bill almost as a matter of form, once it is recommended by the Armed Services Committee, as I believe it will be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, and also a joint letter under date of January 19, 1954, which I received from the Governor of Oregon, the Oregon secretary of state, and the State treasurer, asking for consideration of this matter by the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2863) to amend section 47 of the National Defense Act to relieve State-operated educational institutions, under stated conditions, from giving bond for certain property issued by the United States for use by ROTC units maintained at such institutions, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be enacted, etc., That section 47 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 389), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No such bond shall be required of any institution operated by any State so long as that institution provides such measures for the care and safekeeping of nonexpendable property as the Secretary of the Army, or the Secretary of the Air Force in the case of property issued by the Department of the Air Force, shall determine as a result of periodic inspection to be adequate to protect the interest of the United States therein."

The letter presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

OREGON STATE BOARD OF CONTROL,
Salem, January 19, 1954.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have received advice through the office of Lt. Gen. J. M. Swing, Commanding Officer of the 6th Army, that unless a bond is furnished in the full amount of the equipment issued to the University of Oregon and Oregon State College in connection with the Reserve Officer Training Corps units, that it will be necessary to cancel this training program at the Oregon institutions.

The requirement for such a bond is set forth in sec. 47, National Defense Act, 39 Stat. 192, 10 U. S. C. 389 and Army regulations as set forth in paragraph 5, AR 145–420, 1 February 1952. Since the requirement is statutory, we have been advised that the Secretary of the Army cannot change it through Army regulations.

This matter has been submitted to Robert Y. Thornton, Attorney General of the State of Oregon, and in an opinion rendered August 11, 1953, he holds that the State of Oregon cannot issue such a bond as it would violate the constitutional provision limiting indebtedness incurred by the State to $50,000, whereas the property in question has been valued at $611,028.09.

We are faced with a very serious situation and would ask that you use your influence to obtain an amendment to the Federal statutes which will eliminate the necessity of bond being furnished by the State. We believe the wording of the act can be changed to eliminate the bond requirement and at the same time provide for the necessary care and management by the State institutions using the equipment.

This letter is being sent to each Member of the Oregon Delegation. We will appreciate your assistance in the matter.

Very truly yours,

PAUL L. PATTERSON,
Governor.
EARL T. NEWBRY,
Secretary of State.
SIG UNANDER,
State Treasurer.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of each minority member of the Select Committee on Small Business the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and other purposes. My primary intention is to amend the Small Business Act so as to strengthen and improve the effectiveness of the Small Business Administration.

I have been very much disappointed that in the 6 months since it was established, the Small Business Administration has not made a better record. Part of the difficulty, no doubt, is due to the failure for so long to appoint an Administrator. Just today the name of an Administrator has been sent to the Senate. Unfortunately, small business seems to be assigned a low priority in present-day thinking. Some of the Agency's difficulty, however, stems from basic weaknesses in the statutory authority of the Small Business Act. I had hoped that the President would present recommendations to Congress that would correct these weaknesses. Since he has not done so, I have attempted through these amendments to resolve some of the trouble areas.

One amendment would eliminate the existing termination date for the small business agency and establish it on a permanent basis.

A second provision would authorize the Small Business Administration to make loans to States and municipalities. Although the present legislation authorizes such loans, it left to the discretion of the President the agency to handle it and the President has never delegated the authority. Many small communities badly need some source of Federal credit.

Another amendment would abolish the Loan Policy Board. This Board is made up of the Administrator of SBA, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of the Treasury. It establishes the lending policy of the Agency.

As presently constituted the Board has veto power over the SBA Administrator in loan matters and makes SBA in fact not an independent agency. The result has been that the policy is weighted against the very segment of the economy that SBA is set up to assist.

The amendments also provide two significant changes in the Small Business Administration's lending program. On loans made in participation with banks, the interest rate on that part of the loan made by the Administration could not exceed the interest rate charged on loans made directly by the Small Business Administration. In addition, the $150,000 limitation on loans would be increased to $500,000. The present limitation fails to take care of many independent businesses engaged in essential defense production.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. It is not very long.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2871) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. LONG, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. SMATHERS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 204 (d) of the Small Business Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 233) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 207 of the Small Business Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 235) is amended (1) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as (d), (e), and (f), respectively, and (2) by inserting after subsection (b) a new subsection as follows:

"(c) in order to aid in financing projects under Federal, State, or municipal law, to make loans to, and purchase the securities and obligations of, (1) States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States, (2) public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States, and (3) public corporations, boards, and commissions: *Provided*, That no such purchase or loan shall be made for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses as distinguished from purchases and loans to aid in financing specific public projects: *Provided, however*, That the foregoing powers shall be subject to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(A) No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this section unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms and all securities and obligations purchased and all loans made under this section shall be of

such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment, and such loans may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations or otherwise;

"(B) No securities or obligations shall be purchased, and no loans shall be made, including renewals or extensions thereof, which have maturity dates in excess of 40 years."

(b) Section 204 (b) of such act (67 Stat. 233) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Administration is authorized to obtain money from the Treasury of the United States for use in the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law, not to exceed a total of $300 million outstanding at any one time. For this purpose appropriations not to exceed $300 million are hereby authorized to be made to a revolving fund in the Treasury. Advances shall be made to the Administration from the revolving fund when requested by the Administration. This revolving fund shall be used for the purposes enumerated subsequently in sections 207 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e). Not to exceed an aggregate of $150 million shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 207 (a). Not to exceed an aggregate of $25 million shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 207 (b). Not to exceed an aggregate of $25 million shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 207 (c). Not to exceed an aggregate of $100 million shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in sections 207 (d) and (e). The Administration shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury at the close of each fiscal year, interest on the amount of advances outstanding at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities."

(c) Paragraph (5) of section 205 (b) of such act (67 Stat. 235) is amended by striking out "or 207 (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "(b), or (c)."

(d) Section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act (67 Stat. 231) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 207 (a) of the Small Business Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 235) is amended by striking out *"Provided, however,"* and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided,* That whenever a loan is effected in cooperation with any bank or other lending institution the interest rate on that part of the loan made by the Administration shall not exceed that which would be charged on a comparable loan effected directly by the Administration: *Provided further."*

(b) Section 207 (a) of such act is further amended by striking out "$150,000" in paragraph (2) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 221 of the Small Business Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 240) is hereby repealed.

(b) Sections 222 and 223 of such act are redesignated as sections 221 and 222, respectively.

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—AMENDMENT TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, like every other Member of the Senate, I have been following with a great deal of interest the debate on the so-called Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1. It seems to me that everyone who is trying to make a contribution to this debate wishes to see the following things done:

First. To maintain the constitutional freedom of the President in negotiating agreements.

Second. To insure that Congress will know what is going on.

Third. To protect the rights of the States.

Fourth. To avoid individual State vetoes.

Fifth. To insure an effective date for treaties and to end any uncertainty as to their application.

Therefore, with the hope that I may make a slight contribution to our thinking, I have drafted an amendment which I shall later offer to Senate Joint Resolution 1. It reads as follows:

At the appropriate place insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States 60 days after its transmission to Congress in session unless prior thereto either body of the Congress shall pass a resolution of disapproval. Such resolution may limit the application of the agreement as internal law in whole or in part; and, in case only in part, the agreement shall be effective in its remaining particulars."

Mr. President, I submit the amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON COFFEE PRICE INCREASES

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Coffee Prices of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that public hearings will begin at 10 a. m. on Monday, February 8, 1954, in room 301, Senate Office Building, on the recent coffee price increases.

Anyone wishing to appear as a witness should contact immediately Mr. Ira Dixon, clerk of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG:

Address entitled "The Farmer's Bill of Rights," delivered by Senator Humphrey at 16th annual dinner of the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., on December 15, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address entitled "The McCarran-Walter Act Must Go," delivered by him at the 69th annual meeting of the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society, in New York City on January 31, 1953.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Article entitled "What's Wrong With Social Security," written by Senator KENNEDY and published in the American magazine for October 1953.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "The Bricker Amendment," from the Daily Worker of January 22, 1954.

By Mr. POTTER:

Article entitled "Atrocity Report," written by George Sokolsky and published in the Detroit Times of January 24, 1954.

By Mr. BEALL:

Editorial entitled "Mr. Miller Gracefully Withdraws as Judicial Candidate," published in the Baltimore Sun of January 31, 1954.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Editorial entitled "Southern Hospitality," published in the Wall Street Journal of December 16, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Our Abandoned Patriots," published in the Boston Traveler of January 25, 1954, dealing with prisoners of war and their families.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Article entitled "A Forward Step," written by G. Elmer E. Lindquist, recently field representative in Indian work for the Home Missions Council and the Division of Home Missions of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, dealing with Indian legislation.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Editorial entitled "The Bricker Amendment," and editorial entitled "The Camel and the Gnat," dealing with government expenditures, both appearing in recent issues of the Northwest Arkansas Times.

ARMAMENT AND PEACE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, we are now hearing much concerning armament and concerning peace. I have been very much impressed by an old Chinese proverb which reads as follows:

If there is righteousness in the heart there will be beauty in the character. If there be beauty in the character, there will be harmony in the home. If there is harmony in the home, there will be order in the Nation. Where there is order in the Nation, there will be peace in the world.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 189, Calendar No. 880. This is the resolution relating to the Committee on Government Operations. Notice was given yesterday that the resolution would be taken up today. I note that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 189) providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution,

which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$192,830" and insert "$207,273", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1954, and ending on January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $207,273 in addition to the amount authorized under S. Res. 40, Eighty-third Congress, first session, agreed to January 30, 1953, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

Mr. ELLENDER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I think I was on my feet before the committee amendment was agreed to. I was seeking recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the Senator from Louisiana ask to be recognized at the time the question was put on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment was approved be reconsidered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Louisiana is that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered in order that he may proceed to speak on it. The Senator from Louisiana was on its feet seeking recognition, but had not been recognized.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during the last session, as well as previous sessions of the Congress, I made every effort to try to curtail—by way of eliminating duplication—the expenditures of the various investigating committees which were then in existence or in the process of being created.

During the last session of Congress, when the resolution providing funds to operate this committee was being considered, I attempted to cut back the amount requested—some $100,000—on the ground that the chairman of the committee, who presided over it the year before, had done a fine job and had spent only about $90,000 in order to carry on the operations of the committee.

At that time the committee was engaged in investigating the operations of our Government with a view to ascertaining, or trying to ascertain, whether there was graft, lack of efficiency, and conditions of that kind, all in line with authority conferred upon the committee under the Reorganization Act, as I understood it.

I refer the Senate to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 1, pages 685–686. I suggested to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] that it was my understanding the new chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, Mr. McCARTHY, intended to broaden the field of his committee's work and to take over much of the work being done by a committee first headed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and then by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], that is, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. The Senator from Indiana replied:

Mr. JENNER. In the first place, I hope we will maintain the fine record established by our subcommittee during the past 2 years, when it has been engaged in the field of investigation of communism and subversive activities, and has achieved excellent results. Therefore I see no reason for duplication by any other committee.

I wish to say at this point, in passing, that all I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate today is the extent, if any, to which there has been a duplication of work by the McCarthy committee, the Jenner committee, the Velde committee, and other committees of Congress.

I quote further from the statement made by the Senator from Indiana:

As I read the Reorganization Act, I think the Committee on Government Operations, of which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is chairman, has a proper field of investigation without going into the field of communism or subversive activities in the Government. That is the view which our subcommittee intends to take of the situation. It is our understanding with the Senator from Wisconsin that such an arrangement applies to similar activities on the part of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. When was that understanding reached?

Mr. JENNER. I have talked with the Senator from Wisconsin on many occasions. He came before the Committee on Rules and Administration, I think on January 22, requesting an appropriation for his committee. At that time various members of the Committee on Rules and Administration asked him the specific questions which the Senator from Louisiana has raised.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think there is no possibility of any duplication of the work of the Committee on Government Operations, the work of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Indiana is to be chairman, and the committee headed by Representative VELDE in the other House. I have instructed the staff of my committee to work with the staffs of the committee of which the Senator from Indiana is a member and with the House committee, and I feel certain there is no question that that will be done.

I do not attempt at this time to divest my committee of any jurisdiction which it has, but I can assure the Senate that we will not duplicate the work of any other committee.

I may say that I have been very much concerned about subversive activities within the Government, and I still am. Whenever I find such activities I intend to take them up with the subcommittee of which the Senator from Indiana is to be chairman.

I can also assure Senators that I am not forgetting the issue of communism. However, I understand that while under the Reorganization Act there is unlimited jurisdiction so far as investigations are concerned, there is no question that the Senator from Indiana and I desire to avoid duplication of work.

Mr. President, that was the main purpose I had in mind last year when I attempted to reduce the expenditures of the McCarthy committee, as well as those of all other committees. All I desired to do was to prevent duplication. What I shall seek to do today is to find out, if I can, from the distinguished chairman of the committee the extent to which there has been duplication by his committee with the work of various other committees of the Senate and with committees of the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I was called out of the Chamber to answer a telephone call. I understand that during my absence the Senator from Louisiana asked me a question. Does he desire me to answer the question now? I understand he wants me to tell him the extent of duplication, if any.

Mr. ELLENDER. The question I asked was the one I quoted from the RECORD. I called it to the Senator's attention last year. However, as I have indicated, what I am trying to do now——

Mr. McCARTHY. I thought the Senator from Louisiana asked me a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I want to find out the extent to which there has been duplication by your committee of work done by other committees.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator wish me to answer the question now?

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator wishes to do so; yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. The answer is none.

Mr. ELLENDER. None. We shall see. With respect to the authority of the committee, I believe that question has not emanated from me exclusively. I am not the only one on the floor who has questioned whether the authority of the committee extended to the investigation of subversive activities. If the Reorganization Act is studied it will be found that there is a special committee in the Senate which has to do with investigating subversive activities in our Government; that is, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Reorganization Act specifically assigns the Committee on the Judiciary to that field. The Committee on Foreign Relations has its duties outlined in the Reorganization Act as have the other committees of the Senate.

I have a clipping before me from the Washington Evening Star of January 1, 1954. It reads:

Senator McCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, said today the Senate investigations subcommittee headed by Senator McCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, in its farflung Red

hunts, has "stepped over into a field where it was not intended to function at all."

"I do not say it hasn't done good work, because I think it has," Senator McCARRAN said.

I desire to say at this point that I, also, think the committee has done a good job. I feel that merely dramatizing certain conditions and bringing them to public attention has in itself done some good. I am not unmindful of the fact that other committees brought out the same facts, but, somehow, they were not quite so fortunate as was my good friend from Wisconsin in being able to have the press, the radio, the television, and other such agencies assist in dramatizing the findings.

I read further:

"I don't say it hasn't done good work because I think it has," Senator McCARRAN said, but he added in an interview that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee "can do all the work necessary on the Senate side" in investigating subversive activities.

Senator McCARRAN headed the Internal Security Subcommittee until the Republicans took control of Congress last January and Senator JENNER, Republican, of Indiana, became chairman. The Nevadan still is the senior Democrat in the group.

BOTH MUST SEEK FUNDS

In the new session of Congress starting Wednesday, both the McCARTHY and JENNER investigating units will be forced to seek additional funds from the Senate. Their spending authority will expire January 31.

Senator McCARRAN said nothing about attempting to place any restraints on the activities of Senator McCARTHY, with whom he often has swapped compliments, and emphasized there was nothing personal in his remarks.

He said his interest was in seeing that the Internal Security Subcommittee is adequately financed and staffed for the job assigned it by the Internal Security Act of 1950—a law which he sponsored.

He dismissed as impractical a proposal advanced by some Members of Congress for a joint Senate-House committee to handle all investigations of subversive activities.

"Joint committees never get anywhere, and I am opposed to them," he said.

"There is plenty of room for activity by committees of both Houses in the internal security field. If something should be done about McCARTHY, why don't the Republicans do it? It's not our problem."

The question of possible rivalry and duplication between the two subcommittees was raised early in last year's congressional session by Senator ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, who made an unsuccessful effort to cut the funds they and other investigating groups asked for. He said the McCARTHY group's statutory assignment was to study "economy and efficiency" in Government.

The Senate last year allowed the Jenner subcommittee $150,000 in new funds, plus a carryover of $69,000 from the previous year. For Senator McCARTHY's committee it provided a total of $200,000—$189,000 in new money and a carryover of $11,000.

[From the Washington Post of January 3, 1954]

GILLETTE TO ASK CURB ON SCOPE OF McCARTHY

Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa, said yesterday he will ask the Senate to curb broad investigative powers in the field of international relations now held by the committee headed by Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin.

"This is a glaring situation," GILLETTE said. "It is something that was never intended, and I will ask the Senate to pass on it at the coming session."

McCARTHY is chairman of the Government Operations Committee and of its more widely known Permanent Investigations Subcommittee.

GILLETTE said he wants the Senate to rescind authority for the Government Operations Committee to investigate international affairs and give this solely to the Foreign Relations Committee of which GILLETTE is a member.

Although he has tangled with McCARTHY in the past, GILLETTE made no mention of the Wisconsin Senator in explaining why he sought the change.

"International relationships are delicate now and will be for an unforeseen time," GILLETTE said. "The Senate has given its Foreign Relations Committee authority in this field.

"We all know that careless actions or statements in this field can jeopardize our international status."

GILLETTE's proposal followed by a day a remark by another Democrat, Senator PAT McCARRAN, of Nevada, that the Investigations Subcommittee in its investigations of communism "has stepped over into a field where it was not intended to function at all."

However, McCARRAN said nothing about attempting to curb McCARTHY's activities. He said on the contrary he thought the Investigations Subcommittee has done good work, and emphasized there was nothing personal in his remarks. He and McCARTHY often have exchanged compliments.

The Nevadan said, however, he thought the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, of which he is senior Democratic member, can do all the work necessary on the Senate side in investigating subversive activities.

McCARTHY, in Miami, said Friday that digging out communism is not the primary purpose of his subcommittee and that it has been careful to check with the Internal Security Subcommittee to avoid duplication. He continued:

"If in our investigations we find subversive elements in Government which would prevent the Government from operating properly and no other congressional group is investigating, then we go ahead.

"I have no argument with PAT McCARRAN. PAT is one of the greatest Senators we ever had, and I have unlimited respect for him."

Still another Democrat, Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, said Friday, "If something should be done about McCARTHY, why don't the Republicans do it? It's not our problem."

Other Democrats have proposed various rules changes that might limit some activities of McCARTHY's subcommittee.

Whether that will be done, Mr. President, I do not know, but I am citing these few instances—and there are many others—as evidence of the fact that I am not the only Senator who feels as I do with respect to the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. President, in this connection let me say that I have had prepared a résumé of the law on the subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator's request.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was a request to have printed in the RECORD a résumé of the law concerning investigations.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Constitution of the United States does not specifically grant power to investigate. Such power as it legitimately possesses the Senate derives by implication from the vesting in Congress by article I, section 1, of "All legislative power herein granted * * *." (*Anderson* v. *Dunn* ((1821) 6 Wheat. 204, 224); *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* ((1927) 273 U. S. 135, 161).) While some of the political scientists have argued that the need to inform public opinion legitimitizes congressional investigations, the Supreme Court has not fully embraced this doctrine where other constitutional rights were involved. Rather it has adhered to the presumption of a necessary legislative purpose in authorizing an investigation. (*In re Chapman* ((1897) 166 U. S. 661, 670) and *McGrain* v. *Daugherty, supra.*) We do not believe it essential to indicate further the extent of these basic principles.

The preface to the annual report claims the subcommittee has the arduous task of uncovering fraud, waste, malfeasance, corruption and subversion among public servants. It says communism has inspired espionage, sabotage, and subversion. One of the avowed objectives is to "inform the public." The report states that the investigations have been conducted in accordance with the mandate found in the Legislative Reorganization Act. Let us examine this claim.

Title I of the Legislative Reorganization Act, as an exercise of the rule making power of each House of Congress separately acting, granted general investigatory powers to the standing committees of the Senate. See section 134. Section 136 gave them the power of legislative oversight. But close examination of rule XXV (1) (g), as amended, discloses no specific grant to the Senate Committee on Government Operations to investigate subversion. Indeed, the Senate Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction covering criminal proceedings, espionage, etc., and thus has the basic jurisdiction covering subversion. That this is so is demonstrated by the assignment of such bills to that committee.

The subcommittee has usurped jurisdiction and has perverted principles. For example, the report states:

"Perhaps the most eloquent statement of the practical function of such a committee is to be found in the words of Woodrow Wilson, cited by the Supreme Court in *U. S.* v. *Rumeley* (345 U. S. 41 (1953)):

" 'It is the proper duty of a representative body to look diligently into every affair of government and to talk much about what it sees. It is meant to be the eyes and the voice, and to embody the wisdom and will of its constituents. Unless Congress have and use every means of acquainting itself with the acts and the disposition of the administrative agents of the Government, the country must be helpless to learn how it is being served; and unless Congress both scrutinize these things and sift them by every form of discussion, the country must remain in embarrassing, crippling ignorance of the very affairs which it is most important that it should understand and direct. The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function.' "

Let us read what the Supreme Court did say in the Rumeley case, pages 43–44:

"Although we are here dealing with a resolution of the House of Representatives, the problem is much the same as that which confronts the Court when called upon to construe a statute that carries the seeds of constitutional controversy. The potential constitutional questions have far-reaching import. We are asked to recognize the penetrating and pervasive scope of the investigative power of Congress. The reach that may be claimed for that power is indicated by Woodrow Wilson's characterization of it:

" 'It is the proper duty of a representative body to look diligently into every affair of government and to talk much about what it

sees. It is meant to be the eyes and the voice, and to embody the wisdom and will of its constituents. Unless Congress have and use every means of acquainting itself with the acts and the disposition of the administrative agents of the Government, the country must be helpless to learn how it is being served; and unless Congress both scrutinize these things and sift them by every form of discussion, the country must remain in embarrassing, crippling ignorance of the very affairs which it is most important that it should understand and direct. The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function.' (Wilson, Congressional Government, 303.)

"Although the indispensable 'informing function of Congress' is not to be minimized, determination of the 'rights' which this function implies illustrates the common juristic situation thus defined for the court by Mr. Justice Holmes: 'All rights tend to declare themselves absolute to their logical extreme. Yet all in fact are limited by the neighborhood of principles of policy which are other than those on which the particular right is founded, and which become strong enough to hold their own when a certain point is reached.' (*Hudson Water Co.* v. *McCarter* (309 U. S. 349, 355).) President Wilson did not write in light of the history of events since he wrote; more particularly he did not write of the investigative power of Congress in the context of the first amendment. And so, we would have to be that 'blind' court, against which Mr. Chief Justice Taft admonished in a famous passage, *Child Labor Tax* case (259 U. S. 20, 37), that does not see what '[a]ll others can see and understand' not to know that there is wide concern, both in and out of Congress, over some aspects of the exercise of the congressional power of investigation."

What did the Supreme Court say? It said that Wilson did not write in the light of the history of events since he wrote—events such as some of the investigations of this subcommittee. The Supreme Court is warning Congress that justice no longer can remain "blind" to the type of problem posed by the request of this committee for funds. Do not ignore that warning.

The controlling charter of a committee's powers, says the Supreme Court, is its specific authorization. For the Senate Committee on Government Operations, this means rule XXV (1) (g). Further, the Supreme Court warns that where the first amendment is involved, it may become necessary to reconcile or harmonize the implied investigatory power with the rights guaranteed by the first amendment. No more disastrous way could be found to curtail investigatory powers of Congress than to let a subcommittee, which lacks basic authority, develop a pattern of harassment by investigations for publicity purposes. Read *U. S.* v. *Rumely, supra*, carefully. It is only one of a number of warnings issued by the Supreme Court. It cannot be tortured into a defense of the recent activities of the permanent subcommittee on investigations.

EXCERPTS FROM THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

(k) Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 15 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.
2. Constitutional amendments.
3. Federal courts and judges.
4. Local courts in the Territories and possessions.
5. Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.
6. National penitentiaries.
7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.
8. Holidays and celebrations.
9. Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.
10. State and Territorial boundary lines.
11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.
12. Civil liberties.
13. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.
14. Patent Office.
15. Immigration and naturalization.
16. Apportionment of Representatives.
17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.
18. Interstate compacts generally.

(g) (1) Committee on Government Operations, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

(A) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;

(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

(C) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;

(D) studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

(h) Committee on Finance, to consist of 15 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Revenue measures generally.
2. The bonded debt of the United States.
3. The deposit of public moneys.
4. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.
5. Reciprocal trade agreements.
6. Transportation of dutiable goods.
7. Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions.
8. Tariffs and import quotas, and matters related thereto.
9. National social security.
10. Veterans' measures generally.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish at this time to discuss some of the cases in which I believe there has been duplication, notwithstanding the fact that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has denied it. As I understood the Senator a while ago, with reference to the question of duplication, he said there was none.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the statement which I read, particularly that portion of the RECORD wherein the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin indicated that before undertaking any investigations which might encroach on the field of the Internal Security Subcommittee or the Velde committee in the House, he would see to it that his staff would take the question up with the staffs of other committees in order to prevent any duplication of effort. I do not know whether that has been done, and there is no way for me to find out, but the record is clear that when the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin appeared on the floor of the Senate and asked for funds last year he said there would be no duplication. He said that his staff would consult with the staffs of other committees which might be dealing or which might have dealt with subjects which he proposed to investigate.

I now bring to the attention of the Senate the so-called Fort Monmouth case. From all I have been able to learn, that case has been investigated by many committees. It has been the subject of much investigation by the armed services—by the Signal Corps, and other agencies. I have before me a few excerpts from reports of committees which had to do with such investigations. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee staff looked into the charges. No hearings were held, but it examined the charges. The House Un-American Activities Committee, as early as 1952, submitted reports with reference to the charges which had been made.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I assume the Senator would want me to correct any misstatement of fact.

Mr. ELLENDER. I want the facts; nothing else.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to correct the statement that the House committee investigated the situation at Fort Monmouth. It made an investigation with respect to the disappearance of some 57 classified documents from official headquarters in Washington, but it made no investigation of espionage at Fort Monmouth. I am sure the Senator had no intention of misstating the facts, but the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe the best evidence is the report itself. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin, being a lawyer, will agree to that.

The committee's report for 1952 says:

> The complete files on these cases were made available through the cooperation of Maj. Gen. A. R. Bolling, Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2. These files indicated that little tangible evidence, indicative of espionage or subversive activities, had been developed by the military investigation.
>
> • • • • •
>
> In view of regulations which insist that the custodianship of all top-secret reports shall be recorded at all times, the committee cannot minimize the seriousness of a condition which permitted the whereabouts of even a single such document to be unrecorded at any time. The inescapable conclusion is that lax security prevailed in the Agency.
>
> An intensive investigation by the committee staff added no substantial evidence to that gathered by Army investigators concerning the accused employees. Several of those accused were also given full field investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and no derogatory information, except for the charges of their fellow employees, was uncovered.
>
> • • • • •
>
> The committee is assured that tight security precautions have been established in the

Agency which has been entirely reorganized as a result of the military and congressional investigation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to point out that the Senator is merely proving my statement that the committee did not investigate espionage or subversion. The Senator is reading from a report that does not mention Fort Monmouth. It has to do with 57 documents which were reported missing. The report shows the extent of the investigation was to determine that some of the documents, after they had been stolen, were found to be classified. There was no accounting for each document. My committee has not as yet gone into that subject, but, so that the Senator may not be deceived, let me say that we intend to review it because, in going into the Fort Monmouth situation, we found, contrary to what the Senator from Louisiana apparently believes, that 57 documents were stolen or have not been accounted for. I do not know whether the Senator would call that duplication.

Mr. ELLENDER. The report which I have read dealt with Fort Monmouth. The paragraphs I have just read from the report indicated——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator read from the report exactly the part that deals with Fort Monmouth?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have read excerpts from it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator from Louisiana read any excerpt that deals with the Fort Monmouth investigation?

Mr. ELLENDER. I read the following:

An intensive investigation by the committee staff added no substantial evidence to that gathered by Army investigators concerning the accused employees. Several of those accused were also given full field investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and no derogatory information, except for the charges of their fellow employees, was uncovered.

The files indicated that there was little tangible evidence indicative that espionage or subversive activities had been developed by military investigation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am asking the Senator from Louisiana to read from the report anything which indicates that the Fort Monmouth situation has previously been investigated. I know the Senator from Louisiana is honestly mistaken. He has read from a report which dealt with an investigation of the disappearance of 57 secret documents from Signal Corps Headquarters in Washington, D. C. It has nothing to do with Fort Monmouth.

I may say that not only has the Senator from Louisiana failed to prove duplication of any investigation, but even if he does consider it to be duplication, I intend to run down the facts and to find out where the 57 documents disappeared to. That was not done by the House committee.

A colonel in charge of the investigation came before the House committee and said the documents had all been accounted for. He was asked how they were accounted for.

He said, "We have accounted for them by learning that they were marked down from 'top secret' to a lower classification."

The question then was asked, After he had discovered that they were marked down to "confidential," or to some other classification, did he learn who stole them or where they went?

The answer was, "No, sir, because we were only dealing with top secret material. The ones that had been declassified or marked down, we were not concerned with, as they did not have to be accounted for once they were declassified."

If the Senator from Louisiana considers that duplication, there will continue to be duplication.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since the Senator from Wisconsin investigated Fort Monmouth, I wonder if he would be good enough to tell the Senate under what circumstances the investigation was made. Did the Senator comply with the suggestion he himself made, that he would consult with, for example, the Velde committee, to determine what that committee had done about the matter, before proceeding with his own committee's investigation?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator has asked a good question, and I shall be glad to answer it.

Our staff has been in constant contact with the Jenner committee staff and the Velde committee staff. The net result has been that there has been no duplication of work as between the Jenner committee, the Velde committee, and the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Again I point out to the Senator from Louisiana that he has not read from a report dealing with the Fort Monmouth investigation. I know that the Senator is honestly mistaken. I can understand how the able Senator from Louisiana, having picked up a report having to do with the Signal Corps, which has jurisdiction of Fort Monmouth, could make such a mistake. I emphasize that it is a mistake. The report has nothing to do with the Fort Monmouth investigation. I refer to the document from which the Senator has been reading.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin proceeded to investigate Fort Monmouth, he was quoted in the press to the effect—and this appeared in several newspapers under date of October 14—that the investigation definitely involved espionage; there was no question about it. That referred to Fort Monmouth.

On October 22 the Senator was quoted as saying:

I am not saying whether there is espionage or not.

On December 16, the Senator from Wisconsin is quoted as saying:

We do not feel it is the function of the committee to take over the job of the Justice Department and prove espionage cases beyond a reasonable doubt. We feel it is sufficient to prove espionage, potential espionage, to a sufficient degree as to convince the security officers of the various establishments.

Now, I ask this question: During the investigation by his committee, did my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, discover anything of any kind that had not been previously found by the Velde committee, the Department of the Army, the Signal Corps, or other agencies of the Government which made investigations at Fort Monmouth?

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that, so far as I am aware, no other committee investigated espionage at Fort Monmouth; therefore, everything we uncovered was, of necessity, material other than that which was discovered by any other committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. What about other agencies of the Government?

Mr. McCARTHY. May I ask the Senator, when he reads from a newspaper, if he will, for my benefit, state the name of the newspaper from which he is reading? The Senator has read certain quotations. From what newspaper were they?

Mr. ELLENDER. They were quotations from the Washington Post, the Washington Star, the New York Times, and the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. McCARTHY. Which one? There is a big difference between those mentioned.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin deny having made these statements?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is a big difference whether a quotation is from the Washington Post or the Washington Star.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin deny having made these statements? I can easily check to see from which newspaper the quotations came. It is my understanding that all the quotations I have just read were published in practically all the newspapers; all of them were to the effect that the Senator from Wisconsin was of the opinion, when he first began the investigation, that there was espionage.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Wisconsin is still of that opinion.

Mr. ELLENDER. That it was espionage which impelled him to make the investigation?

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the able Senator from Louisiana that I am not only of the opinion that there was espionage at Fort Monmouth but I know there was espionage at Fort Monmouth. We have had sworn testimony to that effect from witness after witness.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean evidence of recent origin or evidence of 20 years ago or 10 years ago? I am, of course, speaking of current matters.

Mr. McCARTHY. I also am speaking of current matters.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are speaking of current matters. Very well.

Mr. McCARTHY. So that there may be no doubt in the mind of the Senator from Louisiana, if he wishes me to recount some evidence concerning current espionage at Fort Monmouth, I shall be glad to do so. I think it might be of some enlightenment to the Senator from Louisiana, because, while I do not hold the Senator responsible for how he was quoted, although I assume he was correctly quoted, I read a short time ago that the Senator from Louisiana stated in a recent speech that the committee had uncovered nothing new at Fort Monmouth; that it was all warmed over biscuits, or something to that effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did say duplication. Matters previously uncovered by other committees, as well as Army Intelligence.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator from Louisiana would care to have me do so, I should be glad to recount some evidence of very current espionage at Fort Monmouth.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was the evidence taken behind closed doors or in the open?

Mr. McCARTHY. Most of it was taken in public; some of it was received in executive session.

Mr. ELLENDER. Were the hearings ever published?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. If the Senator would read them, he would not make the silly statement he is making to the effect that there is nothing current about the espionage at Fort Monmouth.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Wisconsin will learn that I did not make silly statements. I presume the Senator from Wisconsin would perhaps believe what the present head of the Department of the Army has said, would he not, as to what was found at Fort Monmouth and what is there now?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall let the Sentor proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well, I shall develop that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator from Louisiana desire me to give a résumé of the evidence indicating current espionage? I think he might like to have a résumé, in view of his statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I should like all the information that can be given to the Senate. I would like to have facts.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well. Let us review the facts. The Senator has asked whether the evidence was taken in an open or a closed session.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is with reference to espionage.

Mr. McCARTHY. For the present, let us restrict ourselves to what was developed in open sessions. Some witnesses who have been called in closed sessions have not yet been called in open sessions, but they will be called. I think it might be unfair to the Senator if I dealt with the testimony received in closed sessions, so I shall speak mainly of evidence received in open sessions.

I assume that the Senator from Louisiana will concede that espionage conducted in December 1953 would be current espionage, would he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I would. I would include all of the last year, since the Republican administration came into existence.

Mr. McCARTHY. I assume the Senator would also concede that if a Government employee who is a member of the Communist Party had access to secret material, such material would be in an open conduit available to the Communist Party. I assume the Senator would not require that we catch the agent at midnight, turning this material over to another Communist agent. Am I correct in that?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then let us refer to a few cases. On December 16 we had a Mrs. Levine before the subcommittee. She had been handling top secret material for 10 years. Neither the Senator from Wisconsin nor the very able Senator from Louisiana would have access to top secret material. We would not have access to secret material except in most unusual cases. Here was a Federal employee who was given the highest honor that it is possible for this Nation or any other nation to give.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was that a person named Coleman?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; the person to whom I am referring is Mrs. Levine. She had conferred upon her a higher honor than any Member of the Senate can have conferred on him.

Mrs. Levine was subpenaed on the 13th of December. She then spoke to her security officer. The security officer informed her that she had to answer all questions about Communist activities. She replied, "I will not do it. I will not tell the subcommittee that I have been engaged in a conspiracy to commit espionage and I will not tell them whether I am a Communist Party member or not."

The security officer said, "If you do not tell them your employers will have to take action against you."

Mrs. Levine quit on the 13th. She appeared before the subcommittee as a witness on the 16th. She had been handling top-secret material for 10 years. She had been an employee of the telecommunications office and had been handling Fort Monmouth radar material.

Mrs. Levine was asked:

Mrs. Levine, have you been engaged in the commission of espionage?

I refuse to answer on the ground that my answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mrs. Levine, during the 10 years that you were handling top-secret material, were you at all times a member of the Communist Party?

I refuse to answer on the ground that my answer might tend to incriminate me.

I said:

Mrs. Levine, we did not pick your name out of a hat. You are here because we know something about your background. Is it not true that you have been handing secret radar material over to individuals known to you to be espionage agents?

She answered:

I refuse to answer on the ground that my answer might tend to incriminate me.

Then the subcommittee had before it Mr. Harry Hyman. I might say that his case has been referred to the Department of Justice, as provided under the Smith Act. He had been an employee of telecommunications until 1951. In fact, Mr. Hyman was head of the union which was kicked out by the CIO because it was Communist-dominated. The union was well known to every intelligence agency as one of the important underground agencies of the Communist Party.

Before the subcommittee called Mr. Hyman before it, it had subpenaed records of long-distance phone calls made from just one telephone. The subcommittee did not subpena records of calls made from all the other phones which he may have been using, but only that one. The number of phone calls from just one phone numbered 565 in the last year. The subcommittee had a record of those phone calls before it.

The subcommittee called four witnesses while Hyman was there. One of the witnesses was asked, "Did this man try to recruit you into the Communist Party?"

He said, "Yes."

The subcommittee had Hyman stand up.

The witness was asked, "Is this the Harry Hyman?"

The witness replied, "Yes, it is."

Hyman was identified by four individuals as a violator of the Smith Act. As I previously said, the case has been referred to the Department of Justice under that act.

Then we called Hyman before the committee, and asked him, "Mr. Hyman, have you been engaging in espionage?"

The answer was, "No, I have not."

I cannot quote the language verbatim, but the following is an example of what we did over and over again. We picked up a telephone slip and asked the question:

"Mr. Hyman, on the 13th of December, at 11:30 in the morning, you called the secret radar laboratory at Fort Monmouth, or you called Aberdeen Proving Grounds."

There are eight secret installations which he was calling secretly; and he was not calling them to get weather reports.

He was asked, "At 11:30 you called the secret radar 'lab' at Fort Monmouth. At 12:30 you called Mr. X, who has been labeled as an espionage agent. Were you calling Fort Monmouth for the purpose of getting secret information? Did you then, within an hour, turn that over to a secret agent of the Communist Party?"

Answer: "I refuse to answer on the ground that my answer might tend to incriminate me."

And so on down the line.

I say to the Senator from Louisiana that such testimony is the most convincing proof of espionage that can be obtained.

As I have said before, our committee does not have the function of conducting a criminal trial. It does not have the function of convincing a jury of espionage beyond a reasonable doubt. No one has been convicted of espionage

in this country for more than 10 years. In fact, I believe the last case of espionage was that of the Nazis. As the Senator knows, neither Remington nor Alger Hiss was convicted of espionage. The Rosenbergs were not convicted of espionage; they were convicted of conspiracy to commit espionage.

As I have said over and over again, it is difficult beyond words even for a grand jury, or a court, concentrating on one case, to send a man to jail for espionage.

I may say to the Senator that the Fort Monmouth hearings will prove the most productive of any we have ever had from the standpoint of decimating the ranks of the Communist Party. I do not refer solely to the Monmouth hearings; I am referring to the entire area of investigation, that is, our investigation of sabotage and espionage in defense enterprises. I assure the Senator from Louisiana that the Communist Party is going to bleed very heavily, not only because members of the party will go to jail for the technical crime of espionage, but also for contempt of the committee. In that way we will get them out of circulation just as effectively as if they had committed and were found guilty of some other crime.

In closing, may I remind the Senator from Louisiana that Al Capone did not go to jail for the St. Valentine's Day massacre. The authorities could not have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that he was guilty of that crime, although—it was a matter of common knowledge—everyone knew that he was responsible for it. He went to jail for income-tax evasion. These "fifth amendment" agents, espionage agents like Hyman, will go to jail and they will be removed from circulation by way of a contempt proceeding and under the Smith Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that I hope they will be. I have no more sympathy for them than he has. However, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether or not the matter to which he referred was brought to the attention of Secretary of the Army Stevens, and, if so, when was it brought and with what results?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Secretary of Defense has been kept fully informed during the entire hearings. However, one of the results of the investigation has been the suspension of 33 individuals at Fort Monmouth as security risks, all because of Communist activity. I hasten to add that some of the 33, I assume, will be reinstated. In fact, two have been reinstated directly as a result of our committee hearings. They were called before our committee. The commanding officer at Fort Monmouth was there. The witnesses acquitted themselves very well. They proved that the files showing their Communist activities, while correct, needed an additional entry showing the vast number of years they had been loyal employees. Of the 33 dismissed, some undoubtedly will be reinstated.

I desire at this point to compliment the commanding officer at Fort Monmouth, Gen. Kirke B. Lawton, for giving the persons involved the benefit of the doubt. When he found any person suspected of Communist activities or espionage activities, he immediately suspended them, thus removing them from the handling of secret material.

I may also say to the Senator that in some magazines and newspapers I have read the statement that the suspensions were not the result of this committee's investigation. In answer to that, let me quote the statement made by General Lawton, the commanding officer. When General Lawton was before our committee, in executive session, I said:

> General, why did you wait until our committee started to investigate communism at Fort Monmouth before suspending those people? Why were they not suspended 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 years ago?

His answer was truthful, I am sure, and rather revealing. He said:

> Senator, let me tell you this: Under the old administration, we could not suspend them. It did no good to suspend them. We picked out the rottenest apples in the barrel. If we got by the first Army Loyalty Board, which was difficult, then they would appeal to the appeals board in the Pentagon.

He said even the worst ones we could find, even the most convincing cases, the Board would order the employees reinstated and put back into radar work at Fort Monmouth. The general also said he did not want them to have vacations with pay at Government expense.

In that connection I wish to compliment the new Secretary of the Army for having completely disbanded that appeals board during our investigation, and for having formed a new board, called the Review Board, with entirely different personnel. I think we shall be able to get better results.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the board to which the Senator from Wisconsin refers is the Loyalty Board, created by President Eisenhower.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, by President Truman.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I remember, the President of the United States reorganized the Loyalty Board; and it is my understanding—I remember seeing an article about it, somewhere—that the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and Representative VELDE were called to the White House, to go over it. It is my recollection that the Senator from Wisconsin was high in praise of the new approach, and he felt it would go far toward weeding out from the Government subversives, espionage, and so forth.

Am I correct in that? I have the data somewhere in my papers here, I may state to my good friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me make very clear to the Senator from Louisiana that the appeals board to which I refer consists of 20 persons. They were placed on the board under the Truman-Acheson regime, and were carried over; they were still acting at the time when our committee began its hearings. That board was disbanded. A new board, called the Review Board, was created with different personnel.

I should make it clear that, so far as I know, most of those 20 persons are still working in the Pentagon. I have stated again and again that we intend to call them before our committee. The new Secretary of the Army has objected to that course. I will not honor that objection, unless my committee overrides my decision. I feel that no man in Government can refuse a Senate subpena. When he comes before a Senate committee, he can refuse to answer questions if the answers to them would involve violation of a presidential order or of any other binding legal rule.

I merely make that clear, so as to let my colleagues know that we intend to have those 20 persons, who cleared the Communists and sent them back to handling secret material, appear before the committee, so as to ascertain who hired them, who promoted them to those jobs, and why they cleared Communists.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the article which I was referring to a while ago and from which I was quoting from memory. It appeared in the New York Times on Tuesday, April 28, 1953, and gave the text of President Eisenhower's Executive order setting up new security plans.

In the body of the article, following the heading, is a statement from the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], as follows:

> I think it is a tremendous improvement over the old method. Altogether it represents a pretty darn good program. I like it. It shows that the new administration was sincere in the campaign promises to clean house.

If that board is properly organized, I am wondering why the conditions to which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is now referring have not been corrected.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, after 20 years it is impossible to clean out the stables in one night. That takes quite a while.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I can understand that, but such cases as the Senator has mentioned should be cleared without delay.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am talking about the old Truman-Acheson board.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. McCARTHY. That board made it impossible to clean out such a place as Fort Monmouth. Under President Eisenhower and under Bob Stevens, a new Review Board has been set up. It was set up during our investigation.

I think conditions will be better. I hope so, for they could not be worse.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Senator from Wisconsin bring this matter to the attention of the board?

Mr. McCARTHY. Every bit of the evidence taken in our hearings is available to the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are the persons to whom the Senator from Wisconsin has just referred still on the payroll at Fort Monmouth, or have they been suspended?

Mr. McCARTHY. I just told the Senator from Louisiana that 33 were suspended. So far as I know, they were suspended without pay. Is that clear?

Thirty-three of those with whom we have dealt in our investigation have been suspended. I think two of them have been reinstated, and possibly a few more.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in view of what the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has just stated—namely, that there is espionage at Fort Monmouth—let me say that someone must be mistaken, either he is in error or Secretary Stevens does not know the score. When I returned to Washington last month, I wrote three letters—one to the Hon. Allen W. Dulles, Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D. C.; another one to Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D. C.; and another to Hon. Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C. These letters were identical, except for the addresses; and each of them was dated January 9, 1954. I shall read the one to Secretary Stevens:

DEAR SECRETARY STEVENS: It is my understanding that some time ago your agency investigated the allegations of espionage or other wrongdoing at the Army Signal Center at Fort Monmouth, N. J. As you know, the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee has recently been investigating similar charges.

I am most anxious to ascertain:

(1) Whether the investigation conducted by your agency revealed any espionage or other subversive activity at the Army Signal Center at Fort Monmouth.

(2) What additional information, if any, the recent investigations of the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee have revealed concerning espionage or other subversive activity, that was not uncovered by your investigation; and in this connection, be as specific as you possibly can.

(3) If additional information has been revealed by the Senate subcommttee, why was it that your investigations failed to uncover such information?

It has always been my belief and assumption that your agency, coupled with the other security agencies of our Government, has been doing the most careful and competent possible job in investigating subversive activity; and I am anxious to know if any substantial evidence of subversive activity has been missed in the course of an intensive investigation by your agency.

I may require this information by January 15, and will be grateful if you can furnish it to me by that time.

Sincerely.

The letter is signed by me.

In reply to the letter which I addressed to Mr. Hoover, I received the sort of letter I had expected; I would not have expected anything else. He wrote to me as follows:

I wish to acknowledge your letter of January 9, 1954, in which you make inquiry regarding investigations conducted at Fort Monmouth, N. J.

You will appreciate, I am sure, that I am unable to furnish the information you requested, because of the long-standing policy of the Attorney General regarding the confidential nature of our files.

In view of his interest in such matters, I am referring your communication to the Attorney General.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

From Mr. Allen Dulles I received the following letter, dated January 13—the same as the date of the letter I received from Mr. Hoover:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1954.

The Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: I have received your letter of January 9, 1954, and wish to clarify an apparent misunderstanding with respect to the duties and functions of this Agency and a possible confusion with those of the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army, known as the CIC. The Central Intelligence Agency has conducted no investigation of any nature with respect to the Army Signal Center at Fort Monmouth, N. J.

Section 102 (d) (3) of the legislation establishing the Central Intelligence Agency—the National Security Act of 1947—specifically provides "that the Agency shall have no police, subpena, law-enforcement powers, or internal-security functions."

That is one thing I should have known, but I did not realize it at the time I sent the letter.

Substantially, the only function which the Agency performs within the United States, other than the support of our foreign operations and correlation and evaluation here of intelligence relating to our national security, is the collection of foreign intelligence information available in the United States. We have no investigative functions of any nature in this country except the security investigation of our own personnel or applicants for positions with the Agency.

Faithfully yours,

ALLEN W. DULLES, *Director.*

I wish now to read a letter from the Department of the Army, dated January 15, 1954, in reply to my letter of the 9th. I will ask my good friend from Wisconsin to listen carefully to my reading of it. I should like to have his comments upon it, in view of the statements which have been made by him since this debate started. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in response to your letter of January 9, 1954, wherein you made inquiry with reference to the recent investigation conducted by the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee at Fort Monmouth, N. J.

That is Robert Stevens, Secretary of the Army, speaking.

Your first question is as to whether the investigation conducted by the Army revealed any espionage or other subversive activity at the Army Signal Center at Fort Monmouth.

This inquiry is answered in the negative. Insofar as the Army has thus far been able to determine, there is no current espionage or other subversive activity at Fort Monmouth.

Your second inquiry is as to what additional information the recent investigation by the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee has revealed concerning espionage or other subversive activity at Fort Monmouth. The Army is unable to answer this question because it does not have knowledge of all of the records of the Senate subcommittee, and does not know the extent of the information which may have been developed by the subcommittee.

Your third inquiry likewise cannot be answered for the reasons set forth in the preceding paragraph.

I may point out that the third inquiry was:

If additional information has been revealed by the Senate subcommittee, why was it that your own investigations failed to uncover such information?

The Secretary of the Army closes as follows——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield when I finish reading the letter.

Secretary Stevens concludes as follows:

I share fully your assumption that the Department of the Army coupled with the other security agencies of our Government is doing a careful and, in my judgment, competent job in investigating subversive activities. I am pleased, however, to cooperate with the committees of the Congress and if evidence of subversive activities is produced the Army will take prompt and appropriate action.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

If the Senator from Wisconsin has any comments to make on that letter, I should like to hear them now, in the light of the statements which he has made during the debate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think Bob Stevens made an accurate statement when he stated that the Army, in its own investigation, had not uncovered any espionage as of that date. As Bob Stevens has often stated, he does not answer for the committee. He is in no position to answer for the committee. I assume that the Senator will be interested in our report when it is made. As I have explained to the Senator, we have uncovered espionage. I am sure that we have uncovered what the Senator himself would say was espionage.

I wonder if the Senator objects to our calling before the committee the woman whose testimony I have described, a woman who had been handling top-secret work for 10 years, to tell whether or not she was attending Communist Party leadership schools or was a member of the Communist Party.

I wonder if the Senator objects to our uncovering a man like Harry Hyman.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have absolutely no objection——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator asked me a question, and I want to answer it now.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish the question.

I wonder if the Senator objects to our subpenaing long distance telephone records showing that a known espionage agent is contacting some eight of our top secret installations and getting information from them.

I wonder if the Senator objects to the fact that, as a result of our committee activity, 33 persons with Communist records have been subpenaed and taken away from secret work.

I wonder if the Senator objects to the fact that we intend to decimate the Communist Party's ranks by sending them to jail for contempt of the committee. If he objects to that, I think the people of the country would like to know it. If not, I am wondering what he is talking about here today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not object to it at all; but when there is an agency of

Government whose duty it is to deal with such matters, and which can do so effectively, I believe that agency ought to be the one to do it, as I have just indicated. The letter which was read, from the Secretary of the Army, is dated January 15, 1954. If the Secretary of the Army has in his possession the evidence which the Senator from Wisconsin says he furnished him, I think he is not diligent in his duty. However, I am taking him at his word. He states that investigations have been made by the Department of the Army. They have been made by the Signal Corps. We have before us a letter dated January 15, denying that there is current espionage, or anything like that, at Fort Monmouth.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator answer this question: The Senator from Louisiana has been attacking the Fort Monmouth investigations——

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not been attacking anything.

Mr. McCARTHY. Has the Senator——

Mr. ELLENDER. I want the Senator to know that I have not been attacking anything. I am trying to get the facts, and I am trying to determine the extent to which there is duplication in any of these hearings, not only on the part of committees, but on the part of departments of Government which have to do with this subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my judgment that with President Eisenhower in power, and with the new loyalty board, which my distinguished friend has praised to the skies, the Government agencies are in a position to do a good job.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator does not disagree with that, does he?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator does not disagree with that, does he?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator said he was trying to get the facts.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Did the Senator, before he publicly tried to ridicule the Fort Monmouth hearings, read the available public testimony? As of today, has the Senator prepared himself by reading the available public testimony?

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe the committee's report was placed on the desks of Senators 3 or 4 days ago.

Mr. McCARTHY. Has the Senator read the public testimony which has been available?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, I have not read that testimony. The Senator well knows that the Fort Monmouth hearings have not been printed, at least that is what his office tells me. I have been trying to get hearings for some time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does not the Senator think he should read it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have already told the Senator that I have not been able to obtain copies of the hearings. I was told by the staff of the Senator's committee that the hearings are not in print. I try to repose a little faith in the officials of the Government who have to do with this subject, and who can accomplish something. I think the subject should be brought to the attention of those persons.

I am impressed by the letter which I have just read from the Secretary of the Army. I thought that in all probability the Senator from Wisconsin would also be impressed. Here is an agency which is headed by Secretary Stevens. It is under his jurisdiction. I am sure that the President of the United States is anxious to find out whether or not we still have Communists in the Government, and whether or not there is espionage of any kind. When a letter is produced dated January 15, 1954, stating that investigations have been made by this agency, and that the agency finds no espionage, and when the Secretary says, "I share fully your assumption that the Department of the Army coupled with the other security agencies of our Government is doing a careful and, in my judgment, competent job in investigating subversive activities," I am very much impressed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield in a moment.

I wish also to say that I have the greatest confidence in the FBI. I have supported the FBI for as long as I have been in the Senate, which is 18 years. I have assisted in raising the amount of money necessary to make the FBI an effective agency of the Government. When I first came to the Senate the amount of money, as I recall, which was appropriated for the operations of the FBI was approximately 8 or 9 million dollars, and the number of FBI positions totaled about 2,500. In 1949 appropriations had increased to $47 million; there were 14,300 positions. Today we have so built up that agency that the appropriations for it are approximately $90 million a year. That is what was spent during fiscal year 1952. There are some 15,000 persons employed by the FBI. We are spending that money in order to maintain a sufficient number of agents and investigators and to enable them to ferret out subversives throughout the Government and throughout the Nation.

I believe with that agency, with the Loyalty Board which has been created by President Eisenhower, and with the investigative agencies in the Defense Department, we ought to be able to do a competent job of investigating all the charges which may be made and to act in accordance with the findings.

Mr. JENNER and Mr. McCARTHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator from Louisiana referred to the FBI. I am sure the distinguished Senator knows the FBI cannot hold investigations or hearings. The FBI cannot call in witnesses and swear them and have them testify under oath.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. JENNER. They can gather information and then take the information to the appropriate agency. They cannot question a witness under oath or dismiss anyone from the Government.

In our hearings we found, as the Senator from Wisconsin also found, situations similar to what was found in the Harry Dexter White case, which I cited. The FBI did a perfect job. It did a complete job. When that information was passed on to higher authority, it was ignored. Therefore the FBI should not be charged with trying to enforce the law. They are an investigating agency.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will acknowledge to the Senator from Indiana that there was a great deal of laxity during the past administration. I admit it. However, the FBI today, as in the past, is always gathering information and is passing it on to the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and in fact to other Departments, through the Attorney General.

Mr. JENNER. But if those agencies do not do anything about it, the FBI cannot do anything either.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; but the FBI ferrets out the subversives.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Louisiana, as I understand, expressed a great deal of confidence in a letter dated January 15, which stated there were no more Communists in Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. I quoted from the letter of Mr. Stevens and it speaks for itself.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to testimony taken 2 weeks later than the date of the letter. Today is Tuesday. The testimony I refer to was taken on Saturday January 30, 1954, in New York, in executive hearing. It dealt with a major in the Army. The major was before the committee on Saturday.

Previously we had received testimony from two individuals who had attended Communist Party meetings with the major. They knew what his orders were. I am speaking of a major in the Army who is a major in the United States Army as of this moment.

The major was also accused by witnesses of having recruited soldiers as members of the Communist Party. He is now stationed at Camp Kilmer. His original orders provided that he go to Yokohama, Japan. However, for some mysterious reason, the orders were changed at his request. Apparently, the only reason given was that his wife and daughters were visiting a psychiatrist, whose name he did not know. However, when asked whether a Communist succeeded in getting his orders changed, he gave us the usual refusal to answer. We checked into the matter further and we

found that in August of last year, 1953, a questionnaire was sent to the major. He was asked about his Communist activities. The questionnaire was sent to him as the result of an FBI investigation. It was an excellent FBI investigation. The investigation by the FBI disclosed everything known about the major, and perhaps contained more information than we had about him. For example, it disclosed his attendance at Communist Party leadership schools, Communist meetings held at his home, the recruiting of soldiers into the Communist Party, and so forth. This was August 1953.

He refused to answer on the ground of self-incrimination. In November 1953 he was promoted from captain to major.

This is not a case of a year ago or 2 years ago. We asked the Army to court-martial not only the major but also anyone who promoted him and everyone who knew he was a Communist and did not try to get him out of the service. I suggested to Bob Stevens that this was the only way by which he could blaze a new trail and thus notify every Army officer that the 20 years of treason are past, that the 20 years of Communist infiltration into every branch of the Government, with our high officials looking the other way, are past, and that there is really a new day.

I hope that Bob Stevens accepts the suggestion and acts on it. This major should be court-martialed. Not only should the major be court-martialed, but those who promoted him and those who knew about his activities and did not attempt to get him out of the service should also be court-martialed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, did the Senator bring that information to the attention of Mr. Stevens?

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to finish my question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Senator bring that information to the attention of Mr. Stevens?

Mr. McCARTHY. My letter went to Bob Stevens yesterday. The Senator from Louisiana said the FBI should do the work our committee is doing. I wish to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that——

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not say that.

Mr. McCARTHY. In effect that is what the Senator from Louisiana said.

Mr. ELLENDER. I said we had agencies——

Mr. McCARTHY. Agencies to do the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. That we had agencies that could do the work we are doing.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; agencies that are qualified to do it and that can do it effectively.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let us see if they can do an effective job. I have the greatest admiration for the FBI. I believe J. Edgar Hoover is one of the greatest living Americans. He has done a magnificent job. Let us see how the FBI is handicapped. Let us see what a congressional committee can do and what the FBI cannot do. Let us see the reason for having committees such as the Jenner committee, the Velde committee, and the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

We had before us Mr. Edward M. Rothschild, an employee of the Government Printing Office. He has been there for many years. The Senator from Louisiana knows that the Government Printing Office handles top-secret material for every agency of the Government. Therefore, a Communist spy in the Government Printing Office could do more damage there than in any other agency of the Government.

He was asked:

Mr. Rothschild, did you have access to secret materials?

He said:

Yes.

He was asked:

Up until when?

He answered:

Until this very moment.

I asked:

At 4 o'clock will you go back to work and handle secret material?

His answer was:

That is the schedule.

Of course, Mr. Blattenberger, the Public Printer, saw to it that he did not go back to work.

We next had before us Mr. Mellor, of the loyalty board. He was the secretary of the old Truman loyalty board, working under Mr. Seth Richardson. We said to Mr. Mellor:

The FBI gave you the names of 40 informers who could give you a clear picture of this man's Communist activities; that he had been stealing secret code books from the Printing Office, that his wife was holding Communist meetings at their home, and that they were active in the conspiracy. Why didn't you call them?

Mr. Mellor answered:

Oh, it was not our practice to call anyone who would give derogatory information.

If Senators will read the testimony of Mr. Hipsley, the acting chairman of the loyalty board in the Printing Office, they will read an explanation of how the FBI's hands are tied and why congressional investigating committees are so badly needed.

I said to him:

Let me ask you this: The other day, as I recall, you said your board operated under the general rule—I think that is an exact quote—the general rule that mere membership in the Communist Party was not sufficient to bar a worker under your loyalty program. Is that the general rule under which they operate?

In other words, Mr. President, here is the chairman of the loyalty board, responsible for security in perhaps the most sensitive agency in the Government. I said to him:

Is that the general rule under which they operate?

Here is the answer:

Mr. HIPSLEY. That is true. I went further, sir, if I may take another moment, and told you that Seth Richardson gave us the philosophy behind that——

He was talking about Seth Richardson, who was his boss, representing the Truman-Acheson administration——

He gave us a long-winded story about the fact that some time ago he wanted to become a member of the IOOF, and he had no knowledge of the charter and bylaws, and he wanted to be a member of the IOOF not because of its charter and bylaws but because it has a nice library with books he wanted to read. He said it was the purpose of the membership, why you belonged, that was important. That was his explanation. He was our guide.

In other words, this man said that we must prove something else beside the fact that a man is a member of a conspiracy dedicated to destroy this country. That explains why the FBI could take no action. All it could do was to prove that a man was guilty of treason, and then, if the Government officials refused to act, it could do nothing further.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the view of the Senator that the FBI is not doing a good job and that it should be done away with?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let us not be ridiculous. I have told the Senator, over and over again, that I think the FBI is doing an outstanding job. The Senator knows that the FBI can fire no one; all it can do is to furnish the facts.

Take the Army major whom we had before us last week. The FBI did an outstanding job, but the man is still there because of the philosophy of the Democratic administration which was to protect and cover up and not to let congressional committees dare to expose the extent of the treason during the past 20 years. They do not dare to do that, because if the American people knew it they would repudiate the leftwing Stephenson type of Democrat who still preach the same thing.

I think there are as many outstanding Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle as there are on this side, but, unfortunately, the outstanding Democrats have not run the Democrat Party for 20 years. That is why we are exposing the treason of the past 20 years. We must expose it and we shall expose it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not objecting at all to the exposure of Communist activities, but I think the distinguished Senator ought to be reminded that under the past administration many Communists were actually put behind bars. It was under the past administration that the Rosenbergs were punished. It was under the past administration that many others were brought to the bar of justice under the Smith Act, and the Hatch Act, along with the various departmental regulations and other acts. Let us not overlook that fact. The Smith Act was passed in a Democratic administration, so was the Hatch Act. Since the present administration has been in office I do not know of any cases which have been brought to the surface or which have even been tried. The point I am attempting to make, however, is that the FBI has done a good job. Whenever it had cases to bring before the bar of justice and present to grand juries, the grand juries acted. It was because of that fact that we were able

to obtain convictions which are now landmarks.

Mr. President, a moment ago my distinguished friend from Wisconsin stated that the work would be continued. I want it to be continued. I want the committees to continue acting. There is a good committee set up for that purpose under the Legislative Reorganization Act. It is headed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. Last year when we appropriated funds for the committee headed by the Senator from Wisconsin, the Senator from Indiana said that his committee had an ample field for obtaining information pursuant to the provisions of the act, and it was hoped that the Senator from Wisconsin would keep out of that field and would continue to investigate Government operations in an effort to weed out inefficiency and catch up with grafters.

The distinguished Senator from Indiana said—and I have faith in him and I have faith in the former chairman, my good friend from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]—that a good job has been and is being done. I am not today saying that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has not done some good. I think he has done a great deal of good in dramatizing some of the cases so that the American people could learn how Communists and subversives work. But what I am striving for is the continuation of legitimate congressional investigations. I want them to go on.

I did not oppose the resolution which was presented by my distinguished friend from Indiana last week. I did not attempt to cut the amount requested by his committee for internal security investigations. The Senate voted for the entire amount, and I voted for it also. All I am asking now is that the committees of the Senate which do investigating work shall continue to do so within their own spheres. There is a great deal of work that can be done in order to save expenses and bring on more efficiency in various departments of the Government by the committee headed by my good friend from Wisconsin. A while ago he stated that, notwithstanding the fact that Secretary Stevens recently found there was no espionage at Fort Monmouth, the Senator is convinced that there is.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a clipping with a Fort Worth dateline quoting Attorney General Brownell, under date of December 19, 1953, to the effect that he believed persons suspected of Communist tendencies were all out of the Government. Of course, there may still be some there, but I believe the work of ferreting them out ought to be handled by the new board which the Senator from Wisconsin has so highly praised. Each agency has a good board to do this work, and they do an effective job, as has been indicated by Secretary Stevens.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Army suffer from the same disability from which the FBI suffers? Can the Army discharge any persons whom they suspect of being Communists?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it customary for a Senate committee to inform the Army or any other agency if it has knowledge of any such conditions?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, it is. That is why I asked my distinguished friend from Wisconsin if he had made available to the Army all evidence of espionage turned up during his Fort Monmouth investigation in the latter part of last year. He said he made it available to the Army, to Secretary Stevens. Now comes a letter from Secretary Stevens saying that there is no espionage in the Army, at Fort Monmouth. That is something that I cannot possibly understand; it is beyond my capacity. I am certain that Secretary Stevens would not protect or harbor Communists or subversives.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to go further into details about duplication of congressional investigations, but the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], aided by the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], made an investigation in respect to operations of the Voice of America. I wish to ascertain from the Senator from Wisconsin if he can tell the Senate what it was that his committee learned that was not discovered by the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which investigated the Voice of America. I do not know too much about it, but I think the Senate should know whether there was any duplication in the work done by the committee headed by the Senator from Wisconsin and its investigators, and the work of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which was headed, when it was begun, by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and which was later headed by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], when the Republicans came into power last year.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I think the Senator has asked a good question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think such information should be given to the Senate.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I do not know what the Senator from Arkansas learned from his investigation. He has not discussed it with me up to this point.

One thing which our committee discovered, strictly from the standpoint of waste, was that every competent engineer who appeared before the committee testified with respect to 2 projects, 1 known as Baker East, the other known as Baker West, which were planned to be anchors in the chain of our broadcasting system. The broadcast beams which were to be directed to foreign countries were to be located in what the engineers described as the magnetic storm area. The cost was to have been $10 million or $11 million. It was suggested that the station known as Baker West should be located farther to the south, out of the magnetic storm area, which would result in a saving of approximately $9 million.

As a result of our investigation, the Baker East and Baker West locations were abandoned, and new ones are to be selected. That means a saving of about $18 million. I did not understand that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] had gone into that matter at all.

Incidentally, one of the letters uncovered in the investigation—and, as I recall, it was not uncovered by the Senator from Arkansas—was received from the assistant to the top man in the program. In the letter he said that if the present locations were continued, they would always be faced with congressional investigations concerning the inefficiency of the output. On the other hand, he said if the stations were moved, and the error was admitted, there would be difficulty in obtaining future appropriations.

I think that matter had to be uncovered. It involved an item of $18 million.

Another matter that was uncovered concerned approximately 30,000 books written by known Communist authors. Those books had been distributed throughout the world for use in special libraries. I am not speaking of American libraries, but of libraries throughout the world which are designed to combat communism. The books were written by men like Howard Fast, who within the past few months received an award from Moscow.

We discovered, also, a man named Theodore Kaghan, who was head of the United States information program in Europe which is connected with the HICOG. I do not believe the Senator from Arkansas discovered that. Kaghan had lived with the Communists and had signed the pledge of the Communist Party. He had written plays and had them produced by Communist organizations. He was discharged because of those activities.

Then there was a man by the name of Reed Harris. The committee headed by the Senator from Arkansas did not uncover him, either. I mention this because the Senator from Louisiana asked whether there was duplication concerning Reed Harris. He had been active in school in defending Communists, and active since leaving school, in defending Communists. There is nothing to show that he has reformed from what may be called his early days. At one time he wrote a book which was acceptable to the Communists. We felt that he was not the right man to head a program to combat communism.

Mr. President, I could go down the line and cite case after case after case, but I think it would be a waste of the Senate's time to do so. The report is very complete. I believe there were 35 individuals involved in the Voice of America whose works were being purchased, and who invoked the fifth amendment. I am reciting only those things which the Senator from Louisiana has asked me to recite which were not covered by the Fulbright committee.

The committee found that Public Law 202, which was sponsored by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] was not being complied with. That law provides that a person who is found to be engaged in Communist activities shall not be eligible for a Government job. However, we found instances

of such persons being paid salaries on a part-time basis. We have stopped some of that, but I am afraid we have not stopped all of it. The committee has received widespread reports of such activities during the past few months. For that reason, if the committee will agree to permit it, we plan to return to that matter and go into it in more detail.

At the time of the proposal to reorganize the information program and to remove it from the State Department, I was opposed to the plan. I felt that even the small amount of supervision given it by the State Department was advisable. However, I was convinced by sizable numbers of persons heading the Voice of America to change my position. They argued that under the present law the Secretary of State could not discharge undesirable persons from the State Department. As I recall, that power was taken away from the Secretary of State early last year, the argument having been that there would be a reorganization, and that the new head would clean house. I fear that the housecleaning as of today leaves much to be desired.

Mr. ELLENDER. My attention was directed to these matters by the fact that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin claimed to have saved the taxpayers $18 million. That was why I raised the question.

I have asked the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] to be present, so as to give to the Senate the benefit of his views with respect to the claim made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by the distinguished Senator from Washington, bearing a release date of January 18, 1954. I am certain the Senator from Wisconsin is familiar with it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Washington points out, the only evidence the Senator from Wisconsin was able to obtain was from a man named McKesson, with regard to the building of two towers, one in North Carolina and one in Washington. It seems, according to the statement, that the Radio Corporation of America and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology were in accord and, as a matter of fact, had recommended the building of the stations where they were located.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON

The report just released by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concerning Voice of America engineering projects has come to my attention.

I think it important to point out another report which has come to my attention since the subcommittee held hearings on the Baker East and Baker West radio transmitter projects. This report was prepared for the Department of State by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology working in conjunction with the Radio Corporation of America with assistance from the Federal Communications Commission. It would seem to contradict the contention of one of the key witnesses before the subcommittee, Mr. Lewis McKesson, that the two powerful radio transmitters were mislocated, and would in turn raise a serious question as to the conclusion in the subcommittee report that their subsequent cancellation was in the national interest.

A letter dated July 31, 1953, from Dr. J. B. Wiesner, director, research laboratory of electronics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, transmitting the report to the State Department is attached in full, and I quote here a few pertinent sentences:

"After further consultation with representatives of the International Information Administration, and also with Dr. H. H. Beverage, of Radio Corporation of America, it was concluded that if large differences in signal level of the sort predicted by Mr. McKesson actually existed they would most certainly be disclosed by a brief series of measurements. Accordingly, plans were made to conduct tests during the period from May 28 to July 7, 1952, with assistance from the Federal Communications Commission under arrangements established by the Department of State.

"The results of these tests failed to substantiate Mr. McKesson's predictions."

It should be noted that both the Radio Corporation of America and Dr. Wiesner of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, by previous written statements had endorsed the original location of these projects at Seattle, Wash., and Cape Hatteras, N. C. Their approval had been based upon their own studies and studies of the National Bureau of Standards and the United States Signal Corps.

Among others, one letter dated May 19, 1952, from Dr. H. H. Beverage, director of the radio research laboratory of Radio Corporation of America, to the State Department testifies to this endorsement of the Seattle site:

"Seattle should be slightly better than Los Angeles because the distance to central China is about 800 miles shorter from Seattle than it is from Los Angeles. It is for this reason that Seattle was recommended as the preferred site."

Among others, a letter dated December 26, 1951, from Dr. J. B. Wiesner, director of the research laboratory of electronics, Massachusetts Institue of Technology, to the State Department reiterates this endorsement:

"We believe that the original recommendation that the Baker Station should be placed in Seattle is still sound."

As to the Baker East Station, Dr. Wiesner wrote in a letter dated February 21, 1953, to the State Department:

"The RCA data, which we still believe to be reasonable, indicated that any location on the southeast coast of the United States would be equally good. Cape Hatteras was suggested because it appeared to be slightly better than most other locations."

These are only a few examples. In going through the recent subcommittee report and the hearings on which it was based, I have encountered several other statements which appear to be in contradiction to documents now available and not called to the attention of members of the subcommittee at the time of the original hearings.

I feel this information is important to a thorough understanding of our overseas information program so vital to our national security.

Dr. Wiesner's letter of July 31, 1953, follows:

"MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY,
"RESEARCH LABORATORY OF ELECTRONICS,
"July 31, 1953.

"DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER,
"International Broadcasting Service,
United States Department of State,
New York, N. Y.

"DEAR SIR: The accompanying report, entitled "High-Frequency Transpacific Radio-Transmission Measurements," was prepared at the request of the Chief, Division of Radio Facilities, United States International Information Administration, under United States Department of State Contract SCC 14102.

"The report summarizes results of a series of trans-Pacific radio-transmission measurements made during the period from May 28, 1952, through July 7, 1952.

"The decision to undertake this brief series of measurements followed discussions held at M. I. T. on May 15, 1952, with representatives of the Department of State, including L. M. McKesson and G. S. Jacobs, of the International Information Administration. At this meeting, Mr. McKesson presented certain charts which he had prepared for predicting trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific radio-wave propagation for various transmitter locations within continental United States. Mr. McKesson's data were in sharp disagreement with conclusions of an engineering study of locations suitable for superpower transmissions completed earlier for the Department of State by the Radio Corporation of America. In particular, Mr. McKesson's data indicated that under typical conditions, owing to effects of auroral absorption, signals broadcast to Asian target areas from Los Angeles would be stronger than signals from Seattle by as much as 70 decibels.

"After further consultation with representatives of the International Information Administration, and also with Dr. H. H. Beverage, of Radio Corporation of America, it was concluded that if large differences in signal level of the sort predicted by Mr. McKesson actually existed they would most certainly be disclosed by a brief series of measurements. Accordingly, plans were made to conduct tests during the period from May 28 to July 7, 1952, with assistance from the Federal Communications Commission under arrangements established by the Department of State.

"The results of these tests failed to substantiate Mr. McKesson's predictions. Since quantitative data on transpacific radio transmissions are extremely scant, the test data were analyzed in considerable detail so as to yield the maximum possible useful information. As summarized on page 101 of the report, the test results indicate that when transmission was on frequencies fairly well below the maximum usable frequency for the particular path, as calculated by standard methods, relative signal levels at different locations were in fair agreement with values obtained by standard methods of calculating field intensities, as described in Signal Corps Radio Propagation Unit Technical Report No. 9. Observations on frequencies below the maximum usable frequency were made during periods when severe ionospheric disturbances did not occur. Under these conditions, it was found that attenuation was generally greater on paths receiving more daylight.

"Furthermore, when the test frequency was near or somewhat above the maximum usable frequency for the path, as calculated by standard methods, the ratios of observed field intensities at locations on the more southerly paths to those on the most northern path were generally greater than such theoretically derived ratios. Day-to-day variability in these ratios was very high, and during times of ionospheric disturbance these ratios were usually greater than during ionospherically quiet periods. Because the tests were restricted to a period of slightly more than 1 month, extension of inferences drawn from the results to other seasons, conditions, and locations should be made only with considerable caution.

"The report is merely an analysis and interpretation of the results of the transpacific radio-transmission measurements actually completed and does not include specific recommendations regarding sites for transmitting facilities.

"Very truly yours,
"J. B. WIESNER, *Director.*"

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I call the attention of the Senator from Washington, in particular, to certain facts, as he recited them. The Senator from Louisiana has misstated the facts again. I am sure he has not done so purposely, because he has not had the benefit of our hearings. Roughly, the facts are as follows:

When the stations were originally planned, there appeared to be some difference of opinion as to where they should be located. However, before any sizable amount of money had been expended, the engineers who were consulted, including the chief engineer of the information program, agreed that it would be unwise to place those stations within the magnetic-storm area. This agreement was general, and Mr. Reed Harris, who is not an engineer, differed with it. He asked us to call 8 or 9 different engineers. He said, "They will testify contrary to what McKesson and Gillettee and other competent engineers testified to."

We contacted each of those engineers, and not one of them was willing to testify that the stations should be located within the magnetic-storm area.

The head of the Voice, Dr. Compton, when he saw the evidence, agreed that the stations should not be located within the magnetic-storm area. There was a senior assistant who said, "We are convinced now that the northern locations are unwise." While I cannot quote him verbatim, he said, in effect, "However, if we move to a desirable location, we will be faced with the possibility of a congressional investigation, and we may have difficulty getting funds." He said, "However, if we stay where we are, we will always be faced with the additional expense of operating the station at low efficiency."

It was testified to by competent engineers, and no one corrected them, that a station putting out the same signals in the target area could be built for about a million or a million and a half dollars, representing a saving of about $18 million.

This was sufficiently convincing to lead the information officials to cancel the plans for both stations. What they are doing toward relocating them in a southern area I do not know, but there is nothing to contradict the testimony that had they proceeded as they were when our hearing started, that is, to proceed to build those stations in the heart of the magnetic storm area, the original cost would have been about $18 million higher, and the monthly cost of the operation would have been greatly increased because of the increased amount of electricity required.

If my statement of the facts is not correct, I should like to have the Senator correct them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Washington is now present. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Washington may proceed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I believe the RECORD will disclose that at the time the committee heard the testimony from Mr. McKesson and other witnesses with reference to Stations Baker East and West, the committee did not have the benefit of information that came to us later. The testimony before the committee by Mr. McKesson in substance was that the location of the Baker stations was undesirable from the standpoint of transmission.

It later developed that the theory advocated by Mr. McKesson, in opposition to these locations, had been previously contradicted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dr. Wiesner of Massachusetts Institute of Technology submitted a report to the Department of State in 1952 refuting the contention advanced by Mr. McKesson. At the time of the subcommittee hearing on this subject we did not have available to us for some reason not known to the junior Senator from Washington, this important information.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield at that point?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The engineer mentioned by the Senator is one of those Mr. Reed Harris asked us to call. We called him and asked him whether he disagreed with the testimony we had heard as to the location. He said at that time, "No; I would not care to testify contrary to that." He did say that in the earlier days, before much money was spent, there was apparently a difference of opinion; but at the time we were holding the hearing we could not find a single engineer who would contradict the statement that it was immensely wasteful to locate the stations where they were.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to make the observation that the crucial feature in connection with the location of the two stations was that the members of the committee had not been given the reports from RCA and MIT which had recommended the location of "Baker East and Baker West."

For example, I discovered later, after the hearings had been completed, that on May 19, 1952, Dr. H. H. Beverage, director of the radio research laboratory of RCA, had made a report, and I quote now from his report:

> The conclusions in RCA Engineering Report CM-43-23 are at considerable variance with the results predicted by Mr. McKesson for transpacific paths. * * * Data for the computation of the optimum transmission frequency were obtained from CRPL—

That is, the Central Propagation Laboratory, which is a part of the Bureau of Standards—

> and Signal Corps publications * * * [which] indicate that the path from Seattle to central China has considerable clearance from the auroral absorption zone. On this assumption, Seattle should be slightly better than Los Angeles because the distance to central China is about 800 miles shorter from Seattle than it is from Los Angeles. It is for this reason that Seattle was recommended as the preferred site.

Furthermore, MIT recommended the sites. I think the difficulty which was encountered in connection with this matter is that the information came to us after the hearings had been completed.

The question at issue is, I think, very clear. RCA and MIT had in fact recommended the locations chosen. I would say the "Voice" officials did call on the best scientific brains in the Nation to get the advice necessary to locate the projects wisely. I am now advised the present "Voice" officials feel that we should not build the two transmitters.

The point we should remember is that the "Voice" officials in fact did obtain reliable and authoritative scientific advice in locating the sites. Whether we should have one transmitter on the east coast and one on the west coast is a matter for the policy officers in the Department to decide.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator that he is correct when he says that the original recommendation of MIT was to locate the stations according to the auroral absorption zone. One rather mysterious thing about it is that the engineers from MIT conceded that they had very little experience in the study of radio-wave propagation. The Bureau of Standards witnesses testified that they could have given the Voice all the information at no cost whatsoever. However, the Voice entered into a $600,000 contract with MIT.

I do not desire to take the Senator's time in an argument about the two radio stations. I merely brought up that point because the Senator from Louisiana had asked what the committee had uncovered that had not been uncovered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I may say to the Senator again that he is correct as to what was said in 1952, but there came a time when there was a unanimity of opinion that in fact it was wasteful and improper to continue the Baker East and Baker West projects where they were.

I desire to quote General Stoner's memorandum in which he said, "This is an improper location, but if we move now to a proper location, we may have to be faced with the possibility of a congressional hearing."

I also desire to call the Senator's attention to a further fact, and I know the Senator from Washington will agree with me. The committee uncovered the very unusual situation that the chief engineer supervising the multimillion-dollar building program all the way from Ceylon to Washington State had no training whatsoever in engineering. He had actually 1 year of preengineering course in college, and he flunked everything except speech. He was not qualified under the rules of the Civil Service Commission. He was hired, and was one of the nicest dupes I think I ever saw. He was the one who was doing the planning. I may say that, fortunately, he resigned during our hearings.

Mr. JACKSON. However, I think the record now discloses that not only did

the MIT recommend these two sites, but the RCA concurred in the recommendation and concurred in the location of Baker East and Baker West. I believe the Department consulted with and received advice from the top technical brains in the country. The Radio Corporation of America has not only a national but an international reputation. I think the record will disclose—and all of this was not available at the time when the subcommittee held its hearings——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield, let me ask why it was not available.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not know why it was not available. We did not get it in the subcommittee.

The principal allegation coming from the investigation was that the Voice of America officials were guilty of negligence in locating these stations.

After the hearings were over, it was called to my attention that the RCA and the MIT had been consulted. The employment of RCA and MIT contradicts the charge of negligence. In addition, at the hearings it was stated that the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the Bureau of Standards had not been consulted. Dr. Newbern Smith, the Director, so testified under oath.

The record now discloses that the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the Bureau of Standards had been consulted. The MIT people and the people from the RCA had been in touch with the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to make a statement with regard to our own subcommittee, although, of course, I cannot speak for the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. It is true that I was chairman of a special subcommittee, consisting primarily of members of the Foreign Relations Committee and, I believe, two additional members, under a special resolution adopted 2 years ago. I was chairman until a year ago, when the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] became chairman. I mention it because our subcommittee was authorized, by special resolution of the Senate, to study the entire information program. We were in the course of that investigation when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] entered into that field, approximately 1 year ago, let us say, under the jurisdiction of his committee.

It is true that our subcommittee did not undertake specifically or even indirectly to examine into the loyalty of the employees. The State Department, under which the program then was conducted, has its own security organization, which is now under Mr. McLeod, as the Senator from Louisiana knows. So we had no particular reason to believe there was any great amount of disloyalty in the organization; and in any case, we would assume, as the Senator from Louisiana does in the case of the Army, that the organization itself was attending to that aspect of the matter.

So our study was directed to the efficiency, the policy, and so forth, of the organization.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did any question about subversives ever come before the subcommittee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Our subcommittee did not undertake to make any study of that matter.

After the Senator from Iowa became chairman of the subcommittee, he held some brief hearings in New York, in regard to the operations of the Voice of America; and I think some testimony with regard to that phase of the matter was taken. I would say it was a very minor part of the investigation. The extent of it, I would say, has still been very minor. We had Mr. Streibert, the new Director, before the Foreign Relations Committee, only a few days ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator from Arkansas says "very minor," does he refer to an investigation by his subcommittee or by the McCarthy subcommittee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Streibert, as my colleague knows, is the new man, appointed by the present administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, and he is a very able executive.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think he is a very able man. I have met him only recently. He has had a very fine record.

At that time we asked him whether during the past year—when he had, as my colleague knows, complete authority to discharge anyone he chose, under the special dispensation given to him by the Senate, last spring—there had been uncovered by his organization, any evidence of disloyalty, and so forth.

If I recall correctly—although I cannot quote his words exactly—he said 10 or 20 persons had been separated from the service, as a result of his investigations and the special authority given him, because of being security risks.

We pressed him a little further, and inquired what he meant by "security risks." I, myself, asked him, "Were they disloyal or Communists?" He replied, "No, they were not Communists." He said it was largely a matter of stability—which I take to mean incompetence or the usual thing that we sometimes refer to as "blabbermouth," or something of that sort. But he specifically said those 10 or 20 persons were not Communists or disloyal—which bears out, as I said, that it was not a major problem in the eyes of Mr. Streibert or his security officers.

He testified they have in that organization more than 80 officers devoted to security matters—which is quite a large group, considering the size of the agency.

But I would not lead the Senator from Louisiana to believe that I had any special knowledge regarding their loyalty. I did not think that was the proper objective of our subcommittee, since other agencies, as well as the Internal Security Subcommittee, which are devoting their attention to security matters, would take care of that phase.

As I said, in the case of the Army that work is handled by G–2, and I think it is competent to do it.

The evidence—at least, as supplied by Mr. Streibert—would indicate that it had been done effectively and efficiently.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate two or three other instances of possible duplication.

I understand that the Internal Security Subcommittee has investigated the United Nations. In that connection, I remember that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] spent some time in New York; and I understand that the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives also investigated the problem in connection with the United Nations.

I wonder to what extent the subcommittee headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin has investigated the United Nations.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Very little, Mr. President. The so-called Jenner committee has gone into the question of dealing with the Secretariat of the United Nations. We heard one or two witnesses, but not witnesses from the Secretariat.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why did the Senator's subcommittee go into that field, if he knew that the Internal Security Subcommittee was already engaged in it?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Perhaps I did not make myself clear. I said the Internal Security Subcommittee had been dealing with the Secretariat of the United Nations. We did not investigate the Secretariat. We had several Communist witnesses from the United Nations, outside the Secretariat.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did that matter involve an investigation of any portion of the United Nations which was investigated by the Internal Security Subcommittee?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Not that I know of.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin proposes or contemplates an investigation of stock-piling. Am I correctly informed about that?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Let me reply "yes" and "no," Mr. President. For a number of months we had been investigating stock-piling. Then the Senate gave the subcommittee of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] authority to do that, whereupon we turned over to that subcommittee not only all the information we had, but also our staff member who had been doing the investigating. One of those staff members is still with the Malone committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume the Senator will be satisfied with the report of the investigation which has been conducted by the Malone Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I think the Senator from Nevada is doing an excellent job.

I do not know what phase of stock-piling our subcommittee may investigate. There are some phases of it upon which

the committee of the Senator from Nevada did not touch. I believe he dealt almost solely with minerals, and the effect which purchasing abroad had upon our local mining industry. There are other phases of stockpiling into which we did go, but that will be a matter for the committee to decide, frankly. I have not taken it up with members of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I inquire as to the occupation currency investigation? It is my understanding that the Internal Security Subcommittee and the Un-American Activities Committee of the House have already gone into that field. Does the Senator contemplate entering that field also?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] was chairman of the subcommittee which held 2 or 3 days' hearings on that subject, especially from the standpoint of the espionage angle. The committee of the Senator from South Dakota has made a final report, and I do not think the Senator from South Dakota plans to do anything further along that line. I cannot speak for him. He was made chairman of the subcommittee for that purpose.

At this time I in no way preclude the Investigations Subcommittee from going into anything having to do with the executive departments. Any investigation we make will be taken up with the members of our committee. If our committee agrees to make a given investigation, it will be made. We will do in the future what we have done in the past. We will keep in contact with the staffs of other committees which may be doing the same type of work. There has been no conflict over the past year, and I hope there will be no conflict during the coming year. When I say "conflict" I mean conflict as to jurisdiction.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am very hopeful that the Senator will do that. As I stated on several occasions in the past, what I am attempting to do is to bring about a situation in which each committee will continue to work within its own sphere of activity, so far as possible; and if any suggestion is made to investigate subjects which have been investigated by another committee, or which are in the process of being investigated by another committee, the staffs of the respective committees should be kept informed. That situation should prevail not only in the Senate, but also in the House. In the Senate we have enough heavy work to do in the course of our regular duties. Our situation becomes very difficult when a great deal of extra work is saddled upon us.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me make myself very clear, in order that there may be no claim in the future that the Senator was deceived. Even if I could make a commitment for my committee, I would not propose to commit my investigating committe not to investigate something which had been dealt with by some other committee. If some other committee conducts a white-washing operation, or does a bad job, and if I think there should be a reinvestigation, the subject will be reinvestigated. For example, one matter which I intend to take up with the Jenner subcommittee and with both the Democrats and the Republicans on my committee is the possibility of reopening one of the foulest coverups Senators have ever seen. I refer to the Amerasia case.

So, if during the course of the year the Senator finds our committee going into something which has been previously investigated, I do not want him to be under the impression that I made any promise that I would keep our committee out of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Wisconsin made such a promise last year.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, the Senator from Wisconsin made no such promise.

Mr. ELLENDER. I read it from the RECORD, which will speak for itself.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Wisconsin has made no such promise. The Senator from Wisconsin will not attempt to give any promise to bind his committee, or cut down its jurisdiction. The committee was established under the Reorganization Act. Its powers are very clearly set forth. Every investigation undertaken has been agreed upon unanimously, and I hope hereafter we can continue under the same system.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In that connection I may say to my distinguished friend from Louisiana that, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I appointed the Jenner subcommittee. I was very careful to follow the work of the Jenner subcommittee. The Senator from Indiana has assured me that in only one instance has there been any duplication whatever. That was in connection with the investigation of the personnel of the United Nations. When that matter was called to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] he promptly withdrew from that investigation and left it in charge of the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has investigated the subject of Communist writers. I understand that the Internal Security Subcommittee and the Un-American Activities Committee of the House have also investigated that subject. I am wondering to what extent, if any, the Senator from Wisconsin discovered facts and evidence which were not discovered by the other committees which held hearings on the same subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. I assume the Senator is talking about our investigation of the purchase by the old Achesonheaded State Department of some 30,000 books by Communist authors, and their distribution. I think that was one of the most fruitful investigations we have made, and one of the most revealing. It showed the extent to which the old State Department collaborated with and supported Communists, and urged their ideas upon our friends throughout the world.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the distinguished Senator tell us to what extent his committee utilizes the same witnesses who appear before other committees on the same subject?

Mr. McCARTHY. We have no chart showing the names of witnesses who may have appeared before some other committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not have access to all the closed hearings, and, of course, it was very difficult to learn the facts, but I understand that there is quite a duplication in that respect. For example, I am informed that quite a number of witnesses who have appeared on the subject matter under investigation by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin had appeared before another committee investigating the same subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator is strictly correct when he says that witnesses who have appeared before other committees have also appeared before our committee. That is a duplication which cannot be avoided. For example, as I recall, the House committee and the Jenner subcommittee had been investigating Communist professors in colleges and universities. We have had certain Communist professors before our committee, not because of their teaching work, but rather because of their other activities. For example, take the case of Professor Furry. Professor Furry may have been before the House committee or the Jenner committee. I should be surprised if he had not been. He had been very active as a Communist. We called him because he had been doing secret radar work in the middle 1940's and again in 1950. We called him on that point. When he was before us, naturally, we developed the fact as to where he was then working. He was a professor at Harvard. Such duplication will be found from time to time. However, if he was before another committee, I am sure the other committee did not inquire about his radar work.

Senators may recall that Furry first took refuge behind the fifth amendment. Then he came back and admitted that he had been a Communist. He said he had worked with six Communists in secret radar laboratories, and then refused to tell us who those Communists were. He did not invoke the fifth amendment in that respect. He invoked his conscience.

Furry's case will come before the Senate in the form of a resolution from the committee seeking a contempt citation. Inasmuch as he had known members of the Communist conspiracy handling top-secret work, we feel that he has no right to keep their names from a Senate committee. The type of duplication which I have described will be found from time to time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin would be good enough to give us, percentagewise, how much of the investigative work is followed through on leads which he obtains from people throughout the country.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is difficult to give. I can give the Senator some idea of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, it might be interesting to the Senate to know how he goes about his work.

Mr. McCARTHY. I can give some estimate of it. It must be borne in mind that we have only 11 investigators and that they cannot run down every lead. When we have a lead which seems to be of interest, but which we cannot run down, it is turned over to the proper intelligence agency of the Army or Navy, or to the FBI or the CIA.

During the past year we had 455 what I believe the Senator would call leads. They were followed to a certain extent. Some of them were merely referred to the department in question. On some we received an answer which satisfied us that it involved a subject which we could not go into because of lack of time or because of lack of jurisdiction. Of the 455 so-called leads, I believe we held full-scale public hearing on only about 8 or 9 different major subjects. A number of them are presently pending.

One of some interest, which first appeared to be a minor lead, looks as though it is a rather important subject because it refers to corruption in Alaska. We expect to hold public hearings on it in a month or so, I believe. I cannot give the Senator any definite estimate of the number of leads we have run down. However, I can say that a lead is important if it appears to point to corruption, communism, or dishonesty. Then we run it down after first consulting with the other committees.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent does the Senator or any member of his subcommittee give out information in advance of making a thorough study or investigation of the leads? I have one instance in mind in particular. I have in mind the investigation which was made in the case of an alleged shakedown. I remember that the Senator from Wisconsin made the charge some time ago. I notice that an investigation was made by the State Department and that the State Department reported the lead upon the basis of which the Senator made his statement was without foundation. Can the Senator shed some light on that subject?

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say that the Senator from Louisiana is in error. The reason he is in error, I assume, is that he has been tied up on the floor of the Senate and he has not seen a recent press release from the State Department. It was released since he came on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, the error which the Senator is making is a perfectly logical one. What the Senator from Louisiana is referring to is to a leak from the State Department to the effect that the charges were unfounded. Today the State Department has issued a press release stating that no person representing a friendly government was in any way involved in a shakedown.

The press release today, while I cannot quote it verbatim, is to the effect that no present employee of the State Department is involved. The press release goes on to say, however, that other employees of the Government showed an undue and—I believe this is the word—improper interest in the matter. The press release goes on to say that the Justice Department has issued a statement saying because the statute of limitations has run against any possible criminal action the investigation will be dropped.

I may say to the Senator that the earlier statement which I had made is completely correct. We had evidence of an attempted shakedown and a request for a bribe. We said at that time a friendly government was in no way involved and that it resisted anything improper.

The State Department today says no present employee is involved, but that other Government employees are. It also states that the statute of limitations with respect to criminal cases has run.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator——

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Louisiana asked me how often information has leaked.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Of course it is impossible to make a solid estimate. There are 21 individuals on a committee. For example there is the majority counsel and minority counsel. Therefore it is impossible to make a solid promise that someone will not leak a story. Of course if anyone does, the matter will be promptly handled.

I do say though—and perhaps other committees may be in a similar position—that perhaps 7 Senators may be present, that each Senator has his administrative assistant with him, and that there are also present 4 or 5 investigators, the official reporter, and a diligent group of newsmen.

So far as I know, no staff member has given any preliminary leak in any case.

I have not discussed the subject with the Democratic Members of the committee, but during the past several months we did start a new practice insofar as hearings are concerned. We have followed the practice of talking to the press—or at least we have followed the practice of having the chairman talk to the press—and giving the press a résumé of what occurred, without giving out any information which would reveal the names of witnesses. Whether that is the wise way to handle it I am frank to say I am not convinced at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator concedes that it is unwise to point the finger of scorn in the direction of someone unless the facts are at hand and proof is available?

Mr. McCARTHY. When the Senator asks that question he intimates that we have done it.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, I did not say that. I am asking whether he concedes that that is the correct procedure to follow.

Mr. McCARTHY. "Concede" is the wrong word to use. The Senator is describing the practice our committee has followed over the past years under my chairmanship and also under the chairmanship of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. Do I approve of the practice? Yes; wholeheartedly.

Mr. ELLENDER. The case to which I referred was made known to the State Department under date of July 13, of last year. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin was quoted as saying that the shakedown accusation was based on testimony from witnesses before his investigating subcommittee, but that neither the witness nor the government involved was identified. I suppose that was following the Senator's practice of giving information as to what the committee was doing, but without mentioning names.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. That is a correct statement. We had testimony of an attempted shakedown. That has been confirmed, I believe, by the State Department's press release of today, except that the press release is to the effect that no present employee of the State Department is involved. I am inclined to think that they may be right about that also.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to restate what I said on the floor last year during the debate on the same subject, and what I stated this year with respect to the special investigation resolutions which come before the Senate for approval.

As I pointed out last year, and as I stated this year, I am a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which recommends the appropriation of funds for the operation of all committees of the Senate. As I indicated, the amount of money spent by the committees has increased, over a span of 10 years, by more than 1,000 percent. I have never opposed a legitimate investigation of any kind, but I do feel that we should use every effort to avoid needless expenditures. One way to do this is to avoid duplication of activities on the part of congressional investigative committees. I am hopeful that all committees which receive funds from the Senate will try to operate so that there shall be no duplication or waste in any way. I believe that if that course is pursued we certainly should be able to cut down on the vast sums which have been spent in the past 2 years in connection with congressional investigations.

Mr. President, I notice that since the Rules Committee reported the resolution which we are now considering, the amount of money requested has been increased. Will the Senator from Wisconsin tell us the circumstances under which this was done, and why it was necessary?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the original amount requested was identical with that requested last year. Subsequent to that time we had a discussion with the Democratic members of the committee. One of the reasons why certain Democrats left the committee last year, I understand, was because of a resolution giving the chairman of the committee the sole right to hire and fire employees of the committee. Some of the Democratic members felt that was a violation of the rules of the Senate. They honestly believed that. I differed with them.

There were other matters which we considered and agreed upon in order to create a situation under which the Democratic Members could return. One of their requests, which I think was reasonable, was that they be given a minor-

ity counsel who would have full access to all matters before the committee.

Another request was that we select a clerk on the staff who would be acceptable to the Democratic Members and whose salary would be approximately $11,000, if he is active, as we assume he will be. There will be telephone expenses, and so forth. It is impossible at this time to estimate the exact costs. We set a figure of $16,000. That was reduced to $14,000 in the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I may say, Mr. President, that I think it was a wise request which the Democrats made when they asked for a minority counsel. I had asked for a minority counsel when I was the ranking minority member, but at that time it did not become an issue. We discussed it with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], who disagreed. I feel so firmly that we should have had a minority counsel that I cannot argue against a minority counsel for the Democratic members.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since the committee will be composed again, as I understand, of Republicans and Democrats, is it not a fact that the attorneys, in fact all employees of the committee, will be utilized by all the members of the committee? Will there be any partiality in any way?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct, up to a point. That is the argument which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] made when I asked for a minority counsel. I feel that the minority is entitled to have someone who will work under the instructions of the minority and be available to the minority at all times.

Mr. ELLENDER. But for one common cause, I hope.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. I think it was a very reasonable request on the part of the minority. I do not disagree with it at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, something has been said regarding the conditions under which the Democratic members returned to the committee. I should like to read into the RECORD at this point from the minutes of the meeting, which have not yet been approved, but if the chairman of the committee will follow me, I shall try to read them as they have been given to me by the clerk of the committee, and I assume they will be approved.

Following a discussion, the conference agreed to the following rules:

1. Future staff members as well as all present staff members shall be confirmed by a majority of the subcommittee.

2. The minority shall select for appointment to the subcommittee staff a chief counsel for the minority who shall, upon being confirmed, work under their supervision and direction; who shall be kept fully informed as to investigations and hearings, have access to all material in the files of the subcommittee, and, when not otherwise engaged, shall do other subcommittee work.

3. The minority counsel shall be hired at a salary not to exceed the maximum allowed Senate employees.

An increase of $16,000 on Senate Resolution 189 will be requested to cover the salary and travel, per diem allowance, and incidental expenses.

4. A clerk already on the staff, acceptable to it, shall be assigned to the minority and it is understood that when she is not busy she will do any work assigned to her on the subcommittee.

5. It is understood that before a voucher is submitted to the chairman for a new employee, that an FBI investigation be conducted—a full field investigation requested.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not have the floor, but with the consent of the Senator from Louisiana I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. With reference to the rule numbered 5, which the Senator from Arkansas just read, there is serious doubt whether we can have such an investigation as is provided for in that rule. All I can do is to request it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I personally understand that. It will be understood, and if we cannot have it, it will not be the fault of the committee.

I now read rule 6:

6. No public hearing shall be announced or held if the minority members unanimously object, unless the Committee on Government Operations by majority vote approves of a public hearing.

Mr. President, what I have read constitutes the rules which were adopted on January 25, 1954, by the subcommittee, as the rules of the subcommittee. Upon the adoption of the rules which I have read, and the rescission, or repeal, of the rule and action taken on July 10, last year—a rule adopted by the Republican majority which gave to the chairman the sole and exclusive right to hire and fire staff employees—the Democratic members returned to the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the Democratic members have returned.

Mr. McCLELLAN. They have returned following what I have announced as having occurred.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas tried to get the additional attorney through the funds which were on hand. Why was it necessary to add an additional $16,000?

Mr. McCLELLAN. So far as I am concerned, I think it could have come out of the No. 9 clause, but the chairman and the majority felt otherwise, and, therefore, I personally yielded on that point.

All I desire is at least one person who can have access to all the files and all the material before the committee, and who can keep us informed of the proceedings that go on among the staff, and on other occasions, when it is impossible for Members of the minority party to be present.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I observe one omission. I am certain the Senator from Arkansas will agree with what I am about to say.

I do not believe there was written into the understanding the provision that in the event of further difficulty in getting a meeting of the full committee to pass upon the question of a hearing, they can be called by telephone or contacted by mail or by telegraph.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I read the items as they were handed to me by the clerk. I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin had approved them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I had overlooked this one.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If there are any modifications, they can be considered. These items comprise the substance of changes made to the rules, as agreed to by the members of the committee. I understand the Senator from Wisconsin agrees to them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree perfectly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if the Senator from Wisconsin would answer the question I have asked the Senator from Arkansas, namely, as to why it was necessary to incur the expense of approximately, I think, $14,000 or $15,000 additional to that provided in the original resolution. Why could not an attorney from the present staff have been made available to the minority? As I understood the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] he was perfectly willing to agree to that procedure, but it was on the insistence of the majority that the additional sum was placed in the resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator from Louisiana misunderstood the Senator from Arkansas. As I recall, the minority felt they should hire their own staff member. Am I not correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The minority has a right to make a nomination and submit it to the full committee or to the full subcommittee for confirmation, just as the chairman of the committee has a right to make a selection for the majority and submit the name to the committee for confirmation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does that answer the question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say also for the benefit of the Senator from Louisiana that the committee has been operating with such a tight budget that I have had to place one of the investigators on my own office payroll, although he works full time for the committee. The committee could not get along with less money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that the purpose of my remarks is not to question the authority of the investigation, its scope, or the sum of money which has been allotted by the Rules Committee. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has just spoken on the subject of rules of procedure within the committee. I wish to speak to that point, because it is a matter within the competence and responsibility of the committee, including both members of the majority and the minority. I know that it has been been a matter of general interest in the country.

I am speaking at this juncture because all of us are aware that the Committee on Government Operations is perhaps the best known committee in Congress. It

has received great public notice. It has received great support, and it has been the subject of great criticism.

There is no question about the right of the Congress to conduct investigations. Its value is questioned in the newspapers occasionally, but everyone knows that one of the most important functions of Congress is to be able to secure information for legislative purposes, to check the operations of the administrative branch of the Government, and even to inform the people with respect to matters before Congress, or of public interest. I do not believe there is much that can be done about the scope of an investigation, once a committee has been authorized to act.

But I do raise the question of the conduct of investigations. Investigating committees have wide powers. They can compel the attendance of witnesses and their testimony, and the production of papers.

I raise the question also because of the very nature of this type of investigation, the investigation of Communist activities. Communism is a subject which arouses the deepest emotions and resentments. In actions or in words, it can be a legal crime, under certain circumstances. Membership in the Communist Party or any association with it has attached to it the greatest opprobrium.

Investigations of communistic subversion and activities while not trials, carry with them in the eyes of many the atmosphere of a trial. The power of the committee to compel the attendance of witnesses, and to compel the production of papers, bear the aspect of a trial.

Many Senators have submitted resolutions providing minimum requirements for a code of procedure for investigating committees. I raise the question now because it is the time when it should be raised, because in the atmosphere which must surround the investigation of communism, I think it is of greatest importance that the question be emphasized.

I have learned today that the committee in its deliberations had finally agreed on the organization of the committee staff, although it seems to me to deal chiefly with the question of patronage.

What I am saying may be futile. But, I do not believe the Senate, or its committees, can for long escape the responsibility to see to it that rules are developed for investigating committees. It is necessary in the public interest that investigations be carried on properly for the good of the Government and the people. It is necessary for the complete protection of the individual rights of those called before committees.

The standing of committees must be assured. It must be assured for the benefit and repute of the Senate itself. I have risen to make these remarks with the hope that this committee will provide these safeguards.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. McCLELLAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. COOPER. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Kentucky will permit me to do so, on his time, and if other Senators will not object, I wish to comment briefly upon what the Senator from Kentucky has just observed.

I completely agree with the thesis of the Senator from Kentucky, namely, that there is a need in the Senate for the adoption of a mandatory code of procedure, binding upon all investigating committees. But I respectfully submit that I do not think the time to adopt such a code is at the time we pass upon an appropriation request by an investigating committee. I think to do so would lead to a great many false charges against those of us who are fighting for a mandatory code of procedure binding upon all committees. Some of our critics would say that we are trying to use our proposal for a mandatory code of procedure as a device for preventing Senate investigations.

As the Senator from Kentucky knows, for some years I have urged the adoption of a mandatory code of procedure. Last year, when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, presented the requests for appropriations for the investigating committees, there was a considerable amount of talk in the cloakrooms of the Senate to the effect that Senators would not vote for the appropriations because they did not like some of the procedures that were followed by some of the committees.

I took the position then, and take it today, that, in my judgment, we must separate and divorce the question of appropriating the money which a committee needs to carry out the power of investigation and the issue as to the procedure which ought to be followed not only by that committee, but by all committees. I desire to have the Senate pass a code of mandatory procedure applicable to all committees as an over-all Senate policy, rather than as a policy applicable only to the McCarthy committee, or to the Jenner committee, or to any other committee. I understand the Senator from Kentucky is not so suggesting.

Mr. COOPER. I did not so suggest.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to make that perfectly clear; the Senator from Kentucky is not so suggesting. I think the Senator from Kentucky has made a sound contribution to the debate this afternoon by bringing up the point of the need for a code of procedure, at a time when there is before the Senate the question of an appropriation for the Committee on Government Operations.

I take exactly the same position I took last year on the question of investigation procedures. I know it is going to be misunderstood by a great many people, but that does not bother me. The Senator from Wisconsin has made a prima facie case for the appropriation for which he is asking. Therefore, in keeping with the power of a Senate committee to investigate, the committee is entitled to the appropriation which it is requesting. That applies also to the Jenner committee or any other committee once the committee makes a prima facie case for the funds it requests.

I desire to join with the Senator from Kentucky in what I interpret to be the spirit and the intent of the comments of the Senator from Kentucky this afternoon, as to the need for the Senate of the United States to adopt a mandatory code of procedure, binding upon every committee. I care not who the chairman of the committee may be, I think the Senate should adopt a code of procedure which takes arbitrary discretion away from the chairman of the committee and the committees as a whole, so far as regards the procedure which is to be followed by the committee. Under such a mandatory code of procedure, every American will know that when he comes before a committee—I care not which committee—he is entitled to certain procedural safeguards. They are very simple, it seems to me.

First, he ought to be entitled to a bill of particulars in advance of the time he is called. He ought to be entitled to be represented by counsel. He ought to be permitted to have counsel cross-examine witnesses who appear to testify against him, which means it ought to be required that witnesses testify against him. He ought to have a reasonable time to put in his case in chief. He ought to have an opportunity to present a brief and a rebuttal brief. He ought to have the right to appeal to a court in the event the mandatory code of procedure is violated. I have never heard a good argument in opposition to such fair procedures which are provided in the Morse bill, Senate Resolution 83.

I make no reference to any particular committee, but I refer to all committees. My proposal would apply to the McCarthy committee, the Jenner committee, and to any other committee. The time has come for adopting a mandatory code of procedure binding on all committees.

However, the consideration or adoption of such a code has nothing to do with the right or power of a committee to carry on its investigation work and to have the money which it needs to carry on the investigation after the committee makes a prima facie showing that the money should be appropriated. I do not favor trying to add such a code of procedure as a legislative rider on an appropriation request such as is now before the Senate. However, I shall fight for a passage of Senate Resolution 32 during this session of Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent, if it be agreeable to the Senator from Arkansas, that he may yield in order that we may proceed with the resolution which has been under debate, without his losing his right to the floor. I believe the debate has about been concluded, and I should like to have action on the resolution before the debate on the Bricker amendment is resumed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to have unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD

at this point a quotation from Woodrow Wilson contained in the opinion of the Court in the case of United States against Rumely, decided March 9, 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the quotation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is the proper duty of a representative body to look diligently into every affair of government and to talk much about what it sees. It is meant to be the eyes and the voice, and to embody the wisdom and will of its constituents. Unless Congress have and use every means of acquainting itself with the acts and the disposition of the administrative agents of the Government, the country must be helpless to learn how it is being served; and unless Congress both scrutinize these things and sift them by every form of discussion, the country must remain in embarrassing, crippling ignorance of the very affairs which it is most important that it should understand and direct. The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function. (Wilson, Congressional Government, 303.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "$192,830" and insert "$207,273."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are necessarily absent.

If the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce also that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—85

Aiken	Cordon	Griswold
Anderson	Daniel	Hendrickson
Barrett	Dirksen	Hennings
Beall	Douglas	Hickenlooper
Bennett	Duff	Hill
Bricker	Dworshak	Hoey
Bridges	Eastland	Holland
Burke	Ellender	Humphrey
Bush	Ferguson	Hunt
Butler, Md.	Flanders	Ives
Butler, Nebr.	Frear	Jackson
Carlson	George	Jenner
Case	Gillette	Johnson, Colo.
Clements	Goldwater	Johnson, Tex.
Cooper	Green	Johnston, S. C.
Kennedy	Millikin	Smith, Maine
Kilgore	Morse	Smith, N. J.
Knowland	Mundt	Sparkman
Lehman	Murray	Stennis
Lennon	Neely	Symington
Long	Pastore	Thye
Magnuson	Payne	Upton
Malone	Potter	Watkins
Mansfield	Purtell	Welker
Martin	Robertson	Wiley
Maybank	Russell	Williams
McCarran	Saltonstall	Young
McCarthy	Schoeppel	
McClellan	Smathers	

NAYS—1

Fulbright

NOT VOTING—10

Byrd	Hayden	Langer
Capehart	Kefauver	Monroney
Chavez	Kerr	
Gore	Kuchel	

So the resolution (S. Res. 189), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1954, and ending on January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $207,273 in addition to the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 40, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to January 30, 1953, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

CHANGE IN ALLOCATION OF CERTAIN FUNDS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas now has the floor under the prior unanimous-consent agreement. I wonder if he will yield to me at this time for the purpose of propounding two unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 875, House Joint Resolution 354. I have discussed this matter with the minority leader and also with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN.]. The resolution does not provide for any additional funds, but provides for a different allocation of certain funds of the Hoover Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 354) amending Public Law 207, 83d Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what was the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I asked unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 354. I have consulted with the minority leader and with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I understand that they have no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Reserving the right to object, I am merely asking for a point of information. When will the Senate get back to the Bricker amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. As soon as these two unanimous-consent requests are out of the way, we shall resume consideration of the Bricker amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 354?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk and formally offer a substitute for the first committee amendment. I presented this substitute to the Senate on the day debate upon this question commenced, but I find that I did not formally offer it. I wish now formally to offer it and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the committee on page 3, lines 5 to 19, inclusive, it is proposed to insert:

SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that my amendment be made the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the request of the Senator that the amendment be printed and lie on the table?

Mr. GEORGE. No. I ask that it be made the pending question. I wish formally to offer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia. Is there objection to agreeing to the amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that even the distinguished Senator from Georgia is not asking that

the amendment be agreed to at this time. He is merely formally offering it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stands corrected.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a memorandum prepared by Mr. Alfred J. Schweppe, of the Seattle, Wash., bar, in connection with the power of Congress to regulate executive agreements.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The absolute climax in holding foreign policy action superior to the United States Constitution and State laws was reached in *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203). It is but an extension of the *Missouri* v. *Holland* doctrine to executive agreements. The Bricker amendment as proposed is designed to reach the Pink case and would reach it in the part adopted by Senator George in his proposal. The Bricker amendment in its present form provides that neither treaties nor other international agreements shall become internal law in the United States without legislation. That is section 2 of the Bricker amendment up to the "which" clause. Senator GEORGE accepts this principle as to executive agreements by providing that an international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by act of Congress.

The rule of *United States* v. *Pink*, 315 U. S. 203, 228 (Justices Jackson and Reed not participating, and Chief Justice Stone and Mr. Justice Roberts dissenting) is that an executive agreement made by the President alone, without the approval of the Senate, is, like a treaty, the supreme law of the land and supersedes the fifth amendment as well as the law of New York. This highly dangerous rule concerning the effect upon the laws of the country of agreements lying in the files of the White House or of the State Department can only be overcome by a constitutional provision that executive agreements, as well as treaties, shall have no effect as domestic law within the United States unless implemented by legislation.

In the Pink case the majority of the Court said: "The fifth amendment does not stand in the way of giving full force and effect to the Litvinov Assignment."

This holding was criticized by Dr. Philip Jessup in 36 American Journal of American Law 282 (1942) in the following language: "From the point of view of our constitutional law, the decision may well mark one of the most far-reaching inroads upon the protection which it was supposed the fifth amendment accorded to private property."

Thus, under the Pink case, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, by his letter of acceptance of the Litvinov assignment, set aside the fifth amendment as well as the law of New York.

By the same reasoning, the President by executive agreement could perhaps set aside an act of Congress. The contrary has been held by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in *U. S.* v. *Capps* (204 F. (2d) 655 (April 15, 1953)). The Supreme Court has held as to treaties and statutes that the one last in time controls: A treaty can overcome a preexisting Federal statute, and, vice versa, a later Federal statute, can overcome a prior treaty. *Headmoney* cases (112 U. S. 590, 597–99), and numerous others. (See 1953 Senate hearings on Treaties and Executive Agreements, p. 1241). Does the same rule apply as to acts of Congress and executive agreements, namely, that the one last in time is controlling? Whether the recent Capps case doctrine will ultimately prevail is of course not known. However, while *Missouri* v. *Holland* involved the 10th amendment, the Pink case involved the 5th amendment. Certainly if the President can set aside the 5th amendment by an executive agreement, then surely it can then also be done by treaty. Then where are the 10 amendments and all other constitutional provisions?

And let it be remembered by those who rely on dicta in *Missouri* v. *Holland* that the "prohibitory words" of the 5th amendment did not protect in the Pink case.

At the 1953 Senate hearings (p. 828) Secretary Dulles, overlooking the Pink case, told the Senate that executive agreements not approved by the Senate as treaties "cannot constitutionally become law of the land," unless validated by Congress. His exact words were: "The danger to the Nation, however, from agreements not submitted to the Senate as treaties cannot be great because, without either Senate or congressional action, these agreements cannot constitutionally become the law of the land." But now that the State Department has been told about the Pink case (hearings, p. 1229), it refuses to agree even to the George portion of the Bricker amendment which would make the law exactly what Secretary Dulles erroneously thought it was in April 1953.

Senator GEORGE said in an interview: "I will not support the amendment unless it has this clause. It is the only way that Congress can find out what is in some international agreements. It protects the rights of the States where they must be protected if they are going to be protected at all—in the Congress and the Supreme Court."

ALFRED J. SCHWEPPE.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum written by Prof. Noel T. Dowling, professor of constitutional law at Columbia University, supporting the view that both treaties and executive agreements should be made non-self-executing, and require legislation by Congress to make them effective as internal law within the United States.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSAL THAT A TREATY SHALL BECOME EFFECTIVE AS INTERNAL LAW IN THE UNITED STATES ONLY THROUGH LEGISLATION BY CONGRESS

For purposes of internal law in the United States, this proposal would put an end to the self-executing effect of treaties, would stop lawmaking by treaty. Among the points made by the supporters is that it will assure that national laws will be made by the national legislature. At present, in the absence of an express declaration, there can be no certainty whether a treaty is self-executing, or what its meaning is until the issues are finally decided in court. The requirement of implementation will obviate the problem of the justiciability of a treaty, for courts certainly will pass on the constitutionality of implementing statutes. The proposal would not violate international law since that governs only the effectiveness of a treaty as an international obligation, not the method of giving it internal effect. The power of Congress to supersede the internal effect of a treaty by the passage of a statute is not an adequate alternative to the present proposal; Congress might not be able to muster the two-thirds vote necessary to override a probable veto. The proposal would not unduly prolong the treaty process; if the President and two-thirds of the Senate approve, the majority necessary in each House of Congress should be readily obtainable.

Opponents of the proposal urge that uncertainty of meaning is unavoidable; it is true of statutes as well as of treaties. Uncertainty of a treaty's self-executing effect can be avoided by the insertion in the treaty of a declaration that congressional implementation is necessary. Whatever doubt there may be as to the justiciability of a treaty as an international engagement, there is no doubt that courts will pass on the constitutionality of a treaty as internal law. The proposal would impose a cumbersome procedure for making a treaty effective as internal law: it would require a fivefold approval, by the President and the requisite number of Senators for the treaty itself, and by a majority of Senate and House, plus approval by the President, for the implementing statute. It would make peace more difficult to obtain than war. While the requirement of implementation would not be a concern of other signatories, they would be concerned with the probability of delay or failure in implementation; the United States would be put in a bad bargaining position. Undesirable effects as internal law can be overcome by the passage of a statute.

The case for this proposal is persuasive to me. The making of law for the internal governance of the country is an appropriate function for the lawmaking branch, Congress. There is something in the point that the question whether a treaty shall have internal effect should be determined by Congress rather than by the courts; the judicial processes of treaty interpretation touch upon, if they do not actually involve, political considerations. The legislative process will give certainty, perhaps add clarity. The requirement of implementation emphasizes the responsibility attached to the making of a treaty which will disturb the existing powers of the States. This proposal does not call for a shift in power either from the States to the Nation or from the Executive to Congress. Congress would acquire no new power; it already has power to control the internal law effect of treaties.

True, congressional power would have a different impact: it would have to come into play beforehand rather than be available afterward as a corrective. Even now the House sometimes has to act beforehand—e. g., when an appropriation is needed to effectuate a treaty. At most the proposal would postpone and condition a treaty's effect as internal law; no conclusive showing has been made that it would seriously interfere with the making of treaties as international engagements.

The case against the proposal is not so formidable as it first appears. For example, the argument about the cumbersome procedure is urged as if most treaties were intended to have effect as internal law. I doubt (I do not know) whether very substantial numbers have been so intended. The most numerous and most frequently mentioned are treaties granting privileges to aliens (e. g., to engage in business, to own land, etc.) in return for like privileges to our citizens abroad. As far, however, as internal law on such matters is concerned it may be said in passing that the role for treaties (whether implemented or not) is a diminishing one in this country. The objection that the proposal would make peace more difficult to obtain than war rests upon the assumption that it is easier to get a two-thirds vote in the Senate than it is to get a majority vote in the House—an assumption

the soundness of which is, to say the least, not self-evident.

PROPOSAL THAT EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS SHALL BE SUBJECT TO THE LIMITATIONS IMPOSED ON TREATIES BY THIS AMENDMENT

The effect of this proposal would be to bring executive agreements within the range of the first three proposals discussed above. That is to say, it would make agreements in conflict with the Constitution void; for purposes of internal law, it would shut off the self-executing effect of executive agreements (as in *United States* v. *Belmont*) and prevent development (along the lines of *Missouri* v. *Holland*) of power in Congress based on executive agreements.

Most people would agree, I suppose, that limitations (other than as to the manner of making) applicable to treaties should also apply to executive agreements. Or, putting it another way, few would urge that executive agreements should have any higher constitutional standing than treaties. The Supreme Court in dealing with the legal effect of executive agreements has tended to assimilate them into the category of treaties. The Bricker amendment is on good ground in doing the same. An additional reason is that there is no clear dividing line between treaties and agreements. No satisfactory explanation has yet been offered on how or where to draw the line, and I see no likelihood that drawing the line will become a justiciable question. Whether it is better to proceed via the one or the other is itself a phase of the problem of conducting foreign affairs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the American Constitution is one of the miracles of man's history. It was hammered out initially by great men in a series of great debates. Then it was subjected to the most searching examinatiton in another series of debates carried on throughout the Thirteen States before it was finally adopted.

Generation after generation of Americans has turned to the Federalist debates for enlightenment, not only as to the foundations of the Constitution but also for enlightenment upon the philosophy of democratic government in the United States. The Constitution is our most brilliant, as it is our most enduring, political success. It has been a preeminently workable document adaptable to the incalculable social and political changes that have occurred upon this continent and in the world since it was written nearly two centuries ago. Under it this Nation has successively weathered the mightiest civil war of all time and three world wars stretching from the days of Napoleon to those of Kaiser Wilhelm II, Hitler, and Mussolini. Nor is this all. Under it also the American people have achieved more happiness and prosperity for a longer time and over a wider area than any other system ever erected by men.

The reader of the constitutional debates feels, again, a solemn pride in his country. The debaters were gifted men. They constituted, indeed, such a brilliant company as has rarely been found anywhere, and whose like we have not had since their passing. Widely and deeply educated, they drew upon all the legal-philosophical sources of the ancient and contemporary world. Themselves learned, they respected both learning and the learned. They were free of that swinish blight so common in our time—the blights of anti-intellectualism. I should like to remind you, if I may, that this blight, hitherto alien to our democracy, was endemic in Fascist Italy and Germany as it is endemic today in Soviet Russia.

The Founding Fathers were children of the age of enlightenment. They believed in reason. They sought to convince other men by persuasion rather than to try to bludgeon them into submission by force. They were serene in the belief that reason, applied to human affairs could bring men to a better way of life and living. They had an immense contempt for the debater who descended to the low level of personalities. They detested the use of slogans and epithets, for their use is the last refuge of the mentally insecure and the intellectually bankrupt. They appealed to men's minds; not to their passions. In short, they were reasonable men seeking to establish a new state upon a rational foundation so firm that it could withstand the stress of change in decades to follow.

And here, if I may divert for a moment, I should like to say that I am tired of name calling directed at anyone who does not agree with the other fellow. I am prepared to debate the principles in which I believe. I am not, however, prepared to indulge in any contest of name calling, for not only is this repulsive but it is also, as I see it, an offense to manners that govern the conduct of decent men, and it is antidemocratic in the operation of a democratic society.

The Founding Fathers pursued rationality in their acts and in their debates for another reason. They believed that our democratic society presupposes the code of the gentleman. It does not expect saintly conduct of men. It does, however, expect that they should conduct themselves with a decent respect to the opinions of mankind. But when they do not do so, when public men indulge themselves in abuse, when they deny others a fair trial, when they resort to innuendo and insinuation, to libel, scandal, and suspicion, then our democratic society is outraged, and democracy is baffled. It has no apparatus to deal with the boor, the liar, the lout, and the antidemocrat in general.

Under the Constitution, the United States has gone from weakness to strength, from strength to greater strength, from isolation to world leadership, until now we are a people having an unparalleled prosperity at home and an unprecedented power abroad.

The Founding Fathers were, I repeat, eminently successful in their efforts. Only once was their work violently challenged. And we paid a stupendous price for that challenge in blood, treasure, and heartbreak. At that time, as you know, there were fanatics in Boston and there were other fanatics in Charleston. Men hurled epithets at one another, they refused to listen to reason, faith gave way to fanaticism, and, as Americans venomously distrusted one another, we came to a bloody civil war.

It is then no small thing to drastically alter the Constitution by an amendment that in effect throttles the President of the United States in his conduct of foreign relations. It is indeed bewildering to see the Constitution, which for so long has been the bulwark of our liberties and the primary source of our political strength, come under such violent attack as we have not witnessed since the 1850's. It is even more bewildering when one considers that, so far from being a "loophole" in our Constitution as is now claimed, the treatymaking power was perhaps the most urgent reason for calling the Constitutional Convention. Treaties made under the Articles of Confederation were not enforceable as internal law. The debates of the Convention and the Federalist papers show the extreme care taken in the formulation of this power, and the system of checks and balances applicable to it.

But today I am less concerned with the Bricker amendment in its direct constitutional sense than I am with it as evidence of a disturbing phase of present day thinking common to many men.

The essence of their malady, as I see it, is this: It is an attempt to escape the world. As troubles and problems, many of them apparently insoluble, pile one upon the other, an irresistible desire to escape it all wells up in their consciousness. Political scientists call this tendency to withdraw from the struggle and to pretend it does not concern us isolationism. The psychologists tell us that it is a very natural yearning of a deeply troubled adult to return to the peace and quiet of prenatal security.

Whatever the instinct or the motive we know that such retreat from the world is impossible. Our salvation, if we are to be saved, will come from looking the facts in the face and following wise policies based upon those facts.

We often talk about adopting a tough policy in foreign affairs. I suggest that loose talk about being tough is evidence more of weakness than strength, for a strong man who really believes in himself does not try to impress the other fellow by being tough. We need, not toughness, but toughmindedness; that is, the willingness and ability to look facts in the face, however bitter they may be, to appraise them at their true worth and then to act calmly, judiciously, and determinedly.

I shall not attempt here even to state, much less appraise, the facts of the perilous, troubled world in which we live; a world perhaps teetering to destruction even as we sit here.

Senators are well acquainted with the events of recent years. Suffice it to say that the world order of the last 300 years, under which we developed great wealth and power has been destroyed. Europe the predominant influence in that period is stricken and unable to direct the course of events.

The spread of modern technology into hitherto backward lands has created opportunities and possibilities for peaceful or warlike developments heretofore unimagined.

In a word the destruction of the old established pattern of world power has left us in a period of inevitable and unpredictable change. These are the facts of life, and not idle speculation. We will not be able to go back to the halcyon days of 1900, but must, on the contrary,

continually face unforeseeable perils. This being true we shall not triumph by any device, whether isolation, neutrality, or the Bricker amendment, whose underlying objective is a retreat from the world.

One reason of course that we should like to retreat from the world is that struggle—constant, unremitting, blood-and-sweat struggle—is the primitive law of all life on this planet. Struggle successfully, and you survive. Fail to struggle enough, and you perish. The record of mankind is replete with illustrations of tribes and nations long vanished from the face of the earth because they were unable to meet the conditions of struggle imposed upon them either by their environment or by human enemies. History records their passing but nature does not weep for them.

Nature—pitiless in a pitiless universe—is certainly not concerned with the survival of Americans or, for that matter, of any of the two billion people now inhabiting this earth. Hence, our destiny, with the aid of God, remains in our own hands.

Mr. President, we have been given at times to adopting methods that seem strange to a civilized and enlightened people. For these methods, in essence, are those of the witch doctor in a primitive African village. He attempts to drive away the evil spirit by beating drums or by chanting cabalistic incantations. We who are brought up in the tradition of science are saddened by this spectacle, knowing how fruitless it is. But incantations can be chanted in more ways than one, and when we do it by assuming that we can banish the evil spirits of an evil world by turning our backs upon it through such concepts as neutrality or the Bricker amendment, we are merely denying our intelligence, turning our backs upon our knowledge, retreating from the facts of life, and placing our faith in methods that all history and all experience have demonstrated to be futile.

Our enemy is not the President of the United States, whether the incumbent, his successor to come, or his predecessors. Indeed, so far as President Eisenhower is concerned it is an unbelievable spectacle to see Members of the Senate—particularly members of his own party—trying to hamstring him in the exercise of perhaps the most solemn and far-reaching obligations of his office—namely, the conduct of our foreign relations—when not long ago this Nation gave its life into his hands by making him the supreme commander of our military forces. And one's amazement becomes greater in the face of this spectacle seeing that recently the American people, believing not only in his high qualities as a man but also in his high abilities as a diplomat trained in the hard school of experience, elected him President of the United States at a period when the successful or unsuccessful conduct of our foreign relations may mean the life or death of this Nation.

Mr. President, the Constitution charges the President with the duty of conducting our foreign relations by and with the advice of the Senate. It makes him the leading actor; not a spectator and a mere witness. And this role has been discharged by successive Presidents of the United States throughout the nearly two centuries duration of the Constitution. It was never intended by the Founding Fathers that the President of the United States should be a ventriloquist dummy sitting on the lap of the Congress.

I do not share the fears of an ignorant or willful President or Senate, and this faith on my part is not merely an innocent trust in individuals, present and future. It is a faith in the form of government which we have known for 165 years, in the traditions and history of the institutions of the Presidency, the Senate, and the Supreme Court, and in the ability of our people, present and future, to regulate those institutions through the processes of government, as they have in the past.

Yet we have come to this constitutional crisis—not, I believe, because Members of this Senate, whether Democrat or Republican, have little faith in President Eisenhower's wisdom and patriotism. We have come to it, I think, because in our desperation to escape the world that we can never escape, we are seeking some device of magic that would enable us to accomplish an impossible end.

Many years ago I read an old-fashioned oration on George Washington by Edward Everett. Everett said that, "Commonsense was eminently a characteristic of George Washington." I could not have been more disappointed and disillusioned than by this appraisal of one of my heroes. For as a boy I naturally thought of Washington as a dashing figure on a horse leading his troops into battle, or crossing the ice-caked Delaware to strike the Hessians at night. It was years later that I realized the significance of Edward Everett's words and understood that without George Washington's commonsense it might have been impossible to establish this democracy. Washington has been dead now some one-hundred-and-fifty-odd years. But commonsense is as valuable now as it was in his day, even if it is apparently becoming rarer. I suggest that we could return to it with the greatest benefit to us all.

Presidents come and go. Some are wise; some are less wise. Some are strong; some are less strong. Some are gifted; some are less gifted. This is true, too, of all the men who have sat in Congress since the founding of this Nation. But all our Presidents, our Congresses, and the members of our Supreme Court proceeding with such wisdom as was given them, and operating under the checks and balances of our constitutional system, erected here a system of government without parallel among civilized men.

In so doing they were aware of the wisdom of George Washington when he said in his farewell address:

> Toward the preservation of your Government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles; however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the Bricker amendment and urge the Senate to reject it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 1 is before this body for discussion. In its original form it carried as sponsors the names of 64 Senators including that of the junior Senator from Vermont. I do not know how many of these sponsors signed under the same conditions that applied in my case, but I suspect that a number of us told the author of the resolution that we were making no commitment to vote for it but felt very strongly that the subject was of great importance and that we wanted to contribute to the move to have it carefully analyzed and discussed in committee and on the Senate floor. That objective has been achieved.

Let it be noted at this point that the resolution as reported out of committee still carries the full list of sponsors. There is, perhaps, nothing irregular in this. But the junior Senator from Vermont is not at all sure that he would have sponsored the resolution as it now appears.

As is the case, I assume, with all other Senators, my office has received a voluminous correspondence on this subject both from my own State and from the country as a whole. The consensus of these letters from my own State strongly opposes the proposed amendment to the Constitution. The letters from the rest of the country, on the contrary, strongly sustain the amendment.

There is one point of view that is found in many of the letters supporting the amendment both from within my State and from other States. That point of view is sometimes clearly expressed and at other times only intimated. The bias in these particular letters is definitely anti-United Nations. With those who hold this bias I find myself completely out of sympathy.

We must not give an automatic clean bill of health to the United Nations. I am disturbed at some of the activities that take place under its aegis. It seems to me for instance that UNESCO has gone off on a number of hare-brained and trouble-raising projects. I am sure that we do not know enough about what UNESCO is doing and that if we did know, we might be more concerned about

it than we are now. There are responsibilities in connection with the United Nations which we must learn to assume.

There have been recently two statements, both free from uninformed enthusiasm, which seem to me soberly to present the case for the support of the United Nations. One of them was made by the President in his message on the state of the Union when he said:

> In the world as a whole, the United Nations, admittedly still in a state of evolution, means much to the United States. It has given uniquely valuable services in many places where violence threatened. It is the only real world forum where we have the opportunity for international presentation and rebuttal. It is a place where the nations of the world can, if they have the will, take collective action for peace and justice. It is a place where the guilt can be squarely assigned to those who fail to take all necessary steps to keep the peace. The United Nations deserves our continued firm support.

The other is a reasoned and unextravagant defense by our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Cabot Lodge, who stoutly defended the United Nations, first, for providing "unique services" when war threatened in several trouble spots; second, as the "only real world forum" where "we can use the big truth to demolish the big lie"; and third, as a place where "authentic reactions" of world opinion can be obtained. With these statements I completely agree.

It must be evident to anyone that my original purpose of providing for public debate on the question of treaty law has been amply effected. No undertaking of mine in my legislative experience has been more amply rewarded. In the resulting debate there are points at which the layman in law, like myself, finds himself in the plight of the innocent bystander. Competent legal opinion beats on him from the east and from the west—from the right and from the left. Yet this is no private fight, and he cannot excuse himself from the field of battle. He must stay in it until a victory is won.

The great need for bringing this question into analysis and discussion is one of which many of our citizens are not aware. This is the eighth session of the Senate in which the junior Senator from Vermont has participated. In that time he has been witness to a growing tendency on the part of the State Department and the administration to depreciate the constitutional role of the Senate in the making of treaties. In the last years of the Truman administration it became quite evident that the attitude of the then Secretary of State toward the Senate was one that verged on contempt. It seemed clear that in his mind the only responsibility of this body was to apply the rubber stamp.

It is most unfortunate that it is necessary to go further than this. At times the Secretary of State displayed deceit as well as contempt. This was particularly the case when the NATO treaties were being presented for ratification. It is well known that the senior Senator from Iowa pressed the Secretary of State on the question as to whether the NATO treaties involved sending any American soldiers to the continent of Europe. The final answer to this question from the Secretary was an outright denial of any necessity under the treaties for so doing.

Conceivably the State Department could get out of that one by insisting that the request to send our soldiers abroad may have been consequent on the treaty but was not determined by it. This is not a valid vindication as against the charge of deceit.

It is important that these things should be mentioned at this time, because they are part of the climate of experience and feeling in which the seed of Senate Joint Resolution 1 was planted. It was a soil already prepared by the State Department for the growth of any reasonable proposal to restrain its activities and diminish its power.

Yet in spite of the fact that the State Department of the previous administration prepared the troubles which the present administration is having to meet, we must not be carried away by our emotion and our experience into actions which are unwise from the standpoint of the well-being of the Nation. These matters are therefore mentioned only in passing, and not as conclusive arguments for or against the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

As mentioned before, it is difficult for the layman to judge between conflicting legal opinions of competent lawyers. It is, however, possible to apply the judgments of commonsense with the hope that such judgments may clear the way through the legal jungle to some solid, open ground.

It would seem that commonsense is applicable to section 1 of the resolution. It is surely the intent of the Congress; it is surely the desire of the people of the United States; and, finally, it is the expressed desire of the administration that treatymaking power shall not be so exercised as to conflict with, or in fact alter, the Constitution. Why not say so?

There seems indeed to be an ambiguity in the Constitution itself. In the second paragraph of article VI is to be found the provision:

> All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

This wording has been explained as being due to the historical timing of the treaty of peace with Great Britain and the adoption of the Constitution. Be that as it may, if it were intended to leave unclear the question of the subordination of treaties to the Constitution, this wording could scarcely have been better drawn to that end.

Let us clear up the ambiguity. Let us adopt section 1 of the resolution.

Since section 2 is the most controversial, let us pass on first to section 3. There has been a tendency in recent years for the State Department to avoid the conflicts involved in treatymaking by expanding the use of executive and other agreements with foreign powers and international organizations. That there be no question as to the authority of the Congress to deal with such agreements, nor any misunderstanding as to the status of such agreements as compared with treaties, it seems highly advisable to put into the Constitution section 3, or, alternatively, the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

We come now to section 2. This section cannot be read by the junior Senator from Vermont without arousing strong misgivings. None of the many arguments in its favor which he has read has served to quiet these misgivings. In particular it seems highly inadvisable to relieve the Senate of any of its responsibilities under the Constitution. Rather it would seem wise to accentuate those responsibilities and to make sure that they are lived up to. If we do so, the purposes of section 2 can be effected without constitutional amendment. If we do not do so, no laws or amendments will serve the country as a substitute.

For these reasons, I am against section 2, certainly as it is now written.

The important results of the debate on this amendment should be two. The first is a warning to the administration not to attempt to circumvent the Senate nor to disregard it. The second result should be a sharpening of the feeling of responsibility within the Senate for the careful examination of our treaties and the taking within its purview of any executive agreements which seem in any degree questionable. Let us retain our severe constitutional responsibility.

Let us not dodge it. Let us not dilute it. The Founding Fathers placed upon us a task which we must carry out in all thoroughness and good conscience.

We have not been too careful in the past. Treaties have been ratified as though the Senate itself accepted the State Department idea that our sole duty is to apply the rubber stamp.

We must no longer allow this idea to be harbored either in the minds of the administration or in our own. Let us not attempt to pass off this responsibility onto new laws or constitutional amendments. Let us pick up that responsibility and conscientiously exercise it from this time forth. In particular the very structure of the Constitution makes the Senate the trustee of the rights of the States. Let us exercise that trusteeship with vigor and intelligence.

One new emphasis on our responsibility can be achieved without the formality of constitutional amendment or even of legislation. By a simple Senate rule we can make it obligatory to have a yea-and-nay vote on the ratification of any and all treaties. I hope that such a rule will be enacted. It will have my hearty support.

This debate can have momentous and heartening results. We can persuade the State Department to recognize fully the constitutional role of the Senate in the making of treaties. We can educate ourselves to take those responsibilities deeply so that the State Department will recognize that it must negotiate with care any proposals which are required to be referred to a vigilant Senate.

THE EISENHOWER NEW PUBLIC POWER PROGRAM: "PROGRESSIVE AND DYNAMIC"—BUT NO DYNAMOS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the representative of the Independent Party thinks this is an appropriate time to

make his weekly report. It seems that most of his colleagues are in committee hearings or elsewhere. He will therefore take this opportunity to speak for the RECORD, to the RECORD, and through the RECORD to the people of Oregon, knowing full well that interested colleagues will read the speech in the RECORD. I respectfully suggest that my colleagues had better be interested in its contents, because it deals with what in my judgment is one of the most vital issues to come before this session of Congress. Mr. President, my colleagues will find that in the campaign immediately ahead, there will be a great deal of interest in the subject matter of my speech this afternoon, particularly at the grass-roots of America. My subject is, "The Eisenhower New Public Power Program: Progressive and Dynamic—But No Dynamos."

During the last session of the Congress, the representative of the Independent Party inaugurated a series of reports on our great program of public power and natural resources development programs. In these weekly reports, dedicated to the late Senator George Norris, the origins of our natural resources development programs were described and the important contributions they had made to our national economy and well-being were documented. The reports detailed the Administration attacks which were being made upon the very foundations of those policies.

In the interval when Congress was in adjournment, there was a renewed and concentrated onslaught against such programs through administrative actions. It is a remarkable coincidence that the Administration waited until Congress was safely out of town before it began to wield the knife on those programs in broad daylight.

In the short period of 5 months, the administration, through various policy declarations, criteria, negotiation of contracts, and other devices, made the following basic changes in our great conservation and public power programs:

First. Where the Federal Government in the past had taken the initiative in a far-sighted, aggressive program for natural resources and public power development, the Eisenhower "muddle of the road" administration has abdicated this dynamic role to the predatory private power companies and other big corporate interests, so that our natural resources exploitation can be undertaken for their benefit rather than the benefit of all the American people.

Second. Where the Federal Government, through policies established by the Congress almost 50 years ago, formerly protected the rights of the nonprofit municipalities and rural electric cooperatives so that these peoples' electric systems could obtain a fair share of publicly developed power, the new administration has undermined the rights of these nonprofit agencies. In fact, possibly in conflict with law, the Department of the Interior, which I have renamed for all my speeches in the Senate on the power issue, Mr. President, as the "Department of Private Utilities," now is giving certain private power companies a preferred position in buying public power.

Third. The Federal Power Commission has been charged by law with the authority and responsibility to regulate electric power rates for the protection of the consumer. The Commission has handed over to the private utilities all benefits of the tax amortization program, amounting to billions of dollars, without so much as a bone to the power consumer.

Fourth. And where our Federal Government in the past has attempted to set power rates at the lowest possible level in order to encourage consumption and serve as a yardstick for the private power companies, the present administration is quite clearly abandoning that principle which has done so much to lower rates and stimulate utility service.

Fifth. Not only have the chairmen of two presidential study commissions openly opposed public power, but former President Herbert Hoover did not appoint a single person known to be favorable to public power on his commission's task force on water and power. On the contrary, he appointed a number of men who, by interest and predisposition, are enemies of this program.

Coming from the State of Oregon, which produced that great Senator, Charles L. McNary, who was really a legislative partner with George W. Norris in the development of the great power program of the Federal Government, I cannot remain silent in the Senate and refrain from discussing the record of the administration in scuttling the Norris-McNary power program.

The points which I have mentioned are but a few of the more devastating moves made by the administration during the months that Congress has been in recess, thereby undermining, as I say, a great program by administrative action.

Even before Christmas, administration officials were tying up various parcels of the Federal power program in attractive redtape for delivery to the private utilities. In every home in America, it is a cardinal rule that a gift is not made of another person's property. The Eisenhower administration, however, has made free with resources and programs belonging to all the people.

Mr. President, let us take a closer look at some of these developments.

THE NEW POWER POLICY

On August 18, shortly after Congress took its recess, the Department of the Interior announced its new power policy. It is significant that although the last power-policy declaration of the Department was made at a time when Congress was in session, and could therefore be reviewed by the Congress, the present administration cautiously waited until Congress had gone home before it announced its new power policy. The policy statement is composed of loose generalities. There can be no doubt that it represents, and was designed to declare, a departure from earlier Federal power policy. A close reading, plus interpretation in the light of prior and subsequent administration actions, discloses that this is, indeed, a new policy.

It does not promise the Defense Department feat of more for less. Quite clearly, the Department of the Interior promises less for less. Under the Eisenhower-McKay new look, dams—if any—will be lower, and transmission lines—if any—will be shorter. Any doubts on this point were resolved by later statements, including an article by Mr. McKay in the Washington Post of January 3, in which he said:

> For two decades the Federal Government has overemphasized the development of hydroelectric resources. The Department's recently adopted power policy was directed toward deemphasis of this effort.

Mr. President, de-emphasis is not quite the word which fits the Secretary's program. "Delay" and "decimation" are more accurate descriptions. In that statement the Department has openly announced its intention of abandoning its dynamic role of broadening our horizons of economic opportunities, through sound development of multi-purpose projects. Instead, the Department has announced that it will take a passive role, and will leave the development of our natural resources to others, who have a remarkable record in their notorious failure to make wise use of our natural resources. I refer to the Missouri Basin criteria as a good example of the failure of the Eisenhower administration to protect the public interest.

MISSOURI BASIN CRITERIA

Although the overall power policy statement of the Department issued in August was couched largely in generalities, the Department got down to specifics when it issued its Missouri Basin power marketing criteria on September 9. Here the Department clearly showed how it would overturn policies of almost 50 years' standing. Here the Department spelled out a formula giving lip service to the preference provisions for marketing public power to the rural electric co-ops and municipalities, while in actuality turning over to the private power companies the bulk of the power. The Department made clear that by contracting away power, for a safe 20-year term, to the private utilities, it was taking no chances with the possibility of a reversal of its policies by subsequent administrations.

Here, in brief, are a few of the provisions of these criteria:

First. The Department announced it was abandoning any utility responsibility for serving the growing needs of the rural co-ops and other preference customers.

Second. The preference customers were given only 90 days to submit their needs for power, and were forced to pay what amounts to a penalty for power for which they contract beyond their needs for the next 3 years. While the preference customers are thus discouraged from contracting for more than their 3-year power needs, the Department stated it would give 20-year contracts to private utilities for all power which was not contracted by the preference customers.

Third. Contrary to previous practices of the Department, the 20-year contracts

with the private power companies would not contain any provision for withdrawing the power from the private power companies, to meet the growing needs of the preference customers. The Department, in fact, was so determined to sew up large blocks of power under 20-year contracts with the private companies that, through its new power marketing criteria, it told the private utilities that present short-term contracts would be renewed for 20 years, and the withdrawal clause would be eliminated.

Fourth. Still another significant change in the criteria was the announcement that henceforth the Department will minimize the purchases of thermal power, and will purchase only enough steam power to provide firm power for average water years. Previously, the policy of the Department had been to purchase enough steam power at low rates to make the maximum amount of firm power available to the Department's customers. This was not only good business for the Government, bringing the Government the maximum revenue from its projects, but it also made more firm power available for the preference and nonpreference customers of the Department. There was no problem here, as there is in the Pacific Northwest, of purchasing high-cost steam power which cannot be sold at rates comparable to those for hydropower. Strange, is it not, that this so-called "business" administration promulgates policies which would be considered poor practices for any private business.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior Fred G. Aandahl did not leave much to the imagination as to the effect of these criteria. When speaking at Fargo, N. Dak., on September 29, Mr. Aandahl made it clear that the Department expects to raise the rates of public power closer to the level of the private power companies, and to make more public power available to the private utilities.

Mr. Aandahl said that after meeting the needs of the preference agencies, his Department had proposed that the remaining power be sold on an "equally long-term basis to nonpreference agencies." Then he added—and to give effect to this statement, he underscored it in the printed text:

> The availability of remaining power to nonpreference customers, together with prospective reduced differential in the price of Federal and locally produced power, should materially reduce the unfortunate pressure on local communities to establish local public power entities just to make Federal hydropower available to themselves.

Public power rates will be raised by the simple process of juggling accounting methods. It has been the policy to use power revenues to defray, in part, costs of irrigation, navigation, and other benefits of multipurpose projects. These have properly been considered to be nonreimbursable items of public service. Aandahl, and other members of the Interior team, have declared that power will have to bear a greater portion of the cost burden of the nonreimbursable services. It follows, therefore, that power rates are bound to go up.

In my section of the country, Mr. President, the entire economy is dependent upon an ample supply of cheap power. It happens that an increase of cheap power is necessary in order to prevent frequent repetition in the State of Oregon of a serious unemployment situation, such as the one existing there today. I may say that in the State of Oregon there prevails the highest unemployment rate in all the United States, for as of a week ago today the unemployment rate there was 12.7 percent.

Mr. President, it is by means of the development of the cheap power resources of the Pacific Northwest that my section of the country will obtain the new industries it needs, and from those new industries it will obtain the new jobs it needs, and from those new jobs it will obtain the new taxes it needs for an expanding economy.

But, Mr. President, let us see whether this approach will be used if the long-heralded, still mysterious partnership plan is ever unveiled. Let us see whether private utilities which garner multipurpose dam sites will bear equal burdens for irrigation—if any—navigation, and the like. It is far more likely that the private utilities will receive handsome payments for whatever public services they render. The new accounting is a two-edged sword. Right now it is being wielded to weaken public power service and to raise rates.

At McNary Dam, it has been proposed to saddle power revenues with about 95 percent of the cost of construction. If the Eisenhower administration adopts this threatened course, it will not be sabotaging public power service in the open; it will be strangling and suffocating it in administrative subtleties. The power consumers will not take it. They are fighting mad already; and, Mr. President, they have ample cause.

It is small wonder, therefore, that the new Missouri Basin power marketing criteria stirred up a revolt among the farmers and ranchers who have seen the blessings of the rural electrification program, and know at firsthand of the importance of low-cost hydropower to that program.

Under tremendous pressure from irate rural electric cooperative leaders, farm groups, and a Senate committee investigation headed by the distinguished liberal, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Department of the Interior, on December 11, finally amended one of the most objectionable features of the Missouri Basin criteria. The Department now states that "power available but not needed until a later time by preference customers will be reserved for them as a class by selling it under short-term interim contracts under which it can be recaptured for the preference customers at the termination of such contract."

But, Mr. President, let me make perfectly clear that was not the first intention of the Eisenhower administration. Let me make perfectly clear that was not what they planned to do. They tried to get by with the program I first outlined in my speech this afternoon, and they backtracked only after the committee headed by the senior Senator from North Dakota went to work on the job and after the farmers rose up in their righteous wrath over this matter.

This modification offers some relief on one of the more objectionable features of the criteria. But in taking one foot out of its mouth, the Department promptly put the other one in. For this same amendment to the criteria states that the Department will make 20-year contracts with those nonpreference customers that serve communities which by long use have become dependent on such power.

Thus the Department has given the nonpreference customers the status of a preference customer.

It is no surprise, therefore, that the rural co-ops of the Missouri Basin have retained counsel and are planning to enjoin Secretary McKay and his wrecking crew from putting the Missouri Basin criteria into effect.

These 20-year contracts in the Missouri Basin are the questionable cousins of 20-year contracts negotiated last spring and summer by the Bonneville Power Administration and several private utilities in the Pacific Northwest.

Before Congress adjourned the stifling effects of those proposed contracts were discussed on the Senate floor. Business, yes, private industry, was most irate in objecting to the freeze which they place upon industrial development in the Northwest.

Adequate defense production in the Pacific Northwest has been endangered by these contracts which strictly limit the amount of power available to industrial consumers. The Joint Committee on Defense Production and the Office of Defense Mobilization warned the Secretary of Interior about the possible damage to or interference with defense production from the 20-year contracts.

He simply replied that the contracts could be overidden by suitable legislation, which is, of course, not free of question. He also informed the contractors that sometime defense requirements might necessitate diversion of the power for which they were contracting. He did this—after the contracts were signed and approved. Mr. President, there is not a word in the contracts which provide as a matter of contract law for the right to divert the power.

In his hurry to consummate these agreements the Secretary proceeded on highly dubious legal grounds. He has gambled with the Nation's security.

THE STUDY GROUPS

Enough now for the Department of the Interior. What about the study groups which are being appointed by the Eisenhower administration in this field? We have seen how this Department is changing basic, congressionally established policies, through administrative actions. Now let us see how changes are being affected through Government by Commission.

To set the stage for this discussion, I should like to read a portion of a transcript of a recent television program in which Dean Manion, head of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, was being interviewed by William

Wise, former deputy administrator of REA:

Mr. WISE. Dean Manion, I wonder if you agree with my favorite Republican of all times that the Government should do for the people that which they cannot do for themselves or that which they cannot do so well for themselves. I refer, of course, to Abraham Lincoln.

Dr. MANION. No; I do not agree with Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. WISE. Do you agree that the test should be not whether the States should have the power but whether or not it is necessary for the Federal Government to take certain action in what to protect and advance for the general welfare of all the people to the greatest good for the greatest number?

Dr. MANION. No; I don't.

Mr. WISE. Do you agree that there is no one other than the Federal Government large enough to do certain things which have been done during this last 20 years to which you have referred? I would like to ask you with respect to certain specific action: One, the TVA?

Dr. MANION. I think the TVA should be sold to private business.

This is the man who is chairman of President Eisenhower's study commission, which is to deal with the entire question of natural resources in relation to the power issue.

Mr. WISE. Do you think private business would have built TVA projects in the first place?

Dr. MANION. I don't think the Federal Government should have built the TVA in the first place.

When I read such a statement as that I sometimes try to speculate as to what that great conservationist, George Norris, would say if he were among us today. When we think of the great contribution which George Norris has made to the prosperity of the American people and to their economic well-being through the great TVA project and then listen to the Chairman of President Eisenhower's Commission in this field of natural resources telling us that he thinks the TVA project should not have been built by the Government in the first place, I think all that is necessary to show the dangers of the administration in this field is merely to point out the statement.

I read further from the transcript of the interview:

Mr. WISE. Do you agree that anyone other than the Federal Government could have brought about the rural-electrification program which has resulted in this situation? Back in 1935, when it commenced, 1 farm out of 10 had electricity. Today figures released by the present administration very recently show that 9 farms out of every 10 in this country have electricity.

Dr. MANION. I think that there has been a greater increase than that in television sets, radios, and other things. I don't believe that the Federal Government has been responsible for all the per capita increase of things that have accrued to the benefit of the people in the United States.

Of course, in logic we would call that ducking the issue. If there ever was a non sequitur argument, this statement of Dr. Manion is it. When Mr. Wise asked Dr. Manion the specific question whether he thought any other agency in the United States, or any other economic group, would have developed this great rural electrification program if the Federal Government had not stepped in, he received an answer about television sets. It is a matter of historic record that the private utilities simply would not move in to give service to farmers in sparsely populated areas. If they were to obtain electricity it had to be done by the farmers themselves, through their rural electric cooperatives.

Here is one Senator who is not going to be a party to scuttling the REA program. I am not going to be a party to the program of the Eisenhower administration as set forth in its budget of last year and again in its budget proposals this year, of denying to the REA the funds it needs for the building of transmission lines to serve the farmer's need for electric power—transmission lines which are self-liquidating, paying back to the Federal Government every dollar borrowed, with interest.

I will tell the Senate what is the matter with the private utility monopolies in regard to the REA. They are worried about it, because REA works. It works to give the farmers cheap power. The private utilities feel that they ought to have the right to collect tribute from the farmers of America with high-rate private utility power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Let me finish one quotation, and then I will yield to my friend from Minnesota. I continue to read from the transcript:

Mr. WISE. Do you believe that anyone other than the Federal Government would have brought about that situation?

Dr. MANION. I certainly do.

I now yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oregon might be interested in knowing that recently the Administrator of REA, Mr. Nelson, was quoted, according to a headline in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, as having said in a press interview that REA was as yet unproved.

Mr. MORSE. He is Eisenhower's appointee as head of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. That statement is right in line with the general philosophy and attitude of most of Eisenhower's appointees to the great agencies which ought to be serving the public interest instead of American big business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Administrator, in commenting upon his initial statement about the REA being as yet unproved, went on to say that in the next 10 years we shall determine whether or not the REA cooperatives will be able to pay back the loans which were made. Then he went on to point out that this will depend to a great extent upon farm income, and that if there is a decline in farm income there may be very serious results so far as the REA is concerned.

I ask the Senator this question: If the Administrator's statement is to be taken at its face value, how does the Eisenhower administration place its farm program—a program which provides lower price supports and lower farm income—in line with its fine pronouncements on REA, in view of the fact that the Administrator of REA says that a declining farm economy may very well prove to be disastrous to the REA cooperatives?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota attributes to me a power of clairvoyance which I do not possess. I cannot tell the Senator from Minnesota how the Eisenhower administration can possibly reconcile its farm program and its REA policy with the best interests of the rural population. With respect to the first part of the Senator's observation, let me say to Mr. Nelson from the floor of the Senate that of one thing I am certain, and that is that the Republican administration will not be given much time to continue to scuttle the REA program, because in the 1954 campaign the Republican administration will be turned out. We will get an administration which really believes, with Jefferson and Lincoln, that this Government ought to do for the people what they cannot do so well for themselves and what needs to be done in the public interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Oregon aware of the recent statement made by the Secretary of the Interior to the effect that he believes the Federal Government should raise electric rates under the hydroelectric power program?

Mr. MORSE. I am familiar with it. I shall make some observations on it in a later speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator from Oregon agree with me that if that were done it would result in greater cost to the REA's for power received from Federal hydroelectric power sources, and, secondly, would permit a rather substantial increase in the cost of private power furnished to the REA's?

Mr. MORSE. It is a point which needs to be emphasized, and I am glad the Senator from Minnesota has mentioned it. Let me say to the farmers of America who are being served by REA I warn you today that if the Eisenhower Administration is allowed to say in power so that it can scuttle the transmission-line program of the REA's, you are going to pay through the nose in the next few years for electric power. Your rates are bound to go up if you are forced to take your power off the lines of the private utilities after the administration has scuttled the REA program.

That danger is what worried the farmers of the Missouri Basin in the conferences they had in that area. That is what worried them when they came to testify before the Langer committee. That is what worried many farmers a few days ago, when I spoke to them in convention assembled at Miami, Fla. Never in my political life have I seen a group of farmers—and there were more than 5,000 REA co-op farmers present—so determined to do something to stop the Eisenhower administration from scuttling the REA program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Oregon recall that at the National REA Convention at Miami the Assistant Secretary of the Interior in charge of the Bureau of Reclamation spoke and tried to defend his position?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I am familiar with that fact. However, he did not succeed in his defense. I am also aware that at the same time that convention was in progress the automobile dealers of America held a convention in Miami. There were two conventions being held at the same time, the REA convention and the automobile dealers convention. The Secretary of the Interior appeared at the automobile dealers convention and made a speech, but he did not show his face at the REA convention. He ought to have gone there and learned at first hand what those farmers really thought of the scuttling program he is engineering as the head of the department of private utilities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the delegates assembled at the National Rural Electrification Association Convention in Miami went on record strongly in opposition to the present policy being pursued by the Eisenhower administration in its public-power program?

Mr. MORSE. They most certainly did.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not also true that the REA's are deeply concerned about the budget which is now being recommended and which, as I understand, would provide funds only in an amount that could help—and I emphasize the word help—to meet some of the authorizations and some of the contract obligations which are already existent, but which would deny any new funds for the purpose of building generating facilities?

Mr. MORSE. They are greatly concerned about it, and they certainly have cause to be greatly concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his comment.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am very proud to have him interrupt my speech and to make his contributions to the subject. I am not flattering him when I say that I am also proud to tell the farmers of the State of Minnesota from the floor of the Senate today that the junior Senator from Minnesota is one of the stanchest defenders of the farmers' interests in the Senate and one of the outstanding leaders in the Senate in fighting to protect the interests of the farmers by means of a sound REA program.

I intend to speak in the State of Minnesota in the days immediately ahead, and I wish to say to my good friend from Minnesota that when I speak there I intend to do what I can to make clear to the farmers of the State of Minnesota how important it is that the Senator from Minnesota be returned to the Senate at the election in 1954. They have no more stanch defender in the Senate than the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very grateful. I only hope that I may be worthy of the Senator's comments.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is worthy.

Mr. President, later in the broadcast, when a member of the audience suggested that Dr. Manion should resign from the chairmanship of this commission because of his prejudged views, Dr. Manion countered that his views were well known before his appointment by the President.

It is difficult to see how a Commission headed by such a biased man can come up with any recommendations of value. The new Hoover Commission, unlike the former Hoover Commission, is charged with the responsibility of recommending changes in basic policies, and its work is not confined to administrative reorganization, as was the case with the earlier Hoover Commission. Furthermore, the Commission is directing a major effort toward our public-power program.

Mr. Hoover's hostility toward public power is well known. It is a hostility of long standing.

As President, Mr. Hoover in 1931 vetoed the Norris Muscle Shoals bill that was the forerunner of the TVA. Last year, Mr. Hoover made a speech at Case Institute in which he advocated that the Federal Government get completely out of the power business.

With this background, one would hardly expect that Mr. Hoover would show any sympathy toward public power when he appointed in November his task force on water and power. Still, with a membership of 26 men, Mr. Hoover could have afforded to display some charitable instincts by appointing at least 1 person sympathetic to public power.

But no. According to a statement by the American Public Power Association, not a single one of the 26 members of the task force can be identified as a supporter of public power. On the contrary, there are many known and outspoken enemies of public power on this task force—men such as Governor Lee of Utah; Harry Polk, former president of the National Reclamation Association; Donald Richberg; and former Governor Miller of Wyoming.

The task force also contains experts on valuation and renegotiation of utility properties, and men such as A. B. Roberts, whose report for the earlier Hoover Commission was a blueprint for turning over our valuable hydroelectric properties to the private power companies.

With both the task force and the Hoover Commission itself stacked with men who are prejudiced or special pleaders, it is clear that we can expect only one thing from the Commission: a detailed plan for carrying out Mr. Hoover's own ideas about turning over the Nation's power projects to the private power companies.

THE TAX AMORTIZATION GRAB BAG

During adjournment the Federal Power Commission has been wonderfully generous to the private utilities in ruling upon tax amortization policy.

The tax amortization story is such a touching one that it deserves a separate speech to do it justice.

At an early date the representative of the Independent Party intends to make that subject matter the topic of one of his weekly reports to the country.

THE FIGHT FOR HELLS CANYON CONTINUES

I have spent many hours on the floor of the Senate telling you of the vital economic importance to all the people in the Pacific Northwest, and to the Nation's farmers of the construction of Hells Canyon Dam at the most spectacular hydroelectric site remaining in this country. I shall not now repeat how the power, flood control, navigation, and recreation benefits of this project would contribute to the welfare of Oregon, Idaho, Washington, Montana, and, hence, the Nation; of how the Idaho Power Co. from the State of Maine wishes to build small dams only for its stockholders' benefits—dams whose value would be puny indeed when compared with the high Hells Canyon Dam. The inadequacies of the private utility's plan have become clear during 6 months of hearings thereon before the Federal Power Commission. The hearings have just entered their second phase, during which I suspect the abysmal shortcomings of the company's proposals for the Snake River will become even more glaringly obvious.

Today I wish to concentrate on the maneuvering of the administration in this case. After repeated support and recommendation for the high dam by the previous administration, Interior Secretary McKay officially washed his hands of this case on May 5, 1953, by withdrawing the Interior Department's intervention before the Federal Power Commission. Secretary McKay's hands did not remain out of the case very long, however. Three weeks later, he told an audience in Portland, Oreg., that he favored the application of Idaho Power Co. He said he was withdrawing the Department of the Interior from the case because he did not want to make the Department a special pleader.

I said on the floor of the Senate at the time of the withdrawal that when he withdrew from the case the Department of the Interior became a special pleader for the private utility companies. I said it was the public duty and the responsibility of the Department of the Interior to present the people's case before the Federal Power Commission on the basis of the information and data in the files of the Department. But, Mr. President, 3 weeks after the announcement of the Department's withdrawal, in a speech in Portland, Oreg., the Secretary specifically said he favored the Idaho Power Co.'s program. I suppose that did not make him a special pleader. What it did was to cause him to show his hand. I am told by some who heard his speech that he was speaking extemporaneously at that point and, apparently, because a little carried away by the audience, which was not an audience composed of persons, by and large, enthusiastic about public power.

The Secretary was called to task for this violation of his vaunted neutrality, and has since refrained from making

further openly partisan public statements on this issue. But the administration and the Interior Department have not been idle, and their efforts have not been directed to advancing the high dam at Hells Canyon.

Under an appropriation given to the Corps of Army Engineers last year, the corps, with the help of the Bureau of Reclamation, has restudied the middle stretch of the Snake River and its tributaries, the Salmon and the Clearwater. Each agency took one-half of this area and hastily restudied it.

I desire to emphasize the word "hastily," because there can be no doubt that the entire State of Oregon is aware of my position on this matter. I have repeated many times, up and down and across that State, that I stand on the Army engineers' Report No. 308 for the comprehensive development of the Columbia River Basin, a report which was under preparation by the Army engineers for a number of years. It was made in cooperation, also, with the engineers of the Reclamation Bureau. No hasty restudy of the Snake River or of the Columbia River by the Army engineers is going to make much of an impression on me, Mr. President, unless they can come forward with a body of engineering data and information showing that the engineers were manifestly wrong in their Report No. 308 on the preparation of which they spent years.

I made that very clear to representatives of the Army engineers at the Miami convention a few days ago. In my speech in Miami I pointed out to the Army engineers that I was aware of the fact that this administration was calling for a hasty restudy of the power potential area in the Pacific Northwest. I served notice on them at that time that I intended to go over their restudy with a fine-tooth comb, so to speak. I want them to be ready to show me, if they make any recommendations by way of a modification of what is considered by the Army engineers to be a model plan for the comprehensive development of the Columbia River Basin, that any revaluations have no connection whatsoever with a political climate. I think the Army engineers will understand exactly the implications of the sentence I have just uttered.

During the past 30 years both of these agencies have intensively studied the entire Columbia Basin and have slowly evolved a comprehensive plan for this whole region. This plan has been carefully worked out: Thousands and thousands of pages of data support the construction of the major projects in appropriate sequence, necessary for full utilization of the water and other resources of the region.

In the short period of a few months, the Engineers and the Bureau have brought forth a variation of a well-designed comprehensive plan. Both the Army and the Bureau, on the basis of their exhaustive investigations, had repeatedly come to the conclusion that the high Hells Canyon dam and Nez Perce dam at the mouth of the Salmon, would constitute the best set of dams to control and utilize that stretch of the Snake River. The Clearwater, in a later stage, would be controlled by the Kooskia dam.

After going through the motions of a survey, the Army engineers—in an announcement released on Friday, January 29—propose to muddy the Clearwater with two dams, Penny Cliffs and Bruce's Eddy. They would take the place of Kooskia—which the Army until very recently considered the best site on the Clearwater. And the Bureau, for its share, was building up to a recommendation of a Mountain Sheep dam. It is reported that the foundation—literally and figuratively—at the Mountain Sheep site will not support either a dam or a Bureau recommendation. This dam had been studied sufficiently to have convinced both the Engineers and the Bureau that it has no place in the best plan for the development of the Snake. In no event was it ever considered as an alternative for high Hells Canyon dam, but rather as a possible alternative for Nez Perce.

That is the finding of Report No. 308, Mr. President. It is very interesting that we are now getting proposals for modification hastily devised.

Did anyone consider the public interest in this neat little scheme? What would happen to the comprehensive development for the Columbia Basin devised after many years of thoughtful planning? What would happen to the benefits to be derived from the best plan for the middle Snake River? Is a second or third best plan good enough? Have we resources enough to waste, so that we can accept an inferior plan, when the new power policy is offended by the best plan?

Meanwhile, events have taken another swift turn. News of this misbegotten plan had barely begun to leak out, when a group of five private utilities from the Pacific Northwest came knocking at the doors of the Federal Power Commission and filed for a preliminary permit for the two sites which the Army had not even yet reported to Congress—Penny Cliffs and Bruce's Eddy. Is that partnership? As one irate resident of Idaho referred to it, the administration is cooperating with the private companies to form a Monopoly Valley Authority.

Those who have followed the hearings in the Hells Canyon case before the Federal Power Commission know why there is an administration scramble to come up with an alternate plan for the Snake. The Idaho Power Co.'s case has proven porous. Cross-examination has stripped inflated claims to leave only a flimsy structure of thin reeds.

The people of the Pacific Northwest will not be fooled. They know that McKay and his team have walked out on the public interest. They will not be bought off with a paper scheme which is so vastly inferior to the development which Hells Canyon alone can make possible.

I recommend to the Senate that it proceed to approve S. 1664, a bill to authorize the construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam; and S. 2590, to amend the Federal Power Act by restricting the authority of the Federal Power Commission to issue private licenses for projects which are part of comprehensive river-basin plans.

There has been a great deal of inflated talk by the administration about cooperation with local groups. Mr. Secretary, S. 1664, I say to you from this desk today, provides that when an interstate compact is approved by Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Wyoming that compact will govern the disposition of water in the area affected. That is local partnership; that is real partnership.

The people of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation are now aware of the importance of the Hells Canyon issue. They are awaiting to see actions—they have had their fill of generalities.

Today, because of a lack of time, I have had occasion to touch on only a few of the signs of deterioration of our long and wisely established principles of resource and power development. There are many other equally alarming acts of the "middle of the road" administration in the field of public power:

The withdrawal of the Department of the Interior from the Kings River case in California.

The negotiations for selling out the Central Valley project in California.

The efforts being planned by the administration to amend the Atomic Energy Act in order to turn over this resource to private companies.

The studies being made to allocate higher costs to the power features of multipurpose projects, thereby making it possible to raise the power rates.

The failure by the Rural Electrification Administration to make a single loan for generation and transmission cooperatives. How vitally that failure affects the welfare of the American farmer.

The attempt by the utilities to impose Federal taxes on public power projects.

A discussion of these and other developments will have to await future reports of the Independent Party.

Let me make it clear that a report by the representative of the Independent Party on each of these subjects will be forthcoming before this session of Congress is concluded.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly wish to commend the able Senator from Oregon for the very penetrating discussion he is making of this general subject.

He has mentioned several different matters that may receive his attention in the future. I hope one of them may be the proposal to take away from the Tennessee Valley a part of the load of power it is now supplying to the Atomic Energy Commission. Of course, it sounds good to relieve the TVA of the burden of having to supply a great part of the power to the Atomic Energy Commission, but there are some catches in it. I hope the able Senator from Oregon will discuss that feature at some time.

For instance, the Tennessee Valley Authority has been able to install its power-supplying capacity at a cost of less than $145 a kilowatt, whereas the public utilities propose to install their power-supplying capacity at a cost of $194 a kilowatt, and perhaps may even have to increase that amount.

I hope the able Senator from Oregon, some time in his discussion of the power program, will go into that proposal which the administration is now making.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama and to ask him for his assistance in the matter.

We shall discuss it, I may say, at the seminar the liberals in the United States Senate hold every 2 weeks. It happens to be one of the subjects I shall present at the next meeting of the seminar liberals, prior to presenting it on the floor of the Senate in one of my weekly reports of the Independent Party.

The Senator from Alabama has put his finger on another one of the schemes of the Eisenhower administration to turn the power resources of the United States over to the private utilities.

It is not enough now to stop this emasculation of the public-power program. We must move forward with an affirmative program. We should authorize Hells Canyon and other necessary projects in the Northwest; we must speed up rather than slow down work on dams already under construction; we must provide funds for transmission lines and other facilities necessary to carry public power to the preference customers; we must authorize public redevelopment of Niagara Falls.

These are but a few of the steps which this Congress must take to carry forward a program which has meant so much to America and upon which the future progress of America is so heavily dependent.

It represents, Mr. President, a sphere of action for this administration, in connection with a very much needed public works program of building projects that will be self-liquidating, that will pay back into the Treasury of the United States over the years many times their original cost, and will serve as a great deterrent to the on-creeping Eisenhower recession which is now spreading over so many areas and is causing so much unemployment in various sections of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a very penetrating editorial entitled "Why Not Admit It?" written by one of the most able editors in my State, Mr. Bob Ruhl, of the Medford Mail Tribune. The editorial deals with the McKay power program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune of December 23, 1953]

WHY NOT ADMIT IT?

On our return we found the following inquiry on the editorial desk:

"What does former Governor McKay mean when he says—as he did in Portland—that public ownership still has the same prior claim it has always had, the only difference being that private utility companies now know where they stand in the long-range picture?"

We don't know. We don't believe anyone else knows, including our former Governor, now Secretary of the Interior.

It is only a part of the double-talk that seems to be so popular these days in Washington, and especially where power development and national conservation are concerned.

The claim is made that public ownership is just as highly regarded in this administration as in the Truman and Roosevelt administrations, and in the next breath actions are taken which makes it plain as a pikestaff that this is not true.

The meaning of the phrase "private utilities now know where they stand" may be that so long as the McKay policies prevail the private companies will be given a monopoly in the light and power field as far as this is physically possible.

Other companies will also be given the oil, timber, and mineral deposits that have hitherto been conserved for future generations, and when developed, would have been utilized for the benefit of all the people, instead of the few.

The surprising thing to this department is that there should be any effort to deny this when the evidence of the new "give-away" program is so overwhelming. This technique is directly contrary to one of the basic concepts of the founder of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, when he said all the people can't be fooled all the time. The clear assumption of former Governor McKay appear to be, they can be—or at least long enough and enough of them to put over this program to put big business back where it was in those good old days, before Teddy Roosevelt and his conservation policies and the Norris public power proposals came on the scene.

Those who think only the Democrats and New Dealers are complaining of this grab policy and only they are aware of what is going on, should adjust their bifocals and take another look. For example:—

Surely those who know Palmer Hoyt, former editor of the Oregonian, now editor and publisher of the Denver Post, will agree he is as 100 percent Republican, and enthusiastically pro-Eisenhower as any newspaperman in the country.

And he is also a personal friend of former Governor McKay. Yet this is what he recently wrote about the Secretary of the Interior and his reactionary policies regarding conserving and properly developing the natural resources of the Far West, quote:

"Mr. McKay is not, we are sorry to say, championing the West. He appears to be presiding over the conquest of his department and its historic functions by long-frustrated enemies of western growth and enrichment. And he has—unwittingly perhaps—become the ally of myopic reactionaries who have never changed their view that money invested in western water and land is money pounded down a rathole."

We can't accept that term "unwittingly." For while McKay hasn't a brilliant mind, he is not dumb, and a person would have to be about as dumb as a knot on a tree to be in his position and also to be unaware of what for close to a year now has been happening in Washington.

And in Washington it is not denied, except in political propaganda and canned partisan speeches.

In fact one can find any number of newspaper men in that city who off the record will admit that not only does the present administration oppose public-power development and national conservation of any kind, but boasts of it, under the general heading of Secretary Wilson's classic remark that "anything that is good for General Motors is good for the country."

Which makes it all the more mystifying as to why a person in Secretary McKay's position should come out to his home State and solemnly declare that public ownership and operation has the same prior claim it always has had since the days of TR, Gifford Pinchot, and men like Senator Norris, of Nebraska.

For he must know it hasn't. And if he has his way it will never have. Perhaps the real tipoff lies in that strange claim that the only change in policy has been that the "private utilities now know where they stand."

They do.

So does everyone else.

They are standing pretty. And so long as McKay's principles are carried out they will be standing pretty, with cheap power and Oregon's development as a result of it, getting farther and farther away in the sad and depressing picture. (R. W. R.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "A Sense of Direction," written by Eliot Janeway, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of December 12, 1953.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENSE OF DIRECTION

(By Eliot Janeway)

ALUMINUM AND TITANIUM

Another name for the air age could well be the age of aluminum.

Its use has grown prodigiously with the world's air fleets, military and commercial. But now military aircraft are beginning to fly higher and faster than aluminum can carry them. Titanium appears destined to be the workhorse metal of supersonic airpower—that is, when the United States finally gets around to financing and expediting its production on the scale required by the arms race.

But if titanium is taking over from aluminum in the construction of airframes for supersonic flight, has aluminum passed its peak of use? Is its curve tied to military aircraft? The answer is no. Indeed, it is only because of the coming substitution of titanium that there is hope to meet the continued rise in aluminum demand outside the field of high-powered military aviation.

One phase of the highly publicised "new look" at likely defense requirements taken by the new Joint Chiefs of Staff tells the story. For this overall essay in the recalculation of military needs ran headlong into an older controversy over the very specific use the United States guns-and-butter economy could make of more aluminum capacity. In recent years the country has embarked on two successive programs of ambitious expansion. Only now—thanks to this new supply as well as to the recent slash in defense use combined with some softness in business—has fabricated aluminum come into relatively easy supply.

Nevertheless, sooner or later, regardless of the new engineering frontiers on which perhaps only titanium will do, defense requirements are bound to tax mill availability again; and it is characteristic of the functioning of this emergent guns-and-butter economy that commercial demand comes and goes with defense demand—the commercial buyer wants what the military buyer wants when the military buyer wants it. Accordingly, in anticipation of the next defense scramble and in the hope of protecting military and commercial buyers alike, the military has been pressing for still a third round of aluminum expansion.

Economy-minded civilians outside the Defense Establishment have been resisting this pressure for a third round. In vain, advocates of the program have explained that it could be financed without actual spending by the Government, but simply on the basis of a guaranty to buy any future surplus; so that both the Armed Forces and the civilian economy could be protected at no cost except in the unlikely event of an aluminum glut some years hence.

Into this stalemated controversy burst the military "new lookers." In the past few months this stalemated controversy over the

need for more aluminum has become caught up in the whirl of the "new look," of which it has become a very pointed special case. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that whereas the "new look" started as the question of how many planes were going to be built, it is ending in a question of where to find the titanium to fly them and aluminum to equip the forces that will use them. Thus aluminum has become the litmus paper metal of the moment. If the civilian newcomers to Washington are still demonstrating a dangerous tendency to duplicate the "too little, too late" errors of resources planning on the eve of World War II, the military technicians are making it abundantly clear that they have profited from the errors of recent administrative history.

War planning, as Bernard M. Baruch has so tirelessly emphasized, begins with the calculations of requirements. In determining the aluminum requirements projected by the threat of another mobilization day, the planning technicians in the armed services did a sober job of balancing past experience against future fears. Thus they moved new aluminum specification into products—particularly ordnance and ships—traditionally dependent on copper and steel. This reflected the principle laid down by former Defense Production Administrator Manly Fleischmann that aluminum, abundantly available in America and needing only power at the basic resources level, holds the answer to the long-term squeeze on both our ferrous and nonferrous mineral resources. This, incidentally, provides a welcome case of military planners freely using and profiting from civilian recommendations.

With what result? Excluding aircraft but realistically taking account of shipbuilding (conspicuously omitted from the 1950–53 program), the "new look" at aluminum forecast a new M-day shortage even if the stalled third round of aluminum expansion were already completed.

So much for the threat that aluminum use will soon be on the decline because it is being engineered out of military aviation. The question is rather how soon it will be realized that the aluminum about to be freed by the switch to titanium will be aluminum that is desperately needed even if another round of expansion is belatedly authorized. Meanwhile, the United States will have to adjust its ideas of air power to a familiarity with titanium and we are immeasurably shorter of it than of aluminum itself.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

AIR COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE SOUTHEASTERN SEABOARD AND CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, 7½ years ago a permit was granted to Eastern Airlines to render nonstop air communication between New Orleans and Mexico City. This permit was in line with the logical and natural development of commerce between the United States and Mexico. New Orleans is historically the gateway to the heart of America. From the heart of America, it is regarded as the gateway to Central and South America. To a New Orleans businessman, it is a swinging door between the heart of America and our Latin-American neighbors.

Thus far, Mr. President, 7½ years of determined effort by those of us who represent the New Orleans area have been completely unavailing in securing the inauguration of direct air communication between New Orleans and Mexico City. We have been told by the Civil Aeronautics Board that it was anxiously making every effort to provide service. We have been assured by the State Department and the Executive that this service would soon be forthcoming. Yet we have seen indications that have forced us to question the sincerity of some of those who have given us these assurances.

As one example, we had been led to believe that the Mexican Government was responsible for the delay to implement the authorized route between New Orleans and Mexico City. Yet, while the Mexican Government has, on more than one occasion, made every overture within reason and has shown every willingness to meet us more than halfway, our own Government has not shown a similar desire to work cooperatively.

Our neighbors to the east, in the States of Alabama and Georgia, have likewise suffered from the interminable delays and the endless objections of the majority of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the representatives of the State Department.

Mexico has very properly insisted that any additional air service by an American carrier from the United States to Mexico should be accompanied by a reciprocal agreement for a Mexican airline to fly from Mexico to the United States. Those representing the city of New Orleans have been willing for more than a year to accept service by a Mexican airline flying from Mexico City to New Orleans, thus permitting an American airline to fly from either Atlanta or Birmingham into Mexico City. This was a magnanimous gesture on the part of the representatives of New Orleans in order to resolve the impasse, inasmuch as New Orleans would have preferred an American carrier.

Did it satisfy the Civil Aeronautics Board and the State Department?

Oh, no. Other objections were found.

The majority of the members of the Board and Mr. Barringer of the State Department proceeded to quarrel about technical matters involved in negotiations for additional air service between Mexico City and certain American cities on the Pacific coast. Obviously, there was no need whatsoever of involving west coast negotiations with a simple agreement for reciprocal air service between Mexico City and the southeastern section of the United States. However, the logic in favor of withholding direct air service between southeastern United States and Mexico City necessarily related to the desirability of obtaining a complete bilateral understanding to include every phase of air service shuttling between the United States and Mexico.

Eighteen months ago, Mexico actually issued permission for Eastern Airlines to fly direct nonstop from New Orleans to Mexico City, attaching a condition that a Mexican airline should fly the same route.

At this point in my remarks I desire to call attention to the fact that such a condition is in line with the type of agreement the Department of State and the Civil Aeronautics Board have contended they have always sought, namely, the condition that when a foreign airline flies from a point in a foreign country to a point in this country, an American airline shall have permission to fly over the same route.

Undoubtedly considerable consternation existed among those who had for so long maneuvered behind the scenes to maintain the present monopoly of American Airlines in serving the United States-Mexican route.

Almost immediately President Truman issued a proclamation undertaking to revoke all outstanding permits for additional airline service between the United States and Mexico. Theoretically, the order had as its purpose the protection of this Nation's bargaining power in dealing for a complete bilateral agreement.

Mr. President, when Eastern Airlines, and others, attempt to provide service from the southeastern section of the United States to Mexico City, we receive nothing but delays, postponements, and excuses.

On the other hand, let us see what happens when American Airlines desires to fly from the United States to Mexico City. Last week American Airlines applied for permission to fly a direct nonstop service from New York City to Mexico City. The Board, in an unprecedented session, in a closed-door session that lasted only 40 minutes, granted this permission without notice to any of those who would desire to contest the route.

I am led to believe, Mr. President, that certain things happened in that hearing that should be of interest to the Congress of the United States. Certainly the type of procedure used in this instance is subject to serious criticism. It will be interesting to know the logic of the State Department, particularly when its long-standing failure to permit service desired by the people of Mexico and the people of the southeastern seaboard of the United States are related to its supersonic haste to provide additional service by the carrier presently enjoying the monopoly over the present route. So strong was the desire to provide this additional service in the latter case that the State Department recommended that all traditional standards of notice and hearing, time for study and filing of complaints, should be abandoned.

If the Board can act within an hour to grant additional service to an area already enjoying good service, why then must the peoples of Louisiana, Alabama, and Georgia continue to suffer a callous disregard of their rights extending over a period of 7½ years?

Every time those of us from Louisiana, Alabama, or Georgia have requested that action be taken to permit service between New Orleans, Birmingham, or Atlanta and Mexico City, the State Department and the majority of the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board have contended that we should hold out for a complete bilateral agreement. It has been the position of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the State Department that this Nation should make no further piecemeal agreements for air service between the United States and Mexico. They contend that we should wait until we are

able to settle every conceivable issue in one single agreement with Mexico.

Frequently our State Department and the CAB attempt to tell us that the Mexicans have such a good deal with the route which they fly from Los Angeles to Mexico City that they should be willing to give us many additional routes in return. This position is completely unsound in view of the fact that no route could possibly be more lucrative than the American Airlines main line funneling through Dallas into Mexico City. The American Airlines route is in position to carry practically all traffic originating north of Dallas and east of the Rocky Mountains and terminating in Mexico City. It is true that Aerovias Guest, a Mexican airline, has a service flying from Miami to Mexico City, and Compania Mexicana Aviacion flies a route from Los Angeles nonstop to Mexico City, and Pan American has a flight from Houston to Mexico City. Nevertheless, all these routes put together would not logically draw the traffic of the American Airlines franchise.

It would benefit American Airlines to avoid a hearing, as has been done in the present case, because a hearing might make it possible to prove the enormous traffic potential that exists between the United States and Mexico City. In the absence of a hearing, it aids American Airlines in its opposition to other air routes to Mexico City. So long as they do not have to lay their cards upon the table, they are in a better position to argue that there is not sufficient air traffic to justify air service from New Orleans, Birmingham, or Atlanta to Mexico City.

Again, let us look at the injustice of the situation as it relates to the argument that we should wait for a complete bilateral agreement before we make further agreements with Mexico. As a practical matter, American Airlines has built up a public-relations division, both in the United States and Mexico, that has already achieved considerable fame. The effect of the decision by the Board is to permit American Airlines to seek additional service without a bilateral agreement, while other airlines are told to wait until the complete bilateral can be arranged.

The effect of the decision is to permit American Airlines, with its public-relations contacts in Mexico, to seek an arrangement permitting American Airlines to fly an additional route into Mexico City. Meanwhile, the other airlines which were previously authorized to fly into Mexico City are denied the right to make similar arrangements in order to secure permission from Mexico. When Eastern Airlines obtained such permission about 18 months ago, the then President Truman revoked all permits outstanding where service was not actually being flown.

Thus, this situation makes for the inference that there has been favoritism as between airlines. Even worse is the discrimination between the cities. New Orleans has long been entitled to a priority of air service to Mexico City. A long history of trade between the cities exists.

The State Department and the Board have now set the pattern that they will permit additional service to be agreed upon on a piecemeal basis when they feel that circumstances justify it. Yet they still stand on the ridiculous logic that those who have so long been entitled to service must yet await a complete bilateral agreement which may never occur.

In laying blame at the door of the State Department and the Civil Aeronautics Board, I do not wish to absolve the Executive from his share of the responsibility in this matter. The Executive has certain powers in connection with these international agreements and the Executive could have and still can unwind this mess, if there is the will in the White House to see it done. The previous President failed to do it. I do not excuse him. Thus far, it is entirely possible that President Eisenhower is not familiar with the background of this injustice. In bringing this matter to the attention of my colleagues, I hope I may help to bring it to the attention of the White House. I shall also address myself to the President in this connection.

It is not my purpose to argue the case of Eastern Air Lines. For my part, I have never met Mr. Eddie Rickenbacker. The record will show that I have been willing that the service to New Orleans be furnished by any American carrier or even the Mexican carrier.

Unless the State Department and the Civil Aeronautics Board act immediately to grant service to New Orleans, Birmingham, and Atlanta, they will properly be subject to the charge of improper favoritism.

What better explanation is available when the same State Department officials and the same group of Board members stall for 7½ years to prevent service to those for whom it has been authorized, while in less than 1 hour they clear away all impediments for additional rights to those enjoying the monopoly of this lucrative traffic?

Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD, and ask that it be printed as part of my remarks, an article discussing the recent questionable action of the Civil Aeronautics Board in granting to American Airlines permission to fly direct nonstop service from New York City to Mexico City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of January 28, 1954]

CAB STARTLES INDUSTRY—AMERICAN AIRLINES DECISION PROVOKES DISSENTS

(By Marquis Childs)

Because of the power it exerts over a rapidly growing segment of the Nation's economy, the Civil Aeronautics Board has long been the center of political pressures from many directions. And those pressures have produced some surprising results.

But what happened the other day startled the industry and even some members of the Board, hardened as they have become to seeing plums picked off the political-regulatory tree. Contrary to every precedent, American Airlines, the giant of the air industry, was granted an exemption to start a nonstop service from New York to Mexico City. The Board found this was essential to protect the national interest because a foreign line, Air France, was starting such a nonstop service.

Pan-American Airways has long sought a route to Mexico City, in collaboration with Chicago & Southern, that would compete with American's exclusive service. Pan-American officials were therefore particularly disturbed by the unprecedented action of a three-man majority in awarding the new route to American. The majority decision of Chairman Chan Gurney, Oswald Ryan, a member of the Board since its inception, and the new member, Harmar D. Denny, drew two sizzling dissents from the minority, Josh Lee and Joseph P. Adams.

Adams said that he could not subscribe "to such precipitate action, cutting across all procedural rules of the Board when it gives no consideration to the existing rights of other American carriers in the contest for a New York City-Mexico City route." Lee, former Senator from Oklahoma, went much further in his dissent.

He said that the request for the new route was first presented on January 20 with a letter from American asking for confidential treatment. Thereafter events moved with a speed amazing in contrast to the ordinary processes of bureaucracy.

After a wrangle inside the Board the request for secrecy was denied. The petition for the route was returned to the airline with instructions that any portions which American wished to keep confidential should be deleted and the petition returned. At 8:25 a. m. on January 21, the application was again filed with the Board. Eight minutes later the Board convened and by a 3 to 2 vote approved the request, adjourning at 9:40.

"I must vigorously object," Lee wrote in a statement he said was not a formal dissent since he had not had time to prepare one, "to the unprecedented and drastic action of the majority which disregards the legal requirements of the Civil Aeronautics Act, circumvents the President of the United States and denies other air carriers due process of law, all for the purpose of protecting the monopoly of American Airlines to Mexico."

Lee pointed out that the Supreme Court has held that decisions of the Board involving authorization of overseas and foreign air transportation have only the force of a recommendation with final approval coming from the President. Pointing out that the Board had been frequently asked to shortcut requirements of notice and hearings set forth in the Civil Aeronautics Act and had each time refused, Lee wrote:

"In my judgment, the majority's action in this case violates the rights of notice and hearings which is the very foundation of justice. With no national emergency and actually with no national interest at stake the manner in which this exemption was granted violates my sense of fair play and constitutes an abuse of the exemption power of the Board, an action which is unprecedented in the Board's 15 years of existence.

"This is just another in a recent series of decisions by the majority against competition," Lee concluded. "This decision, like the disapproval of the Pan-American-Chicago & Southern interchange agreement, protects from competition by another United States flag carrier American's monopoly route between such cities as Boston, New York, Washington, Chicago, and St. Louis on the one hand, and Mexico on the other."

Several Pan-Am officials have been prominent in Republican politics which gives recent acts of the Eisenhower administration an ironic look. The Department of Justice recently filed an antitrust suit charging Pan-Am with conspiring to restrain air travel to South America. The political winds these days are strong and variable.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I now submit, and ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a

part of my remarks, a copy of the decision of the Board, together with the dissenting opinions of Commissioners Lee and Adams. I should like to make available certain communications from my file pertaining to this matter. Accordingly, I also submit, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, certain letters written by me and by the Mayor of New Orleans, in discussing this subject; and certain correspondence by me, also dealing with the subject.

There being no objection, the decision, dissenting opinions, and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE MATTER OF AN EXEMPTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 416 (B) OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, AUTHORIZING AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC., TO CONDUCT NONSTOP OPERATIONS BETWEEN NEW YORK, N. Y., AND MEXICO CITY, MEX.

ORDER GRANTING TEMPORARY EXEMPTION

American Airlines, Inc., (American) is the holder of certificates of public convenience and necessity authorizing it to engage in the air transportation of persons, property, and mail, inter alia, between New York, N. Y., and Fort Worth and Dallas, Tex., on route No. 4 and between the terminal points Fort Worth and Dallas, Tex., and the terminal point Mexico City, Mex., on route No. FAM-26, under which authorizations American is required to make a stop at Dallas/Fort Worth in rendering service between New York and Mexico City.

On April 29, 1947, American filed an application, Docket No. 2909, requesting, inter alia, the consolidation of the aforesaid routes, and on January 26, 1951, by Amendment No. 1 thereto filed a specific request that any authorization of the requested consolidation include the right to provide nonstop service between New York and Mexico City.

On January 21, 1954, American filed an application, Docket No. 6510, requesting authority by temporary exemption permitting it immediately to inaugurate and thereafter to conduct air transportation operations on a nonstop basis between New York City and/or Washington, D. C., on the one hand, and Mexico City, on the other, in both directions pending action on the aforesaid Docket No. 2909.

American represents in support of its application, inter alia, that Air France has filed tariffs with the Board for the transportation of first-class and air-coach traffic between New York City and Mexico City, and that American is informed that Air France will, beginning January 26, 1954, carry such traffic on its nonstop service between the said points; that said service will be upward of 2 hours faster than any service American is able to provide owing to the mandatory stop which it must make at the route junction points of Dallas/Fort Worth; that it will therefore operate at a severe competitive disadvantage; that traffic between New York City and Mexico City is the backbone of its service to and from Mexico; that substantial impairment of the said traffic will impose a severe economic burden upon American and make it impossible to continue such operations on a basis of commercial self-sufficiency; and, that questions of national interest are involved which are of major importance.

The application submitted by American presents a problem of unusual difficulty. The Board would normally require that operating rights as important as those involved here should be granted only after full opportunity for notice and hearing to interested parties. The present situation, however, is far from normal. No final pattern of certificated routes for services between the United States and Mexico is in operation at the present time, and it is impossible to predict now when such a final pattern can be achieved. In the meantime, the inauguration of nonstop passenger service by Air France, a major foreign air carrier, would permit it to offer a service which is superior to the service offered by the only United States flag carrier operating between New York and Mexico City at the present time. In addition to the severe competitive effect which American alleges such a service would have upon it, the Board among other things must consider also whether it is in the national interest to permit the service operated by the United States flag carrier between New York and Mexico City to be placed at such a competitive disadvanage and whether that service should be permitted to become inferior in important respects to the service provided by a foreign carrier. The State Department is of the view that comparable United States service should be provided, and has therefore recommended the granting of American's application.

Accordingly the Board has concluded that in the unusual circumstances present here the Board should act to protect the national interest by granting to American a temporary authorization by way of exemption to furnish a nonstop service between New York and Mexico City. It should also be pointed out that the Board's action herein is based on the particular circumstances here involved and is being taken for the purpose of preserving the competitive position of United States flag services between the United States and Mexico pending the establishment on a long-range basis of a certificated air pattern between the United States and Mexico. In view of this fact the action here does not constitute any determination or expression of opinion by the Board as to what that final pattern should be and is also without prejudice to any applications now on file or that may hereafter be filed for New York-Mexico City service.

With respect to American's request for authority for nonstop service between Washington, D. C., and Mexico City, we find no facts or other considerations which would warrant a grant of such authority.

Although persons who may have an interest in the matter have not been given an opportunity to submit formally an expression of their views, it is the Board's opinion that taking into account the need for expeditious action, the temporary nature of the action, the fact that up to the present time it has been impossible for any other United States carrier to inaugurate New York to Mexico City service, and the fact that all interested persons will be given full opportunity to present their views before any final action with respect to the certificated New York-Mexico City route pattern is taken, this is a case of the type contemplated by rule 409 of the Board's Rules of Practice warranting action on the Board's own initiative and without resort to all of the procedures followed in ordinary exemption cases.

Accordingly, on the basis of the foregoing consideration and acting pursuant to the provisions of section 416 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act the Board finds that enforcement of the provisions of section 401 of the act insofar as they would otherwise prevent the operations hereinafter authorized would be an undue burden on American by reason of the unusual circumstances affecting its operations, and is not in the public interest.

It is ordered:

1. That American be and is hereby temporarily exempted from the enforcement of section 401 of the act to the extent necessary to permit the conduct of air transportation on a nonstop basis between New York and Mexico City, in both directions; *Provided*, That the authority herein shall be subject to the receipt of necessary authorizations from the foreign government concerned;

2. That the authority herein shall be effective until final decision on the aforesaid Docket No. 2909;

3. That except to the extent granted herein American's application be and is hereby denied;

4. That this order may be amended or revoked at any time in the discretion of the Board without hearing.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

M. C. MULLIGAN,
Secretary.

Adams and Lee, members, filed the attached dissents.

ADAMS, MEMBER, DISSENTING

This dissent will indicate that this member voted against the procedural action taken by the majority in granting this exemption to American Airlines to operate nonstop service from New York City to Mexico City. The national interest is, of course, as dear to one member as another, but it seems farfetched at best to assume that the operation of a nonstop flight by Air France to Mexico City, three times weekly, as opposed to a one-stop daily flight by American Airlines, is a dire and immediate threat to the national interest.

Especially do I believe that the majority's action in voting the exemption is ill-advised where, as here, the vote was taken within an unreasonably short time of the filing of the application for exemption by the carrier. I cannot subscribe to such precipitate action, cutting across all procedural rules of this Board, when it gives no consideration to the existing rights of other American carriers in the contest for a New York City-Mexico City route.

JOSEPH P. ADAMS.

MEMBER LEE, DISSENTING

I must vigorously object to the unprecedented and drastic action of the majority which disregards the legal requirements of the Civil Aeronautics Act, circumvents the President of the United States, and denies other air carriers due process of law—all for the purpose of protecting the monopoly of American Airlines to Mexico. The action of the majority in approving what amounts to a new route for American between New York and Mexico City has been rushed through so hurriedly that I have not been given time to prepare a dissenting opinion.[1] This statement, therefore, will deal only generally with this problem as time will permit. The majority has based this unusual action upon the allegation that the national interest will be adversely affected by the nonstop service of Air France from New York to Mexico City unless American Airlines is likewise granted a direct route with permission to nonstop, and further undertakes to justify its action by expressing the hope that if the Board acts fast enough the Mexican Government might be persuaded to grant American Airlines

[1] The proposal for this new service first came to my attention in the Board meeting at noon on January 20 when the Chairman presented American's petition with a covering letter which requested confidential treatment. At a special meeting yesterday afternoon the Board denied American's request for secrecy and instructed the examiner to return the petitions to the carrier and advise American's attorney to delete any portions of the application which the carrier wished to keep confidential and to refile the application. The Chairman then announced that such application would be taken up at the Board meeting the following morning. The carrier's application was filed with the Board at 8:52 a. m., January 21, 1954. The Board convened 8 minutes later and approved American's request for exemption by a vote of 3 to 2 and adjourned at 9:40 a. m.

permission to operate this new nonstop service.

Section 401 of the Civil Aeronautics Act expressly provides for notice and hearing prior to the issuance or amendment of a certificate and in the case of certificates involving overseas and foreign air transportation, all of the Board's authority is subject to the approval of the President of the United States as prescribed by section 801 of the Civil Aeronautics Act.[1] The Supreme Court of the United States has held that the decision of the Board in proceedings under section 401 involving certificates for overseas and foreign air transportation has only the force of a recommendation to the President and that the final order of approval is the President's own order embodying his discretion. By taking this unprecedented action in this case the majority has usurped the President's prerogative and has denied the President the exercise of his statutory duties prescribed by the Congress of the United States.

This is not the first time the Board has been asked to shortcut the statutory requirements of notice and hearing which are set forth so clearly in the Civil Aeronautics Act and the Administrative Procedure Act. But this is the first time the Board has ever yielded to such a request without allowing interested parties an opportunity to be heard either through a written document or in oral argument. While time does not permit a detailed analysis of the numerous and consistent denials by the Board to authorize by exemption which should properly be the subject of certificate proceedings under section 401, I have quickly found more than two dozen such instances within the past 2 years, but I have not found one single case in which the Board has utilized the exemption process where the result has been to deny a party an opportunity to be heard. The national interest and the emergency which the majority alleges is scarcely of a nature or degree to justify denying interested parties their constitutional right to be heard.

In my judgment, the majority's action in this case violates the rights of notice and hearing which is the very foundation of justice. With no national emergency and actually with no national interest at stake the manner in which this exemption was granted violates my sense of fair play and constitutes an abuse of the exemption power of the Board, an action which is unprecedented in the Board's 15 years of existence.

The Board has always been very hesitant to grant exemptions where there is opposition. Even the existence of one intervenor has caused the Board to deny applications for exemptions. Of course, in the instant case there are no intervenors for the obvious reason that there has been no opportunity for any other party to intervene.

It is true that the Board has granted exemptions upon the recommendations of one of the national defense agencies but there is no such recommendation in support of this exemption. I recall two cases which are precisely in point with American's present request for an exemption and the unusual action taken by the majority here is directly opposed to those decisions. On June 30, 1947, National Airlines filed an application, Docket No. 3012, asking the Board for an exemption to permit it to conduct nonstop service between New York and Habana. National then had a route between New York and Miami and a separate route between Miami and Habana and could operate single plane service between New York and Habana but could not operate nonstop. National's request for an exemption to conduct nonstop service was based on exactly the same grounds as American seeks to operate nonstop between New York and Mexico City. National's application pointed out that LAV, a Venezuelan company, had already been operating nonstop between New York and Habana, that LAV had been carrying a large number of passengers between such points, that such service had diverted substantial traffic from National, and that National's service between New York and Habana was some 3 hours slower than that offered by its foreign competitor. While National did not receive as speedy action as American has received in connection with its request for an exemption, the Board on July 21, 1947, Order Serial No. E-707, denied National's request for an exemption on the ground that this was a matter which should properly be decided in a certificate proceeding under section 401 of the act.

Another case in point in which the Board refused to depart from its long established principles of fair play was the request of American, Docket No. 3852, for an exemption to permit it to operate nonstop service between New York and Toronto. American's request for an exemption was based upon its desire to participate on a more equal basis with the Canadian carrier who was conducting nonstop operations between New York and Toronto while American was required to stop at the intermediate point of Buffalo. American's application for exemption asserted that it was at a distinct disadvantage because its fastest service was one-third slower than that of the Canadian carrier. Acting pursuant to the recommendation of the Chief Examiner, the Board by Order dated July 28, 1949, Order Serial No. E-3073, denied American's request for an exemption and stated specifically "That the need for the service proposed by American in its application for exemption may more appropriately be determined in the proceeding with respect to its application in Docket No. 3853."

I am in complete disagreement with the majority's statement that American's present request is of an emergency nature and should therefore be disposed of without notice and hearing pursuant to section 302.409 of the Board's Rules of Practice. American has had on file with the Civil Aeronautics Board since April 29, 1947, an application (Docket 2909) to consolidate its routes so that it can operate nonstop service between New York and Mexico City. This matter has been pending nearly 7 years and the Board could have at any time set this matter down for hearing.

The majority's statement that "such action is without prejudice to the rights of other carriers" from a practicable standpoint, amounts to the recitation of so much idle language. American Airlines received its original route authorization to Mexico City on substantially the same temporary emergency "without prejudice to others" basis. The emergency was at least more real at that time since it was during World War II than the present situation but the "without prejudice to others" was as meaningless then as it will be in the present case.

I participated in the Latin American case. The deliberations in that case were based upon the fact that American was already established in Mexico and providing a service there. It was a fait accompli. Practically speaking, there was no de novo consideration in that case.

This happened again in the Southern Service to the West case. Soon after that case was set down for hearing, American and Delta asked the Board to approve an interchange agreement on a temporary basis pending the disposition of that case. The Board in that case, however, as contrasted with the instant case allowed the carriers to be heard in an oral argument. Both Eastern and National protested vigorously against granting the proposed interchange. They pointed out that it would prejudice their pending applications. But the Board approved the interchange anyway relying upon strong assurances that such a decision would not prejudice pending applications. However, when the Board came to decide the Southern Service to the West case its deliberations and considerations were built around the fact that American and Delta were already operating an interchange service. Therefore, regardless of the statement by the majority that its action in granting this route to American will not prejudice the rights of other interested parties, realistically it has no meaning.

In the Chicago & Southern-Pan American Interchange case[2] the majority refused to certificate a competing service with American's monopoly route between Chicago and Mexico City, even on an interchange basis, because of the delicate international situation. If the delicate international situation was a major reason for disapproving the Pan American-Chicago & Southern interchange, it is difficult to understand why that delicate international situation, which is substantially the same today as it was then, will permit the majority to approve for American what is tantamount to a whole new route between New York and Mexico City. This is just another in a recent series of decisions by the majority against competition. This decision, like the disapproval of the Pan American-Chicago & Southern interchange agreement protects from competition by another United States flag carrier American's monopoly route between such cities as Boston, New York, Washington, Chicago, and St. Louis on the one hand, and Mexico on the other.

JOSH LEE.

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
February 20, 1952.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: It is my understanding that you recently had a conversation in Washington with Mr. Angel Martin-Perez, Director of Civil Aviation of the Republic of Mexico, and that he informed you of his willingness to permit Eastern Air Lines to fly to Mexico City from Atlanta or Birmingham provided the Civil Aeronautics Board would permit a Mexican carrier to operate between New Orleans and Mexico City.

While we would much rather have an American carrier operate from New Orleans, the Mexican Government is adamant in its insistence that a Mexican carrier fly the route. We feel that service by a Mexican carrier will be better than no service at all, and will perhaps encourage Mexicans to come to New Orleans to transact their business.

Negotiations between the United States and Mexico were suspended in December when the conferees were unable to agree on service between Mexico City and Los Angeles. We feel strongly that New Orleans, Atlanta, and Birmingham should not be denied this important service because of a failure to

---

[1] SEC. 801. "The issuance, denial, transfer, amendment, cancellation, suspension, or revocation of, and the terms, conditions, and limitations contained in, any certificate authorizing an air carrier to engage in overseas or foreign air transportation, or air tansportation between places in the same Territory or possession, or any permit issuable to any foreign air carrier under section 402, shall be subject to the appoval of the President. Copies of all applications in respect of such certificates and permits shall be transmitted to the President by the Authority before hearing thereon, and all decisions thereon by the Authority shall be submitted to the President before publication thereof."

[2] Chicago & Southern-Pan American Interchange case, decided May 23, 1952, Order Serial No. E-6452.

agree on service to Los Angeles which already has service to Mexico City by a Mexican carrier.

It is our understanding that negotiations will be resumed at an early date, and we feel that it is most important that the Civil Aeronautics Board be urged to reach agreement on as many points as possible in the event complete agreement cannot be achieved.

Sincerely yours,

DE LESSEPS S. MORRISON,
Mayor.

FEBRUARY 28, 1952.

Hon. DONALD W. NYROP,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Department of Commerce Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NYROP: I am enclosing for your information a copy of a self-explanatory letter I have received from the Honorable de Lesseps S. Morrison, mayor of the city of New Orleans, with reference to air service between New Orleans and Mexico City.

As you perhaps know, provision of this service has been a great interest in New Orleans for a number of years, and the entire community is very anxious to have some form of air service inaugurated.

I hope it will be possible for your Board to work out the necessary agreements as quickly as possible.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL B. LONG,
United States Senator.

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
March 4, 1952.

Col. PAUL BARRINGER,
Chief of Transportation, State Department,
New State Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLONEL BARRINGER: I am informed that Mr. Angel Martin-Perez, Director of Civil Aviation of the Republic of Mexico, has stated that his Government is willing to permit Eastern Airlines to fly to Mexico City from Atlanta or Birmingham, provided the Civil Aeronautics Board would permit a Mexican carrier to operate between New Orleans and Mexico City.

While we would much rather have an American carrier operate from New Orleans, the Mexican Government is adamant in its insistence that a Mexican carrier fly the route. We feel that service by a Mexican carrier will be better than no service at all, and will perhaps encourage Mexicans to come to New Orleans to transact their business.

Negotiations between the United States and Mexico were suspended in December when the conferees were unable to agree on service between Mexico City and Los Angeles. We feel strongly that New Orleans, Atlanta, and Birmingham should not be denied this important service because of a failure to agree on service to Los Angeles which already has service to Mexico City by a Mexican carrier.

It is our understanding that negotiations will be resumed at an early date, and I feel it is most important that an agreement be reached on as many points as possible in the event a complete agreement cannot be achieved.

Sincerely yours,

DE LESSEPS S. MORRISON,
Mayor.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, March 7, 1952.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: Reference is made to your letter dated February 28, 1952, transmitting a copy of a communication addressed to you by the mayor of New Orleans relative to the desire of the city of New Orleans for a direct air connection with Mexico City.

Experience has proven that the most satisfactory means of accomplishing the exchange of air rights and air routes, from the standpoint of overall United States aviation interests, is through the negotiation of air transport agreements. The objective of these agreements is to obtain from each foreign government concerned the rights necessary for the implementation of all United States carrier certificates for routes to that country in exchange for an equitable quid pro quo, on an overall basis, for the airlines of the foreign country. Where the price required by the foreign government for the routes requested by the United States has been too high, it has been necessary to forego the conclusion of an agreement.

The United States has made, over a period of 5 years, most serious efforts to conclude an agreement with the Government of Mexico. So far, however, it has not been possible to achieve an exchange of routes which would be mutually satisfactory to Mexico and the United States.

The further development of the route pattern between the United States and Mexico, including direct New Orleans-Mexico City service, is of genuine concern to the Board. The Board is continuing to seek a satisfactory solution to this problem.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD W. NYROP,
Chairman.

APRIL 5, 1952.

Hon. DONALD W. NYROP,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NYROP: I have gone to considerable effort in an attempt to determine why New Orleans is unable to have direct air service with Mexico City. I am sure you are familiar with the years of negotiations involved in this matter. As you know, the Mexicans are willing to permit Eastern Air Lines to fly into Mexico City from either Atlanta or Birmingham provided they are given a route to New Orleans in return. It is my understanding that the Mexicans are also willing to agree to an American airline from Los Angeles to Mexico City with one intermediate stop. Why this matter is not resolved in favor of service to the City of New Orleans is more than I can understand.

In the first place, there is no reason whatsoever why agreement for an Eastern Air Lines route into Mexico City, which could haul traffic from the entire eastern seaboard into Mexico City, would not be a better deal for the United States than a Mexican air route merely terminating at New Orleans. The people of New Orleans, although preferring an American airline, would be completely satisfied to have the Mexican airline rather than no service whatsoever. There are strong bonds of friendship and commercial relations between New Orleans and Mexico City. Our people are bitterly resentful that they should be denied service as the result of interminable negotiations for a second airline to provide nonstop service between Los Angeles and Mexico City. It results in the ridiculous situation that the people of New Orleans are being denied service comparable to that enjoyed by the people of Los Angeles in the effort to negotiate additional service for Los Angeles. In other words, what the people of New Orleans are seeking is what the people of Los Angeles already have. Yet, instead of attempting to provide New Orleans some direct service to Mexico City, the emphasis seems to be upon the proposal to provide additional service for Los Angeles.

Might I suggest that, by providing direct service between New Orleans and Mexico City, it would be establishing a Mexican air route that would soon become profitable, which in turn could be used as a prying pole to obtain reasonable concessions from the Mexican Government. Very little bargaining can be effective on this route until it has proved itself profitable. When that is the case, the Mexican Government will undoubtedly make concessions, if necessary, to keep a profitable route. It stands to reason that they would not concede much for the mere hope of a profit.

The thought also occurs to me that our inability to reach any agreement with the Mexican Government may stem partly from the activities of the carriers who presently carry United States to Mexico passenger traffic. As it stands today, American Airlines and Pan American Airlines share a complete monopoly in air traffic to Mexico. We might suspect that those airlines and their close friends would invariably find reasons to arrive at the conclusion that no proposed agreement, no matter how fair, would be satisfactory. Those who benefit from the present inconvenience to the public might prefer to see the situation remain unchanged.

Inasmuch as the Board apparently believes in service, I see no reason why the Board should not cease these interminable negotiations for a complete bilateral agreement and simply agree to the additional service for New Orleans, Birmingham, or Atlanta for the welfare of the traveling public in the community involved.

I shall very much appreciate having your comments in this matter.

With assurances of my highest esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL B. LONG,
United States Senator.

JULY 15, 1952.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have just been notified that the Mexican Government has granted a permit for Eastern Airlines to fly New Orleans-Mexico City direct nonstop. This represents a great victory for our city interests who have been consistently striving to secure this permit since early 1946. Back in 1946, CAB granted Eastern a permit to go from New Orleans to Mexico City, but the Mexican Government had refused to recognize it. Now they have finally decided to permit this entry by Eastern provided that a Mexican carrier is permitted to fly Mexico City to New Orleans.

Since this has oftentimes been offered in reciprocal conferences in the past, I see no reason why the President, the State Department and the CAB would not immediately approve of this arrangement and permit the inauguration of both these services.

It is so important that the matter not slip in any manner that I am requesting that you and Senator ELLENDER immediately contact Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Senators GEORGE and RUSSELL, of Georgia, to call in a body at the White House, at the CAB, and at the State Department to push this matter through. The mayors of Birmingham and Atlanta have already contacted their respective Senators. They are great beneficiaries likewise of this service.

DE LESSEPS S. MORRISON,
Mayor, City of New Orleans.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1952.

Mr. J. PAUL BARRINGER,
Director, Office of Transport and Communications Policy, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARRINGER: I have read your letter of September 22 and it certainly makes sense when you say that our Government desires to obtain a fair and equitable agree-

ment for air transportation between the United States and Mexico. No one is opposed to the proposition which attempts to secure air service on a fair basis. However, I cannot see how your Department can justify even the slightest delay in this matter when we realize that 2 companies, out of 5 originally certified, are enjoying and will continue to enjoy the fruits of this traffic while the others suffer.

It is plain to me that the longer an agreement is not executed, the longer the present discriminatory situation will continue. So far, it has continued for 6½ years. My city, which is on the direct line from the large cities of the East to Mexico City, is deprived of this vital service, which in all fairness we should enjoy. The public at the same time is being discriminated against because they are having to fly a dog-leg route, pay more money, consuming more time to travel from the East to Mexico City.

I understand that when the permit was first issued to Western, Braniff, American, Pan American, and Eastern, these airlines were asked not to negotiate privately with Mexico, but to await some type of bilateral agreement. The carrier certified from New Orleans (Eastern Airlines) followed your instructions and did not attempt a private agreement. American and Pan American did. And now your delay not only benefits them but continues the discrimination which was created because they failed to comply with your instructions. In other words, they are getting a premium for their action which was inconsistent with your policy. At the same time, Eastern Airlines is being penalized each day because they followed your policy.

The people of my city are disgusted with the continuous series of obstructions. Obviously the game of our opponents is to find some point of difference and perpetuate it as long as they can, and then find another and so on in the future. In the meantime they can enjoy their special privileges to the exclusion of the others.

In plain words, Mr. Barringer, the situation up to this time is neither fair nor equitable and that is why I have suggested if our Government really wishes to settle this matter they ought to cancel all permits into Mexico (both operating and nonoperating) and put everyone on an equal basis. Such a cancellation will then force an immediate settlement and perhaps some degree of fairness and equity will be accomplished.

We are sick and tired of New Orleans being a step child in this air transportation picture. At present, Braniff flies over Canal Street every night without stopping, on its way to South America. American flies around us on the west and various airlines around us on the east on their way to Mexico. We insist that justice be done for our city.

Very truly yours,

DE LESSEPS S. MORRISON,
Mayor.

OCTOBER 8, 1952.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.
Mr. D. W. NYROP,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C.
Mr. J. B. BARRINGER,
State Department, Washington, D. C.:

Through the Aviation Daily of Monday, October 6, we learned of a meeting held by the CAB and the State Department with representatives of interested airlines regarding the Mexico route. We made some further inquiries and found that Pan American Airways had made representations which were absolutely shocking to us. In plain words, these representations were nonsense and if supported would be disastrous to our aviation picture. The Pan American representation contended that Houston, Dallas, San Antonio, and Brownsville were primary sources and that New Orleans was a secondary source. They recommended that the eastern traffic—New York, Boston, Washington, Philadelphia, Baltimore, etc., be routed through Houston, Tex. on an interchange between Eastern and Pan American.

First of all, this is an utter discrimination against our city, which is the second seaport of the Nation, and it has the largest metropolitan area in the South. Second, it is an outright discrimination against the flying public, forcing them to go 150 miles further at greater cost and with two stops instead of one on the direct New York-Mexico line.

Although we are not opposed to having the State of Texas and its cities with entries into Mexico City, we still feel it is unfair that El Paso, San Antonio, Dallas, Houston, and Brownsville all have direct entries and we do not. There just isn't any fairness in this type of suggestion and we are shocked that Pan American that does business in our city should work against our natural rights and interests.

I have advised Senator LISTER HILL, Senator ELLENDER, and Senator LONG, who are likewise incensed about this Pan American representation.

DE LESSEPS S. MORRISON,
Mayor, City of New Orleans.

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS,
Office of the Mayor,
October 21, 1952.

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RUSSELL: The matter of the airline service from New Orleans to Mexico City is now at a critical point. The Mexican picture we understand is in excellent shape, but delays and frustrations are now setting in in Washington.

Since there has been a statement that this matter will be settled before the end of President Aleman's term, December 1, and before President Truman leaves office, I believe it is imperative that you make representations to the State Department, the White House, and the CAB that our rights be protected.

Attached is a copy of a telegram I have sent this day to Dean Acheson.

Sincerely yours,

DE LESSEPS S. MORRISON,
Mayor.

OCTOBER 21, 1952.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand American Airline, Inc., through its lawyers Covington and Burling and its director, James C. Bruce are continuing their efforts to delay and defeat the rights of Louisiana and the Southeastern States to direct air service via New Orleans to Mexico City as certificated to Eastern Airlines, Inc., by the CAB and the President in 1946. Understand you are familiar with details and I urge you and Under Secretary David Bruce to make certain that our rights to the direct service by Eastern Airlines are protected and that negotiations for Mexican permit are concluded without further delay. We vigorously oppose indirect routing or interchange and are demanding common justice.

DE LESSEPS S. MORRISON,
Mayor, City of New Orleans.

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
November 12, 1952.

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RUSSELL: Now that the campaign is over and we are all back to normal again, it is probably appropriate that we make another try at getting the Eastern Air lines New Orleans-Mexico City permit. President Truman has told you and Senator HILL that he wishes to settle this matter before he leaves office and before President Alleman of Mexico leaves office. President Alleman is leaving on December 1, 1952, and President Truman on January 20, 1953.

My suggestion at this time (and you may have a better one) is that you ask the President to write another letter withdrawing his letter of September 8, which intended to cancel the Eastern permit, granted in 1946.

The answer of the State Department and the CAB and the President, was that this letter was only intended as a means of properly negotiating with Mexico and was not intended to forfeit the rights enjoyed by Eastern, Western, and Braniff. The September 8 letter, according to these sources, was intended merely to put the United States in a better bargaining position for the bilateral routes we requested. Time and again the CAB and the State Department have stated in communications to me, that our negotiators would go down to Mexico to accomplish their work before December . From our information, the sources in Mexico, they are ready, willing, and anxious to have the State Department negotiators come down. But as yet, none have arrived. Each time the trip is planned someone delays it. That someone, we believe, is American or Pan-American Airways through the influence that they can wield in Washington.

Certainly, in deference to you, Senator HILL, and in deference to the rights of our State and of Alabama and Georgia, at least an attempt should be made to negotiate this bilateral agreement and someone should be sent to Mexico now. Otherwise, we are merely getting the runaround.

All the best luck.

Sincerely,

DE LESSEPS S. MORRISON,
Mayor.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *February 1, 1954.*

Senator RUSSELL LONG,
Washington, D. C.:

People of New Orleans shocked and chagrined by the final approval of American Airlines New York to Mexico City overflying New Orleans. This is something which we have been assured would never happen. In plain words, action of this type is a disgrace and I am requesting that some sort of a congressional investigation go into the obvious discrimination against New Orleans and the cities of the Southeast who were granted this service 7½ years ago. Our city is indignant and requests immediate action be taken to halt any such proceedings.

DE LESSEPS S. MORRISON,
Mayor, City of New Orleans.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—AMENDMENTS TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I submit an amendment to the committee amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 1, to insert after the word "treaty" on page 3, line 5, the words "or other international agreement." I

ask that the amendment to the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 5, in the amendment of the committee, after the word "treaty", it is proposed to insert the words "or other international agreement."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I submit to the committee amendment a perfecting amendment intended to be offered by me; and I ask that it be read, printed, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table, and will be read at this time.

The amendment to the amendment was read, as follows:

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3 of the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out lines 14 and 15 and insert the following:

SEC. 4. When the Senate consents to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received as a perfecting amendment to the committee amendment, and will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I submit to the committee amendment a perfecting amendment intended to be offered by me; and I ask that it be read, printed, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The perfecting amendment to the committee amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 3, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SECTION 1. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received as a perfecting amendment to the committee amendment, and will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now understand there is at the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is my understanding also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendments which have just been submitted are in the nature of perfecting amendments to the amendment reported by the Judiciary Committee, are they not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct; they are in the nature of perfecting amendments to the amendment of the Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Therefore, I assume that the perfecting amendments will be considered ahead of the amendment in the nature of a substitute. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the perfecting amendments, in the order submitted, will be the pending business, and will be considered ahead of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which previously was submitted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. They have precedence, under the rule, do they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only the first perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, on behalf of himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment, is actually pending; but the others can be offered, and will take precedence in their turn, since they are submitted to the committee amendment as perfecting amendments, rather than amendments in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am very hopeful that we may be able to begin to vote on some of the amendments tomorrow. Since I have not given notice of an evening session today, I am about to move that the Senate take a recess until noon, tomorrow.

I hope all Senators will be able to adjust their schedules in such a way that if it becomes necessary to hold evening sessions during the remainder of the week, we shall be able to do so, and shall be able to complete debate and perhaps also obtain some votes on the several amendments which have been submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from California giving the Senate formal notice that an evening session may be expected tomorrow evening?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, unless there are other amendments to be submitted, or additional business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 3, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 2 (legislative day of January 22), 1954:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Wendell B. Barnes, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Walter H. Hodge, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2, district of Alaska, vice Joseph W. Kehoe, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jon K. Smedberg, St. Andrews Episcopal Church, Grayslake, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage; we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that, through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 29, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, to a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 350. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TO DISCHARGE INDEBTEDNESS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HORAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. TABER, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. MARSHALL.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on House Joint Resolution 358.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

GROUNDHOG DAY

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, for the edification of the Members of the House, today is Groundhog Day—a great day for Punxsutawney, Jefferson County, Pa. The day when that great prognosticator of the weather, the world's renowned meterologist, forecasts the weather for the next 6 weeks from his home in the Pennsylvania hills, on Gobblers' Knob in Punxsutawney.

According to a wire I received from Mr. Sam Light, president of the Punxsutawney, Pa., Groundhog Club, the one and only recognized weather authority has spoken.

The wire reads:

PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA., WEATHER WORKS,
7:28 a. m., February 2, 1954.

The world's foremost and only true weather prophet, the seer of seers' burrow door slowly squeaked open this predawn chilly morning. The sun was just beginning to filter through the clouds. The seer emerged and cast a long, long shadow. Button up your overcoats, and throw another bucket of coal on the fire. It's 6 more weeks of winter and that is straight from the groundhog's shadow.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that these remarks will be a source of consternation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative LEON H. GAVIN, who for years has ridiculously championed the forecasting claims of the illegitimate groundhogs of Punxsutawney, but facts are facts, and the truth will out.

I consider it my responsibility to correctly advise my colleagues, even at the expense of the reputation of my good friend from the environs of Gobblers' Knob.

This morning, in Sun Prairie, Dane County, in the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin, the official groundhog weather forecast occurred.

Here, in the groundhog capitol of the world, members of the Sun Prairie Groundhog Club gathered breathlessly at the burrow to receive their message from Sir No-Talk-In-Sleep, the groundhog king of the world.

At precisely 8 a. m. central standard time the king appeared cloaked in the greatest of dignity and the slickest of fur. Accompanied by his beautiful queen, the former Miss Sleep-All-Winter, with whom he was joined in an official ceremony 2 years ago, and his handsome albino son, the dauphin groundhog prince, Sir No-Talk-In-Sleep was greeted by a cheering crowd and a cloudless Wisconsin sky.

The forecaster king stretched himself and cast a long shadow across the snow. Stanley Rea, of the Wisconsin State Journal, official watcher of the burrow and assistant prognosticator, was ready for the occasion. He flashed the word to the millions of groundhogs who acknowledged Sun Prairie as their world capital: "Sir No-Talk-In-Sleep just saw his shadow—there will be 6 more weeks of winter."

Sun Prairie's Groundhog Club president, Stanley Fisher, informed me that the dauphin groundhog prince had made exactly the same forecast as his distinguished sire, thus assuring the continuance of Sun Prairie's exalted world position.

Tonight, Mr. Fisher will preside over a large banquet to be followed by two dances, all to be attended by the royal groundhog family. Proceeds will be divided among the March of Dimes, cancer, heart, and polio funds.

Emden Schey, Walter Braatz, and Margaret McGonigle, Groundhog Club officers, will assist their president in assuring that the world groundhog capital pays proper tribute to the greatest groundhog forecaster of them all.

THE LATE JOHN H. GRIFFIN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I bring the shocking news of the death of an illustrious constituent of mine, a great and loyal friend, Mr. John H. Griffin, the editor in chief of the Boston Post. A man of unusual ability and of great loyalty to his church and to his country has suddenly departed from this life and has left a vacuum where he once stood and contributed so much to the daily life of our New England community. The people of Boston and New England were deeply shocked yesterday to learn of the passing of this eminent citizen. His home was in my district, where he lived for many years with his very fine family. Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I shall present to the Congress the interesting details regarding this man's distinguished life and the qualities he so constantly illustrated in his daily association with his fellow men. I hope all of you, my colleagues here in the Congress, will take a few moments of your busy time to read my remarks regarding this loyal and admirable American.

His death came suddenly at 11:45 p. m. on January 31, while he was recuperating from a major operation performed a week before at the Polyclinic Hospital in New York City. He was 55 years old. Mr. Griffin was in New York on business when he was first stricken.

John M. Griffin was one of the most widely known and sincerely liked newspapermen in New England. He had been editor in chief of the Boston Post since July 1952.

Previous to his appointment as editor in chief, Mr. Griffin was Sunday editor. Earlier he served as a reporter on the Post staff. He joined the staff of the Post in 1930.

In addition to his duties on the Post he was a member of the television panel, Starring the Editors, a weekly television show viewed by thousands over WBZ-TV.

The death of John H. Griffin removed from the newspaper profession an outstanding figure. He was a man of great journalistic ability. He was erudite and understanding. His death cut short a career as editor in chief of the Post which, in a period of 19 months, had shown his rare editorial talents.

He started his newspaper career with the Springfield Union, after having done part-time work on the Washington Star.

Following a successful period with the Union, he was invited to become a member of the reportorial staff of the Boston Herald, on which paper he spent 5 years, before joining the Post.

A native of Holyoke, and a graduate of Catholic University, Mr. Griffin did graduate work at Harvard University.

As a reporter, columnist and editor he had traveled widely and during the past 2 years his ability, judgment and insight won him assignments covering the most important of the world's news stories. Among them was the elevation of Pope Pius XII.

In 1946 he toured Occupied Germany and wrote a series of articles describing the impressions of that war-torn country. He traveled in Europe three times on newspaper assignments. Among the

many journalistic honors he had received during his career, was the Amasa Howe Award of the Boston Press Club, which was given to him in February 1953, for the best newspaper writing of public significance in Boston in 1952.

Although he attained national fame as an editor, he never lost the desire to cover a story. Only 2 months ago he was aboard the new American Airlines DC-7 Mercury plane which flew from New York to Los Angeles. On the return flight the Mercury broke a record, crossing the country in 6 hours and 31 minutes. Mr. Griffin wrote a vivid story of this flight.

Mr. Griffin was an excellent writer. His Sunday articles were clear, concise and to the point.

His last articles in the Post were a series of stories on the nationwide poll conducted by the Crossley Research, Inc. Mr. Griffin's fourth and final article in this series appeared in the Post January 24.

He leaves his wife, the former Alice Barry, and six children: the Reverend Mr. Richard Griffin, S. J., a student at Weston College; John, a junior at Holy Cross College; Maureen, a junior at Trinity College; Carol, a student at Notre Dame Academy; Kevin, a student at St. Sebastian's Country Day School, and Gerald, a student in the Phillips Grammar School, Watertown.

Also surviving are a sister, Miss Mary Griffin, of New York, and a brother, James Griffin, of Holyoke.

Mr. Griffin's home was at 96 Russell Avenue, Watertown, Mass.

I extend to his family my deepest personal sympathy, and I share in their bereavement, as do so many others, since I regarded him as a close friend, and an inspiration to all who take the privilege of citizenship to heart. I have lost a friend. The people of New England have lost an able and loyal citizen. The Nation, this America of ours, has lost a great editor of a great newspaper.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, like the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, I feel deeply grieved at the passing of John Griffin, who was one of the outstanding men of his profession. He was one of the leading officials of a great newspaper, the Boston Post. For years he gave to the people of the community the benefit of the great mind he had in a forward-looking and constructive manner. John Griffin was a valued friend of mine for many years and his death is a personal loss to me. To his loved ones I extend my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

JOHN GRIFFIN: A NEWSPAPERMAN TO REMEMBER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, John H. Griffin, editor in chief of the Boston Post, the morning newspaper of New England, is dead. In his prime at the age of 55, worn out by his devotion to the profession of journalism.

Those of us who were fortunate to know him as a friend, admired his character and ability. Others, now reading about him at his journey's end, will sense that he was a fine American, in one of the most difficult of all callings, in the service of a free press that is the greatest protector of our liberities.

John Griffin, grew up in the honest, fearless, and independent atmosphere of Yankee journalism reverencing facts in its news reporting, and crusading for higher standards in the lives of public officials and private citizens, in Government, in business, and in every humble job to be well done.

Deep in his heart he knew that freedom of information is the inspiration for all that we have accomplished both as human beings and as a nation. As long as we have men and women to dedicate their lives to this ideal as John Griffin did, our country will go forward, lighting up the way for itself and humanity.

I recommend as an example to all students of journalism, John Griffin, a graduate of Catholic University, where he learned those moral precepts without which knowledge is lacking in fulfillment. He rounded out his studies at the Harvard Graduate School. As a working reporter he started out with the Springfield (Mass.) Union, which many of the best in the business recommend for basic training, later he advanced to the Boston Herald, then to the position of Sunday editor of the Boston Post, and finally becoming its editor in chief.

He was the outstanding member of a panel of New England newspaper editors who appeared weekly on a regular television show. It was here that he developed a wide personal following for his knack of getting to the heart of any public issue. Communism never had a chance in New England after he set out to expose it relentlessly with a surgeon's skill and a newspaperman's courage.

To his widow and his six children, and to the staff of the Boston Post, which was his adopted family, we extend a nation's sympathy.

John Griffin's typewriter is silent, but his memory lives on in the company of other great journalists whose unseen presence guides the clattering keys that send out the news of the day in every paper, large and small, throughout the United States.

And every reporter will be heartened as he thinks of John Griffin, of the American creed that he lived and died for: "Always write the truth that makes and keeps us free."

THE RISING COST OF COFFEE

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, what I will say at this time has nothing to do with groundhogs, since I have no official report on the groundhog seeing or not seeing its shadow in Connecticut this morning. However, my statement is germane only to the extent that the product involved requires ground for cultivation and is ground when used in making a drinking delicacy which I greatly enjoy. As a personal protest against the rise in coffee prices, I have quit drinking my usual 6 to 8 cups of coffee daily during the month of February.

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT PRESIDENT'S TREATYMAKING POWERS SUGGESTED EISENHOWER DOCTRINE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, just as the grave dangers of this constitutional amendment changing the constitutional separation of the powers after 164 years of experience are being widely recognized in the country so too are the dangers inherent in the much-discussed compromises. These compromises seek to introduce new methods for handling the foreign policy of the country which would be so much open to controversy themselves as to leave unsettled the very assurances, safeguards or restraints which are stated to be the reason for them.

At a juncture rarely equaled in our peacetime history when we are seeking to resolve tremendous world issues by negotiation, to make a start on the control of atomic weapons and other methods of mass destruction and to avoid world war III it would be most inopportune to leave in doubt the definition of the powers in handling the country's foreign policy. In addition, it is generally admitted that President Eisenhower's especial appeal to the American people is expressly in this field; why, then, change the balance of constitutional powers now?

I suggest as an alternative for those who continue to have fears that treaties or executive agreements can cut across the Constitution that the President promulgate the Eisenhower doctrine to the effect that the treatymaking power and the authority of treaties is such that no treaty or executive agreement, which conflicts with the Constitution, shall be of any force or effect. Our experience with declarations like the Monroe Doctrine, the Emancipation Proclamation, President Wilson's 14 Points and the Atlantic Charter doctrine of World War II shows the historic force which such a declaration by President Eisenhower would have.

Senate rules can deal with implementing the two-thirds majority required in the Senate to approve treaties by requiring the yeas and nays and other matters, and further consideration may be given to the idea of joining the House of Representatives in the treaty approval power, but the debate now going on relating to the powers of the President in

foreign affairs rather than the powers intra the Congress can and should be settled without compromise on fundamentals. Complete assurances to reasonable fears, if any, of the abuse of Presidential powers in foreign affairs may be given by the Presidential declaration I have suggested.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

UNITED STATES INDIANS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1953, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported to the House favorably with amendments H. R. 4985, to provide a decree of competency for United States Indians in certain cases. The committee since has received evidence that it might be desirable to reconsider provisions of this bill, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be recommitted to the committee so that further hearings may be held.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LANDS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker on July 27, 1953, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported to the House favorably with amendments H. R. 4646, to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands. A rule was granted on July 29 but the bill was not called up before adjournment. During the recess, the author, Mr. ELLSWORTH, worked with the Forest Service in an effort to evolve language that would remove certain objections raised to the bill. The committee now has approved language which it wishes to offer as a committee amendment to H. R. 4646. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the committee be given permission to file a supplemental report to H. R. 4646 so that the committee amendments may be before this body, together with certain pertinent information on the bill, and that the committee have until midnight February 4, to file a supplemental report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

COMMENDING LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES OF WASHINGTON

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Chief Robert V. Murray and the police department of Washington for the success of their determined effort to put an end to the crime wave which has gripped this city for some time.

In recent years, a great number of persons have come to Washington who do not appreciate the privilege of living in this fine city and who have refused to accept the responsibilities of citizenship. They have robbed, raped and murdered to the extent that Washington has one of the highest major crime rates of any city in the United States They have brought disgrace to the Nation's capital and made it a poor place for decent citizens to live.

But a change has taken place and it now appears the police and law courts have served notice on the underworld that Washington no longer will be a haven for bandits, rapists, murderers and racketeers. And, those who live in the Capital City must behave themselves or suffer the consequences of their misconduct. Events of the past week prove without question the police department means business in dealing with criminals, and they can count on many members of Congress and myself to support any request for funds to hire additional policemen if needed, and any new jail or penitentiary that may be necessary, to keep the underworld from roaming the streets of Washington.

HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks from today, on February 16, the gentleman from Washington, Mr. RUSSELL MACK, chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, will begin hearings on flood-control projects which have had the approval of the Army engineers. Hearings will be held in the committee room, 1302, of the New House Office Building.

I am extending in the RECORD a list of those projects which thus far have had the approval of the Corps of the Army Engineers and in which many Members of the House no doubt are interested.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was granted permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, after all the legislative business of the day has been disposed of and following any other special orders heretofore entered.

BORROWING AUTHORITY OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the other body has failed to pass the resolution extending the lending authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, in the resolution which this House handled last Thursday, in the way we passed it. They have provided in their action only a sufficient amount of funds to run that Corporation for about two and a half weeks. The matter now goes to conference and I take this occasion to point out again that while the value of commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation, farm commodities, is in excess of $8,700,000,000, those commodities, nearly all of them, have not been before and are not now offered for sale on the competitive world market at prevailing prices.

The law authorizes such sale. They are being held off the market, not to protect the interests of the American farmers, but against the interests of the American farmers. I feel that those in our Government, whatever the merit may be for such withholding of those commodities from the market, should have charged up to them what is being done, instead of that being charged up to the farmer.

In extending my remarks, I call attention again to the bill which I have introduced which would require that these commodities which are in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation be offered on the world market at prevailing prices as now authorized by law. Then the Government's investment would be the difference between what we loaned on them and what we sold them for. As long as we refuse to sell them, we are charging ourselves with the total value. That is not the fault of the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the failure of the Senate to pass the resolution we passed in the House last Friday increasing the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I present herewith copy of bill which I introduced January 27, 1954. This bill, I think, points up this major problem with the price-support system and the cause of the present situation. By Government policy most of the commodities which the Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand are not offered on the world market at competitive prices. The law authorizes such sale. In fact, the law contemplates such sale.

I point out that firm contracts were given for industrial production at cost plus a profit to meet the needs of the Nation during World War II and in the emergency since. Not only that, but huge grants were made to get industry to expand. More than $29 billion in quick tax amortization were granted. We have built up and now have on hand $129 million worth of military materiel, but this is not on the domestic market. At the end of World War II industry was granted about $16 billion for reconversion to keep industrial labor employed.

With a few minor exceptions there were no grants nor quick tax amortiza-

tion made to farmers. Nor were firm contracts given for increased agricultural production, and 90 percent of the comparative purchasing power the farmer had in 1909–14 through loans was the usual maximum. Much of such production was held in this country by export restrictions when large profits could have been had from sale on the world markets. With the end of World War II no such payments were made to farmers as were made to industry for reconversion costs. Actually some export restrictions were maintained prohibiting export at any price. Now such commodities are still on the domestic market at support price plus 5 percent to force farm commodities through the loan program, and most of them, billions of dollars' worth, are not being offered on the world market at competitive or prevailing world prices. To refuse to offer such commodities for sale to the world markets except at higher than world prices, is to bottle them up within our own country as a depressing influence on our domestic market. It permits the industrial users in our own country to buy at their pleasure, without the need of carrying any sizable inventory.

We are advised that such course has been followed because of our national foreign policy and other complications. The State Department, Commerce Department and others have largely forced this policy of not offering such commodities on the world market at competitive prices. This has resulted in a backup of commodities, with the large Government investment. The borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation is practically exhausted and large storage charges are being incurred. The Government is out the total amount invested as the matter stands. If such commodities were sold on the world market, then the Government would be out only the difference between the support price and the amount received from sale. Not only that, but American farmers are losing world market outlets for the future because such commodities are not offered at prevailing or world prices.

You will note in the first section of the bill the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to consider the national interest, and thereby provision can be made to move these supplies back into world market channels in an orderly way.

Where the world markets simply cannot absorb all these commodities at the present time, without a drastic break in world prices, a quantity of such commodities could be insulated as recommended by the President pending orderly movement of such commodities as could be absorbed by the market.

In the last section provision is made for the President to prohibit sales for use in Communist-dominated countries, where such use in his judgment would be detrimental to our security.

It is not the original producer, the farmer, whose interest is being served by keeping his product off the world market. Such action represents the interest and efforts of those with interests which conflict with the farmer. Unless we get relief, the farmer comes out second best.

The action called for in this bill is sound. Certainly it points up the fact that with such a national policy as we now have, these commodities should be charged largely to whatever national interest is responsible for keeping these commodities off the world market instead of being charged solely to agriculture, unless the purpose be to destroy the farm program.

I herewith present this bill:

H. R. 7546

A bill to authorize the sale of farm commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby finds and declare that the farm price-support system is designed for the purpose of stabilizing the farm income of American farmers and assuring sufficient return to protect the land and other natural resources. The Congress further finds and declares that all peoples and governments have the inherent right to offer on the world market any and all commodities at competitive prices; and it is therefore declared to be the policy of the United States that our domestic farm program shall not be used to keep American agricultural commodities from being offered on the world market at competitive prices.

SEC. 2. The Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to determine what part of present stocks of farm or agricultural commodities in its hands should be held as essential to the national security or in the national interest, and upon such determination title to all such commodities so determined to be essential to the national security shall be transferred to the Department of National Defense, and all commodities so transferred shall be taken off the market: *Provided, however,* That to prevent spoilage or deterioration any part of such commodities may be returned to the Commodity Credit Corporation for sale as hereinafter provided and replaced with a like amount or quantity from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

SEC. 3. In order to make American farm commodities available to users in other countries on the same basis as farm commodities from other nations, all other agricultural commodities of whatever kind or character, title to which is in the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless already committed for sale shall be offered for sale for use outside the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions, at prevailing or competitive world prices: *Provided, however,* That the President by Executive order may restrict or prohibit sales of such commodities for use in Communist-dominated countries when in his opinion such sales would be against the interest of the United States.

A PUBLIC APPEAL TO GENERAL MOTORS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in our great and prosperous Nation, there are scattered labor-surplus areas, some of them classified as chronic.

We are optimistic regarding the United States as a whole, but you will agree with me, I am sure, that we cannot close our eyes to critical areas of unemployment, however few in number they may be.

The Federal Government has been thoroughly briefed on this problem, but prefers to ignore it.

Our only alternative is to appeal to General Motors, as the largest and the most successful unit in the American economy, and as the symbol of free enterprise, to help us put our vacant factories into new and useful production.

We see hope in the announcement that your corporation will spend a billion dollars to expand output. This is proof of your confidence in the demand for your products and in the economic future of our Nation.

I represent a district in Massachusetts where the gradual exodus of the textile industry has resulted in serious and prolonged unemployment. Local individuals and groups are working hard to replace our lost industries. As a Member of Congress, I am searching for a solution in every possible way that I can.

Now, for this area, the problem has become acute.

Greater Lawrence, Mass., has a population of 125,000. It is going through a difficult period of transition. For years textile concerns have been closing or moving to the south and replacement industries have not succeeded in filling the gap. Now, with the imminent end of textile manufacturing in the Wood Mill, the largest woolen-worsted plant in the world, and the key factor in the employment of our people, I have no recourse but to appeal directly to you. I pray that out of this may come help for Lawrence, help that will become a pilot plan to demonstrate how industry can move in to take up the slack in other labor-market areas as well, and prove how private enterprise can overcome any challenge.

Therefore, as part of your expansion program, we ask you to purchase the Wood Mill in Lawrence and adapt it to the manufacture of a General Motors product.

Yours is a growth-industry, and we want to grow with you. It is not charity that we seek, because we offer you the following advantages in return:

Within a 500-mile radius of this city is the largest concentration of industrial markets, barring none.

Its people are skilled in machine-type operations.

Railroads, planes, trucks, and ships, afford ample and convenient transportation facilities.

Power is plentiful.

The finest research centers are only 25 miles away.

These are objective facts that can be checked and verified.

In addition—and perhaps most important of all—you can count on 100 percent community cooperation.

We are willing and anxious to invest—all the citizens of greater Lawrence, from local bankers down to the man or woman with but $50 left in savings—to buy this plant and lease it to you if necessary. We are even prepared to build a new plant if it will encourage you to locate a branch of your diversified production here.

What more inspiring offer could you receive than this?

Jointly to create those employment opportunities which we, on our part, will repay with our proven ability to produce.

It may be unprecedented for a Congressman to avail himself of this national forum to make this urgent and public appeal to General Motors, but I do so because it is the dynamic representative of our free-enterprise system.

Such is the measure of our need, our hope, and our faith.

MY OPPOSITION TO THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY PROJECT

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, if a legislator wants to be proficient in his job, there is one guiding rule he would do well to follow and that is the all-wise dictum: Get the facts.

As I have followed discussion of the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway, I have been struck with the thought that here is a subject upon which there is much misinformation, yes, misinformation in large gulps.

Over the years as this waterway deal has been churned up in the Halls of Congress the claims for it appear to increase and multiply in volume and scope until today, in the view of its advocates, it represents the great deliverance from all economic woes.

So I feel, Mr. Speaker, we can become engaged in no better task than to review carefully the essential facts of this proposal.

First about the adequacy of the proposed 27-foot channel. It is an indisputable fact, Mr. Speaker, that the 27-foot channel would allow for the passage of only about 4 percent of American-flag ocean-going vessels when loaded. This is the statement of the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., which represents the overwhelming majority of all deep-water, dry-cargo American-flag shipping. It is well established that the 27-foot channel would not permit passage of our Liberty ships. It is a pertinent commentary on this whole proposal, Mr. Speaker, that because of the inadequacy of the 27-foot channel for our ships, the Department of Commerce in its surveys on the potential tonnage for the waterway based its figures on American-flag ships being only partly loaded. What a ridiculous proposition. And on top of this consideration is the development which finds the trend in building veering to larger American-flag ships for economical reasons.

Perhaps one of the most damaging bits of testimony relating to this 27-foot channel business, Mr. Speaker, was the opinion of the late Secretary of Defense James Forrestal, who, under date of February 19, 1949, wrote to Senator WILEY:

> American-flag oceangoing ships are predominantly deep-draft vessels, designed to operate economically at drafts ranging from 26 to 30 feet. A seaway of a 27-foot depth would not accommodate as large a portion of American vessels, fully loaded, as would a seaway with a deeper channel of, for example, 30 feet, which would accommodate a majority of United States shipping.

This is only a fragment of the testimony that is available, Mr. Speaker, on the inadequacy of the 27-foot channel. One can only wonder then why the proponents of this plan still stick to this depth, a figure which was first proposed back in 1928. The only plausible answer seems to be that they are afraid to up the depth limit owing to the great jump in cost between the 27-foot and the 30-foot channel or 35-foot channel, and are going on the theory that if they can crack this project first, then they will have made a start and in a short time come back in here for the additional millions to deepen the channel to practical depths.

Along these lines I would like to quote from the testimony of Raymond V. Long, acting director, Virginia Department of Conservation and Development, Richmond, Va., in his statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, made at the instance of Gov. John S. Battle, of Virginia.

Mr. Long had this to say:

> It is generally assumed that the completion of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project will cost many millions of dollars more for the completed project than the estimated $818 million, of which amount the United States would be responsible for $567 million. The prevailing opinion appears to estimate the cost as at least $1 billion for a channel 27 feet in depth. It is recognized by all who are thinking seriously and honestly of the economics of the proposal that a 27-foot channel will accommodate only a small proportion of oceangoing vessels; and, in view of the increasing production of oceangoing vessels, barges and tankers requiring a 35-foot channel, the proposed project would be obsolete and distinctly limited in use long before its construction. If the proposed Senate bill 589 is passed providing for the 27-foot channel, it is reasonable to predict that, as the project gets under way and large sums of money are obligated, strong pressure would be brought to bear for increasing the depth of the channel, which is estimated would cost at least twice the presently estimated cost.

Mr. Long's testimony gives corroboration to some of my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker. Many others have expressed the same opinion. This project, despite its lack of feasibility is being purposely held down to an economy size so that a start can be made and once that is accomplished the bidding will be raised every time we turn around.

While I have Mr. Long's testimony before me, Mr. Speaker, he has another paragraph that is loaded with good, common sense, and I would like to take the liberty of quoting it:

> The bill proposes to authorize the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, which would have authority to construct the proposed seaway by means of issuing bonds and amortizing the bonds by charging tolls. But if the tolls fail to pay off the bonds, they become a direct obligation of the United States Government. There is no reasonable assurance that the tolls will pay off, but on the contrary, a strong probability that the United States Government must sooner or later assume a huge financial responsibility for the undertaking, if authorized. Furthermore, the seaway can be used only about 7 months out of the year, and since the volume of shipping during those 7 months is limited and estimated only, it appears that the tolls would either be exorbitantly high or over a period of years the cost of the project would be subsidized by the Government.

We can readily see, Mr. Speaker, that the prospective volume of traffic the waterway would bear and the tolls it would produce become vital elements for close study. I might say in this respect that the figure on the potential traffic volume for this waterway has been a bouncing-ball sort of thing over the 30 years that the project has been agitated. Going back to 1934, the Army engineers at that time estimated 27 million tons. Coming down to 1941, the Department of Commerce placed its estimate at 25 million tons. Again in 1947, the National St. Lawrence Association, the organization which later became the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, gave an estimate of 37 million tons.

Estimates, it appears, Mr. Speaker, are variables, dependent upon the enthusiastic zeal of the individual estimator. For we find when the problem gets into the hands of Paul M. Zeis of the Transportation Division of the Department of Commerce, he can see business for the waterway of 40½ million tons a year, by his 1947 estimate; then the following year, he got a firmer hold on himself and came up with the projection of from 57 to 84 million tons a year.

Now, to achieve this remarkable growth in tonnage estimates, Mr. Zeis reached out with a long arm and virtually garnered in all the possible traffic on the move; this estimate also accounted for the bringing in of more ore from Labrador than it is proposed to produce, a neat trick, I might add, in passing; he also included the shipment of oil by tankers which is the more likely to be handled by pipeline. These latter estimates have little relation to reality and certainly they cannot be used realistically in trying to find a base for fiscal expectations to set up toll schedules for revenue purposes.

So what it amounts to, Mr. Speaker, is that if this bill goes through, the United States Treasury will inherit a nice, juicy debt obligation, and this at a time when we have found it advisable to slash Air Force appropriations to the tune of billions of dollars in the name of economy.

It is difficult for me to understand how the same Congress which cut back defense appropriations, as did this Congress, can at the same time be prevailed upon to give serious attention to a handout project like this one.

In the reading of the record in these hearings I came across some views of a witness that hits this point effectively. I refer to partial remarks of William F. Giesen, general manager, Maritime Association of the port of New York, in which he states:

> This Nation is becoming more and more aware of the fact that there is a totalitarian force on the face of the earth with designs upon us. It is apparent that we are and will be in a preparedness race for an incalculable length of time. The disproportion of our cost of preparedness and the cost of preparedness fabricated with

slave labor is self-evident. A vast expenditure, or the underwriting of huge investments on enterprises of doubtful merit, should be something celebrated by the totalitarian forces as a step toward final success in their economic warfare. When a project such as this has been vetoed by the weight of opinion for over 30 years, it would appear to be self-evident that American participation is earmarked with at least doubtful necessity. The past record will disclose that the great doubts exist because of economic reasons, and more recently the question of protecting the contemplated seaway during a time of war has been fully considered.

Mr. Speaker, I say the above remarks by Mr. Giesen put the proposition in proper perspective and he is to be congratulated for having it so graphically. He talks about the problem of protecting the seaway so we might explore this aspect of the question a little further on our own. From time to time as this waterway project has been given a facelifting in an attempt to make it more attractive, it has been dolled up in a national defense getup. Now you and I know, Mr. Speaker, that a single bomb could raise havoc with the project, knock it out of operation and scramble up the transportation system the project is supposed to create. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence region is a most vulnerable target for a prospective enemy, and in view of the present state of world affairs, if there is to be an attack on the United States it would come from a direction that would find the proposed waterway right in its path. Relatively speaking, the Great Lakes area, considering prospective attacks over the polar route, is less, not more secure, than our seacoasts.

Valuable testimony on the defense value of the proposed seaway was introduced in the 1951 hearings by Vice Adm. Gerald F. Bogan, retired, when he appeared before the House Committee on Public Works. He testified that during World War II the Germans sank 13 Allied ships in the St. Lawrence and were able to accomplish this with their submarines. It is equally significant that not a single German sub was intercepted while they were accomplishing this grave damage to Allied shipping. A factor of note was that at that time the traffic in the St. Lawrence was relatively small. I ask you to pause for a moment and consider the relatively greater damage that could be done by an enemy if the seaway would carry the heavier tonnage its proponents claim for it. Just remember, too, that a lone bomb or acts of sabotage against any of the 15 locks, necessary to raise and lower ships in the section between Lake Erie and the International Rapids, could bottle up vessels inside for a considerable period of time. By any fair measurement of the matter, the seaway would certainly not appear to aid national security, and might well be a liability.

Inasmuch as the United States Treasury will be used to guarantee the bonds which will be floated to finance this proposal, if it is approved, and the obligation will be one of the American taxpayers, we have every reason to inquire how the American shipping industry, for instance, will be affected by the waterway.

In this respect, I turn to the testimony of Alvin Shapiro, director of research of the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. In appearing in opposition to the project, Mr. Shapiro said:

Our views are confined basically to the navigation aspects of the proposed project on which we feel particularly qualified to testify since our organization is composed of shipowners and operators engaged in deepwater, overseas, and coastal trading.

Our aim is to promote our national maritime policy by assuring, consonant with sound business practices, the existence of an adequate, modern, and efficient American fleet to serve our important waterborne trades, domestic and foreign, and our national defense.

Any project which enlarges the trading opportunities for deepwater ships, and stimulates waterborne commerce in areas in which our vessels can operate would advance this national policy. If our members felt that the St. Lawrence seaway would do this we would appear here strongly in favor.

We do not pose as military experts for the record is too replete with authoritative judgments of the highest possible source to cause us, as shipowners and operators, serious concern about the vulnerability of this long seaway to bombing and/or sabotage. Any such action could effectively bottle up ships west of the obstruction. The prospect of land-locking ships and the products of lake shipbuilding or other national defense plants cannot be casually dismissed.

The principal reasons why we feel that the building of the St. Lawrence seaway will not promote American-flag deep-water shipping are as follows:

1. It is proposed to create a waterway of a depth of 27 feet. Such a draft would not permit utilization of maximum carrying capacity in the operation of an overwhelming majority of our deep-water vessels. The control of the exact trim of a large ocean-going vessel under all conditions is a very delicate one and is affected by frequent changes which occur due to the consumption of fuel, water, stores, or other reasons. Competent navigators do not consider that it would be safe to send a deep-sea vessel over this waterway unless there were at least 3 feet of water under her keel at the lowest point. This automatically reduced the allowable draft to the lowest point to 24 feet.

It should be noted that in order to obtain a clearance permit in Montreal large vessels must have a minimum clearance of 2½ feet; 3 feet for ships over 10,000 deadweight tons.

When fresh water is entered the 3-foot clearance at tidewater entrance would be reduced by about 9 inches, due to the lesser density of the supporting water.

The committee may be interested to know that the designed draft of the Liberty-type cargo vessel is 27 feet 8 inches; the Victory 28 feet 6 inches; the new Mariner type 29 feet 9 inches. These are average drafts and in operation the deepest point of draft may well be below the mean draft.

It is significant to note that of 77 ocean-going vessels currently building or on order in United States shipyards only 1, a coastal tanker, has a designed draft of less than 29 feet. For economic reasons the trend is definitely to larger and deeper draft vessels. Our best available information indicates that of all seagoing ships under construction abroad, only a very minor portion of such tonnage will be usable on the projected seaway.

2. The United States privately owned seagoing merchant marine now totals 15,344,000 deadweight tons. Ships having a draft of 24 feet or less total less than 300,000 deadweight tons. Obviously then not even 2 percent of our privately owned American-flag merchant fleet could operate through this waterway with full utilization of weight-lifting capacity.

Foreign merchant ships are generally smaller than ours for basic economic reasons. Foreign vessels can operate at approximately two-thirds of our costs, primarily because their wages are far below those paid American seamen.

Due to this cost differential America's merchant ships are engaged in a great struggle to remain on the seas. It would be virtually impossible for us to compete other than through larger-size units of greater capacity in order to reduce per-cargo-ton operating costs. The larger the vessel the less important are the labor and other operating costs reflected in the overall expense per ton of capacity.

This situation is perhaps most perfectly demonstrated by the use currently being made of the present seaway with its 14-foot channel. During the 1952 navigation season 60 vessels made a total of 145 voyages from the Great Lakes to foreign ports, primarily in North Europe. These vessels were small, with about 2,500 deadweight-ton capacity, 250 feet long, and naturally of shallow draft. Not one was of United States registry.

To encourage the investment of substantial sums of money in a project which is so one sidedly disadvantageous to American ships in our own commerce, is, in our judgment, not in the public interest.

This testimony which I have just quoted, Mr. Speaker, should serve as a red signal on the play, as it were. We ought to be looking to ways and means to aid United States shipping interests, instead of digging into the Public Treasury to finance a project, which by expert testimony, is calculated to do great harm to our marine industry.

We know, too, from the abundantly convincing testimony that the waterway project will greatly damage the coal industry of our country, as well as the railroad industry, that it will seriously and adversely affect many communities, throw thousands of workers out of employment, open the floodgates to a vast volume of cheaply manufactured goods from Europe, produced by a labor market whose wages cannot begin to compare wth ours.

We have seen that the national defense claims for the measure do not stand the light of examination; that the profession that the waterway can be self-liquidating is a spurious claim, that instead it will be an added burden on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker the indictment against the waterway measure is so devastating and all-sweeping that I am surprised we are put to the necessity of exposing its unworthiness and phoniness. I trust it will be buried where it is.

ONLY ACTION CAN STOP A RECESSION

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently here and elsewhere about the increasing warning signs indicating the possibility of a recession. Some of us have indicated that,

as a matter of fact, the recession has already taken place and positive action is necessary not only to stem this tide but to find methods and means to restore jobs to the millions now walking the streets unemployed.

The reaction of some of the Republican leaders to these warnings has been strange and indicative of the reasons for the growing lack of confidence of the American people in that party's ability to solve the vital problems of our times.

Instead of recognizing the gravity of the situation and trying to find means of solving it, they have started a vicious tirade against all those who have been trying to awaken them from their slumber. Any person calling for action is, in their opinion, a left-wing egghead, a false prophet of gloom and depression. They are even called promoters of a subversive campaign which is Communist inspired.

Were the matter not so serious and important to the welfare of millions of American individuals, it would indeed be ludicrous. All appeals of Members of Congress and of labor leaders for a conference to discuss these problems have been ignored. And yet none has come forth with a constructive program to take us through the period of readjustment without too much suffering because of unemployment. We are told there is no abnormal unemployment; that it is only a temporary and seasonal recurring situation and that everything will be all right again.

This is a fine reassuring thought, except that it reminds many of us of the 1930 days when President Hoover was exuberant in his optimism and assured the country that "prosperity was just around the corner." The Nation waited with raised hopes, but what we got was a crash and a depression which was the greatest calamity in the history of our country.

I am not a pessimist. I hasten to say that I do not expect a repetition of the 1930 depression. The reason is very obvious. In the last 20 years of Democratic administration we have built some powerful props to prevent a repetition of such catastrophes. There is no good reason why, with good planning, we cannot build up a strong and healthy peacetime economy. There is a great need for public works for new schools, hospitals, new highways. But these will not come by just hoping, talking, praying, and waiting. What we need now is action which will justify the fond hopes for continued prosperity.

Let me assure my Republican friends that the warnings of our labor leaders and of our more alert members of Congress are not subversive Communist propaganda. It is just a sober warning to take action now, not later. No amount of talk will cause a depression, but also no amount of talk is sufficient to stop one.

Some of my Republican friends remind me of the farmer who insisted that there was no such animal as a giraffe. After he was actually shown a live giraffe in a zoo he said: "I still don't believe there is such an animal." One of my distinguished Michigan Republican colleagues insists there is no large unemployment in Michigan and that it is only seasonal. I wish he would reassure some of my friends and neighbors in my congressional district, about 30,000 of them in fact, that they are not really unemployed, but that it is only in their imagination. I wish he would read the January report of the Michigan Employment Security Commission and he would probably revise some of the figures he placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The report shows 50,000 more unemployed in January, making a total of 167,000 compared with only 60,000 a year ago. The report further shows that employment will probably continue downward. Let me cite to you the exact words of this official report:

After a temporary halt during the first half of December, Michigan's wage and salary employment continued its downward course. Substantial employment losses occurred at motor vehicle and equipment plants between December 15 and mid-January. In addition, non-factory workstaffs declined sharply as retail outlets completed post-Christmas layoffs. Preliminary estimates place Statewide employment on January 15 at nearly 50,000 below the December figure and approximately 130,000 below the all time high set in June 1953.

Continued manpower reductions among many important auto plants emphasize the increased seriousness of Michigan's labor market situation. A year ago, availability of steel was the key factor governing output schedules in the auto industry. Now, developments hinge almost completely on consumer demand—sales will determine production.

The impact of cutbacks in manufacturing and non-factory activities raised Michigan's unemployment to 167,000 on January 15 (preliminary figure), compared with 138,000 in December and 60,000 a year ago. The available labor surplus substantially exceeds demand at Muskegon, Battle Creek, Port Huron, and Detroit.

Many newly unemployed workers face difficulty in finding employment. Demand for labor in Michigan's manufacturing industries is at the lowest level in 2 years. New hiring in most durable goods lines is near a standstill—employers are filling available vacancies through recall of seniority workers. Reflecting the trend, factory new-hire rates dropped to 21 per thousand employed workers compared with 35 per thousand in August and a high of 67 per thousand in March 1953. On the other hand, layoff rates climbed to 47 per thousand, highest since termination of the steel strike.

Michigan's unemployed workers will find few job opportunities available during the next few months. Employment probably will continue downward, reflecting additional cuts in seasonal non-manufacturing industries. Following the December to January decline, factory employment is expected to stabilize near the 1,175,000 mark, approximately 5,000 below the mid-December level.

Currently, Michigan's employment stands at the level reached in November 1952. More significantly, the outlook a year ago pointed toward record employment gains, but current developments point to a moderate weakening in labor market conditions during the first quarter of 1954. Wage and salary employment probably will continue downward under the impact of seasonal curtailment in trade and construction. The downtrend in factory employment probably will continue at a reduced rate.

Production adjustments in progress since midsummer boosted unemployment to 138,000 in mid-December 1953, compared with 50,000 idle at the end of 1952. Unemployment is at a 3-year high in Muskegon and Battle Creek. Other labor markets, including Detroit, Ionia, Port Huron and Bay City also show a high level of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, if that is not enough, let me remind you that only yesterday the President's own representative in the Treasury Department testified before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report that the present number of unemployed is about two and a half million in the country, and that this is not a temporary situation, but that unemployment is expected to remain and be stabilized at that figure.

I hope my Republican colleagues will not call the Presidential statement to be a subversive act. Let us stop burying our heads in the sand. Let us look the facts squarely in the face and work together on a plan to get us out of the recession as soon as possible.

More aid and relief to big business is not enough. Let us find means of relief for the unemployed. We will then bring prosperity back and earn the appreciation of the two and a half millions of unemployed.

MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, the new concept for defense advanced by the administration places great reliance on nuclear weapons and a buildup of the strategic Air Force. That both should be developed and strengthened is, I believe, a sound policy. However, it is contended that adoption of this concept will enable us to reduce ground forces, on the theory that future wars will be determined largely through the employment of nuclear weapons. In other words, we are to abandon our policy of a balanced force. A reduction in ground forces implies, moreover, that the new weapons possess at least the equivalent capability of the forces to be replaced. Let us analyze for a moment the road upon which we are asked to travel.

Since the end of World War II, Russia has maintained in being large ground forces, including mechanized and armored divisions and an effective tactical Air Force. During the last 3 critical years of the cold war, Russia's 175 infantry divisions and the armies of Communist China have far outnumbered the forces of the free world. Unquestionably, during this period, the Soviets have hesitated to launch global war because of their inability to produce or employ the atomic bomb in sufficient quantities to affect the outcome of a world struggle. However, during this same period, Russia has been producing atomic bombs and building a strategic air force capable of delivering nuclear weapons on targets in the United States. In this struggle for atomic supremacy, it will not be long before we have reached a plateau where both the forces of communism and those of the free world may have neutralized each other in this field. Each will be fearful of employing the

weapon against the other because of the fear of retaliation directed at their homeland. In other words, we may very well find ourselves in the same position that we were in in World War II with reference to gas warfare, where neither side was willing to initiate use of that weapon.

It may be that the Russians have carefully laid the trap into which we are about to walk. All of us recall that when President Eisenhower proposed the pooling of fissionable materials, the first reaction of the Soviets was to go further, and at the same time, outlaw the use of the atomic bomb. It is going to be extremely difficult for us to persuade our friends in the United Nations not to vote against outlawing this weapon until there is a reduction in Soviet ground forces, because in many of these countries there prevails a fear that they and their country might be completely obliterated, should use of nuclear weapons materialize. A few feel that the settlement of no international dispute, however serious, is worth the soul-searing holocaust that atomic weapons would leave in their wake. In all there exists a feeling of uneasiness that man's life on this planet and man's labors toward a fuller existence would be set back centuries, if not eliminated entirely.

Remarks world-wide over the past 8 years indicate that most nations of the world are opposed to the use of mass destructive weapons. Again I repeat, with these thoughts in mind, that there is a very strong possibility that the not-too-distant future will see nuclear weapons outlawed.

Let us suppose that such an event does not come to pass, and the Soviets institute world war III, with the statement that they do not intend to employ the atomic or hydrogen bomb unless we do and that, should we initiate such action, they will immediately deliver the bomb on Detroit, New York, Washington, Seattle, Pittsburgh, and other strategic centers. What kind of a reaction do you think would come from those cities? Do you not think it probable that Congress would be urged to prevent the military from initiating use of atomic warfare in order to prevent Soviet retaliation and destruction of those cities? On the other hand, suppose that Russia should say we do not intend to use the atomic bomb, but if the United States initiates such action, we will immediately retaliate by employing this weapon of mass destruction against Paris, London, Brussels, the Ruhr, Rome, and other centers of free world resistance. What, then, would be the position of our allies with reference to our initiating use of the atomic bomb?

Evidence of the fact that the Soviets foresee this course of events with reference to the use of atomic weapons is borne out by their renewed insistence on scrapping the European Defense Community. The primary effort of NATO and of EDC is to build conventional ground, air, and naval forces to the point where the Soviets, with forces in being, will not be able to overrun Europe. If the free countries are successful in meeting their NATO goals, then Russia will no longer possess a sufficient preponderance of military power and an attack against Western Europe would not be profitable.

If, however, the Russians succeed in crippling EDC or the free world reacts to our announced policy of decreasing ground forces by slowing down their own efforts to build up conventional forces, and nuclear weapons are not employed for the reasons I have discussed, then the Soviets will retain the preponderance of military power. Under such conditions, an attack on Western Europe could successfully be undertaken by the Communists not only to deny us this potential of military manpower and the industrial complex of the area, but to deny us our world markets and cripple us economically.

And so I say to you before we put all our eggs in the strategic Air Force basket, let us remember that utilizing our defense dollars in this manner may be exactly what the Communists want us to do because by relying on nuclear weapons which may never be employed and reducing our ground and naval forces, we will be increasing the Soviets' preponderance of military power. Common sense dictates that we cannot weaken forces and weapons systems upon which we may have to rely in time of national crisis.

Let us go one step further, however, to examine briefly the capabilities of nuclear weapons before relying on them to replace conventional forces and weapons systems. We know from Hiroshima and Nagasaki that they are capable of exacting a terrific toll of human life, when such life is concentrated, exposed, and within the effective radius of the weapon. The Bikini and Desert Rock explosions further indicate the damage which could be expected to material and animal life under various conditions of exposure. These tests, however, are understandably incomplete, in that they have not provided full data as to the effectiveness of such weapons against personnel underground, a division dug in and bunkered, or units deployed in rugged terrain. What such a weapon would accomplish along the central front of Korea, for example, is still a matter of conjecture.

Let us briefly recall the Korean war. This conflict demonstrated that unopposed airpower could not stop enemy infantry. It could harass, slow down, punish, but not stop a determined foe on the ground. The enemy during daylight was usually hidden and unlocated; the movement of troop columns and supplies was generally limited to hours of darkness or poor visibility; infiltration of friendly positions was widely practiced and often impossible to detect. While it is true that our intensive bombings only involved conventional weapons, it is doubtful, under the circumstances enunciated above, whether recourse to atomic weapons would have changed the situation materially.

Whenever an aggressor moves, he moves into territory populated by people whom we aspire to protect. The problem, then, is how to employ our atomic weapons without killing our friends. If Western Europe were overrun and occupied, could we eject enemy forces by devastating atomic blows? If we tried this, we might be liberating the dead. Could we employ atomic weapons in Indochina, where the pressing problem, even on the ground, is to distinguish between friend and foe?

The above indicates that atomic weapons, if they are to be employed, must be limited to, first, the aggressor homeland; second, concentrations of aggressor forces; third, the open sea or air. As a corollary, it follows that ground forces must be available, first, to locate, identify, stop, and eject the aggressor from friendly territory, and, second, to canalize or effect concentrations of enemy forces so as to provide atomic targets within such territory.

This brief analysis has led me to the conclusion that the nuclear weapon does not warrant the reduction of United States ground forces. Without adequate forces on the ground, the loss of free-world countries and our own eventual defeat could conceivably materialize, possession of the nuclear weapon and devastation of the Eurasian land mass notwithstanding.

NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA, CALIF.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the civilian employees and the uniformed personnel at the Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif., have raised the huge sum of $100,000 to contribute to the San Francisco Bay area United Crusade.

This is the largest single contribution made to the fund.

The United Crusade is the unified drive made by a number of contiguous communities to raise the necessary funds to continue the programs for social welfare, relief, and character-building agencies.

The Naval Air Station at Alameda is the most active air station under the naval air arm. It was here that the battle damage and repair of the Korean conflict was handled. It services the Navy's planes in the Pacific.

The Naval Air Station at Alameda has made an enviable reputation for itself. It has always been blessed with conscientious, aggressive, and understanding commanding officers. The present commander, Capt. L. French, United States Navy, continues that tradition. The contribution of this large sum of money collected from the people who operate the Naval Air Station at Alameda is indisputable evidence of the fact that these loyal Federal workers and Navy personnel accept their full responsibility as citizens of the communities in which they live. We of California are proud to have this fine installation in our State.

FOREIGN RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, early last year I introduced a bill to place a quota limitation on residual oil imports. Since then a number of my colleagues have sponsored similar legislation, and many more Members of Congress have otherwise participated in the crusade to protect America's coal, railroad, and related industries from the deluge of residual oil processed in foreign refineries.

Because there has been some confusion regarding the position of certain spokesmen for the forces promoting a program of unrestricted imports, I have obtained a series of documents which I commend to your attention. They are photostatic copies of registrations of a law firm and of individuals serving foreign governments for the purpose of influencing action by Members of the Congress of the United States.

Perhaps the most prominent and most vocal of those persons thus registered is the Honorable Charles P. Taft, of Cincinnati. In the registration statement dated May 14, 1953, Mr. Taft's activities in behalf of a foreign government are listed as:

> Opposition to proposed and pending legislation relating to the imposition of quotas or increased duties upon imports of petroleum and petroleum products.

In a statement filed October 2, 1953, the Cincinnati law office of Headley, Sibbald & Taft is listed as correspondent counsel for the Washington firm of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, with Charles P. Taft named as the person in charge of this connection. The clients served by that firm include the Government of the French Republic, chambers of commerce of Venezuela, and Conseil National du Patronat Français.

Let me say at this time—lest anyone get the impression that there is anything sinister or subversive about being an agent for a foreign government—that such employment or service is quite legitimate and legal. Nevertheless it is important for the American people to be informed of the affiliations of any prominent person who issues public statements on a matter so vital as imported residual oil and its effect on the coal and railroad industries of Pennsylvania and other Middle Atlantic States.

On a recent television program, Mr. Charles P. Taft said that certain newspapers had misstated his position in reference to his foreign connections, and he implied that his work as an alien agent was completed last summer following the refusal of Congress to impose a 5-percent quota on residual-oil imports.

Mr. Speaker, it is not an innovation for a client to dispense with his attorney at the conclusion of his case, and I can see no valid justification for a lawyer's attempt to dismiss his association with a client merely because actual court proceedings are concluded. But since Mr. Taft has resorted to this method of attempting to wash from his hands any evidence that his palm may have been crossed with bolivars, I felt compelled to make a check of the records. I do not believe that Mr. Taft would object to having these records given public notice even if he considers that his has been only a ricochet romance with a wealthy South American client.

Mr. Taft himself admitted the affiliation in a letter appearing in the Cincinnati Enquirer on July 25, 1953. In denying a charge that he was an oil lobbyist, Mr. Taft stated:

> I represent the Venezuelan Chambers of Commerce, through one of the major law firms in Washington. The oil companies and oil jobbers are represented by other counsel.

At that time Mr. Taft was so enthusiastic about his client that he permitted himself entirely too much latitude with the facts of the oil case, ending his plea to the jury of readers with a statement far outside the perimeter of honest or accepted reporting. The letter stated in its concluding paragraph:

> The principal supporter of the oil import quota is the National Coal Association, although their real complaint is against domestic producers and refiners.

My fellow colleagues, you have read and heard statements on this subject by executives of the National Coal Association, by representatives of the United Mine Workers of America, by railroads, railroad brotherhoods, and civic clubs and other groups representing coal-producing areas. You did not hear one word of complaint against domestic producers and refiners; in fact, independent oil men in this country are among the supporters of legislation to restrict imports.

Coal producers and allied groups are complaining because foreign residual oil is usurping markets traditionally served by domestic industries. When you realize that 132 million barrels of residual fuel oil—the equivalent of 32 million tons of bituminous coal in energy value—were shipped into this country last year, you understand the enormity of the problem. In this connection I should like to point out that the 1953 figure is 73 percent greater than total residual oil imports in 1949. Early in 1950 this situation was investigated by a Senate subcommittee, one of whose members offered this appraisal of the situation:

> The importation of residual oil is a direct damage to the coal industry. It is produced abroad as a byproduct. Apparently the demand in Europe and elsewhere throughout the world for this byproduct is not sufficient to use up all of the residual oil resulting from foreign processing. Being a byproduct, it is very difficult to determine the cost, and those who produce it are tempted to sell it for any price obtainable in order to get rid of it. This imposes a great handicap on the coal industry and is responsible for the closing of many mines.

Mr. Speaker, that statement was issued by the late eminent Senator from Ohio, the Honorable Robert A. Taft, whose only client was the United States of America.

SHARP'S RIDGE MEMORIAL PARK ASSOCIATION, KNOXVILLE, TENN.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, following the years of World War II, it was popular throughout the land for States, cities, and communities to erect monuments to commemorate the veterans who fought in the war, and to those soldiers who lost their lives for our cause. It was fitting that these men who fought and died for us should be remembered eternally.

In Knoxville, Tenn., a group of businessmen, in my opinion, had the superlative idea for such a monument. They conceived the thought of a large park which all could enjoy, year after year, which would be an everlasting monument to Knoxville's veterans and to the city's war dead.

This group formed a corporation which was chartered and the men worked tirelessly and endlessly until now atop Sharp's Ridge, overlooking the city, lies a 200-acre park, equipped and improved with park facilities for families to visit and take a respite from their ordinary workdays.

Last July 4 the charter was surrendered by the signers—Robert P. Mehaffey, Beecher Bartlett, Dr Frank Sartz, Lester T. Watts, Bennett Ward, C. M. Walker, Lee McClain, H. A. Tiller, J. E. Akridge, and John L. Wilson—and Sharp's Ridge Memorial Park was dedicated in the memory of veterans of all wars and turned over to the city of Knoxville.

Following is the official record of this transaction:

> Some 15 years ago, at a meeting of the North Knoxville Business Men's Club, an idea was born embracing hope and faith that through the united efforts of the members a suitable place could be located and procured for a playground park. Contacts were made and reports filed for study. Finally it was decided that the south side of Sharp's Ridge, from Sharp's Gap to Arlington, was ample and obtainable. Committeemen assiduously toiled throughout the years and 1945 saw the transition of a dream into a reality. As an evidence of accomplished fact, we offer the following resolution:
>
> Whereas in early August of 1945 a group of 10 men applied to the State of Tennessee for a charter to conduct a nonprofit organization with authority to solicit contributions for the purpose of procuring land on Sharp's Ridge, to improve same with roadways, parking areas, picnic grounds, shelters, comfort stations, etc., to landscape the terrain, and generally transform the area into a park for the benefit of white citizens of Knoxville, Knox County, Tenn., and visitors from near and far; and
>
> Whereas the charter was granted on August 6, 1945, with connoted powers to perfect our organization, fully staffed to bring the outlined plans to fruition; and
>
> Whereas after untold vicissitudes we enlisted the aid of reputable officeholders of Knox County and the city of Knoxville, through whose influential collaboration we succeeded in corralling more than 200 acres of land, conditioning same within the limits

imposed by the amount of moneys raised; and since we deem it now ready for dedication: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That on behalf of the Sharp's Ridge Memorial Park Association, under authority vested in me by the board of directors, I hereby present to the city of Knoxville, to have and to hold in trust forever; but for the purposes herein expressed and to maintain the grounds and appurtenances thereto in manner befitting the demands of the days; this boundary known as Sharp's Ridge Memorial Park, dedicated under God to the memory of veterans of all wars.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT P. MEHAFFEY,
Chairman of the Board.

THE LATE ABRAHAM ROSENTHAL

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 413, providing for the payment of 6 months' salary to Joseph Rosenthal and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Joseph Rosenthal, son of Abraham Rosenthal, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Abraham Rosenthal.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIX MONTHS' SALARY TO BERTHA SULLIVAN

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 420 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives to Mrs. Bertha Sullivan, daughter of Bertha Kehoe, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death, and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Bertha Kehoe.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

THE LATE HON. JOHN A. PETERS

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess, the State of Maine suffered a profound sorrow and the Nation a distinct loss in the death of the Honorable John A. Peters, judge of the United States District Court for the District of Maine from 1922 until he resigned in 1947.

John Andrew Peters was born in Ellsworth, Maine, on August 13, 1864, and died at his home in that city on August 22, 1953. During his long and distinguished career as a lawyer, Congressman, and judge, he established an enviable reputation for integrity, fairness, legal acumen and sound judgment, which extended far beyond the boundaries of his native State.

Judge Peters matriculated at Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine, in 1881, and received the degree of bachelor of arts upon his graduation in 1885, and the degree of master of arts in 1888. At the time of his death he was a trustee emeritus of the college. His close identification with and invaluable services to the college were given tangible recognition in 1923, when he was given the honorary degree of doctor of laws. His pursuit of law was taken for granted. He came from a family of eminent lawyers. His uncle, John Andrew Peters, and his cousin, Andrew Peters Wiswell, both Bowdoin alumni, were each chief justice of the Supreme Judicial Court of Maine.

Judge Peters was admitted to the bar of Maine in 1887 and practiced his profession for 5 years in Bar Harbor and thereafter in Ellsworth, until his appointment to the Federal bench in 1922. From 1896 to 1908 he was judge of the Hancock Municipal Court. He rapidly earned a well-deserved reputation for legal ability, learning, sound judgment and honest dealing with his clients and fellow lawyers. His interest in politics led him to take time from a flourishing and extensive practice to serve in the Maine Legislature as a representative from 1909 to 1913 and as speaker of the house in 1913. He was elected a Representative to Congress from Maine's Third District in 1913, and was reelected for four successive terms. In 1922 he resigned to accept appointment as judge of the United States District Court for the District of Maine, which position he filled most capably until his resignation in 1947.

Judge Peters was well grounded in the law. During his 25 years upon the bench he discharged, with untiring patience, industry, and courage, and most acceptably to practitioners in his court and to the public, the varied and important duties and obligations which devolved upon him. Above all, he brought to bear upon questions, many of them complicated and abstruse, which required his decision, a sound common sense, often so conspicuously lacking in many an otherwise able jurist. In court he presided with courtesy and firmness. It took but a short time for experienced counsel from large metropolitan centers making an initial appearance before Judge Peters to recognize his complete grasp of the proceedings, his ability to conduct a trial expeditiously but in orderly fashion, and his great capacity for applying the law to the facts. It was by no means unusual for such counsel to comment to local associate counsel upon Judge Peters' ability and compare him most favorably with judges before whom they were accustomed to practice in their own jurisdictions. He was several times called to officiate in United States district courts in other districts than his own. One of Judge Peters' pleasanter official functions was the opportunity to admit and welcome new citizens to our country. His remarks on these occasions, kindly, human and genuinely sincere, impressed on his hearers their paramount duty of loyalty to the United States of America. He invited them to enjoy with their fellow citizens, as a solemn trust, the inestimable privileges of American citizenship.

By the death of John Andrew Peters the Nation lost one of its more able jurists, the bar a profound lawyer, the State an honored citizen.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to speak to the House of the death during the summer recess of my very esteemed friend, the Honorable John Andrew Peters, who in 1913 was elected a Member of this House to represent the Third Maine District, and who served here with distinction until 1922 when he resigned to accept appointment as United States district judge for the district of Maine, a post in which he succeeded my own father, Clarence Hale.

Judge Peters was born in the shire town of Ellsworth, Maine, on August 13, 1864, and he died there 9 days after his 89th birthday on August 22, 1953. He was the last survivor of a remarkable group of lawyers born in Ellsworth who wrote their names large in the legal and judicial life of the State. Judge Peters was the nephew of John Andrew Peters, of Ellsworth, chief justice of Maine from 1883 to 1900. He was the cousin of Andrew Peters Wiswell, of Ellsworth, chief justice of Maine from 1900 to 1906. Another cousin of his, Andrew Peters, was mayor of Boston in the twenties.

John Peters was graduated from Bowdoin College in the class of 1885. He was for many years a trustee of the college. He resigned his trusteeship when his health became impaired in his later years but he was trustee emeritus at the time of his death. In 1923, his devotion to the college and his professional eminence were recognized by an award of the degree of doctor of laws honoris causa.

Judge Peters was admitted to the bar in 1887 and practiced law actively and successfully at first for 5 years in Bar Harbor and subsequently in Ellsworth. From 1909 to 1913 he served in the house of representatives of our State legislature which he presided over as speaker in the session of 1913.

My personal contacts with Judge Peters were most intimate and frequent during the 20 years from the time he became district judge in 1922 until I was elected to this body in 1942. During this period I saw him practically every week. Most of my professional time was spent in connection with litigation pending in his court. I can say without hesitation that he was the most satisfactory trial

judge that I ever had anything to do with. Humanly speaking, he was just about perfect. He had the utmost commonsense, abundant courage, and more learning in the law than one would imagine possible for a man who had spent so much of his life in public affairs. He had a kind of down-East Yankee shrewdness that easily pierced through a flimsy or fallacious argument. His sense of relevance was unfailing. His opinions were all written in the English language and could be understood by anyone who spoke it. He never resorted to the legalese jargon that disfigures so many of our law reports. On the rare occasions when the circuit court of appeals reversed him, Judge Peters' opinion generally seemed to me sounder than that of the appellate court.

Throughout the period that he served as judge, the district court of Maine commanded the complete confidence and respect not only of the Maine bar but of lawyers who came from all over the United States. Particularly in bankruptcy matters Judge Peters saw that debtors and creditors were treated with scrupulous fairness and that no attorney got anything more than his due in fees. I remember his saying to a particularly argumentative New York lawyer in a bankruptcy case, "You will understand that the fees in this court are the lowest in the country." He meant it.

For 6 years before his death Judge Peters was in feeble health and I saw him little. But he stayed on the bench until he was 83, and his faculties were unimpaired. His resignation from the bench was mourned by all the members of the bar.

To his gracious widow, I offer my sympathy. As a lawyer, I mourn a fine lawyer and judge. As a Member of this House I acclaim one of the worthiest of the proud company of those who have sat in this Chamber.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1954.*

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes upon Wednesday and Thursday of this week, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PAYMENT OF 10- AND 20-PERCENT DISABILITY COMPENSATION TO VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) to provide that compensation of veterans for service-connected disability, rated 20 percent or less disabling, shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PENSIONS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS WHO SERVED WITH THE UNITED STATES MILITARY OR NAVAL FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5380) to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, each time this bill has come before the House this year, there has been objection to it being passed under unanimous-consent agreement. It, therefore, seems wise to both the Veterans' Committee chairman and myself that we should seek to have the bill withdrawn from the Consent Calendar and thus pave the way for seeking a rule under which the bill can be debated.

This, in my opinion, is a good bill. The Veterans' Committee in four different Congresses has reported it favorably. In the 78th Congress both the House and Senate passed a bill very similar to this one. The President vetoed it. Two years later the House again passed a bill similar in intent to the present one. The Senate took no action. In the 80th Congress and the present Congress, the bill has been reported favorably by the House Veterans' Committee.

We hope Congress will take favorable action this year on this bill to correct a long-standing injustice to a small group of veterans who served their country well in the face of heavy fighting and great danger.

This bill, H. R. 5380, would provide long-delayed justice to a small group of about 500 patriotic and valiant Armed Forces veterans who served our country nobly about half a century ago in stiff fighting in the Moro Province and on the islands of Samar and Leyte, in the Philippine Islands.

Legally and technically the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection ended on July 4, 1902, with a Presidential proclamation of peace. Actually, however, the fighting and hostilities did not end with that date, but continued for a period of several years thereafter. During these years there was stiff fighting in the Moro Province and in the Islands of Samar and Leyte. In this fighting, there were 1,548 casualties and deaths from diseases in the Armed Forces involved. Congressional Medals of Honor were awarded 13 of those engaged in this fighting.

These veterans of the hostilities in the Moro Province and the Islands of Samar and Leyte, despite the severity of the fighting, have never been recognized as wartime fighters and have been denied veterans' pensions for these many years, despite the fact that veterans of other hostilities have been granted the benefit of veterans' pensions.

Half a century has elapsed since these hostilities and only about 500 veterans of this fighting survive. The average age of these veterans is now 78. They, together with about 300 surviving wives and dependent children of such veterans, should, as a matter of simple justice and fairness, it seems to me, be entitled to the same pensions as are paid veterans of the Spanish-American War.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars and the United Spanish-American War veteran organizations take this same position and over a number of years have advocated the paying of pensions to this limited number of Moro Province and Leyte and Samar fighters.

The advanced age of these veterans makes it certain that any belated pensions now granted this group would not be for long, since the average age of these veterans is 78 years.

This bill is not a new proposal. In the 78th Congress, somewhat similar bills were reported favorably by the veterans' committees of both the House and the Senate and passed, under unanimous consent, by both Houses. President Roosevelt vetoed that bill on the ground that it would have the effect of changing the closing date of a war and might establish a precedent which might become costly.

In the 79th Congress, 2 years later, the House Veterans' Committee unanimously approved and the House again unanimously passed a similar bill but the Senate did not act upon it.

In the Republican 80th Congress the veterans' committee again approved this bill but no action was taken on it by the House.

The present bill is the fourth bill of this kind approved by the House Veterans' Committee.

Since the time of the previous bills, the Korean police action has occurred and a pension system has been approved by Congress for Korean veterans, although the Korean action is not an officially declared war.

The Moro Province and Samar and Leyte Island hostilities were similar to what has been happening in Korea and the surviving veterans of these hostilities of 50 years ago, just as those in Korea, should be granted, even at this late date, pensions in keeping with the American tradition of granting special considerations to those who served the Nation honorably and courageously in the face of an armed enemy.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN, N. DAK.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3986) to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

OPERATION OF HEALTH FACILITIES FOR INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 303) to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a rule has been requested for this bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

TAX REFUNDS ON CIGARETTES LOST IN THE FLOODS OF 1951

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4319) to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMEND THE RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4551) to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 removing authorization of projects by the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not do so, but I did want to ask the chairman of the committee this one question so that it would be a matter of record. It is my understanding that this bill does not intend to affect any projects that were authorized by an act of Congress prior to January 20, 1953; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I have an amendment to offer if the bill is considered to clarify that situation so that there may not be any doubt about the bill. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (act of August 4, 1939; ch. 418; 53 Stat. 1187; 43 U. S. C. 485), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"No expenditures for the construction of any new project, new division of a project, or new supplemental works on a project shall be made, nor shall estimates be submitted therefor, by the Secretary until after he has made an investigation thereof and has submitted to the President and to the Congress his report and findings on—

"(1) the engineering feasibility of the proposed construction;

"(2) the estimated cost of the proposed construction;

"(3) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to irrigation and probably be repaid by the water users;

"(4) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to power and probably be returned to the United States in net power revenues;

"(5) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to municipal water supply or other miscellaneous purposes and probably be returned to the United States. Any new project, new division, or new supplemental works may be undertaken by the Secretary only after provision therefor has been made by act of Congress enacted after the Secretary has submitted to the President and the Congress the report and findings involved."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out lines 15 to 19, inclusive, and insert "Construction of any new project, new division, or new supplemental works not authorized by a Secretarial finding of feasibility or by act of Congress on or before January 20, 1953, may be undertaken by the Secretary only after provision therefor has been made by act of Congress enacted following submission by the Secretary to the President and the Congress of the report and findings involved: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to projects which will not exceed the sum of $5,000,000 in cost."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: On page 1, line 8, immediately after the word "project", insert a comma and the following language: "which project, division of a project, or supplemental works on a project have not been authorized by a Secretarial finding of feasibility or by act of Congress on or before January 20, 1953."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considered the amendment this morning and feels it does not add anything to the bill. We have no objection and we accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 15, 1923

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1081) to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6353) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national-defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CANAL ZONE CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4881) to amend the Canal Zone Code in reference to the survival of things in action.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 3 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), is amended by adding, in article 2 of chapter 18 thereof, two new sections numbered 373 and 374, respectively, and reading as follows:

"SEC. 373. Survival of thing in action after death or tort feasor or other person liable

"No thing in action sounding in tort, arising after the date of enactment of this section, shall be lost because of the death of the tort feasor or other person liable. On any such thing in action an action may be brought or continued against the personal representative of the deceased person, but punitive or exemplary damages shall not be awarded nor penalties adjudged in any such action. This section shall extend to a thing in action for wrongfully causing death arising under section 131 of title 4, and an action under said section 131 may be brought or continued against the personal representative of the tort feasor or other person liable. Where a thing in action arises simultaneously with or after the death of the tort feasor or other person who would have been liable if his death had not occurred simultaneously with the act, omission, circumstance, or event giving rise to such thing in action, or had not intervened between

the wrongful act, omission, circumstances, or event and the coming into being of the thing in action, an action to enforce such thing in action may be maintained against the personal representative of such tort feasor or other person. Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the transfer of any thing in action arising out of any tort against the person.

"SEC. 374. Survival of thing in action after death of person injured

"No thing in action sounding in tort, arising after the date of enactment of this section, shall be lost because of the death of the person in whose favor the thing in action arose. On any such thing in action an action may be brought or continued by the personal representative of the deceased person. The damages recovered in any action under this section shall form a part of the estate of the deceased. No thing in action for damages caused by any injury or wrong to a third person shall be lost because of the death of such third person. If an action be brought for physical injuries to a person, and a separate action be brought for his wrongful death arising out of the same wrongful act, omission, circumstance, or event, such actions shall be consolidated for trial on the motion of any interested party: *Provided, however,* That the award of damages appertaining to physical injuries shall not include prospective profits or earnings after the date of death of the person injured. Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the transfer of any thing in action arising out of any tort against the person."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS FOR RETURN OF PROPERTY UNDER TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 373) to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. Supp., sec. 33), is amended by striking out the last portion of the first sentence of such section beginning with the words "by April 30, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "not later than one year from the enactment of this amendment, or two years from the vesting of the property or interest in respect of which the claim is made, whichever is later."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce sets forth in plain terms the reasons that give rise to the need of this legislation.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 373) to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act, considered the same and reported it favorably without amendment and recommended that the bill be passed.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property acquired by the United States after December 18, 1941, until 1 year after the date of enactment of this legislation.

The need for the present legislation revolves around the adequacy of the notice given to claimants of their rights and the adequacy of time within which such claimants could file their claims. Most of the persons whose property has been vested have, for a large part, been located abroad. Thus, while notice was published in the Federal Register, this notice was frequently never communicated to persons with residence abroad. Further, difficulties were sometimes encountered when, by the nature of the case, notice could not specify the person whose property was taken, or did not correctly specify such person.

An example of the difficulties encountered may aid in the explanation of the need for this legislation. One case involved an estate vesting. Early in the war this estate in California was vested. Besides the interests of named Italian beneficiaries, the vesting order vested the interests of unknown heirs of a named Italian national. After April 30, 1949, a probate court issued a determination of heirship, which found the unknown heirs whose interests were vested in 1943 to include an American citizen and resident of the United States. The time within which this heir could file claim under the act, however, had expired before he was identified as the person whose interest was vested. Consequently, that individual has had no opportunity to secure the return of his property.

While the circumstances of the case just cited are peculiar to that case alone, others find themselves in the same predicament, with a similar lack of culpability on their part.

From the evidence before the committee, it is evident that the notice of the right to file for the return of property did not come to the attention of a substantial number of interested persons. In many cases, this was by virtue of the serious dislocations in the world as an aftermath of war. In others, it was because governments were involved in the reconstruction of their devastated countries and were only able to give incidental attention to problems such as these. In still other cases, as illustrated above, the rights of some claimants were not sufficiently ascertainable prior to the deadline in order to enable them to pursue the remedy available to them. It is readily apparent, therefore, that it is both necessary and desirable to permit an extension of time for the filing of claims under the Trading With the Enemy Act so that persons such as those described earlier in the report may seek the return of their property. However, it is also desirable to establish a fixed time after which no further claims for the return of property will be received, in order to proceed as rapidly as possible with the expeditious liquidation of the business of the Office of Alien Property. Consequently, the bill only provides for an extension of the time for filing claims under this act to 1 year after the date of enactment of the act. This relatively short period of time should provide ample opportunity to those who have heretofore been unable to file because of the deadline and, at the same time, permit the orderly disposition of the business of the Office of Alien Property, with a view toward ultimate dissolution of that Office. For these reasons, it is recommended that the bill be favorably considered. The War Claims Commission, the Department of State, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Department of Justice favor the passage of the bill.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 603. (a) Section 4 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) Any officer or employee in the legislative branch of the Government within the classes of officers and employees made eligible for the benefits of this act by the act of July 13, 1937, or the act of June 21, 1947, retiring under this act on or after the date of enactment of this subsection and after having reached the age of 62 years and after having rendered at least 6 years of service as such an officer or employee shall, if he so elects at the time of retirement, be paid, in lieu of an annuity computed under subsection (a), a life annuity equal to the sum of the following:

"'(A) 2½ percent of the average salary, pay, or compensation received by him during the years of allowable service multiplied by the years of service as an employee described in this subsection;

"'(B) 1½ percent of such average salary, pay, or compensation multiplied by the years of service other than as an employee described in this subsection.

"'In no case shall an annuity computed under this subsection exceed an amount equal to 76 percent of the highest average annual salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during 5 consecutive years of allowable service. No officer or employee shall be entitled to the benefits of this subsection unless there shall have been deducted and withheld from his basic salary, pay, or compensation for the last 5 years of his service, or there shall have been deposited under section 9 with respect to such last 5 years of service, the amounts specified in section 9.'

"(b) The last paragraph of section 3 (a) of such act is amended by striking out 'January 30, 1950' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 30, 1954'."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall not apply to employees who were not employed in the legislative branch on the date of the passage of this act: *Provided,* That all payments by or to Members of Congress shall be computed separately.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 603. (a) Section 4 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as

amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'"(g) Any officer or employee in the legislative branch of the Government within the classes of officers and employees made eligible for the benefits of this act by the act of July 13, 1937, or the act of June 21, 1947, retiring under this act on or after the date of enactment of this subsection and after having rendered at least 6 years of service as such an officer or employee shall, if he so elects at the time of retirement, be paid, in lieu of an annuity computed under subsection (a), a life annuity equal to the sum of the following:

"'"(A) 2½ percent of the average salary, pay, or compensation received by him during any 5 consecutive years of allowable service at his option multiplied by the sum of his years of service as an employee described in this subsection and the years of his allowable military or naval service; and

"'"(B) 1½ percent of such average salary, pay, or compensation multiplied by the years of his allowable service other than service referred to in clause (A).

In no case shall an annuity computed under this subsection exceed an amount equal to 75 percent of the highest average annual salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during any 5 consecutive years of allowable service. No officer or employee shall be entitled to the benefits of this subsection unless there shall have been deducted and withheld from his salary, pay, or compensation for the last 5 years of his service, or there shall have been deposited under section 9 with respect to such last 5 years of service, the amounts specified in section 9."

"'(b) Section 3 (a) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'"Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any officer or employee in the legislative branch of the Government within the classes of officers or employees which were made eligible for the benefits of this act by the act of July 13, 1937, or the act of June 21, 1947, serving in such position on the date of enactment of this paragraph, may give notice of his desire to come within the purview of this act at any time prior to the expiration of 6 months after such date of enactment."

"'(c) Section 3A of such act is amended as follows:

"'(1) Paragraph (3) is amended to read as follows:

"'"(3) No person shall be entitled to receive an annuity as provided in this section until he shall have become separated from the service after having had at least 6 years of service as a Member of Congress and have attained the age of 62 years or after having had at least 10 years of service as a Member of Congress and have attained the age of 60 years, except that (A) any such Member who shall have had at least 5 years of service as a Member of Congress, may, subject to the provisions of section 6 and of paragraph (4) of this section, be retired for disability, irrespective of age, and be paid an annuity computed in accordance with paragraph (5) of this section, and (B) any such Member who shall have become separated from the service after having had at least 10 years of service as a Member of Congress and have attained the age of 55 years may receive an annuity computed as provided in paragraph (5) of this section reduced by one-fourth of 1 percent for each full month he is under the age of 60 years."

"'(2) Paragraph (5) is amended to read as follows:

"'"(5) Subject to the provisions of section 9 and of subsections (c) and (d) of section 4, the annuity of a Member of Congress shall be an amount equal to 2½ percent of the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by him during any 5 consecutive years of allowable service as a Member of Congress at his option multiplied by the sum of his years of service as a Member of Congress and his years of active service performed as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States prior to his separation from service as a Member of Congress, but no such annuity shall exceed an amount equal to three-fourths of the basic salary, pay, or compensation that he is receiving at the time of such separation from service."

"'(3) Paragraph (10) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and the term 'basic salary, pay, or compensation' includes amounts received as expense allowance under section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended; and the term 'active service performed as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States' means (A) active service performed as a member of such forces, during any war or national emergency proclaimed by the President or declared by the Congress, by a Member of Congress who left or leaves his office for the purpose of performing such service, and (B) any other periods of active service, not to exceed an aggregate of 5 years, performed as a member of such forces, but shall not include any such service for which credit is allowed for the purposes of retirement or retired pay under any other provision of law, including title II of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948.'

"'(d) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (a) of the act of February 28, 1948—

"'(A) the last proviso in section 9 of the Civil Service Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall apply to Members of Congress; and

"'(B) subsections (c) and (d) of section 12 of such act shall apply in the case of Members of Congress dying after the date of enactment of this section. Such subsections (c) and (d) shall apply to the widower of any such Member of Congress to the same extent and in the same manner as to the widow of any such Member of Congress, if such widower shall have been married to such Member for at least 2 years immediately preceding her death or is the father of issue by such marriage.

"'(2) Section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out "section 4 (a) hereof" in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4 (a) or 3A hereof, as the case may be"; and by striking out "section 1, 2, or 6" in paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1, 2, 3A, or 6."

"'(3) Section 4 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended by the act of August 4, 1939, which is referred to in paragraph (5) of section 3A of such act, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "No person shall be eligible to receive an annuity under this subsection and an annuity under subsection (c) of section 12, based upon the service of the same officer or employee, covering the same period of time."'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee holding hearings on this measure and reporting it to full committee where further discussion was held and finally unanimously reported out, I desire to make this statement of explanation.

This legislation establishes a revised formula for the retirement of legislative employees, and, as well, corrects certain features of congressional retirement which have been criticized as inadequate and which appear as oversights in existing law.

Legislative employees were placed under the regular Civil Service Retirement Act in 1937. Prior to that time they had not received any retirement. The period between then and now has demonstrated that while the regular civil-service retirement meets in general the requirement of employees who are in a career service and who have an opportunity to work enough years to establish an adequate retirement base, it does not meet the needs of the somewhat transitory employment of those in the legislative branch. Nothing demonstrates this more clearly than the fact that less than 50 percent of the legislative employees have seen fit to participate in the retirement system. Temporary employees in the executive branch, of course, who do not expect to work a long period of time, are covered by social security. Legislative employees are not covered by social security.

To meet this need, the committee amendment would do the following for legislative employees:

First. The basis for computing their annuities would be 2½ percent of any 5 consecutive years' average salary, multiplied by the years of service in the legislative branch—military service would be counted under the language of the amendment. The 5-consecutive-year formula is the basis for computing of annuities for employees under present law.

Second. One and one-half percent would be the basis for computation for other allowable Federal service.

Third. The present 80 percent top limit for annuities would be reduced to 75 percent of any 5 consecutive years' average.

Fourth. The present service requirement for legislative employees before they are eligible to receive an annuity would be raised from 5 to 6 years.

Fifth. A requirement that deductions for the retirement fund be made for the last 5 years of service would be added.

Sixth. Legislative employees who are not now members of the retirement plan would be permitted to participate if applications are submitted within 6 months after enactment.

Seventh. A requirement would be added that an employee's last Federal employment prior to retirement must have been as an employee of the Senate or House to be eligible for an annuity under this bill.

You will note that for most benefits that are provided under the committee amendment, there are counterweighing obligations or liabilities.

With respect to Members of Congress, this bill corrects inequities and oversights in the present congressional retirement. In the first place, it provides that survivors of Members of Congress, who die while serving in office, may receive an annuity. Under present law, they do not receive such annuities, while Members who have already retired may provide for annuities for their wives. This was brought to light most recently by the death of some Members of long years of service when it was discovered

that their wives could not receive any annuities since they died while they were still Members of Congress. I am sure that the equity of this change in the provision in the law is clear.

Although the committee amendment makes certain changes in retirement benefits for Members of Congress, it does not make them any more liberal than the comparable present retirement provisions for other Federal employees. In many respects, the committee amendments are more restrictive.

In most cases where the committee amendment adds additional benefits, it adds compensating requirements or obligations.

In most other retirement systems, participants are given credit for time spent in the military service. Currently Congressman may receive credit for time spent in the military service only if it was between their terms as a Member of Congress. The committee amendment would give credit for up to 5 years of past military service provided that the military service is not used as a basis for other Federal retirement system.

Under the committee amendment, Members would be required to pay on their total salary if they participate in the retirement sytem, that is, $15,000. Annuities would be computed on the same salary basis.

Members' annuities would be based on the average annual salary for any 5 consecutive years. This is the same manner of computation for other Federal employees. Presently, Members' annuities are based on the average annual salary for the total length of service. There are some few Members still serving who were Members of Congress when the salary was $7,500 a year.

Under the committee amendment, Members would be authorized to retire at age 55 with a minimum of 10 years of service. The annuity would be reduced by one-fourth of 1 percent for each full month under age 60. Full benefits at age of 60 after 10 years of service would be permitted for Members of Congress who retired.

Finally and again, I believe it can be said, in general, that these changes in annuities for Members of Congress are no greater than present benefits of others participating in the Federal Civil Service Retirement System. In most instances, they are more restrictive.

It is not expected that any additional appropriation will be made as a result of the enactment of this legislation. The total effect on the retirement fund will be negligible because of the relatively few persons involved. As a matter of fact, it is well known that payments out of the retirement fund for congressional retirement have been far less than the amount of money that has been paid into the fund by the Members.

ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY REPORTS BY POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7398) to repeal the requirement of section 3921 of the Revised Statutes that postmasters report to the Postmaster General failure to cancel postage stamps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the part of section 3921 of the Revised Statutes which is codified in section 366 of title 39, United States Code, is hereby amended by striking out the words "and report the delinquent postmaster to the Postmaster General."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "out" insert "the comma following the word 'them' and"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE DEFINITION OF "AIRMAN" IN THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7395) to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (6) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 be amended to read as follows:

"(6) 'Airman' means any individual who engages, as the person in command or as pilot, mechanic, or member of the crew, in the navigation of aircraft while under way; and (except to the extent the Civil Aeronautics Board may otherwise provide with respect to individuals employed outside the United States or employed by a certificated repair station, or by a manufacturer of aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, or appliances) any individual who is directly in charge of the inspection, maintenance, overhauling, or repair of aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, or appliances; and any individual who serves in the capacity of aircraft dispatcher or airtraffic control-tower operator."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce sets forth the reasons that make appropriate the passage of this bill.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7395) to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, considered the same and reported it favorably without amendment and recommended that the bill be passed.

This is permissive legislation in that it authorizes the Civil Aeronautics Board to exempt certain aircraft manufacturers and certain aircraft repair stations from the requirement as defined by the term "airman" in section 1 (6) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. The reason for the granting of this authority to the Civil Aeronautics Board is that under present law aircraft manufacturers must employ certificated mechanics to repair their own products although there is no such requirement with respect to the original production of the same article. Obviously, a manufacturer who has demonstrated his ability to maintain the quality of his production under a Civil Aeronautics Administration production certificate is qualified to repair, restore, or rebuild the same product at his own factory.

Repair stations performing a great variety of special services to aircraft are also certificated by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. The qualifications of the employees are checked upon the initial application for the certificate, and the maintenance of a qualified staff, and of high standards in work done, is requisite to its retention. Since employee qualifications are cumulatively passed upon in connection with this Government certification and inspection program, it is unnecessary duplication to require in addition a check upon, and a certification of, the qualifications of the individual supervisory employees.

In a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, to the committee, he stated:

It is our opinion, therefore, that aviation safety does not require the certification either of mechanics who work for a manufacturer on aircraft and aircraft components which he produces, or of employees of a certificated repair station.

He closed his comments with a recommendation as follows:

The Department of Commerce therefore recommends early and favorable consideration of this proposed legislation by the Congress.

SALE OF POSTAGE-DUE STAMPS FOR PHILATELIC PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7399) to authorize the sale of postage-due stamps for philatelic purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 26 of the act of March 3, 1879, as amended (sec. 275 of title 39, U. S. C.), is hereby further amended by the addition of a sentence to read as follows:

"The Postmaster General may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, authorize the sale of deficiency or postage-due stamps for philatelic purposes through such agency of the Post Office Department as he may designate."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the reading of the Consent Calendar.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors may meet tomorrow afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

HARRY C. BARNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 758) for the relief of Harry C. Barney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Harry C. Barney be, and he is hereby, relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $1,295, representing the aggregate amount that was paid to Mrs. Donald L. Tavener, his sister, as a class E allotment, for the period from October 1, 1943, to February 28, 1945, inclusive, through an error by the Department of the Army.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 4, change the figures "$1,295" to "$1,275." Line 8, strike out "Department of the Army" and substitute in lieu thereof "War Department."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SYLVIA MAE SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1647) for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Mae Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Sylvia Mae Smith, Princeton, W. Va., the sum of $5,000, plus interest on such sum computed at the rate of 6 percent per annum from August 14, 1936, to the date of payment hereunder. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Sylvia Mae Smith against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and permanent disfigurement suffered as a result of an accident which occurred near Pettus, W. Va., on August 14, 1936, when the automobile in which the said Mrs. Sylvia Mae Smith (then Mrs. Sylvia Mae Brown) was riding was struck by a United States vehicle being used by the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000, plus interest on such sum computed at the rate of 6 percent per annum from August 14, 1936, to the date of payment hereunder" and insert "$1,071."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENEROSA BONET

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2616) for the relief of Generosa Bonet.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,400 to Generosa Bonet, who sustained damages to her automobile on August 12, 1941, when struck in Aguadilla, P. R., by a United States Army truck. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the figures and insert "1,100."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUILLERMO MORALES CHACON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2617) for the relief of Guillermo Morales Chacon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to Guillermo Morales Chacon, who was injuried on July 19, 1941, when struck in Aguadilla, P. R., by a United States Army truck. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the figures and insert "$6,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES J. ABARNO AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4340) for the relief of Charles J. Abarno and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following claimants the sum designated in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States which sum, together with the amount advanced by the Department of State or the Economic Cooperation Administration to or on behalf of any claimant listed below, represents the reasonable value of personal property lost by each said claimant as a result of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea:

Charles J. Abarno, $145.76; Elizabeth Abercrombie, $706.65; Norman S. Abramson, $66; Josephine Algarotti, $551.55; Douglas D. Allen, $990.80; Ruth H. Allen, $744.90; Rhea Anderson, $1,809.50; Morton Bach, $9,889.58; David M. Bane, $7,000.95; Francis R. Barnhart, $2,709.13; Carl F. Bartz, Jr., $2,047.50; Joy K. Beacham, $52.07; Mary A. Beebe, $1,599.05; James E. Belew, $89.50; Louis K. Benjamin, $1,850.50; Thomas E. Benner, $352; James H. Berrean, $1,393.50; Samuel Berry, $238.50; Samuel Blankfield, $535.18; Claire E. Boyle, $132.35; Ralph O. Bricker, $8,080.94;

Albin C. Bro, $415.50; Genevieve M. Browne, $704.08; Lorraine R. Bruun, $5,263.90; Vasilys N. Bugovies, $5,991; Betty Burke, $239.66; Elsie F. Caldwell, $1,267; Joseph A. Carmel, $726.50; Joseph H. P. Carr, $246.30; Harry C. C. Chung, $1,002.85; John Chung, $3,337,55; Helemann Clarke, $249.15; John R. Coan, $2,533; Guy T. Colling, $147.40; William A. Conkright, $3,593.95; Francis A. Cooke, $1,282.90; Thomas J. Cory, $4,739.65; Anna M. Crane, $859.61; Ezra L. Cross, $1,407.70; Jane A. Culpepper, $1,518.70;

Ira J. Dale, $2,372.65; Shirley Ann Dawes, $235.75; Owen L. Dawson, $1,828.90; Rose M. Dickson, $391.23; Arthur C. Dieter, $353; Jefferson Dix, Jr., $3,381.10; Winifred Doddridge, $146; Carrie E. Dreibelbies, $460.95; Walter H. Drew, $406.90; Everett F. Drumright, $1,886; Marion Dudenhoefer, $104.14; Florence T. Dunscombe, $75; Theodore J. Eckert, $2,454; Allie L. Edmundson, $431.50; Muriel Gaspar Emery, $168.95; Arthur B. Emmons 3d, $119.50; Frank and Mary England, $3,015.16; Edgar D. Erwin, $516.50;

Alfred M. Ewing, $1,172.50; John M. Farrior, $3,829.65; Ivo D. Fatigati, $261.48; Donald G. Faust, $178.60; Lester C. Fickett, $410.77; Samuel F. Floyd, Jr., $271; Bernard M. Flynn, $593.60; Mildred H. Foreman, $143.77; Catherine E. Foster, $742.25; Herman B. Fredman, $484; Viola M. French, $912.35; Roy Y. Fujioka, $955.75; Charles M. Gage, $364, Walter D. Gardner, $4,714.78; Thomas E. and Margaret D. Gavin, $3,979.06;

Milton G. Geil, $200; Gene O. Gerdt, $103.50; Thomas F. Glennon, $542; Wanda Gondek, $290; John Gonzales, $1,829; Faye Gottfried, $2,881.63; Lorraine T. Gresko, $619.80; Francis Groom, $299.53; Albert W. J. Grotjohan, $3,859.95; Roy I. Hanna, $644.75; Ovsanna Harpootian, $120.90; Reginald L. Hatt, $136.50; Robert W. Heavey, $2,205; Ethel E. Henderson, $215.41; Gregory Henderson, $1,082; Katharine P. Hess, $61.38;

Paul E. Hill, $367.25; Helen E. Hobson, $138; George Hockstaetter, $1,785.50; William D. Holbert, $1,960.50; Roy G. Holloway, $963.25; Jonathan I. Holmes, $115.90; Beatrice H. Holt, $1,377; John D. Huhm, $613.10; Mario B. Iavicoli, $249.98; Dolores M. Jablonski, $508; William R. Jackson, $177.25; Rolf Jacoby, $210; Dwight O. Jennings, $1,494; Ralph J. Jesky, $207.10; Dorothy I. Jose, $2,066.95; Ralph M. Kearney, $4,397.41;

Joseph A. Keener, $533; Dexter E. Kelpe, $1,362.50; Floyd L. Killam, $1,770; Albert S. M. Kim, $213.75; James Y. Kim, $1,403.86; Ricky H. K. Kim, $1,849; Robert Kim, $1,030.30; Yon Ha Kim, $2,352; Travis Kirkland, $84; Eugene Knez, $112.50; Ruth C. Krueger, $91.60; John W. Lamb, Jr., $282.15; Clarissa H. Lane, $532.65; Robert J. Lane, $447.90; Marillyn D. Lanphere, $226; Robert M. S. Lau, $1,066; George E. Leader, $445;

Edward J. Leary, $1,482.50; Kenneth H. Lee, $523; Robert Lee, $1,787; Tai Soon Lee, $1,046; Dewey W. Lighthall, $2,577.70; Joy C.

Little, $1,240.61; Martin B. Little, $3,076.91; Victor H. Loftus, $6,619.90; Gerald W. Lucas, $275.50; Alex E. MacDonald, $1,903.75; Donald S. Macdonald, $921.80; Margaret M. McCann, $30.50; Donald B. McCue, $250.35; Mary P. Manchester, $442; Robert H. Marsh, $3,102.85; Helen Marshall, $1,162.50;

Donald P. Matson, $78.75; Glenwood B. Matthews, $204.80; Patricia E. Matthews, $295.39; Franklin W. Melkus, $181; Oleg I. Melnikoff, $99.85; Hazel V. Miller, $805.90; William J. Millimore, $256.35; Earl P. Mintz, $306; John S. Moister, $1,680.90; Stuart E. Morgan, $231.25; Lenore A. Moriarty, $1,225.82; John J. Muccio, $4,846; Frank B. Murray, $1,041.30; Glenn A. Noble, $175.93; Harold J. Noble, $378; Josef L. Norris, $240.33; Sammy Oh, $377.50;

Joseph E. Olenik, $90.50; James R. Osborne, $1,841.50; Janet A. Osgood, $558; William M. Park, $742; Theresa Parrette, $109.50; Henry B. Pierce, Jr., $503.15; Edward C. Pingleton, $1,295; Janice Plowman, $606.50; William S. A. Pott, $6,621.03; Curtis W. Prendergast, $945.75; Philip K. Pyun, $584.60; John M. Reed, $2,730.15; Joseph A. Reinstatler, $308.38; William G. Ridgeway, $1,815.95; Walter A. Rileigh, $921.85;

Carl E. Rivers, $3,459.80; Dorothy H. Roach, $622.06; Eugene W. Robello, $188.38; John E. Roberts, $255.50; Marjorie L. Rodgers, $405.29; Leo J. Rogers, $5.27; Robert H. Rose, $255; Philip C. Rowe, $1,469.40; Robert J. Rudolph, $167.85; Isabel Rutherford, $1,219.18; Lawrence R. Ryckman, $7.25; Joseph A. Sabino, $530.35; Alfred Salmony, $179.70; Arthur M. Schecter, $260; Marcus W. Scherbacher, $1,576.50; Marjorie D. Schwarz, $2,412.30; William P. Schwerin, $81.50; Robert W. Sherman, $177.79; Geneva B. Shregg, $1,570.38; L. Edward Shuck, Jr., $5.80; Lucy A. Shults, $306; Helen D. Sims, $415.85; John T. Sinclair, $2,358; Robert L. Sisk, $178.01; Harold G. Smith, $--------; Ray M. Smith, $128; Robert F. Smith, $1,688.50; William P. Smith, $549; Ok Mun Song, $259; Delbert D. Sprague, $304; Phyllis J. Southworth, $372.10; Donald W. Stegner, $2,194.63; George Stelmachwitze, $222; James L. Stewart, $3,448.10; John Stone, $724; Charles M. Tanner, $4,632.73; George R. Todd, $366; Arthur B. Traver, $--------; Clara L. Urban, $953.76; James D. van Putten, $242.05; Eloise C. Van Vulpen, $243; Royal H. Wells, $140; Dorothy A. Whipple, $1,535.95; Carlin L. Wilson, $2,069.20; Roger F. Wilson, $880; Francis E. Witman, $199.95; Noble W. Yaste, $278;

Henry F. Akin, $1,643.50; Paul H. Allen, $1,513.70; Arnold T. Amerman, $392; Wilhelm Anderson, $587.25; David A. Andrews, $9.75; James Auburn, $4,281.01; Wilbur De Trude Bacon, $24.30; John D. Baldridge, $4,581.45; Mildred Barody, $7,593.02; Philip Beck, $6,069.50; Harold A. Bennett, $1,441.05; Addison W. Beideman, $4,247.54; Andrew John Bellotti, $568.78; Lionel Benjamin, $5,075.75; Maurice O. Bergeron, $636; Florence Binion, $1,129.97; Albert L. Boucher, $2,874.68; Cy Elliott Bradley, $432.50; Arthur C. Bunce, $3,156.26; Frederick H. Bunting, $78.50;

Edmund F. Burke, $2.40; Timothy Burke, $140; John A. Butler, $72.20; Don L. Carroll, $4,885.65; L. W. Cartland, $504.70; Florence Chang, $3,536.16; Wayne L. Cockrell, $1,039; Harriet Colburn $430.80; Carl S. Coler, $4,-921.59; Alfred J. Coppola, $110; Ruth Crone, $77.85; L. P. Crouse, $1,370.20; William L. Davis, $2,700.12; Paul A. Dent, $6,212.38; G. Constance Doherty, $552.32; Lawrence W. Doran, $3,106.30; Stanley W. Earl, $5,252.25.

Clarence Eskildsen, $1,709.75; Harry J. Evans, $3,227.15; Earl R. Ewin, $4,405.50; Kurt Falk, $615.15; Reginald H. Fiedler, $938; William H. Fippin, $5,338.30; Ralph Hart Fisher, $2,814; Virginia Fitzpatrick, $21.05; Peggy Flood, $43; Leo Flynn, $616; Ernst Fraenkel, $108.50; Herbert L. Fuller, $3,257.76; Howard R. Gaetz, $802.50; Herman C. Gauger, $905.75; Ralph Gleason, $2,813.40; Frances M. Gordon, $912.95; Marlin F. Haas, $3,050.08; Wilbur Harris, $2,847.89.

John E. Harbison, $1,731.15; Harry L. Harting, $3,597.76; Azel F. Hatch, $2,772.94; Charlotte Hazard, $666.95; William Lloyd Heath, $274.70; Charles F. Henrotin, $668.55; Carroll V. Hill, $147.58; Frances C. Hill, $402.16; Robert Hochstetler, $4,068.15; Elmer W. Hoffnauer, $573.50; Beatrice D. Holland, $698.25; James E. Holland, $2,065.68; Helen Gray Hopkinson, $4,728.14; Pitt W. Hyde, $1,615.50; Stanley Jarmolowicz, $877; Gerard R. Jobin, $2,890; Dewey T. Jones, $2,328; Ray Jones, $915; Thomas A. King, $3,378.05; Robert A. Kinney, $4,018.50; Dayton P. Kirkham, $1,-605; Addison R. Ketchum, $3,817.75; Foster Knight, $3,078.51; Carlos Knox, $455; George Kramer, $280.21; Ernest F. Kroner, $5,470.50;

Melvin Lake $237.21; Frances D. Lassalle, $115.50 Woodrow W. Leake, $5,389.40 Carl W. Leveau, $8,516.63; Harold A. Levin, $2,695; Herbert E. Lindemann, $364; Luther L. Long, $356.35; Allen Loren, $1,218; Dexter N. Lutz, $4,568.12; Joseph M. Lynd, $4,822; Vincent S. Madison, $4,381; John W. Magennis, $728.85; Reuben B. Magnuson, $474.95; George Manley, $642.95; Frank E. Manske, $67.53; Charles N. Martin, $782.50;

Lloyd W. Maxwell, $220.70; Edna M. Miencier, $2,758.52; Carl F. O. Miller, $1,407.25; Charles J. Miller, $2,343.50; Gordon N. Miller, $1,571.40; Howard L. Minister, $5,541.14; Joseph H. Moore, $1,921.05; Hamilton Morton, $1,670.97; Claude Murphy, $2,345.55; Kathleen McCabe, $537.80; Carol McCormick, $734; Willie McDaniel, $238.98; Robert L. MacFadyen, $2,071.50; James R. McKinley, $8,278; George E. McLaughlin, $562;

William F. McMillin, $1,640; Norma Neff, $648.10; Lewis G. Nonini, $3,297.75; Paul E. Oakes, $1,375.50; Manuel John Ogas, $1,957; Antone B. Olejniczak, $544.50; Edgar T. Olson, $2,665; Florence Packard, $387.70; Jewel C. Patten, $278.68; Stanley I. Phillippi, $3,305.63; Bruce M. Platt, $1,101.31; Richard Pringle, $260.30; Edwin Rall, $605.25; J. Franklin Ray, Jr., $2,282; Mary Rose Riordan, $138.14;

Oliver H. Ritchie, $562.10; Raymond C. Robeck, $20; Charles S. Roberts, $1,462.60; Howard C. Robinson, $3,236.15; Freda W. Rogers, $741.45; Adeline G. Rose, $858.53; Frederick H. Sacksteder, $6,361.57; Herman E. Schmid, $339.80; Barbara Scott, $1,085; Denny F. Scott, $4,402; Margaret Seale, $229.10; Lillian C. Seitz, $420.83; Mary Frances Shaw, $501.55; Joseph Wayne Shoemaker, $2,585.50; Marguerite Lois Simpson, $1,095; Frances Gray Smith, $4,315.92; Orina McGuire Smith, $3,135.96; Roland D. Smith, $2923.58; Phyllis M. Sterling, $245.60; Wayne Mackenzie Stevens, $8,158.20;

Paul P. Stewart, $3,598; Alfred A. Strauss, $62.75; Paul H. Swope, $2,336.49; Charles W. Taylor, $493.90; Gloria Copelli Thetford, $680.30; Norman E. Thompson, $3,599.50; John H. Thorn, $3,304; Milton C. Towner, $4,138.59; Winthrop A. Travell, $173.15; Harriett M. Tyler, $396.87; Marjorie Van Auken, $602.02; David J. Varnes, $366.73; Ward Vickers, $298; James D. Vine, $107.45; A. C. Walker, $5,952; Elviretta Walker, $887; Ralph L. P. Wallace, $9,627.96; Mabel Warnecke, $408.70; Lucille Watson, $200.40;

Jedediah E. Weeks, $383.10; Charles W. Westerkamp, $4,893.57; William S. Weyant, $1,278.65; Othello J. Wheatley, $1,903.80; M. M. Whitaker, $3,047.03; Julia Wiarda, $1,-088.20; Royce A. Wight, $2,402.43; Frank E. Williams, $1,049.60; Phyllis A. Williams, $299; Albert E. Willis, $149.50; Richard P. Wilson, $1,263.50; Ruby E. Wilson, $219.45; Stanley F. Wilson, $1,319; Ralph E. Winchell, $62; Francis H. Winget, $80; Yvonne A. Wood, $3,379.20; Wilford S. Wright, $1,675.75; Anita E. Yale, $1,354.41; Paul J. Zehngraff, $2,744;

H. Lamar Aldrich, $221.58; Donald R. Auguston, $339; Charles D. Binning, $222.50; Charles R. Boblits, $215; John Bottmer, $618.70; Lloyd R. Bradshaw, $1,675.93; Ebenezer Breingan, $399; Gus J. Chakalakis, $676.50; C. B. Cochran, $278.75; Frank E. Conley, $844; Warren D. Conrad, $221.85; Walter K. Daub, $876; Harvey A. Denison, $760.40; Virginia L. Embree, $434.40; Alvin C. Enke, $192; Daniel J. Fogarty, $3,730;

Sidney T. Gillispie, $110; Russell Gommel, $766; Attilio F. Gramolini, $1586.63; Charles W. Hans, $64.40; Landon H. Heffner, $125; Henry C. Heimann, $55.15; J. S. Henry, $769.60; E. Arlene Hilyard, $929; Lanier C. Howell, $287.60; Robert C. Jaska, $379.50; Glenn H. Johnson, $162; Dwight Keneagy, $311; Thomas J. Kitts, $553.20; Paul R. Lee, $2,300.34; Stanley C. Mathay, $1,067.90; Raymond D. Meade, $711.25; Byron W. Moore, $1,046; Weston J. Naef, $613.07; Robert C. Nash, $1,199; Richard L. Newhafer, $1,086; Edwin L. Niska, $142.25; Sheridan Osborne, $550.65; John W. Patton, $349.90; J. G. Petrison, $1,838.42; Lorence F. Pries, $138.15; K. Nagaraja Rao, $421.50;

Marshall M. Reynolds, $1,271; Mabel A. Robertson, $279.30; W. K. Robertson, $260; Joseph Sabacky, $691.11; James R. Schermerhorn, $661.25; John F. Schmidt, Jr., $90; Lester M. Scott, $1,475; David G. Shaner, $217; John Skory, $121; John F. Snyder, $987; Charles B. Stewart, $855.63; John N. Story, $49.10; Edward L. Traylor, $3,927.50; Patrick L. Urie, $169; Charles E. Van Landingham, $143.10; Edward L. Waldee, $337.50; George A. Walker, $505.50; David P. Williams, $724; Joseph A. Zelinka, $1,839.98: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike the figures "$706.65" and insert "$350."

Page 2, line 3, strike the figures "$551.55" and insert "$250."

Page 2, line 5, strike the figures "$9,889.58" and insert "$8,500."

Page 2, line 5, strike the figures "$7,000.95" and insert "$6,200."

Page 2, line 6, strike the figures "$2,709.13" and insert "$2,000."

Page 2, line 6, strike the figures "$2,047.50" and insert "$1,600."

Page 2, line 7, strike the figures "$1,599.05" and insert "$1,200."

Page 2, line 11, strike the figures "$8,080.94" and insert "$7,000."

Page 2, line 12, strike the figures "$704.08" and insert "$350."

Page 2, line 13, strike the figures "$5,263.90" and insert "$4,200."

Page 2, line 14, strike the figures "$5,991" and insert "$5,300."

Page 2, line 15, strike the figures "$726.50" and insert "$300."

Page 2, line 16, strike the figures "$3,337.55" and insert "$2,500."

Page 2, line 17, strike the figures "$2,533" and insert "$2,000."

Page 2, line 18, strike the figures "$3,593.95" and insert "$3,000."

Page 2, line 19, strike the figures "$1,262.90" and insert "$900."

Page 2, line 19, strike the figures "$4,739.65" and insert "$4,000."

Page 2, line 20, strike the figures "$959.61" and insert "$450."

Page 2, line 20, strike the figures "$1,407.70" and insert "$1,000."

Page 2, line 21, strike the figures "$1,518.70" and insert "$900."

Page 2, line 23, strike the figures "$391.23" and insert "$200."

Page 2, line 24, strike the figures "$3,391.10" and insert "$2,800."

Page 3, line 4, strike the figures "$431.50" and insert "$300."

Page 3, line 6, strike the figures "$516.50" and insert "$250."

Page 3, line 7, and line 8, strike the figures "$3,829.65" and insert "$3,000."

Page 3, line 11, strike the figures "$742.25" and insert "$400."

Page 3, line 12, strike the figures "$912.35" and insert "$450."

Page 3, line 13, strike the figures "$955.75" and insert "$550."

Page 3, line 14, strike the figures "$4,714.78" and insert "$3,700."

Page 3, line 15, strike the figures "$3,979.06" and insert "$3,000."

Page 3, line 16, strike the name "Milton G. Geil," and the figures "$200" and the semicolon thereafter.

Page 3, line 17, strike the figures "$290" and insert "$150."

Page 3, line 17, change the name "Gonzales" to "Gonzalez."

Page 3, line 18, strike the figures "$2,881.63" and insert "$1,500."

Page 2, line 19, strike the figures "$619.80" and insert "$300."

Page 3, line 19, strike the word "Francis" before "Groom" and insert "Estate of Frances."

Page 3, line 20, strike the figures "$3,859.95" and insert "$3,000."

Page 3, line 22, strike the figures "$2,205" and insert "$1,800."

Page 3, line 24, strike the figures "$367.25" and insert "$150."

Page 3, line 25, strike the figures "$1,785.50" and insert "$1,300."

Page 4, line 2, strike the figures "$1,377" and insert "$1,000."

Page 4, line 3, strike the figures "$249.98" and insert "$125."

Page 4, line 3, strike the figures "$506" and insert "$300."

Page 4, line 6, strike the figures "$2,066.95" and insert "$1,500."

Page 4, line 6, strike the figures "$4,397.41" and insert "$3,000."

Page 4, line 7, strike the figures "$1,362.50" and insert "$1,000."

Page 4, line 10, strike the figures "$1,030.30" and insert "$650."

Page 4, line 10, strike the figures "$2,352" and insert "$1,500."

Page 4, line 13, strike the figures "$532.65" and insert "$300."

Page 4, line 13, strike the figures "$447.90" and insert "$250."

Page 4, line 14, strike the figures "$445" and insert "$200."

Page 4, line 15, strike the figures "$1,482.50" and insert "$1,200."

Page 4, line 16, strike the figures "$1,787" and insert "$1,250."

Page 4, line 16, strike the figures "$1,046" and insert "$600."

Page 4, line 17, strike the figures "$2,577.70" and insert "$1,800."

Page 4, line 17, strike the figures "$1,240.81" and insert "$600."

Page 4, line 18, strike the figures "$6,619.90" and insert "$5,500."

Page 4, line 21, strike the figures "$442" and insert "$225."

Page 4, line 22, strike the figures "$3,102.85" and insert "$2,400."

Page 5, line 1, strike the figures "$805.90" and insert "$400."

Page 5, line 3, strike the figures "$1,225.82" and insert "$600."

Page 5, line 6, strike the figures "$377.50" and insert "$200."

Page 5, line 8, strike the figures "$1,841.50" and insert "$1,500."

Page 5, line 8, strike the figures "$558" and insert "$300."

Page 5, line 11, strike the figures "$6,621.09" and insert "$5,975."

Page 5, line 13, strike the figures "$2,730.15" and insert "$1,800."

Page 5, line 14, strike the figures "$1,815.95" and insert "$1,000."

Page 5, line 15, strike the figures "$3,459.80" and insert "$1,500."

Page 5, line 15, strike the figures "$622.06" and insert "$300."

Page 5, line 19, strike the figures "$1,219.18" and insert "$800."

Page 5, line 23, strike the figures "$2,412.30" and insert "$1,800."

Page 5, line 24, strike the figures "$1,570.38" and insert "$1,000."

Page 6, line 2, strike "Harold G. Smith, $——;."

Page 6, line 3, strike the figures "$1,688.50" and insert "$1,250."

Page 6, line 5, strike the figures "$372.10" and insert "$200."

Page 6, line 6, strike the figures "$2,194.63" and insert "$1,500."

Page 6, line 8, strike the figures "$4,632.73" and insert "$3,300."

Page 6, line 8, strike the name "Arthur B. Traver,."

Page 6, line 9, strike "$——;."

Page 6, line 9, strike the figures "$953.76" and insert "$600."

Page 6, line 11, strike the figures "$1,535.95" and insert "$1,100."

Page 6, line 12, strike the figures "$2,069.20" and insert "$1,700."

Page 6, line 16, strike the figures "$4,281.01" and insert "$3,600."

Page 6, line 18, strike the figures "$4,581.45" and insert "$4,000."

Page 6, line 18, strike the figures "$7,593.02" and insert "$5,500."

Page 6, line 19, strike the figures "$6,069.50" and insert "$4,500."

Page 6, line 20, strike the figures "$4,247.54" and insert "$3,600."

Page 6, line 21, strike the figures "$5,075.75" and insert "$4,300."

Page 6, line 22, strike the figures "$1,129.97" and insert "$800."

Page 7, line 1, strike the figures "$4,885.65" and insert "$4,000."

Page 7, line 2, strike the figures "$3,536.16" and insert "$2,000."

Page 7, line 3, strike the figures "$430.80" and insert "$200."

Page 7, line 4, strike the figures "$4,921.59" and insert "$4,100."

Page 7, line 5, strike the figures "$1,370.20" and insert "$1,000."

Page 7, line 5, strike the figures "$2,700.12" and insert "$2,200."

Page 7, line 6, strike the figures "$6,212.38" and insert "$5,000."

Page 7, line 8, strike the figures "$5,252.25" and insert "$4,850."

Page 7, line 9, strike the name "Harry" and insert "Margaret."

Page 7, line 10, strike the figures "$3,227.15" and insert "$2,800."

Page 7, line 10, strike the figures "$4,405.50" and insert "$3,900."

Page 7, line 11, strike the figures "$5,338.30" and insert "$4,050."

Page 7, line 14, strike the figures "$3,257.76" and insert "$2,500."

Page 7, line 16, strike the figures "$912.95" and insert "$500."

Page 7, line 17, strike the figures "$2,847.89" and insert "$2,400."

Page 7, line 18, strike the figures "$1,731.15" and insert "$1,400."

Page 7, line 19, strike the figures "$3,597.76" and insert "$3,200."

Page 7, line 19, strike the figures "$2,772.94" and insert "$2,400."

Page 7, line 22, strike the figures "$4,008.15" and insert "$3,500."

Page 7, line 24, strike the figures "$2,065.68" and insert "$1,800."

Page 7, line 24, strike the figures "$4,728.14" and insert "$4,100."

Page 8, line 1, strike the figures "$2,890" and insert "$2,100."

Page 8, line 1, strike the figures "$2,328" and insert "$2,000."

Page 8, line 2, strike the figures "$915" and insert "$425."

Page 8, line 2, strike the figures "$3,378.05" and insert "$3,100."

Page 8, line 4, strike the figures "$3,817.75" and insert "$3,100."

Page 8, line 4, strike the figures "$3,078.51" and insert "$2,500."

Page 8, line 6, strike the figures "$5,470.50" and insert "$4,700."

Page 8, line 8, strike the figures "$5,389.40" and insert "$4,200."

Page 8, line 8, strike the figure "$8,."

Page 8, line 9, strike the figures "$516.83" and insert "$6,500."

Page 8, line 9, strike the figures "$2,695" and insert "$2,200."

Page 8, line 11, strike the figures "$4,568.12" and insert "$4,100."

Page 8, line 11, strike the figures "$4,822" and insert "$3,900."

Page 8, line 15, strike the figure at the end of the line "$2,."

Page 8, line 16, strike the figures "$758.52" and insert "$1,800."

Page 8, line 16, strike the figures "$1,407.25" and insert "$1,000."

Page 8, line 17, strike the figures "$2,343.50" and insert "$1,600."

Page 8, line 18, strike the figures "$5,541.14" and insert "$4,400."

Page 8, line 19, strike the figures "$2,345.55" and insert "$2,000."

Page 8, line 20, strike the figures "$537.90" and insert "$300."

Page 8, line 21, strike the figures "$2,071.50" and insert "$1,300."

Page 8, line 22, strike the figures "$8,278" and insert "$7,000."

Page 8, line 23, strike the figures "$1,640" and insert "$1,250."

Page 9, line 1, strike the figures "$1,957" and insert "$1,500."

Page 9, line 2, strike the figures "$2,665" and insert "$1,750."

Page 9, line 5, strike the figures "$2,282" and insert "$1,900."

Page 9, line 8, strike the figure "$3," at the end of the line.

Page 9, line 9, strike the figures "$236.15" and insert "$2,800."

Page 9, line 9, strike the figures "$741.45" and insert "$400."

Page 9, line 10, strike the figures "$858.53" and insert "$550."

Page 9, line 10, strike the figures "$6,361.57" and insert "$5,000."

Page 9, line 13, strike the figures "$501.55" and insert "$300."

Page 9, line 14, strike the figures "$2,585.50" and insert "$1,900."

Page 9, line 15, strike the figures "$4,315.92" and insert "$3,600."

Page 9, line 15, strike the figures "$3,135.96" and insert "$2,400."

Page 9, line 17, strike the figures "$8,158.20" and insert "$7,000."

Page 9, line 18, strike the figures "$3,598" and insert "$3,200."

Page 9, line 19, strike the figures "$493.90" and insert "$300."

Page 9, line 20, strike the figures "$680.30" and insert "$450."

Page 9, line 21, strike the figures "$3,509.50" and insert "$3,000."

Page 9, line 21, strike the figures "$3,304" and insert "$2,950."

Page 9, line 22, strike the figures "$4,138.59" and insert "$3,650."

Page 10, line 1, strike the figures "$5,952" and insert "$5,000."

Page 10, line 1, strike the figures "$887" and insert "$450."

Page 10, line 2, strike the figures "$9,627.96" and insert "$8,000."

Page 10, line 5, strike the figures "$4,893.57" and insert "$3,900."

Page 10, line 6, strike the figures "$3,047.03" and insert "$2,500."

Page 10, line 12, strike the figures "$3,379.20" and insert "$2,500."

Page 10, line 13, strike the figures "$1,354.41" and insert "$750."

Page 10, line 13, strike the figures "$2,744" and insert "$2,300."

Page 10, line 21, strike the figures "$3,730" and insert "$3,050."

Page 11, line 17, strike the figures "$3,927.50" and insert "$3,300."

Page 11, line 20, strike the figures "$1,839.98" and insert "$1,600."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL G. KENDALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5025) for the relief of Paul G. Kendall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Col. Paul G. Kendall, United States Army, Army Headquarters Commandant, Military District of Washington, Washington, D. C., the sum of $7,591.73, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the damages sustained by him on account of damage to and destruction of his household goods and personal effects while the same were in the custody of the United States Army and being shipped from London, England, to Washington, D. C., during the summer of 1952, for which he has not heretofore been compensated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures and insert "$6,930.72."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAH CHANG CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5461) for the relief of Wah Chang Corp.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

LT. COMDR. COOK CLELAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5572) for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Cook Cleland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cook Cleland, lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $435. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lt. Comdr. Cook Cleland against the United States for the payment of five money orders which he purchased on or about September 12, 1942, aboard the U. S. S. *Wasp*, and which were lost, together with all records thereof, when such vessel was sunk by enemy action on September 15, 1942. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT VINCENT, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6033) for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

MRS. JOSETTE L. ST. MARIE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6452) for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the application of all laws relating to benefits payable on account of death in the United States Army, the late Frank P. St. Marie, private, 31st Cavalry Reconnaisance Troop, Camp Shelby, Miss., whose death occurred at Camp Shelby, on March 9, 1943, shall be held and considered to have died in line of duty.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEXEI FRANK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6698) for the relief of Alexei Frank.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, to Alexei Frank, of 46 Corringham Road, London, England, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained during his voluntary service with the Armed Forces of the United States at Grenoble, France, in World War II: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. SAMUEL J. ADAMS AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6808) for the relief of Col. Samuel J. Adams and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That relief is hereby granted the various disbursing officers of the United States hereinafter mentioned in amounts shown herein, or in such lesser amounts as may be outstanding on the date of enactment of this act, said amounts representing amounts of erroneous payments made by said disbursing officers of public funds for which said officers are accountable as listed in and under the circumstances described in identical letters of August 1, 1953, the Department of Defense to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, and that the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps the amounts set opposite their names, or such lesser amounts as may be outstanding on the date of enactment of this act:

Col. Samuel J. Adams, Finance Corps, Army (now retired), $80.26; Col. Walter E. Ahearn, Finance Corps, Army, $22; Lt. Col. Edwin Louis Brinckmann, Finance Corps, Army, $225; Lt. Col. Lloyd Burton, Finance Corps, Army, $146.69; Maj. Michael Cohen, Finance Corps, Army, $177.19; Lt. Col. Charles Wesley Conklin, Finance Corps, Army (now retired), $70; Lt. Col. John Hamilton Davin, Finance Corps, Army, $2,015.47; Lt. Col. Ernest Glenn Doyel, Finance Corps, Army, $233.56; Maj. Harris Clark Eichen, Finance Corps, Army, $60.25; Maj. Horace Napoleon Elkins, Jr., Finance Corps, Army, $78.72; Col. John W. Faulds, Finance Corps, Army, $465.15;

Col. Clarence A. Frank, Finance Corps, Army (now retired), $1,089.25; Lt. Col. Thomas Stanley Gasiorowski, Finance Corps, Army, $1,123.40; Lt. Col. Robert H. Hansen, Finance Corps, Army (now retired), $1,250.59; Maj. Edward Charles Hertweck, Finance Corps, Army (now retired), $18,109.76; Lt. Col. Bernard Jeffrey, Finance Corps, Army (now retired), $4,464.97; Lt. Col. Arthur Sanderson Kinsman, Finance Corps, Army, $6,506.21; Lt. Col. Wilfred Knobeloch, Finance Corps, Army, $230; Lt. Col. Orville Aden Lesley, Finance Corps, Army, $149.96; Lt. Col. Royer Knight Lewis, Finance Corps, Army, $137.90;

Capt. Theodore J. Leyden, Finance Corps, Army, $195.20; Lt. Col. Charles Burnham Milliken, Finance Corps, Army, $105.88; Maj. Charles E. Myrick, Finance Corps, Army, $522.04; Lt. Col. Carter Oliver Price, Finance Corps, Army, $25.80; Maj. Alva L. Ritchie, Finance Corps, Army, $29.63; Lt. Col. Harold John Schubert, Finance Corps, Army, $50; Maj. Frank Martin Setzer, Finance Corps, Army, $3,481; Maj. Arthur Anthony Stiefel, Finance Corps, Army, $1,901.67; Lt. Col.

Frederick S. Stratton, Finance Corps, Army, $3,706.93; Col. Samuel Johnson Taggart, Finance Corps, Army, $820.30; Col. John Raikes Vance, Finance Corps, Army, $442.74;

Lt. Col. James Raymond Wilkerson, Finance Corps, Army, $94.04; Lt. Col. Edgar Elliott Enger, Finance Corps, Army, $5,302.81; Capt. Frank Anthony Matuszak, Finance Corps, Army, $679.87; Ens. Verson H. Anderson, Supply Corps, Navy, $93.75; Lt. Edward J. Birtistle, Supply Corps, Navy, $568.44; Ens. James J. Baker, Jr., Supply Corps, Navy, $16; Ens. Herbert Richard Beck, Supply Corps, Navy, $75; Lt. (jg.) Edward B. Barnett, Supply Corps, Navy, $75; Lt. Comdr. Albert Albert, Supply Corps, Navy, $4,013.75; Lt. (jg.) Bernard Abrams, Supply Corps, Navy, $13.20; Lt. (jg.) John P. Abea, Supply Corps, Navy, $30;

Lt. Harold A. Anderson, Supply Corps, Navy, $37.50; Ens. Rodger Adrian, Supply Corps, Navy, $9.50; Lt. Roy William Endorf, Supply Corps, Navy, $8; Lt. (jg.) Vaughn O. Balcom, Supply Corps, Navy, $100; Lt. Thomas Foley Beck, Supply Corps, Navy, $150; Ens. Carol H. Brooks, Supply Corps, Navy, $280; Lt. (jg.) J. J. Bock, Supply Corps, Navy, $1,275; Lt. Comdr. F. C. Brehm, Supply Corps, Navy, $131.25; Ens. W. L. Blumling, Supply Corps, Navy, $100; Lt. (jg.) Thomas W. Bevans, Supply Corps, $75; Lt. (jg.) J. H. Corey, Supply Corps, Navy, $20;

Comdr. Fred C. Burris, Supply Corps, Navy, $480; Ens. Eugene Butcher, Supply Corps, Navy, $200; Lt. Theodore C. Christopherson, Supply Corps, Navy, $93.75; Lt. R. W. H. Darrow, Supply Corps, Navy, $7.27; Ens. Robert Newton Gordon, Supply Corps, Navy, $75; Lt. George E. Brown, Supply Corps, Navy, $193.75; Ens. D. A. Heller, Supply Corps, Navy, $225; Lt. (jg.) Lloyd Goolsby, Supply Corps, Navy, $30;

Lt. John W. Bomar, Supply Corps, Navy, $177.65; Ens. Heber Thompson Hertzog, Supply Corps, Navy, $720; Ens. Boynard Mayhew Graf, Supply Corps, Navy, $70.40; Ens. Stephen S. D. Griffith, Supply Corps, Navy, $550; Lt. H. L. Conner, Suply Corps, Navy, $108; Lt. (jg.) Richard M. Davis, Supply Corps, Navy, $57.50; Lt. (jg.) Wilson E. Deitrick, Supply Corps, Navy, $237.50; Lt. (jg.) Edward J. Dolan, Supply Corps, Navy, $18.75; Lt. (jg.) Thomas C. Dutton, Supply Corps, Navy, $87.50; Ens. Andrew S. Dowd, Supply Corps, Navy, $5.40; Ens. Jackie S. Cook, Supply Corps, Navy, $500; Lt. Comdr. George H. Davis, Supply Corps, Navy, $360.

Comdr. R. A. Donald, Supply Corps, Navy, $525; Ens. William Thomas Echter, Supply Corps, Navy, $20; Ens. William J. Frushtick, Supply Corps, Navy, $175; Ens. David G. Fulton, Supply Corps, Navy, $56.25; Lt. Comdr. Helen Randel Gorham, Supply Corps, Navy, $38.40; Lt. Comdr. Sam Cruse, Supply Corps, Navy, $1,610.84; Lt. (jg.) R. L. McNutt, Supply Corps, Navy, $56.25; Lt. F. A. Nash, Jr., Supply Corps, Navy, $281.25; Ens. H. W. O'Brien, Jr., Supply Corps, Navy, $6; Lt. (jg.) Grace J. Page, Supply Corps, Navy, $98.75; Lt. (jg.) J. W. Peascoe, Supply Corps, Navy, $87.80; Comdr. C. F. Ray, Supply Corps, Navy, $2,025; Lt. Dale M. Robison, Supply Corps, Navy, $187.50;

Ens. C. G. Ross, Supply Corps, Navy, $89.60; Lt. (jg.) P. J. Roy, Supply Corps, Navy, $18.75; Lt. Comdr. G. H. Rathe, Supply Corps, Navy, $75; Lt. S. L. Scharf, Jr., Supply Corps, Navy, $1,150; Lt. Jean M. Shaeffer, Supply Corps, Navy, $56.25; Lt. R. W. Sharpe, Supply Corps, Navy, $93.75; Ens. S. K. Schapiro, Supply Corps, Navy, $216.25; Ens. J. F. Schnaible, Supply Corps, Navy, $737.25; Ens. R. H. Shaw, Supply Corps, Navy, $23.75; Ens. L. R. Smith, Supply Corps, Navy, $250; Lt. H. W. Smith, Supply Corps, Navy, $16;

Ens. R. S. Sylvest, Supply Corps, Navy, $350; Lt. Comdr. W. O. Steinke, Supply Corps, Navy, $217.50; Lt. (jg.) J. E. Larson, Supply Corps, Navy, $60.60; Comdr. Frederick Kim Longshore, Supply Corps, Navy, $298; Lt. Norman C. Lunde, Supply Corps, Navy, $38.40; Lt. Arnold E. Lohnes, Supply Corps, Navy, $131.25; Lt. (jg.) Harry R. Luebbe, Supply Corps, Navy, $87.98; Ens. C. G. Maggi, Supply Corps, Navy, $150; Ens. R. E. Madsen, Supply Corps, Navy, $600; Ens. T. P. McKeown, Supply Corps, Navy, $150;

Lt. (jg.) Eleanor Ann McDuffie, Supply Corps, Navy, $96.25; Lt. (jg.) Mary R. Morrow, Supply Corps, Navy, $1,336.53; Comdr. P. E. F. Quinlan, Supply Corps, Navy, $231.25; Comdr. L. H. Huebner, Supply Corps, Navy, $1,105; Lt. Kenneth Hughes Olsen, Supply Corps, Navy, $75; Lt. T. L. Nalley, Supply Corps, Navy, $93.75; Ens. Alex A. Nordhues, Supply Corps, Navy, $520; Lt. A. W. Lazcano, Supply Corps, Navy, $88.75; Ens. R. F. Murphy, Supply Corps, Navy, $480; Ens. K. P. Miller, Supply Corps, Navy, $159.73;

Lt. W. W. Miller, Supply Corps, Navy, $550; Lt. E. P. Miller, Supply Corps, Navy, $37.50; Ens. N. D. Meyers, Supply Corps, Navy, $30; Ens. Marvin E. McMullen, Supply Corps, Navy, $18.60; Lt. J. G. Smith, Supply Corps, Navy, $51.67; Lt. Comdr. C. L. Stokes, Supply Corps, Navy, $262.50; Lt. (jg.) W. E. Thomas, Supply Corps, Navy, $150; Lt. (jg.) L. E. Toney, Jr., Supply Corps, Navy, $62.80; Ens. L. A. Watson, Supply Corps, Navy, $250; Lt. (jg.) B. B. Wright, Supply Corps, Navy, $112.50; Lt. J. L. Willess, Supply Corps, Navy, $262.50;

Lt. (jg.) G. N. Wade, Supply Corps, Navy, $400; Captain C. G. Warfield, Supply Corps, Navy, $535.17; Lt. Max O. Vermillion, Supply Corps, Navy, $195; Lt. (jg.) Arthur William Holfield, Supply Corps, Navy, $61.24; Lt. Comdr. Henry H. Hoefs, Supply Corps, Navy, $257.50; Lt. (jg.) James C. Keener, Supply Corps, Navy, $120; Lt. (jg.) William H. Keeley, Supply Corps, Navy, $56.25; Lt. Irene M. Kline, Supply Corps, Navy, $100; Ens. J. H. Kamps, Supply Corps, Navy, $173.22;

Lt. Comdr. Ronald Earl Kinney, Jr., Supply Corps, Navy, $150; Ens. Roland J. Knobel, Jr., Supply Corps, Navy, $392; Lt. (jg.) Lynn M. Davis, Supply Corps, Navy, $372.40; Lt. D. R. Ferrin, Supply Corps, Navy, $280.05; Lt. Comd. Earl V. Lanes, Supply Corps, Navy, $1,800; Lt. (jg.) R. Claussenius, Supply Corps, Navy, $3,280; Ens. Keith E. Jacob, Supply Corps, Navy, $75; Lt. (jg.) Howard F. Jacob, Supply Corps, Navy, $175; Lt. William C. Joslyn, Supply Corps, Navy, $520; Ens. D. H. Huntington, Supply Corps, Navy, $40;

Lt. Merrill Hoffman, Supply Corps, Navy, $930; Lt. S. G. Higgins, Supply Corps, Navy, $1,511.75; Lt. Comdr. Robert John Kliese, Supply Corps, Navy, $6,018.25; Comdr. J. C. Burrill, Supply Corps, Navy, $407.30; Lt. Bernard Joseph Hackenson, Supply Corps, Navy, $11,055.28; Lt. Jack W. Hillman, Supply Corps, Navy, $578.75; Ens. William O. Hoverman, Supply Corps, Navy, $525; Maj. Clinton William Bragan, Air Force, $25.36; Maj. George Albert Bringman, Air Force, $501.18; Maj. John Cyril Costigan, Jr., Air Force, $401.09; Maj. Bruce Gregory Duncan, Air Force, $262.40; Lt. Col. Stanley A. Fulcher, Air Force, $51.75;

Maj. Irvin William Gerth, Air Force, $168.13; Capt. Elton Hall, Jr., Air Force, $1,066.98; Maj. Quincy Douglas Howell, Air Force, $143.72; Lt. Col. Charles S. Marsh, Air Force, $1,764.80; Maj. Harry James McAuley, Air Force, $989.26; Lt. Col. Clyde William O'Hern, Air Force, $344.99; Maj. Darrell Leonard Reed, Air Force, $221.32; Capt. Claybert Wilson Reid, Air Force, $142.87; Maj. Joseph William Scanlan, Air Force, $176.55; Capt. Luther Richard Underwood, Air Force, $216.33;

Maj. Earl Bruce Van Blarcom, Air Force, $197.52; Capt. Alfred Viescas, Air Force, $764.88; 1st Lt. Charles Augustus Wrennick, Air Force, $595.80; Maj. Lee B. Andrus, Marine Corps (now retired), $414.49; Maj. Norman C. Bates, Marine Corps, $196; Col. Samuel K. Bird, Marine Corps, $942.65; Maj. Harry O. Buzhardt, Marine Corps, $13; Capt. Edward L. Claire, Marine Corps (now retired), $80; Col. James L. Denham, Marine Corps (now retired), $847.86; Capt. Hubert H. Dunlap, Marine Corps (now retired), $120;

Capt. James W. Eldridge, Marine Corps, $9.80; Maj. George R. Frank, Marine Corps, $275.10; Capt. Willard T. Henry, Marine Corps, $121.80; Capt. Nicholas P. Lengyel, Marine Corps, $132; Capt. Robert H. J. McKay, Marine Corps (now retired), $40.60; Capt. William M. McMakin, Jr., Marine Corps, $37.50; Col. Leo Sullivan, Marine Corps, $228.40; Lt. Col. Paul E. Wallace, Marine Corps, $398.09; Capt. Clareance S. Wick, Marine Corps, $62.66; Maj. Herman A. Zehngebot, Marine Corps, $168.15; the foregoing amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these officers are accountable, which payments resulted from accounting differences and minor errors in determining amounts of pay and allowances due former officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the services concerned or contractors and/or vendors from whom collection of the overpayments has not been effected and which amounts have been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 2. That any amounts refunded by any disbursing officer or his heirs in connection with any item of indebtedness in accounts cleared herein and/or any amount otherwise due any disbursing officer or his heirs which was set off against any item of indebtedness which is cleared herein, shall be refunded to such disbursing officer or his heirs from the account to which credited if that account is available for disbursement, or if not, from the appropriation "Payment of certified claims": *Provided*, That no part of the amount authorized under this section to be refunded shall be charged against any individual other than the person to whom the erroneous payment was made or the person who received the benefit thereof.

SEC. 3. That in all cases where disbursing officers' accounts are cleared or relieved under the authority of this act, such clearance or relief shall be considered and construed as precluding the recovery from such disbursing officers of any interest charges (whether in connection with judicial proceedings or otherwise) arising from any item so cleared or relieved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDERICK W. LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3041) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Frederick W. Lee the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to transfer to Frederick W. Lee, a former employee of the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, by means of an appropriate legal instrument, the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention made by said Frederick W. Lee consisting of a "Method for Determining the Subterranean Extension of Geologic Bodies," as described and claimed in the United States Application for Letters Patent filed May 29, 1942, and covered by United States Letters Patent numbered 2,440,693: *Provided, however*, That such legal instrument shall reserve to the Government of the United States, in all departments, independent establishments, and corporate and other agencies thereof, the right to a nonexclusive, irrevocable, royalty-free license in and to the invention for all governmental purposes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE SANTA MARIA PROJECT, SOUTHERN PACIFIC BASIN, CALIF.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 416) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2235) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 416, which would make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2235) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 416 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself. H. R. 2235 was reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment and the project itself is the result of the combined planning and work of the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, the Corps of Engineers, and the Department of the Army.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2235 proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Vaquero Dam and Reservoir project for irrigation and the conservation of water, flood control, and for other purposes on the Santa Maria River, Calif.

The estimated cost of the project authorized in this bill and to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation is $16,982,000 of which $13,969,000, the amount allocated to water conservation, would be repaid over a certain number of years by the beneficiaries of this water conservation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will see fit to adopt House Resolution 416 which would make it possible to consider this bill that has been favorably reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] has explained the resolution and the objective set forth here very briefly.

There are some questions which arise in my mind about this legislation, which concern me very much. If I may have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee I would like to clarify at least in my mind 1 or 2 of those questions.

I might say in advance that my examination of this matter has been very cursory and I am not prepared to pose as an expert on the matter.

In the first place, as I understand it, we propose to build a dam that will cost almost $17 million—$16,982,000 to be exact. This will not be a dam in the ordinary sense, to collect waters to control them for flood purposes and irrigation, but rather the dam will be built for the purpose of creating an underground reservoir, or rather, raising the existing water level. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Substantially so. The dam actually does collect water for flood-control purposes, to be held in a reservoir, and then it is released through seepage into an underground reservoir. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Again I ask the question, not as an expert, certainly not an engineer: What assurance can the distinguished gentleman give us that that water once it goes underground is not going to seep out all over the country and possibly go out to sea?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that a detailed geological study has been made of the project; it has been checked very carefully by the Army engineers and the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation; and I believe they have come to the conclusion that this water is confined to a reservoir that God Almighty made and that it will be held there in reserve and used for the purpose of being pumped out by private individuals to supply their land for irrigation purposes.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman says he believes the engineers have come to that conclusion.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No, the engineers have come to the conclusion from geological studies.

Mr. COLMER. At best, it would be a conclusion or belief of the engineers themselves and it would have to be tested to be proved. Very well, now I come to the final question; as I figure it there will be nearly 38,000 acres of land to be irrigated or that are being irrigated under the present setup, and the water supply according to the report is sufficient to irrigate only 27,000 acres; in other words, you are not getting enough water for the 38,000 acres. If that be true, and if you hope to get it to all the 38,000 acres that would mean about 11,000 acres more for which irrigation water has got to be supplied if the project works out. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is substantially correct; yes.

Mr. COLMER. That, I figure, would amount to about $16,400 an acre, would it not? Or would that be out of line?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have not used my pencil on it. Perhaps the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] could tell us. I might say, however, that the people of the district have entered into an agreement for a benefit tax, that is, a water users' tax, to repay it; and the people of the cities have entered into an ad valorem or property tax upon themselves in a conservancy district in order to pay back in 40 years all the money that is put into this project.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The payout is $11 per acre per annum upon the area beneficially served by this supplemental water supply paid over a period of 40 years. This amounts to $350,000 per year in 40 annual installments, paying out the reimbursable cost of the project.

Where the gentleman is confused is this: The payout on this project comes from the whole 40,000 acres, not for just those that will be under cultivation if this project is built. If this project is not built about 8,000 acres will go out of cultivation. But this is a supplemental supply for the whole area, and the whole 40,000 acres participate in the repayment on a basis of $11 per acre charge per annum.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will yield, my professional staff tells me that it is about $1,500 an acre.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

Then, responding to my very warm friend, and able friend: I admitted that I was not clear on this, but I do not think I am confused on that proposition. In the final analysis, if you do not build that dam, according to the report you would still be able to irrigate about 27,000 acres. So it gets down to 11,000 acres that are going to cost $1,500 an acre according to the statistics here, the mathematics, to build this dam. It seems to me that is a pretty high cost of irrigation.

I believe that in addition to that my friend from California [Mr. ENGLE] urges that we are going to pay this back at the rate of so much an acre. If I read the report correctly what you are actually doing here is paying the interest—or to put it the other way, you are paying the principal back over a period of 40 years and what would be interest represents the cost to the Government.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. What the gentleman is talking about is a principle which has been in the reclamation law for 50 years, since 1902 as a matter of fact, which provides that the Federal Government will advance interest-free money to reclamation and irrigation projects. That has been true throughout the whole West for half a century. This bill is written and this project will be authorized and built, I repeat, under the principles of the basic reclamation law. If the gentleman has some quarrel with

that basic law then perhaps the law should be repealed, but as long as the law is there, this project merely follows the traditional method of financing projects of this kind.

The reason that the Federal Government has been willing over a period of years, 50 years in fact, and during all administrations, Republican and Democratic alike, to advance interest-free money in connection with the building of reclamation and irrigation projects is because the Federal Government gets a benefit through bringing these areas under irrigation. The actual benefit to the Federal Government, for instance, in tax revenues, more than equals the cost in interest to the Federal taxpayer.

Mr. COLMER. Permit me to say to the gentleman, and I am seeking information, that I have no quarrel with him but in reply to what he says, the fact remains that the Federal Government is financing this project because the Federal Government has got to pay the interest on possibly $17 million for a period of 40 years, which is the time you estimate it will take to amortize the loan.

I think we have to meet these problems as they come along. In conclusion, I may say to the gentleman from California, and those who are interested in balancing the budget and looking after the general welfare of the country, that it seems to me, in the first place, $1,500 to bring in an additional acre of cultivatable land is pretty high reclamation. In the final analysis the Government is going to pay the bill.

I am constrained to be against this bill although in deference to my very good friend, who is so keenly interested in the matter here, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] as well as my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I am still open to conviction.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I want to reply to the gentleman from Missisippi with reference to his statements as to costs of the project. It is true the cost seems high but they will raise on this project artichokes and cauliflower so the return from the irrigation project is tremendous. There is no question about it being paid back.

It is true, under the reclamation law, the interest is waived. That has been in effect for many years. But I would point out that under flood control, which costs far more money than reclamation, no interest is paid and no funds are paid back by the cities, the towns, States, and the communities. The Mississippi River has had hundreds of millions of dollars spent on it for flood-control purposes in order to protect various towns. I have no objection to that, but that money just is not paid back. There is no return from it except in the form of protection of property.

Under reclamation law people have agreed over a period of years to return to the Federal Treasury the money they borrow. It is not a gift, it is merely an investment in a resource of this country. We must remember that the population last year increased about 3,489,000 in the United States. Next year there will be an increase of 4 million and in 1975 there will be more than 200 million people in the United States to be fed. These irrigation projects, this one and others, which we hope to bring before this Congress, are designed to produce food to help feed not only our own people but other people of the world who are going to be in need of food. I hope the gentleman understands that. I am not criticizing flood-control money. However, I do have a critical note on the amount of money we have spent in foreign operations—more than we have spent in our own country for irrigation projects. However, that money has been spent. But here is a project that the people want and it will be paid for, and I hope the gentleman does not enter any serious objection to it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Again I will not quarrel with my friend. The gentleman referred to flood control and the Mississippi River particularly. Since I happen to be from that great State, permit me to say in reply that personally it does not affect my congressional district nor does it affect my State any more than it does any other States through which the river traverses. But the problem there is entirely a different proposition so far as benefits are concerned; not only flood control but the great matter of navigation. I just want to keep the record straight.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the rule provides for general debate on the bill and that there are no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2235) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2235, with Mrs. ST. GEORGE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Madam Chairman, the bill before you is the Santa Maria project which is rather unusual in that there are no irrigation ditches. It provides for the building of a reservoir on the Santa Maria River where flood waters come down, and then these flood waters are stored up and released to underground storage which, from a geological survey, has been established. The water stays underground and it is pumped out by pumps from this underground storage. It is unique in that respect, because every irrigation district in the past has had to have not only a dam and ditches but laterals to complete the irrigation project. This is a project in which the farmers and the town people have gotten together saying "Here we have a project that we agree through two sources to pay back to the Federal Government the cost of the project under the reclamation law." They do it through an ad valorem tax, not only on the town people but on the country people, the people in the conservancy district. Then they also pay it through a benefit tax derived from those who take the water from this underground reservoir. It was indicated that the cost was a little too high.

The cost is estimated at $16,982,000; about $1,500 or $1,600 an acre, to be paid over 40 years' time. But on this irrigation project they raise artichokes, cauliflower, and strawberries. These are small farms that will be able to pay back all charges because of the valuable crops produced.

On the question of whether it is feasible, the projects which come before the committee of which I am chairman are in many cases pretty close to the fringe edge of being feasible. This one is gilt-edged on feasibility. It will pay back all costs.

There are those who say, "You do not pay any interest, and this is a sort of gift by the people of the United States to those people who do not pay interest." That is true under the reclamation law. But I would cite to you irrigation projects, which once developed return many, many times their cost to the United States, through the introduction of new wealth. I would refer you to the North Platte Valley, Scottsbluff, Nebr., one of the oldest irrigation districts in the United States. That district has returned many, many times to the United States its cost. That would be arid land now if it were not for the fact that water was stored up in the rivers and used for irrigation purposes.

New businesses, new wealth, new taxes, growth of the communities, are directly tied to the fact that they are using water at the right time and upon good land.

Irrigation makes a difference between good crops and no crops at all. It makes a difference in the amount of investment and return to the United States in new wealth.

It is true that no interest is paid, that is under the reclamation law. I referred a while ago to flood control projects. Recently I looked at the new budget on flood control. There is about 10 times as much money in the new budget for flood control as there is for irrigation. I have no objection to flood control. I think flood control is necessary. But we have flood-control projects in nearly every State and flood-control projects do not pay back one penny to the people of the United States. They are a direct charge. These communities have too much water—we protect them and no money is returned to the Government. In the arid States water is needed; we build dams and pay for them.

The money is advanced for irrigation purposes as a loan to a community, which they pay back over a period of

years. There is little difference between too much and too little water. Irrigation law requires repayment of money—flood control money is not repaid.

Under debate on the rule, I said something about moneys spent under foreign aid. Perhaps we ought not to bring that subject in here. But, Madam Chairman, $53 billion has been committed or spent on foreign aid since July, 1945, through September, 1953. Foreign aid goes to 43 countries, to say nothing of our good friend, Canada, and South American countries. $53 billion-plus have been committed or spent, and not one penny is returned to the Government.

I recently found, by checking in 5 foreign countries that have been beneficiaries under that loan bill, more money has been spent since 1945 in those 5 countries than we have spent in our own country for irrigation, public works, and flood control. None of that is returned. Perhaps some of it is necessary but, in my book, we ought not to continue that type of program and neglect our own development at home.

I submit to you that this is a good bill. It was reported favorably from the Department of the Interior and there is a favorable report from the Bureau of the Budget, and that, I may say, is something. Recently a group of us visited the Budget Bureau. We found some 18 projects in 10 States have not received their approval as yet, and some of them perhaps are not as good as the project presently under consideration.

Mr. COLMER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Could my friend tell us how many farmers and how many landowners are affected by this project?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, sir, you will find it in the report on page 4.

Mr. COLMER. There are 331, I believe.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe that is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Three hundred and thirty-one people are affected. I have not gone into the mathematics of it, but 331 into 16 or approximately $17 million seems to me like a great deal of money to protect very few people and very few acres.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman might be concerned about it, but let me say the people of this area, the farmers, have examined the project carefully and they have agreed to accept the responsibility of the repayment of the moneys that are given for the development of this irrigation project. I might say also the people in the cities have joined with them because they recognize that they get some benefits when a growing, active community is developed. The city itself gets some benefits. So, they have agreed under a conservancy-district law to have an ad valorem tax to help pay back the moneys for the benefits that will come to that community.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Madam Chairman, I am supporting this legislation; as a matter of fact, I am a coauthor of this legislation with my friend and colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. BRAMBLETT]. Mr. BRAMBLETT's bill is the one currently before the Committee. His bill is H. R. 2235 and my bill is H. R. 2259. I introduced the bill in order to show my approval of this project and to give assistance to my colleague from California, and to give bipartisan support to a very beneficial and a very necessary project in an important area of our State.

There are, I think, some factual matters which should be before the Committee with reference to this project.

First, with reference to the history of the project itself, the people of this area first looked into this problem in 1921. A further investigation was made in 1932. A contract was entered into with the Bureau of Reclamation in 1941 with the local people paying one-half of the cost of making the engineering investigation on this project. The report of the Santa Maria project was submitted by letter of transmittal, signed by Secretary McKay, of the Department of the Interior, dated July 23, 1953. The feasibility of this project has been ascertained and testified to by the Secretary of the Interior, by the Corps of Engineers, by the Department of Agriculture, and by the State engineer of the State of California. The project was found to be feasible by the former as well as the present Secretary of the Interior. In early 1953 the President, by blanket order, requested that all Bureau projects be reviewed. This was done promptly by Secretary McKay, who also determined that the project was feasible and should be built. The Bureau of the Budget approved submission of the project report to the Congress by letter dated July 9, 1953, and so this project has been approved by every department or Federal agency which has had anything to do with it, including the Bureau of the Budget, which approved the project as one which should be authorized to secure appropriations whenever that should be in the interest of our country and permissible under the circumstances.

As to the principal physical features of this project, the project is designed to furnish supplemental water supply for the irrigated lands of the Santa Maria Valley, located on the Pacific coast in the northern part of Santa Barbara County. That is about 150 miles north and west of Los Angeles, for those of you who are not familiar with the geography of that country. The total irrigated land consists of about 40,000 acres. The project plan provides for the multiple-purpose Vaquero Dam, an earth-filled dam 184 feet above stream level, the dam to provide a reservoir having a capacity of 214,000 acre-feet. The proposed method of operation of the reservoir is unique in that no surface water is to be provided. The project water will be used to recharge and supplement an existing underground reservoir. In order to illustrate that unique feature of this project, I have asked to have displayed before the committee a map in which the general area is depicted. A line is run north and south and run east and west, cutting through the area north and south and east and west, with a quarter slice taken out to show the side underground elevations of this project. You will observe that toward the top of the map you will find a designation of what is supposed to illustrate the location of the Vaquero Dam. The water is caught in the dam and then is released slowly downstream. In other words, the stream itself is used as a canal, more or less. The area is very porous. As the water goes downstream, which a part of the year is completely dry, it will seep into the underground reservoir area, feeding the underground reservoir, where it will be stored and thereafter pumped out by the farmers through a pumping system which now exists in that area.

This project is unique in that particular, because there is no canal authorized to transmit any of the water from the project itself; that is, the reservoir itself, down to the lands to be irrigated.

Floodwaters will be stored in the Vaquero Reservoir during periods of high runoff. The reservoir will be emptied as soon as that can be done safely, and the water will be released into the stream for percolation into the underground storage just as fast as the stream bed will absorb the water.

Some people will say this is a unique way of building an irrigation and reclamation project. It certainly is. Every engineer who has made a study of the problem, including the Interior Department, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army engineers, and the State engineers of California all agree that this is a feasible method of handling this particular type of situation. Whether it is or not, the people of that area are willing to form a conservancy district authorized by State law, under which they can tax for the payments necessary to pay out the cost of this reservoir, and they are prepared to enter into a contract with the Federal Government to pay back some $14 million of the cost of this reservoir out of the tax revenues of that area.

Mr. D'EWART. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. D'EWART. Is this not the ideal situation: The water will go under ground and thereby will eliminate evaporation; eliminate canal loss, and make it available to the irrigators by pumping. Is that not an ideal situation in a hot country?

Mr. ENGLE. It certainly is. The people are generally surprised at the amount of water that we lose off of Lake Meade by evaporation. A current controversy before our committee is on a dam called Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. The reservoir losses are so high on other projects that might substitute for Echo Park that they have limited feasibility.

I do not have the figures before me now as to the annual reservoir loss on Lake Meade, but it is tremendous. When the water goes underground it cannot evaporate, so this is a very efficient project from that standpoint.

The construction and operation of the reservoir will accomplish these results. First, it will furnish an average of 18,500 acre-feet of additional water for irrigation. An acre-foot of water is sufficient water to cover an acre of ground 1 foot

deep. It will reduce the standard flood ratio from 23,000 second-feet to 150,000 second-feet. That is an important matter in that area.

These are very, very steep foothills, and when the water runs down in torrential storms it has a tendency to sweep the agricultural land out to sea, and anything that retards or catches that flood flow is, of course, of great benefit.

As to the cost, on the basis of October 1952 prices, the estimated cost of the Vaquero Dam is $16,982,000. This cost is established as follows: Flood control, which is nonrecoverable, $3,117,000; water conservation, which, of course, will be repaid, is $13,969,000; in other words, roughly, $14 million will be repaid by these people.

The repayment program: The project plan contemplates that the local beneficiaries of the project will be obligated to repay the reimbursable capital cost over a 40-year period—everything will be repaid except the approximately $3 million allocated for flood control. The balance, nearly $14 million without any other nonreimbursables, will be repaid by the irrigators based upon the revised estimates of October 1952, which amounts to $350,000 per year. Then the annual cost of maintenance and operation will cost the local taxpayers the amount of $391,000. In short, these people will pay something over $700,000 a year to maintain this project and to pay out the capital investment in it; and they consider themselves sufficiently able to do that and perfectly willing, as I said before, to undertake repayment of this project on the basis of a new conservancy tax district which will not only tax the actual beneficiaries of the project in the agricultural area but will also—which is unusual—place a tax upon the city dwellers who gain considerably from any agricultural development around that area. Santa Maria, which is a little city of about 12,000 people and which you see designated on one of these maps, will also make a contribution toward paying out this project.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I previously asked the gentleman a number of questions. Do I understand the gentleman to say that this conservancy district is not yet in being?

Mr. ENGLE. The conservancy district is authorized.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Already?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes; by a law passed by the State legislature specifically for this area.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Another question: Did the Secretary of the Interior recommend this exemption from the land limitations or not? What is his attitude toward this exemption from the land limitations?

Mr. ENGLE. The Secretary of the Interior did not recommend taking off the land limitation. We took it off. They voiced no objection. We took it off after we had worked for 2 months trying to work out an amendment which would adapt the 160-acre limitation to underground water. I was going to discuss that particular aspect of this project in just a moment.

Mr. HAGEN of California. What would be a fair statement of the position of the Secretary on this matter?

Mr. ENGLE. A fair statement is that noted in the report: The Secretary of the Interior did not interpose any objection to lifting the 160-acre limitation in this instance.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Another question: There has been a lot of agitation in the State of California for the State to take over existing Federal reclamation projects, and I do not know whether any of this agitation comes from this particular area we are talking about, but was any effort made on the part of the beneficiaries of this legislation to secure a State appropriation for the building of this project

Mr. ENGLE. As far as I know there was not; and, of course, if the State built the project it would not be built under the reclamation law and would not therefore benefit by the relief from interest payments as provided in the 50-year-old Federal law.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Have they made any effort to solve their problem locally?

Mr. ENGLE. They made all the effort that local people could make. They put up half of the money required to make the engineering survey; they taxed themselves for that, but it was stated before the committee, and it is undoubtedly true, that building this project ab initio and paying interest on the capital investment is beyond the financial capacity of this area.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Am I correct in assuming that the State engineer's office in California has recommended this Federal construction?

Mr. ENGLE. That is true. The State engineer has approved this project and has approved, too, in its broad aspects at least, the engineering features of the project.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Has the State water authority approved it?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes. I think there is a resolution on record to that effect. I cannot put my finger on it now, but I am sure the water authority has approved the project.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Would it be safe to say that both the water authority and the State engineer's office in California are still interested in securing this Federal reclamation activity in California?

Mr. ENGLE. Very apparently that is the case, yes, and I hope they will continue to be.

Mr. HAGEN of California. From their actions, then, it would be reasonable to conclude that the State has no interest in building this particular project?

Mr. ENGLE. No; the State does not have. The local people have not asked the State to build it for the reasons I have just stated, namely, if the State builds the project the interest-free Federal money which is available under the reclamation law would not be available for this project. If they had to pay interest on this money, they would have to pay back something like $30 million instead of $14 million.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Does the gentleman know whether the land ownerships there could stand that kind of a charge?

Mr. ENGLE. According to the testimony given before our committee, it could not.

Mr. HAGEN of California. The exemption of the acreage limitation provision of the Federal reclamation law is based on the hypothesis that because this water will not be used as gravity surface flow in irrigation there is a justifiable exemption.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I recognize that there are difficulties in policing underground water. As I understand it, there is no contract entered into between the Federal Government and anybody as of this date, so that if these users should welsh on their repayment contract, how would it be possible to establish how much water they were receiving for which there is a continuing enforcible obligation? Is there any lien on the lands or anything like that established on behalf of the Federal Government?

Mr. ENGLE. No. What these people have done is formed a district which has the power to levy taxes, embracing these 40,000 acres, called a water conservancy district under a special act authorizing them to do so by the State legislature. Under the legislative act, that district has the power to levy two types of charges. One is a general charge against everybody and the other is a special benefit charge which, of course, is merely an estimate of what benefits are received.

The contracts with the Federal Government will be made by this legally established agency which pledges the general tax revenues of the district. In short, the Federal Government does not have to look to any single landowner, as is done in the ordinary case. As the gentleman knows, in the San Joaquin Valley the irrigation district makes a contract with the Bureau of Reclamation, or perhaps even an individual farmer in some cases might make a contract with the Bureau of Reclamation to pay for water actually received. In this instance this district, like a county—except it is not a county, it is a different sort of legal entity—enters into a single contract with the Bureau of Reclamation to pay $350,000 a year for 40 years to repay the capital costs of this structure. So the Federal Government does not have to argue with anybody as to how much water went underground and whether it comes from this irrigation project.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Will not the district, if it levies this charge on a benefit basis, have the same problem that the Federal Government would have in trying to police an acreage limitation on this underground water? In other words, you are shifting the status to the local district and taking it away from the Federal Government.

Mr. ENGLE. No; I cannot agree with that because the area within the framework of this project will benefit. Any farmer out there will benefit to a certain extent and will pay a stated charge of

some sort for that benefit. But it has no direct application to specific water. The reason the 160-acre limitation cannot be applied in this case is because you have no way of tracing that water after it goes underground. The fellows who have excess acreage in this instance—and there are the three owners on the west side of the Santa Maria Valley who have the big part of the land—they are the fellows who have the good water supply. Their supply is good for another 20 years, at least. They are willing to come in and pay their share, because they think this project will firm up their water supply and prevent it from dropping any further. These fellows around Santa Maria on the eastern side of the valley keep shoving their pumps down, and little by little they are sucking out all the water. The fellow on the west side has a pretty good supply of water now, and he thinks that if this project is put in, that he gets benefits, because his water supply is firmed up, even though none of the water stored at Vaquero Dam would ever get on the west side and get into his pumps. There is the problem of applying the 160-acre limitation. There is no economic pressure which can be exerted to get those fellows in. They can stay outside the district and put the pumps down anyway. The 160-acre limitation is not being enforced with reference to underground waters because it is impossible to do so and that is why we have made this specific exemption in this case.

As far as I am personally concerned, being one who has supported the 160-acre limitation, or some sort of limitation which will give an equitable distribution of tax-subsidized and power revenue-subsidized water, I have agreed to this exemption for the reason that we cannot find any practical way to apply the 160-acre limitation. We wrestled with this problem for 2 months. The best attorneys sent back here from Santa Barbara County consulted with the Department of the Interior lawyers and tried to work out something, and finally they all threw up their hands and quit.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Let us say that the district adopted a policy of assessment on the basis of benefits and they say that Farmer Jones will not owe $20 per acre for this year. He says, "Well, I do not think the water I am pumping out comes from this dam site, and I am not going to pay that much." Now, what steps are open to the district to prove that Farmer Jones is getting $20 of benefit per acre? I think you have just shifted the problem.

Mr. ENGLE. No. The payment that he makes is small enough so that for any improvement there is in the water level he is not paying too much for it, whereas if you tried to put it on a 160-acre limitation it requires these owners to sell their so-called excess land. If you force on the 160-acre limitation, you put the case in a position where those fellows will stay outside of the bounds of the district, put their pumps down, and pump water anyway.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I just want to comment that the charge is accepted by the landowner and is a lien against his land, and he must pay it. There is no way for him to escape paying it.

Mr. ENGLE. That is right. They pay it by mutual agreement. It is a lot different than telling some fellow he has to break up his ownership and sell it.

Mr. SCHENCK. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I am honored to represent the Third District of Ohio which is a part of the Ohio Conservancy District. In that district there were a number of dams constructed which cost about $30 million some 25 years ago. The cost of these dams was all assessed against the benefiting property on a basis of benefit, and appraisals before and after. Now, the bonds were issued by the district under the Ohio laws and were paid for from these benefits. Would it not be possible to do that same thing in California?

Mr. ENGLE. I think it would. And that is what they are doing here, substantially.

Mr. SCHENCK. If that could be done in California, then why should the Congress of the United States be asked for an authorization of appropriation of almost $17 million?

Mr. ENGLE. Because, when you put the interest on top of the capital investment, the ability of this area to carry the cost is lacking. It is beyond their financial capabilities. In other words, the thing that makes this reclamation program beneficial to these people is the interest-free money. As I said a few minutes ago, they have to pay back $14 million, which is the actual capital cost the Federal Government is putting into this project. In other words, Uncle Sam is getting his money back, but if they had to go out and bond themselves for that, they might have to pay 2½ percent or 3 percent interest. They cannot pay that much.

Mr. SCHENCK. The point is that the United States Government will have to pay interest on that money. So the interest on this project is being paid by all taxpayers of the United States, and it would seem to me that the benefited property owners should pay that, as they did in the Miami Valley.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman is arguing that the basic premise of the reclamation law is wrong. As I said to the gentleman from Mississippi not so long ago, if that is true, let us have a bill in here to repeal it. But as long as it exists, the people out in my State and elsewhere in the West think they have the right to take advantage of it and receive the benefits of it, as the West has for a period of 50 years.

I will say to the gentleman that the reason that the Federal Government over these years has been willing to put up interest-free money is because the taxpaying capacity of that area is so improved by making water available, in the long run the taxpayers of the Nation as a whole get their money back.

Let us take California, for instance. We pay nearly 10 percent of the total taxes paid into the United States Treasury. We pay a large portion of that from the great Central Valley project area in which the Federal Government has invested something like $400 million, a large part of it in interest-free money. That is the basic premise of that law. I do not believe we ought to argue the merits of the basic reclamation law on this particular project. We say that we fall within it. Without it we could not build the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. I yield myself 5 additional minutes, and yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. I think in addition we should state, in regard to this interest-free money, that originally it was interest-free because the money that went into the reclamation fund came from the public lands in public-land States, by the sale of public lands in the public-land States, by revenues from minerals, oil resources, and other revenues from those public lands. Originally it did not come out of the Treasury. Originally it came out of the sale of assets in these public lands, and therefore the Congress recognized that since that money came from those public lands, there was some justice in returning the money derived from their own resources for the development of other resources in the same State without the payment of interest.

Mr. ENGLE. That is perfectly true. In addition to that, as has already been pointed out, flood control cost is completely nonreimbursable. It is a gift from the Federal Government. What is the difference between too much water on land and not enough water on land? Both of those situations are the result of the weather. In the far West, in the arid West, we suffer because we do not have enough water on the land. In the East, where those torrential rains occur, you suffer because you have too much water on the land. The Federal Government goes in and takes care of a condition of too much water and builds the dams and other public works necessary to protect your property. But in the far West, where we suffer from a reverse of that weather condition, the Federal Government comes along and says, "Yes, Mr. Farmer, we are willing to build the project to take care of the fact that the weather is in reverse, but we ask you to pay back to the Federal Government every dime of capital invested."

All we do is put up the interest. That has been the law for a long time. But those of us in the West think there is a little incongruity in soaking us for a condition of the weather when in the East conditions of the weather are taken care of without reimbursement, and for free.

Mr. SHELLEY. With reference to the exception of the application of the 160-acre limitation in this bill, is the basis for that exception as proposed by the committee simply on the ground that underground waters only are involved?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. Yes; that is perfectly correct. As I said to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] a few moments ago, as a matter of fact

the 160-acre limitation as applied to underground waters is not now being enforced in the Central Valley project because of the practical problem and complete infeasibility of tracing water after it gets underground.

Mr. SHELLEY. But the 160-acre limitation is enforced steadily as applied to surface distribution of water, is it not?

Mr. ENGLE. That is right.

Mr. SHELLEY. May I then say to the gentleman and to the committee that I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk, an amendment to the committee's amendment which will limit any exception in this project to the distribution of underground seepage water, and if there is any surface distribution on the project, the 160-acre limitation would apply.

Mr. ENGLE. May I say to the gentleman that I have seen the language of his proposed amendment, and as far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection to it. It was considered in our committee this morning, and I believe our committee would be willing to accept the amendment because we have no intention of establishing a precedent against applying the 160-acre limitation as applied to surface waters. We have no intention of establishing a precedent by this legislation.

Mr. SHELLEY. The gentleman has already, in effect, answered one question that I had in mind, and there was one more question that I was going to ask him. In the gentleman's opinion, would the exception of the application of the 160-acre limitation to the distribution of underground waters in this project establish a precedent which might be detrimental to the continuance of the 160-acre limitation law?

Mr. ENGLE. I do not believe it does, because as I have said to the gentleman the 160-acre limitation is not now being enforced in any reclamation project in the country that I know of with reference to underground waters.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Madam Chairman, in fear that the recent deluge of mail to Capitol Hill with reference to the Dinosaur National Monument might somehow become confused with this issue, I want to make it clear that the project before the House today is one located in Santa Maria, Calif., while the one that you have been receiving mail about is one located in Utah. So you may want to hold your fire on that angle until it gets out of the Committee on the Interior.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I might inform the gentleman there has been a great deal of misinformation distributed concerning Echo Park, particularly a statement made by a group known as the Sierra Club of California and distributed to all Members of the House.

Mr. HOSMER. Madam Chairman, the Santa Maria Valley, the project which is under discussion before the House today, is one of those little emeralds that we have along the coast of California. It is a beautiful farming community. It depends, as do the rest of the farming communities, in fact our entire State depends, on the lifestream of water. This is true not only of California but true of many other areas in the West. Our whole economic community in the West, and not simply farms, revolves around water. It was mentioned earlier in this debate, there are only 331 farms involved in this so why should we go to all this trouble for that small number of farms? But later it was mentioned that this whole valley and its population of some 12,000 in the city of Santa Maria, and all the way through, is an economic unit, and the water in question not only irrigates the farms but it supplies water for the city, for the municipality, and for every other use there. As a consequence, it is not merely 331 individual farms. It is not to be judged and evaluated in the cost of $1,500 an acre, based on some 30,000 irrigable acres, but it is to be evaluated and divided into dollars and cents on the basis of this whole community. As such, you can see what the people of that community think of this project and how they evaluate it when they say, "We will not only tax ourselves for the beneficial use of the water, but the whole area will impose an ad valorem tax to pay back to the United States Government the cost of this project."

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it also the gentleman's understanding that the Santa Maria area is in danger from salt water seepage?

Mr. HOSMER. Yes. The gentleman shows his usual acute interest in California's water. This is a coastal area. When you go out under the ocean you have a lot of salt water pushing down. When you have an underground reservoir you have fresh water pushing down. Where those two meet there is somewhat of a balance. If you take out from the fresh water reservoir, under the ground water, the pressure is actually reduced on the ground side, and it permits the seepage of salt water to come in. There are only 27,000 acres that can be irrigated, although there are over 30,000 acres that should be under irrigation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Then the gentleman would agree, in order to save the existing economy, this project is necessary?

Mr. HOSMER. That is right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that that is the situation we have in Arizona. It is hoped that at the proper time, the same courtesy would be given the gentleman from Arizona by his colleague from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I guarantee the gentleman that Arizona will always receive our very loving attention.

But the point of the gentleman's question was that there is absolute necessity in the use of water along coastal areas, and even farther inland, in the drier States like Arizona, to be careful that your fresh water is not contaminated either by sea water or by any other means.

This project is one of those that would help that along.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Madam Chairman, at the risk of appearing thin-skinned, I ask the indulgence of the House while I answer a letter which has been sent to each Member of Congress by an officer of the Los Angeles chapter of the Sierra Club. For the information of the Members, the Sierra Club is a predominantly Californian conservation organization which is showing a great deal of interest in Utah scenery, particularly when that scenery is involved in projects which will permit four upper Colorado River States to use their share of the water of the river.

This letter, signed by Dan L. Thrapp, of Los Angeles, accuses me by name of sending out a letter containing—and I quote—"information which is out of date, misleading, and at variance with the facts."

If the issue were not so vital—the future of four States is involved—I would toss this canard into the wastebasket. But two Secretaries of the Interior, Douglas McKay and Oscar E. Chapman, his predecessor, have decided that the construction of Echo Park Dam within Dinosaur National Monument is necessary for the full development of the water resources of these States, and for this reason, I feel Mr. Thrapp's charges against me should be answered in full.

At this point I wish to insert a copy of my letter on Echo Park Dam which was sent January 7, 1954, to my colleagues:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1954.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Once again, the officers of some large and well-meaning conservation groups have launched an attack against the construction of Echo Park Dam within the confines of Dinosaur National Monument in Colorado and Utah. You will recall that this dam is a key project in the development of the upper Colorado River and that after extensive and comprehensive investigation has twice been recommended for construction—once by former Secretary of Interior Oscar Chapman and just recently by Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay.

The tragic aspect of these attacks is that they are made by persons who generally are unfamiliar with the effect of the dam on the development of the monument and that they are based upon emotion rather than fact. Perhaps you have been receiving letters on the subject from some of your people back home. It is doubtful that they have visited the area. Less than 1,000 persons have negotiated the treacherous river since 1869.

I do not intend to discuss the merits of the Colorado River project of which this dam is a vital unit at this time. But I appreciate you taking time to read the following statements concerning the dam's relationship to the monument.

1. Fiction: That the dam would flood the famous Dinosaur fossil beds.

Fact: The dinosaur beds lie miles downstream from the dam in a geological formation that does not occur in the areas the dam would inundate.

2. Fiction: That the dam would flood the monument and destroy forever its scenic value.

Fact: The scenic value of the monument is its colorful canyon gorges with walls rising perpendicularly up to 3,000 feet above the river beds. Construction of the dam would result in a reservoir between these walls averaging 200 feet in depth, hardly enough to affect the grandeur of the scenery.

3. Fiction: That the dam would interfere with the development of the monument.

Fact: The dam is necessary for the development of the monument which at the present time is 99-percent inaccessible to the general public. The dam would substitute still water in the bottom of the scenic canyon areas for rapids which now can be negotiated only under the guidance of experienced river runners and always with risk to the traveler, and at an expense of time and money out of range of the ordinary tourist. Sheer walls make the building of roads into most of the scenic area physically impossible.

4. Fiction: That the dam would invade the monument and violate National Park precedents.

Fact: When Dinosaur Monument was enlarged by Executive decree in 1937 from its original 80 acres to its present 209,000 acres, Park Service representatives promised residents of the area that the enlargement would not interfere with power and water projects in the river canyons.

5. Fiction: That alternate damsites outside the monument are just as good.

Fact: The use of any alternate site would increase evaporation loss of water—the arid West's most valuable resource—by from 100,000 to 200,000 acre-feet of water annually. The lower figure would provide enough water to serve all domestic, commercial, and industrial users in a city the size of Denver.

If you should require more information or if you have any detailed questions on this project, my office would be happy to assist you in finding the answers.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Member of Congress.

This attempt at reasonable enlightment brought the following answer from a spokesman of the Sierra Club. In fairness to us both, I ask that the letter be printed here in full:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 25, 1954.*

Dear LEGISLATOR: I have learned, through replies from lawmakers to letters I have written in defense of Dinosaur National Monument, that many of them are depending for their information on a form letter distributed by the Honorable WILLIAM A. DAWSON, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

This contains information which is out of date, misleading, and I believe at variance with the facts.

As a matter of fairness, therefore, I ask that you read the following letter before judging for or against the proposed Echo Park Dam which proponents want to place within the monument. Also that you make arrangements with the Wilderness Society or the National Parks Association of 2411 P Street, Washington, to see a 28-minute motion picture in color and sound, Wilderness River Trail, in which the camera records the canyons under discussion more graphically than any words of the proponents or the opponents. Then if you have any further questions I shall be happy to attempt to answer them.

Here are Mr. DAWSON's selected fiction items, together with his explanations, and my comments on them as a member of the conservation committee of the Angeles chapter of the Sierra Club:

1. Fiction: That the dam would flood the famous Dinosaur fossil beds.

Fact: No one ever claimed it would. The fossil beds cover only a very minute portion of the monument—although they have given their name to it—and they never were in any danger of being flooded. This point was created by the dam proponents so they could satisfactorily answer a point that never was raised.

2. Fiction: That the dam would flood the monument and destroy forever its scenic value.

Mr. DAWSON explains: "The scenic value of the monument is its colorful canyon gorges with walls rising perpendicularly up to 3,000 feet above the river beds. Construction of the dam would result in a reservoir between these walls averaging 200 feet in depth, hardly enough to affect the grandeur of the scenery."

Fact: The walls at their highest are some 1,000 feet high, not 3,000. The canyon walls are not the most inspiring part of the monument, nor do we wish to spare them alone, for that would be futile. The pristine loveliness of Dinosaur lies in the composition of spectacular canyon walls and riverside park areas, the bottomlands with their beautifully gnarled trees, grasslands—some of of them never grazed in all of history—the beaver cuttings and otter slides, the talus slopes and sandbars and above all, the sparkling, spirited rapids. You can't flood the canyons 200 feet deep without destroying those elements that make the monument worth preserving. To say that construction of the dams will not mean destruction of the monument is to rationalize.

"3. Fiction: That the dam would interfere with development of the monument."

Mr. DAWSON says: "The dam is necessary for the development of the monument which at present is 99 percent inaccessible to the general public. The dam would substitute still water in the bottom of the scenic canyon areas for rapids which now can be negotiated only under the guidance of experienced river runners and always out of range of the ordinary tourist. Sheer walls make the building of roads into most of the scenic areas physically impossible."

Fact: Mr. DAWSON's statements are simply at variance with the facts.

Last summer more than 500 amateurs—most of whom had never run any rapids anywhere—coursed the Dinosaur Rapids from end to end, with no hint of an accident, at no peril whatever, often with no "experienced river runners" anywhere within call and with no need for them on most stretches. The youngest person I know of was 4 years old; the eldest was 77. This coming summer a good many more will have this adventurous and entirely safe—with reasonable commonsense employed—experience. The expense was a very great deal less than it would have cost these people to spend an equal amount of time—a week to 10 days in most cases—on the highways, stopping at motels nightly as do most tourists. In short, a Dinosaur Monument vacation is a good deal cheaper than the average vacation for the average person, and he can spend as little or as much time on it as he cares to spend—from a weekend to a month.

Fortunately, the sheer walls where they do exist will, as Mr. DAWSON suggests, make the building of many roads into their canyons impracticable from the cost standpoint. That's why we want to save this perfect fragment of primeval America. He says the monument is 99 percent inaccessible. By that he means that it can normally be traversed only along the water courses. Take a look at a map of the monument and you will see by its odd shape that that is what it was created for—to protect the water courses themselves. That's what we want to do—and not by submerging their most worthwhile features with reclamation dam floods.

4. Fiction: That the dam would invade the monument and violate national park precedents.

Mr. DAWSON again handles his facts a little loosely. He says that when the monument was enlarged to its present 209,000 acres, "Park Service representatives promised residents that the enlargement would not interfere with power and water projects in the river bottoms."

Fact: Mr. DAWSON should be aware that Park Service representatives can promise nothing. They are encharged with administration only.

In the second place, the only part of the monument to which a reservation (that it might be used for other purposes eventually) was attached was Brown's Park at the head of Lodore Canyon, and since that was tied in with a project that has long since been abandoned, even that reservation no longer carries any weight. The big dams under consideration would not flood this area, and Brown's Park therefore does not enter into the picture as Mr. DAWSON must be aware if he has, indeed, personally investigated the matter at all.

5. Fiction: That alternate damsites outside the monument are just as good.

Mr. DAWSON says: "The use of any alternate site would increase evaporation loss of water by from 100,000 to 200,000 acre-feet annually."

Fact: The fact is that no one knows what the loss would be—no engineer, no geologist, no Representative—nobody. Not even the Bureau of Reclamation claims to have more than a good guess on the subject. Too many factors are involved. The figures Mr. DAWSON quotes are suppositions only, and from dubious sources at that.

The fact probably is that if the alternate sites were used, the added storage capacity would more than make up for the added evaporation loss, if any, but of course the point that interests Mr. DAWSON is that if alternate sites were used, the little Utah community of Vernal would not benefit from the dams. At least not directly.

Now, I would like to add a comment to the opening paragraphs of Mr. DAWSON's form letter.

He says "the officers of some large and well-meaning conservation groups" have attacked the dam idea. Well, in the first place, it's not the officers, but the whole membership that is adamantly opposed to these boondoggling schemes, and it is not just the Sierra Club that is interested, but conservation groups from coast to coast, very few if any of whom can be accused of having any personal irons in the fire.

Mr. DAWSON says "the tragic aspect of these attacks is that they are made by persons who generally are unfamiliar with the effect of the dams on the development of the monument, and they are based on emotion rather than fact."

I will wager Mr. DAWSON that there are more Sierra Club members with personal and detailed knowledge of the Dinosaur National Monument and this dam problem than there are citizens of Utah who know anything except political arguments about it.

I will also assert that our facts and figures will come closer to reality than those of the Bureau of Reclamation—many of whose figures are highly suspect—or those of any Utah crowd pushing this scheme that Mr. DAWSON cares to name.

Mr. DAWSON says that fewer than 1,000 persons have run the rivers since 1869. That, of course, is a guess. But 15,000 people registered at the headquarters of the monument last year and 2,900 have driven into the canyon areas. The important factor here, and a point that Mr. DAWSON neglects to mention, is that all but a handful of these visitors have come because the area was made a national monument, that the number of visitors is increasing by several hundred percent annually, and that, intelligently exploited, the monument can and will become the great attraction between the Grand Canyon-Bryce-Zion system of parks to the south and the Yellowstone-Teton-Glacier areas to the north. If he

could but appreciate it, this monument, if properly developed (and that does not mean flooded out of existence), could mean more to Vernal and the rest of eastern Utah than any system of dams yet envisioned.

The gravest aspect of this entire business, of course, is that factor Mr. DAWSON waves off—the threat to the whole national park system. Pressures are mounting against Grand Canyon, Glacier, and a good many others. If we give in on Dinosaur nothing, but nothing, can prevent the piecemeal despoliation of all our national parks. I oppose that, and I'm sure you do, too.

Sincerely yours,

DAN L. THRAPP.

I do not intend to rehash all the argumentative points raised in Mr. Thrapp's letter. They were amply covered during hearings before the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee last week. But I do intend to nail down some of Mr. Thrapp's alleged factual statements. Then the House can judge who is distributing "misleading" information "at variance with the facts."

At point 1, I am accused of setting up a strawman. I am pleased to hear that the conservation groups now all agree that the construction of Echo Park Dam would not flood the Dinosaur quarry. This was not the case when the project was first attacked in 1950 by misinformed members of the conservation groups.

Now for point 2 in the Thrapp letter. Mr. Thrapp challenges my figures concerning the height of the canyon walls. I use the phrase "up to 3,000 feet." He says:

The walls at their highest are some 1,000 feet high, not 3,000.

Who is correct? Which statement is factual?

Here is a descriptive paragraph from Dinosaur National Monument, the official descriptive folder of the monument published by the National Park Service:

Between high vertical walls of tilted strata that represent millions of years of geologic processes, the Green River flows on its turbulent way toward its junction with the Colorado. Thus has been formed through countless centuries of erosive action the magnificent and colorful Canyon of Lodore, more than 2,000 feet deep in places.

Here is a statement of G. E. Untermann, the geologist who mapped the monument for the Park Service:

Whirlpool Canyon in which the dam site is located rises 2,500 feet above this point. In Lodore Canyon, the deepest and most rugged of all the canyons in the monument, the average depth of reservoir water will approximate 350, while the walls rise more than 3,000 feet.

What is Mr. Thrapp's source for his quote "fact" that the walls are 1,000 feet high? He does not say.

Now for point 3 in the Thrapp catalog of misinformation. He challenges my statement as to the monument's inaccessibility. I say the scenic canyons through the monument are dangerous. He maintains this statement of mine is "at variance with the facts." Let me quote Mr. Thrapp at this point:

Last summer more than 500 amateurs—most of whom had never run any rapids anywhere—coursed the Dinosaur Rapids from end to end—

I emphasize, that he says from "end to end"—

with no hint of an accident, at no peril whatever, often with no experienced river runners anywhere within call and with no need for them on most stretches. The youngest person I know of was 4 years old; the eldest was 77.

Now what are the facts? The facts are that the Sierra Club members took the "dudes ride" through the monument. They made no attempt to see the most rugged and spectacular part of the monument—the upper canyons of the Green River. Mr. Thrapp said they ran the rivers "end to end with no hint of accident." At this point I want to read some telegrams I have received:

Congressman WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Park Service has no definite regulation regarding river running. Policy is to discourage such without experienced boatmen. Sierra Club groups totaling 180 ran Yampa River from Lily Park through Split Mountain, 75 miles. Some members disembarked at Mantles Ranch, Pat's Hole, and Island Park. No Sierra groups ran Lodore—Hell's Half Mile—Disaster Falls. No known Sierra members ran Lodore, according to Bus Hatch and Park Service official.

BRIANT H. STRINGHAM,
Vernal, Utah.

Note that the hazardous Upper Green River was not run, despite its scenic attractions. Also note that the dam would not affect nearly half of the 75-mile distance the groups, or a portion of it, traveled on the Yampa River.

Mr. Thrapp says that the group ran the rapids from end to end of the monument with no hint of accident, at no peril whatever.

What are the facts? Again let me read two telegrams about the trip:

Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I was employed as boatman by Bus Hatch during entire summer 1953. I was boatman on two of Sierra Club runs. I personally saved the life of one Mrs. Dot Pepper, a member of the expedition of last run. As result she sent me honorary membership to Sierra Club.

JOHN A. HACKING,
Vernal, Utah.

Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: As a boatman I have taken parties to Yampa and Echo Canyon. Can say they are too rough; dangerous for average boatman. The few who have gone through were taken by expert boatmen, who know every part of river, through the safest parts when the river was at the safest stage. Even so, there will be people killed in future as in past.

LYNN N. POPE,
Vernal, Utah.

Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Being an experienced boatman and having made several trips through the canyons of the Green River in the area the Sierra Club say is so safe. I wish to inform you that it is not safe for anyone, and only experienced rivermen should ever attempt it. I almost lost my own life, along with four others, on one trip. I lived in constant fear last summer while the Sierra Club was on their trips. Letter to follow.

WILLIAM H. SLAUGH,
Vernal, Utah.

Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I have run boats through all the gorges in Dinosaur Monument. Spring of 1951 I ran with the Hatch River group. This trip 2 boats were upset; 5 men were in the river for 1½ miles. I personally saved lives of 2 men. If this river is safe for anyone, it needs better boatmen than I have seen on it.

GRANT MERRILL,
Vernal, Utah.

Mr. Thrapp wants to protect the water courses "and not by submerging their most worthwhile features." Here are some of the features of what he maintains is the accessible canyons and which he would protect. This is in the monument's most ruggedly inspiring canyon. It also explains why this scenery cannot be seen.

In describing Disaster Falls and Hell's Half Mile I can do no better than to quote from Julius F. Stone's outstanding book on river passage, entitled "Canyon Country":

DISASTER FALLS

All who have passed through the canyon of Lodore agree that Disaster Falls is a bad rapid and that running it with loaded boats is out of the question, even though the portage over polished boulders to its foot is heart-breaking labor. Here mishap overtook the original exploring party, a fact which accounts for the name of the rapid. (J. P. Powell, the one-armed Director, United States Geological Survey, wrecked one of his boats here in May 1869.) Our party ran the empty boats through. With their ordinary load they would doubtless have struck slightly submerged or exposed rocks and been damaged or lost. The boulders are so large and numerous as to make traveling, even with an ordinary load, very laborious. Measurements by leveling indicate that the steepest part of this rapid has a fall of 5 feet in the first 700 feet, and 21½ feet in the next 1,968 feet. The water is shallow and the channel rocky. An island of boulders has been formed at the lower end which divides and spreads the water. About 500 feet downstream from the foot of upper Disaster Falls is a rapid called lower Disaster Falls. Here the water descends 14 feet in about 1,200 feet. Here, too, our boats were lightened before the rapid was run.

HELL'S HALF MILE

Hell's Half Mile is where the river tumbles with a descent of 25 feet in a channel beset with a great number of huge boulders. We found the lower end of Hell's Half Mile channel so choked with boulders fallen from the walls that it was impossible to get a boat between them. Here the Kolb brothers found that a cliff had fallen and scattered rocks were piled on both sides in a riotous mass.

Mr. Thrapp challenges my statement that Park Service representatives promised the enlargement of the monument from 80 acres to 209,000 acres would not interfere with power and water projects. In answer to him I submit the following affidavit:

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Utah, ss:

David H. Madsen, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says: that he is over

the age of 21 years and a citizen of the United States, and a resident of Utah County, Utah. That at the time the area of the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded to include the Canyon unit, I was employed by the National Park Service under the title of supervisor of wildlife resources for the national parks. Among my other duties I was acting superintendent of the Dinosaur National Monument and in that capacity was ordered by the National Park Service to arrange for hearings at Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., for the purpose of securing the approval of the citizens of that area for the expansion of the Dinosaur National Monument to include the Canyon unit. Meetings were accordingly held at Vernal, Utah, June 11, 1936, and Craig, Colo., June 13, 1936. A large representation of the citizens of the area were present at these two meetings.

Among other questions which arose was the question of grazing and the question of power and/or irrigation development which might be deemed essential to the proper development of the area at some future time. I was authorized to state, and did state as a representative of the National Park Service, that grazing on the area would not be discontinued and that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power and irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Utah and Colorado, that the establishment of the monument would not interfere with such development.

The first part of this agreement with reference to grazing has been carried out, and the residents of the area involved are entitled to the same consideration with reference to the development of power and irrigation at the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam sites, and any other development that may not unduly interfere for the purpose of the establishment of the monument and which is necessary for the proper development of the area.

DAVID H. MADSEN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March A. D. 1950.

KARL H. BENNETT,
Notary Public
(Residing at American Fork, Utah.)
My commission expires December 25, 1950.

Now for point 5. Mr. Thrapp echoes misinformation that alternate dam sites are available and challenges expert engineering testimony. Under Secretary of Interior Ralph A. Tudor, one of the Nation's outstanding engineers, testified on this question as follows:

I have been furnished with information on the New Moab, Dewey, Desolation dam sites, and have considered the possibility of increasing the height of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam. I am particularly impressed with the showing that any of these alternate dam and reservoir sites would result in a net loss of water from evaporation from approximately 100,000 to 200,000 acre-feet per year. Even the lower figure is enough to provide all of the domestic, commercial and industrial water for a city the size of Denver. In an area where water is so precious this is a matter of very serious consequence. Such lost water cannot be replaced at any cost and the ultimate regional economy would have to be reduced accordingly.

There has been some question as to the accuracy of the estimates of evaporation and the application of the formulas used to compute losses. I have reviewed this matter and, while there may be some error due to a shortage of experimental data, I am convinced that the calculations are reasonable and any error that exists is equally applicable to the calculations for all reservoirs. Therefore, the error in net differences in calculated losses between any two reservoirs must be small.

Then Mr. Thrapp exposes his ignorance about the needs of our arid States by the following remarkable statement. I quote:

The fact probably is that if the alternate sites were used, the added storage capacity would more than make up for the added evaporation loss.

Water cannot be created by storage, it can only be conserved. There will never be enough water to satisfy the needs of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Water lost through evaporation, is water irreplaceably lost. It is ironic that so-called conservationists should be opposing a plan to conserve the West's most precious and limited resource—water.

As for Mr. Thrapp's attendance figures, I can only say that the headquarters area of the monument—where the Dinosaur quarry is located—and where 15,000 people registered last year will not be affected by the dam. He already has agreed that the building of many roads into the canyons is impractical from the cost standpoint.

It is tragic that the development of a great national resource—as well as the opening up of a new scenic area—is threatened by such a pack of misinformation as Mr. Thrapp and some of his group is distributing.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Madam Chairman, I have no further request for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct the project for irrigation and the conservation of water, flood control, and for other purposes, on Santa Maria River, Calif., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior dated January 16, 1953, entitled "Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.," in relation to the Vaquero Dam and Reservoir and any other conservation feature of the project.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That in view of the special circumstances of the Santa Maria project, neither the provisions of the third sentence of section 46 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636, 649) nor any other similar provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall be applicable thereto."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Madam Chairman, I believe the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] intends to offer an amendment to the committee amendment. The full committee considered the amendment this morning and has no objection to it if the gentleman cares to offer it at this time.

Mr. SHELLEY. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHELLEY to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 4, strike the period and add "so long as the water utilized on project lands is acquired by pumping from the underground reservoir."

Mr. SHELLEY. Madam Chairman, when this bill was first proposed I was inclined to oppose it because I am a very ardent supporter of the 160-acre limitation law as applied to lands which receive the benefit of irrigation water developed by public funds. I think the 160-acre limitation which has been in our law for some 50 years or longer has been a great boon to the development of the family sized farm in western lands particularly, and has certainly contributed to a sound economy in the development of farming areas by families. It has stood in the way of the large factory farm, or the corporation farm, as we call them in California, getting undue benefits from the expenditure of public funds and getting irrigation water which they could pay for with their own funds.

After discussing the proposal with members of the committee I realized that there has been a continuous practical problem as to the measurement of the underground water and earmarking from whence that water comes and to whom it goes, and how much is used. I have therefore offered this amendment to the committee amendment which will limit the exemption of the 160-acre law to the distribution of underground waters only, so that if at any time in the future there is any effort to distribute the waters impounded by this dam in this project by surface distribution, then automatically, as I understand this amendment and as I have been assured by those who have studied the subject, the 160-acre limitation will apply; and I am happy that the committee is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, the able minority whip.

Mr. McCORMACK. While this bill relates to an area which is many thousands of miles away from Massachusetts and my district, nevertheless, I have always during my years of service in the Congress been very much interested in the development of our natural resources no matter where located, and I have been a strong supporter of the 160-acre limitation provision of the present law, because of the many reasons stated by the gentleman from California, and for other reasons, to bring about as wide distribution of ownership as possible, as wide development of the middle-class people as possible, for that is very important in any government, and particularly in a democracy, and many other factors—the spiritual aspects being paramount.

I might say that when I first read this bill a doubt was created in my mind. I realized the circumstances justified probably exceptional action being taken in the case of this particular project, and it was my intention to offer an amendment confining the benefits of this project to those who are now the owners, but in a quick conference with my friend from California, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], he satisfied me that the committee had wrestled with that problem and they went into its many practical conditions.

I want the RECORD to show that this bill did not pass this branch—as I assume it will—without Members having thoughts in their minds and doubts in their minds as to whether or not some amendment should be offered to prevent, after the bill becomes law and the appropriations are made and the project is in operation, benefiting the people of that area, the gobbling up of these 160-acre farms or 320 acres in the case of community property, husband and wife. I certainly would not want to see ownership of these properties restricted to a few people; and I am sure the great majority, if not all the Members of the House feel the same way.

I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, for it approaches my state of mind, but even if it is not adopted I would be for the bill, because I realize the difficulties the committee has had, and I know the committee has done the best it could with a difficult project. I shall gladly vote for the bill even though the amendment offered by my friend from California is not adopted, but if it is adopted, which I urge, I shall vote for this bill with more satisfaction.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(On request of Mr. ENGLE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SHELLEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I have asked my colleague from California to yield to comment on the remarks of our distinguished minority whip. He is correct in saying that we wrestled with this problem, which is shown on page 79 of the committee hearings. We tried to write an amendment which would do precisely the thing he is talking about, and the Interior people finally threw up their hands and said they could not administer it.

I do not believe that any big corporation is going to come in there and gobble up these lands. The thing that will cause these lands to be sold and consolidated into major ownerships will be a depreciating water supply. When the water gets so low that they cannot irrigate the land in 60- and 100-acre plots, they are going to throw them together into 500- or 1,000-acre plots and dryland farm. Then we will get the big ownerships. When we put water on the land, we are going to get more people and smaller parcels of land, because it will sustain a kind of agriculture which will provide for a family on smaller parcels.

Mr. SHELLEY. May I say in conclusion that the discussion here has brought out one thing which I think is very significant. Throughout the years the Congress of the United States has rejected efforts to repeal or widely modify or emasculate the 160-acre limitation feature of the law. Time and time again it has been proposed by groups outside who wished that law lifted, but the Congress has rejected such efforts. I think the very discussion that has been had on the floor here today evidences a continued desire and interest on the part of the House of Representatives to continue the 160-acre limitation and this should be adequate notice to those outside of the Halls of Congress that the House will continue to maintain the attitude that it has throughout the years to preserve that law and to say that it works in the best interests of the people of this country, particularly the young veterans whom so many of us are desirous of seeing set up on small family sized farms in the West.

Mr. SUTTON. Madam Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Madam Chairman, it is indeed a pleasure for me to note legislation such as this before the Committee and before the House and the Congress. It is a type of constructive legislation I like to vote for. It is a measure that I wholeheartedly approve and I am going to vote for and support.

The reason I like this sort of legislation is because it helps not only that section of California in which it is located but it helps the entire United States. It is based on the same principle on which the Tennessee Valley Authority is based. Too many people in the United States are led to believe that when we build a project in California like this, the taxpayers of Massachusetts, New York, and the other 45 States are paying for the project. That is not true. It is a misconception. Just as the misconception about TVA.

This money that is going to California is being borrowed by the people of California and their area. The money that has gone into the great Tennessee Valley Authority is not being given to Tennessee but is being borrowed by the people of Tennessee and the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is to be repaid on a 40-year basis, just as this project is to be amortized over a 40-year period.

Such developments are for the upbuilding of the country and of the United States, not for just one section of California or Tennessee. It is to the interest of all the 48 States of the Union. It is a pleasure for me to see legislation like the TVA and this project coming before the House so that we may tell the people of the country that we are going to help America, not just one particular section, and that we are only lending the money which is later to be repaid to the people of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5:

"SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required for the purposes of this act not to exceed $16,982,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, MRS. ST. GEORGE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2235) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif., pursuant to House Resolution 416, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHENCK) there were—ayes 70, nays 16.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING HELP TO CONTROL THE LEVEL OF LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 426 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3300) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself, as the ranking Republican member of the Rules Committee, in rather a peculiar position on this particular measure. I regret that the chairman of the committee is temporarily absent from the floor on other official business and that therefore it is necessary for me to call up the resolution, because I opposed the adoption of the rule in the committee, while the majority of the committee favored this resolution which made in order general debate un-

der an open rule for 2 hours, 1 hour on each side.

House Resolution 426 was introduced into the House by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] and deals with a matter that has been before this body for discussion a great many times in the last quarter of a century, and perhaps for even longer than that. If I may have the attention of the membership for a moment or two, I shall express my own views on this measure and attempt to give you some outline of what it contains.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Works by a divided vote. It deals with the famous Chicago water diversion question.

You may recall that back in 1909 there was a treaty entered into between Canada and the United States, in which a number of the States touching on the Great Lakes were vitally interested, to control the use of the waters of the Great Lakes. The city of Chicago later constructed a drainage system, and also a waterway, by reversing the flow of the Illinois River and constructing a canal to connect with the Mississippi.

I know that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is more familiar with this matter than I, and I hope he will correct me if I am wrong in any detail.

There were great quantities of this water diverted, and the Illinois River and the canal were used more or less as an outlet for sewage from the city of Chicago. A number of suits were brought in the courts by various interested States and communities and also, as I remember, by private business concerns. The matter went to the Supreme Court. In 1930 there was a Supreme Court decision which restricted the amount of water the city of Chicago could take from the Great Lakes, especially from Lake Michigan, for the use of this Chicago sanitation and drainage district.

Ever since that time there have been repeated attempts made by representatives—I do not blame them at all; I can understand their attitude and their reasons—from the city of Chicago to get some sort of a law passed which would permit more water to be taken from Lake Michigan for use in this drainage and sewage system, if you want to call it that. As I recall, practically all of those bills in the old days were introduced by our dean of the House at that time, and our old friend, Adolph Sabath, of Chicago, then chairman of the Rules Committee. All through the years, from 1930 on, Mr. Sabath was never able to get his bill approved. As far as I can recall, the bill was never reported out of the Committee on Rules, his own committee, because there was a feeling that such a measure was not worthy of floor consideration.

All I want to say to you, and I am not going to get into the meat of the argument too much, is that almost everyone who came before the Committee on Rules in support of this legislation had some different reason as to why it ought to be enacted.

To my great amazement, one of our good colleagues and a very good friend expressed as his chief reason for supporting this bill, and why we ought to report it, was that one of his downstate Illinois colleagues in the House, now "getting along in age," as he said, "was reaching the sunset of life." This Member was very dramatic in his presentation of how his friend had described to him many times as to how he used to fish in the then upper reaches of the Illinois River, when he was a boy, and how he caught catfish so long that when he would throw them over his shoulder, their tails would drag in the dust of the dirt road as he wended his way homeward in the evening. He then told us how this friend of his would like very much, in the sunset of his life, to be able to go back to the haunts of his childhood again, and to again fish in the Illinois River, if we would just pass this bill and clear up its waters so he could go fishing. I, too, am heart and soul for that individual Member of the House, from Illinois, but there is one peculiar quirk in the beautiful story about this gentleman's desire to go fishing. It just happens that ever since this splendid gentleman has been in the House, he has opposed this legislation and he is certainly, as I understand it, opposed to it today.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman please identify that person from downstate who wants this extra diversion?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I did not say the gentleman from downstate Illinois was asking for that. It was a gentleman from the city of Chicago who suggested that we should pass the bill in order to permit the gentleman from downstate Illinois [Mr. MASON] to go fishing again. Of course, the gentleman who is now asking me the question has not asked for such an arrangement himself.

Mr. MASON. If I am the person who is identified as wanting to go fishing in the Illinois River, I wish to say I have opposed this legislation four times since I have been in the Congress. I have lived with this problem ever since it occurred some 30 years ago, and I have lived on the banks of the Illinois River, which is a part of this waterway, for 65 years. So I know it first hand. I know how I feel on the matter and I know how the other people feel down along the valley feel on this, and I shall express their views in general debate.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] confirmed the statement I made just a moment ago that, despite the pleas of his colleague from Chicago, he himself had always opposed this legislation and that he expects to oppose it again today. However, all I want to say, in conclusion, is that this piece of legislation is something all of us had better give serious attention to. It is a bill that we should not pass upon lightly, because there are two sides to the story. I do not blame any Member from Chicago for being in favor of something which will relieve their city's present situation. I do not blame anyone in a lake State, or from downstate Illinois, for opposing this legislation which will endanger the welfare of their States and communities. This is a very, very controversial issue.

The proponents of the bill seemingly have not been able to agree as to the real reason why it should be enacted. Each of them seemingly has some different idea as to the purpose of the legislation, and as to what can be gained by its passage. Let me conclude by saying to you that this matter has been a matter of controversy in the great Midwest, and in the lake States, for 50 years or more, and in the Congress ever since the Supreme Court decision of 1930. So this is not a new issue. Many of the older Members will recall hearing arguments throughout the years on this Chicago water diversion bill, which not only affects the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois, but many other cities and States as well. So permit me to again suggest to each of you that you give this bill your most thorough study and careful attention.

Personally I am opposed to the rule, and I expect to vote against it. I am opposed to the bill, and I expect to vote against it.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield briefly.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. The gentleman just made the statement that this legislation has been repeatedly before the House. Can the gentleman cite an instance where it was ever brought before the House?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. I said it had been before the Congress. Mr. Sabath has had similar bills several times before his own committee, and I attempted to point out to you that Mr. Sabath's own committee had refused to report the bill.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. The fact of the matter is that we agreed it was never reported.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have tried to point out that in the past the committees of this House would not let similar bills come to the floor of the House throughout the years. If such a bill ever came to the floor I do not remember it. Even Mr. Sabath could not get his bills out of his own committee when he was chairman of it. So, it does seem that other Congresses in the past have said such legislation should not be enacted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is a new bill as far as the Members of this Congress are concerned, but the purpose is not new and the contest which it seeks to temporarily resolve has been going on for at least half a century. Fundamentally it represents an issue which the Chicago area has sought to win in the courts, and having lost there, now seeks to avoid the courts' decision, and to circumvent the rights of the other riparian areas on the Great Lakes, by means of congressional action.

I am strongly opposed to this legislative attempt, and I base my opposition on four solid points, any one of which should be sufficient to call for the defeat of this proposal at this time.

First, this diversion could lead to irreparable damage and greatly increased cost for other beneficial users of the Great Lakes. Second, this attempt is inconsistent with the authorized survey of Great Lakes levels now being conducted by the Corps of Engineers. Third, the attempt represents a breach of a commitment to our sister nation to the north; and fourth, this legislative attempt flies in the face of firmly established precedent of the United States Supreme Court.

DAMAGE TO BENEFICIAL USERS

Undoubtedly this legislative attempt received its impetus from the high waters of 1952 and preceding years. At that time there was unusual erosion on the shores of the Great Lakes, which gave rise to the argument that the level of the lakes could be reduced without damage, in fact to the benefit, of the riparian owners of Lake Michigan and the other lakes.

As a matter of fact, this is fallacious. The cycles in which the levels of the Great Lakes run from year to year is well recognized. The cycle of high waters reached its peak as we know in 1952. Since then, however, the level of the lakes has been going steadily downward and we have moved into the low-water cycle. For instance, since the high water of 1952 there was a decline in the level of the lakes from 8 inches to 1 foot during the comparable seasonal period of high waters in the summer of 1953. The Corps of Engineers has anticipated that further decline in levels will be manifest during the summer of 1954 so that the accumulative decline will be somewhere in the neighborhood of 1½ feet since the 1952 high-water mark.

I am not unmindful of the statement in the committee report that the proposed diversion of another 1,000 cubic feet per second at Chicago would lower the lakes not more than three-fourths of an inch to 1 inch. It should be pointed out, however, that this represents and increase of two-thirds of the presently authorized diversion at Chicago. The diversion of water would be increased by 66⅔ percent.

Yesterday, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions and Military Construction, representatives of the Corps of Engineers testified as follows:

Lake vessels take advantage of channel depths to carry up to 100 tons of ore for each inch of available depths.

In terms of the highly significant Great Lakes tonnage, the reduction in safe draft of three-fourths of an inch on the Great Lakes would result in annual loss of carrying capacity of more than 500,000 tons. When you consider that 85 percent of the iron ore used in the manufacture of steel in the United States is transported over the Great Lakes, the significance of these figures becomes more apparent.

Nor can I overlook the fact that if the level of the waters on the Great Lakes is reduced, it will mean a vast expenditure for dredging and other navigation improvements in the Great Lakes area. It will greatly affect the required protection from water in downstate Illinois. These requests will come, naturally, before our subcommittee, and I hesitate to think of the magnitude of the expenditures that would be required.

It is true that the Corps of Engineers has given a very cautious approval to the temporary diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second at Chicago, but I think the real professional opinion of the corps was manifested in the testimony of General Chorpening before our subcommittee as follows:

Mr. DAVIS. A substantially increased diversion that coincided with the cycle of lower levels of the Great Lakes could be very detrimental to a great many interests on the Great Lakes could it not?

General CHORPENING. Any diversion of any consequence should certainly be looked upon with a great amount of consideration before being approved.

Yes; this is a serious matter, and it certainly should not be looked upon by the House as a mere experiment to see what will happen to the levels of the Great Lakes if this diversion is authorized.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The thing that bothered me in the hearing before the Committee on Rules on this bill was the experiment to which the gentleman referred. I understand they propose to make the diversion for 3 years as an experiment. Testimony was also adduced, however, to the effect that this rise and fall in the lakes travels in cycles and that at the present time we are in the high phase of the cycle. If there is to be made a 3-year experiment either at the high or the low phase of the cycle how would that determine anything?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is exactly the second point which I mentioned, let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi. This Congress has authorized a survey of the levels of the Great Lakes; we are making appropriations for it every year in my subcommittee. That job will not be done for 2 or possibly 3 more years. Certainly that ought to be completed before we authorize this thing that is looked upon as an experiment but which certainly will affect the results of the study which we have authorized and for which we are appropriating funds. It seems to me it is entirely inconsistent with the previous action of Congress.

Mr. COLMER. May I say to the gentleman—and I do not propose to make observations on it in my own time—I notice from the report that the State Department has filed a statement opposing this legislation. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on that?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman has anticipated my third point, which is that this does represent a breach of faith with our sister nation to the north.

The committee report contains a very thorough and well-reasoned argument submitted by our former colleague from Kentucky, the Assistant Secretary of State Thruston Morton, in which he points out that a joint international engineering board composed of representatives of the United States and Canada has been set up; that Canada has a very good record of cooperation with us in studying this entire matter; and the international joint commission has this matter under advice. It has not yet made its full report. Under those circumstances, the Department of State has said we ought not to take this action which is inconsistent with the present study by the joint commission, and has submitted its report in opposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I will be happy to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it not a fact that the Canadians have taken the waters of two rivers which normally flow into Hudson Bay and dumped them on us?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not sure of that, but I do know that the joint commission which is studying these two rivers and the great lakes to the north is also supposed to make a report on this entire level.

The fourth point is the one that was touched upon by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], in which he mentioned that this thing has dragged through the courts, or did drag through the courts, for 30 years, and then in 1938 the court set the present diversion level of 1,500 cubic feet per second in addition to domestic usage. The court has retained jurisdiction of the matter.

It is a very serious question, even if this Congress did see fit to pass this law, as to whether it would not be invalid and would not be so ruled by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Attorney General of Wisconsin has submitted a memorandum, which I shall insert with my remarks, on that very point. It is stated therein that it is his intention to carry the thing through to get confirmation of the previous decision if the Congress should make the serious mistake of authorizing this additional diversion at the present time.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I should like to clarify the point raised by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] in reference to the State Department. Last year for the first time in 40 years the State Department has raised a question of jurisdiction over the 1909 treaty. Secretaries of State Root, Charles Evans Hughes, Taft, and all of the Supreme Court decisions pointed out that water out of Lake Michigan was the concern of the Congress and not the State Department and not subject to international interpretation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is not what the decision in 1938 said. It said that the question of doing it for the purpose of navigation was a matter for Congress.

PENDING CORPS OF ENGINEERS SURVEY

In 1952 the Congress authorized a survey by the Corps of Engineers of the levels of the Great Lakes. This survey

is now in progress, and appropriations are being made yearly in order to carry it forward. It probably will be at least 2 or 3 years more before this survey can be completed. The authorization of the diversion at Chicago which this bill contemplates would be inconsistent with the previous action of the Congress in setting up a study to determine the nature and the effects of the cycles of the levels of the Great Lakes.

Surely it would be wasteful inconsistency for the Congress to take this step which would substantially interfere with the important study which it has already authorized.

BREACH OF FAITH WITH CANADA

The committee reports contain a very careful analysis of our commitments with Canada submitted by the Assistant Secretary of State, Thruston B. Morton. This report makes it clear that there has been the closest cooperation between the United States and Canada in dealing with the water levels of the entire Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway. It is not necessary for me to in any way repeat or attempt to enlarge upon the very scholarly report of our former colleague, Mr. Morton. Suffice to say that a Joint International Engineering Board composed of representatives of Canada and the United States is now in the progress of making studies with respect to any diversion of water in or out of the Great Lakes Basin, that Canada has made every attempt to cooperate. The International Joint Commission has this matter under advisement and has not yet made its full report. These circumstances, in my opinion, clearly justify Mr. Morton's conclusion that H. R. 3300 or similar legislation should not be enacted pending the receipt of the report and the recommendations of the International Joint Commission.

THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION

The committee's statement in its report that it is aware that the diversion of water at Chicago from Lake Michigan through the drainage canal of the sanitary district has been the subject of considerable controversy is certainly no overstatement. This matter was the subject of long, drawn-out litigation which extended over 30 years, and fixed the diversion at its present amount of 1,500 feet per second in addition to domestic use. A 1938 decision is clear, in my opinion, that Congress can authorize additional diversion of the waterway at the Chicago drainage canal only for the purpose of maintaining navigation. Clearly the court has continuing jurisdiction in this matter and if there is to be a change in the permissible diversion at Chicago, in my opinion, the place to obtain that permission is with the courts, not on the floor of the Congress.

At this time, I should like to insert, in accordance with permission previously obtained, a memorandum from the Honorable Vernon W. Thomson, the attorney general of the State of Wisconsin, in which he deals with the legal history of this matter, and a telegram which I have received from him, which telegram has the approval of the Honorable Walter Kohler, Jr., Governor of the State of Wisconsin.

In view of these four very serious objections to this legislative proposal, I hope the resolution which provides for debate on H. R. 3300 will be defeated.

MEMORANDUM RE: LAKE MICHIGAN WATER DIVERSION

The Chicago drainage canal was opened on January 17, 1900, by the Chicago Sanitary District without any consent from the Federal Government.

Prior to its opening, the United States District Engineer at Chicago had stated that it was a strange fact that the city of Chicago was proposing to expend some $30 million for the purpose of diverting an unlimited amount of water from the Great Lakes to the Mississippi without finding out whether such diversion would be allowed by the interest of the United States or of Canada. The engineer gave it as his opinion at such time that the proposed diversion would lower the waters of the Michigan-Huron Basin and Lake Erie from 3 to 8 inches, and would seriously diminish the carrying capacity of the large vessels which were navigating the Great Lakes. The engineer further pointed out that such a discharge of water would increase the current in the Chicago River and interfere with navigation in the river.

After the opening of the canal in 1900, various civic groups and officials along the Great Lakes filed protests and made personal appearances before various Secretaries of War to demand a halt to the Chicago diversion because of the damage inflicted upon the people of the Great Lakes States. During the course of the years their sanitary district made various applications to Secretaries of War William Howard Taft and Henry L. Stimson for permission for diversions of water of as much as 10,000 cubic feet per second.

When the sanitary district acted in violation of such permission as was granted in October of 1913, the United States filed a bill to enjoin the district from diverting more than 4,167 feet of water from Lake Michigan. This case was consolidated with an earlier 1908 case and then the cases were held in abeyance for some 6 years before Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis gave an oral opinion in favor of the United States on June 19, 1920. Landis resigned from the bench before a decree was entered and further arguments were heard by one Judge Carpenter. He entered a decree which was ultimately affirmed by the United States Supreme Court in January 1925. Meanwhile, in 1922, the State of Wisconsin not anticipating any satisfaction from the other cases pending, filed its original bill in the United States Supreme Court against the Sanitary District of Chicago and the State of Illinois to seek an injunction and against the continued diversion of waters to the Great Lakes. Subsequently Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and New York either joined in this action or filed separate bills against the same defendant. The action was heard by Charles Evans Hughes as special master, and in 1927 he filed his findings to the effect that a diversion of water of some 8,500 cubic feet per second would lower the Michigan-Huron Basin by approximately 6 inches and the levels of Erie and Ontario by approximately 5 inches. Special Master Hughes further stated: "I am satisfied that the evidence requires the finding that the lowering of lake levels of approximately 6 inches has had a substantial and injurious effect upon the carrying capacity of vessels and has deprived navigation and commercial interests of the facilities which otherwise they would have enjoyed in commerce on the Great Lakes."

When the findings and conclusions of law were reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (278 U. S. 368, 73 L. ed. 426), the Court stated that the complainants were entitled to a decree which would "be effective in bringing that violation (of States' rights) and the unwarranted part of the diversion to an end."

In commenting upon the master's opinion, the Court stated: "The master finds that the damage due to the diversion at Chicago relates to navigation and commercial interests, to structures, to the convenience of summer resorts, to fishing and hunting grounds, to public parks, and other enterprises, and to riparian property generally * * *."

The great losses to which the complainant States and their citizens and their property owners have been subjected by the reductions of levels in the various lakes and rivers, except Lake Superior, are made apparent by these figures.

Further, the Court concluded:

"In increasing the diversion from 4,167 cubic feet a second to 8,500 the drainage district defied the authority of the National Government resting in the Secretary of War. And insofar as the prior diversion was not made for the purposes of maintaining navigation in the Chicago River, it was without any legal basis because made for an inadmissible purpose * * *."

Though the restoration of just rights to the complainants will be gradual instead of immediate, it must be continuous and as speedy as practicable, and must include everything that is essential to an effective project.

The cases were then referred back to the master, who was directed to take testimony on practical measures needed for the disposal of sewage without the unlawful diversion of water, time for completion and to report his conclusions for the formulation of a decree. His report came before the Supreme Court again and the decision of the Court of April 14, 1930 (based on his report) is found at 281 U. S. 179, 74 L. ed. 799 (title of the case the same)).

In this latter report, Mr. Justice Holmes, referring to the prior opinion, stated:

"It was decided that the defendant State and its creature, the sanitary district, were reducing the level of the Great Lakes, were inflicting great losses upon the complainants and were violating their rights by diverting from Lake Michigan 8,500 or more cubic feet per second into the Chicago Drainage Canal for the purpose of diluting and carrying away the sewage of Chicago. The diversion of the water for that purpose was held illegal * * *."

Further, the Court stated:

"It already has been decided that the defendants are doing a wrong to the complainants, and that they must stop it. They must find out a way at their peril."

Implicit in the foregoing opinions is the point that if Congress has any power in the premises it is solely power to promote navigation in the Chicago River. There is nothing in any of the opinions that would justify a conclusion that Congress can give the waters to the Sanitary District in order to allow that District to avoid the expense of the construction of a proper sewage disposal plant.

The Sanitary District of Chicago has made repeated attempts to escape from and avoid the effect of the decree of April 21, 1930. The most recent attempt was a so-called request for clarification, Supreme Court No. 4, addressed to the Supreme Court in October, 1950, and this request was turned down by the United States Supreme Court:

Some 30 miles from Chicago on the course of the waterway, the Sanitary District has a hydroelectric powerplant at Lockport. One of the reasons that the Sanitary District wants to increase their diversion of water is clearly revealed by the following

clipping from the Chicago Daily News of Wednesday, May 8, 1946:

"BY DIVERTING MORE LAKE WATER, LOCKPORT CAN DOUBLE POWER

"The Sanitary District's turbines at Lockport can double their power output with a temporary increase of 3,000 cubic feet per second in the diversion of lake water.

"This estimate was made today by H. P. Raney, Assistant Chief Engineer for the District.

" 'Present output at Lockport is 8,500 kilowatts or about 10,750 horsepower,' Raney said. The Commonwealth Edison Company has a capacity of 2,000,000 kilowatts. * * * At present he said 3,000 cubic feet per second flows through the turbines, 1,500 diverted from the lake, and 1,700 from domestic water pumpage. About 200 feet is needed to run the locks.

"Lockport has enough idle equipment to handle easily an additional 3,000 feet of water a second, Raney said.

"Of two 7,500 kilowatt turbines installed in 1936, only one is in continuous use now. The other operates only a fourth of the time.

"In addition, there are four 4,000-kilowatt turbines installed in 1908, two of which are still in good shape."

MADISON, WIS., *January 28, 1954.*

Hon. GLENN R. DAVIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We oppose H. R. 3300 which proposes to allow the sanitary district of the city of Chicago to increase the diversion of Lake Michigan waters through the Chicago drainage canal. This bill would appropriate the trust waters of the Great Lakes, which are the trust property of the riparian States for the financial benefit of a single community of the State of Illinois, and would do so against the opposition of many downstate residents of Illinois.

The property rights of the riparian States were established and declared by the Supreme Court of the United States by the decree of April 21, 1930. This decree resulted from an original action brought in Supreme Court by the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and New York against sanitary district of Chicago and State of Illinois.

The objectives of the sanitary district now are the same as always: (1) To save itself the cost of a proper sewage disposal plant; (2) to generate electric power for its private benefit at Lockport.

The claim that this diversion will minimize high water lake shore damage is false. As of December 1953, level of Lake Michigan has already receded almost 1⅝ feet from the high of 1952 to a present level of 580.93 feet. This drop was predicted by Wisconsin officials at hearing in May of 1952, and further drop of 2½ feet in next 3 years is anticipated.

No claim has been advanced by sanitary district President Anthony Olis that diversion would minimize lake shore damage or improve navigation in Illinois waterway.

On other hand at current or lower levels, unnecessary drop of even 1 inch will decrease carrying capacity of Great Lakes fleet by as much as 1,800,000 tons of shipping in a single season.

Further, lowering level causes port cities expenses for dredging which for Milwaukee alone may reach $150,000.

Further, damages result from exposing pilings of piers, docks and buildings and exposing them to rot.

Lowest levels uncover mud flats along shore areas and become breeding places for insects, mosquitoes and noxious vegetation.

Low levels adversely affect Wisconsin port cities of Green Bay, Manitowoc, Sheboygan and Milwaukee, together with ports of other States.

Finally, we are convinced Congress has no power to take Wisconsin's water and give it to the sanitary district of Chicago; if legislation should pass, it would only place on Wisconsin burden and expense of going to Supreme Court to get it invalidated. We are fully prepared and intend to do so if necessary. Governor Kohler joins in the foregoing.

VERNON W. THOMSON,
Attorney General.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I admit this matter has been before the Congress a long time and I also admit, as is evidenced here today, that it is controversial, but the fact remains that this proposed legislation has been reported favorably by the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Rules has reported a rule. The majority of the members of the Committee on Public Works felt that this matter should come before the House. At a meeting of the Rules Committee the Rules Committee practically unanimously thought this matter should come before the House for consideration.

My good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, states that there is some damage involved. I have the greatest confidence in the United States Army engineers. This bill merely provides—

That, in order to regulate and promote commerce among the several States and foreign nations and to protect, improve, and promote navigation and navigable waters in the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi Valley, and help control the lake level, and to afford protection to property and shores along the the Great Lakes, and to provide for a navigable Illinois Waterway—

And so forth. Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why anyone should hesitate for a moment letting this matter come before the House.

The bill also provides:

That, as soon after the enactment of this act as is possible, the Secretary of the Army shall cause a study to be made of the effect, if any, in the improvement in conditions in the Illinois Waterway by reason of the increased diversion herein authorized—

And so forth. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will approve this rule.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEATING). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventeen Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 5]

Battle	Dingell	Fino
Bramblett	Dodd	Fisher
Buckley	Dollinger	Graham
Celler	Donohue	Gwinn
Chelf	Dorn, N. Y.	Hart
Chiperfield	Dorn, S. C.	Hays, Ohio
Chudoff	Durham	Heller
Cole, N. Y.	Edmondson	Hiestand
Condon	Elliott	Hinshaw
Dawson, Ill.	Evins	Hoffman, Ill.
Deane	Fine	Holifield
Jarman	Phillips	Taylor
Jones, Mo.	Price	Thompson, Mich.
King, Calif.	Radwan	Thompson, Tex.
Mollohan	Reams	Weichel
Morgan	Riehlman	Wilson, Ind.
Mumma	Scott	Yorty
Patterson	Smith, Va.	
Philbin	Stringfellow	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING HELP TO CONTROL THE LEVEL OF LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is only fair that the Members of the House should know that the bill now before them for consideration at this time had the unanimous support of every Member of the House from the city of Chicago, the county of Cook, and including Lake County in the 13th District. That included the Members from both parties.

I also want to point out in the few moments that I have that it is very easy to lift out of context a few words or a few statements and use them in the sense of ridicule. This bill is of such serious nature that I am sure you are not going to be swayed or carried away by any such approach. I also want to point out that in this case, as you consider the bill, you should bear in mind that Congress is not called upon to appropriate $1. It does not call for any appropriation. I also want to point out that the comments made so far about statements before the Committee on Rules that there are at least 4 or 5 essential factors involved in this bill that deal with navigation, with health, with lake storm ravages, with the control of lake levels, and in a general way with the health conditions of the surrounding territory and area where we are attempting to obtain this relief.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to point out that the adoption of this rule should not be affected nor should we be affected by that sort of an approach where the remarks against the bill are confined merely to speculation and conjecture. No one can tell what the elements beyond man's control will do in the Great Lakes with reference to causing damage and calling for the expenditure of money.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I do not know whether the gentleman has brought these facts out or not, but this bill has great significance not only to the Chicago area but it has great significance all over the Mississippi Valley. The gentleman may or may not know that during last fall the Mississippi River was at its lowest point in its recorded history, and despite that low depth—and it was actually fantastically low—navigation on the Mississippi River was maintained. It was maintained by using the flood control reservoirs which had been built all over

the Missouri and the Ohio and the other valleys of the country. But, we had reached a point where those reservoirs were just about exhausted, and if it had not been for the very slight diversion from Lake Michigan, we would have been in very serious trouble, indeed. Those of us who live in the lower Mississippi Valley feel that there is a necessity for greater diversion of water from Lake Michigan. My understanding of this bill is that it requires a complete study of the whole problem, and I commend the gentleman on the bill.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. The gentleman from Louisiana is entirely correct.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, so that I might show the close relationship between the various territories of the United States affected by this proposed bill, in the city of New Orleans all through last fall we were confronted by what we call salt water intrusion, salt water coming up the Mississippi River from the Gulf of Mexico. That was caused by an inadequate flow of water in the Mississippi River at the city of New Orleans, threatening our whole fresh water supply. So, again, your proposal, if finally carried out, would be directly most helpful to these areas in the lower section of the Mississippi River.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I simply want to say with respect to the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana that today he is in here complaining about not enough water going by New Orleans, and next week he will be in here complaining about too much. Now, this diversion is not going to be shut off and shut on to suit the water levels at New Orleans. It is going to be a constant flow of water down through that area.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. With all due respect, at least the gentleman from Louisiana seems to know what he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] said, I want to point out that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] at least predicated his remarks upon something tangible. He pointed out where this waterflow might be helpful under conditions existing in the Mississippi River. He did not confine his remarks to conjecture and speculation, or say what might happen or could happen or would happen.

In this kind of situation you cannot read the stars; you have to be practical and rely on the scientific knowledge that we obtain from what the Army engineers have given us.

In every project that has come before this House, we have taken the testimony and the analysis of men who are learned and trained in that particular sort of work or on that particular sort of project—irrigation dams, widening rivers, flood control, and so forth. In every instance the House has been willing to take the word of the Army engineers, except in this instance. Now some Members have indicated that they do not want to take the word of the Army engineers who say that this flexible bill is in order and that you should pass it and give them an opportunity to determine once and for all what should be done with this problem.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The gentleman says that he believes in being practical. Does not the gentleman believe it would be far more practical to wait until the study which this Congress has authorized, of the control levels of the Great Lakes, and which has been going on for 3 years and which has cost approximately $3 million, has been completed?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. What studies is the gentleman talking about? Does the gentleman refer to the study of the International Joint Commission?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I do; and also the study being conducted by the Army engineers.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. If the gentleman will take the time to read what the International Joint Commission is doing, he will find that its jurisdiction is confined exclusively to that of lowering the level of the boundary waters.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I think the House should know that this bill has the support of all Members of the House of both parties from the city of Chicago. It is a bipartisan bill, as it should be, because it provides for an experiment which our city wants to see undertaken, an experiment which should be of considerable interest to all residents of the States bordering the Great Lakes, as well. This bill proposes to grant authority to the Corps of Engineers to divert an additional thousand feet of water per second from Lake Michigan for a period of 3 years into the facilities of the Chicago Sanitary District, thence into the Illinois River, into the Mississippi River, to empty ultimately into the Gulf of Mexico. The need for diversion of water from the lake has been very great during these last few years. Properties on the shores of the lake have been battered by floodwaters at the highest level in the lake's history and damage of millions of dollars has been caused. Yet the binding force of an ancient decision of the Supreme Court of the United States has prevented any diversion of the lake waters to relieve the situation.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON] spoke a few moments ago about a study that is being made, urging completion of the study prior to this bill being approved. The gentleman failed to point out, however, that what he seeks is the very purpose of this bill, namely, to discover in a very practical way the effect of diverting an additional amount of water from Lake Michigan, to give information to the Corps of Engineers which it now lacks. The Corps of Engineers desires such information.

Furthermore, there will be no harm done to the proprietary interest in the lake of any of the Great Lake States as a result of the study proposed in this bill. The lake is now 5 or 6 feet above its normal levels. The maximum result of the proposed diversion will be a lowering of the lake by only 3 inches during the 3-year period. Obviously this experiment will not jeopardize their interests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this rule be adopted and that the bill H. R. 3300 be passed.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have lived within a stone's throw of the Illinois River for 65 years. I have lived within a stone's throw of what has many times been called the greatest open sewer in the world from the time the human sludge of Chicago was sent down the river by lake water flowing it down. So I know at firsthand something about this.

The first bill that was introduced in the Congress to ignore the judgment of the Army engineers and to ignore the Supreme Court decision was introduced in this Congress by Congressman Hull, the predecessor of our former colleague, Congressman DIRKSEN. I debated with Congressman Hull long before I came to Congress on this matter. These are the various steps. First, the argument was made by Mr. Hull and others that the water was needed for navigation purposes, and that the 1,500 cubic feet established in the Supreme Court decision and by the Army engineers is not enough. They could not make that stick. The Army engineers and the experience of the last 30 years proved beyond any shadow of a doubt that the 1,500 cubic feet per second is enough for navigation. Why we had some 12 million tons of navigation just this last year.

Their second argument which they brought up a few years later was that it was needed because of the sanitary conditions or rather the unsanitary conditions in Cook County and Chicago created because of the fact that the sanitary district of Chicago had wasted millions and millions of dollars in building bridle paths and such things and not building disposal plants. They were refused on that account because the people down the river said, "We do not want that unsanitary, human sludge forced down upon us." Because of the fact that they were refused at that time, they did then start building disposal plants and I am told now that they have between 85 and 90 percent of the difficulties corrected by their sanitary disposal plants. The result of our finally forcing Chicago to take care of their sludge is now being felt down the river because the cities down the river are now being forced by the State of Illinois to build disposal plants.

Then, their third argument was that this high level of the lakes was causing damage and so forth. It was at its high peak in the cycle at that time. Now that is beginning to go down so they no longer have that argument. Still

they come here with the argument to add 1,000 cubic feet per second to the flow for experimental purposes for a 3-year period to see what happens. The Army engineers have from time to time reported and recommended against any further diversion, and there is a survey being made at this time which has only been on for 2 or 3 years, but which will be finished in another couple of years, and until that survey is finished and the report made, there should certainly not be any action upon this bill. I am against the rule. I am against the bill and I have been against it for over 30 years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand this bill its basic proposal is that the Corps of Engineers, which we have held responsible for flood control and navigation over a period of many years, conduct a study of the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois River and ultimately into the Mississippi River; that during the period of the study, some additional diversion be permitted over and above that which is now permitted.

Frankly I think this study is one that is very badly needed. When the gentleman from Chicago was speaking a few moments ago I mentioned the condition prevailing all over the lower Mississippi Valley, the lower section of the Mississippi River, all last fall.

At that time the Mississippi River, particularly between the cities of Vicksburg and Cairo, had reached its lowest point in recorded history. The river was then being artificially fed by reservoirs located throughout the Mississippi Valley. Granted that the amount of diversion from Lake Michigan is very small as compared to the amount of diversion from the established reservoirs, nevertheless that diversion was most important in keeping the channel of the Mississippi River open.

In addition to that, in the lower sections of the river, unless you have certain minimum force, particularly below Baton Rouge, La., the salt from the gulf of Mexico has a habit of working its way up the river. Located along that river are many very valuable and important industrial establishments, all of which are dependent upon adequate freshwater supplies.

I do not intend to get into the fight about sanitation—I have no idea of projecting myself into that fight.

I do know that the Mississippi River, the Great Lakes, the Missouri River, the Ohio River, the great system of intercoastal canals constitute the central waterways of our Nation. I know that they are all tied in together and I know that what happens in this measure affects people living all down that river from Chicago to the mouth of the Mississippi River.

So it seems to me that in passing this measure, in asking the Army engineers and other related bodies, such as the International Commission, and so forth, to make this study to determine its effect, is a wise step and a sound measure which should be adopted at this time. Then we can be governed by the report which will be filed in due course.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my congressional district borders on the shores of Lake Michigan I have had some experience with the wide fluctuation, both high and low, of Lake Michigan in the last 20 or more years. I can vividly recall the disastrous lows in 1930, and equally vividly I recall the damage which resulted from the high water in the years since 1948. In an effort to accomplish a practical and sound program, to see whether it was feasible to control the wide fluctuations of the lake levels, I sponsored a resolution before the House Committee on Public Works to authorize the Army engineers to undertake a comprehensive survey. On June 10, 1952, the Committee on Public Works authorized the survey, and in the budget of the Corps of Engineers for the fiscal year 1953 money was appropriated for the furtherance of that survey, and each year since the Corps of Engineers has been given money to continue this survey. The Corps of Engineers tell me that as of June this year they will have preliminary findings available to give us some sound recommendations of the feasibility of controlling the wide fluctuations in lake levels. I am tentatively informed that it is practical and feasible for the Corps of Engineers to construct certain regulatory works which will prevent the wide fluctuations, high and low, of the Great Lakes. The fundamental question is whether there is a sound cost to benefit ratio.

Because this survey will not be completed in toto by the end of this fiscal year, and because the Army engineers are going to continue their comprehensive survey, it seems to me it would be wise to permit them to go ahead and not take any partial action at this time which would interfere with their long-range studies.

This bill by the gentleman from Illinois provides for a concurrent investigation with the comprehensive survey which is now in progress and on which 3 years of work has been done by the Corps of Engineers. It is difficult for me to believe it is wise in the long run to have concurrent investigations going on simultaneously. For this reason, if the rule is adopted I intend to offer an amendment to the bill, H. R. 3300, which will prohibit the withdrawal of any additional water through the Chicago Drainage Canal over and above that permitted by the Supreme Court decision until the Army engineers' survey now in progress is completed and their recommendations are submitted to the Congress. I think that is the only sound and practical way to approach this mighty serious and extremely involved problem.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I cannot at this moment; I am sorry.

I have studied this matter very, very thoroughly. There are some facts which we ought to realize. No one contends that the additional thousand cubic feet per second will affect the lake level more than 1 inch. The scientific studies which have been submitted to date by responsible authorities indicate that the wide fluctuations to a great degree are dependent upon evaporation and precipitation. However, the Army engineers do feel that it is feasible and possible to construct regulatory works. Undoubtedly control of diversion through the Chicago Drainage Canal would be a part of that program. The real question is whether or not the construction of regulatory works can be economically justified. No one wants us to go ahead and authorize something if the cost is unreasonable or uneconomic in reference to the benefits we, as a nation will derive. It might be unwise, perhaps, to rush into this until we have had all the facts from the Army engineers.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I understand this bill is in two parts: The first permits the immediate diversion; the second is an instruction to the Army engineers to study it again.

As I understand the gentleman's position it is that we already have a study in progress which this Congress has authorized. Does this request in this bill do anything?

Mr. FORD. I think it conceivably interferes with the one already in progress. One thing further, I fear that should we authorize additional diversion certain additional rights would accrue to various affected parties, and then the Army engineers would come up with some new recommendation modifying or restricting the diversion and then you would have a very difficult time revising those fixed or vested rights which have been newly acquired.

In 1952 I favored a bill of this sort. The Lake Michigan level was then at its peak. Additional diversion at that time seemed desirable, at least on an emergency basis. No timely action was taken by the Congress. Instead, we were able to get a comprehensive survey started. We lost valuable time when an emergency existed. Now let us not act precipitously as long as we are seeking a sound, long-range solution.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side back to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the adoption of this rule and I am also in favor of passage of the Jonas bill, H. R. 3300.

I would like to take the time allotted to me to unmuddy the waters that have been muddied up to this time.

Certain statements have been made which might confuse the membership,

such as the statement that the bill should not be before the House at the present time, the statement that "Sabath could not get the bill out of his committee" in 20 years, the statement that this bill "seeks to avoid a court decision," and the statement that consideration of this bill "ignores a Supreme Court decision."

Mr. Speaker, all of those statements should be set in their proper perspective. In a 1929 decision Chief Justice Taft in rendering an opinion about this diversion of water said: "In the absence of any affirmative action by Congress" the Secretary of War has authority to issue a permit for diversion only for navigation purposes.

The diversion here is for navigation "and other purposes," so, therefore, under Mr. Taft's opinion the matter comes to the Congress.

In April of 1930, Special Master Hughes, who later became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, said in his report on rereference of this matter, which was approved by the Supreme Court, that the final diversion of only 1,500 cubic feet per second "in the absence of competent action by Congress in relation to navigation imposing a different requirement."

This is a different requirement, therefore, it is clear the Supreme Court has always recognized that the Congress has the final exclusive jurisidiction over this question of diversion.

We are here purely because the Supreme Court said we should be here. The Supreme Court attached one other criterion for coming to Congress which was that the city of Chicago should complete its sanitary facilities. Mr. Sabath in his bill, and in every other bill that has been before us, had no right to be here because the city of Chicago had not completed its sanitary facilities. As of last year the Supreme Court edict has been met by the city of Chicago and the sanitary district has 100 percent completed tis construction program under the Supreme Court ruling. Chicago has the most efficient treatment of sewage of any place in the world. Many cities in the world have sent people to our plant to find out how to treat the sewage problem. We are treating it 94 percent efficient as high as humanely possible. I think that pretty much demolishes the argument as to why we should be here.

Someone spoke about the damage to some of these lake ports which may be occasioned by drawing off water. The Army Engineers showed that last year $34 million worth of damage was done to the shores and property of Lake Michigan because of the high water levels. So we have to consider who we are going to support here.

The thought has been left that the present diversion has caused the lake to go down 6 to 8 inches, and that this will take it down some more, leaving the impression with the members that that will bring it down too much. This is not so, because at the present time the lake is from 5 to 6 feet over the normal level, so that anything we can do to bring it down is going to be helpful in ending further damage.

Certain statements have been made about the Mississippi River. I heartily agree with the gentleman from the South in that respect, except I would like to put this in the RECORD: In 1933, 8 million tons of traffic was brought up the Mississippi River by barge. Last year 16 million tons. So whatever little water we can give them will certainly help from that angle.

Someone has mentioned that if we pass this bill there will be a "magnitude of expenditures." Outside of the Army engineers asking for money, there is no money to spend. Why? The city of Chicago has completed all of the locks and everything, and there is not a single penny to be spent for locks or for any other purpose. The Army engineers tell the city of Chicago when to turn off the water, when not to use it, and in flood times always cut this diversion so that there is no danger downstream of any flood being caused or being magnified by lake diversion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be given this brief time during the period of discussion on the rule, although I had hoped for full opportunity to place before the House ample evidence of the tremendous shore damage which we seek to alleviate and repair through this bill, and also some facts relative to other purposes of this proposed legislation.

I have listened to the heated debate with great interest. I cannot claim, as does my good friend from Illinois, that I have lived 65 years on the Illinois River or indeed anywhere else; but I have, in truth, lived 35 years on the shores of Lake Michigan and have constantly observed—especially during the disastrous winters of 1951 and 1952—how rising floodwaters along the lakeshore spread disaster to homes, to people, and to the limited park space which serves as the only recreational area available in the northern part of the city of Chicago and north through the 13th District.

I came into this picture 2 years ago when I personally helped evacuate a family from their home on the lake front at a time when the lake was actually surging through the basement and undermining the foundations of the house. At the same time, whole areas farther north in Zion and Winthrop Harbor had to be evacuated with great property damage and complete loss of living quarters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give some of the facts that indicate at least some measure of the damage caused by excessively high lake levels.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I am sorry. I have but 3 minutes and cannot yield. I would remind the gentleman, however, that the residents along Lake Erie have suffered equally from excessive lake level increases.

Now, to give you some facts about the situation in Illinois—facts which show our need for passage of the bill under discussion:

The report on the cooperative beach erosion control study of the Illinois shore of Lake Michigan, transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Army in October 1952, brings conclusive proof of the serious nature of the situation and the need for immediate relief.

In 1949, it was estimated by the office of the district engineer, based on results of an extensive survey, that the average damage to the lake shore within the confines of the 13th district would be $88,030 annually for the next 50 years. The estimated annual average damage to the city of Chicago alone is $102,000 for the next 50 years. I would point out also that this estimate was made prior to the present period of abnormally high lake level when damage has been so extensive. This present increase in damage is shown in a statement of the results of a preliminary examination report on property damage on the Great Lakes resulting from changes in lake levels, made in May 1952, by the Corps of Engineers. For a 1-year period—from the spring of 1951 to the spring of 1952—the total damage on the Illinois shore of Lake Michigan was actually $11,288,000. This damage, I repeat, was for 1 year alone during this period of high lake levels. The total damage on the United States shores of all the Great Lakes for the same period amounted to $61 million.

Besides property damage, there is another consideration—the problem of sewage disposal for the city of Chicago. Permission for withdrawal of additional water from Lake Michigan would benefit the residents of our area in the form of less expensive and more efficient sewage disposal and waste. I have been informed by Mr. Fred W. Trezise, the associate dean of the College of Engineering at the University of Illinois, that he has determined, after careful study, that the Sanitary District of Chicago could safely divert an additional 3,500 cubic feet per second, plus domestic pumpage, which would result in a marked improvement in the Chicago sewage system and produce a cleaner stream throughout the water system.

The bill before you today would increase the flow of water by only an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second and would direct the Secretary of the Army to study the effect, if any, in the improvement of conditions by the increased diversion allowed. A final report would be made to the Congress on or before January 31, 1956, thus allowing ample time for a thorough reconsideration of the problem in the light of actual experience.

It is estimated that the diversion of the additional 1,000 cubic feet per second would result in a decrease of only 5/8 of an inch in the current level of Lake Michigan. While this decrease is minor, it is my firm opinion that no measure which would provide even partial relief should be ruled out at this time.

This bill therefore not only deals with the alleviation of the problem of sewage disposal in Chicago but involves fundamentally the recreation, sanitation, and the health of an entire community. I cannot see why other sections would prefer a dirty stream to the cleaner stream which could be obtained by diverting just one additional thousand cubic feet of water per second.

Mr. Speaker, I have myself argued before the International Joint Commission in favor of the plan offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]; for I am equally interested in his proposed investigation of the problem of the high water levels of all the Great Lakes. This present bill however, seeks to put into effect not a duplicate investigation, but an additional study of the inland waterways, which is an entirely different proposition.

I would say that when you have homes and park land and good health and civic well-being disappearing before an onslaught of high water such as we have known in the last few years, no one should begrudge the city of Chicago the privilege of taking just 1,000 additional cubic feet of water, per second, of clean water.

May I, therefore, express my fervent hope that the House will approve this bill (H. R. 3300), which attempts, additionally, to afford some immediate and practical, if insufficient, help to besieged property owners, and to the cities and small towns at present helpless in the face of tragic loss of park area. This initial relief once granted, we must then go forward firmly in our effort to attack the overall problem from a broader base.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I am keenly aware of the problem which faces the city of Chicago, and I sympathize with the efforts to deal with this matter as envisioned in H. R. 3300. Unfortunately, there are several considerations which have not been taken into account in this measure which are, in my judgment, of overriding importance.

First, as the report which accompanies this measure sets forth, the Department of State and the Bureau of the Budget are opposed to it, and with good reason. This bill affects the waters of the Great Lakes, which, at the specific request of the United States and Canadian Governments, are now being studied by the International Joint Commission, with a view to determining whether action can be taken to bring about a more beneficial range of stage thereon. If, now, the United States unilaterally increases the outflow from Lake Michigan, it will hamper and delay the studies of the International Joint Commission, to the detriment of all the users of the Great Lakes waters, from Duluth to the Thousand Islands.

Moreover, such unilateral action on the part of the United States at this time may cause serious legal entanglements, involving both this country and Canada, which could impede rather than expedite an equitable adjustment of the problem at hand. For 45 years the boundary waters lying between the United States and Canada have been under the jurisdiction of the International Joint Commission, which operates under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. Lake Michigan, while wholly contained within the United States, is an integral part of the Great Lakes system and, hydrologically, forms a continuous body of water with Lake Huron, which lies largely within the Dominion of Canada. For the United States to increase the outflow from Lake Michigan without recognition of its effect on Lake Huron and the other Great Lakes to the east would certainly be a breach of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Boundary Waters Treaty.

I might point out further, that the development of power on the St. Lawrence River, which has been authorized by the International Joint Commission, is contingent in part on maintenance of the existing diversion at Chicago. An increase in that diversion at this time would create specific problems and complications, therefore, not only for our Canadian neighbors, but for all of the States which look to the St. Lawrence for power. The same considerations apply, of course, at Niagara.

There is a way out of this dilemma, Mr. Speaker, which I would respectfully point out. First, we should do everything possible to expedite the water-level studies which the International Joint Commission is now making. Within the framework of its findings and conclusions, we should then press forward toward the establishment of an International Great Lakes Board of Control, functioning under the International Joint Commission, which should have authority and responsibility to maintain these vital international waters at levels which will best serve all the users concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out before that our present policy of tinkering with the Great Lakes water levels, by building a dam here and authorizing a diversion there, without regard to the overall effect of these steps, has resulted in a multi-million-dollar disaster to the property owners along the Great Lakes shores, both individual and corporate.

We cannot, in equity and justice to ourselves and our Canadian neighbors, continue this haphazard approach to these international waters. We should move with expedition to create machinery that will insure comprehensive, farsighted, and responsible management of the levels of all the lakes. Such an approach is envisioned in House Concurrent Resolution 82 which is now pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The undoubted exigencies in Illinois which have given rise to the measure now before us make it doubly essential that we take action within a framework of international cooperation, and on a basis that will be equitable to all the users of the lakes.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point a copy of a communication which our Government has just received from the Government of Canada with respect to this important matter:

EMBASSADIE DU CANADA,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1954.
The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: On instructions of my government, I should like to draw attention to the House of Representatives bill H. R. 3300, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on January 11, 1954, H. R. Report No. 1100.

The bill would authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw from Lake Michigan, in addition to all domestic pumpage, an annual average of 2,500 cubic feet per second, to flow into the Illinois waterway for a period of 3 years. It also provides that the Secretary of the Army shall study the effects of the increased diversion so authorized and shall report to the Congress on or before January 31, 1956.

Although H. R. 3300 authorizes an increase in the diversion only for a limited period, the Canadian Government is of the opinion that adoption of such a measure and, indeed, any increase in the diversion at Chicago, would impair the power potential of the Niagara and the St. Lawrence Rivers and would have an adverse effect upon navigation in the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

With regard to the power aspect of the matter, the Government of Canada wishes to bring to the attention of the Government of the United States the fact that the proposed increase, if continued, would result in the reduction of the total power potential of the Niagara River and the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River of 39,000 continuous horsepower. On the wholly Canadian reach of the St. Lawrence River, the reduction of actual and potential continuous power would be 13,000 horsepower.

Any increase in the Chicago diversion will cause reductions in the water levels of the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence River and the Port of Montreal which will have a detrimental effect on Canadian as well as United States navigation facilities, particularly in the years of low stage in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system. The water levels in the Great Lakes system have recently been high but reductions in levels in the lower lakes and the river, would, of necessity, follow increases in diversion at Chicago by several years. It is evident that the proposed increase does not offer a source of relief from high water and that the ultimate lowering of levels could obtain at times when, in the ordinary cyclical nature of lake supply, critically low lake stages are being experienced.

It may be concluded that the beneficial flood protection aspects of any increase in the Chicago diversion would be small and short-lived; the detrimental effect on navigation interests would continue over long periods, and the damage to the power potential of Niagara and the St. Lawrence Rivers would be substantial and continuous. The Canadian Government wishes to point out, therefore, that in these respects, any increase in the Chicago diversion would be prejudicial to the rights and interests of both Canada and the United States.

As the Chicago diversion is one aspect of a matter now before the International Joint Commission pursuant to the reference submitted jointly by the Governments of Canada and the United States on June 25, 1952, it is suggested that the interests of Canada and the United States would best be served by allowing the International Joint Commission to complete its study of this and related matters under the arrangements already agreed upon.

Accept sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

A. D. P. HEENEY.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be a member of the Public Works Committee in the 82d Congress when hearings were held, for weeks, on this piece of legislation. It was reported out but did not get further than that. It never came to the floor of the House. It was reported out favorably again, I understand, in the 83d Congress.

I listened intently to the testimony to increase water diversion at Chicago into the Illinois Waterway, and I felt that those in favor of increasing the diversion from 1,500 to 2,500 feet per second made out an excellent case. The great preponderance of the evidence pointed to the need for this legislation.

If you read this bill, its purpose is to increase navigation in the great Illinois Waterway, where we need more water. That is one purpose. Another purpose is to lower the lake level which is much too high. Some are interested in that.

As I recall the testimony of the engineers, it was that the reduction which would be brought about by this 1,000 cubic feet per second could not possibly lower the lake level more than three-quarters of an inch in a year. Now, if it is 3 or 4 feet too high at the present time, I think we would be doing those people around the lake a favor by the passage of this legislation.

It would seem to me if this bill is enacted, it would help the Illinois Waterway; it would put fresh water in the stream, and make it better for all the people downstate. At the same time it would bring certain relief to about half the population of the State of Illinois, if you take the population of Chicago and cosmopolitan Chicago as well.

I do not appear in favor of this bill for any special purpose, because I do not live within 100 miles of the Illinois Waterway. But I was convinced at the time, and I am convinced now, that this proposed legislation has great merit. There have been engineering reports galore in the past. The committee members heard much favorable evidence in the 82d Congress. It would seem to me that we could afford to give this legislation a trial. The Secretary of Defense under the bill will keep watch on the increased diversion, and if he feels the legislation does not serve the best interest of all concerned, will recommend to the Congress to rescind the act. And if the Secretary of Defense reports it is advisable to cut the amount of diversion back to 1,500 cubic feet per second, of course, the Congress would immediately follow his recommendation. Why not pass this legislation and give it a fair trial? The Great Lakes have too much water. The Illinois Waterway does not have enough. This legislation would help in both instances.

I think the rule ought to be adopted and the bill passed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy today that the Congress has recognized the great plight of the State of Michigan so we may divert some of the waters of all the Great Lakes down through the Chicago Drainage Canal. I believe this to be in the best interests of the people whom I represent. The people of the State of Michigan alone have suffered a $30-million loss to private property around our shorelines.

This is not going to be a cure-all, but I do believe it is a step in the right direction.

We had meetings with the International Joint Commission who have been in the Great Lakes area to review the overall damage along the St. Marys River. On the basis of that meeting, the International Joint Commission have done nothing. Therefore, the Congress today has recognized the need to assist the people along the Illinois River and still bring about some direct relief to the people in Michigan. I am wholeheartedly behind this bill, and I hope the rule will pass and the bill enacted into law.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the passage of H. R. 3300. The purpose of the bill is, first, to regulate and promote commerce among the several States and foreign nations; second, to protect, improve, and promote navigation and navigable waters in the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi Valley; third, to help control the lake level and thereby afford protection to property and shores along the Great Lakes; and, fourth, to provide a navigable Illinois Waterway for the State of Illinois, and Sanitary District of Chicago. I think it is safe to assume that the real purpose behind the bill is to afford a greater flow of water to assist the Sanitary District of Chicago. The other purposes of the bill are, perhaps, window dressing for the chief purpose that I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, there is a serious legal question involved in this matter. Actually the subject matter is still within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States, and any action approving this bill would run afoul of the Court's jurisdiction. It would seem that further proceedings should be discontinued and the matter referred back to the committee.

It is a matter of record that diversion of water from the Great Lakes through the drainage canal in Illinois has been in the courts and in Congress for many, many years. As a matter of fact, I believe it covers a span of at least 50 years. As a youngster I recall conversations on this subject having lived all of my life on the western shores of Lake Michigan at Racine, Wis. My State has a considerable interest in this matter, as several hundreds of miles of shoreline on the western shore of Lake Michigan and several hundreds of miles of shoreline on Lake Superior are affected. Any diversion of water at this time will seriously impair navigation.

Mr. Speaker, a very able argument in opposition to this matter was presented in the testimony by Mr. Herbert H. Naujoks, general counsel for the Great Lakes Harbor Association. Mr. Naujoks sets forth an itemized statement as to the position taken by his association and I quote from it at this time:

1. Neither the Public Works Committee nor the Congress has the authority, under the United States Constitution, to pass these bills because the Congress has no jurisdiction in the premises, nor has Congress power to authorize the transfer of huge quantities of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence watershed to the Mississippi watershed, with substantial damages to the Great Lakes States, the municipalities located on the Great Lakes, and their peoples. Any additional diversion of water from one watershed for the benefit of another is beyond the power of Congress and the Federal Government particularly when made to create an artificial waterway or artificially to enrich a natural waterway (*Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (278 U. S. 367)).

2. The Supreme Court of the United States has expressly retained jurisdiction of this subject matter, and the proper forum is that Court. It has the machinery, and it has functioned many times, both on the application of the State of Illinois and also on the application of the opposing Lake States to determine issues arising out of the Chicago diversion.

3. The interests of Canada, a friendly foreign nation, with whom we have been at peace for more than 150 years, and which has a vital interest in maintaining the integrity of the lake levels, must be considered.

4. It is the position of the International Joint Commission that if the pending bills have the effect of appreciably lowering the levels of the boundary waters, then it is not within the province of the Public Works Committee to attempt to change the amount of the present authorized diversion. Under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 the 2 signatory nations—the United States and Canada—expressly divested themselves of all authority over the boundary waters as far as raising, lowering, or diverting them was concerned. At the hearings before the House Public Works Committee in June 1952, Hon. A. O. Stanley, chairman of the International Joint Commission, seriously questioned the authority of the committee to take any action which would appreciably lower the levels of the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes Harbors Association concurs in this position taken by the International Joint Commission.

5. Any additional diversion would effect a preference for the ports of Illinois over those of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and is, therefore, unconstitutional (*Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (278 U. S. 367)).

6. Any additional diversion would work injury to the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, depriving them and their citizens and property owners of property without due process of law and depriving such States of the natural advantages of their position, contrary to their sovereign rights as members of the Union.

7. Additional diversion is not required to provide an adequate waterway from Chicago to the Mississippi River. The present diversion is ample and the increased depth can be obtained by dredging without requiring a change in the locks or dams. The present 9-foot channel can carry up to 100 million tons of cargo annually. Considering the annual tonnage transported on the waterway of roughly 17 million tons, an increase in diversion is unwarranted from a practical and economic standpoint and would be grossly inequitable to the Great Lakes States, their municipalities, people, and industries, and contrary to the power and authority of the Federal Government.

8. Any improvement in navigable depths on a waterway from Lake Michigan to the Gulf of Mexico should not be made at the expense of the navigable depths of the Great Lakes.

9. Additional diversion would be of no material assistance in cleaning up the Chicago Drainage Canal or the Illinois River. The only permanent and effective way of cleaning up these streams is by keeping out of them any untreated or partially treated sewage or other material which would pollute the water. Today the lower Illinois River has reached such a stage of self-purification that the residents of that area are again able to enjoy fishing, bathing, boating, and other healthful water sports. If additional diversion is granted, it is certain that the Sanitary District of Chicago would be tempted to dump into the Sanitary Canal,

and thence into the Illinois River, untreated or partially treated sewage which is now being deposited in sludge beds along the banks of the Sanitary Canal and the Chicago River, and which is causing strenuous protests from the residents of those areas because of the obnoxious odors.

10. The Great Lakes Harbors Association suggests that the real motive behind this demand for increased diversion is the desire on the part of the sanitary district to obtain additional hydroelectric power to be generated by the facilities it owns and operates at Lockport, Ill. While the sanitary district has repeatedly denied that it is interested in the development of additional power at Lockport, its denials cannot be given much weight because at every opportunity the sanitary district has pressed for increased diversion of lake water in order to increase the power to be produced at Lockport. On May 8, 1946, a headline in the Chicago Daily News carried the statement that by diverting more lake water, Lockport can double power. This article stated that Mr. Horace P. Ramey, assistant chief engineer for the sanitary district, asserted that increased diversion can double the power output at the Lockport plant of the sanitary district. In 1947 the suggestion was made by Mr. Anthony A. Olis, president, board of trustees of the Sanitary District of Chicago, that increased diversion of lake water was needed for development of atomic power because of the establishment of the Argonne Laboratory along the banks of the sanitary district canal, 20 or 25 miles southwest of Chicago. In 1950 an application for increased diversion was again made by the sanitary district in dispatches to then President Truman, to ex-Secretary of Defense Johnson, and to the Illinois Senators, to obtain additional hydroelectric power during the coal strike. From the foregoing, it is plain that the sanitary district is interested in obtaining additional diversion for power purposes.

11. The United States Supreme Court in 1929 pointed out that the Great Lakes States and their peoples suffered irreparable and comprehensive damages due to the unlawful lowering of the levels of the Great Lakes by the Sanitary District of Chicago and the State of Illinois. It is plain that the Great Lakes commerce will suffer increased costs if the levels of the Great Lakes are lowered through diversion at Chicago. As Secretary of War Stimson well pointed out in 1913 in denying an application by the Sanitary District of Chicago for a diversion of 10,000 cubic feet per second "in a word, every drop of water taken out necessarily tends to nullify costly improvements made under direct authority of Congress throughout the Great Lakes and withdrawal of the amount now applied for would nullify such expenditures to the amount of many millions of dollars, as well as inflict an even greater loss on the navigation interests using such waters."

In the light of the present critical international situation, it is important that shipping on the Great Lakes be maintained at its highest level in order to carry the important iron ore from the Mesabi Range to the fabricating plants which, in turn, furnish the steel and iron needed to provide the weapons for maintaining this Nation strong and free.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the very strong statement made by Mr. Naujoks, the attorney general of Wisconsin, Mr. Vernon W. Thompson, also appeared before the committee and he calls attention to the fact that the Army engineers are now conducting a study and it is anticipated that a report will be forthcoming sometime next year.

Quite significantly Mr. Thompson points out that the Great Lakes were at their highest level since 1929 when in August of 1952 Lake Michigan reached an elevation of 582.7 feet. It is well known that there has been extensive shore damage on all of the Great Lakes as a result of high water and it was suggested that some of this excess water be eliminated through the Chicago Sanitary District canal. However, over the course of a year, the maximum diversion that could take place in this manner would lower the basin level only 1½ inches and hence this lowering would make no contribution to the prevention of lake shore damage.

I do not think it will be denied that it is a fact today that the water level in the Great Lakes basin is presently receding and hence the argument that has been made of the necessity for further drainage is without force or effect at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the States bordering on the Great Lakes should not be subjected to expensive litigation at this time to seek redress in the courts against any such action that might result from passage of this bill. As I have said, the Supreme Court has retained jurisdiction under its decree and it would seem to be the only agency which could hear the matter of increased diversion of water at this time. It goes without saying, I believe, that these States that are so vitally affected must seek redress, if unfavorable action is taken.

It is obvious that in addition to the interests of Great Lakes States, Canada, our neighbor to the north, also has a vital interest in this matter as she too has hundreds of miles of shore line that is affected by any rise in lake levels and any recession thereof. As a matter of fact the interests of Canada are recognized by treaty which established the International Joint Commission which was negotiated on January 11, 1909. I submit that the United States cannot take unilateral action on its own account.

It seems to me that the attorney general of Wisconsin, Mr. Thompson, has made a reasonable suggestion that the matter is properly a subject for negotiation between all of the eight lake States concerned and the appropriate representatives of the Government of Canada. Wisconsin, as Mr. Thompson has so well said, is always ready to enter into any such negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, I again suggest that this matter be recommitted to the committee until such time as the report of the Army engineers is received and that in the meantime an effort be made to reach some agreement between the State of Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District together with Canada and those States that border on the Great Lakes Basin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House today is the result of a new campaign to secure more water from Lake Michigan for the purposes of the Chicago Sanitary District. Chicago is obviously attempting to capitalize on the fact that Lake Michigan water levels have approached an all-time high, causing some damage to unprotected shorelines and localities. The Great Lakes States have historically stood together in opposing Chicago on this issue. Chicago is now attempting to weaken the ranks of other Great Lakes States by enlisting the support of communities and shoreline owners who are suffering from high-water levels.

The best engineering and legal opinion holds that the amount of water proposed to be diverted at Chicago will have no appreciable effect on current high lake levels, inasmuch as water cycles will probably drop sharply in 1954, if the past history of the lake-level cycles is repeated. Increased diversion of water from the lake offers no solution to the immediate problem of high-lake levels.

On the other hand, if Chicago is successful through congressional action or legal maneuvers in securing authority for increased diversion of water on a permanent basis, the removal of water in greater volumes from Lake Michigan may continue indefinitely through high-water and low-water cycles. The true impact of the Chicago "water steal" is felt by the Great Lakes area during the low-water cycles when every inch of lowering in the lake levels is disastrous in its economic effect.

The Supreme Court of the United States after almost 40 years of litigation between Chicago and the other States of the Great Lakes area ruled that the Chicago water diversion had caused a permanent lowering up to that time of 6 inches in the level of the Great Lakes; had greatly damaged lake commerce by decreasing the cargo capacity of lake vessels; had damaged beaches, fisheries, and recreational areas; and had caused a permanent lowering of the water table in the Great Lakes region with great resulting damage to docks, harbor facilities, and building foundations.

Prior to the Supreme Court decision, Chicago had for many years diverted 10,000 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan into the Chicago drainage canal and the Illinois River. The Supreme Court ordered a progressive reduction in the amount of diversion. Since 1937, the diversion has been limited to 1,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage for water supply.

Ever since the Supreme Court decree took final effect in 1937, Chicago has labored unceasingly to evade the effect of the decree and to secure increased diversion of water. Numerous bills sponsored by Chicago have been introduced in past sessions of Congress, thus far without success. Repeated efforts were made during the war and during the present defense period to persuade the White House and various Federal departments to use executive powers to circumvent the Supreme Court decree. Every plausible excuse which has developed over the years has been utilized in these endeavors, ranging from control of water pollution and disposal of sewage down to the offer to generate additional power for war production at the Lockport powerplant of the Chicago Sanitary District. Thanks to the vigilance of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, the Milwaukee Harbor Commission, and the attorneys general of the Great Lakes States, these maneuvers have been defeated without protracted litigation.

Chicago has slowly and reluctantly proceeded with the development of sew-

age treatment plants as ordered by the Supreme Court. Although treatment of sewage in the Chicago Sanitary District has not been totally effectuated as yet, the percentage of sewage treated is considerably higher due to partial completion of a series of sewage treatment plants as ordered by the Court. If Chicago had complied with the Court's decree in this respect, the sanitary issues would have been disposed of entirely. In any event, it is the opinion of authoritative sources that the real motive is the generation of additional power at Lockport, the proceeds of which are added to the revenues of the Chicago Sanitary District.

It is important that cities and individual leaders of public opinion not be misled by the current publicity concerning high lake levels which Chicago generously offers to relieve by increased diversion. The Chicago promise is completely fallacious and represents the foot-in-the-door technique. If greater diversion can be authorized by political pressure, the Great Lakes region will be confronted with another long and costly battle for the protection of lake levels.

Col. W. P. Trower, Great Lakes division engineer, United States Corps of Engineers, has repeatedly publicly stated that an additional diversion of 2,000 second-feet continued for one year would reduce the present level of the Great Lakes by only three-fourths of one inch. It is obvious that this would not minimize or reduce the damage caused by high lake levels and storms on the Great Lakes. However, 2,000 cubic feet per second of additional diversion at Chicago would accentuate or cause disastrous floods in the Illinois River Valley during heavy runoffs or times of flash floods. An increase in the level of the Illinois River due to additional diversion at Chicago would intensify flooding and drainage problems along this river.

The hysterical publicity concerning present high lake levels has obscured the beneficial effects of high water on the Great Lakes. Every increased inch of water on the Great Lakes permits the average bulk carrier to handle an additional 100 tons of cargo. This means that for every inch of additional water, about one and a quarter million tons of additional iron ore may be made available during the season to the hard-pressed steel mills, an important aspect of national security and the defense program.

The complexity of the problem which affects so many interests and people, including State and city governments, shippers, riparian property owners, power interests and recreational facilities is obvious. It is for these reasons that the city of Milwaukee and the Great Lakes Harbors Association at an important conference on lake levels held in Chicago on May 16, 1952, adopted resolutions urging adequate engineering study of the entire problem with a view to a long-range solution.

Lake Michigan is not a bathtub to be filled or drained at the pleasure of the Chicago Sanitary District. It is part of an enormously complicated drainage basin which affects the welfare of 2 nations and 7 States. The problem calls for the best engineering research and long-range study, and not for a superficial political solution such as Chicago is now seeking.

My friends, this legislation will not satisfy the proponents even if the Congress goes beyond the Supreme Court decree of 1930 and authorizes an increase in water diverted at Chicago. It is safe to predict that Congress will be confronted with endless demands for modification and increased diversion in the future. Chicago has never ceased to resent the Supreme Court decree of 1930, which was issued after the most careful engineering study of the problem. It has made no secret of its determination to evade the decree by any means available to it. The Supreme Court in 1930 ruled that Chicago had then permanently lowered the level of the Great Lakes by 6 inches. During the high water stage, we wish sincerely that there was some quick and easy solution to minimize damage caused by the high water cycle. We are very mindful, however, of the infinitely greater damage caused to the Great Lakes Basin and its people by any artificial lowering of the lake levels, during the low water cycle.

As a final and somewhat facetious note, you may be interested in an incident which occurred during a lake levels conference in Chicago on May 16, 1952. The dean of the Engineering School of the University of Illinois appeared before the meeting on behalf of the Chicago Sanitary District to appeal for increased water diversion. He conceded publicly that it will have absolutely no effect upon high lake levels, but suggested that a diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second or more would be of great "psychological value" and would assure frightened property owners and cities that "something" was being done to relieve them. This comment coming from an allegedly responsible source typifies the superficial, political, and hypocritical approach of the Chicago Sanitary District to this problem. The same thinking and the same superficial approach is embodied in the bill we are considering today.

Both the State of Wisconsin and the city of Milwaukee have appeared firmly in opposition to these measures, and the Attorney General has indicated that if, by any mischance, Congress should enact these measures and the President should sign them, legal steps will of necessity have to be taken to protect the interests of the Great Lakes area.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly had the diversion matter before it, and has had the advice of the best legal, engineering, and scientific authorities. Therefore, the Supreme Court rather than Congress should retain jurisdiction in this controversy.

Those of us who oppose this legislation, H. R. 3300, support thoroughly the proposition of an engineering study of this problem with a view to a long-range solution. If, after a thorough study by the Corps of Engineers, an automatic formula for diversion were indicated, the communities in the Great Lakes area would unquestionably be guided by the results of such a study.

By increasing diversion while the study is being made, Congress would presuppose that an increase will be recommended. Therefore, there is only one logical conclusion and that is to defer consideration of this legislation by returning it to the committee until a report from the proper authorities is available.

As part of my remarks I wish to include a resolution relative to a lake study passed by the Milwaukee County Council, common council resolution, file No. 53–2541, adopted December 29, 1953:

Whereas the city of Chicago and the Chicago Sanitary District continue to seek congressional sanction for greatly increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan for the purposes of the Chicago Sanitary District, thereby circumventing the effects of the United States Supreme Court decree of 1930, which was issued after exhaustive investigation and after 40 years of costly litigation; and

Whereas the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin have repeatedly taken the position that the United States Supreme Court should retain jurisdiction of this matter, and that they will firmly oppose any diversion of water from Lake Michigan in excess of quantities fixed by Supreme Court decree; and

Whereas the Public Works Committee, House of Representatives, has favorably reported for passage H. R. 3300, which would, if enacted, provide for an immediate increase in the quantity of water to be diverted from Lake Michigan by the Chicago Sanitary District, and which implies a threat of even greater diversion in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That all affected officers and agencies of the city government are hereby authorized and directed to use their best efforts to prevent passage of H. R. 3300 by either the House of Representatives or the United States Senate; and, be it further

Resolved, That as a constructive alternative, the city of Milwaukee will support the passage of the principles expressed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 and House Concurrent Resolution 62, now pending before the House of Representatives and the Senate, both of which measures call for referral of the problem of fluctuating water levels on the Great Lakes to the International Joint Commission, for the purpose of making studies and investigations as necessary to determine the levels of waters in the boundary waters under its jurisdiction which will most equitably serve the rights and interests of the United States and Canada with respect to commerce, industry, navigation, power development, agriculture, natural resources, and residential use; and to prepare coordinated plans for control of water levels at equitable levels and to recommend control structures or other works necessary to achieve that end.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois) there were—ayes 146, noes 54.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow two conference reports will be called up. The first one has to do with the replenishing of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the other has to do with the omnibus judges' bill. After that, it will be in order to continue with general debate on the measure for which the rule has just been adopted.

I might say to the leadership on the Democratic side, there is a rule reported out on H. R. 4646 having to do with the transferring of certain timberlands. I understand a supplemental report on it may be filed by midnight tonight. If it is, it will be our purpose to have this measure called up tomorrow or Thursday.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, February 22, 1954, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. E. K. BRAMBLETT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1954.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received a subpena directed to me as Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Ernest King Bramblett* (No. 971–53, criminal docket).

The subpena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Respectfully,
WILLIAM R. BONSELL,
Sergeant at Arms.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. E. K. BRAMBLETT, CRIMINAL CASE No. 971–53

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO WILLIAM R. BONSELL, *Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives.*

(Court of Chief Judge Laws.)

(Please see United States Attorney, William Hitz, at 9:30 a. m., room 3400–G.)

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Wednesday, February 3, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the district attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this — day of ——, A. D. 19—.

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By HAROLD G. DODD, *Deputy Clerk.*

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 431) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Ernest K. Bramblett* (No. 971–53, criminal docket) pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, a subpena was issued by the said court and addressed to William R. Bonsell, Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 3d day of February 1954, at 10 o'clock ante meridian: Therefore be it

Resolved, That William R. Bonsell, Sergeant at Arms of the House, is hereby authorized to appear pursuant to said subpena as a witness before the said court; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL YOUTH ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the Federal Youth Assistance Act of 1954 to provide $50 million for Federal aid to State, municipal, and community youth projects. The bill seeks to coordinate on a matching basis a Federal Government program with the youth programs initiated in the many States and municipalities in which youth commissions have been established. Federal funds would also be made available to private, nonprofit agencies operating under the supervision of State and municipal youth commissions.

The whole basis for the bill is to aid youth work on the community level. This is an area, I believe, in which the community must take the lead while the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities help supply the means. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is charged with the administration of the program outlined in this bill, would cooperate with State youth or juvenile committees or commissions, such as now exist in Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, and city committees or commissions in Baltimore; Kansas City, Mo.; Milwaukee; and New York. It is expected that were this bill to become law these cooperating agencies would be established in every State and major city.

The large number of rejections for the armed services of youth for physical and mental reasons and the serious incursions of crime, narcotics addiction, and other moral defects among our young people emphasize the need for this legislation. More than 1 million of our 43 million boys and girls under 18 come to the attention of the police in one way or another each year. We spend over $25 billion annually in this country to fight crime—my bill calls for an expenditure of two-tenths of 1 percent of that amount to save the blight upon the lives of young people because of it.

This measure conforms to the statement made by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Oveta Culp Hobby, in her testimony before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee Investigating Juvenile Delinquency, that: "Many things that must be done in the treatment and prevention of delinquency can best be done when States and the Nation work with communities." It also conforms to the recommendations of the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth, held in December 1950, which dealt with the problems of personal and family life for our youth under conditions of defense mobilization, our struggle against communism, the fight against inflation, and the ability of youth to adjust morally and spiritually to the machine age. It stems from the revelations on the problems of youth before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee Investigating Juvenile Delinquency. My bill seeks to afford the facilities for training which youth must have to deal with these vast problems.

The Federal Youth Assistance Act of 1954 requires State youth programs to be entitled to Federal support to provide, in addition to State or municipal supervision and matching funds, educational facilities, psychiatric health service, vocational training projects, actual employment projects, citizenship orientation courses, and support for training social care and group workers and practitioners where required.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] for 30 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to speak several times last session of Congress on the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I am now asking the indulgence of the House to again speak on this important subject.

A year ago, before the revised budget estimates of the incoming administration were presented to the Congress, I rose in this body to register my hope, and to declare my faith that the new administration would deal wisely and fairly with the interests of the people of the area which I represent in part, and that TVA would continue to be supported.

I stated on the floor then that I was not alarmed by the rash of statements hostile to TVA attributed to persons who believed that a change of administration meant a change in the attitude of the

Executive toward this great agency, I placed my confidence in two things:

First, I relied upon TVA's 20-year record. Here was an agency that was directed to control the floods, and gratifying results had been accomplished. In this valley, an agency had been charged with the responsibility of creating a channel for navigation, and water transportation was available all year round, and growing in volume and value every year. Here was an agency told to experiment in the development of new types of fertilizer for the American farmer, and all over the United States new and better fertilizers were available because of the pioneering work which TVA had carried out at Muscle Shoals in Alabama. Here was an agency directed by act of Congress to provide power to the people under policies laid down by Congress. Those policies had been adhered to with complete fidelity and a record of success unparalleled in Federal administration had resulted.

Congress said to make the power available to the greatest number of residential and farm consumers at the lowest possible cost. And TVA was now able to report that the percentage of farms with electric service had grown from 3 percent to 90 percent, that the 1,300,000 consumers on this system use six times as much energy in their homes today as they did in 1933, with $60 million savings to consumers reported last year. These were the objectives laid down in the TVA Act.

Here an agency intended to be nonpolitical in its administration had been nonpolitical in fact. Not one job had been filled as a matter of political patronage, not one decision had ignored the facts of economics or of engineering to gain political advantage. The story of TVA was a story of good management.

Above all, here was an agency which had made a contribution to national defense of proportions beyond measure. From its record in providing from its own facilities 60 percent of the phosphorus used by the Armed Services in World War II through to its achievement in providing the astronomical amounts of power required by the Atomic Energy Commission for the development of atomic weapons, TVA had proved its value to the Nation far beyond the expectation of its sponsors in 1933.

I knew that record. It seemed to me that when the new administration took over, studied the facts, and assumed responsibility for the future of the TVA, there would be no doubt of the answer. They would find here to a greater extent than in any other region of the United States, the people working in partnership with their Government, a pattern of decentralization unique throughout the Nation, a maximum of local control in every undertaking.

I had the impression from reading statements in the press last year that the new administration intended to emphasize the importance of such local participation in areas where it had not been tried out and particularly in resource development—in power activities. I assumed, therefore, that they would be delighted when they understood that in the TVA power service area there is a greater degree of local control than in any other power system in the country, public or private. For here the distribution systems, 148 of them, that buy the power at wholesale to carry it to the ultimate consumers are all locally owned and locally managed, with an investment last year of $373 million and combined net earnings of $18,428,000. And in the other aspects of resource development, in agriculture and forestry, for example, TVA had done pioneering work in stimulating local responsibility and control.

I recalled, too, when I spoke last year, the statements made when the President visited my State as a candidate. That was my second reassurance, for he had assured the anxious people—

> If I am elected President, TVA will be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency. I have a keen appreciation of what it has done and what it will be able to continue to do in the future. Under the new administration TVA will continue to serve and promote the prosperity of this great section of the United States.

With a keen appreciation of TVA and an intention to support it to start with, and a record like TVA's to study, I discounted the hostile statements emanating from other sources. I felt sure that when the President and his advisers examined the record, when they discovered that here was a great agency nonpolitical in its management, responsible, competent, and incorruptible, TVA's request for funds would be supported, and that the amounts necessary to provide power capacity sufficient to meet the growing load in this single area where the Federal Government has assumed utility responsibility would be included. Prosperity cannot be promoted by a scarcity of power.

Well, I was mistaken. Neither the record of TVA nor the memory of campaign promises were sufficient. An item to begin construction of a new steam plant proposed by TVA had been approved in the budget submitted to the Congress by the outgoing administration. The Fulton steam plant was to be located about 30 miles north of Memphis in the district I have the honor to represent. Two units were proposed for the initial installation, and $30 million had been requested to begin construction. Its construction, together with new units proposed for existing plants, was clearly essential to meet the growing energy requirements of the area. But when TVA's revised budget estimates were sent to the Committee on Appropriations with the approval of the new President, the Fulton plant had been dropped from the budget, and the appeals of Members of Congress and many others who appeared before the committee to urge its restoration were denied. The region was faced with intolerable uncertainty about its economic growth.

I was troubled, my colleagues were troubled, the people of the area were dismayed. But we were patient. We waited for this year's budget to be presented. We were hoping that the disappointment of last year would not be repeated, that our fears of future power scarcity would be removed, that this year the President, with clearer understanding of the means through which TVA could be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency, would make up for last year's error and would recommend the appropriation of all the funds required to provide a safe margin of energy for the region's economic growth.

I have read the budget message. I stand before you now to retract the confidence I expressed last year, to register my disappointment, my fear, that this administration has abandoned that concern for the agriculture and commerce of my State and the surrounding area which was expressed so generously prior to November 1952. I must atone for the optimism I expressed last year. For the budget message as we have received it contains not one dime for TVA to start building new capacity on its power system in fiscal 1955. Funds are included to continue projects under way, but that is not enough. This budget assumes that the 1,300,000 consumers now served by TVA represent the limit of consumers, that no new farms beyond the number now foreseen will want to purchase power by 1957, that the ceiling of economic growth of our region will have been reached, and more dangerously, that no expansion in the defense production of this area will be required.

Now I have not failed to notice the statements by which the decision to build no new capacity was intended to be palatable to friends of TVA. I note that to avoid commencing the Fulton steam plant the budget message states that—

> Arrangements are being made to reduce, by the fall of 1957, existing commitments of the TVA to the Atomic Energy Commission by 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts. This would release the equivalent amount of Tennessee Valley Authority generating capacity to meet increased load requirements of other consumers in the power system and at the same time eliminate the need for appropriating funds from the Treasury to finance additional generating units.

I want to look into that matter a little. As I understand it, this means that to avoid the expenditure of funds for capital investment this year, the Government will commit the Atomic Energy Commission to pay out in annual power payments, for an indefinite period, sums which will in the end total more than the amounts which would be required to build the Fulton plant.

If the President were to advise us that the power requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission were being reduced because the world is now to be a peaceful place, the release of all the power now committed by TVA to AEC would be a matter of the deepest satisfaction, and the arrangement would be applauded everywhere. Clearly that is not the case.

The President's message refers to "negotiations for furnishing these load requirements from other sources." It is fair to assume, I suppose, that the other sources are combinations of private power companies such as the EEI—Electric Energy, Inc.—which is building a powerplant at Joppa, Ill., to serve a part

of the AEC load at Paducah, and OVEC—Ohio Valley Electric Corp.—organized to construct facilities to serve AEC installations at Portsmouth, Ohio.

I am not objecting to such arrangements when they are necessary and in the public interest, but I do not think they should be entered into if they add to the Government power costs—the taxpayer's costs—when compared with the cost when the Government provides the power itself. So far as the record can be judged today, those other sources of power are neither as reliable in meeting their schedules or as low in their costs as is TVA. The first one of these, EEI, was developed with great fanfare. Thomas E. Murray, member of the Atomic Energy Commission, hailed it as establishing a nationwide precedent.

In all my business experience—

He said—

I have never seen a more bold, energetic, or dramatic effort put forth in a shorter time. (Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 9, p. A1438.)

The truth is that it was not bold, nor energetic, nor dramatic enough. The story of the Joppa plant is one of broken promises. Schedules have not been met. Costs have gone up. TVA began construction of its Shawnee plant, at the same time, in the same area, to serve the same load as the privately owned Joppa plant. The construction schedules called for EEI to put the first of its power units into operation 3 months ahead of TVA, and deliveries of turbines and generators from the manufacturers were geared to this program. Secure in knowledge of these arrangements, propagandists for the utilities widely advertised the dual construction program as a race, which would show the superiority of the winner. They were scheduled to win. The race was fixed, but actual performance reversed the order of completion. The TVA units came in first. Two units were in operation at Shawnee before a single unit in Joppa went on the production line. TVA now has four units on the line at Shawnee; Joppa has two units in operation. TVA has completed its first assignment of power for Paducah. Joppa is halfway along. And the utility propagandists have been strangely silent.

So much for reliability as to schedules. Let us have a look at the comparative records on cost. Last spring AEC officials testified before a congressional committee that they then expected the average cost of TVA power to be 3.8 mills per kilowatt hour as against 4.16 mills for EEI.

In August the Wall Street Journal—August 3, 1953, Chicago edition—reported that the estimated cost of the first four power units of the Electric Energy, Inc., plant had increased from $81,000,000 to $118,250,000, and that estimates of the cost per kilowatt of capacity had risen from an original estimate of $126 to $184, with estimates on two additional units then planned running as high as $198 per kilowatt. The truth is that we do not know what the taxpayer is going to have to pay for the power supplied by Joppa. We know the record on Shawnee. We know that TVA reports the cost of the four units at Shawnee to be less than $145 per kilowatt. TVA has kept within its estimates. Joppa has failed.

The story of the experience at Joppa indicates that it may be false economy to give a larger share of the AEC load to private companies to serve. The taxpayer foots the bill whether TVA provides the power or private companies. The difference is that when the plants are paid for by AEC in power payments, the generating facilities belong to the Government in the case of TVA, but to their private owners in the case of the other companies.

I question the wisdom of this alternative. To me it seems a case of pennywise, pound-foolish judgment. I suggest that this would be a fruitful subject for investigation by the appropriate committees of the Congress. But even in the unlikely event that the arrangement should prove to be a good one for the Federal Treasury, this budget for TVA's power facilities would still be too small.

According to the figures in the budget, and assuming that some power now committed by TVA to AEC is released, as proposed, there still will be no margin for load growth not presently foreseen. That means not only that no unforeseen civilian loads can develop, it means not only that TVA must continue to operate the marginal and uneconomical plants which reduce its rate of return to the Government, it means that the administration is prepared to gamble that there will be no unexpected increase in requirements at Oak Ridge or Paducah, no great increase required in the production of the aluminum of which jet planes are built nor of the titanium they require. It means that no more power will be available beyond the present commitments at Tullahoma, where the experiments essential to aviation progress are conducted in the great wind tunnel, or at Muscle Shoals where a great Army project is under construction.

There is no single power system in the country with so large a share of its total energy devoted to national defense production. There is no area in the country where a shortage of power would have such grave national consequences. It is my belief that this administration is taking too great a risk with our national safety in order to show a saving of a capital expenditure in this year's budget. This is sober business. Some errors of judgment can be quickly repaired. Production of some commodities can be expanded swiftly by the use of overtime or by the installation of new equipment. A lag of only days or weeks results. That is not true with power facilities. Even under emergency schedules it takes 3 years to build a powerplant and the plant must be completed before the energy can be applied to defense production. In every study of our national defense requirements the importance of an adequate supply of power has been emphasized, yet in this budget for this vital area it is ignored. I want to know the reason why. My colleagues from my State and from our neighboring States want to know the reason why. The people of the Nation—all the free world—will want to know the basis for this calculated risk. I cannot tell them why. I can only say we will not give up the fight. We who understand what this decision may mean to the future of the region and the security of the Nation will not surrender. There must be no scarcity of power.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. First, I want to express my deep appreciation for the very fine statement made by the gentleman, the dean of our delegation, and to share with him the feeling that there should be, by an appropriate committee of the Congress, some investigation into this proposal of supplying Atomic Energy Commission power needs through a private utility contract rather than the utilization of TVA power. I certainly share with the gentleman the feeling that in the long span it will be much more expensive to the taxpayers of the Nation than under the present plan. I simply emphasize again what the gentleman so well said, that when the power operation of TVA is complete and the amortizations have been made, they belong to the Government.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

MR. CHARLES H. PARKMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in our busy lives since we returned to the House of Representatives after the recess last year, perhaps some of us have not noticed that there is missing from the desk just behind me, in the well of the House, a friendly face who was so well known and well liked by all of us. My words may seem to indicate that something bad has happened to our friend, Charles H. Parkman. That is not the case. Mr. Parkman, who, after serving 47 years on Capitol Hill, on the 31st of December, voluntarily retired. Although I have not seen him since his retirement, he is living very happily and peacefully at his home in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Parkman not only gave his country 47 years of faithful service himself, but his father before him, after having fought through the entire Civil War, came to Washington in 1865 and began service in our Treasury Department, and served some 50 years, working for his Government and ours. He was the father of Mr. Charles H. Parkman who has been here as a clerk to the Official Reporters since 1927.

Mr. Charles H. Parkman, who has just retired, was born here in Washington on January 27, 1879. He came to work at the Capitol in 1906 as secretary to Representative Nicholas Longworth, of the 1st Ohio District, at the time when Theodore Roosevelt was President and Uncle

Joe Cannon was the Speaker of the House. At the beginning of the 63d Congress in 1913, of which Mr. Longworth was not a Member, Mr. Parkman became secretary to Representative Frederick H. Gillette, of the 2d Massachusetts District, and he continued as a secretary for Representative Gillette during the remainder of his service in the House, including 6 years as Speaker of the House. In the summer and fall of 1924 Mr. Charles Parkman assisted Speaker Gillette in his successful candidacy for the Senate against Senator David I. Walsh, and was then secretary for Mr. Gillette the first half of his term in the Senate, when he was appointed by Speaker Longworth to the position from which he has just recently retired.

Mr. Parkman's service thus covered a period of 47 years, during the administrations of 9 Presidents and 10 Speakers. He is probably the only person who has acted as secretary to two Members of this House who became Speaker.

There is another part of the story of the Parkman family which, in my opinion, is equally interesting. Mr. Parkman himself was a second generation in the service of his country here in Washington on Capitol Hill. A third generation of the Parkman family is still working on Capitol Hill.

Robert B. Parkman, Charles Parkman's son, is presently executive assistant to Senator CORDON, of Oregon. Bob Parkman has been on the Senate side of the Capitol as a secretary for a number of years. At this time he is serving his fifth Senator from the State of Oregon. He started in the service of an Oregon Senator, Senator Fred Steiwer. When Senator Steiwer resigned Senator Reames was appointed for a year, and Bob Parkman was his secretary. When Rufus Cecil Holman was elected to the Senate, Bob Parkman served a full term with Senator Holman and he served a number of months with Senator MORSE when he came to the Senate, and then he went with Senator CORDON.

Mr. Speaker, I came here as a freshman Member of the House some 11 or 12 years ago. All of the employees in this Chamber have always given me as a Member courteous assistance—and I am sure all of the rest of you have had the same fine treatment from our people here—but there was one man who always stood out in my thinking, and that was Charles Parkman. When I had a little problem having to do with the RECORD and went to Mr. Parkman to ask him about it, he immediately took my problem on as if it were the most important thing in his life, and he helped me over any difficulties I might have. I shall always be personally most grateful for the fine help that Mr. Parkman, who is now retired, gave me when he was the chief clerk to the official reporters.

Mr. Parkman, of course, never made any headlines; he never attracted any attention to himself; he wanted no part of that, but just wanted to do a good job.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am very glad to be on the floor today when we are making a little something of the very charming, sweet, gentle person who sat just behind me here facing us all, taking care of us all, Charles Parkman. Mr. Parkman has a peculiar quality which draws to him the very warm affection of all of the Members, which made it a joy to go up and ask him a foolish question—I asked him so many—for I was very green when I came here 14 years ago and still need help in the mechanics of the RECORD and so many things having to do with it. It was so good to turn to Mr. Parkman and ask: "Is this all right? What do I do?" Always a smile; and, as my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] has just said, always taking it on as though it were the most important thing in his life.

I know the men who follow him now and those who will do so as time goes on, all have their own very wonderful contributions to make to all of us. But I am sure those of us who have been here during Mr. Parkman's service are going to feel that we need his sweetness. Somehow, I think his sweetness is going to remain with us, as will his gentleness and his absolute accuracy. You never questioned what he said; you felt secure; and that means a great deal to a newcomer, and to an old fellow—a very great deal.

And so I want to wish him well in every day that lies before him; I want to wish him joy and the deep satisfaction of work well done, knowing that the affection and the appreciation of so many men and women go with him into his retirement.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio very much. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for many years during Mr. Parkman's service here I have been a great admirer of his ability, his strength of character, and his humor. He was never too busy to be helpful to any Member seeking assistance, he was always understanding of our difficulties, he was never too busy to go into legislative history and legislative duties. This has been true whether he was serving as secretary to a Member of Congress or as a secretary to Speakers of the House or as clerk to the Official Reporters of Debates.

It was amazing to me how he could keep in mind all of the various details and still go ahead with his regular work. He would speak to us who went to him in reference to remarks in the RECORD and other matters. There are many Members of Congress who may be thankful to him for a corrected or proper statement in the RECORD rather than an incorrect one.

Mr. Parkman has left indelibly his mark in the Nation's Capitol. He has established himself as a very fine person and I wish for him in his retirement many, many happy years to come.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have my colleagues give us these fine words regarding our good friend who is now enjoying a well-earned leisure.

It is a very fine thing to be able to come to the well of the House and speak about someone who has served so faithfully for so many, many years. In my opinion, it is also rather remarkable that this one family should have contributed so many years of loyal service to our country. I not only wish Mr. Charles Parkman many, many happy years in retirement but I hope that his son, Robert will continue in the service on the other side of the Capitol until the total service of the Parkman family reaches 100 years, and that will be only a short time from now. I think that is quite a record of service for one family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to add my few words of praise to the many fine things being said about Mr. Charles H. Parkman today. As Chief Clerk of the reporting staff, Mr. Parkman rendered a devoted service to the House of Representatives. He was always a gentleman, always anxious to be of assistance to all Members. He loved his work and did it well. We all hope the years ahead will be filled with happiness for Mr. Parkman and his family.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and services of Mr. Parkman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

SKYROCKETING COFFEE PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the American public is being forced to drink a bitter brew today in the form of skyrocketing coffee prices.

In the past few weeks, the price of America's favored drink has boiled upwards to well over $1 per pound. And the end is apparently not yet in sight. There have been stories appearing in the press in the last few days that the price will climb to about $1.25 per pound before there is any levelling off. And in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal, a story was carried which reported an advance of 2 cents a pound for coffee futures on the New York Coffee Exchange.

The housewives of America—and all of the wage earners, too—are rightly concerned about this increase in the family market basket bill. They are puzzled as to why coffee prices are surging upwards at a time when the market for almost all other food products is

softening and at a time when the Nation's economists are forecasting a downward adjustment in most lines of business activity.

In their indignation, coffee consumers in many sections of the country have urged cutbacks in consumption. And, even here in the House of Representatives we have heard pleas for less coffee-drinking as a way of bringing the price down and thus avoiding the universal adoption of a 15-cent cup of coffee in restaurants. These are all admirable proposals. They deserve support, and, perhaps, might contribute to a decline in price.

Mr. Speaker, I use the word "might," because there has been some doubt cast upon claims emanating from the great coffee-growing regions of South America that adverse weather, in the form of a frost, has caused sufficient damage to justify a price increase. According to these claims, the frost—plus big increases in coffee consumption in this country and the rest of the world—has brought about a short supply situation. Thus, it would be assumed that a supply-demand cycle would come into play.

This, of course, would be a perfectly logical assumption—providing there had been a frost of sufficient intensity to make big inroads in output, providing there has been great increases in consumption, and providing there is an actual shortage now or in the immediate future. In the light of past shortage scares in coffee, this is a situation which should be investigated. If there is only a fictitious shortage now, that fact should be exposed. And if there actually is a shortage, then, too, that situation should be documented, in order that many people who believe they are being victimized by international speculators may have their apprehensions allayed.

The answer to this shortage question is particularly pertinent in the light of the findings of a subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee which investigated the so-called shortage of coffee in 1949 which brought on steep price hikes. This committee, under the chairmanship of Senator GILLETTE, conducted lengthy hearings and came to the conclusion that the price hikes of 5 years ago were wholly unwarranted. In fact, the Senate subcommittee in its final report described the 1949 shortage thusly:

> While some grocers had difficulty getting supplies fast enough, there never was a time when there were insufficient stocks of green coffee on hand in this country, afloat or in foreign countries to supply the needs of the people.

The Gillette subcommittee investigation was one of the infrequent times when the spotlight has been turned upon the little-known activities of the international coffee industry. It is an industry which cuts across the lives of most American citizens, yet it is cloaked in mystery. Reliable statistics on production abroad and inventories in foreign lands are virtually nonexistent. This produces a situation in which this country, the greatest of all coffee consumers, is at the virtual mercy of foreign production.

In view of the findings of the Gillette subcommittee that the 1949 price increases amounted to a raid on United States consumers, and that the shortage scare of 5 years ago was a myth, it seems to me that another thorough congressional study is warranted. We are being told today that frost in South America, particularly in the Brazil uplands, is causing a shortage. Does that statement have more basis in fact than the 1949 assertions?

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture could well subject the coffee industry to a searching study. It has the experienced staff and knowledgable background in all farm problems to search out the truth and lay it before this House. The American people have a right to know if there is justification for the coffee price hike. For every rise of a cent a pound in coffee, the American consumer is forced to pay around $28 million.

In the January 23, 1954, issue of Hanson's Latin American Letter, published here in Washington, the author terms the present claims of shortage as "a completely phony scare buildup by interests in New York joined with Brazilian speculators to injure the American consumer."

Hanson's Latin American Letter also asserted that the author had examined all available official material in Washington on the coffee situation and had found:

> There is no justification for the recent rise in the price of coffee. There is no shortage of coffee. The statistical position forward does not warrant the increase. The present rise cannot be ascribed to the Brazilian frosts. Before the frosts, the oversupply of coffee in prospect was so great that a terrific fall in prices was likely. The frosts merely postponed that decline. But they left a statistical position that in no way warrants the recent price boosts on what was already a very high price level for coffee.

Along with a thorough study of the coffee situation by the House Agriculture Committee, there are other measures which should be taken. The New York Coffee Exchange should be subjected to scrutiny by the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department and by the Federal Trade Commission to determine if any of the Nation's antimonopoly laws are being violated.

Strangely, the coffee exchange is the only big commodity exchange which is not under the control of the Commodity Exchange Administration of the Agriculture Department. This should be remedied at once.

The Federal Trade Commission should look into the possibility of requiring the Exchange to open up its trading to coffee from countries other than Brazil. At the present time, the only coffee which can be traded on the New York Exchange is "Santos 4," a type of Brazilian bean shipped only from the port of Santos. No other coffee is acceptable on exchange contracts. Coffee from other nations, particularly the smaller Carribean countries, should be eligible for exchange trading.

The charge has been made that the coffee exchange is dominated by Brazilian speculators who reap fabulous profits and who, as foreign citizens, are not required to pay American income taxes. These profits should be taxed, inasmuch as their source is the pocketbook of the American coffee consumers.

The New York Exchange, at the present, requires only nominal margins from traders. This is an unhealthy condition which would not be tolerated in other commodity exchanges under Federal supervision. A margin of at least 50 percent on all coffee futures contracts should be made mandatory to cut down on the speculative activity.

Hanson's Latin American Letter of January 23 in its article on the current coffee situation had this to say about the New York Exchange:

> The Coffee Exchange has resisted proper Government control on the theory that it might discourage Brazilian speculators from using the New York facilities for a gambling joint and might turn them to what is known in other gambling fields as a floating crap game. Yet, here again the body of disinterested judgment is completely on the side of proper regulation.

Hanson's letter also makes two other points which should be mentioned: First, American consumption has actually declined since 1949, not increased—currently consumption is 2,625,000,000 pounds annually; and second, the Government's good-neighbor policy would not be harmed by counteraction against speculators, because the tremendous high dollar profits in coffee are in large measure responsible for the inflation besetting Brazil.

The Justice Department should put its antitrust microscope on the sales and storage activities of the foreign coffee interests who are operating in the United States to see if there has been any violations of the Sherman Act. The assertion has been made that these interests, combined with the National Coffee Association, have persistently resisted the efforts of the Agriculture Department to compile domestic stock figures.

Mr. Speaker, it is, of course, well known that the economic well-being of several of our good neighbors to the South depend to a great extent on their coffee trade with the United States. There is no desire to embarrass them or to harm them economically. Nevertheless, the Congress of the United States has a responsibility to the American people. This should be our first concern. If the shoe were on the other foot, I cannot imagine the South American countries handcuffing themselves with inaction.

The United States consumes about one-half of all of the coffee produced in the world, grows none. This situation should be reviewed by the Department of Agriculture to determine if there are any suitable growing areas in this country. Perhaps, some sections of Texas, Florida or California would be found suitable for coffee cultivation. If we could develop some domestic production, this country would become less dependent on overseas growers.

Another proposal which has merit is contained in the following newspaper article, published January 28 in the Daily Oklahoman:

A. & M. VISITOR BREWS PLAN TO CONTROL THE COFFEE MARKET

STILLWATER, January 27.—The former head of the Government's Office of Foreign Agri-

cultural Relations suggested Wednesday a system of control for the coffee market may be the way to avoid crises such as the spiraling prices now troubling American java drinkers.

Stanley Andrews, who was in charge of the Federal office which checks up on foreign farm production, in 1949–52 and later was head of the point 4 program, said the answer might be found in some type of trade agreement with Brazil.

Such an agreement could be worked out to assure producers of a parity price, which might even give underpaid Brazilian coffee workers some money to spend in return, but which still wouldn't dig hard at American budgets, he said.

Andrews said that under the present free market, coffee drinkers will have to live with price rises, because one country produces the basic coffee supply. Coffee grown in countries other than Brazil are mainly exotic types used in blending, he pointed out.

Now director of a national agricultural information project for the Kellogg Foundation, Andrews was on the Oklahoma A. & M. campus to confer with Aggie editorial workers.

He pointed out the big share of coffee price troubles is found in the fact world consumption of Americans' favorite hot brew has been increasing faster than production.

Andrews, who took over as point 4 chief when A. & M.'s Dr. Henry G. Bennett was killed in 1952, said coffee from Africa some day will come into the world market to relieve the supply situation, but that it will take several more years to develop this new source.

During his point 4 tenure he visited Brazil to look at the coffee industry and came away with convictions some changes are badly needed in farming methods.

Andrews said he stood on land that once was growing coffee trees but that had been worn out and allowed to grow over with brambles. When a coffee grove wears out, he said, the producer just moves to a new plot of ground.

As a man who once was in closest touch with foreign agricultural situations, Andrews indicated it is possible coffee market speculators, helped by a frost which cut the crop and the increased world demand which cut reserves, had a hand in the recent price jump.

Andrews said the coffee-growing business, which requires great capital, is not adaptable to use of farm machinery but depends on masses of hand laborers, who are poorly paid.

"If coffee workers were paid 30 cents an hour for an 8-hour working day," he said, "our coffee would cost about $5 a pound."

Turning from the short-supply coffee situation to the oversupply of United States farm commodities, Andrews declared the problem will not be solved by dumping our surplus on somebody else.

While world conditions are partly responsible for the United States farm problem, it is not their problem, he said.

"It would be easy to get out of it that way, but we can't do it. We need to buy some on the world market, too. We can't do all the selling."

Andrews declared American farmers and farm planners will have to face the problem of surpluses with positive action to adjust production to demand, without adding to the surplus and while holding the world markets we now have.

If such an adjustment is not made with a minimum of upset to the economy, "the gruelling old laws of economics will do it for us," he said.

"When you think about it, a reserve of food is darn nice to have. Not another country outside the United States and Canada has a 6 months supply of food in case of war," he added.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TABER.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today on the bill H. R. 3300 and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. DONDERO.

Mr. CLARDY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARIGG.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) in two instances.

Mr. DEANE and to include a statement.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include a resolution, following the adoption of the rule on H. R. 3300.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. BENDER in seven instances.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. JONES of Missouri (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN), for 1 day, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 3, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1213. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of the operations of Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A–45 upon departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government, pursuant to section 1312 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1214. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification from the Commissioner of Reclamation, regarding the adequacy of soil survey and land classification as required by the 1954 Appropriation Act—Kansas-Bostwick Irrigation District, Bostwick Division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1215. A letter from the Chairman, Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, transmitting the report of the Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, pursuant to title IV, section 401 (a), of an act approved June 29, 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1216. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1953, pursuant to chapter 1628, acts of Congress 1904; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1217. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a comparative general balance sheet of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1953, being a copy of a report made to the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, pursuant to paragraph 14 of the act of March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1218. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting the report of Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1953, pursuant to an act of Congress, approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1219. A letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., transmitting a report covering the operations of Capital Transit Co. for the calendar year 1953, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1953, pursuant to section 10 of an act of Congress approved June 10, 1896, and paragraph 14 of section 8 of an act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (Public Law 435); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1220. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I., pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1221. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the First Semiannual Report of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; pursuant to section 19 of the act (Public Law 203, 83d Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1222. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting an annual report of statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 53 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1223. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the 15th Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1224. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation in the amount of $60,000 for the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, to remain available until June 30, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 310); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1225. A letter from the Acting Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the Ninth Semiannual Report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, pursuant to section 603 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 311); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1226. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Administrator of General Services Administration for the year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 212 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1227. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1953, pursuant to the act of March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1228. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the

activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Bureau of Mines, Anthracite Research Laboratory, located at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., for the calendar year 1953, pursuant to the act of December 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 1056); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1229. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1230. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid by this Department for the period January 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1231. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the annual report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for the fiscal year 1953, and the report of the Judicial Conference of the United States for 1953, pursuant to section 604 (a) (4) of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 413. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to Joseph Rosenthal, son of Abraham Rosenthal, late an employee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1135). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 420. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses of Bertha Kehoe, late an employee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1136). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7512. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Armory Board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use; without amendment (Rept. No. 1137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 582. A bill to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6455. A bill to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6786. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 8, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Geo. L. Reid, Jr.	Clerk	$5,823.00
John J. Heimburger	Counsel	5,823.00
Francis M. LeMay	Staff counsultant	5,823.00
Mabel C. Downey	Assistant clerk	5,630.94
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	3,390.89
Alice Klotz (Baker)	do	3,056.22
Betty Prezioso	do	2,597.57
Arlow Hill	Clerical aid	2,179.36

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	29,458.51
Total amount expended from June 11 to Dec. 31	29,458.51
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	20,541.49

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 6, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	The clerk	$5,823.00
Kenneth Sprankle	The assistant clerk	5,823.00
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk.	5,823.00
Corhal D. Orescan	Assistant clerk	5,823.00
Robert E. Lambert	do	5,823.00
Paul M. Wilson	do	5,823.00
Ross P. Pope	do	5,823.00
Jay B. Howe	do	5,823.00
Samuel W. Crosby	do	5,542.52
Robert P. Williams	do	5,158.68
Frank Sanders	do	4,813.02
Carson W. Culp	do	4,813.02
Robert M. Moyer	do	4,605.66
Robert L. Michaels	do	3,941.88
Lawrence C. Miller	Junior assistant clerk.	3,145.26
G. Homer Skarin	do	3,065.58
Earl C. Silsby	do	3,065.58
Francis G. Merrill	Clerk-stenographer	2,428.32
Samuel R. Preston	do	2,189.34
Charles W. Miller	do	1,505.80
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger	1,854.78
Willie Tarrant	Janitor-messenger	1,517.52
John C. Pugh	Consultant	1,216.14
Ralph W. Horton	Clerk to the majority.	4,951.26
E. L. Eckloff	Clerk to the minority.	4,951.26
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	Clerk-stenographer to the chairman.	2,189.34
Delores Cropper	Clerk-stenographer to the ranking minority member.	1,570.65
Donald G. Adams	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee.	$2,189.34
Nella L. Adams	do	2,189.34
Charles C. Andersen	do	2,189.34
Mary Louise Ardies	do	2,189.34
John G. Clevenger	do	2,189.34
Robbieburr W. Courtney.	do	1,137.71
James W. Dudley	do	2,189.34
Julia M. Elliott	do	364.89
Mary S. Francis	do	2,189.34
Theodora M. Grant	do	2,189.34
Virginia Hudgins	do	364.89
Margaret Lane	do	2,189.34
William J. Neary	do	2,189.34
Esther Schweigert	do	2,189.34
Mary H. Smallwood	do	1,824.45
Frances D. Smith	do	547.33
Louise F. Stevens	do	729.78
Phyliss N. Troy	do	789.83
Mary A. Vaughan	do	2,189.34
Dorothy Vitale	do	1,824.45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$330,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	143,365.05
Total amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	143,365.05
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	186,634.95

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 6, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert E. Lee	Director of surveys and investigations.	$3,073.24
Harris H. Huston	do	1,941.00
George J. Atwater	Investigator	2,626.11
George S. Green	do	5,448.96
Rose Marie Wahler	Stenographer	2,253.06
K. Lois Welch	do	1,289.24
Ethel P. Powers	do	2,010.06
George J. Atwater	Consultant	1,240.00
Murry Brophy	do	1,500.00
Robert A. Collier	do	240.00
Carl P. Herbert	do	885.90
Claude S. Holloway	do	500.00
Edward A. Kracke	do	453.16
Charles W. Kress	do	400.00
Robert W. Zehring	do	240.00
REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES		
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Patricia J. Finn.	Clerk-stenographer	$153.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$430,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	27,552.50
Total amount expended from July 1, 1953 to Dec. 31, 1953	27,552.50
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	422,447.50
Payment of bills rendered for prior fiscal period	8,958.47

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JANUARY 6, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	$5,823.00
John R. Blandford	Counsel	5,823.00
Charles F. Ducander	do	5,823.00
Philip W. Kelleher	do	5,823.00
Janice G. Angell	Clerical staff	2,810.70
L. Louise Ellis	do	2,810.70
Elizabeth Gilmore	do	2,810.70
Agnes H. Johnston	do	3,065.58
John J. Courtney	Special counsel	5,823.00
James W. Birthright	Assistant special counsel.	5,020.38
Edward T. Fogo	Investigator	4,467.42
Lloyd R. Kuhn	do	2,993.82
Dorothy Britton	Secretary	2,348.64
Dorothea Clore	do	2,268.96
Romer Kiess	Clerk	2,189.34
Edwin S. Villmoare	Clerk (July 15 to Aug. 15). (Office of the special counsel operating under H. Res. 125 and H. Res. 156, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)	309.81

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	20,759.96
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	32,427.99
Total amount expended from Mar. 1 to Dec. 31	53,187.95
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	96,812.05

DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JANUARY 14, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink	Technical staff director.	$5,823.00
John E. Barriere	Technical staff	5,823.00
William J. Hallahan	Clerk	5,823.00
Elsie L. Gould	Deputy clerk	4,322.04
Mary W. Layton	Stenographer	3,145.26
Helen E. Long	Assistant clerk	3,145.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee's expenditures: None.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 8, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	$5,822.28
Wendell E. Cable	Assistant clerk	5,822.28
Ruth Butterworth	do	3,463.92
Marie E. Herda	do	2,667.30
Wallace L. Schubert	Special employee (appointed Dec. 1 1953, on a temporary basis).	706.03
George R. Stewart	Professional staff	5,642.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$2,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	40.97
Amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	15.25
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	56.22
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	1,943.78

SID SIMPSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JANUARY 15, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John O. Graham	Chief clerk and staff director.	$5,823.00
Fred G. Hussey	Minority clerk	5,823.00
Edward A. McCabe	General counsel	5,823.00
Russell C. Derrickson	Chief investigator	5,823.00
John S. Hoghland, 2d	Assistant general counsel.	5,823.00
Ben H. Johnson	Investigator	3,762.54
Myrtle S. Locher	Assistant to the clerk.	2,985.18
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant to the minority clerk.	3,001.86
Helen M. McCarthy	Stenographer	2,985.96
Marion E. Sittler	do	2,985.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	1,247.05
Amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	11,450.05
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	12,697.10
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	37,302.90

SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR.,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JANUARY 22, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator and committee clerk.	$5,823.00
Sheldon Z. Kaplan	Staff consultant	5,823.00
Roy J. Bullock	do	5,823.00
Albert C. F. Westphal	do	5,823.00
June Nigh	Staff assistant	3,145.25
Winifred G. Osborne	do	3,384.23
Helen C. Mattas	do	3,145.25
Myrtle M. Melvin	do	3,145.25
Helen L. Hashagen	do	3,145.25

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	1,063.72
Amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	27,811.50
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	28,875.22
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	46,124.78

ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 13, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Helen M. Boyer	Chief of staff	$5,469.72
J. Robert Brown	Research analyst	4,605.66
Joan B. Buechel	Clerk-stenographer (July 1 through Sept. 15, 1953).	1,009.13
Elizabeth A. Buell	Clerk-stenographer	2,481.41
Patricia J. Burtner	Clerk-stenographer (from Nov. 1, 1953).	750.33
Christine Ray Davis	Minority professional staff.	5,124.11
Reuben S. Heppes	Clerk for research and coordination.	2,523.90
William F. McKenna	General counsel (July 1 through Nov. 30, 1953).	4,852.50
Annabelle G. Moore	Clerk-stenographer	2,481.41
Martha C. Roland	Minority clerk	3,424.09
Clyde W. Smith	Investigations counsel (from Dec. 1, 1953).	970.50
Annabell Zue	Chief clerk	5,469.72

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 13, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

(NOTE.—Under H. Res. 339, approved on July 29, 1953, the funds previously appropriated for the House Committee on Government Operations were divided, and the chairmen of the Subcommittee on Military Operations, Public Accounts, Intergovernmental Relations, and International Operations were each granted authority to voucher that subcommittee's expenditures. Hence, no report is made for those subcommittees subsequent to July 31, 1953, as that duty now falls upon each of the subcommittees.)

Appropriation—H. Res. 150	$355,050.00
Expenses, July 1, 1953, through July 31, 1953:	
Full committee	3,532.68
Special Subcommittee To Investigate Federal-State Cooperation in Enforcement of Antiracketeering Laws and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and other Federal labor legislation	3,593.33
Special Subcommittee, Public Housing	2,395.36
Military Operations Subcommittee	4,647.40
Public Accounts Subcommittee	2,875.98
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	2,450.58
International Operations Subcommittee	5,912.39
Amount expended from July 1, 1953, through July 31, 1953	25,407.72
Amount of expenditures previously reported	67,791.97
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1953, through July 31, 1953	93,199.69
Balance unexpended as of Aug. 1, 1953	261,850.31

Full committee, Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN, chairman:

Expenses	817.43
Salaries:	
Lester P. Condon, chief investigator	836.73
Frederick E. Davis, investigator	350.37
Francis T. O'Donnell, investigator	555.65
Clyde W. Smith, investigator	894.34
Mildred Zweig, clerk-stenographer	378.16
	3,532.68

Special subcommittee, Public Housing: Expenses 2,395.36

Special Subcommittee To Investigate Federal-State Cooperation in Enforcement of Antiracketeering Laws and the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and Other Federal Labor Legislation: Expenses 3,593.33

Military Operations Subcommittee, Congressman R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, chairman:

Expenses	631.00
Salaries:	
Michael P. Balwan, staff director-investigator	802.17
Paul J. Cotter, chief counsel	970.50
Lewis J. Lapham, investigator	630.42
Robert T. Morris, legal assistant-investigator	510.93
Sylvia L. Swartzel, clerk-stenographer	417.99
Mary L. Vaughn, clerk-stenographer	378.16
Donnie J. Walters, typist	248.30
	4,647.40

Public Accounts Subcommittee, Congressman GEORGE H. BENDER, chairman:

Expenses	190.98
Salaries:	
Jack H. Bishop, Sr., investigator	510.93
Geraldean Colevas, clerk-stenographer	378.16
Elizabeth Frazer, clerk-stenographer	464.46
C. Niles Garrick, investigator	707.67
Arthur Toll, investigator	623.78
	2,875.98

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Congresswoman CECIL M. HARDEN, chairman: Expenses 535.99

Salaries:

Leslie T. Mahurin, investigator	486.26
Jane E. Morgan, clerk-stenographer	457.83
Ray Ward, staff director	970.50
	2,450.58

International Operations Subcommittee, Congressman CHARLES B. BROWNSON, chairman:

Expenses	$210.95
Salaries:	
Athena Gianakos, clerk-stenographer	335.01
Edward C. Kennelly, counsel	836.73
Maurice J. Mountain, staff director	917.37
Arthur Perlman, investigator	686.12
Chesley Prioleau, clerk-stenographer	358.92
Walton Woods, investigator	686.12
Wallace J. Parks, investigator	601.88
Warren Roberts, investigator	1,279.29
	5,912.39

H. Res. 339, apportioning appropriation originally made under H. Res. 150, allocated to full committee and Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization 100,000.00

Expenses, July 1, 1953, through Dec. 31, 1953:

Full committee, July 1, 1953, through Dec. 31, 1953	29,675.96
Special Subcommittee, Public Housing, July 1, 1953, through July 31, 1953 (expired on July 25, 1953)	2,395.36
Special Subcommittee To Investigate Federal-State Cooperation in Enforcement of Antiracketeering Laws and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and Other Federal Labor Legislation, July 1, 1953, through Sept. 30, 1953 (expired on Sept. 23, 1953)	7,821.70
Amount expended from July 1, 1953, through Dec. 31, 1953	39,893.02
Amount of expenditures previously reported	8,967.71
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1953, through Dec. 31, 1953	48,860.73
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1954	51,139.27

Full committee, Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN, chairman:

Expenses	10,380.88
Salaries:	
Everett W. Brown, investigator	1,422.41
Patricia J. Burtner, clerk-stenographer	668.08
Lester P. Condon, chief investigator	5,423.63
Frederick E. Davis, investigator	1,765.71
Thomas J. Hurley, Jr., investigator	681.27
Murray E. Jackson, investigator	707.67
Francis T. O'Donnell, investigator	2,206.07
F. Albert Reiman, investigator	1,478.22
Clyde W. Smith, investigations-counsel	4,563.86
Mildred Zweig, clerk-stenggrapher	378.16
	29,675.96

Special subcommittee, Public Housing: Expenses 2,395.36

Special Subcommittee To Investigate Federal-State Cooperation in Enforcement of Antiracketeering Laws and the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and Other Federal Labor Legislation: Expenses 7,821.70

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 14, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 5-month period from August 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

(This report is being submitted for the period August 1, 1953, through December 31, 1953, inasmuch as the Committee on Government Operations is reporting expenditures of this subcommittee through July 31, 1953.)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Michael P. Balwan	Staff director-investigator.	$4,500.50
Paul J. Cotter	Counsel-investigator.	4,852.50
Robert T. Morris	Legal assistant, investigator.	2,554.65
James C. Messersmith	Investigator	2,501.55
James F. Eckhart (Dec. 1, 1953 to Dec. 31, 1953).	do	500.31
Sylvia L. Swartzel	Clerk-stenographer	2,089.95
Mary L. Vaughan	do	1,890.80
Stanley T. Fisher	Accountant (Mr. Fisher has been on reimbursable detail from the Securities and Exchange Commission since Nov. 30, 1953, but no reimbursement for salary was made through Dec. 31, 1953.)	

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$64,425.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported (reported by Committee on Government Operations from January through July 1953)	25,297.30
Amount expended from Aug. 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	22,742.70
Total amount expended from January 1953 to December 1953	48,040.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31 1953	16,385.00

R. WALTER RIEHLMAN,
Chairman.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

JANUARY 15, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

(Under H. Res. 150, dated February 19, 1953, the chairman of the full committee was given authority to approve vouchers for the subcommittees. Under H. Res. 339, dated July 15, 1953, the funds were divided and the authority was delegated to the subcommittee chairmen. Therefore, the salaries and expenses of the subcommittee for the month of July 1953 is being reported by the chairman of the full committee.)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during period Aug. 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953, inclusive
Lillian E. Gray	Clerk-stenographer (July 21, 1953).	$12.52
Leslie T. Mahurin	Investigator (Aug. 1 to 31, inclusive).	486.26
Jane E. Morgan	Clerk-stenographer	2,289.15
John A. Stacy	Investigator (Dec. 16 to 31, inclusive).	548.60
Ray Ward	Staff director	4,852.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditures	$59,625.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	9,359.79
July expenditures reported by chairman of full committee	2,450.58
Amount expended from Aug. 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	9,078.02
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	20,888.39
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1954	38,736.61

CECIL M. HARDEN,
Chairman.

INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 28, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 5-month period from August 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 5-month period
Maurice J. Mountain	Staff director	$4,586.85
Edward C. Kennelly	Counsel	4,183.65
Walton Woods	Investigator	3,430.60
Arthur Perlman	do	3,430.60
Wallace Parks	do	2,407.52
Athena Gianakos	Clerk-stenographer	1,328.86
Chesley Prioleau	do	1,924.68
Warren Roberts	Investigator	1,151.41

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$66,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	20,985.42
Amount expended from Aug. 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	25,237.80
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	46,223.22
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	19,776.78

CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
Chairman.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 30, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 5-month period from August 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 5-month period
David H. Ashby, Jr.	Investigator	$300.31
Jack H. Bishop, Sr.	do	3,118.90
Geraldean Colevas	Clerk-stenographer	2,023.60
Lillian M. Freeny	do	520.32
Elizabeth Frazer	Clerk	2,455.10
C. Niles Garrick	Investigator	3,533.35
Curtis E. Johnson	do	1,500.63
Arthur Toll	do	3,202.79

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$65,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	16,617.52
Amount expended from Aug. 1 to Dec. 31	21,200.66
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31	37,818.18
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31	27,181.82

GEORGE H. BENDER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 13, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Marjorie Savage	Clerk	$5,296.92
Lea Booth	Assistant clerk	825.21
Jack Watson	do	4,951.26
Lura Cannon	do	3,463.92
Gladyce Talle	do	2,667.30
Loretta Livingston	do	1,998.12

K. M. LECOMPTE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JANUARY 13, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
R. S. Butler	Minerals consultant	$4,951.26
George W. Abbott	Counsel	4,951.26
John L. Taylor	Territories consultant (employed Dec. 1).	825.21
Clerical staff:		
Orland T. Huyck	Chief clerk	4,605.66
Nancy J. Arnold	Assistant chief clerk	4,093.92
Laura Ann Dick	Minority clerk	2,985.96
Patricia Ann Murray	Clerk	2,985.96
Charlotte T. Spalding	Clerk (resigned Aug. 15, 1953).	746.48

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	281.74
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	7,315.34
Total amount expended from Mar. 16 to Dec. 31, 1953	7,597.08
Balance unexpended as of Dec 31, 1953	42,402.92

A. L. MILLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

DECEMBER 31, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$5,823.00
Harold W. Lincoln	Assistant clerk (resigned to return to school Sept. 8, 1953).	1,158.10
Kenneth J. Painter	1st Assistant clerk	3,264.72
Georgia G. Glasmann.	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	2,826.60
Helen A. Grickis	do	2,731.02
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	2,189.34
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	5,823.00
Arlin E. Stockburger.	Aviation and engineering consultant.	5,823.00
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	5,823.00
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (funds authorized under H. Res. 128)	$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,621.44
Amount expended from July 1, 1953 to Dec. 31, 1953, used or obligated approximately	3,925.56
Total amount expended to Dec. 31, 1953	6,547.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953, approximate	53,453.00

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 15, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bessie M. Orcutt	Chief clerk	$5,823.00
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant	5,823.00
William R. Foley	Committee counsel	5,823.00
Walter R. Lee	Legislative assistant	5,823.00
Malcolm Mecartney	Committee counsel	5,823.00
Velma Smedley	Assistant chief clerk	5,823.00
Mary A. Ahern	Clerical staff	2,667.30
Violet T. Benn	do	3,702.90
Anne J. Berger	do	3,702.90
Rebecca D. Bergesen	do	3,065.58
Lucille E. Brooks	do	3,702.90
Frances Christy	do	3,702.90
Helen Goldsmith	do	3,702.90

1. Funds for preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and Revision of the Laws:	
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1953	$135,276.27
Expended	13,660.26
Balance, Dec. 31, 1953	121,616.01
B. Revision of the Laws, 1953:	
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1953	1,608.51
June expenditures (paid in July)	1,129.81
Balance, Dec. 31, 1953 (to be returned to Treasury)	478.70
C. Revision of the Laws, 1954:	
Authorized by 1954 Appropriation Act	13,760.00
Expended	5,823.00
Balance, Dec. 31, 1953	7,877.00
D. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1953	13,504.69
Expended	0.00
Balance Dec. 31, 1953	13,504.69
2. Funds pursuant to H. Res. 50 (H. Res. 66):	
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1953	44,580.83
Expended	17,208.31
Balance, Dec. 31, 1953	27,372.52
Employees pursuant to H. Res. 50 (H. Res. 66):	
Robert A. Collier, chief counsel (to Aug. 7, 1953)	1,196.94
Rufus G. King, Jr., assistant counsel (to Aug. 7, 1953)	879.04
Margaret J. Robey, staff assistant (to Aug. 7, 1953)	413.17
Jerrold Walden, counsel (to Aug. 30, 1953)	1,941.00
Orville R. Stewart, messenger	1,257.66
Total	5,687.81

CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JANUARY 7, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bernard J. Zincke	Counsel	$5,823.00
Leonard P. Pliska	Chief clerk	5,124.05
Ruth E. Brookshire	Clerk	3,782.52
Frances P. Still	Minority clerk	3,782.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount expended from Aug. 3, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	18.45
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	49,981.55

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

JANUARY 11, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederick C. Belen	Chief counsel	$5,823.00
Charles E. Johnson	Counsel	5,435.16
Lester C. Arvin	Clerk (July 1953)	836.73
John B. Price	Staff assistant	3,463.92
Lucy K. Daley	Assistant clerk	3,224.94
Lillian Hopkins	Secretary	2,826.60
Ann H. Gould	Stenographer	2,667.30
Evelyn K. Carson	do	2,029.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	4,418.03
Amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	13,029.02
Total amount expended from Feb. 18, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	17,447.05
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	32,552.95

EDWARD H. REES,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

DECEMBER 31, 1953.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert F. McConnell	Counsel and chief clerk.	$5,823.00
Charles G. Tierney	Counsel	5,823.00
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.	Assistant clerk	5,823.00
Margaret R. Beiter	Staff assistant	4,248.02
Violet V. Schumacher	do	4,248.02
Mildred A. Ames	do	1,870.68

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Total amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	17,560.03
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	12,439.97

GEO. A. DONDERO,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JANUARY 8, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jane W. Snader	Assistant clerk	$4,246.02
Agnes R. Hanford	do	2,428.32
C. O. Haley	Minority clerk	3,463.92
Humphrey S. Shaw	Assistant clerk (July 1 to 13, inclusive)	306.65

LEO E. ALLEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 18, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing:		
Dolores B. Anderson.	Reporter	$4,017.89
Donald T. Appell	Investigator	5,711.69
Thomas W. Beale, Sr.	Chief clerk	5,823.00
Juliette P. Joray	Secretary to chief clerk.	4,093.93
Robert L. Kunzig	Counsel	5,823.00
Rosella A. Purdy	Secretary to counsel.	4,093.93
Louis J. Russell	Chief investigator	5,823.00
Thelma Scearce	Secretary to chief investigator.	4,017.89
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Counsel	5,823.00
Anne D. Turner	Chief of reference section.	4,467.39
Investigative:		
James A. Andrews	Investigator	4,356.72
Frank Bonora	do	3,264.72
John W. Carrington	Assistant to the clerk.	3,463.92
George E. Cooper	Special investigator	3,463.92
Anniel Cunningham.	Information analyst	2,507.94
Earl Fuoss	Investigator	5,054.97
Jennie Hayes	Clerk-typist	2,268.96
Lillian Howard	Research analyst	3,185.07
W. Jackson Jones	Investigator	4,356.72
Larry Kerley	Special investigator	1,870.68
Helen Mattson	Information analyst	3,344.43
C. E. McKillips	Investigator	4,882.14
Isabel B. Nagel	Clerk-stenographer (appointed July 7, 1953).	2,732.36
Lorraine Nichols	Clerk-stenographer	2,786.76
Raphael I. Nixon	Director of research	5,823.00
Courtney E. Owens	Investigator	4,296.92
Asselia Poore	Editor	3,304.56
Carolyn G. Roberts	Assistant to the chief of reference section.	3,304.56
Rose Sanko	Clerk-stenographer	2,746.98
Leslie Scott	Research analyst	3,463.92
Josephine Sheetz	Switchboard operator.	2,109.66
Gladys Slack	Information analyst	2,587.62
Riley D. Smith	Stock clerk	2,189.34
Alvin W. Stokes	Investigator	3,463.92
Ruth K. Tansill	Information analyst	2,746.98
Margaret Thomas	File clerk	1,870.68
Alice E. Walker	Information analyst (leave without pay Nov. 1, 1953).	1,831.32
Wm. A. Wheeler	Investigator	5,573.40
George C. Williams	do	4,246.02
Kathryn E. Zimmerman.	Clerk-stenographer	2,746.98
Barbara Jean O'Neal	Clerk-stenographer (resigned Oct. 1, 1953).	1,333.65
Billie Wheeler	Clerk-stenographer (temporary Nov. 1, 1953 to Dec. 10, 1953).	628.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	128,101.37
Amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	139,831.39
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	267,932.76
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	32,067.24

HAROLD H. VELDE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JANUARY 11, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Karl Standish	Chief clerk	$5,823.00
Casey M. Jones	Professional aid	5,823.00
Harold A. L. Lawrence	do	5,823.00
Oliver E. Meadows	do	5,823.00
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel	5,823.00
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	4,951.26
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	2,850.50
Frances Montanye	do	2,850.50
Ida Rowan	Administrative assistant	5,823.00
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk	2,970.27
Helen Wright [1]	Clerk-stenographer	2,826.60

[1] Paid from special funds authorized to the committee for an inspection of the Veterans' Administration (H. Res. 34 approved Mar. 4, 1953).

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	3,313.37
Amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	7,233.90
Total amount expended from Mar. 5, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	10,547.27
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31 1953	30,452.73

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JANUARY 15, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Russell E. Train	Clerk (C)	$5,823.00
Thomas A. Martin	Professional assistant (P).	4,605.66
Richard M. Furland	do	5,366.04
Karl T. Schlotterbeck	do	5,823.00
Leo H. Irwin	Minority adviser (P).	5,823.00
Susan Alice Taylor	Staff assistant	3,559.50
Frances C. Russell	do	3,453.92
Anne Gerden	do	2,906.28
June A. Kendall	Staff assistant to the minority.	$2,906.28
Virginia M. Butler	Staff assistant	2,906.28
Hughlon Greene	Messenger	1,870.68
Walter B. Little	do	1,870.68

DANIEL A. REED,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JANUARY 15, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carl E. Davis	Staff director	$4,246.02
David E. White	Chief investigator	3,782.52
L. V. Monzel	Research analyst	3,623.22
Melvin M. Miller	Counsel	2,468.11
Jane M. Deem	Clerk	3,025.74
Elizabeth H. Feltman	Clerical assistant	2,826.60
Elva W. Bell	do	2,677.30
Marjorie E. Heston	do	1,884.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$135,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	30,910.07
Amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	30,447.77
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	61,357.84
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	73,642.16

WILLIAM S. HILL,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY THE SEIZURE AND FORCED INCORPORATION OF LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA BY THE U. S. S. R.

JANUARY 19, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James J. McTigue	Counsel	$1,649.84
Richard B. Walsh	Staff consultant	3,542.15
Will Allen	Staff assistant	2,521.68
Charles T. Baroch	Research analyst	2,384.92
Bette B. Welch	Clerk-stenographer	402.01
Margaret J. Robey	do	1,616.16

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	9,193.56
Total amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	21,310.32
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	8,689.68

CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

JANUARY 19, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from September 15, 1953, to December 31, 1953, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Casey, Kathryn P.	Legal analyst	$1,526.76
Dodd, Norman	Research director	3,282.08
Ettinger, Karl E.	Research consultant	1,773.48
De Huszar, George B.	Special expert	1,339.30
Koch, Arnold T.	Associate counsel	2,966.61
Lake, Ellyn	Secretary to counsel	890.74
Lonergan, Lucy W.	Research assistant	926.48
McNiece, Thomas M.	Assistant research director.	1,900.83
Marshall, John, Jr.	Chief clerk	1,274.19
Miller, Carolyn A.	Assistant clerk	1,214.16
Pickett, Virginia	Secretary	807.72
Wormser, Rene A.	General counsel	3,429.08
Kuhns, William C.	Research assistant	543.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Total amount expended from Sept. 15, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	24,493.74
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	25,506.26

CARROLL REECE,
Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2676. A bill for the relief of Carl A. Annis, Wayne C. Cranney, and Leslie O. Yarwood; without amendment (Rept. No. 1141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5158. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Welch Sanders; with amendment (Rept. No. 1142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5433. A bill for the relief of Perry Perkins and Norah Meredith Perkins, parents of Opal Perkins, deceased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6642. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7460. A bill to pay Warren P. Hoover for services rendered the Army of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 7640. A bill to provide for the disposition as surplus property of Camp Pickett, Va.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 7641. A bill to further encourage the distribution of fishery products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 7642. A bill to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 7643. A bill to provide that loans made under sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress, as amended, shall be referred to as "emergency loans" rather than as "disaster loans"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 7644. A bill to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act, to authorize additional amounts for construction loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 7645. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that revenue from the sale or license of patents shall be treated as capital gains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7646. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a percentage depletion allowance for patents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 7647. A bill to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the North Unit Irrigation District, to authorize construction of Haystack Reservoir on the Deschutes Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 7648. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Iowa State Fair and Exposition; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. D'EWART (by request):

H. R. 7649. A bill to establish the Fort Peck Indian Lands Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7650. A bill to provide home rule for the Assiniboine-Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 7651. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Iowa State Fair and Exposition; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7652. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that no citizen shall be excluded from service as juror by reason of his or her sex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 7653. A bill to prescribe certain limitations with respect to outpatient dental care for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 7654. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 7655. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Iowa State Fair and Exposition; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 7656. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Iowa State Fair and Exposition; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 7657. A bill to provide for the forfeiture of motor vehicles used in violating Federal laws in certain cases involving the use of force and violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7658. A bill to prevent unjustified claims of the privilege against self-incrimination from being made before courts and congressional committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7659. A bill to authorize the expenditure of public funds for the assistance of State, municipal, and other nonprofit youth projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 7660. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Iowa State Fair and Exposition; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 7661. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Iowa State Fair and Exposition; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 7662. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish policies and programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 7663. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish policies and programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 7664. A bill to provide for the development of the Priest Rapids site on the Columbia River, Wash., under a license issued pursuant to the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 7665. A bill to provide for the development of the Priest Rapids site on the Columbia River, Wash., under a license issued pursuant to the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 7666. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Iowa State Fair and Exposition; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 7667. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 7668. A bill to provide for flood-control improvements on the Middle Fork of the Flathead River in the vicinity of Belton, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 7669. A bill to authorize the improvement of Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 7670. A bill relating to the referral of cases by the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Tax Court; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 7671. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, so as to encourage further the distribution of fishery products and the development of markets for fishery products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7672. A bill to provide reemployment rights and benefits for certain persons who serve on active duty with the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAUFFER:

H. R. 7673. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to provide that unemployment compensation grants thereunder shall not be made to any State unless the unemployment compensation law of such State makes benefits available to all employees of contributing employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:

H. R. 7674. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes, bands, and colonies of Indians in the State of Utah and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 7675. A bill providing that there shall be equal pay for equal work for women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 7676. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Iowa State Fair and Exposition; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 7677. A bill to amend section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to increase minimum cotton acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 7678. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 7679. A bill to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the Seneca Nation and the Tonawanda Band of Senecas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7680. A bill to provide for the capitalization of a treaty annuity paid to the Six Nations of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 7681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the limitations on the amount of medical and dental expenses which may be deducted, to permit taxpayers to deduct such expenses, to arrive at their adjusted gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 7682. A bill to establish the United States Air Force Academy at Camp McCoy, Sparta, Wis.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 7683. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 366. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. J. Res. 367. Joint resolution permitting articles imported from foreign countries for

the purpose of exhibition at the International Trade-Sample Fair, Dallas, Tex., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 198. Concurrent resolution expressing the condemnation of the Congress with respect to the arrest and imprisonment of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski and other similar instances of religious persecution in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Res. 432. Resolution providing additional funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by clause 8 of rule XI, incurred by the Public Accounts Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urging the Congress of the United States to investigate fully the unjust annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and the atrocities committed therein by the Communist leaders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to remove that part of the social-security law limiting the earnings of a recipient of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of Colorado State Senate urging Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to effectively administer the Federal experiment stations of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, which are located in the Great Plains area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Colorado State Senate urging Congress to enact legislation granting increased credits under social security to military or naval veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress to urge the Department of Defense, through the Air Force, to establish a troop carrier squadron at the Lawrence Municipal Airport; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress to extend the statute of limitations for prosecuting persons acting against the security and safety of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts urging the Congress to investigate fully the unjust annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and the atrocities committed therein by the Communist leaders; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to enact legislation whereby Korean veterans may receive the same educational opportunities and advantages granted veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to remove that part of the social security law limiting the earnings of a recipient of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress to provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7684. A bill for the relief of the estate of Joseph Alfonso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 7685. A bill for the relief of Artin Kussian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 7686. A bill or the relief of Lynton John Band; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 7687. A bill for the relief of the Noncommissioned Officers Club of the 119th Field Artillery Battalion of the Michigan National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7688. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anneleise Erna Kinney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 7689. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Marcelle Lebrun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 7690. A bill for the relief of Rex R. Atwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 7691. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to George C. Stratton and Ellen J. Stratton; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 7692. A bill for the relief of George B. Wollenschleger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 7693. A bill for the relief of Moses Aaron Butterman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7694. A bill for the relief of Jacob Baronian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 7695. A bill for the relief of Anton Stanak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 7696. A bill to authorize Gen. Charles L. Bolte to accept and wear the Grand Cordon of the Most Blessed Trinity with Plaque from the Emperor of Ethiopia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 7697. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aurelia Milewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7698. A bill for the relief of William V. Dobbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 7699. A bill for the relief of Antonio de Oliveria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

488. By Mr. MAHON: Petition of E. F. Riggs, president of the Gaines County, Tex., Farm Bureau, and others regarding improvement in method for allotting cotton acreage under farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

489. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the President, Volunteer Young Republican Club of Knox County, Knoxville, Tenn., stating their opposition to foreign economic aid except and only under the most urgent circumstances, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

490. Also, petition of the president, the National Society of the Sons of Utah Pioneers, Salt Lake City, Utah, relative to recommending the immediate construction of the Echo Park Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

491. Also, petition of the president, Brooklyn Diocesan Union of the Holy Name Society, Brooklyn, N. Y., requesting passage of the Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

492. Also, petition of Frank S. Ditzen, New York, N. Y., requesting removal of that part of the social-security law limiting the earnings of a recipient of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

493. Also, petition of the secretary, Central Labor Council of Portland and vicinity, Portland, Oreg., requesting that they be placed on record as being in favor of personal income taxes being levied on income, regardless of source, and being opposed to any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

494. Also, petition of Labor Membership of the Union of Taitung District of the Province of Taiwan, Formosa, relative to a communication from the Labor Union of Taitung District of the Province of Taiwan, Formosa, relating to the freeing of the 22,000 anti-Communist prisoners of war in Korea on January 23, 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

495. Also, petition of Iolanda Giannola, Torre del Greco, Naples, Italy, relative to her application for the official repatriation of her husband, Crescenzo Di Donna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Investing in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, never in the history of America has the comfort and prosperity of so many people been so dependent upon so few.

Who are these who have assumed so great a responsibility? They are not the possessors of wealth. Neither are they generals in the Army, nor directors of factories, nor we who make the country's laws. In short, they are the scientists, and we are learning how fearfully small are their numbers.

Two world wars and the threat of a third, have made plain the insufficiency of our resources. As never before, we realize that the 48 States, even with Alaska and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, lack many of the raw materials necessary to a balanced national economy. During times of peace we can import partial supplies of the materials we most need, but let a war break out and the accompanying restrictions could leave us crippled before the enemy.

Our present relative security is due in no small part to technically trained men and women who have confronted each new problem with a "what," a "why," and a "how." The products of their initiative and ingenuity surround us. They include antibiotics and vitamins, fertilizers, new strains of plants to produce food and fiber in greater abundance, metals that refuse to be deformed by heat, new metals, such as germanium, which can be used in tiny transistors to replace complicated electronic tubes, and enough other things to fill a book bigger than the Federal budget.

Their creation is the product of minds disciplined by rigorous training and encouraged to make infinite sacrifices. That this Nation may have such carefully trained and dedicated minds in ample numbers is a problem of major importance.

It remained for the Westinghouse Electric Corp., as recently as 1942, to conceive a plan for dramatizing the search for scientific talent and to interest the possessors of such talent in further study. Science Service, Inc., of Washington, D. C., cooperated with the company to form science clubs of America with chapters in public, private, and parochial high schools over the entire country. By these means, thousands of boys and girls have been encouraged to give serious thought to careers of science.

On February 25, for the 13th time, 40 who have been selected as individual prize winners will come to Washington. For 5 days, these 8 girls and 32 boys will be the guests of the Westinghouse Electric Corp. at the science talent institute, and will compete for $11,000 in Westinghouse science scholarships.

From 16,344 high-school seniors who entered the competition, a young man has been chosen from my district, the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey. He is Bevan M. French, of 98 Alexander Avenue, in Nutley. At 16 he has proved real capacity as a researcher. He stands at the head of his class of 240 high-school seniors.

His interest drew him to the mine dumps of the New Jersey Zinc Co., and the things which he found are written up in a carefully documented report entitled "Present-Day Mineral Collecting at Franklin, N. J." Parts of it are illustrated with color photographs of mineral specimens, which he made under fluorescent light.

My pride in the fact that he has been chosen to come to Washington will be heightened if he receives the $2,800 Westinghouse grand science scholarships or any of the lesser Westinghouse science scholarships. But regardless of how he fares with the judges, I am deeply moved as I think of the contribution this great American industry is making for our future.

These 13 annual science talent searches mark a high point in civic leadership. Neither you nor I can predict what the future holds for this young man, or for the 520 young people who have come to Washington to attend the succession of these events. Least of all can we predict concerning the hundreds of thousands of young people who were encouraged to interest themselves in the opportunities provided by the various fields of science.

We can, however, be certain that these young people will participate in some amazing and profitable developments.

Talents such as they are demonstrating are products of inheritance, the opportunities of a free environment, and educational discipline. Under the best of conditions, those who have them are in the minority. But when a great corporation like Westinghouse sets out to encourage them, the investment promises assurance for America's future.

Port of Baltimore Improvement Excluded From Budget, Yet $105 Million Requested for St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, we have had a few days now to examine the administration's budget and to see in what respects its substance, the proposals for spending and appropriations legislation, differ from the lofty objectives of economy and efficiency to which it is nominally dedicated.

One of the small items omitted from the budget, from which the Nation would derive current and future benefits far greater than cost, is improvement of the harbor and channels at Baltimore. The port of Baltimore, the Nation's second port, has great advantages of position for the future of the steel industry on which our economy and its defense are founded. Through this port millions of tons of iron ore for the expanding steel industry of the eastern States, are imported each year. The imported ores come from huge and rich reserves in South America, and can be used economically by the steel industry because of the location of the port of Baltimore, and the comparatively inexpensive rail transportation available from there. The future development of the eastern steel industry will require use of increasing volumes of imported ores. If vessels of the most economical size for handling this ore are to be accommodated, the port of Baltimore will need both widening, and deepening to perhaps 40 feet. But work for such an essential project, though costing little in relation to the national benefits quickly obtainable from it, is not provided in the current budget. Instead, money is being requested of the Congress for the St. Lawrence seaway, a project which will not be beneficial to American shipping. In fact, only 2 percent of our American ships will be able to use the seaway. It will be used, however, by foreign ships which have shorter drafts than our American vessels. Then too, this seaway is frozen over 4 or 5 months each year.

If we are, as the President proposed in his message accompanying the budget, to "find better and less expensive ways of doing things which must be done by the Federal Government," then we must add to past Federal improvements of the harbor and channels of the port of Baltimore, and avoid projects such as the St. Lawrence which do not need our aid, are of undemonstrated worth and of uncertain, but clearly large, future cost.

Defense Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in making an approach to the amount of funds that should be carried for the Defense Department, we should have in mind not only the requests that the President has made through the budget, but also a breakdown of the unexpended and unobligated balances that will be available out of funds that have already been appropriated but are presently unexpended.

The unexpended funds on June 30 will amount to $51,600,000,000, of which $14,200,000,000 will be for the Army, $13,500,000,000 for the Navy, and $23,600,000,000 for the Air Force, and approximately $300,000,000 for interservice activities.

Of this $51,600,000,000, the budget estimate indicates that $8.5 billion of continuing type money will not have been obligated at all, and that it will be available for the placing of new contracts and orders in the fiscal year 1955. Of this amount, $4,087,000,000 will be available for Army procurement and $700,000,000 more will be available for other Army purposes. A very large proportion of the funds that will be carried forward in this way will be still available to the Army because of the let-up in the Korean hostilities.

I call attention to this situation especially because no new funds are carried in the budget for procurement and production in the Army, although $3,224,000,000 was provided in last year's appropriation, but we already will have available without any appropriation for this purpose the $4,087,000,000, which is 25 percent more than the total appropriation for this procurement and production item last year.

There will be $600 million available to the Navy, and that will supplement the appropriations that are made for the Navy.

There will be $2,800,000,000 available to the Air Force for obligation out of previous appropriations, and of this $1,600,000,000 will be available to the Air Force for the procurement of additional airplanes. This figure, added to the budget estimate of $2,760,000,000 will make a

figure at least $1,100,000,000 above the appropriation that was carried last year. In addition to these amounts, $250,000,000 will be available for obligation for interservice activities.

When you add the practically $30 billion of new appropriations which are requested in the budget for the military functions of the Defense Department to the unobligated balances, you will have a total of approximately $38,400,000,000 available for new obligations, of which over $13 billion will be available to the Army, $10½ billion to the Navy, $14 billion to the Air Force, and over $800 million for interservice activities. This represents, in my opinion, ample funds for the various activities of the Defense Department, and after the Congress has been over the situation carefully we will hope that we will be able to find places where things can be reduced.

The hearings are starting today, and I expect that they will continue for at least 6 weeks and perhaps 7 before we are able to report a bill. This should give us ample time to find out what are the real needs of the Department of Defense.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Moscow has just kicked out its Health Minister. When do they reach the "M's"?

Proposed Concession Awards Submitted for Approval in Accordance With Act of July 3, 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to proposed award of concession permits; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Proposed concession awards submitted for approval in accordance with act of July 31, 1953

	Concessioner	National park or monument	State	Service
1.	Mount Whitney Pack Trains (1 year).	Furnace Creek Ranch, Death Valley National Monument.	California	Saddle horse and pack trip service.
2.	William W. and Barbara W. Myers (1 year).	Wildrose Station, Death Valley National Monument.	do	Public accommodations, facilities, and services.
3.	Martin Kilian (1 year extension).	Mount Rainier National Park.	Washington	Do.
4.	Edward B. Rushford and George I. Gravert (5 years).	Salem Maritime National Historic Site.	Massachusetts	Operate the Rum Shop.
5.	The Naches Co., Inc. (renewal for Oct. 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954).	Mount Rainier National Park.	Washington	Operate ski tows, provide limited lunch service, sell and rent ski equipment.
6.	Albert Weiss, doing business as Friant Garage (1 year).	Millerton Lake National Recreation Area.	California	Towing service and emergency auto repairs.
7.	George W. Hurt (2 years)	Rocky Mountain National Park.	Colorado	Ski tows, lunch stand, and rent ski equipment.
8.	Mrs. Marilyn J. Wright (Sept. 16, 1953, to June 14, 1954.)	Crater Lake National Park.	Oregon	Provide limited lunch service.
9.	Joseph E. Niemeyer (renewal Dec. 1, 1953, through Apr. 30, 1954).	Olympic National Park	Washington	Operate ski rental business.
10.	Glacier Park Co. (1 year)	Glacier National Park	Montana	Public accommodations, facilities, and services.
11.	Donald P. Christianson (renewal Dec. 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954).	Narada Falls-Paradise Area, Mount Rainier National Park.	Washington	Operate portable rope ski tows and provide light lunch service.
12.	Oregon Caves Resort (2 years extension).	Oregon Caves National Monument.	Oregon	Public accommodation, services, and facilities.
13.	Mr. and Mrs. Charles Roening (1 year renewal).	Olympic National Park	Washington	Do.
14.	Mr. and Mrs. John C. Turner (1 year).	Grand Teton National Park	Wyoming	Operate the Triangle X Guest Ranch.
15.	Anton Ashenbrenner (renewal Jan. 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1954).	Olympic National Park	Washington	Operate store, gasoline station, and cabin camp.
16.	Clifton D. Rock (1 year)	Cabrillo National Monument.	California	Sell souvenirs.
17.	Murl Emery (renewal Jan. 1, 1954, through June 30, 1954).	Lake Mead National Recreation Area.	Nevada	Provide public accommodations and facilities at Searchlight Ferry.
18.	Fred Harvey (1 year extension).	Grand Canyon National Park.	Arizona	Public accommodations on the South Rim.
19.	Leroy Orme & John Scudder.	Everglades National Park	Florida	Sale of bait.
	O. P. Patton & J. W. Mills.	do	do	Do.
	Walter F. Mann	do	do	Charter boat service for sport fishing.
	William Mann	do	do	Do.
	Peter G. Mills	do	do	Do.
	Stevie Roberts	do	do	Do.
	Finis A. Williams	do	do	Do.
	Tommy N. Williams	do	do	Do.
	Lewis C. Watson (2 years)	do	do	Do.
20.	J. R. Dickson (1 year)	Kings Canyon National Park.	California	Operate gasoline service station at Big Stump.
21.	Sam B. Davis, Jr. (2 years)	do	do	Pack and saddle horse operations.
22.	McKinley Park Services (5 years).	Mount McKinley National Park.	Alaska	Accommodations facilities and services.

School for Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the news that Uncle Sam is planning a school for the training of air officers comparable to West Point and Annapolis has moved a reader of these notes to propose a new type of training to counteract our emphasis upon military instruction. A school for peace is suggested, with teachers brought in from countries all over the world to present their languages, customs, traditions, and ideas. Such a school would be interested in breaking down the cultural barriers which separate the nations and would be a logical place for the training of diplomats who would be prepared for their arduous tasks.

No one can question the soundness of the proposal as a theoretical approach to our very practical world problems. Like other similar good suggestions, the one obstacle in the way to its realization is the adamant attitude taken by the Soviet Union to every proposal for improved international understanding. They don't let their professors out of sight. They screen every student who even dares to think of leaving Russia for foreign training. What would happen in the present state of world affairs, at least, is what has happened every time, the western countries would be all for it, but the Soviet orbit would remain impenetrable. After a while, you get a little tired of making all the overtures.

What Is the Bricker Amendment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, since the debate is now in full swing in the Senate for the adoption or rejection of the Bricker amendment, let us see what the amendment says:

SECTION 1. That no provision of a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution shall be of any force or effect.

Why should anyone want to object to this section? Those who are against the amendment say this language is unnecessary, because the Supreme Court on many occasions has announced this doctrine. Such assurance from the High Court might be satisfactory if its holding would always be of that purport. But we have seen recently that there is danger of having this view of the Supreme Court changed. The adoption of the Charter of the United Nations has brought about confusion and serious concern to those who are determined to preserve our Constitution, "against all enemies, foreign and domestic."

In the Fujii case in California the lower court held that the provisions of the charter of the United Nations superceded the State laws of California. If that decision had stood the whole country would have been alarmed. The appeals court reversed this decision. The controversy, however, brought about much litigation and many anxious hours for the defenders of the Constitution.

In the Steel Seizure case we again saw the mischief of this Charter. In this case the question before the Court was, "Did President Truman have the power to seize the steel industry of the United States?" The Constitution was examined and nowhere in it could be found any authority for the President's action. If he could seize one industry he could seize any industry by merely stating that the seizure was necessary for the war effort—an undeclared war at that. He could seize any industry in the United States or in its possessions. He could seize all the grain elevators, all the manufacturing plants, all the farms, or any other form of business in the country.

The Chief Justice admitted there was no power in the Constitution authorizing the President to make such seizure, but he turned to the Charter of the United Nations and there found authority for that purpose. Most people will not believe this statement. Nevertheless it is a fact. That is just what the Chief Justice did. Suppose the majority of the Court had been of the same opinion, where would our Constitution be today? It would stand superseded by the Charter of the United Nations, approved as a treaty. Fortunately for the American people, and fortunately for the perpetuation of liberty in America, the majority of the Court decided otherwise.

Had the Bricker amendment been in operation no such situations as those presented in the Fujii and the Steel Seizure cases could ever have arisen.

In this last-mentioned case you can see how close we came to substituting another document for the Constitution of the United States. Three members were for the substitution, one did not express an opinion, and five were against it. Some other time we might not have the majority of that Court standing firmly to support the Constitution of the United States. Why put ourselves in this jeopardy when the Bricker amendment will eliminate that chance?

Section 2 provides that no treaty shall be effective as internal law unless implemented by legislation which would be valid apart from the treaty. In other words, an internal law which is valid under the Constitution of the United States shall stand against any provision of any treaty.

Can anyone object to this? Suppose we have a law in North Dakota that is in harmony with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. Does anyone want to bring about a condition where that valid law can be swept aside by a treaty—such as the Charter of the United Nations, such as the Covenant of Human Rights, such as the genocide treaty? If North Dakota law could be set aside with impunity so could the law or laws of any State in the Union. Do the States want to take this chance? Do the people of the United States want any such treaty power hanging over their heads, endangering the liberties that they and their sires have fought for? The Bricker amendment will eliminate this fear and this constant menace to our liberties.

Section 3 provides that the Congress shall have power to regulate executive agreements, and such agreements shall be subject to the same limitations as treaties.

That means that with the Bricker amendment in operation there could be no more Teherans, no more Yaltas, no more Potsdam agreements, which the people of the United States never knew existed until years after the agreements were made. The Yalta agreement let the Russians right in at the back door of Korea. It made the Korean war possible. It cost us 27,000 American lives, and a billion dollars a month while the fighting lasted. The Potsdam agreement sent 300,000 Germans to the Russian mines to slave their lives away. Would the Congress or the American people have approved either or any of these agreements if they had known what was contained in them? The Bricker amendment will put a stop to this back-door secret agreement business. Where is the American who is not in favor of this?

Now you have the three sections of the Bricker amendment.

It is unusual for a President to get into a legislative fight. It is unusual for a President to interfere with legislation. It is unusual for a President to ask for, or continue, autocratic powers; and unless he has become a complete follower of the Truman internationalism he will not object to letting Congress express the will of the people.

With this President it might be all right to let him operate with a free hand. The most beneficial government on earth is a benevolent dictatorship. But the people have found out from the history of the world that dictators do not always remain benevolent, or that when succeeded a different kind of man may take his place. No, sir. I would not trust any man with this power. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and I propose to exercise that vigilance to protect our liberty and our freedom.

Hearings on Flood-Control Authorizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 the Committee on Public Works will begin hearings on flood-control authorizations for projects on which the Chief of Engineers has submitted favorable reports since the passage of the Flood Control Act of May 17, 1950. Hearings will be held in room 1302, New House Office Building.

The hearings will be before the Subcommittee on Flood Control, of which the Honorable RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington, is chairman, and will convene at 10 o'clock each morning. All proponents and opponents of a project, including Senators and Representatives, will be heard on the day scheduled for the consideration of that project following the presentation of the Chief of Engineers, the Assistant Chief of Engineers, or the representative of the Civil Works Division, Corps of Engineers. All proponents and opponents should submit their names before the hearing to the clerk of the committee indicating the projects in which they are interested.

Tuesday, February 16: Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Chief of Engineers, will open the testimony of the Corps of Engineers with a report on the status of the Federal flood-control program, together with his recommendations for further supplementing the authorized program. General Sturgis will be accompanied by Brig. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Deputy Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, Col. William Whipple, executive officer for the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, and Col. Alfred D. Starbird, Assistant Chief of Civil Works for Flood Control.

Eastern United States: Susquehanna River, Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y.—House Document 500, 81st Congress.

Wednesday, February 17, Ohio and Missouri River Basins:

Little Calumet River and tributaries, Indiana—House Document No. 153, 82d Congress.

Sandy Lick Creek, Reynoldsville, Pa.—House Document No. 716, 81st Congress.

Coal Creek and tributaries, Tennessee—House Document No. 154, 82d Congress.

Little Missouri River at Marmath, N. Dak.—Senate Document No. 134, 81st Congress.

Thursday, February 18, upper and lower Mississippi River Basins:

Mississippi River, Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Ill.—House Document No. 281, 83d Congress.

Mississippi River, Sny Island, Ill.—House Document No. 247, 83d Congress.

New Madrid Floodway, Mo.—House Document No. 183, 83d Congress.

Friday, February 19, southwestern United States, Alaska, and Hawaii:

Arkansas River, Holla Bend Bottom, Ark.—House Document No. 157, 82d Congress.

Arkansas River, Conway County drainage and levee district No. 1, Arkansas—House Document No. 167, 82d Congress.

Arkansas River at Enid, Okla.—House Document No. 185, 83d Congress.

Gold Creek and tributaries, Alaska—House Document No. 54, 82d Congress.

Wailoa Stream, Island of Hawaii, T. H.—House Document No. 529, 81st Congress.

Other flood-control projects eligible for hearings at a later date are as follows:

Missouri River Basin:

Chariton River and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri—House Document No. 561, 81st Congress.

Kansas River and tributaries, Kansas and Missouri—House Document No. 642, 81st Congress.

Southwestern United States:

Brazos River and tributaries, Texas—House Document No. 535, 81st Congress.

Buffalo Bayou, Tex.—House Document No. 250, 83d Congress.

Progress Made in Saline Water Conversion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, as the water needs of our country grow and our available supplies dwindle, the importance of water to our wellbeing and to our overall national economy is impressed upon us more and more. As most of my colleagues know, water is already a critical item in many sections of our land. In this situation, it is necessary that our study and research of possible new sources of supply move forward as rapidly as possible. In 1952, I authored the legislation which initiated the saline water research program, the objective of which is to develop economically feasible processes for converting saline water to fresh water. The progress being made in this program is encouraging. It is my firm belief that as a result of the research and study now underway, large-scale conversion of salt water to fresh water for municipal and industrial purposes is not far in the future. Conversion for agricultural purposes, though further in the future for economic reasons, is not out of the question, particularly in view of advances in the field of atomic power and other energy sources.

Having authored the saline water research legislation, I naturally have followed the program with great interest. The Secretary of the Interior has just transmitted to the Congress his second annual report covering the program and I am pleased to report briefly to my colleagues upon the progress that has been made.

The Department of the Interior accomplishes this saline water conversion program by conducting research through federally financed grants and contracts, encouraging development by correlating and coordinating research efforts in this field, and encouraging other public bodies and private enterprise in research. Every effort has been and is being made to encourage private research and to interest private industry in the development of demineralization processes. As important as any other phase of the program is the coordination of research with private interests and governmental organizations. This makes available in one place the results of all research in the field.

The organization of the program has been completed. It consists mainly of federally sponsored research projects involving known as well as new approaches to saline water conversion. Contract research in a number of areas is now underway and compilation and dissemination of information on demineralization processes are well along. The services of highly qualified scientific personnel have been obtained both to conduct research and to serve as consultants. Already several processes now in the laboratory development stage show promise of successful application to particular phases of the saline water conversion program. More extensive research on these is planned. As processes are developed in the laboratory of sufficient promise, field tests will be needed to determine feasibility on a large-scale basis. Exploratory research now underway in other fields should result in additional promising methods which will warrant further developments. As one possible solution to low-cost demineralization lies in the use, re-use or conservation of the energy required in any applied separation process, considerable attention is being devoted to potential energy sources which might be used. As a result, it is clear that a part of the saline water conversion program must be devoted to research in the direction of new or little-used sources of energy.

Research projects completed or now being carried out through contracts with scientific, engineering, industrial, and educational institutions, and qualified individuals are briefly described in the following paragraphs.

A study of sea water demineralization by solar distillation has been completed at the University of California. Solar distillation is attractive because no fuel is required and relatively little mechanical power is involved. The results were sufficiently favorable to warrant further study.

Ionics, Inc., of Cambridge, Mass., has completed an ion transfer membrane demineralizer and has run tests for producing fresh water from several types of brackish water. The company's cost estimates for fresh water by this process are very reasonable and Department engineers and consultants feel that field testing of larger capacity demineralizers is necessary.

Other research projects that are well along include an investigation by Battelle Memorial Institution of multiple-effect evaporation of saline water by steam from solar radiation; development of an improved method for analyzing vapor compression distillation cycles by the Heinz Engineering Co. of Arlington, Va.; and an engineering survey and evaluation of methods for demineralization of sea water with solar energy by Dr. O. G. Lof, of Denver, Colo. Studies to date under these contracts are encouraging.

Several other projects are under way. The University of Florida has contracted to conduct exploratory research in the development and testing of synthetic osmotic membranes suitable for use in processes for the economical large-scale production of fresh water from sea or other saline waters. A study to determine more exactly the actual energy demands, including energy losses, as compared with basic theoretical thermodynamic minimum energy requirement is being carried on at the State University of New York. Yale University is conducting investigations of a method of improving heat transfer rates in vapor-compression evaporators. Texas A. & M. Research Foundation is conducting exploratory research on the applicability of solvent extraction processes to the economic demineralization of salt water. The objective of a contract with Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn is to develop and test ion selective and ion specific membranes suitable for use in electrodialysis processes.

In addition to the research projects, many surveys have been completed or are under way. In order to have some measure for comparison of costs with the various processes studied, a survey of present water costs throughout the Nation for municipal, industrial, and agricultural uses has been completed. Broad, general surveys of the location and extent of surface and underground brackish water are being made under the supervision of the Geological Survey.

A survey of potential needs for converting sea water for irrigation use is being made under the direction of the Bureau of Reclamation. A contract with the University of Minnesota calls for developing a procedure for surveying waste heat that might be utilized for demineralization purposes.

Many other research proposals have been evaluated and rejected by Department engineers and consultants. Many additional proposals are in the process of being evaluated. Undoubtedly, many will be found desirable for further research and study.

Farm Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a table prepared by Administrator R. B. McLeaish, of the Farmers Home Administration, which reveals the number of loans under the farm housing program from the inception of the program through December 31, 1953. I think the members will be interested to study the figures for their respective States. This has been a sound and deserving program. It is with much concern that I learn that no funds are provided in the new budget for a continuation of this program during the new fiscal year. I call attention to the fact that as of December 31, 1953, there were on file 5,097 applications of which 2,042 were for veterans. Likely, there will be some funds available between January 1, 1954, and the end of the present fiscal year to process some of these loans but what concerns me is the need to continue this program. I am in hopes that the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations will take note of this program and see that this program does not die for the lack of interest:

United States Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Home Administration—Farm housing program data, from inception of program through Dec. 31, 1953

State	Number loans made		Amount loaned		Average amount loaned		Number of borrowers in arrears on Jan. 31, 1953	Applications on hand Dec. 31, 1953			
								Veteran and nonveteran		Veteran only	
	Veteran and nonveteran	Veteran only	Veteran and nonveteran	Veteran only	Veteran and nonveteran	Veteran only		Number	Estimated amount	Number	Estimated amount
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
United States total	18,401	7,675	$93,992,181	$39,819,108	$5,108	$5,188	761	5,097	$25,916,845	2,042	$10,701,349
Alabama	1,022	502	5,509,475	2,802,396	5,391	5,582	8	560	3,018,960	228	1,272,696
Arizona	100	33	722,462	251,015	7,225	7,607	5	13	93,925	2	15,214
Arkansas	971	438	3,209,342	1,419,134	3,305	3,240	14	426	1,407,930	156	505,440
California	449	198	2,734,762	1,173,054	6,091	5,925	20	100	609,100	40	237,000
Colorado	212	101	1,232,162	602,578	5,812	5,966	14	45	261,540	21	125,286
Connecticut	34	15	142,082	64,417	4,179	4,294	1	4	16,716	2	8,588
Delaware	5	1	26,290	5,100	5,258	5,100	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	357	203	2,100,878	1,196,646	5,885	5,895	7	104	612,040	58	341,910
Georgia	1,164	546	5,716,975	2,752,180	4,911	5,041	27	482	2,367,102	166	836,896
Idaho	338	121	2,095,506	750,456	6,200	6,202	37	71	440,200	24	148,848
Illinois	336	122	1,328,605	433,169	3,954	3,551	1	60	237,240	23	81,673
Indiana	302	113	1,539,997	613,875	5,099	5,433	1	77	392,623	45	244,485
Iowa	355	95	1,667,289	488,405	4,697	5,141	1	60	281,820	15	77,115
Kansas	267	103	1,419,791	531,248	5,318	5,158	27	57	303,126	20	103,160
Kentucky	424	192	2,227,883	1,055,420	5,254	5,497	8	56	294,224	31	170,407
Louisiana	640	265	3,322,580	1,403,117	5,192	5,295	13	238	1,235,696	100	529,500
Maine	253	109	1,049,715	399,057	3,991	3,661	7	37	147,667	16	58,576
Maryland	137	51	736,046	287,165	5,373	5,631	7	42	225,666	15	84,455
Massachusetts	20	6	97,043	31,300	4,852	5,217	1	3	15,651	3	15,651
Michigan	414	171	2,002,630	866,094	4,837	5,065	8	69	333,753	29	146,895
Minnesota	304	96	1,262,580	361,770	4,153	3,768	11	65	269,945	19	71,532
Mississippi	1,145	564	4,860,853	2,406,339	4,245	4,267	30	383	1,625,835	155	661,385
Missouri	883	381	3,218,484	1,398,627	3,645	3,671	22	189	688,905	72	264,312
Montana	189	77	1,140,615	462,725	6,035	6,009	24	42	253,470	19	114,171
Nebraska	362	142	1,653,595	705,858	4,568	4,971	28	21	95,928	14	69,594
Nevada	25	9	180,807	62,750	7,232	6,972	3	3	21,696	0	0
New Hampshire	15	10	57,420	42,045	3,828	4,204	0	10	38,280	6	25,224
New Jersey	145	43	740,953	240,943	5,110	5,603	2	17	86,870	5	28,015
New Mexico	238	100	1,357,541	570,475	5,704	5,705	20	39	222,456	23	131,215
New York	165	53	908,547	320,290	5,506	6,043	13	34	187,204	14	84,602
North Carolina	739	309	4,229,947	1,780,397	5,724	5,762	7	152	870,048	101	581,962
North Dakota	196	67	1,239,038	426,387	6,322	6,364	22	162	1,024,164	41	260,924
Ohio	190	88	873,480	369,458	4,597	4,198	7	43	197,671	17	71,366
Oklahoma	960	367	4,847,383	1,833,676	5,049	4,996	77	216	1,090,584	74	368,704
Oregon	204	76	1,332,914	453,866	6,534	5,972	9	47	307,098	14	83,608
Pennsylvania	353	182	1,495,857	782,419	4,238	4,299	12	61	258,518	25	107,475
Rhode Island	2	1	5,570	3,140	2,785	3,140	0	1	3,140	1	3,140
South Carolina	613	319	3,597,104	2,064,680	5,868	6,472	8	206	1,208,808	86	536,592
South Dakota	216	66	1,139,024	367,273	5,273	5,565	28	64	337,472	27	150,255
Tennessee	585	259	3,040,455	1,394,213	5,197	5,383	12	117	608,049	62	333,746
Texas	1,158	415	6,673,353	2,425,767	5,763	5,845	121	215	1,239,045	81	473,445
Utah	264	80	1,654,674	537,207	6,268	6,715	14	51	319,668	26	174,590
Vermont	18	4	71,375	15,365	3,965	3,841	1	7	27,755	1	3,841
Virginia	326	167	2,122,887	1,124,077	6,512	6,731	22	92	599,104	45	302,895
Washington	207	98	1,412,972	681,734	6,826	6,956	8	56	382,256	33	229,548
West Virginia	246	114	1,575,047	790,436	6,403	6,934	3	114	729,942	53	367,502
Wisconsin	289	87	1,328,991	418,855	4,599	4,814	8	51	234,549	9	43,326
Wyoming	141	54	817,672	332,790	5,799	6,163	16	17	98,583	9	55,467
Alaska	1	1	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	101	22	825,950	145,135	8,178	6,597	3	13	106,314	3	19,791
Puerto Rico	296	38	1,369,450	170,585	4,627	4,489	17	98	453,446	13	58,357
Virgin Islands	15	1	75,130	3,000	5,009	3,000	6	7	35,063	0	0

Tribute to Hon. Edward O. McCowen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Sixth Congressional District of Ohio has enjoyed distinguished representation in the United States Congress for many years. Representative POLK is a most worthy successor to the late Representative, Hon. Edward O. McCowen, whose passing we all mourn.

Mr. McCowen came to Congress with a remarkable record of public service. As a member of the Ohio State Senate, as a superintendent of the county schools of Scioto County, Ohio, he brought to this House a background of education, culture, and legislative experience. For three consecutive terms Representative McCowen served in this House as a conscientious and distinguished Member. His tenure of office coincided with the difficult period of the Second World War. Throughout those difficult days he never faltered in his faith and always considered every problem before us from the viewpoint of the national interest alone.

Ohio and the Nation have lost a gentleman whose monument must be the good works, the good name, and the good family he has left behind him.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the story of the Ukraine's struggle for independence is a tragic one, but it is also a story of hope. From it we can learn that a courageous and determined people can withstand the most brutal tyranny and survive. But above all, we can learn that their ideals and their desires for the blessings of freedom and human justice survive too.

Ukrainians have probably borne the heavy yoke of oppression longer than any other people. Tartar, Polish, Austrian, Russian—no conquest was ever complete or lasting. Since the days when the glorious and enlightened principality of Kiev came under the despotisms of the Tartars in the 13th century, the Ukrainian struggle for independence has continued. The desire of the Ukrainians to be once more united as they had been in the days of Kiev could not be destroyed by the harsh oppression of a series of foreign despots.

For 400 years the people suffered and then in 1648 under the leadership of Bohdan Khmelnitsky, they rose successfully against their tyrants. Under this courageous and indomitable patriot, the Ukrainians gained for themselves a new measure of independence.

In this heroic age of the "free warriors"—the Kozaks—the Ukrainians maintained their freedom until the 18th century when Catherine the Great finally conquered them. It was a conquest which cost Russia dearly, and which was never fully achieved. Although the Russians tried to eradicate all traces of the Ukrainian nationality, the people held fast to their heritage and to their love of freedom and independence. In an attempt to make the Ukrainians over into so-called Little Russians the Czars employed the most brutal methods imaginable. The language was suppressed, schools and churches were closely supervised, and there was a steady stream of exiles to Siberia. But the Czars were no more successful in wiping out the Ukrainian spirit than the Tartars had been.

The centuries long dream of independence which the Ukrainians had cherished, seemed almost a reality after World War I. Out of the ashes of the Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires there arose a new free Ukraine. In January 1919, at Kiev, the ancient capital, Ukrainian independence was proclaimed. But the reality was short-lived. By 1921 through the machinations of the Ukraine's neighbors, the new-formed republic was once again devoured.

For the people of the Ukraine, the years that followed were the darkest in their history. The Communist regime attempted to bring about the complete submission and sovietization of this courageous people. They did this through mass deportations, liquidation by the secret police, and a continued suppression of the national tradition. The climax came in the Moscow-made famine of 1930–31, when millions were permitted to die in an effort to wipe out the Ukrainians as a nation.

The struggle of these gallant people is rendered especially hard by geography and international politics, two factors which have determined the course of Ukrainian history. Not only is the Ukraine a crossroads between east and west, she is a rich area which her neighbors have jealously coveted for centuries. But the Ukrainian people have been endowed with an unquenchable national spirit which compensates for these two obstacles. It is this spirit, forged in the period of tragedy which has enabled them to continue the fight and which has given them the courage to persevere in the face of the greatest odds.

The history of the Ukraine teaches us that a nation cannot be denied its rights indefinitely, nor can a people be forever deprived of its just heritage.

The Ukraine spirit could not be and has not been crushed. Underground resistance, insurgence, and sullen opposition to the Kremlin regime continues. The movement for independence refuses to die. Mass murder, deportation, sovietization, famine—nothing can destroy the Ukrainian belief in the righteousness of their cause and the inevitability of its triumph.

After the Big Four Talkfest—What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, whenever a high-level international conference ends, the coroner's jury meets to hand down its verdict. This time there can be little doubt. If world peace hopes are not yet dead, they are certainly under deep anesthesia. Only one positive gain from the western viewpoint emerged from the Berlin meeting of France, Britain, the Soviet Union, and Uncle Sam. That was the sturdiness of the political alliance which the Western Powers have established.

Most of the Soviet's propaganda offensives at Berlin were directed at the prospect of easing the French out of their close association with us. The Russians know that the one inflexible factor in French politics is fear of a strong Germany. This has been the cornerstone of Russian Middle European diplomacy—keep Germany divided and the French will not be eager to join any strong military alliance directed at Russia. But the French conservative leadership has shown a surprising resistance to the Soviet's overtures. As a result, Berlin simply puts the countries a little more uncompromisingly on record. The status quo in Europe remains as much in status as ever, and prospects for a return to something approaching normal conditions, with military occupation forces withdrawing from foreign lands are as remote as the South Sea Islands on a February morning.

Translated into American terms, the Berlin business means more preparations on the military front, more uncertainties for American boys, and continued large-scale spending on exactly those things the world longs to do without—the weapons of human destruction. The stalemate continues, but the players are not yet losing their patience.

Twenty-two Hundred, Two Hundred and Twenty, Twenty-two, Two

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the numerologists are up in arms. And they have a right to be. Any day a law may be introduced consigning them to jail as subversives. They are sure the least that will happen will be a law outlawing numerology.

They have believed and taught that all life is governed by numbers. A new administration devoted to change has destroyed their science.

Republican campaign harangues of 1952 established beyond doubt that our Government was full of subversives. They were in every home, under every bed, in every closet, in every office, under every desk, and in every drawer.

So an enlightened electorate gave a mandate to the discoverers of the evil to clean house and rout out the devils.

With much shouting in and out of investigative halls, not good, but loud, the crusade began.

Now the army of revolutionists has dwindled, first to a regiment, then to a battalion, next to a company, and finally to a squad, and that a squad which had been decimated by the prior Democratic administration.

Now that the name calling is beginning to pall on the American people, please, my friends in the Republican administration, leave the numbers to the numerologists. I assure you they will leave the real problems of government to you. But not for too long, I trust.

Let us see if you cannot do a little better on your other campaign promises.

It is high time to start the serious work of bringing about true world peace, balancing the budget, guaranteeing peacetime prosperity to our people, and improving the condition of our Nation.

Do not be annoyed by the discovery that to do those things you must adopt and pursue the Democratic Party's program and policies. We do not care about the labels. As long as the principles are what is good for our country, we will vote for them.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH L. CARRIGG
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, at a time like this, when the free world looks to American economy as the source-supplier to win the battle for freedom, it behooves this Congress to look well and searchingly into any proposals that affect our basic economy.

There are many facets to this waterway question and not a few of my colleagues have, and others are prepared, to develop specific aspects of the question authoritatively. I have been an interested and intent listener to this debate since its outset, and I am happy to make the frank admission that I have learned much. In like manner, I trust my humble contribution to the discussion will illuminate with equal clarity the area which I believe to be of vital consequence.

Now we are all aware that the world today is composed of two opposite camps, the freedom-loving countries, dedicated to self-determination for all peoples, and the Soviet-ruled domain which is a vast prison.

The contest, as you so well know, is not merely confined to rival ideologies, but also embraces opposing economic systems. And we have had much to encourage us in recent months as the whole world has been informed, through riots and disorders, behind the Iron Curtain, that the Soviet plan is not working out, that hunger stalks rampant over Eastern Europe.

We regret the human misery caused by this collapse of the Soviet economic system and it is one of the distinguishing characteristics of American democracy that we have offered food relief to the poor captive souls behind the Iron Curtain. I hope it will not be considered discursive, but I would like to refresh the memory of all of us that our Government did the same thing about three decades ago, when the American Relief Administration brought succor and comfort and survival to millions of Russians when famine stalked the Soviet Republic. There are those today among the ruling clique in the Kremlin who must remember that errand of mercy by the American Government. So it is all the more callous and heartless that the ruling voices in Russia, in response to President Eisenhower's humane offer of food, shout back that America seeks only to exploit the situation for political propaganda.

While we sympathize with the sufferers behind the Iron Curtain and shall continue our efforts to get relief to them, the fact remains, nevertheless, that this evidence of the weakness of the Soviet police-state economics needs to be assessed and studied on more than one count: we need to consider current Eastern European developments, not only from the viewpoint of foreign policy and what steps are indicated for psychological strategy, but also to ponder on the fact that this is impressive evidence anew that the planned-scarcity economy of the Soviet cannot hold a candle to the free productive enterprise of economic democracy which has raised the United States to the pinnacle of power.

From this general observation, I would like to have the opportunity to lead you into a consideration of certain of the hard-core realities of our American economic system. Steel, you know, is the pivot on which our production system swings; or, to change the figure of speech, steel is the pillar on which the whole economic edifice rests; and steel, as you are so aware, is completely dependent on coal and electric utilities. Thus, it naturally follows that we must, in the national interest, be greatly concerned with the welfare of the coal industry to the end that it will be able to take care of the demands of steel; otherwise our vast production capacity would dry up at the source, and the strong economic structure we have reared would crumble. In that unfortunate contingency would crash the bulwarks of our national security.

The history of the past two world wars informs us that the military front is only the extension of the civilian front, and the frontline depends, in a large measure, for the constant supply of material from home. All of this warns us that we must be on guard to prevent economic misadventures which promise harm to our basic industrial elements.

Do not take my appraisal for it for it may well be that in my enthusiasm for the subject, I may stray beyond the limits of objectivity. I would like you to know, however, what the World Book Encyclopedia has to say on the subject of coal:

> Formed millions of years ago, coal has an important effect on almost every activity of modern life. If the world should be deprived of its coal resources through some disaster, man's present way of life would be very different from what it is. All the substitute sources of energy, such as atomic power, oil, natural gas, and water power, could not at present fill the gap left by the loss of coal.
>
> Without coal, steel mills, factories, powerplants, and railroads would be forced to stop operating. Automobiles, trucks, and buses could still run, but there would be no way of replacing them when they wore out. In a short time the breakdown of transportation would cut off food supplies from the cities. Farmers, too, would have to go back to crude hand methods of earlier days, for modern farming implements could not be made without the use of coal. Without coal there could be no towering skyscrapers, labor-saving machines, or fast-moving means of transportation.
>
> It was coal that enabled man to make full use of iron, and thus made possible the steel age. Coal and iron together have made man the ruler of the earth, sea, and sky. Ocean liners, streamlined trains, transcontinental buses, houses, factories, all are in large part the products of coal mines and blast furnaces. Coal helps make steel, produce steam, and generate electricity. In the United States alone, coal supplies almost as much power and heat as all other sources of energy combined. Coal furnishes an even larger share of energy in other industrial countries.
>
> Coal has also played a prominent part in the course of history and in the struggles among nations. Wars have been fought to gain or keep coalfields, for industrial success depends to a great extent upon the amount of coal a country controls.
>
> Defeat or victory in war may depend upon a nation's possession or lack of coal for arms and munitions cannot be produced without it.

You will find confirmation of all that I have been saying about coal in relation to the national welfare.

Later on, I intend to go into a detailed account of the condition of the coal industry in this country, but for the moment I would like to make the point again of steel's dependency on coal. In 1952, steel mills used 104 million tons of coal, and it is estimated in 1953 that figure is exceeded by from 10 million to 15 million tons. Also in 1952, utilities took 103 million tons of coal. This figure becomes highly important when we realize that 20 years ago, the utilities only consumed 27 million tons of coal. All of this data reveals the extent to which the American economy system relies on coal.

Having said all this, it then becomes our concern: What about the coal industry itself? How is it doing? What are its prospects? Where is it going? What are the favorable factors? What the unfavorable? And how does this proposed St. Lawrence seaway project tie in with all of this?

Well, despite the impressive tonnage used by the steel and utility industries, the coal industry itself is in a sick condition. Mr. A. H. Raskin, in a special dispatch to the New York Times, Sunday, July 19, 1953, datelined Pittsburgh, has this to say:

> King Coal has toppled off his throne as the Nation's principal energy source. For half a century other fuels have been nibbling away at coal's empire; now, for the first time, Government statistics show that oil has supplanted coal as America's chief fuel.
>
> Oil and natural gas are likely to make further inroads in the next few years, but most experts are convinced that the fortunes of the coal industry will begin looking up by 1960 unless now unforeseen developments in atomic energy revolutionize the whole fuel picture. The big problem is how to keep the industry from wasting away during the lean period immediately ahead.

One way to help keep it from wasting away is to refrain from building hydroelectric plants in the name of the St. Lawrence seaway, plants financed by public funds, whose competition will deal mortal blows to an industry that we have already shown needs to be kept in a sound condition for the national safety.

Here is a situation in a basic industry that should stimulate our thinking in constructive channels so that we would be trying to develop ways and means, through governmental policy and program, to assist and strengthen—instead we are asked to bring into being, by taxpayers' funds, projects which will further harm this essential industry—coal.

What has been happening in coal? Take, for instance, the anthracite or hard coal industry. This is located for the most part in northeastern Pennsylvania. In 1917, the hard coal industry reached its peak production with a total of 99,612,000 tons. The shrinkage in the industry can best be understood in light of the fact that last year, the annual

output was 39,974,000. Now in between those figures is a story of depressed communities, sociological hurts, dried-up opportunities, human stagnation. What is equally depressing is the fact that anthracite production during 1953 dwindled further. Frankly, this is a condition that warrants our most serious attention and our help. And at least if we are not going to do anything about it affirmatively, which I hope will not be the case, then the very least we ourselves and the Nation can do, is to put a halt to anything federally sanctioned and financed that figures to deliver a knockout blow to coal. And that is just what this so-called seaway project, with its hydroelectric adjuncts, will accomplish.

While the bituminous or soft-coal industry has not experienced the same sharp fall off as anthracite, the fact is, nevertheless, that its output is off. In 1947 the soft-coal industry had a peak production of 630,623,000, yet in 1952 it was down to 465 million tons. The figures on bituminous production for 1953 vary from 430 million tons to 450 million.

The further significance of all of this is realized when we come to employment figures for the coal industry. In 1923 the soft-coal industry employed 704,793 men. At present, this employment total has dropped off to 296,000. The anthracite industry shows a similar drying up of employment opportunities. From a peak employment of 179,679 its working force has dwindled to 52,700. And the whole story is not contained in these figures. We must consider that basic jobs in prime industries like coal provide a substantial number of jobs in affiliated and service industries. So it is that whole coal regions have been hit to the point where they are surplus-labor areas, and just because of the downslide of the coal industry so many workers have become displaced.

So we must be extremely careful and walk warily else we further speed the decline of a key industry and in so doing add greatly to the growing problems of social security.

It is my firm conviction that instead of being engaged in financing of hydroelectric projects, which are going to aim a dagger at the heart of the coal industry, our Government ought to be engaged in a comprehensive program of research and development and planning, all aimed at reviving and restoring this basic prop of our American economic system.

I know that there are many quick to say that the power projects proposed for the St. Lawrence have nothing to do with the waterway, that they have been severed, so to speak, that one has no connection with the other, but I say to you that they are Siamese economic twins, they are part and parcel of the same thing, they were sired by the same idea, mothered by the same plan.

Always up to now, the hydroelectric projects and the so-called seaway have been one. Repeatedly, this Congress has turned down the proposal and emphatically. So what happened this year? It was deemed the better part of valor, and the tops in strategy, to separate one from the other, to put them in the seaway sweepstakes as separate entries, but they come out of the same stable and they carry the same colors.

In connection with the inseparability of the power projects and the waterway, I would like to quote in part from the able and expert testimony of Mr. Thomas F. Kennedy, vice president, United Mine Workers of America, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in its hearings last May. I am quoting Mr. Kennedy:

> Of course, there is another reason for the building of the St. Lawrence seaway not specifically advanced by the proponents of this measure now, but nevertheless correct, and that is the building of hydroelectric plants on the St. Lawrence principally for the benefit of western New York and for use in Ontario where a shortage of power now exists. The building of these plants naturally affects adversely the coal industry, both bituminous and anthracite, and a considerable loss of tonnage not only affecting the economy in the coal industry but likewise creating unemployment in the coal and railroad industries.
>
> It has been estimated that every 2,000 kilowatt-hours produced by hydroelectric power will displace 1 ton of coal, and for every ton of coal displaced 1 man loses a day's work.
>
> Now, I might interpose that does not necessarily mean every miner will lose a day's work, but taking railroads, taking the collateral industries that make up really the mining industries, men in those industries would lose an average of 1 day's work.
>
> Our Canadian neighbors who are in favor of the seaway are not unselfish in their general attitude. They want more electric power, and they are not adverse to us helping them get it. In the Matawaska River section of Ontario, about 80 miles north of Ottawa, surveys have been made for a number of years by the Ontario Power Authority for the building of a hydroelectric plant on the Matawaska River, near Black Donald, Ontario. This project has been held up, and inquiries made in this section indicate that it has been held up awaiting work or official action by the Congress of the United States on the building of the St. Lawrence seaway, and its collateral objective, the building of hydroelectric plants on the St. Lawrence.
>
> In other words, if we go through with our financing of the waterway and hydroelectric plants, there will be no need for Ontario to proceed with its other contemplated plants on the Matawska River. Another economic factor that prevails is the fact that western New York and the Province of Ontario have not done anything about building electric-energy plants for present and future power needs. They are waiting for the Government and the taxpayers of the United States to do the job for them.
>
> The opposite is true in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and West Virginia, where great electric-energy plants have been built and are being built to take care of present and potential requirements. Private capital has been doing this job, and doing it effectively, while those advocating public hydroelectric power are resting on their oars waiting for the Government to do it for them. If the Government does do it for them, States such as Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and West Virginia, which are progressive and looking forward, will suffer an economic disadvantage because of their foresight and initiative.

Well there you are, the cat is out of the bag, or rather a whole bag of hydroelectric kittens has been opened by Mr. Kennedy, who in his capacity as vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, understands so well just what the sponsors of this project have been about these many years. As he says so pointedly in the concluding phases of his Senate committee testimony:

> In conclusion, I might say that all factors being considered, I think the same reasons exist today as have existed for many years which indicate that the sensible and proper thing to do in the interests of all the people of the United States is to reject this proposed legislation. In other words, special privileges and subsidies at the taxpayers' expense should not be accorded to a few States at the expense of the others. Equal rights to all States and to their economy must prevail.

In other words, we should have our eyes fully opened here and realize what we are doing. If we, as a legislative body, favor the authorization of these federally financed hydroelectric projects, then all well and good and the majority rules. However, please let us not attempt to do by indirection what I believe this body will not do by direction. We should have all the cards on the table and know for a certainty what we are about. I profess I cannot understand how anyone reading Mr. Kennedy's informed testimony would not be persuaded that the proposed waterway and the other powerplants are all in one, so to speak.

Pursuing my interest in the coal industry of America, an interest which I have heretofore demonstrated, bears directly upon the well-being and security of the Nation, I would like to quote pertinent testimony from the statement of F. F. Estes, traffic manager of the National Coal Association, said statement appearing as part of the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this subject. At one point, Mr. Estes said:

> Some years ago when we appeared in opposition to the seaway, we cited the coal tonnage that would be lost should the railroads lose a substantial portion of their freight traffic to the waterway. Today the railroads are not such large purchasers of coal for fuel use, due to the rapid dieselization of their lines in recent years. Nevertheless, the retention of their traffic, and a healthy railroad financial structure rebounds to the interests of the coal industry, in that the railroads are less likely to seek additional increases in their freight rates on coal which would add to coal's competition in the fuel and energy market.
>
> Coal is finding it increasingly difficult to hold a reasonable portion of the fuel market in the face of competition from other private enterprise, to say nothing of the competition it must meet from Government-subsidized industries and the dumping of cheap residual heavy oil at our Atlantic ports. Imports of this heavy oil, now averaging around 440,000 barrels daily, is displacing over 35 million tons of coal annually. Bills have been introduced in both branches of Congress designed to abate this serious threat to our domestic production of both coal and oil. While the effect of the competition of this imported heavy oil is felt at substantial distances from the ports of entry, the vortex of its economic destruction is at, or within close distance of, seaboard. To make seaports of our lake cities as far west as Duluth would but further enlarge this threat to our national resource and railroad industries and the labor they employ, at high wages in comparison with the wages paid in the countries from which the oil is imported. Add to this huge coal displacement the more than 2½ million tons the proposed Barnhart Island power development would displace and more as additional sites were developed,

and it is not difficult to see what would happen to coal production in this country, now running at an annual rate of 200 million tons less than 1947 or 1948, or around 400 million tons.

Still quoting Mr. F. F. Estes, traffic manager of the National Coal Association:

Now getting back to defense. Has any nation ever won a war without an adequate coal supply commensurate with wartime demand? Would not coal, as it has in the past, be called upon to supply the fuel deficiencies brought about by wartime preempting of the available oil for air, Navy, railroad, and truck priorities? Since the competition fuel situation has caused, and is daily causing, many mines, both small and substantial, to go out of business, and those which have managed to stay in business to adopt the most rigid austerity programs, it can be factually stated that the bituminous coal industry has neither the financial reserves nor other wherewithal to hold itself in readiness to increase its annual production 200 or 250 million tons, or any other substantial tonnage figure, to meet a sudden or even slowly progressing national emergency. So when this committee, or any other committee weighs the importance of the St. Lawrence seaway to the defense of our country, consideration should also, and we trust will, be given to the other facets of defense, including the preservation and maintenance of basic industries which have proved their indispensability in wars we have won without the St. Lawrence seaway.

I have quoted at some length from Mr. Estes able testimony because I am certain it has a direct relation to our deliberations here. To that end, I am going to prevail upon your indulgence for one further and final quote by Mr. Estes, who in summing up his testimony concluded:

If the coal industry is to be put out of business by the fair competition of free enterprise, we will retire reluctantly, but I promise you gracefully. But if, on the other hand, we are to be put out of business by Government-subsidized competition, then I can likewise promise you that, in our own behalf, and in behalf of the general public and the national welfare, of which we pride ourselves of being an important part, we will fight to the last to prevent such abnegation and abrogation of the long-established concepts of free enterprise which we—all of us—have heretofore enjoyed.

Certainly this should cause us to pause. Here is the meat of the matter. A basic, resource industry, vital to a flourishing American economy, a valuable weapon in war, a proved servant of national security, is to be jeopardized to the point of economic death by this waterway-power bill.

It must not be. Let us not be beguiled by the blandishments of the visionaries, but rather reckon our course on the bright lights of proved national performances, and among those the achievements of the coal industry loom large and luminous.

I sincerely hope and strongly believe that reason will prevail and justice triumph in this Chamber, and that this ill-considered legislation will be resoundingly defeated. I trust that instead out of our deliberations and discussions will come the firm resolve that America has no more important challenge than putting the once mighty coal industry in repair so that this fountain source of energy, which stokes the fires of American plants, will be fully ready and able to meet any and all demands our national security requires.

Just how the proposed seaway would affect the coal industry adversely is well detailed in the testimony of the Anthracite Institute, an organization which is located in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and, as its testimony declares—

The Anthracite Institute is authorized, on such matters as the subject (the seaway), to speak for virtually the entire industry.

I would remind you before I quote at length from the testimony of the Anthracite Institute that while it speaks for almost the entire hard-coal industry it does not represent the soft-coal industry so that while it gives an impressive picture of the damage the seaway would cause anthracite it does not tell the whole coal story.

Following is the testimony, in part, of the Anthracite Institute as it constitutes a section of the records of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on this subject:

Over 99 percent of the country's anthracite production originates in six adjacent counties in northeastern Pennsylvania. No anthracite is produced in Canada. In 1952 we provided 13 million man-days of work in and at mines, and paid wages of $235 million to our operating employees, all of whom are members of the United Mine Workers of America, whose vice president, Mr. Kennedy, has likewise voiced continuing opposition to any and all St. Lawrence proposals.

Our product is valued at $400 million annually f. o. b. mines, and is sold in our Northwestern States and in the Province of Ontario and Quebec at an estimated retail value of $700 million annually. In addition to constituting the principal source of heat for more than 4 million homes in that area, anthracite also provides an invaluable source of energy for electric generating stations and other local industries essential to the national defense effort and to the national security. This was amply demonstrated in both world wars.

This industry loaded approximately 302,000 railroad freight cars with raw coal for movement to points of preparation, and an additional 592,000 cars with market-bound prepared anthracite in the 12 months ended September 30, 1952. It paid United States class 1 railroads $114,856,000 for this service. This is one of the heaviest movements of any commodity handled by our railroads, according to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and must of necessity be carried on during each week of the year. These figures emphasize the fact that this industry is dependent upon the maintenance of an adequate and efficient railroad transportation system for the transportation of its consuming markets during all seasons of the year, and in all kinds of weather.

Toronto, Ontario, is the third largest city market for Pennsylvania anthracite, while Buffalo is fourth. The Province of Ontario consumes more of our domestic sizes than any State except New York, which is first, and Pennsylvania itself. Thus the Lake Ontario region constitutes the very heart of our markets.

To open this highly valued market territory to the unregulated competition of imported foreign anthracite and fuel oil, waterborne, at taxpayers' expense is a proposal to which we have been and are irrefutably opposed. Prior to the commencing of World War II, our markets in Canada and New England were subject to the competition of millions of tons of overseas anthracite from Great Britain, Russia, Germany, Netherlands, French Indochina, and Morocco to the detriment of our producing and transportation industries, management and labor alike. Canadian imports of such origin came to rest as far up the St. Lawrence River as Montreal, beyond which the cost of transfer to smaller vessels for further westward movement was unfavorable as compared with our all-rail delivered product.

During the war this movement dwindled but never vanished, and in 1952 it had regained importance to the extent of a total of 350,000 tons, a gain of 23 percent over the level of 1951. With continued rehabilitation of European and other anthracite mining, these tonnages are expected to increase steadily and rapidly.

Under prevailing conditions, every ton of this competitive foreign anthracite is produced under socialized government subsidies, moved to tidewater under additional subsidies, and transported to North Atlantic ports at labor costs and transportation rates which are far below the standards prevailing in this country and Canada, over none of which costs and charges any agency of either government has any jurisdiction whatsoever. Furthermore, the great bulk, if not all of it, enters both countries free of duty. We feel very strongly that this competition is serious enough under existing conditions, without being called upon to shoulder our portion of the expense of constructing a seaway to further enlarge its sphere of influence to embrace some of our largest markets.

This is telling testimony and is one of the best arguments in opposition that I have come across. There are some additional points, too, and I would like to go on with them. I am quoting again from the testimony of the Anthracite Institute:

Such a course (that of constructing a seaway) would further constitute the creation of a competitive transportation system which, if sufficient traffic should materialize, would seriously endanger our railroad transportation system on which we must rely, to the extent that it would be compelled to maintain expensive idle standby facilities during the short season of open navigation, to enable it to pick up the load while the St. Lawrence is frozen over, which winter months are the most difficult and expensive for operation.

The placing of this unnecessary burden on our originating and delivering railroad could only result in higher freight rates on remaining traffic or even more severe financial strains, thus placing this industry in a still more grave competitive situation with respect to imported anthracite and fuel oils which would be brought in over the proposed seaway.

As has been testified by experts in that field, only a very small percentage of United States-flag shipping could and would utilize the canal under proposed specifications of depth, with the result that whatever competitive tonnages might be attracted would be transported in small vessels of foreign registry.

Proponents of the seaway have advanced the contention that the proposed project is essential as a transportation artery over which to bring ore from Labrador to steelmaking centers on the lakes and elsewhere in the East. The fact of the matter is that adequate transportation facilities already exist. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa, the Province of Quebec imported 933,262 tons of anthracite from Pennsylvania during the year ending January 31, 1953. Using the Interstate Commerce Commission average of 56.5 tons per car, that amounted to 16,520 cars. The traffic ranged between a low of 730 cars in April and a high of 2,450 cars in October. This haulage of anthracite, and there were large additional tonnages of bituminous coal, moved almost entirely in hopper cars. This

type of car is suitable for and is regularly employed in the transportation of iron ore. The cars carrying coal to markets in Quebec and other eastern seaboard markets return to mines empty. There, therefore, appears to be no reason why this empty return hopper car movement could not be utilized in the haulage of ore from St. Lawrence River ports east of Montreal to steel centers in the United States over any or all of the at least 4 existing direct rail routes connecting the 2 areas.

We are of the opinion that the present proposal to finance the seaway by means of a corporation the bonds of which would be guaranteed by the United States Government is tantamount to an outright expenditure of Federal funds. Such expenditure for this purpose has failed of authorization by every Congress before which it has been proposed, and we therefore contend that the present proposal should likewise be rejected.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania ranks fourth among the States in its contribution to the total Federal tax receipts, and accounts for approximately 7 percent of the total. The cost of a seaway would, therefore, fall very heavily on the taxpayers of Pennsylvania.

According to the Pennsylvania Department of Internal Affairs, the anthracite industry accounts for 32 percent of the total number of employees, 41 percent of the total wages paid, and 44 percent of the total capital invested in productive industry in the six anthracite-producing counties of Carbon, Columbia, Lackawanna, Luzerne, Northumberland, and Schuylkill. Whole communities in these counties are entirely dependent on the prosperity of this industry. Unfortunately, the industry has been far from prosperous and, due to the competition of fuel oil, natural gas, and imported foreign anthracite, it has incurred large losses in recent years. In 1952 it averaged only 208 working days, and since January 1, 1953, production has been 35 percent less than in the corresponding first 3½ months of 1952.

It is obvious that neither management nor labor in this industry, both of which contribute heavily to the tax burden, can afford to incur the additional financial obligations inherent in the construction of an uneconomic and wholly unnecessary transportation which could lead to nothing other than the introduction of additional disastrous competition in the very hearts of our markets.

For the foregoing reasons, therefore, we vigorously renew our long standing and unalterable opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project, and urge that your committee reject it in its entirety, whether financed by the Government directly or through guaranties, and whether it includes power development or not.

Yes, coal needs a boost, not a knock from Uncle Sam.

A Tribute to Walker S. Buel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest forces in America is the influence of the press. In my home town area of northern Ohio, we have a morning newspaper with a unique name and an equally unique reputation for good, solid commonsense. It is an independent newspaper, and I am not sure of its politics. I am sure of its integrity. Fittingly enough, this paper is called the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Many men have worked long and hard to establish the Plain Dealer as a daily requirement on every breakfast table in my community. One of these top-notch newspaper men is observing his 42d anniversary of service with the Plain Dealer today. He is Walker S. Buel, chief of the Washington bureau and associate editor of the Plain Dealer. I should like to nominate him as my choice for man of the day. Thirty-four years ago when he started on the job in Washington, things were a little quieter than they are today. I think Walker Buel has contributed a good deal to livening it up. He has certainly livened up many mornings for many Americans. I congratulate him on his record of devoted service to the public, and I wish for him many more years of vigorous activity here in Washington where he works and thinks and reports with honesty and intelligence.

The Employment Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KIT CLARDY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, of late we have been hearing a chorus of pessimists dolefully predicting economic collapse for the Nation. And we have heard them crying out that unemployment is reaching terrible proportions.

Of course, the fact that we have just finished the most prosperous year in our Nation's history is conveniently forgotten. So also is the fact that the Nation's unemployment today is only a fraction of what it was in 1950 before the Korean war artificially solved the problem for the past administration. And so also is the fact forgotten that, prior to our entry in World War II, unemployment was many times what we find it today.

But it so happens that I have some rather recent information on the situation in my own district. Last week articles appeared in the Lansing State Journal and in the Flint Journal informing us that employment in both those principal cities in my district was at a high peak and going up. A great deal of this is due to the forward-looking program of General Motors, whose president, Mr. Harlow Curtice, recently announced that there would be a billion-dollar program of expansion undertaken immediately.

Of course, when Walter Reuther, of the CIO, lets loose with a blast it is pretty obvious he has in mind the promotion of "Soapy" Williams' ambition to become Governor, Senator, President, or whatever is available. And so I call these facts to your attention so that the Congress will know what weight to give to the political fear mongering you may hear from my State in the future.

The Tax Button

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 6, 1953, in his memorandum of disapproval of the bill repealing the tax on admissions to moving-picture theaters, the President stated:

> Specific proposals for a modified system of excise taxation will be included in the recommendations for tax revision that will be submitted to the Congress next January.
>
> The Treasury analysis has already progressed to the point where I can say that I will include a recommendation for a reduction in the admissions tax in my proposals for a modified system of excise taxation. Action could be taken by the Congress early in 1954 and relief could be given at that time.

With great anticipation, on January 21, 1954, I read the President's tax recommendations in his budget message to the Congress, and what did I find he had to say about "a modified system of excise taxation"? Nothing but a recommendation that the excise taxes which are scheduled under present law to be reduced on April 1 be continued indefinitely at the present rate, and "that any adjustments in the other excise taxes be such as to maintain the total yield which we are now receiving from this source."

If this constitutes specific proposals for a modified system of excise taxation, it seems to me that the field is wide open.

Uncertainty and confusion dominate the picture both as it affects the businessman and the worker.

Protecting Congress Does Not Mean Ejecting Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest consequences of the shocking episode in the House of Representatives appears to be a determination to clamp down on all visitors to the House galleries. Certainly, no one can look complacently upon the relative ease with which a group of fanatics managed to walk into the House armed with formidable-looking weapons. Nevertheless, it has always been one of the America's proudest boasts that admission to the sessions of Congress, for young and old, at virtually all times, has been about as simple to achieve as walking into the county courthouse.

Passes required for entrance are given freely to all who ask and seem interested, and all Senators and Representatives have made it a practice to encourage their constituents to attend sessions

whenever they visit Washington. We must keep this tradition alive, despite our concern for the protection of Congress. Whatever new regulations and protective measures may be set up, they must be planned with this fundamental attitude in mind. Americans must still be encouraged to visit their national legislative Chamber, and if a new occupational hazard has been added to the already lengthy congressional list, all of us in Washington must undertake it with the confidence that the protection of Congressmen can be achieved without the ejecting of Americans from the galleries of the Capitol.

A Risk Is a Risk Is a Risk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the late Gertrude Stein achieved immortality in the literary world with her new approach to language illustrated by such sentences as "A rose is a rose is a rose." The Democrats are doing their best to embarrass the Republicans with all kinds of hollering and yammering about Communists in the Federal Government. They have been demanding a breakdown of the firings of some 2,200 assorted gentry in key Washington departments, insisting that most of these dismissals did not involve Communists.

To which the reply is obvious enough, "What difference does it make if a man is no good because he cannot keep his mouth shut on atomic secrets, or spills confidential information under the influence of intoxicants, or does the same thing because he is a drug addict, pervert, or just plain sap? A risk is a risk is a risk, and such people are dangerous to the security of these United States." What is more, every one of these peculiar characters got into the Government service under the Democratic administrations of the 1933–53 period, and getting rid of them is as important a piece of business as we have to do.

We are doing it, and neither the Dems' delirium nor the Commies' commotion will stop the process.

Adm. Henry B. Wilson Dies, Hero of Two Wars, Native of Camden, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today ceremonial services were held at the burial of Adm. Henry B. Wilson in Arlington Cemetery.

Admiral Wilson, who died on January 30, 1954, at the age of 93 years, was born and raised in the city of Camden, N. J., and served with honor for 49 years in the United States Navy. He had a distinguished career in two wars, the Spanish-American War and World War I, and his entire service was one that exhibited ability and heroism that brought to him high honors.

Upon his return from World War I, a public reception, attended by thousands of Camden citizens, was tendered him in the civic center. It was my privilege on that occasion to present to him on behalf of the citizens of Camden a handsome sword in recognition of his distinguished service. On the same occasion there was presented to him on behalf of the schoolchildren of his native city a beautiful bouquet of flowers. The presentation was made by Dora E. Yuschinsky, now Rose. At that time she was one of the schoolchildren of the city of Camden. She is now my secretary in charge of the Camden office.

Henry Braid Wilson was born in Camden, N. J., on February 23, 1861. He was appointed a cadet midshipman from the First District of New Jersey on September 22, 1876, and graduated from the Naval Academy with the class of 1881. Commissioned ensign (junior grade) on July 1, 1883, he advanced through the various grades as follows: Ensign, June 26, 1884; lieutenant, junior grade, February 2, 1894; lieutenant, September 16, 1897; lieutenant commander, March 3, 1903; commander, July 12, 1907; captain, March 4, 1911; rear admiral, July 1, 1917 (having been selected by the Navy's first selection board); vice admiral, temporary, September 25, 1918; and admiral, temporary, June 30, 1919. He was transferred to the retired list of the Navy, for statutory age, February 23, 1925, in the rank of rear admiral, but was advanced to the rank of admiral on June 21, 1930, in accordance with act of Congress of that date, authorizing World War I flag officers to be retired in the highest rank held on the active list during the war.

After graduation in 1881, he served afloat for 6 years with consecutive duty in the U. S. S. *Tennessee*, flagship of the North Atlantic station, the training ship *Saratoga* (for 4½ years engaged in training apprentice boys, where he first evidenced his interest in the enlisted man, which never lessened throughout his career), and the receiving ship *New Hampshire*. For a brief period he was with a party making astronomical observations in the West Indies, after which he was ordered to the U. S. S. *Albatross*, assigned to the Coast Survey and Fish Commission. Aboard the *Albatross* he made three cruises in the Bering Sea and took part in the deepsea exploration preliminary to the laying of the cable between San Francisco and Honolulu. After his return in 1894 he spent 2 years on the staff of the Naval War College, Newport, R. I.

He next served aboard the U. S. S. *Michigan* in the Great Lakes, then in the gunboat *Bancroft* in the eastern Mediterranean, returning in *Bancroft* to the West Indies at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War. Then a lieutenant, he was highly commended for coolness and bravery in action. He joined the U. S. S. *Indiana* in October 1898, and subsequently was assigned to equipment duty in connection with the building of the battleships *Alabama* and *Maine* at William Cramp & Sons Shipyard, Philadelphia. In 1901 he was sent to the Asiatic station for duty as executive officer of the iron gunboat *Don Juan de Austria*, a prize of the Spanish-American War, and later served, first as navigator and afterward as executive officer of the U. S. S. *Kentucky*, flagship of Rear Adm. Robley D. Evans, United States Navy, commander in chief, Asiatic Fleet.

Upon his return to the United States in 1904, he was ordered to the Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., in charge of the Enlisted Personnel Section of that Bureau. Four years later he was ordered to command the U. S. S. *Chester*, scout cruiser. He returned to the Bureau of Navigation in May 1910 and served as Assistant Chief of the Bureau, second in command, until ordered the following year to command the U. S. S. *North Dakota*, a battleship of the First Division, United States Atlantic Fleet. It was in this command that his reputation for smart ship-handling and all around smart seamanship and ship-keeping came to full fruition.

He reported in 1913 for duty as President of the Board of Inspection and Survey, Navy Department. He served in that capacity until 1916, when he was ordered to place in commission and to command the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania*, flagship of the Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet—Adm. Henry T. Mayo, USN—at that time the largest and finest battleship in the United States Navy. He was in the *Pennsylvania* in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, when diplomatic relations with Germany were broken. With war imminent, and being on the promotion list for flag rank, he was detached from command of the *Pennsylvania* and, in April, was ordered to form, organize, and command the Patrol Force, Atlantic Fleet, with his broad command pennant in the U. S. S. *Olympia*, Admiral Dewey's flagship at the Battle of Manila Bay. These patrol squadrons, so hurriedly got together under the impetus of war, were a composite of cruisers, destroyers, gunboats, Coast Guard cutters, and seagoing yachts taken over from their private owners.

The assigned mission was to protect shipping in the Atlantic waters of the United States from Maine to the Panama Canal. Later in the summer of 1917, some of these ships, as United States Patrol Squadrons, were sent to Gibraltar to base. Wilson, now a Rear Admiral, had transferred his flag to U. S. S. *Birmingham* in early August, after the grounding of the *Olympia*, and arrived at Gibraltar in her on August 18, 1917. His forces were soon engaged in serving as ocean escorts for convoys in the Mediterranean, and between Gibraltar and the British Isles.

Some 2 months after his arrival at Gibraltar there was need for his services in French waters, and on October 23,

1917, he left Gibraltar with 3 members of his staff overland through Spain for Paris. After a short conference trip to London, he reported on November 1, 1917, for duty as commander, United States naval forces on the French coast, with headquarters at Brest. He continued in this duty until on January 15, 1918, he was appointed commander, United States naval forces in France, U. S. S. *Prometheus*, flagship. He so served during the remainder of the war and until January 30, 1919. During this period all naval sea, shore and aviation activities in France were under his command.

His paramount mission was escorting troop and storeship convoys to and from France. It is especially noteworthy that not one passenger was lost by enemy action either inbound or outbound in his area of command. This is a distinct tribute to his skill and leadership, for for many months the available escort vessels were inadequate in size, speed and numbers. For example, he had no true combatant type ship capable of escorting the *Leviathan*. The adopted alternative was to depend on her speed and run her in convoy with the *Great Northern* and *Northern Pacific*, which could maintain position on her at high speed. Such enforced makeshifts were usual.

Another striking accomplishment of the Navy in France was the building of 15 United States naval aviation stations along the French coast. These stations were erected by men of the United States naval forces; were completed and operating in 10 months.

One of his most widely known and difficult decisions made during this period was the one accepting the responsibility for the press dispatch, sent without his prior knowledge, which promulgated the false armistice a few days before the true armistice was signed on November 11, 1918.

For his outstanding wartime services, Admiral Wilson was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with the following citation:

For exceptionally meritorious service in a duty of great responsibility as Commander Patrol Forces Atlantic Fleet, and as Commander, United States Naval Forces in France, in successfully coordinating with the French Navy and in expeditiously operating transports and cargo ships in French ports and war zones.

He also was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal by the War Department, and in addition received foreign decorations as follows: Grand Officer of the Legion of Honor, by France; Grand Cordon of the Sacred Treasury, by Japan; Commander of the Order of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus, by Italy; and Grand Official of the Military Order of Avia, by Portugal.

On February 15, 1919, he returned to the United States, his flag in the U. S. S. *New Mexico*, for duty as commander, Squadron 4, Division 8, Atlantic Fleet. In June 1919 he was designated Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, and hoisted his flag in the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania*, of which he had been the first Commanding Officer. Upon mobilization of the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets for Fleet maneuvers at the Pacific end of the Canal Zone, he assumed command of the combined forces as Commander in Chief, U. S. Battle Fleet. He was detached from this command in June 1921, and reported the following month for duty as Superintendent of the Naval Academy. He served as Superintendent until transferred to the Retired List of the Navy on February 23, 1925, his 64th birthday.

During the three and three-fourths years of his incumbency, the Naval Academy passed through the greatest transformation since its beginning in 1845—a transition from a training school to the University it still is. Though classed as a training school in 1921, it had by the time of his retirement, and largely through his efforts, become a full-fledged member of the Association of American Universities and had qualified for the subsequent authorization to award the degree of bachelor of science to its graduates. The entrance requirements had been raised to compare favorably with those of the better Engineering Colleges. The certificate method of admission had been strengthened to its present unchallenged position. The midshipmen's service uniforms had been changed to conform in general to those the graduates would require as officers of the Navy. The policy of rotating midshipmen officers to give a wider spread of command experience and responsibility among all members of the first class had become a fixture. A text book on Naval Leadership had been especially prepared and introduced into the curriculum. More privileges, though in limited degree, had been allowed the first class on the theory that the transition from midshipman to officer would be smoother and more efficient if less abrupt than in the past. Throughout his entire tenure he emphasized what he called the "Eternal Worth of Character," for without it no naval officer can succeed. He also emphasized the need for smartness in person and dress, and taught this daily by precept and example. He promulgated a mission of the Academy, which started thus: "To mold the material received into educated gentlemen, thoroughly indoctrinated with honor, uprightness, and truth." That theme of honesty and integrity was kept before the midshipman constantly.

His tour at the Academy was marked, as was his entire naval career of 48 years, by his particular interest in the development and training of personnel. The first class to graduate under his command was the class of 1922. The members dedicated their Lucky Bag—class book—to him with the following lines:

To our Superintendent, Adm. Henry B. Wilson, United States Navy, the class of 1922 respectfully dedicates this number of the Lucky Bag—inspired as we have been by his devotion to the Navy and his continued efforts to make us better material for officers, it is our hope that our future success may, in some small degree at least, reach the heights which his has attained, and that we may occasion in our subordinates that same spirit of cooperation which he has inspired in us.

It is of considerable interest that when the class of 1922 held its thirtieth reunion at the Naval Academy last year, they still saw fit to thank Admiral Wilson for the inspiration he had been to them as midshipmen. His health, unfortunately, did not permit him to accept the invitation of the class to be their guest.

Admiral Wilson and his wife, Mrs. Ada Chapman Wilson, have two children: a daughter, Ruth, wife of the Honorable Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War in the Hoover administration; and a son, Henry B. Wilson, Jr., who is an oil company executive. There are six grandchildren.

The service he rendered to his country and the patriotism he displayed throughout his entire life will ever be an inspiration to everyone who has had the privilege of acquaintanceship with him.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, January 22, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who, in the toils and troubles of time, hath set vistas of eternity in our hearts: In a world that lieth in darkness, swept by the chill winds of despair and doubt, we pause at this sheltered sanctuary of Thy grace to make sure that the light within is not dimmed. We would lift our soiled and shadowed faces to the one true Light, knowing that if we keep our hearts with Thee there is no darkness from without which can quench the light that is within.

In this desperate hour, when the world's hope of a brighter tomorrow is committed to our frail hands, join us to the valiant company of unconquered spirits who in evil times have stood their ground, preserving the heritage of man's best, and whose flaming faith has made their lives as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom. We ask it in the ever-blessed Name of that One who is the Light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 2, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had

passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 373) to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 758. An act for the relief of Harry C. Barney;

H. R. 1647. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Mae Smith;

H. R. 2235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.;

H. R. 2616. An act for the relief of Generosa Bonet;

H. R. 2617. An act for the relief of Guillermo Morales Chacon;

H. R. 3041. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Frederick W. Lee the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention;

H. R. 4340. An act for the relief of Charles J. Abarno and others;

H. R. 4551. An act to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 removing authorization of projects by the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 4881. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code in reference to the survival of things in action;

H. R. 5025. An act for the relief of Paul G. Kendall;

H. R. 5572. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Cook Cleland;

H. R. 6452. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie;

H. R. 6698. An act for the relief of Alexei Frank;

H. R. 6808. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel J. Adams, and others;

H. R. 7395. An act to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7398. An act to repeal the requirement of section 3921 of the Revised Statutes that postmasters report to the Postmaster General failure to cancel postage stamps; and

H. R. 7399. An act to authorize the sale of postage-due stamps for philatelic purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 354) amending Public Law 207, 83d Congress, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON SPECIAL ASSISTANTS EMPLOYED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on special assistants employed by the Department of Justice, for the period July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

TERMINATION OF ENLISTMENT CONTRACTS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets at the United States Military Academy or as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve or as cadets at the United States Coast Guard Academy, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Acting Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated January 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON LIGNITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMPULSION OF TESTIMONY UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

A letter from the Attorney General, favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 6899) to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and to grant immunity from prosecution in connection therewith (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending the deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, ETC.

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SOLDIERS' HOME AT FRAMINGHAM, MASS.—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the establishment of a soldiers' home under Federal jurisdiction, at Framingham, Mass.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps for the purpose of establishing a Soldier's Home under Federal jurisdiction at Framingham

Whereas there is no soldiers' home in our Commonwealth under Federal jurisdiction and, although Massachusetts has constructed and operates two excellent soldiers' homes—one in Chelsea and one in Holyoke—the primary responsibility for the care of veterans rests with the Federal Government; and

Whereas there are many federally operated soldiers' homes in various parts of the United States, especially in the southern and western parts, to care for ill and elderly former servicemen in their declining years, the nearest federally operated soldiers' home to Massachusetts being located at Togus, Maine; and

Whereas the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration have indicated that they do not intend to continue the operation of the facilities now known as the Cushing Hospital at Framingham, Mass.; and

Whereas the facilities at Cushing Hospital are ideally suited for a soldiers' home and could be converted at small cost for that purpose: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps, together with the appropriate Federal department to establish a soldiers' home, under Federal jurisdiction, at the present location of the Cushing Hospital, at Framingham, Mass.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Massachusetts, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator for Veterans' Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

TAX EXEMPTION OF STATE AND MUNICIPAL BONDS—LETTER FROM WATER AND LIGHT DEPARTMENT, BRAINERD, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Water and Light Department of the City of Brainerd, Minn., concerning the tax exemption of State and municipal bonds be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF BRAINERD,
WATER AND LIGHT DEPARTMENT,
Brainerd, Minn., January 29, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Council on State Defense advises that a new attack has been presented on the tax exemption of State and municipal bonds in the form of a proposal by private utility interests to eliminate the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds issued for what are termed "proprietary" purposes. This is only the first step in the drive to make the interest on all State and municipal bonds subject to Federal taxation. This is in addition to the plan's attempt to impose a 13-percent Federal tax on public-power systems.

The Water and Light Board of the City of Brainerd are alarmed at both of these threats that will jeopardize future financing of needed municipal improvements and will cause an additional tax burden on the people of this community. They therefore request that you oppose these measures for the best interests of our city and State.

Yours truly,

A. H. THON,
Secretary.

INCREASE IN FEDERAL TAX EXEMPTION—RESOLUTION OF LOCAL 257, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY CLERKS, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by Local 257, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, St. Paul, Minn., in support of an increase in the Federal tax exemption from $600 to $1,500 be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY
AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS,
St. Paul, Minn., January 27, 1954.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The membership of this lodge, Local 257, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, adopted the following motion at our last regular meeting held on January 5, 1954:

"A unanimous motion was made that this lodge, Local 257, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, favors an increase in the Federal tax exemption from the present $600 rate to a $1,500 rate."

The membership feels that big business is constantly requesting tax relief and receiving certain tax relief under many loopholes, but the worker still has to carry the full load; therefore, some consideration should be given the worker.

Trusting that you will give your support to any bill giving relief to the average wage-earner and attempt to introduce such legislation at the earliest opportunity, I remain,

Sincerely,

ALFRED B. BROAD,
Recording Secretary, B. of R. C., Local 257.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1386. A bill to amend section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, relating to the meaning of the word "commodity"; without amendment (Rept. No. 929).

VOICE OF AMERICA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 928)

Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted a report on Voice of America, which was ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVIL EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of December 1953, and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY [1]

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for December 1953 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In December numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,357,294	2,367,330	−10,036	$757,788	$787,889	−$30,101
1. Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,177,760	1,182,189	−4,429	390,958	401,616	−10,658
2. Department of Defense	1,179,534	1,185,141	−5,607	366,829	386,273	−19,443
Within the Department of Defense:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,834	1,852	−18	912	965	−53
Department of the Army	459,389	464,894	−5,505	129,329	138,351	−9,012
Department of the Air Force	288,919	288,587	+332	90,742	94,494	−3,752
Department of the Navy	429,392	429,808	−416	145,837	152,463	−6,626

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States, outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further breakdown in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because payroll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(See table II)

Federal personnel within the United States decreased 8,933 from the November total of 2,190,018 to the December total of 2,181,085.

Exclusive of the Department of Defense there was a decrease of 3,489 from the November figure of 1,120,966 to the December figure of 1,117,477.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the Department of Defense for December was 1,063,608, a decrease of 5,444 from the November figure of 1,069,052.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense decreased 23 from the November figure of 1,801 to the December figure of 1,778.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States decreased 5,119 from the November figure of 414,861 to the December figure of 409,742.

The Department of the Air Force civilian personnel within the United States increased 245 from the November figure of 252,840 to the December figure of 253,085.

The Department of the Navy civilian personnel within the United States decreased 547 from the November figure of 399,550 to the December figure of 399,003.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(See table III)

Outside continental United States Federal personnel decreased 1,103 from the November total of 177,312 to the December total of 176,209.

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in table VI.

A decrease of 940 was reported by the departments and agencies other than the Department of Defense, from the November figure of 61,223 to the December figure of 60,283.

Total civilian employment outside continental United States for the Department of Defense decreased 163 from the November figure of 116,089 to the December figure of 115,926.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense reported 56 in overseas civilian employment, an increase of 5.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 386 in overseas civilian employment from the November figure of 50,033 to the December figure of 49,647.

The Department of the Air Force reported an increase of 87 in overseas civilian employment from the November figure of 35,747 to the December figure of 35,834.

The Department of the Navy reported an increase of 131 in overseas civilian employment from the November figure of 30,258 to the December figure of 30,389.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

(See table IV)

Total industrial employment during the month of December 1953 decreased 4,972 from the November total of 707,586 to the December total of 702,614.

Industrial employment in the departments and agencies other than the Department of Defense decreased 568 from the November figure of 25,912 to the December figure of 25,344.

The Department of Defense decreased its total industrial employment 4,404 from the November figure of 681,674 to the December figure of 677,270.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 3,983 from the November figure of 233,922 to the December figure of 229,939. Inside continental United States Army industrial employment decreased 3,776 and outside continental United States Army industrial employment decreased 207.

The Department of the Air Force reported a decrease of 116 from the November figure of 164,817 to the December figure of 164,701. Inside continental United States Air Force industrial employment increased 220 and outside continental United States Air Force industrial employment decreased 336.

The Department of the Navy reported a decrease of 305 from the November figure of 282,935 to the December figure of 282,630. Inside continental United States Navy industrial employment decreased 374 and outside continental United States Navy industrial employment increased 69.

The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects, such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(See table V)

Table V shows personnel counted in tables I, II, III, and IV who are assigned to the Mutual Defense Assistance Program by the State Department, Foreign Operations Administration, and the component units of the Department of Defense together with their pay.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

(See table VI)

Table VI is included in this report for the first time. It shows foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas who are not included among personnel counted in any other table in this report and who are excluded from usual Federal personnel reporting because of the nature of their work or the source of the funds from which they are paid. In this and future personnel reports by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures they will be regarded as Federal employees to be counted along with but separate from regular employees.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1953, and comparison with November 1953, and pay for November 1953, and comparison with October 1953*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	October	November	Increase	Decrease	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture [1]	$24,078	$23,143		$935	70,262	67,610		2,652
Commerce [2] [3]	18,650	17,388		1,262	45,459	44,203		1,256
Health, Education, and Welfare	12,701	12,330		371	36,238	36,247	9	
Interior	$20,236	$18,680		$1,556	52,367	51,769		598
Justice	13,080	12,121		959	30,172	29,944		228
Labor	2,308	2,087		221	5,237	5,176		61
Post Office	161,349	161,533	$184		508,584	507,645	1,061	
State	[4] 6,977	6,610		367	[4] 20,428	20,106		322
Treasury	31,386	29,933		1,453	81,104	80,873		231
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	130	122		8	247	249	2	
Bureau of the Budget	259	242		17	420	417		3
Council of Economic Advisers	13	17	4		22	28	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	25	25			127	128	1	
National Security Council [5]	16	16			28	28		
Office of Defense Mobilization	191	176		15	395	386		9
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization					6	3		3
Emergency agencies:								
Defense Transport Administration	23	19		4	38	36		2
Economic Stabilization Agency [6]	30			30				
Federal Civil Defense Administration	396	372		24	698	693		5
Foreign Operations Administration	2,200	2,173		27	6,634	6,691	57	
National Security Training Commission	5	6	1		10	10		
Renegotiation Board	399	393		6	699	712	13	
Small Defense Plants Administration [7]	326	153		173				
Subversive Activities Control Board	19	18		1	31	31		
Postwar agencies:								
War Claims Commission	61	58		3	160	157		3
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	91	93	2		447	452	5	
Atomic Energy Commission	3,008	2,862		146	6,404	6,371		33
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	256	246		10	583	583		
Civil Aeronautics Board	274	261		13	542	541		1
Civil Service Commission	1,786	1,696		90	4,487	4,477		10
Commission on Foreign Economic Policy	6	13	7		54	47		7
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	1	2	1		9	20	11	
Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel	7	7			18	17		1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	74	68		6	129	127		2
Farm Credit Administration [1]						786	786	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	3	4	1		8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	527	509		18	1,103	1,126	23	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	444	431		13	1,032	1,029		3
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	236	222		14	373	358		15
Federal Power Commission	321	308		13	663	663		
Federal Trade Commission	342	291		51	582	576		6
General Accounting Office	2,466	2,344		122	5,956	5,927		29
General Services Administration	8,743	8,403		340	27,821	27,622		199
Government Contract Committee	3	2		1	11	13	2	
Government Printing Office	2,777	2,684		93	7,088	7,073		15
Housing and Home Finance Agency	4,773	4,479		294	11,065	11,041		24
Indian Claims Commission	9	9			14	14		
Interstate Commerce Commission	636	816	174		1,814	1,826	12	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,956	2,829		127	7,301	7,264		37
National Capital Housing Authority	112	106		6	343	335		8
National Capital Planning Commission	9	9			20	20		
National Gallery of Art	96	94		2	320	317		3

[1] The Farm Credit Administration, formerly under the Department of Agriculture, became an independent agency effective Dec. 4, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 202, 83d Cong.

[2] December figure includes 967 employees of the Business and Defense Services Administration, an increase of 22 from the November figure of 845.

[3] December figure includes 2,522 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[4] Revised on the basis of later information.

[5] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[6] Ceased to exist Oct. 31, 1953.

[7] Transferred to Small Business Administration under Presidential directive dated Aug. 8, 1953, under Public Law 163, 83d Cong.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1953, and comparison with November 1953, and pay for November 1953, and comparison with October 1953*—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	October	November	Increase	Decrease	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
National Labor Relations Board	$624	$587		$37	1,254	1,250		4
National Mediation Board	75	74		1	112	110		2
National Science Foundation	73	73			170	200	30	
Panama Canal	3,958	3,459		499	17,091	16,944		147
Railroad Retirement Board	753	711		42	2,104	2,114	10	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	776	599		177	1,235	1,214		21
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	1	4	3		5	20	15	
Securities and Exchange Commission	403	372		31	732	727		5
Selective Service System	1,702	1,573		129	7,313	7,327	14	
Small Business Administration	18	101	83		349	415	66	
Smithsonian Institution	177	172		5	498	500	2	
Soldiers' Home	150	149		1	776	777	1	
Tariff Commission	103	100		3	195	193		2
Tax Court of the United States	69	67		2	137	136		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	9,718	9,048		670	22,905	22,796		109
U. S. Information Agency	2,398	2,510	112		9,919	9,351		568
Veterans' Administration	55,804	54,962		842	181,841	181,911	70	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	401,616	390,958	572	11,230	1,182,189	1,177,760	2,196	6,625
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			10,658				4,429	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [1]	965	912		53	1,852	1,834		18
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	124,984	116,016		8,968	414,861	409,742		5,119
Outside continental United States	13,367	13,323		44	50,033	49,647		386
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	86,328	82,765		3,563	252,840	253,085	245	
Outside continental United States	8,166	7,977		189	35,747	35,834	87	
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	143,509	137,314		6,195	399,550	399,003		547
Outside continental United States	8,954	8,523		431	30,258	30,389	131	
Total, Department of Defense	386,273	366,830		19,443	1,185,141	1,179,534	463	6,070
Net decrease, Department of Defense			19,443				5,607	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	787,889	757,788	572	30,673	2,367,330	2,357,294	2,659	12,695
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			30,101				10,036	

[1] Includes $98,662 retroactive pay increases paid in November.

[2] Includes 255 employees assigned to the Cataloging, Standardization, and Inspection Agency and 43 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1953, and comparison with November 1953*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture [1]	68,790	66,118		2,672
Commerce [2 3]	42,324	41,119		1,205
Health, Education, and Welfare	35,693	35,699	6	
Interior	46,389	45,867		522
Justice	29,653	29,427		226
Labor	5,120	5,069		51
Post Office	504,246	505,296	1,050	
State	6,096	6,004		92
Treasury	80,103	79,872		231
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	247	249	2	
Bureau of the Budget	420	417		3
Council of Economic Advisers	22	28	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	127	128	1	
National Security Council [4]	28	28		
Office of Defense Mobilization	395	386		9
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	6	3		3
Emergency agencies:				
Defense Transport Administration	38	36		2
Federal Civil Defense Administration	698	693		5
Foreign Operations Administration	1,448	1,429		19
National Security Training Commission	10	10		
Renegotiation Board	699	712	13	
Subversive Activities Control Board	31	31		
Postwar agencies:				
War Claims Commission	160	157		3
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	15	15		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,391	6,358		33
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	583	583		
Civil Aeronautics Board	534	534		
Civil Service Commission	4,470	4,460		10
Commission on Foreign Economic Policy	54	47		7
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	9	20	11	
Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel	18	17		1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	129	127		2
Farm Credit Administration [1]		775	775	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	1,076	1,100	24	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,031	1,028		3
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	373	358		15
Federal Power Commission	663	663		
Federal Trade Commission	582	576		6
General Accounting Office	5,916	5,888		28
General Services Administration	27,717	27,519		198
Government Contract Committee	11	13	2	
Government Printing Office	7,088	7,073		15
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,925	10,907		18
Indian Claims Commission	14	14		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,814	1,826	12	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,301	7,264		37
National Capital Housing Authority	343	335		8
National Capital Planning Commission	20	20		
National Gallery of Art	320	317		3
National Labor Relations Board	1,233	1,229		4
National Mediation Board	112	110		2
National Science Foundation	170	200	30	
Panama Canal	538	533		5
Railroad Retirement Board	2,104	2,114	10	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,229	1,208		21
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	5	20	15	
Securities and Exchange Commission	732	727		5
Selective Service System	7,105	7,120	15	
Small Business Administration	349	415	66	
Smithsonian Institution	496	498	2	
Soldiers' Home	776	777	1	
Tariff Commission	195	193		2
Tax Court of the United States	137	136		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	22,905	22,796		109
United States Information Agency	2,113	2,087		26
Veterans' Administration	180,619	180,691	72	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,120,966	1,117,477	2,113	5,602
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			3,489	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,801	1,778		23
Department of the Army	414,861	409,742		5,119
Department of the Air Force	252,840	253,085	245	
Department of the Navy	399,550	399,003		547
Total, Department of Defense	1,069,052	1,063,608	245	5,689
Net decrease, Department of Defense			5,444	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,190,018	2,181,085	2,358	11,291
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			8,933	

[1] The Farm Credit Administration, formerly under the Department of Agriculture, became an independent agency effective Dec. 4, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 702, 83d Cong.

[2] December figure includes 867 employees of the Business and Defense Services Administration, an increase of 22 from the November figure of 845.

[3] December figure includes 2,522 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

[4] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1953, and comparison with November 1953*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture[1]	1,472	1,492	20	
Commerce	3,135	3,084		51
Health, Education, and Welfare	545	548	3	
Interior	5,978	5,902		76
Justice	519	517		2
Labor	117	107		10
Post Office	2,358	2,349	11	
State	[2] 14,332	14,102		230
Treasury	1,001	1,001		
Emergency agencies:				
Foreign Operations Administration	5,186	5,262	76	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	432	437	5	
Atomic Energy Commission	13	13		
Civil Aeronautics Board	8	7		1
Civil Service Commission	17	17		
Farm Credit Administration[1]		11	11	
Federal Communications Commission	27	26		1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1		
General Accounting Office	40	39		1
General Services Administration	104	103		1
Housing and Home Finance Agency	140	134		6
National Labor Relations Board	21	21		
Panama Canal	16,553	16,411		142
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	6	6		
Selective Service System	208	207		1
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
United States Information Agency	7,806	7,264		542
Veterans' Administration	1,222	1,220		2
Total excluding Department of Defense	61,223	60,283	126	1,066
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			940	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	51	56	5	
Department of the Army	50,033	49,647		386
Department of the Air Force	35,747	35,834	87	
Department of the Navy	30,258	30,389	131	
Total, Department of Defense	116,089	115,926	223	386
Net decrease, Department of Defense			163	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	177,312	176,209	349	1,452
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			1,103	

[1] The Farm Credit Administration, formerly under the Department of Agriculture, became an independent agency effective Dec. 4, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 202, 83d Cong.

[2] Revised on the basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1953, and comparison with November 1953*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Commerce	490	479		11
Interior	2,516	2,177		339
State	128	130	2	
Treasury	7,140	7,010		130
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	106	108	2	
Panama Canal	1,372	1,372		
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,160	14,068		92
Total, excluding Department of Defense	25,912	25,344	4	572
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			568	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	202,589	198,813		3,776
Outside continental United States	31,333	31,126		207
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	143,928	144,148	220	
Outside continental United States	20,889	20,553		336
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	260,897	260,523		374
Outside continental United States	22,038	22,107	69	
Total, Department of Defense	681,674	677,270	289	4,693
Net decrease, Department of Defense			4,404	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	707,586	702,614	293	5,265
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			4,972	

TABLE V.—*Federal employees assigned to mutual defense assistance program*

Department or agency	Payroll (in thousands)			Civilian personnel		
	In October was—	In November was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November numbered—	In December numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	$6,863	$6,586	−$277	23,802	24,277	+475
State Department	103	85	−18	1,039	1,014	−25
Foreign Operations Administration	22	21	−1	28	33	−5
Office of the Secretary of Defense	69	67	−2	146	149	+3
Department of the Army	[1] 4,719	[2] 4,719		[1] 16,558	[2] 16,558	
Department of the Air Force	1,056	987	−69	2,900	2,906	+6
Department of the Navy	894	[2] 707	−187	3,121	3,558	+437

[1] Revised on the basis of later information.

[2] Subject to revision.

TABLE VI.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from usual Federal personnel reporting because of the nature of their work or the source of the funds from which they are paid, as of December 1953, and comparison with November 1953 (not included elsewhere in this report)*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	November	December	November	December	November	December	November	December
Austria	3	3					3	3
England	45	47					45	47
France	21	5					21	5
Germany	114,738	117,037	94,876	96,346	1,940	1,838	17,922	18,853
Japan	188,234	178,526	128,969	119,406	16,968	17,166	42,297	41,954
Korea	105,662	106,431	[1] 95,676	[1] 96,476			10,006	9,955
Libya		822						822
Ryukyus	14,718	14,007	11,079	10,884			3,639	3,813
Scotland	10						10	
Total	423,451	417,568	330,600	323,112	18,908	19,004	73,943	75,452

[1] Includes 37,036 members of the Korean Service Corps in December as compared with 37,465 in November.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German governments. Ryukyuans reported by the Army are paid from funds appropriated for personal service. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of December totaling 2,357,294. This was a net reduction of 10,036 as compared with employment reported for the preceding month of November.

Civilian employment as reported by employing agencies of the Federal Government by months in the current fiscal year 1954, which began July 1, follows:

Month	Employment	Decrease
July	2,454,714	−14,926
August	2,431,430	−23,284
September	2,401,810	−29,620
October	2,372,745	−29,065
November	2,367,330	−5,415
December	2,357,294	−10,036

These figures show that during the 6 months of fiscal year 1954, civilian employment was reduced by 112,346. December was the 17th consecutive month in which net reductions were reported. As compared with December 1952, a year ago, the reductions in 12 months totaled 203,185.

Civilian employment by the Defense Department continued to decrease during December, dropping 5,607 to a total of 1,179,534. And employment by civilian agencies decreased during the month from 1,182,189 in November to 1,177,760 in December—a decrease of 4,429.

Major decreases were reported by the Department of the Army with a reduction of 5,505, the Department of Agriculture with a reduction of 1,866, and the Department of Commerce with a reduction of 1,256. The only major increase was reported by the Post Office Department with 1,061.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The 2,357,294 employees above were certified to the committee by executive agencies in their usual personnel reports for December; but the committee report also records for the first time an adidtional 417,568 foreign nationals who were working under United States military agencies overseas as of December 31, 1953. They follow:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Austria	3			3
England	47			47
France	5			5
Germany	117,037	96,346	1,838	18,853
Japan	178,526	119,406	17,166	41,954
Korea	106,431	96,476		9,955
Libya	822			822
Ryukyus	14,697	10,884		3,813
Total	417,568	323,112	19,004	75,452

Most Federal personnel reporting is confined to employment paid from funds appropriated for personal service payrolls, and foreign nationals paid from such funds are included in the regular reporting. But these 417,568 are workers who, because of the source of the funds from which they are paid, or the nature of their work, have been excluded from regular reporting.

Some are being hired under labor contracts between the military services and foreign governments. Others are working under American occupation forces and are being paid from funds provided by German governments. Some Ryukyuans are being paid from American personal service appropriations, but because of the nature of their employment, they have been recorded in regular reports only as footnotes. Still others are Korean civilians who have been organized into what is called the Korean Service Corps.

Recording this additional use of foreign national employment, along with but separate from regular employment, fills another gap in Federal personnel reporting. It follows disclosures last summer of thousands who were working for United States agencies overseas but not reported because they were being paid from foreign currencies owed to and owned by the United States which were being used without specific appropriation for personal service.

The President's budget submitted to Congress January 21 presents greatly improved data on the employment of foreign nationals. In addition to showing for the first time those who are paid at local rates, as distinguished from those paid at United States rates, it also includes data on employment under master labor contracts or agreements with foreign governments in lieu of direct employment with funds specifically appropriated for personal service.

From budget document detail it is indicated that Army and Navy and Air Force, for fiscal year 1955, beginning next July 1, are requesting authority to employ nearly 400,000 foreign nationals under contracts and agreements with foreign governments to be paid from funds not specifically appropriated for personal service payrolls—approximately 280,000 under labor contracts and approximately 120,000 under agreements.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES OF FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me on behalf of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, relating to unexpended balances of Federal appropriations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Executive agencies of the Federal Government started the current fiscal year with authority to call upon the Treasury to meet their bills in fiscal year 1954 and subsequent years up to a total of $160.9 billion, $58.8 billion in appropriations and other spending authorizations enacted in the past session of Congress, and $102.1 billion in old appropriations and other spending authorizations enacted prior to the 83d Congress.

During the first 4 months of the fiscal year, through October, $22.5 billion of agency obligations came due and were paid by the Treasury; $8.8 billion against appropriations and other spending authorizations enacted in the last session of Congress, and $13.7 billion against old appropriations and other spending authorizations enacted in earlier years.

These figures were revealed today in the 11th monthly compilation of Federal Appropriations and Authorizations, Expenditures and Unexpended Balances, by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. (The term "unexpended balances" in appropriations and authorizations does not mean that the cash is in the Treasury. It means the agencies are still authorized to call upon the Treasury to meet their obligations up to the so-called unexpended balances in their appropriations and other spending authority. As the bills come due, the Treasury must provide the funds from tax collections, other cash on hand, or from borrowed funds which increase the Federal debt.)

A summary of available appropriations and other spending authorizations, expenditures, and unexpended balances, as described above, through October 1953, is attached.

The President's budget this year emphasizes these so-called unexpended balances more than ever before. The figures in his budget document differ from those to be found in the Treasury records, on which the committee report is based, in several technical respects including: (1) Budget figures represent full year estimates for the permanent and indefinite appropriations, whereas Treasury accounts reflect the actual figures to date; (2) budget figures include total unfinanced contract authorizations, whereas Treasury accounts reflect only the actual figures for appropriations made to date for liquidation of contract authorizations; and (3) budget figures exclude all lapsed appropriations, whereas Treasury accounts include lapsed appropriations until they are actually written off by transfer to surplus. In addition, the committee report does not include figures for the judicial and legislative branches.

The budget document's résumé of appropriations and authorizations, expenditures and so-called unexpended balances shows:

[In billions]

	Balances carried over into—	New appropriations	Total spending authority	Expenditures		
				From old balances	From new authorizations	Total
1953	$99.4	$80.2	$179.5	[1]	[1]	$74.3
1954 (estimated)	102.7	[2] 60.7	[2] 163.6	$35.2	$35.7	70.9
1955 (estimated)	86.9	56.3	143.2	29.3	36.3	65.6
1956 (estimated)	77.1					

[1] Breakdown not available.

[2] Includes $1.2 billion in proposed supplementals not yet enacted.

TABLE I.—*Summary of appropriations and other authorizations, expenditures, and unexpended balances, executive branch of the Federal Government,[1] showing appropriations and other authorizations by current and prior years; and 1954 expenditures from appropriations for the current year and appropriations enacted in prior years, and unexpended balances, as of Oct. 31, 1953*

[In thousands of dollars]

Department or agency	Appropriations and authorizations			Expenditures (through Oct. 31, 1953)			Unexpended balances as of Oct. 31, 1953
	Prior-year appropriations and authorizations	Current appropriations and authorizations, fiscal year 1954	Total [2]	Out of prior year appropriations and authorizations	Out of current appropriations and authorizations	Total	
Executive Office of the President	2,485	9,088	13,202	769	2,853	3,601	9,603
Funds appropriated to the President	10,797,737	4,529,723	15,367,576	976,311	27,134	1,003,448	14,364,133
Independent Offices	11,055,842	5,679,106	16,779,906	1,231,280	1,495,979	2,727,264	14,052,643
General Services Administration	2,732,885	162,381	2,875,254	221,433	45,257	266,692	2,608,562
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,074,068	312,666	5,302,743	47,848	−98,112	−50,264	5,353,004

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Summary of appropriations and other authorizations, expenditures, and unexpended balances, executive branch of the Federal Government,[1] showing appropriations and other authorizations by current and prior years; and 1954 expenditures from appropriations for the current year and appropriations enacted in prior years, and unexpended balances, as of Oct. 31, 1953*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Department or agency	Appropriations and authorizations			Expenditures (through Oct. 31, 1953)			Unexpended balances as of Oct. 31, 1953
	Prior-year appropriations and authorizations	Current appropriations and authorizations, fiscal year 1954	Total[2]	Out of prior year appropriations and authorizations	Out of current appropriations and authorizations	Total	
Department of Agriculture	4,936,489	1,763,755	6,698,140	825,190	159,870	985,058	5,713,081
Department of Commerce	268,749	858,777	1,195,335	161,071	305,569	466,638	728,699
Department of Defense	62,540,891	35,070,229	97,018,954	9,519,729	4,576,880	14,096,608	82,922,346
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	626,735	1,468,421	2,094,483	376,251	339,415	715,665	1,378,818
Department of the Interior	358,652	477,984	833,179	162,034	67,816	229,847	603,331
Department of Justice	22,282	186,978	209,260	12,990	50,149	63,137	146,122
Department of Labor	14,495	242,355	256,858	3,927	93,390	97,319	159,519
Department of the Post Office	1,194	530,518	531,194	−553	159,287	158,734	372,459
Department of State	116,142	209,994	273,636	29,977	50,024	80,000	193,636
Department of the Treasury	4,820,694	7,227,246	11,492,389	144,713	1,531,045	1,674,760	9,817,631
Total	103,069,340	58,789,818	160,942,087	13,711,970	8,806,536	22,518,508	138,423,577

[1] Excluding trust and deposit fund accounts.
[2] Net total after transfers among agencies, and transfer of lapsed appropriations and spending authority to surplus totaling approximately $1 billion.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.
Source: Department of the Treasury.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2875. A bill to provide for the location of mining claims by geological, geochemical, and geophysical prospecting methods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2876. A bill to require inside latches on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 2877. A bill for the relief of Philopimin Michalacopoulos (Mihalakopoulos); and

S. 2878. A bill for the relief of Luca Saltarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2879. A bill for the relief of Helen Hilda Coral Newbery, Peter Julian Newbery, and Prudence Ellen Newbery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (by request):

S. 2880. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide judicial review of certain findings of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare which may result in the reduction or discontinuance of public assistance payments to States;

S. 2881. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for conferences between the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and representatives of the several States; and

S. 2882. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide that public assistance payments to the States shall not be reduced in certain cases by reason of the disapproval by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the personnel practices of the State agencies carrying out public assistance programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2883. A bill for the relief of John F. McKenney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2884. A bill for the relief of Sister Anna Scrinzi, Sister Giuliana Paladini, Sister Iolanda Mazzocchi, and Sister Giuseppina Zanchetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 2885. A bill for the relief of Sandra Lea MacMullin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2886. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals, and for the establishment within the Materials Division, Emergency Procurement Services, General Services Administration, of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2887. A bill for the relief of Hon Cheun Kwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2888. A bill to provide for advancement on the retired lists of the Armed Forces of individuals who did not receive promotions after having been held as prisoners of war during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2889. A bill to expand and extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; and

S. 2890. A bill providing for a Regional Credit Union System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2891. A bill to require inside latches on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

GEOLOGICAL, GEOCHEMICAL, AND GEOPHYSICAL MINING CLAIMS ACT OF 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the location of mining claims by geological, geochemical, and geophysical prospecting methods, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an explanatory statement relative to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2875) to provide for the location of mining claims by geological, geochemical, and geophysical prospecting methods, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The explanatory statement by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED GEOLOGICAL, GEOCHEMICAL, AND GEOPHYSICAL MINING CLAIMS ACT OF 1954

(Statement by Senator MURRAY)

BACKGROUND OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Writers in mining technical journals have been pointing out for some time that most of the hope for the discovery of extensive new ore bodies lies in finding those which have not cropped to the surface.

Although made in another context, a statement by Joel D. Wolfson, formerly Acting Associate Director, Bureau of Land Management, United States Department of the Interior, is in point. He said, "While the laws governing many other aspects of the development of the public domain have changed materially, those relating to the extraction of lode and placer minerals have not changed." As is generally known, a valid location of an unpatented mining claim cannot be made unless there is a physical discovery of mineral in place. The utilization of scientific methods of prospecting is often expensive and the lack of any means of securing an exclusive right to prospect on such public domain as may be open to location is thought to have inhibited greater utilization of these methods.

This is an attempt to provide security for the scientific prospector and at the same time prevent frivolous encumbrance of the public domain, in order to encourage the exploration and development of the Nation's mineral resources.

Draft No. 4 of the Geological, Geochemical, and Geophysical Mining Claims Act of 1954 actually was the seventh draft upon which the Subcommittee on Mining and Minerals Industry of the Senate Small Business Committee, of the 79th Congress, worked in conjunction with representatives of the mining industry. Altogether, several thousand copies of various drafts were widely circulated; and as criticisms and comments were received, those which seemed to be most generally favored were included in the various drafts. There was no claim by the subcommittee that the draft was final or perfect. The present discussion is for the purpose of considering various issues which occurred to the subcommittee staff during the preparation of the various bill drafts. It must be kept in mind that the bill can be further rewritten in the legislative committee to which it is assigned after public hearings have been had.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED BILL

Title

"A bill to provide for the location of mining claims by geological, geochemical, and geophysical prospecting methods, and for other purposes."

Comment: It will be noticed by those who have studied previous drafts of the bill that the word "geological" has been added. Several experts have pointed out that there are definite conditions existing where the geological indications of ore deposition may be of as great or more value than the results of geophysical prospecting. Under these conditions the expense of geophysical work may not be warranted, but it seems only fair to allow an interim location to permit doing geological prospecting, if preferable.

Short title

"SEC. 1. (a) That this act may be cited as the Geological, Geochemical, and Geophysical Mining Claims Act of 1954."

Comment: This short title is merely for convenient reference.

Definitions

"SEC. 1. (b) As used in this act—

"(1) the term 'geological mining claim' means any mining claim, located under the terms of this act, on which geological, geochemical, or geophysical prospecting is to be or has been conducted by the locator subsequent to the location of such claim;

"(2) the term 'geophysical prospecting' means prospecting for mineral deposits by means of scientific instruments for measuring physical differences between rock types or discontinuities in geologic formations;

"(3) the term 'geological prospecting' means prospecting for mineral deposits by the application of the principles and techniques of the science of geology as they relate to the search for and the discovery of mineral deposits;

"(4) the term 'geochemical prospecting' means prospecting for mineral deposits by the application of the principles and techniques of the science of chemistry as they relate to the search for and the discovery of mineral deposits; and

"(5) the term 'locator' means any one person, individual group of persons, association, or corporation or agents thereof."

Comment: In this section the name of the new mining claim authorized by the proposed act is specified as "geological mining claim" by definition to avoid using throughout the bill the longer and more awkward name specified in the short title as "geological, geochemical, and geophysical mining claim."

In addition, a definition of "geological prospecting" is given and also a definition of "geochemical prospecting" and "geophysical prospecting." These have been acclaimed by competent geophysicists as the best definitions so far developed. The definition of "geological prospecting" has not yet been commented upon by industry or geologists.

The section also gives a technical definition of the term "locator" as used throughout the bill and the text of the section above quoted is in this report self-explanatory.

Lands on which geological mining claims may be located

"SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2320 of the Revised Statutes, a location of a geological mining claim may be made on lands belonging to the United States prior to the discovery of a vein or lode or other mineral deposit within the limits of the claim located, and upon which a mining claim may be based under the provisions of such section."

Comment: Section 2320 of the Revised Statutes is the basis of the legal authority for making the traditional type of mining location on the public domain. Subsection 2 (a) makes the necessary exception which permits the location of the new type of claim upon any public lands open for the location of lode or placer claims under the present mining laws.

Size, shape, and orientation of claims

"SEC. 2. (b) Any geological mining claim located under the provision of this act shall be square in shape, and shall contain not more than 40 acres. All boundary lines shall as far as possible be parallel to or coincide with the United States system of public-land surveys. The total acreage of all contiguous geological mining claims located or held at any one time by a locator shall not exceed 640 acres in area or 2 miles in length."

Comment: This section specifies the area of any single claim as 40 acres and, at the same time, specifies that it shall be square so as to generally conform to the public-land surveys, partly for greater convenience when encumbering the public domain and partly because, as no veins may be identified on the surface, the necessity for the rectangular shape is not as real. The words on page 2, line 25, of the printed bill (second sentence of sec. 2 (b)) "as far as possible be parallel to or coincide with the United States system of public-land surveys" has raised some question. "As far as possible" was inserted to take care of those cases where for some reason or other the lines of the public-land surveys are not themselves parallel so that it would in certain instances be impossible to obey a firm mandate to make the claim square and in conformity with the established survey.

A good deal of controversy has arisen over the limitation of the contiguous-group acreage to 640. It is true that the new scientific types of prospecting are frequently done over large areas. The point has been developed in the subcommittee correspondence on this matter that geophysical prospecting by large companies may be so expensive that holding of whole townships may be warranted. At the same time, as a practical matter, it is thought there may be considerable resistance to encumbering large areas of the public domain under one locator, even for the short period prior to discovery permitted under the proposed act. Informally, the subcommittee has advices that the Interior Department may show considerable opposition to including larger areas in the bill.

The limitation in shape for a 640-acre group to a total length of 2 miles is to reasonably limit stringing the claims out for possible nuisance purposes and to prevent nonproductive monopoly holdings of mineralized areas.

The subcommittee realizes perfectly well that without a prohibition against one holder or owner having more than one 640-acre group, the words "a locator" permit a subterfuge similar to that which has been used to circumvent the limitation on placer locations. Clearly several locators may locate contiguous groups and later assign to one party. A very definite quandary has developed on this point. Initial location of great expanses of the public domain might encourage speculation. Likewise, to permit large holdings of idle claims in favorable areas would further restrict or prevent the active development of the Nation's mineral resources by more progressive individuals and companies. On the other hand, prohibition against ultimate accumulation of groups might inhibit large-scale development in certain instances. Generally it seems as though few lode or open-pit operations ever would overlap the 640-acre group, and it is felt this is a reasonable compromise. However, the present wording of subsection 2 (b), while limiting the total acreage of any one group of contiguous geological mining claims to 640 acres, does not prohibit "a locator" from locating and holding practically the entire area over an unlimited number of townships providing each group of claims of maximum acreage is noncontiguous. An alternate to subsection 2 (b) has been proposed and is presented below for consideration. Further comment from interested parties is solicited.

Proposed alternate to subsection 2 (b): "The total acreage of all unpatented or patented geological mining claims located or held at any one time by a locator or holder of such claims shall not exceed 1,280 acres within any one township and no group of contiguous claims shall exceed 2 miles in length and 640 acres in area, except that for each such claim actively being developed and from which periodic shipments of minerals or metals have been made for 6 months, the locator or holder of such claim may exceed the above limitations by 2 additional claims."

Extralateral rights

"SEC. 2. (c) Notwithstanding section 2322 of the Revised Statutes, nothing contained in this act shall be construed to confer upon the locator of any geological mining claim a right of possession to any part of any mineral deposits lying outside of the boundary lines of such claim extended downward vertically, and no extralateral rights to any ore body within the boundary line of such claim shall be acquired by the locator of any lode claim which is located subsequent to the location of such geological mining claim and which is outside the boundaries thereof."

Comment: The exclusion of extralateral rights from the new class of claims is highly controversial. It is desired to make it very clear that this section does not apply to any traditional type of claim authorized under sections 2320 and 2322 of the Revised Statutes, located prior to or subsequent to the enactment of this bill, with the single exception noted below.

As is generally known, the extralateral rights permitted under the present statutes have caused endless litigation and are unique to the United States. It appears possible to lay out the geological claims in such a manner that such rights would be of little value compared with the possible confusion caused by the difficulty of determining the true apex of blind ore bodies.

This section also prevents the locator of a lode claim in the vicinity from speculating on the work done by the locator of geological mining claims by making a subsequent regular lode location, perhaps upon some surface stringer some distance away, which might have enough values to validate a location, and then harass the holder of the geological claims with speculative apex litigation on the theory that the stringer cropping on the lode location dipped under the geological claim and widened into such ore body as was there discovered. Several variations of this theoretical situation may be envisaged.

Surprisingly enough, although diverse opinions have been registered with the subcommittee, the bulk of comment has been surprisingly small and more would be desirable. Some mining engineers and mining lawyers who have practiced in apex cases object to section 2 (c) but it is felt their opinion may be biased. In this matter, as in fact, with all sections of the bill, the subcommittee is completely openminded and wishes to reflect in the legislation what seems to be the best informed and unbiased opinions of spokesmen for the mining industry of the country.

Access to other claims in vicinity

"SEC. 2. (d) The United States Department of the Interior or the locator of a geological mining claim in the vicinity shall have free access to the surface of all unpatented or patented mining claims hereinafter located, for the sole purpose of extending and correlating geological or geophysical prospecting,

which may include examining, mapping, and securing hand samples of exposed geologic formations and structures but shall not include drilling, trenching, or digging prospect holes, except that free access to such claims shall not include the surface within 100 yards of any camp sites or workings in use, buildings, or structures thereon."

Comment: This subsection has not appeared in any of the previous drafts. It is felt certain that there will be resistance to it from certain groups of mining people on the ground that it appears to involve a new theory and is an invasion of property rights in both patented and unpatented mining claims. It must be remembered, however, that in considerable areas today, claims located subsequent to the dates of various acts bearing thereon are limited in the degree of surface rights which pass to the locator so the principle actually is not new.

If free access is not had to the entire surface of the public domain within several miles of newly located claims, it probably would be impossible, in many instances, to accumulate sufficient geological or geophysical data of such a nature as to reasonably warrant physical exploration and the continued holding of such claims. In fact, except for the first few locators in any given area, initial locations of geological mining claims by others probably would not be feasible or legally possible if geological or geophysical prospecting is not permitted on surrounding groups of claims already located.

If the new subsection is carefully thought over in an impartial manner it will be seen, it is believed, that (1) most claim holders would not object to such temporary access and (2) those who might object would be blocking temporary reasonable use of land, which they have obtained from the United States for little or nothing, for purposes which may aid in adding much to the public knowledge of our mineral wealth. It must be observed that even where permission to enter is given to private parties, their findings may eventually become a public record, subject to the limitations of section 9 (b) of the bill, commented upon later in this report. It has been brought to the attention of the subcommittee that there have been instances where right of access maliciously has been denied, causing a considerable difficulty with the particular survey. It is believed that buildings and workings sufficiently are protected from trespass and that mining people generally will approve of the inclusion of this subsection. Comment is invited.

Location monuments or posts

"SEC. 3. (a) Any locator of a geological mining claim under the provisions of this act shall immediately—

"(1) erect a stone monument at least 3 feet high or a post 4 feet above the ground in the approximate center of such claim; and

"(2) erect a similar monument or post at each corner of such claim."

Comment: The method of marking a geological mining claim is similar to that employed when marking a regular lode claim excepting that no side or end center monuments or posts are required as at present designated by certain States, making the total number of monuments 5 rather than 7.

Location notices for monuments or posts

"SEC. 3. (b) At the time the location is made the locator of a geological mining claim shall attach a location notice securely to each monument or post erected as provided in subsection (a), and each such notice shall contain—

"(1) the name of the claim located;

"(2) the name of the locator or group of locators;

"(3) the date of location;

"(4) the linear measurements of the claim;

"(5) the exact position of such claim with reference to the United States system of public land surveys or, if the area has not been surveyed, the exact position of such claim with reference to at least two permanent and prominent natural objects or permanent monuments with which such claim may be identified; and

"(6) in the case of corner posts or monuments, a designation of the specific corner."

Comment: The inclusion of the requirement that the linear measurements of the claim shall be given on the location notice will permit anyone inspecting the notice to immediately identify the claim as a geological mining claim rather than a regular lode claim and to determine the size and boundaries of the claim. Requirement (b) (5) is to more firmly fix the position of the claim than has heretofore been the practice. Anyone who has searched the public domain for unpatented mining claims, only to find in the approximate vicinity of the claim an unmarked monument from which it is impossible to determine the position of other monuments or that in which the location notice has been placed will immediately appreciate the desirability of requirement (b) (6). It is contemplated that a single corner monument will suffice for all claims cornering on the particular intersection provided the marking is sufficiently clear for each claim so cornering.

Filing of location notice

"SEC. 4. (a) Within 30 days from the date of location the locator of a geological mining claim shall—

"(1) file a copy of the location notice in the office of the recorder, or other proper official, of the county in which such claim is situated;

"(2) furnish a copy of the location notice to the United States Bureau of Land Management."

Comment: It will be noted that subsection (a) (1) of this section duplicates present practice in recording location notices, but that (a) (2) is a new requirement. There now is strong popular demand for the registering of such large acreages with the Bureau of Land Management and the subcommittee believes this to be desirable. This requirement will serve multiple purposes: It will make it easier for the Bureau to see that the provisions of the act are properly carried out; it will permit the inclusion of these claims on plats so that, if kept up to date, the prospector can, by stopping in at the nearest office of the Bureau of Land Management, determine what areas still are open for location, and what already located have been abandoned. The desirability of this feature should require no elaboration.

Time limitation for commencing prospecting

"SEC. 4. (b) Within 90 days from the date of location of a geological mining claim the locator shall—

"(1) furnish the United States Bureau of Land Management with a statement of the nature and scope of the geological or geophysical prospecting which the locator intends to undertake;

"(2) commence geological or geophysical prospecting and perform such prospecting according to good current practice."

Comment: It is thought that 90 days will be ample time in which to plan a prospecting program on the particular claims located. As there must be some control over the adequacy of the prospecting program, particularly whether it will be geological, geophysical, or a combination of both, it appears only sensible to file the plan with the Bureau. There has been some discussion of the advisability of authorizing the Bureau to pass on the adequacy of the program and to reject it if unsatisfactory, thus invalidating the location at this point unless the deficiency is cured. There are obvious pros and cons to this requirement and the subcommittee would like to hear further from the mining industry as to its desirability.

One of the most difficult requirements to express is that in section 4 (b) (2), setting up a criterion for geological and geophysical prospecting. Complaints have been made that the proposed act would leave the door open for all kinds of doodlebug prospecting and quackery of various kinds, thus encumbering the public domain with claims located without any scientific foundation for the work proposed to be done. It has been proposed that a board of experts be set up to specify what practices may be suitable. Clearly this would have its drawbacks as such experts might turn out to be ultraconservative and bar methods which, in such a rapidly developing science as that of geophysics, later would be found to be useful. There is no doubt but that methods change and improve from year to year and it was felt that the phrase "good current practice" is as close a limitation as is desirable. Presumably, should there be any contest as to the title to the claim not being properly initiated under section 4 (b) (2) the courts would have to decide whether or not the methods were good current practice at the time.

There may be much better ways of setting some limits against fakers and speculators while leaving the field open to legitimate developments in the science, and if so the subcommittee would be glad to consider them. It must also be remembered that in any case, unless a mineral deposit is found, title will lapse in not more than 2 years and if minerals are found, what method was used becomes unimportant.

Requirements for holding claims for 1 year

"SEC. 5. (a) The location of a geological mining claim in the manner prescribed in section 3 and the performance of the acts required by section 4 of this act shall be deemed sufficient to hold such claim for a period of 1 year from the date of location thereof. Any claim not located or prospected in accordance with such required acts shall be deemed to have lapsed."

Comment: Subsection 5 (a) merely states the maximum time permitted for the geological or geophysical work. The physical work for discovery may be initiated during this period if the locator so desires.

Extending tenancy period for additional year

"SEC. 5. (b) Upon the performance of the acts required to be done in subsection (b) of section 4 of this act and the prosecution of geological or geophysical prospecting to a conclusion the locator of a geological mining claim may, at any time within 1 year from the date of the location of such claim, extend the tenancy of such claim for a period of 1 year, in addition to the tenancy period provided for in subsection (a) of this section, by filing in the office of the recorder, or other proper official of the county in which such claim is located, an affidavit and a notice of intention to hold and by furnishing to the United States Bureau of Land Management a copy of such affidavit and notice, accompanied by a suitable report and maps of the prospecting performed. The report, illustrated with maps, shall show the nature and scope of the work performed and shall present the data, evidence, and results obtained, together with such correlations, determinations, and conclusions as may have been developed or indicated. The affidavit shall state that geological or geophysical data have been accumulated of such nature as to reasonably warrant physical exploration of such claim."

Comment: Subsection (b) provides the means of securing title to the claims for the additional period of 1 year after the geological or geophysical work has been completed. It is during this second period that the physical work generally will be done which may lead to actual discovery.

It may be seen that if the geophysical or geological work does not prove fruitful the location automatically lapses in a year. If the physical work during the second-year period does not result in the discovery of a mineral deposit, the location lapses. The longest time the public domain can be encumbered, in case the results are negative, then, is 2 years. It seems very desirable, in view of practical experience with the present situation with regard to the vast number of unpatented mining claims on which no work whatever is done and where possible active prospectors and miners are blocked from entering, locating, and working in large areas so encumbered, to make sure the ground becomes open for relocation if the geological mining claims are not properly utilized by a locator or if definitive results are not obtained. Where one man fails, another may be successful. The mineral development of our country depends upon active exploration of the public domain, not in tying up great tracts in nonproductive speculative holdings.

Subsection 5 (b) also requires the filing of the notice to extend tenancy for the additional year. At the same time the locator is required to file with the Bureau of Land Management such data as he has acquired during the initial period of the location. It may be thought from the context that the requirements for filing data are too severe but it will be noted from the context that the locator is not bound by any particular schedule of data, but may furnish such as he has in the form in which it was compiled. The wording was developed more or less as a guide to show what is preferred.

The affidavit not only places the burden on the locator of having done the work described but furnishes the legal foundation for the tenancy extension. Here again, in case there should be any contest, the courts would have to decide if the data is of such a nature "as to reasonably warrant physical exploration of such claims."

Undoubtedly, a new body of legal precedent will have to be built up under this proposed act as there are many contingencies which may arise which neither can be foreseen nor can be covered even in the most detailed legislation.

Time limitation for commencing physical exploration

"SEC. 6. (a) Not later than 30 days after the expiration of 1 year from the date of the location of a geological mining claim, where the tenancy of such claim has been extended in the manner provided in subsection (b) of section 5 of this act, the locator shall begin drilling, shaft sinking, or such other physical work as may be necessary to the proper exploration of such claim."

Comment: This subsection merely provides that physical work on the claim shall be started within 30 days after filing intention to hold for the second period. There has been some argument that this is too short a time. But, as the extension is virtually automatic, preparations for physical work actually will be started before filing in the majority of cases. Furthermore, there is no requirement that work be in full course within 30 days.

Validating unpatented mining claim by discovery

"SEC. 6 (b) If, within the periods of tenancy provided in section 5 of this act, the locator of a geological mining claim discovers a vein, lode, or other mineral deposit upon such claim by means of physical exploration, such claim shall become a valid unpatented mining claim upon the filing of an affidavit accompanied by adequate proof to the effect that such vein, lode, or other mineral deposit has been discovered. Such affidavit and proof shall be filed, before the expiration of the tenancy period, in the office of the recorder or other proper official of the county in which such claim is located, and a copy thereof, accompanied by a suitable report of the exploration work performed and the results obtained, shall be furnished to the United States Bureau of Land Management within said period. Title to such claim shall be vested, subject to the paramount title of the United States, in the locator of such claim to the same extent that such title would be vested in the holder of any unpatented mining claim located under the provisions of section 2322 of the Revised Statutes, and any such claim or fraction thereof may be patented upon compliance with the provisions of section 2325 of the Revised Statutes."

Comment: This subsection provides for converting the preliminary location into a valid, unpatented location under the provisions of section 2322 of the Revised Statutes and for patenting in the usual manner under section 2325 of the Revised Statutes, providing all the terms for initiating the preliminary location as required by the proposed act have been met.

It will be noted that discovery must be made on each claim of the group. In the case of a deep-seated ore body the expense of even a single drill hole on each claim might be prohibitive. At the same time, it would not seem logical to permit the whole group to be held because discovery was made on one claim. This matter will merit further discussion.

It has been suggested that where a locator has failed to discover a vein, lode, or other mineral deposit upon a group of geological mining claims on the expiration of the second year or tenancy period, that on the presentation of evidence that physical exploration specified by section 6 (a) has been actively and continuously conducted during said period, weather permitting, the locator or holder shall be permitted to hold such group of claims for an additional year, and as long thereafter as active and continuous physical exploration is conducted in search for mineral deposits and extensions thereto. The subcommittee would particularly like to have comments from the industry on this suggestion.

An affidavit to the effect that discovery has been made must be filed with the proper official of the county in which the claim is located but the report of the exploration work need not be filed with such county official. It is felt the various maps and reports to be filed with the Bureau at various stages of the location will form an important addition to the public-land records and may be of great value in the event of a future war necessitating expanded production of minerals and metals. The Bureau is specifically prohibited under section 8 (b) from making public any of the information so acquired unless the claim is abandoned or otherwise invalidated.

Restricting State or local law requirements

"SEC. 7. (a) No State or local law or rule shall modify the requirements of this act with respect to the location, discovery, annual assessment work, prospecting, or exploration of a geological mining claim."

Comment: As the purpose of this proposed act is to liberalize the mining laws, it is thought well to prohibit limiting its scope by State or local action of any kind.

Annual assessment work

"SEC. 7. (b) The annual expenditure required to hold an unpatented geological mining claim shall be $100 for each 20 acres or fraction of its area: *Provided*, That such expenditure may be made at any one or more points within a group of contiguous claims if it will result in benefit to such claims as a group and if annual expenditures on the group aggregate $100 for each claim."

Comment: There has been considerable discussion about the present value of assessment work. The intent of Congress to cause a certain amount of work to be done has been largely nullified by time. It would take several hundred dollars to do the same work as when the mining laws first were passed. However, as the present mining laws are left untouched, it was not thought fair to set a different standard for assessment work for the geological claims as exists for the ordinary lode claims. As the area of the usual lode claim is about 20 acres, the standard of $100 in assessment work for each 20 acres specified in this proposed bill maintains about the same basis.

Affidavit of performance of assessment work

"SEC. 7. (c) Following the performance of annual assessment work but not later than 12 o'clock meridian on the 1st day of August of each successive year, and until a patent has been issued for such claim, the locator shall file an affidavit of the performance of such assessment work in the office of the recorder or other proper official of the county in which such claim is located and shall furnish the United States Bureau of Land Management with a copy of such affidavit together with a suitable report of the nature, scope, and amount of assessment work performed."

Comment: This subsection requires the filing of an affidavit of assessment work both with the appropriate county official and the Bureau, in order to keep valid the unpatented mining claim. Although the work must be performed within the period now provided by law, an extra month is given in which to file the affidavit required under this proposed act. The copy to be furnished the Bureau will keep its records up to date, and maintain a continuous record of title. The lack of such filing will indicate the claim has been abandoned, permitting the Bureau's records to be adjusted accordingly.

Standard location marker for unpatented claims

"SEC. 8. (a) Within 1 year after a geological mining claim becomes a valid unpatented mining claim under the provisions of this act, a location marker of a standard form to be prescribed and furnished by the Department of the Interior shall be placed at 1 corner of such claim: *Provided*, That 1 location marker may serve for a group of contiguous claims held by 1 locator."

Comment: This subsection is a distinct departure from the usual practice and is an attempt to extend and improve the marking of public lands. Ample time is given to carry out this provision so that in case of early abandonment the locator will not be bound by it. It will be noted that only one marker is required for a group and the locator may choose the claim the corner of which is to be so marked. Platting these claims on maps of the public domain should be made easier by this device.

Maintenance of posts or monuments

"SEC. 8. (b) When locating a geological mining claim all corner posts or monuments shall be conspicuously marked or painted and all such posts and monuments shall be maintained in a condition so as to be readily found at all times."

Comment: Engineers and others whose business has made it necessary to go on the public domain and find old mining locations will appreciate this insistence upon maintaining marking in good order and as conspicuously as possible. The subsection requires no further explanation.

Submission of and receipt for documents furnished Bureau

"SEC. 9. (a) All notices, statements, reports, and affidavits required herein to be furnished to the United States Bureau of Land Management shall be submitted in triplicate to the nearest branch office of said Bureau. Such documents may be transmitted by mail and the Bureau shall furnish an individual receipt for each within 30 days

from the date received. The Bureau of Land Management shall furnish a copy of all reports to the United States Geological Survey."

Comment: The desirability of continuously adding to the knowledge of the resources of the public domain is obvious. It certainly is not too much to ask, as the Government is permitting the use of these lands for private exploitation, that it be furnished with such information for its records as may become available to the locator, and it scarcely seems there will be any objection to this practice, especially when the limitations of subsection 9 (b) hereof are noted. Although 3 copies of notices, statements, reports, and affidavits are required to be filed with the Bureau, it will be noted that only the legal notices are required to be filed with county officials. The requirement should not be deemed too onerous in these days of typewriters, duplicating facilities, and photostat machines. It is specified that one copy shall be for the United States Geological Survey, which can make good use of such data. Of the other 2 copies, 1 is for the local office of the Bureau and the other for its central files. Subsequent possible locators of abandoned areas should greatly be benefited by access to this data.

Limitations on public access to documents furnished Bureau

"SEC. 9. (b) Except for the data contained in the same notices and affidavits required to be filed with the recorder of the county in which a geological mining claim is located, none of the information contained in the reports or statements required to be furnished to the United States Bureau of Land Management shall be made public so long as such claim remains a valid location or claim under this act."

Comment: These limitations on publication of the data accumulated by the Government under this proposed act should give sufficient protection to locators whose operations proceed to the productive state. As a matter of fact, the Bureau of Mines and the United States Geological Survey already are prohibited by law from publishing information which may disclose the business of individuals or firms.

Location and utilization for mineral development only

"SEC. 10. Geological mining claims may only be located and utilized for the purpose of mineral development."

Comment: So many complaints have been heard that some locators of mining claims have intended to use them for purposes other than mining that it seems time to crystallize the sentiment of more responsible mining people against such practice by a specific prohibition against use of geological mining claims for anything but legitimate mining development.

Applicability of present mining laws

"SEC. 11. Except as otherwise provided herein or except where in conflict with the terms of this act, the mining laws of the United States now in effect shall apply with respect to claims located under the terms of this act."

Comment: This section preserves the common mining practices excepting where changes are made by this proposed act to further the purposes thereof.

NOTE.—It is not intended that the proposed Geological, Geochemical, and Geophysical Mining Claims Act of 1954 shall in any way effect or be applicable to the disposition of public lands containing deposits of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, sulfur, potash, or sodium, which are provided for in the Leasing Act of February 25, 1920.

INSIDE LATCHES ON DOORS OF HOUSEHOLD REFRIGERATORS SHIPPED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require inside latches on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce.

During the summer months of last year newspapers and magazines throughout the Nation carried numerous stories of tragic accidents in which children, playing in old iceboxes, refrigerators, and freezers, shut themselves in and were suffocated.

The untimely death of so many children in discarded iceboxes brought prompt action by many civic groups and public-spirited organizations. These campaigns set about to have all hazardous refrigerators, iceboxes, and freezers destroyed or have the latches and doors removed. Premiums were offered in some cities by local merchants for doors that were removed from the iceboxes.

In accord with the campaign for children's safety at the local level, approximately 15 States have enacted legislation which forbids the abandoning of old boxes where they are accessible to children.

Since the initiative to destroy all old boxes has been taken at the State and local level, it seems logical that Congress should pass legislation which would prevent accidents of this kind in the future.

The bill which I have introduced will do just that. The bill would require inside latches on the doors of refrigerators, iceboxes, ice chests, or deep freezers shipped in interstate commerce. The proposed legislation would apply to household refrigerators of a capacity of 1½ cubic feet or more and all those who would violate this law, if enacted, would be guilty of a misdemeanor.

What greater satisfaction could we have than in the realization that we have helped save the lives of the many children that might die each year in this manner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2876) to require inside latches on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 758. An act for the relief of Harry C. Barney;

H. R. 1647. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Mae Smith;

H. R. 2616. An act for the relief of Generosa Bonet;

H. R. 2617. An act for the relief of Guillermo Morales Chacon;

H. R. 3041. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Frederick W. Lee the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention;

H. R. 4343. An act for the relief of Charles J. Abarno and others;

H. R. 5025. An act for the relief of Paul G. Kendall;

H. R. 5572. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Cook Cleland;

H. R. 6452. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie;

H. R. 6698. An act for the relief of Alexei Frank; and

H. R. 6808. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel J. Adams, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.; and

H. R. 4551. An act to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 removing authorization of projects by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4881. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code in reference to the survival of things in action; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7395. An act to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7398. An act to repeal the requirement of section 3921 of the Revised Statutes that postmasters report to the Postmaster General failure to cancel postage stamps; and

H. R. 7399. An act to authorize the sale of postage-due stamps for philatelic purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Brig. Gen. Eugene Mead Caffey, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as The Judge Advocate General of the Army, and as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army, and major general (temporary), Army of the United States; and

Maj. Gen. Kester Lovejoy Hastings, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as The Quartermaster General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 5,363 persons for appointment in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. Among this group are interspersed 90 nominations of flag and general rank. The nominations have been approved by the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations may lie on the table, until the next session of the Senate, without being printed on the Executive Calendar, in order to avoid encumbering the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be received, as in executive session, and will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

CURTAILMENT OF AMMUNITION PRODUCTION SCHEDULES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article entitled "Twin Cities Arsenal Layoff To Idle 1,900 Workers," published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of January 28, 1954. I have been checking into this subject with the Defense Establishment to find out if this is the first of a series of layoff procedures which will be necessitated at the Twin Cities arms plant, which is one of the largest ordnance plants in the country.

This morning I investigated to find out exactly how much offshore procurement in terms of small arms ammunition our country was obtaining. The Twin Cities arsenal manufactures .30 and .50 caliber ammunition.

In view of some of the problems which now face us, it is my feeling that before we lay off American workers the whole subject of offshore procurement should be thoroughly restudied in light of growing unemployment in our own country.

I find that in 1952 and 1953 offshore procurement contracts for small arms were awarded to plants in northern Italy, many of which were later discovered to employ workers from Communist-dominated unions. In some instances there was Communist infiltration in the management itself.

I have ascertained that we are now in the process of letting new offshore armament contracts for small arms ammunition in Italy. I am sure the same situation pertains to other countries. At the same time, we are dismissing thousands of employees in our own country.

I mention this subject today because I took it up with Secretary of Defense Wilson by letter on January 18, but as yet have seen no action beyond a routine acknowledgment. It is my intention to follow it up in committee, and to address a further letter to the Secretary of Defense, asking him to look with very careful and scrutinizing eyes on all offshore arms procurement proposals. I strongly protest the layoffs which have taken place.

Contrary to some indications in the newspaper article that these laid-off workers are out-of-State or rural people who will not be seriously upset by this unemployment, my investigation discloses that is not the case. Inquiry reveals 34 percent of the workers laid off are from St. Paul, 27 percent are from Minneapolis, and almost all the balance are from suburbs of the Twin Cities in Anoka, Elk River, Stillwater, or White Bear. Only a very small number were from our neighboring State of Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIFT TO BE DROPPED—TWIN CITIES ARSENAL LAYOFF TO IDLE 1,900 WORKERS

(By Earl Almquist)

Slightly more than 1,900 workers will be laid off, effective February 26, when the "C" shift at the Twin Cities Arsenal will be eliminated due to a curtailment of production schedules for .30-caliber ammunition.

This announcement was made late Wednesday by Lt. Col. C. C. Gleason, commanding officer at the arsenal.

Workers at the Minneapolis-Moline and Donovan, Inc., shell plants at the arsenal, which make 105-millimeter and 150-millimeter artillery shells, will not be immediately affected by the layoffs, the announcement added.

Affected will be 1,900 employees of Federal Cartridge Corp. who work from midnight to 8 a. m. and 22 Ordnance Corps inspectors who work the same "C" shift hours.

("C" shift workers who have longer seniority rights will be permitted to bump those with less seniority on the "A" and "B" or day and swing shifts, while the 22 Ordnance Corps inspectors will come under customary governmental regulations.)

Elimination of the third shift at the arsenal is not expected to have too great an impact upon the employment situation locally inasmuch as 33 percent of the workers on this shift live in rural and out-of-State areas.

SIX HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOUR RURAL WORKERS

Ralph B. Lynn, workers manager for Federal Cartridge Corp., said 634 of the 1,900 "C" shift workers are in this rural or out-of-State area classification, and in many cases would leave their ammunition plant jobs for farmwork in the spring.

As far as plant operations are concerned, elimination of the "C" shift will leave but 2 shifts, day and swing, each working a 5-day, 40-hour week.

The forthcoming mass layoff at Federal Cartridge Corp. is in sharp contrast to St. Paul industry, which for the most part is engaged in regular peacetime instead of war production, it was pointed out.

For example, the St. Paul plant of Ford Motor Co. is providing overtime with 9 and 9½-hour workdays Mondays through Friday, and in addition is operating on some Saturdays. Plant officials said the outlook for the entire first quarter is for similar full capacity-plus production.

Similarly, officials of Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. reported not a single person has been laid off this month, and current high production is anticipated during the remainder of January.

Earlier in the month the St. Paul office of the State employment division reported there were no mass layoffs in the city and none was anticipated, although small work force reductions throughout the city's industry had been made around the first of the year.

THE FARM PRICE SUPPORT CONTROVERSY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator YOUNG and the Farm Parity Fight," published in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald. I appreciate the editorial very much. I may say that Mr. Oppegard, the editor of the newspaper, is one of the outstanding newspapermen in North Dakota.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR YOUNG AND THE FARM PARITY FIGHT

Life magazine, with the usual finality found in all publications headed by Henry Luce, takes a few cracks at North Dakota's Senator, MILTON R. YOUNG, in its current issue for his position on the farm price-support controversy.

The magazine is, of course, entitled to its view, just as Senator YOUNG has a right to plot his own course on any question. And fortunately, under our Constitution, each is free to criticize the other.

It seems that Life has discovered that Congressmen almost invariably are politicians, rather than statesmen. The order really is reversed in practice, for a person must be a politician before he or she can be a Congressman.

Perhaps that is a reflection on the electorate. It would suggest that the electorate does not reach its conclusions through sound reasoning, but instead bases its favors on emotional considerations.

Life is certain "the old mealy-mouth days" are now dead and gone. Our voters know the score, and aren't going to vote for the best baby-kisser or the most generous dispenser of political pork, for this is a new and sophisticated America.

Thus, we are told, we have become a Nation in which the ambitious politician need not fear to be a statesman first and foremost. This, it seems, was demonstrated when Mr. Eisenhower, a man of no conventional political instincts, training, or experience, was elected President in a national landslide.

The election of President Eisenhower hardly proves Life's point. The general, on the stump during the election campaign, was an excellent politician, wittingly or unwittingly, and he had the advice of top politicians or their equivalent in highly experienced public relations men.

Mr. Eisenhower, it would seem, again wittingly or unwittingly, is performing just as many other presidential candidates after winning office in failing to live up to campaign promises, which is the political way.

As a campaigner, he had the advantage of tremendous national popularity built up through his service as our No. 1 military man in a winning war. He, or his supporters, were politically wise in cashing in on that popularity.

In the campaign, he promised a budget of $70 billion in his first year and one of $60 billion or less in fiscal 1955, which would have meant a balanced budget, for income in that year is estimated around $63 billion.

The people of the United States elected Mr. Eisenhower because (1) he was personally popular, (2) he promised greatly reduced taxes, (3) he opposed the socialistic trends manifest in the Truman administration, and (4) he promised to undo and resist all the things we had come to dislike in the two previous administrations.

The Herald is the first to agree that Mr. Eisenhower was not—and is not—a politician in the accepted sense. It just happened that his campaign performances fitted so well into the pattern of politics.

We consider President Eisenhower a statesman, scrupulously honest in both public and private matters, devoted to the Nation and all the lofty things for which it stands. We are still for him 100 percent.

But we think Life is reaching into the air when it attempts to show that his election marked the burial of politics in Government—even pussyfooting politics as it calls the turn.

Members of Congress, as politicians before they are statesmen, will continue to act on much legislation with an eye to the polls, for unless the legislation they approve is endorsed by their constituents, they will soon become former Members of Congress.

This brings us to Life's attack on Senator YOUNG. It quotes him as saying that if somebody should get up in Congress and propose to keep high-price supports instead of a lower parity percentage for farmers, "Who is going to vote against it?"

"In other words," says Life, "Senator YOUNG and other folklore-ridden politicians of his type would let the Government just keep on giving the farmers everything their most fanatic and shortsighted spokesmen might ask * * * to the eventual ruin of the farmers."

The Herald is not evaluating the position either of Life or Mr. YOUNG when it says it does not necessarily follow that people supporting high-parity protection for the farmer

are folklore-ridden politicians. But they could be wrong, of course, without fitting Life's characterization.

Then Life goes on to inform Mr. YOUNG that "we have news for you. There are a lot more consumers than farmers in America, and they know all about the farm mess that your kind of thinking has created."

Thus, with the power of a majority, Life would suggest that the farm problem will be settled by that weight rather than on the principle that in our Republic the minority will have the same protection as the majority.

Many of us might prefer to see lower prices for automobiles and other products we like to have, and as there are a great many more consumers of those products than manufacturers, perhaps the consumers should adjust the prices. That, of course, would be carrying the principle of majority rule to ridiculous (and impossible) ends.

But to suggest the farm problem can be solved by the mere acceptance of consumer opinion rather than by equity and what is right—whatever it may be—is not the intelligent or fair approach to the problem.

TRIAL OF UNITED STATES SOLDIERS IN NATO FORCES BY FOREIGN COURTS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on January 31 there was published in the Topeka Daily Capital, of Topeka, Kans., an article by Clif Stratton, of the staff of that newspaper. In the article Mr. Stratton deals with the Status of Forces Treaty under which the United States agreed to make United States soldiers in NATO forces subject to the laws and courts of the countries in which they are stationed. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLIF STRATTON WRITES

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Last session of Congress Representative WINT SMITH heartily applauded Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL for voting against ratification of the Status of Forces Treaty, which agreed to make our soldiers in NATO forces subject to the laws and courts of the countries where stationed.

In a letter to constituents the Sixth District Congressman notes:

"Here is the sequel of that treaty: Pvt. Richard Keefe, United States Army, was stationed in France. Private Keefe got intoxicated, got into a taxicab and drove off. A French court gave him 5 years. Private Keefe was a drafted soldier. He was sent to France, not of his own free choice, to defend this country. At least, so the internationalists say. At least, he was in France to defend the soil of France against aggression, which country has failed to defend itself in its last three wars.

"In all past history the protection of the Stars and Stripes followed the American soldier. But that doctrine has been thrown out the window as an old-fashioned idea. We now live in a new, modern, pink-tinted age, where we must conform to the United Nations ideas.

"Two weeks ago Private Keefe's wife filed a habeas corpus proceeding before Judge Curran, of the Federal District Court. The attorneys for Mrs. Keefe argued that Private Keefe's conviction was null and void because it was against the constitutional guarantees (Bill of Rights). But the judge said he had no jurisdiction. Treaties are paramount law. American citizens' rights have been taken away by treaty.

"Just another case of State Department officials giving away rights of American citizens—so they can say we are for international peace and cooperation throughout the world.

"This case proves how necessary the Bricker amendment is, if we are to preserve our basic American domestic rights. This case is sad for Private Keefe and his wife and two children in Riverdale, Md., but it is tragic for America.

"St. Paul, preaching the Christian faith in Asia Minor, was arrested for his teachings. His accusers demanded he be tried in Jerusalem. Paul said: 'I am a Roman citizen. I stand at Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged.'

"The governor of the province said: 'But when Paul had appealed to be reserved into the hearing of Augustus, I commanded him to be kept till I might send him to Rome.'

"Rome gave her world established law and order. The rights of a Roman citizen were protected throughout the breadth and length of the Roman Empire."

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, yesterday evening, on behalf of myself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I submitted to the committee amendment an amendment which is at the desk, and is identified as "2-2-54-C." I wish to modify the amendment to the amendment in the following way: Strike out all of lines 7 to 9, inclusive, on page 3 of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, which is the "which" clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following—which is "C":

SEC. 2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

To the amendment "D" to the committee amendment, I submit, on behalf of myself and the same Senators, the following modification: Change "lines 14 and 15" to read "lines 10 to 15."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The modifications of the amendments to the committee amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from the four corners of the Nation I have received a great many additional expressions from organizations which oppose the Bricker amendment. I send to the desk now several such messages, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Association of University Women at its 1953 national convention adopted a resolution supporting "existing constitutional provisions for the conduct of foreign affairs." Our association is composed of 125,000 members in over 1,200 branches in all the States. The Washington branch of the AAUW after careful study expresses disapproval of the proposed Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1 on amending the Constitution with reference to treaty making and executive agreements. Our branch approves President Eisenhower's opposition to the proposed amendment and believes that such an amendment limiting powers of the President to negotiate treaties and executive agreements is neither necessary nor desirable. Experience demonstrates that the division of power between Congress and the Executive has proved a safe and practical means of conducting foreign affairs. Our organization urges you to use your influence to defeat this amendment and any of the related proposals made today.

KATHERINE H. FREDERIC.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 27, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building:

This is to inform you that I heartily approve of the President's public leadership in opposition to the proposed Bricker amendment. He has our support.

CHARLES F. BOSS, Jr.,
Executive Secretary, Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
Edgewood, R. I., January 24, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We are very much concerned about the Bricker amendment and we firmly agree with your opposition to it. We have written to both of our Rhode Island Senators, neither of whom sponsored the original bill, and we are urging them to stand firm and to oppose any substitute amendment that would delimit the constitutional power of the President or the Senate.

We admire your strong stand in the face of opposition from many of the Senate and we are convinced that the American people would back you up firmly, if they understood the implications of this legislation. In our opinion, it is unnecessary and dangerous, particularly in these critical days in world history.

Sincerely yours,

DORIS M. MILLS,
Legislative Chairman, Providence Branch.

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION,
Nashville, Tenn., January 28, 1954.

Hon. ALBERT GORE and
Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATORS: The board of directors of the Nashville YWCA, upon recommendation of the public affairs committee, wishes to go on record as opposing the Bricker amendment. The committee has studied and given careful consideration to this proposed legislation and the members feel there are hidden dangers in the amendment, namely:

1. It would be a serious obstacle to effective work by the United States within the framework of the United Nations.

2. It would unnecessarily restrict the constitutional power of the President.

3. It would throw a great deal of unnecessary work upon Congress and make less effective the specific functions of the Senate.

Even more important, the adoption of the Bricker amendment would change some of the basic conceptions of our form of government which the makers of our Constitution considered essential:

1. It would repudiate the system of checks and balances by giving Congress unchecked control of foreign policy, and

2. It would weaken the idea that the power of the Federal Government should always prevail and that we should operate as a united Nation in dealing with other nations, because it would in some instances give individual States the chance to repudiate treaties.

Therefore, we respectfully urge you to use your influence toward the defeat of the Bricker amendment.

Very sincerely,

MARGARET MAGER
Mrs. C. F. Mager,
President, Board of Directors.
LOIS WHEELER
Mrs. Arville W. Wheeler,
Chairman, Public Affairs Committee.

THE INDIANA COUNCIL OF CHURCH WOMEN,
South Bend, Ind., January 30, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator from Wisconsin, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The national administrative committee of the United Church Women, and I, as a member of the National Board of the United Church Women, and State president, wish to express to you our support of President Eisenhower in his opposition to the Bricker amendment.

We have made a careful study of the Bricker amendment and oppose it for the following reasons:

1. We believe that it would prevent the United States from acting responsibly in its foreign relations.

2. It would hamper procedures already safeguarded, by adding steps which would cast doubt on the ability of the United States to fulfill its obligations.

3. To avoid paralyzing irresponsibility, the President must be allowed to retain his authority in this field.

Thank you for helping us defeat the Bricker amendment in the Senate.

Yours sincerely,

CLARA D. POINTER
Mrs. P. D. Pointer.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, January 29, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I should like to express my personal admiration for the way in which you have worked to clarify the difficulties that would ensue if the Bricker amendment should be passed, and the statesmanlike manner in which you have handled the situation.

The League of Women Voters of Indiana has written to both Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART and Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER expressing their opposition to the Bricker amendment. We have studied it carefully and the weight of league opinion is definitely opposed to the amendment.

A copy of the letter sent to the two Indiana Senators is enclosed.

Sincerely,

HARRIET R. CLIFFORD
Mrs. Austin V. Clifford,
State President.

JANUARY 29, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: After careful study on the part of our membership, the League of Women Voters of Indiana wishes to express the opposition of a majority of its members to the Bricker amendment. We feel that sufficient safeguards exist in the Constitution and through legislative action and judicial interpretation, and that the power of the Executive and the Senate to conduct foreign relations would be seriously impaired if it were passed. They would have the responsibility, without the necessary authority to carry out this responsibility.

We believe that the traditional balance of power between the executive and legislative branches of government would be disturbed to the extent that some doubt would be cast on the ability of the Federal Government to conduct necessary international affairs.

We believe in a foreign policy based on the principle of international cooperation, and feel that this would be impossible if the Bricker amendment should be enacted.

We urge you to make every effort to insure the defeat of the Bricker amendment.

Sincerely,

Mrs. AUSTIN V. CLIFFORD,
State President.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN, INC.,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This is to let you know that your positive efforts to interpret the inherent dangers of the proposed Bricker amendment have been noted and greatly appreciated by many members of the National Council of Negro Women.

I am enclosing a copy of the letter we sent to President Eisenhower early in January on the subject.

Will you let us know if there is any further step our organization might take which would be helpful to you.

Most sincerely yours,

NAOMAH W. MAISE
Mrs. Naomah W. Maise,
Executive Director.

JANUARY 4, 1954.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States of America, The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER: This is to urge you to continue your opposition to the proposed Bricker amendment and to use the full influence of your office to further circumvent any compromise effort which seeks to limit the treatymaking power of the President of the United States.

The National Council of Negro Women, representing 850,000 women, went on record as opposing the Bricker amendment. The resolution is quoted as follows:

"Whereas passage of the Bricker amendment scheduled to come before the next session of Congress will have an adverse impact on United States participation in the United Nations; and

"Whereas the Bricker amendment will, in effect, take away the traditional power of the President of the United States to make treaties; and

"Whereas the Bricker amendment will cause mistrust of American motives in the minds of our allies throughout the world; be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Council of Negro Women opposes passage of the Bricker amendment and will vigorously describe and interpert its provisions to the entire membership."

Our very good wish for the New Year.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. WILLIAM THOMAS MASON.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week there was carried in the Hearst newspapers across the land a debate between the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and myself on the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 1. One round of that debate was devoted to the answers of the senior Senator from Ohio to certain questions on this subject; another round was devoted to my answers to the same questions.

I now send to the desk the text of the comments I prepared in response to questions put to me by Mr. William Flythe, of the Hearst newspapers; and I ask unanimous consent that my responses may be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal-American of January 29, 1954]

ROUND 2 OF THE GREAT DEBATE—WILEY ANSWERS BRICKER

Controversy over the Bricker amendment has reached the stage of a great debate in Congress. On this page yesterday we presented the answers of its sponsor, Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, to questions submitted by William Flythe, diplomatic correspondent of the Hearst newspapers, Washington bureau.

Today we publish the replies of Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to similar questions from Mr. Flythe.

"Question. Is this proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution a step toward isolationism to take the United States out of foreign entanglements?

"Answer. It is certainly a big step toward isolationism. It comes from an exaggerated fear of foreign entanglements which neither the President nor the Senate have any intention of getting involved in. The actual result of the amendment would be what President Eisenhower has warned: It 'would make it impossible for us to deal effectively with friendly nations for our mutual defense and common interests * * * to achieve and maintain peace.' What a price to pay for imaginary fears.

"Question. Does it give the Congress the veto power over the President's responsibility to conduct foreign relations?

"Answer. Yes. It says specifically that 'Congress shall have power to regulate' all international agreements. Such a power to regulate could easily be used to destroy the position of the President as it now exists under our constitutional system.

"Question. Would it tie the hands of the President in case of war?

"Answer. Yes, very dangerously. Congress would be able to 'regulate' the President in war as well as in peace.

"Question. Is it a States' rights amendment to the extent of making State laws supreme when they conflict with the provisions of a treaty or executive agreement?

"Answer. If a treaty or agreement were made which conflicted with a State law, the State law would be supreme. The only exception would be if the National Government already had power to make a law on that same subject, and if it did actually pass such a special law to put the international agreement into effect in the States. The whole process would be extremely laborious at best, and would probably make other nations unwilling to deal with us."

REGARDING TREATIES

"Question. Would the amendment keep treaties from automatically becoming laws within the United States?

"Answer. Treaties do not now 'automatically' become law until they have been approved by two-thirds of the Senate. It would no longer be enough, as it usually is today, for the Senate to give its consent by a two-thirds majority and then in case the treaty is questioned for the Supreme Court to give its judgment on the treaty. In addition to having the approval of these specially qualified bodies with long tenure, the treaty would usually also have to be passed as a law by the House of Representatives—and often all the 48 States would have to pass separate laws too.

"Question. Would the amendment nullify reciprocal trade agreements or tariffs worked out with other nations?

"Answer. Under the amendment Congress would be free to regulate these agreements completely out of existence."

WOULD WEAKEN U. N.

"Question. Would the amendment weaken the United Nations?

"Answer. It would seriously weaken the United Nations. It would give Congress power to set barriers around all the negotiations which the President conducts with the United Nations and through the United Nations, including matters like the cease-fire in Korea.

"Question. Would the amendment weaken international agreements or nullify those which made the North Atlantic Mutual Security Pact effective?

"Answer. It is impossible to say what the effect of the Bricker amendment would be on existing international agreements. It is clear that the President would be excessively limited in his freedom to make new agreements, such as those that might be needed to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty countries against Russia.

"Question. Would it limit the authority of the Secretary of State to carry on negotiations, such as those now in progress at Berlin?

"Answer. As I have emphasized before, Congress would be completely free to regulate every kind of international agreement and this would surely cover negotiations such as those now in progress.

"Question. At what dangers is the Bricker amendment aimed?

"Answer. The Bricker amendment is not aimed at any real dangers. Proponents have not been able to name one single treaty approved by two-thirds of the Senate that they think would not have been approved if the Bricker amendment had been in effect. They talk about the dangers of United Nations conventions, specifically the Genocide Convention and the Human Rights Covenant. The Genocide Convention has been pigeonholed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for 5 years. The Human Rights Covenant has not even been signed by the United States. Proponents are fearful of so-called executive agreements like Yalta and Potsdam. Both of these agreements were secret and were negotiated by Democratic Presidents. Congress might try to limit such agreements under the Bricker amendment, but how could it succeeed in these secret matters?

"Question. Is it true that a treaty can make law within the United States just as much as an act of Congress?

"Answer. A treaty concluded under the authority of the United States is the supreme law of the land in precisely the same way as a law passed by the Congress is the supreme law of the land. Both treaties and congressional law are subject to the limitations of the Constitution.

"Question. What is the 'which' clause that people are talking about?

"Answer. The 'which' clause states that a treaty is to 'become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of a treaty.'

"Question. What does the 'which' clause do?

"Answer. This clause which I oppose serves notice on the world that there are many things upon which the United States could not conclude treaties. In the words of President Eisenhower, 'it would so restrict the conduct of foreign affairs that our country could not negotiate the agreements necessary for the handling of our business with the rest of the world.'"

PUZZLING SITUATION

"Question. Suppose a treaty deals partly with foreign relations and partly with matters of local concern within the United States. What happens then under the Bricker amendment?

"Answer. I don't know what happens under the Bricker amendment in this case. That is one thing that is wrong with the amendment. We have over a period of 165 years developed a Constitution which most Americans and our courts understand. I would guess in the situation prescribed that we would need to negotiate 2 treaties—1 dealing with foreign relations and 1 dealing with so-called matters of local concern. But what are matters of local concern? Are the fisheries of the Gulf States, of New England, or the Far West matters of local concern? Fish have a tendency to ignore international and State boundaries in their migrations. A fishery that is overharvested while the fish happen to be in Canadian waters, for example, will injure the fishing industry in the United States. We have treaties to protect our fisheries. They would not be possible if the Bricker amendment were made a part of the Constitution.

"Question. President Eisenhower has said he will never ask the Senate to ratify a treaty conflicting with the Constitution and that he will not seek approval of the Covenant on Human Rights. Why, then, is an amendment needed?

"Answer. An amendment is not needed. President Eisenhower stated on January 25: 'I am unalterably opposed to the Bricker amendment as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee.'"

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on January 31, Clif Stratton, the Washington correspondent of the Topeka Daily Capital, of Topeka, Kans., had published an article entitled "Bricker Amendment Called Attempt To Preserve, Protect American Heritage." Most of the article deals with the views of Representative WINT SMITH, of the Sixth Congressional District, Kansas. I concur in most of Representative SMITH's views, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRICKER AMENDMENT CALLED ATTEMPT TO PRESERVE, PROTECT AMERICAN HERITAGE

(By Clif Stratton)

"The Bricker amendment," according to Representative WINT SMITH, Sixth Kansas Congressional District, "in simple language is nothing more or less than an attempt to preserve and protect our American heritage."

During the past 20 years, he said, many attempts have been made to remake American laws that have to deal with domestic and foreign concepts of our American way of life. Some of these attempts have been made openly. But generally these substitutions and alterations have been "deceitful, deceptive, fraudulent."

These modifications of our age-old American rights generally have been placed in a gaudy package bound with pinkish, red, and glittering tinsel, with a motto on the outside—"in the name of worldwide humanity," he said.

"But those who are fighting against the Bricker amendment are using a different wrapping. When you see through their phony legalistic phrases, these become as clear cellophane—and you can see their whole package is designed to make the United States a vassal state in which the internationalists, the one-worlders can get control of the sovereignty of the United States.

"We, in America, always have won our battles for freedom and sovereignty when we could see our enemy. But the enemy who hides behind the Constitution, while plotting its destruction, is sometimes difficult to control. These modern international socialists and Communists who hide behind the fifth amendment to carry on their so-called enlightening reforms are not always easy to apprehend," SMITH said.

"Why not spell out why, after some 165 years, it is necessary to amend the Constitution? Just what are the dangers, and how the Bricker amendment would protect the American heritage?" it was suggested to Congressman SMITH. He has done so, and here it is.

It might be well to recall that this latest attempt to destroy our American heritage (through using the treaty power to bypass Congress and the Constitution in writing internal law) was started at San Francisco at the first organization meeting of the United Nations. And remember, the basic architect, after months of scheming with the internationalist socialistic, pink-fringe crowd—the basic architect was Alger Hiss.

The San Francisco meeting was nothing more or less than the public stage from which the United Nations concept would be launched, again wrapped in gaudy tinsel, to proclaim to the world an organization for international peace.

But the real objective of Alger Hiss, Joe Stalin, and all the Red International Socialists, was a back-door entry to steal the sovereignty of the United States.

The weird organizational meeting opened without prayer so the atheists and other international one-worlders might not be offended by the mention of God's name.

Did the people of the United States elect the delegates to this organizational meeting? No. They were appointed. These delegates simply gambled with the destiny and sovereignty of the American people. Joe Stalin was not there. His presence was not necessary. Alger Hiss was there, as secretary general.

Edward R. Stettinius, one of the United States delegates, told the President of the United States that this United Nations Charter was a declaration and a constitution.

Emphasis was placed as usual by the proponents of the U. N. to show that it was designed basically as a peace organization. Korea is the tragic example of this phony concept. When this U. N. Charter was ratified, it was a blow at the independence of the United States. It was dishonoring to the sound doctrine of George Washington and an insult to the memory of the Continental Army. And, above all, a slave act for the American people.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN has said: "I made an error which I shall regret all the days of my life when I voted for the United Nations."

The basic objective of the Bricker amendment is to insure two things:

1. That world government cannot be forced on the American people through the back door—or by using the Trojan horse technique; and

2. To be doubly sure that the civil liberties of the people of the United States be not destroyed.

Perhaps the Bricker amendment's chief and final objective is to guarantee our basic domestic rights. It certainly is a long jump from our fundamental concepts of basic American rights if foreign states can change, alter, or compel us to change our basic domestic laws. Yet many of those who oppose the Bricker amendment say we must submit to this in order to show international cooperation.

Our own Constitution would never have been ratified by the States if the Bill of Rights had not been added to that Constitution as the first 10 amendments.

The makers of our Constitution thought the Federal Government would be concerned only with treaties concerning boundaries, freedom of the seas, right to trade with foreign nations, etc.

Article VI of the Constitution says:

"All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Edgar W. Waybright, of Florida, has this to say about the intent of the framers of the Constitution:

"They did not foresee that in 1848, a little man who had failed at everything else, by the name of Karl Marx, would devise a scheme for a cruel world dictatorship to enslave all mankind. They did not foresee that thousands of college professors, school teachers, ministers, labor bosses, writers, businessmen, lawyers, and doctors could be led by a few sinister men consumed by the lust for power, to turn the words of the Constitution upside down and inside out, so they would mean what the writers never intended.

"They never could in the wildest nightmare have imagined that these sinister men and these well-meaning but shallow thinkers could take from the preamble of this great instrument the phrase 'promote the general welfare' and interpret it to mean that these words taken from the context authorized, ignoring the rest of the Constitution, the creation of a Communist, Socialistic, or Fascist 'welfare state.'

"Likewise, the framers of this great instrument could never have dreamed that these same men could twist the above-quoted words from article VI to mean that the President of the United States and two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, could by ratification of a treaty, destroy at one fell swoop the Constitution of the United States, every State constitution in each and every of the 48 States of the Union, and every State and Federal law."

By use of the present doctrine in the area of domestic law, the President with the consent of the Senate can do anything he wants to do by treaty, regardless of the restrictions and prohibitions in the Constitution. This may seem to be a bold statement, but stranger and sadder things than this have happened.

Harry Truman, by a stroke of a pen and a telephone call, caused 130,000 men to die in Korea—simply using the authority granted in the United Nations Charter. The Constitution was nullified because it plainly states—only the Congress can declare war.

Patrick Henry well expressed the danger in these words: "If treaties are made to infringe our liberties, it will be too late to say our rights have been violated."

Those who oppose the Bricker amendment say it "can't happen here—domestic American laws are in no danger."

Recently the United States Supreme Court had this to say in one of its decisions: "The U. N. Charter represents a moral commitment of foremost importance and we (the Court) must not permit the spirit of our pledge to be compromised or disparaged in either our domestic or foreign affairs." These words coming from the Supreme Court should warn us all—as a Red flag of danger.

Secretary Dulles, before he was Secretary of State pointed out on two separate occasions the necessity for the Bricker amendment. He said in a Louisville, Ky., speech that treaties can change our domestic law and override the Constitution. But since he has become Secretary of State, he says the danger is unimportant, because "we" won't do anything to undermine the Constitution.

That in effect is what all dictators in history have said: "Just give me power and I'll never misuse it."

Secretary Dulles now says the Bricker amendment would interfere with the international position of the United States. This statement leads to asking Mr. Dulles, the former associate and successor to Mr. Dean Acheson: "Which is the more important, the international position of the United States or the basic constitutional domestic rights of the American people?"

The great mass of the internationalists, the bleeding hearts for the downtrodden world humanity, the pinks, many scholarly unthinking degree-laden college professors saying, "If we pass the Bricker amendment, we will be placing the President in a straitjacket in his treatymaking powers." That is just the point. He should be placed in a straitjacket if he makes any treaty or recommends one that in any way, shape, or form or manner interferes or takes away any basic rights of American citizens.

The American people have been accustomed to living under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I believe they still prefer to live under the constitutional safeguards, rather than upon mere promises. Under the U. N., a (world) Supreme Court consisting of Chinese, Russians, Arabs, Jews, Indians, etc., can make laws and ratify them because we are a part of the United Nations.

It is, therefore, virtually certain that, unless we withdraw from the U. N., or secure an amendment to its charter, or amend article VI of our own Federal Constitution (by adopting the Bricker amendment), all segregation laws, all laws permitting intermarriage of races, all laws fixing national quotas for immigrants, and all laws which in some way affect different races, different religions, different sexes, and different language peoples will fall. This may be already the law of the land. (But such changes would be made for us, not by us.)

How easily could such a vicious treaty be slipped through. At least three recent treaties were ratified legally by one United States Senator. He didn't cast the deciding vote; he cast the only vote. They now are the supreme law of the land. If they had any concealed jokers, American law could not protect you.

Several major treaties have been ratified by a small handful of Senators. For instance, our Mutual Assistance Treaty with Turkey was made the supreme law of the land by six Senators.

A distinguished jurist, Florance E. Allen, judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, recently had this to say:

"At first I was not particularly alarmed about this. I said to myself, 'Well, these international socialists can draft all the laws they want to, but it will not affect the United States.' But then I learned two things I should have known before, but didn't. And those two things are the reasons for the Bricker amendment. Here they are:

"Bear in mind, as I said before, that an international law called a convention is considered a treaty. In the United States treaties are submitted only to the Senate. They are not submitted to the House of Representatives. An ILO convention, for example, can be ratified as a treaty by a two-thirds vote of the Members of the Senate present and voting on the day the vote is taken * * * only a handful present could put through the vote. That is how ratification of a convention might be slipped through."

I am sure we all remember when President Truman seized the steel companies. The Constitution gave him no power to take private property—so said a majority of the Supreme Court. But remember that the three dissenting judges said that our ratification of the U. N. Charter had given our President power to seize private property, in defiance of the Constitution. Had those three judges been able to persuade two more judges to their way of thinking—our Constitution would be dead and we would be completely at the mercy of the United Nations.

Some years ago the Congress enacted a law concerning migratory birds, ducks, and game. The President approved. No one questioned the validity of this act at the time of its passage. But subsequently, someone got arrested for shooting ducks out of season and this migratory bird law was attacked because Congress had no power to act in this field—that the States only had this power. The case was appealed and this migratory bird law was held unconstitutional. What happened? The United States made treaties with Britain, Canada, and Mexico. Then the Federal Government had jurisdiction over migratory birds—but they got this power by treaty and not by congressional law.

If these ardent, intellectual designers of world government believe so strongly in the United States Constitution as they claim, why do they object to putting the Bricker amendment in black and white, and making it a part of the Constitution?

Mr. Frank Holman, former president of the American Bar Association, answers the above question in the following manner:

"The only possible answer that can be made to this is that in recent years there has developed gradually in our midst another kind of American than those who founded this great Republic—the American who is impatient with the slow and safe processes of law; impatient of constitutional restraints; the kind of American who prefers unrestrained power; the kind of American who believed in so-called unhandicapped executive power.

"Behind all this changed attitude of mind on the part of many of our high officials of Government is also the desire to change America from a republic to a socialistic state by and through the treaty process and eventually to put us into some form of world government. Mr. Dulles in his Boston speech on August 26, 1953, before the annual meeting of the American Bar Association, 'let the cat out of the bag'—or half out of the bag—with respect to this matter. He pointed out that the U. N. Charter, by its own terms, comes up for amendment in 1955.

"It is now no secret that Mr. Dulles and others believe in strengthening the Charter in the direction of world government, and that they are planning and hoping to do so by the treaty method in 1955. The clear answer to these diplomatic planners of world government is that whether we have or do not have world government is a matter for the American people to decide.

"World government should not be imposed upon them by treaty law and through mere action of the President, the State Department, and two-thirds of the Senate present and voting."

The former Secretary of State Dean Acheson—and his position is now ratified by Secretary of State Dulles—proclaimed that there is no difference between foreign and domestic affairs. And that treaties are supreme and can override the Constitution, Secretary Dulles has said: "Treaties make international law and they also make domestic law."

As you think about the merits or demerits of this Bricker amendment—keep this thought always in your mind. The Bill of Rights in the Constitution forbids Congress to change your basic American rights. But without the Bricker amendment, since this Republic now is a member of the United Nations, your basic rights can be taken away by a treatymaking agency which consists of the President and two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

The passage of the Bricker amendment will establish once and for all, the American theory that basic American rights cannot be changed by acts of Congress, or by State legislatures—but without the Bricker amendment, those rights can be changed or destroyed by international treaties.

The important thing for everybody to remember is that we are up against the most sinister and diabolical conspiracy in history of the world to destroy the Constitution of the United States and the American way of

life, destroy the opportunity state which made us great, and substitute by the combination of outside force, internal fifth column activities of force and deception, a slave state, in which a government—a world government—shall control everybody and everything.

It is unimportant whether this is called a liberal or progressive government, a welfare state, a socialistic, a Fascist, or a Communist system. They all add up at the same goalpost—a totalitarian dictatorship.

In any discussion about the forces and events that are taking place about the world, particularly in Asia, Africa, and the Far East, one always is struck with this phrase—"self-autonomy and home rule." This is uppermost in these peoples' minds. These thoughts come from Uganda, deep in the jungles of equatorial Africa.

To the people of the Sixth Congressional District—Kansans all—people of northwest Kansas, descendants of men of royal blood—the pioneers—men and women who subdued and conquered the high plains with its drought, its violent upheavals of weather, dust storms—a land of watercourses without water, a land of no high mountain peaks, no wonderland of scenic valleys nestling between forest-covered hillsides—there is no hallowed Plymouth Rock, nor Bunker Hill Monument, nor a statue of a Jefferson, Washington, or Lincoln on a high hill to remind us of our ancient heritage.

But there are living monuments in each city, town, and village and on the ancient homesteads. There are the men who in yesteryear gave their service in the Argonne, Belleau Wood and on the Rhine—men who built bridges over the rivers of Europe, who drove tanks through the Siegfried Line; men who crawled off the ships on the beach of Normandy and waded through the snows of Belgium—and more lately men who took and held Baldy and Pork Chop Hills in Korea. Most of them are home.

They want to live as freemen in a free nation, paying a fair share of taxes to help maintain a government that is theirs. A free man's government. And not a government whose laws can be changed by an international body on a foreign shore.

Men of the Revolution, North and South, gave us our Constitution. We must protect it. It is not yet international. Our trust must be in God. Not in men. Ours is a Government of constitutional law—not officeholders. Let us keep it so. Lift your voice. Protest to those who would come sneaking through the back door to steal your basic American rights.

The Bricker amendment must be passed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, former Senator George Wharton Pepper, for many years a very distinguished Member of this body, and one of the outstanding lawyers of eastern United States, has sent me a telegram which reads in part as follows:

Careful consideration has convinced me of the soundness of the Bricker amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that his entire telegram be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 15, 1954.*

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building:

Careful consideration has convinced me of the soundness of the Bricker amendment. I am hoping that both Senators from Pennsylvania will give it effective support.

GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why the Bricker Amendment Should Pass," which was published in the Norristown (Pa.) Times Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE BRICKER AMENDMENT SHOULD PASS

Under Democratic Presidents since 1933, emergencies greatly magnified the power of the Chief Executive.

Champions of congressional authority and of States' rights became convinced that in this long period many exercises of presidential power actually were abuses—particularly in the foreign policy field.

They complained that grave errors were being made in treaty-writing and executive foreign policy agreements. Yalta was cited as a prime example. They contended, too, that treaties were being approved which established internal American law, in violation of the United States Constitution.

Finally, Republican Senator BRICKER of Ohio drafted an amendment to the Constitution which he said was designed to meet this problem. He won about sixty-odd Senators over to cosponsorship of his amendment, and shortly now it will come up for Senate debate.

His amendment would alter drastically the constitutional provision dealing with treaties, which now reads simply that the President shall have power to make treaties by and with the consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of those present concur.

Under BRICKER'S amendment, a treaty would become effective as internal law only "through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty." This means that after a treaty has been negotiated and approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, it must yet be endorsed by both Houses of Congress in separate legislation.

In the view of many constitutional historians and lawyers, it means also that wherever a treaty provision touched on matters normally reserved to the States, it would have to be approved as well by the separate legislatures of all States.

The second major clause of the Bricker amendment provides that "Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements." This is designed to give Congress authority over foreign policy arrangements which are not treaties and thus do not come up for senatorial vote.

Under the President's constitutional power as it now stands, he has wide discretion in the making of such agreements as well as in negotiating treaties.

President Eisenhower has thrown the weight of his enormous influence with his party, and with the Senate, against the adoption of the Bricker amendment. This is astonishing.

He has no constitutional right to do so. He is invading a sphere of government in which he is clothed with absolutely no authority under the Constitution.

The power to amend the Constitution rests wholly upon the two Houses of Congress, and the States, which may ratify or reject as they please. When and if the Congress adopts a resolution to amend the Constitution the President is powerless to intervene. He can veto other acts of Congress, but not this one.

Time is running out for the Senate. The country expects it to make it a part of the organic law of the land, that no treaty with the U. N. or any alien state can thwart the will of the American people expressed by their Congress and preserved by the rights reserved, by the Constitution, to the people and to the States.

The amendment should be adopted—not as a watered-down compromise but as it stands today, to save the Constitution from the designs of foreign leftists and others who might try to impose—by treaty—a civil-rights program, socialism, and perhaps world government. Many organizations, including law, business, veterans, and nationalist groups, agree with us.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the Senate has for more than a week been debating the proposal made by the so-called Bricker amendment to alter the treatymaking provisions of the Constitution.

A good many Senators have already ably discussed this issue quite thoroughly. Originally, I had intended to join in this discussion at an early point, but last week it was necessary for me to be in Boston for hearings of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

During the time this debate has run the newspapers have reported quite fully the efforts by the majority leader and his associates to effect a compromise on this issue between President Eisenhower and the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. Since the beginning, I have felt that these news stories did not reflect the correct parliamentary situation concerning these issues.

Since the beginning of the 2d session of the 83d Congress, the Senator from Ohio, in my opinion, has never had the necessary votes to win Senate approval of the joint resolution reported last summer by a majority of the Judiciary Committee. At the time when the joint resolution was reported, I was 1 of a minority of 4 of the committee members in opposition to this radical measure; and I still am opposed to it. I have failed to understand why a compromise has been found necessary or desirable. Certainly, on the merits of the issue, none is needed. President Eisenhower and his chief advisers, Attorney General Brownell and Secretary Dulles, have already spoken out firmly against any measure that would lessen the President's powers to conduct our foreign affairs. The President's prestige should add a sufficient number of votes to the votes of those of us who are firmly opposed to any amendment of this sort to assure the defeat of this measure on the floor. The President has only to remain firm in his opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1 as presently amended, or to any compromise.

Those of us who have continually been in agreement with the President have not been consulted or represented in these compromise negotiations. It does not appear to have occurred to anyone among the President's advisers that the Senators who have remained firmly committed to his position may well be the key to this situation. We ask only that President Eisenhower not desert us.

It is unfortunate that the negotiations for compromise have been managed by the majority leader, who was an original cosponsor of the Bricker amendment. He has my sympathy, if not my support, because, of necessity, he must be trying to represent both sides. It is understandable, of course, that he should desire to avoid an open and bitter split within the ranks of his party. For the Republican Party, it is, of course, important to retain the illusion of unity. For the Nation, however, I think it would be

better that the Republican Party appear before the country in its schizophrenic condition, rather than appear harmonious, at the expense of wrecking the Constitution of the United States. President Eisenhower would be well advised to stand by his principles and not attempt to compromise. Then, at least, one part of the Republican Party would show faith in the future, rather than be dominated by a philosophy of fear.

The majority leader has, withal, grown quite frantic in his efforts. It is also apparent that the Senator from Ohio is anxious to fasten onto some face-saving device. Hence much smoke has been created around a radical proposal referred to as the "which" clause. Lately the Ohio Senator has expressed a willingness to surrender even this citadel of the amenders—the sacred "which" clause.

Of course, as pointed out earlier in the debate, the Senator from Ohio, was originally opposed to the "which" clause and he is—or at any rate was—only recently converted to this extreme doctrine.

Nothing constructive for our country can come out of these protracted compromise negotiations.

In a television interview on Sunday evening the distinguished Senator from Ohio stated that he had seen at least 150 drafts of proposed changes. As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee which considered the original resolution, I know of only 2 drafts that the full committee studied. I assume that most of the 150 drafts seen by the Ohio Senator have been written and rewritten during their hasty negotiations. If, finally, a compromise is put before the Senate, it will inevitably be a hodgepodge of vague language which has a different meaning for each person who has a hand in it. I recall hearing that the proponents have conceded it might be 10 years before the Supreme Court could pass on some of its aspects.

I submit, Mr. President, that the Constitution of the United States should not be amended by such a procedure; that the Constitution should not be amended on the Floor of the Senate without the safeguards that come from extensive public debate of the precise language and careful study of it by informed scholars in the fields of constitutional and international law. Only a small fraction of the public has heard of this issue and, according to the Gallup poll of a week or so ago, only 4 percent of the people actually favor the proposals put forward by the Senator from Ohio.

If any proposed compromise would affect the broad historic power of the President to conduct our foreign affairs, it would be contrary to the interests of our country and I shall therefore oppose it. If the compromise does not hamstring the President or weaken his needed powers in any way but is merely an empty gesture in order that it may appear that the Senator from Ohio has won something, I shall also oppose it.

We can never be sure that language purportedly harmless will not somehow be construed to have meaning and effect that would be harmful. And what is more to the point, I hold that the Constitution—the supreme law of our land—must not be degraded by adding meaningless surplusage of language in order that a political party already badly divided against itself might seem to be in agreement.

So, Mr. President, so far as I am concerned—and I think I express the sentiments of a good many other Senators—compromise on this issue is not possible, and I believe that the Senate will reject any compromise that can be concocted or devised at this stage of the debate and submitted to the Senate as a whole without even a minimum of committee consideration. I cannot believe that this august body would adopt any so-called compromise which has been conceived in a series of backroom negotiations.

Having made these general remarks in opposition to any attempt to weaken the Presidential powers in foreign affairs, I shall now yield the floor. But before doing so, Mr. President, I wish to say that at the time the unknown compromise or compromises are unveiled to the Senate and to the country, I shall again address the Senate on the specific provisions of these masked marvels. If no compromise is brought forth in a day or two, I shall again ask recognition to address the Senate specifically on the proposal now before it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say in passing that had the original members of the Constitutional Convention taken the position that no compromise was possible, the Union would have been wrecked before it was started, because there had to be compromises between the large States and the small, by giving to the large States representation in the House in proportion to population and to the small States equal representation in the Senate. There were other great compromises which made our Constitution possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I addressed to Hon. Walter Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State, on February 1, 1954. It has already appeared in the RECORD, but I desire to have it appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1954.

Hon. WALTER BEDELL SMITH,
Under Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the discussions on Senate Joint Resolution 1, there has been a difference of opinion expressed as to the number of executive agreements involved in any constitutional provision that in order for such agreements to have the effect of internal law congressional action would be required.

Article I of the Constitution states: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."

The Constitution also gives the Congress power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

Please furnish me with information showing for each year 1943 to 1953 inclusive the number of executive agreements entered into with foreign governments of international organizations and the number of such agreements which have the effect of internal law. Also list those agreements affecting internal law which were based on prior or subsequent congressional action and those which had no congressional authorization.

I believe that it is essential that such information be made available prior to the submission to the States of the proposed constitutional amendment. Your early reply will be appreciated.

It is also my intention to introduce a Senate resolution requesting the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to make a complete study of this question. It is my belief that in the past the executive department has used executive agreements when the Constitution intended the treatymaking power to be used, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to read at this time a letter from the Acting Secretary of State in reply to my letter just referred to. The reply is under date of February 2, 1954, and reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 2, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have received your letter of February 1, 1954, in which you request information showing for each year 1943 to 1953, inclusive, the number of "executive agreements entered into with foreign governments or international organizations" and the number of such agreements which "have the effect of internal law." You ask also that there be listed those agreements affecting internal law which were based on prior or subsequent congressional action and those which had no congressional authorization.

The Department of State will endeavor to furnish you, at the earliest possible moment, the information which you request.

I am sure you will appreciate the fact that this necessarily involves studies of a highly analytical character. There would seem to be no well-defined rule by which many agreements may be said to have or not have "the effect of internal law." It is assumed that the task involves a determination as to which agreements have or might have an effectiveness that would be recognized by courts within the United States in determining cases which rely to any extent on the existence of such agreements (a reciprocal trade agreement being one of the simpler examples). On that assumption, it would seem that the task will require an extended period of time on the part of our staff. It has been roughly estimated that the completion of the task may take a considerable period, 6 months as a minimum.

Sincerely,

WALTER B. SMITH,
Acting Secretary.

On the same day that I wrote the letter to the Acting Secretary of State I submitted a resolution calling for a complete investigation by the Foreign Relations Committee of all executive agreements.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week I inserted in the RECORD—January 28, page 932—a statement of alleged misstatements about the Bricker amendment which was printed as a paid advertisement in a number of newspapers.

Today I have a statement issued by the Committee for Defense of the Constitution, of which Edward S. Corwin is national chairman. It is entitled "The Fictitious Claims for the Bricker Amendment and the Facts." This statement

refutes, one by one, the fictions which have been advanced by proponents of the Bricker amendment. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FICTITIOUS CLAIMS FOR THE BRICKER AMENDMENT AND THE FACTS

FICTION

The Constitution must be amended to prevent treaties from overriding the Constitution and our constitutional rights.

FACT

No such amendment is necessary. The Supreme Court has consistently made it plain that any treaty which conflicts with the Constitution will be held invalid. A treaty cannot rise above the Constitution any more than a river can rise above its source.

FICTION

With the U. N. and its agencies drafting so many dangerous covenants, the treaty power must be curbed to keep our country from being sold down the river.

FACT

Supporters of the Bricker amendment ignore the fact that the President may not even propose for consideration covenants which have been drafted by the United Nations or its specialized agencies. They also pass over the fact that all treaties must be approved by the Senate—a body so little known for its rash actions that it has been called the "graveyard of treaties," also the fact that the Supreme Court has made it plain that it will not permit a treaty to operate as domestic law in violation of our constitutional rights, and that Congress may at any time override the operation of a treaty as domestic law by a subsequent statute. We should not cripple our treatymaking machinery because a few unwise treaties have been drafted or proposed any more than we should abolish the Congress because a few unwise bills have been introduced. If the Bricker amendment had been in effect it would not have prevented past errors in judgment nor will it secure infallibility in the future. No laws can assure us that all men will be wise.

FICTION

The treaty procedure must be tightened because treaties have slipped through the Senate with as few as six Senators voting.

FACT

Laws have also been passed by the Congress with very few Members present. If the matter is at all controversial, the Members turn out to vote. If necessary, a change in the Senate Rules could require a quorum to be present for votes on treaties. No such drastic step as a constitutional amendment is needed.

FICTION

The Bricker amendment will prevent socialized medicine.

FACT

We already have United States social-security laws passed by a majority of both Houses. The real risk of some form of socialised medicine is not through the cumbersome route of international treaties but by a similar act of Congress. To think that the Bricker amendment can prevent socialized medicine is absurd.

FICTION

We need the Bricker amendment to prevent American boys in uniform from being imprisoned in French jails.

FACT

In the NATO Status of Forces Treaty, military personnel of the sending country, when off duty, are subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the host country.

Senator BRICKER proposed as a reservation to this treaty that the United States be given exclusive jurisdiction over its forces abroad. This would, of course, mean giving foreign countries the same rights over their troops in this country. Under Senator BRICKER's "which" clause, the United States could not assure foreign countries that the individual states would grant these rights. So, the Bricker amendment, far from preventing the adoption of a treaty, such as the NATO Status of Forces Treaty, would in fact make it more difficult to correct the very aspect of it which Senator BRICKER criticizes most.

FICTION

The Bricker amendment would merely put our treatymaking machinery on a par with that of other countries.

FACT

On the contrary, it would make our treaty-making process the most cumbersome in the world.

First. Already, a treaty must be negotiated by the President, and submitted by him to the Senate.

Second. Already, the treaty must be approved by two-thirds of the Senators present, usually after committee hearings, and ratified and proclaimed by the President.

Third. Under the amendment in order to be effective in the United States a treaty would also have to be passed as a law by a majority of both Senate and House, presumably after more committee hearings, and signed by the President. Or, if the subject matter ran afoul of the "which" clause of the amendment, each State would have to pass State legislation to make the treaty effective in that State.

Our legislative bodies are already overworked. This process will be so time consuming that our power to act will be curtailed and other countries will be reluctant to negotiate with us.

FICTION

We are one of the few countries in the world in which it is possible for a treaty to become internal law without the passage of legislation.

FACT

It is true that in many other countries legislation is required before a treaty becomes operative as internal law. However, in such countries there is no requirement of prior consent to the ratification of a treaty, such as our requirement that two-thirds of the Senators concur. Moreover, in practice in such countries, the necessary legislation is generally passed prior to ratification of the treaty by the Executive and is, accordingly, the practical equivalent of the Senate's consent to ratification under our Constitution. In any event a treaty does not go to the legislatures a second time as it would under the Bricker amendment.

FICTION

The Bricker amendment will not hamper our ability to make effective treaties with other countries.

FACT

It is true that the Bricker amendment would not interfere with the technical legal power of the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties. However, the "which" clause would make the consent of the State legislatures necessary to the enforcement in the United States of such vital international agreements as the traditional treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation, narcotics control conventions, and possible arrangements for international control of atomic energy. This would mean that the United States would have to depend on State governments to enforce its treaty obligations and, as a practical matter, would not be able to enter into many necessary treaties or enter into them on as favorable terms as it otherwise might.

FICTION

The Bricker amendment would prevent another Yalta.

FACT

Nothing in any constitution can prevent any government from making bad decisions. The Bricker amendment would merely shift the ultimate responsibility, for conducting negotiations like Yalta, from the President to Congress. Congress would then have three choices: (1) It might do nothing—in which case the amendment would accomplish nothing (except to have everyone in doubt as to whether Congress was going to pass a regulatory law right in the middle of the conference); (2) it might pass a statute giving the President broad powers in general terms—in which case he might actually be able to act with more powers than he has now; or (3) it might pass a very specific statute, defining precisely just what the President could and could not do. That would be nonsense—it would be negotiation by newspaper. Congress might just as well tell the President to stay home, and move the conference right into the floor of the House and Senate (if the other nations would take the trouble to come).

FICTION

The Bricker amendment will solve the problem of drawing the line between treaties and executive agreements.

FACT

Under our present system there are no written definitions specifying when a President may make an executive agreement without congressional authorization, when he must seek the approval of Congress and when he must present the agreement in the form of a treaty to the Senate. Attempts to fit all agreements into set categories have failed and the Bricker amendment does not in any way meet this problem. It merely vests solely in Congress the full power to set up these categories without any guidance as to how it shall be done.

Secretary of State Dulles has correctly stated that: "This is an area to be dealt with by free cooperation between the three departments of the Government which are involved, rather than by attempts at constitutional definition, which are futile, or by the absorption, by one branch of government, of responsibilities which are presently and properly shared."

FICTION

The Bricker amendment would prevent secret agreements by the President.

FACT

The success of delicate negotiations with other countries in peace or war would be jeopardized if all agreements were immediately made public. Since all executive agreements must now by law be published within 1 year following their effective date, we already have one safeguard against Presidential abuse. A more important safeguard is our system of representative government with free elections. No President or party can defy the will of the people for long and remain in office.

FICTION

The Bricker amendment will not affect the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

FACT

The Bricker amendment contains no such exception whatsoever. It gives Congress power to regulate all executive agreements. Imagine Congress debating when, where, and how to open a second front in World War II—or when the Russians were to enter the war against Japan. To give Congress that power would be just as unthinkable as offering Hitler or Tojo a free seat on the Allied Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier today there appeared on the news ticker an AP dispatch dealing with President Eisenhower's conference with the press on the subject of the Bricker amendment. I have had the dispatch transcribed, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

In connection with what was stated by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] a few minutes ago, the press dispatch definitely states that the President stands pat; that there is to be no compromise with principle, and that the President feels he cannot agree to any amendment which would delimit the power of the Executive or of Congress.

There being no objection, the news dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—President Eisenhower said today he will uncompromisingly oppose any attempt to change the traditional balance of power among the branches of the Federal Government.

The President's general comment at a news conference came as the Senate headed toward showdown votes on the Bricker constitutional amendment on treaty powers.

Eisenhower declined specific comment on various proposals put before the Senate as possible substitutes for the plan by Senator BRICKER.

The President said, however, that this is a very, very intricate question which should be studied soberly and on a nonpartisan basis to determine what is good for the United States in the long run.

Thus the President declined to endorse a move by the Senate Republican leadership to revise the Bricker amendment.

Neither did he give an opinion on a different proposal which is being pressed by Senator GEORGE in the wake of collapse of bipartisan talks held in the past few days in an effort to get agreement on some proposal which could command the necessary two-thirds vote.

Eisenhower declared emphatically that he will not compromise one bit—one single word—in any way which would destroy the traditional balance of power between the three branches of Government—executive, legislative, and judicial.

He repeated that he still is willing to endorse any compromise proposal designed to make it clear that no treaty shall contravene the Constitution.

The Republican high command in the Senate battle is composed of Senators KNOWLAND, FERGUSON, MILLIKIN, and SALTONSTALL.

The stiffest threat to their leadership was from Senator GEORGE.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, apropos of the press conference to which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has referred, I believe the position of the President of the United States has been very clear from the beginning. It is that he does not wish to agree to anything which might upset the balance of power under the Constitution. He is just as strongly opposed to the legislative branch encroaching on the executive branch as he is to the executive branch encroaching on the legislative. Personally I feel certain that there could be adopted in the Senate an amendment along the lines that have been discussed for some time, to make certain that there would be no encroachment by the executive branch on the legislative branch, or by the legislative on the executive, in full keeping with the President's desire that the balance of power be not upset.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on behalf of himself and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to the committee amendment on page 3, line 5, after the word "treaty" to insert the words "or other international agreement."

ENFORCEMENT OF INCOME-TAX LAWS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, for some time I have been greatly concerned by what appears to be a difference in the harshness with which our income-tax laws have been enforced against the smaller tax violators as compared to the punishments meted out to the larger and ofttimes more flagrant cases.

To determine the accuracy or inaccuracy of this suspicion several months ago I launched a study in which I documented the history of 20 cases showing how some of the largest of them had been handled.

In presenting these cases I admit that they are among the more glaring examples; but they are by far not the full list that could have been included. Many others in which collection of the taxes, or prosecution, has been extremely lax are omitted because the criminal aspects are now pending in the courts. Criminal prosecution in many of these omitted cases, however, was only resumed during recent months.

Against at least one of the individuals there is an indictment on another but nonrelated case pending in the courts. Reference to that specific case is omitted for the reasons outlined above; namely, that a discussion of a pending criminal case on the Senate floor could prejudice its outcome.

As a result of this study I am convinced that as our laws now stand and as they are being enforced, there is no equality of justice between the punishments meted out to the larger and more flagrant violators as compared to that meted out to the small fellows without any influence.

I recognize the problems with which our courts are faced and that the amount of money involved does not necessarily determine the degree of guilt; but I think that the Department of Justice, the Treasury Department, and the Federal courts should give a serious study to the question of a revision of their existing policies of enforcement.

One suggestion would be that there should be greater publicity given by the Treasury Department to their method of handling some of these cases and their ultimate settlement.

Likewise, Congress should give prompt consideration to the enactment of a law which would prohibit former employees of the Government from representing clients before the same Department with which they were affiliated during the first 2 years of their separation, as proposed in Senate bill 637. This would stop much of the present influence peddling.

I might say that in a recent statement made by the Attorney General of the United States he endorsed in substance the principle of the bill.

For many years this was the established policy of the Government. However, the rule was suspended during World War II and as yet it has never been restored.

Consideration could be given toward reducing the penalties of first-time violators, particularly in cases involving the smaller amounts, to punishment by fines plus the payment of their taxes and the imposition of the 50-percent statutory fraud penalty and interest, but reserving the threat of prison sentences for second- and third-time violators.

I am making these suggestions with the full recognition that perhaps they may not be the ultimate answer. I am convinced, however, that we do not have the answer now, and that some change in our existing policies must be made.

Unquestionably in some of our courts punishment has been meted out during the past not so much on the basis of the crime committed but rather on the basis of the ability of the law violator to wield political influence or to employ the proper attorney.

As examples of how our tax laws are now being enforced against some of the larger violators I shall cite 20 cases. In presenting these cases it should be noted that my report is documented as of a specified date in late 1953, and there is a possibility that in the recent months or weeks some change in the present status of the cases could have been made.

The first 4 cases which I shall outline involve uncollected taxes approximating $4 million. Four of the individuals involved are listed in the Department of Justice files as fugitives from justice. One individual was given the severe sentence of 1 day on probation. Those cases are as follows:

The first case is that of Sidney E. Wolfe, and related cases, arising in San Francisco, Calif. The years involved were 1942 to 1946, inclusive, and the tax and penalty were $1,588,013.

On January 14, 1947, the Intelligence Unit began an investigation of Mr. Wolfe, and on September 15, 1950, their report was filed with the Penal Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

On January 24, 1951, the case was referred by the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice with recommendations for prosecution.

On June 5, 1951, the case was presented to the grand jury, and on June 13, 1951, Mr. Wolfe was indicted.

As of June 10, 1953, the Department of Justice files showed this case was still being carried as an open case, and reported that the reason the case had not been brought to trial was that Sidney E Wolfe has been "out of the country."

On July 16, 1953, the Treasury Department in reply to the question as to whether or not any collections had been made on this account answered:

Liens were filed July 5 and July 18, 1951. Partial collections were made in 1952 as a result of seizure and sale of assets. Taxpayer's petition to the Tax Court was dismissed as untimely.

Representing the taxpayer before the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice were, before the Treasury Department, Conrad T. Hubner and before the Justice Department, Albert H. Davidson, Conrad T. Hubner, Richard C. Marshall III, and James Wintham.

The second case is that of Victor B. Estrella, of Tucson, Ariz. The years involved were 1944 to 1946, inclusive, and the proposed tax and penalty were $748,365.

On March 18, 1947, the Intelligence Unit began their investigation of Mr. Estrella, and on January 2, 1948, their report was filed with the Penal Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

It was not until nearly three years later, on December 5, 1950, that the Bureau of Internal Revenue ever got around to referring this case to the Department of Justice.

On February 16, 1951, the Department of Justice presented the case to the grand jury.

On April 5, 1951, the grand jury returned an indictment against Mr. Estrella charging willful attempted evasion of individual income taxes for the years 1944 and 1945.

On May 21, 1951, Mr. Estrella pleaded not guilty to the indictment and was released on $25,000 bond.

On March 20, 1953—nearly 2 years later—the court, the defendant having waived a trial by jury, found him guilty as charged.

On March 24, 1953, the date set for the sentencing, Mr. Estrella failed to appear. Accordingly, a bench warrant was issued, and the defendant's $25,000 bail was forfeited. The court sentenced the defendant, in absentia, to 2 years' imprisonment plus a fine of $5,000.

The Department of Justice records as of June 22, 1953, listed Mr. Estrella as still being a fugitive from justice and stated that their available information indicated that he had fled to Mexico. Continuing, they stated that the United States has no treaty in force with Mexico authorizing the extradition of criminal tax evaders.

On April 22, 1953, the Department of Justice notified the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the ultimate disposition of the case and of the defendant's fugitive status, and on the same date they also instructed the United States attorney to advise authorities of the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization of the defendant's absence from the jurisdiction.

On September 1, 1953, in reply to the question as to how much, if any, had been collected on this outstanding account the Treasury Department replied:

> Liens were filed August 28, 1947, and October 12, 1949. Partial collection was made in 1947 and 1948 as a result of seizure and sale of taxpayer's assets. Further collection anticipated from sale of seized assets. Civil liability pending in Tax Court.

I was unable to obtain an explanation as to why this case was left in the pigeonhole in the Bureau of Internal Revenue nearly 3 years before being referred to the Department of Justice. Nor does there appear on record any explanation as to why the trial of Mr. Estrella was delayed nearly 2 years after the indictment.

The third case is that of Theodore Rask, New York, N. Y. The years involved were 1943 to 1945, inclusive, and the proposed tax and penalty were $1,474,276.

On November 18, 1948, the Intelligence Unit began their investigation of Mr. Rask, and on June 21, 1950, the report was stamped as being received by the Penal Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

On January 15, 1951, the case was referred by the Treasury Department to the Justice Department for criminal prosecution.

On March 3, 1951, the case was presented to the grand jury, and in that same month Mr. Rask was indicted.

As of June 10, 1953, Theodore Rask was still listed by the Department of Justice as being a fugitive from justice, and the indictment is still carried as an open case.

On July 16, 1953, in reply to my inquiry as to whether or not there had been any collections made by the Treasury Department on this account the Treasury Department replied:

> Accounts have not been paid. Unsuccessful efforts were made to locate assets.

The fourth case is that of Ralph Strassburger of Beaver, Gwynedd Valley, Pa., together with the related case of Frederick S. Fox. The date the case was received in the penal division was September 4, 1945. The years involved were 1936 to 1940, inclusive, and the proposed tax and penalty amounted to $1,044,118.

On September 13, 1943, the Intelligence Unit began their investigation of Mr. Strassburger, and on September 4, 1945, the report was received in the Penal Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue forwarded this report to the Department of Justice on April 18, 1946, and on November 20, 1946, the case was presented to the grand jury.

Mr. Fox was tried and found guilty on June 16, 1950, and approximately 1 year later, on May 3, 1951, he was sentenced by District Judge Thomas J. Clary to probation for a period of 1 day on each of two counts, the sentences to run concurrently. In other words, he had to be a good boy for 24 hours.

Mr. Strassburger, as of June 10, 1953, was still reported by the Department of Justice as a fugitive from justice.

In a letter dated July 16, 1953, the Treasury Department in reply to the question as to whether or not the accounts had been paid, replied that the liability as finally determined had been collected in full.

Representing the taxpayer in this case were, before the Treasury Department, James J. Dougherty and John R. Scholl, and before the Department of Justice, Joseph Daugherty, Mr. Dunn, Miss Enderberg, who was Strassburger's confidential secretary, William P. Quinlan, and John T. Sullivan.

The next cases which I shall outline show how certain individuals with large delinquencies either were not prosecuted at all or, if prosecuted, were merely given token fines or suspended sentences.

In practically every case no collection has been made on the taxes involved.

I now refer to case No. 5:

Name and address:	*Proposed tax and penalty*
United Container Co. (a partnership):	
Lester Kardon, Philadelphia, Pa	$481,579
Eugene Butts Kardon, Philadelphia, Pa	480,230
Morris Weiner, Philadelphia, Pa	408,227
Morris Kardon, Philadelphia, Pa	832,308
Total	2,202,344

Years involved: Morris Kardon, 1944–47, inclusive; three others 1943–45, inclusive.

On October 25, 1946, the Intelligence Unit began their investigation of this case, and on March 26, 1948, their report was filed with the Penal Division in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

On January 14, 1949, the case was referred to the Department of Justice.

On April 20, 1951, a little over 2 years later and after the statute of limitations for the year 1943 had expired, presentation to the grand jury was authorized, and the case was sent to the United States attorney in Philadelphia.

While the case was in the hands of the United States attorney in Philadelphia the statute of limitations for the year 1944 was allowed to expire.

On June 25, 1952, the United States attorney advised that he was declining prosecution for the year 1945.

No explanation has been found as to why the case was allowed to remain first in Washington and then in the hands of the United States attorney with the statute of limitations expiring for the years as mentioned above, nor is there any explanation as to why prosecution for the year 1945 was declined.

On September 1, 1953, in replying to the question as to whether or not they had collected any of the tax referred to above as being owed by these taxpayers the Treasury Department replied:

> No; case has not reached assessment stage and therefore, collections by administrative authority are not permitted under the law. In the absence of circumstances tending to indicate that the revenue is in jeopardy, action respecting civil liability is postponed pending disposition of criminal features to avoid possible prejudices to the criminal case.

Representing the taxpayers before the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department in this case were: Treasury Department: Leonard J. Schwartz, Fred L. Rosenbloom, B. Sidney Krantz, Otto Lowe; Justice Department: Fred Rosenblum, New York City; Jesse Climenko, New York City; Otto Lowe, Washington, D. C.; Leonard J. Schwartz, certified public accountant, Philadelphia, Pa.

I now refer to Case No. 6:

Preston T. Tucker, Ypsilanti, Mich. Years involved, 1945–48, inclusive. Proposed tax and penalty $525,761.

On February 12, 1948, special agents of the Intelligence Unit began their investigation of Mr. Tucker, and on October 13, 1950, their report was received by the Penal Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

In this report the agents proposed a total assessment, including tax and penalty, of $525,761.

On September 1, 1953, in answer to the question as to whether or not any collection had been made on the account of the Treasury Department answered:

No. Case has not reached the assessment stage, and therefore, collection by administrative action is not permitted under the law. Open civil aspects under consideration in a field office of the Internal Revenue Service.

Representing the taxpayer before the Treasury Department were: R. M. O'Hara, Paul V. Rahaley.

It should be noted that in addition to the $525,000 tax delinquency of Preston T. Tucker, the Tucker Corp. of Chicago, Ill., with which he was associated, still owes the General Services Administration more than $2½ million.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in the RECORD the letter of the General Services Administration dated January 12, 1954, signed by John A. Skeen, regional director, in which he itemizes the purchases of certain personal property by his corporations upon which payment has been made along with a breakdown of current unpaid accounts receivable totaling $2,643,903.63.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, REGION 5,
Chicago, Ill., January 12, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This has reference to your letter of December 2, and our acknowledgment of December 15, 1953.

Enclosed is report, in duplicate, listing the data requested on sales of personal property made to companies with which Mr. Preston T. Tucker was connected. The only disposal of real property was a lease, with purchase option, made to the Tucker Corp., Chicago, Ill., of Plancor 792, known as the former Dodge-Chrysler plant, Chicago, Ill. The unpaid account that developed therefrom is listed on the enclosed report.

All of these sales were made by the former War Assets Administration. No sales have been made by the General Services Administration in this region to Mr. Tucker or to any companies with which he was known to be affiliated.

Any further cooperation desired, I assure you, shall be gladly extended.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. SKEEN,
Regional Director.

Purchaser	Date of sale	Original cost to Government	Net amount of sale	Terms of financing	Description	Status
Ypsilanti Tool & Machine Co., Ypsilanti, Mich.	Nov. 14, 1945	$23,039.80	$13,602.26	Conditional sales contract	Precision boring and 3 lathe machines	Paid in full.
Do	do	18,047.07	7,810.82	do	2 lathes	Do.
Do	Dec. 17, 1945	38,425.63	19,298.81	do	5 milling machines, 1 radial, Carlton drill.	Do.
Do	Dec. 18, 1945	41,086.96	21,503.08	do	5 lathes and 1 boring machine	Do.
Do	Feb. 26, 1946	324.38	138.83	Cash sale	Sunnen precision honing machine	Do.
Do	Sept. 26, 1946	1,208.21	668.11	do	Tubing	Do.
Do	do	420.84	214.06	do	do	Do.
Tucker Corp., Chicago, Ill	June 4, 1947	[1] 7,240.00	3,810.21	do	Surface plates	Do.
Do	Aug. 22, 1947	3,654.20	1,922.10	do	do	Do.
Do	Nov. 10, 1947	5,161.00	2,322.45	do	Gun welders	Do.
Do	Dec. 22, 1948	366,571.94	229,592.82	do	Expendable personal property	Do.
Ypsilanti Tool & Machine Co	Feb. 3, 1949	9,472.30	5,683.38	Conditional sales contract	Cincinnati hydraulic grinding machine	Do.
Tucker Corp., Chicago, Ill	Feb. 16, 1949	143.40	99.26	Cash sales	Expendable personal property	Do.
Total		514,795.82	306,756.19			

[1] Estimate.

Current unpaid accounts receivable—Tucker Corp., Chicago, Ill.

Real property taxes on Plancor 792, Chicago, Ill	$131,368.37
Rental unpaid on Plancor 792, Chicago, Ill	2,381,938.44
Interest on rental	62,342.90
Rental of space by trustees	68,253.92
Total	2,643,903.63

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press article under the Chicago dateline of October 30, 1953, entitled "Tucker Unit Earnings Up."

I quote one significant sentence from that article:

Chatz said his attorney still is negotiating for a reduction of the Government's tax claim, which already has been reduced from $2,302,701 to $245,948.

I have no other information regarding the tax claim to which this article refers; however, evidently it is in addition to the obligations which I listed above.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUCKER UNIT EARNINGS UP

CHICAGO, October 30, 1953.—The trustees of the bankrupt Tucker Corp. said today the company's wholly owned subsidiary in Syracuse, N. Y., had an increase of $214,316 in net earnings during 1952.

John H. Chatz, the trustee, in a report to Federal Judge Michael L. Igoe said Aircooled Motors, Inc., the subsidiary, had net earnings of $568,266 for 1952, compared with $353,950 for 1951.

Chatz said the net worth of the firm as of September 30 was $1,658,850, compared with $1,260,824 the previous year. The subsidiary produces helicopter engines.

Tucker Corp. was organized in 1948 by Preston Tucker to produce a radically new type of automobile. It went bankrupt in 1950 without ever going into full production. About 30 cars were produced by hand before the firm was declared bankrupt.

Chatz said his attorney still is negotiating for a reduction of the Government's tax claim, which already has been reduced from $2,302,701 to $245,948. He added the Tucker firm's big problem still is negotiating in regard to the Government's lease claim for $3,374,075, which the Government seeks for use of the Chicago plant which Tucker rented.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it the position of the Senator from Delaware that there may still be certain irregularities in connection with the handling of various tax cases coming before the Internal Revenue Service?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The particular cases I am discussing have been handled, and the criminal actions have been closed. I am speaking as a layman. It is my understanding that nothing further can be done in these cases. I am referring to the record to show that no prison sentences were imposed. I am not discussing the merits or demerits of the cases, but the facts remain in those cases that the defendants were convicted by courts, or, at least, that they pleaded guilty and accepted the sentences.

As I have pointed out, in one or two of the cases, either the sentences were suspended, or the defendants were given no sentence. In one case, the defendant was sentenced to 1 day and was placed on probation.

It is my opinion, from reviewing these cases, that that type of punishment has not been extended to violators in the lower-income groups, who perhaps were not in a position to employ influential attorneys.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Delaware urging that the matter should be investigated by appropriate congressional committees?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection to any committee investigating the matter. I think most of the facts in connection with these cases have been stated. If anyone can think of any further facts that should be developed, certainly I would suggest that they be obtained. I think the record shows, however, that most of the reports are complete in this particular field.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I now refer to case No. 7:

Name and address	Date received penal division	Years involved	Proposed tax and penalty
Harry Kessler, Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 25, 1950	1942 to 1947, inclusive	$430,416.00
K. and L. Knitting Mills, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Jan. 25, 1950	1943 to 1947, inclusive	578,693.81
Total			1,009,109.81

The investigation on these two cases was started by the Intelligence Division in 1948, and on July 25, 1950, the report was forwarded to the Penal Division in the Bureau of Internal Revenue with recommendations for prosecution.

On November 10, 1950, the cases were forwarded by the Penal Division to the Department of Justice for prosecution.

On February 14, 1951, they were presented to the grand jury, and on March 5, 1951, the corporation, Harry Kessler, and Murray A. Linnick were indicted.

The defendants pleaded guilty on October 25, 1951, to count 1 of the indictment.

On November 26, 1951, Mr. Kessler received a sentence of 9 months and $5,000 fine; Mr. Linnick was sentenced to 9 months and $5,000 fine. The sentence of imprisonment was then suspended and the defendant placed on probation for 1 year; the corporation was fined $10,000.

On September 1, 1953, the Treasury Department in reply to the question as to whether or not the accounts had been paid, reported:

No. Liens have been filed, and investigation is underway to uncover any additional assets.

Representing the taxpayer before the Treasury Department and the Justice Department were: Treasury Department: Howard F. Corcoran, Boris Kostelanetz, Edward Margolin, Martin Schwaeber, James D. Saver; Justice Department: James D. Saver, New York City; Martin Schwaeber, New York City.

Mr. President, I now refer to case No. 8:

Name and address	Date received penal division	Years involved	Proposed tax and penalty
Samuel L. Lebis, New York City	Nov. 26, 1946	1940 to 1943, inclusive	$998,121
Rutlee Hotel Corp., New York City	do	1940 to 1944, inclusive	283,017
Hotel Ritz, Inc., Washington, D. C.	do	Fiscal year June 30, 1943	44,625
Total			1,325,763

The investigation on these three cases was begun in 1944, and on November 26, 1946, the report was received in the Penal Division of the Treasury Department with recommendations for criminal prosecution.

It was not until January 14, 1949, over 2 years later, that the report was forwarded to the Department of Justice for prosecution.

The taxpayer was indicted on March 14, 1949.

Three years later on May 28, 1952, the defendant pleaded guilty to all four counts. He received a 2-year suspended sentence and fines totaling $10,000.

On September 1, 1953, the Treasury Department, in answer to the question as to whether or not any of the tax had been paid, replied:

No; case has not reached the assessment stage and, therefore, collections by administrative authority is not permitted under the law. Open civil aspects under consideration in a field office of the Internal Revenue Service.

The taxpayer was represented before the Treasury Department and the Justice Department, as follows: Treasury Department: Morris D. Oppenheim, Louis Lederman; Justice Department: Llewellyn A. Luce, Washington, D. C.; Jesse Climenko, New York, N. Y.

I shall now discuss case No. 9:

Name and address	Date received penal division	Years involved	Proposed tax and penalty
Sol Liebowitz, New York, N. Y.	Jan. 11, 1949	1941 to 1951, inclusive	$563,246
Kay Bros. Clothes, Inc., New York, N. Y.	do	do	168,972
Total			732,218

On February 8, 1945, the Intelligence Unit started their investigation of these two cases, and on January 11, 1949, the Penal Division received their report proposing tax and penalty assessments approximating $750,000, plus recommendations for criminal prosecution.

On June 3, 1949, the Penal Division forwarded this report to the Department of Justice.

On October 31, 1949, the case was presented to the grand jury, and on March 13, 1950, the individual taxpayer was indicted.

On February 6, 1951, he pleaded guilty and was sentenced to imprisonment for 1 year and 1 day. Sentence was immediately suspended conditioned upon payment of the fine of $10,000 within 90 days.

On September 1, 1953, the Treasury Department, in reply to the question as to whether or not the above referred to accounts had been paid, answered:

Accounts have not been paid. Liens were filed April 28, 1952. Steps have been taken to lien against all known assets.

Representing the taxpayer before the Treasury Department and the Justice Department were: Treasury Department: Walter Brower, Joseph E. Brill, Coleman Gangel, J. Frederick Hazelett, Edward J. Ennis, Norman Kaliski; Justice Department; Brower, Brill & Gangel, New York City.

I come now to case No. 10:

Name and address, W. J. Jones, Shelby, N. C.; date received, Penal Division, April 12, 1948; years involved, 1941 to 1946, inclusive; proposed tax and penalty, $562,392.

On August 12, 1947, the Intelligence Unit started its investigation of Mr. Jones, and on April 12, 1948, their report was marked "received" in the Penal Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

On May 19, 1948, the case was referred by the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice.

Following presentation of the charges to the grand jury on September 8, 1949, the taxpayer was on June 5, 1950, indicted, at which time he entered a plea of nolo contendere to two counts.

On January 21, 1952, he was sentenced to 18 months imprisonment.

On March 10, 1952, the court changed its judgment to a 3-year probationary sentence and a fine of $10,000.

On September 1, 1953, in reply to the question as to whether or not any collection had been made on the above account the Treasury Department replied:

No. Lien filed on November 24, 1952. Unsuccessful efforts were made to locate assets.

The taxpayer was represented before the Treasury Department and the Justice Department by: Treasury Department: no record; Justice Department: Richard E. Thigpen, Charlotte, N. C.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his very great energy and activity in investigating these income tax cases. I think he has rendered a fine public service.

However, in the particular case to which he has just referred, the case of W. J. Jones, of Shelby, N. C., this man happened to live in my town. I have known him all his life. He was reared in the country and came to the town of Shelby.

At first he was rather indifferent in his business affairs, and at one time he failed. Then he succeeded and did fairly well.

I do not believe any charge could be brought against the Treasury Department for lack of vigilance or aggressiveness in prosecuting this suit. The man was indicted in the United States district court at Charlotte and submitted to the two counts. The assessment was estimated at $550,000. The man never had that much money; he never saw that much money in all his life. Anyway, he submitted to the court and pleaded nolo contendere to two counts.

The judge sentenced him to 18 months and fined him $10,000. That, I believe, was either in December 1951, or January 1952.

Then it was brought to the attention of the judge that the man's health was

very poor. The judge appointed two independent doctors, not connected in any way with any of the parties to the litigation, and had an examination made. The examination disclosed that the health of the man was in such serious condition that if he were to be incarcerated in prison, it probably would result in his early death.

Under those conditions, the judge placed the man on probation for 3 years. The court had already imposed a fine of $10,000, but, following the placing of the defendant on probation, the judge indicated that something must be done with reference to settling matters. The man then went under examination before Federal authorities and, in the presence of the judge, for 3 or 4 hours disclosed every single dollar and every item of property he had or that he had been able to obtain. It was shown very clearly that he had never had any such amount as would justify an assessment in the sum of $550,000.

He has since that time been trying to arrange for a settlement with the Government. The Government has liens against every dollar of property he has. So that process has been going on. A settlement has not been reached, but he has offered to pay everything in the world that he could pay. The question at issue is just how much can be realized.

I am not offering the statements I have made in the way of an excuse because I think there was a violation of the law, but I am merely saying that the Treasury Department has been aggressive in this matter and has used due diligence. I think, likewise, the Department of Justice has done the same. I think that should be said in justice to all concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I am not discussing the merits of the cases. I am merely stating the record as it appears for the purpose of showing how the laws have been enforced as against some of the larger taxpayers in comparison with how they have been enforced as against some of the smaller taxpayers.

As to whether or not in this particular case the taxpayer owes the amount of money claimed, I am sure the Senator from North Carolina is more familiar with that matter than I am. I am sure the Senator from North Carolina is familiar with the conditions pertaining to that particular case, and that he is speaking from firsthand knowledge and I am not. However, if there was a conference in which it was shown by the record that perhaps the taxpayer did not owe the amount stated, I think it was wrong for the Department of the Treasury to have gone to court against this particular taxpayer, with a claim that $562,000 was the obligation, or for the Treasury Department to prosecute this taxpayer, or any other, for the collection of an amount which the taxpayer did not owe. The Treasury Department is guilty of nothing less than blackmail if it engages in such conduct. I think it has no right to go into court and set a figure at an artificially high level on the basis that "if we claim half a million dollars as being due, and the taxpayer owes a couple of hundred thousand, perhaps we will get all that is coming to us." I think the Treasury Department has an obligation to be as straightforward and as honest as it expects the taxpayer to be in filing his return.

There are cases in which consideration should be given. So far as I know there was no record contained in the report which I obtained from the Department of Justice about the doctor's certificate to which the Senator from North Carolina referred, or I would have incorporated it in my remarks. In fairness to all concerned, I am glad the Senator from North Carolina has mentioned that fact. In many of the cases mentioned there was no such report.

Taking the cases as a whole, I believe that the ones in which the larger amounts are involved are more adequately defended and represented than perhaps some of the smaller cases, in connection with which the taxpayers do not get proper attention and representation. That is the point I was trying to make.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator from Delaware, and I agree with him heartily. I was not complaining about the Department of Justice or the Treasury. All I was saying was that the amount assessed against the man was far and away more than he ever had. I agree with the Senator from Delaware, and I do not think it is good policy to make assessments out of proportion to the realities of the actual amount involved. I wanted the Senator to know that I am not saying the man he has mentioned did not violate the law; he probably did; but he is not a man of great wealth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

I now refer to case No. 11:

Name and address: Isidore Reissman, Guttenberg, N. J.; date received, Penal Division: March 15, 1949; years involved: 1943 to 1945, inclusive; proposed tax and penalty: $918,045.

On February 11, 1947, an investigation was started by the Intelligence Unit, and on March 15, 1949, their report was filed with the Penal Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

On January 3, 1950, the Bureau of Internal Revenue referred the case to the Department of Justice, following which on March 7, 1950, it was presented to the grand jury.

The taxpayer was indicted on March 28, 1950.

He entered a plea of nole contendere on October 22, 1951.

On November 2, 1951, he was fined $5,000 and received a sentence of 18 months. His sentence was suspended.

On September 1, 1953, the Treasury Department, in reply to the question as to whether or not the account had as of that date been paid, replied:

No; case has not reached the assessment stage and, therefore, collections by administrative authority are not permitted under the law. Open civil aspects under consideration in a field office of the Internal Revenue Service.

The taxpayer was represented before the Treasury Department and the Justice Department by: Treasury Department: Joseph T. Higgins, Philip A. Brenner, Maurice H. Rich, Robert E. Zagorin; Justice Department: Higgins, Brenner & Higgins, New York, N. Y.

I come now to case No. 12, Grand Gas Light, Inc., New York City; Samuel Ruderfer, Meyer Ruderfer.

Years involved: 1943 to 1944, inclusive; proposed tax and penalty: $511,584.

On October 9, 1947, the Intelligence Unit started their investigation, and on November 10, 1949, their report was filed with the Penal Division in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

On February 7, 1950, the Bureau of Internal Revenue referred this report to the Department of Justice.

On March 3, 1950, the case was presented to the grand jury and on March 14, 1950, the taxpayers were indicted.

One year later, on April 12, 1951, they entered a plea of guilty and on April 25, 1951, the court imposed the following sentence:

Count 1: The corporation, $10,000 fine; Samuel Ruderfer, $7,500 fine; Myer Ruderfer, $2,000 fine.

Count 2: The corporation, $10,000 fine; Samuel Ruderfer, $7,500 fine; Myer Ruderfer, $2,000 fine.

Under date of September 1, 1953, in reply to the question as to whether or not this account had been paid, the Treasury Department answered:

No; case has not reached the assessment stage, and therefore, collections by administrative authority are not permitted under the law. After disposition of the criminal aspects of the case the civil features were referred to a field office of the Internal Revenue Service for action and are pending in that office.

Representing the taxpayers before the Treasury Department and the Justice Department were: Treasury Department: Louis J. Gribetz; Justice Department: James D. Saver, New York, N. Y.

I now refer to case No. 13:

Name and address:	*Proposed tax and penalty*
Union Packing Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	$1,319,366
Adolph Miller, Los Angeles, Calif.	946,172
Benjamin Miller, Los Angeles, Calif.	224,007
Nathan Miller, Los Angeles, Calif.	225,943
George Epstein, Los Angeles, Calif.	3,511
Total	2,718,999

On March 18, 1946, the Intelligence Unit began their investigation of these four related cases, and in May 1949 their report was received by the Penal Division in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Years involved: Union Packing Co., 1942–45, inclusive; Adolph Miller, 1943–44, inclusive; Benjamin Miller, Nathan Miller, and George Epstein, 1943–45, inclusive.

On February 6, 1950, the Bureau of Internal Revenue forwarded these reports and their recommendations for prosecution of Nathan and Benjamin Miller for the years 1943–45 and for George Epstein for the years 1943 and 1944.

This case was not presented to the grand jury until February 1951, by which

time the statute of limitations had expired on the year 1943 for all three individuals referred to above.

On October 8, 1951, the defendants pleaded nolo contendere and were ordered to pay fines of $2,000 each.

Under date of September 1, 1953, the Treasury Department, in reply to the question as to whether or not the accounts referred to above had been paid, stated:

> No; cases have not reached the assessment stage and, therefore, collection by administrative authority is not permitted under the law. Civil liability pending in Tax Court.

Representing the taxpayers before the Treasury and Justice Departments were: Treasury Department: George Bouchard, Benjamin W. Shipman, Ernest R. Utley; Justice Department: George Bouchard, Los Angeles, Calif.; Benjamin W. Shysman, Los Angeles, Calif.; Wallace Cohen, Washington, D. C.; Prentis Moor, Los Angeles, Calif.; Fred Morrison, Washington, D. C.

I come now to case No. 14, Leo L. Lowry, New York City; American Rolbal Corp., New York City—related cases.

In this instance the original recommendations for criminal prosecution were based on the years 1942 and 1943. The case was pigeonholed in the Justice Department files and allowed to remain until after the statute of limitations had expired for both years. The taxpayer was subsequently indicted for violation of the income tax laws for the years 1945 and 1946; however, upon the latter charge he was acquitted. No collections have been made. Likewise, this same taxpayer was involved in a related case of the American Rolbal Corp. of New York City, against whom proposed tax and penalty assessments total over $700,000. Again, no collections on either of the two accounts.

The history of these two cases is as follows:

Leo L. Lowry: Proposed tax and penalty, $1,088,193; years involved, 1942–43; received, Penal Division BIR, June 5, 1946; date sent to Justice, March 21, 1947; grand-jury presentation authorized, March 9, 1949; payments on account as of July 16, 1953, none.

On April 23, 1947, the Bureau of Internal Revenue's recommendation for proceeding against the taxpayer for evading his taxes for the years 1942 and 1943 was referred to the United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York for his consideration.

On June 14, 1948, the case was returned to the Bureau of Internal Revenue for further investigation with a recommendation that 1944 and 1945 also be investigated.

On December 30, 1948, a supplemental report was received from the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

On February 3, 1949, prosecution was authorized for the years 1943, 1944, and 1945 in the southern district of New York.

On February 21, 1949, the United States attorney pointed out that venue for 1944 and 1945, the two biggest years, lay in the eastern district of New York.

On March 9, 1949, prosecution was authorized in the eastern district of New York; on September 29, 1949, an indictment was returned; and on April 25, 1952, Judge Robert A. Inch granted the defendant's motion for judgment of acquittal.

The statute of limitations was allowed to expire for the years 1942 and 1943 while the case was in the Department of Justice.

The Treasury Department, under date of July 16, 1953, in answer to the question as to whether or not the accounts had been paid, replied:

> Civil liability pending before Tax Court of the United States. Case has not reached assessment stage. Therefore collections by administrative authority are not permitted under the law.

The taxpayer was not represented by counsel while the case was before the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice's file does not show who represented him at the trial; such information would appear in the United States attorney's file.

The attorney representing the taxpayer before the Bureau of Internal Revenue was William B. Miller.

American Rolbal Corp.: Proposed tax and penalty, $700,879; years involved, 1942 and 1943; received, Penal Division, BIR, June 3, 1946; date sent to Justice, December 30, 1948; payments on account as of September 1, 1953, none.

Prosecution of this taxpayer was initiated in connection with the case of Leo L. Lowry—see above.

The Treasury Department under date of September 1, 1953, in answer to the question as to whether or not the accounts had been paid, replied:

> No; case has not reached the assessment stage and, therefore, collection by administrative authority is not permitted under the law. Civil liability pending in Tax Court.

The attorney representing the taxpayer before the Bureau of Internal Revenue was William B. Miller.

I now come to case No. 15: Name and address: M. H. Hall, Shubuta, Miss.; proposed tax and penalty: $572,199.

On April 5, 1946, the Intelligence Unit began investigation of Mr. Hall, and their report was filed with the Penal Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue on October 10, 1947. Years involved, 1942 to 1945, inclusive.

On March 29, 1948, the Bureau of Internal Revenue forwarded this case to the Department of Justice.

It was not until 2 years later on February 21, 1950, that the Department of Justice presented it to the grand jury. The statute of limitations had expired during this interval as to the year 1942.

On May 3, 1950, the grand jury returned a three-count indictment against M. H. Hall for evasion of his individual income taxes for the years 1943, 1944, and 1945.

On February 27, 1951, the taxpayer entered a plea of nolo contendere to the indictment.

The court sentenced him to a fine of $1,000 on count one, $1,000 on count two, and $500 on count three.

On March 14, 1951, the Department of Justice notified the Bureau of Internal Revenue that the case was closed in their files.

On September 1, 1953, the Treasury Department in reply to an inquiry as to whether or not the tax referred to above had been collected answered:

> Partial collections made in 1947 and 1951. Liens filed in March 1947, in April and May of 1948, in September 1950, and in June 1952. Suit to enforce liens pending in Federal court. Civil liability pending before the Tax Court.

Representing the taxpayer before the Treasury Department and before the Justice Department were: Treasury Department: T. J. Wills, DeQuincy V. Sutton; Justice Department: DeQuincy V. Sutton, Wooten & Wooten, Hattiesburg, Miss.; T. J. Wills, Hattiesburg, Miss.

And then there are three cases involving approximately $7½ million in which Joseph D. Nunan, the former Commissioner, appears as the counsel, and again we find the same pattern prevailing as in the previous Nunan cases—no prosecution, no collection.

On February 14, February 21, and again on February 28, 1952, I outlined the manner in which 6 other tax cases had been pigeonholed after Joseph D. Nunan appeared as the counsel representing the defendants.

It should be noted, however, that following the exposure of the lax conditions existing in the Treasury Department, prosecution has been resumed upon those cases in which the statute of limitations had not expired.

Now I come to case No. 16, which is the first case in which Mr. Nunan appears:

The names of the taxpayer and his two companies are omitted in view of the fact that prosecution has been resumed.

Years involved:	*Proposed tax and penalty*
1943–47, inclusive	$1,791,708
1943–47, inclusive	1,041,501
1944–48, inclusive	2,337,343
Total	5,170,552

Investigation of these related cases was started on December 16, 1947, by the Intelligence Unit, and on February 1, 1951, they were stamped as received in the Penal Division, Office of the Chief Counsel, Bureau of Internal Revenue.

No indictment was obtained in this instance until after the exposures of the Treasury Department were well under way and Mr. Joseph D. Nunan had been denounced as an influence peddler. During the period of delay the statute of limitations for a portion of the period had expired.

Under date of July 16, 1953, the Treasury Department said, in answer to the question as to whether or not the accounts had been paid:

> No; cases have not reached the assessment stage, and, therefore, collection by administrative authority is not permitted under the law. In the absence of circumstances tending to indicate that the revenue is in jeopardy, action respecting civil liability is postponed pending disposition of the criminal features to avoid possible prejudice to the criminal case.

The names of the attorneys and accountants registered with the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice as representing the taxpayer are as follows:

Treasury Department: Joseph D. Nunan, Jr.; Bertram F. Bongard; Talbot M.

Malcom; Douglas H. Thayer; Justice Department; Joseph D. Nunan, Jr.; Walter A. Lynch; Douglas Thayer; Thomas McManus; Samuel Hochstein; Samuel Gellin, certified public accountant; Albert Solomon, certified public accountant.

Joseph D. Nunan, who heads the list as representing this taxpayer before both the Departments, entered the case sometime in 1950. Mr. Nunan had resigned as Commissioner of Internal Revenue on June 30, 1947.

I now take up case No. 17, the second case in which Mr. Nunan appears:

Name and address	Years involved	Proposed tax and penalty
Cone Bros. Contracting Co., Tampa, Fla.	1938–46, inclusive	$313,788
Cone Farms Co., Tampa, Fla.	1944–46, inclusive	146,923
Cone Grove Co., Tampa, Fla.	1943 and 1946	205,747
Julian L. Cone, Tampa, Fla.	1939–46, inclusive	1,093,326
Vera G. Cone, Tampa, Fla.	1944–46, inclusive	38,739
Vera G. and Rowena Lee Cone (partnership), Tampa, Fla.	do	119,549
Total		1,918,072

In this case the list of attorneys, as appearing on the records in the Treasury Department as defending the taxpayers, has the appearance of a Who's Who in former Treasury employees. Four were recent top officials, while two others had left the service many years previously. The list of attorneys and their former positions with the Treasury Department is as follows:

Name and former position:	*Date resigned*
Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	June 30, 1947
John P. Wenchel, Chief Counsel, Internal Revenue Service.	June 30, 1947
Robert A. Schulman, attorney, Office of Chief Counsel, Internal Revenue Service.	June 30, 1947
Ferdinand Tannenbaum, attorney, Internal Revenue Service.	Dec. 15, 1922
Sylvan Oestreicher, deputy collector.	Feb. 3, 1919
Leonard E. Ackerman, attorney, Office of Chief Counsel, Internal Revenue Service.	Aug. 4, 1947

The investigation upon these related cases was started by the Intelligence Unit on April 29, 1947; and on June 19, 1950, they were filed with the Penal Division of the Internal Revenue Service, with recommendations for prosecution. The proposed assessments, including penalties, aggregated nearly $2 million.

The records of the Department of Justice show that the case was never forwarded to them by the Treasury Department.

The Treasury on July 16, 1953, in reply to my inquiry as to whether the accounts were still unpaid, replied:

No. Open civil aspects under consideration in the Bureau.

Continuing, the Bureau explained that their decision not to send the case to the Department of Justice was based upon the testimony of Mr. John L. Fahs, former collector in Florida, that he had personally advised Mr. Cone to make a voluntary disclosure by filing amended returns.

They offer no explanation for the delayed collection.

I now come to case No. 18, the third case. In this case I am again omitting the name of the taxpayer, due to the fact that he is now deceased, having died in 1952; however, in view of the fact that the same pattern prevails it is being listed:

Year	Original tax	Proposed deficiency	Penalty
1942	$23,927.03	$15,471.07	$7,735.54
1943	35,853.27	40,278.34	21,648.29
1944	51,847.12	129,454.96	64,727.48
1945	64,774.99	91,437.94	45,718.97
Total	176,402.41	285,642.31	139,830.28

Proposed deficiency	$285,642.31
Penalty	139,830.28
Total	425,472.59

On November 28, 1949, Mr. Nunan filed an application for a special waiver or consent to handle this specific case.

The special waiver was necessary in this instance due to the fact that the case had been pending before the Bureau while Mr. Nunan was serving as Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The waiver was approved on December 14, 1949, by Mr. John L. Graves, chairman of the Committee on Practice, representing the Treasury Department.

At the time of the death of this individual—sometime in 1952—the case was still pigeonholed in the Treasury Department and labeled as: "Case not settled. Pending consideration in office of Internal Revenue Agent in Charge, Upper New York Division."

These 3 cases along with the 6 upon which I reported last February make a total of 9 cases as having now been reviewed, in which Joseph D. Nunan appeared as the counsel. In each instance the same pattern prevailed, namely, no prosecution and no collections after the taxpayers hired Mr. Nunan.

One of the cases mentioned in my remarks in the Senate on February 21, 1952, would bear review in the light of its recent disposition by the courts.

On that date I pointed out how Lawrence Bardin, of Racine, Wis., had in 1946 reported an income of approximately $500,000 upon which the original tax was computed as $426,382.89. However, Mr. Bardin, while apparently reporting his full income for that year, overlooked one slight item, namely, he failed to accompany his return with the necessary payment.

In November 1951, 5 years later, this account still remained unpaid, and the delinquency was called to my attention. I immediately contacted the Treasury Department for an explanation. Fourteen days after my inquiry, the Treasury Department, on December 5, 1951, confirmed the discrepancy, and announced that they were forwarding the case to the Department of Justice.

In my remarks, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14, 1952, I also pointed out how the same Mr. Lawrence Bardin and his brother Alvin, operating as the Indianapolis Brewing Co., had, during this intervening period settled an $812,000 tax case for the insignificant amount of $4,500, following which settlement the same corporation was paid an uncontested claim of $35,000 against the Treasury Department.

I also pointed out how two other corporations owned by the same brothers were likewise delinquent in their corporation taxes.

I now wish to read into the RECORD a letter received from Mr. Marshall E. Hanley, United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana, regarding the final disposition of the Lawrence Bardin case:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, May 25, 1953.

Re *United States v. Lawrence P. Bardin.*

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am happy to advise you that the above-entitled subject was convicted on two counts of income-tax evasion for the year 1946 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana on Friday, May 22, 1953. The court imposed a sentence of 4 years on each count, said sentences to run concurrently.

I thought that you would be interested in learning of the successful outcome of this prosecution in view of the fact that your efforts had a great deal to do with this matter coming to our attention. In preparing this case for trial, I relied to a great extent upon the February 21, 1952, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which sets forth your statement to the Senate concerning this case.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

MARSHALL E. HANLEY.

Mr. President, I appreciate the recognition which Mr. Hanley has given to the part which I played in exposing this case. Nevertheless, the real credit should go to the Intelligence agents who investigated and prepared the report on Mr. Bardin and his affiliated companies, and to the individual who at the risk of his job called my attention to the fact that the reports had been pigeonholed.

My remarks, as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, 1952, were taken in their entirety from the dust-covered files of the Bureau of Internal Revenue—from files and reports which should have been referred by that agency to the Department of Justice months before I ever heard of the case.

I extend my congratulations to the United States attorney in Indiana, Mr. Hanley, for the effective manner in which he handled the case, once the supporting evidence had been made available to his office.

I now discuss case No. 19. The next cases which I shall discuss involve the strange manner in which both prosecution and collection were dropped on a $7 million assessment, on the excuse that the taxpayer and the company were producing strategic materials for the Army.

It is interesting to note, however, that this case was pigeonholed in the Department files for 2 years prior to the outbreak of the Korean war, during which time no effort was made either to prosecute or to collect.

Then, after the Korean war broke out, they picked up the case, and within 3

months had rejected prosecution on the basis outlined above.

Nothing has been done since.

The history of this case is as follows:

Name and address	Years involved	Proposed tax and penalty
Howard Foundry Co., Chicago, Ill.	1943-45, inclusive	$5,061,280
Frank C. Howard, Chicago, Ill.	1943-46, inclusive	2,085,521
Total		7,146,801

On April 25, 1947, the Intelligence Unit began their investigation of this case, and their report and recommendations for criminal prosecution were filed with the Penal Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue on June 25, 1948.

It was not until December 12, 1950, nearly 2½ years later, that this case was ever referred to the Department of Justice.

On March 1, 1951, less than 3 months after its being received by the Department of Justice, the case was sent back to the Treasury Department with the notation that prosecution was declined apparently on the basis that the taxpayer was a supplier of strategic materials to the Armed Forces.

In the Department of Justice files there is a letter, dated January 13, 1951, signed by Frank Roberts, former Director of the Renegotiation of the Air Force Contracts, referring to this particular case. In Mr. Roberts' letter he makes no reference to having any knowledge as to the tax liability or the condition of the taxpayer's health but refers to his letter as only being written in reply to a question which he was asked in a telephone call from Mr. T. Lamar Caudle, who at that time was holding the position of Assistant Attorney General in the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. Apparently Mr. Caudle had called Mr. Roberts requesting information as to the importance of the part which the Howard Foundry Co. had in furnishing critical materials to the Armed Forces. Mr. Roberts' letter merely confirmed that they were large suppliers of strategic materials.

I fail to find any explanation, however, as to what or who prompted Mr. Caudle to request Mr. Roberts' opinion. Furthermore, I know of no reference in our tax laws which would indicate that such a claim by a taxpayer would be sufficient to excuse him from criminal prosecution for a $7 million tax evasion.

Nevertheless the record shows that within 1½ months after the receipt of this letter by the Department of Justice the decision had been made not to prosecute.

Notwithstanding the fact that this report by the Treasury agents recommending proposed tax deficiency, including penalties, of over $7 million was filed with the Penal Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue on June 25, 1948—over 5 years ago—we find that not only was prosecution dropped but the account still remains unpaid.

On July 16, 1953, the Treasury Department in reply to my inquiry as to whether or not any payments had been made on this $7 million account advised as follows:

> No; cases have not reached the assessment stage and, therefore, collections by administrative authority not permitted under the law. Open civil aspects under consideration in the Bureau.

Attorneys representing the taxpayers before the Treasury Department and the Justice Department were: Treasury Department: E. J. Quinn, J. F. Riordan, Eldon McFarland, W. A. Elliott; Justice Department: Eldon McFarland, Mr. McClerkim, Edward J. Quinn, Mr. Riordan, Mr. Elliott.

The next case is No. 20. The last case which I shall outline here today involves one in which the records of the Department of Justice indicate that their decision not to prosecute was in part based upon the recommendations of a Member of Congress.

According to the Department files this Member of Congress in an interview with Mr. Turner Smith, Chief of the Criminal Section, Department of Justice, suggested that it might be advisable to drop criminal prosecution due to the taxpayer's health.

The Member of Congress referred to admits having taken part in the conference but claims that he made no recommendations.

The case is as follows:

Name and address	Years involved	Proposed tax and penalty
Edward E. Jackson, Tampa, Fla.	1942-48, inclusive	$298,202.00
Samuel E. Jackson, Sidney, Ohio.	do	1,119,580.48
Jackson Steel Tube Co., Inc., Piqua, Ohio.	1947	873,509.62
Jackson Tube Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.	1949	424,663.21
Welded Steel Tube Corp., Piqua, Ohio.	1947-49, inclusive	92,920.00
Total		2,808,875.31

The chronological record of the handling of this case is as follows:

On November 30, 1948, the Intelligence Unit started its investigation.

On August 17, 1950, the Intelligence Unit's reports with recommendations for criminal prosecution were forwarded to the Penal Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which at that time was under Charles Oliphant.

On June 29, 1951, the Bureau of Internal Revenue forwarded these reports to the Department of Justice with recommendations for criminal prosecution.

In the Department of Justice files there appears a memorandum dated August 1951, signed by Turner Smith, who at that time was serving as Chief of the Criminal Section of the Department of Justice, and addressed to his superior, T. Lamar Caudle, the then Assistant Attorney General.

In this memorandum Mr. Smith explained that Representative CELLER of New York had on that date visited his office with another gentleman whom he had introduced as a law partner of his brother-in-law. The memorandum further states that Representative CELLER in this interview had explained that his relative who had been representing the Jackson people had just been appointed a judge and that the man whom he was then introducing would be taking his place in the case.

According to Mr. Smith's memorandum Representative CELLER emphasized that it was his personal opinion that the defendant should not be prosecuted for criminal violations due to his health but that the case was one which should be settled in the civil courts. Mr. Smith in this memorandum suggested to Mr. Caudle that should this be their ultimate decision it might be advisable for Mr. Caudle to call Representative CELLER direct and give him their favorable decision. Representative CELLER at that time held the position of chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives.

Three months later, on November 27, 1951, the Department of Justice concurred and returned the case to the Treasury Department, declining prosecution on the basis of the bad health of Samuel E. Jackson.

The Department of Justice records show that following this decision they reasoned that, since they were declining prosecution as to Samuel E. Jackson on grounds of health, they would also decline to prosecute Edward E. Jackson on the basis that Samuel E. Jackson was the key figure.

There the case rested until January 10, 1952, when both the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Department of Justice, as a result of the severe criticism they were receiving following the exposures of the scandals in those agencies, dropped the policy of the Treasury Department's determining these cases on the basis of health. The case was then resubmitted to the Department of Justice for further examination.

On March 25, 1952, the same Samuel E. Jackson was reexamined by a Dr. Zang, of New York City, who certified that the defendant's health was such that he could stand trial.

The Department of Justice then authorized prosecution of Samuel E. Jackson, but not of Edward E. Jackson, for evading the taxes of the Jackson Steel Tube Co. for the fiscal year 1946—action with respect to 1945 was now barred by the statute of limitations—and of the Welded Steel Tube Corp. for the fiscal year 1948 and of the Jackson Tube Co. for the fiscal year 1946.

On May 8, 1953, Samuel E. Jackson pleaded guilty and was fined $30,000 and sentenced to 2 years in each case, to be served concurrently; however, this sentence was suspended, and he was instead put on probation for 2 years.

The Treasury Department advised that as of July 16, 1953, this account still remained unpaid.

I quote their reply under that date to my question as to whether or not payments had been made:

> No; cases have not reached assessment stage. After disposition of the criminal aspects in May 1953, the civil features were referred to the appropriate Bureau field offices for action.

The Justice Department and the Treasury Department record the follow-

ing attorneys as having been registered to represent the taxpayer: Treasury Department: Thomas C. Best; Andrew E. Hurley; Emil N. Baar. Justice Department: Andrew E. Hurley; Maurice Celler, certified public accountant; Judge W. Mayock; Al Wheeler; Judge Baar; Mr. Lieberman; William G. Pickrel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated January 7, 1954, signed by me and addressed to Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., calling attention to a certain memorandum, and the references therein to him.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 7, 1954.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: In reviewing the tax case of Mr. Edward E. and Mr. Samuel E. Jackson, of Tampa, Fla., and Sidney, Ohio, along with their corporations, a memorandum dated in 1951 and signed by Mr. Turner Smith, addressed to his superior, Mr. T. Lamar Caudle, who at that time was serving as Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, has been called to my attention.

In this memorandum Mr. Smith explains to Mr. Caudle a visit which you made to his office accompanied by a gentleman whom you introduced as a law partner either of your brother or of your brother-in-law, who had been representing the Jackson people. According to Mr. Smith you explained that this relative had just been appointed judge, and that the man whom you were then introducing would be taking his place in the case. In Mr. Smith's memorandum he told Mr. Caudle that you had stated that it was your opinion that the defendant should not be prosecuted for criminal violations, due to his health, and requested that the case be settled in the civil courts.

In view of the fact that a report on this case is being considered, and the memorandum referred to above, or its substance, will appear in that report, I felt that it should be called to your attention prior thereto in order that you could have incorporated in that same report your explanation of the interview.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated January 26, 1954, signed by Representative EMANUEL CELLER and addressed to me, together with an accompanying letter under date of January 20, 1954, addressed to Representative CELLER and signed by Mr. Lawrence J. Lieberman.

I may say that both these letters explain Representative CELLER's version of the interview referred to, and I think it is only fair that they be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I received from Mr. Lawrence J. Lieberman, which has reference to the matter contained in your letter to me dated January 12, 1954.

I, personally, have no interest and have had no interest in the case of Samuel E. Jackson. I introduced Mr. Lieberman to Mr. Turner Smith, and recall saying that I felt reliance could be placed on the statements made by Mr. Lieberman, who is personally known to me as a lawyer of good standing. I also recall that I had no interest in and no knowledge whatsoever of the facts involving the case of Samuel E. Jackson.

In other words, I merely introduced Mr. Lieberman to Mr. Smith, and was careful to indicate the aforesaid facts.

Sincerely yours,
EMANUEL CELLER.

Enclosure.

BAAR, BENNETT & FULLEN,
New York, N. Y., January 20, 1954.

Re Samuel E. Jackson et al.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I have before me a copy of a letter of January 12, 1954, addressed to you by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS with reference to the above matters.

My partner, Emil N. Baar, was appointed a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York in 1951. The Jackson tax matter had been in his charge. I succeeded him in the representation of the clients.

Toward the end of July 1951, through associate counsel, I was advised that an indictment or information might be filed against Samuel E. Jackson within a matter of days to protect the Government against the statute of limitations' running on any returns involved, despite the fact that the Department of Justice was awaiting a report from the Public Health Service as to whether an indictment and trial might prove fatal to Samuel E. Jackson. It was my considered judgment that the Department of Justice had incorrectly applied the law and that in fact, if the Department waited until the Public Health Service report was received, not only would the statute not run against any returns that were then involved, but in our opinion, by reason of our knowledge of the client's physical condition, the finding of an indictment prior to consideration of the medical report would result in a miscarriage of justice. Since time was of the essence, I requested you to make an immediate appointment for me with whomever might be in charge of this case in the Department of Justice. On August 6, 1951, as I recollect the date, you introduced me to Mr. Turner Smith, whom you advised as to my taking Judge Baar's place in these matters. You also stated to Mr. Smith that it was my position that the defendant, because of the very precarious condition of his health, should not be prosecuted for criminal violations and that I also wanted to present before the Department a legal argument on the question of the statute of limitations which I confidently believed would demonstrate that there was no urgency in the immediate filing of an indictment, and that consequently, in all fairness, the report of the Public Health Service should be awaited before further action was taken. You will recall at the conclusion of the conference, I was advised by Mr. Smith that if the medical report did not arrive in due time, I would be given an opportunity to present argument on the legal question of the application of the statute of limitations.

In order that you may be fully apprised of subsequent developments, I give you the following information:

The Public Health Service report was such that not only was an indictment not filed, but the Department of Justice returned the matter for civil disposition. However, subsequently and for reasons which, particularly in the light of the foregoing, we never understood, Samuel E. Jackson was indicted in both New York and Ohio. Mr. Jackson pleaded "guilty" to both the New York and Ohio indictments. Under the rules, an application was made to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to have the New York case transferred to Ohio, where Jackson resided, which application was granted. By direction of the judge presiding in the United States district court in Ohio, the defendant was examined by Government physicians and medical proof was adduced as to his condition. By reason of Jackson's state of health, the court fined him $10,000 on each of three counts and sentenced him to 2 years in prison, which 2-year sentence was suspended.

I trust this gives you all the required information in this matter.

Very truly yours,
LAWRENCE J. LIEBERMAN.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF TERCENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF FOUNDING OF CITY OF NORTHAMPTON, MASS.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 93)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, ordered to lie on the table:

To the United States Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 987, "to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass."

The proposed legislation would authorize the coinage of 1 million silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.

The principal objection to commemorative coins is that they detract from the fundamental function of the coinage as a medium of exchange. Multiplicity of designs on United States coins would tend to create confusion among the public, and to facilitate counterfeiting. The Congress recognized the necessity for limiting the designs of coins by section 3510 of the Revised Statutes which provides that "no change in the design or die of any coin shall be made oftener than once in 25 years from and including the year of the first adoption of the design, model, die, or hub for the same coin."

I am further advised by the Treasury Department that in the past in many instances the public interest in these special coins has been so short-lived that their sales for the purposes intended have lagged with the result that large quantities have remained unsold and have been returned to the mints for melting.

I fully recognize the importance to the country of the event which this coin would commemorate. I recognize, too, that the authorization of 1 or 2 or 3 of such issues of coins would not do major harm. However, experience has demonstrated that the authorization of even a single commemorative issue brings forth a flood of other authorizations to commemorate events or anniversaries of local or national importance. In the administration of President Hoover, these

authorizations multiplied to the point where he felt compelled to exercise his veto. The same pattern recurred in the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. In view of this historical pattern, which by now has become so clear, I think that it is both wiser and fairer to make known my views on this subject at the outset. I therefore regretfully withhold my approval of S. 987.

As has been suggested in the past, it seems to me wholly appropriate that anniversaries like this one, which the Congress deems it desirable to commemorate, should be recognized by bills authorizing the Treasury to provide suitable commemorative medals at cost.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1954.*

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES TO COMMEMORATE THE TERCENTENNIAL OF FOUNDATION OF CITY OF NEW YORK—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 94)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, ordered to lie on the table:

To the United States Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 2474, "to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York."

The proposed legislation would authorize the coinage of not to exceed 5 million silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial of the founding of the city of New York.

The principal objection to commemorative coins is that they detract from the fundamental function of the coinage as a medium of exchange. Multiplicity of designs on United States coins would tend to create confusion among the public, and to facilitate counterfeiting. The Congress recognized the necessity for limiting the designs of coins by section 3510 of the Revised Statutes which provides that "no change in the design or die of any coin shall be made oftener than once in 25 years from and including the year of the first adoption of the design, model, die, or hub for the same coin."

I am further advised by the Treasury Department that in the past in many instances the public interest in these special coins has been so short lived that their sales for the purposes intended have lagged with the result that large quantities have remained unsold and have been returned to the mints for melting.

I fully recognize the importance to the country of the event which this coin would commemorate. I recognize, too, that the authorization of 1 or 2 or 3 of such issues of coins would not do major harm. However, experience has demonstrated that the authorization of even a single commemorative issue brings forth a flood of other authorizations to commemorate events or anniversaries of local or national importance. In the administration of President Hoover, these authorizations multiplied to the point where he felt compelled to exercise his veto. The same pattern recurred in the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. In view of this historical pattern, which by now has become so clear, I think that it is both wiser and fairer to make known my views on this subject at the outset. I therefore regretfully withhold my approval of S. 2474.

As has been suggested in the past, it seems to me wholly appropriate that anniversaries like this one, which the Congress deems it desirable to commemorate, should be recognized by bills authorizing the Treasury to provide suitable commemorative medals at cost.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1954.*

RETIREMENT OF EMPLOYEES IN THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 603. (a) Section 4 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) Any officer or employee in the legislative branch of the Government within the classes of officers and employees made eligible for the benefits of this act by the act of July 13, 1937, or the act of June 21, 1947, retiring under this act on or after the date of enactment of this subsection and after having rendered at least 6 years of service as such an officer or employee shall, if he so elects at the time of retirement, be paid, in lieu of an annuity computed under subsection (a), a life annuity equal to the sum of the following:

"'(A) 2½ percent of the average salary, pay, or compensation received by him during any five consecutive years of allowable service at his option multiplied by the sum of his years of service as an employee described in this subsection and the years of his allowable military or naval service; and

"'(B) 1½ percent of such average salary, pay, or compensation multiplied by the years of his allowable service other than service referred to in clause (A).

"'In no case shall an annuity computed under this subsection exceed an amount equal to 75 percent of the highest average annual salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during any 5 consecutive years of allowable service. No officer or employee shall be entitled to the benefits of this subsection unless there shall have been deducted and withheld from his salary, pay, or compensation for the last 5 years of his service, or there shall have been deposited under section 9 with respect to such last 5 years of service, the amounts specified in section 9.'

"(b) Section 3 (a) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any officer or employee in the legislative branch of the Government within the classes of officers or employees which were made eligible for the benefits of this act by the act of July 13, 1937, or the act of June 21, 1947, serving in such position on the date of enactment of this paragraph, may give notice of his desire to come within the purview of this act at any time prior to the expiration of 6 months after such date of enactment.'

"(c) Section 3A of such act is amended as follows:

"'(1) Paragraph (3) is amended to read as follows:

"'"(3) No person shall be entitled to receive an annuity as provided in this section until he shall have become separated from the service after having had at least 6 years of service as a Member of Congress and have attained the age of 62 years or after having had at least 10 years of service as a Member of Congress and have attained the age of 60 years, except that (A) any such Member who shall have had at least 5 years of service as a Member of Congress, may, subject to the provisions of section 6 and of paragraph (4) of this section, be retired for disability, irrespective of age, and be paid an annuity computed in accordance with paragraph (5) of this section, and (B) any such Member who shall have become separated from the service after having had a least 10 years of service as a Member of Congress and have attained the age of 55 years may receive an annuity computed as provided in paragraph (5) of this section reduced by one-fourth of 1 percent for each full month he is under the age of 60 years.'"

"'(2) Paragraph (5) is amended to read as follows:

"'"(5) Subject to the provisions of section 9 and of subsections (c) and (d) of section 4, the annuity of a Member of Congress shall be an amount equal to 2½ percent of the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by him during any 5 consecutive years of allowable service as a Member of Congress at his option multiplied by the sum of his years of service as a Member of Congress and his years of active service performed as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States prior to his separation from service as a Member of Congress, but no such annuity shall exceed an amount equal to three-fourths of the basic salary, pay, or compensation that he is receiving at the time of such separation from service.'"

"'(3) Paragraph (10) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and the term 'basic salary, pay, or compensation' includes amounts received as expense allowance under section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended; and the term 'active service performed as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States' means (A) active service performed as a member of such forces, during any war or national emergency proclaimed by the President or declared by the Congress, by a Member of Congress who left or leaves his office for the purpose of performing such service, and (B) any other periods of active service, not to exceed an aggregate of 5 years, performed as a member of such forces, but shall not include any such service for which credit is allowed for the purposes of retirement or retired pay under any other provision of law, including title II of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948."'

"(d) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (a) of the Act of February 28, 1948—

"(A) the last proviso in section 9 of the Civil Service Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall apply to Members of Congress; and

"(B) subsections (c) and (d) of section 12 of such act shall apply in the case of Members of Congress dying after the date of enactment of this section. Such subsections (c) and (d) shall apply to the widower of any such Member of Congress to the same extent and in the same manner as to the

widow of any such Member of Congress, if such widower shall have been married to such Member for at least 2 years immediately preceding her death or is the father of issue by such marriage.

"(2) Section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out 'section 4 (a) hereof' in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 4 (a) or 3A hereof, as the case may be,'; and by striking out 'section 1, 2, or 6' in paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 1, 2, 3A, or 6.'

"(3) Section 4 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended by the Act of August 4, 1939, which is referred to in paragraph (5) of section 3A of such act, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No person shall be eligible to receive an annuity under this subsection and an annuity under subsection (c) of section 12, based upon the service of the same officer or employee, covering the same period of time.'"

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KENNEDY conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive B, 83d Congress, 2d session, the International Sugar Agreement, dated at London October 1, 1953, and that the agreement, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, as in executive session, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the agreement, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the International Sugar Agreement, dated in London October 1, 1953.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to this matter.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1954.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Acting Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of the International Sugar Agreement.)

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have previously brought to the attention of the Senate misquotations of the text of the Constitution by partisans of the pending joint resolution and now I wish to set forth additional misrepresentations which have been widely disseminated, particularly with respect to the dissenting opinion in the case of the *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company et al.* v. *Charles Sawyer* (343 U. S. 579), commonly referred to as the Steel Seizure case, which was decided on June 2, 1952.

It is reported in the newspapers that Mr. Frank E. Holman, of Seattle, an ex-president of the American Bar Association, has traveled a half million miles over the United States warning the American people that the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution are endangered by what he calls treaty law. It is not his fault if he has failed to express alarm with the fervor of a prophet of woe and destruction at any convention or other assembly held anywhere in the Nation. For the past year and a half he has been pointing out the dissenting opinion of Chief Justice Vinson in the Steel Seizure case as a horrible example of how a treaty might be so construed as to make the United Nations Charter override the Constitution.

The issue in that case, as stated by Mr. Justice Black for the majority of the Court, was whether the President acting within the aggregate of his constitutional powers and as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, in a grave emergency, could seize the steel mills to avert a national catastrophe.

I am convinced that the majority of the membership of the Supreme Court correctly decided that the President was not acting within his constitutional power when he directed the seizure, and that in doing so he exercised a law-making function which the Constitution gives to Congress and not to the President.

Not satisfied that the majority opinion of the Supreme Court adequately disposed of the issue, Mr. Holman dragged into the dissenting opinion some other words not found therein when he stated, in his answer to the minority views on the pending resolution, that the Chief Justice and his associates held that:

> . . . acting under the [United Nations] Charter and other international commitments and implementing legislation based on "treaties" the President has powers not granted to him by the Constitution but even denied to him by the Constitution.

In his pamphlet on Treaty Law and the Constitution, Mr. Holman again refers to a dangerous threat to American rights by stating:

> But the Chief Justice of the United States in his dissent in the Steel Seizure case advanced the alarming doctrine that the United Nations Charter and other international arrangements and implementing legislation pursuant to the treaties gave the President of the United States authority to seize private property which authority is nowhere granted to him either by the Constitution or by the laws of the country.

Under his guidance, or rather misguidance, Mr. Holman has been followed up by statements such as the following in Spotlight, No. C–222, by Garet Garrett, which has been widely distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government:

> And it was the Chief Justice himself who argued that under the United Nations Charter, which is an international treaty, the President had power to do that which under the Constitution he was forbidden to do. His seizure of the steel properties, therefore, was legal—not under the Constitution of the United States but under the Charter of the United Nations. The Chief Justice, happily, was in the minority, supported by only two other members of the Court of nine.

In issue No. C–226 Spotlight printed an article entitled "Again the Issue Is Freedom" by Frank Chodorov, which reads:

> Nor should it be forgotten that the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court argued last year that the President of the United States had authority under the U. N. Charter, because it was an international treaty, to seize the steel mills, something he could not do under the Constitution. The basis for this reasoning is a clause in the U. N. Convention which gives the executive unlimited authority during a declared "emergency." Chief Justice Vinson succeeded in convincing two other members of the Court; six stood by the Constitution. If he had won over 2 of these 6 judges, a precedent in favor of the Charter and against the Constitution would have been established.

Then there is the Economic Council Letter No. 327, for January 15, 1954, which says:

> In 1952 Chief Justice Vinson and two Associate Justices of the Supreme Court upheld the power of the President to seize the steel industry. They based their findings on the mere ratification by the Senate of the U. N. Charter. This startling opinion elicited the phrase from an alarmed commentator, "Two Justices short of a revolution."

On January 27, 1954, an editorial appeared in the Washington News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, under the title "This Agreed," which contained the following statement:

> Three Justices of the Supreme Court in 1952 held that President Truman had the power to seize the steel mills as a wartime act solely because we had ratified the United Nations treaty.

Now comes Dr. Clarence E. Manion, ex-dean of law at the University of Notre Dame, who advertises that he has been in every State in the Union, many of them many times, asserting in his speeches that there is a tremendous unplugged hole in the Constitution which leaves our liberties subject to sudden destruction through a treaty or an executive agreement. It is quite certain that he has not failed to say elsewhere, if not everywhere, what he repeated in a speech delivered in Washington on January 26, 1954, from which I quote:

> In the famous Steel Seizure case three Supreme Court Justices were of the opinion

that the U. N. Charter and the North Atlantic Pact as they are now written justified the Presidential seizure of the steel mills, the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding.

Along with other propaganda which the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment have accepted without question, and included in their 16-page pamphlet entitled "Our Constitution has a Dangerous Loophole," is the following statement:

The fifth amendment to the Constitution says flatly that no person shall "be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law."

Yet under the powers granted the President by the U. N. Charter (a ratified treaty), Truman seized the steel industry. Fortunately, the Supreme Court declared this seizure unconstitutional. The decision was 6 to 3. Had two more Justices joined the minority, it would have set a court precedent which would have given the government the right to seize property . . . which could be your home, your farm, your business, the factory where you work!

In the February issue of The American Legion Magazine is a long article by Ray Murphy, a past commander of the American Legion, in which are assembled all of the usual or standard arguments in favor of the Bricker amendment. Mr. Murphy must be an able lawyer for otherwise he would not be the general counsel in New York City for the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies. Charity, therefore, compels me to say that he must not have read what Chief Justice Vinson actually said, but merely copied from something he saw printed, for otherwise he would not have included this section in the article. I read:

Though the three Justices were a minority and the steel mills were handed back to their owners by a majority of the Court, it is significant that the President had not made a strong point of his right to seize the steel mills under treaty powers. Despite that fact, the three Justices in the minority opinion went out of their way to stress the argument that the UN Charter should override the fifth amendment.

I have read these quotations to show the widespread circulation of this misrepresentation of what was said by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in dissenting from the majority opinion in the Steel case in order that I may say to the Senate that each and every such statement is without foundation in fact.

In a letter dated May 19, 1953, which I received from a constituent of mine, whom I had previously advised of my opposition to amending the Constitution as proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the American Bar Association, is the following paragraph:

I am going to make one last appeal. If you still feel there is no danger to our rights and privileges as American citizens, consider, please, the dissenting opinion of Chief Justice Vinson in the Steel Seizure case. But two more Justices, and we would have been committed to the doctrine that the United Nations Charter is superior to the Constitution of the United States.

After reading the letter very carefully I picked up the telephone and asked to be connected with the Chief Justice of the United States. I felt free to do so because I had served with him in the House of Representatives and we were always good friends. When he came to the telephone I read to him the paragraph I have quoted from the letter and asked for his comment on it. His immediate answer was that he never had any such idea in mind, and went on to say that I would find nothing in the dissenting opinion to justify any conclusion of that kind.

I promised the Chief Justice that I would read the dissenting opinion, and found when I did so that he, Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Minton had agreed upon a statement which cited certain United States statutes to show that by way of resisting worldwide Communist aggression congressional approval had been given to definite national policies in the following seven instances:

First. The United Nations Charter.

Second. The Truman plan for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Third. The Marshall plan for economic aid to Western Europe.

Fourth. The North Atlantic Treaty.

Fifth. Appropriations for military assistance to nations dedicated to the principles of mutual security.

Sixth. Authority to draft men into the Armed Forces.

Seventh. The Defense Production Act of 1950.

The dissenting opinion states:

The President has the duty to execute the foregoing legislative programs. Their successful execution depends upon the continued production of steel and stabilized prices of steel.

And that—

The President's action has thus far been effective, not in settling the dispute, but in saving the various legislative programs from destruction until Congress could act in the matter.

The dissenting opinion makes only this pertinent reference to the United Nations:

Accepting in full measure its responsibility in the world community, the United States was instrumental in securing adoption of the United Nations Charter, approved by the Senate by a vote of 89 to 2. The first purpose of the United Nations is to "maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace * * *." In 1950, when the United Nations called upon member nations "to render every assistance" to repel aggression in Korea, the United States furnished its vigorous support. For almost two full years, our Armed Forces have been fighting in Korea, suffering casualties of over 108,000 men. Hostilities have not abated. The "determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression" has been reaffirmed. Congressional support of the action in Korea has been manifested by provisions for increased military manpower and equipment and for economic stabilization, as hereinafter described.

While it is true that President Truman had not made any point of his right to seize the steel mills under treaty powers, there is not a word in the opinion to indicate that the Chief Justice and his associates went out of their way or otherwise to stress the argument that the U. N. Charter should override the fifth amendment, as asserted by Past Commander Murphy in The American Legion Magazine. The opinion cannot be construed to support the theory of legal authority of treaties over the Constitution. The basis of the dissenting argument was that the President, under the Constitution which imposed the duty upon him to see that the laws were faithfully executed, had the power which would in an emergency enable him to act temporarily to protect the security of the United States, until Congress could take action. It was the law of self-defense, or what Theodore Roosevelt called the stewardship theory.

Among the duties imposed upon the President as quoted in the dissenting opinion was the duty "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression." And when the United Nations called upon the United States to render every assistance to repel aggression in Korea, the United States vigorously responded. The next day, the President sent his message to the Congress asking for its decision on the way to handle the situation.

There is no intimation in the dissenting opinion that the United Nations Charter gave the President any power to seize the steel mills, any more than the acts of Congress implementing the Truman doctrine in Greece and Turkey, the Marshall plan, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization gave such power. They were each enumerated as indicating the duties imposed by law upon the President, which he in turn was bound to execute. They were the facts from which the dissenting Justices justified the finding that there was an emergency which brought into play the implied powers of the President to act to protect the life and security of the Nation. Far from intimating that the United Nations Charter should override the fifth amendment or any other part of the Constitution, the charter was cited only as a fact, among others, that the President could have relied upon to demonstrate the existence of an emergency.

The Chief Justice's argument went like this: By our obligations under the treaty referred to as the United Nations Charter, the United States agreed to take collective action to stop aggression when called upon by the United Nations. The United Nations called, and the United States vigorously responded. The fighting in Korea required munitions, which required steel, and all of this required the steel mills to operate without interruption by strike or otherwise.

Our obligations under the United Nations Charter led to armed conflict, but only remotely and incidentally did it involve the President's exercise of the power to seize the steel mills. By no stretch of the imagination could the charter be said to be the basis for the exercise of the power. It was cited only as one of the things creating the emergency. Even the fact of emegency created no powers. As Chief Justice

Hughes said in *Home Building & Loan Association* v. *Blaisdell* (290 U. S. 398, 426):

> While emergency does not create power, emergency may furnish the occasion for the exercise of power.

The statement in the dissenting opinion that the seizure was for the purpose of saving the various legislative programs at stake from destruction until Congress could act should make it perfectly clear to any reasonable person that all of the alarming quotations I have read which assert or imply that what Chief Justice Vinson said would make the United Nations Charter or any other treaty paramount to the Constitution of the United States is pure demagoguery, which, in my opinion, disgraces all those who have indulged in it.

The seizure of the steel mills was not for all time or for any particular period of time, but only until Congress could act in the matter. If two more Justices had joined with the Chief Justice and the two other Justices, the effect would have been to compel Congress to give immediate consideration to legislation which would empower the President either to continue to retain control of the steel mills or to direct their return to the owners.

The senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has developed ample evidence that the steel strike seriously delayed the production of needed munitions for the conflict in Korea and at a very substantial increased cost in money to the American taxpayer.

There is no doubt at all that the immediate effect of the decision made at that time by the majority of the Justices of the Supreme Court took Congress "off the hook." I can properly add that up to this hour the Congress has failed to lay down any guidance to the Chief Executive as to what he will have authority to do in time of great emergency when steel is urgently needed or when the vital interests of the entire Nation may be endangered by a widespread interruption of transportation or of communications. I am sure that most of the Members of this body agree that Congress should give guidance of that kind, in some degree, to the President and should do so in a period of calm when there is no immediate need for the exercise of such authority.

As further evidence that there is no basis in fact for the repeated misinterpretation of the Vinson dissenting opinion, I can state that I had an opportunity to ask Mr. Justice Burton, with whom I served in the Senate, as to what he knew about the assertions that the Chief Justice had stated that a treaty could become superior to the Constitution. His reply was that he was sure that the Chief Justice did not say or even imply anything of that kind.

To substantiate his reply, Justice Burton pointed out that it is an established practice, which was followed in the Steel case, for drafts of the majority opinion and all concurring and dissenting opinions to be submitted in writing to all members of the Supreme Court, which often results in modifications of statements made in the final opinions. He and all the other five Justices in the majority had an opportunity to read and study what the Chief Justice proposed to say. Justice Burton then went on to say that if any implication could be drawn from the words written by the Chief Justice to indicate that the Constitution was to be subordinated to the United Nations Charter or to any treaty, some of the six justices who disagreed with him would not have failed to notice it, and to comment from the bench upon such a revolutionary idea.

What Fred Vinson and Harold Burton told me leads to but one conclusion: All those who believe that the dissenting opinion in the Steel case would give treaties greater force and effect than the Constitution of the United States must have convinced themselves that Frank Holman and Clarence Manion are much smarter men than any and all of the members of the Supreme Court who participated in the decision itself. Each of them is fully qualified to make amazing discoveries of menaces to our liberties that do not exist. They both have the unquestioned ability to read words spoken by the Chief Justice and to make them convey a meaning of which he never even dreamed. As industrious and indefatigable spreaders of alarm, Mr. Holman and Mr. Manion are without peer in the entire Republic.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated January 29, 1954, addressed to the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] by the Hon. John W. Davis. I served in the House of Representatives with Mr. Davis in 1912 and until he resigned to become the Solicitor General of the United States from 1913 to 1918. I also heartily supported him for President of the United States in 1924.

Mr. Davis, as chief counsel for the plaintiffs, made the winning argument which resulted in denying to the President the right to seize the steel mills. Certainly, by reason of rendering that service in arguing the case before the Supreme Court, Mr. Davis is in position to indicate clearly as he does in his letter, that the Chief Justice of the United States made no assertion of the superiority of the United Nations Charter over the Constitution of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVIS, POLK, WARDWELL,
SUNDERLAND & KIENDL,
New York, N. Y., January 29, 1954.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of January 27.

I am glad to know that you do not feel compelled to vote for the Bricker amendment if it is in the form in which it was reported from the Judiciary Committee.

I am not greatly disturbed by the opinion of Chief Justice Vinson in the Steel Seizure case. Gravely as I dissent from his reasoning, I hardly think either he or his two colleagues in dissent intended to draw from the Charter of the United Nations support for the position that President Truman had the power to seize the steel mills. He was more concerned in building up a picture of the times and the climate rather than pointing to the U. N. Charter as a source of Presidential authority. He was examining the context in which the President had acted. In building up his argument for an implied grant by Congress you will note the Chief Justice cited not only the United Nations Charter but the action in Korea, congressional enactments of foreign-aid programs, Senate approval of the North Atlantic Treaty, congressional implementation of that treaty, and other congressional legislation implementing our efforts to stop aggression. He also alluded to congressional appropriations for defense, for military assistance, the Mutual Security Act of 1951, the congressional direction to the President to build up our defenses, appropriations acts, and numerous other enactments designed to strengthen our national security and to implement the conduct of the Korean war. From all these actions the Chief Justice sought to build up an enlarged view of Presidential authority, going even so far as the right to take private property by Presidential seizure without due process of law. I quote some of the Chief Justice's words:

"There is no statute prohibiting seizure as a method of enforcing legislative programs * * *.

"* * * the single Presidential purpose disclosed on this record is to faithfully execute the laws by acting in an emergency to maintain the status quo, thereby preventing collapse of the legislative programs until Congress could act * * *.

"* * * A sturdy judiciary * * * must independently determine for itself whether the President was acting, as required by the Constitution, 'to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.'

"* * * Faced with the duty of executing the defense programs which Congress had enacted and the disastrous effects that any stoppage in steel production would have on those programs, the President acted to preserve those programs by seizing the steel mills. * * * On the contrary, judicial, legislative and executive precedents throughout our history demonstrate that in this case the President acted in full conformity with his duties under the Constitution. * * *"

The answer to the question as to what would have been the result had the Chief Justice prevailed on just two or more justices to unite with him in his viewpoint is that, in my opinion, a serious miscarriage of justice would have occurred. Congress might have dealt with such a miscarriage either by acquiescing in the Court's finding of previous Congressional intent or it might have passed a statute making it clear that it had no intent to give such arbitrary seizure power to the President. It is not unknown that when Congress disagrees with the Court's determination as to its intent it has in an orderly fashion changed the law. Presumably the Congress will do so time and again in the future and our Congressional processes will continue to function as they have in the past.

I am in entire agreement with what Attorney General Brownell said as to the argument of the Chief Justice when he spoke before the Senate Judiciary Committee:

"I think the basis for the dissent is all these Acts of Congress * * * that impose obligations on the President to implement them. * * * It rests on the view that the President's alleged power to seize the steel mills arose from his duty to execute the legislative programs of the Congress and not from any implication that any treaty gave the President power to seize private property."

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. DAVIS.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I do not desire to encumber the RECORD with extensive remarks, but representations which have been made by supporters of

the Bricker amendment have shown such a total lack of understanding of the potentialities of the amendment and of the constitutional situation that I feel it is necessary to discuss some of the points of danger.

I shall direct my remarks today principally to two provisions of the proposed constitutional amendment which, I feel strongly, would cripple this Nation's conduct of its foreign affairs. These two provisions, which constitute the heart of the proposed amendment, are the so-called "which" clause and the provision permitting "regulation" by Congress of executive agreements.

I am very glad the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] discussed the steel case, which has been so often misunderstood.

Why am I so strongly opposed to the "which" clause? Because it would overturn one of the fundamental principles of the Constitution, and would set back the clock 170 years to the time when the United States lived under the Articles of Confederation.

The Constitution at one time was aptly described as a fence enclosing a field of Federal Government. By a contract called the Constitution, the States gave to the Federal Government its power. It is very significant to remember that by that fence the States were specifically prevented from exercising any right to handle foreign affairs, including treaties. The power to conduct such affairs was vested solely in the Federal Government. It was specifically provided that the States could not enter into treaties with foreign countries.

It is no exaggeration to say that if the great leaders of the Revolutionary era had not brought about the "more perfect union" embodied in the Constitution, we never would have become the great nation and world power we are today. We would still be a collection of loosely associated individual republics, each jealous of its own sovereignty, with no more stability, unity, or influence over world affairs than the nations of South America or of southeastern Europe.

It is from our union that we derive our strength. The effect of the proposed amendment would be to sap that strength by seriously weakening the Union and returning this land to its preconstitutional state.

One of the principal weaknesses of the Confederation lay in the fact that, although the Continental Congress had the power to make treaties, it did not have the power to make the States observe them. When the State did not abide, for example, by the provisions of the Treaty of Paris, which prohibited the prosecution of British sympathizers or the confiscation of British property, all the Continental Congress could do was unanimously to adopt a resolution that all State laws restraining the execution of a national treaty ought to be repealed. As a result of the failure of the individual States to comply with the Treaty of Paris, the British, in retaliation, continued to occupy fortresses in our Northwest Territory in violation of the treaty provision requiring them to withdraw from our soil.

It is not surprising, then, that the problem of putting an end to this sorry state of affairs and providing for the proper enforcement of treaties was one of the first and most urgent subjects taken up at the Constitutional Convention in 1787. Past experience had demonstrated only too well, as James Madison put it, "the necessity of some adequate mode of preventing the States in their individual characters from defeating the constitutional authority of the States in their united character."

The Founding Fathers accordingly embodied in the Constitution the principle, which is fundamental to our form of government, that the treatymaking power is vested exclusively in the Federal Government and that the States must abide by the commitments made by this Nation in its treaties with foreign nations.

Specifically, the Constitution provides that the President shall have power to make treaties, with the advice and consent of the Senate. No treaty can become law unless it is ratified by two-thirds of the Members present in this body. Having thus vested the treaty-making power in the National Government, the Constitution goes on to state that no State shall enter into any treaty, allegiance, or confederation, and also that no State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State or with a foreign power. Two States cannot enter into an agreement to build a bridge without the authority of Congress.

All these provisions were adopted by the Constitutional Convention without a single dissent, thus showing how basic is the principle that the National Government, and not the States, shall conduct our foreign affairs. These provisions must also be read in light of the supremacy clause of the Constitution, which provides:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

This provision is the foundation stone of our system of government; without it, the Constitution could never have created a nation.

I would point to one illustration of the operation of the new constitutional scheme adopted by the Founding Fathers and embodied in the provision I have just mentioned. Under the Treaty of Paris, ending the Revolutionary War, the United States covenanted, among other things, not to confiscate the property of British subjects nor to hinder the enforcement of claims held by them. In direct conflict with this provision of the treaty was a statute of the State of Virginia, enacted during the war, which provided for the discharge of all debts owed to British subjects. Prior to the adoption of the Constitution, the Continental Congress, as we have seen, was powerless to enforce compliance by Virginia with this international obligation of the United States.

Shortly after the adoption of the Constitution, however, the Supreme Court, in a historic decision, struck down the Virginia statute as violative of the British treaty and thus repugnant to the supreme law of the land. This was the case of *Ware* v. *Hylton* (3 Dall. 199), decided in 1797. Thus did the framers of the Constitution succeed in making the Federal Government supreme in the field of foreign affairs and in enforcing compliance by the States with our treaties with other nations.

The basic achievement of the framers of the Constitution would be reversed and nullified by the second section of the proposed amendment, and that is why I am so vigorously opposed to its adoption. This is dramatically illustrated by the fact that the case of Ware against Hylton—decided, as I have said, in 1797—would have to be decided differently if the "which" clause were made a part of our Constitution. The treaty provision involved in that case dealt with a subject; namely, the enforcement of private claims in State courts, which is not included in the enumerated powers granted by the Constitution to the Congress and which is, therefore, ordinarily within the powers reserved to the States under the 10th amendment. The power of the Federal Government to deal with that subject rested, therefore, solely upon its treaty power, for certainly the reciprocal enforcement of the claims of one country in the courts of another is a proper subject of negotiation with foreign powers. Under the second section of the proposed amendment, however, a treaty provision of this sort could not be enforced against a State unless that particular State had passed implementing legislation specifically consenting to such enforcement of the treaty. Since Virginia, of course, had not given its consent to the pertinent provision of the treaty with Great Britain, the Supreme Court in the Ware against Hylton case would have to sustain the inconsistent State statute and declare the treaty unenforceable in Virginia.

Thus, the proposed amendment would, in effect, require the approval of treaties by all 48 States before they could become effective as internal law. The amendment would thus negative one of the principal accomplishments of the Constitution and return us to the chaos of pre-Constitution days, when the Federal Government lacked the power to represent and to bind the States in dealings with other nations.

The effect upon the conduct of our international relations in this critical period of world history would be catastrophic. We would be at a severe disadvantage in dealing with other nations. Our President would not be empowered to represent the entire Nation. He would have to explain that he was simply a bargaining agent for 48 separate sovereignties, and that undertakings agreed to by him were not only subject to the approval of the Senate, but were conditioned upon affirmative expressions of approval by the legislature of each of the States that comprise what used to be known as the Union. I use the words "used to be," because, if the

Bricker amendment went into effect, I think the words would be appropriate.

The practical effect, of course, would be that this Nation would be disabled from engaging in diplomatic relations with other nations. We would be forced into isolationism—which, I believe, is the real reason why some of the self-styled patriotic organizations favor this amendment—with the most damaging consequences to this Nation and to the rest of the free world, which looks to us for leadership.

Mr. President, I think of the story of the distinguished bishop, who, in the early days of the West, was calling on the president of a college. While they were at lunch the bishop made the statement that he thought the end of the world would come soon, because we had made all the discoveries it was possible to make, and all the inventions it was possible to conceive. The president of the institution took issue with him. He said he did not think we had gone that far. He thought that within 50 years men would fly in the air like the birds. The bishop practically condemned him to everlasting torment, because, he said, that was reserved for the angels. The bishop, however, had one son named Wilbur Wright and another son named Orville, who made it possible for men to fly in the manner the bishop had condemned. The advocates of isolationism forget that we ourselves brought into being aviation, which has in effect reduced the size of the Atlantic Ocean to the size of the English Channel in the days of sailing ships.

How, for example, could we enter into treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation with other nations? Such treaties are designed to protect American citizens and American businesses abroad. They normally provide for reciprocal rights for nationals of each contracting nation to acquire property, carry on business, and to be free from discriminatory taxation within the territory of the other contracting nation. These are fields which are customarily within the province of the States and as to which Congress, in the absence of treaty, could not legislate. Therefore it would appear that under the "which" clause, in order that treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation could be effective, each of the 48 States would have to enact implementing legislation expressing its consent to enforcement of the reciprocal provisions of the treaty within its borders. In practice, of course, it would become impossible for this Nation to negotiate such treaties and secure these important protections for its citizens and their business interests abroad.

I wonder what would happen to the salmon-fishing industry and the sealhunting industry if we abrogated the joint international control treaty which applies to the northwestern waters.

Were the proposed amendment to become law it would similarly be impossible to negotiate treaties such as the one ratified by the Senate on July 15, 1953, regulating the status of our military forces in foreign countries. This type of treaty normally provides a limited immunity for our forces from the local jurisdiction of the country in which they are stationed, a subject which is of considerable importance to us in view of the large forces we maintain outside the United States. Yet in order to negotiate these privileges for our forces, we must in fairness agree to accord like privileges to the forces of the other treaty nations stationed within our borders, small as such forces may be. However, under the proposed amendment, the Federal Government could not agree to grant such reciprocal immunity, except it be conditioned upon the express approval of the legislatures of each of the 48 States. As a practical result, of course, we could not obtain such a treaty.

It is obvious that many treaties contain provisions affecting matters normally within the sole cognizance of the States and would therefore, under the proposed amendment, require the approval of all the States as a condition to becoming effective. Almost every peace treaty could be expected to come within the scope of the proposed amendment, for peace treaties customarily contain reciprocal provisions affecting internal law. An important example is the Treaty of Peace with Japan, ratified by the Senate in 1952, which provides for the protection of prewar debts. In fact, Secretary of State Dulles has accurately pointed out that 12 of the 23 treaties approved by the Senate last year would have been unconstitutional under the proposed amendment, and that 8 of these were ratified by a Senate vote of 86 to 1.

The proposed amendment would disable this country from entering into treaties for the international control of narcotics, for such treaties normally require each nation to covenant to prohibit the growth of poppy plants and other sources of drugs within its borders.

Even more dangerous would be the roadblocks the proposed amendment would place in the way of reaching international agreements for the control of atomic energy. These agreements would necessarily affect purely intrastate matters, such as the ownership of atomic mining and manufacturing properties. As is stated in the report of the special committee appointed by the American Bar Association to investigate the proposed constitutional amendment:

> The adoption of the "which" clause might strip Congress of the power to implement an international atomic energy control plan and vest the determination of the extent of United States participation in the efforts at international control of atomic energy in the legislatures of the 48 States.

It was this aspect of the proposed amendment which led the minority of the Judiciary Committee to warn "not to make the means for peace unconstitutional."

The matters of which I speak are serious. They show that adoption of the "which" clause would not merely be ill-advised; it could be suicidal. It would effectively place a straitjacket upon the conduct of our international affairs. In the words of the association of the bar of the city of New York—which, unlike the American Bar Association, adopted its special committee's findings:

> We would stop being a complete Nation like others, able to make treaties on any subject on which they can, and become instead only a partial Nation.

This would be more than ever dangerous and foolish at the present juncture of world history, when the peace of the world may depend upon flexibility in the conduct of our relations with other nations. It would be more than irresponsible for the Senate to approve this ill-considered amendment and upset the constitutional plan which has worked so well for more than 160 years.

I have been speaking against the proposed amendment, and I have been outlining the reasons why it should not be adopted. I believe, however, that the burden should be upon those who propose this radical change in the document which is our Nation's charter. In my opinion, they have failed to establish in the slightest degree that the constitutional procedure established by the Founding Fathers for the making of treaties has worked badly, or that under it treaties that have not been in the interest of the Nation have been enacted. Neither have they shown why it has suddenly become necessary, after so many years of operating under the constitutional plan, to make the fundamental changes they advocate.

Do the proponents of the "which" clause believe the Constitution does not sufficiently protect the Nation against indiscriminate and improper exercise of the treatymaking power? The wise framers of our Constitution, believing strongly in a system of checks and balances, expressly provided that a treaty concluded by the President cannot take effect unless it is approved by two-thirds of the Senators present.

Mr. President, why is the Senate, alone, specified, as between the two branches of the Congress, as the one which, by two-thirds vote, must approve treaties before they can be effective? That is because in the Senate each State regardless of its size, has the same number of votes. That is why that power was placed in the Senate, inasmuch as in the Senate each State has equal power.

Do the proponents of this amendment suggest that even one-third of the Members of the Senate cannot be trusted to strike down treaties which are ill-conceived or unfavorable to this country or violative of the fundamental rights and liberties of our citizens? History refutes such a suggestion. It is not without reason that the Senate has been called the graveyard of treaties.

Is it feared by the proponents of this amendment that the rights of the States are not protected by our historic procedure? Again, there is no basis for such a fear, for here in the Senate each State, regardless of its population, has an equal voice. If, through their representatives in the Senate, two-thirds of the States vote affirmatively on the question of the approval of a treaty, then I say the national interest requires that it take effect.

To sum up my views on the second section of the joint resolution: The "which" clause represents a radical change in our constitutional system. It would

drastically alter the historic treaty-making procedure embodied in the Constitution. It would return us to the discredited state of affairs which prevailed under the Articles of Confederation, when treaties could not be enforced in the States without their consent. It would strike at the heart of our Federal system, by reviving the sovereignty of the States in international affairs. It would disable the United States from reaching accords with other nations, because of the uncertainty and doubtfulness of ever getting all 48 States—some of whose legislatures meet only every 2 years—to pass the necessary implementing legislation. It would return us to isolationism, and would deprive us of our partnership with the rest of the free world in this time of danger.

As to the requirement of the second section of the joint resolution—namely, that no treaty shall become effective as internal law except by legislation—there is no need for it. If there were no harm in permitting the provisions of a particular treaty to be self-executing, the proposed amendment would impose upon us the most cumbersome treatymaking procedure in the world. It would require five separate approvals before the treaty could take effect—as follows: First, signature by the President; second, ratification by two-thirds vote of the Senators present; third, approval by majority vote of the House of Representatives; fourth, approval by majority vote of the Senate; and, finally, fifth, signature by the President of the requisite law.

On the other hand, if it were felt that the internal-law provisions of a treaty should not be self-executing, the treaty itself could expressly so provide, or, if it failed to do so, the requirement of supporting legislation could be attached by the Senate as a reservation at the time when it voted to approve the treaty, because we must realize, Mr. President, that the Senate has the right to adopt reservations to the resolution of ratification of a treaty, and in that way to limit the treatymaking power. No need exists for freezing into immutable constitutional doctrine a provision that no treaty can ever be self-executing as internal law.

I shall move on to the provision of the joint resolution that, after the "which" clause, poses the greatest danger to the proper conduct of our affairs with other nations. That is the clause, set forth in the third section of the joint resolution, which provides that Congress shall have power to regulate all executive or other agreements with any foreign power or international organization.

What is meant by the innocent-sounding word "regulate"? The fact is, of course, that at present Congress can exercise a substantial measure of control over executive agreements. Congress can by legislation override any executive agreement—or even a treaty, so far as domestic law is concerned. Moreover, the courts have quite properly held that an executive agreement which is not expressly authorized by Congress, and which contravenes a prior act of Congress dealing with the same subject matter, is simply void as domestic law.

In addition to this legislative control over executive agreements, Congress has another very effective means of control namely, by reason of its power over appropriations—for executive agreements, like most other things in life, cannot be successfully implemented and carried out without the necessary funds.

So it is misleading to imply that at present Congress has no power to regulate executive agreements. True it is that the power to enter into such agreements is vested in the executive branch of our Government, but that must be the case, for the Government has to make any number of agreements with other nations, in the course of its day-to-day operations.

These agreements deal with such various subjects as the inspection of vessels, the admission of civil aircraft, customs matters, commercial relations, international claims, postal matters, registration of trade marks and copyrights, and so on. Power to conclude such agreements must be placed in the executive. It would be an impossible and intolerable situation if this country's ordinary affairs with other nations had to be conducted by 435 Representatives and 96 Senators.

The fact is, however, as I have pointed out, that Congress is not without power to control these agreements. Consider, for example, the statute, enacted in 1950, which requires publication of all executive agreements within 1 year following their effective date, so as to prevent undue secrecy on the part of the executive branch in concluding the agreements.

The proponents of the "regulation" clause, however, are not satisfied with merely being able to regulate executive agreements. They ask the power to prohibit them altogether, and to make congressional consent necessary to the conclusion of any such agreements. In fact, one version of the resolution contained a clause expressly conditioning the power to conclude executive agreements upon prior congressional approval. It is plain to see that it is hoped that this same result can be indirectly achieved through the deceptively innocent language of the third section of the present resolution. The majority report of the Judiciary Committee points out that "the power to regulate carries with it the power to prohibit." The majority also say that under the regulation clause, Congress could prescribe the conditions, limitations or prohibitions under which executive agreements could be made.

In short, were the Constitution amended in the manner suggested in the third section of the resolution, Congress could pass a statute providing—in the identical language used by the Senator from Ohio in his own original resolution—that executive agreements shall be made "only in the manner and to the extent to be prescribed by law." In other words, unless Congress expressly authorizes the same by statute, the executive may not enter into an executive agreement.

As I have already shown, such a law would be absurd—and tragic. It would produce a complete stalemate in our foreign policy, by making it literally impossible for the State Department to conduct our day to day relations with other nations. And our country would be placed in the position where there would be no one who could act in foreign affairs on matters of urgency and dispatch.

Not only would the proposed "regulation" amendment authorize such a state of affairs, but, as I have shown, that appears to be the very design of its draftsmen. I believe it a very foolish and a very dangerous thing to attempt thus to stifle our international affairs. In this contracted world of the 20th century, when free intercourse among the nations of the world is of such vital importance, the proposed "regulation" clause would have enormously dangerous consequences for our Nation.

I wish to make it very clear that this "regulation" clause is not really what it first appears to be—that is, a mere attempt to prevent the utilization of executive agreements as a substitute for treaties. No one can feel more strongly than I do that it is improper for the executive to use the executive agreement as a substitute for the purpose of avoiding the necessity of ratification by the Senate. But I most assuredly do not believe that the way to avoid this is to incorporate in our organic law a provision that would authorize Congress to prevent the Executive from entering into any executive agreements without its consent.

I do not believe it possible to define for all time what types of international agreement shall take the form of a treaty and what types shall take the form of an executive agreement. The possible situations are too numerous and too difficult to categorize and pigeonhole to permit of such easy definition. It would therefore be dangerous to undertake to do so. As the Secretary of State has said:

> This is an area to be dealt with by friendly cooperation between the three departments of Government which are involved, rather than by attempts at constitutional definition, which are futile, or by the absorption, by one branch of Government, of responsibilities which are presently and properly shared.

In any event, it is clear that the proponents of the third section of the resolution have not even attempted such definition. Instead they have come forward with a dangerous and ill-considered proposal that would authorize the destruction of the vitally important power which the Executive has exercised since the earliest days of the Republic, to conclude executive agreements with foreign governments.

I have discussed, as I promised at the beginning of my remarks, two provisions of the resolution which, in my opinion, would have the most serious consequences for this Nation: the "which" clause, and the provision for congressional "regulation" of executive agreements. Before closing my remarks, I would briefly refer to the first section of the proposed constitutional amendment.

That section would amend the Constitution to read as follows: "A provision of

a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect." One reading this provision would get the impression that at the present time the Government may lawfully conclude treaties which do violate the Constitution. Nothing could be further from the truth. Constitutional lawyers agree that a treaty contravening any of the provisions of our organic law would be struck down as unconstitutional. I need quote but one of the many statements to that effect by the Supreme Court of the United States, as follows:

> It need hardly be said that a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument. This results from the nature and fundamental principles of our Government. (*The Cherokee Tobacco* (11 Wall. 616, 620–621).)

The only purpose for including this first section in the resolution, it seems to me, was to seek to create the impression that unconstitutional enactments could be effected through exercise of the treaty power, and that a constitutional amendment was thus imperative. The fact, as we have seen, is otherwise. Nor do I believe, as do the proponents of the Knowland substitute, that an amendment declaring that treaties must comply with the Constitution should be adopted notwithstanding, as all appear to concede, that it simply restates existing law, according to the long-standing interpretation of the Supreme Court. In other words, the result would be mere redundancy in the Constitution.

I do not believe in unnecessary amendment of our Constitution. That great document has more than stood the test of time. Framed by some of the most brilliant and foresighted men of any age, it has made of the separate States a Nation, a Federal Union, that has had most phenominal growth and the most extraordinary record of freedom and liberty that the world has ever known. Not the least successful of its provisions have been those regulating the conduct of our Nation's international relations and the exercise of the treaty power. The proponents of the resolution have utterly failed to establish the need for amendment of these provisions. I would therefore vote down the entire proposed amendment—in part, as unnecessary, and in larger part, as unwise and dangerous in the extreme.

I would vote down not only the original joint resolution, but all so-called substitutes which would have a similar effect. Let me say, from the bottom of my heart, that we are not debating a law, in the ordinary sense of legislation in the Senate. We are debating the future of the Nation.

The joint resolution would produce the exact opposite of what its proponents claim for it. Instead of producing a stronger United States it would produce a far weaker United States.

Mr. President, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has performed a valuable public service in preparing a comprehensive bibliography of material relating to the treatymaking power of the United States. I believe that it will be of use to every Member of the Senate who is concerned with this important subject, and I should like to include it in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the bibliography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the record of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, vol. 9, No. 2, February 1954]

TREATYMAKING POWER OF THE UNITED STATES—A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL GUIDE

(Compiled by Sidney B. Hill)

On February 7, 1952, Senate Joint Resolution 130 (the Bricker resolution) was originally sponsored by 59 Senators to stimulate full discussion of the treatymaking power of the Government.

On January 7, 1953, Senate Joint Resolution 1 was introduced through Senator BRICKER, by proponents interested in curtailing the powers of the Executive with respect to the treatymaking power.

Hearings on the amendment were held and Senate Report 412, 83d Congress, 1st session, was printed. On page 2 of the majority report there appears this statement, "As a result of these hearings, the study of the peace and law committee of the American Bar Association and other studies, it may fairly be said that the issue of amending the treaty power has been exhaustively considered."

With due respect for the statement referred to above it was found upon seeking material for study that no comprehensive guide to literature on the subject of the treatymaking power of the United States was available.

Recognizing that the Bricker amendment involves fundamental constiutional changes and would have great effect upon international and domestic problems, the librarians of this association upon publication of the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee undertook to ascertain and catalog the material which it appeared would be needed for any scholarly and searching examination of the problems involved by the proposed resolution.

In the hope that a full presentation of the problems which would be created by the proposed constitutional change will be demanded by adherents to both sides of the question, the following checklist of 500 references for study on the treatymaking powers of the United States have been compiled.

It is submitted that adequate study may be made by Members of Congress, opponents, and proponents of the Constitutional proposal, that the voters may come to a decision of their own, as to whether it is advisable again to amend the Constitution of the United States.

Abbott, Lyman. The power of the government to make a general arbitration treaty. Lake Mohonk, 1905.

Adams, John Quincy. Memoirs, Charles Francis Adams, ed. 12 vols. Phila., 1874–1877.

Alger, George. The states and national treaties. 1909. 66 Independent. 890–893.

Allen, Florence E. The treaty as an instrument of legislation. New York. Macmillan. 1952. 114 p.

Allen, Francis W. The legislative effect of a treaty. 1929. 13 Bi-Mo. L., Rev. 41–64.

Amendment of Constitution relating to treaties and executive agreements. 1953. 99 Cong. Rec. 160.

American Bar Association. Section of International and Comparative Law. Report. August 1953.

American Bar Association. Standing Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations. Annual Reports, 1950–51.

American Bar Association. Standing Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations. Reports, Sept. 1950; Feb. 1950; Sept. 1952.

American Bar Association. Standing Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations. Report. 1952. 32 p.

American Jewish Congress. An analysis of the Bricker amd't. N. Y. 1953. 10 p.

American's treatymaking power as defined by the Constitution. 1942. 21 Cong. Digest. 230.

Anderson, Chandler P. The extent and limitations of the treatymaking power under the Constitution. July 1907. Am. J. Int. L.

Anderson, Chandler P. The extent and limitation of the treatymaking power under the Constitution. New York. Baker, Voorhis & Co., 1907.

Anderson, Chandler P. The Senate and obligatory arbitration treaties. 1932. 26 Am. J. Int. L., 328–33.

Anderson, Chandler P. Treaties as domestic law. 1935. 29 Am. J. Int. L. 472–6.

Andrews, B. Amending the Constitution to provide for participation in a world government. 1950. 14 Albany L. Rev. 125–48.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences. Congress and foreign relations. Sept. 1953.

Arreglado, J. M. The need for a more flexible constitutional arrangement for treatymaking. 1953. 4 Law Rev. 101–6. Univ. of Santo Tomas.

Association of the Bar of the City of New York. Report by the Committee on Federal Legislation and the Committee on International Law. Our Constitution and the Bricker proposals. Dec. 1953. 8 The Record. 454–85.

Association of the Bar of the City of New York. Committee report on S. J. Res. 1, 83d Cong., 1st Session. 1953. 8 The Record. 167–202.

Association of the Bar of the City of New York. Committee report on S. J. Res. 130, 82d Cong., 2d Session. 1952. 46 p.

Aufricht, H. Supersession of treaties in international law. 1952. 37 Cornell L. Q. 655–700.

Bacon, Augustus O. The treatymaking power of the President and the Senate. 1906. 182 N. Am. Rev. 502–12.

Baker, Newton D. Some constitutional problems. 1925. 11 A. B. A. Jour. 539.

Barrett, James T. International agreements without the advice and consent of the Senate. 1905. 15 Yale L. J. 18–27

Bascom, John. Growth of nationality in the United States; a social study. New York & London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1899. 213 p.

Bates, Lindell T. Les traites federaux et la législation des états aux Etats-Unis. Paris, Librairie Générale de Droit & de Jurisprudence. 1915. 228 p.

Battling for Bricker resolution. Arguments of groups for and against the resolution submitted by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER. 1953. 11 Cong. Rept. 885–9.

Bellot, H. H. L. Treatymaking power in the United States and the growth of the executive. 1909. 127 Law Times. 384–6.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg. American Secretaries of State and their diplomacy. 10 vols. New York, 1927–29.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg. A diplomatic history of the United States. New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1936.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg. Jay's treaty: a study in commerce and diplomacy. New York, Macmillan Co., 1923.

Benton, Thomas Hart. Debates of Congress, vol. 1 New York. D. Appleton & Co., 1857.

Berdahl, Clarence A. War powers of the executive in the United States. Urbana, 1921.

Bielitsky, Frank. The danger in the treatymaking power—a mirage. 1952. 25 Temple L. Q. 463–71.

Binsse, H. L. Present discontents; constitutional formula making the Secretary of State directly responsible to legislative body charged with ratifying treaties. 1954. 41 Commonweal. 317.

Bird, C. B. Right of states to pass local laws in conflict with foreign powers. 1917. 24 Case and Comment. 200–96.

Bishop, J. B. Theodore Roosevelt and his times. New York, Scribner's, 1920. 2 v.

Bishop, William W., Jr. Cases and materials on international law. New York, Prentice Hall. 1952.

Bishop, William W., Jr. The structure of federal power over foreign affairs. 1952. Minn. L. Rev. 299–322.

Black, Forrest R. Missouri v. Holland—a judicial milepost on the road to absolutism. 1931. 25 Ill. L. Rev. 911–28.

Black, Forrest R. The role of the President and the Senate in the treatymaking power. 1926. 11 St. Louis L. Rev. 203.

Black, Forrest R. The United States Senate and the treaty power. 1931. 4 Rocky Mt. L. Rev. 1–19.

Black, Forrest R. United States treaty power and limited government. 1925. 11 St. Louis L. Rev. 6–17.

Black, Henry Campbell. Handbook of American Constitutional law. 2nd ed. St. Paul, West Pub. Co., 1897.

Blaine, James G. Twenty years of Congress. Norwich, The Henry Hill Pub. Co., 1886.

Borchard, Edwin M. Constitutional amendment on treatymaking. 1945. 39 Am. J. Int. L. 537–41.

Borchard, Edwin M. Executive agreements and treaties. Shall the executive agreement replace the treaty? 1944. 38 Am. J. Int. L. 637–43.

Borchard, Edwin M. The proposed constitutional amendment on treatymaking. 1945. 30 Am. J. Int. L. 537.

Borchard, Edwin M. Reply to M. S. McDougal and A. Lans—treaties and Congressional-executive or Presidential agreements. 1945. 54 Yale L. J. 616–64.

Borchard, Edwin M. Shall the executive agreement replace the treaty? 1944. 53 Yale L. J. 664.

Borchard, Edwin M. Treaties and executive agreements. 1946. 40 Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. 729–39.

Borchard, Edwin M. Two-thirds rule as to treaties—a change opposed. 1945. 68 N. Y. S. B. A. 201–15.

Boyd, James H. Limitations of the treatymaking power of the President of the United States with the concurrent power of the Senate. 1918. 86 Central L. J. 172–76.

Boyd, Julian P. The expanding treaty power. 1928. 6 N. C. L. Rev. 428–56.

Boyd, Willard L., Jr. Treaties governing the succession to real property by aliens. 1953. 51 Mich. L. Rev. 1001–20.

Brandon, Michael. Analysis of the terms "treaty" and "international agreement." 1953. 47 Am. J. Int. L. 49–69.

Brewer, F. M. The treaty power. Editorial Research Report. Jan., 1943. 39–54.

BRICKER, JOHN W. America's greatest danger: domestic legislation by treaty. 1952. 98 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5219–5228.

BRICKER, JOHN W. Bringing the Constitution up-to-date. 1953. Ohio Bar. 409–19.

BRICKER, JOHN W. Government's role. June 1953. Beats Ins. N. (Life ed.) 18–20.

BRICKER, JOHN W. Safeguarding the treaty power. 1952. 13 Fed. B. J. 77–84.

The Bricker amendment. S. J. Res. 1, proposing to limit the President's power to make treaties and executive agreements: pro and con views. Ap. 18, 1953. Information Service. 1–4.

The Bricker resolution: three views, the sponsor, the administration, the opposition. May 1953. Freedom and union. 14–19.

Bronaugh, Minor. Treaties versus the Constitution and Congress. 1923. 27 Law Notes. 168.

Burke, D. B. Executive agreements and the treaty power. 1942. 42 Colum. L. Rev. 831–43.

Burr, Charles H. The treaty making power of the United States and the methods of its enforcement as affecting the police powers of the states. Phila., The Amer. Philo. Society, 1912. 153 p.

Butler, Charles H. Limitations on the treaty making power of the United States in matters coming within the juriadiction of the states. 1929. Prom. of the Am. Soc. of Int. L. 176.

Butler, Charles Henry. The treaty making power of the United States. New York, The Banks Law Pub. Co., 1902. 2 v.

Cadwalader, John L. Notes on treaties and conventions between the United States and foreign powers. Wash, D. C., 1876.

Calhoun, John C. Works. Edited by Richard K. Cralle. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1888.

Calhoun, John C. A discourse on the Constitution and government of the United States. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1888.

Canfield, A. F. Government by treaty. Address. 1952. 19 J. B. A. D. C. 239–47.

Cannon, Clarence. Cannon's precedents of the House of Representatives. vol. VI. Wash., D. C., G. P. O., 1935.

Castel, J. G. International law: effect of war in bilateral treaties; comparative studies. 1953. 51 Mich. L. Rev.. 566–82.

Catudal, H. M. Executive agreement or treaty? 1948. 10 J. Pol. 168–78.

Catudal, H. M. Executive agreements; a supplement to the treaty-making procedure. 1942. 10 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 653–69.

Chafee, Zechariah, Jr. Amending the Constitution to cripple treaties. 1952. 12 La. L. Rev. 345–82.

Chafee, Zechariah, Jr. Federal and state powers under U. N. covenant on human rights. 1951. Wisc. L. Rev. 389.

Chafee, Zechariah, Jr. Stop being terrified of treaties. 1952. 38 Am. B. A. J. 731–4.

Chafee, Zechariah, Jr. Treaty making power. 1952. Harvard L. School Rec. Nos. 1–6.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America. Legislative Dept. Treaty law vs. the Constitution; the threat—the remedy. Wash., D. C. 1953. 33 p.

Chamberlain, Joseph P. Legislative processes, national and state. New York, D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936.

Chamberlain, Lawrence H. The President, Congress and legislation. New York, Colum. Univ. Press, 1946.

Chambrun, Charles Adolphe de Pineton, marquis de. The executive power in the United States: a study of the constitutional law. Lancaster, Pa., Inquirer Print. & Pub. Co., 1874. 288 p.

CHAVEZ, D. Advice and consent of the Senate in the making of treaties. 1944. N. M. S. B. 81–5.

Clancy, Charles Sumner. An organic conception of the treaty making power vs. state rights as applicable to the United States. 1908. 7 Mich. L. Rev. 19–52.

Claudy, Donald E. The treaty power and human rights. 1951. 36 Cornell L. Q. 699–739.

Clayton, J. C. A new view of the deportation cases in the Supreme Court. Is Congress empowered to abrogate a treaty? 1893. 16 N. J. L. Jour. 292–299.

Cockes, William Archer. The supremacy of a treaty and the sovereignty of a state. 1878. 7 Central L. J. 423–6.

Coleman, William C. The treaty power and its relation to state laws. 1909. 43 Am. L. Rev. 641–666.

Cohen, Benjamin V. Some comments on the Bricker amendment. 1953. 48 Northwestern Univ. L. Rev. 185–196.

Commager, Henry Steele. The perilous folly of Senator BRICKER. 1953. 9 Reporter. 12–17.

Congress and the ratification of treaties. 1945. 411 Int. Concil. 363–78.

Congressional Digest for April 1945 is devoted to the question—Should the constitutional treaty process be preserved?

Congressional Digest for November 1952 is devoted to the proposed congressional amendment to restrict the use of treaty power.

Conway, Edward A. Straitjacketing the treaty power. 1953. 88 America. 647–9.

Cooley, Thomas M. Constitutional limitations. 7th ed. Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1903.

Cooley, Thomas M. The general principles of constitutional law in the United States of America. Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1931. 478 p.

Cooper, J. C., Jr. Pan American convention on commercial aviation and the treatymaking power. 1933. 19 A. B. A. Jour. 22–6.

Corbett, P. E. Congress and proposals for international government. 1950. 4 Int. Organ. 383–99.

Corwin, Edward S. The constitution and world organization. Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press. 1994. 64 p.

Corwin, Edward S. National supremacy; treaty power vs. state power. N. Y. 1913.

Corwin, Edward S. The President's control of foreign relations. Princeton, 1917.

Corwin, Edward S. The President: office and powers. New York, N. Y. U. Press. 1941. 476 p.

Corwin, Edward S. The President's treatymaking power. 1953. 19 Think. 5–7, 30.

Corwin, Edward S. The spending power of Congress. 1925. 36 Harvard L. Rev. 548.

Cowles, Willard B. Treaties and constitutional law. Wash., D. C., Amer. Council on Public Affairs. 1941. 315 p.

Crandell, S. B. Treaties, their making and enforcement. 2nd ed. Wash., D. C., J. Byrne & Co., 1916. 663 p.

Crosskey, William Winslow. Politics and the Constitution in the history of the United States. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1953.

Croswell, Simon Greenleaf. The treatymaking power under the Constitution. 1886. 20 Am. L. Rev. 513–27.

Currey, John. State vs. treaty rights. 1913. 6 Lawyer and Banker. 6–16.

Danger in treatymaking powers—a mirage. 1952. 25 Temp. L. Q. 463–71.

Dangerfield, Royden J. In defense of the Senate. Norman, Okla., Univ. of Okla. Press. 1933. 365 p.

Davis, J. C. B. Notes upon the foreign treaties of the United States. Wash., D. C., 1880.

Davis, John W. The treatymaking power in the United States. Address. London, New York, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 1920. 18 p.

Dean, Arthur H. The Bricker amendment and authority over foreign affairs. 1953. 32 Foreign Affairs. 1–19.

Dennison, Eleanor E. The senate foreign relations committee. Stanford Univ. Press, 1942. 201 p.

Deutsch, E. P. Legislation by treaty. 1952. 31 Mich. S. B. J. 19–25.

Deutsch, E. P. Need for a treaty amendment: restatement and a reply. 1952. 38 Amer. B. A. J. 735–8, 793–6.

Deutsch, E. P. Proposed changes in U. S. treaty making power. 1953. 1 La. B. J. 3–11.

Deutsch, E. P. The treaty making clause. 1951. 37 Am. B. A. J. 659–62.

Devlin, Robert Thomas. The treaty power under the Constitution of the United States. San Francisco, Bancroft-Whitney Co., 1908. 864 p.

Dewhurst, William Whitwell. Is the President the sole negotiator of treaties? Wash., G. O. P., 1921. 11p.

Dickey, J. S. Our treaty procedure versus our foreign policies. 1945. 25 Foreign Affairs, 357–77.

Dickinson, Edwin D. Are the liquor treaties self executing? 1926. 20 Am. J. Int. L. 444.

Dickinson, Edwin D. The law of nations as part of the national law of the United States. 1952. 101 Univ. of Pa. L. Rev. 792–833.

Displacement of state laws by treaties. 1914. 14 Colum. L. Rev. 667–9.

Diplomatic correspondence. Vol. 1. Wash., D. C., G. P. O. 1867.

Dobie, Edith. Attitude of the United States Senate upon general arbitration treaties. 1928. 6 S. W. Pol & Soc. Sci. Q. 413.

Dodd, W. F. International relations and the treaty power. 1944. 30 A. B. A. J. 360–2.

Duer, William. Outline of the constitutional jurisprudence of the United States. New York, Collins & Hannay. 1833.

Dulles, John Foster. The making of treaties and executive agreements. 1953. 28 State Dept. Bull. 891–5.

Dulles, John Foster. Speech before the American Bar Association convention. 1953. N. Y. Times. Aug. 27th. p. 4.

Duwalt, G. W. The treaties of the United States and alien land laws of Illinois and other states of the Union. 1896. 43 Central L. J. 211–22.

Eagleton, Clyde. International government. Rev. Ed. New York, The Ronald Press. 1948.

Eagleton, Clyde. Problems on international legislation. 1934. 8 Temp. L. Q. 218, 376, 505.

Eagleton, Clyde. Signature, ratification and accession of treaties. 1934. 8 Temp. L. Q. 376.

Edwards, R. A. Constitution, the treaty power, and juridical isolationism. 1953. 14 Pitts. L. Rev. 199–233.

Effect of objections to treaty reservations. 1951. 60 Yale L. J. 728–35.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. Amendment relating to treaty making power. 1953. State Dept. Bull. 192–194.

Eliot, Edward C. The treaty making power with reference to the reserved power of the states. 1913. 20 Case and Comment. 77–83.

Elliot, Jonathan. The American diplomatic code. Wash., D. C. 1834.

Elliot, Jonathan. The debates in the several state conventions on the adoption of the federal Constitution. Phila., J. B. Lippincott Co., 1896.

Elliott, Charles B. The treaty making power. 1899. 27 Forum. 592–604.

Executive agreements and the proposed constitutonal amendments to treaty power. 1953. 51 Mich. L. Rev. 1202–6.

Fairman, Charles. Finis to Fujii. 1952. Am. J. Int. L. 682–90.

Farrand, Max. The records of the federal convention of 1787. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press. 1937.

Federal treaty power and the reserved powers of the states. 1953. 21 Kan. B. A. J. 277–81.

The Federalist: a collection of essays, written in favor of the new Constitution. Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, John Jay. Nos. 33, 35, 58, 64, 75. New York, Tudor Publishing Co., 1937. Or any edition.

Feidler, E. R., and R. H. Dwan. Extent of the treaty making power. 1939. 28 Ga. L. J. 184–97.

Fensterwald, B., Jr. Trojan horse or Don Quixote's windmill. 1952. 13 Fed. B. J. 85–98.

Fenwick, Charles G. International law. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts. 1948. 744 p.

Fenwick, Charles G. Proposed limitations upon executive agreements. 1953. 47 Amer. J. Int. L. 284–7.

Fenwick, Charles G. Reservations to multilateral treaties. 1951. 45 Amer. J. Int. L. 145–8.

Fenwick, Charles G. When is a treaty not a treaty? 1952. 46 Amer. J. Int. L. 296–8.

Finch, G. A. Treaty-clause amendment: the case for the association. 1952. 28 Amer. B. A. J. 467–70, 527–30.

Fish, Carl Russell. American diplomacy. 3rd ed. New York, 1919.

Fitzpatrick, William H. Government by treaties. Address. 1952. 6 Ark. L. Rev. 315–25.

Fleming, D. F. Role of the Senate in treaty making: a survey of four decades. 1934. 28 Amer. Pol. Sci. Rev. 583–98.

Fleming, D. F. The treaty veto of the American Senate. New York, Putnam. 1930. 325 p.

Fleming, D. F. United States and the League of Nations. New York, 1932.

Fleming, W. H. Treaty making power of the President and Senate. 1909. Ga. B. Assn. 183–207.

Flood, E. C. Treaties and state laws. 1917. 10 Lawyer and Banker. 181–196.

Fort, John Franklin. Treaty power under the Constitution of the United States. 1912. 35 N. J. L. J. 68–76.

Fortuna, C. P. The treaty-making power: senate joint resolution. 1953. 33 B. U. L. Rev. 486–93.

Foster, John W. Diplomatic volumes. 2 v. New York, 1909.

Foster, John W. The practice of diplomacy. New York, 1906.

Foster, John W. The treatymaking power under the Constitution. 1901. 11 Yale L. J. 69.

Fraser, Henry S. Constitutional scope of treaties and executive agreements. 1945. 31 A. B. A. J. 286–9.

Fraser, Henry S. Treaties and executive agreements. 1945. 68 N. Y. S. B. A. 175–84.

Freeman, H. A. International administrative law: a functional approach to peace. 1948. 57 Yale L. J. 976–93.

Ferymond, Pierre. La ratification des traités et la probleme des rapports entre le droit international et la droit interne. Lausanne, Imprimerie La Concorde. 1947. 175 p.

FULLBRIGHT, J. W. and others. Should treaties be ratified by a majority of both houses? Town Meeting, Oct. 19, 1944. p. 1–22.

Gallatin, Albert. Written by John Austin Stevens. Boston, Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1888.

Gallatin, Albert. Writings. Edited by Henry Adams. Phila., J. P. Lippincott & Co., 1879.

Galloway, George R. Congress at the crossroads. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1946.

Garner, James W. Acts and joint resolution of Congress as substitutions for treaties. 1935. 29 Am. J. Int. L. 482.

Garner, James W. American foreign policies. New York, 1928.

Garner, James W. Senate reservations to the inter-American general treaty of arbitration. 1932. 26 Am. J. Int. L. 333–6.

Garrett, Garet. Nullification by treaty. 1953. 3 Freeman. 549–50.

General Electric Co. v. Robertson, 21 F 2d 214. Scope of treatymaking power, when treaties are self-executing. 1928. 26 Mich. L. Rev. 316–21.

Genocide—a commentary on the convention. 1949. 58 Yale L. J. 1142–60.

Gordon, W. C. Self-executing treaties—genocide convention. 1950. 48 Mich. L. Rev. 852–60.

Graham, M. W. Draft treaties of peace. 1946. 40 Am. J. Int. L. 781–4.

Green Bag Editorial. The treaty power and "state rights." 1913. 25 Green Bag. 451–4.

Green, James Frederick. The President's control of foreign policy. New York, Foreign Policy Assn. 1939. 11 p.

Gregory, Charles Noble. Federal treaties and state laws. 1907. 6 Mich. L. Rev. 25–43.

Gulick, Mary S. Legal effect on an act of Congress upon a prior treaty. 1933. 2 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 74.

Hackworth, G. H. Digest of international law. Washington, G. P. O. 1940–44.

Hackworth, G. H. Treaties and executive agreements defined. 1943. 22 Cong. Digest. 233–4.

Hadley, Edwin W. The treatymaking power: an Achilles' heel. 1951. N. L. Rev. 49–53.

Hall, Connor. The treaty power. 1924. 30 W. Va. L. Q. 104.

Hall, J. P. State interference with the enforcement of treaties. 1917. 7 Acad. of Pol. Sci. Proceedings. 548–557.

Hamilton, Alexander. Works. Edited by Henry Cabot Lodge. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1885–86.

Handler, Bidney. Limitations on the treatymaking power of the United States. 1930. 2 N. Y. S. B. A. Bull. 502–9.

Harley, J. E. The obligation to ratify treaties. 1919. 13 Amer. J. Int. L. 389.

Harley, J. H. A reexamination of the treaty power and the Constitution. 1952. 23 World Affairs Interpretor. 275–93.

Harris, L. Treaties under the Constitution and international law. 1950. 54 Dick. L. Rev. 417–31.

Harrison, Benjamin. This country of ours. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897.

Hatch, Vermont. The treatymaking power: "An extraordinary power liable to abuse." 1953. 39 A. B. A. J. 808.

Hatch, Vermont. The treaty power and the case for constitutional amendment. 1953. 42 Maine State Bar Assn. p. 52.

Hayden, Joseph Ralston. The Senate and treaties, 1789–1817. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1920. 237 p.

Hayden, R. States rights doctrine and the treatymaking power. 1917. 32 Amer. Hist. Rev. 566–85.

Hayden, S. S. Shall the Senate modify its treatymaking power? 1943. For Pol. Bull. 2–3.

Haynes, George H. The Senate of the United States. Boston, Houghton. 1938.

Hazlitt, Henry. A new Constitution now. New York, Whittlesey House. 1942. 297 p.

Heicher, Winchester H. and Clyde Eagleton. Revision and termination of treaties. 1934. 8 Temp. L. Q. 505.

Heindel, R. H. Atlantic treaty in United States. 1949. 43 Amer. J. Int. L. 633–65.

Helman, F. E. Treaty law and the Constitution. 1953. 24 Okla. B. A. J. 1333–48.

Henry, Leslie. When is a treaty self-executing? 1929. 27 Mich. L. Rev. 776–85.

Hershey, Amos S. Essential of international public law. New York, Macmillan. 1912.

Hershey, Amos S. The treatymaking power with special references to the United States. 1926. 1 Ind. L. J. 261–9.

Hill, H. C. Roosevelt and the Caribbean. Chicago. 1927.

Hinds, Ascher C. Hinds' precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 2. Wash., G. P. O., 1907.

Hoar, George. Autobiography of seventy years. 2 v. New York, 1903.

Holman, F. E. American rights vs. "treaty law": case for the adoption of the Bricker amendment. 1953. 3 Freeman. 803–5.

Holman, F. E. An "International Bill of Rights": Proposals have dangerous implications for U. S. 1948. 34 A. B. A. J. 984–6, 1078–81.

Holman, F. E. Treaty lawmaking. Address. 1950. 36 A. B. A. J. 707–10.

Holman, F. E. Treaty law—a threat to American rights. 1952. J. B. A. Kan. 253–63.

Holman, F. E. Is the UN's Bill of Human Rights dangerous? 1949. 35 A. B. A. J. 288–90, 360–3.

Holman, F. E. Treaty law and the Constitution. 1953. Okla. Bar. A. J. 1333–48.

Holst, H. von. The constitutional law of the United States of America. Chicago, Callaghan & Co., 1887.

Holt, W. Stull. Treaties defeated by the Senate; a study of the struggle between President and Senate over the conduct of foreign relations. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press. 1933. 328 p.

Horwill, Herbert W. The usages of the American Constitution. Oxford Univ. Press. 1925.

Howland, Charles P. American foreign relations, 1931. New Haven, 1931.

Hudson, Manley O. Charter provisions on Human Rights in American Law. 1950. 44 Am. J. Int. L. 543.

Hudson, Manley O. The membership of the United States in the international labor organization. 1934. 28 Am. J. Int. L. 669.

Hudson, Manley O. Some problems under current discussion. Amer. Soc. of Int. L. Proceedings. 1952. 2–11.

Hudson, Manley O. The treatymaking power of the United States in connection with manufacture of arms and ammunition. 1934. 28 Am. J. Int. L. 736–9.

Hughes, Charles Evans. The pathway of peace. New York, 1925.

Hulen, Bertram D. Inside the Dept. of State. New York, Whittlesey House. 1939. 328 p.

Hunt, Gaillard. The Dept. of State of the United States. New Haven, 1914.

Hunt, Gaillard. The treatymaking power. 1912. 94 Nation. 612.

Hyde, Charles Cheney. Constitutional procedures for international agreement by the United States. 1937. 31 Proc. Am. Soc. Int. L. 45.

Hyde, Charles Cheney. International law, chiefly as interpreted and applied by the United States. Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1945.

International agreements other than treaties—effect. 1953. 47 Amer. J. Int. L. 147.

Jackson, J. L. The tenth amendment versus the treatymaking power under the Constitution of the United States. 1928. 14 Va. L. Rev. 331–57, 441–69.

Jackson, S. W. Treaty powers amendment unnecessary. 1953. 22 J. B. A. Kan. 74–77.

Jefferson, Thomas. Writings, autobiography, correspondence, reports, etc. Wash., D. C., Taylor & Maury. 1853–54.

Jefferson, Thomas. Manual of parliamentary practice. Phila., 1840. 110 p.

Jefferson, Thomas. Writings. Edited by Paul Leicester Ford. Vols. VII, X. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1896.

Jessup, Philip Caryl. The conquering march of an idea; the universal declaration of human rights. 1949. 21 Dept. of State Bull. 432–5.

Jessup, Philip Caryl. A modern law of nations, an introduction. New York, Macmillan Co., 1948. 236 p.

Johnson, H. J., Jr. Federal treaty power; a constitutional wolf in sheep's clothing? 1950. 11 Ala. L. 123–32.

Johnson, W. F. American foreign relations. 2 v. New York, 1916.

Johnston, Henry P. Correspondence and public papers of John Jay. 4 vols. New York, 1890–1893.

Jones, J. M. Constitutional limitations on the treatymaking power. 1941. 35 Am. J. Int. L. 462–81.

Judicial review and the growth of the treaty power. 1952. 3 Syracuse L. Rev. 315–22.

Kearney, J. M. A proposed amendment to the Constitution; Senate Joint Resolution 130. 1953. 3 Catholic Univ. L. Rev. 43–50.

Kellogg, Frank B. Effect of reservations and amendments to treaties. 1919. 13 Amer. J. Int. L. 767.

Kellogg, Frank B. Treatymaking power. 1913. Amer. Bar Assn. 331–392.

Kelly, C. B. The treaty power: its scope and limitations under the Constitution. 1951. 19 George Wash. L. Rev. 422–38.

Kent, James. Commentaries on American law. 12th ed. vol. I. Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1873.

Kuhn, A. K. Supremacy of treaties over state laws in respect to the interstate estates of aliens. 1932. 26 Amer. J. Int. L. 348–51.

Kuhn, A. K. The treatymaking power and the reserved sovereignty of the states. 1907. 7 Columbia L. Rev. 172–85.

Langhin, J. L., and Willis, H. P. Reciprocity. New York, Baker & Taylor Co. 1903.

Lashly, J. M. Should the treaty power be restricted? 1953. 39 Women L. J. 5–8, 23–25.

Laski, Harold U. The American Presidency. N. Y. Harper. 1940.

Lawrence, William. The treaty power under the Constitution of the United States. Washington, 1871–1875.

Leake, Walter. The limitations upon the treatymaking power. 1915. 15 Va. L. Register. 72–75.

Legal Committee acts on treaty reservations. 1950. 9 U. N. Bull. 477–8.

Legislative history of the Senate Committee on foreign relations. 82nd Cong. 2nd Sess. Sen. Doc. 161.

Lenoir, James J. The conclusions derived from treaty cases decided by the United States Supreme Court. 1935. 7 Miss. L. J. 401–5.

Lenoir, James J. Treaties and the Supreme Court. 1934. 1 Univ. Chicago L. Rev. 602–22.

Lesser, S. T. International law: treaty provisions dealing with the status of prewar bilateral treaties. 1953. 51 Mich. L. Rev. 566–82.

Levi, Werner. Lawmaking treaties. 1944. 28 Minn. L. Rev. 247–54.

Levitan, David M. Executive agreements: a study of the executive in the control of the foreign relations of the United States. 1940. 35 Ill. L. Rev. 365.

Library of Congress. List of references on the treatymaking power. Washington, Govt. Printing Office. 1920.

Lodge, Henry Cabot. Selections from the correspondence of Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge. 2 vols. New York. 1925.

Lodge, Henry Cabot. The Senate and the League of Nations. New York. 1925.

Luce, Robert. Legislative problems. Houghton Mifflin Co. Boston. 1935.

Lyle, J. E. Power of treaties. Address. 1952. 15 Tex. B. J. 419–21.

Lyman, Charles M. Bar Associations and the Bricker amendments. 1953. 27 Conn. Bar Journal. 393–406.

McBain, H. L. The living Constitution. New York. 1927.

McCall, Samuel W. The business of Congress. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. 1911.

MacChesney, B. Treatymaking powers and problems. 1950. 39 Ill. B. J. 8–13.

McClendon, R. Earl. The two-thirds rule in Senate actions upon treaties, 1789–1901. 1932. 26 Amer. J. Int. L. 37–56.

McClure, Wallace. International executive agreements. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. 1941. 499 p.

McCormick, J. Francis. Exclusive Federal jurisdiction over aviation via international treaties. 1935. 6 Air L. Rev. 13.

McDougal, Myres S., and Leighton, Gertrude C. K. Rights of man in the world community. 1949. 59 Yale L. J. 60–115.

McDougal, Myres S., and Lans, A. Treaties and congressional-executive or presidential agreements; interchangeable instruments of national policy. 1945. 54 Yale L. J. 181–351, 534–615.

McLaughlin, Andrew C. A constitutional history of the United States. New York, D. Appleton-Century Co. 1935. 833 p.

Maclay, William. Sketches of debate in the First Senate. Harrisburg. 1880.

MacMaster, Donald. United States Senate and treatymaking powers. 1920. 2 J. Comp. Leg. and Int. L. 189–95.

McMaster, John Bach. History of the people of the United States. Vol. II. New York, D. Appleton & Co. 1885.

McNair, A. D. Effects of peace treaties upon private rights. 1941. 7 Camb. L. J. 379–98.

Madison, James. The debates in the Federal Convention of 1787. Mobile, A. Mygatt. 1842. 3 vols.

Madison, James. The journal of the debates in the convention. ed. by Gaillard Hunt. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1908.

Madison, James. The papers of James Madison. Washington, Langtree & O'Sullivan. 1840.

Madison, James. Writings, ed. Gaillard Hunt. vol. VI. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1906.

Magnusson, J. Our membership in the United Nations and the federal treaty power under the Constitution. 1948. 34 Va. L. Rev. 137–64.

Martin, Charles E. and George, William H. American government and citizenship. New York, Alfred A. Knopf. 1927.

Mathews, John M. American foreign relations: conduct and policies. New York, Appleton-Century. 1938. 766 p.

Mathews, John M. The joint resolution method. 1938. 32 Amer. J. Int. L. 349–52.

Matthews, R. E. Bricker proposed constitutional amendment on treatymaking power discussed from both sides. 1953. 22 Hennepin Lawyer. 19–22.

Merrill, M. H. Treaty law. What is bad about it? 1953. 24 Okla. B. A. J. 1465–70.

Mikell, William E. The extent of the treatymaking power of the President and Senate of the United States. 1909. 57 Univ. of Pa. L. Rev. 435–58.

Miller, David H. Treaties and other international acts of the United States of America. 1930. 24 Amer. J. Int. L. 241–63.

Milton, George F. The use of presidential power. Boston, Little, Brown & Co. 1944. 349 p.

Mitchell, N. P. State interests in American treaties. Richmond, Va., Garrett & Massie. 1936. 220 p.

Mitchell, W. D. The Constitution and the treaty to prevent war. 1945. 31 A. B. A. J. 59–62.

Moore, John Bassett. A digest of international law. Washington, Govt. Printing Office. 1906. 8 vols.

Moore, John Bassett. History and digest of the international arbitrations to which the United States has been a party. Washington, Govt. Printing Office. 1898.

Moore, John Bassett. International law and some current illusions. New York, 1924.

Moore, John Bassett. Treaties and executive agreements. 1905. 20 Pol. Sci. Q. 385.

Morey, William Carey. The treatymaking power and the legislative authority of the states. Rochester, The Genesee Press, 1909. 10 p.

Morford, J. R. Constitutional amendment as to the ratification of treaties. 1944. 30 A. B. A. J. 605–7.

Morley, Felix. State of the nation; power to make treaties. 950. 38 Nation's Bus. 17–18.

Morley, Felix. Treaty law and the Constitution. 1953. American Enterprise Assn. (Nat. Econ. Problems Ser. no. 448) 52 p.

Morris, Herman W. Powers of Congress over treaties. 1903. N. Y. State Bar Assn. 95–115.

Morse, W. L. International justice through law. 1946. 26 Oreg. L. Rev. 7–38.

Morton, T. H. International agreements and third states. 1953. 15 Ga. B. J. 417–34.

Moskowitz, M. Is the U. N.'s bill of human rights dangerous? A reply to President Holman. 1949. 35 A. B. A. J. 238–8, 358–9.

Mowat, Robert B. Diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the United States. New York. 1925.

Mullen, J. M. Supreme law of the land. 1953. 39 Va. L. Rev. 729–52.

Murdock, J. O. Constitutionality of a treaty or an executive agreement with the United Nations to establish the "world capital" in the United States. 1947. 15 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 175–90.

Murphy, Jay. Review of: Association of the Bar of the City of New York, Committee on Federal Legislation and Committee on International Law, Report on S. J. Res. 130. 1952. 5 Ala. L. Rev. 198–207.

Myers, Denys P. Treaty and law under the Constitution. 1952. 26 Dept. of State Bull. 371–76.

National supremacy; treaty power vs. state power. New York, H. Hoyt & Co. 1913. 321 p.

Naujoks, H. H. Compacts and agreements between states and between states and a foreign power. 1953. 36 Marq. L. Rev. 219–47.

Nevins, Allan. Henry White. New York. 1930.

New York County Lawyers Association considers treaty amendment. 1952. N. Y. County Bar Bull. 91 p.

New York State Bar Association. Committee on Amendments to the Federal Constitution. Report on proposed constitutional amendments relating to the making of treaties and their effect. June 1952. 47 p.

New York State Bar Association. Committee on International Law. Report on S. J. Res. 1, and discussion of resolution. Jan. 1953. 66 p.

Nigro, Felix A. Senate confirmation and foreign policy. 1952. 14 J. Politics. 281–99.

Nutting, C. B. The treaty power: a legislative footnote. 39 A. B. A. J. 920–21.

Ober, F. B. The treatymaking and amending powers: do they protect our fundamental rights? 1950. 36 A. B. A. J. 715–19.

Ogg, Frederic A., and Ray, P. Orman. Introduction to American government. 9th ed. and 10th ed. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1948 and 1951.

Oliver, L. S. World government inevitable. 1950. 24 Temp. L. Q. 7–26.

On amending the treaty power. 1953. N. J. L. J. 5–6, 6–8.

Opinions of the Attorney General. vol. 6 1853–54.

Our system could be made over by treaty. S. E. P. 1952. Kent B. Assoc. 10.

Palmer, Norman D. and Perkins, Howard C. International relations. Wharton School of Finance and Commerce. Univ. of Pa. 1953.

Patch, B. W. Treaties and domestic law. 1952. Editorial Research Reports. 241–56.

Pearson, Theodore, and Backus, Dana Converse. Save the peace power: don't straitjacket treaties. 1953. 39 A. B. A. J. 804.

Pepper, George W. In the Senate. Philadelphia, 1930.

Pergler, Charles. Limitations on the treaty-making power. 1925. 98 Cent. L. J. 41.

Perkins, James A. Congressional Investigations of Matters of International Import, 1940. 34 Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. 284–294 p.

Perlman, P. B. On amending the treaty powers. 1952. 52 Columbia L. Rev. 825–68.

Phillips, D. W. Senate must recover its lost powers in treaty making. 1951. 223 Sat. Eve. Post. 12.

Phillips, O. L. Treaty-making power—a real and present danger. 1952. 30 Dicta. 397–405.

Pierce, Franklin. Federal usurpation. New York, D. Appleton & Co. 1908. 437 p.

Pomeroy, John Norton. An introduction to the constitutional law of the United States. 9th ed. Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1886. 709 p.

Post, C. Gordon. Treaty versus statute. A note of Cook v. United States. No. 4. 1936. 16 S. W. Pol. & Soc. Sci. Qt. 65.

Post, Russell L. Government spending for general welfare. 1935. 22 Virginia L. Rev. 1.

Potter, D. R. Development of treaty procedure in the United States Senate. Address. 1936. 2 Fed. B. A. J. 325–30.

Potter, P. B. Inhibitions upon the treaty-making power of the United States. 1934. 28 Am. Int. Law. 456–74.

Powers of the States—treaty-making power. 1918. 27 Yale L. J. 406–407.

President withdraws obsolete treaties from the Senate, 1949. 21 U. S. State Dept. Bul. 316.

The President's control of foreign relations. Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press., 1917. 216 p.

President's treatymaking power under fire. 1953. 11 Congressional Q. W. Rept. 502–4.

Preuss, Lawrence. On amending the treaty-making power: A comparative study of the problem of self-executing treaties. 1953. 51 Mich. L. R. 1117–1142.

Preuss, Lawrence. Treaties. Address. 1951. 45 Amer. Soc. Int. L., Proceedings. 82.

Pringle, Harry J. Theodore Roosevelt. New York, 1931.

The proposed constitutional amendment to restrict the use of the treaty power. 1952. 31 Cong. Digest. 257–288.

Proposed Constitutional Limitations on International Agreements. 38 Minn. L. Rev. 46–76.

Putney, Albert H. The police power of the states as restricted by the federal constitution. 1913. 20 Case and Comment. 310–315.

Putney, Bryant. Participation by Congress in Control of Foreign Policy. 1939. No. 18 Editorial Research Reports. 339–355.

Queens County Bar Association. Committee on American Principles. Report concerning the proposals by the United States to amend the constitution of the United States relative to the power of making treaties and executive agreements. 1953.

Rank, R. Modern war and the validity of treaties. 1953. 38 Cornell L. Q. 321–55.

Rawle, William. A view of the Constitution of the United States of America. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, P. H. Nicklin, 1829. 340 p.

Re, Edward D. Treaty-making power. 1954. 5 B'klyn Barrister. 106–112.

Reiff, Henry. The enforcement of multipartite administrative treaties in the United States. 1940. 24 Am. J. Internat. L. 661–79.

Report of the Committee on International Law and Relations on S. J. Res. 1. 1953. 13 Law. Guild Rev. 8–13.

Research in International Law of the Harvard Law School. Law of Treaties: Draft Convention, with Comment. 1935. 29 Am. J. Int. L. Supp., No. 4. 652–1226.

A review of the question, In whom has the constitution vested the treaty power? Philadelphia, printed by Samuel Harrison Smith 1796. 35 p.

Rhyne, Charles. Statement for the U. S. Chamber of Commerce on the need for amendment of the treaty clause. 1953. 12 p.

Richardson, J. D. A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789–1902. Washington, D. C. 1905.

Richberg, D. R. Bricker amendment and the treaty power. 1953. 39 Va. L. Rev. 753–764.

Riley, Robert L. Treaties past and present. Missouri law review. 1952. 17 Missouri law review. 66–73.

Rix, C. B. Human Rights and International Law: Effect of the Covenant Under Our Constitution. 1949. 35 A. B. A. J. 551–4, 618–20.

Rix, Carl B. Human rights and international law. 1949. Amer. Soc. Int. L., Proceedings. 46–58.

Rix, Carl B. Treaty laws and the press. New York, 1953. 11 p.

Robinson, Chalfonte. The treatymaking power of the House of Representatives, 1903. 12 Yale L. Rev. 191.

Rogers, Lindsay. The American Senate. New York, Crofts, 1931. 285 pp.

Rogers, Lindsay. Senator Bricker finds a loophole. 1952. 7 Reporter. 31–33.

Rohrlich, C. Self-release from treaties. 1932. 66 U. S. L. Rev. 18–24.

Roosevelt, Theodore. An autobiography. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1913.

Sandifer, Durward V. International protection of human rights: the United Nations system. 1949. Amer. Soc. Int. L., Proceedings. 59–65.

Satterfield, John C., Sr. Constitutional amendment by treaty and executive agreement. 1953. 24 Miss. L. J. 280–294.

Sayre, F. B. Constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act. 1939. 39 Columbia L. Rev. 751–775.

Schmidt, J. F. International Organization and the Senate. 1945. 19 Tenn. L. Rev. 29–30.

Schurz, Carl. Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers, ed. by Frederic Bancroft. 2 vols. New York, 1913.

Scott, James B. Treaty-Making Under the Authority of the United States, Its Use and Abuse. Washington, D. C., 1934. 36 pp.

Segal, M. Constitutional law—the United Nations Charter and the treaty power . . . 1953. 26 So. Calif. L. Rev. 175–186.

Self-execution of treaties under the United States Constitution. 1926. 26 Colum. L. Rev. 859–70. 1926. 25 Mich. L. Rev. 78–9.

Senate resolutions proposing restrictions on treatymaking powers. 1952. 26 Dept. State Bull. 952–61.

Separation of powers—current proposals to limit international compacts by United States Government. 1953. 29 N. D. L. Rev. 170–79.

Sergeant, Thomas. Constitutional law, Philadelphia, A. Small, 1822.

Should the Constitution be amended to limit the treaty-making power?—a symposium. E. P. Deutsch, G. A. Finch, J. L. Call, H. C. Dillard, Q. Wright. 1953. 26 So. Calif. L. Rev. 347–395.

Should the constitutional treaty power be preserved? 1945. 24 Cong. Digest. 99–128.

Should the treaty authority of the United States Senate be curtailed? 1943. Cong. Digest.

Simpson, W. H. Legal aspects of executive agreements. 24 Ia. L. Rev. 67–88.

Simpson, W. H. Uses of executive agreements in the settlement of international reclamations. 1938. 6 Detroit L. Rev. 23–38.

Skillin, E., Jr. Postwar treaty making; inquiry into current American procedure in the light of present needs. 1943. 39 Commonweal. 110–112.

Smith, Justin H. The Annexation of Texas. New York, 1911.

Spindler, J. F. Executive agreements and the proposed constitutional amendments to the treaty power. 1953. 51 Mich. L. Rev. 1202–17.

Stason, E. B. Forum on Current Problems in International Law. 1948. 47 Mich. L. Rev. 1–71.

Stinson, Joseph Whitla. The Supreme Court and the treaties. 1924. 73 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1.

Stinson, Joseph Whitla. Treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States. 1923. 7 Minn. L. Rev. 113.

Stone, I. M. The House of Representatives and the treaty-making power. 1929. 17 Ky. L. J. 216–57.

Story, Joseph. Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States. Boston, Little, Brown & Company. 1891. 2 vols.

Sturges, W. A. World Law and Order—The Quest for. 1948. 22 Tul. L. Rev. 568–68.

Sutherland, A. E. The Bricker Amendment, executive agreements, and imported potatoes. 1953. 67 Harv. L. Rev. 281–92.

Sutherland, A. E., Jr. Restricting the treaty power. 1952. 65 Harvard L. Rev. 1305–8.

Sutherland, George. Constitutional power and world affairs. New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1919. 202 p.

Sutherland, William Angus. Notes on the Constitution of the United States. San Francisco, Bancroft-Whitney Co., 1904. 973 p.

Taft, William Howard. Four aspects of civil duty. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1908.

Taft, William Howard. Our chief magistrate and his powers. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. 1916.

Tansill, C. C. The Treaty-Making Powers of the Senate. 1924. 18 Amer. J. of Int. Law. 459.

Teller, Henry M. Power of Congress over treaties. 42 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. 6461–6463.

Tennant, J. S. Judicial process of treaty interpretation in the United States Supreme Court. 1932. 30 Mich. L. Rev. 1016–39.

Thacher, Archibald G. The North Atlantic Treaty: "Shield against aggression." New York, Purcell-Davison. 1949. 50 p.

Thayer, William Roscoe. Life and Letters of John Hay. 2 vols. Boston. 1912.

Thirion, N. B. Conflict Between Treaties, Federal and State Laws. 1944. 19 Notre Dame Lawyer. 305–9.

Thompson, B. M. The power of the Senate to amend a treaty. 1905. 3 Mich. L. Rev. 427–441.

Thompson, G. Constitutional law—separation of powers—current proposals to limit international compacts by the United States government. 1953. 29 N. D. L. Rev. 170–9.

Thompson, L. L. State sovereignty and the treaty making power. 1923. 11 Calif. L. Rev. 242–58.

Thorpe, Francis Newton. The constitutional history of the United States. 1765–1895. Chicago, Callaghan & Co., 1901. 3 v.

Tiffany, Joel. A treatise on government, and constitutional law. Albany, W. C. Little, 1867.

Tondel, L. M., Jr. Law by treaty and the Constitution. 1952. U. S. A. 14–21.

Treaties, conventions, international acts, protocols and agreements. Edited by William M. Malloy. Washington, G. P. O., 1910. 2 vols.

Treaties and executive agreements. Senate Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Comm. of the Judiciary on S. J. Res. 1 and 43. 83.1.

Treaties and other international acts of the United States. Edited by Hunter Miller. Washington, G. P. O. 1933.

Treaties and the Constitution—alien property rights. 1937. 37 Colum. L. Rev. 1361–73.

Treaty makers need Senators' help. 1945. 217 Sat. Eve. Post. 104.

Treaty-making power. 1945. 412 Int. Concil. 434–5.

Treaty-making power: a rejoinder. 1914. 199 N. Am. Rev. 893–901.

The treaty-making power. Can the President and Senate set aside the law and establish free-trade? 1902. 29 Am. Econ. 62–63.

Treaty-Making Power—Effect of Treaty on State Alien Land Law. 1948. 2 Rutgers U. L. Rev. 273–6.

The treaty making power of the United States. New York, The Banks Law Publishing Co., 1907. 62 p.

Treaty making powers of the United States Senate; fact material and pro and con discussion. 1943. 22 Cong. Digest. 227–56.

The treaty-making powers under the Constitution. 1901. 11 Yale L. J. 69–79.

Treaty Power—Its Scope and Limitations Under the Constitution. 1951. 19 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 422–36.

Tucker, Henry St. George. Constitutionality of the covenant of the League of Nations. 1919. 89 Central L. J. 79.

Tucker, Henry St. George. Limitations on the treaty-making power under the Constitution of the United States, Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1915. 444 p.

Tucker, Henry St. George. Treaty making power under the constitution. U. S. Congress 63.2 Senate Doc. 539. 11 p.

Tucker, Henry St. George. View of the Constitution of the United States. 1 Blackstone's Commentaries. 140–377. Philadelphia. 1803.

Tucker, John Randolph. The Constitution of the United States. Chicago, Callaghan & Co., 1899. 2 v.

Unconstitutional treaties. 1834. 11 Am. Jurist. 305–308.

United Nations Charter—Its Application as a Treaty to State Law. 1950. 30 B. U. L. Rev. 555–61.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Amendment to Constitution relative to the making of treaties. Hearings before the subcommittee no. 3 on H. J. Res. 6. 78.2 1944. Supt. of Doc., Washington, D. C. 141 p.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Amendment to the Constitution with respect to treaty ratification. Report to accompany H. J. Res. 603. 79.1 H. Rept. 139. Washington, D. C. 10 p.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Constitutional amendment relative to treaties and executive agreements. Report together with minority views to accompany S. J. Res. 1. Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1953. 63 p. 83d Cong., 1st Sess. Senate. Report no. 412.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Treaties and executive agreements. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Eighty-third Congress, first session, on S. J. Res. 1. February 18, 1953. Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1953. 1267 p.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Compilation of treaty reservations. S. Document 135 66.1. 1919, 10 p.

U. S. Dept. of State—Statement before subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S. J. Res. 1 and S. J. Res. 43. April 6, 1953.

U. S. Dept. of State—The treatymaking power in various countries. Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1919. 89 p.

United States—Foreign Relations. Recognition. Power of the President to Negotiate Treaties, and Methods of Recognizing a New State. Washington, Govt. Printing Office. 1921. 56 p.

Vallance, W. R. Two-thirds Rule as to Treaties—A Change Affirmed. 1945. 68 N. Y. S. B. A. 184–92.

Vanderbilt, A. T. The doctrine of the separation of powers and its present day significance. 1952. Univ. of Nebraska. 144 p.

Vanderlip, F. A. Back to the Constitution. 1923. 9 Amer. B. A. J. p. 339.

Van Der Zanden, Jan. Treaties prevail over national law (Verdrag gaat voor wet, ook in nationali rechtsbetrekkinsis). 1952. Zwolle. W. E. J. Tjeek Willink. 506–508.

Van Meter, W. G. Obligations of the United States under the ILO social security convention [dangers of the treatymaking process as a substitute for Congressional legislation . . .] Jan.-Feb. 1953. Am. Econ. Security. 33–6.

Virginia Law Register. [Editorial] Can an unconstitutional law be made constitutional by a treaty? 1918. 4 Virginia L. Register. 305–307.

Wagner, Wienczyslav J. The Colonial Airlines case: treaties and executive agreements relating to aviation. 1952. Wash. U. L. Q. 211–36.

Warner, Charles. Presidential declaration of independence. 1930. 10 Boston Univ. L. Rev.

Warren, Charles. The Mississippi River and the treaty clause of the constitution. 1934. 2 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 271.

Warren, Charles. The Making of the Constitution. Boston, Little, Brown & Company. 1937. 832 p.

Washington, George. Writings, ed. by Jared Sparks. Vol. II. New York, Harper & Bros. 1848.

Watson, David Kemper. The Constitution of the United States, its history, application and construction. Chicago, Callaghan & Co. 1910. 2 v.

Webster, Bethuel M. Amend in haste, repent at leisure. Notes for a discussion of current proposals to amend the Constitution at the meeting of the New York State Bar Association. 1953. 4 p.

Webster, Bethuel M. Let's take a good look. Notes for a speech on current proposals to amend the Constitution at the annual meeting of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. 1953. 9 p.

Weinfeld, A. C. Are labor conditions a proper subject of international conventions? 1935. 24 Calif. L. Rev. 275–87.

Weinfeld, Abraham C. What Did the Framers of the Federal Constitution Mean by "Agreements or Compacts"? 1936. 3 U. of Chi. L. Rev. 453.

Welch, T. J. Treaties and executive agreements. 1953. 41 Ill. B. J. 93–4.

Wharton, Francis. Digest of International Law. 8th ed. Edited by Richard Henry Dana, Jr. Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1866.

What should we do about Bricker amendment? Preserve the treatymaking power, by D. C. Backus; Curtail the treatymaking power, by John W. Bricker. 1953. For. Pol. Bul. 4–6.

Wheeler, Paper on treatymaking power of the Government of the United States in its international aspect. London, 1907.

Wheeler, Everett P. The treatymaking power of the Government of the United States in its international aspects. 1908. 17 Yale L. J. 151–161.

When are Treaties Self-Executing? 1952. 31 Nebraska Law Rev. 463–474.

When self-executing, treaties relating to patent rights. 1930. 28 Mich. L. Rev. 630–1.

Whitlow, J. M. Should the treaty clause of the U. S. Constitution be amended in the light of the provision of the United Nations Charter? 1953. 31 Phi Delta Delta. 9–15.

Whittington, W. V. Treaties and their legal effects. 1940. 2 U. S. Dept. State Bul. 502–6.

Wickersham, George W. The Senate and Our Foreign Relations. 1923. 2 Foreign Affairs. 177–192.

Wiggins, P. K. The treatymaking power—is a constitutional amendment necessary? 1953. Bklyn. Bar. 110–17.

WILEY, ALEXANDER. America's legal experts oppose Bricker amendment 15–0. Remarks in the Senate. 1953. 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. 8584–8587.

WILEY, ALEXANDER. Senate joint resolution 1—refutation of comments by Senator Bricker on minority views of Senate Judiciary Committee. Extension of remarks. 1953. 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix. A4375–A4379.

Willoughby, W. W. The making of the Constitution. 2nd ed. New York, 1929.

Willoughby, Westel Woodbury. The Constitutional Law of the United States. New York, Baker, Voorhis & Company. 1910. 2 vols.

Willoughby, Westel Woodbury. Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration. The Brookings Institution. Washington. 1934.

Wilson, James, and M'Kean, Thomas. Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States of America. London. Printed for J. Debrett, 1792.

Wilson, Robert R. Access-to-courts provisions in United States commercial treaties. 1953. 47 Amer. J. Int. L. 20–48.

Wilson, Robert R. The international law standard in treaties of the United States. Cambridge, Harvard University Press. 1953. 321 p.

Wilson, Woodrow. Constitutional Government in the United States. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. 1921.

Wise, J. C. Unconstitutionality of "foreign legislative contracts." 1932. 18 Va. L. Rev. 875–85.

Wood, T. A. The Federal treaty power and the reserved powers of the States. 1953. 21 J. B. A. Kan. 277–81.

Woolsey, Theodore S. Treatymaking under the United States Constitution. 1902. No. 40 Journal of Social Science. 83–95.

Wright, H. Two-thirds Vote of the Senate in Treatymaking. 1944. 38 Am. J. Int. Law. 643–50.

Wright, Quincy. Congress and the ratification of treaties—the U. S. and international agreements. 1945. 411 Int. Council. 363-98.

Wright, Quincy. Congress and the treaty-making power. 1952. Amer. Soc. Int. Law, Proceedings. 43-58.

Wright, Quincy. Constitutional procedure in the United States for carrying our obligations for military sanctions. 1944. 38 Amer. J. Int. L. p. 678.

Wright, Quincy. Constitutionality of treaties. 1919. 13 Amer. J. Internat. L. 242-66.

Wright, Quincy. The Control of American Foreign Relations. New York, Macmillan. 1922. 412 p.

Wright, Quincy. Treaties and the constitutional separation of powers. 1918. 12 Amer. J. Int. L. p. 64

Wright, Quincy. The United States and International Agreements. 1944. 38 Am. J. Int. L. 341.

Wriston, Henry M Executive Agents in American Foreign Relations. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1929. 874 p.

Young, Richard. The development of international law. 1952. 38 A. B. A. J. 513-15.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO EVENING SESSIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement to the Senate on the program of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

Last evening I gave notice that the Senate would be in session this evening. I expect that the Senate will stay in session at least until 7 o'clock this evening, and perhaps a little later. I am trying to make some adjustments for the convenience of Senators who had made commitments prior to my announcement of yesterday; but, we shall remain in session at least until 7 o'clock this evening. If we do not stay in session later this evening, it is my intention to ask the Senate to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, in order to make up for any time we may lose this evening, and we will definitely have a night session tomorrow night. I hope Senators will be prepared to stay in session tomorrow at least until 9:30 or 10 o'clock in the evening.

Unless we can move along expeditiously on the pending business, it is planned to meet on Friday and, if necessary, on Saturday. I hope Senators will adjust their commitments so that they will be available and will be prepared to vote on some of the amendments to the pending legislation.

I have been trying, both last year and this year, to keep Senators as fully advised in advance as it is possible for me to do. I am sure Senators understand that to predict with any degree of accuracy what will happen in this body is rather difficult, but all of us have seen debate run along for a great many days, and then have voting start and legislation move along fairly rapidly. I shall keep the Senate advised as fully as possible as the situation develops.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it now appears that we have finally arrived at the point where we shall vote on the Bricker amendment and on the amendments offered to the Bricker amendment, as well as on substitute proposals and on amendments in the second degree.

I am glad that we have at long last arrived at the terminal point in the deliberations and that we will once and for all give a timely funeral service to this carcass, which needs to be buried in the annals of the Congress. I refer to the Bricker amendment.

In the last week or two the issue has not been the legal principle involved in the Bricker amendment. The issue has been, "Can we get someone to accept such and such an amendment." We read in the newspapers about compromises. The terminology of the Bricker amendment has literally become meaningless.

Mr. President, I feel that the adoption of the Bricker amendment would be a constitutional tragedy. The amendment has become a constitutional farce, if I may use words of the Greek drama. Some persons even think it is a comedy. But it is not a comedy. It is deadly serious business.

We are engaged in a word game: Will some Member of this great body accept a particular word? Will such and such an amendment be acceptable to Senator So and So?

I say that is not the proper way to amend the Constitution. It may be an acceptable way of amending a simple, minor law. But, Mr. President, we are talking about the fundamental law of this land. Amending the Constitution of the United States requires and deserves careful, judicious, and considered judgment, not clever politics.

I say—and I say it with full recognition of its import and of its meaning—that what we have witnessed in recent days is a desire, on the issue which has been presented, to have unity in the ranks of the Republican Party at the expense of the Constitution and the country. No one can deny that it is party unity which the Republican leadership has been attempting to accomplish. It has tried in one way or another to compromise something that cannot be compromised.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is sincere in his effort. I disagree with his purpose and his effort, but I have admiration for him in his unwillingness to compromise on the purposes and objectives he has set forth.

I say that the President of the United States has shown courage in not being willing to compromise on what he believes to be the heart of the issue.

I also say that it would disgrace this great body if it tried to write, in the lobbies and in the private meeting halls, words and language which will in one way or another say something to the public and to an individual Member of the Senate, but which it is not intended to say so far as court interpretation of the Constitution is concerned.

I regret that we have come to this position. Therefore I must say that it is my purpose and my responsibility and privilege to vote against many of the amendments pertaining to the Bricker amendment.

Legal principle has been surrendered to political expediency. I further point out, as I shall develop in my remarks, what is really behind the Bricker amendment, is not so much constitutional reform as it is a rallying ground on the part of some—I repeat, on the part of some—for a "new-look isolationism," a new brand, a new ground, and a new center of activity.

Mr. President, I speak today in the role of a conservative. By definition, a "conservative" is one who hesitates to accept change. But its verb form, "to conserve," means to "preserve from injury or destruction." Today, the object of injury or destruction is the Constitution of the United States. The injuries and destructive force is the so-called Bricker amendment.

Where does the Bricker amendment strike at our Constitution? Threatened is one of the fundamental characteristics of our fabric of government, if not the most fundamental—the doctrine of the separation of powers. So ingrained in the thinking of the Founding Fathers was this doctrine that the actual arrangement of the Constitution devoted article I to the legislative branch, article II to the executive branch, and article III to the judiciary. Not only was the separation of powers the existing practice and the prevailing political theory, but it represented sound psychological observations—for the Founding Fathers, and their descendants after them, well knew that power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

The Articles of Confederation failed in the early days of our Republic largely because of their inability to deal with foreign affairs.

I digress at this point to say that the Articles of Confederation were our first Constitution. That first Constitution broke up on the rocks of the abuse of power on the part of many States. It was because of the failure of the Articles of Confederation that men like George Washington, James Madison, and Alexander Hamilton called for the Constitutional Convention. They had specific objectives in mind, not based on any theoretical doctrine, but on practical experience.

It is amazing to me that in view of the history of this Nation—a history which is known by every high-school student—that we are now talking about an amendment which would take us back on the long return journey to some of

the conditions that existed before the great Constitution of the United States, which is our fundamental law today, was adopted.

Treaties and their enforcement was one of the most urgent problems that faced the Constitutional Convention in 1787. When the written document emerged from the secrecy that shrouded Philadelphia, article II, section 2, read: "The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." Clearly, the treatymaking power had been vested in the Executive.

Mr. President, anyone who examines Madison's notes—he was the official recorder for the Constitutional Convention—knows that the powers of the Executive were hotly and clearly debated, and that the treatymaking powers under the Constitution were the subject of careful and extensive deliberation.

In vesting the treaty power in the Executive, our Founding Fathers accepted the universal custom of sovereignties to vest the treaty power in the executive branch of Government. There was another powerful and compelling reason to do so—the President, elected by all the people, alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the Nation.

Mr. President, I desire to raise my voice in this Hall today to say that the President of the United States is the one officer of the Government who is elected by all the people. He is the one officer who can truly represent the Nation. One development which I have seen appearing on the political horizon through the years is that some Members of the Senate have begun to feel that they represent the whole Nation. But while we may have powerful constituencies, and while there are Members of this body who have great experience and a tremendous wealth of knowledge, the President of the United States is the only national officer in the Government of the United States elected by the majority of all the people.

As a Member of this body I refuse to place myself in the position of denying to the President, as the leader of the Nation, the authority and the responsibility which he needs to conduct the affairs of this great Republic.

John Marshall, one of the greatest of all Americans, told the House of Representatives in his memorable argument of March 7, 1800, which will be found in the Annals of the Congress of the United States, Sixth Congress, at page 613:

> The President is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations. Of consequence, the demand of a foreign nation can only be made on him.
>
> He possesses the whole executive power. He holds and directs the force of the Nation. Of consequence, any act to be performed by the force of the Nation is to be performed through him.

Mr. President, I think it would be well for the Congress of the United States to realize the meaning of John Marshall's words. The President is the Commander in Chief, the sole spokesman for this Nation in the field of foreign affairs. To be sure, there have been many self-appointed spokesmen in recent years, but it is only our President who can really speak with authority for this Nation in the field of foreign affairs.

But the vital principle of checks and balances does not allow the President free rein. His treaties must meet with the approval of two-thirds of the Senators present. We all know that the Senate has been called the graveyard of treaties. John Hay even went so far as to say—and I quote what I consider to be a choice statement from one of the writings of John Hay:

> A treaty entering the Senate is like a bull going into an arena. No one can say just how or when the final blow will fall. But one thing is certain: it will never leave the arena alive.

Mr. Hay was a little uncharitable, I would say, and the facts of history do not fully substantiate his statement, but he knew that the Senate of the United States, if it performs its duty, if it does its job, can protect every liberty of the American people in the treatymaking process. The fact that some Senators may not be present is another matter. The Constitution has no way of sending out the arm of the law, so to speak, to see that Senators are present. But the Constitution does provide that treaties shall be examined and scrutinized and finally ratified or rejected, depending for ratification upon the votes of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate.

I think it is fair to add that seldom does one political party have two-thirds of the Members of this body. So, as a great historian, Mr. Henry Steele Commager, has said in an article which came to my attention a few days ago, most treaties in our country, in fact, all treaties, have been bipartisan—or should one say nonpartisan?

The vital principle of checks and balances, as I have said, does not allow the President free rein.

In spite of these facts, however, supporters of the Bricker amendment are today asking us to change our traditional executive-legislative balance in treatymaking. Ironically, under the pressure of an atomic-age cold war, the Senate is not only being asked for a vote of no confidence in the Executive, but in itself as well.

I hope the people of the United States realize that when we talk about amending the treatymaking process what we are really saying is that we cannot trust ourselves, despite the record, and despite the facts.

When anyone proposes a basic change in the fundamental law of the land, the burden of proof rests upon him who proposes it to show a clear and present danger to our liberties and to demonstrate the absolute necessity for the fundamental change, because, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] pointed out, we are not discussing a statute; it is not a city ordinance or a ruling made by county commissioners, but it is a proposed amendment to the basic law of the land.

No longer, say those who support the Bricker amendment, can we put our trust in the President, who negotiates treaties, or in the Senate, which confirms them.

Let us take a look at some history. There are men who have studied this subject so well and so long that they have literally written voluminous manuscripts, literary gems of debate. I mentioned Henry Steele Commager as one of the great historians, and I think most persons of objective mentality will agree that he is a learned scholar and a great historian. Here is what he had to say:

> There is nothing essentially new about the so-called Bricker amendment, which proposes strict limitations on the power of the President in making agreements with foreign governments. The fathers of the Constitution knew well the dangers that threatened the rights of individuals and States from a Central Government with extensive powers, and they threw all necessary safeguards around those rights. They knew, too, the threat to the Union and to order from feebleness and imbecility in the conduct of foreign relations, and they took care that the Federal Government should be supreme in diplomacy. They had watched the frustration of treaties by States claiming to be sovereign and the decline of the prestige and power of the Confederation in its relations with other governments, and they determined to put an end to this intolerable situation. They provided, therefore, that treaties should be the law of the land and should take precedence over all State laws.
>
> But because the treatymaking power was, inevitably, supreme and extensive, the fathers carefully safeguarded its exercise. What are the safeguards? After a treaty has been negotiated by the President, it must be ratified by two-thirds of the Senators present. As a single party rarely commands a two-thirds majority, this means that it must have bipartisan support. It must be constitutional, or the courts will hold it void. If it turns out to be a really dangerous treaty, Congress can impeach the President who was responsible for it. It must ordinarily be carried out through legislation, and when Congress comes to vote funds for its administration, that body has another chance to pass upon its merits. If it is found to be unsatisfactory in whole or in part, it can be modified or even repudiated by law. Such an action would constitute a grievance for the other contracting nation, but no one doubts its legality.
>
> The fathers, then, gave amplest authority to the President to conduct foreign relations, and to the Senate to confirm such treaties as negotiated, and then placed careful safeguards around these powers.
>
> Has anything happened in 166 years to suggest that the fathers went wrong on all this?

Who is it here who says that Washington, Franklin, and Madison were wrong? What is their evidence? Suspicion? Is it purely hypothetical?

Mr. President, the burden of proof rests upon those who propose the change.

Mr. Commager says:

> Has the Constitution, otherwise the object of admiration and reverence, here proved to be a failure?
>
> Has the treatymaking power in fact, been—as its critics now so vigorously assert—the Trojan horse of the Constitution? Have President and Senate forfeited American liberties, surrendered the constitutional rights of American citizens, and invaded the proper area of State governments through the abuse of the treaty power?

There is evidence that the United States Senate has abused the rights of more citizens than have the constitutional procedures of treatymaking.

If we wish to do something about procedure, I suggest we legislate some procedures for Senate committees. That is where good work could be done. The record there is, at least, a record filled with examples of abuse of power.

But there is not one instance of a treaty ever having been declared by a court to be unconstitutional. There is not one example of a treaty of the United States giving away the rights of the people of the United States of America, unless someone intends to say that a ban on the right to hunt ducks at certain times in Missouri is a fundamental loss of American liberty.

Mr. Commager points out:

> In the last century and a half the United States has concluded something like 900 treaties and perhaps twice that many executive agreements. If the treaty power is the Trojan horse that its critics now assert, certainly that fact must have been apparent during those years. Surely there is at least one treaty that the critics can cite as evidence of a foreign violation of the Constitution or an invasion of liberties of the citizen.

I say to my colleagues who are lawyers that if they were to go into court with such flimsy evidence, the judge would rule the case out of court before the hearing even began.

A bill of particulars is at least a basic ingredient of a court case; there must be more than an assumption of guilt, or a suspicion of guilt. The supporters of the Bricker amendment present a long list of purely hypothetical dangers. Mr. Commager gives us some very good examples of hypothetical dangers. What are they?—

> There is no mystery about them. They are the dangers anticipated from membership in the United Nations. They are the dangers anticipated from ratification of that body's Draft Covenant on Human Rights, or perhaps from its Genocide Convention.

Mr. President, these are all legal instruments or documents which are before the American people. All of them still await Senate action. As the situation stands, it looks as though they will have a long wait before there will be any action. The fact that there has not been any action indicates that the Senate of the United States is very jealous of its powers when it comes to the ratification of treaties.

> They are the old isolationist fears of international commitments, particularly in the field of human rights. Thus, Frank E. Hallman, past president of the American Bar Association and one of the most vigorous advocates of the Bricker amendment, wrote of those who object to bowdlerizing—

That is a new word for me—

> the Constitution that "They belong to the school of thought that has become so internationally minded that it believes world peace can be achieved by recognizing in the President unlimited power to give America away at the international conference table."

Mr. President, I am always amused by statements of how much of America we seem to be giving away. The rest of the world is poor and weak. Much of the world is on the verge of bankruptcy. Yet every time anybody wants to appeal to the emotions of the American people, the statement is made that we have given everything away. Yet here we are, the richest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth.

Much of mankind is sick, hungry, impoverished, bankrupt, with very few exceptions. We have been sitting at conference tables with other nations for 166 years. Yet, here we stand, the mightiest Nation on the face of the earth, the richest people in God's great kingdom. We are the most blessed people, with the greatest abundance the world has ever known. Yet some people say we are giving everything away. As a matter of fact, it seems to me we have gained quite a little. I have never known a good Yankee who did not make a good trade. We are quite proud of our ability to be good businessmen and good traders.

I shall return later to the article by Mr. Commager. He speaks a lot of good sense. But first I wish to speak about the effects of the Bricker amendment.

The effects of the Bricker amendment would be to require treaties that affect internal law, after going through the usual senatorial "arena," to be either passed by both Houses of Congress, or to be approved by the 48 State legislatures.

This is a basic, fundamental change in constitutional doctrine and practice. Let us not forget that the treatymaking power is exclusively a Federal power. A war was fought to obtain that power—a war of revolution and independence. A Constitution was written to provide that power, and a Constitution was ratified to get it. In fact, Mr. President, the War of 1812, and, indeed, the secessionist movement and the Hartford convention, threatened the supremacy of Executive power in matters of foreign relations.

There has been plenty of trouble in the United States over this power, but it has been maintained.

As one Member of the Senate, I do not intend to cast any vote that will weaken that power.

It is strange that some persons, who have raised their voices as lovers of the Constitution, are the first to want to weaken and injure it.

Once we change the balance of power, once we change the doctrine of the separation of powers, we will have put the constitutional system of the United States off balance.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. If we should proceed on the assumption that the President and two-thirds of the Senate would accept a treaty which contravened the basic rights of the American people, it would be equally possible to assume that the President and the Senate would destroy the freedom of the Supreme Court by packing the Supreme Court.

There is an equal danger that the House and Senate together, by a two-thirds vote, would impeach the President, and thus destroy his independent power.

It is equally possible that the House might refuse to appropriate money, and that, therefore, all possible effects of the foreign policy which depended at all on appropriations could be denied by action of the House.

In other words, our constitutional system is not only a system of checks, balances, and laws, but it also presumes, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said yesterday, the existence of rational men.

If we assume that the President is corrupted and that two-thirds of the Senate is corrupted, then it seems to me there is no hope of survival of the constitutional system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Massachusetts. He has made a profound observation. He has gone to the whole heart of the system of democratic, representative government. It is a question whether people can live, not only within the letter of the law, but also within the spirit of the law.

Mr. President, I do not suppose there is any constitution that can guard against every contingency. No constitution can guard against even ordinary contingencies. As the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, sometimes we must take our chances on happenings, trusting to experience and trusting to common sense and human decency, trusting to the integrity of public officials and the virtue of the people. If we lose the integrity of public officials and the virtue of the people, we do not have a democracy. We may have a scrap of paper; we may have representative government; but we will have lost the real meaning of it.

What are the treaties that affect internal law? The Association of the Bar of the City of New York believes that if the Bricker amendment were adopted we would not be able to make treaties concerning the allocation of radio frequencies, or to adopt uniform quarantine regulations, because they affect internal law.

I am not an expert in these matters. I am simply saying that the Association of the Bar of the City of New York says that the part of the Bricker amendment pertaining to internal law might make it impossible to make treaties pertaining to allocations of radio frequencies or quarantine regulations, because they all affect internal law.

The State Department believes we could not make treaties relating to the control of atomic energy, because such treaties would affect internal law. Let us assume that we wanted to make a treaty to insure a full-scale investigation, to provide a full-scale opportunity to search out and see where there were atomic energy plants. We have been saying to the Soviet Union, "If we have a pact providing for international control of atomic weapons, we want literally to go into your country and investigate to see whether you are pulling a fast one on us, to see whether you have dismantled such plants, and to see whether or not you are going to engage in peaceful pursuits."

If we are to make such a request of Russia, they are going to ask for the same right. Such a situation affects internal law, because the States, under the

Constitution, have the right to regulate affairs within their own borders. They have police power.

Prof. Zechariah Chaffee of the Harvard Law School believes that we could not make certain types of treaties of commerce, ownership, and inheritance of land abroad, and for the carrying out of business and professions abroad because they affect internal law. The distinguished chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee has even said that treaties for the international control of narcotics and international extradition of criminals might not be made because they affect internal law.

It is indeed possible that all these types of treaties will be prevented or impeded under the proposed amendment. But the fact remains that no one knows the exact extent that the internal law clause of the Bricker amendment would affect treaties. Is it not remarkable that we are now discussing the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and we cannot say definitely what will be affected by it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in understanding that under the international narcotics treaty the countries which are signatory thereto bind themselves to prevent the growth of poppies to be used in producing opium?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Countries which are centralized can, of course, by treaty, bind their whole nation. But suppose the Bricker amendment were to be ratified. Then, since the power to control the growth of poppies is not a Federal function, and is not delegated under section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and since the 10th amendment says that powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government are presumed to rest in the State and in the people, that would mean that the States would have complete control as to whether or not poppies should be grown. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would be my understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Such a treaty, in order to be effective under the second section of the Bricker amendment, not only would have to be ratified by the Senate, but enabling legislation would have to be passed by both Houses of Congress, and then enabling legislation would have to be passed by each of the 48 States. Is that the view of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the view held by the junior Senator from Minnesota. It is also the view of the dean of the Harvard Law School. It seems to be the view of most people who have studied the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The result would be, at best, a great delay, would it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That surely would be the result, for many of the State legislatures meet only once every 2 years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In some cases the failure of States to act would mean that poppies could be grown for the production of opium within their borders. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under those conditions, where the foreign countries would be bound by treaties, but we would not be bound by them, to what degree would the foreign nations be willing to enter into treaties with us?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think I would be going into the realm of speculation to venture an answer. However, in my opinion, it must be obvious to all that foreign countries would be reluctant to enter into such treaties, because they would not be sure we would ratify such a treaty, or that the treaty would be operative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the same question involved in the case of ownership of land by aliens, rights of aliens to do business, and rights of aliens to inherit property, together with many other questions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I should like to make one comment at this point. If the provision to which we are at present referring, the internal-law provision of the Bricker amendment, had been in the original Constitution, the Treaty of France of 1778, the treaty with the Netherlands of 1782, and the Treaty of Paris entered into in 1783, would not have become the law of the land. In fact, the Jay Treaty of 1794 would not have become the law of the land, because both of those treaties applied to both nations internally. They applied to the rights of nationals internally. For example, the treaty with the Netherlands provided not only for reciprocal property rights, but reciprocal liberty of worship. In the treaty with France there was involved the question of inheritance of property.

I refer the Senate to the opinions of Dr. Henry Commager in a splendid article, in which he said that there were some who feel that the treatymaking power is not an exclusive right.

For example, the argument is made by the supporters of the Bricker amendment that the constitutional system is one of enumerated powers, that certain powers are granted to Congress, and that all other powers are reserved to the States and the people thereof, and that under that system Congress may not go into the States and dispose of matters in which States have jurisdiction. How lawless and how wicked, they say, it is to permit Congress to do by treaty what it cannot do by internal law or domestic law.

The fallacy of that reasoning is that the Founding Fathers rejected the statement now put forward by the advocates of State's rights in the domestic field. Not all questions of domestic powers are divided between the National and State governments. The 10th amendment makes that crystal clear. I may say to the American people that in the foreign field, in the field of international relations, the State governments are excluded from participation. The paramount and exclusive power rests with the National Government, and the treatymaking process is the responsibility of the Federal Government.

A man who fails to study the Constitution can make a mighty good argument for the Bricker amendment. The truth is, however, that we have a fundamental law in this country which sets up the rights of the Federal Government and the rights of the States.

The 10th amendment is called the great Federal principle. The article which pertains to the Executive, article III, and the article which pertains to the treatymaking powers grant specific, exclusive jurisdiction in the field of international relations to the Government of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the section of article VI of the Constitution which deals with this situation, namely, that "all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land," was adopted deliberately by the framers of the Constitution in order to meet the situation which had been created by the treaty of peace with Great Britain and the other treaties to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred, namely, with France and the Netherlands?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is indeed true, because the constitutional fathers wanted it perfectly clear that the terminology of those treaties was to be fully executed, and the right of treatymaking was vested in the executive branch of the Government. They wanted to make it crystal clear, and to prevent once and for all the intrusion of the States into the treatymaking process.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the treaty of peace with Great Britain in 1783, in return for obtaining from the British the abandonment of the British forts in the Northwest, we on our side made two concessions, first, that we would not seize the property of the Tories inside our country?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, secondly, that the debts of American citizens to Great Britain should not be repudiated?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But after the treaty of peace was signed, a number of States confiscated the property of the Tories, and also passed acts repudiating the debts; is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And as a result, the British refused to abandon their forts in the Northwest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, that is a part of our early history.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that other countries then refused to sign treaties with the United States, on the ground that even though the United States made treaties, they would not be binding upon the individual States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct, and of course that is one of the reasons why we have our present Constitution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not Jefferson—who, from 1783 to 1789, I believe, was our Minister to France, with more or less of a roving commission over the Con-

tinent—continually embarrassed by the fact that foreign governments would say, "We are being asked to bind ourselves in these matters, but you cannot guarantee that your States will so act?"

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was his continual embarrassment; and anyone who reads Jefferson's letters and diary will understand that was the case. In fact, he wrote many times to the Government at that time, pleading for something to be done to bring the States into a responsible position.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was because under the Articles of Conferedation the Federal Government could not bind the States on internal matters by a treaty, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Thus it was necessary to obtain action by the States, to back up a Federal treaty, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Such action had to be taken. However, once it was taken, it was never possible to be sure it would be maintained. Therefore, it was necessary to make the negotiation and ratification of treaties the exclusive prerogative of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not that one of the purposes for which the Constitutional Convention of 1787 was convened?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed it was.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Namely, to write into the fundamental law a provision that—

> All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Illinois knows the Constitution as do few other Senators, and he knows that at the conferences which were held prior to the Constitutional Convention, foreign relations and trade relations and treaties were under discussion, and the final result was the sending of the call to the legislatures of the 13 States for representatives to go to Philadelphia, where they drew up the new Constitution of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it to be well established that if a treaty conflicts with the Constitution, the Constitution will have supremacy. That is true under the holdings of our courts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. The decisions in several cases make that rule unmistakable. Let me say that Justice Story, in his Commentaries—and I think we generally consider his Commentaries on the Constitution to be authoritative—said, in speaking of the making of treaties, that a power given by the Constitution cannot be construed to authorize the destruction of other powers given in the same instrument, but must be construed to be in subordination of them. The Supreme Court has so held in one decision after another, and most clearly held to that effect in a case decided about 1890, as I recall—the case of Geoffrey against Riggs, in which the Court said:

> It would not be contended that the treaty power extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids or a change in the character of the Government or in that of any of the States.

Mr. President, that is the law of the land. It is perfectly obvious that a treaty cannot do something which the Constitution forbids, and it is equally obvious that anything that is done by a treaty can be repealed by a statute.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But if there is a constitutional vacuum, so to speak, and if in order to obtain privileges for our citizens who are abroad, we have to grant reciprocal privileges to the citizens of other countries who are in the United States, in such case the Federal Government is empowered by treaty to act, and the treaty becomes binding as internal law, does it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On the other hand, section 2 of the Bricker amendment would require that after the treaty was negotiated and ratified, both Houses of Congress would have to pass enabling legislation; and then, in order for the treaty to be effective, effective, each of the 48 State legislatures would have to act favorably.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. In fact, I was about to develop that point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg my colleague's pardon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all; I am deeply indebted to the Senator from Illinois for bringing out these points. This subject is most important, of course. We are not discussing whether the minimum wage shall be 75 cents an hour or 76 cents an hour—a matter coming under a statutory provision. On the contrary, we are discussing the fundamental law of the land, the basic law, fundamental constitutional doctrine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Sometimes it is said by the advocates of the Bricker amendment that it is not true that the States would have to act in such cases, because the States would not have to ratify treaties. Is not that beside the point? Of course, under section 2 of the Bricker amendment the States would not have to ratify treaties; but they would have to pass enabling legislation, in order to make the treaties effective, would they not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my understanding. Although I am not a lawyer, yet the vast majority of lawyers who have studied the Bricker amendment feel that the position the Senator from Illinois has outlined in the course of his observations is sound and correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is the difficulty of obtaining speedy enabling legislation covering all the States which would make this provision of the Bricker amendment so cumbersome, is it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my feeling.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It also would make it very difficult for the United States to negotiate with other countries reciprocal treaties of commerce, would it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. For example, Mr. President, the Italian treaty of 1949—our treaty of peace with Italy, which was ratified within the last 5 or 6 years—contains many provisions which apply to internal law. If the Bricker amendment were a part of the Constitution, we would still be in the process of trying to complete that treaty with Italy, because it would have been necesary for the States to have passed enabling legislation, inasmuch as some of the provisions of the treaty have a direct bearing on or application to the internal affairs of the States. For instance, in many instances the scientific and professional standards established by State law are affected by the Italian Treaty.

I wish to say, further, that, as all of us know, the Senate can attach to the resolution of ratification of a treaty any reservations it desires. I have had some little opportunity, though very limited, to be sure, to know that that has been done by the Senate in recent years.

But it is not only the existing legislative-executive balance that would be upset by the Bricker amendment. Equally important is its devastating effect on the Federal-State balance. Not only did our Founding Fathers vest the treatymaking power entirely in the hands of the Federal Government, but they made sure that treaties would be the supreme law of the land, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has thoroughly developed. This was done, in the words of James Madison, to prevent the States in their individual character, from defeating the constitutional authority of the States in their united character.

The Constitution gave Congress a number of specified powers. Powers not specified, or delegated, and not constitutionally necessary and proper for the carrying out of delegated powers, were reserved to the States, under the 10th amendment. I repeat that the treatymaking power was not reserved to the States, and I am not prepared to urge that it be made a part of the privileges and responsibilities of the States. Not only was it delegated to the Federal Government; but article I, section 10 of the Constitution strictly forbids a State from entering into any treaty, alliance of confederation.

That the treaty power, vested solely in the Federal Government, is the supreme law, taking precedence over any conflicting State statute, is not a new and radical principle, as the proponents of the Bricker amendment would have us believe. Only 7 years after the Constitution became effective, in 1796, the Supreme Court held in the case of *Ware* v. *Hylton* (3 Dall. 199), that a Virginia law was unconstitutional because it conflicted with a later treaty. Had there not been a treaty the State statute would have been perfectly legal. I believe this case involved the question of the payment of certain debts. But if the Federal Government had not had this supremacy power in treatymaking, and had the State law remained in effect, we could have had no guaranty that other nations would respect our agreements, or even make treaties with us at all. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has fully developed this point, and I think he has made a very fine contribution to the argument.

Certainly with the distinct possibility that any agreement our representatives negotiated with foreign nations would have no effect as law within the 48 States, our international-bargaining power would be drastically weakened. And that would be the situation under the Bricker amendment. In other words, as Secretary of State Dulles has said,

the Bricker amendment "would set the clock back to an approximation of the conditions which existed under the Articles of Confederation." Any treaty negotiated on any subject that in domestic law is reserved to the States would have to be ratified by the States—by 48 separate bodies, usually meeting for only 60 or 90 days at irregular intervals, some spaced 2 years apart.

The Bricker amendment would repudiate the principles of internationalism which unite the mainstream of both of our major parties. It is the long step backward to the dismal and disastrous go-it-alone way of thinking. It is the psychological roadblock in the path of American participation in world affairs.

I speak not as one who is trying to examine the legal concepts of the Bricker amendment, but as one who is trying to face the political realities of it. I say that it would be a step backward and a repudiation of the principles of international law. It is a psychological roadblock in the path of American participation in world affairs.

Is this merely the thinking of the junior Senator from Minnesota? Not by any means. I hold in my hand one of the leading business newsletters of the Nation, the Callahan Washington Letter, published in New York. This letter is received by thousands of people in the business, professional, and scientific world. This is the issue of Saturday, January 30. I read from page 2, under the title "Isolationism":

> This ideology is growing in the United States Congress. It moves under the guise of patriotism. It fosters such movements as the Bricker amendment to the Constitution. This amendment will be defeated, but—

The author is a good prophet—

> the indications are isolationism is growing, and it will be fanned by prejudice and bias. Unless halted and beaten back it may wreck the Republican Party. Although it is not partisan, and while its most voluble advocates are in one faction of the GOP, there are followers in the Democratic Party.

The Bricker amendment must be defeated, not only because of what it would do to the Constitution, but because it stands today as a symbol of the rebirth—if not the rebirth, at least the regrouping—of the forces of isolationism in this land. We need to support the President of the United States and the foreign policy of this country once again, as we had to do it in the case of the Marshall Plan, as we had to do in the case of the NATO alliance, and in the matter of troops for Europe. We have had to make successive reaffirmation of the desire and willingness of the American people to participate in world affairs and become world leaders. Let our Nation assume the responsibility which is ours, and which we cannot shirk. This goes far beyond any partisanship. As this debate well indicates, this is not a matter of partisanship. This is a matter of making it crystal clear, once and for all, that we are not going backward, and that we are not going to permit ourselves to be shackled in fulfilling our responsibilities of leadership.

I have attempted to show the havoc this amendment would wreak on the basic fabric of our Government—the Constitution, and on our hopes for a free world. I have done this as a student and teacher of government, and not from a legalistic point of view. I am not a lawyer. Great outcries in behalf of this proposal have come from certain small, but vocal, groups of the bar. To analyze their polemics more fully, I call your attention to three blistering legal reports in opposition to the Bricker amendment by the Federal Bar Association, the association of the bar of the city of New York, and the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association. I call the attention of the Senate, as well, to the opinions of 26 out of 27 deans of American law schools who vigorously oppose this threat to the Constitution, and to the numerous forthright statements of opposition by one of our Nation's greatest constitutional lawyers, Mr. John W. Davis.

But even without a law degree one can observe a vital flaw in the arguments of the proponents—for all their reasoning is either hypothetical or based on mere dicta. As one of the most influential proponents said in presenting his case to the American Bar Association:

> We are thinking about what is going to happen 8 years from now.

Would that the Lord would give us such vision. Apparently this man has some kind of superoptical device by which he can see far into the future.

Why do the proponents resort to such strategy? Certainly they would not attempt to build such a case in a court of law. They do so because they cannot point to one single unconstitutional treaty in the 165 years of American history. What could be a greater commentary on our treatymaking system and the wisdom and vigilance of our Executive and Senate? What could be a more powerful answer to those who criticize our Constitution?

Has this minority of the legal profession stopped to look carefully and responsibly at the Bricker amendment in the light of our role in world affairs? Armed with precedents and horn books, have they not failed to see this measure in the far-sighted, long-term light of our foreign policy—and our quest for survival in this atomic age?

I single out these men of the legal profession who support this resolution first because they are honorable individuals in the main whose primary mistake appears to be that they have failed to see the forest of world affairs for the trees of legal dicta. But what about that other group of willful men—those Bricker amendment supporters who are deliberately using the proposal as a weapon in their self-appointed crusade to bring our Nation back into the fold of isolationism, and who rally to the cry of Gerald L. K. Smith to "Kick the U. N. out of the United States and get the United States out of the U. N." If anyone has any doubt as to that statement, I suggest that he see the booklet entitled Abolish the United Nations, published by the Citizens' Congressional Committee To Abolish the United Nations.

On this issue, the extremist fringe is all the more dangerous because they are carefully hiding behind the coattails of legalistic arguments. Gratis, they have finally been given a shield of respectability.

Let us examine some of the arguments these extremist groups have been spreading across the United States in behalf of the Bricker amendment. Let us see how they have distorted the truth to forward their cause.

First, there is the irrevocability of treaties distortion. I quote from Samuel Pettengill, sometime chairman of the old Committee To Uphold the Constitution. Apparently he is unwilling to uphold it now. He has written something called Subverting the Constitution by Treaty, which is being widely distributed by Merwin K. Hart's National Economic Council. You will recall this group as the one that the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the 81st Congress said tries to disparage those who oppose its objectives by appeals to religious prejudice—General Interim Report, Union Calendar No. 1085, page 22. Pettengill writes:

> No matter how foolish or dishonorable a treaty or executive agreement may be, you must bleed and die if you get hooked in one of them.
>
> And once in, you can't get out. • • • Nor could the Senate repeal a treaty. Only our clever lads—

He tells us earlier that this means the Hisses, Achesons, and Dulleses and their friends—

> could agree to change a treaty.

Unfortunately for this spurious argument, the Supreme Court held nearly 70 years ago (in the *Head Money* case (112 U. S. 580), and has since repeatedly declared that any act of Congress can repeal an earlier treaty.

One does not have to be a lawyer to know where to look for these cases. I learned about this subject in the second year of college. It is a part of general living to acquire a knowledge of basic constitutional law.

This rule, by the way, also applies to executive agreements. If we confirm a treaty and later want to repeal it, all that has to be done is to get a simple majority of Congress.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly declared that any act of Congress can repeal an earlier treaty. Therefore, if we should be outbargained at the bargain table, all we need do is to get a new Congress, if we are not satisfied with the one in being, and we can repeal the whole thing and cancel it out. What more protection do we want?

There is absolutely nothing irrevocable about the treatymaking power of the Constitution.

Second, there is the completely fallacious argument that the Bricker amendment would place the United States on a parity, or on a plane of equality, with other nations. The proponents of this line of reasoning appear to have a scanty knowledge of comparative government. Prof. Lawrence Preuss, of the University of Michigan, has shown that their understanding of this issue is based upon "a superficial examination of foreign practice," "an exclusive reliance upon formal texts," and "a misunderstanding of the process by which treaties are given ef-

fect under foreign legal systems."—Michigan Law Review, June 1953.

Yet, a group of ladies calling themselves the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment have spread the inaccuracy in more than 100,000 copies of their pamphlet, Our Constitution Has a Dangerous Loophole. They write:

> The United States is the only major participant in the entire U. N. which permits ratified treaties to become "the supreme law of the land." Let's give ourselves the same protection other nations provide for themselves.

What is the true situation? Let us take the United Kingdom, for example, since it is most frequently cited as the country we are not in a position of "equality" with insofar as treaties becoming domestic law is concerned. Professor Preuss finds that "From the moment the treaty becomes binding internationally, the British Government is in a position to give effect to it internally. No further legislative action is required subsequent to ratification." In other words, it becomes the "supreme law of the land" in Great Britain; and that is the situation in the United States.

The professor then goes on to find the same true of France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, Western Germany, and Australia. I might add that when the State Department asked our diplomatic corps to make a survey of foreign treaty procedures, their findings were similar.

So what about this statement of the so-called Vigilant Women or similar statements by Mr. Frank Holman, who, by the way, would go so far in isolating our country as to oppose the Baruch plan for atomic control, and who has done extensive propagandizing for this amendment in more than 40 States? The true situation is that the Bricker amendment, instead of giving us the same protection other nations provide for themselves, would give us the most cumbersome method of treatymaking in the world, and put us, not on an equal plane, but at a distinct disadvantage in international relations.

No one can dispute that statement of fact. It would tie our hands and it would hamper and hinder our President, and impose upon him details and restraints which would make it literally impossible for him to perform his duties as the Chief Executive. That is why the President has stated he is opposed to the Bricker amendment. That is why the Secretary of State, now that he is the Secretary of State, does not want the Bricker amendment to be adopted. Once a person has responsibility placed upon his shoulders, he is inclined to take a different view of things.

Third, there is the misleading appeal being made to the medical profession. I suppose it would be much more advantageous for me not to mention this point. I am told that it is politically dangerous to do so. However, what little danger there is to the junior Senator from Minnesota is far outweighed by the danger of having an amendment such as being proposed placed before State legislatures, particularly because of the emotion that could run wild in a situation of that kind.

I quote from a letter to American doctors written in December by Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the committee for constitutional government. The group have opposed almost every piece of humane legislation for the past 18 years. Rumely writes:

> Passage of the Bricker amendment is indispensable to safeguard the medical profession and free enterprise for physicians.

I am happy to say that Dr. Charles Mayo, of the State of Minnesota, in a telegram to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and to me, disagreed with Mr. Rumely. Dr. Mayo knows something about medicine, too. In Minnesota we have one of the finest clinics in the world in the Mayo Clinic. I was delighted to receive Dr. Mayo's telegram, and I wired my thanks and gratitude to him. I assured him of my unqualified opposition to the Bricker amendment.

The fact is that the Bricker amendment has nothing to do with the free enterprise of the American medical profession.

The case Rumely and others are trying to build is that a so-called socialized-medicine program will be slipped over on the American people through an International Labor Organization convention. What they fail to tell the doctors is that this ILO convention under discussion would give the Federal Government no legislative powers it does not already possess; that the two-thirds vote of the Senate needed to pass such a convention is more difficult to get than a simple majority of Congress; that such a treaty is non-self-executing and would therefore have to receive enabling legislation from both Houses of Congress, and that as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill was not even able to get out of committee in 1948 there is no possibility for such a convention to withstand the much more arduous formalities necessary for it to become law.

In still another misleading appeal to doctors, it is said that without the Bricker amendment reciprocal treaties for the practice of medicine would lower our medical standards. This is not so for the following reason: If the President negotiates such a treaty, if the Senate by a two-thirds vote confirms such a treaty, if the President then ratifies such a treaty the only thing it could possibly do would provide that a foreign doctor shall not be denied the right to practice solely because of his nationality. He would still have to fulfill the rigid requirements that the States set to protect the public health.

As I recall, only a few months ago the Senate placed reservations in treaties to protect the medical standards of our respective States and of our Nation. They were treaties with Germany and Israel, and with other nations also. I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which considered those treaties. The very first thing we did was to make sure that the scientific and professional activities of American citizens were protected. The Senate will see to it that we are not socialized and that our free enterprise system is not destroyed.

In my own State, Minnesota, we have a State Board of Medical Examiners. This consists of seven physicians appointed for long terms by the Governor. An agreement for the reciprocal rights to practice medicine would not affect this State board. They would still have the authority to set standards and grant licenses. The Bricker amendment has nothing to do with the protection of our high medical standards.

Personally, I am perturbed by the outright insinuation that the duly elected Senate of the United States is engaged together with the President in a world plot to sneak something over on the American people. Furthermore, I consider this attempt to appeal to the so-called vested interests of the American medical profession one of the most unfair tricks of the campaign waged by the supporters of this amendment.

The Congress of the United States holds the medical profession in the highest esteem. Congress and the President would do nothing to harm the medical profession. In fact, I have personally commended the President for his message on strengthening the medical profession and suggesting programs to protect the health and welfare of our country.

There is another appeal being made in behalf of the Bricker amendment. It is the appeal to fear. True, this propaganda technique is only being employed by a small minority. But this minority, from the literature I receive daily, appears to be by far the most vocal. Take, for example, the booklet written by one Bryson Reinhardt called, "You?—In a Foreign Prison." We could laugh this off if it was not for the fact that in the last 4 months it has been reproduced more than 500,000 times; that it has been widely distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government, and that promotional plans for substantially increasing this circulation have been undertaken. Allow me to quote from Reinhardt's discussion of article IV, paragraph 2 of the Constitution, the "supremacy clause":

> Just how does it endanger you? What does this hole in the Constitution mean to you personally—to your children?—your neighbors?—your job?
>
> In one sentence: It means that—with a little manipulation—foreign governments (including Russia) can reach through this hole and control you as they now control the faceless serfs in their own lands.
>
> Control the most intimate details of your personal life, what is taught to your children in school, what you can buy at your grocery store, what your minister may say in church, what union you may join or not join, where and how you work and live.

Mr. President, this is an unabridged passage.

This statement should really be sent to the How's That Again department of the New Yorker magazine. Yet such threats, such unfounded fears are being poured into the bloodstream of our Nation. I appeal to my distinguished colleagues who sincerely and honestly support the amendment, to repudiate this extremist fringe so that the Nation, unhampered, can debate the constitutional

issues involved calmly, dispassionately, with reason and intelligence.

The last argument of the Bricker amendment supporters to which I wish to address a few remarks could be most formidable—if true. I am referring to the political argument. I am referring to the claims of widespread political support for the amendment. Let us examine some of this alleged support:

First. In many of the more than 20 pamphlets that Mr. Frank Holman has published he lists a number of State legislatures that have gone on record favoring the amendment. Yet I have in my possession copies of letters from the secretaries of the senates of two of these States, Idaho and Wyoming, saying that their States have not passed any such resolutions. What is the explanation?

Mr. President, I have in my hand a photostatic copy of a letter from the Senate of the State of Idaho, dated October 31, 1953, signed by the secretary of the State Senate, advising that the Idaho Legislature did not pass a resolution approving the Bricker amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The letter is as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
STATE SENATE,
Boise, October 31, 1953.

Mr. STEPHEN H. HESS,
Instructor of Political Science,
Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. HESS: In reply to your letter of October 27th, received this morning, I can inform you that the Idaho Legislature did not pass the resolution approving the Bricker amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

BRITT NEDRY,
Secretary, Idaho State Senate.

The same thing is true with reference to the State of Wyoming. I have a photostatic copy of a letter from William A. Riner, Jr., of Cheyenne, Wyo., which reads as follows:

CHEYENNE, WYO., *November 12, 1953.*

Mr. STEPHEN H. HESS,
Department of Political Science,
The Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR SIR: With reference to your letter of October 27 concerning possible debates and hearings on the Bricker amendment in the Wyoming Legislature, so far as I know our legislature has not placed itself on record on the matter. During the last session, held last January and February, I was a member of the House of Representatives and recall no such action. A check of the legislative journals seems to confirm my recollection.

I am sorry not to be able to be of assistance to you.

Yours very truly,
WILLIAM A. RINER, Jr.

Second. Last September, at the Chicago Republican Women's Conference, the so-called Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment set up desks for the signing of petitions at every entrance to the grand ballroom of the Hilton Hotel. When the smoke had cleared they had amassed 700 signatures. These, of course, have been presented to the Senate as an indication of grass roots strength. But what really happened? I talked to a university scholar who had personally interviewed many of the women who signed the petition. They told him that in the bustling of convention activities they were handed innumerable official papers to sign. Pushed in among these were the Bricker amendment petitions. Many thought it was an official position and signed. Many did not even have time to examine what they were signing. The treaty-making issue was not even on the conference agenda. Now what was the real extent of support? All that can be concluded is that these vigilantes have well learned the tactics of high pressure politics.

Third. Proponents of the amendment receive great comfort from the favorable resolution of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association. But they also know that behind this facade is a split between two of the ABA's committees—the committee on peace and law through United Nations is for the amendment and the section of international and comparative law is against it. What are these two groups? To answer that question I would like to quote from the 1952 hearings on the amendment. This is from the testimony of the late Mr. Charles W. Tillett. Mr. Tillett was chairman of both groups of the American Bar Association for 2 years and was, therefore, in an unequaled position to evaluate them. I read:

Mr. TILLETT. The section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association is made up not only of lawyers who practice international law professionally but also it is made up of general practitioners who feel that they can help in solving the problems of an effective and free world order by participating in the committee work of the section and its democratically conducted forums where they have an opportunity to present ideas of enduring peace.

Senator HENDRICKSON. How many members do you have in that section?

Mr. TILLETT. From 800 to 1,000.

Senator HENDRICKSON. That is nationwide?

Mr. TILLETT. And I want to impress the fact that it is a democratically conducted section. It is the only phase where the rank-and-file lawyers shall participate. The peace and law committee is not a democratically elected group, but it is appointed by the president. So the difference between the section on international and comparative law and the peace and law is that the one is a representative group of those lawyers who have an interest in that sort of thing, whereas the peace and law committee is appointed by the president, and there is no veto.

I might add that while the group opposing the amendment has 1,000 members, the group for it has 7.

The house of delegates, however, chose to ignore the recommendations of the section of international and comparative law. They accepted the argument of Mr. Holman and others that if the ABA reversed its stand—and I now quote from Mr. Holman:

You will never send another committee down to Congress to speak for this association without the Senators or Representatives saying, "How do we know if we follow your committee that 2 years later your house of delegates won't turn turtle on us and repudiate us?"

Does this mean that for mere prestige the delegates felt it would be better to compound a mistake rather than honestly admit one? They voted in favor of the amendment 117 to 33. But 77 members of the house of delegates did not vote. Furthermore, when an effort was made to poll the entire ABA membership it was sidetracked. Now does this suggest widespread support of the Bricker amendment among American lawyers?

Fourth. The proponents of the Bricker amendment point to public opinion polls to substantiate their claims to widespread popular support. One such poll, the results of which were distributed to 1,800 newspapers, 500 radio stations, and every Member of Congress as a sample of public opinion, was taken by an organization called Facts Forum. It showed 77 percent in favor of the amendment. It is not my purpose to evaluate the credibility of this poll. Suffice it to say it is in question. I do believe it necessary, however, to refer the Senate to the conclusions of the reputable American Institute of Public Opinion which found 5 months after Facts Forum poll, that a mere 9 percent of the people favor the Bricker amendment. The most recent Gallup poll, dated January 26, which is already in the record, shows only 4 percent of the people favor the amendment.

Where, then, is the widespread support? It appears that Samuel Insull himself could not have done a better job of pyramiding manufactured support into paper profits. No votes will be lost by opposing the Bricker amendment. At stake are not Senate seats, but the Constitution of the United States.

It is a matter of great comfort and pride to me that associated in this fight to preserve our cherished Constitution are two national administrations: The Democratic administration of Harry S. Truman and the Republican administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower. We are joined by a great number of our leading newspapers, such as the New York Times, the Washington Post, the New York Herald Tribune, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the Chicago Sun-Times, the Denver Post, the Baltimore Sun, the Boston Herald, and the Minneapolis Star-Tribune.

Mr. President, as I look across this Chamber I cannot help seeing the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY]. I know the attacks that have been leveled against him in his own State. I know the burden he has had to carry in his battle against the Bricker amendment. I say to him that these are stars in his crown; they are glory to his name. A man is sometimes best known not by the friends he has, but by the enemies he makes. I say to the distinguished Senator that he has endeared himself to thousands of persons in this country, because of his bold, courageous, and persevering position in behalf of sound constitutional government. I salute him, as I did in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project.

A great number of our outstanding organizations are opposed to the proposed amendment, including American Association of University Women, League of Women Voters, Young Women's Christian Association, Section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, New York State Bar Association's

Committee on Amendments to the Federal Constitution, St. Louis Bar Association, Federal Bar Association, National Study Conference on the Churches and World Order, Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church, Church Peace Union, Catholic Association for International Peace's Subcommittee on Juridical Institutions, Central Conference of American Rabbis, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Department of Social Education and Action, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, National Foreign Trade Council, American Civil Liberties Union, Air Transport Association of America, American Association for the United Nations, Citizens Conference on International Economic Union, United World Federalists, Cooperative League of the United States of America, Americans for Democratic Action, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II and Korea—Young Republican Club of New York, Committee for Collective Security, American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. President, I wish to make note of the fact that some outstanding private citizens are opposed to the Bricker amendment, among them being the following:

John W. Davis, Democratic candidate for President of the United States, 1924; former Member of Congress, Solicitor General of the United States, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain, president American Bar Association, Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, retired, chairman of board and chief executive officer, Continental Can Co.; Deputy Director of War Program; Commander in Chief, United States Forces; Military Governor, United States Zone, Germany.

Frank Altschul, chairman of the board, General American Investors Co., Inc.; member, advisory council, Yale Institute of International Studies.

Hon. James T. Brand, former chief justice of the supreme court, Oregon.

Harry Amos Bullis, chairman, General Mills, Minneapolis, Minn.

Will L. Clayton, Houston, Tex.; former Assistant Secretary of Commerce; former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Dr. Edward Samuel Corwin, professor emeritus of Princeton University, author and lecturer.

I wish my good friend the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] were present when I mentioned Princeton University. The senior Senator from New Jersey always calls Princeton the cultural hub of the universe.

I make note of the fact that Dr. Corwin is one of the leading opponents of the Bricker amendment.

I continue with the list of distinguished opponents of the Bricker amendment:

Prof. Edwin D. Dickinson, University of Pennsylvania Law School; former president, American Society of International Law; former dean, University of California Law School.

Palmer Hoyt, publisher and editor, the Denver Post.

John Lord O'Brian, attorney, Washington, D. C.; former General Counsel, Office of Production Management; also Supply Priorities and Allocation Board and War Production Board.

Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co.

Justice Owen J. Roberts, dean of law school, University of Pennsylvania; former Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States.

Harrison Tweed, Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, attorneys, New York City; president, American Law Institute; overseer, Harvard College.

Sarah Tilghman Hughes, Dallas, Tex.; judge and educator; president, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

Anna Lord Strauss, New York City; Vice Chairman, President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights; former president, League of Women Voters of the United States.

Elizabeth E. Heffelfinger, Republican national committeewoman for Minnesota; alternate representative to the second extraordinary session of UNESCO.

Elihu Root, Jr., Root, Ballantine, Harlan, Bushby & Palmer, attorneys, New York City; trustee, Hamilton College; Carnegie Corporation of New York; director, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York.

Whether they be Democratic or Republican, the great leaders of law, philosophy, business, the professions, and the great political leaders and statesmen, of yesterday and of today, all are joined in opposition. I consider it a privilege to be joined with them, standing alongside them.

Mr. President, I now wish to allude momentarily to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Section 2 of the substitute, relating to international agreements, certainly has engaged the interest of a number of Senators in reference to what are called Executive agreements. I understand the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Georgia, is now on the floor. I consider the George substitute as a much more desirable provision, by far, than the Bricker amendment.

I also wish to say that a resolution in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for himself and on behalf of other Senators, of whom I am proud to be one, eliminates some of the objections which some persons have raised to the treaty-making procedures, such as the requiring of a yea-and-nay vote and the reaffirming in resolution form certain of judicial decisions that have become the law of the land.

I shall not burden the Senate with a description of the respective measures. Later we shall vote upon them.

Mr. President, I have carried on what I might term a correspondence of argument with the distinguished lawyer, Mr. Frank Holman, and I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I wrote to Mr. Holman under date of July 1, 1953.

There being no objection, the letter was offered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1953.

Mr. FRANK E. HOLMAN,
Holman, Mickelwait, Marion & Perkins,
Seattle, Wash.

DEAR MR. HOLMAN: I have your letter of June 2 commenting on my statement on the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution and alleging that my statement contains numerous errors of law. I am sorry to have to say after carefully studying your letter that I must again disagree with you. My statement, which was based upon the testimony of able and eminent lawyers who testified before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, contained no such errors as you suggest.

Your letter does confirm my opinion that there is great confusion and sharp difference of opinion among eminent lawyers, not only as to the wisdom but as to the meaning and effect of the Bricker amendment. In these circumstances I feel more strongly than ever that there should be no tinkering with the treatymaking clause of our Constitution which was most carefully framed by the Founding Fathers and has served this country well for more than 160 years.

It seems to me that you play dangerously and misleadingly with words when you write that my statement that "the so-called Bricker amendment, proposed a change in the United States Constitution to limit the treatymaking power vested in the President and in the Senate" is "untrue, both as a matter of fact and law." You argue that the proposed amendment would not limit the power of the President to negotiate or the power of the Senate to ratify "treaties on any matter under the sun," but would merely prevent effect being given to certain provisions of a treaty under certain circumstances. Even if the argument were true, it would be a mere play on words, signifying nothing.

But section 2 of the proposed Bricker amendment clearly limited in form as well as in substance the power of the President to negotiate and of the Senate to ratify treaties. It provided that "no treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in the Constitution or any matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." This is a clear limitation of the treatymaking power.

Since my statement and your letter were written, the Senate Judiciary Committee has reported out the Bricker amendment dropping section 2. But as I shall show, the amendment as reported out still seriously shackles the treatymaking power.

In your letter, you assert that "as a matter of fact, foreign nations are not interested in the domestic effect of treaties" and that "this is an unquestioned principle of international law." Certainly these assertions of yours are questioned by the testimony given by many eminent jurists at the hearings. Judge John J. Parker, senior judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and an alternate member of the International Military Tribunal in Nuremburg stated:

"Specifically the proposed amendments would require every treaty to go through a two-step legislative process before becoming valid as internal law of the country. It would have to be approved by two-thirds of the Senate and then be implemented by legislation passed by both Houses of Congress. Treaties of trade and friendship ordinarily provide for rights of aliens to hold, acquire, inherit, and dispose of property, to engage in business and professions and to be free from burdensome taxation. Such treaties are usually self-executing. Since

the beginning of the Republic they have, when ratified by the Senate, become domestic law which overrides State law. The proposed amendment would require all such treaties, even though approved by two-thirds of the Senate to be passed upon, so far as such provisions are concerned, by both Houses of Congress, although in the absence of treaty Congress would have no power to legislate with respect to such matters. I see no reason to hamper the exercise of the treatymaking power in this way when no dangers have resulted under the present constitutional system. We are told that other nations require approval of treaties by their legislative bodies, but the answer is that they do not require double approval. We have been getting along safely for more than a century and a half under a system that requires approval by two-thirds of the Senate instead of the approval of the majority of both Houses required by some countries. If our safeguard is sufficient, there is no reason to encumber the treatymaking power by requiring theirs in addition to ours."

It seems to me to be impossible to maintain, as you attempt to do, that foreign nations are not interested in the domestic effects of treaties. The treaties of trade and friendship to which Judge Parker refers would be of little or no value except for their domestic effect.

In reporting out the Bricker amendment, the Judiciary Committee has made even more rigorous the restrictions to which Judge Parker objected. The amendment as reported out by the Judiciary Committee provides that "a treaty shall become effective as internal law only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty."

When, at the hearings, Judge Parker discussed this more restrictive formulation which was contained in Senate Joint Resolution 43, he pointed out that "most of the treaties of trade and commerce relate to rights which are subject not to the Federal Government, but to the power of the several States, the right to own property, the devolution of property"; and that "the ordinary treaties of trade and commerce which contain these provisions would have to be ratified, not by the Senate or by the Congress, but have to be ratified by every State of the Union, and nobody would make a treaty with us." In these circumstances certainly it cannot be said that the Bricker amendment, as proposed and as reported out, does not seriously limit the treatymaking power.

I cannot accept your assertion that there is danger that the treatymaking power can or will be exercised to infringe or destroy our Bill of Rights. No instance has been cited of a treaty so doing. When Secretary Dulles testified against the Bricker amendment he submitted a legal memorandum prepared by Mr. Phleger, the legal adviser of the State Department, from which I quote:

"A claim that a treaty can violate the Constitution appears unsupportable in view of the fact that it is universally agreed that as a matter of internal law a treaty ranks no higher than an act of Congress which obviously cannot violate the Constitution. It is well settled that a treaty is supplanted as law in the United States by a subsequent act of Congress intended to have that effect. (*Head Money* cases (112 U. S. 580); *Chae Chan Pinz* v. *U. S.* (130 U. S. 581).)

"The cases considering the question have uniformly held that a treaty may not violate the Constitution or authorize what the Constitution forbids. Typical of these are *Doe* v. *Braden* (16 How. 635); *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258); and *Asakura* v. *Seattle* (268 U. S. 332).

"It has been urged that these authorities are not controlling, and that no treaty has ever been declared unconstitutional, the inference sought to be drawn being that a treaty may be supreme over the Constitution. The expressions by the Supreme Court on the subject were germane to the matter in issue and were not mere dicta, and they are uniform. That no treaty has ever been held unconstitutional may be ascribed to the fact that there has never been a treaty which offended the Constitution and therefore no occasion for the Supreme Court so to declare. It is a tribute to the wisdom of the Executive and the vigilance of the Senate that in the 164 years of our history, no treaty offending the Constitution has been ratified. Rather than constituting evidence that treaties may override the Constitution, this record is persuasive evidence that there is little basis for the belief that the treaty power will be abused in the future."

Similar views were expressed by Solicitor General Perlman when he testified last year and by Attorney General Brownell when he testified this year.

In my statement which you criticize I stated that "section 1 (of the Bricker amendment) * * * would be interpreted under the 10th amendment of our Constitution to mean that no treaty would be binding upon any of the 48 States unless the States themselves individually ratified the treaty."

In your letter you paraphrase this statement leaving out the words regarding the 10th amendment which indicate that I was referring to treaties affecting State laws, and assert: "This statement is absolutely without any basis or foundation. There is no provision in either of the amendments for ratification by the 48 States." My statement clearly referred to the broadened effect that the Bricker amendment might be interpreted to give, and that Senate Joint Resolution 43 certainly gives, to the 10th amendment. This would require State legislation to put into effect treaties, such as those referred to by Judge Parker, that affect the laws of the several States.

While you may be technically accurate in stating that there is no provision in the proposed amendments for ratification by the 48 States, legislation by the 48 States certainly would be required to give effect to the ordinary treaties of trade and commerce. As Secretary of State Dulles testified "They (the proposed amendments) would deny to all treaties the force of law, making their enforcement depend on subsequent action of the Congress and, in the case of Senate Joint Resolution 43 (which is incorporated in the Bricker amendment as reported out by the Judiciary Committee), also of the 48 States."

Relying on the testimony of Dr. George Finch, you cast aside as "fantastic hocus-pocus" the views of equally eminent international lawyers to which I refer in my statement to the effect that the proposed Bricker amendment would have prevented our joining the United Nations and participation in other important international organizations. Even the proponents of the Bricker amendment on the Judiciary Committee were sufficiently impressed by the views of the eminent jurists which you choose to ignore that they did not attempt to retain section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as introduced when they reported it out.

In this connection it is important to point out that even Dr. Finch, upon whose authority you so heavily rely, did not attempt to contradict the legal memorandum prepared by Mr. Phleger, the legal adviser of the State Department to the effect that the proposed amendments "would not only prevent our advocating such a proposal (as the Baruch plan for the control of atomic energy), it would prevent our agreeing to such a proposal if advanced by others." When Mr. Phleger's memorandum was read to Mr. Finch at the hearings, he stated: "I have not followed these negotiations in detail, and if they make any such proposal as that, I am in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 1 and Senate Joint Resolution 43 stopping it. I think that would be one reason why we should adopt the amendment."

If I had said in my statement, as you quote me in your letter as saying, that a treaty cannot become effective within the United States except by appropriate legislation, I would agree with you that my statement was inexplicable. What I said was quite different. What I said was "the Senate may now limit the internal application of any treaty. The Senate can at any time amend the internal application of any treaty without the necessity of passing the Bricker amendment."

My views are fully supported by the legal memorandum prepared by Mr. Phleger, the legal adviser of the State Department, which Secretary Dulles submitted at the hearings and from which I again quote:

"It should be realized that many treaties are not self-executing by their terms and the Senate now has the power to require that a treaty be not self-executing either by adding a reservation to that effect or refusing to consent until such a provision is added. * * * There is the additional safeguard that the internal effect of any self-executing treaty can be overcome at any time by a simple act of the Congress."

It is for these reasons that I believe that there is no need for any constitutional amendment limiting or regulating the internal effects of a treaty.

In your letter you term my objections to section 4 of the Bricker amendment as introduced "sheer nonsense." That section provided that all executive or other agreements between the President and any international organization, foreign power, or official thereof shall be made only in the manner and to the extent prescribed by law. Most of the agreements now made by the President with any international organization or foreign country are made as prescribed and authorized by Congress. There is now no obstacle to Congress regulating by law the making of agreements by the President in foreseeable situations and foreseeable circumstances. The difficulty is that unforseeable situations and circumstances may arise in this dangerous world, when emergency action must be taken in the national interest. It is really unthinkable that the President should be deprived of all power to act in a grave or pressing national emergency because Congress has failed to prescribe how the President should act in a situation in which Congress did not anticipate or could not foresee.

The Founding Fathers gave careful consideration to the treatymaking provisions of the Constitution. They considered it necessary to give to the President broad treatymaking powers, subject to the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate. They believed that treaties once ratified should become the law of the land and should override all State laws to the contrary. In this increasingly interdependent world from which we cannot isolate ourselves we should be very slow to sanction proposals which would deprive the Federal Government of the United States of powers with which the Founding Fathers deemed it wise to endow it. It is no accident that last year under the Democratic Administration of President Truman and this year under the Republican administration of President Eisenhower responsible officials of the State, Defense and Justice Departments vigorously opposed tinkering with the treaty-making power. There is no justification in our history or experience for making the radical changes in our Constitution proposed by the Bricker amendment. We must have trust in the processes of our constitutional democracy and not deprive the President and the Senate of powers necessary to protect the security and freedom of our people.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on Senate Joint Resolution 1, which was published some months ago, and which was made available to my constituents.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1, MAY 1953

Senate Resolution 1, the so-called Bricker amendment, proposed a change in the United States Constitution to limit the treatymaking power vested in the President and in the Senate. I did not join Senator Bricker and the other Senators who cosponsored the resolution because I believe it would seriously undermine the effectiveness of our Nation in its attempt to resist communist aggression and establish world peace. I am pleased that in recent weeks President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles, Attorney General Brownell, and representatives of leading church organizations and civic groups have likewise expressed their opposition to the Bricker resolution.

The chief support for the resolution comes from the American Bar Association, but the legal profession is by no means united on this issue. We have had substantial evidence to the fact that a great many lawyers experienced in the problems of international law, including a former president of the ABA, are, in fact, opposed to the resolution. I am informed that the International Law Section of the American Bar Association was opposed to the Bricker resolution, although they were overruled by the house of delegates. The Association of the Bar of the City of New York has likewise testified against the proposed constitutional amendment.

It perhaps would be clearer if I explained my position in a section by section analysis of the Bricker proposal:

SECTION 1

Section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 states: "A provision of a treaty which denies or abridges any right enumerated in this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect." Senator BRICKER intends with this section to change paragraph 2 of article VI of the Constitution which provides that the Constitution, laws made in conformity with it, and "all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land."

The purpose of this section, according to the supporters of the resolution, is to prevent the President and the Senate from agreeing by treaty to any proposal which would, for example, destroy our Bill of Rights. Were I convinced that any such danger exists, I would join in the resolution. The Supreme Court, however, and other constitutional experts, including the Attorney General, have repeatedly stated that no treaty can override the Constitution. Thus no treaty can override our Bill of Rights. This is now existing law without the necessity for the Bricker resolution.

Not only would a treaty undermining our traditional liberties be unconstitutional, but I can't believe that the President of the United States and two-thirds of the Senate would betray their trust by negotiating such a treaty. No treaty becomes effective unless it is agreed to by the President and by two-thirds of the Senate.

My objection to the Bricker amendment, however, goes beyond the argument that it is unnecessary in some respects. Some of its provisions, in my judgment, are quite damaging. Section 1, to which I referred for example, could be interpreted under the 10th amendment of our Constitution to mean that no treaty would be binding upon any of the 48 States unless the States themselves individually ratified the treaty. This would come about by an interpretation that treaties are no longer superior to State laws. Such a condition, in my judgment, would create chaos in our international relations.

SECTION 2

Let me now discuss section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1. It reads as follows:

"No treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control, or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in this Constitution, or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States."

This appears to me to be an ambiguous statement full of danger to our continued existence as a sovereign nation. In testimony presented before the Senate Judiciary Committee, a number of international law experts said that if this provision had been in effect in 1945 it would have prevented us from joining the United Nations. The association of the bar of the city of New York contended that this section would forbid the United States from playing its part in the International Monetary Fund Agreement, the International Telecommunications Union, the World Health Organization, and similar organizations. Thus, we could not participate with other nations in allocating international radio frequencies or adopting uniform quarantine regulations, to mention only a few of the activities these international organizations participate in. The section might also prevent us as a nation from espousing various rights of United States citizens before the International Court of Justice.

There is always a question as to what is meant by the term "domestic jurisdiction." Many experts argue this might forbid the kind of international atomic control program that we as a Nation have been seeking for many years, since we have refused to enter into any agreement which would not provide the right of inspection. If we state treaties cannot cover matters within our "domestic jurisdiction" and if the right of inspection of atomic installations is interpreted as "domestic jurisdiction," it is clear our Nation would be seriously handicapped in attempting to achieve international understanding.

SECTION 3

Section 3 of the Bricker resolution provides that a treaty can become effective within the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress. This adds very little to existing law. The Senate may now limit the internal application of any treaty. The Congress can, at any time, amend the internal application of any treaty without the necessity of passing the Bricker resolution.

SECTION 4

Section 4 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 applies to executive agreements and not to treaties. It states that executive agreements between the United States and other countries should be made only in the manner and to the extent prescribed by Congress through statute. The Constitution places executive agreements within the jurisdiction of the President. This is where I believe they should remain. We enter into scores and perhaps hundreds of executive agreements as a Nation every year. They do not establish vital policy. They provide, for example, for procedures with regard to the activities of our servicemen in other countries and the conduct of our businessmen and nationals when they travel abroad. Some of them are as insignificant as to provide for the construction of sanitary facilities for our servicemen. It is unnecessary to require these executive agreements should be adopted by the Congress.

CONCLUSION

You will remember that when the Constitution was drafted in 1787 a number of demands were made that the treaty power be limited so as to avoid possible abuse. I have carefully studied the debates of the Constitutional Convention with regard to this provision. We were as a Nation at that time quite small, with fewer than 4 million people. We were relatively isolated along the Atlantic seaboard and quite distant from the rest of the world. In spite of that, our Founding Fathers insisted that the door be kept open to international agreements within the power granted by the Constitution when they are deemed necessary for the national welfare. It seems strange to me that now, when the United States is the most powerful Nation in the world, we should want to weaken or take away powers which the Founding Fathers considered to be quite essential to our national security.

I do not believe that we should tamper with the treatymaking power at this critical period in our history. The Bricker resolution would handicap President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles unnecessarily and perhaps dangerously. We need a flexible, positive, and unembarrassed foreign policy. The cold war may last for a number of years. As a Nation we should not have our hands tied behind our back in dealing with international problems as they arise.

We, as a nation, are now facing the greatest crisis of our history. I agree with President Eisenhower that the Bricker resolution would cripple our conduct of international negotiations and would hinder us in assuming international leadership.

In conclusion, I urge the Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike, to unite and defeat the Bricker amendment. The issue is one of patriotism, not politics; saving the Constitution, not solidifying a political party. In this issue I stand with President Eisenhower as I stood with President Truman before him in their united effort to keep our country strong and our Government resilient enough to maintain our position of world leadership.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senate has before it a number of alternative proposals for amendment of the Constitution designed to meet what many thoughtful people regard as a real need for clarification of the status of treaties under the supremacy clause. Some of the proposed amendments would go beyond this and restrict the exercise both of the treaty power itself and of executive authority to enter into agreements with other countries.

Mr. President, I recognize the need for clarifying the supremacy clause. I do not believe, on the other hand, that we should in any way shackle the effective exercise of the treaty power or unwisely hamper the authority of the President in the field of foreign affairs. For these reasons, I have joined my colleagues, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in offering several perfecting amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a synthesis of the four amendments. The placing of the four amendments together in the RECORD will provide an opportunity to make clear their overall meaning, even though they are separate amendments.

There being no objection, the synthesis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts

with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

SEC. 2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

SEC. 3. When the Senate consents to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it was because I believed that the supremacy clause required clarification that I joined in sponsoring the so-called Bricker amendment when it was first offered in the 82d Congress as Senate Joint Resolution 130. Testifying before the Committee on the Judiciary at the original hearings on that resolution, I said:

> One thing seems to me to be clear—that our constitutional forefathers, when they drafted the Constitution, could never have foreseen that the world would grow as small as it has [with the result that] international agreements can involve personal rights that were retained by the people [and] protected under the Constitution.

It seemed to me, nevertheless, that the language of Senate Joint Resolution 130 went too far in restricting the proper scope of Executive authority to deal with other governments. At the same hearings, therefore, I expressed doubts on this point, and added that I believed further thoughtful consideration should be given to the language.

The perfecting amendments submitted by my colleagues and myself would eliminate the ambiguity in the Constitution which led me to join in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 130. They would avoid at the same time the objections which gave rise to the expressions of doubt to which I have just referred.

Mr. President, I should like to outline briefly why I believe that there is a real need for clarifying the present language of the Constitution with respect to the treaty power. Then I propose to explain my reasons for thinking that the language of Senate Joint Resolution 1, as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, goes too far in restricting the effective discharge of Executive responsibility in the field of foreign affairs. Finally, I shall attempt to describe how our amendments meet the need to which I have referred while avoiding the pitfalls of the more extreme approach taken by the committee resolution, and certain other proposed amendments to it.

First. Article VI, section 2, of the Constitution, the so-called supremacy clause, defines the status of treaties in the following terms:

> This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

The most striking feature of this section is the contrast between the language dealing with the laws of the United States and the language dealing with treaties. Both are to be the supreme law of the land. But the former are supreme law only if they shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution. The latter are supreme law provided merely that they are made under the authority of the United States.

What force, then, is to be given to this very obvious contrast in language? One possible answer is that, while laws are valid only so far as enacted under and in accordance with the powers vested in the Federal Government by the Constitution and are not in conflict with any prohibition of the Constitution, these limitations do not apply to treaties. Consistently with this interpretation, a treaty may be valid provided merely that it is entered into by officials duly representing the United States and ratified by the Senate even though some of its provisions conflict with an express prohibition of the Constitution. A treaty, in other words, is the supreme law of the land on the same footing as the Constitution itself and, therefore, not subject to the restrictions imposed by the Constitution.

If this interpretation is correct, it means that a treaty could override provisions of the Constitution designed to safeguard the rights of individuals. It could authorize, for example, searches without a warrant in the enforcement of a pact providing for the control of atomic weapons. It could make possible trial without a jury in the enforcement of an international narcotics control agreement. My own attention was first called to these possibilities by the decision of a district court of California, holding that the State's alien-land law was superseded by article 55 of the United Nations Charter.

This interpretation of the supremacy clause certainly is not the only possible interpretation. It is, however, an interpretation regarded as tenable by many eminent students of the Constitution, by two successive majorities of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, and by countless individual lawyers and laymen throughout the United States.

Other eminent students of the Constitution, I fully realize, do not agree with this group. A treaty, they argue, cannot rise to an authority transcending the very Constitution which confers the power to negotiate and ratify it. That, they say, would be a bootstrap exercise of astonishing ingenuity.

Who is to say which group is correct? Certainly I do not profess to have the grasp of constiutional law required to give an authoritative answer. But I am convinced of one thing, that rights protected by the Constitution should be immune from infringement by any conceivable exercise of the treaty power. Even the lawyers who disagree most violently as to the possibility that this could happen will unite in agreeing that it should not happen.

So long, however, as article VI, section 2, of the Constitution remains ambiguous, the possibility will remain. This possibility, in my view, betrays a real weakness in the Constitution. The doubt raised in my mind by the California decision was not in my mind alone. If it had been, the debate in which we are engaged today would never have taken place. But the constitutional problem symbolized by the California decision gave concern to many thoughtful Americans, and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is to be commended for focusing attention on it through the introduction of the joint resolution for a constitutional amendment which he originally proposed.

Ours is a rapidly shrinking world, and today some people would hasten the establishment of a world government. Others propose various degrees of limitation of national sovereignty in the interest of world order. Some, in their eagerness to better the lot of the underprivileged, would raise the standard of living in other countries at the cost of possible sacrifice of rights of our own citizens.

I believe, therefore, that we should act now to eliminate any ambiguity in the Constitution under which a treaty infringing individual rights might be upheld. The need for such a clarification of our Constitution is what led me to become a joint sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 130. I still believe that this gap should be closed by an appropriate constitutional amendment.

Second. While I favor the clarification of article VI, section 2, so as to guarantee the immunity of individual rights against encroachment by treaty, it is neither wise nor necessary, in my opinion, in order to accomplish this purpose, that we should make any redistribution of power in the field of foreign affairs, between the Federal Government and the States or the executive branch and Congress. Such a redistribution, however, would be the effect of sections 2 and 3 of the committee resolution.

As between the Federal Government and the States, the so-called "which" clause would confine the effect of treaties to the area in which the Federal Government can act under its enumerated powers other than the treaty power. Stated in general terms, this sounds reasonable enough. Practically, however, it would create doubt as to various types of treaty provisions basic to the conduct of day-to-day relations with other countries.

No one knows, of course, just what treaty provisions would be called into question by the "which" clause, because the issue could not have arisen under the Constitution as it stands. Under the "which" clause, some of the common types of treaty provisions which would become of extremely doubtful validity, if not altogether invalidated, would be those dealing with civil aviation, radio frequencies, narcotics, and quarantine requirements. The same questions would arise as to treaties of commerce and friendship containing assurances of fair and nondiscriminatory treatment of investment, the right to do business, to acquire and dispose of real and personal property, to select employees, and so on. The enforcement of extradition treaties would be rendered doubtful. Treaties to protect Americans from dou-

ble foreign taxation of particular transactions and to prevent fiscal evasion with respect to income, estate, and inheritance taxes would become difficult or impossible to negotiate because we could not offer reciprocal advantages in return.

Of less immediate, but great potential, seriousness, the "which" clause would cast grave doubt on any pledge by the United States of cooperation in the international control of atomic energy and mass destruction weapons with strict international inspection, as proposed in the Baruch plan.

Such doubts and difficulties would be bound to breed endless litigation and delay. More serious, in every case where the ultimate decision was that the subject matter of any provision of a treaty fell outside the expressly delegated powers of the Federal Government, separate legislation would be required in each State where the validity of the treaty had some international importance. In the case of most treaties, this would mean every one of the 48 States. The result, of course, would be that no one speaking for the United States, not even the President himself, could give a foreign government any assurance that such a treaty would ever become fully enforceable or ever, indeed, be disposed of in any clear-cut manner. Ratification by the Senate certainly would not mean that the treaty had become binding.

These are some of the reasons why our perfecting amendments to the committee amendment strike out one "which" clause.

As between the executive branch and Congress, section 3 of the committee amendment would redistribute authority to act in the field of foreign affairs by giving Congress power to regulate all agreements of whatever character entered into by a representative of the United States with any foreign government. This, I am convinced, would open the door to legislative interference with powers inherently belonging to the President. The power to regulate is the power to prohibit and to nullify. I do not believe that in the almost daily grist of dealings between the United States and foreign governments the Congress should have such power.

It is true, of course, that Executive authority to deal with other governments is subject to abuse. The Constitution contemplates that the Senate shall participate in the treatymaking process by providing that a treaty can become effective only upon being approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. The plain purpose of this provision is to see that treaties are brought under the scrutiny of a representative body, and, in this way, of public opinion also. Executive agreements can be exploited as a means of evading this requirement. But in seeking to remedy the possible abuse of Executive power, the committee amendment goes too far in enlarging congressional power. Congress is a legislative body, neither organized nor equipped to conduct negotiations with other countries. It should not, in my judgment, undertake to regulate the exercise of Executive responsibility in this field.

Ours is a government of laws, but that does not mean we can never trust men. In electing a President, we choose a man in whom we can confidently put our trust. Let us not take from this great office the powers necessary to its effective discharge.

Section 2 of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the committee amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 1 is subject, in my opinion, to similar criticism. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia would require that "an international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as an internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress." This language is designed to insure congressional scrutiny of international agreements in every case where they affect matters within the domestic legislative powers of Congress or the States.

I, for one, certainly recognize the force of the argument that what amounts to domestic legislation should not be enacted without the knowledge and approval of Congress and the American people.

But the difficulty with the language proposed by the Senator from Georgia, lies in the impossibility of determining in advance what are the possible domestic effects of an international agreement. How can we tell where internal law leaves off and external law begins? The lack of a clear answer to this question would throw into doubt the validity of every international agreement not submitted to Congress for the enactment of implementing legislation. It would, moreover, impose upon Congress the burden of sifting countless international agreements, in order to determine in what cases and to what extent legislation was needed. This could result only in confusion and delay in the administration of routine matters involving our relations with other countries. Thus, while I agree with what the amendment of the Senator from Georgia seeks to accomplish, it must be clarified, in my opinion, so as to overcome these real difficulties.

Third, the perfecting amendments to the committee amendment effectively safeguard individual rights, while avoiding the pitfalls of the committee amendment.

It was, as I have said, because of my concern that the Constitution might conceivably be interpreted as permitting a treaty or an international agreement to infringe individual rights, that I joined in sponsoring the Bricker amendment when it was first introduced.

The possibility that a treaty could ever have this effect is eliminated by section 1 of the committee amendment, which reads:

> A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

We do not propose to eliminate this section, but simply to add, after the word "treaty", the words "or other international agreement." Certainly there can be no dispute that an international agreement should not have a more far-reaching effect than a treaty.

In all probability this section alone completely meets the need for clarifying the Constitution. To make the matter doubly sure, we also propose an amendment to article VI, section 2, of the Constitution which would add at the end:

> Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.

The ambiguity of article VI, section 2, of the Constitution derives, as I have pointed out, from the difference between the language applicable to laws of the United States and that applicable to treaties. This difference in phrasing was deliberate, but it had nothing to do with giving treaties superiority to the Constitution itself. The reason for it, as the records of the Constitutional Convention make clear, was simply to preserve the effectiveness of treaties entered into by the United States under the Articles of Confederation, before the Constitution came into being. Such treaties were entered into under the authority of the United States, but could not have been made in pursuance of the Constitution, because the Constitution did not exist. It was appropriate, however, that those early treaties should be supreme over State law, no less than treaties adopted after ratification of the Constitution or laws enacted by Congress pursuant to the Constitution. The simple phrase "under the authority of the United States" was thus made applicable to all treaties—both those already made and those which shall be made.

Despite this explanation of its origin, this phrase has given rise to the question I have already discussed, namely, whether treaties must be made "in pursuance of" the Constitution, as well as "under the authority of the United States." In order to eliminate this question for the future, the proposed addition to article VI, section 2, in effect demands that all future treaties satisfy both requirements: Not only must they be "made under the authority of the United States," but they cannot take effect as "the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of" the Constitution.

As modified by our perfecting amendments to the committee amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1 would not effect any redistribution of power between the Federal Government and the States. A treaty could still, as heretofore, be effective as internal law upon matters outside the scope of the Federal Government's enumerated powers in the domestic field. As to such matters, the validity of the treaty rests upon the treaty power itself. This being so, the treaty has been made "in pursuance of" the Constitution. It does not conflict with the 10th amendment, which reserves to the States powers not delegated to the United States, because the treaty power is one of the powers delegated to the United States.

On the other hand, a provision of a treaty which infringed prohibitions of the Constitution designed to safeguard individual rights would not be "in pursuance of the Constitution." Moreover,

it would be in conflict with the Constitution, and thus would be invalid, under section 2. The possibility that such a provision might be upheld under the existing language of article VI, section 2, is thus foreclosed.

As between the executive branch and Congress, the perfecting amendments to the committee amendment leave power where it already lies. This, I am convinced, is a wise decision. Much as the experience of Yalta and Potsdam might tempt us to insist upon a larger voice in the area of international agreements, such a voice could be obtained only at the cost of serious restraints upon the inherent powers of the President. As I testified in 1952, this would be a doubtful, and in all probability a damaging, experiment.

Section 3 of the perfecting amendments to the committee amendment requires that "where the Senate consents to the ratification of a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays" and recorded in the Journal of the Senate. This would simply make binding a sound rule of practice. Treaties are a solemn form of international engagement, and the very considerations which justify the requirement of a two-thirds vote also demand that the vote be taken by yeas and nays and be recorded. As to the desirability of this, indeed, there can only be general agreement.

For the reasons I have outlined, Mr. President, I regard the perfecting amendments to the committee amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 1 as embodying a real improvement in the Constitution. They would thus fulfill the main hope of many of us who joined the Senator from Ohio in sponsoring the original joint resolution; namely, that by focusing discussion and debate upon a serious lack of clarity in the Constitution, a sound solution might emerge. Because I believe the solution embodied in the perfecting amendment to the committee amendment is sound, I shall vote in their favor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that, without losing his right to the floor, the Senator from Alabama may yield to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the Senate a highly privileged matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Nevada under that agreement.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, 1954, pp. 1259–1261.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, we have before us the conference report on Senate bill 15, the omnibus judgeship bill, which provides for additional district and circuit judgeships throughout the United States.

This bill was originally passed by the Senate and amended by the House. During the 1st session of the 83d Congress the conferees met on occasions, but were unable to agree as to the differences between the two versions of the bill. When the conferees again met early in this session of the Congress, after much discussion and study, agreement was reached, and we have before us the conference report which has just recently been approved by the House.

The Senate version of Senate bill 15 provided for a total of 39 judgeships, 4 of them being circuit judgeships and the other 35 being district judgeships, both of a permanent and temporary nature. The version of Senate bill 15 as it passed the House contained a total of 13 less judgeships than the Senate version, or a total of 26 judgeships. The conference report which is now before us has a total of 30 judgeships. The ones added to the House version of the bill, and upon which the House receded, were the additional district judgeships for the eastern district of Michigan and the temporary additional judgeship for the western district of Pennsylvania. In addition, the House agreed to accept the Senate version as regards the additional judgeship for the district of North Dakota by making that judgeship permanent instead of temporary. It was also agreed that in lieu of the permanent judgeships set forth in the Senate version for the districts of Nevada and Utah that those two judgeships be granted on a temporary basis. These were the matters upon which the House and Senate conferees agreed.

As I have stated, just recently this conference report has been adopted by the House, and I now move that the Senate adopt the conference report on Senate bill 15, the omnibus judgeship bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in favor of adopting the conference report. I believe it is a good report. There are heavy dockets in many districts and that situation will be taken care of by the adoption of the conference report. I hope it will be adopted. At the same time I wish to give notice that some of the Federal judges will have to do more work. The Committee on the Judiciary held a hearing last week at which former Supreme Court Justice Owen Roberts testified.

There is no question in my mind that some of the judges have been taking too many vacations and too long vacations. Mr. Justice Roberts agreed.

Certainly I cannot see why a judge should take a 3-month vacation in the summer, another 2 or 3 weeks at Christmas, and some more time at Easter. A farmer does not do it, a Member of the Senate does not do it, and a businessman does not do it. I was delighted when former Justice Roberts testified that it was his feeling it should not be done by judges.

If the conference report is adopted, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary will go into the subject of vacations very fully, and I hope with very good results.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was interested in the Senator's statement with respect to the subcommittee. I wonder what a subcommittee could do about it after a judge has been appointed. A judge is appointed for life. I am curious to know what a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee could do about it.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, after a judge is appointed, nothing can be done about it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yet the Senator proposes to provide 30 additional judges.

Mr. LANGER. I am not opposing the appointment of the additional judges.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand. However, it seems to me that the Senator from North Dakota, while providing for additional judges, is at the same time indicting the present judges for not working hard enough.

Mr. LANGER. I am not condemning a single judge who is now on the bench by name; not one.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not by name.

Mr. LANGER. We had one case before us with reference to a judge in a State, which had only one judge, who would go away for the whole summer and it would be necessary to bring a judge from out of the State to do the work of the judge who went on vacation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is not the Senator going to give that State a new judgeship under the bill?

Mr. LANGER. In this particular case that is correct, but the judge I refer to is no longer on the bench.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, the Senator from North Dakota is making it possible for 2 judges to take vacations instead of 1 judge.

Mr. LANGER. The judge I refer to has retired. I am satisfied that a full and complete study ought to be made. A majority of the judges do a good job. I want that clearly understood. However, once in a while there is a judge who does not do a good job, and I believe it to be the duty of the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of the situation. There was a case in Idaho, with which my colleague, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], is acquainted, of a judge who, at least in my opinion, did not hold in very high esteem the judgeship to which he had been appointed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I shall yield in a moment. I might say that I do not know at this time how long a vacation judges took in the early days, or when the practice of taking summer vacations first arose, or when the practice of taking other vacations first arose. However, I believe it to be the duty of the Committee on the Judiciary to find out what the situation is. Certainly we should try to find a remedy. In other words, if a judge can take off 3 months, what is to prevent him from taking off 6 months? Does the Senator from Georgia say that Congress is helpless in the situation?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not take that position. Congress has the power of impeachment, of course. However, I do not understand how we can correct a situation by appointing another judge in a State to help the first judge take his vacation.

Mr. LANGER. I agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator could correct the dereliction which he has alleged on the floor to exist, that would be one thing; but I do not see how it could be done by appointing another judge to help the first judge take a vacation.

Mr. LANGER. If some publicity were given to the situation and the public were to be aroused, the average judge would do a better job.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Did we not also learn during the course of the hearings of the case of a judge who was permitted to stay in office long after his useful days were over and who had to take vacations for reasons of health? Did we not also have testimony to the effect that judges stayed on the active list longer than they should have remained on it, and thereby impaired the work of their courts?

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia will remember that when former Justice Roberts testified, he stated that the average judge does a good job. I certainly agree. I am not criticizing the judiciary in the slightest. However, here and there is to be found an individual judge who takes advantage of his position. Mr. Justice Roberts said he did not like to see a case of that kind when he was on the Supreme Court bench, and he thinks perhaps something could be done about it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I notice that the conference report does not provide for a new judge for the State of Kansas or for the Kansas judicial district. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary if there is a possiblity of getting consideration for additional judges at this session of Congress.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] answer that question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Kansas. I did not hear his question.

Mr. CARLSON. I notice that the report does not contain a recommendation for an additional judge in the State of Kansas.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am advised that the State of Kansas was not included in the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. CARLSON. That is what I understood. Is there a possibility of another judgeship bill being considered at this session?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not at all certain whether such a bill can be considered at this session, but not only does Kansas need another judge, but an additional judge is badly needed in southern Florida and also in California. We tried to have those judgeships provided for in the bill, but were unable to do so. There was a recommendation from the Judicial Conference for an additional judge in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. CARLSON. For many years the Conference has recommended an additional judge in Kansas. I know the docket there is very heavy, and that an additional judge is badly needed. I urge that if at this session a bill is introduced providing for additional judgeships, the appointment of an additional judge in Kansas be given consideration.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as the Senator from Nevada has stated, the Judicial Council has recommended an additional judge in the State of Mississippi to cope with the crowded docket, particularly in the southern district. So far as the Senator from Nevada knows, will the Senate consider that recommendation this year?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will say that when the change of administration came about, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. LANGER] was courteous enough to appoint the senior Senator from Nevada chairman of a subcommittee on judicial machinery. It was out of that subcommittee that this bill originated.

I desire to say to the Senator from Mississippi that it is my intention to take into consideration the recommendations of the Judicial Conference with the idea of trying to relieve the situation in Mississippi as well as in some other States.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator think it is advisable to introduce at this session a bill to that end?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall personally do everything I can along that line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO DURATION OF TODAY'S SESSION

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield in order that I may make an announcement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be very glad to yield, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, earlier today I indicated that we might hold a night session. Because of the fact that the announcement had been made last night, without adequate warning to some Members of the Senate, and because of the fact that a number of Senators had made commitments which it will be difficult for them to break, we shall not run tonight beyond 7 o'clock. So far as the session tomorrow is concerned, I have been informed that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled a meeting to mark up the bill providing statehood for Alaska.

I have no desire to interfere with the committee's functioning in that regard, and, inasmuch as an earlier meeting of the Senate tomorrow might interfere with the work of the committee, we shall meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are some Senators who have speeches they desire to make. In view of two dinners which are scheduled for this evening, the Senator from California does not expect to have a vote on any of the amendments to the pending measure, does he?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has indicated that he will not make a prolonged speech, I am hopeful that we may have some votes this evening and to that extent move ahead a little. Senators on both sides of the aisle have indicated that they would like to have some votes if it is at all possible. I told the Senator earlier that if no votes were taken by 6:30 o'clock this evening, there would be no voting after that hour, even though the Senate might run until 7 o'clock to enable Senators to make speeches.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Will there be any session of the Senate tomorrow night?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have given advance notice that we might have an evening session but I think we might wait until tomorrow before making final determination to that effect. If it looks as though we might proceed with a rollcall by continuing in session until 7 or 8 o'clock, and that meets with the approval of the Senate, I think we

should be in a position to do so. But, as the distinguished Senator from Utah knows, it is very difficult to predict what the Senate of the United States may do under any given set of circumstances. I shall leave it in that nebulous state, to see what we can accomplish during the remainder of this afternoon and tomorrow.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from California is giving us a little bit of carrot in the hope that if we finish tomorrow afternoon we can go home.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me so that I may make a brief statement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 2, the Civil Aeronautics Board was taken to task on the floor of this body for doing something which it is charged by law with doing, namely, the protection of the United States national interest. I have heard criticism here before of failures by our Government to look after the interests of the United States, but I confess I was a little astonished to hear an agency taken to task for doing its bounden duty to protect the Nation's interests.

Mr. President, the facts in the case I am discussing are simple and easy to understand. Once understood, they reflect only credit on the action of the CAB in moving expeditiously to see that the United States gets an even break in air competition with a European flag airline. There is one simple issue at the heart of this matter: Will the United States flag carrier have the opportunity to fly on equal terms with the French Government airline?

The facts, Mr. President, are these: For 7 years the CAB and the Department of State have tried to negotiate with Mexico an air treaty which would provide for the air transportation rights of all interested carriers. Throughout this period their attempts have been unsuccessful. About 2 weeks ago the Mexican Government authorized Air France, the French Government airline, to carry local passengers nonstop between New York City and Mexico City. The United States had given France this right several years ago on the principle of reciprocity for United States flag rights in France, that is, Paris to Rome.

Air France commenced New York City to Mexico City operations immediately with a flight time under 7 hours. This created an emergency situation because American Airlines, the only United States carrier authorized to fly between these two cities, was required to fly a longer route, making intermediate stops, so that its fastest flying time was 10 hours, 10 minutes, against 6 hours, 55 minutes for Air France, a difference of 3 hours, 15 minutes. The history of air transportation shows that with such a disadvantage caused by slower service, our Government would in effect be permitting the great bulk of the business to be transported by a European carrier.

To meet this emergency the CAB, with the concurrence of the Department of State, and acting under its emergency powers, granted American Airlines the right to fly this route nonstop. This allows the United States carrier to compete on equal terms. American Airlines being the only United States carrier operating the route between these two cities, this was the only thing the Board and the Department of State could have done to meet this emergency.

For several years, Mr. President, American, which has worked to develop this traffic since 1942, has been aware of the possibility that one day Air France would start such a nonstop service between New York and Mexico City. It has been diligent in advising the CAB and the other interested Government agencies that it, too, should have opportunity to compete for the traffic it had developed on equal terms with the European airline. The record of the CAB is full of the representations made by American in this regard.

So, Mr. President, when the matter came to a head late in January through Air France obtaining permission from the Mexican Government to carry United States-Mexican traffic nonstop between these cities, the CAB, with the concurrence of the Department of State, moved swiftly to insure the protection of our national interest.

Contrary to the impression that some are trying to create, the CAB did not act hastily or on ill advice. The facts in this situation, I reiterate, have been known to the Board and to the Department of State for several years. They are spread upon the public records of the Board. The State Department and the Civil Aeronautics Board moved swiftly to protect the United States national interest, and for doing that, Mr. President, they deserve the commendation of this body and the thanks of every American.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is aware of the fact, is he not, that there are two former Senators on that Board, one of whom takes the same position that I have taken for some time, namely, that cities like New Orleans and Birmingham, for example, are entitled to have air service to Mexico City?

Mr. WILEY. I am also acquainted with the fact that Air France makes flights there, and I am also acquainted with the fact that American Airlines was promised service some time ago and should have had it. I shall not attempt to thresh out the merits of the question. If we are going to criticize the decisions of boards and courts, we are assuming a jurisdiction which does not belong to us. We are legislators. I mean no reflection on the Senator from Louisiana. I realize he received good publicity and received many letters, but I think a statement on the other side is merited.

Mr. LONG. How would the Senator from Wisconsin feel if, after his State had been one of those given permission 7½ years ago to have air service between his State and another country, the people of his State were then told they could not have the service until there had been entered into with the foreign country a bilateral agreement which would settle every issue?

After we had listened to that excuse for 7½ years, American Airlines decided it wanted to establish a nonstop line from New York to Mexico City. There was no bilateral agreement in that case. The Civil Aeronautics Board said, "Go down and work out an agreement with Mexico. So far as we are concerned, it is all right."

But for 7½ years service has been denied to New Orleans, Birmingham, and Atlanta. If the Senator's State of Wisconsin were being discriminated against, how would he feel? Would he not speak out in favor of the people of his State?

Mr. WILEY. I have no criticism of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I have always thought he was very fluid in his expressions, and was loyal to his State and his constituents. I do not blame him a bit. I say, Three hurrahs for him.

At the same time, I felt that since a former Senator had been attacked, his views should be given, although he had not asked me to express them. Chan Gurney is an old friend of mine. I thought the views of both sides should be placed in the RECORD, not merely the views of one side.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly; and I say to the Senator from Louisiana, Shake hands.

Mr. LONG. Whenever former Senator Chan Gurney, now Civil Aeronautics Commissioner Gurney, is in favor of granting adequate air service to Louisiana, I shall be at the side of the Senator from Wisconsin, standing with him.

EXPANSION AND EXTENSION OF DIRECT HOME AND FARMHOUSE LOAN AUTHORITY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is my purpose in taking the floor to introduce three bills, and to make a short explanatory statement about each of them.

First, I wish to refer to a bill I am introducing to expand and extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes.

The bill, which I shall send to the desk at the conclusion of my remarks, seeks to continue the life of the veterans' direct-loan program, which I originally introduced, and which Congress first authorized in the Housing Act of 1950.

I hope that this bill will receive the wholehearted support that it deserves. It is the only way that the GI-loan benefits of the GI bill of rights can be made possible for many of our World War II and Korean veterans who live outside the large metropolitan centers.

My reason for introducing the bill is that the President, in submitting his housing program, omitted any reference to this extension; and if the program as the President presented it were to be en-

acted, the very fine and worthwhile program to which I am referring would expire on June 30 of this year.

It is important to distinguish between the regular GI-loan program of the Veterans' Administration and the supplemental direct loan program which is confined to the small towns and rural areas. The regular GI-loan program of the Veterans' Administration is the program under which private mortgage capital supported by the VA guaranty has made available the advantageous terms of GI financing to more than 3 million World War II and Korean veterans. These are loans made by private banks, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies, and the loans are partially guaranteed by the VA.

The protection of the VA guaranty has encouraged lenders to make loans at low interest rates and on very liberal terms. Most of the regular GI loans have been made with no downpayment or with a much smaller downpayment than that normally required. The typical maturity has been for 20 or 25 years.

VA's direct-loan program—with which my bill is concerned—was set up by the Congress in 1950 as a necessary supplement to the regular VA-guaranteed GI-loan program. The reason that Congress authorized the direct loan program is simple. We had found that ever since the GI-loan program was first authorized in 1944, veterans who lived in many of our small towns and semirural communities were unable to find private lenders willing to make GI loans.

In many of these areas the only lending institution is a relatively small country bank which does not have sufficient capital to make long-term mortgage loans. The primary business of these country banks is to supply the commercial and farming credit needed by the community. It usually has very limited funds available for long-term mortgage loans. Also the going interest rate for mortgages in these rural areas has typically been much higher than the 4 percent or 4½ percent interest rates permitted for GI loans.

The increase in the interest rate on regular GI loans from 4 percent to 4½ percent, which was effective last May, has had little effect on the availability of GI loans in rural areas and small towns. Since that time, the Veterans' Administration has been able to remove a few areas from direct loan eligibility, but the number of such actions has been very small, and in general the areas where 4-percent GI loans were customarily unavailable are virtually identical with the areas where 4½-percent GI loans are unobtainable today.

Recognizing this basic inequity which, in effect, denied to veterans living outside of urban areas the benefits of the GI loan law which Congress intended to be available for all veterans, the Congress authorized the Veterans' Administration to make loans direct with Government funds in those areas where private lenders were unable or unwilling to make GI loans.

In its report, the President's Advisory Committee makes clear that there are areas where there is always an acute shortage of housing investment funds. It would try to solve the shortage, however, by raising interest rates and charging higher fees. This might make more money available, but those added charges would make the cost prohibitive. Experience shows that my proposal is the sound way to fill this admitted gap.

I may say at this point that the last time this measure was before the committee for hearings, bankers, investment bankers, and representatives of insurance companies who came before the committee, I believe without exception, acknowledged that the program was a good one and ought to be continued.

The sum originally made available to VA for the direct-loan program was $150 million, a relatively small sum when compared with the $22 billion which private lenders have made available for GI loans with the VA guaranty.

Congress extended the program again in September 1951, and authorized the $150 million to be used as a revolving fund which would permit the VA to make new loans as outstanding loans were repaid or sold to private investors. Then later, in April 1952, when VA funds for additional direct loans were exhausted, Congress authorized an additional $125 million to be made available to the VA in quarterly installments.

Last year the Congress authorized a 1-year extension of the program and a continuation of the authorization for additional allotments of $25 million per quarter. However, under existing law the final $25 million allocation will be made available on April 1, and the VA's authority to make additional loans will expire on June 30 of this year.

The need for VA's direct-loan program which Congress has clearly recognized ever since 1950 is as great today as at any time over the past 3 or 4 years. The supply of funds available for GI loans appears to be somewhat better now than it was a year ago, but this improvement has been confined primarily to the urban areas of the country.

I hope that the improvement will eventually be felt in some of our more sparsely populated communities. If so, under the law, the Veterans' Administration will be able to remove such areas from direct-loan eligibility. However, there is little prospect in the immediate future that private capital will be able to meet the home financing needs of veterans in rural areas and small towns.

If we do not extend the life of VA's direct-loan program and provide additional money, we will have to face the brutal fact that the GI loan benefit will be nothing more than a hollow mockery to those veterans who do not happen to live in the urban areas where GI loan money is obtainable. I do not want to see that happen, and I am confident that the other Members of Congress do not want to see it happen either.

In order to meet the needs of the direct-loan program my bill would provide a total of $200 million for the year beginning July 1. However, the $200 million would not all become immediately available but, following the present pattern, the money would become available to the Veterans' Administration in four quarterly installments of $50 million each during the next fiscal year.

Also, as under the present arrangement, the $50 million quarterly allotments would be reduced by the amount of sales of loans to private lenders made by VA in the preceding quarter.

You will note that my bill would call for quarterly allotments of $50 million or double the $25 million which VA has been receiving each quarter over the past year. I propose that the quarterly allocation be increased for the very simple reason that the $25 million allocation has fallen considerably short of meeting the demand for GI loans by World War II and Korean veterans in the smaller towns and rural areas.

There are many thousands of veterans now on the waiting lists hoping to receive GI loans. If the program expires on June 30, the unsatisfied waiting list would still number many thousand veterans. The increase to $50 million should help to reduce the size of that waiting list substantially, and more effectively meet the direct loan demand by veterans in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I may preface my remarks by saying that the matter being discussed by the Senator from Alabama is one in which I am indeed interested, because quite recently I have received several requests from veterans in Mississippi for help in connection with the loans referred to, not help in getting the actual loans, but for assistance in getting their names on the list, which is very long. On a quick inquiry, I understand that there are pending in Mississippi at the present time more than one thousand applications. I understood the Senator to say a while ago that the law, unless amended, will expire within a very short time. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It will expire on June 30, and there will be available from April 1 to June 30 only $25 million.

Mr. STENNIS. I may point to one case in particular, in which the Veterans' Administration was not to blame, because the veteran made a mistake as to his title. In any event, the veteran waited several months, and then the mistake was discovered. He was then told, on last August 12, that he would have to take a new place on the list and await his turn. I have before me a letter dated December 23, 1953, in which it is stated that the veteran would still have to wait, and that it would be several months before his name would be reached. It was anticipated that by that time the funds would not be available.

I desire to ask the Senator from Alabama how long it is proposed to extend the life of the legislation. I am talking about the direct loans, because the Senator has said that in the small towns and rural areas such loans are not available to veterans from other sources.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, I may say that all I am proposing in the

bill is to extend the law for 1 year. As a matter of fact, if I had my way—and I may say that this suggestion now comes from the national headquarters of the American Legion—I would extend it for the same period which is provided for in the GI bill of rights. I would make the two laws conterminous. However, I see nothing wrong in our reviewing the program every year, and for that reason I am simply proposing to extend the law for 1 year.

I may say further to the Senator from Mississippi that one reason why I feel rather confident in favoring the proposal to extend the law for 1 year is that it has been extended year by year.

I introduced the bill originally at the request of the American Legion and in response to the action taken at their national convention, which suggested the kind of program I am sponsoring. The American Legion sent the bill to me and asked me if I would sponsor it, and I did so.

I may say that I was reenforced in my support of the bill by letters which I had received from bankers in the smaller towns in my own State. I remember one in particular which came from a gentleman in Tuscumbia, Ala. As the Senator from Mississippi knows, that town is very near his State. It is not a large place. It is a fairly sizable town, but it certainly is not one of the metropolitan areas.

The banker said, "You know, I am president of a little bank. We are limited by capitalization. We can put only so many loans in our portfolio; then we are through. I have tried to help the veterans of this area, but my portfolio is full. I can't move the loans into the market. It does make me sad not to be able to take care of the veterans in this community."

I had many letters of that kind from banks, as well as letters from veterans in rural communities, touching on the subject.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may recall that when I introduced the bill originally I had great difficulty in getting the Committee on Banking and Currency to approve the bill, because it was something new, and it was a direct-loan program. When the bill was brought up on the floor of the Senate, we had a very difficult time in securing its passage, but it scraped through on a trial basis, with an appropriation of $150 million for 1 year.

The next year the matter came up again. Under the amendment which I offered, the fund was changed into a revolving fund, and the bill provided that as the banks sold the mortgages, they could use the money over and over. I remember that the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] spoke in behalf of it at that time. The bill then passed unanimously.

A similar bill again came up in April of 1952, and at that time it was passed unanimously.

Now the time comes for the subject to be considered again. Frankly, I would not introduce the bill had the President included such a provision in his program. However, the President did not include it, and I think it is vital for us to continue the program.

I have from the American Legion an informal statement that, by all means, the program should be continued, and they suggest continuing it for the life of the GI bill of rights program.

If the Senator from Mississippi will pardon me, I may say, in connection with the statement just made by him, that unless such a program is continued a veteran to whom he referred cannot hope to get a loan.

I may add that the Korean veterans are just returning, so the Korean veterans in the rural areas cannot hope to profit under this program or any other housing program unless such a bill as I am introducing is passed.

Mr. STENNIS. In answer to the Senator's observation, I call attention to a statement in the letter I said I had received:

> Our manager in Jackson indicates it may be several months before Mr. Coleman's request is reached in turn, dependent upon the many variables which enter to affect the amount of funds available and the housing desires and needs of veterans ahead of him on the waiting list.

I may add that I have discovered that the law will expire before many months pass.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And before his name on the list is reached.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator from Alabama yield further on this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I happen to know what the situation is with reference to the small-town banks. It is pertinent to inquire whether or not local lending institutions can carry loans of the nature provided for in the Senator's bill. Although small-town banks are solvent and sound, they do not have the long-term investment funds and the big trust departments which the banks in larger cities have. Except for a few loans, they cannot go beyond agricultural loans and the short-time commercial loans which are usual in such communities. The State laws do not permit their going beyond that. The banks are not created to go beyond such loans. In small towns veterans do not have available to them loans for construction of homes and they are without avenues of financing which are available to veterans in other areas where are located larger financial institutions or banks, with larger financial structures. I am impressed with the fact that in the relatively small State of Mississippi, more than 1,000 such applications are pending, with no hope of obtaining loans before the expiration of the law.

Certainly the Veterans' Administration is not at fault; I wish to make that clear.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course that is true. The trouble arises because of the limitation on the program. It has been operated on the basis of $25 million a quarter. A few minutes ago I said, as the able Senator may recall, that I was proposing that the program be increased to $50 million a quarter, less any sales which are made, because of the tremendous backlog that has been built up. The Senator from Mississippi has referred to the backlog which has been built up in his own State. Of course the backlog is increasing as the Korean veterans return home.

My guess is that the backlog which has developed in the State of Mississippi represents a complete program for that State for about 18 months. In other words, in Mississippi a backlog of about 18 months exists at the present time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Alabama recalls a meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee, of which he is a very distinguished member, about 1 year ago, at about the time when we were discussing increasing the interest rate on VA loans. We had before us a large number of representatives of the smaller lending institutions in the smaller communities, who testified—with great conviction, I thought—that although there was no doubt that in the large money centers, such as New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Baltimore, and possibly New Orleans, sufficient mortgage money was available at a fair rate of interest, so as to permit the larger lending institutions to care for the veterans' needs, yet in the small centers, such as the one referred to by the Senator from Mississippi—and let me say they are multiplied many hundreds of times, if not thousands of times throughout the Nation—there was no way by which a veteran could obtain a loan; except through the direct intervention of the Federal Government.

It seems to me that the testimony given there was so convincing that there should be no difficulty in persuading Congress to pass this bill, so as to authorize $50 million a quarter, instead of the $25 million a quarter which has been allowed in the past, but which has been entirely inadequate.

I wish to commend the Senator from Alabama very highly for introducing the bill. He can be assured of my full support.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York.

Let me say that I remember the meeting of the committee. The Senator from New York will remember, too, that not only were there present at that meeting representatives who spoke of the need, but also some of the most distinguished bankers of the Nation. For instance, I remember quite well that the representative of one of the leading New York banks—and the Senator from New York may recall which one it was; I am uncertain whether it was Chase National Bank or the Guaranty Trust or the City National Bank; I believe it was 1 of the 3—testified in behalf of, and paid his compliments to, the program, and said it had done a good job, and was needed because there were areas which his bank and similar banks could never, never hope to reach.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, I remember that distinctly. As I recall, that testimony

was given by a representative of the Treasury Department.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from New York may be correct as to that.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. At the outset of the GI home-loan program, the Government guaranteed most of the amount, and the rest was borrowed at a fixed rate of interest. Is not that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and that is still done.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; where it is possible to find a bank that will make such a loan.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. At the outset the RFC bought the loans from the banks, and even paid a commission for them. Of course Congress had to stop that practice, because of abuses. Is not that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Of course the home mortgage market, as in the case of many other markets, has gone up and has gone down. We have had a secondary mortgage market, which was supposed to help when the other market "went bad." But of course there was a time when it bought all the mortgages; that is the instance to which the Senator from West Virginia has referred.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. The big problem at this time arises from the fact that in the smaller communities—such as those referred to by the Senator from Mississippi—the local banks get their portfolios loaded with home mortgages, of which they can take only a certain percentage, under the regulation; and then it is encumbent upon the prospective borrower to obtain the loan elsewhere, thus entailing brokerage fees. Is not that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. But, of course, there are other areas where loans under the Government program are not available at all; and some of those areas are in the State which is so ably represented by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. It is true that there are such areas in the State I in part represent. However, even in those areas, the Government has to have its interest safeguarded, in handling such loans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. The Government officials have to check the loans, and have to have the properties appraised. Therefore, the operation under this program is much cheaper and also much safer for the veteran, and entails no cost to the Government. Is not that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. In fact, I think the Government will show a profit on the operation. A little later I shall show in detail how good the program has been. In fact, defaults have occurred in a little less than one-tenth of 1 percent of all the loans handled.

Mr. KILGORE. Furthermore, the program results in a decreased cost to the veteran; and it costs the Government no more; and the risk is practically negligible, even as compared to private bank-loan risks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

By the way, let me point out that we wrote into the original law a requirement that the veteran had to be a good credit risk. That requirement is still in the law.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. And, I can give an illustration of it: I happen to know of a case in which the FHA was willing to finance a piece of property at an evaluation of $17,500. The seller agreed with the veteran, however, to accept the Veterans' Administration appraisal, which was $16,000. The loan was handled in that amount, through the Veterans' Administration. Of course the veteran had a certain amount of money of his own which he would use. Thus he was able to finance the loan, and was saved $1,500, because of what I would consider to be possibly an excessively large valuation which had been placed on the property by the seller.

So in the long run the program redounds to the benefit of the veteran, and at no cost to the Government.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The distinguished Senator is correct in the conclusion he reaches.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana, who, as I remember, was previously an outstanding member of the Banking and Currency Committee when this program was approved by it.

Mr. LONG. Yes, I had the honor of serving on the subcommittee headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama.

I wish to compliment him on the very fine work he has done in connection with housing bills which have provided for housing for veterans and, in fact, for persons in all walks of life.

So far as I recall, I have agreed with his views on housing in every instance.

I should like to have the Senator from Alabama tell me, if he can, whether the Government has lost any money on the program of direct loans, or whether the Government will be able to look upon this program as one which has been without cost to it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not have the figures available, except as to foreclosures. A moment ago I said that foreclosures have amounted to a little less than one-tenth of 1 percent. In a moment I shall present those figures.

I am quite certain that not only has the Government not lost any money on the program, but probably there will be a slight margin of profit. Of course, the program is not for the purpose of profit. However, I am quite certain that—just as in the case of all the other housing programs—this program will show a profit to the Government. I am excepting, of course, such programs as those for slum clearance, urban redevelopment, and public housing, which are long-range programs. Actually, as to them we could figure a profit if we considered the tax returns. However, I am speaking solely of initial operations.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further to me, at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that these loans perhaps carry a small amount for insurance of the loans?

Mr. SPARKMAN. They do.

Mr. LONG. The losses to the Government have never been nearly so great as the amount the Government charges for the insurance of the loans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. I wish, however, to draw a distinction. These are guaranteed loans, rather than typical FHA insured loans.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. So rather than saying that there is an insurance, I prefer to say that there is a margin in the interest rates which takes care of expenses. In connection with the regular FHA loan, there is a definite amount which goes into an insurance fund. While this discussion has nothing to do with that, I digress to say that that fund has shown a rather handsome return, and has today a large reserve to take care of loans.

Mr. LONG. Of course we know that in years gone by the Government was able to borrow money for perhaps as little as 1½ percent. The present administration is borrowing money currently at around 2½ percent. But even at 2½ percent, the Government is in a position to borrow money at a lower interest rate than it is charging to veterans when it lends the money to veterans at 4 percent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is exactly correct. The Government loans it at 4½ percent to the veterans, whereas money which comes out of the Treasury, as the Senator has correctly said, costs the Government an average of about 2½ percent. The rate has varied from about 2¼ to 2¾ percent, but at the present time it is about 2½ percent.

Mr. LONG. In this program to help veterans, what the Government is doing, in effect, is helping veterans to borrow money at a low interest rate so that they can own their own homes, but it is charging the veterans 2 percent more than the cost of interest to the Government.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct; and the program is limited to veterans who are good credit risks, but because of the fact that they live in a remote area, a rural area, or a semirural area, they are unable to obtain private capital. There is a provision written into the law that if they can get the money elsewhere, they are not eligible under this program. The Veterans' Administration limits the area of operation. While a great portion of Alabama is eligible, my home county is not eligible. Not a single loan can be made in my home county. Such loans may be made in almost any part of metropolitan New York, New Orleans, or some of the parishes which enjoy a good, strong economy, where mortgage money is available.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is familiar with the fact, is he not, that unemployment is increasing by leaps and bounds at the present time? We saw a report the other day which indicated that unemployment was approaching the two-and-a-half-million mark. So there is certainly more than one reason why the

Government should not abandon the program at this time. It is desirable that veterans have housing, but it is also desirable that employment be maintained for such useful purposes as building houses for veterans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That certainly is a very strong feature of the program which the President has recommended to us in the economic report. By the way, as the Senator knows, I am a member of the Joint Economic Committee, and we are in the process of studying that report in order that we may make our recommendations to the Congress by March 1, as required by law.

One of the strongest features of that program is the overall housing program. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that, as he knows from the studies which we conducted when he was a very able and helpful member of the housing subcommittee, we must have a bare minimum—and I stress the words "bare minimum"—of 1 million housing units. That will not take care of our needs. That will simply enable us to get by. We probably need as many as one and a half million, but certainly somewhere between one million and one and a half million. We are not going to get them unless we have a housing program which will make it possible for all segments of our population to enjoy the housing program, as they have done in the past. Cutting off the veterans' direct loan program would be cutting off that much of the overall housing program. Certainly, as the Senator has so well pointed out, at a time when unemployment is climbing and the number of workers is shrinking, we should not be looking for programs to curtail the economy, but programs to maintain it. That is the theme of the President's economic report to Congress. We want to project this economy into 1954, and through 1954, so that 1954 will be practically as good a year as 1953. I believe 1954 is referred to as promising to be the second best year in the Nation's history.

Mr. LONG. The Senator well knows that it had been predicted that shortly after World War II we would have a postwar depression.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LONG. The large veterans' housing program which was passed by Congress was only one of the factors which made it possible for us to readjust the economy, when we had 14 million servicemen coming home looking for jobs. With soldiers coming back from Korea, and with the Government cutting back on defense expenditures, it seems that now would be the worst possible time to discontinue the program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is no time to curtail a program to sustain the economy. Aside from the fact that the veterans are entitled to an opportunity to share in the overall-housing program, there are many veterans in the parishes of northwestern and southwestern Louisiana, in portions of Alabama and Mississippi, in upper New York, western New York, and all over the country, who are returning from the service and who will not otherwise have an opportunity to share in the housing program if this program is allowed to die.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Alabama to say that the rate of default was only one-tenth of 1 percent?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. This is not a big program. It could not be on $25 million a year. Remember, the Veterans' Administration guaranteed loan program has run to $22 billion, whereas this program has been only about $300 million.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the record of one-tenth of 1 percent defaults will compare very favorably with the experience of most of the insurance companies and banks in New York which deal in loans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator will remember that bankers testified before our committee that a wonderful job had been done with this program.

Mr. LEHMAN. It must be remembered that the one-tenth of 1 percent does not mean that there is one-tenth of 1 percent of actual final loss in this investment by the Government, because, of course, the Government recoups the value of the houses.

Is it not also true that whatever small loss there might be and it would be a very small loss—would be more than counter-balanced by the profit which the Government makes in borrowing cheaply and lending at a reasonable rate, as well as the Government's profit on insurance premiums?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am reluctant to use the term, but in the absence of a depression or a very severe recession, or adjustment, or whatever it may be called, there will be no losses in the overall program. As the Senator points out, the one-tenth of 1 percent referred to foreclosures, and not to the loss. The chances are that the Government did not lose a dollar.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator refers to the fact that there might be a loss in connection with some of these programs if we have a depression. It should be pointed out that there is a connection between these programs and a possible depression. If we should cut back on home construction, if we should make it difficult for the Nation's economy to go ahead, as it has been doing in the past, if we should raise the interest rates and thereby discourage people from making long-term investments or capital improvements, those things would bring on a depression, which, of course, would mean that we would lose money, even under the existing FHA loans, as well as loans made by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not have the figures with me, but I know the Senator will readily agree with the general statement that there is perhaps no other industry in the United States which contributes more economically, in providing people with work, than does the construction industry, of which home building is a great part, because its effect goes on down the line, reaching cement mills, iron and steel mills, equipment, lumber, furniture, refrigerators, and about everything that one can think of.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator referred to small towns in the rural areas. Does the bill limit or clearly define the areas along that line?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it does not spell it out, except it charges the Veterans' Administration to determine the areas in which the program ought to apply and it does restrict it to those areas, and it restricts it to those veterans who are not able to get mortgage loans elsewhere.

Mr. STENNIS. That could be important. Suppose there is a county, one side of which is much stronger economically than the other.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Administrator can divide a county. He does not have to say, "This whole county is eliminated" or "This whole county is eligible." He could draw a line and say, "All of this county is included except such and such a city or the western half of the county."

Mr. STENNIS. The case to which I referred a short time ago was of a young man from a little town of about 5,000 population. He would not be precluded merely because the town had more than a smalltown status?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, no. That is not the definition. The Senator will remember that each time I have referred to it I have said that "rural or semi-rural areas," or "small towns," and so forth.

The key to the situation is whether a mortgage for home financing is available. Of course in the case of a large metropolitan area mortgage money is nearly always available, because large banks and other financial institutions maintain representatives there.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator makes a distinction between what he calls a private loan and——

Mr. SPARKMAN. And a guaranteed loan.

Mr. STENNIS. And a guaranteed loan.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, the Senator's bill pertains solely to direct loans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. The President's program proposes to continue the GI guaranteed loans, but it does not offer a continuance of this part of the program. That is why I am introducing the bill. Had this part been included in the President's recommendation, certainly I would merely have gone along with the recommendation.

Mr. STENNIS. The President's bill does not include this particular group?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was not included in the President's message. So far as I know, a bill has not yet been introduced.

Mr. STENNIS. On the basis of actual need and on the basis of our economy—and the Senator from Mississippi is in fairly close contact with the military program, and he knows that it is bound to be slowing down—I believe housing, together with what goes into the build-

ing of a house and what goes into the house after it is built, is the safest and soundest and most certain way of sustaining an economy. I commend the Senator very highly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the statement of the Senator from Mississippi as to the economic value of housing programs. I do want to be cautious in one respect, however. I would not advocate overbuilding merely for the purpose of maintaining our economy. As I stated a few minutes ago, in order to take care of our increasing population we need between a million and a million and a half units a year. That is just a normal increase. Certainly this is no time to cut that program below what we need, taking into consideration the great contribution it makes to a sound and healthy economy, particularly in the employment of so many different people in so many related lines.

Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senators who have propounded questions to me, because I believe such questioning has brought out a good many facts that needed to be brought out. I shall continue with my statement.

Mr. President, please note also that the effect of my bill would be to raise the maximum size of the revolving fund from $375 million to $575 million. If the mortgage money market continues to improve during 1954—as many financial observers predict—I would hope that VA's efforts to sell its loans would be more successful and that the total fund would revolve more effectively in the future so that more and more veterans in our rural and semirural areas can be accommodated with direct loans, without a further increase in the revolving fund.

To further the revolving fund feature of the program, my bill proposes an amendment which I think will help VA in its efforts to sell the loans it has already made. Under existing law eligible purchasers must be private lending institutions. My bill would remove that limitation so that VA could sell to charitable funds, pension funds, as well as private individuals. Since, when VA sells a direct loan the purchaser is guaranteed against loans just as in the case of a regular GI loan, I believe that my amendment will broaden the market for VA's existing direct-loan portfolio.

Some of those who have opposed the VA direct-loan program have done so on the ground that it is competitive with private enterprise. These charges have no validity when applied to VA's direct-loan program. It simply is not competitive with private enterprise. It is instead a necessary supplemental program which is designed to supply a need which cannot be met by private lending institutions in the areas where VA's direct-loan program operates.

First, it should be emphasized that VA will make direct loans only in areas which it declares eligible. Those areas are confined, as Congress intended, to the smaller towns and semirural areas of our Nation. The large urban centers are not eligible for VA direct loans. In the continental United States no city of over 50,000 in population is eligible, and relatively few cities in the twenty-five to fifty thousand size group are eligible.

In the second place, the law and VA's procedures prevent the making of a VA direct loan whenever a private lender is willing to make the loan. The veteran must show that he is unable to obtain a VA-guaranteed loan from a private lender in his community.

In view of those basic safeguards, I do not see how anyone can argue that the program is competitive with private lenders. It just is not so. In fact, I have been told by country bankers themselves that the direct-loan program is supplying a real need in their communities which would otherwise go unsatisfied.

I know that has been the case in my own State of Alabama. Under the program about 1,700 direct loans have been made in the smaller towns and rural areas in the State of Alabama. Without the aid of direct loans I doubt that any of those 1,700 World War II and Korean veterans' families would have been able to start on the road to home ownership with the beneficial terms of GI financing. It is my fervent hope that we will continue to make it possible for more families like them to enjoy the same benefit.

Another argument I hear offered against VA's direct loan program is that it cost the Government money. It is true that when the Veterans' Administration makes a direct loan the Treasury does have to disburse the necessary funds. But remember, that is only the initial step. That money is not a gift; it is a loan which the veteran must repay and repay with interest. And the veteran is doing just that in a most commendable fashion. I know Senators will share in my pride when I report that out of almost 41,000 direct loans made to date, only 52—or slightly over one tenth of 1 percent—have defaulted to a point where the Veterans' Administration has had to acquire the property. Incidentally, Mr. President, earlier in my remarks I referred to less than one-tenth of 1 percent. It is slightly more than one-tenth of 1 percent; but I doubt that any other housing program past or present can point to such an outstanding record.

Bear in mind also that the Government is receiving a substantial net income from these loans. The Veterans' Administration has paid the Treasury about 2 percent for its direct loan funds but it receives 4½ percent interest on the new loans it makes. I am confident that that spread will be more than sufficient to cover the administrative costs of the program, and in addition to set up reserves against future losses so that in the long run the program will not cost the Government a dime. It will more than likely show a tidy profit.

It may be argued that a serious economic depression would cause the program to lose money. In that eventuality so would all the other housing programs, and in any case I believe that is an eventuality we are all willing to do our utmost to prevent.

In short, I am proud to be the sponsor of a bill to which my mind should be a "must" on our Legislative Calendar this session.

Mr. President, I now introduce the bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2889) to expand and extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended—

(a) by striking out of clause (C) of section 512 (b) "June 30, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955";

(b) by striking out of section 512 (d) "to any private lending institution evidencing ability to service loans" and inserting in lieu thereof "to any person or entity approved for such purpose by the Administrator";

(c) by striking out of the first sentence of section 513 (a) "June 30, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955";

(d) by striking out of the third sentence of section 513 (c) "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1956";

(e) by striking out of the first sentence of section 513 (d) "June 30, 1954"; and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955"; and,

(f) by striking out of section 513 (d) the second time it appears the sum "$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the sum of "$50,000,000."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Alabama, in the course of his remarks, referred to the fact that there is a need for a million units of new housing, or probably a million and a half units.

The original bill was passed before I became a Member of the Senate. It provided for the construction, I believe, of 135,000 units. That was, of course, gradually reduced, because recommendations were made at various times, for 75,000 units. The Senator will recall that 2 years ago, after a long debate, we passed a bill providing for 35,000 units. That was eliminated in conference, and no new housing whatsoever was authorized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the Senator that the final agreement was 20,000 units.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thought the item had been entirely eliminated.

In the message of the President of the United States on the subject of the housing program he recommends the construction of 35,000 units. In view of the situation which has been described by the Senator from Alabama, and in view of the need of a minimum of a million more units and probably a million and a half more units, does the Senator not think that 35,000 units of public housing is quite inadequate?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from New York that the one person who has probably had more to do with formulating the public housing program than has anyone else was the late Senator Taft, of Ohio. I was a member of the Banking and

Currency Committee when the housing bill of 1949 was reported and passed.

I remember quite well Senator Taft's testimony before the committee. It was given while he was serving as a member of the committee and he teamed up with the predecessor of the distinguished Senator from New York, the late Senator Wagner, and with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. The bill first became known as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. In the 80th Congress it became known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and it was during that Congress that the bill was reported, although it was not passed until the following year, 1949. But it was undoubtedly the continuing hard work and the application of a fine mind by the distinguished Senator from Ohio that eventuated in the enactment of that law.

I have said many times that I never would have thought of that plan of meeting a part of the needs of the municipalities of this country. After all, a great many persons think of public housing as being owned by the Federal Government. It is not. It is owned by the cities, the municipalities and municipal organizations. It may be a county or some other political subdivision.

Senator Taft's argument was that approximately 10 percent of the housing ought to be what we had come to call public housing. The committee finally worked out a compromise bill providing for 810,000 units over a period of 6 years, which would be an average of 135,000 a year, but with the right of the President to increase or decrease the number.

Since that program was passed, instead of building 10 percent of public housing, we have built a total of 187,000 units. The able Senator from New York can see that we have fallen even below 5 percent, much less the 10 percent which Senator Taft recommended.

I think that answers the Senator's question.

There is another thing which we must remember. There has been a great backlog built up.

I desire to say to my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], because he in part represents a State which is very much like my own, in that both have large rural areas, that when the public-housing program was cut off last year, certain small towns in Alabama were eliminated. Indeed, 32 such towns were eliminated. They got under the wire late. They had made all their plans and were ready to go ahead, but they were eliminated when the program was cut last year. That backlog is still present. I believe it should be taken into consideration in determining the number of units that should be constructed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of the 35,000 units, cities in New York will get a negligible number.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My hope is that we shall first take care of the small towns which were omitted. If that is done, however, I think New York would not get any.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think there is a great deal of merit in the Senator's concern regarding the small cities and towns. I have been fighting the battles of areas of this country other than my own for many years, and I shall continue to do so. But there is a very urgent need in New York, as there is in the State of Mississippi, the State of Alabama, and other States. So I hope that New York will not only get its share, but that the number of units authorized will be very materially increased over the 35,000 now proposed in the President's message and which, in my belief, is entirely inadequate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before the Senator leaves that point, I should like to invite his attention to a fact which was brought out in the report of the President's Advisory Group on Housing. I urge every Senator to read that report. There are portions of it with which Senators may not agree, but the group did a good job in assembling facts and figures. There was one figure that surprised me. We hear many persons speak about the terrific cost of public housing to the Federal Government. During the entire time the public housing program has been in effect—and, remember, it first became effective in 1938—the total cost of all housing that has been built under the so-called public housing program of the Federal Government to date has been $116 million. People sometimes speak of the cost of this program in terms of billions of dollars.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very grateful to the Senator from Alabama for having brought out that fact.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are many interesting facts contained in the report of the advisory group. I recommend that each Senator procure a copy of the report, and I commend to Senators a reading of every phase of our housing program.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very grateful to the Senator from Alabama for making the point he has made. There have been more misunderstandings and more wild statements made, day after day, with regard to the cost of the public housing program to the Federal Government than have been made on almost any other subject with which I am familiar.

As a matter of fact, the public housing program is a cooperative partnership arrangement, in which the Federal Government, of course, has taken the lead, and in which it participates. I am indeed very glad the Senator from Alabama has pointed out that the loss which has been sustained by the Federal Government has been very small.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Borrowers can apply to the Federal Government only after their State legislatures have enacted laws making such action possible, and only after their respective city councils, city commissions, or whatever their city governments may be called, have passed ordinances permitting such borrowing.

The housing does not belong to the Federal Government. The Federal Government does not build it. Neither does the Federal Government supply the money for building it. The housing authorities issue bonds, which are sold on the open market to private investors. The housing authorities make contracts with private builders to build the housing. The cities rent the housing and collect the rental fees.

About the only place where the Federal Government enters into the picture is when it says to a city, "The housing is to be used for the benefit of people who need decent housing but who are not able to pay the full cost of such housing."

In other words, such housing is considered to be a necessity, like food, clothing, or anything else that a city might include in its welfare program.

The city says to the housing authority, "You are to make the housing available to people who are not able to afford the whole rent, and you are to collect from them what they are able to pay."

I believe the rental is figured to be about 25 percent of a person's income, as a maximum. If a person were earning $120 a month, he would be considered to be able to afford a rental of about $30 a month. If the actual break-even cost of the rent of an apartment were $40 a month, the Federal Government would subsidize the difference of $10.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; but the States also help to subsidize rentals.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. So it is a true partnership arrangement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a partnership arrangement between the Federal Government and the State, county, or city.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder if the Senator from Alabama will not agree with me that, as a matter of fact, the cost of financing the sale of housing authority bonds, whether they cover property in New York, Florida, Mississippi, or Alabama, is exceptionally low. I think it has averaged less than 2 percent during the past 2 or 3 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know, but my guess would be that the Senator's statement is correct. Had I been asked, I would have said it was between 1¾ percent and 2 percent.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is my recollection of the figure.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield, before he leaves that subject?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall not take the time of the Senator to express some thoughts I have in mind with reference to the proposed legislation. I simply wish to thank the Senator from Alabama for the very fine work he has done on the bill and for his presentation of the subject matter here today. It certainly hits the spot. There is a real need for such public housing in my area of the country, and I am impressed with the soundness of the plan proposed by the Senator from Alabama. I certainly hope the bill will become law, and that the program will not become interrupted any more than it has been. I hope additional funds will be provided beyond those which are available for this year, so that the sound loan applications, the ones that are considered to be good risks,

can be handled, and the entire needs met.

I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the remarks of the able Senator from Mississippi.

I shall not place any of them in the RECORD, but I have a collection of letters from veterans in my State, and also some letters from veterans in other States. Most of the letters are from veterans in my State. The veterans tell about their experiences with the direct-loan program, and of how it would have been absolutely impossible for them to have financed their homes had it not been for the existence of this law.

I believe the law ought to be continued beyond June 30 of this year.

Mr. President, I desire now to introduce another bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

REGIONAL CREDIT UNION SYSTEM

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a regional credit union system. The bill is for the benefit of credit unions that exist in many communities and in other places where people work.

I do not desire that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the regional credit union bill.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED REGIONAL CREDIT UNION BILL

The basic objective of the proposal is to establish a method by which credit unions may supplement funds derived from their members' share purchases in order to make additional loans to their members for the provident or productive purposes that are characteristic of the credit union movement.

In order to accomplish this objective, it is proposed that the Federal Credit Union Act be amended to provide for the organization, on a voluntary basis, of a number of Regional Credit Unions. These regional credit unions would be corporate organizations basically financed by the purchase of their shares by State and Federal credit unions. The funds of the regional credit unions would be available for borrowing at reasonable rates of interest by both State and Federal credit unions.

Full participation in the program by State credit unions would in many instances necessitate amendments to State laws. However, if the program is to be placed under way, it is obvious that a start must be made somewhere. After most careful consideration, it has been concluded that the best method of procedure is by amendment to the Federal Credit Union Act, to be thereafter supplemented by such amendments to State laws as are necessary to place the program in full effect.

It is contemplated that each regional credit union will be a substantially autonomous organization under the general control of its own board of directors who will be responsible to the members of the regional credit union by whom they will be elected. At the same time it has been felt that there should be a central source from which there will be obtained such general supervision, examinations and administrative regulations as may be necessary, within the framework of the proposed act of Congress, in order to provide for efficient operations.

The proposed bill contemplates that the functions noted will be performed by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. It appears particularly logical that this method of procedure be followed in view of the fact that the program contemplates as its basic framework an amendment to the Federal Credit Union Act. The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions is an existing agency which is fully familiar with all aspects of credit union operations.

Following this introductory background statement, there is hereinafter set forth a summary of what are deemed to be the most important features of the proposed regional credit union bill.

The proposed bill would include provisions of the following substance:

1. The Federal Credit Union Act would be amended to provide for the creation of not less than 6 or more than 12 regional credit union districts, subject to apportionment and reapportionment from time to time by the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, with due regard to the convenience and customary course of the business of credit unions in the various areas.

2. A regional credit union may be organized in each such regional district and may have not to exceed three offices in such district. The minimum number of State or Federal credit unions required for obtaining a charter for a regional credit union would be fixed by the Director of the Bureau, but would be not less than 50 nor more than 200, and the minimum aggregate required stock subscription would be $250,000.

3. No credit unions would be forced to become members of a regional credit union. Credit unions desiring to become initial members of the regional credit union would be required to purchase stock equal to 2 percent of their membership holdings, adjustable annually not later than October 1 on the basis of their membership holdings as of the previous year end. Credit unions thereafter desiring to become members would be required to purchase stock equal to 2 percent of their membership holdings on the basis of their previous month-end statement. This minimum percentage could be increased up to not over 5 percent of membership holdings upon a favorable three-fourths vote of the member credit unions in a regional credit union, each member credit union acting through its board of directors.

4. The par value of shares would be $100. A regional credit union would be permitted to repurchase shares which it sold.

5. Subject to any applicable regulations prescribed by the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, required shareholdings of members could be withdrawn upon a written notice, not in excess of 1 year, of intention to withdraw from membership, except in case of liquidation of a member credit union. In the event of liquidation of a member credit unit, no more than 60 days notice of withdrawal may be required. Shareholdings in excess of the minimum requirements of members in good standing would be subject to withdrawal pursuant to notice requirements, not in excess of 60 days, fixed by the board of directors.

6. Indebtedness of a member credit unit to the Regional Credit Union shall be liquidated upon withdrawal from membership. In connection with such liquidation any collateral posted by the member shall be returned to it and the shares of stock of the Regional Credit Union owned by such member should be surrendered and canceled and such member shall be paid a sum equal to the par value of the shares so surrendered, together with all deposits, whether time or demand made by such member and any unpaid dividends and interest due such member. However, if the board of directors of the Regional Credit Union, or the director of the bureau, finds that the paid-in capital of such Regional Credit Union is then impaired as of the date of such withdrawal, the Regional Credit Union shall withhold from the amount to be paid in retirement of such shares, the pro rata amount of such impairment.

7. Each Regional Credit Union would have 8 directors, a credit committee of 3, and a supervisory committee of 3. Terms of office would be up to 3 years, as provided by the bylaws. The board of directors would be divided into 3 classes, 3 from members with assets less than $100,000, 3 from members with assets of $100,000 to $500,000, and 3 from members with assets over $500,000, subject to future reclassification by asset structure by the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions in a manner to provide equitable representation. Officers of the Regional Credit Union would be elected by the directors and could be compensated.

8. The annual meeting of the regional credit unions would be held during the month of February of each year, and each member credit union would have only one vote, regardless of the number of shares held. Member credit unions would be able to vote in person or by mail but proxies would be prohibited.

9. Any Federal credit union would be eligible to become a member of a Regional Credit Union in its district. Any State credit union would be eligible to become a member of a regional credit union in its district to the extent permitted by the applicable State law as then in effect or as thereafter amended.

10. There would be no distinction between State and Federal credit unions in voting for directors of regional credit unions.

11. Member credit unions in good standing, that is, having the minimum shareholdings required of credit unions to be eligible for full membership privileges, would be entitled to a statutory preferential interest rate on loans of at least one-half of 1 percent per annum. Loans to credit unions would be made at an interest rate not in excess of one-half of 1 percent a month on the unpaid balance, or 6 percent per annum, inclusive of all charges incident to making the loan.

12. The maximum borrowing power of a regional credit union would be limited to 100 percent of capital and surplus, including borrowings from the sale of debentures, bonds, and other obligations.

13. Where State laws are restrictive, State-chartered credit unions would be permitted to become nonmember borrowers pending enactment of amendatory State laws permitting such credit unions to acquire stock and become members of a regional credit union.

14. Regional credit unions would have authority to make deposits in national banks, other regional credit unions, State banks, trust companies, and mutual savings banks.

15. Regional credit unions would have authority to invest funds in loans to State or Federal credit unions and other regional credit unions, in obligations of the United States of America or securities fully guaranteed as to principal and interest thereby, in shares or accounts of Federal savings and loan associations, and in shares or accounts of any other institutions, the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

16. The initial charter fee would be $250 for each regional credit union and the Federal credit union supervisory fee formula would be applicable to supervisory charges, with a minimum supervisory charge of $500 per annum. Examination fees would be on a basis comparable to that of Federal credit unions.

17. Each regional credit union would accumulate a reserve fund by transfer of 20

percent of each year's net income with a maximum reserve equal to 50 percent of the members' shareholdings.

18. A regional credit union advisory council would be established consisting of one representative of each regional credit union, to meet at least once annually to confer with the Director of the Bureau on business affecting regional credit unions and their members and to make recommendations.

19. The Director of the Bureau would have general powers of administration and regulation comparable to those applicable in the case of Federal credit unions.

20. Regional credit unions would be exempt from taxation to an extent and in a manner comparable to the present status of Federal credit unions.

The bill (S. 2890) providing for a Regional Credit Union System, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REQUIREMENT OF INSIDE LATCHES ON DOORS OF HOUSEHOLD REFRIGERATORS SHIPPED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require inside latches on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a letter dated October 19, 1953, addressed by Mrs. Frances Glaze to Gov. Gordon Persons; a letter I have received from Gov. Gordon Persons, of Alabama, dated October 26, 1953, addressed to Mrs. Frances Glaze, of Montgomery, Ala.; and a letter dated November 6, 1953, written by me to Mrs. Frances Glaze, be printed in the RECORD.

I may say that following the writing of my letter of November 6, 1953, to Mrs. Glaze, I wrote to the legislative counsel and suggested the preparation of a bill which would remedy the situation.

It seems to me it would be a very simple and inexpensive matter for the manufacturers of iceboxes and refrigerators to provide facilities for the opening of such appliances from the inside. We are aware of the tragic occurrences, particularly during the last year, when small children lost their lives when trapped in iceboxes which could not be opened from the inside.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Alarmed Over Icebox Deaths," published in the Alabama Municipal Journal for November 1953. This journal is the official publication of the Alabama League of Municipalities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the requests of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2891) to require inside latches on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person to introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce any household refrigerator unless the door of such refrigerator is equipped with a latch which enables it to be opened from the inside.

SEC. 2. Any person who violates the provisions of the first section of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall on conviction thereof be subject to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective 6 months after the date of its enactment.

The letters and editorial presented by Mr. SPARKMAN are as follows:

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *October 19, 1953.*

Hon. GORDON PERSONS,
Governor, State of Alabama,
Montgomery, Ala.

DEAR GOVERNOR PERSONS: I think there should be a nationwide law forcing all persons discarding old iceboxes to remove all locks or hooks from the box before it has been discarded, thus saving lives of little children.

Yours very truly,

FRANCES GLAZE
Mrs. Frances Glaze.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
Montgomery, October 26, 1953.

Mrs. FRANCES GLAZE,
Montgomery, Ala.

DEAR MRS. GLAZE: Thank you for your letter, and as you mentioned the need for a nationwide law in connection with the removal of locks from old iceboxes, I am taking the liberty of forwarding this to Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, who will, I know, give your suggestion every consideration.

My kindest regards.

Sincerely,

GORDON PERSONS.

HUNTSVILLE, ALA., *November 6, 1953.*

Mrs. FRANCES GLAZE,
Montgomery, Ala.

MY DEAR MRS. GLAZE: Governor Persons has sent me your letter of October 19 addressed to him with a copy of his reply. I assure you that I share fully your feeling regarding discarded iceboxes. I am not a member of the committee that handles this legislation, but I shall be glad to discuss it with members of that committee to see if something can be worked out along the line that you suggest.

May I suggest to you that this legislation would be handled by the Commerce Committees of the two Houses of Congress. As it happens, Alabama fortunately has a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I refer to Congressman KENNETH ROBERTS of Anniston. I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of my reply to KENNETH. I am sure that if you care to write him you will find him fully sympathetic.

Sincerely,

JOHN SPARKMAN.

ALARMED OVER ICEBOX DEATHS

Steps to prevent unused iceboxes from becoming death traps for children have been taken by local governments in six States. Communities all over the Nation are considering severe regulation.

Action has been in the form of ordinances that provide fines up to $100 or jail sentences for those who leave old refrigerators where children might find them, according to the National Institute of Municipal Clerks, Youngstown, Ohio, Beverly, Mass., Warwick and Hampton, Va., Olean, N. Y., Jackson, Tenn., and Takoma Park, Md., are among those legislating against the abandoned icebox danger.

Youngstown set a $50 penalty on failure to tightly bolt doors of old iceboxes or to remove their latches or locks. Beverly's ordnance involves a $20 fine.

Punishment grew stiffer as local officials learned of the suffocation within 3 days in August of 11 children in three separate incidents. Following the death of 4 boys in a cast-off refrigerator in Richmond, Va., both Warwick and Hampton adopted emergency ordinances stating that iceboxes, refrigerators, or other containers with "airtight doors" or locks that will not open from the inside cannot be left in places accessible to children unless the doors or locks are taken off. Violation means a fine of $10 to $100 or 10 days in jail. Previously, 4 boys and a girl had suffocated at Proctor, Ark., in a chest, and 2 boys had been found dead in Haverhill, Mass., in another abandoned icebox.

Olean's common council made it a misdemeanor to leave iceboxes where children might come across them while playing. The councilmen made violations punishable by a $100 fine or 30 days in jail. At Takoma Park, similar punishment will go into effect after 24 hours, a time provision made to give leeway to persons who are moving. In Jackson, it's also a misdemeanor now to discard iceboxes where children might find them. The city court sets the punishment there.

The situation in Illinois is taken care of by a State law that imposes a $50 fine and/or a 30-day jail sentence on those who store or leave iceboxes in accessible places unless the doors have been removed.

The City Council of Lynchburg, Va., for a contrast, declined to enact an ordinance directed against the danger. Councilmen said it would be too hard to enforce and instead asked police and public welfare agents to be on the lookout for abandoned iceboxes and to notify owners to dispose of them.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HAGEN, Mr. WITHROW, and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 373) to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on January 29, 1954, the senior Senator from Nevada offered an amendment proposing compromise language for Senate Joint Resolution 1. It is interesting to compare this language with the proposals made on February 2, 1954 by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on behalf of himself, the able majority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

I now ask that the clerk read the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, and marked "Amendment B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read as requested.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend paragraphs 1 through 4 of the committee amendment so as to read as follows:

1. After the ratification of this amendment no treaty shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.

2. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

3. No international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States except through legislation.

4. Any vote in the Senate on the question of ratifying a treaty shall be determined by the yeas and nays.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the so-called perfecting amendment lettered "C," offered by the Senators to whom I have referred, to the committee amendment, would accomplish exactly the same thing as the first paragraph of my proposal. Mechanically, the proposal of the four Senators on the other side of the aisle is different, in that it follows a formula long urged by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and would actually amend the Constitution in the body of that document. This is something which has never been done since the Constitution was adopted. All constitutional amendments heretofore have been added at the end of the document.

The entire proposal offered by the senior Senator from Nevada would be a new amendment at the end of the Constitution.

However, in effect, the two proposals are exactly the same. Each would provide that after the ratification of the new amendment, no treaty would be considered as supreme law of the land unless it was made in pursuance of the Constitution.

Both proposals would take effect immediately upon ratification of the amendment. Both proposals would affect all treaties, whether made before or after the date of ratification of the amendment. Both proposals would restore the supremacy of the judiciary, making it clear that the Supreme Court has the right to invalidate a treaty on the ground of unconstitutionality.

The so-called perfecting amendment lettered "B," offered by the four Senators from the other side of the aisle to the committee amendment, is precisely in line with the proposal made by the Senator from Nevada. The language of the committee amendment, if amended as proposed by these four Senators, would coincide exactly with the language proposed in the second paragraph of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The purpose of the amendment lettered "D," offered by the Senator from Michigan, on behalf of himself and his three colleagues, is identical with the purpose of the fourth paragraph of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada on January 29. Both are designed to require yea-and-nay votes in the Senate on any question of ratifying a treaty.

Perhaps it would be more fair to say that the purpose of the fourth paragraph in the proposal offered by the Senator from Nevada is identical with that offered by the Senator from Michigan and his colleagues, since it seems clear that both proposals stem from the amendment offered on January 27 by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Nevada is frank to say that he adopted the substance of this proposal in his own amendment, changing the language somewhat for the purpose of simplification, and eliminating surplusage, but not changing in any way the purpose or effect.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], to the committee amendment makes a very fine approach to the problem, and was one of the bases of the proposal offered by the senior Senator from Nevada. However, the second paragraph of the George amendment is susceptible of an interpretation which would bring grave danger to the rights of the States. This danger arises from the provision that treaties and international agreements shall become effective as internal law only by an act of the Congress. It would appear that this might give the Executive, through the negotiation of an executive agreement, power to preempt a legislative field to the extent of foreclosing all State legislation in that field, whether or not Congress acted.

We all know that if Congress acts in such a way as to preempt a field, which is within its delegated powers, State legislation in that field is void and further State legislation in that field may not be enacted. It would be a matter of very grave consequence if similar preemption could result from the negotiation of a mere executive agreement, by the President; yet this is the threat which is posed by the George amendment.

This is why, in writing a similar provision into his own proposal, the senior Senator from Nevada used the words "by legislation," instead of the words "by an act of the Congress."

In the same respect, namely, the limiting of the effect of an executive agreement as internal law to what may be provided by an act of Congress, the amendment of the Senator from Georgia would preclude all future possibility of the negotiation of executive agreements which, by their terms, should become effective in different States only as such States by their own laws might provide.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. How would the amendment to the committee amendment, submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, to which the able senior Senator from Nevada has just made reference, if adopted, operate to preempt the field more specifically than it now would be preempted by an executive agreement entered into between the United States and a foreign power, under the decision in the case of United States against Pink?

Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will yield further, I should like, if I may have his permission to do so, to read into the RECORD from that decision, as follows:

A treaty is a law of the land under the supremacy clause (art. VI, cl. 2) of the Constitution. Such international compacts and agreements as the Litvinov assignment have a similar dignity.

I turn now to a part of the next paragraph:

But State law must yield when it is inconsistent with, or impairs the policy or provisions of, a treaty or of an international compact or agreement. * * * Then the power of a State to refuse enforcement of rights based on foreign law which runs counter to the public policy of the forum * * * must give way before the superior Federal policy evidenced by a treaty or international compact or agreement.

I recognize the validity of the point the distinguished Senator from Nevada has made; but I submit that under this holding of the United States Supreme Court, the same preemption of the field could occur by executive agreement, without reference to Congress.

The amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the committee amendment would require action by the Congress to make an executive agreement applicable to internal law.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. But under the prevailing decisions an executive agreement has internal law application without reference to Congress.

Mr. McCARRAN. But if Congress acts within the field of its authority, the State is precluded from acting. I think the Senator will agree to that proposition.

Mr. GORE. I agree.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is what I am contending for with reference to the language of the George amendment.

Mr. GORE. Going further, the question I submitted to the distinguished Senator was how that would differ from

the preemption of an executive agreement under the present holding of the Supreme Court.

Mr. McCARRAN. Personally I think it differs very materially, in that by the proposed constitutional amendment we would give sanction to the Congress only to act in a field, and thereby specifically preclude a State from acting in that field.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In the decision which I have just read the Court has held that, through implied power or specific power, or a combination of both, the President has power through the medium of an executive agreement to make that take precedence over State laws.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know what the Senator's question is, now.

Mr. GORE. That was a statement rather than a question.

Mr. McCARRAN. I was merely trying to fit the statement into the Senator's query.

Mr. GORE. I was trying to make the point that the power to make executive agreements apply as internal law, which the George amendment would permit through action by Congress, is now effective by action of one man alone, by execution of an agreement with a foreign power.

Mr. McCARRAN. What is the date of the decision from which the Senator reads, as compared with the decision under the Migratory Bird Act?

Mr. GORE. This decision was handed down on February 2, 1942. The case of Missouri against Holland, to which the Senator has made reference, was many years earlier.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

My thought on the whole subject, as I have tried to express it, is this: I would be partial to the George amendment were it not for the one expression, "only by an act of the Congress," which I think would be a constitutional amendment which would specifically say that it is for the Congress alone, thereby taking the States out of that field entirely. That is what I have in mind, if I am expressing my thought intelligibly.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is always intelligible. In the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Nevada has made a valid point. The question I am raising is whether the same point would not lie with respect to the existing situation, without action by Congress.

Mr. McCARRAN. That might be.

Both proposals would take effect immediately upon ratification of the amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia would preclude all future possibility of the negotiation of executive agreements which, by their terms, should become effective in different States only as such States by their own laws might provide. Yet such executive agreements have been entered into in the past, and it would not be wise to preclude the possibility that they might be entered into in the future.

If the words "only by legislation" are used, instead of the words "only by an act of the Congress," it is perfectly clear that the Congress would have power to act; and if the Congress did act, State law to the contrary, could be rendered ineffective by that congressional action; but in the absence of congressional action, the States would remain free to act; and there would be nothing to prevent the negotiation of an executive agreement giving proper weight to State law.

The basic objective of the "which" clause in the Bricker amendment was to restore the supremacy of the judiciary; to make certain the power of the Supreme Court to rule on the constitutionality of a treaty or legislation under a treaty. The McCarran amendment, though containing no "which" clause, would have the effect of restoring the supremacy of the judiciary in this regard; it clearly would give the Supreme Court the right to rule on the constitutionality of a treaty or legislation under a treaty.

The first paragraph of the McCarran proposal deals with treaties alone, and would impose on treaties the same requirement which clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution now imposes upon laws, namely, that they be made in pursuance of the Constitution. At the present time, it is only required that a treaty be made under the authority of the United States. Under this clause, the Supreme Court could hold a treaty invalid if it found the treaty was not made in pursuance of the Constitution. Of course, no legislation could be based on a treaty so held invalid.

Paragraph 2 of the McCarran proposal deals with both treaties and other international agreements, which embraces the type of agreements commonly referred to as executive agreements. This section would permit Supreme Court action to invalidate a single provision of either a treaty or an executive agreement on the grounds that it conflicted with the Constitution.

Paragraph 3 of the McCarran proposal deals solely with international agreements other than treaties; in other words, with executive agreements. It is a limitation designed to prevent any executive agreement from being self-executing as domestic law in the United States. This paragraph would permit Congress to implement an executive agreement; but since there is no contention that an executive agreement gives Congress any enacting powers, legislation to implement such an agreement would have to be legislation within the delegated constitutional powers of the Congress. In the event Congress should act to implement an executive agreement, State action for the purpose would be unnecessary, and State laws in conflict with the act of Congress would be invalid. On the other hand, if Congress should not act, it would be possible for a State to act, and the State law would be effective unless and until Congress should act to the contrary. This would permit the negotiation in the future of executive agreements such as have been negotiated in the past, making certain provisions contingent upon State legislation. But this would not require action by both Congress and the States, nor give States any power to enact valid statutes in conflict with Federal law.

Paragraph 4 of the McCarran proposal simply requires a recorded vote in the Senate on the question of ratifying any treaty. This would prevent ratification of a treaty by unanimous consent.

From the standpoint of the administration, the amendment offered by Senator McCarran should have two big advantages:

First. It eliminates the "which" clause.

Second. It does not limit the treaty power in any way except to "nail down" a requirement that treaties must be made in pursuance of the Constitution.

Another point which should meet the administration's viewpoint is the fact that the McCarran proposal does not contain any language such as found in the Bricker amendment, dealing with the power of Congress to regulate executive agreements; though the McCarran proposal does contain a new provision making executive agreements ineffective as internal law without legislative implementation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in order to keep the record straight, I should like to refer to the first time the language relative to the ratification of a treaty by a yea-and-nay vote of the Senate was first proposed. It is approximately the same language which has been in the Constitution since its inception, with respect to overriding a presidential veto. It was placed in the Constitution for the very sound reason that a presidential veto of legislation is a rather drastic act. Likewise, the overriding of a veto is a very important act. Therefore, Senators should be recorded with respect to their action.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am entirely in accord with what the Senator has stated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The ratification of a treaty, particularly in view of the fact that it becomes a part of the supreme law of the land, is equally important and should also be by a yea-and-nay vote.

However, the first time the language was proposed in an amendment was not on January 27, or whatever date the Senator from Nevada has mentioned, when the distinguished Senator from Michigan and I offered the amendment. It was first used in the substitute which was submitted last July 6. Although it was submitted under my name, actually it was the work of a large number of Senators who were also interested in the subject, and who at that time were trying to work out an area of agreement in this field.

I also invite the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that section 2 of the substitute which was offered on July 22 of last year, which is now the language of section 1 of the committee amendment, with the modification proposed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and certain other Senators, follows the language which appears in section 1 of the substitute to which I have referred, which reads:

A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with the

Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

I merely mention that fact because some members of the press and perhaps others throughout the country have gained the impression that some of the language being proposed has merely grown up over night, or that someone has scribbled it on the back of an envelope, without any thought being given to it at all.

As a matter of fact, the subject has caused great concern to many Senators. I know that the distinguished Senator from Nevada, who is an able constitutional lawyer, has been giving thought to this subject for a long time.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], as well as many of us who are not lawyers but who have a responsibility in the field of amending the Constitution, have also given great thought to the subject for a long period of time.

Therefore the fact that new amendments may be presented does not mean that they have been grabbed out of thin air, or have been submitted without any prior thought being given to them.

It is important for the RECORD of the Senate to indicate that fact, so that the public will not get the misconception that it is something which is just being done over night.

Mr. McCARRAN. I agree with what the Senator from California has stated. I may say that the Bricker amendment, as it came from the Committee on the Judiciary, was the subject of long and continuous study, and some of the most brilliant legal minds in the country presented their thoughts to the committee before the committee arrived at a conclusion.

However, amendments which come in from day to day are not pulled out of thin air by any means. They come from the thoughts and minds of those who have studied the subject for a very long time.

PRINTING OF "A NEW LOOK AT THE NATIONAL AIRPORT PROGRAM" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 95)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a panel of most distinguished representatives of the aviation industry, appointed at the request of the Transportation Council of the Department of Commerce, has made an extremely interesting report which I am sure will be of interest to every Senator. It is, indeed, a document of historic importance, which should be widely disseminated, and preserved for future reference. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this report, entitled "A New Look at the National Airport Program," may be printed with its appendixes, as a Senate document.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator state again who issued the report? Was it issued by an official agency of the Government?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, it was issued by a panel appointed at the request of the transportation council of the Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I did not have an opportunity to examine the insertions made in the RECORD today by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] concerning my criticism of the Civil Aeronautics Board for its failure to provide air service between the cities of New Orleans, Birmingham, Atlanta, San Antonio, and Mexico City.

It is my understanding that the Civil Aeronautics Board was created by Congress and was intended to be a creature of Congress to carry out the will and purpose of Congress.

Therefore I believe that it is incumbent upon Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to observe the actions of the Civil Aeronautics Board, as well as those of other boards, and to state when they believe such boards are not carrying out a policy to advance the best interests of the country. If we violently disagree we may find ourselves compelled to take legislative steps. In other respects I believe we should watch developments of the Board to make certain that every section of the United States is protected; and to speak out when we violently disagree with any of their actions.

I should like to discuss at this time another subject which is pending before the Board, and which I believe to be of major importance to the people of the United States.

Briefly stated here is a question that must be answered by the Board:

Should the certificated all-cargo carriers, not now permitted to carry any mail, be allowed to participate in an experimental program just inaugurated by the Postmaster General for the carrying of first-class surface mail by air transport? Stated otherwise, should this developing field of air commerce be monopolized by our major passenger airlines which already have many monopolies of transportation in addition to the huge subsidies they have received from our taxpayers?

On October 6 last year the Postmaster General inaugurated a highly significant experimental program to determine the practicability of transporting first-class letters by air at current 3-cent-mail rates. If carried out in the manner originally proposed by the Postmaster General, this experiment will have an excellent chance to provide a basis for establishing faster and improved regular mail service to the public and of effecting important economies in the operation of the Post Office Department. The present minimum rate paid by the Post Office Department for airmail is 45 cents per ton-mile. The new rate for air transport under the experimental programs of the Postmaster General of ordinary surface mail will average less than 20 cents per ton-mile.

The Postmaster General deserves our congratulations for starting this program which can lead to a basic and extremely worthwhile evolution in our postal system.

Although the Post Office Department had urged that certificated cargo carriers be permitted to serve in the experiment, applications by the all-cargo carriers to the Civil Aeronautics Board for permission to participate in the Post Office Department experiment were denied by the Civil Aeronautics Board on December 22, 1953. The order of denial was made by a bare majority of three, Commissioners Lee and Adams dissenting.

Last week, on January 21, the Postmaster General asked in a petition to the Board, as amicus curiae, for reconsideration by the Board of its opinion and order which denied to the all-cargo carriers opportunity to participate in the experiment being conducted by the Post Office Department. This petition is now pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board but will probably be acted on in the near future.

In the petition the Postmaster General emphasized that his experiments are "being undertaken in the interest of improving the mail service; the objectives are to provide a basis in actual experience for determining the extent of the economies and efficiencies that may be realized from the use of air transportation for surface mail and to test the practicability of such an operation. Of the scheduled airlines, only the certificated cargo carriers have offered their whole system for experiment by the Department at the lowest rate now being paid for the present segmentary experiment. Thus, it would appear to the Department that the public benefits that could flow from the requested grant of exemptions would outweigh any objection. The rates offered by these carriers over their entire system or any part thereof present a firm basis upon which the Department could proceed to determine whether the experiment should be expanded and whether they could be utilized on the grounds of economies and efficiencies."

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a copy of the Postmaster General's petition. Every Senator will, I think, find it most interesting to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, personally, I am most concerned in having a first class mail by air service provided for the people of my State, and of the Nation. I am equally interested in this new and improved service being provided at the most reasonable cost to our taxpayers, with the accompanying economies which can be realized by the Post Office Department. Inclusion of all-cargo carriers in the program obviously would seem to provide a major rate stabilizing factor and a firm anchor on costs to the Government.

It is my understanding that certain of the major airlines which have regular high-cost-to-the-Government air-mail contracts, authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board, alone have urged that the all-cargo carriers be excluded from the postal experiments. Participation

by the all-cargo carriers would unquestionably seem in the national interest, and in the event that this second request of the Post Office Department for permission to use their services is denied, I feel that it would be most appropriate for the Congress to intervene and by a thorough investigation to clearly establish the relevant facts and the proper national policy to be pursued.

It might be proper, under those circumstances, that legislation be enacted to make it possible for the all-cargo carriers to compete in carrying the mail, and thereby realize economies for the taxpayers.

It also should be stated that there is presently pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board an application of two overseas cargo carriers to participate in the carriage of overseas military mail. This application likewise has the support of the Post Office Department as well as of our military authorities. This support may be understood when it is realized that our overseas passenger planes are paid 85 cents per ton-mile for the carriage of such mail while the overseas cargo carriers are anxious to participate in the program at 25 cents per ton-mile.

At present our major domestic passenger airlines have a monopoly on carrying 6-cent air mail at 45 cents per ton-mile. They likewise have a monopoly and a profitable field in the air transportation of passengers, parcel post, and express, as well as the right to compete against the cargo carriers in hauling freight. Moreover, for many years such major airlines have enjoyed huge bounties and subsidies from the Federal Government by virtue of which they are now in a most advantageous position and safely secured against any loss.

While I am personally convinced of the need of maintaining strong and solvent passenger air carriers supported by public subsidies, if necessary, I must express my serious concern at any attempt to throttle competition and to foster monopolies by granting additional exclusive contracts to them for the carriage of surface mail in opposition to the program and conviction of the Postmaster General.

EXHIBIT 1

BEFORE THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

In the matter of the applications under section 416 (b) of the act by various air carriers to carry first-class and other preferential surface mail by air on a nonpriority basis for the Post Office Department. Docket Nos. 5551, 5553, 6325, 6333, 6334, 6335, 6336, 6337, 6366, 6390.

PETITION OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, AMICUS CURIAE, FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE BOARD OPINION AND ORDER OF DECEMBER 21, 1953

Comes now Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, amicus curiae, by his undersigned counsel, and respectfully petitions for reconsideration of the Board's opinion and order denying exemptions [1] adopted in the above-captioned proceedings on December 21, 1953, insofar as said opinion and order denied the applications of air carriers certificated to engage in the air transportation of property only. In support hereof, the Postmaster General shows to the Board as follows:

The Board, in opinion No. E-7937, dated December 3, 1953, held that the Board is empowered by section 416 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt air carriers not holding mail certificates from the requirements of that act relating to the transportation of mail, and to fix rates for such services under section 406 of said act. However, in its opinion and order dated December 21, 1953, the Board denied the request of the certificated cargo carriers for appropriate exemptions which would permit them to transport mail in conjunction with the experimental services being operated and proposed to be operated by the Postmaster General for the transportation of first-class mail and other preferential mail by air, holding:

"In summary, it does not appear that there is any need at this time for the participation of noncertificated-for-mail carriers in the movement of first-class and surface mail in order to insure the success of the Post Office experiment."

It would appear that the Board's remarks were directed to the experimental services now in operation between New York and Chicago, and Washington and Chicago. The results of those experiments have been very satisfactory. But it must be reemphasized that the Board's decision was apparently based only on considerations pertaining to the New York-Chicago and Washington-Chicago segments where the experiment is being operated by four mail-certificated carriers. Additionally, a question has been raised as to the fitness of many of the applicants to perform the mail service.

The applications of the certificated cargo carriers present an entirely different question. They include considerations broader in scope than the question merely as to whether additional carriers are needed in conjunction with the presently authorized experimental services to Chicago. Moreover, no question of fitness should exist as to these carriers who are already certificated by the Board. The Postmaster General's experiments are being undertaken in the interest of improving the mail service; the objectives are to provide a basis in actual experience for determining the extent of the economies and efficiencies that may be realized from the use of air transportation for surface mail and to test the practicability of such an operation.

Slick Airways, Inc., The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., and Riddle Airlines have requested exemptions which would not only permit them to participate in the New York-Chicago and Washington-Chicago experiments at the rates already prescribed by the Board for the experimental services over these segments, but make the remainder of their certificated services available to the Post Office Department at the rate of 18.66 cents per mail ton-mile. In the opinion of the Department, such rates are fair and reasonable on an experimental basis.

The rates offered by these carriers over their entire system or any part thereof present a firm basis upon which the Department could proceed to determine whether the experiment should be expanded and whether they could be utilized on the grounds of economies and efficiencies. Such determinations for expanded experiments could, therefore, include various segments comprising the systems of these certificated cargo carriers which are being offered for the use of the Department.

Of the scheduled airlines, only the certificated cargo carriers have offered their whole system for experiment by the Department at the lowest rate now being paid for the present segmentary experiment. Thus, it would appear to the Department that the public benefits that could flow from the requested grant of exemption would outweigh any objection.

Subsequent to the inauguration of the initial surface-mail-by-air experiment on the Chicago-Washington and New York segments, the Department has used to advantage similar systemwide services offered by the various local service air carriers during the past Christmas season, pursuant to Board approval. The Department has just filed its letter of January 18 supporting additional motions of these local service carriers to extend their own experimental period for carrying surface mail by air throughout the balance of 1954.

As stated above, the experimental mail services performed by the mail-certificated carriers over the New York-Chicago and Washington-Chicago segments have been completely satisfactory. However, it is the opinion of the Post Office Department that since the experimental exemption requested by the certificated cargo carriers will make their services available at the rate of 18.66 cents per ton-mile over the remainder of their systems as well as the New York-Chicago and Washington-Chicago segments, their requests should be granted as being in the public interest at least insofar as the other points are involved. To this extent the need exists for their services at the rate offered, in that they could be used to advantage in circumstances similar to those existing in connection with the feeder lines.

If the board grants these requests for a temporary exemption, these services, too, will be used in those instances where in the judgment of the Postmaster General there would be improvements in the present postal service commensurate with the transportation charges. These services could and will be used, as stated in our letter of December 14, in those instances, emergency in nature, where the movement of surface mail would otherwise be delayed; and in other instances where pilot tests are deemed proper by the Postmaster General for additional data as to the advisability of expanding the present experiments involved in the surface-mail-by-air program. It is not presently contemplated, however, that the Department will conduct experiments with these certificated cargo carriers on the same scale and with the same regularity as is presently being conducted with the trunkline carriers operating on the New York-Chicago and Washington-Chicago experimental segments.

* * * * *

3. That if the Board finds that the services of the applicants are not needed in conjunction with the New York, Washington, and Chicago experimental segments, that the exemption be granted at least for the remainder of their systems at the requested rate of 18.66 cents per ton mile, and for a period of time coextensive with the present trunkline experiment.

Respectfully submitted.

LOUIS J. DOYLE,
Acting Solicitor,
Post Office Department.
JULIAN T. CROMELIN,
Attorney, Office of the Solicitor,
Post Office Department.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the foregoing petition upon all parties of record in this proceeding by mailing a copy thereof, in a franked envelope and properly addressed, to each such party or their attorney.

JULIAN T. CROMELIN,
Attorney, Office of the Solicitor.

Dated January 21, 1954.

[1] Order No. E-7985.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have discussed with the minority leader, earlier in the day, a call of the calendar next week. It is planned to have a call of the calendar from the beginning on Monday next. In addition to that, there are several bills which it is my intention to ask to have considered during next week. I have discussed several bills with

the minority leader, and he said that while he did not know whether there might be individual Senators who would oppose some of the bills, he would have no objection to taking them up next week.

I now read the list of the bills which I have in mind.

Calendar No. 617, S. 2038, to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government;

Calendar No. 856, H. R. 5861, to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government;

Calendar No. 857, S. 1647, to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces;

Calendar No. 877, S. 2772, to provide for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates;

Calendar No. 881, Senate Resolution 194, to print additional copies of Senate Report No. 848, 83d Congress, on Korean atrocities;

Calendar No. 888, H. R. 2326, to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and

Calendar No. 923, S. 1184, to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminate war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State.

Mr. President, I am following my customary practice of giving as much advance notice as may be possible. We hope to be in position to call up those bills during next week.

Mr. President, if there be no further business at this time, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 4, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, in this brief moment of worship, may we be inspired with a vivid perception of life's noblest purposes and a clear vision of how best to serve Thee and our fellow men.

Grant that we may apprehend and appropriate by faith the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace which Thou hast placed at our disposal.

May nothing impair the strength and integrity of our character and conduct as we seek to prove worthy of the trust that our beloved country has placed in us.

We pray that the evening hours of each day may be radiant with joy and peace as we look back upon work well done.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who has called us to be His partners in the glorious task of establishing on earth His kingdom of righteousness. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 354. Joint resolution amending Public Law 207, 83d Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2175) entitled "An act to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KENNEDY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the determination of President Eisenhower and the Republican administration to obtain the greatest value for the American taxpayers' defense dollar was demonstrated yesterday with the announcement of the award of the contract for building the third *Forrestal* carrier to the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. As a result of calling for fixed bids, an award is being made at a saving of $28,314,000 under the next low bidder.

Another vital factor in the defense program was likewise recognized yesterday in the award of a contract for three destroyers to the Quincy, Mass., yard of the Bethlehem Steel Co., as against a lower bid, in order to keep available the great mobilization potential of this shipyard and retain its skilled employees.

The two factors of saving the taxpayers' dollar and maintaining certain facilities and manpower for defense which have been recognized are worthy of note. Certainly those of us who have dealt with Secretary of the Navy Robert B. Anderson have gained a high respect for the conscientious and fair, as well as wise, decisions that he has made under very difficult circumstances.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body will recognize that the present policy of retiring older naval vessels and constructing modern ships, particularly aircraft carriers, is essential. And, speaking of carriers, I call attention to the fact that the so-called supercarrier is the only answer to a mobile air base capable of launching the modern jet plane which will be coming off the production line in the next few years. We should bear in mind, too, that the *Forrestal* class carrier cannot pass through the Panama Canal and, therefore, it is in the national interest that facilities and skills for constructing and repairing the so-called supercarrier must be available on the west coast.

I believe that we now have one of the greatest Secretaries of the Navy this country has ever had. I believe that he will recommend that we continue the program of building a new modern carrier each year and that the Congress should see to it that the authorization and funds are included in this year's budget for a fourth 60,000-ton carrier. Also, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the Department of the Navy will consider it in the national interest to allocate the construction of this fourth carrier to the Pacific coast.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, Monday next, February 8, marks the fifth anniversary of the sentencing of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Budapest, Hungary, by a Communist kangaroo court.

It is my intention to take advantage of the special order which I have just been granted to speak on that unhappy event. I was a personal friend of Cardinal Mindszenty. I was in Budapest at the time he was sentenced. I hope I will be able on Monday next to pay due tribute to the courage of this man, and also to describe something of the tribulations and tortures which he had to undergo at the hands of his Communist interrogators.

Not because of myself but in respect to this great martyr of the 20th century, I hope there will be a goodly number of my colleagues on hand at that time.

INTERFERENCE WITH FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION IN GUATEMALA

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Guatemala yesterday expelled two American news correspondents, Mr. Sydney Gruson, of the New York Times, and Mr. Marshall Bannell, of the National Broadcasting Co. Mr. Gruson was charged with having systematically defamed and slandered the Guatemalan Government. I understand there are no charges against Mr. Bannell.

At any time this sort of treatment of American news correspondents would be of concern to the United States. But since this action has been taken by a government which is, to say the very least, hostile to the interests of free peoples everywhere, this becomes an event of great magnitude.

To those who have been watching the situation in Latin America this is one more fact in evidence that the Government of Guatemala is Communist, using every Communist method against all who disagree.

Guatemala, Mr. Speaker, is about 4 hours flight from New Orleans and considerably less than that from the Panama Canal. We can only interpret the recent actions by the Guatemalan Government as an open threat to the way of life we in this country—and most of our neighbors—hold dear.

I feel certain our Government will not let these actions go by without some firm counteraction. I know the other Members of the House will agree with me that freedom of communication is basic to better understanding among all peoples and that any interference with the free transmission of news by an accredited American correspondent indicates a very unfriendly act on the part of a foreign government.

GUATEMALA

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, relative to the remarks of the gentlewoman from Ohio, the situation in Guatemala is becoming one which is of increasing concern to the free peoples of the earth. The exclusion of Mr. Gruson, of the New York Times, and Mr. Bannell, of the National Broadcasting Co., is another example of the exercise of the powers of a police state which is becoming a common occurrence in Guatemala. The exclusion order follows upon the expropriation without compensation of private property belonging to nationals of foreign countries, nationals whom, I might say, have made considerable contributions not only to the standard of living of the people of Guatemala, but have paid millions of dollars in taxes into the treasury of that country.

The price of coffee is high in the United States, but it is certainly not so high that the people of this country will not give serious thought to the exclusion from the United States of coffee produced in Guatemala, the American dollars paid for which renders possible the continued stability of the Guatemalan economy. Treaties to which the Goverment of the United States is signatory forbids the imposition of sanctions at Federal level but the American housewife who treasures human freedom for her family may well prove to be a tremendous factor in the market place of the United States.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Thursday, February 25, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, on the subject of Guatemala.

INCREASED ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR CERTAIN WHEAT GROWERS

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has signed Public Law 290 which passed the House and the Senate recently, and which includes a provision that permits him to increase acreage allotments on classes and subclasses of wheat that are in short supply.

My State grows a large amount of high-protein wheat that is in short supply, as is evidenced by the premium even as high as 72 cents a bushel that is paid for high-protein wheat.

I understand the Secretary of Agriculture is now considering rules and regulations to implement the increase in acreage allotments for these high-protein wheat growers. I am hopeful that the regulation can be worked out and the provisions of this law can be put into effect so that the allotment of acreage for these high-protein wheats that are in short supply can be increased during the present season.

Mr. Speaker, I am today addressing the following letter to the Secretary of Agriculture:

FEBRUARY 3, 1954.

The Honorable EZRA T. BENSON,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is with reference to Public Law 290 and the provision contained therein which permits you to increase acreage allotments for growers of classes or subclasses of wheat which are in short supply.

As you may know, I introduced a similar measure on the opening day of this session, in an effort to afford a larger acreage of the high-protein spring wheats that are grown in Montana. This wheat is in short supply, and the best evidence of this fact is the payment of premiums of up to 74 cents per bushel for the protein content.

I wish to urge that you take steps immediately to declare that this high-protein wheat is in short supply, and to issue regulations to permit larger acreages for the growers of such wheat. This action must be taken very soon in order to be effective for this crop year. Your assistance and cooperation in behalf of both the growers and the consuming public will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore granted.

PROPOSED REINSURANCE SYSTEM—HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in taking this time is to acquaint the House with a portion of the program which is to be considered as part of the President's health program as contained in the President's message on health. As you are aware, already several bills to effectuate the program have been introduced and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. There has been some question raised as to whether it was the intention of the administration to present legislation to provide a limited system of reinsurance to encourage insurance companies and organizations to make available to more people broader insurance against the cost of illness. In that connection, I bring to your attention a statement made today by Mrs. Oveta Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as follows:

> The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is working out a number of specific details connected with the President's proposal for a limited reinsurance system to encourage insurance companies and organizations to make available to more people broader insurance against the costs of illness.
>
> There is absolutely no truth to any report that the reinsurance proposal is being dropped by the administration.

It is indeed very gratifying to learn that it is the intention of the administration to make effective this very important part of the President's health program.

DISCHARGE PETITION NO. 7 ON ALASKAN STATEHOOD NOW ON CLERK'S DESK

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, today I placed on the Clerk's desk a discharge petition to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the Alaskan statehood bill. The Rules Committee has failed to grant a rule on Alaskan statehood, and our information

is that the Rules Committee does not intend to do so. Consequently, the discharge-petition procedure is the only one left to us to get consideration of this measure. Many of us have long supported Hawaiian statehood, but we believe that Alaska should be given similar consideration. As a matter of fact, our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has always considered them as companion measures.

Alaskan statehood has already once passed this House. During the 81st Congress the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with only one dissenting vote, reported the Alaskan statehood bill to the House, and that measure passed the House on March 3, 1950. The Senate companion committee voted 8 to 2 to vote the measure favorably in the 81st Congress, but the bill did not receive consideration on the Senate floor. On several previous occasions our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has favorably considered and reported Alaskan statehood. The first Alaskan statehood bill to receive committee action was approved unanimously by the House Public Lands Committee and reported to the House on April 14, 1948, in the 80th Congress.

In June 1953, 83d Congress, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported an Alaskan statehood bill favorably to the House. The committee vote on this measure was 19 to 4. This bill is still pending before the Rules Committee and is the subject of the discharge petition which I have placed on the Clerk's desk. I wish to urge those who believe that Alaska statehood should be considered along with, even though not connected to the Hawaii statehood bill, to sign the discharge petition. The discharge petition on the Clerk's desk is discharge petition No. 7.

PROBLEM OF DOMESTIC COMMUNISM

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that Adlai Stevenson has suggested the formation of a high level commission to ferret out subversives in Government.

This suggestion is somewhat similar to my bill, H. R. 6943, which I introduced on the opening day of the present session of Congress.

Since then I have conferred with President Eisenhower about the establishment of a study commission to go into the entire problem of domestic communism and I hope that action on this resolution will be forthcoming soon.

It is, I would like to repeat, a nonpartisan move which is receiving the endorsement of both Republicans and Democrats.

I have received several hundred letters from American citizens all over the Nation favoring this approach to this issue which is one of the most important facing the Nation today.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was granted permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Friday next, if the House is in session, and if not, on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

DRINK SASSAFRAS TEA: A SOLUTION TO THE COFFEE PROBLEM

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today offering a solution to the coffee problem. The jumbled coffee situation seems to be getting no better fast. I have given considerable thought to this perplexing situation which is creating jangled nerves, strained pocketbooks, and is a threat to social life itself. In this extremity I offer a suggestion which I believe has merit: Drink sassafras tea.

Having been reared in the Missouri Ozarks, where I am sure there is not a family but what is familiar with this most delicious beverage, I have drunk literally gallons of sassafras tea. In the spring—in the Ozarks—when the blood is tired we turn to sassafras tea for a pickup, and such a delightful pickup it is. This pleasant drink is made from the roots of the humble sassafras. The roots of this shrub, or switch, can be obtained through commercial channels, and are also available for the digging. I am sure that in my district alone enough sassafras roots can be harvested to bring comforting relief to the many citizens of our country who take a dim view on coffee prices.

You are all cordially invited to Missouri for an ample supply of this satisfying beverage. To any of you who contemplate a trip to this great State in order to procure some of these magic sassafras roots, I point out that the shrub can be easily pulled from the ground. The ever-present aroma in this harvesting process will be ample reward, and remember—the roots may be boiled over and over, and over again without impairment to the flavor of this invigorating elixir.

I might mention that a concentrate of sassafras tea is said to have certain medicinal qualities. While I have never used the product for this particular purpose, I pass it on to you, not with the thought of course that it is so needed, but anyway, it is said and firmly believed in my section of the hills that sassafras tea is a "sure cure for the itch." However, with all the seriousness at my command I recommend sassafras tea for its unusual qualities: pleasing flavor, delightful beauty, and satisfying results as a beverage—either hot or iced, and preferably with sugar and cream. And, of course, as a solution to the coffee problem.

For jumpy nerves, sleepless nights, financial strain, and tired blood, why not switch to sassafras. Enjoy the "switch that satisfies."

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. JONAS of Illinois submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1133)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional circuit judge for the fifth circuit and two additional circuit judges for the ninth circuit. In order that the table contained in section 44 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this section in the number of circuit judges for said circuits, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuits:

"'Circuits	Number of judges
* * * * *	
Fifth	Seven
* * * * *	
Ninth	Nine
* * * * *	

"SEC. 2. (a) (1) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the southern district of California, one additional district judge for the district of Colorado, one additional district judge for the district of Delaware, one additional district judge for the southern district of Florida, one additional district judge for the district of Idaho, one additional district judge for the northern district of Indiana, one additional district judge for the southern district of Indiana, one additional district judge for the western district of Kentucky, one additional district judge for the district of Massachusetts, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, one additional district judge for the western district of Michigan, one additional district judge for the district of New Jersey, two additional district judges for the southern district of New York, one additional district judge for the district of North Dakota, one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, one additional district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, and one additional district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

"(2) The existing judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Missouri, created by the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri', approved December 24, 1942 (56

Stat. 1083), the existing judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by section 2 (d) of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes', approved August 3, 1949 (63 Stat. 495), and the existing judgeship for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia, created by the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia', approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1805), shall be permanent judgeships.

"(3) In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this subsection in the number of permanent judgeships for certain districts, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said districts:

"'Districts	Judges
California:	
Southern	11
Colorado	2
Delaware	3
Florida:	
Southern	4
Idaho	2
Indiana:	
Northern	2
Southern	2
Kentucky:	
Western	2
Massachusetts	5
Michigan:	
Eastern	6
Western	2
Missouri:	
Eastern and Western	2
New Jersey	7
New York:	
Southern	18
North Dakota	2
Ohio:	
Northern	5
Pennsylvania:	
Eastern	8
Western	5
Texas:	
Southern	4
Eastern	2
Virginia:	
Eastern	3
West Virginia:	
Northern and Southern	1
Wisconsin:	
Eastern	2

"(b) (1) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the district of New Mexico. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

"(2) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the district of Nevada. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

"(3) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the district of South Dakota. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

"(4) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the middle district of Tennessee. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

"(5) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

"(6) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the district of Utah. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

"(7) The second sentence of section 94 (a) (3) of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Court for the Hammond Division shall be held at Hammond and Lafayette.'

"(8) (a) Section 102 (a) (1) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) The Southern Division comprises the counties of Jackson, Lapeer, Lenawee, Livingston, Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, Saint Clair, Sanilac, Washtenaw, and Wayne.

"'Court for the Southern Division shall be held at Detroit and Port Huron.'

"(b) The second sentence of section 102 (a) (2) of title 28 of the the United States Code is amended to read as follows: 'Court for the Northern Division shall be held at Bay City and Flint.'

"(c) Section 102 (b) (1) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) The Southern Division comprises the counties of Allegan, Antrim, Barry, Benzie, Berrien, Branch, Calhoun, Cass, Charlevoix, Clinton, Eaton, Emmet, Grand Traverse, Hillsdale, Ingham, Ionia, Kalamazoo, Kalkaska, Kent, Lake, Leelanau, Manistee, Mason, Mecosta, Missaukee, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newaygo, Oceana, Osceola, Ottawa, St. Joseph, Van Buren, and Wexford.

"'Court for the Southern Division shall be held at Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, and Mason.'

"(9) The second sentence of section 115 (a) (1) of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Court for the Eastern Division shall be held at Cleveland, Youngstown, and Akron.'

"(a) The first sentence of subsection (d) (4) of section 124 of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows: '(4) The San Antonio Division comprises the counties of Atascosa, Bandera, Bexar, Comal, Dimmit, Frio, Gonzales, Guadalupe, Karnes, Kendall, Kerr, Medina, Real, and Wilson.'

"(b) The first sentence of subsection (d) (5) of section 124 of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows: '(5) The Del Rio Division comprises the counties of Edwards, Kinney, Maverick, Terrell, Uvalde, Val Verde, and Zavalla.'

"(10) The present incumbent of the judgeship created by the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri', approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1083), shall henceforth hold such office under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by this Act.

"(11) The present incumbent of the judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by section 2 (d) of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes', approved August 3, 1949 (63 Stat. 495), shall henceforth hold such office under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by this Act, and section 2 (d) of the said Act approved August 3, 1949, is repealed.

"(12) The present incumbent of the judgeship created by the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia', approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1805), shall henceforth hold such office under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by this Act.

"(13) (a) Section 134 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 134. Tenure and residence of district judges.

"'(a) The district judges, except in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, shall hold office during good behavior. The district judges in Hawaii and Puerto Rico shall hold office for terms of six and eight years, respectively, and until their successors are appointed and qualified.

"'(b) Each district judge, except in the District of Columbia, shall reside in the district or one of the districts for which he is appointed.

"'(c) If the public interest and the nature of the business of a district court require that a district judge should maintain his abode at or near a particular place for holding court in the district or within a particular part of the district the judicial council of the circuit may so declare and may make an appropriate order. If the district judges of such a district are unable to agree as to which of them shall maintain his abode at or near the place or within the area specified in such an order the judicial council of the circuit may decide which of them shall do so.'

"(b) Orders made by the judicial councils of the circuits under the second sentence of subsection (c) of section 134 of title 28, as amended by this section, determining that a specified district judge shall maintain his abode at or near a place or within an area which the council has theretofore designated for the abode of a district judge under the first sentence of such subsection, shall be applicable only to district judges appointed after the enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 26 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, as amended (48 U. S. C. 1405y), is amended to read as follows:

"'The President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands who shall hold office for the term of eight years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless sooner removed by the President for cause, and a district attorney who shall hold office for the term of four years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless sooner removed by the President for cause.'

"(b) This section shall take effect upon its approval but shall not affect the term of any incumbent whose term has not yet expired.

"SEC. 4. (a) Sections 371 and 372 of title 28, United States Code, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"'§ 371. Resignation or retirement for age.

"'(a) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good

behavior who resigns after attaining the age of seventy years and after serving at least ten years continuously or otherwise shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary which he was receiving when he resigned.

"'(b) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior may retain his office but retire from regular active service after attaining the age of seventy years and after serving at least ten years continuously or otherwise, or after attaining the age of sixty-five years and after serving at least fifteen years continuously or otherwise. He shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary of the office. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a successor to a justice or judge who retires.

"'§ 372. Retirement for disability; substitute judge on failure to retire.

"'(a) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior who becomes permanently disabled from performing his duties may retire from regular active service, and the President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a successor.

"'Any justice or judge of the United States desiring to retire under this section shall certify to the President his disability in writing.

"'Whenever an associate justice of the Supreme Court, a chief judge of a circuit or the chief judge of the Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or Customs Court, desires to retire under this section, he shall furnish to the President a certificate of disability signed by the Chief Justice of the United States.

"'A circuit or district judge, desiring to retire under this section, shall furnish to the President a certificate of disability signed by the chief judge of his circuit.

"'A judge of the Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or Customs Court desiring to retire under this section, shall furnish to the President a certificate of disability signed by the chief judge of his court.

"'Each justice or judge retiring under this section after serving ten years continuously or otherwise shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, receive the salary of the office. A justice or judge retiring under this section who has served less than ten years in all shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, receive one-half the salary of the office.'

"(b) The analysis of chapter 17 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding §371 of such title, is amended by striking out the items '371. Resignation or retirement for age: substitute judge on failure to retire.' and '372. Retirement for disability.', and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'371. Resignation or retirement for age.
"'372. Retirement for disability; substitute judge on failure to retire.'

"SEC. 5. Section 373 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 373. Judges in Territories and Possessions.

"'Any judge of the United States District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii who resigns after attaining the age of seventy years and after serving at least ten years, continuously or otherwise, or after attaining the age of sixty-five years and after serving at least fifteen years, continuously or otherwise, shall continue during the remainder of his life to receive the salary he received when he relinquished office.

"'Any judge of any such courts who is removed by the President of the United States upon the sole ground of mental or physical disability, or who fails of reappointment, shall be entitled, upon attaining the age of sixty-five years or upon relinquishing office if he is then beyond the age of sixty-five years, (a) if his judicial service aggregated sixteen years or more, to receive during the remainder of his life the salary he received when he relinquished office, or (b) if his judicial service aggregated less than sixteen years but not less than ten years, to receive during the remainder of his life that proportion of such salary which the aggregate number of years of his judicial service bears to sixteen.

"'Service at any time in any of the courts referred to in the first paragraph, or in any other court under appointment by the President, shall be included in the computation of aggregate years of judicial service for the purposes of this section.'

"SEC. 6. The Act entitled 'An Act to clarify the law relating to the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, and to provide for the appointment of an additional United States district judge for the eastern, middle, and western districts of Pennsylvania,' approved July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 654), is amended by adding at the end of section 2 a new sentence to read as follows: 'If a vacancy arises in the office of district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania while the judge appointed pursuant to this section is holding the office created by this section, such judge shall thereafter be a district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania.'"

And the House agree to the same.

EDGAR A. JONAS,
USHER L. BURDICK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
HERMAN WELKER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House passed the Senate bill after amending it by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting its own provisions. The Senate insisted upon its version and requested a conference; the House then agreed to the conference.

The conference report recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the House amendment and agreed to the same with an amendment, the amendment being to insert in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment the matter agreed to by the conferees, and the House agree thereto.

In substance the conference report contains the language of the House amendment with a few exceptions which are subsequently explained in detail.

EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

The House amendment did not provide for one additional judge for the eastern district of Michigan. The Senate bill created one additional district judge for that district. In the conference report the House receded and adopted the language of the Senate bill.

THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA

The Senate bill provided one additional district judge for the district of North Dakota. The House amendment provided one additional judge for the district of North Dakota with the provision that the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for said district shall not be filled. In the conference report the House receded from its amendment and adopted the language of the Senate bill.

THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

The Senate bill provided for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Nevada, but the House amendment made no provision for the appointment of the additional district judge in that district. In the conference report both the House and the Senate receded from their respective provisions and adopted a substitute which provided for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Nevada with the proviso that the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in that district shall not be filled.

THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

The Senate bill provided for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Utah, but the House amendment made no provision for the appointment of the additional district judge in that district. In the conference report both the House and the Senate receded from their respective provisions and adopted a substitute which provided for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Utah with the proviso that the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in that district shall not be filled.

WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Senate bill provided for the creation of one temporary district judge in the western district of Pennsylvania but the House amendment contained no such provision. In conference the House receded and adopted the language of the Senate bill.

RESIDENCE AND TENURE OF DISTRICT JUDGES

The Senate bill did not contain the general language amending section 134 of title 28 of the United States Code, which was a part of the House amendment to the Senate bill. In conference both the House and the Senate receded from the language in their respective versions and adopted the substitute language for the conference report. The effect of this substitute language is merely to clarify minor points in the provision of the House amendment. The substance of the substitute language is the same as that proposed in the House amendment. Its effect is merely to clarify minor points and to permit more flexibility in providing that the abode of a district judge should be at or near a particular place for holding court when public interest and the nature of the court's business requires it.

In the Senate bill 4 circuit judges had been created while the House version created only 3. The conference report provides for only three additional circuit judges.

In the Senate bill 28 additional permanent district judges were created while the House amendment provided for only 19. The conference report increases the House figure by 2 to a total of 21. One of these 2 additions, namely, the 1 for the district of North Dakota, was changed by the conference from a temporary to a permanent, as it had appeared in the House amendment. The Senate version created 7 temporary district judges, while the House amendment provided for 4. Under the conference report three temporary judgships were added, namely, those in Nevada, Utah, and the western district of Pennsylvania.

EDGAR A. JONAS,
USHER L. BURDICK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 6]

Andresen, August H.	Elliott	Morgan
Barrett	Fino	Philbin
Battle	Graham	Phillips
Bramblett	Gwinn	Powell
Chelf	Hart	Reams
Chudoff	Hinshaw	Sieminski
Coudert	Hope	Small
Dawson, Ill.	Hyde	Stringfellow
Dingell	Jarman	Vursell
Dorn, N. Y.	Jones, Mo.	Weichel
Dorn, S. C.	Lyle	Yorty
	Mollohand	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 396 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not enter into a long dissertation relative to the many details that are involved in this conference report or the bill as originally proposed and passed by the House. I can only emphasize again that the measure now pending before the House, the subject matter under discussion, was preceded by many hours of painstaking and careful consideration of the various applications and reports that were submitted with reference to expanding the program dealing with the appointment of judges of our Federal courts.

In our original hearings we had the benefit of the judgment and statement of Judge Biggs, the chief judge of the Third United States Circuit of the State of Pennsylvania, who was appointed by the Judicial Conference to make a minute investigation of the various requests made to add additional Federal judges throughout the various areas of the United States, including the Territory of Alaska.

We heard testimony from quite a number of the Members of the House who appeared in every instance, as I recall, in support of requests for an additional judge, or one or more judges to be added to the areas that comprised the judicial districts in their States.

Finally a bill was submitted to the House, which differed from the bill submitted by the other body. Following the compilation of all the testimony that we had, and when the bill was presented, there was some deviation from what the other body suggested. The bill was passed in the House. It was then submitted to conference. I might report to you that it was a rather tedious and difficult problem to arrive at some definite agreement as to who should recede from one problem pertaining to eliminating a judge, or adding another, and so on. But we had numerous meetings, and it finally resulted in a stalemate. Upon the reconvening of Congress in 1954, the conferees met again on a number of occasions and finally decided to report out their findings in the manner as has been noted, and to which your attention has been called.

I might state that as far as my State is concerned, we do not get an additional judge. I am not personally interested in this bill. What I am trying to do is to try to be helpful, because if you had occasion like I had and the other Members had, to hear the statements of the various individuals, including judges, Members of the other body, and Members of this House who made appeals to get additional judges, you would have been impressed with the stories they told and the appeals they made. You would have come to the conclusion that if the condition prevails as represented in some areas in the United States at the present time and in some States in particular, there is grave danger that the judicial system created under the Constitution is on the way to losing some of its high regard and respect that it has heretofore commanded for so many years in this country.

There is too much criticism of the plan to expand our Federal judiciary and add new judges, too much that is not germane or pertinent to that issue. In some instances the reports indicated the court calls are so bogged down and the case backlog is so great that it is a matter of conjecture as to how long this situation will be tolerated by the people in the respective districts that are affected thereby.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. In that connection I would like to point out to the gentleman that in the eastern district of Pennsylvania the civil list is about 40 months in arrears, and in the western district the calendar is so congested that the senior circuit judge has instructed the district court judges to try nothing but criminal cases; so it is utterly impossible to have a civil case tried.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for the contribution that he has made. The facts bear out the statement that conditions in western Pennsylvania are as bad as he indicated; we tried to remedy the condition by giving the western district of Pennsylvania an additional judge.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. As to the western district of Pennsylvania there has been some comment that the proper recommendations have not been made to the Executive by the Attorney General's Office. Is that correct?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. You mean as to the additional judge that was added in the conference?

Mr. FULTON. We have a judgeship that has been vacant for many months and not filled. Now you are adding another temporary judgeship in western Pennsylvania. I am asking: What is the reason the present judgeship has not been filled?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I am afraid that the gentleman must draw on his imagination. If he does that he will find that in his State, according to what I am told, there is some conflict between the two men who represent the State in the upper body—this is just from statements I have obtained, I do not know whether I can state it as a matter of fact, but it has been so reported to me.

Now, regardless of that condition in the State of Pennsylvania the fact remains that you have a condition in your courts that has been aptly set forth by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], one of the worst backlogs in case loads that is imaginable in any district court. As a matter of fact, as has been stated, one judge has ordered that no case be tried except criminal cases. What happens to the civil cases? Justice delayed is justice denied, and you are on the road to anarchy if you do not correct that situation.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield for a further statement.

Mr. FULTON. As the gentleman will recall, I was on my feet when the bill went through last year urging that an additional judgeship be set up for western Pennsylvania and then we were advised that there was one judgeship unfilled; as I recall I was advised that it was on the part of the Executive that the recommendation had not been made, that previously recommendations had been made to the Attorney General's office by the ones involved in Pennsylvania and then no action had been taken. I wonder if the gentleman has any information on that?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I wish to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I have no information about that. The vacancies should be filled and I am in sympathy with the litigants. I am

not prepared to say why the vacancies have not been filled.

Mr. CELLER. There are four.

Mr. WALTER. There are four vacancies.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I am advised that there are four vacancies in Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. We need judges in Pennsylvania.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Does the gentleman believe that regardless of the roadblock that has evidently occurred with reference to filling of vacancies in the gentleman's State the litigants should suffer the consequences? We have to look beyond that and see that we get our Judicial Department moving and working and serving the people according to the intent and ideas that are implemented in the inherent nature of the job to be done by the Federal courts. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. FULTON. Yes; and I want to compliment the gentleman and the committee because we in western Pennsylvania are not getting justice and that is not through any fault of the judges up there.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. There is really no serious objection, as I can see it, to the revised situation as is being presented here.

Some question may be raised as to why a temporary judge was allotted the State of Utah and the State of Nevada. Utah has a population of nearly 770,000 people according to the 1952 census. There are a number of States in the Union that do not exceed that population that have two judges. You have there a temporary judgeship which expires as provided by law. So it does not assure those States they will have two permanent judges. Of course, later these temporary judgeships may be made permanent, but that is a matter for the future. I am speaking about the situation that prevails at the present time. The same thing is true of the State of Nevada.

The conference report suggests a change by giving North Dakota a permanent judgeship instead of a temporary judgeship.

I want to mention what occurred in the State of Michigan. Subsequent to the time that our conferees met last summer, we received letters and statements, factual statements, from Members on both sides of the House in reference to conditions that prevailed in the eastern district of Michigan. It is only fair and common sense, when one is clothed with responsibility to see that justice is done and to look into the situation further. This was not done hastily through committee activity. The committee exchanged views and ideas between one another following the receipt of the data at that time. If the facts are to be taken as true, as submitted by Members on both sides of the House, then the eastern district of Michigan does need another Federal judge.

Many equations and many factors enter into delays pertaining to the expediting of justice and cleaning up of your court calendar. There is sickness, old age, impairments in health, and many other factors that you know as well as I do and that I do not need to mention here.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Has the gentleman ever heard of a temporary judgeship that was not finally converted into a permanent judgeship?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. You know, I look to the gentleman for counsel every once in a while. I have a high regard for him. May I advise him that I am not familiar with that but if the House yields and does make a temporary judgeship permanent, is that not the will of the House? I cannot assume that there is something surreptitious about that.

Mr. CELLER. No; but that is the way the camel gets his nose under the tent. We simply say it is a temporary judgeship and that seems to mollify some Members of the House; however, in my whole experience as a Member of this House every single temporary judgeship has been finally or at some time converted to a permanent judgeship.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. May I say then that the gentleman from New York has exercised his prerogative because in this bill we took that into consideration in the State of Pennsylvania. There are a number of other situations that exist. If that matter comes up, in due course I am sure the point he raises can be again emphasized, proven or dissipated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think probably the chief interest relates to two of the judgeships more than others. Will the gentleman advise the House as to what the approximate cost is to the taxpayers each year for a United States District Court judge?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Well, the salary is $15,000 a year and it takes about $25,000 to $30,000 to set the court up; to get the clerk, to get the crier, the marshal, and so on.

But, may I interject this, pursuant to the gentleman's question, we do not want to go away with the impression that all goes out of the courtroom and nothing comes in. There is considerable money collected in the clerk's office because the litigants have to pay for the right to litigate.

Mr. McCORMACK. You do not appoint judges on the income; you appoint judges for the administration of justice, I assume.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. The gentleman's question raised this point: He asked me what it would cost.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; the cost per year. Of course, for every judgeship that is unnecessary, why we save about $50,000 a year during the term of the judgeship.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. It does not cost $50,000 a year if the court keeps busy, because the cost is offset by what the clerk collects, which goes into the United States Treasury, and which is used in distributing the cost of running the judiciary of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not think we should vote to create judgeships where it is not necessary, does he?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. No; I certainly do not, but who is to be the judge of that?

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman kindly give me the justification for the temporary judgeship in Utah?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. For the State of Utah?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I will give the justification for it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Having in mind that the gentleman just stated that he would not stand to have judgeships created that are unnecessary.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. The State of California asked for three additional judges to set up a court of appeals. The conferees gave them 2; that is, in the House we gave them 2. The distances involved in the State of Nevada—not the population so much—and the inconveniences that are created by reason of the litigants having to travel hundreds of miles to where their case can be tried, is one factor involved. The second factor is that California can obtain the aid of his temporary judge to help clear up their calendar, and it will not cost any additional money.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, why not give California an additional judge rather than use that as an excuse for appointing a temporary judgeship?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. The State of California asked for three judges in addition to the number that constitute their United States circuit court of appeals.

Mr. McCORMACK. I asked about Utah. The gentleman is straying around. The gentleman has seen the certificate of the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Utah, which was based on the record of June 30, 1953, has he not? He certified the criminal cases pending on the date that Hon. William W. Ritter took office, November 1, 1953, there were 59; June 30, 1953, 11. In 5 of the 11 cases pending June 30, 1953, the defendants are fugitives. The Department of Justice has been unable to locate them following indictments and the issuance of bench warrants. We find that in one of the cases pending June 30 the defendant has since changed his plea.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. May I interrupt the gentleman to say that if the gentleman wants some time and there is some time available, I will be very glad to give him some time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman give me 5 minutes?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. If there is any time left, I will be glad to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Fine.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the omnibus judgeship bill which is being considered today is of great interest to the judges, lawyers, and people of California and the ninth circuit. As the

only member of the Committee on the Judiciary from California or any State included in the ninth circuit area, I rise to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] and his distinguished Judiciary subcommittee which labored so long and hard on this legislation.

NINTH CIRCUIT

The bill as amended, provides for an increase in the number of circuit judges in the ninth circuit from 7 to 9. These new judgeships are recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States. The ninth circuit covers the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Arizona, Montana, Nevada, California, the Territory of Hawaii, Guam, and the Territory of Alaska. The caseload per judgeship for the ninth circuit was 63.4 cases filed compared with the national average of 47.4. The number of cases filed in the first half of the fiscal year 1953 was 234 compared with 217 in the first half of the fiscal year 1952. This represents an increase of 8 percent. In the first half of the fiscal year 1953 the number of cases in the court of appeals for the ninth circuit was larger than in any other circuit. In 1952 the median time interval from filing to final disposition was 10.2 months in the ninth circuit compared with the national median of 7.3 months.

Judge Denman, chief judge of the ninth circuit, has urged the appointment of one more judge than is provided for in this legislation. He cites the ever-increasing population and caseload in this circuit as strong evidence of this need. While the House and the other body have not seen fit to grant this request at the present time, it is my hope that consideration will be given in the near future to the suggestion and advice of the distinguished chief judge of the ninth circuit.

I wish to point out that this bill incorporates legislation I introduced in the 82d and 83d Congresses to increase the membership of the ninth circuit bench.

When debate on this legislation took place in the House last year, I offered an amendment to increase the number of ninth circuit judges by 3 instead of 2 and in the course of my remarks in support of that amendment, I submitted the testimony of Judge Denman before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Unfortunately, the House did not accept the amendment but did act favorably on my original request.

The following table points up the increased judicial business in this circuit in support of the position Judge Denman and I have taken:

Cases filed, terminated, and pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, fiscal years 1941–52 and first half of 1953

Fiscal year	Filed	Terminated	Pending
1941	295	339	[1] 140
1942	333	272	201
1943	296	282	215
1944	342	280	277
1945	267	324	230
1946	285	306	209
1947	312	270	251
1948	284	323	212
1949	319	290	241

[1] Adjusted figure.

Cases filed, terminated, and pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, fiscal years 1941–52 and first half of 1953—Continued

Fiscal year	Filed	Terminated	Pending
1950	317	307	251
1951	409	337	323
1952	444	419	[2] 348
First half of 1953	234	136	[2] 430

[1] Includes cases which had been decided but in which motion for rehearing was pending or time for such motion had not expired.

[2] Does not include cases which had been decided but in which motion for rehearing was pending or time for such motion had not expired.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Speaker, in addition to provisions pertaining to the ninth circuit, this legislation also provides an increase in the number of judges of the United States District Court for the Southern District of California. The number of judges in this district would be increased from 10 to 11, and again the bill incorporates legislation I introduced in this and the previous Congress.

A considerable portion of the population increase of the ninth circuit has occurred in the southern district of California, and, even though Public Law 205 of the 81st Congress was of invaluable aid in solving the congestion of that district, more aid is indicated. The pending caseload of private civil cases was 406 in 1948. In 1949 it rose to 517 and in 1950 to 587, and finally in the first half of 1953—so far reported—it has risen to 621.

On the criminal side of the docket there were, in 86 districts, 169 cases commenced per judge during the fiscal year 1950. In the southern district of California for the same period the caseload was 230.

It is noted that this figure is well above the national average. The high rate of criminal cases is enhanced by immigration cases which arise on the Mexican border and which are filed in great numbers in this district.

It is my belief that particular consideration in the future should be given to the possibility of realining and perhaps increasing the number of judicial districts in the State of California. The increased number of cases, both civil and criminal, originating in San Diego County has been brought to the attention of the Congress by the San Diego Bar Association and is a factor which should be taken into account. The San Diego area, with a population of over a million, which is more than many States, is today merely a division of the southern district of California.

At the same time, the increasing population growth in the northern district of California deserves attention and requires further study relative to the needs of that area. It should be pointed out also that the great Central Valley area of California is divided between two districts, the northern and southern districts of California. Some members of the bar in this area have already contacted me to express the hope that a new judicial district to be known as the middle district of California be created.

In order to illustrate the tremendous growth in the southern district of California and the constantly increasing caseload, I submit the following statistical data:

Southern District of California—Cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year, beginning with 1941

TOTAL CIVIL CASES

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	668	708	633
1942	808	807	634
1943	898	697	835
1944	922	821	936
1945	1,093	1,104	925
1946	1,204	1,088	1,041
1947	2,034	1,568	1,507
1948	1,292	1,824	975
1949	1,816	1,497	1,294
1950	2,191	1,917	1,568
1951	1,575	1,904	1,239
1952	1,264	1,173	1,330
First half of 1953	850	577	1,603

UNITED STATES CIVIL CASES (UNITED STATES A PARTY)

[OPA cases are in parentheses [1]]

1941	276	251	226
1942	468 (2)	351	343
1943	668 (68)	398	613
1944	707 (146)	585	735
1945	891 (414)	872	754
1946	906 (508)	853	807
1947	1,441 (996)	1,160	1,088
1948	729 (323)	1,248	569
1949	1,177 (662)	969	777
1950	1,557 (838)	1,353	981
1951	986 (388)	1,313	654
1952	715 (67)	628	741
First half of 1953	548 (29)	307	982

PRIVATE CIVIL CASES

1941	392	457	407
1942	340	456	291
1943	230	299	222
1944	215	236	201
1945	202	232	171
1946	298	235	234
1947	593	408	419
1948	563	576	406
1949	639	528	517
1950	634	564	587
1951	589	591	585
1952	549	545	589
First half of 1953	302	270	621

CRIMINAL CASES

[Cases transferred are not included in "Commenced" and "Terminated" columns]

1941	1,077	997	300
1942	1,226	1,232	288
1943	1,048	1,087	249
1944	1,004	1,687	256
1945	1,733	1,690	299
1946	1,746	1,740	305
1947	2,896	2,761	385
1948	3,384	3,112	537
1949	3,280	3,109	563
1950	2,208	2,476	446
1951	1,806	1,983	322
1952	2,229	2,206	280
1st half of 1953	948	920	344

[1] OPA cases, including rent control, are separately listed because from 1945 to 1947 they constituted a large proportion of all civil cases commenced, although they required on the average a relatively small proportion of court time per case for disposition during those years. They are included in the figure which they follow.

Mr. Speaker, the population of the State of California is growing by approximately 500,000 per year. The unprecedented growth of this State demands that the Congress recognize the problem and take steps to provide for the increasing judicial needs of the people of California. Failure to do so could well deprive thousands of litigants of due process of law.

It is my hope that the members of the State bar of California will maintain constant vigilance in this situation and

bring to the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary its recommendations for California and the ninth circuit.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. I would like to congratulate the gentleman and his great committee for their foresight in setting up the need of additional judgeships. I would like to tell the gentleman that in Erie, Pa., western Pennsylvania, for one year and a half since the death of our last judge, we have not tried one civil case, and the great need in the third largest city of Pennsylvania for an additional judge is well established. I congratulate the gentleman and his committee for seeking to bring about relief in that district.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his complimentary remark.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, may I first express to the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS], my appreciation for all of the work, effort, and study that both he and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] have put into this judges bill. As he has stated to the House, a great deal of time was consumed not only by the members of the committee of conference, but also the members of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary in studying this bill over a long period of time. They are to be complimented and congratulated on the wonderful bill they brought before the House last year. Unfortunately, the bill did not meet with the approval of a good many of us, and it had to go to conference.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the original Senate bill called for 28 additional permanent district judges. The House bill provided for only 19. The conference report increased the number from 19 to 21, and 1 of these was for a temporary judge in North Dakota that we have made a permanent judge instead of a temporary judge. It was in our bill when it was here in the House.

The Senate bill created 7 temporary judgeships, while the House bill provided for only 4. Under the conference report, three temporary judgeships were added, in Nevada, Utah, and the western district of Pennsylvania.

In other words, the conference report recommended a permanent judge for North Dakota and a permanent judge for eastern Michigan, which were badly needed, and a temporary judge for western Pennsylvania, which was also one that carried a very, very heavy caseload. However, together with those, that are well merited, the committee on conference has added two temporary judges for Utah and Nevada. As I see it, there is no rhyme or reason why we should accept that part of the report of the committee of conference. I was for the original judges bill last year and the year before, and I am for additional judges at the present time, but I think when we mete out these judgeships in the various States and the various districts in the States we ought to take into consideration the need and necessity for such judgeships.

There are many, many States that have a heavier caseload than Nevada and Utah, and they were in the original Senate bill. I refer to the southern district of Florida, the western district of Washington, the northern district of Ohio, the eastern district of Pennsylvania, the Territory of Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the State of Arizona. All those courts have a heavy caseload, and we have nothing for them in this conference report.

I am not against the entire conference report, Mr. Speaker, but only two phases of it. I hope that at the proper time I may have an opportunity to make a motion to recommit with instructions to the committee on conference to strike out those two, which are most controversial.

Some question has been asked about the need for a judge in the district of Nevada. The chairman of my committee well stated that a judge there has to travel a considerable distance because court is held in Las Vegas, Reno, Carson City, and Elko. The reason is given that because of the distance traveled, 200 miles each way, we should have another judge. But that is not the real reason that a judge is wanted in Nevada at the present time. The caseload indicates that in the first half of 1953 only 104 cases were pending, and from the figures taken away back in 1941 only 95 cases were pending. In other words, there has been a difference of only 9 cases since 1941. The figures also indicate the caseload is somewhat less than the national average. The present district court judge in Nevada is continually being assigned to adjoining districts where the congestion is acute and his service is more needed. Although this situation in Nevada, Mr. Speaker, has been studied time and time again by the Judicial Conference and hearings have been held, at no time has the Judicial Conference ever recommended another judge for Nevada.

Let us look at the State of Utah. Under the provisions of this conference report, the number of judges for the State of Utah is increased to two. They have one permanent judge at the present time, and this calls for a temporary judge. As the former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary stated, "Always the temporary judges are made permanent as time goes on."

The volume of private, civil cases commencing in 1952 in Utah is less than one-half of the national average. There were 58 such cases filed in Utah in 1952 as compared with the national average of 126 cases. This situation has been prevalent according to the records since 1941.

The Judicial Conference, Mr. Speaker, at no time has recommended an additional judge for Utah due to the fact that the case load does not warrant such an increase. The Republican governor of the State has publicly opposed an additional judgeship for the State of Utah.

One of our two Congressmen from the State of Utah has publicly opposed additional district judgeship for his own State. The president of the Utah State Bar Association and the Salt Lake County Bar Association from whom I have a wire has also opposed this additional judgeship temporary or permanent.

May I quote, Mr. Speaker, from the telegram of the Governor of the State of Utah, Gov. J. Bracken Lee, to the State congressional delegation and to the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Hon. Leonard W. Hall, one of our former colleagues. The telegram reads as follows:

> The bill which provides for an additional district judge in Utah is the same type of graft that the Republicans so severely criticised the Democrats for in the past.

May I quote from the letter from one of our colleagues from Utah to the House Committee on the Judiciary concerning the additional judgeship. Mr. Speaker, this is not me talking but a Congressman from Utah:

> On the basis of the current workload there is little justification for the appointment of a second Federal district judge for Utah. The present judge's predecessor in office handled all of the Federal court cases for Utah with dispatch until he was almost 90 years old. All the evidence which has been presented to me indicates that his successor's court calendar is up to date and that he has been able to serve part time in other districts without causing the delay of cases in Utah—

The Congressman further stated in his letter, and I admire him for his forthright opinion—

> at a time when we are trying to cut down Federal expenditure and the size of the Federal payroll, it behooves us all to examine our wishes in the light of the overall good of the country. In this light I cannot support the addition of another high-paid Federal judge, when it is clearly demonstrated by the facts that such a judge is not now needed for the efficient operation of our Federal court.

The following memorandum in opposition to S. 15, to create an additional judge for Utah, was forwarded to me by one of the leading law officers in the State of Utah:

> MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO SENATE BILL 15 TO CREATE AN ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR UTAH
>
> The judgeship for Utah in the bill (S. 15) is not recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States.
>
> And, the judgeship is not recommended by the American Bar Association.
>
> A second judgeship for Utah is opposed by the great majority of the members of the bar of the State of Utah. Six hundred members of the Utah State bar reside in Salt Lake County. The Salt Lake County Bar Association on July 16, 1953, held a meeting called for the purpose, at which 147 were in attendance and voted unanimously to oppose a second Federal judgeship for Utah.
>
> The proposal for a second judgeship for Utah is opposed by the Honorable WILLIAM A. DAWSON, Congressman from the Second Congressional District of Utah.
>
> It is also opposed by Gov. J. Bracken Lee, of the State of Utah, and many other persons all of whom know there is no justification based upon a need for an additional Federal judge for Utah.
>
> Another judgeship will represent a large and unnecessary expenditure of public money.
>
> Action by Congress should be based upon true and correct information showing the necessity for another judgeship.

The printed report on this bill of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate does not appear to have been based upon such information.

Nine sentences out of a total of 22 sentences in the supporting information for the additional judgeship for Utah at pages 27 and 28 of the Senate committee report contain incorrect or misleading information.

The vice of that part of the committee report is that—

1. It leaves the impression that there is an increasing backlog of pending cases. Nothing is further from the truth. There is no backlog of either civil or criminal cases in the Federal court in Utah; nor has there ever been. There are (on June 30, 1953) only 11 criminal cases pending in Utah's Federal court. All cases pending are listed and analyzed in the certificate of the clerk of the court at the end of this statement.

2. It implies that the judicial business in Utah has suffered because Utah's Federal judge has been called to Colorado by the chief judge of the 10th circuit to relieve the congestion there. The implication is unjust and wholly unwarranted. It is Colorado that needs a judge, not Utah. The Utah judge can go to Colorado because his work is completely current. Nothing needing attention in Utah district has been delayed, let alone, neglected.

3. Further support is sought for another judge by providing in the bill that Federal court be held at Cedar City.

No justification, in fact, or necessity can be found for holding Federal court in Cedar City. There was only 1 case from Cedar City out of a total of 224 civil cases filed in Utah's Federal Court during calendar 1949. There were only 2 cases from Cedar City out of a total of 168 civil cases filed during 1952.

There has been filed an average of only 2 cases each year from Cedar City since 1948.

There has been a total of only 10 civil cases filed from Cedar City since 1948, as compared with a total of 774 filed from all over the State.

The following summary of statistical data has been compiled from statistical information supplied by Mr. Will Shafroth, Chief of the Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Supreme Court Building, Washington 13, D. C. and can be checked there:

1. Cases in the United States District Court for the District of Utah reach trial in about one-half of the time of the national median.

The median time from filing of a case to disposition by trial in Utah has been constantly below the national median, Mr. Will Shafroth says. In 1951 the time for filing to disposition by trial of 35 cases was 6.9 months in comparison to the national median of 12.2 months. The average time from issue to trial was 3.4 months in comparison to the national median of 7.3 months.

2. The volume of private civil cases commenced per judge in 1952 in the Federal District Court in Utah is less than one-half of the national average per judge.

There were 58 such cases filed in Utah in 1952 as compared with the national average of 126 cases per judge. This relationship generally has prevailed in Utah since 1941.

3. No other State, with the exception of Wyoming, had a smaller number of civil cases pending January 1, 1953, than were pending in the Federal District Court of Utah.

Civil cases are of two types, those between private citizens or companies, and those wherein the United States is a party. United States civil cases, i. e., those in which the United States is a party, are on the average far less burdensome than private civil cases, because the clerk enters defaults in the vast majority of them and the judge never sees them. They are finally disposed of in the Utah Federal Court within 30 or 40 days of filing.

4. There were fewer criminal cases pending in the Federal District Court for Utah on January 1, 1953, than in all other States with the exception of New Hampshire, Connecticut, Delaware, and Montana.

5. The number of private civil cases commenced in the Federal court for Utah has decreased every year for the past 5 years from 83 in 1948 to 58 in 1952.

6. The number of both private civil cases and civil cases in which the United States is a party pending on June 30, 1951, was 37 and on June 30, 1952, was 70. The number of civil cases, both private cases and cases in which the United States is a party, pending on June 30, 1953, is 72. These are the lowest numbers of civil cases pending in the United States District Court for Utah on the closing date of any fiscal year since 1941.

7. The total number of civil cases commenced in any one year since 1947 has decreased from a high of 294 cases in 1947 to 177 cases commenced in 1952.

8. A similar comparison on criminal cases commenced shows a high of 315 criminal cases commenced in 1947 compared with 130 criminal cases commenced in 1952.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the present judge for the Federal district court in the State of Nevada could hardly agree with all the statements of the preceding speaker. I am sure he feels, and justifiably so, that he is the busiest judge in the State of Nevada. Last year, statistics point out that the Nevada district court was the fourth busiest court in the ninth circuit, which consists of nine Western States and Alaska and Hawaii in trying criminal cases. I should like to point out that the State of Nevada is the sixth largest State, with 110,000 square miles. Congressman LANE, the gentleman from Massachusetts, pointed out that court is held in Las Vegas, which is separated by some 500 miles from Reno. It is also held in Elko, which is some 300 miles from Reno. The biggest problem out there is, perhaps, not the number of cases but the geographical distances involved for the judge to travel from one area to the other. The State is also the second fastest growing State in the Union. One-third of the population is located in the southern part of the State around Las Vegas. Approximately one-third of it is located in the vicinity of Reno.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. What appeals to me about this situation is the fact that litigants and lawyers are put to great inconvenience to get to the only place for holding court. If this additional temporary judgeship were approved, it would relieve the inconvenience to which these people are put.

Mr. YOUNG. That is certainly true, and I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Then I take it, the argument is, that if there is inconvenience in any State which has only 1 judge, they should have 2 judges. If this bill passes, I should like to say, these States have only one judge: New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine, Rhode Island, and Wyoming. Inconvenience is caused to many lawyers in those States, if they have only one judge.

Mr. YOUNG. I might point out that all of those States, except Wyoming, probably could be put into one of the larger counties of the State of Nevada.

In addition, we have an unusual type of caseload in Nevada. There is a large number of corporation cases. The law of the State of Nevada has been somewhat favorable to the organization of corporations there. There is also a large number of irrigation cases which take a great deal of time. There is a large number of criminal cases, arising not from the trial of criminals who have committed crimes in Nevada, but those who have committed crimes outside of the State, but who are caught passing through our State.

I know from personal experience of the workload in the Federal district court. When I first stated practicing law in 1949, we filed a suit in the Federal district court. When I came back to Congress last year, we were still unable to get to a hearing.

As the gentleman who first spoke this afternoon pointed out, justice late is justice denied. This is only a temporary appointment at best, and I think it would help clear up the caseload that is now clogging the courts.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I handled in the last Congress a number of these judgeship bills. I went thoroughly into the situation of these two States of Nevada and Utah, and judged by usual standards I will say beyond peradventure of doubt that there is no more need for any additional judge in those two States than there is need for any one of you gentlemen to have a hole in your head. You can put the litigants of Nevada in the proverbial telephone booth. I say that, despite the remarks of the youthful and distinguished Member who preceded me, who comes from that State.

It is interesting to note the average case load in Nevada which, in 1952, was 169; 74 civil cases and 95 criminal cases. There are 86 United States district courts throughout this country. Nevada ranked 84th in number of cases. In other words only two districts had fewer cases.

I suggest that Members from those States which contain those 83 United States districts that have more cases than Nevada come right in here and ask for additional judges. Ask for it while the going is good. Put in your thumb and just pull out a plum. That is indeed the pattern that has been followed by two of the distinguished Members of the other body.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the distinguished gentleman from New York have any

record of the amount of time spent in traveling in those districts to which he has referred, which have a larger caseload than the State of Nevada?

Mr. CELLER. Of course, in many of these States, they have to travel miles from various places to points where courts are held.

It is most unfortunate that the other body did not accept the bill that we passed in this House which followed generally the recommendations of the Judicial Conference. These additional judgeships for Nevada and Utah did not earn the recommendation of the Judicial Conference. In the case of Utah, the entire bar is opposed to this additional judge. Utah ranks 56th in number of cases per judge among all court districts.

By token of the argument advanced, I think other States where the caseload is similar to that in Nevada should come in here and ask for more judges. Let us consider some figures on Utah. The number of private civil cases commenced was less than one-half the national average per judge.

No other State in the Union save Wyoming had a smaller number of civil cases pending on January 1, 1953, than the State of Utah. The case load in Utah was—in 1952—177 civil cases, 130 criminal, or a total of 307.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. LANE. And does the gentleman know that just at the present time the judge from the State of Utah is sitting in the State of Colorado because of no work in Utah?

Mr. CELLER. If there is need for an additional judge in Colorado, for goodness sake, give Colorado an additional judge; do not siphon off a judge from Utah and have him go into Colorado and use that defection as a reason for one more judge in Utah. To my mind, that does not make any sense.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true that in the 82d Congress the gentleman's committee brought in an omnibus judgeship bill here that included one for the State of Nevada?

Mr. CELLER. I do not recall that.

Mr. HALLECK. I am quite sure it is.

Mr. CELLER. In the committee I opposed the additional judgeship for Nevada.

Now why should we sacrifice, or why should the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle sacrifice their vaunted economy on the altar, shall I say, of appeasement of two distinguished members in the other body? When the conference was held two certain gentlemen insisted that unless they had their way, they would hold up the bill in conference. That is most unfortunate. Are we to swallow that kind of procedure?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

I am sure he does not want to give the impression that caseload is the only and basic determining factor in passing on the question of whether we need additional judges. If such be the fact, then there is no way of leveling off the situation in any State. I understand the gentleman does not contend that caseload is the only criterion.

Mr. CELLER. I will say that it is a very important factor, but the judicial conference went into all the factors and they came up with the recommendation in words of common parlance and colloquialism, "no soap" for Nevada and Utah.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will give me another minute.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I will give the gentleman another minute if he requires it.

I wonder if the gentleman knows that the chairman appointed by the Judicial Council, Judge Beggs, of Pennsylvania, appeared before our committee and he did not oppose—as a matter of fact he underwrote the justification for a judge in Nevada and in the State of Utah when the bill was up. It is not spelled out in the record, but we did not go contrary to the wish or the apparent will of the Judicial Conference. They were for these additional judgeships.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CELLER. I take it that was sort of secret diplomacy which was exercised.

I will say to the Members who might vote for this bill because they might get an additional judgeship in their State that they nonetheless ought to vote for the motion to recommit; otherwise they will be guilty of political log-rolling, and I do not think that we should put this kind of political spots and stains on our judiciary. If the bill goes to conference again the judgeships for Utah and Nevada can be stricken therefrom. The bill is, otherwise, a good bill. I do not think any kind of political chicanery can justify the judgeship for Nevada or Utah. No amount of sophistry can offset the iniquity of this unholy bundle—it is an unholy judgeship bundle. There is much talk of the need for these judges. That is true for all the States, save Nevada and Utah. The Judiciary Committee had bills before you during the last Congress but it was Republican opposition which prevented passage through both Houses. The delay lies with those on the other side.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY].

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I am against the bill; I voted against it before; I am going to vote against it again in the name of economy.

Since I have been here—this is my first time—I have discovered that we are continually reminded that we have certain fixed commitments that we cannot escape. But here you are going to make another fixed commitment of a hundred millions a year.

I voted against another measure to establish an Air Academy for the same reason, yet I have been a pilot and a plane owner for 25 years. I do not see how you are ever going to balance the budget in the future if you keep on adding $50 million or $100 million a year to the fixed charges of the Government.

I do not intend to argue for one moment whether there is any necessity or any need for these judgeships in my own State. I am of the opinion that we could get along without any additional judges in Michigan, certainly without two.

However, that is not the basis upon which I have made my decision to vote against this conference report. The balancing of the budget and the reducing of taxes are the most important things confronting us and we are not going to do this as long as we move in the wrong direction.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the conference committee on his presentation of this conference report. I also want to thank him for the observations he made concerning the factual basis which impelled the committee to include the additional judge for the eastern district of Michigan in its recommendations. That judgeship, of course, was in the Senate bill and the House conferees yielded on that point.

I might remind the Members of the House that since 1939 when the last additional judge for the eastern district of Michigan was created there had been an increase of approximately a million and a half in population up to the 1950 census. Since that census, there has been an additional increase in population.

These facts were taken into account by the conferees.

May I make an observation concerning the position of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY]. I have been as economy-minded, I believe, as any Member of this House and I intend to remain economy-minded. But, Mr. Speaker, we should not be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

One of the reasons for the growth of our administrative law and the determination of legal questions by trial examiners and administrative officials has been alleged to be the inability of the courts to handle expeditiously the legal business of the Nation. It is against the public interest, in my opinion, to detract from the judicial branch of our Government while at the same time we are expanding administrative tribunals and administrative decisions of officials.

Before the Judiciary Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, there is now pending a bill which would render open to judicial review the finality clause in certain defense contracts. This legislation, if adopted, would permit the courts of the United States to go behind factual determinations of administrative officials in certain appropriate cases. It would add measurably to the volume of litigation in the Court of Claims and in Federal courts.

As lawyers, many of you must have run into situations where a factual determination has been made by a trial examiner which is precluded from review by the courts. Lack of judges should not

be a reason for denying litigants the proper review of findings of fact or conclusions of law by administrative tribunals and administrative officials. It is foolish economy to deny adequate justice to the people of this country.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an affidavit from the clerk of the United States district court for Utah.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this bill is rather interesting in several respects. One, principally, is that I find myself on the side of economy, on the side of real economy. I find many of my Republican brethren—I do not know how many—on the other side. If we have a roll call it will show, and if we do not, why it will not show—that the case of at least one of these judges is a reckless expenditure, a heedless expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

There is absolutely no justification for a judgeship in Utah. I accept the word of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] in relation to Nevada, but I know something about the situation in Utah, because I have before me an affidavit from the clerk of the United States District Court, and based upon that, the inclusion of a judgeship, temporary or otherwise—temporary means during his life—so far as Utah is concerned, is not only unnecessary even from a stretched political angle, but constitutes a reckless expenditure of the taxpayers' money. While that is going on, creating a job that is unnecessary and one for life, it will cost the taxpayers about $45,000 a year during the lifetime of the judge, and when the increase in pay goes through it will be $10,000 or $12,500 more. I hope the judges' bill goes through; I am for the increase in pay for judges, and I am for the increase in pay for Congressmen. I hope both will go through, but if we have not the courage to vote for an increase in salary for ourselves, I hope we will have the courage to give the judges the justifiable increase they are entitled to. But, if it goes through, it means from $10,000 to $12,500 a year more so far as unnecessary judges in this bill are concerned.

Furthermore, while this is going on, I am thinking of a letter I received yesterday from the Department of the Navy that they are going to lay off from 1,000 to 1,400 men at the Boston Navy Yard between now and June 30. Up in the Springfield Arsenal, in Massachusetts, they are laying off many hundreds of employees. All over the length and breadth of this land they are laying off thousands of employees, and they are boasting about it. Yet in this bill they are creating—and I hope my friend from Indiana will answer this if he is going to talk—at least one judgeship that I know of that is absolutely unnecessary. As I have said on two occasions, it is a reckless expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

We are cutting down the Army and we are cutting down the Navy. They cut down the Air Force last year to 120 air groups and now they are going to build it up to 137, and I am glad. If the Republicans are right now, they were wrong then, only 7 months ago. We Democrats warned against cutting our defense in the air, but you did it. Now you are going to increase the number to 137. So you cannot be right today and right 6 months ago. You are right now and you were wrong then or you were right then and you are wrong now.

In order to bring about an increase in the Air Force, there is a decrease in the Army and Navy. That is because Mr. Humphreys and Mr. Dodge insist upon a mandatory budget for our Armed Forces. I wonder how Mr. Humphreys and Mr. Dodge are going to feel when they hear that today this House voted at least 1 judgeship, if not 2, that are absolutely unnecessary.

I wonder how many thousands throughout the country who have been discharged, whose services have been terminated, and the many more whose services will be terminated in the near future, in the next 6 months, will feel when they know that the Republican Party is creating another judgeship to give to some Republican candidate.

The following certificate of the clerk of the United States court for the district of Utah shows the current condition of the judicial business in that court to the date of June 30, 1953:

CERTIFICATE

I, O. K. Clay, clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Utah, do hereby certify with reference to the status of the criminal and civil dockets as of June 30, 1953, as follows:

CRIMINAL CASES

Criminal cases pending on date Hon. Willis W. Ritter took office, November 1, 1949, 58.

Criminal cases pending on June 30, 1953, 11.

In 5 of the 11 cases pending on June 30, 1953, the defendants are fugitives. The Department of Justice has been unable to locate them following indictment and issuance of bench warrants, 5.

In one of the cases pending on June 30, 1953, the defendant has since changed his plea and on Friday, July 10, 1953, sentence was imposed (*U. S.* v. *Floyd A. Taylor* (Cr. 32–53), filed March 2, 1953).

In one case pending on June 30, 1953, the defendant entered its plea of guilty and sentence was imposed on July 10, 1953 (*U. S.* v. *Smith Canning Company* (Cr. 74–53), filed May 24, 1953).

In one case the defendant had a heart attack after the jury was sworn, is now in the hospital and will be tried as soon as his health permits (*U. S.* v. *Oliver C. Howell* (Cr. 39–53), filed March 19, 1953).

One case is at issue on plea of not guilty and is waiting trial in the Northern Division (Ogden) (*U. S.* v. *George Pappas, et al.* (Cr. 55–53), filed April 22, 1953).

One case which was pending on June 30, 1953, was transferred on July 7, 1953, for plea and sentence to the Federal district court at Topeka, Kans. (*U. S.* v. *Walter Thomas Moffatt* (Cr. 76–53), filed May 29, 1953.

One case is at issue on a plea of not guilty involving a Mexican who has been released on his own recognizance to enable him to discover evidence of citizenship. The trial is continued without date (*U. S.* v. *Manuel Espinosa-Casillas* (Cr. 60–53), filed May 16, 1953).

Total, 11.

CIVIL CASES

Civil cases pending on date Hon. Willis W. Ritter took office, November 1, 1949, 185.

Civil cases pending June 30, 1953, 72.

There are no cases filed prior to 1952 among the civil cases pending on June 30, 1953.

ANALYSIS OF 1952 CASES

There are 18 cases filed during 1952 among the civil cases pending on June 30, 1953.

Of these cases filed in 1952, eight cases are filed by Chinese and Japanese in Hong Kong, China, to establish their American citizenship. Trials are waiting action by the State Department of the United States to enable plaintiffs to get out of Hong Kong to come to trial. Ninth Circuit cases are now pending involving the same legal questions.

Of the cases filed in 1952, there are two cases tried in September 1952 by Judge William Robert Wallace, of Oklahoma, and are waiting decision by him.

One case (*James M. Ham* v. *Oregon Short Line R. R.*, filed December 4, 1952) has been continued to October 1953 at the request of the parties to enable the Comptroller of the United States to find a record.

Two cases (*Donaldson* v. *Warner Bros.*, filed April 22, 1952, and May 16, 1952) are waiting decision by the Supreme Court of Utah of a case there pending which will be decisive.

One of the 1952 cases (*George Travis* v. *Arnold Travis*, filed July 11, 1952) pending on June 30, 1953, was settled on stipulation and dismissed on July 13, 1953.

Two cases (*Sinclair Refining Co.* v. *Greer*, filed October 11, 1952; *Village Theater, Inc.* v. *Paramount Pictures, Inc., et al.*, filed October 15, 1952) are on the October 1953 trial calendar.

One case (*Sylvia Marie Brown* v. *Paul Cox, d/b/a Cox Trucking Co., et al.*, filed December 24, 1952, transferred from Nevada) is on the calendar July 23, 1953, for summary judgment.

ANALYSIS OF 1953 CASES

There are 54 cases filed during 1953 among the civil cases pending on June 30, 1953.

January 1953

Four cases filed in January 1953 were pending June 30, 1953.

A 3-judge court tried 1 of these cases on July 8, one is set for trial July 28, 1 is on the October 1953 jury calendar, and 1 is not at issue.

March 1953

Three cases were filed in March 1953 and were pending June 30, 1953. One of these cases is set for trial in October 1953. The other two are not at issue.

April 1953

Two cases filed in April 1953 were pending June 30, 1953. One of which is set for trial July 27, 1953. The other is not yet at issue.

May 1953

Fourteen cases were filed in May 1953 and were pending June 30, 1953. Three of these cases, filed May 16, 1953, May 25, 1953, and May 26, 1953, are on the October 1953 trial calendar.

One of the May cases filed May 25, 1953, was dismissed on June 8, 1953.

Two May cases are at issue but not pretried. The remaining 8 cases filed in May are not at issue.

June 1953

Thirty-one cases were filed in June and pending June 30, 1953.

One of these cases filed June 10, 1953, and pretried July 10, 1953, is set for trial October 1953.

The balance are not yet at issue—30.

Total civil cases pending June 30, 1953, 72.

Twenty cases of the 31 filed in June are brought against the same defendant, a steel company, and involve the same questions of nuisance and damages. These 20 cases probably will be consolidated.

Counsel have indicated they may not be tried.

The court has disposed of and terminated 46 of the civil cases filed in 1953, between January 1 and June 30. Between these dates 100 civil cases (private and United States) were filed. Only 54 remain pending on June 30. Hence 46 were closed.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of this court this 15th day of July, 1953.

[SEAL] O. K. CLAY, *Clerk.*

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I would not be in favor of following the gentleman from Massachusetts if I had my way about it. I would rather speak ahead of him.

I am in favor of having two judges, at least two, in every State in the Union, and I will tell you why. I went through the experience in North Dakota of having one Federal judge. He finally became a dictator. No lawyer would oppose him, because if he did he lost his business. There is only one lawyer that did oppose him, and he is right here now. When I came to Congress I introduced a bill for another temporary judge in North Dakota, and it passed. After that he was the finest judge you ever saw. They get arrogant.

You say that out in Nevada there is a large caseload. That is right. There will not be half as many cases next year as there are now, because the lawyers will not bring a case before that judge. If you had at least two judges in every State in the Union you would overcome this arrogance. Just because they are appointed for life, and are sitting under the flag of the United States, some of these judges think they own the Government. They are just servants of the people the same as we are.

Would it not be an awful thing, a blow against the integrity of the Republican Party, on expenditures, if we happened to put in one temporary judgeship that might cost the people of the United States $12,500, while the same Democrats who complain about that will vote $40 million for some foreign country anytime a demand for it is made.

I was on the conference committee. I was not bulldozed. I was rather proud of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] who was the only one that stood up, because he did not want to have that expenditure going on of $12,500 or whatever the amount of money is, added to the expense of the Government. But if the situation in Nevada is the same as it was in North Dakota, with one arrogant judge, then I am in favor of an additonal judge in Nevada.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. What about the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine, Rhode Island, and Wyoming? They have only one judge each.

Mr. BURDICK. I would rather have two. If the people there need another judge, and I am in Congress, and I expect to be here a long time, I will vote for another judge for Vermont.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. Why was the additional judge allowed in the Senate bill for the State of Washington removed in conference?

Mr. BURDICK. This is the first time I ever sat on a conference committee. I have been here since the Potomac River was started, and I finally got up to the 12th position on the Committee on the Judiciary. This is my first experience in conference. They told me when I entered that august body that I would have to give away some of the ideas I had of my own; and that they would have to give. It was a conference agreement. Well, I suppose I gave away all I had when I got in there—I do not know. At least we came to a conference agreement.

Mr. HOLMES. With the increased population in the State of Washington and the fact that they did have an additional Federal district judge included in one of the bills which went into conference, it seems to me that the conferees were a bit hasty in sacrificing the judgship for the State of Washington in the face of the overwhelming need which was demonstrated for an additional judge.

Mr. BURDICK. May I say to the gentleman that if he will get behind the bill I have, which would provide at least two judges for every State in the Union, he can add that into that bill.

If the people of the United States ever lose confidence in the integrity of courts or if the manner in which they override justice, then I say this country will go the way of many experiments in government in the past.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we certainly always enjoy hearing the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] and because we do, I rather suspect we, too, feel that he will be here a long time. He entertains us and he always has something worthwhile to contribute. When he said he had been in conference and had been told—this was his first experience—that you go over there to agree—I understand and appreciate his point. Of course, a conference involves a give and take. Generally speaking, neither the House nor Senate get everything they started with.

The address of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], who felt called upon because he was in such a strange role, to announce he was speaking for economy, was similarly illuminating. It was a rather strange role for him. I would find no reason to doubt his word—I am quite convinced that everything he had to say was undoubtedly motivated by reasons of economy. But, might it be possible that the fact that Utah has a Republican Senator and Nevada has a Democratic Senator has something to do with it? I do not know. He may have been a bit concerned about that. Of course, as to whether or not we ought to talk of Air Force reductions now is something that has nothing to do with the matter before us.

Let us talk about the conference report on this omnibus judges bill. I hope this conference report is not recommitted. I hope it is agreed to because these judges are desperately needed. I want also to make the record clear. The gentleman from New York was not quite certain what he was doing in the 82d Congress when he was chairman of this committee. Also, the gentleman from Massachusetts was the chairman of the subcommittee, yet now he says he is going to try to recommit this bill because of the inclusion of the State of Nevada.

May I state to the gentleman from New York that on April 22 on the floor of the House in the debates, he listed the judgeship for the State of Nevada as one included in the bill. He argued for that bill and asked its passage. Now he is here asking us to strike out Nevada, and that is what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is asking us to do. It is one of the most sudden reversals of form that I have seen in all my years of service in the House of Representatives. Likewise the gentleman from New York was in error when he said all of the additions are outside of the recommendations of the judicial conference because they are not. The judicial conference recommended an additional judge for the eastern district of Michigan, and for the western district of Pennsylvania. That is my information from the judicial conference.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I said that the recommendations with reference to Utah and with reference to Nevada were outside the purview of the recommendations of the Judicial Conference.

Mr. HALLECK. I understood the gentleman to refer to all of these additions that were made as a result of the conference action.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] dared to speak here of something that many of us do not like to talk of too much, but we all recognize that in some of these circuits situations may develop with respect to personnel that would seem to indicate that something needs to be done. I think that is true in the consideration before us.

Let me point out that after the other body and the House acted on the question of the omnibus judgeship bill last spring, the measure went to conference. The conference dragged on through the end of the session and no agreement was reached. In the meantime I, as the majority leader, was beset by representatives of the bar associations, representatives of the Judicial Conference, by the Attorney General, by all people who realize, who know just how desperately needed these judges are, who said to me, "Heavens and earth, get this bill through."

It did not get through in the last session. But, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] has pointed out, the conferees went back into session to undertake to work out a bill. Finally this agreement was reached. It provides for temporary judgeships in Utah and Nevada. I do not admit that they will become permanent. No one knows about that. But let me say this to the membership: Do you want to take the responsibility of jeopardizing this whole legislation after our representatives in the conference did all they could do and after the matter was passed on? Do you want to jeopardize the enactment of this legislation and the creation of these judgeships in places where they are so desperately needed, by recommitting this bill? I do not think so. For that reason I hope the motion to recommit will be voted down and the conference report adopted.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report in its present form and shall vote to recommit, with instructions.

My opposition is based mainly on the fact that there is no need for these additional judges in the States of Utah and Nevada. However, I have a further objection. I believe that this action on the part of this Republican-controlled Congress is purely political. This bill, or one very similar to it, was reported out and came up for a vote on the floor of this House in the 82d Congress. Most of the Members who are now advocating its passage opposed it at that time for frankly political reasons. They felt that in the coming presidential election there was a possibility that a Republican President would be elected. In that event, appointments to the Federal judiciary would be made by the new Republican President.

The need for additional judges was just as great in 1952 as it is today; yet the Republican Party was willing to sacrifice necessity for expediency.

One further reason for my opposition is the fact that in New York City, particularly in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the calendar of pending cases is over 4 years behind. The bill in 1952 called for an additional 5 judges, whereas this bill gives us only 2 additional judges. This, in the face of the fact that Utah and Nevada, which are up to date, receive an additional judge, is rank unfairness; and the only way in which this situation can be corrected is to recommit the bill and have the committee of conference agree to changes in it.

The SPEAKER. All the time has expired.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LANE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANE moves to recommit conference report No. 1133 on S. 15 concerning the appointment of additional circuit and district judges to the committee on conference with the following instructions to the managers on the part of the House: To insist on disagreement to section 2 (a) (I) of S. 15 on page 2, lines 20 and 21, by striking out the words "One additional district judge in the district of Nevada", and also lines 4 and 5, on page 3, by striking out the words "One additional district judge for the district of Utah."

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] to recommit the conference report.

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. LANE) there were—ayes 43, noes 118.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty are present, a quorum.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. METCALF DESIGNATED TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to on February 2, 1954, the Chair designates the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 22, 1954.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES TO COMMEMORATE THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 319)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1917, "to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase."

The proposed legislation would authorize the coinage of not to exceed 2½ million silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase.

The principal objection to commemorative coins is that they detract from the fundamental function of the coinage as a medium of exchange. Multiplicity of designs on United States coins would tend to create confusion among the public, and to facilitate counterfeiting. The Congress recognized the necessity for limiting the designs of coins by section 3510 of the Revised Statutes which provides that "no change in the design or die of any coin shall be made oftener than once in 25 years from and including the year of the first adoption of the design, model, die, or hub for the same coin."

I am further advised by the Treasury Department that in the past in many instances the public interest in these special coins has been so short-lived that their sales for the purposes intended have lagged with the result that large quantities have remained unsold and have been returned to the mints for melting.

I fully recognize the importance to the country of the event which this coin would commemorate. I recognize, too, that the authorization of 1 or 2 or 3 of such issues of coins would not do major harm. However, experience has demonstrated that the authorization of even a single commemorative issue brings forth a flood of other authorizations to commemorate events or anniversaries of local or national importance. In the administration of President Hoover, these authorizations multiplied to the point where he felt compelled to exercise his veto. The same pattern recurred in the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. In view of this historical pattern, which by now has become so clear, I think that it is both wiser and fairer to make known my views on this subject at the outset. I therefore regretfully withhold my approval of H. R. 1917.

As has been suggested in the past, it seems to me wholly appropriate that anniversaries like this one, which the Congress deems it desirable to commemorate, should be recognized by bills authorizing the Treasury to provide suitable commemorative medals at cost.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1954.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING HELP TO CONTROL THE LEVEL OF LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3300) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3300, with Mr. McDONOUGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this occasion to thank the members of the Committee on Public Works and particularly the chairman for the consideration and courtesy they extended to me individually, as well as all those who had to do with presenting both sides of the issue before that very capable and very active and very efficient committee.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3300 contains language that is plain and unequivocal in its terms. There is nothing complicated about this measure. It authorizes the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

This bill specifically stresses the fact that it is intended to protect, improve, and promote navigation and navigable waters in the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi Valley, to help control the Lake Michigan water level, and to afford protection to property along the shores of the Great Lakes.

Under existing law, the State of Illinois and the sanitary district are authorized to withdraw from Lake Michigan a total annual average of 1,500 cubic feet of water per second. H. R. 3300 would permit an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second to flow into the Illinois Waterway for a period of 3 years from and after its enactment, subject to certain stipulations.

The whole project of diverting additional water is subscribed by law, with the express provision that the Secretary of the Army shall order a study to be made of the effect, if any, in the improvement of conditions in the Illinois Waterway and in Lake Michigan by reason of the increased diversion; and pursuant to such study, the Secretary shall, on or before January 31, 1956, report to the Congress the results of his study, together with his recommendations as to the continuation of the increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second, or the decrease of such fixed amount.

The Committee on Public Works made an extended investigation of the facts and written data submitted by the proponents of the bill—and likewise heard evidence in opposition to the measure. The subject matter embraced in the bill was extensively gone into and explored, not only once, but twice. The committee held two separate investigations—one in the 2d session of the 82d Congress, and the latter during the 1st session of the 83d Congress. In each instance the committee reported favorably on the bill, without amendment, and requested that it do pass.

The Department of the Army, in collaboration with its Corps of Engineers, made its last report on water diversion from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway in 1933. At that time the question of sewage disposal and purification had not been solved. The sanitary district pledged itself to meet this very serious problem, and it may be said to the credit of the municipal body that it has made good on its promise. Approximately $200 million has been spent by the district in the construction of intercepting of sewage disposal plants.

The 1933 report of the Army contemplated constructive action by the trustees of the sanitary district, designed to meet the then ever-mounting and existing public nuisance created by sewage pouring into the sanitary district canal. Their report contained this specific directive:

> A further study should be made when sewage purification plants had been completed and placed in operation by the Sanitary District of Chicago.

The district has kept faith with the Army engineers; and the time has now arrived when further study should be made—and this bill is primarily designed to bring about what the Army engineers recommended should be done when it had been established that the sanitary district had fulfilled its commitments.

The Army engineers testified before the Public Works Committee that they, too, were ready to complete their agreement, and pointed out the necessity for further study of the vexing problems still remaining in connection with operation of the sanitary district canal and the inland waterway. The engineers requested a 3-year limit to fulfill their part of the agreement.

In brief, Col. William B. Milne, Deputy Chief of Civil Works, testified before the Public Works Committee that the increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second could have little adverse effect on lake or river interests, and affords an opportunity to secure valuable information on the exact effects, favorable or otherwise, of the increased flow.

Now, what has happened since 1933 relative to high or low water level in the Great Lakes? It is conceded by proponents and opponents of this bill that during the past 20 years the water level in the Great Lakes has reached heights unsurpassed, and only equaled once or twice, during the time that scientific records were kept of periodic rises in water levels on the Great Lakes.

In the past 20 years, with the water level at this extreme height, property bordering on either side has been unnecessarily and unexpectedly inundated, thereby causing great damage and annoyance to property owners.

But what has been infinitely more annoying and serious has been the violent storms that cause the water of Lake Michigan to damage and even destroy waterfront property to an extent never before equaled since the shorelines were inhabited and developed.

The destruction and devastation caused by the high water, in some instances, beggars description. Whole areas made up of projecting shore property have been washed away—seawalls, jetties, piers, houses, and other buildings of various descriptions, located on or near the lake shore, have been swept away or so severely damaged as to be beyond repair.

The property loss has mounted into hundreds of millions of dollars. This destructive force has persisted and now persists in Lake Michigan while the high watermark is still in evidence.

To date nothing has been accomplished that tends to militate against the forces of nature, except the plan embodied in this bill, which would divert additional water from the Great Lakes into the channel that constitutes the Chicago Sanitary Canal and the Illinois Inland Waterway. This exploitation, the Army engineers point out, will not injure or harm navigation on the lakes for the time being. But a study of water diversion will give the engineers an opportunity to learn what, if any, overall effect prolonged water diversion will have on the lake level marks that now prevail.

In addition to what has already been noted, what does this bill aim to accomplish? First of all, let me point out that it will provide the opportunity for the Army engineers once and for all time, to refute the charge that increased water diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second would increase the flood hazard in the lower sections of the waterway to any appreciable extent.

Second. Because of the high efficiency of the district's modern plants and facilities for sewage disposal, pollution of the waterway has been reduced to a minimum. Increased diversion in the amount suggested would restore the vitally necessary oxygen content. At this time it is not disputed that the highly scientific and effective treatment of the sewage content extracted from water flowing into the sanitary district canal abates and virtually destroys the oxygen content.

Third. The increase in the current of the stream would be slight and would have no material effect on the cost of barge operators.

Fourth. Restoration of the waterway to a wholesome condition would provide relief for more than a million citizens inhabiting the upper reaches of the waterway who frequently are plagued by the malodorous condition caused by the sluggish flow.

Fifth. Proposed increased diversion is not intended to provide increased hydroelectric facilities.

Sixth. Existing treaties with Canada, and express or implied authority vested in the International Joint Commission, does not conflict with the objectives sought by the enactment of H. R. 3300.

It can be well stressed here that Chicago would not be the sole beneficiary of this legislation, and that the project under consideration does not contemplate or provide for a congressional appropriation.

The contention that commerce over a wide area would benefit from the proposed increased diversion has not been effectively challenged. In the past 20 years traffic on the Illinois Waterway has increased from about 200,000 tons to over 16 million tons a year.

It is not seriously disputed that marine life in the waterway and commercial

fishing in the Illinois River have been damaged severely, owing to lack of sufficient oxygen in the water. As a matter of fact, the oxygen deficiency has resulted not alone in diminishing, but in virtually destroying, marine life in the Illinois Inland Waterway system.

I would like to point out briefly that H. R. 3300, if enacted into law, will accomplish much good, and certainly can do no real harm.

First, it will improve health conditions not only for Chicago, but for considerable distances along the waterway.

Second, it will reduce storm damage to lake front properties in Michigan and Illinois.

Third, it will aid the expanding navigation of the Illinois Waterway, without adding to flood hazards in the lower sections of the waterway.

Fourth, marine life and commercial fishing of the region will be greatly benefited.

Fifth, lake and river property and navigation interests are amply safeguarded in that the bill directs a study by the Secretary of the Army as to the effect, if any, on the improvement of conditions in the Illinois Waterway, and conditions in the Great Lakes, by reason of the increased diversion.

And, finally, the Secretary of the Army is directed under this bill to report to Congress the results of his study on or before January 31, 1956, together with his recommendations. The words "on or before" do not limit the Secretary of the Army to withhold his report until January 31, 1956.

Because of the flexibility of the language in the bill, he is clothed with the authority to report to Congress within any reasonable time after enactment of this measure, if he deems it necessary and proper to do so, in order to bring to the attention of Congress any alarming, detrimental or injurious results emanating from the increased diversion permitted by and through this legislation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, today I join with my colleagues supporting the passage of H. R. 3300, believing the bill is in the best interest of our Nation, and will directly assist in bringing about relief to the great pressure and flooding of waters over private property along the shores of the Great Lakes and its connecting waters.

Private property has been damaged to the extent of $30 million in Michigan alone, which includes the flooding and disrupting of sewage-disposal plants and contamination of drinking water which is extracted from wells. Many farms have become completely submerged in the past 3 years—property which had been under cultivation for close on to 75 years and which was considered the most productive farmland in the growing of row crops.

In June of 1952 the International Joint Commission held a meeting in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, which was attended by owners of private property from Michigan and Canada. Those attending this meeting protested the opening of the 16 compensating gates at the Soo Rapids after such dams had been closed for a period of months and had built up a high wall of water in Lake Superior. This order came through from the International Joint Commission, the Corps of Engineers claimed that the dams must be opened to release the waters to raise the levels in Lake Huron and Lake Michigan. They did not adhere to the request of the property owners for a continuous flow of water from Lake Superior down through the Great Lakes, claiming that in some periods Lake Michigan was too high. The determination of the International Commission to proceed in the same manner has caused a great deal of anxiety among those who have private property bordering on the shores of the St. Marys River and the Great Lakes.

After the order by the International Joint Commission in June of 1952 and the decision of the Corps of Engineers to open the compensating gates the Sugar Island Causeway washed out. This had to be rebuilt and the Corps of Engineers participated in the total amount of $50,000 for reconstruction.

I am of the opinion that this bill will bring about some needed relief to the areas which have been flooded, by diverting waters through the Illinois waterway. I do not claim this is a cure-all for the high water conditions that exist now in our Great Lakes area, but believe that it will add some relief to the State of Illinois and indirectly bring some relief to the shorelines of our Great Lakes and connecting waters which Michigan borders.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the essence of the report of the Randall Commission on Foreign Economic Policy is a proposal to throw open the markets of the United States to low-cost, cheap-labor imports. It proposes this without any assurance the United States will receive any concession in return, and in the face of direct evidence that this policy already has resulted in ruinous damage to American industry and agriculture.

I do not see in the proposal any net expansion in world trade, only the giving away of an increased share of our United States markets.

The Commission proposes this opening of our markets despite its own conclusions, which read like a good argument for doing away with the reciprocal trade adventure which Uncle Sam has been engaged in for the past 20 years. Here are the Commission's conclusions:

The United States is no longer a high-tariff country, a fact that cannot be disputed since 34 out of 42 countries have higher tariffs than the United States.

The present tariffs have never been tried under normal trade conditions. During the past 20 years of reciprocal trade, we have gone from depression into war, from heavy foreign aid again into war in Korea. These certainly cannot be called normal conditions for trade.

Exports and imports in American trade are now in approximate balance and the dollar gap has been virtually closed as foreign nations have built up their gold reserves.

There has been a great overemphasis on tariff reductions as a solution to trade problems. This the Commission concedes in pointing out that other countries have discriminated heavily against the United States in regulating trade.

Finally, the report agrees that free trade is impossible as long as the threat of Communist aggression hangs over the world.

These conclusions appear convincing to me, Mr. Chairman. But the report turns its back on the facts and recommends a 3-year extension of the President's authority to negotiate new trade agreements, and authority drastically to reduce existing tariff rates. The escape and peril-point provisions would be retained, but the report wants expressly spelled out the President's authority to disregard such findings "whenever he finds that the national interest of the United States requires it." It is worth noting that without this express authority, relief from competitive imports under the escape clause has been given only 3 times in the past 5 years, out of 57 applications filed by 46 industries.

The Commission would eliminate the preference now given the United States merchant fleet in the shipment of Government-owned and Government-financed cargoes, and would weaken the Buy American Act.

The Commission's report not only passed over its own arguments in making these recommendations. It ignored the hard realities of unemployment and closed plants over the country that are the direct result of competition from low-wage foreign imports.

In my own State of Rhode Island, unemployment is mounting every day. Working hours are being reduced in some plants, others are laying off part of their work force, and in other cases plants have had to shut down. The situation is becoming acute in the lace, rubber footwear, textile, and jewelry industries—and it is due chiefly to imports which are invading United States markets for these domestic products.

More than 60 percent of the Nation's lace industry is located in Rhode Island. We have 55 plants providing jobs for some 10,000 workers. The lace industry represents a $35 million a year business to Rhode Island. Today our lace manufacturers and their employees face a struggle for survival against competitive imports. The greatest competitive factor in lace manufacture is the cost of wages. The machinery used in the world lace industry is all made in England. Production techniques are generally the same. Consequently, when an American manufacturer pays $3 an hour in wages, the British manufacturer paying 59 cents for similar work, and the French manufacturer paying 39 cents have an almost insurmountable advantage. For-

eign producers receive additional subsidies and encouragement for exports from their governments. For example, France rebates to her lace producers the social security taxes paid for French workers whose products go into export.

The only way to offset such a marked competitive advantage for foreign lace is through an equalizing tariff which will enable American manufacturers to meet this competition on an equal footing.

Ninety percent of the Nation's jewelry industry is located in Rhode Island, providing jobs for 25,000 wage earners. Here too the workers are troubled and uneasy over the threat that unfair foreign competition holds for their future.

The manufacture of rubber footwear is another important Rhode Island industry. The pattern of past competition in the export market foreshadows what our producers can expect if domestic markets are further opened to foreign competition. Thirty-five years ago the United States supplied more than half the world's need for rubber footwear. That export market almost vanished in 10 years as foreign producers copied American designs and methods. Today the United States supplies only 2 percent of the world demand. If American producers can be driven from the world market, they can be pushed out of their home market by foreign producers benefiting from lower production costs and export help from their governments.

These are relatively small industries, made up of many small plants scattered over our State. But they are no less important to Rhode Island's economy. They have equal rights with other American industries and it is because they are small that they must be protected when life-and-death decisions are being made.

And let me say this: The vitality of these industries is of equal importance to the economy of the United States.

It may be pleasant for one segment of our economy to sit smugly by, enjoying a taste of prosperity, shall we call it, while shedding a few crocodile tears over the sad plight of New England's industry. I would like to remind all of you, once again, that what injures New England industry injures the entire Nation.

My State is the most densely populated State in the Union. All of southern New England is crowded with people who buy products of the rest of the land—agricultural commodities, raw goods, and manufactured products.

When any one section of the United States or any one industry deliberately ignores the interests of New England, then that section of the country or that industry is deliberately spurning one of the country's greatest market places. For the sake of a temporary economic advantage, obtained through artificial means, or by adopting a "me first" attitude, it is indicating a willingness to let one of the country's greatest purchasing areas become stagnant and ineffective.

We in New England have seen much of our industry attracted elsewhere—lured by cheap labor costs and temporary tax benefits. We have listened to well-phrased pleas that our country's economy is so geared to heavy industry and agricultural production that these two great segments of our economy must be supported and sustained no matter what may be the cost in the way of price supports and export trade stimulation.

We have been loyal children in our mother's house. We appreciate full well that the general good of the entire Nation is the paramount concern. We are fully aware that our United States must discharge the responsibilities that go with being a member of the world's society of Nations.

But we also appreciate that we have Main Streets and Broadways; and mill villages and farm communities. We have heavy industry; we have some of the world's most skilled mechanics; we can build ships and submarines and airplanes, as well as produce the most delicate and intricate types of machinery. We can weave the fabric from which your clothes are made; and we can make your hats.

It would be impossible for me to attempt to run through the entire scope of New England's productive potential. It would be just as ridiculous if I should attempt to spell out the commodities, the articles, the products which New England consumers absorb in their every-day contribution to the sustaining of the Nation's economy.

Suffice it to say this: New England industry is worthy of the concern of every one of you. It forms an integral part of the fabric which is industrial America. If our industry is to be penalized through tariff reductions in order to provide preferential consideration for some other section of the country, then I think we in New England shall have to resort to something like the artificial methods now employed by others to produce a form of prosperity, which, in the final analysis, is a will-o'-the-wisp.

I doubt very much that it is possible to find in any section of the country a more keen awareness of the fact that we are all part of one great organism than that which prevails in New England.

You will recall our forebears were among the first Americans. We helped in great measure to build this great institution which is the United States of America. Many of our farmyards were battlefields; behind many of our stone walls men bled and died in order that there might come into being this great community of people, all interested in the welfare of one another.

However, I want to say quite frankly that we in New England are bit by bit being forced into a closing of the ranks, where we will have to stand by our own decisions, for our own welfare; for the good of our families, our homes, and our shops.

We come from hardy stock. Our people have seen the ups and downs of many a cycle, political and economic. But the time comes, it seems to me, when we have to forget our political differences in order to preserve the community which we love so much.

Several years ago I recall proposing that the leaders in State government, labor, and industry should get together and study New England's problems and seek to reach a mutually agreeable solution to those problems. It has always been my belief that such groups could come to a meeting of the minds and arrive at decisions which would be beneficial to New England industry, yet would be in harmony with the aims of all who genuinely seek the general welfare of all the people of America.

I still urge that these leaders exercise all their talents and ingenuity to come up with recommendations for concrete action which will benefit our section of the country. It is also my feeling that such decisions fairly arrived at can best bind the members of the Federal legislature who represent New England constituencies into an impregnable unit, regardless of party politics.

I can support the concept of a healthy, two-way trade among nations. But in this Randall report, which has disturbed me, there is the dangerous concept that Uncle Sam must make all the sacrifices. It proposes that we embark on a new program of tariff reductions in the hope that the rest of the world will go along with us. Let us remember that we launched such a program 20 years ago. In that time, the United States has reduced its general tariff level by more than 75 percent, and 60 percent of our imports are completely free of duty. But other nations have raised their tariff walls, applied embargoes and quotas, and further discriminated against the United States through currency manipulations, shipping preferences, subsidies, and other forms of favoritism to their own products.

In 1945—on May 26 to be exact—I suggested to this House that the authority to reduce tariffs to the extent proposed in the extension legislation then under discussion was too much to place in the hands of my President. The Randall report proposes the same tariff reduction authority to which I objected then, and to which I still object. The proposal that the President be authorized, with or without receiving reciprocal concessions, to reduce tariffs by not more than 50 percent of the rates that prevailed on January 1, 1945, is one proposal with which I cannot go along. Whether or not any particular rate should be reduced, or perhaps increased, must be determined upon particular study of the particular situation in the industry involved and the impact of such a reduction or increase on that industry and the community immediately dependent upon that industry.

In 1945 I defended, here in this House, the principle of reciprocal trade—but I expressed the fear then that there would be little or no reciprocity resulting from our execution of these trade agreements. I said then:

> In the further reduction of tariffs I am convinced there is grave danger to the men and women who toil in the textile mills of Rhode Island. You say, "They will not suffer." I am afraid to run the risk. There are too many signs of danger.

That I said in May of 1945. I voted against the passage of the reciprocal-trade agreements extension bill at that time. Nothing has happened since that date to cause me to change my attitude.

Tariff reductions as a solution to world trade problems have been given a fair trial. Standing alone they do not work. The United States has made concessions that other nations have not returned.

New England industry can no longer afford to be the goat. If sacrifices must be made in the name of world stability then all must bear a portion of the burden.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 3300. This bill authorizes an increase in diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, in the amount of 1,000 cubic feet per second, in addition to the present amount of 1,500 cubic feet per second annual average now authorized by permit of the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Army to make a study of the effect in the improvement in the conditions of the Illinois Waterway by reason of this increase in the diversion and to report the study results to Congress before January 31, 1957, with the Army's recommendation as to the continuation, increase, or decrease as to the proper diversion amount. The Army made a report to Congress in 1933, when a diversion of 5,000 cubic feet per second, plus domestic pumpage, was authorized, and stated that while in their judgment, aside from sanitary requirements, a minimum average diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage as ultimately authorized by the Supreme Court decree would meet the needs of a commercially useful Illinois Waterway, a further study should be made when the sewage purification plants had been completed and placed in operation by the sanitary district of Chicago.

That time has now arrived and no studies as to the Illinois Waterway on this phase have been made since 1933.

At the hearings before the House Public Works Committee of the 82d Congress in June 1952, the Army engineers recommended an increase in diversion and authorization for the further study, recommended in 1933. They stated 3 years would be required for such study. The Committee on Public Works in the 82d Congress favorably recommended similar bills following the Army engineers' recommendations.

Similarly at the hearings before the House Public Works Committee of the 83d Congress, 1st session, the Army repeated their recommendation for an increase in diversion and authorization for the study. The House committee at the first session likewise again favorably recommended passage of this bill.

This bill authorizes such a study, their report to be submitted to Congress on January 31, 1957.

I firmly believe that this legislation is in the best interests not only of the Cook County area but of the entire Midwest.

The Illinois Waterway is steadily increasing in importance. It connects the two most important waterway systems in the Nation, namely the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River. An additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Michigan, in addition to the presently authorized 1,500 cubic feet per second, would provide a clean stream and improve navigation. It would result in a marked improvement in the Chicago sewage system, and would lead to a drop in the level of Lake Michigan.

I know that some of my colleagues are concerned with the effect that this legislation may have on the Great Lakes water levels. I want to reassure them that we are also concerned with those water levels, but this legislation will have no material lowering effect on these lakes, a mere three-fourths of an inch on Lakes Michigan and Huron and only about one-half of an inch on Lakes Erie and Ontario and, as the report shows, these effects would not be realized until several years after the increased diversion commenced. The bill provides for the increased diversion only for a period of 3 years, after which the Corps of Engineers will file its complete study report, on which the right to further diversion will depend.

The Great Lakes today are in the period of high levels, causing much damage to adjacent property owners. This condition will continue for several years, so this legislation can have only a salutary effect on the property owners.

As for the shipping interests, I doubt whether anyone can seriously contend that three-fourths of an inch lowering can materially affect the shipping to the extent as to outweigh the needs, necessities, and benefits to the residents of Cook County.

There has been some talk of opposition from down-State Illinois, because of the fears of pollution from the filth and slime of the cities downstream. This objection has been adequately met by the assurances that in times of high water in the rivers, the increased diversion would not be used. Instead of polluting downstream waters, the heavier flow will provide the means to freshen the waterway. The improved sewage treatment methods used by the sanitary district will help the purification of the water.

Frankly, I see no basic reason why anyone should oppose the adoption of this bill. I sincerely hope and trust that it will carry the House by a substantial majority.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I find myself in disagreement with my friends in this House from Chicago on both sides of the aisle. This legislation has been before this Congress for thirty years. The people along the Illinois river in the counties I represent have opposed it exactly that long.

Mr. Chairman, this bill in the enacting clause says, "To authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan and promote commerce." Better language for the resolution would be to call it a memorial to "Chick" Sale.

I think, furthermore, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the matter of promoting commerce, when I hear people talking about a depression in this country today, anyone who thinks that we are in a depression should not support this legislation because there is no use of promoting any more waterway commerce. If they are right we have enough now.

I think further, after looking at page 5 of the report and referring to the last paragraph, it would be well to quote from Thruston B. Morton's letter to the committee, where he states:

> In the circumstances, it is considered that these bills should not be enacted and that action in regard to this matter should await the receipt of the report and recommendations of the International Joint Commission—United States and Canada on this subject pursuant to the reference of June 25, 1952.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Assistant Secretary of State, speaking for the Secretary of State, opposes this legislation.

On page 6 of the report, Mr. Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army, states in the last paragraph of his communication to the committee:

> The Bureau of the Budget advises that while there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed report to the committee, they have advised the Department of State that there was no objection to the submission of the State Department's adverse report, and that the Bureau of the Budget concurred in that Department's recommendation that the bills not be enacted.

That would mean to me, Mr. Chairman, that if this bill passes the House and the Senate and goes to the President for his signature, he will call on these two departments for advice as to whether to sign or to send up a veto. I would further assume that these 2 departments would recommend a veto. That is what this House is facing today.

On page 2 of the report it states:

> That report was submitted to the Congress on December 7, 1933. Commerce on the Illinois Waterway, which amounted only to about 200,000 tons in 1933, has increased to over 16 million tons in 1950. The diversion since 1938 has remained at 1,500 cubic feet per second.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the tonnage on this river and waterway has increased from 200,000 tons in 1933 to over 16 million tons in 1950. That is a very good increase in commerce on any river or on any railroad. Furthermore, the newspapers in the last week have contained accounts of railroad employees being laid off. Why should we continue to subsidize a waterway and continue to lay off railroad employees? I can see no reason for it.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the following telegrams I have received in opposition to this bill:

> BEARDSTOWN, ILL., *January 29, 1954.*
> Hon. SID SIMPSON,
> *House Office Building:*
> We urge you strongly oppose Lake Michigan diversion bill.
> BEARDSTOWN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
> By D. R. WELBOURNE.

> MARSEILLES, ILL., *January 29, 1954.*
> Hon. SID SIMPSON,
> *House Office Building:*
> Is longest open sewer in world to revive again? Better to leave it buried.
> IKE HAUGHMAN.

> BEARDSTOWN, ILL., *January 29, 1954.*
> Representative SID SIMPSON,
> *House Office Building:*
> Urge you to vote against Chicago water diversion bill.
> GLENN TILLITT, *Mayor.*

HAVANA, ILL., *January 29, 1954.*

Hon. SID SIMPSON,
House of Representatives:

Please renew your opposition to diversion bills slated for floor debate today. If amendment limiting diversion to 3,500 cubic feet per second maximum is offered, please give the amendment your support.

ILLINOIS FISHERIES COUNCIL,
HOWARD S. WHITE, *Attorney.*

BEARDSTOWN, ILL., *January 29, 1954.*

Representative SID SIMPSON,
House Office Building:

Please oppose Chicago water diversion bill today on behalf of Beardstown.

ILLINOIAN STAR.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those happy occasions when the Democratic and the Republican Members of Congress from the Chicago area are united as a team behind a measure calculated to contribute to the progress and general welfare of the American people.

Whatever is good for Chicago is good for the United States. I am not attempting to paraphrase. I am seeking only to present a factual picture. Chicago is the great inland city of the country. It contributes equally to the prosperity and well-being of the seacoasts of Atlantic and Pacific and of great intervening areas of agriculture, of mining and of grazing.

Chicago is one of the greatest in volume of the payers of taxes into the Federal Treasury. The sums of money that we pay out in our income and other taxes make possible in part the liberal grants for the development of waterpower in the Far West and of flood control and comparable aids beneficial to the South and other areas. Much of the financial contribution to price supports for agricultural products is traceable to the taxpayers of Chicago.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to make crystal clear is that the great city of Chicago, second in population of all the cities of the United States and among the very largest of the payers of Federal taxes, has practiced in its approach to national problems a self-abnegation that is without parallel. At every turn we have given to the national welfare everything that we had to give, and often at the sacrifice of our own interest.

Now we are asking something in return. The something we are asking will bring in fact equal benefit to other regions.

There is no valid argument against the proposal before us. Both Republican and Democratic delegations from our area are solidly behind this measure. It is proper, too, to mention that an increased authorization for water adequate to serve the needs of the Illinois Waterway was the end sought in bills introduced in many Congresses by our late beloved dean, the Honorable A. J. Sabath.

I have before me a telegram from the Honorable Russell W. Root, attorney for the Sanitary District of Chicago. He says in this telegram that he sincerely hopes that the House vote today on Mr. JONAS' bill will be favorable. Russell Root is a great American. He is the Republican committeeman of the ward in which I am a resident. He was the nominee of the Republican Party for mayor of Chicago. He is my beloved friend, but he never voted for me because he is that kind of Republican. Indeed, the highest compliment I can pay him is that he is as good a Republican as TOM O'BRIEN is a Democrat.

Ralph Church, too, was my long time personal friend. It was a fine friendship that ran back into our youthful days in the General Assembly of Illinois. Ralph served many years in this Chamber, a beloved personal friend of mine although in politics we never agreed. His widow and his successor, a brilliant woman, spoke in eloquent advocacy of this bill. You see, Mr. Chairman, on this issue the Republicans and the Democrats of the Chicago area are united.

I want to digress here, Mr. Chairman, to include LEO ALLEN, chairman of the all important Rules Committee. I will never forget his talk of yesterday. When LEO ALLEN from downstate Illinois spoke with broadened vision for all of Illinois, yes, for all America, I felt that statesmanship had transcended the bounds of provincialism.

I confess to a feeling of affection and warmth for the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and my friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. I did appear before the Rules Committee in the matter of the Lake Michigan water diversion measure and I did make mention of my affection and concern for NOAH MASON. For 30 and more years NOAH MASON has been longing for the good old barefoot days when the fish were big and the bites were plenty.

For all these years my beloved friend from Illinois has had a grudge against the city of Chicago because he holds Chicago responsible for the tragedy of a lost boyhood and a barren fishing ground. Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is not a matter of much moment compared with the great material benefits that will come from the enactment of this legislation but it did bring a glow of satisfaction to me that one of the results of the passage of this bill, which NOAH MASON had always opposed, would be to bring back to him, livelier and bitier and sportier than ever, the dear old fishing ground of his youth.

NOAH MASON and I have a common background of memories, our boyhood in the same Huckleberry Finn era of glamour, our first legislative experiences in the senate chamber in Springfield, Ill. Since NOAH MASON and I were boys there have been great changes. I do not know that they have brought greater happiness to men and women. I do not know that at the days of the kerosene lamp, the outhouse, the barefoot boy with fishing pole over his shoulder, were not more filled with the simple joys than the present period. But it is not our job as legislators to meet the needs of the present in terms of our nostalgia for the past.

Chicago now has the largest and most efficient sewage disposal plant in the world. This plant services, besides Chicago, 74 suburbs. It disposes of 1,100 million gallons of waste every day. From this waste 92.5 percent solid matter is removed and converted into fertilizer. The 7.5 effluent, which remains, is a clear liquid requiring the addition of oxygen to render it wholesome for fish life, and also to dilute the nitrogen content. This latter, because it promotes plant growth, has the effect of hindering navigation. Hence it is that we in the city of Chicago who are seeking from this Congress authority to increase to 2,500 cubic feet per second the water diversion from Lake Michigan to the Illinois Waterway really would restore to reality Mr. MASON's boyhood dreams of mammoth sturgeon in the fishing grounds of his youth.

Among the opponents of this legislation are the Great Lakes shipping interests who claim that a withdrawal of 2,500 cubic feet per second will lower lake levels to the detriment of Great Lakes shipping. Scientific studies made by a body of engineers appointed for the purpose have indicated that the rise and fall of lake levels, which follow a natural cycle, are 6 feet, whereas the 2,500 cubic feet contemplated diversion would lower lake levels eight-tenths of 1 percent, a negligible amount. When the suit of the Great Lakes States was instituted in the early 1920's, lake levels were going down, following the natural cycle, which covers a period of approximately 23 years. Since then the high-water level has been reached, resulting in floods which have damaged commercial properties, homes, and beaches in the Great Lakes area. Many of the property owners who were antidiversionists in the early twenties are now urging, not that we divert the 2,500 cubic feet per second contemplated in this legislation, but that we return to the 10,000 cubic feet per second which was cut to 1,500 cubic feet per second by order of the Supreme Court.

Antidiversionists maintain that Congress is without authority to grant increased diversion since the Supreme Court has spoken and limited the diversion to 1,500 cubic feet per second. This is far from the fact, since Mr. Justice Hughes, acting as a special master in chancery in the diversion case, stated:

> Provision should be made for further study when the sewage treatment plant (at Chicago) is completed.

And Mr. Justice Holmes, who wrote the opinion in *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* ((1930) 281 U. S. 179, 197–199), declared:

> These requirements as between the parties are the constitutional right of those States, subject to whatever modification they hereafter may be subjected to by the Congress acting within its authority. It will be time enough to consider the scope of that authority when it is exercised. * * *
>
> * * * All action of the parties and the Court in this case will be subject, of course, to any order that Congress may make in pursuance of its constitutional powers, and any modification that necessity may show should be made by this Court.

Clearly the Supreme Court was rendering its decision in a specific case and not precluding the Congress from further action based upon subsequent developments. Among these subsequent developments have been (a) the building of sewage disposal plant at Chicago; (b) the rise in the lake level as part of a natural cycle of rise and fall.

The development of an Illinois Waterway from the earliest history of the State has been regarded as a matter of joint concern by the Congress and the State. In March 1827, Congress granted the State of Illinois 284,000 acres of public land for the purpose of aiding the State in opening a canal to unite the waters of the Illinois River with Lake Michigan. Since then the development of a waterway connecting the Illinois River with Lake Michigan has received both State and Federal aid, the State building locks, canals, and dams, Congress appropriating funds for dredging and navigation projects.

In 1908 the voters of Illinois approved a constitutional amendment to authorize the expenditure of $20 million for a waterway to connect the Chicago drainage canal at Lockport with the navigable Illinois River at Utica. The Illinois Legislature, June 1919, pursuant to the referendum vote of 1908, passed the Illinois Waterways Act and authorized the sale of $20 million of bonds to finance the construction of this 9-foot lock-and-dam project, from Lockport to Utica. Construction thereafter proceeded until 1930 when all the State funds were exhausted, and work estimated at $7,500,000 remained unfinished.

Congress in the River and Harbor Act of July 3, 1930, extended the Federal navigation project in the Illinois River up through the Illinois Waterway and on through the main channel and the Calumet-Sag Channel of the Sanitary District of Chicago to connect with the Federal navigation projects in the Chicago and Calumet Rivers and appropriated $7,500,000 to complete the Illinois Waterway.

The Illinois Waterway was completed at Government expense by March 1, 1933, and officially opened June 22, 1933. The report on the water needed for the waterway was made September to December 1933—House Document 184, 73d Congress, 2d session. The report of the United States district engineer, September 26, 1933, and by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, November 13, 1933. It was approved in general by the Chief of Engineers, December 6, 1933, and transmitted to Congress by the Secretary of War, December 7, 1933.

The general conclusion of this report was that the diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second annual average from the Lake Michigan watershed, in addition to domestic pumpage, was sufficient to meet the direct—flotation—needs of the waterway, but that indirect needs in the matter of securing satisfactory sanitary conditions for those aboard vessels or employed at terminals could not be determined until after the waterway had been fully completed, the sewage-treatment plans of the sanitary district placed in full service, and the diversion limited to 1,500 cubic feet per second for a sufficient period of time—suggested at not more than 2 years—to observe conditions as they might then exist.

A further conclusion in this report by Col. Dan I. Sultan, 1933, was to the effect that the water authorized by the 1930 act for the Illinois Waterway would result in low-water flow of 2,400 cubic feet per second in the Illinois River. This amount was inadequate to provide 9-foot navigation in the lower Illinois River, then improved in accordance with the 1927 project, which required about 5,000 cubic feet per second diversion. Therefore, the complete canalization of the Illinois River was recommended, involving the removal of the Kampsville lock and dam, the rebuilding of the La Grange lock and dam, the construction of a new lock and dam in the Illinois River near Peoria, and a new lock and dam in the Mississippi River at Alton. This recommendation was adopted by Congress August 30, 1935, and the existing improvement of the Illinois River has been constructed in accordance with that recommendation.

Since the completion of the waterway in terms of recommendation adopted by Congress in 1935, traffic on this waterway has grown from 2,171,374 tons in 1936 to 17,617,941 tons in 1951, the latest figures made available in the report of Chief of Engineers, United States Army, 1952. The 1951 traffic includes 79,844 tons of imports and exports to Canada, 50,464 tons of coastwise—via New York State Barge Canal, Oswego—receipts, 365,485 tons of lakewise shipments, 4,857,818 tons of goods exchanged within the limits of the waterway, 6,172,174 tons from the Mississippi to ports on the Illinois Waterway, and 1,310,481 tons downbound—outbound—in other words, destined for ports on the Mississippi.

Picking at random some of the items carried, we have paper pulp, newsprint, coal, fuel oil, gasoline, kerosene, grains, soybeans, coaltar products, chemicals, fertilizer, animals and animal products, textiles, metals, building materials, heavy machinery, electrical equipment, spices, coffee, and sugar. Clearly the Illinois Waterway is a system of arteries carrying the lifeblood of commerce to and from the State of Illinois.

The legislation which we are considering should be enacted into law because it is designed to promote the physical as well as the economic health of the State of Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. VELDE. The gentleman mentioned the fact that Congressmen representing the 16th District, or what is now the 18th District, have opposed this bill since its inception. We were very fortunate to have such fine men as our junior Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. Hull, oppose this type of bill in the past. Now I want to ask you to get on the real issue of this bill instead of talking about NOAH MASON'S boyhood fishing days. I am a fisherman, too. I saw what happened to the fishing industry in central Illinois. I would like to have the gentleman get onto the issues presented by this bill. I have great respect for my good friend from Chicago.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. That is a very forthright question.

Mr. VELDE. I want to know from the gentleman whether or not this is a lake diversion bill or a bill to regulate the level of the Illinois River. The gentleman described it as being both.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Yes. This bill will have very many wide-sweeping benefits, not the least of which is its contribution to the Illinois Waterway, on which we now have over 17 million tons of freight moving. We are looking ahead to a great development there. The bill will affect the health of the people of Chicago. It will affect the health of the people in the gentleman's region. It will contribute to commerce. We think it will at least provide the medium for a study as to the increasing damage being done by lake waters that are too high.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the passage of H. R. 3300, to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water to the present 1,500 cubic feet per second into the Illinois Waterway.

This proposed legislation has been reported favorably by the Public Works Committee and provides to regulate and promote commerce among the several States and foreign nations, and to protect, improve, and promote navigation and navigable waters in the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi Valley, and keep control of the lake level, and to afford protection to property and shores along the Great Lakes, and to provide for a navigable Illinois Waterway.

The passage of this bill is most needed and does not call for any appropriation. It deals with navigation, with health, with lake storm damages, and with the control of lake level affecting the surrounding territories. The passage of this bill has great significance, not only to Chicago but great significance all over the Mississippi Valley, allowing a slight diversion from Lake Michigan, which waters flow eventually to the lowlands of the Mississippi Valley.

The Mississippi River was at its lowest point in its recorded history, and if it were not for the flow of waters from the flood-control reservoirs of the Missouri and Ohio Rivers the heavy water traffic of the Mississippi River would be at a standstill.

Mr. Chairman, it is, therefore, my hope that H. R. 3300 will be approved in order to give relief to property owners and shores along the Great Lakes area.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY].

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the good steamrollering I got earlier in the afternoon, I ought to be subdued and remain in my seat, but I think I have a little information that has not been discussed that might be of interest to the few of you that are present here this afternoon.

I have heard all of these arguments, every one of them, and a good many more, because I was in the fortunate position when the litigation involving this matter was started of being an assistant attorney general for the State of Michigan. In that capacity it became necessary for me, along with many others on

the staff, to go through voluminous records to take care of organizing the case for presentation for the several States that were opposing this thing. I took part in the preparation of briefs, evidence, and other things.

I want to make one important and I think essential point. Every argument, every fact, everything that has been said in favor of this bill was presented over and over again in the court proceedings that culminated in the court decision you are now being asked to overturn. I do not propose to discuss in detail all of that, but I do want to leave with you the fact that this Congress is now being asked to reverse the Supreme Court decision that has stood for, lo, these many years.

The information given the Congress is only a fractional part of that which was presented and considered by the Court. We knew at that time that the thing which has come to pass would probably come to pass; that the levels would go up and that again they would come down. We knew everything that you have heard discussed. It was presented fairly and squarely and at length to the Court. The result was adverse to the city of Chicago—that wanted a great deal more than she got in this particular decision you are now asked to overturn. As things stand, we therefore today are being asked to reverse, in effect, the Supreme Court decision without a single new additional fact being adduced to justify it. There is nothing except, perhaps, a stimulated and increased desire on the part of the city of Chicago, at the expense of downstate Illinois, to destroy a case and a legal precedent which was established regarding the rights of the States in the Great Lakes. Representing the State of Michigan, as the department of which I was a member did, I think I am fairly familiar with the complex legal situation with which we are now confronted. I think it would be deplorable if with the scanty facts before us we should choose to do that which we are asked to do.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield.

Mr. SHEEHAN. If the gentleman will read the record of the Supreme Court, I think he will find it predicated its decision upon the fact, and they so stated in their decision, that when the city of Chicago completed its construction of the sanitary facilities, they should come back to the Congress. That is what we are doing, and we are not trying to overturn the Supreme Court.

Mr. CLARDY. I must respectfully differ with the gentleman. I not only read the decision, but I took part in preparing the documents which led the Court to reach its decision. I am convinced that the interpretation placed upon the language of the Court is incorrect. But I do not want to spend time on petty details. I merely want to make the inescapable point, as I see it, that there has been nothing new presented to the Congress. Everything was considered by the Court and it would seem to me bad judgment on the part of the Congress to do this merely because Chicago wants more water. She delayed and she procrastinated. She refused to obey a court decision. They appealed and reappealed, and we fought and we refought the battle and protestingly she has gone forward with a sewage disposal plant. Now, it seems to me it is about time when she is almost through with the thing she should have done years ago that we wait for the report that is to come out and then have exhaustive hearings to bring all of the facts out, which were brought out in the Court's decision.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is making an excellent statement, and I agree with him 100 percent. I commend him on his statement. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. CLARDY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 7]

Andresen, August H.	Elliott	Morgan
Barrett	Engle	Moulder
Battle	Fino	Norrell
Bramblett	Fisher	Philbin
Canfield	Graham	Phillips
Celler	Gwinn	Powell
Chelf	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Chudoff	Holt	Regan
Coudert	Jarman	Stringfellow
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Mo.	Teague
Dingell	Lantaff	Welchel
Dorn, N. Y.	Lyle	Yorty
Dorn, S. C.	Miller, Calif.	
	Mollohan	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McDONOUGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3300, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 389 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the point of no quorum was made, the time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY] had expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Referring to the point raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] I am of the opinion that the decision to which he refers was merely dicta in the case, and also an observation made by the referee.

Mr. CLARDY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman mentions a pending survey. As a matter of fact, there are now two surveys pending, one by the Corps of Engineers and the other by the International Joint Commission, both of them bearing directly on this problem.

Mr. CLARDY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say. I trust that you will bear in mind the one point that I was trying to make, and that is that in the litigation in which I played a small but important part all of the arguments and all of the facts and much more was considered than is now before you. There has been no change in the situation since then.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield.

Mr. VELDE. I compliment the gentleman on the very fine statement that he has made.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why the pending bill should be overwhelming defeated, but there are four reasons of such transcendent importance as to make the defeat of the present bill imperative.

First, even more important than the harm that the legislation would do to shipping on the Great Lakes, by the serious loss of cargo, the injury to ships, and the minimizing of our means of national defense, is the fact that the Great Lakes have always been considered as the common property of Canada and the United States. Under every principle of justice and morality these two countries have proprietary rights in common, to the waters of the Great Lakes.

Recognizing this principle of common ownership, the boundary waters treaty of 1909, between the United States and Canada, providing for the control of Great Lakes levels as a joint problem of the two countries, certainly indicated a very high standard of international morality. The two countries, in the treaty to which I have referred, did, it seems to me, follow the course that was best calculated, not only to continue the friendly relations of the two countries, but to increase the confidence of each country in the other country's desire to act according to the highest standards of justice. Under that treaty the United States is obligated to cooperate with Canada to control the waters of the Great Lakes in a way calculated to promote commerce and navigation to the best advantage. That obligation is not fulfilled by a unilateral diversion which disregards the rights of Canada as well as the bordering States.

Second. As to the effect H. R. 3300 would have on commerce let me say that the most accurate calculation by the experts of the Lake Carriers' Asso-

ciation shows that a reduction of ¾ of an inch in the level of the Great Lakes, would lessen the carrying capacity of 95 percent of the Great Lakes vessels owned by the Lake Carriers' Association, operating under the United States flag, to the extent of more than one and one-half million tons of cargo annually.

Third. In recent years we have all been greatly concerned about adequate national defense. You will therefore, I am sure, be surprised to have me tell you that 85 percent of the iron ore used in the manufacture of steel in the United States is transported over the Great Lakes. During the last few years, anyone standing on the shore at Port Huron would feel that they were witnessing a practically constant procession of ships, laden with very valuable cargo of tremendous importance in many ways to the defense effort of our country.

Fourth. In addition to the serious loss of cargo-carrying accommodations, amounting to more than one and one-half million tons of cargo per year, the effect of the proposed diversion, would greatly increase the hazards of navigation. Rocks and shoals would come closer to the surface, channels and turning basins would be made shallower and narrower and movement in and out of harbors would be made more difficult. Congress would soon be deluged with requests for funds to deepen channels and harbors now maintained by the Corps of Engineers.

In addition to the reasons which I have already mentioned, it seems to me the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] stressed a point, which in itself should be sufficient to cause the overwhelming defeat of the pending measure.

I remember many years ago; yes, more than 20 years ago, when a bill for the diversion of water from Lake Michigan by the Chicago Sanitary Commission was before the House for several years. The Illinois people downstream from Chicago protested very vigorously against the sending down upon them through the river every kind of filth from the stockyards, and from the city of Chicago, filth both of human and bestial nature. The nauseating filth was allowed to accumulate on the banks of the river creating an almost unbearable stench. Other cities of the Great Lakes at that time urged that Chicago be required to provide a modern sewage disposal plant to dispose of the filth of Chicago without offending the sensibilities of anyone. Other cities, much smaller, had provided such sewage disposal plants where most of the filth was incinerated and otherwise destroyed to the great comfort of the people.

I remember well, that the Members of the House representing other cities than Chicago, vigorously opposed the diversion of the waters, and that to Theodore Burton, an oldtime Member of 30 years' service, it became almost a constant obsession.

I earnestly request Members to reject the pending measure by an overwhelming majority.

LAKE CARRIERS' ASSOCIATION,
Cleveland, Ohio, January 29, 1954.

H. R. 3300: IT SHOULD NOT PASS

To Members of Congress From Great Lakes States:

1. Diversion from Lake Michigan by Chicago Sanitary District fixed by Supreme Court decree: After exhaustive consideration of the evidence and of the rights of the people of the Great Lakes region, the Supreme Court of the United States fixed at 1,500 cubic feet per second the amount of water which the Chicago Sanitary District may abstract from Lake Michigan.

2. Waters of Great Lakes owned by all States (not only Illinois) and Province of Ontario: The waters of the Great Lakes belong to all the people of the Great Lakes area; not only to Illinois. The United States has no proprietary interest in those waters and Congress has no legal right to divert those waters from the people of that area for the use of the people of another area.

3. Present stage of Great Lakes levels downward: Although lake levels have been high for several years, the peak was reached in 1952. A downward cycle is underway. In 1953 the general levels were about 7 inches lower than in 1952. All indications are that 1954 will see a drop of an additional 6 inches.

4. Effect of increased diversion contemplated by H. R. 3300: The Supreme Court held that any diversion at Chicago has the same lowering effect upon all the Great Lakes. Diversion of another 1,000 cubic feet per second would lower each of the lakes a three-fourths inch. This lowering applies to the water levels at their low points as well as their high points. The result of diversion cannot be turned off and on like a water faucet. Several years are required for the ultimate effect to be reached, whether it be a lowering of the lake levels after diversion is started or a raising of the levels after diversion is stopped. If the diversion proposed by H. R. 3300 were started today, its full effect would not be reached until 1957, a year after the Corps of Engineers would be required to report to the Congress on the effect of the proposed additional diversion.

5. Effect of added diversion upon Great Lakes commerce: If all the vessels owned by members of Lake Carriers' Association (constituting about 95 percent of Great Lakes tonnage under United States flag) had their safe draft reduced by three-fourths inch, the annual loss in carrying capacity would be more than 1½ million tons of cargo.

6. Relation of Great Lakes commerce to national defense: The cargoes carried over the Great Lakes are always important to the national economy and are of utmost importance in times of war. For example, about 85 percent of the iron ore used in the manufacture of steel in the United States is transported over the Great Lakes.

7. Relation of lower water to safety of navigation: A lowering of the waters in the Great Lakes by further diversion would increase the hazards of navigation as well as reduce the carrying capacity of the vessels. Rocks and shoals would come closer to the surface, channels and turning basins would be made shallower and narrower and movement in and out of harbors would be made more difficult. Congress would soon be deluged with requests for funds to deepen channels and harbors presently maintained by the Corps of Engineers.

8. Control of Great Lakes levels joint problem of United States and Canada under Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909: Under that treaty, Congress has the obligation to cooperate with Canada in the preservation of the waters of the Great Lakes for purposes of commerce and navigation. That obligation is not fulfilled by unilateral diversion which disregards the rights of Canada as well as the bordering States. House Concurrent Resolution 12 and House Concurrent Resolution 82 propose that the matter of the causes of the fluctuation in water levels of the Great Lakes be studied by the International Joint Commission and that the Commission recommend appropriate remedies to the two countries. Those resolutions should pass, not House bill 3300.

Respectfully submitted.

LYNDON SPENCER,
President.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to say that I certainly recognize the position of my good friends from Chicago with reference to this legislation. I have a very great respect and a very high regard for the author of the bill, Judge JONAS, of Illinois. Notwithstanding, I am sure that they recognize that so far as Wisconsin is concerned, the Representatives from that State have always been opposed to the diversion of water through the drainage canal.

I would also like to say that there must be some way to solve this irritable problem of lake water diversion at Chicago. Perhaps it can be handled by compact between the States that are concerned, so there could be an end to constant litigation. It is an expensive undertaking for all parties concerned.

Chicago, in my opinion, is destined in the not distant future to be the largest city in the United States. It has a potential population of 10 million or more. There are no formidable barriers to future expansion to the west. As a matter of fact, expansion is possible, to the north, south, and west and its position in the middle of the country augurs well for its future. Hence the necessity for resolving this most difficult problem by some mutual agreement between all parties concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I spent all of last evening reading the hearings. It seems to me that the proponents of the proposed legislation have failed to meet a valid objection, and a legal one, which has been made by those who are opposed to this bill. Jurisdiction of the subject matter of the present bill is still in the Supreme Court of the United States. Why does not the Sanitary District of Chicago seek relief there?

Before proceeding further with my statement, I call attention to a statement that was made yesterday that this bill would not cost any money. According to the testimony of Colonel Milne, it is going to cost just $200,000—and I am quoting from his testimony on page 2 of the hearings. He says:

> The estimated cost to the United States of this study is $200,000, of which $150,000 would be required by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and $50,000 would be required by the Corps of Engineers.

While we know that $200,000 is a small sum of money in some quarters, it is a lot of money in my book. We cannot

afford to forget about it in considering this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think I pointed out yesterday during the discussion of the rule on this bill that the cost of this would be a very material sum, especially what this will lead to indirectly in the way of expenditures, because if these waters are diverted it will mean a great number of requests for improving and deepening the channels in the Great Lakes which will be necessary; and it will also involve expenditures and also mean need for greater protection against the water which will be flowing down as a result of the increased diversion. It is not $200,000 by which we should measure the cost; it should be in terms of millions.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

On the question of the right to divert further water at this time, it seems to me that we have an answer in two places in the testimony, on page 14.

Mr. Stanley, Chairman of the International Joint Commission, was present. He makes this statement with reference to the further diversion of water, and I am quoting him:

> I said that personally I do not object to withdrawal of 2,500 feet but I did not mean by that Congress could authorize withdrawal of it. You cannot withdraw 1 foot of water from these Great Lakes and their connecting streams without the approval of the International Joint Commission under the terms of the treaty. But if the matter comes before us, as it is in a way under the present reference, why, I am inclined to welcome a larger withdrawal.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Does the gentleman know how many feet were authorized for withdrawal in 1909 when this treaty went into effect?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; I am not familiar with that.

Mr. SHEEHAN. It was 10,000 cubic feet per second. Today we are withdrawing only 1,500 feet, so we have 8,500 feet to play on.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is not the question before us. This is a matter for the Supreme Court.

Mr. SHEEHAN. We are entitled to stand on the international agreement.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The matter is still in the courts, and what relief is to be had must be secured in the courts.

Mr. Chairman, on page 117 of the hearings, Mr. Stanley again repeated his previous statement and I quote him:

> The question of serious effect is a question for the Commission to decide. But the Commission itself will not take cognizance of a violation that is not material. The treaty does not deal with that. The law is mandatory and article 3 of the treaty provides that no raising or lowering or diversion of any kind or use of any kind of this international waterway shall be tolerated without the prior approval of the International Joint Commission.

Hence it would seem to follow that the bill before us is not properly here at this time. I repeat again that relief is possible only upon order of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I suppose I have more shoreline in my district than any other individual Member of Congress coming from the Great Lakes region. I happen to have about 225 miles of shoreline along Lake Michigan, including Green Bay. This bill is, therefore, of considerable concern to the people of my district.

I am not going to direct my remarks to the matter of the study; I think it is sufficient to say that we have already as a Congress authorized a comprehensive study of the lake-level problems and all of the other implications that go along with that problem, so another investigation as called for is simply adding another directive to the Corps of Engineers. It is not at all necessary.

It is my purpose to direct my remarks to the diversionary aspects of this bill, the authority that will be given to divert further waters from Lake Michigan and other Great Lakes down through the canal and thence into the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers.

It seems to me when we want to determine the merits of a bill we should look at the purposes of the bill. If the purposes stand up, fine, the bill should probably stand up; if the purposes fall, it would seem to me that the bill should fall also.

Let us first take the stated reasons and the reasons as announced by the various Members from the city of Chicago, who are the proponents of this legislation. If you will just take a copy of the bill, H. R. 3300, you will find a number of the objectives stated; first, "That in order to regulate and promote commerce among the several States and foreign nations."

That is the first purpose. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] certainly showed how this bill does not promote any commerce between the States by reducing the amount of tonnage that can be carried on the Great Lakes. So that purpose must fall immediately. They have produce no evidence of any promotion of commerce as between the States. All of the evidence is to the contrary.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CROSSER. Also, it interferes with navigation, as the experts of the Lake Carriers Association showed.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Absolutely. No. 2: "and to protect, improve, and promote navigation and navigable waters in the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi Valley."

Have we heard any evidence of how it is going to promote navigation? Absolutely not.

When I heard these arguments advanced I made a check of the traffic moving on the Illinois River and up and down the Mississippi River. I think it will be interesting to the Members of the House to realize that in the last year for which we have figures, 1950, the tonnage upbound, that is going up the river, were 13.7 billion ton miles of cargo; downbound 5.6 billion ton miles of cargo.

What are you going to do here? Increase the diversion, thereby increase the current going downstream so that your upbound traffic which is almost three times greater than the downbound traffic faces a heavier current. Is that aiding navigation, which is another objective in this bill? Of course, it is not and it cannot.

No. 3: "and help control of the lake level, and to afford protection to property and shores along the Great Lakes."

I have 225 miles of shoreline in my district. How much shoreline do these members from the city of Chicago have that they are so interested in protecting? Certainly very little. All of the facts and all of the evidence is that the water level now is going down. We had a problem a year ago. The lake was at a very high level, but no authority has said that this diversion will help that kind of a situation at all.

Let me ask you to do this. Do not take my word, do not take the word of the people of Chicago as to what is going to be accomplished. Wait until we have the Engineers' survey that this Congress has asked the Corps of Engineers to make. We have been advised by the author of that resolution, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], who has been following this matter closely, that their study is approaching completion and that they will be able to report in the next year or so. Let us wait until we have their report available, then we will be legislating on sound ground. Can we be expected, with the divergence of views that exists here, to legislate intelligently? How silly it is to appropriate money for a study by the Corps of Engineers, and then legislate without even waiting for their report. Let us wait for the report, study it, and then legislate at the proper time on this very controversial issue.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCVEY].

Mr. MCVEY. Mr. Chairman, first, I should like to add a word in behalf of H. R. 3300. The amount of opposition that has arisen against this measure has been somewhat surprising to me. The discussion up to this point certainly indicates very clearly that this is not a partisan measure.

Second. The statement which has been made that all of the Congressmen from Chicago are for this legislation does not mean that all 3 or 4 of us are for it. It means that all 13 of us are supporting it, because there are 13 Congressmen from Chicago and Cook County in which it is located. This is one more than half of the Congressmen from Illinois. There are 7 Democrats and 6 Republicans from Chicago and Cook County, and we are all for it.

Third. I have in my portfolio a letter from a businessman who details an expenditure of $12,669 to repair the damages done to his place because of the high lake level. He wanted to sue the Government for damages, but I told him that there were thousands of such cases, and the Government could hardly take care of all of them.

Fourth. I am not thinking only of this plant—I am thinking of the thousands of homes which were constructed along the lakefront when such construction seemed entirely safe and proper. Today, their bathing beaches are gone, houses have been inundated, expensive walls of protection have been built, and some of them have toppled into the lake.

Fifth. One estimate I have here places the damage to lakeshore property during the winter of 1951–52 at $30 million. As stated before, this flood stage comes at the end of a cycle of about 23 years. In August 1952 the lake hit a level of 582.7 feet above the mean tide in New York. The high point in August 1929 was 582.69 feet. In spite of the present flow of 1,500 cubic feet per second at the end of the last 23-year cycle, the level was slightly higher than 23 years before. There does not seem to be dependable proof that the increase of the flow to 2,500 feet per second will have any material effect upon shipping or the lake level.

Sixth. I was pleased yesterday to find that our colleague from Louisiana is for this bill. If we can help his territory with an increased flow from Lake Michigan, that is fine. We want everyone possible to share in the benefits.

Seventh. Now this is an old subject. The same old objections were trotted out years ago. Then, too, an investigation was called for. We have been patient with these investigations, and this bill does in no way stop them. My friends in Wisconsin think that an increased flow may jeopardize their shipping. There appears to be more supposition than facts in this statement. With all respect to my friends who made them, I am in doubt as to their authenticity.

Eighth. It has been estimated that this extra flow of water will have little effect upon the lake level, and I think it is well to remember that this is a trial period for 3 years only, and, if at the end of that time, damage is indicated, a change can easily be made by the Congress.

Ninth. This bill provides that during this 3-year period the effect of this increase in the flow of water will be studied by the engineers—not likely by a new group of engineers, but by the same people who are studying the subject today. How can we judge the effect of this increase in flow if we do not give it a trial? It seems absurd to be making statements here about something concerning which many of us know so little.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McVEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am rather confused. The gentleman says it is not going to change the level of the lake and yet he says it is going to keep the shore from having any damage. I do not see how those two statements agree. Would the gentleman explain what he means?

Mr. McVEY. Well, the damage to the shore is caused by the excess water during the flood season. That is not when the lake level is in question. It is in question when the waters are low, so we can reduce that level at the time when we have excessive heights in Lake Michigan, and many of the homes will not be inundated as they have been in the past. This cycle in the lake extends over a 23-year period. In 1929 we had a cycle slightly below the cycle we experienced in 1952.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be fortunate in many respects in having lived on the shores of Lake Michigan for a couple of years, and also in having lived the major part of my life along the Illinois River.

The gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] yesterday mentioned that her home was immediately adjacent to Lake Michigan, and she had some hardship from the raising and lowering of the lake level over the past several years. As a matter of fact, since God created Lake Michigan it has been raising and lowering over 20-year periods. I can recall back in 1931 when I was attending Northwestern University when classes were dismissed in Swift Hall because the lake was at a high level at that time and the waves were dashing high and water was on the floor of the classroom in which I sat.

May I say to the gentlewoman from Illinois and the other proponents of this bill from Chicago, that I have a very deep regard for their integrity and great regard for their ability to promote this type of legislation, but I would rather live on the shores of Lake Michigan and take my chances at being put out than I would live on the shores of the Illinois River and suffer the damages we have in the past by Chicago's dumping sewage into the canal and then into the Illinois River.

I have not very often agreed with the editorial policy of the Washington Post. As a matter of fact, when I read the editorial on this particular issue I searched my mind and made a little investigation as to whether it was possible that any communistic issue could be involved in this particular bill, and decided, of course, that there was none. So, being opposed to the editorial policy of the Washington Post generally insofar as communism is concerned, I am happy to say that I can commend the editorial policy of the Washington Post in this particular case.

The editorial is from the Washington Post of Tuesday, February 2. It is entitled "A Rose by Another Name," and reads as follows:

ROSE BY ANOTHER NAME

Readers concerned with the problem of pollution along the Potomac will be interested in the fight between Chicago and downstate Illinois which is about to erupt on the floor of the House. An elaborately camouflaged bill, scheduled for debate on Wednesday, purports to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by authorizing the sanitary district of Chicago to divert additional water from the lake into the Illinois waterway.

So far as we can determine, the real objective of supporters of the bill is to help reduce the stench from the industrial wastes and the incompletely treated Chicago sewage that are dumped into the waterway leading to the Illinois River. Chicago undeniably has a sewage problem. At the same time downstate cities, some of which contribute to the pollution, have a justified fear of aggravated flood dangers resulting from the additional water. All this, however, would be merely an internal Illinois dispute (and one of long standing, incidentally) were it not for the camouflage of the bill.

Nowhere does the measure mention either sewage or pollution. Instead it speaks loftily of an intent to regulate and promote commerce among the several States and foreign nations and to protect, improve, and promote navigation and navigable waters in the Illinois waterway and Mississippi Valley, and help control the lake level, and to afford protection to property and shores along the Great Lakes, and to provide for a navigable Illinois waterway. Now, there has been little evidence that the Illinois waterway is not already adequate for the commerce it carries. Moreover, the proposed additional diversion from Lake Michigan would mean an estimated difference of only about 1 inch in the level of the lake—scarcely enough to protect property. But the bill would amount to a direct violation of the 1909 treaty with Canada, which provides that water diversion from the Great Lakes shall be studied by the International Joint Commission. It also would override a 1930 decision by the Supreme Court which limits the amount of water diverted by the Chicago Sanitary District to the present volume.

Altogether the innocuous language of the diversion bill affords a prize demonstration in how to beat around the bush. The best answer the House could give would be to insist that the pollution problem be met by a bill that means what it says—and by more comprehensive action against industrial wastes of the sort being taken in the Ohio Valley and on a more limited scale in the Potomac Basin.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VELDE. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Does the gentleman believe in guilt by association?

Mr. VELDE. That has nothing to do with this particular issue, as I see it. I do not believe in guilt by association.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VELDE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHEEHAN. It must make the gentleman happy to have the Washington Post agree with him once in a while.

Mr. VELDE. It does.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VELDE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does it not cast a doubt in your own mind as to your own position?

Mr. VELDE. I do not see how it could cast a doubt in my own mind on my position in any way whatsoever. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understood it, you announced your gratification because the Washington Post agreed with some position that you took. With me the fact that they agreed would

make me suspicious that I was wrong. That is the point I was trying to make.

Mr. VELDE. I am not of the same opinion as the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You certainly do not believe what the Washington Post says about you, do you?

Mr. VELDE. As I mentioned before, in many cases I do not. I do not agree with them, but in this particular case they are right, and I am happy they are right in this one instance.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McDONOUGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3300) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMENDING LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch, with an amendment of the House thereto, insist upon the amendment of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HAGEN of Minnesota, WITHROW, and DAVIS of Georgia.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member, reported to the House with an amendment, S. 2150. This bill provides for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security and authorizes the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway. The bill further empowers the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway, and authorizes negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls and for other purposes.

This bill, as passed by the other body, has been defended repeatedly by the proponents of the measure as being a self-liquidating project.

Senator WILEY, author of S. 2150, has stressed repeatedly in television appearances and in debate the fact that the project would pay for itself. On page 207 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 13, 1954, Senator WILEY is quoted as saying "the project would pay for itself, and the pending bill would not put an additional burden on the Treasury."

Later in the same debate, as reported on page 217 of the RECORD, Senator WILEY said:

> One of the arguments the railroads previously made was that the St. Lawrence seaway would not be a self-liquidating project. Now we have taken steps to provide that it shall be self-liquidating.

Repeating his vigorous allegation on page 217 of the RECORD, Senator WILEY stated positively, and I quote:

> The project will be fully self-liquidating and will not cost the taxpayers a cent.

I also seem to recall hearing Senator WILEY on television, radio, or debate compare the financing of the Seaway Corporation to that of the toll-road authorities created by many States to finance and build modern turnpikes.

I wish I could accept the argument that the financing of the seaway as provided in S. 2150 did embody the same principles as that of the majority of the existing toll roads. Most toll roads are completely self-liquidating projects. Earnings from tolls and from concessions must maintain and operate the highway and provide in full the interest and principal payments associated with the bonds which provided the funds for financing the road.

As indicated, most toll roads are set up as completely self-liquidating projects. Only the revenue which can be collected from special charges associated with the project are available. Generally, the bonds have been sold with no security except the toll-road revenue.

I was not the only one at our committee meeting this morning who had misgivings about the pledges that have been made to the public to elicit support for S. 2150 on the grounds that it would not cost the United States taxpayers a cent. I expressed my concern by offering an amendment in committee which would sever all connections between the United States Treasury and the Seaway Corporation.

I offered this amendment because I was anxious to support President Eisenhower by voting for the St. Lawrence seaway if I could be guaranteed that the pledges of Senator WILEY and the other proponents of the seaway were so firmly tied down in the legislation itself that there would be no question of the people of my district ever having to dig down in their own pockets to finance the project with taxpayers dollars.

Mr. Speaker, it was evidently a like concern over the financing provision in section 5 of the bill which prompted my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] to offer an amendment which changed the form of the corporation obligations from "notes, debentures, bonds or other obligations" to "revenue bonds which shall be payable from corporate revenues."

As I understand the amendment of the able gentleman from Ohio, who has long served on the Public Works Committee, this change in the form of securities to be offered by the corporation is designed to further safeguard the United States Treasury from a direct charge by the seaway. I am happy that the gentleman from Ohio shares my concern for the taxpayers and is interested in protecting them against bearing the cost of the seaway. I wish I could agree with him in the statement which he released to the press immediately after the committee meeting. The gentleman from Ohio is quoted by the United Press in reference to the seaway bill and his amendment:

> It is not going to cost the taxpayers a cent.

The McGregor amendment is excellent as far as it goes, but I question whether the mere changing of the words "notes, debentures, bonds or other obligations" to the words "revenue bonds which shall be payable from corporate revenues" will adequately protect the taxpayers from future drains on the Treasury. Changing the color of the wrapping paper cannot alter the content of the package which it wraps. As long as the last sentence of section 5 of S. 2150 is left intact, I cannot see where the high principles and good intentions of the McGregor amendment will be effective. This sentence is:

> The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations of the Corporation to be issued hereunder and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations hereunder.

Mr. McGREGOR's amendment passed the committee. Then, with the idea of perfecting the bill so as to make it mandatory that the pledges of the supporters be upheld and that under no circumstances would the cost of the present seaway proposal be a charge against the Treasury, I offered the following amendment:

> I move to amend the bill, as amended by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] as follows:
>
> Page 7, lines 3 and 4, strike out "to the Secretary of the Treasury."
>
> Page 7, line 12, strike out "and the Secretary of the Treasury."
>
> Page 7, line 14, strike out after the word "years" of the McGregor amendment, the sentence beginning "Such obligations" and the remainder of the paragraph through page 8, line 8, and insert "Obligations of the Corporation shall not be purchased or guaranteed by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, except that the Corporation shall have a capital stock of $2,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury the sum of $2,000,000 for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment for such capital stock

when payment is called by the Board. Receipts for payment by the United States for or on account of such capital stock shall be issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be evidence of stock ownership by the United States."

I have no pride of authorship in this amendment. Much of it was frankly borrowed from House Joint Resolution 104, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, Mr. DONDERO, on January 9, 1953, as a culmination of his years of tireless campaigning for the seaway. I believe that the principle of making the obligations of the seaway available for purchase by private investors is sound, especially at a time when the national debt of the United States stands at $274,806,646,812.25 as of February 1. Some of the distinguished gentlemen of the other body who have been most enthusiastic in adding a contingent liability of $105 million against the United States Treasury have been reluctant to raise the debt ceiling. This raises the interesting question as to whether we are not financing our share of the seaway with a rubber check against an overdrawn account.

If seaway revenues are up to anticipation and if the venture is profitable, Mr. MCGREGOR'S amendment is adequate. It is my firm contention, however, that the amended bill does not extend complete protection since, under its provisions as I understand them, the United States Government must guarantee the principle and interest of the revenue bonds the bill authorizes, since they are sold to one customer only, the United States Government. This would mean that, if for some reason the rosy predictions and estimates of the proponents of S. 2150 should not be realized and the seaway should fail to make sizable profits the Government and the taxpayer would be stuck. My amendment would prevent this from happening.

It is my present intention to introduce this amendment, or one which would accomplish the same purpose at the time the seaway bill is considered next week. In the meantime I shall attempt to perfect the amendment and check with existing authorities to work out the best possible solution which will achieve the guaranteed protection to the taxpayer which is so essential to plug up the loophole that exists in S. 2150 as amended. That this plan of selling the revenue bonds to private investors is not impossible was borne out by the testimony of Secretary of the Treasury Humphreys before the Public Works Committee several years ago when he was speaking as a private citizen and the head of a great industrial empire.

The daily newspapers in my hometown of Indianapolis are currently running full-page advertisements which reproduce a White House press release of May 8, 1953, which is a report of Cabinet approval of the seaway. One of the recommendations of the Cabinet in that release is that—

> Participation by the United States should, however, be expressly conditioned on: * * * (c) predication of the project on a self-liquidating basis.

The largest farm organization in the country, the Farm Bureau Federation, in testimony before the House Committee on Public Works last June reiterated their support of the project with the statement that—

> The project should be built and operated on a self-liquidating basis. It should be financed by revenue bonds.

In an exchange between Mr. MCGREGOR and the Farm Bureau Federation witness, incorporated on page 165 of the hearings on House Joint Resolution 104, June 11 through 18, 1953, Mr. Allen B. Kline, as president of the Farm Bureau, is recorded as having told the Senate the previous February that—

> The American Farm Bureau Federation wants the project to be a success. It seems clear that since revenue bonds cannot be sold unless the project is economically sound, the use of such bonds would be the greatest guaranty that the project would be successful. We do not see how the other proponents of the project can be for anything less. If the project is put on a sound revenue-bond basis, investors will not need the guaranty of the United States Government. If the United States Government guarantees the principal and interest, there is no need for the investors to investigate the economic feasibility. In such event the already overburdened Federal finances would be unnecessarily subjected to additional burdens of an indefinite amount.

This expresses my position as a small-business man in Congress.

I realize that the district I represent is a large rail center without any navigable water or port facilities close to it. That probably accounts for the fact that my mail is running better than 20 to 1 against the seaway. But, I am also a stanch supporter of President Eisenhower and would like to see as much of his legislative program enacted as possible. I am proud that my constituents are economy minded, and if I could guarantee them that this project would cost the taxpayers of Indiana no money, I could justify my support for the bill and for the President.

Mr. Speaker, the committee did not see fit to adopt my amendment this morning, although the support received was encouraging to me and many conversations I have since held with fellow members of the committee indicate that it will have even more support on the floor.

As I have pointed out, the President, the author of the bill before the House, and many others have repeatedly emphasized that the seaway project should be self-liquidating without cost to the public. If my amendment had been adopted, the bill now before the House would have that guaranty written into it.

Without that guaranty I cannot see how proponents of the seaway can go on glibly promising protection based only on traffic forecasts and a rosy glow of optimism. I will support the seaway if there is assurance written into the legislation that the taxpayers will not be betrayed. I hope I shall have that opportunity.

MILLIONAIRE UNIONS AND RACKETEERING AND EXTORTION PRACTICED BY A VERY FEW UNION OFFICIALS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the recent loan of a million dollars of union funds, by Dave Beck, of the Teamsters Union, to the Fruehauf Trailer Co., of Detroit, calls attention to the fact that a number of unions are in the more than a million dollar annual income group.

In the U. S. News & World Report of February 5, page 64, will be found a factual statement showing the net worth of several unions.[1]

No criticism is made of this accumulation of wealth, which, as I have been given to understand, was all legitimately received from union members either as initiation fees, dues, or special assessments, or returns on investment of union funds.

OTHER MILLIONS IMPROPERLY COLLECTED THROUGH THE ACTIONS OF A VERY FEW INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE IMPROPERLY USED THEIR POSITIONS AS UNION OFFICIALS TO ENRICH THEMSELVES

Having long realized that not only the public, but union members, were forced, through extortion, to pay tribute to greedy individuals, early in 1953, as chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, I appointed a subcommittee of three to look into the alleged racketeering and extortion practiced by union officials. At my request, a similar subcommittee, of which I was a member, was appointed by the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Acting jointly, the two subcommittees held hearings in Detroit on June 8, 11, 12, and 13, 1953.

Milton Lomask, an experienced and factual writer, gives you a picture of those hearings in the February 1954 issue of the Sign, national Catholic magazine. A copy of his story is as follows:

BIG RACKET IN SMALL CHANGE

(By Milton Lomask)

THE SLOT MACHINES HAVE BECOME A BIG RACKET—SO BIG AND PROFITABLE THAT AN OFFICIAL WARNED: "ANYONE WHO PRINTS THESE THINGS IS DEAD"

The American people last year shoved a billion dollars' worth of small change into vending machines, and at least a tenth of it eventually landed in the cash drawer of a syndicate whose top brass reads like a Who's Who in the Underworld.

That the mobsters were cutting themselves a slice of the industry's dollar first came to light during the Kefauver hearings in 1950 and 1951. Subsequent investigations, including a 2-day congressional hearing in Detroit last summer, plus information from vendors and their customers, round out the picture.

---

[1]

Railroad Trainmen	$54,419,333
AFL Teamsters	$31,341,838
AFL Electrical Workers	$25,983,389
CIO United Auto Workers	$17,451,658
CIO Steelworkers	$13,838,794
AFL Ladies' Garment Workers	$12,752,049
United Mine Workers	$34,032,833

It isn't an edifying picture. It hasn't been edifying to assemble. A union official said, "Anyone who prints these things is dead." Said a smalltime Brooklyn vendor, "People have been known to get into trouble digging up stuff like this."

What is the vending machine industry? Its 2 million vending machines, including 400,000 juke boxes. Its some 1,600 suppliers and manufacturers. Its 1,200 operators ranging from the Automatic Canteen Co. of America with a 1952 gross of $40 million to individual owners of from 50 to 100 machines each.

To operate a machine is to find a spot for it. The operator services the machine and collects the proceeds. The owner of the spot—bar, restaurant, factory, filling station—receives a commission, usually 5 percent.

At the turn of the century, the only things you could get out of a vending machine were a ball of gum or a fistful of peanuts. Today, you put your nickel, your dime, or your quarter in here and anyone of 50 different items tumbles out there.

At St. John's University, in downtown Brooklyn, the New York Automatic Canteen Corp. maintains a battery of machines out of which a student can dine from soup to nuts. Over the country, some 25 percent of all cigarettes, candy bars, gum, and drinks are disbursed in this manner. There are coin-operated typewriters, coin-operated letter-mailers, and coin-operated washers. A few years ago, a Texas operator pocketed a nice profit from a machine that dispensed whiffs of pure oxygen for hangover sufferers.

The vending-machine racket, not to be confused with the industry, employs the usual shakedown methods. To stay in business an operator often finds it advisable to join both a trade association and a union. Association and union work together. Together they see to it that outsiders leave their members' spots alone and that no member covers another's customers.

In the case of a legitimate industry, the higher the turnover the lower the cost per item. Gangland entrepreneurs work the other way around. Their product is freedom from terror. The more they sell, the more they charge, and the consuming public ultimately foots the bill. In Cleveland, Detroit, New York City, and 1 or 2 other cities, many operators pay off to an association, a union, or both—or else.

"Or else," in the words of a terrified gangster, Lucky Luciano, now of Italy, courtesy of the Federal deportation authorities.

And there's Meyer Lansky, whom Senator KEFAUVER once identified as a kingpin in the New York City underworld. Lansky used to be in the television-set business with mobsters Frank Costello and Joe Adonis. He's been active in sundry vending-machine activities.

These men and their peers administer the vending-machine racket, the country over. In most areas, their major interest is the profitable cigarette machine business. In Detroit, it is the jukeboxes.

Testifying in the Michigan industrial capital last summer before the subcommittee headed by Congressman HOFFMAN, a building service labor consultant shook his prepared statement and contemptuously denounced "the Hoffas and the Bufalinos."

James R. Hoffa is no pebble on the labor beach. He's a boulder, smoothed by 20 run-ins with the law on assorted criminal charges. As second in command to International Teamster Chief Dave Beck, currently a prime mover in the attempt to tidy up the New York waterfront, Hoffa breathes the heady air of upper A. F. of L. regions.

Himself a witness at the Hoffman hearings, Hoffa took frequent refuge in the great 20th-century cliché. "I decline to answer on the grounds that * * *." He declined to say whether or not he had a financial interest in any corporations. It is a matter of record that he does, or at any rate did as of 1951. He does, or he did, own half interest in 6,000 shares of stock in the Columbus Trotting Association, and Detroit newspapers recently reported that he was trying to oust the Building Service local which now has jurisdiction over the racetrack employees and replace it with an outfit of his own.

He declined to say whether or not his wife was an employee of Teamster Local 985, which another witness called a paper operation engaged in finding favorable jukebox locations for members of the Michigan Music Operators Guild, a Detroit trade association composed of jukebox operators and dominated by known gangster elements.

William Eugene Bufalino, under indictment at this writing, is president of local 985. Mr. Bufalino was unable to attend the Hoffman hearings. He was in a Detroit hospital suffering from what was originally billed as a respiratory ailment, subsequently altered to severe psychoneurotic depression.

A witness at the Hoffman hearings called Bufalino the dictator of the Detroit jukebox industry. The statement is subject to the reservation that Bufalino obviously takes his orders from a person or persons "upstairs." In New York City last summer, a Mr. Frank Calland died suddenly. Calland was not well known to the public, but was well known along what the racket boys call the vending-machine circuit. Among the floral pieces at his funeral was a $100 spray, sent by Bufalino and paid for by his union.

Bufalino's wife is a sister of Vincent Meli, a director of the Michigan Music Operators Guild, the trade association previously mentioned. Vincent's uncle, Angelo Meli, is no stranger to Detroit law enforcement authorities. From his $25,000 home in Grosse Pointe Park, Mich., Angelo is reputed to oversee some of the major operations of the Detroit underworld.

The situation in New York City has never been subjected to extensive official scrutiny. Reputable vendors and their customers, however, are not averse to supplying details.

The organization which cigarette vending machine operators are urged to join is the Cigarette Merchandisers Association, Inc. Vendors say the Association guards its member's spots. If John Jones, tavern owner, becomes dissatisfied with his cigarette vending machine and tries to replace it with that of another company, he is likely to get no place at all. Chances are any company he calls will be a member of the Association. Instead of sending him a machine, the company gets in touch with the Association. After which, pressure is put on tavern owner Jones to keep the machine he has.

Matthew Forbes, director of the association, says "only one-half of the 140 operators in this area belong to the association." He offers this as evidence that there is nothing to the allegation that nonmembers are frequently super-persuaded to join up. He concedes that his members do 80 percent of the business in the five boroughs of New York City and in nearby Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties. This is a sizeable amount as there are some 30,000 cigarette machines in the area. Nonmembers, however, say the association boys do 90 percent of the business.

Reached by phone, Mr. Forbes was a first reluctant to talk. "All information about the association," he said, "must be obtained from the national." Meaning the National Automatic Merchandising Association, a reputable trade group headquartering in Chicago.

"We're an affiliate of NAMA," said Mr. Forbes, "and I'm not permitted to give out any data whatsoever."

Apprised of charges made against the association, Mr. Forbes became communicative. "All the association does," he said, "is keep members abreast of developments in the field. We take no interest whatsoever in any member's business affairs."

Asked how a member did business, Mr. Forbes said: "Oh, you know. He puts his machine in a spot and signs a contract. In return for the contract, he gives the spot-owner an advance on commissions or a loan or a bonus."

The union to which many New York vending-machine service employees belongs is Teamsters Local 805. Its vice president and welfare fund administrator is Abe Gordon. Gordon is the owner of the Abe Gordon Trucking Co. and the A. & P. Cordage Co., both of New York City.

A partner with Gordon in these enterprises is Phil Kovalick, alias Spic Farvel, alias Joseph Phillips, etc. In 1939, a New York prosecutor called Kovalick one of the most important figures in the New York underworld. At that time, he was being held by police as a material witness in connection with strong-arm activities by racketeers in the New York City garment district.

As a truck-company owner, labor leader Gordon is also an employer of labor. "But my men don't belong to this local," he said, speaking of 805. "They belong to a different local."

Gordon is a surly conversationalist. To each of half a dozen questions concerning the activities of his local, he gave one of two replies: "You guess," or, "Ask the International." He volunteered: "You try to connect Dave Beck and you're dead. Beck has thrown out his best friends. If he saw a man on a truck out there, he'd yank him off." Loosely translated, this double-talk seems to mean that, in Gordon's opinion, teamster chief Beck is trying to keep his big union clean.

Among several medium-sized vending enterprises in New York is the National Vending Corp., which places cigarette machines directly or through a number of subsidiaries in greater New York, Florida, Dallas, and Los Angeles. President of National is Harold Roth, of Hewlett Neck, Long Island.

In 1952, Roth and an associate applied to the New York State Liquor Authority for a restaurant liquor license. On October 23, 1952, the two applicants were summoned to an SLA hearing conducted by Deputy Commissioners Sol Johnson and Michael J. Monz.

Portions of what transpired at this hearing are "must" reading for every serious student of the problems confronting one of America's fastest growing industries.

In 1942, according to a transcription of the testimony, Roth and a partner purchased the assets of a small Brooklyn vending concern called the Kings County Cigarette Service. Roth admitted knowing that one of the former owners of Kings County—one of the men from whom the purchase was made—was gambler Joe Adonis, Brooklyn's foremost gangster, who is currently sweating out an appeal from a court conviction which, if upheld, will exile him to Italy. Roth explained that he and his partner had not bought the stock of Kings County, only its assets, the right to use its name and what Roth termed its "dubious prestige."

Asked Commissioner Johnson: "When you realized you were buying something with which Joe Adonis was associated, didn't it occur to you that possibly" the bar owners and others who were using those machines were doing so "because of that association?" Later, Roth was asked another pointed question. Had he no compunction about doing business with mobsters?

He replied that not only had he no compunction but that in doing business with mobsters he had done the vending-machine industry a service. He pointed out that the industry is full of "undesirable elements" and that in buying out Joe Adonis he had got rid of at least one of them.

Further testimony brought out a touching fact, namely, that after doing his good deed for the industry Mr. Roth had modestly proceeded to keep it a secret. He never told the customers of Kings County that the company whose machines they were using had

changed from bad hands to good. On the contrary, by his own admission, Roth made a special effort to give these customers the impression that Joe Adonis still had a financial interest in their cigarette-vending machines.

Roth was asked where he purchased his cigarette-vending machines. He mentioned three companies, among them the Rowe Corp. Rowe, with a 1952 gross of $37 million, is the largest manufacturer of vending machines in the country. Some idea of what long arms Grandmother Racket has is shown by the well-authenticated fact that in 1949 a group of men claiming to be representatives of the Rowe Corp. offered officials of a United Automobile Workers–CIO union in New Jersey $4,800, with more to come, if they would persuade their negotiators to permit Rowe to speed up production in its manufacturing plant at Whippany, N. J. The union officials turned the offer down.

In addition to its production branch, Rowe maintains 53 retail vending distributor companies in American cities, including New York, and one of the corporation's officers is also listed as an officer of the trade association headed by Matthew Forbes. An attempt to find out whether the Rowe officials were aware of the 1949 bribery attempt was met with a statement by the corporation's public-relations agency that "You're barking up the wrong tree."

So it goes—a case history of what is happening to one of the dozen or more industries on which, according to Senator KEFAUVER, organized crime has imposed an enervating share-the-wealth program.

The story is becoming shamefully commonplace. It is becoming so, according to many troubled observers, because law-enforcement authorities are forced to work in a climate of public opinion hamstrung by a philosophy of moral relativism. Even a Catholic publication has complained that there is too much moral indignation today about labor racketeering. The editors say people are all too ready to believe the worst of labor. They imply that many businessmen also live in a glass house.

The point is not who is committing these sins but that they are being committed and that the public is permitting them to happen.

What is at stake is simple human freedom. If a man cannot go into business without paying tribute to human parasites, if he cannot competitively bid for customers on the open market, it is flim-flam to talk about freedom in America and to scatter over the world pious pronouncements about democracy.

There is no such thing as freedom from this or that. There is no such thing as political freedom or economic freedom or religious freedom or freedom from want, fear, or nagging wives. There is only freedom. It is indivisible; and when these snakes in the underworld lash their fangs into a phase of it, they poison the whole business.

The public is rightly indignant at the presence in America of a Red fifth column. But these gangsters are doing the country every bit as much harm as any addlepated, Communistic technician snooping in the archives at Fort Monmouth, N. J. They comprise a black sixth column with a gun at the back of every American, employer or employee, liberal or conservative, rich or poor, God-fearing or otherwise.

Never, from any member of the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, have I heard any complaint as to the manner in which those hearings were conducted, nor the results accomplished thereby—some twenty-odd individuals were indicted as a result of the hearings held in Detroit and Kansas City. Nevertheless, on July 15, the full Committee on Government Operations,[2] by a vote of 23 to 1, ended my authority to continue to hold such hearings.

They gave no reason for such action. The argument then was that the committee had no jurisdiction to hold such hearings and that, in a broader sense, they were unnecessary. Whatever may have been the intent, the net result was to give encouragement to the racketeers.

Subsequently, hearings were held in Detroit beginning on November 23 and ending November 27, by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and of which I was a member. The authority of that subcommittee, however, expired.

On January 20, I again asked permission of the House Committee on Government Operations to continue my investigations and hearings into racketeering and extortion. Though the committee again was apparently unable to find any fault with either the procedure or the result of the hearings in which I had participated, they again slapped me down—seven Republicans being present—and denied me the opportunity to continue the work which I had started and in which, ever since 1937, I have had experience.

The committee gave the authority to a committee of which my colleague from Ohio, GEORGE H. BENDER, is chairman, who, so far as I know, has never exhibited any particular interest in the subject. He is, however, an astute politician, and, at present, is a candidate for the Republican nomination as United States Senator from the State of Ohio.

I am still an ex officio member of the Bender subcommittee and, as such, will continue my efforts to lay before the public the activities of those who, through extortion, are enriching themselves by preying not only upon the public generally, but upon members of labor organizations.

PROPOSED REINSURANCE SYSTEM—HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, tremendously hopeful developments are emerging from the current hearings of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—hearings on the health needs of our citizens. These developments point the way to new private enterprise solutions to some of the most serious and perplexing problems in the field of medical care. These developments, new only in scope, have been tried and tested in several areas of our country during the past 20 years. They could and should be applied to supply more medical care for millions of our people. I commend them to you for your consideration. This, in brief, is the background.

Extensive testimony has been presented to our committee during the past several months regarding the high cost of medical care, the tragic financial burdens of illness, and the need for high-quality medical care for all our people. As the President pointed out in his health message of January 18:

> Two of the key problems in the field of health today are the distribution of medical facilities and the costs of medical care.
>
> Not all Americans can enjoy the best in medical care. * * *
>
> Even where the best in medical care is available, its costs are often a serious burden. Major long-term illness can become a financial catastrophe for a normal American family.

Witnesses before our committee have provided full documentation for President Eisenhower's statements.

Yet, there are some who would have us believe that there is no problem here; that the availability, costs, and distribution of medical care are of no concern to Government; that any program which would involve the slightest departure from the prevailing methods, techniques, and patterns of medical care services is socialized medicine masquerading as progress. If we heed these advocates of do nothing and fail to recognize the needs of the people, we may find ourselves forced down the road to Government socialized medicine. Our committee has listened patiently to these advocates of complacency, these advocates of do nothing. Their arguments, however, lack conviction. Their allegations find no support among the overwhelming majority of witnesses who have appeared before us—spokesmen of many millions of American workers and their families, leaders of major industries, physicians of unimpeachable authority and of eminent regard, both within and outside their profession.

It is quite evident that the voice of the American people cannot be detected in the utterances of these advocates of do nothing. It is equally evident that the voice of the American people has found effective expression in the words of President Eisenhower when, after illustrating the seriousness of the problem of medical costs, he insisted that we must, therefore, take further action on the problems of distribution of medical facilities and the costs of medical care. Later, in his health message, the President urged the Congress to give early and favorable consideration to his recommendations, stating that—

> No nation and no administration can ever afford to be complacent about the health of its citizens. While continuing to reject Government regimentation, we shall with vigor and imagination, continuously search out by appropriate means, recommend, and put into effect new methods of achieving better health for all our people.

New methods of achieving better health for our people have been de-

---

[2] CLARE E. HOFFMAN, R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, CECIL M. HARDEN, GEORGE H. BENDER, CHARLES B. BROWNSON, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, GEORGE MEADER, FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., CLARENCE J. BROWN, LOUIS E. GRAHAM, WALTER H. JUDD, GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, WILLIM E. MILLER, JEFFREY HILLELSON, RICHARD H. POFF, WILLIAM L. DAWSON, CHET HOLIFIELD, FRANK M. KARSTEN, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, BILL LANTAFF, EARL CHUDOFF, FRANK IKARD, JACK B. BROOKS, LESTER HOLTZMAN, ROBERT L. CONDON, THOMAS J. DODD, ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, L. H. FOUNTAIN, and J. L. PILCHER.

scribed in considerable detail to our committee. These methods demonstrate the effectiveness of applying sound principles, American initiative, private enterprise, and imagination to the problems of medical care distribution and costs. These methods drive home the message that medical economics must keep pace with medical science. Horse-and-buggy methods of distributing medical care services and stagecoach methods of defraying the costs of such services have no place in our modern era of outstanding progress in the medical and allied sciences. This is how one of these new methods works.

Three principal elements—prepayment or insurance, group practice by doctors, and self-supporting hospitals and medical facilities—are compounded into a program designed to provide comprehensive care to our people at costs within their means. Individually, these elements are quite familiar to all of us. When brought together, they offer the people a typically American, private enterprise solution to the problem of meeting the high costs of medical care--a solution not debased by Government regimentation.

Prepayment on a voluntary basis is the first of the three essential elements. We all know this principle. Some 90 million of our people have some form of voluntary health insurance coverage which involves prepayment. However—as pointed out by the President in his health message—this coverage must be broadened. Most health insurance plans provide coverage only when a person is ill and, in most instances, benefits under these plans are cut off, resulting in inadequate protection for catastrophic prolonged illness. For the principle of prepayment to be most effective, coverage under prepayment plans must be broadened at both ends of the scale of illness; coverage must include preventive services and services for the early detection of disease, and it must include services during catastrophic illness. The full advantages of prepayment cannot be achieved when limited benefits are provided on an indemnity, fee-for-each-service basis during only part of an illness. The full advantages of prepayment on a voluntary basis can be achieved only when medical and allied services are offered to keep people well; and, when illness strikes, to provide the necessary services for the necessary length of time to return the patient to health as quickly as possible.

Group practice is the second essential element in the program. We may not be familiar with the term "group practice," but we have all heard of the world-famous clinics where doctors practice on a group basis. For example, the Mayo Clinic, the Lahey Clinic, the Johns Hopkins Clinic, and the Crile Clinic. An efficient and effective use of modern day medical skills is found in group practice. Such has been the testimony of eminent physicians, high in the councils of their respective medical societies, who have testified before our committee. Today, more than 600 groups of physicians are in group practice throughout the country. Sixty percent of the physicians in the Armed Forces at the end of World War II indicated through a questionnaire that they desired to go into group practice at the end of the war.

By combining group practice and prepayment into voluntary group practice prepayment health service plans, a new type of program begins to emerge.

Mr. Henry J. Kaiser, industrialist, and Dr. Sidney R. Garfield, medical director of the Kaiser Foundation health plan on the west coast, described how these elements—group practice and prepayment—have been fused into a splendid plan which provides comprehensive medical care coverage at low cost to more than 400,000 persons. Dr. George Baehr, former president of the New York Academy of Medicine, former chief of medical service and director of clinical research at Mt. Sinai, and now president and medical director of the health insurance plan of Greater New York, told us about the excellent group practice prepayment health service plan in New York City. Dr. H. Clifford Loos, from Los Angeles, and Dr. Russell V. Lee, from Palo Alto, Calif.—both outstanding men in their profession and leaders in their respective communities—described their successful group practice prepayment plans. Other witnesses described similar plans in operation in other parts of the country.

These witnesses have all stressed the basic elements of group practice prepayment health service plans, that is, comprehensive care, emphasis on preventive services, and reasonable costs—all achieved through group practice when combined with prepayment. Under these plans, our committee has been told, costs can be reasonable because the well help pay for the sick; because group practice results in substantial economies in overhead expenses, in joint use of auxiliary personnel, services, and equipment; and because it is less expensive to keep people well than it is to care for them when they are sick. It is not surprising that spokesmen for millions of Americans have informed our committee that they want the services of group practice, prepayment health service plans. The market for these services is nothing less than millions upon millions of our citizens. The American people should be given the opportunity to exercise their free choice—the choice to be served by teams of doctors working on a group practice basis.

Self-supporting medical and hospital facilities constitute the third essential element in this program. As Mr. Eisenhower has pointed out, the distribution of medical facilities constitutes one of the two key problems in the field of health today. Here we can spell out the useful role Government can play in the extension of medical care coverage and the broadening of coverage for millions of Americans—without Government regimentation, and without initial Government handouts.

Witnesses have assured our committee that hundreds of new groups of physicians would provide group practice prepayment health services if they had the necessary medical and hospital facilities in which to work. They have pointed out that additional group practice prepayment plans would be developed over all the country if such facilities were available.

Doctors and others interested in providing comprehensive coverage within the means of our people tell us that one need is long-term financing. They have pointed out the key role medical centers and hospitals play in increasing the efficiency, effectiveness, and economies of group practice prepayment plans.

They have also pointed out the difficulties in obtaining long-term financing, particularly for hospital facilities. The traditional hospital which is not affiliated with a group practice prepayment plan has unstable sources of income. They are considered by the banks and other lending institutions to be poor credit risks. When hospitals are affiliated with group practice prepayment plans, as they are on the west coast under the Kaiser Foundation, such hospitals are self-sustaining and constitute excellent credit risks.

Witnesses have emphasized the point that numerous groups of doctors and other persons interested in the development of group practice prepayment health service plans need medical and hospital facilities and want them. What they seek is long-term financing, not Government subsidies or grants.

A role of Government in this field can be that of stimulating the growth and development of such plans by encouraging private capital investment for the construction and equipping of hospital and medical facilities. This can be accomplished through Government-insured mortgage loans patterned after the FHA loans, the VA loans, and the Defense Production loans. Using this insurance principle, Government has stimulated the investment of private capital, has proven eminently successful in the above-mentioned programs. There is every reason to believe that the same principle would work to provide necessary hospital and medical facilities for many millions of Americans.

The President has stated that voluntary health insurance plans "can reach many more people and provide better and broader benefits. They should be encouraged and helped to do so. Better health insurance protection for more people can be provided."

To further these objectives, so well stated by our President, I am today introducing a bill (H. R. 7700) entitled "The Medical Facilities Mortgage Loan Insurance Bill of 1954." I am confident that this bill, if enacted, will result in a tremendous expansion and extention of medical-care services on a prepayment basis to meet the medical-care needs of millions of Americans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. WIER.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in 2 instances and in 1 to include certain material.

Mr. BUSBEY on Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JONES of Missouri (at the request of Mr. WILSON of Texas), for 1 day, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 354. Joint resolution amending Public Law 207, 83d Congress.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 373. An act to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on January 29, 1954, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7209. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 4, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1232. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets at the United States Military Academy or as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve or as cadets at the United States Coast Guard Academy, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1233. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, with compensation payable from the allotment contained in section 202, General Provisions, Department of Justice, pursuant to the Department of Justice Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1954, approved August 5, 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1234. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of December 31, 1953, pursuant to section 5 (c) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1235. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the annual report of tort claims paid within the Housing and Home Finance Agency and constituent agencies, Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration, pursuant to Public Law 601, 79th Congress, sec. 404; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1236. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Harris"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1237. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1238. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4816. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Robert Graham a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; with amendment (Rept. No. 1146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 7700. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide mortgage-loan insurance for hospitals and medical facilities used in connection with voluntary prepayment health plans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 7701. A bill to restore the right of certain veterans to apply for insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 7702. A bill to provide that persons entitled to relief from the policemen and firemen's relief fund, District of Columbia, may waive all or part of such relief; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 7703. A bill to amend chapter 1, subchapter C, of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7704. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 7705. A bill to provide that pension for non-service-connected permanent and total disability may be paid to single veterans who have a dependent parent, and whose annual income does not exceed $2,700; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 7706. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for conferences between the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and represenatives of the several States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7707. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide that public assistance payments to the States shall not be reduced in certain cases by reason of the disapproval by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the personnel practices of the State agencies carrying out public assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7708. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide judicial review of certain findings of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare which may result in the reduction or discontinuance of public assistance payments to States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 7709. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 7710. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to the mailing and transportation of obscene matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 7711. A bill to provide for a study of the mental and physical consequences of malnutrition and starvation suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees during World War II and the hostilities in Korea; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 7712. A bill to amend the Veterans' Regulations to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 7713. A bill to extend and improve the old-age and survivors insurance system, to provide permanent and total disability insurance and rehabilitation benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 368. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that a new State may be admitted only pursuant to the procedure established by the Constitution for amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to take necessary steps for the purpose of establishing a soldiers' home under Federal jurisdiction at Framingham, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps for the purpose of establishing a soldiers' home under Federal jurisdiction at Framingham, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachu-

setts urging the Department of Defense, through the Air Force, to establish a troop carrier squadron at the Lawrence Municipal Airport; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to take the necessary steps for the purpose of establishing a soldiers' home under Federal jurisdiction at Framingham, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to extend the statute of limitations for prosecuting persons acting against the security and safety of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts urging the Congress of the United States to investigate fully the unjust annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and the atrocities committed therein by the Communist leaders; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to enact legislation whereby Korean veterans may receive the same educational opportunities and advantages granted veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to remove that part of the social-security law limiting the earnings of a recipient of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts House of Representatives favoring increase of bicycle importation tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 7714. A bill for the relief of Homer Cazamias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 7715. A bill for the relief of Vanuccio Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 7716. A bill for the relief of Der Chuck Yee and Wu Mei On; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER (by request):

H. R. 7717. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7718. A bill for the relief of Chris P. and Mabel Barkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7719. A bill for the relief of Frank Budman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 7720. A bill for the relief of Bogdan Chylinski (also known as Dennis Bogdan Chylinski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7721. A bill providing for the extension of patent No. 119,187; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 7722. A bill for the relief of Yechiel Shulman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 7723. A bill for the relief of Jose Victor Villapol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7724. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Strazzullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7725. A bill for the relief of Arthur Frank Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7726. A bill for the relief of Rista Milosevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7727. A bill for the relief of Alberto Araujo Silveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 7728. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Orange County, N. Y., to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 7729. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Tsirigotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 7730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lotte Erna (Meuhle) Taylor and her minor son, Gerhardt Meuhle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 7731. A bill for the relief of Margarete Seitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7732. A bill for the relief of Rogerio Santana de Franca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Park Concessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD 22 resolutions which were adopted by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House on February 2, 1954. These resolutions find no objection to the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior on proposed concession awards by the National Park Service.

The act of July 31, 1953—Public Law 172, 83d Congress—provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees. Recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior concerning 22 proposed contracts or extensions of contracts have been referred to date by the Speaker to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for review.

Meeting in open session on February 2, 1954, the committee was apprised of no reason to disapprove the Secretary's recommendations thereon and the following resolutions were therefore adopted:

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Congress, 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 23, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed extension of contract No. I-1p-1114 which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service on behalf of the Government, extend for 1 year from January 1, 1954, unless sooner terminated by a new contract, the authorization under which Fred Harvey provides accommodations, services, and facilities for the public on the South Rim of Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 14, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Edward B. Rushford and George I. Gravert which will, when finally approved by the regional director, region 1, National Park Service, authorize Messrs. Rushford and Gravert to operate the Rum Shop at Salem Maritime National Historic Site, Mass., for a period of 5 years from January 1, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate

and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 14, 1953 containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mount Whitney Pack Trains which will, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, authorize the permittee to provide saddle horse and pack trip service from bases on privately owned lands located at Furnace Creek Ranch in Death Valley National Monument, Calif., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 14, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to William W. and Barbara W. Myers which will when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, authorize them to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at Wildrose Station in Death Valley National Monument, Calif., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated November 16, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed extension of contract No. I-1p-3348 which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service on behalf of the Government, extend for 1 year from January 1, 1954, the authorization under which Martin Kilian provides accommodations, facilities, and services for the public in Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong. 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated November 9, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a letter to the Naches Co., Inc., which, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, will renew for the period of October 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954, concession permit No. 14-10-426-43, under which the company is authorized to operate ski tows, provide limited lunch service, sell ski accessories and supplies, and rent skis in Mount Rainier National Park, Washington; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 7, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. Albert Weiss, doing business as Friant Garage, which will, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, authorize Mr. Weiss to provide towing service and emergency automotive repairs and services in Millerton Lake National Recreation Area, California, for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated January 4, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. George W. Hurt which will, when approved by the regional director, region 2, National Park Service, authorize Mr. Hurt to operate ski tows and a lunch stand and to rent ski equipment in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., for a period of 2 years from November 1, 1953; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated November 9, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mrs. Marilyn J. Wright which will, when finally approved by the Regional Director, region 4, National Park Service, on behalf of the Government, authorize Mrs. Wright to provide a limited lunch service at Crater Lake National Park, Oreg., for the period September 16, 1953, to June 14, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of con-

cession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 14, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a letter to Mr. Joseph E. Niemeyer which, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, will renew for the period December 1, 1953, through April 30, 1954, concession permit No. 14-10-447-56, under which Mr. Niemeyer is authorized to operate a ski-rental business in Olympic National Park, Wash.; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate commitees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 16, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed extension of contract No. I-1p-1101 which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service on behalf of the Government, extend for 1 year from January 1, 1954, the authorization under which Glacier Park Co. provides accommodations, facilities, and services for the public in Glacier National Park, Mont.; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 14, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a letter to Mr. Donald P. Christianson which, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, will renew for the period December 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954, concession permit No. 14-10-426-42, under which Mr. Christianson is authorized to operate portable rope ski tows and provide light lunch service in the Narada Falls-Paradise area, Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 16, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed extension of contract No. I-1p-6780 which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service on behalf of the Government, extend for 2 years from January 1, 1954, unless sooner terminated by a new contract, the authorization under which Oregon Caves Resort provides accommodations, services, and facilities for the public in Oregon Caves National Monument, Oreg.; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 16, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a letter to Mr. and Mrs. Charles Roening, which will, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, renew for 1 year from January 1, 1954, concession permit No. 14-10-447-89, under which they are authorized to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public in Olympic National Park, Wash.; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 18, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to John C. Turner and Louise M. Turner, his wife, which will, when approved by the Regional Director, Region 2, National Park Service, authorize Mr. and Mrs. Turner to operate the Triangle X Guest Ranch in Grand Teton National Park, Wyo., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1953; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 17, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a letter to Mr. Anton Ashenbrenner which, when approved by the region director, region 4, National Park Service, will renew for the period January 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954, concession permit No. 14-10-447-84, under which Mr. Ashenbrenner is authorized to operate a store, gasoline station, and cabin camp in Olympic National Park, Wash.; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 17, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. Clifton D. Rock which will, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, authorize Mr. Rock to sell souvenirs and related items at Gabrillo National Monument, Calif., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman.*
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 17, 1953, continuing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a letter to Mr. Murl Emery which will, when approved by the regional director, region 3, National Park Service, renew for the period January 1, 1954, through June 30, 1954, concession permit No. 14-10-304-7 under which Mr. Emery is authorized to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at Searchlight Ferry located in Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nevada; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman.*
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated November 18, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to nine proposed awards of concession permits which will, when approved by the Regional Director, region 1, National Park Service, authorize charter-boat services and bait sales to be provided in Everglades National Park, Fla., for a period of 2 years from January 1, 1954, by the following: Leroy Orme and John Scudder, sale of bait; O. P. Patton and J. W. Willis, sale of bait; Walter F. Mann, charter-boat service for sport fishing; William Mann, charter-boat service for sport fishing; Peter G. Mills, charter-boat service for sport fishing; Stevie Roberts, charter-boat service for sport fishing; Finis A. Williams, charter-boat service for sport fishing; Tommy N. Williams, charter-boat service for sport fishing; Lewis C. Watson, charter-boat service for sport fishing; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman.*
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 24, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. J. R. Dickson which will, when approved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, authorize him to operate a gasoline service station at Big Stump in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman.*
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated January 19, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. Sam B. Davis, Jr., which will, when aprpoved by the regional director, region 4, National Park Service, authorize him to conduct pack and saddle horse operations in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., for a period of 2 years from January 1, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman.*
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated January 20, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to McKinley Park Service, Inc., which will, when finally executed on behalf of the Government, authorize the company to provide concession accommodations, facilities, and services in Mount McKinley National Park for a period of 5 years from June 15, 1953; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman.*
Adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Commonsense Unity or Division of Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, only recently it has come to my attention that remarks which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 8, 1953, have since then been made part of an anti-Semitic article in a publication misnamed Common Sense, which is published in the State of New Jersey.

I wish to state clearly and unmistakably that I not only thoroughly condemn the evil purpose to which my comment was put by Common Sense, but also that I consider the very existence of publications of this kind a cancer in our body politic.

As early as June 1951, the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, denounced Common Sense as "un-American because of its hate preaching against minority groups." Similarly, the Americanism Commission, American Legion, Department of Illinois, included Common Sense and its publisher, Conde McGinley, in its 1949 and 1950 reports on subversive activities. Other veterans' groups, civic, and religious leaders of all denominations have condemned the division activities of Common Sense and McGinley, who has been an outspoken apologist for Robert H. Best, convicted pro-Nazi traitor.

Because it has arrogated to itself the misleading title "The Nation's Anti-Communist Paper," Common Sense has been scrutinized by some of the outstanding journalistic authorities on communism. Cornelius Dalton, well-known columnist for the Boston Traveler, came to the conclusion that Common Sense actually "is a nasty little hate paper which specializes in anti-Semitism."

In the April 9, 1951, issue of the Freeman, George Sokolsky, veteran fighter against communism, branded Common Sense as a publication devoted to anti-Semitism. He correctly stressed the fact that the paper's publisher, McGinley, by his emphasis on racial and religious hatred, paves the way for precisely the evils which he claims to oppose. Sokolsky concluded his analysis by imploring real fighters against communism to denounce this paper, Common Sense.

I wish to do this here and now. I also wish to appeal to my colleagues to join me in relentlessly exposing false anti-Communist prophets, such as McGinley and his senseless Common Sense. It is agencies of that kind which under the guise of Americanism and under the pretext of combating subversion create discord in our Nation. By fostering bigotry and race hatred, they undermine the foundations of our Republic, and they do spadework for the Kremlin by dividing our people into hostile camps at a time when the threat of communism makes united efforts of all Americans more necessary than ever.

Another New York Times Error

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., spoke before the 46th annual banquet of the Philadelphia Real Estate Board in Philadelphia. In his speech, Mr. MARTIN referred to a dedicated group of people who want to lead us into socialism. Speaking of these leftwingers Mr. MARTIN said:

> They are the egghead wing of American political life. They infest the ADA, an organization which calls itself Americans for Democratic Action, but which might properly be renamed "A Depression Anytime."

The Associated Press, in reporting this portion of Mr. MARTIN's speech, reported:

> Representative MARTIN said these leftwingers infest Americans for Democratic Action, an organization which backs the principles of the Roosevelt New Deal and the Truman Fair Deal.

I have checked with the Associated Press in Washington and they have informed me that the above sentence is exactly the way they reported it. The New York Times, however, was not content with reporting the AP story as it came to them but had to doctor it up by reporting under the AP dateline the following:

> Mr. MARTIN charged that such leftwingers infest the Americans for Democratic Action, the anti-Communist organization that backs the principles of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

Thus, the New York Times compounded its misdemeanor. For Mr. MARTIN did not refer to the ADA as an anti-Communist organization. Nor did the Associated Press refer to the ADA as an anti-Communist organization. The New York Times ran the story as an AP story. Therefore, a reader of the New York Times would obviously conclude that either Mr. MARTIN or the Associated Press had referred to the ADA as an anti-Communist organization. The doctoring of any AP story without removing the AP label is certainly not considered a minor violation of proper journalistic practice. Moreover referring to the ADA as an anti-Communist organization in what is supposed to be a straight news story would be an infraction of good journalistic practice even if the New York Times had removed the AP label. For it would be hotly debated by many that the ADA has any color of right, much less a claim to fame, to be entitled an anti-Communist organization. In fact, many would contend that it is rather soft on Communists.

In any event, certainly the ADA's principal characteristic as an organization is not that it is anti-Communist. No one would refer to the Washington Redskins football team as an anti-Communist organization although, undoubtedly, they are opposed to communism. I am sure that many of my colleagues would be more ready to term the Redskins an anti-Communist organization than the ADA.

Usually newsmen do not criticize newspapers, just as doctors do not criticize doctors and lawyers do not criticize lawyers. The exception is in the case of particularly mischievous misdoing. An indication of the mischief of the offense committed by the New York Times is the fact that Journalist Howard Rushmore called the Times to task in the New York Journal-American of January 30.

I include herewith the pertinent extract from Mr. MARTIN's speech in Philadelphia, the full text of the New York Times story of January 24, and the story by Mr. Howard Rushmore, which appeared in the New York Journal-American of January 30:

> I do not need to tell this audience that unfortunately we have here in America a dedicated group of people who want to lead us into socialism. They have devoted approximately the last 20 years of their lives to that goal. Their basic philosophy is that the Government should do everything. They have made immense gains, but they still have not arrived at their goal. If I need cite the evidence, I will refer you to the outcome of the presidential election of November 4, 1952. I think Americans made it unmistakably clear that they had all they wanted of Socialist experiments with our American way of life.
>
> Down through the years, I have been a careful student of leftwing utterances. Knowingly or not, these leftwingers are unable to hide the fact that they make their greatest gains at the expense of human hardship.
>
> They are the ones who, in the thirties, were telling us that our plant was built, there were no more horizons.
>
> They are the ones who, in the forties, as World War II ended, were telling us that we were going to have 10 million unemployed.
>
> They are the ones who today are yelling depression.
>
> These leftwingers live on pessimism. They get up each morning with their mouths tasting like back issues of the New Republic. They go to bed each night secure in the knowledge that everybody had advanced 1 more day toward the yawning cavern that is the tomb.
>
> They are the egghead wing of American political life. They infest the ADA, an organization which calls itself Americans for Democratic Action, but which might properly be renamed "a depression any time."

[From the New York Times of January 24, 1954]

MARTIN CONDEMNS TALK OF A SLUMP—FEELS LEFTWING EGGHEADS TRY TO PROMOTE HARD TIMES AS CUE FOR SOCIALISM

PHILADELPHIA, January 23 (AP).—Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., charged tonight that leftwing eggheads were trying to promote us into hard times for political reasons.

Their aim, he declared, is to lead us into socialism.

In a radio speech before the 46th annual banquet of the Philadelphia Real Estate Board, the Massachusetts Republican said that "despite pessimistic statements of alarmists there is not a valid economic sign today * * * pointing to anything like the unemployment of 1949–50, when these people were so silent."

The Nation is now going through a period of readjustment, Mr. MARTIN asserted, and today's unemployment figure of 2 million may vary upward in the next few months.

"Despite this period of transition," he added, "the year 1953 just finished was the most prosperous in the history of our country, and the fact is there are 62 million American civilians at work today at gainful occupations."

Representative MARTIN's speech was billed in advance by his office as a major address, with a nationwide broadcast arranged.

In 1949 and 1950, under a Democratic administration, the Speaker said, unemployment reached 3,400,000 and 4,750,000, but the four-alarm prophets of the leftwing * * * were silent. There were no cries of recession, no cries of depression.

"Each time you read one of these political utterances," he advised, "go back and check up the gentleman's statements in 1949 and early 1950. You will find that the color of the coat has changed."

Mr. MARTIN charged that such leftwingers infest the Americans for Democratic Action, the anti-Communist organization that backs the principles of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

He said he knew of no responsible businessmen who were pessimistic about the economic outlook. Politicians, he added, know

less about the country's economy than businessmen and economists, and do more talking about the subject.

Mr. MARTIN also reviewed the first year of the Republican administration and predicted that 1 million homes would be built this year, with private enterprise performing in a manner so outstanding that public housing soon will become only a memory of the unlamented days of the managed economy.

Because of the narrow political margins in Congress, he conceded no one can predict with certainty the fate of President Eisenhower's legislative program. But, he said, the American people will demand its enactment and they will get its enactment, if not by the narrow majorities of this Congress, then by sufficient majorities in the next Congress.

[From the New York Journal-American of January 30, 1954]

SUBVERSIVE FRONT: ADA GETS HELP FROM NEW YORK TIMES

(By Howard Rushmore)

For the past several months Americans for Democratic Action has been under fire from bona fide Democrats as an outfit that does harm to the cause of genuine liberal politics.

Recently House Speaker MARTIN, speaking for the Republicans, slapped at ADA as one of the organizations trying to promote a depression in the United States.

With the ADA under fire from both camps, help was needed to rebuild the outfit in the public mind. Oddly enough the New York Times, which loudly trumpets its nonbias, was one of those who came to the ADA's aid.

MARTIN's statement was carried by the Associated Press out of Philadelphia. The AP reported: "Representative MARTIN said these leftwingers infest Americans for Democratic Action, an organization which backs the principles of the Roosevelt New Deal and Truman Fair Deal."

PHRASE ADDED

This certainly was honest reporting and a fair and accurate description of the ADA. But not the New York Times. It carried the same AP story thusly: "Mr. MARTIN charged that such leftwingers infest the Americans for Democratic Action, the anti-Communist organization that backs the principles of the New Deal and Fair Deal."

The addition of the phrase "the anti-Communist organization" was the idea of the New York Times. It was not in the original AP story. We confirmed that with AP. It is an old rule, learned by cub reporters in their first year, that you don't doctor or editorialize wire service stories. Even when the ADA is in need of tender and loving care.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, we will celebrate the 36th anniversary of the democratic and independent Republic of Lithuania. Lithuania, which was an independent state of great importance in the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries, was resurrected to independent statehood on February 16, 1918, by the sacrifices and sufferings of her people. On the 36th anniversary of that date, it is fitting to recall that this small nation on the Baltic Sea has contributed greatly to human freedom throughout the ages. It was the Grand Duke Algirdas, of Lithuania, who stopped the Mongols in 1362, when they swept westward into Europe from the Asiatic steppes behind the Ural Mountains.

And—let it be recalled—it was this brave little country which first fought the Communist aggressors of the Kremlin. The world can learn many things from the experiences of the gallant people of Lithuania, who, after 14 years of almost constant Soviet occupation, are still fighting to free themselves from the grip of Communist terror. And I am glad to be a member of the select committee of this House which is currently pursuing an inquiry into the experiences of these gallant people through the seizure of their country by the Soviet Union. From this inquiry, I expect we shall learn a great deal which will be of inestimable value to the people of the United States.

In area, Lithuania is the largest of the 3 Baltic States, with a population of about 3 million. Since the 11th century, Lithuania had been a free, independent, and sovereign state.

Today, the Kremlin claims that Lithuania is part and parcel of the Soviet Union. This claim is based on the most fraudulent piece of fakery the world has ever seen. This ridiculous fraud was the faked elections which the Communists staged in Lithuania in 1940, while the country was tight in the grip of an overwhelming Red army and while the wolves of the fiendish Soviet secret police had spread a reign of terror throughout the nation.

Those elections of 1940, held on July 14 and 15, were conducted under the guns of the Red army. They vere supervised by a special emissary from the Kremlin. And they were managed exclusively by the Communist Party with a single list of candidates, while other political parties that stood for the country's independence were barred from the polls and their candidates were arrested.

The Lithuanian people were dragooned to the polls. The elections were compulsory. Those not voting were considered saboteurs and enemies of the Red regime. Those who appeared at the polls had their passports stamped as having voted. Those who lacked such stamps on their passports were subject to arrest, and countless thousands were arrested and deported to their doom in Siberia.

And the Soviet Union has had the colossal impudence to demand that the world accept this as an honest and legitimate election expressing the free will of the Lithuanian people.

The Moscow radio announced at the time that over 95 percent of the Lithuanian people voted in favor of the Communist candidates. The results sent from Moscow were published in the London newspapers.

But apparently Moscow had not been informed that the elections, which were supposed to be held on 1 day, had been extended over 2 days. And the laughable result was that the final election returns announced by Moscow were printed in the London papers 24 hours before the polls closed.

Nor does there appear to be a word of truth in the Soviet claim that over 95 percent of the Lithuanian people voted in favor of the Communist list of candidates. Some diplomatic observers stationed in Lithuania at the time estimated that only about 16 percent of the Lithuanian people went to the polls at all. And most of these did so only to get their passports stamped, and then they nullified their ballots by defacing them with cartoons and slogans of defiance against the Soviet invaders.

The select committee of this Congress has already had witnesses before it who have given us testimony about these fake elections. Some of these witnesses were people who were at the polls. And some of these witnesses were members of the election boards who conducted the elections and counted the ballots. And their testimony, in great part, has been that false returns were reported in almost every case. In some districts, the false returns provided figures which exceeded the total number of persons living in those districts.

The truth appears to be that only a small percentage of the Lithuanian people went to the polls, and that a large part of these deliberately invalidated their ballots in order to avoid giving even this token of support to the incredible Communist monsters who were devouring their country and their kin.

One further feature of importance should be noted in connection with these fake elections. During the short "electoral campaign," no question of joining Soviet Russia was raised or even mentioned. On the contrary, the only slogan of the campaign was in favor of insuring "friendly relations between Lithuania and Soviet Russia."

The so-called elections over, the newly elected members of this Soviet puppet parliament convened on July 21. The first and only business of their agenda was the passing of a resolution humbly requesting that Lithuania should be admitted into the Soviet Union. Having passed it, the puppet parliament dispersed. The farce was completed when the Supreme Soviet granted the request, and it was announced, on August 3, 1940, that Lithuania was declared to be a part of the Soviet Union.

Who was it that declared this piece of impudence to the world?

It was the same criminal who stuck the gun in the back of the victim and robbed him of his life and his fortune.

And this criminal now demands that the world take his word for it that the victim voluntarily gave up all that he loved and had worked for.

Look at the proof, this impudent criminal now tells the world; look at how we asked the victim and how the victim, by over 95 percent, begged and pleaded with us to kidnap him and take him into captivity.

Now, by painstaking work, the select committee of this House is carefully collecting evidence from the victims of this monstrous crime against peace among men, this crime against civilization and humanity; and I predict that the criminal's colossal impudence will

avail him nothing in the end; and that the world will choose to believe the evidence from the lips of the victims which the select committee of this House is daily entering into the record of history.

For the sake of anyone knowing little about the steps leading up to the tragedy of Lithuania and the other Baltic States, it might be pertinent to present the facts.

Under the pressure exerted upon all the Baltic States by the fact of the Nazi-Communist Pact, Lithuania was forced to agree to the demand of the Soviet Union for a mutual-assistance pact between them, signed on October 10, 1939.

The mutual-assistance pact stipulated nonintervention in the internal affairs of either contracting party. Limited garrisons of Soviet troops in Lithuania were agreed upon. Lithuania, for obvious reasons, scrupulously observed all the requirements of the pact and expected, naturally, a reciprocal attitude from her colossal neighbor.

During the short period of comparative tranquillity, satisfaction was expressed by Soviet authorities concerning the treatment accorded the Red army garrisons in Lithuania. But on May 25, 1940, like a thunderbolt out of a clear sky, came the news that Soviet officials had made charges alleging mistreatment of Red army soldiers in Lithuania and accusations that the three tiny Baltic States were conspiring against the Soviet Union—charges for which not the slightest bit of evidence has ever been advanced in the 14 years since that time.

All efforts on the part of the Lithuanian Government to wipe out all possible misunderstandings and suspicions and to placate the Soviet authorities were in vain. The Prime Minister of Lithuania went personally to Moscow to seek a betterment of the situation and to beg the Soviet authorities for cooperation in clarifying and investigating the charges.

Instead of cooperating in behalf of peace in the world, the Soviet Union, at midnight of June 14, presented an ultimatum to Lithuania, demanding a pro-Soviet Government and the admission into Lithuania of an unlimited number of Soviet troops.

If the last legitimate Government of Lithuania could be accused of any guilt, it certainly was not guilty of any provocative acts against the Red army garrisons, but perhaps had too lenient an attitude toward them. In this instance, it is well to recall an opinion of one great American statesman that "the presence of troops of one country on the soil of another constitutes prima facie evidence of aggression."

Although the terms of the Soviet ultimatum violated the letter and spirit of the mutual assistance pact and constituted an illegal intervention in Lithuania's internal affairs, the Lithuanian Government, in view of the imminent invasion by the Red army, complied with the terms of the ultimatum and resigned. The President of the Lithuanian Republic designated General Rastikis to form a new government; but this move, which was the last act of the free government, failed, when the Soviet authorities rejected it. The Soviet choice, Justas Paleckis, was named Prime Minister instead.

Concerning the Soviet Union's demand for unlimited numbers of Red army troops to be stationed in Lithuania, it must be observed that such a demand should have been prompted by some emergency or by an anticipated attack by some European power, as stipulated by article 5 of the mutual-assistance pact.

But the plain fact is that there was no emergency and no anticipated attack from anywhere. And if the Soviet Union's demand to increase her army garrisons in Lithuania were to constitute an extension of the pact, there was no formal agreement entered into and ratified as required by law.

On June 15, 1940, numerous Red army divisions crossed Lithuania's frontiers at several points. President Smetona of the Republic of Lithuania departed from the country and went abroad without tendering his resignation as president. A few hours later, a special Commissar from Moscow arrived by plane in Kaunas to supervise the formation of a new government. Thus, on June 17, 1940, the Paleckis government came into being.

With the creation of the Paleckis government, with the Red army present in all parts of Lithuania and new elections carried out to suit its purposes, the Soviet Union, using the most modern methods of veiled aggression, accomplished its task—the destruction of the independence of the Lithuanian Republic at a time when peaceful conditions prevailed and the development of friendly relations had a fair chance of success.

This evil act was committed by Soviet strategem while the Lithuanian-Soviet Union nonaggression treaty was still in effect, and the clause of nonintervention in internal affairs was only 8 months old.

The treaty of nonaggression between Lithuania and the Soviet Union sounds rather ironical in present circumstances:

ART. 2. The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other.

ART. 3. Each of the two contracting parties undertakes to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party.

The occupation, seizure, and incorporation of Lithuania and her two sister Baltic Republics violated every agreement previously entered into by the U. S. S. R. and the three countries.

Soviet occupation of the three countries continued until July 1941. During this time, more than 200,000 people were killed, deported, or disappeared. Then, in July, Hitler attacked the Soviet Union, occupied the Baltic area, and held it until 1944, when the Red army again returned and the Soviets completed the annexation and incorporation that was started in 1940.

Lithuania, with her rich historic traditions dating back from the 12th century, her ancient language, her devotion to religion and western culture, has the indisputable right to independence and free economic development.

During her recent 22 years of independent existence, Lithuania—with her population of 3 million souls, who differ racially and linguistically from the Soviet Russians—thanks only to the spirit of independence, was able convincingly to demonstrate to her neighbors and to the world her ability of self-government and to achieve rapid progress in every respect.

It is gratifying that Lithuania, in her moments of distress, was not left alone. And it is doubly gratifying to me as an American that the United States gave moral and material encouragement to Lithuania and to her good neighbors, Latvia and Estonia; and that a select committee of this House is even now spreading on the pages of history the record of the infamous crime committed by Soviet communism on the peaceful shores of the Baltic Sea.

And let us recall the ringing words of the Secretary of State when Mr. Dulles opened the first public hearings of the select committee of this House on November 30, last:

What of the future?

Asked Mr. Dulles.

First of all, let us never lose hope that there is a future.

And then our Secretary of State went on to speak thoughts which spring from every American heart:

Some say that it is unrealistic and impractical not to recognize the enforced incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union. We believe, however, that a despotism of the present Soviet type cannot indefinitely perpetuate its rule over hundreds of millions of people who love God, who love their country, and who have a sense of personal dignity.

The Soviet system, which seeks to expunge the distinctive characteristics of nation, creed, and individuality, must itself change or be doomed ultimately to collapse. The time of collapse depends largely on whether the peoples who remain free produce spiritual, intellectual, and material richness; and a faith which can penetrate any Iron Curtain. The captive peoples should know that they are not forgotten, that we are not reconciled to their fate, and, above all, that we are not prepared to seek illusory safety for ourselves by a bargain with their masters which would confirm their captivity.

We must continue to be guided by this policy—standing firm against Soviet claims to Lithuania. Our continued confidence in the eventual freedom of Lithuania will keep alive the spirit of freedom, and one day will inspire the people to rise up and throw off the Communist yoke of bondage.

Let us not fail the people of Lithuania. Let each and every one of us, on this 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, pledge anew our efforts and reaffirm our determination to continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with these brave people of Lithuania until Lithuanian independence is a reality.

Criteria for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, early in October 1953 it was my pleasure to meet with a group of REA managers at Sidney, Nebr. They

were concerned with the new power criteria directive which had been issued August 18, 1953, by the Under Secretary of the Interior Department. This was followed by several meetings between the REA's, the Department of the Interior, and Members of Congress.

In my opinion, the REA's and preference customers had every reason to be concerned about the first interpretation of the new power criteria. The criteria were vague, inconsistent, and lacked a clear understanding or explanation from the Department of Interior.

As chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I scheduled 3 days of hearings on this matter. The REA's from a half dozen States were represented. Many questions were asked by them and answered. The testimony of these hearings is now available to interested groups.

Let me suggest that with the change of the administration a year ago that there are a number of individuals lacking official endorsement to speak for either of the major political parties who have been making a political football out of the REA. The REA in the past has had both Republican and Democratic support in Congress. It has cut across political lines with strong support. Several of these self-appointed spokesmen were disgruntled former employees of past administrations. Indeed, the attorney who was appointed to represent a large group of REA's was an individual who was released from the REA at the national level. It is unfortunate that these self-appointed spokesmen have tried to drive a wedge between Members of Congress, this administration, and the good work being carried on by the REA cooperatives.

Coming to the desks of Congressmen has been a great deal of propaganda which made the farmers believe they were being sold down the river. Rumors were set afoot that interest rates were to be raised. Any thinking person knows that these rates were set by Congress. Propaganda said that the public-power policies of the Congress would be scuttled. It was said that the Rural Electrification Administration was going to sell the cooperatives to private power companies. Letters went to REA's carrying misinformation, half-truths, and insinuations that the REA's were to be hurt. Rumors are still repeated that the REA's must contract and pay for power not needed for several years.

These unfounded rumors and statements spread confusion and misunderstanding among the REA cooperatives. It seemed to be a plan and a pattern followed by those who wanted to hurt the administration. In my opinion, the production of electric power should be strictly an economic problem. Those who would make it a political issue do a disservice to the REA's.

I do know that the good REA directors in Nebraska and other States were not taken in by the groundless rumors and half-truths which came through this New Deal lobby in Washington.

The Department of the Interior was represented before the committee of which I am chairman. They were asked a great many questions which had been presented by REA groups. When you examine the hearings you will find that the question of a short-term contract was frequently explored. Mr. Aandahl's answer was always to the effect that short-term contracts would be so drawn that the power would be available to preference customers when they needed that power.

In its revision of article 7 of the Missouri Basin Power Marketing Criteria, dated December 11, 1953, the Department of the Interior has given greater recognition to the rights of the preference customers by declaring:

> That power not already under contract and not needed until a later time by preference customers will be reserved for them as a class by selling it under short-term interim contracts under which it can be recaptured for the preference customers at the termination of such contract.

It should be noted that the January 1, 1954, deadline has been so modified that REA cooperatives should no longer suffer a loss because they are permitted to adjust their future requirements after January 1, 1954. The Interior Department will review carefully all requests for future power and no contracts will be let which, on the face of them, would seem to indicate that the REA might be penalized for asking for more power than they can use at the present time.

In the case of the four power groups in Wyoming and Colorado who now get electric energy from the Reclamation Bureau, Mr. Aandahl said that there were 53,000 kilowatts under contract in the western division with nonpreference customers and to the best of my knowledge, all of the contracts have a withdrawal clause in them. I asked the question:

> They have a withdrawal clause in them so that the power would be available on application of preference customers for power within a reasonable time?

Mr. Aandahl replied:

> If preference customers made application then it would be up to the Department or the Bureau of Reclamation to make an administrative decision as to whether or not they would withdraw the power and there is a 30-month notice required in the meantime.

Mr. Aandahl stated without qualification that there would be no penalty clause on the REA's. In other words, the estimates of January 1 can be changed by the REA's at any time.

All evidence points to the fact that in the western Nebraska and Wyoming-Colorado division that there will be a shortage of power. A shortage even though nonpreference customers in 2 to 5 years give up the 53,000 kilowatts they are now using.

In the power-hungry Missouri Basin, applications have been received from preference customers for 523,000 kilowatts. An additional 224,000 kilowatts are sought by nonpreference private utilities. There will only be 325,000 kilowatts of new and uncommitted power available for sale through 1956. In the western divisions of Colorado, Wyoming, and Nebraska a similar condition exists. It may take the wisdom of a Solomon to divide up the available power. There are those who complain that the Department will commit large blocks of power to nonpreference customers on a long-term basis with no withdrawal clause. This has been the policy of past administrations. Some of these contracts still have from 5 to 16 years to run. The committee has been assured that no contracts will be made on such a basis.

It is quite obvious from the testimony of the witnesses that there exists some very serious misunderstandings on the part of the many people as to the interpretation of the Federal laws on the distribution of power. It seems also that there are some profound differences as to the proper role the Government should play in the economy of the electric industry. There are those who would insist that the Federal Government be responsible for producing and transmitting all of the power produced. There are others to the extreme right who would like to eliminate all of the socialistic ideas and let free enterprise handle the production and distribution of all electrical energy.

The testimony shows that there are 13 longtime contracts made by the Bureau of Reclamation prior to 1953 which have no withdrawal clause. There is one 30-year contract in the Southwest Power Administration with an industry which has no withdrawal clause. There are 19 industrial contracts running for many years in the Bonneville Power Administration which have no withdrawal clause. In one instance, a previous administration entered into contracts for a 20-year period for more than 1 million kilowatts of firm power produced at public expense but which was sold to private utilities with no withdrawal clause whatever. Why were the very people who now protest so much on the power criteria so strangely silent then?

It was unfortunate that the power policy statement of August 18, 1953, was developed and announced without consultation with the representatives of the REA's and Congress. This new policy would seem to represent a sharp departure from established policies which, under the first interpretation, could mean a financial loss to REA co-ops. This has since been modified and interpreted so that no loss or penalty will be made against the REA's.

The REA's and your State organization should be interested in securing an adequate wholesale electric source of power at as reasonable rates as possible. Nebraska is entirely a public power State. In the State there have been differences between the REA's, the municipalities, the hydros, and the consumers. Public power has somewhat of a monopoly in the State. These groups should work together for the best interests of all concerned. I have long felt there should be one public power agency in Nebraska to represent all of the people. If this is not done, there will always be conflicts between the semipublic agencies.

All of us know that the cost of generating electricity, and all the details that go into its production, and distribution have increased costs. It has been necessary for the managers and the directors of REA cooperatives to adjust rates in order to meet payments on past loans or to borrow money for further de-

velopment of their projects. Few REA's are delinquent, good business management prevails.

It is quite evident that many people fail to distinguish between Federal power and public power. Throughout the country there are hundreds of examples of successful power operations, both generation, transmission, and distribution. They were constructed by the States, public agencies, municipalities and REA cooperatives. The Federal Government and the Department of the Interior had nothing to do with their construction or operation. These non-Federal power agencies are splendidly run and have good credit. In fact, most of the power received by REA's comes from private development of electrical power. The records indicate 58 percent comes from that source.

The growth in the consumption in electric energy has been phenomenal. In 1924 it was 455 kilowatt-hours per person. In 1951 it was 2,888 kilowatt-hours per person. It is steadily rising.

In 1936 10 percent of the farms in the United States had electricity. Under the REA development, electricity in 1950 was available to about 90 percent of the rural districts and farms. The growth has not been stopped.

The Federal Government produces little more than 13 percent of the electrical energy produced in America. And even though all of the additional hydroelectric power which could possibly be developed in the next 15 years would be developed, the percentage would change very little because of demands of the American people for electricity. There can hardly then be a monopoly of public power by any group. It would take at least 50 percent or more of the control of power to produce a monopoly.

It seems to me that the differences of opinion on the power criteria actually boil down to a difference in the philosophy of government. The one philosophy is that the Department of Interior is under obligation to take care of the growing needs of the rural system for all time to come. The philosophy is one of placing the Federal Government in the business of supplying electric energy to certain classes of customers.

This philosophy would require the Federal Government to invest billions of dollars which would mean a tremendous Federal payroll engaged in the management of these enterprises. The philosophy would commit the Congress to make unlimited appropriations in building public electric generating plants. It would mean federalizing the electric industry.

The opposite view is that of looking at the cooperatives and other agencies as individual enterprises which should look after their own needs at the local level. I can find no place in the law which would require the Bureau of Reclamation or any power agency to engage in the power business as such. The reclamation law requires that electric energy, which is secondary, should be used to assist irrigation projects in their repayment plans. Congress has never authorized the Federal Government to take care of the needs of the people for electrical energy.

Again, I would point out that a score or more of long-term contracts were let under previous administrations without any withdrawal clause for preference customers. One contract of over a million kilowatts was let at a firm power base and with no withdrawal clause. I have often asked myself the question, "Why did not the very people who are screaming so loudly now about the contracts which are proposed do some screaming under previous administration?"

Statement on St. Lawrence Seaway, by Hon. James C. Auchincloss, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1954

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, at the meeting today of the Public Works Committee, prior to the vote taken on reporting the measure on the St. Lawrence seaway project (S. 2150) out of committee, I made a statement to the committee explaining my position on this legislation, which reads as follows:

When I first came to Congress and studied the St. Lawrence seaway project about 12 years ago, I gained the immediate impression that it involved the expenditure of vast sums of money with very little likelihood that the investment made by the United States would be worthwhile or would ever be repaid. In addition, it appeared that it would seriously affect the business of the ports along the eastern seaboard as well as the Nation's transportation system generally. Hundreds of thousands of our citizens have their savings invested in railroads in our country, and their fears about the effect of this proposal on their investments have never been adequately answered by the proponents of this measure. Furthermore, the whole proposition was complicated not only by the engineering and shipping problems involved, but also by the construction of dams to create electrical energy to be distributed in the United States and Canada. In spite of the support given this proposal by various Presidents of the United States, as well as the Army engineers, and the exhaustive hearings which were held, it was consistently rejected by the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress. It is easily understandable why those Members of Congress who represent the areas in the Great Lakes region, as well as some Members from the Middle West, feel that their communities would be benefited by such an undertaking, but even their arguments never altered the above-mentioned facts. At the same time, those who live elsewhere in the country find it hard to understand how any project of this kind, which would be usable only about 5 months in the year, would be a proper undertaking by our Government at the expense of the American taxpayer.

As the years have gone by this project has been altered materially and today the power development feature has been entirely separated from it and we find that our growing and prosperous neighbor, the Dominion of Canada, is ready and willing to proceed with the construction of the waterway without our assistance. Under the present circumstances today, it is inevitable that the St. Lawrence seaway will be built by Canada whether we share the expense or not. Because of these various developments the cost of this seaway to the United States has been reduced from hundreds of millions of dollars to something more than a hundred million dollars with the first year's expenditure to be about $10 million. In addition to that, provision has been made for the repayment of such advances through the collection of tolls and there may be a reasonable chance that our Government will be materially reimbursed by such collections. The delay caused by those in opposition to this proposal has produced beneficial results.

There are some features, however, still remaining in this project which may be termed questionable as far as the advantages to the United States are concerned. The first is whether a 27-foot channel will be adequate for American built and operated ships. The testimony before the Committee on Public Works is to the contrary and, therefore, it is evident that if American vessels are to make use of this seaway its depth will eventually have to be increased to at least 30 feet and, of course, such an operation is expensive. Second, if oceangoing vessels with 26-foot draft are to operate in the Great Lakes and in the American harbors therein, a large dredging operation will have to be undertaken to provide for such accommodation. While no detailed estimates are available, nevertheless it has been suggested by competent authority that the cost of such dredging operations in 17 American ports will be well over $100 million. If this project is to be completed which will bring about the necessity for this dredging operation, fair play would dictate that by far the greater part of its cost should be borne by the States and communities benefiting thereby. Such an expense in all justice should not be allocated to the other States of the Union which receive no benefit and, inded, might suffer from the construction of the seaway.

As I have already stated, there is no question but that the seaway will be built by Canada with or without our cooperation, and there is every reason for Canada to build it. Canada's budget is in balance, her taxes have been reduced, she is enjoying a great industrial expansion; and so why should debt-ridden Uncle Sam, laden down with burdensome taxes, undertake any new obligations he does not have to? Furthermore, under the treaty made with Canada in 1909, the interest of the United States is protected including the imposition and collection of tolls whether we participate or not. Under these circumstances it is difficult to understand the decision made by this administration to spend any money of the American taxpayers for this project, even if the expectations are realized that the tolls collected will pay for the whole operation.

In spite of all this, the proposition has been changed materially and, in addition, there may be something in the argument that because of our intimate relations with the Dominion of Canada, because of the years of close cooperation and friendship between the two countries and the desirability that this friendship continue, it is wise for both nations to be jointly committed to a project involving as it does our international boundary. Because of the considered decision of President Eisenhower and his administration to support this undertaking I believe it is desirable that the proposal should be considered by the House and therefore I will vote in favor of reporting this bill out of committee, at the same time reserving entire freedom of action when it is debated in the House.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, January 22, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Glen B. Walter, St. Mark's Episcopal Church, Millsboro, Del., offered the following prayer:

O great and glorious God, infinite in power and pity, majesty and mercy; we thank Thee that our chance to serve this great country with courage and humility has come in a time of crisis and need. Pour out Thy guiding spirit upon us, making us equal to our task. Let the light of Thy love for all mankind be our pathway to noble service. In Thy straight path of righteousness we shall neither stumble nor falter. We praise Thee for our privilege of serving; we humbly accept our responsibility to serve Thee acceptably. May the verdict of history inscribed on the rolls of the centuries say, "Well done." As we ask for Thy guidance, we promise our obedience, in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 3, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me say that yesterday evening I pointed out that on the coming Monday we hope to have a call of the calendar, from the beginning, of bills and other measures to which there is no objection.

In addition, there are a number of measures which, if not passed on the calendar call, I gave notice we would like to have considered. I have already discussed them with the minority leader. For the information of the Senate, I shall state again that those measures are the following: Senate bill 2038, Calendar No. 617, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government; House bill 5861, Calendar No. 856, which is similar to Senate bill 2038; Senate bill 1647, Calendar No. 857, continuing in effect the provisions relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; Senate bill 2772, Calendar No. 877, providing for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates; Senate Resolution 194, Calendar No. 881, for the printing of additional copies of the Senate report on Korean atrocities; House bill 2326, Calendar No. 888, to continue in effect the provisions relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and Senate bill 1184, Calendar No. 923, to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State.

I make that announcement at this time, so that the Senate may be advised in advance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Other than the call of the calendar on Monday and the bills the Senator from California has specifically enumerated, does he anticipate that there will be votes on major legislative items next week?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, it is always difficult to determine what some may term major legislative items. Certainly I think we will not have any votes on proposed legislation of the type of either the Bricker amendment or the Hawaii statehood bill or other legislative measures of that category. I would not wish to limit the activity of the Senate next week merely to unobjected-to measures, because there may be some measures which Members may desire to debate or to ask questions about—such as, for instance, measures similar to the resolution relating to the Committee on Government Operations, with respect to which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] desired to develop some facts, but for which he finally voted.

I would hope we would not be precluded from taking up some measures which might be controversial, but would not be of a major nature.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from California have in mind any measures other than the ones he has enumerated, for consideration?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not, at the time; but if others come to my attention during the day, I shall call them to the attention of the minority leader and other Senators, so that they may be advised of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Am I correct in saying that Senators may understand that, other than the measures enumerated and the calendar and measures which are not considered to be major legislative items, no formal votes will be taken next week?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, except for taking up the Executive Calendar or conference reports which may come to us from the House of Representatives.

I always desire and endeavor to discuss such items in advance with the minority; but I should like to have the legislative program proceeded with, for I say prayerfully and hopefully that it is my desire to have the Senate adjourn by July 31, and I am sure that sentiment is shared by Senators on both sides of the aisle. On the other hand, unless we can keep things moving along expeditiously, we shall not be able to conclude the session by that date.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I apologize to the majority leader, but I wish to be sure that I understand him correctly.

Do I correctly understand that he does not contemplate that any vote will be taken next week on any portion of the Bricker amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Perhaps it is a forlorn hope, but I have been hoping all week that during this week we might reach votes on some of the amendments to the Bricker amendment. Today is Thursday. I am still hopeful that we shall have a chance to vote today on some of the clarifying amendments, and also tomorrow, I hope, and, if necessary, perhaps even on Saturday.

However, I may say to the Senator from Oregon that if the Bricker amendment is not disposed of this week, then I think we shall try to take up some of the less controversial matters during the following week.

Mr. MORSE. That clarifies the point I had in mind. I understand that the majority leader does not expect to have the Senate vote on the Bricker amendment or amendments thereto, next week; but he hopes there may be votes on amendments to the Bricker amendment this week. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is right.

If we can reach a point where we have had at least some votes and some expression of sentiment on the part of the Senate, by action on some of the clarifying amendments, it might be well to let the country and the Senate digest that much during the following week, and then resume the discussion and the debate after that time.

I do not expect to schedule any major measure in the interim, because I would not wish to schedule it and then have to lay it aside.

Mr. MORSE. As I have previously told the majority leader, I shall serve notice on him whenever I intend, if I decide to do so, to move to recommit the Bricker joint resolution. It is my present highly tentative plan not to consider making a motion to recommit until after there is a vote on the amend-

ment of the Senator from Georgia or on some amendment that may be substituted for it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, I assume that what the Senator from Oregon has in mind is that first there would be the votes on the clarifying amendments to the committee amendment, which of course take precedence.

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And that then the votes would come on any further clarifying amendments which might be offered, and then the vote would come on either the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, which is in the nature of a substitute, or on other substitute amendments which might be in order.

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At that point, and before any vote is taken on the question of the passage of the joint resolution in its finally amended form, I assume the Senator from Oregon intends to move to recommit.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. In order to be perfectly specific for the RECORD, let me say it is my present very tentative plan to make a motion to recommit after the Senate has voted on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia or on any other amendment which seeks, in line with the same principle, to be a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Oregon for the information.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the majority leader to say that next week he might call up the Executive Calendar, including the Beeson nomination?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I said I might call up the Executive Calendar. I have not yet heard from the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as to whether that committee has completed its hearings on that nomination. I would not wish to foreclose the possibility of bringing up that nomination tomorrow; it is one of those which might be included.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that if the facts are as I understand them to be—and I make no commitment on that understanding until I hear from the committee—I think it goes without saying that the Beeson nomination will produce rather lengthy debate on the floor of the Senate. So, in my opinion, it would be a mistake to bring up the nomination next week, when so many of our colleagues will be absent, because if that were done I believe it would only serve to prolong the debate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator encourages me, in a way. If there is to be lengthy debate, perhaps the nomination should be considered next week.

Mr. MORSE. I think that would be very unfair to our colleagues, who certainly ought to hear the debate on the nomination, even if they hear no other debate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope that when our colleagues find it necessary to be absent they may follow the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I find that, during the lengthy debate which has taken place this week, because of committee hearings and other public business, Senators are not always able to be present in the Chamber to receive the benefit of the enlightenment which comes from Senate debate. I am not sure that they will be present in any substantial numbers to listen to the debate, but it will be available to them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD through the verbatim reports which our very competent Official Reporters of Debates make. So if the Senator has any idea of a lengthy debate, I should like to discuss the matter with him a little further.

Mr. MORSE. It is not my idea; but judging from the educational seminars which my Democratic friends have already taken me through in connection with the Beeson nomination, I think it would be a great mistake to deny to absent Senators the advantage of hearing the debate which will probably develop over this nomination.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The majority leader expects to be in his seat during all of next week. I shall be prepared to receive any enlightenment which the Senator from Oregon may be prepared to offer.

Mr. MORSE. I expect to be present, because this year I shall not be making any Lincoln Day speeches.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should assume not.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As chairman of the committee, let me say that I have called a meeting of the committee for 10 o'clock tomorrow. It will be necessary for the committee to postpone for a little while hearings on proposed amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. I hope we can dispose of the nomination tomorrow, so far as the committee is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall keep in touch with the chairman of the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

THEODORE J. HARRIS

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Theodore J. Harris (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF STATUS PHASE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES SURVEY

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a copy of the Report of the Status Phase of the School Facilities Survey, conducted by the Office of Education (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing Congress to deed the title to all the area of Fort Logan, except that area now used as a national cemetery, to the State of Colorado, together with all appurtenances thereto

"Whereas the State of Colorado is in urgent need of adequate housing facilities for the aged, infirm, and senile psychotic; and

"Whereas the facilities at the Colorado State Hospital at Pueblo are rapidly becoming incapable of handling increasing admissions; and

"Whereas the State of Colorado faces a financial crisis in apportioning available moneys to cover these necessary State services; and

"Whereas the State of Colorado lacks a proper site for the care, control, and treatment of alcoholics; and

"Whereas the State of Colorado has no adequate hospital facilities for the active study and treatment of psychotic persons committed to the custody of the State for treatment; and

"Whereas the United States of America owns certain lands and improvements located in Arapahoe County, Colo., which was formerly operated as a military installation under the name of Fort Logan; and

"Whereas it appears that the use of Fort Logan by the United States Government as a military installation has practically ceased and that many of the buildings and other improvements thereon are not being used presently for any particular purpose; and

"Whereas Fort Logan has some adequate brick and stone buildings with sun porches and wide expanses of lawn ideally suited for the proper housing and recreation of aged people; and

"Whereas certain buildings on the situs of Fort Logan would be ideal for the housing, care and treatment of alcoholics presently crowding local facilities; and

"Whereas the veterans' housing project located on part of the grounds could be continued as such without interference from the State of Colorado: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the 39th general assembly in 2d regular session convened (the senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact appropriate legislation, in the event the present bill before Congress to transfer title of the said property to the Veterans' Administration does not pass or another agency of Government does not request the property, so as to cause the transfer by deed to the State of Colorado, title to all of the area of Fort Logan, except that area now used as a national cemetery, together with all appurtenances thereto; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATLIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action to lower the high cost of coffee.

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact laws to lower the tariff on the importation of coffee and to take such other action as may be necessary to lower the high cost of coffee; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, and to the Federal Trade Commission."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of increasing benefits under the Federal Social Security Act to a minimum allowance of $100 monthly

"Whereas the rising level of prices indicate that current benefits available under the Federal Social Security Act are insufficient to meet the basic needs of the people; and

"Whereas these inadequacies seriously threaten the comfort and happiness of millions of American citizens, and call for a liberalization of our social security legislation; and

"Whereas this problem of instituting a proper social security program for the American people presents a vital question the answer to which cannot long be postponed: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will provide that the amount of financial aid or assistance furnished to recipients under the provisions of the Federal Social Security Act be increased so that the minimum monthly allowance of each recipient be $100; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the Central Labor Council of Portland, Oreg., protesting against any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Finance.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF CITY OF CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we are all deeply interested in the problems confronting American youth, and have been gratified that the current Senate investigations of juvenile delinquency are making a serious attempt to learn its causes and discover constructive remedies.

Understanding the necessity for private and Government action at all levels, National, State and local, I was especially pleased to learn from my friend, Alderman Alfred J. Cilella, of Chicago, that the city council there has adopted his resolution for the creation of a Chicago Youth Commission.

I think many others will be interested to learn of this serious approach to the problems of delinquency in Chicago. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Chicago City Council, and that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Nation has been shocked and horrified in the past 2 years by a wave of juvenile crime and vandalism of an unprecedented nature; and

Whereas existing methods and means of dealing with juvenile delinquency are apparently inadequate to cope with the problem; and

Whereas juvenile violence has been particularly aggravated in the metropolitan centers of the United States, including the city of Chicago; and

Whereas a new approach is desperately needed to prevent and halt the deterioration and degradation of a large segment of our youth; and

Whereas the problem is one which can be best and most efficiently dealt with at the local level: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Chicago establish a commission to be known as the Chicago Youth Commission, for the purpose of inquiring into the causes and origins of juvenile crime, violence, and vandalism and suggesting measures for their alleviation.

Resolved further, That the said Chicago Youth Commission consist of 3 members of the Council of the City of Chicago, and 8 members chosen from our outstanding businessmen, professional men, religious leaders, educators, civic leaders and sponsors of youth activities.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HENDRICKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 2689. A bill to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio (Rept. No. 930);

H. R. 2842. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii (Rept. No. 931);

H. R. 5632. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Camp Butner Military Reservation, N. C., to the State of North Carolina (Rept. No. 932); and

H. R. 6025. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H. (Rept. No. 933).

By Mr. HENDRICKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 489. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut (Rept. No. 934); and

S. 1827. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the State of Washington (Rept. No. 935).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 4, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 373) to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2892. A bill for the relief of Metamorfe Haita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2893. A bill for the relief of Seraphina Papgeorgiou;

S. 2894. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Azniv Y. Hasserdjian;

S. 2895. A bill for the relief of Brede Syver Klefos; and

S. 2896. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen M. Sargent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2897. A bill to extend the term of patent No. 2,118,558 for 5 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 2898. A bill to provide home rule for the Assiniboine-Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; and

S. 2899. A bill to establish the Fort Peck Indian Lands Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2900. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Harding Lake Camp, Inc., of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use as a youth camp and related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2901. A bill to provide for a study of the mental and physical consequences of malnutrition and starvation suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees during World War II and the hostilities in Korea; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution designating the third week in June of each year as National Amateur Radio Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MALNUTRITION OF PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a study of the mental and physical consequences of malnutrition and starvation suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees during World War II and the hostilities in Korea. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a brief statement by me describing the purposes of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2901) to provide for a study of the mental and physical consequences of malnutrition and starvation suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees during World War II and the hostilities in Korea, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor

and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the War Claims Commission, in cooperation with, and with the assistance of, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is hereby authorized and directed, within the limit of funds appropriated pursuant to the authority of this act, to make all necessary arrangements for the conduct of medical and scientific research activities to determine the mortality rates and the mental and physical consequences of malnutrition and imprisonment sustained by members of the Armed Forces of the United States and civilian American citizens who were imprisoned by enemies of the United States during World War II or by forces with which the United States has been engaged in armed conflict after June 25, 1950. The War Claims Commission shall report the results of the research activities conducted pursuant to this act to the President for transmittal to the Congress. The results of such research activities shall, to the extent practicable, be used by the War Claims Commission, the Veterans' Administration, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the purpose of determining—

(1) the procedures and standards to be applied in the diagnosis of the mental and physical condition of former prisoners of war;

(2) the life expectancy of former prisoners of war;

(3) whether there is evidence to sustain a conclusive presumption of service connection in favor of former prisoners of war for purposes of hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities; and

(4) standards to be applied for the evaluation of claims of American civilian and military personnel based upon the physical and mental consequences of the conditions of their imprisonment, in the event such claims are later made compensable.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The statement presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS ON INTRODUCTION OF BILL FOR STUDY OF MALNUTRITION OF PRISONERS OF WAR

I am again introducing the bill to provide for a study of the consequences of malnutrition and starvation suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees during World War II. It authorizes and directs the War Claims Commission, in cooperation with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to make arrangements for this study.

The bill is in substantially the same form as S. 513, which was approved by the Senate in the 82d Congress, though later held up on a motion to reconsider. A similar companion bill had also passed the House.

There is one significant change in this new bill. It adds to the scope of the study those prisoners of war and civilian internees imprisoned by enemies of the United States during the Korean hostilities.

The memories of the atrocities committed and the suffering inflicted on American prisoners recently released by their foes in Korea are too vivid to require recounting. Malnutrition and starvation appear to have been an accepted form of torture. A study of the physical and mental consequences of this treatment, as of the earlier imprisonment of Americans by the Japanese, is clearly essential to any plan to make just and wise provision for those who went through these crushing experiences.

Another technical change in this new bill is to substitute the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Federal Security Administrator, named in S. 513.

More specifically, the purpose of such an inquiry, as stated in the bill, would be to determine the proper standards to be applied to the diagnosis of the mental and physical after-effects of prolonged abuse of health and its resultant influence on life expectancy. A further objective would be the determination of whether there is evidence to sustain a conclusive presumption of service-connection in favor of prisoners of war for purposes of veterans' hospitalization. Moreover, in the event additional claims of American civilian and military personnel are recognized, the results of the study would serve as a criterion in determining the extent of such claims.

The spadework for this inquiry was initiated by the War Claims Commission as a result of the directive in section 8 of the War Claims Act of 1948. By the enactment of the War Claims Act of 1948, we sought to ameliorate some of the more critical suffering arising from the last war. The Congress, however, recognized the fact that this act solved only a part of the problems, and directed the War Claims Commission to make a comprehensive study and evaluation of the residual inequities of war and to report its findings and recommendations.

The War Claims Commission's report of 1950 disclosed that many former prisoners of war, both military and civilian, assert emotional and physical disability which may be ascribed to the malnutrition and other hardships of their imprisonment by the enemy—afflictions which gain little recognition due to the lack of knowledge on the peculiar problem. According to information furnished to the Commission, it is the almost unanimous view of physicians and medical specialists on nutrition that the disabling aftereffects of imprisonment are almost universally found among former prisoners of war, and that medical science is presently unprepared to cope with the problems presented.

Several years ago there was conducted at the University of Minnesota a conference on the residues of nutritional insult. The internationally recognized experts on nutrition who participated in that conference gave serious consideration, among other things, to the related problems of former war prisoners. On the basis of the discussion conducted and the finding of the conferees, recommendations were drafted concerning necessary future steps to be undertaken in the field of nutritional insult. In this regard, it should be noted that among the tentative recommendations of the conference was one calling for a study of the type provided for in this bill.

Utilizing existing research facilities, the Commission originally hoped to be able to conclude such a study in about a year. If the bill is acted upon promptly, this should permit completion prior to the ending of the Commission's work on March 31, 1955. If the Commission should be given further responsibility and time to administer benefit programs for returned Korean prisoners, as provided in some pending legislation, however, it would have additional time also for this study.

I am very glad to note that Congressman JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania, has advised me that he intends to introduce a companion bill in the House.

FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS IN POLAND

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas, pursuant to the agreement entered into at the Yalta conference, the Polish Provisional Government was pledged to the prompt holding of free and unfettered elections on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot; and

Whereas the Polish Government has refused to discharge its obligations under such pledge, although it has been repeatedly reminded of such obligations by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain; and

Whereas the Soviet Government has consistently refused to support or participate in any action designed to bring about compliance by the Polish Government with its pledge; and

Whereas until such pledge is fulfilled, harmonious relations between the Governments of Russia and Poland and the free nations of the world will continue to be jeopardized; and

Whereas action by the Soviet Government to bring about fulfillment of such pledge would do much to restore the confidence of the free nations in the sincerity of the expressions of such government with respect to her peace aims and in her faithfulness in keeping international agreements: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (1) it is the sense of the Congress that free and fair elections should immediately be held in Poland in accordance with agreements made pursuant to the Yalta conference.

(2) The President is requested to communicate this resolution to the United States representative to the United Nations with a request that the substance thereof be brought before the General Assembly of the United Nations for appropriate action.

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTIES IN SOVIET SATELLITE COUNTRIES

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas one of the purposes of the United Nations is the promotion of universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms; and

Whereas the Government of Russia has subscribed to this purpose as a member of the United Nations; and

Whereas the Government of Russia has refused to permit the recognition of civil and religious liberties in its satellite countries: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) it is the sense of the Congress that the United Nations should take such action as it deems appropriate to bring about a recognition, in Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and all other countries under the domination of the Soviet Government, of civil and religious liberties, including (1) rights of persons accused of crime (A) to be admitted to reasonable bail, (B) not to be prosecuted for capital or otherwise infamous crimes except upon presentment or indictment of a grand jury, (C) to a public trial before an impartial jury, (D) to have the assistance of counsel and to produce witnesses and evidence in their defense, and (E) to cross-examine witnesses against them, (2) the right of members of the press of other countries to attend and report the trials of such persons, (3) freedom of worship by all peoples, (4) freedom of every church and creed to maintain its own place of worship and conduct its own affairs free from governmental interference, and (5) freedom of the priests and other ministers of such churches and creeds from unwarranted arrest or molestation under governmental authority.

(b) The President is requested to communicate this resolution to the United States representative to the United Nations with the request that the substance thereof be

brought before the General Assembly of the United Nations for appropriate action.

(c) The President is requested to instruct the Secretary of State (1) to lay the substance of this resolution before the conference now taking place in Berlin, and (2) to urge the representative of the Russian Government at such conference to recommend to his Government the taking of steps necessary to bring about the recognition of the civil and religious liberties referred to in this resolution, including the withdrawal of troops and secret police forces from those nations.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON SAVINGS AND LOAN BRANCHES

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Banking of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that public hearings will begin at 10 a. m., on Tuesday, February 16, 1954, in room 301, Senate Office Building, on the bill (S. 975) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended.

Anyone wishing to appear as a witness should contact immediately Mr. Ira Dixon, clerk of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 2647, THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1954

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement in regard to a hearing before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This announcement is in accordance with action by the committee.

I desire to give public notice that, pursuant to action taken by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at its meeting on February 3, 1954, the first of public hearings on S. 2647, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1954, will be held at 10 a. m., on March 1. Representatives of interested organizations or other persons desiring to testify should communicate their request to the committee clerk at once.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be the representative on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

George Holmes Roderick, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF PHILIP K. CROWE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nomination of Philip K. Crowe, of Maryland, Ambassador to Ceylon, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the Representative of the United States of America to the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947. I give notice that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired.

PLAN TO DISPOSE OF SURPLUS FOODS TO NEEDY UNITED STATES CITIZENS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on February 3 I addressed letters to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, urging immediate action on a surplus-food disposal plan and asking their cooperation in drafting a sound, humane, morally desirable and administratively practical program to put Government-held food stocks on the tables of elderly and unemployed United States citizens who cannot afford an adequate diet. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1954.

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been made abundantly clear that one of the primary concerns of the administration is to find ways to dispose of the rapidly mounting accumulation of agricultural surpluses, especially foods, that are under governmental control, and perishable or subject to deterioration. I share that concern fully and over the years have devoted considerable effort to expanding farm markets at home and abroad in such ways as increased industrial utilization of farm products, such as alcohol from grain, and improved methods of distribution to reduce price spreads and stimulate consumption, relief shipments abroad, etc.

In his recent state of the Union message the President announced the intention to seek greater foreign markets, and at your recent appearances before the Senate Agriculture Committee you disclosed plans to dispose of some billion-and-a-half dollars' worth of farm surpluses to other nations. This is a most praiseworthy objective, and has my full support, but it will be most difficult to attain in any early future.

I do not believe that in our efforts to dispose of surpluses abroad we should ignore the very great possibilities of reducing accumulated food stocks by a system of disposal to our own citizens, many millions of whom simply cannot afford to enjoy an adequate diet. Increasing unemployment means that a growing number of workmen's families will lack proper nutrition. The woefully inadequate stipend which millions of our older people receive from pensions and similar payments, makes it impossible for them to obtain the necessary strength-sustaining foods. Most important of all, I am a firm believer in the ancient rule: charity begins at home.

As of November 27 last year, it was announced that the Commodity Credit Corporation had in its custody 250 million pounds of butter, 260 million pounds of cheese, 426 million pounds of nonfat dried milk, plus lesser amounts of fat milk, as well as large quantities of canned beef and other readily consumable foodstuffs. Since that time surpluses have been growing ever greater, while we find little or no prospect of disposing of them through the regular channels of commerce.

My purpose in writing you at this time is to initiate discussion of the basic thought behind a proposal suggested to me by one of my constituents and to request the cooperation of your Department in drafting legislation to implement the proposal, if it should appear worthy of implementation.

Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter addressed to me some days ago by an Iowa dairyman, Mr. C. J. O'Neil, of the O'Neil Dairy Co., of Ames, which makes the suggestion that surpluses of dairy products, such as butter, milk, and cheese be distributed through a food-stamp system to the recipients of old-age and unemployment insurance payments.

I believe the basic idea suggested by Mr. O'Neil is practicable, and that it can be made to work through the corner grocery store without dislocating normal trade or competing unfairly with products in normal business channels. I feel sure, furthermore, that the principle he advocates can be extended to include eggs, canned beef-in-gravy, and all other directly consumable farm surpluses now controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation. While the particular method he suggests, namely amendment of the Social Security Act to provide that "any portion or all of any old-age security check could be exchanged for twice its dollar value in food stamps for purchasing such foods as are in surplus," may on analysis not prove to be the best approach and may well appear too ambitious, nevertheless the fundamentals of the proposal are sound, highly commendable, and worthy of the careful consideration of all concerned with the problem.

The concept of food-stamp plans, of course, is not a new one. There have been frequent references to the need for some such arrangement emanating from many sources in recent months. Certain of my colleagues have already taken steps in the formulation of plans to bring about the desired result. Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, have pending before the Agriculture Committee a bill to institute a food-stamp plan, and Senator HUMPHREY has frequently brought to the attention of the Senate his dairy diet dividend plan. But to my knowledge no specific, concrete food-stamp proposal has yet been submitted by the administration for the consideration of Congress. In writing you, I seek to stimulate immediate action in that direction.

Because this is a highly complicated and technical matter, I do not wish to attempt drafting legislation without the advice, counsel, assistance, and cooperation of the experts of the Department of Agriculture and other interested Government and private agencies. I am writing in similar vein to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under whose jurisdiction falls the administration of social-security laws, and to the Secretary of Labor.

Among the many questions which arise is whether any new legislation is really needed to carry out the general proposition that persons receiving old-age pension and unemployment benefits be afforded the opportunity to obtain a more nutritious diet by means of a system of distribution of the surplus of perishable and directly consumable food stocks.

Of course, I have in mind that the Agricultural Act of 1949 provides for disposal of surplus foods "found to be in danger of loss through deterioration or spoilage before they can be disposed of in normal domestic channels." It further provides that these foods "may be made available by the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation at the point of storage at no cost, save handling and transportation costs incurred in making delivery from the point of storage, as follows in the order of priority set forth: First, to school-lunch programs; and to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Federal, State, and local public-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons; second, to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States; third, to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States."

Under the general proposal which I am transmitting to you, surplus foods would be disposed of to the following additional groups of people through a food-stamp plan or other similar arrangement: recipients of old-age-assistance checks from State agencies, recipients of unemployment-compensation payments from State agencies, and, thirdly, recipients of social-security old-age-insurance payments.

I wish to stress that at this point I am less concerned with any particular method for placing these surpluses on the tables of those of our citizens who need them than I am with getting action. I have no preconceived notions of how to proceed. What I seek is a way to bring the needs of millions of our people, on one hand, and the accumulated surplus food stocks, on the other, into a relationship by which both problems can be mitigated and at least partially solved.

I therefore request that you assign one or more qualified staff experts from your Department to work with me and my staff, with the experts whom I am requesting Secretary Hobby to appoint, and with representatives of interested private organizations, in a concerted cooperative effort to draft such legislation as may be required to bring about the desired results. I am also making the same request of the Secretary of Labor.

To secure congressional approval of any legislation of this scope during the present crowded session will require introduction of a bill in the very near future.

The present sight of mountains of edible and nutritious foods going to waste in the face of the want and need of millions of undernourished and improverished people is abhorrent to every American. In addition, the rapidly accumulating surpluses hang like a Damocles sword over our markets and threaten the stability of our great agricultural industry.

May I close with the hope that the broad, objective outlined in this letter meets with your sympathetic consideration, and that the collaboration of the interested executive, legislative, and private agencies will be fruitful and result in a sound, humane, morally desirable and administratively practical program?

With kind regards,

Respectfully,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

STATUS OF ALASKA STATEHOOD BILL

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraksa. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement to the Senate regarding the action taken this morning by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, so that all Members of the Senate will be advised as to the status of the Alaska statehood bill.

Last week the committee had decided that in order to reach a definite decision on this matter we would schedule a vote on reporting the bill on today, February 4. That vote was taken this morning, and the committee voted to report the Alaska statehood bill favorably, with certain amendments which the subcommittee was directed to draft. The bill, therefore, will not be presented in final form for a few days until the proposed amendments have been put in proper form.

The vote was 14 to 1 for reporting, with, however, a number of the members reserving the right to oppose the bill on the floor.

I thought this announcement might be of interest to the Senate, so that Senators may know of the progress we are making. I anticipate that within a comparatively few days we shall have a vastly improved Alaska statehood bill for the consideration of the Senate.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—OPPOSITION OF THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a letter which I have received from Mr. Wallace J. Campbell, director of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, expressing the opposition of that fine organization to the dangerous Bricker amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U. S. A.,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We just wanted you to know that the cooperative league at its annual meeting in Chicago last week voted to support the President in opposition to the Bricker amendment. As you know, the league represents about 2 million farm and city families who are members of consumer, purchasing, and service cooperatives.

Our people feel very strongly that in these crucial times we should not cripple the Executive in negotiations with other countries, and while some changes may be needed, none should be made precipitately at this time.

Sincerely yours,

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE,
WALLACE J. CAMPBELL.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—LETTER FROM AUDUBON SOCIETY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a great deal has been made of the Missouri against Holland decision in connection with the debate on the Bricker amendment. What is not realized by some folks apparently is that if this decision were to be upset by the so-called which clause, it would in its essence strike a harmful blow against the very backbone of international efforts in the field of conservation of wildlife, in addition to a thousand and one other harms it would inflict.

I send now to the desk the text of a letter sent to me by the President of the National Audubon Society, enclosing a telegram which that renowned organization sent to President Eisenhower opposing the Bricker amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that these messages be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY,
New York, February 2, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed please find a copy of the telegram which was sent to President Eisenhower last week immediately after the meeting of the board of directors of this society.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. BAKER,
President.

JANUARY 28, 1954.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

At today's meeting of the Board of Directors of the National Audubon Society it was unanimously voted that you be advised of the society's full support of your opposition to the Bricker amendment to the Constitution as proposed and that you be urged to stand fast against any compromise or weakening of the existing treatymaking power of the executive against the legislative arm of the Federal Government and against any action granting, in effect, veto power on treaties to any State. To the society it seems of utmost importance that the validity of the decision in Missouri against Holland be sustained.

JOHN H. BAKER,
President, National Audubon Society.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—PHILADELPHIA RADIO DISCUSSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have read with extreme interest the text of a radio panel discussion involving the Bricker amendment recently broadcast from a Philadelphia station. The text was forwarded to me by Mr. Raymond Pitcairn, and I believe that it is an important contribution to public thinking on this issue.

I send to the desk the text of the program, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PANEL DISCUSSION OF BRICKER AMENDMENT
(RAYMOND PITCAIRN AND OTHERS)

ANNOUNCER. Public discussion is growing throughout the country over the Bricker amendment, as another historic debate is in the making. The issue now comes before the Senate of the United States. Belatedly, the average man and woman is becoming increasingly interested in what the Bricker amendment is, and what effect it will have on the lives of all of us. In the true American tradition, issues of this kind can best be made clear through public debate and public discussion. We have with us tonight, Mr. Raymond Pitcairn, prominent Philadelphia lawyer and longtime student of constitutional government, who is deeply concerned in the question. In hometown fashion, he explains the issue and discusses it with a group of his friends and neighbors. Their discussion and views on the subject

may help you, our listeners, better to understand the Bricker amendment. Mr. Pitcairn.

Mr. PITCAIRN. I appreciate this opportunity to discuss what I believe is an issue of greater importance to the future of this country than most people yet realize. Some of my neighbors have come here with me tonight to talk about this problem. First let me introduce Dr. William Whitehead, professor of political science in our Bryn Athyn College. Dr. Whitehead.

Dr. WHITEHEAD. Thank you, Mr. Pitcairn. I have been impressed by what certainly is an organized hysteria behind this Bricker proposal. For example, the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., claims to have some 75 nationwide organizations already lined up behind the amendment, ranging all the way from the American Legion to the American Council of Christian Churches. This propaganda is high-pressuring the public to get them to stampede the Senate. The type of adroit, misleading arguments being used makes me feel the public has a right to the actual facts. Won't you then, Mr. Pitcairn, tell us in a plain, direct way, just what the Bricker amendment means?

Mr. PITCAIRN. The public certainly needs more information. Senator BRICKER'S amendment provides that after the President negotiates and signs a treaty, and after the Senate ratifies it by a two-thirds vote, Congress must pass a law by a majority vote of each House in order to make the treaty effective. And where treaties deal with matters affecting State law, such as reciprocal rights to own property and to carry on business here and abroad, the treaty would also have to be passed by both legislative houses of each of the 48 States and be approved by the 48 governors. And what is unbelievable, the legislative vote of one State would veto and thwart the will and block the action of all the other States and of the United States Government itself. All this would consume precious time which could have tragic consequences.

Dr. WHITEHEAD. Thank you Mr. Pitcairn. I think that's a clear, concise statement on what the Bricker amendment really is. But our friend, Sig Synnestvedt, professor of history in our local college, has a question. Mr. Synnestvedt.

Mr. SYNNESTVEDT. Mr. Pitcairn, would the Bricker amendment strengthen the Constitution or damage it?

Mr. PITCAIRN. It would most seriously damage it. It would drastically restrict and curtail the power of both the President and the Senate in dealing with foreign affairs—a power much needed in the past, more needed today, and which wil be needed always by future Presidents and Senates. Today we are fortunate in having a President who is a proven expert in dealing with representatives of foreign nations. Yet the backers of the Bricker amendment would shackle and bind the President's hands in his conduct of international affairs. It would strip him of the necessary authority which every President has exercised since the establishment of our Republic.

Dr. WHITEHEAD. Then, Mr. Pitcairn, how did it happen that the Bricker amendment has gained so much support?

Mr. PITCAIRN. The Bricker amendment when first proposed seemed reasonable to many, including a large number of Senators, who did not realize its implications and practical effects. But as it was examined by experts on constitutional law, its dangerous fallacies were detected, and today it is almost unanimously denounced by competent authorities on constitutional law everywhere. Senator BUSH, of Connecticut, one of the original cosponsors of the amendment, was the first Senator openly to break away from the support of the amendment; and others are now following.

Mr. SYNNESTVEDT. But why at the outset did so many Senators indicate their support of the Bricker amendment?

Mr. PITCAIRN. I believe they were caught off guard. One reason was because of a fear that the Executive power might be used some day to land us into another Yalta. But, as the New York Times leading editorial, last Sunday, remarked: "Serious mistakes can be made in executive agreements, as did happen at Yalta. But the Bricker amendment does not protect us against these dangers. If the President and two-thirds of the Senate can make a serious mistake, so can the President plus both Houses of Congress." Moreover, since Yalta Congress has passed legislation requiring publication of all executive agreements.

Dr. WHITEHEAD. That is a plain statement of the fallacy of the Bricker amendment. Mr. Pitcairn, Miss Creda Glenn wants to ask a question. She is, as you know, deeply interested, like many other American women, in questions which affect the whole family. Miss Glenn.

Miss GLENN. Certainly it is as impossible to make a man wise by law as it is to make him good by law. Do I gather then, Mr. Pitcairn, that you believe the Bricker amendment would greatly weaken the power of this country in the handling of international affairs?

Mr. PITCAIRN. Most certainly it would. In fact, it would go even further. It would paralyze our foreign policy. Many commentators agree that the Bricker amendment, in effect, is not so much a plan to prevent the making of bad treaties or dangerous executive agreements at all. It is a plan to make it impracticable to make any treaties. We hope the Senators who have been supporting Mr. BRICKER will realize this fact before it is too late.

Mr. SYNNESTVEDT. Mr. Pitcairn, may I break in to make another point?

Mr. PITCAIRN. Yes, Mr. Synnestvedt.

Mr. SYNNESTVEDT. These advocates of the amendment are really trying to prevent the United States from playing its needed part in world affairs. The effect of the Bricker amendment would be to hopelessly divide power over the conduct of foreign affairs. And it would certainly confuse every nation that does business with us. As a student of American history, I would say it will bring back much of the impotence and confusion which prevailed prior to the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

Miss GLENN. Mr. Pitcairn, what does the President himself think of this amendment?

Mr. PITCAIRN. President Eisenhower has thrown his entire weight against it. In his recent letter to the Senate he said: "I am unalterably opposed to the Bricker amendment. It would so restrict the conduct of foreign affairs that our country could not negotiate the agreements necessary for the handling of our business with the rest of the world. Such an amendment would make it impossible for us to deal effectively with friendly nations for our mutual defense and common interests." Continuing, the President's letter says, "These matters are fundamental. We cannot hope to achieve and maintain peace if we shackle the Federal Government so that it is no longer sovereign in foreign affairs. The President must not be deprived of his historic position as the spokesman for the Nation in its relations with other countries." The President warns that the Bricker amendment, and I quote: "Would be notice to our friends as well as our enemies abroad that our country intends to withdraw from its leadership in world affairs. The inevitable reaction would be of major proportion. It would impair our hopes and plans for peace and for the successful achievement of the important international matters now under discussion. This would include the diversion of atomic energy from warlike to peaceful purposes." And as you may recall, at a recent press conference, the President pointed out that each one of the States under the Articles of Confederation had a right to repudiate a treaty, and because of this fact the Founding Fathers had provided that a treaty properly ratified should take precedence over any State law.

The President further indicated that the Bricker amendment would take us back to the general system which prevailed before the Constitution was adopted. He said he most certainly could not agree to such a proposal.

Dr. WHITEHEAD. A lot of people are fearful about the amount of power given to a President. However, are the President's traditional powers really necessary?

Mr. PITCAIRN. The answer to that is simple. If it was important to give the President sufficient power in international affairs in the horse-and-buggy days of 1787—when we were an infant Nation—how far more vital is it now in the day of the jet plane and the atom bomb. In the First and Second World Wars, time was on our side, but—just as the oceans that once protected us have shrunk—we have lost the advantage of time.

Miss GLENN. Some people have expressed to me their fear that treaties and agreements made by the President would grant powers that affect our individual rights to other nations or to the United Nations. Are we sufficiently protected?

Mr. PITCAIRN. The answer is that the Constitution already provides adequate protection against unwise treaties. First, to become effective, the Senate must ratify every treaty by a two-thirds vote. Second, a treaty or agreement cannot override the Constitution itself. Third, Congress can at any time, by simple legislation, nullify and override any treaty after it has been adopted. These existing provisions are ample safeguards. I am glad you brought up that point, Miss Glenn, because I particularly want to refute the propaganda that treaties can override the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. This simply is not true.

Dr. WHITEHEAD. In other words, Mr. Pitcairn, Senator BRICKER is trying to scare people with the idea that treaties can take away individual rights or States rights; and in this he is misrepresenting the issue. For example, Senator BRICKER recently charged that "reactionary one-worlders" are trying to vest legislative powers in * * * nonelected representatives of the United Nations Socialist-Communist majority." Now is that a fact?

Mr. PITCAIRN. Absolutely no. Senator BRICKER'S statement itself is reactionary and is designed to cripple our relations with and undermine our confidence in the United Nations. He knows, as you know, that no United Nations treaty could supersede the United States Constitution. Under the guise of protecting individual rights, Senator BRICKER would have us turn around and go down the road to isolationism.

Dean KLEIN. How does the Constitution afford sufficient protection against unwise treaties, even United Nations treaties?

Mr. PITCAIRN. Under article VI, section 2, of the Constitution, a treaty is a legislative act just as much subject to the Constitution and to repeal or amendment as any other legislative act. The Supreme Court has so decided several times.

ANNOUNCER. Mr. Pitcairn, before we end this broadcast, will you tell us why you think that the Bricker amendment is so dangerous a move at this time?

Mr. PITCAIRN. It is a dangerous step because, for the sake of America and the whole free world, our President must be able to act quickly and decisively. It is not a question of giving him unlimited power; but leaving him enough power to enable him to do his

job. Today the world looks anxiously to us for powerful and prompt leadership. In foreign affairs we must act as one Nation—not 48 separate nations. We must not, out of a spirit of needless fear and distrust, strip the Presidential office of its time-honored constitutional authority to deal with foreign nations. To sum up, the Bricker amendment is born of unjustified fear that our President or some future President may sell our Government down the river; that the United States Senate cannot be trusted to guard the Nation against unwise treaties; and that the United States Supreme Court will reverse the law which it has established and decide that the President's treaty power can override the Constitution through which alone he derives his power. Finally, as Senator BUSH has said, in a speech at New Haven, the Bricker amendment "would hamstring this great Nation in a time of world crisis, when we must be able to move swiftly and resolutely."

Therefore, I urge everyone of you interested in the safety of this country to move swiftly and resolutely now, by writing or wiring to your Senators asking them to defeat the Bricker amendment.

ANNOUNCER. You have just heard a program sponsored by Raymond Pitcairn and his friends on the issues of the Bricker amendment.

FLEXIBLE FARM PRICE SUPPORTS—COMMENTS BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I was invited by the North American Newspaper Alliance to present comment on the issue of our future farm program. Certain questions were put to me, and in response, I prepared a detailed statement. That statement is being printed in leading newspapers throughout the Nation today.

I send to the desk the text of my comments, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY INSISTS ON 90 PERCENT "PLUS" FARM PRICE SUPPORT

I shall speak for, vote for, and fight for dairy price supports at or above 90 percent of parity.

I believe that it could lead to catastrophe to follow any proposed flexible-parity program which would permit dairy prices to sink still further.

It could set off a chain reaction of economic disaster for America. Every major United States depression in the past has had its inception in a recession in agriculture which quickly spread throughout the rest of the economy.

Were a farm recession to deepen, the consequences could be extremely harmful to the Republican Party and the Republican administration. But wholly aside from any political consideration, the health of farming, particularly family size farming, is especially important today in view of our worldwide responsibilities.

As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I believe that it would be wrong for me to be engaged in two inconsistent objectives abroad and at home:

1. To strive, as I will, for continued sound American military and economic aid to the free countries of the world; while at the same time,

2. even to consider voting for a program which would depress farm prices still further. Such skidding prices would endanger America's prosperity—on which the whole free world depends.

If we have billions to contribute abroad for our defense, we should devote a few hundred millions to sustain the welfare of the crucial farm segment of our population. Not only charity, but the exercise of enlightened self-interest should begin at home. Aid against international communism has never constituted charity, nor has parity aid for American farming.

Actually the farm program has not cost a fraction of what the foreign-aid program has cost. Moreover, it is not a question of one program or the other; it is a matter of both programs being carried out.

I fully respect the concern of the administration over the headache of mounting farm surpluses. I believe, however, that we are not lacking in sufficient ingenuity and intelligence to find constructive and immediate answers to the farm surplus problem—without putting the farmer through the economic wringer.

It may be easy enough for some city people to say, "Drop the floor on farm prices from 90 to 75 percent." What those persons may not realize is that as the floor is pulled from under the farmer and his income nosedives by 15 percent, he is going to hit the lower income floor with terrible impact. The shock of his fall would be felt throughout the American economy.

Already, the decline in farm prices has been felt in the farm-machinery industry, and in every other industry directly dependent upon rural purchases. The number of farms which are up for auction today are reflected immediately in the number of business failures in villages and towns, in unemployment and underemployment of labor and in other economic dislocation radiating throughout America.

With particular reference to dairying, I look for a solution to the farm-surplus problem through such means as—

(a) Increased consumption by Americans of dairy products—for their own health and well-being.

(b) Increased research designed to find new chemical byproducts for milk.

(c) Sound distribution of surpluses through the school-lunch program and through aid to underprivileged groups in our own population.

(d) Distribution of surpluses through CARE and other established overseas channels, without depressing world dairy prices.

Regardless of how strongly the administration may feel on the parity issue, I do not believe that the 83d Congress will permit the dairymen to suffer still further and that it will permit dairy parity to be lowered.

I do not take this position simply as the senior Senator from Wisconsin—the leading dairy State of the Nation. I take it in the interest of America as a whole, in the interest of dairying as a whole.

Dairying is the single greatest source of cash farm income. Dairying is crucial to the health of American soil. If we can maintain high price support of tobacco, for example, which contributes little or nothing to the soil or to men's health, we can support dairying, which builds bodies, just as it enriches the soil. Dairying is not simply one kind of farming; it is a way of life in itself—constructive and wholesome.

What I have to say about dairying, however, applies to other phases of American farming.

If the American farmer's income drops further, he cannot possibly pay his State and local taxes for school, highway, and other purposes; nor can he pay his Federal taxes at the level which he has been paying.

Upon the continued inflow of that tax revenue depends Uncle Sam's ability to fulfill his international commitments. In a very real sense, therefore, the American farmer is carrying on his back the European farmer, and the South American farmer, and the free world's city dwellers as well.

Our farmers cannot share that world-wide burden unless they are assured their cost of production, plus a reasonable profit.

The parity formula is obsolete to begin with, and does not adequately reflect mounting costs of farm labor, feed, and machinery. To compound the farmer's troubles and to lower the parity level is to risk economic disaster.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM FOR AMERICAN PERSONNEL IN SPAIN

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, recently the question has been raised as to whether there will be religious freedom for American personnel in Spain in connection with development of new bases there.

The fear was expressed that American personnel in Spain might be restricted on their exercise of religious freedom by Spanish regulations imposed through our agreements with that country.

When this matter was brought to my attention I immediately wrote to the Secretary of State for a statement in the matter.

Under date of January 25, 1954, Assistant Secretary Thruston B. Morton answered and I am glad to report that there will be no such restriction. Here is the nub of the reply:

There is nothing in the agreements which contravenes the right of American military personnel in Spain to worship freely, a principle which the United States Government defends everywhere. In those military areas where United States military authorities will have primary jurisdiction, American soldiers will have the same facilities for worship which they enjoy at other United States installations abroad. While visiting in other parts of Spain, American military personnel will have the same opportunities and privileges for religious worship as are granted to their fellow citizens who may be tourists or residents in the country. There are approximately 170 Protestant chapels in Spain.

THE PRICE OF COFFEE—SUGGESTED SUBSTITUTE

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, along with many other Americans, the junior Senator from Delaware has noted the increase in the price of coffee to the consuming public. In these days, when the cost of living is already very high and with layoffs occurring in some industries, it is unfortunate that housewives are confronted with a situation which makes their job of balancing the family budget all the more difficult.

I have just been appointed to a subcommittee which will investigate the coffee situation; I look forward to that assignment with much anticipation and in the hope that it will bring favorable results to the consumer.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, while coffee prices remain high, we are at the same time faced with a large surplus of dairy products produced here in the United States. I am not acquainted with the total quantity of coffee consumed in the United States, but it is certainly extensive even with the currently inflated

prices. It seems to me that the people of this Nation might successfully take steps to lessen the impact of high coffee prices and at the same time help to reduce our surplus dairy products. This could be done by substituting milk at 1 or perhaps 2 meals where coffee is now used. Unquestionably, at today's prices, milk is cheaper than coffee. In addition it is certainly far more nourishing, rich, and satisfying. American milk producers have brought their product to the highest peak of perfection through constant improvements in their methods of handling and distribution. I may add that our excellent standards of milk production have been very expensive for the American farmer.

I have no desire to handicap those countries which produce coffee. But in terms of dollars and cents, I know that American housewives, by substituting milk for coffee at 1 or perhaps 2 of their family meals, will effect a monetary saving to themselves, and will assist in alleviating the problem of the farm surpluses—both of which are of fundamental importance to all of us here in the United States.

THE WETBACK PROBLEM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, following the deep concern I have expressed from time to time in the Senate over the invasion of our southern border by millions of illegal entrants or wetbacks, I addressed an inquiry about the matter to the Attorney General of the United States on last June 15.

I was greatly pleased in August and September to read newspaper reports that the Attorney General shared this concern and was planning action or recommendations to relieve the situation.

On November 20, 1953, the Department of Justice replied to my earlier letter, and furnished convincing evidence of the startling dimensions of this illegal invasion by over 4 million persons, of the consequent danger to our internal security, and of the resulting serious injury to citizens of this country who are displaced from their jobs.

Now the negotiations with Mexico for legal immigration of farm labor have broken down, and no outlines of a remedial program by our Government have yet been revealed. It seems to me essential, therefore, to note again the seriousness of the problem, as revealed in my exchange of correspondence with the Department of Justice; the inadequacy of the announced objectives of our Government in its dealings with Mexico; and the main points of an immediate program to deal with this situation. I have done this in a further letter dated January 21, 1954, to the Attorney General.

For the information of Members, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letters of June 15, 1953, and January 21, 1954, to the Attorney General; and the response, dated November 20, 1953, from the Assistant Attorney General, J. Lee Rankin. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent article on Migratory Workers, written by the outstandingly able Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio, and published in the January 15, 1954, issue of Commonweal.

There being no objection, the correspondence and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER FROM SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL HERBERT BROWNELL

JUNE 15, 1953.

Hon. HERBERT BROWNELL,
Attorney General of the United States,
United States Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: As you well know, our country has a most serious immigration problem with respect to illegal entry over the southern border. My legislative record reflects a continuing concern for several years with this illegal traffic which, rather than diminishing, increases with staggering momentum each year. Illegal entries over the southern border have reportedly risen over 6,000 percent during this last decade. Voluntary departures of these entrants so far this year indicate that 1953 will set a new record above last year's mark of three-quarters of a million persons.

I don't need to remind you of the problems posed by this wholesale illegal immigration: Wages and working conditions of American workers are severely depressed; Mexican workers are exploited; American citizens are made displaced persons in their own land; death and disease rates run fantastically high in areas of greatest concentration; illiteracy is widespread in such areas; racial discrimination against Americans of Mexican ancestry is appearing where none existed before; lawlessness and crime are spreading; the narcotics traffic is abetted; and the apprehension, detention, and return of these hundreds of thousands of illegal entrants is costing American taxpayers greater sums each year.

Not only am I gravely concerned by our own failure to adopt measures which would bring this traffic under control, I am also concerned by the failure of the Mexican Government to adopt such measures. Mexico is vocal in denouncing this illegal immigration, but seemingly takes no steps to halt it.

I hope you are putting this problem high on your list of items requiring urgent attention. To assist in our consideration of the matter in Congress, could you furnish to me, first, the up-to-date figures of deportation of such illegal entrants for the first 5 months of 1953, with monthly and annual totals for 1950, 1951, and 1952? Secondly, to the extent to which it can be disclosed, I would be glad to be advised of the progress of the negotiations with the Mexican Government for legal, farm-labor importation. Thirdly, I would appreciate your comments on the dangers to national security through the entry of enemy agents under cover of this heavy illicit traffic over our southern border.

Finally, inasmuch as your Department has enforcement responsibilities on immigration, it occurs to me that persons most affected by this traffic may have written of their plight, asking you to enforce the law. Accordingly, I am wondering whether you may have any material in your files indicating the effect of this illegal immigration on wages, displacement of American citizens, on lawlessness and crime, or on any other of the problems which it brings in its wake. If you should have such material, I should very much appreciate your making it available to me.

Your assistance on these requests will be greatly appreciated and will aid us as we consider appropriate legislation.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

LETTER FROM ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL J. LEE RANKIN TO SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1953.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your letter of June 15, 1953, addressed to Attorney General Brownell and referred to this office for reply, in which you expressed concern over reports of the increasing number of illegal entries into the United States across the Mexican border. As you know, the Department of Justice has given top priority to this problem, and I delayed replying to your letter until our study was complete in order that I might be in a position to give you the factual information you requested in full.

Since January 1, 1953, the border patrol of the Immigration Service has apprehended over 880,000 Mexican aliens illegally within the United States. Some were deported, but the vast majority of them were permitted voluntary departure in lieu of deportation. The monthly apprehension figures for this year are:

January	66,725
February	62,413
March	73,176
April	86,502
May	93,484
June	93,634
July	102,192
August	107,734
September	97,829
October	98,598

I am also enclosing, as you requested, a table showing monthly border patrol apprehensions for the fiscal years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953. A comparison of the 1950 total with that for 1953 shows that apprehensions have almost doubled in the last 4 years, and that the number of apprehensions, now approximately 100,000 a month, will bring next year's fiscal total to well over the million mark. This is borne out by the fact that there were 406,353 apprehensions in the first 4 months of the present fiscal year.

One of the major factors contributing to this annual increase in apprehensions has been the fact that many of the provisions of the 1951 migrant labor agreement with Mexico have proven so costly and unsatisfactory that many farmers have refused to contract for legal labor. Perhaps the most unrealistic restriction has been the refusal on the part of Mexico to permit border recruiting, despite the fact that there are thousands of qualified workers in border areas in need of employment and many farmers on our side of the border who require the services of Mexican labor.

The present agreement expires December 31, 1953, and negotiations for a new agreement are already being conducted through Ambassador White and formal conferences between representatives of both Governments are expected to begin within 2 weeks. We have advised the Mexican Government that we expect to obtain substantial modification in the present agreement in articles dealing with wages, subsistence, insurance coverage, blacklisting of employers, and workers' obligations. We have also asked for a new article to authorize border recruiting with adequate safeguards, and a provision to permit the withholding of a portion of the worker's salary to guarantee faithful fulfillment of his contract obligations. In the past "skips" have been a serious problem, because there was no incentive for a worker to remain on the job if more attractive employment was offered elsewhere.

We are hopeful that pending negotiations will result in an agreement for a recruiting program which will be simpler, more attractive, less expensive to the users, and less cost-

ly to the Government. The Mexican Government has indicated it is willing to make concessions on some of the more onerous provisions, and is agreed in principle to border recruiting. As you know, until sufficient domestic workers are available we must continue to draw upon Mexican workers to assist in the planting and harvesting of crops. A workable program will not only be beneficial to the farmers, but will do much to solve the wetback situation. If our border patrol was relieved of the overwhelming enforcement problem arising from the agricultural program, it would be free to concentrate on subversives, smugglers, and other undesirables who seek illegal entry into the United States from Mexico.

You have also requested our opinion on the dangers to national security caused by this heavy flow of illicit traffic over our southern border. I regret that I am unable to report any exact figures, but the Immigration Service conservatively estimates that for each apprehension, three Mexican aliens cross the border and either return undetected or infiltrate into our northern industrial areas. This means that during 1953 over 4 million persons will have entered the United States illegally from Mexico. The great majority are "braceros," who seek only seasonal employment, but it is apparent that this border is also an easy avenue of entry into our country for almost any number of Communists or foreign agents from Mexico, Guatemala, Dutch Guiana, and, entry into Mexico being as easy as it is, from any country in the world. The seriousness of this situation is self-evident; until this border is brought under control our internal security program will remain in jeopardy.

Finally, to provide you with some idea of the effect of this invasion on wages, standards of living, and our own domestic agricultural workers, I am enclosing some correspondence received from residents in the border area and a photo-offset of a newspaper article which appeared in the California papers.

Please feel free to call on us at any time we may be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

J. LEE RANKIN,
Assistant Attorney General,
Office of Legal Counsel.

Persons apprehended by the Border Patrol

	Fiscal year 1950	Fiscal year 1951	Fiscal year 1952	Fiscal year 1953
July	33,410	38,410	59,835	67,101
August	87,013	40,130	61,473	87,807
September	29,104	42,186	38,061	53,322
October	25,282	40,029	37,266	52,520
November	19,565	40,573	33,137	46,706
December	21,340	32,501	30,027	55,759
January	27,167	33,432	36,151	66,725
February	37,016	36,759	40,375	62,413
March	40,918	51,637	45,662	73,176
April	45,078	64,070	46,720	86,502
May	56,178	51,899	49,645	93,484
June	47,510	38,729	53,367	93,634
Total	409,581	510,355	531,719	839,149

LETTER FROM SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL HERBERT BROWNELL

JANUARY 21, 1954.

Hon. HERBERT BROWNELL,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: I appreciate the letter of November 20, 1953, on the wetback situation from Assistant Attorney General J. Lee Rankin which replied to my letter of June 15, 1953, and which was awaiting me on my recent return to Washington.

It is clear from Mr. Rankin's letter and from press reports of our negotiations with Mexico that this problem is growing in seriousness. His estimate that "during 1953 over 4 million persons will have entered the United States illegally from Mexico," reveals the immensity of the human wave with which our national policy must deal.

I am also glad that his reply reveals a growing awareness of the grave dangers that hidden away in this flood enemy agents may secure admission to this country and that "until this border is brought under control our internal security program will remain in jeopardy."

The letters which Mr. Rankin enclosed from resident workers in the border area further confirm my fears that our own citizens are being displaced by these illegal entrants, not only from farm jobs, but also from industrial (in these cases, railroad) employment. I know we also feel the effects of such displacement in sections far from the border, as in my own home area of Chicago.

In the face of these facts and the rise in our own unemployment, I have serious doubts from the point of view of our national interest about the adequacy or desirability of the announced objectives of our negotiations with Mexico on the contract labor situation. Rather than break down the standards and protections previously set up for Mexican contract workers and easing their introduction into this country, would it not be preferable to try to extend these benefits to our own farm workers and lessen, rather than increase, the reliance on this foreign contract labor? I know the farm owners need labor. But it seems to me we should give priority to our own citizens and fix standards which will not exploit individuals or debase community living conditions.

In terms of our total policy in halting the flood of illegal entrants and stopping the entry of enemy agents, can we look to the administration also for support for (1) S. 1567, to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor; (2) more adequate appropriations for the border patrol; and (3) legislation like that previously passed in the Senate to make the knowing employment of illegal entrants a misdemeanor?

There is much more that needs doing in this complex situation. Enforcement of child-labor laws and provisions for the education of migratory children are among the most obvious requirements. But I hope the minimum steps listed above, or some even better alternatives, may have your active support. We cannot afford to let this situation which Archbishop Lucey, of San Antonio, has described as an international scandal drift and allow the national and human interests so clearly at stake to be endangered.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

[From the Commonweal of January 15, 1954]

MIGRATORY WORKERS — EMPLOYERS' GREED, POWER POLITICS, EXPLOITATION, CHILD LABOR, AND GENERAL NEGLECT HAVE PRODUCED A SITUATION WHICH IS THE SCANDAL OF ALL THE WORLD

(By Robert E. Lucey[1])

For half a century reports have been written about migratory labor, but not very much has been done about it. The problems of migratory workers are many and serious. No single solution to these problems is possible, but a great deal can be done, and must be done, for these displaced persons. Most of them are American citizens; some are Mexican nationals working here on contract; others are illegal aliens, generally known as wetbacks.

In American industry the working people to some extent are organized; they have a voice and a vote in their government and in their jobs. They have raised their own standards of living and that of millions of fellow workers who are unorganized. They are a stable, substantial segment of American life. But in agriculture the nonmigratory laborers who work in the county of their residence are for the most part unorganized. The vast majority of those who are migrants, wandering from county to county and from State to State during the harvest season, must take what they get in the matter of wages, hours of labor, and conditions of work. The wetbacks, of course, are utterly defenseless in the labor market. This lack of organization among workers in agriculture is a great misfortune for them, a temptation to injustice on the part of many employers, and a weak spot in the American economy.

So far as the workers are concerned, whether farmhands or migrants, it is doubtless true to say that many of them are treated with some measure of justice by farmers, ranchers and growers. But the income of agricultural labor is decidedly below that of industrial labor with due regard to differences in the cost of living.

The lot of the migrant is worse than that of the farmhand with steady employment in one place. In the case of the migrant, there is great uncertainty about wages, housing, hours of work, weather, health, transportation, and even employment itself. In a bad year many a migratory family comes home dead broke. Even when weather and crops are favorable, there may be labor surpluses in many areas and consequent unemployment for some.

Conditions in this segment of agriculture are chaotic. Workers are attracted to certain areas by radio announcements, newspaper ads, grapevine information, rumors and advice from the employment services. If American industry got its employees in that fashion the whole country would be in chaos. It is true that labor recruiters and crew captains deliver workers to employers, but they cannot control either the weather or the crops. It is also true that this whole thing is seasonal and temporary, but there need not be so much hopeless disorder. The Federal Government, State governments, employers associations, and labor unions ought to cooperate to put order into this situation.

Congress has shamefully disregarded the needs and the rights of American citizens in the migratory labor force. These workingmen and women and children are making a tremendous contribution to our economy at great personal sacrifice. One shudders to think of their sacrifices—absence from home as much as 6 months of the year; precarious employment: low annual wages; little or no education for the children; housing that may be fair, poor, unspeakable or just the shade of a tree; constantly moving from one place to another; long hours of stoop labor even for women and children; abominable health conditions, meager food and often no sanitation; lack of priests who speak their language and lack of churches easily available.

Why should any sane man take his wife and children on such an adventure? The old Romans had a saying which went: Primum est vivere—the first thing to do is to live; if you can't survive you are finished. The migratory laborer has to work to live. He is unskilled in the ways of industry and turns to agriculture. All the jobs in his area may be taken by Mexican nationals working on contract or by wetbacks. The American citizen has no alternative but to seek employment elsewhere. The Mexican national may be paid 50 cents an hour, with a shack to live in; the wetback will work for 20 to 30 cents an hour and live in the brush.

---

[1] Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey is the archbishop of San Antonio.

An American family, regardless of low living standards, cannot survive on 50 cents an hour.

More than 200,000 Mexican nationals are brought into our country every year to work in agriculture because the farmers and growers claim that they cannot get domestic workers to harvest the crops. The work is seasonal, and the laborers must be available promptly to bring in the harvest. The Employment Service may not certify a shortage of labor unless sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work. That word "willing" is the key to the situation. If a substantial number of American agricultural laborers in a given area are not willing to work for starvation wages, they create a labor shortage in that area and alien workers may then be brought in.

The Mexican national, here on contract, is supposed to be paid 50 cents an hour or the "prevailing wage," whichever is greater. During hearings held by the President's Commission on Migratory Labor the question was sometimes asked: "How do you discover the prevailing wage?" The method described was interesting. Some growers in a given area would get together and decide what wage they would pay. That was then the prevailing wage. Some growers claim that 50 cents an hour is too high and they don't like laws which interfere with human liberty. There was a time when the Supreme Court of the United States held that a minimum wage law was unconstitutional because it violated liberty of contract. Some growers still believe that to pay starvation wages is a natural right.

The international contract agreed upon by our Government and that of Mexico not only stipulated a minimum wage but had certain requirements regarding housing, health, unemployment, and death. No such safeguards are granted to American migratory workers. The Congress of the United States, aided and abetted by certain powerful growers' associations, has seen to it that native-born American citizens in the migratory labor force have not even a minimum of protection by social legislation. It is passing strange that a little group of willful men can so sway the Congress of the United States.

If American citizens receive such harsh treatment, pity the poor wetback. American migrants can be exploited, defrauded, and subjected to every manner of injustice but they cannot be deported; the illegal alien must keep a sharp lookout for the Immigration Service in the Department of Justice.

The growers who like foreign slave labor, even when their own fellow citizens are unemployed, can concoct a rather persuasive argument for their iniquity. After all, these illegal aliens are human beings and children of God. They are creatures of marvelous dignity and sublime destiny. They are good workers, honest, faithful and docile. Many of them are married men who seek only to support themselves and their families. Work is scarce in Mexico and wages in agriculture are pitifully low. By working 12 to 14 hours a day in Texas at 20 cents an hour their income is much better than it would be in their homeland. They save their money and send most of it back to Mexico to support their families in decent and frugal comfort as becomes these honest working people. And, anyhow, Americans won't do stoop labor; they aspire to something higher.

Thus the grower becomes, in a small way, a benefactor of humanity—generous, upright and benevolent. After all, this is a free country and a man may hire whom he chooses. The fact that the employee is here illegally is a mere coincidence; he is still a man with all the rights and needs inherent in his nature. He must work to live. The grower wants to help him.

Plenty of people in our country do not see the sophistry of these excuses which are offered to hide crimes of greed and injustice. Surely it is not necessary to declare that we subscribe unreservedly to the proposition that all men are created in the image of God. The illegal alien has our sympathy, our prayers and our hopes for a better future, but citizens who serve their country in peace and war, who pay taxes and build our schools and churches, have a prior right to employment when it is available.

Recently the writer spoke to a rural pastor about the small debt on his parish and asked if some of it could not be paid off every year. The pastor explained that his men were out of work because of a wetback invasion. Asked if he could not get a public official, perhaps the mayor, to remove these illegal workers, the pastor replied: "The mayor? He has 50 wetbacks on his ranch."

Businessmen also suffer from these conditions. Citizens who live in rural areas cannot patronize stores and business houses when they have no income. The wetback does not dare to shop in the town; his simple needs can be supplied at the commissary on the ranch and if he is charged exorbitant prices that is too bad for him. And if the employer refuses to give him his wages at the end of his service that is also too bad but he has no recourse because he is a fugitive.

Humanly speaking, the hiring of wetbacks is smart business. If a cotton grower in California or Arizona pays $5 per hundredweight to cotton pickers and a grower in the Rio Grande Valley pays $1.50 for the same work he has an obvious economic advantage. Perhaps this grower doesn't know, or doesn't care, that in 1 year as many as 65,000 workers have left south Texas to labor in seasonal agriculture in other States because they couldn't find jobs with decent wages at home. Counting women and children, this army numbered at least 150,000 persons. Not a few parishes in our jurisdiction are pretty well emptied out by these departures, many of which extend from April to November.

Our concern is largely with the Spanish-speaking migrants of the Southwest, but we are aware that tens of thousands of white and colored migrants from the Deep South make their way north every year to harvest crops in the eastern and northeastern States. They, too, suffer the hardships and the heartaches of migratory labor in American agriculture.

Last year the Mexican hierarchy requested the archbishop of Guadalajara to contact the writer to learn if a program might be worked out to give more general spiritual care to Mexican migrants in the United States. It was suggested that priests from Mexico might labor among these people in the dioceses where they are employed in large numbers. American bishops have made great sacrifices to supply Spanish-speaking priests for these migratory workers during the harvest season but many difficulties stood in the way.

The proposal that Mexican priests come to this country to work among Catholic migrants was referred to the American hierarchy at their annual meeting and approved. Fortunately machinery was available in Texas to effectuate the plan. Eight years ago the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish-speaking was set up, of which all the bishops of the Southwest are members. They maintain a regional office for the Spanish-speaking supported by an annual grant from the American Board of Catholic Missions. During the past 2 years the office has been in Austin, Tex., and has now moved for a period of 2 years to Houston.

The staff of the regional office was delegated to head up the Operation Migratory Labor on this side of the border and a priest in the social-action office in Mexico City was appointed our liaison officer by the Mexican hierarchy. The American bishops who needed Mexican missionaries were contacted to learn how many priests they would need and the period of time when their services would be required. Then the search for priests in Mexico began and continued for several months. Despite the scarcity of clergymen there, the bishops and religious superiors allocated 24 priests to this adventure in international cooperation for the welfare of souls. They came from 6 dioceses in Mexico and 4 religious provinces.

The regional office received excellent cooperation from the State Department in Washington, the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice, Mexican consulates in the United States, the Department of Immigration, NCWC, and the United States Ambassador to Mexico. The details of this operation were almost countless but the staff of the regional office carried on valiantly.

Arrived at their destination in a diocese of one of the Northern States, the missionaries found themselves strangers in a strange land. Their own people were out in the fields, however, and to the fields they went to minister to them. Mass was said wherever possible, confessions were heard and holy communion distributed. Marriages and baptisms were arranged through local pastors. The word of God was preached to the people in their own language.

The American bishops who welcomed these missionaries to their dioceses for temporary service during the harvest season deserve special mention for their zeal and generosity. They paid transportation costs by air from Mexico City and return, board and lodging, travel expenses through the rural areas and a generous honorarium to the priests. They were happy to do this for their guests, both clergy and laity. The problems are immense. In 1 diocese 12,000 Spanish-speaking migrants move in for about 3 months. Their spiritual and religious welfare is not easy to achieve.

The church is doing all that she can for her migratory children but the civil authority has been negligent. Among several major recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor this one is central: That the Congress should pass legislation establishing a Federal Committee for Migratory Labor to study the problems involved, work with State legislatures, farmers' associations, labor unions, and private organizations and make recommendations to Congress for necessary legislation to bring order into this chaotic segment of American agriculture. The present situation, characterized by the greed of some employers, power politics, exploitation of defenseless workers, child labor, utter neglect and senseless disorder, is an international scandal.

These migratory workers are making a tremendous contribution to the Nation by harvesting much of the food and fiber that we need in peace and war. States, counties, and local communities should be grateful to them for their services and pay more attention to their temporal needs. Many of them are American citizens, all of them are human beings; they are a gentle, generous, and lovable people.

One of our sister catechists was recently talking to a family that had just returned to San Antonio from the North. For several Sundays they found themselves 17 miles from the nearest church. Father and mother loaded the children into an old jalopy and drove over bad roads to mass. In the evening they made the journey again to say the rosary in church with their Spanish-speaking friends. I wonder how many English-speaking folks who look down on these poor and humble people would drive a dilapidated car 34 miles on Sunday morning over rough roads to assist at mass and drive another 34 miles in the evening to say the family rosary in a wayside chapel.

To defraud and exploit such people is indeed reprehensible.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial from the New York Daily News of yesterday, in regard to the so-called Bricker amendment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE'S GOT US STUMPED

In his attitude toward the Bricker amendment and kindred proposals, as set forth at his news conference yesterday, we must admit President Eisenhower has us stumped.

The general idea back of these projects is that no treaty should be permitted to override the Constitution, and that executive agreements should be open for approval or rejection by Congress.

MORE YALTAS—MORE POTSDAMS?

Executive agreements are usually harmless. But they were used by Presidents F. D. Roosevelt and H. S. Truman as devices for bypassing the Senate, whose consent is necessary to make a treaty valid.

General Ike knows perfectly well that deals which gravely damage the United States were made by executive agreements at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. He must know, too, that there is no guarantee against the American people's some day electing another President as contemptuous of Congress as were Roosevelt and Truman.

Well, in his talk with the reporters yesterday, the President said he would go for a law stating that no treaty can be superior to the Constitution, but was dead against any shift in the basic balance of power between Congress and the White House. That's a roundabout way of saying he wants the President's power to make executive agreements to continue as is.

Why? Why this Eisenhower unwillingness to insure the Nation against future injuries by overambitious (to put it kindly) Presidents?

We simply can't understand it—and we think General Eisenhower owes the people a full and clear explanation of his reasons for feeling as he does about this deadly important issue.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the pending joint resolution, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to the committee amendment, inserting on page 3, line 5, after the word "treaty", the words "or other international agreement."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, before discussing the pending amendment, I ask to modify the amendment which I have heretofore submitted, designated "2-3-54-B," by striking out, in line 1, the words "When the Senate consents," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "On the question of advising and consenting."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the Senator from Michigan has asked permission to modify his amendment. Has the amendment been modified?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan is entitled to modify his amendment. It has no parliamentary standing, and he can modify it at any time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, when this Nation was formed its founders decided that there should be a division of power, and so the sovereignty was divided among the three departments of the Government and the people. This did not mean that the Federal Government would be powerless. There was an allocation of power. History had taught the Founding Fathers that if power were placed in one person, tyranny could be expected. Therefore, the sovereignty was divided in such a way as to prevent tyranny on the part of any particular branch of the Government.

The founders of the Government, in establishing the Constitution, were faced with the question of making peace with the British, and they discovered that in making such peace it was necessary to negotiate a treaty. At that time the Colonies had won their hard-earned independence, and in establishing the Constitution they had to consider the question of treaties.

Benjamin Franklin proposed that the National Legislature be empowered to negative all laws enacted by the several States contravening any treaty subsisting under the authority of the Union. The Franklin formula would have given to Congress the power to veto State laws running counter to treaty provision. His formula was rejected and instead article VI, clause 2, of the Constitution provides:

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. President, treaties have another constitutional sanction. In article III, section 2, the following language is found:

SEC. 2. The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority—to all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers, and consuls—

And so forth. Again, in article I, section 10, the Constitution provides that "no State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation." However, at the very end of the section which contains that language the Constitution provides:

No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty * * * keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace—

And this is the language which I wish to stress—

enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power—

That is the language to which I desired to call particular attention. The section continues—

or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

Therefore, Mr. President, while States were prohibited from entering into a treaty, alliance, or confederation, they were, with the consent of Congress, given power to make agreements or compacts with another State or with a foreign power.

Again referring to the Constitution, the President, under his powers as enumerated in article II, section 2, "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

That section clearly indicates that the treatymaking power was considered by the Constitutional Convention and made a part of the Constitution.

I have searched the Constitution and I find no place where the power to make other international agreements, or executive agreements, was given specifically to the President. I do find provision which deals with international agreements in the section which allows States, with the consent of Congress, to enter into international agreements, and this is the same section that prohibits the States from entering into treaties, alliances, or confederations. That language indicates that at least the thought of other international agreements was considered by the convention.

The reason I now discuss the question of international agreements is that the purpose of the amendment to the amendment now before the Senate is to insert on page 3, line 5, after the word "treaty", the words "or other international agreements."

In *United States* v. *Belmont* (301 U. S. 324) we find reference to such international agreements. Justice Sutherland, speaking for the Court, said:

This Court held that the conduct of foreign relations was committed by the Constitution to the political departments of the Government, and the propriety of what may be done in the exercise of this political power was not subject to judicial inquiry or decision.

The Court in that case was speaking of the recognition of Russia.

Of course, the Constitution specifically provides that the President of the United States can receive ambassadors and ministers.

Then we turn to what might be called the famous Pink case, which also involves the consideration of executive agreements. The case is found in Three Hundred and Fifteenth United States Reports at page 203. The decision quotes Justice Sutherland's decision in the Belmont case:

This Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Sutherland, held that the conduct of foreign relations is committed by the Constitution to the political departments of the Federal

Government; that the propriety of the exercise of that power is not open to judicial inquiry; and that recognition of a foreign sovereign conclusively binds the courts.

There is another significant statement in United States against Pink, at page 230. I quote the sentence because it shows what the Court was thinking with respect to international agreements, and it indicates the reason we believe the words "international agreements" ought to be included in this particular section of the Constitution. I quote:

"All constitutional acts of power, whether in the executive or in the judicial department, have as much legal validity and obligation as if they proceeded from the Legislature. * * *" (The Federalist, No. 64.) A treaty is a law of the land under the supremacy clause (art. VI, clause 2) of the Constitution. Such international compacts and agreements as the Litvinov Assignment have a similar dignity. (*United States* v. *Belmont, supra* (301 U. S. at p. 331).)

It is the words "similar dignity" that I wish to discuss at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Would I interrupt the Senator's train of thought if I were to ask him a question at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I gladly yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I would ask the Senator to observe at this point that from that decision both Chief Justice Stone and Mr. Justice Roberts dissented.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. And two other Justices did not participate; therefore, it was a five-judge case.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is significant.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have had great difficulty in reconciling the decision of Mr. Justice Douglas and many of his statements in that particular decision with my understanding of the constitutional situation.

But we are dealing with a decision of the Supreme Court, and, after all, decisions of the Supreme Court, construing the Constitution, in effect become part and parcel of the Constitution.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wished to have noted the dissents in the case.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think it well to refer to the question of the Litvinov assignment, which was an international agreement, really an executive agreement between the State Department of our Government and the Foreign Office of the Russian Government. The court says it had the dignity of a treaty. The dignity which is given to a treaty of the United States is that it becomes the supreme law of the land when it is executed under the authority of the United States.

Mr. President, some of us felt that if the first section of the Bricker amendment, as modified, were to become a part of the Constitution—and I am of the opinion that it should become a part of the Constitution—it would forbid treaties being made which are in conflict with the Constitution. The opinion from which I have quoted seems to indicate that an international agreement other than a treaty has the same dignity as has a treaty, and I feel that such an international agreement should be judged by the same standard and should not be allowed to conflict with the Constitution and be of any force or effect.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is merely taking the provision which was in the report of the committee, that other international agreements shall be limited by the provisions limiting treaties.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. If section 4 is taken out, other international agreements must be inserted in section 1.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. It makes it much stronger to put it in in connection with the word "treaty," so that there will be no doubt that it was the idea of the Senate that it was to become part of that section and was to receive at least the same construction.

Mr. President, section 1 of the Bricker amendment, as reported by the Judiciary Committee, provides that a provision of a treaty—and we would insert by this amendment "or other international agreements"—which conflicts with the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

The supremacy clause of the Constitution reads as follows:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in the States shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

If we approve section 1 of the Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1, as modified by my amendment, and not alter the supremacy clause, we would discover that we had permitted a conflict to exist in the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I agree with the Senator entirely in what he is saying in regard to article VI, that if the second section were interpreted alone, any treaty under that article would still be the supreme law of the land. By interpretation of the Court in the Pink case, an international agreement would be lifted to the same dignity.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. So it is necessary that the first section of the Senator's amendment be included.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. President, I think we must consider the two amendments together, the amendment to the first section, and a new second section which would amend clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States by adding at the end thereof the following language:

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.

Mr. President, should the President and the Senate be able to change our form of government or act as if there were no Constitution, or should the Constitution be the supreme law of the land, because if the Constitution is the people's law, any other law which is made, whether it be a treaty law or a statutory law of Congress, has to be made in pursuance of the Constitution?

Mr. President, if we were to say that a treaty is on the same basis as the Constitution, then the President and two-thirds of the Senators voting would be able to change the Constitution. They would be able even to repeal it. Whereas, if the people themselves wanted to amend the Constitution or to repeal it, they would have to follow the provisions of the Constitution which set forth that amendments may be proposed by two-thirds of each House of Congress and shall become valid when ratified by three-fourths of the State legislatures, or by conventions duly called in three-fourths of the States.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I further yield.

Mr. BRICKER. A further danger exists, in that under the interpretation by the Supreme Court in the decision referred to as the Pink case, the President of the United States alone can do that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the serious danger.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the decision of Mr. Justice Douglas, it might appear that an international agreement has the same dignity as a treaty. In the same opinion he used the word "dignity," and at the same time he said a treaty was the supreme law of the land, and cited article VI of the Constitution to prove it.

Mr. President, we know that the Constitution can be amended, and article V provides the method. I ask unanimous consent to have article V of the Constitution in its entirety printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, article V of the Constitution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress: *Provided*, That no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article, and that no State without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we find that these several provisions of the Constitution impose express limitations upon the powers of Congress. Similarly, other provisions impose express limitations upon the powers of the States. Still other provisions of the Constitution impose express limitations upon powers without specifying to whom or to what the limitations are applicable.

Even though there appears to be no provision of the Constitution which, by its express terms, limits the subject matter which can be dealt with by treaties, numerous dicta in Supreme Court decisions indicate that there are limitations on the subject matter which can be dealt with under the treatymaking power. For a review of the decisions, I refer Senators to page 3 of Senate Report No. 412, 83d Congress, on Senate Joint Resolution 1, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary.

What these limitations are is not clear from the dicta. Whether they are the ones imposed by the limiting provisions of the Constitution, which are silent as to whom or to what directed, whether they are among the limiting provisions applicable expressly to the Congress, whether they are inherent in the nature of our Government, or whether they are limitations stemming from the fact that the word "treaty" as used in the portion of the Constitution conferring upon the President the treatymaking power must be interpreted to include only the power to deal with subject matters which it was customary for nations to deal with by treaty at the time of adoption of the Constitution, are matters left for conjecture.

I feel that is the reason why section 1, as it is proposed to be amended, and section 2 are necessary to clear up the matter and to speak forcefully on the subject.

Certainly Missouri against Holland, which is reported in Two Hundred and Fifty-second United States Reports, at page 416, about which we have heard much during the debate, a case which is sometimes called the "duck" case, makes clear the fact that matters can be dealt with by treaty and by legislation to implement a treaty which, because of the absence of expressly delegated power and the provisions of the 10th amendment, cannot be dealt with by Congress alone in the absence of a treaty.

In attempting to determine what effect the Supreme Court would be likely to give to the sentence which it is proposed to add to clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution, it is desirable, if possible, first, to ascertain what meaning the Court will be likely to give to section 2 of the proposed constitutional amendment. The Court will read the proposed constitutional amendment as a whole, and will attempt to give meaning to each portion of it. The Court will be unlikely to assume, unless there is clear evidence to the contrary, that the amenders intended to accomplish by section 2 of the amendment the same purpose accomplished by the sentence added to clause 2 of article VI.

In attempting to predict the meaning which will be given to section 2 of the proposed amendment, we do not proceed in the same absence of the light of legislative history as confronts us with respect to the sentence to be added in clause 2 of article VI. Section 2 of the proposed amendment, except for the reference to "other international agreement," is identical with section 1 of the original so-called Bricker amendment found in Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 83d Congress, which is now under debate. Section 1 of the Bricker amendment is discussed at length in the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, pages 3 to 8.

In discussing that section, the report first reviews the dicta in early Supreme Court decisions indicating that there are limitations on the treatymaking power. Then it indicates that confidence in those dicta has been undermined by the decision in Missouri against Holland. The report goes on to discuss the case of *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation* (299 U. S. 304); the dissenting opinion in the case of *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company* v. *Sawyer* (343 U. S. 579), which was the Steel Seizure case; and the growth of apprehension with respect to the scope of the treaty power. The report then states, with respect to section 1:

> Section 1 removes any possible doubt whether a treaty must be consistent with the Constitution. It gives unequivocal constitutional effect to early judicial dicta not yet incorporated in binding decisions that no provision of a treaty which violates the Constitution or which is inconsistent with the nature of the Government of the United States or of the relation between the States and the United States shall be valid (*New Orleans* v. *United States* (10 Pet. 662, 736); *The Cherokee Tobacco* (11 Wall. 616, 620–1); *Holden* v. *Joy* (17 Wall. 211, 243); *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258, 267); and see *Asakura* v. *Seattle* (265 U. S. 332, 341)). The inferences drawn by some persons from *Missouri* v. *Holland*, cited supra, and *U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation*, also cited supra, that the treaty power is unlimited in any field of alleged international concern, regardless of the Constitution, will be unqualifiedly negatived, and any doubt on this score forever put to rest.
>
> * * * * *
>
> * * * Undoubtedly, it is best to establish once and for all, by unequivocal language, that the treaty power cannot be used for purposes in conflict with the Constitution.
>
> * * * The necessity for this section of the amendment has already been examined, and it should be entirely clear to the Supreme Court or to any other agency which interprets this section that it is intended only to state what most of the American people have always felt should be the law. In plain words, this section is designed to make it inescapably clear that a treaty may not override the Constitution or be in conflict with it.

A fair reading of the portion of the committee report dealing with section 1 of the Bricker amendment, which is now section 1 as amended by the proposed amendment, indicates that its purpose is to place in the Constitution a provision which will have the effect of fixing as constitutional law the early judicial dicta to the effect that no provision of a treaty, or other international agreement which violates the Constitution, or which is inconsistent with the nature of the Government of the United States, or of the relation between the States and the United States, shall be valid.

One of the sections of the Constitution relating to the States guarantees to every State a republican form of government. There are those who say that the Federal Government by treaty would have the power to alter this provision guaranteeing to the States the right to have a republican form of government.

Despite the discussion of Missouri against Holland, and later cases, contained in this portion of the report, it does not appear from the report to be the purpose of section 1 of the Bricker amendment to reverse the rule of constitutional law enunciated by the Court in Missouri against Holland. That this is so seems reasonably clear from the fact that section 2 of the Bricker amendment—the "which" clause, the one we are seeking to have stricken out—does by its express terms accomplish the result of reversing the rule of Missouri against Holland.

In view of the almost complete identity of section 2 of the proposed amendment with section 1 of the Bricker amendment, it may be asserted with reasonable assurance, tempered with contemplation of the legislative history yet to be written, that section 2 of the proposed amendment will be interpreted by the Court as indicated in the preceding paragraph. This, then, would apply to international agreements also.

Having determined what meaning the Court may give to section 2 of the proposed amendment, we come next to the problem of what meaning it may give to the sentence proposed to be added to clause 2 of article VI.

Any consideration of this question requires that we first attempt to determine the significance of the variation in the existing wording of that clause with respect to what laws and what treaties are the supreme law of the land. The clause now provides in effect that laws of the United States made in pursuance of the Constitution are the supreme law of the land, while treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States are the supreme law of the land. We know that one purpose of the difference in wording used was to make certain that treaties which had been made by the United States prior to the establishment of the Constitution would continue to be valid international commitments of the United States and effective internally. On the other hand, it was desired to give the status of supreme law only to those laws of the United States made in pursuance of the Constitution, and not to laws made prior to the establishment of the Constitution.

Mr. President, it will be noted that under the proposed committee amendment, treaties which were made prior to the establishment of the Constitution would be allowed to remain in effect. The second section, which is an amendment to Article VI, would affect only treaties made after the establishment of the Constitution. So we recognize that part of the construction.

Whether or not this is the only significance of the different wording used is a matter which has not been clarified by decisions of the supreme and inferior courts. The opinion of Justice Holmes in Missouri against Holland contains one sentence which indicates that he thought there was considerable significance in the difference in wording, but he did not further develop his understanding of the significance of the difference in wording. The sentence he used reads:

> Acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared

to be so when made under the authority of the United States (252 U. S. 416, 433).

I underscore the word "while." The use of the word "while" to connect the two clauses of the sentence may indicate that the Justice felt that treaties were to be tested for Constitutional validity by quite different criteria from those used to test statutes.

Further indication of judicial recognition of the significance of the difference in wording is contained in the opinion of the District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas in the case of *United States* v. *Thompson* (258 F. 257)—by the way that was another duck case—a proceeding which, like Missouri against Holland, involved the Migratory Bird Act of July 3, 1918, and was decided prior to the Supreme Court decision in Missouri against Holland. In the case of United States against Thompson, Judge Trieber, after quoting clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution, said at page 258:

It will be noticed that this section, in speaking of the laws of the United States, limits the power to enact them to such laws as are "made in pursuance thereof." On the other hand, when referring to treaties, the only limitation is "which shall be made under the authority of the United States," omitting the words "in pursuance of the Constitution." It cannot be assumed that the framers of that instrument intended to make no distinction between laws and treaties, when using language differing so materially. The words "laws made in pursuance of the Constitution," can have but one meaning, namely, when authorized by the Constitution, while as to treaties the limitation is when made "by authority of the United States." The reason for this distinction is obvious. In making laws, our own consent alone, is necessary, but in forming treaties the concurrence of the other power to the treaty is required.

What Judge Trieber says in the last part is that if Congress makes a law, the people's representatives in the Congress are the lawmakers; but, in effect, when the President makes a treaty, it is a contract with another government, by which so far as internal law is concerned the foreign government is imposing part of its desire and its wish upon the people of the United States, for Judge Trieber states:

In making laws, our own consent alone is necessary, but in forming treaties, the concurrence of the other power to the treaty is required.

The quotation from Judge Trieber's opinion indicates that he, like Justice Holmes, saw considerable significance in the difference in wording, but his opinion does not go further to analyze the significance of the difference. On the other hand, the opinion of Mr. Justice Field in the case of *In Re Ah Lung* (18 F. 28), decided in the Circuit Court for the District of California in 1883, indicates that he saw no significance in the difference in wording. In that case, the Justice said, at page 29:

The Constitution of the United States, however, places both treaties and laws, made in pursuance thereof, in the same category, and declares them to be the supreme law of the land.

Thus it appears that Justice Field felt that, with respect to treaties made after the establishment of the Constitution, the criteria by which they are to be tested to determine whether or not they are supreme law are the same criteria by which statutes are to be tested. The opinion of Chief Justice Marshall in *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137), which it might be thought would be of considerable significance in determining the meaning of the phrase "made in pursuance thereof" as used in clause 2 of article VI, actually sheds little light on the meaning of the phrase, and no light on the significance of the difference in wording with which we are concerned.

It is easy to understand why Chief Justice Marshall was a little careful in the language he was using. He did not have a treaty before him, and was only speaking about whether or not a law could be held unconstitutional, that is, not made in pursuance of the Constitution, and he did not refer to the treaty-making power, or the words used in reference to the treatymaking power.

In Marbury against Madison, the Chief Justice said, at page 180:

It is also not entirely unworthy of observation, that in declaring what shall be the supreme law of the land, the Constitution itself is first mentioned; and not the laws of the United States, generally, but those only which shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution, have that rank.

Having examined the judicial utterance which may be pertinent to the question, we revert to the problem of what effect the Supreme Court might give to the addition of the proposed sentence at the end of clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution. If Mr. Justice Field's view of the matter, as revealed by the quotation from the case, in re Ah Lung, is determined by the Court to be the correct view, no effect would be given to the added sentence, because the Court would have determined that treaties are already required to be made in pursuance of the Constitution. However, it seems questionable that the Court would so hold, because to do so would be to determine that the added sentence had no effect whatsoever, a result which the Court is extremely reluctant to reach. Moreover, the very wording of the added sentence, which begins "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause," indicates that the amenders intend to establish a rule different from that which prevails in the absence of the amendment.

Assuming that the Court will give the added sentence some significance, the next question to be considered is what that significance might be. If, as I have indicated, the Court is likely to decide that the effect of section 2 of the amendment would be to write into the Constitution the rule enunciated in the early judicial dicta relating to the treaty-making power, it is not likely to decide that the effect of the sentence added to clause 2 of article VI is the same.

Mr. President, I find that many people have had the idea all along, without examining the Supreme Court's decisions, that the Court has held that a treaty, to be adjudged as being the same as a law, had to be made in pursuance of the Constitution. I am going to read some of the holdings of the Court. For instance, it was held in the *Cherokee Tobacco* case (11 Wall. 616, 620):

It need hardly be said that a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument.

In *Doe* v. *Braden* (16 How. 635, 637) it was held:

The treaty is, therefore, a law made by the proper authority, and the courts of justice have no right to annul or disregard any of its provisions, unless they violate the Constitution of the United States.

In the case of *United States* v. *Minnesota* (270 U. S. 181, 207) it was held:

Of course, all treaties and statutes of the United States are based on the Constitution; * * * the decisions of this Court generally have regarded treaties as on much the same plane as acts of Congress, and as usually subject to the general limitations in the Constitution.

But some doubt is raised when the Court uses the words "as on much the same plane."

In the case of Missouri against Holland the Court held:

We do not mean to imply that there are no qualifications to the treatymaking power. * * * The treaty in question does not contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution.

But, Mr. President, those who believe the Constitution should be amended know there has never been a decision of the Supreme Court—I have checked on this matter, and I have never been able to find such a decision—holding a treaty to be void because it violated the Constitution.

Our purpose in submitting this amendment is to make sure of this point. The amendment will mandate the Court to the proposition that a treaty is to be judged by the Constitution, and is not to conflict with it. The purpose of the amendment is to require that a treaty be in pursuance of the Constitution, if it is to become the supreme law of the land. Under the amendment, a treaty must conform to the Constitution, and must not conflict with it.

The amendment will thus prevent the delegation of executive, legislative, or judicial power to an international organization. Mr. President, I wish to repeat that this amendment will prevent the delegation of executive, legislative, or judicial power to an international organization, for under the Constitution these powers are vested exclusively in the President, the Congress, and the Federal courts. The amendment will prevent the United States by treaty or executive agreement from depriving any United States citizen of any of the rights or freedoms guaranteed to him by the Constitution. It will prevent the United States from conferring, by treaty, jurisdiction on an international court to charge, try, and sentence a United States citizen for an offense committed in the United States.

Mr. President, I think we should state clearly that that is the purpose of the amendment, and that it would prevent these things, which many persons feel can now be done. The amendment would effectively remove one of the premises of the decision in the case of Missouri against Holland, namely, that

whereas a statute of the United States, in order to become the supreme law of the land, must conform to the provisions of the Constitution, a treaty may become the supreme law of the land if it is made only under the authority of the United States.

The amendment will not alter, however, the other premise of the decision in the case of Missouri against Holland, namely, that Congress can implement a treaty by legislation, under the necessary and proper clause, even though it cannot enact such legislation under its grant of legislative power, in the absence of the treaty. In other words, Mr. President, the amendment will strike out the "which" clause, which in my opinion is contrary to this amendment.

If we were to amend the Constitution by means of section 1 of the proposal now before the Senate, and if we did not change the supremacy clause of article VI, we would be left with a conflict between the two provisions.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to a State Department publication No. 3972, foreword by President Truman. It is State Department publication No. 3972, published in September 1950. In the foreword, President Truman said:

> There is no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs.

Mr. President, it was that sentence which seemed to place in the mind of the President and, therefore, in the minds of his representatives in the State Department, the view that conditions had become such that there was no longer any difference between domestic affairs and foreign affairs. If that were true, a treaty then could effect the things I have been talking about; it could alter the people's unalienable rights.

If it be true that the treaty power is above the Constitution and the will of the people, and if Mr. Justice Douglas in his decision in the Pink case was correct when he held that an executive agreement has the same dignity as a treaty, the power to make an executive agreement or the power to make a treaty is above the Constitution and the will of the people. That cannot be the case in the United States, Mr. President.

On the other hand, there is concern lest it might in some way be the case. When we examine the dissenting opinion of Chief Justice Vinson and two of his colleagues in the recent steel company seizure case—and I stress that it is a dissenting opinion—we find reference to the President's 1952 Executive Order No. 10,340 and references to the preexisting national emergency which had been declared "to fulfill our responsibilities" to the United Nations. The order then argued, plausibly enough, that "a continuing and uninterrupted supply of steel" was indispensable to the conduct of the United Nations' effort to repel aggression in Korea. It noted the strike called by the CIO union, and asserted that this would immediately jeopardize the defense of those joined with us in resisting aggression.

Mr. Truman stated, further, that "by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution" he directed the Secretary of Commerce "to take possession of all of such plants, facilities, and other property of the companies named in the list attached hereto, or any part thereof as he may deem necessary."

Moreover, in his opinion sustaining this seizure Chief Justice Vinson maintained that the President was wholly justified by the treaty obligations under the United Nations Charter. He seemed to suggest that those obligations entitled the President to govern by decree, paying no more attention to Congress, in effect, than a dictator would.

Let me read what Justice Vinson said:

> The Executive may act upon things and upon men in many relations which have not, though they might have, been actually regulated by Congress.

The fifth amendment to the Constitution says flatly that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. In the Steel case the Chief Justice, as I have indicated, strongly intimated that a treaty can nullify the due process clause. In effect, the Pink case said the same thing—that the due process clause did not apply to international agreements. This conflict, which in the Steel case was provisionally decided upon the theory of government by executive decree, is clearly inherent in our United Nations membership, and may again be precipitated by any President at any time. Americans are prone to consider the steel industry of the United States in the same situation as the steel industry of Great Britain, which can be taken over and socialized, and then returned. I think it is always well to look at dissenting opinions, because they may eventually become the law.

Coming back to the question of what we are trying to do, suppose a treaty were made which undertook to deal with the rights of American citizens in the social, economic, and cultural fields. Would this be a valid exercise of treaty power? I mention the subject because of the attitude of the previous administration, to the effect that there is now no difference between the domestic and the foreign fields. If that be true, if that be a valid exercise of treaty power, then Congress could implement such a treaty by legislation. However, such a treaty would not deal with matters of international concern, but rather with matters of purely internal concern. The economic, social, and cultural freedoms which are the subject of the 14th amendment are, of course, reserved to the States.

Can a law of Congress repeal a treaty? I should say that if that question were asked members of the bar we would receive the reply that certainly a law of Congress can repeal a treaty.

Because in the Pink case an executive agreement was given the same dignity as a treaty, the next question is, Can a law of Congress repeal an international agreement other than a treaty? I should say that the great majority of lawyers would immediately say, "Certainly a law of Congress can repeal a treaty, no matter what the treaty is, or no matter what the executive agreement is."

I wish to refer to the case of *Fong Yue Ting* v. *U. S.* (149 U. S. 698). I read from page 720 of the opinion:

> As was said by this Court in Chae Chan Ping's case, following previous decisions: "The treaties were of no greater legal obligation than the act of Congress."

That is what I think most lawyers would say. I continue the quotation:

> "By the Constitution, laws made in pursuance thereof and treaties made under the authority of the United States are both declared to be the supreme law of the land, and no paramount authority is given to one over the other."

I think that is what would generally be said. Therefore it would be said immediately, "Certainly a law of Congress can repeal a treaty or an executive agreement."

I continue the quotation:

> "A treaty, it is true, is in its nature a contract between nations, and is often merely promissory in its character, requiring legislation to carry its stipulations into effect. Such legislation will be open to future repeal or amendment."

For example, let us take the case of Missouri against Holland. The migratory bird treaty had to be implemented by a law of Congress. Having implemented it by a law of Congress, we would feel that Congress might repeal such law.

I continue reading from the decision:

> "If the treaty operates by its own force, and relates to a subject within the power of Congress, it can be deemed in that particular only the equivalent of a legislative act—"

That language in the opinion is very significant. I repeat it:

> "If the treaty operates by its own force, and relates to a subject within the power of Congress, it can be deemed in that particular only the equivalent of a legislative act, to be repealed or modified at the pleasure of Congress."

I emphasize the words "in that particular only."

Coming back to the migratory bird treaty, that treaty provided for an act of Congress. But suppose that that particular treaty had been a self-executing treaty. Suppose that treaty had been such that the Congress could not have acted upon it. Congress could not have passed a law without the treaty in that case. Therefore the kind of legislation which we can enact repealing a treaty seems to be that described in the language:

> "If the treaty operates by its own force, and relates to a subject within the power of Congress, it can be deemed, in that particular only, the equivalent of a legislative act, to be repealed or modified at the pleasure of Congress. In either case, the last expression of the sovereign will must control.
>
> "So far as a treaty made by the United States with any foreign nation can become the subject of judicial cognizance in the courts of this country, it is subject to such acts as Congress may pass for its enforcement, modification, or repeal."

Let us note the significance of that language. The Court says that if a treaty with a foreign nation can become the subject of judicial cognizance in the courts of this country, it is subject to such acts as Congress may pass for its enforcement, modification, or repeal.

We know that in decision after decision the Court speaks of the political right of the Executive to make a treaty.

With respect to that kind of treaty, most lawyers would say, if asked whether a treaty could be repealed by an act of Congress, that it could be. However, the decision to which I have referred clearly shows that when the President is acting in his political capacity, and therefore not subject to judicial cognizance in the courts, the Congress of the United States is helpless, after a treaty is once made and becomes the law of the land.

I think it is well to consider what was said in the particular case to which I have just referred. I have read three decisions which seem to show that a treaty must be made in compliance with the Constitution. The three cases which I have mentioned were all decided before the case of Missouri against Holland, and I find no reaffirmation of those cases since. If treaties had the same standing as an act of Congress, everyone would say, "Congress can step in at any time and rectify any mistake which has been made." Therefore, we feel that an amendment to the Constitution is essential. We are not talking only about taking powers away from the Executive or taking them away from Congress or taking them away from the courts. What we are concerned with here is what we can do.

There is a very interesting case known as *U. S.* v. *Capps* (204 F. 2d 655). It is very interesting to note that that case is now being appealed to the Supreme Court by the Department of Justice. Judge Parker wrote the opinion of the court. The case was heard by three very able and distinguished justices: Parker, Soper, and Dobie. The court said:

On the facts we think that judgment was properly entered for the defendant, but for reasons other than those given by the District Court. We have little difficulty in seeing in the evidence breach of contract on the part of the defendant and damage resulting to the United States from the breach. We think, however, that the executive agreement was void because it was not authorized by Congress and contravened the provisions of a statute dealing with the very matter to which it related and that the contract relied on, which was based on the executive agreement, was unenforceable in the courts of the United States for like reason.

Judge Parker found that the State Department made an executive agreement which was not authorized by Congress, and that it contravened a provision of an act of Congress. Notwithstanding that fact, we find that the Department of Justice is appealing the case. I continue to quote from the decision:

We think also that no action can be maintained by the Government to recover damages on account of what is essentially a breach of a trade regulation, in the absence of express authorization by Congress—

And so forth. I quote more significant language of Judge Parker:

It is argued, however, that the validity of the executive agreement was not dependent upon the act of Congress, but was made pursuant to the inherent powers—

Mr. President, where did we hear that expression before—inherent powers? The steel mills of America were seized under that very language—

pursuant to the inherent powers of the President under the Constitution. The answer is that while the President has certain inherent powers under the Constitution, such as the power pertaining to his position as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

I do not want to take away from the President his war powers which are his under the Constitution, but I believe that the President does not want what is known as inherent power, under which he can make an executive agreement or a treaty which is in direct conflict with a statute or which is not authorized by law, but which is within the power of Congress, as, for example, the question of foreign trade.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Did not the opinion of the Court also hold that under the agreements and treaties which the country can enter into, power flowed to the President not given him in the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. That is what was appealed from. The court continues:

The power necessary to see that the laws are faithfully executed, the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, is not among the powers incident to the Presidential office, but is expressly vested by the Constitution in the Congress. It cannot be upheld as an exercise of the power to see that the laws are faithfully executed, for, as said by Justice Holmes in his dissenting opinion in *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 177, 47 S. Ct. 21, 85, 71, L. Ed. 160), "The duty of the President to see that the laws be executed is a duty that does not go beyond the laws or require him to achieve more than the Congress sees fit to leave within his power."

Then the Court cites the Steel case, *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer* (343 U. S. 579):

We think that whatever the power of the Executive with respect to making executive trade agreements or regulating foreign commerce in the absense of action by Congress, it is clear that the Executive may not through entering into such an agreement avoid complying with a regulation prescribed by Congress.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The citation of that case takes me back to the argument of the Steel Seizure case. When we hear on the floor of the Senate the argument that the President has such broad powers in foreign affairs that they are tantamount to absolute power, I go back to the steel case and the argument of John W. Davis, in which he told the Supreme Court that the President of the United States has but one absolute and unfettered power; the power of pardon; all other Executive powers hedged about by checks and balances, as are the powers of the legislative branch.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say that this case does not relate to the present Secretary of State or the present President.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. My remarks are not intended to go to the present Secretary of State or present President.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. May I inquire when the appeal was taken?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was taken last April.

Mr. GEORGE. Under this administration?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the famous Capps case.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. It is being appealed by the present Attorney General.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Surely, I am surprised.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was surprised, too.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. In view of the decision of the Court in the Potato case, to which the Senator has been referring, and the attitude of the Department of Justice, that the President should have the power to amend, suspend, or revoke local legislation, what reason can be advanced in opposition to a requirement that there be legislation enacted before an executive agreement becomes internal law?

Mr. FERGUSON. May I ask the Senator to repeat his question?

Mr. BRICKER. In view of the appeal taken by the Attorney General in the Potato case, which is an appeal based upon what he claims to be the right of the President to make an executive agreement which would repeal internal law and which would void a law of Congress, what is the objection to making executive agreements the internal law of the land only by an act of Congress?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to read from the brief of the Attorney General, and that may answer the Senator. I have his brief before me. I may say that his brief in the appeal case has not been filed. I have the certiorari brief.

Mr. BRICKER. Has the certiorari been allowed?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; it has been allowed. This is what the brief states at page 14:

The Court has explicitly confirmed the President's capacity, subject to constitutional limitations, to enter into such executive agreements in appropriate cases.

He cites the cases of United States against Curtiss-Wright, United States against Belmont, United States against Pink, and other cases, and says:

Executive agreements so concluded have the same status as treaties.

The Attorney General affirms the opinion in the Pink case when he says that executive agreements so concluded have the same status as treaties. That is one of the reasons why we wanted to put into the first section the words "and other international agreements."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. No doubt, for the same reason, the Attorney General will oppose limiting the power of the Presi-

dent to make executive agreements, secret or otherwise.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. He cites the Altman case which involved the right of appeal. He cites United States against Belmont and United States against Pink, and here is where he hedges. He says, "subject to constitutional limitations."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator recognize that under the Pink case, the Belmont case, and the case of Missouri against Holland, there is any constitutional limitation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I wanted to know the meaning of those words, "subject to constitutional limitations." What limitations?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Has it not been said by the courts that neither a treaty nor an executive agreement can override the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Where is that law?

Mr. COOPER. It is implicit in the Constitution. It has been said by the Supreme Court in many cases—I will agree that it is dictum—but, it has been said in many cases that a treaty will not supersede the Constitution or the Bill of Rights.

Mr. FERGUSON. A treaty has never been held void because it contravened the Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. An argument could very well be made that no treaty has been ratified which could be construed as tending to supersede or invade the Constitution or the Bill of Rights. It can be argued that treaty power has been properly exercised.

Mr. FERGUSON. That seems to argue that the Founding Fathers need not have been careful when they drew the Constitution, because there had been no violations of the Constitution up to that time. All we are trying to do is to write into the Constitution that which the Senator is now saying, that the rights guaranteed to the people by the Bill of Rights cannot be taken away from them by a treaty or an executive agreement.

Mr. COOPER. Does not the Senator think that is in the Constitution now?

Mr. FERGUSON. From what I have read of the decisions, I would think that the Supreme Court would say that it is a political function, and, therefore, it was not intended to be included in the Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. I am not captiously asking these questions. I realize the work that has been done, and I realize the Senator's concern that the Constitution shall not be violated. I should like to ask a few questions later to bring out, if I can, the purposes intended by this amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Pink case is authority for the statement that the fifth amendment to the Constitution itself could not stand in the way of the decision made in that case which raised to the dignity of a treaty a mere executive agreement.

Mr. FERGUSON. I quite agree with the Senator that it was decided, in effect, that the fifth amendment was not applicable to executive agreements.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I certainly would not be presumptious enough to disagree always with the distinguished Senator from Georgia. He knows the profound regard I have for his opinion as a constitutional lawyer, as well as his great ability in the legislative field. I said on Friday in the short speech which I made here, that the Pink case went too far and I thought its precedent bad, I also stated, that I did not believe the Pink case held that an executive agreement could supersede the fifth amendment. There was no issue in the case between an alien within the Territory of the United States and, therefore, under its protection, and a citizen of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not now assenting to the soundness of the finding in the Pink case. I never have. I think it is authority for one proposition, namely, that nothing in the fifth amendment stands in the way of the decision. It may not have been entirely pertinent. There are a great many things that are obiter in court decisions.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think when the Court is deciding constitutional questions there are many things included which could just as well be omitted.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think it is important at this juncture to point out the fact that the executive agreement in the Pink case was never brought before the Senate for ratification, and that the Senate did not have any opportunity to study it. It was an agreement made solely by the President on his own initiative, and, in my opinion, it violated the fifth amendment and set aside laws of the sovereign State of New York without any action whatever on the part of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has said that in his opinion the present law is that the fundamental rights reserved by the people in the Constitution cannot be overridden.

Let us look at the Constitution. We formed a new government. Therefore, we had to have sovereignty. As I said in the beginning, we divided that sovereignty. We had an idea, which was a good one—and if we could establish it all over the world it would have a good effect and I think we would have world peace—that there are inalienable God-given rights that cannot be taken from man. Our forefathers called them unalienable instead of inalienable rights. They specified certain rights which could not be taken away because they were inalienable. They belonged to the people by virtue of God, and, therefore, a government could not take them away from the people. They were suspicious of public officials in those days. They knew that the right of habeas corpus, for instance, was not sacred under the British law and the British Constitution. The right of habeas corpus is one of our sacred rights. There were other rights. All I am trying to say is that we should make this Constitution the instrument which we have always believed it to be—guaranteeing to all American citizens that their sacred and inalienable rights cannot be taken from them unless they themselves consent.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator from Michigan believe that such a result can be accomplished by the amendment that is proposed without disturbing the historical balance between the States and the Federal Government?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I do. I shall come to that later when I discuss the 10th amendment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. In relation to the Pink case, I wish to quote certain language from the decision:

> Frequently the obligation of a treaty will be dependent on State law * * *. But State law must yield when it is inconsistent with or impairs the policy or provisions of a treaty or of an international compact or agreement * * *. Then the power of a State to refuse enforcement of rights based on foreign law which runs counter to the public policy of the forum * * * must give way before the superior Federal policy evidenced by a treaty or international compact or agreement.

That is what that case decided. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think I said earlier that the people of the Colonies, who had fought a war to gain their independence, and won it, then undertook to form a Constitution. They tried to write something that was different from that which they had had before.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. As a matter of fact, they were introducing into the world for the first time the inherent right of people to govern themselves in their internal affairs, were they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It was the beginning of local self-determination. That is what the Constitution of the United States provided for, and that is what our Founding Fathers gave us.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Let us proceed to article I of the Constitution. In section 8 of article I, the founders of the Constitution gave Congress certain rights:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and

excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States.

I refer again to the Capps case. If an executive agreement can do what the agreement discussed in the Capps case did with respect to interstate commerce, when Congress has been given the right to regulate interstate commerce, then the executive branch of the Government will have the same right, by international agreement, to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, because that power is given to Congress, too.

As will be seen from section 8 of article I, Congress was given certain powers, becase the Founding Fathers did not want the States or the Executive to exercise those powers. I have shown that it was not desired to have States make treaties. The United States Government was authorized to make treaties.

The drafters of the Constitution said to the States, "You can make an agreement only with the consent of Congress."

But in section 9, article I, what did the writers of the Constitution provide? They were referring to inalienable rights. What are those rights?

The second paragraph of section 9, article I, provides:

The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it.

Does anyone contend—I hope no one does—that by executive agreement the writ of habeas corpus could be suspended? I do not think it could be. All that is desired, under the two proposed amendments, is to make certain that the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended in the United States by executive agreement. There has been so much loose language in decisions of the Supreme Court and of the appellate courts that I think the time has come when Congress ought to state definitely that the law is actually what the people of the United States believe it to be today.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to section 1 of article I, which provides as follows:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

That is the only place in the grant of powers where the word "all" is used in the Constitution. We have now come to the time when, under the decisions of the Supreme Court, the President and two-thirds of the Senate can legislate, and when the President of the United States himself, by an agreement with another power, can legislate for the people of the United States. The Attorney General is attempting to sustain that power in the appeal in the Potato case.

Section 1 of article I is a clear section of the Constitution that has been violated every time an international treaty or executive agreement has become domestic law. That is what the senior Senator from Ohio wishes to prevent. I desire to have all domestic legislation remain in the hands of the Congress of the United States, as it was intended it should remain by the original drafters of the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. At the present moment I am speaking only of sections 8 and 9 of article I. I understand the Senator from Ohio has sent to the desk another amendment, about which I shall wish to speak later. I am now speaking about section 9 of article I of the Constitution, which enumerates the rights that, in my opinion, the people did not want to have anyone take away from them.

Let us move to the next provision of section 9:

No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed.

I know there are persons who argue that that provision applies only to Congress, because only Congress can pass a law. They say that a treaty or an executive agreement is a combination of a law and a contract not made by Congress. It may not be called legislation, but it has its effects upon the people's rights.

Does anyone contend—I hope no one does—that Congress would be able to make an agreement with another nation by passing a bill of attainder, or that under such an agreement attainder would take place, or that ex post facto decisions would apply?

Let me refer to another provision of section 9, article I:

No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.

Could we provide in an international agreement on commerce that a tax would be laid upon articles exported from the States? To whom are the people reserving this right? I think they have reserved it to themselves, in order to prohibit anyone from taking it away from them in any way, because it is one of the inalienable rights.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD that part of the Constitution comprising sections 8 and 9, of article I, which granted to Congress certain powers which provide in effect that those rights and powers shall not be taken from the people.

There being no objection, sections 8 and 9 of article I of the Constitution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 8. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

To establish post offices and post roads;

To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries;

To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations;

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards, and other needful buildings; and

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

SEC. 9. The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibted by the Congress prior to the year 1808, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding $10 for each person.

The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it.

No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed.

No capitation, or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.

No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one State be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another.

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, officer, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire now to take up each of the amendments to the Constitution and to have them printed as a part of my remarks, because I desire to speak about them.

The first amendment to the Constitution provides:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

I think the amendment as now drafted, amending article VI, would apply to the first amendment to the Constitution, even though the first amendment provides only that Congress shall make no law of the kind proscribed, because I believe that these are inalienable rights. Congress cannot establish a religion, and such an establishment could not be made by executive agreement or treaty.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I appreciate the Senator's making the record to that extent, because the original first amendment was drafted so as to prohibit Congress from making any such law. It was done because nobody at that time, either in the Constitutional Convention or in the First Congress of the United States, or in the States, in ratifying the Constitution, ever thought that anybody but Congress had any power to legislate. That is the reason why it was written in that way.

Of course, by a recent decision, I think the Senator from Michigan will agree with me that that provision extends to all administrative arms of Congress.

But let me ask the Senator from Michigan about the proposed Covenant on Human Rights, which has been worked on by Congress for a long time with encouragement given by the State Department. Many proponents of that covenant have appeared before committees of Congress, including the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on the Judiciary.

Let it be said, to the fullest credit of the Secretary of State, that the Secretary of State has said that it has many elements of danger in it, and that this administration feels it should not support the covenant because of those elements of danger.

But if it should become the supreme law of the land, by reason of the President acceding to it and two-thirds of the Senate ratifying it, there would be a limitation and restriction, and perhaps the annulment of the rights of freedom of speech, of freedom of the press, and of freedom of personal worship.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope, too, that Congress will not ratify it if in any way it would violate the first amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator see that provision in the Covenant?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and I find that the 14th amendment seems to try to relate those functions to the States.

Mr. BRICKER. It has been interpreted that it does relate to the powers of the States. Practically every State has a similar provision in its own bill of rights.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the people have prohibited such a right to their Congress, certainly no right seems to be granted to anyone else, unless we look to the inherent right of the President to act. Congress is forbidden to do anything in the way of the establishment of religion or the prohibition of the free exercise thereof, the abridgment of the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition their Government for a redress of grievances.

The combination of the two amendments under discussion would certainly take care of anything arising under the first amendment, or, in fact, any other amendment.

We come now to the fifth amendment, which has been mentioned here in relation to the Pink case:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself—

The latter clause seems to be the only part of the fifth amendment people remember, the one under which one can refuse to testify on the ground of self-incrimination—

nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

I cite the two amendments to show their relation to the form in which we have drafted the committee amendment. I shall presently come to a discussion of the 9th and 10th amendments.

I am not one who feels that there should be lodged in the States the right in any way to make treaties. The absolute prohibition I have read is in the Constitution. The only exception is that the States have the right, by the consent of Congress, to make agreements and compacts. I think the first case relating to that question involved the State of Maine, and in that case the Court held that the provision meant just what I have stated it meant.

In my opinion the 10th amendment was not meant to apply to treaties. I make that statement based on two reasons; first, that the power to make treaties is granted to the United States; second, that it was prohibited to the States.

The 9th and 10th amendments are tied together so far as the treatymaking power and foreign relations are concerned, except, as I have stated, that agreements or compacts may be made by the States by the consent of Congress.

Other provisions of the Constitution provide that the right to a writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended except in certain contingencies and that money shall not be appropriated except through an act of Congress.

I say that we must not return, and that no one desires that we shall return to the situation in which my State of Michigan would have to ratify every treaty or every executive agreement. I do not know of anyone who has any such desire.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Certainly I agree that nobody is in favor of giving any State authority to annul a treaty or make a treaty, other than as authorized by the Constitution with the consent of Congress. Let us read the ninth amendment:

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

The ninth amendment is rather indefinite. The 10th amendment is more definite. It states:

The powers not delegated to the United State by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Let me recur to the ninth amendment. What are some of the rights retained by the people which are not enumerated in the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. What does the Senator say they are?

Mr. BRICKER. I shall explain a little later what I think they are, but I ask the Senator if he agrees that they are the rights contained within the police power of the States, the right to determine property ownership, the right to build highways, the right to determine speed laws, the right to adjudicate in domestic relations, divorce, alimony cases, and as to family relationships, the rights of employer and employee, insofar as the Federal Government has not absorbed that function, and all matters with which the State legislatures are dealing day by day?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would have to say that, in my opinion, what we are seeking to accomplish—and I believe the Senator is trying to reach the same goal in section 1 and section 2 of the joint resolution as reported by the Judiciary Committee and modified—is to provide that a treaty or an executive agreement should be held unconstitutional if it would attempt to take away those rights.

Mr. BRICKER. As it affects the Federal structure.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER That is what we had in mind originally.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER Passing that by for the moment has the Senator anything in mind regarding the rights under the ninth amendment, which are rights retained by the people, than the ones we have been discussing? What are some of the fields which by treaty or legislation the National Government can enter which are reserved to the people under the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. I really cannot give the Senator an answer at this time.

Mr. BRICKER. We tried to get an answer to that question during the hearings, but we did not succeed. I wondered whether the Senator had anything in mind in that respect.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, I have not, but I have stated that I do not think the 10th amendment applies to treaties and executive agreements. The 10th amendment reads:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States.

That was included when the Federal Republic was established. The Founding Fathers were saying, "There are certain things we will not allow anyone to touch. We will spell them out." They did spell them out. Then they were fearful, in my opinion, that there were some others which they may have forgotten, which were sacred, inalienable, and God-given rights, and they included this provision to indicate that such rights went back to the States or to the people. That is the way I view the 9th and 10th amendments. I do not contend that those two amendments would give the States any right to enter into international relations, through treaties or other international agreements.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, in the interest of continuity, I shall ask my colleagues not to interrupt during the presentation of my remarks.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, before the Senator commences his address, will he yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BRICKER. Is the Senator from Maryland willing to yield to me at this time, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, to the Senator from Ohio, provided it is understood that in doing so, I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, numerous charges have been made in this Chamber with respect to alleged errors, inconsistencies and fallacies supposedly appearing in a report on Senate Joint Resolution 1 which I filed for the Committee on the Judiciary. I cannot allow those charges to stand uncontroverted, lest some uninformed persons give them a credence which they do not deserve. These charges are baseless, as anyone will discover if he examines the subject more than superficially. I propose to show just how baseless they are.

Many of these charges involve trivia to which I do not intend to reply save to issue a general denial of their accuracy. I must admit that when I first heard them, I felt impelled to answer each and every one of the allegations, whether trivial or not, but upon reflection I decided not to burden Members of the Senate with a lengthy recitation and refutation of minutiae. Consequently I shall try to content myself with replying to those allegations concerning the committee report which are of a more serious nature. I believe that this is consistent with the desire I expressed at the opening of this debate that discussion be commensurate with the importance of the issue involved.

On pages 657 and 658 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 22 a Senator referred to the committee report and stated that there are no Supreme Court holdings directly in point showing that the Supreme Court is ready at a moment's notice to rule that a treaty can amend the Constitution or enlarge the scope of authority of the Federal Government.

The history of the legislation involved in the case of Missouri against Holland will show that prior to the adoption of the treaty with Great Britain, similar acts had been declared unconstitutional in Federal courts as being outside the authority of the Federal Government. After the adoption of the treaty, the Supreme Court held that the Federal Government did have the authority to enact legislation not otherwise within its delegated powers. It must be clear to any individual who will examine this case and its history objectively, that the Supreme Court viewed the treaty power as enlarging the scope of authority of the Federal Government, and I submit that the holding is directly in support of that point.

At another point in the discussion of the majority report, reference was made to the available evidence on the question of the self-executing nature of articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter. This was the statement made on the floor of the Senate a week ago last Friday:

> The Department of State and the Department of Justice have both concluded that articles 55 and 56 of the U. N. Charter are not self-executing. (For the official position of the Department of State see letter to the Attorney General from Ernest A. Gross, the legal adviser of the Department of State, reproduced in part in 36 Va. L. R. 1080. The Justice Department made its position clear in its brief amicus curiae in *Shelley* v. *Kraemer* (334 U. S. 1 (1943)).)
>
> Except for an overruled decision by a California court, an unrecorded and unappealed ruling by a judge on a lower Idaho court, and the views of a law professor in Iowa, there is no evidence to support the interpretation that articles 55 and 56 are self-executing. On the other side of the question are the views of almost all of the legal commentators on the subject and the unanimous opinion of all of the judges of the California State Supreme Court which has passed on the question. The question has never arisen in, or been appealed to, the Federal courts.

The author of that statement either did not read, did not comprehend, or ignored a significant passage of the majority report which pointed out that 4 Justices of the Supreme Court in the case of *Oyama* v. *California* (332 U. S. 633 (1948)), thought those articles should be given self-executing effect. Two of those Justices are still on the Supreme Court. For the edification of the speaker who committed that error, citation to that decision, including the names of the Justices involved and the pertinent quotations, appear on page 9 of the majority report. I hope he, and others who may have heard or read his remarks, will note those quotations and then examine the earlier definition of a self-executing treaty, which appears on page 8 of the report. Prof. Quincy Wright is responsible for that definition. Since he is an opponent to the Bricker amendment and a professor, perhaps his definition will prove acceptable to the opponents of the joint resolution.

But that is not all. Others have viewed those articles of the U. N. Charter as self-executing. I have examined a few briefs, amicus curiae, and otherwise, too. Perhaps the opponents of this amendment should be aware of a few individuals and organizations who have viewed articles 55 and 56 as self-executing. The opponents might examine the briefs in the Takahaski case, for instance. Several briefs urge the court to strike down a State law which they viewed as inconsistent with the human rights provisions of the charter. Let me list some of them.

In the brief for the petitioner on the writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court of the United States, it is pointed out, at page 33:

> More recently, the Federal Government has taken further action in this field. By articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter, this Government has pledged itself to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization to achieve.

There follows a recitation of the text of paragraph C under article 55 of the United Nations Charter.

Then later in the brief, beginning on page 37, it states:

> Thus it will be seen that the Federal Government has legislated domestically, and, in the international field, has twice agreed with other nations to eliminate within its borders the very discrimination on account of race which the amendment of 1945 to the California Fish and Game Code, if valid, would perpetuate. This amendment must, therefore, fall in the face of this national action.

It may be interesting to some Senators to know that one of the counsels for the petitioners in this case was former Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People filed an amicus curiae brief in this action, in which they stated:

> More recently they [aliens] have been afforded an added protection by the act of the United States in subscribing to the United Nations Charter, article 55 of which has pledged this country to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.
>
> The United Nations Charter is a treaty, duly executed by the President and ratified by the Senate (51 Stat. 1031). Under article VI, section 2 of the Constitution such a treaty is the "supreme law of the land" and specifically, "The judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."
>
> • • • • • •
>
> While it is true that Japan is not a party to the United Nations Charter, the treaty obligations of the United States under the charter are not limited simply to nationals

of the other member nations. It has now become clear by the action of our own Government and of other governments in international affairs that the treatment of any minority group within any country is a proper subject of international negotiations.

* * * * * *

There cannot be any question that this legislation violates the letter and the spirit of the treaty obligations of the United States and under our Constitution must fall before the superior power of such treaty.

Another brief filed in that case was that filed by the American Jewish Congress. On page 2 of the brief of that organization this paragraph appears:

We believe that this provision is invalid for the further reason that it violates Federal policy, especially as embodied in the United Nations Charter (art. 55, ch. 56; 59 Stat. 1046). The fundamental issue of the impact of this policy upon State discriminatory practices has been presented to this Court in the pending cases involving the enforceability of restrictive covenants. (*J. D. Shelley* v. *Louis Kraemer* (October term, 1947, No. 72; also Nos. 87, 290, and 291).) The relevance of that issue here is clear. See concurring opinions of Justices Black and Murphy in *Oyama* v. *California* (92 L. Ed. 257, 266, 278). However, we will not dwell further on that subject, as we believe that the equal protection clause alone requires reversal of the present judgment.

Another brief filed in the same case was filed by the American Civil Liberties Union. In their brief that organization made this assertion:

To permit enforcement of such a discrimination embodied in State law would conflict with the treaty obligation undertaken by the United States under the United Nations Charter, to "promote * * * universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." United Nations Charter, articles 55 and 56; 59 Stat. 1046, 1945).

Since the foregoing obligation is under article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution, the supreme law of the land, it follows that the statute must be denied enforcement for this reason as well.

The footnote to this last paragraph reads as follows:

Nielson v. *Johnson* (279 U. S. 47); *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416). For the particular applicability of the cited charter provisions to anti-Japanese legislation, see *Oyama* v. *California* (332 U. S. 633, 649, 650, 673, concurring opinions).

And finally, another brief filed in that case was the brief of the American Veterans' Committee, which contains the following statement, beginning at page 15:

Since section 990 of the California Fish and Game Code denies to some persons, solely because of ther racial ancestry, this "human right and fundamental freedom," which the charter expressly states applies "for all" persons "without distinction as to race," the racial discrimination in section 990 is plainly inconsistent with the charter. Under article VI of the United States Constitution, the supremacy of this Federal treaty provision overrides "anything in the * * * laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." [Citations omitted.] Indeed, this court could not permit the continued enforcement of section 990 without thereby itself violating the pledge of this Nation to "promote * * * universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race."

I should not neglect to mention the American Association for the United Nations which, in an amicus curiae brief, in the case of Shelley against Kraemer, argued for self-executing effect for articles 55 and 56. After the California case, the American Association for the United Nations changed their tune (see p. 755 of the hearings), temporarily, at least.

I cannot help wondering whether the Senator was acquainted with all these statements when he made his assertion that there was no evidence to support the interpretation that articles 55 and 56 are self-executing and that almost all of the legal commentators on the subject are on the other side of the question. Perhaps a closer study of the matter is warranted on the part of the Senator, since most of these organizations support him in his opposition to the amendment.

I shall touch on one more statement made recently on the subject of the nonself-executing clause of the Bricker amendment.

The statement made reference to the report and the citation it contained to the decision of an appeal court in California on the self-executing nature of articles 55 and 56. Then the statement was made that the lower court holding had been reversed. The statement was so worded as to infer that the majority report did not record that fact. I invite Members of the Senate to examine page 9 of the report again to see for themselves that such was not the fact. To be exact, the committee report is more correct than the statement in the speech delivered a week ago last Friday because the decision in that case was not reversed—"the opinion," I think the statement called it. The truth is, the same decision was reached although the highest court of California disagreed with the reasoning expressed by the lower court. "Opinions" are not overruled in law; decisions are. If the opponents of the resolution desire precise accuracy in others, let them be accurate themselves.

Following the statement that the opinion cited had been overruled by the California Supreme Court on this point, the Senator made the statement that "in fact, the lower court opinion does not even appear in the permanent California reports". This, of course, is misleading; it infers that the case is not even reported, when, as a matter of fact it is, and the Senator will find the citation to the case on page 9 of the committee report. To save the Senator the trouble of referring to page 9, I will tell him here and now that he can find the decision of the lower California court in 217 P. 2d at page 481 and again at 218 P. 2d 595.

On page 659 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated January 22, the Senator referred to a statement in the majority report that three judges in the steel-seizure case seemed to find authority for the seizure of a whole industry in the obligation of the President to carry into effect certain treaties and acts of Congress. The observation was then made that such a statement regarding the steel-seizure case was purely a statement of opinion and not of fact. The Senator then sought to show that the statement had been categorically rejected by no less a lawyer than Attorney General Herbert Brownell. The Senator, however, did not make reference to a resolution adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General, representing the attorneys general of all of the 48 States, wherein that distinguished body of lawyers stated:

Whereas adherence to this new concept of international relations and obligations of national states, directly affecting private persons and property even when not expressly required by treaty terms, has reached such a level of judicial acceptance as to be incorporated in a dissenting opinion of the Supreme Court of these United States wherein the general military obligations of the United States under the terms of the United Nations Charter and conventions and the North Atlantic Treaty were advanced as justification for the seizure of private property by the National Government and might equally well be advanced as a justification for invasion of the traditional liberties of our citizenry.

In the resolving clause the National Association of Attorneys General recommended that steps be taken to amend the Constitution to subordinate the treatymaking power of the National Government to each and every provision of the Bill of Rights to the Constitution. If the Senators would like to examine that resolution, they will find it on pages 695 and 693 of the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1. Whatever the Attorney General may have thought concerning the dissent of the three judges in the steel-seizure case, the National Association of Attorneys General seem to have a different viewpoint.

Later on in his presentation the Senator made the statement that the majority report gives credence to the oft-repeated but never substantiated statement that over 200 treaties are in preparation in the United Nations or its affiliated agencies. The statement which appears in the committee report reads as follows:

The committee is informed that over 200 treaties are in various stages of preparation in the United Nations or its affiliated agencies.

The Senator suspected that the vast majority of the treaties referred to in that statement were International Labor Organization documents. I do not know why the Senator chose the word "documents" because in most cases they were referred to by the International Labor Organization as conventions. I do not think the Senator knows which of these conventions, or documents, whichever we want to call them, will be submitted to the Senate upon their completion. On page 535 of the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1, a witness who himself was an employer-delegate to the International Labor Organization said that there was now in existence in the International Labor Organization conventions ready for submission dealing with the following subjects:

Safety provisions in the building industry.

Gathering of statistics on wages and hours in mining, manufacturing, building, and agriculture.

Government regulation of written contracts of employment of indigenous workers.

Government regulation of hours of work and rest periods of bus and truck drivers.

Medical examination of children employed in industry.

Freedom of association of employees and protection in the right to organize.
The setting up of a Federal employment service.
Regulation of night work of women employed in industry.
Labor clauses in public contracts.
Regulation of methods of payment of wages.
Government regulation of employment agencies.
Minimum wages in agriculture.
Equal pay for men and women for equal work.
Holidays with pay in agriculture.
Social security.
Government benefits for maternity.

Will the Senator who spoke a week ago last Friday inform the Senate how many of these will likely be submitted as treaties, and which ones? I do not know why any of them should be submitted as treaties, in view of the fact that the Secretary of State testified, as did his legal adviser, that the Department of State has not participated in the formulation and adoption of any of the ILO conventions. That testimony begins on page 895 of the hearings. On page 896, the legal adviser of the Department of State says:

There are some 170 various conventions that have been drafted since we became parties to the International Labor Organization.

Mr. Phleger also testified that it was his understanding that the Department of State did not participate at all in the formulation of these conventions. As a matter of fact, Mr. Phleger went on to testify that he did not think the Department of State was consulted at all on whether the convention on maternity protection was an appropriate subject for international agreement. Thus we have the spectacle of treaties being prepared by an international agency in which the Department of State did not even participate and was not even consulted. The opponents of the Bricker amendment expect us to believe that no treaty will be made on a subject which is not proper for international negotiation, yet the department of Government supposedly best able to prepare treaties has not even been consulted on some of them. With knowledge of that, what right have we to expect that no treaty will be made involving a matter which most of us would agree was not a proper subject for international negotiation?

A distinguished Senator made the remark during this debate that during the early drafting stages of the Covenant on Human Rights, the United States made it clear that we could never become a party to that covenant without the inclusion of a non-self-executing clause and a Federal-State clause. He also observes that these clauses would have protected us from the "pictured dangers." It looks as if the Senator again did not read the record of the hearings conducted by the Committee on the Judiciary on this resolution, for, if he had, he would have found on page 618 a report of the committee on amendments to the Federal Constitution of the New York State bar. That committee does not favor the Bricker resolution yet, let me read a portion of their views with respect to the competence of these clauses which the Senator says would have protected us from the "pictured dangers":

If such a treaty as the Covenant on Human Rights is within the treatymaking power, then under our Constitution and the decisions of our Supreme Court the effect of our becoming a party to the covenant would be to give the Congress of the United States full power to enact legislation effective within the States to put the covenant into effect. That obviously would be accomplished in accordance with the constitutional processes of the United States. It would be a result consistent with our Constitution, as already determined in *Missouri* v. *Holland*. Consequently, Congress would be in accordance with our constitutional processes, have full power, and subdivision (b) dealing with favorable recommendations to the States would be inoperative. If we want to put a clause in the covenant on this subject, it would have to go further and provide that the Federal Government assumes no obligation to enact legislation which it could not constitutionally enact, in the absence of the treaty. This would relieve the Federal Government from an obligation to enact Federal legislation, but even then it might be held that under the rule in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, Congress would gain power to fully implement the covenant although under no international obligation to do so.

From this quotation it may be seen that the Senator's own allies do not support his position on the adequacy of these clauses.

In discussing the ratification and implementation of treaties, the statement recites the sentence in the committee report which reads:

The United States is one of the few Nations of the world where a treaty becomes domestic law of the land immediately upon ratification.

The point being made at that time was that the treaty did not become part of the domestic law without action by the legislature of the signatory nation. It should be noted that in the recitation by the Senator of the laws applying in the several countries, reference is sometimes made to ratification of treaties and other times to a time when a treaty enters into force. In either case, it will be recognized by a reading of the recitation of the various laws and constitutions of the major nations of the world, that the predominate number of them require action by the body which is comparable to our Congress, either before the treaty enters into force or is ratified, or in some cases, afterward. The point which is largely ignored by opponents of the Bricker amendment is the fact that the legislation referred to in section 2 of the amendment may either precede or follow the adoption of a treaty. If it precedes the treaty, then by the Senator's own description, it is the same procedure as that followed in Great Britain and the other dominion nations on some occasions. That this section of the amendment contemplates that the legislation referred to may be prior to as well as subsequent to the adoption of the treaty, is borne out by references in the committee report. For instance, on page 11 of that report this statement appears:

The effectiveness of any treaty within the United States will be limited to the extent that appropriate legislation has not been enacted.

Reference might also be made, to establish this point, to page 30 where the report states:

In authorizing, for example, reciprocal-trade agreements, Congress could certainly provide in the same act that any agreement made by the President under its authority would become internal law in the United States.

This statement, although made with reference to executive agreements is equally applicable to treaties since by the terms of section 3 of the amendment, executive agreements are made subject to the limitations imposed on treaties.

It is important that those who study the Bricker amendment recognize the importance of the fact that the legislation referred to may be prior to the adoption of the treaty. This means, of course, that if a treaty is adopted within an area ordinarily reserved to the States and the State legislatures have already enacted legislation which would be in furtherance of the amendment, the treaty would immediately enter into force in those States. This realization becomes important when it is said that the Bricker amendment would render impossible the making of treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation dealing with the rights of aliens to own lands within the several States. The testimony before the committee of a well qualified witness who had examined the State laws was that 40 of the 48 States now permit ownership of land by aliens. Thus any treaty containing a provision permitting aliens to own land in the United States as freely as citizens would immediately become valid within 40 of the 48 States of the United States. It does not seem to me that this renders impossible the negotiation of such a treaty.

As a matter of fact, the United States has concluded treaties with foreign nations on this sort of basis both in the past and at the present time. The treaty involved in the case of Geofroy against Riggs contained the following provisions:

In all the States of the Union, whose existing laws permit it, so long and to the same exent as the said laws shall remain in force, Frenchmen shall enjoy the right of possessing personal and real property by the same title and in the same manner as citizens of the United States. * * *

As to the States of the Union, by whose existing laws aliens are not permitted to hold real estate, the President engaged to recommend to them the passage of such laws as may be necessary for the purpose of conferring this right.

Similar provisions appear in some modern treaties. For instance, the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, signed with China on November 4, 1946, reads in part as follows:

The nationals, corporations, and associations of either high contracting party shall be permitted to acquire, hold, and dispose of real and other immovable property throughout the territories of the other contracting party subject to the conditions and requirements as prescribed by the laws and regulations of such other high contracting party * * *. In the case of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States of America which does not now or does not

hereafter permit the nationals, corporations, and associations of the Republic of China to acquire, hold, or dispose of real and other immovable property upon the same terms as nationals, corporations, and associations of the United States of America, the provisions of the preceding sentence shall not apply. In that case, the Republic of China shall not be obligated to accord to nationals of the United States domiciled in and to corporations and associations of the United States of America created or organized under the laws of such State, Territory, or possession treatment more favorable than the treatment which is or may hereafter be accorded within such State, Territory or possession to nationals, corporations, and associations of the Republic of China.

As I recollect, provisions respecting certain State laws appeared in recent treaties with Greece, Denmark, Ethiopia, Israel, and Japan. It should be abundantly clear to anyone who has not blinded himself that such treaties have not been the cause of any loss of sovereignty by the United States. Although these types of treaties would be permitted under the terms of the Bricker amendment, as reported by the Judiciary Committee, the opponents of the measure have been loudly proclaiming that its ratification would make the Federal Government only partially sovereign. The ridiculous nature of this charge is apparent from the conclusion of this type of treaty prior to the consideration of this amendment, and even more so, because of treaty requirements now obtaining in Canada. Who is prepared to say that Canada is only partially sovereign? Canada continues to enter into agreements and treaties, notwithstanding its provisions of law, or criticisms of her by law professors. The fact of the matter is that Canada is as fully sovereign as we are at the present time, and as sovereign as we would be under the terms of the proposed amendment.

The majority report of the Committee on the Judiciary was also criticized recently for saying that the case of Missouri against Holland provided the mechanism whereby Congress has power to make laws pursuant to a treaty which it would not possess in the absence of a treaty. The statement of the Committee in its report reads as follows:

2. "WHICH" CLAUSE

a. Necessity for clause: The Constitution of the United States vested all the legislative powers granted in that instrument in a Congress of the United States consisting of a Senate and a House of Representatives. It also conferred upon the Congress the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for the carrying into execution of all of the powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. These have always been significant grants, but they became even more significant after the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Missouri* v. *Holland* (cited supra). As indicated earlier, the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* established that the treatymaking power was a delegated power which was, therefore, not restricted by the reservation of the States and the people in the 10th amendment. *Missouri* v. *Holland* has provided the mechanism whereby the treatymaking authority can adopt treaties on subjects not normally within the legislative powers, and by virtue of that ability and the necessary and proper clause, the Congress may pass legislation pursuant to a treaty which it could not otherwise constitutionally enact.

Under this unusual authority the Federal Government has within its power the means to destroy the present Federal-State relationship. At the time the Constitution was adopted, and until recently, treaties were restricted to their traditional field as instruments of contract between sovereign nations, imposing duties and obligation on the contracting states and not on individual citizens. As long as treaties were so restricted, the need for constitutional limitation on treatymaking power perhaps was not so strikingly urgent. As mentioned earlier, however, treaties are today being proposed which impose criminal and civil liabilities directly on individual citizens, which affect their rights, and impose duties on individual citizens, all of which were heretofore reserved for State legislation.

I submit that the foregoing statement in its proper context is neither illogical nor inaccurate, as charged by the opponents of the pending resolution. The committee statement recites the authority in the Constitution relied upon in the case of Missouri against Holland, and then sets forth the uncontroverted fact that Missouri against Holland is responsible for exposing this possibility of Congress' lifting itself by its own bootstraps. That the result of Missouri against Holland was not contemplated by those who lived at the time of the adoption of the Constitution appears evident from the comment of Thomas Jefferson in his Manual of Parliamentary Practice, wherein he stated:

By the general power to make treaties, the Constitution must have intended to comprehend only those objects which are usually regulated by treaties and cannot be otherwise regulated.

It must have meant to except out all those rights reserved to the States; for surely the President and the Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole Government is interdicted from doing in any way.

The opponents of the proposed amendment, in contending that the Founding Fathers intended the results of Missouri against Holland, invest those mortal men with visionary powers unparalleled in human history. I do not seek to discredit the Founding Fathers in any respect, but I do not think it is correct to assert that the Founding Fathers could have contemplated the formation of the United Nations and the attempts of that body to formulate rules of conduct for individual citizens in the signatory nations. This is something new on the horizon, and nowhere has it been better stated than in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, wherein Mr. John P. Humphrey, at that time Director of the Division of Human Rights of the United Nations, wrote:

What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationships between the state and individuals, and therefore a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of states. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supernational supervision of this relationship between the state and its citizens.

The Bricker amendment is a sincere and conscientious effort to meet, through our constitutional system, a situation which did not exist at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and which was not within the reasonable contemplation of those who participated in its formulation.

In a discussion of the ability of the courts to rule on the constitutionality of treaties, the report of the Committee has been criticized for reciting language in the decision in the case of *United States* v. *Reid* (73 Fed. 2d, 153, 155), to the effect that there is some doubt whether the courts have power to declare the plain terms of a treaty void and unenforceable. The statement made on the floor of the Senate the other day attempts to discredit this statement by citing a footnote in the case of *Perkins* v. *Elg* (307 U. S. 325). The statement was made that the court said that it was compelled to disagree with the Reid case, as its conclusions "are not adequately supported and are opposed to the established principles which should govern the disposition of this case."

This reference to the case of Perkins against Elg is misleading, since the footnote to which the speaker referred is not authority for asserting that the statement cited in the report was in any wise discredited. I shall now read the footnote which appears at page 349 of volume 307 of United States Reports, which presumably is the citation referred to, but not quoted by the speaker criticizing the majority report. This is the footnote:

The same may be said of the opinion of the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit in *United States* v. *Reid* (73 F. 2d 153 (certiorari denied upon the ground that the application was not made within the time provided by law, 299 U. S. 544)), so far as it is urged by petitioners as applicable to the facts of the instant case.

In discussing the authority of the Supreme Court to declare treaties unconstitutional, the opponents of the joint resolution have sought to discount the language appearing in the celebrated case of Marbury against Madison, which contains an indication that the Court, in asserting its authority to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional, relied, at least to some extent, upon the "in pursuance" clause of article VI of the Constitution. They follow this assertion with the fastest shuffle of position I have witnessed for some time. After denying that the Court relied in any respect upon the "in pursuance" language of article VI, they assert that Marbury against Madison supports the supremacy of the Constitution over treaties. Yet they acknowledge that no treaty was at issue in Marbury against Madison, and certainly the language of article VI of the Constitution does not require treaties to be in pursuance of the Constitution. Even so, the majority report did not urge the case of Marbury against Madison as establishing that a treaty could not be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, but asserted solely that that case does not negate the possibility that a treaty need only be made under the authority of the United States rather than in pursuance of the Constitution. There is a considerable difference between a statement that a case does not negate a possibility, and an assertion that a particular case supports a possibility. This

is indicative of the careless reading of the majority report inherent in the attempts which have been made to discredit it. The case which was cited stands as authority for the point which was made, and nothing in the argument of the distinguished Senator who recently spoke on the floor alters that fact.

One of the allegations made concerning the effect of the "which" clause is that it would prevent any attempt by this Nation to cooperate with other nations to eradicate narcotics trade. This statement is often based upon a lower court decision, *Stutz* v. *Bureau of Narcotics* (56 F. Supp. 810), which held that Congress could regulate the growing of poppies within a State by virtue of the fact that a treaty had been concluded on that subject prior to the adoption of the Opium Poppy Control Act of 1942. That act forbids the growing of opium poppy except under Federal license, and limits such licenses to the quantities needed for medical and scientific requirements. The majority report points out that it is hardly correct to conclude from this case alone that the Congress lacked the power to regulate the growing of poppies simply because a lower court chose to rest its decision upon the authority of Congress under a treaty previously adopted. However, the criticism was voiced a week ago Friday that the report did not say that in addition to this case, the General Counsel of the Treasury Department had testified that the United States could not become a party to a treaty designed to control traffic in narcotics drugs if the "which" clause of the Bricker amendment were in effect.

In order that Senators may understand the exact nature of the problem here under discussion, the sole question involved is whether the Congress now has power to deal with narcotics and the growing of opium poppies without a treaty. If it does, this Government would not be impaired in any manner in concluding with other nations treaties on the subject of narcotics control. With all due respect to the opinions of the General Counsel of the Treasury, I do not feel that he has given sufficient weight to the power of Congress under its delegated authority to regulate interstate commerce. As all of us know, the Congress has the constitutional authority to control the domestic production and distribution of wheat. Such power has been exercised by the Congress in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by the act of 1941, where production is regulated even when not intended for commerce, but only for consumption on the producer's farm. *Wickard* v. *Fillburn* (317 U. S. 111, 118, et seq.). If the Congress possesses this power with respect to wheat, by what stretch of the imagination can it be concluded that Congress does not have a similar power over the growing of opium poppies, especially when the added obligation of protecting the national health and welfare is involved? The opponents of this amendment are not casting doubt on the effect of the "which" clause, as much as they are on their own knowledge of Supreme Court decisions involving the powers of Congress. Whatever may be the views of Members with respect to these decisions of the Supreme Court, we must recognize that they are now the law, and that Congress does have authority to act in areas which some previously thought were beyond congressional power.

Mr. President, let us now discuss for a moment the effect of the "which" clause on the rights of aliens within the United States. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] in his very excellent statement on the floor the other day pointed out that in two cases, Hines against Davidovitz and Tackahashi against the California Fish and Game Commission, the Supreme Court of the United States had clearly indicated that Congress, by virtue of its powers over immigration and naturalization, had ample authority over aliens within the United States. The briefs submitted to the Supreme Court in the Tackahashi case are very interesting, and Senators who are lawyers would undoubtedly be interested in the statements contained in them. For instance, the brief submitted for the Government by the then Attorney General, Tom C. Clark, and the then Solicitor General, Philip B. Perlman, states at pages 22 and 23:

> Whatever its basis, there can be no doubt as to the supreme power of Congress to prescribe the terms and conditions upon which aliens may enter or remain in the United States. *United States ex rel. Volpe* v. *Smith* (289 U. S. 422, 425.) The Civil Rights Act of 1870 constitutes a legitimate exercise of that power. It commands that aliens shall have "the same right in every State and Territory * * * to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other."

If the Congress has the authority, attributed to it by the Attorney General and Solicitor General, to prescribe the terms and conditions upon which aliens may enter or remain in the United States, including their right to full and equal benefit of all laws and the same treatment as citizens in matters of punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, I do not see how it can be contended that the Congress would not have authority to implement any treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation after the adoption of the "which" clause. This authority exists independent of any treaty, and for that reason is not affected by this amendment.

The next objection raised to the "which" clause has been that it might render impossible the conclusion of treaties of extradition. In the report which I filed for the majority on Senate Joint Resolution 1, I sought to show that these objections were without foundation in fact. Nevertheless, despite that showing, argument has again been made on the floor of the Senate that if the "which" clause were adopted, treaties of extradition could not be made. Again such an argument must be based upon the assumption that Congress has no authority, in the absence of a treaty, to provide for the extradition of criminals. This assumption is utterly without foundation; and I think I can prove that it is, by using the same authorities previously cited by the opponents of the joint resolution to back up their argument.

In the statement made on the floor a week ago last Friday, the Senator quoted a statement from a volume authored by Mr. Charles Cheney Hyde. In this volume Mr. Hyde makes reference to a decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Ballantyne* v. *U. S.* (299 U. S. 5), and quotes a statement from that case that—

> Applying, as we must, out own law in determining the authority of the President, we are constrained to hold that his power, in the absence of statute conferring an independent power, must be found in the terms of the treaty.

Please note that in that opinion Chief Justice Hughes qualified his statement by saying "in the absence of statute conferring an independent power." This alone would suggest that Congress has authority to provide for the extradition of criminals without resort to the treaty power, and that both Mr. Hyde and Chief Justice Hughes recognized such authority.

Also quoted in an attempt to show that the power of extradition was solely a matter of treaty law was the learned work of Mr. John Bassett Moore entitled "Digest of International Law." These quotations when submitted on the floor of the Senate, however, were not complete, for the speaker omitted to mention the "a" section dealing with extradition without treaties, appearing at pages 248-253 of volume 4 of Moore's Digest. Judge Moore in this volume reached the conclusion that, in the United States, the general opinion and practice has been that, in the absence of a conventional or legislative provision there is no authority in the Government to deliver up a fugitive to a foreign power. I hope Senators will note particularly the language of Judge Moore when he says, "In the absence of legislative provision" as well as "conventional provision." Judge Moore also reaches the same conclusion in volume I of his work on treaties of extradition which was not cited to the Senate the other day. But lest there continue to be any doubt of it, let me quote a statement from the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Grin* v. *Shine* (187 U. S. 181, 191). It is the last sentence of this quotation which I want to draw to the attention of Senators, but in order that it may be placed in its proper context I shall read the preceding sentence. This is the quotation from the case:

> The treaty is undoubtedly obligatory upon both powers, and, if Congress should prescribe additional formalities than those required by the treaty, it might become the subject of complaint by the Russian Government and of further negotiations. But notwithstanding such treaty, Congress has a perfect right to provide for the extradition of criminals in its own way, with or without a treaty to that effect, and to declare that foreign criminals shall be surrendered upon such proofs of criminality as it may judge sufficient.

I hope this recitation of authority will convince Senators of the complete invalidity of this argument against the "which" clause.

One of the opponents of the joint resolution, in a speech on the Senate floor stated that he took sharp issue with the

proposition stated in the majority report, that neither a reservation nor an understanding affects the power of Congress to set aside State constitutions and laws and existing Federal law within the purview of the treaty. The untenable nature of this position is easily demonstrable. Just following that statement, the speaker took the position, with which no one disagrees, that subsequent legislation can annul the domestic effect of a treaty. This being the case, it is possible for Congress to pass an act in derogation of a reservation adopted by the Senate and asserting authority which the reservation sought to discount. It should be clear that it is no more difficult to remove the effect of a reservation to a treaty by subsequent legislation than it would be to remove certain aspects of the domestic effect of a treaty once made. As a matter of fact, it may prove even less difficult. Whereas the President would likely veto legislation limiting the domestic effect of a treaty which he negotiated, the same officer of the United States would be less likely to veto legislation reversing a reservation attached by the Senate.

Whether the opponents of this resolution choose to recognize it or not, it is possible for the Congress to legislate with respect to a treaty, even though reservations to that instrument would seem to deny that authority. The opposition once more has reached the wrong conclusion as the result of their love for their own rhetoric rather than their adherence to facts and law.

The basic criticism of the opponents directed at the committee report on section 3 of the resolution, relating to executive agreements, seems to be that the committee did not give more particular attention to the "relative powers of the Congress and of the Executive under the Constitution." There is at least one very obvious reason why this was not done. The constitutional amendment proposed here only confers upon the Congress the power to regulate executive agreements. It does not seek to delineate the areas within which regulation is required. That remains to be worked out through legislation adopted by the Congress and approved by the President. That such legislation will be worked out with due regard to the constitutional powers of the Chief Executive and the Congress should be apparent when it is realized that the President ond one-third of either House, plus one, can forestall any bill which does not give proper consideration to the separation of powers.

On the same subject of executive agreements, the opponents of this resolution have been hard put to explain away the sweeping effect of the opinion and decision in the cases of United States against Pink and United States against Belmont. They will likewise have some difficulty in explaining the language used in the opinion of the United States Court of Claims in a case appearing at 106th Federal Supplement at pages 191 and 195, where that court states that—

> The Byrnes-Blum agreement between the United States and France is the type of agreement which has been recognized as a treaty within the meaning of article VI, clause 2, of the Constitution and thus is a part of "the supreme law of the land" (citing the Pink, Belmont, and other cases).

No explanation which has heretofore been made, or which may hereafter be made, can divorce the Pink case from its result and the language used to reach that result. It is a fact that the Supreme Court in that case did give an executive agreement effect over State laws and State policies, and it is also a fact that the language of the decision is consistent with that result, protestations of some of the opponents to the contrary notwithstanding. If the President of the United States can override State court decisions as a result of an agreement concluded simultaneously with the recognition of an ambassador, I see nothing which would prevent him from making any other kind of agreement affecting State law as an incident of this authority to receive ambassadors or, for that matter, as an incident of any of his other powers. The Senator who sought to distinguish the conclusion reached in the Pink case on the basis that the agreement was concluded as an incident of the Presidential power to receive ambassadors should know that even his own allies do not agree with him. Mr. Philip Jessup, whom I hesitate to cite as an authority, but who happens to be opposed to this joint resolution, seemingly for many of the same reasons as those announced by Senators on this floor, wrote, in volume 36 of the Journal of American Law, at page 282:

> From the point of view of our constitutional law, the decision may well mark one of the most far-reaching inroads upon the protection which it was supposed the fifth amendment afforded to private property.

Undoubtedly Mr. Jessup had in mind the statement of the majority opinion in the Pink case when he said that, for the Court said:

> The fifth amendment does not stand in the way of giving full force and effect to the Litvinov assignment.

The dangerous implication underlying the Pink and Belmont cases will not be dispelled by high-sounding platitudes voiced by those who oppose this amendment. The possibility of abuse of this executive authority is plain enough. We need not wait for further abuses to demonstrate the need for this amendment.

In attacking the analysis of the committee report that the President could by his veto usually block any invasion of his constitutional prerogatives, one of the opponents sought to discredit this analysis by asserting that such regulation could take the form of legislation attached to an appropriation measure. In the first place, the Senator ought to realize that legislation on an appropriation measure would be subject to a point of order, and such a point of order would undoubtedly be sustained. Secondly, I have no doubt that if the Congress ever sought to invade the constitutional prerogatives of the President through such a device, the President would not hesitate to veto such legislation, even at the expense of many unpaid bills on the part of the Federal Government, and that he would promptly proceed to put the blame for those unpaid bills on the lack of the Congress. Also, the suggestion that such a procedure would be followed by the Congress in order to regulate executive agreements is unwarranted.

The provisions in this amendment relating to executive agreements are as important, if not more so, than any other phase of this bill. The Senator from Georgia, in introducing his substitute, it seems to me, has given recognition of this fact, for he has included a provision in that substitute that an executive agreement shall not have the force and effect of law in this country until the Congress adopts legislation to implement it. While the vigilance of the Senators in giving their advice and consent to a treaty may offer some solace so far as treaties are concerned, no such comfort can be gained where Presidential executive agreements are involved.

The Pink and Belmont cases stand as a warning to this body, and a plea of ignorance will be of no avail if further extensions of this device by future Presidents develop. I do not agree with those individuals who contend that we must stand and wait until such an eventuality becomes a reality, for liberty lost is seldom regained. When the power of Congress and the reserved rights of the States and the people have been invaded by an ambitious Executive, the authority thus lost may be irretrievable. It is undoubtedly trite but true that it is much too late to lock the barn door after the horse has been stolen. As Mr. Justice Sutherland has said:

> For the saddest epitaph which can be carved in memory of a vanished liberty is that it was lost because its possessors failed to stretch forth a saving hand while yet there was time.

I regret that I have been compelled to answer with such vehemence the unwarranted statements which have been made concerning the committee report. However, I do not feel that I could ignore such charges and expect those who read the RECORD to be able to sift through them and discover their fallacies. The majority report is sound in analysis and well documented. I urge all Senators who have not done so, to read it carefully.

CRITICISM BY LEGISLATURE OF GUATEMALA OF REMARKS BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who is to speak at this time, has agreed to yield me 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to do so, provided I do not not lose the floor.

Mr. WILEY. I make the unanimous-consent request that the Senator from New York may be permitted to yield to me, with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the newspaper wire services have reported the action of the Guatemalan Legislature on February 1 in passing a resolution, criticizing me for the statement which I made on the floor of the Senate on January 14 in which I pointed out the alarming Communist penetration of the Guatemalan Government.

The resolution adopted by the Guatemalan legislators is, of course, an unfortunate, unjustified, and indeed a ridiculous approach to the very serious problems which that country is facing.

LEGISLATURE DID NOT TRY TO REFUTE CHARGES

The Guatemalan Congress objected to my remarks, but in no way did it refute or even pretend to refute the 22 incontrovertible facts which I had set forth, showing the extent of Communist intervention in Guatemala.

I emphasize the word "intervention" because in my judgment, the Soviet Union has manifestly—through act after act—demonstrated a blatant policy of intervention in the internal affairs of republics of the hemisphere and, in particular, of Guatemala.

LEGISLATURE SHOULD TRY TO FREE GUATEMALA FROM COMMUNISM

Now, of course, it is not my intention to engage in a running discussion with the members of the Legislature of Guatemala or of any other government.

I can only express the hope that non-Communist members of the Guatemalan Legislature would devote their energies toward combating the dangerous Communist octopus whose tentacles are tightening around every segment of their own nation.

I would hope that the non-Communist Guatemalan legislators would direct their energies toward the regaining of their country's independence from the Soviet intervenors in their internal affairs.

I would hope that the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of that government might act so that Guatemala might reembark on a course leading toward her full freedom, her full prosperity, toward the improvement of her relations with her sister republics and toward a greater share of earth's blessings for all of her own people, in accordance with the free enterprise system.

Mr. President, I intend to continue to speak the truth on Guatemala, or on any other subject, as I see it.

I intend to continue to combat the international Communist conspiracy wherever it rears its ugly head.

I intend to join with my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and, in particular, those of my colleagues on the American Republics Subcommittee, headed by my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], in continuously reviewing this problem, so that we are adequately informed and so that the American people are adequately informed.

In my initial address on this issue, I referred to 22 basic facts about Communist penetration of Guatemala. It is my intention in the future to add to those 22 facts by citing further incontrovertible evidence.

FACT NO. 23: PRO-RED ACTIVITIES BY AMBASSADOR ALVARADO FUENTES

I should like today, however, simply to refer to fact No. 23.

I refer to activity of the Guatemalan Ambassador to Mexico City, Senor Alberto Alvarado Fuentes, who held a press conference on February 2 for the purpose of repeating the false Guatemalan charges of alleged "plotting" attributed to United States interests for the alleged purpose of overthrow of the Guatemalan Government.

These absurd charges made by the Ambassador included most of the well-known and outworn Communist techniques with which we are all so familiar—throwing up a smokescreen of false accusations.

Moreover, it is symbolic of a basic Communist technique; namely, to slander a foreign people on the ground of allegedly defending oneself against foreign attack.

For years, the Soviet Union has been piously moaning self-defense claiming that she is being "encircled by capitalist enemies"; whereas, actually, it is the Soviet bear which has attempted to throw its brutal paws and vicious claws around the body of the free world.

Now, why do I pay particular attention to the false charges by the Guatemalan Ambassador to Mexico?

It is because the penetration of the diplomatic service of the Guatemalan Government, or any government, is obviously a key objective of international communism.

Such penetration permits the poisoning of international channels, rather than simply domestic channels. I point out that the absurd attacks made by the Guatemalan Ambassador to Mexico were, of course, not made elsewhere by Guatemalan diplomats who are not pro-Communist. I must assume, therefore, that Senor Alvarado Fuentes is acting upon his own—which means he is acting under Communist discipline and control—discipline and control which are made easier by the presence of the intriguing Soviet Embassy in Mexico City.

I know that every one of our sister republics of this hemisphere must be alarmed, as I am, at the penetration by Communist agents of a diplomatic service of any of the Republics of this hemisphere.

THE PROVED RECORD OF AMBASSADOR ALVARADO FUENTES

I should like to point out that Ambassador Alvarado Fuentes has long been and still is a devoted fellow traveler.

He has proved himself to be a willing and effective tool of the international Soviet conspiracy.

He has lent his name and presence to almost every pro-Communist activity in Guatemala. He follows closely the Moscow line in his constant attacks against the United States. He has sponsored various so-called peace appeals and congresses, including the Stockholm Peace Appeal and Partisan Peace Committee—prime channels of the international conspiracy.

In October of 1951, when he was a deputy to the National Congress of Guatemala, he obtained leave from the Congress for the purpose of attending the Communist-run World Peace Congress in Vienna.

I challenge Ambassador Alvarado Fuentes to refute these facts. I challenge his Government to attempt to do so.

Ordinarily, Mr. President, I would be loath to name a particular individual in the course of comments such as this. I have never believed in referring to personalities as such, and I mention the name of this particular individual now only as a symbol of the dangerous problem which exists.

ATTACK AGAINST FREEDOM OF PRESS

Now, Mr. President, there is one additional aspect of the alarming Communist situation in Guatemala to which I should like to refer. In the past few days the Guatemalan Communists have dropped their masks further and have conducted a direct, premeditated attack against some of the remaining vestiges of the free press and radio there—against reporters of both Guatemalan and foreign nationality.

It is inevitable, of course, that the Communists regard a free and courageous press as Moscow's mortal enemy.

I point out the fact, therefore, that the correspondent of the New York Times has been forced to leave the country. I point out that the correspondent of NBC radio, who is also a correspondent for various newspapers and magazines, has been expelled from the country.

This is the latest sickening demonstration of the Communist octopus at work.

It is the latest danger signal to the free world that the situation in Guatemala is fast deteriorating. It is another notice to the people of that unhappy country that the last of their liberties are endangered.

We may well ask:

What is the Guatemalan Government afraid of in taking this arbitrary action of expelling these journalists? Why does it fear their reporting the facts as they see them? If the Government has nothing to hide, why does it abridge freedom of the press? If it does not plot an absolute Red dictatorship, why does it fear exposure of communism?

What the Guatemalan Government apparently wants is an uninformed, censored international press, a press similar to those newspaper organs in its own country which it now controls. Those Government mouthpieces are full of the usual Communist propaganda and lies, including, incidentally, propaganda and lies against the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for my having told the truth about communism.

Those servile, lie-filled organs stand in marked contrast to the remaining free Guatemalan newspapers and radio voices which have so courageously brought the facts—the stark facts—of communism to the attention of their readers and listeners.

GUATEMALAN PEOPLE LOVE LIBERTY

And what of the Guatemalan people themselves?

I do not have the slightest doubt that an overwhelming proportion of the people of Guatemala are aroused against the foul Moscow-directed activities of the Guatemalan Communists.

I do not have the slightest doubt that the hopes and prayers of the devout people of Guatemala are directed toward that day when the atheistic Communist yoke will have been severed; when the Soviet intervention in Guatemala's affairs will have been defeated.

I conclude by conveying my deepest personal greetings to the liberty-loving

people of Guatemala. I greet those of their freedom-loving leaders at home or in exile in whom the flame of liberty still burns brightly. I know that I am joined by the people of my country as a whole and men of good will throughout this hemisphere.

Mr. President, the sands are apparently running out in the hourglass of freedom of Guatemala. God grant that they may not run out completely. God grant that this country not become a Soviet Republic in this hemisphere.

I pray that, in the interest of the hemisphere, in the interest of my own Nation, in the interest of freedom everywhere.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. GORE and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad to yield to Senators provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I intended to make some remarks which I think should be in the RECORD. I have talked with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], asking him if he thought it would be a good idea to have a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations having to do with treaties and executive agreements, in connection with which there would be a member of the staff representing the majority and a member of the staff representing the minority, make a study which would enable the subcommittee first, to point out to the committee, and then to the Senate, what treaties affect internal laws. This proposed subcommittee could also get in touch with the attorneys general of the States. In that way the Senate would be given a better idea as to all treaties and executive agreements coming before it. The law now requires the printing of executive agreements.

Has the Senator from Wisconsin given that matter consideration?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan spoke to me casually on the floor with reference to the matter, but I have not had time to give it further consideration. I see no real objection to it, except that treaties are supposed to be thoroughly studied by the Foreign Relations Committee. We have been going over a large group to ascertain into what categories the various agreements fall. I am sure the matter can be taken up by the Foreign Relations Committee, and if a subcommittee should be constituted, I see no reason whatsoever why one member of the staff for the majority and one member of the staff for the minority cannot go over it in conjunction with the State Department. It would only formalize what the committee has been doing up to this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think such information, printed in the RECORD, would perhaps give a better idea of what the Senators were to vote upon.

Mr. WILEY. I see no objection whatever to the procedure suggested. Of course, an examination of a treaty itself would throw light upon its effects. However, if the objective of the subcommittee is to study treaties to see particularly how they might affect internal matters, I think it might prove very helpful.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, earlier in the afternoon, when the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], was speaking on the amendment which he had offered, I said then that I wanted to ask him a few questions, at the close of his speech. He told me he would be glad to answer the questions.

I should like first to repeat what I said a little while ago, when the Senator from Michigan was speaking, I am aware of the great amount of work he has devoted to the preparation of the amendments offered by him. He knows the regard I hold for his knowledge of constitutional law. I had the pleasure of serving with him for 2 years on the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask a few questions for information and, I hope, for the benefit of the Members of the Senate. The Senator's amendment was offered only a few days ago, and until today we have not had an opportunity to know the Senator's views as to its purpose. There are several constructions or interpretations which I think might be placed upon the amendment.

When the Senator began his discussion, I understood him to say there was no doubt in his mind that a treaty could not invade or violate the Constitution or the individual rights of the people of the United States as assured by the Bill of Rights. Later on it appeared that the Senator was offering his amendment for the purpose of preventing such an invasion, and that, it occurred to me was an inconsistent position. I should like to hear the Senator's views upon that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not take that position. But, as we read the cases decided by the Supreme Court we find that they become interpretative of the Constitution. The court has never actually ruled that a treaty can be unconstitutional. It has made statements to that effect, but never has it actually ruled on the subject. Therefore, all its statements in that connection are dicta.

There is a feeling in the State Department that treaties are political. I admit they are political when they do not involve internal laws. As to international relations, they are political.

When the President of the United States, under his right to receive an ambassador, recognizes a nation by receiving its ambassador, he acts in a political way. When he undertakes by treaty to make internal law—and the courts say that a treaty becomes the supreme law of the land—I do not think he is acting in a political way. It has not been construed in the past that such a treaty can be determined to be unconstitutional.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator will agree, however, that the Supreme Court has said in a long line of decisions that it is the Court's opinion that a treaty cannot be construed or interpreted to be superior to the Constitution or the Bill of Rights and that it cannot change the structure of the Federal Government or of State governments.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know the Court has said that, but nowhere has it been anything other than dicta. When the Court had an opportunity to pass upon the question, as it did in the Holland case, it said, in effect, that when a treaty was ratified the Congress had the right to legislate under it.

That has been interpreted to mean that the Constitution can be amended by a treaty and, therefore, after a treaty has been made Congress is permitted to act, whereas, before the treaty was made, Congress was not authorized to act.

Mr. COOPER. I know that is the contention of the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 1, a contention which I think is unsound. I should like to ask the Senator's interpretation of the amendment he has proposed. The Senator proposes as an amendment to article VI, clause 2, this provision:

> Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.

If the Senator will read that clause as a whole, assuming his amendment should be adopted, it would read as follows:

> All treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

The amendment of the Senator from Michigan, as I have said, provides:

> Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. It must follow that the amendment is intended to change the present constitutional concept of a treaty. What is the change? Do the words "in pursuance of this Constitution" mean a change in the interpretation of the Constitution which the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 1 envisage, a Constitution that would not allow treaties to be superior to State laws, or does it mean the Constitution which the opponents of the Bricker resolution believe is the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. I stated in my remarks on the floor that I do not believe the amendment changes the idea that the States have no power to ratify a treaty. I believe the States have no such power. This amendment would not give them the power to ratify a treaty. The amendment would make clear to the Supreme Court that in its interpretations of treaties and their relation to internal law, the Supreme Court shall apply the rule that treaties shall not be in conflict—the word "conflict" is used

in the first section—with but in pursuance of the Constitution, that they shall not change the form of government, and that they shall not take away the inalienable rights, as set forth in the Constitution.

I believe the Senator from Kentucky will agree that that is what has always been thought to be the law.

Mr. COOPER. I certainly agree with the Senator. If I thought the treaty-making power under the Constitution today could invade the Constitution and set aside the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, I certainly would be in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 1 or something similar. But I do not believe the Senator from Michigan has answered the question I have asked.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan reads:

> Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.

Suppose that provision were adopted and became a part of article VI, clause 2, of the Constitution and that afterward a case was presented to the courts similar to the case of Missouri against Holland. Would the Senator from Michigan say that if his amendment were adopted, the decision of Missouri against Holland would be possible?

Mr. FERGUSON. As I said in my argument before the Senate, one of the statements of Mr. Justice Holmes in the case of Missouri against Holland was that the language in relation to the statutory laws was "in pursuance thereof"—that is of the Constitution—whereas in relation to treaties it was "under the authority thereof." That clause would be changed, because both statute law and treaties would have to be "in pursuance of," but it would not change the principle the "which" clause would have changed. The "which" clause would have said the law could not be originally constitutional, and the making of a treaty could not make it constitutional. That is the "which" clause. I am not purporting to include the "which" clause.

Mr. COOPER. I understand, but if the amendment of the Senator from Michigan should be adopted, and a treaty should be entered into which would be perfectly within the scope of international treaties, but yet would affect matters which are reserved traditionally to the States but for the treaty power, would it then be necessary for the States to enact legislation to carry into effect such a treaty?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not unless the treaty itself so provided. The Senator from Kentucky was not present when I concluded my earlier remarks. I wish to make it clear that I did not include in my amendment, nor is it the purpose of my amendment to apply the 9th and 10th amendments to the Constitution to the treatymaking power. In other words, the proposed amendment does not say, "except as are found in the Constitution." The rights that were given to Congress exclusively, prohibited to the President, or prohibited to either the Congress or the President, or those which do not specify as to whom they were prohibited, cannot be violated by a treaty, because then the treaty would be in conflict with—"conflict" being the word used in the first section—and would not be in pursuance of the Constitution, but might take away a republican form of government or some other right expressly provided for in the Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. The section the Senator from Michigan proposes, it seems to me, complicates the problem, because section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, as I understand, would make invalid any treaty entered into in violation of the Constitution.

If that is the purpose of section 1, then why is it necessary to adopt this amendment? What is the purpose of the section which proposes to amend article VI of the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. Section 1 refers only to a conflict with the Constitution. Article VI has been interpreted as authorizing a treaty made under the authority of the United States, which, as Justice Holmes indicates in Holland against Missouri, merely meant that it had to be proposed by the President and ratified by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. In other words, if a treaty so made were ratified, it became the supreme law of the land.

Then I read from another decision, Fong Yue Ting against United States, which clearly indicated that the old finding of the Court which said a treaty had to be in conformity with the Constitution, would not apply unless it was a treaty that was cognizable by the courts.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator intend, then, by his amendment, to article VI, to prevent a treaty, which does affect in some way a State or a local law, from becoming the supreme law of the land, and being superior to a State constitution or State laws, as is now held by the Supreme Court? Is that the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, not unless it is in conflict with the Federal Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. But that is the Constitution, and the holding of the courts today.

Mr. FERGUSON. I said it did not apply to the ninth and tenth amendments, because I think there the powers reserved to the States and the people were the powers not able to be seen by the people at that time. I do not know what they were. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] asked me what they were. I think he agreed that they are such powers as were not prohibited in the Constitution, but which the people wanted to reserve; that if there were any God-given rights which had not been expressed in the Constitution, the people were reserving them to themselves.

Mr. COOPER. I do not wish to labor the point, but I go back to the proposition that the Senator would not offer the proposed amendment to article VI unless it was intended to change in some way constitutional concept of the power and position of a treaty as it is interpreted today. There would not be any other reason. The question is, Is it intended for the purpose of establishing by judicial interpretation that a treaty entered into properly by the President and the Senate, which might in some way affect State or local law, would not be valid, after the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan was adopted, except through implementing legislation by the States?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not the purpose of the amendment. It is not to take the place of, and it specifically strikes out the "which" clause.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, but very briefly.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan, after the illuminating discussion between two constitutional lawyers, whether this is the position he takes:

> The treaty is therefore a law made by the proper authority, and the courts of justice have no right to annul or disregard any of its provisions, unless they violate the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. From what is the Senator from Wisconsin reading?

Mr. WILEY. I am reading from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Doe against Braden.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator from Wisconsin kindly read that provision again?

Mr. WILEY. The provision is as follows:

> The treaty is therefore a law made by the proper authority, and the courts of justice have no right to annul or disregard any of its provisions, unless they violate the Constitution of the United States.

Does the Senator from Michigan stand by that principle?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is only dictum, and I would say we are proposing to make it the law of the land. It is the same as saying it is not in conflict, and it is in pursuance of. If it is not in pursuance of, and is in conflict, then it would not be a valid treaty.

That is dictum, and we are trying to make that the law, as I have interpreted the language "not in conflict with and in pursuance of."

Mr. WILEY. Would not a simple recitation to that effect be the best way to clarify the matter?

Mr. FERGUSON. We could not have made it any simpler than it is stated in the amendment submitted by us.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to ask one other question. In that same decision the court said:

> It would be impossible for the executive department of the Government to conduct our foreign relations with any advantage to the country, and fulfill the duties which the Constitution has imposed upon it, if every court in the country was authorized to inquire and decide whether the person who ratified the treaty on behalf of a foreign nation had the power, by its constitution and laws, to make the engagements into which he entered.

Does the Senator think that is good constitutional law?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I do. I do not think one should have to find out whether Litvinov was the proper foreign officer in charge and therefore, under

Russia's law, had the right to negotiate the treaty, because later the proposed treaty is advised and consented to by the Senate, the President affixes his signature, and it becomes a treaty. The same process would apply in the foreign country. I do not think we should inquire into the question whether or not a proper officer in the office of the Secretary of State negotiated the treaty, or whether the proper officer in the foreign office of another land negotiated the treaty.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator agree that the Congress and the President, like the courts, possess only such power as is derived from the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. Then the Senator does not agree with the other theory ennuciated in the Curtiss-Wright case, that before the Constitution existed there were certain powers that belonged to the Government, irrespective of the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I do not believe that there are such implied powers as were asserted in the steel seizure case. I think one has to read the Constitution to find what powers are granted. Powers are derived from the Constitution.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. BUSH. Section 2 of the proposed amendment, which ends with the words, "in pursuance of the Constitution," is thought by some of our colleagues to be the "which" clause in sheep's clothing, so to speak. Does the Senator subscribe to that statement?

Mr. FERGUSON. I state that the clause is naked, and that there is no clothing on it to conceal it. It is not the "which" clause. I have said that all along.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield, without losing his right to the floor, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. GORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak upon the pending question of a proposed amendment to the Constitution to plug up alleged and, in my opinion, largely imaginary loopholes in our basic charter of law.

Before going into a detailed discussion of this subject, Mr. President, let me recall what all of us know; namely, that our Constitution has been in effect 165 years, and that during that long period it has been amended on only 13 separate occasions. In only one instance was a constitutional amendment which had been approved ever repealed. That was the prohibition amendment, which had been enacted in haste and under the pressure of propaganda, and was repealed only after a debate which deeply divided the country and detracted the attention of the public from much more vital and basic issues of the time.

Mr. President, our Constitution has now worked well for 165 years, and has been an effective document for the protection of the freedoms and liberties of the American people. There have been very few instances where there has been any occasion for the people or for any States to claim that their rights have been abridged by reason of the treaty-making power of the United States. That record is a rather good one, Mr. President.

So, Mr. President, I warn the Senate against hastily approving, on an emotional basis, anything so fundamental as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Once approved and ratified, should it later develop to have been an unwise undertaking, it would be a difficult thing to undo. Let us consider carefully and soberly what it is proposed that we do. I hope we do not do it; in fact, I am very confident we will not do it.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the supremacy of the Constitution over treaties and executive agreements, if necessary to be reaffirmed at all, and their relationship to internal law, should be reaffirmed and clarified at this time by joint resolution, rather than by amending the Constitution.

If there were, in fact, any substantial question as to the supremacy of the Constitution, a constitutional amendment would be not only appropriate but imperative. But in a situation like the one actually before us, where there is no sound ground for doubting the supremacy of the Constitution, an amendment of the Constitution would create more confusion and uncertainty than it could conceivably remove.

In actual practice, we know from our recent experience that the Congress has not been indifferent to the consequences of Supreme Court decisions. Within the past decade the effects of Supreme Court decisions have been remedied on at least four occasions. Congress provided for State regulation of the insurance business, after the Supreme Court had held it subject to the Federal antitrust laws; the claims for portal-to-portal pay were extinguished by act of Congress in 1947; the State fair-trade laws have been revived; and unilaterial determinations in the executive branch are no longer binding upon businessmen having contracts with the Government.

The congressional power to enact legislation superseding a treaty as internal law has been clearly established by the Supreme Court. An act of Congress having this effect, like any other act of Congress, must be in pursuance of the Constitution, and therefore subordinate thereto. It strikes me as wholly illogical to claim that a treaty might stand above the Constitution, when we know that, as internal law, a treaty can be overridden by legislation which must be subject to the Constitution. If a treaty can stand no better than an act of Congress, to my way of thinking it follows that a treaty must be subject to the Constitution in the same degree as an act of Congress.

The decisions of the Supreme Court afford no basis for any claim or fear that treaties may override the Constitution. In fact, the statements on this subject in the Supreme Court's opinions are definitely in accord with our traditional concept of constitutional supremacy. For instance, I find the following in an opinion of the Supreme Court, written in 1870:

> It need hardly be said that a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument.

Why did this "need hardly be said"? Obviously because the Supreme Court felt there was no real question about it. I feel exactly the same way.

Mr. President, there appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post an excellent article by the very able and distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, in which he clearly points out the impossibility of reaching an agreement regarding the meaning of the various compromise proposals on the Bricker amendment which have been put forward. He also states there is no question regarding the supremacy of the Constitution to any treaty.

At this time I should like to read excerpts from the article:

> There is no emergency of any kind which requires or could justify an immediate and unconsidered amendment to the Constitution. The world we live in is, heaven only knows, full of peril. But there is no part of that peril which could be lessened or averted by amending the Constitution in a hurry.
>
> For no amendment is needed to establish the undisputed rule that the Constitution is superior to any treaty. And no amendment that could be devised by the wit of man can guarantee, or even make it more certain, that the President will never make a serious mistake in the conduct of foreign relations.
>
> I have a letter from Mr. Lucius Wilmerding, a close student of the origins of American institutions, in which he points out that Senator BRICKER's fear, which has frightened so many, was raised and disposed of long ago in the debate on the Jay Treaty with Great Britain. In 1796, Representative Brent argued, as does Senator BRICKER now, that "treaties may change the fundamental principles of our Government; then the President and Senate, by entering into stipulations with a foreign government, may give us a monarchy, may convert our President into a king, and our Senate into a nobility."
>
> On this point Mr. Wilmerding writes "that the Constitution is paramount to both laws and treaties was admitted in 1796 by both political parties. Gallatin asserted the proposition in terms; so did Madison and Jefferson. The Federalists were in perfect agreement. Representative Murray conceded that, if the treaty with Great Britain were unconstitutional, 'it would not be the law of the land.' So, among others, did Representatives Tracy, Buck, William Smith, Nathaniel Smith, Coit, Hillhouse, and Harper. Alexander Hamilton refuted Senator BRICKER as completely as did Gallatin. Asserting the general proposition that whatever is a proper subject of compact between nation and nation may be embraced by a

treaty between the United States and a foreign power, he continued: 'The only constitutional exception to the power of making treaties is, that it shall not change the Constitution.'"

Mr. President, please note the words "that it shall not change the Constitution."

I read further from the article by Mr. Lippmann:

It has been said that there cannot be any harm in an amendment which spells out the paramountcy of the Constitution over treaties, and that to do this would quiet many popular fears. The answer to this is that if we start amending the Constitution to allay unjustified popular fears, we shall have begun to treat the Constitution not as the charter of the Government but as a kind of billboard on which to paint political slogans.

Mr. Lippmann closes his article with these words:

The fears that have been aroused must be heard, examined, answered. But there is no need to debase the Constitution because it is tiresome or politically dangerous to debate the issues fully and to show the people how and why they have been misled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

FORTUNATE COLLAPSE

The collapse of the negotiations for a revised Bricker amendment has probably saved the Senate from an act of irresponsibility that it would be hard to live down. For what the negotiators were trying to do was to have the Senate agree to a proposed amendment to the Constitution without giving the country the time and the opportunity to study the new amendment. A new text hurriedly and secretly concocted was to be put through the Senate without hearings, without public discussion, and without serious deliberation.

In its various versions the Bricker amendment has been before Congress since 1952. It has been the subject of extensive hearings by subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee during two sessions of Congress. It has been under intensive scrutiny and debate in which lawyers and constitutional authorities have been heard. Put to the test of this prolonged and searching public debate, the Bricker amendment has been rejected by responsible opinion in the Senate and in the country, and its essential principle is now abandoned. On what ground, then, did the negotiators suppose that they could improvise a different amendment to the Constitution which could be, which ought to be, accepted without serious scrutiny and merely because they had agreed on it?

The proposal of Senator GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, or a Knowland-Ferguson-George proposal, might or might not have been an acceptable or a desirable amendment. The immediate point is that nobody now knows what to think. For the time being no one, not even Mr. GEORGE or Mr. KNOWLAND, can in fact really say he knows what any of these proposals mean.

Senator GEORGE, for example, is surely one of the leading constitutional lawyers in the Senate. But for how long, and how intensively, has Senator GEORGE studied his own proposed amendment? How many men of equal competence and authority have been consulted? There cannot have been many. For the text of the new proposal has been published only for a few weeks. There have been no hearings, there has been virtually no expert discussion of it. There is available for the guidance of Congress and of the public almost nothing that is more than off-the-cuff comment.

In my own scanty inquiries among men whose views would surely count, I have found some who thought the George amendment would hobble the President dangerously; I have found also, believe it or not, others who think it would in fact enlarge the President's power.

The one thing that is quite clear is that the only constitutional amendment on which the Senate can with propriety vote at this time is Senator BRICKER'S. His amendment is a dangerous proposal but it has at least been subjected to the process through which proposals to amend the Constitution are meant to pass. None of the compromise or substitute proposals has been subjected to this process. They may be good, bad, or indifferent. But one and all they are unwashed, unpeeled, uncooked, and not yet fit to be eaten by the Senate of the United States.

If the Senate were unanimously in favor of any one of them, it would still be grossly improper for the Senate to vote now to propose such an amendment. To vote now without hearings and without serious debate would be to reduce the grave business of amending the Constitution to the level of a political deal. There is only one proper course for the Senate. If it rejects the Bricker proposal, it must send any other proposal back to the committee for hearing and for study.

There is no emergency of any kind which requires or could justify an immediate and unconsidered amendment to the Constitution. The world we live in is, heaven only knows, full of peril. But there is no part of that peril which could be lessened or averted by amending the Constitution in a hurry.

For no amendment is needed to establish the undisputed rule that the Constitution is superior to any treaty. And no amendment that could be devised by the wit of man can guarantee, or even make it more certain, that the President will never make a serious mistake in the conduct of foreign relations.

I have a letter from Mr. Lucius Wilmerding, a close student of the origins of American institutions, in which he points out that Senator BRICKER'S fear, which has frightened so many, was raised and disposed of long ago in the debate on the Jay Treaty with Great Britain. In 1796 Representative Brent argued, as does Senator BRICKER now, that "treaties may change the fundamental principles of our Government; then the President and Senate, by entering into stipulations with a foreign government, may give us a monarchy, may convert our President into a king and our Senate into a nobility."

On this point, Mr. Wilmerding writes, "That the Constitution is paramount to both laws and treaties was admitted in 1796 by both political parties. Gallatin asserted the proposition in terms; so did Madison and Jefferson. The Federalists were in perfect agreement. Representative Murray conceded that, if the treaty with Great Britain were unconstitutional, 'it would not be the law of the land.' So, among others, did Representatives Tracy, Buck, William Smith, Nathaniel Smith, Coit, Hillhouse, and Harper. Alexander Hamilton refuted Senator BRICKER as completely as did Gallatin. Asserting the general proposition that whatever is a proper subject of compact between nation and nation may be embraced by a treaty between the United States and a foreign power, he continued: 'The only constitutional exception to the power of making treaties is, that it shall not change the Constitution.'"

It has been said that there cannot be any harm in an amendment which spells out the paramountcy of the Constitution over treaties, and that to do this would quiet many popular fears. The answer to this is that if we start amending the Constitution to allay unjustified popular fears, we shall have begun to treat the Constitution not as the charter of the Government but as a kind of billboard on which to paint political slogans.

The fears that have been aroused must be heard, examined, answered. But there is no need to debase the Constitution because it is tiresome or politically dangerous to debate the issues fully and to show the people how and why they have been misled.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am no constitutional lawyer—in fact I am no lawyer at all. The court decisions and arguments to which I have referred have been furnished me by constitutional authorities and I draw them to the attention of the Senate and the public for their further consideration. But as a layman, I cannot see that any new or startling doctrine was promulgated by the migratory bird decision of 1920, the now famous case of Missouri against Holland.

Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, writing the opinion in the migratory bird case, went out of his way to forestall any disquieting inference of a revolutionary change in our constitutional law. He said:

We do not mean to imply that there are no qualifications to the treatymaking power.

The migratory bird decision sustained a Federal law implementing a treaty even though the law dealt with a subject which would have been within the exclusive control of the States if a treaty had not been involved. This means simply that the treaty power is supreme over State law, as the Constitution says it is, in any matter which is an appropriate subject for a treaty; and this supreme power is plenary, sufficient to do the full job required of a treaty.

There appeared in the New York Times this morning a very interesting, illuminating, and educational article, in the form of a letter to the editor of the New York Times from the distinguished lawyer, Mr. Arthur H. Dean, Special Ambassador to Korea. The letter appears under the heading "Interpreting Amendments." It reads as follows:

INTERPRETING AMENDMENTS—MIGRATORY BIRD RULING DISCUSSED IN RELATION TO BRICKER PROPOSAL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the last few days there have been increasingly frequent references by the proponents of the Bricker amendment and in commentaries on the constitutional debate which it has precipitated to the 1920 decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland*. This decision, so it is asserted, established that a treaty could override the 10th amendment to the Constitution.

If this assertion is correct the provision included not only in Senator BRICKER'S original amendment, but also in the compromises proposed by Senators KNOWLAND, GEORGE, and MCCARRAN, respectively—that a treaty provision which conflicts with the Constitution will not be of any force or effect—will not be a mere restatement of existing law but may in fact inadvertently reintroduce by the back door the controversial "which" clause of the Bricker amendment.

The facts in *Missouri* v. *Holland* were that after two lower Federal courts had held a Federal statute regulating the shooting of migratory birds to be unconstitutional on the ground that such regulation of wild life was not within the specifically enumerated powers delegated to Congress, the United States and the United Kingdom (acting for Canada) entered into a treaty providing for reciprocal legislation establishing specified closed seasons for migratory birds. When Holland, a United States game warden, sought to enforce the implementing statute, Missouri sued to enjoin him from doing so on the ground that the act was an unconstitutional interference with rights reserved to the States by the 10th amendment, which provides that:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

TREATY POWER

Mr. Justice Holmes, but not speaking for a unanimous Court, upheld the constitutionality of the treaty and statute on the basis that the treaty was within the treatymaking power specifically delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, and that the implementing Congressional statute was necessary and proper to execute an expressly delegated Federal power, and hence within Congress' power under the "necessary and proper" clause which authorizes Congress:

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers (the enumerated powers of Congress), and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or officer thereof."

No question of the statute overriding or conflicting with the tenth amendment was involved: The 10th amendment by its express terms reserves to the States or the people only those powers not delegated to the United States or prohibited to the States. The treaty power and the necessary and proper power were both expressly granted to the United States and the treaty power was expressly prohibited to the States by the framers of the Constitution and by the States themselves in ratifying the Constitution. Hence, these two powers are not among the powers reserved to the States by the 10th amendment.

With respect to the real as opposed to the fancied constitutional limits on the treaty power, Justice Holmes found that the migratory-bird treaty did not contravene any constitutional prohibitions and that the treaty dealt with a matter which can be protected only by national action in concert with that of another power.

FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

If in some future case the Supreme Court were to be convinced that today's amenders viewed Missouri against Holland as a case in which a treaty and treaty-implementing congressional legislation were given effect despite the fact that they conflicted with the 10th amendment, the proposed provision that a treaty conflicting with the Constitution shall not be of any force might very well be taken as intended to reverse Missouri against Holland and to establish the 10th amendment as a limitation on the treaty power and Congress' treaty-implementing power. If this came to pass, Congress' power to enforce treaties would then be restricted to the legislative powers of Congress in the absence of a treaty.

This would mean that in areas not falling within these powers of Congress it would be necessary for the State legislatures to implement a treaty. This is exactly the effect that the so-called "which" clause of section 2 of the Bricker amendment avowedly seeks and the compromises seek to avoid. Hence, any compromise amendment purposely omitting the "which" clause, yet declaring a treaty conflicting with the Constitution null and void, should provide that it is not intended to limit the treaty power or Congress' power to implement a treaty under the necessary and proper clause, to Congress' powers in the absence of a treaty, or, at the very minimum, carry with it a clear statement to this effect by its sponsors on the floor of the Senate.

The easiest and surest way of avoiding subsequent judicial misinterpretation of an amendment merely designed to declare and restate existing law is to refrain from making any amendment at all. Otherwise there is always the danger that a court will strive to give some other meaning and effect to the amendment.

ARTHUR H. DEAN.

NEW YORK, *February 2, 1954.*

Mr. President, I see nothing revolutionary in the doctrine which has been described.

A really revolutionary decision would have gone in the opposite direction and undermined the treaty power in disregard of precedent dating back to 1796, when the treaty ending the War of Independence was enforced against contrary State legislation.

The 1796 decision was dictated by the language of the supremacy clause of the Constitution, which was framed expressly to permit treaties made prior to 1788, prior to the effectuation of the Constitution to override State laws.

This effect could not have been given to treaties negotiated before 1788 if the supremacy clause had provided that treaties, like ordinary Federal legislation, must be "in pursuance" of the Constitution. There was no Constitution before 1788. Thus the supremacy clause refers simply to treaties "made or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States." Of course all treaties entered into subsequent to the adoption of the Constitution were made pursuant to the Constitution, and subject to it.

In view of this historical background, and the substantial practical reason for the precise wording of the supremacy clause, I can see no basis for any inference that the Constitution would permit its safeguards to be nullified by means of a treaty.

We have the word of James Madison, the father of the Constitution himself, that treaties are subordinate to the Constitution. At the Virginia Convention he met Patrick Henry's argument that treaties would be, as the supreme law, paramount to the Constitution, by saying that "the supremacy clause made treaties paramount only to the laws and constitutions of the States."

We also have the word of an overwhelming majority of the leading modern experts in the fields of constitutional law, American history, and international relations.

LAW-SCHOOL DEANS OPPOSE TREATY AMENDMENT

Last summer the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] solicited the views of law-school deans and professors of constitutional law in all parts of the country on the need for a constitutional amendment on the treaty power, and the almost unanimous reply was—and I think I am quoting the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin accurately—that no such amendment was necessary even to declare the supremacy of the Constitution over treaties.

Amending our Constitution, Mr. President, is a serious business. On only 13 occasions in our entire history has this important step been taken. We should, therefore, hesitate to propose a constitutional amendment which appears to be merely a restatement of the existing law. President Eisenhower told a press conference last spring that it would seem anomalous to amend the Constitution simply to show that it is going to be the same as it always has been. But I wonder whether such an amendment might turn out to involve something more serious than an innocuous anomaly.

A basic principle which the courts apply in interpreting a statute is that the statute in question is presumed to have a substantial purpose; in other words, that the legislators did not enact it just for exercise.

This presumption is much stronger in the case of a constitutional amendment, which requires a two-thirds vote in each House of the Congress and ratification by three-fourths of all the State legislatures.

Can it be taken for granted, Mr. President, that a future Supreme Court would hold that the long, complicated task of amending the Constitution had been undertaken by Congress merely to repeat what was already the law; or might not the Court be ingenious in finding that in some way or other—unbeknownst to those of us who are now deliberating upon it—the proposed amendment did, in fact, change the present meaning of the Constitution?

In this connection it is interesting to recall some of the things that were said last August by the senior Senator from Ohio in commenting upon a substitute measure proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from California. This measure would have amended the Constitution along substantially the same lines as those which I have been discussing thus far. The Senator from Ohio said of this substitute measure:

The court must give it some meaning.

And he also said:

It would be a vain and utterly ridiculous thing to repeat in a constitutional amendment that which is already in the Constitution.

Senator BRICKER further referred to the Knowland proposal as "a probably dangerous amendment to our fundamental law."

And he also characterized it as "preposterous."

In his view it was a proposal which "might shift vital foreign-affairs responsibilities to the Supreme Court."

He felt that it might cause the Supreme Court to abandon its rule against passing upon political questions.

Other persons commenting upon the same proposal have raised the possibility that the Supreme Court might find that the treaty power had actually been cut back—perhaps to the extent of outlawing the principle of the migratory bird decision and the 1796 precedent on which it was based. Thus we might find that the highly unfortunate "which" clause of Senate Joint Resolution 1 had, by a sort of reverse English, slipped into our Constitution after all.

We would do well to bear in mind that many decades might elapse before the Supreme Court would be called upon to construe such a constitutional amendment. It is now more than 80 years since the adoption of the 14th amendment; and the Supreme Court is still trying, in the school-segregation cases, to determine what force should be given to various statements in the congressional debates on that amendment in the last 1880's.

The perspective which accompanies the passage of time is not free of inaccuracy. Remoteness can produce a loss of detail. The legislative intent, which may now seem to us so sharply defined, can become blurred as the decades go by. What assurance do we have that the intent will be found to have been one of restating the law rather than changing it? Who has the power or authority, under our form of government, to make this intent so clear as to remove any doubt on this score for all time?

Moreover, the evil of such an amendment would lie not only in the possibility of an unfortunate construction by the Supreme Court, but in the mere existence of a constitutional question affecting, and therefore clogging, the treaty power.

We all know that the uncertainties of constitutional law can be a source of very great difficulty to the American businessman. But to adopt a constitutional amendment which might becloud the law on the treaty power would be to place an unnecessary handicap upon the representatives of our country in their dealings with other nations.

We cannot afford to assume any further handicap in these times when the outcome of the struggle against communism depends so largely upon how successful we are in strengthening the alliance of all freedom-loving nations and peoples. In these perilous and confusing years, if our country is to act on the world scene with any chance of success, it is a primary requisite that the authority of our representatives should be absolutely clear cut.

Finally, Mr. President, in reference to the Knowland proposal and also to section 1 of the Bricker resolution, it is unthinkable to me that our Constitution, particularly the fundamental guaranties in the Bill of Rights, could be overridden by a treaty. So far as I know, no treaty has ever been made which purported to have this effect. I find it impossible to assume that any such treaty would be agreed to in the future by a President of the United States and two-thirds of the Senate, both elected by and responsible to the American people. Even granting this unlikeliest of all contingencies, I cannot imagine that the Supreme Court, the guardian of our most sacred traditions, would permit the Constitution to be overridden in this way.

On top of all this, how can we conceive that the Congress would be so supine and helpless that it would not immediately pass a law restoring the supremacy of the Bill of Rights over any such hypothetical treaty. With a Congress as helpless as that, our situation would be hopeless anyway; and I am opposed to redesigning our Constitution, which has stood for 165 years, in order to provide for hopeless situations.

Mr. President, in reference both to section 2 of the Bricker resolution and also to section 2 of the George proposal, there is no need for a constitutional amendment limiting the President's power to make executive agreements.

In my opinion whatever advantage might be gained through such an amendment would be outweighed by the serious risk of mortal harm to our country if the executive branch should be saddled with a procedure which might cause delay and confusion in an emergency crying for swift and decisive action. I, therefore, oppose at this time a constitutional provision along the lines of any now pending before us to require congressional action before an executive agreement can have effect as internal law.

Under the Constitution as it now stands there is a wide area in which executive agreements are inferior to acts of Congress. Within this area an executive agreement will have no force if inconsistent with an act of Congress. It makes no difference whether the act of Congress was passed before or after the executive agreement was made.

In a case decided only last year a Federal court denied effect to an executive agreement which was inconsistent with a prior act of Congress. Within this wide area, then, where congressional enactments prevail over executive agreements, I regard the existing safeguards as generally adequate. If there are loopholes, they should be studied and proper remedial legislation carefully drafted in whatever form that legislation should best take. Certainly at this time I can see no need for a constitutional amendment of any kind. Mr. President, I wish to make it completely clear that I am against any constitutional amendment in any form and of any character at this time. I consider all such amendments to be dangerous, and we should not even consider them. I want no misunderstanding with regard to my stand on that subject.

CRIPPLE PRESIDENT'S POWERS AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF ARMED FORCES

Outside of this area, the George proposal, in my judgment, would seriously cripple the President's authority as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. This is a matter of vital importance in time of war.

In modern times our wars have been fought, not single-handed, but with allies. In the past 4 decades we have fought 3 coalition wars. For nearly 7 years out of the last 12, we have been engaged in coalition wars. To forestall the calamity of a third world war, we are now building the strongest possible alliance against the threat of Communist aggression.

Executive agreements can provide for a wide variety of routine matters in a military alliance. They are also a means of carrying out important decisions which demand and require swift action.

In my opinion, the constitutional amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] would be a tragic handicap in time of war. Suppose, for instance, the enemy made a surprise attack on Alaska and it was necessary to rush a Canadian motorized division from eastern Canada to support our troops in Alaska.

Under present law, an executive agreement could instantly open the way for this Canadian division to use our superior highway network. This, however, would affect many provisions of internal law, and under the George amendment an act of Congress would be required before agreement could be made effective.

Let me suggest a further variation of this problem. Suppose our Intelligence agencies should intercept a message indicating a possible but not certain attack upon Alaska, like the attack on Pearl Harbor, without a declaration of war. Our countermeasures in such a crisis would require not only speed but complete secrecy. How would either speed or secrecy be possible if the Constitution barred the way until the Congress could act?

These contingencies, and many more that might be cited, are by no means improbable. In fact, they are relatively simple situations. We cannot foretell what kind of complicated emergency might arise in a supersonic atomic blitzkrieg.

This is a most serious consideration, Mr. President. I believe it would be reckless of us to approve the George proposal without thorough consideration of all the implications involved. I have mentioned just those few implications which have occurred to me. I say that an amendment to our Constitution, such as the George proposal or any of the others pending before us, must be carefully examined by all the appropriate committees, including the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I am deeply troubled, Mr. President, by the prospect of a constitutional amendment evolved from a hasty political compromise. Without detracting in any way from the sincerity and diligence and patriotic intentions with which a number of Senators have worked in recent weeks to bring about a compromise of the issues raised by Senate Joint Resolution 1, I am compelled to say that in my view any such compromise would be fundamentally wrong.

We all know the valuable function of compromise in our national life. But compromise must not be reached at the expense of beclouding our Constitution and conceivably even jeopardizing our national security. If compromise is needed to preserve the unity of any party, let that compromise be at the expense of some lesser object than the Constitution of the United States, the basic charter of our liberties, the bedrock of our institutions.

Mr. President, I do not wish to appear to be against everything. I think there is a constructive alternative pending before us.

The substitute measure proposed by the senior Senator from Tennessee and cosponsored by 11 other Senators, including myself, offers, in my opinion, the most appropriate disposition of the issues which have been raised by Senate

Joint Resolution 1. The Kefauver resolution provides, first of all, for the presence of a quorum in the Senate, and a record of the yeas and nays, upon the ratification of all treaties. It applies the same safeguard to both Houses of the Congress whenever a constitutional amendment is to be submitted to the States.

This provision was originally, I am proud to say, my proposal. I introduced it on July 18 last year as a simple resolution to amend the rules. Since then it has been agreed to in principle by all groups in the Senate and in the country. It is reflected in the Knowland proposal as well as in others pending before us. In my proposal and in the Kefauver resolution, all this would be accomplished, not by cluttering up the Constitution, but by simply amending the internal rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives. As the distinguished Senator from Ohio told us last August, this is the "proper way to handle it."

But, Mr. President, this substitute measure, the Kefauver resolution, being a joint resolution and nothing more, would of course substitute for the various constitutional amendments which have been proposed. But it will serve a valuable purpose by recording clearly and unmistakably the only valid and substantial grounds upon which such amendments are alleged to be based.

Furthermore, if this substitute is adopted, no one will be able to say in future times that by rejecting the constitutional amendment pending before us, we implied that treaties may override the Constitution. Any such argument would be knocked out by this substitute measure, which solemnly affirms "that the Constitution of the United States is superior to all treaties and other international agreement." It further affirms the duty of the courts to invalidate treaties and international agreements conflicting with the Constitution; and it proclaims our constitutional attributes of national sovereignty and independence as incident to the making of treaties and other international agreements. It is because these things are so—not because they are not so—that there is no need or basis for a constitutional amendment.

The bitter dispute over the treaty power seems to me in large measure symptomatic of the tensions of the world in which we live. There is an increasing tendency, in this atomic-supersonic age, to think and talk in extremes.

Our country is now beset by vociferous minorities at opposite ends of the political spectrum. At one end are those who would subvert our freedoms and our national security in the interests of the Soviet Union. At the other end are those who in the name of national security are apparently willing to throw overboard the essence of American liberty.

In the middle of the bewildering crossfire from these two extremes, the rest of us are seriously trying to work out the safe course to both security and freedom.

The dispute over the treaty power has provided a parallel situation. To a large extent this dispute was touched off by a few ill-considered opinions of inferior courts and a few poorly reasoned law-review articles containing statements which have been described to me as being fallacious almost to the point of irresponsibility. These opinions and articles were the product of extremist thinking, bent upon a quixotic pell-mell rush into all-out world government. The fallacies of these statements, and the lack of authority for them, are obvious upon calm analysis. But at the other extreme the ostrich isolationist element in our country seized upon these statements and brandished them as hobgoblins to frighten the American people. "Wake up, America," they cried. "Get the United States of America out of the U. N. Get the U. N. out of the United States of America."

In between these extremes stand the great majority of the American people, devoted as ever to our American traditions.

The Kefauver substitute joint resolution, Mr. President, gives no ground to either extreme. It reaffirms the determination of the American people to work out their salvation within the time-tested framework of our Constitution as it stands today and as it will, I pray God, remain for ages to come.

FACTUAL INFORMATION REGARDING EMPLOYMENT OF FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on December 23, 1953, I addressed a letter to Mr. Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in which I requested him to provide me with certain factual information regarding the employment of Federal personnel during the past 20 years. In my letter of that date I requested certain statistics.

I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to read them, but I ask unanimous consent that the statistics which I requested, and Mr. Young's letter to me of January 13, 1954, giving certain statistics and information which I requested, be printed at this point in the RECORD. I think the Senate may find the information of interest.

There being no objection, a statement of the information requested and Mr. Young's letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMATION REQUESTED

1. The number of employees, by years, in the executive branch of the Federal Government since March 3, 1933.

2. A list of laws enacted by the Congress during the period from March 9, 1933, to July 7, 1952, which authorized employment of personnel without regard to civil service and classification laws. (This information has previously been submitted to another Senator, but I desire to have it incorporated in this report.)

3. The number of employees involved in the respective acts requested above.

4. The numbers and percentages of Federal employees in the competitive or career civil service during the years 1933 to 1952.

5. The number of employees brought into the classified civil service without benefit of competitive examination during the years 1933–52. In this connection, I desire to have the authority (statute, executive order, etc.) under which such action took place.

6. The number of employees in the executive branch of the Government on January 20, 1953. The number of said employees on December 1, 1953, or the latest date available.

7. The number and percentage of Federal employees in the competitive or career service on January 20, 1953. The number of said employees on December 1, 1953, or the latest date available.

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: It is my pleasure to send you the statistical information which was requested in your letter of December 23, 1953.

Table I supplies the figures requested in items 1, 4, 6, and 7 of your letter. Since the statistics reported by the agencies to the Commission are as of the end of each month, table I contains figures as of February 28 instead of March 3, 1933, and as of January 31 instead of January 20, 1953.

Table II contains the list of laws requested in item 2 of your letter.

Table III supplies the statistics requested in item 5 of your letter.

The tables contain statistics on all items listed in your letter except item 3. This item requested the number of employees involved in the acts of Congress which authorized employment of personnel without regard to civil service and classification laws. Many of the acts of Congress listed in table II covered only certain blocks of positions in the agencies named. As an example, the provision in the Federal Power Act of 1935 covered certain officers, attorneys, examiners, and experts. While we do have statistics available on the total positions excepted from civil service in these agencies, we cannot determine how many of the positions were excepted by the legislation enacted between 1933 and 1952.

If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely,

PHILIP YOUNG, *Chairman.*

TABLE I.—*Trend of Federal civilian employment, 1932–53*

Date	Total, all areas [1]	Competitive civil service	
		Number	Percent
June 30, 1932	583,196	467,161	80.1
Feb. 28, 1933	567,697	[2] 453,590	[2] 79.9
June 30, 1933	572,091	456,096	79.9
June 30, 1934	673,095	450,892	66.9
June 30, 1935	719,440	455,229	63.3
June 30, 1936	824,259	498,725	60.5
June 30, 1937	841,664	532,073	63.2
June 30, 1938	851,926	562,909	66.1
June 30, 1939	920,310	623,832	67.7
June 30, 1940	1,002,820	726,827	72.5
June 30, 1941	1,358,150	990,218	72.9
June 30, 1942	2,206,970	(3)	(3)
June 30, 1943	3,157,113	(3)	(3)
June 30, 1944	3,312,256	(3)	(3)
June 30, 1945	3,769,646	(3)	(3)
June 30, 1946	2,722,031	(3)	(3)
June 30, 1947	2,128,648	1,733,019	81.4
June 30, 1948	2,090,732	1,750,827	83.7
June 30, 1949	2,109,642	1,802,706	85.4
June 30, 1950	1,966,448	1,687,594	85.8
June 30, 1951	2,486,491	2,175,668	87.5
June 30, 1952	2,603,207	2,246,446	86.3
Jan. 31, 1953	2,556,482	[2] 2,213,658	[2] 86.6
June 30, 1953	2,470,963	2,137,705	86.5
Nov. 30, 1953	2,365,629	[2] 2,040,828	[2] 86.3

[1] Totals through 1941 are taken from annual reports of the Civil Service Commission. After that date the source is the monthly report of Federal Civilian Employment.
[2] Estimated.
[3] Data not collected during war years.

TABLE II.—*A list of laws enacted by the Congress of the United States during the period from Mar. 9, 1933, the beginning of the 73d Cong., through July 7, 1952, the adjournment of the 82d Cong., carrying provisions authorizing employment of personnel without regard to civil-service and classification laws*

COVERAGE OF THE LIST

The list is not exhaustive, although it purports to be comprehensive within certain boundaries. These boundaries are drawn to eliminate references that would not only add to the bulkiness of the list, but would so becloud its purpose that its usefulness and accuracy could well be questioned.

Therefore, to keep the list within a proper perspective the following kinds of references have been omitted.

1. Laws creating small commissions or committees to exist for a short period of time to perform some specific duty such as "An act to provide for the appointment of a commission to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia."
2. Laws authorizing participation by the Federal Government in celebrations, expositions, and fairs such as the California Exposition Commission, the Texas Centennial Commission, operation of the Freedom Train, and the Paris Exposition.
3. Provisions appearing in the annual appropriation acts appropriating sums to various agencies for the employment of experts, consultants, or other personnel usually on a temporary basis. The amounts of money are usually not very large and the provisions seem to have no degree of uniformity. Sometimes they appear only once; sometimes they appear 2 or 3 times and then are dropped.
4. Laws pertaining to participation in international organizations such as a law providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization.
5. Laws pertaining to the District of Columbia government such as those dealing with policemen and firemen.
6. Laws pertaining to employees outside continental United States.

USE OF THE LIST

The short titles of the laws are used if available; otherwise, the long titles are shortened.

The date approved means the date the President signed the law.

The page reference in the citations to the Statutes at Large is to the page on which the provision appears rather than to the page on which the law begins.

The section of the law is listed to make it easier to find.

Some of the provisions examined authorized employment without regard to civil-service laws; some authorize the fixing of compensation without regard to the Classification Act; some authorize both. Therefore, the last column is divided into two parts to indicate from which law the employees are exempt. The symbol X is used to show an exemption.

Often the provisions exempting personnel from the civil-service laws and/or Classification Act are limited to certain officers and employees. Where such is the case, the limitation is set out in a footnote.

The footnotes appear at the end of the list.

Title of act	Date approved	Citation to Statutes at Large	Section No.	Exempt from—	
				Civil-service law	Classification Act
Agricultural Adjustment Act	May 12, 1933	48 Stat. 37	10	X	
Emergency Farm Mortgage Act, 1933	do	48 Stat. 49	33	X	X
Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933	do	48 Stat. 56	3 (b)	X	X
Tennessee Valley Act of 1933	May 18, 1933	48 Stat. 59	3	X	
Corporation of Foreign Bondholders, 1933	May 27, 1933	48 Stat. 93	203	X	X
For the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system	June 6, 1933	48 Stat. 114	2	X	X
Home Owners Loan Act of 1933	June 13, 1933	48 Stat. 131	4 (j)	X	X
National Industrial Recovery Act	June 16, 1933	48 Stat. 195	2 (a)	X	X
Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works	do	48 Stat. 200	201 (a) (b)	X	X
Emergency Railroad Transportation Act, 1933	do	48 Stat. 211	2	X	X
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act	Jan. 31, 1934	48 Stat. 345	1	X	X
For loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1934	Feb. 23, 1934	48 Stat. 355	4	X	X
Regulation of cotton industry	Apr. 21, 1934	48 Stat. 605	17	X	X
Securities and Exchange Act of 1934	June 6, 1934	48 Stat. 885	4 (b)	[1] X	[1] X
Communications Act of 1934	June 19, 1934	48 Stat. 1067	4 (f)	[2] X	[2] X
To establish a National Archives of the U. S. Government	do	48 Stat. 1122	2	X	
National Housing Act	June 27, 1934	48 Stat. 1246	1	X	X
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	do	48 Stat. 1256	402 (c) (5)	X	X
Tobacco Control Act	June 28, 1934	48 Stat. 1279	10 (c)	X	X
For loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1935	Feb. 20, 1935	49 Stat. 29	4	X	X
To regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products	Feb. 22, 1935	49 Stat. 33	9 (b)	X	X
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1935	Apr. 8, 1935	49 Stat. 117	3	X	X
Protection of land resources against soil erosion	Apr. 27, 1935	49 Stat. 164	4 (2)	[3] X	[3] X
National Labor Relations Act	July 5, 1935	49 Stat. 451	4	[4] X	
Central Statistical Board	July 25, 1935	49 Stat. 499	4	[5] X	[5] X
Social Security Act	Aug. 14, 1935	49 Stat. 636	703	[6] X	
Potato Control Act of 1935	Aug. 24, 1935	49 Stat. 790	218	X	X
Public Utility Act, 1935	Aug. 26, 1935	49 Stat. 837	31	[7] X	[7] X
Federal Power Act, 1935	do	49 Stat. 859	310	[8] X	[8] X
Railroad Retirement Act, 1935	Aug. 29, 1935	49 Stat. 972	8 (c)	X	X
Federal Alcohol Administration Act	do	49 Stat. 977	2 (c)	X	X
Rural Electrification Act, 1936	May 20, 1936	49 Stat. 1366	11	[9] X	
Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection	May 27, 1936	49 Stat. 1384	5 (a)	[10] X	
Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission	June 3, 1936	49 Stat. 1399	2 (c)	X	X
For loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during 1937	Jan. 29, 1937	50 Stat. 6	5 (a)	X	X
Providing for the construction and maintenance of a national art gallery	Mar. 24, 1937	50 Stat. 52–53	4 (c)	[11] X	[11] X
Bituminous Coal Act of 1937	Apr. 26, 1937	50 Stat. 73	2 (a)	[12] X	[12] X
Office of Consumers Counsel		50 Stat. 74	2 (b) (3)	[13] X	[13] X
To establish a civilian conservation corps	June 28, 1937	50 Stat. 320	5	X	
Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act	July 22, 1937	50 Stat. 528	41 (a)	X	
To authorize completion, maintenance, and operation of Bonneville project	Aug. 20, 1937	50 Stat. 736	10	[9] X	[9] X
To create a commission and extend further relief to water uses on reclamation and Indian irrigation projects	Aug. 21, 1937	50 Stat. 738	2	X	X
To provide for taking census of partial employment, etc	Aug. 30, 1937	50 Stat. 883	2		[14] X
Federal Crop Insurance Act	Feb. 16, 1938	52 Stat 73	507 (a)	X	
To authorize completion, maintenance, and operation of Fort Peck project for navigation	May 18, 1938	52 Stat. 406	9	[9] X	[9] X
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1941	June 26, 1940	54 Stat. 622	21 (b)	X	X
Selective Training and Service Act, 1940	Sept. 16, 1940	54 Stat. 894	10 (a) (3)	[15] X	[15] X
Making an appropriation to the United States Maritime Commission for emergency cargo ship construction	Feb. 6, 1941	55 Stat. 6	1	[16] X	[16] X
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1942	July 1, 1941	55 Stat. 404	16 (b)	X	X
National Youth Administration Appropriation Act, 1942	do	55 Stat. 490	Par. 16	X	X
National Archives Trust Fund Board Act	July 9, 1941	55 Stat. 582	8 (b)	X	
To provide for the planting of guayule and other rubber bearing plants and to make available a source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses	Mar. 5, 1942	56 Stat. 127	2 (a)	X	X
To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meatpacking establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies	June 10, 1942	56 Stat. 351	2 (c)	X	X

[1] Exemption applies to certain officers, attorneys, and other experts.
[2] Exemption applies to a secretary, a director for each division, a chief engineer, and not more than 3 assistants, a general counsel and no more than 3 assistants, and temporary counsel for performances of special services.
[3] Exemption applies for not more than 8 months after passage of act; thereafter employees are to be appointed in accordance with civil-service and classification laws.
[4] Exemption applies to an executive secretary, attorneys, examiners, and regional directors.
[5] Exemption applies to persons appointed for temporary periods, not exceeding 12 months.
[6] Exemption applies to attorneys and experts.
[7] Exemption applies to attorneys, examiners, and other experts.
[8] Exemption applies to certain officers, attorneys, examiners, and experts.
[9] Exemption applies to attorneys, engineers, and experts.
[10] Exemption applies to technical staff.
[11] Exemption applies to Director, Assistant Director, Secretary, and Chief Curator.
[12] Exemption applies to the secretary, a clerk to each Commissioner, the attorneys, the managers and employees of the statistical bureaus, and such special agents, technical experts and examiners as the Commission may require.
[13] Exemption applies to clerk to the counsel, the attorneys and such special agents and experts as the Council requires.
[14] Exemption applies to temporary personnel.
[15] Exemption applies to clerical and stenographic employees for local boards.
[16] Exemption applies to personnel engaged in the maintenance, repair, operation, or management of plants or facilities.

TABLE II.—*A list of laws enacted by the Congress of the United States during the period from Mar. 9, 1933, the beginning of the 73d Cong., through July 7, 1952, the adjournment of the 82d Cong., carrying provisions authorizing employment of personnel without regard to civil-service and classification laws*—Continued

Title of act	Date approved	Citation to Statutes at Large	Section No.	Exempt from— Civil-service law	Exempt from— Classification Act
National Youth Administration Appropriation Act, 1943	July 2, 1942	56 Stat. 573	Par. 15	X	X
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1943	do	56 Stat. 642	15 (b)	X	X
Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942	Dec. 18, 1942	56 Stat. 1058	2 (b)	X	X
Surplus Property Act of 1944	Oct. 3, 1944	58 Stat. 768	5 (a)	[17] X	[17] X
To amend Bonneville Project Act	Oct. 23, 1945	59 Stat. 546	5	[18 20 21] X	[19 21] X
To establish Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration	Jan. 3, 1946	59 Stat. 679	14 (a), 14 (b)	[22] X	[22] X
Atomic Energy Act, 1946	Aug. 1, 1946	60 Stat. 771	12 (4)	[23] X	[23] X
Veterans Canteen Service	Aug. 7, 1946	60 Stat. 888	2 (e)	[24] X	[24] X
To establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System, etc	Mar. 31, 1947	61 Stat. 32	6 (a) (4)		X
To exclude interns, student nurses, and other student employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation or benefits of Federal employees.	Aug. 4, 1947	61 Stat. 727	1, 2		X
Economic Cooperation Act of 1948	Apr. 3, 1948	62 Stat. 139	104 (e)		[25] X
To provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau	June 2, 1948	62 Stat. 286	3	[26] X	[26] X
To authorize establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.	June 19, 1948	62 Stat. 536		X	X
To provide for Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	Apr. 14, 1949	63 Stat. 46	2 (f)	X	X
Classification Act of 1949	Oct. 28, 1949	63 Stat. 954–957	202, 204, 205		X
Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act	May 3, 1950	64 Stat. 100	4 (a)	X	X
Federal Records Act of 1950	Sept. 5, 1950	64 Stat. 584	503 (c)		[27] X
Renegotiation Act, 1951	Mar. 23, 1951	65 Stat. 20	107 (c)	X	
To confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission.	June 19, 1952	66 Stat. 139	1	X	X
Communications Act Amendments, 1952	July 16, 1952	66 Stat. 711	3 (2)	[28] X	

[17] Exemption applies to special assistants, certified public accountants, qualified cost accountants, industrial engineers, appraisers, and other experts.
[18] Exemption applies to Assistant Administrator, Chief Engineer, and General Counsel.
[19] Exemption applies to laborers, mechanics, and workmen on construction work.
[20] Exemption applies to physicians to examine the laborers, mechanics, and workmen.
[21] Exemption applies to experts.
[22] Exemption applies generally to medical specialists; however, some of the personnel are subject to the civil-service and classification laws.
[23] The law provides that officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with civil-service and classification laws "except to the extent the Commission deems such action necessary to the discharge of its responsibilities, personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws."
[24] Exemption applies to personnel necessary for the transaction of business at canteens, warehouses, and storage depots.
[25] Exemption applies to not more than 100 employees.
[26] Exemption applies to employees for meteorological investigations in the Arctic.
[27] Exemption applies to National Historical Publications Commission.
[28] Exemption applies to a legal assistant, and engineering assistant and a secretary for each Commissioner and an administrative assistant for the chairman.

TABLE III.—*Incumbents granted civil-service status noncompetitively under various pieces of legislation, Executive orders, and the civil-service rules and regulations between Mar. 4, 1933, and June 30, 1952, by authority and agency*

BY LEGISLATION

	Number
Act of Congress, Apr. 27, 1935 (Public Law 46): Soil Conservation Service	10,328
Act of Congress, June 29, 1936 (Public Law 835): U. S. Maritime Commission	894
Act of Congress, May 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 421): The National Archives	293
Act of Congress, June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1076): Post Office Department (postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class offices)	10,271
Act of Congress, July 2, 1940 (Public Law 719, 76th Cong.): District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board	118
Act of Congress, Nov. 26, 1940 (Public Law 880, 76th Cong.): Ramspeck Act	81,618
Act of Congress, Dec. 20, 1941 (Public 363, 77th Cong.): District of Columbia Board of Public Welfare	966
Total, by legislation	104,488

BY EXECUTIVE ORDERS

	Number
Executive Order 5817, Mar. 10, 1932: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce	192
Executive Order 5859, June 21, 1932: Treasury	191
Executive Order 6134, May 18, 1933: Farm Credit Administration	965
Executive Order 6758, June 29, 1934: Farm Credit Administration	1,660
Executive Order 7195, Sept. 26, 1935 (as amended by Executive Order 7223, Nov. 9, 1935): Civilian Conservation Corps	809
Executive Order 7458, Sept. 26, 1936: Rural Electrification Administration	288
Executive Order 7732, Oct. 27, 1937: U. S. Housing Authority	388
Executive Order 7852, Mar. 29, 1938: Lighthouse Service	194
Executive Order 7916, June 24, 1938	17,726
Executive Order 8383, Mar. 28, 1940: Interior (Office of Indian Affairs)	456
Executive Order 8699, Mar. 1, 1941: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	475
Executive Order 8811, June 30, 1941: Office of Government Reports (Executive Office of President)	297
Executive Order 8886, Sept. 3, 1941: Coast Guard	181
Executive Order 8939, Nov. 13, 1941: Farm Security Administration	1,104
Executive Order 8952, Nov. 27, 1941	1,282
Executive Order 9807, Nov. 29, 1946	354
Executive Order 10080, Sept. 30, 1949	4,248
Executive Order 10157, Aug. 28, 1950	16,520
Total, by Executive order	47,330

BY OPERATION OF CIVIL-SERVICE RULES AND REGULATIONS (CIVIL-SERVICE RULES ARE PROMULGATED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER)

	Number
Rule II, sec. 9 (formerly rule X, secs. 11 and 13)	87
Classified status given to citizens of the United States who had rendered faithful service overseas for not less than 7 years in a civil capacity. This regulation was revoked effective May 1, 1947.	
Rule III, sec. 3.101 of the regulations (formerly rule II, sec. 6)	35,324
Incumbents of positions brought into the competitive service.	
Rule III, sec. 3.101—Continued	Number
The largest groups included in this total are: 7,286 clerks in third-class post offices and special delivery messengers in first-class post offices; and 7,191 employees of Farmers Home Administration processed under this regulation as a result of the act of Congress, Aug. 14, 1946 (Public Law 731, 79th Cong.).	
Rule III, sec. 3.101 (a) (2) of the regulations (formerly rule II, sec. 7)	6,183
Post Office Service: Employees in offices advanced from the fourth class to a higher class, or in a post office consolidated with one in which the employees are classified as competitive.	
This regulation has been suspended effective Dec. 1, 1950.	
Rule III, sec. 3.104 of the regulations (formerly rule X, sec. 4)	47
Employees who have served at least 2 years in the immediate office of the President or on the White House staff and whose transfer to a competitive position is requested by any agency.	
Rule III, sec. 3.2 (formerly rule II, sec. 8)	115
Appointments in the competitive service without competitive examinations whenever the Commission finds that the duties or compensation of the position are such, or that qualified persons are so rare, that, in the interest of good civil-service administration, the position cannot be filled through open competitive examination.	
Total, by operation of rules and regulations	47,756
Grand total	193,574

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] desires to obtain the floor. I suggested to the Senator from Montana that if he would withhold the delivery of his remarks upon his obtaining the floor, and would yield to me for a period of 10 or 12 minutes, I would agree to his securing recognition first.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield for a question, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. THYE. I have two questions I desire to propound in connection with the proposed amendments. I should like to raise the questions sometime this afternoon, especially before such time as the Senate may be asked to vote on the amendments. If a vote is to be taken this afternoon, I wish to raise my questions first, so that the authors of the amendments may give consideration to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Minnesota that the Senator from Oregon has asked for recognition following the completion of the remarks of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. That is all the information the Chair has at this time.

Mr. THYE. May I ask the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], if, when the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has completed his remarks, the Senator from Montana will yield 2 or 3 minutes to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing his right to the floor, the Senator from Montana may yield to me for a brief period following the completion of the remarks to be made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRICKER. I desire to thank the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Minnesota. I shall make my remarks as brief as I can. However, they are pertinent to the issue under discussion and are in relation to the amendments offered by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The three perfecting amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 1 approved by the administration are also approved by me. These amendments were submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. These three amendments should be supported by all Senators who desire to give the American people greater protection against abuse of the treaty-making power.

Taken together, the three perfecting amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 1 may be regarded as an administration substitute proposal. That proposal does not go far enough. Those who have supported me in this fight for a treaty-control amendment believe that it would be better for the Senate to pass no amendment this year than to pass an inadequate substitute.

On the other hand, by adopting one additional amendment to the Senate Judiciary Committee text, we would have a constitutional amendment embodying substantially all the objectives of Senate Joint Resolution 1. Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and most of the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee who voted to report Senate Joint Resolution 1 with a favorable recommendation, I have submitted an amendment to the committe amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 1.

The amendment I have proposed, together with the three amendments to which the administration has no objection, would result in a treaty-control amendment reading as follows:

SECTION 1. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof: Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.

SEC. 2. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

SEC. 3. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by the Congress unless in advising and consenting to a treaty the Senate, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, shall provide that such treaty may become effective as internal law without legislation by the Congress.

SEC. 4. On the question of consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Section 3 in the above text represents the area of disagreement as between the administration and myself.

Throughout the course of this debate, I have indicated my willingness to compromise on language but not on principle. The proposed modification of Senate Joint Resolution 1 should prove even to the most hostile segment of the press that I have never had the slightest desire to hamstring the President in carrying out his enormous responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs. At the same time, adoption of the modified text would completely vindicate the efforts of those patriotic organizations and individuals who have alerted the American people to the dangers of treaty law.

The modified text of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would definitely accomplish these ends:

First. All treaties in conflict with the Constitution would be of no force or effect. This provision has been a part of every proposed constitutional amendment I have drafted.

Second. All executive agreements in conflict with the Constitution would be of no force or effect. This provision has also been under consideration ever since Senate Joint Resolution 130 was introduced by me on February 7, 1952.

Third. Legislation implementing invalid treaties and executive agreements would be of no force or effect.

Fourth. The Senate's advice and consent to the ratification of treaties must be by a yea and nay vote, thus insuring the presence of a quorum. This proposal stems from the proposed substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 1 introduced by the majority leader on July 22 of last year. It should prove very helpful in curbing abuse of the treatymaking power. I am happy to accept it.

Fifth. All treaties would be nonself-executing unless the Senate by affirmative action of two-thirds of the Senators present should permit a treaty to be self-executing. This provision is a modification of the nonself-executing clause of section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as reported by the committee. This modification recognizes the fact that some relatively noncontroversial treaties should not be required to be enacted into law by both Houses of Congress. At the same time, the amendment I have proposed will protect the people of the United States from far-reaching changes which may flow from the ambiguous phrases of a treaty which the Senate cannot always anticipate at the time it acts on a treaty.

Sixth. Executive agreements would not become effective as domestic law without implementing legislation, thus overruling the pernicious doctrine of United States against Pink.

Two controversial features of the committee text are not present in the new text. They are:

First. Confirmation of the power of Congress to regulate the making of executive agreements. Since most American lawyers, including many opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1, believe that Congress already possesses such power, the elimination of this provision was a relatively minor concession to the administration's point of view. With this provision eliminated, it is now impossible to contend that anything in the proposed amendment will hamper the President in the field of foreign affairs. Furthermore, the deletion of this provision enables all proponents of the amendment to say that nothing contained therein has any effect whatever on the existing powers of the President, of the Senate, and of the Congress, insofar as the foreign affairs of the United States are concerned.

Second. Elimination of the so-called "which" clause will be brought about. As Members of the Senate will recall, when Senate Joint Resolution 1 was originally introduced by me on January 7, 1953, it did not contain the so-called

"which" clause. That clause was not included in the original version because at that time I felt there might be some subject of genuine international concern appropriate for a treaty but which, in the absence of treaty, fell within the constitutionally reserved powers of the States. After hearing the testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, I became convinced that there was no subject within the reserved powers of the States which could be a legitimate matter of international concern.

As I pointed out in my opening speech in the debate on Senate Joint Resolution 1, I am convinced that even in the absence of treaty Congress has full power to regulate the rights of aliens in the United States, the growing of opium poppies, extradition, and all aspects of atomic energy. However, in view of honest doubts as to the wisdom of the "which" clause, and in view of the many erroneous charges circulated concerning it, I have concluded that it is wise to drop that clause from the amendment. As a matter of fact, I offered long ago to make this concession to the administration's point of view.

Some protection to the States against the treaty power is contained in the modified text. For example, it is provided in the amendment I will propose to the committee amendment that the Senate, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senator's present and voting, may provide that a treaty shall become effective as internal law without legislation by the Congress. This will enable two-thirds of the Senators to consider and to protect the reserved powers of the States in appropriate cases, if it so desires. This has been frequently attempted in the past in the Senate by way of reservation to a treaty in the form of a Federal-State clause. For example, when the Senate consented to ratification of the Charter of Organization of American States in 1951, it attached the following reservation:

> None of its provisions shall be considered as enlarging the powers of the Federal Government of the United States or limiting the powers of the several States of the Federal Union with respect to any matters recognized under the Constitution as being within the reserved powers of the several States.

Unfortunately, under the doctrine of Missouri against Holland, it is impossible for the Senate by way of a reservation to a treaty to deprive the whole Congress of its power under the Constitution as interpreted in Missouri against Holland. This is a danger which even the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 recognize. For example, a report of the New York State Bar Association appears in the record of hearings beginning at page 618. This report was signed by Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. William D. Mitchell, and Mr. Harrison Tweed, all able lawyers and all opponents of any treaty-control amendment. Their report points out, however, that a Federal-State clause would probably not be effective to protect the reserved powers of the States under the Constitution as it stands today. On page 621 of the record of hearings the following statement appears:

> If we want to put a clause in the (Human Rights) Covenant on this subject, it would have to go further and provide that the Federal Government assumes no obligation to enact legislation which it could not constitutionally enact, in the absence of treaty. This would relieve the Federal Government from an obligation to enact Federal legislation, but even then it might be held that under the rule in *Missouri* v. *Holland* Congress would gain power to fully implement the Covenant although under no international obligation to do so.

I see no reason whatever why the Senate in advising and consenting to a treaty should be powerless to respect the reserved powers of the several States. In many cases, the Senate has attempted to show a decent respect for States prerogatives. I do not see how any Member of the Senate can successfully maintain that the Senate should be unable to protect the powers of the States from the full impact of a treaty if two-thirds of the Senators so decide. That is constitutionally imposible today because of the decision in Missouri against Holland. One of the premises of that case is that Congress has unlimited power to legislate in implementation of a treaty. That is a power which the Senate cannot take from the Congress merely by attaching a reservation to a treaty. However, if the amendment which I have proposed is adopted, two-thirds of the Senators present and voting will be able to make such reservations effective.

I listened with great interest today to the speech made by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on the amendments endorsed by the administration. Specifically, I agree with him that those amendments, if adopted, will produce the following results:

First. Prevent any delegation of the executive, legislative, or judicial power of the United States to the United Nations or to any other international organization. In other words, the amendments proposed by the Senator from Michigan and endorsed by the administration, which I approve, will prevent world government by treaty or by executive agreement.

Second. Prevent the United States from becoming a party to the United Nations draft statute for an International Criminal Court except by further amendment of the Constitution.

Third. The proposed amendment of the supremacy clause will remove all doubt as to the effectiveness of the following section providing that a treaty or other international agreement in conflict with the Constitution shall be of no force or effect.

I agree with the senior Senator from Michigan that the dissenting opinion in the steel seizure cases shows the danger of treaty law.

I agree with the senior Senator from Michigan that all prudent men, in view of the decision in Missouri against Holland and other decisions of the United States Supreme Court, should not take the risk that a treaty might be held some day to override the Constitution and cut across the Bill of Rights, as suggested by the Secretary of State at Louisville.

I agree with the senior Senator from Michigan's analysis of the Pink case, namely, that the President by an executive agreement, not approved by either House of Congress, was able to override the law of the State of New York and to deprive alien creditors of their property otherwise protected from confiscation by reason of the fifth amendment.

Thus it appears that there are two major differences between the administration and myself with respect to what constitutes an adequate treaty-control amendment. The first difference is one to which I have already referred. I would make all treaties non-self-executing, subject to the right of the Senate to make them effective without legislation, in order to prevent the ambiguous phrases of a treaty from producing far-reaching and unintended consequences.

If such a provision had been in the Constitution of the United States in 1945, we would not have the problem today with respect to articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter. All Members of the Senate in the 79th Congress believed, on the basis of official representations, that the human-rights provisions in the charter were non-self-executing. As a practical matter, it was impossible for the Senate to consent to ratification of the charter with any reservation whatsoever. This same general problem will come up again and again. In my judgment, making all treaties non-self-executing as domestic law will facilitate the ratification of treaties by the United States Senate.

The second major difference between the administration's position and my own concerns the problem of executive agreements as domestic law. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] recognizes the need to prevent executive agreements from overriding the Constitution. I submit that it is just as important to prevent one man, the President of the United States, from making domestic law simply by making a promise to some foreign power. We have not plugged the loophole in the Constitution merely by providing that executive agreements shall not override the Constitution. We must go further and provide, in effect, that no powers of domestic legislation are vested in the President, as was decided in the Pink case. My amendment to the committee amendment will carry out the purpose of the Founding Fathers when they provided in the very first section of the first article to the Constitution:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has permission from the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to ask a question, with the understanding that the

Senator from Montana will not lose the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield, provided the Senator from Montana does not lose the floor by my yielding.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that neither the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] nor the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] will lose the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. What is the purpose the Senator from Michigan has in mind?

Mr. FERGUSON. I was going to ask if it was possible to have a vote on the amendment designated "2-2-54-B," on page 3, line 5, after the word "treaty", to insert "or other international agreement."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it would be a mistake to vote tonight on the amendment. Some of us would like to read the RECORD. Since it is a very important amendment, I think it should go over and the vote on it taken tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has secured permission from the Senator from Minnesota to ask a question. Does the Senator from Michigan desire to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I ask for a vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota will yield to me, under the same condition, that he will not lose the floor?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wondered whether the Senator from Oregon would object to a vote today. The amendment was not offered today. It has been under consideration for a considerable period of time, and is merely an amendment offered to perfect the committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. If I understand the parliamentary situation correctly, the Ferguson amendments and the Bricker acceptance of them have quite a bearing on the perfecting amendment. I think we ought not to consider the Ferguson amendments and the Bricker acceptance of them tonight in view of what the RECORD shows regarding what the Senator from Michigan put in the RECORD by way of argument in support of his amendments. I do not think the perfecting amendments can be separated from the amendments offered today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon object to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. There is nothing the Senator from Oregon can do to prevent a vote if, in the orderly course of debate, we get to a vote; but there will be discussion before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the desire of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan desires a vote on the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the plan is to vote now, the Senator from Oregon has a speech he should like to make.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I realize the pitfalls which are inevitable when we seek to write into our basic law language that gives a clear and unmistakable understanding, but I think it is extremely important that when we propose a constitutional amendment we are very certain we are saying what we mean.

I find in the wording of the substitute amendment before the Senate this sentence:

> No treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.

My first question in relation to this sentence is: Whether it would possibly have the effect that all treaties entered into by this country up to this time would be subject to reexamination in our courts, or does it refer only to treaties to be approved after the adoption of the new provision?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. THYE. Yes, indeed. I am asking a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. The answer is that it would apply to all treaties made after the establishment of the Constitution, because the Constitution speaks as of the date of its establishment. I may say that after the 14th amendment was adopted, all laws and all State constitutions in conflict with it were considered void, even though they were in existence before the 14th amendment was adopted.

Mr. THYE. My other question relates to the meaning of the words "in pursuance of." Here I find real ground for confusion.

Webster's Dictionary indicates that the word "pursuance" means carrying out or into effect.

The Constitution itself, in the very article proposed to be amended, uses the words correctly in saying "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof." In other words, the language means laws which are made to carry out the Constitution or put it into effect.

I have never heard of a treaty being negotiated in order to carry out the Constitution of the United States or put it into effect.

If the language had been "pursuant to", the phrase would mean in agreement with our Constitution, according to the usage prescribed by Webster's Dictionary.

"In accordance with" and "in conformity with" would be more accurate phrases than "in pursuance of," as I understand the intent of the authors.

The phrase "in pursuance of this Constitution," as applied to treaties, in the language of the substitute amendment, could very well be interpreted as meaning treaties which are made to carry out or put into effect the Constitution of the United States.

Since no treaties have been or will be made for that purpose—the Congress of the United States by the enactment of statutes and the courts of the land by their decisions being the agencies which implement provisions of the Constitution—this amendment, as now worded, becomes utterly meaningless when the language is strictly interpreted in the light of its proper meaning.

I should like to inquire of the authors, therefore, whether this provision or language really means what it says.

Are we referring only to treaties made "in pursuance of this Constitution"—that is, to put the Constitution into effect or carry out its provisions—or are we referring to all treaties made by our Government? The language is most difficult to understand, and it has a meaning which could well be otherwise interpreted. Therefore, I raise this question before I am willing to cast my vote on this proposal.

By means of this amendment, Mr. President, shall we be saying that only treaties made to put the Constitution into effect or carry out its provisions would be the supreme law of the land? If so, where will that leave other treaties which might be in agreement with our Constitution, but not "in pursuance of" it? Let us ponder that question.

It may be said the intent is clear. That could well be the case so far as the record of the debate in Congress is concerned; but an amendment to the Constitution involves ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, and to them the intent might not be quite so clear.

Mr. President, I am frankly concerned over the effort we are making to write amendments to the Constitution in the course of debate on the floor of the Senate. We have a great Constitution, which basically has stood the test for 166 years of representative government. We have made changes in it when the needs of the Nation have required them from time to time. It is our business seriously to consider reasonable changes.

Therefore, Mr. President, let us be very certain that we do not introduce into this great basic law, language that is hazy and will lead only to controversies in the future.

Mr. President, to those two questions, I should like clear answers before I would care to cast my vote on this very important question.

The Senator from Michigan was able to answer the first question. However, the question as to the interpretation of the words used, according to Webster's dictionary, I should like to have answered in a crystal-clear fashion before the vote is taken.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will read the remarks I have previously made, I think he will find that we have made the amendment crystal clear. The language here used is identical with the language used in article VI, in relation to a law. "Made in pursuance thereof" is the same as "made in pursuance of this Constitution"; and it is to avoid a conflict with the previous article as proposed, which would become a part of the Constitution, that is, that no treaty or international agreement which was in conflict with the

Constitution would be of any force or effect.

If we do not include this amendment in relation to the article VI, clause 2, we then would have a serious conflict with what we would be including. I refer to what is known as the conflict clause and the clause we are presently discussing.

Mr. THYE. The question is as to the meaning of the words "pursuant to." If we consult Webster's Dictionary, we find ourselves in a somewhat confused frame of mind, because the language does raise the question of what is meant by "pursuant to."

I raise this question because I do not wish to tamper with something which has served our Nation so well for 166 years, unless some of my colleagues who are qualified from a legal point of view—of course, I do not speak as an attorney, and therefore I raise this question with those of my colleagues who can qualify as legal experts—make certain that we do not make the error of including in the Constitution amendments which later may be found to be very vague and may be interpreted to mean something we never intended them to mean.

So I wish all my colleagues to ponder this question before we proceed to vote.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding this time to me.

CONGRESS MUST ACT TO AVERT A DEPRESSION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in recent weeks widespread concern has developed across the country with regard to the economic state of the Nation. The press daily carries headline stories concerning curtailed industrial production and mounting unemployment in many sections of the country. Editorials and special articles in the press, as well as speeches in both Houses of the Congress, have been expressing apprehension over these conditions. It is being asserted by many economists that we are heading for a real depression if something is not done to grapple with these serious economic developments.

The course of the administration in regard to our national economic situation is now clear. President Eisenhower has delivered his economic report. In it he has admitted but minimized declines in various segments of the economy. He has talked wistfully and hopefully about an end to these declines by midyear. He has talked about the necessity of Government action to keep the economy growing. But, so far as I can find, he has proposed neither immediate nor adequate long-term action to reverse this definite trend in our economy.

That we are now undergoing a recession is conceded by many economists, commentators, and editorial writers. This downtrend is gaining momentum. The administration, however, is seeking to refute the inference that there should be any real concern in the country so far as these conditions are concerned. We are told that what is occurring in this country is, in reality, a healthy readjustment and a return to normalcy.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask the Senator if the words "return to normalcy" awaken any recollection in his mind of the 1920's. Does he remember any such slogan as of that time?

Mr. MURRAY. I remember it very well.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator from Montana also studied the present apparent trend to concentrate contracts in certain selected industries? Has he ever encountered a situation in which, for example, the Government will exceed real needs in requiring production by plants, and then require those plants, after having overproduced, to bid against one another in an endeavor to dispose of goods which cannot be disposed of to anyone else but the Government? Has the Senator noticed that trend? I have seen it in the East in several instances.

Mr. MURRAY. That is a very serious development.

Mr. KILGORE. That might be good business on the part of so-called big business, but it is not good government income balancing business, is it?

Mr. MURRAY. No. I am absolutely opposed to that. I do not think it has any justification whatever. It seems to me that contracts should be spread among corporations which are capable of manufacturing the things which are necessary, so that if the time comes when we need to speed up production in any line, we shall have plants ready and available to take the contracts.

Mr. KILGORE. But if those plants, by reason of such a system, are put out of business, does not that weaken the defense agencies of this Nation?

Mr. MURRAY. That would have a very definite weakening effect upon our ability to produce.

It has been stated many times that the late war was won largely by the enormous production we were capable of making. That enormous production was made possible as a result of the widespread distribution of contracts, bringing smaller concerns into manufacturing. Small manufacturing shops were brought into the field, which contributed to the great production which was made.

Mr. KILGORE. That is true, particularly if the items produced go into such hard-to-produce products as shell steel, disc steel, and tool steel. Such a trend as I have described might seriously cripple our defense effort if we were called upon to engage in a rapid expansion of production.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct. The Senator is very familiar with that subject.

Mr. President, since I started preparation of this address I have been distressed to learn that the copper mines of my home city of Butte have been placed on a 5-day week and 2 mines have been closed entirely. Butte is a community almost entirely dependent on the full operation of its copper mines. This cutback in the workweek means a cut of approximately $500,000 a month in buying power. It is simple arithmetic to understand how quickly this will be felt by every merchant and businessman in the city of Butte.

As further evidence of what is taking place in this single community I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from the carpenters and joiners union of Butte.

The men working in the Butte mines are about to receive, on the average, a cut in their monthly paychecks of $125. Surely they cannot take the view that this is a "healthy readjustment" of their economic status. Nor can the Butte merchant who will feel this loss of purchasing power regard it as a "healthy readjustment."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL UNION NO. 112,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF
CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Butte, Mont., January 29, 1954.

Hon. JAMES MURRAY,
United States Senator,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

GREETINGS: On behalf of the membership of the local union I represent, we, the carpenters and builders of Butte, Mont., want you to know, with all due respect, that we admire you as a Senator and as a man who has devoted his best and very able services to the welfare of the people you represent.

To begin with, sir, conditions here in Butte are very serious, in our opinion, as to the slump and lack of work that the carpenters and builders of the city and county are experiencing. Construction has come to a virtual standstill. Businessmen of the city seem to be setting aside plans for renovation, which should be in full swing about now, and the truth of the matter is this: that the members of the local union are worried and have been forced to sign up for meager unemployment benefits.

In regards to the signing up for unemployment benefits, many of our members are experiencing much grief in the securing of their checks. Many carpenters have complained that they have had to wait a month or in some instances longer for their checks. Then, too, a carpenter will go back to work, the job will fold up for one reason or another, and even though this individual's claim is active there is another waiting period he must go through before he receives his small subsistence. We of the union protest these conditions as being most unsound, and the principles that the industrial accident and unemployment commission of this State that have been substituted for the letter of the of the law to be used at their own discretion we wish to condem as most un-American to say the least. Will you please help us in this matter?

With the best of wishes.

JAMES P. KOHN,
Recording Secretary.

Mr. MURRAY. Nevertheless, Mr. President, the conditions to which I have adverted seem to be continuing and growing more threatening day by day. Many businessmen express the view that we are in a downtrend which is gathering momentum, and that these conditions cannot be longer ignored.

Efforts are being made to get us to ignore the condition to which I have referred. Attempts are even being made to frighten anyone who mentions recession or depression by accusing them of attempts to talk us into a decline.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Would the distinguished senior Senator from Montana be willing to give to the Senate the benefit of his understanding as to the real difference between a recession and a downward adjustment?

Mr. MURRAY. A recession seems to me to be much more serious than a downward adjustment. A downward adjustment means a simple readjustment of conditions, which would not result in unemployment or in serious curtailment of production. If it goes so far as to result in very serious unemployment, it seems to me that it should be designated as a recession, instead of being called a readjustment.

Efforts were made to ignore and then talk our way out of the depression following the Wall Street collapse of 1929. It was fruitless. We did not begin to recover until we faced the facts. And we must face the facts today.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am very happy that the Senator from Montana has mentioned the copper situation, because my State, like his State, depends to a great extent for its economy upon the output of copper. The Senator is aware, I believe, of the fact that we have been paying 35 cents a pound for Chilean copper. I believe that in the Senator's State copper producers are receiving 27½ cents a pound. In Arizona we receive 24½ cents a pound.

Would the Senator from Montana be agreeable to providing some protection to the copper mines of our country, as well as to the lead and zinc mines?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly they are entitled to protection. I seems to me it would be very serious to permit American copper mines to be so seriously affected by the importation of copper that they would be compelled to shut down and allow their mines to fill with water. If that should happen there would be a very serious situation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Has the Senator from Montana given the subject sufficient thought to be able to suggest a tariff figure or other protection we might consider?

Mr. MURRAY. I have not gone into the subject carefully enough to be able to offer anything at this time. I would rather hear the position taken by the American copper producers before attempting to offer any proposal.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Of course, the Senator from Montana realizes that copper production depends upon demand, and that the domestic output of copper has not been sufficient to meet the demand. It seems reasonable to expect a continuation of domestic copper production, and there has been no indication in my State of a shutdown, but I realize there is a difference between copper-mining operations in my State and in the Senator's State. I thank the Senator for his observation that he would participate in the consideration of protection not only for copper mines but also for the lead and zinc mines of the West.

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. In a recent issue of the Washington Post, Mr. Roscoe Drummond writes:

> Few of the experts forecast a depression. Few of them foresee an extended recession. But their calculations do see a degree of temporary recession that could cause alarm to voters and to the politicians and, as in 1949, produce a serious economic crisis within the economies of some of our allies.
>
> It will be healthier to face this problem now than to be surprised and unprepared if it comes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sorry I was called out of the Chamber. The Senator is discussing the condition of the copper, lead, and zinc mines of the country. I may say that in my State many copper mines have shut down; and when a mine is shut down it costs a great deal of money to reopen it.

In view of the vital materials involved the subject should be thoroughly studied, and we should not allow our mines to be ruined to the extent that in case of an emergency we would not be able to produce locally the minerals which would be needed.

As was suggested, paying from 7 to 10 cents a pound more for the foreign product than we pay for the local product does not sound good to me. In my own State some mines have shut down and others are being forced to shut down because they cannot make ends meet. There is a saying in the Bible which can be paraphrased as: "If you don't look after yourself, you are unworthy." It is a subject which we must think about very seriously.

Mr. MURRAY. The remarks of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, are very relevant to the situation with which we are confronted. Studies are now being made of the problem of zinc, lead, and copper production and generally with reference to the protection of mining in this country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am sure the Senator from Montana would be interested in a fact which I determined just yesterday, namely, that we pay Peru 17½ cents a pound for zinc. There is no zinc or lead mine operating in my State today, because the domestic price is too low.

However, we cannot ascribe that particular difficulty to the present administration, because it inherited the laws under which we are now operating and paying the high prices to alien producers.

I shall certainly join with the Senator from Montana in any effort to bring justice to our western miners.

Mr. MURRAY. The subject certainly is entitled to very careful and exhaustive study. At this time hearings are being held and studies are being made.

Mr. President, the evidences of an economic decline are too obvious for the situation to be hidden or ignored; and, in my judgment, now that we have the President's economic report, we should bring it out in the open, discuss it thoroughly, and institute remedial action as quickly as possible.

It seems to many of us that the unwise administration policies which have been inaugurated are causing a shift of income from the consumer spenders to lenders, wealthy stockholders, bondholders, landlords, and large corporations.

The big industrial and business organizations of the country are following the same course they followed in the depression which began with the Wall Street collapse in October 1929. They have worsened the present situation with such price rises as those made in June and July by steel, and by the electrical, aluminum, and petroleum industries—rises which are being maintained and which continue to depress demand.

Some of us in the past have drawn attention to the tremendous concentration which has taken place in the American economy, and what it portends in the way of monopolistic control and exploitation contrary to the public welfare. Now we have evidence of the denial of competition in the launching by the big industries of cutbacks in production to maintain control of the market place and keep prices from dropping as demand falls off. The giant industries of the country are placing the burden on the backs of the workers as they did in the great depression. They are reducing employment and hours of work; gearing production to the amount of goods that can be sold at high, rigid prices—altogether unmindful of the effect of these manipulations on the total economy and on the masses of our people.

Why, in all the long list of 21 "musts" in the President's State of the Union message, is there not a single word said of this significant factor causing today's recession? Could it be that this big-business administration is wedded to the philosophy of restricted production, a waiting line of workers at the factory gate, a Taft-Hartley law to prevent labor from using its economic strength to halt recession, and a profit margin maintained no matter what its depressing effect on the entire consuming population?

The fires of economic fear are burning across the land, and they are fanned alike by Presidential statements about maintaining a growing economy when every student knows it has already been thrown in reverse, and by the indiscreet and irresponsible statements of the President's advisers that Government should act only when undue disaster strikes, or when we reach the 25 percent to 30 percent decline that Mr. Burgess defines as a "spiraling recession" level.

The people are fearful because it is apparent today that the administration's performance does not match its promises—that the promises are hollow. They are today given, for example, within the limits of a single section of one speech, both the glittering promise and the reality: The assurance that farmers are to share fairly in the increases in our standard of living, and then, only two

breaths later, the reality that in no case should there be an abrupt downward change in the dollar level of their price supports. It is no longer possible to make the promises and delay the reality a year pending more studies. The admission of intended downward adjustments now follows right on the heels of the glittering generalities.

The people are fearful because the progressive economic policies which helped us avoid a postwar depression of the kind which followed all other wars have been repudiated as inflationary.

They are fearful because neither the administration nor the appropriate committee of this Congress is yet in action to implement the Employment Act of 1946, which pledges the Federal Government to "coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

I understand the Joint Committee on the Economic Report is now in session and is considering these matters.

They see instead economic policies reflecting the desire for higher profits of bankers and monopolists, causing unemployment, declining production, falling incomes, and even bankruptcy to millions of Americans.

If these policies are not promptly reversed—and at this point I see no hope for such reversal except by this Congress taking the initiative—we shall end in another economic debacle that will disastrously drag down the economic strength of our democracy at the moment of its most critical test in world history.

Let it be remembered that a drop in our level of economic activity of only 5 percent or 6 percent can mean widespread unemployment and national disaster in many Latin American, Asiatic, and South African countries which supply raw materials, and particularly in those countries whose economies are heavily based on a single raw material.

In 1938 there was a drop in gross national product here of only 6 percent, but United States imports dropped 31 percent. In the sterling area of Asia and Africa the proceeds from commodity exports dropped 48 percent. A decline in demand for tin, rubber, sugar, and similar commodities which frequently are the principal export of a nation, means extensive unemployment, lowered wages, and a depression many times greater in the producing country than anything we experience in the United States.

In all these countries, communism stalks in search of recruits, awaiting the very opportunity that economic chaos resulting from an American recession would give them. And it is not just these underdeveloped countries. Italy totters on the brink of political-economic disaster. France likewise.

I am deeply concerned that the so-called "healthy readjustments" in the United States may mean the actual loss of entire nations by the free world—losses which, if the result of military action, would shake this Nation and the whole world. The losses will be just as real and just as damaging if by economic blundering as if by military blundering.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad the Senator is pointing out the danger involved in the growing unemployment in this country. The Senator heard me say on the floor of the Senate recently that the highest rate of unemployment in the United States at the present time is in my State of Oregon. A week ago last Monday the unemployment rate was 12.7 percent. It is very interesting to note how little the press in my State seems to have to say about the unemployment situation in the State. By and large, the press line is that it is a seasonal unemployment problem. But a 12.7 percent unemployment rate cannot be explained on the ground of any seasonal phenomena. The construction industry is pretty much down; in the lumbering industry there is great unemployment; and there is a loss of purchasing power throughout the State which is reflected in a great reduction of sales in retail stores.

There arrived today from Oregon two pictures which I wish could be placed in the RECORD. Under the rules, they cannot be published in the RECORD, but the captions can be printed. The pictures are from the International Woodworkers Trade Union paper, which very graphically displays the situation in my State, and the comments call attention to the fact that the press is not informing the people of Oregon as to what the situation is regarding unemployment.

But here we have the picture, and if the Senator from Montana will permit me, I should like to give a verbal description of them. They are reminiscent of the 1929, 1930, and 1931 era. They are soup-line pictures. Under one picture this statement appears:

Soup lines are growing in Portland, Oreg., as effects of GOP sound-money policy fail to wear off despite frantic efforts of administration to backtrack to comfortable-money methods. Above are 2 segments of 500-man line at about 5 p. m. on evening of January 19, 1954. Men are shivering in freezing temperature as they wait for free lunches and table space in Blanchet House of Hospitality. State of Oregon Welfare Commission will not give financial aid to employable single men, so they must depend on charity after their unemployment compensation expires, if they are lucky enough to have compensation of $25 a week. Blanchet House food is provided by donations and much of it comes from Catholic hospitals in city. All help is volunteer, including that of director, John Beirne. Most Keynesian economists agree these lines will increase many times if GOP doesn't resort to New Deal pump-priming on vast scale. Oregon's problem is mainly seasonal, so far.

The article in the paper which printed these pictures goes on to point out the deplorable unemployment situation which is developing in my State. But it is not exceptional. There are other spots in America where unemployment is rising at a rapid rate.

I desire to repeat what I said when I was the first one to suggest on the Senate floor in this session of Congress, that one of the things which this administration should do, and do quickly, is to provide such charitable institutions as the Blanchet House of Hospitality in the State of Oregon, and other charitable institutions across the Nation, with quantities of surplus food from Government storage bins with which to feed these fellow citizens of ours who already are shivering in soup lines as a result of the rapidly growing Eisenhower recession.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. John Ball, of Lebanon, Oreg., the person who sent me the pictures of the Oregon soup lines, and also the article in the International Woodworker, entitled "Oregon Democrats Seeking Emergency Legislation."

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEBANON, OREG., *January 28, 1954.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You will find enclosed some clippings from the official paper of the International Woodworkers of America, CIO, The International Woodworker.

The attitude of the present administration seems to be that of boom and bust. * * *

The pictures which are enclosed of the soup lines in the city of Portland, Oreg., would only be found in a labor paper as the reactionary press of the State make every attempt to ignore the fact that we have a serious unemployment problem.

May I urge you to keep up the good work toward the Hells Canyon Dam issue and also urge you to examine the possibility of the Hells Canyon project as a public-works project to help relieve the unemployment situation which we have in the Pacific Northwest.

Very truly yours,

JOHN BALL.

OREGON DEMOCRATS SEEK EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

PORTLAND, OREG.—The Democratic Party of Oregon has called for a special emergency session of the Oregon Legislature, which ordinarily wouldn't meet until 1955, to deal with the critical unemployment situation in the State.

Governor Patterson's office responded quickly to the needle and requested the Oregon Development Commission meet with him to discuss setting up a subcommittee to study the situation.

The Democrats' appeal, signed by Monroe Sweetland, national committeeman; Lilian Burton, national committeewoman; Howard Morgan, chairman, and Gladys Last, vice chairman, asked Governor Patterson to call the session.

They pointed out that emergency projects could be undertaken to relieve joblessness and that thousands of Oregon workers have exhausted their unemployment-insurance benefits. They said funds and surplus foods could be authorized to help counties maintain welfare standards. They urged appeals to the United States Congress and Secretary of the Interior McKay to halt the proposed threat to raise electricity rates in

the Northwest and requested Oregon intervene in Federal hearings on the Hells Canyon situation so as to prevent piecemeal disintegration of maximum power plans for the Northwest.

Patterson turned his back on these proposals for the moment.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon for his interpolation. I was about to refer to facts which indicate a recession.

PRODUCTION HAS DECLINED

What is our domestic economic situation?

Since the Korean war peak the production of nearly every sort of goods is off. The U. S. News & World Report of December 11 showed item-by-item declines: Iron and steel production are off 11.1 percent, other metals off 11.8 percent, automobiles off 11.5 percent, lumber off 12.7 percent, machinery off 4.9 percent, textiles off 20 percent, crude petroleum off 5.3 percent, furniture off 7.6 percent, manufactured foods off 3 percent, chemicals off 3.1 percent, rubber off 12.7 percent.

Since last May, industrial production has veered especially sharply downward.

The Federal Reserve Board's revised index of industrial production released December 31 disclosed that production fell from 137 percent of the 1947–49 average in May to 130 percent in November. This is a decline of 5 percent in 6 months, equal to an annual rate of decline of 10 percent.

Let me point out that this 5-percent decline, which continued through December and is continuing today, has already exceeded the magnitude of 5 percent which we have been told constitutes a healthy readjustment.

The fall in industrial production already has been translated into reduced jobs and rising unemployment.

In December 1952 there were 61,509,000 civilian jobs. Allowing for seasonal influences, there was a further increase of 500,000 nonagricultural jobs in the first half of 1953. After midyear, a decline began. This decline accelerated with each passing month. Unemployment increased 700,000 from mid-October to mid-December. For the month of December alone, insured unemployment rose half a million. This indicates that the total rise in unemployment since mid-October may now be 1 million or more.

Not only has the half-million gain in nonagricultural jobs in the first half of 1953 been wiped out, but total civilian employment of 60,764,000 in December 1953 represented 745,000 fewer jobs than a year earlier. In the aggregate we have experienced a loss of 1,245,000 jobs since mid-1953. Perhaps as many as half a million previously employed workers have removed themselves from the labor force since midyear as the futility of obtaining a job became apparent.

THE EMPLOYED EARN LESS

These employment figures do not reveal the full extent of the drop in workers' income. Those who have not been laid off have suffered a reduction in earnings as a result of a decline in hours worked.

The workweek of production workers on factory payrolls last November fell below 40 hours for the first time in 4 years. The average workweek of 39.9 hours in mid-November was nearly 2 hours less than the average of 41.7 hours worked in December 1952. It came back slightly during December; but December 1953 average weekly earnings were still 36 cents under December 1952.

NEW WORKERS AND RISING PRODUCTIVITY DISPLACEMENTS NOT ABSORBED

The declines in jobs and hours worked, as serious as they are, do not measure the full extent of our failure to maintain full employment.

If the full employment commitment is to be honored in our country of growing population, there must be a constantly expanding number of jobs.

The Census Bureau estimates that in a prosperous peacetime economy we would have an average annual increase in the labor force of about 800,000 workers. The decline in total number of workers employed shows we have not provided jobs to absorb any such new labor force in 1953.

Additionally, we need to be providing new jobs to absorb workers who are displaced by increased productivity.

Average annual gain in output per man-hour in private industry since 1948 has been 3.3 percent. Without a comparable annual growth in demand for goods and services, we will be displacing 3.3 percent of our privately employed labor each year. Jobs have not been provided to offset these displacements, as shown by the net decline of 745,000 jobs I have already mentioned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to commend the Senator from Montana for taking note of the continuous and constant growth of the labor force in our economy. As the Senator from Montana has pointed out, merely by the natural processes of population increase, and also as a result of the accelerated process of education in the United States, approximately 800,000 new workers are coming into the economy every year.

In particular, I commend the Senator from Montana for the philosophy of his remarks, namely, that we must not be thinking in terms of a static economy; but the whole philosophy that should grip the country is one of progress, of setting higher goals.

For example, it is now reported that the year 1953 was the most productive, the most properous year, I believe, in the history of the United States. 1952 was the most prosperous year up to that time.

Now there is in progress what is being called a readjustment. There is an argument as to whether it is a temporary readjustment, which an upswing will soon take care of. Be that as it may, the prognostication for the year 1954, which is not the most optimistic, is that there will be a mild decline in national productivity. A mild decline in productivity is much more drastic or important than it sounds, because there should not be even a mild decline in national productivity.

Do I understand that that is the sense of the Senator's remarks?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. He has carried out my thought in somewhat more detail than I have it before me. I appreciate his very able assistance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. About 2 days ago I made a 2- or 3-minute statement in reference to a newspaper item which had come to my attention. That item pointed out that in my State of Minnesota—and the newspaper item was applicable to conditions in other parts of the country—there had been a layoff of 1,900 employees at the Twin Cities ordnance plant, one of the large ordnance plants in the United States. The plant is operating under a prior contract. It is a federally owned installation. The Federal Cartridge Co., of Minnesota, owns the plant.

I have been given to understand that further layoffs of between 3,400 and 3,500 employees can be expected.

I was also informed that a 155 millimeter ordnance plant, which had recently been rehabilitated and modernized, would not even be opened, although a substantial number of employees had already been hired. When I say, "Not opened," I do not mean that it will not go into full production; I mean it will be cut off entirely.

Therefore, I serve notice that when the appropriation bill for the Mutual Security Administration or the Foreign Operations Administration comes before the Senate for consideration, I shall ask that the offshore procurement program be reexamined. I am certain many of my colleagues in the Senate will be keenly interested in that subject. It seems to me that our first obligation is our own labor force, our own industry, our own economy.

I examined all the evidence I could find on the subject, but I had to do so rather hurriedly; therefore, my investigation was incomplete. However, I ascertained that the United States is now contemplating negotiating offshore procurement contracts for the manufacture of .30 caliber and .50 caliber ammunition with several firms in Italy.

I am deeply interested in the Italians. I have supported the offshore-procurement program as a part of our general mutual-security efforts. But I believe that when the point is reached where we begin to see a decline in our own economy, one of the things that should be done quickly is to reevaluate the placement of orders outside the United States, particularly when such orders have been placed in the hope of checking Communist infiltration and Communist growth in some of the foreign countries. I regret to report that in Italy the strength of communism is growing, even though the United States has poured into Italy a substantial amount of money.

I have in the past supported economic, security, and mutual-aid programs, and I desire to continue to do so; but when we begin to see a slight slackening off in the economy of our own country—I hope it is only temporary; I want to

think in those terms—the least we can do is to reevaluate the policies which take jobs away from the United States.

I feel certain that the Senator from Montana will lend his support as we consider this question, because to me it is imperative that before we go to the American taxpayers and ask for additional funds for foreign aid, we should at least assure the taxpayers, producers, and workers of the United States that we shall keep in the United States Government contracts for the defense program, in order to bolster up the weak spots in our own economy.

If the Senator from Montana were to go from State to State, particularly to Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, the States with which I am most familiar, he would find substantial layoffs of employees. Some of the layoffs are due to a reduced defense program. The American people are looking and yearning for the day of peace. In the process of converting from defense production to peacetime production, there will be temporary layoffs, but there is no sense in sending business several thousand miles away to obtain production when our own people can take care of it.

Does the Senator from Montana have any feelings about that matter? Does he intend to discuss it? Does what I have said fit into his observations?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; during the course of my remarks I shall make some references to the matters discussed by the Senator from Minnesota. He is entirely correct. I appreciate his raising the points at this time in such a clear, vivid manner.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am making my statement now as a sort of forewarning to the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Foreign Operations Administration. I think it is only fair to let them know that many Members of Congress are thinking along these lines. From private conversations I have had with some of our colleagues, I have learned that other Members of Congress, particularly Members of the Senate, are definitely thinking in this way.

So I suggest to the Administrator of the Foreign Operations Administration and the Secretary of Defense that in a reevaluation of the foreign aid program, very careful consideration be given to the offshore procurement situation, in view of the problems which confront us at home, and that as many contracts as possible be placed in the United States. It is important that as many contracts as possible be placed in this country, and particularly important is it that offshore procurement Government contracts on strategic materials and strategic designs of planes and other weapons should not be allowed to fall into unfriendly hands.

I desire to thank the Senator from Montana for giving me this opportunity to reiterate what I intend to urge in the Committee on Foreign Relations and on the floor of the Senate. I do not propose to stand idly by and see seven or eight thousand people in the State of Minnesota, whom I in part represent, pushed out of jobs, when the factory facilities are there, when the contracts have already been placed, in order to satisfy some foreign commitments in areas where we have had much trouble in trying to build up defensive strength.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for the very wise observations he has made. What he has said is exactly true, and the Congress should give very careful consideration to his suggestions. I shall now proceed with my statement.

CONSTRUCTION AND HOUSING DECLINE

The construction industry, and particularly residential construction, has declined from the peak levels reached in March and April this year. Since the inauguration of the deflationary hard-money policies early in 1953, residential construction starts, at annual rates, have fallen 16 percent.

An official Government forecast made jointly by the Departments of Labor and Commerce predicts a further 7 percent decline in spending for new dwellings in 1954.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to hear the Senator refer to the construction industry, which includes the building of homes and dwellings, because that industry is a tremendously important factor in the industrial life and prosperity of our country. I am certain the Senator knows that last year we reduced the authorization for the building of public housing units to a maximum of 20,000 units, whereas the act provided for 135,000 units, and that this year the President has recommended authorization for only 35,000 units. We are not certain, of course, that the Congress will authorize the building of even that number of units, but I assure the Senator that I shall do my very best, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to broaden the authorizations to at least the number mentioned, and I hope very many more.

I also desire to ask the Senator, because of the importance of the subject which he is discussing, whether he was on the floor yesterday when the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] referred to the act which authorizes the granting of direct loans to veterans for the acquisition and building of homes, and to the fact that veterans in rural areas are not able to secure mortgage loans through regular mortgage and banking institutions.

That act will expire on June 30 of this year. The operations under that law have been very successful, and through that act alone the building of many homes by veterans through direct loans by the Government has been made possible.

The Senator from Alabama has introduced a bill extending the act for another year, and increasing the amount which will be available for lending from $25 million a quarter to $50 million a quarter. I think there is nothing more important than making such funds available, because we know—and I speak now from my experience as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency—that last year many, many people came from all over the country and testified that while mortgage loans were obtainable in large population centers like New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, and San Francisco, where mortgage money is available, there was absolutely no way a veteran could obtain a direct loan or a mortage loan of any kind in the small towns, which have no mortgage money available under any circumstances.

Such testimony made a deep impression on me, and I fought at that time for a larger amount. I shall certainly back up the efforts of the Senator from Alabama and the distinguished Senator from Montana to obtain the passage of the bill to which I have referred.

Mr. MURRAY. I certainly agree with the Senator from New York. It does seem to me, on the basis of the conditions which the Senator has described, that it would be impossible for anybody not to realize the importance of extending the act.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is very important. Although I know the Senator from Montana is familiar with the matter, I should like to state that such lending operations have not cost the Government one cent.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. In the past several years there has been a default in such mortgages of only one-tenth of 1 percent, and that did not mean a loss to the Government, because the forced sale of the houses resulted in as much money being recovered as was loaned on such houses.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Actually it was a profitable venture for the Government. I think it was too profitable, because the Government was able to borrow money at an interest rate of 1⅞ percent and 2 percent and lend mortgage money to veterans at an interest rate of 4 percent and 4½ percent. Actually, it was a profitable venture. I think that by providing such funds we can help maintain the prosperity of the country.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is exactly correct in the statement he has made, and he has made a very persuasive argument. I believe the reasons set forth by the Senator would justify everyone's recognizing the need to continue to carry out the program he has been discussing.

AUTO PRODUCTION MAY FALL AS MUCH AS 40 PERCENT

The financial publications are daily reporting layoffs in the auto industry, an industry which accounts for 10 percent of total industrial production. It is a major consumer of steel, copper, glass, rubber, and textiles. In the second quarter of 1953, production in this vital industry was running at an annual rate of 6.8 million cars. The December level was down to 6 million cars annually. Various estimates I have seen indicate a 5-million car production this year. The Chicago Federal Reserve Bank last June estimated that by the second quarter this year the annual rate of automobile production might be down to 4.2 million

cars annually. This would mean a year-to-year reduction of 40 percent.

THE FARM RECESSION WORSENS

Farmers are in the midst of a serious recession and it is worsening.

The net income of farmers fell $1 billion between 1952 and 1953, from $13.5 billions to $12.5 billions, according to reports of the Department of Agriculture.

The Department's official forecast is that there will be a slight worsening in 1954.

This prediction appears to be on the optimistic side when compared with trend statistics contained in the December issue of Economic Indicators, supplied by the Council of Economic Advisers.

The Council has submitted to us the Department of Commerce estimates of income from current production of various groups. They show that the trend of farm proprietors' income is sharply down. During the first three quarters of 1953, the trend was down $2 billion, at annual rates. By the end of the third quarter of 1953, the downward trend was at the rate of $3.6 billions annually, as compared to the situation in the same quarter a year earlier. There was some improvement in the fourth quarter.

The Commerce figures reflect net change in inventory value, which is not included in Department of Agriculture farm-income statistics. This inclusion, plus the fact that there were heavy cattle liquidations during 1953, might cause some exaggeration of the trend in the Commerce figures; but even if they are adjusted, the deepening of the farm recession is clearly indicated.

SMALL BUSINESS INCOMES DOWN IN 3D QUARTER, FAILURES UP IN 4TH QUARTER

Unincorporated business and professional incomes, excluding incomes of farm proprietors, were rising slightly in 1952, and continued up, from a rate of $26.7 billions at the end of the year, to $27 billions by mid-1953. A turn came in the third quarter of last year, when these incomes dropped to $26.9 billions. In the fourth quarter, both the number of business failures and the amount of liabilities rose sharply, indicating a further drop in the income of this segment of our economy.

Business failures in the fourth quarter of 1953 totaled 2,538, as compared with 2,110 business bankruptcies in the preceding quarter—an increase of 428. The increase was even more striking when compared to the figures for the year before. In the month of December, 1953, business bankruptcies were up 375, or 66 percent above those in December, 1952. Liabilities involved in 1953 were $400 millions, as compared to $283 millions during 1952.

Mr. President, I have reviewed the official Government figures on production, employment, earnings, productivity, the construction and housing industry, auto production, the farm recession, and small business.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Before the Senator from Montana continues with his interesting discussion, I believe we should seriously consider the remarks which already have been made.

I desire to call particular attention, if I may do so, to the figures which have been quoted.

The figures the Senator from Montana has been using, indicating an adjustment in our economy, are based entirely upon the cessation of war. I dislike to think that the American people will accept war as a means of obtaining prosperity.

When we look back to 1939, we find that then there were 9.4 million unemployed in the United States. Then war came, and the unemployment figure dropped to a very low rate.

The war ended in 1945. In 1947, on a monthly average, 2.1 million were unemployed in the United States. In June 1950 we went to war in Korea. In that month there were 3.3 million unemployed in the United States.

From that time until the end of the Korean war, the unemployment situation in the United States was remarkably good; the number of unemployed was at a very low figure. All that indicates that war was the great reason at that time for high employment.

I dislike to think that we have to resort to war in order to solve our economic problems, as related to employment. I do not think we do. I think we shall work out of the situation with private enterprise to the point where we can maintain full employment.

I should like to discuss for a moment the farm situation, for there we find exactly the same condition. The farmers are now in a position similar to the one they were in during the early part of 1949, and extending to the middle of 1950. At that time the farmers were losing money. Then came war, accompanied by a great demand for our agricultural surpluses. During the war period, until approximately April of 1952, the farmers enjoyed a high degree of prosperity.

Then came a period of relatively low prosperity, and then a few months of increased prosperity.

When the end of the Korean war came, the demand for the products of the farms decreased, and the farmers' incomes started to decline. The high-parity situation also had something to do with this result.

My point is, do we need to have a war in order to enable the United States to maintain prosperity? I do not believe the American people think so.

Mr. MURRAY. I am not advocating prosperity based on a war economy.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know the distinguished Senator from Montana is not advocating war, but I could not let this opportunity pass without commenting on the fact that the figures he has used have grown out of the cessation of a war, and that we are going into a period almost identical to the one we were in during 1945.

The only difference is—as I hope, being on this side of the aisle; and I know the Senator from Montana agrees with me—that we can come out of this situation by natural means, not by unnatural means.

Mr. MURRAY. But the trouble is that we have to provide a growing economy. That was the trouble in the 1929 collapse. At that time the country saw unemployment develop along with low wages. At that time the farmers received almost nothing for the products of their farms. As a result, we had a depression.

In the present situation, it seems to me that big business is neglecting its obligations. Big business has not lowered the prices of its products, and has not done anything to stimulate growth in our economy. Big business has an obligation to meet.

I remember reading in Fortune magazine an article about the cause of the depression which began in 1929. The article pointed out that business had an obligation to the country to provide an economy which would give employment to the workers of the Nation; and that if big busines did not do so, it was not measuring up to its obligation. In addition to making money for itself, big business owed the Nation the duty of providing an economy which would operate in such a fashion that there would be employment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield further, let me suggest that the real cause of the continuation of the 1929 depression was not economic, but was psychological. That is what we have to be careful of, in the discussion of any figures indicating an adjustment.

That depression was caused by an overextention of credit, and it was continued by the depression attitude of the people. In fact, it got out of hand.

Mr. MURRAY. It was brought about by the wrong policies of big business and finance in that period. They failed to provide an economy which would give jobs to enough men. Labor was oppressed; it had no purchasing power, and when men were able to obtain jobs during that period, their wages did not provide them sufficient purchasing power; all they had was merely enough to live on.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me suggest to the Senator from Montana that the free-enterprise system depends upon the operation of the incentive system. If prices are reduced to a point where there is no profit, there are no jobs, and thus no wages.

I should like to suggest, further, that the end result of the American economy is that prices are constantly being lowered. If we discount the "thick cream" of taxes from the prices of the items we buy today, and also discount inflation, we find that in most cases the prices of the things we buy are lower than they have ever been. High production, and only high production, makes that possible. There is no way for the Government to do it.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not agree with the Senator. I expect to discuss that point a little later in the course of my remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very much interested in the comments of my good friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] but he lost me between his statement of cause and his statement of effect. So I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a few questions.

Of course, Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has made clear that he is not suggesting that our great capitalistic system is dependent upon war, in order to maintain prosperity. That is true, is it not? Is it not correct that he is not contending or suggesting that our capitalistic system is dependent upon war, in order to maintain prosperity?

Mr. MURRAY. I certainly am not making a plea for a war economy in this country; just the opposite.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that one of the points the Senator from Montana is trying to bring out is that there is no justification for the spokesmen for this administration trying to alibi and rationalize the rising tide of unemployment at the present time, on the basis of the argument that we must expect such a thing when we move from war into a peacetime economy? The Senator does not accept that alibi, does he?

Mr. MURRAY. I think that is a fallacious alibi.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my assumption that what the Senator from Montana is trying to point out is that when we move from an economy which existed during a war period, and which required for the successful prosecution of the war the production of many nonconsumption goods, it becomes the obligation of our Government to take, in advance of unemployment, the steps which are necessary in order to carry out the spirit and intent of the Full Employment Act of 1946, for which the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Minnesota, and the Senator from Oregon fought so hard on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Oregon is exactly correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall the debate on the Full Employment Act of 1946, when we pointed out in speech after speech on the floor of the Senate that we should get ready for a transition between a hot war and a return to a peacetime economy, by having the blueprints ready—I recall the language very distinctly—so that the Government would use all the resources it possessed, if necessary, to prevent unemployment? Does the Senator recall that debate?

Mr. MURRAY. I recall it very vividly. I recall that big business, including the National Association of Manufacturers and the chambers of commerce, opposed the passage of that law at the time. They charged that the Full Employment Act of 1946, which undertook to establish the Council of Economic Advisers, was taken out of the constitution of the Soviet Republic. I recall that argument being made on the floor at the time. However, the law was passed. Walter Lippmann says that it was one of the most important pieces of legislation enacted in the United States in the past half century. I think he is not extreme in making that statement. I think it is a very correct statement.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Montana agree with me that the strength of enlightened capitalism is to be found in its power to grow and expand into what we call a growing and expanding economy?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Montana agree with me that if we are to have an expanding economy through a capitalistic system which will meet the economic troubles which are beginning to rear their ugly heads these days, we need, for example, to build such wealth-creating projects as Hells Canyon Dam; we need to build across the country such wealth-creating projects as a network of super-highways, which highway experts tell us will help to reduce the tremendous loss of life on our highways, which amounted to more than 30,000 lives lost last year? Does the Senator agree with me that we need to build great public works projects which will give to the school children of America in 1954, 1955, 1956, and the years immediately ahead, better school facilities than they had in 1920, in view of the fact that the educational experts now tell us that the American school population today has poorer facilities than existed in this country in 1920? Does the Senator from Montana agree with me that vision and foresight call upon this administration to come forward with blueprints and start building that kind of employment-creating facilities immediately?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Big business is planning and acting boldly, but not to end the recession, not to turn the tide of income from the wealthy and the big corporate treasuries into consumer expenditures by the masses.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question, which will be my last?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that the kind of employment-creating economic program for which the liberals are now fighting in the United States Senate is an economic program of public works which will start giving encouragement to construction industry, encouragement to those groups in our economy that today are suffering from unemployment, and that therefore it is the liberals in the Congress of the United States these days who are really fighting for an expanding, enlightened capitalism?

Mr. MURRAY. I agree with the Senator from Oregon. I think his remarks are in point, and I thank him for his interruptions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have listened with keen interest to the colloquy between the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I know that it is of little avail to argue history. What we really ought to be interested in is today, and tomorrow. We receive only a certain amount of educational and cultural delight from talking about the yesterdays. However, occasionally it is a good thing to keep history accurate, and not let history be rewritten. I made this statement on a previous occasion on the floor of the Senate, when, as I recall, some effort was being made to rewrite certain political history.

I listened to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] say that the break in 1929 was primarily psychological.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let us correct that statement. I said that the break was due to expanded credit. I said that the extension was psychological.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I accept the Senator's modification or correction. I understood the Senator to say that there was a psychological development which lent itself to that particular situation. Then he went on to say that extended credit or expanded credit resulted in much of the collapse. I should like to have the Senator from Arizona restate his position. I do not wish to misinterpret him. I have great admiration for him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The statement I made was that the depression of 1929 was caused by extended credit. It was lengthened, until the war of 1941, by psychological factors, which no economist could control or foretell. Such factors are entering into the situation today. The figures which the distinguished Senator from Montana is using can be used as he is using them; but the fear which is engendered by such figures is the result of misinterpretation of them. That is the thing of which I am personally afraid. I am not afraid of the American economy. I am not afraid of this administration's ability and willingness, plus the willingness of the entire Senate, to meet any challenge, but I am afraid of the American mind if these figures continue to go out without some explanation being offered.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the Senator take the position that low wages and low purchasing power on the farms had nothing to do with the depression?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator referring to the depression of 1929?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; the depression of 1929.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The break started in May. The Senator will find from looking at the records that in the middle of October everything was very high.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think this is one of the most interesting periods in American economic history. The truth is that Mr. Hoover inherited a bundle of trouble in 1929, which had been building up until that time. The fact that he did not do much to correct it is another matter. However, he was the great inheritor of the mismanagement of the preceding 9 or 10 years.

Actually, the first break in the American economy after World War I took place between 1920 and 1922, when there were more bankruptcies than in any other comparable period in American history.

The next trouble period was in late 1925, 1926, and 1927, when bank after bank closed its doors, and millions of dollars of savings were lost. In my own State of Minnesota two-thirds of our banks closed their doors, and by 1928 three-fourth of them had closed their doors.

The truth is that America's economy was rotten and weak at the base. What we saw was the glittering gold of the stock market at the top; but the base was bad. That is why the whole house came tumbling down.

The second truth is that there were no built-in antidepression measures on the books. I notice the administration now is saying that if things get out of hand it will go to work on the situation. Every day we are being reminded that if there is any major recession we should not worry, because the administration is prepared to stop it. It is prepared to stop it with what?

Mr. President, I will tell you with what. It is prepared to stop it with social security. How did social security get on the statute books? It was at first condemned as being collectivism, regimentation, slightly communistic, and on the pink side; it was not too red, but at least had a slight red coloration.

What other antidepression measures will the administration rely on? The Unemployment Compensation Act. Who put that act on the statute books? It was not put on the statute books by people who were talking about prosperity being just around the corner in the eternal economic roundhouse in which there were no corners. Let us take a look at some of the other built-in antidepression measures. Let us take the Federal Reserve System, for example.

We ought to make the record as clear as we can, in the next few moments.

The first point I make is that we had serious bankruptcies during 1921 and 1922 which were almost unprecedented. That was not a psychological dream; it was miserably factual. The second point is that we had a series of bank failures throughout the country.

Surely that was the beginning of the collapse of our economic structure in terms of finance and credit.

As the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has stated, we had an expansion of credit far beyond what the economic base of the country could possibly maintain.

In addition, there were some other factors which confronted our country. For example, home construction dwindled. Of course, at one time, in 1926, it was at a rather high point, but it dwindled rapidly. So did commercial construction.

The whole organized labor movement was practically destroyed. During this entire period there was little or no unionization. Real wages, as compared with money wages, went down. I do not need to remind my colleagues that the American economy became increasingly depressed, starting in 1920, with a mortgage indebtedness of less than $2 billion, and ending in 1930 with a mortgage indebtedness of $11 billion.

Those are not psychological points; those are solid economic facts. The collapse of the stock market in October 1929 was being predicted by economists throughout the country for nearly a year because the base and the underpinning of our economy had become corroded and weak and fictitious.

The Full Employment Act took all of that into consideration, it recognized all those happenings. We have started out now in our country to build more firmly. As a result, I believe we have a much stronger economy today.

I agree with the Senator from Arizona that there is much in our economy which should give us a feeling of optimism, and a sense of real security. However, there is one danger point, and we must do something about it rather quickly, and take for the most part private measures to avert it, because the Government cannot do it all itself and we must rely on private measures. If we do not take quick measures, the situation is apt to unravel very quickly, because we live in a very highly volatile economy. I refer to the point to which the Senator from Montana is directing his attention.

Of course, I do not want to be a prophet of doom. I know that those of us who have talked about unemployment and a break in the economy are called prophets of doom. But, Mr. President, if one has a toothache and it hurts him he should say he has an ache, or if he has a backache he should admit that he has a backache.

That is what we ought to be doing, and that is what we ought to be hearing. The Senator from Montana has been doing something about it. For example, he is the author of the Full Employment Act of 1946, if I recall the history of the Senate correctly.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield so that I may make one observation in reply to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have the greatest respect for the Senator from Minnesota, whom I almost call "neighbor," because he visits my State so often. My good friend from Minnesota stated that economists forecast the depression of 1929 for nearly a year. I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the columnists have been predicting a depression in this country since the end of World War II. What I do not want to see happen—and I know the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Montana share my feeling——

Mr. MURRAY. We do not share the feeling; we are telling the facts.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know the Senator shares my feeling with respect to what I am saying now, namely, that we do not want to add to a depression or a recession any contributory factors which are not normal, or which we cannot correct before they have effect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate that I believe we are in a much better condition than even some of us give credit for, not only with respect to the basic strength of our economy, but in many other ways.

Let us look at American agriculture. Even with depressed prices, the soil of our American farms is far better than ever before because of sound soil conservation practices. Most of our farm machinery is modern, or at least a reasonably good part of it is modern, because of the price-support program, to which the Senator from Montana is now directing his attention.

Mr. President, I was referring to antidepression devices. We can think of such devices as the public works program, the Full Employment Act, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Federal Reserve System. We have on the books programs like the Federal Aid to School Construction Act. At least it is in its embryonic stage, but it is ready to be used, and it could be expanded almost overnight. We have social security, old age insurance, unemployment insurance, and survivors' and old-age insurance.

Many such devices are available as a result of 20 years of good government under Democratic administrations. Those devices have been built into our economy. Those are the very things which this administration relies upon now.

The interesting thing to me is that, after his party has been out of office for 20 years, the President delivers to the Congress a great state of the Union message. I have complimented him on it. It is a good message. I intend to compliment the President every time I believe he sends to the Congress a good message. I liked his social-security message. I liked his health message. I think he has been sending us some very good messages.

It is interesting to note, however, that after 20 years of being told how bad some of the New Deal measures have been, he does not ask that even one of them be repealed. In fact, Mr. President, he out-New Dealed the New Deal. For example, let us look at social security. Let us look at some of the other programs, such as the housing program. Last year Congress provided for only 25,000 housing units. The President this year recommends 35,000 housing units. I am not unhappy. I raise my voice in a sort of political hallelujah. I see my good friend from Tennessee on his feet. I am sure we will hear some very penetrating, thought-provoking statements by him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remark of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. However, instead of rising to attempt to give utterance to a penetrating thought, I rise to inquire of him if he had noticed, along with the fine messages to which he has made reference, namely, the President's messages on health, vocational rehabilitation, and hospital construction, that the budget did not compare at all with those messages. We have had some very fine messages, but Secretary Hum-

phrey—may I inquire whether Secretary Humphrey is any relation to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator that I am sure that I can see no kinship in terms of political spirit. I hope we may have some kinship in terms of fellowship.

Mr. GORE. Secretary Humphrey and Mr. Dodge seem either not to have read the high-sounding messages or to have embarked upon a deliberate design to undercut those fine messages.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana further yield at this point?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee has thought about the big print and the fine print in an insurance policy. An insurance policy seems to offer great benefits. If one stubs his toe he receives benefits that will carry him on for weeks to come. That is what we call the bold print. But the insurance company says, "Read the fine print." The average American citizen does not read the budget. We read that we need to build diagnostic centers, great clinics, nursing homes, homes for the chronically ill, and we say, "What a wonderful message." And then we find out that only $50 million are allotted for those purposes. I am afraid the chronically ill will not get very much coverage under that program.

Mr. GORE. Just how does that square with the policy of being liberal with humans and conservative with material things? How can we have more hospitalization and better programs of social security while withholding the material things that make them possible? How does the Senator from Minnesota rationalize that kind of policy? He inquired of me if it had occurred to me that it is something like the big print and the fine print in an insurance policy. I will answer that it has. I now inquire of him if it appears to be something like working both sides of the street.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That may be an apt analogy. The junior Senator from Minnesota did not say it, but he is willing to accept it in the context of the debate. We have been told that the Eisenhower program is a humanitarian and a liberal program, and I think I would agree that in the main the pronouncement of the program is so. So say the columnists, the news commentators, and radio commentators. But then comes in that famous word, the greatest word in the American and English language—"but." It is sound in its conservative economics, but the trouble with the program is that it is somehow short of political hemaglobin; in other words, the economic plasma, the dollar is a little short. People love to hear the liberal philosophy. A political party cannot remain long in power in America unless it recognizes human needs. I say, in all sincerity, that I believe the President does see the human needs, but, as the Senator from Tennessee points out so well, there happens to be a Bureau of the Budget, and there happens to be a Secretary of the Treasury, both of whom are noted, eminent, and competent men, and when they get the budget all added up they cannot quite make the figures meet the hopes. In other words, the cold cash does not quite meet the warm heart. I think we may call it a social or political lag. We have a warm heart and a friendly program, and over here we have the cold cash and a limited program.

Mr. GORE. What the Senator is saying is that the messages are fine, but then come the budget and the tax bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The spirit is strong, but the flesh is weak.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to thank Senators for the contribution they are making. I think they have made a very thorough explanation of the reason why conditions are as they are today.

WILL THE ECONOMY ADJUST ITSELF?

Call it what you will, all these figures show that we are now in a recession and immediate steps must be taken to reverse the trend and start this Nation back on the road mapped by the Employment Act.

In the state of the Union message, the President indicated major reliance on "a business community willing, as ours is, to plan boldly and with confidence" to create "a climate assuring a steady economic growth."

The record of big, monopolistic industrial, and business interests is to the contrary. The record shows that, in the depression of the 1930's, the dominant business and industrial interests failed to cooperate with the administration programs. They raised prices and began skimming the cream off the Government spending, thus bringing on a recession in 1937. The record today discloses that big business is following precisely the same sort of shortsighted policy now as then: price maintenance, widening of processing and distribution margins, and even price rises in the face of recession.

Over 15 years ago, on June 16, 1938, I made a national broadcast, reporting on findings of the Special Senate Committee on Unemployment and Relief. It is pertinent to recall what I said then because in many respects that situation parallels our situation today. I told the Nation:

> We have learned that returning prosperity last summer was completely upset because of certain monopolistic activities and certain mistaken monetary policies. In 1936 and 1937 prosperity was rapidly returning, but the great monopoly-controlled industries of the country had suddenly advanced prices and had undertaken to rake in the lion's share of the steadily increasing prosperity of the country. Authoritative statistics show that many of these monopolistic corporations made more profits in 1937 than they did in 1929, which was the highest period of American industrial prosperity.
>
> Such a record of profiteering, of course, cannot be justified. It was accomplished by means of unfair price advances which enabled them to skim the cream off the prosperity which had been induced by Government spending. It counteracted all our recovery efforts and started the country on a downward spiral of recession. Economists point out that these unbalanced, monopolistic prices interfere with the smooth operation of our economic system and that something must be done to prevent such practices if we are to have real recovery.

Continuing in that broadcast, I pointed out that unwise banker control of monetary policy had contributed to that recession through the tightening of credit—a hard-money policy. The representatives of industry were at that time demanding repeal of the capital-gains tax and the undistributed-profits tax, and I cautioned strongly against following such advice.

It will interest the Senate, I believe, to note that among the witnesses quoted at the time was Robert W. Irwin, a furniture manufacturer at Grand Rapids, Mich., who testified that the recession had been brought on by maintenance of artificial prices. Another was Prof. Alvin Hansen, of Harvard. A third was Dr. Paul H. Douglas of the University of Chicago, now the truly distinguished Senator from Illinois, who testified that monopoly price fixing was clearly shown to be a major cause of the then-existing recession as well as the depression which started in 1929.

HARD MONEY AND HIGHER PRICES

Early in 1953, the new administration initiated a hard-money policy deliberately designed to bring on a deflation. Instead of recognizing the need for steady national growth, there was a deliberate policy of halting growth, of "taking the bubble off the boom," or, as a more recent apologist for the recession put it, "ending the overtime economy."

Then, in the summer of 1953, the giant monopoly-controlled industries, particularly the steel, aluminum, electrical, and petroleum industries, suddenly advanced their prices, just as happened in 1936–37, in an effort to grab while the getting was good.

They acted boldly and with confidence—just as described in the recent message of the President—when it came to grabbing profits, but they acted without the economic welfare of the Nation in mind.

A leading, nationally syndicated newsletter, Report for the Business Executive, stated on June 25, 1953:

> It was a case of now or never for most of the businesses that raised their prices.
>
> In steel, for example, any decline in operation this year would kill any chance of increasing charges; so producers seized the occasion of wage boosts to announce long-planned raises and give themselves room to make price concessions later.
>
> In petroleum * * * producers sought to widen margins.
>
> In appliances, manufacturers are trying to recoup higher costs wherever an item is in brisk demand.

Here are some of the price increases that took place:

In April, steel producers increased "extras" on steel products.

Early in May, base prices on steel rails were raised from $4 to $15 per ton. In June, base prices on steel products were raised 4 percent.

Crude petroleum prices were raised 10 percent.

Following the steel price increase in mid-June the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported July 10, 1953:

> Numerous retail price increases, some of them small but others ranging up to 20 per cent were made by manufacturers of electrical and other household appliances. These advances, mostly by major manufacturers, cover a wide variety of household appliances, including electrical and gas ranges,

ironers, dishwashers, carpet sweepers, baby bottle sterilizers, food mixers, electrical clocks, and window frames.

In the next few weeks the Bureau reported additional price increases. Electrical refrigerators went up 3 percent to 5 percent, pressure cookers were raised 4 percent to 5 percent more, and television sets were boosted 3 percent to 11 percent.

PRODUCTION DOWN, PRICES UP

Between May 1953 and January 1954, the steel industry has reduced its operating rate from 100.1 percent of capacity down to 75 percent of capacity—a drop of one-fourth. But the price of steel mill products remains unchanged at a level approximately 9 percent higher than a year before.

In the food industries, the middlemen's margins have been widened from 46 percent of the food dollar to 56 percent—an increase of more than 20 percent in margins.

The big-business men are getting theirs while the getting is good precisely as they did in 1936 and 1937.

There were those who hoped after the depression of the early thirties that monopolists would see the folly of pricing the Nation into a recession. Those hopes were blasted in 1936. The recent price increases in face of an expected decline in sales is only another classic demonstration of greedy, monopoly-pricing accelerating recession.

CORPORATE PROFITS ALREADY HIGH

The profits of the largest corporations had already been raised substantially prior to their last ditch round of price increases.

Data released by the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission show that during the year ended June 30, 1953, manufacturing corporations with assets of $100 million and over had increased their profit margins per dollar of sales from 11.6 cents to 12.9 cents, a rise of over 11 percent during the year.

For all manufacturing industries, profits per dollar of sales rose from 9.2 percent in the second quarter of 1952 to 10.4 percent a year later. Rate of return on stockholders' equity before taxes rose from 22 to 26.4 percent in the same period. The largest of these gains were by corporations with $100 million or more in assets. Those under $5 million assets showed no appreciable gain.

The rate of profit on stockholders' equity in all manufacturing corporations had already risen from the second quarter of 1952 to the second quarter of 1953—after taxes—from 10 percent to 11.2 percent, a rise of 12 percent in the profit rate.

The annual rate of profit after taxes on stockholder equity in the steel industry rose from 5.5 percent in the second quarter of 1952 to 11.4 percent in the second quarter of 1953—an increase of more than 100 percent in the rate of return in 1 year. The profit margins per dollar of steel sales rose from 4.3 cents to 14.8 cents, or more than 300 percent in the same period.

Total national personal interest income and dividends have risen from an annual rate of $21.5 billion in December 1952, to $22.8 billion in October 1953. Figures are not yet available through December 1953, but extras and increases on regular dividend rates were widespread during the month.

Corporate profits before taxes increased from a level of $40 billion annually at the end of 1952 to a rate of $46 billion annually by the third quarter of 1953.

It is evidence of sheer economic illiteracy to look to the big corporations of this country by themselves to either plan or to act boldly to stem a depression.

Big business is planning and acting boldly; but not to end the recession, not to turn the tide of income from the wealthy and the big corporate treasuries into the hands of the masses of consumer spenders, and thus stimulate demand and production. The bold planning and actions of big business interests is to keep the excess profits tax from being reenacted, to reduce the corporation tax levy, to tighten Taft-Hartley in order to hold down labor's wages, to shift taxes to sales—to get more and more and more concessions which will increase their gains but will also deepen and not relieve the recession.

WILL THE ADMINISTRATION ACT?

It is apparent that we cannot look to the administration for leadership or action that will reverse the present economic trend. It is too heavily weighted on the side of big business to act impartially.

I have referred previously to the philosophical attitude of the President's advisers who say that Government action should be undertaken only to prevent undue disaster. The undue disaster level first mentioned by Secretary of Agriculture Benson now appears, according to the deputy to the Secretary of Treasury, Mr. Burgess, to be somewhere below a 25 to 30 percent decline in the economy.

I have discussed the expressed faith of the Chief Executive, which I very much fear will prove unjustified, however well-intentioned, that big business will do what it should to develop a climate assuring steady economic growth.

Now, let us examine for a moment the record of the administration itself and what has been proposed in the state of the Union message.

The very first project which the new administration undertook in January 1953—without benefit of advice from the appropriate congressional committees or even a study group or an advisory board—was the disastrous boosting of interest rates and tightening of credit, wholly engineered by Mr. Burgess.

The whole concept of this policy was regressive, to take money away from the mass of interest payers and to increase the income of interest collectors; to reduce purchasing power and thereby "take the bubble off the boom"—a bubble and a boom which, if they ever existed, were by April no more than corpses being kept warm to divert attention from the real purpose of hiking the hire of money for the benefit of a few big banks and insurance companies.

That deflationary policy has helped no one but the money lenders and they are even now learning that the resulting decline in business activity and business loans may make it costly over the long run. But now, with unemployment rising, take-home pay dwindling, farmers' incomes a billion dollars below 1952 levels, and production levels off 5 percent in 6 months, the big banks are enjoying the highest profit levels in history. This, despite the fact that loans to business, the chief source of bank income, declined in 1953.

National City Bank of New York, which supplied the present deputy to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Burgess, to this administration, enjoyed an increase in interest income from private and Government securities of $6 millions, and an increase of income from business loans of $10.2 millions. Net profits after taxes jumped $2.5 million, or more than 9 percent. Dividends paid to stockholders were increased by $850,000 in 1953.

It is extremely interesting that interest, rental income, and corporate profits, benefiting from the new administration's policies, have risen nearly $7 billion during 1953, or almost twice as much as wages and salaries, net farm income, and unincorporated nonfarm business and professional incomes.

More important, these latter items are currently declining while profits, dividends, interest, and rents continue to go up. Beginning in August 1953, payrolls in durable-goods manufacturing began to decline. This became more marked in September and spread to nearly all manufacturing. By November wage and salary receipts had fallen $2.9 billions below the August annual rate.

Administration policy has diverted income from mass consumer groups, to higher-income groups numerically much smaller; from spenders to nonspenders, starting off the recession now causing grave concern to the American people.

TAX RELIEF AT THE TOP

The specific proposals in the President's recent state of the Union message would largely further accelerate shift of income from low income to higher income groups.

The President's proposal of accelerated depreciation for modernization of plant and equipment, and to permit treatment of research and development outlays, as expense instead of capital outlay, will benefit primarily only the largest corporations.

These companies need tax relief the least. Current annual provision for depreciation of plant and equipment, depletion, and so forth, is close to $30 billions. In addition, corporations are setting aside $11 billions annually out of after-tax profits. That totals $41 billions available for replacement, modernization, research, and expansion. As against this amount, the Machinery and Allied Products Institute reports that actual annual replacement of plant and equipment amounts to only $14.3 billions.

Business is already faced with the problem of maintaining new private investment high enough to absorb current excess of replacement and depletion reserves and undistributed profits amounting to nearly $27 billions. The effect of the President's new tax-give-

away proposal will be to encourage the writing off of the initial cost of new investment even more rapidly than now. This will increase the rate of business saving, thereby diminishing the income available for the already weakened level of consumer demand.

This is one sure road to depression, and a roadblock to economic recovery.

The state of the Union message proposes to permit the 10-percent reduction in personal income taxes long ago enacted but delayed by this Congress. The economic benefit of this cut is now reduced by the necessary increase of ½ percent in the social-security levy, a levy which should not be delayed. The propagandists attack the old-age security plan back home charging that the reserves are depleted. Here in Washington they oppose the increased contribution to make it completely sound. Their scheme, of course, is to engineer a deficit in the social-security reserves to discredit the program.

The state of the Union message likewise said nothing about the effect of failure to renew the excess-profits tax.

In 1947, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which the late Senator Robert Taft was chairman, reported, as follows:

> Undoubtedly the most important influence in sharply increasing net profits of corporations and in reducing the losses of others was the elimination of the excess-profits tax in 1946, along with the reduction in the corporate income tax * * *. The sweeping tax reductions on corporate business were largely turned into net profits.

In view of the findings of Senator Taft's own study, reenactment of the excess profits tax as well as maintaining present corporation tax rates, would be the wise course in the present economic emergency.

In the field of agriculture, the farmers' worst fears were confirmed by the State of the Union message and the subsequent special message. The administration, despite its golden promises to the American farmer, is for flexible, sliding scale farm price supports. Although this segment of our economy is the most seriously hurt thus far, only a sedative has been offered it. Only the assurance that it will be bled white gradually, not abruptly.

The administration has now submitted its chief economic documents outlining their evaluation of the economic situation and their proposals, the economic report and message. These proposals afford little encouragement to the more than 2 million Americans who are now unemployed. The administration tells the unemployed that if they wait until midyear, the decline in business may stop. They do not even offer them the prospects of regaining their jobs. They only hope that the decline will stop, and they are not even sure of that.

Fancy phrases such as inventory recession do not put food into the mouths of laid-off workers, or reassure those who expect to be furloughed or separated. When businessmen cut inventories they do so for lack of customers. And if there are not sufficient customers to absorb what the existing factory capacity produces, at present prices, there is no reason to believe that businessmen will continue to keep expanding their capacity. In short there is no basis for considering the decline we have experienced and are continuing to experience as anything different than other slumps, namely, the inability of the people to buy what the factories are turning out at monopoly-managed prices.

The President's Economic Report points to unemployment insurance as the first line of defense against a depression. Yet we all know that when a worker's paycheck is cut from $85 a week to $25 a week there is a sharp cut in his buying power. Multiply this by 2 million or more unemployed, some of whom get unemployment benefits for only a few weeks, and we see a terrific drop in buying power.

This leads me to the budget that the President has proposed. This budget is a deflationary budget. For fiscal 1955 it proposes a reduction in Government expenditures of $4.5 billion on a cash basis. This reduction in rate of Government expenditure will, of course, be felt.

In view of its record and its pending proposals, on interest rates, tax relief for big business and profit takers, further deflation of the farmers and denial of the help for consumers, it is clear that the administration, under its present policies, is not going to lead us out of recession.

CONGRESS OFFERS THE ONE REMAINING HOPE

Mr. President, an analysis of the facts of our situation makes it clear that a great responsibility rests upon this Congress and its leaders.

Historians will not be so interested in what percentage of the Eisenhower program we adopted in relation to domestic affairs, as in what we did in face of a growing recession; what we did to reject the give-away and take-away program of the depression makers and to implement the Employment Act of 1946.

The Employment Act of 1946 must be implemented immediately. It is clear today that amendments to that act, of which I had the honor to be the original sponsor, would be wise, making mandatory upon the executive branch those obligations under the act which have been disregarded in recent months.

The obligation of the administration under the law is to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The law does not say that the administration must wait until a "spiraling recession" has been reached at 25 percent to 30 percent below a desirable level of economic activity. It does not say that we should wait until "undue disaster" is upon us to act.

The law does not call for half-way measures. It calls for the Government to utilize all its planning function and resources.

Despite the fact that most economists agree that merely easing monetary and credit controls is not sufficient to stop a depression, that is the most that this administration could possibly claim that it has done—eased off a little on the unwise hard-money crusade on which the administration itself tragically embarked in its opening days.

President Eisenhower's message stated that in the transition from wartime to peacetime economy, he will maintain flexible credit and debt management policy. That simply means more tinkering by the very bankers who got us into the present mess. I am strongly of the opinion that one of the first things this Congress should do is to recapture control over monetary and credit policy which has been surrendered to the bankers at the Treasury and the Federal Reserve.

The power to fix interest rates on Government securities is the power to fix all interest rates. Yet the only statutory interest rate ceiling on Government securities fixed by the Congress is that on Series E bonds.

We should enact statutory interest rate ceilings on all Government securities. The record of the Federal Reserve Board in the exercise of discretionary authority over the money supply has been so bad that the Congress should consider mandatory rules tying the annual rate of growth of our monetary supply to the annual rate of growth of production needed to provide full employment.

I strongly favor the reformation of the Federal Reserve Board to free both it and the Open Market Committee from banker domination. The number of governors should be expanded and there should be mandatory representation for farmers, labor, white-collar workers, and other consumers, and businessmen on the Board.

There has been a great deal of discussion of the millions of dollars which the unwise interest boosting spiral of 1953 will cost the Government, States, counties, municipalities, and private borrowers. It is a staggering sum.

But much more important, Mr. President, is the achievement of control over credit and monetary policy.

With control now firmly in the hands of bankers, money and credit can be manipulated by the bankers to defeat even the will of this Congress. Our efforts to stimulate the economy could be offset quickly by the bankers by boosting interest rates again and shortening the supply of credit.

We have long heard a cry for an independent Federal Reserve. I am for it—a Federal Reserve independent of a big banker domination, with monetary and credit policies truly in the hands of the Government.

STEPS BACK TO A HIGH-LEVEL ECONOMY

Apart from regaining control of monetary and credit policy, Congress needs to take many other steps at once to lift the economy back to a high level. A program to do this must deal with many phases of the problem. Without attempting to outline a complete program, I wish to mention briefly a few essential steps:

First. We must deal immediately with monopolistic price and profit policies. The antitrust division at the Federal Trade Commission has been emasculated, its top men fired in a disproportionate cut of personnel. The New York Journal of Commerce now tells us that the Attorney General is substituting private deals—consent compromises—with

private business for enforcement of our antimonopoly laws in open court.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point portions of a Journal of Commerce article of January 11, 1953.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPLIANCE, NOT SUITS, KEYS ANTITRUST CASES—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT AND FTC AIM TO PUT MORE STRESS ON OUT-OF-COURT SETTLEMENTS AND AVOID TRIALS BASED ON NARROW GROUNDS AND NOVEL THEORIES

(By Oscar E. Naumann)

WASHINGTON, January 10.—Administration of the antitrust laws this year will be keyed to settlement of complaints out of court, wherever possible, and to a firm intention to examine all the facts in each case rather than to proceed on narrow legal grounds.

The heads of the two Government agencies directly charged with enforcement of the antitrust statutes are agreed that there is a distinct advantage to the Government, as well as to many prospective defendants, in seeking compliance with the laws short of the usual long-drawn-out litigation.

At the same time, it appears certain that the Government will not try to interpret existing antitrust laws to cover novel legal theories which occasionally have been propounded in the past.

AMENDMENTS AT THIS SESSION HELD UNLIKELY

It also seems unlikely that the administration will ask this session of Congress to amend the antitrust laws, although that may be a very good probability for 1955.

Both Stanley M. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, and Edward F. Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, are stressing compliance with the law short of court action.

Judge Barnes has, in fact, instituted a new procedure at the Department of Justice involving the negotiation of consent judgments prior to the filing of civil complaints. Since taking office last May, he has selected seven cases, all different, that had reached the point at which the Justice Department ordinarily would have filed suit.

But instead of filing in the courts, DOJ prepared the same complaint it would give to a court and then presented it to opposing counsel with the request that counsel supply DOJ with the same answer it would file in court.

The purpose of this procedure, Judge Barnes explained, was to try and work out consent decrees which could be handled in court in a day, rather than to go through long and extensive litigation. The score so far: Two of the situations "look hopeless and we will file suit"; 2 look promising for consent decrees; 2 are still being negotiated; and in the final case the prospective respondent initially declined DOJ's procedure but recently reversed itself.

FTC ALSO MOVING TO SIMPLIFY PROCEDURE

The Federal Trade Commission also is placing emphasis on compliance and enforcement short of the courts, where that is possible. This is part of a move to simplify and to speed up enforcement of the laws.

The Government's firm determination to examine all the facts in each case—to depart from the legal theory, where possible, that certain acts automatically constitute per se violation of the antitrust laws—was highlighted in the Pillsbury case, reported in detail in the Journal of Commerce, December 28.

In this case, Chairman Howrey plainly went out of his way to delineate the Federal Trade Commission's thinking on administration of the statutes. He himself regards the opinion as a landmark in recent FTC history.

In the Commission's opinion Mr. Howrey stated that "if a particular competitive act is automatically to be presumed unlawful, the administrative process of the Commission loses its purpose, and the justification for limiting the scope of judicial review and for exempting the Commission from executive control no longer remain."

Then he declared that "there must be a case-by-case examination of all relevant factors in order to ascertain the probable economic consequences."

Of considerable interest to businessmen who may be wondering whether practices so far deemed legal under the antitrust laws will come under scrutiny as lawyers develop new theories of enforcement is the determination of both the Attorney General and FTC to avoid such enlargement of the laws.

ONLY NUGGET OF FACT SUPPORTED SOME CASES

Judge Barnes told the Journal of Commerce that "we have sought to get away from the desire of administrative officials to enlarge the antitrust jurisdicition into unexplored areas for sociological reasons." DOJ now is confronted with a good many cases brought under previous administrations in which the complaint was supported by a nugget of fact but nevertheless went far beyond the supporting evidence.

DOJ has no desire to institute any such new fishing expeditions, the Assistant Attorney General said.

But this does not mean that DOJ will not consider cases of first impression, that is, cases which will clarify some heretofore untested facet of the antitrust laws. In fact, one of the cases now being considered for filing by DOJ is a case of first impression under section 7 of the Clayton Act. This is the section of the law, as amended in 1950, which applied in the recent Pillsbury decision by FTC—also a case of first impression.

Similarly, FTC has no intention of testing "new and novel" theories. This may be exemplified in a decision involving two liquor companies, Seagrams and Schenley. In the fall of 1952 the then Democrat-dominated FTC brought a complaint against each of the companies, charging that each conspired with its own subsidiary companies to fix prices. The new theory involved was that the antitrust laws, which prohibit conspiracies between independently owned companies, also apply to companies under the same management.

CONSENT DECREES SEEN IN LIQUOR LITIGATION

The present FTC almost certainly would not have issued such a complaint in the first place, and chances are that the existing complaints will be settled by consent decree.

While the antitrust division of DOJ, and FTC, are revising their thinking on enforcement of the antitrust laws, and striving for better administration, still another group is at work on the same problems. This is the Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws, which was appointed by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., with the support of President Eisenhower.

Named last August, this group is making a substantive and procedural study of the applicable laws and is due to report this year. But because the President already has outlined a heavy legislative program for Congress, and because the Committee may not complete its studies and recommendations until well along in the session, it appears doubtful that the administration would ask for new antitrust legislation this year.

Here is a list of the many problems on which the Committee is working:

(1) Concepts of competition and monopoly, the legal definitions versus economic definitions, the tests and criteria; (2) per se versus the rule of reason; (3) oligopolies; (4) implied conspiracies, price leadership, parent versus subsidiary; and (5) Robinson-Patman Act, hard versus soft competition.

Also (6) exclusive dealing; (7) fair trade and the McGuire Act; (8) foreign commerce the ICI case, extraterritoriality; and (9) exemptions—labor and agriculture.

Also (10) concurrent jurisdiction of DOJ and FTC; (11) patents and trademarks; (12) consent decrees; (13) use of criminal prosecution, grand jury versus discovery proceedings.

While this very broad study is going forward FTC has itself appointed a committee of experts to examine cost justification, since where savings in costs can be justified they provide a defense against charges of price discrimination.

While these forward-looking studies are going on, the antitrust division and FTC are busy catching up with a large backlog of pending litigation. Judge Barnes pointed out that DOJ has had some antitrust cases pending for as long as 12 years.

Taking 12 cases that have been hanging fire from the period between 1941 and 1946, the antitrust division has closed out 8, 2 were dismissed by DOJ, 3 were dismissed by the courts, and 3 were settled by consent decrees.

Both agencies also are taking a look at the orders they issued over the past years to make sure that they are being complied with. At the present time neither agency has a group to supervise such compliance.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the story is to the effect that the Attorney General proposes to submit his cases to the opposing counsel in antitrust matters, reach compromises, and then make them of record in the courts in a single day to save time consumed in trials.

This proposal to take away from the courts the power to decide what is right and wrong—to undermine the position of the judiciary in our Government—has been made before and rejected. How can a judge be fully briefed and advised of all the evidence and ramifications of a complicated antitrust matter in a few hours? How can we expect attorneys in court to justify a compromise to give the court full facts? What about the people's right to the facts as developed in open, public trials?

Apparently this big business administration now proposes to deal with its supporters and campaign contributors in secret, as far removed from the public eye as possible. How soon will we relieve the courts of holding criminal trials? How soon will all justice become a matter of making a deal with the Attorney General?

I hope that no one now tries to reassure us by advising us that only monopolists are going to get this special treatment; that back room settlements will be their exclusive privilege.

Writing in the Wall Street Journal of February 1, 1954, on the Outlook, Mr. George Shea asks:

How long will it be before * * * industries decide that real price reductions are what will bring in demand? As the economic advisers stress, manufacturers' prices in many instances have not yet followed the earlier declines in raw materials * * *.

Under the circumstances, current noisy efforts of self-appointed spokesmen to reassure the Nation, on the theory that recessions are purely a matter of psychology, could boomerang. If too many businessmen are thereby persuaded to keep inventories and prices too high too long, the consequence can only be distress when the inevitable liquidation comes.

In addition to vigorous antitrust law enforcement, the price spread studies

at the Federal Trade Commission, which this Congress last year forbade, should be started again, and adequate funds provided to do a prompt and thorough job. The story of the last ditch price increases in the face of recession should be developed fully. The public should learn how food trades have increased their take, and why prices have not fallen as a result of termination of the excess profits levy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lower Taxes: Lower Prices," published in the Washington Post of Wednesday, January 12, 1953, in regard to the maintenance of high automobile prices after the presumed death of the excess profits levy. It points out that some companies argued last year that nearly all the benefits of excess profits tax repeal would be passed to the consumers—a $2 billion melon.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOWER TAXES: LOWER PRICES

Last week's announcement that the Defense Department would cancel contracts for $140 million worth of jeeps and trucks hardly represents a disturbing loss of business for the companies concerned. The news should not be interpreted as another indicator of a business downturn, even by auto workers who are beginning to see signs of less work ahead. Five companies will share in the $140 million contract cuts. In 1952, General Motors alone did a business of $7.5 billion, $1.4 billion of which was for defense; Chrysler did a business of $2.6 billion, $360 million of which was for defense.

Of more significance to workers and to consumers than the small defense cut announced last week was the expiration of the excess profits tax. It should make possible some price adjustments as well as operational adjustments which will have a tonic effect on business. Some 70,000 of the 400,000 American corporations have been paying excess profits taxes netting the Government about $2 billion annually.

No figures are available to indicate what the companies will do with the money saved. Some of it may be applied to price cuts; some may be applied to dividend payments, higher wages or new supplies and equipment. At any rate, the savings probably will not be hoarded. The effect on general business, therefore, should be stimulating. Some companies argued last year that the excess profits tax was almost wholly passed on to the consumer and that he would be the chief beneficiary of the end of the tax.

The demand of the market, of course, is the primary determinant of price. But with the market for some goods now softer than in several years, price competition should become more widespread than it is at the moment. With the enormous capacity for production, business may find that price reductions are essential to the most economical operation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, has anyone heard of any big price reductions since January?

Why are not the benefits to consumers showing up?

I do not mean those questions seriously, for I know that very little of the $2 billion will get to consumers because of monopoly price practices.

Second. Priority in tax relief should be given in the lower-income brackets. The per capita personal exemption should be raised from $600 to $1,000 at minimum. In 1939, the standard family and individual exemptions enabled those with sufficient incomes to enjoy an acceptable standard of living. A single person had an exemption of $1,000. An equivalent exemption today would have to be $1,936, not $600.

In 1939, a married couple with two minor dependents had an exemption of $3,300. An equal exemption today would be $6,389 to provide the same tax-exempt purchasing power. The current exemptions are only $2,400 for a family of four—much less than the $3,800 needed for such a family to have a modest but adequate standard of living.

Increased personal exemptions for families or individuals earning $4,000 or less from the present low of $600 to $1,000—still less than the 1939 equivalent—would release substantial additional purchasing power.

Third. We should correct defects and inequities in the present tax laws to provide revenues to offset the relief necessary to bolster consumption. Eliminating income-splitting would raise an estimated $3 billion additional. More vigorous enforcement of business returns, withholding taxes on interest and dividend income, and less liberal depletion and capital-gains treatment would raise $2 billions. The Bureau of Internal Revenue tells us that almost half of all business returns contain tax errors. Combined with the reenactment of the excess-profits tax, these amendments would raise a total of $7 billion.

These tax suggestions are based on my firm belief that in a period of recession, such as we now have, business and upper bracket tax relief must be deferred and the highest priority given to tax cuts that stimulate demand, industrial activity, and recovery.

Fourth. We should repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. To insure the maintenance of full employment it is necessary that management be willing to share promptly with wage earners as well as consumers the benefits of tremendous increases in productivity. I am gratified that Mr. Harold Stassen has so advised European employers. On the other hand, I am fearful that the punitive Taft-Hartley Act will encourage recalcitrant groups of employers in this country to break down the standards and reduce the economic gains in this direction made possible by the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

The President's endorsement of the Taft-Hartley law, his appointment of business-connected persons as members to the National Labor Relations Board, and his proposed amendments and outright concessions to the National Association of Manufacturers, are, of course, only new evidence of the bad advice he is receiving and his failure to understand the forces at work in our economy contributing to recession and depression.

Employers who know how the vicious provisions of the Taft-Hartley law can be used to damage labor organizations and weaken their representation of workers can only interpret the President's affirmation of belief in Taft-Hartley as support of their ends.

In connection with Taft-Hartley repeal, it should be said that there are some people in this land who would relish a recession and be willing to run the risk of serious depression to break down the effectiveness of labor organizations.

Some persons would recommend a goal of at least three to five million unemployed, so there would be a floating pool of excess labor hanging as a threat over the unions, their negotiators, and individual members.

The mandatory elections proposal in President Eisenhower's labor message takes on a very clear meaning when related to the goal of those who want stabilized unemployment. The results of a mandatory election in a city with breadlines would undoubtedly differ from the results in a full employment economy.

A recession and a tightening of the Taft-Hartley Act constitute a double-barreled shotgun blast at the labor unions.

Fifth. We should extend 90 percent of parity farm price supports to additional products, including feed grains, beef, and other perishables, and we should make them permanent. We should then devote ourselves to seeing that our food production is used to provide adequate diets for our own people, and to assist in achieving freedom from want in the rest of the world.

The farm recession is very real. Output of farm machinery has been cut 25 percent since March 1953, indicating the effect of the farm recession on industry. Industry's answer, it should be noted, has been a 2-percent rise in tractor prices since December 1952.

The threat of the administration's sliding scale price supports now hangs over the farmers. Members of Congress know it has little likelihood of enactment; that enough Republicans are going to join the Democrats to defeat any such further deliberate deflation of agriculture to win urban votes. But the farmers cannot be sure until we have voted, and the present uncertainty should be dispelled as soon as possible.

Sixth. We should raise our rate of investment in the development of the resources of this country back to, and beyond, the levels current before the present unwise economy cuts were made, for the real purpose of freezing development while private power monopolists grab our best hydroelectric power sites. Our rate of investment in resources development should be geared, as the Employment Act of 1946 contemplated, to the requirements of maximum employment, maximum production, and maximum purchasing power.

This economy ruse succeeded in obtaining a 50-percent reduction in our rate of investment in western development, a cut from approximately a $300 million level to half of that. The Government is providing private electric utilities the equivalent of more than five times such reduction in public investment by permitting quick amortization of $1.8 billion in new plants at a tax loss of $845 million. The full effects of the reductions in western investment have not yet been felt because of funds in the pipeline. Unless this Congress acts

promptly to correct the unwise cuts of last year, and keeps investment in resources up, reductions will strike in our western areas, already staggering under drought and discouragement, within the next few months.

I shall again join with other Senators in proposing the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority or Commission to develop the resources and stimulate the economy of that great region. I shall be happy to join Senators from other great river basins in separate bills or in an omnibus valley authority bill; for here is a demonstrated, sure way both of providing sound measures of recovery and, at the same time, of increasing the wealth-creating potential of an expanding, healthy economy.

Seventh. Public investment in schools, hospitals, medical facilities, roads, and other public works must be geared to the needs of the Nation, both for services and maintenance of full employment.

The current rate of 50,000 new classrooms built a year is 14,000 less than needed to match increased student numbers, thus adding to overcrowding and the accumulated deficit of facilities. In 1952, the public elementary and secondary school capital needs amounted to $10.5 billion. The existing legal bonding or taxing limits would permit the States to raise only $5.8 billion, or 55 percent, of the funds required to fulfill backlog needs. New construction contract awards in 1952 provided for only 13 percent of total new construction needs as of September that year.

In 1953 the hard-money policy raised interest rates, which meant less schoolroom space per dollar expended. Some construction was postponed as a result of the new policy. With a rise in the school enrollment of 10 percent in 1953 over 1952, planned expenditures for new construction in 1954, up 11 percent, will just cover new needs and leave the existing backlog, plus replacement needs, virtually untouched.

The Nation's highway backlog at the start of 1954 was above $12 billion. The annual rate of growth required to meet anticipated needs is about $1.6 billion. In 1954 planned new highway construction expenditures will be $3.4 billion. At such a rate, it would take 24 years to eliminate the backlog in highway deficiencies. The amount contributed by the Federal Government for construction of State highways will remain unchanged at $575 million.

The bulk of current school, highway, and public-housing outlays is financed by State and local governments. With a drop in economic activity, State and local governments will retrench as receipts fall and limits of indebtedness are reached. It will require Federal action to increase the rate of highway, slum clearance, public housing, and school construction activities.

Eighth. A small-business agency that functions and provides loans at reasonable interest rates must be put in operation. The RFC has been liquidated and the present small-business agency has done nothing of consequence except to make an untimely announcement that interest rates will be increased on its loans—if it ever makes any.

SPEED HOUSING

Ninth. The public-housing programs must be resumed at or above their former level, interest on veterans' and Federal housing backed mortgages brought back down, and new emphasis placed on slum clearance. This Congress last year imposed a statutory ceiling of 20,000 public-housing units annually, causing a 34-percent drop in construction. The limit must be lifted. Emphasis on slum clearance is essential because of a prospective fall in the rate of new-household formation. The Census Bureau's Projection of the Number of Households and Families, 1955–60, reports that under favorable economic conditions there will be an average annual increase of only 650,000 in households in the next 7 years, compared to 1,100,000 annually in the last 7 years. The low birthrates of the last great depression are now being reflected in the family formation. A decline in demand for new-family units gives us both the opportunity and the economic need for replacement of substandard homes.

Tenth. We must move imaginatively and boldly to stimulate foreign trade and foreign markets. The world food reserve which several of us proposed in the last session of Congress should be enacted into law. The technical-assistance and point 4 programs should be given renewed emphasis.

As I have pointed out previously, a small decline in our economy can be ruinous to many nations now on the side of a free world. We need to help them build up their economies and to stimulate their growth. Our technical-assistance and point 4 programs are the soundest and most economical road to economic improvement and stability in the free world which has yet been devised. The programs should be expanded as rapidly as is sound.

This Congress should study the possibility of establishing a system of international development contracts which will put a floor under annual demand and price for some of the basic raw materials moving in world trade and thereby insure friendly nations which trade with us against the economic disasters and political upheavals which accompany sharp curtailment of international demand for their production.

Economic measures are the sure, sound road to lasting peace. Revolutions do not occur where people are reasonably well off and when their economy is growing, giving them hope for the future.

Mr. President, I know that there are other steps which will be necessary to reverse the present downtrend and achieve the continued growth which is essential to a healthy economy.

There can be no dispute that transition from a wartime economy to a partial mobilization or defense economy has presented problems. It is unfortunate that in such a period of transition many difficulties have been created unnecessarily as a result of the indefensible hard-money crusade of 1953, by the emasculation of our small business credit programs, by crippling of the housing programs, and by the curbing of resources development programs and of the great foreign assistance programs which were aimed at the ultimate growth of export business and foreign trade.

It will be tragic if this Congress delays another year in righting the situation and enacting whatever legislation is necessary to establish and require the pursuance of a maximum employment policy by the administrators of our Government. This is no time for study commissions, but for emergency action.

We need immediately to make it clear to the people of the Nation that this Congress is not going to sit by and tolerate a 25- to 30-percent decline in business activity before there is action.

The fear created by the irresponsible statements about awaiting undue disaster and spiraling recession must be dispelled. Since the administration has taken no steps to renounce and disassociate itself from the philosophy of awaiting ruin complacently, it becomes the responsibility of Congress to give the people of this Nation reassurance, and to act boldly and firmly.

Keeping the Nation in the dark about how far the healthy readjustment is going to be permitted to proceed, and continuing to talk about continued growth and maintaining growth, while all the economic indicators decline, have created uncertainty and apprehension, which can only lead to curtailment of outstanding commitments by business and consumers that will accelerate the decline.

We need quickly to assure the people that there is an understanding of the true situation in the Congress, that there will be prompt action to rebuild the economy, and that we do not subscribe to the theory that 3½ to 4 million unemployed is healthy.

The termination of uncertainty will of itself be a long step forward, but specific action must follow along the lines which I have outlined.

A national advertising campaign creating a great cloud of smoke about our economic situation will not do the job. Too many people still remember how long prosperity was "just around the corner" in the last depression to make anything short of early, positive action adequate today. In my opinion, we must move promptly to control this recession before it gains momentum. This country can and must move forward. This Congress can and must act now.

NOTICE OF SPEECH BY SENATOR MORSE

During the delivery of Mr. MURRAY'S speech—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the understanding that my interruption will follow the speech of the Senator from Montana, I should like to say that the majority leader has kindly and cooperatively entered into an understanding with the Senator from Oregon—and the acting majority leader I am sure will correct me if I do not have a clear understanding of the situation—to the effect that the Senator from Oregon will

not make his speech tonight, but will make his speech when he can get the floor at the convenience of the Senate tomorrow afternoon, and that at the close of the speech of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], unless another Senator wishes to make a speech, the Senate will recess in accordance with the arrangement which has been entered into between the acting majority leader and the acting minority leader, with the further understanding that no votes will be taken in the Senate tonight.

Unless I hear dissent I assume that is the understanding.

Mr. GOLDWATER. As acting majority leader, I will say that the Senator is correct in his statement. The majority leader informed me that no votes will be taken tonight, and that when the rhetoric shall have been exhausted we will go home.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say to my good liberal friends on the other side of the aisle that the reason I prefer not to make my speech tonight is not only that I desire always to accommodate my colleagues in the Senate, but that I am about to go to a banquet of businessmen who would like to cross-examine me on a few matters, and I do not want to forego that pleasure. Therefore, with the understanding I have noted, I shall depart.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to my good friend from Oregon that it is a very interesting discussion we are having, to which the Senator from Oregon has made some valuable contributions. He leaves us with a good feeling, and we want to bid him fond farewell for the moment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. And a safe return.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And a safe return, indeed.

SURVEY OF BUSINESSMEN'S EXPECTATIONS FOR SECOND QUARTER OF 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a document entitled "Survey of Businessmen's Expectations for the Second Quarter of 1954, Conducted by Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Survey of businessmen's expectations for the second quarter of 1954 conducted by Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.—Second quarter of 1954 compared with second quarter of 1953: What businessmen expect

[Based on interviews with executives of 1,315 business concerns between Jan. 11–22, 1954, regarding expectations for their respective businesses]

	All concerns	Total manufacturers	Manufacturers: Durable	Manufacturers: Nondurable	Wholesalers	Retailers
Net sales:						
Number reporting	1,315	685	355	330	407	223
Percent expecting:						
Increase	46	47	44	50	46	44
No change	32	29	28	30	34	36
Decrease	22	24	28	20	20	20
Net profits:						
Number reporting	1,182	618	324	294	357	207
Percent expecting:						
Increase	37	41	41	42	31	36
No change	42	38	36	40	47	44
Decrease	21	21	23	18	22	20
Selling prices:						
Number reporting	1,284	671	344	327	393	220
Percent expecting:						
Increase	13	10	10	10	17	13
No change	68	71	74	68	63	68
Decrease	19	19	16	22	20	19
Level of inventories:						
Number reporting	1,295	677	350	327	399	219
Percent expecting:						
Increase	20	20	20	20	20	23
No change	47	48	50	46	49	43
Decrease	33	32	30	34	31	34
Number of employees:						
Number reporting	1,309	683	350	333	402	224
Percent expecting:						
Increase	11	13	12	14	7	9
No change	80	76	71	80	86	84
Decrease	9	11	17	6	7	7
New orders:						
Number reporting	----------	595	319	276	----------	----------
Percent expecting:						
Increase	----------	42	41	42	----------	----------
No change	----------	36	34	38	----------	----------
Decrease	----------	22	25	20	----------	----------

RECESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, if there be no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 5, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4 (legislative day of January 22), 1954:

UNITED NATIONS

Philip K. Crowe, of Maryland, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ceylon, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Harold R. Becker, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. Roy M. Gulick, United States Marine Corps, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

William M. Stewart, Alexander City, Ala., in place of J. T. Fuller, retired.

Emitt J. Stricklin, Bremen, Ala., in place of K. R. Rice, resigned.

Charles D. Moore, Montgomery, Ala., in place of R. L. Nolen, Jr., resigned.

ARIZONA

John W. Crozier, Benson, Ariz., in place of W. D. Spangler, transferred.

Richard E. Lawrence, Jerome, Ariz., in place of J. E. Wagner, retired.

Ollie C. Wilson, Scottsdale, Ariz., in place of A. H. Adams, retired.

ARKANSAS

Thomas H. Edwards, De Queen, Ark., in place of W. H. Wardlaw, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Amey L. Weiser, Aptos, Calif., in place of C. W. Spencer, transferred.

Robert H. Marshall, Bakersfield, Calif, in place of J. P. Shields, retired.

Edwin R. Vetter, Big Creek, Calif., in place of J. W. Barr, retired.

Emil J. Nelson, Brookdale, Calif., in place of H. I. Hollen, resigned.

Martha L. Ward, Canby, Calif., in place of M. E. Bowden, resigned.

Carl H. Stahlheber, Chula Vista, Calif., in place of F. J. Norton, retired.

Charlie L. Veitch, Compton, Calif., in place of Clark Wallace, retired.

Ellen G. Goforth, Covelo, Calif., in place of F. E. Hagne, transferred.

John F. Nielsen, Jr., Forest Knolls, Calif., in place of A. M. Knowles, resigned.

Ronald L. Pascoe, Gustine, Calif., in place of W. R. Woods, removed.

Donald H. Onstad, Ione, Calif., in place of D. M. Stewart, resigned.

John Healy, Livingston, Calif., in place of E. C. Ulrich, transferred.

Edward S. Chadburn, Needles, Calif., in place of W. L. Carter, retired.

William L. Klette, North Fork, Calif., in place of M. M. Franklin, deceased.

S. Merritt Williams, Palm Springs, Calif., in place of R. M. Gorham, retired.

Eugene E. Schulenburg, Pismo Beach, Calif., in place of W. J. Carter, resigned.

John H. Shewman, Pomona, Calif., in place of J. R. Casey, retired.

Warren J. Bond, San Quentin, Calif., in place of J. M. Eliason, deceased.

Louis Sibilio, Santa Maria, Calif., in place of R. E. Shamhart, retired.

Leola E. Heinz, Shingle, Calif., in place of C. L. Scheiber, deceased.

Alma W. LaChambre, Sunset Beach, Calif., in place of M. C. Galle, resigned.

Elizabeth J. Otto, Temecula, Calif., in place of I. J. Shirley, removed.

Harold E. Rolfe, Topanga, Calif., in place of J. W. Gay, removed.

Blythe W. Richards, Tracy, Calif., in place of G. H. Gischel, retired.

Charles Hugh Ross, Tulare, Calif., in place of J. H. Clark, retired.

Warren F. Hollingsworth, Turlock, Calif., in place of M. M. Brame, retired.
Roy A. Ray, Upland, Calif., in place of O. P. Brady, deceased.
Fred H. Jenkins, Watsonville, Calif., in place of W. D. Thornton, deceased.

COLORADO

Austin C. Bledsoe, Fleming, Colo., in place of D. D. Hopkins, transferred.
Phillip J. Woods, Las Animas, Colo., in place of C. E. Samuelson, deceased.
Reba L. Bradley, Palmer Lake, Colo., in place of Evelyn Myers, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Ellen S. Breining, Bloomfield, Conn., in place of M. W. Pinney, retired.

FLORIDA

Charles E. Yon, Blountstown, Fla., in place of J. I. Martin, transferred.
Thelma S. Speer, Boca Grande, Fla., in place of Jefferson Gaines, deceased.
William A. Fisher, Dunedin, Fla., in place of W. J. Christie, deceased.
Bernard O'Brien, Panama City, Fla., in place of J. W. Padgett, resigned.

GEORGIA

Mattie H. Chandler, Keysville, Ga., in place of G. E. Chandler, Jr., resigned.
Lloyd C. Ricks, Macon, Ga., in place of C. L. Bowden, declined.
Albert D. McKee, Moultrie, Ga., in place of J. B. Monk, retired.

ILLINOIS

Carrie L. Smith, Bellflower, Ill., in place of M. L. Mears, deceased.
Donald W. Fraser, Blue Island, Ill., in place of D. J. Boyd, resigned.
Alan E. Rigg, Bone Gap, Ill., in place of Ellis Drury, retired.
Charles E. Eyestone, Brownstown, Ill., in place of M. G. Diveley, deceased.
Gertrude E. Dean, Flossmoor, Ill., in place of Margaret Echols, retired.
Harley Gustine, Greenfield, Ill., in place of J. M. Vandaveer, retired.
Orville O. Rathbun, Gridley, Ill., in place of Francis Hayes, transferred.
Frank A. Smallwood, Harmon, Ill., in place of R. W. Schmidt, resigned.
Gregory M. Sheahen, Highland Park, Ill., in place of D. L. Cobb, retired.
James A. Hight, Karnak, Ill., in place of W. V. Webb, retired.
Milo L. Craig, Kewanee, Ill., in place of E. O. Reaugh, retired.
John S. West, Lockport, Ill., in place of J. E. Fitzgerald, removed.
Cynthia Afton Stewart, Olive Branch, Ill., in place of W. F. Wilbourn, retired.
Edgar J. Baldwin, Palos Park, Ill., in place of C. C. Saunders, retired.
Curtis Fenton, Sims, Ill., in place of B. A. Jones, retired.
Harold J. Winans, Sycamore, Ill., in place of J. F. Boyle, deceased.
James L. Rousey, Wapella, Ill., in place of F. H. Greene, deceased.
Kenneth J. Tate, Waterman, Ill., in place of H. E. Davis, retired.
Clifton M. Evans, Waukegan, Ill., in place of J. P. Daly, deceased.
Raymond A. Smith, Wilmington, Ill., in place of M. I. Quinn, retired.

INDIANA

Clifton E. Coffman, Bainbridge, Ind., in place of C. E. Steward, retired.
Richard W. Troyer, Churubusco, Ind., in place of J. S. Kriegbaum, deceased.
Norman L. Bent, Fort Branch, Ind., in place of P. M. Davis, retired.
Avis L. Carlile, Scottsburg, Ind., in place of M. L. Hughbanks, retired.
Herbert B. Harrison, Winchester, Ind., in place of J. L. Wall, transferred.

IOWA

Arthur M. Robinson, Bayard, Iowa, in place of C. W. Crees, deceased.
Kenneth C. Anderson, Clinton, Iowa, in place of W. T. Oakes, retired.
Ralph O. Woods, Colfax, Iowa, in place of J. A. Davis, retired.
Louis P. Obye, Estherville, Iowa, in place of C. E. Kennedy, retired.
Keith H. Radloff, Farmersburg, Iowa, in place of George Glawe, retired.
Stewart L. Schwab, Guthrie Center, Iowa, in place of J. L. McLaughlin, retired.
Donald E. Clayton, Hamburg, Iowa, in place of Howard Colon, retired.
Lewis L. Welden, Iowa Falls, Iowa, in place of E. C. Wirds, removed.
James Emerson Evans, Joice, Iowa, in place of E. H. Brunsvold, transferred.
Goldie M. Schneider, Popejoy, Iowa, in place of John Schneider, removed.
Edwin G. Dieter, Rock Rapids, Iowa, in place of Florence Gilman, retired.
Norman W. Jespersen, Royal, Iowa, in place of Amber Bailey, resigned.
Morris G. Dahl, Sloan, Iowa, in place of J. A. Clark, transferred.

KANSAS

Esther L. Thomm, Athol, Kans., in place of A. J. Panter, transferred.
Reuben H. Moore, Holton, Kans., in place of A. E. Hosmer, retired.
Edward J. Schoenhofer, St. Paul, Kans., in place of J. T. Dowd, retired.

KENTUCKY

John R. Lawton, Central City, Ky., in place of J. L. Fentress, Sr., retired.

LOUISIANA

Alton Leander Lea, Baton Rouge, La., in place of M. B. McCarley, retired.
William C. Tucker, Haynesville, La., in place of C. C. Brown, retired.

MAINE

Ralph A. Miles, Jr., Burnham, Maine, in place of E. B. Davis, retired.
Arthur Atwood Anderson, Caribou, Maine, in place of F. A. Smith, retired.
Bentley L. Glidden, Damariscotta, Maine, in place of P. E. Woodbury, deceased.
George W. Warren, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine, in place of B. W. Brown, retired.

MARYLAND

Nelsie M. Hannon, Accokeek, Md., in place of L. L. Dyer, resigned.
Robert R. Ripple, Clinton, Md., in place of E. A. Loveless, retired.
Anna V. Groves, Glenn Dale, Md., in place of R. W. Suman, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Martha Helen Lindsey, Huntington, Mass., in place of N. J. Buckwheat, removed.
Mabel Griffin, Mendon, Mass., in place of N. M. Burr, deceased.
John J. Gobell, New Bedford, Mass., in place of J. A. Murphy, deceased.
Emile F. St. Onge, Ware, Mass., in place of J. J. Moriarty, removed.

MICHIGAN

Lewis G. Howe, Bath, Mich., in place of C. D. Porter, retired.
Clair E. Courtade, Buckley, Mich., in place of R. F. Duff, resigned.
Bernard C. Shankland, Cadillac, Mich., in place of E. R. Brodeur, retired.
Lawrence A. Olson, Coleman, Mich., in place of Edward Nelson, resigned.
Harold J. Geers, Kent City, Mich., in place of H. A. Saur, removed.
George W. Crist, Litchfield, Mich., in place of P. A. Walkup, transferred.
James Martin Littlejohn, New Buffalo, Mich., in place of F. F. Siegmund, resigned.
Carl E. Dennis, Rockford, Mich., in place of Glenn Davis, retired.
George E. Osgood, St. Johns, Mich., in place of G. E. Judd, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Loran V. Nelson, Bellingham, Minn., in place of George Zahn, transferred.
Harvey M. Madson, Grand Rapids, Minn., in place of Archie Rassmussen, deceased.
Keith W. Oleson, Isanti, Minn., in place of B. M. Otto, resigned.
Darrell W. Matter, Lyle, Minn., in place of J. P. Mortensen, transferred.
Carrol J. Strom, St. James, Minn., in place of C. V. Hawkinson, deceased.
James P. McCoy, Savage, Minn., in place of I. A. Riley, removed.
George H. Carrell, Zumbrota, Minn., in place of M. S. Stubstad, retired.

MISSOURI

Donald L. Bess, Bloomfield, Mo., in place of C. C. Oliver, retired.
Clarence L. Robertson, Jr., Brashear, Mo., in place of F. R. Moore, retired.
Frank D. Griswold, Jr., Clarence, Mo., in place of W. H. Burnett, retired.
Nelson H. Auer, Fulton, Mo., in place of S. B. Herndon, retired.
Hubert A. Bittiker, Mendon, Mo., in place of Kathryn Barry, retired.
Charles H. Hutsler, Osceola, Mo., in place of G. D. Brown, removed.
Max E. Schmid, Queen City, Mo., in place of F. B. Miller, deceased.
Norman T. Crater, Ravenwood, Mo., in place of L. J. Henry, Jr., transferred.
Lolita E. Lorch, St. Marys, Mo., in place of G. M. Pratte, retired.
William L. Dalton, Salem, Mo., in place of J. F. Dent, transferred.
Ethel Esther Eberts, Smithville, Mo., in place of C. F. Heathman, retired.

MONTANA

Jack A. Warner, Cut Bank., Mont., in place of E. M. Minette, retired.
Merle A. Griffith, Fairfield, Mont., in place of F. H. McLean, retired.
Emory B. Pease, Glasgow, Mont., in place of J. P. Sternhagen, retired.
Howard K. Stenehjem, Plentywood, Mont., in place of J. F. Murray, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Eugene J. O'Neill, St. Libory, Nebr., in place of F. H. Holtorf, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Wilbur F. Rue, Allentown, N. J., in place of J. J. Sanders, retired.
Thomas Alfred Stevens, Cape May, N. J., in place of L. E. Miller, Jr., deceased.
Margaret H. Merrill, Essex Fells, N. J., in place of M. L. Callaghan, resigned.
Wilbur A. Smock, Farmingdale, N. J., in place of W. H. Thompson, retired.
Robert F. Wichmann, Little Silver, N. J., in place of W. H. Wichmann, deceased.
Richard G. Haffey, Longport, N. J., in place of J. A. Boyle, Jr., resigned.
Eleanor S. Howell, Stewartsville, N. J., in place of E. B. Rinehart, resigned.
Harry Thomas Applegate, Toms River, N. J., in place of S. B. Pierce, retired.
George R. Baldwin, Wenonah, N. J., in place of M. W. Veitch, retired.
William C. Nestor, Westfield, N. J., in place of J. H. Traynor, retired.
Leon E. McElroy, Woodbridge, N. J., in place of W. G. Weaver, retired.
Louis A. Pime, Woodbury, N. J., in place of E. H. Carpenter, retired.

NEW YORK

Glenn O. Robinson, Adams, N. Y., in place of J. W. Cain, retired.
Nicholas J. Graziose, Albertson, N. Y., in place of A. C. Johnsen, retired.
Charles L. Messer, Auburn, N. Y., in place of J. F. McGrath, retired.

Alexander R. Clark, Babylon, N. Y., in place of Joseph Keenan, retired.
May Frances Moore, Canaan, N. Y., in place of G. G. Taylor, removed.
Clifford O. Lincoln, Cherry Creek, N. Y., in place of E. G. Champlin, resigned.
Floyd W. English, Corning, N. Y., in place of J. F. Kennedy, retired.
Clarence A. Smith, Cornwallville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.
Leigh R. Jones, Franklinville, N. Y., in place of A. W. Rogers, resigned.
Mark S. Western, Herkimer, N. Y., in place of F. A. Fagan, retired.
Homer J. Smith, Lake George, N. Y., in place of G. C. Pharmer, resigned.
Leslie G. Ross, Lake Placid Club, N. Y., in place of R. F. McIntyre, transferred.
Florence B. Densmore, Livonia, N. Y., in place of M. E. Murphy, retired.
Sherman J. Day, Lowville, N. Y., in place of K. M. Nortz, retired.
Ina E. Tymeson, Maine, N. Y., in place of F. H. Tymeson, retired.
Dora L. Walsh, Mellenville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
Marion E. Dickens, Middleville, N. Y., in place of G. M. Mumford, deceased.
Anthony J. Keller, Niagara Falls, N. Y., in place of T. F. Gray, deceased.
Neva B. Quick, Nichols, N. Y., in place of W. E. Merrill, retired.
Walter E. Davis, Port Jefferson, N. Y., in place of J. J. Cassidy, retired.
Howard L. King, Potsdam, N. Y., in place of R. E. Perrin, retired.
Charles Thomas Williams, Rome, N. Y., in place of T. V. O'Shea, retired.
Frank L. Miller, Roslyn Heights, N. Y., in place of G. P. Murphy, resigned.
Mildred S. Worcester, Rotterdam Junction, N. Y., in place of W. E. Worcester, retired.
Ronald J. Smith, Springville, N. Y., in place of Monte Yost, retired.
Karl F. W. Mowitz, Tonawanda, N. Y., in place of W. F. Baltes, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

William C. Stainback, Henderson, N. C., in place of J. R. Teague, retired.
Ruby Allen Phillips, Henrietta, N. C., in place of M. M. Wells, resigned.
Joshua P. Seymour, Hookerton, N. C., in place of E. S. Edwards, retired.
Neece N. Osborn, Jamestown, N. C., in place of C. V. Bundy, retired.
Sam J. Smith, Lexington, N. C., in place of Raymond Bowers, resigned.
Lillian B. Spencer, South Mills, N. C., in place of Bessie Granger, retired.
Jack F. Harmon, Sr., Statesville, N. C., in place of J. L. Milholland, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Eunice L. Bjella, Epping, N. Dak., in place of P. J. Karp, deceased.
Irvin J. Prichard, Maddock, N. Dak., in place of O. H. Haagenstad, resigned.
Esther Ward, Palermo, N. Dak., in place of H. D. Ward, deceased.
Harold W. Bachman, Streeter, N. Dak., in place of Paul Kietzke, deceased.

OHIO

Theodore Buehrer, Archbold, Ohio, in place of R. D. Walter, transferred.
Arthur E. Cornwell, Athens, Ohio, in place of F. P. Frebault, retired.
Paul F. Ralston, Chillicothe, Ohio, in place of J. R. Gunning, deceased.
Willard Alton Drown, Clyde, Ohio, in place of D. C. Franks, retired.
Guy H. Mundhenk, Dayton, Ohio, in place of H. F. Schlewetz, retired.
Robert A. Pouttu, Gates Mills, Ohio, in place of Frederick Higham, deceased.
Olive E. Starkey, Glenford, Ohio, in place of G. V. Danison, transferred.
Russell W. Carter, Mason, Ohio, in place of R. W. Gutermuth, retired.
William K. Wobbecke, Jr., Newark, Ohio, in place of E. F. Reeb, retired.
Russell L. Lorenzen, Sandusky, Ohio, in place of T. A. Lauber, retired.
Phillip H. Gifford, Urbana, Ohio, in place of W. A. Strapp, deceased.
Lyle M. Shumaker, Wauseon, Ohio, in place of R. E. Lucas, transferred.
Sherman O. Kreischer, Westerville, Ohio, in place of J. E. Mattox, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Claude G. Jones, Jones, Okla., in place of W. F. Goff, retired.
Leo D. Johnson, Perry, Okla., in place of E. S. Bowles, transferred.

OREGON

William A. Rees, Fairview, Oreg., in place of Elsie Langley, retired.
Glendora V. Smith, Grass Valley, Oreg., in place of I. A. Blagg, resigned.
Walter E. Sneddon, Lowell, Oreg., in place of C. M. Cox, resigned.
Robert R. Ireland, Milton-Freewater, Oreg., in place of E. H. Steen, retired.
Herbert R. Parker, Oakland, Oreg., in place of H. E. Mahoney, retired.
James H. Grieve, Prospect, Oreg., in place of M. E. Grieve, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Franklin Levis Stringfellow, Chester, Pa., in place of I. A. Hiorth, retired.
William H. Anderson, Ebensburg, Pa., in place of Rosemary Dugan, removed.
Earl M. Miller, Elizabethtown, Pa., in place of H. R. Schneitman, deceased.
Kathryn E. Kurtz, Leacock, Pa., in place of P. M. Kuhns, declined.
George A. Paul, McConnellsburg, Pa., in place of E. L. Lynch, retired.
Elmer B. Neff, Mount Holly Springs, Pa., in place of M. C. Souders, retired.
Milton L. Dodge, Smethport, Pa., in place of T. P. Kennedy, resigned.

RHODE ISLAND

Louis Clay Whitman, Coventry Center, R. I., in place of P. P. Bentley, retired.
Philip W. Martin, Little Compton, R. I., in place of A. G. Bliss, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth J. Cooper, Mayesville, S. C., in place of B. T. Cooper, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Florence M. Weiland, Marion, S. Dak., in place of W. W. Brady, transferred.
Vada E. Koehne, Oldham, S. Dak., in place of G. S. Blackstone, deceased.
Elmer R. Humeston, Redfield, S. Dak., in place of E. H. Fox, removed.
Chester A. Beaver, Yankton, S. Dak., in place of J. R. Crowe, retired.

TENNESSEE

Roscoe Byrd, Huntsville, Tenn., in place of M. H. Williams, retired.
Daniel B. Shofner, Shelbyville, Tenn., in place of L. D. Jordan, deceased.

TEXAS

John Brice Jones, Baird, Tex., in place of John Gilliland, retired.
James T. Jolley, Clarksville, Tex., in place of B. D. Wren, deceased.
Robert M. Anderson, Clute, Tex., in place of A. M. Dunn, removed.
Dudley C. Jernigin, Fort Worth, Tex., in place of J. E. McKee, resigned.
William X. Priesmeyer, Garwood, Tex., in place of H. F. Priesmeyer, retired.
Perry H. Martin, Georgetown, Tex., in place of F. B. Secrest, retired.
Matilda H. Barham, Helotes, Tex., in place of Blanche Maltsberger, resigned.
Marion M. Seymour, Jacksonville, Tex., in place of D. L. Haberle, resigned.
Nell G. Pryor, Kirbyville, Tex., in place of G. T. Sharbutt, resigned.
Julia W. Toalson, Kyle, Tex., in place of H. C. Wallace, retired.
Guy Wetzel, Longview, Tex., in place of T. H. Bivins, transferred.
Rufus L. Boren, Mart, Tex., in place of J. L. Spencer, retired.
Cecil F. Sorrell, Mission, Tex., in place of M. M. Hatch, retired.
Bertrand T. Hansen, Navasota, Tex., in place of C. H. Prestwood, deceased.
Frank N. Cook, Olney, Tex., in place of D. B. Wood, deceased.
Allie M. Sanders, Scurry, Tex., in place of A. D. Sanders, deceased.
Arthur T. Ward, Shiner, Tex., in place of Edmund Herder, retired.
Thomas Everett McClanahan, Slaton, Tex., in place of K. L. Scudder, removed.
Margie Hugonin, Tomball, Tex., in place of F. K. Rose, transferred.

VERMONT

Lois G. Hughes, Bomoseen, Vt., in place of C. J. Coon, retired.

VIRGINIA

Fitzhugh L. Davis, Altavista, Va., in place of L. A. Arthur, retired.
William L. Skinnell, Bedford, Va., in place of H. B. Jordan, retired.
Tousley M. Hooker, Berryville Va., in place of H. B. Harris, deceased.
Marian H. Gardner, Fredericks Hall, Va., in place of G. S. Pettit, retired.
Thomas W. Travis, Keysville, Va., in place of J. D. Crawford, resigned.
James M. McIntosh, Orange, Va., in place of P. M. Watts, retired.
Wilbur R. Johnston, Winchester, Va., in place of C. L. Campbell, transferred.

WASHINGTON

Murriel C. West, Lyle, Wash., in place of D. M. Hewett, retired.
Sadie B. Sands, Metaline, Wash., in place of D. L. George, resigned.
Clarence H. Currie, Monroe, Wash., in place of D. G. Donovan, removed.
Erma M. Newman, Napavine, Wash., in place of L. F. Bushnell, retired.
Earl D. Kelley, Newport, Wash., in place of J. H. Field, retired.
Walter S. Herstrom, Port Townsend, Wash., in place of E. M. Starrett, transferred.
Myrtle M. Prim, Ryderwood, Wash., in place of J. E. Clark, retired.
Irene Eva Weeks, Seahurst, Wash., in place of M. W. Carleton, retired.
Helen G. Young, Spanaway, Wash., in place of C. G. L. Phipps, retired.
Herbert A. Miller, Stevenson, Wash., in place of R. K. Morley, resigned.
Will K. Munson, Sunnyside, Wash., in place of C. A. Hughes, deceased.
Oscar L. Hanson, Vancouver, Wash., in place of E. N. Blythe, retired.
Thomas Stave, Yakima, Wash., in place of F. B. Wilkins, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Norman H. Lenselink, Clear Lake, Wis., in place of L. C. Holmes, resigned.
Alice J. Molstad, Clearwater Lake, Wis., in place of A. G. Murray, resigned.
Bert E. Thorp, Ephraim, Wis., in place of S. M. Hogenson, retired.
Robert G. Docken, Galesville, Wis., in place of C. E. Anderson, transferred.
James P. Darling, Genot City, Wis., in place of J. M. Keuper, deceased.
Violet V. Polivka, Grand Marsh, Wis., in place of H. E. Hoskins, transferred.
John W. Arnold, Lake Geneva, Wis., in place of M. K. Powers, retired.
George A. Durfmeister, Nashotah, Wis., in place of L. E. Brogle, resigned.
Hubert P. Gehrig, St. Nazianz, Wis., in place of J. W. Schnettler, deceased.
Charles H. Petersen, Salem, Wis., in place of M. E. Raditz, deceased.
Percy L. Norness, Stoughton, Wis., in place of H. F. Schumacher, retired.
Irene C. Riegert, Underhill, Wis., in place of Mabel Janssen, retired.
Herman J. Adler, Waunakee, Wis., in place of John Michels, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK) laid before the House the following communication:

I hereby designate the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Dr. James A. Sawyer, pastor, First Baptist Church, Cocoa, Fla., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our gracious Heavenly Father, we acknowledge with grateful hearts every evidence of Thy bounty and Thy loving kindness to us. We thank Thee for our national heritage, and for the noble deeds and unselfish sacrifices of those who have preserved and kept this glorious heritage which is ours to enjoy today.

We thank Thee for the strength and help that comes to those who seek Thy favor and grace. Illumine their minds with that understanding and insight that makes for clarity of vision and nobility of actions so sorely needed in these tempestuous times.

Nourish our souls, we pray, with that spiritual manna that comes from Thee, that we may be thoroughly furnished unto every good work, in the name of our blessed Lord and Redeemer, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 15) entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes."

FLORIDA ORANGE JUICE: A GOOD GIFT FROM GOOD PEOPLE

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, many Members will regret the necessary discontinuance of a fine service that has contributed to our health and happiness. I refer to the practice of the Florida delegation—Congressmen HERLONG, CAMPBELL, BENNETT, SIKES, LANTAFF, ROGERS, HALEY, and MATTHEWS, and Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS—and the Florida Citrus Commission of providing fresh-frozen orange juice for Members of Congress. This practice, enjoyed by all who have entered into it, extended over a period of some 33 months.

During that time, approximately 500 cases of this delectable beverage have been consumed. Getting down to actual figures, that means 6,000 quarts of concentrate were used, at the rate of 12 quarts to a case. Nor does that tell the whole story. These quart cans of orange-juice concentrate make a gallon each of juice. So, the Members drank some 6,000 gallons of fresh-frozen orange juice, or better than 13 gallons per Member.

The orange is no new fruit.

Paris, legend has it, gave a golden apple, presumably an orange, to Venus as an award in a beauty contest among goddesses.

They were so valued among the ancient Greeks that they were included among the prizes given at the early Olympic games.

Richelieu, renowned French Prime Minister, decided many of the problems of state in his day in the confines of his own private orangery.

Oranges were a delicacy for the nobility in England during the dramatic days of Charles II.

Today, oranges—and orange juice—are a must on the diet of strong Americans.

Medical authorities recommend orange juice. The consumer applauds the recommendation. It is a rarity to have something which is, at the same time, good to the taste and good for you.

I have been told that the mere raising of oranges has a tendency to soften old feuds. Perhaps, there are members of the Florida Citrus Commission by the names of O'Brien, O'Hara, and Kelly who have no objection to being known as "orange" men.

Seriously, the orange is a miracle of nature.

It represents both taste enjoyment and condensed health. It provides, at once, a living for thousands and a better life for millions.

It reflects the genius of our age—to be able to make an orange juice concentrate which saves space, facilitates distribution and makes the juice easier to serve commercially and in the home.

A great German poet once wrote:

Know'st thou the land where the lemon trees bloom,
Where the gold orange glows in the deep thicket's gloom,
Where a wind ever soft from the blue heaven blows,
And the groves are of laurel and myrtle and rose?

I know such a land. That land is Florida.

And the men and women who grow these oranges, the men and women who process them, and the men and women who distribute this product, including many former Oklahomans, who have used their talents are worthy of the boon to mankind which they have helped to bring to you and to me.

I am grateful for what the Florida delegation has done for me and for my fellow Members.

It may have been necessary for them to stop serving their orange juice to Congress.

I can assure them that I, for one, will not stop drinking the prime health product of their great, their productive, their progressive State.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Messrs. BERRY and SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. D'EWART), for the balance of the week.

WHO GETS PROPOSED TAX RELIEF

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey is reported in the Washington Post this morning to have stated that the present tax-revision bill being considered by the Committee on Ways and Means provides $600 million in tax relief for individuals, and others will receive an additional $600 million.

I take issue with the Secretary's statement. The average individual will get tax relief in only rare and exceptional cases, and this relief adds up to only about $250 million, according to the estimates given to the Committee on Ways and Means, in fiscal 1955. On the other hand, businesses, mainly corporations and their owners, will receive about $600 million in tax relief in fiscal 1955. In the case of shareholders of corporations, it is estimated that within 4 years they will be receiving relief at the rate of $1.2 billion a year.

The staffs of the Treasury Department and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation estimate that in the third year of operation of the main tax-relief provisions which the committee has agreed to so far, the loss will run at the rate of $2,914,500,000.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while the citizens of the Ninth Wisconsin District are not directly affected by the provisions of H. R. 3300, I would be remiss in my duty to our entire State if I did not register a voice of protest in opposition to the bill.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to say that anything which seriously affects the lakeshore region of Wisconsin also concerns all of the citizens in Wisconsin.

For this reason, then, I am opposed to H. R. 3300, which calls for an additional withdrawal of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second into the Illinois Waterway.

PLANNED OR UNPLANNED DEFICITS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, we have become somewhat accustomed to have one member of the present administration contradict the position taken by another member, but when the same member contradicts himself on succeeding days, I think it deserves the attention of the House. In testimony before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, as reported in the Washington Post on February 3, the Secretary of the Treasury stated that the President's tax-revision program would result in individual income tax relief of $750 million. However, the Post reports on February 4 that the Secretary stated in a radio program that the tax benefits would add up to only $600 million. This is a change of $150 million in the estimate within 1 day. In the same radio speech the Secretary is reported to have said that the financial accounting of the tax program had just been completed. Are we to conclude that the tax program was prepared and presented to the Congress without any financial accounting?

The administration has repeatedly denounced what it calls the "planned deficits" of previous administrations; apparently they favor as an alternative unplanned deficits together with unplanned tax proposals.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the attention of the press, more especially of the television and radio people, if permitted, but I suppose I cannot make the request—the rules prohibit it—but here is something in which I am sure they will all be interested.

Rules 13 (a) and 13 (b) adopted this morning by the Committee on Government Operations—this is a dandy. There were only two votes against it, and it was not a secret ballot. My colleague from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], as well as the Member from the Fourth District, voted "no." There was no previous agreement between us because we seldom vote alike.

Permit me to read the amendment:

Rule 13 (a): None of the hearings of the regular subcommittees, or any of the special subcommittees which may be appointed, shall be telecast or broadcast, whether directly or through such devices as wire recordings, wire tapes, motion pictures, or other mechanical means, unless approved by unanimous consent of the members of such regular subcommittee or of any special subcommittees. Such consent shall be expressed by secret ballot and the vote on such secret ballot shall not be released to the public, unless the vote is unanimous; provided, that if any member of any regular subcommittee, or any special subcommittee shall be ill or otherwise unavailable for such vote on such secret ballot, his consent shall not be necessary, if at least a quorum of such regular subcommittee or special subcommittee unanimously approves such telecast or broadcast.

Rule 13 (b): None of the hearings of the full committee shall be telecast or broadcast by any of the means set forth in rule 13 (a) unless approved by secret ballot, by a majority of the members of the full committee (not merely a majority of the members present and voting).

That cuts out these little machines, stenotype, where they sit and play on them and come up with a paper tape carrying a record of what happened.

That amendment permits a member of a subcommittee to force a closed hearing at any time on any subject.

What becomes of the constitutional guarantee of a free press and free speech?

Already by this amendment the television and radio people are behind the committee's iron curtain as I have been for some time. The press may be next. Listen for their protests.

REVISION OF TAX LAWS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the statements made about the loss or gain in this overall revision of the tax laws are like Mark Twain's death, they are very greatly exaggerated. The facts of the matter are that the estimate or guess as to the loss with the over-all revision was about $1.3 billion, half to individuals and half to businesses. That was a guess.

We are revising the Internal Revenue Code. We are only a third of the way through. No one can tell at this time what it will mean in toto. So whether it is $600 million for individuals or $750 million for individuals, they are just guesses at this particular time. So what is the use of making such a fuss about nothing?

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to have vacated his special order for Monday next.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. The personal privilege involves certain headlines and news items that appeared in the press concerning my connection with a certain income tax case. Those headlines impugn my motives and reflect upon my character.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have the headlines of the newspaper article on which he bases his question of personal privilege?

Mr. CELLER. I do not have them with me. I have them in my office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I am sure the gentleman will understand it will be necessary first for the Chair to rule whether or not it is a proper matter for recognition as a matter of personal privilege.

Mr. CELLER. I can indicate to the Chair that the headlines were as follows:

Charge CELLER Aided United States Tax Cheat in 1951.

Tax Meddling Laid to CELLER.

Senator WILLIAMS Says Representative CELLER Aided Firm in Tax Matters.

Here is one from the Philadelphia Inquirer:

CELLER Accused in Tax Scandal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the headlines and the newspaper articles and believes the gentleman has stated a question of personal privilege. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House are very strict and properly so with reference to expressions of Members in either branch concerning Members of the other branch. My understanding is that under the rules of the House, one Member cannot make a comment, either favorable or unfavorable, about Members of another body. My parliamentary inquiry is whether or not my understanding of the rules is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands it is the established rule of the House that in the debates on the floor of the House, Members may not refer to proceedings in the other body or to individuals in the other body.

Mr. McCORMACK. And does not the same situation exist in the other body with reference to Members of this body?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair doubts whether he should undertake to pass upon the rules of the other body.

Mr. McCORMACK. But there is a set of parliamentary laws and procedures coming under the head of comity between the two branches; is there not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state, of course, in order that the rule of comity be in force between

the two bodies, it is to be expected that both bodies would have rules of that kind.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in August 1951, I was asked to introduce an attorney, one Lawrence J. Lieberman, to the Department of Justice official in charge of the case for tax violations against one Samuel E. Jackson. I did not know Samuel E. Jackson, in fact, I never heard of him. I have never seen him. He was and is an utter stranger to me even now. I did know Mr. Lieberman, who was associated with my brother-in-law, Hon. Emil N. Baar, who had been appointed Justice of the New York State Supreme Court by the Governor of the State of New York, Governor Dewey. The law firm headed by Judge Baar represented the said Jackson. When Judge Baar ascended the bench and resigned from his law practice, Mr. Lieberman apparently took over. The judge asked me to introduce Mr. Lieberman to one Mr. Turner Smith, who was handling the case for the Department of Justice. The facts in the case as far as I am concerned are simple. I knew nothing about the merits or demerits of the case nor do I know to this day. I visited Mr. Smith by appointment with Mr. Lieberman. I told him I did not know Mr. Jackson, the accused taxpayer; that I was unacquainted with the facts in the case. I simply introduced Lieberman to Smith and added that Lieberman was an attorney in good standing and that his representations might be deemed trustworthy, and that he was substituted for Judge Baar, my brother-in-law.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 8]

Barrett	Elliott	Multer
Battle	Fine	O'Brien, Mich.
Berry	Fino	Philbin
Bow	Graham	Poage
Bramblett	Hillelson	Powell
Brooks, La.	Hyde	Rogers, Mass.
Buckley	Jarman	Rogers, Tex.
Chelf	Jones, Mo.	Saylor
Chudoff	Klein	Short
Cole, N. Y.	Lane	Stringfellow
Colmer	Lyle	Sutton
Coudert	Miller, Nebr.	Taylor
Curtis, Mass.	Mollohan	Tollefson
Dingell	Morgan	Wainwright
Dollinger	Morrison	Welchel
Donohue	Moulder	Yorty

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a speech was made yesterday in another body, which as reported in the press calls in question my motives and impugns my conduct in a certain income-tax case. I repeat in part what I said previously before the point of no quorum was made. It would appear in August 1951 I was asked to introduce an attorney, one Lawrence J. Lieberman, to the Department of Justice official in charge of the case for tax violations against one Samuel E. Jackson. I did not know Jackson. In fact, I never heard of him. I have never seen him. He was and is an utter stranger to me even now. I did know Mr. Lieberman, who was associated with my brother-in-law, Hon. Emil N. Baar, who had been appointed justice of the New York State Supreme Court by Governor Dewey. The law firm headed by Judge Baar represented said Jackson. When Judge Baar ascended the bench and resigned from his law practice, Mr. Lieberman apparently took over. The judge asked me to introduce Mr. Lieberman to Turner Smith, who was handling the case for the Department of Justice.

The facts in the case as far as I am concerned are simple. I know nothing about the merits or demerits of the case, nor do I know to this day. I visited Mr. Smith by appointment with Mr. Lieberman. I told him, Mr. Smith, that I did not know Mr. Jackson, the accused taxpayer; that I was unacquainted with the facts in the case. I simply introduced Mr. Lieberman to Mr. Smith and added that Lieberman was an attorney in good standing, that his representation might be deemed trustworthy; that he was substituted for Judge Baar, my brother-in-law, as Jackson's lawyer. I thus did what many Members of the House and Senate have done and in all likelihood will continue to do, namely: contact an official on behalf of a constituent or friend.

Mr. Lieberman stated that the taxpayer was ill. I had no knowledge of Mr. Jackson's condition. I repeat, I never knew him and still do not know him.

I did not remain throughout the conference. I had another appointment and left during the interview. I never heard about, much less cared about, the case after that, until about a fortnight or so ago I got a letter from Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, that in checking the Jackson case he found my name in the papers, indicating that I had called upon Turner Smith. The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1954.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: In reviewing the tax case of Mr. Edward E. and Mr. Samuel E. Jackson, of Tampa, Fla., and Sidney, Ohio, along with their corporations, a memorandum, dated in 1951 and signed by Mr. Turner Smith, addressed to his superior, Mr. T. Lamar Caudle, who at that time was serving as Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, has been called to my attention.

In this memorandum Mr. Smith explains to Mr. Caudle a visit which you made to his office accompanied by a gentleman whom you introduced as a law partner either of your brother or of your brother-in-law who had been representing the Jackson people. According to Mr. Smith, you explained that this relative had just been appointed judge and that the man whom you were then introducing would be taking his place in the case. In Mr. Smith's memorandum he told Mr. Caudle that you had stated that it was your opinion that the defendant should not be prosecuted for criminal violations due to his health and requested that the case be settled in the civil courts.

In view of the fact that a report on this case is being considered and the memorandum referred to above, or its substance, will appear in that report, I felt that it should be called to your attention prior thereto in order that you could have incorporated in that same report your explanation of the interview.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

I told the Senator over the phone I would write him a letter setting forth the simple facts and asked that he include the same in his record. I wrote the following letter:

JANUARY 26, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I received from Mr. Lawrence J. Lieberman which has reference to the matter contained in your letter to me dated January 12, 1954.

I personally have no interest and have had no interest in the case of Samuel E. Jackson. I introduced Mr. Lieberman to Mr. Turner Smith and recall saying that I felt reliance could be placed on the statements made by Mr. Lieberman, who is personally known to me as a lawyer of good standing. I also recall that I had no interest in and no knowledge whatsoever of the facts involving the case of Samuel E. Jackson.

In other words, I merely introduced Mr. Lieberman to Mr. Smith, and was careful to indicate the aforesaid facts.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

I included a letter which was addressed to me by the same Mr. Lieberman. I shall not read it all now, but shall read the significant part of it, and place the letter in its entirety at the end of this address:

Since time was of the essence, I requested you—

Meaning myself—

to make an immediate appointment for me with whoever might be in charge of this case in the Department of Justice. On August 6, 1951, as I recollect the date, you introduced me to Mr. Turner Smith, whom you advised as to my taking Judge Baar's place in these matters. You also stated to Mr. Smith that it was my position—

Not mine, but Mr. Lieberman's position—

that the defendant, because of the very precarious condition of his health, should not be prosecuted for criminal violations, and that I also wanted to present before the Department a legal argument on the question of the statute of limitations which I confidently believed would demonstrate that there was no urgency in the immediate filing of an indictment, and that, consequently, in all fairness, the report of the Public Health Service should be awaited before further action was taken.

In the light of what occurred in the other body yesterday—a speech was

made which I said before by indirection impugned my motives and called in question my conduct.

I want to say this to fellow Members: My conscience is clear. I am guilty of no immoral, venal, or much less illegal action. I am guilty of no moral turpitude. An innocent act has now by inference been construed into a heinous offense. Headlines have appeared as follows:

TAX MEDDLING LAID TO CELLER.
Senator WILLIAMS Says Representative CELLER Aided Firm in Tax Case.
Charge CELLER Aided United States Tax Cheat in 1951.

It is made to seem as if I am guilty of complicity with others of the wrong of permitting a malefaction to go unwhipped of justice.

I did not act as lawyer in this case in any sense of the word; I acted as Congressman.

I received nothing of value.

I am not thinskinned. I know one must in the game of politics accept darts and slings and stings, but I must take this opportunity to rise in my place by way of personal privilege to express, however, some chagrin at the unfair treatment accorded me in certain quarters, to indicate disquietude at the unjustifiable implications flowing from my conduct.

I assure you all the mean and snide asides stemming from the headlines and some of the news items—while inherent in modern journalism—are, nonetheless, hurtful.

The distinguished gentleman of the other Chamber to whom I have made reference, although I am sure he did not so intend, has made it possible for most injudicious conclusions to be drawn. Unwittingly he made it possible—convenient for some—for me to become the focal point of what that distinguished Senator considers a whole series of cases involving untoward actions of the Internal Revenue Bureau and the Department of Justice, whereas, in truth and in fact I was mentioned in one case. Despite my limited part in the matter—a simple act of introduction appears now to be magnified to a point where I was put within the framework of charges that—

There is no equality of justice meted out to larger and flagrant violators as compared to that meted out to the small fellow.

I did not know what had become of the case against Jackson until I received the letter aforesaid dated January 20, 1954; nor did I care. I had and have no interest in it.

The same gentleman details the names of many attorneys in the matter; some I understand are from New York City and others from Ohio.

Aside from Judge Baar and Mr. Lieberman, I do not know any of them.

I made no pretense of knowing and evaluating the facts in the case before or since August 1951.

I ask you, my colleagues, in the light of what I have told you, to compare these horrendous charges that are inferred from the newspaper items and headlines with what I have just told you, and I leave the judgment in your hands.

I herewith insert in full the letter of aforesaid Lawrence J. Lieberman:

BAAR, BENNETT, & FULLEN,
New York, N. Y., January 20, 1954.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Re Samuel E. Jackson et al.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I have before me a copy of a letter of January 12, 1954, addressed to you by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS with reference to the above matters.

My partner, Emil N. Baar, was appointed a justice of the supreme court of the State of New York in 1951. The Jackson tax matter had been in his charge. I succeeded him in the representation of the clients.

Toward the end of July 1951, through associate counsel, I was advised that an indictment or information might be filed against Samuel H. Jackson within a matter of days to protect the Government against the statute of limitations running on any returns involved, despite the fact that the Department of Justice was awaiting a report from the Public Health Service as to whether an indictment and trial might prove fatal to Samuel E. Jackson. It was my considered judgment that the Department of Justice had incorrectly applied the law and that in fact, if the Department waited until the Public Health Service report was received, not only would the statute not run against any returns that were then involved, but in our opinion, by reason of our knowledge of the client's physical condition, the finding of an indictment prior to consideration of the medical report would result in a miscarriage of justice. Since time was of the essence, I requested you to make an immediate appointment for me with whoever might be in charge of this case in the Department of Justice. On August 6, 1951, as I recollect the date, you introduced me to Mr. Turner Smith, whom you advised as to my taking Judge Baar's place in these matters. You also stated to Mr. Smith that it was my position that the defendant, because of the very precarious condition of his health, should not be prosecuted for criminal violations and that I also wanted to present before the Department a legal argument on the question of the statute of limitations which I confidently believed would demonstrate that there was no urgency in the immediate filing of an indictment, and that consequently, in all fairness, the report of the Public Health Service should be awaited before further action was taken. You will recall at the conclusion of the conference, I was advised by Mr. Smith that if the medical report did not arrive in due time, I would be given an opportunity to present argument on the legal question of the application of the Statute of Limitations.

In order that you may be fully apprised of subsequent developments, I give you the following information:

The Public Health Service report was such that not only was an indictment not filed, but the Department of Justice returned the matter for civil disposition. However, subsequently and for reasons which, particularly in the light of the foregoing, we never understood, Samuel E. Jackson was indicted in both New York and Ohio. Mr. Jackson pleaded guilty in both the New York and Ohio indictments. Under the rules, an application was made to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to have the New York case transferred to Ohio, where Jackson resided, which application was granted. By direction of the judge presiding in the United States District Court in Ohio, the defendant was examined by Government physicians and medical proof was adduced as to his condition. By reason of Jackson's state of health, the court fined him $10,000 on each of three counts and sentenced him to 2 years in prison, which 2-year sentence was suspended.

I trust this gives you all the required information in this matter.

Very truly yours,
LAWRENCE J. LIEBERMAN.

AUTHORIZING HELP TO CONTROL THE LEVEL OF LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3300) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 9]

Barrett	Hyde	Patman
Battle	Jarman	Patten
Berry	Jones, Mo.	Philbin
Blatnik	Kelly, N. Y.	Phillips
Bow	King, Calif.	Poage
Boykin	Klein	Powell
Bramblett	Lane	Rhodes, Ariz.
Buckley	Lyle	Rogers, Mass.
Chelf	McConnell	Rogers, Tex.
Chudoff	Machrowicz	Saylor
Cole, N. Y.	Miller, Nebr.	Short
Colmer	Mollohan	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Morgan	Stringfellow
Dingell	Morrison	Sutton
Dollinger	Moulder	Taylor
Donohue	Multer	Tollefson
Elliott	Norblad	Wainwright
Fine	Oakman	Weichel
Fino	O'Brien, Mich.	Yorty
Graham	O'Brien, N. Y.	Young

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 366 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING HELP TO CONTROL THE LEVEL OF LAKE MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3300, with Mr. MCDONOUGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] had 21 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] had 33 minutes remaining.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of regard for my friends from Chicago but I cannot help but note that all facilities bordering on the Great Lakes are being called upon to help solve Chicago's sewage disposal problem at the hazard of navigation.

Now, I should like to aid my friends in this regard but not at the expense of navigation.

In Milwaukee we have had to meet our sewage disposal problem, too. But we have not interfered with navigation. We have constructed a sewage disposal plant that completely solves this problem without interfering with the rights of anyone.

I am against this measure.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the discussion under the rule I pointed out what I considered to be four very significant objections to the approval of this legislation at this time. Those objections were, first of all, that this diversion, if permitted, would do irreparable damage to the users of the Great Lakes.

Secondly, that we now do have pending a study that was authorized by the Congress, and for which we are making appropriations each year in the subcommittee of which I am a member, of the level of the Great Lakes. Most of you know that the levels of the Great Lakes do fluctuate considerably from year to year, so that high water in one year may be followed by extremely low water in succeeding years.

Thirdly, that this enactment would represent a breach of our commitment to our sister nation of the north, in cooperation with which we are now sponsoring a study by the International Joint Commission. That study has not been completed. We do not yet have the benefit of the information that that study is to bring to us.

And then fourthly, that because of the situation in the courts, where the Supreme Court in 1938 took cognizance of this situation and has maintained jurisdiction of it ever since, it is highly questionable that even if the Supreme Court did take the action we are being requested to take in this measure, whether it would be valid in the eyes of the courts.

Meantime, while that issue would be redecided, great damage could be done that it would be impossible to repair even though the Court did confirm the decision it has already made.

Since the discussion on the rule providing for consideration of this measure, the debate has tended to channel itself along about three lines. First of all, much has been made of the fact that this is a nonpartisan effort. I do not think what we have seen transpire here proves nearly so much that this is a nonpartisan effort as it does the fact that this is completely a local, sectional effort that is being made. I do not think you can attach too much significance to the fact that the Members from the Chicago area of both parties, are in her attempting to divert water from the Great Lakes. In fact, if that is the basis upon which this is to be decided, I can point with equal authority to the fact that the Wisconsin delegation, the Ohio delegation, and several of the other neighboring delegations of both parties are here unanimously in opposition to this effort.

The second channel of the argument has been along the line that this would help navigation. So far that has been purely an allegation and we have not had any evidence submitted of any kind that this would serve to improve navigation on the Illinois waterway and downstream. But there is ample evidence of the fact that this would greatly hamper navigation on the Great Lakes. Until they can come forward with some proof that some benefit can be gained to offset the great loss of navigation on the Great Lakes it seems to me that that allegation completely falls on its face.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Does the gentleman contend the position that the Secretary of the Army has taken on this bill is not entitled to some credence? Does the gentleman propose to substitute the judgment of the commissions that are now actively working, as he has indicated, for that of the Secretary of the Army and of the Corps of Engineers, who have recommended that this bill should pass, and who are in favor of it?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The Corps of Engineers have played quite a game of "footsie" on this proposition. If the gentleman listened to the testimony that was adduced before our committee, and which I furnished to the House the day before yesterday, I think he recognized that they have been very careful about the way they have given any commitment with respect to this measure.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Would the gentleman not commend the Army and the Corps of Engineers for being careful on a project of this kind? Is not that what the gentleman is concerned about?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I hope the House will be equally careful and will await the results of the studies that the Corps of Engineers are now making on the Great Lakes levels and the study now being made by the International Joint Commission on the levels of the lakes.

There has been much psychological impetus given to this measure by the fact that we did have a period of high water on the Great Lakes in 1952 but just as we had high water in 1952, by 1955 or 1956 we may have a corresponding period of low water.

Now, three-quarters of an inch of less water at high water can and will have only an infinitesimal effect on shoreline erosion. On the other hand, such a lowering of the levels, can and will have a very serious effect on navigation on the lakes. The Corps of Engineers submitted a statement to our subcommittee to the effect that an inch of water on the lakes permits vessels to carry up to 100 tons of ore for each inch of available depth. Thus, in the contest between erosion and navigation, this measure offers small relief as an erosion preventative, but presents a very substantial threat to maximum navigation benefits. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, this bill should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think I may answer in some way the cause of the high water in the Great Lakes by stating that the State of Michigan has a normal rainfall of 27 inches annually; however, for 2 years that normal rainfall was increased from 27 to 37 inches, which accounts for 20 inches of the rise in the level of the Great Lakes.

I have in my hand a letter which I received this morning from the Detroit Board of Commerce, which reads as follows:

DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE,
Detroit, Mich., February 3, 1954.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Chairman of the Committee on Public Works, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is in reply to your letter of January 25, regarding H. R. 3300, the Jonas bill, to authorize the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second through the Chicago drainage system. As you know, Detroit interests have historically opposed further diversion of water through the Chicago drainage canal.

While H. R. 3300 proposes a study to be made of the effect, if any, in the improvement of conditions in the Illinois waterway, by reason of the increased diversion resulting from the legislation, no mention is made of the effect on the lake levels. At least, according to the way we read the bill, the study would not consider the effect of the diversion on the shipping channels in the Great Lakes.

We find ourselves urging the deepening of channels in the Great Lakes for shipping, and at the same time, Chicago proposes a diversion of water which would probably have an adverse effect on these same channels.

According to the local press, the Michigan congressional delegation is under some pressure, as our St. Lawrence seaway interest is being balanced against this diversion problem. At least, that is the impression one gains from reading the local newspapers.

There is nothing in H. R. 3300, according to the copy that we have at hand, which would give protection to shipping channels if the increased diversion had an adverse effect. Accordingly, it would seem in the best interests of Detroit and Michigan, that this legislation be opposed, unless safeguards are placed therein.

Very truly yours,
HUGH D. CAMPBELL,
Manager, Transportation Bureau.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like for the gentleman to be prepared later on when the St. Lawrence seaway matter comes before us to explain how you can divert water out of the Great Lakes and at the same time meet the 27-foot level as provided in the St. Lawrence legislation.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to my friend from West Virginia that when that

time comes we will be prepared to meet the gentleman's question.

Mr. BAILEY. I will be waiting with considerable interest.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I think it is important now that we know something about what this St. Lawrence matter will mean to the Great Lakes just as it means to the Illinois River or anything else.

Mr. DONDERO. We are not here debating the St. Lawrence seaway today. We are trying to save the State of Massachusettts, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, always I hesitate to differ with my friends the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH, Mr. BYRNES, and Mr. DAVIS].

I only wish they would take over and operate a little more extensively in the organization of our party and its program on the floor.

So I say it is with apologies to you gentlemen from Wisconsin that I today am unable to go along with you on this bill.

The report of the Engineers from the office at the Michigan Soo on the St. Marys River shows that in a previous year there was a $4-million damage to shore property from the high water in the lakes. There is no question about that, the damage occurred.

Perhaps Michigan Congressmen have been remiss in their duty. When the people from the Southwest, when the people from Missouri, from almost every part of the country, yes, from the Northwest also, came along and wanted something to repay them for losses sustained because of nature's pranks, usually the Michigan Members have gone along with you. You have had appropriations to help distressed areas. That we have done whether it was damage caused by fire, flood, drought, windstorm, or hail. We of Michigan have not come begging and we are not begging now. We are not asking now that you repay some of these losses. We are just asking that you go along and see that we are not damaged further by the unusually high water in the Great Lakes.

Why do we have this high water? There are three reasons. As was stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], all through recent years the water has been up. That is one thing we cannot do anything about.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I merely ask to interrupt the gentleman at this time to point out that in the period since 1938 the water levels, of Lake Erie at least, have gone up 1.65 feet.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Have gone up?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Yes; which is some comparison to the maximum of five-eighths of 1 inch in a 3-year period which this bill might reduce the water level.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As has been said here many times, the seasons change. I recall some 30 to 35 years ago when in Kent County—that is the district represented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]—the cottages rolled down the bank; even when they were built up on the bluff 50 to 100 feet they still rolled down into the lake. We accepted that. We took it. Now we have the same situation back again and we will have still greater damage at times. The reasons for this high water, this excessive rainfall, is one I have given.

Now, the next point made against the bill has to do with the legal argument. Our Wisconsin friends are afraid we will offend Canada; we are going to get into trouble with Canada. Listen. There are two rivers that ordinarily, in the state of nature, put their water into Hudson Bay; flow north. What did the Canadians do? They turned some of that water south and dumped it down into Lake Superior and the other watershed. That is what they did.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Was not that change in the flow of the river done by international agreement beforehand, however, sir?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Undoubtedly. And is there any reason, if you let them dump their water down on us, we should not ask them to quit when by so doing they destroy our property on Lake Michigan and all around Lake Huron? Is there any reason? I see none. If it comes to a season of high water, and we have taken their water during the period when it was low, should they not reciprocate now and turn their own water back up to Hudson Bay where nature sent it? What is good for them in times of low water ought to be good for us when the lake level is high.

Now, I sat in on some of those international hearings. I knew what they were doing, and at two plants they had their gates open and were dumping the waters down into Lake Michigan; water that naturally flows north into Hudson Bay. There is where it went finally. And they said that maybe they would try to find a way to stop it in part, and they did, to a very little extent. We got some relief from that.

Then there is another thing. Of course, there at the locks, at the Soo—and that is under our control—the boys there opened the gates, great big gates, one after another, not all at once, but as fast as they could, and just as soon as one was opened another was ready, and the water came down the St. Marys. I saw it. Oh, it came down so that the business places down below were flooded away up above the desks in the offices.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, now, the gentleman has had a lot more time than I have had.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I just wanted to ask a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman know of any testimony before the committee to the effect that this diversion would result materially to help the high-water situation in the lake?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I do not know about any testimony, but I know this, that if you upset a pail of water you spill it out, and I know if you put a siphon in a pail of water and let it run, there is not much left in the pail, and if you run that water out of Lake Michigan into Chicago it is not going to stay in Lake Michigan, and when there comes a storm or a high wind it will wash the homes down into the lake as it has been doing. That is self-evident right on the face of it.

Here is the last point I want to make to you who oppose it. How many billion—I said billion—how many billion dollars over the years has the Congress voted to develop your harbors, to relieve the distress of your constituents when they suffered from disasters? Practically every bill that ever came in here for appropriations for a harbor, in Wisconsin, in Ohio, in Indiana, in all your lake ports, all the way around the Great Lakes, Congress has voted to give the shipping interests good harbors, improved harbors. How many billions has the Congress given you for relief or harbor improvements? Now, when we come along and ask for relief from this excessively high water, and it costs you not a cent, these harbor boys say, "Oh, no. Nothing doing, we will protect the shipping interests, the lake carriers, the 'good harbor' boys, but not a dime for the individual property owners." Now listen, some of us are not going to continue to vote for these millions for the improvement of these harbors, raising the water in all the harbors, pay flood, drought, fire damages if you will not give us, not dollars, but a little protection from damages caused in part by our Canadian neighbors.

Here along the shoreline is a bank from 50 to 80 feet high; the high water comes along; there is a clay subsoil, the waves hit the shore and the homes slide down into the lake. Maybe there are 5, 6, 7, or 8 rods in a yard in some places, and when the waves hit, the houses slide over down the bank into the lake.

Now, we do not come begging you for dollars. We are not begging now. We are only asking for a temporary lowering of that lake level. If the lake gets low and they want more water in the harbors, all right, shut off the flow down the canal.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to have the eloquence of my colleague from Michigan, nor the wit of the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois. I can only state to you that I find myself in a strange mental position as I have listened to the arguments here today and yesterday and the day before. On the one hand I find a great point made that there has been high water in the Great Lakes, that the water levels of the Great Lakes need control, and with that I am in complete sympathy and agreement. My district, the 11th of Ohio, borders on Lake Erie, and we have areas where the inundation has been terrific.

However, I submit to you that the evidence which has been given would indicate that the maximum correction which would result in the high water in the lakes as the result of this bill would be 1 inch in 3 years. One inch is not going to settle the erosion problem, the high-water problem, which exists in my district, nor to my knowledge anywhere along the lake. What has the House done about the erosion problem? Three years ago it initiated a survey by the Army engineers, who have been engaged since that time in a study of the water levels and their control in the Great Lakes area. We have appropriated money in this House for that project, and it is my hope that we will continue to appropriate enough money until we find a firm solution.

What are we attempting in this bill? We are attempting to add another study on top of that study, and we are attempting by congressional action to siphon water out of the Great Lakes because of the desires and needs of one of the areas that is adjacent to that lake. At the same time we will be faced in this House very soon with the question of whether or not we will approve the St. Lawrence seaway. If that question is approved, there again the question of the level of the waters of the lakes will be involved.

I call to your attention that the level of the harbors in Chicago and Cleveland, in Ashtabula, and in Conneaut, the great ports that handle the sinews of our country, are supposed to be dredged to a mean level of 25 feet. The actual level last September and last October was 24 feet. The draft of the major vessels now on the lakes is 24 feet.

I can speak only of the two harbors in my district, but in both Conneaut and Ashtabula the ships that come in to dock are forced at times to go through the muck and mud of the bottom.

I say that if we permit a constant draft, a regular draft upon the waters of the Great Lakes, with no provision put into the bill for allowance for variation in the water level in a particular year, we can well cause serious disturbance to our economy. I want to remind the House that for every inch you take off the carrying capacity of your boats sitting in the water, you remove 100 tons of ore per trip.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I say to the gentleman it seems to me this is in large measure a local problem, perhaps I should say it is entirely a local or sectional problem. Many of us would want to do the right thing about it, and be open minded about it, but it is a little discouraging to find you Members coming in here thoroughly disagreeing on a vital matter, and anything that can be done to clear up the minds of some of us would be helpful.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I appreciate the coments of the gentlemen. Of course, I cannot agree with him that this is just a local matter inasmuch as it has international repercussions and inasmuch also as there is a very real legal problem involved which I did not make any attempt to discuss.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Does the gentleman take the position that this affects the South and the West and the Far West and the New England States?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I certainly do, sir, inasmuch as it relates to our relations with our neighbor to the north.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The position that some of us take is that certainly there is a controversy here, but as part of the procedure to resolve that controversy, the Congress has established a Study Commission and has authorized the Army engineers and have asked them to make a study of it and come in with a report, and we suggest that this legislation should at least stand by until the report is furnished and thus the Members will have some impartial judgment upon which to base their action. It appears that the gentlemen most vitally concerned are differing among themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, as we are approaching the close of the debate on H. R. 3300, a bill to provide a temporary increase in the diversion of water down the Sanitary District Canal in Chicago, I would like to attempt to answer some of the arguments that have been advanced in opposition to the measure during the course of the debate.

Three different speakers opposing the increased diversion of water referred to the agreement of the 1909 treaty between the United States and Canada, which set up the International Boundary Commission. One of the speakers suggested that we wait for a report of the International Joint Committee. Another speaker said that we would be wrong in diverting additional water because Congress should live up to its treaty obligations, and further went on to say that the Congress should not stand for a unilateral disregard of our treaty obligations. Yet another Member advanced the argument that you cannot withdraw without consent of the International Joint Commission.

A review of the treaty provisions and the various reports of the International Joint Commission will reveal that all of these gentlemen are in error.

Article II of the 1909 treaty referring to diversion, specifically provides "but this provision shall not apply to cases already existing or to cases expressly covered by special agreement between the parties thereto."

The diversion in Chicago then assumed to be 10,000 cubic feet per second was already in existence at the time of the approval of the 1909 treaty and, therefore, exempt from the provisions of said treaty and the jurisdiction of the International Joint Commission created thereby.

The second interim report of the Canadian section of the International Waterways Commission—dated April 25, 1906—leading up to the treaty of 1909, contained the following paragraphs pertaining to diversion at Chicago:

At Chicago, the Americans have built a drainage canal, which, when in full operation, will use about 10,000 cubic feet of water per second.

* * * * *

It is exceedingly important in the interest of navigation, both to ourselves and the people of the United States, that the diversion by way of the Chicago drainage canal should be limited. * * *

* * * * *

If our proposal is carried out the diversions will be about as follows:

Diversions of the American side

	Per second cubic feet
Niagara Falls	18,500
Chicago Drainage Canal	10,000
Total	28,500

Diversions of the Canadian side

	Per second cubic feet
Niagara Falls and on the Niagara Peninsula	36,000

Mr. Chairman, you can see from this report that there is no question but that Chicago was acknowledged to draw up to 10,000 cubic feet of water per second without reference to treaty negotiation.

In the report of the American members of the International Commission regarding the Preservation of Niagara Falls, dated March 19, 1906, the following was contained:

32. (a) The Secretary of War to be authorized to grant permits for the diversion of 28,500 cubic feet per second, and no more, from the waters naturally tributary to Niagara Falls, distributed as follows:

	Cubic feet
Niagara Falls Hydraulic Power & Manufacturing Co	9,500
Niagara Falls Power Co	8,600
Erie Canal or its tenants (in addition to lock service)	400
Chicago Drainage Canal	10,000

32. (b) All other diversion of water which is naturally tributary to Niagara Falls to be prohibited, except such as may be required for domestic use or for the service of locks in navigation canals.

You can again see that the American members of the Commission, as well as the Canadian members, recognized that diversions of lake water at Chicago could take place up to 10,000 cubic feet per second.

From the foregoing reference to the official reports and the recommendations contained therein by the Canadian section and, by the American members in separate reports to their respective Governments, and in the joint reports to both Governments, the amount of diversion ultimately allocated to each of the Governments, under article V of the 1909 treaty, namely: 20,000 cubic feet per second to the United States and 26,000 cubic feet per second to Canada, contemplated recognition and continuation of the then existing diversion at Chicago of 10,000 cubic feet per second.

Otherwise, there could have been no justification or excuse for the difference in diversion allotted to Canada of 36,000 cubic feet per second and to the United States of only 20,000 cubic feet per second. The Canadian and American members both clearly and jointly recog-

nized that the difference was to be accounted for by the allowance of the 10,000 cubic feet per second diversion at Chicago.

It seems to me that the gentlemen who believe this should be referred for action by the International Joint Commission certainly must not be aware of the terms of the treaty.

As we all know, over in the other body of Congress, a big debate has been going on with reference to passing an amendment for the protection of our constitutional guaranties from treatymade law. Secretary of State Elihu Root, at the time of the passing of the 1909 treaty, explained that difference in allocation of water at Niagara Falls of 36,000 cubic feet of water per second for Canada and 20,000 cubic feet per second for the United States was due to the amount reserved for Chicago. Secretary Root also made the point that Lake Michigan was not a boundary water, hence the Congress could authorize whatever diversion it saw fit up to 10,000 feet per second without objection by Canada. Yet, now we have the familiar cry of some people saying that the treaty is supreme and our State Department, in its usually subservient attitude in trying to get along with foreign powers, now is of the opinion that this matter should be decided by the International Boundaries Commission. We are certainly in need of some amendment to clarify the fuzzy thinking of some of the people in the State Department.

By the same token, the gentlemen who are trying to protect the so-called treaty provisions do not say a word about Canada dumping her excess water into the Great Lakes and costing our taxpayers millions of dollars.

In the Corps of Army Engineers report of February 1952 on the variation in Great Lakes' levels, on page 20, they report on diversions from the Hudson Bay watershed into Lake Superior. Canada is diverting from the Long Lake project and the Ogoki project over 5,000 cubic feet of water per second into the Great Lakes Basin, even now during the high lake levels in the Great Lakes. The report on page 20 states:

> These diversions averaging 5,000 cubic feet per second will, when their ultimate effect is attained, raise levels in Lakes Michigan and Huron in the order of 4 inches and Erie and Ontario in the order of 3 inches.

You can see from this report of the Army engineers that the opponents are worried to death about a possible 1-inch lowering of water in the Great Lakes, while they are not the least bit concerned about the Army engineers telling them that the Canadian diversions will raise the lake levels 3 to 4 inches, thus increasing the property damage along all of the Great Lakes.

Quite a few of the gentlemen from Ohio are opposing this diversion, and from their arguments it seems they are afraid a reduction in the water level will decrease the freight carried in their ports. From the above report of the Army engineers, they should be worried about flooding out their cities. According to an article in the Chicago Daily News on June 23, 1952, which paper is controlled by Mr. John Knight, who also controls the Akron Beacon Journal in Akron, Ohio, and should know something about the situation, it is brought out that certain sections of Ohio should not oppose Chicago diversion because of the damage presently being done. The editorial went on to state:

> The high water in Lake Erie has so damaged lakefront property that the board of tax revision in Cuyahoga County, where Cleveland is located, has announced a policy of cutting the valuation on such land by 37½ percent. Some $50 million of valuations will be affected. The board has started putting this policy into effect in rulings affecting Bay Village, a western suburb.

It is my understanding that many other parts of Ohio are very seriously damaged by the high lake levels, and insofar as this request for an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second is only a temporary matter and must come back to Congress at the end of 3 years, I believe that the interests of the property owners must be weighed against the interests of lake shippers.

Another gentleman stated that he had several hundred miles of shoreline along Lake Michigan, and at the same time brought out the fact that a possible lowering of the lake level would reduce the income of lake carriers. According to another Army engineers' report, in the 1-year period from 1951 to 1952, damage to lakeshore property along Lake Michigan amounted to $30,643,000. Again, somebody must decide whether they want the lake carriers to get a little additional income or whether they want the taxpayers to suffer millions of dollars in yearly damage.

Another gentleman referred to the fact that downstate areas might be flooded out. At the hearings on the subject bill, the Army engineers and Chicago Sanitary District officials testified that at all periods of floods or heavy rains the water diversion through the sanitary district locks is shut off so that any floods in downstate Illinois are certainly not caused by water diversion at Chicago.

The Division of Waterways of the State of Illinois has reported many times that the increasing flood stages in the lower Illinois River area are due primarily to construction of levee districts in the lower valley and not to the diversion from Chicago. The flood plain of the Illinois River below Peoria originally covered about 450,000 square miles. Of this, more than 250,000 square miles have been included in levee districts for cultivation. The reduction of the flood plain by more than 50 percent necessarily increases flood stages for a like flood flow. The discharge of the Illinois River at Beardstown has been as high as 115,000 cubic feet per second, and diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second at Chicago could not have any measurable effect on the flood level in Beardstown, or any other locations along the Illinois River. Moreover, as stated before, in times of floods the diversion at Chicago is shut off.

One of the opponents of water diversion made the completely erroneous statement that the city of Chicago is sending filth and sewage down the Illinois River. Nothing could be further from the truth. A Mr. William Patterson, an elected member of the Sanitary District Board of Chicago, showed to the Public Works Committee the effluent which the sanitary district discharges into the river, and this was a clear liquid with no solids in it whatsoever. The Sanitary District of Chicago completely removes all solids before discharging the effluent into the river. So far as I know, no other sewerage plant in the world treats the material as efficiently and to such a high degree of purification as does the Sanitary District of Chicago.

Proof of the efficiency of the sanitary district operations, and cognizant of the old adage that a picture is worth a thousand words, I would like to offer proof positive to refute the arguments advanced about the so-called filth and sewage which is allegedly dumped into the drainage canal after processing by the sanitary district. Also to refute the arguments of the gentleman who said that money would have to be spent to dredge and clean out the river beds, I offer the following:

Last night I received a telegram from Mr. Anthony Olis, president of the Sanitary District of Chicago, addressed to me, which said:

> Under separate cover, by airmail special delivery, we are sending you approximately 1 quart of effluent. This is a sample of the liquid which is discharged from the sewage treatment plants into the drainage canal.

The sample arrived this morning, and you can see from this specimen of the material discharged down the drainage canal, which sample I hold here in this glass jar, that all these arguments are erroneous.

The final arguments brought out against the bill, both in the debate under the rule and in the debate on the bill, were to the effect that, as one gentleman put it, "The Congress is now being asked to overturn a court action."

The Supreme Court in the various lake level cases has always recognized the final authority of Congress in the matter of diversion at Chicago. In the 1925 case of the Sanitary District against the United States, the Supreme Court upheld the Government's contention that the Congress had final exclusive jurisdiction over this diversion and ruled in the absence of action by the Congress the Secretary of War had authority to regulate the diversion of water from Lake Michigan in the interest of navigation.

In a later decision in the Sanitary District against the United States, the Court expressed a similar opinion, recognizing the final power of Congress on diversion.

In January 1929, in the case of Wisconsin et al. against Illinois, Chief Justice Taft, in rendering his decision, held in the absence of any affirmative action by Congress, the Secretary of War had authority to issue a permit only for navigation purposes.

The right of Congress to authorize a diversion at Chicago, in relation to navigation, different from that of 1,500 cubic feet per second finally authorized by the Supreme Court in its decree of April 21, 1930, was clearly recognized by Special Master Hughes, later Chief Justice, in

his report to the Supreme Court on rereference, which was approved by the Supreme Court. He recommended the final diminution of diversion to 1,500 cubic feet per second in the absence of competent action by Congress in relation to navigation imposing a different requirement.

The Supreme Court in its decision ordered the city of Chicago to complete its sewage-disposal facilities and suggested that at that time Congress should pass on the matter. The Sanitary District of Chicago has completed all of the requirements laid down by the Supreme Court edict and its sanitary district plant is treating all of the sewage in accordance with the Supreme Court verdict.

Therefore, it is clear that the Supreme Court has always recognized that the Congress has the final exclusive jurisdiction over this question of diversion.

I personally feel the successful passage of this bill will accomplish many purposes. First of all, it will enable the Congress to pass on the matter as provided for by the Supreme Court; secondly, if the additional diversion is granted, a study for the next 3 years and a report back to the Congress will enable the Members of Congress to come to a more definite conclusion; thirdly, increased diversion will introduce more oxygen into the Illinois watershed, thus increasing the growth of fish life and plant life and will serve to purify further the riverbeds; also, in a small measure, the increased diversion will help to drain off some of the surplus water in the Great Lakes, which high-water condition the Army engineers estimate will last for another 3 to 4 years at least. Then, too, outside of the money requested by the Army engineers, there will be no expense to the Federal Government because the locks and control system for diverting the additional waters are already built and in operation.

I hope the Members of this body will see fit to pass H. R. 3300.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. The gentleman will admit, will he not, that there is still a sewage disposal of 7 percent by the city of Chicago into the Illinois River under existing law?

Mr. SHEEHAN. What does the gentleman mean by "sewage"?

Mr. VELDE. I mean what the ordinary concept of sewage is.

Mr. SHEEHAN. That is the trouble—this is not the ordinary concept of sewage. This is the fluid after everything is taken out.

Mr. VELDE. It is just spreading it a little bit thinner.

Mr. SHEEHAN. No; we have tried to handle it as efficiently as is humanly possible.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to regulate and promote commerce among the several States and foreign nations and to protect, improve, and promote navigation and navigable waters in the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi Valley, and help control the lake level, and to afford protection to property and shores along the Great Lakes, and to provide for a navigable Illinois Waterway, the State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, are hereby authorized to withdraw from Lake Michigan on the Great Lakes, in addition to all domestic pumpage, a total annual average of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second, to flow into the Illinois Waterway heretofore authorized by Congress for a period of 3 years from and after the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That, as soon after the enactment of this act as is possible, the Secretary of the Army shall cause a study to be made of the effect, if any, in the improvement in conditions in the Illinois Waterway by reason of the increased diversion herein authorized, and shall, on or before January 31, 1956, report to the Congress as to the results of said study with his recommendation as to the continuation, increase, or decrease in the amount of increased diversion herein authorized.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, this bill was introduced a year ago this month but was not reached in the last session of the Congress. On page 2, line 13, the date set on which the Army engineers may make their report is January 31, 1956. I offer an amendment, which is on the Clerk's desk, to change "1956" to "1957" in view of the fact that almost 1 year has already expired from the time the bill was filed. I do not think there is any opposition to this amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: Page 2, line 13, strike out "1956" and insert "1957."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 2, line 8, strike out all of line 8 through line 16, inclusive, and insert the following: "*Provided*, That no withdrawals from Lake Michigan over and above 1,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage shall be permitted until the Army Corps of Engineers have completed and submitted to the Congress the comprehensive survey of the water levels on the Great Lakes as authorized by the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works on June 30, 1952."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is obvious. It provides that no additional withdrawals over and above that presently authorized by the Supreme Court decision shall take place until the Army engineers have completed their comprehensive survey of the water levels on the Great Lakes Basin, which survey is expected to be in proper form within the next 12 months at the latest.

This amendment says that we shall not authorize additional withdrawals until we know what the effect might be. The bill as introduced provides that we shall have withdrawals first and, concurrently, the Army engineers will conduct an investigation, and thereafter it shall be determined whether or not the effect of the withdrawal was desirable or undesirable.

It seems to me it is far wiser to complete the survey and know the effects before you do anything that you might later regret. It seems to me that additional withdrawals now, before you know what the effect will be, would be premature. I can visualize some very unsatisfactory conditions from hasty action.

Suppose under the proposed legislation Chicago did get the authority to withdraw 1,000 additional cubic feet per second. As a result of those additional withdrawals, certain public works conceivably will be constructed downstream and also in Chicago. Thereafter the Army engineers as a result of the report proposed in the bill may make a recommendation and say, "No, the effect of the additional withdrawals is undesirable." Then the Army engineers would have to shut off additional withdrawals. At that time you would have considerable hollering and screaming from those people who had assumed they had a vested right in the additional water.

It just appears to me now that the temporary emergency has apparently passed as far as the high water is concerned; that it would be the better part of wisdom to make the study first before you take the action rather than take the action and then find out what your result might be. Two years ago when we had water on Lake Michigan, for example, anywhere from 8 to 12 inches higher than it is at the present time, it was logical as an emergency measure to seek additional diversion, but I think we are on a downward slide in the lake levels. Consequently, that emergency is not as acute today as it was before.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly recommend the adoption of this amendment. It makes sense. It does not harm anybody. It just protects us from doing something now that we may regret in the months ahead.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the significance and impact of this amendment has not been fully understood as we listened to it here hurriedly.

This amendment provides that no withdrawals from Lake Michigan over and above 1,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage shall be permitted until the Army Corps of Engineers have completed and submitted to the Congress the comprehensive survey of the water levels on the Great Lakes as authorized by the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works on June 30, 1952.

This bill, H. R. 3300, does not deal with the overall picture of the Great Lakes water levels as proposed in a resolution that was passed in the House in 1952. This deals with a local problem with an inland waterway.

If we were to combine our efforts with the pending resolution about which the gentleman from Michigan has talked and to which he has called your attention, let me tell you how very involved this question would become and what it would entail in the matter of determining who was in authority and who could accomplish anything.

The resolution the gentleman from Michigan is talking about reads as follows, and I will give you briefly how

the Commission created under this resolution is constituted:

The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(1) Four persons who are officers or employees of the executive branch of the Government; one of the Maritime Administration; one of the Weather Bureau; one of the Corps of Engineers who is not an officer or employee of the Beach Erosion and Shore Protection Board; and one of the Beach Erosion and Shore Protection Board.

(2) One representative of each State which borders on one of the Great Lakes and agrees—

Mark this and mark it well—

and agrees to make a contribution as provided in section 8 (a).

What does section 8 provide. It provides this:

Each State from which a member of the Commission is appointed shall make a contribution into the Treasury of the United States to be applied toward meeting the expenses of the Commission. The amount of each State's contribution shall be fixed by the Commission on the basis of the benefits expected to be derived by the State from the activities of the Commission.

In one instance there is the provision that you go to the Treasury of the United States and dip your hands into the Treasury to keep this Commission alive. On the other hand, you pass the hat to obtain voluntary contributions of the States who will volunteer to enter into this agreement and who will be paid in return according to the benefits the Commission thinks they have derived from this investigation.

It is elementary and clear that these two commissions are so widely separated that there is no coordination of thought or idea or objective or anything else that is relevant to the bill I propose as the one to take care of the inland waterway in the State of Illinois.

May I make this further observation in connection with the amendment that is being proposed here? The Secretary of State wrote a letter, and I can refer to it if you wish that I do so. It is a part of the proceedings here in the RECORD. It bears the signature of a former Member of the House who is now one of a number of Under Secretaries of State. In his report he says that we should ignore the Army engineers and the Department of the Army and we should refer this whole matter to the International Joint Commission.

Now we get into the third phase of this. One is the bill dealing with inland waterways—period. Second is the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, where he tries to take over and we are to wait until he gets through with what they try to accomplish under the resolution he has on file now. Third is the observation of the Under Secretary of State that we should wait on what the International Joint Commission will report with respect to additional diversion of cubic feet of water into the Illinois inland waterway channel. Finally, just one more word. I think you are all aware of the fact, and you can see what inspires this great opposition. Let us not lose track of the influence that has been brought to bear by the Lake Carriers Association.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think the discussion of the problem here today clearly points up the need for a comprehensive understanding of the relationship of the various uses to the whole problem involving the waters of the Great Lakes. It seems to me that the more we try to put a patch upon a patch, the more trouble we run into. I have introduced a resolution which would call for not only a survey of the Great Lakes Basin but the bill has for its purpose the delegation to the International Joint Commission authority and responsibility to establish remedial measures for the control of the waters of the Great Lakes with full regard to navigation and full regard to power and with full regard to the property owners and shore owners all over the Great Lakes Basin. It seems to me the amendment which has been offered is in good taste and is in good order because until and unless we know the full effect of these diversions and these uses, and what effect such changes will have on the interests of all of the Great Lakes, we should move slowly and wisely.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I think the gentleman from Illinois got the wrong impression of my amendment. He indicated that the amendment contemplated enactment of legislation I previously introduced to set up a Great Lakes Water Level Commission. That is not the case. The Army survey to which I referred is the one which states the Army engineers shall conduct a comprehensive survey to review the original survey of 1920. And you may be interested to know what the original survey of 1920 encompassed. It said:

A comprehensive investigation to determine remedial measures necessary to compensate for the effects of the then existing diversions from the Great Lakes and to investigate the preservation of the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and Niagara River.

This Army Corps of Engineers survey which was included in my amendment, has nothing to do with the setting up of a Great Lakes Water Level Commission. It is only an investigation to determine what can be done to handle the outflow and the inflow of water as far as the Great Lakes are concerned.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask the gentleman from Michigan a question?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Is it not the purpose of the amendment which was introduced by the gentleman from Michigan to delay action on the bill H. R. 3300 and to wait further action and report from the commission in which the gentleman was interested, and with reference to the creation of which he introduced a resolution in order to study the legal lake levels; is that right?

Mr. FORD. No; that is not right. That is not the right impression of the intent of the amendment. My amendment says as soon as the Army engineers have completed their survey, they may authorize more diversion up to 2,500 cubic feet per second, if that is sound. This has no relationship whatsoever to the creation of a commission such as was indicated by the bill I introduced pertaining to a broader subject.

Mr. OSTERTAG. If I understand correctly, the gentleman from Michigan did introduce a resolution calling for this survey. However, the House Committee on Public Works of its volition directed this survey. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Works if this is true?

Mr. DONDERO. I think that is substantially correct. However, this survey which we are asking the Army engineers to make was mostly concerned with the lake problem because of the recent high levels of the Great Lakes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The survey mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan is the ordinary kind of survey that comes before our Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions from time to time, and I can testify as to where that money is coming from for that survey. It is not coming from the States.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I just want to reiterate that this situation is strictly one that will continue to plague us from time to time, until and unless we provide the machinery for the control of the waters of the Great Lakes generally. I hope this survey amendment will prevail in order that we may know what we are doing and the effect of such a change in the use of these waters.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Yesterday I spoke in opposition to the bill and reminded you of the fact that I was engaged in the litigation as an assistant attorney general from its beginning until its end. I played a minor part, but I am thoroughly familiar with it. I want to point out that the amendment, which in my opinion does not go far enough, which the gentleman from Michigan has introduced makes good, sound, solid sense for this reason. Both the legal and the practical problems in the court controversy involved not just what should be taken out to satisfy the city of Chicago, to wash away its sewage, but the entire problem of lake levels from one end to the other. We are draining at both ends.

All of the talk that has gone on here was put into the RECORD more or less ad nauseum in the court case. Today, with this amendment before us, it seems to me that we ought to remember that every time we enact a temporary measure, such as one on taxes; it becomes permanent. And, as my brother from Michigan remarked, the moment that this is enacted, and the additional two-thirds is added to that already permitted under the court decree, you have enacted it for all time; because not only will the vested interests scream to high heaven, but there will be political problems raised as to the advisability of doing something that may hurt some of us

his report to the Supreme Court on rereference, which was approved by the Supreme Court. He recommended the final diminution of diversion to 1,500 cubic feet per second in the absence of competent action by Congress in relation to navigation imposing a different requirement.

The Supreme Court in its decision ordered the city of Chicago to complete its sewage-disposal facilities and suggested that at that time Congress should pass on the matter. The Sanitary District of Chicago has completed all of the requirements laid down by the Supreme Court edict and its sanitary district plant is treating all of the sewage in accordance with the Supreme Court verdict.

Therefore, it is clear that the Supreme Court has always recognized that the Congress has the final exclusive jurisdiction over this question of diversion.

I personally feel the successful passage of this bill will accomplish many purposes. First of all, it will enable the Congress to pass on the matter as provided for by the Supreme Court; secondly, if the additional diversion is granted, a study for the next 3 years and a report back to the Congress will enable the Members of Congress to come to a more definite conclusion; thirdly, increased diversion will introduce more oxygen into the Illinois watershed, thus increasing the growth of fish life and plant life and will serve to purify further the riverbeds; also, in a small measure, the increased diversion will help to drain off some of the surplus water in the Great Lakes, which high-water condition the Army engineers estimate will last for another 3 to 4 years at least. Then, too, outside of the money requested by the Army engineers, there will be no expense to the Federal Government because the locks and control system for diverting the additional waters are already built and in operation.

I hope the Members of this body will see fit to pass H. R. 3300.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. The gentleman will admit, will he not, that there is still a sewage disposal of 7 percent by the city of Chicago into the Illinois River under existing law?

Mr. SHEEHAN. What does the gentleman mean by "sewage"?

Mr. VELDE. I mean what the ordinary concept of sewage is.

Mr. SHEEHAN. That is the trouble—this is not the ordinary concept of sewage. This is the fluid after everything is taken out.

Mr. VELDE. It is just spreading it a little bit thinner.

Mr. SHEEHAN. No; we have tried to handle it as efficiently as is humanly possible.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to regulate and promote commerce among the several States and foreign nations and to protect, improve, and promote navigation and navigable waters in the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi Valley, and help control the lake level, and to afford protection to property and shores along the Great Lakes, and to provide for a navigable Illinois Waterway, the State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, are hereby authorized to withdraw from Lake Michigan on the Great Lakes, in addition to all domestic pumpage, a total annual average of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second, to flow into the Illinois Waterway heretofore authorized by Congress for a period of 3 years from and after the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That, as soon after the enactment of this act as is possible, the Secretary of the Army shall cause a study to be made of the effect, if any, in the improvement in conditions in the Illinois Waterway by reason of the increased diversion herein authorized, and shall, on or before January 31, 1956, report to the Congress as to the results of said study with his recommendation as to the continuation, increase, or decrease in the amount of increased diversion herein authorized.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, this bill was introduced a year ago this month but was not reached in the last session of the Congress. On page 2, line 13, the date set on which the Army engineers may make their report is January 31, 1956. I offer an amendment, which is on the Clerk's desk, to change "1956" to "1957" in view of the fact that almost 1 year has already expired from the time the bill was filed. I do not think there is any opposition to this amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: Page 2, line 13, strike out "1956" and insert "1957."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 2, line 8, strike out all of line 8 through line 16, inclusive, and insert the following: "*Provided*, That no withdrawals from Lake Michigan over and above 1,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage shall be permitted until the Army Corps of Engineers have completed and submitted to the Congress the comprehensive survey of the water levels on the Great Lakes as authorized by the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works on June 30, 1952."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is obvious. It provides that no additional withdrawals over and above that presently authorized by the Supreme Court decision shall take place until the Army engineers have completed their comprehensive survey of the water levels on the Great Lakes Basin, which survey is expected to be in proper form within the next 12 months at the latest.

This amendment says that we shall not authorize additional withdrawals until we know what the effect might be. The bill as introduced provides that we shall have withdrawals first and, concurrently, the Army engineers will conduct an investigation, and thereafter it shall be determined whether or not the effect of the withdrawal was desirable or undesirable.

It seems to me it is far wiser to complete the survey and know the effects before you do anything that you might later regret. It seems to me that additional withdrawals now, before you know what the effect will be, would be premature. I can visualize some very unsatisfactory conditions from hasty action.

Suppose under the proposed legislation Chicago did get the authority to withdraw 1,000 additional cubic feet per second. As a result of those additional withdrawals, certain public works conceivably will be constructed downstream and also in Chicago. Thereafter the Army engineers as a result of the report proposed in the bill may make a recommendation and say, "No, the effect of the additional withdrawals is undesirable." Then the Army engineers would have to shut off additional withdrawals. At that time you would have considerable hollering and screaming from those people who had assumed they had a vested right in the additional water.

It just appears to me now that the temporary emergency has apparently passed as far as the high water is concerned; that it would be the better part of wisdom to make the study first before you take the action rather than take the action and then find out what your result might be. Two years ago when we had water on Lake Michigan, for example, anywhere from 8 to 12 inches higher than it is at the present time, it was logical as an emergency measure to seek additional diversion, but I think we are on a downward slide in the lake levels. Consequently, that emergency is not as acute today as it was before.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly recommend the adoption of this amendment. It makes sense. It does not harm anybody. It just protects us from doing something now that we may regret in the months ahead.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the significance and impact of this amendment has not been fully understood as we listened to it here hurriedly.

This amendment provides that no withdrawals from Lake Michigan over and above 1,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage shall be permitted until the Army Corps of Engineers have completed and submitted to the Congress the comprehensive survey of the water levels on the Great Lakes as authorized by the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works on June 30, 1952.

This bill, H. R. 3300, does not deal with the overall picture of the Great Lakes water levels as proposed in a resolution that was passed in the House in 1952. This deals with a local problem with an inland waterway.

If we were to combine our efforts with the pending resolution about which the gentleman from Michigan has talked and to which he has called your attention, let me tell you how very involved this question would become and what it would entail in the matter of determining who was in authority and who could accomplish anything.

The resolution the gentleman from Michigan is talking about reads as follows, and I will give you briefly how

the Commission created under this resolution is constituted:

The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(1) Four persons who are officers or employees of the executive branch of the Government; one of the Maritime Administration; one of the Weather Bureau; one of the Corps of Engineers who is not an officer or employee of the Beach Erosion and Shore Protection Board; and one of the Beach Erosion and Shore Protection Board.

(2) One representative of each State which borders on one of the Great Lakes and agrees—

Mark this and mark it well—

and agrees to make a contribution as provided in section 8 (a).

What does section 8 provide. It provides this:

Each State from which a member of the Commission is appointed shall make a contribution into the Treasury of the United States to be applied toward meeting the expenses of the Commission. The amount of each State's contribution shall be fixed by the Commission on the basis of the benefits expected to be derived by the State from the activities of the Commission.

In one instance there is the provision that you go to the Treasury of the United States and dip your hands into the Treasury to keep this Commission alive. On the other hand, you pass the hat to obtain voluntary contributions of the States who will volunteer to enter into this agreement and who will be paid in return according to the benefits the Commission thinks they have derived from this investigation.

It is elementary and clear that these two commissions are so widely separated that there is no coordination of thought or idea or objective or anything else that is relevant to the bill I propose as the one to take care of the inland waterway in the State of Illinois.

May I make this further observation in connection with the amendment that is being proposed here? The Secretary of State wrote a letter, and I can refer to it if you wish that I do so. It is a part of the proceedings here in the RECORD. It bears the signature of a former Member of the House who is now one of a number of Under Secretaries of State. In his report he says that we should ignore the Army engineers and the Department of the Army and we should refer this whole matter to the International Joint Commission.

Now we get into the third phase of this. One is the bill dealing with inland waterways—period. Second is the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, where he tries to take over and we are to wait until he gets through with what they try to accomplish under the resolution he has on file now. Third is the observation of the Under Secretary of State that we should wait on what the International Joint Commission will report with respect to additional diversion of cubic feet of water into the Illinois inland waterway channel. Finally, just one more word. I think you are all aware of the fact, and you can see what inspires this great opposition. Let us not lose track of the influence that has been brought to bear by the Lake Carriers Association.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think the discussion of the problem here today clearly points up the need for a comprehensive understanding of the relationship of the various uses to the whole problem involving the waters of the Great Lakes. It seems to me that the more we try to put a patch upon a patch, the more trouble we run into. I have introduced a resolution which would call for not only a survey of the Great Lakes Basin but the bill has for its purpose the delegation to the International Joint Commission authority and responsibility to establish remedial measures for the control of the waters of the Great Lakes with full regard to navigation and full regard to power and with full regard to the property owners and shore owners all over the Great Lakes Basin. It seems to me the amendment which has been offered is in good taste and is in good order because until and unless we know the full effect of these diversions and these uses, and what effect such changes will have on the interests of all of the Great Lakes, we should move slowly and wisely.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I think the gentleman from Illinois got the wrong impression of my amendment. He indicated that the amendment contemplated enactment of legislation I previously introduced to set up a Great Lakes Water Level Commission. That is not the case. The Army survey to which I referred is the one which states the Army engineers shall conduct a comprehensive survey to review the original survey of 1920. And you may be interested to know what the original survey of 1920 encompassed. It said:

A comprehensive investigation to determine remedial measures necessary to compensate for the effects of the then existing diversions from the Great Lakes and to investigate the preservation of the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and Niagara River.

This Army Corps of Engineers survey which was included in my amendment, has nothing to do with the setting up of a Great Lakes Water Level Commission. It is only an investigation to determine what can be done to handle the outflow and the inflow of water as far as the Great Lakes are concerned.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask the gentleman from Michigan a question?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Is it not the purpose of the amendment which was introduced by the gentleman from Michigan to delay action on the bill H. R. 3300 and to wait further action and report from the commission in which the gentleman was interested, and with reference to the creation of which he introduced a resolution in order to study the legal lake levels; is that right?

Mr. FORD. No; that is not right. That is not the right impression of the intent of the amendment. My amendment says as soon as the Army engineers have completed their survey, they may authorize more diversion up to 2,500 cubic feet per second, if that is sound. This has no relationship whatsoever to the creation of a commission such as was indicated by the bill I introduced pertaining to a broader subject.

Mr. OSTERTAG. If I understand correctly, the gentleman from Michigan did introduce a resolution calling for this survey. However, the House Committee on Public Works of its volition directed this survey. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Works if this is true?

Mr. DONDERO. I think that is substantially correct. However, this survey which we are asking the Army engineers to make was mostly concerned with the lake problem because of the recent high levels of the Great Lakes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The survey mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan is the ordinary kind of survey that comes before our Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions from time to time, and I can testify as to where that money is coming from for that survey. It is not coming from the States.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I just want to reiterate that this situation is strictly one that will continue to plague us from time to time, until and unless we provide the machinery for the control of the waters of the Great Lakes generally. I hope this survey amendment will prevail in order that we may know what we are doing and the effect of such a change in the use of these waters.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Yesterday I spoke in opposition to the bill and reminded you of the fact that I was engaged in the litigation as an assistant attorney general from its beginning until its end. I played a minor part, but I am thoroughly familiar with it. I want to point out that the amendment, which in my opinion does not go far enough, which the gentleman from Michigan has introduced makes good, sound, solid sense for this reason. Both the legal and the practical problems in the court controversy involved not just what should be taken out to satisfy the city of Chicago, to wash away its sewage, but the entire problem of lake levels from one end to the other. We are draining at both ends.

All of the talk that has gone on here was put into the RECORD more or less ad nauseum in the court case. Today, with this amendment before us, it seems to me that we ought to remember that every time we enact a temporary measure, such as one on taxes; it becomes permanent. And, as my brother from Michigan remarked, the moment that this is enacted, and the additional two-thirds is added to that already permitted under the court decree, you have enacted it for all time; because not only will the vested interests scream to high heaven, but there will be political problems raised as to the advisability of doing something that may hurt some of us

in some of the districts, and so on, and so on, and so on.

So in voting upon this amendment I trust that everybody will bear in mind that actually all we are suggesting is that we do not take a disastrous step that cannot be retrieved, both politically and practically. We may find ourselves, as the court case developed, at a point of extremely low water level when the 3 years are over, or we may not. Only nature can answer that question. But so far as the practical politics of the situation are concerned, you have placed yourselves in a position from which, you must admit, there is no escape. Once you have decided upon this diversion it is ended. It makes sense to me to look before you leap. We are proposing to jump off the precipice and trust that somebody will have a net spread below us.

I can close only by repeating what I started with saying yesterday, and that is this: All this was considered at such great length, so many times, and resulted in such a firm decision, that it seems to me foolish for us to be suggesting for 1 minute that we reverse a Supreme Court decision merely because one of the great cities of the land wants to escape, in my humble opinion, the expenditure of additional money for additional sewage-disposal plants. To me that is what it all comes down to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman think that we can reverse a decision of the Supreme Court?

Mr. CLARDY. No. What you will be stumbling into is a constitutional impasse that will make our actions look ridiculous before we are through.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Does not the gentleman take into consideration the fact that when the Secretary of the Army and the Corps of Engineers testified and gave their reasons for supporting this bill, they must have had at least some legal advice as to the constitutionality of this question, or the question that the gentleman raises, that something might occur in the future that might interfere with what is proposed in this act if it were passed, because it was illegal? It is to be presumed that they would not subscribe to an important measure of this character unless they were at least reasonably satisfied that it had some legal basis.

Mr. CLARDY. I wish I could agree with the gentleman but I am pushed to the opposite conclusion because I have seen too many foolish pronouncements from each of those directions.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Does not that go both ways?

Mr. CLARDY. Probably so; but I think we had more competent witnesses and more evidence in the court case, by far.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHEEHAN. The gentleman said that this would be enacted for all time. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will see that this is only for a 3-year study.

Mr. CLARDY. I said practically and politically, once you grant this, there is no way of backing out. The gentleman's district unquestionably will be one of those so vitally affected that he would not dare to take any other position.

Mr. SHEEHAN. It automatically goes back to 1,500 feet.

Mr. CLARDY. And then we will have another request made to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY] has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, it is now half past two, or very nearly that. I understand we have four or five more amendments at the desk. There is a desire that we complete this bill this afternoon; and it is my understanding that the House may even adjourn over until Monday. In view of that I trust that debate on these amendments will be limited somewhat in order that we can complete the bill this afternoon.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If this amendment is adopted does not that end the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is such a good lawyer that he can answer his own question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I suspect that is what it does.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I object.

WATER DIVERSION AT CHICAGO SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] would have answered the legal question that is involved in this legislation. As I recall—and I may stand corrected—he was talking about decisions as far back as 1911. It is my contention that more recent decisions—1950—control this situation. The earlier decisions have been overruled by the later ones.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In just a moment. I will yield after I complete my remarks.

Wisconsin is definitely opposed to this bill. In recent decisions, as late as 1950, the Supreme Court of the United States fixed the amount of water that can be diverted. I refer to the hearings on page 105 and quote the Attorney General of the State of Wisconsin. He said:

> It is for this principal reason that the State of Wisconsin, along with the other Lake States, was compelled to initiate action in the Supreme Court of the United States, which after long and costly litigation resulted in the decree of April 21, 1930, which ordered the Sanitary District of Chicago to reduce its diversion to the present level of 1,500 cubic feet per second, plus domestic pumpage, which makes a total of 3,200 cubic feet per second (278 U. S. 367 (1929), 281 U. S. 179 (1930)).

We say that the Supreme Court has retained jurisdiction and it still retains jurisdiction. Now I want some proponent of this bill to tell this committee how we can overcome that decision, by any action that might be taken here today.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman if he wants to speak on that question.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I understand the Supreme Court decision of 1930 contained two provisions: No. 1, that the water diversion be reduced to 1,000 cubic feet per second; No. 2, that the Sanitary District of Chicago complete all of their sewage facilities and then implied that they should return to Congress for further relief if needed.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Then we have the decision in 1950 which states that 1,500 feet shall be the limit. How can you overcome that? The gentleman does not answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are you attempting to tell us that if conditions change the Supreme Court cannot change that level?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am telling you that the only relief you can get is by a petition to the Supreme Court of the United States, yes; you cannot get it by legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think I will have difficulty in absorbing that statement.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. You will have difficulty in absorbing a lot of things.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They have sent it back to Congress and it is before us now.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. But the court has not sent the matter back to us. The Sanitary District of Chicago is seeking relief.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to my distinguished friend from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. May I say this to the gentleman from Wisconsin: The

gentleman takes the position that the doors are closed and that the Supreme Court has actually and unequivocally settled the matter. If the position taken by the gentlemen from Wisconsin and Michigan is correct that the petition here is illegal, then why debate it?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman knows that the doors of the court are open at any time by petition, because the court has retained jurisdiction. If you can make a case upon petition no doubt there will be relief, but you cannot do it this way.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Who says you cannot do it this way?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Illinois should not be making the effort at this time to put Wisconsin and the neighboring States to the expense of going into court and protecting the rights they now have. That is what they are trying to do here.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman said a moment ago I had difficulty in absorbing a lot of things. Is that due to the fact I have followed the gentleman for so many years?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; it is because of the water in the drainage canal.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We want more water in the canal. I thought it was due to the sewage in the canal.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is not the argument I have been making. I am dealing with the legal question. The question is whether the Congress has the right at this time to pass the pending legislation in the face of that Supreme Court decision rendered in 1950. I say that we have no jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, I want to quote a paragraph from some testimony given by Mr. Gilbert R. Johnson, counsel, Lake Carriers' Association. Of course, the question of freight carrying is a very vital matter, a very vital issue, in this whole situation.

Mr. Gilbert Johnson states on page 112 of the hearings:

> There is much that has been said over the years on the legal issue raised by any proposal that the Congress authorize a greater abstraction of the waters of the Great Lakes into the Mississippi River system than is permitted by the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States. It seems to me, however, that the issues are narrowed to two: (1) Whether or not the Congress has any right to authorize the diversion of the waters of the Great Lakes to another watershed; and (2) whether or not any additional diversion is permitted by the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.
>
> It will be recalled that the decree of the Supreme Court was entered in the ancient controversy between the State of Illinois, acting through its creature, the Chicago Sanitary District, and the seven other States bordering on the Great Lakes. That controversy was settled by the court, exercising its equity jurisdiction conferred by the Constitution of the United States (*Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (278 U. S. 367)). The decree was entered only after exhaustive consideration of the evidence and of the rights and conveniences of the States and the people of the Great Lakes area, and a determination of the amount of water which, under all the evidence and the law, may be abstracted from Lake Michigan by the State of Illinois. While the decree was originally entered on April 21, 1930, the decree has been reconsidered on several occasions on the application of the State of Illinois. Even though the Congress had the power to destroy or modify the decree of the court, the Congress would be acting rashly and arbitrarily by taking action and it is unthinkable that the Congress would, under our constitutional system of the separation of powers, invade the field of the judiciary and nullify its work.
>
> It is not, however, within the power of Congress to make such disposition as it wills of the waters of Lake Michigan. These waters belong to the people of all of the Great Lakes States (*Wisconsin* v. *Illinois*, supra). The United States has no proprietary interest in them (*Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. (U. S.) 212); *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. (U. S.) 367)). The use of those waters belongs to the people and may be rightfully claimed by them for purposes of navigation and commerce (*Barclay* v. *Howell* (6 Pet. (U. S.) 498, 511)). In the regulation of commerce it is the obligation and responsibility of the United States to preserve those waters to all our people for purposes of navigation and commerce upon the Great Lakes (*Sanitary District* v. *U. S.* (266 U. S. 405); *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois*, supra). Ruling in 1913 on an application of the sanitary district for an increase in the amount of water permitted to be diverted, the late Henry L. Stimson, then Secretary of War, held that he had no authority under the River and Harbor Act of 1899 to permit any diversion from Lake Michigan for the purpose of flushing sewage down the Illinois Waterway. In *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois*, supra, the Supreme Court held that the Federal Government was without power to authorize any diversion for uses outside the Great Lakes and that the power of the Federal Government was limited to the maintenance and preservation of the waters of the Great Lakes for purposes of navigation and commerce on those waters by the people of the Great Lakes States.
>
> The abstraction of water proposed by these measures is not a regulation of commerce and navigation on the Great Lakes. The lowering of the water levels is designed to provide enjoyment of those waters to persons outside the Great Lakes and to give relief along the Great Lakes to owners of property not used directly in commerce or navigation. The increase in the flow from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway would bear no relationship to the regulation of such commerce. The real fact is that all of these measures would interfere with and be harmful to Great Lakes commerce and navigation and deprive the people of the Great Lakes States of the use and enjoyment of those waters in their natural state. The Congress may not, and should not, set in motion any action which would impair the advantages in commerce and navigation in the use of the waters of the Great Lakes in their natural state.
>
> The United States is obligated under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 to preserve the waters of the Great Lakes for uses of commerce and navigation. By that treaty the United States and Canada agreed with each other that the waters should be so preserved and that there would be no greater diversions than those then authorized except those necessary in the ordinary use of the waters by riparian owners, by either country unless the other agreed. In *Sanitary District* v. *United States*, supra, the Supreme Court held that the United States was under a duty by that treaty to prevent the State of Illinois from abstracting more water than was permitted by the treaty. If the Congress should enact any of these measures, it would violate a solemn treaty obligation and offend the people of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is finally passed, it will mean that the State of Wisconsin will undoubtedly seek relief in the courts again. I urge that the bill be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, following my statement of a few minutes ago, I am advised there are three remaining amendments pending on the desk. In order that we might finish consideration of this bill today, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto be concluded by 3 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto be concluded by 3 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, all I want to say is that adoption of the pending amendment will, as the gentleman from Michigan pointed out, very effectively kill the bill and there will be no more to do here today. Secondly, I would like to point out one statement. Some are worried about a study of the Army engineers. The Army engineers are the ones who recommended that the flow be increased from 1,500 to 2,500 feet. So why do we need any further study?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. If debate on all amendments to the bill is to close at 3 o'clock, how is the balance of the time to be divided on the other amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. It depends entirely on the amount of time spent on this amendment pending before the House at the present time.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. If debate on this amendment continues until 3 o'clock, will that preclude debate on the other amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. By vote of the House; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What becomes of my recognition by the gentleman from Illinois made awhile ago? He said he yielded to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois yielded to the gentleman, and then yielded back the balance of his time.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yielded back the balance of my time, and then reconsidered, and yielded to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is not of vital importance, but I just wanted to know where I stood.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. I have heard various gentlemen from Wisconsin outline their opposition to this bill and their support of the Ford amendment. Their support of the Ford amendment is based upon the damage that the bill would do to those who represent districts bordering on Lake Michigan in the State of Wisconsin. I have not heard anyone speak for those who represent districts bordering on the Illinois River, which is the area so adversely affected by this bill. About 85 miles of the Illinois River runs through my congressional district. That makes 172 miles of shoreline owned by riparian owners. At the present time I have no way of knowing nor do I have any way of telling my constituents the amount of damage this bill will do, and we will not have any way of explaining to our constituents the amount of damage it will do until we get a formal report from the Secretary of the Army and the Corps of Engineers. Now this river has been running ever since God created it. The lake has been there and it has been changing levels constantly. The Illinois River has ample roller dam projects whereby the level of the river can be controlled at the present time without any help from you fine Members from Chicago. I believe therefore that this bill must be defeated. I believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], should pass.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close.

Mrs. CHURCH. I was on my feet seeking recognition, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. So was I.

Mr. DONDERO. There are three other amendments on the Clerk's desk, and in order to give those Members some opportunity to be heard, certain debate on this amendment should be terminated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was not the time limit for debate set at 3 o'clock?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; on the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. And all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is it in order now to make a motion on a specific amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is in order.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan) there were—ayes 58, noes 56.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FORD and Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 73, noes 67.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VELDE: On page 2, line 4, after "total", strike out "annual average" and insert "never to exceed at any time a maximum flow."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 3 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, the way this bill reads at the present time a total annual average of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second could be diverted from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Canal and thence into the Illinois River. At the same time there is no limit upon the amount of water at any one time that can be diverted. The sanitary drainage district could divert 10,000 cubic feet per second of sewage and water, if they so desired. This causes a situation further down the river that is similar to what we know as flash floods. The amendment, which I have introduced, prevents that from happening. My amendment would limit the amount of water that could be diverted at any one time to 2,500 cubic feet per second, thus tending to thwart plans that the sanitary drainage district might have to cause us flash floods downstate and thus cause a hardship on the riparian landowners and all those good citizens who live along the Illinois River and its tributaries We along the Illinois River have a system to control the level of the river both for navigation and for other purposes. It is the roller dam system. The amount of diversion from Lake Michigan allowed by this bill could cause serious difficulty with the operation of the roller dam system. I believe this amendment is a good amendment. Not only will it regulate the level, or help to regulate the level of Lake Michigan by not taking too much water out at any time, but it will regulate the level of the Illinois River without any chance of so-called flash floods. I asked the gentleman from Illinois yesterday just what the purpose of this bill really was. It says first of all that it is a bill to regulate the level of Lake Michigan and then to regulate also the level of the Illinois River. I believe this is a subterfuge for the purpose of dumping more sewage from the city of Chicago down the Illinois River on the rest of us riparian landowners along the river.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VELDE) there were—ayes 26, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois: On page 2, line 16, strike out the period and insert "*Provided further*, That the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago shall not withdraw any water from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois Waterway during any period in which the Secretary of the Army determines that there is danger of floods along the course of such waterway."

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is germane, and the reason I think so is that it deals with the very thing that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] said a while ago it did not pertain to, namely, diversion.

The Illinois River from the Lockport Dam flows southwesterly 275 miles. Probably the greatest part of its length flows through the 20th Illinois District. The Illinois River has a fall of 1 inch to the mile. It flows through the flat part of Illinois. We do not want any more water in that area. We want less. Not only that but we have our homes to protect.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not germane to the pending bill. I started to make that observation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McDONOUGH). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair has read the amendment. It pertains to the purpose and intention of the bill, and the Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the towns of Peoria, Marseilles, Pekin, Havana, Beardstown, Pearl, Meredosia, Grafton, and numerous towns bordering the Illinois River lie flat against the river bank. There is very little, if any, protection from flood control. The gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] a little while ago said that homes built on Lake Michigan were being washed into the lake. Lake Michigan does not flow southwest. Its natural flow is northeast and into the St. Lawrence River. They are making the water flow uphill instead of downhill in this instance.

My only request is that when the Illinois River is at flood stage, the Army Chief of Engineers, through the Secretary of War, has the right and authority to say whether or not any increased diversion shall come from that stream toward the homes in our cities along the Illinois River.

My amendment is to try to protect cities and homes bordering the Illinois from additional water when the river is at flood stage. More diversion would do just that.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. CROSSER. Does not the Secretary of State recommend against the passage of this bill?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Thruston Morton for the Secretary of State does.

Mr. CROSSER. Well, he is the Acting Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON] has expired.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call your attention to the language that is in the amendment and is as follows:

> The State of Illinois and the sanitary district of Chicago shall not withdraw any water from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois waterway during any period in which the Secretary of the Army determines that there is danger of flood along the course of said waterway.

Obviously any time the Secretary of the Army did not enjoy a good night's sleep and concluded that there would be real or apparent danger of floods in the State of Illinois along in areas embracing the inland waterways, he could shut off not only the additional flow of water that we are asking for now, but also the 1,500 cubic feet per second that is now permitted pursuant to a decision of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. It is not of so much importance to me as to whether the Secretary of War has a good night's sleep down here in Washington as it is whether the people who live along the banks of the Illinois River can have a good night's sleep in time of flood danger.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. That is very true; nevertheless you have to be consistent. You offer an amendment to do away with what we are permitted to do according to law. The Supreme Court has ruled, and it has been emphasized here time and time again, that the Court has established a precedent and fixed 1,500 cubic feet per second as the absolute limit of water to be drained out of Lake Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the action of the Secretary of War under his amendment might also result in sewage being stacked along the river banks along the course of this river.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. It is not a matter of raw sewage being dumped in the river. We saw a specimen of the effluent exhibited here, which to hear them talk, you would think was so pure they wanted us to drink it.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I cannot overemphasize the importance of voting against this amendment. If you place the power in the hands of the Secretary of the Army here to shut off all the flow water, that could result in the creation of a pestilence or disease, the spreading of, or what is worse, cause a severe epidemic. I am sure you do not want that to come to pass.

Mr. Chairman, if I have any time remaining I yield it back.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the Committee divided and there were—ayes 30, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind you that everyone of us has to stand for reelection next November to the House of Representatives. During the past year, I have heard a great many Members brag about the platform they ran on 2 years ago, saying they ran on a platform for pure drinking water and against sin. I am sure the Members of this body do not want to go back to their constituents and admit they have not kept their campaign promises. When we get back into the House, a separate vote will be asked on the Ford amendment. I trust you will all stand up and vote against the Ford amendment, and for the bill as it was originally introduced by the committee.

I want to take this opportunity to concur in what has been said by the proponents of this bill, H. R. 3300. To say anything more along that line would be repetitious. I trust the Ford amendment will be voted down on the rollcall.

This is a rare opportunity to tell your constituents that, when you had a chance, you rose to the occasion and proved yourself a statesman by voting for pure water.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCDONOUGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3300) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, pursuant to House Resolution 426, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 2, line 8, strike out all of line 8 through line 16, inclusive, and insert the following: "*Provided*, That no withdrawals from Lake Michigan over and above 1,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage shall be permitted until the Army Corps of Engineers have completed and submitted to the Congress the comprehensive survey of the water levels on the Great Lakes as authorized by the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works on June 30, 1952."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 202, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—177

Alexander	Gamble	Meader
Allen, Calif.	Gathings	Merrill
Andersen, H. Carl	Gavin	Merrow
	Gentry	Miller, Md.
Andresen, August H.	George	Miller, N. Y.
	Golden	Mumma
Arends	Goodwin	Nelson
Auchincloss	Grant	Norblad
Ayres	Gross	Norrell
Barden	Gubser	Oakman
Bates	Gwinn	O'Hara, Minn.
Becker	Hagen, Minn.	O'Konski
Bender	Hale	Osmers
Bentley	Haley	Ostertag
Bentsen	Hand	Pelly
Betts	Harris	Pillion
Bishop	Harrison, Nebr.	Prouty
Bolton, Frances P.	Harrison, Wyo.	Radwan
	Harvey	Ray
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hays, Ohio	Reams
	Heselton	Rees, Kans.
Bonin	Hess	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bosch	Hiestand	Riehlman
Bray	Hillelson	Robsion, Ky.
Brooks, La.	Hillings	Rogers, Fla.
Brooks, Tex.	Holt	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Hope	Schenck
Brownson	Horan	Scherer
Broyhill	Hosmer	Scott
Budge	Hruska	Scrivner
Burdick	Hunter	Secrest
Burleson	Ikard	Seely-Brown
Bush	Jackson	Shuford
Byrnes, Wis.	James	Simpson, Ill.
Canfield	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Cederberg	Jensen	Small
Chatham	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Kans.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Wis.	Smith, Va.
Clardy	Jonas, N. C.	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Jones, N. C.	Taber
Cole, Mo.	Judd	Talle
Coon	Kean	Teague
Corbett	Kearns	Thomas
Cotton	Keating	Utt
Cretella	Kersten, Wis.	Van Pelt
Crosser	Kilburn	Van Zandt
Curtis, Mass.	Kilday	Velde
Dague	King, Pa.	Vorys
Davis, Ga.	Laird	Westland
Davis, Wis.	Lantaff	Wharton
Derounian	Latham	Widnall
Devereux	Lipscomb	Wigglesworth
Dondero	Lovre	Williams, N. Y.
Dorn, N. Y.	Lucas	Wilson, Calif.
Dowdy	McConnell	Wilson, Tex.
Ellsworth	McCulloch	Withrow
Feighan	McGregor	Young
Fenton	McIntire	Younger
Ford	Mack, Wash.	Zablocki
Frelinghuysen	Mailliard	
Fulton	Mason	

NAYS—202

Abbitt	Celler	Fountain
Abernethy	Chenoweth	Frazier
Adair	Church	Friedel
Addonizio	Condon	Garmatz
Albert	Cooley	Gary
Allen, Ill.	Cooper	Gordon
Andrews	Crumpacker	Granahan
Angell	Cunningham	Gregory
Ashmore	Curtis, Mo.	Hagen, Calif.
Aspinall	Curtis, Nebr.	Halleck
Bailey	Davis, Tenn.	Harden
Barrett	Dawson, Ill.	Hardy
Beamer	Dawson, Utah	Harrison, Va.
Belcher	Deane	Hart
Bennett, Fla.	Delaney	Hébert
Bennett, Mich.	Dempsey	Heller
Blatnik	D'Ewart	Herlong
Boggs	Dies	Hill
Boland	Dodd	Hinshaw
Boiling	Dolliver	Hoeven
Bonner	Donovan	Hoffman, Ill.
Bowler	Dorn, S. C.	Hoffman, Mich.
Boykin	Doyle	Holifield
Brown, Ga.	Durham	Holmes
Buchanan	Eberharter	Holtzman
Busbey	Edmondson	Howell
Byrd	Engle	Javits
Byrne, Pa.	Evins	Jonas, Ill.
Camp	Fallon	Jones, Ala.
Campbell	Fernandez	Karsten, Mo.
Cannon	Fisher	Kee
Carlyle	Fogarty	Kelley, Pa.
Carnahan	Forand	Keogh
Carrigg	Forrester	King, Calif.

Kirwan	O'Neill	Sieminski
Kluczynski	Passman	Sikes
Knox	Patman	Smith, Miss.
Landrum	Patterson	Spence
Lanham	Perkins	Springer
LeCompte	Pfost	Staggers
Lesinski	Pilcher	Stauffer
Long	Poff	Steed
McCarthy	Polk	Sullivan
McCormack	Preston	Thompson, La.
McDonough	Price	Thompson, Mich.
McMillan	Priest	Thompson, Tex.
McVey	Rabaut	Thornberry
Machrowicz	Rains	Trimble
Mack, Ill.	Rayburn	Tuck
Madden	Reed, Ill.	Vinson
Magnuson	Regan	Vursell
Mahon	Rhodes, Pa.	Walter
Marshall	Richards	Wampler
Martin, Iowa	Riley	Watts
Matthews	Rivers	Wheeler
Metcalf	Roberts	Whitten
Miller, Calif.	Robeson, Va.	Wickersham
Miller, Kans.	Rodino	Wier
Mills	Rogers, Colo.	Williams, Miss.
Mollohan	Rooney	Williams, N. J.
Morano	Roosevelt	Willis
Moulder	Sadlak	Wilson, Ind.
Murray	Scudder	Winstead
Natcher	Selden	Wolcott
Nicholson	Shafer	Wolverton
O'Brien, Ill.	Sheehan	Yates
O'Brien, N. Y.	Shelley	
O'Hara, Ill.	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—55

Baker	Hays, Ark.	Phillips
Battle	Hyde	Poage
Berry	Jarman	Powell
Bow	Jones, Mo.	Reece, Tenn.
Bramblett	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Mass.
Chelf	Klein	Rogers, Tex.
Chudoff	Krueger	Saylor
Cole, N. Y.	Lane	Short
Colmer	Lyle	Stringfellow
Coudert	Miller, Nebr.	Sutton
Dingell	Morgan	Taylor
Dollinger	Morrison	Tollefson
Donohue	Moss	Wainwright
Elliott	Multer	Warburton
Fine	Neal	Weichel
Fino	O'Brien, Mich.	Yorty
Graham	Patten	
Green	Philbin	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of Nebraska for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Neal against.

Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Fine against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Graham for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Hyde for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Elliott against.

Mr. Green for, with Mr. Yorty against.

Mr. Chudoff for, with Mr. Hays of Arkansas against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts with Mr. O'Brien of Michigan.

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Baker with Mr. Donohue.

Mr. Krueger with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Phillips with Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Weichel with Mr. Rogers of Texas.

Mr. Tollefson with Mr. Sutton.

Mr. Stringfellow with Mr. Jarman.

Mr. Bramblett with Mr. Battle.

Mr. Fino with Mr. Chelf.

Mr. Wainwright with Mr. Lyle.

Mr. Warburton with Mr. Moss.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BONNER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, during the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule I offered an amendment to change the year 1956 to 1957 and explained why. Would it be in order at this time in view of the action of the House just now to offer the amendment again?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can ask unanimous consent to have the date corrected, and if there is no objection it will be done.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on page 2, line 13, the figure "1956" be stricken out and the figure "1957" inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Michigan, chairman of the committee, just voted for an amendment which looked to me as though it would cripple this bill, I do not know whether I want to be helpful to him or not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not object.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ZABLOCKI moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 3300, to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 150, nays 234, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—150

Alexander	Bosch	Devereux
Allen, Calif.	Bray	D'Ewart
Andersen, H. Carl	Brooks, La.	Dorn, N. Y.
	Brown, Ohio	Dowdy
Andresen, August H.	Broyhill	Feighan
	Budge	Fenton
Auchincloss	Burleson	Ford
Ayres	Bush	Frelinghuysen
Barden	Byrnes, Wis.	Fulton
Bates	Chatham	Gamble
Becker	Chiperfield	Gathings
Bender	Clardy	Gavin
Bentley	Cole, Mo.	Gentry
Bentsen	Corbett	George
Betts	Cotton	Golden
Bishop	Crosser	Goodwin
Bolton, Frances P.	Curtis, Mass.	Grant
	Dague	Gross
Bolton, Oliver P.	Davis, Ga.	Gubser
	Davis, Wis.	Hale
Bonin	Derounian	Haley
Hand	McConnell	Scott
Harrison, Wyo.	McCulloch	Scrivner
Heselton	McDonough	Secrest
Hess	McGregor	Seely-Brown
Hiestand	McIntire	Shuford
Hillelson	Mailliard	Simpson, Ill.
Hillings	Mason	Simpson, Pa.
Holt	Merrill	Smith, Kans.
Hope	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Hosmer	Miller, Md.	Smith, Wis.
Hruska	Miller, N. Y.	Taber
Hunter	Nelson	Teague
Jackson	Norblad	Tollefson
James	Norrell	Utt
Jenkins	O'Konski	Van Pelt
Johnson, Calif.	Osmers	Van Zandt
Johnson, Wis.	Ostertag	Velde
Jonas, N. C.	Pelly	Vorys
Jones, N. C.	Phillips	Westland
Judd	Pillion	Wharton
Kean	Prouty	Widnall
Kearns	Radwan	Wigglesworth
Keating	Ray	Williams, N. Y.
Kersten, Wis.	Reams	Wilson, Calif.
Kilburn	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Tex.
Kilday	Rees, Kans.	Withrow
King, Pa.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Young
Laird	Richlman	Younger
Lipscomb	St. George	Zablocki
Lovre	Schenck	
Lucas	Scherer	

NAYS—234

Abbitt	Fisher	Miller, Kans.
Abernethy	Fogarty	Mills
Adair	Forand	Mollohan
Addonizio	Forrester	Morano
Albert	Fountain	Moss
Allen, Ill.	Frazier	Moulder
Andrews	Friedel	Mumma
Angell	Garmatz	Murray
Arends	Gary	Natcher
Ashmore	Gordon	Nicholson
Aspinall	Granahan	Oakman
Bailey	Gregory	O'Brien, Ill.
Barrett	Gwinn	O'Brien, N. Y.
Beamer	Hagen, Calif.	O'Hara, Ill.
Belcher	Hagen, Minn.	O'Hara, Minn.
Bennett, Fla.	Halleck	O'Neill
Bennett, Mich.	Harden	Passman
Blatnik	Hardy	Patman
Boggs	Harris	Patterson
Boland	Harrison, Nebr.	Perkins
Bolling	Harrison, Va.	Pfost
Bonner	Hart	Pilcher
Bowler	Harvey	Poff
Boykin	Hays, Ark.	Polk
Brooks, Tex.	Hays, Ohio	Preston
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Price
Brownson	Heller	Priest
Buchanan	Heriong	Rabaut
Burdick	Hill	Rains
Busbey	Hinshaw	Rayburn
Byrd	Hoeven	Reed, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Hoffman, Ill.	Regan
Camp	Hoffman, Mich.	Rhodes, Pa.
Campbell	Holifield	Richards
Canfield	Holmes	Riley
Cannon	Holtzman	Rivers
Carlyle	Howell	Roberts
Carnahan	Ikard	Robeson, Va.
Carrigg	Javits	Robsion, Ky.
Cederberg	Jensen	Rodino
Celler	Jonas, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.
Chenoweth	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Church	Karsten, Mo.	Rooney
Clevenger	Kearney	Roosevelt
Condon	Kee	Sadlak
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Scudder
Coon	Keogh	Selden
Cooper	King, Calif.	Shafer
Cretella	Kirwan	Sheehan
Crumpacker	Kluczynski	Shelley
Cunningham	Knox	Sheppard
Curtis, Mo.	Landrum	Sieminski
Curtis, Nebr.	Lanham	Sikes
Davis, Tenn.	Lantaff	Small
Dawson, Ill.	Latham	Smith, Miss.
Dawson, Utah	LeCompte	Spence
Deane	Lesinski	Springer
Delaney	Long	Staggers
Dempsey	McCarthy	Stauffer
Dies	McCormack	Steed
Dodd	McMillan	Sullivan
Dolliver	McVey	Talle
Dondero	Machrowicz	Thomas
Donovan	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Dorn, S. C.	Mack, Wash.	Thompson, Mich.
Doyle	Madden	Thompson, Tex.
Durham	Magnuson	Thornberry
Eberharter	Mahon	Trimble
Edmondson	Marshall	Tuck
Ellsworth	Martin, Iowa	Vinson
Engle	Matthews	Vursell
Evins	Mender	Walter
Fallon	Merrow	Wampler
Fernandez	Metcalf	

Watts	Williams, Miss.	Wolcott
Wheeler	Williams, N. J.	Wolverton
Whitten	Willis	Yates
Wickersham	Wilson, Ind.	
Wier	Winstead	

NOT VOTING—50

Baker	Graham	Patten
Battle	Green	Philbin
Berry	Horan	Poage
Bow	Hyde	Powell
Bramblett	Jarman	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Mass.
Chelf	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Tex.
Chudoff	Klein	Saylor
Cole, N. Y.	Krueger	Short
Colmer	Lane	Stringfellow
Coudert	Lyle	Sutton
Dingell	Miller, Nebr.	Taylor
Dollinger	Morgan	Wainwright
Donohue	Morrison	Warburton
Elliott	Multer	Weichel
Fine	Neal	Yorty
Fino	O'Brien, Mich.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of Nebraska for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Neal against.
Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Dollinger against.
Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Fine against.
Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Graham for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Multer against.
Mr. Hyde for, with Mr. Morrison against.
Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Elliott against.
Mr. Green for, with Mr. Yorty against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Baker with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Krueger with Mr. Lane.
Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Short with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Fino with Mr. Jones of Missouri.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Bramblett with Mr. Sutton.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Warburton with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Wainwright with Mr. Morgan.

Mr. ANDREWS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a joint statement on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] and myself, a joint statement in reference to the so-called Randall Commission, a statement of dissent; also I ask unanimous consent that this be done notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $382.50; and I also ask unanimous consent that this be made a part of the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that it appears in the full report of the Randall Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I will not, many Members are very much interested in what the program, if any, will be for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, there are no rules out of the Rules Committee that we propose to call up. There are, however, two matters that are in conference, one having to do with additional money for the Commodity Credit Corporation and the other having to do with legislative employees' retirement and other associated matters. If those are brought in we will try to dispose of them on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman have any hope that a conference report is going to be brought in on additional money for the Commodity Credit Corporation? I do not seem to be able to find out from this side.

Mr. HALLECK. I have made some inquiry over here. I cannot assure the House it will come in. Of course, it is a matter of considerable urgency and should be disposed of as soon as possible. I am hopeful that a conference report will be brought in and that action by the House can be had not later than Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE LATE CHESTER B. McMULLEN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. For the purpose of this discussion I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the late Chester McMullen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in order to perform a sad duty. It is with great regret that I announce to the membership of the House the death of a former colleague, the Honorable Chester B. McMullen, who died at his home in Clearwater, Fla., on November 3, 1953. He served in the 82d Congress as representative from the 1st Florida District. It seems but a few short days ago at the close of the 82d Congress that I took the floor to express my sincere regret that Chester had announced his decision to retire from Congress. With many other Members of the House I expressed appreciation for the splendid manner in which he had discharged his duties. We realize now that he probably knew that time was not long for him and nobly made his decision to step aside.

Now we pause to pay honor to his memory. Chester McMullen was rare among men. His courage and his determination to stand up for his Christian convictions was an inspiration to all who knew and worked with him. His influence was strong among us because instinctively we realized that his opinions were based on quiet, sound reasoning. He was not swayed by bigotry or influenced by prejudice. His death has left an empty place. In Florida, in Washington, wherever he was known he had friends who deeply mourn his passing. I find it hard to realize that we will not see his smile again or hear his cheery good morning or benefit from his wisdom until that better day somewhere in the great beyond. Truly the State of Florida and the Nation have sustained a loss. To his family my earnest sympathies are extended. Theirs is the greatest loss of all.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment period of the Congress, my district in the State of Florida and the Nation lost a great American. November 3, 1953, marked the untimely death of my good friend and predecessor, Chester Bartow McMullen, of Clearwater. During the time Chester McMullen served in the Congress, he came to be recognized for his strong character, great ability, and unswerving allegiance to whatever he considered right and just.

It was my pleasure to know Chester for over a quarter of a century. He was a member of a pioneer family in the greater Tampa Bay area—a truly pioneer Florida family endowed with great American tradition, which patterned his whole career. Chester entered public life in 1927, when he was appointed county prosecuting attorney. In 1930 he was elected as State attorney of the Sixth Judiciary District of Florida, where he set an enviable record for law enforcement and justice. In 1950 he resigned this seat when he was elected to this House. I shall always remember Chester for his winning smile, his kind and gentle manner, his great courage and generosity.

I recall very vividly the prayer of Dr. H. W. Blackburn, pastor of the First Methodist Church of Clearwater, when at the graveside he uttered these words:

We thank Thee for the life of Chester McMullen; for his warm and natural friendliness. We are grateful for the fact that he improved his native gifts by devoted and unselfish service.

We are grateful for his humility, his democratic spirit, his fine common touch, his appreciation of the high and low, the rich and poor; his eagerness to be of service to any claimant upon his time and energy.

We thank Thee for his personal and professional integrity; for bringing to his high office a fine quality of professional skill and a moral courage. We thank Thee for his basic honesty and his frankness in dealing with the duties assigned to him. We recognize our debt to him for his faithful and distinguished service to our county, State, and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of this fine and outstanding citizen, Chester McMullen. He only served a short time, but as I do with all new Members, I defer judgment on men until they have had a chance to demonstrate what they are and what they can do. I do not think that in all my long years of service here have I met a man who, during his first term, impressed me more than Mr. McMullen. He was a gentle type of man; he was a fair man; he was just, and he possessed many of the elements that I admire most in men. I regret his passing, and to his family, his loved ones, and his friends, I extend my deepest and sincerest sympathy.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, many years ago I had the pleasure of meeting Chester B. McMullen. From our very first meeting I saw that this man was no ordinary person, but a Christian friend, a kindly, gentle person; a man of integrity, high ideals, commonsense, and great ability.

He leaves to his family and friends a splendid heritage, one that will remain green in their memory for all time.

A long time ago I reached the conclusion that when I came to the end of what we call the journey of life I will look back over the years and to the things I cherish most. One of those things will be the warm personal friendships that I have been privileged to enjoy along this journey of life. That was the kind of friend I had in Chester McMullen. That friendship emanated from a warm heart, an able and keen mind, and a charitable soul.

I did not serve in Congress with Chester McMullen, but he served part of the constituents of my district. I am trying to do my utmost to serve these people with that same high integrity and honesty which he exemplified while a Member of Congress.

For some 20 years prior to his coming to Congress he served continuously as the State attorney in Pinellas County, Fla. From the time he was first elected to that office until he was prevailed upon to come to Congress he never once had opposition. By this simple fact you can see that the people who knew him held him in the highest esteem. I find it difficult to express my thoughts because of the nobility of his character and the profound impression he made on me through his simplicity.

He diligently served his fellow citizens with a zealous effort, hoping that in some way he could leave this country a better place in which free Americans could live their lives under the greatest government of all time.

Chester McMullen was from a family of pioneer Floridians. His father, who was affectionately known as Uncle Eli, moved to Pinellas County, Fla., by oxcart before the War Between the States. Uncle Eli raised eight children, all of whom are extremely well thought of in our State. The name of McMullen is one that is almost revered in our fair State of Florida. Chester McMullen further endeared that family name in our State by his many worthwhile deeds.

There are two groups of people in particular, in this great Nation of ours, who lost a great friend and patriot with the passing of Chester McMullen. While he never lived to be an old man, his record clearly shows that the well-being of the aged was a primary concern of his continually. His gentle and kindly Christian spirit never allowed him to be hoodwinked into an unrealistic approach to the problems of those eligible for old-age assistance. The record clearly shows that some of the problems he tried to help solve are still confronting us today. But nevertheless, many of you here today who served in Congress with him gained a better insight into these problems, because of his interest in them.

The first bill Chester McMullen introduced on the floor of the House of Representatives was one to benefit veterans of the Korean conflict. Though this bill never became law, it paved the way for other legislation that eventually gave proper recognition to the veterans of this conflict.

We of Florida are particularly proud of the legislation Chester McMullen saw through to completion. With the Stephen Foster Memorial now in existence in our great State, he was instrumental in having the date of this great American composer's death declared a national holiday.

One of his favorite hobbies was fishing. I suspect that his great love for that noble sport stems from the fact that it not only gives a man time to relax and enjoy the warm sunshine, but it also affords him time to collect his thoughts, return to nature, and commune with God.

Theodore Roosevelt declared:

There are many qualities which we need alike in private citizen and in public men, but three above all; courage, honesty, and commonsense.

Courage, honesty, and commonsense were the qualities that most marked the life, the character, and the services of Chester McMullen. He brought honor and distinction on the State of Florida, his family, and his friends.

I liked him, respected him; and admired him very much. He had a quality which I admire most in a public servant. He was friendly. He instinctively made friends with those with whom he became acquainted, regardless of whether they agreed with him on political or other matters.

In arriving at conclusions, he was very conscientious. He was not a political opportunist, nor did he run with the herd, just because it was the popular thing to do. He made up his own mind on the issues before him. When his mind was made up it was on the basis of facts and the good that issue would do. When his mind was made up, he had the courage to see that issue through to completion. He did not seem to have any prejudices. He simply looked at the issue, not from the standpoint of himself, but from the standpoint of the average citizen, the people who he represented. Very few men whom I have known have had greater integrity, greater character, and greater determination to serve the public interest than Chester McMullen.

Tomes of reasoned wrong, glozed on by ignorance.

In these words the poet Shelley expressed his contempt for the law. By ignorance Shelley did not mean mere ignorance of law: he meant rather too much knowledge of law, and ignorance of everything else. Chester McMullen knew the law well, and was a defender of the law for a long period. He helped write part of the laws of this Nation. He was the kind of man that was not all knowledge of law, but he had knowledge of many other things. He was eloquent in the expression of his thoughts; he thought logically, judicially, and temperately. It has been said that few men have the wisdom to prefer criticism over praise. Chester McMullen had the ability to offer constructive criticism in such a way that the unwise man thought it was praise, while the wise man knew the sincerity with which it was given.

It is quite true that he was a noble soul, filled with the milk of human kindness.

According to some of our learned scholars, the two highest aims of life are the formation of character and the development of personality. In the formation of Chester McMullen's character he learned fair play, charity, honor, industry, fidelity, trustworthiness, firmness, and a sense of justice. His character was borne of the spirit that dwelt in him and his personality was the vehicle through which that spirit was manifested. His personality radiated all the flowers of his good nature. His noble and dependable character was anchored in the fear and love of God.

By having known Chester McMullen for a long period of time I can say that my life has been enriched. I offer my sincere and heartfelt sympathies to his widow and family. Let us be comforted in this interlude of life until we can meet again in that eternal land of Thine.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1952, when many of the Members of the 82d Congress were paying tribute and publicly testifying as to the high esteem in which we held Hon. Chester B. McMullen, of Florida, because he found it necessary to give up his work in Congress and to return to his career as a private citizen in Florida, none of us at that time visualized that we would, in such a short time, be paying tribute to his memory. He departed this life at Clearwater, Fla., on November 3, 1953.

Now, of course, we know that when Chester decided that he must retire after having served only one term in the Congress, he was a sick man. I have never heard more beautiful tributes paid a man than those paid Chester on June 24, 1952. His record during the 82d Congress would be a badge of honor and distinction for any Member. He was loved by all who knew him—we admired his sterling qualities. His virtues were many and his leadership was constructive.

Chester was a graduate of the University of Florida and had a long and distinguished career as an outstanding lawyer, plus his experience over many years as a prosecuting attorney. He possessed an analytical mind and had the happy faculty of weighing both sides of every issue.

Chester was especially loyal to his friends and devoted to his wife, Veda, and his children. He possessed a noble soul that was filled with the milk of human kindness.

While we in Congress had lost him as a Member, the State of Florida and the Nation could ill afford the loss of this man. To have known him was enrichment. To have memory of him is sturdy equipment.

To his beloved wife and family our expressions of sympathy are the deeper as we measure knowingly the incalculable loss they endure.

Chester B. McMullen was a devout Christian, a great American, and a noble citizen.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my voice to those of our colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of our late, beloved former colleague, Chester McMullen. He was a great man—a great American, and we shall all miss him.

I could take a great deal of time in extoliing the virtues of our former colleague, but as Chester was a man of few words I shall only speak briefly this afternoon. He served with us only one term, yet in that short time few Members of Congress have so endeared themselves to their colleagues, or made such a deep impression on them by reason of his sincerity, fairness, friendliness, and all-around ability as did Chester McMullen. Two very able and distinguished men now represent the district formerly represented by Chester. I am sure that the record of service that he made while he was among us will be an inspiration to each of them. Our deepest sympathy goes to his bereaved family in their and Florida's great loss.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, Florida lost one of its most loved citizens with the passing of Chester McMullen. His death came as a great shock to all of us who served with him in the House, and had learned to admire and respect his integrity, his devotion to duty, his tireless efforts in behalf of good government, and his warm, friendly manner. Chester McMullen was recognized by the people of my State as an outstanding and brilliant lawyer and as a distinguished, able State's attorney. Chester McMullen was a warm-hearted, generous man who was quick to respond with a helping hand whenever a friend was in need.

Although he was a mild-mannered, soft-spoken Christian gentleman, he was dynamic, aggressive, and forceful in espousing a cause in which he believed, or in helping to advance the best interests of Florida or the country.

We in Florida have lost a great friend, and all of us are deeply grieved over his death. To his beloved wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, no words I can select could adequately express my high regard for the fine life of Chester McMullen. He was a treasured friend of mine and I respected not only his able mind, but also his splendid character. Despite his great successes in public life, I will alway remember him mostly for his unexcelled qualities as a good husband, father, and friend. His humility in all things gave proof of his greatness. I am proud and happy that we were friends. I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. McMullen, who was such a devoted and loving wife, and to his entire, fine family.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the Florida delegation in expressing to the dear ones of Chester McMullen my heartfelt sympathy on his passing. Just a few months ago when I was elected to Congress, my friends in my hometown of Gainesville, Fla., invited the Florida delegation to attend a little sendoff party honoring me, and even though Chester McMullen had not offered for reelection, so sincere was his desire to help that he came that day and brought with him the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FRANK BOW]. I had the opportunity of talking to Chester that day about service in the Congress. That incident illustrates to me the unselfish spirit of service that belonged to Chester McMullen.

There are two fragments of poems that come to my mind as we think of death. One is in that beautiful Elegy by Gray that I am sure all of us recall:

The boast of heraldry, the pomp of pow'r,
And all that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave,
Await alike the inevitable hour:
The paths of glory lead but to the grave.

Chester McMullen was not a man to whom the spirit of that poem might be applied. There was about him none of the boasting, none of the pomp, and no display of power, I am inclined to think of Chester in terms of the injunction in that other poem about death:

So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan which moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Such a man was Chester McMullen.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, on November 3, 1953, a great Floridian and an unusually outstanding American laid down the working tools of life and crossed over the river in the shade of the trees.

I will always treasure the privilege I have had to know and become firm friends with brilliant men in all sections of our country. Among that distinguished group, Chester B. McMullen had no peer and he won and earned an outstanding place in my memories and my heart.

Perhaps I knew Chester as intimately as any Member of Congress, other than his own Florida delegation. It was natural that we would meet at once as we came to Congress together. Chester came from Pinellas County, Fla., the county that gave to me my precious wife. Had she not come to Georgia with me, he would have been her Congressman, as he was the Congressman of her mother, father and family. My wife's brother attended the University of Florida with Chester, where Chester won the confidence and admiration of my brother-in-law, and my brother-in-law assured me years ago that Chester was a real American, whom it would be good for me to know. Further, our lives had paralleled each other's in a way, for I had been prosecuting attorney in Georgia in the same courts and for about the same length of time Chester held those offices in Florida.

Chester's forebears were Georgians, leaving Brooks County, Ga., many years ago and settling in the little village of Largo, when Florida, to the person interested only in the present, saw Florida only as swamp, sand, and mosquitoes.

McMullen is a name to conjure with in Florida. It was not acquired, it was earned. It is the type family that made America and the kind that must save America. With profound respect for that honored name, no one by that name served his State or Nation better or was greater loved. Modest and unassuming as great men are, Chester made a record for service that will endure through the ages. He was trained to work and believed in and found happiness in work. Years ago, his law firm composed of his distinguished brother, who adorned the circuit court as judge, and Cyril Pogue and Chester, established themselves as the leading law firm of the west coast. I had the privilege of visiting Chester in his law office, and I will always appreciate the privilege I had to see the genuine affection the members of that firm had for each other. Above all, I thrilled over the fact that I never saw a man or woman in Pinellas County who did not say Chester was incorruptible and did not consider him a friend.

No man came to the 82d Congress and left that had more friends than Chester, or was more admired for his devotion to duty, his straight thinking, and his ability. I doubt that any man will make a better record in one term.

His devotion to his family was inspiring. He loved them with all his heart and they returned it in full measure.

Though a young man when he passed on, he filled all the pages in his book of life with honor and fidelity. Florida's heart swells with pride at the mention of his name.

Mr. Speaker, on the wall of my office hangs a photograph of Chester, which he gave me, inscribed—"To a true friend and real American," and signed "Chester B. McMullen." That tribute to me was undeserved, but I know of no one that I would rather have had that tribute from. I will always keep it as a reminder of the life and the statesman who loved his State, Nation, family and his friends with a love that surpasseth human understanding.

As long as this country can produce men like Chester this country will endure.

To his dear and honored family, I extend my deepest sympathy and friendship, with assurance to them that heaven is a little brighter now because Chester is there.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues and pay my tribute to the splendid life and worthwhile deeds of our late colleague, Chester B. McMullen.

Upon taking his oath as a Member of this Body, he was assigned to the committee of which I was and still am a member. From his first meeting of attendance upon such committee, I came to know him as a gentleman of industry, companionability, capability, and integrity. During my years in Congress, I have known no Member more conscientious in his service or more desirous of finding the right answer for difficult problems. During his first year as a Member of Congress, it was my privilege to be a member of a special committee, chairmanned by him, having as its purpose the study of native possessory rights in Alaska. One of my life's finest experiences of fellowship was on that trip. Mr. McMullen was most conscientious in the discharge of his responsibility and as leader of that journey to our northernmost shores, was exceedingly fair in the way he handled the committee hearings. Such industry and fairness was exemplified by him in all the relations I had with him.

I have never known a more pleasing and noble personality. I was most sorry when he announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection. Only the announcement of his passing advised more fully of one of the reasons of his voluntary retirement. I know that his final decision was made in light of what he thought was to the best interest of the people whom he had the honor to represent. What a difficult decision he had to make. And how nobly he made it. His life was full of many instances of such nobility of character and evidences of unselfish devotion to the interests of his fellowmen. His contribution was one of kindliness and goodness. The world sorely needs more men like Chester B. McMullen.

I take this opportunity to again express my continuing sympathy to Mrs. McMullen and the other surviving members of his family.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the country and the State of Florida have lost a good man. He was a man of the people and labored for them unceasingly. I first came to know Chet through the interest of my mother and dad who, in retirement, reside in Chet's congressional district. The entire Sieminski family feel a loss in the passing of a dear friend. To Mrs. McMullen and family go our sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of my good friend Chester McMullen. He was a Christian gentleman, a devoted husband, father, and grandfather.

His service here was short, being a Member of this House for 2 years. He elected to return to his beloved Florida. On talking to him about his intended retirement, he told me his desire was to continue his law practice rather than ask for another term of service here.

Chester McMullen possessed a ready smile which was genuine. He was personable and pleasing in manner. He never met anyone he did not like. He met no one who did not like him. It was a distinct privilege to have known him and serve with him. My life is richer for this experience.

I offer my condolence to his widow and family.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Chester B. McMullen. He served on the same committee of which I am a member, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He also acted as chairman of a special subcommittee which made a study of land tenure in Alaska. I came to know Mr. McMullen as a member of that committee and I had the highest regard for his industry, his integrity, his willingness to work and cooperate with the committee in trying to work out good legislation that would solve the problems before us.

He made a special contribution in his chairmanship of that committee which had to do with land tenure in Alaska. The information that we gathered under him as chairman and the background of information which we developed is now being used to go forward in solving a most difficult problem in Alaska.

I join my colleagues in expressing regret over his passing. His country, the State of Florida, and the Congress of the United States have lost a true and good citizen. I express my very deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

TO GO OR NOT TO GO, THAT IS THE QUESTION—"WHY MORE CONGRESSMEN GO ABROAD"

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, to a certain extent, the dollars collected from taxpayers are trust funds to be appropriated by Congress for necessary purposes only. Especially is this true when we have a national debt of approximately $275 billion on which we are paying an annual unescapable interest charge of around $7 billion—a grievous tax burden—and are faced with the necessity of balancing the budget.

With that thought in mind, as chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, charged with checking on expenditures by the executive departments and agencies, it occurred to me that our committee might well set an example for the Departments we so often criticized.

So, on June 29, I wrote Mr. CHARLES B. BROWNSON, chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee; Mr. GEORGE H. BENDER, chairman of the Public Accounts Subcommittee; Mr. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee; and Mrs. CECIL M. HARDEN, chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee; and, after calling their attention to the situation, wrote:

> Will you kindly begin to curtail the activities of your subcommittee, by confining your investigations to 1 complaint, advising me of its nature, and cut your staff so that beginning August 1 (that was the approximate date of the sine die congressional adjournment) it will consist of no more than 1 investigator and 1 clerk or stenographer.

A subcommittee had, during 1951, made a 42-day trip around the world in a Government plane and at Government expense. That subcommittee made a worthwhile report which should have enabled the executive departments to make substantial savings in connection with some billions spent abroad and limit the advisability of other foreign excursions.

It was my thought that, the economic situation being what it was, our committee members might well forego, or at least limit, trips not only abroad but in the Western Hemisphere. There are, including the chairman, seven members on each subcommittee. They evidently did not agree with my recommendations, and, on July 15, slapped me down, by resolution declared they would do as they pleased—and they did. It may be they were right, that I was wrong. But that I was not alone in my thinking that money might be saved by more careful expenditures is indicated by an article in the Saturday Evening Post of January 9, 1954, entitled "I Rode Uncle Sam's Gravy Train," and one in the U. S. News & World Report of January 1, 1954, entitled "Why More Congressmen Go Abroad." That article—and no one questions the conservatism of the U. S. News & World Report—reads as follows:

> WHY MORE CONGRESSMEN GO ABROAD—JOB CALLS FOR IT, AND TRAVEL MONEY COMES EASY
>
> (Some traveling Congressmen have hit a jackpot—all kinds of spending money in unlimited amounts, and few questions asked.

The cash comes from a little-known treasure trove called counterpart funds. Sometimes it makes business a pleasure. If so inclined, Congressmen on official trips can dip into the fund and see the world—it costs them only pocket money.)

A way to see the world, to conduct official business and to enjoy a life of travel, all at very little cost, is being discovered by more and more Members of Congress.

In the 5 months since Congress adjourned, 120 Senators and Representatives, some of them with wives and families, have gone out to see the world on business and pleasure. For a large number, mostly those going to Europe, there was a thrill in finding what seemed to be a gold mine that turned up spending money as it was wanted.

A great many Members of Congress were careful about how they dipped into this mine. They were scrupulously careful about the accounts they kept.

But a few of them found that, for as little as $200, a man could travel around the world, getting the best accommodations on planes, ships, and trains. He could live in fancy Paris hotels, be entertained by high public officials. He could shop in the strange bazaars of Istanbul, watch the exotic dancers in Cairo night clubs, sample fine food in the best restaurants of the world.

The windfall comes from what are known as counterpart funds. These funds come into being as a result of American military or economic aid. For example, when the United States gives France a tractor, the French farmer who finally gets the tractor pays for it in francs. That payment in francs is set up by the French Government as a counterpart fund. A small portion of that fund is turned back to the United States to cover this country's expenses in France.

Counterpart funds, thus, are in the form of local currencies—French francs, English pounds, Danish kroner, Italian lire, Greek drachmas—and can be spent only inside the country. These funds cannot be converted into dollars. So what Congressmen get, in effect, is a part of a frozen deposit to the credit of the United States Government and only a small part of that.

The experience for some Members of Congress, however, seemed almost too good to be true. They simply asked for what money they wanted, got a bundle of bills, signed a receipt and that was that.

In the wake of congressional visits, all sorts of stories spread. Some Congressmen rented private cars with chauffeurs, rather than ride trains that did not conform to their own schedules. One flew from Rome to Cairo and back to get a glimpse of the Egyptian dancers. Others sprinkled money in bars, gambling casinos, and nightclubs. They bought perfumes, cameras, binoculars, expensive hats and ties. And they demanded plush treatment from American officials.

Since all foreign currency looks a little strange to Americans, who are used to counting values in terms of dollars, Congressmen often referred to the stuff they spent as wallpaper money. A few of them drew from $100 to $200 a day in this foreign currency.

Congressional spending of this money sometimes ran at a rate of from 8 to 16 times the $12-a-day expense allowance that is made for State Department officials when they are on duty away from their usual stations abroad. And State Department men must explain in careful detail how they spend their expense money. The Department has to account to Congress. But Congressmen account only to themselves. And it is a matter of tradition that one Congressman does not question the integrity of another.

Congressmen are supposed to return to the embassies any money not used for official expenses inside the countries. It may not be carried out of the country. In some cases it is not accounted for in the same manner as money drawn by Congressmen from the expense funds of their own committees, or from the contingent funds of their own House of Congress.

Some committee chairmen are rigorous, however, in demanding an accounting from their members of all counterpart funds spent. They demand itemized expense accounts, with a clear separation of private spending from that which is done for the conduct of official business. Other chairmen leave the matter up to the individual discretion of their committee members.

Most Members of Congress are careful about such matters. A few of them spend their own money on investigative trips they make about the world. But some others are free and easy in their handling of this money.

Ninety percent of the money deposited in the counterpart funds by the countries participating in Marshall plan aid and mutual security operations goes back to these countries for their own use for common defense or other uses. Only 10 percent of the fund is available for United States spending.

The United States portion is used for technical and informational work, for buying strategic materials, and for defraying various costs of American agencies in those countries. Only a fractional part of this goes for traveling Congressmen.

The size of these funds is constantly changing, as the countries deposit currency in these special accounts to match United States contributions. Up until July 31, 1953, there had been piled up $586 million for United States use. Most of this was in European countries. Only a little more than $10.5 million for United States use is available in Asia.

Out of this total, about $76 million has been transferred in a 5-year period by the Foreign Operations Administration and its predecessor agency, to the use of other governmental agencies. This includes the funds that have been turned over to the State Department for the use of touring Congressmen.

Up until last July 1, various agencies operating abroad could use these funds without getting approval from Congress. Beginning in July, however, it was specified that any agency using the money had to get congressional approval and handle the money just as it would handle dollars. But there was an exception made about the requirement. It does not apply to Congressmen and to certain Defense Department activities.

The way it works is that the chairman of a congressional committee writes the State Department that members of his committee are going abroad to study anything from olive production in Spain to air bases in the Middle East. The State Department is to make the necessary travel arrangements.

The State Department informs the Foreign Operations Administration that counterpart funds will be needed. The FOA arranges with the Treasury to provide these funds. The money is turned over to State Department men.

Congressmen dip into these funds as they wish, using much or little. They simply sign a receipt. The State Department official mails this receipt back to his home office in Washington. It follows the way of all Government receipts and drops into a record somewhere. But no one is quite willing to say who has the final records.

The State Department says it simply acts as a disbursing agent. FOA says its function is a perfunctory one. And the Treasury says it has not yet gotten together its records on counterpart funds.

In the meantime, touring Congressmen are beginning to come back to Washington for a new session of Congress. Some of them will be required to turn in expense accounts to the chairman of their committees. Others will not. The procedure varies from House to Senate, and according to committee chairmen.

At any rate, all expense accounts will be in the hands of friends, handled behind a Chinese wall of secrecy.

WHERE CONGRESSMEN GET FREE CASH TO SPEND ON TRAVEL

1. A committee of Congress decides that one of its members, Congressman Doe, should look into conditions abroad. The committee chairman notifies the State Department that Mr. Doe will visit country X on official business.

2. The State Department alerts the United States Embassy in country X. Diplomatic officials start making necessary arrangements with local officials for the Congressman's visit.

3. The Embassy draws on the treasury of country X for local currency in whatever amount Mr. Doe thinks he will need. This comes out of money set aside by country X as an offset to United States aid—money known as counterpart funds.

4. Congressman Doe arrives in country X. The Embassy gives him his spending money. He signs a receipt. No questions are asked about how he will spend it. He is expected to turn back any money he doesn't spend on official business.

5. The Embassy files a report telling the United States Treasury how much it has drawn in local currency to cover Congressman Doe's expenses. Mr. Doe goes about his business. No accounting is required.

ARE WE REWRITING THE TAX LAWS, OR THE CONSTITUTION?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as Members know, some of the most far-reaching decisions affecting the future of the American economy and the well-being of our citizens are being made these days behind the closed doors of the House Ways and Means Committee in executive sessions devoted to a complete revision of the tax laws. The issues in many cases are highly technical and should be given extensive study. But in instance after instance, sufficient study has not been given, in my humble opinion. Eventually, the bill, whatever it contains, will probably come up here on the floor under a rule prohibiting any amendments, and bang, the House will have committed itself to extremely far-reaching changes in the tax laws with no real opportunity to take them apart and examine them closely and in detail. Suffice it to say, most of the changes as they are being gaveled through in committee are intended to ease the tax burdens of the wealthy and well-to-do and shift greater share onto the backs of the lower income groups.

I spoke in this Chamber recently on the most glaring example of that shift in tax burden—the virtual elimination of income taxes within the next 3 years for those fortunate individuals whose income comes largely or solely from corporation dividends. If sustained, this proposal will stand as the biggest giveaway of this whole giveaway-minded Congress.

Developments within the committee in recent weeks have disclosed another remarkable reversal of the principle of

fair tax policy. The committee, or rather a majority of the committee, has undertaken to rewrite the Constitution by singling out certain types of municipal and State securities which are, for the first time, to become subject to Federal taxation.

This is a shocking step, based not on revenue considerations, but as a means of punishing the kind of perfectly proper municipal activities of which a majority of the committee disapproves on either political or ideological grounds.

ATTACK ON STATE AND LOCAL RIGHTS

Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to kick to death the already anemic public housing program, by making municipal housing authority bonds issued in the future subject to Federal taxation, the committee majority has struck not only at public housing but at the whole constitutional concept of separation of powers and State and local rights. It is a step of grave risk and consequence to the States and municipalities of the Nation, for it opens the door to the eventual taxation of all State and local securities.

If you would ask my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee who voted for this revolutionary change in the tax laws to give their individual views on the subject of States' rights, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, each of them would deliver a stirring oration confirming his thorough devotion to the principle of State and local freedom of action as guaranteed under the Constitution. Yet the same members of the committee have nevertheless voted to launch an attack on State and local rights where it hurts the most—in the fiscal and financial nerve.

IS THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE THE PROPER FORUM FOR HOUSING POLICY?

In connection with public housing, members of the Ways and Means Committee certainly have a right—as do all Members of the House—to be against public housing and to oppose the substantive legislation or the appropriations necessary to build public housing. But our committee is hardly the proper forum in which the entire House is to be committed for or against public housing. That is a matter primarily within the province of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Yet so intense is the passion among some members of Ways and Means to end public housing once and for all, through the tax laws, if necessary, that they have proceeded in effect to rewrite the Constitution.

But while seeking to torpedo public housing through tax discrimination, the committee majority has taken a step which would adversely affect every State and county and city and township in the country in all of its legitimate financing operations.

No wonder mayors, city councils, township commissioners, State attorneys general, and other officials throughout the Nation are flooding us in the Ways and Means Committee with letters and telegrams of alarm. They have a right to be alarmed.

They point out that if municipal housing authority bonds issued in the future can be made subject to Federal taxation, then the principle can easily be extended to similar bonds issued in the past, and to every type of State and municipal bond.

They believe, and I believe, that this whole step is unconstitutional, and that the courts eventually would so rule. But what would happen in the long-drawn-out interval in the meantime? Chaos would certainly invade the marketing of public securities, and the blame for that chaos would rest in a hasty, ill-considered action behind closed doors of the Ways and Means Committee—an action motivated not by needs of revenue but by enmity for a program of Government to which the Congress as a whole has repeatedly given its approval.

CONSEQUENCES OF SUBJECTING LOCAL BONDS TO TAXATION

What happens, Mr. Speaker, if State and municipal bonds are made subject to Federal taxation? This is no soak-the-rich proposal—the rich will do all right in any event; we have certainly shown them how in making dividend income virtually tax exempt. No, it would be the States and municipalities which would suffer, for their bonds, which now enjoy salability at low interest rates largely because of the tax-exempt feature, would have to compete on equal terms with other offerings. Interest rates would have to go up. That would add hundreds of millions a year to the cost of operation of our cities alone, and everyone knows the desperate straits most cities find themselves in now to meet their obligations without taxing real estate to death.

Confining it just to the case of public housing, what would happen to this program if the committee fails to reconsider its hasty action and this provision stays in the forthcoming tax law? Local communities would either give up further public housing projects, which is the committee majority's objective, or else they would put the Government more deeply into the lending business in connection with public housing. I wonder if the committee majority was conscious of the fact that these authorities could still borrow from the Federal Government? They have chosen in many cases to borrow from the public instead because, through the lower interest rates obtainable through their tax-exempt issues, they could reduce the cost of public housing and thus save the Government itself money in the operation of the projects.

Apparently in ignorance of this fact, the committee majority has fired a shotgun at public housing which could well miss the target entirely and do damage to the whole concept of local government exemption from Federal taxation.

COMMENTS FROM STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

The spokesman for the Nation's cities, Mayor Elmer E. Robinson, of San Francisco, president of the United States Conference of Mayors, wired me that the committee majority's unprecedented action involves the sovereign and constitutional powers of the 48 States and their political subdivisions, and I think he is right.

The chairman of the Conference on State Defense, Austin J. Tobin, who is executive director of the Port of New York Authority, put it this way:

A single constitutional rule protects all State and municipal bonds from Federal taxation. You can't kill the rule for unpopular bond purposes and have it survive for approved purposes. No State is willing to have Congress assert power of Federal Government to sit in judgment on propriety of State purpose with exemption the reward for compliance and taxation the penalty for noncompliance. Tax immunity is constitutional right of States, not vehicle for Federal discipline.

The mayor of Chicago, Martin H. Kennelly, wired me that the proposal would seriously affect financing plans for the city's parking facility construction program, improvements to O'Hare Field, as well as public housing.

The mayor of Philadelphia, Joseph S. Clark, said:

This action appears to be completely inconsistent with President Eisenhower's housing program as well as the administration's announced objective of encouraging the various States and municipalities to assume additional responsibilities in this field. This action not only will make it more difficult to finance local housing programs but will, by forcing an increase in the interest on such securities, result in imposing an additional heavy burden on local taxpayers, particularly homeowners who are already bearing a crushing tax load.

I insert at this point in my remarks the full text of these communications and of others from Mayor James T. Hanlon, of Scranton; the mayor and city commission of Topeka; Mayor David Aronberg, of Ashland, Ky.; Township Manager John A. Paulus, of Mount Lebanon, Pa.; Attorney General Harold R. Fatzer, of Kansas; Secretary A. C. Edgecombe, of the Housing Authority of the County of Beaver, Pa.; Executive Director Bryn J. Hovde, of the Pittsburgh Housing Association; and Robert Moses, chairman of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority of New York; the New York State Bar Association; and Clarence C. Klein, administrator of the Pittsburgh Housing Authority.

SCRANTON, PA., *February 2, 1954.*

Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives:

As mayor of Scranton, which has a vital interest in the problem, I vigorously oppose the departure from the historic exemption from taxation which State and municipal governments have always enjoyed. The proposed amendment if enacted into law would have a permanent crippling effect on all municipal financing. Any attempt to minimize the importance of this change in the constitutional safeguard should be vigorously fought. This is particularly harmful to Scranton because of our housing and redevelopment programs. Please convey to the members of your committee the serious concern of the people of our community.

JAMES T. HANLON,
Mayor of Scranton.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 2, 1954.*

Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

We have heard of the committee's attempted reassurance to State and municipal officers regarding its intent in taxing certain State and municipal bonds. We are more than ever convinced that the committee will

do great disservice to the Nation as well as States and municipalities if it persists in refusing to hear State and municipal officers. The right of States and municipalities to constitutional protection from Federal taxation is attacked when the committee asserts power to tax certain municipal bonds and not others. We strongly urge reconsideration of your position.

ROBERT MOSES,
Chairman, Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 25, 1954.*
HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of the United States Conference of Mayors and as mayor of the great city of San Francisco, I vigorously register my protest to the action of the House Ways and Means Committee in approving the addition to the proposed revenue-revision bill of 1954 of municipal securities of any type to Federal taxation. This closed-door action is completely in opposition to the best interests of all the citizens of the United States and is unprecedented in any legislative action involving as it does the sovereign and constitutional powers of the 48 States and their political subdivisions. It is respectfully requested that your honorable committee reconsider this action and that those duly elected officials of States, counties, and cities who are desirous of so doing be given opportunity to present testimony in opposition to the committee's position in public hearing.

Sincerely,

ELMER E. ROBINSON,
Mayor of San Francisco.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 28, 1954.*
Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Committee press release yesterday on municipal bonds shows absolute necessity of hearings to explain issues. Apparently committee completely misunderstands State and municipal position. Release intensifies our fears. A single constitutional rule protects all State and municipal bonds from Federal taxation. You can't kill the rule for unpopular bond purposes and have it survive for approved purposes. No State is willing to have Congress assert power of Federal Government to sit in judgment on propriety of State purpose with exemption the reward for compliance and taxation the penalty for noncompliance. Tax immunity is constitutional right of States not vehicle for Federal discipline. Issues terribly hard to summarize this way. Too much is at stake to deny sovereign States hearings.

AUSTIN J. TOBIN,
Chairman, Conference on State Defense; Executive Director, the Port of New York Authority.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 26, 1954.*
Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Pittsburgh Housing Association, a citizens organization concerned with good housing for all, considers public housing necessary for low income families and for urban renewal. Removal of tax exemption for local housing authority bonds as proposed by Ways and Means Committee will greatly reduce if not destroy the salability of these bonds to the private money market. Thus it will either add much to the role of the Federal Government as a lender or it will effectively stop public housing.

BRYAN J. HOVDE,
Executive Director.

TOPEKA, KANS., *January 26, 1954.*
Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

The governing body of the city of Topeka, Kans., deems the action of the House Ways and Means Committee of the United States Congress in recommending the taxation of certain State and municipal bonds to be against the public interest and unconstitutional. Said governing body believes taxation of State and municipal bonds by the Federal Government extremely dangerous and detrimental to the economic and financial structure of the cities and States of the United States and to the United States itself. Said governing body requests the members of the House Ways and Means Committee and other Members of the United States Congress to take action to eliminate this threat to the economies of the respective governmental units.

MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF TOPEKA, KANS.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 29, 1954.*
Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In reference to the revenue revision bill of 1954.

Information received indicates that the Committee on Ways and Means has agreed to certain substantive changes which if enacted will have an extremely harmful effect on the city of Chicago and other municipalities throughout the country.

This effect would arise from the taxation of income from revenue bonds issued by the city of Chicago to finance an extensive parking facility construction program, contemplated revenue bond financing of improvements to Chicago's new international airport, O'Hare Field, and bonds issued by the Chicago Housing Authority for low-rental housing. We regret exceedingly that a decision was made without permitting distressed municipalities to have a hearing.

It is therefore respectfully requested that you, as a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, take the necessary steps to have the Committee on Ways and Means reconsider its action and provide an opportunity for officials of States, counties, and cities to present testimony in a public hearing.

MARTIN H. KENNELLY,
Mayor of Chicago.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 26, 1954.*
Congressman HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The action of the House Committee on Ways and Means incorporating into its revenue revision bill, which will be reported to the House floor under a rule which does not permit the offering of amendments, a provision removing the Federal tax exemption on municipal housing authority securities is a matter of deep concern to municipalities engaged in redevelopment, slum-clearance, and public-housing programs. This action appears to be completely inconsistent with President Eisenhower's housing program as well as the administration's announced objective of encouraging the various States and municipalities to assume additional responsibilities in this field. I am particularly concerned that this action was taken at a closed-door executive session without affording an opportunity to any governor, State attorney general, mayor, county commissioner, or similar public official to present testimony. This action not only will make it more difficult to finance local housing programs but will, by forcing an increase in the interest on such securities, result in imposing an additional heavy burden on local taxpayers, particularly home owners who are already bearing a crushing tax load. I most earnestly urge your committee to reconsider the action taken and to extend an opportunity to the above-mentioned officials to present testimony at a public hearing.

JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr.,
Mayor of City of Philadelphia.

CITY OF ASHLAND, KY.,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
January 29, 1954.
The Honorable HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Congressman, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the citizens of Ashland, Ky., I wish to protest the action of the House Ways and Means Committee in their efforts to authorize Federal taxation on municipal bonds.

The Federal Government has preempted practically every avenue of taxation. Our only favorable break, if it can be called such, is the fact that cities could issue bonds at a low rate of interest. There is no logical reason whatever for discontinuing this accepted intergovernmental principle of long standing.

There is something rather queer about the proposed legislation that calls for an explanation. Why were those affected denied the privilege of a hearing? Why the secrecy? As there was no Presidential request, whose recommendation was it? The action and methods of the committee do not meet with favor by any fair-minded person.

Our citizens ask you to reconsider this proposed legislation that we consider to be most unfair.

Very truly yours,

DAVID ARONBERG,
Mayor, City of Ashland, Ky.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE
COUNTY OF BEAVER,
Vanport, Pa., January 25, 1954.
Representative HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House Committee on Ways and Means,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EBERHARTER: The House Committee on Ways and Means announced on January 20: "Interest on new issues of bonds of local public agencies or public housing agencies which are secured by the Federal Government as provided in the Housing Act of 1949 is to be taxable. These are in effect Federal bonds issued in the municipality's name. This provision does not apply to any outstanding bonds of the local housing agencies, or to those yet to be issued where the United States has already entered into a contract with the local government units."

The above seems to constitute committee action, taken in closed executive session, in the process of writing the tax bill for 1954–55. The local authority is concerned in that it still has to finance permanently the development cost of 2 low-rent projects; 1 in Midland, Pa., the other in Aliquippa, Pa. The wording of the proposal implies that the contemplated action be another roadblock for low-rent public housing and redevelopment of slum areas.

For the last 30 years, efforts have been made by successive Congresses to remove the tax-exemption features from municipal and State bonds. Heretofore an opportunity has always been given for the duly elected representatives of public bodies to be heard on the proposal, but throughout the tax hearings this year the feature has never been given consideration. Now, suddenly, local housing-authority bonds, as well as industrial-development bonds of State and local government units, are singled out for discriminatory action.

Many a Supreme Court decision has been rendered to the effect that the power to tax is the power to destroy, and Federal taxation

of municipal bonds has been declared unconstitutional by the courts. It would seem that, if the committee intended to increase Federal revenue through removing the tax-exempt feature of State, municipal, and authority bonds, a better approach would be a proposal to amend the law. If the measure were to be passed, the validity undoubtedly would be challenged in the courts, and innumerable State and municipal housing and redevelopment programs would be stopped for years, in all probability while appeals to the courts were heard. Certainly, if the constitutional issue were not raised, the market for the sale of low-rent public housing and redevelopment bonds would be greatly restricted, with great increases in interest rates. This latter effect, would increase greatly the annual contributions from the Treasury.

Therefore, the members of the Housing Authority of the County of Beaver respectfully urge that your committee—

1. Reconsider its vote to remove the tax-exempt feature of local housing-authority bonds. They are local bonds, issued under State and municipal authority.

2. Provide an immediate opportunity for duly elected State and municipal officials to be heard on this issue by the committee.

Appreciating your consideration of this very important matter, I am

Very truly yours,

A. C. EDGECOMBE,
Secretary, Housing Authority of the County of Beaver, Pa.

THE TOWNSHIP OF
MT. LEBANON, PA.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., January 27, 1954.

Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House of Representatives, Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EBERHARTER: I have been advised that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has voted to recommend that the Federal Government tax the interest on State and municipal bonds in cases where the bonds are used to finance improvements of property to be leased to private concerns where the governmental issuer does not pledge its full faith and credit or taxing power. In addition, I understand that the committee has also recommended that the Federal Government tax the interest on municipal housing authority bonds. The purpose of this letter is to protest this action by your committee and to request that you seriously consider withdrawing the recommendation and substituting for it a recommendation that the Federal Government not tax any State or municipal bond interest.

Aside from any questions as to constitutionality of such action, the taxation of the interest of State and local bonds would be a serious threat to the economic stability of political subdivisions in the United States and would seriously curtail many capital improvements that are now contemplated. As your action was reported to me, its purpose is to discourage the use of municipal or State borrowing powers to improve property for private industries. I am fully in accord with this objective but sincerely believe your committee is trying to accomplish its purpose in the wrong way.

As you will know, State and local officials are certain that if your recommendations are enacted into law by the Congress, the next step will be to tax the interest of all State and municipal bond issues. Although your present purpose is evidently other than one for obtaining revenue, we believe that the time will come when the temptation to extend such taxation for revenue purposes will be too great to resist.

Your serious attention to this matter will be sincerely appreciated.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. PAULUS,
Township Manager.

STATE OF KANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Topeka, Kans., January 27, 1954.

Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Member, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EBERHARTER: I was disturbed to read in our newspaper of the unprecedented action taken yesterday by the House Ways and Means Committee to tax the interest on certain State and municipal bonds without public hearings.

I think the action of the committee established a most dangerous constitutional precedent and I hope that your committee will reconsider its action in this respect.

The State of Kansas is authorized to issue revenue bonds to build student dormitories at our State university and colleges; to erect a new State office building, and has established a turnpike authority to build and operate a super toll highway, all to be paid for by revenue bonds which are planned to be retired by rental or toll paid by the users. If these bonds are subject to Federal income tax, it will result in a greater cost to the State of Kansas to construct, maintain, and operate such projects because of an unquestioned higher interest rate, and, in addition, may have a harmful effect upon the marketability of these bonds.

The action of the House Ways and Means Committee to subject interest on certain State and municipal bonds to Federal income tax is a step to tear down the entire structure of tax exemption of State and municipal bonds for all the State and local governments, and undermines fundamental constitutional safeguards of State and municipal immunity from Federal taxation.

I am requesting that your committee reconsider this proposal and at least permit public hearings on this important question.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD R. FATZER,
Attorney General.

NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,
February 2, 1954.

Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I inclose herewith an exact copy of a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the municipal section of the New York State Bar Association at its annual meeting held in the city of New York on January 28 and 29, 1954. In substance, it urges the House Ways and Means Committee to hold public hearings before recommending that Congress assert the power to tax certain municipal bonds.

The section respectfully requests your consideration of its action.

Very truly yours,

JAMES T. HARRINGTON,
Secretary.

Resolved, That the municipal law section of the New York State Bar Association respectfully urges the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to reconsider its action recommending, without hearings, that the Congress assert the power to tax bonds of municipal housing authorities and municipal industrial-purpose bonds (now before the committee), on the basis of its detrimental effect as a violation of the constitutional immunity of the States from interference by Federal Government taxation.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE
CITY OF PITTSBURGH,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 2, 1954.

The Honorable HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Member, House Committee on Ways and Means, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EBERHARTER: The Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh, at its last regular meeting on Thursday, January 28, 1954, instructed me by unanimous vote to voice its concern over the action of the House Ways and Means Committee in recommending taxation on the interest of certain State and municipal bonds. The authority obviously is primarily interested in its effect upon its own financial operations. Without presuming to comment on the constitutionality of the proposed action, our consensus is that the market for the sale of low-rent public-housing bonds would be greatly restricted and that the interest rate would rise from 1 to 1½ percent above the current rate. Furthermore, the best estimate of the resultant situation is that the cost of the annual contributions made to local housing authorities by the Treasury would be vastly increased, although no provision is recommended permitting an increase in the maximum annual contributions for that purpose.

The acute and critical housing situation confronting people of low income in the United States has by no means been resolved. The adoption of the action of the House Committee on Ways and Means would further restrict any tangible help that local housing authorities might give to decent American families in that income category. The authority, therefore, instructs me to respectfully request your favorable judgment and action in preventing the enactment of the proposed provision for eliminating certain State and municipal bonds from the tax exemption hitherto properly granted to them.

Very sincerely yours,

CLARENCE C. KLEIN,
Administrator.

Those letters and telegrams, Mr. Speaker, are typical of scores I have received.

MANY CITIES PROTEST

The mayors and city councils of Watertown, N. Y.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Altoona, Pa.; Bethlehem, Pa.; Cumberland, Md., and Bloomington, Ill., have sent similar messages. Formal councilmanic resolutions have come in from Williamsport, Pa.; Roanoke, Va.; Oakland, Calif.; St. Paul, Minn.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Royal Oak, Mich.; Fargo, N. Dak., and Youngstown and Sandusky, Ohio.

The mayors of Quincy, Mass.; Duluth, Minn.; Ogden City, Utah; Providence, R. I.; West Palm Beach, Fla.; Baltimore, Md.; New Castle, Pa.; New Rochelle, N. Y.; New Kensington, Pa.; Anniston, Ala.; Columbia, S. C.; Hutchinson, Kans.; Lancaster, Pa., and Alhambra, Calif., have also sent in official protests. I have also heard from the city controllers or treasurers of York, Pa.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Binghamton, N. Y., and Bay City, Mich.; the auditor of Portland, Oreg.; the solicitor of Altoona; the solicitor and borough manager of Waynesboro, Pa.; the director of finance of Flint, Mich.; the city manager of Danville, Va.; the president of the board of estimates and taxation of Minneapolis, and the director of revenue and finance of Newark. More wires and letters are coming in every day.

Among Pennsylvania organizations of municipal groups on record against this proposal are the Pennsylvania Municipal Authorities Association, the Pennsylvania Association of Housing Authorities, the Pennsylvania Association of Boroughs, the League of Third-Class Cities of Pennsylvania, and the Pennsylvania State Association of First-Class Townships.

So far as I know, Mr. Speaker, the only group fully in favor of this proposal is the lobby seeking by one route or another, and every possible route, including the unconstitutional path of discriminatory tax legislation against municipalities, to kill off public housing.

BIG GUNS FOR SMALL TARGET

The public-housing program of this administration is now so starved and anemic that it would not take much more than a slight breeze wafting through the House Appropriations Committee to kill it off entirely. This proposal of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, therefore, is a needless use of the tax law cannon or blockbuster to do the work of a BB gun. And the careless use of this vast power of Federal taxation to hunt down and destroy the mouse of public housing can have grave consequences to the whole structure of State and municipal financing.

Let us not try to rewrite the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, just to strike at a gnat, or scratch a mosquito bite.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include telegrams and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. LECOMPTE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WATTS.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. NICHOLSON).

Mr. CRETELLA.

Mr. SHELLEY in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. HELLER.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. HELLER).

Mr. CARNAHAN.

Mr. BARRETT and to include a statement relative to a bill he is introducing.

Mr. REED of New York.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HYDE (at the request of Mr. DEVEREUX), for today, on account of official committee business.

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN), on account of attendance at a funeral.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 15. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 354. Joint resolution amending Public Law 207, 83d Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 8, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1239. A letter from the Acting Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report for the 6-month period ending December 31, 1953, pursuant to sections 2 (c) (11) and (16) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1240. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting a report on the audit of the Bureau of Land Management, an agency in the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Part II, supplemental report on H. R. 4646. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 68. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk; without amendment (Rept. No. 1147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 123. An act for the relief of Anni Wilhelmine Skoda; without amendment (Rept. No. 1148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciray. S. 153. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert; without amendment (Rept. No. 1149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 179. An act for the relief of Insun Lee; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 205. An act for the relief of Evdoxia J. Kitsos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 236. An act for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban; without amendment (Rept. No. 1152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 296. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz (Litman); without amendment (Rept. No. 1153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 303. An act for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr; without amendment (Rept. No. 1154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 305. An act for the relief of Antonio Vocale; without amendment (Rept. No. 1155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 313. An act for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama; without amendment (Rept. No. 1156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 323. An act for the relief of Rose Cohen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 353. An act for the relief of Li Ming; without amendment (Rept. No. 1158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 506. An act for the relief of Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar; without amendment (Rept. No.1159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 550. An act for the relief of Thomas O. Robitscher; without amendment (Rept. No. 1160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 569. An act for the relief of Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee of the Judiciary. S. 606. An act for the relief of Hannelore Netz and her two children; without amendment (Rept. No. 1162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 730. An act for the relief of Winfried Kohls; without amendment (Rept. No. 1163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 801. An act for the relief of Eugenio S. Roiles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 825. An act for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb; without amendment (Rept. No. 1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 973. An act for the relief of Doctor Jawad Hedayaty; without amendment (Rept. No. 1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 982. An act for the relief of Helena Lewicka; without amendment (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1009. An act for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten; without amendment (Rept. No. 1168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1018. An act for the relief of George Ellis Ellison; without amendment (Rept. No. 1169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1226. An act for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu; without amendment (Rept. No. 1170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1281. An act for the relief of Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1323. An act for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney; without amendment (Rept. No. 1172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1432. An act for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic; without amendment (Rept. No. 1173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1443. An act for the relief of Jose Deang; without amendment (Rept. No. 1174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2108. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Sommer; with amendment (Rept. No. 1175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2151. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ala Olejcak (nee Holubowa); with amendment (Rept. No. 1176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 197. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7251. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon P. Parry, the right, title, and interest of the United States in foreign countries in and to a certain invention; with amendment (Rept. No. 1178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 7733. A bill directing the Secretary of the Defense to declare Camp Pickett, Va., excess property; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7734. A bill to amend section 47 of the National Defense Act to relieve State-operated educational institutions, under stated conditions, from giving bond for certain property issued by the United States for use by Reserve Officers' Training Corps units maintained at such institutions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7735. A bill to amend section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, relating to the meaning of the word "commodity"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 7736. A bill to extend the period during which veterans may apply for and receive education and training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 7737. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to authorize insurance of loans made to finance deep-well irrigation systems; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7738. A bill to revise the laws relating to the claims and services of former employees in matters affecting the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7739. A bill authorizing an appropriation to enable the Secretary of Labor to make additional unemployment compensation payments to States having large numbers of unemployed persons in labor surplus areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 7740. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7741. A bill to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 7742. A bill to authorize the withholding, upon request, from compensation of Federal employees, of amounts for the payment of rates and premiums of voluntary prepayment plans and insurance for hospital and medical care, or both; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 7743. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 7744. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.35; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 7745. A bill to amend certain provisions of the act of August 2, 1939, commonly known as the Hatch Act, relating to employees of State or local agencies whose activities are financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 7746. A bill to extend the time limit within which recommendations for and awards of certain military decorations may be made; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 7747. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 7748. A bill to amend an act of September 1, 1949, so as to prohibit the future use for parking purposes of certain land leased under such act by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to Milwaukee County, Wis., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. J. Res. 369. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in October of each year as Grandparents' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. J. Res. 370. Joint resolution directing the Civil Aeronautics Board to procure an amendment to the Warsaw Convention, with reference to limitation of liability on overseas travel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution expressing the condemnation of the Congress with respect to the arrest and imprisonment of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski and other similar instances of religious persecution in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. Res. 433. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Select Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature in favor of increasing benefits under the Federal Social Security Act to a minimum allowance of $100 monthly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to take action to lower the high cost of coffee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of increasing benefits under the Federal Social Security Act to a minimum allowance of $100 monthly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action to lower the high cost of coffee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of increasing benefits under the Federal Social Security Act to a minimum allowance of $100 monthly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action to lower the high cost of coffee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 7749. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Mueller and her minor chid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 7750. A bill for the relief of Kermit R. Lay, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7751. A bill for the relief of John Mathewdakis, Mrs. Sophie Mathewdakis, and Helen Mathewdakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7752. A bill for the relief of Alberto Cortez Cortez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 7753. A bill for the relief of the estate of Carlo de Luca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 7754. A bill for the relief of Emma Margarethe Bicker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. R. 7755. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Pugeda de la Cerna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 7756. A bill for the relief of Joseph (Giuseppe) Aiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 7757. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Elief Rue of certain real property situated in Cassia County, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 7758. A bill for the relief of Hilbert Ewart Fitz-Maurice Homer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7759. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 7760. A bill for the relief of John Napoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 7761. A bill for the relief of John Lewis Pyles, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 7762. A bill for the relief of M. M. Hess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

496. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Kate B. Carter, Daughters of the Utah Pioneers, Salt Lake City, Utah, relative to the construction of the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir as being a necessary action, and that it should be undertaken and completed as soon as reasonably practicable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

497. Also, petition of the secretary, Newport County Bar Association, Providence, R. I., relative to requesting passage of Senate bill 1663, and making known its approval and support of the pending legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

498. Also, petition of the secretary, Democratic Women of Bexar County, Tex., San Antonio, Tex., opposing the proposed Bricker amendment or any compromise amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

United States Wheat to Pakistan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1954

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States Wheat to Pakistan film produced by the Government of Pakistan was shown in the Senate Office Building to Senators and Congressmen and officials of Foreign Operations Administration and the Department of Agriculture, on January 28, 1954. Senator AIKEN, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, welcomed Pakistan Ambassador Syed Amjad Ali.

In his remarks the Ambassador explained that he was sent last year by his Government on a special mission to Washington to negotiate wheat aid from the United States as Pakistan was facing a serious food shortage due to two successive seasons of drought. I quote briefly from the Ambassador's remarks:

Last month I visited Philadelphia to be on hand to see the 87th ship carrying United States wheat to Pakistan. I was taken on a tour of the city, and when I was looking at the Liberty Bell I inquired from the curator of the museum when the bell had tolled last. He told me that it was in 1835. Later that day I had occasion to speak a few words to the group which had assembled to see the ship off. I recounted my query about the Liberty Bell and said: "Perhaps historically it is true that the bell tolled last in 1835, but I hear that bell ringing again and again. It no longer rings the freedom of the people of the United States alone, it rings the freedom from want to the people of Pakistan when a United States wheat ship arrives in Karachi. It rings when a shipload of milk from the United States arrives in Hamburg. I pray that that bell may continue to ring again and again bringing the message of freedom from want to the peoples of the far corners of the world."

To promote friendship between the peoples of the United States and Pakistan, the Government of Pakistan is offering a free trip to Pakistan to an American high-school boy and an American high-school girl. These two young people will be selected through a high-school essay contest which is now in progress.

A Bill To Increase the Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1954

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in 1949 when the Congress was considering increasing the minimum hourly wage to 75 cents, I proposed a figure of $1. Unfortunately, the minimum wage was increased to only 75 cents. It is obvious that today the minimum of 75 cents is under the amount required and desired to maintain a fair standard of living by the working classes. Only recently the President suggested that the Congress consider increasing the minimum wage.

I have today introduced a bill to increase the minimum wage to $1.35. There are several reasons why I believe there is an even greater need today for a substantial increase in minimum wages. At the risk of being called a "scaremonger" or "crier of doom," I refer to the current recession in business and trend toward a depression. With production decreasing and unemployment increasing, we owe it to the working people to ensure them of decent paychecks for the time they devote toward increasing their employers' profits.

On January 1, 1954, the excess-profits tax expired. This means that many large business firms throughout the country will save millions of dollars annually. To date, consumer prices have not dropped and the workingman is still paying excise taxes and hoping that he will have a drop in his income tax equal to the percentage of decline in taxes now being enjoyed by big business. I feel that this is one of the reasons why the laboring classes should no longer be deprived of the long overdue increase in minimum wages.

My proposed $1.35 minimum wage amounts to a weekly income of $54 per 40-hour week, before social-security and income-tax deductions. It is generally accepted that one-quarter of an individual's income is spent on rent alone. But do you know where the average family of five persons can rent an apartment or home for $54 per month? The present administration has not only wrecked the public-housing program of the Democratic Administration but has also laid plans for disposing of existing public-housing projects by offering them for sale to private individuals or concerns.

Mr. Speaker, do you believe that a family of five can be properly fed on less than $108 per month? The remaining $54 must cover utilities, medical expenses, transportation, clothing, and all miscellaneous essential items. We must also remember that a large number of persons falling within this low-income category do not work a full 40-hour week.

In the interest of those working people whose living conditions are pitifully substandard, I consider it my obligation to urge the Congress to give early consideration to my bill, H. R. 7744, proposing a minimum hourly wage of $1.35.

The GOP Elephant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, since taking over the reins of our Government a most amazing phenomenon has occurred to the GOP elephant. It is a metamorphosis that may well go down in history as the eighth wonder of the world. It is a hybrid no one ever dreamed possible. After discontinuing an Antimonopoly Subcommittee it now urges strong measures against monopolies. After promising to balance the budget it now concedes the great difficulty thereof. It no longer opposes social-security legislation as "creeping socialism" but embraces it approvingly and seeks to expand it. After admitting it had no policy with respect to public housing and after virtually destroying the program in the House the elephant suddenly claims to champion the cause. After reducing the Air Force from 143 wings to 120 over strong Democratic opposition it now urges the so-called new look with great emphasis on air power.

My colleagues, this is truly a phenomenon—an elephant with a donkey tail.

An Analysis of Conditions Responsible For the Furloughing of Railroad Employees in the Altoona, Pa., Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Altoona, Pa., area, which is located in my congressional district, has some 3,300 railroad employees furloughed from their positions with the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Because of the large volume of mail I am receiving on the subject, and my intense desire to be of any possible assistance in relieving this distressing problem, I am inserting herewith a copy of a detailed report regarding my activities. The report follows:

Since the beginning of the furloughing of employees by the Pennsylvania Railroad, I have been actively engaged in an overall study of the situation in an effort to provide, if possible, a solution to this distressing problem.

So that you will fully understand the scope of my survey and my personal efforts to relieve the situation, I am giving you the following information developed from conferences with the Office of Defense Mobilization, the United States Department of Labor, the Association of American Railroads, the Pennsylvania Railroad, the American Federation of Labor, and the International Association of Machinists.

To begin with, my first contact was with James Mitchell, Secretary of the United States Department of Labor, to determine whether the Federal Government could intervene on behalf of the furloughed employees.

Secretary of Labor Mitchell informed me on December 29, 1953, as follows:

"Thank you for your letter of December 21, 1953, in which you enclosed correspondence from Mr. Fred W. Deiss, recording secretary, International Association of Machinists, Altoona, Pa., in which he expressed the opinion that the frequency of recent reductions in force among the employees of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. is tantamount to discrimination against certain local employees of the company in Altoona, Pa.

"While we are deeply concerned over the financial plight of all these employees and their families, the fact is, as you know, that the Federal Government has no right or authority to deal with matters of this kind."

While awaiting the above reply from Secretary of Labor Mitchell, I contacted high officials of the Pennsylvania Railroad, pointing to the distress of many families in the Altoona area especially during the Christmas season. In addition it was urged that every possible effort be made to rescind the furlough order.

Under date of January 6, 1954, I received a letter from Mr. Frank J. McCarthy, assistant vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, which reads in part:

"Our traffic had been declining for 3 months prior to the force reductions, with a marked falling off in the month of November. It is a normal condition to encounter a falling off in traffic in November and the winter months, but this year our November carloadings showed a progressive decrease of between 12 percent and 15 percent, as compared with the same weeks a year ago. That was an abnormal situation, and since it is difficult to predict with certainty whether this situation will be one of only brief duration, it was necessary that our people take timely action to offset the loss in revenues."

While I was waiting to hear from the Secretary of Labor and the Pennsylvania Railroad, I conferred on several occasions in my Washington office, with representatives of the American Federation of Labor and the International Association of Machinists.

As a result of these conferences I found that the furloughing of railroad employees was nationwide and not confined to my congressional district. I checked further with these representatives of labor to make certain that I was doing everything possible to relieve the situation and they assured me I had gone the limit.

At a later conference when I showed them the reply of the Secretary of Labor to the effect that the Federal Government had no jurisdiction they agreed with his assertion.

I then inquired from these representatives of labor as to whether it was possible to stagger the workload in an effort to spread employment. In this connection, I was informed that under existing work agreements the seniority clause could not be violated.

After conferring with these officials of organized labor, I went back to the officials of the Pennsylvania Railroad and was advised in a letter of January 6, 1954, from Assistant Vice President Frank J. McCarthy that "very careful consideration was given to the possibility of reducing working hours in lieu of reducing force, but there were a number of reasons why this was found to be impracticable. As an example, we had a considerable force assigned to the repair of hopper cars, but due to the reduction in mineral freight traffic, we found ourselves with some 10,000 cars of this class idle. A reduced work week spread over both car and locomotive works would have necessitated curtailment of some types of operation which it was desirable to maintain on a full-time basis. The practical thing to do was to discontinue repairs on the equipment that was not needed."

Realizing that we were up against a stonewall in trying to relieve the unemployment situation I then wrote to Mr. C. I. Clugh, manager of the Altoona works of the Pennsylvania Railroad, suggesting the possibility of having the Altoona works bid on defense contracts in order to provide employment for those furloughed.

On January 20, 1954, I received a letter from Manager C. I. Clugh, in which he stated:

"Unfortunately, there are a number of difficulties which make it inadvisable for the works to take the steps which you have proposed. During the emergency created by World War II, it was possible for us to undertake work for the Government on the assumption, which proved to be correct, that we could overcome legal difficulties involved by virtue of the necessity of the work and through the Government's cooperation. However we are faced with a provision in the constitution of Pennsylvania which specifically prohibits railroads from engaging in manufacturing, and our charter, of course, does not permit us to engage in such operations. Likewise, there are other legal difficulties. In addition, during World War II the work which we did on Government contracts was specifically exempted from the requirements of the Walsh-Healey Act and the necessary compliance with that act which would now be required might result in serious labor difficulties. I regret to advise you, therefore, that we cannot see our way clear to undertake performance of any Government contracts."

Faced with the impossibility of staggering the present work load so as to provide employment for more persons, and in view of the inability of the Altoona works of the Pennsylvania Railroad to engage in defense contracts, I continued my efforts to try to find a solution to this vexing problem.

It was found, however, from the following statistical table furnished by the Pennsylvania Railroad, that over a period of years Altoona railroad workers have experienced seasonal furloughs:

Altoona works, number of active employees

	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953
Jan. 15	12,299	10,724	14,170	11,129	10,579
Jan. 31	12,266	9,221	14,284	11,073	10,574
Feb. 14	11,563	10,353	14,361	11,003	10,603
Feb. 28	11,269	10,375	14,302	10,971	10,159
Mar. 15	11,120	10,989	14,187	10,951	10,075
Mar. 31	11,109	11,341	14,133	10,931	10,081
Apr. 15	11,101	11,557	14,072	10,880	10,080
Apr. 30	11,083	11,954	14,022	10,745	10,042
May 15	11,081	896	13,701	10,523	10,032
May 31	1,933	11,274	10,801	10,715	10,010
June 15	5,303	11,975	10,748	4,521	9,924
June 30	5,416	12,372	1,851	3,948	9,860
July 15	5,628	12,550	10,592	1,954	9,923
July 31	7,331	12,840	10,758	2,828	9,923
Aug. 15	7,444	13,191	10,907	5,820	9,918
Aug. 31	8,004	13,457	1,702	8,269	9,893
Sept. 15	7,538	13,509	11,458	9,698	9,860
Sept. 30	1,843	13,647	11,523	10,352	9,840
Oct. 15	1,751	13,871	11,551	10,412	9,814
Oct. 31	1,968	13,881	1,387	10,380	9,788
Nov. 15	2,825	14,006	11,624	10,418	9,758
Nov. 30	3,759	13,987	11,181	10,497	9,728
Dec. 15	6,912	14,046	11,152	10,545	8,140
Dec. 31	7,477	14,161	11,130	10,563	8,140

For example, in 1949 employment reached a peak in January of that year with 12,299 employed. In September of that year 10,456 employees were furloughed, and by the end of December 5,634 of this number had been recalled.

In the year 1950 during the month of January there were 10,724 employed, but in May because of the coal strike employment dropped to 896, when 9,828 were furloughed for a 2-week period.

When the Korean war began in June 1950 employment increased, and in December it reached a peak of 14,161.

In 1951 there were 14,170 employed in January. While this number decreased during the year, there were 11,130 employed in December. During this year there were three furlough periods in June, August, and October. During these furlough periods some 9,000 employees were given 2-week furloughs.

During the year 1952, 11,129 were employed in January. As of December 31 of that year there were 10,563 employed, with some 6,000 employees being furloughed during June, July, and August, due to the steel strike.

The year 1953 began with 10,579 employed and ended on December 31, with 8,140 employed. During this 12-month period there was a gradual monthly decline until in December the total number of furloughed employees was 2,439, of which 1,688 were laid off in December.

Summarizing the situation, during the year of 1949, 10,456 employees were furloughed for short periods.

In 1950, 9,828 were given similar furloughs; in 1951 about 9,000 employees were furloughed; in 1952 some 6,000 were furloughed; while in 1953 the number of furloughed employees decreased to 2,439.

By the middle of January of this year the Pennsylvania Railroad advises that the number of furloughed employees in the Altoona area was 3,000—2,700 of them being from the Altoona Works and 300 furloughed from the Middle Division.

Wanting to make certain that the furloughing of railroad employees was not confined to the Altoona area, contact was made with the Association of American Railroads, and statistical information was furnished which proves that, with the exception of war years, there is an annual decline in business on class I railroads that makes mandatory the furloughing of employees.

In comparing the downturn in railroad traffic and earnings, the Association of American Railroads furnished me informa-

tion showing that carloadings were down 10.9 percent in November 1953 against November 1952. In December 1953 carloadings were down 9.7 percent as compared with December 1952. For the first 3 weeks of January 1954 carloadings dropped 12 percent under the corresponding weeks in 1953.

The Association of American Railroads reports that the net railway-operating income is off about 30 percent starting in November 1953 and continuing to the present time. This loss of net operating income is traceable to the downturn in railroad traffic, during the past 3 months.

At the time this report was prepared my attention was called to the recent statement by Mr. W. E. Callahan, manager of the car-service division, of the Association of American Railroads, that "this recession which has been with us for over 3 months should level off soon and carloadings should return to a basis more comparable with 1953." At the moment it is my understanding that carloadings are beginning to pick up.

In considering the overall picture, statistics prove that railroad employment has been on the decline since the advent of the diesel engine, the diversion of passenger and freight traffic to other modes of transportation, affecting employment in the railroad industry, together with other factors.

In my opinion, the real answer to the seasonal employment in the Altoona area is the further diversification of industry, which can be accomplished by securing new industries.

It is common knowledge that since 1949 the Altoona Chamber of Commerce has been successful in attracting new plants, through its industrial-development program, which led to the creation of Altoona Enterprises, Inc. Based on information furnished me by the Altoona Chamber of Commerce 12 new sources of employment were secured providing jobs for 3,500 people. It is my understanding that at the present time prospects are bright for obtaining additional industries.

Not only have I worked arm in arm with the chamber of commerce to bring new plants to Altoona, but at my request the United States Department of labor classified Altoona as a critical area, from the standpoint of surplus labor. As a result, the Office of Defense Mobilization has placed Altoona in the class IV category, which entitles industries capable of bidding on defense contracts to receive special consideration.

In this connection, full information has been placed in the hands of all concerned, and representatives of the Small Business Administration (formerly the Small Defense Plants Administration) are in constant contact with industries needing assistance. Already this organized approach has brought business to several of Altoona's industries.

In addition to the efforts I have cited, in trying to solve the unemployment problem, let me give added assurance that in Washington I am leaving no stone unturned in fighting legislation such as the St. Lawrence seaway and the unrestricted importation of foreign residual oil, or any other legislative measures which threaten to destroy jobs in the coal, railroad, and related industries.

Commission on Foreign Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following minority report:

COMMISSION ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

(Minority report by DANIEL A. REED and RICHARD M. SIMPSON)

COMMISSION ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1954.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States, and President of the Senate.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIRS: On January 23, I transmitted to you the report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, which was constituted pursuant of Public Law 215, 83d Congress, 1st session, approved August 7, 1953, 67 Stat. 472.

I now have the honor to transmit to you the attached minority report submitted by Representatives DANIEL A. REED and RICHARD M. SIMPSON.

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE B. RANDALL,
Chairman.

COMMISSION ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Clarence B. Randall, Chairman, Chicago, Ill.

Lamar Fleming, Jr., Vice Chairman, Houston, Tex.

Presidential appointees: David J. McDonald, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Cola G. Parker, Neenah, Wis.; Jesse W. Tapp, San Francisco, Calif.; John Hay Whitney, New York, N. Y.; John H. Williams, Cambridge, Mass.

Senators: EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Republican, of Colorado; BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa; PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican, of Connecticut; WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia; HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia.

Representatives: DANIEL A. REED, Republican, of New York; RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania; JOHN M. VORYS, Republican, of Ohio; JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee; LAURIE C. BATTLE, Democrat, of Alabama.

MINORITY REPORT BY DANIEL A. REED AND RICHARD M. SIMPSON

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 25, 1954.*

Hon. CLARENCE B. RANDALL,
Chairman, Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANDALL: In accordance with our letter of January 18 forwarding our statement of general dissent to the Commission's report, we are submitting the second section of our dissent referred to in that letter, which is a more detailed expression of our dissent, as well as a statement of principles and recommendations which we believe should apply in the formulation of our foreign economic policy, as required under the act setting up the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely,

DANIEL A. REED,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Members of Congress.

INTRODUCTION

To the report of the Commission on Foreign Economc Policy, dated January 23, 1954, we file a vigorous general dissent.

Basically, our dissent is founded upon the following:

(1) The report was prepared too hastily, without adequate consideration of the views of our industries, farmers, and workers, all of whom would be adversely affected by its recommendations. The mandate of the Congress called for submission of the Commission's report by March 6, 1954. This was admittedly a short time within which to consider the many problems involved. In his letter of transmittal of the report, the chairman says in part:

"The time available to us for this study has been extremely short, but we have pressed our work to early termination because of the obvious urgency of the matters involved."

The urgency referred to could hardly be a good justification for the haste to present an inadequate and one-sided report. The legislation providing for the Commission became law on August 7. The first meeting of the Commission, at which time officials and former officials of the Government were heard, was held on October 21. Some of the staff were not even recruited for some weeks following that date. The final report was approved by a majority, with numerous individual dissents on specific sections, on January 11, with the proviso that individual statements of dissent or comment by members must be filed by 5:30 p. m. January 18. The report was delivered to the President and released to the press on January 23.

Thus, the elapsed time from the taking of first testimony (October 21) until the release of the report (January 23) is but 3 months and to the approval by a majority of the Commission (January 11) was 2 weeks less. These periods of Commission activity are only 45 percent and 39 percent, respectively, of the 7 months granted by Congress. After the filing of the report on January 23, there remain 6 weeks which the Commission might have used to prepare a more comprehensive and competent report. In fact, if more time had been needed, we are sure Congress would have gladly extended the filing date.

(2) The report does not meet the mandate of Congress, because it fails properly to coordinate foreign economic policy with the domestic economy and national security of the United States.

(3) The report sets forth no recommendations for the handling of unemployment which admittedly would result from the adoption of its recommendations.

(4) The report does not consider the impact of its recommendations, if adopted, upon the tax revenues of Federal, State, and local governments.

(5) The report's basic concepts are founded upon economic conditions which have now ceased to exist in other nations of the free world. It ignores official reports of the United States Government which show increasingly sound and improved conditions of the other countries of the free world and trade among them.

(6) The numerous reports of the Commission's staff apparently will become an integral part of the Commission's report with the implication that they have had the affirmative approval of the Commission—an implication that is not warranted. Such staff reports should not be accepted as either comprehensive, objective, or essentially correct with respect to their factual contents. Nor should such reports be considered as representing more than the personal opinions and conclusions of the individual members of the staff who prepared them.

In our dissent we stated that we would propose alternative recommendations to those of the Commission, and provide more detailed criticism of the report, setting forth, in principle, those guiding doctrines for foreign economic policy which we believe will be in the best interests of the country as a whole.

Basic principles

Our dissent and recommendations are founded on the basic principle that it is the function of the United States Government to take only such action as may be advisable or necessary to provide a proper atmosphere within which the domestic economy, acting through private enterprise, can flourish and provide our people with a high standard of living. Unquestionably, we cannot live in isolation and a part of that atmosphere can be provided only through the medium of international relations, diplomatic, economic, and military. But such

international relations are not an end in, and of, themselves. They are merely a means to an end—namely, the welfare of the citizens of this country. Accordingly, foreign economic policy should be considered primarily in its relation to the domestic economy.

However, whether the problem be looked at basically as one of domestic economy, as we think it should be, or as a foreign economic policy apart from the domestic economy, two basic facts exist as to which we think there is no dissent. These facts are recognized as true throughout the Western World and we set them forth without further attempt to support or justify them. They are:

(1) A sound, stable, and prosperous domestic economy in the United States is the most vital factor for a sound international trade and for healthy economies in the other countries of the free world, because of the tremendous rate of consumption of world products arising from the high standards of living prevailing in the United States.

(2) A sound, strong, and solid United States defense structure, founded upon a strong industrial base, is a prime prerequisite for peace and security in the world, without which stable international political conditions and expending international trade cannot exist.

Anything which unduly disturbs these two basic factors necessarily imperils, not only international trade, but also the peace and security of the world.

This report is divided into two parts of (I) an analysis and criticism of the Commission's report, and (II) our recommendations—as alternatives to those of the Commission—for a foreign economic policy founded upon these principles and facts.

PART I. ANALYSIS AND CRITICISM OF THE COMMISSION'S REPORT

After careful analysis and consideration of the position of the majority of the Commission we have been forced—reluctantly—to file this separate statement. There are substantial areas of the report to which we subscribe without qualification. Unfortunately there are, however, much larger areas of disagreement with respect to which we feel it is our duty to record in some detail the reasons for our dissents.

The majority report is merely a synthesis of the individual preconceived conclusions and opinions of a majority of the Commission. Indeed, it could not be otherwise in the absence of exhaustive hearings and studies of the conditions, problems, and issues which would be necessary for soundly conceived policy determinations.

In addition, of the 8 topics specifically referred to the Commission by the Congress, only 2 have been given adequate coverage in the report. Others are only superficially treated as to substance. Still other assigned topics, including some of the most vital, are totally ignored, as we point out later.

The Commission misconstrues its congressional mandate

The majority holds that "this report • • • is primarily concerned with the steps that this country can take toward solving the world's dollar problem, steps that will be consistent with our own political, economic, and security interests." The report then continues: "Or, to employ the language of the statute under which this Commission was organized, this report must deal with the enlargement of international trade in a manner consistent with a sound domestic economy."

To construe these two statements as synonymous is a clear misconception of the much broader congressional directive. The equating of these two statements permits the majority to proceed merely to offer their solutions for the so-called dollar shortage instead of addressing themselves to the problems, issues, and principles involved in the congressional assignment.

Areas of general agreement

The substantive sections of the majority report of the Commission are divided into 11 areas. We agree with many of the minor recommendations of the report. In fact, in eight of these areas we find ourselves in more or less substantial agreement with the conclusions and recommendations of the majority of the Commission.

Foreign investments: We find ourselves generally in accord with the recommendations in the area relating to foreign investments. The American investment market is open to foreign governments and their nationals on the same basis as to American citizens and private enterprises, provided they offer the same type and degree of security and the same financial integrity.

The first consideration in this area is to return international finance to private channels and put an end to loans from government to government. This would require proper protection by treaty or otherwise, at least for a reasonable length of time, against confiscation without just compensation. This will encourage a sufficiently adequate flow of capital abroad to offset continuing export balances on the part of the United States, the largest creditor nation in the world, for a period of a decade or more. During such a period it may be possible to regain multilateral convertibility of currencies on a gold standard basis, return to the traditional triangular trade which existed for decades before it was disrupted by wars, and to adjust the political and ideological differences which now prevail between the East and the West.

In this connection, however, we cannot go along with the recommendation that the Government insure American private investments against the risk of war, confiscation, or convertibility of currencies. Among other things, this would merely encourage rather than discourage the dangers of confiscation of foreign investments by socialistically inclined governments.

On the other hand, we agree that incentive and other considerations should be given to taxation of income derived from foreign investments of American corporations and citizens. However, this is one of the matters now under careful consideration by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to be reported to Congress in this session, and therefore we neither approve nor disapprove the proposals of the majority in this statement. (We subscribe fully to the views of Senator MILLIKIN on this subject as set forth in his letter, included in the report, which well expresses also our reasons for not committing ourselves at this time.)

We also approve the return to and expansion of the role of the Export-Import Bank with respect to governmental financing of foreign economic development and industrial projects, whether through the use of its own funds or through special appropriations from Congress for that purpose, particularly in the case of primary industry such as transportation and power.

We ourselves propose that the United States could further stimulate foreign investments by exempting foreign governments from registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission of their securities offered to American investors, putting them on the same basis as our own States.

Foreign aid and technical assistance: The Commission's recommendations as to rendering assistance to underdeveloped areas are based primarily upon moderate grants or loans by the Government on a matching basis with the "host" country, with primary emphasis upon technical assistance for the purpose of increasing the productivity and standard of living of those areas whose products are primarily raw materials for which the United States and the world stand in increasing need.

We heartily approve the Commission's recommendation that all foreign economic aid on a grant basis should be terminated as soon as possible, even in this limited field of underdeveloped areas.

We are skeptical with reference to the recommendation regarding offshore procurement. It should be made clear that offshore procurement for military purposes and military aid should not be used as a subterfuge for economic aid. Nevertheless, we are in full accord with the Commission's recommendations that where supplementary support is needed to maintain military forces or conduct military operations connected with our own security beyond the economic capacity of a country to sustain, we should make grants to such a country and not loans. Likewise, where substantial economic aid may prove necesary in the interests of the United States, but cannot be obtained from private or international sources, loans should be made and not grants.

Finally, although we agree with the majority that foreign aid should not become an instrument of coercion, we believe that where aid is extended we are fully justified in specifying conditions which attach to its use.

Adjustments to increased imports: We emphatically agree with 14 other members of the Commission that the proposal for Government subsidies to industries, workers, and communities that might be adversely affected by downward tariff adjustments should not be granted. By doing so, we would open up another Pandora's box of Government spending, subsidies, and control and create vested interests that might become entrenched and perpetuate themselves.

East-West trade: We cannot approve the majority proposals that the United States acquiesce in more trade between Western Europe and the Soviet bloc, without full consideration by Congress of this entire problem and its relation to our national security.

Farm policy: In view of the fact that the President has just forwarded a special message to Congress on this subject, we agree with the majority of the Commission that the matter should revert to Congress for its study and decision.

Raw materials: With respect to national commodity control schemes and international commodity agreements (involving export and import quotas, minimum prices, reserve and buffer stocks, and production controls or similar devices), we are opposed not only to extensive resort to their use, as the majority recommends, but we are against their revival or continuation in any form. They are cartel devices contrary to a free economy and likely to develop into forms of State production and trading—State socialism.

We also approve the majority's suggestions that the United States encourage diversification of the economies of countries that now depend upon a narrow base of production, largely of raw materials; and pursue policies that will temper the fluctuations of our economy and their effects upon those of other nations.

Tariffs and trade policy: Finally, as the last and perhaps the most important topic in the area of general agreement, we find ourselves in accord with some of the facts, conditions, conclusions and recommendations of the Commission in this area. More specifically, we approve the Commission's recommendations with respect to simplification of all commodity definitions and classifications of rate structures, elimination of multiple and conflicting standards of classification, consideration of changes and the bases of valuation of imported articles, and elimination of delays, redtape, and similar

technical obstacles to efficient customs-levying administration.

Furthermore, we approve the recommendations with respect to proposed study by the Treasury Department of amendments to be recommended to Congress for changes in the now obsolete Anti-Dumping Act, which is no longer adequate under changed conditions to perform the functions intended.

In addition, the law is grossly unfair in several respects. The test of "injury to domestic industries" requires revision in light of technological developments in industry and reciprocal trade policies of recent years. The law fails to guarantee adequate notice and hearings to the importer and permits what are in effect star-chamber practices contrary to American principles of justice. The law also permits retroactive application of antidumping practices, as well as the dragging out of proceedings for months and even years before final determination, with additional imports suspended or reduced to nominal volume in the interim.

We cannot, however, agree with the recommendations of the Commission to the effect that the Buy American Act, passed by Congress in 1933 as an antidepression measure to reduce unemployment, should be amended "to give the President authority to exempt • • • the bidders from other nations that treat our bidders on an equal basis with their own nationals." Nor can we agree with the additional recommendation that the President in the meantime be authorized to direct Federal procurement agencies "to consider foreign bids which satisfy all other considerations on substantially the same price basis as domestic bids." Already the administration of this act has emasculated it and prevented it from accomplishing its objectives. The act should now be applied to protect the industrial base essential to national security and sound economy of the United States.

We cannot support the Commission's recommendation that the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934, as extended and amended from time to time thereafter, be further extended for a period of 3 years, with the President empowered to negotiate new trade agreements providing for a reduction in tariff rates by not more than 5 percent of their present level each year. If extended at this time, the act should be continued for not more than 2 years for reasons stated later in our recommendations.

Here it may be noted that, since the passage of the original Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act in 1934, average tariff rates have already been reduced 70 percent. Already, the United States stands seventh from the bottom of a list of 45 nations with respect to the average level of their tariff structure (according to the United States Tariff League). Any further reduction of any rate should be made on a selective basis, industry by industry and commodity by commodity, after a careful analysis of the potential impact of such cuts on each industry and each segment of agriculture, their employees, and the communities in which they operate.

At the same time we emphatically approve the Commission's recommendation that the President's power to increase rates wherever advisable should not be curtailed. But the guiding principle should be the welfare of the domestic economy, reflecting the views of those charged with responsibility for it.

The next recommendation in this area needs clarification. It proposes that the President be authorized, with or without receiving reciprocal concessions, to reduce tariffs by not more than 50 percent of the rates that prevailed on January 1, 1945, on products which are not now being imported or which are being imported only in negligible volume. As stated, it is not clear from this recommendation what not being imported means. Do the words cover situations where articles are not being imported because of existing high tariff rates or for other reasons?

We cannot go along with the recommendation that the President be authorized to reduce to 50 percent ad valorem or its equivalent any prevailing tariff rate now in excess of 50 percent. Whether or not any particular rate should be reduced should be determined upon individual study of the individual situation in each instance.

We approve, however, the recommendations that both the escape clause and peril point provisions in existing tariff legislation be retained. But their administration should be forthright and provide the protection which they were intended to give. To date, they have been of little practical assistance in stopping the spread of reduced business activity due to low-priced imports.

Finally, we support the majority's recommendations that the same standards of sanitation and health should be applied to imported as to domestic goods (and) plant and animal quarantine provisions should be maintained as at present.

We cannot, however, leave this important area without registering our extreme disappointment with respect to the inadequate coverage of this section of the report. It fails to recognize the existence of the fundamental principles of international trade and the essential philosophy of tariff policy development which Congress has followed since 1792. Under these policies we have developed the most dynamic, the most productive, and the most balanced society of all history with the highest living standards for our people.

While changes in past policies may now be advisable in our enlightened self-interest, such changes should be effected only after full consideration of their potential impacts on our American economy.

To abandon these policies at this time by a substantial overall reduction from present rates would, in effect, be the equivalent of acceptance of unilateral free trade and would jeopardize important segments of our society.

In view of the failure of the Commission to offer new criteria for establishing a basis for our tariff structure, this should be undertaken by Congress.

Areas of general disagreement

Up to this point this statement has largely dealt with areas of the majority report with which we are in general agreement—with exceptions noted within specific areas where we could not go along with the Commission's recommendations in all respects. The remaining areas of the report, while few in number, are, in our opinion, among the most vital. At the same time they represent the areas of the report with which we are in fundamental disagreement.

Labor standards in international competition: The majority report gives this subject utterly inadequate treatment. The discussion is very brief and nonfactual. It is not comprehensive of the problems of either comparable labor standards or other essential cost elements involved in competition for international trade.

In fact, the majority recommendation is confined strictly to a single, simple problem. Its sole proposal provides that negotiators of trade agreements shall grant no tariff concessions "on products made by (foreign) workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country" (and that) "the United States attempt to raise labor standards (abroad) through consultative procedures and cooperation in international conferences such as those proposed by the International Labor Organization."

We fully agree with the recommendation that no concessions be granted on products where workers abroad receive wages that are substandard in their home country. We cannot, however, accept the recommendation with respect to the proposals that the United States attempt to interfere with the process by which foreign labor standards are determined within foreign countries. This, we believe, is strictly a matter within their own jurisdiction. We ourselves would strongly resent any attempt from abroad to interfere with our collective bargaining and other practices by which our wage rates and other working conditions are determined.

It is incomprehensible to us that the Commission has ignored the vital importance of wages, total labor, and other costs in determination of overall production costs and their relation to the intense international competition for our own domestic, as well as all world export, markets.

The Commission had access to recent authoritative research studies of the relative position of the United States and major foreign nations in respect to prevailing wage and other labor costs, tax costs, direct export subsidies, exchange subsidies and other indirect subsidies, as well as their relationships to, and effects upon, prices of merchandise offered in international trade. These studies show that wage differentials have broadened sharply in Europe and Japan in the postwar years over prewar differentials with the United States. In fact, wage rates in Europe and Japan now range from one-tenth to one-third only of prevailing American wage rates. In addition, the legal workweek in Europe averages 45 hours, in Germany in most industries 48 hours, while in Japan it is closer to 49 hours per week in contrast to our legal workweek of 40 hours. In addition, overtime pay abroad averages 25 percent in contrast to 50 percent here. These important considerations are not even mentioned in the report.

Productivity differences between the United States and its international competitors cannot be adequately measured, contrasting one country to another, but exhaustive studies made in recent months and presented to the Commission show conclusively that foreign productivity has increased substantially since 1945. Likewise, these studies show that in the postwar years wage rates abroad have not been advanced in proportion to productivity increases, as they have in the United States.

All these things add up to a substantially greater overall labor cost advantage to foreign producers over their United States competitors than existed prior to World War II. While it is fully recognized that our average man-hour productivity—with exceptions in specific industries—is substantially above average productivity abroad, nevertheless lower wage rates and other cost advantages abroad are so great that the high productivity in the United States is nullified or reduced in many fields.

In addition to these overall labor cost advantages, these studies show that foreign exporters enjoy considerably lower tax costs than their American competitors. Finally, they show that most all foreign nations also grant to their exporters direct and indirect export and exchange subsidies which are not offered by the United States Government to its exporters.

For more than a century, all these vital factors have been the primary basis on which Congress has determined tariff policies. Yet, they have been given no consideration by the report in face of a direct mandate from Congress to the Commission to study and report back in this field.

The postwar dollar problems and currency convertibility: As we have pointed out earlier, the majority deliberately or otherwise has assumed that the key problem referred to it by Congress was the solution of the so-called dollar gap that has prevailed in the postwar world. Under cover of this misconstruction of the key mandate, the Commission has proceeded to present those facts,

conclusions, and recommendations which relate primarily to the justification of substantial increases in United States imports. The result is a failure to come to grips with the underlying problems which have disrupted international trade and finance. Stabilization and expansion of international trade cannot be achieved until the basic problems have been recognized and solved.

If the remedy were merely to open up United States markets to foreign imports in order to assure more dollars to European nations, the result would be a perpetuation of the problems that have caused the dollar gap. It would further mean that Europe would be encouraged not to return to its traditional channels of trade and multilateral convertibility of currencies which had existed for many decades. The results would be that the present imbalance in the western world would be increased and perpetuated.

As Mr. Bernard Baruch pointed out in his statement before the Commission:

"In all studies of this kind too much emphasis was placed on tariff reduction as if it held the solution to all international economic difficulties. One effect of this distorted emphasis is to give foreign countries an excuse for blaming their troubles on the United States, and by feeling sorry for themselves, to overlook what they must do on their own. * * *

"At present the lack of stable currencies is a far more serious obstacle to free trade than tariff barriers. These barriers take the form also of quotas and Empire preferences. As long as currencies continue to be manipulated, all trade is made more difficult. What trade does take place tends to be forced through Government channels. If the energies and ingenuities of the multitude of individual traders all over the world are to be given a chance, as is so vital, the very first requirement is to have a free market and free currencies.

* * * * *

"Nothing stimulates trade more than the knowledge that currencies are indeed freely interchangeable. Nothing does more to block the flow of trade, apart from war, than the fact that a nation's currency lessens in value beyond its own borders.

"It may be argued that currencies cannot be stabilized and kept stable unless there is a far larger volume of trade. Under certain conditions this argument would have validity. One of the responsibilities of the Randall Commission, as I see it, is to ask itself whether the instability of currencies is really due to a shrinkage of trade or whether the causes lie in the unwillingness of governments to do what must be done, to live within their means; also, in the failure to make peace. If these and other questions are faced up to, the answers may be unpleasant, but no policy can succeed if it is based on an evasion of the facts. No doctor's recommendations are better than his diagnosis."

This position of Mr. Baruch was vigorously supported by Mr. Per Jacobsson, representative of the economic advisers to the Bank of International Settlements, when he appeared before this Commission in Paris.

There he said:

"Convertibility means a free exchange market * * *; a free exchange market means getting rid of exchange controls—the worst features of restraint on trade * * *; now, why do we have convertibility? You know the textbook reasons, that there is more world trade, more prosperity, and a raised standard of living, and these reasons are very correct. * * * I also believe that in all European countries we shall never get the savings and confidence in the currencies really before we get convertibility. So we will never be able to stand on our own legs before we get a sound currency system * * *. It is my honest belief that the only way to stop aid (United States aid abroad) safely is to see that the countries apply monetary discipline and I know of no other way to get them to do it than to have convertible currency * * *; convertibility is for me one of the great defenses for a free economy."

The Commission does not comment on either the Baruch or the Jacobsson statements.

The majority report in this area confines itself primarily to a discussion and attempted justification of its conclusions that the recent dramatic improvement in gold and dollar reserves and international balances of payment may be only temporary. It argues that too early a return to convertibility would jeopardize rather than encourage expansion in international trade. It attempts to justify this position by stating that there is a danger of unfavorable developments in the terms of trade of Western Europe, by which is meant a decline of export prices without a corresponding decline in prices of imported raw materials. This in itself is contrary to past precedents following both World Wars and to the experience since the peak of inflation in the Korean war. Raw materials prices generally fall faster than finished goods.

The Commission makes only one recommendation in this area, but states its beliefs in other respects. It underlines its belief by repudiating the idea of establishing free markets, thereby approving the continuation of arbitrarily pegged exchange rates with substantial overvaluation of foreign currencies in terms of the dollar.

Nowhere in the Commission's entire report is any reference made to the desirability of return to gold as a basis for regaining multilateral convertibility and trade, despite the fact that an international gold standard has been proven over the years to be the best method of attaining and maintaining convertability.

Concluding its review of this area, the Commission makes the only positive recommendation by proposing as a "means of strengthening foreign reserves and providing foreign exchange support operations to assist in the gradual attainment of general convertibility—that the Federal Reserve System explore with foreign banks the possibility of standby credits or line of credit arrangements." This is an astounding proposal. The Commission justifies it as a means "to prevent increase in the public debt."

This proposal would authorize the Federal Reserve System to engage in, or make loans to foreign central banks to engage in, currency stabilization operations to stimulate stability and convertibility even in the face of the disastrous experience of the Bank of France, the Bank of England, and other foreign central banks as well as their official stabilization funds. Most of these funds became bankrupted in the years between the two wars in their efforts to accomplish this same objective. In fact, the Bank of France lost its entire capital and reserves and had to be recapitalized by law out of French Treasury funds.

All these past efforts were attempts to peg arbitrarily fixed exchange rates rather than permit all currencies to seek their own level on free markets or be made mutually convertible by reestablishment of an international gold standard.

This proposal of the majority of the Commission constitutes one of the greatest threats to which the American bank system and American bank depositers have ever been subjected.

PART II. RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Against the background of the facts and views set forth in part I, we believe that a sound foreign economic policy can be outlined.

The economy of the United States is the most prosperous, most productive, and most dynamic in the world. One basic factor in that economy is the protection afforded to our essential industries, our agriculture, our workers, by tariffs. Many industries could have been developed only under this protection and without them we would probably have lost World War II.

Tariffs insured to them the opportunity to develop productive facilities, products, and markets within the United States in full and free competition with those whose standards of production, labor costs, and other cost and pricing factors were similar. Legitimately expanding, as well as infant and defense, industries in this country have been protected from unfair competition of sweatshop labor, child labor, collusion, monopoly, and similar unfair competitive practices, long ago declared illegal in this country. Similarly, they have been protected from all such practices on the part of foreign competitors through tariffs, the objectives of which have been and should continue to be the elimination of all unfair competition.

There is no doubt but that the foreign economic policy of this country requires review and revision at this time in the light of changed conditions both in this country and throughout the world. But the basic question is: Are we going to force our industries, our farmers, and our workers to submit to more intensified competition with foreign producers operating under practices which in this country would be illegal? No sound reason has been submitted, insofar as we know, as to why the same standards should not be imposed upon foreign producers, shipping in interestate commerce in this country, that are imposed upon United States producers. To force United States producers to do business within the borders of this country against this type of competition from abroad would be the grossest kind of discrimination by a government against its own citizens.

In addition to this basic factor, it is generally recognized that international trade can be no stronger and healthier than the combined health of its parts, namely, the combined health of the different individual countries participating in international trade. One of the outstanding developments of the postwar world has been the dramatic economic recovery in Western Germany. This has been founded, not only upon the aid received from us for rehabilitation as a bulwark against communism, but also upon her own initiative and strenuous efforts to get her own house in order. She has stabilized her currency. Her people have worked long hours and without the self-pity which might have been expected in a defeated and devastated country. As a result, Western Germany is now the principal proponent in Europe of stability and expansion of international trade and finance and currency convertibility, a position based upon its own internal economic and political stability. Its efforts in this respect have been retarded by nations which have not achieved the same stability because of failure to put their own houses in order.

However, until other nations of the free world achieve such stability, anything which the United States does to assist convertibility may be only a temporary prop. We should not endanger the stability of our own economy to provide to foreign countries temporary supports which can never have permanent effect unless political and economic stability is internally created by other nations which receive the benefit therefrom.

Should we jeopardize our economy for the purpose of providing temporary aid for unstable economies of countries that refuse to take steps necessary to eliminate the causes of the very conditions that occasion their continued appeals for aid in one form or another?

The Commission's report frankly recognizes that changes involved in its recommendations will adversely affect segments of

our domestic economy and cause unemployment and distress. Is this anything else but a different form of foreign aid, assessed against individual segments of the economy of the country rather than against the country as a whole? With all of the other major political and economic problems which we now face, we believe now is not the time to break up our winning home team upon which the future of the free world depends, by suddenly changing the rules of the game. Rather, it is the time to strengthen that home team and recognize those points where it can be strengthened. This necessarily means the avoidance of unemployment and stagnation as a result of failure to protect important segments of our industries and our agriculture.

What is needed, quite obviously, is not a redivision of existing markets. We must expand these markets and create new ones. Initial efforts have been made toward this in Europe and Africa through the creation of customs unions and wider, common markets, such as the Iron, Coal, and Steel Authority and similar joint efforts. Much has also been done, both privately and through our Government, by way of technical assistance—but this effort has been to increase production, not to expand consumption. Expanding consumption through improved marketing facilities and methods is what is now needed. Also, the answer lies in more stable political and economic conditions in the individual countries, conducive to expanding markets.

This leads inevitably to the basic question: What can be done to insure better political and economic stability in other countries? To date little, if any, effort has been made to place conditions upon the aid and assistance given by the United States to our friends overseas. We have financed attempts at socialism. We have financed various types of other political philosophies and economic systems. Despite this, our efforts have had some success, as shown by the great improvement in production, both agricultural and industrial, as well as in fiscal and monetary conditions in the free world in the last year or two. But the fact that we have gained little from the concessions made in our reciprocal trade treaties—the fact that restrictions and discriminations against the import and export trade of the United States are greater today than ever before—the fact that other nations have failed to follow our leadership in efforts to liberalize trade and increase markets—are all dramatic evidence of failure in our policy of free and unconditional aid and concessions.

We have supplied the means for new plants, machinery, and know-how in our programs of foreign aid, but we did not contemplate by this action that our aid would be further extended to give away also the domestic markets of our own industries and workers to absorb this newly created foreign capacity.

In our opinion the time has come for a firmer position by the United States—one which would contemplate a refusal of aid and concessions, unless conditions looking to sounder and expanding national economies are met. What we need in international relations is a commercial type of bargaining, which has been sadly lacking to date.

The foreign economic policy of our country involves two aspects, one relating to imports and their impact on our economy and defense structure, and the other relating to actions which can be taken only toward other countries in respect of such matters as convertibility of currencies, and their internal problems. Naturally, the two are interrelated. Insofar as restraints upon imports into the United States are concerned, these are found basically in our tariff structure, now one of the lowest in the world, and to minor degrees in the Anti-Dumping and Buy American Acts.

In the light of all the foregoing, therefore, we would propose the following broad principles for a foreign trade policy, based upon a new look at the conditions as they are today:

(1) The Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, if extended at all, should be continued for no more than 2 years. Meanwhile, changes in existing tariff rates should be made only after individual study by Congress of the effect of the proposed changes upon the particular industry and the entire economy.

(2) Administrative procedures should be provided to permit those industries which have already laid off employees, or are now or hereafter threatened with layoffs, because of low-priced foreign competition to seek and, where justified, obtain tariff adjustments which will place foreign producers on an equal competitive basis in the United States market.

(3) During the period of any extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act a thorough review of the tariff structure of the United States should be made by the Tariff Commission, industry by industry, and product line by product line. Such review should be held through open hearings, with ample opportunity for all parties with a legitimate interest to be heard. From this review recommendations for a new tariff structure should be made for submission to the Congress as a new base from which our foreign economic policy could be developed.

The fundamental principle guiding the review and the recommendations of the Tariff Commission should be that of equalizing, by tariffs, the overall differentials which exist between this country and other countries. Any such review would, of necessity, reflect the fact that in mass-production industries, with high and efficient mechanized processes, tariffs can be low or nonexistent. Such review would also reflect the fact that in industries manufacturing custom-built goods, with high labor content, tariffs, to insure continued research and development and to insure a sound economic and defense structure, may require higher rates. Any such tariff structure would have to be sufficiently flexible to provide formulas for administrative adjustment to compensate for foreign governmental subsidies and other discriminatory factors which would militate against United States producers in their own home markets.

Obviously, in any review, protection should be eliminated or avoided for industries which are economically unsound and are not required for the economy and security of the country. Frivolous efforts by individuals or organizations to start new industries not essential to the economy, which can be more economically conducted elsewhere, should be discouraged.

(4) A review of the tariff structure also necessarily involves a review of the Anti-Dumping Act, which is now obsolete.

Also the review should take into consideration the Buy American Act. This act was initially passed during the depression to insure employment in this country, but it had the important corollary effect of insuring to the country basic industries and services essential in both peace and war. This corollary effect, resulting from the Buy American Act, should be recognized as an essential goal and function of any new policy, whether that goal be achieved by tariffs or otherwise.

Recognizing that certain industries, particularly public service industries such as transportation, electricity and gas, and communication, are basic to the entire economy in both peace and war, any sound policy should consider the necessity of insuring that their operation is not dependent upon any foreign sources of supply of equipment or maintenance which cannot be depended upon in any emergency.

(5) The question of raw materials poses a special problem. The Nation is becoming a deficient Nation in many commodities. It is important that foreign raw materials have easy access to the country. On the other hand, it is essential for the safety and security of the country that domestic sources be not permitted to die even though their costs may be comparatively high. We do not purport to have the answer to the problem, but recommend that special studies, commodity by commodity, be made by an appropriate agency chosen by Congress with a view to providing a better and sounder answer than has been forthcoming to date.

(6) The field of agriculture also poses a special problem. The world market is overhung with surpluses held in this country with the resultant instability. On the other hand, as with industry, we cannot afford to undermine our production of agricultural products with low-priced imports which may bring depression and stagnation to our agricultural areas. Revision of past policies which have created the current situation is now under consideration by the Congress as a result of the President's recent message.

(7) Unquestionably, American investment abroad should be encouraged. Incentives by way of tax revision are now under consideration by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and this phase of the problem will, therefore, be considered by Congress. It should be recognized that the basic factor in the encouragement of foreign investment is the stability of the countries in which investment is needed. As one aspect of this—and by way of recommending that the Government withdraw to the maximum extent from underwriting private foreign investments and from direct Government financing—it should be recognized that relatively few and comparatively small defaults on private credits and investments have occurred overseas, in contrast to governmental loans. There are, of course, major exceptions to that, especially in those areas that have resorted to nationalization where the losses or threat of losses have been very large. There are also restrictions upon withdrawal of dividends, interest, and capital, but these relate primarily to the problem of local stability. The major defaults of foreign countries have been on Government loans, and have been due, to a large degree, to the lack of a sound business approach by our Government to the problem. To a large degree private credits and foreign investments have been paid back to their investors.

(8) In furtherance of the effort to develop private foreign investments, United States Government agencies, probably the Export-Import Bank, should be empowered to make loans on a sound business basis to Latin America, and countries with similar economies, for primary industry such as transportation and power. This would be done in anticipation that, with the primary industry provided, private capital will be encouraged to invest in secondary industries such as manufacturing. Gradually, even this primary industry financing should be turned over to private investors as the economic climate improves and private capital again becomes accustomed to, and interested in, investment in foreign fields. Obviously such action would increase the capacity of these countries to absorb imports from both the United States and other countries.

(9) As already stated, the strengthening of political and economic stability of other countries will contribute more than any other factor to multilateral convertibility of currencies. Every effort toward restoration of convertibility should be made by our Government, consistent with the recommended reduction and elimination of economic aid. An additional major step can be taken in this direction—constructive leadership by the United States in urging other nations to return to the international gold standard. Only Switzerland, of the

other nations, has it now. Improved economic conditions throughout the world make this not only a desirable, but a feasible goal. Encouragement by the United States in this field, in our opinion, has more likelihood of being effective by other nations than any other form of action which we might take.

The first step in world leadership would be for the United States to return to gold convertibility in its domestic affairs for which we have more than adequate gold reserves.

(10) Finally, there exists at present a wide division and dispersion of responsibility and authority in the field of commerce, both domestic and foreign, among the various departments and agencies of Government. This inevitably results in confusion, delays, and uncertainties in this area. We recommend that Congress study this problem with a view to clarifying and coordinating the policies and actions of the Government by adoption of appropriate administrative procedures and responsibilities in this field. The goal of any such study should be to coordinate foreign-trade policy with our domestic economic and defense policies in order to strengthen the latter.

Respectfully submitted.

DANIEL A. REED.
RICHARD M. SIMPSON.

The Best Years of Our Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last night—Wednesday night—I had the pleasure, along with many of you and other Members of Congress and the Government, of attending the White House Correspondents' Association showing of Samuel Goldwyn's fine motion picture, The Best Years of Our Lives.

It is true that this was not a "premiere" in the narrow definition of the word, but the timeliness of this film which deals so effectively with the veterans' homecoming problems of readjustment to civilian life is as great as it was back in 1947 when it received nine academy awards. It richly deserves to be brought back so that a new generation of veterans may have the opportunity to see it.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Harold Russell, one of the stars of the film, is from my home State, and no veteran has done more for the cause of all veterans than he. Injured by a grenade explosion, Harold lost both his hands, but through courage and determination soon became a shining example to other amputees who were faced with the difficult task of using prosthetic appliances such as artificial limbs.

As national commander of the AMVETS, and now as one of the spearheads of a world veterans' organization, he is an outstanding citizen who has overcome his handicaps, and I am indeed proud that he claims Massachusetts as his home.

When Mr. Goldwyn first decided to film The Best Years of Our Lives, he wanted to show graphically the problems which were confronting the World War II returnee, and how these problems could be overcome and the readjustment to normal civilian life accomplished successfully. That is why he chose Harold, not a professional actor, but a veteran who had surmounted what at that time was considered an almost insurmountable handicap, to play a starring role.

In 1954 we are faced with striking parallels to the situation which existed immediately following World War II. Once again the men of the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force are returning home—this time from Korea—to face the same reorientation task.

And so it was, last November, that the General Federation of Women's Clubs and other prominent national civic organizations urged Sam Goldwyn to bring back The Best Years of Our Lives—because of its timeliness in depicting the return home of the fighting man.

In order that the film's return would be on a high plane and would gain richly deserved public recognition, the White House Correspondents' Association hosted last evening's special premiere. I want to congratulate the Washington press corps for this magnificent gesture in tribute to the homecoming veteran and to the one motion picture which so beautifully depicts his story.

Address by Arthur J. Connell, National Commander of American Legion, to Committee on Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1954

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, last week I was afforded the very happy privilege and honor of presenting officially to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs the national commander of the American Legion, Arthur J. Connell, of Middletown, Conn. We of Connecticut are especially proud of the national commander, and I am sure that the rest of his many friends both in and out of the Legion throughout the Nation join in this sentiment. I have been privileged to be a personal friend of Art Connell for many years, and I am therefore cognizant of his devotion to duty and his loyalty to his Nation and to God. The American Legion has as its national commander a man of the qualities which perpetuate the principles of true Americanism.

Commander Connell has graciously presented a report to the Veterans' Affairs Committee which I think should command the interest of all Members of this body who are concerned with the care and wellbeing of our veterans who answered the call to duty. To me, Art Connell represents the voice of the American veteran, whose country should be eternally grateful for his courage, and his display of patriotism to the Nation.

A Bill To Amend and Supplement the Federal Aid Road Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1954

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, I introduced H. R. 7678, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, first approved in 1916.

This bill, as I introduced it, contains what I consider are three major improvements in the existing legislation.

First, H. R. 7678 would increase the amount of funds authorized from $550 million for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 to $800 million for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. There is a great need to increase the amount of moneys spent on our roads. A survey conducted by the American Association of State Highway Officials shows that 66 percent of the Federal aid highway systems across the Nation are below tolerable standards and that it would require in excess of $32 billion to bring the roads up to par.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that $800 million is an unreasonable sum for the Federal Government to consider spending on its highways when you realize that in 1952 it collected $848,800,000 in Federal gasoline taxes and $1,018,172,000 in Federal taxes on vehicles and automotive products, a total of $1,866,972,000 collected from the motorists in just 1 year.

The second change which I propose would amend the basic legislation with respect to the matching formula for the funds for the national system of interstate highways. My bill would retain the present matching formula of 50–50 for funds contributed by the Federal and State government with regard to all the highway systems except for the national system of interstate highways which H. R. 7678 would change to a 75 percent Federal contribution to a 25 percent State government contribution. By permitting States to match funds on the interstate system on a 75 to 25 basis, it will increase their ability to match Federal funds on the other road systems on a 50–50 basis. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly evident that in the near future, though taxing themselves to the maximum feasible limits, some States are going to find it difficult, if not impossible, to match the funds provided by the Federal Government on a 50–50 basis. If the States were permitted to match Federal funds on a 75 to 25 basis for the national interstate system, it would make additional moneys available to the States with which to match the Federal funds for the primary, secondary, and urban road systems on the 50–50 basis.

I do not feel that it is unreasonable for the Federal Government to provide additional financial assistance for the interstate system inasmuch as this network of 40,000 miles was designated by the States and approved by the United States Bureau of Public Roads in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944. At the time the National Interstate System was created, it was felt that there was a great need to build a network of good highways connecting our States from coast to coast and border to border. It was the opinion of most people that the interstate system would benefit the economy, commerce, and national defense of the entire country, as well as provide safe, comfortable travel for motorists. Though the interstate system amounts to slightly more than 1 percent of the Nation's roads, when it is improved it will carry a fifth of all travel.

The third change which is contained in my bill would provide that any one of the funds set up for the primary, secondary, urban, or interstate roads, could be increased by 20 percent to be deducted from either one or more of the other categories. Such a transfer would have to be determined to be in the public interest by the State highway department and approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads. This provision would be extremely beneficial for most States in that it would give greater flexibility to the law and would permit funds to be expended by a State where they were most needed.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Public Works I am greatly concerned with the need for a good network of roads for our country. When this matter is before the entire House, I hope that it will have the careful and thoughtful consideration of every Member.

Radio Station's Opinions Not Reflected in Commander Dixon's Remarks Printed In February 2, 1954, Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1954, I presented for the RECORD the speech of Thomas Dixon, national commander of the United American Veterans, which was delivered over radio station WUST on January 29, 1954. I should have added to this speech a statement of the radio station saying:

> The views and opinions as expressed by Commander Dixon via WU3T broadcasting facilities were his own, and in no way do they represent the views and opinions of the management and staff of the radio station WUST.

I think every radio station has this right regardless of what speaker appears on their system, and I therefore, in the interest of fairness, add the quotation referred to above.

Unemployment in My Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been receiving a continuous flow of letters from people employed in the Brooklyn Navy Yard, located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. They are complaining about the curtailment of work and the dismissal of employees. Last April the Naval Clothing Factory was closed and some 1,200 families lost their means of a livelihood. In January of this year the Naval Supply Facility was transferred from Brooklyn to a depot elsewhere and another 700 employees lost their jobs. A great number of these employees are constituents living in my congressional district, and the sad part of the story is that they represent a huge group of disabled veterans and widows of veterans.

In looking into this very serious matter, which is adversely affecting the welfare of my constituents, I learned that a further reduction in employment at the Brooklyn Navy Yard will take place during the latter half of fiscal 1954—which means by June 30 of this year. The new reduction may affect perhaps another 700 employees and will bring down total employment at the Brooklyn Navy Yard to a low of 17,500.

By way of comparison, it is worth recalling that in the summer of 1952 employment at the yard was over 20,000. Thus, within a relatively brief period of time, more than 2,500 workers at the Brooklyn Navy Yard and nearly 2,000 employees at other naval establishments in the area will have lost their jobs—making a total of 4,500 who have been directly affected by these layoffs.

Those who still retain their jobs are worried about the future. Naturally, morale cannot be too high under such circumstances, and the whole economy of this particular area in Brooklyn is beginning to show signs of economic strain.

In recent weeks the flow of such mail from my district is becoming increasingly heavy. Worry is gradually giving way to bitterness, as more and more join the ranks of the "riffed" and the unemployed. People, who for many years had performed their duties faithfully and enjoyed a certain degree of economic security, suddenly are driven out of their jobs and are forced on the relief rolls. They cannot understand how it is possible for our Government to "economize" and for our Nation to gain economically when whole families become destitute and must resort to charitable aid.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has failed these people miserably. I do not pretend to know the extent of unemployment in our country today—some say it reaches 2 million, others claim it is 3 million or more—but this I do know: the confidence which the American people have had in our economy during the past two decades has been thoroughly shaken, if not totally destroyed. It will require prompt and forceful action to regain that confidence, but thus far I fail to note any effort in that direction.

While the administration is still sitting back taking no measures to deal with this snowballing unemployment situation, the problem is assuming serious dimensions in our local communities. In my district, the effects of the situation are becoming more noticeable with each passing day. Not only is the growing unemployment affecting the workers and their families directly involved, but also those who live in constant fear of an approaching layoff, and it is also having a telling effect on the storekeeper, the small-business man, and the manufacturer whose volume of business is shrinking. In short, the whole community suffers because of this most infectious disease.

What is the Government going to do about these people? Does it have any plans to cope with this situation, or is it willing to simply let them proceed to the nearest relief agency? Is the Government going to continue blindly down the path of false economy, or will it adopt the necessary provisions to prevent economic chaos?

Mr. Speaker, these are danger spots and warnings which should not go unheeded. Perhaps we should be thankful that this situation is being brought to our attention while it is still time to do something concrete about it. Today we can still prevent a calamity, tomorrow may be too late.

A Revealing Reflection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am referring to a statement from the U. S. News & World Report.

The U. S. News & World Report says that the "period of the 1920's isn't out of the mind of today's planners." This is revealing. I did not believe that anyone who had lived through those harrowing days would care to be reminded of it except for the few who profited at the expense of the many. This, to my mind, is what happened: a few prospered and many suffered.

There are many millions living today who have no recollection of that period, but to older people it was anything but a happy time. I am one who remembers it and I would not care to live through those days again. Now I am fearful that I might have to. Let this Government think more of the people, the common people—the masses of the people. Unless they do that, we are in for very tough times.

Mexican Farm Labor Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 78 of the 82d Congress provides authorization for the Secretary of Labor, "pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico," to recruit Mexican nationals for work on American farms. The international agreement under which this program has been proceeding expired on January 15. Because of the intransigent attitude of the United States Government, inspired by organizations of large-scale corporate farmers, no new agreement has been negotiated. Thus, the arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico no longer exist. By all the rules of law and logic, therefore, the Department of Labor is not at this time authorized to conduct a recruitment program among Mexican citizens nor to spend the funds Congress appropriated under that authorization.

In spite of this fact and in deliberate evasion of the law, the Department is at this moment continuing such recruitment. Further, this is apparently being done with the implied approval of the Department of State and the Department of Justice, in the face of the express opposition of the Government of Mexico. Not content with ignoring the plain language of United States law, they are also slapping the face of a friendly neighbor intent only on protecting the rights of its citizens and shielding them from exploitation by some United States employers—the same employers who seem to be dictating the policy this administration is following.

This is indeed a sorry situation, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly a prime example of diplomacy at its worst and makes us a legitimate target for the hitherto unjustified charges of imperialism levied against us. The Laredo (Tex.) Times on January 27 published an editorial, reprinted in the Washington Daily News, which gives a trenchant analysis of the indefensible position in which we have placed ourselves to promote a system of peonage and impose it on a friendly people. I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD. It is all the more damning when we consider that it comes from the heartland of much of the agitation for a no-holds-barred system of flooding the United States with cheap labor.

The editorial follows:

Mexico's President Ruiz Cortines last Thursday issued the best statement yet to come out of the misunderstanding between his country and the Eisenhower administration.

Ruiz Cortines asked the people of Mexico to be calm.

He said that Mexico did not by any means consider this misunderstanding between the two countries as an extreme emergency.

However, the drastic action taken by the United States is certainly not becoming a well-informed Government.

The United States attitude is more in keeping with a "not good-neighbor policy."

The United States seems to have a policy of not wanting even normally close relations.

The reason we say a "not good-neighbor policy" is because when a great country like the United States disregards the laws, the wishes, and the will of her closest neighbor then she is merely imitating the worst of European and Asiatic conflict.

One of the most regrettable things about this Eisenhower Republican policy toward Latin America is the case of Mexico.

Mexico has a new President, Ruiz Cortines.

Ruiz Cortines became President when Mexico's financial condition and her treasury were at their lowest. He is now in the process of building up Mexico's cash reserve.

In addition, probably no other leader in any of the Latin-American countries has ever set such a high standard of honesty—which should merit respect in Washington.

In the past World War, Mexico produced and shipped for a long period of time 80 percent of all the war minerals that came from Latin America.

Besides, in the early part of the war, when we were training our troops, practically all of the small ammunition used by United States troops came from Mexico. Mexico was producing small ammunition while we were not so active in that department.

Mexico sent troops overseas in World War II and she had another 75,000 ready to go, but they were refused because there was no place for them at that time.

During the Korean War, Mexico checked her air force to see how many would volunteer to go to Korea.

More than half of each squadron volunteered and in some cases the total squadron voted to go.

This move, however, was vetoed. Because the high command in Mexico felt that although the United States was in the war, and was furnishing 90 percent of the troops, she still showed no disposition to actually win the war.

Now the Eisenhower administration is complaining that the bracero hiring agreements with Mexico for surplus farm workers is too troublesome; that there are too many demands by Mexico; and that there has been too much delay by those negotiating for Mexico.

The same problem came up before Eisenhower ever went into office.

But then the United States Ambassador would usually sit down with someone he considered the most important Mexican official, and, in 20 minutes clear up the "log jam."

Mexico knows what happened in the past—before she became the contracting agent for her farm laborers who worked in the United States.

Before these labor contracts began, Mexican braceros received from 20 cents to $1 per day in the United States.

So, several years ago, Mexico decided to end this type of abuse. Mexico took over contracting of these laborers.

This doesn't, of course, include the "wetbacks." As everyone knows the "wetbacks" were sometimes worked by farmers and ranchers, and, when they demanded their pay, they were turned over to the immigration authorities to be deported or, sometimes, put in the penitentiary.

Mexico also knows that it was only a few years ago that United States Judge Hannay had a case of peonage before him where ranchers and farmers were working Mexicans without paying them anything.

Judge Hannay sentenced the farmers and ranchers to the penitentiary where they belonged.

This new Eisenhower policy toward Mexico is hardly in keeping with relations between two free governments.

It is undoubtedly true that these wage agreements are troublesome.

And it is probably true that Mexico may have insisted on more red tape than is necessary.

But for the Eisenhower administration to cause Mexican troops to come to the United States border and patrol, for the first time since 1914, shows the United States policy to be that of a bulldozer which intends to force its will on a foreign country whether that country likes it or not.

Yes, we would like to see the bracero problem worked out sensibly—without threats or intimidation from either side.

That's the only way that it can be worked out in the final analysis.

As it is now, it merely means eventually lowering wages.

And, as everyone knows, when Mexican braceros received only 75 cents a day in this area, then the United States workers were also forced to accept lower wages.

That situation doesn't mean prosperity for the ranchers or farmers.

Because when farm workers' salaries are lowered—whether they are Mexican citizens or United States citizens—it eventually lowers salaries all along the line. And that means the farmers and ranchers sell less or receive less for their products, thus lowering the standard of living for all workers.

We all know how the farmers have done along this entire border.

They have more money since the workers have received decent living wages.

And now the Eisenhower administration has broken off good relations with Mexico in a very European style of bulldozing.

It's time for someone to point it out.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues in the House know from recent press reports what has been happening down on the Mexican border, particularly that part of the border which separates my own State of California from Mexico. We have been treated to the spectacle of agents of the United States Government standing on one side of the border encouraging citizens of Mexico to cross despite the attempts of Mexico's armed forces to block the border and keep their people home where they belong. On January 25 the authorized representatives of agricultural labor organizations in the territory directly affected protested vigorously to President Eisenhower against this body blow at our friendship with Mexico and against violations of immigration law by our Government officials. Thus far the protest has been blandly ignored. Indeed, the administration has had the audacity to ask the Comptroller General of the United States for an opinion upholding the legality of their illegal actions and to ask Congress for additional funds to finance their depredations. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read into the RECORD at this time this honest and indignant protest against the infamous action of the United States Government representatives:

EL CENTRO, CALIF., *January 25, 1954.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER: On behalf of the members of our respective unions we submit to you the following information:

Armed officers of the Border Patrol, under the direction of the Department of Justice, have in the past 3 days recruited Mexican citizens who entered this country illegally for employment on Imperial Valley farms. An undetermined number of these wetbacks—not less than 20—were processed by the Immigration agents and referred to the

Department of Labor immediately without the wetbacks having made legal entry by passing over Mexican territory. We make this statement in the nature of a charge of violation of the immigration law by those entrusted with its enforcement.

We further advise you that Department of Labor officials now operating in the Imperial Valley have taken these same wetbacks and contracted them for employment in agriculture. The negligence of the Department of Labor is aggravated, in our judgment, by the failure of the Department to determine the actual need for foreign labor in the Valley at this time. We wish to call your attention to the fact that some lettuce cutters have earned only $56 in the last 6 weeks, and that carrottiers are making as little as $12 a week. These examples of underemployment will be news to the Department of Labor but we are sure that their present ignorance of the facts will not justify their hasty and illegal contracting of wetbacks.

We wish further to earnestly emphasize the great and present danger to the good relations of our country with all of Latin America raised by the body snatching of Mexican citizens who are induced to enter the United States for farm employment. Several tug-rope incidents have already taken place in which United States and Mexican border guards have pulled and tugged upon the body and physical person of the same Mexican wetback in opposite directions. It is difficult for us to explain why Secretary of State Dulles has failed personally to inquire into this ignominious performance which may lead to a border incident that will shake Latin American public opinion.

We are not requesting that you order investigations by the respective Departments of the executive branch of those conditions. Past experience shows that the personnel in charge of these affairs is not equipped to sit in judgment on its own derelictions of duty. We merely present this information with the earnest hope that you will share with us the feeling of concern over this situation and that you may be able to find effective means for correcting it—soon.

Respectfully yours,

ERNESTO GALARZA,
National Agricultural Workers Union, AFL, Local 274, Brawley.
BEN PERRY,
United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Workers, CIO, Local 78, El Centro.

Mr. Speaker, negotiations between the United States and Mexico looking toward an extension of the international agreement on farm labor recruitment began in October of last year. Mexico was satisfied to continue the terms of the then existing agreement. However, the United States under prodding from large farm interests in the Southwest insisted on removing from it much of the scant protection it afforded Mexican nationals who entered the United States under its terms. They wanted to make it more flexible so as to, as they put it, "encourage American employers to hire legal entrants" rather than so-called wetbacks. This flexibility appears from conversations with State Department officials to have consisted of depriving Mexico of the right to refuse to supply workers in areas where the wages to be paid their people would be so far below the already substandard wage paid elsewhere that they could not in conscience do so. We also wanted to improve the agreement's flexibility by refusing the Mexican Government the right to blacklist employers who failed to live up to the terms of the agreement. We also demanded that United States employers be given—in their euphonious terms—a firmer grip on the Mexicans whom they hired. This firmer grip consisted of permitting the employer to withhold from the starvation wages paid these desperate people enough money to pay the expense of their return to Mexico—an obligation long recognized as part of the employer's obligation in poor return for the financial benefit he reaps from the system. Here is peonage indeed. The obvious purpose of this proposal is to give the employer such a grip on the worker that, no matter how deplorable the conditions under which he works and lives are, he can be kept in bondage until he can redeem this blood money.

Is it any wonder that Mexico rejected these terms? The only wonder is that our Government had the gall to propose them. The State Department says that their prime purpose is to wipe out the illegal traffic across the border.

Apparently their reasoning is that if we simply remove all restrictions on border crossings, as we have done since expiration of the agreement, all crossings will be legal and we will, therefore, wipe out the wetback problem. This reasoning fits very nicely into the pattern of thought of the organized growers who have from year to year successfully propagandized against adequate border patrols to stop the traffic as it should be stopped. Their propaganda has been powerful indeed, as we who sit here each session and watch appropriations for this purpose defeated know. The present administration apparently intends to make the propaganda no longer necessary.

The State Department points to the experience of the past 2 weeks as proof of the success of the "unilateral interim program" now in practice. They say that the crowds of Mexicans storming the border to "cross 'legally' prove that we will have no more wetbacks if we only continue to keep the program flexible." They completely ignore the fact that such uncontrolled control can only serve as inducement for Mexicans from all over the interior to migrate to the border. What do they think will then happen when our required quota is met? Those people are not going to go home without jobs and probably could not exist long enough to get home if they wanted to. The end result can only be a greater flood than ever of wetback competition to American labor.

Let us not overlook either the practical situation now existing at the border, which the administration conveniently ignores. In fact they deprecate the fact that the press has brought the unpleasant situation to light. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we should ignore it. In order that my colleagues may be informed as to just what the situation is I ask that there be printed at this point in the RECORD two news stories from the Arizona Republic, published in Phoenix, Ariz. These stories, dated January 28 and January 29, tell the story of what was happening at Calexico, Calif., and Mexicali, Mex., on those days. There is no evidence that the situation has changed.

The story for January 28 is headlined "Mexican Mob Storms Border." It follows:

CALEXICO, CALIF.—Fire hoses were used yesterday to turn back thousands of Mexican farm laborers attempting to stampede across the United States-Mexican border in search of work.

The fire department of Mexicali manned the hoses at the request of Mexican border officers who feared that unless the braceros—farm hands—were controlled the situation would get out of hand.

Several of the workers were trampled and injured in the mob movement. They were taken in patrol cars to a hospital in Mexicali.

After order was restored, Mexican immigration authorities permitted the farm laborers to cross the border to fill 500 jobs which opened up yesterday for field hands. Although United States Department of Labor representatives asked for only 500 men to fill the jobs, more than 2,000 were allowed to cross by Mexican border guards.

From that number, 500 were selected by hiring agencies and the balance were sent back across the border to await a possible call later for more workers.

Yesterday's mob action came on the third day of open labor recruiting along the border here since a United States-Mexican agreement on farm labor expired.

Mexican authorities at first had sought to close the border to the workers, but later decided to permit them to cross if jobs were available.

The second story, dated January 29, 1954, is as follows:

BRACEROS AWAIT CALL

CALEXICO, CALIF.—No more workers are needed until Monday at least, the United States Department of Labor reception center announced yesterday as 1,500 to 2,000 Mexican farm laborers jammed against the border fence hoping to get the Imperial Valley harvest jobs.

The reception center in nearby El Centro said all 3,500 jobs available had been filled since last Friday under its program of recruiting Mexican help.

Workers restlessly waiting along the border in hopes of getting jobs threw rocks over on the American side today—not maliciously or in anger, observers said, but just to kill time. Three newsmen said they were hit but not hurt.

In a riot Wednesday of more than 1,000 laborers attempting to storm the border and get jobs, a small Mexican girl was thrown against a slow-moving freight train and knocked unconscious. One man was trampled severely and four others less severely.

Mr. Speaker, no comment from me is needed to underline those stark facts. This is a successful system indeed. I am sure that the Members of the House from the great cattle-raising States of the Southwest will agree that the ranchers in their States would not allow their cattle to be treated that way—and we are doing it to human beings. But then, beef is expensive and a farm laborer comes mighty cheap.

We have ignored the protests of our sister Republic and forced them into a situation where they had no choice but to permit their people to cross the border as an alternative to riot and bloodshed. We have ignored the recommendations of the Department of Labor's Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, composed of able men who know the

story first hand, and who, on January 22, urged resumption of the interrupted negotiations for an international agreement while deploring the Department of Labor's present course as an affront to Mexico. We have ignored the considered recommendations of the Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers, which met in Mexico City in December with representatives of the AFL, the CIO, the Railroad Brotherhoods, the United Mine Workers, and the Mexican Federation of Labor—CTM—present and urged reforms in the then existing program to prevent exploitation of migrant workers. The American representatives incidentally had the door shut in their faces when they offered their assistance to Ambassador White in the negotiations then going on. We have ignored every consideration of human decency, international courtesy, and, in short, everything but the demands of the organized growers bent on an open door to cheap farm labor, regardless of the consequences.

That is an intolerable situation, Mr. Speaker, over which every American citizen should be up in arms. Let us hope that the Comptroller General, if he has not already done so, will rule that our high-handed practices have been completely illegal and that the funds so spent were spent in violation of the law. If he does not so rule I trust that the wisdom of the Congress will move us to refuse the funds the administration has requested to finance their shocking course.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, January 22, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in this still moment give us the grace of hospitality to the highest. As citizens of a world that carries on its bent shoulders a burden of suffering greater than humanity has ever borne, make us inwardly adequate to be Thy ministers of reconciliation.

We come gratefully conscious of the priceless privilege of carrying everything that concerns ourselves or our Nation to Thee in prayer. Our hearts rejoice at the upsurge of faith witnessed in an inspiring hour as the chief leaders of our Republic, in its executive, judicial, and legislative branches, hallowed this very week by together acknowledging Thy sovereignty, calling on Thee to save in these perilous times, taking cognizance of the exhaustless divine resources available, and being strengthened with might by the confidence that the spiritual forces with us are greater than those a godless materialism can ever assemble. In Thy name send us forth with serenity to meet an agitated world with an inner certainty that the gates of hell cannot prevail. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 4, 1954, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing through February 15, 1954.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3300) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following a quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

THOMAS BARRON *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D. C., transmitting a corrected copy of the opinion of that court in the case of *Thomas Barron v. The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Acting Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, reporting, pursuant to law, that no contracts were negotiated by that Committee during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report, dated January 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

MINORITY REPORT OF COMMISSION ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a minority report of that Commission, dated January 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Works:

"A joint resolution petitioning Congress to continue to maintain and operate locks on the Kentucky River

"Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to provide for the continued maintenance and operation of all existing locks and dams on the Kentucky River, and to provide for modernization of these locks and dams.

"SEC. 2. That the clerk of the senate is directed to forward copies of this resolution to each Member of Congress from Kentucky and to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress.

"Attest:

"THOS. R. UNDERWOOD,
"Clerk of the Senate."

A resolution adopted by the County Board of Supervisors, Delaware County, N. Y., protesting against the construction of a flood-control dam on the Charlotte River, at Davenport, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action to lower the high cost of coffee

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact laws to lower the tariff on the importation of coffee and to take such other action as may be necessary to lower the high cost of coffee; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, and to the Federal Trades Commission."

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 5, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2902. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 2903. A bill to provide that equipment for use in post offices shall be furnished by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2904. A bill for the relief of Jan Hajdukiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2905. A bill to affirm the temporary appointments of certain officers of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 2906. A bill to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets at the United States Military Academy or as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve or as cadets at the United States Coast Guard Academy, and for other purposes; and

S. 2907. A bill to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bills, by request, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2908. A bill to establish a Metals Credit Corporation in order to provide a stable market for and a ready supply of certain domestic metals in the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2909. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Hatzistavrou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2910. A bill providing for the creation of certain United States judgeships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED ARMED FORCES LEGISLATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a series of three bills relating to the Armed Forces. Two of these bills are recommended by the Department of the Navy and one by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and are accompanied by letters of transmittal explaining the purpose of the bill in each case. I ask that the accompanying letters be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following the list of bills introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters accompanying the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, by request, were received, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 2905. A bill to affirm the temporary appointments of certain officers of the Navy, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2905 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, January 28, 1954.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "to affirm the temporary appointments of certain officers of the Navy, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954. The responsibility for representing the Department of Defense on this legislation has been delegated to this Department by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to authorize the President to affirm, under the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, temporary appointments of officers made under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and to authorize the honorable discharge with severance pay of lieutenants and lieutenants (junior grade) who have twice failed of selection for temporary promotion under the act of July 24, 1941, as amended, if the officer requests discharge within a period of 6 months after the enactment of this proposed legislation.

Section 426 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended authorizes the President, at such time or times as he may deem advisable during any war or national emergency declared after August 7, 1947, to suspend the operation of any or all of the provisions of that act which relate to the distribution in grades, promotion by selection, involuntary retirement and discharge of officers of the naval service. Pursuant to this authority the President, by Executive Order 10266 of June 30, 1951, suspended, for the duration of the present national emergency, the operation of the provisions of title III of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, which relate to the distribution in grades, promotion by selection, temporary promotion, and discharge on second failure of selection for promotion, of officers of the grades of lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade) and ensign of the Navy, and of corresponding grades of the Marine Corps.

The influx of thousands of Reserve officers in the junior grades of the Navy and Marine Corps incident to the Korean situation made the continued operation of the rigid provisions of the Officer Personnel Act impracticable for those grades. When Executive Order 10266 was issued it was not intended to depart from the system of promotion provided by the Officer Personnel Act for any longer period or to any greater extent than was absolutely necessary. Now that the period of rapid expansion of the Navy has passed it is desired to return to the Officer Personnel Act for the promotion of lieutenants and lieutenants (junior grade). This cannot be done at this time for the corresponding grades in the Marine Corps and still meet billet requirements of the Marine Corps for those grades.

Under the proposed legislation the President would be authorized to affirm at any time temporary appointments made under the Temporary Appointment Act of July 24, 1941, as amended, and the appointments so affirmed would continue as temporary appointments under the Officer Personnel Act. The temporary appointments made under the act of July 24, 1941, were effected under a selection process as nearly like that provided in the Officer Personnel Act as was practicable under the circumstances.

The proposed legislation would also permit the orderly discharge of officers of the grades of lieutenant and lieutenant (junior grade) who have twice failed of recommendation for promotion under the act of July 24, 1941, as amended, if they request discharge within a period of 6 months after the enactment of the proposed legislation. Officers so discharged would be entitled to receive the same severance pay provided for officers of those grades who twice fail of selection for promotion under the Officer Personnel Act, that is, a lump-sum payment computed on the basis of 2 months' active duty pay at the time of discharge for each year of commissioned service, not to exceed a total of 2 years' active duty pay.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal to the Congress. The Department of the Navy, on behalf of the Department of Defense, recommends its enactment by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. ANDERSON.

S. 2906. A bill to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets at the United States Military Academy or as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve or as cadets at the United States Coast Guard Academy, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2906 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, February 1, 1954.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets at the United States Military Academy or as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve or as cadets at the United States Coast Guard Academy, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954. The responsibility for representing the Department of Defense in this legislation has been delegated to this Department by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the legislation is to provide that members of the Armed Forces appointed as cadets at the United States Military Academy or as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve or as cadets at the United States Coast Guard Academy, from enlisted status in any of the Armed Forces, would have a contingent enlisted status while continuing as cadets or midshipmen. In the event of separation prior to graduation, these persons would revert to their enlisted status, and be continued in such enlisted status for the remainder of their obligated service.

This legislation is considered necessary due to the actions of certain cadets and midshipmen in recent years, subsequent to the enactment of legislation requiring compulsory military service. These young men, having enlisted or having been inducted into one of the Armed Forces, having been appointed as cadets at the Military Academy, as midshipmen at the Naval Academy, as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve or as cadets at the Coast Guard Academy, and having been discharged from enlisted status for the convenience of the Government to accept appointments as cadets or midshipmen, have tendered resignations, had them

accepted, and thus have evaded further military service. Under present Selective Service regulations, all further military service is avoided in such a situation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the transmittal of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration. The Department of the Navy, on behalf of the Department of Defense, recommends that the proposed be enacted by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. ANDERSON.

S. 2907. A bill to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2907 is as follows:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS,
Washington, D. C. January 20, 1954.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Attached is a draft of a bill to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The present law provides that the chairman of the Research and Development Board of the Department of Defense shall be one of the 17 members of NACA appointed by the President. Reorganization Plan No. 6, which became effective June 30, 1953, transferred the functions of the Research and Development Board to the Secretary of Defense and abolished the office of Chairman of the Research and Development Board.

The proposed legislation is merely a perfecting amendment to existing law. The Department of Defense and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics are in accord that its enactment will be consistent with the intent of existing law and will promote the public interest.

The proposed legislation is submitted with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Very truly yours,

J. F. VICTORY,
Executive Secretary.

NEW CUSTOMS DUTIES ON GIFT PACKAGES TO POLAND

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution putting the Senate on record in behalf of the American people in condemning the tyrannical action of the Soviet decree of January 9, which will inevitably add to the suffering of the Polish people.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 210) submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received and referred to the committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the people of the United States have a long tradition of friendship for the people of Poland and have given frequent expression of their sympathy for the Polish people in their sufferings as victims of Soviet tyranny; and

Whereas the American people have during recent years, as a token of their concern for the welfare of the people of Poland, been accustomed to sending large numbers of packages containing food, clothing, and other necessities of life in an effort to alleviate the ordeal through which the Polish people are passing; and

Whereas the present Soviet regime which rules Poland has on January 9 of this year levied new customs duties on such gift packages from the United States of such magnitude that it will be impossible in the future for the people of Poland to pay these exorbitant taxes with the result that they will be deprived of further assistance of this nature from the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate, in behalf of the American people, hereby condemns this tyrannical action by the Soviet regime which will inevitably add to the suffering of the Polish people.

SEC. 2. The Senate further respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to take all appropriate measures to indicate to the Soviet regime in Poland of the action of the Senate and of the attitude of the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Senate further expresses in behalf of the American people renewed sympathy for the plight of the Polish people and determination to seek continuously for means of assisting them in their struggle for freedom.

The statement by Mr. SALTONSTALL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. SALTONSTALL

The Soviet decree of January 9 levying impossible tax burdens on gift packages to the people of Poland from their friends in the United States is simply one more demonstration of the oppression which they suffer today.

From the time of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who sacrificed his life in the defense of American liberty during the battle of Savannah, on October 11, 1779—through the time of Ignace Paderewski, one of the greatest men Poland has ever known—and right up to the present day America and other free nations of the world have been proud of Poland and the Polish people.

The Polish people can rightly take pride that in moments of great historical significance, especially after catastrophes and persecutions, they find among themselves men from whom they can draw example, solace, and courage. Such patriots as Pulaski and Paderewski are great examples of unselfish lives dedicated to freedom.

Let us remember the words of Paderewski: "Poland is immortal. We shall deliver her from captivity and restore her from ruins."

Let us pray that Poland will have opportunity to reassert itself in the restoration of justice and human liberty and once again join the brotherhood of free nations.

INCREASED SALARIES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE JUDICIARY—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1663) to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION OF RAILROAD TRACKS TO CROSS KENILWORTH AVENUE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CASE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1691) to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia, and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION TO FILE BILL RELATING TO HOUSING DURING RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may file with the Secretary of the Senate a bill on housing during a recess or adjournment of the Senate next week; that the first and second readings of the bill be waived, and that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3300) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

DESTROYER CONSTRUCTION AWARD BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, it has been my belief that the present administration was dedicated to obtaining more economy in our Government. I have had full confidence that the present administration would do its utmost to get the most out of every dollar spent for national defense.

But my confidence has been greatly shaken by the recent action of the Navy Department in switching the award of three destroyers from the lead yard on destroyer production—the yard that traditionally has produced the best destroyers at the lowest cost to the American taxpayers—to another yard, at a cost of $6½ million to the American taxpayers.

This action on the part of the Navy Department violates the policy of awarding construction contracts on the basis of competitive bidding to the lowest qualified bidder. Such a violation is a breach of trust to the American taxpayers to get the most out of every dollar spent for national defense, a violation that is costing the American taxpayers $6½ million.

The excuse given for the switch is that competitive bidding was abandoned in order to give economic assistance and to keep a private shipyard operating. This is hardly acceptable to Maine people, whose production efficiency is thus being penalized, instead of rewarded. It is hardly acceptable to the American taxpayers, when it costs them $6½ million which otherwise would be saved. The political implications of this shocking switch are disturbing, to say the least.

This destroyer contract switch casts a shadow of suspicion over the entire defense-procurement program.

Mr. MAYBANK subsequently said: Mr. President, yesterday I was advised by the clerk of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, and later I read a statement issued by the Subcommittee on Defense Activities of the House Committee on Armed Services, that bids had been called for for the construction of three destroyers, and that a shipyard in Maine, as the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has so ably stated, was the low bidder by $6,545,040. The Newport News, Va., shipyard was the next low bidder, but, of course, the low bid was that made by the Maine shipyard.

I have been advised that, as the Senator from Maine stated this morning, the construction of the three ships has been transferred to the Bethlehem Steel Corp. at Quincy, Mass. I understand there is some unemployment there, which is why the taxpayers will have to pay in excess of $6 million more for the construction of these destroyers.

I call this to the attention of the Senate because on the first day of this session I introduced a bill, Senate bill 2641, designed to stop that kind of wrongdoing by this administration.

I see the distinguished Republican leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], in the Chamber at the moment, and I thank him for what he said about the statement I made when I discovered that the practice now complained of was to be continued, and when I said that it was wrong.

Mr. President, this is not a sectional issue with me, and some of my colleagues in the Senate, as some have tried to make it. I do not know of any shipbuilding contracts which have been moved from my State. But right is right and wrong is wrong, and I am frank to say, while the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is present, that if the Department can take a contract from the State of Maine, and transfer it to Quincy, Mass., because of unemployment there, they can transfer contracts all around regardless of bids, and that is wrong.

Mr. President, no one has any more sympathy for those who are out of work than do I. I grieve that there are people out of employment in all sections of the country at this time. But when the Congress is called upon to provide for and support armies and navies, and the Military Establishment transfers contracts, made as a result of bids, for relief purposes, and that is what the action amounts to in this case, it is wrong, and as the distinguished majority leader said, it will affect all of us.

Mr. President, I am sorry about what happened to Maine, I am distressed about people being out of work in Quincy; but I reiterate that when I introduced the bill to which I called attention, S. 2641, and the present occupant of the chair supported an amendment I offered to an appropriation bill, I had no idea of any sectional issues. The issues at that time were largely confined to the State of New Jersey, the State of Arizona, and, as I recall, the State of New Mexico.

I again urge that hearings be held on Senate bill 2641, and that the bill be passed. If it is not passed, I intend to offer again this year an amendment to the military appropriation bill when the Appropriations Committee brings it before the Senate. I will never retreat from the stand I took in connection with the agreement the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and I had. I am glad to be able to say that he kept his part of the bargain, but officials of the White House did not go along. I shall try to get my colleagues, who believe in honest, straightforward government, and who believe in the rights of the taxpayers, to assist me in holding up any military appropriation bill which may come before the Senate, even though it be a deficiency bill, until the law is changed, or until it is understood that low bidders will get the business of the Defense Department.

I am not talking about some contracts which involve secret weapons. We all know that contracts for secret weapons have to be negotiated. I am talking about the ordinary case of a bid, when the department receives bids from establishments in Virginia, Maine, Massachusetts, and other States, and I want to prevent the contracts being awarded in such a manner as to give away more than $6 million of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, such a practice is wrong, and my protest is certainly not sectional.

VICTORY OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY IN HOUSE COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation rejoices in the inspiring 23-to-6 vote by the House Public Works Committee on behalf of the Wiley-Dondero St. Lawrence seaway bill.

It is our earnest hope that the proseaway bandwagon, which now is rolling in high gear, will move further ahead by a triumph in the House Rules Committee.

We welcome the splendid announcement by House Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN that the issue will come up on the House floor next month.

I want to urge all the citizens of our Nation who appreciate the significance of this great project to get in touch with their Representatives and respectfully ask them to support the seaway bill.

One can be quite sure that certain railroad interests will unfortunately be busy in all 435 congressional districts, as will certain other interests, trying to sabotage the seaway bill in these, its final stages.

I send to the desk the text of two proseaway newspaper editorials carried in Wisconsin newspapers.

The first is an editorial which appeared in the February 3 issue of the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal.

The second is an editorial from the January 29 Janesville (Wis.) Gazette. I ask unanimous consent that their texts, along with the text of several gracious messages which I have received from Wisconsinites, rejoicing in the seaway victor, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am deeply appreciative of all the many gracious messages which have poured in.

There being no objection, the editorials and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAWAY OPPOSITION FADES

On the heels of victory in the Senate, the St. Lawrence seaway has won an important round in the courts, increasing the good omens that have cheered seaway supporters in the last few weeks.

The United States appellate court has unanimously turned down an attempt to keep New York State from joining with Ontario to construct a hydroelectric plant on the St. Lawrence. The hydroelectric project is an important part of the seaway planning. New York has Federal Power Commission and Presidential authority to get going on the project. The court has cleared the way for a start.

Just as important are the gains being made in support for the seaway and in neutralizing opponents. The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, longtime bitter seaway foe, has stopped its opposition. The brotherhood's new president says that he's ready to stop fighting the seaway and start developing rail service from seaway ports to inland areas which will use lakes to sea transportation.

This recognition of the inevitable removes a formidable foe and points the logical course for the railroads themselves. It's a case of if you can't lick 'em, jine 'em. And the brotherhood is now ready to jine 'em. Its president points out that if our managements are enlightened and quick about it they can help and benefit from the increased industrialization the seaway will bring. He added: "In addition to new jobs for old, the project's most important contribution to us is the expanding productive capacity of this Nation."

There is good news from the House of Representatives, too. In our own State several Congressmen have changed from quiet opposition or inactivity to open endorsement of the seaway. And men like Representative HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana, floor leader in the House, who has opposed the seaway in the past, now favors it. So does Representative MCGREGOR, Republican, of Ohio. His change of heart helps, for he is an important member of the House Public Works Committee, which Wednesday approved the project by a 23 to 6 vote.

These and other good omens give promise that the House will go as the Senate did and approve cooperation with Canada to get the seaway built. We trust that the House will, and quickly, and that Canada will still accept our participation at this late date. Canada has already started the job. We need to join up now or lose our chance for a voice in the channels that will open the lakes to larger ships from all the seas of the world.

[From the Janesville Daily Gazette of January 29, 1954]

SENATOR WILEY'S VICTORY ON SEAWAY A BIG START

After years of hard work in pushing the St. Lawrence seaway project in the Senate, Wisconsin's Senator ALEXANDER WILEY has finally succeeded in garnering the necessary votes for passage in that branch of Congress.

The battle is well under way, but its success is not yet assured. The House has yet to consider the measure. Canada, which has urged the United States of America to join in the venture, finally decided it could wait no longer and started its own project independently, designed to be built on the Canadian side of the border. Having progressed to this point Canada now may not be willing

to join with us in a joint plan for the seaway.

Railroad, coastal ports, and other interests have selfishly opposed this great project to open another avenue of access to the Nation's heartland, but they are losing strength in the fight. Opposing Senators have been persuaded, one by one, to vote for instead of against the issue. By persistent, logical selling tactics, by continuous pressure, and positive action, Senator WILEY and his cohorts are winning the battle for the seaway.

It will be a boon to the Nation as a whole, not just the Middle West, for what enriches one section benefits all.

OFFICE OF CLERK OF COURTS,
CHIPPEWA COUNTY,
Chippewa Falls, Wis., January 21, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Allow me to extend to you an expression of my sincere appreciation and gratitude for your excellent job well done.

The reference, of course, is to the Wiley St. Lawrence seaway bill which you championed so ardently and with such great determination for so many years.

All of us are proud of you, and America will go forward, economically and militarily stronger as a result of your statesmanlike leadership in this matter.

These mere words hardly count. You have within your own heart and being the sense of satisfaction of having achieved a great accomplishment after an immense amount of hard work.

Cordially,

JOHN RITZINGER.

WISCONSIN STATE BANK
OF MILWAUKEE,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 25, 1954.

Hon. Senator WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was glad to hear the information on radio and again today in your weekly newsletter of January 21, that your St. Lawrence seaway bill, S. 2150, was finally voted by the Senate.

I will write the Congressman of my district to support this bill, which will be of wonderful benefit to the people of our State and the whole United States.

Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

JOHN UNGRODT.

YOUNG RADIATOR CO.,
Racine, Wis., January 25, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It is encouraging for us from Wisconsin to read of the 51 to 33 vote in connection with the St. Lawrence project. I know that you have given your heart and best effort to this cause which we are greatly in need of action about. It is important that the United States of America holds its position on this continent and it would have been fatal had this been given in its entirety to Canda.

We appreciate very much your stalwartness in this matter.

It will interest you to note that we are making shipments from Milwaukee in domestic crates to the port of Amsterdam at Holland in Europe.

Most sincerely yours,

P. M. YOUNG.

ST. JOHN'S MILITARY ACADEMY,
Delafield, Wis., January 22, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ALEX: I have been watching with deep interest the magnificent fight you have been leading for the St. Lawrence Waterway. The morning papers report that you have won a signal battle in your campaign, and I received the news with cheers. I hope you will be as successful in the House as you have been in the Senate.

With all kind personal regards in which my family joins me, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

ROY F. FARRAND, *President.*

MILWAUKEE BOSTON STORE CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 26, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Congratulations upon winning your fight and obtaining Senate approval for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. The long-term benefits of the seaway will be very important to Wisconsin. We are happy that our senior Senator has effectively guided the necessary legislation through the Senate.

With all good wishes to you and your family.

Cordially yours,

R. E. VOGT,
Vice President and Treasurer.

CITIZENS AMERICAN BANK,
Merrill, Wis., January 28, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I just want to add my thanks and appreciation for the wonderful manner in which you have carried on successfully the fight for the St. Lawrence seaway. You certainly deserve appreciation from everyone in the State of Wisconsin.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. BANKS,
Vice President.

GREETING TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE FROM HON. MANUEL B. LLOSA, A SENATOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF PERU

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, several days ago I had as my guest at luncheon in the Senate restaurant the Honorable Manuel B. Llosa, a Senator of the Republic of Peru; the Peruvian Ambassador, Mr. Birkmeyer; Ambassadors from Latin American countries; and several Senators. Senator Llosa brought to the United States Senate and the Congress a warm greeting from the Peruvian Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the greeting brought by Senator Llosa so that it may be available to all Senators and Representatives. I regret that not all Senators were able to meet Senator Llosa personally.

There being no objection, the greeting was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREETINGS TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE FROM HON. MANUEL B. LLOSA, A SENATOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF PERU

I need hardly say how greatly I appreciate the honor you and your colleagues of the United States Senate have dons to me in inviting me to the Capitol, which is the scene of your labors and which holds in its confines as a result of your work the potential good or ill, not only of millions who inhabit this country but in a certain way that of the whole world as well.

The traditional friendship of my country to the United States is well known, and that friendship is broadened by the remembrance of many outstanding American scientists, artists, teachers, technicians, investors, and men of enterprise who are so much contributing, from outside and from inside, to the cultural, political, social, and economic development of Peru.

As a democratic nation, my country professes an inextinguishable feeling of gratitude, respect, and admiration for the patriotism and spirit of sacrifice of your gallant soldiers, purified in the refining fires of two world wars and in the Korean battlefields. They have shed their blood not only for your own safety but for the maintenance of freedom and of the rights of man all over the world. And we also admire your citizens who maintain the spirit of their forefathers who fought for the liberty that they so sacredly preserve, and who hold the view that it is the duty of every man to whom the opportunity presents itself to make some contribution outside his personal interest to the community in which he lives, whether it be in the political, cultural, or social sphere, without any thought of reward, except the feeling of satisfaction that comes to one who has done his best to improve the lot and conditions of life of his fellow men, outside and inside his own country, making them, as the result of his labors, happier and more confident. And it is this spirit that has contributed in so great a measure to the success of your democratic institutions, particularly mirrored through the activities of the United States Senate, so rich in tradition, so powerful, so effective in its action, and so independent.

My visit here is one of good will, at an invitation kindly extended to me by the State Department. Here I don't feel tied by official bonds, so I dare to speak freely, in a friendly way.

First of all, I must convey to you a message of cordial greetings and best regards from the President of the Peruvian Senate, Señor Julio de la Piedra, a good friend of the United States, and from my colleagues. We all keep the best recollections of the visits paid to us by distinguished members of this Chamber and my presence here may be considered as a return visit to confirm the gladness and gratitude with which we received those visitors.

I expect to continue here the interesting exchange of views initiated in Lima on those occasions, with only a too modest participation on my part, and to follow closely the works, findings, recommendations and resolutions that are going to come on issues that I consider of paramount importance for my country. I shall try to get a concise and up-to-the-minute summary of them.

In getting myself acquainted with your labors, I seek also to obtain a fund of knowledge that will help me in my lawmaking duties, and to increase my possibilities of explaining your position from the floor of the Peruvian Senate and advise my countrymen accordingly.

Although I have been in your country many times and have often worked in cooperation with Americans in Peru, I am still highly impressed by the scope and grandeur of the United States Congress and greatly honored by my association with its Members. I feel confident that I shall get the best out of my situation as a wandering student partaking of the rich diet of firsthand nutritious teachings of American keymen.

And I think I have arrived at a most opportune time because you are considering the Presidential messages in which the administration is outlining its program, and we have special interest in the trends of the foreign policy that may develop as a result of the budget message, already delivered, the report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy presided by Mr. Clarence Randall, just submitted to the President and the Congress, and the forthcoming report of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee headed by Senator HOMER C. CAPEHART, who recently toured Latin America.

Peru is particularly concerned with the final aims of the policy now in the making, because Peruvian economic life is closely tied to United States economy, and it is needless to say how anxious we are for your continued friendly cooperation, both official and private, in this field.

My country is boldly working its way up; keeping as much as possible a regime of free exchange and free trading, without controls and subsidies of any kind, fighting as the best against inflation, tapping everywhere its extraordinary natural resources, stimulating its industrial growth, and developing a well-studied program of public works with particular emphasis on irrigation, road building, and social welfare. It is enacting laws that give full protection and incentive to foreign investments. We need, as you know, economic and financial cooperation, short of grants, and also technical aid, in order to increase our production, raise our national income, improve our standard of life, and make Peru a stronger member of the community of nations engaged in the defense of this continent.

As President Odria has stated, we think that the political cooperation that we are so fully giving, and are ready to continue giving, entitles us to the sympathetic considerations of the statesmen and people of this country, especially as regards our requirements based on that cooperation.

Lately, American private investors have shown certain preference toward my country, which is heartily welcome. But you are aware of the fact that my country has received only an insignificant proportion of the loans granted by the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank to other Latin American countries.

However, I can assure you that our applications are well founded and, at least one of them, which I know thoroughly, has been filed with all the details and estimates requested by the Export-Import Bank and a proposed contract has been agreed upon without further results.

A hard dollar and high-priced American products may be a heavy load for our economy, especially if our raw materials face lower quotations in their export markets and protectionist tariffs and quotas loom at the receiving ends. Unemployment and individual sufferings may turn into real threats, a strong pressure on our economy may menace our policy of no controls, our purchasing power of American products may decline, and communism, fought so successfully in our country, will welcome such allies.

To give you an example of the determination with which our Congress and our Government are ready to combat any adverse economic condition, I shall mention the recommendations that Senator Julio de la Piedra made in the Peruvian Senate in the course of a recent debate on the problem created by the high rate of exchange of the dollar in terms of the Peruvian sol.

He suggested, among other things, the following: to avoid the flight of speculating capital; to liquidate the debt of the Government with the Banco Central de Reserva del Peru; to restrict some importations by means of administrative measures without employing a system of control; and to reform our tax structure. A close vigilance on the execution of the national budget will keep expenses in harmony with revenues at any moment.

We are sure that those measures and others to be adopted will put an end to that situation and will reestablish the steady and progressive march of our economy which rests on solid and healthy bases. Nevertheless, we cannot envisage a long-range future of economic stability and welfare for our Nation except in the case that a broad-minded economic policy be adopted along the lines suggested by President Eisenhower in his inauguration speech, aimed at uniting this country to all other countries of the Western Hemisphere in the work to perfect a community of fraternal confidence and common purposes. President Odria outlined a similar policy when he said, "A more realistic orientation of the economic policy of the continent in necessary in order to adjust it to sentiments of fraternal unity." It is my understanding that fraternal relations do not imply a yes-man policy. Brothers may disagree in certain cases; they may even struggle and occasionally hate each other, but they are always ready to go along together again, enjoying the satisfaction of a sincere reconciliation. Brothers are always ready to understand each other, to help each other, both materially and spiritually, and to cordially sympathize among themselves under all circumstances.

The good-neighbor policy has been very helpful, but it suggests the existence of at least a hedge fence between the neighbors. In the new formula of cooperation, inspired by fraternal feelings and sponsored by the above-mentioned chiefs of states and also by the president of the Peruvian Senate, all separations among American nations will be done away with and the inter-American relations will be definitely set on permanent and effective foundations.

May providence guide your deliberations in order that the present administration may succeed in translating those highly inspired feelings into a fruitful inter-American economic policy.

My dear colleagues, I am gratified by all the kind words I have heard concerning my country and the Peruvian Senate. I regard those words as a fraternal homage to my country and its democratic institutions.

In a few weeks I shall leave the United States, your great country, which is a monument to the men who have gone before and a living testimony of the wonderful achievements of the present generations; and, although I will be many thousands of miles away, I would have you believe that I shall continue to feel that, binding us, are those invisible bonds of fraternity which the passing of time may possibly strain but can never break.

Thank you, sirs.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there are on the calendar some uncontested nominations, other than the Beeson nomination. We should like to dispose of them. I have discussed them with the minority leader. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Neil H. Jacoby, of California, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers;

Walter W. Stewart, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers; and

Wendell B. Barnes, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Glen A. Lloyd, of Illinois, to be Deputy to the Director, Foreign Operations Administration; and

Philip K. Crowe, of Maryland, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ceylon, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative to the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Laurence Ballard Robbins to be Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eugene James Lyons to be Assistant Postmaster General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert O. Boyd to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the remainder of the term expiring February 1, 1954.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert O. Boyd to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1957.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert Cummins Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of Mr. Beeson be passed over at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Laurence McKinley Gould to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward Steidle to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Whiting Willauer to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Honduras.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

REGULAR AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Regular Air Force.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Regular Air Force be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Regular Air Force are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Eugene Mead Caffey to be Judge Advocate General of the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Kester Lovejoy Hastings to be Quartermaster General, United States Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Oswald B. Lord to be representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Holmes Roderick to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair will say that there are lying on the table certain routine nominations reported by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Is it desired to consider them at this time? What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, are the nominations below the rank of flag officer in the Navy and general in the Army?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will say to the Senator from California that some of them appear to be above that rank in the Navy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In that event, I think the nominations had better lie over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, at this time I wish to refer to a nomination about which I have conferred with the minority leader, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who, in turn, has also taken up the matter with the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There was reported this morning, from the committee, the nomination of Philip K. Crowe, of Maryland, who is Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ceylon, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the tenth session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, March 28, 1947. For that reason the Department of State has asked that the nomination be considered immediately. Otherwise, under the rule, it would be printed on the Executive Calendar and would not be taken up until Monday, when the session of the Economic Commission is to begin as I understand. So I ask that the rule be suspended and that the nomination, which is at the desk, be immediately considered, as in executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request that the nomination be considered as in executive session? The Chair hears none.

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning, I believe, the majority leader asked to have consideration postponed on a number of nominations that were lying on the table. There were some 53 such nominations, and they are contained in the list I hold in my hand.

While the present chairman of the Committee on Armed Services does not expect such a situation to occur ordinarily, nevertheless, 64 promotions of flag rank and 26 promotions of general rank were intermingled in the list. It was impractical to separate those nominations without disrupting the entire list. But all the nominations are in order, and there were no objections to any of them. They comply with the formula of the Committee on Armed Services with respect to the number of brigadier generals, major generals, and officers of other ranks.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, had an opportunity to discuss the situation with the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not discuss it with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. But Democratic members of the committee were present, including the next ranking Democrat, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], as were several other Senators, when the lists were approved. There was no objection by any Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection, and I understand from the minority leader that there is no objection on the part of the minority to the approval of the nominations on the list.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, as in executive session, I move that the list of nominations in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps be confirmed, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified of the confirmations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION AND THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, during the 1952 presidential campaign, President Eisenhower, who was then a candidate for President of the United States, made the following statements:

> In this region, I know you are deeply interested in the Tennessee Valley Authority, and in the part it has played in the improvement of the agriculture and commerce of this area. TVA has served rural areas well and has created many new industries in this section. It has helped conserve natural resources, control floods, and promote national defense. Certainly there would be no disposition on my part to impair the effective working out of TVA. It is a great experiment in resource development and flood control for this area.

This speech was made at Memphis, Tenn., on October 15, 1952. I quote from the Knoxville, Tenn., speech on the same day:

> In this region you are deeply interested in the Tennessee Valley Authority, and in the part it has played in the improvement of the agriculture and commerce in this area. TVA has served rural areas well and has created many new industries in this section.
>
> It has helped conserve natural resources, control floods, and promote national defense. Certainly there should be no disposition on my part to impair the effective working out of TVA. It is a great experiment in resource development and flood control for this area.

In addition General Eisenhower sent Judge John Jennings, Jr., of Knoxville, the following telegram:

> I made very clear my regard for the TVA and my wish for its effective working out.

The use of TVA power by farmers, dairymen, housewives, small-business men, schools, churches, and industry, large and small, in the region is proof of its strong support by the people.

The following telegram was sent by General Eisenhower on November 1 to Loye W. Miller, editor of the Knoxville News-Sentinel:

Thank you for your telegram. Let me reiterate what I tried to make clear in my addresses at Memphis and Knoxville, that TVA has served well both agricultural and industrial interests of this region.

Rumors are being maliciously spread in TVA areas that I propose not only to decrease the efficiency of the operation but to abandon it, which is grossly untrue and utterly false.

If I am elected President, TVA will be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency.

I have a keen appreciation of what it has done and what it will be able to continue to do in the future. Under the new administration TVA will continue to serve and promote the prosperity of this great section of the United States.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has created a new world in the great valley of the Tennessee River. I doubt if any agency of any government in history has contributed more to the economic betterment of its people than the TVA has contributed to the economic progress and the betterment of the people within the valley.

I will go further, Mr. President, I will say that no other project of its type has ever contributed more to the development and security of the Nation than the development of the Tennessee Valley by the Tennessee Valley Authority has contributed to the welfare of the American Nation. This is a national project, and the people of every section of the United States have benefited from its service and its example. It has served as a beacon, and a proving ground for the development of the great river resources of America. Only last week, the Senate passed the St. Lawrence seaway measure, which is sectional in its geography but national in its implications.

And so it has been with the TVA. I have watched with anxious eyes to see how the administration carries out the commitments made during the campaign. A program to construct the St. Lawrence seaway and develop that river and then throttle the development of the Valley of the Tennessee would be an irony that would surpass the imagination. No one can justify the development of the St. Lawrence, and at the same time the throttling of the Tennessee. That would be sectionalism, which has no place in modern America. I sincerely hope that the Republican Party will make good its promises. I must say, however, Mr. President, that I was amazed when I studied the implications of the budget message of the President. But there will be more about this later.

Mr. President, ever since the change in administration last year, the country has been engulfed with a propaganda campaign. Television programs, radio programs, newspapers, are full of propaganda for the sale of the assets of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Former President Hoover, Dean Manion—a high appointee of the President's—and others prominent in the Republican Party have spearheaded this movement.

Why, Mr. President? Why, out of all the projects in which the American Nation has been engaged for the betterment of its people have they singled out the Tennessee Valley Authority? This propaganda is on such a lavish and gigantic scale that I have often wondered if it represents the official view of the Republican Party. How could it in view of the President's speeches at Memphis and Knoxville?

Let me say here and now that this propaganda will fail. The American Government will never dispose of its priceless assets on the Tennessee River. It will never divide navigation, flood control, and power because they are parts of an integral unit just like the fingers on a man's hand. No, Mr. President; the assets of the Tennessee Valley Authority will not be sold, but what we must fight now is the starvation diet which has been set for it and the war of slow attrition which stalks behind this camouflaged propaganda.

Mr. President, ever since the message of the President transmitting the Budget of the United States was submitted to the Congress I have been trying to study and to understand it. The budget is a complicated document by its nature. The tables and exhibits revealing its details require skill and patience and time to read and understand. To those of us who are not members of the Committee on Appropriations the difference between "obligations" and "expenditures" is confusing. Hopes are raised on one page only to be dashed on the next.

Like other Senators of the minority, I suppose, my first news about the budget recommended by the President for fiscal 1955 came from reporters. Armed with preliminary copies of the document, fresh from Executive briefings, members of the press called around to get reactions. I was informed that the appropriation to be requested for TVA would include no funds for what are called new starts in generating capacity.

The news alarmed me, but I withheld my comments until I could read at least the message of the President accompanying the budget. On page 11 of that message in the huge document delivered to my office, at the bottom of the page I found a sentence which diminished my misgivings, and raised my spirits. After some comments about budget reductions and savings this is what I read in the President's message:

On the other hand, estimated expenditures for the Tennessee Valley Authority * * * will be the largest in our history.

That did not sound as though the TVA appropriation had been sharply reduced. That sounded as though at long last the new administration had recognized that an adequate supply of energy was basic to our economic progress. That sounded as though the corps of big-business men who now direct our Government were applying enlightened business principles to this great Government operation, and with the vision, the courage, and the foresight which is so becoming to them, they understood, I thought, that money provided for increased power capacity on this Government-owned system was a good investment, earning modest but sure returns directly for the Government itself, and indirectly providing uncounted sums by stimulus to the economy. So I called the reporter who had given me the bad news to reassure him. He contended he was right. In support he read these figures to me: Total appropriated for TVA in fiscal 1953, $336,027,000; for the current fiscal year, 1954, $188,546,000; in fiscal 1955, $141,800,000, less than half of the total appropriated for 1953. He was unable to reconcile the message sentence I quoted with the figures. It had escaped his attention.

I checked further. Finally I was assured that the glowing sentence was correct—correct, but sadly misleading. The sentence of course related to expenditures, not appropriations. The administration felt free to boast about the size of expected expenditures because TVA's carryover balance is estimated to be large enough to make the impressive total. Not a kilowatt of power is added to the TVA system by the carryover balance. Most of the carryover is already obligated. Only a little more than a million dollars is estimated to be unobligated, and this, combined with the $141,800,000 of new money, will raise the total available from appropriations for new obligations in fiscal 1955 to $142,868,000. This figure for new money is definitely not the largest in our history. The bountiful sentence in the President's message refers largely to money which will be paid out of the Treasury in fiscal 1955, it is true, but paid from funds available from prior appropriations. This simply means that TVA will meet its obligations. It means that materials ordered by authorization of earlier appropriations and now being manufactured in Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Michigan, Missouri, and in all the other great industrial States where this money is spent, are expected to be delivered, installed, and paid for in fiscal 1955. Government revenues in the form of income taxes paid from profits in all these States will be larger because of these anticipated expenditures by TVA in fiscal 1955. The administration is counting on that, too.

That is a circumstance worth noting. Last summer, according to my recollection, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] inserted in the RECORD a table showing where TVA had purchased material and equipment over the years. The table pointed up the fact that while electricity consumers in the region will repay the money appropriated from the Treasury to expand the facilities of the TVA power system, actually a large proportion of the appropriations are spent outside the area. The TVA program in the Tennessee Valley has meant payrolls, employment, and profits in every single State of the Union. It will mean payrolls, employment, and profits for private business so long as it continues to play a vital role in our economy.

For the moment I am referring to TVA's direct expenditures, the kind of

expected expenditures the President's message was reporting. Indirectly, the profits realized in other areas of the Nation are staggering. For while TVA is buying pipes, boilers, generators, and turbines, the farmers of north Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee are buying farm machinery, the housewife is buying deep freezers, air conditioning is going into the modern industry now developing, and men are at work all over the Nation. The TVA power-service area is providing the best market in the United States for the sale of electrical appliances, and the region itself is not a producer of electrical appliances. According to Electrical Merchandising, a trade magazine which annually compiles statistics on appliance sales, the State of Tennessee, for example, with only 1.95 percent of the United States consumers of electricity, purchased 2.66 percent of the electric refrigerators, 3.44 percent of the electric water heaters, and 5.53 percent of all the electric ranges sold in the United States in 1952. In the whole power-service area, principally Tennessee, northern Alabama, northern Mississippi, and western Kentucky, consumers have purchased well over a billion dollars worth of electric appliances from the end of World War II through 1952. Think what that has meant to Massachusetts, to New Jersey, to Pennsylvania, and to New York, and to every other industrial State. Think what it would mean if that market were to diminish instead of expanding. Consider what concern such news would add to the growing fears about our national employment level.

The budget shows no awareness of the vital part which power plays in our national life, no understanding of the interrelation of various sections of the country. For this budget is planning a scarcity of power in the TVA service area in 1957. Even according to the President's own figures, there is no margin for load growth. I have read the portion of the message which explains how the administration is prepared to make this scarcity less than it would otherwise be. They are determined not to add capacity to TVA's power system, but are willing to cut down the load which TVA had expected to be obliged to serve. They propose to do this by relieving TVA of as much as 600,000 kilowatts of capacity which is now under construction and will be available in 1957. The capacity was ordered to meet TVA's contractual commitments to AEC. The administration proposes to find another source of power for this amount of power required by AEC.

Let me read from page 84 of the President's message:

> Arrangements are being made to reduce, by the fall of 1957, existing commitments of the Tennessee Valley Authority to the Atomic Energy Commission by 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts. This would release the equivalent amount of Tennessee Valley Authority generating capacity to meet increased load requirements of other consumers in the power system and at the same time eliminate the need for appropriating funds from the Treasury to finance additional generating units.

That will keep the appropriation down this year, but I am afraid, Mr. President, it will cost the taxpayer more in the future, for the taxpayer pays the power bills of AEC, no matter where the power comes from, and the record so far indicates that the Government saves money when TVA supplies the power.

I understand, and am not unsympathetic with, the desire of this administration to reduce the amounts of money to be appropriated in this year. I do not think, however, it is unfair to ask for a little more candor. I think we ought to know what we are letting future administrations, and future Congresses, in for. We are not told what this decision means in the way of larger power costs for AEC. We are not told what it means in reduced earnings for TVA. We are left in the dark.

We ought to have the facts. We ought to be told if we will make this saving in next year's budget only at the expense of deliberately raising the costs of the Government in fiscal 1957 and thereafter, on the one hand, and, on the other, reducing earnings which otherwise would be realized by the Government through TVA.

I note that TVA earnings are increasing. On page 203 of the budget document a table caught my eye. It reports TVA revenues from operations in 1953 at $131,299,130; estimated for 1954, $170,723,000; and estimated for 1955, $227,708,000. In fact, when I first studied that table I discovered another source of confusion about the proposed budget for TVA. For in the course of separating expenditures from obligations I had run across a statement carried in some newspapers that the money TVA would have for obligations in fiscal 1955 would be the greatest amount in history. Various public statements hailed this as evidence of the generous level of support for TVA by this administration. It turns out that the total amount for obligations includes operating revenues. The reason why the total is large is that TVA's revenues are estimated to be huge. Fifty-five percent of the TVA total budget for 1955 will be provided by its revenues, as compared with 40 percent in this fiscal year and 25 percent in 1953. I point out that these revenues do not accrue because of any action of this administration. These revenues are possible because of past investment.

Payments into the Treasury from TVA power revenues are increasing, too. They were $15,000,000 in fiscal 1953, estimated at $20,000,000 for 1954, and estimated at $50,000,000 in fiscal 1955. They will be larger, I judge, in 1956. But in this present budget the administration proposes to deny the investment necessary today to expand those revenues in 1957 and thereafter. This is a spurious economy, a deceptive saving, a mistake of grave proportions. My own view is that this administration has failed to remember the fable, and to recall what happens when the goose that lays the golden egg is killed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the present interest of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi in this subject, and his interest in years gone by. Last year it was stated, when the budget was reduced, but not nearly so much as it has been reduced this year, that private interests would take up the slack and would begin building steam plants, dams, and so forth, which would save the taxpayers money and that the cost of electric current would not be any higher. I wonder if any construction has been begun on those steam plants since the recess of Congress last August.

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator from Mississippi recall that it had been said that the steam plants would be built?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, I recall that statement; but there is only one solution, and that is to expand the Tennessee Valley Authority and to give it the money with which to operate.

I am alarmed to read in the President's message that the decision to ask for no funds for increased capacity for TVA rests not only on the hazard of making arrangements to take over a portion of the AEC load, but on the optimistic assumption that there will be no increase at all in the defense loads TVA must carry. That means no increase beyond present commitments for the production of aluminum, titanium or phosphorus, no increase for the United States Air Force at Tullahoma, no increase for atomic energy at Oak Ridge which is served solely by TVA, no increase in the power requirements for atomic energy at Paducah, which TVA would have to provide in an emergency. I do not feel comfortable with this assumption. It means one of two things: Either defense production is going down all over the country because international tensions are reduced—and the news today is not reassuring on this point—or it has been decided that future defense expansions will be denied to the great area of the Tennessee River. Even if the first premise is correct, even if there are no increases in defense loads anywhere, this Eisenhower budget provides no margin for unanticipated load growth on this great power system, and there has been such growth every year for the past 15 years. Every progressive power system has to have such a margin to fulfill its obligation to the communities it serves.

I am not content with the budget for TVA. More detailed discussions of its provisions can be postponed to a later time.

I want to make my own position clear. I do not believe that campaign promises to keep TVA operating at full efficiency can be honored by references to the expenditures of funds already obligated. I do not believe the administration is treating TVA and the region it serves with generosity or with fairness. I believe this administration is prepared to put us on a starvation diet so far as power is concerned. I do not agree that it is wise to pinch this year at the expense of the future, at the risk of national security. I am against such meager planning for defense as this budget reveals. It takes 3 years to build a power plant. It is folly to run such a needless risk. I insist that funds must be provided for TVA to start construction of a new steam plant in fiscal 1955. I know it will be good for the region and good for the Na-

tion. It will contribute to prosperity. It will strengthen defense.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for the very strong, able, timely, and challenging address he has just delivered upon the subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority. There have been many battles fought in the Senate over the TVA.

I observe that my friend, the distinguished Republican leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], smiles when I make this statement, because he can so well bear witness to the fact that many such battles have been fought over appropriations for TVA.

Senators may recall the battle in connection with the confirmation of the nomination of the present exceptionally able, devoted, and outstanding Chairman of the TVA, Mr. Gordon R. Clapp.

In all the battles, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has been present, fighting for TVA. His very eloquent and able speech today is one more evidence of his friendship for TVA and the strong support he has continuously given to TVA throughout the years.

I wish to ask the Senator from Mississippi if it is not a fact that by 1956, practically one-half of all the power of TVA will be going directly to national defense.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from Alabama says is certainly correct. I may add that in the battles in behalf of TVA the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama has always been a leader.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi is very kind to make that statement.

Is it not also true that, in addition to the 50 percent of the power which will go directly to defense production, an additional 25 percent of the TVA power will be used for the production of such items as aluminum, minerals, phosphorus, and other commodities which are absolutely essential for the defense of the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. HILL. Would it not be shortsightedness, would it really not be dereliction in the performance of our duty to provide for the defense of this Nation, if adequate power were not made available in the Tennessee Valley?

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from Alabama says is true. Furthermore, it is necessary to obtain appropriations to build additional generating plants to make possible normal industrial expansion, if the Tennessee Valley area is to care for the increased standard of living which will occur among all the people who live in that region.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi has cited the fact, has he not, that for the past 15 years the actual demand for power in the Tennessee Valley area has exceeded the anticipated demand?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. Everything, including the experience of the past and the knowledge of the present, would strongly indicate that Congress must provide additional power facilities for the TVA in order to meet the needs of the growth, progress, and expansion of the Tennessee Valley, and also to meet the needs and demands of the national defense. Is not that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Alabama is eminently correct.

I might remind the Senator that industrial expansion has occurred because industries from other sections of the country have located in that area. There has been a tremendous expansion of the economy of the South, especially in the TVA area. The standard of living of the people has risen, and their purchasing power has increased. The industrial development and the progress of the area have closely paralleled each other.

It is up to the administration to make good its commitment to see to it that there shall be sufficient power with which to enable the industries of the Tennessee Valley to continue the tremendous progress which has been made in our economy and our prosperity, and which we anticipate in the future.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi is absolutely correct. With the new growth and new development in the immediate area there has also come, as the Senator from Mississippi has so well pointed out in his speech, a new and greater purchasing power in other sections of the South.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is certainly correct. One section of the United States cannot be helped without other sections of the United States being helped. All parts of the Nation are interrelated.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Mississippi also has so well stated in his speech, the Government is buying power for defense installations today at considerably less cost than the Government can purchase the power from other sources.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, again I wish strongly to commend the senior Senator from Mississippi for his excellent and able speech.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I desire to join the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama in complimenting the senior Senator from Mississippi upon his excellent and forceful statement of the need for additional electricity in the Tennessee Valley Authority region, and for his description of the splendid progress which has been made in that important section of the United States.

I desire to ask the Senator from Mississippi if it is not true that along with the requirement that additional electric power be secured from the Shawnee steam plant for the atomic energy development near Paducah, there is need to furnish electric power to the Memphis area. There will be a great loss of electricity in transmission from that section to Memphis, where there is a great demand.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator says is exactly correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I had understood if additional electric power was to be diverted from the Shawnee plant to other parts of the TVA system, it would probably be necessary to build another very expensive transmission line from New Johnsonville or from Shawnee to the Memphis area, which would add to the expense of the TVA system. Is that not correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not true that, based on the development and use of electric power in the TVA area, approximately 750,000 additional kilowatts will be required every year to supply the region with electricity in order to take care of its normal growth?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. The Senator means, I am sure, increased capacity.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, increased capacity.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is not provided in the budget this year an appropriation to begin any new facility whatsoever. Is that not correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true. Furthermore, such action borders on sectionalism because it appears as though there is an attempt to throttle the TVA at the very time we are going to develop the St. Lawrence Seaway. I voted for the St. Lawrence Seaway. As I recall, the Senator from Tennessee voted for the St. Lawrence Seaway. I think we did that from a national point of view. However, we were not unmindful of the fact that the Northeast and Midwest areas interested in the St. Lawrence development had on occasion been generous with those of us who were interested in the development of the valley of the Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I did vote for the St. Lawrence seaway and my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] also voted for it. I think we in the Tennessee Valley region have always been willing and glad to assist Senators from other sections of the country in securing the construction of necessary projects, realizing that what is good for one section is beneficial to the people of all the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would it not be sectionalism to throttle the Tennessee Valley Authority development while at the same time expanding and developing the St. Lawrence?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I certainly agree with the Senator that it would be.

Is it not also true that the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority in our great section of the United States aids other sections in many ways? Is it not true that, with the additional electric power available to people of the Tennessee Valley, and with their improved standard of living, they can buy, in increasing amounts, goods which are manufactured largely in other parts of the Nation?

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator says is, indeed, true. There has been a tremendous expansion in the prosperity and the purchasing power of the people of the Tennessee Valley. The goods bought as a result of that increased purchasing power have largely been manufactured in the industrial areas of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, but wish to emphasize the point brought out in the question asked by the Senator from Tennessee—that the goods which are now in demand in the Tennessee Valley area are manufactured elsewhere.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That situation has arisen because of the fact that the wife of one who was formerly a poor farmer is in a better position now to purchase a deep freeze, if she needs it. Where is it manufactured? Certainly not in that area. If she needs a radio and can afford to buy one, she does not get one manufactured in that area. If she needs a washing machine and can afford to buy one, she cannot get one made in that area. Hence, so far as the economic life of the country is concerned, the Tennessee Valley Authority makes it possible for the residents of that area to purchase such articles, which are manufactured in other sections of the country.

Mr. EASTLAND. They are manufactured in other sections. The Senator is certainly correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Hence, what is good for the Tennessee Valley Authority and what is good for the people of that area is good for the entire United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is certainly true. That is sound reasoning, in my opinion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the Senator from Mississippi agree that what we are asking for regarding the Tennessee Valley Authority is only what any utility company would be entitled to, that is, the facilities to enable it to anticipate demand and to furnish the electricity needed in a growing section of the United States? Like any utility company, the Tennessee Valley Authority ought to be enabled, through its Board of Directors and the Congress, to provide additional facilities at places where they are needed and where they can be economically operated.

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the law, a public utility is in a preferred position. Further, it has certain obligations. A public utility, whether it be a transportation utility, a power utility, or whatever it may be, has an obligation, which is conferred upon it by law, to serve a particular area. Public utilities are certainly entitled to the money and to the power with which to expand in order to meet such obligations as are placed on them.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In view of the fact that the Congress of the United States has, by law, required the Tennessee Valley Authority to pay back to the United States Government every dollar invested by it in electrical facilities within a period of 40 years, is it not true that it is not quite fair at the same time to impede and to make it difficult for the Tennessee Valley Authority to operate economically by not allowing the Authority to have facilities to meet its increasing electrical demands?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is the function of the Tennessee Valley Authority to supply power to a particular area of the United States. That obligation is placed on it by statute. The same obligation is imposed by law on all public utilities. It is sound business, sound economics, and certainly sound common sense, to give the Tennessee Valley Authority the power and the finances with which to expand, so that it may be able to meet its commitments in supplying needed power for the area it serves.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If electricity is taken from the Shawnee plant near Paducah to supply the regular commercial needs of the TVA, it is not going to save the Government any money, because some other organization then is going to have to build the steam plants near Paducah to take care of the atomic energy needs which the TVA's Shawnee plant was built to furnish. Is that not correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The record shows that the power from plants which do not belong to the Tennessee Valley Authority costs the Government more money, and the taxpayers therefore have to pay more.

Is it not also true that under the law today the Tennessee Valley Authority is paying back to the Treasury every dollar invested in power facilities? Furthermore, as the Senator from Mississippi clearly brought out in his remarks, the Tennessee Valley Authority is paying a nice profit into the Treasury.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I merely desire to say, Mr. President, that the senior Senator from Mississippi has been a thoughtful and strong supporter of the Tennessee Valley Authority ever since it was created. I hope he will continue his forceful efforts to secure sufficient appropriations for the TVA in order that it may continue to operate economically and advantageously, as it is entitled to do, and that the efforts will meet with success. I hope there will be, and indeed, I am sure there will be, bipartisan support in this endeavor to make certain that the desired objectives are accomplished.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have listened to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi with interest; I agree with much that he has said. I have joined with him and with the other Senators who represent States served by the Tennesee Valley Authority to obtain apriations necessary for TVA.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has certainly been a very zealous and effective advocate of the TVA.

Mr. COOPER. There is ground for discussion as to whether the appropriation recommended for TVA in the budget is sufficient for the needs of the Tennessee Valley Authority. In that respect, I am in accord with, and go along with, my distinguished colleagues from the area.

However, in one respect I am not in accord with them. When they leave the question of the sufficiency of appropriations proposed, and imply that the President is violating his campaign statement regarding TVA or say that the administration is attempting to kill TVA, to sell it or to change its character, I disagree with them, and challenge the statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; we said we hoped that would not happen.

Mr. COOPER. Nevertheless, that charge has been made, and is being made constantly.

I should like to ask my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, if the President of the United has ever said that the assets of TVA should be sold?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, no; the President of the United States has never said the assets of the TVA should be sold.

What I said was that former President Hoover and Dean Manion, who is a high appointee of the President, have advocated such a thing; but that, in the light of the President's statements, I could not believe that was the stand of the Republican Party.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad the Senator from Mississippi has said that.

However, many statements are made to the effect that the Republican Party and the President are attempting to destroy TVA.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am apprehensive because for the past year there has been throughout the country propaganda in favor of selling the TVA. When we trace down that propaganda, we find it comes from a prominent Republican and not from persons in the administration, with the exception of Mr. Manion.

I agree that the President has never made such a statement. In the light of his commitments—and I know he is an honorable man—I do not believe that is his policy.

But in the country today there is a drive to do that; and I think following that drive, the new budget places the TVA on a starvation diet.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad the Senator from Mississippi has made it clear that

neither the President nor anyone else in the administration has said that the TVA should be sold or its assets sold or that its character should be changed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Except for Mr. Manion.

Mr. COOPER. Dr. Manion, about whom a great deal has been said, is, I understand, on a temporary commission dealing with a special subject and has no authority regarding the TVA.

I raise the question because the charges have been made in the TVA area and on this floor. They have been made in newspapers throughout the country.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is very unfortunate.

Mr. COOPER. The two budgets which have been presented by the President indicate clearly that it is not his purpose to hurt TVA.

Last year his budget, which was presented and adopted, called for appropriations of approximately $188 million of new funds for the TVA. It provided funds for continual construction of 7 steam plants and for 2 new steam plants. The 1954 budget certainly gave no indication of any intention on the part of the President or on the part of the administration to destroy the TVA.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does my colleague mean there was no intention to sell the TVA?

Mr. COOPER. No, I refer to any indication of an intention to destroy the TVA.

Mr. President, I have just examined the budget which has been submitted this year. While it is true that the new budget does not recommend new construction of steam plants, it does recommend an expenditure of $120,976,000 for the power program of the TVA.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is much less than was included in this year's budget.

Mr. COOPER. It is not a great deal less, a cut no larger than for the budget as a whole.

Mr. EASTLAND. But it is less.

Mr. COOPER. I repeat. The current budget recommends that $120,976,000 be appropriated in new money for the completion of generating plants. That does not indicate enmity toward TVA.

Mr. EASTLAND. But that amount is quite a great deal less than the amounts previously provided, and not a dime is proposed for new projects.

Mr. COOPER. I ask my colleague, the Senator from Mississippi, who knows that I am a TVA advocate, to state the amount of power which he understands will be needed in 1957?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, the TVA has made out a case for the new Fulton steam plant, to meet the needs beginning in 1957. It takes about 3 years to build a steam plant.

Mr. COOPER. I now read from the budget:

> Projects now under consideration will increase the rated generating capacity of TVA system, including plants of the Aluminum Company of America and Cumberland Basin plants of the Department of the Army, from 5,300,000 kilowatts, as of June 30, 1953, to 9,984,000 kilowatts by December 1957.

I cannot say, from an engineering standpoint, that the figures are correct, but the budget does state that if the present program is carried through there will be available for TVA in December 1957, 9,984,000 kilowatts.

Can the Senator from Mississippi tell me whether that is less than the amount the TVA thinks will be needed?

Mr. EASTLAND. It provides for no unanticipated needs.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator from Mississippi know whether TVA authorities state that more power will be needed in 1957?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am certain of that.

Mr. COOPER. Last year, when TVA appropriations were being considered, one of the arguments made for an increase in the power capacity of TVA was that TVA was then being required to furnish atomic-energy plants with a large amount of power which could be used in the TVA system.

Now, when it is suggested that new sources of power for the atomic-energy plants will be made available, releasing power for the needs of the TVA, I am at a loss to understand the objections raised by advocates of the TVA.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that even if that power is released to the TVA, it will not meet the unanticipated needs which the experience of the last 15 years shows will have to be met?

Furthermore, is it not true that this power is available in the extreme end of the TVA region; and it would be more expensive to transmit that power into the great consuming region of the Tennessee Valley, than it would be to construct a plant at the proper economical, businesslike, and strategic place in the valley?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true. And where is the appropriation for the new Fulton steam plant?

Mr. HILL. Of course, the budget does not include a dime for it.

Mr. EASTLAND. But a case for it has been made.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In asking these questions I wish it distinctly understood that they involve no reflection upon the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who has been such a loyal and effective supporter of the TVA, both during the time he has been in the Senate and in private life.

Is it not true that last year the TVA asked for an appropriation to start the Fulton steam plant, with the statement that it needed two units of a steam plant near Memphis, which in 1956 would furnish an installed capacity of 600,000 kilowatts, and that without such steam plant there would be a power shortage in the Tennessee Valley region in 1956?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not true that the TVA, in submitting its estimates of electrical needs for years to come, has been uncannily accurate in estimating the needs it would be required to meet in future years?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think it has been very conservative.

Mr. KEFAUVER. So there is a 400,000 kilowatt shortage already in sight for 1956. Is it not true that for 1957 the TVA estimated that it would need a new facility of about the same size in order to take care of the increased needs for that year?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But no provision has been made in the budget for the increased amount, either for 1956 or for 1957. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not true that while no one in the administration, with the possible exception of Dr. Manion, has advocated the sale of the TVA, the TVA could be destroyed and supplanted by some other method of furnishing the electric power users of the valley with electricity, as well as by strangling the TVA to death through lack of appropriations?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. It has been put on a starvation diet.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Has that not been our great fear in the valley during the last session of Congress, and so far this session?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is a fact. Many prominent Republicans are saying, "Sell TVA; sell TVA." It has our people apprehensive. Let me say in that connection that no man has done finer work for the TVA than has the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Would not the Senator from Mississippi agree that one way to eliminate the talk about the sale of TVA or the destruction of TVA, and one way to eliminate the justified fear which we in the Tennessee Valley region have that we may have a power shortage in years to come by reason of the absence of sufficient appropriations, would be for the administration simply to appropriate the amount of money which the TVA needs?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. Every dollar would come back into the Treasury.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I will yield the floor if the Senator so desires.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wished to ask a question. I was just leaving the Chamber when I heard the Senator again state that he has some fear, as I understood him, that a policy was developing in the administration looking toward the sale of TVA.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from California certainly misunderstood what I said. I said that that could not be the administration's policy in the light of the President's commitment; but I stated that there has been a drive throughout the country, accompanied by a great deal of propaganda, to sell the assets of

the Tennessee Valley Authority; and that the fact that each time the person who takes the lead is a prominent Republican has caused our people to be in an apprehensive frame of mind. It makes me apprehensive.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that I feel certain in my own mind that there is no policy in the administration either to sell or liquidate the TVA. I can say to the Senator on my own responsibility that I would most vigorously oppose such a policy.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am very glad to have that statement from the Senator. It is certainly worth while. But if we are going to starve TVA to death, that process will be just as deadly as a sale. The TVA must have appropriations. The law has placed certain obligations on TVA to supply the power needs of a certain area, just as any other utility does. It is certainly entitled to the finances and the authority necessary to fulfill its obligations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator will find that the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Director of the Budget, in considering the problems of the Nation in connection with fiscal affairs, certainly will not permit any area of the country to be starved to death or deprived of the proper economic development of its resources.

Mr. EASTLAND. In the light of the fights we have had in the Senate, I wish I were as confident on that score as is my friend the distinguished senior Senator from California.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the effort to reduce appropriations and hold down spending, but at the same time continue business activity so that we can have prosperity in the United States, does not the Senator feel that the Director of the Budget and others who may contend that appropriations for the TVA are simply adding to the national debt are laboring under a mistaken assumption? Actually the TVA is an investment, not only from the standpoint of return to the Federal Government, but from the standpoint of return to all sections of the country. The TVA pays excellent dividends and should not be placed in the classification of a drain on the Treasury which is adding to the national debt.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is anything but a drain on the Treasury. It has resulted in the payment into the Treasury of the United States of huge sums in income taxes by those who do business in that area. It certainly has been a tremendous boon to the entire economy of the Nation.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation in the Senate with respect to the pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 1, now seems to many of us to be thoroughly confused. Various Senators have submitted a number of so-called perfecting amendments or substitutes for the joint resolution reported by the Judiciary Committee. I have talked with many Senators since yesterday, and a number have told me privately that they are not at all sure what would be the effect of the various proposed amendments to the so-called Bricker joint resolution.

I am sure that many Senators who are not members of the Judiciary Committee, and who have been unable to make a thorough study of the drastic constitutional changes implicit in some of the proposed amendments, are likewise unprepared to consider these proposals on their merit.

As Walter Lippmann said this morning with commendable clarity:

> The one thing that is quite clear is that the only constitutional amendment on which the Senate can with propriety vote at this time is Senator BRICKER'S. His amendment is a dangerous proposal but it has at least been subjected to the process through which proposals to amend the Constitution are meant to pass. None of the compromise or substitute proposals have been subjected to the process. They may be good, bad, or indifferent. But one and all, they are unwashed, unpeeled, uncooked, and not yet fit to be eaten by the Senate of the United States.

It has been clear for some days that if the majority leader will permit the Senate to vote on Senate Joint Resolution 1, the measure will be defeated. As I indicated yesterday, it is natural that, for the sake of his party, the majority leader desperately wants to avoid a decisive showdown. For the sake of the country, what we must avoid is a premature effort to vote on changes in the wording of the resolution that have not been put to the test of long and careful study and analysis.

For the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] I have the warmest affection and the highest respect for his statesmanlike wisdom and his acknowledged authority in the field of foreign relations and constitutional law. It is, therefore, with great reluctance that I find myself, in this instance, unable to follow his leadership. Even as to his proposed substitute, able Senators and constitutional lawyers disagree. Other experts in this field have expressed doubt concerning the meaning and ultimate effect of his proposal. When eminent authorities are in doubt and disagreement, it behooves the Senate to move with caution in this matter of such great importance. Not all Senators can be expected to be expert in the complex field of constitutional law.

As I understand the position of the Senator from Georgia, he is disturbed because the courts have ruled that the President, by means of executive agreement, may override Federal and State laws. Although I think there is some doubt on this point, I think it is well for us who oppose changing the Constitution to concede that this may be the correct interpretation of the President's existing power. In any case, however, I think it can be maintained that our traditional system of checks and balances between the three branches of the Federal Government and between Federal authority and the rights of States has not been seriously jeopardized by any President in the past through use of executive agreements.

On the other hand, amending the Constitution to provide that executive agreements made by the President in his role as Commander in Chief and a manager of our foreign relations shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of Congress would adversely affect our great constitutional system of government in two ways. One effect would be that the control over foreign relations and national defense now vested in the President would be shifted to the Congress. The second effect would be that power now residing in the States would be given over to the Federal Government.

First, I want to discuss briefly the shift of power from the States to the Federal Government that would result from the proposed amendments dealing with executive agreements.

It seems to me somewhat ironic that Senators who cherish dearly the powers reserved to the States by the Constitution are toying with amendments that would make it easy for a future President, with the acquiesence of an accommodating Congress, to strip the States of their power. In addition, as I read the proposed substitute concerning executive agreements put forward by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, it would transfer powers away from the Southern and Western States with smaller populations and give them to the more populous Northern and Eastern States. I cannot understand why my southern friends would want to do this.

The Constitution of the United States is silent on the subject of executive agreements. The President's power in this respect is an implied power stemming from his position as Commander in Chief and as the manager of our foreign relations. Because the power to execute executive agreements is an implied one and does not come from the provision of the Constitution creating the Presidential treatymaking powers, the executive branch of the Government has never claimed that executive agreements and treaties are interchangeable or that treaties can be bypassed by the use of executive agreements. If, however, we lift executive agreements to the dignity provided by constitutional sanction, we may well open the door to their indiscriminate use by future Presidents who might be inclined to ignore the traditional difference between treaties and executive agreements.

Under the Constitution, as it presently reads, State laws and State constitutions

have been traditionally overriden by international agreements only if these agreements are in the form of treaties and two-thirds of the Senate agree to the treaties' ratification. State laws and State constitutions, under the proposed amendments, however, could be overridden by executive agreement implemented by an act of Congress approved by a simple majority of both Houses of the Congress.

In the past, I am sure that the executive branch of our Federal Government has often refrained from negotiating and sending to the Senate for approval treaties that would affect internal law of the United States because of the likelihood that two-thirds of the Senate would not ratify the treaty. Under the proposed amendments, the executive branch would not be confronted with the necessity of obtaining the approval of two-thirds of the Senate; the executive could probably count on obtaining approval of an executive agreement by a simple majority of both Houses. Such an amendment would pave the way for future Presidents to take the easy road in foreign affairs provided by executive agreement. In short, under these amendments, we would evaluate executive agreements to a constitutional status and provide an easy method for overriding State laws and State constitutions.

As I suggested earlier, this likelihood should be of deep concern to all those who cherish our constitutional system which protects the rights of States. That the proposed amendment would have this result is clearly seen when we analyze it. Under the Constitution as it now stands, one-third plus one of the Senate can defeat any effort of a President to override States rights by means of a treaty. At most, this means 33 Senators can prevent encroachments by the Federal Government on States rights through treaties.

As a practical matter, a much smaller number of Senators have prevented usurpation of State power by the Federal Government through the device of a treaty. Do Senators, who can, as one of 20 or 26 or at most 33 Members of this body, prevent abuse of Presidential power by treaty want to dilute their strength in this manner?

To me, Mr. President, that is unthinkable; I do not believe the distinguished Members of this body intend to relinquish their power and their right as Members of the Senate representing their sovereign States. It seems to me altogether objectionable, Mr. President, to give to the Federal Executive or to the Congress this sweeping power to override State laws and constitutions.

For this reason alone, I shall vote against all the proposed amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me invite the Senator's attention to a very recent one, the case of the United States against Pink, reported in 315th United States Reports.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is a New York case.

Mr. GEORGE. It is. Let me also invite attention to exactly what the court held in that case. It was a case of a simple executive arrangement; it was not even in the form of a treaty.

Mr. HENNINGS. It related to the recognition of Russia.

Mr. GEORGE. It related to more than that. It related to the disposition of assets held in the State of New York, which assets had been pledged for the protection of policyholders in insurance companies. That particular decision is what makes it necessary for the Congress to act with reference to executive agreements if the Congress is going to protect the rights of individual citizens and of the States. The court held, in brief:

> The fifth amendment—

That is, the fifth amendment to the Federal Constitution—

> does not stand in the way of giving full force and effect to the Litvinov assignment.

The Litvinov assignment was a proposal made by a representative of Russia to the President to assign certain assets then held in the State of New York to the Government of the United States for the purpose of being used in adjusting whatever the status of accounts between the United States and Russia might be. The insurance commissioner of New York State acted in behalf of citizens who had rights in the preservation of those assets which, under New York law, had been pledged for the protection of policyholders in a certain Russian insurance company.

But the Supreme Court said:

> The fifth amendment does not stand in the way of giving full force and effect to the Litvinov assignment.

It also said that the executive arrangement, which was simply a letter to the President and a short letter in reply thereto, saying, on behalf of the United States, "I accept this assignment to be carried into execution as stated in the assignment." That is substantially what was said. I am not attempting to quote the exact language. It was a very brief statement——

Mr. HENNINGS. Was not that a 4 to 3 decision?

Mr. GEORGE. No; it was a 5 to 2 decision.

Mr. HENNINGS. There were two justices who did not sit.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct; but, unfortunately, it is still the law of this land, because the majority of the Court agreed to it.

The Court also said that this executive agreement, which was not made by the Congress or approved by the Congress, but was made by the President and placed into the files of the executive branch of the Government, either in the White House or in the State Department, had the effect of nullifying a law of the State of New York.

That is why I have offered my amendment. I have suggested that if we are going to preserve the rights of individuals and of the States, we must do so by saying that executive agreements which can override the laws of the States and can even overcome provisions in State constitutions, and, according to the Pink case, might be wholly indifferent even to a provision in the Federal Constitution, must not be made merely by one man, but must be submitted to the Congress.

I do not believe the President has any other views than those which I am now expressing. But if he has, and if he will read the Pink case, he will have great difficulty in explaining to the American people that he wants the power in the President to override constitutions of States and the laws of States which are otherwise valid. If the President wants to go to the country on that issue, he can do so; but the President will never accept that proposition when he thoroughly considers it.

I am saying to the Senator from Missouri that if nothing is to be done in the field of executive agreements, which have multiplied out of all real proportion to the treatymaking power of the President as exercised under the Constitution itself, we may as well close up shop.

I do not mean to compare the President to Hitler, but I do not know what sort of a President we may have at some future time. Does the Senator know how Hitler got his power? He got it through perfectly constitutional means. He had the German Constitution so framed as to authorize him in the event of a great emergency to exercise government by decree. What is government by decree if it is not the writing of a simple letter by the President of the United States, to remain unseen unless some circumstance might bring it to light? The President would not, I am certain, defend the proposition that he wants placed in him power which is not to be scrutinized by the Congress of the United States.

A later case, the Capps case, which was decided by the fourth circuit court unfavorably to the Government, has been appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. The appeal has been taken on the direction of the present Attorney General I am informed. What does it mean?

It means only this, that undoubtedly what the Attorney General—not the President—wants is the Pink case with all of its implications. He wants it even to the extent of knocking out a law which had been passed by the Congress, providing that the President could not make an agreement with Canada which was held contrary to the Trade Agreements Act. If the Supreme Court knocks out the decision which has been appealed and stands by the Pink case, which is the law at this time, then we have the possibility of a one-man rule in the United States of America.

The Senator may say that is visionary. It is not. It has been done over and over again. My amendment is offered solely because the Supreme Court of the United States has said that an executive agreement which was nothing but

an answer to a letter written by the Russian representative in this country had the effect of overcoming the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and, also, had the effect of overriding a State law.

My proposal is simply this, and nothing but this: That with respect to executive agreements which Congress has no part in shaping or formulating, such executive agreements shall not become internal or domestic law of the United States unless Congress, by an act, shall so provide.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield so that I may propound a question to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I desire to say to the Senator from Georgia that I was very fearful the Senator's amendment in the nature of a substitute would in some way impair the effectiveness of the 10th amendment. Will the Senator please clarify that situation for me?

Mr. GEORGE. I had not intended to go into that at this time, but I think——

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If the Senator from Georgia intends to discuss that matter later, I do not insist on his doing so now.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, I shall do so later; but I may say that the 10th amendment speaks for itself. The 10th amendment simply provides:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

One point which the Supreme Court often overlooks, or, I may say, of which they lose sight, is that the ultimate sovereignty in this Nation resides in the people, not in the officers elected to administer the Government.

Mr. HENNINGS. The last four words of the 10th amendment are: "or to the people."

So the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor by it to the States, are reserved to the States, or to the people.

Mr. GEORGE. They are reserved to the States or to the people.

Mr. HENNINGS. The last four words of the 10th amendment reserve such powers to the people.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Missouri is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is basic.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true. The 10th amendment itself provides:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The framers of the Constitution expressly delegated the treatymaking power to the President, with the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate.

Not only that, but the framers of the Constitution denied to the States the power to make a treaty or an alliance, or to enter into any agreement or compact as between themselves or with a foreign state, except by consent of Congress. So it seems to me the 10th amendment speaks for itself.

I do not wish to disturb in this field basically the fundamental relationship between the Federal Government and the States. If the powers of the States are to be preserved, they must be preserved on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives. The buck ought not to be passed to the courts.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further, so that I may ask another question of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be glad to yield, but I desire to complete my statement at some time.

Mr. GEORGE. I beg pardon of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his contribution. I did not in any way wish to shorten his discussion.

Mr. GEORGE. I thought the Senator from Missouri had practically concluded his statement.

Mr. HENNINGS. No.

Before getting into further ramifications, I should like to complete my statement, which I think will, in part, at least, answer some of the points raised by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely desired to call the attention of the Senator to the Pink case.

Mr. HENNINGS. I think all of us can agree—and I say this with great deference—that there are respectable differences of opinion, even upon the question of the Pink case being good law. I would say, in partial answer to the observation of the distinguished Senator as to the Pink case, that the result, insofar as it affected a citizen of New York, was incidental to the recognition of Russia at that time. But that was not the primary purpose or objective of the Executive order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may be mistaken, but my recollection of the Pink case, about which there have been discussions on numerous occasions during the debate which has been in progress during the past few weeks, is that the Mr. Pink referred to in the case was a commissioner of New York State, so he was acting as an official of the State of New York, carrying out the laws of the constitution of New York. As such, he was acting in the interest of the citizen involved, and also in the interest of all creditors, I suppose, or all those who had assets in the company.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Pink was the equivalent, at least, of a commissioner of insurance.

Mr. HENNINGS. I hope to advert to that general proposition later, I may say to both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from California.

In the past, I believe the executive branch of the Federal Government has often refrained from negotiating, and sending to the Senate for approval, treaties which would have affected the internal law of the United States, because of the likelihood that two-thirds of the Senate might not ratify such treaties.

Under the proposed amendment, the executive branch of the Government would not be confronted with the necessity of obtaining the approval of two-thirds of the Senate. I think my friend, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, will bear out that statement.

I believe the distinguished majority leader will recall placing in the RECORD on a recent day an interchange of correspondence between himself and Gen. Walter Bedell Smith.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Acting Secretary of State Smith.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes. Did not the distinguished majority leader at that time ask the Acting Secretary of State for a list of executive agreements which had been made in the past year?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the past 10 years.

Mr. HENNINGS. I stand corrected; in the past 10 years. Did not the Acting Secretary of State say that it would take 6 months or more in which to compile such a list?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Missouri is correct. In his letter to me, which was placed in the RECORD, the Acting Secretary of State said it would take, in his judgment, 6 months in which to compile the information requested.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes. So, by the same token, if it would require 6 months in which to compile such a list, may we not speculate as to the length of time it would have taken the United States Senate to have passed upon all those agreements, in concurrence with the House of Representatives? In other words, there were so many executive agreements that a list of them could not have been compiled in less than 6 months.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not think that would necessarily follow. I think it might require 6 months in which to compile information regarding a series of executive agreements entered into during the past 10 years, but I think it would not take the United States Senate 6 months to act on the principle involved in the agreements; of course, I could have asked for a list of executive agreements entered into during the 2 or 3 years.

Mr. HENNINGS. I was not referring to the principle involved in each agreement the Senator had requested. I understood the Senator had asked for a list of such agreements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I asked for a list of agreements in which the Department believed internal law was involved, and those for which the Department had obtained either prior or subsequent congressional authorization.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Missouri has been speaking about the great number of executive agreements which have been entered into. The Senator appreciates, does he not, that this amendment goes only to the internal effect of any executive agreement?

Has the Senator from Missouri read the record of the committee hearings?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have read the record of the committee hearings.

Mr. BRICKER. It is recorded in the committee hearings that Secretary Dulles, when he appeared before the committee, said that treaties not approved by the Senate cannot constitutionally become the law of the land. Does the Senator from Missouri recall that testimony?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not remember that specific testimony; but if the Senator from Ohio says that is the testimony, I will accept his word for it.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the testimony, as I recall. But when the Secretary of State learned about the Pink case, which incidentally he had not known about, which gives the President the power the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] mentioned a moment ago, then the Secretary wanted to hold on to that power.

In the hearings, I asked the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and others, as did other members of the committee, "In what fields is it necessary to make executive agreements domestic law, so as not to interfere with foreign relations?"

There was not a case cited then, and there has not been a case cited since. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Missouri cite any such case, if he can.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio, for whom I have great respect and affection, in what case other than the Pink case has it ever been held there was a violation of the internal law of any State?

Mr. BRICKER. We do not know how many there are, and we will not know until we get the compilation. Many of the agreements are secret. Many of them may affect the rights of the American people. The Senator or I or someone else may wake up 10 years from now and discover that our constitutional rights have been violated by executive agreement. We do not want to wait until something like that happens before taking steps to prevent its happening. If that had been the attitude of the makers of the Constitution, if that had been the attitude of the first Congress of the United States, we would not have had a Constitution or a Bill of Rights.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask the Senator when he first discovered the existence of the Pink case, and whether it was before or after he introduced Senate Joint Resolution 1?

Mr. BRICKER. I knew of the Pink case long before I introduced the joint resolution. Discussion on this question took place on the Senate floor many years ago.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask whether the Senator contemplated executive agreements, and thus in effect contemplated the effect of the decision in the Pink case?

Mr. BRICKER. I contemplated that from the very beginning. That was one of the reasons why the original joint resolution was introduced, and why we have been battling for it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator suggest that the amendment or the substitute proposed by the Senator from Georgia in effect supplements the so-called "which" clause, which I have understood, from reading the newspapers, the Senator from Ohio has abandoned?

Mr. BRICKER. I have not abandoned the "which" clause, which I suggested long, long ago, insofar as it controlled executive agreements made solely on the authority of the President. I believe the report of the committee should have the full support of the Senate. I concurred in it when it was offered, as many other Senators concurred, on both sides of the Senate. However, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Georgia, or the substitute, whatever it may be called, would prohibit the President's singlehandedly entering into agreements which would violate any of the rights of the people of the United States. It would not interfere with the President's international negotiations, or the international conduct of affairs of this country by the President in any way, shape, or form. The only point on which the Senator from Georgia and I differ is that I feel the principle he enunciates ought to be applied to treaties. I am willing to go far enough in the amendment which I submitted yesterday to admit that the Senate of the United States has the power to say that a treaty should immediately become effective if the needs of the country are such as to justify it, and leave the approval of the treaty to a vote of the Senate. I do not see how there could be objection to that in any way, shape, or form.

I do know it is essential and necessary at this time to go at least as far as the Senator from Georgia is willing to go, and as I think the majority of the Senate is willing to go. I would go further, and apply the same rule, in a limited way, to the treatymaking power; always under the control of two-thirds of the Senate.

I do not know what business it is of any foreign government, I do not know what business it is of any citizen of any other country, to have a voice in the making of internal law in the United States. What is their concern in the kind of life the Senator from Missouri lives in Missouri or that I live in Ohio? What is their concern about the laws of Ohio?

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me ask my friend, the distinguished Senator from Ohio, what would happen in the negotiation of an executive agreement if the President or his representative could not offer a firm commitment, bearing in mind, as seems to have been overlooked in some of the discussion of this matter, that when we get something from a foreign nation, we must expect to give something in return, and conversely when we give something, we expect to get something in return. Treaties and agreements are not unilateral; they are bilateral.

Mr. BRICKER. And multilateral.

Mr. HENNINGS. And multilateral at times, in nature as well as in benefit, or they would not be entered into, presumably, assuming the good faith of the negotiators. We have to trust somebody when such matters are being negotiated.

For example, if this country were to be invaded and the United States were to call upon the Dominion of Canada for aid and there should be an executive agreement entered into to permit Canadian troops to pass through the Senator's State of Ohio, and the Congress happened not to be in session, what would the Senator suggest could and should happen under those circumstances?

Mr. BRICKER. There is not any question about the exclusive right of the President in a case of that kind to invite them in. If they are invited in, they have all the prerogatives which go with the sovereignty of Canada. There is nothing anyone else could do about it. If the Senator will read the cases, the Senator will agree with me, I am confident.

Mr. HENNINGS. In such a case the Senator does not believe, does he, that the State laws of Ohio or the rights of any individual in the State might be infringed by the fact that foreign troops entered Ohio?

Mr. BRICKER. Of course not. That argument was made by a couple of lawyers in the New York City Bar Association. It has been followed by those who have not read the cases and have stated such an eventuality as an argument against the amendment. There is not a scintilla of truth in it, because that just is not the law. The amendment would not affect a sovereign government's rights under such circumstances. The amendment would not affect such a right in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator say that this would not be done pursuant to an executive agreement?

Mr. BRICKER. Certainly it could be done without an executive agreement. It could be done unilaterally by the President of the United States. We are not attempting to affect the war powers of the President. No one can find such a suggestion in the amendment. Such powers constitute the first rule of self-preservation.

Mr. HENNINGS. Would the Senator say such authority may be found in the inherent powers of the President?

Mr. BRICKER. I do not think the President has any inherent powers not granted to him by the Constitution, and I do not believe he ought to have. I think one of the greatest dangers has been the opinion by the Supreme Court

or the Attorney General that the President has some extraordinary power. I desire everybody, President, Congress, and the judiciary, to be bound by law. I do not want a government of men. That is what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] referred to a moment ago.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes. A great many Jeffersonian Democrats and a great many of us who have prided ourselves on our advocacy of those principles have been trying to move in that direction for a long time.

Mr. GEORGE. The only two objections raised by the Attorney General to the second clause of the amendment which I offered is that it might limit the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and might restrict his power to receive Ambassadors and Ministers from foreign countries. I would be perfectly willing, if it was a sound principle of law which I could justify, to say that my amendment should not be construed to affect the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy or his power as provided in the Constitution to receive Ambassadors and Ministers of foreign governments. I am perfectly willing to amend it in that manner. The only reason why I have not done so is that when it is attempted to enumerate the powers which are not affected other powers may be excluded which it is not desired to exclude, or other powers may be weakened which no one wishes to weaken.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the distinguished Senator from Georgia consider, or has he considered, the possibility of adding to his amendment a proviso at the end thereof, to the effect that "nothing contained herein or in this section shall affect the executive powers of the President under the Constitution of the United States?"

Mr. GEORGE. I have not considered it in that light. I would be willing to add exceptions if it were not for the danger that when one begins to enumerate certain powers, one would probably then exclude other powers that one does not wish to exclude.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I say to the Senator that he is entirely sound when he points that out, but the issue is raised as to the possibility, if we say that the amendment would not interfere with the powers of the President either in the receiving of ambassadors and ministers or in his powers as Commander in Chief, whether by enumerating only those two powers, we would run into the difficulty of apparently not enumerating other powers which all of us recognize the President properly has under the Constitution.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is the danger. Personally, I have no objection to saying that this clause should not be construed as limiting the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces or as limiting the power of the President to receive ambassadors and ministers of foreign governments, as provided in the Constitution.

I had not thought of the other proposal, let me say.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish the Senator would give it some thought, at least.

It seems to me the President has made it very clear. He is, of course, familiar with the Pink case, and it has been called to his attention; and I think he has demonstrated a concern about that case. But he has also raised certain questions, of which the Senator has mentioned several; and there are others in this connection.

I think the President has made it very clear that he does not want to trespass, and does not believe any executive should trespass, upon the legislative responsibilities of the Congress; and he does not believe the legislative branch of the Government should trespass upon the responsibilities of the executive branch of the Government.

I think the distinguished Senator from Georgia will agree with that general statement.

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly I agree with it. And I will agree of course—just as my amendment says—that it shall be applicable only to making any secret agreement effective as internal law in the United States. I think that is what I am trying to provide.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I understood the distinguished Senator from California, the majority leader, to suggest that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia should contain an express provision as to the war powers. Is that correct, or did I misunderstand him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. The Senator has mentioned the powers of the President as Commander in Chief or his power to receive an ambassador, where the receiving of an ambassador has a certain effect upon internal law, although it may not make internal law.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The distinguished Senator from Georgia had pointed out—and I fully agree with him—that if we begin to enumerate certain powers, our failure to enumerate other well-recognized powers might be regarded as an attempt to limit the right of the President to have those powers, which he has under the Constitution.

I raised the question whether the distinguished Senator from Georgia had given consideration to the inclusion of a proviso to the effect that "nothing contained herein shall limit the executive powers of the President under the Constitution of the United States," and whether that should be explored.

Mr. HENNINGS. At this time does the Senator from California feel that the extent or effect or full impact of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia might be subject to some misinterpretation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I certainly speak as a layman, not as a lawyer—whereas, of course, the distinguished Senator from Georgia is an outstanding lawyer.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from California speaks as a very good lawyer.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But I believe that is one of the concerns the Attorney General and the President of the United States had with the language which now appears in the George amendment. They suggested certain alternative language. However, the alternative language went so far that the distinguished Senator from Georgia felt—and quite properly so, I may add, in my opinion—that the alternative language would nullify the first part of his amendment. At that point the discussions broke down because language could not be found to meet the very real needs which I believe the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, and at the same time not possibly interfere with the constitutional executive powers the President of the United States has under the Constitution.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio; but thereafter I shall ask my colleagues not to request that I yield until I have completed the delivery of my prepared remarks, following which I shall be very glad to yield again.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I have considered the suggestion made by the distinguished leader of the Republicans. I considered it thoroughly, and I read the cases on it.

If it were written into the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, it would completely nullify any meaning that amendment has, for the reason that the Supreme Court already has held that certain executive agreements, namely, the Litvinov assignments, were within the executive power of the President; and the Court has sustained that power, and has lifted those executive agreements to the dignity and standing of a treaty.

Therefore, if the suggestion referred to by the Senator from California were included by way of an exception or a condition in the amendment suggested by the Senator from Georgia, it would confirm for all time in the Constitution of the United States the rule in the Pink case—just as the Attorney General wants it confirmed, as he stated in the brief he filed in the Supreme Court in connection with the certiorari proceedings in the Potato case.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio whether he disagrees with the holding in the Pink case that in the peculiar cir-

cumstances of the case, the New York law should be superseded by an executive agreement, and nothing more?

Mr. BRICKER. I certainly disagree with the rule in the Pink case, and I think it should forever be abolished under the Constitution of the United States. If that is not done, we shall be on the verge of a virtual dictatorship whenever the United States has a President who wishes to rule the Nation single-handed.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then, by the same token, I assume that the distinguished Senator from Ohio thinks a treaty should have been made.

Mr. BRICKER. In the Pink case?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Certainly a treaty should have been made—just as a treaty should have been made in many other cases where the President has acted individually by agreements many of which have been kept secret.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then I assume the Senator from Ohio does not agree that it is the exclusive right of the President, without interference on the part of Congress, to recognize foreign governments.

Mr. BRICKER. Certainly it is the President's right to recognize foreign governments. But the question of abolishing one of the rights of the people under the fifth amendment has nothing to do with the recognition of a foreign government.

Mr. HENNINGS. I asked that question because in the Pink case such recognition was involved; was it not?

Mr. BRICKER. No; it was not. That case involved only the disposal of the insurance funds of a defunct Russian insurance company in New York.

If the Supreme Court wishes to lift to the dignity of a treaty an executive agreement which resulted in taking those funds away from their rightful owners and giving them to the Russian Government, under a letter written by the President, which was said to be an executive agreement, then almost anything can be lifted to the dignity of a treaty.

The element of recognition occurred in the Belmont case, but was not directly involved in the Pink case.

Mr. HENNINGS. Both the Belmont case and the Pink case had similar elements of that sort.

Would the Senator from Ohio have been better satisfied with the Pink case if an executive agreement had been acted on by both Houses?

Mr. BRICKER. If it had been ratified by the Congress?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. That could be done under the amendment I have suggested, so long as the agreement did not violate the Constitution.

I want treaties and executive agreements to be held within the bounds established by the provisions of the Constitution, just as laws passed by Congress are held within the bounds of the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then does the Senator from Ohio agree with the proposition of overriding State law without the consent of two-thirds of the Senate, as in the case of executive agreements?

Mr. BRICKER. Not as in the case of executive agreements. I do not think a State law ought ever to be overridden——

Mr. HENNINGS. I said "as in the case of executive agreements."

If I may restate my question to the distinguished Senator from Ohio: Does he or does he not approve of overriding a State law without the consent of two-thirds of the Senate?

Mr. BRICKER. I do not.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Ohio does not?

Mr. BRICKER. But if the Congress acts upon it, and makes it internal law, then Congress and the law enacted by Congress are within the provisions of the Constitution; and that is all I want—namely, to hold treaties and executive agreements to the constitutional provisions.

Mr. HENNINGS. Can the Senator from Ohio think of any situations in which it might be essential for the President to conclude some executive agreements which would have the effect of overriding a State law, without waiting for either the Senate or the Congress to approve?

Mr. BRICKER. I cannot; and by no stretch of the imagination do I think it ever ought to be.

Mr. HENNINGS. Suppose the President were to go ahead and do it under his inherent powers?

Mr. BRICKER. I have heretofore expressed myself on the subject of inherent powers.

Mr. HENNINGS. As I understand, the Senator does not believe that the President has any inherent powers.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not believe that the President has any inherent powers, any more than Congress has inherent powers, or ought to have any.

Mr. HENNINGS. I take it the distinguished Senator agrees with the decision in the Pink case in one instance, but disagrees on the subject of inherent power.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not agree with the decision in the Pink case in any way, shape, or form. It must be rectified in some way, at some time, or we shall face danger.

Mr. HENNINGS. Although the Senator disagrees with the conclusion in the Pink case, if I may burden the Senator with one further question regarding his position, are there no other situations in which an agreement overriding State laws would be essential for our safety? Does the Senator think we ought to freeze our Constitution and our law in such a way as to completely forbid such agreements?

Mr. BRICKER. I certainly do. Let me ask the Senator, is there any situation in which he thinks the President, by executive agreement ought to have the power to abolish State laws or State constitutions?

Mr. HENNINGS. No. I do not believe the President should ever violate the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BRICKER. We are agreed on that point.

Mr. HENNINGS. We are in complete agreement on that point.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my distinguished friend from Ohio for his contribution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] indicated that he did not intend by his amendment to cover the acts of the President as Commander in Chief.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. That is entirely correct. I do not believe that my amendment touches such acts. I would not undertake to interfere with his right as Commander in Chief, because he is recognized in the Constitution as Commander in Chief.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, in the opinion of the Senator from Georgia, the President, as Commander in Chief, could do what he might do in an executive agreement. Therefore the Senator's amendment would not really touch his acts as Commander in Chief.

Mr. GEORGE. Not at all; nor his acts in the exercise of his necessary war powers, the power to prosecute a war, or defend the country.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the same way, he may receive an ambassador or minister, because the Constitution is specific on that question.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly.

Mr. FERGUSON. When he receives such ambassador or minister he does not now enter into an executive agreement that such ambassador or minister has certain international law rights.

Mr. GEORGE. No. The ambassador gets such rights under international law, which our court is enjoined to protect. The Supreme Court is given original jurisdiction over cases affecting ambassadors and ministers.

Mr. FERGUSON. The same would be true of the embassy.

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. FERGUSON. The law among nations provides that the embassy is, in effect, the land of the foreign country.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly. I would not interfere with those powers. I would not hesitate to enumerate them if I were not sincerely afraid that we might be excluding some other powers.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia whether he will adopt the suggestion of a proviso which has been made by the distinguished majority leader, further to clarify the amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. I could not accept it, because I am afraid that it would negate what I am trying to do. I am indicating that the single affirmative purpose of the

amendment is to deal with the executive agreement which is made alone by the President or by someone authorized by him to act, wherever such agreement has the effect of overriding what would otherwise be a valid law in any State, either in its Constitution or in its statutes.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I should like to take a few moments to analyze briefly what I understand to be the shift from the President to the Congress of the power over foreign relations and national defense which would result from the proposed amendment.

I think we all concede that under our Constitution the President has the power to enter into executive agreements, which, under certain circumstances, the Court would give effect to as internal law.

For example, the President, in his role as Commander in Chief or as the head of our foreign affairs, can conclude executive agreements which, in the absence of conflicting Federal legislation, will be given effect as internal law without implementation by the Congress.

Under the proposed change, as I understand, it would be impossible for the President to meet swiftly any emergencies involving national defense, for the reasons which we have heretofore discussed, and with respect to which we find ourselves in disagreement.

However, it seems to me that the proposal with respect to moving troops, which was discussed in the colloquy which we have just engaged in, would entail an executive agreement to be implemented by Congress before it would be effective. Consider the case of an attack upon Alaska. In these circumstances, we want Canada to send troops immediately to our aid, and for this reason we wish to conclude an immediate agreement with Canada for our common defense. The Canadian troops must travel through the United States to embark for Alaska. Any such agreement with Canada would of necessity contain many provisions that must be made effective as internal law within the United States. To be specific, I suggest that the Canadians would insist on the right to carry firearms and other implements of war without being subject to our laws; they would have to be exempted from speed laws in order to get to the ports of embarkation as quickly as possible; and, in summary, they would have to be immune from prosecution in our local courts for the violation of many of our State and Federal laws that had been drafted without any thought to such an emergency.

Yet the proposal would require that such an executive agreement must be implemented by the Congress before it could be effective. Under the terms of this amendment I do not believe that the Canadian Government could move its troops until Congress had deliberated and enacted appropriate legislation. Otherwise, the representatives of that government and the troops would be subject to many penalties and harassments in the courts of the United States. Congress might not even be in session at the time of such an emergency. This delay might well be fatal, unless, of course, the Canadians were willing to risk violation of State law.

I believe this is one example which makes it clear that the President must have the power to act on his own initiative in national emergencies. The proposed amendments would, in my judgment, completely paralyze the President in his role as manager of our foreign affairs.

From the very beginning of our Nation the President has been given sole authority to recognize a new country or a new government, and this, without question, has been exclusively his function. Traditionally it has been regarded as a political act, entirely outside the jurisdiction of Congress.

When the President recognizes a new country or a new government, such action inevitably has certain effects upon our internal law—as, for example, in the matter of diplomatic immunity. When the President, through an executive agreement, recognizes a new government and agrees to exchange diplomatic representatives, this country necessarily guarantees that the other government's representatives shall have diplomatic immunity from prosecution in any of our Federal or State courts. Our country's representatives are likewise granted immunity in the courts of the foreign country. Without such immunity, which is traditional under international law, an exchange of representatives could not take place, and diplomatic relations with other nations would be at a standstill.

However, under the proposed amendments, as I understand them—and apparently there is some difference of opinion as to what their full meaning, consequence, and impact might be, as demonstrated by the discussions on the floor this afternoon, and the colloquy which just preceded this observation—an executive agreement setting forth the terms of the recognition of the new country or the new government could not be effective until the Congress had enacted legislation providing the representatives of the foreign country with immunity from prosecution in our courts. In the absence of such implementing legislation, the foreign country would have no assurance that its diplomatic representatives here could not be prosecuted in any local court anywhere in the country. It is obvious that under such circumstances foreign countries would not agree to exchange representatives with the United States until after Congress has passed the necessary legislation. In effect, Congress, under the proposed amendments, would exercise a veto over the recognition of new countries and new governments.

Another objection to the proposed amendments lies in the confusion it would create in our courts. If the amendments are adopted, a litigant in our courts would be unable to use an executive agreement unless and until it had been implemented by an act of Congress. I am sure that the proponents of the amendments do not desire to work unfair hardships upon American litigants by denying them the benefits to be derived from executive agreements.

Nonetheless, any of the proposed amendments would have this result. This is true both because of the number of executive agreements and the difficulty of determining in advance which of the many agreements might be pertinent to some legitimate lawsuit in the courts of the United States.

According to the testimony of the Secretary of State, over 10,000 executive agreements have been made solely in connection with the NATO system. Could anyone tell which of these agreements might have some bearing on a lawsuit in this country? Let us consider for a moment the Korean armistice agreement, which is an executive agreement. Is anyone able to tell in advance which of its very complicated provisions would need implementation by the Congress under the proposed amendments because of this agreement's relevance to a domestic lawsuit. I am sure that any lawyer would agree—or almost any lawyer, because all lawyers never agree—that there are a number of types of litigation which could involve the agreement. I have in mind such matters as insurance contracts containing war clauses and the termination of war contracts.

Mr. President, is the Congress equipped to examine the thousands of executive agreements that will necessarily be concluded in the future by the President to determine whether any American litigant might legitimately want to plead them in court? Is the Congress equipped to undertake this tedious and technical legal screening? As a member of the Judiciary Committee, which now handles more than half the bills that are considered by the Senate, I can say quite frankly that I am repelled by the prospect of taking on even a part of this staggering burden.

With the claims bills and private bills and immigration bills, and the multitude of other measures which are considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, the committee is now to be charged with considering executive agreements also, under the views and advocacy of some people. It seems to me fairly clear that the executive branch, as a matter of caution, would be forced to request the implementation of all executive agreements, on the off chance that any of them might affect our internal law.

Is the Executive to say that some agreements are to be implemented by Congress, and others not? Therefore, I assume that, under the theory and notion of the proponents of the several amendments, the President would dump all executive agreements on Congress, as apparently some of us say we want him to do, because the President would not, in my opinion, wish to take the responsibility for deciding that certain executive agreements might and others might not have an effect upon the internal law of the United States.

Any of the proposed amendments concerned with executive agreements contain ambiguities of language which would

create innumerable problems having serious consequences. For instance, none of the texts give any indication of the type of congressional action required to give internal effect to an executive agreement. Using the Korean armistice again as an example, I ask how the Congress would make this agreement appropriate for use in our courts on behalf of the heirs of an American GI. Having an insurance policy with a war clause in it, would the Congress merely pass a law which declared the agreement enforceable in American courts? To carry the question a step further, would the Congress make this pro forma type of implementation in the case of all executive agreements presented to it by the executive branch? Would the Congress be obliged to incorporate into acts of Congress the full text of executive agreements which it implemented? Other questions which occur to me are: What type of implementation by the Congress would satisfy the Federal courts, or the various State courts? The text of the proposed amendments, as far as I can see, provide the answers to none of these problems; nor to many more that would unquestionably arise.

The reciprocal trade program so important to our internal economy involves many executive agreements made pursuant to laws already enacted by the Congress. In a case of such executive agreements, would it be necessary for the Congress to pass a second law in order to give domestic effect to these agreements? No one will question that all of the agreements made under this program directly affect the rights and obligations of American citizens in this country. The proposed texts appear to support the theory that the legislation implementing them would have to follow their execution. It is possible that one could logically reach the opposite interpretation, but the language of the proposed amendments is not at all clear on this point.

Still another problem is whether the proposed amendments would have retroactive effect. Here, again, the language is not clear.

It seems apparent, therefore, that where an executive agreement might have internal effect, the proposed amendments would render the President almost helpless, even in cases of great emergency or where the very safety of the Nation would be at stake.

I have already cited the need that might arise in connection with the Canadian Army. Many other examples can be given, such as the use of our harbors by the warships of an ally.

I might point out just in passing that not even the Congress of the United States is immune to error. Some legislation has been passed which we acknowledge to be poor, and we have repealed or amended it. Even had the proposed amendments been in effect ever since the framing of the Constitution, they could not have guaranteed infallibility in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Nor can constitutional amendments and acts of Congress bestow wisdom upon a President. When the American people elect a man to the highest office in our land, we do so because we have confidence in his judgment, trust in his ability and devotion to the ideals of democracy, and faith in his determination to act always in the best interest of our country.

Are we then to turn upon the man on whom we have bestowed this high honor and say to him, in front of the rest of the world, "Mr. President, we have no confidence in you"?

Removing the present flexibility from our system of executive agreements would be doing just this, and it would, moreover, create a rigid condition contrary, I think, to our national interest.

I submit that this is not the American way to do things. A vote of no confidence in our Chief Executive is a matter to be decided at the polls every 4 years; it is not a matter which should be resolved by rewriting the Constitution.

Mr. President, I have today sent a letter to President Eisenhower which I should like to read at this time. It is as follows:

FEBRUARY 5, 1954.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your profound devotion to the Constitution of the United States and your determined and strongly expressed opposition to any compromise that would jeopardize the historic separation of powers among the three branches of our Government and between the States and the Federal Government reflect a high degree of statesmanship. I am confident that your position has the strong support of the American people despite all the efforts of a minority who seek to paralyze the traditional and vital powers of the Presidency in our foreign relations.

That the Chief Executive of our Nation should be deprived of the necessary power to act swiftly and effectively in the national interest is unthinkable. Whether such efforts to abrogate these powers take the form of direct assault on the treatymaking power or the more insidious method of so-called harmless amendments is unimportant. The dangers inherent in altering the treatymaking powers are well known, having been subjected to intensive study and debate. The dangers implicit in the harmless amendments are perhaps less readily recognized precisely because of their apparent innocence. The very fact that they have not had that careful and searching scrutiny which any amendment to the Constitution should have dictates against their hasty acceptance at face value for incorporation into the supreme law of our land.

The negotiations among Senators concerning the latest series of proposed changes are fast taking on the atmosphere of barter and horse trading. I am moved to write to you because I am concerned lest you be persuaded to agree to some proposal that are urged upon you as nothing more than a restatement of the traditional powers of your office. Mr. President, language having no real purpose and effect should not be added to the Constitution. Amendments that do not amend are always dangerous. Our Constitution is our basic covenant. For 165 years statesmen have resisted efforts to debase it by adding words without meaning or redundant declarations.

Mr. President, your uncompromising attitude in this grave constitutional crisis is most reasonable. That you will keep faith with your solemn oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States is beyond question. That you have already spoken out against this dangerous encroachment and in defense of our American system of Government is a tribute to your courage and perseverance. Those of us who have stood firm in supporting you and in our own unalterable opposition to any compromise know that you will remain steadfast in your principles, even in the face of determined pressure.

This is a matter, Mr. President, which, I know you fully appreciate, transcends any personal or partisan consideration. It is a matter of such gravity that nothing short of the full authority of your office coupled with your great personal prestige should and must be brought to bear against any and all proposals, substitutes, or compromises that would destroy, annul, or dilute the essential powers of the Presidency.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I may say that on Monday next, as has been previously announced, it is proposed to have a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection. This call will include all bills on the calendar for which reports are available to the majority and minority calendar committees. Some bills are being reported today for which printed reports will not be available. Normally the calendar call is concluded at the last point where there are in the files printed bills, together with committee amendments and committee reports.

It has been suggested to me by the staff, and I think the suggestion is a good one, that while the entire calendar will be considered, we should start where the last call of the calendar was concluded, beginning with the bills as to which there has as yet been no opportunity for consideration, so that those bills can be processed. Then, when the call of the calendar has been completed from the point where we left off at the

last calendar call, we shall return to the beginning of the calendar and continue to where the previous calendar call was concluded. Inasmuch as there have already been objections to most of those bills, and it is very likely that there will be objections to them again, or at least to most of them, that procedure will aid in the processing of the bills.

Except for such speeches as Senators may desire to make on Monday, the only additional business I know of which is likely to come before the Senate is the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, which was considered by the Senate last week. I understand the committee of conference met today and have reached an agreement. But the House is not in session today, and, according to rules, on the conference report on that particular bill, the House is required to act first. So probably the Senate will not receive the report until sometime in midafternoon on Monday, when, the report being a privileged matter, I shall propose that it be taken up for discussion, debate, and Senate action.

Beyond that point, I would not expect that a late session would be held on Monday, but that the Senate would recess as soon as it had completed its business, and would not hold an evening session.

I do not anticipate the holding of any evening sessions next week. From present indications, daily sessions of the Senate probably will be held from Monday through Friday. However, I expect that the Senate will have a relatively short session on Friday next, 1 week from today.

It may be, as the situation develops next week, that in order to enable Senators to catch up with the work in their offices, and to afford committees that will still be functioning an opportunity to meet, the Senate might recess over 1 day, and thus not meet daily. But the present indication at least is that daily sessions of the Senate will be held next week.

After having consulted with the minority leader, I have already announced a list of bills which it is hoped may be considered during the next week. The list was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, and also, I believe, of the day before. If anything else should develop during the week, such as the receiving of a conference report from the House, or of additional executive nominations, advance notice always will be given to the minority of such matters as it is desired to have considered. I shall try always to give the Senate not merely 1 day's notice, but several days' notice, so that there will be ample time in which to prepare for the consideration of such matters.

I do not expect that any votes will be taken next week on highly controversial or major legislation, including the Bricker amendment, but I hope the debate on the Bricker amendment may be resumed beginning the week of February 15, with the hope of reaching votes on the amendments at that time.

That is about as much as I can advise Senators who are making their plans for next week. If any Senators have been planning to speak on the proposed constitutional amendment, I hope they will, if they so desire, make their speeches during next week, because Senate Joint Resolution 1 still will be the unfinished business, although it may be laid aside, in effect, from day to day. While it is proposed not to vote on any amendment, it is hoped that Senators who intend to do so will carry on their discussion and debate.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESSES BY SENATORS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that, according to the statement by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senate will lay aside the consideration of the Bricker amendment after today until the Lincoln Day addresses around the country have been completed.

As my colleagues on the other side of the aisle go out to speak of the great founder of the Republican Party, I hope that they will keep in mind certain words of his with regard to the Constitution. I know that I shall have them in mind after next week, when we reach the point of voting on the Bricker amendment, an amendment which will change the historic balance of powers our forefathers worked out so carefully.

On June 20, 1848, in the House of Representatives, Abraham Lincoln spoke as follows:

> I wish now to submit a few remarks on the general proposition of amending the Constitution. As a general rule, I think we would much better let it alone. No slight occasion should tempt us to touch it. Better not take the first step, which may lead to a habit of altering it. Better, rather, habituate ourselves to think of it as unalterable. It can scarcely be made better than it is. New provisions would introduce new difficulties, and thus create an increased appetite for further change. No, sir; let it stand as it is. New hands have never touched it. The men who made it have done their work, and have passed away. Who shall improve on what they did?

Speaking in Peoria, Ill., on October 16, 1854, he said:

> I do not * * * propose to destroy, or alter, or disregard the Constitution. I stand to it, fairly, fully, and firmly.

And in Kalamazoo, Mich., on August 27, 1856, Abraham Lincoln said:

> Don't interfere with anything in the Constitution. That must be maintained, for it is the only safeguard of our liberties.

Mr. President, as a Democrat, I wish my Republican colleagues many successful Lincoln Day dinners, in the true spirit of Abraham Lincoln, who sought to preserve what the Founding Fathers had wrought.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the outset of his address today, the representative of the Independent Party wishes to have printed in the RECORD as an introduction to his speech the masterful argument made by a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, Hon. James T. Brand, before the Commonwealth Club in the city of San Francisco. This great speech sets forth a scholarly and learned analysis of the so-called Bricker amendment, and presents Judge Brand's reasons for opposing the adoption of the amendment.

I am proud, Mr. President, to have the speech inserted in the RECORD, because this great justice, although he is not a political supporter of mine, is, in my opinion, one of the keenest legal scholars at our bar. I have always thought so highly of his legal attainments that it was a great pleasure of mine some few years ago to recommend to the then administration his appointment to the court then sitting and hearing the trials at Nuremberg. Justice Brand was a justice of the court which conducted some of those trials. He made a distinguished record. One would not be surprised at that, when he comes to read his brilliant argument against the Bricker amendment, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks in the body of the RECORD. I wish to associate myself with the arguments which Judge Brand makes in the speech.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF THE CONSTITUTION

(By James T. Brand, justice of the Supreme Court of Oregon)

Gentlemen of the Commonwealth Club, I read in your bulletin that my address is entitled "Against the Bricker Amendment." I hope that it is not too late to change that title. I approve the admonition to "eliminate the negative, accentuate the positive, and latch on to the affirmative." My subject is not against the Bricker amendment. On the contrary, it is "For the Constitution of the United States." The task of this hour is to preserve, protect, and defend the living Constitution—that instrument which Gladstone described as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

This great city has a Golden Gate which opens outward to the highway of the world—the seven seas. The call of that road is to commercial and political intercourse with the peoples of the world. You have businessmen here—men of vision and creative power who can see beyond the 3-mile limit and are not afraid to face world problems or to seize world opportunities. It is to you that I would speak, and not to the myopic and timorous souls who are afraid to face the problems of the future with the courage of their fathers who faced those of the past.

This is not an oration, but a shop talk. I am to discuss the Bricker amendment, a proposal which would radically alter the division of powers between the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, and which would also alter for the indefinite future the division of powers between the Federal Government and the several States in matters of foreign policy. Under the Constitution, those matters now lie in the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government. (See article in Foreign Affairs, October 1953, by Arthur H. Deane, partner in firm of Sullivan & Cromwell, New

York.) The Bricker amendment reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article."

This amendment would in effect give to the several States the power to nullify many treaties negotiated by the Federal Government.

I shall first consider whether so radical a change in our form of government is necessary, and second, whether the specific proposal is either wise or safe. A heavy burden rests upon anyone who advocates amending the Constitution under which for 160 years the Nation has grown great and its people have remained free. In every part of the Union, and in countless addresses, the proponents of the Bricker amendment have cried out, in the words of Senator BRICKER, that "From * * * 1796 to the present time, the treatymaking power has been a persistent threat to the liberties of the American people." One might expect that a persistent threat for 158 years would by now have caused some noticeable impairment of those liberties. And the absence of any such dire result might arouse a suspicion that the threat was somewhat exaggerated. However, proponents and opponents of the measure are all agreed that those liberties must be preserved. The charges against our system are made by men of eminence and must be given serious consideration. The Honorable Frank Holman, whose eloquence you have heard and enjoyed, is really the chief propagandist for the Bricker amendment. His fears grow out of the shrinkage of the world in this, the atomic age.

When the infant Nation was snuggling safely between two oceans, across which windjammers plied their perilous way, George Washington feared entangling alliances, and today the proponents of this measure say "amen," although the tentacles of the Soviet Union are reaching out to strangle liberty in any country which remains isolated from the other free peoples of the world. Many proponents of the amendment regret the formation of the United Nations and its activities, and fear evil results if the declaration or covenant of human rights or the Genocide Convention or proposals of the International Labor Organization should be submitted to the President and if he should submit them to the Senate and if the Senate should approve them and if being so approved they should destroy our civil rights and if the Supreme Court should fail of its duty to declare the supremacy of the Constitution. I quote Mr. Holman: "The peace of the world is endangered by the United Nations ambition to supervise and control the purely domestic affairs of its members." This branding of the United Nations as the body threatening world peace comes to me as a surprise. I had supposed that Communist Russia was the aggressor and that the U. N., in Korea and elsewhere, was striving, unsuccessfully perhaps, to maintain the peace. But let it pass for the moment. Mr. Holman asserts that the end result will be a superstate or world government unless the amendment is adopted. Now let me state that we are not debating the U. N.—the covenant of human rights, or world government. Sane men who do not live in an ivory tower must know that world government is unthinkable so long as half the world is ruled by dictators who scoff at human liberty. We are debating a proposed basic change in our form of government. Such change should not be made on the unproven theory that the Government will be run by traitors or crackpots.

The proponents whom I have named are sincere gentlemen, but lesser lights who share their convictions have confused and misled thousands of Americans by blatant misrepresentation. Clarence Manion, an impassioned orator, asserts as positive fact that "a treaty is superior to the Constitution of the United States, its Bill of Rights, and all Federal laws * * *." A card mailed in St. Louis, addressed to the Oregon Bar Association and entitled "Re Bricker Amendment" contains this gem about the United Nations: "If this slimy octopus of foreign and home-grown traitors and spies becomes permanently established it will mean goodby to our Constitution and Bill of Rights." Many years on the judicial bench has convinced me that when an advocate resorts to exaggeration and vilification there is reason to suspect that he is not quite sure of the soundness of his case.

At the hearings before a Senate subcommittee on the Bricker amendment, resolutions of the American Coalition, the Wheel of Progress, and numerous other women's organizations, were graciously received by the Senators. The ladies whereas-ed that Mr. Holman has explained to us that our liberties are in danger, and now therefored that the Bricker amendment should be adopted. Then a resolution was offered by the Church Peace Union opposing the amendment. This organization, of which I have never heard, was founded by that great wild-eyed, rabble-rousing radical, Andrew Carnegie, according to the Senate chairman, and was made up mostly of rabbis and ministers. Whereupon Mr. Holman said, quote: "I think you ought to check the nature of that organization, Mr. Chairman." Now, I confess, with appropriate fear and trembling, that I belong to an organization which is opposed to the Bricker amendment. It is headed by that great lawyer, John W. Davis, and by Gen. Lucius Clay. Among others who are, quote, "unalterably opposed" to it, I name a certain Dwight D. Eisenhower, one of the great men of all time. We await a supena from the committee, but we will not invoke the fifth amendment. Enough of this.

Is a treaty superior to the Constitution of the United States? The proponents say that it is. The United States Supreme Court says that it is not. This is the issue. Let me remind you of the provisions of the Constitution which relate directly to this issue.

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." (Constitution, art. VI, par. 2.)

"No State shall enter into any treaty * * * ." (Constitution, art. I, sec. 10.)

"These provisions made a nation out of 13 independent but important States. And the mandate was not that of the States; it was that of the people * * *." We the people.

Other relevant provisions are:

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America." (Art. II, sec. 1.)

"He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." (Constitution, art. II, sec. 2.)

This section would be amended by implication if the Bricker proposal were adopted.

The Constitution provides:

"The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof." (Constitution, art. I, sec. 8.)

This section vests in Congress the power to carry into effect all treaties which are not violative of the Constitution, and by the same token, Congress has a check on the treaty power by refusing to carry a treaty into execution whenever legislation is necessary for that purpose. Last, but not least, I cite the following provision:

"The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made or which shall be made under their authority." (Art. III, sec. 2.)

Section 1 of the proposed amendment is as follows:

"A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect."

This section is the bait on the hook. Thousands of hopeful and patriotic members of women's clubs and men's lodges have read section 1 and then said "Amen" to the whole amendment. All agree that a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution should be held void. I shall prove that section 1 states only what now is and ever since 1789 has been the fundamental law. If I succeed, then you will agree that section 1 is unnecessary.

At least 10 times, the United States Supreme Court has said that a treaty violative of the Constitution would be void. Time permits reference to only two. In the famous Cherokee Tobacco case, the Court said: "It need hardly be said that a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument."

The proponents of the Bricker amendment express fear that our rights of life, liberty, and property, guaranteed by the fifth amendment, may be impaired by treaty. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the fifth amendment restrains every branch of the Federal Government, whether of an executive, legislative, or judicial character. (Cite: Willis, Constitutional Law, p. 653; *Sterling* v. *Constantin* (287 U. S. 378); *Bullock* v. *Florida* (254 U. S. 513). *Murray's Lessee* v. *Hoboken Land & Improvement Co.* (18 How. 272, 276).)

The fifth amendment is therefore a restraint on the treaty power, and the Supreme Court has said so. In a case, seldom if ever discussed by the proponents, the facts were these:

Plaintiff sued a French defendant for infringement of plaintiff's patent. The Court, speaking of the effect of treaties on property rights in a patent, said:

"* * * The demand if well-founded in the patent laws could not be controlled or put aside by the treaty, for by the laws of the United States, the rights of a party under a patent are his private property and by the Constitution private property cannot be taken for public use without just compensation." (*Brown* v. *Duchesne*, (9 How. 183 at 197).)

The famous Judiciary Act of 1789 has been considered an authoritative and contemporaneous construction of the Constitution. That statute provided that the United States Supreme Court may reexamine on writ of error any judgment or decree of the highest court of any State "where is drawn in question the validity of * * * a treaty" if the decision is against its validity and such decision may be reversed or affirmed (sec. 25). Here is a direct declaration that the Supreme Court may, in the exercise of its appellate jurisdiction, either hold a treaty valid or invalid. The present Judiciary Act contains a similar provision (U. S. C. A., title 28, sec. 1257).

Since the proponents of the Bricker amendment cannot believe that the Supreme Court means what it has 10 times said, I propose to show by simple logic and in few

words that treaties violative of the Constitution are void:

Point 1: A Federal statute violative of the Constitution is void and the Supreme Court will so declare. Seventy-six times the Supreme Court has held a Federal statute unconstitutional and void.

Point 2: In 1829 Chief Justice Marshall held that whenever a treaty is so drawn as to operate of itself without the aid of any legislative provision, it is regarded in courts of justice as equivalent to an act of the legislature (meaning Congress) (*Foster* v. *Neilson* (8 U. S. 108)). Again, in 1887 the Supreme Court by Justice Field said, "By the Constitution a treaty is placed on the same footing and made of like obligation with an act of legislation." (*Whitney* v. *Robertson* (124 U. S. 190 at 194).) See also *United States* v. *Rauscher* (119 U. S. 407 at 418); *Cook* v. *United States* (77 L. ed. 641); *Valentine* v. *United States* (81 L. ed. 5 at 9, by Hughes C. J.); *United States* v. *Minnesota* (270 U. S. 181, 70 L. ed. 549). If these cases hold, such treaties are the equivalent of statutes and if unconstitutional statutes will be held void, it appears to be a reasonable inference that the same would be true of treaties.

But let us check this proposition in a different way. The following rule of constitutional law is established beyond the possibility of doubt. Where there is conflict between the provisions of a treaty and a subsequent statute, "The act of Congress will control in the courts of the United States as the last expression of the municipal law of the United States." (*Pigeon River* v. *Cox* (78 L. ed. 695).) Senator BRICKER himself was coauthor of Senate Joint Resolution 2 in which he recites that a treaty or an executive agreement may be abrogated or superseded by a subsequent act of Congress. Why then, his present alarm?

Now, if the Constitution prevails over a statute violative of its provisions, and if a statute prevails over and supersedes an earlier treaty, how in heaven's name can the proponents of the Bricker amendment keep their faces straight when they broadcast the statement that a treaty is superior to the Constitution? Not only has the Supreme Court held that a treaty cannot violate the fifth amendment, the Federal courts have also made it clear that a treaty cannot violate the rights of free speech, free press, and freedom of assembly and religion. For brevity I shall quote the Attorney General of the United States on this point:

"If there is one argument which should be put to rest it is that there is need for this constitutional amendment because the Constitution does not protect against a treaty which might impair rights of free speech, press, or religion."

Speaking of the first amendment he says:

"The courts have regarded it as prohibiting any action by the Federal Government or any of its branches impairing freedom of speech, press, or religion, or the rights of assembly and petitions."

My first point has been that the fears of the proponents lest treaties will overthrow the Constitution are groundless. I suppose their next contention would be that even if a treaty cannot override the Constitution, they may nevertheless be unwise and may involve us in foreign entanglements. First, let me say that if a constitutional amendment could be devised which would impede or prevent the making of foolish treaties but would not interfere with the making of wise ones, it would be worthy of consideration. But that cannot be done. The Constitution cannot legislate wisdom into the Senate of the United States or any other body. Any power vested in any body is subject to abuse. No form of government can be a substitute for wise administration. It is not, however, the spirit of this age to limit the speed of all automobiles to a crawl because there are some careless drivers. I quote:

"History bears out the genius of the Founding Fathers who created a government subject to law but not * * * subject to inertia where vigor and initiative are required."

Let us consider the safeguards which now exist in the constitutional system for the prevention of the abuse of the treaty power. First we have the great doctrine of the separation of powers. The judiciary is the guardian of the rights of the people and will strike down an unconstitutional treaty. Second, so far as a treaty operates as internal law it can be repealed by a subsequent statute. Third, most treaties require the appropriation of funds for their implementation, and the purse strings are in the hands of Congress. Fourth, though the President alone has the power to negotiate a treaty, and though, as the Supreme Court recently said, "Congress is powerless to invade the field of international negotiations" (*United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (81 L. ed. 255)), the President can make no treaty without securing the consent of two-thirds of the Senators present. Fifth, there remains the power of impeachment if there should ever be a serious breach of trust by the President. Sixth, and most potent, there is the compelling power of public opinion expressed by a free people. Public opinion is the great safeguard against abuse of public trust, but in truth it is this voice of the people which the isolationist sponsors of the Bricker amendment fear and distrust. They are neither prophets nor sons of prophets, yet they claim to know what would be good or bad for America a hundred years from now, and they would now bind the hands of all future Presidents and Senates by constitutional restriction for fear that a century hence, they may do what they and some of us now believe would now be unwise.

I say unto Senator BRICKER and his sponsors, oh ye of little faith in America. When has a President been so faithless to his trust as to attempt to bargain away by treaty the liberties of the American people for the benefit of an alien state? Since when has the Senate become a wild-eyed group of radicals who cannot be trusted to reject any treaty which is subversive of our rights? The Senate has been well called the graveyard of treaties. It serves as a great safeguard against reckless innovation. If the American people have been sold down the river by a treaty, why don't the proponents name specific cases in which human rights have been flouted and why have the American people been unconscious of the rape of the Constitution if it has occurred? No, gentlemen, the animating force behind this passionate attempt to change the Constitution is the force of fear. Because we fought a world war to establish peace and liberty and have found that there is yet no peace, good men but timid men have lost faith. Now they would have us emulate the ostrich and bury the Nation's head in the sands of continental America. They are shocked and alarmed at the shrinkage of the earth. They reject the incontrovertible truth that peace and ultimately justice must be global or they will be illusory. They shudder at the responsibilities of world leadership which fate has cast upon us. Yet they know that if we resign from that leadership, the vacuum will be filled by the Godless, ruthless, and evil power of aggressive communism. Let us have faith in a greater greatness of America. Let us assume those calculated risks which are inherent in courageous action.

I am amazed at the inferiority complex which has afflicted the great Senate of the United States. Over the years we have observed the ardor with which the Senators have defended their prerogatives and privileges, including the right to filibuster. Yet here we have the astounding spectacle of 64 Senators lending their names as sponsors of the Bricker amendment (before it was changed for the worse). They did it knowing that the judicial power has been held adequate to strike down an unconstitutional treaty; knowing that they, the Senators, have the power to modify or amend a treaty (*Jecker* v. *Magee* (9 Wall. 32, 19 L. ed. 571)); and that one-third plus one of those present can kill any treaty. They know that a statute passed by Congress can nullify any treaty as internal law and still they are overwhelmed by the fear that dangerous or unconstitutional treaties will be made by their own votes. This means that the senatorial sponsors are afraid that they or their successors will be unfaithful to their trust and will approve some treaty subversive of the rights of the people. If half of the sponsors of the Bricker amendment in the Senate would vote "no" on any bad treaty, it would be defeated. They disapprove of the proposed Genocide Convention. So do I—in its present dreamy-eyed form. Very well, let them vote against it and all will be well. Let me add that I have far greater respect for the wisdom and fortitude of the Senate as a bulwark against radicalism or subversion than the proponents of the Bricker amendment appear to possess.

Lastly, the proponents cite the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416), as proving the dangers of the treaty power. That brings us to the relation between the treaty power and the laws of the several States. Ducks and geesse migrate. If they are slaughtered at breeding grounds in Canada, there will be none to hunt in California, and vice versa. The Federal courts had held that Congress had no power under the commerce clause to protect migratory birds from extinction. Ducks are not engaged in interstate commerce. Unless, therefore, an international compact could be made, fixing proper closed seasons in both countries, a great resource in food and sport would be lost to both nations. The Supreme Court has held that the Constitution has committed to the National Government the entire control of international relations (*Nishimura* v. *United States* (142 U. S. at 569)). The States are expressly excluded from treatymaking. The treaty power covers all subjects properly pertaining to our foreign relations (*De Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258)). A treaty regulating the hunting seasons in the two countries was made between Britain and the United States. Since it was not self-executing, Congress, under the necessary and proper clause, passed an act to implement the treaty. The constitutionality of the treaty and statute was challenged by the State of Missouri as an interference with the reserved power of the States under the 10th amendment to the Constitution, which reads as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

But the treaty power was delegated to the United States and was prohibited to the States. The Supreme Court recognized its power and obligation to pass upon the constitutionality of treaties. It then considered the issue and held the treaty was valid. The Court then cited the provision of the Constitution which provides that Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution all powers vested in the Government, and held that if the treaty is valid "there can be no dispute about the validity of the statute." The treaty was held valid. The Court said, "We do not mean to imply that there are no qualifications to the treaty-making power." The opinion continued:

"* * * It is obvious that there may be matters of the sharpest exigency for the national well-being that an act of Congress could not deal with but that a treaty followed by such an act could, and it is not likely to be assumed that a power which

must belong to * * * every civilized government is not to be found."

Now, after this decision has rested in the books in comparative peace for 35 years it is discovered as a menace to the liberties of the people. If I saw a sign on a doghouse saying "Dangerous—Beware vicious dog," and that hound had wandered at large among the populace for 35 years, and had bitten nothing but a migratory duck, I would wonder why they put up the sign.

The Constitution provides that treaties made under the authority of the United States are the supreme law of the land and "the judges in every State shall be bound thereby." Under this provision, of course, treaties made within the delegated power and subject to the limitations of the first and fifth amendments, prevail over State constitutions and laws. If this were not true, the Nation and the States would be impotent to negotiate, make, or carry out treaties with other nations. They would return to the impotency of the Articles of Confederation. The supremacy of treaties over State laws was recognized in the Constitutional Convention and has repeatedly been asserted by the Supreme Court. It was restated in the very recent case of *Clark* v. *Allen* (91 L. ed. 1633, 331 U. S. 503). The case went up from California and is one of the now rare decisions in which the Supreme Court was unanimous.

I have demonstrated that the amendment is unnecessary, first, because any treaty violative of the Constitution will be stricken down by the courts. Second, because there are adequate political safeguards against abuse. Third, because treaties must prevail over State laws if we are to remain a sovereign state, and the case of the ambulatory and migrant duck merely declares preexisting law. But if doubting Thomases are still unconvinced, let them support the proposed Knowland amendment, which is unnecessary but harmless. Its adoption should satisfy any person that treaties violative of the Constitution will be held invalid. It has the support of President Eisenhower and reads as follows:

"A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect. The judicial power of the United States shall extend to all cases in law or equity in which it is claimed that the conflict described in this amendment is present."

Significantly, Senator BRICKER and Mr. Holman are not satisfied with the Knowland amendment, which is in even stronger terms than section 1 of the Bricker amendment. We must now inquire why.

Section 2 of the Bricker amendment provides that a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation. A treaty constitutes internal law when, under the supremacy clause of the Constitution, it directly affects the rights or duties of citizens in the several States. It is conceded that in all such cases the procedure which would be required under the Bricker amendment would be as follows: The President negotiates a treaty with a foreign power and submits it to the Senate. After the usual committee hearings, the Senate may reject it, modify it, attach reservations, or give its consent. Under the present Constitution, if it ratifies the treaty, it becomes law, but not so under the Bricker proposal. After negotiation and senatorial consent, a bill would have to be introduced in Congress, passed by the House and again by the Senate, and sent to and signed by the President, who proposed the treaty in the first place. Though it might be vitally necessary, secrecy would be impossible; though dire emergency might require speed, months, if not years, might elapse before this duplicate process could be completed. No country in the world has so clumsy a system. To me such a system appears to be cockeyed, but it is worse than that when we consider the variety of treaties which would be subject to the requirement. Senator BRICKER himself recognized that there were many treaties which have internal effect as law. In his testimony before the Senate subcommittee he criticized the wording of the amendment which he later adopted, and which now bears his name. He said he could agree to it if section 2 should be made applicable only to multilateral treaties effective as internal law instead of to all treaties having that effect. This was a weird suggestion. It lets at least one cat out of the bag. It shows that he was attempting to forestall the adoption of treaties emanating from the United Nations. He seems to have forgotten that several bilateral treaties could have the effect of one multilateral treaty. Yet he wanted to incorporate such a unique provision into the fundamental law. He then made another suggestion, I quote:

"For the purpose of protecting those bilateral agreements which are necessary for the relationship, the amicable relationships of our Nation to other nations."

And then mirabile dictu, and believe it or not, this is what he said concerning the agreements "which are necessary": "One example might be the migratory bird treaty. * * *Another might be the rights to sue and be sued in the courts of the country. Another might be the rights of ownership of property. Another might be * * * the right to use automobile tags of the respective countries in this country in consideration of our right to do the same thing in other countries."

Here the Senator mentioned four out of many kinds of treaty which if adopted would affect internal law within the States and would prevail over the law of a State. He recognizes them as necessary, yet he now sponsors a treaty which would make it impossible to accomplish these necessary objectives without implementing legislation by the 48 States.

Section 2 of the Bricker amendment provides that a treaty shall become effective as internal law "only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty." Under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, Congress can now make all laws which are necessary and proper to effectuate the powers vested in the Government or any department or officer thereof including the treaty power.

In the domestic field the powers of Government are divided between the Nation and the States. But in the field of foreign relations exclusive power is delegated to the Federal Government. Within the domestic field, matters dealing with rights of aliens to own property; to inherit or bequeath it; to do business; to sue and be sued; to collect debts; to incorporate; to be fairly taxed; to enter the professions; are regulated by State law. Except for the treaty power, Congress has not been delegated power to control the policy of the 48 States in these areas. But America is a commercial Nation. Cut us off from intercourse with foreigners; hamper foreign travel and interchange of students, statesmen, and scientists; erect an iron curtain under the Bricker patent, and disaster would follow.

America is a great industrial and commercial country. The peace of the world and our prosperity depends upon the establishment of stable and favorable trade relations. Trade, not aid, is the slogan of the hour. If we are to enjoy the privileges of travel, trade, freedom, and rights of ownership and inheritance abroad; if we are to secure fair and nondiscriminatory treatment for our investments abroad and for disposal of our surpluses there, we can get these benefits only by treaty. If you gentlemen want rights which will protect your lives, investments, and activities abroad, you can get them only by treaties which will give reciprocal rights to aliens here. The Federal Government alone can make treaties and alone can secure these rights for us. If under the Bricker amendment a treaty could become effective internally only through legislation and only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty, and if Congress under the 10th amendment could not legislate in the absence of treaty, then such treaties could not be made either by the President and Senate or by the President, Senate, and Congress, and could only be made or enforced by legislation of the 48 States. We would be back under the Articles of Confederation again. Will a foreign state accord us rights and privileges abroad if we offer in exchange a reciprocal agreement but advise the foreign state that we cannot comply with it unless 48 State legislatures agree?

I have spoken of commercial interests. What about national survival. The Bricker amendment if adopted would make impossible the adoption either by treaty or congressional legislation of the Baruch plan for effectively outlawing atomic warfare, because that plan involves international inspection within the States. Nor could a treaty regulate production and traffic in narcotics under the Bricker amendment.

Let me give you the simplest illustration I can think of. Any State can pass, and all have passed, many laws which affect interstate commerce, and the laws have been held valid. But if Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution occupies the field and manifests the intent to occupy it exclusively the State laws must give way. Because commerce has grown nationwide since 1789 the congressional power has necessarily been more widely used to regulate it. No one can honestly assert that the power to regulate interstate commerce when exercised is unconstitutional merely because State laws must give way before it. Unless a man is still thinking in the 1890's he knows this was inevitable. The constitutional provision respecting the treaty power presents a similar situation.

The very purpose of the treaty provision in the Constitution was to make it clear that in matters affecting legitimate issues in our relations with foreign countries a treaty shall prevail over a State law. That is why the Constitution says treaties made under the authority of the United States are the supreme law of the land, as Federal statutes are, and why it added, "the judges shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." When commerce between the States becomes so important that it must be regulated by the National Government to prevent fatal confusion, the Federal Government acts and the State laws give way. So too, when the conduct of our foreign relations requires enforcible agreements with foreign States in fields wherein the several States of the Union are powerless to make agreements, the Federal Government steps in under the treaty power and inconsistent State laws must give way.

Now let me give you some facts. During the last session of Congress the United States Senate approved 23 treaties, 12 of which, according to the legal advisers of the Secretary of State, would be unconstitutional if the Bricker amendment had been in effect, because they deal with commercial regulations and thus with matters touching upon jurisdiction of the several States. In 8 of these 12 treaties, the vote was 86 for and 1 against. Fifty-five of the sixty-four Senators who were originally listed as sponsors of the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) voted for these treaties. The Secretary of State commented as follows:

"This suggests, I think, that the import of the proposed amendment is not fully understood, even in the Senate, and that the Senators, when it comes down to concrete cases, recognize that our Nation must be able to make treaties which will bind not only the Federal Government but also the States."

Section 3 of the Bricker amendment would give to Congress the power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. Concerning this, the Secretary of State said:

"No more fundamental change in our constitutional system can be imagined, for under it Congress and not the President would be responsible for the day-by-day conduct of our foreign relations."

He adds:

"The proposed amendment * * * would have a calamitous effect upon the international position and prospects of the United States."

But, gentlemen, this is not all. Section 3 would make all executive or other agreements subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by section 2. God only knows what they mean to accomplish, but what they say is this: A treaty can be effective internally only through legislation. An executive agreement is subject to the same limitation as a treaty. Then such executive agreements could become effective only through legislation. Thousands of executive agreements have been made under the authority of the President. He is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. Suppose it was necessary for United States troops to traverse Canadian soil, or for Canadian troops to detour through the northern part of the United States to repel invasion. Must the President await congressional or State authority before making the necessary agreements with Canada? Time permits no present discussion of the dangers of section 3. It presents all the problems, the delays, and the perils which would flow from section 2, plus the additional objection that Congress would become bogged down in the details of innumerable matters incident to our foreign relations. Furthermore, it would alter the traditional separation of powers between legislative and executive branches, and would paralyze the power of the President for prompt and efficient action. Viewing the picture as a whole, I ask, must the great Senate of the United States deprive itself of its exclusive constitutional prerogative concerning treaties, and share its power with the House of Representatives and the State legislatures in order to restrain itself from its own hypothetical excesses of which it has never been guilty?

In closing, let me say that after months of study of this subject I have yet to find any genuine and expressed recognition by the advocates of the Bricker amendment of the one controlling and all-important fact which must determine our action, the course of our history, and the preservation of our liberties. That fact is that this Nation is perched on a pinnacle of perilous peace, and tottering on the verge of a devastating war with a ruthless and aggressive opponent who seeks to destroy our Constitution and our liberties.

No man knows what the future may bring. No man knows what tomorrow may bring. Every man knows that united we stand; divided we fall. Standing alone, America cannot hope for victory in war or for stability and prosperity in peace. We must have friends among the free nations of the world. We must tie them to us by friendly agreements for mutual trade and common defense. We have a great, sane, and patriotic President in Dwight D. Eisenhower. In him is vested the executive power of the Nation. He must be free to act quickly in emergency. As Commander in Chief, he must be free to make executive agreements with our allies, and the time may come when decisive action delayed for a day, or a week, may spell too little and too late.

We are entering a new era in the history of the world, an era in which the paralyzing threat of war will hang over the nations until that faroff day when the rule of law shall displace the international anarchy of the present. The Bricker amendment, if adopted, will bind Presidents and Senates yet unborn, in crises as yet undreamed of. Should we not quiet our fearful hearts and adhere to the calm, wise, and courageous decision of the men who drafted our Constitution; who considered and rejected the very issues now being debated; and whose counsel has guided America to freedom and power for 150 years?

That the treaty power of the United States extends to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and the governments of other nations, is clear. It is also clear that the protection which should be afforded to the citizens of one country owning property in another, and the manner in which that property may be transferred, devised or inherited, are fitting subjects for such negotiation and of regulation by mutual stipulations between the two countries. As commercial intercourse increases between different countries the residence of citizens of one country within the territory of the other naturally follows, and the removal of their disability from alienage to hold, transfer, and inherit property in such cases tends to promote amicable relations. Such removal has been within the present century the frequent subject of treaty arrangement. The treaty power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or of its departments, and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent. *Fort Leavenworth R. R. Co.* v. *Lowe* (114 U. S. 525, 541 (29: 264, 270).) But with these exceptions, it is not perceived that there is any limit to the questions which can be adjusted touching any matter which is properly the subject of negotiation with a foreign country. *Ware* v. *Hylton* (3 U. S. 3 Dall. 199 (1: 568)); *Chirac* v. *Chirac* (15 U. S. 2 Wheat. 259 (4: 234)); *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. 483 (25: 628)); Droit d' Aubaine (8 Ops. Atty. Gen. 417); *People* v. *Gerke* (5 Cal. 381); *De Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258, 33 L. ed. 642, 645 (1889).)

Confirmation of what was said in *De Geofroy* v. *Riggs, supra,* appears in *Fort Leavenworth R. R. Co.* v. *Lowe* (114 U. S. 525 at 541). In that case it was stated that when a controversy arose between the United States and Canada as to boundaries of Maine and Massachusetts "it was deemed necessary on the part of our Government to secure the cooperation and concurrence of Maine * * * and Massachusetts." This confirms that cession of part of the territory of a State could not be made by treaty alone. The Court also said:

"The jurisdiction of the United States extends over all the territory within the States and therefore their authority must be obtained as well as that of the State within which the territory is situated before any cession of sovereignty or political jurisdiction can be made to a foreign country." (Opinion by Justice Field (1884).)

"And certainly a treaty subsequently made by the United States with France could not divest rights of property already vested in the state even if the words of the treaty had imported such an intention." *Prevost* v. *Greneaux,* 19 (Howard 1, 7). (Opinion by Taney, C. J. (1856).)

Similar statements have been made in other cases. Thus, in *Doe* v. *Braden* (16 Howard 635, 657 (1883)), the Court stated that:

"The treaty is therefore a law made by the proper authority, and the courts of justice have no right to annul or disregard any of its provisions, unless they violate the Constitution of the United States."

"The decisions of this Court generally have regarded treaties as on much the same plane as acts of Congress and as usually subject to the general limitations in the Constitution" (*United States* v. *Minnesota* (270 U. S. 181 at 207, 208, 70 L. ed. at 549)).

In *Asakura* v. *Seattle* (265 U. S. 332, 241, 68 L. ed. at 1044) the Court said:

"The treatymaking power of the United States is not limited by any express provision of the Constitution, and though it does not extend so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, it does extend to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and other nations." See also *Thomas* v. *Gay* (169 U. S. 264 at 271); *Maiorano* v. *Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.* (53 L. ed. 793); *Whitney* v. *Robertson* (124 U. S. 194); *Foster* v. *Neilson* (2 Peters 253, 314); *Valentine* v. *United States* (81 L. ed. 5). Consider analogy of *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137, 2 L. ed. 60 (opinion by Marshall)).

"And be it further enacted, That a final judgment or decree in any suit, in the highest court of law or equity of a State in which a decision in the suit could be had, where is drawn in question the validity of a treaty or statute of, or an authority exercised under the United States, and the decision is against their validity; or where is drawn in question the validity of a statute of, or an authority exercised under any State, on the ground of their being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties or laws of the United States, and the decision is in favor of such their validity, (d) or where is drawn in question the construction of any clause of the Constitution, or of a treaty, or statute of, or commission held under the United States, and the decision is against the title, right, privilege, or exemption specially set up or claimed by either party, under such clause of the said Constitution, treaty, statute, or commission, may be reexamined and reversed or affirmed in the Supreme Court of the United States and upon a writ or error * * *." (The Judiciary Act of Sept. 24, 1789, sec. 25.)

"A treaty will not be deemed to have been abrogated or modified by a later statute unless such purpose on the part of Congress has been clearly expressed (*Chew Heong* v. *United States* (112 U. S. 536, 28 L. ed. 770, 5 S. Ct. 255); *United States* v. *Payne* (264 U. S. 446, 448, 68 L. ed. 782, 783, 44 S. Ct. 352 * * *); *Cook* v. *United States* (288 U. S. 102, 77 L. ed. 641)).

"Where the provisions of a treaty and a subsequent act of Congress are in conflict, the act of Congress will control in the courts of the United States as the later expression of the municipal law of the United States" (*Pigeon River* v. *Cox* (78 L. ed. 695)).

"The act of Congress under which the duties were collected authorized their exaction. * * * It was passed after the treaty with the Dominican Republic and if there be any conflict between the stipulations of the treaty and the requirements of the law, the latter must control" (*Whitney* v. *Roberson* (124 U. S. 190, 193)).

"A treaty may supersede a prior act of Congress and an act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty."

The above was necessary to the decision. A treaty exempted the Cherokee Nation from United States taxes and a statute later imposed a tax. The two were held to be repugnant and the later statute prevailed over the treaty. (*The Cherokee Tobacco Case* (11 Wall 616 (1870)).

In *United States* v. *See Yen Tai* (185 U. S. 213, 46 L. ed. 878), the court said of a treaty with China:

"That it was competent for the two countries by treaty to have superseded a prior act of Congress on the same subject is not to be doubted; for otherwise the declaration in the Constitution that a treaty concluded in the manner prescribed by that instrument shall be the supreme law of the land would

not have due effect. As Congress may by statute abrogate, so far at least as this country is concerned a treaty previously made by the United States with another nation, so the United States may by treaty supersede a prior act of Congress on the same subject."

See also *Thomas* v. *Gay* (169 U. S. 264); *Foster* v. *Neilsen* (8 U. S. 108); and see *United States* v. *See Yen Tai, supra* (46 L. ed. 878 at 882); *Cherokee Tobacco* v. *United States* (11 Wall. 616, 621, 20 L. ed. 227); *Johnson* v. *Browne* (205 U. S. 309, 321, 51 L. ed. 816).

In discussing the superiority of treaties over State laws, under the supremacy clause of the Constitution, James Madison said:

"The indiscreet zeal of the adversaries to the Constitution, has betrayed them into an attack on this part of it also, without which it would have been evidently and radically defective. To be fully sensible of this, we need only suppose for a moment, that the supremacy of the State constitutions had been left complete, by a saving clause in their favor.

* * * * *

"In fine, the world would have seen for the first time, a system of government founded on an inversion of the fundamental principles of all government; it would have seen the authority of the whole society everywhere subordinate to the authority of the parts; it would have seen a monster, in which the head was under the direction of the members." The Federalist, No. XLIII.

"Did not Congress very lately unanimously resolve, in adopting the very sensible letter of Mr. Jay, that a treaty when once made pursuant to the sovereign authority, ex vi termini became immediately the law of the land? It seems to result unavoidably from the nature of the thing, that when the constitutional right to make treaties is exercised, the treaty so made should be binding upon those who delegated authority for that purpose. If it was not, what foreign power would trust us? And if this right was restricted by any such fine checks as Mr. Mason has in his imagination, but has not thought proper to disclose, a critical occasion might arise, when for want of a little rational confidence in our own Government we might be obligated to submit to a master in an enemy. * * *" Answer to Mason by James Iredell, Federalist and other Constitutional Papers, p. 903, (1788).

"A treaty is a law of the United States and a part of the law of every State" (*Boudinot* v. *United States* (Cherokee Tobacco) (11 Wall. 616, 20 L. ed. 227)).

"A treaty is a law of the land whenever its provisions prescribe a rule by which the rights of the private citizen or subject may be determined" (*Re Cooper* 143 U. S. 472, 36 L. ed. 232).

Cherac v. *Cherac* (2 Wheat. 259) held that:

"A treaty with France gave to her citizens the right to purchase and hold land in the United States; removed the incapacity of alienage and placed them in precisely the same situation as if they had been citizens of this country" (100 U. S. 489).

To the same effect see *Carneal* v. *Banks* (10 Wheat. 181); *Hughes* v. *Edwards* (9 Wheat. 489); *Hgrden* v. *Fisher* (1 Wheat. 300) (Opinion by Marshall, C. J.); *Strother* v. *Lucas* (12 Peters 410, 9 L. ed. 1137); *Maiorano* v. *Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.* (213 U. S. 268, 53 L. ed. 792); *Barcardi Corp.* v. *Domenech* (311 U. S. 150, 85 L. ed. 98); *Cherokee Tobacco* v. *U. S.* (11 Wall. 616, 20 L. ed. 227).

In *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. 483) plaintiffs were Swiss heirs of a Swiss citizen who died intestate in Virginia. The State of Virginia claimed escheat. Plaintiffs claimed under treaty entitling them to time to sell the land and receive the proceeds. The treaty was made to give Americans reciprocal rights in Switzerland. The court said:

"If the National Government has not the power to do what is done by such treaties, it cannot be done at all, for the States are expressly forbidden to 'enter into any treaty.' It must always be borne in mind that the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States are as much a part of the law of every State as its own local laws and constitution. This is a fundamental principle in our system." See also *United States* v. *O'Donnell* (303 U. S. 501, 82 L. ed. 980).

That the treatymaking power has been surrendered by the States and given to the United States is unquestionable. It is true also that the treaties made by the United States and in force are part of the supreme law of the land and that they are as binding within the territorial limits of the States as they are elsewhere throughout the dominions of the United States. *Baldwin* v. *Franks* (120 U. S. 678 at 682–683).

"That the United States have power under the Constitution to provide for the punishment of those who are guilty of depriving Chinese subjects of any of the rights, privileges, immunities, or exemptions guaranteed them by this treaty we do not doubt." (*Baldwin* v. *Franks, supra* (120 U. S. 678 at 682–683). See *Jordan* v. *Tashiro* (278 U. S. 123, 73 L. ed. 214); *Hopkirk* v. *Bell* (3 Cranch 454, 2 L. ed. 497 (1806)).

In the Constitutional Convention motion was made that "no treaty shall be binding on the United States which is not ratified by a law." Motion lost (pp. 606, 607) (1 yes, 8 no) (U. S. Documents, 69th Cong., 1st sess., H. Doc. No. 398). Same motion made later and lost (p. 683) (1 yes, 10 no).

"The remarks made in a former number, will apply with conclusive force against the admission of the House of Representatives to a share in the formation of treaties. The fluctuating, and taking its future increase into the account, the multitudinous composition of that body, forbid us to expect in it those qualities which are essential to the proper execution of such a trust. Accurate and comprehensive knowledge of foreign politics; a steady and systematic adherence to the same views; a nice and uniform sensibility to national character; decision, secrecy, and dispatch, are incompatible with the genius of a body so variable and so numerous. The very complication of the business, by introducing a necessity of the concurrence of so many different bodies, would of itself afford a solid objection. The greater frequency of the calls upon the House of Representatives, and the greater length of time which it would often be necessary to keep them together when convened, to obtain their sanction in the progressive stages of a treaty, would be a source of so great inconvenience and expense, as alone ought to condemn the project" (Hamilton, Federalist, LXXV).

"Some are displeased with it, not on account of any errors or defects in it, but because, as the treaties, when made, are to have the force of laws, they should be made only by men invested with legislative authority. These gentlemen seem not to consider that the judgments of our courts, and the commissions constitutionally given by our governor are as valid and as binding on all persons whom they concern, as the laws passed by our legislature. All constitutional acts of power, whether in the executive or in the judicial department, have as much legal validity and obligation as if they proceeded from the legislature, and therefore, whatever name be given to the power of making treaties, or however obligatory they may be when made, certain it is, that the people may, with much propriety, commit the power to a distinct body from the legislature, the executive, or the judicial. It surely does not follow, that because they have given the power of making laws to the legislature, that therefore they should likewise give them power to do every other act of sovereignty, by which the citizens are to be bound and affected" (the Federalist, No. LXIV, John Jay).

QUESTIONABLE CURES FOR UNPROVEN PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, having associated myself with the arguments which were presented so effectively by Justice Brand, it will not be necessary for me to speak at great length this afternoon. Of course, had it not been for Justice Brand's brilliant statement of the legal arguments which I believe to constitute sound reasons why the Senate should not adopt the Bricker amendment, I would have been compelled to present—in a less able way, to be sure—the same thesis.

Therefore, I now turn my attention to certain points not covered in detail in Justice Brand's speech. I shall entitle the speech I make this afternoon Questionable Cures for Unproven Problems.

Mr. President, the debate on the Bricker joint resolution and possible substitute constitutional amendments shares an important characteristic with the debate last year on the so-called tidelands bill.

Before any of my colleagues draws a hasty conclusion from the statement I have just made, let me assure the Senate that a night watch will not be needed on this occasion, because I hope to complete my speech in approximately 45 minutes. However, at the outset I wish to say that I believe that up to this hour the debate in the Senate on the issues involved in the Bricker amendment and the series of amendments which have been offered on the floor of the Senate support very clearly the desirability of the adoption of the motion which, very early in the debate, I filed at the desk, namely, that the joint resolution be recommitted, for further consideration by the Judiciary Committee. As I shall point out in the course of my speech today, Mr. President, in my judgment the floor of the Senate is not the place where legislation should be drafted; it is not the place where legislation should be written. Legislation should be written in committee, following the introduction of a bill, where, if need be, appropriate amendments may be made to it. That should be done in committee, Mr. President, for one very good legal reason, as well as for a great many good policy reasons: It should be done in committee because the place to make the legislative history of a bill, which is desirable in order to aid the courts when, subsequently, they are called upon to interpret the bill and the legislative intent, is in committee. Thus we may give the courts the benefit of a committee hearing and of a committee report on any amendment which finally becomes a part of a bill to be voted upon by the Senate. Particularly is this important, and even essential, when the legislation under consideration contemplates action so fundamental and solemn as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, the debate on the Bricker joint resolution and on the various amendments submitted to it shares an important

characteristic with the debate which occurred last year on the so-called tidelands bill, in that in both cases the major problems which supposedly require cure do not exist. In both cases, a prodigious advertising campaign has been built on slogans and catchwords which bear little resemblance to the legal issues involved.

In effect, the Senate is being urged to take action, leading to amendment of the Constitution of the United States, to deal with a problem which has not risen. At the least, the various proposals are designed to declare that the Constitution is superior to, and is controlling upon, treaties.

It is argued that this would be no more than a restatement of existing law; and I agree. Some who hold this view see little danger in a harmless amendment of this sort. Some see definite advantage to reassuring a questioning Nation that the Constitution does stand above, and regulates, treaties. According to Gallup, the Nation is not disturbed.

Mr. President, in one section of the speech delivered by Mr. Justice Brand, of my State's supreme court, which I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this afternoon, he discussed the question of what the Supreme Court of the United States has already held regarding the superiority of the Constitution as the supreme law of the land; and he cited—and accurately so—a long list of judicial decisions which in my judgment leave no room for doubt as to this premise, and support the contention I make this afternoon that there is no problem which needs to be cured.

REJECTION OF AMENDMENT WOULD REMOVE DOUBT

But if the people are disturbed, what better answer can there be than flat rejection of the proposed resolutions? This, indeed, would tell the people of our country that it is the judgment of the Senate of the United States that their fears are groundless; that the Constitution which has withstood the day-to-day test of 164 years is sound in this regard.

THE GRAVE RISKS OF AMENDMENT

Mr. President, can we safely graft new words onto the Constitution? I say we cannot, in the absence of proven need.

The Constitution is a short document declaring in general terms basic principles and procedures of Government. In the annotated edition authorized by the Senate, it consists of not quite 25 pages. The annotation and commentary run to about 1,200 pages. Cases interpreting the Constitution run into the thousands.

If we launch a constitutional amendment, we do not know where it will lead; and certainly we have no way of knowing where it will come to rest. This is all the more true of a joint resolution which, if passed by the Congress, will be amended on the floor, and probably in conference, without the needed searching inquiry into the potential effect of every word and phrase. Any joint resolution passed or recommended for passage as a result of this debate will be a miracle of ambiguity.

Under the ordinary rules of judicial interpretation, the courts will assume that the joint resolution was passed for a purpose. The courts will also assume that the Congress did not act in a vacuum. The courts always will assume that the Congress acted for the purpose of bringing about a change. As a result of the procedure thus far, there will not be—there cannot now be—any authoritative committee report to enlighten the courts, with respect to the joint resolutions and the amendments to it, unless it is recommitted.

Mr. President, our foresight can carry us so far. Mr. Justice Cardozo, in the Nature of the Judicial Process, presented the problem with his usual insight and clarity, as follows:

> The rule that fits the case may be supplied by the Constitution or by statute. * * * There are gaps to be filled. There are doubts and ambiguities to be cleared. There are hardships and wrongs to be mitigated if not avoided. Interpretation is often spoken of as if it were nothing but the research and the discovery of a meaning which, however, obscure and latent, had nonetheless a real and ascertainable preexistence in the legislator's mind. The process is, indeed, that at times, but it is often something more. The ascertainment of intention may be the least of a judge's troubles in ascribing meaning to a statute. "The fact is" says Gray in his lectures on the Nature and Sources of the Law (sec. 370, p. 165) "that the difficulties of so-called interpretation arise when the legislature has had no meaning at all; when the question which is raised on the statute never occurred to it; when what the judges have to do is, not to determine what the legislature did mean on a point which was present to its mind, but to guess what it would have intended on a point not present to its mind, if the point had been present." (Cf. Pound, "Courts and Legislation," 9 Modern Legal Philosophy Series, p. 226.)

That is the end of the quotation from the great Mr. Justice Cardozo, which I think is so pertinent to the subject before the Senate.

Mr. President, in my judgment it would be unwise to meddle with the treaty clause of the Constitution without a set and pressing purpose to appease a manufactured clamor or to extricate elected officials from a political predicament.

TAMPERING WITH THE SEPARATION-OF-POWERS DOCTRINE

Mr. President, an amendment redistributing responsibility and authority in the field of foreign relations would disturb the nice accommodations and interrelationships of the separation of powers and the checks and balance system, which in practice have proven so effective.

If the requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate on treaties is not sufficient protection against executive abuse, a new formula will not provide for what is lacking.

If at times in our history there were threats of overexpanding executive power—and charges to that effect were leveled against Jackson and Theodore Roosevelt and Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, but against none so bitterly as against Lincoln—the cause for concern today is the tendency to vest more and more authority in the Congress.

I wish to emphasize that point. There is in America, in the thinking of too many of our citizens, a dangerous trend toward delimiting the system of checks and balances by making the legislature supreme. Let me say to the American people that if the time ever comes when we destroy the coequal, coordinate, three-branch system of Government, with no branch supreme over the other two, then truly we shall start losing our liberty. If for no other reason than that of protecting the separation-of-powers doctrine under the Constitution of the United States, I never could go along with the Bricker amendment, because, when all is said and done, the Bricker amendment would undermine the separation-of-powers doctrine and would have the effect of making the legislature supreme over the judicial and the executive.

Listen to what Mr. Justice Stone had to say. He had cause to protest. In the great dissent in *U. S.* v. *Butler* (297 U. S. 1) he said:

> Courts are not the only agency of government that must be assumed to have capacity to govern. Congress and the courts both, unhappily, may falter or be mistaken in the performance of their constitutional duty. But interpretation of our great charter of government which proceeds on any assumption that the responsibility for the preservation of our institutions is the exclusive concern of any one of the three branches of government, or that it alone can save them from destruction, is far more likely, in the long run, "to obliterate the constituent members" of "an indestructible union of indestructible states" than the frank recognition that language, even of a constitution, may mean what it says (*U. S.* v. *Butler* (1936) 297 U. S. 1, 78 ff).

This magnificent passage holds a great lesson for today, as we debate in this historic Chamber the Bricker amendment and the substitute proposal. I say to the American people, do not forget what Justice Stone said. Recognize that the Constitution may mean exactly what it says. I respectfully submit that if we read the Constitution in this light we do not need the Bricker amendment.

THE PRESIDENT SPEAKS FOR THE PEOPLE IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Let us remember that every Member of the House and Senate is chosen and rechosen or rejected by only a small portion of the electorate. We have national responsibilities, but the political check upon us is sectional.

The President of the United States is the only official of our Government elected nationally. He was the appropriate choice of national spokesmen in national affairs at the time of the adoption of the Constitution.

He is even a more appropriate national spokesman today, as his actual election is, in reality, by direct vote of the people, as it was not in 1789.

The President represents the Nation to the rest of the world. It is the present function of the Senate to balance his vast authority in some measure. It would be absurd and incapacitating to make the Congress his ball and chain.

I make these remarks irrespective of who occupies the office of President of the United States, so far as party affiliation is concerned. We are dealing here with an absolutely nonpartisan issue. As one who disagrees with Dwight Eisenhower on a great many domestic issues,

I wish to say that in this instance I rise on the floor of the Senate to praise his statesmanship in opposing the Bricker amendment. I praise him for recognizing that under his oath of office he has the tremendous responsibility of upholding and protecting the Constitution and all it stands for.

I praise his political courage in telling the American people that on this issue, so far as he is concerned—if I interpret his statements correctly—there can be no compromise, because no President of the United States has any right to compromise with the separation-of-powers doctrine, indelibly written into the Constitution of the United States.

I shall always be proud, as the representative of the Independent Party, to stand on the floor of the Senate and sustain the hand of Dwight Eisenhower or any other President of the United States when, in my best judgment, he is upholding the best interests of the Republic. In my opinion, by his position on this issue he is not only standing for the best interests of the Republic today, but he is standing for the best interests of American history of the future. I am proud to rally behind him in what—and we should mince no words about it—augurs well for a great political contest in America arising over this attempt to weaken the separation-of-powers doctrine of the Constitution of the United States.

SECTION 2 OF THE GEORGE RESOLUTION

The case of *United States* v. *Pink* ((1942) 315 U. S. 203, 62 S. Ct. 552) has caused some perplexity in the course of this debate. It has been cited as an instance of limitless executive power—or at least executive power without defined limits—to override State internal law.

I submit to the Senate that the Pink case does not stand for such a proposition. I have been for some time disturbed by the absence of a dividing line between treaties and executive agreements as have others in the Senate. But the nub of our concern has not been that executive agreements have operated to deny to the States their appropriate authority. Our concern has been that executive agreements may be resorted to as a means of circumventing the constitutional requirements of ratification procedures which carry with them the appropriate safeguards of the checks and balances system.

The George amendment, as it pertains to executive agreements, deals only with those which would have internal effect. It reads:

> An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress.

Its desirability depends in part upon the extent to which the Supreme Court's holding in the Pink case created a loophole through which the Executive can conclude agreements which some fear have the force of treaties to override local law without the safeguard of a two-thirds ratification requirement.

U. S. V. PINK

Let us examine the Pink case to see whether such a threat exists. I deny that it does.

The case concerned a Russian insurance company which established a branch in New York State in 1907. Soviet Russia nationalized the company, but the branch continued to do business in New York until 1925 when the State supreme court took possession of its assets for a determination of claims of policyholders and creditors in the United States. Let us never forget, in this debate on the Pink case, that all claims of domestic creditors were satisfied.

The New York court then directed payment of foreign creditors and distribution of the remaining assets to a quorum of the board of directors of the company.

Some claims were paid under this latter order, but further action was restrained by injunction obtained by the United States.

The claim of the Federal Government was based upon the executive agreement concluded as part of the recognition of Russia in 1933, which dealt with the settlements of outstanding claims by and against Russia, the United States, and the nationals of each. In sum, Russia assigned all of its claims against United States nationals, including corporations such as the insurance company, to the Federal Government as a preliminary step to final adjustment. This settlement had been a major obstacle to the resumption of recognition between the two countries.

The executive power to recognize other governments is conferred by article II, section 3, of the Constitution, which reads:

> He (the President) shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers.

The New York court had, in adjudicating the claims of the United States, declared—not as a matter of statute but as a matter of public policy—that the Soviet Government had nothing to transfer to the United States and that, as a result, the Federal Government's claims upon the fund were invalid. The New York court so held. The New York court took it upon itself to decide what the United States Government had by way of legal right as a result of the negotiation of an agreement by the United States with the Soviet Union.

The Supreme Court of the United States held otherwise as to the fund before the court. The Supreme Court clearly limited its decision. I urge my colleagues to read the language of limitation in the Pink case:

> At the outset it should be noted that, so far as appears, all creditors whose claims arose out of dealings with the New York branch have been paid. Thus we are not faced with the question whether New York's policy of protecting the so-called local creditors by giving them priority in the assets deposited with the State (citation) should be recognized within the rule of *Clark* v. *Williard* (294 U. S. 211) * * * or should yield to the Federal policy expressed in the international compact or agreement (*Santovincenso* v. *Egan* * * *; *United States* v. *Belmont, supra*). We intimate no opinion on that question. The contest here is between the United States and creditors of the Russian corporation who, we assume, are not citizens of this country and whose claims did not arise out of transactions with the New York branch. The United States is seeking to protect not only claims which it holds but also claims of its nationals.

The State court's determination was based upon a refusal to recognize the nationalization of the insurance company—

> that the Russian decrees had no extraterritorial effect, according to Russian law; that if the decrees were given extraterritorial effect, they were confiscatory and their recognition would be unconstitutional and contrary to the public policy of the United States and of the State of New York (315 U. S. 203 ff.).

The Supreme Court held that the New York court erred in its determination, a determination of fact under the New York law, as to the extraterritorial effect of the Russian nationalization decree. The Court further held that the discharge of a constitutional function such as recognition of a foreign government carries with it the right to condition such action to insure the protection of interests of the United States and its nationals.

Some talk as if the Federal Government's action was to uphold the Soviet seizure of the insurance company and other properties. Quite to the contrary, the agreement was to alleviate the hardships and losses suffered by our citizens from the Soviet expropriation.

To permit New York's policy—a policy in part based upon its construction of the policy of the United States—to have greater status than the national agreement would have been to atomize the settlement of cross claims, and possibly prevent any settlement at all.

The High Court's holding is not dissimilar from the manner in which one State's laws must give way under the full faith and credit clause to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State. In superintending the application of that article of the Constitution, the Supreme Court has occasion to overrule certain characterizations of fact or law which erroneously deny such full faith and credit, and it has done so in many cases coming before it for determination.

The policies of the Pink case and the constitutional provision are the same: orderly administration of law and the protection of the rights of all the States which on occasion requires that the courts of one State reach a conclusion they would otherwise prefer not to adopt.

There is dictum in the Pink case which is broad, such as:

> But State law must yield when it is inconsistent with or impairs the policy or provisions of a treaty or of an international compact or agreement. (See *Nielsen* v. *Johnson* * * *.) Then the power of a State to refuse enforcements of rights based on foreign law which runs counter to the public policy of the forum (*Griffin* v. *McCoach* * * *) must give way before the superior Federal policy evidenced by a treaty or international compact or agreement.

I respectfully submit that this language in the Pink case is dictum, because it is not necessary to the result of the case.

The Supreme Court has said of dictum—*Cohens* v. *Virginia* (1821, 6 Wheat. 264, 399):

> It is a maxim, not to be disregarded, that general expressions, in every opinion, are to be taken in connection with the case in which those expressions are used. If they

go beyond the case, they may be respected but ought not to control the judgment in a subsequent suit, when the very point is presented for decision. The reason of this maxim is obvious. The question actually before the Court is investigated with care, and is considered in its full extent. Other principles which may serve to illustrate it are considered in their relation to the case decided, but their possible bearing on all other cases is seldom completely investigated.

So, for example, in *Myers* v. *U. S.* ((1926) 272, U. S. 52, 139–144) the Supreme Court had before it the question of the power of the President to remove officials appointed by him with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Court observed that in the landmark case of *Marbury* v. *Madison* ((1803) 1 Cranch 137) Mr. Chief Justice Marshall expressed opinions on the subject. Holmes said that while Marbury against Madison was the authority on the power of the courts to pass upon the validity of acts of Congress, Marshall's opinion as to the removal power was merely dictum because the case turned upon the question of the lack of power of Congress to confer original jurisdiction upon the Supreme Court to grant the remedy of mandamus. It followed that the views expressed by Marshall on the removal power were not controlling as they were not necessary to the decision of Marbury against Madison.

The broad language quoted from the Pink case discusses the effect upon State public policy of "a treaty or of an international compact or agreement" and "a treaty or international or international compact or agreement."

Clearly no treaty is involved so that even if the statements are correct as to treaties, they do not constitute precedents. The first sentence deals in the most general terms with State law. The second sentence pertains only to "rights based on foreign law," which are related to an executive agreement.

Most importantly, the agreement in the case was a valid exercise of power conferred by the Constitution. The broad statements quoted could hardly be expected to apply to an executive undertaking not so sanctioned.

The holding of the case, I submit, is as follows: An executive agreement takes precedence over local law when the agreement is a necessary incident to the exercise of a power conferred upon the President by the Constitution.

That is the holding of the case. In my judgment, Mr. President, it is a holding of fact, different from the dictum in the Pink case which has been cited by the proponents of the George amendment as a justification for the adoption of the Bricker amendment, as modified.

We should bear in mind that the Pink case involved the property of a foreign corporation, its directors and foreign creditors.

I suggest to the Senate that this single case which is of narrow applicability is not a sufficient basis for amending the Constitution of the United States—amending it indeed on the strength of floor debate only, in which the necessary "legislative history" cannot be supplied with anything approaching authority under accepted rules of judicial interpretation.

There is great protection in the superintendence of the courts. There is practical protection in the power of Congress to modify or upset executive agreements in the same fashion as it has authority to do so in the case of treaties.

It may be obvious to observe that an executive agreement cannot possibly operate to effect "internal law" until it is published and known. The George amendment has nothing to do with executive agreements which are secret.

POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF SECTION 2 OF THE GEORGE RESOLUTION

As to the words "international agreement other than a treaty," I take it that these words, being unqualified, necessarily include every agreement which is entered into between the Government of the United States or any of its officials and the Government or officials of any foreign country. It must be assumed that all such agreements are included, no matter what their subject matter, no matter what their duration, and no matter what the circumstances may be which have led to the making of such agreements. If we concede that in some areas of foreign affairs the President has express constitutional authority, let us say, for example, in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, to deal with other nations and to make with them certain agreements to cope with certain conditions, then we must concede that, by an amendment of the kind proposed, the presidential authority in those areas as well as others would be subjected to regulation by the Congress. How? By making it necessary for the President to obtain a congressional enactment before any such agreement could be made if it is to have any effectiveness in the United States.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is misapprehending my whole purpose and, I think, the language of the substitute which I have offered. It refers only to the effectiveness of an executive agreement with respect to the internal affairs or domestic laws of the United States. It does not apply to anything beyond that, and it certainly could not affect the powers of the President as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. It certainly could not affect his power, as an illustration, to invite and receive ambassadors and ministers of foreign countries. Those powers are expressly guaranteed in the Constitution, and under international law, as well. International law, I think the Senator will concede, is a part of the law which our courts must accept and enforce, where there is a well established principle of international law which we have recognized.

So, the only effect of the second section of the substitute which I have offered is to limit the application of those provisions in an executive agreement or some other international agreement which would override an otherwise valid provision of the constitution or of State law.

I think, also, that it will be necessary, in view of the appeal taken by the Attorney General in the Capps case, to bear in mind that an executive agreement, a secret agreement, or an international agreement, might override a prior law of the Congress of the United States on the same subject. That appeal is pending before the Supreme Court, and I, of course, do not know what the court will decide. But what I have stated is the sole effect and purpose of the amendment which I have offered.

I have said today that were it not for the violation of what I regard as a sound principle in making a Constitution and in making of laws, that the enumeration of certain exceptions might tend to exclude others, or, at least, weaken them, I would have no objection to saying that "nothing in this protion shall in any wise affect the powers of the President as provided in the Constitution as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, or his power, as provided in the Constitution, to receive ambassadors and ministers of foreign nations." There may be many others, but I feared the enumeration of certain powers which are not affected might tend to exclude others.

All I desire to say to the Senator is that the sole purpose I have, and the only effect which I think the language of my proposed substitute has, is to say that an international agreement other than a treaty—I am not worrying about treaties; they have been before the Senate and two-thirds of the Senators present have concurred in them, or the President could not have made them, and that is sufficient notice to the people of the country—I am not worried about them, but I am concerned only that an international agreement shall not become effective as internal law in the United States; that is to say, shall not override otherwise valid provisions of the constitution of a State or the laws of a State. I narrow it to that one purpose, because that is the only purpose I have in mind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Georgia I desire to say that I am sure he knows that I have the highest regard for his expertness in the field of constitutional law. I consider the Senator from Georgia to be one of the foremost constitutional lawyers in the United States—there are others, of course—but I say most respectfully to the Senator from Georgia that I do not have any doubt as to what he intends. It does not follow, however, that what the Senator from Georgia intends by his amendment is necessarily the intent of the amendment when it comes to interpretation by the courts. I say, most respectfully, that I do not think the George amendment as presently worded will be interpreted by the courts in accordance with the interpretation for which the Senator now argues on the floor of the Senate. That is why I believe it is so important that the language of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia should go back to the Judiciary Committee for hearings, where outstanding experts on constitutional law throughout the country can be called to testify and present their views as to whether they agree with the Sena-

tor from Georgia concerning the meaning of his amendment. I say, most respectfully, that we are going to find that a great many constitutional experts completely disagree with the Senator from Georgia as to what the effect of his amendment may be.

Therefore, I think it would be a great mistake, with only the record made in the debate on the floor of the Senate, to proceed to a vote on an amendment to the Constitution until we have had further hearings before the Judiciary Committee as to the meaning and effect of the Senator's amendment. That is why, next week, or whenever the Senate again takes up the joint resolution, I shall urge that the resolution and all amendments to it, including that of the Senator from Georgia, go back to the Judiciary Committee, because I have already heard from some outstanding constitutional experts who have the same respect for the Senator from Georgia that I have that in their opinion the Senator from Georgia is mistaken in the interpretation he makes of his own amendment as to the effect it will have once the language becomes a part of the Constitution.

It may be that the Senator from Georgia is right and that those of us who do not share his point of view are wrong, but the only proper procedure for determining that difference of opinion is through Judiciary Committee hearings, where the Senator from Georgia can present on the record before that committee his point of view and the authorities he thinks support his point of view, and where those who have a contrary point of view can present their arguments, and then let the committee determine the pros and cons and bring back to the Senate a report on the George amendment which we do not have at the present time.

Mr. GEORGE. I was only anxious that the Senator from Oregon should understand my purpose. I agree with him that when we construe the Constitution we do not pay very much attention to the intent or purpose, but I want to make my position clear that what I have stated is my sole purpose. I have not sought to interfere with the treaty-making power except to this extent: I am willing to say in the first section that no provision of a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution, and no provision of an executive agreement or other international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution, shall be of any force or effect. I am willing to go that far. But when it comes to a limitation upon the right and power of the President to make executive agreements, the only concern I have grows out of cases like the Pink case, which I agree is not very good law, but which hapens to be the decision of the Supreme Court. It grows out of the feeling I have that the Court has been moving in that direction for some time, and it looks as if the Court in that case "went overboard."

My only purpose is to see to it that although the making of executive agreements can go on, just as it has gone on and must go, such an agreement shall not be binding within the United States unless an act of Congress so declares. That is to say, they will not override an otherwise valid law of a State or a provision of the constitution of a State once Congress passes on the question. I do not want to confuse the treatymaking power of the Federal Government with the power of the States. I want to keep it out of that realm. Therefore, I have not proposed anything which I believe fundamentally would affect the relationship between the States and the Federal Government.

I do, however, want to deal with executive agreements, because that happens to be the field in which the wide expansion of powers in the realm of foreign affairs has been carried on. International relations have been carried on during the past 15 to 20 years to an almost unprecedented extent.

I deplore every effort to short-circuit the treatymaking power of the United States Government. Certainly I think that the President should be under constitutional restraint to send to Congress in the form of a treaty everything that properly should be considered in a treaty, but I do not want to limit his power to make executive agreements, except to the extent of saying, "If an executive agreement really overrides an otherwise valid law of a State of the Union, then it will not become effective as internal law until Congress has had an opportunity to pass upon it and to approve or disapprove it."

That is the whole purpose I have in mind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with his usual brilliance, the Senator from Georgia certainly has made clear his intent and purpose. I have no doubt as to his intent and purpose. I am simply pointing out that there are those, including the junior Senator from Oregon, who do not believe the language the Senator from Georgia has used in his amendment will be subject only to the limited interpretation which he so forthrightly has suggested in his remarks on the floor of the Senate. That is why I have said that the joint resolution and all amendments proposed to it should be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary. The constitutional authorities in the United States, including the senior Senator from Georgia, should be asked to appear before the committee to testify as to the effects of the George amendment and of the other amendments which have been offered.

Following such hearings, let the Committee on the Judiciary report the results of its hearings, and then let the Senate decide, for the first time, whether or not we wish to vote for such an amendment to the Constitution.

In my brief speech, I am setting forth some of my reasons why I think the George amendment will not have the legal effects, in their entirety, the Senator from Georgia intends it shall have.

As I was saying—and I wish to repeat a paragraph—if we concede that in some areas of foreign affairs the President has express constitutional authority, let us say, for example, in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, to deal with other nations and to make with them certain agreements to cope with certain conditions, then we must concede that, by an amendment of the kind proposed, the Presidential authority in those areas, as well as others, would be subjected to regulation by the Congress. How? By making it necessary for the President to obtain a congressional enactment before any such agreement could be made if it were to have any effectiveness in the United States.

Let us go on, however, to other wording of section 2 of the George proposal. The words "shall become effective" may be intended to apply only as to agreements made, after the amendment is made effective, but there is at least a lurking suspicion that it could be construed to apply retroactively.

The expression "effective as internal law" would be wholly new to the Constitution. What does it mean? If we try to arrive at a common denominator on the basis of remarks which have been made on both sides of the argument, we find no clear agreement on any precise meaning. That, in itself, indicates a need for further study and a recommital to the Committee on the Judiciary for the taking of expert testimony.

Apparently the expression could be construed in the same sense as "law of the land" in article VI of the Constitution in regard to the Constitution, laws, and treaties. I shall have more to say on that score in a moment.

On the other hand, the expression could be intended only to apply to an agreement to the extent that it might be necessary to give effect to it in the United States. That is really, I submit an oversimplification of the problem. It might well be that an agreement, the primary objective of which is the taking of certain action abroad, could become involved in administrative or judicial proceedings in this country. Recognition of the existence and validity of such an agreement might be an essential element in the administrative or judicial determination of a case involving rights or obligations in the United States. For example, the existence and effectiveness of the Korean armistice agreement might become a matter of importance in court proceedings in this country.

For instance, it has been pointed out that litigants in a suit concerning insurance or other contracts might need to rely on some provision of such an agreement in aid of their position.

My only purpose in these remarks is to point out that the scope of the proposal, its meaning, and its potential applications are by no means as simple as at first reading they might appear to be.

Analyze the proposal as you will, I think you cannot escape the conclusion that in actual effect the making of all international agreements other than treaties would or might be subjected to regulation by the Congress and that in certain areas where traditionally the President's authority has been considered paramount under the Constitution the President's powers would be cut down or limited by the proposed section 2.

Then, too, Mr. President, I think section 2 might give possible encouragement to circumventing treaty requirements.

That is a negative phase of the proposal. Let us look at another side of the

picture. It has been suggested by some that section 2 could be construed as giving the Executive and the Congress the power to accomplish by international agreement and legislation whatever may be accomplished by treaty. Is this a far-fetched argument? Let us look at this carefully.

I have not heard any of those who have been in opposition to the Bricker amendment expound the doctrine that an international agreement other than a treaty, or so-called executive agreement, could become law of the land in the sense that it could override either Federal or State laws, let alone override the Constitution. Secretary of State Dulles, in his testimony at the hearings, declared that such agreements could not create law of the land in any such sense.

If the expression "effective as internal law" can, as appears possible, be construed as meaning essentially the same thing as law of the land, then to what conclusion are we led? Just this: That the President can negotiate an international agreement on any matter—at least, there is no qualification stated in the proposed section 2—and such agreement, through congressional enactment, shall become effective as internal law—law enforceable in the United States. Under the treatymaking procedure provided for in the Constitution a treaty becomes law enforceable in the United States when it enters into force after approval by the Senate. What is the essential difference?

I am not saying that the proposed section 2 is intended to have the effect of placing international agreements other than treaties on a par with treaties so far as their effect as internal law is concerned. I am saying, however, that it is open to such possible construction, and it finally is going to be construed by the courts. So the Senate had better lay a very careful foundation, through hearings in the Committee on the Judiciary, as to the intent and purpose of the language and as to the possible construction to which it can be subjected.

If we approved any such amendment, we would be inviting the President and a majority of the Congress to make international agreements without regard to the treatymaking processes, thus circumventing the treatymaking clause of the Constitution. Moreover, in the absence of clear limitations to the contrary, Congress could be expected to find, under the "necessary and proper" clause of the Constitution, full sanction for legislation analogous to that in the migratory-bird case, Missouri against Holland, to give effect to agreements other than treaties.

I have not attempted to analyze all the facets and potential effects of the proposed section 2 of the George amendment, but surely hoped I have said enough to indicate that any proposal of this kind requires a great deal more study in this field.

Thus, as debate is closed as of the time of adjournment this afternoon, to await the passage of a week or 10 days before the issue is again taken up, I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the Senate will give serious thought to my motion to recommit the resolution and all amendments to it to the Committee on the Judiciary. I respectfully say—and I say it out of admiration for the great Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]—that the Senate is here dealing with an amendment which has so many implications affecting the future history of our country, in respect to the operation of the checks and balance system, and the separation of powers doctrine, that I do not believe there should be a vote on it on the floor of the United States Senate until Senators have had the benefit of thorough, scholarly hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary. We should have the testimony of the leading constitutional authorities of the United States, including the testimony of the eminent constitutional lawyer from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The George amendment, in my opinion, would cause more and worse confusion and difficulties than it seeks to cure. It would injure our checks and balance system and undermine the separation of powers doctrine. It would introduce a new legal concept into constitutional law, namely, internal law. This phrase alone would open up a myriad of interpretation possibilities by the Supreme Court any one of which might do violence to our historic theories of constitutional checks and balances.

I respectfully submit that there is no need for the George amendment. Certainly, there is no need for it based upon any fears growing out of the dictum in the Pink case. There is no need for it and no justification for it based upon any fear that Presidents of the United States cannot be trusted to respect the coordinated and coequal rights of the three branches of our Government. It is my view that the George amendment and the entire Bricker resolution should be recommitted because in their present form they would have the effect of destroying the separation of power doctrine by making Congress supreme.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, continuing the discussion on at least one segment of the issue regarding Senate Joint Resolution 1, I desire to reply to a suggestion made by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. In his speech of February 1, 1954, the Senator from Wisconsin took exception to some of my remarks in my speech of January 28, 1954, pointing out that Senate Joint Resolution 1 is opposed by the avowed enemies of the concept of national sovereignty. In my speech of January 28 I said:

> Most of the opponents of this resolution seek to elevate treaty law above domestic constitutional law. They seek to codify all fundamental human rights—civil, political, economic, social, and cultural—in a law superior to that of sovereign nations.

I also said:

> Most of the opposition to this treaty-control amendment comes from those who yearn for the domination of a supranational government. Some of them would surrender national sovereignty immediately; others would destroy it gradually by means of U. N. treaties and by less formal agreements. Some would organize a suprastate on a global scale, while others would first establish a regional government.

In addition, I said:

> Many opponents of the amendment are inspired by an overweening zeal to transfer legislative authority from the States and the Congress to some international body. They consistently support all measures designed to consolidate the power of government in fewer hands and at a greater distance from the people.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin said that—

> The ultimate effect of all these statements is to question the motives of those of us who oppose the Bricker amendment.

I said in my speech, and I repeat it now, that most of the opposition to this treaty-control amendment comes from those who yearn for the domination of a supranational government. The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] in his speech of last Monday, February 1, asked who is included among most of the opposition, and who are "many of the opponents" to whom I referred. I shall now proceed to place in the RECORD the names of those who oppose Senate Joint Resolution 1 and who advocate some form of world or regional government.

I might say in passing, Mr. President, that there are but few in this Government, either in the Senate or in the administration, who oppose any form of a constitutional amendment.

Senate Joint Resolution 1 is an anti-world-government amendment. Naturally, those who want to undermine the sovereignty of the United States oppose it. This amendment does not involve returning to the old Articles of Confederation; submitting treaties to the States for ratification; or giving the States a veto power on questions of genuine international concern. It is ridiculous to suggest that the American Bar Association, more than 20 State bar associations, and the National Association of Attorneys General, and the legislatures of a dozen States, would endorse any such amendment. The issue is simply this: Shall we adhere to the traditional function of treaties as understood from 1787 to 1945, or shall we permit treaties to be used to destroy the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States?

The senior Senator from Wisconsin in his speech of February 1 objected to my statement of the issue as, "Shall the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States be protected against abuse of the treatymaking power?" From this question the senior Senator from Wisconsin drew the implication that all opponents of the amendment favor abuses of the treatymaking power. My statement of the issue in this debate is not subject to that implication.

The President of the United States does not advocate abuse of the treatymaking power. He has endorsed a substitute proposal which recognizes that the treatymaking power can be abused, but which, in my judgment, affords inadequate protection.

Within the past several months, two organizations have been formed for the express purpose of defeating the pro-

posed treaty-control amendment. The organizations to which I refer are the misnamed Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power, and the misnamed Committee for Collective Security.

It is interesting to compare the list of officers of these two committees with the list of officers of the three very influential organizations which advocate a quarter, half, or full world government; namely, the American Association for the United Nations, Atlantic Union Committee, and the United World Federalists.

The proposed amendment is not an attack on the U. N. or its legitimate activities. The U. N.'s worst enemies are those who would distort its purpose. The American Association for the United Nations has consistently urged a gradual approach to world government through the United Nations. It would transform the United Nations from an organization of sovereign States into a true world government with legislative, executive, and judicial powers operating directly on the people.

This gradual approach to world government advocated by the AAUN would be achieved through revision of the United Nations Charter, through the adoption of the Human Rights Covenants and other U. N. treaties, and, if necessary, by fanciful interpretation of the United Nations Charter. If anyone is inclined to doubt that this is the purpose of the American Association for the United Nations, he need only read the testimony presented by members of that organization in the hearings on revision of the United Nations Charter before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in February of 1950.

The Atlantic Union Committee urges immediate formation of a quarter world government. It is true that former Justice Owen Roberts and other leaders of the Atlantic Union movement say that the necessary surrender of sovereignty should be achieved by a constitutional amendment. But it is also true that sovereignty could be surrendered to an Atlantic Union government by treaty and perhaps by executive agreement.

The United World Federalists proposal is to establish a full world government immediately, recognizing the fact that the world government might have to be organized in the beginning without the participation of the Soviet bloc.

These three groups—the American Association for the United Nations, the Atlantic Union Committee, and the United World Federalists—are working hard for the creation of a suprastate in which the United States would become only a minor province. The American Association for the United Nations and the United World Federalists are on record as opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 1. The Atlantic Union Committee has taken no formal position in the matter. But practically all of the officers and the members of the aforementioned three organizations are opposed to any treaty-control amendment which would prevent their ends from being achieved by treaty or by executive agreement.

The following officials of the American Association for the United Nations are also members of the Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power: John W. Davis, New York City; Harry A. Bullis, Minneapolis; Anna Lord Strauss, New York City; Stuart Chevalier, Los Angeles.

The following officials of the AAUN signed the statement in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1 circulated by the Committee for Collective Security: Dr. James T. Shotwell, New York City; John W. Davis, New York City; Clark M. Eichelberger, New York City; Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, New York City; Albert I. Edelman, New York City; Paul C. Sheeline, New York City; Herbert Bayard Swope, New York City; Prof. Quincy Wright, Chicago; Mrs. Dana C. Backus, New York City; W. W. Waymack, Adel, Iowa.

Members of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace, a research affiliate of the AAUN, who signed the statements circulated by the Committee for Collective Security are: Rev. Edward A. Conway, New York City; Earl F. Cruickshank, New York City; Dr. Clyde Eagleton, Tuckahoe, N. Y.; Arthur J. Goldsmith, New York City; Albert Edelman, New York City; Dr. Hans Kohn, New York City; Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde, New York City; Paul C. Sheeline, New York City; Dana C. Backus, New York City.

The following are the sponsors of the Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power, who are also members of the Atlantic Union Committee: James T. Brand, Salem, Oreg.; Harry A. Bullis, Minneapolis; Will L. Clayton, Houston; Palmer Hoyt, Denver; Owen J. Roberts, Philadelphia.

These signers of the statement opposing Senate Joint Resolution 1, released by the Committee for Collective Security, are also listed as members of the Atlantic Union Committee: Herbert Agar, New York City; Russell W. Davenport, New York City; Rt. Rev. Charles K. Gilbert, Charlemont, Mass.; Ernest M. Hopkins, Hanover, N. H.; Dr. Hans Kohn, New York City; Frederick C. McKee, Pittsburgh; Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, Norfolk, Conn.; Herbert Bayard Swope, New York City; Telford Taylor, New York City; Mrs. Robert P. Patterson, New York City.

Finally, these signers of the statement in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1, circulated by the Committee for Collective Security, are also listed as members of the United World Federalists: Pierce Butler, St. Paul, Minn.; Henry B. Cabot, Boston; Cass Canfield, New York City; J. A. Migel, Charlestown, R. I.; Paul Shipman Andrews, Syracuse, N. Y.; Thomas H. Mahoney, Boston.

It should be noted, Mr. President, that members of the two misnamed committees listed above include only those members who are officers of 1 of the 3 organizations advocating some form of world government. I think it is safe to predict that over 90 percent of the members of the two misnamed committees are also members, although not necessarily officers of 1 of the 3 major groups advocating world or regional government. It is quite illuminating, I think, to examine the views of some of the individuals whose names appear on the list I have just read into the RECORD.

Mr. John W. Davis is a member of both the misnamed committees. He claims credit for inventing the doctrine of Missouri against Holland, under which it is possible to transfer, by treaty, all the powers of the States to the Federal Government or to some international authority.

Three members of the misnamed Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power—John W. Davis, William D. Mitchell, and Harrison Tweed—have conceded—and remember this, Mr. President—that the U. N. Human Rights Covenants are dangerous; that they would destroy our Federal-State system; that the Supreme Court might not hold the covenants invalid; and that a reservation to the Human Rights Covenants designed to protect the reserved powers of the States might be ineffective, by reason of the doctrine of Missouri against Holland. The views of these gentlemen are contained in the report of a committee of the New York State Bar Association, which appears in the record of hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1, beginning on page 618. In speaking of the probable ineffectiveness of a reservation to the Human Rights Covenant, the report says:

> If we want to put a clause in the covenant on this subject, it would have to go further and provide that the Federal Government assumes no obligation to enact legislation which it could not constitutionally enact, in the absence of the treaty. This would relieve the Federal Government from an obligation to enact Federal legislation, but even then it might be held that under the rule in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, Congress would gain power to fully implement the covenant, although under no international obligation to do so.

The report in which Messrs. Davis, Mitchell, and Tweed joined also points out that the proposed Covenant on Human Rights contains a pledge as to the manner in which we shall treat all individuals within the United States. Then comes the very pertinent question:

> Just what concern have other nations with the manner in which we treat our citizens, and is that subject an appropriate matter for international agreement?

The report continues that if the Senate should ratify the Human Rights Covenant—

> It would place a heavy strain on the Supreme Court to hold that the treaty is invalid (and) it is possible that the Court would sustain the validity of the treaty, although that is far from certain.

The committee report then points out that under the rule of Missouri against Holland, the Congress, if the Senate should approve the Human Rights Covenant "would have unlimited power to enact legislation on the subject effective within the States, and thus upset the normal division of power between our State and National Governments."

The New York State Bar Association committee report, signed by Messrs. Davis, Mitchell, and Treed, concludes as follows:

> Such a distortion of the treaty power should be condemned as a mere device to enlarge Federal power at the expense of the States, and not within the treaty power.

After thus pointing out all the dangers which might flow from abuse of the treaty power, along the same lines as those pointed out by Mr. Dulles in his famous Louisville speech, Messrs. Mitchell, Davis, and Tweed then conclude that no amendment is necessary. They are willing to play with fire and hope they will not get burned. Since these formidable opponents of any constitutional amendment recognize that the treatymaking power may be dangerously abused, I see no reason whatever for permitting liberty to be lost before trying to do anything about it. Of course, the Human Rights Covenants could not win approval in the Senate of this Congress. We must remember, however, that at one time there were less than 20 Senators of the minority party.

Mr. President, I wish to say, further, that I desire to commend the President and the Secretary of State for the position they have taken regarding this matter. Even though it meant that the Secretary of State had to reverse the position he formerly took, he stated before the committee that although there were elements of approval, there were also in the Human Rights Covenants elements of danger to the constitutional system of our Government.

Another member of the misnamed Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power is former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts. He said, in a speech at Ottawa, Canada, on April 30, 1952, that "we must not stand on the silly shibboleth of national sovereignty" and that "sovereignty must be surrendered to some higher authority—call it what you will." Justice Roberts' colleague on both the misnamed Committee for Defense of the Constitution and on the Atlantic Union Committee, Will Clayton, testified in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1, on the ground that—

> It is an unlimited expression of slavish dedication to the fetish of national sovereignty at a time when the free world must pool its sovereignty if it is to avoid annihilation.

He further said that—

> NATO must speak with one voice or it will not be heard.

Mr. Clark M. Eichelberger, who signed the statement circulated by the Committee for Collective Security, is executive director of the American Association for the United Nations. When testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in 1950, Mr. Eichelberger said:

> We are anxious that the United Nations evolve—that it evolve as rapidly as possible—into that degree of world government necessary to achieve political security, economic advancement, and a greater enjoyment of human rights.

Mr. Eichelberger specifically recommended that the evolution of the United Nations into world government be achieved by "a liberal interpretation of the charter, by implementation through multilateral treaties or the creation of new bodies, by practice," and "by revision of the charter."

No wonder Mr. Eichelberger is opposed to any constitutional amendment that would prevent world government by treaty or by executive agreement between the President and the United Nations.

Mr. Albert I. Edelman testified in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1, as a member of the board of directors of the American Association of the United Nations. He also signed the statement circulated by the Committee for Collective Security. In spite of the fact that the American Association for the United Nations recommends that the American people be deprived of control of their own destiny. Mr. Edelman told the Senate Judiciary Committee that Senate Joint Resolution 1 proposed "a radical renovation of our constitutional system."

Prof. Quincy Wright, of Chicago, is also a member of the American Association for the United Nations who testified in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1 and one who signed the statement against the amendment circulated by the Committee for Collective Security. Professor Wright would naturally be opposed to any treaty-control amendment because he has written many articles to sustain the proposition that articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter are self-executing and, therefore, the fundamental human rights of the American people are no longer a matter of domestic concern but have become matters of international concern subject to definition, supervision, and control in accordance with the terms of United Nations treaties.

Dr. Clyde Eagleton also signed the statement of the Committee for Collective Security and is a member of the research affiliate of the American Association for the United Nations. Dr. Eagleton testified in the hearings on revision of the U. N. Charter before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in February 1950. In those hearings Dr. Eagleton said that the steps suggested in a resolution then under consideration moved "a surprisingly long way toward world government and yet they can be taken without need of revision of the Charter of the U. N., which, at the present moment, seems almost impossible." In other words, Dr. Eagleton was suggesting that we move toward world government through the United Nations by interpretation of its Charter. Dr. Eagleton also advocated the creation of a United Nations police force, another foundation stone in any world government plan, and he said "that the point he was making is that we could get that world government plan under the Charter of the United Nations. No amendment is necessary; no revision of the United Nations into a world government." Dr. Eagleton would naturally oppose any constitutional amendment designed to prevent world government by treaty, by executive agreement, or by strained interpretation of the United Nations Charter.

Also a member of the American Association for the United Nations and a member of the Committee for Collective Security is Mr. Dana C. Backus. Mr. Backus also testified in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1. Mr. Backus is one of the coauthors of a report of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York from which most of the erroneous charges concerning Senate Joint Resolution 1 have been drawn.

Judge James T. Brand, a sponsor of the Committee for Defense of the Constitution and a member of the Atlantic Union Committee, helped to circulate the fantastic charge that Senate Joint Resolution 1 as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee would require some treaties to be ratified by each of the 48 States. I take it that this argument has been so thoroughly discredited that we need not consider any of Judge Brand's other comments with reference to the resolution.

Mr. Frederick C. McKee, a member of the Atlantic Union Committee and of the Committee for Collective Security, also testified in 1950 at the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on revision of the United Nations Charter. Mr. McKee's contribution to the development of an enlightened foreign policy was the suggestion that the United Nations be given authority to supervise and to regulate contracts between American corporations and foreign countries to insure that the provisions of those contracts did not result in any exploitation of the foreign country. It is interesting to note that in the past several years the United Nations has adopted several resolutions condoning the practice of expropriation of business assets. In addition, article 1, paragraph 3 of the United Nations draft Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights provides:

> The right of peoples to self-determination shall also include permanent sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources. In no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence on the ground of any rights that may be claimed by other states.

What does that language mean? It has been claimed by the opponents of this amendment that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with reasonable care can predict the effect of any treaty under consideration. The article just quoted would appear to indicate, and has been so interpreted, as granting to any nation the right to confiscate any and all property within its boundaries regardless of the rights of foreign business enterprises.

Prof. Covey T. Oliver, who signed the statement by the Committee for Collective Security, testified in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1 for the American Association for the United Nations.

Prof. Myers S. McDougal signed the statement circulated by the Committee for Collective Security. In the record of hearings beginning at page 659 there will be found a brief prepared for the American Association for the United Nations in the Supreme Court case of Shelley against Kraemer. This brief was written by Professor McDougal along with Alger Hiss and four other lawyers. This brief takes the position that article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter does not recognize that the fundamental human rights of the American people are matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the

United States. Professor McDougal was also the author of a 252-page article in the Yale Law Journal in 1935 which attempted to prove that treaties and executive agreements are wholly interchangeable instruments of national policy. Professor McDougal reached this startling conclusion on the ground that the Constitution had been amended by usage and that amendment by usage was preferable to formal textual alteration.

Mr. William H. Hessler, a signer of the statement of the Committee for Collective Security, wrote an article several years ago in the Cincinnati Enquirer in which he contended that the U. N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights was a much better document than our own Declaration of Independence and our own Constitution.

I think enough has been said in answer to the request of the senior Senator from Wisconsin that I name those opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 who yearn for the domination of a suprastate and those who support the philosophy of world government. I do not contend that the senior Senator from Wisconsin is numbered among that group. I do know that many influential advisers of the President on this proposed constitutional amendment are included among those who oppose any treaty-control amendment because it would make the achievement of world or regional government more difficult.

Finally, I should like to give special attention to the views of Dr. Edward S. Corwin, who is national chairman of the misnamed Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power. Dr. Corwin, it should be noted, was one of the few distinguished students of constitutional law who supported President Roosevelt in his dangerous plan to pack the Supreme Court of the United States. In a speech given by Dr. Corwin at Johns Hopkins University and reported in the Baltimore Sun for March 6, 1937, Dr. Corwin said:

> The President was returned to power by a large majority. It seems to me he was given a mandate to continue the New Deal. How are we to get this different view of the Constitution? Some say a square and honest way is by a constitutional amendment.

But Dr. Corwin disagreed with the square and honest approach because it was too hazardous. He said:

> The proposed amendment could be rejected by its defeat in 13 States, containing less than one twenty-fifth of the population of the Nation. It also would be too slow a method.

Today, we find Dr. Corwin in the awkward position of saying that a square and honest change by constitutional amendment is actually an attack upon the Constitution and unwilling to trust that only 13 States will agree with his views.

Dr. Corwin is also an authority for the proposition that no constitutional amendment is necessary for United States participation in world or regional government. His views in this regard may be found in his book A Constitution of Powers in a Secular State.

Dr. Corwin's views with respect to the treatymaking power are also spelled out in the Annotation of the Constitution—Senate Document 170, 82d Congress—prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress with Dr. Corwin as editor. On page 430 Dr. Corwin points out that some people have contended that the treatymaking power could not be used to cede the territory of a State of the Union without the consent of the State. Dr. Corwin dismisses this alleged limitation on the treaty power "as resting on the unallowable idea that the United States is not as to its powers a territorial government but only the agent of the States." Thus, it would be possible under Dr. Corwin's theory, for the United States by treaty to transfer to some supranational government all the territory of all the States of the Union.

Also on page 430 Dr. Corwin discusses the contention that the treatymaking power could not permit an appeal being taken from the Supreme Court of the United States to an international tribunal. That was the contention of President Taft in connection with the Hague Convention in 1907 providing for an International Prize Court. President Taft objected on the ground that the treatymaking power could not transfer to a tribunal not recognized by the Constitution any part of the judicial power of the United States. As a result of President Taft's position, the United States was permitted to be a party to the treaty even though appeals from United States courts to an international court were not permitted. But, says Dr. Corwin, "President Taft's position was fallacious." If Dr. Corwin is correct as to the existing scope of the treatymaking power, it is entirely possible for all criminal and civil cases involving the rights of American citizens to be tried before international tribunals established by treaty.

Mr. President, I invite attention to another statement by Dr. Corwin in the article to which I referred a moment ago, which I believe to be illuminating as to his thought processes. This is what he had to say about the Supreme Court:

> History shows that each President has usually appointed three Justices during each administration. At times the Court would be increased to perhaps 16, but this gradual addition of men, who are in touch with the economic conditions and trends, would put things on a rational basis. It would keep the Court fairly contemporary.

Here is the important quotation:

> Today, the Supreme Court is not merely a judicial body. It is a superlegislature, under the form of a judicial body, and exercises the power of a legislature.

Mr. President, I do not believe the Congress of the United States or the people of the United States are ready to follow the leadership of this person, who seems to be and assumes to be an adviser on the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

NOTICE OF SPEECH BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about ready to move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday. A few minutes ago I was informed that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] wanted to make a statement on the floor relative to some remarks he desires to make on Monday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the majority leader for his consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the opening of the session on Monday I may have permission to address the Senate on a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to object if the subject is one of personal privilege. I do not know whether the Senator from Minnesota was in the Chamber when an order was entered for the consideration of bills on the calendar on Monday. Does the Senator from Minnesota have any idea as to the length of time he will take on his point of personal privilege, so I may be advised?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that my remarks will not take more than 45 minutes or an hour. I hope, however, there will be in the Chamber 1 or 2 other Senators who are interested in the subject. Therefore, I would say the matter would not take more than an hour and a half.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, since it is a matter of personal privilege, the Senator from Minnesota is entitled to speak at any time. However, is it his desire to speak before the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business?

Mr. HUMPHREY. As a matter of fact, I am not particularly interested that it be before the morning hour. I can speak immediately following the morning hour. I thought it would accommodate every Member of the Senate if we had a definite understanding about it, and I would prefer to speak as early as possible on Monday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If it would be agreeable to the Senator from Minnesota, I would prefer that the Senate have the customary morning hour which normally does not take more than 15 or 20 minutes—and I doubt very much that it will take much more time than that on Monday—and then have the Senate immediately proceed with the call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection. I know many Senators are planning on being in the Chamber during the call of the calendar and desire to leave immediately thereafter. So Senators who had made their arrangements before the Senator from Minnesota indicated he desired to speak on Monday would be confronted with somewhat of a problem.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in view of what the majority leader has stated, the junior Senator from Minnesota would greatly appreciate the privilege of coming to the Chamber at 12 o'clock noon, and immediately following the quorum call proceeding with his remarks. In view of the privilege accorded to Members of this body on a point of

personal privilege, I feel I must ask that I be granted the privilege of speaking immediately after the quorum call.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Considering the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota I would certainly not object and I do not object.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Minnesota will have the floor immediately after the Senate convenes on Monday?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I assume the Senator from Minnesota will have the floor immediately after the approval of the Journal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Immediately after the approval of the Journal and the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the approval of the Journal and the quorum call the Senator from Minnesota will have the floor. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISCHARGE OF INDEBTEDNESS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 96)

Mr. BRIDGES submitted a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$550,151,848"; and the Senate agree to the same.

STYLES BRIDGES,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
OAKLEY HUNTER,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
JOHN TABER,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRED MARSHALL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the previous order of the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 8, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 5 (legislative day of January 22), 1954:

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1956. (Reappointment.)

Philip K. Crowe, of Maryland, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ceylon, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Whiting Willauer, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Honduras.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

George Holmes Roderick, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Eugene James Lyons, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Laurence Ballard Robbins, of Illinois, to be Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Robert O. Boyd, of Oregon, to be a member, for the remainder of the term expiring February 1, 1954. Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Robert O. Boyd, of Oregon, to be a member, for the term expiring February 1, 1957. (Reappointment.)

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Laurence McKinley Gould, of Minnesota, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1956. Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Edward Steidle, of Pennsylvania, to be a member, for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 1955. Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS

Brig. Gen. Eugene Mead Caffey, O9329, Army of the United States, to be the Judge Advocate General of the Army, and as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army, and major general (temporary), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Kester Lovejoy Hastings, O12219, Army of the United States, to be the Quartermaster General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

REAPPOINTMENT, APPOINTMENT, OR APPOINTMENT BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of John H. Swenson and 510 other officers, which were received by the Senate on January 25, 1954, and which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on said date and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 25, 1954, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John H. Swenson, which appears on page 719, and ending with the name of Karl E. Wolf, which is shown on page 721.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of John A. Peterson, Jr., and 264 other officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 18, 1954, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John A. Peterson, Jr., which appears on page 373, and ending with the name of Marjory E. Winston, which is shown on page 374.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Adm. Richard L. Conolly, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral.

Adm. Joseph J. Clark, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Alfred M. Pride, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Arthur C. Davis, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Director, Office of Foreign Military Affairs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Rear Adm. John R. Perry, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Rear Adm. Frederick R. Furth, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

Lt. Gen. William O. Brice, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant general while serving as Assistant Commandant (Air) of the Marine Corps, Director of Aviation, Headquarters Marine Corps, and Assistant Chief of Naval Operations (Marine Aviation).

ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Walter W. Wensinger and 4,844 other officers for appointment in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 25, 1954, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Walter W. Wensinger, which appears on page 723, and ending with the name of Billy L. Whitley, which is shown on page 732.